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THE

PREFACE.

ALTHOUGH the ensuing Treatise is not of a Size or in a Form proper for a Part of any Preface; yet I call it a Supplement to the Preface of my first Volume of The Sacred and Prophane History of the World connected, because the Subject-Matter of it ought, and was intended to have been treated in that Preface; but was deferred, as I wished to see what others, who were writing after me (a), would offer upon a Subject so variously

(a) The Writers of the Universal History soon after began to publish their Work; and after their Account of the Creation, gave us, as I hoped they would, what they could collect of the Fall of Man. See my Preface to Vol. I. p. 36.
thought of by divers able and valuable Writers, rather than too hastily offer to the Public, Sentiments upon it, which I had a just Diffidence of, as many of them seemed to be more peculiarly my own.

A supposed Impossibility of reconciling a literal Interpretation of Moses’s Account of the Fall of Man, to any reasonable Notions of God, and to what must in Truth be his Dispensations towards us, (b) is, I believe, what has introduced the Notion of explaining some Parts at least of his Narration into Apologue and Fable: The Shadow of Allegory seems to give us some Appearance of knowing, what we do not plainly understand; and an unexamined Hearsay of eastern Sages, their Mythology and Literature, amuses us with a Colour of being very learned, whilst perhaps we really mistake the Rise and Design of the very Liter-
naturaleza we have Recourse to, in endeavouring to resolve into it Moses's Narration, which most evidently sets before us Particulars absolutely incapable of admitting any allegorical Interpretation whatsoever.

That the great Point of which Moses informs us, is of this Sort; absolutely incompatible with Allegory is, I think, evident beyond Contradiction (c): And I hope, the ensuing Pages, may as clearly shew, of every Part of what he has related upon the Subject, that taken literally to be done, as he has recorded it, the whole very pertinently agreeing to the great Design of all subsequent Scripture, must shew us, that, in all that happened unto our first Parents, nothing befell them, improper for their being unto us for Examples (d); and that the Account we have of them, so far from being mythic or unintelligible, is most plainly written for

(c) See p. 239.  (d) 1 Cor. x. 11.
our Admonition; that we may indeed learn from it, in what Manner and Measure, from the Beginning it was, as it still is, the One Thing needful for Man truly and indeed to obey God: All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God; and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness; that the Man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good Works (c): If in explaining Moses's Narration of the Fall literally, we can shew it to bear evidently all these Characters of holy Writ, as I trust from what is to follow, it will be seen to bear them, we shew what must be of more real Weight for a literal Interpretation, than all that is otherwise suggested against it.

But, tho' what I have here intimated, and have further evinced in the ensuing Treatise, will make it evident, that Moses did not here write Apologue

---

(c) 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.
and *Fables*; whether what I am going to suggest be certain Fact or not, yet it may not be disagreeable to the Reader to remark, that the relating *mythologically physical* or moral Truths concerning the Origin and Nature of Things, was not perhaps, as modern Writers too hastily imagin, the customary Practice of *Moses’s Age*; but rather began after his Times. The Poet’s Rule may be a very good one to judge even of the Stile and Manner of Authors,

Ætatis cujusque notandi sunt tibi Mores.
Hor.

And a few Intimations may possibly shew us, that a due Use of it may not be altogether of no Effect in the Inquiry before us.

The *Wisdom of the East Country*, and its *eastern Sages* were in high Esteem in the Days of Solomon (*f*);

(*f*) 1 Kings iv. 30.  

A 4  but
but it is observed at the same Time, that the Wisdom of Egypt stood in Competition with it (g): There were then Western Sages, as well as Eastern; and how readily soever Eastern Sages flows from the Pen of modern Writers, as far as I can find, we must go to the Western ones for the Rise of Mythologic Writing. Mythology began in Egypt: It was new and recent there in the Times of Sanchoniatho; the νεώτατοι εἰσελθόντων, the Priests, who at that Time were most modern, had then invented and introduced it (h) : Sanchoniatho flourished about A. M. 2760 (i) : Moses died A. M. 2553:

(g) 1 Kings iv. 30. (h) When Sanchoniatho made his Inquiries we are told that, οἱ νεώτατοι ἐκ ἑσπερίας τῆς ἑρμοῦ καταγούσαν. Αὐτοὶ δὲ τοὺς καρδικοὺς παθήματα συνήγαγον καὶ πολλοῖς ἐπίγον. τοὺς ἐκ τούτων, τοῖς μὲν ραδίως τινὲς σωζόντα καὶ τὸ κατ' ἀλήθειαν γενόμενον. Euseb. Prepar. Evan. Lib. i. c. 9. (i) Sanchoniatho flourished ἐκ τῶν τροικῶν ἔχον, ἄγνωστος τοῖς Μοσσίω. Euseb. ibid. Troy was taken, according to Archbishop Usher, A. M. 2820: according to the Arundel Marble 2796. Agreeably hereto Sanchoniatho is said to have conversed with Jerombaal a Priest of the God Jew, in or near Phœnicia: The Country of the Jews was often taken as a Part of Phœnicia: The
2553 (k): In the Interval of these 217 Years, we have Reason to suppose the Rise of Mythology.

It is remarkable, that in this Interval the Correction of the Year was made in Egypt, when Asebth was King there (l): Asebth or Assis was the sixth Pastor King, the second after Apophis, who perished at the Exit of the Israelites in the Red-Sea, A M. 2513 (m):

The four Letters of the Word Jebovah may easily be so pointed as to be pronounced Jebob: Gideon, who was also called Jerubahad. Judges v. 32, was a Prophet, a Ruler, a great Deliverer of his People under the especial Direction of this God, whose Name was Jebovah [גְּבֹהַ֣א] Judges vi, vii, viii. With the Heathens, and in the most ancient Times; the Ruler was also Priest unto his People; see Connect. Vol. II. B. 6; so that they might naturally deem Jerubahad a Priest of the God יְהֹוָה גֶּבֹּהַד, as they pronounced it, from his having been appointed by Jebovah to rule and govern his People: Mr. Dodwell indeed wrote a Treatise to prove Sanchoianiatho not to have been thus ancient: But I cannot apprehend his Endeavours to be at all conclusive. Take Jerubahad to be Gideon, and Gideon to have ended his War against Midian about A M. 2760, see Usher's Annals, about that Time Sanchoianiatho might have access to him. (k) See Connect. Vol. III. B. 12. p. 300. (l) 'Ἀραμαῖον ἐσανθασαν Ἄστις — τῷ Ἰς Κόμμι [ἐ]+θαν[τα] χαὶ Ἰσραήλ ὡσὶν ἑαυτὰν τὰς τὸν ἴταρχον καὶ ὅπαν ὁμοίον ἀστικῶν ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ τῆς Κύπρου Ἀραμαίαν ἐναυσί. τοῦ μονον τόν τὸν μετράκων πληρώς. Synellus, p. 123. According to Synellus, Asebth lived about A M. 2716. According to Sir John Marsham, we must place him 2665. See Connect. Vol. II. p. 284. But from the Years of the Egyptian Kings, as I deduce them, see Vol. III. p. 237, his Times are from 2563 to 2603. (m) See Connect. Vol. III. B. xi. p. 237, 242.
Affis began to reign at the end of 50 Years after the Death of Apophis; i.e. A.M. 2563; the Correction of the Year was not until after the Beginning of his Reign; in what Time of it we are not told; he reigned 40 Years; we may well place it towards his Death, about perhaps A.M. 2600, which is about 47 Years after the Death of Moses; 22 Years after the Death of Joshua.

The Fable that is handed down to us along with the Account of their Correction of the Year, very significantly points out that their Mythology took its rise from this Incident: They now found out, that there were five Days in the Year more than they had thought of, and they mythologized,

(n) Ibid. p. 237. (o) The Reign of Tanias, the intermediate King between Apophis and Affis or Asis, brings us to begin Affis's Reign at this Year. (p) Ibid. (q) Conneft. Vol. II. Book viii. (qq) Affis died 2603; vide quæ sup. (r) Moses died 2553. (t) Joshua died A.M. 2578. Conneft. Vol. II. Book xii. p. 428. (t) The Egyptian Year was now first computed to be 365 Days, being before reckoned 360 only. Syn-cellus ubi sup. Conneft. Pref. to Vol. I.

that
that five Gods were now born, Osiris, Orus, Typho, Isis, and Nepthe (u): They could not mean, that these Personages now first began to be; for they had been, Ages before, mighty and renowned Princes in their Country; but they now first ascribed to them a Rule and Influence over all Things sublunary, by supposing each to be the governing Power in some Star, thought to be animated by them. The Dog-Star was reputed the Orb of Isis (w); to the others were allotted, in like manner, their respective Spheres (x), and the Philosophy of the Egyptians at this time seems to have been exerted in such a Lustration of their Year,

— ἐσπερατο εἰς θυσίων
"Argus" Aratus.

as to assign ruling Influences of the Stars over the several Parts of it, and

to suppose their ruling Stars animated by those who had been the early Founders, and Supporters of their States and Cities. What their former Theories had been, shall be mentioned presently. What I would here hint is, that they now fell into a Way of Thinking, which the Roman Poet took up afterwards to make his Court to Germanicus Cæsar,

Cæsaris Arma canant alii, nos Cæsaris Aras,
Et quoscunque sacrís addidit ille Dies.
Ovid. Fast. Lib. I.

They consecrated, and placed over their Times and Seasons, the venerable Personages of their most ancient Ancestors, who had laid the early Foundations of all the Egyptian Glory and Prosperity, and they hoped, that if they with proper Rites worshipped Gods so auspicious,

—— felix totus ut annus cat.
Ovid. ubi sup.

that
that Ages of all national Happiness might be renewed to them.

What had been the more ancient Egyptian Theology, the Inquiries of Sanchoniatho declare to us: He having examined their ancient Records, and set aside all the Mythology that had been induced, gave us their true ancient Dogmata (b); and what he has left us, evinces, that their Doctrines were, that the Origin of Things happened from Principles of Nature effectuating without Choice or Intelligence, what blindly by a mechanical Event of Things arose from them (i). He talks indeed of a τὸ πνεῦμα, what we might think to call a Spirit; tells us, that it was in love with its own Principles (k), but his Spirit was such an One, as a modern Author exhibits to

(b) ὁ Ἰσραήλ ὁ τῶν ἔθεσιν ἐπιθέτων ὀρθέτης τηρεῖσθαι ἀμυνόμενος γενεάσας καὶ ἀνετότητα ἀρετῆς, ὃ μένσιν ἀποτελεῖ ἓν τὶ ισχυος, καὶ τῆς ἐκπεπλήθει τὴ σειράμαται, ἵνα καὶ ἀρχᾶς μίθου, καὶ τὰς ἀληθείας ἐπιδράν τοιοοῦσιν, Εὐθύσσω τῷ πρότερον. Euseb. Praep. Evang. Lib. I. c. 9. (i) Id. ibid. c. 10. (k) ἔσμαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀρχῆς. Id. ibid.
us: a Spirit, "which clothed with "one Set of material Organs, is only "capable of exerting its Intelligence "in the Performance of Attraction or "Repulsion, and when jarring Ele- "ments meet, breaks forth in Thun- "der and Lightning, and Earthquakes, "or any other mechanical Operations, "but may, when united to a diffe- "rent Set of Organs of a more ex- "quisite and delicate Contexture, be "capable of exercising voluntary Mo- "tion, may be enabled to think and "to reason, to operate in Love or "Hatred, and when provoked by "Opposition, may be agitated with "Anger and Resentment, and break "forth in Quarrels, Contention and "War (/)." The Egyptian τὸ πνεῦμα which generated all Things, was an Original like this Author's Spirit, un- to which tho' Sanchoniatho ascribes operating Principles, yet he expressly

tells us, they were insensible (m), and sometimes caused jarring Elements, and broke forth in Lightning and Thunders (n), and what is very wonderful, he also opined that these unintelligent operating Powers produced some animal Beings which being alive, but having no Thought, procreated other Beings that had both Life and Intelligence (o): These later Productions must be surely conceived, like the Spirit of our modern Writer above cited, to have kindled into Cogitation, by having Bodies unaccountably formed to strike out this Flame, and without which they could have made no Collisions of a finer Nature, than what might cause the Voice of Thunder, and the Flashes of Lightning to be

---

(m) ἔγρατο σύμφωνας ἦν άπλοκη ένεμὴ ἐκλάθη ΠΟΘΟΣ: ἀνωτὰ ἀρχὴ έποιεις ἄπα. ουτοί δὲ έστι ενίσχυσε ἢ άποτά κλησ. ουτό, if the Reader consults the Place, he will see it refers to τὰ πρώτα preceding. Eupeb. Prop. Evang. I. i. c.10. in princip. (n) ἐπεσεν ἐνέκειαν, ή το ἴδιν τοῦ ἐνεκειείσας δια το ήλιον τύμωσιν, ή πάντα σωλωτῷ ταῦτα άποτά τοις θα ή ίσωρροπας, τεταλειπότα τους αυτούς. Eupeb. ibid. (o) ον το τινα ζωα έν έχοντα αἰώνιοι, ή άπο εξερετο γα αισχυν. Id. ibid.
heard and seen from them: These were the ancient Dogmata of Egypt (q), and it is not so great a Wonder they were so, considering the low State of their Rudiments of Knowledge; but that any Writer should think of offering Sentiments of this Sort in an Age of Philosophy, so clear and intelligible, as all, who know Philosophy, are now versed in, is, I confess, to me most amazing.

But this, as I have said, was, before Moses's Age, the Wisdom of Egypt: Atheistic, sine Deo (r), supposing the World to have been made and governed without a God, by blind and unintelligent Principles of Nature; and their Worship and Religion

(q) τοῦτ' ἐσθι ἐν τῇ ἡφαιστείᾳ ψευδημωνίᾳ των ἔθεων. Eutheb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 10. (r) See Connect. Vol. II. B. ix. It may be thought surprising that it should; but Philosophy seems to have begun upon these blind Principles in all Countries. It appears to have been the old Way of those of the first World, who perished in the Flood, see Job xxii. 15, 16, 17. And in later Ages, after the Deluge, the Greeks, copying after the first Rudiments of Egypt, long philosophized, without supposing any Intelligence to have made or govern the World. Anaxagoras is said to have introduced this Principle: πρῶτος τῷ ὧδε Νῆν ἐπίζησαν. Laert. in Anaxag.
was according to it: But Moses, tho' learned in all the Wisdom of the Egyptians (i), was also better instructed, and taught in opposition to the Egyptian Literature, that, in the Beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth, and that without him was not any Thing made that was made (u): And the God, whom Moses had thus declared, had most amazingly exalted his Power against all the Gods and Religion of Egypt, by bringing his People, a Nation, out of the midst of and from under their Subjection to the Egyptians, by such Signs and Wonders, by such a mighty Hand and stretched out Arm; by such amazing Miracles, and intire Overthrow of all the Strength of Egypt, that if it were asked of the Days that were past, since the Day that God created Man upon Earth, no such Thing as this great Thing had ever been, nor any Thing heard like it (w). Egypt

(70) Deut. iv. 32—34.

a was
was destroyed, greatly diminished and brought low; its King and Armies overwhelmed and lost in the Red-Sea (x); six hundred thousand Slaves, besides Women and Children, had left this Country, the Egyptians not being able in the least to oppose it, where now, and what were the Gods of Egypt? their Elementary Powers, or sidereal Influences? was it not too plain to be contradicted, that there was a Power that ruled in the Heavens far mightier than they, who disposed of them, as he pleased, and was able to do of himself whatsoever he would have done in the Earth? Should the Egyptians that remained turn and inquire, and seek after to serve this God? Would not State-Policy, which always has, and always will try to work its Way notwithstanding Religion, have herein prevented them, and offered it to their Consideration, whether, if they took

(x) Exod. x. 7. xii. 29, 30. xiv.
this Course, the Israelites might not come and take away their Place and Nation? It seems better to have satisfied them, to correct their Year, and reform their own System; and what more likely Reform of their Religion might they fall into, than now to consider, that unquestionably they had been wrong in supposing Elements to govern the Course of Nature, without a personal Agent ruling in them: But conceiving the Israelites to have their God, they reputed every Nation to have its own (y), and looking back to their most early Progenitors, who had been the Glories of their Times, and under whom had been laid all the Foundations of their public and private Happiness, they opined them, after they had left the Earth, to have taken their Orbs, to govern and influence the Things below, in some Element, Star, or Sphere above, from

(y) See Micah iv. 5. 2 Kings xvi. 33, 34, 35.

Heaven.
Preface.

Heaven. The Greeks thus reputed Astraea, after long Labours on Earth, to do good to Mortals, to have at last left the World, to give her Light from the Constellation called Virgo (ɔ): And we find it an ancient Apotheosm of the Egyptians, that their most ancient Kings who had prosperously governed them, were divine (a); accordingly they now canonized these, and endeavoured to devote and consign themselves to their Protection.

That Mythology came in upon this Alteration of their Theology, is obviously evident: for the mingling the History of these Men when Mortals, with what came to be ascribed to them when Gods, would naturally occasion it. And of this Sort we generally find

(ɔ) Ἐναθ' ύπερενία, ταῦτ' ἔγερ εἴρηντε χόρῳ
'Ἡξι ὕπερ εἴρηντε ἔτο φαίνηε' ἄνθρωποι

Aratus Phœn. ver. 134.

Thus the Egyptian Heroes departed: τας ἦ ἤγος λαμπέων ἀκτών. vid. Plut. de Isis et Osirid. (a) Δοέγετ ἦ ἦ ζάμμενο έν Ἀργοντῷ φιλοσόφῳ ἀνακάταθεν ἀνεπέταξεν τό νεότερον, το νάδις χιεράς πεπερασμένος τὸν Την τῇ μάραγον ὧν ἐκάρο ὧς κατέτυχεν δάνῳ εἰς. Plutarch. in Alexandr.
the Mythoi told of them (b). I will go no further at this Time into this Topic, altho' I might much enlarge upon it, by considering how Mythology spread from Egypt into Phænicia, was indeed a little check'd by the Inquiries of San-choniatho; but soon obtained again to be grafted upon his Philosophy (c), infected even the Israelites, when in their Defection from their Worship of the true God, they took up the Tabernacle of Moloch, and the Star of the God Remphan (d); how it travelled into Greece; where new Fables were in-

(b) The Egyptians having called their Heroes by the Names of their Sidereal and Elementary Deities, added to the History of the Life and Actions of such Heroes a Mythological Account of their Philosophical Opinions concerning the Gods whose Names had also been given to such Heroes, &c. See Connect. Vol. II. B. viii. (c) ἐν σαρλοῦν εἰς ἑπεράνων ἵστεις χριστοῦ ἔνθεν ἔσταιν αὐτὸν [i. e. πρέπον beforegoing] ἔνθεν ἥταν, καὶ ἐὰν τὸ ὑπὸ δεῖ τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἐν πάσιν. Euseb. Frap. Evang. l. i. c. 9. (d) The Israelites Worship of the Calf at Horeb was in imitation of the Sacra of the Egyptians; for the Egyptians had consecrated Animals to their Sidereal and Elementary Divinities before the Israelites left them. See Connect. Vol. III. B. xi. Vol. II. B. viii. But St Stephen, Acts vii. 43, does not say that they worshipped Moloch and Remphan in the Wilderness; but after the 40 Years in the Wilderness they were, at the Expiration of which they came into Canaan, they were after this given up to worship these Gods, who were Hero Gods of some of the Countries round about them.
vented, and added to the more ancient ones; and these varied in different Ages (e), until they grew too gross

(e) The Ἐρώς of Tautus, the blind Mechanical Principle so called by the Egyptian Naturalists, became the Ἐρως of the Mythologists, not meaning by that Word, Cupid, the blind God of Love; for, this God of Love is not named, or is, if mentioned, called Ἰμερός in Homer, never Ἐρως or Ἐρως; and Hesiod also names him Ἰμερός, and describes him to belong to Venus, and not to be Ἐρως. For of Venus or Cytherea he says,

Τῷ Ἐρώς ὥμαρτον ὡς Ἰμερός ἐστεο ναλος

Hesiod. Theog. v. 201.

Eros himself was not the blind and inconstant Boy unto whom later Fables ascribed a Presidency over the

Res solliciti plena Timoris Amor — — — — — Ovid.

over the sickle Passion, which admits, as Terence tells us, neque Consilium neque Modum, &c. but Eros was in the Beginning from Chaos and Tellus, like Πόθος in Sanshoniatho, and is described,

— Ἐρως, ὡς θαλλις ὡς ἁθανάτιοι σεισις
Λυσιμέλης, πᾶιτων τε θεων πᾶιτων τ' αὐρώπων
Δμωναῖον εἰς ηθεασι βόον χ' ἐπίφερα ζελων

Hesiod. Theog. v. 120.

Eros, in the natural System called Πόθος, was the Principle that brought Things into the Harmony of Order out of Chaos or Confusion, and the Person signified by the Fabulists to be this Deity was some eminent Personage, who had excelled in Ability to temper and moderate the Minds of Men: who had governed himself, and greatly taught others to have Peace in themselves, and to live in Peace and Harmony with other Persons: And that Love should follow after, wherever such a Person is acquainted with Venus, the Goddess of all Elegance and Beauty, is no unreasonable Supposition; but whether this Myros was more antique than Hesiod I am uncertain; I think we find nothing like it in Homer: He supposes Venus to be the Goddess, who subjected unto Love both Mortals and Immortals, and Ἰμερός, whom Hesiod makes a Person, is like νική, in Homer, not a proper Name, but generally, I think always, a common Noun. Hom. II. ξ, ver. 197. &c.
for Philosophy to bear them, and occasioned those who speculated upon them, to think many of them only Tales of Poets, to please and take the Minds of the Vulgar, altho' they saw in some a deeper and recondite Meaning, which they endeavoured to explore and interpret, as their Traditions furnished Tenets for the Solution of them: But having hinted that in Fact, the Writings of Egypt, in Moses's Age, were only plain Narrations; as they conceived Things to have been caused by Operations of Nature exerting themselves without any intelligent Being creating and directing them; and that Moses, contrary hereto, set forth as plainly that there was a God, who created and governed all Things; that in Opposition hereto the Heathen Nations, not acknowledging the One God, and yet brought to think, that Agencies without Intelligence could not be the Powers, that ruled the World, set up Gods many; and those such Gods, that
Fable and Mythology naturally arose from the Institution of them; and consequently had their Rise not until Moses's System was thus opposed, not until after his Days, altho' I cannot herein pretend to any Certainty of Demonstration, yet I think, I may venture to say, nothing so probable as what I have offered, can be collected from any Remains of Antiquity, to contradict it.

The Objections, I have replied to in the ensuing Treatise, are taken chiefly from Dr. Burnet, sometime Master of the Charter-House: He appears to have given us the Substance of what can be offered against the literal Interpretation; other Writers do but copy after him: Dr. Middleton, I think, improves not any Point he took from him. One indeed he states in a Manner something different from Dr. Burnet, I will here consider it as Dr. Middleton represents it.
Dr. Middleton suggests to us, that it is not possible for any Mortal, "to give an historical Narration, to describe the particular Manner, Order and Time, in which; or the Materials, out of which this World, and its principal Inhabitant Man were formed: that were any Writer to pretend to it, we should apply to him what was said by God to Job, Where was thou, when I laid the Foundations of the Earth? declare, if thou hast Understanding: And we should think the same of him, which Job confesseth of himself; that he had uttered what he understood not; Things too wonderful for him, which he knew not (f): We should conclude at once that the whole, which the wisest of Men could write upon the Subject, must be the mere Effect of Fancy and Imagination." ---- "From the Na-

(f) Job xxxviii. 4.

