



LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Case, SCC *Division,*

Shelf, 2381 *Section,*

Book, *No.,*

THE
B E L I E F
O F A
FUTURE STATE

Proved to be a
FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLE
O F T H E
Religion of the *Hebrews*.

And the DOCTRINE of the ancient
P H I L O S O P H E R S

Concerning a FUTURE STATE, shewn to be
consistent with REASON, and their Belief of
it demonstrated:

And the whole S Y S T E M of HEATHEN
T H E O L O G Y Explained,
W I T H A N

A P P E N D I X,

Concerning the
G E N E A L O G Y and T I M E of *JOB*.
A N D

Some REMARKS on the Fifth Volume of the second
Part of Mr. *Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel-History*.

By *J O H N J A C K S O N*,
Rector of *Rossington*, in the County of *York*,
And Master of *Wigston's Hospital*, in *Leicester*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *JOHN NOON*, at the *White-Hart*, near the *Pauling*,
in *Cheapside*. MDCCLV.

1910

1000 1000 1000 1000

1000

1000 1000 1000 1000

1000

1000 1000 1000 1000

1000

1000 1000 1000 1000

1000 1000 1000 1000

1000

1000 1000 1000 1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

THE
BELIEF
OF A
FUTURE STATE

Proved to be

A FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLE
of the Religion of the *Hebrews*, &c.

AS the Evidence of *Natural* Religion, which teaches the Worship of God, and the Belief of a future State, is deduc'd from the Principles of Reason and the *ordinary* Providence of God ; so the only direct Proof of *reveal'd* Religion is founded on an *extraordinary* divine Providence manifested in *Miracles* and *Prophecies* : nor can any other immediate or direct Evidence be given of a Revelation. And as all Revelation presupposes natural Religion, and is an immediate divine Attestation given to it, so it is design'd to reform

the Corruptions brought into it, and to add Light to the Evidence, and Force to the Obligations of it.

I propose therefore to shew that the Religion of the *Hebrews* or *Jews* was founded on the Principles of natural Religion, to which Revelation was added ; and particularly, that the Belief of a future State, or Life to come, was a primary fundamental Article of this Religion.

This is very clear and evident to me, and I shall endeavour to make it so to the Reader, without desiring or intending to enter into Controversy with any learned Person, who is or shall be of another Opinion.

Whoever attentively considers and compares together the Old and New Testament will, I think, find such an Agreement and Connection between them, that they must appear to be two Parts of the same general System of Religion, reveal'd by God first to the Patriarchs and their Descendants the *Hebrews* or *Jews*, and contain'd in the Writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets* ; and afterwards both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, or the rest of Mankind, by Christ, and contained in the Gospels and other Writings of his Apostles.

In the Connection of the two divine Covenants or Laws, it is easy to see that all the main and essential Parts of the latter or Christian Covenant are contain'd, and either plainly and expressly, or else typically and symbolically declar'd and represented in the first Covenant, and in the Explanations of it by the Prophets.

As the great Design and End of God's Revelation to *Abraham* and the Patriarchs, and afterwards to *Moses*, was to preserve amongst the *Hebrews* the true Belief and Worship of him *the only true God*, in opposition to the Idolatry and Superstition which then prevail'd in other Nations, and almost in every Part of the World; till he should by a farther and more perfect Revelation by *Christ Jesus* make his Will known to the Gentiles, or the rest of Mankind, in order to destroy all Idolatry and Superstition, and to establish true Religion in the whole World: so by the wise and good Providence of God, the Coming of Christ, and the End of his Mission, was from the Beginning gradually and in various manners represented and foretold in the Revelations made to *Adam* and the Patriarchs, to *Moses* and the Prophets.

By these the *Jews*, and all who embraced their Religion, were taught as it were beforehand the Gospel of Christ; and by *Faith* in God's Promises, and Obedience to the Commandments of the Law, became Partakers of the Blessings of it.

Now, as the great End of the Mission of Jesus Christ was *to abolish Death, and to bring Life and Immortality to Light by his Gospel* (2 Tim. i. 10.) so the Apostle St. Paul assures us in the foregoing Verse, that this *Life and Immortality* in or by Christ Jesus was purpos'd by God, and given or reveal'd *before the World began*, as it is render'd in the *English Version*. But the *Greek Words* [*πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων*] mean *before the Times of the Ages*, that is, before the

Ages of the *Jewish* Dispensation. The Time of the Gospel-Dispensation is in the Old Testament [*Isai.* ix. 6. according to the best *Greek* Copies, with which *Theodotio* and *Symmachus* agree in their Versions of the *Hebrew* Text] call'd *the future Age* or *Age to come*, in contradistinction to the then present Age or Time of the *Jewish* Dispensation: and so *before the Times of the Ages* is the same as before the Ages or Time of the *Mosaic* Law. I thought it proper to explain this Phrase of the Apostle *, who in like manner says, that *the Hope of eternal Life*, thro' Christ, was *promis'd by God* [*πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων*] *before the World began* (*Tit.* i. 2.) that is again, before the Time or Age of the *Levitical* Institution. The Apostle's Expression is borrow'd from or refers to the Prophecy of Christ's coming, *Mich.* v. 2. where his *Goings forth* or *Manifestation* is said to have been *of old* or *from the Beginning* (of the World) explain'd in the following Words [*ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος*] *from the Days of the Age*; which may mean either *the Age of the World*, or the Age of the Dispensation of the Law, but most probably the first.

It is evident from the whole *New Testament*, that Christ the Author of it was the End of all the Dispensations and Revelations given in the *Old Testament*; and that the eternal Life made manifest by the Gospel was promis'd from the Beginning of the World, and Ages before the *Jewish* Law

* The Apostle uses the same Phrase, *Rom.* xvi. 25. and in the same Sense the Words ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων. *Ephes.* iii. 9. *Coloss.* i. 26.

Law was given. He was promis'd to the Patriarchs before the Law; and was also promis'd by *Moses* in the Law, and was foretold by the Prophets after the giving of the Law. Whence it is most certain, that a future State of Life and Immortality was reveal'd and promis'd to the *Hebrews*, and was always believ'd by them: and this Faith in the Promises of God was that which justify'd them, and entitl'd them to the Blessings of eternal Life, more fully and clearly reveal'd in the Gospel.

And as these Promises of eternal Life were to be confirm'd and establish'd by the Revelation of the Gospel, and by a new Covenant to be made and seal'd by the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, as the Propitiation for Sin, and the *Author and Finisher of our Faith*, and the great and most divine Lawgiver of this new Dispensation; we may be assured, and it will easily appear, that this our Redeemer and his Gospel-Dispensation, with all the Blessings which were to attend it, were pre-figur'd and fore-express'd in the other preceding Dispensations; and the *Promises* of them were the Foundation of the Faith and Hope of all the Patriarchs, and of *Moses* and the *Jews* under the Legal Covenant.

Hence it is that Christ says (*Mat. v. 17.*) *Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil (them.)* He was so far from destroying the Law or the Prophets, by teaching any thing contrary to them, that he came on purpose to fulfil all that had been taught and foretold in the

Writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets* concerning the *Messias*; and the Gospel-Law to be deliver'd by him.

Hence also *St. Paul* says (*Gal. iii. 23, 24.*) *Before Faith* [of *Jesus Christ* promis'd before and under the Law, as he argues in the preceding Verses] *came, we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the Faith which should afterwards be reveal'd,* [by the Coming of *Christ*:] *wherefore the Law was our Schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justify'd by Faith* [in him.]

We see here, that the Law, by containing the Promises of *Justification* to eternal Life thro' Faith in *Christ*, the promis'd Seed of *Abraham*, did, like a *Schoolmaster*, teach the Knowledge of that Salvation which was to be reveal'd in the Gospel, and to be obtain'd thro' Faith in *Christ*; and so did, in the Apostle's Expression, *v. 8th* of this Chapter, *preach the Gospel* to the *Jews*, and lead them to the Faith of *Christ*, and to receive his Gospel, whenever he should come and reveal it.

Hence also again the same Apostle (*Heb. x. 1.*) says, *the Law had the Shadow of the good Things to come,* [see *Coloss. ii. 17.*] that is, of the Glory and Happiness of the future State; which, like the *Shadow* or first Draught of a Picture, was imperfectly represented in the Law: but the full and perfect Image of the heavenly State was finish'd in strong and florid Colours, and exhibited, as it were, to the Life in the Gospel-Dispensation.

So that the whole Tenor of the evangelical Writings suppose, that the future State reveal'd by Christ was promis'd and believ'd both before and under the Law: and we may thence conclude, that the whole *Jewish* Nation did believe in the promis'd *Messias*, as being *the Seed of Abraham*, in whom all the Families of the Earth should be blessed; and that thro' Him, as *Moses* and the Prophets foretold, they shou'd receive with the temporal Blessings of the Law, *the Remission of their Sins* (Jerem. xxxi. 34.) for which the Law had provided no express or particular Atonement; and in consequence, the spiritual Blessings of the Life to come, eternal in the Heavens.

As a future State may be demonstrably deduc'd from Principles of natural Reason, so it is contain'd in the Proposition laid down by *St. Paul*, *He that cometh to God* (as a Worshipper of him) *must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of those who diligently seek him*, Heb. xi. 6. Agreeably to this Maxim, it was the universally receiv'd Faith of all Nations at all times, and a primary Article of all Religion, that pious and just Men wou'd be happy, and impious and unrighteous Men miserable in a future State.

This Opinion prevail'd from the Beginning wherever the Descendants of *Noah* were dispers'd and settled, from *Cbina* in the *East* as far as to the *Western* Ocean: nor was any People ever known that believ'd the Existence and Providence of God, but in consequence they also believ'd the future Existence of the Soul, and the Rewards
and

and Punishments of another Life. There was not in the most ancient Times of the World any Nation or any one Man (I believe) ever known, who did not believe a future State: and it is certain, that in later Times, none but *Atheists* wholly disbeliev'd it. This was not only the Belief of all the Nations bordering on the Country of the *Jews*, as the *Phœnicians*, *Syrians*, *Chaldeans*, *Arabians* and *Egyptians*, but their very Superstition and the Idolatry of * Hero-Worship presuppos'd and was built upon it.

It must therefore appear a very strange *Paradox*, for any to suppose or assert that the *Jewish* Nation were ignorant of or did not believe this fundamental Article of Religion; which in their Case wou'd also be attended with this farther unequall'd Absurdity, that God deliver'd a Revelation to a Nation of Atheists. But on the contrary to such a Supposition, it is very plain and certain, that the *Hebrews* had a fuller and stronger Evidence of a future State than any other Nation then had; an Evidence not only founded on the Principles of natural Reason and Conscience common to them with the rest of Mankind; but they had this Evidence strengthened and confirm'd to them by divine Revelation.

From the Writings of *Moses* the *Hebrews* had abundant Evidence to confirm their Belief of a future State, founded on the Light of Nature, and

* Quod autem ex hominum genere consecratos, sicut Herculem et cæteros, coli lex jubet, indicat omnium quidem animos *immortales* esse; sed fortium bonorumque divinos. Cic. de Leg. lib. 2. p. 412. edit. Gryph.

and receiv'd from the Patriarchs of their Nation, from the Beginning. The History of the *Creation* and of the *Fall* of Man were both of them Evidences of this Belief.

Man was formed in the *Image* of God, and had a rational Soul breath'd into him from God, which the ancient *Jews* always believ'd to be of a spiritual and immortal Nature; and that it did not die and perish with the Body, but *ascended upward*, as they express'd it, and *return'd to God* who gave it, to be judg'd and dispos'd of by him, according to the Good or Evil done in this Life.

It is the Doctrine of the wise Preacher and King of *Israel*, that the *Dust shall return to the Earth as it was, and the Spirit shall return to God who gave it*, Ecclef. xii. 7. * And the *Chaldee Paraphrast* on the Place shews the Sense of the ancient *Jews*. He interprets the Text; *Thy Flesh which was created out of the Dust shall return to the Earth, whence it was originally taken; and the Spirit (or spiritual Part) of thy Soul shall return and stand in the Judgment before him (the Lord) who gave it to thee.* And the Words of the 17th Verse of the third Chapter,

* Καλῶς ὁ Επίχαρμος· Συνεκριθῆ, Φησι, καὶ διεκριθῆ, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἔθεν ἤλθε πάλιν, γὰρ μὲν εἰς γᾶν πνεῦμα δ' ἀνω· Apud Plut. de Consolat. ad Apollón. p. 110. very agreeably to the Sense of *Solomon*. And the same *Epicharmus* has these beautiful *Trocaicks*: Ἐσεβῆς τὸν νῦν πεφυκῶς ἐπάθης γ' ἔθεν κακὸν καλῆσανῶν, ἀνω τὸ πνεῦμα διαμενεί κατ' ἄραν. Ap. Grot. Prolegom. And *Pythagoras* had the same Notion: ἀπεφαίνετο Πυθαγόρας ἐπάνου εἶναι ταῖς ψυχαῖς· Ap. *Jamblic. vit. Pythagor.* Sect. 178. p. 150.

ter, which are, *I said in my heart; God will judge the Righteous and the Wicked: for there is a Time* [i. e. a Time of Judgment appointed by God] *for every Purpose and for every Work: These Words, the same ancient Paraphrast thus interprets; God will judge both the Innocent and the Sinner in the Day of the great Judgment: for a Time is appointed for every Cause; and they shall be judg'd there for every Work done in this Life.*

It follows, *ŷ. 21st, Who knoweth the Spirit of Man (or of the Sons of Man) if it goeth upward; and the Spirit of the Beast, if it goeth downward to the Earth?*

Which Words do not intimate that the Souls of Men perish like those of Beasts; or express a Doubt whether there is any Difference between the one and the other: but they are only spoken of those voluptuous and wicked Men mention'd *ŷ. 16th and 18th*, who having plac'd all their Happiness in the brutish Pleasures of this Life, he supposes, neither knew or consider'd what became of their Souls hereafter; whether after Death they went *upward*, where they will be judg'd by God; or *downward to the Earth*, and perish'd like the Souls of Beasts.

The Question therefore is put to them, and is; Who amongst these foolish Men knoweth what becomes of the Spirit or Soul of Man after this Life? But the wise King has given his Judgement of the matter very plainly and expressly, *that the Spirit shall return to God who gave.*

gave it; and that both the Righteous and the Wicked shall be judged by him for every Work.

The other Parts of this Book, as also other Places of the Scriptures which seem to some to be inconsistent with the Doctrine of a future State, do only seem to be so; but really refer, some of them very plainly, to the common Fate of Men and Beasts in this Life, and to the common Death and Dissolution of their Bodies: and others shew at most that the ancient *Jews* believ'd the State after Death to be very imperfect, and a sort of Sleep or Inactivity till the coming of the *Messias* who was to abolish Death, and to reveal and confer a State of Life and Immortality both of Body and Soul on all who believ'd in him. But no Part of Scripture any where implies that the *Jews* believ'd the Soul to be *mortal*, and to die with the Body; or that they did not believe a Life and Judgment to come.

Josephus speaking of the Creation of Man related *Gen. ii. 7.* says, that *our mortal Bodies were all form'd out of corruptible Matter, but that the Soul which dwells in the Body is immortal, and a Portion of God.* [De Bell. lib. 3. p. 852. edit. Genev. 1635.]

Moses gave the *Jews* an Intimation of a future immortal State both of Soul and Body, in the Prophecy that *the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's Head*, who by his Temptation had brought *Death* upon our first Parents, and in them upon all Mankind their Descendants. *Gen. iii. 15.* This Prophecy was to be to them and to their Posterity, a Remedy against the
Power

Power of the *Serpent*, or of that evil Spirit who had by the Serpent as his Instrument obtain'd the *Power of Death*.

This Prophecy therefore shew'd the *Jews*, that Death should not always or for ever prevail over the Sons of *Adam*; but that their *Messias*, *the Seed of the Woman* *, should overcome Death and be raised up from it to a State of Immortality; and shou'd also raise up all who believ'd in him and obey'd his Laws, to the same State.

Moses and the ancient *Hebrews* undoubtedly understood this Prophecy of the Coming of the *Messias* to set up a spiritual Kingdom over Death, and to translate his true Believers and Followers to a spiritual and heavenly Paradise. As this was the Sense of the Prophecy, and given by *Moses* to the *Jews* to be their great Support, as it was to their Forefathers, under the Calamity of Mortality incurr'd by the Fall of their first Parents; they cannot, with any Reason, be suppos'd to have been ignorant of the Meaning of it.

The Royal *Psalmist* understood it when he said by the Spirit of Prophecy: *I have set the Lord always before me—therefore my Heart is glad and my Glory rejoiceth: my Flesh also shall rest in Hope. For Thou wilt not leave my Soul*

* *Christ* is here emphatically styled *the Seed of the Woman*, to denote that he was to be miraculously born of a *Virgin*. And this Prophecy shews that the *Messias* was promised from the Foundation of the World, and that the Hope of eternal Life thro' Him was given from the Beginning of the Creation.

Soul in Hell (in the Grave or State of Death) neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy one to see Corruption. Thou wilt shew me the Path of Life: in thy Presence is Fulness of Joy, at thy right hand there are Pleasures for evermore. Psalm xvi. 8—11.

Could *David* say this of the *Messias*, and have no Hope or Belief of a future State thro' Him? What is this *Path of Life*, *this Fulness of Joy in God's Presence*, and those *everlasting Pleasures at God's right Hand*, but the Enjoyment and Happiness of the future State, and that Life and Immortality which was to be revealed by the Gospel of *Christ*, and to be conferr'd as the Reward of Obedience to his Laws? This Prospect of the future heavenly Life and Glory warm'd the Prophet's Breast, and made it glow with seraphic Raptures of Joy in the Hope of it. And what signified these Prophecies to the *Jews*, but to raise in them the Belief and Assurance of future Happiness thro' the *Messias*; as they were assured of present and temporal Felicity thro' Obedience to the Law: and their present earthly Happiness was the Earnest and Type of the greater spiritual Felicity which was future.

A plain and direct Indication of another Life after this was given to the *Jews*, in the Translation of *Enoch*, of whom *Moses* relates, *Gen. v. 24. Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.* The evident Meaning is, that he was by a bodily Translation taken into Heaven. And thus *St. Paul* explains the Words, (*Heb. xi. 5.*) *By Faith Enoch was translated*

translated, that he should not see Death, and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his Translation he had this Testimony, that he pleased God. Josephus * says, that Enoch went unto God; and therefore the Scriptures make no mention of his Death. The Book of Wisdom says of him, that he pleased God, and was beloved of him: so that living amongst Sinners he was translated. Chap. iv. 10. And that Enoch did not die, but was translated from a mortal to an immortal Life, as Philo explains the Word, was the Sense of the Greek Translators of the Son of Syrach, Eccclus. xliv. 14. and of the ancient Jews in general, as well as of the Apostle and of the primitive Christians: And the old Paschal † Chronicle well explains both the Sense and Design of the Account of the Translation of Enoch. This Enoch is he, against whom the Denunciation of Death had no power; for he was translated by God, that he should not see Death, as the divine Scripture relates: and also that in him we might be before inform'd, that Death shall not (finally) prevail over Men. — This Enoch is he who was translated to (another)

* Ἄνωχ — ἀνεχώρησε, πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ὅθεν οὐδὲ τελευτήν αὐτῷ ἀναγεγράφασι. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 3. p. 14. Edit. Havercamp.

† Ἔτις ἐστὶν Ἐνώχ πρὸς ὃν ἔτε ἡ ἀπόφασις τῆ θανάτου ἐκράτησεν· μετετέθη γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆ θεῆ τῆ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καθὰ τῆ θείᾳ γραφῇ δοκεῖ· ὅπως καὶ διὰ τῆς προμνηστῆ ἡμῶν, ὡς ἔκρητῆσει ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ θάνατος—ἔτις ἐστὶν Ἐνώχ ὁ μετετέθη εἰς ζωὴν εἰς δεῖγμα τῆς τῆ θεῆ δυνάμεως ταῖς μετὰ ταῦτα γενεαῖς τῆς δυναμένης διαληθῆσαι τῆς θνήσκῆς μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῶντας τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον ἀλλαγῆν ὑπομένειν. P. 44. Edit. 4^o Rader.

ther) *Life, to shew to future Generations that God by his Power was able to preserve Mortals from dying; and that they who are alive should wait to be changed to a better State.*

The Word used by *Moses*, for God's *taking* or *translating* *Enoch*, is the same which is used in the Book of the *Kings*, to express the Translation of *Elijah*, 2 Kings ii. 3. And that *Moses* meant by the Translation of *Enoch*, or his being taken by God, that he was by the Power of God taken away out of this World, without dying, to a State of immortal Happiness with God, is very evident from the Reason given of his Translation. For it was, because *he walked with God*, and pleased him, by the Purity of his Faith and Worship, and an extraordinary Holiness of Life all his Days; and was an Example of Piety and Righteousness in a corrupt and sinful Age, *when the Wickedness of Man was great in the Earth, and their Thoughts and their Works were evil*, Gen. vi. 5. This is a good reason for the Translation of *Enoch* out of a wicked World to the Happiness of the heavenly State, before he had liv'd out half the Days of his Forefathers. But if by God's taking *Enoch* was meant, as some modern *Jewish Rabbis* foolishly alledged, that God took away his Life by a *sudden Death*; and so, that he was cut off before he arriv'd at the Middle of the Age of Man in those Days: this could not be thought to be a Token of his having *walked with God*, and *pleas'd* him; or to be a Reward of Godliness by those who did not believe a future State. On

the contrary, it must have been thought a Mark of the divine Displeasure, and of his not having walked with God, that his Days and the Happiness of his present Life were so much shorter than the Life both of his Forefathers and Descendants, when Length of Days and earthly Prosperity were esteem'd to be Tokens of the divine Favour. It is therefore certain that God's taking of *Enoch* was a *bodily Translation* of him to a State of Immortality, as the taking of *Elijah* into Heaven was: and both Examples were designed to confirm the *Jews* in the Belief that all the true Worshipers of the God of *Israel* should hereafter live with God, as they did in the heavenly *Paradise* or *Canaan*; and be made immortal both in Body and Soul, as they were. And the History of *Enoch's* Translation was an Evidence of the Redemption of the Body from Death, agreeably to the Promise made to *Adam* and *Eve*; and was a divine Attestation to Men in that and the following Ages, that the Body as well as the Soul should exist in a future State; and this was probably the general Belief of Mankind in the most early Ages of the World, and both before and after the Flood.

That the Immortality of the Soul and a Life to come, was the common received Faith in the Days of *Moses*, may appear from *Balaam's* Wish, (*Numb. xxiii. 10.*) *that he might die the Death of the Righteous*: that is, that his Soul after Death might be with the Souls of the *Righteous*, or that righteous People the *Jews*, whom God had commanded him *to bless*.

If *Balaam* had not believ'd a future State, such a Wish would have been vain and insignificant : and knowing that God had determined to make the *Jews* a prosperous and powerful Nation, he would rather have wished to have enjoyed their Portion in the present Life, than that his Death should be like theirs. Therefore we may conclude that *Balaam*, who was a Prophet amongst the *Moabites* and *Midianites*, believed that the *Righteous* after Death were blessed and happy ; and that this Doctrine prevailed amongst his People.

The frequent Appearance of *Angels* to the Patriarchs before the Law, and their Ministration at the Delivery of the Law and afterwards, was a sensible Evidence to the *Jews* of another invisible State distinct from the present Life. And the Law itself plainly sheweth that the *Jews* as well as other Nations did believe the Existence and Influence of the Souls of the Dead : and therefore it forbids the Use of *Divination*, and consulting with *familiar Spirits*, and *Necromancy*, (Deut. xviii. 10, 11.) Which Prohibition evidently supposes that the Doctrine of *Divination* and *Necromancy*, which consisted in invoking and consulting *Dæmons* and the Souls of dead Persons, prevailed amongst the *Jews* ; and which was a principal Part of the Superstition of the *Egyptians*, and of that of all other Nations : and is a plain Demonstration that the *Jews* believed a future State equally with other Nations. When *Elijah* raised the Widow of *Zarephath's* Son, he prayed to God, saying, O

Lord my God, let this Child's Soul come into him again: and it is added; *that the Soul of the Child came into him again and he revived*, 1 Kings xvii. 21, 22. This shews that the *Jews* believed that the Soul at Death did not die with the Body; and that it existed in a separate State, from whence by the Power and Will of God it might return to the Body again.

That the Faith of the *Hebrew* Patriarchs, and those also who lived before the Flood, had respect to a future and eternal Life, is proved at large by St. *Paul* in the eleventh Chapter of his Epistle to the *Hebrews*. This he proves from the Nature of divine *Faith* itself.

Faith (says the Apostle) *is the Substance of Things hoped for, the Evidence of Things not seen*; that is, of Things future and invisible. *ſ. 1.*

By this Faith Abel offer'd to God a more excellent Sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained Witness that he was righteous, God testifying [his Acceptance] of his Gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh, *ſ. 4.* that is, declareth that God is the Rewarder of those who believe in him, tho' they are dead.

By this Faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see Death, and was not found (on Earth) because God had translated him [into Heaven] for before his Translation he had this Testimony, that he pleased God, ver. 5. But without Faith (he adds, ver. 6.) it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that

he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them who diligently seek him. And this Reward he shews, both in the foregoing and following Examples, to consist in the Life and Happiness of a future eternal State.

By this Faith *Noah* having obeyed God's Command in preparing an Ark to save himself and Family from the Deluge, which God had declared he would bring upon the Earth, became Heir of the Righteousness which is by Faith, ver. 7. that is, an Heir of that eternal Life which under the Gospel is promised to the Righteousness of Faith.

Again, by this Faith [in God's Word, that he was *his exceeding great Reward*, Gen. xv. 1. that is, *in the World to come*, say the Targums of Jerusalem and Jonathan] Abraham having sojourned in the Land of Promise, as in a strange Country with Isaac and Jacob, the Heirs with him of the same Promise, look'd for a City which hath Foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God, ver. 9, 10. That is evidently, they look'd for not an *earthly* but an *heavenly* City or State; not in the Life that now is, but in that which is to come, *eternal in the Heavens*: and accordingly, this City which they looked for is called *a better Country* [than the Land of Canaan] *that is*, as it is added, *an heavenly*, ver. 16. Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, or is not ashamed of them, in being called their God, as the Words may be render'd; *for he hath prepared for them a City*, that is again, *an heavenly* one just before mentioned. And this Reasoning

of the Apostle shews the true Import of the Words of *Moses*, *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, as *Christ* also himself explained them; namely, that he was their God, who, tho' dead, *liv'd with him* in that heavenly State or City which he had prepared for them, and promised to them and their Seed as the Reward of their Faith in him. And this *St. Paul* declares to be the Sense of the Promises made to the Patriarchs, and unto which the twelve Tribes instantly serving God day and night hoped to come, *Acts xxvi. 6, 7.* namely, the Resurrection of the Dead, as he had said before, *chap. xxiv. ver. 15.*

And that *Moses* firmly believed the Rewards of the future State, is evident from what *St. Paul* adds, saying, that by Faith *Moses chose rather to suffer Affliction with the People of God, than to enjoy the Pleasures of Sin for a season.—For he had respect unto the Recompence of the Reward*, *Heb. xi. 25, 26.* It is manifest that this *Recompence of the Reward of Faith*, was neither the Glory, Riches, or the Pleasures of *Egypt*, all which he renounced; nor was it the Enjoyment of the Blessings of the Land of *Canaan*, which he never partook of: and therefore it was the Recompence and Happiness of the future State, and the invisible Glory and Reward of the Life to come; for which he chose Afflictions in the present State, rather than all the Greatness he was possessed of in *Pharaoh's* Court. This is plain from the following Words, *ver. 27.* *By Faith he (Moses) forsook Egypt, not fearing the Wrath of the King, for he endured*

as seeing him who is invisible. His Faith in the invisible God, and of being rewarded by him hereafter, made him despise all worldly Greatness and temporal Satisfactions, and endure with Patience Reproaches and Persecutions with the afflicted People of God.

So that according to the Explanation of St. Paul and of our Saviour himself, the Promises made unto Abraham and other Patriarchs, and also to the Jewish Nation as their Seed and Heirs of the same Promises, contained an Assurance given to them of a future heavenly Life to be obtained by Faith in God, and Obedience to the Laws of everlasting Righteousness, which was to be revealed by the Messias.

This is that justifying and saving Faith, under which the holy Patriarchs conducted their Lives, and walked with God, and pleased him; and after Death obtained the blessed Reward of it. And that this Faith in God, which at all Times and in every Nation raised in just and pious Men a steadfast Hope of future Happiness, was the grand fundamental Principle of the Patriarchal and Jewish Religion, is at large argued by St. Paul, in the third Chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians.

The Scripture, (says he, x. 8.) foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen [that is, call them to the Promises of eternal Life revealed in the Gospel-Dispensation] through Faith [in Christ] preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, in Thee shall all Nations be blessed. Gen. xii. 3. xviii. 18. xxii. 18. Abraham therefore was justified,

justified, and entitled to eternal Life by his Faith in the Promise of God made unto him and his Seed, [Gal. iii. 16.] The same may be said of *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and their Seed who had the same Promise, Gen. xvii. 19. xxviii. 14. Now according to St. *Paul's* Reasoning, this Justification by Faith in God's Promises, which he also confirms from the Words of the Prophet, [Habac. ii. 4.] was in a Life different from that which was promised to the *Doers of the Law*, and was the Reward not of the *Works of the Law*, but of *Faith*. Therefore he adds, y. 11. *But that no one is justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: for the just shall live by Faith.* Habac ii. 4. and yet he allows that the Promise of Life was made to the *Doers of the Law*. The *Law* (says he) is not (or consisteth not) of *Faith*: but the *Man that doeth them shall live in* (or by) *them*, y. 12. From which Reasoning it appears, that Justification in the sight of God, or the Life which the Just by God's Promise were entitled to by *Faith*, was a better and more valuable Life than that which was promised to the Performance of the Works of the Law, or to the Observance of the *Levitical* Institution; and therefore it was the Life of the future State, or that eternal Life which was revealed by *Christ*: and that *Blessedness* which all *Nations*, *Heathens* as well as *Jews*, were to partake of; and therefore was the *Blessedness* not of the *Law*, but of the *Gospel*; not of this Life, but of that which is to come.

Hence

Hence it is plain, that St. *Paul* thought that both these Benefits were given to the *Jews*, the first of *Justification* to eternal Life thro' Faith, in the Promises of God made unto *Abraham* and his Seed, and which is called an *everlasting Covenant*, Gen. xvii. 7. the second of temporal Blessings in the present Life promised to the *Doers of the Law*.

Therefore the *Jewish* Nation in general had delivered to them as well as to *Abraham* himself that Faith in the Promises of God which the Apostle calls *the preaching of the Gospel*, and to which *Justification* or eternal Life was annex'd, and by which *Abraham* himself was *justified in the sight of God*.

It was on account of this Faith in God's Promises to his Seed that *Abraham* is said to have *seen the Day of Christ*, and to have *rejoiced* at the Foreknowledge of it, *John* viii. 56. He saw it first in the Birth of *Isaac*, to whom the Promise was made; and again in the Deliverance of him from the Altar whereon he was commanded to sacrifice him; his miraculous Birth was a Type of the miraculous Incarnation of *Christ*; and his being offer'd up a Sacrifice to God, and then deliver'd from Death, was a Type of *Christ's* Sacrifice of himself and Resurrection from the Dead, who really suffer'd Death as a Sacrifice for Sin. *Abraham* understood the Meaning of the Promises made to his Seed, in whom or thro' whom *all Nations were to be blessed*; and so he *saw* or foresaw the Coming, and Death, and Resurrection

tion

tion of the *Messias* or *Christ*, the promised Seed who was to descend from him.

Secondly, this Faith in the Promise of God made to *Abraham's* Seed was strengthened and more clearly set forth in the Law itself, in these Words: *The Lord thy God will raise up unto Thee a Prophet from the midst of Thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me, unto him ye shall hearken. — And I will put my Words in his Mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my Words, which he shall speak in my Name, I will require it of him.* Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19.

The Knowledge of this Promise of the *Messias* and of a future and eternal Life to be obtained thro' him, which the *Jews* always believed and hoped for, is an unquestionable Evidence that under the Law they looked farther than to the carnal and temporal Promises of it; and expected a spiritual and future heavenly State, which God had promised to be revealed by the *Messias*, thro' Faith in whom all were to be *justified* and saved.

It was evident that the Promises made to *Abraham* could not be completed by the temporal Blessings of the Land of *Canaan* given to the *Jews only*; because they were Promises in which other Nations besides the *Jews* were equally concerned; they were Promises by the full Completion of which *all the Nations or Families of the Earth* were to be *blessed*: and therefore they were not Promises made to the *Doers of the Law* only,

only, which was given to the *Jews*, and to no other Nation ; but they still subsisted under the Law, and were to be an *everlasting Covenant* made with that Seed of *Abraham* in whom *all the Nations of the Earth* were to be *blessed* ; that is, the promised *Messias*, who was to be the Author and Dispenser not of temporal but eternal Felicity.

Therefore as the *Jews* did undoubtedly believe the Promises of God made unto *Abraham*, and that they were to be fulfilled at the coming of the *Messias* who was to descend from him ; they must consequently believe that the Blessings promised to be confer'd thro' him were not the carnal and temporal Blessings promised to the Doers of the Law, and which *Abraham* and the Patriarchs never received ; but the Participation of that spiritual Happiness of a future and eternal Life which *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* enjoyed with God, as the Reward of their Faith and Righteousness ; and with which *all the Nations of the Earth* were to be blessed by Faith in God, and Obedience to his Word and Commandments deliver'd in the Gospel of *Christ*.

So that Faith in the promised *Messias* always consequentially infer'd the Belief of eternal Life and Happiness. And as the Belief of a future and immortal Life was the natural Consequence of Faith in God, as the Rewarder of all his faithful Worshippers, and was common to the *Jews* with the rest of Mankind, and drawn from the Principles of natural Reason ; so this Faith was render'd stronger in the *Jews* than in any other People

People who had not a divine Revelation by the Promise of the *Messias* who was to be the Author of this Life and Immortality.

All this is evident, unless we suppose that *Abraham* and his Posterity believed the Promises of God which were to be fulfilled in the *Messias*, not to be of a spiritual but of a meer carnal Nature, like those of the Law; and that he and they were justified in the sight of God by such a meer carnal Faith: which Supposition is highly absurd in itself, and also directly contrary to St. *Paul's* whole Reasoning. But as the Reasoning of the Apostle is highly agreeable to the natural Notions of God, as well as to the Revelations given by *Moses* and the Prophets; so it throws a great and strong Light upon all the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament. It shews how the *Law* was a *Shadow* of the future good Things more fully and clearly revealed by the *Gospel*; as representing them under the Promises of God made to *Abraham* and the *Jews*; and also under the Sacrifices and ritual Institutions of the Law itself. But on Supposition that the Blessings of the future State were not promised, represented, or known to the *Jews* under the Law, there is no ground to call the Law a *Shadow* or imperfect Representation of them. A *Shadow* or first Draught of a Picture is a Similitude and faint Resemblance of the Substance or Body from whence it is taken, and to which it refers; as the *Image* is the perfect and finish'd Portraiture of it. And this is the Difference between the Law and the Gospel; the first is an imperfect Delineation of those

those *heavenly Things*, of which the latter is the *express Image*. In the former, the Author of eternal Salvation is only promised, and veil'd under Types and Ceremonies ; but in the latter, he is exhibited in Person, and manifested to the World.

The whole History of the *Jewish* or *Hebrew* Nation from the Beginning is sufficient to convince any who consider it, that as they were brought up in the Worship of the true God, by whose extraordinary Providence *Abraham* their Father and the Founder of their Nation was brought out of an idolatrous Country into the Land of *Canaan* ; so they liv'd under the constant Sense of his governing Providence, and the Hope and Belief of receiving the final Reward of their Obedience in another Life after this.

As it cannot be doubted but this was the Faith of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* concerning the divine Providence, and the Meaning of the Promise of Blessedness made to them, and which they were told not to expect in the Land where they lived only as *Strangers* and *Sojourners* ; so it can as little be doubted but that it was their principal Care to teach and inculcate into their Descendants and Families the same Faith in God as their great Protector here, and Rewarder hereafter.

It was therefore the grand fundamental Principle of the *Abrahamic* Religion to depend only on the divine Providence both for temporal and spiritual Blessings : for the Happiness of this Life and also of that which is to come.

Under

Under this Faith and Trust in God the *Israelites* were by divine Providence conducted into *Egypt*, and preserved there by the same Providence till they became a great and a numerous People. During their Abode in *Egypt* under the Patriarchs and Heads of their Tribes and Families the Worship of the true God was preserved amongst them ; and continued, at least, so long as *Joseph* was Governor of the Land of *Egypt*. So that if it can be supposed that the *Israelites* ever lost the Knowledge of the true God, and with it the Belief of a future State received from their Forefathers, it must have been after the Death of their Patriarch *Joseph*, when they were reduced into a State of Slavery and hard Bondage, and fell into the *Egyptian* Idolatry ; and, instead of the God of *Israel*, worshipped the great *Egyptian* God *Osiris*, whose Symbol was a living Bull call'd *Apis* at *Memphis*, and another call'd * *Mnevis* at

* These Bulls had been consecrated and worshipp'd as the Symbols of *Osiris* before the Days of *Abraham*. And it is a gross Error in some learned ancient, as well as modern Christian Writers, to fancy that *Joseph* was worshipp'd by the *Egyptians* under the *Apis*. The Scripture tells us, that the Memory of *Joseph* was not regarded after his Death ; and so it is not in the least probable that *Pharaoh*, who is said not to know him, as he really did not, should make him an Object of Worship. It may easily be proved that *Osiris* reign'd in *Egypt* above a Century before the Birth of *Abraham* ; and tho' *Diodorus Siculus* hath from less ancient and from false Accounts ascrib'd to *Osiris* the real Actions and Exploits of *Sesostris* who reigned about nine Centuries after *Osiris* ; yet the more ancient and credible Writers *Herodotus* and *Manetho*, and *Strabo* after them, did not confound either their Persons, Times, or their Actions. But it is a still greater Error to confound

Sesostris

at *Heliopolis*, where the *Hebrews* chiefly worship'd this *Egyptian* Idol. But it is certain that whilst they continued in the *Egyptian* Superstition, tho' they might forget or lose the Knowledge

Sesoftris both with *Osiris* and *Sesach* or *Shishak*; since it is certain that *Shishak* reign'd in *Egypt* above three hundred Years after *Sesoftris* reign'd there: and there is not one Action of the Reign of *Shishak*, besides his Expedition into *Judea*, which agrees to *Sesoftris*. Had *Sesoftris* taken *Jerusalem*, and spoil'd the *Temple* and the King's Palace of all their Treasures, as is related of *Shishak*, *1 Kings* xiv. 25, 26. and which is all we know of his Exploits; the *Egyptian* History, which relates so fully the Actions of *Sesoftris*, could not have fail'd to mention this so famous an Expedition. But as there is not the least mention of any such Expedition in the Reign of *Sesoftris*, as his going to *Jerusalem* and plundering the *Temple* and King's House, so it is no wonder that no such mention should be made, because there was neither any King of the *Jews*, or a *Temple* at *Jerusalem* till many Years after the Death of *Sesoftris*. I thought it proper to observe this, because our learned Chronologer Sir *John Marsham* fell into this Mistake; and occasion'd, as it seems, the more learned Sir *Isaac Newton* to fall into the same Error of confounding *Sesoftris* with *Shishak*; and others have follow'd these Authors without examining the Matter by the best and most ancient Historical Evidence: and the Mistake is both very gross, and wholly ungrounded; and tends to confound and overthrow all History and Chronology together of the most ancient Times. *Sesoftris* and the Greek *Bacchus* liv'd about the same Time; and so the *Greeks* ascrib'd to their *Bacchus* the Actions of the *Egyptian* *Sesoftris*: and because they call'd *Osiris* by the Name of *Dionysus* or *Bacchus* [tho' they distinguish'd him from the later *Bacchus* Son of *Semele*, by calling him the Old *Dionysus*] the Exploits of the Greek *Bacchus*, and which were really the Exploits of *Sesoftris*, were ascrib'd to *Osiris* also. And thus three different Persons have been confounded; and this Confusion of the Names and Actions of these Heroes in *Greek* Writers, occasion'd all the Errors of Sir *Isaac Newton* about them.

ledge of the God of their Fathers, they cou'd not lose the Sense of a future State, which was a fundamental Doctrin of the *Egyptians*, and had always been receiv'd amongst them.

With this Doctrin therefore, along with the *Egyptian* Superstition, the *Israelites* were strongly possess'd when *Moses* led them out of *Egypt*: and then they plainly saw that the Gods of *Egypt*, whom they had serv'd, were no Gods, and that the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, their Fathers, who had brought them into *Egypt*, and had blessed and supported them there for 215 Years, was the only true God, who deliver'd them from the Power of *Pharaoh* and all their Enemies, that they might serve and worship him alone, their Saviour and Redeemer.

As soon as they came into the Wilderness of *Sinai*, *Moses* deliver'd God's Law to them from *Horeb*; whereby God promis'd, upon their Obedience to it, to be peculiarly *their God*, and that they shou'd be *an holy Nation*, and a *peculiar Treasure to him above all People*; and that he would fulfil to them the Promises made to their Fathers *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, to give them the Land of *Canaan* as a sure Token of his Favour; and that they might know that he was their God, and that they were his People and Heirs of all the Promises made to their Fathers, and entitled to the Blessings which they had receiv'd and were possess'd of, as the Reward of their Faith and Righteousness.

It was on this account that *Moses* wrote the History of the *Creation*, and of the *Flood*, and of the

the *Hebrew* Nation down to his own Time, that his People might know how God in all Times had blessed and preserv'd holy and just Men, who were the true Worshippers of him, both here and after this Life: and that they might be assured that the divine Providence extended not only to this Life, which was made *mortal* by the Disobedience of our first Parents, but also to a future and *immortal* Life, he set before them the Promise made to *Adam* and *Eve* upon their Repentance, of a Deliverance from that Mortality and Death which they and their Posterity had incurr'd by Sin. By the Translation of *Enoch*, he gave them an undoubted Evidence of a cœlestial State reserv'd for those, who like him *walk'd with God*, and worship'd him with true Faith and Holiness of Life. He also related the wonderful Providence of God towards *Abraham*, from whom they descended; and shew'd them that it was *his Seed* which was promis'd to come and *to bruise the Serpent's Head*, and deliver Mankind from the Power of Death to Life and Immortality. And farther to convince them of the Continuance of God's Favour to his faithful Servants after this Life, God by him declar'd that he was *the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob*, after they were dead; and wou'd be worshipp'd by their Children under that Name thro' all their Generations for ever.

It was with the same View of manifesting the eternal Providence of God, and also at the same time to support and comfort the *Israelites* under

their Afflictions in *Egypt*, and during their Sojournment in the Wilderness, that *Moses*, as is most probable, gave them written in their own Language the History of *Job*, who died but a few Years * before they came out of *Egypt*; and the Account of whose Sufferings and great Deliverance and Prosperity after them, was then recent and well known.

It appears from the Scope of the Book of *Job*, that it was the general Sense and Belief of Men concerning divine Providence at that Time, and in the most ancient Times before, that God did never grievously afflict righteous Men in this Life; or suffer them to perish under temporal Adversities, *ib. iv. 7, 8.* and this Notion is fully asserted in the whole 8th Chapter, and other Parts of the Book: and in this, *Job* and his three Friends agreed. On this account it is, that they so constantly accuse *Job* of being a Sinner and an Hypocrite, tho' he appeared to be righteous; and therefore they press'd him to confess his Sins, and to humble himself before God, who would certainly restore him to his Prosperity, if he was penitent and truly righteous: and the same Opinion of the Equity of the divine Proceedings made *Job*, who knew his own Sincerity and Integrity, think that God was hard upon him, and did not deal with him as he used to do with his faithful Servants and true Worshipers; and by the Afflictions which he laid upon him, gave occasion to his Friends to arraign and calumniate

* See the Appendix concerning the Genealogy and Age of *Job*.

calumniate his Uprightness and Innocency, as feign'd and insincere. But God made him at last understand that it was foolish and impious in him to arrogate so much Righteousness to himself, who was but sinful Dust and Ashes; and that as he was not able to comprehend the Power and Works of God, and the Judgments of his Providence, which were unsearchable, he ought, notwithstanding his Afflictions, to have been more patient, and to have concluded that God was just, and to have, without repining, trusted in him for a Deliverance.

Job, indeed, had a better and juster Sense of the Providence of God than his three Friends had; and as he had express'd a firm Trust and Confidence in his Righteousness and Goodness for receiving from him a Reward hereafter, whatever he suffer'd in this Life: on this Account he was approv'd by God, and his Humiliation and Repentance was accepted. But his Friends are blam'd for their uncharitable Charge against his Integrity and Righteousness, merely because he was afflicted by the Hand of Providence. Their Fault was their Misrepresentation of God's Dealings with *Job*, and speaking what was *not right* concerning the Design of divine Providence; they had utter'd confidently *what they understood not* concerning it, as *Job* also himself had done; but he repented of his Rashness and Folly, and so was pardon'd, whereas his Friends repented not of theirs, *in not speaking*

of God *, (i. e. of his Providence) *the Thing that was right*. And therefore *God's Wrath was kindled against them*, as it is represented in the last Chapter, *ſ. 1—8*. But the Event ſhew'd them, that God tried *Job* by Afflictions, to increaſe his Virtue, and to make him an Example of Patience, Reſignation, and Humility; and then let both them and him ſee that the Equity of his Providence had not fail'd, but that after Trial he cou'd and wou'd reſtore him to Proſperity, and even to greater than he had bleſſed him with before.

