



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

A
R E P L Y
TO
CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS
ON
THE BAMPTON LECTURES
OF THE YEAR 1815,

CONTAINED IN
THE BRITISH CRITIC
FOR DECEMBER 1816 AND JANUARY 1817,

IN
A LETTER TO THE HEAD OF A COLLEGE,

BY
REGINALD HEBER, A. M.

CANON OF ST. ASAPH; RECTOR OF HODNET, SALOP; AND
LATE FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD.

—◆—
OXFORD,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS FOR J. HATCHARD, PICCADILLY,
LONDON; SOLD ALSO BY J. PARKER, OXFORD.

1817.

(6)





MY DEAR SIR,

WHEN I first consigned my Bampton Lectures to the press, I neither expected that all my opinions would escape uncensured, nor desired that they should, any of them, be received without inquiry. I was aware that the view which I have taken of my general subject, though sanctioned by the name of Warburton, was neither the ancient nor the popular interpretation of our Saviour's promise; and that, in venturing, with whatever diffidence, to suggest a new solution of a difficult passage in Daniel, I must run the risk of being thought presumptuous or visionary. I flattered myself, however, that neither my intentions nor the tendency of my arguments could admit of a doubtful interpretation; that my offerings to the cause of orthodoxy would not be less useful or less favourably received because they were, to a certain extent, original; and that those who did not feel the force of my suggestions would, at least, allow them to be innocent.

In this hope I have been mistaken. In the *British Critic* for last December and January, I find my name held out as "having taken an injudicious view of Christianity through the medium of Rabbinical learning;" as assailing "the fundamental doctrines of the Faith;" as "interpreting Scripture on Unitarian principles;" as using "offensive language;" as "a sceptic," and at variance with "the declaration of conformity;" as a dealer in "sophisms" and "casuistical distinctions;" "making void the faith" of Christians; "a disciple of Volney and Tindal;" a

retailer of "blasphemies!!" and as having chosen a subject on which it was impossible to "be original "without becoming dangerous^a." Do you tremble, my dear Sir, for your friend; or do you wonder at the change which his opinions must have undergone, to expose him to such revolting charges? Your friend, be assured, is the same that you have hitherto known him, a sincere, though possibly an unskilful, advocate of the Church; and the greater part of the positions against which these invectives are levelled, are either such as he has never maintained at all, or such as were heard without alarm or astonishment by one of the most learned and orthodox congregations in the world.

To such charges, however, I need no excuse for attempting a reply. My name is too obscure, of itself to bid defiance to calumny. To leave my character to be defended by my friends might be prudent, but would hardly be generous; nor can they be expected to be very solicitous in repelling accusations to which I myself appear insensible. There are, at the same time, few greater misfortunes which can befall a clergyman, however private his rank, and his views however unambitious, than that a charge of heterodoxy should be affixed to his name, and that it should be suffered to remain unanswered. It is a charge which no blamelessness of life or correctness of doctrine can, thenceforward, entirely remove; inasmuch as the first is sometimes recognised in those whose religious opinions give us ample reason to regret their blindness or prejudice, and since the second will be often regarded as the stratagem of an enemy or the temporizing policy of a hypocrite. Time may, at length, do him justice, as it, some way or other, does justice to all.

^a Brit. Crit. vol. vi. pp. 652, 656, 658, 661, 664, 666; vol. vii. pp. 52, 57, 61, 67, 68, 73.

But his sphere of usefulness is in the meanwhile circumscribed; his peace of mind embittered; and those of his own order (with whom chiefly, as life advances, every man of every profession is most anxious to associate) either regard him with suspicion, or avoid him, lest they should be themselves suspected; while, the greater the love which he really feels for the Church, his pain must be the greater to find himself classed among her enemies.

I am compelled, then, however reluctantly, to entreat the attention of the world to myself and the charges brought against me, which, when separated from those flowers of rhetoric of which I have already given a specimen, may be reduced to the following articles.

I. That I have employed, in the illustration of my subject, injudicious and dangerous authorities.

II. That I have been guilty of a grammatical error in adducing the pronoun *ἐξἑνός* as a proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit.

III. That I have departed from the authority of Bishop Bull, in my observations on Justin Martyr.

IV. That I have entertained too favourable an opinion of the Platonic and Alexandrine theology.

V. That I have renounced "the authenticity of the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses."

VI. That I have not sufficiently distinguished between the authenticity of Scripture and the truth of the doctrines contained in it.

VII. That I have renounced those proofs of the Trinity on which the Church is accustomed to depend.

VIII. That I have brought forward doctrines concerning the archangels Michael and Gabriel, which are inconsistent with the Liturgy of the Church of England.

IX. That I have employed a sophism in my explanation of Christ's promise of the Paraclete.

X. That I have erroneously asserted Baptism and the Eucharist to have been ceremonies familiar to the ancient Jews.

XI. That I have erroneously applied the peculiar title of "Paraclete" not only to the immediate occasion of our Lord's departure, but to the subsequent protection of the Church by the same Holy Spirit of God.

XII. That I have grievously erred in supposing the ordinary and sanctifying graces of the Spirit to extend to Jews and heathens.

XIII. That I have deprived the Christian sacraments of their due honour.

XIV. That I have given a false explanation of 1 Cor. xiii, 12.

XV. That I have supposed the *abode* of the Comforter to be equally proved by his absence or his presence.

XVI. That I have made dangerous concessions with regard to the inspiration of Scripture.

In collecting these imputations against me, I have not wilfully or knowingly omitted or misstated any. There are many of them, indeed, which, of themselves, would not have demanded a reply. But, as I have entered the lists, I will decline no part of the contest; but begin, without further preface, on the first of this formidable array.

I. The first allegation is advanced by my censor as the prominent and pervading fault of my whole unfortunate volume. As *he* has stated it, indeed, it wears at first sight a more formidable character than I have myself ascribed to it; since his "strongest objection" to my Lectures "is the view which" I have "taken of *Christianity*, through the medium of Rabbinical learning." As, however, he advances no examples in support of this very serious and sweeping charge; as, of those tenets which he imputes to me as erroneous,

three only, the seventh, the ninth, and the fourteenth, have any connection with Rabbinical authorities; as even these can, by no fairness of construction, be supposed to affect *Christianity* in general, and as all the Reviewer's arguments are levelled, not only against an *improper use* of Rabbinical learning, but against its application in any way whatever to the explication or illustration of Scripture; I am compelled to conclude, that, even where he assents to the consequences thus elicited, he is offended with the mode of proof, and that the sword of Goliath is not, in his opinion, to be wielded, even in defence of the people of God.

That I am not without precedents for this mode of warfare, the Reviewer is probably aware. Whatever disgust my numerous citations have given him, he must have felt it in an equal degree when consulting the labours of Hammond, Lightfoot, Kidder, Prideaux, Patrick, and Wetstein. "To the valuable collections of Allix and Lardner," he tells us, he has "been ever forward in offering the merited tribute of his praise." Yet it is certain that these collections are, in a great degree, derived from the same authors, and employed in reference to similar objects with mine; nor is it easy to discover the reason of the distinction thus made between us, unless it be that both those eminent persons are no longer susceptible of censure.

To qualify himself, however, for the task of reviewing my Lectures, this Gentleman has, for the first time in his life, and, apparently, at very short notice, undertaken the laborious and not very inviting study "of the more abstruse and recondite parts of Rabbinical learning." The industry was, doubtless, great, which supported him in such an exertion; and the courage (I may be allowed to say) is greater still, which, after a few months thus partially occupied in a new course of

reading, is not afraid to decide "with confidence" on the utter demerit of some of the most voluminous and difficult writings in existence.

The fruit, however, of his inquiries, so far as he has imparted it to the world, does not possess that novelty which is amongst the sweetest rewards of labour. His statement, thus magnificently announced, contains no more information than he might have obtained from the commonest compendium of Jewish history, or from a single article in Calmet. He tells us only, that the *Mischna* was composed in the third century after Christ; that the oldest Cabbalistic work which exists is attributed to Akiba, a contemporary of Hadrian; that the *Gemara* was finally completed in its present form about the year 506; that it abounds in preposterous legends, and affects to deduce its traditionary secret from a very high and fabulous antiquity; and that the Jewish doctors of that, as of every other age, were very far from desiring to advance the cause of Christianity.

To this elaborate statement I am inclined to make no objection. But that it is exceedingly irrelevant to the merits or demerits of my work, and to the only use which I have made of the Rabbinical writings, the following observations will, I trust, sufficiently demonstrate.

In the first place it will be readily admitted that the doctrine of the Rabbins, as such, is by no means obligatory on Christians; and that their dicta are only so far entitled to our attention, as they confirm or coincide with a probable sense of Scripture. But I challenge the man who thinks worst of me and wishes me worst, to bring forward any instance in which I have believed the Rabbins rather than the word of God, or have advanced any religious opinion on their sole authority, or for which a reason, such as the Reviewer himself would allow to be "specious," was not, at the same

time, advanced from Scripture. I could, on the other hand, bring forward several instances in which I have rejected, and, on scriptural grounds, have laboured to confute opinions, in support of which the Rabbins are pretty nearly unanimous, and which, from them alone, though the obligation has not been sufficiently acknowledged, have become generally current among Christians. But, though I disclaim the character of a blind and implicit believer in Jewish tradition, yet, surely, those doctrines which are, in themselves, consistent with Scripture, do not become less likely to be true, when they are found conformable to the received and ancient opinions of those to whose ancestors the Old Testament was peculiarly committed, and the New first preached;—our Lord's own kindred according to the flesh; who speak the same language and observe the same outward form of worship with himself and his disciples. If, then, I have employed the Jewish Rabbins as commentators on their own Scriptures, or as means of illustrating ours, I have done no more than I was justified in doing, both by the reason of the case itself and the example of innumerable learned men; no more than has been done by the Apostles in their quotations of the Book of Enoch and the Phetirah Moscheh^b; nor than this very Reviewer has practised in the present article, when he attempts to illustrate 1 Thess. v, 23, by a singularly unfortunate reference to Maimonides^c,

But, if their writings may be thus lawfully and usefully employed for the general purposes of illustration and commentary, their application to the leading object for which I have called in their aid, is still more efficacious and reasonable.

^b Jude, 9—14.

^c Brit. Crit. vol. vi. p. 658, note.

In discussing the personality of the Holy Ghost, (to which attempt a considerable part of my Lectures is devoted,) it was obviously desirable to ascertain the previous opinion of those who were our Saviour's auditors. It is to be presumed that he spoke with an intention of being understood, and that he would not have communicated his promise in terms which, according to their usual and conventional meaning, must have conveyed a false impression. And, as it is probable that our Lord's hearers had no different ideas of the Holy Ghost from those which were entertained by the majority of their countrymen, no better way could be suggested to obtain the meaning of this term, than a reference to those Jewish writers who have the greatest authority with their sect, and who lived nearest to the time of our Saviour.

Nor will the Reviewer obtain any advantage by retorting, that I should have confined myself, in this case, to the limits of the original Mischna, between which and the Gemara he makes a distinction, which (though no Jew will assent to it, and though he carries it beyond all reasonable bounds) I have now no leisure to combat. But, admitting this difference in their authority, yet, judging the Gemara on its own merits, it is evident that his objections will not affect the purpose for which I have referred to that collection. Those objections are, first, that the date of its composition is too modern; secondly, that its compilers were actuated by the bitterest hostility to our Faith; and, thirdly, that their mode of reasoning is singularly weak and fanciful, and their pages filled with improbable fables.

The two first of these (the third I will consider presently) are very strange objections from one who has himself, repeatedly and with much exultation, referred

to the works of Maimonides, an author who flourished above six hundred years posterior to the latest of the Rabbins of the Gemara, and whose opposition to Christianity has been seldom surpassed or equalled. But I might also reply with reason, that, to whatever date these compositions are referred, they are, nevertheless, the oldest works from which any information on the subject of my inquiry could be anticipated. Josephus, as writing for foreigners and in a foreign language, has entered very little into the minutiae of Jewish Theology. Philo has written in so mystical a style, that it is seldom easy to do more than guess at his real opinions; and he at no time, that we know of, enjoyed any general reputation with his countrymen. The Mischna, which is nothing more than the canon law of the Jews, is almost entirely occupied in the discussion of legal impurity, of sabbath-breaking, of rites and ceremonies. The Gemara alone, which discusses with a superstitious refinement the minutest expressions of the law, and which is filled with anecdotes, prayers, and moral and doctrinal apophthegms of the leading members of the synagogue, from Nicodemus and Gamaliel down to Rabbi Samuel, is a work where we should reasonably look for examples of the manner in which those persons spoke of spirits in general, as well as of that particular spirit whom they designated as Holy and Divine.

If, then, I am censured for resorting to writers who lived some centuries after Christ, to ascertain the sense in which Christ's contemporaries understood a scriptural expression, I might answer, in justification of myself, that I have sought for information where alone it was to be found; that I have furnished the most ancient opinions on the subject which could now be recovered; and that I am not to blame, that no better

evidences have survived the lapse of ages and the calamities of the Jewish nation.

But, further, it is apparent, from the statement of the Reviewer himself, as well as from the best historical evidence of which the case is capable, that the Gemara is by no means so modern a compilation as to render it incompetent evidence of the opinions of the ancient synagogue. Even if its authority rested solely on Rabbi Ase of Babylon and his pupils, between the years 400 and 506, we have still an antiquity little if at all inferior to some of the most eminent Greek and Latin Fathers, whose weight, in an argument of Christian antiquity, the Reviewer would not treat thus contemptuously. Nor is this all. The Gemara is a compilation, made by professed and laborious casuists, of the written and traditional opinions of those by whose comment, as declaratory of the law, the synagogue had long been governed; of the contemporaries of Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian; Akiba and Meir, and Simeon the son of Jochai. We have no reason to suppose that the compilers of the Gemara had either the power or the inclination to impose their own inventions on their countrymen, as the precedents established and dicta bequeathed by these elder and more illustrious Rabbins, any more than we have to suspect that Plutarch forged the *Placita Philosophorum*, or that the fragments of more ancient and now lost writers in Irenæus and Epiphanius were mere impositions on the Church. And if such a *Bibliotheca Patrum* had been commenced by Jerome in the beginning of the fifth, and completed by the Monks of Bethlehem in the beginning of the sixth century, it is apparent that it would have been by no means despised by those who desired to know the doctrine even of the primitive Christians. And, though the Reviewer's ob-

jection might be used with some probability, if the Jews had been likely to borrow from the Christians, or if the opinion to prove which I called in their aid was *adverse* to the general sense of the Christian Church; yet it is, in the present instance, actually neutralized by the second objection, which relates to their inveterate hostility to the Christian name, and evinces that, far from desiring to *assimilate* their faith to ours, they were disposed to *recede* from it as widely as possible.

For if assertions are found in the Talmud approaching to those which on similar subjects an orthodox Christian would employ, as it is plain that neither the one nor the other party would ever copy from their enemies, we can only account for this similarity by supposing, either that both parties have affixed the same sense to the same passages of the Old Testament, or that the opinions of both are derived from that ancient Jewish Church whose privileges and spiritual gifts were transferred to the Gentiles; but of whom the Rabbins of Tiberias and Babylon were the natural, though outcast, offspring.

That even the former of these suppositions would be a considerable accession of strength to the orthodox cause, the Reviewer will not, I think, deny. But that this alone will not suffice to account for the similarity, is plain from the former part of my antagonist's third objection;—that the Rabbins adopted a very inconsequent style of reasoning, and were accustomed to deduce the doctrines in question from Scripture through the refinements of "Gematria," and the fancied powers of the Hebrew alphabet.

For, the fact being allowed, that such doctrines were professed by the synagogue; the similarity being too great to arise from *chance*, and *copying* being out of the

question ; we should still inquire from what source these Jews obtained them ? Their method of arguing from Scripture, as we have seen, was too imperfect to give much hope of their arriving at truth by such a process. There is no mysterious sympathy between the Apostles' Creed and the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, which could approximate to the one the conclusions derived from the other. But it is as possible and as usual to set about proving an established truth by a new and foolish method, as it is to adopt a new and foolish method of reasoning, and to let it carry us where it will. And the very correspondence in these doctrines between Christians and Jews, no less than the uniform opinion of the latter, that they were not innovations of Akiba and his disciples, are convincing arguments that the refinements of the Cabbala might be, indeed, adscititious, but that the doctrines in question were both known and received by their synagogue long before the school of Tiberias attempted their elucidation by comparing the powers of letters and numerals, and distorting into mystery some of the plainest passages in Scripture.

And this, if I understand him rightly, my Reviewer himself does not deny. He is ready enough to account for the imperfect traces of a Trinitarian faith in the Cabbala and the Rabbins, by the supposition that these were relics of their ancient and national confession^d, though he forbids me to urge this similarity as an argument against the Socinians. He is willing himself to argue, that the Jewish Church, in the time of our Lord, believed in the personality of God's Spirit, and that therefore Rabbi Akiba was also compelled to acknowledge it ; but he cries out Cabbalist and Legen-

^d Brit. Crit. ubi sup. p. 651.

dary when I *reverse* the argument; though, by thus doing, I apply it in the only manner which can do good to either Jew or Gentile. It yet remains to be seen in what manner and with what success he would himself conduct a controversy.

Nor is the authority of the Rabbins less applicable to the purpose for which I have employed them, though I admit, as in my work I have often expressly admitted, that their arguments are weak, and that their writings abound in fable.

