

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
SACRED BOOKS
AND OF
JOSEPHUS,
ESPECIALLY THE FORMER,
FROM VARIOUS
MISREPRESENTATIONS AND CAVILS
OF THE CELEBRATED
M. DE VOLTAIRE.

Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?
JOB xxxviii. 2.

BY
ROBERT FINDLAY, A. M.
ONE OF THE MINISTERS OF GLASGOW.

GLASGOW:
PRINTED BY ROBERT AND ANDREW FOULIS,
AND
SOLD BY J. GILMOUR AND SON, J. BARRY,
AND THE PRINTERS.
M.DCC.LXX.

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
SACRED BOOKS
AND OF
JOSEPHUS
AGAINST MR. VOLTAIRE.
PART I.

OF MR. VOLTAIRE'S INJURIES TO JOSEPHUS.

I BEGIN with the injuries done by Mr. Voltaire to the Jewish historian, and I take them all from his *Philosophy of History*, though I bring my proofs of the succeeding parts of my complaint against him, not only from this, but from several other of his literary compositions.

It requires greater pains to justify the reproach of disingenuity and bad faith against our author here, that he seldom obliges his readers with any direction in what book and chapter of Josephus's works, the passages are to be seen which he professes to cite or build on. But with chearfulness I submit to the additional trouble which this vague and loose manner of reference creates, that I may convict him of unfair dealing, and furnish an effectual caveat against a

blind dependance upon him, and a precipitate resignation of the understanding to the light he hangs out about those antient facts which have any connection, more immediate or more remote, with divine revelation. Perhaps some may examine the charge of such abuse of a writer merely human, and allowed by all to be under no superior guidance, more impartially; and by finding it made good against him, may be more disposed to listen to the same accusation of him, for trying to mislead the world by false accounts and explications of those authors, whom Christians maintain to have been favoured with inspiration more or less plenary.

S E C T I O N I.

Of his saying in Chapter twenty-fourth of his *PHILOSOPHY of HISTORY*, that the Jews called their city *HERSHALAÏM*, and that the Greeks altered it to *JERUSALEM*, according to *JOSEPHUS*.

TO enter then upon this branch of my task, I will first remark upon his detail in chapter xxiv.* ‘ Josephus himself, in the book against Appi-
‘ on, acknowledges that the Greeks could not pro-
‘ nounce the barbarous name of Jerufalem, because
‘ the Jews pronounced it Hershalaim: this word
‘ grated the throat of an Athenian, and it was
‘ changed by the Greeks from Hershalaim to Jerusa-
‘ lem.’ But where hath Josephus said that the Jews

* Page 116 of English Translation, printed at Glasgow 1766 which I always quote.

called the metropolis of their country Herſhalaim? or that the Greeks, unable to pronounce ſo harſh a word, altered it into Jeruſalem? I find indeed, in his firſt book againſt Appion, he quotes * a paſſage from a treatiſe upon ſleep by Cleanthes, a famous peripatetic philoſopher, where Ariſtotle is introduced, ſaying, ‘ That the region which the Jews poſſeſs is called Judea, and that the name of their city is very crabbed or uncouth, for they call it Jeruſalem.’ And this I ſuppoſe to be the place Voltaire had in his eye, as it is the only one which ſeems to have any relation to the matter. But how far is it from affording any ſufficient handle for his ſtory? The plain ſound of the Hebrew term is Ieruſhalaim, or Ieruſhelem, as it is variously pointed. Accordingly, all Greek writers, both thoſe who are now loſt, in their teſtimonies produced by Joſephus, as Manetho, Dius, Menander, Berofus, Lyſimachus, Heccatacus, Agatharcides, and thoſe who are ſtill preſerved, as Strabo, Diodorus, &c. call it Ieroſoluma, without any intimation that they made ſuch an alteration as he ſpeaks of, to accommodate it to the ears and lips of thoſe among whom they lived. Even Lyſimachus, who had ſaid that the firſt ſettlers in Judea named the city which they built and inhabited, Ieroſula, from † their carrying thither the ſpoils of the temples of the gods, which he makes them to have deſtroyed in their retreat from Egypt, confeſſes, that their poſterity, having waxed powerful there, in proceſs of time changed the name of the

* Edit. Hudſon, ſect 22. p. 1347, *Ὀνομα παντοσκολιον εστιν, Ἰερουσαλημ γὰρ αὐτὴν καλοῦσι.*

† Ibid. ſect. 34. *Quod ἱερά σεσυληκασι,* ſays Hudſon.

city into Ierofoluma, that they might not, in its appellation; furnish any handle to upbraid them for such sacrilegious plunder. The falshood of that tale however, is easily manifested by repeating Josephus's observation with a view to confute it: ‘ This fine
 ‘ writer *, says he, through his too keen desire to
 ‘ calumniate us, did not consider that we Jews do
 ‘ not express robbing temples by the same word as
 ‘ the Greeks, for what more need be said against one
 ‘ who lies so impudently?’ And, in like manner, another of these writers whom Josephus quotes, Agatharcides, expressly affirms †, ‘ That the natives or
 ‘ inhabitants of the country, called the city Ierofoluma ;’ as the attentive reader must have observed Aristotle say, that the Jews called the city Ierusalem, in the passage itself which Voltaire is thought to allude to.

* Sect. 35. Edit. Hudf. Ὁ δὲ γενναῖος ὑπο πολλῆς τῆς λοιδόρου ἀκρίστιας ἐστειλέκεν ὅτι ἱεροσολεῖν ἔκατα τὴν αὐτὴν φωνὴν Ἰουδαῖοι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὀνομαζόμεν, &c.

† Ibid. sect. 22. Ἦν καλεῖν Ἱεροσολύμα συμβαίνει τὰς ἐγχωρίαις.

SECTION II.

Of his saying in Chapter twenty-fifth of the same, that JOSEPHUS owns MINOS received his Laws from a God, where also DR. MIDDLETON'S Assertion, that he does not insist on any divine Authority of MOSES, nay that he had no inward Conviction of it, is considered.

BUT let us now proceed to the detection of a falshood more important. Says Voltaire, chap. xxv. * ‘ Flavian Josephus does not hesitate saying, ‘ that Minos received his laws from a god. This is ‘ a little strange in a Jew, who, it should seem, ought ‘ to allow no other god than his own, unless he ‘ thought like the Romans his masters, and like all ‘ the first people of antiquity, who allowed the exist- ‘ ence of all the gods of other nations.’ With the sentiments of the Romans, and other idolatrous nations, on this point, I have at present no concern. My business now is only to enquire, whether Josephus hath allowed such divine authority to the lawgiver of Crete. This I confess would appear to me not a little strange, as Voltaire pronounces it: but altogether inconsistent with his character as a Jew, who professed to believe that Jehovah, the God of Israel, was the God of the universe, and that there was none besides. But there is no reason for imputing such an absurdity to him. What he says is ‘ Our ‘ lawgiver, Moses, was not a juggler or impostor, as ‘ they say, reviling us unjustly, but such a one as the

* See page 118.

‘ Greeks * boast Minos to have been, and after him
 ‘ other lawgivers ; for some of them said their laws
 ‘ were of divine original, Minos at least referred his
 ‘ laws to Apollo and his Delphic oracle, they either
 ‘ thinking it was so in reality, or supposing they
 ‘ would easily persuade the people of it :’ which is no
 more an argument that Josephus thought Minos re-
 ceived his laws from a god, than it would be an evi-
 dence that a Christian judged Mahomet to be a di-
 vine messenger and instructor, if he should say that
 Jesus was such a person as the Turks believed Maho-
 met to have been.

So much for Voltaire’s reflection. But the recital
 of the passage furnishes a natural occasion to observe,
 that Dr. Middleton hath from it imputed such senti-
 ments to Josephus concerning Moses, as are too de-
 rogatory to his honour to pass uncensured ; for he
 maintains, † ‘ That Josephus here does not insist on
 ‘ any supernatural or divine authority of Moses ; but
 ‘ ascribes all the great things done by him to his own
 ‘ personal skill and management, putting him on the
 ‘ same footing with Minos, and the other old law-
 ‘ givers of Greece, and giving him the preference on-
 ‘ ly on the comparison, for the superior excellency
 ‘ of his laws.’ With what injustice he does so, is evi-
 dent in part already ; but to obviate further any bad
 impressions which his assertion may make, I add, that
 as Josephus often speaks of the divine inspiration and
 mission of Moses, so he does in that very place, ac-

* Contra Appion lib. 2. sect. 16. page. 1376. Αλλ’ οἱον παρα-
 τοις Ελλησιν αυχασιν τον Μινω γεγονεναι, &c.