"ture
ture of the Story itself, we should readily conclude, that no Writer whatsoever, could be so sufficiently informed, as to be able to give an historical Narration of it, or could have Authority enough to make it pass for such with any judicious Reader (g).” Dr. Middleton introduces the Suggestion, not pretending directly to say, that Moses could not possibly, supposing him an inspired Writer, give an authentic Account of the Facts related by him, but desiring to have the Reader weigh and consider, what he would reasonably think of such Facts so related, if the Relator was believed not to have the Warrant of a real Revelation from God, of the Matters declared by him (b). What Argument can be drawn from what he thus offers seems to me very obscure:

(g) See Middleton’s Examinat. p. 128. Burnet’s Archæol. p. 284. (b) Let us take a Review of the Story, as if it had been told us by Sanckoniato. Middleton’s Examinat. p. 128.
obscure: The Apostle tells us, that through Faith we understand that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God (*i*): He herein evidently refers to the Mosaic History: That the Worlds were not eternal, but were made by the Power of God, may be demonstrated from the Reason and Nature of Things; but that God spake the Word and they were made; commanded and they were created (*k*); that they were not made, without the Word spoken by him; not made by the immediate Purpose of his Will; but that he said, Let them be and they were so (*l*); as also that Things did not instantly, all at once take their Being, as he might design them, but in six Days, were in their several Orders framed and fashioned, Day by Day, such in every Day, as he was pleased to appoint, when before there were

(*) Heb. xi. 3.  
(*k*) Pfal. cxi. viii. 5. See xxxiii. 6, 9.  
(*l*) Gen. i. 3, 6, 11, 14, 20, 24, &c.
none of them, this we may have no Reason to believe (n), but upon the Authority

(n) Nothing would give us so clear a View of the Apostle’s Reasoning in the Eleventh Chapter to the Hebrews, as the carefully observing his Distinction and Definition of the Word Faith: Faith, he tells us, ver. 1. is the Substance of Things hoped for, the Evidence of Things not seen. The Word we translate Substance is ἔσος, how we came here to render it Substance is not easy to say: as derived from ἐστὶ and τὸν, it may signify what the Logicians define Substance, Res substanti et substantia accidentibus, but Faith, an Act of the Mind, is no such Substance: There is a Passage in the new Testament which may lead us to render this Place more pertinently: St. Paul tells us, 2 Cor. ix. 4. of the ἔσος of his Boasting: Here we render the Word the Confidence: The Apostle assuredly believed his Boasting not to be groundless, and this assured Belief he called ὑπὸσ. In this we have a clear Meaning: Faith is this Assurance, an undoubted Persuasion of the Things hoped for: The Apostle adds, that it is the Evidence, ἔπλησθαι, what argues to us Things not seen: We are apt to be very indifferent in our Notions of Faith. In common Speech we often take Faith and Knowledge the one for the other: The believing a Thing upon good Testimony, and the knowing it, are in a general Acceptation reputed one and the same Thing: But the Scriptures shew us a real Difference between Faith and Knowledge: They are not the same Attainments; for we are exhorted to add the one to the other: Add, says St. Peter, to your Faith Knowledge, 2 Pet. i. 5. Faith is the believing Things not seen, not known to ourselves, but declared to us, and believed upon Testimony, that they are true: We are capable of Information, without the Testimony of others, two ways, by our Senses, and by our Understandings: Things external strike our Senses, and we immediately know what Impressions we receive of them: And we have an Ability of Mind to see and compare our Thoughts of Things, and to form a Judgment what to conclude of them: In this Sense divers Things, which literally speaking are invisible, may in the Language of St. Paul be said to be clearly seen, being understood, Rom. i. 20. We have a Knowledge, an Intuition of them in our Mind, from our clear Reasonings upon them, without Information of them from
Authority of Moses's History: And now shall we ask the Question? What if we set aside all Consideration of the Authority of Moses, and suppose what is written by him, as if written by Sanchoniatho, or any other ancient Sage, who wrote uninspired, what he apprehended to be true, agreeably to his own Sentiments of Things? I answer: It will unquestionably follow, such Sage not being infallible, if there be many as possible Ways, in which the Things related by him, might have been done, besides the particular one he has adopted, we may have no Reason to believe the Particulars declared by him, exclusive of all others; but I see no Point hence gained towards Infidelity; because the Authority of the inspired

from another: But Faith is not of this Sort: Faith cometh by Hearing, Rom. x. 17: It is the Belief of what we do not know, of ourselves, but are assured is known by some other, and declared to us: And if we would accurately distinguish between Belief in the general, and that Faith which is our religious Concern, in the One we believe Things, which are testified to be known by Men to be true; in the other we believe Things, that are well testified to have been declared from God.

Writer,
Writer, not being destroyed, but only for Argument's sake, put aside out of the Question; the Foundation of God remaineth still sure; the Authority of the inspired Writer, whenever we look back to it, brings its Force along with it, to assure us, that what is declared by such Writer must be true, and ought to be believed by us. Our Disputant therefore seems to me to be contriving rather how to beguile us, than substantially to confute us: To be desired for Argument's sake, to lay aside the Authority of sacred Writ, to examine how far the Truth, of what is declared, is such, that by Reason alone without other Authority we may prove it, is a specious Proposal; but if upon such Examination, we find of the Matter inquired after, that, had it not been authentically related to have been done in a particular Manner, many other Ways might be conceived, in which it might as reasonably have been effectuated, if we will not here reassert the Authority
Authority of the Relation made to us, to give it its just Weight to determine our Belief; we cannot be said to be reasoned out of our Faith; for we inconsiderately give it up, without any Reason for our so doing.

For Man to tell, how human Life began
Is hard; for who himself beginning knew?
Milton's Parad. Lost, B. viii.

For Man to pretend further to speak of his own actual Knowledge of Things done and past, before he had any Being, is in the Nature of the Thing impossible; but for Adam, during the Space of a Life of above 900 Years (n), to recollect all that he had experienced, from the Time, that he had a Knowledge of his Being; to conceive him to have had Revelations from the Voice of God, of all that God thought fit should be made known unto Men; of his Creation of the Heavens and the Earth, and of all the Host and Crea-

(n) Adam lived 930 Years; Gen. v. 5;
tures of them; for Adam frequently
to inculcate to his Children all he thus
knew; for authentic Narrations of
these Things to have come down from
before the Flood to the Posterities, that
were afterwards (o); and to have been
when Moses wrote his History, no such
obsolete Remains, as we now may be
apt to think them; are Things in
themselves not at all improbable.

From Adam unto Abraham, con-
dering the then Duration of Men's
Lives, is comparatively speaking no
greater Length for even Tradition, than
from our Father's Grandfather unto
us (p): Abraham lived to A. M.
2183 (q) to see Jacob, the Father of
Joseph, about 15 Years old (r): Ja-
cob had from his Youth up, been a
diligent Inquirer into, and Observer of
the Hopes (s), and Fear of his Fa-
thers,

(o) There might be among the Faithful before the Flood more express Revelations than have come down to our Times.
Vol. II. B. vi. p. 34. (r) Jacob was born A. M. 2168. Vol. II.
B. vii. p. 117. (s) Ibid. p. 188, &c.
thers (i), and had himself many Revelations from God (u). He came down unto Joseph, and lived with him in Egypt seventeen Years before he died (w), and lived there full of the Hope of the Promises, and died in the Belief of them (x), and left Joseph as fully embracing them, and persuaded of them, and testifying them unto his Brethren when he also died (y): Joseph lived to see his Son Ephraim's Children of the third Generation (z); and Moses was not lower than in the third Generation from Levi (a): The Father of Moses must have been well known personally to Joseph: Put these Things together, and we may reasonably admit all that had been believed from the Beginning in this Family, might have come down unto Moses so authentically testified that all that he wrote of, from the Creation to his

(i) Gen. xxxii. 53.  (u) See Gen. xviii. xxxii. xxxv. &c.  
(w) Gen. xlvii. 28.  (x) He prophesied of them to his Sons very largely, Gen. xlviii. xlix. lxxix. 29.  (y) Gen. 1. 24.  
(z) Ver. 23.  (a) 1 Chron. vi. 1—3.
own Times, might unquestionably be received by his Brethren and Fathers as well warranted to be true: And agreeably heretofore we find, that notwithstanding all the Oppositions he had from his Israelites, enow surely, during the whole forty Years he had the Charge of them (b), to make it plain, that they were not a People disposed implicitly to believe him, but rather, wherever they could find the least Pretence for it, most zealously asserting a Liberty to gainsay and contradict him; notwithstanding, in all he had related to them from the Creation to his becoming their Leader, we have not any one Hint, that they disbelieved it, in any One Particular at all.

But, should I here rest this Matter, and suppose Moses's History of the Creation and Fall to have no greater Authority, than what can be given it from its being reasonable to believe he

---

might write it merely from the Records of his Fathers, I should most egregiously trifle; for, let but the Conduct of Moses, what he said, and what he wrote, and what he did, be considerately examined, and it will appear beyond a Possibility of Contradiction, that God himself was in many Things his infallible Director (c): And if God was his Director in other Parts of his Writings, what Reason can we have to think he was not so from the Beginning? In the History of the Fall Moses writes so emphatically, that one Person should be descended from the Woman, to be the capital Subduer of the great Enemy of Mankind (d); he limited this Person to be of the Seed of Abraham (dd); of Isaac (e); of the Tribe of Judah (f): that Flesh and Blood only, could not have assured him 1500 Years before-hand that thus

it should be (g): But the Things he thus foretold were accomplished in a miraculous Manner when the Fulness of their Time was come: The Prediction then, and the fulfilling it, bear an undeniable Testimony to each other: Nothing but the immediate Power of God could have brought to pass the Things foretold, in the Manner in which they were accomplished, so that the particular Accomplishment of them could be none other than the Work of God; and as no one could foresee what God would thus do, but the Spirit of God (b); so no Man before-hand could say of these Things, that they should so be, unless it had been revealed from God.

Contrary to what the Scriptures inform us, and which I have had occasion to mention, that our Saviour was a Descendant from David, Dr. Middleton would seem to argue that he was

---

(g) Matt. xvi. 17. (b) 1 Cor. ii. 11.
not really of the Tribe of Judah; but rather of the Tribe of Levi: I need not go thro' a long Detail of what he offers, the whole of it may be comprised in a few Particulars. 1. He observes, that Joseph, the Husband of Mary the Mother of Jesus, was only the reputed Father of our Saviour; he says our Saviour had really no Share or Participation of his Blood (i): And yet 2. That the Evangelists, whenever they deduce his Pedigree, shew him to have been the Son of David, by a Line up from Joseph only (k): 3. That they never say, that Mary the Mother of Jesus, thro' whom alone his real Genealogy could come from David, was descended of David (l): 4. That their Silence herein seems to make it probable that Mary was not of such Descent: 5. That Mary is observed to be the Cousin of Elizabeth (m), and that Elizabeth being of the Daughters

---

of Aaron (n), Mary her Cousin was most probably of the same Tribe, namely of the Tribe of Levi, and not of the Tribe of Judah (o). The Answer to this is, 1. The Evangelists are particularly careful to observe, that Jesus was not descended from Joseph his reputed Father (p). 2. Their deducing Joseph’s Pedigree from David, was purely to remove the Prejudices of the Jews: The Jews at first would look no further than to consider Jesus as the Carpenter’s Son (q), and were scandalized at the Meanness of his Birth (r); thought him a Fellow of so low an Extraction, that there was no saying whence he was (s): Contrary to these their prevailing Sentiments, the Evangelists, at the same Time not concealing or disguising the Truth, that Jesus really was of God (t); that Joseph was only his supposed Father; never-
theless took care to shew, that had his Genealogy been as they imagined, to be reckoned by or thro' Joseph; even thus also, he would have been the Son of David: and this, either of the two ways in which the Jews counted their Pedigrees; in one they reckoned the Son to belong to the Parent who begat him; in the other, where a Man died without Issue (a), and his Brother or next of Kin married the Widow, and raised up Seed to the Deceased, the Seed raised up was counted not to the real Father who begat him, but to the Deceased who died without Issue (w): And this is allowed to have occasioned the Difference between St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Genealogies (x): both which considered were Evidence to the Jews, that, altho' they were obstinate and would reckon our Saviour's Descent thro' Joseph, yet even here, count which Way they would, the Genealogy

(a) Deut. xxv. 5. (w) Ibid. ver. 6. (x) Matt. i. Luke iii.
would come up to David. But 3. Why was not the Descent of Mary, of whom alone our Saviour's Genealogy could truly come from David, as expressly said to be from that Patriarch, as Joseph's? I answer, it was. St. Luke tells us in recording the Angel's Salutation of Mary, that the Son to be born of her should have the Throne of his Father David; so that he recognizes David to be the Progenitor of Jesus: He immediately after allows that this Child was to be born of Mary without her knowing Man (y): if he had not before hinted of the Child thus to be born, that by his Mother he was a Descendant of David, his Narration would evidently be a Contradiction to itself: But this the Evangelist had sufficiently guarded against in plainly telling us, before he begins the Salutation, that the Angel Gabriel was sent to a Virgin of the

(y) Luke i. 32, 35.
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House of David (z): The Words espoused to a Man, whose Name was Joseph, inserted between Virgin—and of the House of David (a), may be a Parenthesis, indicating that of the House of David should not be attributed to Joseph: For as I have observed, the Sense and Argument of the whole Context must lead us to think otherwise; as indeed does also the Manner of the Expression: For as the Genealogies of the Jews were deduced in the Male Line, it is most reasonable to think, that if the Evangelist had here intended what he said, to be understood of Joseph, his Expression would have been, as he elsewhere says of him, of the House and Lineage of David (b); but Women, tho' not said to be of the Lineage, being with Propriety recorded to be of the House of their Fathers (c), the Expression concurs with the Reason of

(z) Luke i. 27.  (a) The Words of the Text are, ἐπεί Χαράβων, μὴ ἔμενε Ῥώμη ἀπέλθεν αὐτῆς Ἰακὼβ. ἐκ δὲ Δαυὶδ. An obstinate Critic may fight this Battle, but I apprehend ἐκ δὲ Δαυὶδ to belong to εὐδόκησαν. (b) See Luke ii. 4. (c) Psa. xlv. 10. Gen. xxiv. 36. et in al. loc.
the Narration, that the Evangelist herein spake of Mary only: But 4. Why was not this Point, more frequently, more clearly, more largely insisted upon? I answer: Because it was a Point doubted by none, but allowed by all: It was, St. Paul tells us, προδηλον, manifest, without Controversy, that our Lord sprang of the Tribe of Judah (d); how sprang of that Tribe? by his Father Joseph? This the Apostles denied: It must then be thus undisputed by the Descent of Mary only: For 5. As to what is said of Elizabeth being Cousin to Mary, and therefore, Elizabeth being of the Tribe of Levi (e) that Mary also was of that Tribe——; this way of arguing —— for any one of Letters to make use of it is a most indefensible Trifling: It can have Weight only with a mere English Reader, who possibly may be deceived by the common Acceptation

of our English Word Cousin: The Word used by the Evangelist is συγγενής (f); St. Paul uses the same, where he tells us of his great Heaviness and continual Sorrow of Heart for his Brethren, his Kinsmen according to the Flesh, his συγγενῶν κύριος σάρκα (g): Who they were, that stood in this Relation to him, he informs us very clearly. They were not those of the Tribe of Benjamin, his own Tribe, only (b); but they were all the Israelites (i), all to whom pertained the Adoption, the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law: the Promises, unto which all their twelve Tribes hoped to come (k): so that it is most evident, that the Relation specified between Mary and Elizabeth, in the Word Cousin or συγγενής, did not at all mean, that they were both of the same Tribe; but that they were Children of the same People; both of them Israelites,
of one and the same Stock, namely of the Stock of Abraham (I). The Reader cannot but see, that in this Argument Dr. Middleton descended below every Notion we can have of a Man of Learning, to invent an Expedient to puzzle (to such Readers as might not be able to consider the Texts cited by him, in their original Language) the most clear and allowed Truths concerning our Saviour, of which he could not but know No real Argument could be formed to contradict them: And this he came down to (what induced him I will not take upon me to determine) at a Season of Life, when he stood upon the very Threshold of Immortality.

The Principles, which I have made the Foundation of the following Treatise, are, that human Reason was not originally a sufficient Guide for Man, without some express Revelation from

(I) Acts xiii. 25.  

God;
God; and that positive Precepts given by God, however we may be apt to conclude of them, from their not appearing intrinsically of real Moment to the Rectitude of our Lives, are not therefore unreasonable and vain: The professed Opposers of Revelation must be herein unanimously against me: And some valuable Writers not apprehending a Necessity, tho' allowing the Expediency of a Revelation, do not entirely think with me in these Particulars: The Reader will find their way of Reasoning considered in the following Pages (a): All I would here offer is, that if Authority was of Moment, I might cite even Dr. Middleton for me in these Points: It is obvious to observe, that he knew there might be found "the Testimony of all Ages; "the Experience of all the great Reasoners of the Heathen World, that "Reason [human Reason alone] had

(a) See Chap. V. p. 73, &c.

"not
not Light enough to guide Mankind
in a Course of Virtue and Morality
that there was "such an universal
Conviction and Experience, he says,
of the Insufficiency of Reason, as
seemed to be the Voice of Nature
disclaiming it, as a Guide, in the
Case of Religion (b):’’ In like Manner,
treating of positive Precepts, he
deduces an Argument from what may
be observed of God’s Works; That
the Wise of all Ages have from the
Excellency of God’s Works collected
the Excellency of his Nature: Yet
in those Works all still agree; that
there are some Particulars, not only
whose Nature, but whose Use or
Reason of Existence cannot be dis-
covered by the most curious Searchers
into Nature; nay, some Things,
which considered separately appear
even noxious to the rest; all which,
tho’ not understood, are yet reason-

(b) Letter to Dr. Waterland, Edit. 88. p. 49 50.

ably
ably presumed to be good and perfect in their several Kinds, and sub-

servient to the general Beauty and Excellency of the whole System (c): He proceeds: "'Tis full as unreasonable to charge all positive Precepts supposed to come from God, whose Use and Relation to Morality we cannot comprehend, to Fraud and Imposture; as in the visible Works of God to impute every Thing we do not understand, or even every Thing that seems hurtful, to the Con-

trivance of some malicious Power opposite to the divine Nature----?"

As on the one Hand, we do not ex-

clude from the Catalogue of God's Works all those Particulars, in which we cannot trace the Marks of divine Wisdom; so on the other, we cannot exclude from the Body of his Laws, those few Injunctions, which seem not to have impressed on

(c) Id. p. 61.
them the legible Characters of Mo-
rality (d).

In examining the Text of Moses, I
have proposed to the learned Reader's
Disquisition, whether in the 19th and
20th Verses of the second Chapter of
Genesis, two Words, nesheb chajab have
not been, by the Mistake of Transcrib-
ers, removed in the Text from one Line
into another (e): The Mistake is so
easy to be made, and the true and
clear Meaning of the Place is rendered
so indisputable, by allowing such a
Transposition, that I apprehend, what
I have suggested, may perhaps carry
its own Vindication: If I had the Op-
portunity, which a learned Author is
making a very commendable Use of (f),
to search such Manuscript Copies as
we have of the Hebrew Bible; I should
very carefully have examined whether
any can be found, which may justify

(d) Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 62. (e) See p. 56. (f) See
Koenicott's State of the printed Hebrew Text of the Old Testa-
ment.
my Supposition: There are other Texts, I could name, which I would make a like Inquiry into: I will mention two: one is the latter Part of the 24th Verse of the xlixth Chapter of Genesis. The Inquiry should be whether the Words now printed in any Manuscript wrote, are not in any Manuscript wrote, The supposed Difference is in one Letter only; whether the first Letter in the first Word be a Mem or a Beth; a Difference so small, that a Reader not very attentive may not see it; the least Dash of a Pen added or omitted (the Letters are so similar) may make it the one or the other. The other Text is Psal. cv. 28. He sent Darkness and made it dark: In our Bibles the Translation of the latter Part of the Verse is, and they rebelled not against his Word. The old Version still used in our Common Prayer is, And they were not obedient unto his Word: The two Versions evidently
P R E F A C E.

dently contradict each other: The original Words are printed

(8)

It would, I think, be of no Moment to consider how the Translators came thus to differ, the Reader may see it by consulting the Critics (b); I do not find any good Way proposed for bringing them to an Agreement: Both the Versions cannot be true: and it is therefore possible that neither may: I would hereupon inquire whether what we make two Words לא מאריו, and read loa maru, were not originally wrote in one Word לאמריו, to be read læamorō, the literal Translation of the Verse to be thus; He sent Darkness and made it dark, and by his speaking his Word: In this Correction we do not alter a Letter: We only suppose what are now read in two Words to be really

(8) The Word is printed in the Text לבריו, but the Marginal Reference tells us it should be לבריו.

(b) Vide Pa

םינש, in loc.
but one, and we vowel the Words to sound their Syllables but very little differently in the one Case or the other (i): But the Fact alluded to being, that God said unto Moses, Stretch out thine Hand toward Heaven, that there may be Darkness over the Land of Egypt --- And Moses stretched forth his Hand toward Heaven, and there was a thick Darkness in all the Land of Egypt (k); And the Intention of the Psalmist being to ascribe these Miracles most expressly to the Word of God; He spake, says he, and there came divers Sorts of Flies, and Lice in all their Coasts (l); again, He spake, and the Locusts came &c; both the Manner of the Psalmist and the clear Meaning of the Place seem to lead us to the Reading I am inquiring for.

(i) We read נַחַל. We must punctuate the Words instead of נָחַל. (k) Exod. x. 21, 22. (l) Psal. cv. 31, 34.
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I am sensible some very pious English Readers may hastily conceive Offence at every Liberty of this Sort: They will be ready to ask: May not a Pretender to Learning at this Rate, make what he will of our Bible? I answer, not at all; and may give a very plain Sight, as it were, of the whole of this Matter: Suppose our English Tongue had been originally written like the Hebrew, without inserting the Vowels, which give us the Sound of the Syllables: Let us consider the following Paragraph, He that taketh Heed to the Commandment offereth a Peace-Offering (m): It may be seen, that if these Words, were to be written without Vowels, the Words Peace-Offering, might be thus characteriz'd, Pc f frng: suppose, thro' some early Mistake of transcribing, all printed Copies had both divided erroneously these Letters into Words,

(m) Eccles. xxxv. 1.
and had not put the proper Vowels under their respective Letters; suppose the Letters $\frac{ie}{ie}$ which make one Word, had the Vowels being $ie e$ put under them as I have marked them; $ie$ to be read between $p$ and $e$, and $e$ after $c$ a letter final; so as to read this Word Piece: suppose the first $f$ was taken to be a Word by itself and $o$ put under it to read it of; suppose $f_{ng}$ were vow-eld as I have underlined them; $i$ to be founded after $r$, $e$ to be the final Letter, the Word to be thus read Fringe; would any one rest satisfied to read the Sentence, He that taketh Heed to the Commandment offereth a Piece of Fringe. And should any one shew, that of is with the following Letters but one Word, and that the Letters might be so vowelled, as to read $pc f fr ng$, a Peace Offering, would not the clear Sense of the Place vindicate this to be the true Reading, and evince that the other, of what Date
forever, and how much forever followed
must be an Error? and would any rea-
sonable Man be ready to think of him,
that should offer so expressive an Emen-
dation, that it might be dangerous,
left he should make the English Tongue speak whatever he had a Mind
to, and not its certain and true Mean-
ing? I do not intend to insinuate that
the Case I have put exactly resembles
either of our Translations of the Psalm
above cited: It certainly does not,
neither of our Translations being in
themselves absurd. And the Hebrew
Tongue is not so various in its Num-
ber of Words so far similar, as that
Instances can occur in it, such as may
be in our English if so written: But,
altho' in the Hebrew the Vowels put
under the Words in Points, may be
necessary to Pronunciation, to teach or
remind us to give the Word such Syl-
lables, and each Syllable such Sound,
as the Points put under them direct,
yet,
yet, as such Points were not originally in the sacred Pages (n); so neither are they necessary to any one who tolerably knows the Language, to ascertain to him the true Meaning of a Text; for if a Word happens to be wrong punctuated it may mislead him; and if it be not punctuated at all, the Letters of the Word, and the Context, will better direct him to see the true Meaning of the Text, without any false Bias to divert him from it.

