

FALSE WORSHIP:

H. T. Strong
1858.

AN ESSAY.

BY THE REV.

S. R. MAITLAND, D.D. F.R.S. & F.S.A.

LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

1856.

Lately published,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

SUPERSTITION AND SCIENCE:

AN ESSAY.

Price 2s.

C O N T E N T S.

SECTION	PAGE
1. Antediluvian Worship	1
2. The Deluge	10
3. The Origin of False Worship	15
4. The descendants of the Giants	20
5. Angels ; their sin and punishment	27
6. The Abyss—Spirits in Prison	45
7. Leviathan	53
8. Daemoniacal Possession	67
9. Pagan doctrine of a Supreme Being	78
10. The Nature of False Worship	88
11. The Worship of Angels	96
12. Women in relation to False Worship	116
13. Fascination	134
14. Isaiah iii. Ezek. xiii.	152
15. The Moral character of Jewish women	192
16. Children in relation to false worship	211
17. Healing	243
18. Oracles	257

NOTE

A. Hesiod of the Titans (referred to p. 44)	273
B. The Serpent of the Abyss (referred to p. 67)	274
C. The Book of Enoch (referred to p. 69)	279
D. Bishop Warburton on Mysteries (referred to p. 96)	281
E. Female Superstition (referred to p. 117)	283
F. The Theological Critic (referred to p. 145)	289
G. Invultuation and Facillation (referred to p. 150)	291
H. Kedesim (referred to p. 209)	299
I. Mesmeric Séance at Geneva (referred to p. 234)	307
K. Mr. Lacy and the French Prophets (referred to p. 236)	309
L. Spiritualist Therapeutics (referred to p. 257)	313
M. The Delphic Oracle (referred to p. 264)	316
N. Lucian and some recent phænomena (referred to p. 270)	325
Note on Ezek. xiii. 18 (referring to p. 191)	331

“Although I be as desirous to know what I should, and what I should not, as any of my brethren, the sons of Adam ; yet I find that the more I search, the further I am from being satisfied, and make but few discoveries, save of my own ignorance : and, therefore, I am desirous to follow the example of a very wise personage, Julius Agricola, of whom Tacitus gave this testimony, ‘ Retinuitque (quod est difficillimum) ex scientia modum :’ or, that I may take my precedent from within the pale of the Church, it was the saying of St. Austin, ‘ Mallem quidem eorum, quæ a me quæsivisti, habere scientiam quam ignorantiam ; sed quia id nondum potui, magis eligo cautam ignorantiam confiteri, quam falsam scientiam profiteri.’ And these words do very much express my sense. But if there be any man so confident as Luther sometimes was, who said that he could expound all Scripture ; or so vain as Eckius, who, in his ‘ Chrysopassus,’ ventured upon the highest and most mysterious question of predestination, ‘ ut in ea juveniles possit calores exercere ;’ such persons as these, or any that is furious in his opinion, will scorn me and my discourse : but I shall not be much moved at it, only I shall wish that I had as much knowledge as they think me to want, and they as much as they believe themselves to have.”

JEREMY TAYLOR.

FALSE WORSHIP

PART I.

Antediluvian worship—the Deluge—the Origin of false worship—the descendants of the Giants.

EXCEPT the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, the records of the antediluvian world furnish no account of any thing which we should include in the idea of divine worship, or adoration paid by man to the Supreme Being. That such offerings as were made by these sons of Adam were expressions of adoration—that one offering was acceptable, and the other unacceptable—and that the acceptance depended on the faith of him who offered—we know beyond all doubt from the inspired testimony that, “by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained

witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts¹."

But, in the history of the antediluvian period, we are not directly told so much as that sacrifices had been required of man; and we do not learn with what rites they were performed. We may assume that where there was an offering there was an altar; but even then, it seems as if we might almost adopt the words of the Roman historian, "aram tantum et reverentiam"—unless indeed he meant to exclude the idea of a material and substantial sacrifice. It looks as if we might say, not merely as he says of Mount Carmel, that there was no image, no temple, no building consecrated by holy rites, or dedicated to sacred purposes; but that there was nothing like what we now call "religious service" consisting of confession, prayer and thanksgiving. But while we say this with regard to ritual worship, I think there can be no doubt that we should be authorized to add for our world, so far as it was then peopled, what a believer in the Bible would have added to the description of the sacred mountain by Tacitus—that it was sanctified,

¹ Heb. xi. 4.

and glorified, and linked to heaven by the inestimable gift of Prophecy.

For reasons which will become more apparent as we proceed, I mention this at the outset. It is in my view the link which unites the visible and invisible worlds; and it is important that we should come to an understanding on this point, as far, and as soon, as we can. It is the more necessary because well known, and highly respected, writers have used such language respecting the “liberty of prophesying,” and the “large sense” of the word “prophet,” as has tended to throw some obscurity on the matter². Without entering into

² Take a specimen from Doddridge’s commentary on Titus i. 12. “One of themselves, even a prophet of their own.” He says “*A Prophet*] Epimenides, whose words Paul here quotes, is said, by Diogenes Laertius, to have been a great favourite of the gods; but Aristotle says, he never foretold any future event; which, as Dr. Scott justly observes, (Scott’s Christian Life, vol. iii. p. 650.) is a plain argument that the word *Prophet* is sometimes used in a large sense, for one, who is supposed, by the person applying the title to him, to be an *Instructor of men in divine things*, from whom the will of the Deity may be learnt.” Vol. v. p. 565. Suppose (and the thing is not altogether impossible) that Aristotle said rather more than he could prove, what becomes of the “plain argument,” and of the Commentator’s claim to be considered a “prophet?” No doubt Dr. Doddridge and Dr. Scott were instructors of men in divine things. Bishop Patrick on

details on this point, however, I will merely state what I believe to be the truth.

When we speak of a “prophet,” the idea most commonly and readily presented to our minds is that of one who predicts future events. This, however, arises from our adopting a word which we suppose to imply the power of prediction. How far it suits the greek προφήτης, I do not here enquire; but clearly it does not embrace all that we ought to understand by the hebrew נבִיא. I do not mean that this hebrew term can be made to include either mere poets who wrote verses about divine truths, or teachers who merely preached sermons, sung psalms, or performed other divine offices of that nature. As far as I can understand, the characteristic of a prophet, was that in matters of thought, word, and deed, he was, either for the time, or habitually, under an influence which enabled, and required, him to

1 Chron. xxv. 1. which refers to the sons of Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun who were separated to “ prophesy with harps” &c. “Who should prophesy.] Sing *Psalms*, which David and other prophets composed. For these young men were not prophets, as their fathers were; but are said *to prophesy*, because they sung in the service of God those divine prophetic hymns, which were composed by their fathers, who were men divinely inspired.”

think, and say, and do, things beyond his natural powers, and beyond the faculties of men in general. It might be that he predicted an event, or announced a command, or that he performed a miracle without speaking; but in every thing relating to his official character, he—or more properly speaking the power by which he was instructed and influenced—was the link between the visible, and the unseen, world.

It seems as if there had been prophets from the days of Enos, for so I think we must understand—“then began men to call upon the name of the Lord.” Gen. iv. 26. Who can believe that mankind lived on for centuries without prayer to God, or the invocation of his Name? and yet I know not what else our translators would have us to understand by the words which I have just quoted. Can they mean any thing but that hitherto men had not been wont to “call upon the Name of the Lord?”

The Jewish interpretation is, if possible, still more unsatisfactory. According to it, the words mean, that at this period, men began to profane the name of God by giving it to false gods. Maimonides begins his tract on Idolatry by telling us, that in the days of Enos,

mankind, and even the patriarch himself, fell into great error. They taught, he says, that God had created the heavenly bodies to rule the earth, and that he designed that those his creatures should share his glory, as a king desires to see his servants honoured, the respect being, in fact, paid to himself; and he adds, that, having taken up this notion, mankind fell to work, and built temples, and framed rites, in honour of the Sun, Moon, and Stars; and so idolatry was, it would seem, almost at once, established in full blown majesty.

These “undevout astronomers” must, I suspect, have been contemporary, if not identical, with the original politicians who framed social contracts, and invented civil governments; but I notice the interpretation for two reasons—first, because in all cases, the traditional opinions of the Jews, on matters relating to their own history and language, are entitled to some consideration—secondly, because, though erroneous as an interpretation, it appears to have reference to matters which may come under discussion in the course of this enquiry, and it may be desirable to refer to it³.

³ Partly on the latter of these grounds I transcribe a

As to the passage of Scripture itself, surely we may say that, simply construed, it means, that from that time forth men began to speak, or proclaim, in the name of the Lord. It is barely possible, that if we had not the long sacred history which follows, we might be more or less in doubt as to the meaning of the phrase; but what can be more plain when we are expressly told that Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied (*προεφήτευσε Jude 14.*), when Noah is described as a preacher of righteousness (*δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα 2 Pet. ii. 5.*), and these early prophets are followed in Scripture History, by a long line of chosen and inspired men, crying to one generation after another, “Thus saith the Lord?”

It appears, as I have in part suggested, that a prophet, according to the Scriptural account, was a man whose thoughts, words, and actions were under an influence which it may not be

remark of Dionysius Vossius, the translator of Maimonides. “*Cœperunt ædificare sideribus templæ]* Exposita origine idolatriæ, ad modum autor transit. Primum cultum facit templæ, sacrificia, hymnos, et adorationem. Vellem ordinis majorem paullo rationem habuisset. Nam simul cum religionis exordio templæ esse ab hominibus exstructa parum sane verisimile videtur. Simplicissimi mortalium simplicissimo quoque cultu usi sunt.”—*Cap. i. § 2.*

strictly correct to call foreign and external, but which might be either occasional, or habitual, and (if I may so speak) official. Without attempting to enter into detail or strict definition on the subject, I may just refer to the cases of Samuel and Saul. When all Israel, from Dan even to Beersheba, perceived that the Lord was with Samuel, and did let none of his words fall to the ground, they knew that he was established to be a Prophet of the Lord⁴; and that office he retained all the days of his life. The very singular and interesting history of Saul⁵, furnishes much matter for reflection, while it wonderfully illustrates the other case, or what I have ventured to call the occasional exercise of the prophetic character; but this is not the place for discussing it.

It is more properly our business to observe, that if the records of the Antediluvian world furnish but little information respecting the worship of the true God, they say absolutely nothing of Idolatry, or the worship of false gods. This is a very remarkable fact; and one which the reader should keep in mind, not only in this enquiry, but when commentators

⁴ See 1 Sam. iii. 19. 20.

⁵ Ibid. ch. x.

tell him about the pious descendants of Seth, and the idolatrous progeny of Cain.

We may add, that what the Bible does say of the state and proceedings of men before the flood, even supposing it to be capable of being so stretched as to make it comprehend every kind of sin, does not seem ever to have been understood as relating to idolatry, or as implying that the sinners were guilty of that particular species of impiety. In the sixth chapter of Genesis we read that, “the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” v. 5.—“the earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.” v. 11.—“God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.” v. 12.—the consequence was that the earth was “filled with violence.” v. 13. We might, perhaps, make the language of these strong and repeated statements include the worship of false gods, if we found reason elsewhere for believing that idolatry was then practised. But I know not where we can find evidence of this. Certainly we get no countenance from the quarters to which we might

most naturally turn for information. Our Lord, in his reference to the days of Noah⁶, speaks of the sinful carelessness, and carnal security,—perhaps of the sensual sin—of the antediluvians; but He suggests no idea of idolatry; and the Jewish writers do not appear to have supposed that false worship had then come into existence.

§ 2. *The Deluge.*

I have passed very hastily and slightly over the Antediluvian period because it is my desire to impress on the reader's mind, one very simple idea—namely, that if with such scanty materials as we have, we trace the history of divine worship from the Creation to the Deluge, we find no mention of false worship.

This is I believe a fact; and it is important to consider in connexion with it, that those who have taken up the subject of pagan mythology, studying it in its maturity, and pursuing an analytical and retrogressive method

⁶ Matt. xxiv. 38. Luke xvii. 27.

of enquiry, have not only been unable to trace back false worship beyond the Deluge, but they have decidedly and unequivocally traced it up to that particular period, and demonstrated, as one of its most obvious and unquestionable characters, that it was, in some very peculiar manner, connected with that catastrophe.

I shall so soon and so clearly show that I am not a convert to Mr. Bryant's system of mythology, that I am not afraid to express my high respect for his character, and for the learning, industry, and ingenuity, which characterize his "Analysis." I must even go farther; and say, that making only due allowance for specific mistakes and errors such as must occur in so large a work, on so wide a subject, I think he proves most of his points, except *the* point to which, in his view, all his proofs tended. As I have already suggested, he traced up the Mythology of the ancients to the flood. "Time with the ancients," he tells us, "commenced at the Deluge; and all their traditions, and all their genealogies terminated here; even the birth of mankind went with them no higher than this epocha⁷." "I shall

⁷ Vol. iii. p. 98.

endeavour” he says “to show that the history of the deluge was religiously preserved in the first ages: that every circumstance of it is to be met with among the historians and mythologists of different countries: and traces of it are to be particularly found in the sacred rites of Egypt, and of Greece⁸. ” This task Mr. Bryant performed with great labour and learning, and with considerable success; but he was less happy in his attempt to raise what was in fact the top stone of his structure. We may, indeed, almost without a figure, say that the Sun of his system was the deified Noah;—“They styled him” says he “Prometheus, Deucalion, Atlas, Theuth, Zuth, Xuthus, Inachus, Osiris. When there began to be a tendency towards idolatry; and the adoration of the Sun was introduced by the posterity of Ham; the title of Helius among others was conferred upon him⁹. ” In short, according to the system of this learned mythologist, all the gods were Noah, and all false worship, by whatever names or rites it might be distinguished, was directed ultimately to him.

Mr. Bryant’s readers had been prepared for this by his suggesting, that the details of the

⁸ Vol. iii. p. 7.

⁹ Ibid.

tremendous Deluge would be long remembered, and recounted with awe, by the survivors. “We may,” he says, “reasonably suppose, that the particulars of this extraordinary event would be gratefully commemorated by the Patriarch himself; and transmitted to every branch of his family: that they were made the subject of domestic converse; where the history was often renewed, and ever attended with a reverential awe and horror: especially in those, who had been witnesses to the calamity, and had experienced the hand of Providence in their favour. In process of time, when there was a falling off from the truth, we might farther expect that a person of so high a character as Noah, so particularly distinguished by the Deity, could not fail of being reverenced by his posterity: and, when idolatry prevailed, that he would be one of the first among the sons of men, to whom divine honours would be paid. Lastly, we might conclude that these memorials would be interwoven in the mythology of the Gentile world: and that there would be continually allusions to these ancient occurrences in the rites and mysteries; as they were practised by the nations of the earth¹. ”

¹ Vol. iii. p. 6.

That circumstances connected with the deluge were interwoven with, and in fact gave rise to, the mythology of the Gentile world, I fully believe; and I feel very grateful to Mr. Bryant for the light which he has thrown on that point, but in his deification of Noah, I can by no means acquiesce. Supposing the Patriarch to have been treated by his descendants with a degree of reverence of which I find no trace, I cannot bring myself to imagine his being deified. We who look back on things which are obscure, but which having certainly existed, seem as if they must be accounted for, are under a great temptation to let explanations pass which would not stand cross-examination. Moreover, in this particular case, we are prepared by having been made familiar from childhood with the notion of men being deified, and with explanations that so-called gods were only men whom their fellow-men thought fit to deify and worship. It is easy to suppose that this or that heathen god for whom nobody on earth knows how to suggest any other origin, was a king whom his subjects adored; but I have no good faith in such idolatrous loyalty, and doubt whether it ever existed. I suspect that people who made their gods in such a way

would not be likely to worship any thing very much. We know that great men, belonging to times far too modern to be of use in our enquiry, when they were gone, were said to have been admitted to the number of the Gods; but even this, I suspect, was more in compliment to their successors than to themselves. If they had not been succeeded by living dogs, even dead lions might have waited long enough for their altars. Folly and flattery may go a great way. I can believe that Virgil said, “erit ille mihi semper Deus” &c. but I do not believe that the tower of Babel was built in honour of the God Noah, or that its many-tongued builders, or even their successors at some uncertain period, concurred in calling him god, and worshipping him.

§ 3. *The Origin of False Worship.*

What then may we consider to have been the origin of idolatry and false worship? I believe that a writer of the present day has given the popular view of the matter when he says, “With respect to the way in which false reli-

gions were first introduced, there can be no doubt that they must have crept in gradually. For men would not all at once forsake the worship of the great Creator, and forget his very existence, and serve other Gods *instead* of him. But it is likely, that when they had come to imagine certain inferior spirits to reside in the sun and moon, the sea, rivers, groves, &c. they would next be led to call upon these beings, in the hope that *perhaps* such prayers might be heard²."

This view appears to me to be very unsatisfactory for several reasons, of which I will at present mention only one. That is, that it seems to countenance a notion taken up by some unthinking talkers on the subject, who speak as if in their idea "a Religion" was a system cut and dry, and compacted—an ecclesiastical polity with all its properties of doctrine, discipline, and practice—as if there had been, from the beginning, something of this kind universally acknowledged and established throughout the world—as if in the course of time, this established system had been con-

² Quoted in "Lectures on the Scripture Revelations respecting good and evil Angels" (p. 99.) from "Lessons on Religious Worship."

fronted and opposed by another—and then, after a trial of strength, like that between Elijah and the priests of Baal, one Religion had prevailed to the extinction of the other.

But as I have already suggested, there was not, so far as I can find, any such system in the antediluvian ages. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel, and the fact that men prophesied and declared the will of God by divine inspiration, seem to be the only things on which we can ground any notion of *worship*. They are, indeed, pregnant facts as it regards *religion*, though they afford little information respecting the external observances by which it was manifested. It is likely that some men were more ignorant than others; but it is also likely, especially considering the duration of human life, that one generation after (or we may almost say, with) another grew up in the knowledge of God. That man, though fallen from innocence, acknowledged the true God and Him only. That, even while a disobedient sinner against Jehovah, he did not tender his allegiance to another sovereign. That if he neglected to worship the true God, he did not pretend to worship any thing. And, what is most of all to our purpose, that when he did

come to worship any other being it was on other grounds, and with worship of a different kind from that which he had rendered, and perhaps continued to render, to his Creator.

Of course the progress of apostasy in individuals, and in communities, may have been gradual. Who, I wonder, ever did suppose that men would “all at once forsake the worship of the great Creator, and forget his very existence, and serve other Gods *instead of him?*” But our question is, How did apostasy begin? How came men to take the first step? Was it, as we are told that when they had come to imagine that certain inferior spirits were resident in the Sun and Moon, they thought they would pray to them as a mere matter of experiment? It seems to me that, if we accept this explanation, it only throws us another step back, and we have to enquire how men came to believe that spirits resided in the sun and moon. How came they to imagine such a thing? What led to this notion about “inferior spirits?” That mankind did believe in, and serve, and seek after, “inferior spirits” even while acknowledging a supreme power, is beyond all doubt. “Paganism” said a very learned writer “was the opinion of all the

nations of mankind—one excepted. It is (as it were) the *catholic tradition* of the World. It is that of a world of lies and errors, and therefore is devoid of authority. But falsehood is usually built upon foundations of truth; and therefore more things will perhaps be found to be *untrue* in Paganism, than quite *unfounded*³—and to avoid prolixity and obscurity I will at once state my belief that the “catholic tradition of the World” on the subject of “inferior spirits” relates to, and is founded on the facts related in the sixth chapter of Genesis.

I have elsewhere stated, at considerable length, my reasons for believing that by “the Sons of God” mentioned in that chapter we are to understand, “Angels.” Without, therefore, repeating what I have said in defence of that opinion,—and also in some degree anticipating what I hope to establish by farther argument and illustration — let me ask the reader to consider in his own mind, how it was that the ancient heathen world ever came by the notion of a Theogony? Whence arose the idea of Gods generated and generating? I will beg him to remember that, whether he

³ Brit. Mag. vol. xxi. p. 389.

believes them to be true words or false words, whether he refers them to angels or to men, these words, “the Sons of God” and these facts relating to their wives and progeny, were written long before the days of Hesiod and Homer. Ages before those pagan writers were born, people might read, and did read, about “the Sons of God” in the book of Genesis, if no where else. I am not saying that the tradition of “a world of lies and errors” is of equal authority with the scriptures; but I think that the “catholic tradition of the world” on this point, even though partially “untrue” is not wholly “unfounded.” I hope in the sequel to explain, and establish, the grounds of my belief that the foundation, in this case, was the Sin of the Angels—in fact, that the first false worship was introduced by them, and that they were themselves the first objects of it.

§ 4. *The descendants of the Giants.*

I have suggested that so far as regards what I have just been stating, it makes no difference whether the reader applies the words of the

sixth chapter of Genesis to men or to angels. I may say the same with reference to one or two remarks which I wish to make on the subjects of this section. However they may differ on other points, those who refer the history to the descendants of Seth, and those who understand it to relate to angels, are perfectly agreed as to the fact that, at some time during the sixteen hundred years which elapsed between the Creation and the Deluge, the "Sons of God" took wives of the "Daughters of men;" and that these parties became the parents of a race of "Giants." The Scripture, they agree, states that these unions led to such sin and misery that the Creator resolved to destroy the race of mankind; and that, except the few souls preserved in the ark, every living creature perished in the deluge.

Perhaps we are liable, rather hastily to take up the notion that by this catastrophe the race of the Giants became extinct. When, in the history of later times, we read that "Og king of Basan remained of the remnant of the Giants⁴;" and still later of "Ishbi-benob which was of the sons of the Giant⁵;" we

* Deut. iii. 11.

⁵ 2 Sam. xxi. 16.

may perhaps be satisfied, as to the former, with Bishop Patrick's remark, that the Rephaim were "a very ancient people in that country ;" and for the latter by his suggestion that Ishbi-benob was a son of Goliah, "though Bochartus thinks the hebrew word *Rapha* signifies any giant." Perhaps, I say, we may take this for commentary, without further enquiry as to what "giants" had to do with the matter at all; or if we are not satisfied with this, and think that we see reason for believing that the word here translated "giants" has reference to antediluvians⁵; it may be suggested that, as those original "Giants" or their offspring were "men of renown," there might probably be warriors in after ages who would profess to be the descendants of those heroes, and whose pretensions were not likely to be questioned while they were prepared to support them by spears like weavers' beams.

For my own part, however, I see no reason why Ishbi-benob may not have been personally

⁶ If I seem to assume this without proof, it is because I shall have occasion to state my reasons for the supposition in the sequel. They will be at least more intelligible, and perhaps more convincing, after we have noticed some other points, which bear on the question.

and lineally descended from “the Sons of God,” whosoever they may have been. Some people were, I suppose, and why not he? We must consider, that though the ark contained only one family, consisting of but eight souls, yet in all probability that family represented five lines of pedigree. The Patriarch Noah, it may be remembered, was himself of the family of Seth. Whatever idea we may have of his personal holiness, and of the antediluvian piety of his sons, we are not, I suppose, authorized to assume that by something amounting almost to a miracle, the several lines of Noah himself, of his wife, and of his three daughters-in-law—lines going back perhaps through many ages and generations—were all kept pure from any mixture of giant blood. Those who imagine that the originators of all the evil which was raging in this world of violence and furious sin, were the descendants of Seth, and persons so eminent for holiness as to have been called, on that account alone, “the Sons of God,” cannot fairly insist on a more rigid and scrupulous selection of partners by the sons of Noah. One can scarcely help feeling sorry that the very brief records which we possess do not enable us to form any precise idea of the cir-

cumstances of the Patriarch's family. The statement that "Noah was five hundred years old, and Noah begat Shem Ham and Japhet," may perhaps be taken as consisting of two distinct propositions; and may mean that when Noah was five hundred years old, he *had* begotten those three sons—at least, if (as appears to be the case) we are to understand that Noah received notice of the impending judgment at that time; for in that earliest intimation his "sons' wives" are particularly mentioned⁸.

Perhaps it is worth while to notice the probability that most readers of Genesis, both those who consider the Sons of God as Angels, and those who take them for Sethites, have been apt to think of the offence which gave rise to this great visitation of mankind, as a criminal act committed by certain parties at a certain time, rather than as a course of transgression extending over an undefined, and perhaps protracted, period, growing worse and worse, and reaching to the day of vengeance—"they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark"⁹." I lay no stress on it,

⁷ Gen. v. 32.

⁸ Gen. vi. 18.

⁹ Matt. xxiv. 38. Luke xvii. 27.

but would suggest that there may be a significance in our Lord's words which has not been commonly observed. It seems natural that the eating and drinking should form a feature in the character of the gigantic sons of violence and sin ; and that it should be followed by every species of outrage ; but perhaps we should hardly have expected the mention of marrying. At all events, it is more easily understood if we consider it as relating to marriages essentially unlawful, and of such a character as to have called for the impending visitation.

One thing, however, seems clear—namely, that so much knowledge of antediluvian history and sin survived the flood as was likely to give colour and complexion to the history and the sin of later times. Imperfect as our information is, and doing our best to accept Mr. Bryant's charitable suggestion, we are unhappily precluded from the natural assumption that the offspring of the righteous patriarch, just delivered from such judgments, would thankfully and awfully remember the judgments which they had escaped, and walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. Little as we can learn of persons,

places, and things belonging to this period of history, we know too well that the land of “Ham,” and the land of his accursed son “Canaan,” were the hotbeds of false worship and superstition. “Magic and incantations are attributed to Chus” says Mr. Bryant, “as the inventor; and they were certainly first practised among his sons¹. ”

But instead of immediately pursuing our enquiry in this direction, it may be more convenient to drop it for the present, and to resume it after having considered some other points which require our attention.

¹ Vol. ii. p. 60.

PART II.

Angels; their sin and punishment—the Abyss; spirits in prison—Leviathan—Dæmoniacal Possession.

As the whole question before us is grounded on the assumption that the Bible is true, and I address myself to those who believe it to be a divine revelation, it is unnecessary to enter into any formal proof that there are such beings as angels. The church of England teaches her members to pray, “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;” and I have observed in a Collection of Hymns used in

many of our churches under very high sanction, language maintaining doctrine quite in unison with this prayer.

“ Angels, unseen, attend thy saints,
And bear them in their arms,
To cheer their spirit when it faints,
And guard their life from harms^{1.}”

I do not know how much the greater part of those who use these prayers and hymns really believe respecting angels, and spiritual existences and interferences, but from my own observation I am inclined to think that many, if they spoke honestly, would say, “I think I believe all that the Bible says about them—what that amounts to I have not particularly enquired, and do not clearly know—but I hope that I do, in fact, believe and disbelieve enough

¹ Hymn 83. of “Psalms and Hymns adapted to the Services of the Church of England” London 1850. The work is dedicated to the Bishop of London ; and, in the Preface, the Editor says that, “ He is also bound to acknowledge with gratitude the condescension of the distinguished prelate to whom the volume is inscribed, in permitting the sheets, after they had received all the improvements which the various criticisms of friends could suggest, to be submitted to himself for his general opinion ; beyond which the Editor would not be understood as claiming the sanction of his Lordship’s approval.”

to keep me clear of infidelity on the one hand, and superstition on the other²."

No one, however, who has carefully read the Bible, needs to be informed, or even to be reminded, of the active part which angels are represented as taking in the affairs of the world that now is, or of its being stated as a distinctive characteristic of "the world to come," that it is "*not* put into subjection" unto the angels³.

It is, perhaps, scarcely more necessary to say that some of the Angels, "kept not their first estate; but left their own habitation⁴;" but, considering how we have been engaged in the preceding section, it may be well to state dis-

² What may be the state of opinion among the dissenters I do not know. In the number for July 1855 of a penny publication now circulating among the Spiritualists, or Spiritrappers in the North of England I find the Editor replying to an independent minister of Birmingham who had attacked him. "It had" he says "come to our knowledge previously, that several of those who put on a sanctimonious look, and talk loudly, and at great length about the 'Holy angels,' and 'Heavenly messengers' that are ever guarding our footsteps, had become alarmed at the belief which was becoming prevalent that those things were realities—that Spirits were not only present, but that they could and were daily giving visible signs of their presence."

³ Heb. ii. 5.

⁴ Jude 6.

tinctly that in this present section I am not discussing the question whether “the Sons of God,” mentioned in the sixth chapter of Genesis, were men or angels. Without reference to that part of the scriptures, or to the events which are there recorded, it is agreed on all hands that at some time, and in some way, some of the angels did sin, and were punished. People may argue that this admitted fact has, or has not, reference to the Antediluvians, and the Sons of God; but it is merely as a fact related in the scripture, that we are at present considering the sin of the Angels. St. Peter says “God spared not the angels that sinned but cast them down to Hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment⁵. ”

The first thing to be observed in this passage—and it is the more worthy of observation, because there are so many other cases which provoke the same remark—is, that many difficulties, and mistakes, have arisen from the course pursued by our translators, who have so frequently, and I must add, without any sufficient reason, rendered the same original words

⁵ 2 Pet. ii. 4.

by different English ones, while, on the other hand, they have translated different originals by the same English ones. I say without sufficient reason—for, of course, on many occasions they could not have done otherwise than as they did without manifest absurdity, and misrepresentation of their original; but any one who enquires into the matter, or even observes the few instances which I shall have occasion to produce in this little work, will perceive that they indulged in a laxity on this point which has done much mischief by creating apparent difficulties, as well as concealing real ones.

I need not say that ambiguity and confusion have arisen from their using the single word “Hell,” as the equivalent for both *Hades* and *Gehenna*; but before we acquiesce in their identifying a third word with those two, we may do well to enquire about its meaning. The apostle’s statement respecting the sinning angels is that having been *tartarus’d* (if, in order to avoid any assumption of meaning, I may make such a word to translate *ταρταρώσας*) they have been reserved unto judgment. It would seem that they had been consigned, not to Hades, nor to Gehenna, but to Tartarus.

The question then is, what is meant by Tar-

tarus? That is, what did a Christian Apostle mean by it? To say that he used a popular word which he knew his readers would understand, is unsatisfactory on two grounds. First, that, in fact, neither he, nor any other writer of the New Testament *did* adopt, or use, this word, except in this single instance, and with reference to this particular case of the sinning angels. There is much in the New Testament relating to the condemnation and punishment of sinners—much of Hades and Gehenna—but (except in this place) not a word of Tartarus. Secondly, such a suggestion only removes the difficulty one step. The Apostle certainly might borrow the word from heathen writers; but if so how had they come by it? In discussing such matters, the words and notions of pagan writers whose works have reached us deserve great attention and respect; but we are not to look on them as if there were no higher antiquity of thought, or language, to which we might appeal, and which we must take into consideration.

We come again, then, to the question, “What was Tartarus?” The popular account as it stands, in Lempriere’s Classical Dictionary is, that it was “one of the regions of Hell,

where, according to the ancients, the most impious and guilty among mankind were punished. It was surrounded with a brazen wall, and its entrance was continually hidden from the sight by a cloud of darkness, which is represented three times more gloomy than the obscurest night. According to Hesiod it was a separate prison, at a greater distance from the earth than the earth is from the heavens⁶."

Though enveloped in this unnatural and characteristic darkness, some mortals are said to have obtained information respecting the interior of Tartarus. It was a prison which Æneas was not permitted to enter, but he could hear the groans uttered by the prisoners, the blows inflicted on them, the grating of irons, the dragging of chains. He saw, moreover, Tisiphone, seated outside the portal, ready to summon her sister Furies whenever new victims should be brought to that place of despair. But, except in so far as that it was a place of punishment, did *Tartarus* resemble the scriptural account of *Hades* or *Gehenna*? I believe it did not; and I apprehend that with

⁶ The reader will, of course, understand that I quote this passage, not for its accuracy, or as an authority, but merely as giving the popular account of the matter.

regard to one very particular and characteristic point it differed entirely. The rich man was tormented by the flame in Hades⁷. And our Lord warned his hearers against falling into the unquenchable fire of Gehenna⁸, but I have discovered no trace of fire within the bounds of Tartarus. Outside its triple wall of brass, ran the fiery river Phlegethon, but I repeat that in such accounts as I have been able to meet with there is no trace of fire. On the contrary it is represented as a peculiarly cold place. Hesiod says

————— ψυχὴ δ' ἄιδόςδε κατεῖεν
Τάρταρον ἐξ κρυόενθ'

————— animaque ad Orcum descendebat
Tartarum in frigidum⁹.

And Plutarch in his treatise *De primo frigido*, explains that Tartarus received its name on account of its coldness ; because to shiver, and tremble, and suffer from intense cold was called “tartarizing¹. ”

⁷ Luke xvi. 24.

⁸ Mark x. 43.

⁹ Sc. Herc. v. 254.

¹ “ διὸ καὶ τάρταρος οὐτος ὑπὸ ψυχρότητος κέκληται. ὅηλοι δὲ καὶ Ἡσίοδος, εἰπὼν, τάρταρον ἡρόεντα. καὶ τὸ ριγοῦντα πάλλεσθαι καὶ τρέμειν ταρταρίζειν.” *Op. Vol. ii.* p. 948.

What then was there in Tartarus? What would *Aeneas* have found if the fury porteress Tisiphone had opened the gate, and allowed him to pass? Why, the very first thing would have been the *Hydra*; a being (whether real or imaginary) rather to be looked for in water than in fire. What sort of place that monster was supposed to inhabit I do not precisely know. He seems to have been (popularly speaking) *in* Tartarus, and to have been considered as the inside guardian of the gate; but, at the same time it was not until after he was passed that Tartarus strictly speaking (*tartarus ipse*) began. And then what was it? Nothing, that I can learn, but a mere gulph—a very dark and very deep *barathrum*, or pit, or abyss in what we may call the heart of the earth, or perhaps more properly in the language of scripture, “the heart of the sea.” Take Homer’s description ;—

ἢ μιν ἐλών ρίψω ἐς Τάρταρον ἡερόεντα
τῆλε μάλ', ἥχι βάθιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον,
ἔνθα σιδήρειαι τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδὸς
τόσσον ἔνερθ' Ἀΐδεω, ὃσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης.

Il. θ. 1. 13. Heyne Vol. i. p. 407.

Aut ipsum correptum projiciam in Tartarum tenebrosum
Procul valde, ubi profundissimum sub terra est barathrum,

Ubi ferreæque portæ et aureum limen
 Tantum infra orcum, quantum cœlum distat a terra.

But the matter of most interest to us is that it was the place of the Titans; of those whom Hesiod calls “Subtartarus’d Titans” Τιτῆνες θ’ ὑποταρτάριοι². To return therefore to Virgil; he also will tell us that in the lowest depth of this abyss lay the rebel TITANS. It is true that there were other prisoners in Tartarus, but obviously the Titans were the principal offenders, and occupied the lowest depth. The Sibyl who conducted Æneas, and who had before directed his attention to the Fury sitting outside the gate (“Tartarei regina barathri” as Statius calls her³) afterwards proceeded to describe the interior.

“Quinquaginta atris immanis hiatibus Hydra
 Sævior intus habet sedem; tum Tartarus ipse
 Bis patet in præceps tantum, tenditque sub umbras,
 Quantus ad Æthereum cœli suspectus Olympum.
 Hic genus antiquum Terræ, Titania pubes,
 Fulmine dejecti, fundo volvuntur in imo⁴.”

The apostle might, of course, have found the word Tartarus in many heathen writers; but I think from all of them he would only have

² Theog. 851.

³ Theb. v. 185.

⁴ Æn. vi. 576.

gathered the idea of a cold, watery abyss—in fact something very like what might be imagined of the bottom of the sea. And with this view we must take into account that he was writing especially for readers of the Septuagint, who had there been told of “the Tartarus of the abyss.” I confess that I do not understand the two passages of their version in which the Seventy saw fit to use the word; but I shall speak more fully of them presently; and in the mean time only observe that in each case it occurs in connection with Leviathan and the great deep; and to say the least, singularly coincides with the pagan tradition of the Hydra and Tartarus.

As to the origin of the word, I have met with nothing but what seems utterly senseless⁵; and therefore I will venture to offer a conjecture.

There is a passage in the prophecies of Isaiah (xiv. 22.) which stands thus in our

⁵ The only derivation that I have seen is from *ταράσσω* or *ταράττω* for which Scapula gives “commoveo, turbo,” adding “proprie aquam aliquis *ταράττει* quum limum in ea commovet et excitat: et medicus pharmaceum quum id spatha agitat: ut apud Luc. in Lexiph.” But this is altogether unsatisfactory; for, of all places, the lowest depth of the abyss is least likely to be troubled and stirred up.

version—"I will rise up against them saith the Lord of Hosts, and cut off from Babylon the name and remnant and son and nephew, saith the Lord. I will also make it a possession for the bittern and pools of water: and I will *sweep it with the besom of destruction*, saith the Lord of Hosts." We have (from acquaintance with the use of it in this place) become so familiar with the phrase which I have marked by *italics*, that, content perhaps with admiring its strength and its fitness to represent the annihilation of a great city, we have never enquired whether it gives the real meaning of the original. But as to this it must be observed

(1) In the first place, the words translated "sweep" and "besom" are (as far as a verb and a noun can be) the same; and this is the only place in which either of them is used. This renders us somewhat more dependent on versions than if we were dealing with words of more frequent occurrence. I presume that our translators were led by the Vulgate which has "*scopabo eam in scopis terens.*" Montanus has "*scopabo eam in scopis delendo.*"

(2.) Before I suggest any other rendering let me ask the reader's attention to Lowth's obser-

vations on the nature and bearing of the prophecy. They seem to me to be very just; but I need hardly say that they were not made with any view to the purpose for which I quote them. I give his words exactly; but insert within brackets the texts to which he only refers.

“Compare chap. xiii. 21, 22. xxxiv. 11. Babylon stood in a low marshy ground, and the prophet threatens that it shall be as entirely destroyed, as if it were sunk into the bottom of a great lake or pool. See Jerem. li. 64.” [with 63, thus “and it shall be when thou hast made an end of reading this book that thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the Euphrates : and thou shalt say ‘Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her, and they shall be weary’ &c.] “This agrees with what is said chap. xiii. 19 that it shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah which were swallowed up in a lake of fire and brimstone. Several learned men are of opinion that the same sort of punishment is threatened to mystical Babylon *Revel.* xviii. 21.” [A mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone and cast it into the sea saying ‘Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all’] “which the prophet hath here all along in his eye.”

The idea of being “sunk into the bottom of a lake or pool” which Lowth derives from the whole tenor of the prophecy, is, I imagine, quite right. It is adopted by his son; who, in

his version of Isaiah translates, "I will plunge it in the *miry gulph* of destruction," and in his note on the passage says "I have here very nearly followed the version of the LXX, the reasons for which see in the last note on De Poesi Hebr. Praelect. xxviii." The note referred to is on the lines of the poetical version

— “vasta teget palus
Demersam”

and it defends the LXX version which is θίσω
αὐτὴν πηλοῦ βάραθρον εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ponam eam
luti voraginem in perditionem.

But what is the hebrew word which, as I have said, occurs in this place only, and which the Septuagint translators rendered $\beta\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\beta\sigma\nu$? It is (at least it appeared to Michaelis to be) an unaccountable quadriliteral, only to be understood from the arabic in which language it exactly corresponds and signifies, according as it is a noun, or a verb, *fossa*, or *effodere altius fossam*; so that, as he observes, Lowth has well rendered the word⁶. This hebrew quad-

⁶ Michaelis, in a note on this note, says "A ወኅዎ vix video, quomodo secundum leges grammaticas fieri possit quadrilaterum አውኅዎ. Nec opus incerta derivatione, habet enim Arabia

ipsum hoc verbum effodere altius fossam et nomen

riliteral then is ΝΩΝΩ and it appears to me that if to TATA, we add the greek or roman termination *ος* or *us*, we get something very like *Tartarus*. Thus the noun which we translate “besom” would mean an “abyss;” and the corresponding verb something which one could not exactly translate except by the mediæval word *abyssare*, which the french have preserved in *abysmer* and *abîmer*⁷.

fossa. Sensus est idem, quem recte eximio carmine Lowthus expressit (Vol. ii. 605).

⁷ Since this was written my friend Mr. Heath has published his very curious and interesting work on “The Exodus Papyri.” How far he is right or wrong in supposing the MSS. to belong to the period of the Exodus, or in his version of them, I cannot, of course, form any opinion ; but I may express a hope that he will prosecute his enquiries, and farther elucidate documents which, on any hypothesis of date or origin, so well deserve investigation. I refer to the work here merely to mention one or two passages, the bearing of which on the subject of our enquiry I need not particularly point out. In some verses on the death of Amen-m-Apt the writer referring to the state and occupation of the deceased says

“ He sings to his God,
He adores the Lord of the gods,
Namely, of the lords in the *abyss*.
Food is issued for thee in *Tattou*,
And drink in Purgatory.”

“ The word” says Mr. Heath “ which I translate Purgatory is literally the land of Divine contest. The idea was that a contest or trial is still to proceed after death” &c. p. 78.

This etymology, I offer in particular to the readers of Bryant; but I would call the attention of all persons who are in any way interested in the enquiry to the language of heathen writers respecting these *Titans*. Whether Parkhurst is right in deriving their name from Τίταν (a word which seems to be as nearly connected with Τάρταρος, as the Titans were with Tartarus) I do not undertake to decide; but the terms used respecting them and their history are very remarkable. In addition to the specimens already given let us take a few lines of the sentence against Rufinus, which Claudian puts into the mouth of Rhadamanthus. The infernal judge, absolutely shocked and disgusted, exclaims,—

“Adspexisse sat est. Oculis jam parcite nostris,
Et Ditis purgate domos. Agitate flagellis
Trans Styga, trans Erebum. Vacuo mandate barathro
Infra TITANUM tenebras, infraque recessus
Tartareos nostrumque Chaos. Qua noctis opacæ

The word *Tattou* occurs elsewhere. “It may be remembered” says Mr. Heath “that in the Book of the Dead 82. 4. the deceased makes a feast of bread and common wine in *Tattou*” p. 151. “In chapter 124 the deceased is introduced as thus boasting:—My soul is edified triumphant in *Tattou*” p. 156. Is it merely coincidence of language?

Fundamenta latent, penitusque immersus anhelat,
Dum rotet astra polus, feriant dum littora venti ^{8.}"

It seems as if we might safely believe two things—First, That Tartarus was, in the Apostle's view, the place to which the sinning angels were consigned—secondly, That it was in the view of heathen writers a place where certain rebellious sinners had been confined with a view to subsequent punishment. What can be plainer than the language of Hesiod when he tells how Cœlus rebuked and threatened his Titan progeny?

*Toὺς δὲ πατὴρ Τιτῆνας ἐπίκλησιν καλέεσκεν
Παιᾶς νεικείων μέγας Οὐρανὸς, οὓς τέκεν αὐτός.
Φάσκε δὲ τιταίνοντας ἀτασθαλίῃ μέγα ρέξαι
Ἐργον, τοῦ δ' ἐπειτα τίσιν μετόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι.*

“ Illos vero pater TITANAS cognomento vocabat,
Filios objurgans magnus Cœlus, quos genuit ipse.
Dictitabat porro, poenas sumentes ex protervia magnum
patrasse
Facinus, cuius deinceps ultio in posterum futura sit.”

Theog. v. 207.

And does not the whole passage from which I extract the following lines, mark out a locality in the great abyss — the waters under the earth?

⁸ In Ruf. l. ii. 522.

αὐτὰρ ὑπερθεν

Γῆς ρίζαι πεφύασι καὶ ἀτρυγέτοι θαλάσσης.

Ἐνθα θεοὶ Τιτῆνες ὑπὸ ζόφω νέρδεντι

Κεκρύφαται βουλῆσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο

[Χώρῳ ἐν εὐρώεντι, πελώρῃς ἔσχατα γαῖης.]

Τοῖς οὐκ ἔξιτόν ἔστι, πύλας δ' ἐπέθηκε Ποσειδέων

Χαλχείας.

“ sed superne

Terræ radices sunt et inexhausti maris.

Illic Dii Titanes sub caligine obseura

Absconditi sunt, consiliis Jovis nubicogi

Loco in squalido (ubi) vastæ ultima terræ.

His non exitus patet : portas vero imposuit Neptunus
Ferreas ^{9.}”

Goettling, the german editor of Hesiod, asks why Neptune was employed to make the prison gates which shut in the Titans instead of Vulcan—a question which deserves a better answer than he has made for himself¹. I do not pretend to say that I can furnish one; but I shall be glad if I can give any help towards indicating the Key which those gates of the prison in the Abyss undoubtedly had.

⁹ Theog. v. 727. See note A.

¹ “Cur Neptuno hoc injunctum negotii est, non Vulcano ? πύλας ἐπέθηχ’ Ἡφαιστος ? Nempe quod ille proximus est sede. Ceterum Neptunus etiam Laomedonti moenia condiderat pertinetque id negotium proprie ad hujus prolem, Cyclopas [who must however have been rather out of their element on this occasion] v. Hes. ap. Schol. Lycophr. v. 393. Hom. Il. xxi. 442.”