† See Middleton’s works vol. 3. 8vo. Defence of Letter to Dr.
 Waterland, page 95.

according to all MSS. declare his conviction of it; while Middleton, in preference to their authority, follows the reading of the old Latin translation, which the learned * Joseph Scaliger hath censured as the work of a most unskilful and ignorant interpreter; nor can the accusation be denied to be well founded. The historian's words are, ' There being in Moses a
 ' virtuous intention and great achievements, we
 ' reasonably concluded, that he † had a divine leader
 ' and counsellor, and being persuaded himself that
 ' he acted and meditated all things according to his
 ' will, he judged it behoved him especially to inspire
 ' this opinion into the multitude, for they who be-
 ' lieve that God inspects their lives, do not allow
 ' themselves to neglect any duty.' ‡ If he say, after the

* See the preface to Hudson's edit. ' Josephus Scaliger, recentiorum doctissimus, veterem Flavii interpretem imperitissimum appellat,'

† Edit. Hudf. 1376. Εἰκότως ἐρομίζομεν ἡγεμόνα τε καὶ συμβουλον θεοῦ εἶναι. Middleton with the old translator reads ἐρομίζειν, which makes Josephus declare only Moses's own conceit in the matter.

‡ These the Doctor hath represented thus, ' Such an one,' says he, ' whose intentions were so just and noble, might reasonably presume that he had God for his guide and counsellor; and having once persuaded himself of this, he judged it necessary above all things, to instill the same notion into the people, that every thing he did was directed by the will of heaven, not acting herein the part of a magician or impostor as some have unjustly accused him, but like the famed lawgivers of Greece, who, to make their good designs the more effectual, used to ascribe the invention of their own laws to the gods, and more especially like Minos, who imputed all his institutions to Apollo and the Delphic oracle ' Letter to Dr. Waterland, containing some remarks on his Vindication of Scripture. *ibid.* p. 29.

But every one who is able to read the original, will see he hath taken unjustifiable liberties in this translation which he hath here given. For besides making Josephus only tell Moses's own belief, that he

passage a little ago produced from him, and introduced by the words just now recited, ‘ Who of them
 ‘ constituted the best laws, and entertained the just-
 ‘ est sentiments concerning the deity, all may learn
 ‘ from the laws themselves, comparing them with
 ‘ one another.’ This is no proof that he imagined Moses had no claim to superior honour and respect, as alone of the two vested with a commission from the Creator of heaven and earth; it is only an appeal to the world about the equity of his pretensions, that he had a divine teacher.

I am aware the same great man, though he † owns Josephus speaks of the inspiration of Moses where the Scripture does it, from which he professes to copy, hath contended also that he had no inward conviction of it, because he varies remarkably from the Mo-
 saic account in his narration of many facts, against his own solemn declarations of strict and rigorous adherence thereto. But does not Fabricius ‡ himself, to

was under a divine conduct, where, by all MSS. he expresses this to have been the sense of his nation, of which above, he omits what he hath about his great actions, and about his thinking it a duty incumbent on him from his knowledge of God’s attention to his behaviour, to impress the people with a persuasion of his divine mission. And he disguises his plain meaning, that Moses was such in truth and reality, as the Greeks falsely boasted or bragged Minos to be. With the same view further he restrains the term rendered impostor, to signify one who used the pretence of miracles, to cheat and deceive for his own advantage, Defence of his Letter, *ibid.* p. 102. when yet it denotes a person, who puts a trick or fallacy upon another, from any principle, and with any design whatever.

† See Remarks on the Reply to the Defence of his Letter. *Ibid.* p. 200.

‡ See Fabricius’s *Bibl. Graeca*, lib. 4. cap. 6. or Hudson’s editi-

whom he sends us for proof of these deviations from it, guard us against drawing this conclusion in his answer to Bayle, who from the same topic, had argued Josephus's opinion of the fallibility, and by consequence, of the non-inspiration of Moses? His reflection here seems to me very sensible, and removes, or at least greatly lessens the difficulty; on which account, as I do not recollect to have met with it in English, I shall here transcribe it. ‘ This notion, that
 ‘ Josephus did not believe Moses's divine authority,
 ‘ is not probable, says he, and is confuted by his own
 ‘ most express assurances. I would rather hold, that
 ‘ being a Pharisee, he did not think he contradicted
 ‘ the sacred writers, when he most interpolated their
 ‘ accounts according to the traditions of his nation,
 ‘ or even wrote things repugnant to their true and
 ‘ natural meaning. How many are there among
 ‘ Christians, who, while they have expounded the
 ‘ sacred books according to their own preconceived
 ‘ opinions, have done the same thing, and still do it?
 ‘ Yet there neither was, nor is any doubt in their
 ‘ minds, concerning the divine inspiration of their
 ‘ authors. I will not believe that either Peter Co-
 ‘ mestor, author of the Scholastic History *; or that
 ‘ Xavier the Jesuit, author of the Evangelical History
 ‘ for the use of the Persians, had any hesitation about
 ‘ the truth of the divine oracles, or that they can be

on of Josephus, who hath copied the whole chapter of that work into his preface.

* This contained an abridgement of the Scripture facts from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Acts of the Apostles, and was in great esteem and use from the twelfth century when it was published, till the Reformation.

‘ convicted from their own writings of entertaining
 ‘ any suspicion concerning this point, though they
 ‘ are not more accurate and exact than Josephus, in
 ‘ representing the sacred history.

He moreover appears to found * his opinion of Josephus’s infidelity upon these many passages in his Antiquities, where, having given a relation of some fact agreeable to Scripture, he subjoins, ‘ But about
 ‘ this let every one think as he pleases.†’ Or, ‘ But
 ‘ if any one will think otherwise about these things,
 ‘ let him possess his diversity of sentiment without
 ‘ blame.’ But will these passages bear all that stress which he lays upon them? It is evident Josephus uses this form of expression where he cannot be supposed either to have disbelieved or doubted the truth of the matter he writes of. To give an example or two, after refuting || their story, who affirmed that Moses and the Israelites were expelled from Egypt on account of the leprosy, by this argument, That then he would neither have subjected those who might labour under this disease to such incapacities, nor have imposed upon them such burdensome ceremonies as he has done in his law for their recovery from them; especially, as in some countries, persons infected with this malady, were crowned with honours both civil and religious: he adds, ‘ But about these
 ‘ things let every one think as he pleases.’ Again, having mentioned ‡ some more recent instances of the great reverence of the Jews for the law of Mo-

* See his Defence, p. 108, 109; and Remarks in reply to his Defence, p. 201.

† See his Antiq. 2. 18. 5. and 10. 11. Fin.

|| Ibid. 3. 11. 4.

‡ Ibid. 3. 15. 3.

les, and one which happened only a little before the war broke out with the Romans, in the reign of Claudius and pontificate of Ishmael, about their abstinence from all use of a supply of corn which arrived at the passover, though the famine was so severe before, that an altar * had been sold for four drachmas, in order to shew the credibility of the Scripture accounts of the respect paid to their legislator, by the immense numbers whom he led through the wilderness, seeing the statutes delivered by him had still so great force and authority, that their enemies themselves confessed a divine establishment of their polity by Moses, he, in like manner, says, ‘But every one will receive these things as to him seemeth fit.’ The true key therefore to these phrases appears to be, not that he rejected, or even suspected, the divinity of the Mosaic religion, but that he was de-

§ As I could not find this ancient measure in any tables of Arbuthnot and others, I was a while uncertain about its capacity, though desirous to explain it to the reader. I have, however, at last discovered, that Josephus translates by this term the Hebrew word *gno-mer*, which we turn omer, as indeed his Greek word *ασσαρων* is easily formed from the Hebrew *gnas Sharon*, which is used as equivalent to it, Exod xxix. 40, &c. for the omer is declared to have been (as *gnas Sharon* signifies) the tenth part of the ephah, Exod xvi. 36. thus, Antiq. 3. 1. 6. he uses it to express the measure of manna which was to be gathered for every man, which all know to have been an omer; now an omer is reckoned equal to $5\frac{1}{6}$ pints of English corn measure, being the tenth part of the ephah, which made three pecks, three pints, or a bushel and a half, sixteen pints going to compose the peck, and two pecks to form the bushel. By consequence, Josephus’s meaning is, that a measure of meal, containing about a third part of our peck, was sold at half a crown, the drachm being about seven pence half-penny of our currency. A great dearth indeed!

firmous to obviate the prejudices of the heathens against it as unfociable, and against himself and his countrymen who embraced it as turbulent; and to wipe off the imputation, frequently cast upon them, as if they required that all men should renounce their opinions for theirs, and would not allow the world to live in tranquillity, without such a change in their faith †. And this point he might think more important to be accomplished, as they were then in a state of distress and affliction, through the belief which the Romans entertained of their restless and perverse temper.

As to the quotations which Dr. Middleton further brings from Philo, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, to justify his hypothesis, That Moses had recourse to the fiction of having received his law from God, that he might give it greater force and authority, every one must be sensible it would require a long digression to examine them; the hypothesis which he urges them to support, must indeed seem very strange in one who professed himself a sincere friend to Christianity, and was vested with the character of a public teacher of it, after the clear declarations by Jesus, Paul, and Stephen, that Moses was a prophet of God; and the more strange, that, notwithstanding these, he pronounces the opposite scheme only a senseless ‡ prejudice, which it becomes rational apologists for the gospel to destroy

† The same account Dr Warburton gives of these expressions in the Jewish historian, which have a sceptical or libertine air, while in other passages, he hath all the marks of a zealous believer, as I have lately observed. Div. Legation, vol 4. book 5. p. 274, and 280.