The talking of various Readings, Transpositions of Words, Additions in some Copies of the Scriptures, Omissions in others, are indeed Matters so managed by the artful, who desire to perplex and deceive, as to raise terrible Appearances or Apprehensions in the Minds of the well-meaning, but unwary and unlearned: And I know of no Writer, that has endeavoured this Point more unfairly than the late Lord

(n) See what the very learned Dean Prideaux has wrote at large upon this Subject, Connex. Part I. B. v.
Bolingbroke: He roundly tells us, that
"the Scriptures are come down to us
"broken and confused, full of Additions, Interpolations, and Transpositions, made we neither know when
"nor by whom; and such, in short, as
"never appeared on the Face of any
"other Book on whose Authority Men
"have agreed to rely (o):" In another
Place he says the Scriptures are "Ex-
tracts of Histories not Histories, Ex-
tracts of Genealogies not Genealo-
gies (p)," and in a third Place, that
"it would not be hard to shew upon
"great Inducements of Probability,
"that the Law and the History were
"far from being blended together as
"they now stand in the Pentateuch
"even from the Time of Moses down
"to that of Esdras (q):" It would
not be decent in me to say how pa-
 lpably untrue all these Assertions are:

(o) Of the Study of History; Letter III. p. 95, 96. (p) Id. p. 102. (q) Page 100.
The two last of them I some time ago considered very largely, and I hope with the utmost Freedom and Impartiality (r): And that the sacred Books are far from having had a worse Preservation than other ancient Writings, has been unanswerably shewed by a more able Hand, as far as concerns the new Testament (s), and should Mr. Kennicott proceed as he has began, and collate the Manuscript and printed Copies of the Old Testament, we should see the Event come out in the one Case, as it is known to have done in the other. Dr. Bentley would have told Lord Bolingbroke upon what he says of Additions, Omissions, Interpolations, Variations, &c. in the Scriptures, "that it filled him with disdain to see such common Stuff brought in with an Air of Importance." All his Lordship offers has been before offered

---

by even the lowest Creatures of the unbelieving Tribe; even the Assertion his Lordship seems to plume upon, that "the Scriptures would have been pre-
"served entirely in their genuine Pur-
"ity had they been entirely dictated "by the Holy Ghost (t)," and they have been answered over and over (u).

These are the Kings, that reigned in the Land of Edom, before there reigned any King over the Children of Israel (w): It is commonly observed of this Paragraph, that it could not be written until after there had been a King in Israel; until after the Times of Saul, and consequently that it was not written by Moses: suppose now that we can in no wise find out by whom it was written; admit that some private Owner of a Manuscript Pentateuch wrote it in the Margin of his Manuscript as a Remark of his own,

(t) Lord Bolingbroke's Letter III. p. 95. (u) See Phil. Lii. 11.

(w) Gen. xxxvi. 31.
that a Copier of such Manuscript carelessly wrote it into the Text of his Transcript; is there any thing material in this Interpolation? Must not the Learned see the Scripture to be perfect without it, and can the Unlearned see any Detriment in having the Observation? Of this Sort are the Interpolations so formidably talked of: They are very few in Number, tho' said at Random to be so many: And whatever Apprehensions may be raised in the Minds of the Unlearned about them, nothing is more easy to be shewn, than that no Point of our Religion is materially affected by them at all.

But there are Omissions in some Texts of Scripture—. They who say this should produce their Instances, deal openly and fairly with the World; let us see of what Nature their Objection is, that we may not be amused and alarmed, where there is no Reason. I will therefore give an Instance or two, that even the unlearned Reader may judge
judge of this Particular. In the xiiith Chapter of Exodus, ver. 40. we read, 

Now the Sojournings of the Children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt (I should rather translate the Hebrew Words, which they sojourned) in the Land of Egypt, was four hundred and thirty Years. It is plain, that the Israelites were not 430 Years in Egypt, for they came into Egypt A. M. 2298 (γ); and their Exit was A. M. 2513 (ξ); so that their Sojournig in Egypt was but 215 Years: But the Septuagint give us this Text as follows. Now the Sojournings of the Children of Israel which they sojourned in the Land of Egypt, and in the Land of Canaan, was four hundred and thirty Years (α); The Words here added are and in the Land of Canaan: Now Abraham came into Canaan to sojourn there

(γ) See Connex. Vol. II. B. vii. p. 186. (ξ) Book ix. 44. (α) Ἡ 5 κατοίκησις τῷ Ισραήλ, ἣν κατοικήσαν ἐν γῇ Α. γυναιχρί ἐν γῇ Χανάν ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοστα τεσσαρόν. Ver. Se-

A. M.
A. M. 2083 (b); count hence to the Exit, and we find it exactly 430 Years: What Difficulty now can we have, even supposing that no Hebrew Manuscript now extant, has the Words we render and in the Land of Egypt (c), will any reasonable Inquirer not think, that these Words were in the Text which the Septuagint translated from, and that they really belong to the Hebrew Text, tho' the manuscript Copies we have may by some Carelessness of Copiers have omitted them. The Observation of our learned Critic is a very just one. "If Emendations are true, "they must have been once in some "Manuscripts, at least in the Author's "Original: But it will not follow, "that because no Manuscript now ex- "hibits them, none more ancient ever "did (d),"

(b) Connel. Vol. I. B. v. p. 275. (c) I ought not to omit, that in the Samaritan Pentateuch the Hebrew Words are found, which we render, and in the Land of Egypt. (d) Philel. Litt. p. 105.
No one can doubt but that Moses, in the xxxiiiid Chapter of Deuteronomy, blessed the twelve Tribes, every Tribe particularly according to his Blessing; and yet we are said to have no one Copy of the original Text, no one Version in the general, which mentions the Tribe of Simeon at all, the Alexandrian Manuscript of the Septuagint only inserting the Name Simeon in the 6th Verse, writes that Verse in that one Word differently from all other Copies (e): Here then is an Omission that can be supplied from no Hebrew Manuscript: Will it follow here is no Omission? No Version that we now have amends this Omission except one Copy of one Translation: Will it follow that originally all Versions had not the Name of Simeon? Is it not ap-

(e) The Hebrew Text is,

יִשָּׁרְאֵבָא זָאֵל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

The common Septuagint Version is Ζῶτος Ράχων καὶ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν οὐκ ἐξετάζῃ: The Alexandrian Manuscript is Ζῶτος Ράχων καὶ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν. Καὶ Συμεών οὐκ ἔσται εὐθυμησθεὶν.
apparently more reasonable to conclude the Alexandrian Manuscript was transcribed from some Copy of some more ancient Manuscript that had the Word Simeon, that the Original Manuscript of the Septuagint translated from an Hebrew Copy, that had it likewise; and that the Word Simeon was originally in the Hebrew Text, however thro' some Carelessness of Transcribers it came to be dropped, and to occasion great Numbers of Copies and Versions to be without it. There is Room in all Cases of this Nature for a reasonable Consideration of Inquiry: And I dare venture to affirm, that there is no Scripture Difficulty of which a serious Inquirer, able to make a proper Search for it, may not find a proper Solution: As for those who have not Literature for the Examination, if they read the Scriptures with a careful Design to be made wise by them unto Salvation, they will soon know enough, not to be led away blindly by those, who
who perhaps know little more than what may enable them to impose upon and deceive others in Points, of which whether they can say correctly, what is the right or the wrong, may not be materially of Moment to them.

The Learned have raised a great Dull about a Text in St. John's First Epistle, whether in Chap. v. Verses 7 and 8. For there are three that bear Record [in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear Witness in Earth,] the Spirit, and the Water and the Blood, and these three agree in one ---; whether the Words which I have written in a different Character are in some Manuscripts; and in what particular Copies they are not: The Reader may see the whole of what can be offered upon this Point in Dr. Mills (f), and will probably not think there is any Thing in the whole,

that will greatly affect him, when he considers, that what is here said of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost, that they are one, is a Doctrine to be deduced from other Texts of Scripture: And, if I may be permitted, I would inquire, whether it may not perhaps be shewn to be not a Jot or Tittle more, than what even Moses had declared 1500 Years before the writing any Books of the New Testament were at all thought of.

The 39th Verse of the xxxiød Chapter of Deuteronomy has in our English Version of it these Words, \( I \text{ even } I \text{ am He, and there is no God with me: } I \) would hereupon observe, 1. That the Hebrew Text is, \([\text{Ani Ani Hua, ve ein Elohim nimmadi}] (g):\) 2. There is no Word in the Text answering to the English Word even, nor is there any Verb expressed in the Text, no Word for am, nor for is. 3. That Ani Ani

\[(g) \text{ The Hebrew Words are}\]
\[
\text{אָני אָנִי הָאָנִי אֵלֹהִים נִמְמָדִי}
\]
is not the usual Way of expressing even I in Hebrew: It should rather have been Ani binnedi, if even I had been intended. I even I do bring a Flood, is not Ani, Ani, but Ani binnedi (b): For these Reasons ought we not to translate the Words of Moses literally? Ani Ani Hua ve an Elohim nimmadi (i) I, I, He, but not Gods with me. The Verb substantial here understood speaks itself to be. There are: I and I and He, are three personal Pronouns: And the whole Sentence is verbally rended, There are I and I, and He (k), but not Gods with.

(b) See Gen. vi. 17. Be bold I even I do bring a Flood—י, עニー חנמי מביא את ואבד and it is by some thought that וני ליל here should be wrote ק ליל without the suffix Pronoun, as in Exodus xxxi. 6.

(i) הוהי הוהי אלהים עליי mecum Dii at non ille Ego Ego

A like Expression, I think, is found in Isaiah xliii. 25.

וּבני עֲנִיּוֹ וּאֱלֹהָיָה עֲלִיִּי and in a like Signification. It was God, who is anochi, anochi hua; or ani, ani, hua. that blotted out the Transgressions of his People. (k) The Comma in English supplies the Cojitive, which cannot but be understood in the Hebrew, though inferred.
It was a Doctrine before taught by Moses, that there were more Persons than one called Jehovah, God whom no Man hath seen at any Time, nor can see; and the Lord, who had appeared unto Abraham (l). And yet he strictly charges Israel to hear, i.e. to observe it to be their Faith, that Jehovah their Elohim was One Jehovah (m): May we not suppose him in the Text before us declaring in the Terms of the same Faith, that the three Persons he here speaks of were not Elohim, Gods in the plural Number (n); for, to use the Words of Scripture, they were One Jehovah. And now, If what I have thus offered may be admitted, it must surely be a vain Labour for any to endeavour to strike the Words they are desirous to contest, out of the New Testament, unless they

(m) See Deut. vi. 4. Connet. ibid. The Hebrew Words in Deut vi. 4, are, הוהי אלוהים אחד. (n) The Word וע_shuffle_ is often used as a Noun plural in Scripture, see וע_shuffle_ וע_shuffle_.  
2 Sam. vii. 22. See Deut. vi. 13, &c.
could really put the Doctrine intended in them out of the old: But such is the Harmony of Scripture, that nothing in it is really \textit{idas Φυλώσεως} (\textit{of a private Interpretation, so peculiarly differing from all other Scriptures as not to have such a Coincidence with them, as may warrant it to be true: Rather oftentimes what the Prophets of a later Age have said, when considered, opens itself to have such a Foundation in what had been said before, tho' it be evident that the Speakers had no Intention of speaking the one from the other, that herein appears some \textit{Signature} of what is said, that it is of God (\textit{p}).

There remain to be considered some other Variations of \textit{Copies} of the sacred Books from one another. The Books of the New Testament have it seems been collated with so scrupulous an Exactness, that we have it marked as

\textit{(e) 2 Pet. i. 20. (p) Ibid.}
Various Reading if there is in different Copies, or Versions from Copies, or in Citations of Texts by subsequent Writers for near 500 Years, the least Difference of writing the smallest Particle or Article of Speech, or if the Order and Collocation of Words minutely differs, tho' the Meaning is exactly, and most clearly the same, and with all this indefatigable Preciseness, the Variations in the New Testament only are said to be 30000 (q): But let us consider: Can we think of any Book, that if it had been published so many Years, and there were so many different Copies of it, Translations into different Tongues, Citations made from it in divers Languages, and all these were to be ransacked, and it were remarked as a different Reading, wherever the Word And was wrote in three Letters, or in the Character &c, this was wrote ' or that ' therefore 'for,' &c.

(q) See Phileleuth Lips.
with many other such (r) Minutenesses; abundance of Variations beyond Number might not be amassed in this Manner. Our learned Critic assures us, upon his own Knowledge, that there is hardly a Classic Author, which thus examined would not afford more Various Readings than the Scriptures (s): I may perhaps be allowed to say very securely, that of the 30000 Variations in the New Testament, not near one in a thousand are in themselves worthy to be in the least regarded, though the Learned and Laborious do well to collect them, that those who know how to use them may have full Materials to shew, that all the Fancies and Surmises, of which the Imaginations of the Opposers of Religion are ever-pregnant, are rash, groundless, frivolous and vain. And as to the few that are

(r) We might gather many of this Kind of Variations from Books printed in the old black Letter, wherein are Number of Abbreviations different from any now in use. (s) Phil. Lipt. P. 99, 97.
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of any Moment in either the old Testament or the New, as far as my little inquiry has been able to carry me, I never could see one, of which such an Account may not be given as will shew that it neither deprives me of the Instruction of any Page of the sacred Writings, nor extinguishe any Article of the Faith, nor alters or makes void any One Duty of our Religion: And may safely affirm to those who of themselves may not find out these Particulars, or if pointed out to them, are not able readily to judge of them; that, altho' I would not prevent any from endeavouring to add Knowledge to their Faith, in whatever Points they are able; being fully satisfied, that no Freedom of Inquiry, justly conducted, can be of Disservice to the Truth, provided we do not give ourselves up to be carried to and fro, with every Wind of what seems new to us, beyond what we understand ---: I say, even the lowest of our People, who can only read, mark,
learn and digest our Scriptures as our received English Version offers them to us, to gather from them, that Doctrine, Reproof, Correction and Instruction in Righteousness, which they plainly afford us, will find, that they can want nothing more to make them wise unto Salvation: And consequently how obvious to them will be the Answer long ago returned to such a Supposition, as is offered by Lord Bolingbroke? That if the Scriptures were entirely the Word of God, all of them absolutely given by Inspiration, they would have been as absolutely preserved from all Variations of Copies, and Mistakes of Transcribers. The Answer is:

What a Scheme would these Men make? What worthy Rules would they prescribe to Providence? That in Millions of Copies transcribed in so many Ages and Nations, all the Scribes or Notaries, many of whom perhaps made it their Trade and Livelihood to transcribe, should, whenever they
they wrote out Scripture, be infallible and impeccable; that their Pens should spontaneously write true, or be supernaturally guarded, tho' the Scribes were nodding and dreaming; And to what Purpose should we require this Miracle? To keep clear and indubious the Articles of our Faith, or the necessary Rules for our moral Lives? No: In all these we are safe notwithstanding any Imperfections of Copies; But merely to silence every Doubt and Whim, which no Man truly religious, drawn by the Cords of a Man, by rational, ingenuous and moral Motions will have, but may be captiously taken up, by the Impiety and Folly of such as will be pleased with any Thing, that but seems to be an Objection against the Scriptures (u). Upon the whole, Variations of Evangelists in their Accounts of the same Facts, the Conduct of this or that particular Apostle,

(u) See Phil. Liss. p. 112, 113.
as also the Differences of Copies of the Scriptures, are Topics, that designing Men, with very little Examination and Knowledge of what they confidently affirm, are extremely apt to take up; one saying just what another had said before him, only perhaps with a little more Freedom and false Assurance, not considering how fully all they say; or can say upon these Topics has been answered over and over: To Writers thus determined, of saying the same Things there is no end: All we can do, is to remind the Candid and Sincere, that the Points so industriously propagated, have been fully, freely and impartially considered by the ablest Writers; not only of that Profession, which it is become a Fashion, with some, most unmercifully to speak against; but by Gentlemen also of Inquiry and Impartiality; of Abilities and Characters, which no Approbation of mine can add to: And that, as well from what they have particularly
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early written (w), as from what others have more in the general considered upon these Subjects, it may be sufficiently known by even the plainest Reader, that the Providence of God has permitted the Scriptures, to have the Lot of all other Writings, that have passed thro' the Hands of Men: And has suffered even the Writers of these Books sometimes so to differ, both in Conduct and in Matters related by them, as to give an Evidence, that there has been no Confederacy of Men to make the Scriptures what they are; But there is in the sacred Pages; In the New Testament, a Morality so perfect, that it cannot be conceived humanly speaking, that the first Preachers of the Gospel, Men of such low Parts and Education as they were, could in

(w) No Reader, that would judge of these Subjects, should omit to consider and examine carefully Mr. Woff's Observations on the Resurrection of Christ: And another Treatise intitled, Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul.
all Points, without any one Error (x) have thus taught the Way of God in perfect Truth; There is a Forgiveness of Sin, exactly what is necessary for Man (y); and yet determinately indulging no one human corruption.

(x) It would have Weight with any serious Examiner to consider, that altho' the Wise Heathens endeavoured by the Line of Reason to trace out the Lines of moral Duty, and many excellent Rules were given by many of them, and perhaps a careful Collector might form a good System from them all, as they were but Men, so every one of them had their Mistakes: But herein there is a Difference: There are no Defects, no Error in the Morality of the Gospel: The first Publishers of were mean, illiterate, unlearned Men, and yet they gave moral Precepts, "all pure, all unmixed: no Conceits or fab Rules; nothing tending to the By-ends of any Man, or as "Party; no Tang of Fancy or Superstition; no Footsteps in "Pride or Vanity; no Touch of Oflentation and Ambition, "but all sincere: Nothing too much, nothing wanting; be "the whole is so perfect and complete; tends so absolutely "the good of Mankind, that all would be happy even in the "World, if all would sincerely endeavour to practise it: And "if we could come up to the full Practice of it, we should be "so whole as to need no Physician, to attain the Bliss and Glory "of the World to come."

(y) The Scriptures conclude every Man to be under Sin, Gal. iii. 22, affirming that there is no Man that sinneth not, 1 King vii. 46. And not only the Scriptures testify that we every one know this of ourselves, that, if we say we have no Sin, we deceive ourselves, and the Truth is not in us, 1 John i. 8, but the very Heathens allow it: Quisque innocentem se dicit, superstition Te sem non Consicientiam, says Seneca, de Ira lib. I. The Question then will occur, How can Man be justified with God? Job xxv. 4. A Forgiveness of Sin must be necessary for any Flesh to be saved.
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whatsoever (z); There is an Atonement for Sin, such as no Invention of Man would have proposed (a), but yet so

(z) The Point I would here offer to the Reader's Consideration is, Whether if the Pardon of Sin offered in the Gospel had been the Contrivance of Men, it would not, like what human Contrivance is for inventing, have offered Indulgences for particular Failings; and whether therefore on the contrary, considered truly as it is, a Doctrine that favours no one Foible of human Nature, admits no Thought of our continuing in any one Sin, that Grace may abound, Rom. vi. 1. as there can be no Deceit where there is no Error proposed to us, a Pardon of Sin thus circumstanced, briefly commanding an impartial Endeavour to perfect every Thing that is Right, tho' it gives us Hopes, having sincerely endeavoured this, not to be called to an Account which the Spirits of even just Men cannot be equal to, whether, I say, such a Pardon of Sin does not approve itself to be not only Grace, but Truth, John i. 17.

(a) The Sentiments which the inquisitive Heathens had upon this Subject were as follow. They agreed Philosophy to be useful, to correct what might be wrong in us: Est profecta Animis Disciplina Philosophia, Cic. Tuscul. Disput. Lib. III. c. 3. They did not see how they could purge or cleanse the Conscience of sins that had been committed. All the known Rites of Ablution they knew to be unphilosophical: Animis Labes nec Diuturnitate easse remit, nec annis ullis eli potest. Cic. de Leg. lib. 2. c. 10. They did not think Repentance could make them whole: Poem penitet peccasse penes est innocens, is, I think said by the same Writer, he does not wholly acquit upon Repentance: They had Notions that there might be Purifications of Sin in another World: Thus Virgil tells us of Souls departed,

--- exercentur penis, veternunque malorum
Supplicia expendunt: alia panduntur inanes
Subsista ad ventos: alio sub Gurgite vasto
Infectum elatum septis, aut exsavit igni:
Quifque suos pateat Manes

Æneid. 6.

The Construction in the last Verse is, I think, clear and easy, tho' both our Commentators and Dictionaries seem to make it difficult.
to foretold, and prefigured from the Beginning, throughout all Ages, the

Palace.

Manes signifies our Spirits departed out of this Life, is the Accusative Case, signifying the Part of us affected: Ludo Caput, I have Pain in my Head; patimur Manes is we feel in our Souls departed. But others philosophized, that when Life was over, they, who had lived well, should go into the Star, such as they had made themselves meet to live in: Sane et honeste Curriculum vivendi à Naturâ datum confecerit ad lud Astrum, cui aptus fuerit revertetur. Cic. Lib. de Univer which State was not opined to be absolutely final; for that Spirits in a future Life might have a Progress to Perfection, go from higher State to higher, until they arrived at their supreme Good. Vide Platon. in Phaedon, in Lib. de Legib. &c. Some allowed the Body a Participation herein with the Soul. Metacolaus, τούτους τε σώματιν όμοιον συμπίεσται Σοϕαχείς, μη καλάφιον εἰς ἅρμα, ἐὰν ἕμπεχῃ εἰς φανερόν, αἱ βιοσίοις Σοϕαχείς μετασχηματισμοῖς ἐὰν ἕμπεχῃ εἰς ἅρμα, ἐὰν ἕμπεχῃ εἰς ἅρμα. Plut. Orac. Defect. How different are all these Schemes is what the Gospel proposes concerning Christ? that This Man offered one Sacrifice for Sin for ever, as through the offering of his Body once for all, will perfect for all those who come unto God through him, Heb. x. 11, 12, 14. Whether now could the first Preachers of the Gospel have the Things? No Wieldon then in the World would have fugged any such Doctrine to them: That the Prophecies indeed securely, like a Light shining in a dark Place, foretold them, true; that their Matter beginning from Moses and all the Prophets had expended unto them in all the Scriptures the Things concern himself, is acknowledged; but as this Exposition was indeed different from all that the Rabbies of the Jews had opined, as all their Doctors learned in their Law and Scriptures contend for, that these Things thus hid from the Wise and Prudent, should at once be brought to Light by Babes, be preached uniformly and confidently by a Set of Men, that had no human Learning; and the Truth of them be attested, by the Author of the visibly raising himself from the Dead, and going up into Heaven, and by the Preachers of his Doctrines being approved God, in the many Miracles wrought by them at the Time of their preaching this Gospel; those Things must put it out of Doubt, that this Doctrine was not of Man, and that it was of God.
it must be thought to have been appointed by God. In the Old Testament, a Morality the very same, tho' not so fully explained, and inforced to the Perfection, in which he who came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them, taught with Authority, how, what they read in the Law, was to be understood, to direct both the Thoughts of their Hearts and the Actions of their Lives; There is a Series of legal Institutions, such as we may see many Reasons to think no Legislator from human Wisdom would have thought of and contrived (b); yet in many Points so plain a Schoolmaster to bring those to whom they were given unto Christ (c); so clearly referring to Things that were to come, and be revealed, as plainly to indicate, that

(b) See Connex. Vol. III. B. xii. p. 337. not to remark both of Sacrifices of the living Creatures, see Vol. I. B. 1. p. 82, and also of Circumcision, that it is most impossible to give any probable reasonable Grounds of their first Institution, other than that they were appointed by God. (c) Gal. iii. 24.
there was more than human Foresight and Design in them. In a Word, both Testaments there are such Prophesies of Things that were to be, and of some that are yet to come; such Fulfilling of all that is completed and thence so reasonable an Assurance that there shall be a Performance of what remains to be fulfilled in its Season, as must give every considering Reader, whether learned or unlearned, a Steadiness of Belief better grounded than to be shaken, by the Disputes we can have concerning the Canon of Scripture; when it was settled; by whom these or those Books were particularly written; what Errata have crept into some Copies in some Texts; In all which, and many other Disquisitions of a like Nature, that may be started, however we may find that the Scriptures, in their being committed unto Men, have been a Treasure, put into Earthen Vessels, as to furnish Evidence enough, that the Excellency
of them is not of Man (d), yet there are Contents in them, which, altho' the Miracles done, to bear Testimony to them, were done in an Age long since past, so that we may carelessly overlook them, nevertheless will force us to allow, that the Books of Scripture are such as could not have come merely from Man, but must be from God.