Now this Hiſtory was an extremely proper Conſolation to the *Jewiſh* Nation to reflect on, who had endur'd ſo great Afflictions under their Bondage in *Egypt*, and ſtill continued to ſuffer in the barren and deſolate Wilderneſs: and therefore, was probably wrote by *Mofes*, to comfort them with an Assurance, from the Example of *Job*, that their preſent Sufferings were a Trial laid upon them [tho' they might alſo ſee that their Sins and Idolatry had cauſ'd them] and that if, like *Job*, they humbled themſelves before

* *Ye have not ſpoken of me the Thing that is right, as my Servant Job hath.* ch. xlii. 7. where the Hebrew Word *Ali* or *Alai*, ſignifies either of me, or before me: in the latter of which Senſes, the *Greek*, *Vulgate*, and *Syriac* Verſions render it: and either Interpretation makes the Senſe good. The meaning is, they had calumniated *Job* before God, and had not ſpoken right Things concerning his Providence: and therefore God commanded them to offer a Sacrifice by way of Atonement, and made *Job* their Interceſſor to pray for their Pardon. It is obſervable, that the Sacrifice was, of *ſeven Bulls* and *ſeven Rams*, ver. 8. which is the Number of each which *Balaam* commanded *Balak* to offer. *Numb.* xxiii. 1, 15, 29, 30.

fore God, and worship'd him alone, and trusted in his Mercy, they wou'd be deliver'd as he was, and in due Time be rewarded with the Inheritance of the Land, and all the Blessings promis'd to their Forefathers.

If it be said that in this History of *Job*, God's Providence is manifested only in temporal Prosperity and Adversity ; this will appear to be a great Mistake. For altho' the Occasion led *Job*'s Friends to talk only of a temporal Providence, yet as no doubt can be made of their believing a future State of Recompence both for the Righteous and the Wicked ; so this seems to have been the very Ground of their thinking, that God would and also did make a Difference between them in this Life : and that it was not suitable to his good Providence that the Wicked should escape Punishment either here or hereafter ; or on the other hand, that the Righteous should not be happy both in this Life and that which is to come. There are, I think, several Passages in this Book of *Job*, which shew his Belief of a future State, and of a Resurrection to eternal Life.

He declareth, that tho' *God should slay him, yet that he will trust in him* *, (ch. xiii. ver. 15.)

C 3

trust

* *Etiamsi occiderit me, in ipso sperabo.* So the *Vulgate*, and the *Arabic* and *Syriac* Versions have it, agreeably to our Translation. And this is the Sense of the *Hebrew* Text. For *Hen* signifies *si*, as well as *ecce*, and *Lo* signifies *annon* as well as *non*. And so the *Hebrew* Words are rightly render'd, *Si occiderit me, annon sperabo?* (i. e. in ipso,) *If he will slay me, or though he should slay me, shall I not trust in him?* Yes surely, I will. This

trust in him for what? not a temporal Deliverance, surely, that is plainly absurd; but he will trust in him for *Salvation* (after Death) *ŷ.* 16. and for this he trusted in God, who knew the Integrity of his Heart: for he adds, *an Hypocrite shall not come before him.*

In the 14th Chapter, we have these remarkable Words: *There is Hope of a Tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender Branch thereof will not cease (or fail,) tho' the Root thereof wax old in the Earth, and the Stock thereof die in the Ground; yet thro' the Scent of Water it will bud, and bring forth Boughs like a Plant.* Then it follows; *but Man dieth and wasteth away: yea Man giveth up the Ghost, and where is he? ŷ.* 7, 8, 9, 10.

These Words thus render'd seem to make against a future State; but if render'd interrogatively, as they may well be, they conclude for it: as if *Job* had said, is there * Hope of a Tree that is cut down, that it will sprout again? *But shall Man die and waste away; shall he give up the Ghost and be no more?* No, surely: for as it is added, *ŷ.* 14. *If a Man die, he shall live (or rise) again, after the Days of his Life are finish'd: I will wait till I shall be changed, (or*
live

I take to be the true Sense of the Words. The Particle *Hen* signifies *Si.* in *Job* xi. 18. and in other Places. The Words may also be understood, *tho' he slay me, yet I will hope,* i. e. for a Recompence hereafter.

* Ἄρα, Φησὶ, ἔσθε πίπτοντες, καὶ ἐγειρομένοι, ἀθροῦσθε αὐτὸς ἐπὶ οὐ τὰ ἔσθλα γέροντες, καὶ ἐγείρεται; so reads Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem, and confirms this Reading from the 14th Verse, as I have render'd the Greek. Catech. 18.

live again.) This is agreeable to the * *Greek Translation*, as well as to the *Hebrew* † *Text*. Then it follows, *Job*. 15. *Thou shalt call and I will answer thee: reject not thou the Work of thine Hands.*

If this is the true Sense of the Words of *Job*, then it will appear from the 12th Verse, when he expected his Resurrection and Change to come to pass, namely, *when the Heavens shou'd be no more*: or as it is express'd in the 19th Chapter, and 25th Verse, *at the latter Day*, or the End of the World. And here in this last-mention'd Place, I cannot but think that *Job's* Assurance of the Resurrection of his Body to a future Life is very plainly and fully express'd. *I know*, (says he) *that my Redeemer liveth, and that I shall rise* [so *St. Jerome* renders the *Hebrew Text*] or, *that my Body shall rise* [so the *Greek Interpreters* render it] *at the latter Day upon the Earth; and tho' after my Skin Worms destroy this Body, yet in my Flesh shall I see God.* Ch. xix. 25, 26 ‡.

C 4.

This

* Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀποθάνῃ ἄνθρωπος, ζήσεται· συνελέσας κήρας ἰθὺς αὐτῆς ὑπομεινῶ ἕως πάλιν γένωμαι.

† *If a Man die, shall he not live again?* where the *Hebrew Particle He* (ה) signifies *nonne* affirmatively, before the Verb, and was so understood by the *Greek Translators*.

‡ The present *Hebrew Text* has *Yakum, He* (that is, God my Redeemer) *will rise*; which is hardly Sense. *Jerome* reads *Akum, I shall rise*, which is a very proper and good Sense, and is very probably the true and original *Hebrew Reading*. He renders the whole two Verses: *Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum: et rursus circumdabor pelle mea,*

This Declaration of his Assurance of the Resurrection of his Body at the last Day, is that which in the preceding Words he wishes might *be written and printed in a Book: or, that it might be graven with an Iron Pen and Lead in the Rock for ever.* ver. 23, 24.

The

mea, et in carne mea videbo Deum. The *Greek* Translators, and *Theodotio*, read *Jakim* ἀναστήσει, which is also a good Sense: and *Jerome* renders the *Greek*, Scio enim quia eternus est qui me resoluturus est. Super terram resurget cutis mea quæ hæc patitur. Tom. 1. p. 1202. edit. Benediçt. *Jerome* also read *Ukaph circumdabor*, from *Jakaph* instead of *Nikphu contriverint*, from *Nakaph*. *Clemens* the Apostolical Bishop of *Rome* reads, ἀναστήσεις [τὴν] σάρκα με ταύτην ἣν ἀναβλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα. Ad Corinth. Epist. 1. p. 164. edit. Coteler. Pat. Apost. And *Clemens* understands the Passage of the Resurrection of the Body: and his Explication shews this was the Sense of the Words in the Days of the Apostles; and no doubt *Clemens* knew that the Apostles so understood them. And that this was understood to be the Meaning of the Words from the Beginning, appears from the last Words of the Book preserv'd in the *Greek* Translation, viz. *it is written that He (Job) shall rise again with those whom the Lord raiseth, (or shall raise.)* These Words were added by the first Compiler of the History of *Job*, immediately after his Death: and it is evident they were added, from what *Job* had declar'd concerning his Assurance of the Resurrection of his Body, and so they put the Sense beyond all doubt. And that the Words were originally in the *Hebrew* Text, appears from their having been always in the *Greek* Copy or Translation, and also in *Theodotio's* Version, either from the *Hebrew* or the *Greek*, in the second Century of the Christian Æra, about A. D. 175.

The Reason of the *Jews* leaving out the Words in some of their Copies, seems to have been their having absurdly interpreted the Words of *Job* of a temporal Deliverance and Retitution to a prosperous State in this Life.

The

The whole Passage is so well paraphrased and explained by a learned Prelate of our Church, that I shall take the liberty of transcribing his Words. *Job* wishes that the Plea of his Innocence was engraved in the Rock for ever, “ That
 “ it might remain till the Time in which God
 “ would come to judge his Cause: for I know,
 “ says he, that my Redeemer liveth. Suppose
 “ *Job* to expect a future Time of Judgment,
 “ the whole Passage is exceeding beautiful
 “ and proper. I find, says he, that my Com-
 “ plaint is disregarded here; that Man has no
 “ compassion for me, and that God in his un-
 “ searchable Wisdom suffers the innocent as
 “ well as the guilty to be unfortunate in this
 “ Life: but the Time will come when my
 “ Plea shall be heard; and so satisfy’d am I in
 “ the Righteousness of it, that I would have it
 “ remain as my Monument for ever graven in
 “ the Rock. For tho’ I myself shall soon be
 “ gone, yet my Redeemer lives, and will at the
 “ last

The *Complutense* Editors of the *Greek* left it out in compliance with the *Latin* Version, and contrary to the Authority of all their *Greek* Manuscripts. And this Practice of making Omissions and Additions, in conformity to the *Latin* Vulgate they unfaithfully use all thro’ the Old Testament, as may be observ’d; and this makes their Edition of the *Greek* of far less value than otherwise it would have been. *Olympiodorus* says, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν γεγραπταῖν δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσειαί ἕως τέλους, φασὶ μὲν ἴνες μὴ εἶναι τῆς ἱεράς γραφῆς, ἀλλὰ παρεγγεγράφαι τῶν βιβλίων τὰ ῥήματα. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ἕως εὐρηκότες γεγραμμένην τὴν βίβλον, πάντα τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα ἕνω δεχόμεθα ὡς παρὰ τῶν πατέρων παρελήφμεν. *Apud Caten. in Job. c. 33. p. 607.* And the ancient *Apostolic Constitutions* cite the Words, *Lib. 5. c. 7. p. 312.*

“ last Day call me from the Grave ; and with
 “ *my own Eyes shall I see God* my Saviour. But
 “ if you suppose *Job* to expect only a temporal
 “ Restitution within the Compass of his own
 “ Life, to what End or Purpose does he so pas-
 “ sionately wish to have his Complaints render’d
 “ immortal ! What Sense is there in saying, Oh !
 “ that my Complaint which you despise may
 “ *never be forgotten*, for I know that *within a*
 “ *little Time*, I shall be restored by God to all
 “ my Glory and former Felicity, and shall have
 “ no cause to complain any more ? In one view
 “ the Images are lively, passionate, and the Sen-
 “ timents just and proper ; in the other, there
 “ is neither Force, nor Vigour, nor Propriety ;
 “ nor indeed hardly any Sense.” Bp. *Sherlock’s*
2d Diss. p. 265, 266.

This Assurance of a bodily Resurrection might
 be grounded on God’s Promise to *Adam* concern-
 ing *the Seed of the Woman*, which might well be
 known to *Job* by Tradition who was of *Abra-*
ham’s Family, as well as to the Patriarchs of the
Jews : and which he understood to mean to be a
 Promise of a Deliverance from Death to a future
 and immortal Life. A future Renovation of all
 Things was a most ancient Opinion among the
Arabians ; and it is not improbable, but that
 the Restitution or Resurrection of the Body to a
 State of Immortality was the most ancient and
 the original Notion of a future State, whether
 founded on *Revelation*, or on Principles of *natu-*
ral Reason.

As the plain and natural Sense of the Words of *Job* is a Testimony of his Belief of the Resurrection of the Body and a future State; and which it is probable was the prevailing Opinion of those ancient Times, and of all preceding Ages; so there is not the least reason, that I can see, for any learned Person after *Grotius* to understand the Words of his Assurance of being restored to a State of Prosperity in this Life. Such a Construction is so forced and unnatural, that nothing but an absolute Necessity of the Words being so understood to make them consistent with the rest of the Book, can make it in the least probable: but the Improbability of it appears sufficiently from the whole Tenor of the History, throughout which *Job* sheweth no Expectation of a Deliverance from his Afflictions, and of a Restoration to his former prosperous Condition; and that he had no hope of seeing his Miseries end and Prosperity revived in this Life, appears from what he says afterwards in the 23d Chapter, *viz.* *But He (God) is of one Mind, and who can turn him? And what his Soul desireth, even that he doth. For he performeth the Thing that is appointed for me: and many such Things are with him. Therefore am I troubled at his Presence: when I consider, I am afraid of him. For God maketh my Heart soft, and the Almighty troubleth me. Because I was not cut off before the Darkness, Darkness shall cover my Face, or Darkness hath covered my Face; so the last Words seem to be rightly render'd, &c. 13—17.*

These are not the Words of one who with confidence had declared that he expected a Deliverance from his Troubles, and to be again happy in this Life : nor what follows in the 30th Chapter ; *Terrors are turned upon me ; they pursue my Soul as the Wind ; and my Welfare (or Hope, as the Greek has it) passeth away as a Cloud.*—*He hath cast me into the Mire, and I am become like Dust and Ashes. I cry unto thee, and thou dost not hear me : I stand up and thou regardest me not. Thou art become cruel to me : with thy strong Hand thou opposest thyself against me.*—*For I know that thou wilt bring me to Death.* *ψ. 15, 19, 20, 21, 23.* These are not Expressions of Hope and Assurance, to be delivered from Death and restored to worldly Prosperity ; but, on the direct contrary, are plain Expressions of Despair of any such Deliverance ; and of his Belief of God's Purpose, that his Afflictions should have no End but in his Death ; nor is there any where in *Job's* Discourses the least ground to think that he hoped for, and much less that he was assured of a Deliverance from his Sufferings and Miseries in this Life. His Confidence was in his Integrity, and he knew that how much soever he suffered at present from the Hand of God, he should be justified at the Resurrection, and be blessed in the future State. And as he was persuaded of the future Happiness of righteous Men, so he believed that wicked Men, tho' they were sometimes prosperous on Earth, would receive the Recompence of their evil Deeds at
the

the future Day of Judgment. *The wicked (says he) is reserved to the Day of Destruction: They shall be brought forth to the Day of Wrath.* ch. xxi. 30.

Upon the whole then, the History of *Job* informs us what were the most ancient Opinions of Men concerning the Providence of God; and the Hope and Expectation which they infer'd from it, both of present and future Happiness. They never doubted but that righteous and good Men would be blessed with Immortality in another Life after this; and that the Blessings of this Life also would not fail to attend their Virtue and Piety. They also thought, that as this Life was a State of Pilgrimage and Trial, and Death the common Lot of all, both of the righteous and the wicked; the great and final Recompence of both was reserv'd in the Hands of God, to be dispens'd hereafter; when the wicked should rise to be condemned and punish'd according to their evil Deeds, and the Righteous be rais'd to receive the Reward of their Piety and good Works.

This Opinion was agreeable to the genuine Principles of natural Reason form'd concerning the divine Providence, and the State and Condition of Man; and was strengthened and confirmed by various Revelations made in the most early Ages of the World. By this History also the *Israelites* were taught to trust in God under all Adversities, and that righteous and pious Men might be, and were afflicted here for a Trial of their Faith and Patience: and at the same time

it let them see that God had determined that such, tho' they suffered a while, should receive a Reward of their Faith and Humiliation in this Life, as well as in the next at the Resurrection of the just.

And this was more especially to be the case of the *Israelites*, who after all the Afflictions of their Forefathers, and of their whole Nation in the Land of *Egypt* and in the Wilderness, had a Promise from God that if they obeyed the Law which he had given them by *Moses*, they and their Posterity should be rewarded with temporal Blessings and Prosperity in the Land of *Canaan*, which were to be a perpetual Earnest to them of the divine Favour, and of the greater Blessings which they with *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* should be Partakers of in the Life to come.

It was a peculiar Privilege and Advantage to the *Jewish* Nation to be assured by Promise from God himself, that their Obedience to the Law of *Moses* should be rewarded with temporal Happiness; as on the other hand, their Disobedience to it was threatned to be punished with the greatest worldly Adversity. These were powerful Motives to engage their Observance of the divine Laws; but they were not intended to supply the more powerful Sanctions of Religion founded on Faith in the prior Promises of God and the Belief of a future State; but on the contrary, these Promises of temporal good Things were design'd to confirm and invigorate their Assurance of the better Things to come, of which these were only Types and Shadows, and as it were a Foretaste and Earnest.

The Law of *Moses*, as that of other Nations with regard to Religion, regulated only the public Worship and Ceremonies belonging to it; all which in the *Jewish* Law were appropriated to the one true God, as those of other Nations with the *Egyptians* were appropriated to Idols and false Gods. The Profession of the *Unity of God* and of his Worship alone, made the difference between *Judaism* and *Heathenism*. The Notion and Doctrine of the one supreme God was in a manner kept secret amongst the *Egyptians* and other Heathens; and was never taught at all amongst them, but with a Mixture of imaginary Deities: and God was never worshipped publicly by the People, whose Devotion and Temple-Service was all paid to *Idols*. But under the *Levitical* Institution the *Unity of God* was the publickly known and received Doctrine; and the whole Devotion and Worship of the People was directed to him alone in the Place dedicated for that purpose. The *Jews* were taught to depend entirely upon the Providence of God, and to pay an unreserv'd and undivided Obedience to his Laws alone in all Things; and even to die in the defence of them, or rather than be compelled to renounce or forsake them; the extraordinary Providence of God was to be their Security and Support, and on him alone they were to trust and rely for all their Happiness.

Now for any one to suppose, that the *Jews* did believe that the Providence of God, by whose immediate and extraordinary Power their whole
 Nation

Nation was conducted and governed, extended only to the present Life, without their having any Knowledge of a future State; or to suppose that they were not taught nor did believe that God would be their God not only in this Life, but in that which is to come; either of these Suppositions makes the *Jews* more ignorant of the Foundation of all Religion, than any Heathens then were; and their Law and whole Oeconomy of Religion to be a mere worldly Policy, and utterly unworthy of God to be either the Author or Conductor of it.

Such a Law could give no comfort to distressed pœnitent Sinners when they came to die; nor to the many thousands of innocent Persons who in this Life were miserable and unhappy, and punish'd for the Crimes of their Parents. The Law was inexorable; the Children tho' innocent must beg their Bread, and live under Oppression, and in Disgrace and Slavery for the Transgressions of their Fathers: and others suffered unjustly under the Tyranny of powerful and idolatrous Rulers of their own Nation.

The Law made no Provision in these Cases. But as an extraordinary or miraculous Providence attended the *Jewish* Nation to preserve them from Idolatry; so the unequal Dispensations of it with respect to private and particular Persons could not be reconcil'd but by the Knowledge and Belief of a future State.

There was no occasion for the Law to make express mention of a future State, the Belief of which was the fundamental Principle of the Patriarchal

Patriarchal Religion under which the *Jews* were educated: but yet in the Dispensation of the Law itself, this was a primary Article of Faith, and Ground of the Worship of God. This is evident, because though the *Jews* had a Promise of temporal Blessings in the Land of *Canaan* given them, to reward their Obedience to the Law; yet they were told at the same time that they should look on themselves to be only *Strangers* and *Sojourners* in it, as their Forefathers had been. This was an Indication to them, that their earthly Prosperity, how great soever it should be, was not the End of their Faith, and final Reward of their Obedience, but that future heavenly Felicity which was promised to *Abraham* and his Seed.

David, who well understood the Nature and Design of the *legal* Covenant, in his Prayer to God says, that *he was a Stranger with him* (in the Land) *and a Sojourner, as all his Fathers were.* *Pf. xxxix. 12.* And he made the same Confession a little before his Death. *1 Chron. xxix. 15.* In this he was mindful of what God himself told the *Jews*, *Lev. xxv. 23.* that they *were Strangers and Sojourners with him* (or before him) *in the Land which he gave them, & 2. The Land* (says God) *is mine, and ye are Strangers and Sojourners with me.* It is called the Land of their Father's sojourning, *Gen. xvii 8.* *Abraham* was a Stranger and Sojourner in it, though God gave it to him, as well as to his Seed after him. And though the Land of *Canaan* was given to *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*

for an Heritage, yet they looked upon themselves as *Pilgrims, Strangers, and Sojourners* in it; knowing they had there no abiding Habitation, and looking for a better which was to come, that is, an *heavenly* one, as the Apostle argues *Heb. xi. 13, 14, 16.* And in the same Chapter he shews, that neither *Abraham* and the other Patriarchs before the Law, nor *Moses* and all the other *Jewish* Worthies and Prophets under the Law, *received* in this Life the Accomplishment of the Divine *Promises, §. 39.* which proves beyond all Doubt, that the *Promises* made to the true Believers and Worshipers of God, were not designed to be completed by the Blessings of the Law, or a temporal State of Happiness, but by the *better Things to come,* as the Apostle calls them *§. 40.* and the Blessings of eternal Life.

This is the Key to open the true Design of the Patriarchal and *Jewish* Dispensation; and to explain the full Meaning of the Promises of God made under them: and shews that the primary Article and Object of Faith on which the Patriarchs and *Jewish* Nation rested, was not the Inheritance of the promised Land of *Canaan*; but an Assurance that their God had provided a future and heavenly State, as the final Reward of their Faith and Obedience.

This was the grand Principle of the *Abrahamic* Religion, and propagated to all his Posterity; and this was the Faith of *Moses* and the *Prophets.* The being Heirs of a future and heavenly State, was a fundamental Article of the
Jewish

Jewish Religion, and contained in the Promises made to *Abraham* and his Seed: the Law was added to keep up their Obedience to God, and Dependence upon him, and to prevent their falling away from their Faith to Idolatry, and enforced with the Promises of temporal Blessings to the Doers of it; besides the Spiritual Happiness promised before the Law as the Reward of Faith. And therefore as the Law was to be enforce'd with the Sanction of temporal Rewards and Punishments, *Moses* speaks of no other as Parts of his Law; nor was it proper that he should: the Blessings of the future State being properly the Rewards to which they were entitled, not by doing the Works of the Law, but by Faith in the Promises of God made to their Forefathers, and to them their Seed. It was for his Faith that God promised *Abraham* to be his exceeding great Reward, *Gen. xv. 1.* and declared that he would be his God, and the God of his Seed for ever, *Gen. xvii. 7. Exod. iii. 15.* Under the Influence of this Faith they were to walk before him with a perfect Heart, *Gen. xvii. 1.* and worship him alone for their God, according to the Law of everlasting Righteousness.

This was the Covenant which the Children of *Israel* enter'd into with God, in the Land of *Moab*, beside the Covenant which he made with them in *Horeb*, *Deut. xxi. 1.* By this Covenant they were established to be his People, and he to be their God, as he had sworn unto them, and to their Fathers, to *Abraham*, to *Isaac*, and to

Jacob, §. 13. And this Covenant on their Part was, *to serve the Lord their God with all their Heart; and not to turn away from him to other Gods, and to the Worship of Idols, as it is expressed in the following Verses.* On this Condition, and not by the ritual Works of the Law, they were entitled to the Blessings promised to *Abraham*: and this was the Condition, that in all their Dispersions amongst the several Nations of the Earth which *Moses* foretold; *if they returned unto the Lord their God, and obeyed all his Commandments with all their Heart, and with all their Soul; then the Lord their God would turn their Captivity, and have Compassion on them—and gather them from all the Nations, whither the Lord their God had scatter'd them.* After which Return into their own Land from a general Dispersion, and Captivity amongst all Nations, even *unto the outmost Parts of Heaven,* God promiseth that *He will circumcise their Heart and the Heart of their Seed, to love the Lord their God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul, that they may LIVE, Ch. xxx. 1—6, and following.*

It is most probable that these last Declarations of *Moses* to the People of the *Jews* refer to the Gospel-State, and to their miserable Dispersions and Captivity, and the Desolation of their Country by the *Romans* plainly predicted from the 49th Verse of the 28th Chapter of *Deuteronomy* to the End of that Chapter, and continued in the 29th and 30th Chapters. I shall transcribe some Part of them: *The Lord shall bring against thee*

a Nation from far, from the End of the Earth, [this could not be said of the Assyrians or Babylonians] as swift as the Eagle flieth, a Nation whose Tongue thou shalt not understand: a Nation of a fierce Countenance, [under which last Character the Romans are described by Daniel, Ch. viii. 23. and it is known that the Eagle was placed upon the Standards of the Roman Legions;] which (Nation) shall not regard the Person of the old, nor shew Favours to the young—and he shall besiege thee in all thy Gates, until thy high and fenced Walls come down, wherein though trustest, throughout all the Land—and thou shalt eat the Fruit of thine own Body, the Flesh of thy Sons and thy Daughters in the Siege, and in the Straitness wherewith thine Enemies shall distress thee: So that the Man that is tender among you, and very delicate, his Eye shall be evil towards his Brother, and towards the Wife of his Bosom, and towards the Remnant of his Children which he shall leave: so that he will not give to any of them of the Flesh of his Children whom he shall eat, because he hath nothing left him in the Siege.—The tender and delicate Woman among you, who would not adventure to set the Sole of her Foot upon the Ground for Delicateness and Tendernefs, her Eye shall be evil towards the Husband of her Bosom, and towards her Son, and towards her Daughter; and towards her young one that cometh out from between her Feet; and towards her Children which she shall bear: for she shall eat them for want of all things, secretly in the Siege and Straitness,

wherewith thine Enemy shall distress thee in thy Gates. If thou wilt not observe to do all the Words of this Law that are written in this Book, that thou mayst fear this glorious and fearful Name **THE LORD THY GOD.**—
 And the Lord shall scatter thee among all People, from the one End of the Earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other Gods, which neither thou nor thy Fathers have known, even Wood and Stone.—And the Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with Ships—and there ye shall be sold unto your Enemies for Bondmen and for Bondwomen, and no Man shall buy you.

vs. 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 64, 68.

This Prophetic Description of the Miseries, Captivity, and Dispersion of the Jewish Nation, agrees not at all, either to the Assyrian or Babylonian Captivity, or with any Miseries and Dispersions which fell on them before the Time of the Gospel: But it is so lively a Description of the unparallel'd Miseries of that People, when after a long War and Siege their City and Temple were destroyed, and their whole Country laid waste by the Romans, that there can in Reason be no doubt of its being a Prophecy of it. During this Siege their Distress was so great through Pestilence and Famine, that thousands died in one Day: and both Men and Women killed their own Children and eat them for Want of Food. And after the City was taken, of those miserable Captives who were saved from the general Slaughter, some were sold for Slaves in all Parts of the Roman Empire, and great Numbers

Numbers were sent *in Ships*, as *Moses* foretold, into *Egypt*, and there forced to work in the Mines; and the rest were kept to be slaughter'd like Beasts in their Theatres at their public Games and Festivals.

These Miseries fell upon the *Jews*, not for their Disobedience to the ritual Law of *Moses*, or for forsaking the Worship of the God of *Israel*; but for their rejecting the *Messias*, the Seed of *Abraham*, promised both before and under the Law: for their refusing to hearken to the Words of God spoken to their Forefathers concerning this promised Seed; and refusing also to hearken to the Voice of that Prophet whom God promised by *Moses* to send to them. *Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19.*

Their Rejection of the *Messias* was a Breach of the Covenant, on the observing of which, God promised to be their God, and by virtue of which all the Blessings of the Land of *Canaan* were given them: for it was the Rejection of that *Seed of Abraham* in whom *all the Nations of the Earth* were to be blessed; and who was the *Prophet* by whom God promised to deliver his Commandments to them, and to whose Words they were commanded to hearken, with the threatenng, that *it should come to pass, that whosoever should not hearken to God's Words, which that Prophet should speak in his Name, he would require it of him, or would take vengeance of him*; as the *Greek, Vulgate, and Syriac* Translations render the last Words. And therefore, as *their Return unto God, Ch. xxx. 2.* was to be a returning from
 D 4 their

their Infidelity to the Acknowledgment of *Jesus* to be the *Messias* promised to *Abraham*, and to their Fathers under the Law; and to whom as God's Prophet they were under Covenant to *hearken* and to *obey his Words*, whenever he should be sent to them: so the *Life* promised to them *ψ. 6.* must mean, *the Life and Immortality brought to Light by the Gospel*: or the eternal Life, which was to be the Reward of Faith in the *Messias*, and of Obedience to the Commandments of God delivered by him.

The Priests were commanded to read all the Words of the Law, at the End of every seventh Year, to the Body of the People assembled together at the Feast of Tabernacles. *Lev. iii. 9—13.* And it was also the Business of the Priests and *Levites*, to instruct them at all times in the Precepts and Promises of the Law, so that they could not be ignorant of what was taught in them.

The Promises of the *Messias* and eternal Life to be obtained through him, was the *Spirit* of the Law, of which the *Levitical* Institutions were the *Letter*: and therefore the Law was intended to prefigure the Gospel, and to lead the *Jews* to the Knowledge and Reception of the *Messias*, who was the End of the Law, and accomplished the Prophecies of it; and by his Death abolished the legal Sin-Offerings and Sacrifices, which were Types of it. This *St. Paul* very elegantly sets forth in the third Chapter of the second Epistle to the *Corinthians*: and this *spiritual*, as well as *literal* Sense of the Law
was

was represented in the Service and Ordinances of it. And for this End there were two sorts of Sacrifices appointed.

The ordinary Sacrifices were chiefly appointed for Breaches of the ceremonial part of the Law, and not for Immoralities, especially the most heinous, for which no particular Sacrifices were instituted.

These Sacrifices, which were daily offered, could not take away Sin, or purge and satisfy the Conscience, or justify the Sinner before God. But there was also an annual Sacrifice appointed to be a Propitiation for the Sins of the whole Nation; when a general Confession was made of all the Sins, both of the Priests and People; and an Atonement made for them by Blood sprinkled upon *the Mercy-Seat* within the second Veil of the Tabernacle by the High-Priest himself, which was not done in any other Sacrifices. And as this was a Type of the Propitiation to be made by the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of *Christ* for the Sins of the whole World; so the *Jews* always, as is highly probable, look'd upon the Atonement made by the Blood of this annual Sacrifice to be a Token of the divine Favour, and a Propitiation for all their Sins; whereby an Entrance was made for them into the Happiness of the future State, or Heaven itself represented by the *Holy of Holies*. Thus much appears from this Ordinance of the Law of *Moses*, compared with the Explanation of it by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. On that Day, [speaking of the
annual

annual Expiation] *shall the Priest make an Atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your Sins before the Lord.— And he shall make an Atonement for the Priests, and for all the People of the Congregation: And this shall be an everlasting Statute unto you, to make an Atonement for the Children of Israel, for all their Sins, once a Year. Lev. xvi. 30, 33, 34.*

That this was a typical Representation of the Atonement made by the Blood of *Christ*, and of the future heavenly Kingdom purchased for us by it, we are assured by *St. Paul*, who having spoke of the Service of the Tabernacle, which consisted of two Parts, one called the *Sanctuary*, and the other the *Holiest of all*, or *most holy*, adds; *Now when these Things were ordained, the Priests went always into the first Tabernacle, accomplishing the Service of God. But into the second went the High-Priest alone once every Year; not without Blood, which he offered for himself and for the Errors of the People. The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the Way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while the first Tabernacle was yet standing, which was a Figure for the Time then present.—It was therefore necessary, that the Patterns of Things in the Heavens should be purified with these [legal Sacrifices] but the heavenly Things themselves with better Sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy Places made with Hands, which are the Figures of the true, but into Heaven itself, now to appear*

pear in the Presence of God for us. *Heb. ix. 6, 7, 8, 9, 23, 24.*

Hence it appears, that the *Holy of Holies* in the *Jewish* Tabernacle, was in the divine Appointment of it intended to prefigure the future heavenly State; and the Atonement made there for the Sins of all the People by the High-Priest's sprinkling the Blood of the Sacrifices upon the *Mercy-Seat*, was a Type and Figure of the Propitiation for the Sins of all the World made by the Blood of *Christ*, who as our High-Priest entered into Heaven itself to appear there in the Presence of God, as our Mediator; and to open an Entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven for all true Believers.

If God designed the Institution of the *Jewish* Tabernacle, and the Service of it to be, as *St. Paul* tells us, a *Pattern, Figure, and Shadow* of the Gospel Dispensation, and of the future heavenly State revealed by *Christ*; what need we doubt but that the *Jews* under the Law had a Knowledge of it, though imperfect in comparison of what we have received by the Light of the Gospel?

I have fully shewn that the *Patriarchs, Moses* and the *Prophets*, worshipped God under a steadfast Belief and Expectation of a Reward in another Life after this. The Appearance and Ministration of *Angels* before and under the Law; the bodily Translations of *Enoch* and *Elijah*; and the Resurrection and eternal heavenly Kingdom of the *Messias* foretold by *David*, were plain and demonstrative Evidences of a future
invisible

invisible and immortal State: and the whole Oeconomy of the Law itself was a typical Representation of it; and the Prospect and Hope of it was kept up and transmitted through all the Generations of the People of the *Jews* in the Promises of the *Messias*: and besides all this, the Prophets have in their Writings given express Declarations of a Resurrection to eternal Life.

Isaiab says; *He (God) will swallow up Death in Victory, and the Lord God will wipe away Tears from off all Faces: and the Rebuke of his People shall he take away from all the Earth, for the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that Day, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us: This is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his Salvation. Ch. xxv. 8, 9. Again; Thy dead Men shall live, together with my dead Body shall they arise: Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the Dust; for thy Dew is as the Dew of Herbs, and the Earth shall cast out the Dead.—For behold the Lord cometh out of his Place to punish the Inhabitants of the Earth for their Iniquity; the Earth also shall disclose her Blood, and shall no more cover her Slain. Ch. xxvi. 19, 21.*

These Prophecies cannot with any Propriety be applied to any State or Deliverances of the *Jewish* Nation, and to the Destruction of their Enemies. It is in vain to attempt or offer such an Explanation. They are in their plain natural Sense Prophecies of the Gospel-State, and of the final Happiness and Salvation of the *Jews* in
that

that State, after they shall be converted to the Faith of *Christ*. The Resurrection of the Dead and the Day of Judgement are very clearly set forth, and undoubtedly meant in these Prophecies, and they are so understood and applied by *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* xv. 54. and by *St. John*, *Rev.* vii. 17. *Ch.* xxi. 4.

The Prophet *Daniel* also, speaking of the End of the Gospel-State and of the World, says; *Many* [that is, *all*, by a well-known Synecdoche frequent in Scripture] *of them that sleep in the Dust of the Earth shall awake; some to everlasting Life, and some to Shame and everlasting Contempt.* *Ch.* xii. 2.

This Text is too plain to need any Explanation, or to leave Room for any Evasion of the Sense of it: and the Exposition of *Grotius*, who knew nothing at all of Scripture-Prophecies, is too absurd to be even mentioned.

I shall confirm and conclude all that has been said with the infallible Testimony of our Saviour himself, *Luke* xvi. 31. whose Words are, *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the Dead.* This is said to shew, that under the Law Men needed no other Evidence to persuade them to Repentance, in order to avoid the Miseries of the future State, than that which was given by *Moses* and the *Prophets*. *Moses* therefore and the *Prophets* must have given sufficient Evidence of a future State, to persuade Men to repent of their Sins, for fear of suffering the Torments which were to be inflicted in it on all impenitent

penitent Sinners. But if *Moses* said nothing of a future State; if he never taught it to the *Jews*, or they had no Reason to believe it under the *Mosaic* Institution, how did the hearkning to the Law of *Moses* [and to the Prophets] convince Men as effectually of a future State, where Men were to suffer for their Sins unrepented of, as one sent from the Dead to preach this Doctrine to them was capable of doing?

Moses could only set before them, on the foregoing Supposition, the Danger of suffering here, which we see had no Effect on the wicked rich Man, who abounded all his Life in worldly Prosperity; and had put away from him the Thoughts of suffering in the Life to come: and the Law would naturally have as little Effect on other prosperous wicked Men, if they believed nothing of a future State to be taught there and in the Writings of the Prophets; or that the Law and the Prophets taught them not to expect such a State.

But if the Doctrine and Belief of a future State was in itself, as no doubt it always was, the most powerful and only Motive to bring prosperous wicked Men to repent of their Sins; this Repentance could only be wrought in them under the Law, by supposing the Belief of a future State to be a Principle and Doctrine taught in the Law and the Prophets. And in truth, it was a primary and fundamental Article of the Religion taught by *Moses*, and was set forth in God's Declaration at the Head of it, *viz.* that he was *the God of Abraham, and of Isaac,*
and

and of Jacob. This the *Jews* very well knew imply'd his being still their God, and, as he had promised, *their great Reward*, who lived with him in the Joys of the heavenly *Canaan*.

It is indeed almost impossible to conceive, that any Nation should be called by a Revelation to the Worship of the true God without the Belief of a future State of Happiness to be given them as the final Reward of their Faith in him, and Obedience to his Laws: and especially that the *Jews* could think that *Abraham*, &c. who were so highly honoured by God after their Death, that he was pleas'd to be called by their Name, and to be worshipp'd as their God, did not, as our Saviour infers, still *live with him*.

Thus I have proved, that the Belief of a future State was, next after the Belief of *the one God*, the great fundamental Article of the Religion of the *Hebrews*; which was taught by the Patriarchs, and exemplify'd in the History of *Moses*, and in the Declarations, Promises and Institutions of the *Law*; and more fully and expressly declared by the *Prophets*. So that the *Jews* had better and stronger Reasons to believe a future State, than any other Nation ever had before the Revelation of the Gospel. It is therefore very absurd to imagine, either that the *Jews* had not the Knowledge of a future State before the *Babylonian Captivity*, or that they received it from the idolatrous *Chaldeans*. The Writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*, by express Declarations, and also as explained by our Saviour and his great Apostle

St. Paul, plainly, as I have shewn, confute both these ungrounded and vain Pretences.

Having proved the Belief of a future State to have been a fundamental Part of the Religion of the *Hebrews*, (as indeed it was of the Religion of all Nations) it is vain to alledge, as some learned Writers have done, that the Doctrine of a future State is not *expresly* taught in the *Law of Moses*; and vainer still to make this an Argument that the *Law of Moses* is of divine Authority.

This Doctrine of a future State was not expressly taught in the ancient *Laws of Egypt, Athens, Lacedæmon, or Rome*: but will this prove the divine Mission or Authority of *Thoth, Lycurgus, Solon and Numa*, and so of other Legislators? Nor is there any Reason at all to infer the divine Mission of *Moses* more than of the other Legislators, from the Omission of a future State, because his Laws had the Sanction of an extraordinary or miraculous Providence attending them: for this extraordinary Providence might as well have subsisted with the Doctrine of a future State; and without it could not be a sufficient Sanction of *Religion*, though it might be of merely civil or political Laws: and on the other hand, the Law might be given from God and be of divine Authority, though no extraordinary Providence afterwards attended it. So that there is not the least Connexion between the two Propositions, an *extraordinary Providence* and *Omission of a future State*, that the former, or a divine Authority, may be inferred from

from the latter. The extraordinary, or miraculous Providence did alone without any more to do directly prove the divine Authority of the Law of *Moses*, whether the Doctrine of a future State was delivered in that Law or not: but the Omission of that Doctrine cannot possibly infer or prove an extraordinary Providence, or the divine Authority of the Law of *Moses*; nor can it be with any Reason concluded, that the Doctrine of a future State was omitted in that Law, because it was to be supplied by an extraordinary Providence: this cannot be the Reason, because it would not be sufficient for the Purpose of that Law, which is both of a religious and civil Nature.

Religion cannot be supported, nor ever was, without the Belief of a future State, though civil Society might subsist without it; the Obligations of human Laws are sufficient for the Ends of civil Society, which are to preserve Peace and Property. But Religion, which consists in the Worship of God with a pure Heart, and unfeign'd Obedience to the Laws of right Reason, teaches Men to believe the Rewards and Punishments of a future State naturally to attend their good or evil Works. The Light of Nature shew'd them at all Times that they were accountable and liable to be judged for all their Actions; and it was evident to them that Virtue is not always rewarded in this Life, nor Vice punished; but that the contrary frequently happens: nor was there ever any Ground to think, that God by an extraordinary Providence did

or would provide so far for every particular Case, that temporal Good or Evil should immediately attend every one's particular Actions and Desires ; this would be laying a Force upon human Thoughts and Actions not consistent with true Religion, and a voluntary Worship and Obedience. And as it is certain there never was such a Providence any where manifested, so an extraordinary Providence attending a Society or Nation as such, and made the Sanction of a political Institution, could not be sufficient to support Religion in the particular Cases of those who might either be Partakers of the Blessings or of the Miseries brought upon that Nation for their good or evil Behaviour, for their Obedience or Disobedience to the Laws of God.

In the Execution of such an extraordinary Providence, the People would suffer for the Sins of their Rulers, and the Children for the Sins of their Parents ; and the most innocent and truly religious would be made miserable for the public Impieties and Irreligion of a Nation which brought down divine Vengeance upon it ; as well as by the Oppression, Tyranny, and Injustice of those who had Power to exercise them. Add to this, the natural Evils and Calamities of Life which promiscuously fall upon the Virtuous and Vicious, those who are Worshipers of God, as well as those who worship him not.

Hence it is evident, that Religion cannot be supported without the Belief of a future State, to secure the Obedience of the Heart to the Laws
of

of God, and to ascertain a Reward to well-doing.

The Reason therefore, why the Doctrine of a future State was not expressly taught in the Law of *Moses*, was the same Reason, and no other, than that for which it was not taught in the Laws of other Nations; and this Reason was the natural and general prevailing Belief of a future State every where amongst Mankind.

It was therefore sufficient for all Laws to command divine *Worship*, and to direct the Modes of this *Worship*; and also to command the moral Duties necessary to preserve and secure the Peace, natural Rights, and Well-being of Society. This was the only proper Business of Legislation; and this is all the Alliance that naturally joins Religion with Politics, or the Church with the State.

Religion or divine *Worship*, whether true or false, was set at the Head of the Laws: and this was enough, because the very Notion of Religion or divine *Worship* implied the Belief of the Providence of God, and of a future State of Happiness or Misery for Actions good or evil. And this was as much the Doctrine of Superstition as of true Religion, [but it would be strange to suppose it more so;] and none but *Atheists* denied a future State and the Obligation of divine *Worship*, and disbelieved a Providence.

It was the Duty and Wisdom of Legislators, to take care that the Belief of divine Providence

and a future State should, by their Encouragement to Philosophers and public Teachers, be strongly inculcated and impress'd upon the Minds of the People; as it was both reasonable in itself, and also a great means of securing Obedience to the Laws, out of Conscience and Regard to the divine Being, or the Gods they worshipped; and thereby strengthening the Sanctions, annex'd to the Laws themselves.

Heads of Families instructed their Children and Servants in the most ancient Times in this Belief; and when Places of public Worship were appointed, and Religion was under the Direction of national Laws, Priests were instituted to preside in religious Services, and to instruct the People; and Poets made Religion the Subject of their Poems.

When Religion became corrupted with Superstition and the Worship of false Gods, who were no other than the Souls of dead Men, supposed to be rewarded with Immortality for their Virtues and Benefits done to Mankind, and to be invested with a Power of presiding over Countries and Cities; and to do good or evil unto Men according to their Behaviour; as this Supposition was founded on the general prevailing * Belief of the Immortality of the Soul and a future State, so this State was by the Priests and Poets represented under Allegories and Fables to render it more sensible and affecting to the com-

MON

* Quod autem ex hominum genere consecratos, sicut *Herculem* et cæteros, coli lex jubet, indicat omnium quidem animos *immortales* esse, sed fortium bonorumque divinos. *Cic. de Leg. lib. 2. p. 412. Edit. Gryph.*

mon People. Future Happiness and Misery were described under bodily Images, and worldly Scenes of Pain and Pleasure. This, it was thought, would make greater impression on the Minds of the Vulgar, than telling them of a merely spiritual State : and they were taught that the Gods they worshipped had once lived amongst Men ; and as they had been great Benefactors when they lived on Earth, so they would after their Residence in the cœlestial Mansions not fail to bestow great Favours and Blessings on their Worshippers ; or else punish those who were impious, and neglected to adore them with Sacrifices and Oblations.

This was the original Superstition of Hero-Worship, to correct the Errors and Absurdity of which, religious Mysteries were instituted, wherein the Priests instructed the initiated in the Knowledge of the one supreme God and other spiritual Beings, and made a metaphysical System out of the vulgar and political Superstition, and resolv'd the Multiplicity of Hero-Gods into natural Principles and physical Elements. These Mysteries were first instituted in *Phœnicia*, and *Egypt* ; and from thence were propagated into *Syria*, *Chaldæa*, and other Countries. The ancient Poets and Philosophers of *Greece* carried out of *Egypt* the Theology taught in the *Egyptian* Mysteries, which consisted of the Theory of one supreme God or universal Soul, and several Orders of subordinate spiritual Beings, *cœlestial*, *aërial* and *terrene*, represented as Ministers of the divine Providence in the several

Parts of the Universe, and operating every where by the Will and Command of the supreme Soul or God. This Theology was receiv'd amongst the *Pythagoreans* and *Stoicks*; and *Plato* refin'd and subtiliz'd it with other Theories. In the *Egyptian* vulgar and political Theology also, the human Soul was taught to be *immortal*, and to subsist after Death; and those which were pure and religious were believ'd to reside amongst the Gods; and wicked and irreligious Souls were believ'd to pass thro' various States and Degrees of Punishment by means of a Transmigration into all Kinds of Animals, till they became reform'd and qualified to return to the human State. This Doctrine of the Transmigration of Souls after Death was in early Times propagated from *Egypt* into *Arabia* and *India*; and many Ages after was carried by *Pythagoras* out of *Egypt*, and spread amongst the *Greeks* and *Latins*; and was taught to the Vulgar in the grossest sense. But the Philosophers themselves believed nothing either of the corporeal * Transmigration; or of a future State of sensitive Pains and Pleasures in *Tartarus* or *Elysium*, tho' they taught them in their public Discourses and political Writings, to keep up the

* The *Egyptian* Notion of Transmigration of human Souls seems to have been deriv'd from *Necromancy*, and the Delusion of Dæmons or evil Spirits, which personated the Forms of dead Men and Women, and sometimes also of Beasts and Birds, &c. whereby they were led to believe, that these dæmoniacal Appearances in the Forms of various Animals, were the Souls of dead Men and Women which had after Death pass'd into those Bodies, as the Dæmons who inform'd them, related to them.

the Belief of a future State in the Minds of the common People, who were not, as they alledg'd, capable of receiving it under any other than a material Representation, and fenfitive and corporeal Images.