‡ See Dr. Middleton's Defence, &c. p. 71.

in this age, when it is so vigorously assaulted; even as a skilful engineer demolishes the weak outworks of a place he would defend, that serve only for a shelter and lodgement to the enemy, whence to batter it the more effectually. Nevertheless the accurate discussion of his arguments for it, as I aim at brevity, cannot be now undertaken. I will only therefore remark concerning Philo's * words, who is the sole Jewish evidence he offers after Josephus, ' Whatever
' Moses dictated to them, whether he had invented it
' himself, or received it from the deity, they imputed
' it all to God.' That they can never afford any good ground to conclude such was his creed, as he represents, since he must be reasonably thought there to express himself according to the principles of those enemies of their polity, with whom he had been arguing, when he speaks of Moses's having contrived his statutes himself, as in numberless other places of his writings he asserts his divine mission and guidance. And I refer to Pearce † for full satisfaction about the rest.

If this article hath been more prolix, it is hoped the

* Philo, apud Euseb. Praepar. lib. 8 cap. 6.

† He at that time curate of St. Martin's in the Fields, and since bishop of Rochester, was, if I mistake not, author of the Reply to Dr. Middleton's Letter to Waterland, and of the Reply to his Defence of it, and shews, according to my information (for I have not been able to procure a sight of these pieces,) that Clement of Alexandria, where he makes him speak of the Greeks borrowing from Moses the practice of lying, to serve the ends of government, intends no more than the use of stratagems of war against enemies; and that Eusebius Praepar. lib. 2. where he says there are infinite examples of fictions for the benefit of mankind in the books of Moses, only means metaphorical representations of God, as susceptible of human passions.

plausibility of Dr. Middleton's pretences for thinking that Josephus supposed Moses only to feign a divine commission, together with his distinguished reputation for literature, and the moment of shewing there was no solid foundation for such an inference about his sentiments, will abundantly vindicate it from any blame.

S E C T I O N III.

Of his lame and defective Account of JOSEPHUS's Prediction to VESPASIAN in Chapter thirty-first.

THE next example I will mention of Voltaire's misrepresentation of the Jewish historian, is from his thirty-first chapter *. Having related Josephus's prediction to Vespasian, in the name of the God of the Jews, that he and his son would become emperors, and observed that hereby he ran no risque, he goes on, ' Vespasian informed this Josephus, that, if he were a prophet, he should have foretold him' (Voltaire should have said, himself) ' the loss of Jotapat, which he had ineffectually defended against the Roman army. Josephus replied, that he had in fact foretold it; which was not very surprizing. What commander, who sustains a siege in a small place against a numerous army, does not foretel that the place will be taken?' But is this a just account of Josephus's reply? far from it; though I mean not to defend the truth of the story about his prophecy, only to correct Voltaire's recital of the fact.

* Page 139, 140.

The historian's † narrative runs thus: ' When Josephus had foretold the advancement of Vespasian and Titus to the imperial dignity, Vespasian seemed at first to give him no credit, and suspected he spoke those things craftily, to save himself. But by degrees he was induced to believe he would be raised to the government by divine providence---He found also Josephus true in other things: for one of the two friends, who with Titus was present at this private conference, said he wondered that he neither foretold to the Jotopatans the taking of their town, nor to himself his being made a prisoner, if these things were not fictions from a desire to avert his displeasure. But Josephus answered, " That he had predicted to the Jotopatans, that they would be taken after the forty-seventh day of the siege, and that he himself would be taken captive by the Romans." These things, upon private inquiry of the prisoners, Vespasian learned to have happened, and began to believe his prophecies about his own preferment.' Indeed Josephus was too wise to rest Vespasian's faith of his prediction, that he would be exalted to the throne, upon the fulfilment of another prophecy by him, about the fate of that post, which he was employed to maintain against the Romans, so general, vague, and indeterminate, as that which Voltaire mentions. He easily saw it behoved him to make it more minute and circumstantial: he therefore represents himself to have shewed, that it would baffle and disappoint all the efforts of the enemy for forty-seven days; but that at the expiration of this

term, it would fall under their power: and farther he says, he pointed out his own fortune at a distance, that he would not be slain, but taken alive. Yet none of these particulars could any one divine from Voltaire's detail, important as they are, to give any shadow of reasonableness to Vespasian's reliance on his prediction of his future grandeur, amidst the appearances which it had of artful and interested flattery.

S E C T I O N IV.

Of his Misrepresentations in Chapter forty-fifth; where he affirms that JOSEPHUS makes DANIEL Governor of three hundred and sixty provinces, and ZOROBABEL a Jewish Slave, an intimate Friend of the King of Kings, and very imperfectly relates his Account of DARIUS's Question, and of the Answers of his Academy of Wits.

INOW pass over to Voltaire's forty-fifth chapter. This will furnish several instances of gross misrepresentation. I might observe, that he has no authority from Josephus's book against Appion, to assert, as he does, that his history of the Jewish nation met with a small number of readers, when it appeared at Rome. For he says in his preface, or dedication to Epaphroditus, ' That he wrote his answer to Appion. ' because he * saw many gave ear to slanders, which ' were thrown out by some through hatred, and did ' not credit his Antiquities; and used as an argument that their nation was of a later rise, that the

* *Επει δὲ συχρὸς ὁρῶ, &c.*

‘ illustrious Greek historians were silent about them:’ which leads rather to suppose, that he had a great number of readers, so far as it justifies any conclusion about the matter:---But I do not dwell upon this. He goes on a little after*, ‘ Josephus relates, that ‘ Darius the son of Astyages, had appointed the prophet Daniel governor of three hundred and sixty ‘ cities, whom he forbade, upon pain of death, to ‘ pray to any God for a month.’ But is this a fair account? The Jewish historian writes thus: ‘ That † ‘ Daniel was one of the three presidents whom Darius set over three hundred and sixty provinces; ‘ for he made so many.’ He is therefore silent about the number of cities, and does not represent him to have been vested alone with the government and superintendency of so many provinces, but to have had two others joined with him in rule over them. It is even probable, that the provinces are here swelled to three hundred and sixty, through a mistake of some transcriber, or, according to Hudson, through a slip of memory in Josephus himself, since Daniel, from whose book the relation here is in general plainly borrowed, intimates, that the empire was divided only into one hundred and twenty provinces. ‘ It ‘ pleased Darius to set over the kingdom an hundred ‘ and twenty princes, who should be over the whole ‘ kingdom; and over these three presidents, of whom ‘ Daniel was first, &c.’ Further, Josephus himself makes the number of the provinces only one hundred and twenty-seven, in the reign of Darius ‡ Hytaspes, about eighteen years after; when yet the empire had

* Page 216. † Antiq. 10. 11. 4.

‡ Ib. 11. 3. 2. Compare Daniel vi. 1.

been enlarged by additional conquests through the interval.

It follows, ‘ Josephus seems to imagine afterwards, ‘ that all the Persians turned Jews.’ But where is the foundation for this? For my part I can see none. It is true, that after mentioning Daniel’s deliverance from the lions, and the destruction of them who accused him, laying snares for his life, Josephus writes, ‘ King * Darius sent through the whole country, ‘ praising the God whom Daniel worshipped; and ‘ saying that he alone was true, and possessed all ‘ power.’ But surely every one must be sensible this is not enough to shew, that the historian entertained such a conceit, as is here imputed to him.

Mr. Voltaire proceeds: ‘ The same Josephus gives ‘ the sacred temple of the Jews rebuilt by Zorobabel, ‘ a singular origin. “ Zorobabel, says he, was the “ intimate friend of king Darius.” ‘ A Jewish slave ‘ an intimate friend of the king of kings! This is ‘ much the same as if one of our historians should tell ‘ us, that a fanatic of the Cevennes, released from ‘ the galleys, was the intimate friend of Lewis XIV.’ How unjust this reflection, let every reader judge. Josephus indeed, when he begins to inform us how the second temple, the foundations of which were laid under Cyrus, was at last completed in Darius’s time, (the progress of the work having been stopped in the intermediate reigns, through the artifices of the Samaritans, and other enemies,) speaks in this manner: ‘ This† Darius, son of Hystaspes, while he ‘ was a private person, had vowed to God, if he ‘ should be raised to the kingdom, that he would

* Antiq. 10. 11. 7. † Ib. 11. 3. 1.