If we are to renounce the authority of every ancient writer who is liable to these objections, it is plain that our ecclesiastical studies would be reduced within a narrow compass, and that the exclusion would apply to many authors whom this Reviewer, I trust, is little disposed to undervalue. The venerable fragment which bears the name of Barnabas, is allowed to be an exposition of Scripture little less weak or mystical in some parts than the wildest comments of the Talmud. St. Clement records as a fact the natural history of the phœnix; Hermas is a Platonist; Justin trifles strangely about the derivation of the word "Satan;" Clemens Alexandrinus and Jerome are equally fond of an internal and figurative sense in the historical parts of Scripture; and the tales of Antony and Hilarion, as recorded by the latter, are neither more probable nor more ingenious than the miracles of Rabbi Chanina. But, as evidences of the contemporary faith and existing tradition of their brethren, all these have kept, and always must keep, their weight with candid men; and we should no more think of disbelieving their testimony on points where they were likely to be well-informed, because on others they were apparently credulous, than we should fling Livy to the moths, because he has filled his book with prodigies.

But the Jews, we are told, are a crafty and insidious people—"Timeo Danaos." "When the confession of an enemy is not indirectly elicited, but *obtrusively advanced*, prudence seems to dictate that it should be regarded with suspicion. He must be but an unsafe advocate of a cause, who is so little aware of the arts by which he may be overreached, that he remains to be informed of the *very ample concessions* which may be made *by an opponent*, as lures to secure some great though distant advantages^e."

If I had not good reason to suppose that my Reviewer is in serious earnest, I should have regarded this passage as a banter only; so marvellous is the ignorance of facts which it displays, and its reasoning so strangely inconsequent. The expressions in the Talmud which accord with the orthodox faith are almost invariably *indirect* and *incidental*. They were so far from being *obtrusively advanced* on the notice of Christians, that many ages elapsed before Christians were informed of their existence. In the works which contain them, the Christians are rarely mentioned; they cannot, therefore, deserve the character of concessions made in controversy; and it would puzzle the ingenuity of a whole Sanhedrim to discover what "*great though distant advantages*" could arise to their cause, from furnishing their antagonists with arguments in favour of Christianity. Let it be granted however, as this learned gentleman contends, that Rabbi Akiba, in his hatred to the Gospel, effected an insidious change in the opinions of the synagogue; let it be granted, that his system of the Cabbala was intended to "*super-*" "*sede*" a faith in the Trinity; would he have attempted this (does the Reviewer suppose?) by contriving that

^e Brit. Crit. ubi sup. p. 651.

the synagogue should approach *nearer* to Christianity than before; or would he not rather retain as *few as possible* of those traditions and expressions which inclined to the obnoxious system? If any, then, remain, which favour the Christian cause, is it not plain, on the Reviewer's own principle, that they can only have stood their ground, as being too well known and too generally recognised to be controverted or passed over in silence? When we pass through a dismantled city, we of necessity conclude that its vestiges of ancient grandeur are inferior both in number and importance to those glories which must have met the eye, when its columns stood erect, and its minarets sparkled in the sunshine: and its remains, however scanty, are the more valued by the traveller, in proportion to the devastation which it has sustained, and the ages which have elapsed since its ruin. After all, then, we must come back to that conclusion which the Reviewer is so anxious to weaken or qualify; that, "the confession of an enemy is the strongest evidence of the truth." Nor can I regret having drawn reinforcements to orthodoxy from quarters which were supposed to be most completely in the adversary's occupation, though the return which I meet with from those who profess the fiercest zeal for God's house is a caution against insidious concessions, and a hint that my own views of Christianity are unfortunately tinged with Rabbinism. We know who they were who would not believe that any good could proceed from Galilee; and surely, they who will not receive the testimony of the school of Tiberias, even in favour of the Christian faith, are less fond of truth than hostile to novelty, and more willing that the temple should fall, than that it should be strengthened in an unusual manner.

II. The second objection is to the stress which I

have laid on the masculine pronoun ἐκεῖνος, as implying the personality of God's Spirit. Lect. ii. p. 59. *Brit. Crit. ubi sup.* p. 652. I still think, and so do others better acquainted with the niceties of the language than I am, that this is justified by that part of my argument which the Reviewer *forgot* to mention; the recurrence, namely, of ἐκεῖνος in the 13th verse of the same chapter of St. John, in conjunction with the neuter πνεῦμα. Nor, even in the instance which he has selected, is the masculine pronoun to be disregarded as evidence, when we recollect the care which Plato took, on a similar occasion, to distinguish *a thing* from *a person*. We read, in the Apology of Socrates, ὅτι μοι θεῖόν τι καὶ δαιμόνιον γίνεται φωνή. And, if the Paraclete had been (like a voice) nothing more than a *modus operandi*, or physical motion of the air, it is probable, that, in so important a document as that before us, both our Lord and his historians would have observed a similar accuracy.

If the Reviewer's observations on "the sex of the Paraclete" are meant for wit, it is wit very strangely misapplied, and on which I may well be excused from commenting. But the ostentatious trifling which follows, as to "the synonymes of the word *person*," may demand some little examination, since nothing but an ignorance of the Hebrew, very remarkably at variance with his boast of having studied the Rabbins, could have led him to suppose that גוף was such a synonyme.

To you, my dear Sir, it is well known that גוף is not "*person*" in that sense in which only the word can be applied to the Spirit of God, but "carcase," "body," matter," or "substance." Thus the men of Jabesh Gilead took the *body*, or *carcase* (גופת) of Saul to bury it in Jabesh. (1 Chron. x, 12.) The manumitted servant (Exod. xxi, 3.) was to be set free *corporally*, (בגפר,) or perhaps *naked*; (a Spaniard would say, *in cuerpo*, and the Rab-

bins understand the passage to mean, *without such clothes as his master might have furnished during the time of his servitude.*) The Israelites are described in the Schemoth Rabba, §. 15. fol. 113. 2. as “overpowered “by the evil lust which dwelleth in their body,” (בגופן). Rabbi Tzebid (Schekalim, fol. 6. 3.) “celebrated a “marriage *bodily* (גרפיה) on the sabbath,” (that is, *παρῶν ἐν σῶματι*, not merely by letters of permission.) “A false *matter*” (גרופה) is spoken of, Macoth, fol. 5. 1. and the Paschal Lamb, according to Schöttgen, is habitually called גופו של פסח. Unless, then, the Reviewer is prepared to maintain that there are *three bodies* in God’s nature, or, in express contradiction to the Catholic Church, to divide the *substance* of the Trinity, I would advise him, in future, to adhere to the usual word פנים, when he desires to express *person* in Hebrew.

III. The next point urged against me is, that “in my “observations on Justin Martyr I have departed from “the authority of Bishop Bull.” This charge, I confess, surprised me. There is one instance, indeed, and only one, where I have in the slightest degree varied from that Prelate’s expressed opinion, and that is in the translation of the word ταῦτα. The Bishop renders the words of Justin in his Dialogue with Trypho,—*ἃ δ’ ἂν πλείστοι ταῦτά μοι δοξάσαντες εἴποιεν*, “*Neque sane plerique “eadem mecum sentientes, illud dixerint.*” My version is, “*Nec multi, sane, hæc mihi, opinione ducti, dixerint* ^f.” This translation of mine, the Reviewer says, “he will “not at present object to.” My objection to the Bishop’s version I am not afraid of stating.

^f I do not mean to contend that no part of this translation is susceptible of alteration or improvement. It is possible, that *πλείστοι* would be more accurately translated “*plerique*,” than “*multi*.” But these differences have no bearing on that charge which the Reviewer attempts to ground on them.

The word respecting which we differ is written with a circumflex in all the editions of Justin which I had then met with; and it is so written in Bishop Bull's own citation. But is it necessary to inform my critic, that *ταῦτα* and *ταύτα* are words of very different meaning, and that the former is not *eadem* but *hæc*? Is it not "safe to depart" from the authority of Bishop Bull even in cases of obvious inaccuracy? or, is not more care required in me than was in him, in proportion as I have not the same commanding talent and learning to atone for trifling errors §?

But how, in the name of common sense and common honesty, can the Reviewer, from a discrepancy of this kind, (and I repeat again, that between Bishop Bull and myself there is no other,) deduce such an accusation as follows?

"Without objecting at present to Mr. Heber's translation of the passage of Justin, we must for ourselves protest against the consequence which his exposition involves: that the Syrian Martyr, unsolicited by the occasion, would have professed his disposition to run counter to the common sentence of the Church. If the ingenious writer before us review the context of Justin, we are convinced he will not need a reference to the exposition of Bishop Bull, or any exertion of his natural sagacity, to perceive that his insinuation is not supported by his author's text. The 'human doctrines,' which Justin Martyr under the common term, 'we are commanded,' represents the great body of Christians and himself as disclaiming, in order to follow the doctrine of 'Christ and the prophets,' were merely those notions which the Ebionites held in com-

§ The Paris edition, I have since found, reads *ταύτα*. But, even if I had known this, I should certainly not have thought it wise to depart without reason (for the effect on the sentence is immaterial either way) from Thirlby, Stephens, and the Editor of Bishop Bull's own work.

“ mon with his opponent Trypho, relative to the person
 “ of Christ. Such is the *decision* of that admirable
 “ person to whom we have already referred, from whose
 “ sentence we have seldom found it safe to depart.”
Brit. Crit. ubi sup. p. 654.

To what “ decision” of Bishop Bull’s this Gentleman alludes, my “ natural sagacity” has been, as yet, unable to discover. I was not aware that any dispute had arisen as to the meaning of the particular words ἀνθρώπινα διδάγματα, nor that Justin could be thought to have any other purpose in view, than to give a reason why the Church could neither profess nor admit the opinions for which Trypho contended. But where have I said, or from what part of my exposition does the “ *consequence*” follow, that Justin “ professed his disposition to run counter to the sentence of the Church?” Does not, on the contrary, my whole chain of argument conduct to the conclusion, that the great body of the Church *agreed* with him on the subject of Christ’s divinity, and that *not many* would either profess or accord with the peculiar opinions of Ebion? I have said, indeed, (p. 107,) that the consequence which the Reviewer imputes to me would follow from that exposition of Justin’s words which is usually adopted by *the Socinians*; and I have shewn that, even on their own principles, such a consequence would be little to their advantage. But if the Reviewer has ever read what immediately follows respecting Thirlby and Waterland, he *must have seen* that this is not *my* exposition, but *that which I have laboured to overturn*. He *must have seen*, that, so far from “ *insinuating*” that Justin and the Church either then were, or were ever likely to be, at variance, I have concluded that “ the words, which “ have been *sometimes supposed* to be the reason given “ by the Syrian Martyr for dissenting from the usual “ doctrine of the Church, are, *in truth*, no other than

“ the reason why *the universal Church* were so earnest
 “ to inculcate those opinions which were a stumbling-
 “ block in the way of Trypho’s conversion, but which,
 “ as received from the Deity himself, their principles
 “ would neither allow them to suppress or compromise.
 “ Ἐπειδὴ ἐκ ἀνθρωπείοις διδάγμασι κεκελεύσμεθα κ. τ. λ.”

If Bishop Bull has expressed himself in a manner at variance with this exposition, I shall be glad to know where the passage is to be found. I am sure that no difference is discoverable between my statement and the doctrine which he holds in those sections, whither the Reviewer refers me; and as, to use his own civil language, I “ cannot suspect the latter of fabricating an authority to support a point^h,” I am constrained to believe either that his intimacy with his “ old favourite” Bishop Bull has been long interrupted, or that he has read the *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ* with no greater care than he has, apparently, bestowed on my unfortunate Lectures.

But am I to understand that my censor conceives even the contemplated event of the majority of the Church denying our Lord’s divinity to be “ an occasion” which does not call for a professed resolution to “ run counter to their sentence?” When Athanasius was fighting almost singlehanded against an erring world, would this zealous person have calmly submitted to the sentence of the more numerous party? This is, indeed, a prudent determination in those who, like some other writers in the *British Critic*, are continually foreboding dangers and disasters to our Establishment; but it is a faith which has found few public professors except the venerable vicar of Bray, and it is one to which Justin Martyr was, I will confidently assert, a stranger.

IV. The fourth objection is, that I have entertained

^h *Brit. Crit.* vol. vii, p. 59.

too favourable an opinion of the Platonic and Alexandrine Theology. And of this partiality three instances are given; first, that I have “admitted a similarity” between the Theology of Plato and the Gospel; secondly, that I have described it as “perhaps a vulgar error to suppose, that the Platonists, or their Alexandrine successors, assigned the name of Deity to any thing evil or material.” Thirdly, that I have myself adopted and inculcated the notions of Plato, in a point which “affects no matter of speculative opinion, but the fundamental doctrines of the Faith,” in the point, namely, of secondary or animal souls.

How little justice there is in any of these objections, I shall now proceed to shew.

From the Reviewer’s preliminary observations, I find that he has himself, some time since, given an answer to that hypothesis of our adversaries which deduces the doctrine of the Trinity from the intermixture of Platonic tenets with Christianity, and that he has gone much farther than I have done, in his denial of that similarity which has been supposed to exist between the Christian and Academic Theology. It is, doubtless, very natural that he should prefer his own view of the subject to mine; but it is a little too much to misrepresent this last as admitting, without restriction, the similarity between Platonism and orthodoxy, and advancing no other argument than Apostolic tradition to render it improbable that the Christians were the borrowersⁱ.

ⁱ “On the former subject we stand committed, having disputed that the similarity asserted to exist between the Platonic opinions and Catholic Faith had any foundation in reality, and having undertaken to prove, that the converts of the Church were so far from following the disciples of the Academy, that *they* (quære, *the Christians?*) lived in irreconcilable enmity among *themselves*. While our Author, *admitting the similarity*, proceeds *merely* to reduce it to a case of the ‘highest improbability,’

Those who have only judged of my work through the medium of this statement will be surprised to learn, that, through a very large proportion of my third Lecture, I am occupied in proving that the Platonists had neither power nor inclination to disseminate their opinions widely in the Church ; that the leading and more conspicuous tenets of the Academy were of a character utterly opposed to orthodox Christianity ; that the general spirit of the sect was antichristian ; that those who were converted, for the most part, joined the heretics ; that “ the small number of philosophers who embraced “ the Catholic Faith were rather orthodox in spite of “ their Platonism, than conducted by Platonism to orthodoxy ;” and that, even of these last, “ the allegiance was, at no time, free from suspicion with the “ more rigid and less learned believers^k.” If the Reviewer had not read this argument, he was incompetent to judge of my work or to pass censure on it. If he had, I know only *one* name to which that man exposed himself, who, with these passages before his eyes, could treat me as the apologist of Platonism, or assert, *in general terms*, that I “ admitted the similarity” between “ the Platonic opinions and the Catholic Faith.”

The single admission which I have really made, I am not afraid to repeat or to maintain : it is as follows.

“ That a doctrine, however, may be found in the “ works of Plato which bears a resemblance, *though an* “ *imperfect one*, to the Catholic Faith of one Divine “ Being displayed in three hypostases, is a truth acknowledged by all. And though the above considerations may prove, that the Christians *cannot* have borrowed it from the Academy, the Socinians may do “ that the Christians should have been borrowers ; as they ever regarded “ the Apostles as the founders of their Faith, and have acknowledged no “ interruption in the ecclesiastical tradition.” p. 654.

* Bampton Lectures, p. 131—144.

“ well to reflect, whether that opinion, which was
 “ espoused by the deepest thinkers of the ancient world,
 “ can be in itself so repugnant to natural reason or
 “ natural religion as its opponents would have us be-
 “ lieve !.”

I need not, my dear Sir, observe to you, how far this admission falls short of the claims of Cudworth, Ridley, and Horsley. Nor do I think that, thus qualified, and taken together with my previous argument, it is materially at variance with the conclusions of Basnage himself. Sure I am, that, in admitting some degree of similarity between the Platonic and the Christian Trinity, I am countenanced by the strongest assertions and common consent of those who were of all men most likely to be well informed on the subject, the ancient Christian Fathers, and even those Platonists who rejected Christianity. The former did not, indeed, (as this Reviewer most falsely and injuriously imputes to Origen,) regard Plato as the fountain to whom they “ traced” their opinions^m, but, while they took a very

^l Lectures, p. 144.

^m “ Origen has himself virtually admitted the charge, (of Platonism,) by tracing to Plato the Trinitarian doctrines which the primitive Christians are supposed to have imbibed in the philosophic school.” *Brit. Crit.* 655. And in the margin we find the following reference. “ Origen contr. Cels. lib. vi. p. 308. ed. Spencer.” Will it be believed, that, in the page thus referred to, Origen is actually employed in *answering an objection of Celsus*; “ That the Christian notion of the Son of God was a perverted imitation of what the ancient philosophers had said concerning the world,” and that he confutes him by urging that “ *the Christians derived their faith on this subject, from an authority far more ancient than the oldest Greek philosophers,*” from “ *Moses,*” namely, “ *and the prophets.*” Ὡς ἔφη δὴ [Κέλσος] Τὸν Θεῦ ἡμᾶς λέγειν, παραποιήσαντας τὰ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου, ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ γινομένου, καὶ Τίῳ ὄντος αὐτοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ. Οὐ γὰρ ἰδυνήθη ἰπιστήσας τοῖς χρόνοις Μωσίου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἰδεῖν, ὅτι καθόλου τὸ εἶναι τινα Τὸν Θεῦ, παρὰ Ἑλλήνων, καὶ ὧν φησὶν ὁ Κέλσος παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν, οἱ παρὰ Ἰουδαίους Προφήται προσηφάνισαν. This the Reviewer calls “ tracing to Plato the Trinitarian doctrine;” and supposing “ the primitive Christians to have

different way of accounting for the similarity, they perceived and insisted on it most strongly. On the other hand, the praises bestowed, by the Pagan Amelius and the other Platonist mentioned by St. Augustine, on the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, as they are familiar to all the readers of Cudworth, so they sufficiently prove that the feelings of both parties were the sameⁿ. That too great a stress has been often laid on the points of similarity between them, I have, in my Lectures, explicitly allowed. But that so many on both sides could be mistaken in supposing a likeness where there was absolutely no likeness at all, neither Basnage, nor Baltus, nor this learned Gentleman, will be easily able to convince me.