§ 6. *The Abyss—Spirits in Prison.*

IF we were now for the first time to open the Bible, and to read at the beginning of the ninth chapter of the Apocalypse, “to him was given the key of the bottomless pit,” we should probably take for granted, that the “bottomless pit” was a place which had been described in the preceding pages of Scripture, or was supposed, from some circumstances or other, to be so well known as to need no description. As it is, we are so familiar with the words, owing to their use in this book, that we do not enquire whether we have ever seen them elsewhere, or whether we form a very clear idea of a bottomless pit, especially when we add the idea of its being a place of incarceration.

It is however only another instance of the inconstancy, not to say caprice, of our translators. The words which they have taken together to mean what they call a “bottomless pit,” would have been more properly rendered “the pit of the abyss”—τοῦ φρέατος τῆς ἀβύσσου. The first of these is a common, unpretending, word which seems to have meant

nothing more or less than a “pit.” It occurs in the New Testament only where our Lord speaks of an ox or ass falling into a *pit* (Luke xiv. 5.) and where the woman of Samaria speaks of Jacob’s *well* (John iv. 11, 12².) The Vulgate therefore reads very correctly “*clavis putei abyssi.*”

The second word, “abyss,” occurs repeatedly in subsequent passages of the Apocalypse to which we may hereafter have occasion to make more particular reference³. In the mean time it is worth while to notice two previous passages (previous, that is, according to the order of the books of Scripture) in which it occurs.

First; we meet with it in the account of

² The Septuagint translators use it for the slime *pits* of Siddim Gen. xiv. 10. the *well* of Hagar Gen. xvi. 14. the *well* of Midian Ex. ii. 15. thine own *well* Prov. v. 15. the *well* of Sechu 1 Sam. xix. 22. the *well* of Sirah 2 Sam. iii. 26. the *pit* of Asa Jer. xli. 7. 9. and the wells of Judah Jer. xiv. 3. Among all the foregoing instances (unless we accept the *pits* of Siddim, which had probably come to be much the same things) there is only one in which the word means any thing but a *well*. The exception is that of the pit of Asa, which seems to have been intended for his enemies ; and to have been what the Psalmist calls a “pit of destruction” (Ps. lv. 23.) and the Septuagint translate “φρέαρ διαφθορᾶς.”

³ Ch. xi. 7. xvii. 8. xx. 1.

a case of possession which is recorded by three of the evangelists. According to St. Matthew (viii. 28.) there were two dæmoniacs. St. Mark (v. 1.) and St. Luke (viii. 26.) mention only one; and the fragments of discourse (forming probably only a small part of what passed) are different, though not discrepant, in the three gospels.

All that we need notice at present is that while all the three accounts represent the dæmons as fearing and deprecating punishment, that of St. Mark records their prayer that Jesus “would not send them away out of the country;” while St. Luke tells us that they “besought him that he would not command them to go out into the *deep*,” (v. 31.) or as it should have been translated “the *abyss*.” How far their request was granted I do not pretend to say—that is, how far their actually going into “the sea” εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (according to St. Matthew and St. Mark) into “the lake” εἰς τὴν λίμνην (according to St. Luke) was equivalent, or introductory, to their going into “the abyss.” On this point the reader will form his own opinion. I only call his attention to the fact that the dæmons are re-

presented as fearing that they might be sent into the abyss, and as deprecating that fate.

The second passage is Rom. x. 6. where St. Paul alludes to the language of Moses—"this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us that we may hear it, and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayst do it" Deut. xxx. 11. St. Paul in quoting these words of Moses, makes a very important alteration, or explanation, whichever we may consider it to be. His words are, "Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above:) or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.)" The alteration, if it was intended to be one, is perhaps greater than at first sight appears. It is obvious that the words of Moses convey the idea of going across, or

beyond, the sea to obtain the object sought for; while those of St. Paul convey that of diving for it, and bringing it up from the depths. And this is not a mere verbal difference, though there is a distinction in the words which it is worth while to notice. Of the two words commonly used to designate the sea, Moses employs the most common and familiar, while the apostle uses a word of more force. Instead of taking it (as the LXX did) for *τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*, he makes it “the deep”—*τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*; who shall descend into the abyss? and (let it be observed) who shall descend there for the purpose of bringing up Christ *from the dead?* *τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν.* This is a passage well worthy of the reader's study; but I here call his attention to it merely as one in which the “abyss” is mentioned as the place of the dead; and in order that he may compare it with some others which have been, or will be, submitted to his consideration.

It seems impossible not to connect this passage with that in which our Lord declared that as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the *heart of the*

earth ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς (Matt. xii. 40.) There seems to be an evident reference to the language of the book of Jonah (ii. 3.) where the prophet is said to have been בלבב ים which the Septuagint translate εἰς βάθη καρδίας θαλάσσης; and our version “in the midst of the seas;” with “Heb. *heart*” in the margin. There may, perhaps, be no great difference between the heart of the earth, and the heart of the sea; but there is much difficulty in supposing our Lord to have used such language to describe his own interment; that being such as we know it to have been. Indeed it seems to me impossible to translate the καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς in any way that will not appear to have some reference to, and throw some light upon, the statement that our Lord descended “into the lower parts of the earth” εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς. Eph. iv. 9.

Yet I should not lay much stress on these passages,—perhaps it would be hardly worth while to refer to them in this enquiry—were it not for the passage in St. Peter’s first epistle (iii. 18.) which has such a direct bearing on our subject. “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in

the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing."

I can scarcely think it possible that any one who has seriously considered the passages of Scripture which have been quoted in the foregoing pages, should doubt that the "Spirits in prison" were the fallen angels. It seems to me that we have just been reading the history of Spirits who were disobedient in the days of Noah, and were in custody in Tartarus, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Why our Lord should visit them, or what might be the nature of his communication, we are not told; and the fact that no hint is given on these points, is to say the least, not opposed to the idea that the preaching was addressed to others than the human race. At all events, however, it is stated that our Lord went and preached to certain Spirits in prison, and whatever may be meant by the words, they remain an immovable part of the word of God.

So also does the text which I mentioned at the beginning of this section—"I saw a star

fall from heaven unto the earth; and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit (*ἡ κλεὶς τοῦ φρέατος τῆς ἀβύσσου*) and he opened the bottomless pit (*καὶ ἦνοιξε τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου*) and there arose a smoke out of the pit (*ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος*). . . . the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit (*ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ τοῦ φρέατος*). I do not know how far it is of any importance to remark that in all these passages the pit (*φρέαρ*) is specified, and it appears as if it was a part of, or a place belonging to the abyss. At the same time, after the description of the locusts who came out of the smoke of the pit, it is said that they had a king over them which is the angel of the abyss (*τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου*) without mention of the pit. Indeed I do not know that reference is made to the pit anywhere else. The “abyss” by itself occurs in ch. xi. 7. The beast out of the bottomless pit (*ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου*). Shall ascend out of the bottomless pit (*ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου*) ch. xvii. 8. An angel having the key of the abyss (*τῆς ἀβύσσου*) ch. xx. 1. and v. 3. cast the dragon into the abyss (*εἰς τὴν ἀβύσσον*).

§ 7. *Leviathan.*

In a preceding section I have stated that Tartarus is twice mentioned in the Septuagint version, in connection with Leviathan and the great deep.

The first is 'Επελθὼν δὲ ἐπ' ὕρος ἀκρότομον ἐποίησε χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ. Job xl. 20. There is no use in attempting to reconcile this with our version of the Hebrew. I will therefore merely give the latin version of the LXX which stands in our Polyglott (and is in fact that of Flaminius Nobilis) and the english translation by Sir L. C. S. Brenton. The former is, “Adveniens autem ad montem præruptum fecit lætitiam quadrupedibus in Tartaro.”—the latter, “When he has gone up to a steep mountain, he causes joy to the quadrupeds in the deep.” A marginal note adds, *Gr.* Tartarus. *Heb.* field. *q. d.* level, or low place. In this version it stands as ch. xl. 15.

This is certainly very obscure; and I do not know that the other passage (which is Job xli. 31), though clearer, and more to our purpose, in itself, throws much light upon

it. Still referring to Leviathan it is said
'Αναζεῖ τὴν ἄβυσσον ὥσπερ χαλκεῖον. ἦγγηται δὲ
τὴν θάλασσαν ὥσπερ ἐξάλειπτρον τὸν δὲ τάο-
ταρον τῆς ἄβυσσου ὥσπερ αἰχμάλωτον. ἐλογί-
σατο ἄβυσσον εἰς περίπατον. Here again it is
not worth while to discuss the difference be-
tween this, and the hebrew text which is fol-
lowed by our version. The latin version, just
referred to, has, “Fervere facit abyssum tan-
quam ærarium. Putat autem mare tanquam
vas unguentarium, et *tartarum abyssi* tanquam
captivum. Reputavit abyssum in deambula-
torium.” The english translation is, “He
makes the deep boil like a blazing caldron ;
and he regards the sea as a pot of ointment,
and the lowest part of the deep as a captive.”

I do not undertake to explain these pas-
sages : and the reader must keep in mind that
I was led to quote them for the purpose of
shewing, that the Apostle Peter might have
come by the word Tartarus from the Septua-
gint version. The fact is merely incidental,
though well worth observation, that, notwith-
standing their obscurity, these passages shew
that in the mind of the greek translators,
Tartarus was connected, but not confounded,
with “the abyss;” and that the abyss was the

place of Leviathan. It is, let me add, impossible to read of “the lowest part of the deep” (or literally “the Tartarus of the abyss”) without being reminded of “the pit of the abyss” which we have already had occasion to notice. What is meant by Leviathan’s regarding that lowest part of the abyss “as a captive,” I do not pretend to say, but it seems to suggest the idea of something in his custody. But this may be spoken of presently; in the mean time, as I have mentioned the subject of Leviathan, and believe that his history is connected with our enquiry, I am tempted to refer to a few passages of Scripture which relate to it.

I will first mention the five places in which the word occurs in our version.

(1.) “Let them curse it that curse the day, who are ready to raise up their mourning.” Job iii. 8. The margin, instead of “their mourning” suggests “or a Leviathan.” Certainly the original is לֹיתָן; and I do not see that the versions throw much light on the meaning. The LXX have τὸ μέγα κῆτος; and the Vulgate “qui parati sunt suscitare Leviathan.”

(2.) “Canst thou draw out Leviathan with an hook?” Job xli. 1. *heb.* xl. 20. One cannot help suspecting that the marginal reading of our bibles does not afford much help towards our understanding this passage, by suggesting, “That is, *a whale*, or *a whirlpool*.” There seems to be nothing impossible in the idea of drawing out a whale with a hook, and if one cannot do the same to a whirlpool, that is no proof of human weakness, but arises from the nature of things. The LXX has ἀξεις δὲ δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ. I need not say that the whole passage is exceedingly obscure, and mysterious, or that it would afford ground for much discussion and verbal criticism; but I will here only observe that for “he is King over all the children of pride” (in verse 34. of our version) where the Vulgate has “rex super universos filios superbiæ” the LXX has βασιλεὺς πάντων τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν.”

(3.) “Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the dragons (*תנינים*) [marg. or whales] in the waters. Thou brakest the heads of Leviathan (*לויתן*) in pieces and gavest him to be meat to the

people inhabiting the wilderness.” The LXX has $\tauῶν \deltaρακόντων$ and $\tauοῦ \deltaράκοντος$ and the Vulgate “capita draconum,” and “capita draconis.” Ps. lxxiv. 13.

(4.) “There go the ships; there is that Leviathan whom thou hast made [*marg.* Heb. formed] to play therein. The LXX has $\deltaράκων οὗτος ὃν ἐπλασας ἐμπαίζειν αὐτῷ$. The Vulgate “Draco iste quem formasti ad illudendum ei.” Ps. civ. 26.

(5.) “In that day the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish Leviathan the piercing serpent, even Leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea.” Isa. xxvii. 1. The passage is obscure, and does not appear to receive light from its context, except so far as that the chapters which precede it shew that it relates to the judgments which shall be executed in the great and terrible day of the Lord. The context which follows, does not appear to offer any explanation. The Prophet, after the words which I have quoted, appears to quit the subject abruptly and proceeds “In

that day sing ye unto her a vineyard of red wine. I the Lord do keep it" &c.

It may be worth while to remark that Leviathan is here described as a *nachash* שָׁנָה. This word usually means a serpent; and as far as I see, in many cases, nothing but a common serpent. For instance "Dan shall be a serpent" Gen. xlix. 17.—"the way of a serpent upon a rock" Prov. xxx. 19.—"whoso breaketh a hedge, a serpent shall bite him" Eccl. x. 8. and elsewhere. By a common serpent I mean the reptile to which we give the name, and which seems to be referred to in such passages as those which I have just quoted. It is, however, obvious that this application of the term to Leviathan does not accord with our idea of a serpent; and there are some other passages which tend to increase our difficulty. On two of these I may in the first place remark that they are (if I mistake not) the only ones in which the LXX does not carefully and consistently discriminate between ὄφις and δράκων—that is, except in the case already mentioned, and in two which I am about to mention (and no where else) the LXX always translates שָׁנָה by δράκων, and not by ὄφις.

The first of these is Job xxvi. 13. “his hand hath formed the crooked serpent.” The ground for supposing this to refer to Leviathan may perhaps appear more clearly hereafter. In the mean time we may notice the second passage, which is plainer and more remarkable—“Though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent and he shall bite them.” Amos ix. 3.

In this enquiry we must not forget or lose sight of the fact that in this word *nachash* we find at once the name and designation of the *Serpent of Paradise*, and the *Leviathan of the Abyss*. Recurring to the passage just quoted (Is. xxvii. 1.) we find Leviathan described by two epithets, and by another name which deserves notice.

1. In the first place he is called by our translators “the *piercing* serpent.” This is their rendering of בָּرָח נַחַשׁ. I have not found any thing that explains how they came to translate בָּרָח by “piercing.” The word is one of frequent occurrence; but with two meanings as widely different from each other, as both of them are from “piercing.” The first meaning and one in which the word very commonly occurs, is “to flee, or run away.”

So the LXX seem to have understood it; and they translated $\tauὸν δράκοντα ὄφιν φεύγοντα$. The other meaning of the word, and one in which also it frequently occurs, is indicated by our translators who, as an alternative for “piercing.” give in the margin “crossing like a bar.” This agrees with the Vulgate which has “serpentem vectem.” Whether this is the right translation of בָּרֶךְ, and if it is, what is meant by it, I do not pretend to say; but I think no one who has read the account of the Hydra and Tartarus can fail to be reminded of it when he reads the words of Taylor, who certainly thought of no such thing. He says “To run across”—for he thought it right in compliment to ideality, and the other common use of the word, to get in the word “run”—“to run across like a bar; a cross-bar to strengthen a tent; or secure the gates of a city.” But in fact it is only once or twice used in this sense as a verb. It generally occurs as a noun, and never, so far as I know, as an adjective or epithet, except in this place, and in the passage already quoted “his hand hath formed the crooked serpent” Job xxvi. 13. I then suggested that some reason might be produced for supposing the passage to refer

to Leviathan, and it was with a view to this singular use of the word בָּرַח which does not, I believe, occur in the same way anywhere but in these two places. It is singular that, in this latter (Job xxvi. 13.) while our translators give “the *crooked* serpent,” Parkhurst is particular in explaining it to mean “the *straight* serpent;” and tells us that in Is. xxvii. 1. “it seems to denote the crocodile, whose body is remarkably *straight, rigid, and inflexible.*” He also states that in this passage of Isaiah this word (whether straight or crooked) is “contradistinguished from נְחַשׁ עֲקֵלָתוֹן the tortuous, sinuous or coiling serpent.” For my own part I have never supposed that any contradistinction was meant between “Leviathan the piercing serpent” and “Leviathan that crooked serpent” and I doubt whether Parkhurst has more authority for “straight” than our translators had for “piercing.”

But let us look at this epithet which Parkhurst supposes to contain the contradistinction—the epithet עֲקֵלָתוֹן which our translators render “crooked.” It is a word which occurs in only three other places—namely (1.) Habak. i. 4 where our version has “wrong [marg. wrested] judgments” and the Vulgate “judicium per-

versum.”—(2.) Ps. cxxv. 5 “As for such as turn aside unto their crooked ways;” the LXX reading, *εἰς τὰς στραγγαλιὰς* and the Vulg. “declinantes autem in obligationes.”—(3.) Jud. v. 6 “travellers walked through by-ways.”—“ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδοὺς διεστραμμένας”—“ambulaverunt per calles devios.” These are I believe the only places in which the word occurs and they certainly seem to convey an idea of moral obliquity and perverseness rather than of bodily crookedness; and may well apply to one whom the LXX, translating בָּרַח נָחֵש in this verse (Job xxvi. 13.) calls the “apostate serpent”—δράκοντα ἀποστάτην. Indeed the whole of the chapter of Job in which this passage occurs is full of curious matter for enquiry and consideration; and I think that no thoughtful reader, even if he uses only our English version can fail to see that it relates to something more than crocodiles whether straight or crooked. But I hope to refer to it again, farther on, in speaking of the Rephaim, the “gigantes” who according to the vulgate “gemunt sub aquis;” and at present it is more to our purpose to return to the passage of Isaiah (xxvii. 1.) and to add a few farther observations which it suggests.

For beside these two epithets, which, I cannot help thinking, both refer to Leviathan—there is another very remarkable statement which seems to me to point the same way—the Lord, we are told shall punish “Leviathan the *piercing* serpent, even Leviathan that *crooked* serpent; and he shall slay the *Dragon* that is in the *sea*.” In the two former of these passages Leviathan is named and described as נַחַשׁ *nachash*; but who, or what is the *dragon* that is in *the sea*—that is (as we should have thought) the very place where Leviathan was to be found. However we must take things as we find them, and do our best to understand them. The dragon here is not a *nachash*, but תנין the *tanin*. This word is used in Gen. i. 21 to tell us that God created great “whales.” Beside this, our translators have given the same version in two other places; namely Job vii. 12. “Am I a sea, or a *whale*, that thou settest a watch over me?” (a question in which an attentive reader of foregoing passages may find matter for reflection) and Ezek. xxxii. 2 “Thou art as a *whale* [marg. or *dragon*] in the seas: and thou camest forth with thy rivers, and troubledst the waters with thy feet, and fordedst their rivers.” I quote these three

passages (the only ones in which our translators have rendered the word by *whale*) in order that the reader may form his own opinion as to how far they were warranted in so translating at all. We must take into the account, that while in these three places they translate *whale* (to say nothing of three others where they translate ‘*serpent*,’ and one “*sea-monsters* or in the margin *sea-calves*”) there are twenty places where they render by *dragon*⁴. This may probably appear to others, as it certainly does to myself, confused and unsatisfactory; but I know not how to render it clear and intelligible; and I hope I may be doing some good in proposing it to the consideration of others. Much of the difficulty and con-

⁴ These are some of them—“art thou not it that hath ent Rahab and wounded the dragon” Is. li. 9. “The young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet” Ps. xci. 13. “Nebuchadnezzar hath swallowed me up like a dragon” Jer. li. 34. “Their wine is the poison of dragons” Deut. xxxii. 33. “I will make Jerusalem heaps and a den of dragons” Jer. ix. 11. “To make the cities of Judah desolate and a den of dragons” Jer. x. 22. “Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons” Jer. li. 37. “Wild asses snuffed up the wind like dragons” Jer. xiv. 6. It is however more particularly to our purpose to mention such passages as “Thou brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters” Ps. lxxiv. 13. and “dragons and all deeps” Ps. cxlviii. 7.

fusion arises from the irregularity and inconsistency with which words have been translated. Indeed the course pursued by our translators with regard to the word חַנִּינָה which is now under consideration, furnishes an instance of a latent difficulty arising from this practice, which is worth mentioning.

We are told that Moses by the divine command cast his rod “on the ground, and it became a *serpent*” (Ex. iv. 3.) Afterwards we find him directed to say to Aaron, “Take thy rod and cast it before Pharaoh and it shall become a *serpent*” (vii. 9.) In the next verse we find that in pursuance of this direction Aaron did “cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and before his servants, and it became a *serpent*” (v. 10.) On this the magicians cast down their rods, and “they became *serpents*” (v. 12.) Three verses farther on we read that Moses was commanded to meet Pharaoh, taking in his hand the rod which had been “turned to a *serpent*” (v. 15.)

All this reads very smoothly; and who would imagine that our English word “*serpent*” was the representative of two wholly distinct Hebrew words? Who would doubt that the rod of Aaron underwent the same change as that of

Moses? What the difference might be I do not pretend to say, but certainly the rod of Moses (v. 3 and 15.) was changed into a שָׁנַחַשׁ *nachash*, and that of Aaron, as well as that of each magician into a τανίν *tanin*. This difference is recognized by the LXX which has consistently translated the *nachash* of the 3d and 15th verses by ὄφις, and the *tanin* in the three verses (9, 10, 12) by δράκων.

The difficulty, however, of obtaining a clear idea respecting the matters under our more special consideration at present, would be much more sensibly felt, if it were not that in the minds of most readers of the English translation, the word “dragon” conveys only the idea of a fabulous animal. It is thought to be something oriental, and poetical, and that is next door to saying that it may be any thing or nothing. At the same time I have thought it worth while to bring together and lay before the reader, so much that is obscure, without much attempt at such verbal criticism or conjecture as might perhaps remove, or in some degree diminish the obscurity, because it seems to me that dark and mysterious as these hints of the Scriptures are, they point to some of the hidden things of the great deep, and have a

remarkable coincidence with ancient and widespread traditions of the heathen world.

This is of course too large a subject to be entered upon in this place; and besides, I am quite aware that it has been so worked out that any thing which I could say, especially in such limits, could only be a brief and injurious abstract of what is popularly known. I will therefore say nothing of Egypt or Greece or Rome or India; not merely because so much has been said of their mythology; but because I have not the knowledge, or the access to books, which would be requisite for a discourse on the strange, universal, and (unless we accept the Scriptures) unaccountable, worship of the serpent. But several considerations induce me to give some extracts from one or two popular works which have lately fallen into my hands. They are curious as relating to the Serpent of the Abyss⁵.

§ 8. *Dæmoniacal Possession.*

Those who read the sixth chapter of Genesis with a belief that all the parties concerned—

⁵ See note B.

the Sons of God, the Daughters of men, and the Giants—were Sethites and Cainites, and mere common mortals, will perhaps be satisfied to suppose that all of them, (that is, all who were living at the time) perished in the Flood.

On the other hand those who believe the Sons of God to have been Angels, may think that they gather some obscure indications of their fate from the sources referred to in the preceding pages. They may perhaps suppose that the destiny of those daughters of men who were partakers—or may we say, victims?—of the transgression, was not essentially different from that of their human fellow-sinners. But as to the mixed race, the Giant-offspring, some doubt and uncertainty may be entertained respecting their fate.

The doctrine of the Jews at a very early and interesting period may be gathered from the Book of Enoch, even supposing that the learned Primate who translated and published that work is correct in his supposition that it was written only “a few years at most before the beginning of the christian æra⁶. ” The

⁶ P. 18 of Archbishop Laurence’s Preliminary Dissertation

passage which it is to our purpose to notice occurs in that part of the work which the writer calls, “the book of the words of righteousness and the reproof of the Watchers.” The prophet is represented as having been sent to denounce the sentence of the Creator against the sinning angels, and it will be seen that the first paragraph of the following extract relates to them; and is only quoted here to introduce what the Lord is said to have revealed to the prophet respecting their offspring;—

“ Ch. xv. 6. You from the beginning were made spiritual, possessing a life which is eternal, and not subject to death for ever.

7. Therefore I made not wives for you, because being spiritual, your dwelling is in heaven.

8. Now the giants who have been born of spirit and of flesh, shall be called upon earth evil spirits, and on earth shall be their habitation. Evil spirits shall proceed from their flesh, because they were created from above; from the holy Watchers was their beginning and primary foundation. Evil spirits shall they be upon earth, and the spirits of the wicked shall they be called. The habitation of the spirits of heaven shall be in heaven; but upon earth shall be the habitation of terrestrial spirits who are born on earth.

9. The spirits of the giants *shall be like* clouds which shall oppress, corrupt, fall, contend, and bruise upon earth.

to his edition of the book of Enoch, Oxford 1821. Some farther remarks on this book may be found in note C.

10. They shall cause lamentation. No food shall they eat; and they shall be thirsty; they shall be concealed, and shall not rise up against the sons of men, and against women; for they came forth during the days of slaughter and destruction.

Ch. xvi. 1. At the death of the Giants, wheresoever their spirits shall have departed from their bodies, let that which is carnal in them perish before judgment. Thus shall they perish until the day of the great consummation of the great world. A consummation shall take place of the Watchers and the impious.” Ch. XV. v. 6.—Ch. XVI. v. 1.

Some readers will probably reject this at once, as mere Jewish fable. Others may hesitate to do so from the recollection of certain facts with which they are familiar, and which they believe on higher authority. They have read in the New Testament that in the days of our Lord’s ministry, evil spirits actually were going up and down the earth. How they came there, is not, so far as I see, stated; but that they were realities admits of no doubt.

I should not venture to say that I believed the New Testament, if I did not believe, as a matter of fact, that men had been possessed by evil spirits. It is very well for philosophers to talk of lunacy, and epilepsy, and what they will; but it appears to me that no honest man of common understanding can dispute that

the New Testament speaks of real possession. To deny that seems to me to be a mere simple denial of Christianity. I do not want to make any great argument about this; or to speak harshly of those who may think that they believe evasions and explanations which they have hastily, and inconsiderately adopted, in order to escape from some apparent difficulty; but, I must say, that I should think it worse than a waste of time to argue the matter with any man who could affirm that, after consideration and reflection, he really believed what appears to me so absurd, as well as blasphemous.

I speak not of the avowed infidel who is, of course, free to say what he pleases; and who may be consistent in representing all religion as folly and imposture; but of the opponent who professes some faith in Christianity, and some reverence for its Divine Founder. For the real state of the case is, that, professing that faith and that reverence, he asks me to believe, that the Jewish nation held an opinion respecting themselves and their fellow-creatures, which to his own mind appears to be most absurd, and contrary to truth—a doctrine absolutely horrible in his own estimation and such

(he thinks) as common sense, and common humanity, should join in execrating. He asks me to believe that our Lord Jesus Christ, not only knew the foolish and abominable thoughts of those whom he came to seek and to save, and with this knowledge suffered them to remain in error, but that by the language which he used, he gave the fullest countenance to it. Not only so—not only that in his intercourse with madmen their Saviour humoured their delusion—not only that in more private and confidential communication with those disciples to whom it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, he does not seem to have vouchsafed any explanation—but that, on the contrary, he went out of his way to use language which must have tended to aggravate, and confirm, the delusion which he knew them to lie under.

It was not to madmen, but to the wise and the learned, the Scribes and Pharisees, that our Lord said, “When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man he walketh through dry places seeking rest and findeth none⁷” &c. What did the hearers understand? what are we to

⁷ Matt. xii. 43. see also Luke xi. 24.

understand? Would a philosophical commentator help us much by telling us to read, “When the epilepsy is gone out of a man, it walketh through dry places” &c.? It is worth while to observe that both the Evangelists, in relating this discourse with the jews, state that our Lord spake as he did, because “he knew their thoughts;” and, in fact, we find that he directly and openly met those thoughts, and set his audience right, up to the very point at which our philosopher would have us believe that he turned aside to mislead them, and give his sanction to absurd and blasphemous untruth.

But even this is not all. Our philosopher not only requires us to believe that this strange affectation of adopting, and humouring, insane delusion was practised by our Lord, and his apostles, while they had to do with insane or disordered persons. He insists that the same extraordinary course was pursued by the inspired writers in their character of historians. It cannot be pretended that, in their evangelist character, they give us any hint of our Lord’s adopting the language of ignorance and error in condescension to infirmity. They speak on such points as plainly as he did. Is it possible,

for instance, to distinguish between two things more plainly and perfectly than the writer of the Acts does between, “the evil spirit,” and “the man in whom the evil spirit was⁸? ” People may argue if they please about the truth of the doctrine of possession; but that it is the doctrine of the New Testament, seems to me to admit of no question.

I may add—not as a reason why it must be believed without proof or argument, but as a reason why a clergyman need not undertake a formal proof whenever he refers to it,—that it is the doctrine of the Church of England. Her ministers are directed to warn their flocks that they are liable, if they commit certain sins, to be entered into by the devil “as he entered into Judas,” and to be brought thereby “to destruction both of body and soul.”

Who and what then were the spirits of whom Beelzebub was the chief? They are, in the New Testament, called Dæmons; and furnish fresh occasion to lament the lax inconsistency of our translation. The course pursued by our translators in rendering the words *Δαιμων* and *Δαιμόνιον* by “devil,” instead of by “dæmon,”

⁸ Acts xix. 13, &c.

has led to a twofold error. First by asserting a plurality of devils, while the Scripture speaks of but one individual; and secondly, by identifying the beings called dæmons (whatever they may have been) with *the* devil; from whom—even if, like wicked men, they may be subjugated and enslaved by him so as to be his angels and agents—they may, perhaps, be distinguished by a specific and essential difference of nature.

At the same time whether more or less related to, connected with, or governed by, Satan, these dæmons were “*evil* spirits.” Our Lord healed many of *evil* spirits πνευμάτων πονηρῶν (Luke vii. 21.) They were wicked spirits; and, it would seem, some wickeder than others. Our Lord represents the evil spirit as returning with others worse than himself πονηρότερα ἐαυτοῦ (Matt. xii. 45. Luke xi. 26.) They were, as a class “*evil*”—this is plain—but why are they called “unclean,” ἀκάθαρτα? “*Evil*,” we may understand. We may, certainly, say, that it was wicked to invade the persons of mankind, and to make the victims of such invasion exceeding fierce, and terrible to their fellow-men; and it was wicked to throw a child into fire and water with the pur-

pose of destruction. All this was, no doubt, sinful on the part of the aggressors; but I do not see any thing in the history of those spirits, or of the persons possessed by them, which should lead to the use of the epithet “unclean” in any such sense as we should think of assigning to the word. If we could imagine the evil spirits or dæmons thus represented as wandering on earth, to be the impure spirits who left their own habitations, we might perhaps suppose that they were characterized and described, not by the acts of their vagrant humiliation, but by the sin which had led to it. This however does not seem to be consistent with the idea of their custody; and I am more inclined to believe that the uncleanness, or impurity, relates to their mixed nature; not purely human, or angelic. It is worthy of observation, that the word rendered “unclean” is not used in the gospels except as an epithet of these *πνεύματα*. In the Acts only once in any other sense, and that is with reference to Peter’s breaking through the distinction between Jew and Gentile⁹; and, what is yet more observable, the Apostle Paul employs it

⁹ Acts x. 14. 28. xi. 8.

in speaking of the offspring of mixed marriages, “the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children *unclean*; but now are they *holy*¹. ” The title, or epithet, it seems to me, may be used to mean much the same as Cyprian² and Minucius Felix³ did by “*insinceri*.”

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 14.

² “Spiritus sunt *insinceri* et *vagi*” *De Idol. Van.* § 6.

³ “Spiritus sunt *insinceri*, *vagi*” &c. *Oct.* § 26. p. 36. He begins the next section with “*Isti igitur impuri spiritus*,” where the impurity seems to have been merely characteristic of “*substantiam inter mortalem immortalemque, id est inter corpus et spiritus medium, terreni ponderis et cœlestis levitatis admixtione concretam*.”

PART III.

Pagan doctrine of a Supreme Being—the Nature of False Worship—Worship of Angels.

If any reader has had the patience to get thus far, he will have discovered my disposition to believe that the Sons of God and their descendants were the *Originators* and *Objects* of False Worship. Perhaps I have said more than enough by way of introduction to a plain statement which is, after all, only what is as plainly declared by the Apostle,—“the things that they sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils [dæmons] and not to God¹. ” Did St. Paul write for those who read the Gospels? What dæmons did those readers of the Gospels know

¹ 1 Cor. x. 20.

about except those of whom Beelzebub was the chief? What daemons but those who had been put in subjection to the followers of Christ? Surely St. Paul was teaching the Corinthians that the objects of heathen worship were the very same evil spirits which their Saviour had been casting out. I am, therefore, I repeat, only saying what the Apostle said as plainly as he could—as plainly as when he warned the Colossians against being drawn into “worshipping of angels²;” a point on which I hope to speak more fully presently. In the mean time I will only observe that, according to this view, by the time that false worship began, the objects of it would be distributed—as the great commandment against that worship gives us to understand they were—“in the heaven above, and the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth.”

I have suggested that those are wrong who speak as if the worshippers of false gods must be understood to have renounced the worship of the true one. It may be granted that some of those heathen worshippers talk laxly about “the Gods,” as if they were speaking of a corporate

² Col. ii. 18.

body, or as if no distinctions existed among all that was called God and worshipped. Moreover, different individuals, or communities, may at some times or places have fallen into the opposite, or identical, sins of worshipping every thing or nothing—but I believe that the theology of the world clearly and unequivocally embraced the doctrine of a Supreme Deity—that the “catholic tradition” of mankind cried always “I believe in God the Father Almighty;”—and that the church of Christ rightly answered in her triumphant song, “All the earth doth worship Thee the Father everlasting.” I do not deny, or doubt, that when the nations of the world knew God they worshipped him not as God; but I believe that they *did* know God as much as many who call themselves Christians, and talk now and then about the Great Creator, and an overruling Providence, without much consideration of the words, or of the ideas which they should convey. No doubt there were millions of ancient heathen living either wholly without God in the world, as there are now in every country christian or pagan; or else with entirely stupid and confused ideas of Gods many, and Lords many; and either case puts them rather out of

our way. But, for all this, the great, pregnant, imperative, idea of a supreme Power, man's Creator, Ruler, and Judge, call it Saturn, or Jupiter, or Fate, or what you will, reigned paramount in the minds of men, and in the catholic tradition which they passed on from generation to generation, even after they had been given up to idolatry and the worship of false gods.

I do not mean, merely, that the doctrine of the divine Unity was attained, or promulgated, by philosophers who wrote *De Natura Deorum*³, or that it lay enshrined in mysteries, or was obscurely insinuated by mystagogues, and hierophants, or that it might be more or less learned from poetical pedigrees by the student of theogony—but that it was the doctrine taught among the people, and freely received by them⁴. It would be easy to parade pas-

³ “Itaque imposuistis in cervicibus nostris sempiternum Dominum, quem dies et noctes timeremus. Quis enim non timeat omnia providentem, et cogitantem, et animadvententem, et omnia ad se pertinere putantem, curiosum, et plenum negotii, Deum ?” Cic. de N. D. I. 20.

⁴ “Audio vulgus, cum ad cœlum manus tendunt, nihil aliud quam Deum dicunt et: *Deus magnus est* et: *Deus verus est* et: *Si Deus dederit.* Vulgi iste naturalis sermo est, an Christiani confitentis oratio ? Et qui Jovem principem vo-

sages in proof that it was held by the learned ; but my object is to speak of what was *popular*, and to call the reader's attention to the fact that the belief in a divine supremacy was, even among heathen nations, the creed of the people and assumed to be such, and taken for granted, by those who wrote for their instruction or amusement.

By way of illustration, let me just briefly mention two instances from writers of different times, places, qualities, and language. In some other points of view the quotations are not altogether irrelevant to our enquiry.

First from Hesiod ;—who has a special claim on our attention, as being the most particular, and perhaps I should say original, writer on the Theogony, or Generation of the Gods. Perhaps he made those long pedigrees out of his own head, or at least altered them to his own fancy. Herodotus seems to have suspected him of something of the sort⁵; but, in any

lunt, falluntur in nomine, se de una potestate consentiunt.” See this, and more, of Minucius Felix. *Oct.* c. xviii. and xix.

⁵ “Si Herodoto credimus, Homerus et Hesiodus inventores fuere Theogoniae, antea Graecis ignotae. Sic enim loquitur Lib. II. c. 53”—so says Le Clerc near the beginning of his *Notulae* on Hesiod ; but perhaps some readers may prefer Mr. Cary’s translation of the passage of Herodotus—

case, I apprehend that his materials were much older than himself. Be this as it may, we are not for our present purpose going to his Theogony, and I only refer to it for the sake of reminding the reader that Hesiod, of all people in the world, did not write in ignorance of the polytheism which was patronized and dominant in his country. Our business is with his “Works and Days.” The poet’s brother, for whose instruction the work seems to have been written, is addressed rather as a fool, than a philosopher⁶; and it will be remembered that my object is merely to direct attention to what the writer says (for the most part incidentally) respecting the doctrine of a Divine Supremacy.

“ Whence each of the Gods sprung, whether they existed always, and of what form they were, was, so to speak, unknown till yesterday. For I am of opinion that Hesiod and Homer lived four hundred years before my time, and not more, and these were they who framed a Theogony for the Greeks, and gave names to the gods, and assigned to them honours and arts, and declared their several forms.” p. 116. Le Clerc, however, justly observes that Homer and Hesiod speak as of things previously known, and appear to have only embellished them with some circumstantial.

⁶ Σοὶ δὲ ἔγώ ἐσθλὰ νοέων ἐρέω, μέγα νήπιε Πέρση—which may, I suppose be most properly translated “great booby.” Goettling seems to think that this plain speaking might appear unkind, and suggests that the Delphic Oracle addressed Crœsus in the same terms; but it needs no such apology.

After charging his brother to follow the way of righteousness, because it is that which bringeth peace at the last, he tells him that states and cities where Justice prevails flourish, and the people in them flourish too, for Jupiter does not send war into their peaceful land, or famine, or calamity, while he punishes states where wickedness abounds, sometimes even for the sins of a single individual, with all those evils⁷. And after describing in detail the circumstances of prosperity and adversity, which he attributes simply to the sovereign and overruling power of Jupiter, he breaks forth into an address to Kings in which he calls on them to lay these things to heart specially on the ground that the “Immortals” conversant among mankind observe such things,

ἔγγυς γάρ ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔοντες
Ἄθανατοι λεύσσουσιν·

and he goes on to state that there are, ranging about among the manifold inhabitants of earth, thirty thousand of “Jupiter’s immortals, guardians of mortal men” whose business it is to take notice of all such things⁸. After more in

⁷ V. 225, &c.

⁸ Τρις γάρ μύριοι εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πονλυβοτείρη

the same strain, he turns and addresses his brother, exhorting him to follow the way of righteousness, in what is really an anticipation of Dr. Watts's little hymn ;—

Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
For God has made them so.

His ground is simply, that Jupiter has laid down the law of peace for man, while he has given the instinct of mutual destruction to fishes, and to wild beasts⁹.

But let us turn to another writer of a later age, and different character, and one whom it is perhaps still more to the purpose to quote on the subject of popular opinion. Plautus not only agrees with the doctrine which we have just seen respecting the immortal watchers, reporting to the supreme Deity, but he brings one of these immortals on the stage. There he gives some account of himself, and adds what a modern audience would consider as fitter for a sermon than for the Prologue to a play. He tells the company that he is a citizen

*'Αθάνατοι Ζηρὸς, φύλακες θυητῶν ἀνθρώπων·
Οἵ δὲ φυλάσσοντί τε δίκαιος καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
'Ηέρα ἐσσάμενοι, πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἰαν.*

⁹ See v. 274—286.

of the heavenly city of Him who rules all nations, seas, and lands; being, as they may perceive a splendid star, known both in heaven and earth by the name of Arcturus—that by night he shines in the heavens, and is among the gods; but spends the daytime in walking to and fro on the earth—that other stars do the same, because Jupiter, Ruler of Gods and men, has appointed them to different districts, to note the actions, manners, piety, and faith, of mankind, that he may know on whom to bestow the reward of opulence; and also to report those who are perjuring themselves to carry on false suits, or conceal embezzlements.

“We take up their names in writing to Jupiter,” he continues, “every day he knows which of you is about mischief, which seeks to gain his cause by false witness, or to get a wrong decision from the Judge. He tries these causes over again, and mulcts the parties in much more than their ill-gotten gain. He has another list of the names of good men. Irreligious persons take up the idea that they can please Jupiter with gifts and sacrifices; but their trouble and cost are thrown away. He will not hear any thing in the nature of prayer from perjured men. A man who is pious, and

prays to the gods, will much more easily obtain favour than an irreligious man. And therefore I give you this piece of advice, you who are good, and spend your days in piety and faith, persevere in that course that hereafter you may rejoice."

Much more might be said in illustration of this point; and probably better examples will occur to those who are more familiar with the pagan writers of antiquity; but all I aim at is to get the reader to consider whether the people who talked, and were talked to, in this manner, did not actually, and practically, believe in the doctrine of a Divine Supremacy and Unity. Whether that doctrine, instead of being one of the secrets of their mysteries, was not a part of the common, popular, belief. Men, as I have observed, spoke laxly of the gods, they called these "immortals," gods, they expected good and evil from them, they feared them yet they sought converse with them, they desired to profit by them as well as to learn from them. It may be that, step by step, they went on till they worshipped and served them with blasphemous idolatry, and in contempt of the Creator. But they did not put them in His place—they did not assign to them the govern-

ment of the universe—in short they did not set them up *instead* of the True God.

But I do not think it “likely” that worship was offered to these “immortals” on mere speculation that some almost indefinable good might be obtained. I do not believe that, having by some means—nobody knows how—“come to imagine certain inferior spirits to reside in the sun, and moon, the stars, rivers, groves &c.” men took to praying “in the hope that *perhaps* such prayers might be heard¹. ”

§ 10. *The Nature of False Worship.*

What was this worship, and to whom was it paid? I am much inclined to assent to the ancient opinion of the Jews, adopted by so many christian writers, that men learned this false worship, and the curious arts which have always been connected with it, by giving heed to wandering spirits and the teaching of dæmons. It is clear that at an early period these arts flourished in Canaan. The inhabit-

¹ See before p. 16.

ants “hearkened,” we read, “to observers of times and unto diviners;” and we are expressly told that they were to be driven out of their land for *these* “abominations.” I do not know what is meant by causing children “to pass through the fire;” and, I suppose, nobody would undertake to define the specific differences between the classes of offenders enumerated by Moses, and designated in our version as those who used divination, observers of times, enchanters, witches, charmers, consulters with familiar spirits, wizards, and necromancers. Much has been, and much more might be, written on these words; but it is not to our present purpose to treat of them in detail. I must however remark, that the long list of “abominations,” and the fact of nations being exterminated for the practice of them, suggests the idea of something very different from the dark and secret practice of sorcery and magic by solitary individuals, and still more different from the pretended conjurations of impostors, which may be traced in later ages. It was undoubtedly a reality; and not the less so because it has been imitated by cheats, and denied by infidels. There was sin always; but it was not until it had been visited

that it became mystery. I cannot doubt that it was the secret of *the* Mysteries—the stronghold of pagan Superstition. That it was the tradition of knowledge and practice that had survived the flood, and spread over the world, from the lands of Ham and his son Canaan.

What then were the Mysteries? a very wide question, which nobody perhaps will undertake fully to answer; but something of their nature may be learned; and even what is popularly known is sufficient to furnish a reply that is much to our purpose. I have already said that I cannot consider Mr. Bryant as having succeeded in establishing the main point at which he laboured in his Analysis of pagan Mythology; but I am always glad when I can give weight to any opinion of my own by borrowing the words of so learned and thoughtful a writer. He says plainly, “All the mysteries of the Gentile world seem to have been memorials of the Deluge; and of the events which immediately succeeded².” Believing, however, as I do that they also included a reference to things which *preceded* and actually occasioned the deluge, I should not think it fair—indeed, it

would not be to my purpose—to quote this statement, were it not that on the same page Mr. Bryant proceeds to say “The first thing at these awful meetings was to offer an oath of secrecy to all, who were to be initiated: after which they proceeded to the ceremonies. These began with a description of Chaos: by which was signified some memorial of the Deluge of the rites above mentioned we have an account in the Orphic Argonautica;” and he then quotes a passage which he thus translates, “After the oath had been tendered to the Mustæ, we commemorated the sad necessity, by which the earth was reduced to its chaotic state.”

I am very glad to have Mr. Bryant’s sanction as far as he goes; but it seems to me as if by the very authority which he quotes, the commemoration comprehended the cause, as well as the effect and its consequences. This being understood I may fairly quote, and express my concurrence with what he says elsewhere—“My purpose is not to lay science in ruins; but instead of desolating to build up, and rectify what time has impaired: to divest mythology of every foreign and unmeaning ornament, and to display the truth in its native

simplicity: to shew, that all the rites and mysteries of the Gentiles were only so many memorials of their principal ancestors; and of the great occurrences to which they had been witnesses. Among these memorials the chief were the ruin of mankind by a flood; and the renewal of the world in one family. They had symbolical representations, by which these occurrences were commemorated: and the antient hymns in their temples were to the same purpose. They all related to the history of the first ages, and to the same events which are recorded by Moses³."