‘ send all the vessels of God, which were in Babylon,
 ‘ to the temple in Jerufalem. But about that time,’
 (the time of his being made king) ‘ Zorobabel, who
 ‘ had been anointed prince or ruler of the Jewish cap-
 ‘ tives, came from Jerufalem to Darius, for he had a
 ‘ friendship of a long standing with the king; where
 ‘ being accounted worthy to be a body-guard to him
 ‘ also with two others, he enjoyed the honour which
 ‘ he hoped.’ Now where is the absurdity of this ac-
 count of his friendship with the Persian monarch? Zorobabel, though a captive in war, was not ad-
 judged as a public criminal and malefactor to some
 ignominious punishment, like Voltaire’s fanatic con-
 demned to the gallies. Besides he was a man of high
 birth in his own nation, and of exalted rank: for
 in Cyrus’s decree, which granted liberty to the Jews
 to return, he is long before denominated governor
 or leader of the Jews, and hath a joint commission
 with Mithridate, the keeper of the king’s treasure,
 to rebuild the temple in Jerufalem; and a joint trust
 given him of the vessels which had been carried away
 to Babylon, though of immense value. His intimacy
 moreover with Darius, is not represented to have
 commenced after his elevation to the throne, but
 said to have been many years previous to it; for it
 was * a ‘ friendship which had been of old, or of long
 ‘ continuance,’ says the historian, speaking of the
 time when he was chosen king, after murdering with
 the assistance of others, Smerdis the mage, who u-
 surped the crown as Cyrus’s son, through the well
 known stratagem of his groom. As incredible then
 as it is, that a fanatic released from the gallics, should

* Παλαι γαρ ην αυτω φιλια προ; του βασιλεα.

have been an intimate friend of Lewis XIV. who succeeded to the throne of France, in right of his descent from a long race of kings, there is no improbability at all, that there should have been a familiarity between Darius a Persian nobleman, before his election to sway the Persian sceptre, and Zorobabel a prince of the jews; especially when we consider that we are certain some captives of this nation dwelt about Susa or Suhan, where that nobleman's father resided as governor. Have not persons, who have been prisoners by the fate of war, been often admitted to a familiarity and friendship with subjects of the most distinguished parentage, fortune, and station, in the country where they were detained? The fact cannot be denied.---It were therefore needless to bestow more words on exposing the futility of Mr. Voltaire's scoff here.

He goes on: ' Be this as it may, according to Flavius Josephus, Darius who was a very sensible prince, proposed to all his court a question worthy of the *Mercure Gallant*; namely which had the most power, wine, kings, or women? The person who gave the best answer, was to be recompenced with a flaxen† head-dress, a purple robe, a golden necklace, &c. Darius seated himself upon his golden throne, to hear the answers of his academy of wits. One entered into a dissertation in favour of wine, another was for kings, Zorobabel was an ad-

† So *κεφαλὴν βύσσινον* is turned; but the expression denotes a tiara of fine linen. Now the tiara was a kind of turban rising up with a sharp point without bending, which was a dress peculiar to the Persian kings; for the other Persians wore their turbans bending downwards to their foreheads, in token of subjection. See *Ant. Univ. Hist.* vol. 5 p. 121.

' vocate for women. " There is nothing so powerful
 " as they ; for I have seen, said he, Apamea the mis-
 " tress of the king my master, give his sacred majesty
 " gentle flaps on the face, and take off his turban to
 " dress her head with." Darius found Zorobabel's
 ' answer so smart, that he immediately caused the
 ' temple of Jerusalem to be rebuilt.' But no more
 does Voltaire give a fair and candid relation here,
 than in former instances. The question was not pro-
 posed to all his court, but to his three body-guards.
 ' When the king,' says * Josephus, ' could not sleep
 ' any more, having soon awaked, he enters into con-
 ' versation with his three body-guards ; and promises,
 ' that upon him who should give him the most true
 ' and judicious answer to his question, he would be-
 ' stow gifts,---as a reward of victory.---Having pro-
 ' mised that he would confer those gifts upon them,
 ' he asked the first if wine had greater power; the
 ' second if kings; the third if women; or more
 ' than these, truth. After asking these things of them,
 ' he went to rest ; but in the morning, having
 ' called the nobles and governors of provinces, and
 ' other rulers of Persia and Media, and having seat-
 ' ed himself in the usual place, he commanded each
 ' of the guards, in the hearing of all, to declare his
 ' judgment about the question proposed : ' and having
 told us the answers of two of them, he adds, ' when
 ' thus the second was silent, Zorobabel the third, be-
 ' gan to speak---and having finished about women,
 ' he began to speak about truth, saying, " I have
 " shewed how much power women have: they,
 " however, and the king are weaker than truth, &c.'

* See Antiq. xi. 3. 2—8.

have been an intimate friend of Lewis XIV. who succeeded to the throne of France, in right of his descent from a long race of kings, there is no improbability at all, that there should have been a familiarity between Darius a Persian nobleman, before his election to sway the Persian sceptre, and Zorobabel a prince of the jews; especially when we consider that we are certain some captives of this nation dwelt about Susa or Sushan, where that nobleman's father resided as governor. Have not persons, who have been prisoners by the fate of war, been often admitted to a familiarity and friendship with subjects of the most distinguished parentage, fortune, and station, in the country where they were detained? The fact cannot be denied.---It were therefore needless to bestow more words on exposing the futility of Mr. Voltaire's scold here.

He goes on: ‘ Be this as it may, according to Flavius Josephus, Darius who was a very sensible prince, proposed to all his court a question worthy of the *Mercurie Gallant*; namely which had the most power, wine, kings, or women? The person who gave the best answer, was to be recompenced with a flaxen† head-dress, a purple robe, a golden necklace, &c. Darius seated himself upon his golden throne, to hear the answers of his academy of wits. One entered into a dissertation in favour of wine, another was for kings, Zorobabel was an ad-

† So *κίθαριν βύσσινον* is turned; but the expression denotes a tiara of fine linen. Now the tiara was a kind of turban rising up with a sharp point without bending, which was a dress peculiar to the Persian kings; for the other Persians wore their turbans bending downwards to their foreheads, in token of subjection. See *Ant. Univ. Hist.* vol. 5. p. 121

‘ vocate for women. “ There is nothing so powerful
 “ as they ; for I have seen, said he, Apamea the mis-
 “ tress of the king my master, give his sacred majesty
 “ gentle flaps on the face, and take off his turban to
 “ dress her head with.” Darius found Zorobabel’s
 ‘ answer so smart, that he immediately caused the
 ‘ temple of Jerusalem to be rebuilt.’ But no more
 does Voltaire give a fair and candid relation here,
 than in former instances. The question was not pro-
 posed to all his court, but to his three body-guards.
 ‘ When the king,’ says * Josephus, ‘ could not sleep
 ‘ any more, having soon awaked, he enters into con-
 ‘ versation with his three body-guards; and promises,
 ‘ that upon him who should give him the most true
 ‘ and judicious answer to his question, he would be-
 ‘ stow gifts,---as a reward of victory.---Having pro-
 ‘ mised that he would confer those gifts upon them,
 ‘ he asked the first if wine had greater power; the
 ‘ second if kings; the third if women; or more
 ‘ than these, truth. After asking these things of them,
 ‘ he went to rest; but in the morning, having
 ‘ called the nobles and governors of provinces, and
 ‘ other rulers of Persia and Media, and having seat-
 ‘ ed himself in the usual place, he commanded each
 ‘ of the guards, in the hearing of all, to declare his
 ‘ judgment about the question proposed:’ and having
 told us the answers of two of them, he adds, ‘ when
 ‘ thus the second was silent, Zorobabel the third, be-
 ‘ gan to speak---and having finished about women,
 ‘ he began to speak about truth, saying, “ I have
 “ shewed how much power women have: they,
 “ however, and the king are weaker than truth, &c.’

* See Antiq. xi. 3. 2—8.

‘ And when he had done, and the multitude cried
 ‘ out that he had spoken excellently, and that truth
 ‘ alone hath power unchangeable, and which wax-
 ‘ eth not old, the king commanded him to ask some-
 ‘ thing besides these things he had promised.---After
 ‘ he had spoken these things, he put him in mind of
 ‘ the vow which he had made, if he should receive
 ‘ the kingdom, that he would build Jerufalem, and
 ‘ repair therein the temple of God, and restore the
 ‘ vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had plundered and
 ‘ brought to Babylon.’ “ And this, fays he, is my
 “ request, which thou now sufferest me to ask, whom
 “ thou hast judged wise and intelligent.” Where-
 ‘ upon he gave orders to promote the work.’ This is
 a fummary of Josephus’s history about this affair;
 whence every one must fee, upon the flightest atten-
 tion, how different Voltaire’s account is from it. In
 this writer’s representation, there is not one syllable
 about the king’s inquiry concerning the power of
 truth, nor about Zorobabel’s decision in favour of its
 superior virtue and efficacy, which won him the ap-
 plauses of the audience, and gained from the king
 the tendered prizes, together with the invitation to
 ask something additional. Nor is there in him any
 mention of the monarch’s vow while in the station
 of a subject, probably through the ardour of his
 friendship to the prince of the captivity; which, to-
 gether with this man’s preference of truth to wine,
 and kings, and women, are set forth by Josephus, as
 the cause of his favourable edict concerning the temple
 in Jerufalem. In all which, the author of the first
 book † of Esdras agrees with him.---May I not then

† See first Book of Esdras, chap. 3. and 4. Such, however,

say, how false and defective is his detail! how injurious to Josephus! and how willing to be deceived must they be, who rely upon him as a safe guide in antient facts, which have any connection with religion!