The second point on which we differ is, that I have doubted whether it be not a vulgar error to suppose that the Platonists ascribed the name or characteristics of Deity to any thing evil or material. "If we," says the Reviewer, "have inadvertently adopted this vulgar error, "it must be confessed we have adopted it with asso-

"imbibed it in the philosophic school." And this is the man who taxes me with "superficial inquiry," and who calls on me "to give a good account where I met with" my citations!

ⁿ *Just. Martyr. Ap. I.* Οὐχ ὅτι ἀλλότριά ἐστι τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκ ἑστὶ πάντη ὁμοία. *Id. Ap. II.* Καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι Τιμαίῳ φυσιολογούμενον περὶ τῷ Τιῷ τῷ Θεῷ,—παρὰ Μωσίου λαβὼν ὁμοίως εἶπεν. *Clem. Alex. Pæd. l. ii. c. 1. ad fin.* Πλάτων, τὸ ἵνασμα τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας ζωπυρῶν. *Id. Strom. i. p. 274. Ed. Par.* Ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος Πλάτων. *Id. v. p. 598.* "Ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ ἅν ἴσῃ, [ὁ Πλάτων,] Περὶ τὸν πάντων, κ. τ. λ. ἐκ ἄλλως ἔγωγε ἱξακῶ, ἢ τὴν Ἀγίαν Τριάδα μνηύσθαι. *August. Civ. Dei, xi. §. 25.* Plato—cui neque Naturarum omnium Autor nisi Deus visus est, neque intelligentiæ Dator, neque amoris quo bene beateque vivatur, Inspirator. See also his still stronger expressions, *Confess. VII. §§. 9, 20. viii. §. 2, &c. &c.* The number of similar testimonies might be swelled almost *ad infinitum*. The corresponding assertions of Amelius and Augustine's Platonist may be found, *Euseb. Præp. Eῶan. xi. p. 517. Ed. Steph. Aug. Civ. Dei, x. 29. and Cudworth, Int. Sys. I. iv. 628.*

“ciates of no vulgar name. Not to insist on the evidence of Proclus, quoted by M. Baltus, which will not be easily set aside; such appears to have been the opinion of Cicero, and, if we may follow his authority, such the opinion of Plato himself. ‘Idem (Plato) et in Timæo et in Legibus et mundum Deum esse, et cœlum, et astra, et terram, et animos, et eos quos majorum institutis accepimus.’ “If we,” he continues, “at all understand this passage, it not only proves, that Plato ascribed the name of Deity to matter, but that he accounted every thing material to be God. And we here pledge ourselves to prove, by documents aduced from the Chinese, Sanscrit, Persian, and Arabic, that this representation alone accords with the true state of that ancient philosophy which prevailed from Peking to Alexandria, and which it is notorious was derived to Plato from an oriental source.”

On this statement I will shortly premise, first, that “the doubt,” which I have expressed, as I trust in sufficiently modest language, was unquestionably justified, even by the Reviewer’s own subsequent acknowledgment, that “highly respectable authority may be quoted on either side.” Nor is the question doubtful only; but, so far as my work is concerned, altogether immaterial, inasmuch as my “doubt” is only incidentally and in common candour stated, in the midst of a discussion in which I am not *defending* the Academy, but insisting that, whether this charge against them were true or false, their opinions as to the material principle were of a nature less conformable to religion or to reason than even Polytheism itself. So that nothing but mere captiousness could have induced the Reviewer to speak of this as “the main point” at issue between

• Brit. Crit. p. 656.

† Lectures, pp. 137, 138, et seqq.

us; in the same manner as nothing but ignorance of the commonest language of the schools could have induced him to take offence at the term, "vulgar error." Secondly, I defy any one to guess, from the vagueness of his charge, whether it is Pantheism or a belief in two opposite Gods which he would impute to Plato. It is pretty evident, indeed, from his language, both in this place and when speaking of the heathen objects of worship⁹, that he has no definite ideas on the subject at all, but confounds three distinct systems together, of which one only can be properly accused of "confounding nature "with nature's God," or "ascribing the name of God "to every thing material."

There are three senses, in which only men have given or can give the name of God either to nature in general, or to those natural objects which are enumerated in the Reviewer's quotation from Cicero.

First, they may suppose, as Anaximander and Spinoza did, that there is no God besides the Universe, or, in other words, that God is only a generic and inclusive term for all existing things. And this is atheism and nothing else; for universal nature is nothing and nobody; it is an aggregate of individuals, not an individual itself; a common name, and nothing more, by which we describe our fields, our neighbours, our oxen, and ourselves. Nor is the system improved by defining God to be a plastic and vital principle, by which all nature is animated and pervaded. For, if the definition goes no farther, it is plain that this is not an individual but a quality, like attraction, or love, or hunger, in the possession of which many individuals agree, and by which those individuals are enabled or induced to perform certain particular actions. Disguise and adorn it as we may, it is still an

⁹ Brit. Crit. vol. vii. p. 62, 63.

abstract term, or a personification only, and, in his heart, if not with his mouth, the fool who holds it says, "There is no God."

But, secondly, there have been and now are those who give the name of God to the universe at large, and the natural objects which this term comprises; because they believe that all things have proceeded from God by emanation; and that they are all therefore of the same simple nature and substance with him. This is, without doubt, a very false and unphilosophical mode of speaking; since the very term *emanation* supposes a separation from God's essence, and since what is so separated can no more be God, than water exhaled from a lake can be the lake itself, though it may be of the same quality with it. It is not, however, atheism; nor does it prevent the acknowledgment of God as an intelligent Being, distinct from the universe which he governs. For that which *emanates* from another necessarily supposes something left behind; and as nature, though proceeding from God, is thus, for the time, "extra Deum;" so it is, in the strictest sense of the word, a proper object of the Almighty's guidance and animadversion. Accordingly, both the Chaldeans, Cabbalists, and Soofees, by which last sect the doctrine in question is still maintained^r, have always professed to distinguish the stream from the fountain, nature from its author; while they have been so far from ascribing the name of God to any thing evil or material, that they actually deny that any thing evil or material exists at all.

With this doctrine of emanation others have so far coincided, as to believe that all *spiritual* existence emanated from God. But they have differed from it in

^r See Malcolm's Hist. of Persia, vol. ii. p. 500. et seqq. and Quarterly Review, num. xxix. p. 276. et seqq.

supposing that something else existed, which was not of the same nature with God, and did not proceed from him. To this they gave the name of matter, and of this they supposed the whole visible universe to be framed. Whether they conceived this matter to be made by God out of nothing, or to be in itself coeternal with him; whether this eternity was ascribed to it, as by Plato, in its chaotic state; or, as by Aristotle, in its present form and beauty, is nothing to the present question. Even in the latter case, it is certain, that they spoke of God as the First Mover, and Preserver, and Superintendant of the visible world; though they believed his power to have been thus exerted on matter during an infinite series of ages. So far, then, from this opinion being worse than Atheism^s, it is plain that the Divine Workman was sufficiently distinguished from the subject of his operations; that so far from *all things* being God, *matter* was expressly defined either as *his subject* or his *captive and vanquished enemy*; and that either doctrine was logically consistent with his physical and moral government of all.

If, then, the name of God were, by men like these, assigned to any thing material; it must have been because they either gave this awful title to the evil prin-

* "Those systems" [of Plato and Aristotle] "appear to be *not only* inconsistent with the existence of God, *but* with his *existence* and *providence*." *Brit. Crit.* vol. vii. p. 63. A plain man would have thought that the *existence* of God being denied, his *providence* was not worth contending for. But to deny the latter, it seems, is a pitch of wickedness to which even Atheists do not always attain. But how is the existence of God inconsistent with the belief in *two* eternal principles? "I believe in *two* Gods," says the Manichee; "ergo, you believe in *none*," says the Reviewer; "and *what is worse*, you not only say *there is no* God, but that this *no* God does *not* govern the world!" O sound Divine! O admirable Logician! Well hast thou abstained from the Atheistical works of Aristotle!

ciple as well as the good, (an impiety which, though imputed both to the Platonists and the Manichees, was always earnestly disclaimed by them;) or else, because they assigned to a Divine Spirit or Spirits the names of those visible and material objects which were supposed to be guided and governed by them. Thus the names of Sun and Moon were applied indifferently both to those luminous bodies themselves and to the genii who presided over them; but it was the spirit, not the body, which they intended under the name of Genius, God, or Dæmon. The name of the "Universe" was given not only to the circle of creation, but to Him (whether an inferior Divinity or the One Supreme) who clothed himself with his works as with a garment; but it was the King himself, and not the palace or the territory, whom they adored as God and Father. We act ourselves in a manner not dissimilar, when we speak of "the Ottoman Porte," instead of the Sultan; when we use the terms "France or England," to denote their respective governments; or when we profess, in common parlance, our reliance on the protection of "*Heaven*." Surely then we do not act wisely when we deny to the Heathen the same extended construction to which we lay claim ourselves, or when we abandon to the Atheist those arguments against his blasphemies which are derived from the authority and common consent of the best and wisest men of uninspired antiquity.

And that to the benefit of this construction Plato is fairly entitled, is apparent from the context of those passages on which so much stress is laid by the Reviewer. That he was no Pantheist is evident, since he distinguishes God from matter; that he did not ascribe to matter the name of God is evident from the manner in which he defines it; that he does not "con-

“found nature with nature’s God,” we know, not only because the Soul of the world is by him expressly distinguished from the material world itself, but because even this soul, or governing and pervading spirit, is described as himself an emanation from the Supreme Father of all spirits, and Framer of all natural things. He expressly gives as a reason for assigning the name of deities to the Sun, Moon, and Stars, that all these were guided and governed in some manner or other by spiritual intelligences; and so far is he from understanding by these different expressions a brute and plastic nature or principle of vitality, that there is hardly any one doctrine so frequently or so earnestly insisted on in his writings as the providence of the Gods, and that they are rewarders of those who diligently seek to please them^t. I do not mean to deny

^t Plato in his *Timæus*, vol. ix. p. 346. ed. Bipont. defines matter as it existed before the creation of the world. Ἄόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον, πανδιχίς, μεταλαμβάνον δι’ ἀπορώτατά πη τοῦ νοητοῦ. And of this he speaks as reduced by GOD to form, out of his will to make all things good. *Ib.* p. 305. Βουλῆθεις γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγαθὰ μὲν πάντα, φλαῦρον δὲ μηδὲν εἶναι κατὰ δύναμιν, εὐτὼ δὲ πᾶν ὅσον ἦν ὄρατον, παραλαβὼν, οὐχ ἡσυχίαν ἄγον, ἀλλὰ κινούμενον πλημμυλῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως, εἰς τάξιν αὐτὸ ἤγαγεν ἐκ τῆς ἀταξίας, κ. τ. λ. (2.) The soul of the universe is distinguished from the material creation and the supreme Creator. *Ib.* 311.—ὄλον καὶ τέλειον ἐκ τελίων σωμάτων σῶμα ἐποίησε. ψυχὴν δὲ εἰς τὸ μίσην αὐτοῦ θεῖς, διὰ παντός τι εἶποι, καὶ εἴτι ἐξω τὸ σῶμα αὐτῆ περιεκάλυψε. *Ib.* p. 312. Ὅ δὲ καὶ γινίσι καὶ ἀρετῆ προτίραν καὶ πρῆστυτίραν ψυχὴν σώματος, ὡς δισπότιν καὶ ἀρεξουσιν ἀρεξομένου συνισήσατο. *Ib.* p. 437.—ὄδες ὁ κόσμος, ἔτω ζῶν ὄρατον, τὰ ὄρατὰ περιέχον, εἰκὼν τῆ νοητῆ Θεῖ, κ. τ. λ. (3.) So of the souls or guardian spirits of the sun and moon, &c. *De Leg.* l. x. vol. ix. p. 96. Ἄστρον δὲ δὴ περὶ πάντων καὶ σελήνης—ἰπειδὴ ψυχὴ μὲν ἢ ψυχὰ πάντων τούτων αἰτίαι ἐφάνησαν, ἀγαθαὶ δὲ πᾶσαν ἀρετῆν, θεοὺς αὐτὰς εἶναι φήσομεν, εἴτι ἐν σώμασιν ἰνοῦσαι, ζῶα ὄντα, κοσμοῦσι πάντα οὐρανόν, εἴτι ὄση τι καὶ ὄπως. (4.) That these gods were judges of our good and evil actions, and to be honoured accordingly, appears, *Erinomis*, *Ib.* p. 274—275. Ἀμιλλῆσαι δὲ οὐ θεμιτόν ἐστι θεῶν—καὶ εἴτι δημοσίᾳ τις ἐπιτηδεύσας ταῦτα εἴτι ἰδίᾳ διαβίῳ, τὰ αὐτὰ ὡσαύτως αὐτὸν πράξιν παρὰ θεῶν. So *De Leg.* x. *Ib.* p. 109. Ὅτι μὲν γὰρ θεοὶ τι εἰσὶ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἰπιμίλονται, ἔγωγε—φαίνη ἡμῖν

that he fell into a grievous error, when he assigned so prodigally the generic term of God and Dæmon to the whole range of spiritual beings, from the Almighty to the human soul. I am not justifying his Polytheism, nor the idolatrous worship which he paid to these subalterns in the celestial kingdom; though (as he acknowledged one Supreme) the first of these errors very slightly differed from that which has been held, by some whom I could name, concerning guardian angels. But from all these declarations, (with which the commentaries of Proclus are in perfect unison,) it is evident that Plato was no Pantheist, and that I have not expressed myself too strongly in doubting, that he ever applied the name of God to any thing material or evil.

In the Reviewer's appeal to the *Persian, Sanscrit, Chinese, and Arabic*, I certainly cannot pretend to follow him. Nor, if it were true that the philosophers of those nations were Pantheists or Dualists, (for these, I must again inform him, are completely opposite errors,) would it any otherwise affect what I have just observed, than as it would shew that the Platonists (whose doctrines only I was inquiring into, and not into the state of the universities on the Yellow Sea) had, in these respects, departed from their Eastern instructors. We may learn, however, from Sir J. Malcolm, that the Sooffees and Boodhists are not guilty of the former of these errors; and both Hyde and Beau-

ἀποδείξει. So also many expressions in the Phædo and elsewhere. But I have already adduced enough, and it is indeed a very strange necessity which my learned censor has imposed on me, to prove that Plato neither held doctrines "inconsistent with the existence of God, nor with his existence and providence." I wish him well enough to rejoice, should my statements induce him to cultivate some slight acquaintance with an author whose opinion he now seems to have only guessed at through Basnage, Baltus, and Cicero; but who will repay, more richly than most others, whatever labour is bestowed on him.

sobre have expressly denied, that the Guelres and Manichees can be justly accused of calling their material principle a Divinity. Nor can I suppress my suspicion, that the authority of these writers will for the present outweigh that of my learned censor, and that he who has so strangely misunderstood the Grecian philosophy will obtain but little credence when he speaks of Zoroaster and Confucius.

III. The last particular in which I am accused of Platonism, is an answer which I have given to a well-known and frequent objection of the Socinians to the personality of the Holy Ghost, as distinct from God the Father. They urge, that the Spirit of God is compared by St. Paul (1 Cor. ii, 11.) to "the spirit of a man which is in him." And hence they argue, that "as the spirit of a man is not distinguished from the man himself, so neither can the Spirit of God possess any distinct personality." To this I have, among other arguments, replied, that the persons whom St. Paul addressed, and, *possibly*, St. Paul himself, really believed that man was a *compound animal*, in whose essence more than one person was, *bona fide*, acknowledged to exist, as comprising, besides the body, not only a *rational soul*, but *another soul* also, of an inferior nature; corresponding with that of irrational creatures; the "anima" of the Latins and "ψυχῆ" of the Hellenistic Jews, contrasted with their "animus" and "πνεῦμα." I expressly guarded against this psychological theory being considered as a parallel case to that of the Divine Persons; but I urged, that, as a plurality of persons was thus really believed to exist in the human nature, so the comparison of St. Paul, between God's Spirit and the spirit of man, could by no means militate against a plurality of persons in the Deity ^u.

^u Lectures, p. 178. et seqq.

This ancient opinion as to the nature of man I have not stated as my own opinion, though the Reviewer thinks fit to impute this statement to me; far less have I, as he pretends, advanced it as obligatory on the faith of my brethren^x. It is not even necessary to the force of my argument to suppose that St. Paul himself believed it. If, as my censor does not deny, it were the common opinion both of the Greeks and the learned Jews of St. Paul's time, the Apostle might, with perfect propriety, employ such an illustration of his argument, as applicable to them, without underwriting the perfect accuracy of the hypothesis itself. What the Corinthians allowed to be the case with the spirit of man, might well be urged on them, as not, on their own principles, impossible with the Spirit of the Almighty.

But I have said, that "*possibly*" St. Paul himself was of the same opinion. I have said so, first, because we know that it was a common opinion in his age and with his nation, and because it is an opinion which, whether true or false, is so perfectly indifferent in a religious light, that we have no reason to suppose that St. Paul received any revelation on the subject, or that it was a point in which he might not safely be left to the usual metaphysics of the Synagogue and the Academy. Secondly, I have suggested this possibility, because many of St. Paul's expressions in other parts of his writings are strikingly illustrated by this supposition. Thus we have, in a passage which this Reviewer has himself brought forwards, (1 Thess. v, 23.) τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα, as accurately distinguished as even Plato himself could have distinguished them. Again, in speaking of the "natural man," St. Paul

^x Brit. Crit. vol. vi. pp. 660, 661.

uses many expressions, some of which I have instanced in my Lectures, applicable, in propriety of language, to a person only. That these expressions *may* be metaphorical, or that the animal affections may be in these places personified, is certainly not impossible; but those who recollect what I have insisted on in my second Lecture, as to the greater general probability of a literal above a metaphorical interpretation of Scripture, will not wonder that I have, in conformity with my own principles, in these instances, preferred the former.