I have already said that in the history of the world before the flood we find no account of false worship; and perhaps I may say the same of about four centuries after that catastrophe. The earliest on record is I believe that which Joshua refers to when he says that "in old time" Terah the father of Abraham "served other gods⁴." This was while as yet Abraham "dwelt on the other side of the flood;" and from thence he was not called until the year A.M. 1921—that is to say about 428 years after the Deluge. About eight years later

³ Vol. I. pref. xl.

⁴ Josh. xxiv. 2.

the land of Canaan was promised to his seed; with the remarkable declaration that the iniquity of the Amorites (one of the nations then inhabiting it) was “not yet full.” Such a statement leads, of course, to the supposition that the iniquity for which the Canaanites were expelled was already abounding; and perhaps the particular mention of the *Amorites* may fairly raise a suspicion that they were an exception, and that the iniquity of the other ten nations which are named, *had* arrived at a state of greater maturity. But before this Abraham had been down into Egypt, and had left that country bringing away great riches, not only in cattle, but in “silver and gold,” and probably other proofs of the civilization and cultivation of the offspring of Ham.

“The first and original Mysteries of which we have any account,” says Warburton, “were these of Isis and Osiris in Egypt from whence they were derived to the Greeks, under the presidency of various gods, as the institutor thought most for his purpose⁵;” and I presume that he was not mistaken in the more general statement that “All mysterious worship came first from Egypt⁶. ” What Abra-

⁵ Div. Leg. Bk. II. § 4. Vol. I. 138.

⁶ Ibid. p. 315.

ham knew when his fathers “dwelt on the other side of the flood,” and what he learned in Egypt, or found in Canaan, it may be impossible to say; but we know that after about 180 years (that is A.C. 1739) his grandson, Jacob, had teraphim which his wife had stolen from her father⁷ and seven years later he was obliged to call upon his household to “put away the strange gods” that were among them⁸.

Without, however, entering into the discussion of all the points connected with this reference we may safely say; that by the time that we know any thing of history after the Flood, there had been full opportunity for a system of superstition which was, on the one hand and as to generals, public and notorious; and on the other as to particulars and details, secret and clandestine; to spread among mankind—to have its rites and mysteries, its prophets and priests,—and the more easy will it be to imagine this in proportion as we suppose the false religion to have contained more or less that had survived the deluge.

Our common use of the terms *sacred* and

⁷ Gen. xxxi. 19.

⁸ Gen. xxxv. 2.

profane as applied to history make it seem as if it were somewhat strange to speak of *mysteries* and *initiated* persons. It is not that there is any thing unlikely in the theory, on the ground of irreligion; for we are familiar enough with accounts of idolatry, and priests of Baal, and of high places; with the golden calf, and the abominations of Chemosh and Molech. Indeed, there has been, I think, a very general disposition on the part of commentators to exaggerate rather than to extenuate, the loathsomeness and disgusting nature of many of these idolatrous rites. I do not say to exaggerate the sin; for what can be a greater and more presumptuous sin than idolatry? but I believe that, partly owing to misapprehension of language, and partly to seeking for explanation from heathen writers of more modern date, they have, in fact, given an exaggerated view of the sensual immorality connected with the rites of idolatry in earlier times. A fitter place, however, for a remark or two on this point, may be found when we come to speak of matters which involve the moral character of the Jewish people, and more especially of the Jewish women, and of the part which they took with regard to

Religion. In the mean time I only remark that how much soever the Mysteries might degenerate in later times, I believe that “they continued long in religious reverence”—but, as to this, I refer the reader to what Bishop Warburton says in support of his assertion that “it was required in the aspirant to the Mysteries, that he should be of a clear and unblemished character, and free even from the suspicion of any notorious crime⁹. ”

§ 11. *The worship of Angels.*

I have already referred to the caution which the Apostle gave to the Colossians to beware of the “worshipping of angels¹. ”

Doddridge says, “It evidently appears from several passages in Philo, to have been the

⁹ Div. Leg. Bk. II. § iv. Vol. I. p. 143. The passage is too long for quotation; and the work, perhaps, so accessible as to render it unnecessary; but still, considering the place which the Mysteries occupied in False Worship, I wish the reader who may not be familiar with Bp. Warburton’s work, to look at one or two extracts which he will find in note D.

¹ Col. ii. 18.

opinion of the learned Jew, that Angels were messengers who presented our prayers to God, as well as brought down his favours to us. He represents this view of the matter, as most *humble* and reverential, and there is no doubt but it prevailed among other Jews; (compare Tob. xi. 14. xii. 12. 15.)”

Supposing this to be quite true, what can be more irrelevant? The fact that the Jews held this belief respecting angels, is no proof that they had any disposition to worship them. The history of Tobit to which Doddridge refers looks quite the other way. It tells us that when Tobit and his wife learned that he whom they had hired, and treated, as a servant, was “Raphael, one of the seven holy angels,” they were “both troubled, and fell upon their faces: for they feared;” but they are not represented as having addressed Raphael in any way, or even as having seen him after they knew him to be an angel.

I cannot therefore agree with Doddridge when he proceeds to say, “and that the Apostle refers to this seems much more probable than the interpretation of Tertullian, who would explain it of worship taught by angels, or persons pretending to receive reve-

lations from them.” It seems to me unnecessary to repeat what has been collected by others from patristic sources on this subject, because in this superficial essay, I have no idea of writing a history of False Worship. If that were my purpose I should certainly be disposed to maintain Tertullian’s interpretation as the most probable of the two. As it is, I cannot resist the temptation to copy from that Father, a few lines which are not only pertinent to the subject of this section, but still more so to that of the preceding one relating to the doctrine of a Divine Supremacy. After speaking of other heresies, he says;—“The system of the sorcery of Simon, which doeth service to angels, was of course itself also counted among idolatries, and was condemned in Simon himself by the Apostle Peter. These are, as I think, the different kinds of corrupt doctrines, which, we learn from the Apostles themselves, existed under the Apostles: and yet we find, among so many varieties of perverse teachings, *no one School, which mooted any controversy respecting God as the Creator of all things. No one ventured to surmise a second God*². ”

² De Praeser. c. xxxiii. Dodgson’s Tr. in Lib. of Fathers, p. 467.

But as to the worship of angels;—my object is rather to speak of more modern times and things. What may have been the precise circumstances, or peculiar danger and temptation, of the christians at Colosse, does not appear; but the history of the church in every age from theirs to ours, sufficiently attests the proneness of man to this species of false worship. Not as Tertullian justly observes setting up an angel, or the whole hierarchy of Angels, *instead* of God—not addressing any but One Almighty Creator with the worship due to the Supreme Deity—not doing this, or any thing like it; but seeking forbidden intercourse with angels and dæmons, and using forbidden means to obtain it.

Among the more modern philosophers of this kind, one of the best known by name in our country is Dr. Dee; whose work containing “A true and faithful relation of what passed for many yeers between” himself and “some spirits,” was published in the year 1659 “with a preface confirming the Reality (as to the point of Spirits) of this Relation; and showing the several good uses that a sober christian may make of all. By Meric Casaubon, D.D.” Being myself, however, fully convinced that in

these transactions Dee had no intercourse with any spirit but that of the rascal Kelly, whom he employed as his “Seer” or “Skryer,” I will here only remark that (so far as I see) the work is of little value, except for the insight which it gives us into the method used by those who professed to hold intercourse with spirits, and to conjure with stones, mirrors, and crystals which was, no doubt known and followed by Kelly; and also for the melancholy, but instructive, picture which it presents of a man learned, benevolent, pious, and in other things, wise and able, cheated and infatuated by a wretch whose atrocious impudence, blasphemy, and lewd villainy, are perhaps without a parallel in the history of sin.

Since the time of Dee, perhaps, the best known and most influential assertor of what it might not be right (even in the qualified sense in which the word may be used) to call the worship of angels and spirits—perhaps we may say, of intercourse with them—was the Baron Swedenborg; and from his time, it has been, I believe, chiefly by his followers that the doctrine has been maintained.

“ You ask me,” he says in a letter to the Superintendent Oettinger dated Nov. 11, 1766,

“if I have spoken with the Apostles? to which I reply, I have spoken one whole year with Paul, and also of what is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, chap. iii. 28. I have spoken three times with John; once with Moses; and I suppose a hundred times with Luther, who owned to me that, contrary to the warning of an angel, he had received the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, merely with the intent that he might make an entire separation from popery. But with the Angels I have conversed these twenty-two years past, and daily continue so to do; with them the Lord has given me association, though there was no occasion to mention all this in my writings: Who would have believed, and who would not have said, shew some token that I may believe? And this every one would have said who did not see the like³. ”

But as my object is rather to call attention to the state of things in the present day—and, among those things, to the progress of angel-worship—let us take a more recent specimen, from a very different source.

“I turn me to my angel as an image of the inapproachable

³ New Jerusalem Mag. for 1790, p. 32.

glory ; for angels and men are finite forms and images of God into whom He breathes the breath of life. My Angel smiles, as he communicates to me this beautiful truth, he feels beating within my heart a new ardor of love, as I perceive this truth ; for it is a consolation to the yearning heart's desire to love God, that we can love him in a finite form. Yes I turn my angel yet more to the light of the divine Sun, I make him to 'turn his face to the Lord' that he may reflect the light of God's countenance upon me. And ah, how innocent and pure he grows in his desires to reveal to me that which is HIGHEST and best. Yes it is the image of God that I love in him. Here is the same celestial purity and meekness, the same tender mercy and overflowing love, there is no thought of self in the heart of my angel, he gives his love and wisdom to me, even as the Lord gives His to His Bride, the church. It is my happiness he seeks, not his own glory ; but I delight to ascribe to him my joy and happiness, even as the church delights to magnify and glorify and exalt the Lord from whom she receives all things."

* * * *

" My Angel is happy that I realize myself as essential to his happiness, and it is to me a new and blessed joy. It is a stimulus to a life of the most intense devotion to him. And this devotion will be to him blessedness.

* * * *

" My Angel is the first receptacle, through him I receive from God ; he is the tie that binds my spirit to the Infinite Life. He is the substance of love, I am the form moulded upon that substance."

Some of my Exeter Hall friends will think that they know from what quarter this comes ; but they will be as much mistaken as if they

thought it was Socrates discoursing about his Genius. It is no more Greek than it is roman ; though, as Bishop Burnet says we “know that it was a part of heathenish idolatry to invocate either dæmons, or departed men, whom they considered as good beings subordinate to the divine essence, and employed by God in the government of the world, and they had almost the same speculations about them, that have been since introduced into the church concerning angels and saints⁴. ” What I have quoted however came (that is it came to me) from Massachusets. I copied it from a Boston Newspaper of as recent a date as October 1853 ; and it would be easy to tire the most patient reader with the same sort of effusions from similar sources ; but this may suffice for what good Mr. Strype used to call “giving a taste” of such performances. I ought, perhaps, while thus placing them in *juxta-position*, to say that those who in the present day call themselves “Spiritualists” entirely repudiate the followers of Swedenborg ; and that both parties likewise repudiate, and are repudiated by, Mesmerists. It is however a very remark-

⁴ On the XXII. Art. p. 247.

able thing that on this point of what I may perhaps call angelic interference, all parties concur. With regard to Mesmerism, indeed, the following extract will shew that this singular phænomenon is not occasional or accidental, that it is not merely something happening to, and to be expected now and then in the cases of mystics, fanatics, and enthusiasts, but that it is a regular step in the progress—a grade to be obtained by the patient as part of the purpose and looked-for result of mesmeric treatment — something which the man of science is quietly and coolly to describe in this manner ;—

“ But whatever method be adopted, it is important not to suspend the passes immediately when the sleep is established ; for by continuing to magnetise we determine a series of phenomena, of which the last only are the manifestation of complete somnambulism. The young patient, for instance, whose case has been given by M. Despine in the Bulletin of d’Aix (Estelle), first saw particles of fire scintillate before his face. After eight minutes she experienced a feeling of chewing in her mouth ; in ten minutes slight subsultus in her arms and legs ; in fifteen minutes she distinguished with her eyes shut the hands of her magnetiser ; in thirty-five minutes she divined the thoughts of the persons present at the sitting, and expressed them aloud. A little after it was a fantastic vision which frightened her. In some minutes after luminous tufts seemed to her to shine at the extremities of all the fingers of

her magnetiser. At length another vision came on which filled her with joy and hope. It was a heavenly figure, which became her tutelary divinity, her preserving genius, and which, like Socrates' genius was to serve her as a guide, to enlighten her on the nature of her suffering, to direct her mode of living each day and to bring about her cure. This instance is sufficient to explain our meaning; but it would be wrong to suppose that it includes the precise elements of a practical rule; for, with every new subject that is magnetised, it is observed that the different phases of the sleep are marked by different signs⁵."

I have already said, but the matter is so important that I must repeat it, that these things are not merely taught, and vouched for, by the credulous and superstitious. It would be easy to fill a volume with cases of Angelic visions seen, or imagined, by those whose thoughts and habits of mind might be supposed to account for them. But this is not the matter; it is that something of the sort is continually making its appearance where one would least expect to find it.

Take for instance a case related by Dr. De Valenti. The patient was a servant maid thirty years of age who suffered from hysterical head aches. One day, he says, he went to see her master who was his patient, and asked her

⁵ Teste's Animal Magnetism, translated by Spillan, p. 166.

to bring him a glass of water. On her doing so he grasped the thumb of her left hand with his left hand and with the thumb of his right made some passes down her left arm from the shoulder to the fingers. She fell into convulsions; and he continuing to mesmerise her, she became clairvoyant. On a subsequent occasion of her being mesmerised a circumstance occurred which Dr. Valenti thus describes—"the patient made room on her chair by drawing herself up into less compass and assumed a look of unusual liveliness and kindness. On my asking her what she was about she said with strong emotion "Yes there is an angel there who comes and seats himself by me. More angels keep coming into the room. Now there are three come in to him. Ah! they look very kind."

"How" said I "you see angels? I see none.—

"(*Smiling*) Ah! I can believe that you do not see any."

"Well, but why should not I see them? My eyes are as good as yours.—

"Yes! with these eyes you cannot see angels. If you were once to sleep as I do, or to die, you would see the Angels."

“Well, now let the Angels go about their business, and do you go on sleeping quietly.”

It would have been easy, the Doctor says, to have raised her to a higher state; but he studiously kept her in the lower regions of clairvoyance⁶.

It is certainly possible that a german house-maid might think of angels, even when there seems to have been nothing to excite her imagination in that direction.

We may turn with greater safety to M. Cahagnet’s “Magnétisme. Arcanes de la vie future dévoilés” published at Paris in 1848 and the following year. He says “Binet (Bruno) mon premier extatique était un jeune homme d’une intelligence très-restreinte en matière de spiritualisme”—in fact, as M. Cahagnet elsewhere states, that singular and valuable clairvoyant had no turn at all for devotion—“n’est nullement porté vers la devotion.” During the first trance he affirmed that he had received a communication from Gabriel; and in the second he stated that he (like all other persons) was habitually attended by both a good and an evil angel;—

⁶ System der höhern Heilkunde, Vol. i. p. 83.

“ Mon bon ange est devant moi planant dans le chemin de la vertu, qu'il me montre, et le mauvais est à ma gauche.”

In the third this conversation passed between him and M. Cahagnet ;—

M. C. Pensez-vous qu'il y ait un moyen de communiquer avec les anges ou esprits ?

B. B. Oui.

M. C. Quel est-il ?

B. B. La Prière.

M. C. Quelle espèce de Prière ?

B. B. Celle du Cœur ; mais dans l'état où je suis, on a plus de facilité d'être avec eux, on n'a qu'à les désirer, ils sont de suite près de vous” p. 5.

In the fourth *séance*, after he had discoursed on the duty of prayer to God, M. Cahagnet enquired

“ Faut-il prier aussi son bon ange ?”
and Bruno replied

“ Oui, non pour lui qui ne pourrait accepter ce que n'appartient qu'à Dieu seul ; mais étant plus rapproché de son trône par sa nature et sa vertu, il nous sert d'intermédiaire en offrant notre prière à Dieu, et plus nous nous mettons sous sa protection, plus il peut nous inspirer de bonnes pensées” p. 6.

"Emile Rey, âgé de 10 ans, d'une nature espiègle et très-curieuse," says M. Cahagnet "était mon petit voisin." He was often at his house and appearing to shew susceptibility to mesmeric treatment he magnetized him. He flatters himself that such a patient will not be supposed to have been prepossessed in favour of any system of psychology. At the same time it must be observed that in the first séance, he attempted, as he says, to put him "en rapport avec les esprits dégagés de la matière" and told him to ask for his angel. Perhaps we ought not to be surprised at his answering "Le voici," and giving such a description as might be expected from a child—and that the next séance should begin with "Voilà mon ange."

With another patient the following conversation is said to have taken place—Mme Gouget dit recevoir des avis salutaires de son ange.—Quel est votre ange?—C'est saint Paul—Il y a deux saints Paul, est-ce l'apôtre ou l'ermite?—C'est l'ermite.—Comment vous apparait-il?—C'est un respectable vieillard" . . . "Les anges ont donc vécu sur terre?—Oui."

Even more remarkable is the case of Dr. Elliotson's patient Elizabeth Okey who ac-

cording to the Zoist “accurately foresaw the events of her case, but fancied they were told her by a beautiful negro : if in her higher ecstatic sleep-waking, in which she looked like an unearthly being, she was asked a question, she asked it in a whisper of this imaginary being, and then fancied that she received the answer from him, before she herself gave it. Such hallucinations are recorded of patients and seers of all countries and periods. At last Elizabeth Okey predicted without this fancy : and then was aware and told her mesmeriser that previously a degree of delirium had been mixed up with her state⁷,” — that was all. One wonders how she found it out, when the doctor could not.

How far it is strictly accurate to say that, “such hallucinations are recorded of patients and seers of all countries and periods,” I will not undertake to decide ; but, as I have observed, such things certainly do occur very frequently ; insomuch that something of the kind has entered into the popular idea of a seer, conjuror, or fortune-teller. Nobody knew this as a fact, or knew how to describe it, better

⁷ Zoist, Oct. 1846, Vol. iv. p. 376.

than Daniel De Foe, and it will be quite worth while to borrow a page from his Life of Duncan Campbell “a Gentleman, who tho’ Deaf and Dumb, writes down any stranger’s Name at first Sight: with their future Contingencies of Fortune. Now [i. e. 1720] Living in Exeter Court over against the Savoy in the Strand.” Of course I do not quote such a book by such a man, as an Authority ; but simply as shewing De Foe’s acquaintance with the mesmeric trance, and his notion of the phænomena accompanying it. Whether Duncan Campbell was a more real personage than Robinson Crusoe, I know not ; but after a most absurd account of his birth, his biographer goes on to say ;—

“ One day, I remember, when he was about nine years of age, going early to the house where he and his mother lived, and it being before his mother was stirring, I went into little Duncan Campbell’s room, to divert myself with him. I found him sitting up in his bed, with his eyes broad open, but as motionless as if he had been asleep, or even (if it had not been for a lively, beautiful colour, which the little, pretty, fair, silver-haired boy always had in his cheeks;) as if he had been quite dead. He did not seem so much as to breathe : The eyelids of him were so fixed and immovable, that the eyelashes did not so much as once shake, which the least motion imaginable must agitate : Not to say that he was like a person in an *extasy* he was at least in (what we commonly

call) a *brown study* to the highest degree, and for the largest space of time I ever knew. I, who had been frequently informed by people, who have been present at the operations of second-sighted persons, that, at the sight of a vision, the eyelids of the person are erected, and the eyes continue staring till the object vanishes, I, I say, sat myself softly down on his bedside, and with a quiet amazement observed him; avoiding diligently any motion, that might give him the least disturbance, or cause in him any avocation, or distraction of mind, from the business he was so intent upon. I remarked, that he held his head sideways, with his mouth wide open, and in a listening posture; and that after so lively a manner, as, at the first general thought, made me forget his deafness, and plainly imagine he heard something, till the second thought of reflection brought into my mind the misfortune that shut up all passage for any sound through his ears. After a steadfast gaze, which lasted about seven minutes, he smiled, and stretched his arms, as one recovering from a fit of indolence, and rubbed his eyes; then turning towards me, he made the sign of a salute, and hinted to me upon his fingers his desire for pen, ink and paper; which I reached him from a little desk, that stood at his bed's feet.

“ Placing the paper upon his knees, he wrote me the following lines; which, together with my answers I preserve by me, for their rarity, to this very day; and which I have transcribed word for word, as they form a little series of dialogue.

Duncan Campbell. I am sorry I can't stay with you; but I shall see my pretty youth and my lamb by and by, in the fields near a little coppice, or grove, where I go often to play with them; and I would not lose their company for the whole world: For they and I are mighty familiar

together; and the boy tells me every thing, that gets me my reputation among the ladies and nobility ; and you must keep it secret.

My Question. I will be sure to keep it secret. But how do you know you are to meet them there to day ? Did the little boy appoint you ?

Duncan Campbell. Yes he did ; and signified that he had several things to predict to me concerning people that he foreknew would come to me the week following, to ask me questions.

My Question. But what was you staring at, when I came in ?

Duncan Campbell. Why, at that little boy, that goes along with the lamb I speak of ; and 'twas then he made me the appointment.

My Question. How does he do it ? Does he write ?

Duncan Campbell. No he writes sometimes, but oftener he speaks with his fingers, and mighty swift : No man can do it so quick, or write half so soon " &c. p. 69.

But there is no need to multiply proofs and illustrations on this subject ; and I will add to this section only one observation on the worship of angels, which may perhaps tend to place the subject in a clearer light. I have already expressed my belief that those are mistaken who write, or speak, of it as if it were such worship as the Revelation of the Supreme Being directs his creatures to pay to him, or such as his unprofitable and unworthy servants do desire and attempt to render—that is, the

worship of adoration, acknowledgment, and desire to serve, the outpouring of the heart in prayer or praise to a Father in heaven for good things which he has given or promises to give, and for great works which he has done or promised to do—not this—perhaps we have no proof that any thing of the kind is sought for, or desired, by those to whom a false worship (whether of their invention or not) is paid—a worship which consists in man's seeking after clandestine and forbidden intercourse with spirits; a *cultus* offered by man, conscious of his weakness and ignorance, to those who, “inferior” as they may be compared with the Creator, are in some points superior to himself, and as he has been led to believe capable of helping him to obtain many things which he covets, and especially two which he naturally and not unlawfully desires;—HEALTH and KNOWLEDGE. It is for this reason that, looking at False Worship on the great scale of time, and place, and circumstance, we find it consisting of (one can hardly say divided into) two branches—the *Therapeutic* and the *Oracular*—the former comprehending all the ramifications of false practice in medicine, quackery, poisoning, and the use of charms

and incantations for the production or remedy of disease; the latter, all the sorts and forms of false prophesy, divination and fortune-telling.

On these points I hope to speak more particularly in succeeding sections; but in the mean time I would ask for the reader's attention to some other matters.

PART IV.

Women in relation to False Worship—Fascination—Isaiah iii. and Ezekiel xiii.—moral character of Jewish women—Children in relation to false worship.

LEST I should appear to be entering on a very deep, and almost boundless, subject, let me say at once that the point to which I wish to call attention is, the position of women with reference to false worship, and false gods, in that one, single, privileged, nation where true worship was offered to the true God.

As to the position of heathen women in heathen countries, before the advent of Christ, and without any written revelation of the True God, we get a familiar but vague idea from the Scriptures, as well as from what we find in pagan writings, of Priestesses, Pythonesses,

Sibyls, and others engaged in Mysteries and Occult Science¹. But they are not the objects of our present enquiry. Indeed they have nothing to do with it except incidentally, from having appeared where they could least of all excuse such an intrusion.

For women, it must be recollect, though perhaps it has not been sufficiently considered, held a position of much influence in the Jewish church and state. The earliest, I suppose,—at least the earliest who is dignified by the title of PROPHETESS—is Miriam the sister of Aaron. She is described² as *הנֶּבֶת אַהֲרֹן*, ή προφῆτις LXX. The next, I presume is Deborah, who united with her prophetic character that of a Ruler and a Judge. “Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel . . . and she dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah between Ramah and Beth-el in mount Ephraim: and the children of Israel came up to her for judgment³. ” It was not inconsistent with the will of God that a woman should be the medium of divine revelation, or the vicegerent of divine authority. Deborah, we see, was a married woman; and so was “Huldah the

¹ See note E.

² Ex. xv. 20.

³ Judg. iv. 4.

prophetess the wife of Shallum though “she dwelt in Jerusalem in the College⁴. ” However highly Deborah may have been honoured, Huldah was scarcely less so. Indeed one could scarcely imagine a higher compliment than that which was paid to her character and office. When the High Priest “found the book of the law in the House of the Lord⁵, ” and the King, who had rent his clothes commanded him and Shaphan, and Achbor, and Ahikam and Asahiah, to enquire of the Lord concerning the words of that book, they “went unto Huldah the prophetess . . . and they communed with her.” This reference to the Prophetess, and the unhesitating deference and respect with which her communication was treated, when “they brought the King word again,” is well worthy of notice. I am much tempted here to say something of the “great woman” who knew, and intercepted the prophet, and who has been known to all succeeding generations as the Shunammite; but the grounds of my speculation (and perhaps it is a mere speculation) would occupy a good deal of space, and are not precisely to our purpose.

⁴ 2 Kings xxii. 14.

⁵ Ibid. xxii. 8—14.

We must not however forget to add to the list of prophetesses, the wife of the prophet Isaiah⁶."

But while I believe, and think it must be obvious, that, in both a social and religious point of view, great honour was put on the female sex I am not prepared to go all lengths with Lightfoot; who, having in his text referred to the ill-conduct of Eli's sons, with regard to those whom he calls "the women that waited on the sanctuary," says in a note "הנשׁים הצבאות" ch. ii. 22, women that had some office and attendance at the Tabernacle; as, Num. iv. 23, הבא לצבא is, to do the sanctuary-service. Anna was such a woman, Luke ii. 37⁷."

That Anna, or any other woman, ever had any *office* in the Temple, I very much doubt⁸;

⁶ Isa. viii. 3.

⁷ Harmony sub an. 2909 Vol. II. p. 163.

⁸ Since writing the above, I see that Lightfoot says elsewhere "It may be doubted, whether any women ever discharged any office in the Temple: some think they did. But that, which they allege out of 1 Sam. ii. 22, concerning the women, that assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation,—is quite another thing from any public ministering, if we will admit the Targumist and the Robbins for expositors." *Heb. and Tal. Exer. on St. Luke c. ii. 37.* As to the women here mentioned I hope to speak elsewhere.

but it is to our purpose to observe that she was a prophetess. Like all the gifted and honoured women whom we have had occasion to mention, she had been married; indeed the only exception that I know of, is the decisive one, that Philip the Evangelist “had four daughters virgins which did prophesy⁹. ” In the early christian church the gift of prophecy appears to have been imparted to women as well as to men¹; notwithstanding the absolute prohibition of female preaching, “Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak². ”

But whatever part may have been assigned to, or assumed by, women in the worship of the true God, according to the method of his appointment, it seems but too clear that they were very early, and very deeply, implicated in the ministry of false worship and the maintenance of superstition. Under the period between A.M. 2581—2595 Lightfoot says, “Idolatry is begun in Israel, by a woman, and in Ephraim, where afterward Jeroboam established it by law: Micah’s mother devoteth eleven hundred shekels to the making of an idol, and

⁹ Acts xxi. 9.

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 5.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 34 and see 1 Tim. ii. 11 and 12.

nine hundred of them to go for materials, and two hundred for workmanship³:" but I fear that this must not be considered as the beginning of idolatry in Israel, or of the defection of women to false worship. More than three centuries before this time we find Rachel carrying off her father's teraphim, which he (whatever may have been his precise meaning) denominated his "gods." But, perhaps, it is going back far enough if we take up the history in the days of Saul. We cannot but infer the addiction of females to occult science, and forbidden arts, when we find him saying, "Seek me *a woman* that hath a familiar spirit⁴." It is indeed implied in the terms of the mosaic law, that either a man or a woman might have a familiar spirit⁵; but this command of Saul may, perhaps, indicate that the practice was more cultivated by females.

That the women of Israel were actively engaged in idolatrous worship in their own land, appears from a passage in the book of Jeremiah "Seest thou not," says the Prophet, "what they do in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children gather

³ Harmony cap. xvii. Vol. II. p. 147.

⁴ 1 Sam. xxviii. 7.

⁵ Lev. xx.

wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven” vii. 17; and there is another remarkable passage in the same book which shews that they were devotedly attached to the same sin when in a foreign land. The forty-fourth Chapter of the Book of Jeremiah contains, “The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the Jews that dwelt in the land of Egypt,” v. 1; and also the reply which was made to it, by “all the men which knew that their wives had burned incense unto other gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt in Pathros” (v. 15). It amounted simply to a declaration, that they would not hearken to the prophet, but would adhere to their false worship. They “answered Jeremiah, saying, As for the word which thou hast spoken to us in the name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee” &c. But the matter which concerns our enquiry is this—that the women boldly asked “when we burned incense to the Queen of Heaven, and poured out drink offerings unto her, did we make her cakes to worship her, and pour out drink offerings unto her, *without our men?*” or as our margin reads

“*husbands*” (v. 19). Such an answer, given before the face of God’s prophet, and their husbands, leads me to doubt whether the rites in which these women were engaged were as licentious, as some have supposed.

Of course I am not here palliating the sin of their idolatry. Nothing could be more wicked than such rebellion against God, in whatever form it might be manifested; but with reference to their moral and social character, I think that injustice has been done to the women of Israel. I believe that they were deeply attached, and devoted, to their false worship; and I quite agree with Blayney when, in his commentary on the passages which I have quoted, he observes that, although both sexes were implicated, “the women, however, seem to have taken the most active part in the business; and the men to be rather passively concerned;” and again, on v. 25. after some remarks on the grammar he says the sense “appears to be this; that though the women were the immediate actors, in the idolatrous vows and service, the men would still be considered as having a principal share in the guilt, forasmuch as they made the acts of the women their own, by not preventing what

without their allowance could not have been carried into effect."

All this however goes to clear them of the sort of charge to which I have alluded—a charge which has, perhaps, gained colour from a fact on which it may be proper to say a few words. If they form in any degree a digression, it shall not be a long one.

We may, without material error, speak of the false worship which is the subject of our enquiry as common to all the people and nations of antiquity—that is to say, common in doctrine and demonstration, though these might be modified by circumstances. But it is to our purpose to notice one important difference between the Jew and the Heathen; and to observe the language in which the sin is spoken of in the scriptures, according as it relates to one, or to the other. As a sin of heathen nations, the worship of false gods, as far as I have observed, is simply represented as an abomination in the sight of the true God, and as calling down his vengeance on those who practised it. But with reference to Israel the language is different. They were a peculiar people, and in very peculiar circumstances. When *they* offended in this manner

their sin was represented under the figure of adultery. There is no need to enter into detail on this point. Such passages as “thy maker is thine husband,” Is. liv. 5. “I am married unto you,” Jer. iii. 14. “I was an husband unto them,” Jer. xxxi. 32, may suffice to shew the idea on which many passages in the prophets (take for instance the third chapter of Jeremiah, and the second of Hosea) are based.

The language to which I refer is familiar to every reader of the scriptures; and I am inclined to think that the frequent use of it, in a figurative and metaphorical sense, with reference to false worship, has had some effect in leading readers to associate the ideas of idolatry and lewdness, and to exaggerate the amount of sensual immorality connected with false worship. I say to exaggerate it—because I do not mean to dispute that there might be some grounds for such an opinion. No doubt among sensual and immoral nations, who had not, and desired not, the Knowledge of God, and who were given up by him to follow their own evil ways, there was much sin of all sorts mixed up with their worship; and, so far as the Israelites adopted that worship, and fraternized with the worshippers, they would be likely to practise

the sin. But it does appear to me, and I think it right to express my belief, that the scriptures do not authorize, or countenance, our forming a low opinion of the moral character of the women of Israel generally, though among them, as in all nations, many ill-conducted persons were to be found.

It will illustrate the point, and perhaps throw some light on the subject of our enquiry generally, if we look somewhat more closely and particularly at a few passages which concern the women of Israel. One of the most remarkable will be found in the third chapter of Isaiah, beginning at v. 16. Taking it as it stands and as it is generally understood, can we help feeling some surprise, that in the midst of so solemn and fearful a denunciation of God's judgments on his people, the mere dress and trinkets of female vanity should be catalogued, and inventoried, and set forth, as if they were one chief cause of the judgments? We may, if we please, say that the dress of the women was indecent, but the scripture suggests no such thing. We may say that these daughters of Zion adorned themselves with immoral purpose, but the Bible does not say so. Indeed I think one might fairly ask what

harm there was in wearing “mufflers” and “bonnets” and “head-bands” and “mantles” and “wimples?” Whether christian ladies, under the stricter teaching of St. Paul, scruple to use chains, and bracelets, and ear-rings, and glasses, and fine linen, and hoods, and vails? Perhaps we might even go a step farther, and ask what women might wear, and were expected to wear, and in short what they were to do, if all these articles of useful and ornamental dress were proscribed in a manner so fearful. But there is no use in pursuing this course of reasoning while, in fact, we know so little of the plain grammatical meaning of the passage; and before we proceed to enquire respecting that, let us for a few moments, take a more general view of the context.

The prophecy begins with the second chapter of Isaiah; and at the sixth verse, the reason of the house of Jacob being forsaken, is stated to be “because they be *replenished from the east*, and are *soothsayers like the Philistines*, and they please themselves in the *children of strangers their land also is full of idols*, they worship the work of their own hands, that which their own fingers have made,” v. 8. Proceeding to denounce the judgments—or

rather to express more particularly, and to describe, those judgments which had been denounced—the prophet begins the third chapter by saying “For behold the Lord, the LORD of Hosts, doth take away from Jerusalem and from Judah the stay and the staff.” This translation, however, has a tendency to mislead; for it would hardly be supposed that the words translated “stay and staff” are the same, except the mere difference of gender. The words are מִשְׁמָרָה וּמִשְׁמָרָה and the LXX translate them *ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἵσχυονσαν*. Bishop Lowth renders, “Every stay and support;” but says in his note,

“Heb. ‘the support masculine, and the support feminine:’ that is, every kind of support, whether great or small, strong or weak. ‘*Al Kanitz wal-Kanitzah*; the wild beast, male and female. Proverbially applied both to fishing and hunting: *i.e.* I seized the prey, great or little, good or bad. From hence, as Schultens observes, is explained, Is. iii. 1. literally the *male and female stay*: *i.e.* the strong and weak, the great and small.’ Chappelow, note on Hariri” &c.

Unfortunately for this explanation, the declaration of the Prophet is that God would “take away” the strong and *leave* the weak, remove the great and *leave* the small. But why not take the words according to their

plain meaning? The reader may be in some degree prepared for my suggesting the probability that there actually was a strong female influence at work, sharing, or perhaps overruling, the government, and leading the people into sin and calamity. If not, farther and plainer proof will appear presently, for the prophecy proceeds “I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them,” v. 4. Lowth translates, “I will make boys their princes; and infants shall rule over them;” but in his note he refers to only the first clause of this declaration, “I will make boys their princes—]. This also was fully accomplished in the succession of weak and wicked princes from the death of Josiah to the destruction of the City and Temple, and the taking of Zedekiah, the last of them, by Nebuchadnezzar.” It was well enough to render בָּנָי by “boys;” but with the “babes” of our version the Bishop could not go farther than to change it into “infants,” in the translation, and say nothing about it in the notes. Yet words have meanings in Hebrew, as well as in other languages; and in the Bible, as well as in other books. If there is meaning in language בְּנֵי תַּעֲלֹם means young children. If

has nothing to do with what is “weak and wicked;” but belongs to those whom their loving Saviour set forth as types of the kingdom of heaven; and who if in this case they were employed in doing what was wrong, did it innocently and in ignorance. The word may be strained to make it meet a preconceived opinion—the Vulgate may translate “effæminati” and Taylor, after recording a score of places where it is rendered in our version by the words, child, infant, babes, young children, little ones, and by nothing else, may add between brackets, to suit the preconceived opinion as to this particular chapter of Isaiah, “babes [weak childish persons] Is. 3. 4.”—“children [weak, childish persons, children in understanding] 12.”—but as long as the word remains, it must be allowed to mean “children” properly so called; and those who have to reconcile the statement with history must do the best they can⁶.

Again, at v. 12 it is said “As for my people,

⁶ The LXX seem to have had a different text, and have translated by *ἐμπαῖκται*, *illusores*, *irrisores*, that is, not weak and foolish persons, but persons who made fools of others. This may agree with what we must suppose to be the real state of things; and it seems to do so with the subsequent part of the prophecy; but I suppose it is wrong.

children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths.” The version of Lowth offers no material alteration ; and his single note on the verse relates to the word which our translators have rendered “destroy.” He does not give us the least information respecting the women who are so expressly mentioned as rulers. Perhaps he thought that his father had put them out of the way for ever by his note on the passage :—“Women signify here, metaphorically, the weakest and most contemptible part of the people, who take upon them to govern their betters.”

All this appears to me very unsatisfactory ; but if I believed it to be correct, I should feel it only the more surprising that the tide of prophetic denunciation should turn suddenly on the dress of the women of Israel. Yet so it is according to the common view of the matter. After denouncing that the mighty man, and the man of war, the judge, and the prophet, the prudent, and the ancient,—in short all that was honourable, estimable, and influential among men should be taken away,—all that could be called “the stay” of *men*, the prophecy (we are told) is directed against the

stay of *women* not, I repeat, to impeach their morals, but to detail their dress and ornaments. Our version is indeed so framed as to give the english reader an idea that immorality, if not openly charged is insinuated. For instance our translators speak of their “wanton eyes” while truth obliges them to put in the margin “Heb. *deceiving with their eyes.*” If that were really the hebrew it would have been better to make the english correspondent. But of this I hope to speak presently; for as I have already said it seems to be worth while to look at the particulars of the charge brought against the daughters of Zion.

In the mean time, though I think that no reader who takes any interest in the subject can have failed to perceive the drift of my remarks, and the opinion which I hold on the subject, I will very briefly and plainly express my belief that the people of Judah and Jerusalem were very much under the government—that is, actually and practically under the influence and guidance—of those who taught and practised the superstitions of false worship;—that, as has always been the case in every form of magical superstition many of those teachers and practisers were women who used the agency

of young children ;—and that the various matters particularized in Is. iii. 16—24 were not merely matters of dress and ornament—or, at least, were not referred to and specified because they were so—but were such things as were used in superstitious practices and false worship. The reader will not understand from this, either that I profess to know what all the things were, or that I wish to represent them as very curious, or mysterious, in themselves, or rather I should say perhaps, in their names, for that is as much as we really know of some of them. But it must be considered that if we were denouncing the practices, and describing the apparatus, of a modern magician, we should probably have to mention several articles in common use and not necessarily connected with the occult sciences—as mirrors, crystals, wands; perhaps even such more familiar, and less scientific, things as baskets, bottles, hats, and frying-pans.

But before we come to look at these charges, or particular counts in detail, I would offer some remarks on one which I have already mentioned, and which suggests so much, and requires so much to be said, that it will be better to give it a separate section.

§ 13. *Fascination.*

I have already observed that our translators represent the women of Israel as walking with “wanton eyes;” and that they say in the margin “Heb. *deceiving with their eyes.*” Lowth translates “Falsely setting off their eyes with paint;” but begins his note by,

“Heb. *falsifying* their eyes. I take this to be the true meaning and literal rendering of the word from קשׁ. The Masoretes have pointed it as if it were from קשׁ a different word. This arose as I imagine from their supposing that the word was the same with קְרַב Chald. *intueri, innuere oculis* or that it had an affinity with the noun סִקְרָא which the Chaldeans, or the Rabbins at least, use for *stibium* the mineral which was commonly used in colouring the eyes.”

To Lowth, who considered the passage to be merely an “inventory, as one may call it, of the wardrobe of a Hebrew lady” this might be satisfactory; but to me it seems quite the reverse; and I venture to suggest that whatever may be the general scope of the passage we should be safer in keeping to the plain meaning of the words. He says indeed “Heb.

falsifying their eyes”—but, even in this professed accuracy, he takes a most unwarrantable liberty with the text. The word “their” is of his putting in. How does it appear that the charge against them was not that of falsifying the eyes of others? To make people believe that they saw what they did not see, has always been a prominent and important part of magic; and some modern performances have led many persons to feel more difficulty than they used to do in disbelieving old stories of glamour and visual deception.

It may relieve the tediousness of verbal discussion, and will be no digression from our subject—on the contrary it may lead to the notice and illustration of some points connected with it which might otherwise be passed over for want of a proper opportunity to introduce them—if I take occasion from this part of the charge brought against the women of Israel, to say a few words on the employment of the eye, and the effects said to be produced by it, in magical and superstitious practices.

I do not undertake to decide what the offence charged on these Prophetesses really was. All that appears to me is that it was “falsifying eyes;” while, as I have already stated, it does

not seem to be at all certain whether they falsified their own eyes, or those of other people; and this uncertainty lets in the whole question.

The offence may have been what is commonly and popularly called Fascination; that is, exerting by means of the eye, such an influence over others as to bring them into some abnormal state; or it may have been that the women themselves entered into, or placed their agents or confederates in, some state which was abnormal as regarding their own eyes.

As to the first of these things, one of its most common forms is that by which people are made to believe that they see what they do not see. That this has been actually done—whether through the skill of the fascinator, or through the weakness of his victims—in cases innumerable and indisputable—cannot be doubted. When Leonardus Vairus published his quarto volume “*De Fascino*,” he began with an enquiry respecting the reality of Fascination, and placed as a heading to his first chapter, “*An Fascinum sit;*” and while mildly suggesting that it was by no means necessary, he cited a very considerable array of ancient authorities, which we are not required to

examine in detail. For I may be allowed to remind the reader that my present object is not to prove the probability that certain things, having been done in former times, may be done now—though I should not refuse to argue that case, and to maintain that what has happened once, may happen again—but merely to direct attention to what seem to be well-attested facts, taking place before our eyes, and to argue that what is done by men and women now-a-days, may have been done by men and women five thousand years ago. Instead of talking about Aristotle and Alexander Aphrodisiensis, we may quote the testimony of well-known and respected witnesses of our own age.

Professor Gregory, in his “Letters to a candid inquirer on Animal Magnetism” mentions, in his first part, a great many cases which occurred in his own house, and under his own eye. He says of them “these cases, all utterly indisputable, and which were seen by many persons of high standing, both in society generally, and in literature, in art, and in science, will be given in Part II. I can testify to the exactness of all the details⁷. ” And in the

second part, after giving the details of eight cases the Professor says ; “ I could adduce ten or a dozen similar cases, in which I saw Dr. Darling operate ; but the above are sufficient, and I have selected them, without in any instance detailing all the experiments, which would be tedious, as fair examples, all of which occurred in my own drawing-room, in the presence of large parties, including many scientific and medical gentlemen, all of whom were perfectly satisfied of the facts⁸. ”

“ The process ” says the Professor “ followed by Dr. Darling, which, he informs me, he has never made a secret, is to cause a certain number of persons, willing to try, to *gaze* for ten or fifteen minutes steadily at a small coin, or double convex mass of zinc with a small centre of copper, placed in the palm of the left hand. . . . He ascertains, in the first instance, which of them have been affected, by desiring them, singly, to close the *eyes*, when he touches the forehead with his finger, makes a few passes over the eyes, or rather presses the eye-lids down with a rapid sideward motion, and then tells them that they cannot open their

⁸ P. 358.

eyes. If, in spite of him, they can do so, he generally takes hold of one hand, and desires them *to gaze* at him *intently* for a moment, he also gazing at them, and then repeats the trial⁹.” “In Dr. Darling’s preliminary process, the chief part of the work is done by the subject himself, through *intense gazing* at an object. Now we know, that in Mr. Braid’s process, even the sleep is produced by the *gazing* of the subject at an object rather above and a little before his eyes. This *gazing*, therefore, since it produces the greater effect, naturally also produces the less¹.” “In a large party at my house, Mr. Lewis acted on the company *en masse*, standing at one end of the room, while all present were requested to *gaze* at him, or at any fixed point in the same direction, and to keep themselves in as passive a state as possible. Mr. Lewis *gazed* on the company, beginning at one end of the circle of 50 persons, and slowly carrying his *gaze* round, with the most intense concentration I have ever seen, as expressed in his face, attitude and gesture².” Among those affected by this, Mr. D. a medical student was apparently one of

⁹ P. 190.

¹ P. 196.

² P. 343.

the most susceptible ; and when, seeing this, Mr. Lewis approached him he “bent forward with *fixed insensible eyes* and heaving respiration, and seemed to be attracted towards the operator Mr. Lewis then desired Mr. D. to *gaze* at him for a second or two, he *gazing* in return ; when the eyes at once became fixed, the pupil dilated, and utterly insensible, so that no contraction ensued when a candle was passed close across the eye, or held close before it ³.”