The Original and Progress of Language is a Subject that has been treated by many Writers: The Learned seem mostly inclined to think, that God put into the Minds of our first Parents all such Words, and a Knowledge of the Meaning of them, as could be necessary for their Conversation with one another. They represent, that the allowing them to be made sociable Creatures implies necessarily that they were in actual Possession of all Words instantly to commu-

(d) See 2 Cor. iv. 7.

DICATE
nicate a Variety of Sentiments: But I confess I do not see the Consequence to be a necessary one: They began Life, I apprehend, without any Stock of actual Knowledge: They grew gradually into Knowledge, and by like Advances came to think of, and make Words, to signify what they wanted to name, and converse upon: The allowing them to be able to do this early, and as variously as they wanted it, and to improve it, as fast as their Knowledge increased, answers every Social Demand we can suppose, as fully, and more naturally, than to imagine them full of innate Words before they had acquired the Sentiments, or Observation of the Things which were to be intended by such Words to be spoken of: But it is a Subject I have at different Times so far treated, that I do not see I need add any Thing to clear it (c): As to the

(c) Connell. Vol. I. B. ii. Vol. II. B. ix. See the following Treatise, Chap. III.
Opinion of some Writers, that our first Parents' Minds were filled with original Words, that expressed to them (what they could not otherwise know) the very Natures of Things, so as to enable them to speak, and thence to think philosophically of them; and that the Hebrew was originally a Language of this Sort---it is romantic and irrational: That there are Words of a Sound corresponding to what the Ear hears, when the Object denoted by them is presented to us, is unquestionable; and the using Words of this Make properly, is thought an Elegance in many Writers. Virgil is remarked to have thrown the Sound of the Thing he writes of, sometimes over a whole Line, thus in the following Verse he is observed to sound, as it were, the Trumpet he speaks of,

Ære ciere Viros Martemque accendere Cantu.

Virg. Æn. 6.

And in another Place to express the
very Beat of the Horses Feet on the Ground he supposes them to move upon,

Quadrupedante putrem sonituquatit Ungula Campum.  

Homer's --- πολυ φλοιοσκεω σαλαςκ sounds to the Ear both the hollow Roar of the rising Wave, and the Crash of its Waters breaking upon the Shore. Single Words may sometimes affect the Ear in like Manner: The Hebrew Word רוח [Ruach], which signifies Wind, may be thought to sound the Rushing Noise made by that Element, and many like Instances may be had from diverse Languages, but will any one say, that the philosophical Natures of the Things thus described are in any wise indicated, by any Word, Part, or the Whole of any such Descriptions? Words are but Sounds: It is easy to conceive how by arbitrary Agreement different Sounds may come to denote such Things as are intended to be meant by them, but
but to say any particular Sound has a necessary Connection or Relation to the Essence or Nature of one particular Thing more than of another, is a Confusion we could not fall into, if we did not overlook some Particular in the Train of Thinking, that leads us into it: Allowing the Word *create* to denote the producing Things out of Nothing, *Creator* may signify Him who made all Things, and is God: But the Word can have no such Reference from any thing in the Nature of the Word; but merely from its being first established, that to *create* shall be the Sound to signify this Act of making Things have Existence: From such known Designation [*Bara*] in *Hebrew* (f); *creavit* in *Latin*; any other Word in any other Language appointed to denote the Exercise of this Act of Power, shall equally have this Signification, and without such Appoint-

---

(f) נָּרָא Gen. i. 1.
ment no one Sound can have it, in the Nature of Things, any one more than any other. The Manner in which Adam and Eve were brought into the World, duly considered, will lead us to suitable Thoughts of the Rise and Improvement of their Language. If they could be conceived instantly to have talked copiously of all Things, before Time and Experience had taught them to know them, there would be Reason to think that they had Words for such Conversation not of their own inventing. But Moses hints to us nothing of this Nature: The contrary appears most plainly throughout his Narration, and accordingly, many Expressions occur in his Hebrew, of which I apprehend the following Words, The Lord is a Man of War may be One Instance (g), which hint, that

(g) Exod. xv. 3. I may say of this Expression, as also of another that occurs later, wherein God is represented to be like a mighty Man that shouteth by Reason of Wine, Pial. lxxxix. 65. that neither of them can be imagined to
that in the most early Times, the Expressions used had their Rise not from any innate Sentiments of the Natures of Things, nor from Words innate, that could speak to Men, concerning Things, further than what they had felt, seen or heard, and agreeably there-to conceived and understood of them. As to such Words as God was pleased to speak to our first Parents in the Beginning of their Lives; I have considered what, I think, must be admitted concerning them (b): And that Names made from Words agreed to signify Qualities of Things, may denote the Natures of Things so named, so far as to tell us, that they are reputed to have the Qualities expressed by the

to express any Thing of the Nature of the Power of God: Rather human Imagination struck with the Terror of a Man of War coming forth armed to the Battle; or of the terrible Fury of a Giant, awakened, refreshed with Wine, furnished the Ideas, that occasioned these Expressions: Other Words, very different would have been used, had a natural Description of the tremendous Power of God, terrible in Majesty infinitely beyond what these Words convey to us, been at all intended. (b) See hereafter, Chap. II.

(c)
Words which are given for Names to them, may reasonably be allowed (i). If I know Nabal in Hebrew to signify to be of no Value or Moment, I may possibly conclude a Man called by that Name to be one of that Character (k); but had any other Word than Nabal, been the Verb to signify the having this Character, the Sound Nabal might have conveyed a very different Idea to me. It is the same of all other Circumstances of Things, which their Names can hint to us. If Terra be the allowed Word to signify Earth, the saying of a Person, that he is terrestris, may speak him to be earthly, but had the first agreed Idea annexed to Terra, been what we call Heaven, it is evident nothing in Nature would have prevented terrestris being of a Signification opposite to what is now understood by it. What a learned

(i) See Consett. Vol. II. B. ix. (k) 1 Sam. xxxiv. 25. Consett. ibid.
Writer very clearly thought upon this subject, he has expressed as intelligibly; "there is, he says, between Sounds and Things no Relation\(^{(k)}\): Words signify Things, from no other, than the arbitrary Agreement of Men: ’tis evident that Language is not natural but instituted:” “That the human Organs, being admirably fitted for the Formation of articulate Sounds, these with the Help of Reason might in Time lead Men to the Use of Language ---; I own it imaginable that they might \(^{(l)}\):” The judicious Author would, I think, after all this, not have imagined, that without an Inspiration of Language from God, Mankind might have lived a Series of Generations not having a sufficient Use of it, if he had happened to consider the Steps and gradual Progress

\(^{(k)}\) See Revelation examined with Candor. Vol. I. p. 36.

\(^{(l)}\) Ibid. p. 37.
in which *Moses* represents our first Parents coming into their Knowledge of themselves and the World (*m*).

The Reader will find me in the following Sheets to have had great Assistance from Mr. *Pope*’s very excellent *Essay upon Man*: The Poet himself confesses, that he could not have expressed his Thoughts with that Force and Conciseness in Prose, as he could in Verse (*n*): As to myself, I am sure, I should have lost the Reader a Pleasure, and the Subject an Advantage, had I used only my own Language; what

I oft had thought
would have come far short of being

so well express'd;

I wish I could have had the like Assistance of this powerful Pen for some other Sentiments which I have endeav-

---

(*m*) See *Revelation examined*, p. 51–61. (*n*) See what the Author says in the Design of the Poem.
oured to defend; but in these I have ventured to desert the Poet, thinking him to have some Lines, that require correction: Speaking of the \textit{primeval} state of Mankind, he seems to represent their only Guidance to have been the Light of Nature; He says,

\textit{The State of Nature was the Reign of God (o).}

He in no wise supposes Man in his first Estate to have began his Being under the especial Direction of a Revelation, but rather, that,

\textit{To copy Instinct then was Reason’s Part (p).}

And he sends our early Progenitors to learn Arts and Sciences from the animal World, sooner than we can think the animal World could be so considered as to afford them this Knowledge (q): In like Manner, he appears to

---

(o) Ep. III. v. 147.  (p) Ver. 171.  (q) Solomon indeed bids his Sluggard, \textit{Go to the Ant, consider her Ways, and be wise}, Prov. vi. 6. And it is natural to think of Solomon, who had marched deep into Nature, see 1 Kings iv. 33. that he should offer
to think, that Sacrifices of the living Creatures were not offered in the first Times: He represents that the Shrin was now with Gore unstain'd (r), that unbloody stood the harmless Priest (i). He has these and some other Sentiments in the Third Epistle, which to me do not seem entirely to accord with other Parts of his Poem: If I might gues from one Maxim hinted

---

offer this Instruction: But to think of Mankind, that they'll not brought out many Inventions, but were without Work, Drudgery and Contrivance of their own, until they had observed the kind of the Creatures, is extremely improbable: That who, primus per Artem movit agros, Virgil; learned of the Man's plow, Pope, ver. 178. or that Cain form'd the Plan of Buffings of his City Enoch, Gen. iv. 17. from any Observations of the Bee, her little Cells, Lodgments and Structures, is an Imagination, and I dare say, had Solomon had no Ships to sail to Ophir, until Men had learnt.

---

of the little Nautilus to sail
Spread the thin Oar, and catch the driving Gale.

Pope, ver. 179.

He would have brought no Gold to Jerusalem... Men had invented a great many Arts of their own, before they could serve what in any wise corresponded to them in the Creatures, tho' we may perhaps well allow, that when they thus came to make from themselves to the Creatures, Reflections might add to teach them to correct Art by Nature, and to add to their own Inventions: a Regularity and Improvement, which otherwise they might not have thought of. (r) Pope, ibid. ver. 157.

(i) Ver. 159.
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—go, and thus o'er all the Creatures fly away,
Thus let the Wiser make the rest obey. (t);

He seems to opine superior Understanding to give a Right of Dominion; a Thought spread so largely in the Imagination of (u) his admired Statesman, whom he stiles

(t) Ibid. ver. 195, 196.
(u) Lord Bolingbroke hints to us, that "the Author of Nature has mingled among the Societies of Men, a few, and but a few of those on whom he is graciously pleased to bestow a larger Proportion of the ethereal Spirit, than is given in the ordinary Course of his Providence to the Sons of Men. Those are they, who ingross almost the whole Reason of the Species, who are born to instruct, to guide and to prefer, who are designed to be the Tutors and the Guardians of human Kind." See Letter on the Spirit of Patriotism, p. 10. I am at a Loss, what to say of this random Sentiment: It seems to me to want more Explication, and the Application of it to be guarded and regulated, beyond what one would expect of any Thing said by a wise Man. If the Ethereal Gentii of the Age happen in any Country not to have either the Reins of Government; nor the Chair, Seat, or Bench, to guide, direct, and give Law to Mankind; and surely many of them often have not; and I can apprehend it some Times for the good of the World that they have not; there is a far more useful Principle to be thought of, than that these Wise should try to make the rest Obey, namely, that every One should study to be quiet, and mind his own Business, in the Duties of that Station in Life that happens to belong to him. It must undoubtedly be a great Blessing to the World, when those who have the Power over others, are the truly Wise; but the Happiness of Mankind can never have any Settlement, unless those who may not attain, what they may happen to think their Genius most fit for, know how to govern themselves wisely, and to be Patterns to others to learn them the same Thing. The Ethereal Gentlemen a
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his Friend, his Genius —
— Master of the Poet, and the Song; (w)

that I should think, much of what we find from about the 147th Line of the Third Epistle, to the 216th was written upon Anecdotés given the Poet, and in Respect to him that gave them, well ornamented; but they have not that Firmness and Stability which can be given to nothing but what is true: It would be going absolutely from the Subject I am concerned in, to examine all Mr. Pope's Positions, which might be here stated.

ing otherwise, have often occasioned great Convulsions to the World: and many times, when they get the Power they aim for, and make the rest obey, they are neither the public Benefactors they think, nor perhaps do they do any great and good even to themselves. Our Author's Sentiment seems to be better, than a not-well-digested Refinement of a Noble idea found amongst the Heathen Disputants: viz. that Mankind are born, some with Endowments to rule and govern, others with Capacities fit for Servitude only: That where the Rulers of States find such, as born for Servitude will not submit to it, a War upon these is but a lawful Hunting, to take Men, as we do, by a like Exercise, the Beasts of the Field, to train and reduce them to their proper Application. Nimrod was perhaps a mighty Hunter of this Sort, and hereby raised himself his Kingdom, Gen. x. 9. But how far any Thing of this Nature can be useful or right, I shall submit to further Consideration. (w) Epit. IV. ver. 363.
One of them, indeed, I am more particularly concerned in, namely, the Origin of Sacrifices. I have supposed Sacrifices of the living Creatures to have been appointed from after our first Parents' Transgression, and what I have offered upon this Topic has been largely replied to: I hope I shall not misspend a few Pages if I endeavour to clear this Matter.

It is argued, that Sacrifices of the living Creatures were not made in the most early Ages: That they did not commence until after Mankind took Flesh: That we need not imagine them to have had their Rise from a positive Command of God; For, that there is Weakness enough in human Nature for us to opine, that Mankind might invent this Service, without any Command injoining the Use of it: All these Points have been treated by a very ingenious Writer (o), an

(o) See Philo's On Hypothesis, Letter V.
Answer to whom will, I hope, be sufficient Reply to all that can be objected upon this Topic: And my Answer hereto is, that Abel unquestionably offered a Sacrifice of an Animal or living Creature; that he did it in Obedience to a Command of God; And consequently that the Original of this Institution was not of human Contrivance.

I. Abel, I say, offered a Sacrifice of a living Creature: Abel, Moses tells us, brought of the Firstlings of his Flocks, and of the Fat thereof (b). This Offering was made before the 130th Year of the World (c), and is indeed the first Sacrifice the Scripture mentions: That Abel’s was a Sacrifice of a living Creature is, I think, to be proved both from Moses’s express Account of it, and from what is said upon it by the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

(b) Gen. iv. 4.  (c) Adam was but 130 when Seth was born after Abel was killed, Gen. v. 3.
Moses's Account begins with the Offering of Cain: Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground an Offering unto the Lord (g): It is plain, nothing animate was intended in Cain's Oblation: It was an Offering of Corn or Herbs, the Produce of the Ground, and of nothing more: And it will be observed, that it is accordingly called Minchah (h); the Word often used for a Meat-Offering or Oblation of Things animate, in Distinction to the Sacrifice of a living Creature (i): But Abel brought of the Firstlings of his Flock, and the Fat thereof: The Words that follow are to be observed: And the Lord had Respect unto Abel, and to his Offering (k); the Text says, Ve ael Minchatbo (l): so that the Word [Minchah] is here also used, to speak of Abel's Offering, as it was of Cain's;

(g) Gen. iv. 3. (h) See Levit. ii. 1, 4, 5, 15. vii. 9, 10. xiv. 10. xxx. 16. Numb. xv. 3—6. xxviii. 5. et sextent. al. in loc. (k) Gen. iv. 4. (l) The Hebrew Words are מנה ליהויא.
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wherein then did they differ? or why should we think Abel's Offering to be a Sacrifice of a living Creature, when it is thus hinted to be a [Minchah]? The Learned are herein very diligent to exert themselves. Grotius observes that the Word we render the Fat thereof (m) may signify the Milk thereof, and would think, that Abel did not sacrifice a Lamb; but perhaps only some Wool and Cream, of the Lactage, and Growth of the Firstlings of his Flock (n). I answer, learned Men will seem to say something for any Singularity they have a Mind to support, and Grotius is herein remarkable in this Particular: But it is observable, that he lays the Stress of what he would argue, upon explaining a Word not material to the Argument, but says nothing upon some other Words, on which the true Meaning of the Place.

(m) Annot. in loc. (n) Grotius observes these to have been thought very ancient Sacrifices by the Heathen Writers, ibid.
most absolutely turns: The Word we translate Fat, may signify Milk, or must be rendred Fat, as the Sense and Context, when it is used, requires; but the Words here to be principally considered are, of the Firstlings of his Flock (o): The Firstling or Firstlings of Beasts, of Cattle, of the Herd, or of the Flock, are Expressions very common in Moses (p), and the Question is, whether wherever he speaks of an Offering of Firstlings, he means any Thing but an Offering of the living Creatures so called? Whether in Moses's Language had Abel offered only Wool, and Milk or Cream, the Expression must not have been, he brought of the Wool, Milk or Cream of the Firstlings of his Flock an Offering to the Lord? And whether, supposing the Word we render fat may signify Milk, the Words of Moses here used,

(o) נָבְטָרָלָא. Gen. iv. 4.
xiv. 23, &c.

he
he brought of the Firstlings of his Flock, and the Milk thereof, would not have denoted, that he brought both the living Creatures, and their Milk also? But a further Question is, whether Firstlings were ever reckoned but by the Males only (q)? If they were reckoned thus only, our learned Annotators mistake most ridiculously. Abel, I apprehend, brought of his young Rams unto the Lord; And the Lactage of his Rams ---; our learned Disputants would be as well fed, as they would teach us, if they had nothing else to eat, till they gave up this Absurdity. In a Word: Moses's Expression can in no wise signify any Thing else but that Abel brought a living Animal of his Flock an Offering unto the Lord: For,

As to Abel's Offering being called a Minchab, that is easy to be accounted for: The Word Minchab is

(q) See Exod. xiii. 12.
Indeed often used sacrificially to denote an inanimate Offering in opposition to the Sacrifice of a living Creature: but it has also a more general Acceptation. It is the Word used of Jacob’s Present to his Brother Esau (r), and again, for the Present sent out of Canaan to Joseph (s): It is well translated, when used in this Sense, by the Greek Word Δῶρον, a Gift: The Apostle thus renders it (t): In this general Sense it is, and may be used of all Sacrifices both animate and inanimate; for every Sacrifice is, in this Sense, a Minchab, Δῶρον, a Gift, or Present unto the Lord; tho’ every Minchah or Gift, is not a Sacrifice of a living Creature.

Having thus far shewn, that Moses must be understood to express Abel’s Offering to be of a living Creature, I come now to consider, that the Apostle

---

(r) Gen. xxxii. 13, 19. (s) xlii. 10. (t) Heb. xi. 4.
plainly tells us, that this was his Meaning: The Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us of Abel's Offering, that it was **_$\nu\sigma\iota\alpha_*$**, i.e. the Oblation of a Creature slain (**$\nu$**): I laid great Stresses upon the inspired Writer's using this Term (**$w$**): I am answered, that it is notorious, that the Word **_$\nu\sigma\iota\alpha_*$** is several Times used in Scripture for an *inanimate* Oblation: And the ingenious Writer above mentioned cites for his Assertion *Lev*. ii. 1.

(***x***) Undoubtedly he might have cited many other Passages. His Mistake is, he cites the *Septuagint* Translation for Scripture; not considering, that the

---

(u) **_$\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\nu_*$** *$\alpha\varepsilon\lambda_*$ *$\pi\varepsilon\zeta\omicron\varsigma\omega\varsigma\omicron_*$ *ibid*. I might, in think, have observed, that the *Apostle* elsewhere expressly calls *Abel's Offering an Offering of Blood*: Alluding to the Blood of Christ, by whose Death we have the Forgiveness of Sins, he says, *Ye come — to the Blood of sprinkling which speaketh better Things than that of Abel*, *Heb.* xii. 24 — that of *Abel*; he does not mean *Abel's Blood*, or the Blood shed by the Death of *Abel* for *Abel's Death was no Sacrifice for Sin*; but the Blood of *Abel was the Blood that *Abel* offered in his *_$\nu\sigma\iota\alpha_*$*, or Sacrifice which *Abel* accepted by God, as he had commanded it, was but a Shadow in comparison to the Sacrifice of *Christ*.

(w) See *Consect*. *Vol*. I. B. ii. p. 82.

(x) *Phil. to Hych*. Letter V. p. 32,
Preface.

Translators not being infallible, might err in their Translation. The Translators of the Septuagint were extremely careless in their Use of this Word: They render the third Verse of the fourth Chapter of Genesis, ἰνεκλὲν Καίω καὶ καρπῶν ὅ γὰς ἁυσίαν τὸ Κυείω. Here they call Cain's Offering, which is described and allowed to be of the Fruits of the Ground only, ἁυσίαν, a Sacrifice or Mæritation: But then it is to be remarked, that the Apostle here-in particularly corrects them, removes the Word ἁυσίαν misapplied by them, and uses it of Abel's Sacrifice only, and not of Cain's Offering (y): The

inspired

(y) I would take away all possible Ambiguity, that can be supposed in the Apostle's Expression, and would therefore observe, that should any one imagine the Apostle's Words to be Elliptical; that the Words may be taken, By Faith Abel offered a more excellent Sacrifice than Cain's, i. e. Sacrifice: that the Word ἁυσίαν may as well be understood at the End of the Period, as inserted in the Beginning. I answer, it is impossible to construe the Apostle, his Words being, τὰς παρασώπιας ἁυσίας. Were this the Meaning it should be ἢ ἀρκήν ῥῆ Καίω. But we say, a more excellent Sacrifice; where do we find παράσωπα to signify more excellent? Things that are more excellent are called τὰ ἀριστερά Rom. ii. 18. Phil. i. 10. A more excellent Way is, υπῆρχεν ἢ ἡ μεταμόρφωσις.
inspired Writers of the New-Testament are known generally to cite the Old Testament according to the Septuagint Version, and where they do so, it is evident they did not think the Expression importantly faulty: But when, in any particular Passage, an Apostle thus remarkably varies and corrects the Dictionary of the Septuagint, ought we not to think he observed an Impropriety, and designed to amend it? Συνία is in many Places of the Septuagint Ver...
tion used to signify *inanimate* Offerings, but the Septuagint were not inspired Writers, and therefore ought to stand corrected by those who were. The Word *φυσις* occurs frequently in the New Testament: But altho', after the legal Sacrifices of the Old Testament were done away, the sacred Writers of the New adopted the Word *φυσις*, to use it in a *spiritual* Sense, to express the making our *Bodies a living Sacrifice* (z); to represent our *Charity* to be a Sacrifice acceptable unto God (a); to exhort to offer the *Sacrifice of Praise* (b) --- &c. I say; altho', after animal Sacrifices were ceased, the one real Sacrifice being offered, which alone could take away Sin (c), inspired Writers did use the Word *φυσις* in a *spiritual* Sense, to signify our giving ourselves up to perform many of the commanded Duties of the *Christian* Religion, sacrific-

(z) Rom. xii. 1.  (a) Phil. iv. 18.  (b) Heb. xiii. 15.  
(c) See Heb. x.
Preface.

Facing ourselves in them truly to serve God in Spirit and in Truth; yet, I think, they did not use the Term *svxia* of any Sacrifices of the Old Testament, but of such only, wherein there was the Shedding of Blood (d); preserving it an allowed Truth of all revealed Religion from the Beginning of the World, that without shedding of Blood there had been no declared Remission of Sin.