But, as they themselves had more rational Notions concerning a future State, they taught their Difciples a different Doctrine about the Soul, and the Happinefs and Mifery of the State after Death. This was called the *Efoteric* or fecret Doctrine, in diftinction to the *Exoteric* or public and vulgar Opinion.

They taught that the human Soul was congenial with the Soul of the World; and that the Happinefs of it after Death confifted in its Return to and intimate Union with the divine Nature, or God, from whom it was deriv'd: On the other hand, that the Mifery of it confifted in being excluded from this Union with God, and having no communication with him; and being left to affociate with evil Dæmons. Some diftinguifhed between the *Soul* and *Spirit*; but all agreed, that as Happinefs confifted in the Improvement of the intelligent or rational Soul in divine Knowledge and Virtue, fo in the future State the Soul, they constantly believ'd, was render'd more perfect in Knowledge and Virtue by its Union and Communion with the divine Substance, or Deity. This was a rational and exalted Notion of a future State, and very agreeable to the Doctrine of it taught by Revelation. This was the *Efoteric* Doctrine of the Philofophers concerning a future State, which they

thought the Vulgar not capable of receiving; and so they taught it only to their Disciples, and explain'd it in their Writings in a metaphysical manner, not understood by the common People; and let the political Notions remain as they were received.

But now it cannot with any reason be inferr'd from the Philosophers Doctrine of *the Return* of the Soul to God, and its Reunion with the Deity or divine Substance, that they did not believe a future State at all, nor could believe it. This [*ἐπ' αὐτοῦ*] *Return* and *Union* was in their opinion so far from destroying the personal Subsistence of the Soul, that they thought it the Completion of its personal Happiness. And this Notion of future Happiness was not only firmly believed by the Philosophers in general, but is also highly rational in itself: And to suppose that any *Union* of the Soul with God, by which it became more knowing and happy, should destroy its personal Existence, or be inconsistent with the Belief of it, is contrary to all Reason and true Philosophy. For as no Union with the divine Substance can make any other Thing or Being have identical or sameness of Subsistence with the divine Substance; so personal Subsistence is evidently consistent with any conceivable Union: and any one may with as much reason suppose that the Philosophers could not believe the personal Existence of the Soul in the present State, because they believ'd it to be deriv'd from the divine Substance, as that they did not believe the future personal Existence of it

it

it in his *Return* to and *Union* with the Deity. And that which shews farther that they neither did or could disbelieve the future personal State of Existence of the Soul in its most intimate Union with the Deity is, that the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonics* both of them believ'd the Soul in this Union to subsist in a material Body, tho' different from and more refined than the gross Body which it had on Earth: and this is utterly inconsistent with their believing the Soul in its Union with the divine Substance to have the same personal Subsistence with it; for they never believ'd either that the supreme Soul or God, or the inferior divine [Νῆς] *Mind*, was personally united to *Matter*, or had a material Vehicle or Body. A Soul or Spirit united to Body or Matter, and having the same personal Subsistence with a pure immaterial or incorporeal Soul or Spirit, was an absurdity which never enter'd into the Heads of the ancient Philosophers to believe or suppose so much as possible; and is altogether an unphilosophical Fiction. And surely it is very unreasonable to charge Men with Infidelity in a point which they constantly and invariably profess to believe, only because we imagine (whether right or wrong) that they held something inconsistent with it: This is a way of reasoning that will destroy all the Faith and Religion of many who think themselves very knowing Christians and true Believers.

But the Philosophers had even without Revelation very rational Notions of the future State of Happiness and Misery as the Lot of righteous and

and wicked Men: and they founded their Belief of it on the best Principles of Reason, *viz.* upon the Nature of Virtue and Vice, the Fitness of Things, and the Rectitude and Purity of the divine Nature or God, who was not actuated by or capable of any human Passions. It was therefore their fixed Principle [*ὁ καθαρὸς μὴ καθαρῷ ἢ μὴ μίγνυται*] that a *pure or holy God had no communion with an impure or unholy Person*: That he was of *purser Eyes* [according to the Scripture-Phrase] *than to behold Iniquity*, Habac. i. 13. and that *no Evil could dwell with him*. They thought the Virtue of good Men would bring them to a Communion with God, by which their Happiness would be made perfect and unchangeable, from the very Nature and Constitution of Things, to which the divine Actions and Will were for ever conformable, and directed by them: and that the Wickedness of evil Men would separate them from this Communion and Felicity from the same immutable Cause; and subject them to unavoidable Misery. And this Foundation of Happiness and Misery they thought (as it truly was) more sure and invariable, than the supposing it to proceed, as the Vulgar thought, from the *Passions* either of *Love* or *Hatred*, which were variable and very unworthy to be conceiv'd as belonging to the divine Nature: tho' the ascribing such Passions to the vulgar Hero-Gods was not so unsuitable to their Characters, who had been Men, and was thought would sooner raise Impressions of *Fear* and *Obedience* in the Minds of the common

mon People, than the philosophical Notions were likely to do.

Therefore it is by no means true, either that the Philosophers did not believe a *future State*, or that they taught it to the People in order only to support the Authority of human Laws, and more effectually to secure Obedience to them, and for no other end. On the contrary, the Philosophers undoubtedly did *believe*, as well as constantly *profess* a future State of Happiness and Misery; and it is also certain that they did not teach this Doctrine merely to promote Obedience to human * Laws, but chiefly to promote the final Happiness of human Nature, which they believ'd to be completed only in a future State: And this is plain, because the *Epicureans* and *Sceptics*, who did not believe this Doctrine themselves, did not teach it to the People.

The ancient Heathen Theology having been much misrepresented and misunderstood, I shall give a short account of it.

The *Phœnician*, *Egyptian* and *Chaldean* Priests were the first Theologers: and the Theology of their Nations was very anciently mix'd
and

* *Cicero* well observes; Quid ii qui dixerunt totam de Diis immortalibus opinionem fictam esse ab hominibus sapientibus *Reipublicæ causa*, ut quos ratio non posset eos ad officium religio duceret, nonne omnem religionem funditus sustulerunt? *De Nat. Deor.* lib. 1. ad fin. Do not they who alledge that the whole System of Opinions concerning the immortal Gods is a Fiction of wise Men taught for the Benefit of the Public, that such as could not by *Reason* be brought to do their Duty, might be engaged by *Religion* to do it; do not they, who alledge this, *fundamentally subvert all Religion?*

and join'd with their natural Philosophy. But as the *Chaldæan* and *Phœnician* Theology agreed very much with the *Egyptian*, and are less known than the latter; and as the *Greeks* had their oldest Theology and Philosophy from *Egypt*, it will be sufficient to give an account principally of the *Egyptian* Theology.

The *Egyptian* Theology was contain'd in their *Hieroglyphics* engrav'd on Columns of Stone, which were laid up in the inner and more sacred Parts of their Temples, and also on their Obelisks; and could be explain'd by none but the Priests; and the Knowledge of it was communicated to none but those who were initiated into their Mysteries.

The *Hieroglyphics* were *symbolical*, in which the System of the Universe was represented under the Figures and various Attitudes of *Men* and *Women*, *Beasts*, *Birds* and *Fishes*, and a Mixture of these together; of *Plants* also and *Flowers* and *Utenfils*, with some Geometrical Lines and Instruments, and Astronomical Schemes, and an Intersperſion of *sacred Characters*. These were applied to nothing but Philosophy and Theology. The Figures did not signify what the Forms expressed; as an *Hawk*, *Dog*, *Beetle*, &c. did not signify merely those Animals; but they represented and denoted *mysterious Notions of Theology.

So

* *Jamblicus*, the best Explainer of the *Egyptian* Theology, says, πρόσθεν δὴ σοι βέλομαι τῶν Αἰγυπτίων τοῦ ἱερέως τῆς θεολογίας διεσκημένους· ἔτσι γὰρ ἴην φύσιν, τῶ
 παυλὸς

So that the *Egyptian Hieroglyphics* were very different from the *Chinese Characters*, in their Use and Signification, as well as Form : and it was impossible to use them for Letters to express common Language, for which the *Egyptians* had alphabetical Elements, or Letters which were older than their *Hieroglyphics*.

Nor were the *Hieroglyphics* of any use in *Oneirocritics*, or the Interpretation of Dreams ; these were always, as is well known, explain'd by *Divination*,

The

παντός καὶ τὴν δημιουργίαν τῶν Θεῶν μιμέμενοι, καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν μυστικῶν καὶ ἀποκεκρυμμένων καὶ ἀφανῶν νοήσεων Ἐικόνας πινὰς διὰ συμβόλων ἐκφαίνουσιν. I will first explain to you the Method of the *Egyptian Theology*. They therefore in imitation of universal Nature, and the Operation of the Gods in the Works of the Creation, represent mysterious, recondite, and secret Notions by *Symbols*, *De Myst. Sect. 7. c. 1.* And *Celsus*, in Reply to *Origen's* Objection charging the *Egyptians* with worshipping *Cats, Apes, Crocodiles, Goats* and *Dogs*, which they made the Symbols of their Gods, says, that the wise and knowing did not worship the *short-liv'd Animals*, but the *eternal Ideas* (or intelligent Beings) represented by these Symbols. Ἰδεῶν εἰδῶν, καὶ ἕχ [ὡς δοκῆσιν οἱ πολλοὶ] ζώων ἐφημερίων τιμὰς εἶναι τὰ τοιαῦτα διδάσκουσι. *Orig. cont. Cels. Lib. 3. P. 121.* And *Kircher* is very right in saying, *Hieroglyphica Ægyptiorum sapientia, testantibus omnibus veterum scriptorum monumentis, nihil aliud erat quam scientia de Deo divinisque virtutibus, scientia ordinis universi, scientia intelligentiarum Mundi præsidium quam Pythagoras et Plato, notante Plutarcho, ex Mercurii columnis, i. e. ex Obeliscis didicerunt. Oedip. Ægypt. Tom. 3. p. 567.* But these *Mercurial Columns* were not the public *Obelisks*, but those *Pillars* or *Tables* of Stone laid up in the inner parts of the Temples : From which the *Egyptian Priests* instructed *Pythagoras* and *Plato* in that mysterious *Theology*.

The original Use of the *Egyptian* Hieroglyphics was to represent the Properties, Powers, and Operations of the several Orders of divine Beings; of the Empyrean, Aërial, and Planetary Deities; of the Aerial, Terrestrial, Aqueous and Subterraneous Gods. Therefore Hieroglyphics were not known till Systems of physical Theology were form'd on Astronomical and Astrological Observations, and Improvements were made in natural Philosophy: the most ancient *Egyptian* simple Theology of deify'd Heroes was contain'd in their sacred Books, wherein their Actions were recorded: and their philosophic Theology was afterwards form'd upon the prior and original Idolatry and Worship of dead Men and Women, who were the first Kings and Queens; and of others eminent for the Invention of Arts and Sciences: whose Souls after Death were deify'd, and placed in the Stars, Planets and other Parts of the World, which were called after their Names, and were believed to preside in them, and to have a power and influence over the Affairs of Mankind. These made up the first political and popular Superstition. But as these Hero-Gods were absent and invisible, the Priests thought proper that the People should have some sensible and visible Representations of them; this gave rise to Images, into which the Priests by *Magic* and *Invocations* pretended to bring down the Deities, and make them reside in them, when and as oft as they pleas'd: and this was the Foundation of *Oracles*.

But

But instead of Images of Wood and Stone, by which the *Phœnicians*, *Chaldæans*, and other Nations represented their Deities; the *Egyptians* very anciently, and even before the Time of *Abraham*, consecrated *Animals* to be living *Symbols* of their Gods; by the several Uses and Properties of which Animals, their Characters were better represented and understood than by inanimate Statues: and then as the Gods were thought to delight in the symbolic Animals which were consecrated to them, and to impart their Divinity to them; these living Symbols became Objects of Worship, and had Images made and consecrated to *them* also, which were worshipped by the superstitious People.

These Symbols were the Foundation of the *Egyptian* Hieroglyphics, of which they made a considerable Part; and the original, political and popular Use and Signification of them was refin'd into a philosophical Theory of Theology. The Priests, to put a better Gloss on the plain and simple Idolatry of worshipping dead Men and Women, did in very ancient Times set up Mysteries, and allegoriz'd the popular Theology into a philosophical System. The Symbols and historical Actions of their Gods were resolv'd into natural Causes and Effects, and into celestial and mundane Elements; and the Powers, Attributes and Operations of several Orders of Gods celestial, æthereal, and terrestrial, &c. all which were dependent on and subordinate to one supreme Deity; and were suppos'd to be the Ministers of his Providence in the several Parts
of

of the Universe, which He as the universal Soul filled and sustained; and this supreme Deity the *Egyptians* symbolically represented by a *winged Globe*.

Jamblicus *, the best Interpreter of the mystical Theology of the *Egyptians*, tells us, that their various Symbols were Representations of the Power and Operations of the one supreme Deity.

Sanboniathbo †, the oldest *Pagan* Historian that we have any Remains of, and who lived, as the learned *Porphiry* assures us, about 1230 Years before the Christian Æra, related that the historical Actions of the Hero-Gods of *Phœnicia* had been allegorized by the first Hieropphants, who presided in the most ancient Mysteries. He also mentions some symbolical Statues of *Saturn* and other Gods of *Phœnicia* made by *Taaut* the first *Hermes*: and these might give the first Occasion of allegorizing the History of the first Hero-Gods, which allegorical Theology was begun to be taught in the *Phœnician* Mysteries, which were instituted before all others; and afterwards was taught in those of ‡ *Egypt* and *Chaldæa*.

The

* Βλέπειν μὲν ἢ συμβολικὴ διαδοχὴ [fortè, διδαχὴ] διὰ τῶν πλείστων τῶν δοθέντων τοῦ ἑνὸς θεοῦ ἐμφατικῶς καὶ διὰ τῶν πολλοτρόπων δυναμέων τὴν μίαν αὐτῆ παριστάναι δύναμιν.
De Myster. Sect. 7. c. 3.

† Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 1. c. 9. p. 30, &c.

‡ The Time of the first Institution of Mysteries cannot be certainly known; but those of *Phœnicia* and *Egypt* were long before the Time of *Cecrops*, and so before the *Greek* Theogony.

The Notion of one supreme God, and of several Orders of Divine or Angelic Beings by him set over the several Parts of the Universe, was every where received by Tradition from the most * early Ages; and this was the Foundation of the physical Theology taught in the Mysteries of *Phœnicia*, *Syria*, *Egypt*, and *Chaldæa*, which succeeded the Institution of Hero-Worship †, and reformed it into a more rational System :

* This is evident from the most ancient Histories of all Nations; and may be inferr'd from the Words of *Moses*, *Deut.* xxxii. 7, 8. *Remember the Days of old, consider the Years of many Generations—when the Most High divided to the Nations their Inheritance, when he separated the Sons of Adam, he set the Bounds of the People according to the Number of the Angels of God.* This is the true Reading preserv'd in the *Greek Translation*, instead of the *Children of Israel*, which has no sense, and seems plainly a Corruption of the original Text, which had *Sons of God*, meaning, *Angels*.

† The Worship of Hero-Gods was first instituted in *Phœnicia*; and as appears from *Sanhoniatho*, not long after the Dispersion of the Descendants of *Noah*. *Eliun* or *Hypsistus* reign'd in *Phœnicia* about *Byblus* soon after the Dispersion, and after his Death was deify'd by *Uranus* and his other Sons. This was the first deify'd King or Hero-God, that we read of. *Uranus*, who succeeded *Eliun* with his Son *Saturn*, and many of his Family both Men and Women, were also deify'd after their Deaths. *Saturn* was the most potent of all the first Heroes, and was worship'd as the principal God of the *Phœnicians* and *Syrians*.

The Priests who promoted Hero-Worship out of Fear and Flattery of their Kings, and to impress a religious Reverence of them amongst the People; apprehending that the Notion of the *one supreme God* and of Angelic Cœlestial Spirits, the Ministers of his Providence, would by degrees be lost and forgotten after all external religious Services and Devotion were paid to Hero-Gods, in-

System: and in this Theology the whole Oeconomy of the Universe was resolved into, and referred to one supreme Cause and Agent. This Doctrine was so opposite to the vulgar Idolatry, that it was always kept secret, and communicated to none but such as were qualified to be admitted into the Mysteries.

This was the Doctrine of the [τὸ θεῖον] Deity mentioned by *Plutarch*, where he says, that *the End of the Isiac Mysteries is the Knowledge of the first intelligent Being, and Lord of all Things; whom the Goddess exhorts all to enquire after, as residing with her.* Wherefore, he adds, that the Temple of *Minerva* [who is the same as *Isis*] had this Inscription upon it; *I am all that WAS, and IS, and WILL be; and no Mortal ever laid open my Veil**.

And that God was unsearchable in his Nature, the *Egyptians* signified by his Name *A-*
mun

stituted *Mysteries* in order to preserve amongst the wise and learned Part of Men the true Doctrine and Belief of the supreme Deity. So *Mysteries* were at first a pious Institution, and design'd to prevent the Knowledge of the one supreme God from being lost amongst a Multitude of deify'd Men and Women: tho' in time they were corrupted with Superstition, Lewdness and Impiety, especially amongst the *Greeks* and *Romans*. See *Clem. Alex. Admonit. ad Gent.* P. 8—14. Edit. Paris. *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* Lib 2. c. 3.

* Ὡν [ἐν ἱεροῖς λαλῶντων] θεός ἐστιν ἢ Ἰσὶς πρώτη καὶ κυρία καὶ νοητὴ γυνῶσις· ὃν ἡ θεὸς παρακαλεῖ ζητεῖν παρ' αὐτῆς· καὶ μετ' αὐτῆς ὄντα καὶ συνόντα. *De Is. et Osir.* p. 352. Ἐγὼ εἶμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὄν καὶ ἐσόμενον· καὶ τὸν ἑμὸν πέπλον ἄδεις πω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψεν. *Ibid.* p. 354.

mun [*Αμῦν*] by which Word *Manetho* † the learned *Egyptian* Chief-Priest said, his *hidden Nature* was expressed : and *Hecateus* ‡ of *Abdera* said the *Egyptians* thought this hidden supreme God was *the same with the Universe* : and agreeably to this *Apuleius* says ||, that *Isis* was represented in her *Mysteries* as the *supreme Deity* and *universal Nature*.

And it was the received ancient Notion of the Deity, that the Supreme God was the universal Soul, which comprehended and sustain'd all Nature. This was the old *Egyptian* Doctrine of the Deity, which *Orpheus*, *Homer*, *Thales*, *Pythagoras*, *Empedocles*, *Plato*, and the ancient *Stoics* learned in *Egypt*, and propagated amongst the * *Greeks* and *Latins*.

Strabo and *Diodorus Siculus* speaking of *Moses*, thought he had the same Notion of God.

Moses

† *Ibid.* p. 354.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 354.

|| *Metamorph.* Lib. 11. p. 169, 180.

* Παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ παλαιῶν — ὅτι θεοίτε εἰσιν ἔτσι [*Cœlestes Dii*] καὶ περιέχει τὸ θεῖον τὴν ὅλην φύσιν. *Aristot.* *Metaphys.* Lib. 14. c. 8. fin. And the great *Egyptian* God *Serapis* or *Osiris*, being asked at his Oracle by *Nococreon*, King of *Cyprus*, what God he was, made Answer——— Ἐμὶ θεὸς τοῖόςσε μαθεῖν, οἷον κ' ἐγὼ εἶπω, ἑράνιθ' κόσμου κεφαλὴ γαστήρ δὲ θάλασσα γαῖα δὲ μοι πόδες εἰσι, τὰ δ' ἔατ' ἐν αἴθερι κεῖται, ὕμματα τηλαυγῆς λαμπροῦ φάος ἡελίου. *Apud* *Macrobi.* *Saturn.* Lib. 1. c. 20. fin.

Aeschylus says ;

Ζεὺς ἐστὶν αἰθήρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ, Ζεὺς δ' ἕρανός,

Ζεὺς τοι τὰ πάντα καὶ ὅτι τῶν δ' ὑπέρτερον.

Apud *Clem. Alex.* *Strom.* Lib. 5. p. 603. *Edit.* *Parif.*

Moses (says * *Strabo*) affirmed and taught that the Egyptians had not right Notions of the Deity, who represented it in the Form of wild Beasts and Cattle : nor had the Libyans right Notions ; nor even the Greeks, who made the Images of their Gods in human Shape. He (*Moses*) thought that alone to be God, which contains us all, and the Earth and Sea ; and which we call Heaven, and the World, and universal Nature.

But tho' in the political Religion of *Egypt* and *Greece*, the Gods were in the former represented both by Images and under the symbolic Forms of Animals ; and in the latter by Images of human Form : this was only the Superstition of Hero-Worship.

But

And *Lactantius* tells us, this was the Opinion of *Pythagoras*. *Pythagoras quoque unum Deum confitetur, dicens incorporalem esse mentem quæ per omnem rerum naturam diffusa & intenta, vitalem sensum cunctis animalibus tribuat. De Ira Dei, Sect. 11. Minucius Felix* relates the same Notion of *Pythagoras*, Sect. 19. And the Stoic *Chrysippus* : Vim divinam, rationalem naturam, et mundum interim et fatalem necessitatem Deum credit. Ibid.

* Ἐφη γὰρ ἐκεῖνος [Μωσῆς] καὶ ἐδίδασκειν ὡς ἐκ ὀρθῶς φρονῶσιν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι θηρίοις εἰκάζουσαι καὶ βοσκήμασι τὸ θεῖον· ἐδ' οἱ Λιβυεῖς· ἐκ ἐδ' δὲ ἐδ' οἱ Ἕλληνας, ἀνθρωπομορφῶς τυπῶσαι· εἶπεν γὰρ ἐν τῷτο μίονι θεὸς τὸ περιέχον ἡμᾶς ἀπαντας καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλαττον ὃ καλεῖμεν ἕρανὸν καὶ κόσμον καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄλων φύσιν, [I read from the MSS. ὄλων, instead of the vulgar Reading ὄντων] *Geog. Lib. 16. p. 1104.* The Words of *Diodorus Siculus* concerning the Doctrine of *Moses* are : Τὸν περιέχοντα τὴν γῆν ἕρανὸν μόρον εἶναι θεὸν καὶ τῶν ὄλων κόσμον. *Apud Phot. Bibliothec. p. 1152.*

But in their mysterious recondite philosophical Theology the *Egyptians* and *Greeks* both taught one Supreme Deity or God, who fills, contains and governs all Things: they supposed that one supreme intelligent Mind pervaded and operated in every Part of Heaven and Earth; the several Parts of which they therefore deify'd, and believ'd to be animated with Divine Beings, and to be the Residence and Habitation of Souls and Spirits human and divine.

This was the oldest Pagan Philosophic Theology; and was the most natural and plain to be understood. The Notion of an *Unity* [τὸ ἕν] and a *Mind* [Νῦς] superior to the universal Soul, *mundane* and *supramundane*, seems to have been the peculiar Conceit of *Plato* and his Followers: or it might be borrowed from the *Chaldæan* Theology; if the later *Chaldæans* did not rather borrow their Metaphysics from the *Platonics*; tho' yet the *Chaldæan* Oracles speak of a supreme and first Mind superior to the second or mundane Soul the Creator of intelligent Beings.

As the *Greek* Philosophers resolved the Historical Actions of the Hero-Gods worshiped by the Vulgar and represented by Images of human Form, into a System of natural Philosophy, and metaphysical Divinity, which was nothing but Speculation and empty Amusement: so the *Egyptian* Priests refer'd all the animal Symbols, &c. of their Hero-Gods, whom alone the People worship'd, into the universal Power and Providence of one

Supreme Deity or God, administer'd by several Orders of subordinate Divine Beings *.

Jamblicus, in his Book of *Egyptian Mysteries*, relates the Design of them to be to teach, that there is but one supreme self-existing God and original Cause of all Things, from whom all sensible and intellectual Beings are deriv'd; and who from the Beginning appointed æthereal and cœlestial Spirits or Gods, to administer under him the Disposition and Government of the Universe; and that all their mundane Symbols taken from the several Parts of the Creation, animal, aerial, vegetative and aqueous, express'd the various Operations of the Power of the one supreme Being or God, and were refer'd ultimately to the Knowledge of him.

Jamblicus seems indeed to mix later Platonic Notions with the older and more genuine *Egyptian* Theology: or else we must suppose that the *Egyptian* Priests before the Time of *Plato's* being amongst them, had refin'd and subtiliz'd their Theology, and deliver'd it so to *Plato*. He speaks of several [*ἀρχαί*] *original Causes*; and of a *first Mind*; and also of a *creating Mind*: and talks much in the *Platonic* Strain in the second, third, fourth, and fifth Chapters of his eighth Section. *Pythagoras* does not appear to have learned any of these refined Notions in *Egypt*; and the most ancient *Egyptian* Theology

* *Cicero* therefore rightly says; Quid, qui aut fortes aut claros aut potentes viros tradunt post mortem ad Deos pervenisse, eosque esse ipsos quos nos colere, precari, venerarique soleamus, nonne expertes sunt religionum omnium? *De Nat. Deor. Lib. 1. prope fin.*

Theology taught and explain'd in their Mysteries, was the Doctrine and Notion of the [τὸ θεῖον] Deity or God, as the one supreme Soul or Mind diffus'd through the Universe; and that the Cœlestial Gods, and other suppos'd Deities or divine Spirits, were the subordinate Ministers of his Providence, who by his supreme Appointment presided in the several Parts of the World, and all depended upon him as the Sovereign Governor and Sustainer of the Universe.

This was the most ancient Theology of *Egypt* and *Chaldæa*: and was taught amongst the *Chinese* before the Days of *Abraham*; and was propagated by the Sons of *Noah* in their Dispersions after the Flood; and was probably the received Faith of the religious antediluvian Patriarchs; and was founded on the Appearance of Angels, as the Ministers of God in the first Ages of the World.

The Knowledge of this Theology was delivered under Allegories and Symbols, and was kept secret from the People, after the Institution of Hero-Worship was set up, and became the vulgar and political Religion of almost all Countries: this was the recondite * mysterious Learning of the *Egyptians*, so famed over all

F 4

the

* The *Egyptians* placed the Figures of *Sphinxes* at the Entrance of their Temples, to denote that their sacred Doctrine was ænigmatical and allegorical: they also placed the Image of *Harpocrates* pressing his Lips with one of his Fingers, to signify that it was to be kept secret, and not to be divulged to the common People: and farther

the World; and which brought Philosophers out of all Nations to be instructed in it; and this was the *Wisdom* in which *Moses* was learned whilst he lived in the Court of *Pharaoh*.

Phornutus or *Cornutus*, who has wrote of the allegorical Interpretations of the popular or political Theology, tells his Son to whom he addressses his Book, in the Conclusion of it, (p. 105) that by understanding the allegorical Fables of the Gods, he will be able to come at the Truth; and that those Ancients, who made use of them, were not endued with ordinary Understandings, but had sufficient Knowledge of the Nature of the World, and happily explain'd it by Allegories and Symbols. And he concludes, that the whole Design of Allegories and Symbols was to instruct Men in the Knowledge of true Religion, and the right Way of worshipping the Gods with Sacrifices and Prayers. And * *Clemens* of *Alexandria* esteems the ancient Allegories to be highly useful for the Knowledge of Truth.

So

ther to represent that divine Knowledge was to be received with *Silence* and *Attention*. Πρὸ τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς Σφίγλας ἐπιεικῶς ἰσάουτες, ὡς ἀνιγματοῶδη σοφίαν τῆς Θεολογίας αὐτῶν ἔχουσιν. Plut. de Is. et Osir. p. 354. and Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. p. 561. Erat etiam simulacrum quod digito labiis impresso admonere videretur, ut silentium fieret: hoc significare idem *Varro* existimat, ut homines eos [Isim et Serapim] fuisse taceretur. Ap. August. de Civit. Dei. Lib. 18. c. 5. *Varro* seems to be mistaken in the Design of the Image of *Harpocrates*: but from it *Pythagoras* learned his Maxim of *Silence*, which he enjoin'd his Auditors.

* Strom. 2. p. 358.

So that the grand Design of all the ancient *Phœnician*, *Egyptian* and *Chaldæan* Mysteries, seems originally to have been to discover to those who were initiated in them, that the Gods whom the Vulgar worship'd, were no other than *dead Men*; and that their History and Actions were to be understood and explain'd in an allegorical Manner; and to be referr'd to mundane Elements, and to natural Causes and Effects: and to teach that the true Object of Adoration was the one Supreme God and Author of Nature, and those cœlestial and æthereal Gods, who, by his Appointment, presided over the several Parts of the World; and that all the Symbols refer'd by the Vulgar to the Hero-Gods, were to be refer'd to the various Operations of the Power of the one Supreme God; to illustrate his Nature and Perfections, and to explain the Works of Creation and Providence. In these Mysteries the Initiated were also taught that the true Perfection and Happiness of Men consisted in the right and rational Worship of the one Supreme God, and of other cœlestial Beings subordinate to him: and that by imitating their Purity, Goodness and Benevolence, and governing their bodily Appetites and Passions, they would be happy in this Life, and after Death be still happier by a more intimate * Union with God and cœlestial Beings, and a Communication of more perfect Knowledge: whilst the Wicked and Ungodly would be for ever

* This is fully treated of in *Jamblicus's* Discourse of *Theurgy*. *De Myster.* Sect. 10. c. 5, 6.

ever miserable, by being separated and alienated from the blessed Communion and Fellowship with the immortal Gods. This made *Cicero* say, that the *Eleusinian* Mysteries taught * *not only the Way of living here with Joy, but also of dying with a better Hope, viz. of future Happiness.* And *Celsus* in *Origen* says †; *It was the Business of the Interpreters and Mystagogues of the sacred Mysteries to instruct those who were initiated in them in the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; from the Belief of which Doctrine, he adds, no Mortal ought ever to depart.*

Pythagoras ‡, who was instructed in the Mysteries of *Egypt, Chaldaea, and Greece,* taught, that the Souls of pious and good Men returned unto God; and that those of the wicked

* Neque solum cum lætitia vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum spe meliore moriendi. De Leg. lib. 2. p. 416. edit. Gryph.

† Μάλιστα μὲν ὃ βέλτιστε, ὡσπερ σὺ κολάβεις αἰώνιως νομίζεις, ἔτω καὶ οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκεῖνων ἐξηγηταὶ τελεσταὶ τε καὶ μισαγαθαί. He adds; Τῆτο μὲν γε ὀρθῶς νομίζουσιν, ὡς οἱ μὲν εὖ βιώσαντες εὐδαιμονήσουσιν, οἱ δὲ ἀδικοὶ πάνπαν αἰωνίοις κακοῖς συνέξουσιν, καὶ τὰτα δὲ τῷ δόγματος μὴ ἔτοι μήτ' ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων μηδεὶς ὡσεὶ ἀποσῆ. *Cent. Cels.* lib. 8. p. 408. 409. These Words of *Celsus, Origen* very justly admires. p. 410.

‡ Ἀγγέλλειν δὲ [Πυθαγόραν] αὐτῶν, [τῶν Θεῶν] τὰς καθαρμὸς καὶ τὰς λεγομένας τελείας, τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην εἰδῆσιν αὐτῶν ἔχουσα.— ἃ μὲν μαθόντα παρὰ τῶν Ὀρφικῶν, ἃ δὲ παρὰ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἱερέων, ἃ δὲ παρὰ Χαλδαίων [ita lege, non vero Χαλκιδῶν, ut editi libri habent] καὶ Μάγων, ἃ δὲ παρὰ τῆς τελείης τῆς ἐν Ἐλευσίῳ γινομένης, ἐν

wicked and ungodly were punished in Hades : and this was the general Doctrine of the *Greek Philosophers* deriv'd from the *Orphic * Myseries*.

Pythagoras, to make this Doctrine have the stronger Impression on the Minds of the Vulgar, represented it under the sensible fabulous Image of a Transmigration, as † *Timæus Locrus* observes,

* Ἰμβρω τε καὶ Σαμοθράκη καὶ Δήλῳ, &c. *Jamblic. de Vit. Pythag. cap. 28. Sect. 151.*

Ἀπεφαίνετο Πυθαγόρας ἐπαίονεν εἶναι ταῖς ψυχαῖς— καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν τόπον, ὅπε σαφῶς οἶδε τὰς Ἐραγχεῖς κολαζομένους. *Jamblic. Vit. Pythag. Sect. 178. p. 150.* agreeably to this the *Pythagoric Verses* say :

Ἦν δ' ἀπολείψας σῶμα ἐς' αἴθερ' ἐλεύθερον ἔλθης,

Ἔσσεαι ἀθάνατος Θεὸς ἄμειροτος ἕκει θνητός.

And *Epicharmus* says :

Ἔσσεαι τὸν νῦν περικῶς δ' πάθης γ' ὅδεν κακὸν

Καθαυὼν, ἄνω τὸ πνεῦμα διαμένει καὶ ἔρειον.

Trocaic. Catalect. ap. Grot. Prolegom. ad dict. Poet. Empedocles also in like manner writes :

Ἀθανάτοις ἄλλοισιν ὁμέςιοι, ἔντε τραπέσαις

Εὔνιαι, ἀνδρείων ἀχέων ἀπόκηροι, ἀπειρεῖς.

Hence we may correct the Citation of these Verses in *Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. p. 607.* where the second Line is corruptly read ;

Ἔόντες ἀνδρείων ἀχαιῶν ἀπόκληροι, ἀπειρεῖς.

But in the first Citation, instead of *Εὔνιαι*, we ought, I think, to read *Εὐνάδες*.

* Ἄπαντα γὰρ ἢ παρ' Ἑλληνσι θεολογία τῆς Ὀρφικῆς ἐστὶ μυσταγωγίας ἔκδοσις, πρῶτα μὲν Πυθαγόρας παρὰ Ἀγλαοφῆμε τὰ περὶ θεῶν Ὀρφια διδασχθέντος· δευτέρως δὲ Πλάτωνος ὑποδεξαμένου τὴν ποντελῆ περὶ τέτων ἐπιστήμην ἕκτε τῶν Πυθαγορείων καὶ τῶν Ὀρφικῶν γραμμάτων. *Procl. in Plat. Theolog. c. 5. p. 13.*

† Ἐπαινῶ τὸν Ἰωνικὸν ποιητὴν— ὡς γὰρ τὰ ἑρῶματα νοσῶδες

observes, imitating the Example of wise Physicians, who cure some distemper'd Bodies with morbid Medicines, when they find salutary ones have no Effect. He therefore represented the Doctrine of a future State, as the *Egyptians* did, from whom he learned his Doctrine, under a *Metempsychosis*, or a Transmigration of Souls after Death successively into the Bodies of several Kinds of Animals, in which the wicked were to be punished for a determined Duration, and then return into an human Body again. This Circuit of Punishment, according to the *Egyptians*, was finished in *three* thousand Years*.

This Account of the future State of Punishment, tho' fabulous, shews that the Ancients believed the Doctrine itself to be of so great Consequence to Religion, that they thought proper to deliver it to the People, under such feigned Symbols and allegorical Representations, as they judged would impress it in the strongest Manner on their Minds; and affect them with a deeper Sense of Religion, and of Purity of Life.

This was the Method of all the ancient Philosophers, who learned it from the † *Orphic Mysteries*, and *Orpheus* learned it in *Egypt*.

There
 νοσώδεσι πόκα υγιάζομεν, εἴκα μὴ εἴκη τοῖς υγιεινοτάτοις· ἔτω
 τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπειργόμεν ψεύδεσι λόγοις εἴκα μὴ ἄγνηται [f.
 ἄγνηται] ἀλαθέσι· λέγοντο, δ' ἀναγκαίως καὶ τιμωρίαι
 ζῆναι, ὡς μετενδόμεναν τὰν ψυχὰν, τῶν μὲν δειλῶν ἐς γυ-
 ναικίαν ζῆναι, &c. *Timæ. Loc. de Anim. Mund. p. 23.*

* Herodot. lib. 2. c. 123.

† Ἔστι δὲ ὁ μὲν διὰ τῶν συμβόλων τὰ θεῖα μενέειν ἐφίε-
 μεν, ὁ δὲ φυσικὸς καὶ ἄλλως τοῖς τὰς θεομιθίας γράφουσιν αἰετῶ-

There can no doubt be made, with any Reason, but that all the ancient Philosophers, except *Epicureans* and *Sceptics*, and a few others, firmly believed a future State of Happiness and Misery. The Vulgar had gross Conceptions about it, which were owing to the mythological and symbolical Representation of it made by the Poets and Philosophers, and which they explained only to their learned * Auditors or Disciples: and the *Exoteric* and *Esoteric* Philosophy had only a Reference to the Difference of the vulgar and political from the philosophical Notions of the future State, and not at all to the Reality and Belief of it, which was always believed in different Ways of Explication by the Learned and Unlearned; by the Poets and Philosophers, as well as by the common People: And the contrary Supposition is not only absurd in the highest Degree, but tends to introduce universal Scepticism into Religion.

For

os. It is added a little after, Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ὁ τῆς μυθολογίας τρόπος ἀρχαῖος δι' ὑπονοιῶν τὰ θεῖα μυνύων, καὶ πολλὰ παραπετάσματα τῆς ἀληθείας προβεβλημένους, καὶ τὴν φύσιν ἀπεικονίζομενος, ἢ τῶν νοητῶν αἰσθητὰ, καὶ τῶν ἀύλων ἔνυλα, καὶ τῶν ἀμεριστῶν μεριστὰ προτείνει πλάσματα, καὶ τῶν ἀληθινῶν εἰδῶλα καὶ ψευδῶς ὄντα κατασκευάζει. Procl. in Theolog. Plat. c. 4. p. 9, 10.

* Τὸν Συμβολικὸν τρόπον κατακρύπτει [ὁ Πλάτων] τὴν περὶ τῶν θεῶν ἀλήθειαν καὶ μέχρι ψιλλῆς ἐνδείξεως ἐκφαίνει τὴν αὐτῆ βέλῃσιν τοῖς γησιωτάταις τῶν ἀκούων. Procl. ibid. — The *Pythagoreans*, *Stoicks*, and *Aristotelians* with the *Platonics*, all used a double Way of explaining their Doctrines: one popular, call'd *Exoteric*, and the other private amongst their Disciples only, call'd *Esoteric*. See *Clem. Alex. Strom.* p. 575, 576. Editio

For we cannot be more sure of any Truth, or Doctrine in Religion, or Philosophy, having ever been taught and believed, than that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments was taught and believ'd by the ancient Philosophers.

One may with more Reason [tho' not without great Absurdity] affirm, that no vulgar Pagan ever did, or could believe any thing of the Immortality of the Soul and of a future State, because their Notions about these things were absurd and founded on Fable; than that the Philosophers either did not or could not believe them, whose Notions were more rational and agreeable to Truth. I shall therefore add, for the more full Satisfaction of the Reader, a few other Passages besides those before set down in these Papers, to shew their constant Profession and Belief of this most important Doctrine of Religion.

Jamblicus * says, that in his Time, *All the Galatians and Trallians, and most of the barbarous Nations taught their Children to believe, that the Soul did not perish, but continue after Death.*

Tully says †, that the Existence of the Soul
after

* Ἐτι καὶ νῦν οἱ Γαλάται πάντες καὶ οἱ Τράλλεις καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων τὰς αὐτῶν γὰρ περὶθεσιν, ὡς ἔκ ἔστι φασκεῖναι τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλὰ διαμένειν τῶν ἀποθανόντων. *Vit. Pythag.* p. 147. This Doctrine of the Soul's Immortality, he says, they learned from *Pythagoras*.

† *Permanere animos arbitramur consensu nationum omnium. Tusc. Quæst. lib. 1.*

after Death is the concurrent Belief of all Nations, to which he agrees.

Lactantius says †, that *Epicurus*, who held the Soul to be mortal and extinguish'd by Death, was herein *confuted both by all Philosophers, and the general Persuasion of Mankind.*

Tully relates of * *Socrates*, that a little before he drank the fatal poison'd Cup, he express'd clearly and fully his Belief of a future State, and of the different Condition of holy and unholy Men.

Plato, in his *Phædo*, makes *Socrates* tell his Friends, a little before he died ; *I shall continue no longer with you, but I shall immediately go hence to the happy State of the blessed—and this, he adds, is for your Comfort as well as my own.* [Phæd. p. 85. Edit. Francof. See Gorg. p. 357.]

Sallust † says ; *It appears to me a manifest Truth, that the Life of all Men is superintended by God ; and no good or evil Action of any one*
is

† Quid quod animas extinguibiles facit ; [Epicurus] quem refellunt non modophilosophi omnes et publica persuasio. Epit. p. 86.

* Duas esse vias duplicesque cursus animorum e corpore excedentium. Nam qui se humanis vitiis contaminassent—iis devium quoddam iter esse seclusum a concilio deorum : qui autem se integros castosque servavissent—essentque in corporibus humanis vitam imitati Deorum, his ad illos a quibus essent profecti reditum facilem patere. *Tusc. Quæst.* lib. 1.

† Mihi pro VERO constat omnium mortalium vitam divino numine invisi : neque bonum neque malum facinus cujusque pro nihilo haberi, sed ex natura diversa præmia bonos malosque sequi. *Orat. 2da. ad Cæsar. fin.*

is disregarded by him : but that by the natural Constitution of Things a different Recompence hereafter is appointed to good and evil Men.

Aristotle † says, Justice is always the Attendant of God, to punish those who depart from the divine Laws : whoever therefore will be blessed and happy [hereafter] ought immediately in the beginning of his Life to be Partaker of her.

And Socrates says in * Plato ; If Men do not reform their Wickedness, that Place in which no Evil dwells will not receive them after Death ; but they will then continue in the same State of Mind, and always associate with wicked Persons like themselves. In another place he says †, But it is fit to consider, that since the Soul is im-

† Τῷ δὲ [θεῷ] αἰεὶ ξυνέπειται δίκη τῶν ἀπολειπομένων τῷ θεῷ νόμῳ τιμωρὸς ἧς ὁ εὐδαιμονήσειν μέλλων, μακάριός τε καὶ εὐδαιμόνων, ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐθὺς μέτοχος εἶη. De Mund. c. 7. fin.

* Ὅτι ἂν μὴ ἀπαλλαγῶσι τῆς δεινότητος, καὶ τελευτήσαντας αὐτὸς ἐκεῖν μὲν ὁ τῶν κακῶν καθαρὸς τόπος εὐδέξεται, εὐθάδε δὲ τὴν αὐτοῖς ὁμοιότητα τῆς διαγωγῆς αἰεὶ ἔξοσι κακοὶ κακοῖς συνούτες. Theætet. p. 129.

† Ἄλλὰ τὸ δ' ἔφη, ὧ ἄνδρες δίκαιον διανοηθῆναι, ὅτι εἴπερ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀθάνατος ἔστιν, ἐπιμελείας δὴ δεῖται ἕχ' ὑπὲρ τῷ χρόνῳ τῆτε μόνου ἐν ᾧ καλῶμεν τὸ ζῆν ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῷ παντός. Καὶ ὁ κίνδυνος νῦν δὴ καὶ δόξειεν ἂν μάλιστα δεινὸς εἶναι, εἴτις αὐτῆς ἀμελήσει ἐν εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ὁ θάνατος τῷ παντός ἀπαλλαγῆ, ἔρμαιον ἂν ἦν τοῖς κακοῖς ἀποθανῶσι τῆτε ζώματι ἅμα ἀπηλλάχθαι καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν κακίας μετὰ τῆς ψυχῆς. Νῦν δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἀθάνατος φαίνεται ἔσα, ἑδεμία ἂν εἴη αὐτῇ ἄλλη ἀποφυγὴ κακῶν εἰδὲ ζωτηρία, πλὴν τῆ ὡς βελτίστη καὶ φρονιμωτάτη γενέσθαι. Phæd. p. 80.

immortal, it requires our Care of it, not only for the Time of this present Life, but for all Duration: and the Danger of neglecting it now must be very great. If indeed Death put an end to all Things, wicked Men would be Gainers by Death, in that their Wickedness would cease along with the Existence of their Souls and Bodies. But seeing that the Soul is immortal, there is no other way for it to escape Punishment or to obtain Salvation, but by being wise and good.

It was the Opinion of the *Stoicks**, that it was by no means impossible, [i. e. that it was probable] that after Death and some determined Periods of Time, we shall be restored again to the State in which we now are.

Their Notion was, that the † Soul was generated and corruptible, but did not immediately

* Δήλου ὡς ἔσθαι ἀθάνατον καὶ ἡμᾶς μετὰ τὸ τελευτῆσαι, πάλιν περιόδου τιῶν εἰλυμένων χρόνων, εἰς ὃν ἔσμεν ἀποκαταστήσασθαι ἡγήμα. Chrysisp. ap. Laet. lib. 7. p. 666.

† Τὴν ψυχὴν γεννητὴν καὶ φθαρτὴν λέγουσιν· ἔκ εὐθὺς δὲ τὴ ζώοντι ἀπαλλαξίῃσιν φθείρεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπιμένειν τινας χρόνους καθ' ἑαυτήν. Τὴν μὲν τῶν σπυδαίων μεχρὶ τῆς εἰς πῦρ ἀναλύσεως τῶν πάντων· τὴν δὲ τῶν ἀφρόνων πρὸς ποσὸς τινας χρόνους——Τὰς δὲ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων ψυχὰς ζῶον πόλλυται τοῖς ζώμασι. Ex Ario Didymo apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 15. c. 20. See the *Milesian Oracle* in Laet. de Vit. Beat. lib. 7. p. 640.

Esse inferos Zenon Stoicus docuit, et sedes piorum ab impiis esse discretas: et illos quidem quicquas ac delectabiles incolere regiones; hos vero luere poenas in tenebrosis locis atque in cœni voraginibus horrendis. Idem nobis Prophetæ palam faciunt. Laet. de Vit. Beat. lib. 7. p. 623. Edit. Oxon.

perish, when it departed out of the Body, but continued to exist for a certain Term of Duration. That the Souls of good Men existed till the general Conflagration and Dissolution of the Universe: but those of the wicked continued only to a certain Period — and that the Souls of Brutes perished with their Bodies.