Perhaps I have quoted enough to shew that the *eye* and the employment of it in *gazing* are very important agents, or means, in the art or science which has been of late called electro-biology ; and, that a falsification of the eyes of the subjects, or patients, was the result, will be sufficiently apparent to all who credit the Professor’s statement. A few words will be sufficient to shew this. If the Cases 2 and 3 relating to two lads who came to Mr. Lewis with a message one evening when the professor and several other gentlemen were with him, stood by themselves, very incredulous persons might suggest the possibility of their having

³ P. 344.

been prepared for the part, certainly a most difficult one, which they were to play. One part of this case, not the most curious but the most connected with our subject is that “they were easily made, by suggestion, to fancy themselves any other persons, and acted in character. They shot, fished, swam, lectured, and exhibited every feeling suggested to them. They were as easily made to suppose a stick to be a gun, a rod, a sword, nay, a serpent; or a chair to be a tiger or a bear⁴. ”

The next case is that of a gentleman who after being acted on by Mr. Lewis “found that his perceptions were under control”—in other words that his senscs of sight, taste, and smell, were deceived. “An apple was given to him, and he was then told it was an orange. At first he denied this, but by degrees he began to feel doubtful. At last he said, ‘It is certainly very yellow,’ (it was dark brown.) He then took a sly glance round the company, each of whom had an apple, but found them all yellow too. He next cut out a piece with his finger, looked at the inside, smelt and tasted it, and concluded with, ‘Well, it *is* an orange,

⁴ P. 348.

but yet I know I took an apple into my hand.' I could give at least twenty similar cases" says the Professor, in which I saw Mr. Lewis produce numerous effects of suggestion in the conscious state &c.⁵ And after giving another case he says "I could easily multiply these instances, but my space is too limited, and what I have given will suffice to illustrate the principle. With all of the subjects except Mr. H. the experiments were often repeated on different occasions, when Sir David Brewster and many other scientific gentlemen were present, all of whom were satisfied as to the genuineness of the facts, as far as they saw them. It will be observed that most of these facts were the result of suggestion, acting on persons in a peculiarly impressible state. But they were not all the effects of suggestion; for the effects produced on the pulse and on the *eye*, which were also shewn in many other cases, besides that of Mr. D., were produced without any suggestion⁶." Then follows a case of "Mr. W. an officer" who met Dr. Darling at the Professor's house. "He was found, in about two minutes, quite susceptible or

⁵ P. 349.

⁶ P. 352.

impressible." It is not to our purpose to observe that "his muscular motions were controlled in every possible way"—that he was made "to forget his own name"—and "compelled, for a time, to give a false answer to every question asked; and then was forced to give true answers to every question in spite of any effort he might make to do otherwise." It is not, I say, to our purpose to dwell on these points, though I cannot help observing that they seem to me to give a very startling and fearful character to the whole business; and the idea of one man exercising such a power over another, as to be able to make him tell lies with a consciousness that he is lying, is very horrible. But our point is to observe how completely the patient's eyes were falsified when "he was told that a stick was a gun, and with it, he shot and bagged a grouse, which he was *made to see* before him. He was told the piano-forte was a horse, and after feeling and closely examining it, he specified its points and defects, and appraised its value. . . . He was told that Dr. D.'s hand was a mirror, and in it he saw himself with a black face, as Dr. D. told him to do. . . . He was made to see, in Dr. D.'s empty hand, a bank note for

10*l.*, to read its number, to fold it up, and put it in his pocket. And when afterwards asked, he declared he had done so, and was surprised not to find it there. . . . *In every one of these experiments, Mr. W. was quite aware that the suggested idea was false, but found it impossible to resist the impression.* About 50 persons were present, including Sir David Brewster, and other men of science⁷.”

Such statements as I have quoted—and they might be multiplied almost indefinitely—lead one to enquire whether there may not be some truth in stories which have long since been laughed out of countenance.

I have elsewhere mentioned a story of the celebrated conjuror Trois Echelles, with reference to “some particulars which look as if he had the power of producing at least some of the phænomena which are now exhibited by the professors of electro-biology. . . . Performing in the presence of the King of France and some of his court Trois Echelles made them believe that they saw the links of a gold chain, worn by a nobleman at some distance from him, come one by one into his hand, the

chain appearing immediately afterwards to be perfectly whole and unaltered^s.” The King and the rest of the company were so persuaded of the truth and reality of the matter, that the performer was very near being hanged for his pains. Of course we may assume that the witnesses were incompetent, and that if we had been there we should have detected imposture; but I do not know that it should be much more difficult to suppose that *Trois Echelles* could “falsify the eyes” of people, than to believe it of Dr. Darling and Mr. Lewis.

Another story is related of this magician which is still more to our purpose. Meeting with a clerk, in the presence of several of his parishioners, he exclaimed “Look at that hypocrite, who under pretence that it is his breviary, carries about a pack of cards.” To clear himself from such a charge, the indignant clerk produced his breviary; but to his astonishment it seemed to him that it really was a pack of cards. And so likewise it seemed to all who saw it; insomuch that he threw it down ashamed, and ran away. Soon after, however, some other persons coming to the spot took up

^s *Theological Critic*, Vol. II. P. ii. p. 181. See note F.

the breviary, which to them presented only its natural appearance; as indeed it did to all those who had not been present when the magician wrought his spell⁹. This story appears to me to bear a strong resemblance to those which I have given on the authority of Professor Gregory.

But we have as yet said nothing of what the professor, in a passage which I have already quoted, speaks of as “the greater effect” of “gazing;” that is in fact, mesmeric sleep¹. It would be easy to multiply illustrations; but one or two will suffice. The Hon. Mrs. Hare in a statement of her case which has been published by Mr. Kiste says;—

“On the 16th of Septr. last [i.e. 1844] we had some friends to dinner, amongst whom was Mr. Kiste, who is an amateur mesmerist, and has been successful in curing diseases which had baffled the skill of medical men. He expressed a wish to try his power; but as our friend Mr. B., Mons. Lafontaine and Dr. Ashburner had failed to produce the sleep, I sat down with the idea that I could not be affected by mesmerism; he sat before me earnestly and steadily *gazing in my eyes*. In a few minutes I felt a most unusual tranquillity of mind; the objects in the room seemed to lose their outline;

⁹ Bodinus, Lib. III. c. iii. p. 319. Hauber. II. 449.

¹ P. 196.

and the last thing I remember having seen were my mesmeriser's *eyes*. I was afterwards told, that in eight minutes I sank down in the arm-chair, and that Mr. K. pronounced me to be in what is called mesmeric somnambulism, a peculiar state of the nervous system^{2.}"

The Hon. Miss Boyle, in a statement of her experience addressed to Dr. Elliotson and published in the *Zoist*, says;—

"Mr. Hands [the mesmeriser] withdrew about three or four yards, *gazed earnestly*, and pointed at Ellen, [the patient who was to be rendered clairvoyante] who sat in an arm-chair close to the window, and in less than three minutes she was in a mesmeric sleep^{3.}"

Mr. Kiste had also about the same time as the patient already mentioned, another, "Miss Martin the daughter of a highly respectable tradesman in Plymouth," in whose house he lodged. She was afflicted with ophthalmia; and having recovered under his mesmeric treatment, she had, at his request furnished him with a written account of her case, which he sent through Dr. Elliotson to the *Zoist*. After describing the state of her eyes at the begin-

² *Zoist*, No. IX. for April, 1845, p. 96.

³ *Ibid.* No. X. for July, 1845, p. 237.

ning of the year 1844, when Mr. Kiste first mesmerised them, this young lady says ;—

“They had been in this state for several weeks, so that I was obliged to shade them from the light, and it was quite distressing for me to look steadfastly, even for a moment, at any object, or to meet the eyes of any person. For this reason I was much embarrassed during the first few minutes by your *earnest concentrated gaze*, and my eyes wandered for relief from one object to another. Very soon, however, I felt irresistibly impelled to fix them on your own, and was much surprised at finding them strong enough to obey this impulse, which grew more powerful at each succeeding trial, and my eyes appeared to gather strength by obeying it *.”

The influence of the agent’s eye, however, is said not to be exclusively exercised on the eye of the patient. Lieut. Hare, R.N. in a letter dated Sep. 2, 1847, addressed to Dr. Elliotson, and published in the *Zoist*, says, with reference to a boy whom he had mesmerised, “I could readily make his arms rigid by will or by passes. . . . Upon placing round rulers in each of his hands, and making the latter clasp them firmly, I could relax either by *gazing* at it for a short time;” and afterwards, speaking of a young lady whom he frequently mesmerised he says, “she was far more sensitive; a *look* at

* *Zoist*, No. IX. p. 33.

her hand was at any time enough to make it rigid, and a few seconds' *gaze* would relax it.⁵" Nor is this " *vertue ejaculatrice*" efficient only when applied directly to a living subject. Dr. Elliotson says

" I have *looked intensely* at one sovereign among several lying together: and then called the Okey's into the room, and desired them to take them up one by one. No effect occurred till the sovereign which had been *stared at* was taken up: and then the hand was violently contracted. No word was spoken—no look given. It was totally impossible for the children to have known any thing about the matter. Sir George Cayley well recollects one occasion of these satisfactory experiments at University College Hospital, though beneath the notice of the council and professors?⁶"

The cases which I have quoted may suffice to illustrate the subject of modern fascination, and " falsifying of eyes;" but I must add a few more words respecting earlier art and language. Few readers will need to be told that *facies* is the latin for *face*, and that *vultus* has a meaning not very different; but those who do not happen to have fallen in with the mediæval

⁵ Zoist, No. XIX. Oct. 1847, 309.

⁶ The words are Montaigne's. See the Zoist, No. XI. Oct. 1845, where there is more on the subject of fascination.

⁷ Zoist, No. XV. Oct. 1846, p. 355.

tongue, sometimes irreverently called “dog-latin,” may not be aware how many words connected with occult science, and magical practice, are derived from, or compounded with, those two. A man may be a good scholar in classical latin without having been introduced to the families of words which belong to the subject of **INVULTATION** and **FACILLATION**. Yet they must not be passed over; though the minutiae relating to them may be most suitably discussed in a note⁸; and a few words, in this place, will make them sufficiently intelligible for my purpose—which is by connecting what I have said of this part, as well as others, of modern proceedings, with the practice of antiquity, to contribute somewhat, however little, to our understanding of the Scriptures. I here offer only a single specimen.

The command which prohibited the Israelites from holding intercourse with “familiar” spirits (**אֱבָת**) stands in our version “Regard not them that have familiar spirits” Lev. xix. 31. No doubt most english readers (even those who know a little french) understand this *regard not* to mean that the Israelites were not to

⁸ See note G.

pay attention, or *give heed*, to the performances of those who had familiar spirits. So, indeed, I suppose, our translators understood it. How far it can be said that the word ever has this meaning, it is not worth while to discuss; it is certain that in almost every other place where it occurs, it is translated by *look*, or *turn*. It is obvious that in many cases, one of these words is equivalent to the other; because, when people *look* at a thing, they commonly turn towards it; and they often *turn* towards a thing merely to look at it. We find the word in “Look unto me and be ye saved.” Is. xlv. 22. “Look upon me.” Job vi. 28. “Look thou upon me.” Ps. cxix. 132. “The head looked,” Ezek. x. 11, and scores of other places might be referred to where it is translated by *look*, or *turn*.

At the same time the strict translation of הַנְּפָאֵל is a word which we have in common use, though I believe it does not occur in the Bible. We say that soldiers are ordered to *face* to the right or the left, that a house *faces* the north or south, that a delinquent could not *face* his accuser &c. That this is the strict interpretation is shewn by the obvious derivation; and I notice it, because, when the command is

repeated in the sixth verse of the next chapter, there seems to be a reference to this meaning of the word, which may contain an allusion to the method by which the forbidden practice was performed. Here our translation is “the soul that *turneth* after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards to go a whoring after them, I will even *set my face* against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people.” The idea obtained by a literal rendering seems to be, “the man who *faces* one that has a familiar spirit, I will *face*” but this is lost in our translation.

I have not thought it necessary to say any thing of the effect of the eye on brute animals. The subject is so familiar that it need only be mentioned; at the same time so important that it must not be overlooked.

§ 14. *Isaiah* iii. *Ezek.* xiii.

I wish to give the reader the earliest, and most direct, notice that this section is more than usually dull—that it consists chiefly of attempts to make out the meaning of obscure

words, by references to dictionaries—and that though I believe it to contain several things pertinent to our subject, and confirmatory of the view which I am maintaining, yet if he does not like to encounter a few pages of such matter, he may turn them over, and go to the next section without any material prejudice to the argument.

I have already spoken of the general scope of the prophecy contained in the third chapter of Isaiah⁹; and would now invite attention to some of the words contained in a passage beginning at the 16th verse. I give it as it stands in our version, marking those words by *italics*, and numbering them to facilitate reference in the subsequent remarks on them. The reader will I trust continually bear in mind that I am not undertaking to explain all these words, but in most cases, as the first step to farther knowledge, to shew that we do not as yet understand them.

“ Moreover the LORD saith, Because the daughters of Zion are (1.) *haughty*, and walk with (2.) *stretched forth* (3.) *necks* and (4.) *wanton eyes*, walking and (5.) *mincing* as

⁹ See before, p. 126.

they go, and making a (6.) *tinkling* with their feet: Therefore the Lord will (7.) *smite with a scab* the (8.) *crown of the head* of the daughters of Zion.”

(1.) *haughty*] **רָגִב** may certainly be so translated; as when the Psalmist says “Lord my heart is not *haughty*” cxxxii. 1. but it is much more commonly used in the sense of mere exaltation, as Job xxxv. 5, “the clouds which are *higher* than thou”—or if used metaphorically it is more frequently in a good, than in a bad, sense. For instance, “as the heavens are *higher* than the earth, so are my ways *higher* than your ways.” Is. lv. 9. and many passages may be cited where it refers to exaltation in temporal power and government. See for instance Ezek. xix. 11, “She had strong rods for the sceptres of them that bare rule, and her stature was exalted among the thick branches, and she appeared in her *height*;” and again of the Assyrian cedar in Ezek. xxxii. 10, “thou hast lifted up thyself in *height*.” The word certainly states that the Daughters of Zion were *elevated*, perhaps it may mean in mind, as well as in station; but this I think is not necessarily implied, and it seems to me that the sense is improperly, or at least imperfectly, rendered by “*haughty*.”

(2.) *Stretched forth]* נָטוּוֹת—to Taylor assigns three significations. Under the First of these it is translated by various words, of which the most frequent seem to be “stretched out, turned, or bowed down,” and to these ideas, which may not perhaps be very different among themselves, most of the others may be reduced. The second signification (נָטָה) is a word of common occurrence and except in one place always translated “bed.” The exception is the “bier” of Abner (2 Sam. iii. 31.) where our translators put in the margin “Heb. bed.” The third (נָטָה) signifies according to Taylor “The rods or branches which stretch out of the stock of a tree, Ez. 7. 11—19, 12. 14 [but let it be observed that here it is used metaphorically and is part of that same description which I have just already noticed with reference to נְגַד—that is, these “rods” of v. 11 and 12. had to do with those who “bare rule” &c.—he proceeds] “Hence I. a Tribe or division of a family &c.” “II. a staff or rod;” and the fact is apparent from the references that it most frequently occurs as used for a tribe. At the same time it is used to denote (and it seems that such was the original idea, giving rise to the secondary meaning) as Taylor says

“The instrument of striking, beating down: hence *power* exerted in conquering, punishing, ruling. *Isai.* x. 5, 24—xxx. 32. *Jer.* xlvi. 17. A scepter, the Ensign of Dominion and authority, *Ps. cx. 2.*” Thus it is used for the rod of Moses, *Ex. iv. 2, 17. vii. 15.* The staff of Judah, *Gen. xxxvii. 18, 25.* Jonathan’s rod, *1 Sam. xiv. 43.*

(3.) *necks*] גְּרוֹן—must I suppose mean *throat*, or *neck*; but I do not see that it is ever used metaphorically.

(4.) *wanton eyes*] מִשְׁקָרוֹת עֵינִים—this has been already discussed¹.

(5.) *mincing*] טַפּוֹף—There seems to be no pretence for “mincing” except this—that טַפּ is a plain straightforward word meaning “children;” and therefore you are to suppose women walking after the manner of children; in order to do which they must adopt a “mincing” manner. Taylor says, “Little ones, or children while they are in the hands, and under the care of women; in conjunction with whom they are commonly mentioned. And therefore, putting the part for the whole, when *little ones* only are named, both women and children are

¹ See before, p. 132.

often, if not always, included.” With one single exception (Gen. xlvi. 12. where it is rendered “families”) it is always translated “children” or “little ones;” but in the case before us he says “mincing [in a *childish* affected manner] Isaiah 3. 16.” Gesenius gives for the noun טַף the same meaning of children; and for the verb טָפֵף from the Arabic he gives, “to take many and short steps, to trip, to mince, spoken of affected coquettes. Is. iii. 16. . . . Deriv. טַף children (9. v.) perhaps so called from their manner of walking.” Parkhurst says of טָפֵף “the meaning seems to be, to move, or walk with short steps, or with a mincing tripping gait, like young children. . . to move with a mincing tripping gait, from affectation and nicety, occ. Is. iii. 16. where Syriac version מְטֻרְפֵּן tripping, from טָרֵף ‘tripudiavit’ *Castell.*” I make these extracts partly with a view to points which will arise in the sequel.

(6.) *making a tinkling]* תַעֲכֹסֶנָה with their feet. This word translated “tinkling” will occur again in the 18th verse; and, beside that, I believe it is only to be found in one place—viz. Prov. vii. 22. where our translators render it by “stocks”—“as a fool to the cor-

rection of the *stocks*.” The meaning therefore is very obscure; and the rabbinical explanation, which makes it the poison of a serpent, does not render it less so². I do not know how far this translation deserves attention; but I think that of the LXX does; they have *τοῖς ποσὶν ἄμα παιζουσαι* and the Vulgate so far follows them as to say, “composito gradu incedebant.” Brenton has “and motion of the feet.” It is worth while to quote the beginning of what Schleusner says under this word “Παιζω, *ludo, jocor, illudo, fidibus vel aliis instrumentis musicis cano, choreas duco, salto, quasi contr. ex παιδίζω, כוחל, chorus. Inc. 1 Sam. xviii. 6, παιζουσα—כע Pch. impeditus incedo. Ies. iii. 15. τοῖς ποσὶν ἄμα παιζουσαι.* Bene quoad sensum: nam כע est h. l. *pedibus ad mensuram ordinatis gradiri.* Vulg. composito gradu incedebant. Arab. عكس inflexit et عكس in gyrum se convertit.” The circling dances of their feet, is certainly what, if I may borrow the language of interpreters, I should call “an easier sense,” than “tinkling ornaments.”

² Buxtorf only says, “*Venenum serpentis* *juxta R. Salamonem. Iesa. iii. 16. Vide et Vaijkra Rabba Sect. 16. ab initio et ibi gloss.*”

(8.) *crown of the head*] קְדָר—*is another word not found elsewhere in that form; but which is supposed (perhaps rightly) to be the same as קַדֵּר, a word very commonly met with as a verb, signifying “to bow,” and as a noun meaning the crown of the head. But although, grammatically considered, this might be doing*

the best that our translators could do for these two words, it may still be doubted whether they attained the true meaning. At least the version of the LXX deserves attention; and without undertaking to explain exactly how they got it, I must say that it agrees much better with my own idea of the actual circumstances of the times, and the tenor of the prophecy, than our version of the passage. They say, *καὶ ταπεινώσει ὁ Θεὸς ἀρχούσας θυγατέρας Σιών*—that God would humble these *ruling daughters of Zion*.

But to come to what are considered and treated by commentators as the articles of dress, and ornaments by which the daughters of Zion drew down divine judgments on their nation;—

“In that day the Lord will take away the (9.) *bravery* of their (10.) *tinkling* ornaments about their feet, and their (11.) *cauls*, and their (12.) *round tires* like the moon, the (13.) *chains*, and the (14.) *bracelets*, and the (15.) *mufflers*, the (16.) *bonnets*, and the (17.) *ornaments of the legs*, and the (18.) *head-bands*, and the (19.) *tablets*, and the (20.) *ear-rings*, the (21.) *rings* and (22.) *nose-jewels*, the (23.) *changeable suits of apparel*, and the (24.) *mantles*, and the (25.) *wimples*, and the (26.) *crisping-pins*, the (27.) *glasses*, and the (28.) *fine linen*, and the (29.) *hoods*, and the (30.) *rails*.²”

(9.) *bravery*] חַפְאָרֶת—will occur again presently under No. 16.

(10.) *cauls*] שְׁבִים־מַ—The word occurs nowhere else; and the versions seem to rest chiefly on conjecture. Perhaps the only one worth mentioning, chiefly so because it seems to have been the foundation of the others is that of the LXX who have *τοὺς κοσύμβους*; but this does not throw much light on the matter; for what is one to make of a word, the explanation of which begins with “*nodus crinium, capitis redimiculum, fibula, vestis fimbriata*³? ”

(12.) *round tires*] שְׁהָרִינִים—These are only mentioned here, and in Judges viii. 21, 26. In this latter place, something found on the neck of the camels of the Midianites, is signified. These things the LXX call *μηνίσκους*. From this other versions have been led to adopt the idea of something like the moon. Montanus has *lunulas*, and Lowth *crescents*. It seems not improbable that these were amulets, or some kind of things connected with superstition, or false worship. Such they certainly became when Gideon made an ephod of them in Ophrah, and “all Israel went thither a whoring after it,” v. 27.

³ See Schleusner in v.

(13.) *chains*, marg. *sweet balls*]—נְטָפּוֹת—As of the preceding word, I may say that it only occurs in any such sense here, and among the Midianitish spoil just mentioned in Judges viii. 26 where our version has “collars” or marg. “sweet jewels.” I do not see how our translators came by the epithet “sweet,” as נְטָפּ is said to mean “myrrh,” which is bitter. However, as a verb, the word signifies to drop or distil; and it may be quite right to say, as Parkhurst does, “Drops, jewels, ornaments in the shape of drops.” Perhaps the reason for translating “chains,” in our version, was that the LXX translates the word here used by κάθεμα, as it also translates the word רַבֵּיד in Ezek. xvi. 11, where our version reads “a *chain* on thy neck.”

(14.) *Bracelets*]—שְׁרוּת—occurs, I believe, nowhere else. The Vulgate and Montanus have *armillas*.

(15.) *Mufflers*] רַעֲלֹת. Taylor under רַעַל says it “hath two meanings. I. *Horrere, tremere.* To be violently shaken, to be giddy, to reel, to stagger, as a drunkard. A cup of trembling is such a dispensation of Providence, as occasioneth *horror, trembling, giddiness,*” &c.

Under the first of these meanings, he refers

to Nah. ii. 3, “the fir trees shall be terribly shaken.” Zech. xii. 2, “make Jerusalem a cup of trembling,” or as the margin has “slumber” or “poison.” Ps. lx. 3, “to drink the wine of astonishment.” Isa. li. 17, 22, “the cup of trembling.” These are all the references given for the first signification; that is, these four are the only other places in which the word occurs. The second consists entirely of, or rather is made on purpose for, the passage which is under our consideration. In fact neither it, nor anything like it, is to be found elsewhere. We read “II. *Bracteolæ tremulæ*. Some unknown ornament.” And this, which is all that the concordance-maker can tell us about it, seems to be nearly as much as we can learn from Versions and Lexicons. The Vulgate has *mitras*, Montanus *velamina*, and Lowth *thin veils*—thinking, I suppose, that thick veils would not be tremulous. Buxtorf has “*רעל tremere, contremiscere, labascere*,” and he quotes “the feeble knees, *genua trementia*” of Is. xxxv. 3. He has also “*רעל tremulum*.” The notion of *mufflers* was, I suppose, derived from the Talmud. In the Misnic Title relating to the Sabbath (cap. vi. § 6) a distinction is made between the jewesses of Arabia and those

of Media. The former were to go abroad with רעלות, the latter with פְּרוּפּוֹת. Maimonides understands the first to mean little bells; Bartenora explains, “h. e. obvelatae circa caput suum; ita ut facies earum obvelatae (totae) sint, exceptis oculis pro more Arabum⁴. ” Interpreters, jewish as well as christian, seem at a loss; but Bartenora’s idea of a covering for all the face, except the eyes, comes nearest to that of our translators. But surely such mufflers seem to have less probability of connection with meretricious finery, than with the ideas suggested by the word in all other places.

(16.) *Bonnets]* פָּרִים—The sense of the verb is sufficiently ascertained, and is plainly to make glorious, or beautify. It may be observed that we have already had תְּפִאַת translated “bravery” of their tinkling feet (see No. 9). But the point most worthy of notice is, that it is the word used to describe the “goodly bonnet” which was to be worn by the High Priest and his sons. See Exod. xxxix. 28, and see also Ezek. xliv. 18.

(17.) *Ornaments of the legs]* צְעִידּוֹת—The plain meaning of the word as a verb, is to walk, go, or proceed; and Taylor, after stating

⁴ See Suren. II. 26, and Wotton’s note Shab. Vol. I. 54.

that it has two significations, gives many references to passages where the noun is translated by “steps, paces, goings,” &c. Coming however to his second signification “*Armillæ, periscelides, ornamenta crurum,*” he ingenuously adds “We understand so little of the dress and ornaments of the Hebrews, that I believe no certain account can be given of this sense, nor of its connection with the root.” Surely what he says of the dress and ornaments of the Hebrews, he might have said, with at least equal truth, of the rites which characterized their false worship, and the peculiarities which distinguished their false teachers. As it is, however, the references (in addition to the passage before us) are but two. Num. xxxi. 50, where the word is used for the “chains;” which, as in other cases, already noticed, were part of the spoil taken from the Midianites (see Nos. 12 and 13); and II. Sam. i. 10, for the bracelet which was on Saul’s arm. Lowth translates “fetters” and Gesenius suggests “chains” from one leg to the other, with which, he says, the eastern women confined their steps.

(18.) *Head-bands]* קִשְׁרִים — The plain and common meaning of קִשְׁר according to Gesenius

is “(1.) *To bind, fetter.* Gen. xxxviii. 28. Metaphorically Gen. xliv. 30. Prov. xxii. 15. (2.) *To enter into a conspiracy, to conspire,*” &c., and the verbal noun קְשָׁר a *conspiracy*, as קְשַׁר קְשָׁר to *form a conspiracy*. He afterwards adds “— קְשִׁירָה masc. plur. verbal from קְשַׁר a *girdle*, an ornament worn by women. Isa. iii. 20. Jer. ii. 32.” The latter of these passages is, I apprehend, the only one which gives any colour to the translation of the other; and I do not feel that it is conclusive. The words are “Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her *attire?* yet my people have forgotten me days without number.” It seems to me to make quite as good, and better supported, sense to ask whether a bride could forget, or be excused for acting as if she forgot, the *engagement* or *bond* that she was under, the *conspiracy* we may call it, into which she had entered with a husband. This is not a more metaphorical use of the word than that to which Gesenius refers, “his life is *bound up* in the lad’s life,” Gen. xliv. 30, or than that which tells us that “the soul of Jonathan was *knit* with the soul of David,” I. Sam. xviii. 1. I would however add two observations. First, I cannot help suspecting

that in this passage there may be, as I think there is in many others—so many that I must only allude to them generally in this place—a reference to the conspiracies, or secret unions, or societies, or in other words the *Mysteries*, of False Worship, and the bonds that united the initiated.

Secondly it may be worth while to observe, that the talmudical writers took the word to mean literal *bandages*, and such as were not meant to be ornamental. On the contrary the word, as used by them, is to be found in very suspicious places as to healing and superstition. Buxtorf specifies “*alligamenta medicinæ causa*,” and refers to that part of the Mishna which has just been quoted for another purpose⁵. The question under discussion respects the lawfulness, and unlawfulness, of carrying things on the Sabbath—what constitutes a burthen, or the bearing of one? may a cripple carry about his wooden leg? Rabbi Meir allowed it, R. Jose forbade it, for reasons, no doubt, satisfactory to their own minds, but on which we need not speculate. The section with which we are concerned (that is § 9) begins

⁵ See before, p. 163.

הַבְנִים יֵצְאִים בְקָשָׁרִים וּבְנִי מֶלֶךְ בְזֹונִין. וְכֹל אָדָם This Wotton translates, “Little boys may go abroad with leading-strings; and great men’s sons with bells; and so [may] every body.” In a note on our word “leading-strings” Wotton very frankly says, “This I have translated by guess. It is plain by the Bells in the next words, that this constitution relates to infants when they are carry’d abroad upon the Sabbath. And there is nothing else that relates to male infants in this chapter. *Kesharim*, the original word comes from *Kashar*, which signifies to *tye* with a cord, or string, or thong; and *Kesharim* are strings, and sometimes knots. The account of these *Kesharim* in Maimonides and Bartenora, seems to me extremely impertinent. But Maimonides, who was a man of admirable judgment, screens himself, by acquainting us, that he took his explication out of the Gemara. They say, that when a boy (for there is not that danger of girls forsooth) is extremely fond of his father, so that he cannot leave him safely, if the father ties the latchet of his left shoe about the boy’s arm, he may be left by himself without danger. If my explication

be not right, it must be allow'd to be natural⁶."

It would certainly be giving to Wotton's words a meaning which he did not anticipate, if we were to say that it is natural for one who translates "by guess," not to explicate aright; but it is no disparagement to his learning, or ingenuity, to say that one considers Maimonides and Bar-tenora, with the Gemara to back them, as better authority than his guess. The thing itself might be very absurd; but the reference to some sort of superstition seems confirmed by the fact that the next section in this chapter of the Mishna proceeds to speak of the lawfulness of carrying charms (viewed, that is, as burthens) on the Sabbath. Wotton translates it thus:—"R. Meir allows [men] to go out with eggs of locusts, Foxes' teeth, Nails taken from a man that has been nailed to the gallows, when they are used as medicines: But the wise men bind even upon a working-day, because of the ways of the Amorites"—a matter of fact, and a reason assigned for it, which are both worthy of notice.

(19.) *Tablets*] —בְּתֵי הַנֶּפֶשׁ—We shall perhaps

⁶ Shab. Vol. II. p. 57.

think that some other writers, who would not confess, as freely as Wotton, that they had translated by guess, must have sometimes adopted meanings supported by very slender authority. It seems strange to find our translators rendering “tablets,” and Bishop Lowth (following the *olfactoriola* of the Vulgate) translating “perfume boxes;” and Parkhurst “perfume boxes, vessels or boxes to snift or smell at;” but different as the things are, one translation is perhaps as good as the other. Who would believe that the original is בְּתֵי הַנֶּפֶשׁ, “houses of the soul?” The idea of our translators was, I presume, that by writing down their thoughts the Jewish women made their tablets the depositories of their minds; and in some sense the houses of their souls; while those who like Lowth understood the prophet to mean what Taylor (1182. 64) describes as “small neat boxes inclosing a delicious perfume, which the ladies wore about them, to please and recreate themselves with the smell,” looked upon these boxes as a sort of storehouses from which revival, and as it were fresh soul, might be obtained by the fainting. Surely it would be better to get rid of such fanciful

guesses, and to acknowledge that we do not know what is meant.

(20.) *Ear-rings*] לְחַשִׁים—The derivation from לְחַשׁ is clear enough; and the sense of that word is equally plain and undisputed. Gesenius says, “(1.) strictly to whisper, murrenare (2.) to conjure from the muttering over of magic spells שָׁחַט m. verbal from שָׁחַט (1.) *a whispering, sighing or calling for help (2.) magic, conjuration*, Is. iii. 3. Particularly *the charming of serpents*, Jerem. viii. 17. Eccl. x. 11. (3.) *a charm or amulet*. Plur. שָׁחַטִּים Is. iii. 20. (Comp. in Arab. قَسْ, *to practise magic, and to fortify one's self by amulets against magic*.) These amulets were female ornaments, prob. engraved precious stones or the like, which the orientals make use of for amulets. Schröder and others: *small serpents*, worn for ornaments; but without equal etymological support.”

It is important to observe that the idea of amulets and female ornaments, rests wholly on the passage of Isaiah now under our consideration; and that it has been made up simply and entirely to meet the exigency of this particular case, and the prepossessions of trans-

lators. That the matters in question here called מְחַשֵּׁבָה, were somehow connected with magic, and that they were used by these women seems plain. Not however by them exclusively; for whoever compares this with the third verse of this chapter will find the words נָבֹן לְהַשְׁמָן which are rendered by the Vulgate “prudentem eloquii mystici,” and by our translators “eloquent orator.” One argument which has been used to prove that female ornaments are meant, I cannot help mentioning, as a specimen of the way in which translators and commentators are too often influenced by preconceived ideas. Parkhurst tells us that the word signifies “Some female ornaments, probably so called from their yielding a low whistling or tinkling sound”—then after some extracts from Pitts and Harmer on the dress of oriental prostitutes, he adds, “But after all, מְחַשֵּׁבָה may perhaps mean, as the Vulg. and our translators render it, *ear-rings*. Vitrunga observes that if this be not its signification, then we must say that the prophet has omitted this capital article of female decoration, since there is no other word in his list to express it. A kind of ear-rings might

be thus called from being made in such a manner as on the motion of the head to yield a low tinkling sound."

But why should not the word mean here what it means elsewhere? a whispering or conjuration? Is it to have a new meaning made for this one particular case? It occurs in only half a dozen places, beside this chapter; and in all of them the sense is either muttering charms, or speaking like those who do so. Ps. lviii. 5. Eccles. x. 11. Jerem. viii. 17. II. Sam. xii. 19. Ps. xli. 7. Is. xxvi. 16. It is singular that an illustration has been preserved in the Mishna where we find it recorded that, to the classes there enumerated, and by universal agreement excluded from the blessedness of eternal life, Rabbi Akiba added all who muttered (*הלווח*) over a wound, those words of scripture, "I will put none of these diseases upon thee which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the Lord that healeth thee⁷."—But this is getting into another part of the subject.

(21.) *Rings*] —*טבעות*—This seems to be the plain meaning and to require no remark. It is

⁷ Sanh. cap. xi. § 1; the passage is Deut. vii. 15.

obvious that rings of all sorts, especially engraved, or signet, rings were likely to be part of the apparatus of superstition.

(22.) *Nose-jewels*] נזמי האף—Of this much the same may be said. Parkhurst says, “A Ring to be worn either on the ear, as Gen. xxxv. 4. Exod. xxxii. 2, 3—or on the nose,” for which he gives several references. He also quotes from Harmer a passage in which Sir John Chardin says, “‘I have seen some of these [larger] ear-rings with figures upon them and strange characters, which I believe may be talismans or charms, or perhaps nothing but the amusement of old women. The Indians say they are preservatives against enchantments. Perhaps the *ear-rings* of Jacob’s family [which he buried with the strange gods, Gen. xxxv. 4] were of this kind.’ Thus my author. And indeed it appears from Hos. ii. 13, or 15, that the idolatrous Israelites in after times wore *ear-rings* in honour of Baal or the Sun, as perhaps the Midianites likewise did, Jud. viii. 24, 25, 26; as well as שחרנים or crescents in honour of the moon. And Jacob’s sons might have brought some idolatrous trumpery from Shechem, and some unwar-rantable practices and superstitious ornaments

might have crept into Laban's family, before Jacob left Padan Aram; though Laban was far from being an idolater in the worst sense of the word. See Gen. xxxi. 24, 49, 50, 53."

(23.) *Changeable suits of apparel*] —**מְחֻלָּזֹת**—This may be the meaning; but how it is arrived at, or indeed what it is, I do not clearly see. The plain sense of the verb is undoubtedly that given by Gesenius, "to loose, or pull off, to draw out," &c. The same is said by Parkhurst, who makes a remark which, notwithstanding the absurd derivation with which he introduces it, deserves notice. He says, "As a N. fem. plur. **מְחֻלָּזֹת** either *loose robes* or *garments*, or rather such garments as were worn only on particular occasions, and are therefore continually *put off*, occ. Is. iii. 22. Zech. iii. 4. In the latter passage it seems to denote the high priest's robes, which were worn only on solemn occasions (LXX ποδήρην robes reaching down to the feet) in the former, some kind of cloak," &c. But it will be remembered that we have had occasion to observe in the foregoing list the "goodly bonnets" which were ordered for the priests; and it seems not unlikely that those who probably acted in some way or degree as priest-

esses, should affect in some particulars the sacerdotal costume. What was meant by the Vulgate translation “mutatoria,” or by Montanus when he made it “vestes mutatorias,” I do not know. Lowth has “embroidered robes.”

(24.) *Mantles*] מִלְפָתָח—The lexicons seem to agree with Taylor, who says under the root, “I. Operire, ri: to cover as the body is covered with a garment, Ps. lxxiii. 6, or the ground with corn, lxv. 13 [or he might, of course, have added ‘anything, by any other thing’]. Figuratively to conceal, Job xxiii. 9—to faint, to swoon, to have the mind covered or muffled up with sorrow or languishment.” This is followed by many references to passages where our version has “faint, overwhelmed, hideth, covereth, swoon, fainted,” but there is nothing that I can see (except the prepossession of the translators) to countenance the idea of the word’s belonging to an article of female dress.

(25.) *Wimples*] מַטְפָּחִית—Taylor gives two significations “I. *Palmus*. The expanded, open, palm of the hand, or a hand’s breadth. . . . II. What is expanded, or spread over other things as (1.) the roof of a building, &c.

. . . . (2.) some part of a woman's dress which was expanded or spread over the other parts of her dress; as an apron, Ruth iii. 15. Isa. iii. 22. But we do not know certainly what it was." [It will be observed that the latter of these two references is the only one which supports, or gives any colour to the former—but he proceeds] "(3.) To stroke gently and smoothly with the open hand, as mothers do the limbs of their infants. Lam. ii. 20 [*children of a span long*] children whom they have tenderly stroked. And so v. 22, *those that I have swadaled*, or stroked with the tenderest affection."

In all this, it will be observed, there is nothing to shew that a female garment or ornament was meant; and nothing to give colour to such an idea, except the single case of Ruth's apron, if it was an apron. The meaning of the word, as gathered from its use, seems to have had some reference to the hand, and to stroking with it. It may be remembered that we have already had occasion to mention young children under the word "mincing" (**נְפָלָה** singularly resembling the word now before us⁸⁾) and to observe, that they were

⁸ See No. 5, p. 156, before.

commonly, and to a great extent, implicated in the rites and practices of false religion. It seems clear, at least, that the Jews imagined the word to be connected with some superstitious practice. Buxtorf, in his rabbinical dictionary, under the root טפּחָא, speaks of persons who professed to discover, by striking walls with their hands or fingers, whether there was concealed treasure⁹.

(26.) *Crisping pins*] חַרְטִים—This is certainly a very awkward attempt to make the word mean something that may suit the translators' preconception about female dress. It occurs but four times in the scriptures, and the meaning seems to be quite uncertain. Taylor says very frankly that it "hath two significations. I. *Stylus sculptorius*. An engraving tool, a pen, a style. How this sense can be made to accord with that of *Bags* and *Crisping Pins* below, I know not." With his notions of radicalism, and idealism, he was certainly bound to find some accordance; but I am not, and I think it may be enough to say that (beside the passage before us) there are only three in which the word occurs;

⁹ "Percussores. Sic vocantur, qui palmo sive digitis parietem percutiendo cognoscunt, num ibi argentum sit absconditum, Metzia foli. 42. 1." col. 900.

namely, where Isaiah is ordered to write with a man's *pen*, viii. 1, and where we are told that Aaron fashioned the golden calf with a *graving tool*, Ex. xxxii. 4, and that Naaman bound the silver in *bags* for Gehazi, II. Kings v. 23.

(27.) *Glasses*] גָּלִינִים—The word occurs but once elsewhere, and that is in the passage just referred to, where Isaiah is directed to take a great “roll” גָּלִין and write in it. Gesenius gives this latter as a “verbal from גָּלַה . . . tablet of wood, metal or stone, for writing on. Is. viii. 1. . . . Plur. גָּלִינוֹת Is. iii. 23, probably *mirrors* (here as a female ornament, comp. Ex. xxxviii. 8) literally *metallic plates*. So the Vulg. and Chald. According to the Sept. *thin transparent garments*” &c.

The passage in Exodus, here referred to by Gesenius, is very well worth our notice in this enquiry—“he made the laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the *looking-glasses* [marg. ‘Or *brasen glasses*’] of the women assembling [marg. assembling in troops] which assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation”—but all that need be said of it in this place is that these “*looking-glasses*” are designated by a word wholly different from that used in the passage of Isaiah with which we are at present

engaged. I do not doubt that the women were of the same class and profession, and it is likely that the articles (whatever they may have been) though spoken of by the two different words were similar, or perhaps identical. But we must bear in mind that the words of description are wholly different and unconnected.

As to the “glasses,” however, with which we are at present concerned, Gesenius, as I have shewn, derives the word from גָּלַה; and of that verb he has just given the meaning “to uncover, open, disclose, reveal . . . in Kal for the most part in a figurative sense, particularly (1.) ‘פְּגַלֵּח אֹן גָּלַה, *to uncover or open the ear of any one*, i. e. to reveal something to him. I. Sam. ix. 15 [The Lord had told Samuel in his ear]. xx. 2 [Jonathan said ‘my father will shew it to me’] verses 12, 13. xxii. 8, 17. II. Sam. vii. 27 [Thou O Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, *hast revealed* to thy servant]. Ruth iv. 4” [I thought to advertise thee]. Afterwards with reference to the phrase ‘פְּגַלֵּת עַיִן’ he says “*To open the eyes of any one* (spoken of God) i. e. to let one see what he otherwise would not have seen, particularly what is concealed from mortal eyes. Num. xxii. 31, then opened Jehovah the eyes of

Balaam, and he saw the angel of Jehovah stand in the way.” xx. 4. 16 [Balaam falling into a trance but having his eyes open]. Ps. cxix. 18” [Open thou mine eyes].

It will be remembered that these passages are not of my selecting; but are given by the lexicographer, to explain the origin and meaning of the word. Many other references might be added; and I cannot help thinking that taken altogether they favour the idea of mirrors or crystals, used as we know they have been by other persons, in other times, for the purposes of divination. It is right however to add that the rendering of the Septuagint *Διαφανῆ Λακωνικὰ* is adopted by Lowth who has, “transparent garments.” Parkhurst seems inclined to do the same; and observes that the garments worn by the Lacedemonian maidens were so made as to be “highly indecent,” adding “it is possible that some of the Jewish ladies in Isaiah’s time might wear dresses of a similar fashion.” Nevertheless he says of Lowth, “it is remarkable that though he contends for *γυάλα* in Is. viii. 1 signifying *a mirror*, an interpretation not favoured by any of the ancient versions, yet in his note on Is. iii. 23 he does not even mention the Targum’s and

Vulgate's explaining סְדִינִים or גָּלִילִים to the same sense."

The Vulgate has "specula;" and the targum of Jonathan does certainly not seem to have known anything of transparent garments in this place, but has מְחַזֵּתָא, which Buxtorf (under אֶתְהָ) renders by "Speculum, ab ostendendo sic dictum."

Parkhurst also says "ultimately from this root no doubt it was that the interpreters of prodigies among the Sicilians were called *Galei* or *Galeotæ*." And he adds in a note the words of Cicero "Interpretes portentorum, qui Galleotæ" [tum] "in Sicilia nominabantur." *De Divin.* I. xx. Pearce's note is "Hi portentorum interpretes videntur sui nominis originem debere voci Hebraicæ גָּלָה quæ significat *revelavit*¹."

(28.) *Fine Linen*] סְדִינִים—The word is I believe only used in two other places—namely, in describing the manufactures of the virtuous woman ("She maketh fine linen" Prov. xxxi. 24) and as a part of the wager concerning Samson's riddle. The loser was to pay "thirty sheets" as well as the changes of garments. Jud. xiv. 12, 13.

¹ See this and more, ed. Moser. p. 102.

What these really were it seems impossible to say. The LXX in the first of the places translates σινδόνας, and the Vulgate and Montanus have “Sindones;” but though the Septuagint thus translates in the 12th verse of the passage here quoted from the book of Judges, yet in the 13th (that is in Samson’s repetition) it translates ὁθόνια; and this I presume has been the ground of our version, which Lowth improves into “fine linen vests.”

(29.) *Hoods*] צניפות. It is perhaps enough to say of this, that it was one of the holy garments assigned to Aaron “for glory and for beauty.” Ex. xxviii. 2, 4. The direction was “Thus shall Aaron come into the Holy place with the linen *mitre* shall he be *attired* [mitred] *these are holy garments.*” Lev. xvi. 4. In conformity with this we read of Joshua the High Priest “Let them set a fair *mitre* upon his head. So they set a fair *mitre* upon his head, and clothed him with garments.” Zech. iii. 5. Here is, surely, another confirmation of the idea that the parties addressed, if not actually usurping the priestly office, were imitating some of its external peculiarities.