II. The second Point I am to consider is, that Abel's offering his Sacrifice, was an Obedience to some divine

---

(d) See Matth. ix. 13. xii. 7. Luke ii. 24. xiii. 1. Aduit 41, 42. 1 Cor. x. 18. Heb. v. 1. vii. 27. viii. 3. ix. 9. &c. I know but one Place in the New Testament, where *svxia* seem to be used of an inanimate Offering of the Law: One of the Evangelists says, every Sacrifice, *svxia* are the Words of the Evangelist, shall be salted with Salt, Mark ix. 49. The last here referred to is Levit. ii. 13. which may be thought to be the Law of the Meat-Offering. But I would observe, that the text in Leviticus first provides, that the Meat-Offering, which was indeed *inanimate*, should be salted: But having ordered this it adds further, *With all thy Offerings thou shalt offer Salt.* The Word for thine Offerings is מְלָכָה, a Word used of Sacrifice of an Animal, Numb. xxviii. 2. as מְלָכָה. Levit. i. 2. So that the text provides, first, that all Offerings inanimate shall be salted, and then further, that Salt shall be also used in all Sacrifices, and the Word *svxia* is used by St. Mark referring to the Law given in the latter Part of the Verse.
Command, some explicit Injunction given by God: And I confess, that to me a most unanswerable Argument that it was so, is Abel’s being said by the Apostle, to have made his Offering by Faith, Heb. xi. I have already argued, that the Faith concerning which the Apostle wrote this Chapter supposes in all the Instances he gives, some express Declaration or Direction from God, the believing and paying Obedience to which is the Faith set forth and recommended to us (f): I have shewn this to be the Fact in the Case of Rahab, when she entertained the Spies at Jericho (g): My ingenuous Adversary thinks otherwise (h); but with how little Reason, I must entirely submit to the Reader’s impartial Consideration: He would argue of Enoch, as he reasons of Rahab (i): He opines Enoch to have obtained his Translation

to Heaven, not upon Account of him receiving and believing any particular Declaration by an express Revelation from God to him, but upon Account of the general Tenor and Conduct of his Life, that he was a Man of eminent Virtue, faithfully attached to perfect Holiness in the Fear of God, assuring himself, that he should have Reward for thus doing: I answer, had the Hopes of Enoch been only the general and rational Expectations arising from a moral Life, he had not been herein in any wise above others eminent for Faith, which is not an Act of Mind paying Regard to Arguments arising from considering what may appear intrinsically, without external Testimony, to be in Reason true, but Faith cometh by Hearing (k), Faith is the believing something that is testified or declared to us (l). Accordingly, the Author of Ecclesiasticus, who observes of Enoch,

(l) Vide quæ sup.
that he pleased God and was translated, does not acribe his being translated, to his being more and above others a Man of a righteous or moral Life, but tells us he was made an Example of Repentance unto all Generations (II): We should perfectly understand what is here suggested, if we may say a special Revelation was made to Enoch, that Man should have Life for ever in another World, if they sought it believing, through his Name by Repentance, to receive Remission of Sins (m): If Enoch embraced and testified unto others this Faith, and it pleased God to confirm unto the World, that what he had declared by Enoch was true; by granting to Enoch not to die and fall like other Men, but without tasting Death, to be received to the Life to come which was published, and by him believed, and declared according to the Word of God, made known to

(ii) Ecclus. xlii. 16. (m) See Acts x. 43.
him; herein we shew Enoch to have been literally, according to the Words of the Author of Ecclesiasticus, set forth an Example of Repentance until all Generations: and as clearly according to the full Meaning of the Apostle's Expression, by Faith, believing and doing according to what had been especially revealed to him, was translated that he should not see Death (n).

There is no Point upon which many able and very learned Writers appear more fondly mistaken, than in not truly stating the Doctrine of Faith, according to the Scriptures. It is a favourite Notion with them to divide the State of Mankind have been in, into that of natural Religion, and that of the Gospel: They call the State of Creation or natural Religion the Dispensation of the Father; the State of the Gospel the Dispensation of the Son of God: and they argue the former, na-

(n) Heb. xi. 5.
Natural Religion, to be a necessary Preparation for the latter (o): But herein they certainly introduce a Language very different from the Scriptures: To come unto God, to seek God, to walk with God, all these and other like Expressions, in their Scripture-Meaning signify, to accede to that Law which is from God’s Mouth, to lay up his Words in our Hearts; to live according to what God has revealed and commanded (p); the fearing God and working Righteousness according to what is called natural Light, is not what is in Scripture designed by those Expressions: In like Manner the Dispensation of the Father in Contradistinction to the Dispensation of the Son, must be the Revelation of the Old Testament, as distinguished from the Revelation in the New: Our blessed Saviour’s Exhortation to his Disciples was,

(o) The Reader may see this Way of Thinking fully stated by the late Dr. Clarke, Serm. I.

that
that as they had believed in God, also they would believe in him. (q)
And the enforcing this particular Duty is the great Intendment of the whole
Epistle to the Hebrews: God at sundry Times and in divers Manners had spoken to their Fathers (r): Here now is the Dispensation of the Father, which the Scriptures recognize, and from hence the Apostle endeavours to lead them to the Dispensation of the Son, to what in these last Days God hath spoken to us by his Son (s), that they should take the more earnest heed to the Things which we have heard, not to neglect the great Salvation, which was began to be spoken by the Lord himself, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him, God also bearing them
Witness, both with Signs and Wonder, and with divers Miracles and Gifts of the holy Ghost (t): He observed

(q) John xiv. 1. (r) Heb. i. 1. (s) Ver. 2. (t) Cap. ii. 1.
them, that in obeying Moses, they had not refused One, that spake to them on Earth: He exhorts them now agreeably hereto, not to refuse him who spake to them from Heaven (u): In a Word, the whole Design of this Epistle is to set forth to the Hebrews, That faith had always come by Hearing; that the Foundation of all revealed Religion had in all Ages been, the receiving and believing the Word of God; and the Intent of the eleventh Chapter is to set before us a Cloud of Witnesses or Examples of this Fact: And to suppose any one Instance given by the Apostle in this Chapter to be intended to hint any other Faith, than the Belief of some explicit Revelation, is to suppose the Apostle to have deviated from his Argument to something entirely foreign, if not opposite to it.

(u) Heb. xii. 25.
PREFACE.

But it will be here asked: What Proof, or Shadow of Proof can we bring of Enoch’s having had any express Revelation from God? I answer, 1. We are informed that Enoch prophesied of the Judgment to come, that the Lord would come with thousands of his Saints — &c. (w). 2. Moses informs us, that in Enoch’s Days Men began to call upon the Name of the Lord (x). Upon which Words I would observe, 1. That the Expression in this Place means, that at this Time began the Distinction of Mankind’s being called some the Sons of God, others the Sons of Men (y). 2. I have indeed observed that the Words [Kara βεβημ Ιεβωα] was an Expression used of Abraham and his Descendants, and signified that they invoked God, in the Name of the Lord who had appeared to Abra

PREFACE.

Iam (2): But I do not think this Expression to have been thus used before the Days of Abraham (a). 3. A very learned and judicious Writer observes, and gives Instances that the Word [Hochal (b)], which we translate Baal, may signify bad Hope (c): and he remarks that the Septuagint so un-

(2) See Connect. Vol. I. B. v. p. 293. I have been told that must be thought to err in my giving this particular Interpretation of the Words Kara be fhem. It is said, that the xviiith chapter of the first Book of Kings, ver. 26. shews, that the expression signifies to call on the Name. The Priests of Baal, as are there told, [אַלֹ֣ם נְאֹרָ֛ה נָּעַ֖ר בָּאָ֣ל יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל] called upon the Name of Baal, saying, O Baal, hear us. Are we not here told plainly, that their saying, O Baal hear us, was their calling upon the Name of Baal? Why then must [Kasdau bestem Baal] be any Thing more than they called upon the Name of Baal: I answer, We are easily herein misled by our rendering [leamor] saying, had the Participle been here used, [leamor] dicitur, there would have been a greater Plea for that is objected to me: but the infinitive Mood with le prefixed, do not need to be often rendered by the Gerund in do, in Latin [leamor], dicitur is also many Times to be rendered by the Gerund in dam, [leamor] ad dictendum, see Noldius in Partic. and may signify to the saying: when thus used it implies a Proceeding from what was said before, to something further. We often pray unto God in the Name of our Saviour; but we often proceed further and say, O Christ hear us. In this Manner, the Priests of Baal invoked in the Name of Baal, to the saying, i.e. and proceeded even to pray, O Baal hear us. Kara be fhem, or Kara el fhem may signify to invoke, or call upon the Name; but Kara be fhem cannot admit this Signification, see Connect. ubi sup.  
(a) Conne&. Vol. II. B. VII. p. 131.  
(b) See Ru*ehforth's Essay on Virtue, p. 297.  
(c) The He-"\(\text{er}^7\) Verb is speravit: Desiderio expeclavit. &c.
understood and translated it. Εὐγνώμονα ονομα κυριε ἂν ἔχῃς μεν. To Enoch then Hope was given in his being called by the Name of the Lord his God. I can see no Reason to reject what this able Writer offers upon the Text: And we may consider upon it, that the Hope was undoubt edly great unto whom it was given to be called by this Name: Why ought we not to reason concerning them, as we may of ourselves? Beloved, what Manner of Love was herein bestowed upon them that they should be called the Sons of God (d)? They were not the Sons of God: Undoubtedly it did not appear what they shall be; but as Enoch prophesied unto them, that the Lord cometh, with ten thousands of his Saints, to execute Judgment, -- it must be, that all that had this Hope of their Calling, and held fast the Profession of it, knew that when he shall appear,

(d) See 1 John iii. 1.
they shall be like him, for they shall see him as he is (e): When he who is their Life shall appear, they also shall appear with him in Glory (f): We may surely hence well understand what was the particular Revelation made to Enoch; namely, a Revelation of the Hope of another World, and the supposing him translated for receiving and embracing this Faith, and faithfully preaching it to others, himself living an Example of Repentance according to the Tenor of it, is no more than supposing God, to testify in him to the World, that what he had published by him was Truth: Enoch was translated A.M. 987, which is 57 Years after Adam’s Death (g): Enoch was born A.M. 622 (h), above 300 Years before the Death of Adam: If we may suppose Enoch to have received and preached the Revelation of this Hope,

---

(e) 1 John iii. 2. (f) See Coloss. iii. (g) See the Table of the Lives and Deaths of the Antediluvian Patriarchs, Genesis, Vol. I. B. i. p.49. (h) Ibid.
in about the Middle of his Life, we have the Grounds for what the Reader will find me to have offered; namely, that some time before Adam died, God had given the Hopes of another World (i).

III. I have to consider, that Sacrifices of the living Creatures were not originally the Invention of Men. The Writers that would argue them to be such, carry us back to the Times of Orpheus, or of some other sage and wise Personages of about his Age, who reformed and civilized the barbarous Clans of savage and uncultivated People, who over-ran the Parts adjacent to them: They endeavour to shew us, that the first Step they took to humanize the Minds of those they conversed with, was to endeavour to dissatisfy them with the Thoughts of eating the living Creatures, and to persuade them, that taking away the Life of any Thing

(i) See hereafter, p. 286.
must be a Violence that could not make the so doing an acceptable Sacrifice to God. This, the Poet tells us, was the Endeavour of Orpheus in particular,

Sylvostres Homines sacer Interpresque Deorum
Cadibus & fædo Victu deterruit Orpheus,
Dictus ob hoc lenire Tigres rapidosque Leones.
Hor.

Orpheus is supposed to have lived about the Argonautic Times, later than A. M. 2700: But what if he, and all the Reformers such as he was, had lived much earlier; what if, not really knowing the History of the Beginning of Mankind, they had thought it a reasonable Doctrine, very proper to repress and subdue the Outrage and Violence they saw the Earth full of, when Men not only destroyed the Beasts of the Field, but made as free with the Lives of one another ---; what, I say, if they deemed it a Doctrine that might be effectual, to put an End to these...
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Violences, to teach that the Gods could not be pleased with Blood; that the first Sacrifices of Mankind, were of the Fruits of the Earth; or Mixtures of Oil, Milk, and Honey, of odoriferous Spices, Herbs and Gums, of the Leaves of Trees, of Nuts, Acorns and Berries, of every Thing, that Men could offer innocuous, neither doing Violence to any Thing to which God had given the Breath of Life, nor to one another? Will it, because these Doctrines have them, what is agreeable to the Humanity of our Nature, and might be thought reasonable to these Men, who first taught these Tenets, will it, I say, hence follow, that what a well warranted History relates to us to have been Fact near 3000 Years before, was mere Fiction and Fable, because it does not accord to what was taught in these so much later Times?

If the natural Tenderness and Regret of human Nature against all Appearance of Barbarity were made use of
of to shew, how great a Consternation it must have been to the first Men, at a Time, when the Creatures were not their Food (k), and it could not but be more natural for them to say of every Thing living,

— vitæque magis quam morte juvatis,

Ovid.

When to see it living, must have been more agreeable as well as more useful (l) than to put it to Death; What less than a Command from God, whenever they committed a Sin, that the

(k) The Writers who would argue Sacrifices of the living Creatures to have commenced from human Institution, would have it, that the eating Flesh was before the Flood; that the Command to Noah, was to regulate, not to give the first Liberty to eat Flesh. See Philemon to Hymas, p. 55. Letter V. But what a mere Pretence, without Shadow of Foundation this is, let any one consider, who will examine what Lamech said at the Birth of Noah, Gen. v. 29. If they had eat Flesh as freely before the Flood, as after Noah had obtained a Grant of it, what Comfort did they want or could expect concerning their Work and Toil of their Hands, because of the Ground which the Lord had cursed? (l) The Heathen Poets conceived that some Creatures might be sacrificed upon Account of their destroying the Fruits of the Earth, of the Vines or Trees, or otherwise having been prejudicial to Men. See Ovid Fastor. l. 1. Metam. l. 15. But nothing of this Sort can be imagined to have been Abel's Reason for offering of the Firstlings of his Flock.

Sin
Sin might not remain, and lie at their Door (m), could have induced them to bring an innocent, and to them innocuous Animal, to offer its Blood up on Account of their own Transgression? Time and Custom may reconcile us to almost any Thing; but it is difficult to avoid the Reflection, that when Mankind came first to this Service, it would truly rent their Heart to see as it were Death, unto which they knew themselves must one Day come; to have displayed before their Eyes its Pangs and Agonies inflicted by themselves on a Creature that had no Demerit; merely because they had themselves committed some Offence against their God; — Such a Service could not but cause them both to think upon the Victim and upon themselves. As to the suffering Animal; how could they avoid asking, What has this Sheep done (n)? Upon themselves they must

(m) See Gen. iv. 7.
(n) Quid meruiis Oves, placidum Pectus —— Ovid.
ook with Confusion of Face, that what Flesh and Blood would naturally shrink back at, was without Mercy to be performed, purely upon Account of their Misdoings: One would think, that whilst their Minds were tender, (and they ought carefully to have kept them so) nothing could have been injoined them, that could have been a more affecting rebuke of Sin, to raise in them hearty Desires, if possible to sin no more, rather than to come often to repeat a Service in its Nature so disagreeable; to perform deliberately the Rites of it: one would think, not Cain only, but all Mankind, would have been glad to have avoided it, if the Offering of the Fruits of the Ground might have been accepted instead of it.

In Fact, Sacrifices appear to have been offered thousands of Years, before any Thing that can be cited concerning them from Heathen Writers was written: And in Truth nothing can be
be hence cited to shew us the Reason of them or their Origin: Sacrifices of the living Creatures, as in the Case of Abel, were made Ages before Mankind had any Thought of eating Flesh: and consequently, none of the weak Reasons our ingenious Writer supposes Mankind might fall into, to induce them to offer to the Gods in their injudicious Way of thinking, Part of what they experienced to be of Sustenance to themselves, could have any Place in their Minds at all: From what is argued in the New Testament, the first Sacrifices in the World came of Faith, were made in Obedience to some divine Command: They may be apprehended to be an Institution so dehortatory against Sin, that even upon this Account they would appear a Command worthy of God, to Creatures wanting to be strongly warned against it; And they bear such a Reference to what was afterwards in Reality to take away Sin, and they might so instructively
Instructively prepare the World to receive the Revelation of it, when it should be more fully published, and to lead Men to it; that, what is said for its being supposed to be an human Institution being shewn to be frivolous and without Foundation, I may, I think, without further Controversy refer the Reader to what I have given as the Reason of this Institution, viz. that God having determined, what ought in the Fulness of Time be the Propitiation for the Sins of the World; namely, Christ, who through his own Blood obtained us eternal Redemption, thought fit, from the Time that Man became guilty of Sin, to appoint the Creatures to be offered, to represent the true Offering, which was afterwards to be made for the Sins of all Men (o).

(o) See Comm. Vol. I. B. i. p. 84. My ingenious Adversary, see Philo of Hades, Letter V. p. 31., thinks it not reasonable to suppose that Abel offered Sacrifice for any Sin of Adam's, and would argue from St. Paul's having said, that Sin is not imputed without a Law, Rom. v. 13, that there was no Law given in Abel's Time that declared Death to be the Punishment
I have here endeavoured very largely for a Reply to what has been objected to me. The punishment of any Sin, but of the first Transgression; and consequently, that there could be no Reason, that Abel should offer a Sacrifice for any Sin of his own. A little Observation may both explain St. Paul's Meaning, and clear the Confusion raised by my Antagonist. The Apostle thus argues: 'As the Man Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin, AND so (should render it EVEN so) Death passed upon all Men, for its all Men have sinned: For until the Law Sin was in the World. The Point to be observed is, That the Scriptures conclude Men under Sin. Gal. iii. 21. affirm, that there is no Man on Earth that sinneth not: I Kings viii. 46. This therefore being allowed Truth, that Sin was in the World until the Law, be from Adam unto Moses, not Adam and Eve only, but every individual of their Descendants had actual Sins of their own, the Apostle reasons, that there can be no Injustice pretended that ευ το 'Αδαμ πατησε σαμονισκνων, that in Adam all, i. e. in Cor. xv. 22. εφ' εσενας εμακρανν τως Rom. v. 12. not a whom all sinned, as our marginal Reference would correct or Version; for had this been intended it would have been like ευ τον 'Αδαμ πατησε σαμονισκνων εφ' εσεναι ο γεων, or because: As by one Man, says the Apostle, Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin, του γεων — even so, in like Man: i.e. as deservedly Death hath passed upon all Men. The Foundation of which Reasoning is plain: For Death being the Wages of Sin, and all Men having done the Works of our first Parents, having actually sinned as well as they, we not only receive in dying, but by our Sins deserve the same Wages. Haying thus stated this Point, the Apostle proceeds to consider an Objection. But Sin, says he, is not imputed, where there is no Law, Nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even as them that had not sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression, ver. 13, 14: The Apostle's Argument is so clear, I wonder it can be mistaken. He allows, that Sin is not imputed where there is no Law; which indeed is exactly what he says, Where no Law is, there is no Transgression, Rom. v. 15. For as St. John observes, Sin is the Transgression of a Law, 1 John iii. 4. Nevertheless, says he, notwithstanding all this, may thus be reason, and altho' none like our Parents but
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me upon this Subject, I thought it to require a full Consideration: I would as freely defend or retract any Thing I have written, that other.

at of the forbidden Tree, yet Death hath reigned from Adam own to Moses; all have received the Wages of Sin, and therefore in Fact all have sinned, and consequently, as there would have been no Sin, had there been no Law; there certainly has been a Law, which all Men, every one, has in many Instances sided of living up to, and in these Failures every Man living, that has lived, has had actual Sin; And thus the Apostle's Argument concludes directly contrary to my ingenious Correspondent. Abel had Sin as well as all other Men: But he would have had no Sin, if he had not lived under some Law: Abel therefore lived under the Law of some Revelation which appointed Sacrifice for Sin: And upon sinning, that his Sin might not remain and lie at his Door, believing and obeying that God had commanded, he offered his Sacrifice, and there- in by Faith obtained Forgivenes of Sin.

If it was not foreign to the Point before us to proceed to the Context, we might refute by it a Calumny of Lord Bolingbroke against Eve: He says she damned her Children before she bare them. Study of History, Letter III. p. 109. His Lordship in his underload, How, not as the Offence in Adam, so also is he free Gift in Christ, Rom. v. 15. In Adam indeed all died, and so in Christ shall all be made alive, 1 Cor. xv. 22. But we shall not only be made alive: that might be given us, and we might live unto Condemnation for our own Sins: But the free Gift abounded in the Forgivenes of many Offences unto Justification of Life, Rom. v. 16-18, &c. And thus Eve damned none of her Children; for there was no Necessity, that any should thus terribly perish: All were to live again: And to as many as would truly strive to obtain it, Power was given to become the Sons of God, to live unto Honour, to Glory, to eternal Happiness. But this is not the only Instance of this unhappy Writer's most unwarrantable Rashness: How dogmatically he can abuse even the Scriptures, not really knowing them, must be very evident to any one that will read. Mr. Hervey's most excellent Remarks on Lord Bolingbroke's Letters; a Treatise worth every one's attentive Consideration.

Writers
Writers have thought wrong, if I apprehended it alike material: But where I think myself only misrepresent, or a Controversy to be rather fought for than to be of any Service to Truth, I wish to enjoy Silence and Quiet, rather than to trouble the World with a Pother of Altercation that can be of no Utility: In some small Points the Reader may observe me to have varied from myself: When I began my Connection I too hastily concluded, that God appeared to Cain (b): I thought this a Mistake, when I wrote my second Volume (c): I have in the ensuing Treatise followed what I apprehended upon second Examination to be true(d): And yet I let my Error stand in later Editions of my first Volume, as I at first printed it: I shall do the same Thing, as to what I differ in this Treatise from what I formerly conceived to

The Situation of the Garden of Eden (e): I would not, by having wrote, be confined from growing wiser; but, I hope, the Alterations of what I have written, may not be necessarily so many, but that, if I live and have Health to finish my Connection, they may be collected and referred to in a Page by themselves, and the whole of what is printed continuing as it is, I may shew myself at least just to the World, in not printing new Editions of any Thing that is mine, such as may depreciate any former ones.

The chief Point inquired into in the ensuing Treatise is indeed the direct Opposite to what I see stated, by the Author I have often cited: "If we consider, says he, the Order of the Sciences in their Rise and Progress, the first Place belongs to natural Philosophy, the Mother of them all, or the Trunk, the Tree of Know-

ledge, out of which, and in Propor-

tion to which, like so many Branches,

they all grow" (f): The Scriptures, I
think, teach otherwise: The first hu-
man formation Man had, came from hear-
ing the Word of God (g), and the first
Error, that came into the World, arose
from our first Parents opposing to
their first Philosophy (b): Their Thought
was indeed low and mean, not de-
fining to be called Philosophy; but it was
the supposed Science of their Day, and
they ventured to be led by it, contrary
to what God had commanded. If we
proceed, the Scriptures shew us, where
in the Word of God was to be to Man
the Ground of Truth, and how human
Science, falsely so called, opposed to it,
has been, and may still be the 
Root of all Error: And the rightly deter-
mining how far we ought to begin un-
der the Guidance of Faith, and where

(f) Lord Bolingbroke's Letters to Sir William Wyndham, as
to Mr. Pope, p. 466. (g) Gen. ii. 15, 16. See the ensuin
Treatise, Chap. IV. V. (b) Ibid. Chap. IX. p. 165, &c.
in and how we may proceed to add Knowledge to it, to prove and examine whether we be in the Truth, in Contradistinction to what some contend, that we must begin in Knowledge, and hereby become perfect, is the One Question, which rightly stated and examined, will, according to what we determine concerning it, incline us to Deism, or to embrace and see the Reason of the Revelation set before us in the Scriptures; concerning which, with Regard to myself, I will venture to say, I have studied them, not, as Lord Bolingbroke imputes to us, in order, (i.e. right or wrong determined) to believe; But the more impartially I examine, I find more and more Reason to believe them to be true, and accordingly, although I am a Clergyman, I am verily persuaded, I believe and profess in Matters of Religion no Thing, but what, if I was a Layman, I should believe and profess the same. His Lordship says of the Clergy, in his round and large Manner
Manner of affirming, That "in natu-
ral Religion the Clergy are unnece-
sary; in revealed they are dangerous
"Guides" (i): How far any will be
guided by me, I hope I shall always
know myself so well, as to leave that to
their own Choice: As to the Inutility
of my Inquiries, and also the Impartia-
ality of them, here I confess myself to
wish, as I think what I wish, may be
a Good, not absolutely terminating
upon myself, that the Reader will con-
 sider with as unbiased a Freedom, as I
have written, how far he may exempt
me out of his Lordship's most absolute
Sentence of Reprobation.