“But,” argues the Reviewer, “St. Paul uniformly “opposes the soul to the body, the spirit to the flesh.” Granted: but how will this compel the inference, that in St. Paul’s opinion there might not be, in the nature of man, a third principle, distinct from either of these? When I have occasion to speak of the traveller and his vehicle, I set these *in opposition* to each other, but I do not mean to deny the existence of the horse by whom the vehicle is drawn. But what if, in the term of body or flesh, or fleshly nature, or old Adam, or *ἄνθρωπος*, (all which names, I agree with the Reviewer, are sometimes used in Scripture synonymously,) what if, in these terms, not only the body itself, but all belonging to the body and necessary to the animal functions as opposed to the rational, be naturally and almost necessarily included? When this gentleman calls a *coach*, does he always think it necessary to express the horses and driver in his order? When he speaks of journeying by *boat*, are the rowers particularly specified? *Σῶμα* is often used to express the whole person of man; and why may not *σὰρξ*, as opposed to the *rational* soul, include in itself, not only the *flesh*, properly speaking, but that animal principle, which, though of a different nature

from the flesh, is its servant and inseparable companion? That something more, indeed, than material organization is intended by St. Paul under this term of "flesh," is apparent, inasmuch as "the flesh" is said to "lust against the spirit." But *flesh as such*, though it may be susceptible of outward impressions, cannot possibly *wish* for any, any more than a tree can wish for water in a drought, or a frozen river for the return of spring. When the natural man, therefore, is said to *lust* against the spiritual, it must mean, either that those bodily impressions, which, from their violence, induce the rational soul to desire things contrary to his sounder views of happiness, are *personified* as a secondary soul; "ita ut nos," as Cicero observes, "quasi duo simus;" or else, that such a secondary spiritual principle of animal life was really believed to exist. The moral and religious inference is, I acknowledge, in either case, the same; and the lesson is equally valuable to those who hold the one as the other hypothesis. But why, when we know that the latter was the general doctrine of the time, are we forbidden to suppose that St. Paul's converts, and *possibly* St. Paul himself, understood these expressions literally?

As for the Reviewer's reference to Maimonides, to tell us that the Jews were accustomed to swear "per vitam animæ tuæ," but were forbidden to swear "per vitam Domini;" it is so strangely irrelevant to the present dispute, that I cannot be expected to answer it. That Maimonides himself did not believe in a plurality of souls, I needed not to have been informed: but both Maimonides and this Reviewer allow that this was the opinion of the more ancient Jewish teachers. The quotations from Genesis in the note only prove, what I never denied, that the words נפש and דיי are, in the Hebrew, often used, with considerable laxity, in

a similar sense. And it would be a loss of my own time and that of my readers, to expose the nauseous folly of that string of illustrations which my antagonist has borrowed from "the Swiss and Hungarian Miners;" "le Comte de Gabalis;" "the Rape of the Lock;" "John Hunter;" "girls eating chalk;" and "the glands which secrete the saliva!"

My arguments, however, he tells me, (by the way,) are founded on *Socinian principles*. And this charge he introduces by a chain of reasoning, which is little less masterly than that which I have already noticed concerning the denial of God's existence and providence. First, he observes, that, "in order to render Mr. Heber's arguments effective against the Unitarians, there should be really two souls in man." Now, if he means (which is all that the case requires) that the persons to whom St. Paul wrote must have thought so, he reasons very accurately; and I have expressed myself very ill, if it is not visible that the whole force of my argument depends on this assumption. But he has no sooner made this statement, than he assumes, in direct opposition to all which I have said, that I understand the expressions of the Apostle not literally but figuratively, that I suppose the "natural soul" to be "merely the animal affections personified;" and, consequently, that my "exposition is favourable to the cause of the Unitarian Antagonist." Then, turning short round once more, he reasons against this same exposition on grounds which can only apply to its literal meaning, and tells me, that "it can be only such a mode of interpreting Scripture as distinguishes the school of Dr. Priestley, which can find, in the term flesh and body, a second spirit or soul." Of the term "flesh," &c. I have already spoken. But how little my hypothesis respecting it deserves the charge of being

founded on Socinian principles of interpretation, is plain, since it is deduced by understanding in a *literal* sense many passages which all Socinians understand figuratively; and since the supposition of inferior souls, if granted, entirely subverts the strongest argument which has been urged in favour of the Socinian principle of materialism. For if, as the Socinians and this Reviewer maintain, (p. 658. note *) beasts have no sentient principle about them distinct from matter; as it is certain that beasts *think*, it must follow that matter may be intelligent. But if it be maintained that there are *animal souls*, of a lower order indeed than the spirit of man, and of faculties only adapted to the preservation of their bodies, yet spiritual and distinct from the body; this argument of the Materialist will necessarily fall to the ground, and that doctrine be established, which teaches that no arrangement of matter can possess either reflection or memory or mental combination. I own that this has nothing to do with the merits of the question, whether man has or has not such an animal soul distinct from his rational spirit. I only mention it to prove, that the affirmative is not a Socinian opinion, and to expose the Reviewer's inconsistency in thus charging me, while his own statement is, of the two, the most favourable to the views of Dr. Priestley.

Of his own exposition of this difficult text, I will only say, that though he is right enough in supposing (what I never denied) that St. Paul is speaking of the different ways by which the knowledge of divine and human things is acquired, he leaves untouched the whole difficulty which arises from the comparison of God's Spirit with the soul of man; and that when he distinguishes the *Spirit of God* from the *Spirit which is*

in God, he has stumbled into something very nearly resembling heresy.

But I have quoted St. Jerome to prove that he understood 1 Cor. ii, 11. as I have done. And this has drawn down some heavy reflections both on myself and that learned Father; inasmuch as “ a more intimate acquaintance with his writings would have taught me, that, when Jerome provoked Ruffinus to recriminate, he was compelled to confess to more error adopted from Plato through Origen, on this very doctrine of the soul, than he was ever able, in his declining years, to palliate or defend.”

What may be the extent of my familiarity with Jerome's works, this learned gentleman cannot possibly know. I do not mean to boast of it; but, such as it is, it enables me to say with confidence, (and I appeal for the truth of my assertion to any competent judge,) that Jerome nowhere, in all his eleven volumes, confesses to having adopted any errors from Origen; that he nowhere states, that the opinion in question was derived through him; that he nowhere recants that opinion; that the “ animarum status” (which the Reviewer supposes to relate to this question of animal souls) belonged to a very different controversy; and that nothing but a total inexperience in the works both of Jerome and Origen can have led my censor into such an extraordinary misstatement^z.

^z Jerome owns, indeed, to having read and translated some of Origen's works; and he puts the case hypothetically, that “ supposing he had been an Origenist, he was not to be blamed for having forsaken his errors.” But, far from allowing that this had really been the case, he challenges, repeatedly, his accusers to point out any single instance in which he had supported an heretical doctrine of Origen's. *Ep. lxxv. ad Pamm. et Ocean.* “ Arguite—ubi hæresim defenderim, ubi pravum Origenis dogma lau-

V. I know not whether the allegation which follows is designed to be unfavourable or no. It may, however, illustrate the readiness with which my Reviewer undertakes to answer for the opinions of another. He says, that I “*obviously* renounce the celebrated text of the “*Heavenly Witnesses.*” The truth is, I have nowhere mentioned it, either one way or the other; nor (whatever were my private opinion on this subject) do I apprehend that any controversialist in his sober senses would, with the degree of estimation in which this passage is generally holden, have laid any stress on it in a controversy with Socinians. But I am very sure that, in points like these, the Reviewer has *no right* to infer the thoughts of his brethren from their silence, or to introduce my name, and what little authority that name may possess, into a controversy in which I have shewn no disposition to embark, and in which, for all he knows, I may have had neither leisure nor critical ability to form any fixed opinion.

VI. The next objection is levelled at my reply to the ancient cavil, “that the doctrine of the Trinity is rather implied than asserted in Scripture.” To this I have answered, that the proof by implication is often stronger than the proof by direct assertion; inasmuch as in the former case, there is less reason to apprehend that the document, on which the doctrine depends, has been

“*daverim.*” *Apol. adv. Ruff.* p. 135. “Ego in commentariis ad Ephesios sic Origenem—secutus sum ut fidei meæ non amitterem veritatem.” *Ib.* 163. “In Origene laudavimus scientiam Scripturarum, et tamen dogmatum non recipimus falsitatem.” The error which Jerome imputes to Origen, “*de animarum statu,*” was “*eas per negligentiam ad terrena corpora esse delapsas;*” and, “*nasci ex fine principium et ex principio finem, et ita cuncta variari ut et qui nunc homo est, possit in alio mundo Dæmon fieri, et qui Dæmon est et negligentius egerit—homo fiat.*” *Ep. lix. ad Arist.* Compare *Apol. adv. Ruff.* pp. 135. 140. 145. 157. 163. 164. 166.

altered or interpolated, to serve the views of any particular sect or party. And on this the Reviewer observes, that my arguments, which, he is pleased to say, “cannot be denied their weight, have more efficacy in establishing the authenticity of the document, than in proving the truth of the doctrine, which is derived by implication from the text.” What *doctrine* is he talking of? I am stating the superiority of one species of *proof* over another. It is the *character* of the evidence, not its *relevancy*, which is now in dispute. I had already shewn the latter; and he imputes it to me as a defect, that my present statement is applicable only to the former! What would this gentleman have done in the schools of our University?

VII. The succeeding charge is of a graver nature, and is founded on the following circumstance. I have said in my fourth Lecture, that, “with all due deference to the learning and piety of those who have attempted to demonstrate the mystery of the Trinity from the plural number of the word *Elohim*, and from the apparition of those glorious beings who visited Abraham beneath the oak of Mamre, it is wiser and better to place no reliance in argument, on circumstances, at best, of a doubtful character; and which, whether true or false, have been found by experience less likely to conciliate those who are in error, than to give occasion to indecent raillery and to the grossest imputations against that truth which we, by such means, endeavour to defend.” And I have observed, in my note on this passage, first, that the plural number of *Elohim* *does* probably imply the plurality of persons in the Godhead; but it *may* be also an eastern expression of reverence; in proof of which I have adduced a passage in Genesis xlii, 30. where Joseph is called האיש אדני הארץ. And secondly, (which the

Reviewer does not notice,) that "in the visitors of
 " Abraham, instead of recognizing the whole Triune
 " Godhead, (of whom the first Person, at least, has
 " never been thus visible to man,) a little attention to
 " the circumstances of the history will enable us to
 " distinguish the Divine Logos from his two attendant
 " angels."

How these observations should, either in sentiment or language, have been thought "offensive," I really cannot discover. The offence was at least unintentional; nor do I apprehend that my censor himself will maintain, that, while engaged in the defence of the truth, it is unlawful or indecorous to concede what appears to ourselves an untenable position, or to caution our successors in controversy against daubing the walls of Sion with untempered mortar. He will not say, that, because some Jews have been converted to the faith by arguments drawn from the grammatical anomalies of Scripture, all those arguments, whether right or wrong, are to be, thenceforward, at all hazards, maintained; lest I should retort on himself the well-known fact, that these same Jews have almost unanimously agreed to lay, at least, an equal stress on those Rabbinical and Cabbalistic concessions, against which he has himself so fiercely argued. As he tells us, however, that the proofs in question are precisely those on which his own faith is founded^a, though I may regret that he has no better grounds to offer in defence of the truth, I may pardon some little irritation, and will proceed to examine with the greater care those arguments by which he meets my objections.

He urges, first, the authority of Meyer against that of Fagius and Drusius, and trusts that his character, as "a

^a "We are concerned in stating, he commences by rejecting the authority on which our opinion is founded," p. 661.

converted Jew," will not "be lightly estimated, when "weighed in the scale against theirs." There are, I believe, few Hebrew scholars, who, on a grammatical question, will not place the authority of Fagius and Drusius, to whom I might have added Buxtorf, as high as that of any native Jew whatever. But, where the question is strictly as to a fact, and lies in so narrow a compass, the discussion may be carried on without allies on either side.

Secondly, he assures me, "with that fulness and "accuracy which become the occasion," that "the "mystery of the Trinity is not proved by the plural "number of *Elohim*, but by the plural nominative "joined with a singular verb, of which extraordinary "form of expression the regal idiom furnishes no in- "stance."

Thirdly, he "begs leave to deny that, in any part of "the Old Testament, the word אֲדֹנָי is applied, in the "plural number, to any person but the Divine." This position he founds, as he tells us, on "a painful inves- "tigation" "of every passage of Scripture in which the "word is found." "The word אֲדֹנָי," he continues, "in "nine places out of ten, is perfectly analogous to Mon- "seigneur in the French; and is expressed in the "Greek and Latin translations by *Kύριε μὲν*, 'Domine "mi;' and, in the English version, by 'my Lord,' "and has accordingly *opposed to it*, in Hebrew, יהוה "or יהוה אלהי, as it has, in English, the Lord, or the "Lord God." "This distinction," he tells me, "will "enable us to perceive the full import of the expression "before us, הַאִישׁ אֲדֹנָי הָאָרֶץ. The final י is retained, "not to mark reverence to Joseph by the plural, but to "limit, by the pronoun, the acknowledgment of his "authority to the person who spoke; the indefinite "form אֲדֹנָי הָאָרֶץ, conveying a blasphemous sense."

I am almost ashamed of my suspicions, yet I cannot help feeling some pretty strong ones, that this "painful investigation" of "every passage of Scripture in which the word is found," is of the nature of Gulliver's travels. Had he really made such a tour, he could not, I think, have failed to notice, that, in that very verse of Genesis which I have partially quoted, **וַיִּדְבֹר**, as applied to Joseph, is actually joined to **וַיִּדְבֹר** "locutus est." So that, if **וַיִּדְבֹר** be plural, this passage decisively proves, that "this extraordinary form of expression" is *not* peculiar to the Deity. And secondly, though it was no bad guess, that the passage which I quoted might be an address to Joseph from his brethren, and, therefore, that the vocative **וַיִּדְבֹר** would have been perfectly in place, and translated in the several versions, by *Κύριε μὲ*, "Domin| mi," or "my Lord;" yet, if he had really consulted either the original or any of the versions, he could not have avoided seeing that Joseph's brethren were not speaking to him, but of him, historically, and as of an absent person; and that, consequently, no version either has or could have rendered the words as he has done. What sort of a sentence would it be to read, *Ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐστὶν Ὁ ΚΥΡΙΕ ΜΟΥ τῆς γῆς ἐλάλησεν*; or, "Domine mi terræ locutus est;" or, "the man who is *O my Lord of the land spake roughly?*" Nor, if we allow him to get rid of his vocative, (which, if he did not mean it to apply to the particular passage in question, has no business here at all, and could be only introduced to mislead,) will the addition of the pronoun to the singular nominative accord either with the idiom of the sentence or the circumstances of the speaker. What authority did the prime minister of Egypt possess over Jacob's sons when they were returned into Canaan? Or how would the expression run, in any known language, by which, speaking of an absent person, we

should say, "The man who is *my lord* of France or "Italy?" Is it to avoid the blasphemous equivoque occasioned by אֲדוֹן being followed by הָאָרֶץ? This is prevented already by the word הָאִישׁ. But if the Reviewer had really searched, as he pretends, the parallel passages, he must have found, in this same history of Joseph, the same word אֲדוֹנִי, employed in a similar manner with a singular verb, where neither a vocative case is possible, nor the occurrence of הָאָרֶץ can be pretended. Gen. xxxix, 20. וַיִּקַּח אֲדוֹנֵי יוֹסֵף אֹתוֹ. "Et Domini Joseph (Potiphar) *prehendit* eum!" After this, it is useless to urge, what I have no intention to dispute, that in the *major part* of the passages where אֲדוֹנִי occurs, the suffix י is pronominal. In the cases which I have produced, this construction is evidently impossible; nor have we, therefore, any pretence for deserting the distinction there made by the Masoretic scribes, who have pointed the word, not אֲדוֹנִי, but אֲדוֹנֵי.

But what does the Reviewer mean by asserting that אֲדוֹנִי "has *opposed* to it in Hebrew, יהוה or יהוה "אלהי, as it has, in English, The Lord, or The Lord "God?" Does he mean an opposition of dignity, that "my Lord" is applied to inferior beings in contradistinction to "The Lord?" Where, then, is the Deity of Abraham's visitants at the oak of Mamre, to one or all of whom the word אֲדוֹנִי is, undoubtedly, addressed by the Patriarch? See Gen. xviii, 3. But have the Reviewer's inquiries into Scripture been really so "painful" to him, that he could not hold out long enough to discover that אֲדוֹנִי is, not once or twice, but, perhaps, twenty times applied to God? Or is he ignorant of that which every sciolist in Hebrew knows, that "Lord," in our English version, is not the translation of יהוה, but of אֲדוֹנֵי, אֲדוֹן, or אֲדוֹנֵי, which the superstition of the synagogue is accustomed to substitute for the in-

effable word : that יהוה does not denote *power* of any kind, but *self-derived existence*, from the root יהיה, and, consequently, that Jehovah and Adonai, instead of being *opposed* to each other in Hebrew, have no mutual relation whatever? And this gentleman ventures to tax me with “superficial investigation !”

If, indeed, we were allowed to consider אדני-הארץ, when applied to Joseph, as a *compound word*, resembling אדני-צדק or מלכי-צדק, we might, with more plausibility than in the manner which the Reviewer has suggested, elude, in the case of Gen. xlii, 30. the sentence of Buxtorf and Fagius. But Gen. xxxix, 20. would still remain, where no such construction is possible; and we should be still embarrassed with the similar anomaly, 1 Kings xx, 17. where אדנים is applied to *Ahab*; and Isaiah xix, 4. where it occurs coupled with the *singular adjective*, ביד אדנים קשה, “In *“manu dominorum duri.”* After all, I am far from denying that this form of speech may have been, originally, an impious application to earthly superiors of the manner in which God spoke of himself; but I am not the less convinced, that, while there are so many satisfactory arguments by which the Trinity may be deduced from the Old Testament as well as the New, it is “wiser and better” to lay no stress on a proof so equivocal as a grammatical anomaly.