After the general Conflagration the *Stoicks* believed a new State of Things would follow; and a Restoration of all Things [Men, Animals, &c.] which had existed before, to a new State of Life and Being. This made some Christian Writers think, that the Opinion of the *Stoicks* was not much different from the Christian Doctrine of the || *Resurrection*.

Athenagoras * the Christian Apologist says, that many of the Philosophers taught the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*. And another Christian † Writer says, that the ancient Philosopher and Legislator *Zoroaster*, taught the *Resurrection*

|| Οὐδὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔτϞ [the ancient Writer *Ephesus* he is speaking of] ἐκ τῆς βαρβάρου Φιλοσόφιας μαθὼν τὴν διὰ πνεύρος κάθαρσιν τῶν κακῶς βεβιωκότων, ἣν ὕστερον ἐκπύρωσιν ἐκάλεσαν οἱ Στωϊκοί· καὶ δ' οὐ καὶ τὸν ἰδίως ποιῶν ἀναστήσεσθαι δογματίζουσι, τὰτ' ἐκεῖνο τὴν ἀνάστασιν περιεπύρωτες. Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. p. 459. Edit. Paris. Vid. Nemes. de Fat. c. 38. ap. Biblioth. Pat. vol. 2. p. 542. Οἱ ἐλλογιμώτατοι τῶν Στωϊκῶν δογματίζουσι περὶ τε ἐκπυρώσεως — καὶ τῆς τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν ἐκείαμουῆς. Ibid. p. 599.

* Ὅτι μὲν τοι εἰ καὶ ἡμᾶς μόνον ἀναστήσει τὸ σῶμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ πολλὰς τῶν Φιλοσόφων. Legat. pro Christian. p. 39. int. Oper. Just. Mart. Edit. Paris. Fol.

† Ὁ δὲ Ζωροάστρης προλέγει ὡς ἔσται τότε χρόνϞ ἐν ᾧ πάντων νεκρῶν ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙΣ ἔσται. Æn. Gaz. ap. Bib. Pat. Tom. 2. p. 413.

rection of the Dead. And Cicero says †, *It was the fixed Opinion of the Ancients, that there was Perception in the State of Death; and that Man when he departed out of Life did not wholly die—their Minds were fixed in the Belief that Death was not a Destruction of every Thing, but was a sort of Migration and Change of this Life for another.*

After these and Multitudes of other plain Passages, which might be alledg'd, and wherein the Sentiments of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future State are clearly and fully express'd, one may as reasonably doubt whether any Christians ever did or do believe a future State, as whether the Philosophers amongst the Heathens did believe it: and their Representation of it under Allegories and Symbols, is in many Parts very beautiful, and agreeable to the figurative Descriptions of it in the sacred Writings.

Having in these Papers been led to discourse of the *Egyptian* Symbols, I shall add a few Observations on the *Egyptian* Worship of Animals, and the *Golden Calf* of the *Israelites*, which was the Symbol of one of them.

The *Egyptians* believed, that those Animals which were most useful to Men, were most favour'd by the Gods; and having at first been

G 2

dedi-

† Unum illud erat infitum priscais illis, quos castos appellat Ennius, esse in morte sensum; neque excelsu vitæ sic deleri hominem, ut funditus interiret.—hæsit in eorum mentibus mortem non interitam esse omnis tollentem atque delentem, sed quandam quasi migrationem, commutationemque vitæ. *Tusc. Quæst.* lib. 1.

dedicated to the Hero-Gods for their Service and * Usefulness; as also to express by some Properties peculiar to them the Qualities and Characters of the Gods, whose Symbols they were made, they were believed to be inspired by their Divinity which resided in them, and thence were thought proper Objects of Worship as vicarious Deities. In consequence of this Doctrine, the *Egyptians* believ'd, that the Souls of holy and wise Men pass'd into the Bodies of their sacred Animals; and that the Souls of wicked and ungodly Men went into unclean Beasts, as the *Asis*, *Hippopotamus*, &c. They also believed, that their principal Gods did sometimes put on the † Forms of the sacred Animals as well as of Men; and travell'd thro' all Countries and Cities: on these Accounts several Animals were made Objects of Worship.

The animal Bull, call'd *Apis* and also *Mnevis* was the Symbol of the greatest *Egyptian* popular

* *Aegyptii nullam belluam nisi ob aliquam utilitatem quam ex ea caperent, consecraverunt. Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. 1. c. 36. See Diod. Sic. lib. 1. p. 77, 78. and Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 2. c. 1. where he mentions several Reasons for the Consecration of Animals.*

† Πᾶσαν τὴν οὐρανὴν ἐπιπορεύεσθαι [θεῶς] φανταζομένης τοῖς ἀθρώποις, ἐν ἑρῶν ζώων μορφαῖς· ἐστὶ δὲ ὅτι εἰς ἀνθρώπων ἰδέας ἢ τιῶν ἄλλων μεταβάλλουσας. *Diod. Sic. lib. 1. p. 12. See Hom. Odyss. 17. Lin. 485, &c. and Hesiod. Opera et Di. v. 249, &c. and v. 254, 255. who deriv'd their Notions from the Egyptians. And the ancient Opinion of the Egyptians concerning the Gods visiting Men in human Form, was originally deriv'd from the Account of Angelical Appearance in the most early Ages of the World; and might be taught in Egypt by the first Tuaut or Thoth the Son of Mizraim.*

lar God *Osiris* ; and therefore the *Israelites* chose in Imitation of the *Egyptian* Superstition to make a *Golden Calf* to represent their own God *Jehova*.

The foolish *Israelites*, when *Moses* stay'd in the Mount, who was to them the living Representative of *Jehova* their God, thought they ought to make an Image to be his Symbol, and to keep his Residence amongst them in the Absence of *Moses*. This was conformable to the *Egyptian* Superstition of making Symbols of their Animal Gods, which were the Images of them, in which they believ'd their Gods resided as well as in the Animals themselves ; and carried them about in their Festival Processions, and in their Journies, as Protectors and Preservatives against their Enemies, and the Power of evil Dæmons. And it is probable, that the Animal *Apis* and *Mnevis* was then represented by a *Golden Calf*; both in the Temple at *Memphis* and *Heliopolis* where he resided ; as well as in other Parts of *Egypt*, where the Image of him only was kept and worship'd. *Plutarch* † relates that a *Golden or Gilded Bull covered with black Lawn, was expos'd to the sight of the People; at the annual Lamentation of Osiris, as his Image or Symbol.*

It is certain, that the Animal *Apis* and *Mnevis* was worship'd in *Egypt*, and had been de-

G 3

ify'd

† 'Οι ἱερεῖς ἄλλα τε σιθευπά, καὶ βῆν διὰ χρυσοῦ ἱματίῳ μέλαισι βροσίῳ περιβάλλοντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ δεικνύουσι. Βῆν γὰρ 'Οσίριδος εἰκόνα νομίζουσι. De Is. & Osir. p. 366. It is not known when the Sacred Animals began to have their Symbols or Images consecrated to them.

ify'd several Centuries before the *Jews* came out of *Egypt*, or even went thither. This appears from *Manetho*, and the Time may be fixed from his Dynasties: and the Worship of this Animal-God is far more ancient than *Eusebius* has made it; and he has plac'd it 1832 Years before the Christian Æra.

The Worship of the Animal *Apis* and *Mnevis*, with other Animals, at the Time of the *Exodus* of the *Israelites* under *Moses*, gives light to what is related, *Exod. xii. 12.* where God having said, that *He would smite all the First-born in the Land of Egypt, both Man and Beast*, he adds, *and against all the Gods of Egypt I will execute Judgement*: and this is said to have been done, *Numb. xxxiii. 4.*

Now this Execution of Judgement upon the *Gods of Egypt*, seems to mean the Destruction of their *Animal-Gods* amongst the other Beasts which were destroy'd: and so it is probable, that the sacred Animals, the *Apis* and *Mnevis* and *Mendes*, and other *Animal-Gods*, were smitten, and died amongst the First-born of the *Egyptians*, *Man* and *Beast*.

Artapanus *, an ancient Author, who wrote a Book of the *Jewish* History, relates, that at the going of the *Jews* out of *Egypt*, many of the *Egyptian* Temples were demolished; and that the sacred Animals, whom the *Egyptians* carried with them in their Pursuit of the *Israelites*, perished with them in the Sea.

The

* Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 9. c. 37. fin.

The *Israelites* could not have a living *Apis*, to make a Symbol of *Jehova*; because this Bull was of a peculiar Kind, and had certain Marks to distinguish it from all other Bulls, and to make it a true *Apis*. This the *Jews* knew very well, who had been long used to the Worship of it. Besides God had commanded the living Bull to be offered in Sacrifice; and so it could not be made a sacred Symbol in Agreement to the *Egyptian* Religion, which would not permit any of the sacred Animals to be offered in Sacrifice. And this shews the Propriety of the Prohibition of *Graven Images*, by which they were forbidden to represent the Lord *Jehova*, who alone was their God, as the *Egyptians* represented their Gods by Symbols and Images. There was no need to forbid expressly Animal-Worship; for the sacrificing and eating the Animals, which were worship'd by the *Egyptians*, was a standing Testimony against Animal-Idolatry; and the *Jews* were in no danger of it, when they were out of *Egypt*, for Animals were worship'd no where else: but they were every where in danger of Image-Worship, which was the common Superstition of the rest of the World, and more especially in the Land of *Canaan*, and the neighbouring Countries.

That the *Israelites* had been guilty of Idolatry in worshipping the *Egyptian* Gods, is evident from several Places of Scripture: *They shall no more offer their Sacrifices unto Devils* (or Demons) *after whom they have gone a whoring,*

Lev. xvii. 7. And *Joshua* chargeth them, to put away the Gods which their Fathers served on the other side of the Flood [Euphrates] and in Egypt, *ch.* xxiv. 14, and the Prophet *Ezekiel* representing the divided Kingdoms of *Israel* and *Judab* by two Women, says, they committed Whoredoms (i. e. Idolatry) in Egypt; and committed Whoredoms in their Youth, [that is, when they were beginning to be a Nation] *ch.* xxiii. 3. and so again, *v.* 8, 19, 21. This gives light to and shews the Reason of their making the *Golden Calf*

But the Sin of the *Israelites* did not so much consist in making a *Golden Calf* for the Symbol of their God; as in building an Altar and offering Sacrifices to it, and worshipping it in a leud idolatrous Manner, (*Exod.* xxxii. 6.) as they had been used to worship the * Image of *Apis* and *Mnevis* in *Egypt*. And they had been a little before expressly forbidden the making any *Graven Image*, to worship it, *Exod.* xx. 4, 5.

The Sin and Provocation of the *Israelites* consisted in making a Symbol or Image to represent their God, and falling down to it and worshipping it in the manner of the *Egyptian* Superstition, *Exod.* xxxii. 8. But Images, as mere Symbols, and consecrated to the true God, were by God's own Appointment made and placed in the most holy Place both of the *Tavernacle*

* *Pomponius Mela* speaking of the *Egyptians* says; Colunt Effigies multorum animalium, atque ipsa magis animalia. *De Sit. Orb.* lib. 1. c. 9.

bernacle and the Temple, *Exod.* xxv. 18—23. 1 *K.* vi. 23—30. 2 *Chron.* iii. 10—14. And what is more remarkable, the *Cherubims*, which were the Symbols of the Presence of the God of *Israel*, were made up of the same Figures with the most ador'd *Egyptian* Symbols, viz. the compound Figure of a *Man*, a *Calf* or *Bull*, a *Lion*, and an *Eagle*, as we read in *Ezek.* x. 14. i. 10. A Cherubim was a mixed Portraiture of all these Figures, as several of the *Egyptian* † Symbolic Images were of some of them.

The Cherubims were also plac'd in the most secret and holy Part of the Tabernacle and Temple of the *Jews*; as the *Egyptian* Symbols were placed in their *Adyta*, or inner and most hidden Parts of their Temples. The sacred Books likewise of both were laid up in the same *Adyta*. The *Egyptians* also had Lamps kept always burning in the inner Parts of their Temples, as the *Jews* had in their Sanctuary.

In all these Institutions the *Jewish* Hierarchy by divine Appointment resembled that of the *Egyptians*. Symbols therefore in Religion were in themselves not only innocent but significant,
if

† Εἰκασται παρ' αὐτοῖς [Αἰγυπτίσις] τις (Θεός) μέχρι τραχήλου ἀνθρωποειδής, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον ὄρνέας ἢ λέοντος, ἢ ἄλλης τινος ζῶας κεκλιμένον. Porphyr. de Abst. lib. 4. Sect. 9. Καὶ πάλιν αὐ κεφαλὴ ἀνθρώπειον ἢ ἄλλων τινῶν ζῶων μέρος ᾧ μὲν ὑποκείμενα, ᾧ δὲ ἐπικείμενα. Ibid. See *Spenser de Leg. Heb.* lib. 3. c. 4. And the *Sphinxes* placed before the Entrance of their Temples were mix'd Figures of an human Face, Wings of a Bird, and Feet and Body of a Lion.

if the Use of them had not been perverted to Superstition. The *Egyptians* worship'd the Symbols, as well as the Idols or Dæmons to whom they were consecrated, and who were either dead Men or other fictitious Deities: but the *Jewish* Cherubims were only Symbols of the true God, and refer'd only to him; and were significative of his being the only Creator of both rational and irrational Animals, the principal of which made up the Cherubic Symbol; for it was compos'd of four Figures, *viz.* of a *Man* the Representative of the rational Creation, a *Bull* the principal of tame Animals, a *Lion* the Head of the wild Creatures, and an *Eagle* the Chief of feather'd Animals.

The *Jewish* Symbols were kept secret, and never expos'd to the View of the People, lest they should have been abus'd to Superstition, as they probably would have been, if made public: and therefore when the Tabernacle was taken down upon the *Israelites* removing their Camp, the Priests cover'd the Ark of the Testimony (on which the Cherubims were plac'd) with a Vail, Numb. iv. 5. But the *Egyptians* carried about in solemn Procession at their sacred Festivals the Symbols of their Gods, on purpose to be worship'd by the People. This was the Difference between the *Egyptian* Symbols, and those which God himself appointed to represent his Presence amongst the *Jews*, and to assure them of his continual Providence, in the Preservation of their Religion and Worship
of

of him against the Power of all false Gods, and their idolatrous Worshippers.

The Cherubims therefore were placed spreading their Wings over the *Mercy-Seat*, which was fixed upon *the Ark of the Covenant*, wherein the Law of the two sacred Tables was laid, with other Evidences of God's miraculous Dispensation; and with their Faces looking towards it, to denote God's peculiar Care and Watchfulness over his own holy Law and true Religion. Whence we may observe, that Symbols, which had been apply'd to Superstition and the Worship of false Gods, were by divine Wisdom made Representatives of the true God; but so as to be safe from being made Idols or abus'd to superstitious Worship. And no Objection with Reason can be made against the divine Religion of the *Jews* from the use of Symbols, because they were used in the Worship of false Gods; any more than can be made from the Use of Temples, and Sacrifices and a Priesthood being instituted by the true God, because they were also consecrated and appropriated to the Service of Idols.

Indeed, God in his all-wise Providence ordered the Religion and Worship of his People in many Things similarly to that of the *Egyptians*. Therefore as the *Egyptians* pretended to have received all their Laws and Polity and religious Rites from their Gods, or those in whom they suppos'd the Spirit of the cœlestial Gods to reside and inspire them; and to preserve their Country under the Providence and constant invisible Govern-

Government of their Gods, consecrated every Part of it to them; erecting to them Temples, Images and Symbols in every Province, where Priests were appointed to attend and solemnize their Worship; that hereby they might secure their Influence and Protection, and make their Kingdom a *Theocracy*: So the true God by giving Laws to the *Jews*, and instituting all their religious Worship, and appointing the sacred Symbols, which were to represent and secure to them his continual Presence and Favour, made their Nation a real *Theocracy*.

Thus the false Revelations of Heathen Legislators, who pretended to have received their Religion and Laws from their Gods, made it fit for the true God to oppose their Superstition established upon forged and fictitious Revelations, by sending inspired Prophets to deliver his Laws and true Religion to the Worshippers of him.

But then as all the *Egyptian* Theology was kept secret, and hidden under Hieroglyphical Symbols, and wrote in their sacred Books in Characters known only to the Priests, the People had no Access to the Knowledge of the Gods they worshipped; and were kept entirely ignorant of spiritual Things; and blindly ador'd all those monstrous Figures and Symbols, which their Priests set before them, or shew'd them in their Temples, as also all the Animals and inanimate Things which they had consecrated, without knowing what they did, or what they worshipped. Their greatest Gods had been no
other

other than Kings and Heroes, and Men and Women famous for inventing useful Arts and Sciences, who after Death were deify'd, and inspir'd, as they were taught to believe, those fantastick Images and the Animals consecrated to their Deities.

But the God of *Israel* made himself known to all * his People, as well as to the Priests; and ordered his Law to be written in the vulgar Language, and to be read and explained to all the People: so that all the *Jews* were equally Partakers of the Knowledge of the true God, whom alone they were commanded to worship without any material Symbol, Image, or Representation whatsoever.

The *Egyptian* Priests indeed had more Sense than to believe there was any real Divinity in their symbolic Images or sacred Animals; but then they let the People go on in their gross and senseless Superstition, and encourag'd it by their own Practice and Example. They made and consecrated their Gods for them; and pretended by Amulets, Divinations and magical Charms, to animate the Images with Genii and Dæmons, and to confine them to their Symbols, and make them propitious to the Worshippers of them.

* For this Reason there were no *Mysteries* instituted amongst the *Jews*, the Design of these being to deliver in a secret Manner the Knowledge of the one Supreme God, and of his Government of the World by cœlestial and other ministerial Beings: but this Knowledge was communicated to the *Jews* in the Law itself, and in the most perfect Manner.

A N

APPENDIX

CONCERNING THE

Genealogy and Time of J O B.

IN the End of the Book of *Job*, it is added from a *Syriac* Copy, that *Job* lived in the Land of *Aufitis* [or *Uz*, as the *Arabic* Version has it] upon the Borders of * *Idumæa* and *Arabia*. He was at first called *Jobab*; and having taken an *Arabian* Woman to be his Wife, he had by her a † Son, whose Name was *Ennon*. His Father's Name was ‡ *Zare*, a Grandson of *Ejau*; but his Mother's Name was || *Bosfora*. So that he was the fifth from *Abraham*. And these were the Kings who reigned in *Edom*, of which Country he [*Job*] also was a Prince,

* It was upon the Borders of *Euphrates*, according to the Reading of the *Alexandrian* MS. and this is more probable.

† The *Alex.* MS. omits the Mention of this Son; but it is in the Copy of *Jerome*. Fin. lib. *Job*.

‡ The *Alex.* MS. calls him *Zareth* of the East. He is called *Zerah* in the *Hebrew* Text, 1 *Chron.* i. 44.

|| The *Alex.* MS. calls her *Bosfora*. The *Arabic* Version and *Jerome* say, she was of *Bosja*. The City might be so called after her Name.

Prince, viz. the first was *Balak* the Son of *Beor* §, and the Name of his City was *Denna-ba*. After him reign'd ||| *Jobab*, call'd *Job*. After him reigned *Ašom* or *Aššom*, [*Casum* says *Jerome*, and the *Hebrew* has *Huſham* in the first Chapter of the first Book of *Chronicles*, x. 45.] who was of the Country of *Theman*. After him was *Adad* the Son of * *Barad*, who smote *Midian* in the Plain of *Moab*; and the Name of his City was † *Getbem*. But his Friends who came to visit him were *Eliphaz* of the Sons of ‡ *Eſau*, Prince of the || *Themanites*;

§ Instead of *Beor* the *Alex. MS.* corruptly has *Seppher* or *Zirpor*. But this *MS.* has *Beor* rightly. *Gen.* xxxvi. 32. He is also called *Beor*, *1 Chron.* i. 43. But *Balak* is call'd *Bela* or *Belub* in the *Hebrew Text*, *1 Chron.* i. 43.

||| He is called *Jobab*, *Gen.* xxxvi. 32. *1 Chron.* i. 43.

* He is called *Bedad* in the *Hebrew Text*, *Gen.* xxxvi. 35. and in *1 Chron.* i. 46. But the *Vulgate* and *Jerom* call him *Badad*, and so the *Samaritan Hebrew Text*, and this is the true Reading: the Similitude of the *Hebrew Letters R* and *D* (i. e. ר and ד) occasioned the *Greek Interpreters* to write *Barad* for *Badad*.

† This City is called *Avith* or *Gavith* in the *Hebrew Text*, *1 Chron.* i. 46. *Gen.* xxxvi. 35.

‡ The *Alex. MS.* has it, *Eliphaz* Son of *Sophan* of the Sons of *Eſau*: and *Theodotio*, as *Chryſoſtom* relates, had it *Eliphaz* Son of *Jeſaphas*. *Eſau* had a Son called *Eliphaz*, *1 Chron.* i. 35. and 'tis probable the *Eliphaz* in *Job* was the Grandson of that *Eliphaz*, and the Son of *Sophan* or *Jeſaphas*.

|| He dwelt at *Theman*, a City of the *Stony Arabia*, which *Hydr* ſays lay to the South of *Edom*, in which was *Boſra* mentioned, *Eſai.* lxiii. 1. *Not. to Peritſol's Itiner. Mund.* p. 73. But this is a Miſtake; for *Theman* lay in the Country of *Edom*, as appears from *Jerem.* xlix. 7, 20. *Ezech.* xxv. 13. *Amos* i. 11, 12. and it ſeems to have been

nites; Baldad King of the § *Souchæans*; Sopbar King of the ||| *Minæans*. The *Alexandrian* Manuscript adds; *Theman* Son of *Eliphaz*, Prince of *Idumæa*: but *Jerome* has not this Addition: and it is an Error in the *Alexandrian* MS. How *Job* or *Jobab* was the fifth from *Abraham* exclusive, appears from the first Chapter of the first Book of *Chronicles*, where the Genealogy of *Esau* is related. Two of the Sons of *Esau* are there, §. 35. call'd *Eliphaz* and *Raguel* (or *Reuel*) and *Zare*, *Zara* or *Zerab*, was the Son of *Raguel* or *Reuel*, §. 37. and the Father of *Jobab*, §. 44.

This History of *Job* was undoubtedly in the *Greek* Version from the Beginning, and *Theodotio* might take it thence, if it was not in his *Hebrew* Copy. *Polybistor* * says that *Aristæus*, who lived at the Time of the *Greek* Translation, and wrote a large Account of it, makes mention of it. He relates that *Job* was descended from *Esau*, and lived in *Ausitis*, in the Borders

been the chief City of *Edom*, so called from *Theman* the Grandson of *Esau*, 1 *Chron.* i. 36. and *Bosra* or *Bozra* was the next principal City.

§ The *Alex.* MS. has it, *Baldas* Son of *Amnon*, Son of *Chobar*: And so *Theodotio*. The *Alex.* MS. adds the *Auchite* Prince. *Hyde* says, he dwelt at *Shuah*, a City of *Arabia Deserta*, bordering on the North Part of *Arabia Felix*. [Not. to *Peritfol's Itin. Mund.* p. 73. It was so called from *Shuah*, a Son of *Abraham* by *Keturah*, *Gen.* xxv. 2. 1 *Chron.* i. 32.

||| He is called *Sopbar the Naamathite*, *Job* ii. 11. xi. 1. xx. 1. He lived at *Naama*, as the *Chald.* Paraphrase says, *Job.* ii. 11. And this was a City in *Arabia Felix*, as *Hyde* says. Not. to *Peritfol's Itin. Mund.* p. 74.

* Apud *Euseb.* Præp. *Evang.* lib. 9. c. 25. p. 430₂, 31.

Borders of *Idumæa* and *Arabia* ; and that he was at first called † *Jobab*.

He mentions also *Eliphaz* King of the *The-manites*, and *Baldad* King of the *Sauchæans*, and *Sopbar* King of the *Mannæans* or *Minoæans* ; to whom he adds, *Elibu* Son of *Barachiel* the * *Zobite*.

Origen ‡ also assures us, that this History of *Job* was both in the *Greek* Version, and in *Theodotio's* Translation ; tho' it was omitted in his Time in the *Hebrew* Copy, and in *Aquila's* Version. We may therefore depend that this Account of *Job's* Genealogy was originally in the *Greek* Version, and in the *Hebrew* whence it was made.

Jerome || thinks that *Job* did not descend from *Efsau*, but from *Us* or *Uz*, the Son of *Nachor*, *Abraham's* Brother. This he infers from his being said to have liv'd in the Land of *UZ*.

† In the *Greek* of *Eusebius*, it is *Ιωβὰμ* for *Ιωβὰβ*, which is owing to the *Greek* MSS. of the tenth and eleventh Centuries writing *B* (*β*) in the End of Words like an *M* (*μ*).

* It should be *Buzite*, as the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Texts both have it, *Job* xxxii. 2. He descended from *Buz* the Son of *Nachor*, *Abraham's* Brother, *Gen.* xxii. 21. who was Uncle to *Aram* or *Ram* there mentioned ; and therefore *Elibu* is said to be of the Kindred of *Ram*, *Job* xxxii. 2. where the *Complutense* Copy has *Aram*.

‡ Αλλά καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς *Ιωβ*, τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστῆσεσθαι μεθ' αὐτῶν ὁ κύριος· ἀνίστησιν, ἄχρη τέλεος, ἢ κείτται παρὰ τοῖς *Ἑβραίοις*· διόπερ ἔδὲ παρὰ τῶν *Ἀκύλα*· παρὰ δὲ τοῖς *Ο*. [i. e. 70.] καὶ *Θεοδοτίωνι* τὰ ἰσοδυναμῶντα ἀλλήλοις. *Epist. ad African.* p. 14, 15. Edit. *Benedict.*

|| *Quest. Heb. in Gen.*

There was a Land of *UZ* in *Edom*, as we learn from the *Lamentations* of the Prophet *Jeremiah*, iv. 21. This was so called from *UZ*, one of the *Horites*, *Gen.* xxxvi. 28. But *UZ*, the Land of *Job*, was in the Desert *Arabia*, which lay on the East of *Judea*, and is called *the East*, *Judg.* vi. 3. and on the Borders of it lived the *Sabæans* and *Chaldæans*: and it was so called from *UZ* the Son of *Nachor*, who was *Abraham's* Brother. It is therefore most probable, that *Job* was not the *Jobab*, who was King of *Edom*, which lay at too great a Distance for the *Chaldæans* to come and plunder him; but that he was a very rich Man, and a great Lord or Prince, who lived in *Arabia Deserta*, near the *Chaldæans* and the *Sabæans* of the Desert *Arabia*, where *Ptolemy* places † *Sabe*.

Jerome's Opinion may farther be confirm'd from the Account of *Job's* Friends, who visited him in his Afflictions; and one of whom, *Eli-phaz* King of *Theman*, ruled over the *Edomites* at *Theman*, the Capital of *Edom*: So *Job* could not be King here ‡; and *Hyde*, as I before observ'd, is mistaken in placing *Theman* in the *Stony Arabia*, on the South of *Edom*: for *Jerem.* xlix. 7, 20. *Ezech.* xxv. 13. *Amos* i. 11, 12. all place *Theman* in the Country of *Edom*. *Job's* other Friends all lived in one of the *Arabias*, and two of them were his Kinsmen, and descended from *Abraham* and *Nachor*. For
Bildad

† Geograph. p. 144.

‡ Tho' he might reign at *Bozra* where *Jobab* reigned; but other Reasons are against this Opinion.

Bildad the *Shubite* was descended from *Shua*, a Son of *Abraham* by *Keturah*, *Gen.* xxv. 2. *1 Chron.* i. 32. And he was Prince of *Shua*, so called from his Ancestor, and which City lay in the South Part of *Arabia Deserta*, towards *Arabia Felix*, called by *Ptolemy* § *Sava* [Σαυή]. The third Friend of *Job*, called *Sopbar* or *Zophar* the *Naamathite*, who lived at * *Naama*, as the *Chaldee Paraphrase* says on *cb.* ii. 11. This City was in *Arabia Felix*, as † *Hyde* tells us: and is confirm'd from his being said to be Prince of the *Minæans*, whom ‡ *Ptolemy* places in *Arabia Felix*, a little North of *Saba*. The last Prince was *Elibu* the Son of *Barachel* or *Barackiel* the *Buzite*, of the Kindred of *Ram*, and of the Land of *UZ*, as the *Greek Version* has it, *cb.* xxxii. 2. *Elibu* therefore was a Descendant of *Buz* the Son of *Nachor*, *Gen.* xxii. 21. and *Buz* was the Uncle of *Ram* or *Aram*. So *Elibu* lived very near to *Job* in a Part of the Land of *UZ* and was his Kinsman, both being Descendants of two Sons of *Nabor* or *Nachor*, *Gen.* xxii. 20, 21.

It was the generally received Opinion of the ||

H 2

Jews

§ *Geograph.* p. 144. See *Hyde's Not. to Peritfol's Itiner. Mund.* p. 74. *Cellar. Geograph. Antiq.* tom. 2. p. 599.

* *Naama*, as *Hyde* says, signifies *Felix*, *Amœna*, &c. But yet 'tis probable that *Zophar* was called the *Naamathite*, from one of his Ancestors *Naama* or *Naamat's*, as all the other Princes were called from their Ancestors.

† *Ibid.* p. 74.

‡ *Geograph.* p. 154.

|| See *Hottinger's Tnefaur. Philo'seg.* p. 193, &c.

Jews, that *Job* was born at the Time when the *Israelites* went into *Egypt*; and that he died about the Time that they departed out of *Egypt*.

Origen * says, that *Job* was older than *Moses*. And *Eusebius* † writes, that *Job* lived two Generations before *Moses*, as being the fifth from *Abraham*; whereas *Moses* he says was the seventh. But *Eusebius* did not consider that in reckoning *Job* the fifth from *Abraham*, *Abraham* himself is not reckoned; but in reckoning *Moses* the seventh from *Abraham*, he is reckon'd. So that by the Account of *Eusebius*, taken from the *Greek* Addition at the End of *Job*, *Moses* is but one Generation after *Job*.

An ancient || Anonymous Commentator on the Book of *Job* says, that the History of *Job* was wrote originally either by *Job* or one of his Friends in the *Syriac* (or *Arabic*) Language; and was translated into *Hebrew* by *Moses*: And this Author adds, that he found it “ related by
 “ the Ancients, that when the great *Moses* was
 “ sent by God into *Egypt*, and saw the grie-
 “ vous Afflictions of the Children of *Israel*, and
 “ was not able to comfort them under the la-
 “ mentable Hardships inflicted on them by the
 “ *Egyptians*; he declared to them for their
 “ Con-

* Ἐν τῷ ἀρχαιότερῳ καὶ Μωϋσεως αὐτῷ Ἰωβ ὁ διάβολος ἀναγέγραπται παρίσταναι τῷ θεῷ, &c. Cont. Cels. p. 305.

† Demonst. Evang. lib. I. c. 6. p. 14.

|| At the End of the second Volume of *Origen's* Works, Edit. Bened. p. 851.

“ Consolation the grievous and terrible Miseries
 “ which *Job* had suffered: and as they had
 “ lately happened, he put them in writing, and
 “ deliver’d them to that People.”

Methodius * thought, that the Book of *Job* was wrote by *Moses*.

Chrysostom, in the *Catena* on *Job*, p. 613. says, *Job* was in his Prosperity when the *Jews* sojourn’d in *Egypt*: and that they were stir’d up to Piety by his Example, all that had befallen him being then new and fresh in Memory all over *Arabia*.

Polychronius, in the Preface to the same *Catena* (p. 4.) agrees with *Chrysostom*, that *Job* lived before the Time of *Moses*; and also thinks that his History was wrote by *Moses*, to encourage the *Israelites* to bear Afflictions in the Wilderness. *Julian Halicarnassensis* is of the same Opinion. [Ibid. p. 6.]

It is therefore probable, that *Job* was born about the Time of the Birth of *Joseph*, and died a few Years before the *Israelites* went out of *Egypt*, and whilst *Moses* was in the Land of *Midian*, where the History of what happened to *Job* was well known. And *Job* dying whilst *Moses* lived there, *Moses* either transcrib’d the History out of *Arabic* into *Hebrew*, or compos’d it originally from the Accounts he receiv’d of it.

That which makes it highly probable, that
 H 3 the

* Το ἰδὲ βιβλίον Μωσῆος εἶναι ὃ ἔγραψεν Φωσι.
 i. e. Methodius, Apud Phot. Biblioth. p. 938.

the History of *Job* was wrote before the *Israelites* went out of *Egypt*, is, that there is not in it any Mention of the miraculous Deliverance of that People; of any of the Plagues inflicted on the *Egyptians*, or of the Miracles wrought by *Moses* in *Egypt*. And as the Miracles wrought by *Moses*, and the miraculous Destruction of the great Army of *Pharaoh* with *Pharaoh* himself in the *Red-Sea*, and the no less miraculous Passage of the *Israelites* through that Sea on Foot, must have been known in *Arabia*, where *Job* and his Friends lived; it cannot be supposed but that those wonderful Works of Divine Providence would have been spoken of in that Part of the History, which sets forth the Almighty Power of God, and the great and marvellous Works of his Providence, if the History had been wrote after the Passage of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*.

Therefore we may reasonably infer, that it was wrote before the *Jews* came out of *Egypt*; and as the *Jews* received it originally in the *Hebrew* Language, and always accounted it a Part of their Canonical Scriptures, we may, with probability, conclude, that they received the Book of *Job* from *Moses* himself: nor is there room to imagine any other to be the Author of it. The History was very proper to comfort the afflicted *Israelites* under the Miseries they endur'd, both in *Egypt* and in the Wilderness; and to build an Assurance upon of a Deliverance from all their Afflictions, and
of

of possessing the Blessings of the Promis'd Land of *Canaan*, if they rely'd on the Divine Providence, and worship'd the God of *Israel* alone, and obey'd his Laws.

Rossington, Aug. 11.
1744.

J. J.

REMARKS
UPON THE
FIFTH VOLUME

Of the SECOND PART of

Mr. LARDNER'S Credibility of the
Gospel-History.

IN this History, Mr. *Lardner* has made Objection to some Parts of my Preface to the Edition of *Novatian*, [whom he erroneously, as I shall prove, calls *Novatus*] wherein I fix the Date of that Author's famous Book concerning the received primitive Doctrine of the Trinity, to the Year of our Lord 250; or some Time before he fell into his Schism, which was *A. D.* 251.

Mr. *Lardner* says, (p. 74, 75.) " It is easily
" proved that *Sabellianism* [mentioned by *No-*
" *vatian*] was not known long before the Year
" 257. For in that Year *Dionysius* of *Alex-*
" *andria* sent Pope *Xystus* the Second an Ac-
" count of what he had said and writ in that
" Controversy, which had its Rise in *Ptolemais*
" in *Egypt*; and therefore probably had not been
" on

“ on foot above a Year or two, or three at the
 “ most — This Argument need not be en-
 “ larg’d upon — I think then that *Dionysius’s*
 “ Account of the *Rise of Sabellianism* is an in-
 “ vincible Argument, that it did not appear in
 “ *Egypt* before (*A. D.*) 254, or 255, or 256.”

This is all that Mr. *Lardner* has to alledge by way of Argument against my Time of dating the *Sabellian* Heresy, which I ascertained by various Proofs, not in the least taken notice of by him: and he might easily have seen that I had obviated this Objection drawn from the Writing of *Dionysius* against the *Sabellians*, and shewn there was nothing in it. This would have appeared at once to the Reader, if Mr. *Lardner* had given a true Account of what *Dionysius* wrote.

Dionysius then in his Letter to *Xystus* gives no Account of the *Rise of Sabellianism*; nor is there any Evidence, that it had its Rise in *Ptolemais* in *Egypt*. So Mr. *Lardner’s* invincible Argument falls of itself in the very Foundation of it. *Eusebius*, from whom Mr. *Lardner* has the Account of *Dionysius’s* Letter to *Xystus* wrote *A. D.* 257, does not say either that his Letters against *Sabellius* therein mentioned were wrote in the Pontificate of *Xystus*; or that in them he gave an Account of the Rise of *Sabellianism*. What *Eusebius* relates is very different. He says [*Hist. Eccles. B. 7. c. 6.*] that *Dionysius* in a Letter sent to *Xystus* about other Things, acquainted him in it, that the
Sabellian

Sabellian Heresy then greatly spread, and had been warmly agitated in *Ptolemis*, one of the Cities of *Pentapolis* in *Egypt*. That he had received Letters about it from both sides, *viz.* those who defended and those who oppos'd it: and that the Parties had debated the Point before him; and that he had wrote Letters upon the Subject, of which he then sent him Copies. These Letters are mentioned by *Eusebius*, [B. 7. c. 26.]

Now allowing this Letter of *Dionysius* to *Xystus* to have been wrote *A. D.* 257, or six Years after the Rise of the *Novatian* Schism, does it hence invincibly follow, that *Sabellius*, whose numerous Followers only are mentioned in it, had not propagated his Doctrine any where several Years before, or even in *Libya* and *Egypt*? This is not so easily prov'd, nor is it at all probable.

It does not appear how long it was before *Dionysius* sent his Letter to *Xystus*, that he had wrote against the *Sabellians*: it might be two or three Years before, as *Mr. Lardner* allows; and so within about three Years before the Schism of *Novatian*: But supposing the Letters wrote but the Year before, or even that very Year, it is still plain, that *Sabellianism* was not then just risen in *Egypt*; but was much spread and propagated, and was openly defended, which occasion'd *Dionysius* to write against it after he had heard it debated by both sides.

Sabellius himself was undoubtedly noted many Years before: and upon the Death of his Master

ster

fter *Noetus*, about *A. D.* 220, spread his Doctrine in several Parts of *Asia*; and might well be known at *Rome* several Years before the Schism of *Novatian*. Therefore *Sabellianism*; was probably propagated about *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, and other Parts of *Asia*, where it was first taught by *Noetus*, before it was carried into *Libya* and *Egypt*: and it might be known in *Egypt* before *Dionysius* was Bishop of *Alexandria* *A. D.* 248. and he speaks of it not as an Heresy just then risen, but which had made a Progress, and had many Favourers and Abettors. And this Account of *Eusebius* from *Dionysius* is well consistent with *Sabellianism*, being known and received in *Libya* and *Egypt* at least six or seven Years before the Letter was wrote to *Xystus*; and is no Argument at all that it was not known before the Schism of *Novatian*. Mr. *Lardner* has by no means given a just Representation of the Letter of *Dionysius* to *Xystus*, of which I gave a true Account, which he had before him*.

Nor is Mr. *Lardner* in his Relation consistent with himself: for in his Fourth Volume, p. 591. he

* Cum vero *Dionysius* coætaneus fuerit *Novatiano* potuit *Novatianus* ante lapsum in schisma *Sabellianæ* Hæreseos meminisse, contra quam non statim *avortam* sed *increbrescentem et late grassantem* — se opposuerat. Præfat. p. 17. The Words of *Eusebius* to which I refer are, *Σημαίνων δὲ ἐν ταυτῷ ἢ περὶ τῶν κατὰ Σαβέλλιον αἰρετικῶν ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιπολαζόντων.* — *περὶ γὰρ τῶν νῦν κινήσεως ἐν τῇ Πτολεμαίει τῆς Περσικῆς δόγματος,* &c. *Eccles. Hist. lib. 7. c. 6.*

he represents the Matter rightly, *viz.* “ That
 “ *Dionysius* informed *Xystus* of the great In-
 “ crease of the Sabellian Hereticks at that Time.”
 This sure is not the same as giving him an *Ac-*
count of the Rise of Sabellianism.

Having removed Mr. *Lardner's* Argument drawn from the Letter of *Dionysius* to *Xystus*, which any Reader may see makes nothing against my Date of *Novatian's* writing his Book of the Trinity, or my Account of the Rise of *Sabellianism*, being many Years before he fell into his Schism; I must remind Mr. *Lardner* of several direct Proofs, which I had given to confirm my Date of *Novatian's* Book; and which shew that it might be wrote several Years before the Time I have placed it, or before the Rise of his Schism. These Proofs Mr. *Lardner* has not endeavoured to reply to, tho' they lay before him.

I observ'd (p. 13.) that *Sabellius* was the most noted Disciple of *Noetus*; and after his Master's Death propagated his Doctrine with such Zeal, that it was from him call'd the *Sabellian* Heresy. Now *Hippolytus*, who wrote against *Noetus*, flourish'd, as I said, and as I find Mr. *Lardner* agrees (vol. 4. p. 438.) about *A. D.* 220. If he wrote at that time against *Noetus*, who, as appears from *Hippolytus*, was lately dead; and whose Doctrine was reviv'd by his Followers; this was thirty-one Years before the Schism of *Novatian*; and *Sabellius*, who was the most famous Disciple of *Noetus*, must then
 be

be known ; and no doubt was one of those who propagated his Master's Doctrine. *Epiphanius*, I also observ'd (p. 15.) agreed with *Hippolytus*, that the Disciples of *Noetus* propagated his Doctrine after his Death. I added (p. 14.) that supposing *Hippolytus* wrote against the *Noetians* A. D. 230, the Year in which he suffer'd Martyrdom ; this was twenty-one Years before the Schism of *Novatian* : in which time *Sabellius* must have been famous, and have spread his Doctrine both in lesser *Asia* and *Egypt* ; and it must have been known at *Rome* as the *Sabellian* Heresy. This Argument appeared to me decisive, that *Novatian* might have mention'd the *Sabellian* Heresy before he fell into his Schism, between which and the Rise of the *Sabellian* Heresy there was a Space of about thirty Years, and at least of twenty.

I farther added (p. 17, 18.) in Confirmation of my Argument the Authority of two ancient Chronologers, *Isidore Hispalensis*, and *Ado Viennensis*, who in their Chronicles agree to place *Sabellius* about A. D. 220. This Mr. *Lardner* takes notice of ; and instead of a proper Reply, takes a strange Liberty of supposing that these Authors meant *Noetus* by *Sabellius*. But Chronologers will never endure such arbitrary Suppositions ; all the Foundation that Mr. *Lardner* goes upon being a Pretence, that what they say agrees not with *Dionysius*, which I have shewn at large that it does ; or that it is not inconsistent with his Account.

Upon

Upon the whole, it is evident that *Novatian's* mentioning the *Sabellian* Heresy is no way inconsistent with his writing his Book of the Trinity on or before the Year 250. He might have mentioned it several Years before *A. D.* 251, when he became a Schismatic. And as there is nothing in his excellent Book, which favours the peculiar Notions he fell into upon his Schism, it is probable that it was wrote before his unhappy Separation from the Catholic Church.

2dly, Mr. *Lardner* has not passed a better Judgement on the Name of my Author, whom he will have call'd *Novatus*, and not *Novatian*, as I call him.

His principal and, we shall see, his only Argument for calling him *Novatus*, is, that *Eusebius* (whom he fancifully calls *Eusebe*) generally calls him so; and the Historian *Socrates* likewise after *Eusebius*. It is true and well known, that *Eusebius*, and some Greek Writers who followed him, do generally call him *Novatus*, confounding the Name of the Roman Presbyter *Novatian* with that of *Novatus* Presbyter of *Carthage*, who was his Cotemporary and Fellow-Schismatic. But even *Eusebius*, tho' he himself calls him *Novatus*, has preserved his true Name in his Seventh Book of Ecclesiastical History and Eighth Chapter: where he is call'd *Novatian* [*Νοβαλιανός*, or as other Copies read *Νοουαλιανός*, which is the same Reading, but no Copy has *Νοβάτος*, *Novatus*] in the Letter which
his

his Cotemporary *Dionysius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, wrote concerning his Schism to his Name-fake of *Rome*. *Dionysius* had reason to know his true Name much better than *Eusebius*; not only as being Cotemporary with *Novatian* and *Novatus*, but also having wrote Letters to them; and it is hard he should not know the Name of him he wrote to, whose Name also made so great a Noise in the whole Christian Church. That *Dionysius* in his Letter call'd the *Roman* Presbyter to whom he wrote, *Novatian*, is confirmed in the Chronography of *Georgius Syncellus*, who cites it, (p. 374.) and also by the History of *Nicephorus* (B. 6. c. 4.) where he is still call'd *Novatian* [*Novatianòs*] in the Letter of *Dionysius* to him, as also in that to his Name-fake Bishop of *Rome*. (c. 9.) This alone is a sufficient Confutation of all that Mr. *Lardner* has to alledge. But he is also called *Novatian* in the Chronicon of *Eusebius* translated by *Jerome*, (p. 175.) and *Sozomen*, in his Ecclesiastical History, calls the *Roman* Presbyter *Novatian* (*Novatianòs*, lib. 3. c. 8.) and so he is expressly against Mr. *Lardner*, tho' he has alledged him on his Side (p. 366.) But such things he can easily do, who alledgeth *Jerome* for calling the *Roman* Presbyter *Novatus* in the very place where he calls him *Novatian*, and distinguisheth him from *Novatus* Presbyter of *Carthage*. “ *Novatus*, says Mr. *Lardner*, Presbyter of the City of *Rome*, &c.” (p. 10.) where he translates the Words of *Jerome*, which

are [*Novatianus Romanæ urbis Presbyter*] *Novatian Presbyter of the City of Rome*. This *Novatian*, he * adds, “endeavouring to seize
 “ the Episcopal Chair in opposition to *Cornelius*, constituted the Sect of the *Novatians*,
 “ which is called in *Greek* the Sect of the
 “ *Cathari, Puritans*, not allowing penitent
 “ Apostates to be received into the Church.
 “ The Author of this Sect was *Novatus*, one
 “ of *Cyprian’s* Presbyters.” *Jerome* also says, that *Dionysius* called him *Novatian* in the † Letter which he wrote to him. And he constantly distinguisheth him from *Novatus*: and says, that the Book ‡ concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity was wrote by *Novatian*, whose Name it bears.