(30.) *Vails*] רדידים—The translation appears to be little better than guessing. The general

idea of the original word seems to be that given by Gesenius, “*to spread out, stretch on the ground, to subject, sternere*, e. g. nations *to spread out*, hence *to overlay with metal spread out*.” So that we may take it to mean any garment, or anything else, that is “spread over” another, or over the wearer, or over any other thing. Accordingly, here and in Cant. v. 7 (the only other occurrence of the noun) our translators have “*vail*;” Lowth has “*manteles*.” The Vulgate “*Theristra*,” not venturing to translate the LXX θέριστρα, and Montanus “*Palliola*.”

I have occupied so much more space than I intended in the discussion of this passage of Isaiah, that I will here say very little about the prophecy of Ezekiel, to which I have referred. I am sorry that I can do so little towards explaining it, and regret that I can only use the language of enquiry and suggestion. At the same time the passage is too important to be passed over; and the words as they stand suggest three things which are worthy of our notice, and such as may make us wish that we understood them better. First, the reproof is expressly and in plain terms addressed to the women as Prophetesses. It distinctly acknow-

ledges their assumption of that sacred character. Secondly, it contains, in terms equally plain, a declaration that God would deliver his people out of their hand ; implying, beyond all question, that the people were, in some way or other, subjected to their influence. For this reason I extract the whole passage, though I propose here to comment on only a few words of it.

17. Likewise thou son of man set thy face against the daughters of thy people, which prophesy out of their own heart ; and prophesy thou against them,

18. And say, Thus saith the Lord God ; Woe to the women that sew pillows to all armholes [*marg.* Or elbows] and make kerchiefs upon the head of every stature to hunt souls ! Will ye hunt the souls of my people, and will ye save the souls alive that come unto you ?

19. And will ye pollute me among my people for handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread to slay the souls that should not die, and to save the souls alive that should not live, by your lying to my people that hear your lies ?

20. Wherefore thus saith the Lord God ; Behold, I am against your pillows wherewith ye there hunt the souls to make them fly [*marg.* into gardens] and I will tear them from your arms, and will let the souls go, even the souls that ye hunt to make them fly.

21. Your kerchiefs also will I tear, and deliver my people out of your hand, and they shall be no more in your hand to be hunted, and ye shall know that I am the Lord.

That sew pillows] First as to the “pillows” כסתות. I believe that it occurs only here and in the 20th verse. Taylor and Parkhurst gave it as a separate root, and so did Gesenius in his original edition. Whether he subsequently altered it I do not know; but the American translation by Gibbs inserts “verbal from כסה;” and Cocceius (Schulz, I. 596) places it under that word. If this be right, the result appears to be that it means “coverings” of some sort —that is things that cover some other things, for so it is rendered in scores of places; and I do not see that it has any other meaning assigned, or any variation from the noun or verb “covering,” except in a very few cases, where we find “conceal, hide, overwhelm, raiment, clothing,” and perhaps some other word obviously taking its original meaning from “covering.” Our Translators however appear to have followed the Septuagint who translate προσκεφάλαια. This word is as plainly used elsewhere to mean a pillow. Without copying the references to heathen writers which are given by Schleusner, it may be sufficient to mention the use of it by the LXX for Saul’s *bolster* (I. Sam. xxvi.11, 12,) its being used in the

Apocrypha for the *pillow* of Darius, III. Esdr. iii. 8. It occurs too in the New Testament in the description of our Lord's sleeping in the storm given by St. Mark ch. iv. 38. Whether the LXX were right in using the word here I do not undertake to say. They have been followed by the Vulgate *pulvilloς*, and by Montanus *pulvinaria*.

Without, then, attempting at present to decide on the true meaning of what is rendered “pillows,” let us notice the word translated by “sew,” מִתְפָּרֹת. It occurs, I believe in only three other places ; and in two out of the three such a translation seems to be peculiarly infelicitous. It may be tolerable to say that there is “a time to rend and a time to sew” Eccl. iii. 7. but the idea of sewing is so inseparably connected with a needle and thread, that it seems strange to say that Job “sewed sack-cloth” upon his skin, xvi. 5, and that our first parents “sewed figleaves” in Paradise. Gen. iii. 7. The simple idea seems to be, to unite, or bring together. Sewing is certainly one way of doing this; but not an usual way of connecting pillows with armholes, any more than sackcloth with the skin of a living man.

“To all arm-holes”—דַּיְלֵי—אֲצִילֵי—What are

we to understand by this? The nonsense offered to us by some lexicographers under the notion that they must keep up a connection between this verb, substantive, and particle, the common root of which they must make to be אַצֵּל is enough to excite disgust and indignation. Taylor under the root אַצֵּל (105) gives as the meaning “*Reponere, servare, seponere. To lay up in store, under our nearest care and inspection, what is choice and much esteemed.* Hence a particle signifying *near to, by, at, with, beside.* It is also applied to select persons of distinction and eminence. And may signify *Arm-holes*, as those are near to the body;”— while (he should have added) the legs are far from it. Parkhurst is equally absurd. Under the root אַצֵּל No. IV. he says “As a N. masc. plur. in Reg. אַצִּילִי, and fem. אַצִּילָות *The arm-pits*, i. e. the space comprehended between the upper half of the arm and the body, and so called from being *retired* parts, and frequently used for *reserving* things to oneself.” Gesenius is more rational, and says ; “אַצִּיל (verbal from אַצֵּל i. q. צָל = Arab. وصل *to join* dec. I. b. *a joining, juncture.* Hence סְדִיר אַצִּיל *juncture of the hands, or of the arms, for the arm-pit or shoulder.* Jer. xxxviii. 12. Ezek. xiii. 18. xli. 8.

The passage in Jeremiah particularly favours this interpretation. The other passages seem to require *wrist*, or, according to some, *the juncture of the fingers with the hand*. It is difficult to decide."

This particular difficulty,—and, at the same time, all that relates to the word "arm-pits"—will, I think vanish if we look at the personal history of Jeremiah. There is nothing but his circumstances, and the account of his deliverance, to give colour to the notion of sewing pillows to arm-holes, or talking of arm-pits at all; and of this history of Jeremiah, I cannot but think, there has been some misunderstanding. The prophet was in the dungeon when Ebed-melech obtained the royal authority to deliver him; and (according to our version) he took his "men with him, and went into the house of the King under the treasury, and took thence old cast clouts and old rotten rags, and let them down by cords into the dungeon to Jeremiah. And Ebed-melech the Ethiopian said unto Jeremiah, Put now these old cast clouts and rotten rags under thine armholes under the cords. And Jeremiah did so. So they drew up Jeremiah with cords²."

² Jerem. xxxviii. 11.

The idea commonly formed from this is, I believe, that the prophet was to place, and did place, the cords under his arm-pits, and that he was to be, and actually was, drawn up by them, the rags being obviously intended to save him from the pain and injury which he might have received from the cords under such an operation. Is it not probable that the reality was something even more simple than this? I imagine that the deliverers of the prophet, keeping hold of both ends of the cord, lowered it in the form of a loop, directing him to place the rags in the loop, or bight, and to clasp his hands together over those rags; and that he did so. The question may seem to be trifling, but it is really of more consequence than at first sight appears; because, as I have already observed, it is the only thing that gives any colour to the common interpretation of the passage in Ezekiel. If I am right there was just what Gesenius seems to have felt the want of, a “juncture of the hands,” or a “juncture of the fingers with the hand;” and there is nothing about “arm-pits” or “arm-holes” or “shoulders” in the matter. I had formed this opinion before I saw what I have quoted from Gesenius, or had noticed the Targum of

Jonathan on Jerem. xxxviii. 12. For the אָצְלוֹת of the text, the targum has מִדְבָּקִי יְדֵךְ. Now if we enquire after the meaning of דָבַק, Buxtorf will tell us “Hærere, adhærere, cohaerere, conjungi, conglutinari, ut Hebraice,” &c. and if we look for it in Gesenius we find the primary meaning of the verb “to cleave, or stick to, to adhere” &c. and the verbal as, “1. the soldering or welding of metals. Is. xli. 7. 2. plur. דָבְקִים I. Kings xxii. 34. II. Chron. xviii. 33. probably *the joints* of the coat of mail. So the Chald.—Others: *shoulders*; comp. Chald. מִדְבָּקִי יְדֵךְ Jer. 28. 12. Targ.” It is curious to see this passage brought by itself, and without any support or colour, to give a new meaning to a common word. Surely nobody can doubt that, whatever may be the sense of the passage, the grammatical meaning of both Hebrew and Chaldee is, “the joining of hands” and not armpits, armholes, or shoulders.

But, instead of entering into a discussion of words, I will here merely repeat that this passage appears to me most important, not only for the two reasons which I have already mentioned,—but as calculated to throw light on the secret, and perhaps I may most properly say *mysterious*, combination, or confedera-

tion, which seems to have existed in the false worship of Israel; when hand joined in hand, and the yoke, the putting forth of the finger, and speaking vanity, oppressed the people. Of this we may, perhaps, see farther and plainer traces in the sequel.

§ 15. *The moral character of Jewish women.*

I have already had occasion to refer to the women who “assembled”—or as our margin reads “assembled by troops,” *הנשׁים מִצְבָּאות*, “at the door [the *pathach*, *פֶתַח*] of the Tabernacle³;” and, but that I have been already so tedious, I should like to enter into some enquiry respecting the title or description which they bear, (which the Vulgate translates *quæ observabant*,) as well as the place in which they were assembled. I have likewise noticed the women who are said to have assembled in the same way (that is at the door of the tabernacle) of whose looking-glasses the foot of the laver was made⁴. Of these women

³ 1 Sam. ii. 22. See before, p. 119.

⁴ Exod. xxxviii. 8. See before, No. 27, p. 179.

much might be said; but I here only remark on the place which they occupied, and I advert to that for the sake of what follows; and to say that here, as elsewhere, I do not clearly understand what sort of place we are to understand by *pathach*. It is easy to talk of a door, or a gate, or an opening; but I think that those who take the trouble to trace out the word will feel some difficulty in defining its precise meaning. It is observable that when in later times the prophet Ezekiel was brought “in the visions of God to Jerusalem” it was “to the *pathach* of the inner gate” and that this was the scene of idolatry—the place “where was the seat of the image of jealousy, which provoketh to jealousy⁵.” The same chapter also brings before us “women weeping for Tammuz,” v. 14. and I might here take occasion to speak of the women who “wove hangings [marg. houses] for the grove⁶;” but I do not enter into particular enquiry on these points. I have no doubt that with some specific differences of doctrine and rites, all these females were united and combined in the celebration of false worship. Neither do I doubt

⁵ Ezek. viii. 3.

⁶ II. Kings xxiii. 7.

that some of the consecrated and initiated were persons of licentious and immoral life. At the same time truth, and a strong suspicion that injustice has been done not only to these women but to their nation,—as well as that the sense of Holy Scripture has been misrepresented,—compels me to express an opinion, that these daughters of Zion, not only took upon them something like a sacerdotal or prophetic character, and in addition to public ministrations had secret rites, and carried on mysteries performed only by the consecrated, and witnessed only by the initiated, but were distinctly recognized by a name derived from their sacred (or pseudo-sacred) character—in other words, that a woman belonging to this class was called a female saint, a holy woman, a קדשה. I know that the word is, in our version, rendered by “harlot;” but I will state as briefly as I can the grounds on which I believe this translation to be erroneous. If it be so, I need not say that even when it comes before us as קדשה, it ought to be set right; but that it is incomparably more important to have it rectified when it appears as קדשָׁה, and is rendered as it has been by our translators.

Every one who knows but a few words of

Hebrew, is aware that קָדֵשׁ meaning (as it is a noun or a verb) *holy*, or *to be holy*, is one of the commonest words in the Bible. If any one doubts let him look out the word in Taylor's Hebrew Concordance: and count the hundreds of references which fill ten columns of that folio book. Each one will direct him to some such English word as *holy*, *hallow*, *sanctify*, *consecrate*, *purify*, or some one or other of their immediate derivatives. Accordingly, in the Scripture, he reads, “Ye shall be holy קָדֵשׁ for I am holy קָדֵשׁ.” Lev. xi. 44. He finds the Psalmist exclaiming, “The heavens shall praise thy wonders O Lord: thy faithfulness in the congregation of the saints קָדְשִׁים;” and after learning from these, and a multitude of similar, passages what he is to understand by the word קָדְשִׁים, and what sort of persons the *Kadesim* were, he finds to his surprise, when he comes to read of the reformation by Josiah, that one of that king's pious and approved actions was to break down the houses of the *Kadesim* “that were by the House of the Lord.” II. Kings xxiii. 7. He finds, in fact, that in this, and some nine or ten other places, the word is supposed to designate, not merely what is not sacred, but what is most

wicked and unholy. It has certainly puzzled commentators. Bishop Patrick says with great simplicity, and equal truth, “ whence this name should be given to harlots is a great doubt, it coming from a root which signifies that which is *sacred*.” What is the enquirer to do? must he go back to Taylor, and finding so much discordance in the concordance part of his work, is he to take to the lexicographic notice which that absurd writer prefixes to this root? Imagine his surprise when he is told that “ with respect to morals Persons are holy or *sacred*, when habitually addicted or devoted either to piety and virtue, or to vice and filthiness.” Perhaps no other writer has been quite so absurd; but some have been tempted to account for this strange use of the word by suggesting that the persons in question were such as had been set apart, or as it were consecrated, to the service of false gods by obscene rites and practices. In confirmation and vindication of this, they have collected, and I hope I am right in believing, and in saying, they have at least magnified, and exaggerated, all that could be found respecting the impurities of early false worship. Indeed I am inclined to go the length of saying that they have in

this case wholly misrepresented the matter; and made a heavy charge which has no foundation in truth.

If however I err in this matter, and the *Kadesim* really were as bad as they have been thought to be, is it not strange to find them in such a locality as that from which they were driven by King Josiah? We read of their houses “that were by the House of the Lord;” a strange thing surely, even when it comes before us softened and smoothed a little by our translators who have strained a point in order to make it credible. They seem to have been shocked (as with their view of the matter they very well might be) and absolutely ashamed to give the obvious and plain statement of the text. In contradiction of the original, and, I believe, of every version, they took the responsibility of removing the abomination (whatever it may have been) out of the precincts of the Holy Place. The words “in” and “by” are small, but very different, and very important. If these houses were *in*, they were *in*; if they were *by*, they were *out*. Were they in the House of the Lord or not? It is but too certain that false gods were set up in the true Temple; and that rank idolatry

penetrated into that sacred place. There was a time when “ ALL THE CHIEF of the PRIESTS and the PEOPLE transgressed very much after ALL the abominations of the heathen, and polluted the House of the Lord which he had hallowed.” II. Chr. xxxvi. 14. “They have defiled my sanctuary,” said Jehovah by his prophet; and he added “when they had slain their children to their idols, then they came on the same day into my sanctuary to profane it, and lo thus they have done in the midst of mine House?.” One can hardly imagine such a desecration of the Temple of God by false worship; but that it should be defiled by such established abominations as our version suggests, is, without most clear and convincing evidence, quite incredible. I cannot help thinking that there has been a mistake; and I will endeavour to shew that this is the case, and to explain how it has arisen—but for this we must turn back to very early history.

The patriarch Judah seems, for some reason or other, to have withdrawn from his family. We are told that he “went down from his brethren,” and married a woman, the daughter

⁷ Ezek. xxiii. 38. see also ch. v. 11. ch. vii. 20. and all ch. viii.

of a certain Canaanite, named Shuah. By her he had three sons. The two elder were successively married to Tamar; and, both having died, their widow, it seems, according to the then established course of things, would have been married to the third son, Shelah, but for his youth. Judah told her, "Remain a widow at thy father's house till Shelah my son be grown;" and accordingly she went, and dwelt in the house of her father. How long she remained there does not appear; but it was long enough for her to see "that Shelah was grown, and she was not given unto him to wife." It is not however said that she made any complaint, or any claim, or took any steps, until the death of her mother-in-law left her father-in-law Judah a widower. Then the neglected daughter-in-law seems to have thought that she had a right to call on him to fulfil in his own person, the promise which he had made respecting his son. We are not here discussing either the law or the morality of the case; but it must be observed that, at a subsequent period, Judah did not defend his own conduct, or impeach hers. He confessed "she hath been more righteous than I; because I gave her not to Shelah my son." Right or

wrong, however, this seems to have been the impression under which she acted.

It was at the house of Hirah the Adullamite, many years before, that Judah had met with his Canaanitish wife; and now, when his grief for the loss of her had somewhat subsided, he set forth with this old friend to go to the sheep-shearing at Timnath. The Seventy represent Hirah as Judah's shepherd; and perhaps the faithful old servant was merely going to Timnath in the way of his vocation, and thought it would do his master good to go with him. Meanwhile somehow, and by somebody, "it was told Tamar, saying, Behold thy father-in-law goeth up to Timnath to shear his sheep;" and she resolved to meet him on the way. With this view she divested herself of her widow's garments, "and covered herself with a vail, and wrapped herself, and sat in an open place, which is by the way to Timnath."

Bishop Patrick in commenting on this passage says "*Covered herself with a vail]* As all women did in the eastern countries, when they went abroad" &c. But I am inclined to think that there was something more, perhaps something which we may not clearly understand, in the matter. The word *vail* is common enough

in our version, and suggests perhaps nothing more than what the bishop has said. There is no reason why the english reader should suspect its representing on this occasion any hebrew word, but that which it so often represents elsewhere. In fact, however, it is here the representative of a word which is to be found in only one other place in the Scriptures. Whatever it may have been that Tamar put on when she thus went to meet Judah, we only read of such a thing having been worn by one other person, on one other occasion. That was by Judah's own grandmother when she went out to meet her betrothed Isaac. Rebekah lighted off the camel and “took a *vail* and covered herself⁸. ” Whatever the נִזְזָה may have been, we do not hear of its being used, or worn, on any other occasion; and I am inclined to think that it must have been something of more importance and significance than a common *vail*⁹.

⁸ Gen. xxiv. 65.

⁹ With reference to what I have said respecting translation, I may observe, that on the three occasions of this word's occurrence, twice in Gen. xxxviii. 14. 19, and once in Gen. xxv. 65, the Vulgate uses three different words to represent it — *pallium*, *theristrum*, and *habitus*. The Douay translation likewise has three, *cloak*, *rail*, and *apparel*. Our version is consistent

There is another point in this description which appears to be very obscure. We are told that Tamar not only covered herself with a vail, but also “wrapped” herself, *נִלְעַת*. The word is not often to be met with; and in the other places where it occurs it has no such meaning as that which is here assigned to it. They are but five. (1.) “Thy sons have *fainted*.” Is. li. 20. (2.) “That he [Jonah] *fainted*.” Jon. iv. 8. (3.) “Young men *faint* for thirst.” Am. viii. 13. (4.) “The trees of the field *fainted*.” Ezek. xxxi. 15. (5.) “Bright ivory *overlaid* with sapphires.” Cant. v. 14. There seems to be nothing in this to justify—or perhaps I should say to account for—our translation. The LXX have *ἐκαλλωπίσατο*, and the Vulgate “mutato habitu.” Both interpretations look like guesses. As to the

in using the word *vail*; and that of the LXX by rendering *θέριστρον*, a word of which it seems impossible to make any thing satisfactory. Schleusner suggests a light summer garment, such as were worn by reapers (*vestis aestiva, messoris vestimentum, vestis tenuis a θέρος vel θεριζω*) but then he goes on to tell us that it means a plough-share in I. Sam. xiii. 20, unless, as he supposes to be the case, the text is corrupt. He then refers to the three instances which I have quoted, and tells us that the word is equivalent to *peplum*, for no reason that I see, unless it be that such an interpretation seems as if it might suit the context.

former, the idea of her *adorning* or *beautifying* herself, seems contrary to the whole tenor of the history; and as to the latter, the statement that she was in a *changed dress* is mere repetition of what had been circumstantially stated before; and neither, as is obvious, has any kind of connexion with, or resemblance to, the interpretation most frequently given to the word.

After making these preparations, whatever they may have been, Tamar, according to the text of our version, “sat in an open place which is by the way to Timnath.” The margin has, “Heb. *the door of eyes* or *of Enajim*. The LXX translate ἐκάθισε πρὸς ταῖς πύλαις Αἰνᾶν ἦ στιν ἐν παρόδῳ Θαμνά—thus directing us to understand by the “open place” the “gates” of a town which was on the road to Timnath. The original is פַתְח, *pathach*; a word which we have already had occasion to notice; and all the circumstances seem to be in favour of this version, which makes it a town (and not Tamar) that was on the way to Timnath.

We are not required to follow the history minutely. It is sufficient for our purpose to observe, that when Tamar had obtained the

tokens by which Judah might be identified, her only immediate object was to escape without detection: “She arose and went away, and laid by her vail from her, and put on the garments of her widowhood.”

At the same time, it seems, the Patriarch, and his friend the Adullamite, pursued their way to Timnath; and the latter was sent back to Enaim with the promised kid. We do not wonder to hear that Hirah’s mission was unsuccessful; “he found her not. Then he asked the men of that place.” And what was the nature of his question? According to our version, “he asked the men of that place, saying, Where is the harlot that was openly by the way side?” (the margin reads, “or *in Enajim.*”) To say nothing of Hirah’s age, of the probability of his being known to the inhabitants of a place on the road to Timnath, or of the motives of respect for his own character, and fidelity to his friend or master, which would lead him to pursue his enquiry at least without ostentation—to say nothing of this, the question was on other accounts a very strange one. Certainly we cannot tell what grounds he might have for supposing that the inhabitants of Enaim to whom he applied,

could answer it. Though we are not told so, he may perhaps have furnished them with further information as to time and place, giving them to understand what “way side” he meant, when the woman had been seen there—the particulars of her dress, which was so singular—and other criteria by which she might be identified. But even with these data, was it to be expected that “the men of that place” should be able to direct a stranger how to find a woman—a stranger also, as far as appears, who at some previous time, and once only, had sat in the gate or by the way, being at that particular time of her sitting there, so veiled, covered and muffled up, that her own father-in-law did not recognize her? I do not deny that all this may have been so; but I do say that it appears to me very strange.

And if Hirah’s question was strange, equally so was the answer of the men of whom he enquired. One would almost think that they took him for a simpleton, and answered him according to his folly. If this was not the case—and even if we do not insist upon the strict letter—it would surely have been a singular and almost incredible testimony to the good state of morals in Israel at that time.

“They said, There was no harlot in this place.”

For my own part, however, I do not believe that Hirah asked such a question, or received such an answer. My suspicion is, that when Hirah went to look for Tamar, and had looked in vain, he found himself in the same predicament as Saul did when he went to seek his father’s asses; and in his difficulty had recourse to the same expedient—that, just as Saul asked the maidens, “Is the *seer* here?” and Samuel himself, “Tell me I pray thee where the *seer’s* house is¹? ” so Hirah asked the men of Enaim “Where is the *Kadesah*? ”

I think this will appear if we look at the passage rather more closely;

“He asked the men of that place saying Where is the harlot that was openly by the way side? And they said, There was no harlot in this place. And he returned to Judah, and said, I cannot find her; and also the men of the place said, that there was no harlot in this place.”

There is no obvious difficulty in this—he who reads our version has been told that Judah “thought her to be an harlot.” v. 15.

¹ I. Sam. ix. 11, 18.

In the passage itself the word “harlot” occurs thrice, and a few verses further on he is told that Tamar was accused of having “played the harlot.” All is quite straightforward, and raises no suspicion of difficulty. But, if we look at the original words, we find that, in the first and last of the five passages, a word is used which is quite distinct from, and (grammatically considered) unconnected with, the intermediate three. The inspired writer tells us in the first of them, that Judah, when he saw Tamar, supposed her to be a *zonah* זונה, the word commonly used to denote a prostitute; and in the fifth, that she had acted as a *zonah*; but in the three intermediate passages, the word is not *zonah*, but *kadesah* קדשה.

Let it be observed that Hirah does not speak of a *zonah*, nor does he represent “the men of that place” as speaking of one. All their conference was of a *kadesah*; and naturally enough, we do not find him telling them why he wanted to consult her. His language seems to favour the idea that he knew, or had known, of such a person in the place. Not indeed as it is given in our translation, which makes Hirah describe the person whom he

sought as one who “was *openly* by the way side.” The word which gave rise to the mention of “an *open* place” in v. 14 is not used here at all, either by Hirah or the men; and for this simple reason, that the woman for whom he was enquiring, was not the woman who had sat in the *pathach*. I believe the passage would be more correctly translated by “Where is the *kadesah*? she at Enaim-on-the way.” אֵיכָה קָדְשָׁה הִוא בַּעֲנִים עַל־הַדָּרֶךְ which the LXX translate, Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ πόρνη ἡ γενομένη ἐν Αἰνᾶν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ; we may recollect that Enaim is originally described in v. 14 as “Enaim that is *on the way* to Timnath.” עַנִּים אֲשֶׁר עַל־דָּרֶךְ תְּמִנָּתָה Aἰνᾶν ἡ ἐστιν ἐν παρόδῳ Θαμνᾷ. The simple fact, I believe to have been, as I have partly said, that Hirah returned to Judah reporting that he had searched for the woman in vain, and sought the assistance of a seer equally in vain, and that there the matter must rest; and so far as appears there it did rest. When the truth came out, we hear nothing of any *Kadesah*, but the charge against Tamar was that she had acted the part of a *zonah*.

It may be thought that I have spent too much time and trouble on this passage; but it

seems to me very important to come to the right meaning of it. The question is whether it requires, or authorizes, us to treat *zonah* and *kadesah* as equivalent words? This lies at the foundation of the matter. My own belief is that when the greek interpreter came to the latter word he did not know how to translate, and did in fact mistranslate, it; and this suspicion is (as I shall shew) fully justified by the way in which the word is dealt with in other parts of the greek version. This passage, however, relating to Tamar is the primary one. In the five places (*zonah* twice, *kadesah* three times) the LXX have πόρνη, πορνείας, ἐκπεπόρνευκε; and thus they have stamped the word *kadesah* with a meaning which would not otherwise have been thought of, and which has entailed the most awful and injurious charge on the Israelites of both sexes.

At the same time, if in this case the LXX have originated an error by the translation which we have been considering, their version does, elsewhere, in a very remarkable way, support the view which I am endeavouring to maintain. For details on this point I refer the reader to a note²; and here only suggest, that

² See note H.

when in any greek writer of that age we find a set of persons, or the things belonging to them, mixed up with such words as *τελεσφόρος*, *τελεσκόμενος*, *τελετὰς*, *τετελεσμένων*, and others of that family, we may safely believe that those persons and things were considered by the writer as connected with the so-called Sacred Mysteries. So the LXX, as far as they knew what to make of the word, seem to have thought of the *kedesim*; of any such version as that given by our translators, they seem to have had no idea.

A few words I must add—and I think a very few will suffice—to draw the reader's attention to the bearing of this history on the subject of the present section, and the light which it throws on the state of things moral and political in the patriarchal age. When Judah heard—and all his conduct seems to authorize our adding, believed—the charge against his daughter-in-law, he said “Bring her forth, and let her be burnt.” Whatever may have been the origin of the law under which they were living, and whatever we may think of it viewed from other points, it seems to me scarcely compatible with the notion of a very corrupt and licentious state of society.

§ 16. *Children in relation to false worship.*

I proceed to offer a few remarks on the part taken in false worship by children. As yet we have only seen them in the humble occupation of gathering sticks³, though not without intimations that they were, or should become, more important persons than they might at first sight appear to be.

It is curious that, in touching on such a point, we should be immediately reminded of recent occurrences in the ancient seat of magic and sorcery, and find modern Egypt astonishing the rest of the world with its works of darkness. Twenty years have not passed since the Quarterly Review amused, and instructed, its readers by an article on Mr. Lane's "Account of the Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians written in Egypt during the years 1833, 1834, and 1835;" and more particularly "by extracting an account of one of the most extraordinary feats of magic

³ See before, p. 121.

that have been recorded since the days of the Pharaohs^{4.}" Most readers will probably recollect that in all the cases mentioned in that article, a very principal performer in the business was a young child. A few days after Mr. Lane's arrival in the country, Mr. Salt, the English Consul General, employed a magician to detect a thief in his family.

"The magician came; and said that he would cause the exact image of the person who had committed the theft to appear to any youth not arrived at the age of puberty; and desired the master of the house to call in any boy whom he might choose. As several boys were then employed in a garden adjacent to the house, one of them was called for this purpose."

It is not necessary to quote at length, what is so popularly known, and so accessible to every reader who takes any interest in the subject; but I may be allowed to add a few pages for the purpose of shewing that an old notion existed that children had a peculiar power, or gift, or capacity, for becoming or being made, the medium of supernatural communication; and also, that if not that opinion, yet the truth of the phænomena on which

⁴ Q. Rev. July 1837, Vol. LIX. p. 195.

it rests, is maintained in the present day by persons whose position, attainments, and well-known character, entitle them to a respectful hearing.

Without entering into nice distinctions we may perhaps say, that the services of children for purposes of divination were employed in two ways. In one case the child who appeared to be awake, and in the full possession of his senses, was said to see in a mirror, a precious stone, a crystal, or a transparent vessel filled with transparent fluid, certain images or representations of persons or things not visible to the by-standers. In the other case the child was asleep, or entranced, or in that state which is now called “sleep-waking,” and delivered its oracle by word of mouth. Of each of these methods I would offer one or two specimens with a view to shew the importance which was attached to the child’s office, and to suggest that much might be done by, and might depend on, those whom, from their tender years and simplicity we might naturally consider as very insignificant members of the commonwealth. Our enquiry is not whether the thing was true or false; but, whether a belief in it existed, and was

influential; and first as to the mirror, or crystal.

John of Salisbury, the companion of Thomas à Becket, and one of the greatest ornaments of the twelfth century tells us that in his childhood he was sent to learn the Psalms, the earliest stage of Christian education in those days, of a priest who practised mirror-magic—*speculariam magicam*—that he, and another boy, a little bigger than himself, were employed by him as what Dr. Dee calls “seers” or “skryers.” After being subjected to some magical rites, they were seated at his feet, where they remained looking either at their nails anointed with oil or chrism, or else at the polished surface of a bowl in expectation of seeing what might enable them to answer his enquiries. John says that his companion professed to have discerned some faint and cloudy images (*imagines tenues tamen et nubilosas*) but that, for his own part, he saw nothing but his own nails and the bowl⁵.

Reginald Scot, in his “Discovery of Witchcraft” has given “sundry sorts of charms

⁵ Polycrat. II. 28. Cited in the note to Apuleius de Magia edit. Hildebrand Vol. II. p. 537.

tending to divers purposes⁶ ;” and among them “Charmes to find out a theefe,” not altogether resembling those employed in modern Egypt, but marked by the same feature of puerile instrumentality :

“The meanes how to find out a theefe, is thus. Turne your face to the east, and make a crosse upon cristall with oily alive⁷ and under the crosse write these two words (Saint Helen). Then a child that is innocent, and a chaste virgine borne in true wedlock, and not base begotten, of the age of ten yeares, must take the christall in his hand, and behind his back, kneeling on thy knees, thou must devoutly and reverently say over this prayer thrice : I beseech thee my lady S. Helen, mother of King Constantine, which diddest find the crosse whereupon Christ died : by that thy holy devotion, and invention of the crosse, and by the same crosse, and by the joy which thou conceiveddst at the finding thereof, and by the love which thou bearest to thy sonne Constantine, and by the great goodnesse which thou doest alwaies use, that thou shew me in this christall, whatsoever I aske or desire to know ; Amen. And when the child seeth the angel in the christall, demand what you will, and the angel will make answer thereunto.”

The same writer afterwards tells us ;—

“Cardanus derideth these and such like fables ; and setteth downe his judgment therein accordingly, in the

⁶ Booke XII. chap. xvii. p. 187.

⁷ I suppose it should be *olive* ; but I do not venture to alter the text on conjecture, in such occult matters.

sixteenth booke *de rerum rar.* These conjurors and coseners forsooth will shew you in a glasse the theefe that hath stolne any thing from you and this is their order. They take a glasse-viall full of holy water, and set it upon a linen cloth, which hath been purified, not only by washing, but by sacrifice, &c. On the mouth of the viall . . . two olive-leaves must be laid acrosse, with a little conjuration said over it, by a child ; to wit thus : *Angele bone, angele candide, per tuam sanctitatem, meamq; virginitatem ostende mihi furem,*" &c.

It is right to add that according to Reginald Scot's account, Cardan, after examining into the matter, affirmed that it was "plain knavery and cosenage⁸."

I have already had occasion to speak of Dr. Dee, whom I believe to have been the simple, fanatical, dupe of an atrocious villain, who alternately bullied, and cheated, and threatened to leave him. On one of these occasions, when they were in Bohemia, Kelly intimated his intention of going away, and stated that he was to be succeeded in the office of seer by Arthur Dee, the son of the philosopher. The father's account of the way in which the child was prepared for, and inducted into, the office, is so singular, and so illus-

⁸ Scot *ubi sup.* Some farther particulars may be found in Delrio, Tom. II. p. 127, and Wier. Lib. iv. p. 505.

trative, not only of his character, but of some other points which we have had occasion to notice, that I am induced to give it in his own words. They are his memoranda respecting the transaction, set down in the following terms ;—

Note. Upon this former part of the Third Action General where my first begotten Son (namely Arthur) was assigned to the ministry of seeing and hearing, in place and stead of E. K. if he would utterly refuse the same office (hitherto by him executed, and by him to be executed, until the seven actions general finished). And that the same Childe and Son, in the mean space (that is to say, between the day of the part of Action received, and the end of the same : determined to be fourteen days after) should be exercised before God. I thereupon thinking that E. K. would, should, or best could instruct and direct the childe in that exercise did always await that E. K. would of himself call the boy to that exercise with him ; and so much the rather, because he said, that he was very glad now that he should have a witness of the things shewed and declared by spiritual Creatures : And that he would be more willing to do what should be so enjoined to him to do, then if onely he himself did see, and that for divers causes. But when E. K. said to me, that I should exercise the childe and not he, and that he would not, I thereupon appointed with myself to bring the childe to the place, and to offer him, and present him to the service of Seeing and Skrying from God, and by God's assignment, and of the time of fourteen days yet remaining, being the 15, 16, 17 days of April, and next before the 18 day, (the day assigned

to end the action in) to have the childe exercised in them. And thereupon contrived for the childe this order of prayer ensuing.

Die Mercurii summo mane die Aprilis 15. anno 1587. Trebonæ

In the name of God the Father, of God the Son, and of God the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

Glory be to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. *Amen.*

O Almighty and Everlasting, the true and living God, have mercy, pity and compassion on my father John Dee, and on me Arthur Dee; who being now called hither by thy assignment, am now here present and ready in all humility, obedience and faithfulness, to serve thy Divine Majesty with all the gifts and graces which thou hast hitherto endued me with; and with all other which of thy most bountiful and fatherly mercy thou wilt henceforward bestow upon me. Lighten (therefore), O Almighty God mine eyes, and open thou mine ears; Quicken, Instruct and Confirm in me, and unto me my discretion, judgement, understanding, memory, and utterance, that I may be a true and perfect Seer, Hearer, Declarer, and Witness of such things which either immediately of thy Divine Majesty, or mediately by the ministry of thy holy, mighty and faithful Angels shall be manifested, declared or shewed unto me, now, and at all times and occasions, for the advancing of thy praise, honour and glory. Amen.

Hereupon Wednesday morning, (the 15 of this April) I brought the Childe to the holy table, being in order of the furniture thereto belonging, and set before him the stone in the

frame, (my first sanctified stone) and caused him on his knees, to say the foresaid prayer. And I also praid to the child's hearing, other prayers to God for the purpose in hand &c.

I am very unwilling, and, as I have already said, I see no reason, to believe that this most unhappy man was an impostor, or deceived any body else so much, or so injuriously, as himself.

Camerarius in his preface to Plutarch's Treatise “*De defectu Oraculorum*” relates a matter which occurred to a friend of his own, from whom he received the account; and on his authority⁹ he relates it. A friend of his, a member of one of the best families in Nuremberg, a person of honour and gravity, called on him one day and shewed him a spherical crystal wrapped in a piece of silk. He stated that it had been given to him many years before by a stranger into whose company he had accidentally fallen, and who after having been his guest for a few days gave him the crystal at parting in acknowledgment of his kindness and hospitality. He likewise taught him how to use it; directing him whenever he wanted to obtain informa-

⁹ That is, “*ex narratione optimi, pietateque et prudentia præstantis viri, Lassari Spengleri Norici.*”

tion by means of it, to take it out and set a male child (*puerum marem castum*) to look into it, assuring him that the boy would see in it, what would furnish the information required. He added that having followed these directions, he had never been misled, and had learned wonderful things from the boy, at times when others looking at the crystal could see nothing but its natural appearance. The matter, however, seems to have got wind, and to have been talked about; and, at length, he came to Spengler, and told him that he had been much troubled in his mind about the crystal—that he was persuaded that he had been guilty of a great sin in using it—and that he did not mean to use it any more. He placed it therefore in Spengler's hands desiring him to do what he pleased with it; and Spengler, who had a great hatred of superstition, broke it into little bits and threw them away¹⁰.

Aubrey tells us, “the magicians now use a crystal sphere, or mineral pearl, as No. 3. [that is, in a plate at the beginning of the volume, which contains a representation of the

¹⁰ Jaquerii Flagellum Hæreticorum Fascinariorum. Franc. 1581. p. 323.

instrument] for this purpose, which is inspected by a boy, or sometimes by the querent himself. There are certain Formulas of Prayer to be used, before they make the inspection, which they term a Call. In a manuscript of Dr. Forman of Lambeth (which Mr. Elias Ashmole had) is a discourse of this, and the prayer. Also there is the call which Dr. Napier did use."

This "Call" composed of prayers will remind those who recollect the form of invocation given by Lane, as a translation of the call by which the Egyptian magician summoned "'Tur'shoon,' and 'Turyoo'shoon,' which he said were the names of two genii, his 'familiar spirits.'"

"Tur'shoon ! Turyoo'shoon ! Come down!
Come down ! Be present ! Whither are gone
the prince and his troops ? Where are El-Ahh'mar
the prince and his troops ? Be present,
ye servants of these names ! And this is the removal.
And we have removed from thee
thy veil ; and thy sight to-day
is piercing. Correct, correct^{1.}."

On the next page to that already quoted, and referring to the same copperplate, Aubrey

¹ Q. R. p. 197, citing Lane, vol. 1. p. 349.

says “A clothiers widow of Pembridge in Herefordshire, desired, Dr. Sherburn (one of the Canons of the church of Hereford, and Rector of Pembridge, to look over her husband’s writings after his decease. Among other things he found a Call for a crystal. The Clothier had his clothes oftentimes stolen from his Racks; and at last obtained this trick to discover the thieves. So when he lost his clothes, he went out about midnight with his Crystall and Call, and a little boy, or little maid with him (for they say it must be a pure virgin) to look in the crystal, to see the likeness of the person that committed the theft. The Doctor did burn the Call, 1671². ”

In all these cases the children used the crystal or some equivalent; and it appears from the statement of Dr. Gregory that their powers in this way are still exercised. In his “Letters to a Candid Inquirer on Animal Magnetism,” published in the year 1851 he says “The high odylic virtue of rock crystal seems to have been known to the adepts of the middle ages; and crystals were cut into a round or oval shape that they might act as mirrors.

² Aubrey Miscellanies, p. 165, 167.

Several of such crystals, said to be magic ones, exist in this country. It is now pretty generally known that one of these, said, on what authority I do not know, to have belonged to the magicians Dee and Kelly, who certainly had one, came into the possession of a noble lady, distinguished in the literary world who has died since that time. She was told it was a magic crystal, but could not discover any of its powers. At the sale of her effects it was purchased by a gentleman who knew its history. One day on entering the room he found a group of children round it, who declared that the crystal was alive; and it appeared that they saw in it the images of absent persons, it is said, even of such as they had never seen, and of some that were dead. I cannot vouch for the details of this story, however, and I shall only say that I am not prepared to reject the statements made concerning the crystal, although they may have been distorted and exaggerated³.” He afterwards says “I have been informed of two other magic crystals both of which are said in the same way to act on children”

³ P. 312.

. . . . “I have been informed,” he adds, “on good authority, that round or oval masses of glass are made in England, and sold at a high price to the ignorant, for the purposes of divination. The persons who sell them perform a certain process which they say is necessary to their virtue.”

In the second part of his work the Professor gives an account of experiments which he performed by means of three boys; and adds “Earl Stanhope informs me that he has made experiments with three crystals, in one or other of which visions have been seen by fifteen children of both sexes and of different ages, and by seven adult females one of them upwards of sixty years of age⁴. ” But the most important thing in regard to our enquiry is the Professor’s testimony that “most of the seers are children, often very young and ignorant⁵. ”

Spartianus tells us that the Emperor Didius Julianus, at the close of the second century, was much addicted to the practice of magic; and particularly specifies that he employed the services of children, for the purpose of

⁴ P. 368, 370.

⁵ P. 374.

divination. He adopted, says the historian the method called “ad speculum;” which he proceeds to describe (not very intelligibly I think) as consisting in the inspection of mirrors by children who were blindfolded. It is not very material to decide how, or what, the children did ; the point for our consideration being, that whatever it might be that was done, they did it⁶. If there be any uncertainty about the method of performance, this notice of the fact may be in its right place, as forming a link between the two classes of children—those acting by inspection in a wakeful, and apparently normal state, and those who were entranced, and delivered their

⁶ There is a rather curious variation in the text as I find it in different places. “ Fuit præterea in Juliano hæc amentia, ut per magos pleraque faceret quibus putaret vel odium populi deliniri vel militum arma compesci. Nam et quasdam non convenientes Romanis sacris hostias immolaverunt, et carmina profana incantaverunt, et ea quæ ad speculum dicunt fieri, in quo pueri præligatis oculis incantato vertice respicere dicuntur, Julianus fecit. Tuncque puer vidisse dicitur et adventum Severi et Juliani discessionem.” *Hist. Aug. Grut.* Julianus § VII. p. 293. Thus also it is quoted by Delrio. Lib. IV.C. ii. Q. vi. § 4. p. 223. But Du Cange (in v. *Specularii*) reads “in quo pueri præligatis oculis *incantando* vertice respicere dicuntur.” It seems as if this various reading might be worth the notice of mesmerists ; but I do not undertake to give any opinion on it.

oracles in a state of apparent sleep and without consciousness, or recollection.

This latter class are mentioned by Tertullian, from whose *Apology* I will extract rather more than our present purpose requires, because, we may have occasion to refer to it hereafter.

"Moreover, if magicians also produce apparitions and disgrace the souls of the departed ; if they entrance children to make them utter oracles ; if, by means of juggling tricks, they play off a multitude of miracles ; if they even send dreams to men, having, to assist them, the power of angels and daemons, when once invoked, (through whom both goats and tables have been accustomed to prophesy;) how much the rather would that power study with all its might to work of its own will, and for its own business, that service which it rendereth to the business making of another." *Dodgson's Tran. Lib. of the Fathers*, p. 56⁷.

Apuleius, in defending himself against the charge of magic says that his enemies, having made themselves ridiculous by one of their

⁷ Porro si et magi phantasmata edunt, et jam defunctorum infamant animas, si pueros in eloquium oraculi elidunt, si multa miracula circulatoriis præstigiis ludunt, si et somnia immittunt, habentes semel invitatorum angelorum et dæmonum assistentem sibi potestatem, per quos et capræ, et mensæ divinare consueverunt ; quanto magis ea potestas de suo arbitrio, et pro suo negotio studeat totis viribus operari, quod alienæ præstat negotiationi ? *Apologeticus*. c. xxiii.

accusations, thought it expedient to take up something of a more common-place and credible nature; and so, in conformity with the popular notion they framed a tale of a boy secretly enchanted and thrown into a trance⁸. Such wonderful things relating to children, were not he says merely matters of common and popular belief; but he had read in the works of the learned and erudite Varro among other things of a like nature, that when the Trallians set to work to learn, by magic, what would be the issue of the Mithridatic war, a boy contemplating an image of Mercury in water sang forth a prediction of what should occur, in one hundred and sixty verses. Also, that Fabius when he had lost 500 denarii consulted Nigidius, and regained a part, and got information about the rest, by means of boys who were enchanted—"pueros carmine instructos." "These and many other such

⁸ "Ad præscriptum opinionis et famæ confinxere puerum quempiam carmine cantatum remotis arbitris, secreto loco, arula et lucerna : et paucis consciis testibus, ubi incantatus sit, corruisse ; postea nescientem sui excitatum. Nec ultra isti quidem progredi mendacio ausi. Enim fabula ut impletetur, addendum etiam illud fuit, puerum eumdem multa præsagio prædixisse : quippe hoc emolumentum canticis accipimus, præsagium et divinationem."

things" says the philosopher "I read, to be sure, respecting magical children (*de magicis pueris*) but I hesitate whether to pronounce them possible or impossible;" and he goes on to speculate whether the human mind, especially in the simplicity of childhood (*præsertim puerilem et simplicem*) may not, by charms and odours, be so rendered insensible to present things, and brought into its divine, and really natural, state, as to account for its obtaining some degree of prescience. But dropping the philosopher, and resuming the advocate, Apuleius says that whether the thing itself be true or false, according to all that he has ever heard, the foresighted boy employed in such matters (*ille nescio qui puer providus*) should be well-favoured and intelligent, and so a fit receptacle for the divine power. "If so" he says to his accusers "name the boy answering these conditions (*nominate quis ille fuerit puer, sanus, incolumis, ingeniosus, decorus*) whom I have taken the trouble to enchant. As to Thallus, whom you have named, he wants a doctor more than a conjuror. He is a miserable creature; such a martyr to epilepsy that frequently he will tumble down three or four times a day

without any enchantment." And after giving a list of the poor lad's ailments and infirmities he adds "The greatest of all conjurors would he be, who could keep Thallus on his legs for any considerable time together, in spite of disease and sleep."—"A nice boy" he afterwards says "you have chosen, for one to join with in a sacrifice, to handle his head, to deck in pure raiment, to expect an answer from. I only wish he were here. I would turn him over to you *Æ*Emilian, and hold him, if you would question him. Here in this place, in the middle of the examination, he would turn up his fierce eyes at you, sputter over your face with his foam, contract his hands, shake his head, and at length bounce into your lap⁹." The whole story is worthy the attention of modern mesmerists.