My objection to that hypothesis which identifies the three celestial forms, who appeared to Abraham in Mamre, with the Three Persons of the Deity, I have already restated in my original words. That objection the Reviewer meets, first, by misrepresenting it as an objection to “the visibility of the Deity^b,” *in general*, instead of confining it, as I have done, to the *First*

^b Brit. Crit. p. 663.

Person in that mysterious union; secondly, by adducing two passages in my own Lectures, pp. 262, 271, in which I have instanced some occasions, where, as I conceive, the Holy Ghost, or *Third Person*, has appeared in an angelic form! What is this to the purpose? I repeat again, and repeat it without fear of refutation, that no man hath seen God the Father at any time; and that the circumstances of the vision, in the eighteenth chapter of Genesis, evince that, not the whole Trinity, but the Word only, with two attendant angels, was, on that occasion, made visible to the Patriarch.

There are yet two arguments by which the Reviewer seeks, if not to establish the solidity of his favourite proofs, at least to shame me from opposing them. In the first of these he reminds me that the Church of England has appointed Gen. i. and xviii. to be read as morning and evening lessons on Trinity Sunday^c. But that is a very lame process of reasoning which infers that the Church, therefore, adopts and commands others to adopt the same precise interpretation of every passage in those chapters which this Reviewer adopts. The only *translation* of the first chapter of Genesis, which is read in our Church, retains no trace of that plural אלהים, on which the Reviewer depends so entirely. Nor, in the argument prefixed to the chapter, nor in any of the Homilies or Articles, (which only can be considered as the authentic chart of their opinions,) have the founders of our Church given us to understand that this species of proof was in their contemplation. In the case of the eighteenth chapter, the presumption is yet stronger against my learned censor, inasmuch as, in the argument prefixed, we find Abraham's visitants called "*three angels*," a name which, in a certain sense,

^c Brit. Crit. p. 664.

may doubtless tally with either the Second or Third Person of the Trinity, but which, from the reason of the thing, and the common consent of all theologians, is utterly inapplicable to Him, who cannot be a *messenger*, since there is no one to send him.

There is, however, in Gen. i. one passage, which, though it may have escaped the Reviewer's attention, has been, from the earliest ages of Christianity, regarded as almost decisive as to a plurality of Persons in the Godhead; a passage of which the force is transfusible through every version, and perceptible to the meanest capacity. I mean that passage in which the Almighty saith, "Let *Us* make man in our own "image." Surely I am allowed to suppose that this text, and not an uncertain grammatical refinement, is the circumstance which has induced the framers of our Liturgy to associate this chapter with our devotions on Trinity Sunday!

Of Gen. xviii. the appropriate use is no less evident, without recurring to that strange hypothesis which the Reviewer chooses to insist on. Though we may vainly seek in it a direct proof of the Three Hypostases, the identity of God's Son with that Person who is repeatedly called by the sacred historian, "Jehovah," and "God," may be made obvious, from the circumstances of its narrative, to even the least learned of our congregations. The first link may be thus obtained to a chain of argument which a skilful divine will not be backward in pursuing: and such an one may conscientiously and profitably make use of the portions of Scripture appointed by his superiors, without either insisting on or submitting to those particular arguments on which the orthodoxy of this gentleman (and of few besides him) depends.

The second argument is also "ad hominem," and is, word for word, as follows.

"The valuable work of Dr. Allix, *in which the proof of that doctrine* [the Trinity] is adduced at length, "has now attained, by general suffrage, the authority of a standard book; and, if the opinion of the great body of divines may be taken from the sentence of an individual, it is entitled to the rank in which the experience of more than a century has placed it, by the unqualified approbation of Bishop Bull. The professed object of this work, which speaks thus adequately the sentence of the Established Church, is to *prove*, that the mystery, which it illustrates by that species of proof which we are engaged in defending, *was the standing doctrine of the Jewish Church. Having pursued our induction thus far, we shall now,*" &c. &c.

Of what "induction" is the learned gentleman talking, or what is it which he wishes to prove against me? That Allix has written an excellent book in defence of the Trinity, or that the doctrine of the Trinity is received by the Church of England? What are these assertions to the purpose, or what charge will he ground on them? That the Church of England believes this mystery to have been in some degree recognised by the ancient Jewish Church? Supposing this to be true, where have I denied it? I have myself taken some pains to establish the point, so far as the personality of the Holy Ghost was concerned, and I have attempted it by the very same process which Allix himself has, in a great measure, pursued—a reference to the Rabbinical collections. If, then, the Reviewer means to infer, (which is the point to which his "induction" would most naturally carry him,) that I have either myself

denied the Trinity, or that I have abandoned that argument in its favour which is deduced from the consent of the ancient synagogue; he means what he will not, I think, say plainly; and what, after all which I have written on the subject, I shall certainly not condescend to answer.

But does he merely intend to say, "Dr. Allix has illustrated the mystery of the Trinity by this species of proof which I am engaged in defending. And Dr. Allix's book is regarded as a standard work by the Church of England. But Mr. Heber differs from Dr. Allix in the soundness and relevancy of this species of proof. Therefore Mr. Heber is at variance with the Church of England?"

If this be his meaning, I will venture to say that never was syllogism so disguised as he has disguised it, nor, when found, so little worth the search. For, first, it is plain that the *general subject* of Dr. Allix's book, which figures so prominently in the Reviewer's diatribe, and which he has put in the place of his conclusion, is entirely irrelevant to the question between us; and, if not intended to convey a false impression as to the nature of our dispute, has, unintentionally at least, the merit of doing so. And, secondly, what church in the world (except perhaps one) ever undertook to warrant the absolute infallibility of even her most able uninspired defenders, in every argument which they might bring forwards? What would this Gentleman say, if I turned his own weapon against himself, and reasoned, by a process like his own, to prove him every thing of which he most abhors the imputation? Bishop Horsley, for instance, is regarded by our Church as a standard writer against the Unitarians. And Bishop Horsley contends, very strongly, that the Platonic Trinity resembles that of the true Faith. But the Reviewer has

denied that any such similarity exists. Ergo, the Reviewer is a Dissenter. Dr. Wall and Bishop Tomline, both names of no small weight among us, have proved the antiquity of infant baptism from the prevalence of the same rite among the Jews. But the Reviewer has denied that such a rite existed among that people. Ergo, the Reviewer is an Antipædobaptist. Cudworth, Pearson, and a host of writers equally celebrated, have inferred the truth of God's existence from the general consent of all nations in the world. But the Reviewer maintains that all the heathens were Atheists or (which is the same thing) Pantheists. Ergo—but I will pursue "the induction" no farther; nor do I think that my censor himself will be in any great haste to resume the chace of an *ignis fatuus*, which has already led him into a slough so hopeless.

Since, however, we are on the point of authority, I may be allowed to inquire a little, what has been the opinion of some of the most celebrated divines of our own and other churches on the subject of the Elohim, and of Abraham's vision in Mamre. And here it is worthy of notice, that not one single Father of the ancient Church, whom I have been able to meet with, adduces the plural number of Elohim, or its conjunction with a singular verb, as a proof or presumption of the Trinity. Many of them, such as Justin, Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome^d, were well qualified to judge of the refinements of the Hebrew language; and almost all have laid very considerable stress on the expression, "Let Us make man." We may from hence reasonably infer, that the argument from the word Elohim was

^d Jerome, indeed, actually notices the plural termination of אלהים, and calls it "Verbum communis numeri." *Hier. Quæst. Hebr. Op.* t. iii. p. 134.

either unknown to them, or that they did not approve it.

The same argument is passed over in silence by Luther^e, by Grotius, by Bishop Patrick; none of them likely to have passed over such a proof from negligence or ignorance. It is rejected as frivolous or dangerous by Calvin, Fagius, Vatablus, Drusius, Cartwright, and Le Clerc. If more consummate scholars than these can be found, I profess I know not where to look for them. I am well aware that highly respectable names may be produced on the other side, and I have already allowed that, so far as my own opinion goes, the probability really is, that, in the plural number of the word Elohim, a plurality of Persons was intended. But, when such men as these have expressed their doubts, the question may be well considered as in abeyance.

In my assertion, that the Second Person only, and not the whole Triune Godhead, condescended to visit the tent of Abraham, I agree with Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Irenæus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and many other of the principal Fathers; and, among the moderns, with Calvin, Vatablus, Cartwright, Castellio, Piscator, Wells, Leslie, and the Reviewer's "old favourite" Bishop Bull. In admitting that even *one* Divine Person was present on that occasion, I go further than Augustine, Luther, or Bishop Patrick; names which will not be easily suspected of betraying the Catholic Faith, even by those who, in this respect, differ from them^f. On the other

^e Luther. Comm. in Gen. Op. t. i. p. 10. Calvin. Op. t. i. p. 2. Fagius ad loc. Crit. Sacr. t. i. p. 5. Vatablus, Ib. p. 14. Drusius, Ib. p. 21, 27. Cartwright, Ib. p. 46. Clericus ad loc.

^f Just. M. Dial. ii. p. 411. ed. Thirlby. Οὗτις ἐν Ἀβραάμ, ἕτις—ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων εἶδε τὸν Πατέρα καὶ ἀόρατον κύριον τῶν πάντων ἀπλῶς—ἀλλ' ἐκείνου

side I recollect none but Cyril, Hilary, Munster, and Parkhurst. The Reviewer may perhaps find some few more; but it is a little too much to bring forward an interpretation as exclusively sanctioned by the Church of England, when so great a majority of the wisest and best in this and every other Christian Church have openly expressed a different opinion.

VIII. The next in the catalogue of my imputed errors, is a speculation which I have advanced, (I hoped with sufficient diffidence,) that Michael and Gabriel, as mentioned in the tenth chapter of Daniel and elsewhere, may, possibly, be no other than names for the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity. And the chief grounds on which I have founded this hypothesis are, first, that to both Michael and Gabriel the ancient Jews assigned most of the same offices which we ascribe to God the Word and God the Holy Ghost. Secondly, that such actions are ascribed to Michael and Gabriel in Scripture as are inconsistent with the character of created angels. To the first of these the Reviewer replies, that “the same authority of “Rabbinical tradition which discovers, in Michael and “Gabriel, the Jewish Mediator and Holy Ghost, like- “wise identifies those ministering spirits with *two* of

τὸν κατὰ βουλὴν τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα, Ἰὸν αὐτῷ, καὶ Ἄγγελον, κ. τ. λ. Clem. Alex. Pæd. I. p. 110. ed. Par. Tertull. adv. Praxeam, p. 509. Ed. Rigalt. Filius — ad humana colloquia descendit, 510. Ille altissimus — apud Abraham sub quercu refrigeraverit. Scilicet et hæc nec de Dei filio credenda fuisse, si scripta non essent; fortasse non credenda de Patre, licet scripta. Irenæus, adv. Hær. iv. §. 13. p. 283. §. 15. p. 302. Euseb. Demonst. Evang. v. §. 9. p. 147. Ed. Steph. Epiphan. Anchor. xxxix. Op. t. ii. p. 34. Καὶ ᾤφθη, φησὶν, ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ — ἵνα τὸν ἵνα δείξῃ Θεόν, τὰς δὲ συνισπομίνας αὐτῷ ἄλλας δύο Ἄγγελους αὐτῷ. Chrysost. Hom. xlii. in Gen. p. 340. ed. Eton. Calvin. Op. t. i. p. 100. Vatablus, Cartwright, Castellio, ap. Crit. Sacr. ad loc. Piscator ap. Poole, Wells ad loc. Leslie, Soc. contr. Dial. 2. §. 18. Bull. Defens. Fid. Nic. c. i. §. 11. p. 10. col. 1. August. Civ. Dei, xvi. 29. Luther. ad loc. Patrick ad loc.

“ the angelic Personages who gave Abraham promise
 “ of the expected seed. If Mr. Heber denies that they
 “ *personify the Trinity* in the one place, he cannot with-
 “ hold his consent that we should deny *they* are meant
 “ in the other.”

How *two* Persons can “ personify the Trinity,” is, to my English understanding, as obscure as any thing in the Cabbala. Nor is it very clear from the construction of this gentleman’s sentence, who “ *they*” are, whom he denies to be meant in the tenth chapter of Daniel. *Michael* and *Gabriel* are the natural antecedents to his pronoun ; but, as Daniel has actually *named them*, no doubt can remain that *they* are meant, though some doubt may exist as to their rank in the spiritual world. Omitting, however, all further observations on my censor’s language, if he had read my note, p. 276, from beginning to end, he would have seen that I expressly assert His visible presence under the Oak of Mamre, whom I conceive to be elsewhere shadowed under the name of Michael. I am not, therefore, so much at variance with my Rabbinical friends as he imagines. It is true that I do not agree with them in supposing Gabriel also to have been then visibly present ; because, conceiving him, for reasons which I have given in their proper place, to be no other than the Holy Ghost, I cannot recognise him in either of those who are mentioned in Scripture, as no other than attendants on the Patriarch’s Divine Visitant. This may seem strange to the Reviewer, who cannot conceive it possible to accord with Allix in the main purport of his book, unless we assent to all his illustrations and arguments. It is, however, the usual way in which all human commentators on Scripture are consulted, who are no further confided in, than as they appear consistent with the sacred volume or themselves.

But, "if the Rabbinical authority," he continues, "on which *it is obvious* Mr. Heber's proof depends, "and by which *it is apparent* it was first suggested, "rest on any other grounds than that Cabbala by "which two persons may be considered the same, if "their names be convertible by an anagram, or consist "of letters having the same numerical force, we should "feel obliged by seeing it pointed out."

I cannot help remarking, that when this gentleman tells the world that "it is obvious my proof depends on "Rabbinical authority," he obviously begs the question, inasmuch as, whether successfully or not, I have taken considerable pains to prove my positions from Scripture. And when he says, that my opinions respecting Michael and Gabriel were "first suggested" by this authority, he takes on him to answer for another in a manner which no man has a right to do. I shall be happy, however, to oblige him, and will therefore say, that he cannot point out a single passage in my work where I have adopted the Cabbalistic forms of reasoning, or where my conclusions at all depend on them. The Rabbins, whom I have quoted to establish the fact of that exalted rank which their countrymen assigned to Michael and Gabriel, profess, in all the passages which I have adduced, to give the traditional and established opinions of the synagogue concerning them: and I have already shewn, that, as depositaries of such opinions, they are entitled to attention, however weak and fanciful the mode of reasoning by which they attempted to support or illustrate them. Nor will it be easily supposed, that concessions so important to Christianity as those which involve, in their direct and acknowledged consequences, the preexistence of the Messiah and his office as a celestial Mediator, can have been the innovations of the later Jews, or of those Rab-

bins who were peculiarly distinguished by their hatred of the Christian name.

On the scriptural objections made by the Reviewer to my theory a very few words will suffice. Matt. xxv, 31. and Luke xxii, 43. are so irrelevant, that they can only have been referred to by accident. Matt. iv, 10. is really in my favour; since *adoration* is there appropriated to the Trinity alone, and since I have shewn (p. 270.) that Daniel, without reproof, paid this homage to Gabriel. 2 Pet. ii, 11. and Jude 9. are by no means against me; since the name of Angel is allowed to be sometimes given to Christ, and since ἐτολμήσεν is well known to signify not “daring,” only, but “thinking fit,” or “prevailing on ourselves.” It is a ridiculous misrepresentation to say, that I “presuppose the Divinity of “Michael in the notion of his giving assistance to “Gabriel,” when I have been occupied, for some pages before, in attempting to establish the doctrine in question. To receive help from the Son is, under certain circumstances, not unworthy of the Holy Ghost, since we know that this last, in his capacity of Paraclete, is both sent by the Son, and receives of his doctrine: and that the distinction between the angel Gabriel and the Holy Ghost, Luke i, 26—35. is any other than a distinction between the Giver of celestial power and the power thus communicated, this gentleman will not find it easy to shew.

What follows, however, demands a more serious notice. The Reviewer “sees nothing in the *Scripture account* of those ministering spirits, (the angels,) which “he does not conceive himself fully adequate to defend.” The Scripture account! Who hesitates to give way to an acknowledged assertion of Scripture?

† Brit. Crit. p. 666.

But *what is* the Scripture account? This and this only is the question between us; and till he has refuted the objections which I have brought against the popular interpretation of the latter chapters of Daniel, it is a shameless begging of the question to assume that this is the true one; and it is still worse to hold out his antagonist as “a sceptic,” where the testimony of Scripture is concerned. But this is not all. He goes on to “remind me of the declaration of conformity to the “Liturgy which I have subscribed, in which there is a “festival set apart to St. Michael and all Angels, with “an appropriate service for the day. As Mr. Heber,” he proceeds, “will doubtless follow the dictates of his “own conscience in celebrating or omitting this service “when the rubric enjoins it to be performed, he will “of course acquit us of useless or presumptuous zeal, “in having so far discharged ours, as to provide against “the chance of his readers taking unjust offence at this “part of the public service.”

Now, Sir, the appropriate service for St. Michael's Day consists in a Collect, Epistle, Gospel, and four proper Lessons. The Collect is as follows :

“O Everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of angels and men in a wonderful order; mercifully grant, that, as thy holy angels always do thee service in heaven; so, by thy appointment, they may succour and defend us on earth, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

The Epistle is, Rev. xii, 7—12. The Gospel, Matt. xviii, 1—10. The Lessons are, Gen. xxxii. Acts xii, —20. Dan. x, 5. Jude 6—16.