(i) Lord Bolingbroke, ubi sup. p. 531.

Canterbury,
June 2, 1753.

Errata.

Page xxv. 1. 11. was read was.
Lxxiii. 1. 4. guarded read guided.
1. 15. Motions read Motives.
Lxxviii. in Notes, 1. 23. whether, read whence.

Page 7. 1. 23. the Lord God. read, for the Lord God.
43. 1. 22. dele It is illative.
49. 1. 14. Job. read, the Book of Job.
98. in the Title of Chap, VII. Him. read Them.
177. 1. 11. prefereved read, persevered.
THE CREATION AND FALL OF MAN.

THAT Mankind have not been in this World, nor this World itself been from Eternity, may be proved by many Arguments from the Nature, and from what is, and has in fact been the known State of the World in the diverse Ages of it (a): But in what particular manner Men at first began to be; where, and how they lived; are Points we can be certain of no farther, than we have some authentic Testimony declaring them unto us.

(a) See Archbishop Tillotson, Serm. 1. Wilkins, Nat. Rel. Book 1, c. 5.
The Heathen Writers have given us their Conjectures upon these Subjects, but they are Conjectures only: Some part of what they offer, might be admitted as probable; if we were not better informed, that in the Beginning Things were not done as they supposed: But in having Moses' Writings, we have a real History of these Matters: And, as I have elsewhere made some Observations upon his Account of the Creation of the Heavens and the Earth; I would herein examin, what he relates concerning the Creation of Mankind; the Manner and Circumstances in which our first Parents began their Being, and the Incidents which befel them; hoping, that I may shew, that Moses' Account may reasonably be believed to set before us what were real Matters of Fact, and that no part of what is related by him ought to be taken to be Apologue and Fable, as some Writers are fond of representing.

That

(b) Diodor. Sic. p. 5. Lib. i. (c) Connef. Sac. & Pref. Hift. Pref. to Vol. i. (d) It is observabfe, that some Yeares ago the most forward Writers expressed Doubt and Reserve treating this Subject: Quaedam effe Parabolica in hac Narratione nonne penitus ad Litteram exigendae omnes fere agnoscent: Nonnulli eum totum Sermo non volunt ςτοτυπωτιν artificiosam ad expendas Res veras, faid Dr. Burnet, Archæoloc. p. 283. we find Writers, who have added no Argument beyond what D.
Fall of Man.

That the Subject I am attempting has many Difficulties I am ready to confess, and not willing to be too positive I can remove them all: But as I apprehend the Substance of what I have to offer, will be seen to carry an evident Design to give a Reason for, and thereby to establish the Principles of revealed Religion; I persuade myself I shall find all that Candour, which I have long ago experienced the World not unwilling to bestow upon a well-intended Endeavour, conducted, as I trust this shall be, without Ill-nature, or Illmanners to other Writers, however I may happen to differ from them.

Chapter I.

The Contents of the first and second Chapters of Genesis; and how they are to be adjusted to each other.

The first and second Chapters of Genesis give us the whole of what Moses relates concerning the Creation of Mankind: And

Dr. Burnet had before offered, now more absolutely ascertaining, that the Matter of Moses Account is inconsistent with the Character of an historical Narration, and must, they say, convince all, who consider it without Prejudice, that it is wholly fabri- 

kaus or allegorical. See Middleton's Exam. p. 155.

We
we shall see them to accord perfectly; the one to the other; if we consider the first Chapter to give only a short and general Account of this great Transaction; and the second to be a Resumption of the Subject, in order to relate some Particulars belonging to it, which in the Conciseness of the first Relation were passed over unmentioned.

In the first Chapter, Moses having recorded the several Transactions of the five preceding Days, begins the sixth Day with God's creating the Cattel, and living Creatures of the Earth (e), and then adds his Determination to make Man: God said, Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness, and let them have Dominion over the Fish of the Sea, and over the Fowl of the Air, and over the Cattel, and over all the Earth, and over every creeping Thing that creepeth upon the Earth (f): After this Moses tells us, that God effectuated his Purpose: So God created Man in his own Image, in the Image of God created he HIM (g): unto which he adds, Male and Female created he them (h): The Hebrew Words are as I have below transcribed

(e) Gen. i. ver. 24—25.  (f) ver. 26.  (g) ver. 17.
(h) ibid.

them:
them (i): And they might be translated as I have underlined them: *The Male and the Female, He created them Both*; not the Male only, but the Female also: The Words of Moses are very plain: He tells us, that God on the sixth Day created the Woman as well as the Man: He does not say, that God created Both at the same Instant, nor in the same Manner; for this he distinctly considers in the next Chapter: But he here hints to us that God made both the Male and the Female within the time of this sixth Day: And Moses’s Expression gives no Ground for the Conceits concerning Adam before Eve was taken out of him, in which some Writers have egregiously trifled (k).

(i) eos creavit et Feminam Marem

(k) Some fanciful Writers have represented, that the Man was at first created of two Bodies, a Male and a Female; and that God of these made two Persons, by dividing or separating the one Body from the other: And it is generally said, that this was a Fiction of the Rabbins; but I should apprehend it to be of a more early Original. Plato’s Fable of the Androgynes (see Hist. in conviv. Vol. 3. p. 189. Edit. Serrani) shews us what sort of Traditions he met with in searching thro’ the then ancient Literature, and I should think it no unreasonable Supposition, that a Figment of this kind might have its first Rise in those early Times, when the Egyptians and Phoenicians began or made Proficiency in disguising the plain Narrations they found of the Origin of Things, with their Fables and Mythology. See Euseb. Prep. Evang. I. 1. c. 10. Consec. of Sac. & Proph. Hist. Vol. 2. B. 8.
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After both the Man and the Woman were created, God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the Earth and subdue it: and have Dominion over the Fish of the Sea, and over the Fowl of the Air, and over every living Thing that moveth upon the Earth: And God said, Behold, I have given you every Herb bearing Seed, which is upon the Face of all the Earth, and every Tree, in the which is the Fruit of a Tree yielding Seed, to you it shall be for Meat: And to every Beast of the Earth, and to every Fowl of the Air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the Earth, wherein there is Life, I have given every green Herb for Meat (l): And now the Evening and the Morning were the sixth Day (m): The sixth Day was now completed, and the seventh Day began, on which God having finished the Creation,

(l) Gen. i. 28, 29, 30. (m) Ver. 31. This was the ancient original way of computing the natural Day: It began from the Morning, proceeded to the Evening, and continued until the next Morning, finished the preceding, and began the ensuing Day: Thus the Evening and the Morning were the Day. Gen. i. 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31. And in this way of computing the Jews continued to their latest Times: For thus we are told of the End of the Sabbath, Matt. xxviii. 1. The Sabbath was ending, as it began to dawn towards the first Day of the Week: The End of the Night which had closed the Sabbath was the End of the computed Day: The Day following began with the Morning Sun.
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rested from all the Work which He had made: And God blessed the seventh Day, and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all his Work, which He had created and made (n): These are the Generations of the Heavens, and of the Earth, when they were created (o).

Moses here ends his summary or general Account of the Creation: And here, I think, the Dividers of our Bible into Chapters and Verses should have ended the first Chapter of Genesis; and the second Chapter should have began with these Words — In the Day that the Lord made the Earth and the Heavens, &c.

The second Chapter of Genesis being, as I have hinted, a Resumption of the Argument treated in the first, in order to set forth more explicitly some Particulars which the first Chapter had only mentioned in the general, begins thus: In the Day that, i.e. when (p) the Lord made the Earth and the Heavens, and every Plant of the Field, before it was in the Earth, and every Herb of the Field before it grew, the Lord God had not caused it (q) to rain

---

(n) Gen. ii. 2, 3. (o) Ver. 4. (p) Ex Die, i.e. quando—Dius Tempus in Genere passim dicitur. Cleric. in Loc. (q) We begin this Sentence with the Particle For: The Hbreu Text having the Particle יְהוָּה [ci], we put in for to answer it: But it should be here rendered nempe, quidem, indeed, not for: the Sentence
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rain upon the Earth; and there was not a Man
to till the Ground; nor (r) did a Mist go up
from the Earth and water the whole Face of
the Ground: But the Lord God formed Man
of the Dust of the Ground, and breathed into
his Nostrils the Breath of Life, and Man be-
came a living Soul: And the Lord God had (s)
planted a Garden eastward in Eden, and there
he put the Man whom he had formed —

In

Sentence not being, for the Lord God had not caused it to rain—
but rather, the Lord God had indeed not caused it to rain —
(r) We render this Paragraph, But there went up a Mist from
the Earth, in the Affirmative; whereas the Sense of the Place
shews us, that Moses intended to assert, that God made all
Things, before any natural Powers were in Activity to be the
Cause of their Production: The Hebrew Particle (ve) is here
used, and joins similar, i.e. negative Sentences; There was
no Man to till the Ground, nor Mist went up from the Earth.
The Arabic Version has observed the true Meaning of the
Place, rendering it, Nee exhalatior ascendetat, &c — (s) We
say planted, in the perfect Tense: But the Hebrew perfect Tense
is often used in the Sense of a preter/preterfet, to speak of
things done in a Time past. This the Syriac Version seems
rightly to observe in a Passage like this in the 19th Verse of this
Chapter. We say, The Lord God formed out of the Ground every
Beast —, as if God then made them, whereas the Beasts were
made some time before: The Syriac Version is rendered, And the
Lord God had formed —. And thus we should render the Place
before us: And the Lord God had planted a Garden — for the
Garden was undoubtedly planted on the third Day of the Cre-
tion, when God caused all the Plants and Trees to spring out
of the Earth, Gen. i. 11, 12, 13. Vide Diodor. Sic. Hilt.
Lib. i. p. 5. The Greeks had Sentiments of this kind from
Egypt: For thus Enuipides,

"Ως άφανε τα γαλα την μέρεν μικα"
Επει δ' εκασθησει ολιγων ον ριχα,

Τίκλει
In this manner Moses proceeds to reconsider the Creation of Man; first observing, that of itself, or by any Powers of its own, the Earth had produced nothing. It was an ancient Opinion, and very early in Egypt, where Moses had his Birth and Education, that the Earth originally, of itself, brought forth its Fruits, and Plants, and Trees, and all kinds of living Creatures, and Men (t):
And some opined that the natural Fertility of the Ground for these Purposes was put in Action either by the Rain which fell from Heaven, or by some Moisture exhaled from the Earth, fertilized by the Sun, and falling down in a Mist, spread abroad over the Face of

The Roman Poet seems to have been in doubt between two Opinions in this Matter; rather inclining to introduce an Opifex Rurum into all the Produce of the whole Creation; but not absolutely determining against the Opinion of all Things arising from their natural Seeds in the Earth, as soon as the Earth was aptly disposed to give Rife to them.

Ille.
The Creation and of the Ground (n): But Moses, contrary to all the Imaginations of this Philosophy, affirms, that by the Word of God only all Things were made; that there was not a Plant, which God did not create before it was in the Earth; nor an Herb, which He had not made before it grew; and that God had made them all, before either Rain or Dew had watered the Earth; or the Earth had had any Tillage from the Hand of Man; for that all the Produce of the World had its Beginning before there was any Man to till the Ground: But that other things being thus set in order, God last of all made Man. —— He had, as I have observed, before told us, that God made Man; and that He made two Persons, the Male and the Female (w): He now proceeds more distinctly to relate, of what Materials God made them Both; when, and how they were created; where He placed them, and what Command and Directions He gave them, as soon as He gave them Being.

 Ille opifex Rerum, mundi melioris Origo; Sive recens Tellus seduæque supér ab alto Äethere cognati retinucat Semina Cæli. Ovid. Metamorph.
(n) Thus perhaps they thought who would have sung with Pindar, "Æisbv μεν ἢσσειρ' Olymp. Ode 1. or thought with Thales —— Aquam esse Initium Rerum. Cicero Lib. de Nat.
Deor. 1. c. 10. (w) Gen. i. 27.
And 1. God made the Man of the Dust of the Ground, breathed into him the Breath of Life, and caused him to become a living Soul (x). 2. He put him into the Garden which He had planted, to dress it and keep it: And having therein caused to grow every Tree either pleasant to the Sight, or good for Food; the Tree of Life also, and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil (y); the Lord God commanded the Man, saying, Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the Day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die (z): 3. Having given the Man this Injunction, the Lord God said, It is not good that the Man should be alone, I will make him a Help meet for him (a): But 4. before God proceeded to make this meet Help for Man, the Beasts of the Field being before formed (b), and every Fowl of the Air, God brought Adam to a Trial how he might name them (c): And after this 5. God caused a deep Sleep to

(x) Gen. ii. 7. (y) Ver. 9. (z) Ver. 16, 17. (a) Ver. 19. (b) We render the Place God formed; but, as I have before observed, the Syriac Version is rightly translated, God had formed; for the Creatures were made before Man. (c) Ver. 19, 20.
fall upon Adam, and he sleep: And He took one of his Ribs, and closed up the Flesh instead thereof: And the Rib which the Lord God had taken from Man, made He a Woman, and brought her unto the Man: And Adam said, This is now Bone of my Bones, and Flesh of my Flesh, she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of the Man (d). These are the Particulars relating to the Creation of Man-kind, which Moses distinctly mentions in this second Chapter: And if we would place them in order as they were done, together with what is hinted in the first Chapter, we might add them between the 27th and 28th Verses of the first Chapter. God created Man in his own Image: In the Image of God created he him, and the Male and the Female he created both of them (e). The Male he formed of the Dust of the Ground (f); placed him in the Garden, commanded him his Duty there (g); declared that he did not intend him to be alone (b); called him to try to name the Creatures of the World (i); then caused him to fall into a deep Sleep, and out of the Man, made the Woman to take her Beginning (k). And now both the Male and the Female being

(d) Gen. ii. 23.  (e) Gen. i. 27.  (f) Gen. ii. 7.  (g) Ver. 11—17.  (b) Ver. 18.  (i) Ver. 19, 20.  (k) Ver. 21, 22.
created, God gave them. Both the general Blessing, and said unto them all that Moses farther adds in the 28th, 29th, and 30th Verses of the first Chapter: In all which the two Chapters entirely agree, and the second is no more than a Supplement to the former: For I think it needless to remark, that there is no manner of Contradiction between the first Chapter's giving them Leave to eat of every Tree upon the Face of all the Earth (l), when the second shews plainly, that of one Tree in the Garden they were not to eat (m): It is only to be observed that the forbidden Tree was one Tree only, and that growing in the Garden; there was no forbidden Tree out of the Garden all over the World; the Restraint, as to one Tree, was injoined to be observed by them within their Garden, but wherever they went out of their Garden into the Earth to replenish and subdue it, all was common: They had no Care to inquire, whether a like Tree with that prohibited in the Garden, grew any where else in the World; for all that grew without the Garden, every Tree, and every Herb upon the Face of the Earth, was indiscriminately given them for Meat.

(l) Gen. i. 29.  (m) ii. 17.
Some Considerations of some of the Particulars related by Moses to belong to Adam’s first Day.

No sooner was Adam created, than Moses tells us he heard the Voice of God (n); and that, I think, upon two different Points: First, He was audibly commanded, that he should not eat of the forbidden Tree (o). Secondly, He was told, that he should not live alone; for that God would make for him an Help, that should be his Likeness (p). With-

(n) Gen. ii. 17. (o) Ibid. (p) Ver. 18. I apprehend the Word which our Version renders an Help meet for him, might be translated, an Help, that shall be his Likeness. The Hebrew Words are [יתנין ינות] nezer cenegeddo: The interlinear Latin renders them, Auxilium quasi coram eo, an Help, as it were before him, i.e. in his Sight or Presence, to stand ready to receive his Instructions, to aid and execute them: But I do not find the Word [Naged] ever thus used: To stand before, or in the Presence of one ready for his Aid or Service, is, I think, always otherwise expressed in Scripture: See Deut. x. 8. 1 Sam. xvi. 22. &c. Some of the Versions intimate the Meaning of this Passage to be, that God would make for Adam an Help like himself: Adjutorium sibi sibi, says the vulgar Latin. Βοήθησαι, says the Septuagint. The Syriac is, Adjutorum sibi sibi similis ipsi. Onkelos, Adjutorium quasi eum. And why may we not, instead of taking the Word [Naged] to be a Preposition, and to signify coram, before, or in the Presence of, suppose it to be a Noun Substantive from the Verb [Nagad] indicavit, and translate [cenegeddo] quasi Indiciun ejus; I would say in English, an indicating, or, as it were, a speaking Likeness of him?
Fall of Man.

out doubt he sufficiently understood what was thus spoken to him, otherwise the Voice of God had spoken to him in vain. But it will be here queried, How should Adam, having never before heard Words, instantly know the Meaning of what the Voice of God thus spake to him? May we not fully answer this Question by another? How did the Apostles, and such of the early Disciples of Christ as God so enabled (q), instantly know Words, viz. the Meaning of Words, in Tongues or Languages never before heard or understood by them? The Spirit of God in both Cases raised in the Mind the Ideas intended, as far as God was pleased to have them perceived, which the Words spoken would have raised, had a Knowledge of such Words in a natural way been attained. God, who planted the Ear, hath given us to hear; has so made us, that whatever Sound strikes that Organ, shall move the Mind of him who hears it: But in themselves Words are but mere Sounds; when they strike the Ear, the Understanding instantly and naturally judges, whether they are soft or loud, harsh or agreeable; i. e. how the Ear is affected by them: But to give Words a Mean-

(q) 1 Corinth. xii. 10——30.
ing; to make them carry, not only the Voice of the Speaker to the Hearer's Ear, but the Intention of the Speaker's Mind to the Hearer's Heart; this comes not naturally from mere hearing, but from having learn'd what Intention is to be given to such Words as are spoken to us. Should a Man hear it said to him, *Bring the Bread*, it is evident that if the Words had never before been heard by him, they would be to him Sounds of no determinate Meaning: But let the Word *Bread* be repeated to him, and the Loaf shewed him, until he perceives, that whenever he hears the Word *Bread*, the Loaf is intended by it; let him farther, upon hearing the Word *bring*, see the Action intended by this Word done, until he apprehends it, and from that time the Words, whenever he hears them, will speak their Design to him: But should we now say, that therefore some Process of this sort must have been necessary for our first Parents understanding what God, in the Beginning of their Being, was pleased to cause in Words to be heard by them, we err most inconsiderately, neither attending to the Scriptures, nor to the Power of God. The Scriptures shew us, in the Instance of the Apostles and early Disciples above-mentioned, that God has in Fact,
long since the Days of Adam, made Men instantly understand Words, never before heard or learned by them: And, he can undoubtedly, from any Sound heard, teach the Heart of Man what Knowledge he pleases, instantly causing, from any Words spoken, such Sentiments to arise in the Mind, as he thinks fit to cause by them: A Matter I apprehend so plain, that it cannot want in the general to be argued; tho' it may not be improper before I leave this Topic to consider a little farther, what Extent or Compass of Ideas we may reasonably suppose our first Parents had of the Things spoken to them from the Words of God, in this their first Day heard by them.

An ingenious Writer has queried upon this Subject: How could Eve, upon hearing that Death was threatened to the eating of the forbidden Tree, have any Notion of what could be meant by dying (r), having neither seen nor felt any thing like it? Our Author seems to opine, that our first Parents could have no Ideas of Death at all, if they had not such Sentiments as Time and Experience enabled

---

them to form, and gradually to have more and
more enlarged of it: whereas nothing can be
more obvious, than that if upon hearing what
God threatened, namely that they should die,
God caused them to apprehend that they
should cease to be, tho' the Manner how might
in no wise be conceived by them; a general
Notion of this sort might have been sufficient
for them. Their first Idea of dying was un-
doubtedly, not the Image which they after-
wards came to have of it, when they flew
their first Sacrifice: And their Idea of Death
became afterwards farther augmented with
new Terrors: The Murder of their Son Abel
by Cain, shewed them more plainly how it
would affect them in their own Persons; and
many Incidents, very probably, occasioned
them additional Observations and Reflections
concerning it; altho' as we cannot, so neither
could they have their Idea of Death full and
complete, until they had gone thro' their own
Dissolutions. But as in this one Instance so
in all others, the Sentiments which God was
pleased to raise in the Minds of our first Pa-
rents of the Things he spake to them, were no
more than as it were their first, and unim-
proved Notions of those Things: God did not
cause them to think of them in that Extent
and Variety of Conception, which they came afterwards to have about them, as their Thoughts enlarged by a farther Acquaintance with the Things spoken of, and with other Things from which they distinguished, or with which they compared them. In and from the Words which God was pleased to speak to them, he gave them some plain and obvious Sentiments, which were the first Beginnings of the Thoughts of their Lives; Conceptions which grew gradually, and produced others more enlarged and diversified, as they grew more and more acquainted with themselves and the Things of the World.

It may here be considered, whether God was pleased to give Adam and Eve to understand all the Words of some one Language, so that whatever was said to them in that particular Tongue, was immediately conceived and understood by them. It has been by many supposed, that God endowed them with both the speaking and understanding some innate Language: But I confess myself not to see sufficient Reasons for this Sentiment, as I have suggested in another place (s). The Author of Ecclesiasticus does indeed tell us of

our first Parents, that they received the Use of the five Operations of the Lord; and in the sixth place he imparted them Understanding, and in the seventh Speech, an Interpreter of the Cogitations thereof (t); but we shall hastily go beyond the true Sentiment of this considerate Writer, if we conclude from it, that God instantly gave Adam every Word he was to introduce into his Language, or gave him instantly to understand every Word of that Language in which God spake, by whomsoever any Word of it might have been spoken to him. The Author of Ecclesiasticus does indeed pronounce the Speech of Man to be the Gift of God; but in like Manner he represents the Perception of Man by his five Senses, and the Judgment of Man by his Understanding to be so too (u); not meaning that in giving Man Speech, God actually gave him every Word he was to utter, any more than that in giving him the five Operations of his Senses, or in giving him Understanding, God planted innate in him every Idea his Senses were to raise in him; or actually formed upon his Mind every Sentiment that was to be his Judgment and Understanding of the Things that

(t) Ecclesiasticus xvii. 5.  (u) Ibid.
were perceived by him. Rather, in all these cases, God gave a Capacity or Abilities only: in the one he made Man capable of Sensations of the Things without him; in the other, able to form a Judgment of the Things perceived by him, and in Language capable of uttering Sounds, and of judging from what he had heard from the Voice of God, how he might make his own Sounds signifcant to himself, and in Time to others, to intend what he might fix and design by each Sound to point out and denominate. In this Manner Adam and Eve might form for themselves all the Words of their Language, over and besides those few which had actually been spoken to them by the Voice of God: Their immediately understanding these, was unquestionably from him who spake to them (w): But because they were instantly enabled, by the Power of God, who could affect their Minds as he pleased, to understand each Word that proceeded from the Mouth of God (for otherwise they could not have been instructed by God’s speaking to them), that therefore they should as readily understand all the Words of some one whole Tongue: Herein there is no Consequence.