Enough has, however, been said to shew that children have been very commonly employed, and have acted a very important part, in the performance of magical rites; and it will perhaps be admitted that these little oracles, in the hands of those who knew how to make use of them, might exercise

⁹ De Mag. c. xliv.

a considerable power over the state, and by an appeal to the passions and feelings of the people, or the hopes, fears and interests of individuals, might control the government. But we may well imagine the possibility of something more than this. Modern history furnishes a case which is very curious with reference to our enquiry generally, and particularly calculated to illustrate this part of it—a case in which the actions and lives of thousands were, humanly speaking, placed at the disposal of their little children—a case in which we might very truly say, of men as savage and ferocious as ever wielded the sword, or (in their hands more terrible) the scythe, that babes ruled over them.

Flechier, the celebrated Bishop of Nismes has left us an account of the “prophetic movements” which took place, during his time, in the south of France. He states that what was considered the prophetic gift was brought from Geneva, by an inhabitant of Dauphiny, shortly before the beginning of the year 1689. Beside imparting this gift to his family which was numerous, he got together many young boys and girls, whom he afterwards

sent to various places under the names of Prophets and Prophetesses, to preach in their sleep against the mass and the priests. In fact, he seems to have learned, and practised the art of mesmerism; and the Bishop goes on to say, that he taught them a kind of ecstatic sleep, drilled them as to their gestures, and furnished them with commonplaces of evangelical doctrine, and of invective against the church of Rome.

One is sorry to say so, but it seems to have been from the patronage of a Lady of rank that the matter grew into importance. Of “*La Dame du Bays veuve d'un Conseiller au Parlement de Grenoble*,” I know nothing but that, according to the bishop’s statement, she had a taste for such “*controverse pathétique*;” and took upon herself the task of forming and bringing forward the preachers. It was then resolved that missionaries should be sent out to the provinces, and first to the Vivarais. Accordingly Gabriel Astier, a labourer of Cliou in Dauphiny, not far from Bays went to Bressac, “*s’établir Prophète*,” about the middle of January 1689. One of his first cares seems to have been to organize a company of infant prophets, and the num-

ber of his followers rapidly increased. Almost immediately we find prophetesses in the forefront of the business. It is not however to our purpose to trace all their proceedings—that is all such as the Bishop knew of, or thought fit to record—but there is one case which it is worth while to notice, because it so closely resembles that of the false prophetesses of Israel beguiling the people with political predictions. At a great gathering held at Plots, after others had informed the audience that, in a few days, Poussin would be destroyed, and instead of houses and churches between that place and Privas, there would be only a great lake—after this, I say, a new prophetess, who had had her eyes bandaged, by way of outdoing the others, announced as a communication from the Holy Spirit, that an angel had been already dispatched from heaven, to take the Prince of Orange, and bring him into France by the hair of his head, with an army of an hundred thousand men. The bishop adds that this news was very agreeable to the company, and the young prophetess got great reputation.

But as to children—after his account of what went on in the Vivarais the Bishop pro-

ceeds to give a “ Memoire de ce qui s'est passé à Geneve touchants les petits prophetes du Dauphiné et du Vivarais¹. ” This Memoir states that for some months the prophesying in Dauphiny had made a noise at Geneva and the neighbourhood. It was reported that the Spirit had been poured out on all flesh ; that, above all, children prophesied ; that people flocked to hear them, and that they edified every body by the surprising discourses which they delivered in both a waking, and a sleeping, state. People viewed the matter according to their previous opinions and prepossessions ; but the greater number thought that there was something supernatural and divine.

One of the most celebrated Professors, however, employed several sermons in proving that the children could not be divinely inspired, and that they were in fact inspired by the Devil ; and that their malady, if not a possession, was at least an obsession. Great was the impatience of people to know the truth, and great the excitement which prevailed when they learned that one of the

¹ Ibid. p. 425.

gifted children had arrived in the city. They insisted on his performing that very evening; and they had what would now be called a Mesmeric seance, the account of which is so curious that I must give it in the Bishop's own words which the reader will find in a note². It is enough to say here that the child seems to have exhibited the phænomena of sleep-waking now so common, and to have gone through much the same ordeal as he might have been subjected to twenty years ago in London. Happily for the poor child—who confessed that he was an impostor, and would probably have confessed any thing—the public attention was drawn from him by the arrival of two other prophets, one of them thirty years old, and the other only ten. “On abandonna le premier pour courir aux autres,” and “enfin ils avouerent tous trois leur imposture.” Some would have had them more severely punished; but, on the whole, it seemed as if it might be enough to conduct them out of the city, to forbid their re-entering it, and to assure them that if, after this warning, they repeated their performances in Switzerland, they would be hanged.

² See Note I.

Such says the Bishop was the fate of these fanatics. It had been thought, and there was perhaps good ground for thinking, that they owed their origin and maintenance to Geneva and received their instructions from thence; but their performances were too gross. The authorities, under the eyes of others more enlightened, could not sanction them—“on sacrificia donc ces misérables quand on vit qu'on ne pouvoit les couronner.”

But the “miserables,” though driven out of Switzerland, were not made a full end of; and I only mention their history as an introduction to that of those who, remaining in the Vivarais, and recovering, among the mountainous fastnesses of the Cevennes, from the dragooning of M. le Comte de Broglie, were becoming more numerous and important; and certainly not more fond of the church of Rome. Passing over three and twenty years, we find these “miserables” in a state of open war with their king. A fierce and sanguinary contest continued for several years with regard to which we have only one fact to notice—that the children acted a very important part in it.

After the insurgents had been put down,

some of those who had been active in the war came over to England where they were known as “the French Prophets.” A considerable number of them made “declarations,” which were afterwards published by John Lacy Esq., a gentleman, I believe of fortune, and unimpeached moral character, who fully credited and believed that he shared in their inspiration³. In the preface to his work which he entitled “A Cry from the Desart or Testimonials of the marvellous things lately come to pass in the Cevennes, verified upon oath, and by other proofs. . . . With a Preface by John Lacy Esq.⁴” he says that it is wonderful that persons of so little education, and but newly inspired, should have been able to do what these persons did; and he adds, “whatever weight there is in this observation the same is doubled from the consideration that it should arise first among the *children*, wemen and meanest youth of a country, uninstructed in, and ignorant of the Scriptures⁵. ” This Preface is followed by an “Advertisement to the Reader,” which begins “The Matter herein contained, is the

³ A few particulars respecting him will be found in Note K.

⁴ 21 Edn. Lond. 1707. 8vo.

⁵ P. xvi.

diffusion of a Variety of Admirable Gifts and Graces upon a multitude of *children* in Age and Understanding in the Southern parts of France," &c. But it will be more to our purpose to give a few extracts from the "declarations" which I have mentioned. Whatever opinion we may have of those who made the statements, they are in themselves very curious, and in many points illustrative of our subject.

"John Vernet of Bois-Chastel in the Vivarez, declared at London on the 14th of January 1706, as followeth. I left Montpellier about the month of May 1702; the persons I saw first under inspiration, were my own mother, my brother, my two sisters, and a cousin-germain; it is at least thirteen years agone, that my mother received her Gifts, and she continued to have them from that time, to my leaving Montpellier; and I understand by several persons, who have seen her not long since, that she is still in the same condition, she having been in prison now eleven years, on the said account; my sisters received the Gift soon after her, one at the age of eleven, the other nineteen, who are both dead, since my departure thence; the most agitation of body my mother had, was of the breast, which made her have great gulplings of the throat, she spoke at the times of inspiration only French, which surprised me exceedingly, because she never before attempted to speak a word in that language, nor has since to my knowledge, and I am certain she could not do it; the same thing I can say of my sisters. . . . About a year before

my leaving the country, in cherry-time, Antony Coste and Lovis Taiton my acquaintance went with me, to see a friend of ours, one Jaquet, near Vernoux ; as we were drinking together at his house, a girl of the house came to call her mother, who was with us, saying, ‘Come, mother, and see the child ;’ soon after the mother coming back to the door of our room, called to us to come, and see the babe that spoke, bidding us not be frightened, for that miracle had happened before ; we ran all immediately ; the child was thirteen or fourteen months old, and cover’d then in the cradle, which had never of itself spoken a word, nor could it go alone ; when my friends and I came in, where it was, the child spoke distinctly in French, with a voice small like a child, but loud enough to be well heard, all over the room ; it exhorted (like others in that condition) to the works of repentance ; but I gave so little attention then, that I am not able to recollect particularly anything ; the room where the child was, had about twenty persons present in it, who most of them round the cradle, were weeping and praying ; when the extasie ceased, the child was taken out of the cradle, the mother said, he had preceding motions of body, but I perceived none, and ’twas not easie to see them, because the cradle-cloaths were over it ; I heard much talk of a sucking child at Clieu in Dauphine, who used to preach by inspiration.” p. 13.

“ Mr. Boyer in his book, entituled, *The Lawfulness, glory and advantage of giving immediate and effectual relief to the Protestants in the Cevennes, printed anno 1703,* says.—When by these unwarrantable methods the Papists thought to have got an entire victory over the resolution of the Protestants, Providence did miserably baffle their hopes, by the ministry of those very children, whom they had taken so much care to instruct in their erroneous tenets, and who,

like so many prophets, rouz'd their parents out of their spiritual lethargy. These new and unlook'd-for preachers did not a little surprise the papists, who, to prevent the effects of their exhortations, endeavoured to insinuate that they were taught by some impostors, and caused some of them to be severely whipt, and others to have the soles of their feet burnt, to make them confess the authors of what they spoke. All this having not been able to extort anything from these young prophets, and their number being in a little time increased (in the Cevennes and the Lower Languedoc) to near eight thousand, Monsieur de Basville, the Intendant of the Province, order'd the College of Physicians of Montpelier to meet at Usez and examine these children. Pursuant to the order, the physicians observed their behaviour, trances, and extempore speeches ; but though they were surpriz'd to hear young and illiterate persons utter things which they had never been taught, and quote the Scripture very pertinently, yet being over-aw'd by the Intendant, they gave them the name of Fanatics." p. 18.

" Peter Chaman, native of the city of Usez, declar'd, he saw several children inspired at Nismes and at Usez, and in divers assemblies elsewhere, met to hear them, particularly at the house of one Gaydan at Usez, a child of five years old, who in his presence fell into an extasie, at several distinct times, with agitations of the head and body, after a relaxation whereof, he began to speak, but with some interruptions, as the force of those agitations permitted him ; the said child, did at those times always speak French." &c. p. 19.

James Brisson declared " Before my leaving the Cevennes, I saw, and heard at several times, a great number of inspired persons of every age and sex, I cannot but think I have seen at several times near 400 ; many of the inspired

being of my neighbourhood and acquaintance, I frequently heard and saw several not exceeding 7 or 8 years old ; my own sister aged 15 had the Gift, sometimes twice in a day a child of 3 years old I saw taken with the bodily signs, and heard him 4 or 5 different times, exhort urgently to repentance with a clear distinct voice and good French, which he could not speak out of the extasie my sister when the gift came upon her, did usually fall first into a swoon." p. 23.

James Mazell says, "The youngest people I saw inspired were, Peter Mazel my nephew about 9 years of age, two children of Lewis Croste both between 7 and 9, and one of 13 named Dormes." p. 25.

James du Bois says "I left Montpelier and that Country, and got to Geneva in May 1705. From the year 1701 I saw persons inspired, in divers parts of the country, in all at least 200 at various times and places, of every age and sex ; I saw among others, a boy of fifteen months of age at Quisac, taken in the arms of his mother, with great agitations of body all over, especially of the breast, he spoke with gulps of the throat, in good French, distinctly, with an audible voice, though with interruptions, for which reason it was needful to listen, in order to hear some words I am very sure, I have seen sixty other children between three and twelve years of age, in the same condition ; the discourses of all which, tended constantly to press, with ardor, an amendment of life, and foretold also several things at a friend's house, a boy who fled to shelter himself in that house, being at the age of six, fell into motions of the head and breast, spoke aloud in good French, many arguments to repentance, with some predictions, and said among other things, that one part of Babylon the great, would be destroyed in the year 1708. Another boy of

eight years old, I heard in his inspiration at Montpellier prophesy, touching the re-establishment of the reformed religion in France." p. 31.

William Brugnier of Aubissargues near Uzes, declared, "in the village of Aubissargues, I saw three or four small children, between three and six years of age, in particular that of James Bousiege aged about three, who was taken with the spirit, and being flung to the ground, struck his breast with the hands with all his might he said, that we were in the last times, that we ought to fight bravely the fight of faith another of these little infants was Susan Jonequet, between four and five years old, who in my presence fell into the extasie, being also struck to the ground ; she had near the same motions of body as the other ; she spake louder, in good French, as she could not, out of that fit ; she said, the church's delivery would soon be a girl of six, named Mary Suel, I saw at Teroux in her transport, who after half a quarter of an hour's convulsions, of the body and breast, began to speak she said . . . that Babylon would be destroyed very shortly." p. 34.

David Flotard of Vigan, after a long account, says "besides the above mentioned, I saw a great number of other infants, and people of every age and sex, under inspiration ; some who set themselves to calculate the number of those persons, computed 8 thousand at the least in Languedoc ; it was chiefly at the assemblies for worship, that they appeared numerous ; I saw them in troops carried to Gaol, in many places the prisons were in a little time so thronged, with these poor creatures, especially children, they knew not what to do with them." p. 76.

I have perhaps given more than sufficient

evidence on this point. I do not enquire—it matters not for our purpose—how much, or by whom, these children were tutored. I only call attention to the fact that they “bare rule.” They not only exhorted sinners to repentance, but they uttered prophecies, and gave the word of command to an army of most fierce soldiers.

Taking into consideration the things contained in this, and in the preceding section, I submit that we are more likely to be right if we take the words of the Prophet Isaiah in their plain, obvious, sense, than in the use of evasions not sanctioned either by grammar or history.

PART V.

Healing—Oracles.

IF I have not been altogether wrong in supposing that the temptation to false worship lay in man's desire to obtain health and knowledge—and in the view which I have suggested of the therapeutic and oracular relations of superstition—it must be obvious that each of the two words placed at the head of this section comprehends a great subject, the discussion of which would require, on the part of both reader and writer, much learning, labour and patience. I need not say that I do not think of attempting such a thing; and if I did, I should not set about it in an

essay which is already twice as long as I expected it to be. Notwithstanding this, however, I hope the reader will bear with a few desultory remarks and extracts which I wish to offer on both points; and first of Healing —though perhaps it will appear that they cannot be altogether separated.

It is related of King Asa that, “in his disease he sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians.”⁶ The importance of that passage with reference to the subject before us, will appear if we translate (or rather leave untranslated) thus—“he sought not to *Jehovah*, but to the *Rephaim*.⁷”

I have already assumed the connexion or identity, of the Rephaim, with the Sons of God or Giants; and I do not know that I can better introduce what I wish to say farther on the subject than by one or two extracts from a Sermon of Mede on Prov. xxi. 16. His text according to our translation is, “The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead”—literally the *Rephaim* for the original is בְּקָהַל רִפְאֵי־ם, which the LXX render

⁶ II. Chron. xvi. 12.

ἐν συναγωγῇ γιγάντων. The Vulgate has, *in cætu gigantum.*

“ Which word [Rephaim] properly signifies *Giants*, and to that sense is always rendered by the Seventy γίγαντες, γηγενεῖς, τιτᾶνες, or ἀσεβεῖς, though we and the later interpreters, both in this and some other places, take it for *manes* or *mortui*, the souls of the deceased : but the ancient, I think, deserve the more credit, especially it being confessed that the word elsewhere so signifies. *In cætu Gigantum* therefore, that is, of those Giants and Rebels against God of whom we read Gen. VI. those mighty men and men of renown of the old world, whose wickedness was so great in the earth, that it repented and grieved God he had made man ; and to take vengeance upon whom he brought the general deluge upon the earth, and destroyed both man and beast from the face thereof.”

He afterwards produces two other passages from the book of Proverbs, which are highly deserving of attention ;—

“ First chap. ii. 18 where we reade according to the Vulgar, *Domus mulieris alienæ inclinata est ad mortem, et ad inferos semitæ ipsius.* ‘The House of the strange woman inclineth unto death, and her paths unto hell.’ Here for *ad inferos*, unto Hell, the Hebrew hath רְפָאִים, ‘to the Giants ;’ and the Seventy render it with an exegesis ἔθετο παρὰ τῷ ἄδη μετὰ τῶν γηγενῶν τοὺς ἄξονας αὐτῆς She hath put, or set, her paths in Hades, or Hell, with the Giants. Again chap. ix. 17, 18. *Aquæ furtivæ dulciores sunt, et panis absconditus suavior:* Et ignoravit quod ibi sint

Gigantes, et in profundis Inferni convitæ ejus: Stollen waters are sweeter, and hidden bread is more pleasant: but he knoweth not (namely, he that goes in to a strange woman) that the Giants are there, and that her guests are in the depths of Hell. Here in some editions of the Vulgar are added these words, *Qui enim applicabitur illi, descendet ad inferos; et qui abscesserit ab illa, salvabitur:* For he that is joined to her, shall go down to Hell; but he that departs from her, shall be saved. An argument how this place hath been understood; for the meaning of both these places seems to be no other, but, that the strange woman will bring them who frequent her to Hell, to keep the apostate Giants company."

"There is another place in the Hagiographa where these Rephaim are mentioned, to wit, Job xxvi. 5, 6. which, though of a more ambiguous sense and scope, yet as it is translated by the Vulgar Latine (and well enough to agree with the Hebrew) seems to be no other than a description of Hell, with the former. *Gigantes, saith he, gemunt sub aquis, et qui habitant cum eis: nudus est Infernus coram illo, (id est, Deo) et nullum est operimentum perditioni.* The meaning hereof seems to be this; The Place where the old Giants mourn or wail under the waters, and their fellow inhabitants, the rest of the damned with them, even *Infernus*, and the place of perdition itself, is naked and open to the eyes of God, from whom nothing is hid. Which is agreeable to that, Prov. xv. 11. 'Hell and destruction are before the Lord: how much more then the hearts of the children of men?' In this place the Jews take the word *Abaddon*, which we render 'Destruction,' for Gehenna; that is, elliptically, for Beth Abaddon, the House of Destruction. And why then should not the same word be so taken in that place of Job; and *Nullum est operimentum perditioni,*

'There is no covering for Destruction,' be as much as, *Nullum est operimentum loco perditionis*, or *Gehennæ*, 'There is no covering for the House or place of Destruction, or for Hell ?'

"Compare with these places in the Hagiographa two in the Prophets : One in the 14. of Esay v. 9, 10. where by way of a poetical or prophetical hypotyposis of the destruction or fall of Babylon, the King thereof is brought in coming to the Rephaims or Giants in the other world. 'Hell (saith the text) from beneath is moved for thee, to meet thee at thy coming : it stirreth up the Rephaims for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth. And they shall say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we ? art thou become like unto us ?'

"The other is in the 32. of Ezekiel, concerning the fall of Egypt, where their slain are bestowed in like manner in the nethermost parts of the earth, with the *Gibborim*; which signifies not only *mighty men*, but *Giants*, and so is rendered in this place by the Seventy." *Works*. Book I. Disc. vii. p. 32.

"And thus much," adds Mede "from comparison of places of Scripture." He believed, and I think justly, that he had brought together sufficient scriptural authority for the maintenance of his opinion that the Rephaim were the antediluvian Giants.

But while this appears to be true, and well established, it is equally clear that the word נְדָר as a verb means to heal and *Rephaim* as a noun means, those who healed. Taylor

whose humiliating self-stultification in search of roots, and connexions and meanings is worthy of notice, because he was not ignorant of what others had said, and always spoke with the collected examples of use before him, having given the instances for the first of three senses as “*Curare, sanare,*” and coming to the next, says “II. *Gigas.* A Giant. How this sense should come under this root I cannot tell; unless these Giants were called רְפָאִים from their hale, robust, vigorous constitutions”—that is (one would suppose) because of all people they least needed curing themselves, and were more likely to be found killing than curing others. It seems to me as difficult to believe this, as to suppose that men who were distinguished by gigantic descent and proportions, might have, or pretend to have, curious arts and traditional secrets by means of which they could inflict or remove disease.

But at all events we cannot get rid of the plain use of the word. We began this section with a reference to the sin of Asa in consulting the Rephaim; and we find the same word translated “physician” in Jerem. viii. 22 “Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no *physician*

there." In Genes. l. 2. twice of the *physicians* who embalmed Jacob and in Job xiii. 4 "physicians of no value" are mentioned; while the use of the verb, as signifying "to heal" is so common as scarcely to require references. The prayer of Moses for Miriam (Num. xii. 13) and the case of Hezekiah (II. Kings xx. 5, 8) are sufficient examples.

The therapeutics of False Worship do indeed form a very wide and curious subject. I have described them as comprehending all the ramifications of false practice in medicine, quackery, poisoning, and the use of charms and incantations for the production or remedy of disease⁷. I might, perhaps, have gone farther; but this is suggesting, and specifying, much more than I am qualified to discuss; and what has been largely and recently discussed by others.

There is however one point on which I would say a few words, because they seem to be called for by present times and circumstances, and to relate to a fact which is not, I think, sufficiently observed, and appre-

⁷ See before, p. 114.

ciated by reflecting men. I mean the connexion between the therapeutics of false worship and divination—or in other words, the pretensions of those by whom, or on whom they were practised, to the possession, and use of that prophetic gift which, as I stated at the outset, seems to me to form the link of union between the visible and invisible world.

Mesmerism as originally practised by Mesmer was, I believe, confined to the cure of disease; but it very soon assumed a form of medical divination. When this began I do not know. Probably those who are more perfectly instructed in the history of the matter, may be acquainted with prior cases, but I know of none earlier than one which I will briefly mention, as being instructive in many points of view, though selected merely as being the oldest story that I know. In 1787 Dr. Metzger of Strasburgh published a latin Programme on Magnetic Somnambulism for the use of his pupils. It was translated into french by M. Robert, who says “on peut le considérer comme une sanglante, mais juste satire contre mesmérisme en général, et le somnambulisme artificiel en particulier.”

In the course of this Programme⁸ Dr. Metzger states that by advice of Lavater—homme d'ailleurs aussi probe que respectable—Wienholz and Olbers, in the presence of Bickers (all three being physicians) had magnetised “deux jeunes filles hysteriques” whose “bonnes mœurs” are vouched for. The young women exhibited many of the phænomena of Mesmerism, “mais le principal de l'affaire est cet état extatique, accompagné *d'un vertu divinatoire* que ces jeunes filles semblaient s'être acquise et qui était si surprenante, que de l'aveu de l'auteur, [that is Dr. Bicker who had published an account of the matter in two letters “adressées au célèbre Baldinger⁹”] elle ne pouvait guère cadrer avec les notions communes de la psychologie.”

Here is the matter plainly stated, and the claim plainly asserted, by men who were considered eminent and leading members of their profession. Seventy years at least, have passed since their experiments were made; and what did not, perhaps, then begin, has been going on ever

⁸ Pref. p. xii.

⁹ Metzger refers “Voy. Hamburgisches Magazin, et Baldingers med. journal” &c. Robert p. 268.

since. It is worth while just to see how their testimony was met by M. Robert. This philosopher, who had perhaps partaken of the illumination which had somewhat changed the face of philosophy between 1787, when Metzger published, and 1824 when he was publishing himself, thinks it unsafe to let this statement pass without a note; and accordingly he gives one beginning “Pour rendre raison de ces phénomènes, il eut donc fallu selon l'auteur, recourir à la doctrine ténébreuse du spiritualisme”—but then without venturing to look at the ghost which he has raised, he goes off at once to the safer course of charging falsehood and says “Les magnétiseurs séduits par quelques symptômes particulier au somnambulisme, ont toujours plus ou moins exagéré les faits dont ils étaient témoins. [toujours—all of them more or less false witnesses—that is the shortest way—but he is aware that there is a sort of collateral security in candour, so he goes on] “Les hypnobates, il est vrai, sont susceptibles d'un degré d'exaltation d'autant plus considérable qu'ils affectent une condition extatique, et que leur imagination acquiert une grande force; mais toutes ces particu-

larités ne blessent nullement les lois de la nature." Oh no—we may take M. Robert's word for that—with what pleasing simplicity he expects us to believe *him*. It does not appear that this Medecin en chef des Hôpitaux de Langres, knew anything but what he learned from Metzger of the experiments made nearly forty years before, I believe as far off as Bremen—or of the men who made them, except the high professional character which they had borne—but they asserted what he did not believe, and he did not know what to do but to call them liars or fools. I wish nobody else had ever done the same in like circumstances.

I am sorry that Dr. Metzger has not given more light as to the alleged power of divination in these young women, which so strongly impressed Dr. Bicker. It is stated however that "Plongées dans un sommeil magnétique, ayant une intime conscience d'elles-mêmes, avec une mémoire intègre et des idées distinctes, ces filles raisonnaient avec clarté, indiquaient exactement l'issue de leur maladie, et les remèdes convenables¹." After stating some other particulars—among the rest that they "con-

¹ Rob. 270.

naisaient l'ecriture par le tact"—he adds "leur vertu divinatoire, qui chez la première malade etait fort énergique, et qui toutefois ne l'était guère moins chez la seconde, ne leur inspirait rien de certain, a l'exception de ce qui avait rapport à leur maladie."

This being the case, M. Robert seems to think that there was not much in the matter; and as I should not think it worth while to tell such stories merely for their own sakes, but do it with a view to exhibit the way in which they have been received by those who wished to be thought philosophical and scientific men, I will give the note which he appends to this passage;—"Chez ces jeunes filles, l'art divinatoire etait porté, dit-on, à un tres haut degré, et cependant elles ne prophétisaient rien de certain, à l'exception de ce qui etait relatif à leur maladie. *Præter morbum tamen suum nihil certi hariolari solebat earum virtus divinatrix quæ major erat &c.*² Mais quand on a été long-temps malade,

² This, I cannot help thinking, is much the same as if one were to say to the owner of so curious an animal, if we could imagine one to exist "I do not see much in your dog's poetical recitations, for I observe that you cannot absolutely depend on his accuracy in anything but Gray's Elegy."—His owner might reply, "Well but is not that something?"

quand on s'est trouvé entre les mains des médecins, on peut bien raisonner sur son mal sans être grand sorcier." This french Physician does not, as I have said, seem to have known anything of the case at Bremen, but what he learned from the Professor at Strasburgh's preface which he was translating into french. But instead of addressing himself to the part of the story which really seems to require explanation, he wisely remarks that patients who have been long ill may, as far as regards their own complaints, become as wise as their doctors without being great conjurors. Who doubts it? at the same time who says that these girls had been for a single day under any medical treatment whatever? Only M. Robert, as far as I can see; and certainly with no countenance from the text;—"Ainsi, les vaticinatrices ou devineresses dont il est question, étaient dans ce cas-là: elles discutaient sensément sur leur affection morbide, tandis qu'elles ne dis rien de raisonnable sur tout autre objet. Telle était cette grande puissance dont on faisait un sujet d'admiration." M. Robert may have been an honest man; but if so he affords a sad specimen of the effect of stupid prejudice.

He who has just told us that magnetisers always more or less exaggerate in their testimony respecting facts, here sets before his readers on the same page Metzger's original "*nihil certi*," his own translation "*rien de certain*," and then (still on the same page) converts this into "*rien de raisonnable*." Metzger, apparently a fair, though bitter enemy of the magnetisers adds, however, "*Bicker enfin atteste que le recouvrement de la santé fut le résultat du régime prescrit par ces somnambules elles-mêmes*." It is not worth while to quote the silliness in which M. Robert suggests the possibility that spontaneous cure might supervene to snatch the prey from the hands of these three high german doctors—for truly the girls were now, though I see no ground for saying that they had been before, "*entre les mains des medecins*"—or any other equally groundless suggestion. My object in bringing forward the case is not merely, or even principally, to shew how the matter has been dealt with by those who would have been sorry to be thought unphilosophical. I mention it as an early case of the development of what was considered by those who were best able to

form an opinion, of a power of therapeutic divination in mesmeric patients. It had, no doubt, been preceded by many others; and by how many it has been followed is notorious. I do not enter into the subject here; but for the sake of readers who might otherwise be deluded by those who affect to treat “spiritualism” as a delusion that has passed away, I will give a few extracts in a note³.

§ 18. *Oracles.*

The very mention of Oracles raises in the mind images of Temples, priests, altars, pompous worship and secret rites. We think of some few notorious cases which history has made known to us—we are told that they were the work of priestcraft—that some were obviously false, and others were seemingly more or less true—but that, no doubt, they were all imposture from beginning to end. I feel it difficult to believe this—that is to believe

³ See note L.

that the population of ages and generations were taken in by such shallow devices as are supposed to have deluded them; especially because, as I have already remarked, there seems to have been a time before mysteries began—when what we call occult sciences were not occult—and curious arts were not so veiled in secrecy as they were after they had been denounced as sins.

Cicero begins his Treatise on Divination by stating that it was an ancient opinion, derived from even the heroic age, and received with universal consent by the Romans, and all other nations, that there really was such a thing among men as what they called divination, and the Greeks called *μαντική*—that is a presentiment and foreknowledge of future events. “A grand thing truly,” he continues, “and most beneficial, if it is really so; and one raising the human nature almost to an equality with the divine.” “I know of no people either so civilized and learned, or so rude and barbarous, as not to believe that future events are foreshadowed, and that there are persons who can foresee and predict them.”

This passage is worthy of consideration on

several grounds; but much less so than what follows; for in this as in some other strange things the explanation is the most curious part of the matter—that which the reader finds it most difficult to understand—and that which the philosopher would have been wise in omitting. How did men come by this ancient and universal opinion? What put it into their heads that there was such a thing as divination? The philosopher says he will go back to the very earliest period; and he tells us that the Assyrians, living in open plains with a wide expanse of heaven above them, were in the habit of observing the motions of the heavenly bodies; and having noticed their several meanings, and significations, they framed a system of astrology. How they came to suppose that the “*trajectiones motusque stellarum*” had any thing to do with divination, Cicero does not tell us; neither does he give us any hint of the way in which men found out what the meaning and signification of the stars was, when they had discovered that there was one.

But unsatisfactory as Cicero’s method of accounting for it may be, his testimony as to the fact is worth notice, and so is his state-

ment that the art was supposed to have been practised in Egypt for ages almost innumerable—that it was carried wherever Greece was dispersed—“What colony did Greece ever send to Æolia, Ionia, Asia, Sicily, Italy, without consulting the Pythian or the Dodonæan or Hammonian Oracle? or what War did it ever enter upon without consulting the Gods?” And he afterwards goes on to say that it was not one single species of divination that was “publicly and privately carried on.” To this point by the way I would call the reader’s attention, because as I have already said, I suspect that the practice of these curious arts was more common on a small scale and in private, than we may have been apt to suppose⁴.

I am not however writing a History or a Treatise, and only purpose here to notice one point which is rendered somewhat interesting by recent circumstances.

Those who have paid any attention to the controversy relating to the Oracles of antiquity will be aware of the stress which was laid on the statements of the Psalmist, and

⁴ See before p. 117 and note E. there referred to.

the Apostle Paul, respecting idols. “David,” says Fontenelle, “reproche aux payens des dieux qui ont une bouche et n’ont point de *parole*⁵,” and St. Paul taught them that an idol was nothing in the world. It was sufficient perhaps to reply, as the Jesuit Baltus did, “David had reason to reproach the heathens, since in truth the idols they worshipped, were nothing but dumb and lifeless images; and the Fathers who believed, that oracles were delivered by devils, did not therefore believe, as you imagine, that idols had the use of speech⁶. ” It might suffice to say that a statue of Apollo at Delphos, or a head of Orpheus at Lesbos, had given an answer to a question, if it had done so by its priests. “He” that is Vandale, says the author of the Continuation of the Answer to Fontenelle “might pretend by the same reason that it was the Tripus, and not the priestess Pythia, that spoke and delivered the oracles of Delphos since Philostrates⁷ as well as a great many other authors often ascribe to this Tripus the answers which the priestess

⁵ P. 38.

⁶ Ans. to Fontenelle tr. by Bedford, p. 53.

⁷ Ieonus Lib. II. in Dodon. p. 829.

delivered when seated thereon^{8.}" It will be observed that both parties in this controversy write as if they considered articulate *speech* as necessary in the delivery of an Oracle; and therefore with them, or at least in their argument, the want of speech, was decisive against the claim to inspiration, or oracular power.

Let us however take up the enquiry from a different point. No doubt fifteen hundred years ago the oracle at Delphos was an old story. We need not enter into the various questions which have been raised about the facts, or the causes, of the cessation of that and other oracles. Probably some both of the earlier, and the later, writers on the subject have said more than can be implicitly relied on; but at the same time, if we can meet with a party of men belonging to the fourth century, seriously engaged in divination—professedly imitating the Delphic oracle, and believing that they were proceeding according to its practice—it may be worth while to enquire how they managed the matter.

We need not enter into the history of the

⁸ Contin. p. 237.

Roman Emperor Valens further than to observe that, after reigning fifteen years, he died A.D. 378. The divination was used to discover who would be his successor. Whether as Cassiodorus⁹ states the Emperor was a party to the transaction is immaterial, Sozoman¹, is followed by Nicephorus² in stating that the enquiry was made by means of an oracle from a tripod; but the fullest account is that given by Ammianus Marcellinus³ a contemporary historian. He names four conspirators—Fidustius, Irenæus, Pergamius and Hilarius—and adds that there were others whom he does not name. Delrio (from whom I quote, and borrow these authorities) suggests that perhaps among these were Jamblichus and Libanius, who are mentioned as parties concerned by Zonaras⁴. The confessor is Hilarius. We are told that while under torture, he thus addressed his judges ;—

“ With direful rites, oh, august Judges, we prepared this unfortunate little table which you see, of laurel branches in imitation of the Delphic cortina ; and when it had been

⁹ Tripart. Lib. VII. c. 35.

¹ Lib. VI. c. 35.

² Lib. II. c. 45.

³ Lib. XXVI.

⁴ Delrio Disq. Mag. II. 248.

duly consecrated by imprecation of secret charms, and many and long choric ceremonies, we at length moved it. The method of moving it, when it was consulted on secret matters, was as follows,—it was placed in the midst of a house purified with arabian odours; upon it was placed a round dish made of various metallic substances, which had the twenty-four letters of the alphabet curiously engraved round its rim at accurately measured distances from each other. One clothed with linen garments and with linen socks on his feet and his hair formed into a tuft on his head, carrying branches of a sacred tree, and having by charms framed for the purpose propitiated the deity who is the giver of prescience, places other lesser eortinæ on this larger one with ceremonial skill. He holds over them a ring which has been subjected to some mystical preparation and which is suspended by a very fine Carpathian thread. This ring, passing over the intervals, and falling on one letter after another, spells out heroic verses pertinent to the questions asked, and correct as to versification, like those obtained from the Pythic or Branchidian Oracles. We then thus enquiring who should succeed to the government of the empire the leaping ring had indicated two syllables, and on the addition of the last letter, one of the persons present cried out, ‘Theodorus.’ ”

The original of this passage, with a few remarks on it, will be found in a note⁵; I here only observe that after mentioning imprecations, and choric movements, the con-

⁵ See note M.

fessor says, “at length we moved it—*movimus tandem.*”

As far as the words are concerned, they certainly might be used to signify that the conjurors merely *moved* (or as we should perhaps say *removed*) their little table from the place where it was made, and consecrated, to some other. Viewed in this light, they of course leave the narrator open to the questions, Why, Whence, and Whither, they moved it? And if he should reply, that he chose to keep those points secret, we may ask why he said any thing about *moving* it at all. But there is, I think, something in the statement which would seem to imply that they moved the *mensula* by means of these performances; an idea, which but from some recent phænomena would be at once rejected as absurd—or perhaps, I should say, could never have arisen in the mind of any reader. At the same time it certainly takes colour, not only from modern experiments, but from some hints which are to be found in the writings of the ancients. One appears in Lucan’s description of the visit paid by Appius to the deserted oracle at Delphos.

“ Sic tempore longo
Immotos tripodas, vastæque silentia rupis
Appius Hesperii scrutator ad ultima fati
Sollicitat⁶.”

It seems implied that there was something remarkable in the fact that the tripods had been long unmoved. As if it was not merely that Appius found lifeless furniture standing still where there was nobody to move it, but as if the tripod's being at rest was a characteristic feature in the picture of suspension and desertion. In describing the furniture of a deserted house we should scarcely think of remarking that the chairs and tables were standing still, though we might mention that the clocks had stopped. Were this all however we might allow that the tripods used in oracular rites might be moveable articles of furniture, and would naturally be moved from one place to another as long as business was going on at Delphos, and that they remained unmoved when nothing was doing there. But something more is implied by the language of Claudian. He tells us how admirably the face of things was altered when

⁶ Pharsal. Lib. V. 120.

the Python had been slain—“jam liber Parnassus erat”—and among other evidences of the happy change,

“Omnis, iō Pæan, regio sonat : omnia Phœbum
Rura canunt. Tripodas plenior aura *rotat*.”

This not only agrees with Seneca’s description of Apollo as “qui tripodas movet⁸,” and with Lucian’s *τὸν τρίποδα διασεισαμένη tripode concusso*¹,” but distinctly states that the motion was *rotatory*.

It may be remembered that, at page 226, I have quoted a passage in which Tertullian speaks of conjurors who, not only by invoking angels and dæmons, caused *tables* to prophesy, but who did many wonderful things “*circulatoriis præstigiis*,” which Mr. Dodgson translates “by means of juggling tricks.” This was natural; and I suppose that fourteen years ago, when his volume was published as a part of the Library of the Fathers, nobody would have done otherwise, or have supposed that any thing more could be meant by the words. But now that the rotation of tables, and the practice of regarding them as

⁷ In Ruf. Lib. I. Praef. 11. ⁸ Med. 86.

¹ In Bis accusato. Vol. II. 792.

oracles, and setting them to prophesy, have become common facts with which every one is familiar, it seems impossible not to suspect that something of the same kind was alluded to by Tertullian, as well as by others who speak of “Circulators” and “Circulatory” arts².

I must however recur to what I have said before (p. 261) on the dispute between Fontenelle and his opponent, with reference to the power of speaking which, both parties allowed, to have been denied to dumb idols; because it affords an instructive lesson against hastily cutting knots which, if we let them alone, may be curiously and carefully untied by the hand of time. It is the more remarkable because M. Fontenelle’s opponent had said “Our critick who believes also that there were images which delivered oracles of themselves, and not by the priests; objects a pas-

² I do not know how far Mencke is correct in his derivation of *Charlatan* from *Circulator*; but apologizing in the Preface, for the title of his book “De Charlataneria Eru-ditorum” he says “Latinus utique *Circulatoriam* dicere poteram, cum vox illa ex Hetrusco *cialare*, quod est circulare seu decipere, descendat, unde *Ciarlatano* seu *Cerretano*, *circulator*, et Gallicum *Charlatan*, quod veteres *Ciarlatan* scripsere.”

sage against me, taken from the book *de Dea Syria*, which is among Lucian's works; where it is said, that among other wonders which were seen in the temple of that goddess, the images did sweat and stir of themselves, and deliver oracles. But though the author of this book had not explained himself, yet ought we to examine *how* these images delivered Oracles."

It is not, however, worth while to copy this author's remarks; but a passage which he proceeds to quote from Lucian is so curious when compared with some recent phænomena, that I transcribe it;—

"He" [Lucian] "says in express words, to explain the particular manner, in which it delivered oracles: 'That all the Oracles of Greece, as well as those of Egypt, Libya, and Asia, only spoke by their priests, and prophets.' What can be said more plainly for the opinion which I maintain? 'Whereas, adds he, Apollo that was in this temple, delivered his oracles by the different motions he was seen to make: For, (continues this author, whom I believe to be Lucian himself, who in this book had a mind to write according to the style and humour of Hero-

dotos) ‘when this image intends to deliver Oracles, *χρησμηγορέειν*, immediately it stirs upon its pedestal: then the priests straightway take it up; for if they did not do so, it would sweat, and shake itself, and advance of its own accord. Next when they carry it upon their shoulders, it makes them go on all sides; sometimes moving itself to the right, sometimes to the left. Lastly, the chief priest presenting himself before it, asks it questions concerning all sorts of subjects; and when it disproves of them, it retires backward: And when on the contrary it approves them, it comes forward; and makes those who carry it, advance. It is thus, that it delivers its oracles; and no affair either sacred or profane is taken in hand, without having first consulted this image in this manner^{3.”}

I need not recapitulate; but I would repeat what I have already suggested—namely that the knowledge of Antediluvian sin, whatever it may have been, lived through the Deluge. If those who had this knowledge, knew or believed that it had been obtained

³ Contin. p. 235. For some remarks on similar recent phænomena see note N.

from “inferior spirits,” it is not wonderful that they should have sought intercourse with them. It was natural that they should seek after and apply to them, not from love towards them, or the expectation of being loved by them; but from a belief that those unseen powers were able to communicate Knowledge which the Creator had not granted to man, or enabled him by any lawful means to obtain. Thus one form of false religion—the form of all others the most seductive—came to be the Oracular. The highest ambition of man, the most insatiable craving of his nature, has ever been, to attain the knowledge of good and evil—from the day that it led to his first sin in Eden, it has been the great source and main support of False Worship.

N O T E S.

NOTE A. referred to p. 44.

Hesiod of the Titans.

A PART of Hesiod's description of the war of the Titans is so much to our purpose, that though unwilling to encumber the text with a longer quotation I cannot help here transcribing a few of the lines which precede those which I have given. Readers to whom the Greek would be useful will probably possess it, or can easily refer to it; and the object is not to criticise the language, but to observe the facts stated, and their singular concurrence with some which we have met with elsewhere. The passage quoted at p. 44 is thus introduced ;—

“ Illi vero inter primos pugnam acrem ciebant,
Cottusque, Briareusque, Gygesque insatiabilis belli.
Hi sane trecentas petras robustis e manibus
Mittebant frequentes : obumbrarunt autem jaculis

TITANAS : atque hos quidem *sub terram* longe patentem
Miserunt, et *vinculis molestis alligarunt*,
Vincentes manibus, superbi licet essent,
Tantum infra sub terram, quantum *cœlum* distat a terra.
Par enim spatium a terra in *Tartarum caliginosum*.
Novem enim noctes ac dies ferrea incus,
Coelitus delapsa, decimo die ad terram perveniret:
Novem rursus noctes et dies ferrea incus,
Ex terra descendens, decimo die ad Tartarum perveniret.
Quem circa ferreum septum ductum est. Circum vero
ipsum nox
Triplici ordine fusa est circa collum. Sed *superne*" &c.

NOTE B. referred to p. 67.

The Serpent of the Abyss.