Jerome, who was the most learned of all the *Latin* Writers, and had liv’d several Years at *Rome*, could not be mistaken in the Name of a noted *Roman* Presbyter. But *Rufinus* also a learned *Italian* Writer, who was Cotemporary with

* *Novatianus Romanæ urbis presbyter adversus Cornelium cathedram sacerdotalem conatus invadere, Novatianorum, quod græce dicitur καθαρὸν (or καθαρῶν) dogma constituit, nolens Apostatas suscipere pœnitentes: hujus auctor Novatus Cypriani presbyter fuit. Catal. Script. Eccl. c. 70. p. 120. Edit. Martianay.*

† *Dionysius scripsit — et ad Novatianum causantem quod invitus Romæ Episcopus ordinatus esset: cujus Epistolæ hoc exordium est: Dionysius Novatiano fratri salutem, &c. Ibid. p. 119.*

‡ *Liber, cui titulus est, de Trinitate, nec Tertulliani liber est, nec Cypriani dicitur, sed Novatiani, cujus et inscribitur titulo. Apol. adv. Ruf. lib. 2. p. 415.*

with *Jerome*, and *Pacian* a *Spaniard*, who lived a little before them, do both call our Author *Novatian*. Mr. *Lardner* therefore is in a great Error in thinking that *Jerome*, in the Places where he mentions the Doctrine of *Novatus*, meant the *Roman* Presbyter, whom he has so carefully distinguish'd from him; on the contrary, he certainly meant *Novatus* of *Carthage*, in all the Places which Mr. *Lardner* refers to; and there needs no other Evidence of it than what I have before given from *Jerome* himself, who makes *Novatus* of *Carthage* the principal Author of the *Novatian* Sect: And this *Novatus* he supposes to have been a Writer, in his 56th Epistle to *Tranquillinus*, p. 589.

Mr. *Lardner's* Argument (p. 371.) that the Sect being called *Novatians*, must be so denominated from *Novatus*, and not *Novatian*, from which latter Name, he says, they would have been call'd *Novatianists*; whereas, he adds, they are always called *Novatians* from *Novatus*, who must therefore, he infers, be himself called *Novatian*. This Argument is so weak, that I wonder he should think it any thing to the purpose: and that he should alledge *Philastrius* and *Augustine* to confirm it (p. 370.) *Jerome* has told us, that *Novatus* of *Carthage* was the Author of the *Novatian* Sect call'd *Cathari*, i. e. *Puritans*: therefore they were so called from *Novatus* of *Carthage*, not of *Rome*. Can any thing

thing be more evident? *Augustine* * agrees with *Jerome*, and so does † *Philastrius*: and these *two material Witnesses*, as he calls them, both bear Testimony against him. I have given their Words below. Mr. *Lardner* should have prov'd that either *Philastrius* or *Augustine* had ever call'd *Novatus*, (from whom they say the *Novatians*, and *Cathari* were so call'd) a *Roman* Presbyter; and not have presum'd him to be the *Novatianus* so call'd, and that truly, who was a Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*. *Augustine* mentions *Novatian* by Name more than once; and surely Mr. *Lardner* does not think he meant *Novatus*: who then should he and *Philastrius* mean by *Novatus*, but the Presbyter of *Carthage*? And as the Sect was call'd *Novatians* from *Novatus* of *Carthage*, and generally bore that Name; so they are by *Cyprian*, who knew both their Names very well, call'd *Novatianenses*, *Novatianists*, from *Novatian*, the *Roman* Presbyter, just as Mr. *Lardner* supposes they would be call'd, tho' he says, they were never so call'd, or were *always call'd Novatians*. But *Cyprian* calls them *Novatianists*, and *Augustine* from him, as Mr. *Lardner* knows very well. See *Cyp. Epist.*

* *Cathari*, qui seipfos isto nomine, quasi propter Munditiam, superbissime atque odiosissime nominant, secundas nuptias non admittunt, pœnitentiam denegant, *Novatum* sectantes hæreticum: unde etiam *Novatiani* appellantur. De Hæres. c. 38.

† *Novatiani* surrexerunt post persecutionem postremam a *Novato* quodam, &c. Hæres. c. 82.

Epist. 73. to *Jubaianus*, p. 199. and *August. cont. Donatistas*, lib. 3. c. 12.

Thus Mr. *Lardner* is destitute of any Evidence from *Latin* Writers, for his new and strange Opinion, that the Name of the *Roman* Presbyter call'd *Novatian*, was really *Novatus*, contrary to the Testimony of the most ancient *Greek* and *Latin* Writers; and such as could not possibly mistake the Name.

But could Mr. *Lardner* have produc'd a Testimony from any later *Latin* Writer, what would it avail against the numerous plain and express Passages of *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, in many Epistles which he wrote on the Subject of the *Novatian* Schism, which rose in his Time, and was propagated in his Diocese: and many of which Epistles were wrote to the Bishop and Presbyters of *Rome*. *Cyprian* could no more mistake the Name of the *Roman* Presbyter whom he always calls *Novatian*, *Novatianus*; than he could mistake the Name of his own Presbyter, whom he calls *Novatus*: nor yet even less could the *Roman* Clergy mistake the Name of one of their own Presbyters, when they were sent by him to *Carthage* to acquaint *Cyprian* that he was ordain'd Bishop of *Rome*: in which Message they call him (*Novatianus*) *Novatian*. See *Epist.* 45. to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, p. 85. and *Epist.* 52. to the same Bishop, p. 95. *Edit. Amstel.* 1691.

The Testimonies of *Dionysius* amongst the *Greeks*, and of *Cyprian* amongst the *Latins*, are alone decisive and irrefragable Evidences, that the Name of the *Roman* Presbyter who wrote the incomparable and invaluable Book concerning the Doctrine of the *Trinity* was truly and undoubtedly not *Novatus* but *Novatian*: and Mr. *Lardner*'s Error about his Name has occasion'd great Confusion in his large Account of him; which he ought, I think, by all means to revise and correct: and I am sorry I had Occasion to make the precedent Remarks on so learned and valuable an Author.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

P. 9. l. 2. read supposes. p. 11. l. 31. r. κακὸν ἢ κατθανῶν; and after Prolegom. add, et excerpt.
 p. 481. p. 15. l. 23. r. this. p. 41. l. 22. r. them. p. 53. l. 13. r. thy. p. 73. l. 1. r. in it's. p. 75. l. 25. r. quid? p. 77. l. 31. r. præsidum. p. 83. l. 28, 29. r. εἶπω ἢ θάλασσα ἢ κεῖται ἢ. p. 90. l. 21. r. κολάσεις. p. 91. l. 13. r. πολαζομένως. p. 92. l. 7. r. Metempsychosis. l. 33. r. μηνύειν. p. 93. l. 22. r. μηνύων. p. 95. l. 15. r. State. p. 96. l. 23. r. ἐνθάδε. p. 100. l. 34. r. Appearances. p. 101. l. 30. r. ἄλλα τε δρώσι. p. 111. l. 14. r. Zippor.

A
D E F E N C E

Of a Book, intitl'd, The
BELIEF of a FUTURE STATE

Prov'd to be a
FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLE of the
Religion of the HEBREWS, &c.

Occasion'd by

Some Immoral Reflections on the Author and
his Writings, contain'd in the Second Part of
Mr. WARBURTON'S Remarks, &c.

In which DEFENCE alſo,

The Command of God to *Abraham*, to offer up his
Son, is fully confider'd, and clear'd from all
OBJECTIONS.

By JOHN JACKSON,
Rector of *Roffington*, in the County of YORK,
And Maſter of *Wigſton's Hoſpital*, in *Leiceſter*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN NOON, at the *White Hart*, near the
Poultry, in *Cheapside*. MDCCLVI.

A

D E F E N C E

Of a Book, intitled,

The Belief of a Future State proved
to be a fundamental Article of the
Religion of the HEBREWS, &c.

IN my late Book, intitled, The Belief of a Future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the *Hebrews*, &c. I declared my Purpose was to *shew*, that the Religion of the Hebrews or Jews was founded on the Principles of natural Religion, to which Revelation was added; and particularly, that the Belief of a Future State, or Life to come, was a primary fundamental Article of this Religion.

This was very clear and evident to me, and I endeavour'd to make it so to the Reader, without desiring or intending to enter into Controversy with any learned Person, who is or shall be of another Opinion; page 4.

I knew Mr. Warburton was of a different Opinion; and I had not Vanity to think, that he wou'd be any more convinc'd by my Writings, than I had been by his: This was not my View: But the Opinion I had of his Abilities and Manner of Writing, made me resolve not to mention either him or his Books at all, that he might have less Pretence to excite his hostile Spirit against me; and he wou'd now have pass'd unregarded by me, [who was determin'd to mind nothing but Argument, with which I knew he wou'd not trouble me] had his Reflections been ever so rude and unmannerly, for that I expected, if they had not also been *immoral* and *dishonest*.

The Case was this: After I had read his *Divine Legation*, so call'd, I found nothing in any Part of it of real Learning or solid Argument. All is a dark, confus'd Mass, without Light or Order; and the Whole so manag'd, as to expose the divine Mission of *Moses* under a Pretence of defending it; tho' I believe he did not see that Consequence when he first wrote: This was mere pardonable Ignorance; but as he must since have seen it, his Obstinacy and wilful Opposition to Truth is unpardonable.

To suppose, as he does, that the Nation of the *Jews* were not taught, nor did believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, is such a staring Absurdity, and if true, such a Presumption against a divine Revelation being made to them, as will render him who asserts it incapable of proving such a Revelation; and so must needs be a most preposterous and wrong-headed Way of proving the divine Mission and Authority of *Moses*.

Mr. *W.* himself confesseth, [*Div. Legat.* p. 241.] *that no Religion ever existed without the Doctrine of a future State.* He also says, [p. 438.] *that all Legislators, except Philosophers, taught and believ'd a future State of Rewards and Punishments, also that all Nations believ'd it.* Yet *Moses*, he thinks, who was no profess'd Philosopher, did not teach it, nor his People believe it. What a strange Circumstance is this, if true? that one who was wiser than the wisest of Pagan Legislators shou'd not teach a Doctrine which they both taught and believ'd, and a Doctrine so important, that no Religion ever existed, or can be supported without it; and that a People having not only the Use of natural Reason, but who were also *taught of God*, shou'd not believe what all Nations believ'd by the Light of Nature, and what is a necessary and fundamental Doctrine of Religion. This looks as if *Moses* (as his Enemies suggested) *had put out the Eyes of his People*; and had taken from them, or at least left

left them destitute of the greatest Support of Religion, *without which no Religion ever existed*, that he might support it by a far inferior Sanction, and such as never did, nor ever can effectually support Religion.

But the Belief of a God and Providence always infer'd the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, if the Apostle knew how to reason, *Heb. xi. 6*. And it is a true and *necessary* Inference drawn from the Nature and Attributes of God consider'd with the Nature and State of Mankind; and therefore it was the general Sense of Men at all Times, from the Beginning, of Jews and Pagans; and there never was a Nation or People known in the most ancient Ages, and before the Light of the Gospel appear'd, which did not believe a future State. So that I have wonder'd that Mr. *W.* shou'd have gain'd any Character for Learning from such Writings as he has publish'd, in Opposition to so plain a Truth; and which cannot be oppos'd without attacking Providence itself, as well as the Evidence of History and Revelation. He aims to carry his Point by mere Effrontery and ill Manners, without either Learning or Judgment: But he is mistaken; and the Age he writes in is too old for him by four or five Centuries; so that Books wrote in so unscholar-like and ungentleman-like a Manner, deserve not any Answer, or any Notice to be taken of them, but Contempt.

These were Reasons which engag'd me not to make any mention of him in my last Book ; but I thought the Subject, which had suffer'd and been abus'd by his ill-judg'd Management, deserv'd to be consider'd and defended.

I have therefore demonstrated both from Scripture and Reason, that *the Belief of a future State was a fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews*, which this Man has boldly deny'd. I have also shewn, that the ancient Philosophers did believe a future State, which this Author affirms, by a peculiar kind of Reasoning and Philosophy of his own, that they neither did or cou'd believe, although, he owns, they constantly taught and profess'd it ; and by which kind of Reasoning it is easy to prove, that Mr. *W.* neither does or can believe the Christian Religion.

He owns, [*Div. Legat.* p. 437, 438.] “ that
 “ as to the Legislators who were not Philoso-
 “ phers profess'd, by what can be learnt from
 “ their History and Character, it appears, that
 “ they all believ'd as well as taught a future
 “ State of Rewards and Punishments---not that
 “ we are to think they credited all the idle
 “ Fables wherewith it had been cloath'd, in
 “ order to lay hold of the gross Imaginations of
 “ the People.”

So he has nothing to charge the Philosophers with, as the Ground of their pretended Unbelief of this Doctrine, but only their Philosophy, which he calls *metaphysical Whimfies concerning*
 God

God and the Soul *, merely because he does not understand it; and yet he allows that these Philosophers constantly profess'd their Belief of this Doctrine, as well as the Legislators did; and they had the same Instructions concerning God and the Soul in the Mysteries, as the Legislators had, who there learn'd the Truth of this Doctrine, and believ'd it; and which was no other than a mere rational Explication of it divested of Fable, than that which was taught to

* Their metaphysical Whimsies (as he calls them) concerning God were; that there was but *one* supreme intelligent unoriginated Being indued with infinite Perfections, whom they call'd God, or τὸ Θεῖον. That no other intelligent Being or Agent was *equal* to him, or of the *same Nature* with him. And their metaphysical Whimsies concerning the Soul in the future State were, that the Souls of virtuous and godly Men after Death resided in some luminous Orb, which was the Mansion of their Happiness, and where they enjoy'd the Society of cœlestial Beings and other holy Persons, who had liv'd on Earth; and by divine *Knowledge, Faith* and *Virtue* were united to and had Communion with God, and were blessed with the *beatific Vision* of the divine Perfections. That the Souls of wicked and ungodly Men after Death were banish'd from the Communion both of God and all holy Persons; were associated with evil Dæmons, and condemn'd to a State of Misery and Punishment: These were the Doctrines concerning God and the Soul, which were taught in the Mysteries, and were the *Esoteric* Doctrines of the Philosophers. And these two different future States were also represented figuratively and *Esoterically*; the one by Regions of Light and delightful Entertainments of the Senses; and the other by Scenes of Horror and Darkness, wallowing in the Mire, and being terrify'd with dismal Sights, and tormented in Flames of Fire.

to the People. And supposing the Philosophers in their Explanations refin'd upon this Doctrinè, which was both reasonable in itself, and taught in the Mysteries by Priests who were also Philosophers, wou'd any Writer but this Author draw such a weak and absurd Inference, as that they neither did or cou'd believe it?

As our Author farther had ventur'd to dogmatize on other Parts of Literature, in which he is intirely ignorant, I gave a Sketch of the recondite Learning of the Pagans, merely to try his Talents that Way. I have shewn that he knows nothing of the *hieroglyphical* * Learning of the *Egyptians*, nor is vers'd in the Schools of the ancient Philosophers of *Greece* and *Italy*. If he has not quite exhausted his Stock, or has any left, let him produce it, having a Field given him to shew away in; but

* He is so little vers'd in the Knowledge of the *Egyptian* Hieroglyphics, as to think they were the first Letters or Characters made use of to convey the vulgar Language; whereas a Smattering in ancient Books wou'd have taught him, that elementary Letters were far older than Hieroglyphics; and that Hieroglyphics were so far from being us'd to express and convey the vulgar Language, that the Vulgar never understood them at all; and none but the Priests, or they who were initiated into the Mysteries, cou'd explain them; and also that they were intirely symbolical Figures, under which their philosophical and religious Notions only were contain'd. I have given an Account of them, p. 76, 77, 78. and all that this Author hath wrote about them, *Div. Legat.* Vol. II. p. 66—159. is mere Revery and Romance.

as he only rails, instead of making an Answer, it will convince all intelligent and unprejudic'd Readers, (but I was convinc'd before) that he is greatly deficient in Learning and Argument, as well as Manners; and so is forc'd, instead of playing the Scholar, to play the Fool.

Before I proceed to consider the *immoral* Reflections which Mr. *W.* has cast on me and my late Book, wrote in Defence of the *Jewish* Revelation, and upon some other Matters treated of in his Writings, I think it proper to explain more fully the Command of God to *Abraham*, to sacrifice his Son, in the Interpretation of which Mr. *W.* has signaliz'd himself, and is so confident of Success, as to venture, out of pure *Honesty*, as he says, to make an Objection to it himself, and which no one but himself can answer; and his Reply shews over and above the Sagacity and consummate Modesty of our Author.

His Interpretation of God's *tempting* or *trying* *Abraham's Faith* by commanding him to sacrifice his only and beloved Son, is this: "That
 " the Command was *merely* an Information by
 " Action instead of Words, of the great Sacrifice of the Redemption of Mankind, given
 " at the Request of *Abraham*, who long'd impatiently to see *Christ's Day*." And this Interpretation he builds on the Words of our Saviour, *John* viii. 56. where he tells the *Jews*, *Your Father Abraham rejoic'd to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad.* Div. Leg. p. 572.
 Again

Again he says: " The Command was *only* the
 " Conveyance of an Information by Action in-
 " stead of Words --- and that the Action being
 " *mere Scenery* --- it had no *moral* Import."
 See his Remarks, Part II. p. 110. And again,
 " The Act commanded was both in the Inten-
 " tion of God and in the Knowledge of *Abra-*
 " *ham a mere scenical Representation;*" p. 112.

This most extraordinary Interpretation, he
 supposes to be liable but to one plausible Ob-
 jection, which *he holds it not honest to conceal*;
 Pref. p. iii. *viz.* " That it is difficult to con-
 " ceive how a Circumstance of so much Im-
 " portance to Revelation, as the removing one
 " of the strongest Infidel Objections against its
 " Truth, and proving a real Connexion be-
 " tween the two Dispensations of it, should
 " never be clearly explain'd and insisted on by
 " the Writers of the New Testament; tho'
 " the Historian of the Old might have had
 " sufficient *Reason for concealing it.*" To which
he begs Leave to reply, " That it is very cer-
 " tain that many Truths of great Importance
 " for the Support of Religion against Infide-
 " lity, were taught by Jesus to his Disciples,
 " [amongst which, says he, I reckon this In-
 " terpretation to be one] which never came
 " down by their Conveyance to the Church.
 " But being by the Assistance of God's holy
 " Spirit *discoverable by those who devote them-*
 " *selves to the Study of the Scriptures with a*
 " *pure Mind,* have, for the wise Ends of Pro-

“vidence inscrutable to us, been left for the
 “Industry of Man to find out, that, as Occa-
 “sion requir’d, every Age might supply new
 “Evidence of God’s Truth *to put to silence the*
 “*Ignorance of foolish Men;*” p. iv. In the next
 Page *he presumes to have discovered* one of these
 important Truths unknown to the Church in
 all Ages, in his Interpretation of the Command
 to *Abraham*. And thus, *tertius è cælo cecidit*
Cato.

But I beg Leave to reply, that it is not the
 Way of the Writers of the New Testament to
 insist on Proofs from the Old Testament, which
 have no visible Foundation there, and more
 especially not to interpret the History of the
 Old Testament, so as to contradict the Letter
 and plain Sense of it; but it is their Way to
 explain the Prophecies, and to insist on other
 Proofs deliver’d there concerning the Messias.
 And this Author’s Explanation of the Com-
 mand to *Abraham* shews very plainly, that it
 was not reserv’d for his Discovery. And if there
 were no better Arguments to convince Unbe-
 lievers, than those he has offer’d, they must
 for ever continue Unbelievers for any thing he
 has said against them. But what, I pray, is
 the *strong infidel Objection* against God’s Com-
 mand to *Abraham*, which he pretends to re-
 move? I know of no real one that the History of
 it is liable to; tho’ I know of insuperable ones,
 which I shall produce presently, against his
scenical Interpretation. There is no Appearance
 of

of *Immortality* in the divine Command, nor can any *immoral* Inference be fairly drawn from it.

First, A Man must be void of natural Reason, that cannot see that God, the sole Proprietor of Life, might consistently with his Attributes deprive any of his Creatures of the Life he gave them, in what Manner, or by what Means he shou'd think fit. This is an evident Principle of natural Religion.

2dly, He must be equally void of Reason, who argues or shall argue, that *Abraham* cou'd not be fully and clearly satisfy'd that the Command to sacrifice his Son came from God, and was not, or cou'd not be a Delusion; because it is evident and demonstrative, that God by an immediate Impression from himself upon the human Mind, can give to it an Evidence of his Will equal to that which natural Reason does or can give us in any Case of Truth or Morality, that is, equal to Self-Evidence or Intuition. So there is no Difficulty there.

3dly, He must be full as void of Sense or Reason, who does or shall argue, that this Command gave any Countenance to human Sacrifices. They who believ'd that *Abraham* had such a Command from God, and was by the same God forbid to execute it, and therefore knew that God intended it only as a Trial of his Faith and Obedience: These, I say, cou'd not think the Command gave Countenance to human Sacrifices, not only without any Com-
mand

mand from God, but contrary also to the divine Intention in the Case of *Abraham*. This, I hope, is also clear.

Nor, 4thly, could others, who either knew nothing of the Command, or did not believe it, think it justify'd their human Sacrifices, which were not offer'd to God, but to dead Men or deify'd Heroes, who in their Life-time delighted in Wars and Slaughter. And the Foundation of these inhuman Sacrifices was, no Doubt, originally a Delusion of wicked Spirits, who perswaded their superstitious Votaries, that these Sacrifices were acceptable to the cruel and savage Idols whom they worshipp'd. These were probably older than *Abraham*; and the Command to him, taken in any View, could give no Handle or Countenance to them.

But now, according to Mr. *W.*'s Interpretation of God's Command to *Abraham* to sacrifice his Son being a *mere scenical Representation*, which *Abraham* before-hand knew very well how it would end, would any one imagine he had look'd into his Bible, or that the Scriptures had said, that it was a *Trial of Abraham's Faith and Obedience*? *Moses* says, *Gen. xxii. 1, 2.* that *God tempted* (or *try'd*) *Abraham*, when *he commanded him to take his Son, and offer him for a Burnt-Offering*; and *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. xi. 17, 19. writes, *By Faith Abraham, when he was try'd, offer'd up Isaac --- accounting that God was able to raise him*

him up even from the Dead. Is this consistent with a mere *scenical Representation*, the Design and End of which was known to *Abraham*? Had this been all, it would be absurd to say, that God *tempted* or *try'd Abraham*, when there was no Trial at all; or that *Abraham by Faith* offer'd up his Son, if he knew that he was not to be really offer'd. And certainly, had *Abraham* known the Intention of God, that his Son shou'd not be sacrific'd, he would not, as *Moses* relates, have *stretch'd forth his Hand, and taken the Knife* (with Purpose) to *slay his Son*, Gen. xxii. 10. And that he did intend to slay him is evident from the Apostle's saying, that *he accounted* [or thought or reason'd with himself] *that God was able to raise him up from the Dead.* This demonstrates, contrary to Mr. *W.*'s Interpretation and Assertions, that *Abraham* did not know the * Intention of God, but thought it was, that he shou'd sacrifice his Son;

* Mr. *W.* p. 111. cites his own Words from Dr. *Stebbing*, and says, " That *Abraham* very well understood " how the *scenical* Representation was to end --- and must " needs conclude, either that God wou'd stop his Hand, " when he came to give the sacrificing Stroke, or that --- " his Son sacrific'd in the *Person of Christ* was immediately to be restor'd to Life." Here Mr. *W.* says, that *Abraham* understood very well how the *scenical* Representation was to end; and this he shews by owning in the next Words, that he knew not how it would end: For, says he, he must needs conclude, either that God would stop the sacrificing Stroke, or that, if he did not, his Son would be immediately restor'd to Life; and thus

Son; and therefore was prepar'd to do it in Obedience to his Command, trusting the Event to God, who he knew was able to raise him up from the Dead. This is the plain Account of the Command to *Abraham*, which was given, as the Scripture assures us, for a Trial of his Faith and Obedience in a most difficult Case, to make him an Example of these Virtues to all his Descendants: And the promis'd Reward which God confirm'd to him by an Oath, was
as

Abraham very well understood the End of the Scenery. *Q. E. D.* that is, *Abraham* knew the End of the Matter very well, argues *Mr. W.* because he knew his Son was to be sacrific'd, or that he was not. Commend me to such an acute Logician, who can prove that a Thing must either be or not be; and by that can prove, that he knows very well how it will be. But if *Abraham* knew how the Scenery was to end, and that God would revoke his Command, and not suffer *Isaac* to be sacrific'd, which was the End of the Matter, what Ground had he to reason with himself, and to conclude either that God would not suffer him to slay his Son, or, if he did, would immediately restore him to Life? It is therefore plain and certain, that *Abraham* did not know how the Command to offer up his Son wou'd end: He knew nothing, but that *Isaac* was to be really offer'd and slain; but God knew and intended that he should not be slain. *Abraham's* Intention was to slay *Isaac*, and God's Intention was, that he should not slay him.

But this is not all which is to be observ'd: *Abraham's* Son, according to *Mr. W.* was to be sacrific'd in the Person of *Christ*. One would think, if the Sacrifice of *Isaac* had any Relation to the Sacrifice of *Christ*, that just on the contrary to what he says, *Christ* was representatively sacrific'd in the Person of *Isaac*, and not *Isaac* in the Person of *Christ*. But our Author is one of the Family of the Wrong-Heads.

as great as his Faith and Obedience had been. *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this Thing, and hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son; that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea-shore; and thy Seed shall possess the Gate of his Enemies: and in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, because thou hast obey'd my Voice,* Ver. 16, 17, 18. This Promise is here made to *Abraham*, because *he obey'd God's Voice* or Command; yet says *Mr. W.* there was *no moral Import* in it; it was a *mere scenical Representation* of the Sacrifice of Christ for our Redemption, made at the Request of *Abraham*, and the End of which he knew beforehand. Thus his Discovery is a plain and downright Contradiction to Scripture; quite destroys both the Faith and Obedience of *Abraham*, so illustriously display'd and rewarded, and makes him act a mere scenical Part, the Plot of which God had told him beforehand. And thus the most meritorious Act of Faith and Obedience that was ever done by any mere mortal Man, is divested, by his Interpretation, of all its moral Virtue, and turn'd into *mere Scenery*.

Let us next examine the Foundation of our Author's great Discovery, which is almost as extraordinary as the Discovery itself. He builds it on the Words of our Saviour, *Your Father Abraham rejoic'd to see my Day, and he saw*

it, and was glad, John viii. 56. In this Text, he has discover'd that the Word *Day* has no Relation *to Time*, and does not mean (as vulgar Interpreters understand it) the Appearance or Coming of Christ to bless all Nations, as was promis'd to *Abraham*; which Interpretation one wou'd think was easy and natural. No! but *Day*, he says, means the great Sacrifice of Christ's Death for our Redemption: And for this Interpretation he is not beholden to Language or common Sense, but to something, as he intimates, little short of Inspiration.

Shou'd I indulge his Imagination, and allow him, that the Word *Day* has no Reference *to Time* in the Text, but refers to the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, he wou'd be as far as ever from proving from it, that the History of the Command of God to *Abraham* was a *mere scenical* Representation of this Sacrifice. This Interpretation is plainly contrary both to the Old and New Testament Account of it, as I have shewn. Surely God, after he had try'd *Abraham*, and found him faithful, might reveal to him the Coming of the Messias, who was to be his Seed; and might reveal also, for aught we know, that he was to be a Sacrifice for Sin and for Man's Redemption: There is no Absurdity in this; tho' it cannot be inferr'd from the Words of our Saviour above cited; nor if true, will it favour our Author's Scenery at all. But if we take Scripture for our Guide and

Inter-

Interpretation of the Word *Day*, then *seeing the Day of Christ* does plainly and literally mean no more than seeing his Coming to be the Saviour of the World; and it must be exceeding Joy to *Abraham* to see or foreknow, that the Christ of God, *in whom all Nations were to be blessed*, should be *his Seed*, and descend from him. That Christ was the Seed of *Abraham*, and that *Abraham* knew of his Coming, is a Scripture Truth; but we are not beholden to any Discovery of Mr. *W.*'s for it.

The *Day of Christ* or *Day of the Lord* has in Scripture always a Respect to Time, *viz.* of the *Coming, Revelation* or *Appearance* of him. In *Luke* i. 80. the Time of the Baptist's Coming to preach Repentance to the *Jews* is called *the Day of his shewing unto Israel*. And the *Day of the Son of Man* is the Day or Time of his *Revelation* and *Coming* to take Vengeance on the *Jews* for their Infidelity. *Luke* xvii. 22, 24, 30. so *Philip* i. 6, 10. *2 Thess.* ii. 2. *2 Pet.* iii. 10, 12. so again, *1 Cor.* v. 5. *2 Cor.* i. 14. *1 Thess.* v. 2. And thus it constantly means in the Old Testament; and all these explain *John* viii. 56. *viz.* that *Abraham* desired earnestly to see the *Day* or the *Coming* of Christ to bless all Nations; and he saw it (afar off) and was glad. But there is no Text wherein *Day* signifies (as Mr. *W.* says it does, p. 13. and often repeats it) *the great Sacrifice of Christ*. It has always a Respect to Time: And to think that the *Sacrifice* of Christ's Death is meant by

the *Day of Christ* in the Text of St. *John*, is a wild Supposition without any Foundation either in the Language or Sense of Scripture.

But Mr. *W.* has, he thinks, still something left to favour his Interpretation; and he tries to make St. *Paul* speak for it by mangling and misunderstanding what he says, *Acts* xxvi. 22, 23. where in his Defence he testifies before King *Agrippa*, that in his preaching the Gospel of Christ he had said *no other Things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say shou'd come* [or more literally, *which the Prophets did say shou'd come to pass, and Moses also*] *that Christ shou'd suffer, and that he shou'd be the first who shou'd rise from the Dead, and shou'd shew Light unto the People* [of the Jews] *and to the Gentiles.* A Man would be a little puzzled to find out how these Words favour his Interpretation of the Command to *Abraham*: The Words do plainly and naturally imply, that the several Things here mention'd relating to Christ were foretold in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets; not that *Moses* or any particular Prophet had foretold them all: It was sufficient, if *Moses* had foretold some of the Parts, and other Prophets the other Parts of the Character and Office of Christ. But Mr. *W.* to serve his Turn, and to give Credit to his Discovery of the Sense of God's Command to *Abraham*, stops short at the Words, that Christ *shou'd rise from the Dead*; and then, as if St. *Paul* had meant that the Death and Resurrection
of

of Christ was foretold by *Moses* particularly, he says, *now where, let me ask, in all his (Moses's) Writings, except in the Command to Abraham, is there the least Trace of any such Circumstance, as that Christ shou'd suffer, and that he shou'd be the first that shou'd rise from the Dead? Or in that Command either, if not understood according to our Interpretation?* Pref. p. vi. If our Author hath studied the Scriptures, as he tells us, *with a pure Mind*, it is however evident, he has not studied them with a clear Head: For it is plain and certain, that in the Command to *Abraham*, even according to his Interpretation, there is not the least Trace of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, but only as being typify'd or represented in the offering up of *Isaac*, and his Deliverance from the intended Death; and this Representation is far more rational according to the common Interpretation, than his is. Who denies, that in the Intention of God the offering up of *Isaac* was a Pre-representation or Type of the real Sacrifice of Christ, and this without any of his foolish Scenery? But had he fairly apply'd the whole of what *St. Paul* said was foretold by *Moses* and the *Prophets*, viz. that Christ should not only die and rise from the Dead, but should also *shew Light unto the People and to the Gentiles*; he would not have been able to shew *the least Trace* of this last Circumstance in the Command to *Abraham*, tho' understood according to his Interpretation. If he thought that

St.

St. *Paul* meant, that all the Circumstances concerning Christ which he said were foretold by *Moses* and the *Prophets*, were contain'd in the Writings of *Moses*, why did he drop the Circumstance of the Gospel being preach'd to Jews and Gentiles, and that they should be converted to the Religion of Christ, which is meant by *his shewing Light to them*? There is as much Reason and more to apply this Circumstance to the Writings of *Moses*, than the preceding, because it is clearly and distinctly foretold in them; but the other Circumstances are not; nor did St. *Paul* mean to say that they were, but only that they were contain'd in the Writings of the *Prophets*, as they plainly are. Mr. *W.* therefore, to serve a Turn, has misapply'd or perverted the Sense of St. *Paul*, and apply'd to the Writings of *Moses* what properly belongs to the Writings of the *Prophets*; and has dropt the Part that really is contain'd in the Writings of *Moses*, because it would not suit his Purpose, or Interpretation of God's Command to *Abraham*. This is the Effect of his *Discovery*. But what St. *Paul* says was foretold concerning Christ in the Writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*, is plainly contain'd in them; one Part in the Prophecies of *David*, *Isaiab* and *Daniel*, which relates to his *Sufferings*, *Death* and *Resurrection*; and this not figuratively or representatively only, but directly and in plain and express Terms, as I have shewn in other Writings, and which any one who is but

a very little vers'd in the Prophetic Scriptures, may easily see : And the latter Part or Circumstance is directly predicted in the Writings of *Moses*. *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his Feet, until Shiloh* [i. e. as the ancient Jews themselves expound it, *the Messiah*] *come ; and unto him shall the Gathering of the People* [Jews and Gentiles] *be*, Gen. xlix. 10. Here it is foretold, that Christ should *shew Light to the People and to the Gentiles*, who should be gather'd or converted to his Religion. Again, *Deut. xviii. 15, 18. Moses* foretels concerning Christ, *The Lord thy God shall raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me ; unto him shall ye hearken ; --- and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him*. In these Passages it is foretold, as well as in the Prophets also, [*Isai. xlii. 6. xlix. 6.*] concerning Christ, that he should preach the Word of God to the People of the Jews as *Moses* had done, and that the Gentiles also should embrace his Religion : This *St. Paul* meant by his *shewing Light to the People and to the Gentiles*. But with regard to typical and figurative Predictions of the Death and Resurrection of Christ [which have no Place in the Words of *St. Paul*, and which Words therefore have nothing to do with *Mr. W.'s* Discovery] there are several in the Writings of *Moses*, and apply'd to Christ by the Writers of the New Testament. Thus the Sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb related by *Moses* was a Figure or
 typical

typical Representation of the Sacrifice of Christ *the Lamb of God*; and St. *John* supposes that the Death of Christ was predicted by it, Chap. xix. 36. The annual propitiatory Sacrifice at which the High Priest entered with the Blood into the Holy of Holies, was a Type or Representation of Christ's Death as a Sacrifice for Sin, and of his Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven, as I shewed, p. 57, 58, 59. And the daily Sacrifice of a Lamb Morning and Evening, for which every one of the Children of *Israel* paid Half a Shekel, which is said to *make an Atonement for their Souls*, Exod. xxx. 15. may well be also thought a Pre-representation of the Death of Christ the Lamb of God, the Price of Man's Redemption. These more strongly prefigur'd the Death of Christ, as being a real Sacrifice, and a Sacrifice for Sin, than the offering up of *Isaac*, who did not really suffer Death; nor was any Atonement represented by it.

What now is become of Mr. *W.*'s Discovery of the Death and Resurrection of Christ being no where to be found typify'd or represented in the Writings of *Moses*, but only in the Command to *Abram*? and there only, he pretends, *by a mere scenical Representation*, without any *moral Import*? Must we not conclude, that his important Discovery is all a mere Dream, and his *Scenery* fit only for poetical Fiction?

But

But he has an Objection against the common Interpretation of the Command to *Abraham* to offer up his Son; for he denies that in that Interpretation *Abraham and his Family* were effectually warn'd against offering *human Sacrifices*, by God's revoking the Command: His Reason is; he says, *they were prejudic'd in favour of human Sacrifices; the one, viz. Abraham, by his Education in his Country Religion [infected, as he says, with this horrid Superstition] the other, by their Communication with their Pagan Neighbours --- and would be naturally tempted to think as favourably of human Sacrifices, as those Pagans were, who understood that Diana required Iphigenia, tho' she accepted an Hind in her stead.* P. 107, 109. And as if he had done a Feat, and made an Objection that no-body could answer but himself, finally leaves it to his *Readers*.

I believe a sensible Infidel would be glad to see how this Objection can be answered by his Interpretation; (tho' there is not the least Difficulty in answering it) for he does not deny, that God gave the Command to *Abraham* to offer up his Son, and also that had he so pleas'd, he might have suffer'd him to have executed it, as he was ready to have done; and therefore God's accepting a Ram instead of *Isaac* does not, by our Author's Interpretation, and according to his Reasoning, effectually condemn human Sacrifices; but they might think favourably of them notwithstanding, had they

like other Pagans *been prejudic'd in their Favour*. For it is nothing to the Purpose to say, (or to prove, if he could) that God was only representing to *Abraham* the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, upon his having before requested it: Might not (will the Infidel object) God represent a Thing by the Symbol of a Sacrifice which he approv'd of? Or does it not rather shew, (might they say who were prejudic'd in favour of human Sacrifices) that God approv'd of them, since he chose to represent a future human Sacrifice to be made by his Appointment, by commanding *Abraham* to offer up his Son? Had he not approv'd, or had he condemn'd all such Sacrifices, he would, say they, have represented the future human Sacrifice of Christ, not by commanding *a Man* to be sacrific'd, but a *Lamb* or a *Kid*: These would have serv'd for *a mere scenical Representation* of Christ's Sacrifice, as well as the offering up of *Isaac*: And tho' God accepted a Ram instead of him, he might have accepted of him, if he had pleas'd; and did not, when he revok'd his own Command, condemn at the same Time human Sacrifices: And to they who were prejudic'd in their Favour, and had before thought them acceptable unto God, might still have thought them to be so. So this Objection might be left to Mr. *W.* as he leaves it to his candid Readers.

But now, tho' Mr. *W.* cannot answer this Objection, yet there is really nothing in it.

Human

Human Sacrifices of innocent Persons being a gross Violation of the Law of Nature, and evident Murder, can never be acceptable unto God; but must be abominable in his Sight, as most opposite to his Benignity and Goodness. So that there can be no possible Plea for offering such Sacrifices, but an immediate Command from God, the original Proprietor of Life, who alone knows in what Case it may be fit to dispense with the great Law of Nature, and take away the Life of an innocent Person: And tho' there may be in the Course of Providence, inscrutable by us, Reason for God to command an human Sacrifice to be offered to him; yet we have no Reason to think, that he ever intended to permit such a Sacrifice to be offered: He never commanded it but in one Instance that we know of, and that for a Trial only of *Abraham's Faith*, and would not suffer his own Command to be executed; which shews, that an human Sacrifice was never acceptable unto him. And it is impossible, without the grossest Abuse of Reason and human Nature, for any to infer from this Instance, that God would approve, or would not condemn such an horrid Superstition. So that *Abraham* and his Family, after they had left the *Chaldean* Idolatry, and were Worshippers of the true God, could not be prejudic'd in favour of this or any other Superstition which they had abandon'd.

Abraham by Revelation from God left his own Country, that he might not be infected with the Superstition of it; and thenceforth both he and his Family were Worshippers of the true God only. So that Mr. *W.* does great Injury to *Abraham's* Family, in supposing it was too apt to fall into Idolatry, and would be naturally tempted to think as favourably of human Sacrifices as other Pagans did. What! were *Abraham's* Family no better instructed in true Religion than other Pagans were, not even after they became Worshippers of the true God? Were they after that, thinks he, as naturally tempted to think favourably of the very worst Part of Superstition, that is, human Sacrifices, as those Pagans were who offered them in honour of *Diana*? Had they ever thought favourably of this Superstition, they must have known better and abhor'd it, after they had forsaken the Worship of those Idols to whom such Sacrifices were offered.

But it is more injurious still in this rash Writer to say, that it appears from Scripture, that *Abraham's* Family were but too apt to fall into Idolatry. This is a gross Abuse of that Father of the Faithful and Friend of God, of whom God himself bears this Testimony; I know him, that he will command his Children, and his Household after him, and they shall keep the Way of the Lord, &c. Gen. xviii.

After all, Mr. *W.*'s Supposition of *Abraham* and his Family being prejudic'd in favour of human Sacrifices by the Religion of his Country, has no Foundation in History. Tho' *Chaldæa* was an idolatrous Country, yet the Superstition of human Sacrifices was not practis'd in it either in *Abraham's* Time or many Centuries after. *Phile Judeus*, in his History of *Abraham*, p. 370, Edit. Paris 1640. tells us, that the *Chaldeans* did not offer human Sacrifices; nor is there any Evidence, that human Sacrifices were any where offered in or before the Time of *Abraham*, but in *Phœnicia*, from whence they were in After-Times carried into *Egypt*, *Greece*, *Africa*, *Italy*, and other Countries: So the very Foundation on which our Author's Objection is laid, being unsound, sinks of itself: And just on the contrary to what he says, *Abraham* and his Family knew nothing of human Sacrifices before they came into *Canaan*, and could not but be shock'd at the Impiety and Cruelty of them; and this would make the Command of God more trying to *Abraham*, and which nothing but the surest Evidence of the Command coming from God, and the firmest Faith and Trust in him, could have made him resolve to obey.

Thus the Command of God to *Abraham* is clear of all Difficulties; and the Immorality and Impiety of human Sacrifices have not the least Countenance from it, any more than if no such Command had been given.

I proceed to consider that Part of Mr. *W.*'s Remarks, which relates more particularly to me and my Writings. What he says, is contain'd in about fifty Lines, wherein is more *Weakness* and *more Meanness*, than can easily be found in so many Pages of any other Writer of the lowest Class. However, for the sake of vindicating *St. Paul* as well as myself, from his Abuse, I will transcribe his Words, partly for the Entertainment of the Reader with his Reasoning, and partly to shew the Spirit of the Man.

He introduces his Remarks [p. 2.] with this Grimace, *viz. That he would willingly avoid all Controversy, so far as is consistent with a Regard to the Public; to which he has thought fit to appeal; and to which consequently [says he] I have given a Kind of Right to expect either an Answer to all material Objections, or a Confession of their Force.* Thus *the Public* (as every Mountebank will tell you) is greatly interested in his Drugs, which he vends merely out of Regard to the public Good.

But is the Republic of Letters any way concern'd in his Writings? Have they receiv'd any Benefit or Knowledge from them? Or has he any Voucher or Attestation to shew from the Society of the Literati? I believe *this Public* are well satisfy'd, that he neither can answer any material Objections which have been made to his Writings, and that he is not ingenuous enough to confess the Force of them. The
Public

Public has seen so much of him, as to expect nothing from him of real Learning and Argument, or any Thing but bad Reasoning and rude Behaviour: It is thus that he *answers*, and thus that *he confesses the Force of the Objections* of his Adversaries.

To excuse his entering into a *serious Dispute* with me, he ridiculously tells his Reader, p. 2. that I am one “ who *cannot see, and therefore* “ with a modest Boldness peculiar to the Blind “ affirm, there is not the least Connexion be- “ tween the two Propositions, an extraordinary “ Providence, and the Omission of a future “ State.” To which he answers, “ that with “ the same Quickness of Sight he makes no “ Doubt I would affirm, that there is not the “ least Connexion between the old *English Ho-* “ nour and the long Omission of a Qualifica- “ tion Law for Members of the House of “ Commons; and am therefore to be referr’d “ to the Class of those whom he sends for an “ Answer to the Story of *Bertrand* and his “ *Reading Glasses.*”

The *Public* by this small Specimen sees the great Use of *Bertrand's Glasses*, by the Help of which our Author *without Reading* is able at one View to answer all the Objections which are contain'd in the Writings of his Adversaries; * and not only so, but is able by their
Virtue

* He confesses himself to be what he elegantly calls an *Answerer by Profession*, writing what he call *Answers without*

Virtue to foresee what any of them had to object, and to answer their Objections beforehand. Therefore citing a Part of the Title of my Book, he says, [p. 3.] “ That the Reader
 “ will see that all my Objections, even to the
 “ very *Blunders*, have been obviated or answer’d
 “ by him long ago.” And to shew his Regard to the Public, and do more than he promis’d, he adds; “ An Instance of this, as it now
 “ happens to lie before me, will not be *unen-*
 “ *tertaining* ;” then he cites my Words, *viz.*
As a future State may be demonstrably deduc’d from Principles of natural Reason, so IT IS
 CONTAIN’D in the Proposition laid down by St. Paul : *He that cometh to God, (as a Worshipper of him) must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of those who diligently seek him, Heb. xi. 6.*

The Remarker *entertains* the Public with his Observations on these Words as follows: “ His
 “ Argument [says he] requires him to mean
 “ *necessarily contain’d* ; but before that can be
 “ shewn, it must be prov’d, that God CAN-
 “ NOT in this World reward those who dili-
 “ gently seek him: And he who should go
 “ about to prove that, would go near to con-
 “ tradict all which *Moses* has said in the Sanc-
 “ tion

out reading over the Books he writes Answers to, as he owns Append. to first Remarks, p. 151. But I think he might have left that (which is obvious enough) for others to observe, without bewraying himself.

“ tion of his Law, that God not only could,
 “ but would reward those in this World who
 “ diligently seek him *. But [he adds for Il-
 “ lustration] St. *Paul* knew what he said, tho’
 “ this Man does not: He knew the Proposi-
 “ tion did not necessarily, but *might or might*
 “ *not contain a future State*, just as the Writer
 “ apply’d it; and he deliver’d it accordingly.
 “ First, as he was an *exact* Reasoner; because
 “ (*N. B.*) *the Support of Religion depends not*
 “ *on Rewards here or hereafter; but on the equal*
 “ *Distribution of them*, wheresoever they are

* What then, has *Moses* any where said that God would reward in this World *only* those who diligently seek him? If *Moses* has not said any Thing like this, our Remarker’s Inference is quite absurd; and what he says, goes near to contradict *Moses*, is perfectly consistent with every Thing he has said in his Law. For cannot our Remarker see, that the Belief of a future State may be a *necessary* Support of Religion, tho’ God may also confer temporal Blessings on his true Worshippers, when and as he shall see fit; since these earthly Blessings are neither the certain or only Rewards of Virtue and Piety, or were ever design’d by God to be so? And therefore the Apostle may surely mean, that such a Belief is necessary for every true Worshipper of God to be endued with, and might truly say, that *without this Faith it is impossible to please God*, ver. 6. And farther, that which *may be demonstrably deduc’d from Principles of natural Reason*, [as he dares not deny but a future State may] surely is a *necessary* Article or Doctrine, if it be at all an Article or Doctrine of Religion. This only by the Way; for our Remarker’s Reasoning on one Hand, and the Apostle’s on the other Hand, will be set in a full Light.