Let the Reviewer compare, once more, these passages of our Liturgy and of the Scripture with my fourth Lecture, and I am greatly mistaken if his conscience will not accuse him of something worse, far worse,

than "presumptuous or useless zeal," in the charge which he has brought against me! What have I said or insinuated which can make it improper for me to join in this service, or which can, by any possibility, prejudice others against it? Do I detract from the dignity of the angelic character when I teach that the eternal Son of God himself has not disdained the title of their Prince? Do I deny or undervalue the assistance of Michael and his angels in our war with the Infernal Dragon, when I believe that Michael is the same with that Captain of our Salvation, in whose army both we and the angels are fellow-soldiers? Can we not thank God for appointing the services of angels and men in a wonderful order, though we cannot find in Scripture any authority for supposing, with Ephraim Syrus, that the kingdoms of the earth are parcelled out to different spiritual sovereigns; that these sovereigns have wars with each other, and that there are factions in the court of heaven? Can no other way be conceived in which the angels of God may minister to the heirs of salvation, but in the overturning of empires at their pleasure, and a contumacious resistance to God's decrees concerning them? Or can we forget that it is as *messengers* only that they are described in Scripture; and that, so soon as we install them into the rank of *guardians* or *patrons*, that moment the foundations of idolatry are laid, and the glory of the Most High is shared with others?

It is therefore that I have insisted with more earnestness on the apparent contradictions of that system of tutelary sovereigns for which the Reviewer contends, and that I have entered more at length than the immediate subject of my Lectures required, into the *probability*, (for I have given it no stronger name,) that both Michael and Gabriel are more than created spirits.

In assigning the rank of Deity to the former of these Persons, I have followed the footsteps of Luther, Calvin, Clavius, Horsley, and some other of the most illustrious names in our own and foreign churches, so many, indeed, that Maldonatus describes the dogma as a general and distinctive tenet of Protestantism. In my sentiments respecting Gabriel, I have only Coccejus on my side; but Coccejus is no unlearned name, nor was his suggestion treated with scorn even by those who differed from him. But both the former and the latter supposition I have introduced as speculations only, which, if true, might illustrate, but, if false, could not weaken the more solid columns and ancient confession of Christianity. If I am shewn to be in error, I shall openly and cheerfully acknowledge it. If the rulers of that Church to which I have sworn allegiance regard these disquisitions as dangerous, they are not of such importance as that I should continue to maintain them publicly against the judgment of older and wiser heads than mine. But to charge me with opinions which I have nowhere held, and consequences which none of my assertions involve, is not the way either to convince or to silence me; nor is there any heresy of which I would not rather bear the imputation, than the consciousness that I had so dealt with my neighbour as this Reviewer has attempted to deal with me!

IX. The next charge brought against me is, that I have subverted the usual interpretation of Christ's promise of a Comforter by a "sophism, whereby the promise is first narrowed by a contracted view, and the refutation of those who adopt it in a full and comprehensive sense then conceived to follow from the subversion of its use in a false and confined acceptance^h."

^h Brit. Crit. vol. vii. p. 53.

The meaning of this objection can be only understood by a short review of my general hypothesis, which is mainly that of Bishop Warburton, who maintained, as I do, that the promise made by our Lord, John xiv, 16. and fulfilled by the Holy Ghost in his character of Paraclete, was the grant to mankind of a knowledge of God's will with reference to the Christian covenant; and that, as this knowledge was first communicated to the Apostles by inspiration, so is it since continued to the Church, through the medium of the Holy Scriptures, by that same divine Person who dictated them first, and by whose providence they are still preserved among us.

In maintaining this hypothesis, I have not denied that both the *extraordinary* or miraculous, and what are called the *ordinary* gifts of grace, proceed from the same good Spirit to whom the name of Paraclete was, on another account, assigned. I have enlarged on the glorious signs and wonders by which the same Holy Ghost distinguished the primitive Church. I have devoted nearly one whole Lecture to prove the reality and necessity of his sanctifying grace; and I have acknowledged that this last is to be sought for by Christians through a faithful use of those ordinances which our Lord, while on earth, appointed.

But I have said that these were not the specific mercies foretold by Christ in the promise which is the subject of my Lectures. And this I have done for the following reasons. First, the promise of the Comforter was made to the Church *for ever*, and throughout all generations. But this promise cannot be said to have been fulfilled by the grant of miraculous powers to a few individuals in a single generation. Secondly, the Comforter was to guide us into all truth, to teach us things to come, &c. But neither miraculous powers,

nor sacramental ordinances, nor even that sanctifying grace which we are to seek through them, can be said of themselves to *teach us* any thingⁱ. Thirdly, that grace, whatever it be, which the Comforter was to dispense, was *promised* by Christ as a consequence of his departure, and therefore related to something which, when he spoke, his disciples had not yet received, and which was to be a compensation for the loss of his visible presence. But if the apostles were ever baptized at all, they must have been baptized while Christ was on earth. We know that before this conversation passed, they had received the Eucharist; and they must also have partaken in the sanctifying graces of the Holy Ghost, to enable them to believe on Christ at all, or to entitle them to the honourable name of his "friends." It follows, that before our Lord's departure, and at the very time of his making the promise now under con-

ⁱ It is true, indeed, as the Reviewer observes in the conclusion of his article, that it is only "by the special grace of God, that we are enabled to embrace and understand the proffered terms of acceptance." But it cannot be said, as he supposes, that, therefore, "in strictness and propriety of speech it is he who" [by his ordinary grace] "teaches us all things necessary to salvation." To enable a man to learn is a very different thing from teaching him any thing; and while I allow that the first of these actions is to be ascribed to God the Holy Ghost, as our Sanctifier, I may also maintain, that it is only as the Giver and Preserver of the Holy Scripture that he can be said to do the latter. Nor can any inconvenience be apprehended from thus separating his operations, since I maintain that both are absolutely necessary to our salvation, and ascribe both one and the other to the same Giver of all good things, though I suppose that to the latter alone this particular promise refers. But there are many advantages to be derived from such precision in our ideas, which may sufficiently account for the stress which I have laid on this distinction. It removes many difficulties from the salvation of the heathen and of infants; many from the doctrines of free-will and preventing grace; and it cuts up by the root the most common cause of enthusiasm,—a confusion between the inspiration of religious feeling and that of religious knowledge.

sideration, they were already possessed of the spiritual advantages derived from the use of the sacraments and the ordinary grace of God, and therefore that neither of these could be that particular advantage which our Lord here promises as a future and compensating consequence of his departure.

There are other arguments which I have advanced to the same effect; but these are the parts of my statement, to which, if I understand him right, the Reviewer affixes the charge of sophism. And this charge he attempts to make good, first, by observing, that the promise of Christ "is of a complex nature;" that, though certain blessings are in John xiv, 16. promised to remain with the Church for ever, (which, he admits, will not apply to the case of miraculous powers,) yet miraculous powers are *also* promised, as a consequence of his departure, (John xiv, 12. xv, 26.) though these last were not promised to remain with the Church for ever. "And if," he continues, "as Mr. Heber is compelled to admit, the promise received its accomplishment on the day of Pentecost, when the expected Comforter arrived, according to the express stipulation of the Giver, there cannot be much room to doubt, that as it was particularly evidenced in the gift of tongues, it was peculiarly fulfilled by the grant of miraculous powers."

To this I answer, that, of the two passages which the Reviewer produces, the first (John xiv, 12.) has no connection whatever with the promise of a Comforter; and the second (John xv, 26.) makes no mention of the power of working miracles. In the former, our Lord, indeed, informs his disciples, that, in consequence of his departure, they should have greater miraculous power entrusted to them than they now possessed. But he does not say that they shall have this additional power

over diseases and devils, in consequence of the arrival of the Comforter. That Comforter, indeed, is not yet mentioned at all; nor, when his coming is foretold, is it spoken of as a *reason* why the Apostles should be able to work greater miracles, but as an *additional source of consolation*, over and above that miraculous power. “He that believeth on me, the works that I do, he shall do also.—*And*, I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter,” &c. If a friend, on his departure to a far country, tells us, “I leave you heirs to my property, *and* I will obtain for you, in my absence, the protection of another guardian;” these would necessarily be considered as separate and distinct promises, inasmuch as the one might be given and received without the second, though the occasion (our friend’s departure) might be the same for both.

As for John xv, 26. it is again begging the question to say, that the manner in which the Comforter was to bear witness of Christ was by enduing the Apostles with miraculous powers, when he may be far more reasonably understood to have borne this witness by revealing the will of God, and the nature of the redemption wrought for us. For miracles, as I have taken some pains to shew^k, however great, could not obviate the objections urged by the Jews against the lowliness of our Lord’s condition and the ignominious nature of his death. Miracles might shew him and his followers to be prophets; but those other circumstances would, in the apprehension of Israel, be conclusive against his being the Messiah: nor could they be answered, except by a knowledge of that mystery of our redemption, which required Christ thus to be rejected, and thus to suffer.

But “the promise received its accomplishment on

^k Lecture VII. p. 469. et seqq.

“ the day of Pentecost ; ” and on that day “ it was particularly evidenced in the gift of tongues. ” Granted : but, if the Reviewer were only moderately skilled in the forms of dialectics, he would perceive, that though the “ gift of tongues ” was an *evidence* of the Holy Ghost’s coming, it does not follow that “ the gift of tongues, ” or any other miraculous power, was the definite blessing which he came to bestow, or that blessing from the dispensation whereof he was to derive his name of Paraclete. A deed of gift is *evidenced* by its signature and seal ; but the signature and seal are not the things given. The performance of that promise which God made the Israelites to give them a law from Sinai, was *evidenced* by the fire and smoke and sound of the celestial trumpet ; that is, the Law then pronounced was, by these circumstances, proved to proceed from God : but no man will say, God gave the Law attended with thunder and lightning ; therefore thunder and lightning were the things promised to the Israelites. So much for my “ sophism, ” so far as I have narrowed Christ’s promise to the exclusion of miraculous powers.

But, so far as the sacramental and sanctifying graces of the Holy Ghost are concerned, the Reviewer will not venture to say that they are *explicitly promised at all* in any part of our Lord’s present discourse. And as I have shewn (what he allows) that they were already enjoyed by the Apostles at the time of Christ’s speaking, it would be strange indeed to conceive them to be implied or intended in the assurance of future blessings. For the continuance of that which we already enjoy during our friend’s lifetime cannot make it *expedient* for us to lose a friend ; nor, though it be a topic against the violence of our grief, can it be considered as a compensation. And as the same reason will operate against whatever was conferred during Christ’s abode with his

disciples, the ministerial grace of ordination which he bestowed before his ascension is, from this as well as other considerations, obviously excluded.

But "no," says the Reviewer; "though the Apostles, before the departure of Christ, had been participants of grace, they were wholly unacquainted with the mode and reality of its operation. He found it accordingly *necessary* to apprise them specifically of the fact;" 'He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' But it is no less clear, that, however high their privileges were, they could be no source of comfort to those who were unconscious of their existence. In the assurance of this single fact, as far as the question of ordinary operation is concerned, a measure of consolation was ministered to the disciples, of which they were previously unconscious. On the day of Pentecost," he goes on to observe, "the Apostles received unquestionable assurance—of the presence of that Holy Spirit which sanctifies to salvation;—and *in that assurance* received abundant consolation to justify the peculiar title of Comforter¹."

That the Apostles or their countrymen were, down to the period of the day of Pentecost, "wholly unacquainted with the mode and reality of the" ordinary "operation" of God's Spirit, is what was never asserted by any theologian before, and is contradicted by innumerable passages in the Psalms and Prophets; no less than by the manner in which our Lord, in his discourses to the people, repeatedly speaks of the Holy Ghost as a name well known, and which required no explanation.

¹ Brit. Crit. ubi sup. p. 55. I have in this quotation omitted several passages, which, as they relate to the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, have been already disposed of, and can do nothing, and were, in this place, apparently, designed to do nothing, but perplex the question of his ordinary and sacramental graces.

If, indeed, as the Reviewer supposes, our Lord *himself*, on the present occasion, *informed* his disciples of this circumstance, it is utterly ridiculous to say that those disciples were *ignorant of it* during forty days afterwards, or that they could want any further *assurance* of the fact from God the Holy Ghost, than they had already received from God the Son. The quotation which the Reviewer has given from John xiv, 17. cannot prove, that the fact of the Holy Ghost's sanctifying presence was the fact of which our Lord intended to inform his disciples, far less that they were previously ignorant of it. He might mean to say, "The same Spirit of truth which now, as ye believe, dwelleth in you as a Sanctifier, shall then dwell in you as a Comforter and Instructor in divine things." And that this *is* his meaning is clear; since he does not say, ye *shall* or ye *will* know him hereafter, which he must have done had they then been ignorant "of the mode or reality of his operations;" but "*ye know him,*" already, which very sufficiently proves, both that the sanctifying graces of God's Spirit were not first given to the Apostles, nor first perceived or understood by them, in consequence of our Lord's departure from the world, and therefore that these are not the peculiar graces which the Paraclete was to bestow.

But, even on the Reviewer's own principles, my hypothesis is triumphant, inasmuch as all which I have been labouring to prove is, that the promise of a Comforter after Christ's death was not fulfilled by the continuance of privileges which the Christians already possessed, but by the gift of that knowledge which they did not before enjoy, and which opened their eyes to the advantages of their situation, and to the wonderful things which Christ had, by his sufferings, purchased for mankind. And my opponent now tells me, that it

was by an “*assurance*” of this very kind, that the Holy Ghost made good his claim to the “peculiar title of “Comforter,” and that “the circumstances which attended the fulfilment of his promise seem to limit “it to *this particular signification.*” Can I desire a more definite concession of the principles on which my hypothesis depends? And yet this Gentleman can, immediately after, “conclude, against Mr. Heber’s second “objection, that, after our Lord’s departure and effusion “of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the Holy Ghost “sustained his office of Comforter, as Dispenser of sacramental grace!” I will not retort on him the charge of “*sophism* ;” that is too hard and crafty a word for such arguments as I have been obliged to examine; but I will hint to him, that it must be a very clumsy sophist indeed, with whom he can safely trust himself in battle.

X. But I have also observed, as a fact well known to the learned audience to whom my Lectures were addressed, that the rites of Baptism and the Eucharist were ceremonies already familiar to the Jews. I have nowhere maintained, as this Reviewer seems to suppose, that the privileges, to which Christians are admitted by their means, are not far greater and more glorious than those which the Israelites obtained by them. Far less have I insinuated, that, now that the privileges of the Temple are transferred to the Church, the baptismal washing and cup of thanksgiving which the unbelieving Jews still retain, can be any more than unavailing forms. But that they were *once* something more, we must of necessity believe, if we believe, with the Jews, that they were instituted by God himself in Egypt and in Horeb; or if we acknowledge that the ministry of John the Baptist was “of heaven, and not of men.” And, however the baptism of repentance and the Pas-

chal cup were inferior in dignity and blessedness to the baptism of adoption and the body and blood of Christ, yet is it plain that the participation in these rites, anterior to that knowledge of divine things which the Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, bestowed, could be no source of comfort or pledge of God's favour to the Christian more than to the Jew. I may fairly, therefore, argue, that neither these rites, nor the silent and imperceptible graces which attend their due celebration, were, in themselves, the blessing which was to comfort the orphan flock of Christ; but rather that discovery of our hopes and privileges, which developed the meaning of these, previously, obscure ceremonies; and not of these only, but of every type and every ordinance of Moses, or the Prophets, or the Son of God.

But the Reviewer denies that baptism was really a rite practised by the ancient Jews; and having discovered that, in my reference to the Mischna to prove the fact, I have used the word "*baptizetur*," where the translation ought to have been "*baptizet se*;" he calls on me, in a tone at least sufficiently authoritative, to "give a good account of *the place where I found this passage*, and of the reasons which have induced me to set aside the authority of the learned Editor of the Mischna, who has assigned it a signification not much to my purpose." In both these points I am willing to give him satisfaction. I *found* the passage where it was most likely to be found, in Surenhusius's edition of the Mischna, tom. ii. p. 167. ed. Amstel. I can only account for the mistake of "*baptizetur*" for "*baptizet se*," as well as some other, though very insignificant, variations from the version of the learned Editor, by supposing that they were occasioned by the abbreviations and obscurity of a memorandum written with a pencil. But the Reviewer is greatly mistaken, if he

supposes that “ baptizet se,” or “ immerget se,” is less favourable to my purpose than “ baptizetur;” inasmuch as the adult who himself enters the water, and not only consents to, but cooperates with, the act of the initiator, may be said, indifferently, either to be baptized, or to baptize himself, or to cause another to baptize him. Nor can the context of this passage, on which he lays much stress to prove that baptism was not there intended, prove any thing more than (that which nobody ever denied) that there were other washings usual among the Jews, in cases of pollution, &c. But that the *immersion* enjoined to a proselyte was baptism, and nothing else, is so plainly proved, by Lightfoot and Wall, from the common consent of the Jews, (among whose testimonies we have the most positive assertions of the Reviewer’s friend Maimonides,) that I should have been ashamed to have spoken of it before the University of Oxford, as a fact with which they were not already familiar.

But still the Reviewer insists, that the Sadducees only, of the school of Schammai, baptized; and he supposes them to have derived it from John the Baptist. First, he says, the school of *Schammai* only is noticed in the *Mischna* as using this *immersion* of their proselytes. If he had taken the trouble to read the commentaries of Maimonides and R. Obadiah de Bartenora, on the passage which has been quoted, he would have seen that the dispute between the sects of Schammai and Hillel was not, whether the proselyte should be baptized or no; but whether, *immediately* after circumcision, he should be baptized and admitted to eat the passover, notwithstanding any previous impurity which he might have contracted in his state of Gentilism. But, secondly, he tells us, that, in the passage which I have produced from St. Augustin, “ the *Pharisees* are

“ tacitly excepted from the number of those who used baptism ; *the Sadducees* only being particularised as “ using that rite.” Where were his eyes when he made such an assertion ? The words of Augustin are, “ Pa-
 ganus baptizat, JUDÆUS baptizat, Sadducæus baptizat.” What sect of Jews was that which was opposed to the Sadducees, and which, as being the prevailing party, was identified, in common parlance, with the nation at large ? Were not these Pharisees ? Are they not Pharisees still ? He has read the Rabbins and Maimonides to little purpose, if he is ignorant of this circumstance. But whence could these Pharisees have derived the custom which they still retain, and which we know, from the authors of the Talmud, who were all of the same sect, they used in the fifth and sixth centuries of the Christian era ? Would they have copied the Christians, whom they abhorred, in this distinctive badge of their profession ; or have deserted the ancient practice of the synagogue in compliance with an invention of their enemies, the Sadducees ? Both these suppositions are alike impossible ; and there remains no other than that which all the Jews with one voice maintain, and which is confirmed by the testimonies of Arrian, Tertullian, Basil, Cyprian, and Gregory of Nazianzum, that it was a tradition handed down among them from remote antiquity^m, if not from the time of Moses himself.