I am sorry that some of the books which I mentioned as having fallen into my hands, slipped through my fingers before I had copied out what I intended for quotations. My object was to show the antiquity, and wide prevalence, of the notion respecting a Serpent of the Abyss. The fact that it enters into so many very different systems of false worship, if it cannot be accepted as a proof that the notion is true, may yet be considered as some evidence of a common origin —or at least of a very early identity or connexion —between the Mythologies in which such a singular feature is so prominent. China and Scandinavia are

sufficiently distant and different to render them good specimens ; and of the former Mr. Medhurst says ;—

“On the 30th of August [1835 I believe] we were in sight of Këä Tsze, or Cup-chee bay, with the wind ahead, and frequent squalls. About noon, several water-spouts were seen, which afforded us much interest ; one of them formed within a hundred yards of the vessel, so that we could distinctly mark its operation : we were, however, in great consternation, lest it should break over our heads, particularly as it fell a dead calm just at the time, and we found our vessel drifting nearer and nearer to the aqueous phenomena ; till at length to our surprise and joy, it dispersed. The Chinese imagine these water-spouts to be occasioned by the ascent and descent of the ‘dragon King of the Deep’ ; and indeed they bear such a striking resemblance to a rising serpent, a foaming dragon or a flying monster that we can scarcely wonder at their having formed this superstitious idea. When the watery cylinder first rises, they say, the Dragon is ascending to heaven ; and when the spout is forming in the clouds, they imagine they can trace his horns : while his head and tail they think never appear at the same moment. Representations may frequently be seen in Chinese houses of the ‘divine dragon,’ the idea of which probably originated in these water-spouts. They have, however, carried their fancies of the dragon much farther than water-spouts would warrant, and have associated it with every thing that is imperial and divine ; hence we find dragons depicted in their temples, rampant on the roof, twining round the pillars, or encircling the candles ; while ‘the dragon throne,’ ‘the dragon eyes,’ and ‘the dragon pencil’ are terms exclusively applied to the Chinese autocrat. It may be that ‘the great red dragon, that old serpent the devil’ has invented and fostered this idea, in order to get himself worshipped, in his own much loved form, by one third of the human family¹. ”

¹ “China ; its state and prospects, by W. H. Medhurst. London, 1840.” 8vo. p. 383.

It is in almost every sense of the words, going as far as we can from the Chinese traditions if we turn to those of Scandinavia ; and I will give a few extracts relating to them from an interesting little volume lately published². After noticing in succession the other deities of that strange and romantic system, the author says ;—

“ Last, although not the least important, comes Asa-Loke, the most busy and prominent actor of the Scandinavian Mythology. Descended from the Giants he was, notwithstanding, received amongst the spirits of light. He retained, however, all the vices of his race ; though eloquent and fair of form, he was cowardly, treacherous, and cruel, ever plotting against his benefactors, of whose destruction he at length proves the cause. He is called Asa-Loke, to distinguish him from Utgard’s-Loke, a Giant or evil daemon, and king of the lower world, Utgard (or the outer residence) being, as already remarked, the abode of the infernal deities of the Scandinavians. As son of a Giant, Asa-Loke claimed the advantages of his connexion, and had frequent intercourse with his infernal relatives. Both Giants and Gods, however, mistrusted him, and he, not unfrequently, received punishment at the hands of both. The Edda describes his laughter as terrible, making the hearer shudder. By his wife, Signi, he had a son, Narfe, and by an amour with a giant woman, Augerbode, the three monsters ; Fenris, the wolf ; *the great Serpent, Jormungandur* ; and Hela, the Queen of death, the constant source of terror to the Gods, as destined to prove the chief engines of their destruction.

“ Besides the Asa and the Giants, the Scandinavian Mythology included various subordinate intelligences, the most

² A Manual of Scandinavian Mythology. By Grenville Pigott. 1839.

important of which were the Dwarfs, sprung from the decaying body of Ymer [the first of all beings, the chaotic Giant] who form a connecting link between the Asa and the Giants, in their nature partaking of evil and good, but most inclined to evil. They lived beneath the earth, and could not endure the light of the sun.” p. 24.

* * * * *

“The Gods having been forewarned that this progeny of Loke would one day cause much evil to Asgard, sent to the land of Giants to secure them. Odin cast *Jormungandur*, or, as it was also called, the great Midgard’s Serpent or Worm, into the ocean, where it grew to such a prodigious size, that it girt round the whole world. There it was to lie with its tail in its jowl, in sullen expectation of revenge at Ragnarokur [the twilight of the Gods; the period of the destruction of the universe] Jormungandur was the chief object of fear and hatred to Gods and men.” p. 79.

* * * * *

“After that the primitive race of the Giants, with the exception of Bergelmer (the old dweller on the mountains) and his wife, had been submerged in the blood of their parent Ymer; a new progeny sprang up from these two, who were condemned by Odin to inhabit the dark barren rocks which encircled the earth, and were separated from it by a trackless waste, and by the stormy ocean, in which lay imprisoned the great Serpent *Jormungandur*.” p. 102.

I might fill many pages with extracts from this volume, illustrative of various points which I have touched on in the foregoing essay. All that relates to the Giants, and in particular “Thor’s journey to Jotunheim, or Giant-land” p. 102 is particularly worthy of notice. Here, it will be remembered, I only refer to it as illustrating the wide-spread tradition of the Serpent of the Abyss. As, however, in so doing I have alluded to the very

singular account of the descent of Thor (the son of Odin and inferior to him alone), I will take advantage of that circumstance to tack on a note which I accidentally omitted to insert or refer to on p. 51, where mention is made of our Lord's descent into Hell. A very full collection of authorities on this subject may be found in an American work which I have only seen since the above was written. It is entitled "The belief of the first three centuries concerning Christ's Mission to the Underworld. By Frederic Huidekoper. Boston. 1854." A very cursory inspection does not enable me to form any opinion respecting its accuracy; but the purpose of the work is plainly stated in its concluding words; and is very curious. Up to the very last page, an unsuspecting reader might suppose that he was reading an historical enquiry respecting the belief of the early christian church; and he might be somewhat startled by the syllogistic paragraph with which the enquiry is terminated. The author says "If we have evidence that the Catholics of the second and third centuries believed any proposition unanimously, we have evidence that they believed the following:—'Jesus Christ at his death went on a mission to the subterranean world.' But the earth is now known to be a solid globe, revolving in space. Their belief, therefore, of a subterranean world, and the mission to it, was incorrect." It is of course intended that the reader should add, as the moral of the whole enquiry, "and therefore the unanimous belief of catholics was given to a lie in this case, and is not worth a farthing in any other"—but suppose that, instead of this, the reader should answer,

"I don't think the earth *is* known to be a solid globe,"—
What then?

NOTE C. referred to p. 69.

The book of Enoch.

It will be understood that I do not pretend to give any opinion respecting this book, except only, that, view it in whatever light we may, it is a very ancient, and curious, document. On this ground I think that some readers may thank me for transcribing a few sentences from the beginning of Archbishop Lawrence's "Preliminary Dissertation." He says ;—

"The Apocryphal Book of Enoch, in the last and the preceding century, proved a prolific subject for critical speculation and theological discussion. The circumstance of its having been quoted by an inspired writer of the New Testament³ augmented the despair of recovering a supposed treasure, which had long been lost. It was known until the eighth century of the Christian æra; after which it seems to have sunk into complete oblivion."

"A considerable fragment of it however was discovered by Scaliger in the Chronographia of Georgius Syncellus; a work which had not then been printed. He extracted the whole of this fragment, and published it in his notes to the Chron. Can. of Eusebius. Still however, as it did not contain the

³ Jude v. 14, 15.

passage quoted by St. Jude, doubts were entertained whether the Apostle really referred to the same production as was cited by Georgius Syncellus, or derived his information respecting the prophecy of Enoch from some other source.

" Since the discovery of Scaliger, much has been written, but very little, if any, additional information obtained upon this subject. The fullest account of the opinions entertained by the Fathers, and the quotations which they made from this celebrated apocryphal production, before it was lost, as well as what has since been conjectured respecting it by modern critics, are to be found in Fabricius's Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Testamenti Vol. i. p. 160—224; who also gives at length the greek fragment of it, preserved by Georgius Syncellus.

" But although the greek copy of this book, itself perhaps nothing more than a mere translation from some Hebrew or Chaldee original, seems to have been irretrievably lost, yet an idea prevailed so early as at the commencement of the seventeenth century, that an Ethiopic version of it still existed in Abyssinia."

The Archbishop, having noticed the proceedings, and the unsuccessful search, of Ludolf, proceeds ;—

" After the disappointment of Ludolf, every idea that the book in question existed in an Ethiopic version was altogether abandoned, until towards the conclusion of the last century, when our own enterprising countryman, Bruce, not only proved its existence, but brought over with him from Abyssinia three copies of it. The following is the account which he himself gives of the manner in which he disposed of them.—‘ Amongst the articles,’ he remarks, ‘ I consigned to the library at Paris, was a very beautiful and magnificent copy of the prophecies of Enoch, in large quarto; another is amongst the books of Scripture which I brought home, standing immediately before the book of Job, which is its proper place in the Abyssinian Canon; and a third copy I

have presented to the Bodleian Library at Oxford by the hands of Dr. Douglas, the Bishop of Carlisle."

After some notice of the sensation created by this discovery, and of Dr. Woide's impatience, which led him to set off immediately to Paris to see the manuscript without waiting for Bruce's arrival in England, the Archbishop adds ;—

" Whatsoever might have been the public curiosity and impatience upon this point at the period alluded to by Mr. Bruce, it seems to have long since subsided ; as the copy deposited in the Bodleian Library has quietly slept there undisturbed to the present day. At length however I have ventured to break in upon its repose ; and to employ myself in the subsequent translation of it."

NOTE D. referred to p. 96.

Bishop Warburton on the Mysteries.

The Bishop had previously said ;—

" Lest it should be mistaken, that *initiation* alone, or any other means than a virtuous life, entitled men to this future happiness, the *Mysteries* openly proclaimed it as their chief business, to restore the soul to its original purity. ' It was the end and design of initiation (says Plato) to restore the soul to that state, from whence it fell, as from its native seat of perfection.' They contrived that every thing should tend to shew the necessity of virtue ; as appears from Epictetus. ' Thus the *Mysteries* become useful ; thus we seize the true spirit of them ; when we begin to apprehend

that every thing therein was instituted by the ancients, for instruction and amendment of life.' ”

After some further remarks in the same strain, and comprising the passage which I have quoted at p. 96, the Bishop adds ;—

“To come at the truth, he was severely interrogated by the priest or hierophant, impressing him with the same sense of his obligation to conceal nothing, as is now done at the roman Confessional. Hence it was, that when Nero, after the murder of his mother, took a journey into Greece, and had a mind to be present at the celebration of the *Eleusinian* mysteries, the conscience of his parricide deterred him from attempting it. On the same account, the good Emperor M. Antoninus, when he would purge himself to the world of the death of Avidius Cassius, chose to be initiated into the *Eleusinian* mysteries, it being notorious, that none were admitted into them, who laboured under the just suspicion of any heinous immorality. This was originally a fundamental condition of initiation, observed in common, by all the *Mysteries*; and instituted by Bacchus, or Osiris himself, the first inventor of them; who, as Diidorus tells us, initiated none but pious and virtuous men. . . Nor was a less degree of purity required of the *Initiated* for their future conduct. They were obliged by solemn engagements to commence a new life of strictest piety and virtue; into which they were entered by a severe course of penance, proper to purge the mind of its natural defilements. Gregory Nazianzen tells us, that no one could be initiated into the mysteries of Mithras, till he had undergone all sorts of mortifying trials, and had approved himself holy and impassible. The consideration of all this made Tertullian say, that, in the *Mysteries*, ‘Truth herself took on every shape, to oppose and combat Truth.’ And Austin, ‘That the Devil hurried away deluded souls to their destruction, when he promised to purify them by those ceremonies, called INITIATIONS.’ ” Div. Leg. Book II. § 4. Vol. I. p. 142.

NOTE E. referred to p. 117.

Female Superstition.

The authors of the *Malleus Maleficarum*, Johannes Nider, Martin of Arles, Cornelius Agrippa, and, I doubt not, many other writers on the subject, discuss the question, why women are more addicted to superstition than men? The fact they take for granted. How far they are right or wrong in that, I do not take upon me to decide; but I am inclined to believe that False worship and Superstition were in a great degree maintained by women—not merely such females as I have alluded to, persons assuming sacred characters, performing religious rites, or practising occult arts and sciences—but lady-patronesses as we should now call them, who gave character, supplied means, and paid expenses.

I have often thought, though I have not seen it noticed, that Plautus, in a few words, gives us a curious gleam of information on this point. In his *Miles Gloriosus*, Periplectomenes, a gay old bachelor, being rallied on the subject of marriage, takes it very good humouredly; but while he self-complacently admits that he is quite entitled to offer his hand to a lady of the highest family and fortune, he answers very much as he might have done if he had been a creation of Congreve or Dryden. This wife, he suggests, would not

trouble herself about him, or his comforts. She would never say,

“Eme, mi vir, lanam, unde tibi pallium
Malacum et calidum conficiatur, tunicae hibernæ bonæ,
Ne algeas hæc hyeme. Hoc nunquam verbum ex uxore
audias.”

Which Thornton translates

“‘Buy me some wool my dear, that I may make you
A garment soft and warm, good winter cloathing,
To keep your limbs from starving.’ Not a word
Like this you’ll ever hear come from a wife.”

But she would, he says, be perpetually teasing him for money for other purposes ;—

“Ere the cockerow, from my sleep she’d rouse me,
Crying—‘My dear, pray give me wherewithal
I may present my mother in the *Calends*.’”

And what next ?

“Give me a cook ; and get me a confectioner”—

Not a very outrageous demand if this is really all that is meant by

“Da qui farciat, da qui condiat ;”

But what next ? for we have as yet heard nothing of jewels, equipage, furniture, slaves, and other expenses which one who thought himself entitled to marry a woman of fortune and rank—uxorem dotatam genere summo ducere—would expect to incur. But the old gentleman, without making the slightest allusion to any such matters, comes at once to the subject of the monies

to be extorted from him for superstitious uses. First of these is the offering which she would have to make, or the expenses to be incurred at the festival of Minerva, called the Quinquatrus; half a dozen of which he enumerates. Immediately after the lines which I have quoted he proceeds ;—

“ Give something to bestow in the Quinquatrus,
On the *diviner*, on th’ *enchantress*, on
The *soothsayer* :—it were an heinous crime
To send them nothing ;—how they’d look upon me !—
And then it can’t be, but I must present
The *sorceress* with some kind and gentle token :—
The *taper bearer* is already angry,
That she has nothing had ”—

The original of that part with which we are concerned is,—

“ da quod dem Quinquatribus,
Præcantatrici, conjectrici, hariolæ atque aruspiceæ :
Flagitium est, si nihil mittetur, quo supercilio spicit !
Tum *piatricem* clementer non potest quin munerem.
Jampridem, quia nihil abstulerit, succenset *ceraria*.”

I have given Thornton’s version notwithstanding its faultiness (for it will be observed that he omits one of the parties, though from his freedom of translation one cannot say which), because for those who may wish for a translation I am always desirous to offer what is not made by myself, or for the occasion. He says in a note “ *Diviner—Enchantress—soothsayer—&c.] Præcantatrici, Conjectrici, Ariolæ, &c.* We have no words that will answer to these exactly in the original, as they relate to the religious ceremonies and superstitions of

the ancients; and I shall not trouble the reader with explaining them." I suspect that the translator would have found more trouble, than he would have given; and if I have a reader, I beg him to understand that I pass them over in no such spirit of forbearance, and do not explain them simply because I do not know how. I would, however, make an attempt if I thought it worth while, which I really do not; considering that my sole object in bringing forward the passage is to call the reader's attention to the fact, that in this speech, put into the mouth of a man of fashion, six different classes of females employed in the service of superstition are specified—he expects (let it be taken half in jest if the reader pleases) that his wife, if he had one, would contribute to the maintenance of each, and torment him for the means of patronizing them—he adds nothing to what I have quoted except a gift to the Midwife, and to the nurse who brings up the slaves born in his house, and then exclaims

" These and a thousand other like expences,
Brought on by women fright me from a wife,
Who'd plague and tease me with the like discourses."

" Hæc atque hujus similia alia damna multa mulierum
Me uxore prohibent, mihi qui hujus similes sermones serat."

Thinking of Plautus and superstition, leads me to mention another little matter, not unconnected with our subject. It appeared to me curious when I first noticed it. I mean that, as used by him—that is to say, in the oldest use of the word which I know of, the *superstitious* person was the person who had, or professed, or was sup-

posed, to have, supernatural powers, and not the credulous person who believed him. Thus, in the *Amphitryo* of Plautus, Mercury, pretending not to see Sosia, says,

“haud longe abesse oportet. verum longe hinc absuit⁴. ”

and Sosia overhearing, mutters to himself ;—

“ Illie homo *superstitiosus* est.”

Curelio, in the play which bears his name, when Lyco exposes his boastful lie, about the wound which he had received, exclaims,

“ *Superstitiosus* hic quidem est : vera prædicat⁵. ”

But the most remarkable instance occurs in the *Ruddens*, in connexion with circumstances quite worthy of our notice. Palæstra, the heroine of the piece, is the daughter of Dæmones, though neither of them know it, because she has been carried off at a very early age by pirates, and afterwards sold by them to a slave-dealer. This rogue, having brought her up, agrees to sell her to a young gentleman who has fallen in love with her ; but, after having made the bargain and received the deposit, he carries off the girl, induced by a report that he may obtain a better price for her in Sicily. Arcturus, who is I hope already favourably known to the reader⁶, highly disapproves of this conduct, and raises a great storm. The ship is wrecked and the cargo lost. Palæstra and her maid escape in a little boat which is, of course, drifted on shore just at the spot where her excellent, but unknown, father resides. It so happens

⁴ Act I. Sc. i. 166.

⁵ Cure. Act III. Sc. i. 27.

⁶ See before, p. 86.

that, early on that same morning, Gripus a fisherman in the exercise of his calling fishes up a wallet filled with things belonging to the slave-dealer. Having brought it to land he gets into a quarrel with another man who claims a share; and the dispute is referred to the decision of Dæmones. His still unknown daughter Palæstra is by a train of circumstances brought to be present at the enquiry which ensues. She immediately recognizes and is delighted to see the wallet. She knows that it belongs to the slave-dealer, and contains among other things a small casket belonging to herself, containing toys and ornaments which she had carefully preserved from her infancy, in the hope that they might some day enable her to make some discovery relating to herself and her parentage. Gripus the fisherman, is apprehensive that the new turn which things are taking may deprive him of some part of his prize; and by way of discrediting Palæstra, bluntly remarks that she had declared the wallet to be the slave-dealer's before she could possibly have examined enough to form an opinion. The young woman replies that she will at once set that matter at rest, by giving a minute account of the contents of her casket, while it yet remains in the unopened wallet; and will be content to renounce all claim to the things if her statement is found incorrect.

“ I'll make this matter plain, and clear up all.
There is a wicker casket in that wallet;
And each particular that it contains
I'll reckon one by one : you shall not shew me :
If wrong, my word will serve me in no stead,
And all that's in the casket shall be yours ;
If right, I pray you let me have my own.”

To this the old gentleman, who is acting as judge or arbiter, frankly answers that he considers it a fair offer ;—

“ Agreed : she only asks for common justice
In my opinion.”

and Trachalio, the other claimant, expresses his acquiescence

“ And in mine.”

But Gripus is not satisfied with such a test. He seems to have a suspicion that she may be a clair-voyante or possess some powers of divination which may enable her to deprive him of his prey. He exclaims

“ But what

If she’s a witch, and by that means should tell
What’s in the casket ? shall a witch then carry it ?”

“ Quid si ita aut *superstitiosa*, aut ariola est, atque omnia
Quidquid insit, vera dicet ? anne habebit ariola ?”

Rud. Act IV. Sc. iv. 95.

NOTE F. referred to p. 145.

The Theological Critic.

I refer to a paper which I wrote in the second part of the second volume of this work, published in June 1852, “On the conduct of the Clergy with regard to magic and sorcery.” It was chiefly occupied by an

examination of some statements contained in an Article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* No. XI. and since that time circulated through many popular channels. Certainly at the time when I wrote it I had no doubt about the authorship ; and I said in a note, “ I call the article in the Review ‘ anonymous ’ not as pretending to be ignorant that it is ascribed to Sir Walter Scott, or because I doubt that he wrote it ; but because I do not know that I have a right, without better authority, to fix upon him the authorship of an article which does him so little credit, and which he published without his name.” p. 167. I do not know that I have ever had a doubt that Sir Walter’s “ Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft,” were an expansion of this Article until yesterday, taking up this old number of the Review with a view to what the writer says of Trois Echelles, I fell upon a little foot-note among some others, which if I ever before saw it, I had totally forgotten. Either is possible, and the former not so improbable as it may seem ; because though I was answering the facts and statements of the Reviewer, it was as they were quoted by others ; and they did not, I think, quote this little note which is amusing if we are to consider it as an appendage to Sir Walter’s own review—“ Since this article was put in types, we observe an announcement of a History of Daemonology and Witchcraft, for Murray’s family Library, by the person best qualified perhaps in Europe for the task—Sir Walter Scott.” p. 25. I shall be sorry if I have been misled into charging Sir Walter with an article of so much pretension exposing such ignorance and absurdity.

NOTE G. referred to p. 150.

Invultuation and Facillation.

If the reader has Adelung's very useful and convenient "Glossarium Manuale, or Compendium of Du Cange" (Halæ 6 vol. 8vo. 1772—84) he may, in its proper place, find;—

"**INVVLTARE.** (1) **INVVLTARE, INVVLTVARE,** vultum effingere. Marius Victorinus ad Candidum Anianum p. 162. *Excitatus enim in anima 185 intellectualis potentiam anima illustrat, et illuminat et Invultuat, ac figurat, et innascitur animæ intelligentia et perfectio.* (2) De iis qui ad artes magicas *Inrvtant, dicitur in Vultiuoli.*"

This will probably puzzle him. I know, at least, that it puzzled me, when I first saw it; the rather because I knew that, long before, I had read the passage in the folio edition of Du Cange, without any sense of such difficulty as I then experienced. So I turned to the folio edition, which at once explained the mystery; and I mention it not merely because it may prevent some reader from being puzzled, but because it presents one of the oddest specimens of a misprint, that I have ever met with. The Editor apologizes for the delay of this fourth volume, on the ground that the press had been very full of business; and perhaps that had led to the employment of some inferior workmen. At all events, it seems

clear that the compositor of the sentence just quoted, either had no greek, or did not know that it was greek, when he came to νῆστος; and, by way of coming as near as he could, he put 185.

Let us, therefore, on this occasion put aside, the Compendium—though it is a most convenient, and valuable work, and generally, as far as I know, very correct—and take a few words from the Benedictine folio Du Cange (under which title the reader will understand me to include the Supplement) just as they come; for the order is of little importance.

With reference to the word *Vultivoli*, to which we have just been referred, Du Cange quotes the statement of John of Salisbury (lib. i. de Nugis Curial. c. 22) to shew that the word designated those who, when they desired to obtain power over the wills and affections of particular persons, made images, or representations, of them, in wax, or clay, or some soft material. He states that the same words are to be found in the work *De Praestigiis Fortunae* attributed to Peter of Blois; and he refers to the well known passages in Virgil and Ovid. The explanation given in the Supplement is not more satisfactory than this one; but both are suggestive. According to this authority, the word means waxen images, into which enchanters stuck needles, in those parts of the body in which they wished to give pain to the persons represented—imagines cereæ in quas incantatores acus defigebant in locis quibus viros ipsos pungere decreverant. The authority quoted by the Supplement, is the register of Odo Archbishop of Rouen, which relates how a certain priest confessed that he had been

under an ill-report respecting a certain waxen image, made for magical purposes (*de quodam vultu cereo constructo per sortilegium*) of which however he disclaimed all knowledge—and also, letters of Philip V. of France (an. 1319) ordering the enlargement of Joan de Ligny who had been committed to prison as guilty, or vehemently suspected, in the matter of some waxen images intended to injure the person of the Count of Valois (*de vultibus cereis olim, ut dicitur factis contra personam dilecti et fidelis Karoli Comitis Valesii*). The third authority given in the Supplement, represents Henry, a brother of the order of the Holy Trinity as enquiring, “*Que est-ce que Voust?*” The question is, if I understand right, addressed to Robert Count of Arras, “*C'est un image de cire, lui répondit-il, que l'en fait pour baptisier, pour gréver ceux que l'en vult gréver. L'en ne les appelle pas en ces pays Voulz, repliqua le religieux, l'en les appelle manies.*” It would lead us too far, if we were to follow out the references appended, and to enquire into the rites of magical baptism, in which the representation (whatever it might be) received the name, and was considered as identified with the person, of him who was to be wrought on by the magic. But I may mention that, under the word *Imaginatio*, the writer, having quoted a passage from Thomas of Otterbourne (edit. Hearne p. 158) stating that a certain Carmelite charged the Duke of Lancaster with *imagining* the death of the King,—accusavit ducem Lancastriæ de *Imaginatione mortis Regis*—says “*Forte pro Machinatione; nisi id spectet ad sortilegii speciem, quo adversarium vulnerare vel etiam occidere tentabant,*

illius imaginem ex cera compactam pugione percutiendo" &c. Certainly of the two the latter seems the more likely.

I cannot feel better satisfied with Du Cange's explanation of *Vultuare*, and *Vultuarii*. The former he states to mean "veneficio occidere," which strictly taken might seem to mean poisoning; and one might suppose that the substantive would designate the persons who were guilty of that crime. He tells us, however, that Delrio (in his sixth book) makes the *Vultuarii* the same as the *Vultivoli* and calls them *incantatores*. Du Cange's only authority, however, as to *Vultuare* is to be found in a document of the year 1396, which relates to some persons who had been dealt with to injure the Duke of Burgundy—ad *vultuandum* ducem—but this gives no information as to the means or process to be employed.

Under the word *Vultuarios*, Du Cange introduces another word—inde *Invultus*, ipsæ vultivolorum præstigiæ, in Legibus Henrici I. Regis Angl. cap. 71. "Si quis veneno vel sortilegio, vel *invultu*, actione, seu maleficio aliquo faciat homicidium;" and the Benedictine editor puts the word in its place, "INVULTUS, Invultuorum præstigiæ V. *Vultivoli*." I apprehend however that this word is an imaginary one arising out of a mistake in the single authority just quoted; where I cannot but think, *invultu*, *actione* should be, *invultuatione*. This word we find in the determination of the faculty of Theology in Paris of 19 Sep. 1398, which speaks of "sortilegia per carminatores, per invocationes dæmonum, per quasdam *invultuationes* et alia maleficia" (D'Argentré Tom. I. P. ii. p. 156).

Still under the same word *Vultuarios*, Du Cange goes on to quote an accusation against the Bishop of Troyes, who was falsely charged with having caused the death of Joan Queen of Philip the Fair. There were those who said "quod idem episcopus fecerat *invultari* reginam, et quod illa *invultatione* decesserat." He quotes also from the Register of the Court of Parliament of Paris (an. 1343) a statement that one person had "*envulté*, ou fait *envulter*" another.

"*Invultuor*" Du Cange explains to mean "præstigiator qui ad artes magicas vultus effingit;" but the authority which he quotes does not seem sufficient to bear out this explanation. It is only that, in the Synodal statutes of the Church of Nantes (an. 1389) there is a passage which stands in one MS. "de sortilegiis et divinationibus, de *magis*," stands in another MS. "de sortilegiis et divinationibus, de *invultuoribus*."

But all this does not appear to me to contain a full explanation of invultuation, or to shew that it consisted merely in making waxen images, any more than that the *defixio* which Du Cange mentions under *Vultivoli* meant the sticking of pins and needles into them after they were made, though I do not in the least question that such arts were practised. After quoting the lines of Ovid,

"Devovet absentes, simulachraque cerea fingit,
Et miserum tenues in jecur urget acus"

he says "Atque inde forte genus sortilegii, *Defixio*, videtur appellatum, quod scilicet ejusmodi incantatores acus subinde *defigerent* in imagines cereas" &c. It seems

as if the references which he proceeds to give might have suggested to him that there was something more, and different, in the matter “Gloss. Lat. Græc. *Defixiones νεκρομαντεῖαι*. Paulus lib. 5. Sentent. tit. 23 *Qui sacra impia nocturnave ut quem obcantarent, defigerent, obligarent, fecerint &c.* Apuleius lib. de Virtutib. herbar. c. 7. *Si quis devotatus defixusque fuerit in suis nuptiis &c.* Vide Cujac. lib. 21. Observ. c. 22. Certainly Du Cange and his editors had never seen Dr. Darling or Mr. Lewis, or perhaps a cataleptic patient.

But instead of pursuing the enquiry in this direction, I will here notice only two other points relative to invultuation. First that after having formed the opinion which I have just expressed, and having written all, or nearly all, that I have here brought before the reader, I was glad to find that I had the sanction of the *Malleus Maleficarum*, no mean authority in such a matter. The authors of that work with reference to the bearing of a passage of scripture, say “ubi agitur de *fascinatione seu invultuatione vetularum*” and the marginal note is “*Fascinatio sive invultatio triplex.*” (*Pars I. Q. ii.*)

Secondly, I mention that I may not seem to pass the fact, that *Vultus* seems to have been sometimes used for the whole figure and to have meant as Du Cange and his editors say, “quævis imago” but the passages which they quote, and of which I have already, perhaps, given more than enough, are sufficient to shew that the word kept its proper meaning, and also maintained its connexion with occult arts, in later times and languages. Farther to illustrate this I will add a

few words from Roquefort's Glossaire de la Langue Romane

VOLT: visage; *vultus*.

VOULST, voult, vout, vult: Visage, image, face; *vultus*.

VOULT, vout: Vœu, image de cire servant aux sortiléges; face, visage, air, mine; *vultus*; volonté; *voluntas*.

VOUST: Image de cire qui servoit aux sortileges; de *vultus*.

On appeloit *lo sainz voult*, la face de J. C. qui resta empreinte sur un linge lorsque Sainte Veronique essuya son visage pendant qu'il portoit la croix sur le Calvaire.

VOUT: Visags, mine, toute espèce d'effigie; *vultus*.

VULT: Visage, effigie, image; *vultus*.

ENVOUSTEMENT, *envoutement*: Sortilege, ensorcellement, malice.

ENVOUSTER, *envoulter*: Enchanter, ensorceler; de *vultus*.

ENVULTER: Faire une effigie en cire pour s'en servir a des sortiléges.

I must however add a few words on *Facillation*. It is no offence to the reader's scholarship to suppose that he may never have met with such words as *facistergium*, or *facitergium*, as Latin for a towel, or seen a lady's complexion eulogized in terms declaring that she was “*facialiter duobus decorata coloribus, albedine scilicet et rubedine*.” Without being aware of these and similar words he would not suspect that *Faccinerius* was a name for a sorcerer. But so it is. Du Cange, and his editors will tell him “**FACCINERIUS**, fascinator, *præstigiator*, alias nostris *Facinier*” and will refer him to **FACHINERARIUS** where he will find again fascinator, sortilegus, *præstigiator*. Occitanis *Falchiner*. And if, taking this hint we recur to Roquefort's Glossary we find “**FACHE**: La face, le visage; facies.”—“**FACHIL**, *fachigner, fachillner, fachinier, facinier, faichinier, faitalié, fatalié*:

Sorcier, enchanter, devin, diseur de bonne aventure ; *faticulus*." The Supplement to Du Cange, however gives us, "FACHILATOR, fascinator præstigiator" and refers to "FALCHILLA" under which word (how properly I do not know) "Veneni species, vel sortilegium" the authority being a document (an. 1384) relating to a man who was said "portari fecisse *falchillas* ad intocitendum" a certain person. This is not very explanatory; but it refers us to FACILLARE in Du Cange's own part of the glossary, where after quoting the single authority from the life of S. Deiculus which I will copy presently, he says, "Ubi Bollandus, *Facillare est quasi fauces aperire* i. cum nemo esset, qui de his ne quidem hiscere auderet." The Benedictine editor adds "A *Facilla* dictum puto *Facillare*, quod sit quasi *Facilla* secare unde *Facillare* eo loco resecare facile interpretarer, i. cum nemo esset, qui exortum malum strenue compesceret." (I should perhaps say that *Facilla* is just before explained to mean a "*facula, Gallis Faucille*" that is, a sickle.) It is added however by Du Cange "Alias FACILLARE est strangulare, sive fauces opprimere" and his editor adds "a *Fauce* quasi *Faucillare*. Gloss. Lat. Græc. *Facillare στραγγαλίσαι*." With sincere respect for such authorities I really must say, that I think they have altogether mistaken the matter; and that all the writer meant to say was, that a great evil grew up, and there was nobody to face it. Here are the words; let the reader judge for himself—"Cumque nefas tale cresceret, et nemo esset, qui *facillaret*, quasi licenter miserum caput tanto utebatur incestu."

I may add that the Synod of Beziers, in the year 1342

excommunicated all the various classes of persons using magical arts who were comprehended under the name of *Fachilners* (Mart. Anec. IV. 161.) and the Synod of Nismes in the year 1364, included among the cases to be reserved for the bishop's judgment, those of "fachinerarii et divinarii, auguratores, et facientes experimenta diabolica, et etiam eos qui eos consulunt." I need not say that the Waldenses were charged with practising sorcery, or as it was called after them *Vauderie*, or *Vaudoisie* which Roquefort explains "La secte des Vaudois; hérésie; assemblée des soi-disant sorciers;" but it may be observed, and perhaps it may throw some light on the nature of the charge brought against them that they bore the name of *faccinerii*. There is a very curious letter dated 23 Aug. 1432 (*Mart. Amp. Coll. Tom. VIII. Col. 162*)—an extract is given by Du Cange in v. *Faccinerii*) from Peter Faber an inquisitor, in their neighbourhood, excusing himself from attendance at the Council of Basil, on the ground that he was so occupied with the heretics and *faccinerii* on whom for two years past he had been doing great execution—"ager Dominicus ibidem quasi squalet incultus, licet magnas executiones de multis hæreticis et *faccineriis* fecerim a duobus annis."

NOTE H. referred to p. 209.

Kedesim.

I will here briefly notice the other parts of scripture in which the word occurs; or, I should rather say, those

in which it has been supposed to have an injurious meaning.

(1.) The first of these is Deut. xxiii. 17, 18 where, again, our translators have used the same english word to represent the two hebrew words of the original. The law actually stands that there shall be no *Kadesah* of the daughters of Israel, nor a *Kades* of the sons of Israel. Thou shalt not bring the hire of a *zonah*, or the price of a dog, into the House of the Lord, &c. If the two hebrew words had the same meaning, it is strange that first one and then the other should be used. It is, however, worthy of remark that the 17th verse has, in the LXX, a double rendering, or is translated twice over. Schleusner⁷ suggests that the second, (or repetition) is brought in from Theodotion. Be this as it may it looks as if two different persons had translated the verse, and both translations had been inserted in the text, one after the other. As if some one who was dissatisfied with the rendering, had written another on the margin which had afterwards crept into the text, and made a repetition. In short it stands thus
 Οὐκ ἔσται πόρνη ἀπὸ θυγατέρων Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται πορνεύων ἀπὸ νιᾶν Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔσται τελεσφόρος ἀπὸ θυγατέρων Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται τελισκόμενος ἀπὸ νιᾶν Ἰσραὴλ. This reduplication is curious. The terms of it will be more properly noticed hereafter. In the mean time I only point out its existence; and add that Aquila translates *Kadesah* in this 17th verse by ἐνδιηλλαγμένη, as he had done in Gen. xxxviii. 21. and

⁷ In voce τελεσφόρος.

as he does in other passages which we shall have occasion to notice.

(2.) Again ; we are told that during the reign of Rehoboam “*Kades* was in the land **וְגַם־קָדֵשׁ הִיָּה בָּאָרֶץ**” 1 Kings xiv. 24 ; where it is further stated that “they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the Lord cast out before the children of Israel.” What “the abominations of those nations” were, is distinctly and specifically stated in Deut. xviii. 9. 12. They are expressly particularized, and recited as *the* abominations for which the nations were cast out ; but nothing in the whole list gives the least colour to such a translation as that now before us. In this case it seems as if the LXX had read **κράτος** instead of **קדשׁ** for they translate *kai σύνδεσμος ἐγενήθη εν τῷ γῇ*. It is thus that they translate Athaliah’s cry of “Treason, Treason” II. Kings xi. 14. and they perhaps understood, and meant to convey the idea that there was a conspiracy in the land ; or perhaps, that secret association and union in false worship which, as I have already said, seems to have existed.

(3.) In I. Kings xv. 12 we are told that Asa “took away the *Kedesim* out of the land.” The LXX translation is *kai ἀφεῖλε τὰς τελετάς*. The same version is given by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.

(4.) We read I. Kings xxii. 46. that Jehoshaphat took away out of the land all the *Kades* (**קָדֵשׁ**) remaining from the time of his father Asa. It is observable that in the common text of the LXX this verse, and the three which follow it, are omitted. The Cod. Alex. however, has *περισσὸν τοῦ ἐνδιηλαγμένου* which is

received by Tischendorf. In the recent edition of Steir and Thiele the text stands *καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν τῶν τετελεσμένων.*

(5.) II. Kings xxiii. 7. I have already had occasion to notice that Josiah brake down the houses of the *Kadesim*. The point for our observation here is that the LXX does not give any translation, but retains the word in greek letters *καδησίμ*. Theodotion does nearly the same, writing *καδησίμ*. Aquila has ἐνδιηλλαγμένων. Symmachus has *τῶν τελετῶν*.

(6.) In Job xxxvi. 14. Elihu according to our version says of the “hypocrites in heart”—“they die in youth and their life is among the unclean” (בְּקָדֵשׁ). The LXX has *ἡ δὲ ζωὴ αὐτῶν τιτρωσκομένη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων.* The passage is very obscure, and I do not know that it can be made to throw any light on our present enquiry.

(7.) We read in Hosea iv. 14 “they sacrifice with harlots.” וְעַמֹּדְקָדְשׁוֹת זְבַחּוּ. The LXX read μετὰ τῶν τετελεσμένων ἔθυον. Aquila has ἐνηλλαγμένων or in some copies διηλλαγμένων; Symmachus ἵταιρίδων or ἀκαθάρτων, and Theodotion κεχωρισμένων or τοῖς βδελύγμασιν.

The reader who has considered the foregoing passages will probably have formed an opinion that the greek interpreters were somewhat puzzled by the hebrew—that is, when they met with it in these places—for the word which they had to translate was one which they were perpetually meeting and recognizing in a popular and ordinary sense. I know of no other instance in which any thing like such a rendering as those which

we have been looking at occurs, unless it may be Deut. xxii. 9. where our version reads "Thou shalt not sow thy vine-yard with divers seeds : lest the fruit of thy seed which thou hast sown, and the fruit of thy vine-yard, be defiled" (**פָזַת קָרְדֵשׁ**). In this case the LXX reads *ἴνα μὴ ἀγιασθῇ*, and the Vulgate *sanctificatur*. Jewish commentators seem to have cut the knot by suggesting that **תקדשׁ** is put for **תוקד** and means "to be burned." Maimonides (on Celaim cap. viii.⁸) says "Dicitur Deut. xxii. 9. **פָזַת קָרְדֵשׁ** de heterogeneis vineæ, ubi **תקדשׁ** traditio exponit per **תוקד** *incendas, comburas*, cuius sensus statim igne consumenda esse istiusmodi heterogenea, et nemini licitum esse iis frui," he refers to it again at p. 319. In Trumoth cap. x. § 6 Bartenora quotes the original words and says "id est igne consumuntur." Whether more or less of this be right or wrong, it seems as if our translators had no good ground for using the word "defiled;" and that the passage altogether has nothing to do with our subject. Indeed I only mention it because it is an instance (as far as I know the only one except those which I had previously specified) in which the word generally translated "holy" has been supposed to mean something "unholy."

Let us then return to the consideration of those passages which are to our purpose; and now that we have them all before us they may perhaps throw some light on each other.

First let us notice the way in which the word has

⁸ Misch. Suren. Vol. i. p. 143.

been dealt with by the Septuagint. It may be observed that there is one case (No. 4.) in which the word is omitted. Two (Nos. 2 and 6) in which the translators seem to have had a different text, or else exhibit a difference of rendering not easily to be accounted for. In one (No. 5.) they do not translate at all, but read καδησίμ; giving colour to Tychsen's hypothesis that they used copies of the hebrew text written in greek characters. In two others (both in No. 1.) they translate by πόρνη for the feminine and πορνεύων for the masculine; making *throughout*, therefore, no reference to the worse meaning adopted by our translators, and adding (or perhaps it might be retaining) a duplicate rendering which gets rid entirely of those words. And in three (that is Nos. 1, 3 and 7) giving us the words τελεσφόρος, τελεσκόμενος, τελετὰς, τετελεσμένων.

These are the greek words, therefore with which we have to deal; and two things are obvious—first that they are all of one family; and secondly that the Septuagint understood the hebrew words which they used these greek words to translate as referring to persons *consecrated* or *initiated into mysteries*. No such meaning as that of our version seems to have been known to them, nor am I aware of any reason why they should have thought of it. And this is the more worthy of observation, because it is obvious that consistency with their own translation (if we are to speak of the LXX as a single version) seemed especially to require it from them. We are therefore, in fact, brought simply to enquire respecting the meaning of the words used by the LXX. And I think that

every one who consults only such lexicons as happen to be within even my reach, will be satisfied that all the words related to initiation, or to persons initiated, into the mysteries of false worship. I will give a few extracts from the large quantity of matter which might be quoted on this point. Schleusner says

“*Τελεσφόρος*, proprie : *qui ad finem perducit vel perducitur, sive perductus est;*” and then proceeds—on no authority that I know of except the passage just quoted (No. I.)—to say “*Apud LXX vero aut potius Theodotionem : prostibulum s. fœmina gentium sacris vel mysteriis fornicatione initiata. Deut. XXIII. 17.*” Perhaps I need not repeat that what he says with reference to the mode of initiation appears to me to be altogether gratuitous and untrue. His explanation, which is too long to admit of my quoting it entire, he concludes with an extract from Theodoret on Deut. i. 1. *τελεσφόρον ἐκάλει τὸν μυσταγωγοῦντα, τελεσκόμενον δὲ τὸν μυσταγωγούμενον.*” The same idea, however, of obscene rites pervades his next explanation which is of

“*Τελεται, sacrificia, mysteria sacra, sacra impura*” &c. and he quotes Grotius as saying, “*μυστήρια in arcanis quibusdam vocibus et symbolis consistebant, τελεται in victimis.* Sic Diodor. Sic. lib. I. p. 20 Anton. Liberal. Fab. 10 *τελετὰς καὶ μυστήρια* et Augustinus de Civ. Dei lib. IV. c. 31 *teletas ac mysteria conjunctim memorat.* 3. Macc. II. 30. *ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς μεμνημένονς, illis, qui mysteriis initiati sunt.* Eodem sensu vocem legimus apud Ælian. V. H. lib. II. c. 31. et Clementem Alex. Strom. lib. V. p. 555” &c. Perhaps Schleusner was indebted to Suicer who has much of this, and more to

the same effect s. v. *τελετή*, especially quotations from “Hesychius Τελεταὶ, ἔορται, θυσίαι, μυστήρια. Festa sacrificia mysteria : Suidas, Τελετὴ, θυσία μυστηριώδης” &c. and afterwards “S. Maximus in cap. I. Dionysii Areopagitæ de Cœlesti Hierarchia, p. 3. Τελετὴ λέγεται κατὰ τὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων φιλοσόφους ἡ μετάδοσις τῶν μυστηρίων” &c.

Τελισκόμενος has been already noticed. Schleusner under the word says, “proprie *completus, absolutus, a τελίσκω περαγο*. Speciatim : *gentium : sacris vel dæmonum mysteriis fornicatione initiatus*;” and he refers to what he has said on *τελεσφόρος*. Here again the reference is to Deut. xxiii. 18 (that is No. 1.) and, as far as I see, that is the only ground for the suggestion of any such sinful mode of initiation.

Τετελεσμένος—Suicer says “Hinc apud Suidam *τετελεσμένον, μεμυημένον, initiatum, inauguratum*.” He adds “Quid *τετελεσμένος* sit pluribus exponit Theodoretus ad cap. iv. Hoseæ v. 14. p. 715 Τετελεσμένους καλεῖ τὸν τὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας ὅργια μεμυημένους”—and adds what he thus translates, “*Initiatos* vocat sacrīs impietatis imbutos et instructos. Nam sicut nos divinis mysteriis ornatos *fideles* vocamus, ita Græci gentiles *initiatos* nominarunt exactius ad suam impietatem institutis.” This is under the word *Τελέω*, where there is more to the same purport, as well as under the preceding word *Τελετὴ*, from which I will only quote his translation of the passage of St. Maximus in cap. I. Dionysii Areop. de Cœl. Hier.—“*Τελετὴ seu mysterium ritus dicitur, secundum gentiles Philosophos, communicatio mysteriorum, tanquam perficiens eum, qui initiatur et perfectiva existens eorum, qui ad talia accedunt,*” which I have just given from Schleusner.

Nobody doubts that some false worship was attended with obscene rites—nobody doubts that some of the consecrated and initiated were persons of immoral life—or that at some times and places and by some persons the mysteries were abused and made subservient to unchaste purposes and practises—but I repeat that I have not found any thing to sanction the translation respecting Tamar and the other to which it gave rise, and hope that the considerations which I have offered may not only place in a more true light the condition and character of the jewish women with reference to both true and false religion, but may have a further tendency to relieve the character of the people of Israel from undeserved reproach.

NOTE I. referred to p. 234.

Mesmeric Séance in Geneva, 1689.