“ conferr’d. Secondly, he was a *pertinent*
 “ Reasoner; because he would include the
 “ Sanction of the *Mosaic* as well as *Christian*
 “ Religion: The first of which, as he tells us
 “ elsewhere, had the Promise of the Life that
 “ now is; the other, *of that which is to come.*
 “ This Blunder, (he goes on) as the Reader
 “ may remember, was expos’d in the first Part
 “ of these Remarks, p. 164. But (he adds)
 “ I would recommend Mr. *Jackson’s* whole
 “ Pamphlet to his (the Reader’s) Perusal, as a
 “ *Specimen of that illustrious Band* in which he
 “ has thought fit to enlist, and which indeed
 “ would have been imperfect without this An-
 “ swerer General, *who has all his Life long op-*
 “ *pos’d himself to whatever receiv’d the public*
 “ *Approbation:* And after having written a-
 “ gainst the *Enquiry into the Nature of the hu-*
 “ *man Soul*, does me too much Honour to be
 “ intirely overlook’d; which however it is pro-
 “ bable he had been, but for these Words in
 “ his Title Page --- *the Doctrine of the ancient*
 “ *Philosophers concerning a future State shewn*
 “ *to be consistent with Reason.* This the Re-
 “ marker calls a *vile Insinuation*, intimating,
 “ that he had written something against the
 “ Reasonableness of that Doctrine.”

Thus he has paid *his Regard to the Public*,
 and *entertain’d* them, either with an *Answer to*
my Objections, or with a *Confession of the Force*
of them. But our witty and modest Remarker
 has by his Observations *entertain’d* the Public
 much

much more than he design'd; for it is all at his own Cost, as we shall now see.

First, he charges me with not being able to *see* the Connexion between the two Propositions; *an extraordinary Providence, and the Omission of a future State*; but having a Piece of his Wit to give me, instead of an Argument in Proof of such Connexion, and that he might have a Pretence to send me to *Bertrand's* Reading Glasses, which is our Doctor's infallible Cure for all those who do not see exactly as he does; or, in other Words, are not as blind as himself; he insinuates to the Reader, that I said, *I cannot see*, which he puts in Italic Characters for a Blind; and without this his Joke is lost.

Now I did not say, that *I cannot see* the Connexion between an extraordinary Providence and the Omission of a future State; for who says, *he cannot see* that *two and two* are equal to *ten*? I said therefore, *that there is not the least Connexion* between the two Propositions, which I see as clearly that there is not, as I see that *twice two* are not equal to *ten*. And I can with as much Reason and good Argument infer *ten* from the Addition of *two to two*, as he can infer an extraordinary Providence from the Omission of a future State: And this, which is the Basis of *his Divine Legation of Moses*, is a self-evident Blunder and intuitive Paradox. So that Mr. *Warburton's* Wit is like Mettle in a blind Horse, which frequently makes him

run his Head against a Post. So much for his Joke. But had I said, I cannot see the Connexion between the two Propositions before-mentioned, is it any Wonder, since he himself has labour'd thro' many hundred Pages to make it *visible*, and has not given the least Glimpse of Light whereby to see it? but instead of that, has rais'd such a Dust, as is enough to make it invisible, if it was ever so plain to be seen before. One would think he uses *Bertrand's* Glasses only in the Dark, in Hopes to see what no-body else can see, or can be seen. But this I do see, that the Supposition of the Omission or Ignorance of a future State under the *Mosaic* Dispensation, is a strong Argument against an extraordinary Providence being administered under that Dispensation.

As it cannot be suppos'd, that God would reveal his Will to a Nation of Atheists, or command the Worship of himself to those, who did not believe his Existence and Providence; so it cannot be suppos'd, that he would make a Revelation to those who did not believe a future State, which is a fundamental Article of Religion, and immediately connected with the Belief of the Existence and Providence of God. Therefore if God be suppos'd to have given a Religion and Law to the *Jews*, it cannot but be suppos'd, that they believ'd his Existence and Providence, and in consequence of it, the Doctrine of a future State:

State: Or if they could be suppos'd not to have believ'd this Doctrine, it must have been taught in a Religion which came from God; or else a Divine Religion would have wanted a fundamental and necessary Article of true Religion. So that an extraordinary Providence cannot subsist with the Omission or Ignorance of a future State. *Q. E. D.* And this overthrows all that Mr. *W.* has wrote on the Subject.

Farther, the Supposition of a future State not being an Article of the Religion of the *Hebrews*, or taught by *Moses*, and that they were wholly under a temporal Dispensation, makes that Religion to be in Reality a mere political Scheme, and not a religious Institution.

For if the *Jews* were not taught to regard any Laws, or that they lay under any other Obligation, but the Sanctions of the Law of *Moses*, and that they were to expect these Sanctions to be no other than temporal Rewards and Punishments; how can this be call'd Religion? There are, on this Supposition, under it no Fears to deter the most Wicked and Unjust beyond this Life; nor any Hopes of future Happiness to reward righteous and just Men for their Piety and good Works. Nay, they could not be under the Sanctions to be administred in a future State, or capable of being judg'd, and rewarded or punish'd there, if they were under a mere temporal Dispensation,

tion, and had no Knowledge of a future State. And what Provision in this Case was to be made for injur'd or oppress'd Virtue and afflicted Piety? Or on the other Hand, what Discouragement to successful Wickedness and prosperous Impiety? Many * Cases of both these happen'd under the Law of *Moses*; and therefore to suppose it destitute of the greatest and most powerful Sanctions of all Religion, without which no Religion ever did exist, is to suppose it unworthy of God to give, and of rational Creatures to be under. Thus an extraordinary Providence or Divine Revelation is so far from being connected with the Omission of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, that it is absolutely inconsistent with it.

But

* There is not the least Ground from Scripture to infer, that an *equal* or *extraordinary* Providence in respect of *particular Persons* was administered amongst the *Jews*; but the contrary most evidently appears.

The Scripture tells us how God suffer'd the most innocent, righteous and religious Persons to be persecuted and slain by the most irreligious and wicked Kings and Rulers; and that both *Priests* and *Prophets* were kill'd for doing their Duty, and obeying the Laws and Commands of God.

This was remarkably exemplify'd in *Saul's* ordering all the *Priests of Nob* to be slain for entertaining *David*; when more than 300 of them were murder'd in one Day; and all the Men, Women and Children of the City were without Distinction put to the Sword. 1 *Sam.* xxii. 17, 18, 19. And we may say with *St. Stephen*, [*Acts* vii. 52.] *which of the Prophets were not persecuted?* The Sufferings
of

But the Misfortune of our Remarker is, that he mistakes *Connexion* of Ideas for *Association* of Ideas; and his Head is full of the latter, tho' empty of the former. Therefore he adds for Illustration another very curious Connexion, viz. *the Connexion of old English Honour* [whatever he means by it] with the *long Omission of a Qualification-Law for Members of the House of Commons*. In this Manner *Don Quixot* connected *Giants* and *Windmills*, and all the Reveries of his distemper'd Brain; and till our Remarker shews us some of the Links by which those two Propositions are connected, it may pass (to express it in his refin'd *English*, p. 218.) for an *unintellecual Absurdity*.

Next he entertains his Reader with a Specimen, how he has obviated, or would answer what

of *Isaiab*, *Jeremiah*, *Zechariah Son of Jehoiada*, and others of the Prophets are known, and are no less remarkable Examples, that God did not administer an *equal extraordinary Providence* over particular Persons, not even over the best Men and most faithful Worshippers of him under the *Jewish* Dispensation: But those holy Persons, of whom the *World was not worthy*, had under the Law *Trials of cruel Mockings and Scourgings --- of Bonds and Imprisonments*. *They were ston'd, they were sawn asunder --- were slain with the Sword --- were destitute, afflicted, tormented*, Heb. xi. 36, 37.

This shews that Mr. *W.*'s Assertion of an *equal extraordinary Providence* being administered over *particular* Persons, as well as over the Nation of the *Jews* as such, under the *Mosaic* Oeconomy, has no Foundation, and is inconsistent with that very Oeconomy and the History of Scripture.

what I have written : He instanceth in what he calls a *Blunder*, which, he says, *will not be unentertaining*. This *Blunder* is my saying ; as a *future State may be demonstrably deduc'd from Principles of natural Reason ; so it is contain'd in the Proposition laid down by St. Paul : He that cometh to God (as a Worshipper of him) must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, Heb. xi. 6.*

As an Introduction to the Entertainment of the Reader, I would ask this Inventor of *Blunders*, whether a future State is or is not contain'd in *St. Paul's* Proposition ? [he will speak out at last, tho' it be to his own Shame.] If it is not contain'd, then *St. Paul's* Examples, by which he introduceth it, and which he adds in Support of it, are not properly produc'd ; because, as I shew'd, they are Examples of those who were not rewarded in this Life, but by Faith look'd for the Rewards of the Life to come. Such as *Abel, Enoch, Abraham, Moses*, and others. They are Examples of those who look'd for a City which hath Foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God, Ver. 10. of those who died in Faith, not having receiv'd the Promises (of the Blessings of this Life) but confess'd that they were Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth ; and desir'd a better Country [than an earthly one] that is, an heavenly ; wherefore God is not ashamed to be call'd their God, for he hath prepar'd for them a City, Ver. 13, 16.

Of

Of those who chose rather to suffer Affliction with the People of God, than to enjoy the Pleasures of Sin for a Season; and had Respect unto the Remembrance of the Reward, as seeing him who is invisible, Ver. 25, 26, 27. Of those who were to be made perfect [in Happiness] by those better Things [than the temporal Promises of the Law] which God hath provided for Christian Believers, Ver. 40.

These shew that St. Paul meant by his Proposition, that God was the Rewarder of his faithful Servants and Worshippers in the future State: And therefore if a future State is contain'd in the Proposition of the Apostle, this Remarker is absurd and impertinent in denying what I say; and the least I can do, is to return his Compliment; that St. Paul knew what he said, tho' this Man does not.

I beg the Reader to observe the Exactness of St. Paul's Reasoning, to which our Remarker's is a Contrast. The Apostle says; *He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of those who diligently seek him.* His saying that every true Worshipper of God *must* believe that he is a Rewarder, shews that the Reward will *certainly* follow Faith and the sincere Worship of God: But is Faith or true Religion and Virtue *certainly* rewarded in this Life? If they are not, and the Reward spoken of by St. Paul be that which will *certainly* follow Righteousness and Piety, it must be the Reward of the Life to

come. Could *St. Paul* say in general of all the true Worshippers of God [for he speaks in general Terms] that they *must* believe that he is a Rewarder of them, and mean that this Reward may be in this Life only, as our Remarker argues? Was ever any virtuous or truly religious Man rewarded in this Life only? If not, then it is evident that *St. Paul* meant to include in his Proposition the Reward of the future State; as being that Reward which will certainly follow Holiness of Life, and which it is the Duty of every good Man patiently to wait for. But as it is not our Duty, or even fit for us to believe that God will reward the true Worshippers of him in this Life only; or so much as to expect temporal Rewards at all; it is evident to Demonstration, that the Rewards the Apostle speaks of, which will certainly attend the true Worshippers of God, and which it is their Duty to believe that he will bestow upon them, are the Rewards of the future State. This Author cannot shew, that any one in any Age ever believ'd a God and Providence, but he also believ'd a future State; and considering the State and Circumstances of Mankind it is demonstrably deduc'd from this Belief. This shews the Exactness of *St. Paul's* Reasoning. And that which farther indubitably proves this to be his Meaning, is his speaking expressly and on purpose of the Faith of those who receiv'd not their Reward in this Life: And in the two preceding Verses which

introduce his Proposition, he instanceth in the Faith of *Abel* and *Enoch*. Now all the Reward that *Abel* receiv'd in this Life for his Faith and Worship of God, was to be slain by his Brother for his very Piety in the Days of his Youth: And the Reward of *Enoch's* Faith is expressly said to be, *that he was translated* [into Heaven] *without seeing Death*; and *that God took him*. Was this a Reward in this Life? Nor will our Remarker's senseless Explication, after some *Rabbies*, of the Words as meaning, not a *Translation without seeing Death*, and a *Taking to God*, as the Texts say, but only a *sudden Death*, in direct Contradiction to them, at all help him; unless to be cut off by a *sudden Death* in the midst of one's Days may be called a Reward in this Life, *for walking with God*, and *having pleas'd him*. The same may be said of *Abraham*, *Moses*, &c. as I largely prov'd p. 20, 21, 22.

All that our Remarker has to say is; that my Argument requires me to mean, that a future State is *necessarily* contain'd in St. *Paul's* Proposition: *But* (he adds) *before that can be shewn, it must be prov'd that God cannot in this World reward those who diligently seek him*.

I have demonstrated St. *Paul's* Sense; so I might leave him to look to his Consequence, if it was one. But I think any Man but this would be asham'd of such a palpable and pitiful Fallacy; but it is the best Reason he can *entertain* his Readers with, of whom he must

either have the meanest Opinion, or they of him. What! cannot St. *Paul* mean that God is a Rewarder in the future State, unless he means that God *cannot* reward in this World? Cannot a future State be contain'd in St. *Paul's* Proposition, so as that all the true Worshippers of God *must* and *ought* (which is the Apostle's Sense) in Reason and Duty believe it and depend upon it, and yet God reward them also in this World? Cannot God consistently bestow both temporal Favours and Blessings to righteous and religious Men, and also spiritual and future Rewards? But as God in the ordinary Course of his Providence does not always in this Life reward with temporal Prosperity, nay does often afflict and subject to temporal Misery, *those who diligently seek* and obey him; all such are taught by the Apostle to believe and expect a certain Reward of their Faith and Well-doing in a future State.

This it is reasonable, this is their Duty to believe, this they must believe, that whatever Reward God shall please to bestow, or not, on righteous and good Men in this Life; they will certainly receive a Reward in the Life to come: This is evidently the Apostle's Sense, and is demonstrable from his own Explanation of it by Examples throughout the whole Chapter. Could the Apostle mean, as this weak Man would have him mean, that God *might or might not* reward in a future State *those who diligently seek him*, and then illustrate his Meaning by the Exam-

ples

ples of such holy Men and true Worshippers of God, as receiv'd not their Reward in this Life, but only in a future State? Is this treating St. *Paul* as an *exact* and *pertinent* Reasoner? And he must be blind indeed, who cannot see that the Supposition of God rewarding his faithful Worshippers with temporal Blessings, when and as he sees fit, is very consistent with the *certain, invariable, universal* Truth, that he will reward them in a future State; and also that the future Reward only is that which it is the Duty of all to hope for, believe and trust to, who are sincere Worshippers of God, and obey his Laws. This is what St. *Paul* says, every one *who cometh to God, must believe*.

And that the Belief of the Rewards of a future State was always a *necessary* Support of Religion, is evident and demonstrable from the present State and Circumstances of Mankind, and the Dispensations of Divine Providence in all Ages of the World; and therefore no Religion ever did or could exist, and be effectually supported without it. And the Apostle supposes this Belief to have been equally necessary in all Ages, both before and under the Law, as well as under the Gospel-Revelation. He supposes that *Moses, David, Samuel, and the Prophets* under the Law liv'd and dy'd in this Faith, notwithstanding the temporal Promises of the Law; as *Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham,* and other Patriarchs had done before the Law.

And this Faith the Apostle makes so *necessary*, as to say in the Words immediately preceding those so largely treated on, *without Faith it is impossible to please him* [God.] And that this Faith is no other than the Belief of being rewarded by God in another Life for good Works done in this Life, is still farther evident from his foregoing Words, Ver. 5. That by this Faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see Death; and was not found (on Earth) because God had translated him [into Heaven;] for before his Translation he had this Testimony, that he had pleased God: Then, to shew the Necessity of this Faith, he adds, Ver. 6. *But without Faith it is impossible to please him: For he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him.*

But to entertain the Reader to Purpose, this Remarker at last, after all his Confusion, agrees that a future State is contain'd in St. Paul's Proposition: For he says, that he included the Sanction of the Mosaic as well as Christian Religion; the first of which (as he tells us elsewhere) had the Promise of the Life that now is, the other of that which is to come. So he owns that St. Paul's Proposition contain'd or included the Sanction of the Christian Religion, viz. the Life which is to come; and yet, so insincere is he, he would have his Readers think that he has been confuting my Assertion, that a future State is contain'd in the Proposition laid down by St. Paul. Is not this a pretty Way of entertaining

taining his Readers; and answering, as he engages to do, *all material Objections, or confessing the Force of them?* p. 2. But though he may treat me as he pleases, is *St. Paul* to be treated in this Manner? And as no-body doubts, or can doubt of *St. Paul's* being an *exact* and *pertinent Reasoner*; so it is not to be doubted, but that our Remarker is neither exact or pertinent. Logic is by no Means his Talent: He has indeed declar'd War against it thro' all his Writings. But he must contradict whatever disagrees with what he has once advanc'd, tho' it be by the most evident Self-Contradiction.

Our Remarker wants many Qualifications to enable him to make a proper Use of the Scriptures: He has not yet read them with any critical Skill or rational View at all; and he appears at present to be too *wise in his own Conceit* to learn or become wiser.

But I cannot yet part with this Gentleman; who is really *so entertaining*. To prove *St. Paul* to be an *exact Reasoner*, he says, in direct Contradiction to him, *that the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter, but on the equal Distribution of them*; and he has no sooner said this, but he owns *St. Paul* included [as the Support of Religion] the Sanction both of *the Life that now is, and that which is to come*. And yet it seems *the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter, but on the equal Distribution of them*. So by this Remarker's Logic *St. Paul's* Propo-
sition

fiction *might or might not include a future State of Rewards*; 2dly, *it includes both the Promises of this Life, and that which is to come*; but, 3dly, *the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter*. And thus he has prov'd St. Paul to be an *exact and pertinent Reasoner*. This may pass for exact Reasoning with such a Reasoner as our Remarker, who, whenever he attempts to reason, always blunders: But it is neither St. Paul's Reasoning, or that of any exact Writer. St. Paul, on the direct contrary, reasons that Faith in God, as a *Rewarder of those who come to him*, is the Support of true Religion: They are according to the Apostle to rest in this, that God will certainly reward them. He says not or intimates one Word of an *equal Distribution of Rewards*, nor had he any Occasion to mention it.

It is indeed very gross to say, that *the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter*. Future Rewards are the only proper Support of Religion; but temporal Rewards never were or can be so: And he who believes that God will reward his *Faith and Virtue* in a future State, has a sufficient Support of Religion, and leaves the Distribution of the Rewards to the *Justice and Goodness* of God, and cannot but conclude, that God will *reward every one according to their Works*; which is what he means, or should mean, by an *equal*, that is, an equitable Distribution of them. But our Remarker regards not what he says, if he does

does but contradict, tho' it be *himself*, for the *Entertainment* of his Readers. He might as well have reason'd, and no doubt is prepar'd to do so, that Civil Laws are not supported by the Sanction of civil Penalties, but on the *equal Distribution* of them.

Our Remarker next *entertains* his Reader, by *recommending my whole Pamphlet to his Perusal, as a Specimen of that illustrious Band, in which, he says, I have thought fit to inlist; and which indeed, he adds, would have been imperfect without this Answerer General.* This I look upon as meant for a Compliment, and as a Specimen of his being an illustrious Critic in the *English Tongue*. The Reader must then try what Sense he can make of *a Pamphlet being a Specimen of a Band*; and be the Sense what it will, if my small Pamphlet be a Specimen of *a Band*, his numerous Writings, full of *Blunder* and *Rudeness*, must be a Specimen of an *Irish Mob*. But as the Expression is errant *Nonsense*, I am willing that in the next Edition of the *Dunciad* he shall commence *Blunderer General*; and I desire he will take care to do himself Justice.

The Top of all his *Civility, Justice* and *Good Nature* is shewn in what he adds next, *viz. that I have all my Life long oppos'd myself to whatever receiv'd the public Approbation.* This unchristian and inhuman Charge is too ferious to be entertain'd with any Thing but **Abhorrence** and **Detestation**.

If I have all my Life long oppos'd myself to *whatever receiv'd the public Approbation*, I must have oppos'd the Truth both of *natural and reveal'd Religion*, which it has been the unwearied and zealous Study of my Life to promote and defend. Surely his Heart could not but reproach him, when he wrote this Charge against me, which is as false, as it is mean and base; and comes with a very ill Grace from him, whose main Writings are a direct Opposition to what has receiv'd the public Approbation, and will always receive it, so long as the Scriptures are receiv'd. Here, if ever, this *immodest Man* ought to blush, if he is capable of blushing.

I have wrote in Defence of *the Existence and Unity of God*, and of the Truth both of *natural and reveal'd Religion*. I have also particularly wrote in Defence of *human Liberty and free Agency* against *Atheists and Fatalists*; and also in Defence of *Christian Liberty* both *civil and religious*, against *Popery, Persecution and Tyranny*. I have also wrote in Defence of the Scripture-Evidence of the *Resurrection of Jesus Christ* against the *Deists*; and prov'd the Divinity of his Mission and Religion both from his own *Miracles and Prophecies*, and the prior Predictions of *Moses and the Prophets* concerning him; and also from those of his own Apostles, which are the strongest and even demonstrative Proofs of the sacred Truth of reveal'd

veal'd Religion. Have I in these *oppos'd* what has receiv'd *the public Approbation*?

I have also wrote an *Exposition of the Lord's Prayer*, and of *the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. I have also defended the *divine Mission* and *mediatorial Authority* of Christ the Son of God over the Church, against *Sabellianism* and *Tritheism*, and the blasphemous Anti-christian Doctrines of *Cerintbus* and the *Gnostics*: And what is worst of all, I have oppos'd many Paradoxes of this Author, advanc'd and supported, as he thought, with much Learning; all which I have confuted in a few Pages, and shewn to be nothing but bold Assertions, destitute of Evidence and Truth; and that with all his Glare and Pretences he has not shew'd a Taste of real Learning in any one of all the Points he has treated of.

Have I in all or any of these *oppos'd what has receiv'd the public Approbation*? What then does this *Ignoramus* mean by my *opposing whatever receiv'd the public Approbation*? Will he to gain the *public Approbation* inlist himself into that illustrious Band, to which indeed I have made it the Business of my Life to oppose myself in Defence of natural and reveal'd Religion, and in Defence of religious and civil Liberty; in Defence also of human Reason and free Agency; and in Defence of Prayer and divine Worship? Or will he rather chuse to act a more becoming Part; to repent of his Rashness and unchristian Calumny, and to ask Pardon of the

Public, if not of me also, for his most injurious Treatment of it ; as if opposing *Atbeism*, *Deism*, *Tyranny*, *Persecution* and *Poperly* was opposing what *has receiv'd the public Approbation*. Will he not own, that in opposing these I have not oppos'd, but concurr'd with the *public Approbation*? If he will not, I desire he will try his Talents against any Thing I have wrote, which he thinks opposeth the public Approbation ; and that he will let the Public see whether he understands the Scriptures and the primitive Writers of the Christian Church any better than he does *Plato* and *Virgil* : For had he understood the former, he would not have said that the Philosophers neither *did* or *could* believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments. And had he understood *Plato's* Way in his Works of representing his own Opinions under the Person of *Socrates* who speaks them, he would not have pretended, that *Plato* did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, and yet allow that *Socrates* did believe it.

Had he also understood *Virgil*, he would not have wrote such a Heap of Revery about the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, which has no Foundation either in *Virgil*, or any other ancient Author. The Mysteries which *Virgil* alludes to were not the great Mysteries of *Ceres* celebrated at *Eleufis* ; but those lesser of *Proferpine* the infernal *Hecate*. These latter most properly represented *the State of the Dead*, and
were

were different from the *Eleusinian* Mysteries. *Apollodorus* relates, that *Hercules* descended into the infernal World after he had been initiated into the *Eleusinian* Mysteries *: And *Virgil* makes *Hecate* reign where *Æneas* † descended; and plainly supposes them to be the Mysteries of *Pluto* and *Proserpine* or *Hecate*, and not of *Ceres*, to which he refers, and embellisheth his Narration with poetical ‡ Fictions. The Sacrifices also are such as were offer'd to the infernal Gods, and not to *Ceres*: And none but *Pluto* and *Proserpine* or *Hecate* are the chief Deities || address'd; nor is *Ceres* ever mention'd as concerned in these Mysteries or Visions of the Dead.

And was not Mr. *Warburton* specially qualify'd to write a Treatise on the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, when he did not so much as know the Place where they were celebrated? He says, [*Div. Legat.* p. 136.] *the Eleusinian Mysteries were*

* Bibliothec. lib. ii. p. 121.

† —————Nec te

Nequicquam lucis Hecate præfecit Avernis.

Æneid. lib. vi. ver. 118.

‡ Noctes atque dies patet atri janua Ditis. v. 127.

Junoni infernæ dictus sacer ----- v. 138.

Hoc sibi pulchra suum ferri Proserpina munus
Instituit. v. 142.

| Quatuor hic primùm nigrantes terga juvencos
Constituit. v. 243.

Voce vocans Hecaten, cœloque Ereboque potentem. v. 247.

---Sterilemque tibi, Proserpina, vaccam. v. 252.

Could these be the Mysteries of *Ceres*, where she had neither Sacrifices nor Invocations offer'd to her?

were celebrated at ATHENS in honour of Ceres. And p. 224. he repeats the Blunder, and says, *Musæus* had been Hierophant at Athens, i. e. in the Eleusinian Mysteries, of which he is speaking. Whence does this learned Remarker think they were called *Eleusinian Mysteries*, but from *Eleusis* or *Eleusin*, where they were celebrated in the Temple of Ceres. Let him consult *Herodotus*, the *Parian Marbles*, *Diodorus Siculus*, or any ancient Writer who has mention'd them; or let him look a little into *Meursius* whom he cites, but one would think had never read.

Our Remarker's Explication also of the *Esoteric* and *Exoteric* Philosophy is all a mere Blunder, owing to his not being able to distinguish between a Proposition or Subject and the Explanation of it. The Terms *Esoteric* and *Exoteric*, with respect to the Doctrine of a future State, had no Relation to the Doctrine or Subject itself, which was taught and profess'd equally amongst the Philosophers and amongst the Vulgar: But the Philosophers explain'd it in a different Manner in their popular and political Discourses, from what they did in their Lectures to their Disciples; the first was the *Exoteric* Way, the second the *Esoteric*: And this was the Case in respect of Theology in general; and this is all the Mystery of *Esoterics* and *Exoterics*, which our Remarker has made so much Work about; and infers from it most absurdly, that the Philosophers, tho' they profess'd

feels'd and taught, did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

I may leave the Consideration of his vile and *immoral* Charge to every honest and Christian Reader, who must see and think, that it proceeded from Gaul and Bitterness of Spirit, and a very corrupt Heart. But I will tell him, that such Kind of Slander and Calumny is not the Way to save a sinking Character. However, I could not desire a greater Revenge upon him, than that he should be oblig'd to try his boasted Abilities in confuting all or any Thing I have wrote. Nay, I will be so fair, since I presume he has not studied, or knows any Thing of the Subjects of the greatest Part of my Writings, as to talk him only with a Defence of himself against my last Book wrote on the Subjects, which he pretends to have consider'd and to understand.

But what must all serious Persons and Men of Learning think of such a Writer, who by mere Self-Conceit imagining himself possess'd of what he really has not, takes upon him to abuse at random every one who differs in Opinion from him. But as his Learning will never hurt any one, so his abusive and unchristian Behaviour will hurt no one but himself.

I have indeed wrote in Defence of the *Jewish* Revelation, and in it have oppos'd several absurd Notions of this Remarker; but I have been so far from abusing him, or casting the
least

least Reflection on him or his Writings, that I never so much as mention'd his Name or Writings at all : Indeed I did not think them worth my Notice.

For this I am call'd *blind, Blunderer, Answerer General, and one who have all my Life long oppos'd myself to whatever receiv'd the public Approbation*, with other such like Slander. Thus it is *he answers*, as he promis'd the Public, p. 2. *all material Objections made against his Writings, or confesseth the Force of them.* All I have to say is, that he is welcome to oppose, as far as he is able, any or every Thing I have wrote, which clasheth with his Opinion : But then I expect him to do it with hard Arguments, and not with hard Names ; and that he write like a *moral Man* at least, if not like a *Scholar* ; because the first is in his Power, tho' the latter may not be so. I have not yet seen any Thing of the Scholar or judicious Learning in any of his Writings ; but instead thereof have seen a great many Citations of *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, which have no Relation to his Subject, and serve only for Shew and Digression * ; also many bold and empty

* As he exercises his critical Talent on some of the Passages he cites, it may not be improper to observe his Acuteness in an Instance or two, out of many I might produce: One in *Greek*, and one in *Latin*. These two fell in my Way accidentally, as I was looking over his learned Dissertation on what he calls the *Eleusinian Mysteries*.

empty Assertions call'd *Demonstrations*; and instead of Arguments and Reasoning, downright Bullying, Railing, and personal Abuse and immodest Reflections; and as I have had no small Share of them, I tell him that I heartily despise them, and pity the Author of them.

steries. The first is a Citation of *Arrian's Epictetus. Dissert. lib. iii. c. 21.* ἕτως ὠφέλιμα γίνεται τὰ μυσήρια: ἕτως ΕΙΣ ΦΑΝΤΑΣΙΑΝ ἐρχόμεθα, ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ καὶ ἐπανορθώσει τῆ βίῃ κατεστάθη πάντα ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν. The Words εἰς φαντασίαν ἐρχόμεθα he calls an *obscure Expression* (*Div. Leg. p. 139.*) but that nothing may seem too hard for him, he translates it, *we seize the true Spirit of them.* Now, *seizing the true Spirit of them* is but a coarse Expression, if it was the Sense of the Author; but as to that, he might as well have translated it any Thing else. The Expression is plain and easy enough, and means; *we come to the Perception* (or Knowledge) *that all these Things* [he had mention'd before] *were instituted by the Ancients for Instruction and Reformation of Life.*

So I advise him, when any more *obscure Expressions* come in his Way, that he will not venture to translate them, since he is so unlucky at doing it.

The other is a Passage in *Virgil*, which he cites p. 209. *Hos juxta, falso damnati crimine mortis, Æn. vi. ver. 430.* *Virgil* says, that at the Entrance of Hades, near to those innocent Infants who were snatch'd from their Mothers Breasts to the Grave, they were plac'd *who were unjustly condemn'd to Death.* Can any Thing be easier than this Explication? Or can any more proper Place be assign'd to those who suffer'd Death by an unjust Sentence, than amongst those who died immaturity in their infant State? Yet he would have the Place corrected without any Evidence of Authority, and read, *falso damnati tempore mortis.* As if *Virgil* had alluded to the Fable of *Plato's Gorgias*, which no Doubt was as far from his Thoughts, as our Author's Emendation of his Verse was. But *Virgil* is too dangerous a Writer for such a Critic to tamper with.

Not knowing what to say against my Book, he intimates that he should not have taken notice of me (to abuse me, for this is all the Notice he has taken of me) but for the *Words in my Title Page*, viz. *The Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future State shewn to be consistent with Reason*. This he calls a *vile Insinuation*, intimating, that he had written something against the Reasonableness of that Doctrine. This, I suppose, was to excuse his unrighteous Charge before-mention'd; and thus he adds *Sin to Sin*, thro' Hardness and Impenitency. But what Doctrine [I pray this acute Logician to explain] do I intimate he has wrote something against? Does he mean against the Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future State, for my Title Page speaks of nothing else? If so; has he not wrote a great Part of his Books to prove, that the ancient Philosophers in expressing their Notions of the future State, have so explain'd it, as to shew that they did not believe it at all; nay, what is more extraordinary, *that they could not believe it?* Will he deny this? Tho' it is a gross Misrepresentation of the ancient Philosophers; the Reasonableness of whose Doctrine in this Point, and their actual Belief of it, I have shewn at large. But if he means to charge me with having *insinuated*, that he had wrote something against the Reasonableness of a future State, I will leave it to every Reader of common Sense, whether my Words insinuate

nuate any Thing he chargeth them with, or will bear to be so understood. I speak only of the Doctrine of the *ancient Philosophers*; and I do not find, that he has pleaded for the *Reasonableness* of their Doctrine; but on the contrary I find, that he has endeavour'd to shew that their Doctrine is inconsistent with any future State of Rewards and Punishments. So if any Thing be insinuated, (for I neither mention him or any of his Writings) it can only be, that he has wrote something against the Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future State, which he knows he has wrote against, tho' very weakly.

I doubt not, therefore, but he took notice of me in an abusive Way, merely because he knows he cannot answer me in a Scholar-like Way. Railing and Calumny are his Talent; and he may enjoy the unmanly Triumphs of them over his Adversaries with as much Pleasure as he can.

I could easily shew (if it was worth while) the Weakness and Absurdity of every other Notion advanc'd in our Remarker's Writings, which are in this Respect all of a Piece: But as he is in the Hands of others, who are able (if they will mispend a little Time) to confute, but not to convince him; so I should not have troubled the Public with the preceding Confutation of so vain and empty a Writer, (who would have pass'd unobserv'd by me) if his

immoral Reflections had not made a Defence of myself both just and necessary.

Mr. *Warburton*, no Doubt, will be so partial to himself, as to think that I have been too severe with him: But he who has so outrageously and no less unjustly and unprovok'd abus'd so many learned and worthy Men, has no Cause to complain of meeting with some of that Correction, which he justly deserves. And if his own Heart does not condemn him for many Things he has said, I shall be sorry for him, and pity his Condition, as being worse than that of a mere Infidel.

But if any Thing I have said shall do him any Good, and make him reflect on his own bad Conduct and Behaviour, I shall be glad, and hope that in Time he will come to a modest Way of thinking of his own Talents; which, whatever they are, are employ'd to very bad Purpose; and I am sure have nothing in them, to give him a Superiority over those he treats with so much Haughtiness and Contempt. He is but a *Novitiate* lately come from School, and a Stranger in the learned World; and wants much to learn, and especially to know how to behave as a Gentleman as well as a Scholar. And till he shews more Judgment, and mends his Manners, they who are possess'd with either, will have nothing to do with him.

It is probable that he will again fly out into Abuse, having nothing else left. But as I have given him no Occasion for it, and said nothing but in the Way of Reason and Argument, and in the just Vindication of myself from personal Calumny, I cannot think of mispending my Time about such a Writer; and therefore I take my Leave of him, wishing him both a sounder Head and a better Heart.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Page 8, line 9, read *more*. l. 33, read *Exoterically*.
 p. 14, l. 10, read *inhumane*.

BOOKS printed for J. NOON, at the White-Hart,
near Mercers-Chapel, in Cheapſide.

1. **H**ermanni Boerhaave ΦΥΣΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ, ſeu *Oeconomia Animalis*, *Æreis Tabulis* 54, *eleganter inſculptis, illustrata: In quibus, humani Corporis partes, dilucide & diſtincte exhibentur.*

2. A new Verſion of St. Matthew's Goſpel, with ſelect Notes; wherein the Verſion is vindicated, and the Senſe and Purity of ſeveral Words and Expreſſions in the Original are ſettled, and illuſtrated from Authors of eſtabliſh'd Credit. To which is added, a Review of Dr. *Mills's* Notes on this Goſpel, correcting that great Man's many Miſtakes and Errors, and ſupplying his Omiſſions. By *Daniel Scott*, L. L. D.

3. A Paraphraſe and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Coloffians, Philippians, and Hebrews: after the Manner of Mr. *Locke*. To which are annex'd, ſeveral critical Diſſertations on particular Texts of Scripture. By the late Reverend Mr. *James Pierce* of Exon. 2d Edition.

4. A Paraphraſe and Notes on the Revelation of St. John; with large Hiſtorical Obſervations, and a Preface giving an Account of the Deſign and Uſe of this Book; with a Scheme and Uſe of the Prophecies. By *Mofes Lowman*.

5. A Paraphraſe with Notes on the Revelation of St. John, in the Manner of Dr. *Clarke*; with a Preface concerning the Uſefulneſs and Intelligibleneſs of that Book. By *Thomas Pyle*, M. A. Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury;

6. A Paraphraſe on the ſeven Catholick Epistles: after the Manner of Dr. *Clarke* on the four Evangelists. Uſeful for Families.

7. A Paraphraſe and critical Commentary on the Prophecy of Joel. By *Samuel Chandler*.

8. The curious and uſeful Sermons of the Reverend Mr. *James Foſter*. 4th Edition. 4 vol. 8vo.

9. The ſame Gentleman's Defence of the Uſefulneſs, Truth, and Excellency of the Chriſtian Revelation, in answer to Chriſtianity as old as the Creation. 3d Edition.

10. His three Letters to Dr. *Stebbing* on the Subject of Hereſy. 2d Edition.

BOOKS printed for J. NOON, at the White-Hart.

11. A free and impartial Study of the holy Scriptures recommended. In 3 vols. 8vo. Containing Notes on many peculiar Texts of Scripture, and Discourses on various Subjects. By *Joseph Hallett*, jun.

12. The Laws and Liberties of the Gospel: or, The Duties and Privileges common to all Christians explain'd and recommended in several practical Discourses. Designed to promote Christian Truth and Charity, Peace and Unity. By *Gilbert Michell*, M. A. Rector of Bredfall near Derby.

13. Fifteen Sermons on several Occasions. To which is added, a Scripture Catechism, or the Principles of the Christian Religion laid down in the Words of the Bible. By the late Rev. Mr. *James Pierce*.

14. Funeral Discourses: In two Parts. Containing, 1. Consolations on the Death of our Friends. 2. Preparations for our own Death. By *William Harris*, D. D.

15. *Novitiana opera, cum copiosissimis Observationibus & Notis, in quibus totum argumentum auctoris de Regula Fidei ex veterum Patrum Monumentis late discutitur. Præmittitur Dissertatio de Filii Dei Homousio, sive Coessentialitate uni Deo Patri.* Studio *Johannis Jackson*, *Ecles. Angl. Presb.*

16. A second Edition of a Defence of Human Liberty, in answer to the principal Arguments which have been alledged against it, and particularly to Cato's Letters on that Subject. To which is added, a Vindication of Human Liberty: In answer to a Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity; written by *A. C. Esq;* By *John Jackson* Rector of Rossington in the County of York, and Master of Wigston's Hospital in Leicester.

17. *Cyropædia*: or, the Institution of Cyrus, concerning Religion and Government. Translated from the Greek Original of Xenophon, by the late honourable *Maurice Ashley*, Esq; (Brother to the late Earl of Shaftsbury.) Address'd to the Lady Elizabeth Harris, in a Dissertation upon the true Liberty of thinking in Matters both Ecclesiastical and Civil. By the Translator. In two vol. 8vo.

18. The History of the Sevarambians, a People of the South Continent: In five Parts. Containing an Account
of

BOOKS printed for J. NOON, at the White-Hart.

of the Government, Laws, Religion, Manners, and Language of that Nation. Translated from the Memoirs of Capt. *Siden*, who lived near fifteen Years amongst them.

19. A Treatise of Human Nature; being an Attempt to introduce the experimental Method of Reasoning into moral Subjects: Wherein the Nature of the Understanding and Passions is examined and explained. In 2 vol. 8vo.

Rara temporum felicitas, ubi sentire quæ velis, & quæ sentias dicere licet. Tacit.

20. The Philosophical Grammar of Experimental, Natural Philosophy, in the familiar Way of Dialogue; adapted to the Capacities of Youth, and illustrated with Variety of Copper-plates, Maps, &c. The 2d Edition, with large Additions. By *B. Martin*.

21. The Principles of Moral and Christian Philosophy: In two Volumes. Vol. I. Containing Moral Philosophy. An Enquiry into the wise and good Government of the Moral World. In which the Continuance of good Administration, and due Care about Virtue for ever, is inferred from the present Order in all Things, in that Part chiefly where Virtue is concerned. Vol. II. Containing Christian Philosophy. The Christian Doctrine concerning God, Providence, Virtue, and a future State, proved to be agreeable to true Philosophy, and to be attended with a truly philosophical Evidence. By *George Turnbull*, L. L. D.

22. A Methodical System of Universal Law: or, the Laws of Nature and Nations, deduced from certain Principles, and applied to proper Cases. Written in Latin by the celebrated *Jo. Got. Heinccius*, Counsellor of State to the King of Prussia, and Professor of Philosophy at Hall. Translated, and illustrated with Notes and Supplements, by *George Turnbull*, L. L. D. To which is added, a Discourse upon the Nature and Origin of Moral and Civil Laws; in which they are deduced, by an Analysis of the Human Mind in the experimental Way, from our internal Principles and Dispositions. In 2 vol.

23. The Elements of all Geometry. Containing, 1. The Rudiments of Decimal Arithmetick, Logarithms, and Algebra. 2. *Euclid's* Elements of plain and solid Geometry demonstrated in an easy Method for Learners without a Master. 3. The Elements of Spherical Geometry, after the Manner of *Euclid*, &c.

A FARTHER
D E F E N C E
O F T H E
Ancient Philosophers,
Concerning their
D O C T R I N E and B E L I E F
O F A
F U T U R E S T A T E.

Against the Misrepresentations of a CRITICAL
ENQUIRY, Prefac'd by Mr. WARBURTON.

—*Fragili quærens illidere dentem*
Offendit solido. HORAT.

By JOHN JACKSON,
Rector of *Rossington* in the County of *YORK*,
And Master of *Wigston's Hospital* in *Leicester*.

L O N D O N :
Printed for JOHN NOON, at the *White Hart*, near
the *Poultry*, in *Cheapside*. M.DCC.XLVII.



INTRODUCTION.

I See the Part Mr. *Warburton* has acted in a late *Critical Enquiry into the Opinions and Practice of the ancient Philosophers, &c.* We have before us two *Sofias*, one *Exoteric*, and the other *Esoteric*; but neither of them has any the least Resemblance to *Mercury*.

Mr. *Warburton* says in his Preface, that the *Critical Enquiry* was wrote by a Gentleman whose Modesty would not suffer him to put his Name to it: but he communicated it to him from the Press. Whence we may suppose, if we please, that he had not seen it before. However, Mr. *Warburton* is in as great Raptures about it, as if it was really his own Performance. He says, *it goes near to establish his Novelties*, [tho' it pretends no more than to defend one or two of them, and which signify nothing to his main Point, if they could be defended] and it has not its Match scarce in the World; for he adds, that it has such an *Extent of Learning and Force of good Argument*, that he DARES to become responsible for ALL he says: and is willing

that those Opinions of his, which are here defended, may stand or fall by the Strength or Invalidity of this Defence, p. 10. Would he have said this of any Performance but his own? And who would not have such a Champion to fight his Battles? A Gentleman must be *modest* indeed, not to put his Name to such an *incomparable* Work, confirm'd by the Warrant of so able a Critic as Mr. *Warburton*. But others will suspect that something very different from *Modesty* made the Author conceal himself: and there are undoubtedly other good Reasons for so doing. One is, that it is too full of fulsome Flattery and Compliments, for all which however Mr. *Warburton* dares to be responsible. Another thing is, that a *Critic* of any degree of *Modesty* would be ashamed to be the Author of such Stuff. But the Features of some Faces are so strong, as easily to be discover'd almost under any Disguise; though this of the Critic's is but a very thin one. His *Modesty* as well as *Criticism* appears through the whole Piece: and they are certainly sympathetic, if not identical with Mr. *Warburton's*; and the whole Work is as like his as if it was spit out of his own Mouth. However, I shall not presume to know him; and shall only call him the *modest Critic*.

Now let us hear what Mr. *Warburton* has to say for himself. He says, *p. 3.* that he has *bidden adieu to Controversy*.

It

It is certainly time for a Man that has been so often fairly beaten off the Stage to give over boxing : but I see he is resolved to die hard. For as he is bidding adieu to Controversy, he ought to have spent some time in examining himself, and how he has behaved during the Course of his Controversies, that he might ask and receive Pardon ; and *bid adieu* with Decency, and not with Shame.

The Conscience of those Pagans whom he has so much misrepresented and abused for want of being able to *read* them, would suggest, that before he bids adieu, he should beg Forgiveness for all the Indignities and Injuries he has done to those who never gave him the least Provocation ; and to one who had not so much as mentioned his Name, or any of his Writings.

As I never bore him any Ill-Will, and perceiv'd his Rowness and Imbecility in all kind of Learning, and his want of Good-Manners ; I gave him some friendly Correetion and Advice which might have done him good, and prevented his exposing himself again in this *Critical Enquiry*. However, I hope it has had some effect upon him, so at least as to engage him to *bid adieu to Controversy* ; which is all *the amends* he can make to the Readers of his *incomparable Work*, as the modest Critic calls it.

He thinks it hard that any should be *displeas'd at his shewing* [or rather calling with-
out

out proving] *the Pagan Philosophers, Knaves in Practice and Fools in Theory*: and especially that any *Friend to Revelation should be offended at the Force and Fidelity of the drawing*, p. 6.

That he has *strongly abused* the Philosophers is certain; and were any of them alive, they would as much contemn him for his Ignorance. All Men ought to have Justice done them, especially the Dead, who cannot answer for or defend themselves. All I proposed was to do them Justice, so far as to make them to be rightly understood; and that fair Consequences should be drawn from their Assertions and Doctrines; and not such as will make all Men almost equally *Fools and Knaves*; and very Orthodox Christians as great Atheists and Unbelievers as the Pagan Philosophers were: and I shew'd that Mr. *Warburton's* Method and Reasoning, instead of vindicating, really weakned and hurt reveal'd Religion; and gave greater handle to Unbelievers, than, I believe, he was aware of.

Could a Deist or even an Atheist desire greater Advantage against Reveal'd Religion, than to have it told them and insisted on by a Professor of Revelation, that God reveal'd a Religion by a Man who industriously concealed from the People, to whom he was sent to instruct them in the Divine Will and Laws, the Doctrine of a future State; and that in consequence the People taught of God did

did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, which is a fundamental and primary Article of all true Religion; without which any Religion is a mere political Scheme; and very bad Politics too; as wanting the strongest Obligation to Obedience from Conscience, and the Fear of the future Consequences of Vice, and Disobedience to the Divine Laws. This I proved with such Reasoning in my Defence of the *Jewish* Revelation, as I suppose Mr. *Warburton* has no Logic to disprove. And in truth Mr. *Warburton's* whole Scheme of the *Divine Legation* of Moses is so unhappily managed, that the opposing it is defending both Natural and Reveal'd Religion.

