ferer’s bringing the first fruits of pasturage or agriculture to that sequestered place where the Deity used to be more solemnly invoked, at the stated times of public worship ; and there presenting them in homage, with a demeanour which spoke to this purpose : 'I do hereby acknowledge thee, O my God, to be the author and giver of all good ; and do now, with humble gratitude, return my warmest thanks for these thy blessings particularly bestowed upon me.’ ” Things thus devoted became thenceforth sacred ; and to prevent their desecration, the readiest way was to send them to the table of the priest, or to consume them in the fire of the altar. Such, in the opinion of our au­thor, was the origin of eucharistical sacrifices. Impetra­tory or precative sacrifices had, he thinks, the same origin, and were contrived to express by action an invocation for the continuance of God’s favour. “ Expiatory sacrifices,” says the same learned prelate, “ were in their own nature as intelligible, and in practice as rational, as either of the other two. Here, instead of presenting the first fruits of agriculture and pasturage, in corn, wine, oil, and wool, as in the eucharistical, or a portion of what was to be sown or otherwise propagated, as in the impetratory, some chosen animal, precious to the repenting criminal who deprecates, or supposed to be obnoxious to the Deity who is to be ap­peased, was offered up and slain at the altar, in an action which, in all languages, when translated into words, speaks to this purpose : ‘I confess my transgressions at thy foot­stool, O my God, and with the deepest contrition implore thy pardon, confessing that I deserve death for those my offences.’ The latter part of the confession was more for­cibly expressed by the action of striking the devoted ani­mal, and depriving it of life ; which, when put into words, concluded in this manner : ‘ And I own that I myself de­serve the death which I now inflict on this animal.’ ”

This system of sacrifice, which his lordship thinks so well supported by the most early movements of simple nature, we admit to be ingenious, but by no means satisfactory. That mankind in the earlier ages of the world were accus­tomed to supply the deficiencies of their language by ex­pressive gesticulations, we are not incliped to controvert. The custom prevails among savage nations, or nations half civilized, at the present day. His lordship, however, is of opinion, and we heartily agree with him, that our first pa­rents were instructed by God to make articulate sounds sig­nificant of ideas, notions, and things, and not left to fabri­cate a language for themselves. That this heaven-taught language could at first be copious, no man will suppose, who thinks of the paucity of ideas which those who spoke it had to express ; but when we consider its origin, we cannot en­tertain a doubt but that it was precise and perspicuous, and admirably adapted to all the real purposes of life. Among these purposes must surely be included the worship of God as the most important of all. Every sentiment therefore which enters into worship, gratitude, invocation, confession, and deprecation, the progenitors of mankind were undoubt­edly taught to clothe in words the most significant and une­quivocal ; but we know from Moses, whose divine legation the bishop surely admitted, that Cain and Abel, the eldest children of our first parents, worshipped God by the rites of sacrifice ; and can we suppose that this practice occurred to them from their having so far forgotten the language taught them by their father, as to be under the necessity of denoting by action what they could not express by words ? If this supposition be admitted, it will force upon us another still more extravagant. Even Adam himself must, in that case, have become dumb in consequence of his fall ; for it is not conceivable, that as long as he was able to utter arti­culate sounds, and affix a meaning to them, he would cease, in the presence of his family, to confess his sins, implore forgiveness, and express his gratitude to God for all his mercies.

The author, as if aware of some such objection as this, contends, that if sacrifices had arisen from any other source than the light of reason, the Scripture would not have been silent concerning that source ; “ especially since we find Moses carefully recording what God immediately, and not nature, taught to Adam and his family.” “ Had the ori­ginal of sacrifice,” says he, “ been prescribed and directly commanded by the Deity, the sacred historian could never have omitted the express mention of that circumstance. The two capital observances in the Jewish ritual were the Sabbath and sacrifices. To impress the highest reverence and veneration on the Sabbath, he is careful to record its divine original ; and can we suppose that had sacrifices had the same original, he would have neglected to establish this truth at the time that he recorded the other, since it is of equal use and of equal importance ? I should have said, in­deed, of much greater ; for the multifarious sacrifices of the law had not only a reference to the forfeiture of Adam, but likewise prefigured our redemption by Jesus Christ.”

But all this reasoning was foreseen, and completely an­swered, before his lordship gave it to the public. It is pro­bable, that though the distinction of weeks was well known over all the eastern world, the Hebrew’s, during their resi­dence in Egypt, were very negligent in their observance of the Sabbath. To enforce a religious observance of that sacred day, it became necessary to inform them of the time and occasion of its first institution, that they might keep it holy in memory of the creation ; but, in a country like Egypt, the people were in danger of holding sacrifices rather in too high than too low veneration, so that there was not the same necessity for mentioning explicitly the early in­stitution of them. It was sufficient that they knew the di­vine institution of their own sacrifices, and the purposes for which they were offered. Besides this, there is reason to believe, that, in order to guard the Hebrews from the in­fections of the heathen, the rite of sacrificing was loaded with many additional ceremonies at its second institution under Moses. It might, therefore, be improper to relate its original simplicity to a rebellious people, who would think themselves ill used by any additional burdens of trouble or expense, however really necessary to their happiness. Bi­shop Warburton sees clearly the necessity of concealing from the Jews the spiritual and refined nature of the Chris­tian dispensation, lest such a backsliding people should, from the contemplation of it, have held in contempt their own economy. This, he thinks, is the reason why the prophets, speaking of the reign of the Messiah, borrow’ their images from the Mosaic dispensation, that the people living under that dispensation might not despise it from perceiving its end ; and we think the reason will hold equally good for their lawgiver concealing from them the simplicity of the first, sacrifices, let they should be tempted to murmur at their own multifarious ritual.

But his lordship thinks that sacrifices had their origin from the light of natural reason. We should be glad to know what light natural reason can throw upon such a sub­ject. That ignorant pagans, adoring as gods departed he­roes, who still retained their sensual appetites, might natu­rally think of appeasing such beings with the fat of fed beasts, and the perfumes of the altar, we have already ad­mitted ; but that Cain and Abel, who knew that the God whom they adored has neither body, parts, nor passions; that he created and sustains the universe ; and that from his very nature he must will the happiness of all his creatures, should be led by the light of natural reason to think of appeasing him, or obtaining favours from him, by putting to death harm­less animals, is a position which no arguments of his lordship can ever compel us to admit. That Abel’s sacrifice was in­deed accepted, we know ; but it was not accepted because it proceeded from the movements of the human mind, and the deficiency of the original language, but because it was offered