“ Il s’endormit de commande, à la lecture de quelques chapitres de l’Ecriture Sainte, lecture nécessaire, disoit-il, pour le faire dormir et tomber dans l’extase. L’extase suivit de près, il commença à prophétiser, et ses premiers auditeurs publioient qu’il avoit dit des choses surprenantes. Le hasard contribua à faire valoir à ce qu’il dit. Il y avoit dans la maison qu’on avoit choisie, une femme du païs de Gex, Catholique de naissance, qui nourrissoit un fils du maître de la maison. Le Prophète dit à ses auditeurs, qu’il y avoit parmi eux une infidelle, et qu’il falloit qu’elle sortît,

si l'on vouloit qu'il prophétisât. Il n'en fallut pas davantage pour établir sa réputation ; Messieurs et Dames le demanderent à l'envi pour avoir part à ce spectacle, et le donner à leurs amis : mais il fut conduit chez un des Professeurs de Geneve, où toute la compagnie se rendit. Le chambre fut bientôt remplie. Le Prophète y fut mené en pompe, et assis dans un grand fauteuil : on fait la lecture, il s'endort ; on observe tous ses mouvements avec attention et avec silence. Il parle comme il avoit accoutumé.

“ Quelques personnes d'esprit et de qualité, des refugiés même de France, qui n'avoient pas moins d'intérêt que les autres, à faire valoir cette nouveauté furent les premiers à s'apercevoir de la fourberie. Cet air sombre, ce sommeil forcé, certains petits embarras où se trouvoit cet enfant, qui n'avoit pas encore joué son rôle en si bonne compagnie, cette pitoïable rapsodie de plusieurs termes de l'Ecriture sainte, et de quelques passages tronqués, les ennuierent d'abord, et la fourberie leur parut si grossière, qu'ils sortirent de la maison avec une indignation, qu'ils firent connoître à tout le monde, et que le Prophète ne devina pas. M. Turretin fils du Professeur étant survenu, et voulant éprouver s'il étoit vrai que le fer ne pût rien sur ces endormis insensibles, comme on leur écrivoit, et comme le croïoit M. Juriel, ficha une épeingle dans le bras du Prophète extasié, qui lui fit faire une terrible exclamation en ces termes, *Scribes, Pharisiens, Hypocrites*, ce qui fit juger qu'il étoit sensible aux piqûres.

“ Messieurs du Conseil aïant appris le lendemain ce qui s'étoit passé, ordonnerent à M. Léger Pasteur et Professeur de Philosophie, d'examiner ce miserable. Il le fit venir chez lui, et voulut le voir prophétiser ; mais soit qu'il eût perdu courage, soit qu'il craignît de se décrier, il demeura comme interdit, et feignit de ne pouvoir s'endormir, quelque nombre de chapitres de l'Ecriture sainte qu'on lut en sa présence. On se retrancha donc à lui faire avouer sa fourberie, et à decouvrir qui la lui avoit inspirée. Mais on apprit au même-tems qu'il venoit d'arriver deux autres Prophètes.” &c. *Lettres Choisies de M. Flechier Vol. II. p. 424.*

I am sorry that when that part of the foregoing essay to which this note refers was printed, I was not aware of a passage, which I should otherwise have quoted from Spinckes's tract entitled "The New Pretenders to Prophecy examined," which is appended to Dr. Hickes's "Spirit of Enthusiasm exorcised." It will not be out of place if I tack it to this note.

"One great prop of their pretended prophecy, is the part that children, I say not of thirteen years old and under, but of three years, of fifteen months, and of six months, nay, of seven days old, are said to have in it. And the words of any of these are not only esteemed to conclude as much as those of any other persons; but their inspirations are accounted of double the authority of others, by reason of their tender age. And Mr. L. instances in it, as one of those miracles whereby their dispensation is attested, that children should preach, ay, and foretel at that rate they did amongst them. And if the fact as to these little ones was true, it must be acknowledged very strange, and to have something supernatural in it; yet this will not prove it to be from God, but rather from another sort of inspiration." &c. p. 496.

NOTE K. referred to p. 236.

Mr. Lacy and the French Prophets.

I know very little of Mr. Lacy—indeed only what I have picked up from his preface to the "Cry from the Desart" published in 1707 (which I have quoted) his

"Prophetical Warnings" published the same year, and his "Relation of the Dealings of God with his unworthy servant John Lacy since the time of his believing and professing himself inspir'd," published in the following year. That he was under a most awful delusion admits of no doubt; but that there was any thing like deceit or imposture in his proceedings, it seems impossible to believe. What little he tells us of his personal history indicates that he was of good family. In the preface to the first part of his "Prophetical Warnings" which he states to have been "pronounced under the operation of the Spirit; and faithfully taken in writing, when they were spoken," he says;—

"I had four elder brothers, who had each of them the happiness of academical education, two at Pembroke Hall, and two at Magdalen College in Cambridge; but as for myself, 'tis well known among my relations and friends, that I came from Walden in Essex to London, in the year 1680, being then sixteen years of age, having learned no farther at school than Virgil, Horace, and a little of the greek grammar."

His object in mentioning this personal history is to shew that he had not the classical attainments which might have enabled him to talk latin in his extasies, as he is reported to have done. He had previously said;—

"I have great reason to bless God for having had a virtuous education, and for the grace that he has since vouchsafed me, never to allow myself to live in the practice of any known sin, nor deliberately or presumptuously to commit any one such act; I have therefore the more confidence that

God does not now deliver me up to so horrid a delusion, as the voluntary speaking, of myself, in his person would be ; and when I believe the wilful doing thereof would be such a heinous crime as would deserve that I should be struck down instantly into hell : It is a great comfort to me (and the means of my assurance that I am no longer in my natural liberty of thought and speech at such times) that my agitations generally hold me a quarter of an hour before I speak ; which time is generally employed in mental prayer and acts of resignation, without the least previous thought for the most part, of what at length is spoken, though sometimes indeed some few words may be represented to my intellect perhaps a minute before. I know assuredly, that no trouble of mind, nor melancholy, nor a prepossession of prophetic schemes, drew me into the state that I am under : I enjoy at this time, through mercy, a perfect health, without any pain, sickness, or weakness whatsoever, or any sort of disorder proceeding from the frequent ecstatic agitations ; I sleep ordinarily seven hours in twenty-four ; I have a good appetite and digestion ; and I appeal to all persons with whom I converse about my necessary affairs, and to such other company as does daily occur to me, whether I am otherwise beside myself, than only to God."

Mr. Lacy however is but an appendage to the refugee Camisards ; and they are objects of our attention at present, only on account of their children. I should not therefore have made this particular reference to him had it not been that some of the phenomena of modern spiritualism are said to have been exhibited in his person.

In the first place his moving, or being moved, in a strange manner ;—“ About two o'clock the same day [July 30. 1707] Mr. Lacy being under extasy, and standing strait upright in a corner of the chamber, with his heels, calves of his legs, and knees, close touching each

other, his hands also thrust athwart into his bosom, was carry'd, in this posture, strait forward, to the other side of the room, being the space of ten or eleven foot. He was moved as sliding. His motion lasted four seconds of time, and made the chamber shake. This was seen at first by Mr. Allut and his wife, and Eliz. Gray : and was again seen a second time, by the persons aforesaid, and Mr. Facio. That second motion was somewhat different from the former. Mr. Lacy did declare, he had no fore-thought at all of this ; nor did in the least any ways act in it, but was only passive." (*Warnings Part II.* p. 64.)

In another of his works he says ;—" Under this influence, I have experienced sometimes a voice so strong and clear, sometimes so harmonious, as my natural one never did or could furnish : Under the same, I have been carried on my knees, several times round a room, swifter than I could have gone on my feet." (*Relation p. 11.*)

Secondly, he visited the sick and alleges that his "words of healing" were followed by cures.

Thirdly, what is still more remarkable, he seems to have been, according to the language of modern spiritualism, "developed as a writing medium." In a long latin discourse uttered by him on the 12th July, an english sentence occurs. The marginal note on this sentence is "Scribit oculis clausis verba sequentia;" and the words which he is said to have written with closed eyes are "This shall begin sensibly to you within two months;" after which the latin goes on "Aliter scribendi facultatem et tibi et fratri tuo [the marginal note explains that N. F. (I presume Facio) is meant] dabo."

(*Warnings* P. I. p. 90.) With reference to this, he says
“ ‘Tis no longer I, as the voluntary prime mover and agent, that speak ; and oftentimes I know not the sense, till the words are spoken, and so heard by me as by other persons present : Nor did I myself write those english words which are contained in the warning of the 12th of July ; but my fingers were forcibly moved to do it my eyes being then close shut, and I under the agitations ; therefore I utterly deny myself to be the framer either of the agitations, or of the voice.” (*Warnings* P. I. pref. p. v.) Again he alludes to it, in his *Relation* p. 10 ; “ Under this foreign influence, I felt my fingers forcibly contracted and moved, to write those words in p. 90 of the first book of *Warnings* : Under this influence, my body was removed ten or eleven foot, as in p. 65 of the second part, without any concurrent mixture of my agency.”

NOTE L. referred to p. 257.

Spiritualist Therapeutics.

I had intended to say something on this point, but what I prepared has been superseded by a paper which appeared in Chambers's Journal for Feby. 9th. The chief difference (or rather distinction, for there is no real difference) is that my illustrations were for the most

part deduced from New York papers, while his are from those of Boston. But they are ‘both in a tale ;’ and I had rather borrow a few lines from this able paper, in Chambers, which well deserves the serious attention of all sober-minded persons. It is a happy thing that while in other quarters timid ignorance is keeping its eyes shut, and talking of these things as by-gone follies, which are, or ought to be forgotten, the editor of a periodical so well conducted and influential, has a more just appreciation of the real condition of our *paries proximus*, and of our concern in the matter. He says ;—

“As America, altogether, is an exceedingly interesting study to us in England, we think it may be worth while to give some account of this extraordinary movement of the earnest minds in that quarter of the world. We are enabled to do so by a perusal with which we have been favoured of some numbers of the *New England Spiritualist*, a weekly Boston newspaper, devoted solely to the concerns of spiritualism.

“From this singular journal, edited, with all appearance of grave good faith, by Mr A. E. Newton, we learn that the Spiritualists are persons of all ranks of life, including literary men and judges. It is computed to embrace a quarter of a million of believers, including twenty thousand ‘mediums,’ and has seventeen periodicals devoted to the promulgation of its facts and philosophy. As yet, their meetings are mostly of a private nature ; but they seem just on the point of beginning to have their meeting-houses like other religious communions.”

As to the subject of this note, however, the writer says

“Certain of the mediums—that is, persons peculiarly under the influence of spirits—profess to work cures solely through the power entrusted to them from a source beyond this

world. In Mr Newton's newspaper, there are advertisements from several men and women professing to have the power of healing. Dr W. T. Osborne announces himself as very successful in chronic and consumptive affections—‘office-hours from ten to four daily, at No. 5 Summer Street;’ ‘terms, a dollar for each examination.’ Mr and Mrs Charles C. York, of Claremont, New Hampshire, ‘healing and clairvoyant mediums,’ are prepared to visit any part of the country, to heal the afflicted, or to give prescriptions on receiving the name, age, and residence, in the patients’ handwriting, or a lock of their hair! John M. Spear and daughter announce their having taken rooms at No. 365 Washington Street, Boston, ‘for educational and healing purposes.’ They are willing to visit the sick and *disharmonised* at their habitations—not for fixed fees, but with the expectation of ‘offerings of gratitude.’ Calvin Hall, Charles Main, and a Dr Clapp, profess to exercise their sanative power by the laying of hands upon the sick, somewhat after the manner of Valentine Greatrakes, or of the Stuart sovereigns in the seventeenth century. Charles Main, who seems the most distinguished of the healing mediums, has lately opened a sanatory establishment in Boston, partly for the benefit of the poor.”

* * * * *

“It should not be overlooked that spiritualism, besides its special physicians, has its own medicines. ‘Rice’s Spirit Medicines’ are conspicuously advertised. There is a Healing Ointment, also a Nerve-soothing Elixir, a Purifying Sirup—all ‘prepared from spirit directions.’ James M’Clester & Co. press on public attention a Dysentery Cordial, an Elixir for cramps of the stomach, and a Restorative Sirup for languid and unequal circulation, ‘all carefully compounded according to Mrs Mettler’s clairvoyant recipes.’”

While this sheet has been passing through the press, the kindness of a friend has furnished me with a copy of the New York Spiritual Telegraph of Dec. 1st, 1855,

containing the following advertisements. They are given verbatim; but two, which are long, are curtailed.

MEDIUMS AND CIRCLES.

SPIRITUAL CLAIRVOYANCE.

MRS. LORIN L. PLATT would respectfully announce that she has taken rooms at No. 134 Canal, where she offers her services to the public in the examination and treatment of Diseases, by means of Clairvoyance.

TERMS.—Examination, \$2; Examination and Prescription, \$3; if the person is present or if absent, by autograph or lock of hair, \$5. Psychometrical Readings, \$1. 176

CLAIRVOYANCE AND PSYCHOMETRY.

TERMS : For Medical Examination and Prescription	\$3
For Psychometrical Delineation of Character, includ-	
ing conjugal adaptations	2
172 Address, R. P. WILSON, Cincinnati, Ohio.	

MRS. JENNIE E. KELLOGG,

SPIRIT MEDIUM.

ROOMS, NO. 625 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Mrs. Kellogg will hold circles for Spiritual Manifestations, daily, from 9 A.M. to 2 P.M., and from 7 to 9 P.M. No sittings on Sundays, nor after 2 on Mondays and Wednesdays.

DR. WILLCOCKS, CLAIRVOYANT PHYSICIAN,
Will hold circles for Spiritual Intercourse and the Examination of Diseases daily, from 9 to 12 A.M., and 2 to 5 P.M. No sittings on Sabbath. Residence 424 Broome-st. 184-4

MRS. HARRIET PORTER, Clairvoyant Physician and Spirit Medium. ROOMS—109 West Twenty-fourth Street, between Sixth and Seventh Avenues. Hours from 10 to

12 A.M., and from 2 to 5 P.M., Wednesdays and Sundays excepted.

MRS. HAYWARD, Clairvoyant for the treatment of diseases—residence 147 Prospect Street, Brooklyn. 180 4w

MISS A. SEABRING, Tipping, Writing, Seeing, Personating and Speaking medium, 443 Broadway. Hours, from 10 A.M. to 10 P.M. 71

HEALING MEDIUM.—Mrs. BRADLEY can be consulted at 94 Green Street, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, from 10 A.M. until 4 P.M. 172

MRS. E. SPARKS, Healing Medium by Manipulations, Nature's Restorant. No. 339 Fourth Avenue, near East 25th-st. Hours from 10 to 4.

J. B. CONKLIN, 134 Canal Street; Free Circle Daily (Saturday excepted) from ten to twelve; Evening Circle, half-past seven to half-past nine; Sunday evening, eight to ten.

MRS. METTLER'S MEDICINES

HAVE now been long enough before the public to win a good name for them—their best voucher is actual trial. All of her Remedies are compounded according to her directions, given while in a state of Clairvoyance, and are purely vegetable, and perfectly safe under all circumstances . . . &c.

WONDERFUL DISCOVERY.

THE NERVE-SOOTHING VITAL FLUIDS,

A new Medicine Purely Vegetable.

PREPARED ENTIRELY BY SPIRIT-DIRECTION, THROUGH

MRS. E. J. FRENCH, MEDIUM, . . . &c.

MRS. E. FRENCH,

LATE OF PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA,

CLAIRVOYANT AND HEALING PHYSICIAN,

OFFICE 341 BROADWAY, OPPOSITE TELEGRAPH BUILDING.

Hours, 10 A.M. to 1 P.M., and 2 to 4 P.M. All morbid conditions of the human organism delineated and prescribed for with accuracy hitherto unknown in the annals of Mesmeric Phenomena.

184tf

CLAIRVOYANCE AND SPIRIT MEDIUMSHIP.

A. B. SMITH, of Charlestown, N. H., has recently removed to the village of Rondout, N. Y., where he will examine the sick by the aid of Clairvoyance, and practise as a Healing Medium. Persons at a distance are carefully examined, and their diseases accurately described by simply having the name. By the same means the appropriate remedies are designated.

Mr. Smith takes on the symptoms of the disease of the person under examination ; he was formerly in ill health and afflicted with fits. The Spirits first took possession of him during a violent spasm ; he has never had one since, is well, and now weighs 200lbs.

185-4t

J. G. ATTWOOD,

"THE WONDERFUL HEALING MEDIUM OF LOCKPORT, N. Y.,"
Can now receive into his family new patients from abroad, on reasonable terms ; and with the aid of Mrs. Attwood, who is a superior Medical Clairvoyant, he continues to make scientific examinations and prescriptions for diseased persons, residing at any distance.

TERMS :—Examination, two dollars ; including prescription, three dollars, if parties are present ; if by letter, (age and name given) from three to five dollars.

185-4t

THERAPEUTIC, CLAIRVOYANT AND PSYCHOMETRIC MEDIUMSHIP.

MRS. M. B. GOURLAY, No. 178 North Tenth-street, Phila-

adelphia, will examine and prescribe for disease and give psychometric delineations of character.

TERMS.—Examination and prescription, with full directions for regimen, § 5; psychometric delineation, § 3.

REFERENCES.—Prof. Robert Hare, M.D.; Rev. E. Phelps, D.D.: Dr. William Geib, Dr. Hutner, Aaron Comfort.

NOTE M. referred to p. 264.

The Delphic Oracle.

It is not our present business to follow the history connected with this attempt to imitate the Delphic Oracle; but I wish to add a few words on some of the particulars which I have quoted. I do not undertake to explain them; but I think they are worth a few notes, which, I am sorry to say, must be notes of enquiry, rather than of explanation.

1.) "We prepared this unlucky or ill-fated little table." I venture to translate "construximus" by "prepared," first, because I do not see how they could well make a table of laurel branches; and secondly I think the translation is sanctioned by the phrase "construere mensam dape" which Facciolati quotes from Catullus.

2.) What they did was with laurel branches, *de laureis virgulis*. It is needless to say how the laurel was connected with the oracle. Van Dale says "religioso ac pio prætextu non sola ipsa Pythia, et Prophetæ quoque, et cæteri Antistites ac ministri sacrorum, ut et illi qui Deum consulendi gratia ibi aderant; verum et ipsa Adyta eorumque introitus, et cella et aræ ibi positæ laureis coronis ac frondibus obsepta erant." He pro-

ceeds to quote passages in proof. One from Aristophanes—*τὶ δῆθ' ὁ Φοῖβος ἔλακεν ἐκ τῶν στεμμάτων.* which he translates, “Quid ergo Phœbus locutus est, e loco coronis (seu ramis laureis) obsepto ;” and he adds from the scholiast on that verse *ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ τῶν στεφάνων καθημένη ἔλεγεν ἡ Πυθία,* “Quod medio coronarum, ac frondium, sedens Pythia, ita sua reddiderit responsa.” He farther quotes the line of Lucretius,

“Pythia, quæ tripode ex Phœbi, lauroque, profatur^{9.}”

But whether this work of their hands was made of, or only prepared, furnished, or adorned with, laurel, taking it as a whole, it was made in imitation of the Delphic *cortina*—“ad cortinæ similitudinem Delphicæ.”

3.) What then was the Delphic *cortina*? The word seems to be understood by many as equivalent with “Tripod ;” and it may probably be true that generally speaking a “cortina” really was a “tripod,” being a pot or kettle with three feet ; but I feel much disposed to imagine that the word when applied to the Delphic oracle, meant either generally the whole apparatus consisting of tripod and laurel, or if used with more restriction, the laurel texture, or whatever else might surround, and, in fact, conceal the actual tripod. Something like this seems as if it might be inferred from the language of Prudentius. Speaking of the cessation of oracles he says

“Delphica damnatis tacuerunt sortibus antra,
Non tripodas cortina tegit^{1.}”

Giselin in his commentary on the passage quotes Robert

⁹ Van Dale de Orac. p. 125.

¹ Apoth. p. 227.

Stephens as understanding the phrase *magni cortina theatri* to mean “locum velatum unde mimi et actores egredierentur”—in short the *curtain* of a theatre; which, as he remarks, was a meaning not unlike that which he had learnt in his childhood from Erasmus, “revolvere lecti *cortinas*,” meaning, I presume to draw the *curtains* of a bed. This view is supported by the more modern understanding and usage of the word. Du Cange, says under the word, “Cortina,” “Neque aliunde petenda origo *Cortinarum*, seu velorum, vel aulæorum, quibus altaria clauduntur apud Christianos, atque adeo lecti ipsi nostrates. Ebrardus Bethuniensis in Græcismo:

Velum *cortina*, velum tectura vocatur!

Alibi,

Aulæ dicuntur Aulæa : petasmata templi :
Cortinæ thalami : velaria, vela theatri.

Iso Magister in Gloss. ‘Aulea, proprie *Umbhang*, ab aula Attali Regis dicta, proprie *Cortinæ*.’ Auctor Bre-viloqui: ‘*Cortina* est ornamentum ecclesiarum, vel tabernaculorum, sicut vela depicta, quæ in lateribus altarium suspenduntur ne sacerdos aspectu circumstantium confundatur.’ S. Augustinus lib. 2. Quæst. super Exod. cap. 174. Αὐλαίας, quas Græci appellant, Latini Aulæa perhibent, quas *Cortinas* vulgo vocant. S. Hieronymus lib. 1. in Lamentat. Hierem. cap. 2. ‘In tentorii nomine et tabernaculi, quamvis unum videatur sonare, eo quod tabernacula inde sint dicta: quod *cortinæ* dissentiae funibus tabernaculis infra stantibus appenderentur, quæ tentoria sustinerent. Monachus Sangallensis lib. 1. cap. 2. ex emendatione Codicis Cæsarei apud Lambe-

cium : ‘Tunc adolescens ille, quem post *cortinam*, juxta quam consederat rex, stare præceperat, ut audiret quomodo singuli supplicarent, cum ipsa *cortina* ipsum circumplexus, in hos quæstus erupit, Domine’ &c.

4.) They used direful rites of secret charms for the consecration of this little table. We may feel some curiosity to learn the nature and details of these rites and charms, but I know not how such curiosity is to be gratified. Nevertheless a few words may be said respecting one of these rites—namely that they used many and long “choric ceremonies”—so I have translated “*choragiisque multis ac diuturnis ritualiter consecratam*”—and no doubt the mystic dance around the *Tripod*, gave rise to the verb *tripudio*, and a large family of words in various languages, all descended from it. *Tripudiatio* may have come, in the course of time, to mean generally a sacred dance around the Altar; and it may be correct to say Χορεία ἵερέως περὶ τὸν βωμόν. Gloss. H. Steph. Under *tripudio*, Facciolati quotes “Venant. Fort. lib. viii. car. iv. l. 4 “sacro *tripudiare* gradu,” and under *tripudium* from Livy I. 20. “cum *tripudiis* solemnique saltatu.” And if we look into Du Cange and his Supplement, we are led on through *tripodiare*, *tripudiare*, *tripidare*, up to the more acknowledged verb *trepidare* and its derivative *trepidation*. He explains it as meaning to tourney; from *trepidare* being the word used to describe a horse going rapidly, “Gallis *Galoper*;” and his next article is about *trepidarii equi* in which he quotes Vegetius, and refers his readers for farther information to what he has said under *Trottare*, and *Trepidare*. This naturally prepares us—perhaps in strict

deduction it has carried us beyond—the more obvious English *Trip*; as well as the *Trepare* which Du Cange gives as “verbum ital. *jocari*, *saltare*, *tripudiare*, *Gall. danser*.” And the supplement adds “Olim nostri dicebant *Triper*, *Treper* et *Tripeter*, pro *saltare*, a Latino ut videtur *Tripudiare*.” Beside these there are perhaps two other derivatives. One which may be (to borrow the words of the proverb) “right as a *trivet*,” but which is not particularly to our purpose. We are brought to it through *Triparium*, which we find explained by Du Cange as “*Supellectilis genus, forte Tripus, Anglis à Trewet, quasi Three-feet, Gall. Trepié seu Trepier*.” The other derivative I am almost afraid to produce, because I have no authority to offer—but still I will, not confidently, but quite seriously, ask the reader what he thinks of *Tripe*? What is the origin of the word? Will he read what Du Cange, and his editors, say under the words “*Tripa, interanea, intestina, Gall. Tripe*” &c. “*Triparius. f. Extaris propola, Gall. Tripier*.” The passage occurring in a list of occupations forbidden to the clergy he suggests “possent etiam intelligi *saltatores a veteri Gallico Triper, saltare*.” I think it fair to state this, though I must add that I do not see much weight in it as it comes between “*unguentarii*” and “*molendinarii*.” If there was as he goes on to tell us such a place as a “*Triperia, locus ubi venduntur tripæ seu intestina, Gall. Triperie*” there must have been such a person as a *Triparius* or *Triperius* to manage it; and Du Cange gives both of these explaining the former by “*Extaris propola, Gall. Tripier*,” and the latter by “*Triparum propola*.” It seems probable that when divination by the inspection

of entrails was common there was a good deal to do in that line of business. I do not however mean to press it ; and will only add to this note the original passage of Ammianus Marcellinus, or rather, an extract from Delrio's work in which that passage is included. Having referred to the statements of other historians relating to the fact he says

"Sed hos omnes falli ex eorum temporum scriptore Ammiano patet, qui reos quidem quæsiti vaticinii nominat Fidustum, Irenæum, Pergamium, Hilarium, et hos quidem convenisse alios vaticinandi peritos, (quos non nominat et forte fuere Libanius et Jamblichus) et recitat mox verba Hilarii jam latera fodicati ;

"Construximus (magnifici judices) ad cortinæ similitudinem Delphicæ, diris auspiciis, de laureis virgulis, infaustam hanc mensulam, quam videtis ; et imprecationibus carminum secretorum, choragiisque multis ac diuturnis ritualiter consecratam, movimus tandem. Movendi autem, quoties super rebus arcanis consulebatur, erat institutio talis. Conlocabatur in medio domus, emaculatæ odoribus Arabicis, undique lance rotunda pure superposita, ex diversis metallicis materiis fabrefacta : cujus in ambitu rotunditatis extremo elementorum viginti quatuor scriptiles formæ perite incisæ dijungebatur spatiis examineate dimensis. Has linteis quidam indumentis amictus, calceatusque itidem linteis soccis, torulo capite circumflexo, verbenas felicis arboris gestans, litato conceptis carminibus, numine præscriptionum authore, cærimoniali scientia supersistit cortinulas, pensulum annulum librans ex carpathio filo perquam tenui mysticis disciplinis initiatum : qui per intervalla distincta retinentibus singulis litteris incidens saltuatim heroos efficit versus interrogationibus consonos, ad numeros et modos plene conclusos ; quales jeguntur Pythici, vel ex oraculis editi Branchidarum. Ibi tum querentibus nobis, qui præsenti succedet imperio, *quoniam omni parte expolitus fore memorabatur*; assiliens annulus

duas perstrinxerat syllabas, et cum adjectione literæ postrema, exclamavit quidam præsentium, Theodorum &c."

The reader will perceive that I have inserted, and marked by *italics*, some words which I omitted in the translation in p. 264, because I do not know exactly what they mean.

NOTE N. referred to p. 270.

Lucian and some recent phænomena.

I say nothing by way of criticising this translation of Lucian, because my object in bringing forward the passage, is merely to direct the reader's attention to the statement respecting the automatic movement of the statue. I must however observe, by the way, that the translator's prepossession has led him, unintentionally and unconsciously, to misrepresent his author. Lucian does not say that other oracles "only spoke by their priests;" he says that they did not answer without priests and prophets ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν οὐτε ἵρέων ἄνευ οὐτε προφητέων φθέγγονται, leaving it open to enquiry whether there was any *speaking* in the business; and, if there was, whether it was avowedly by the priest, or whether the image spoke, or seemed to speak, by some agency and intervention of the priest.

It is, however, to the alleged fact, and to its resem-

blance to some recent phænomena that I wish to draw attention. In a pamphlet lately published by a gentleman whose character and position place him above all suspicion of falsehood or jesting, the author says¹ ;—

“On the 23rd of this month, I tried, with one of my little girls, an experiment upon her wooden doll. I placed her hands round the doll’s waist ; the doll soon afterwards began to rotate : this I prevented, by holding the doll fast by its legs. The rotating was converted into another motion, the doll struggling to move, sometimes upwards and sometimes downwards, sometimes to one side, sometimes to the other, as in the case of the small table ; and as the limbs of the doll were moveable, some of the motions were very singular, and amusing.

“The next day, I read in the ‘Morning Post’ a paragraph, from which I make the following extract :

“‘The wickedness of the people induced the Church authorities to bring out the saints in procession, and implore their aid (May 19, 1853). The favourite image at Tramutola is the Mother of God, the Holy Virgin of Rosario. . . . The Mother of God was moved to pity poor sinners, and began to show signs by pushing the robust men, who carried her, backwards on more than one occasion. The movements of the image became still more decided as she entered the church ; so much so indeed, that the immense mob began to cry, “Miraculo ! miraculo !” The statue was now exposed in the church, and a homily pronounced when God permitted a most prodigious miracle. Flames were seen to issue from the bosom of the image—the most sacred Virgin of Rosario.’

“It is not my intention to trouble you with any remarks upon the latter part of this narrative, but to me the earlier

¹ “Letters on Table-moving, on the recent miracle at Tramutola, and on the influence of animal motion upon attraction. By A. B ” London. 1853 Bailliere.

part is quite intelligible ; and I think it perfectly possible that the image might have moved in the manner described, without any premeditated design on the part of those that carried it. It is possible that 'the robust men, or some of them, had the power of communicating the moving force, and in their efforts to keep the image in its position, had converted the rotatory into another kind of motion ; and as the motion has for a time a tendency to increase in intensity, its greatest development would probably occur just previously to the image being replaced in its former position.

"My experiment with the doll was an undesigned miniature representation of the phenomenon at Tramutola."

Still more recently a narrative, which I believe to be true so far as relates to the matter for which I refer to it, has appeared in one of our most respectable periodical works, under the title of "The Detective in India." It details the method pursued by the natives of that country for the detection of thieves. A gentleman misses the watch which he had left hanging in his dressing room. By native advice a Brahmin, famous in the detective line, is sent for and arrives ;—

"A few introductory remarks as to the place from whence the property was taken, the time it was supposed to have disappeared, and party suspected, were speedily gone through ; and, permission having been accorded, the ceremony was proceeded with in front of the house under the veranda or portico. Slowly uplifting his hands above his head, he muttered a few initiatory sentences ; and then producing his brass drinking-mug, proceeded to the Hooghly to fill it with water from this the most holy stream which flows from the sacred Gunga or Ganges. Afterwards, he brought forward and laid on the ground with much care his mystic bamboo-rods—two in number, about eight feet in length, an inch and a half broad, and a quarter of an inch

thick. These were sprinkled from end to end with the river water, and duly prayed over. A leaf containing some red pigment was then produced, and in a brief space each knot in the bamboos was daubed with a red spot, and blessed, and upon each painted spot was placed a leaf of the sacred Tulsee tree, which the wind did not long allow to remain ; but that evidently was of little consequence.

"The preliminaries being now arranged, the Brahmin advanced to our friend C——, bowing his head, and at the same time raising above it his close-pressed open hands—a token of great deference. 'Sahib,' he said, 'all is ready ; but I require two men of the same creed or religion to hold the rods : no cross sects or creeds will do ; they must be influenced by the like fear or favour of their gods.'"

This requisition led to some difficulty and delay ; as most of the numerous bystanders, for one reason or another, were shy of undertaking the office. At length, however,

"a couple of Ouriers—a caste upon the Madras coast—volunteered ; whereon the rods were removed from the ground, and the men stationed a sufficient distance apart, facing each other. The ends of the rods were then placed under their armpits—that is, the end of one rod was placed under the right armpit of one man, while the other end of the rod was placed under the left armpit of his opponent, the other rod being similarly placed under their other armpits, and both rods were lightly supported below by the palms of their open hands. Again another prayer was uttered, and the rod sprinkled afresh, when the operator, in a very grave and business-like way, informed the bamboos of the nature of the lost property, and humbly requested them to proceed to the place from whence it was abstracted, then point out the thief, and discover where the watch was secreted.

"Standing midway between the supporters of the rods was the priest, who kept reminding the bamboos of their duty,

and stimulated them to the performance of it by repeating the words : ‘Sigi, sigi ! juldee, juldee !’ (Soon, soon ! quick, quick !) but, like their prototypes which would not beat the dog, the sticks remained for a length of time inexorable. At length a sudden outbreak of discordant exclamations announced something of importance, and the rods were now reported as obeying the mandates of the deity ; and we confess, to our great surprise, we beheld the bamboos crossing each other horizontally, and afterwards alternately rise up and descend. The motions were exceedingly slow and uncertain, but there was no mistake about them. The operator, observing the effect produced, remarked it was but trifling in comparison with what they would accomplish ; and, in reply to sundry questions, stated they would bend in the direction they required their supporters to go, which would first be to the place from whence the watch was taken, and afterwards in search of the thief, whom they would indicate by bending towards him ; and the party so pointed at, when ordered to sit on the ground, the sticks, being held over his head, would separate, and, descending, enclose his head between them.

“With this explanation the affair proceeded.”

The rods having visited and been made fully acquainted with the place from whence the watch had been stolen, it was suggested by the impatient europeans that the detective should forthwith proceed to point out the thief, if he was to be found among the servants.

“The domestics, some fifteen or sixteen, were ordered to stand in two rows, facing each other.

“This accomplished, the bamboos, with fresh supporters, were slowly moved along in front of those on one side, and repeated with those on the opposite ; and in every instance were rigid enough, save when in front of the khansamar, or head-servant : to him they bent gently forward, and at length touched him. This was repeated several times with a similar result, and the natives were perfectly satisfied the

offender was identified. The sahibs, however, declined such evidence as satisfactory, more particularly as the man had always appeared a civil, honest, good attendant.

"This want of conviction being communicated to the Brahmin—to afford additional and conclusive evidence, he ordered the servants to squat or sit, as is their custom, upon their heels ; and again the rods were taken along in front of them. This time, the guilty man's head was encompassed. The bamboos passed slowly and inactively along until they arrived again in front of the khansamar, when the rod nearest him began to extend over his head ; and both rods now descending, the unfortunate's head was enclosed between them. In the hope that some deviation might take place in favour of the presumed culprit, we caused the operation to be repeated several times, but the result was unvarying ; and it was evident the man was viewed by his fellows as a thoroughly proved criminal ²."

The story is long and highly interesting ; but it is not to our purpose to pursue it here, because "the unlooked-for turn things had taken, and the length of time which had elapsed since the affair began, made the Europeans tired and disgusted." They had recourse therefore to other means of detection less tedious than the ceremony of Nole Chanlaun but strangely confirmatory of its indications.

My authority in this case being a periodical work as justly valued for its ingenious fictions, as for its interesting and instructive essays on subjects where nothing but strict truth is of value, I should add that I do not quote it without having made enquiry, and received such information as leads me to believe that this story may claim a place in the latter class, as a simple statement of facts.

² Chambers's Journal for Jan. 26, 1856.

NOTE on EZEK. xiii. 18.

which should have been referred to p. 191.

It was not until these notes were passing through the press that I looked at Houbigant's commentary on this passage. It is, however, so much to the purpose that I subjoin it :—

“**בְּסֶתֶות**, *pulrillos*. Ita fere omnes. Tamen, versibus 18. et 20. diligenter inter se collatis, perspicuum erit, neque esse **בְּסֶתֶות**, *pulrillos*, nec **הַמִּסְפָּחוֹת** *cervicalia*; nam duæ illæ res non quadrant in verbum **צָדֵר** *renari*, seu *laqueo capere*; quo ex verbo docemur similitudinem duci ex astutia venatorum, et ex artibus, quibus aves, aut animalia, venatu capiantur. Deinde si convertes *pulrillos* et *cervicalia*, laborabis postea ut interpreteris **אֲצִילִי יְדֵי**. Illud etiam considerandum est, non convenire in prophetissas, que hic objurgantur, ut *consuant pulrillos*. Neque enim consuere pulvillo, pars est prophetæ, ut neque incantamenti. Nos **כְּסֶתֶות** convertimus *phylacteria*, ut, apud Hexapla unus Interpres, qui *φυλακτήρια* nimirum *rittas*, quas mulieres illæ asserebant **בְּהָן אֲנַחֲנָא מַהְרְשָׁן יְתֵ נְפָשָׁן** *in his nos incantamus animas* Deinde convertimus *tænias*, sive *funiculos*, **ex כְּפָסָס**, *adhærere, adjungere*. Quas *tænias* illæ mulieres *appli-cabant*, seu *ligabant* **עַל רַאשׁ כָּל קְוָמָה** *ad summītatem omnīs staturaē suā* (*קְוָמָה*) *vel pro קְוָמָה* quæque ex humeris pendebant. Notum est omnibus talibus instrumentis artium magicarum usas fuisse veteres Sagas. . . . **וּנְפָשָׁות לְכָנָה** . . . **חַיִנָּה** . . . *et animas sibi ipsis virificant*, non modo quia lucrum faciebant ex falsis vaticinationibus et incantamentis, sed etiam quia regi et aulicis placebant, cum Dei prophetis adversabantur.”

I N D E X.

- Aaron's rod, 65.
Abyss, 43 ; serpent of, 274.
Ammianus Marcellinus, 263.
 324.
Angels, their sin and punishment, 27 ; hymn relating to, 28 ; worship of, 96 ; Book of Enoch relating to, 69.
Anna the prophetess, 119.
Antediluvian worship, 1.
Appius, visit to the Oracle, 265.
Apuleius, defence of himself, 226.
Asa, King, 244.
Asa-Loke, in Scand. Mythology, 276.

Baldinger, 251.
Baltus, Jesuit, 261.
Bicker, 251. 253.
Bryant's Analysis, 11. 90.

Cahagnet, Magnetisme, 107.
Call, or formula of prayer for Spirits, 221, 222.
Calling on the name of the Lord, 5.
Camerarius, 219.
Campbell, Duncan, 111.
Canaan, curious arts there, 89.

Cardan, his opinion of mirror-magic, 215.
Cassiodorus, 263.
Chambers's Journal on Spiritualism, 313 ; Detective in India, 327.
Charlatan, 268.
Charm to find out a thief, 215.
Chinese account of Sea Serpent, 275.
Chus, inventor of magic, 26.
Children in relation to false worship, 211 ; among the french prophets, 237.
Cicero on divination, 258.
Circulators, 268.
Claudian, of the tripods, 267.
Cortina, 320.
Crystals, magic, 213. 223.

Daemonical possession, 67 ; of the swine, 47.
Darling, Dr., experiments, 138.
Deborah the prophetess, 117.
Dee, Dr., 99. 214. 216 ; Arthur, 216.
Defoe, Dan., life of Duncan Campbell, 114.
Delphic Oracle, 319.
Delrio, 268. 324.

- Deluge, 10 ; connection with heathen mythology, 14.
 Detective in India, 327.
 Didius Julianus, practice of magic, 224.
 Divination, Cicero on, 258.
 Doddridge on the worship of Angels, 96 ; on Tertullian's interpretation of Col. ii., 97.
 Dragons, 64. 66 ; Chinese, 275.
 Egyptian Magic, Lane's, 212.
 Electro-biology, 138.
 Enoch, book of, 68. 279.
 Exodus Papyri, Heath's, 41.
 Eye, its alleged effects, 135.
 Ezekiel xiii., 184.
- Facies, 149.
 Facillation, 150. 297.
 False worship, origin of, 15. 78.
 Fascination, 134.
 Female superstitions, 283.
 Flechier, Bp. of Nismes, 230.
 Fontenelle on Oracles, 261. 268.
 French Prophets, 230. 236. 309.
- Gazing, 138.
 Geneva, so-called prophetic gift brought from, 230 ; proceedings there, 233. 307.
 Giants, 68. 70 ; descendants of, 20.
 Gregory, Dr., Letters on Mesmerism, 137 ; of children acted on by Crystals, 223.
- Ham, the land of, a hot-bed of false worship, 26.
 Healing, 243.
 Heart of the earth, 49.
- Heath's Exodus Papyri, 41.
 Hell, the word used as equivalent for Hades and Gehenna, 31.
 Hesiod on the doctrine of a Supreme being, 82 ; of the immortals, 84 ; of the Titans, 273.
 Houbigant on Ezek. xiii., 331.
 Huidekoper, 278.
 Hulda the prophetess, 117.
 Hydra, 35.
- Idolatry, no record of before the flood, 8. 10 ; Maimonides on the origin of, 5 ; figuratively described as adultery, 124.
 Jeremiah delivered from the dungeon, 189.
 Jewish interpretation of calling on the name of the Lord, 5.
 Invultation, 150. 291.
 John of Salisbury, 214.
 Jormungandur, Scandinavian Serpent, 276.
 Jotunheim, Giant's-land in Scand. Myth., 277.
 Isaiah (iii.) 126. 152 ; (xiv. 22), 37.
 Ishbi-benob, 21, 22.
 Judah, the Patriarch, 198.
 Julianus Didius, his practice of Magic, 224.
- Kadesah, Kadesim, 194. 299.
 Kelly, Edward, Dee's Skryer, 216.
- Lacy, John, his Cry from the Desart, 236 ; Note on, 309.
 Lane's Egypt, 211.
 Laurence, Abp., Book of Enoch, 68. 279.
 Leviathan, 53.

- Lewis, Mr., experiments in electro-biology, 139.
 Loke—see *Asa* and *Utgard*.
 Lucan, 265.
 Lucian, of the tripod, 267 ; of oracles, 269. 325.
- Magic, Egyptian, 211.
 Maimonides of idolatry, 5.
 Marrying in the days of Noe, 24.
 Mede, Joseph, extract from, 244.
 Medhurst, of Chinese Dragon, 275.
 Mencke, Charlataneria Eruitorum, 268.
 Mesmeric sleep produced by gazing, 146.
 Mesmerism in Geneva, 307.
 Mesmerists repudiate Spiritualists and Swedenborgians, 103.
 Metzger, Dr., 250.
 Mirrors, magic, 213, 214.
 Moses' rod turned into a serpent, 65.
 Mysteries, memorials of the deluge, 90 ; Warburton on, 93. 281 ; all mysterious worship from Egypt, 93.
- Nachash, Leviathan, 58. 63.
 Noah, Bryant's idea of his deification, 12 ; his family, 23.
 Nole Chanlaun, 330.
- Og, King of Basan, 21.
 Okey, Eliz., her case, 109.
 Olbers, 251.
 Oracles, 257.
- Pagan doctrine of a Supreme Being, 78.
- Papyri, Exodus, 41.
 Pathach, 192.
 Philip's daughters prophetesses, 120.
 Physicians, 248.
 Pigott, Scandinavian Mythology, 276.
 Pit, bottomless, 45. 52.
 Plautus on the doctrine of a divine Supremacy, 85 ; female superstition, 283.
 Prophecy, 3.
 Prophets, french, 230.
 Prophetesses, 117.
- Quarterly Review of Lane's Egypt, 211.
- Rephaim, Bp. Patrick's account of, 22 ; Joseph Mede's, 244.
- Robert, M., 250.
 Romans (x. 6), 48.
- Salisbury, John of, 214. 292.
 Scandinavian Mythology, 276.
 Scot, Reginald, discovery of witchcraft, 214.
 Scott, Sir Walter's Daemonology, 290.
 Sea Serpent, 67.
 Seers and Skryers, 215.
 Seneca, of the tripod, 267.
 Septuagint, of Tartarus and Leviathan, 53.
 Serpent of the abyss, 274.
 Sons of God, (Gen. vi.) 19.
 Spartianus, 224.
 Speech of Oracles, 262.
 Spincke's "New Pretenders to Prophecy," 309.
 Spirits, evil, why called unclean, 75.
 Spirits in prison, 50.
 Spiritualist Therapeutics, 313 ; Advertisements, 316.

- Spiritualists repudiate Swedenborgianism, 103.
 Superstition, female, 283.
 Supreme Being, Pagan doctrine of, 78.
 Swedenborg, 100.
- Table-moving in the fourth century, 265.
 Tamin, 63.
 Tartarizing, 34.
 Tartarus, place of sinning angels, 31; etymology of, 41; in the LXX, 37. 53; Hesiod's description, 273.
 Tertullian on doctrine taught by angels, 97; of entranced children, 226; on table prophesying, 267.
 Theogony, origin of, 19.
 Theological Critic, 145. 289.
 Titans, etymology, 42; their place, 36.
 Tramutola miracle, 326.
- Tripudiare, 322.
 Trois Echelles, 144.
- Valens, the Emperor, 263.
 Valenti, Dr. De, of a mesmeric case, 105.
 Van Dale on oracles, 261.
 Vivaraïs, so-called prophets in, 231. 233.
 Vauderie, Vaudoisie, 299.
 Utgard, Utgard's-Loke, 276.
 Vultivoli, 292.
 Vultus, 149. 293. 296.
- Warburton, of the mysteries, 93. 281.
 Watchers, book of Enoch, 69.
 Wienholt, 251.
 Women in relation to false worship, 116.
- Zonaras, 263.