P. 5. Mr. *Warburton* thinks that *the Denial of the Resurrection of the Body arose out of the Gentile Philosophy*. It is true, it did so; though the Stoicks held it in their way. But he is at a loss why *Tertullian*, who inform'd him of *the Heresy of denying the Resurrection*, did not mention another Heresy, which he has shewn in his *Divine Legation* stood upon as wide a Bottom; namely, that which holds the human Soul to be of the same Nature and Substance with God. As Mr. *Warburton* is so little acquainted with ancient Christian Writers, I will tell him why *Tertullian* omitted mentioning that other Heresy; it was, because he himself held it, as is well known: And would he have had him called himself

an Heretic? And I desire Mr. *Warburton* to observe, that though *Tertullian* held the human Soul to be *consubstantial with God* [for he says, *es animal rationale a rationali artifice non tantum factus, sed ex substantia ipsius animatus.* adv. Prax. c. 5.] he did not for this disbelieve a future State; nor can be justly charged with any such Consequence of his Notion of the human Soul: though this is one of Mr. *Warburton's* grand Arguments to prove that the Philosophers *did not*, nay *and could not believe a future State*: which Consequence, if it has any Logic in it, equally affects those Christian Writers, others besides *Tertullian*, who thought *the human Soul to be of the same Nature and Substance with God*. And as they took that Notion from the Doctrine of the Pagan Philosophers, it farther shews, that they did not think those Philosophers who they supposed to hold it, either *did not or could not believe a future State* in consequence of it. Let Justice then be done to the Philosophers.

P. 8. Mr. *Warburton* blames those Defenders of Christianity, who represent *Antiquity as quite ignorant of the first Principles of Religion and moral Duty*: nay not only that it knew nothing, but that nothing could be known—Here, he adds, *the Infidels turned their own Artillery upon them, in order to dismount their boasted Reasonableness of Christianity*—and indeed, what room was there left

left to judge of it, after human Reason had been represented as so weak and blind? All this is very right: but yet unhappily for Mr. Warburton, he all through his Books supposes this *Weakness* and *Blindness* of human Reason to have subsisted in the ancient Philosophers, (who of all others studied the Cultivation of human Reason) by insisting that *there never was any such thing as Natural Religion* amongst them; because, he says, they neither did or could believe a future State of Happiness and Misery; which future State is a fundamental Article of Natural Religion, without which, he himself is forced to own, *no Religion ever existed*, Div. Leg. p. 231. This he has got by meddling with the Philosophers. After this, the Infidels will laugh at him, and leave him to defend Christianity upon his own Principles as well as he can: but any one may foresee that he will never be able to make one Convert to it.

P. 10. He says his modest Critic *has made the best of a bad Reasoner*; and that he will be *responsible for all he says*. Whether he means me or Dr. Sykes by *the bad Reasoner*, it is no matter, we are both contented; and it is no bad Compliment to come from him; because I dare say the honest Man means no more by *a bad Reasoner*, but any one who has oppos'd or shall oppose *his Novelties*: and that whoever defends or thinks him in

the right, is and must be a good Reasoner, let him argue as he will, or even like our critical Enquirer. I therefore own myself a *very bad Reasoner*. All Men are bad Reasoners in their turns. Sir *I. Newton* is with him a bad Reasoner; and every one else whose Notions do not agree with his. And though I may think him *a bad Reasoner*, it is not his Fault but his natural Incapacity; for it is plain he was never design'd by Nature to be either a Critic or a Philosopher. I do not blame him therefore for what he cannot help; but only for arrogantly and ridiculously pretending to be what he is not, and for abusing at the same time every one who differs from him in Opinion.

However, he is so good-natur'd as to be *responsible for all* his Defender says, (it would be unnatural not to be so) and applauds himself under the Skin of this Critic, as the cleverest and most *incomparable* Author in the World. He says he will be *responsible*. Tho' his Credit in Literature is not great, we must take it for want of better. But 'tis certain the poor Critic stands in need of a good and sufficient Sponsor; and if he has no better than Mr. *Warburton*, he is, as will appear presently, in a pitiful Case: for with all his *Extent of Learning*, 'tis certain he can see no farther than his Nose; and his Arguments have the *Force* of Gun-Powder, they flash and vanish. I was thinking how this Critic
came

came to be so good a Reasoner ; and find it is, because he has bestow'd many high-flown Compliments upon Mr. *Warburton*, which others are to take, if they please, for Arguments of his being an *incomparable Writer* ; and with which I can easily suppose Mr. *Warburton* to be as well pleas'd, as if he had really something to say in his Defence.

Of all the *Novelties* advanced by Mr. *Warburton*, the modest Critic undertakes to defend only one, and that of little or no Consequence to his main Point ; namely, that the Philosophers *did not and could not believe a future State*. Whether this was owing to his *Extent of Learning* reaching no farther ; or to his real Modesty and Conscioufness that no other of Mr. *Warburton's* *Novelties* could be maintain'd or defended, I shall not take upon me to judge.

I ventur'd to say that the ancient Philosophers profess'd constantly and invariably the Doctrine of a future State, and that there was Reason to think that they believ'd what they profess'd and taught ; and I produc'd several Evidences of it. But I excepted *Epicureans*, *Pyrronists* and some others. I prov'd it with respect to *Plato* the Prince, and, as *Cicero* calls him, the *Homer of Philosophers*, not only from several Passages of his Writings, to which many others might easily have been added : but also from Mr. *Warburton's* own Confession that *Socrates* did believe a future

State; because 'tis well known, that what *Socrates* speaks are *Plato's* own Sentiments express'd in his Name. Nor do I find that our Critic has any Passage from *Plato*, that can make the least Doubt of his believing a future State. So the *Platonists* are out of the Question, as much as any Christian Writers can be. The same may be said of all the *Egyptian* and *Chaldean* Philosophers. The Critic has not one Passage to oppose to their Profession of a future State, founded on the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul. The same is also true of the Heads of all the Sects, as *Pythagoras*, (*Plato* is before mention'd) *Aristotle*, *Zeno*. He has not one Passage to alledge to purpose against their constant and invariable Profession of a future State; and what Passages he offers, he either misrepresents and misconstrues; or they are founded evidently on a Mistake, which every one the least conversant in Pagan Philosophy must know.

A FARTHER
DEFENCE, &c.

THE critical Enquirer, whose Head is turn'd in the same Mould with Mr. Warburton's, begins his first Chapter, p. 3. with a *Misrepresentation*, just as Mr. Warburton did in his *Remarks*: this is but a bad setting out. He says, that I undertook to *demonstrate* that the Philosophers believ'd a future State: and this he every where tells me of; as if I had frequently used the Expression *demonstrate*. Now tho' I might have call'd a strong and irrefragable Proof, which I think, I gave of the Point, by the Name of *Demonstration*; yet I avoided that Word all thro' my Book, because Mr. Warburton's *Demonstrations* had made me sick on't. It is pity but he had pointed out the Places where I undertook to *demonstrate* what he says I did. Our Critic's Head was so full of *Demonstrations* with which Mr. Warburton's Books are larded, as if he intended to bring them into Disgrace, that he sees *Demonstrations* wherever he

he reads, and fights with Mr. *Warburton's Shadows*, as if they were mine. I own I asserted over and over, and prov'd, as I think, that the Philosophers did constantly and invariably profess the Doctrine of a future State; and I suppos'd that they believ'd what they taught, and gave Reasons for it. Our Critic is welcome to make the best of what I said, and of the Reasoning with which I supported it: I consider'd well what I said, and can maintain it.

The learned Critic, *p. 4. joins Issue with me, and takes upon him to assert that this constant and uniform Profession* (which I own) *is all a mere Invention of mine contriv'd only to serve an Hypothesis.* The Reader observes our artful Critic only undertakes to *assert*, but not to *prove*, that what I both said and prov'd, *is a mere Invention of mine*: and this we shall see is all that he has done in his following Observations, in which is not a Tittle of Proof: and this way of managing may be a Contrivance between them to save the Forfeiture of Mr. *Warburton's* Recognizance, who stands *responsible* for him. This I think is not a fair joining of Issue. However, let us see *what he takes upon him to assert.* He begins to assert that the *School of Pythagoras* was not constant and uniform in the Profession of a future State. He wisely says nothing against *Pythagoras* the Head of the School, whom I prov'd to be a constant Professor of this

this Doctrine ; and for whom as well as *Plato*, *Cicero* will be responsible in his *Tusculan Questions*, and *first Book*. But he attacks two of his Scholars, whom I had also produc'd, *Empedocles* and *Epicarmus*. He brings *Plutarch* to prove that *Empedocles* held *Death to be a Separation of the fiery Substance*, (that is, the Soul) *from the other Parts*, [*i. e.* the Body] and therefore, adds our Critic from *Plutarch*, he suppos'd that *Death was common to the Soul and Body*. de Placitis, &c. c. 25. This is his Argument for the Voice of Antiquity, that *Empedocles* did not believe a future State, p. 4, 5. The Argument is this; Death is the Separation of Soul and Body, therefore (N. B.) Death is common to the Soul and Body. Who can withstand the Force of such an Argument? Is it not equal to one of Mr. *Warburton's Demonstrations*? Was there ever such an illative THEREFORE seen before? *Plutarch*, who stands in our Author for the Voice of Antiquity, made a great Blunder ; and our acute Critic and Mr. *Warburton* took it for a Demonstration. I hope then *Empedocles* may stand for an uniform Professor of a future State, as I alledg'd him in my Defence of the Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers, p. 91.

Epicarmus comes next to be examin'd. He said, as cited by *Sextus Empiricus*, “ * It is
“ no

* Τὸν δὲ Σάαλον, ὅτι ἔδεν ἔστι πρὸς ἡμᾶς, Ἐπίχαρμος ἀντὶ πρῶτον μεμνημένον, εἰπὼν, ἀποθνήσκει ἢ τελευτᾷ καὶ ἄ μὴ διαφέρει.

“ no Concern of mine, either to die, or to
 “ be in the State of the Dead.” This our
 Critic says *is a Charge fix'd on Epicharmus*
 (that he did not believe a future State) *in*
Terms too strong to be possibly evaded. I be-
 lieve the Reader is as much at a Loss to see
 the *Force* of this Argument, as that above
 from *Plutarch*. Certainly, to die is not our
 Concern, it belongs only to God to dispose
 of Life and Death. But says * *Epicharmus*
 in the Passage I cited from him; *If you are*
endued with a pious Mind, you will suffer no
Evil by Death: for your Spirit will ascend to
Heaven and abide there. Can any thing be
 a stronger or more rational Profession of a
 future State? And the preceding Words
 cited by *Sextus Empiricus*, and alledged by
 our Author, are perfectly agreeable to it. So
 that our Critic's Charge is just as strong against
Epicharmus, as the preceding is against *Em-*
pedocles, to prove that these famous *Pytha-*
goreans were really *Epicureans*, or did not
 believe a future State. At this rate of Proof,
 it is easy to prove not only that Mr. *War-*
burton and his Critic, but that no Christian
 believes a future State. He has but one other
 Evidence of *the Voice of Antiquity* about the
Pythagoreans not believing a future State;
 and

* Ευσεβίης τὸν νῦν πεφουκῶς ἔ παθῆς γ' ἔδεν κακοὶ κατ-
 θανόν, ἀνω τὸ πνεῦμα διαμένει κατ' ἕρανόν.

See my first Book in Defence of the *Jewish Reve-*
lation, p. 91.

and I tell him plainly beforehand, that I will not be responsible for him : but let him not triumph for that. He is *Teles* ; whom our Critic calls a *Pythagorean* ; but he might easily have seen that he is an *Epicurean*, with which Sect I have nothing to do, as being Atheists. A *Pythagorean* would not have said, as *Teles* does, that the lamented dead Friend *would exist no more* ; or that he had not existed *in the time of the Trojan War*, or even when *his Friend's Ancestors existed*. He ought to know something of the Dogmata of *Pythagoras* and his Followers, before he cites such an Author for a *Pythagorean*, as *Teles*, who deny'd all Pre-existence to the present State. Besides, *Porphyry* would have told him that the *Pythagoreans* wrote in the Doric Dialect ; and 'tis certain that they generally did so ; but *Teles* is *Attic*. And had he look'd into *Jamblicus*, the Writer of the Life of *Pythagoras*, and who there gives a large Catalogue of all the noted Scholars and Followers of *Pythagoras*, he would not have found *Teles* amongst them. So he may please to take him again, for I allow not his Evidence. Our Critic found him in *Fabricius*, where he is put amongst the *Pythagoreans* by Mistake : but a Critic should look better about him, and compare Things together, to find out the Truth.

Thus we see that our Author, with all his Extent of Learning, is guilty of egregiously
 C bad

bad Reasoning, and has not been able to produce one Instance that the *Pythagoreans* were not *constant* and *invariable* in their Doctrine of a future State. And therefore *he need* (as he says, *p. 6.*) *give himself no farther Trouble*: for it will be in vain; and all is up with him with regard to the School of *Pythagoras*, which produc'd by far the most eminent Philosophers of *Greece* and *Italy*. And as the *Immortality* of the human Soul was a primary Tenet of the *Pythagoreans*, as all know; so in consequence they invariably taught the Doctrine of a future State; and no doubt they believ'd what they taught, unless our Critic could demonstrate the contrary.

Our Critic next attacks *Aristotle*, who is known to have held the *Immortality* of the Soul. I produc'd a Passage (*p. 96.*) from his Book *de mundo*, for his Belief of a future State. Our Critic excepts to it, because he thinks that Book not to be the genuine Work of *Aristotle*; this looks something like an Argument. But all he has to say for this Piece of *Aristotle* not being genuine is, that *the two Scaligers*, *If. Casaubon*, *Salmasius*, *Dan. Heinsius*, *Gassendi*, *with other Critics*, endeavour'd to prove that this Treatise was not *Aristotle's*. Very well. But did they prove it? He does not say they did. However, greater Critics than these our Author alledges, have allow'd it, and cited it as genuine: as *Stobæus*, *Demetrius de Elocut.* c. 239. *Apuleius*,

Apuleius, *J. Martyr*, and others; who must be better Judges of the Genuineness of ancient Books, than any modern Authors can be. But notwithstanding that I have the better Evidence on my Side, I will not insist on that Passage, but will give him another instead of it out of *Plutarch*, who says, *Aristotle* taught, * *that the Body only and not the Soul was subject to Death: for that the Soul did not die.* Will this satisfy him? If not, the next to be cited ought, which he himself in part alledges against me, p. 7. *Aristotle*, he says, *proposes it as a Problem*, "Whether any Man can be happy after Death." And asks; "Whether this would not be strangely absurd according to his own System, which supposes that Happiness consists in Operation?" *He tells us too*, adds our Critic, "That it may be fairly disputed, whether the Dead are CAPABLE of any Good or Evil." So what *Aristotle* proposes problematically, this Critic and Mr. *Warburton* take without any more ado for his resolving the Question on their Side, in point-blank Contradiction to what *Aristotle* says in answer to the Problem; which had he cited, must have appear'd to the Reader to be in point for me.

C 2

I

* Θάνατον εἶναι μόνον τῷ σώματι, ἢ ψυχῆς τούτης γὰρ ἔχει ὑπάρχει θάνατον. De Placit. Philos. lib. 5. p. 909.

I must call him a little to account for his extensive Knowledge in the *Greek Language*, or for his Fraud in a wilful Misconstruction of *Aristotle*. Where did he learn to translate the Word [*κοινωνῶσιν*] *are capable*? In what Author or Lexicon did he ever find it to have this Sense? He saw this Construction would serve his Purpose; and therefore right or wrong, and in spite of Grammar and the known Sense of the Word, he render'd it *capable*, instead of *participate* or *partake*; which would have discover'd *Aristotle's* Sense; and that the Problems he propos'd were founded on the Doctrine of a future State being out of all Dispute. For the Question to be debated was, “ * Whether they who are “ happy after Death, *participate* of the Fortune (good or evil) of their Posterity.”

Aristotle does not enquire whether the Dead are *capable* of any Good or Evil; but whether the Dead *participate* in or are affected with the good or evil Fortune of their living Posterity, Friends or Relations. This is the Point he is upon; and he resolves in the Affirmative, that no doubt they are affected by it in some degree and in some measure; but that *so little*, as not to render *them unhappy* who are in a State of Happiness; or on the other hand to make *those happy* who are

* Εἰ κοινωνῶσι τῆς τύχης τῶν ἀπογόνων οἱ μακάριοι μετὰ τελευτῆν. So *Andronicus* of *Rhodes*, the renowned Follower of *Aristotle*, puts the Question, *cap.* 18. *p.* 46.

are unhappy. I will cite *Aristotle's* Words fairly and fully, in order to shew the great Extent of our Critic's reading; and with what Modesty he has impos'd upon his Readers.

“ * A Question (says *Aristotle*) may perhaps
 “ be made whether the Dead *participate*
 “ of any Good or Evil: for it is thence
 “ plain, that if Good or Evil can extend to
 “ them, it must be either absolutely *small*,
 “ or at least so to them. It must be how-
 “ ever of such Quality and Degree, as not
 “ to make those *happy*, who are not already
 “ so: or to deprive those of Happiness who
 “ are already possess'd of it. It seems there-
 “ fore (adds he) that the Dead are some-
 “ what affected with the Prosperity and Ad-
 “ versity of their Friends; but so and in
 “ such a degree, as neither to make those
 “ unhappy who are happy, or *vice versa*.”

He elegantly supposes them to be affected like those who are affected with Events acted in Tragedies: and *Andronicus of Rhodes*, the famous

* Μᾶλλον δ' ἴσως τὸ διαπορεῖσθαι περὶ τῆς κεκμηκότας, εἴ τινα ἀγαθὰ κοινουῦσιν, ἢ τῶν ἀλλικειμένων· ἔοικε γὰρ ἐκ τούτων, εἴ κ' διακρίνεται πρὸς αὐτὰς ὅτινα, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε πικρῶν τι, κ' μικρὸν ἢ ἀπλῶς, ἢ ἐκείνοις εἶναι· εἴ δὲ μὴ, τοσαύτον γε κ' τοιαύτον, ὥστε μὴ ποιεῖν εὐδαίμονας τὸς μὴ ὄντας· μηδὲ τὸς ὄντας μακαρίους ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τὸ μακάριον. Συμβάλλεσθαι μὲν ἔν τι φαίνονται τοῖς κεκμηκόσιν αἱ εὐπραξίαι τῶν φίλων, ὁμοίως δὲ κ' αἱ δυσπραξίαι· τοιαῦτα δὲ κ' τηλικαῦτα, ὥστε μήτε τὸς εὐδαίμονας, μὴ εὐδαίμονας ποιεῖν, μήτ' ἄλλο τῶν τοιαύτων μηδέν. *Ethic. Nicom. lib. 1. c. 11. p. 15. Tom. 2.*

famous Peripatetic, interprets his Sense, viz.
 “ * That the Happiness or Misery which be-
 “ falls Relations, affects the Dead as diffe-
 “ rently from what it would do if they were
 “ alive; as the same being represented in a
 “ Tragedy differs from the real Events them-
 “ selves.” What a Figure the Discussion of
Aristotle's Problem makes on our Author's
 Supposition, that *Aristotle* did not believe a
 future State of Happiness and Misery, let the
 Reader judge. But *Aristotle's* own Resolu-
 tion of the Case shews his genuine Notion
 and Belief of a future State, and leaves no
 room for our Critics idle and vain Distinction
 of Exoterics and Esoterics, by which every
 thing is to mean just what they please. One
 would think our Critics should not have the
 Hardiness to look *Aristotle* any more in the
 Face, after they have so much abus'd him.
 But yet they venture to cite him (without
 producing his Words) p. 8. The Passage is
 in the ninth Chapter of his third Book of
 Ethics, where he is treating of *Fortitude* in
 enduring temporal Evils. Of these he says,
 † *Death is the most dreadful: for it is the last*
 of

* Ἐχει δὲ διαφορὰν, ὅσα ζώντων ἔτι τῶν μακαρίων
 τοῖς οἰκείοις συμβαίνει, τῶν συμβαινόντων μετὰ τὴν αὐτῶν
 τελευτήν, ὅσην ἔχει τὰ ἐν τοῖς τραγωδίαις πλαττόμενα
 κακὰ τῶν προὔπαρξάντων πραγμάτων, ὧν ταῦτα σκιαί.
Ethic. Nicom. Paraphraf. lib. 1. c. 18. p. 47.

† Φοβερώτατον δ' ὁ θάνατος· πέρασ γὰρ· καὶ ἄδεν ἔτι τῷ
 τεθνεώτι δοκεῖ, ἕτε ἀγαθὸν ἕτε κακὸν εἶναι. *Ethic. Nicom.*
lib. 3. c. 9. Edit. Paris. 1629. tom. 2. See Div. Leg. p. 357.

of Evils (or the Period of them) and after this there remains, as it seems, to the Dead no Sense of either Good or Evil. What has this to do with the future State? *Aristotle* is only speaking of Death as the greatest temporal Evil and most to be dreaded, as being the Period of Life, after which there seems to remain no more Good or Evil to be possess'd or endur'd. He expresseth himself with Caution, that the *Dead seem* to have no Sense or Feeling of either Good or Evil; because he had said a little before that the Dead did *participate* a little in the good or evil Fortune of their living Friends and Relations. But our Critics according to their usual Accuracy and Fidelity render the Words to serve their Turn, *viz.* "Death is of all things the most terrible; for it is the *final Period of Existence* [this is their Translation of one Word $\omega\epsilon\gamma\alpha\varsigma$,] and *beyond* that it appears there is neither Good nor Evil for the dead Man *to dread or hope.*" The Words *to dread or hope* are to stand for the Sense of another single Verb ($\epsilon\iota\psi\alpha\iota$) which signifies neither of them. And it would be strange for *Aristotle* to say, that *beyond* a State of Non-Existence there was no Good or Evil for the Dead *to hope or dread.* So *Aristotle*, who held the Soul to be *immortal, and not subject to Death*; and that the Dead were either *happy or miserable* in the future State, as they had liv'd virtuously or wickedly in this Life, must contradict

contradict with the same Breath, as it were; all he says and thought; because our Critics are pleas'd to misrepresent his Sense, and to misconstrue his Words.

This is the Trouble one must have with Critics, who cite Scraps of ancient Authors at random; and never enter'd into the true Sense of any Philosophy.

Nothing remains to save our Author's Credit, but the *Stoics*; and if they fail him, he is undone. He sets out towards them with Triumph, p. 8. *The Stoics we shall find (says he) have often proclaim'd their Disbelief of another Life in the most absolute and strong Terms. The following Testimonies will prove this beyond all Exception; and so may serve to inform us, that the learned Author has all along been imposing a fanciful Hypothesis, as contrary to the Evidence of all Antiquity, as it is to the Principles of the Divine Legation.*

Whether I or Mr. Warburton and his Critic have been all along imposing upon the Reader, the preceding Discussion of the Doctrine of the *Pythagoreans* and *Aristotle* will make plainly appear: in which I think it is evident, that they have been guilty not only of bad Reasoning; but of gross Misrepresentation of the Sense and Misconstruction of the Words of the Authors cited by them: and that the Passages they have alledged, when understood, are

are a strong Confutation of that which they were brought to prove.

Here *the Evidence of all Antiquity* in respect of the Doctrine of the *Stoics*, lies in two or three Passages of *Seneca*: it is true, he might have cited other Authors, and they would have been as much to his Purpose, as we shall see *Seneca* is. I cannot but observe that, as a bad Omen of our Author's Success, he dares not examine *Zeno* the Father and Head of the *Stoics*, whom I cited (*p.* 97.) from *Lactantius*, speaking of a future State in a Strain like that of a Prophet, as *Lactantius* says: and one might have thought that *Cicero's* Testimony, that the *Stoics* taught the Doctrine of a future State, tho' they deny'd the *Eternity* of it, might have satisfy'd both *Mr. Warburton* and his Critic. But let us hear what they produce from *Seneca*; which is no more than what any Christian might and does frequently say, speaking of Death and the Calamities attending it; to alleviate the Apprehensions and Fear of it, he says; that Death is no more than like *the State precedent to our Birth, wherein we felt no Misery or Torment*: where we are insensible of all bodily Pain; and where all sensitive Afflictions, Diseases and Torments are extinguish'd and cease, and have no more Place in us than they had before we were born. I allow him that *Seneca* speaks his real Opinion to his Friend *Lucilius*, and a Philosopher

too; and it would be ridiculous to suppose that he amus'd him with any *Exoteric* or vulgar Opinions; or did not communicate his real internal Sentiments in the private Epistles wrote to him. I hope I have conceded as much as he desires. But I think that our Author with the least Attention might have seen, that *Seneca* is speaking only of bodily and sensitive Passions; of the Pain and Death which puts an end to the animal Life, and to all the Affections of it; so that nothing after Death can grieve or hurt that which does no longer exist. I have thrown one of his Citations into the * Margin, which is as strong as any of the others, which the Reader may read in the Author, if he thinks it worth while.

The Citations from *Seneca* are therefore no way inconsistent with his Belief of a future State; and had our Author read the Epistle next following one which he cites, he could not but have seen in what strong and rapturous Expressions he declares his Belief of it. “ Then (he tells his Friend) will
 “ our Soul have to congratulate itself withal,
 “ when being emerg'd out of the Darknes
 “ in which it grovels, it shall no longer be-
 “ hold splendid Objects with faint Vision,
 but

* Brevis morbus ac præceptis alterutrum faciet, aut extinguetur aut extinguet. Quid autem interest, non sit, an non sim? utroque finis *dolendi* est. Ep. 78. *Seneca* adds presently after; *corpus tuum valetudo tenet non animum.*

“ but admit into it the full Day ; and shall
 “ be restor’d to its native Heaven, and pos-
 “ sels the Mansion allotted to it. It is called
 “ to its original Seat above : and it will be
 “ there even before it be set at liberty
 “ from this (mortal) Prison ; when it shall
 “ have cast off its vicious Affections, and
 “ pure and without Impediment shall glo-
 “ riously issue forth into divine Contempla-
 “ tions. Thus ought we to act, most dear
 “ *Lucilius* ; to this press forward with all
 “ our Might ; tho’ few be privy to it, tho’
 “ no one sees it. * ” Could any one express
 a stronger Sense of the Happiness of a future
 State ? And this is to a dear Friend, to
 whom he would disclose his inward Sentiments
 and most sincere Persuasion. With
 the same Sentiments he comforts *Marcia*,
 who was inconsolable for the Death of her
 Son. “ The Image only † (says he) and
 D 2 “ imperfect

* Tunc animus noster habebit quod gratuletur sibi,
 cum emissus his tenebris in quibus volutatur, non tenui
 visu clara prospexerit sed *totum diem* admiserit : et redditus
 cœlo suo fuerit, cum receperit locum quem occupavit
 forte nascendi. *Sursum* vocant illum initia sua. Erit
 autem illic etiam antequam hac custodia exsolvatur, cum
 vitia disjecerit purusque ac levis in cogitationes divinas
 emicuerit. Hoc nos oportet agere, Lucili carissime, in
 hoc ire impetu toto : licet pauci sciant, licet nemo videat.
 Ep. 79.

† Imago duntaxat filii tui periit, et effigies non similis.
 Ipse quidem æternus, meliorisque nunc status est,
 despoliatus oneribus alienis, et sibi relictus. Hæc quæ
 vides

“ imperfect Resemblance of thy Son is dead.
 “ He himself has a permanent Life, and subsists
 “ in a better State, despoil'd only of an ex-
 “ traneous Burden, and set at liberty. These
 “ bodily Parts which you see we are wrap'd
 “ up in, are the Fetters and dark Prison of
 “ our *Minds*.—He is soaring to the Place
 “ from whence he came, where everlasting
 “ Rest and Tranquillity awaits him, and
 “ where instead of confus'd and gross Ob-
 “ jects, he enjoys *pure* and *radiant* Vision.”
Seneca has many other Expressions of the
 same Force, and declares his inward Sentiments;
 and bids *Marcia* not to mind the vulgar Fables
 about the future State. And was it not very
 strange that Mr. *Warburton*, or a Critic, should
 produce *Seneca* to prove that the *Stoics* disbeliev'd a future State?

The Block which Mr. *Warburton* and this
 Author have all along stumbled on, for want
 of seeing their Way into the Schools of an-
 cient Philosophy, is, their not distinguishing
 between ψυχή and νῆς; or πνεῦμα, *i. e.* the sen-
 sitive *Soul*, and intelligent *Mind* or *Spirit* in
 the *Greek* Writers; and between *Anima* or
Sensus, and *Animus* or *Mens* in the *Latin*
 Writers of Philosophy. The Distinction of
 these is essential to the understanding the old
 Philosophy:

vides ossa, &c.——quibus involuti fumus, vincula ani-
 morum tenebræque sunt——nititur illo unde dimissus est;
 ibi illum æterna requies manet pro confusis crassisque pura
 et liquida visentem. *Consol. cap. 24.*

Philosophy: and had our Authors attended to it as they ought, they would have seen that all the Inconsistencies with which they charge the Pagan Philosophers would have vanish'd: and that their Profession of a future State was *uniform, constant and invariable*, as I asserted, and they have not been able to disprove in one single Instance.

The *Stoics*, as well as *Platonists* and others, held a *sensitive Soul* of a distinct Nature from the *intelligent Soul*, or *Mind* or *Spirit*. This inferior Soul they thought to be the only Subject of *Pain* and *Pleasure* which belong'd to the animal Life. The *Platonists* agreed with the *Stoics*, that this Soul was *material*, and died with the Body: but they both agreed that the superior Soul or Mind existed after Death; the *Stoics* said to certain Periods of Time; but the *Platonists*, *Pythagoreans* and *Aristotelians*, to an endless Duration. I shall give them *Plato's* Words about it, and then leave them to grow wiser by a farther and more *critical Enquiry*.

Plato * in his *Timæus*, describing the Formation of Men by the inferior created Gods, has

* Καὶ τῶν μὲν θεῶν αὐτὸς γίνεσθαι δημιουργὸς· τῶν δὲ θεῶν τὴν γένεσιν τοῖς ἐκείνῃ γενήμασι δημιουργεῖν προστάξεν. Οἱ δὲ μιμνήμενοι πικραλαθόντες ἀρχὴν ψυχῆς ἀθάνατον, τὸ μὲν τὸ θεῶν σῶμα αὐτοὶ περιετόρνευσαν· ὄχημα δὲ ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα ἔδοσαν, ἄλλο τε εἶδος ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχῆς προσκομίσαντο, θεῶν, δεινὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα ἐν αὐτῷ πλάσματα ἔχον. P. 1073. Edit. Ficin.

has these remarkable Words ; “ He (the
 “ supreme God) is the Maker of the divine
 “ Beings (or celestial Deities) but he com-
 “ mitted the Formation of mortal Beings to
 “ those whom he himself created. They
 “ imitating their Creator, from whom they
 “ receiv’d *the presiding Soul that is immortal,*
 “ fram’d a *mortal* Body to receive it ; and to
 “ be an Habitation and Vehicle for it : and
 “ likewise added another Soul which was of
 “ a *mortal Nature* ; to be the Subject of *ve-*
 “ *bement Passions*, which are under the Power
 “ of Fate.”

I hope I shall have no more Occasion to prove my Assertion [not *Demonstration*, for this is peculiar to Mr. *Warburton*] that all the Philosophers, except *Epicureans* and *Pyrronists* did constantly and invariably profess and believe a future State. They all believ’d that after Death the intelligent Part, Mind or Spirit, being separated from the Body, was happy or miserable as it had been virtuous or wicked in this Life. That good and pious Souls after Death enjoy’d uninterrupted Peace and Tranquillity, encreasing in Vertue and Knowledge by the Society and Communion of celestial Beings and of the Supreme God Himself the Fountain of all Happiness and Perfection : and that the wicked and impious were secluded from this blessed Society and Communion, and left to associate with evil Dæmons and wicked Spirits like themselves ;

selves; and to be tormented with the Remorse of their evil Deeds. And let me *ask again* Mr. *Warburton* and his learned Defender, how come the Philosophers so constantly both in public and to their Friends in private to profess their Belief of a future State; and take so much pains to demonstrate the Reasonableness and Probability of it by many strong Arguments deduc'd from the Nature and Operations of the Soul, and the essential Difference of Good and Evil; and yet all the while not believe it, nay directly (as they say) deny it, in Opposition both to their own Reason and the universal Consent of Mankind?

Having now fully confuted all the Pretences of Mr. *Warburton* and our Critic that the Philosophers did not believe a future State; the Reader will see that I need add no more; and might fairly bid Adieu to them and to the Controversy. But in Order (if it may be) to put a stop to any farther such critical Enquiry, I will set before the Reader the positive Declarations of the Philosophers concerning their Belief of a future State, from some Passages I cited before and others added to them. But for the better understanding of the ancient Philosophy or Theology in the Doctrine of the future State, it is to be premis'd that all the eminent Philosophers as well as Legislators were initiated into the Mysteries, especially the *Eleusinian*, where
 the

the Happiness and Misery of good and evil men were symbolically represented * in Scenes of Horror and Delight.

As soon as they came into the secret mystical Part of the Temple of *Ceres*, they heard many strange and horrible Voices, and saw many terrible Sight and Appearances to strike them with Awe and Reverence of the sacred Solemnity. They were sometimes surrounded with Flashes of Lightning and the Noise of Thunder, which made them sweat and tremble; and sometimes were involv'd in Clouds and Darkness. After this, a more agreeable Scene of Light and Pleasure was exhibited to them: they were led into pleasant Fields, where they were entertain'd with singing and dancing, and solemn Discourses concerning sacred Things and divine Truths, and saw many holy † Sights. And now being initiated and fully instructed in the Mysteries; they walk'd about surrounded with Light and crown'd with Myrtle; and convers'd with pure and holy Men: and beheld an uninitiated impure Herd of living Persons sunk immers'd in Mire and Darkness. The Design of these Mystical Scenes was to represent

* See Stob. Serm. 117. ad Mœurf. Eleuf. c. 11. Themist. Orat. in Patrem, p. 50. Aristid. Orat. Eleuf. Pletho in Schol. ad Orac. Mag. Zoroast. &c.

† Plato alludes to these in his *Phædrus*; ὀλόκληρα δὲ καὶ ἀπλά καὶ ἀτρεμῆ καὶ εὐδαίμονα φάσματ' αὐτῶν μύθουσι τε καὶ ἐποπτεύοντες ἐν αὐγῇ καθαρῶν καθαρῶν οὐτες &c. P. 1224.

sent the different States of Virtue and Vice, and the Happiness of the one and the Misery of the other after Death in the future State.

They were instructed by the Priests out of the sacred Books laid up in the Temple, concerning the Nature of God and of celestial ministring Beings; and that the supreme Happiness of Man consisted in Piety and Holiness of Life: that the Happiness of those who liv'd virtuously here would in the future State consist in the Contemplation of Truth, and in the intellectual and beatific Vision of the supreme Mind; and in the Society of Cœlestial Beings and pure and holy Persons gone before them to the Mansions of Blessedness: but that the wicked and ungodly were to be secluded from all this Happiness; and doom'd to wallow as it were in spiritual Darknes and Ignorance; and to be tortur'd by the Consciousness of Sin and Impiety with unspeakable Torment. This cœlestial Felicity *Socrates* call'd * *the blessed Initiation of Souls*, where the Gods were, as it were, the *Mythagogues*. *Isocrates* † says, that they who partake of the *Eleusinian Mysteries* have the most delightful Hope concerning both the End of Life, and all Duration. And *Celsus* in *Origen* says, || *It was the Business of the*
E Interpreters

* See Proc. in Plat. Theolog. lib. 4. c. 16. p. 217.

† Orat. Panegy. p. 78, 79. See *Arift. Orat. Panathen.*

p. 323.

‡ Cont. Cels. lib. 8. p. 408, 409, 410.

Interpreters and Myſtagogues of the ſacred Myſteries to inſtruct thoſe who were initiated in them in the Doctrines of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; from the Belief of which Doctrines, he adds, no mortal ought ever to depart.

THESE MYSTERIES were the Foundation of the Doctrine and Belief of a future State. Here the moſt ancient Poets and Philoſophers learn'd them: and with the beautiful Symbols exhibited in the Myſteries the Poets adorn'd their Poems; and the Philoſophers mix them in their Diſcourſes, about a future State: and neither of them can be underſtood without the Knowledge of the myſtical Scenes and Symbols to which they allude. Our uninitiated Critics being unacquainted with theſe Things run into endless Abſurdities; and fancy the Philoſophers Notion of a future State was founded on their own Fictions (p. 24, 25.) and becauſe they allude to the myſterious Scenes, mention *the Fields of Elyſium*, and *the Darkneſs, Fire and Filth of Tartarus*, &c. therefore they conclude that the Philoſophers had *no Notion of a future State but what was founded on the Fables of the Populace* (p. 32.) This is want of Taſt; and is juſt ſuch Reasoning as if any Infidel ſhould argue that Chriſtians do not believe a future State, becauſe they do not believe literally the *Banquets and Marriage, the precious Stones, the River iſſuing from*
the

the Throne of God, the Tree of Life, and its variety of monthly Fruits and healing Leaves, mention'd by *St. John* Apoc. c. 21, 22. and in other places of Scripture, which are figurative and very beautiful Expressions by which the Happiness of this State is describ'd. When our Saviour taught the Doctrine of a future State under the Parable of the *rich Man* and *Lazarus*, which might be of his own framing; and talk'd of *Abraham's Bosom* and a *great Gulph*; and of the Discourse between the rich man in *Hell* and the poor man in *Abraham's Bosom*; does it follow thence that our Saviour did not believe a future State at all; or any but what was founded on his own Fictions? Would Mr. *Warburton* or our Critic hear with Patience an Infidel who should argue in this manner? They ought therefore to consider that their reasoning is not only highly absurd, but tends to confound all Notions of Religion, and to introduce universal Scepticism. *Heaven* in the Pagan Scheme of Religion was as *real* as it is in the Christian Revelation, and so was *Hades*, let our Critic or Mr. *Warburton* ever so confidently deny it (p. 26.) It signify'd the Place and State of future Happiness, which the Philosophers represented very beautifully under the Symbols and Scenes of the Mysteries: but they knew they were Scenes only; and never the less believ'd a future State, because it was shadow'd under *material* and *sensible*

Images. It was the Method of the Philosophers from ancient Times to deliver *divine* and *intellectual Truths* under symbolical Disguises, which they learn'd from the *Orphic Mystagogy*. Our Critics might have known this from *Proclus* the most learned *Platonic*, whose Words I cited in my Book concerning *the Belief of a future State* &c. p. 92, 93. And would they be consistent, they should *dare to assert* the Impossibility of a future State being believ'd by any who had been initiated into the Mysteries; or indeed by any who represent or speak of the Happiness and Misery of the future State under *sensible* Images, Symbols or Parables: and where this will, end is too easy but too horrible to see.

Having dispers'd the Clouds of our Critic's and Mr. *Warburton's* Darkness which are spread over their whole Work, the Reader will be able to see clearly that the Doctrine of a future State is *constantly, uniformly* and *invariably* taught by all Sects of Philosophers but *Epicureans* and Sceptics, notwithstanding their Confidence to the contrary.

I have observ'd that this Doctrine was taught in the most ancient Mysteries. *Orpheus* brought it out of *Egypt* into *Greece*; and is said to be the first who taught there
 “ * the Punishment of impious men in Hades

* Τὰς τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐν Ἅιδε τιμωρίας, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἐυσεβῶν λειμῶνας. Diod. Sic. lib. I. p. 107. edit. Wessiel.

“ des, and the happy Mansions of the
“ pious.”

Pythagoras was instructed in the *Orphic Mystagogy*, and taught the Doctrine of a future State of Happiness and Misery. *Timæus Locrus* an ancient *Pythagorean* delivers his Doctrine. “ * He to whom God has given
“ this Portion [of divine Knowledge before-
“ mention’d] arrives by means of true Know-
“ ledge to the most happy State of Life.
“ But if any one is obstinate and disobedient
“ to it ; he shall receive Punishment, both
“ such as the Law inflicts ; and those Tor-
“ ments which are threatned by Heaven,
“ and are endur’d in Hades : for inexpiable
“ Punishments are reserv’d for these unhappy
“ Souls after Death : and all those Miseries,
“ which I commend the *Ionic* Poet for tran-
“ scribing from the ancient *Mystagogy*.”

Jamblicus

* “Ὅτω μὲν ὁ Δαίμων μοίρας ἴσος ἔλαχε, δι’ ἀλαθεσά-
ταν δόξαν ἀγέλαι ἐπὶ τὸν εὐδαιμονέσσιον εἶον· εἰ δὲ κάτις
σκλαρὸς καὶ ἀπειθὴς, τῆτω δ’ ἐπέθω κόλασις αὐτ’ ἐκ τῶν
νόμων, καὶ ἂ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σύντομα ἐπάροισα δείματά τε
ἐπικρόνια καὶ τὰ καθ’ ἄδω ὅτι κολάσιες ἀπαραίτητοι [so it
ought to be read, and not ἀπεραίτητοι which is not greek]
ἀπόκεινται δυσδαίμοσι νεπτέροις· καὶ τᾶλλα ὅσα ἐπαινέω τὸν
Ἰωνικὸν ποιητὰν ἐκ παλαιᾶς ποιεῦντα ἴως ἐναγέως. De A-
nima mundi p. 23. Mr. *Warburton* did not understand the
last Word, ἐναγέως, which he has translated *Tradition* ;
(Div. Leg. p. 296.) which is a better rendring than that
of the learned Editor who has translated it *memoria*. It
should have been render’d by *Mystagogia*, or *initiiis*,
a Word us’d by *Cicero* concerning the *Mysteres*. The
Scholiast

Jamblicus also says (vit. *Pythagor.* Sect. 178.) that *Pythagoras* taught the Return of the Soul (after Death) and the Place where he certainly knew that impious Men and Murderers were punish'd. And the *Pythagoric* Verses teach the same Doctrine; and it was universally held by his Followers.

Plato gives both his own Sentiments and those of the *Pythagoreans* concerning the Doctrine of a future State. I cited several Passages from him (p. 95, 96, 97.) which deliver this Doctrine in the clearest and strongest manner. I shall add a few others for the Reader's farther Satisfaction.

The first Passage shall be out of a Letter wrote to some of his Friends, in which we may be sure he deliver'd his real inward Sentiments. " There * is (says he) nothing
" good

Scholias on *Oedipus Tyr.* v. 666. says: ἐναγές δὲ τὸ σεβασμιον καὶ ἀγνόν· ἄγος γὰρ τὸ ἱερὸν σεβασί. And *Timæus* meant that *Homer* deriv'd his Doctrine of the future State from the Old *Orphic* Mysteries. The Word ἐναγές has the same Sense. Hes, c in voc. and Suid. voc. ἐναγής; and ἐναγές. I do not blame Mr. *Warburton* for not being more accurate in his Translations, than he appears to be, but only when he wilfully and knowingly misconstrues to serve his Turn; which is really corrupting Authors.

* Κακὸν γὰρ καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἕδεν λόγῳ ἀξίου ἐπι τοῖς ἀψύχοις· ἀλλ' ἢ μετὰ σώματος ἔση ψυχῇ ἴκτο συμβήσεται ἐκάστη, ἢ κεχωρισμένη· πειθεσθαι δὲ ἔτιωσ ἀει χρη τοῖς παλαιοῖς τε καὶ ἱεροῖς λόγοις οἳ δὴ μυνύουσιν ἡμῖν ἀθάνατον ψυχὴν εἶναι· δικαστὰς τε ἔχειν καὶ ἰνείναι τοῖς μεγίσταις τιμωρίας, ὅταν τις ἀπαλλαχθῆ ἴδ' σώματος. Epist. 7. p. 1283. edit. Ficin.

“ good or evil that is worth regard in Things
 “ that are inanimate : but every *Soul*, whether
 “ in the Body or separated from it, is worthy
 “ of regard. For we ought constantly al-
 “ ways to believe those ancient and sacred
 “ Writings, by which we are inform’d that
 “ *the Soul is immortal*, and will be judg’d,
 “ and suffer the greatest Punishment, after its
 “ Separation from the Body.”

Again ; “ * the Soul which is invifible
 “ paffeth (after Death) into a Place which is
 “ invifible, pure and appointed for Virtue,
 “ in Hades ; in truth, unto the good and
 “ wife God : whither, if he fo wills, my
 “ Soul will foon go. — Wherefore the
 “ Soul that is fo well difpos’d, does it not go
 “ away to that divine Being which it refem-
 “ bles, even to the immortal and wife Deity ?
 “ whither arriving is it not made happy, be-
 “ ing deliver’d from Error and Ignorance and
 “ Fear, and brutifh Affections and other
 “ Evils incident to human Nature : and as
 “ is faid of the initiated, fpending its remain-
 “ ing

* Ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ ἄρα, τὸ αἰδιόδες, τὸ εἰς τοῦτον τόπον ἕτερον
 διχομόμενον, γενναῖον καὶ καθαρὸν καὶ αἰδιῶδες, εἰς ἅδου, ὡς ἀλη-
 θῶς παρὰ τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ φρόνιμον θεόν· οἱ αὖ θεὸς ἐβόλη
 αὐτίκα καὶ τῇ ἐμῇ ψυχῇ ἴτεσι—ἐκεῖν ἔτω μὲν ἔχουσα (ἡ
 ψυχὴ) εἰς τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτῇ τὸ θεῖον ἀπέρχεται τὸ θεῖον τε
 καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ φρόνιμον ; οἱ ἀφικομένη ὑπάρχει αὐτῇ
 εὐδαίμων εἶναι, πλάνης καὶ ἀγνοίας καὶ φόβου καὶ ἀγρίου
 ἐρώτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κακῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπειου ἀπολαχ-
 μένη· ὡς περὶ δὲ λέγεται κατὰ τῶν μεμνημένων, ὡς ἀληθῶς
 τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον μετὰ θεῶν διάγουσα ; Phæd. p. 61.