(w) Vide quæ sup.
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Some Writers do indeed set forth Adam abounding in a great Fluency of Speech, pouring forth the Fulness of his Heart in most eloquent Soliloquies, as soon as he perceived he was in Being (x); but a considerate Inquirer will think this very unnatural. Adam, tho' created a Man, not in the Imbecillity of Infancy and Childhood, cannot be supposed to have had a Mind stored with Ideas (and without these what could be his Thoughts?) before he attained them by Sensations from without, or Reflections upon his Perceptions within: And shall we think him to have had Words upon his Tongue sooner or faster than he acquired Sentiments? Moses introduces Adam into the World in a manner far more natural: Whatever Adam heard and understood from the Voice of God, Moses does not hint him to have attempted to speak a word, until God called him to try to name the Creatures (www); so that here we find the first Attempt Adam made to speak: And we see the Manner and the Process of it: God, we are told, brought the Beasts of the Field, and the Fowls of the Air (y) unto Adam, to see what he would call

(x) See Milton's Paradise Lost, Book VIII. ver. 273.
(www) Gen. ii. See to ver. 19. (y) The Fact here related will be more distinctly considered Chap. 3.
them: And whatsoever Adam called every living Creature, that was the Name thereof (z). After Adam had been called to this Trial, we find him able to name the Woman (a). But before this Trial we read nothing that can cause us to think he attempted to speak at all; but rather, an Attention to what was said to him by the Voice of God entirely ingrossed him. God brought to Adam the Creatures, to see what he would call them; i.e. to put Adam upon considering how to name them. But how superfluous a thing would this have been, if Adam had had an innate Word for every Creature that was to be named by him? Whenever he saw a Thing, the innate Name for it would have readily offered itself without Trial; he must have had that Name for it, and he could have had no other: But the Text plainly supposes Adam, in naming the Creatures, to have been more at liberty; Whatever Adam named every living Creature, that was the Name thereof. He might have called them by other Names than he did; he might have fixed this or that Sound, just as he inclined to call this or that Creature, and therefore had no innate Names for any; but, having

(z) Gen. ii. 19.  (a) Ver. 23.  C 4  deter-
determined with himself what Sound to use for the Name of one, and what for another; God Almighty herein not interposing, he was left to himself, and so fixed what he determined for the Name of it. But,

I cannot but confess, that an Incident which follows may require our Examination before we leave the Point before us. If we consider how Eve was affected when the Serpent spake to her (b), we see no Reason to think she had any Difficulty in understanding any Part of what was said to her: She as readily took the Meaning of what the Serpent expressed to her, as either she or Adam had before apprehended what had been spoken to them by the Voice of God: God doth know, said the Serpent, that in the Day that ye eat thereof, then your Eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as Gods, knowing Good and Evil (c). God had said nothing to them concerning their Eyes being opened, nor of their being as Gods; and therefore, if they had no farther Knowledge of the Meaning of Words, than of those only which the Voice of God had spoken to them, here seem to have been Sounds never before heard by them, and how could these

---

(b) Gen. iii. (c) Ver. 5.
be so readily received and apprehended? We can in no wise suppose the Serpent to have had God's Power to make his Words instantly as intelligible to Eve as he pleased.

And it will increase the Difficulty, if we may consider the Words here spoken to carry not a plain but a metaphorical Meaning: Their Eyes were to be opened, i.e. say some, their Understandings were to be enlarged; Open thou mine Eyes, said the Psalmist, and I shall see wondrous things from thy Law (cc): The Psalmist here prays for what he elsewhere expresses in Words without the Figure, that God through his Commandments would make him wiser, would give him more Understanding than he should have had without them (d): And it may seem that, according to Moses, the Event of their Eyes being opened was, they knew they were naked (e); they had a different Knowledge of themselves, other than what they had before; so that we may perhaps think, that Moses here used the Eye of the Body metaphorically, for the Sense of the Understanding, intending by the opening of the one the Increase of the Judgment of the other: And if this was the Meaning of the

(cc) Psalm cxix. 18. (d) Ver. 98, 99. (e) Gen. iii. 7.
Words of the Serpent to Eve, and if Eve thus understood them, she cannot be conceived to have been at this Time a mere Novice in Language, just beginning to form first Notions of a few original and plain Words; rather we must think her an Adept in the Tongue the Serpent spake in, to have a ready Conception of all the Elegancy of its Dictation, to give its Metaphors and figurative Expression their true Meaning, to receive and feel the full and real Import of them. But to all this I answer:

1. There was no Metaphor intended by Moses in the Words in which he has expressed what the Serpent said to Eve: The Dictation of the Psalmist is indeed figurative, Open thou mine Eyes, and I shall see wondrous things from thy Law (f), but the Word used for open, is not the same with that of Moses: [Gal nainai] says the Psalmist (g): The Word here used is a Termination of the Verb [Galab]: But Moses expresses the Serpent’s Words to Eve, Your Eyes shall be opened, [Niphkechu nemi-cem (b)], Moses’s Word for shall be opened is a Termination of the Verb Pakach: The Hebrew Language has both these Verbs, and we

(f) Psalm cxix. ubi sup. (g) יָלַי יִתְיְמָה (b) נֶפְקָהַו נְהוֹיִכָּם Gen. iii. 5.
render both by the Word open; but the one only, namely Galah, speaks in the metaphorical Sense, means by opening the Eye instructing the Understanding, either by our forming a better Judgment of Things, or when God by Vision, or in any other manner, was pleased to give an extraordinary Revelation (i): [Pakach Nain] signifies no more than to see, what is the Object of the natural Eye (k): And to this Meaning it is confined so strictly, that altho’ [Pakach Nain] is sometimes said of God, when God is spoken of, after the manner of Men, yet it is used only where God is said to look upon such outward Actions as can come under the Observation of the Eye (l); wherever God is said to regard what can be matter of the Attention of the Mind only, the Expression [Pakach Nain] is, I think, not used. [Pakach Nain] therefore carries the Intention no farther than to the outward Sight; signifies no more than to open the Eye of the Body: I might say, it has such a Propriety to express this and this only, that as facere in


Latin
The Creation and Latin may be put as it were idiomatically for to sacrifice.

cum faciam Vitulæ —— Virg.

so a Participle of the Verb [Pakach] without [Nain] the Word for Eye after it, may be used in the Hebrew Language for one who has Eye-sight, in opposition to the being blind (m); so that we use Hebrew Words, not in their Hebrew or true Meaning, if we take Mofes by the Words he has used, to intend the Serpent to have herein said any thing referring farther than to their natural Eye. (n) But

2. Let us observe, that in what the Serpent said to Eve, he was for the greater part confined to use the very Words, and none other, than what both Eve and Adam had heard and understood from the Voice of God; and there—

(m) Exodus iv. 11, xxiii. 8. (n) It may perhaps be her queried, whether the Words in this Place used by Mofes, was the very Words spoken by the Serpent? And indeed I should apprehend they were not, as I do not conceive that Mofes's Hebrew was the first original unimproved Language of the World. See Conneft. Vol. I. B.II. But as we have all Reason, whether we conceive Mofes to have wrote by an immediate Inspiration, or whether under a divine Direction, he wrote from ancient Memoirs of his Forefathers, which perhaps were recorded in an older, and perhaps then obsolete Diction; we may and ought to allow, that he expressed in the Language of his own Times, with a strict Propriety, what the Serpent had spoke in Words of the same Meaning, tho' probably of a more antique Form, Construction, and Pronunciation.
fore all these she readily understood as she had before heard and understood them. Accordingly, there could be nothing in the Serpent’s first Address to Eve, *Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every Tree of the Garden* (p), but what she must have readily understood from God’s having said, *Of every Tree of the Garden ye may freely eat* (q); only we may remark, that tho’ Moses has in diverse Places historically called God, *Elohim* (r), yet that God not having as yet so named himself to her and Adam, the Word [*Elohim*] God, might not have been heard by Eve before the Serpent spake it to her: But if this was in Fact true, as there was no other Person but one that had spoken before this to her or Adam, there could be no Confusion in her hearing the Serpent call him [*Elohim*] God; she must readily understand who by that Name was intended by him. To go on—The Serpent’s next Words, *Ye shall not surely die* (s), must instantly, when spoken, be sufficiently understood, from her having understood what God had said before, *ye shall surely die* (t), as any one that understands a Proposition affirmed, must understand the De-

---

(p) Gen. iii. 1.  
(q) Gen. ii. 16.  
(r) See Gen. i. & ii.  
(s) Gen. iii. 4.  
(t) Gen. ii. 17.
nial of that same Proposition. The Serpent proceeded, *For God doth know, that in the Day that ye eat thereof then your Eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as Gods [Cē Elohim] as God, knowing Good and Evil.* Here I would observe, that *in the Day that ye eat thereof,* had been before said to them from the Mouth of God (x), and that God had called the Tree, *the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil* (y), and therefore from what God had in these Words said to them, all the Sentiment she had of Knowing, and of knowing Good and Evil, may be conceived to arise upon the Serpent’s in these like Terms speaking to her. The Serpent told her they should be *as Gods;* we render it in the plural Number, but not rightly; for it is not reasonable to imagine the Serpent intimated to her herein, that there were spiritual Beings, many in Number in the invisible World; this as yet did not enter her Imagination: She and Adam had heard but one that spake to them; the Serpent had told Eve that this Person was [*Elohim* (z)]; he here tells her, that if they eat of the Tree they should increase in Knowledge of Good and Evil, be [Cē Elohim] like him: and herein, as

(x) Gen. ii. 17.  (y) Ibid.  (z) Gen. iii. 1.
far as they had any Notions of what Knowledge was, nothing unintelligible was proposed to her.

There remains still to be considered, what she expected from what seem'd promised in the Words, *Your Eyes shall be opened*: But I may fully answer this in three or four Observations. 1. I have already said, that these Words have no Reference to the Improvement of the Knowledge of the Mind: What the Tempter offered concerning that, came afterwards under the Words *Ye shall be as God*, knowing *Good and Evil*. The Words concerning their *Eyes being opened*, are such, that according to the Hebrew Idiom, they speak no more than some Enlargement of their outward Sight. 2. I would remark, that it cannot be necessary to say, that *Eve* had an adequate and full Notion of the true Meaning of these Words. The Writers that would puzzle and perplex this Matter, would contend, that the Fall happened immediately after the Creation; but we can in no wise find any one Reason for such an Assertion. Rather, I apprehend, we shall see what may induce us to think that several Days intervened between the Sabbath after
after (a) the Day of Adam and Eve's Creation, and the Day on which the Serpent tempted Eve. On the Night of each of these Days, Adam and Eve in the Course of Nature had known what Sleep was, and how it differed from the being awake, and therefore what it was to shut the Eye, and what it was to open it; and probably had made themselves before the Serpent spake to Eve, a Name for the one, and a Name for the other; and therefore, tho' the Serpent here used Words which they had not heard from the Mouth of God; yet he might not herein use Words which they had not agreed to make, and had daily spoken to and heard from themselves, and consequently were Words that were not without Meaning. I do not say that Adam or Eve, at hearing these Words, conceived exactly the Event which afterwards came to pass; for it is obvious to observe, that we may be said to know the general Meaning of Words, suf-

(a) See hereafter. Syncellus cites the άντι Είνα τετελεσμενος to say, that Adam was guilty of the Transgression in his seventh Year, and expelled Paradise in his eighth. Syncelli Chronogr. p. 8. What the Minutes of Genesis here cited were, I cannot say, as by whom made; their Authority can avail only to hint, that there have been ancient Writers who did not think the Fall to have been so instantaneous as others have since imagined.
sufficiently to give us Expectations from them, and yet not be able determinately to see their full Extent and Import: Every one that has a common Understanding of the Greek Tongue, would upon reading the Philosopher, ἅταξις λογικῆς ἐστὶ αἱ μαθηματικαὶ ἐπιστήμαι (b) apprehend that these Studies may greatly improve us, as the English Reader may, from no better Translation of the Words than, the Mathematics are Purgations of the reasonable Mind: But the particular Improvement to be had from them, would not hence be known to any, who had not experienced the Habit that may be acquired from these Studies of pursuing long Trains of Ideas variously intermingled, so as to see thro' all the Steps that truly lead to the most distant Conclusions. Whether Eve, well knowing from many Days Experience, wherein the opening the Eye differed from the shutting it, thought that after eating the Fruit she should never more slumber nor sleep; or whether she conceived such an Addition to their Sight, as that they might thenceforth be able to see Him whom hitherto they had heard only without his

(b) Hierocles in aurea Carmina Pythag.
being visible to them (c), I cannot say; but
may conceive her to have formed to herself
great Expectations, without reaching the full
Meaning of the Words, much less apprehen-
ding what became in reality the Event of
them. Upon the whole: When God was
pleased to speak to Adam and Eve, they hav-
ing not before heard Words, it is not to be
conceived that they could have understood
what the Voice of God spake, unless God
had caused them to understand the Words
spoken; but allowing that God enabled them
to perceive what He thought fit to say to
them, and duly attending to what Moses re-
lates farther, we shall see no Reason to think,
that any Thing more was said to them, or
that they hurried into the World, or the
Things of the World broke in upon them,
fa stern, or in a greater Variety, than they could
form themselves Words, to talk of, and to
know distinctly, as far as their Knowledge
did, or it was necessary it should then reach,
the Things they had to hear or to speak, to
be concerned in, or affected with in their
Lives: And therefore no more being necessary

(c) No divine Appearance is recorded to have been seen
Fall of Man.

For them, than that God should cause them so to understand what He thought fit to speak to them, we justly conclude, that as to making other Words, and settling the Meaning and Intention of them, he left our first Parents to do what He had given them full Powers and Opportunity to do, in a natural Way for themselves, unto which God was pleased to lead Adam, as far as he herein wanted Guidance and Direction in the Manner which shall be set forth in the ensuing Chapter.

CHAP. III.

A Consideration of the particular Manner in which God was pleased to lead Adam to name the living Creatures of the World.

The Fact, which I am in this Chapter to inquire into, is thus related to us by Moses: Out of the Ground the Lord God formed every Beast of the Field, and every Fowl of the Air, and brought them unto Adam, to see what He would call them, and whatsoever Adam called every living Creature, that was the Name thereof: And Adam gave Names to all Cattle, and to the Fowl of the Air,
The Creation and Air, and to every Beast of the Field (d). To form a right Judgment of what is here said to be done, we must not too hastily set down with our English Version of Moses's Words, but inquire more strictly into the Text of Moses, and examine how he indeed relates this Matter.

The Words of Moses are:

[Vejitser Jehovah Elohim min ba Adamah oL chajath bafidah, veath Col Noph bafemaim, ujabca aL ha Adam lineeth nab jikrah lo: Ve col ofsher jikra lo ba Adam nefeb chajah kva Shemo: ujikra ba Adam Shemoth lecol habefsema we lenofb has Shemaim ve lecol chajath bafidah] (e)

The Passage verbally translated is as follows:

And the Lord God formed out of the Ground every Beast of the Field, and every Fowl of the Heavens, and He brought unto Adam to see what He would call it. And whatsoever

(d) Gen. ii. 19, 20. (e) The Hebrew Words are, and may be written and interlined as follows:

The words are:

agri animal omne Humo ex Deus Dominus et formavit

Adum ad et adduxit coelorum volatile omne ac eum

ipse Adam illi nomen dedit quod et omne daret illi nomen quid ad vitam

Belifin omni nomine ipse Adam et edidit nomen ejus hoc

agri animali et omni coelorum et volatil

Adum
Adam called it, the living creature, that was the Name of it. And Adam gave names to every living creature, and to the fowls of the heavens, and to every beast of the field.

It is observab]l of the Passage, that the first Period of it, namely, And the Lord God formed out of the ground every beast of the field, and every fowl of the heaven, was not intended to hint to us, that God, now at this juncture, created any living creatures anew: Rather, the Words should have been rendered agreeably to what is the Translation of the Syriac Version (f), the Lord God had formed—; for they are not a Relation that God now made them, but a Recognition of what had been before related, that God had been the Creator both of the Birds and Cattle (g); none of which were now made at this Time; for the one were created a day sooner than Adam (h), the other on the same Day, but earlier and before him (i).

In like manner: The Words which begin the 20th Verse, And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to

---

(f) Compgerat autem Dominus Deus de Humo omniem Bestiam.
(g) See Gen. 1.
(h) Ver. 20. (i) Ver. 24, 25.
every Beast of the Field, do not mean that Adam now, at this one Time, gave Names to all living Creatures; but are rather a Remark, that the Names of the Creatures were given by Adam, and by no other: He himself, [by Adam] says the Text, named them; not now, all at once, that undoubtedly would have been too much for him: But he named them gradually, some at one Time and some at another in the Process of his Life, as Incidents happened to give Occasion for his so doing.

That the Fact really was, not that Adam now named all the Creatures, is evident, from the very express Words of Moses, which relate the Particular we are examining: The Words of Moses are: And the Lord God brought unto Adam, to see what he would call it (k): And whatsoever Adam called it, that was the Name of it (m): The Question here to be asked is: What did God bring unto the Man? Our English Version, following other Translations,

(k) Lirethb mab-jikra lv. Gen. ii. 18. (l) Ve col other jikrah ha Adam nepho chajoth bna Shemo. ibid. (m) Hna Shemo. ibid. The Samaritan Text is rendered more strictly to the Hebrew Words in the Latin Translation of it in our Polyglot Bible thus, Adduxitque ad Adam, ut vidisset, quomodo vocaret illud: Et quod vocaret illud Adam animae viventis hab est Nomen ejus.
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says them; i.e. every Beast of the Field, and every Fowl of the Air, for these are the Words which them must refer to: But we are to observe, that the Word them is not in the Hebrew Text: According to Moses, the Name given by Adam was [יְהוָה] Lo, i.e. to it: The Pronoun is of the singular Number, not plural: And the next Sentence expresses this more fully: The Words being not as we render the Text, And whatsoever Adam called every living Creature. — There is no Word in the Text for every: The Hebrew Words say, whatsoever Adam called it, the living Creature, That was the Name of, not them, but the Text says that was the Name of it.

Thus the Fact before us appears to be, that God brought unto Adam, not all the living Creatures; for the Text says no such Thing: God indeed made all the Creatures (א), and Moses here recognizes this Truth: But God brought unto Adam some one Creature only; a [נ་פּ הַשְׁחַד] in the singular Number (א), to see what he would call it:

Adam

(a) Gen. i. (א) See the Text of Gen. ii. 19. I should have some Difficulty to say, why נפשׁ השַחָב is not לָנָפְּשׁ השַחָב, in the Dative Case, as I think נפשׁ standing after and referring to Lo the Conjunction should require: But I would offer to the Con-
Adam hereupon gave it a Name: And what he thus called it, that was the Name of it. God was pleased herein to bring Adam to a Trial, to shew him, how he might use Sounds of his own to be the Names of Things: God called him to give a Name to one Creature, and hereby put him upon seeing how Words might be made for this Purpose: Adam understood the Instruction, and practised according to it. For so Moses tells us: Adam gave Names to all Cattle, and to the Fowl of the Air, and to every Beast of the Field (p). The Names of the Creatures were not given by any express Words from the Voice of God, but were of Adam's own Making, as he proceeded to use Sounds of his own to be the Names of Things, as himself designed the

Consideration of the Learned, whether if in the ancient Manuscript this Text was wrote in Lines ending with the Word which I have made the final Word of the several Lines, so I have before transcribed them, Napebo chajab, might not be so situated at the End of a Line, as that a Copyist might mistake, and put it to the End of the third Line, when it really should be at the End of the second. If this may be supposed, the Words of Moses are exceeding clear, being exactly as follows:

And the Lord God had formed of the Ground every Beast of the Field, and every Fowl of the Heavens, and brought unto Adam a living Creature to see what Name he would give to it. And whatsoever Name Adam gave, that was the Name of it, &c.

(p) Gen. ii. 20.
Names of them: God, as I said, brought Adam to name one Creature: Adam had the Sense and Understanding to see hereby, how he might make Words, and make use of them: And accordingly in the Progress of his Life, as the Creatures of the World came under his Observation, he used this Ability, and gave Names to them all.

And now if this was the Fact, it must I think be allowed me, that Adam had, as I have already observed, no formed, fixed, and innate Language: For had he had such Language, it must have been a most superfluous Thing to bring him to this Trial, to set any Creature before him to see what he would call it. An innate Language, whenever and wherever he had seen any Creature or Thing in the World, would have instantly given him its innate Name; no Trial could have been wanted to lead him to it, this Name would, as it were, have offered itself, and I cannot see how he should have thought of any other: But Moses seems in no wise to represent Adam under these Limitations; a Creature was brought to him to see what he would call it: There is not the least Hint, that he was so much as directed what to call it: for [ba Adam] Adam himself named all the Creatures;
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tures (q); we have no Reason to think that
God dictated the Name of any: And the Ex-
pressions of Moses hint Adam to have had all
possible Liberty to name them as his own
Imagination should lead him: Nothing seems
to have been herein fixed or determined for
him but he called every Thing by what Name
he pleased, and whatsoever Name he fixed
and determined for any Creature, that was the
Name thereof.

Our Bibles close the 20th Verse of the se-
cond Chapter of Genesis with these Words:
But for Adam there was not found an Help
meet for him: The adding these Words to the
End of this 20th Verse may seem to repre-
sent, that in the Transaction ending with this
Observation, there undoubtedly had been a
Survey taken of all the Creatures of the World,
to have it seen that none of them were fit to
be Adam's Associate, and consequently that
all the Creatures had been convened for Adam
to name them. I believe our Translators had
this Sentiment, and the Dividers of the Bible
into Verses were probably of this Opinion. It
is a Thought that may easily take the Un-
wary, tho' I am surprized that the Difficulty

(q) Gen. ii. 20. ut sup.
of conceiving how it could be, has not occas-
ioned it to be more strictly examined. How-
ever as I have shewn Moses’s Text to say no
such Thing, I may as clearly evince, that in
the Words of Moses, which we improperly
add to the 20th Verse; there was really in-
tended no such Infusion. For,

1. But for Adam there was not found an
Help meet for him: These Words ought not
to have been made a Part of the 20th Verse:
They are the Beginning of the Relation of a
new Transaction, and not having any Refe-
rence to any thing before-going, they should
have began a new Period absolutely independ-
ent of, and detached from the former. Agree-
ably hereto we may observe, 2. That the Par-
ticle [ve] which we here translate but, ought
to be in this Place rendred and: It is often so
rendred in the first and this second Chapter of
Genesis: It is not here a discrétive Particle,
disjoining and distinguishing two Parts of one
Period; but it is illative: It is the Particle
often used by Moses when, having finished his
Narration of one Fact, he passes on from that
to quite another (r): 3. If we will suppose
the Words above-cited to belong to the 20th

(r) Gen. i. 6, 9, 14, 20, &c. ii. 7, 15, 18, 20, 21.
Verse, we shall have Difficulties to make out their grammatical Construction; Difficulties to ascertain a Nominative Case to the Verb found; for the Word which we translate was found is not passive, as we render it: the Words are נָכוּנָו-נָל [loa Matza], he did not find, in the active Voice: and the Nominative Case to this Verb follows after the next Verb in the next Verse, and is [Jehovah Elohim] the Lord God (s): This is a Construction very clear and frequent in many Languages, and in the Hebrew Tongue amongst others: and our Translators ought to have been carefully attentive to it. 4. I would farther observe, that the Hebrew Verb [Matza] does not always signify to find a Thing, after having looked for it; but when used with a Noun to which ה is prefixed it makes an Idiom of the Hebrew Tongue, to which we have something similar in a particular Use of our Word find in English: Buxtorf remarks (t) that the Verb [Matza] with a Dative Case by the Prefix

(s) The Words are Gen. ii. 20.