But “ Nicodemus,” it is still urged, “ a ruler of the Pharisees, was ignorant what was meant by this “ term.” Till now, it had been always supposed, not that Nicodemus was ignorant of what was meant by baptism, but that he was ignorant, or affected to be so, of

^m See Wall, Introd. p. lxxvi. et seqq.

the necessity of being himself baptizedⁿ. “But,” he continues, “we have higher and positive authority that the “latter sect” [the Pharisees] “*rejected baptism, when administered by St. John.*” Luke vii, 29—30. We have also as high and as positive authority, that, though *some* of the Pharisees did reject his baptism, *many* were baptized of him. Matt. iii, 7. Nor did those others reject it because baptism was a novel rite, but because they denied the title of John to administer it. John i, 25—26. “When “John,” observes Bishop Tomline, in a work of which the sound sense and various learning will be the more appreciated the further we advance in our theological studies, “when John commanded the Jews to repent, “he commanded them also to be baptized, not only as “a symbol of sanctification, but as a confession of their “being sinners; and the Jews, *accustomed to this practice upon the admission of the heathen into their society,* “expressed no surprise at the connection of repentance “and purification; they only inquired who *he was that assumed to himself such an authority*°.”

The last objection, however, which the Reviewer advances is the most singular, perhaps, of all. “When “baptism was administered,” (he had just now denied that it was ever practised by the Jews,) “it was used “with a different view than as an initiatory rite. Drus. “*de Sectt. Jud. ii, c. xv, p. 102. ed. 1619. ‘Circum-* “*cisio signum erat fœderis in quod recipiebantur, bap-* “*tismus requirebatur ad munditiem, cum gentes omnes* “*pro immundis haberent.’*” Let us see what the Jews

ⁿ Wall, ubi sup. p. 96. “All that was new in this saying of our Saviour was this: the Jews knew, that any Gentile that would enter the “kingdom of God must be born again: but our Saviour assures Nicodemus, that every one, Jew or Gentile, must be so born.”

° Elements of Christ. Theol. vol. ii. p. 447—8. See also Burnet on the Articles. Art. XXVII.

themselves say as to the initiatory nature of baptism. Gemara ad Tit. Cherithoth. "Patres vestri non ingrediebantur in *fœdus*, nisi per circumcisionem et *baptismum*." Jevamoth. fol. 46. 2. "Per quidnam congregantur [proselyti] sub *alis Schechinæ*? Resp. "Nullus proselytus fit, nisi qui circumciditur et *baptizatur*." If this be not *initiation*, what can deserve the name? Drusius indeed is right in saying that the peculiar *seal* of the *covenant* was *circumcision*; but that, without which the privileges of that seal were cancelled, was as necessary a part of *initiation* as the other; nay, it is by Rabbi Judah considered as the "*principal thing*." Lustration by water was, in fact, with almost every nation of antiquity, a familiar and expressive type of purification from guilt; and the "*mundities*" which it betokened is described by Josephus, (when speaking of the baptism of John, which, as a Jew, he could only understand on Jewish principles,) as not, indeed, in itself, availing to expiate sins, but as acceptable to God when used to the purification of the body, *in token* that the soul was *previously purified by righteousness*.—ἐφ' ἀγγελία τῆ σῶματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προεκκαθαρισμένης.—"In corporis purificationem, quasi anima jam ante per justitiam purgata p." But enough has been said in defence of an opinion which, by the unanimous verdict of Grotius, Selden, Hammond, Lightfoot, Gataker, Schöttgen, and Wetstein, is placed among received and established truths, and which is only opposed by the doubts of Basnage, who doubted almost every thing; and those of Schickard and Wolfius, names every way respectable, but whose authority is hardly to be set in competition with the common voice of Jewish and Christian scholars. They who wish to inquire

p Jos. Ant. XVIII. v, 2. p. 804. ed. Havercamp.

further, are referred to Wall and Bishop Tomline, in the places already cited ; and (for some very plausible reasons for the divine appointment of the Jewish baptism) to Joh. And. Danz. "Antiquitas Baptismi." *Jenæ*, 1710.

Respecting the Eucharist, the Reviewer says nothing.

XI. The eleventh charge is, that I have mistakenly applied the name of Paraclete not only to the immediate occasion, "when the Apostles received the heavy tidings of his departure," but "in reference to the peculiar office and function which the Holy Spirit would sustain during his abode with the Church, until our Lord's second advent⁹.

That I have done what is here imputed to me I am most ready to avow; nor do I yet perceive how I could have done otherwise, seeing the Comforter, *as such*, was promised by Christ, with reference, indeed, to the peculiar occasion of his own departure; but, in consequence of that departure, "to abide" with the Church "for ever." This point, by the avowal of the Reviewer himself, vol. vi, p. 661. was "briefly but adequately decided" in the early part of my fourth Lecture; and the arguments which he has now brought against his own previous acknowledgment are not of sufficient consequence to demand any further reply.

XII. A double portion, however, of the Reviewer's severity is called forth by a proposition, which, though incidental only to my subject, I had been induced, for the sake of the interesting corollaries which depend on it, to discuss at some length in my sixth Lecture; I mean the assertion, that sanctifying Grace was not denied to the heathen. The arguments by which I supported this opinion I may be readily excused from repeating.

⁹ Brit. Crit. ubi sup. p. 60.

It may be well, however, to repeat, that, to guard against its possible abuse, I had expressly stated, First, that no man of any country or religion can hope for salvation; except through the imputed merits of our Lord, though I venture to extend the limits of his atonement beyond the circle of those on whom the light of the Gospel has arisen. Secondly, that this favourable construction cannot apply to those to whom the Gospel has been made known, and who have rejected it. Thirdly, that the ordinances of Christ are means absolutely necessary to grace or salvation wherever they are known or accessible; though I have denied that any man will be punished with damnation for the want of rites of which he has never heard, or which were out of his reach. Fourthly, that, as all sanctifying grace must be more or less powerful in proportion to the motives which it suggests to the soul; so, by the superiority of their knowledge, Christians have an infinite advantage over the benighted heathen, and infinite reason to labour in the diffusion of those truths which it was the peculiar errand of the Comforter to reveal to mankind.

To this statement, thus restricted, the following answer is offered. First, the Reviewer affects to wave “the declarations of our Lord, John, xiv, 17. of St. Peter, Acts ii, 38. of St. Paul, Rom. iv, 14. of John, iii, 5. vi, 53, 45. Rom. x, 14—15.” and not “to press “the repugnance” of my opinion to “the doctrine of “original sin;” and “the solemn decisions of our pure “apostolical Church, as formally laid down in her Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies⁹.”

But, though he waves these arguments, I am not inclined to accept his courtesy, and will therefore take

⁹ Brit. Crit. ubi sup. p. 61.

the liberty of examining what those weapons are which he declines to employ against me.

First, It was the whole object of my Lectures to prove, that "the Spirit of Truth," John xiv, 17. was not meant of the Holy Ghost as Sanctifier of good men, but of the Holy Ghost as Giver of celestial knowledge. The reference, therefore, in the present place, is a begging of the question. Secondly, Though Peter promises, in Acts ii, 38. the gift of the Holy Ghost to those whom he urges to receive baptism, it remains to be proved, that the influence of grace was *first* given in baptism, or to the baptized *only*; nay, we know that this was not the case, since they who were baptized must have been first converted; and they could not have been converted without sanctifying grace. But that fresh grace might be obtained, and previous grace augmented and improved, by a faithful use of the appointed means, I have so repeatedly allowed and inculcated, that it is strange that any one who has read my Lectures could bring such an argument against me. The Holy Ghost, as we trust, is received by us *afresh*, in every due participation of the body and blood of Christ; but the renewal of an ancient, and, with many of us, an habitual blessing, is extremely different from the advent of God's Spirit in a new and distinctive character. I might allow then, that St. Peter promised spiritual aid to those who sought it by the appointed ceremony, in the same manner as Christ promised, while on earth, the Holy Spirit to those who prayed for his help, and as David and the Prophets long before expected to obtain it by devotion and study of the Scriptures. But this I might allow, without supposing that those who looked for a fresh illapse of grace were altogether strangers to it before, and without admitting that this grace was the particular blessing promised as a compensation for

Christ's departure. The same answer will apply to John iii, 5. vi, 53, 45. Rom. x, 14—15. Thirdly, The doctrine of original sin, and the necessity of regeneration, I have as strongly maintained as the Reviewer himself can do ; though I have supposed spiritual grace to be sometimes given where the outward form is unattainable. Fourthly, To the Reviewer's interpretation of the Articles and Homilies, I shall venture to oppose the following passage from the same excellent work of Bishop Tomline, which I have already quoted. " Let it not be understood that " the eighteenth Article excludes from the benefits of " Christ's incarnation all to whom the Gospel has not " been made known.—It only condemns those who " confound all religions ; who make revelation useless, " and the grace of God of none effect, by denying the " necessity of believing the Gospel when it is pro- " posed, and by asserting that everlasting happiness " would have been equally attainable, if Christ had not " been born into the world^s." But, of all the arguments which the Reviewer has professed to " pass " over," the citation of Rom. iv, 14. is most extraordinary. St. Paul, he tells us, declares, " that by *this* " *hypothesis*" [the hypothesis, namely, which I have advanced] " *faith* is made void, and the *promise* of no " effect." Is there a conventicle to be found, whose pastor would not be ashamed of such shameless wresting of Scripture ? St. Paul is speaking of the Law of Moses and the promise made to Abraham, and this the Reviewer transforms into an assurance, that, if the heathen are not totally deprived of all grace, and, consequently, of all hope of salvation, the faith of Christians is rendered nugatory ! I do not wonder that he

* Elements of Christ. Theol. ubi supra, p. 318—19.

was anxious to wave all discussion of arguments like these, though he still threw them in, for the chance of finding some readers so careless as to swallow them.

The arguments on which he professedly depends to overturn my hypothesis are, first, that the heathen did not believe in a Being "*essentially the same* as the God "whom we worship." I have said, that it was enough if they believed in a God, the Sustainer and Governor of all things; and so St. Paul himself says, when he defines the lowest degree of saving faith to amount to the confession, that "God *is*, and that he is the Rewarder "of those who diligently seek him." But, to wave such discussions, the Reviewer first denies that such a God as he describes was known to the heathen. And this denial he attempts to make good by the assertion, that "the faith of the ancient heathens was not *pure* "Deism, but *gross Pantheism*; in which the Deity was "not merely multiplied into Polytheism and debased "into idolatry, but nature taken into the notion of "God."

On this statement, it may be observed, first, that between *pure* Deism and *gross Pantheism* there are very many and very marked gradations; and that it was not necessary for my purpose to shew that the Deism of the heathen was absolutely *pure*, though I am greatly concerned to shew that they were not *Pantheists*. Secondly, to debase the Deity *into idolatry*, is a form of speech which in our University would hardly pass current. Our *idea* of God may be debased *by* the practice of idolatry; but neither God himself nor our idea of him can be debased *into* that which is only an *erroneous manner of serving* him. Thirdly, I have already shewn, that "nature may be taken into the notion of "God," (as in the case of those who regard all things as emanations from his essence,) without being re-

garded as coextensive, and absolutely identical with him, and, consequently, without incurring the crime of Pantheism. But that the heathen were not, in general, Pantheists, is apparent from the simple fact, that they worshipped a God or Gods, that they raised temples, offered sacrifices to them, and believed that they had power to punish neglect, or reward devotion. But Pantheism, as I have already shewn, is only Atheism in disguise; and it is as absurd to believe that the whole world would join in costly and painful expressions of their trust in that which they regarded as a non-entity, as it would be to suppose that they prayed to the 25th of March, or burnt incense to their own names. “But the populace were deceived by the crafty pretences of their priests.” Into what opinion were they deceived? that the name whom they worshipped belonged to some real person, who was able to punish or reward them? Nothing short of this would produce the effect which was produced, and few tythes would have been brought into the manger of Apis, if the God whom he represented had been held out as nothing more than a personification of the earth. But if the people were deceived into the belief of a God, (a strange doctrine, by the way, this would be, in the mouth of a Christian and hyper-orthodox Reviewer,) then the people were Theists; and on the very face of the question, my position becomes established with nineteen twentieths of the world.

Nor is it so clear as this Gentleman supposes, that even the *enlightened few* among the heathen believed God to be no more than an inclusive term for all things. The sacred colleges of Egypt, so far from believing in no God at all, believed, as Plutarch tells us¹, in *two*

¹ Plutarch, de Isid. et Osir. Op. t. vii, p. 456. ed Reiske.

Eternal Principles, the one Good, the other Evil ; and confined to the first, or Immaterial Principle only, the name of Deity. Pythagoras and his followers are justified from the charge of Atheism by the positive testimony of Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and by those passages from the Pythagorean writings which may be seen in Cudworth^u. Nor were they ever liable to such a suspicion, except with those who had not distinguished between the doctrine of Emanations and perfect Identity, or who could not understand the notion of an Omnipresent and All-pervading Deity. For even their strongest expressions, like those of the Grecian poets on which the Reviewer lays such stress, amount, when rightly understood, to nothing more than a confession of this last undoubted and sacred truth ; or at most to that erroneous, but far from Atheistic principle, which admits, with Berkeley, but one single substance, and supposes God, in the strictest possible sense, to be the Author and Fountain of existence.

It is something beyond even the usual limits of this writer's carelessness, to adduce Cudworth, p. 419. et seq. as a proof that the Stoics were Atheists, when he must have seen, from that very page, that those philosophers (though their conceptions on the subject of nature were singularly gross and material) yet excepted "the one Supreme Deity," from the degrading consequences of their system. And, if he will take the trouble of turning over the leaf, in the place to which he refers, he will find that they believed "Mind, or Understanding," to be "an Eternal Unmade thing and Maker of the Universe ;" and that they reasoned, to

^u Plutarch. de Plac. Philos. l. i. t. ix, p. 475. Diog. Laert. l. viii. §. 25. Joseph. contr. Apion. ii. p. 482. Clem. Alex. Adm. contr. Gentes, p. 47. ed. Par. Cudworth, p. 370, et seqq.

prove the certainty of such a rational Creator, in nearly the same manner which Paley has adopted in his Natural Theology.

Of Plato and Aristotle I have already spoken, and it is not necessary to my hypothesis to defend the Epicureans and Ionics, inasmuch as my position was not that *all* the heathen believed in God's being and providence, but that *some* among them were, in these particulars, within the limits of Divine knowledge prescribed by St. Paul, as necessary to enable us to come to God.

But "if they were not Pantheists, they were, at all events, Polytheists." Not all; for, with some, it is a fact sufficiently well known, and one which this Reviewer does not deny, that the various deities were regarded as so many different names for One Sole and Supreme. But even the grossest *Polytheists* (excepting only the sottish followers of Epicurus) are well known to have been *Monarchists* also, and to have made a distinction, both in eternity and power, between the inferior immortals and the Father of gods and men, very little less marked than that which some Christians make between God and guardian saints or angels. I do not justify this Polytheism; far less do I seek to extenuate the idolatry to which it led; but to say, that a Polytheist, as such, necessarily disbelieved the existence of one supreme and overruling Providence, is as rare a piece of logic, as that which makes Aristotle worse than an Atheist.

But "in Greece, and, we may add, in Rome, to which Mr. Heber confines his attention, Homer was the standard of private belief, and the directory of public worship." And the account which Homer gives us of "the Father of gods and men," is such as, the Reviewer apprehends, will prove, that he was not speaking of the true God. If it were worth while, I

could shew that Homer was very generally considered as having blasphemed the Gods, and therefore, that his first position, "that Homer's writings were the standard of belief and worship," is not to be taken without great exceptions. But, though Homer has spoken many things injuriously of Jupiter, it will by no means follow that Tertullian was wrong in acknowledging Jupiter to be the same with the One Supreme, or Cudworth fanciful in deriving Jove from Jehovah. The very definition which is given of Jupiter, "Father of gods and of men," as it contains in itself all the circumstances of Paternity, Supremacy, Superintendance, and Sovereignty, is evidently nothing else than God described by his attributes. It is God's own name, as written in the universal language of mankind; and, wherever we meet with this description, we recognise in it the Being whom we adore. It is certain that of this Deity many unworthy things are spoken in Homer; nor (though I might safely do it without any fear of exposing the ancients to the charge of Pantheism) will I fly for succour to the allegories brought forward by Cudworth. But such injurious opinions will not prove, that he is speaking of a different God from the true, but that he spake of the true God unbecomingly. The Rabbins have related of their God many vain and disgusting fables; but is it not Jehovah whom the Jews worship as well as we? The ascetic, who believes that his voluntary sufferings have a positive efficacy in conciliating the All-wise; the persecutor, who, while indulging his own furious passions, apprehends that he is gratifying the All-merciful; both these have very erroneous notions of the Eternal Majesty: but are they, therefore, apostates or idolaters? Unless St. Paul were wrong in asserting that the Athenians ignorantly worshipped the same God whom he declared to

them; unless he were guilty of "blasphemy" in comparing the Deity of Aratus with that of the Gospel, my hypothesis must yet stand firm, that the God whom we worship was also revered by the heathen.