“ ing Duration in Converse with the Gods.”
 Again, “ There * is nothing now to hinder
 “ due Rewards being confer’d on Righteous-
 “ nefs and every other Virtue, such as are fit
 “ for the Soul to receive from Men or from
 “ the Gods, whether in Life or after Death.
 “ — Thus then we are to resolve concern-
 “ ing the righteous man, that, whether he
 “ labours under Poverty or Diseases or any
 “ other seeming Evil, these will conduce to
 “ his Good, either whilst he lives, or after
 “ Death. For he will never be neglected by
 “ the Gods, who endeavours to be righteous,
 “ and by the Exercise of Virtue to be as like
 “ to God, as it is possible for man to be.”

Again ; “ † Every one of us ought to be-
 “ lieve that the Soul is immortal and goes
 “ away

* Νῦν ἤδη ἀνεπιφθονοῦν ἐστὶ, πρὸς ἐκείνοις καὶ τὰς μισθὰς τῆ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆ ἄλλῃ ἀρετῇ ἀποδοῦναι, ὅσας ἴε καὶ ὀνειδος τῆ ψυχῆ παρέχει παρ’ ἀνθρώπων τε καὶ θεῶν, ζῶντός τε ἔτι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ἐπειδὴν τελευτήσῃ—ὅπως ἄρα ὑποληπτέον περὶ τῶ δικαίου ἀνδρός, εἴαν τε ἐν πενίᾳ γίγνηται, εἴαν τε ἐν νόσοις, ἢ τινι ἄλλῳ τῶν δοκούντων κακῶν, ὡς τὰ τῶ ταῦτα εἰς ἀγαθόν τι τελευτήσῃ ζῶντι ἢ καὶ ἀποθανόντι· ἔ γὰρ δὴ ὑπὸ γε θεῶν ποτὲ ἀμελεῖται ὅς ἂν προθυμῆσθαι ἐθέλη δίκαιος γίγνεσθαι, καὶ ἐπιτηδεύων ἀρετῆν εἰς ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπων ὁμοιοῦσθαι θεῶν. De Repub. lib. 10. p. 760. Seep. 761.

† Τὸν δὲ ὄντα ἡμῶν ἕκαστον ὄντως ἀθάνατον εἶναι ψυχῆν ἐπονομαζόμενον παρὰ θεῶν ἄλλως ἀπιέναι δῶσοντα λόγου, καθάπερ ὁ νόμος ὁ πάτριος λέγει· τῷ μὲν ἀγαθῷ θάρραλέον, τῷ δὲ κακῷ μάλα φοβερόν· βοηθείαν τε αὐτῷ μήτινα αὐτῷ μεγάλην εἶναι τελελευτηκότι. ζῶντι γὰρ ἔδει εὐθεῖν πάντας

“ away hence to other Gods to give an Account (of our Works) as the Law of our Country declares to us: which Account good Men will give with Confidence, but evil Men with great Terror, having no Help to deliver them after Death. For in Time of Life our Relations ought to assist us, that every one may live righteously and holily, and after Death escape the Punishment due to Sins.”

Again; he says: “ that * by being like [the intelligent Mind of the Universe] we obtain the End of the best Life propos'd to men by the Gods, both in the present state and that which is to come.”

Again; *Plato* having related what he calls a beautiful Fable or Narration concerning the Happiness and Misery of the future State; which he describes in an elegant parabolical Manner not unlike the Representation of them in the sacred Writings: Having spoken at large of both States; he in Conclusion adds, “ † but they who excel others in holy living; “ these

πάντας τὰς προσήκουσας, ὅπως ὅτι δικαιοτάτος ἂν καὶ ὁσιώτατος ἔσῃ ἡ ζῶν, καὶ τελευτήσας ἀτιμώρητος ἀνκακῶν ἀμαρτυριῶν ἐρίγνετο τῶν μετὰ τὸν ἐνθάδε βίον. De Leg. lib. 12. p. 994.

* Ὁμοιωτάτα δὲ τέλος ἔχειν τῷ προτεθέντος ἀνθρώποις ὑπὸ θεῶν ἀρίστα βίαι, πρὸς ἡ τὸν παρόντα καὶ τὸν ἐπειτα χρόνον. Timæ. p. 1087.

† Ὅι δὲ εὐὴ ἀνδύξωσι διαθερέντως πρὸς τὸ ὁσίως βιώσασθαι,
F 8 τοί

“ these are they who after they are deliver’d
 “ and set free from their earthly Habitation,
 “ as from a Prison, ascend to Regions above
 “ the Earth and dwell in a pure Mansion.
 “ For this Cause we ought to strive and la-
 “ bour after the Attainment of Virtue and
 “ Wisdom in this Life: for the Reward is
 “ glorious, and the Hope (of it) is great.
 “ Therefore (he concludes) thô a wise man
 “ ought not to take literally what he had re-
 “ lated [concerning the Land of the Blessed
 and Tartarus, &c. the place of the Wicked]
 “ yet it becomes every one to hold and to run
 “ any Hazard for the Opinion that something
 “ analogous will attend the Soul in the future
 “ State, since it is *immortal*.”

These and many more such Passages of
Plato are so express and strong for the Doc-
 trine of a future State, that they who can read
 his *Phædo*, *Timæus* and other Books; which,

as

ἑτοί· εἰσιν οἱ τῶν δὲ μὲν τῶν τόπων τῶν ἐν τῇ γῆ ἐλευθερῆμενοι
 τε καὶ ἀπαλλαττόμενοι, ὥσπερ δεσμοτηρίαν, ἄνω δὲ εἰς τὴν
 καθαρὰν οἰκῆσιν ἀφικνύμενοι καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς οἰκίζόμενοι·——
 τῶν δὲ ἕνεκα χρὴ ἂν διεληθῆσθαι, ὃ Σιμμία, πάντα
 ποιεῖν, ὥστε ἀρετῆς καὶ Φρονήσεως ἐν τῷ βίῳ μεταρχεῖν· καλὸν
 γὰρ τὸ ἀθλοῦν, καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς μεγάλη· τὸ μὲν ἔν ταῦτα διῆχ-
 ρίσασθαι ἕτως ἔχειν ἄς ἐγὼ διελέλυθα, ἔ πρέπει νῦν ἔχουσι
 ἀνδρεί· ὅτι μέντοι ἢ ταῦτ' ἔστιν ἢ ταῦτ' ἄττα περὶ τῆς ψυ-
 χῆς ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν οἰκῆσεις, ἐπεὶπερ ἀθάνατός γε ἡ ψυχῆ
 φαίνεται ἔσα, τῆτο καὶ πρέπει μοι δοκεῖ καὶ ἄξιον κινδυνεύ-
 σαι διομένῃ ἕτως ἔχειν. *Phæd.* p. 81—84.

as * *Proclus* his most learned Commentator tells us, contain'd his genuine Sentiments and arcane Doctrines, and yet not be persuaded that he believ'd a future State, must be hardened Sceptics or Unbelievers. I shall conclude the Platonic Doctrines with the Words of *Maximus Tyrius* a noted Platonic, who speaks the sense of the whole Sect. “ † That (says he) which is commonly call'd Death, is the Beginning of *Immortality*, and the Birth to the Life to come: our Bodies perishing at their appointed Time; but the Soul restor'd to its proper Place and Life.”

The *Stoics* were likewise constant and uniform in teaching the Existence of the Soul after Death and the Doctrines of a future State. *Cicero* bears this Testimony of the *Stoics*, † “ They held that the Souls of Men continu'd

F 2

“ a

* Εἰ δὲ δεῖ ἰδῆς μάλιστα τὴν περὶ θεῶν μυσταγωγίαν ἡμῶν ἐμφανέστατος τῶν πολλῶν προθεῖναι διαλόγων, ἐκ αὐτῶν φθάοιμι τὸν τε Φαίδωνα καὶ τὸν Φαῖδρον ἀπολογιζόμενος — καταλέγων, καὶ Κράτυλον καὶ Τίμαιον· ἅπαντες γὰρ ἔβλεπον τῆς ἐνθὺς τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐπιστήμης δι' ὅλων (ὡς εἶπεῖν) ἑαυτῶν πλήρεις τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες. In Theolog. Plat. p. 12.

† Οὐ καλεῖσθαι οἱ πολλοὶ θάνατον, αὐτὸ τῆτο ἢν ἀθανασίας ἀρχὴ, καὶ γένεσις μέλλοντος; εἴη, τῶν μὲν σωμάτων τῶν αὐτῶν [ita lege; non αὐτῶν ut edit] νόμων καὶ χρόνων φθειρομένων, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτῆς τόπον καὶ εἶον ἀνακατασκευῆς. Differtat. 25. p. 262.

† Diu mansuros aiunt animos; semper negant — Stoicos dimittamus; eos dico qui aiunt animos manere, e corpore cum excefferint, sed non semper. Tusc. Quæst. p. 164. 2d. Col. edit. Ald. 1523.

“ a long Time (after Death) but not for ever.” Zeno * taught *that there was a future invisible State ; in which the Mansions of the pious were separated from those of the ungodly : that the first inhabited Regions of Peace and Delight ; but the impious underwent Punishment in dark Abodes and dreadful Gulfs of Mire. The Prophets* (adds Lactantius) *plainly relate the same Thing to us.*

Our Critic vainly alledges (p. 52, 53.) that the Words of Zeno relate to the popular Account of a future State. What ! because there is a figurative Expression in the latter Part of them, something like the Scripture-phrase of being *cast into outer Darkness, &c.* cou'd not he see that Zeno spake the Language of one initiated into the Mysteries? where future Punishments were scenically represented by *Darkness, wallowing in Mire*, and other Emblems of Terror : as Happiness was by *Light* and sensible Delights and Entertainments. But does it follow hence, that the Doctrines of the Mysteries were *Exoteric* and *vulgar* Notions only, contrary to the Design of them? and that Men were there taught to disbelieve

a

* Esse Inferos Zenon Stoicus docuit, et sedes piorum ab impiis esse discretas : et illos quidem quietas ac delectabiles incolere regiones ; hos vero luere pœnas in tenebrosis locis atque in cœni voraginibus horrendis. Idem nobis prophetæ palam faciunt. Lactant. de vit. Beat. lib. 7. p. 623. edit. Oxon. He adds ; Totam igitur veritatem et omne divinæ Religionis arcanum Philosophi attigerunt. Ibid.

a future State? It is difficult to express strongly the Happiness and Misery of the future State without using Figures and Allegories, and they are beautifully so represented in Scripture. The Difference between the Notions of the Vulgar and Philosophers concerning a future State was not, as Mr. *Warburton* and his Critic most absurdly suppose, that the Populace believ'd it and the Philosophers did not believe it: but the Vulgar believ'd literally the Fables and Emblems under which the Doctrine was taught, more especially by the Poets; but the Philosophers knew these to be Allegories and Symbols, and believ'd the Doctrine in a more rational Way without them; thô they also made use of them in delivering their Opinions of the future State. This is the true Account of *Exoterics* and *Efoterics*, which Mr. *Warburton* and his Critic seem resolv'd never to understand. The People believ'd there was a Supreme God both of Heaven and Earth; but they worship'd none but deify'd Heroes who were dead Men: the Philosophers believ'd and worship'd the one Supreme God and also inferior celestial Deities; but they did not believe that dead Men ought to be worship'd. The People believ'd they were to be rewarded or punish'd after Death for their good or evil doings: they also believ'd these Rewards and Punishments would be appointed by *infernal Judges* who had been Men: and that *Furies* and *fiery Rivers* &c. would torment the Wicked;

Wicked ; whilst the Righteous would live and enjoy fenfitive Pleasures in *Elyfium*. The Philofophers believed none of thefe Stories, but that future Happinefs confifted in the divine Enjoyments of the Soul ; in the Society of cœleftial Beings and blefled Souls departed ; in delightful fpiritual Contemplations ; in Improvements in Knowledge and Virtue by a nearer and more intimate Communion with the Supreme Good : and that the Mifery of wicked Souls was the Reverse of all this Felicity. Both therefore believ'd a future State of Happinefs and Mifery : and it is the higheft Abfurdity to fuppoſe otherwife.

To go on with the Doctrines of the *Stoics* :
 “ *Cleanthes* * taught, that the Souls of all
 “ Men continued (after Death) till the Con-
 “ flagration. But *Chryfippus* ſaid, that the
 “ Souls of wife Men only continued fo long.”
 The Souls of their wife Men in the future State they call'd † *Heroes*. In fine, their Theology was, that the Supreme God was *incorruptible, ungenerated, and the Maker of the*

* Κλεάνθης μὲν ὅν πάσας ἐπιδιαμένειν τὰς [ψυχὰς] μεχρὶ ἐκπυρώσεως. Χρύσιππος δὲ τὰς τῶν σοφῶν μόνων. Diog. Laert. Vit. Zenon. lib. 7. p. 201, 202.

† Φασὶ——καὶ ἦρωας τὰς ὑπολειμμένας τῶν σπαρδαίων ψυχὰς. *ibid.* p. 200. Λέγουσι δὲ κόσμου τριχῶς· αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀπάσης ἐστίας ἰδίως ποιῶν, ὃς οὐκ ἀφθαρτός ἐστι καὶ ἀγέννητος, δημιουργὸς αὖν τῆς διακοσμήσεως, κατὰ χρόνων ποικίλως περιόδους ἀναλίσκων εἰς ἐαυτὸν τὴν ἀπασαν ἐστίαν καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἐαυτοῦ γενῶν. *Ibid.* p. 197. Edit. Lond. 1664.

the System of the World ; and that after certain Periods of Time he dissolv'd the whole Substance of Beings into Himself, and produc'd it again from Himself. Arius Didymus says, the Stoics held ||, “ that the Soul was generated
 “ and corruptible : but did not immediately
 “ perish when it departed out of the Body,
 “ but continued to exist for a certain Term
 “ of Duration. That the Souls of good Men
 “ existed till the general Conflagration and
 “ Dissolution of the Universe : but those of
 “ the Wicked continued only to a certain
 “ Period——and that the Souls of Brutes per-
 “ ish'd with their Bodies.”

Thus I have shown that the three most ancient and renowned Stoics, *Zeno*, *Cleantes* and *Chrysippus* taught the Doctrine of a future State : and that *Seneca* taught the same Doctrine in the strongest and most expressive Terms I prov'd above.

Yet our Critic would have us think that *Chrysippus* believ'd nothing of a future State, because he believ'd that it was not improbable but that *after Death and some determin'd Periods of Time, we shall be again restor'd to the State in which we now are.* This our Critic thinks *decisive* against *the Doctrine of another Life* (p. 43.) And such Pretences as these stand with Mr. *Warburton* for *Demonstration.* *Chrysippus* believ'd the Souls of wise or good Men existed with God after
 Death,

|| Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 15. c. 20.

Death, till the general Conflagration; and that after that they might probably be restor'd again to the State they liv'd in here: therefore conclude our two acute Critics, it is *decisive* that *Chrysippus* believ'd nothing of *another Life* after this. Such as these are all Mr. *Warburton's* Demonstrations: and whoever will go about to confute them, is with him *a bad Reasoner*: so I shall let them alone, and leave them to the Reader. This *Renovation* of the *Stoics* was by some ancient Writers thought to be a sort of *Resurrection*: not the same with the Christian Notion. I did not cite *Clemens Alexandrinus* for that Purpose; but only to shew that the Ancients thought there was something similar between them. The *Stoics* believ'd the Existence of the Soul after Death, till the general Conflagration of the Earth and Heavens; and that after this the Soul would be re-united to a Body, and live again in a bodily State as before Death: The Christians believe the Soul to exist in a separate State after Death till the general Resurrection, when the Heavens and Earth will be destroy'd by Fire; and they shall live in a new bodily State. So far there is a plain Similitude; and I suppose *Clemens* went no farther: and therefore neither *Le Clerc* nor our Critic (p. 48.) had any reason to find fault with *Clemens* for supposing this Likeness, which is evident, between the Stoical and Christian Doctrine. But to make this

this Doctrine of the Stoics a *decisive* Proof against their Belief of a future State, is like no Reasoning but of Mr. *Warburton* and our Critic: and I need not observe to the Reader, that the Proof is equally decisive against the Christian Doctrine of the Existence of the Soul after Death, and a future State. Our Critic runs away in his fifth Chapter (*p.* 37—52.) with a gross Mistake, as if the *Stoic* Notion of the Return of the Soul after Death, and its Union with its congenial Substance, was the *Refusion* and the *Dissolution* of it. The *Stoics* on the contrary expressly taught, that the Soul after Death continued *happy* or *miserable* till its Dissolution: the future State of the *Stoics* was that which interven'd between Death and the general Conflagration; when all Beings were dissolv'd into God, and afterward restor'd to a new State of Life. In this intermediate State they believ'd the Souls of wise and good Men to be exalted to the Prerogative and sublime Happiness of *Heroes*; others were happy according to their several Degrees of Virtue: and the Wicked and Ungodly were extremely miserable. A very little Thought would have sav'd our Critic the trouble of writing no less than thirty Pages together, to shew his Extent of Learning to no manner of Purpose.

I shall conclude the Doctrine of the Philosophers concerning a future State with that of the Academics from *Cicero*. He supposes

the *Permanency* * of the Soul after Death to be the unanimous Opinion of all Nations, to which he agrees. He says also; † That when he closely considers the Nature of the Soul, it is not so clear, and is more difficult to apprehend, how it exists in the Body as in a strange Dwelling; than when it leaves it, and has free Access to Heaven as to its native Habitation.

Again; I know not how it is ||, but a *Præ-sage of Ages to come hereafter is fixed in the Minds of Men; and inheres most strongly in those of the greatest Genius and most exalted Minds.* And speaking of the ancient and most venerable Sages of Italy, it was ‡ (says he) the primary fix'd Opinion of those ancient Sages, as *Ennius* calls them; that there was
Perception

* *Permanere animos arbitramur consensu nationum omnium.* Tusc. Quæst. lib. 1.

† *Mihi quidem naturam animi intuenti multo difficilior occurrit Cogitatio, multoque obscurior, qualis animus in corpore sit tanquam alienæ domui: quam qualis cum exierit, & in liberum cœlum quasi in domum suam venerit.* Ibid. p. 159.

|| *Nescio quomodo inhæret in mentibus quasi sæculorum quoddam augurium futurorum: idque in maximis ingeniis altissimisque animis, & existit maxime.* Ibid. p. 155.

‡ *Unum illud erat insitum priscais illis, quos *castos* appellat Ennius, esse in morte sensum; neque excessu vitæ sic deleri hominem ut funditus interiret: idque cum multis aliis rebus, tum e pontificio jure et cerimoniis sepulchrorum, intelligi licet; quas *maximis ingeniis* præditi nec tanta cura coluissent, nec violatas tam inexpiabili religione sanxissent, nisi hæsisset in eorum mentibus, mortem non interitum esse omnia tollentem atque delentem, sed quandam quasi migrationem commutationemque vitæ.* Ib. p. 154.

Perception in the State of Death: and that Man, when he departed out of this Life, did not wholly die. This we may infer, as from many other Arguments, so likewise from the pontifical Ordinances, and sepulchral Rites: which they who were endued with the most consummate Understandings would not have establish'd with so much Care, and made the Violation of them so inexpressible; but that they were firmly persuaded in their Minds, that Death did not destroy and extinguish our whole Being; but was a sort of Migration, and Change of this Life for another. What says our Critic to this? By a peculiar Acuteness of Genius and Extent of Learning, he has discover'd, that those *Caschi* or ancient Sages of *Ennius*, and whom *Cicero* makes to be of the highest Order and Dignity, and of the greatest Genius, were no other than *the rude and barbarous Inhabitants of old Italy*, p. 21. The *Caschi*, which is a meer Noun Adjective in *Ennius*, and an old * *Sabine* Word, which signifies *ancient*; our Critics took to be the Name of a *People*, who liv'd somewhere, they know not where, in *Italy*, whom they call *the Caschi*. They were not, it seems, polite and learned enough to be Infidels, who

G 2

did

* Et primum *cascum* significat vetus. Ejus Origo *Sabina* —vetus esse significat *Ennius*, cum ait, quam primum *caschi* populi genere Latini. Var. de Ling. Lat. lib. 6. p. 70. These were therefore the ancient Sages; the venerable wise Men of old *Italy*. *Cicero* calls them *Aucthores optimi* and *maximis ingeniis* præditi. Ubi sup.

did not believe a future State ; and therefore our Critic calls them *rudc* and *barbarous* : but *Cicero* speaks of them as those whose Opinions were of the best Authority and highest Regard ; Men of Dignity and the greatest Understandings : and the Doctrine they so firmly believ'd concerning a future State, they had deliver'd to them from their Ancestors, and it was receiv'd both by Priests and People.

Having beat our Critic and Mr. *Warburton* along with him out of all the Schools of Philosophy, I might leave them to shift for themselves. They fly to the ancient Christian Writers, to whom they are certainly as great Strangers as they are to the Philosophers. And whether the sixth Chapter of our Critic was wrote to expose their Reasonings, or to shew he did not understand them, let them look to it. One Instance will suffice to be taken notice of. *J. Martyr* charges some Platonics with holding the Soul to be *immortal*, and says ; *we ought not to say that it is immortal ; because if it be immortal, it must be unbegotten or ungenerated.* Now what is this to our Critic's Purpose ? or how does it appear that he understands the Martyr's Words ? Not in the least. Does he think that the Martyr deny'd the *Immortality* of the Soul, and a future State ? or does he think that *Plato* held the human Soul to be (*ἀγέννητον*) *ungenerated* ? The Martyr then held the Soul to be *immortal by the Will of God*, but not of itself, or by an ungenerated

ungenerated Immortality or Independency of Existence ; and this our Critic ought to know was the very Doctrine of *Plato* himself : and *Plato* and *J. Martyr* agreed in the Doctrine of the Soul's Immortality and of the future State.

But the Martyr says, that *some who were call'd Platonics thought the Soul to be ungenerated*, and to have a self-existent Immortality ; who they were, he does not tell us, nor is it of any Consequence to know ; since the Doctrine of *Plato* is clear and consistent concerning the future State. [See *J. Mart. Dial. p. 147, 148. Edit. Thirlb.*] Nor do any of those three or four ancient Christian Writers cited by him say or argue, as our Critic does, that the Philosophers *did not or could not believe a future State* : so that he has *try'd his Talents* to no manner of purpose, and they appear to be just what I expected. I made *no Appeal* (as he pretends, *p. 58, 59, &c.*) *to Antiquity* ; nor did I give our Critic any Occasion to shew his Extent of Learning amongst the Christian Writers upon this Subject at all. And he has introduced some of them by Force, principally to abuse me. He says in the beginning of his 6th Chapter, that *Mr. Warburton contents himself to demonstrate that the Philosophers did not believe a future State, and willingly leaves it to Mr. Jackson to persist in affirming that the sacred and primitive Writers did not believe*

believe

lieve a Trinity, p. 52, 53. This unrighteous Calumny has all the *Meanness* and *Ignorance* that is peculiar to Mr. *Warburton*: and 'tis evident that his Hand is in it: and the Critic could not but know when he wrote it, that it was a vile Misrepresentation. I call therefore upon the Critic or Mr. *Warburton*, who is responsible for him, to shew where I affirm that the sacred and primitive Writers did not believe a Trinity: if they cannot shew that I affirm any such thing, as I am sure they cannot, they must either take upon themselves, or bear the Shame of being Slanderers.

Our Critic in his 7th Chapter undertakes to prove the old Philosophers to be *Spinozists* or *Atheists*. His two principal Authorities are a Passage from *Cicero*, and another from *Plutarch*. The Passage from *Cicero* is to shew, that * Pythagoras, who thought there was a Mind diffus'd thro' all Nature, from which our Souls were deriv'd, did not see that God was divided and rent to pieces, by this tearing of human Souls from him. Any one at first sight may see that this is the Reasoning of a Man who neither fear'd nor car'd what he said, in order to disparage the Opinions of other Sects: yet our Critic is so wrapt up with him, because he thinks his Reasoning

favours

* Nam Pythagoras, qui censuit animum esse per naturam rerum omnem intentum et commentem, ex quo nostri animi caperentur, non vidit distractione humanorum animorum discerpi et dilacerari Deum, &c. De Nat. Deor. lib. 1.

favours him ; that he says, *p. 63. It is hardly in the Power of Language to speak in a more accurate and precise manner.* I will shew him another Instance of his Author's *Accuracy and Preciseness*, in his Censure of *Plato* and the *Greek Philosophers*, a little after the Place before-cited : He says of *Plato*, *that he would have it, that God is incorporeal ; which how it can be, he cannot conceive. For if so* (adds this accurate Reasoner of our Author's) *he must necessarily want Sense, Prudence and Pleasure : all which Things are comprehended in the very Notion of Gods **. Is not this a special Advocate for *Mr. Warburton* and our Critic ; who can argue, that the Notion of God supposes him to be *corporeal*, and to have *sensitive* and *corporeal* Affections ? If the Reader has not already found out this *accurate and precise* Philosopher, whom our Critic, if he could, would have pass upon him for *Cicero* ; I will tell him who he is : namely, no other than an *impudent Epicurean* call'd *Velleius* in *Cicero* ; who is brought upon the Stage to abuse all the Philosophers but those of his own atheistical Sect. As our Critic is so fond of him, perhaps he may like him the better for the Character which *Cicero* gives him, and which resembles very much
that

* Quod vero sine corpore ullo Deum vult esse (Plato) ut Græci dicunt, ἀσώματον : id quale esse possit, intelligi non potest. Careat enim sensu necesse est, careat prudentia, careat voluptate : quæ omnia una cum Deorum notione comprehendimus. Ibid.

that of one he is well acquainted with.
 “ Then * (says Cicero) *Velleius* began to
 “ speak with that Assurance that is peculiar
 “ to the Sect: fearing nothing so much as
 “ lest he should seem to doubt about any
 “ Point; as if he was just come down out
 “ of one of *Epicurus’s* fictitious Worlds,
 “ and had been there in Council with the
 “ Gods.”

Lactantius tells us, what was the Opinion of *Pythagoras*, viz. *Pythagoras* (says he) *professed one God*, saying, *that he was an incorporeal Mind which was diffus’d thro’ and comprehended all Nature; and gave Life and Sense to all animated Beings.* (De Ira Dei, Sect. 11.) It does not appear with any probability that the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonics* held the human Soul, or even the cœlestial Beings, to be of the same Nature and Substance with the Supreme unbegotten God: and tho’ the *Stoics*, who held the supreme God to be *material*, were more likely to hold that human Souls were of the *same Nature* with him, yet it does not appear that they did so; and it is certain that they unanimously held that the supreme God had a peculiar Nature of his own, which was ungenerated and incorruptible, and that all other Beings were mortal and corruptible. The
 Truth,

* Tum *Velleius*, *fidenter* sane, ut solent isti, nihil tam verens, quam ne dubitare aliqua de re videretur, tanquam modo ex *Deorum* concilio, et ex *Epicuri* intermundiis descendisset, Audite, inquit, &c. *Ibid.*

Truth, I think, is, about which both Ancients and Moderns have been puzzled; that the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists*, with whom other Philosophers agreed, held that the one supreme immutable God form'd all other Beings out of a pre-existent Substance, which was unform'd, and void of Properties: that the cœlestial Gods and mundane Soul were form'd out of a Mixture of the pure, individual and invisible Parts of this Substance, which made *Soul*, with the divisible and visible Parts which made *Body*: and that God infus'd *Mind* into the Soul to make it intelligent; and the whole to be as perfect as it could be, and to bear a Resemblance to him the supreme Mind and Creator: and that human Souls were made out of the same Mixture, but in a *less perfect* manner. This was undoubtedly the precise Opinion of *Plato*, as appears at large from his *Timæus*; and also of *Timæus* himself. And in this respect only it is that the *Platonics* and others speak of the human Soul, as congenial with and Part of the divine * Substance: not of the supreme

H God,

* Hence *Cicero* says; *humanus autem animus decerptus ex mente divina, cum alio nullo nisi cum ipso Deo, si hoc fas est dictu, comparari potest. Tusc. Quæst. lib. 5. p. 236. Edit. Ald.* *Cicero* meant that the rational or intelligent Soul or Mind was a Portion of the universal divine (v̄85) Mind, which was infus'd into the mundane Soul, and made it the most perfect created Being, and most like to the Supreme God: and so bearing a Similitude to God himself, cou'd only be compar'd with him, *if it was lawful so to say.*

God, but of the universal and mundane Soul. And our Critic has given me two Citations of renowned *Platonics* which confirm this Notion. *Plotinus* tells us *, “ that our Soul “ is of the *same Species* with the Soul of the “ Universe.” And *Alcinous* says ; “ The “ Souls of Men and the Universe do both “ partake of the *same Miftion*,” p. 65. These are indeed the precise Notions of *Plato* ; and probably of the *Pythagoreans*, because they are the Notions of *Timæus Locrus* : and this I observ’d to our Critics, p. 71. of my first Piece. So here we agree. And they must allow that *Plutarch’s* is a crude Representation of *Plato’s* Opinion ; who certainly never thought the *human Soul* to be a Part of the one Supreme God in any Sense whatsoever. And now what signifies all that our Critic has been arguing in his 6th and 7th Chapters, that

* He might have added from *Plotinus* ; “ that the Soul “ after it departs from the Body, goes to the Place appointed for it by divine Justice : for no one will ever “ escape the Punishment due to unrighteous Works. “ For the divine Law is inevitable ; and is able to inflict “ the Judgment which shall be given.” “ Ηκειν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἑσσι δίκης. ἢ γὰρ μὴ ποτε τις ἐκφύγοι ὁ παθεῖν ἐπ’ ἀδίκαις ἔργοις προσήκει· ἀναπόδρασ· ὅ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς νόμος, ὁμῶς ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ κριθὲν ἤδη. Ennead. 4. lib. 3. p. 389. And in the seventh Book of the same Ennead, he shews that the Souls of Men departed do not cease to do good to Mankind ; by which they demonstrate that they are not extinct These are the genuine inward Sentiments of this great *Platonic* Philosopher.

that the *Philosophers* neither did nor could believe a future State: why? because they thought the Soul to be *congenial* with and of the *same Miffion* or Mixture with the *Soul of the World*? they thought the Soul to be of a divine Nature, but still to be *made by God*, and accountable to him for the Use of the Life and Faculties with which he had endued it: and by which it was capable of doing Good or Evil here, and being happy or miserable hereafter. What if their metaphysical Notion of the Soul was not right or strictly philosophical, as no wonder it was not, since it is fo hard to investigate the Nature of it? yet since they unanimously held it to be *created* and dependent upon the Power and Providence of God; and that it was under his Infpection and Difpofal both in this Life and another to come; and since, as I have fully prov'd, they constantly and unanimously profess their Belief of the future Existence of the Soul, and of a State of Rewards and Punishments, of Happiness and Misery: since also such a State is consistent with every Notion of the Soul, (tho' some may be less philosophical than other Notions) that does not make it of the same Nature or Subfistence with the one Supreme God; with every Notion that makes it a Creature and of an imperfect Nature, which was the Opinion of all Philosophers: why should any one imagine that they did not believe a future State, which they fo constantly

stantly and uniformly professed? Nay, if it could be prov'd that the Philosophers held something, in their Notions of the Soul, that was really inconsistent with a future State of Happiness and Misery, or even with a future Existence: would it follow, that they who did not see or own this Inconsistency, did not believe a future State?

I cannot help taking notice of another thing, merely for the Ridiculousness of it. I had a little expos'd Mr. *Warburton's* Ignorance of the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, which make one of the principal *Shews* in his *Divine Legation*: I made it appear that he neither understood them, or knew so much as the Place where they were celebrated. Our Critic is too *modest* to own this; but modestly pretends *I stole my Account of the Mysteries from him*, p. 82. What! he thinks I stole my Confutation of Mr. *Warburton* from Mr. *Warburton*, and so beat him with his own Weapons. This is ridiculous enough: and one must be a mean Pilferer indeed, that will steal from a Man who is so poor as to want Necessaries. But it is time to have done with our modest and so extensively learned Critic; and I will ease the Reader of him, after I have briefly set forth the Sum of the whole Argument.

The Sum of the whole is; Mr. *Warburton* and our Critic pretend to have *demonstrated that the Philosophers did not believe a future State*,

State, and what is more absurd, *that they cou'd not believe it*. They are so far from having demonstrated this Point, that they are forc'd to own that the Philosophers profess'd this Doctrin in the clearest and strongest Terms : and have not been able to bring the least Proof of any Variation or Inconsistency in their Doctrin. They speak of it in Terms not unworthy to be us'd by a Christian ; and represent it under the most beautiful Figures and Emblems, not unlike those made use of by the sacred Writers : by knowing God and having Communion with him, and with those blessed cœlestial Beings who attend his Throne : by inhabiting Regions of Light, and partaking of divine Vision ; and being admitted into the Mysteries of Heaven ; and by an intimate Union with the most perfect Being by *Faith*, *Virtue* and *Knowledge* beati-fying the Soul to endless Duration.

They represent the future Punishment in a no less elegant manner ; by direful Reflections excited in the Mind by *Guilt*, *Vice*, and *Impiety* ; by being excluded from Communion with God and from the blessed Society of cœlestial Spirits ; and associating with evil Dæmons, and the Spirits of wicked Men like themselves ; wallowing in Darkness, Filth and Mire ; and by other Emblems of Horror. The Beauty and Propriety of these Expressions our Critics have no Taste for : and so conclude they meant nothing by them :
because

because they (like all other rational Men) speak of Death as putting an end to all Diseases, and bodily and sensitive Pains and Pleasures ; and setting the Soul at liberty as from a Prison and a State of Darkness, into a full Day of Light and Felicity. The *Stoics* call'd Death a Separation of the Soul (which they thought to be of a fiery Nature) from the Body ; and taught that after that, the Soul return'd to its congenial Element, and continued happy or miserable for certain determin'd Periods of Time, or till its Dissolution at the general Conflagration and Refusion into the Supreme Soul of the Universe. So they differ'd in two Points from the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists*. First, in making the rational Soul to be material and corruptible ; which the others held to be immaterial and immortal : and secondly, in limiting its Duration in the future State, which the others thought to be unlimited and eternal. But they all agreed that the sensitive Soul, which was the Subject of the Passions and animal Life, was distinct from the intelligent Soul, Mind or Spirit ; and that it was *material, mortal and corruptible*, and was extinguished with the Body. This is well known to every one conversant in the old Philosophy ; and clears up all the seeming Inconsistencies of the *Stoics*, when they speak of Death. So that unless our Critic or Mr. *Warburton* can destroy this Distinction and

Duplicity

Duplicity of the Soul, the *Stoics* are as consistent as the *Platonics* and all the rest we have examin'd. But as they must be conscious that nothing can be said on that Head; and that all their Arguments *a posteriori* from Evidence and Fact are utterly overthrown; they try what they can do *a priori*, in the metaphysical way, in which Philosophy they are excellently skill'd. They will prove that the Philosophers *neither did or cou'd believe a future State* (let them say themselves what they will to the contrary) because they held the Soul to be *consubstantial*, not with the incorruptible and ungenerated Spirit of the Supreme God, (this is a great Error) but with the inferior mundane Soul; or as the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* held, of a Substance congenial but less perfect than that of the mundane Soul; as *Plato* shews in his *Timæus*, (p. 1054.) and *Timæus Locrus* himself taught: and that at Death the Soul return'd to some luminous * Seat or Orb, or to the *Anima Mundi*, where it resided in Communion with cœlestial Beings: this was the Condition of virtuous and happy Souls departed from the Body. But our Critics argue, if the Soul was *consubstantial* with God or the Soul of the World, it cou'd not exist in a future State: what sort of Consubstantiality of the Soul
the

* Καὶ ὁ μὲν εἶ τὸν προσήκουσα βίης χρόνον πάλιν εἰς τὴν τῆ συνόμου παρευθεῖς οἰκισιν ἄσπε βίου εὐδαίμονα ἔξει.
Plat. Timæ. p. 1054.

the Philosophers held, I have shewn, which has no appearance of Inconsistency with a future State. And in whatever Sense they held the Consubstantiality of the Soul, they might as well and as consistently believe that it existed in a future State, as they believ'd it to have Existence in the present State. And our Critics either cannot or will not see that their Reasoning (if it may be call'd so) equally proves that the Philosophers did not and cou'd not believe the Soul to exist in the present State, as that they did not and cou'd not believe its Existence in a future State. If any Consubstantiality of the Soul is inconsistent with a future State, it is, to Demonstration, equally inconsistent with the present State, or with any Subsistence at all. This I shew'd Mr. *Warburton* before, *p.* 72, 73. of my *Defence of the Jewish Revelation*, if he wou'd have consider'd it. And if they who believe the human Soul or any other Beings, (for the Argument is the same in all) to be consubstantial with God, must necessarily deny or disbelieve a future State; what will become of the Faith of such ancient Christians as *Tertullian* and others; and of a great part of Christians in all later Ages as well as the present? [I do not include our Critics; for they, no doubt, are wiser than to believe any such Consubstantiality, tho' exoterically they are ready to profess and to subscribe to the Truth of it.]

Another

Another Argument of our Critics, that the Philosophers *neither did or cou'd believe a future State*, is ; that they taught the *Return* of the Soul to God after Death, and an *Union* or *Communion* with the Divine Nature and with cœlestial Beings. If this be any Proof, it equally holds in the Christian Doctrin, as in that of *Plato* and other more ancient Philosophers. But our Critics are so accurate as to confound *Union* with *Dissolution*, or the Stoical *Refusion*. This is for want of a little Metaphysics. For as God or the Divine Substance is essentially and necessarily infinite and omnipresent, it must not only comprehend and contain all other created Substance or Being ; but it must be as intimately and more intimately present with every Substance or Being, than any conceivable Union can make one Substance present to another : nor can any Person or intelligent Being [consubstantial or not is all one] by any *Union* be the same with that to which it is united ; and therefore any Being may exist in any conceivable Union, either with God or any other Being, either in the present or future State, without destroying its Nature or Subsistence. The Stoical *Refusion* or *Dissolution* was quite another thing, which our Critics confound with *Union* ; and indeed was the direct Opposite to it : the one was the Foundation of the Happiness of the Soul ; the other was the

Destruction of its personal Subsistence. After all ; the Philosophers did not think the human Soul was consubstantial, or of the same Nature and Substance with the Supreme God ; which cuts the Sinews of all Mr. *Warburton's* and his Critic's *Demonstrations* on this Head : they cannot prove it of any of them out of their own Writings : and indeed it is a vulgar Error which ancient as well as modern Writers have fallen into, by not duly considering the first fundamental Article of the Pagan Theology ; that the Supreme Deity was *one, unbegotten, and immutable* : the Creator of all other Beings, intellectual and animate as well as inanimate, which were form'd by his Power and Will ; and became either *mortal* as the *Stoics* held, or *immortal*, as the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonics* held, by his Pleasure and Appointment. Nothing is more plain than that the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* held the human Soul to be of a distinct and inferior Nature to that of the Supreme God : and it is as plain that the *Stoics* held the Supreme God to be *immortal* and *incorruptible*, and the human Soul to be *mortal* and *corruptible* : and that the Supreme God had peculiar Properties distinct from every created Being. So that tho' they held the Supreme God to be *material* ; yet they no more suppos'd the human Soul to be of the same Nature with the Supreme God, than they

they suppos'd it to be of the same Nature with the grossest Matter. They made as great a Difference between the several Species of Matter ; as other Philosophers did between *Matter* and *immaterial* Substance. And they who conceiv'd the human Soul (as the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* did) to be congenial and of a like Substance with the mundane Soul : yet the mundane Soul itself was by them thought, especially by the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists*, to be *created*, and to be infinitely inferior to the supreme unbegotten Being, or God. Some of the *Stoics* seem to have confounded *the World* and *God* the Creator of it together : but the general Notion of the *Stoics* was, that God was the Mind or Soul which was diffus'd thro' and actuated all things, as they suppos'd the Soul acted in the whole human Body : so they thought the World was as it were the Body of which God was the Soul ; and that he made or form'd all things, as he will'd, out of this his Body : that human Souls were form'd from the *fiery Element* ; that cœlestial Gods were made of a still more *pure elementary Fire* : and that the Supreme Mind was of a fiery Nature infinitely more pure and spiritual than either *Gods* or *human Souls*, because it was *immutable* and *incorruptible*. Hence it is no wonder that the *Stoics* shou'd call the Soul *a Portion of God* ; without seeing that their

Notion was inconsistent with the Individuality of the Supreme Mind ; or with believing a future State of Happiness and Misery, according to the Will and Appointment of the Supreme God.

So that Mr. *Warburton* and his Critic can never get off by pretending at last, (*p.* 55.) that they meant only *that the Philosophers cou'd not believe a future State consistently with their Notions of the human Soul.* They might then believe a future State, tho' inconsistently, if Mr. *Warburton* and his Critic are Judges of Consistency. And so at last all that Mr. *Warburton* has been doing is, not to prove that the *Philosophers did not believe a future State, or cou'd not believe it* ; but only that they did not nor cou'd believe it *consistently with their Notions of the Soul.* Yet both the Authors have charg'd the Philosophers with not believing a future State in absolute Terms, without any Reserve or Limitation. Now they pretend that they *meant* only that they cou'd not believe it consistently with their Notions of the human Soul : however they did believe it, they must at last own ; and so, that Mr. *Warburton's Demonstrations* and a great Part of his *incomparable Work* falls to nothing. But these Critics are as far from proving that the Philosophers Notions of the human Soul are inconsistent with their believing a future State ; as they ever have been

been and ever will be, that they did not actually believe it.

I gave Mr. *Warburton* a Caution both of the Fallacy and Danger of drawing Consequences (whether right or wrong) from Mens speculative Opinions; and then charging them directly with Infidelity in a Point which they constantly and invariably profess to believe; because we imagine that they held something not consistent with such Belief.

If no one is to be allow'd to believe a God and Providence and future State, which all depend on each other, and were uniformly profess'd by all Sects of Philosophers, but *Epicureans* and *Pyrrhonists*, or Atheists and Sceptics; because some metaphysical Notions may be mix'd with their Belief, which are either in themselves absurd, or which we fancy to be inconsistent with it; what must become of Christians as well as Pagans; nay even of Mr. *Warburton* and his modest Critic?

To conclude; I have with very little trouble confuted every thing alledg'd *in the Critical Enquiry* against my Proof that the ancient Philosophers did constantly and invariably profess and believe a future State. The critical Enquirer and Mr. *Warburton* have been so far from *demonstrating*, as they boast, the contrary; that they have not produc'd one Passage of any one ancient Writer to their Purpose :

Purpose: tho' they have tried by Misrepresentation and Misconstruction of their Sense and Words to make them speak what they wou'd have them. But the Philosophers are consistent and uniform; and had even without the Light and Assistance of Revelation, a very just and high Sense of the Being and Providence of God; and of the Obligation of being virtuous, holy and good, in order to do his Will, and to be acceptable to him: to be like him here, and rewarded by him hereafter. They founded their religious Notions and moral Practices on the Consideration of the divine Perfections; on the essential Difference of Good and Evil; and the Assurance of Happiness attending the one, and Misery the other, from the immutable Reason of Things; and also by the positive Appointment of God.

These are the Men whom Mr. *Warburton* calls *Fools in Theory and Knaves in Practice*: which Language is very *barsh* and *unphilosophical*. It would have been more to his purpose, to have made good his Charge against them by fair Reasoning and Argument, than to call them *Names*; which he wou'd not have done if he had been better acquainted with them. They wanted the Light we have; and many of them wou'd undoubtedly have been glad of it: and tho' the Lives of some of them were vicious and immoral;

moral; yet others were illustrious Examples of real Virtue and Piety.

I have defended them in the Part I undertook, and leave it to the Reader to judge, whether, as Mr. *Warburton* proposes, *his Divine Legation in the Points debated is to stand or to fall, by the Strength or by the Invalidity of what has been said in his Defence in the Critical Enquiry.*

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

P. 16. l. 29. *ν. κακὸν.* P. 32. l. ult. *ν. ἐποπτεύουτες,*
 P. 39. l. 26. *ν. οἱ ἄν.*

BOOKS printed for JOHN NOON, at the White
Hart near Mercer's Chapel, Cheapſide.

I. **N**ovatiani Opera, cum copioſiſſimis Obſervationibus & Notis, in quibus totum argumentum auctoris de Regula Fidei ex veterum Patrum Monumentis late diſcutitur. Præmittitur Diſſertatio de Filii Dei Homouoſio, five Coeſſentialitate uni Deo Patri.

II. A ſecond Edition of a Defence of Human Liberty, in anſwer to the principal Arguments which have been alledged againſt it, and particularly to CATO's Letters on that Subject. To which is added a Vindication of Human Liberty: In anſwer to a Diſſertation on Liberty and Neceſſity; written by A. C. Eſquire.

III. An Anſwer to a Book, intitled, Things Divine and Supernatural, conceiv'd by Analogy with Things Natural and Human.

IV. A Diſſertation on Matter and Spirit, with ſome Remarks on a Book, entitled, An Enquiry into the Nature of the Human Soul. 1s

V. The ſecond Part of the Plea for Human Reaſon, in anſwer to a Letter written to the Author of the Plea for Human Reaſon. 1s.

VI. A Narrative of the Caſe of the Rev. Mr. *Jackson's* being reſuſed the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at *Bath*, by Dr. *Coney*, Miniſter of *Bath*. With ſome Obſervations upon it, worthy the Conſideration of all Friends to true Religion, and Liberty of Conſcience. 3d.

VII. The Belief of a future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the *Hebrews*; and the Doctrine of the ancient Philoſophers concerning a future State ſhewn to be conſiſtent with Reaſon, and the Belief of it demonſtrated: and the whole System of Heathen Theology explain'd. With an Appendix, concerning the Genealogy and Time of *Job*, and ſome Remarks on the fifth Volume of the ſecond Part of Mr. *Lardner's* Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory.

VIII. A Defence of a Book, intitled, the Belief of a future State, &c. occaſioned by ſome immoral Reflections on the Author and his Writings, contain'd in the ſecond Part of Mr. *Warburton's* Remarks, &c. Wherein the Command of God to *Abram*, to offer up his Son, is fully conſider'd, and clear'd from all Objections.

IX. A farther Defence of the ancient Philoſophers, concerning their Doctrine and Belief of a future State: againſt the Miſrepresentations of a Critical Enquiry, Prefaced by Mr. *Warburton*.

All the above Writings by Mr. John Jackson.