S E C T I O N. V.

Of his Falshoods in his Detail of JOSEPHUS'S Story of JADDUA and ALEXANDER, in Chapter forty-sixth; together with his unjust Reflection on ROLLIN.

LET us next examine his forty-sixth Chapter, in which he is angry with Rollin for copying from Josephus, that romance-writer, as he calls him, the story of Jaddua's procession to meet Alexander; and his exhibition of prophecies to him, which clearly indicated that he would conquer the kingdom of Persia; styling the same absurd, and considering it as framed to raise his nation. But is he satisfied to produce this story as it stands in the Jewish author, and to dwell upon the real difficulties with which it is incumbered? No. He alters it; and then proposes

the proneness of some men to misrepresent things here, for the sake of a laugh, that I have seen in a foreign gazette, the same lame and defective account of the answer of the three officers to his Majesty Darius from this author, as Mr. Voltaire hath given us thereof from Josephus: while a poetical translation of the arguments of orator Zorobabel to prove the superior strength and power of the fair sex is concluded thus, ' Thus far the eloquent Zorobabel. Be dumb ye modern orators! Neither lord Mansfield or lord Chatham ever spoke such a speech.' *Virginia Gazette*, printed by Purdie and Dixon, May 25th, 1769.

vain and groundless cavils against it. ‘ Josephus’,
 ‘ says he, pretends that Alexander had, in a dream
 ‘ at Macedon, seen Jaddus the high-priest of the
 ‘ Jews;’ (supposing there was a Jewish priest whose
 name terminated in *us*) ‘ that this priest had encour-
 ‘ aged him to undertake his expedition against the
 ‘ Persians, and that this was the reason that Alexan-
 ‘ der had attacked Asia.’ But how senseless this objec-
 tion, from the termination of the high-priest’s name
 in the narrative! Be it that *us* is not the termination
 of any man’s name in the Hebrew language, does
 not every person, who is at all acquainted with Jose-
 phus, know that he varies the termination of the
 names of other persons, from what it is in that tongue
 in the same manner? and yet against their real exist-
 ence, there never was, on this account, the smallest
 exception. Thus, † Joshua son of Josedece, is, with
 him, Jesus son of Josedeceus; Abiad is Abius, &c. why
 then might not Jaddua be also with him Jaddus,
 without creating any suspicion of his genuineness?
 Nor does he affirm that this high-priest suggested to
 Alexander the design of subduing Asia, as Mr. Vol-
 taire’s readers may naturally imagine: what Josephus
 makes Alexander say, is, ‡ ‘ That, when he was de-
 ‘ liberating with himself how he would become mas-
 ‘ ter of Asia, he commanded him not to delay, but
 ‘ with confidence to pass over, for he would lead his
 ‘ army, and give him the empire of Persia.’ Mr.
 Voltaire goes on, ‘ He could not then avoid going
 ‘ six or seven days march out of his way, after the
 ‘ siege of Tyre, to visit Jerusalem.’ This is by way of

* See the Philosophy of History, page 220.

† Antiq. 11. 3. 10. and 3. 8. 1.

‡ Ibid. 11. 8. 3. 4. 5.

sarcasm, for he had said before, ‘ It was necessary,
 ‘ after having made Tyre submit, not to lose a mo-
 ‘ ment before he seized the post of Pelusium; so that,
 ‘ Alexander having made a forced march to surprise
 ‘ Gaza, he went from Gaza to Pelusium in seven
 ‘ days. It is thus faithfully related by Arrian, Q. Cur-
 ‘ tius, Diodorus, and even Paul Orosius himself, ac-
 ‘ cording to the journal of Alexander.’ But is there
 really such cause for scoffing? Josephus, whose rela-
 tion Voltaire means to ridicule, does not carry Ale-
 xander from the siege or conquest of Tyre to Jeru-
 salem, which, as this city stood at no great distance
 on the left hand of the road from Tyre to Gaza,
 would have been more favourable for the story of
 his interview there, with the Jewish high-priest; on
 ‘ the contrary, his narrative is, ‘ That, having settled af-
 ‘ fairs at Tyre, of which he became master after a
 ‘ siege of seven months, he marched to Gaza, and
 ‘ took it after sitting two months before it; and, that
 ‘ having destroyed this place, he hastened to go up
 ‘ to the city of the Jerusalemites†;’ which is mak-
 ing him turn backwards for several days; and, being
 inconsistent with that quick progress from Gaza to
 Pelusium, in which other historians agree, creates
 much embarrassment to those critics who maintain
 the truth of that visit. Why then does Mr. Voltaire
 lead his readers into a belief, that Josephus places his
 journey to Jerusalem before his attempt on Gaza?
 We may, however, easily forgive this misrepresenta-
 tion of Josephus’s sense, since he has probably been
 betrayed into it by following such modern writers
 as make this arrangement of it. For many think it

† Josephus’s Antiq. 11. 8. 3. &c.

more reasonable to suppose Josephus was mistaken about the order of time in which the journey to Jerusalem was executed, than to conclude the whole an idle fiction, merely because it is omitted by the few heathen authors now extant, out of the great number that wrote Alexander's transactions, who, they observe, must in general be thought to have entertained too much aversion and hatred against the Jewish nation, to preserve and perpetuate the memory of a fact in its circumstances and effects so honourable to them, whatever information they might have of its certainty. They conclude, therefore, Alexander went thither while his troops were employed in the siege of Tyre, or after it was finished, while the main army was refreshing; rather than that he first passed so considerable a fortress, and then went back from Gaza to take it in: which is making Josephus only guilty of an error in a circumstance, while they admit him a good voucher for the principal fact. Nor is this shewing him greater respect than is often paid to the single testimony of historians of approved credit. For upon such evidence we often allow the truth of a fact about which others are silent. Especially we do so when it is corroborated or supported by any appearances which are best accounted for from it, and of that kind is the present one. For Josephus informs us, that Alexander granted to them extraordinary privileges, the use of their own laws, and freedom from tribute every seventh year, as in it they did not cultivate and sow their lands. And Hecataeus, * a contemporary of this prince, af-

* His words, as he is cited by Josephus against Appion, 2. 4. are,
 'Τὴν Σαμαρειτὶν χώραν προσέθηκεν αὐτοῖς εἶναι ἀφορολογητοὺς.'

fures us, appealing to Alexander's letters, and other monuments in testimony of it, that he also bestowed upon them the country of the Samaritans, after they had mutinied, and murdered Andromachus their governor, with an immunity from taxes for its possession: which are indications they must have stood high in his favour.

After this, Voltaire having related Jaddus's order from God to salute this king, and his obedience to it, with Alexander's persuasion, that he was the same man who had instructed him seven or eight years before to come and conquer Persia, which he communicated to Parmenio, proceeds thus: 'Jaddus had upon his head his cap, ornamented with a plate of gold, upon which a Hebrew word was engraved. Alexander, who was doubtless a proficient in the Hebrew, immediately discovered the word Jehovah, and prostrated himself with humility, knowing very well that none but God could have this name.' In this manner he laughs, and leads his readers to think Alexander considered the high-priest as the Divinity. But Josephus having observed, that the name of God was inscribed on the plate of gold, (without marking whether it was Hebrew or Greek; though I suppose it was the former, wherefore Alexander would need to receive an explication of its import from others,) only says, that 'hereon he† worshipped the name, and saluted the high-priest.' So that he plainly distinguishes between his behaviour toward Jehovah, and toward his priest. Accordingly he acquaints us, that when

† Antiq. xi. 8. 5. Το τε Θεοῦ ὄνομα ἐγεγραπτο, προσελθὼν μὲν οὗτος προσεκύνησε τὸ ὄνομα, καὶ τὸν ἀρχιερεῖα πρῶτος ἠσπάσατο.

Parmenio, as the king and he were alone, asked why he whom all men worshipped, worshipped the Jewish high-priest, he replied, ‘ I did not worship this man, ‘ but the God with whose high-priesthood he hath been ‘ dignified;’ and that thereafter having gone up into ‘ the temple, he offered sacrifice to God according to ‘ his direction, and bestowed upon the high-priest and ‘ the priests suitable honours.’ Further, whereas Voltaire adds, ‘ Jaddus instantly displayed prophecies, ‘ which clearly indicated that Alexander would conquer Persia, prophecies that were ever made after ‘ the event had happened;’ Josephus says no more than this: ‘ The book of Daniel having been shewed him, ‘ in which he declared that a certain person among ‘ the Greeks would destroy the empire of the Persians, thinking himself was the person signified, ‘ he with joy dismissed the multitude; and having ‘ called them to him on the succeeding day, he commanded them to ask whatever gifts they pleased.’ And then adds, ‘ In consequence of this, he indulged ‘ them in the use of their own laws, and in freedom ‘ from tribute every seventh year, as in it they did ‘ not cultivate their land.’ As to his charge, that the prophecies in Daniel concerning the destruction of the Persian empire by the Greeks, were forged after its actual overthrow, it does not now fall under my consideration, unless it be to remark, that it hath no foundation in Josephus, lest any person should suspect, strange as it may seem, that it was his suggestion, when it is wholly Voltaire’s own sense of things. So much for the misrepresentations of Josephus in his forty-sixth chapter.