The grievous idolatries and various abominations into which too many of the heathen fell, I have nowhere extenuated or concealed. But I have shewn from the frequent and parallel apostasies among the Jews, that as God, in the chosen nation, never failed to leave himself a remnant; so the like remnant may have been left, and appears to have been so left, in the shining virtues of many among the less favoured, but not altogether abandoned, inhabitants of the Gentile world. But, retorts the Reviewer, if the shining virtues of the heathen are proofs that they were actuated by grace; what shall we say of the virtues of Hindus, Mahommedans and Jews? "As Mr. Heber," he urges, "will not, we hope, assert, that they also may attain to the *consolations* of grace while they live in wilful neglect of its means; he will probably help us to some *casuistical distinction*, which will solve the paradox, how the same mode of proof, applied to two cases essentially the same, should enforce conviction in the one, and *decide* against it in the other x."

In this argument the Gentleman begins, as usual, by misstating the question, and ends, as is also usual with him, with an assertion, which, even on his own principles, is a "*non sequitur*." First, my assertion was not that the heathen shared in the *consolations* of grace; but that sanctifying grace, in general, was not withheld from them. And sanctifying grace I had defined, (with which definition the Reviewer does not quarrel,) "the inspiration of religious feeling and recollection y."

x Br t. Crit. p. 67.

y Lectures, p. 328.

Whether this be consolatory or no must depend on other causes; on the voice of conscience; on the degree of knowledge; on the hopes or fears of the individual. Like the natural light of heaven, it may, according to the subject on which it is exercised, display misery and deformity and danger, as well as happiness, beauty, and security. It will not, therefore, necessarily follow, that where *grace* is given, the *consolations* of grace are given at the same time. And, secondly, it is a most illogical way of talking, to maintain that in any case the *virtues* of Jews and Mahommedans can be *decisive* against their being actuated by grace, though *other causes* might lead us to suppose, either that their virtues were not real, or that they proceeded from some other fountain. But, to dismiss these criticisms, it is evident, that those principles which I applied to the ancient Greeks and Romans will apply to all, who, at the present day, are worshippers of God, but who live in inevitable ignorance of his more perfect will as revealed in Jesus Christ. The difficulty, then, will only belong to those cases where Christianity and the means of grace have been really offered and rejected. And here I would first inquire, whether Christianity had been presented to the persons in question in a rational and convincing form; whether the inventions of men had not been obtruded on their assent, instead of the genuine principles of the gospel; and whether no circumstances might exist, perhaps known only to God, which rendered their error, however unfortunate, invincible and conscientious. I would next inquire, whether their virtues were, in fact, so shining as was pretended; whether they had really the appearance of proceeding from the love of God; and whether there were not other reasons, besides their infidelity, to induce us to believe that his Spirit was not with them. Lastly, if I were

satisfied that the persons in question had really enjoyed sufficient opportunities of instructing themselves in the truth ; that they were really virtuous, and virtuous from that motive which alone is acceptable with our Maker ; (an extreme case this, and which, for all that appears, is purely hypothetical ;) I still should not be obliged to ascribe their gracious actions to any other principle than the source of all strength and holiness. I am not one of those, (whatever my censor may be,) who conceive the grace of God to be always irresistible ; or who deny the possibility of a man obeying His voice in some things, who, in others, is overpowered by the force of temptation, habit, or prejudice. The case of such heathen would not be more extraordinary than that of many Christians who have renounced the greater part of their evil habits, but who cling to one darling lust with blinded and fatal pertinacity. Yet of these we should say, indeed, that grace had effected as yet only a partial conquest of their souls ; but not that they were altogether strangers to it. But of all such, whether heathens or Christians, I should regard the condition as most perilous, and, without repentance, damnable. I should apprehend with reason, that the Spirit by which they were not yet abandoned might not much longer continue to strive with them ; and I should be stimulated to labour more earnestly for their conversion, not only from the sorrow that such virtues should be all in vain, but from the assurance which those virtues would give me, that my endeavours were aided by an ally within the garrison, and that God himself was warring in their hearts to deliver them. With this distinction, whether *casuistical* or no I will not judge, I dismiss the case of the virtuous heathen.

XIII. The Reviewer is indignant at my asserting, that “ the initiative and commemorative ceremonies of our

“religion,” have not a *positive*, but a *relative* efficacy; in other words, that the forms cannot save us without inward faith, and that inward faith may save us where the forms are unattainable; though I have, at the same time, solemnly stated that, *as appointed signs* of our faith, those forms, when possible to us, are absolutely necessary to salvation. If my censor thinks differently, I shall be curious to see his confession and the arguments on which he grounds it.

XIV. The next charge relates to an exposition which I have given in my notes of 1 Cor. xiii, 12. in which I have ventured to suppose, that the “glass,” or “*ἑσοπτρον*,” through which we are described by St. Paul as beholding the divine mysteries in our present state of mortal imperfection, is an allusion to an ancient Rabbinical allegory, which describes the visions which were vouchsafed to the ancient prophets, as exhibited through “specularia” more or less pellucid. And I have further ventured to suppose, that this Rabbinical figure is itself derived from the practice of the Pagan mystics, who were accustomed to display their Phantasmagoria through media like the Chinese shades, well known to children.

Of the ignorant pertness with which this suggestion is treated, I have no inclination to take notice^z. The

^z There is one assertion, however, for which I am bound to demand, and do demand, an explanation. It is said, that I have often “quoted the *blasphemies* of the Cabbala as *authority*.” *Brit. Crit.* vol. vii, p. 67. What *blasphemies*, in God’s name, have I quoted at all from “the Cabbala;” or what *blasphemies* of the Jews have I noticed, unless with a view to point out the true method of refuting them? What does the Reviewer mean by his “*authority*?” Will he say that I have myself adopted any blasphemous opinions? that I have used any blasphemous language? that I have adduced any blasphemous opinions of the Jews as obligatory on the faith of Christians? He will not; he dares not. If this were mere folly and ignorance of the force of his own expressions, I

objections urged against it are, if I understand them rightly, that ἑσοπτρον is a *mirror*, not a *window*;—That, ἐν αἰνίγματι is *verbally dark*, not dark in the sense of an opaque body;—That the Rabbins, from whom I quote, lived “centuries after St. Paul was martyred;”—That the Eleusinian mysteries were “a source of every thing “impure and impious;”—That “it must provoke a “smile in the *sagest* reader, to see Mr. Christie’s Phantasmagoria and the Jewish Cabbala associated as authority in the explanation of inspired truth;” and that such a conduct is “more worthy of a disciple of “Volney or Tindal, than of Spencer or Le Clerc^a.”

To the first of these objections I reply, that ἑσοπτρον, a word of very rare occurrence, if it be found at all, in any writings but the Scripture, has been conceived by all the best modern critics of the continent, by Shöttgen, Wolfius, Wetstein, Schleusner, and many others whom it is unnecessary to name, as synonymous with “specular,” not “speculum;” as meaning a diaphanous, not a reflective, substance. So universally has this interpretation been adopted, that in Germany, I believe, not a single dissentient voice is found; and the scholars of that country, of all men, most accustomed to Biblical criticism, have considered the fact of St. Paul’s alluding to the above named Rabbinical allegory, as a point altogether decided. Secondly, when I said that ἐν αἰνίγματι was rightly translated, *darkly*, I did not enter into the question, which was extremely irrelevant to my purpose, whether that darkness referred to the opacity of the medium through which the visions were supposed to be seen, or the obscurity of the language in which

should have passed it over unnoticed; but when folly and malignity go hand in hand, we can scarcely strike too hard.

^a Brit. Crit. p. 67.

they were described. I merely reflected on the injudicious refinements of Warburton, who appropriated that expression to "mysteriously contrived marks," and "images" different from the things themselves; which, in fact, implied no more than a general darkness of conception or intimation. The Reviewer, then, might have spared his pains in collecting testimonies from Exodus and Maimonides, to illustrate the nature of "parables," inasmuch as neither Wetstein nor myself supposed that St. Paul really saw God through a semipellucid substance, but that God's nature was revealed to him in declarations so obscure, that they might be compared to the Rabbinical **אספקלריא** ^b.

But though I readily admit the relation of St. Paul's *ἐν αἰνίγματι* to the **בהידת** of Moses, Num. xii, 8. yet I cannot so easily allow that **תמונה** and *ἑσσοπτερον* are by any means akin. Even if I should grant that it was promised to Moses that he should "behold the Lord, "not through figures," it will not, therefore, necessarily follow, that either St. Paul was alluding to this expression in the word *ἑσσοπτερον*, or that "the figures" of Moses "properly meant the image of an object reflected in a mirror." But further, my learned censor is doubtless aware, that both our English Version and the Septuagint, as well as the modern Jews themselves, give a very different meaning to the words from that which he has produced from the Vulgate. They render the verse in question, not "ore ad os loquar ei, et palam et non per ænigmata et figuras Dominum videt:" but "ore ad os loquar ei, et palam et non per ænigmata; et figuram Domini videbit." "With him will "I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently and not in

^b Schöttgen, p. 651. "Priorem locutionem Paulus bis effert, semel more Biblico *ἐν αἰνίγματι*, iterum more Judaico, *ἐν ἑσσοπτερον*, **באספקלריא**."

“dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold.” Στόμα κατὰ σόμα λαλήσω αὐτῷ ἐν εἶδει, καὶ οὐ δι’ αἰνιγμάτων, καὶ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου εἶδε. And the learned Reviewer is no doubt prepared to give a reason, why he rejects a translation which is not only most common, but most literal also, and most consonant with the rules of grammar, and which has no conceivable inconvenience, except that it does not support the hypothesis of his friend Mr. Nolan ^c.

As for the objection taken from the period at which the Gemaristic Rabbins flourished, I have answered it already, but cannot help observing, that a proverbial form of speech, like that of the “specular,” is one of those circumstances which last longest in the traditions of every sect and nation. When the Reviewer has informed me wherein the Eleusinian mysteries consisted, I shall be the better able to decide whether they really were (what I never found them styled before) “the source of every thing impure and impious;” and a reason is yet to be given, why it would be unbecoming in St. Paul to allude to a Jewish proverbial allegory, or unbecoming in the Jews to illustrate the comparative plainness or obscurity of prophecy, by a harmless metaphor taken from the customs of the neighbouring nations. Why the Reviewer should speak disrespectfully of Mr. Christie’s work I cannot discover. I am sure that many curious facts and learned observations are to be found there, which this Gentleman has never beheld even through the “specular non lucidum.” But the dictum, that it is only worthy “of the disciples of

^c There are seven other passages in Scripture where the word תְּמוּנָה occurs. In none of these is it used as a *reflected image*, or *shadow*, but as the *form* or *outward shape* of any thing. The word which means *shadow*, *likeness*, or *representation*, in the only sense which suits the Reviewer’s purpose is, צֶלֶל. Gen. i, 27.

“Volney and Tindal” to attempt the explanation of Scripture by a reference to the manners and phrases of uninspired antiquity, demands some little further notice. I will not insist on the inaccuracy of expression by which the “explanation of inspired truth” is confounded with the explanation of the language in which that truth is conveyed, and the imagery whereby it is illustrated; though it is plain that the application of Cabbalistic and heathen authorities was, in the present instance, not to explain a doctrine, but a metaphor.

But will this Gentleman undertake to maintain, as a general principle, that it is profane and heathenish to apply our heathen learning to the use and illustration of God’s word? If this be not the point to which his censure is meant to extend, it would be well that he should be more definite in his invective. If it be, how greatly have our Universities erred in the education of a learned clergy, and how much time has been wasted by almost every commentator on the Bible, from Erasmus down to Michaelis? Do Shaw and Pocock illustrate a difficult text from the customs now prevailing in Syria? “Surely,” cries this Reviewer, “it must make “the *sagest* reader smile to see the laws and customs of “Turks and Arabs, who lived centuries after our Lord “was crucified, adduced as authority in the explanation “of inspired Truth!” Is the name of *εὐεγγέτας* explained by Grotius from Plutarch and Isocrates? “It is a conduct only worthy of Volney and Tindal.” How much are we indebted to Spencer and Le Clerc themselves for the application to Scripture of those stores of information which this Gentleman would resign to the exclusive use of infidelity! If my illustration is irrelevant, let it stand or fall by its own merits; but my censor can only shew his own weakness and petulance

by assailing me on those grounds which concern the common cause of learning and rational criticism.

XV. The fifteenth charge, that I have supposed the "abode of the Comforter" to be equally proved "by his absence, as his presence," is not of a nature to detain me. The Reviewer has confounded in the passage on which this charge depends, the presence of the Apostle Paul, by whose mouth and writings the Comforter equally spoke to the Church, with that of the Spirit by which he was actuated; and whose influence was, by such writings, felt at Corinth, or Colosse, even while the writer was in chains at Rome.

XVI. I have urged, in answer to those objectors who adduce the apparent contradictions of Scripture as evidence against its Divine origin, that, *supposing those contradictions to be real*, which I have been very far from admitting, still they relate to those parts of the Evangelists' narration "which have reference not to doctrines but events;" which affect no single article of faith or lesson of holiness, but "can do no more, at most, than leave their reader under some degree of hesitation as to the hour of the crucifixion, the title on the cross, or the year in which our Saviour drove forth the money-changers from his temple." I have urged, that "circumstances which, whether true or false, have no possible bearing on the doctrine or character of Christ, may belong, indeed, to his history, but are no essential parts of his Gospel;" "and that we may admit the New Testament as an unerring and imperative rule in every point of doctrine or of practice, though we should be for ever ignorant of the year in which Cyrenius governed Syria, or whether the apostate Judas met his fearful end by strangulation or by rupture." "For the inspiration of the New Testament," I have further remarked, "is doctrinal, not

“ historical ; that our Lord, who has given so explicit
 “ a promise to his Apostles of ability to record his
 “ words, has no where declared, that in relating every
 “ particular occurrence of his life, they should have the
 “ same supernatural accuracy ; far less that they should
 “ possess it in their references to the contemporary
 “ history of Judea and the Roman empire^d.”

Of these passages the Reviewer has selected the last, in order to observe on it, that he “ rather chooses to
 “ meet the objection, by throwing the censure upon the
 “ fallible transcriber, than the *inspired writer* ; by fixing
 “ it on our own limited discrimination and knowledge,
 “ than fastening it upon the *inspired infallible truth*^e.” In these expressions it is needless to point out the temper which imputes to me the “ throwing a censure on
 “ *the inspired writer, &c.*” when the very point in question is, whether his inspiration applied to those particulars or no. If a man receives inspiration as a prophet of God’s will, it will not necessarily follow that he is also inspired when speaking of the king’s coronation ; and if, as the Reviewer will not deny, the supposed contradictions in Scripture relate to events not more the subjects of religious faith than the event which I have instanced, my argument must hold good, for all which he has urged against it. But is the Reviewer prepared to urge (whatever may be his private suspicions) a supposed negligence of the scribe or corruption of the text of Scripture, in answer to every contradiction in the Sacred Volume which he may be otherwise unable to solve ? If so, I heartily hope that he may never have to dispute with an infidel. And, lastly, when he expresses his disposition to account for the apparent contradiction by “ his own limited knowledge,” where was his

^d Lectures, pp. 573. 575. 576. 577.

^e Brit. Crit. p. 72.

candour in omitting to notice that I had myself expressed the same sentiment in far stronger terms, when I stated the fact of these supposed contradictions, not as my own opinion, but as a concession which might be safely made to my antagonist; when I contended that the difficulties in question "might be, and had been satisfactorily solved, without impeaching in the smallest degree the accuracy of the sacred historian;" and when I declared my "confidence," that "such difficulties as yet remain to try our faith and our humility, will, hereafter, in God's good time, receive their perfect solution^f."

It is this of which I complain, and this which is the offensive and pervading characteristic of the whole article before me; that, not content with maintaining his own opinions, or censuring those in which I really differ from him, he is busied throughout in advancing such charges as have most tendency to render me suspected or odious, careless whether his inferences are justified by the expressions which I employ; careless whether those expressions which, taken separately, favour his charge, are not softened or explained by passages which he thinks fit to pass over in silence; careless how many eminent persons are involved with me in his indiscriminate imputations; careless of his own consistency, and indifferent to the exposure of his own superficial information; so that my work may be held out as of dangerous tendency to the cause which I have defended. What are his motives for such a line of conduct, he himself best knows; nor is it worth my while to inquire. In my answer I have had no object but the necessary vindication of my character as a clergyman, which alone could have induced me to intrude my com-

^f Lectures, pp. 575—576.

plaints on the world, or to trouble you, my dear Sir, with this long apology. If I have, in any part of it, expressed myself with undue warmth against my censor, the extent of the provocation will, I trust, be remembered; and that it is almost impossible to feel strongly and speak with perfect calmness. Nor let it be forgotten that, as the Reviewer is unknown, my reflections, though they may give him some salutary pain, can do him no real injury. If, indeed, they lower his own estimation of himself, and teach him to take fewer liberties with his neighbour; if they teach him to boast less and perform more, and to conduct his "investigations" of Scripture in reality as well as fancy; if they teach him to judge of Plato from his original works, "*et libris Aristotelis diligentius incumbere*;" if they teach him, above all, that to call his brother "heretic," may be easy, indeed, but is not always prudent; and that misrepresentations, however confidently urged, for the most part recoil on their author; he will have reason to thank me for the animadversions which he has provoked, and (which is the best effect of that wise secrecy which a reviewer usually observes) neither the world, nor my friends, nor I myself, can be ever tempted to withhold the due tribute of our praise from his exertions in a better cause and under another character.

To yourself, my dear Sir, some apology may yet be due for the liberty which I have taken in thus addressing to you in particular, a vindication intended for the public eye; and in making you a sort of party to a cause in which I only am concerned. But as it is to your instructions and encouragement that I mainly owe what little learning I possess and whatever of praise I have been honoured with, I have felt anxious to prove to you above all, that your pupil has not so far degenerated from your lessons, nor your friend from your