I cannot, however, forbear here to vindicate so

agreeable and profitable a writer, as Rollin, from a reflection which he hath thrown upon him in it. It is this: ‘ Rollin indeed says, that Alexander took Tyre, only because the inhabitants scoffed the Jews, and that God would avenge the honour of his people; but Alexander might have had still other reasons.’ By his manner of expression, a person is inclined to believe, that Rollin made Alexander to be actuated by a desire of chastising the Tyrians, for their injuries to the people of God. But does Rollin afford any reason to impute this sentiment to him? Far otherwise. He says in his Antient History, ‘ Tyre had now filled up the measure of her iniquity by her impiety against God, and her barbarity exercised against his people;’ and having recounted her insults over the ruins of Jerusalem, and her violence to the inhabitants of the land, and her seizure of the most precious things from the temple of God there, to enrich therewith the temples of her idols, he remarks, ‘ This profanation and cruelty drew down the vengeance of God upon Tyre.’ But though God had this intention in prospering his efforts against Tyre, he always supposes Alexander to have been animated by other motives, such as, his resentment at the affront the Tyrians put upon him, in refusing him entrance into their city when he asked it, that he might offer a sacrifice to Hercules its tutelar god, and the importance of his possession of it to his interest. For he thus expresses himself, speaking of the above-mentioned indignity: ‘ This conqueror, after gaining so many victories, had too high an heart to put up such an affront, and thereupon was resolved to force them to it by a siege.’

Again, ‘ Alexander imagined that there were essential reasons why he should possess himself of Tyre, * &c.’ Indeed while Rollin had such veneration for the Jewish scriptures, as to acknowledge the interposition of Providence, in his determination to lay siege to the place, in spite of all the difficulties of the work, when according to the rules of war, after the battle of Issus, he should have pursued Darius with vigour, because God had therein denounced its ruin for its pride and other vices, he was too wise not to be aware, that Alexander, who knew not God and his oracles, was wrought upon by very different principles.

SECTION VI.

Of his Assertion, That Josephus does not include the Book of Job among the Writings of the Hebrew Canon, in Chapter forty-seventh.

TO return from this digression, which, it is believed, was due to so excellent a writer’s merit, as nothing occurs in Voltaire’s forty-seventh chapter that requires animadversion, according to my present design, I go forward to his forty-eighth chapter † where is a sentence too material to be overlooked, viz. That Josephus does not include the book of Job among the writings of the Hebrew canon. After affirming, that the book of Job was first written by the Arabians, his words are: ‘ Flavian Josephus, who does not include it among the writ-

* See Rollin’s Ancient History, Book XIV. Sect. vi. pages 166, 167, 183, 184.

† Page 231.

'ings of the Hebrew canon, removes all doubt upon 'this head.' Accordingly he again asserts in the same chapter, that 'It is not a Jewish book,' * The same thing I know said cardinal Pezron, though I have never been able to see his book, or the arguments by which he contends, that it is omitted in the catalogue of the sacred books by Josephus.

But does there appear any sufficient evidence, that Josephus did not allow it a place in the sacred code of his nation? I apprehend not. It is surely of no force at all to prove this, that he makes no mention of the calamities which befel Job, and his deportment under them, and his deliverance from them, in the great work of his Antiquities; for herein he proposed only to write the history of the Jews from the earliest times, and to give an account of the constitution of their state. He might therefore be silent about his fortune and behaviour, who was of a different people and country, as appears from the beginning of the book itself, though it was a part of the Jewish canon, and honoured by himself as such. And of as little weight must it be to evince this, that he does not touch upon his character and affairs in his book against Appion; since here his sole aim was to vindicate the honour of his own nation, to which as hath been said, Job did not belong.

It is true, he † represents Moses to have written no more than five books, comprehending their system of laws, and the series of events and transactions from the formation of man until his own death. And he makes the prophets after Moses, to have written the acts and occurrences of their own times, from his

* Page 236.

† Contra Appion, lib. 1. cap. 8.

death till the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes upon the throne of Persia; which is unfavourable to their hypothesis, who reckon Job to have been older than, or contemporary with Moses, and the book which derives its name from him, to have been composed by this person while he abode in the land of Midian, or while he led Israel in the desert, or even amidst his residence in Egypt; since none pretend to count it among his five books, which have been described. And an equally unfavourable aspect it hath upon their scheme, who have looked upon it as the production of Joseph, or any other of superior antiquity to Moses. Nevertheless all this affords no evidence, that the book of Job was not a part of the canon of Scripture among the Jews. He might notwithstanding know it to be so, and judge it to have been written, either by some prophet in, or near the time of the Babylonish captivity, as Grotius, Cudrcus, Le Clerc, and the learned bishop of Gloucester have done; among whose arguments, it may seem none of the most contemptible, that though he is twice mentioned by Ezekiel, as a person of distinguished piety and virtue, with Noah and Daniel, he is always mentioned after the last; while the other, as the order of time required, hath the precedency in the honourable band. Or, he might suppose it, if not written in so late a period, to have been penned by some prophet, who was raised up after Moses in the Hebrew nation, and coeval with the stranger, whose vicissitudes and patience are the subject of the piece. And in this view it may not be unworthy of observation, that Jerome in his letter to Paulinus, after finishing his account of De-

teronomy; and saying, ‘ So far Moses, so far the Pentateuch,’ introduces Job as an example of patience, where he proceed to speak of the book of Joithua the son of Nun, and the rest. If indeed Josephus had said, that the prophets after Moses wrote the affairs of the Jewish nation, between his death and Artaxerxes’s reign, as Mr. Whiston gives his sense, in his supplement to his essay towards restoring the true text of the Old Testament p. 28, there could have been no room for this supposition; unless we should have said, he was to be understood to declare the theme of their writings in general, and not to express himself with rigour and strictness about the subject of them; since even in these books of theirs, which are unquestionably authentic, there are predictions and histories of the successes and disasters of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and other nations, where the Jews were not parties to the quarrel, as well as prophecies and histories relative to their own country and people. But there is no need of such solution, for Mr. Whiston’s account of his meaning is unfair—the import of the words being no more than this, That they wrote the acts of their own times; as every scholar may perceive, by casting his eye toward the foot of the page, where he will find the original text. Agreeably, the book of Job may be counted among the sacred books of the Jews, without swelling their number beyond twenty-two, which the historian has given as the sum of their code in whole; Yea, without increasing the books of their prophets that arose after Moses beyond thirteen, which he makes, in the passage transcribed † be-

† Ubi supra, ‘ Απο δε της Μωυσεως τελευτης μεχρι της Αρτα-

low, the amount of them. This is done by making the books of Judges and Ruth, the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the books of Jeremiah and Lamentations, and the books of the twelve prophets stand only for seven books in his catalogue. For thus Job's book is easily introduced among the thirteen books of the prophets, and no pretence left for saying, as Mr. Whiston has done, that the Canticles must be excluded from the Old Testament, to make room for its admission among the four books of hymns and instructions for the conduct of human life, which Josephus mentions as, with these thirteen, and the five books of Moses, constituting the canon of his nation. But upon what just and reasonable grounds, such a method of numeration is to be used, cannot now be explained, though the matter appears to me of great moment; for if we are once assured that these books, which now compose the Old Testament, were the received holy scriptures among the Jews, and neither more nor fewer, during the ministry of Jesus and his apostles, the inference will be certain and irresistible, that they are of divine † authority; because they who

‘ ξερξυ—αρχης, οἱ μετα Μωυσην προφηται τα κατ’ αυτες πραχθεν-
 ‘ τα συνεγραψαν εν τρισι καὶ δεκα βιβλίοις.’

† It is from a persuasion, that these books, which compose the Old Testament canon, had the sanction of our Saviour and his apostles as the oracles of God, and that there are other evidences of their inspiration, that Christians treat them with such respect, not merely because they were written by Jews. How injurious then is Mr. Voltaire, when he represents this as the foundation of our reverence for them, and faith in them. and then proceeds to accuse us of the most unparalleled inconsistency: ‘ We despise and abhor the Jews; and

bore a commission from heaven, and gave satisfactory proofs of it, appeal to them as such upon all occasions. Yet I do not know that it hath been shown hitherto, with that fulness of evidence which it allows. I only observe farther, ere I dismiss this article, that * Philo a Jew of great learning in Alexandria, brother to the Alabarch, that is, the chief magistrate of the Jewish people there, and of the race of that nation, who was cotemporary with Christ and his apostles, quotes the words of Job, in the same manner in which he produces passages from other books of the Old Testament, which he speaks of in the most respectable terms, calling them the sacred word, the divine word, the prophetic word, the sacred scriptures, the holy oracles, and the like, that he may confirm his own opinions by them. Thus, in his treatise concerning the change and alteration of names, ‘ Who, as Job saith, is free from defilement, ‘ though life be one day? For there are innumerable ‘ things which pollute the soul, &c.’ So indeed, Job’s words run very much in the Greek version, according to the Alexandrian MS. for they are, chap. xiv. 4. ‘ Who is pure from defilement? Not one, though ‘ even life be of one day.’ Instead of which, we have in our translation, ‘ Who can bring a clean thing ‘ out of an unclean? Not one.’ Upon the whole

‘ yet we insist, that all such of their writings which we have collected, ‘ bear the sacred stamp of divinity. Never was such a contradiction ‘ heard of!’ See his Philos. Dictionary, Article Solomon, p. 331.

* Philo, De mutatione nominum, page 1051. Paris Edition 1640. Τίς γάρ, ὡς ὁ Ἰωβ φησὶ, καθάρος ἀπο ῥυτίε, καὶ μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ εἶναι ἢ ζῆν; &c. In Alex. MS. Τίς γάρ ἐστι καθάρος ἀπο ῥυτίε; ὅδε εἷς, ἐν ᾧ καὶ οὐκ ἡμέρας γεννᾶται ὁ βίος.

then, Voltaire had no good cause to say, that Josephus did not include the book of Job among the writings of the Hebrew canon.

SECTION VII.

Of his concluding, in chapter forty-ninth, that the Jews did not call Jacob, Israel, nor themselves Israelites, till they were slaves in Chaldaea, from a passage of Philo.—And of his saying, That Josephus owns the practice of circumcision was learned from the Egyptians, agreeably to the testimony of Herodotus.—That he ascribes their being unknown by the Greeks, to their omission to cultivate letters.—That he makes the translators of the law into Greek, tell some stories to Philadelphus, which he does not.—And of his wrong inference from these stories.

I ONLY further accuse him of injuries to Josephus in another chapter of this treatise. It is in the forty-ninth, where he discusses this question, ‘Whether the Jews were instructed by other nations, or other nations by the Jews.’ Here I find him guilty of such a number of misrepresentations, as perhaps can scarce be paralleled in so few sentences.

As it is my professed intention to shew that Mr. Voltaire gives false accounts of Josephus, I might omit animadverting upon his first paragraph; where, from Philo’s telling us, ‘That Israel is a Chaldaean word, that it was a name the Chaldaeans gave to the just who were consecrated to God; that Israel signified, *seeing God*;

he concludes, ‘That this a-

‘ long seems to prove, that the Jews did not call Ja-
 ‘ cob, Israel; that they did not take upon themselves
 ‘ the name of Israelites, till such time as they had
 ‘ some knowledge of this Chaldaean tongue, which
 ‘ could not be but when they were slaves in Chal-
 ‘ daea.’ And the rather that here indeed I cannot
 blame him for wrong quotation. Nevertheless I can-
 not forbear observing, that there is in it very false
 reasoning. For Moses represents, not the Hebrews,
 as Mr. Voltaire supposes, but God himself, whose
 knowledge of all languages will not be disputed, to
 have bestowed the name of Israel upon their great
 progenitor, which again gave rise to the nation’s be-
 ing called Israelites. He also makes God to have sub-
 joined * at the same time, a very different interpre-
 tation of it from that by this dreaming allegorist,
 and an interpretation which hath its foundation in
 an Hebrew etymology. Nay Philo himself, in his
 treatise concerning drunkenness, sets forth God al-
 tering Jacob’s name into Israel, and produces the ve-

* Thus Moses acquaints us, that the person who wrestled with Ja-
 cob in human form, said unto him, ‘ Thy name shall no more be cal-
 ‘ led Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God
 ‘ and with men, and hast prevailed.’ Gen. xxxii. 28. Wherefore Is-
 rael must be derived from the Hebrew words, *יָדָו* *dominari, princi-*
pem esse, et יְהוָה Deus. How strange is it then that Philo’s explication
 of it should have been adopted by so many fathers in the Christian
 church, as Origen, Eusebius, Didymus of Alexandria, and even Jerome
 in one place! though indeed he argues against it in another, at consi-
 derable length, as violent and unnatural; it being necessary for de-
 fence of it to suppose that it is an abridgment of three Hebrew words,
 with the alteration of some of their letters, and the suppression of o-
 thers. Compare his Treatise de Nominibus Hebraicis, Bened. edit.
 tom. 2. p. 536, and his Commentary upon the passage in Genesis,

ry words of Scripture, quoted below, concerning the cause of that change, according to which it must have happened many hundred years before the captivity by Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans; then there likewise he proposes his own idle fancies about its signification. ‘ When God was about (says he, ‘ to make him see those things which he had before ‘ heard, for the sight is more faithful than the ears, ‘ the oracle founded, His name shall not be called ‘ Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name, because thou ‘ hast prevailed powerfully with God and with man. ‘ Jacob then is a name of learning and proficiency, ‘ depending upon the powers of hearing, but Israel ‘ of perfection, for the name denotes the sight of ‘ God.’ And agreeably he introduces Moses calling his people in his time, by the name of the children of Israel: * ‘ For it is rightly said, the children of Israel groaned on account of their labours.’ Since then God was the author of the name of Israel, both according to Moses and Philo, were the unacquaintedness of the Hebrews, who however had their original from Ur of the Chaldees, as great as Mr. Voltaire supposes, till they were carried into that country by their enemies, his inference from the passage of Philo, in the beginning of his History of his Mis-
 ibid. p. 215. The same gloss is also to be found in the Apostol: Constitutions, lib. 7. cap. 37. and lib. 8. cap. 15. But when Daille brings this as an evidence, that these Constitutions were a later production than the third century, as he does in his Book de Pseudepigraphis Apostolicis, lib. 1. p. 188. edit. Harderovici, 1683; saying ‘ Their authors must have borrowed it from the fathers in that age of the church, he must certainly have forgot that Philo taught the explanation long before.

* See Philo, p. 333. and compare Exod. ii. 23, 24.

sion to Caligula, must fall to the ground. I give now a literal translation of it, that every reader may judge how far it will bear his superstructure upon it: ‘That sort of men,’ (he is speaking of the suppliant or devotional kind, *το ικετικον γένος*) ‘is called indeed in the Chaldaean tongue, Israel; but, the name being interpreted into the Greek language, seeing God.’

But let us now consider his gross misrepresentations of Josephus here, which must be still more inexcusable than his false reasoning. ‘Flavian Josephus, says he, in his reply to Appion, Lyfimachus, and Molon, plainly acknowledges, that the Egyptians taught other nations circumcision, as Herodotus testifies.’ But does Josephus confess, that the practice of circumcision was learned by the Jews from the Egyptians, which is evidently Voltaire’s meaning, since otherwise he acknowledges nothing to his purpose? I think he does it not, either in express terms, or by just deduction. Let us examine the passage. To confute Appion’s charge, that the Jews were an upstart race, he observes, * ‘Neither was Herodotus the Halicarnassian, ignorant of our nation, but appears to have mentioned it after some fashion; for writing about the Colchians in his second book, he says, “The Colchians, and Egyptians, and Ethiopians, do alone of all men practise circumcision from the beginning: for the Phoenicians and Syrians in Palestine, confess they learned it from the Egyptians; but the Syrians about Thermodon, and the river Parthenius, and their neighbours the Macrones, say they learned it lately from the Colchians: and these are they who only of all

* See Book I. against Appion, Sect. 22. Hudson’s edit.

“ men are circumcised; and they seem to do so in
“ the same manner with the Egyptians. But I can.
“ not tell as to the Egyptians or Ethiopians, which
“ of them learned it from one another.” Thus far
Josephus quotes Herodotus, then follows his own re-
flection. ‘ He (meaning Herodotus) ‘ hath said there-
‘ fore, that the Syrians in Palestine are circumcised;
‘ but the Jews only, of them that inhabit Palestine,
‘ are circumcised: he therefore hath mentioned this,
‘ knowing about them.’ Now is there here any plain
acknowledgment by Josephus, that the Jews learned
circumcision from the Egyptians? Herodotus indeed,
according to him, relates that they confessed it; but
he himself does not in terms own the truth of that
account. Nor can it be argued from his silence, that
he thought it just: for that he makes no objection
to Herodotus’s assertion, that they confessed they de-
rived the custom from the Egyptians, can never be
a proof that he believed it had its rise from them,
when he only produced the passage against Appion,
who had not reproached the Jews with having bor-
rowed that ceremony from the Egyptians, but mere-
ly denied that the Greeks had any knowledge of them.
Every one must perceive, it was enough against his
adversary, to shew that Herodotus had mentioned a
practice prevalent among the Jewish nation; nor had
he any business to discuss whether he gave a right
or wrong account of its introduction, as there was
no controversy between them upon that point. There
are even strong reasons against putting such a con-
struction upon Josephus’s omitting to contradict He-
rodotus about the original of circumcision among
the Jews; because he cannot be supposed, without

great inconsistency, to approve every thing in this passage of the Greek historian, although he hath not found fault with him. For how could Josephus believe with Herodotus, that the people he enumerates, were alone of all men circumcised, when he tells us, * ‘ That the Arabians circumcise their children,’ who are a different nation from any in his catalogue of them that practised that rite? Nay, how could he believe the very thing which Voltaire makes him to confess, That circumcision prevailed among the Egyptians before it obtained among the Jews, when he tells us, ‘ That God gave unto Abraham the command of circumcision, because he was willing his posterity should continue separate, and distinguished from others†.’ Surely he who says this, shews his opinion that it was, at the time of its institution, peculiar to them, and unobserved by the rest of the world.

We will now try the author upon another point, whether his representations of Josephus are agreeable to truth. Says he, ‘ The same Josephus acknowledges, that his nation, whose credit he endeavours nevertheless to enhance, had for a long time no commerce with other nations; that it was in particular unknown to the Greeks, who however were at the same time acquainted with the Tartars and Scythians. Nor is it surprizing,’ says he, meaning Josephus, ‘ that a people so far removed from the sea, and neglecting the cultivation of letters, should be so little known.’

* Antiq. i. xii. 2.

† Josephus’s words are, Antiq. i. i c. 5. Προσαΐξε δε (ὁ Θεός) ἐννομενὸς τὸ αὐτὸ γένος μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ συμφυρομένοισι, περιμενοῦσθαι τὰ αἰόσια.

But where does Josephus give this account? I might insist he does * not mention the Tartars at all, as a nation known to the Greeks, for he speaks of the Scythians and Thracians; but the Thracians will not be allowed by any, who are skilled in geography, to have possessed the same tract of land with the Tartars: They are rather thought to have been settled about Constantinople, and through that country where the Turks now live, as indeed Josephus mentions their being known to the Greeks, on account of their neighbourhood, which suits that opinion very well. But to pass this, Josephus does indeed attribute their ignorance of his nation to these things, ‘ To
 ‘ their want of a country upon the sea-coast, and to
 ‘ their neglect of trade, which things were chief
 ‘ causes of intercourse with strangers; for their towns
 ‘ were distant from the sea, and they were employ-
 ‘ ed in cultivating their good land. Above all, they
 ‘ were intent upon educating their children, and
 ‘ observing their laws, and the religion delivered ac-
 ‘ cording to them, which they reckoned the most
 ‘ necessary work of their whole lives.’ He imputes it further, ‘ To their peculiarity of diet, and to their
 ‘ fathers not being addicted to war, through desire
 ‘ of more extensive territory, though their country
 ‘ abounded with many thousands of brave men:’ and he shews that other nations were also long unknown to them, for like reasons, as the Romans and Spaniards, &c. But he does not say that their ignorance of the Jews, proceeded from this people’s omission to cultivate letters, as Voltaire alledges. So far is he from assigning this reason, that he contends the Py-

* See Josephus’s first book against Appion, p. 12.

thagoreans* had taken some of their lessons from them, and that divers states had imitated their customs.

He goes on: ‘ When the same historian relates
 ‘ with his usual exaggerations, the manner equally
 ‘ honourable as incredible, in which the king Pto-
 ‘ lomy Philadelphus purchased a Greek translation
 ‘ of the Jewish books, done by Hebrew writers in
 ‘ the city of Alexandria; Josephus, I say, adds
 ‘ that Demetrius of Phalereus, who ordered this
 ‘ translation for his king’s library, asked one of the
 ‘ translators how it happened, that no historian, no
 ‘ foreign poet, had ever spoke of the Jewish books?’
 The translator replied, ‘ As these laws are all divine,
 ‘ no one has dared to undertake speaking of them,
 ‘ and those who have thought proper to do it, have
 ‘ been chastised by heaven.’ Now here again are
 two mistakes; for whereas Mr. Voltaire makes De-
 metrius ask the translators, Josephus represents the
 king to have done it: and whereas he makes one
 of the translators reply, Josephus tells us that De-
 metrius answered him. His words are, ‘ Philadel-
 ‘ phus rejoiced, seeing his scheme usefully finished;
 ‘ but especially he was pleased with the laws read to
 ‘ him, and was astonished at the wisdom and under-
 ‘ standing of the lawgiver; wherefore he began to
 ‘ hold a conversation with Demetrius, how, the le-
 ‘ gislation being thus admirable, none of the histori-
 ‘ ans or poets had mentioned it. But Demetrius re-
 ‘ plied, that none dared to touch the writing of these
 ‘ laws, because it was divine and venerable, and be-
 ‘ cause some were hurt by God who attempted it.†’

* See the same book, Sect. 22. † See Antiq. 12. 2. 13.

Voltaire after this, cites the stories about Theopompus and Theodectes, as related also by the same translator, for he continues them all as a part of his reply to Demetrius, ere he shut up the period which he had begun, with the requisite mark, ‘ Theopompus being inclined to insert some part of it (the Jewish law) in his history, lost his senses for thirty years; but being acquainted in a dream, that he had become an idiot for wanting to penetrate into divine things, and to acquaint the prophane therewith; he appeased the wrath of God by prayer, and recovered his senses. Theodectes, a Grecian poet, having introduced some passages, which he had taken from our holy books, in a tragedy, became blind; and did not recover his sight, till after he had acknowledged his fault:’ But neither were these stories, which to many seem incredible, told by one of the translators of the law unto Greek, or indeed by any Jew, according to Josephus, but by Demetrius himself; so that he must answer for them, as well as for the account to the king, of the cause why the historians and poets were silent about the legislation of the Jews, with which he introduced them.

So much for the misrepresentations of Josephus in this chapter. Yet it may be proper to subjoin, in consequence of the detection of falshood here made, that the censure with which he finishes it is ill placed, ‘ These two stories of Josephus,’ says he, ‘ which are unworthy of a place in history, or of being related by a man that has common sense, are in fact contradictory to the praises he bestows upon this Greek translation of the Jewish books; for if it was a crime to insert any part of them in another lan-

‘ guage, it was a far greater crime doubtless to enable all the Greeks to understand them. Josephus in relating these tales, at least agrees that the Greeks never had any knowledge of the writings of his nation.’ But how does this follow? The stories are Demetrius’s, not Josephus’s, for they are only mentioned as a part of his reply to the Egyptian monarch, without any affirmation of their truth. And was it inconsistent with such recital of them, to commend the translation of their sacred books into the Greek language? Surely not. He might even, I think, have believed them himself, and averred their reality to the world, and have praised that work, without incurring any just blame for self-contradiction. For the instances of divine vengeance were upon them, who mixed and blended passages from their sacred books, with prophane fables or relations, placing them on a level. Here, their holy volumes were exhibited pure and unalloyed. Still plainer it is, that in perfect consistency with his insertion of these stories of Demetrius, in so indifferent a manner, he might suppose the Greeks to have had knowledge of their affairs, either by conversation with Jews, or by a version of their scriptures in whole or in part, into a language which they understood. But our design was not to defend the truth of Josephus’s narrative, but only to convict Voltaire of † gross mis-

† These remarks, upon this forty-ninth chapter of the *Philosophy of History*, were all, except the last, published in the *Museum*, so long ago as December 1765. Nor had I then any intention of taking any more notice of Mr. Voltaire, for I concluded them thus, ‘ I leave it to every unprejudiced person to judge, whether any confidence can be reposed in such an author’s account of facts. It cannot be thought,

representations of his meaning upon different occasions, in his Philosophy of History, which I hope is sufficiently done.

Upon the whole, from these numerous detections of Mr. Voltaire's falshood, with respect to Josephus, to which more might have been added, must not his admirers be rendered more distrustful of his details from antient writers in general, and more cautious of giving their assent to them as genuine, without examination? or if they suppose him more honest and faithful in his recitals from heathen authors, must they not acknowledge him to have been so carried away by prejudice and partiality, to violate the rules of truth in his accounts of the Jewish historian, as will leave an indelible and perpetual reproach upon his character for disingenuity, and upon themselves for rashness and credulity, if they shall hereafter rely upon them, as just representations of his sense?

‘ that his violations of the great rule of truth, are peculiar to this Chapter. May these remarks through the channel of your Magazine, put the public on their guard against being misled by him, till some person of greater leisure and ability, more fully expose him!’ Nor did I form the scheme of the present detection, till a considerable time after, upon reading repeated wishes, that some person would animadvert upon the abuse with which he had treated religion; and upon seeing that his works were printed with eagerness.——If any reader observe any difference between the quotations of Voltaire's words in the Museum for Dec. 1765, and here, the plain account of it is, that the remarks were then drawn up, on reading the translation of that chapter by the Monthly Reviewers for July of that year, I hope in an honest indignation, at seeing so many misrepresentations in so few sentences: whereas they are now accommodated to the English translation of the whole treatise.