(t) Buxtorf in Voce נָגוּנָו.
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[le] signifies to suffice: I should rather say, sufficiently to supply: Thus Numbers xi. 22. Shall the Flocks and the Herds be slain for them? וְמֵאַצַּא לְבֵא [ve matza lehem], and will it suffice them? i.e. will it sufficiently supply them? Thus again, Judges xxi. 14. And Benjamin came again at that Time, and they gave them Wives which they had saved alive of the Women of Jabesh Gilead, but [the Hebrew Words are לֹא מֵאַצַּא לְבֵא κָנ, Ve loa matzaeu lehem cen] and yet so they sufficed them not, they did not sufficiently supply them so. I would, more closely to the Hebrew, translate both these Places by our English Word find: Shall the Flocks and the Herds be slain for them? I should say, Will it find them? In the Passage in the Book of Numbers, They gave them Wives, which they had saved alive of the Women of Jabesh Gilead, but (I should render the Place) they did not find them so: The Expression to find a Person, is still used in some Parts of England, to signify to supply that Person with such Things as we undertake to procure for him: And in this Sense I take the Word [Matza] to be here used by Moses: God had promised to find Adam with a Person or Helper, that should be his Likeness: Moses, now going to relate in what Manner God
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God made this Person, introduces his Narration very properly with observing, that God had not yet (u) found or supply'd Adam with this Companion: And having suggested this Observation, he proceeds to relate in what Manner God now supply'd him. And the Lord God had not supply'd or found the Man with the Help meet for him: But caused a deep Sleep to fall upon him, &c. (x).

---

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Formation of Eve, and the further Transactions of Adam's first Day; together with some Observations upon the whole.

The Account given by Moses of the Formation of Eve is in Words as follow: And the Lord God caused a deep Sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: And he took one of his Ribs, and closed up the Flesh instead thereof: And the Rib, which the Lord God had taken from Man, made he a Woman, and brought her unto the Man. God caused a deep Sleep to fall upon Adam: The Hebrew

(u) Gen. ii. 20. (x) Ver. 21.
Word for a deep Sleep is [Tardemah]: It is a Word used in diverse Places in the old Testament: In some it signifies no more than what we in English call a sound Sleep; a Sleep from which we awake, not having dreamed, or been sensible of any thing that has passed during the Time of it: It is thus used in the Book of Proverbs, Slothfulness casteth into a deep Sleep (y); and more emphatically in the first Book of Samuel, where David and Abishai went by Night into Saul’s Camp, and took away the Spear and Cruse of Water from his Bolster, without awakening him or any of the Soldiery, that lay asleep round about him (z); for says the Text [Tardemah Jeborab] a deep Sleep of or from the Lord was fallen upon them, hereby meaning, that they were in a most exceeding sound Sleep, so found an one, that we might, using the Hebrew Idiom (a) speak as

(y) Prov. xix. 5. (z) 1 Sam. xxvi. 12. (a) It is a solemn, but not unusual Expression in the Hebrew Tongue, to say of a Thing beyond measure great, that it is of the Lord; not always meaning hereby, that God himself is the immediate Caufe of it, but signifying it to be such, that naturally no Account is easy to be given of it: So great was the Hardness of Pharaoh’s Heart, that God is thus said to have hardened it, tho’ Pharaoh really hardened his own Heart, Exod. vii. 13, 22. viii. 15, 19. 32. ix. 7, 34. See Connell. Vol. 2. B. ix. And thus it is said, that it was of the Lord to harden the Hearts of the Canaanites, that they should come out against the Israelites in Battel, Joshua ix. 19. Not
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as if God himself had been the Cause of it. But altho’ this is the general Signification of the Word [Tardemah], yet it is farther used sometimes to denote that Kind of Sleep in which God, in the earlier Ages of the World, was pleased in diverse Manners to give Revelations unto Men: Sound asleep, their Natural Sensations made them no Impressions; but by internal Visions and Movements of their Minds, they had strong and lively Sentiments raised in them, of what God was thus pleased to shew unto them. Daniel says of himself, using the Verb from which the Noun Tardemah is derived, [Nirdampti] I was in a deep Sleep, on my Face towards the Ground, but I touched me, and set me upright (b): In a deep

Not that we are to say that God actually prevented the Gomarnites from securing themselves from Ruin. See Cant. Vol. III. B. XII. It was the Obstinity of their own Heart that brought them to Destruction, which Obstinity being so great, as that we in English would call it a fatal Obstinity, the Hebrew Expression for it was, an Obstinity from the Lord, not meaning hereby, that when any Man was tempted he should say he was tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with Evil, neither tempteth he any Man, James i. 13. Their Obstinity was their own Wilfulness, great, and indeed beyond all common Expression, and therefore said to be of the Lord: And in this Sense I should understand what is said of the sound Sleep of Saul and his Army, not taking the Text to mean any more, than that it was so deep a Sleep, as might be hard to say how it could be, that they were not awakened out of it.

(b) Daniel viii. 18.
Sleep of this Sort Daniel was made to understand a Vision that appeared to him (c). And Job in like manner in [Tardemab] a deep Sleep of this Kind, when a Vision of the Night befell him, saw a Spirit passing before his Face, an Image before his Eyes, and heard a Voice (d). Abram (e) in [Tardemab] this Depth of Sleep had a very signal Revelation made to him, and accordingly, such was the [Tardemab] deep Sleep, that on the Occasion before us fell on Adam: Whether abstracted from all Impressions of his outward Senses, he saw, as Balaam speaks, a Vision of the Almighty (f); as Job mentions, a Spirit, an Image before him (g) actually performing what was done to him, I cannot determine: But, as Moses has no where said, that Adam ever saw any Similitude or Appearance to represent God (b), I should rather think, that God was pleased, by Impressions, such as the Ear usually conveys to the Mind, and which God undoubtedly can cause to arise in us, as lively as he pleases, as well without their actually coming thro' the Ear, as if they did come
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thro' it, to cause Adam to perceive the same, as if awake he had heard that Voice, in which God had before spoken to him, commanding a Rib, a Bone to be taken out of him, and seen that it was done; bidding the Flesh be closed up instead thereof (i), and it was so; saying, Let the Woman be made hereof, and she was created: Upon Adam's awaking, he found in Fact, what in his Sleep had been shewed to him: The Woman, such in reality as he had before apprehended her, was brought to him, i.e. was present before him: And he now using the Power of naming Things, the Exercise of which was upon his Mind, as he had just began to practise it, before he fell asleep; having had a clear Perception of what had been transacted; said naturally of this new Creature: This is now Bone of my Bone, and Flesh of my Flesh: She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man (k): But I conceive here Adam ended: For he in no wise added the Words which follow, Therefore shall a Man leave Father and Mother, and shall cleave unto his Wife, and they shall be one Flesh (l): For Adam could not yet say what it was to be a Father or a Mother, and there-

fore could draw no Conclusion concerning them. *Moses* indeed records these Words as now spoken, but he does not say that *Adam* spake them: And our Saviour has told us, that not *Adam*, but God himself said this to them: *It was he which made them,* that said, *For this Cause shall a Man leave Father and Mother, and shall cleave to his Wife,* and they *twain shall be one Flesh.*

The last Transact ation of this first Day of *Adam’s* Life was, that after the Woman was created, God blessed them both, and said unto them what we read in the 28th, 29th, and 30th Verses of the first Chapter of *Genesis*; the Particulars of which may be sufficiently considered, if I take a general Review of the Things concerning *Adam* said and done in this Day.

One of Dr. *Burnet’s* Objections to the History of *Moses* is, that it heaps together too many Things for the Space of Time allotted to them (*n*): And indeed this Writer has endeavoured to run together a Multiplicity of Incidents, and to crowd them all into this One Day, in order to represent it to have

---

*(m)* Mat. xix. 4, 5. *(n)* Quantillo Tempore hae omnia per-ada narratur — ! Quot autem, et quanta congeranda sunt in hunc unum Diem! Burnet, Archæol. p. 294.
been a Day of great Hurry and Confusion, rather than such as the Day ought to have been, on a cool and deliberate Sense of which, and a Conduct according to it, depended the Life or Death; we might say, if there had been no further Purpose in the deep Counsel of God for us, depended the Whole of Man: But if we carefully examine, and distinguish what are the Facts which Moses ascribes to this One Day, and what are not, and in what Manner he describes them, we shall see Reason wisely to differ from this Writer. God breathed into Adam the Breath of Life, and caused him to become a Living Soul (o); but Moses in no wise describes Adam as soon as he began to think, to abound instantly in a Variety of Conceptions concerning his own Nature, concerning the Deity; or of the Works of God, and of the Fabric of the World (p): Had Moses brought forth Adam expatiating in such an unbounded Wild of sudden and indigested Apprehensions, there would have been Reason to consider whether the human Mind would not have hence fallen into great Con-

(o) Gen. ii. 7. (p) We may see a large Field of Imaginations of this Kind most beautifully coloured, but in Fact and the Reason of the Thing mere Fancy and Romance in Milton, Par. Lost. B. VIII.
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visions. But there is a Propriety in the Manner in which *Moses* brings *Adam* into the World: He does not tell us, that in Order to take his first Sight of Things, God set him upon an Hill, to look around him over the Creation; but God put him into a Garden, where a few plain and easy Objects surrounded and confined his first Views from taking in a Variety, that would have been too much for him. A bounded Shade of Trees was a Scene, that neither fatigued his Eye, nor gave a Multiplicity of Conceptions to his Mind: In this silent Cover from the many Things there were in the World, he hears the Voice of God, and feels himself to know what was said to him.

And the Words now spoken to him, were not such as called him into the midst of Things to load him with a Multitude of Sentiments, either of God, of himself, or of what was in the World; or concerning what were to be the moral and relative Duties of his Life; but the Voice of God, as yet, spake to him only of the plain Objects then visibly before him; called the lofty Plants which he saw, the Trees of the Garden; told him, that he might eat of all of them except one; but commanded him not to eat of that one; for that
that if he did eat of it, he should surely die (q): And it is remarkable of that one Tree, that it was so distinguished from all others by its Situation (r), that it could not but at Sight be thereby known in order to be avoided, before he had Time to make Observations, to see wherein one Tree differed from another.

May we add, that Adam heard the Voice of God declare, that it was not good, that he should be alone; but that an Help, which should be his Likeness, should be made for him (s)? Take these Words to have spoken to him, not all the enlarged Notions of the Wants and Imperfections of solitary Life (t), nor the Variety of the Comforts of social Happiness, the Ideas of which could not

(q) Gen. ii. 16, 17. (r) It does not seem to me determinate, that the Tree of Life stood also in the Midst of the Garden: Eve seems rather to hint that the forbidden Tree stood single and alone in that Situation, Gen. iii. 3. Our 9th Verse of the second Chapter might be pointed and translated thus: And out of the Ground made the Lord God to grow every Tree that is pleasant to the Sight, and good for Food, and the Tree of Life: in the midst of the Garden also the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. And thus this Verse would agree exactly with what Eve said in the next Chapter: (s) Gen. ii. 18. Vide quæ sup. (t) Milton supposes Adam wonderfully able to expatiate upon the Unhappiness of Solitude; the Benefits of equal Society; to try why God might, but Man could not comfortably be alone. The Representation he draws is most delightfully poetical: But we can in no wise think considerately, that Adam could as yet have Thoughts like these upon the Subject. Milton Par. Lost. B. 8. 365—455.
begin and increase in him, sooner or farther, than a Knowledge and Experience of Life raised and improved them; but supposing the Words to suggest to him no more, than that another Person like him should be made to be with him, and that it was good for him to have it so: (a Point, which perhaps if God had not told him, he would as yet not have thought of); nothing herein was proposed to him so complex, as that his first Thoughts could be in any Confusion about it.

The next Incident may indeed seem an Embarrassment, if we imagine it to have been transacted as it is commonly conceived: But this, I think, I have already obviated: There was no Assemblage of the living Creatures of the World for Adam to name them, nor could he at any one Time make a Survey of them: It would have been a Work too large for him: But observing, that tho' Adam had heard the Voice of God, yet he had not as yet made any one Word of his own for himself, we may allow, that the Fact of his naming the Creatures, as Moses truly states it, shews us very naturally how the Man, having been enabled to understand the Words that God had spoken to him, was introduced to begin and exercise himself to make further Words for the Occa-
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fions of his Life: The naming one Creature
taught him how he might name another; and
the making Names for the Creatures gradu-
ally apprised him how he had it in his Power
to name and to speak of all Kinds of Things,
for him and Eve to begin and improve a con-
versible Life: For it was in this easy and na-
tural manner that, to use the Words of the
Author of the Book of Wisdom, it was granted
to them, to speak as they would of the Things
that were given them (u).

Before Adam had proceeded far in naming
the Creatures, it pleased God to cause him to
fall into a deep Sleep (x), wherein no Sen-
sations from without gave him any Interrup-
tion, but he had a clear and disimplicated Per-
ception of the Manner in which Eve was
taken out of him, and therein learned to name
some Parts of his own Body, a Rib, a Bone,
his Flesh, and from what he had perceived
concerning her Origin, to name the Woman
also according to it. And,

After he had received the Person made for
him, and given her a Name reconsidering her
Extract, He that made them both, said unto
them (y); the Voice of God spake, what he

intended
intended should be the strict and indissoluble Union of Man and Wife in their Lives. Relations of Life were indeed here suggested, of which Adam and Eve as yet could not have any Judgment; for it seems to appear that Adam as yet did not know that Eve was to be a Mother, or himself a Father; it being observed, that as soon as he knew she was to be the Mother of all Living, he gave her a Name accordingly, and thereupon called her Name Eve (z): But this was not until after the Fall, and after the Sentence of God passed upon them (a): However, it may be apprehended, that what God here said must strike their Minds, charged as yet with but few Things, and be so remembred by them, as that when afterwards they came to be a Father and a Mother, and in Time had Children grown up to be Husbands and Wives, they might consider and instruct them, what in the Beginning had been said unto them, and how according to God's original Designation and Commandment, Man and Wife were inseparably to live together in the World.

Before the Close of this their first Day God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful,
The Creation and multiply, and replenish the Earth, and subdue it, and have Dominion over the Fish of the Sea, and over the Fowl of the Air, and over every living Thing that moveth upon the Earth — (b). It does not seem that they had, I rather think I may affirm, that our first Parents as yet had not looked beyond their Garden: They had not seen the Compass of the World, nor took Account of the Numbers of the Creatures that were therein: They had not been on the Sea Shores; neither could they know the Inhabitants of the Floods, whose Paths are in the Waters; so that it would be unnatural and absurd to think of the Words now spoken to them, that they were any further understood by them, than to give them a general Expectation of seeing and becoming acquainted with a various and extensive Scene of Things far beyond what was at yet beheld by, or known to them. Their Garden was the Inclosure that at present surrounded them: But they were now informed, that there was a whole World to be opened to them; that they should find innumerable living Creatures on the Land, in the Seas, and in the Air; and that they themselves should

(b) Gen. i. 28, &c.
be fruitful and multiply, should replenish the Earth, and subdue it, and have Dominion over, and be, as it were, Proprietors of all the living Creatures that were created; that there was a Sustenance provided for all Things living, in the Fruits of the Ground; for that they were all given without Exception or Restraint, the one Limitation only observed, of one Tree in the Garden, of which Adam and Eve were not to eat (c). These were the Intimations now given them; but they were in no wise instructed by them to know the Things spoken of, as fully as Day after Day more and more led them to understand them: Rather, what God now spake to them had only this general Effect; it so prepared them, that as the World opened to them, nothing in it was so absolutely unexpected as to surprise and confound them; for remembering what had been said to them, they might, as new things presented themselves, gradually proceed to name them and distinguish them, and daily grow acquainted with them, to consider how they could use their Power over them to make them useful or agreeable to them.

I should add further; that how much ever

(c) Gen. i. quae sup.
of these Things was told them, it appears to have been provided for them, that they should not hurry too fast to look into, and after the many Things in the World; for the Day ensuing was to be a Sabbath (d), a Day of Rest, to be set apart to recollect and consider all that had been said and shewed to them; that before they proceeded, they might have all the Instruction which a repeated Review of it could give them, distinct upon their Hearts: And when the Sabbath was over, they were not instantly at Liberty to wander at large over the Earth; for their first Business was in their Garden: God had herein given them Employment: They were to dress it, and to keep it (e): Their Duty here, if attended to, would so far confine them, that the World would not break in upon them, nor they go into the World faster or farther than they might become gradually able to receive and digest the Knowledge of Things that would arise from it: In this Manner Moses represents God to have given our first Parents the Beginnings of their Lives: And whoever will duly examine the Sentiments which he sets before us upon this Subject, and compare them with what other

(d) Gen. ii. 2.  (e) Ver. 15.
Writers have fancied and represented; of all whom we shall find none so likely to captivate us as our Milton (f)—: I say, whoever will compare Moses with other Writers upon this Subject will find, that he deeply entred into the real Nature of Man: and will be brought to say of him above all others,

Quanto rectius hic—

—nil molitur ineptè. Hor.

His Account speaks itself to be Fact, and not Fable: And however our first Thoughts may not go to the Bottom of what he has written, a careful Examination of it will shew us, that they who have thought it Fable, have not taken Pains truly to understand it. I have only to observe, before I close this Chapter, that from what has been said we may reasonably conceive, that our first Parents were not hurried into any Scene, of either Things or Sentiments, larger or sooner than they could be able to form, as they should want them, all such Words as the Incidents of their Lives would call for, over and besides those which God already had, or did afterwards speak to them.

(f) Paradise Lost.
An Inquiry, what we may reasonably think to have been at this Time, the actual State of Adam's Knowledge.

Most Writers who have treated of the Fall, give us Accounts of what they think the primitive State of Adam's and Eve's Knowledge before they committed Sin: But their Sentiments, however they may seem ingenious, are no better than groundless Imaginations. Our English Poet represents Adam as soon as he was created, not only to see Things as they came before him, but instantly to know their Natures, by God's giving him an immediate Apprehension of them: Introducing Adam relating how he named the Creatures; supposing the Hypothefis to have been Fact, that God caused an Assemblage of the whole Animal World, to see what Adam would name every Creature of it, he makes Adam say of himself,

I nam'd them as they pass'd, and understood Their Natures, with such Knowledge God endu'd My sudden Apprehension. — (k)

(k) Milton's Paradise Lost, Book VIII. 352.
That God could, if he had pleased, have thus endow'd Adam, can be no Question: But that God did not, is plain; for nothing can be more evident, than that neither Eve nor Adam had in Fact this Knowledge: They seem both to have been together when the Serpent spake to Eve (l): But neither of them appear to have been surprized at hearing a Serpent speak in Man's Voice: The Observation they hereupon seem to have made was, that the Serpent was more subtil than any Beast of the Field (m): They had heard no other Creature thus speak, and therefore apprehended the Serpent to have higher Endowments than other Animals: But we have no Hint which represents either of them to have been at all aware that the Serpent was not by Na-

---

(l) The supposing Eve to have gone forth to work separate from Adam on the Morning that the Temptation befell her, is an ingenious Fiction of our Poet's, which gave him Room to introduce an Episode as beautiful, and well ornamented in all its Incidents, as human Imagination could contrive or can conceive. See Milton's Paradise Lost, Book IX. But I do not see that the Text of Moses appears to countenance it: Moses says, that Eve,

That she took of the Fruit and did eat, and gave also to her Husband, who was with her, and he did eat. (m) Gen. iii. 1.

ture
ture as convertible as themselves (n); a plain
Indication, that they had no such Knowledge
of the Animal World as Milton supposes.
Milton variously imagines Adam to have had
this innate sudden Apprehension to guide him
aright to judge of all Things; of the Nature
of God (o); of the Nature of Man (p); in a
Word, of every Thing knowable, within the
Reach of the human Capacity: And in Truth,
this seems to be the general Opinion of
Writers: They speak of Adam that he was
created a Philosopher; had implanted in him
a natural Fund of all Science, instantly in-
forming him of the true Natures of Things,
whenever any Sight of them came before
his Eyes, or any Occasion was given him to
have Thoughts of them in his Mind; that
he had innate Sentiments of all moral Duties;

(n) Milton, Book IX. supposes Eve to have been much sur-
prized at hearing the Serpent speak, and represents her to af,
how he came by that Ability, and him to answer, that he was
raised to that Attainment by eating of the Fruit of the forbi-
den Tree, and that she hence argued, that if the dumb Animal
was so heightned beyond his natural Abilities by eating of this
Fruit, well might she and Adam hope to be as God, if they et
of it: But however agreeable this Fiction is in the Manner the
Poet has most elegantly painted it, yet it can be but an elegant
Fiction. Moses suggests nothing like it, nor is it likely that God
would have permitted what might have given a more than ordi-
inary Appearance and Strength to the Temptation. See here-
after. (o) Book VIII. 357—413, &c. (p) Ibid.
that before the Fall he was ignorant of nothing but of Sin: But the History of Moses sets before us plain Facts flatly contradicting all these Assertions. If Adam had a true and innate Knowledge and Apprehension of the Nature of God, how could he have been so ignorant of him with whom he had to do, as to think him such an one, that the getting behind the Cover of a few Trees, would hide him from his Presence (q) or if he philosophically knew himself, had full and innate Apprehensions of the Use and Light of his own Reason, and of all that could come within the Reach of it, what Room could there be for the Serpent frivolously to offer to open further either his Eyes or his Understanding? Rationally judging, and having a right Judgment of every Thing that came before, either his Outward Perception, or his Inward Reflection, the Serpent's Temptation must have appeared intuitively absurd to him; he would both have felt himself not to want such Additions as the Serpent suggested, and have had a better Thought of Things, than to be capable of imagining, that the Improvements proposed to him could arise from doing what the Ser-
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pent recommended: We may therefore, if we will write at Random, say high Things of Adam and Eve's natural and philosophical Knowledge; but we can never make them appear to have had as yet much Science, if in Fact they knew Things no better than to be capable of thinking, that a Serpent might naturally be able to speak to them, or of grossly believing, that Meat for the Body might be Food for the Understanding; that the Fruit of a Tree which they saw growing in their Garden, could be a Thing to be desired to eat to make one wise; a Sentiment not to be digested by any one that has, and consequently must speak our first Parents as yet not to have attained Advances of real Knowledge.

Adam, as soon as he received the Breath of Life, became a living Soul: But he had a Body made of the Ground, and his Soul was, as our Souls are, shut up within the Inclosure of this Tabernacle: In this State, the Things without him, the material Objects of this World, could raise in him no Ideas, but as Sensations of them were conveyed to him by

(r) Gen. iii. 6.  (s) Gen. ii. 7.  (t) Ibid.
by his outward Senses (u) : And he could naturally judge of what he thus perceived no farther than ἔνθεν εἰς τῶν ἁμαρτίων τὰ παραφάσιών (av), to think of them suitably to what was given, or presented to him: And if he looked inward upon himself, he could form Ideas of his own Mind, only as he made Trial of the Capacity and Powers of it, and thereby came to know them: So that Experience only could give him naturally an Increase of Knowledge. Let us suppose him to turn his Thoughts from himself to an higher Object; to consider Him who made him;

Say, — of God above ——
What could be reason, but from what he knew?
Pope (x).

He knew of God as yet no more, than what the Words which God had spoken to him could teach him, or his own few and first Observations of Things done might lead him to infer.

(x) This I think must be allowed as unquestionable. See Locke's Essay on Human Understanding. B. 2. c. 1. unless we could imagine Adam to have been a Creature originally furnished with different Abilities of perceiving the Things without him, other than the five Operations, or Senses, which the Author of Ecclesiastes represents him to have been endued with as we are, Eccles. xvii. 5. (av) Wisdom viii. 15. (x) Essay on Man. Ep. 1.
There are indeed some Texts of Scripture, which, if not rightly considered, may lead us into Mistake in this Matter. St. Paul tells us of the Gentiles, who had not had the Light of the Law of Moses, that they did by Nature the Things contained in the Law: not having the Law, they were a Law unto themselves: which, he says, shew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts, their Conscience also bearing Witness, and their Thoughts — accusing, or else excusing one another (v): Are we now to conclude from hence, that God has actually wrote, as it were, or implanted innate Sentiments of Duty upon the Heart of Man? I should rather apprehend, that a true Essay of the human Understanding; a true Judgment of whatever was, or still is the Ability of Man will shew us, that a Capacity of attaining just Notions of our Duties, and not an actual Possession of real Sentiments of them, is the Utmost of what the first Man was created in, or we any of us are born to: And a careful Examination of what is offered by St. Paul, will in no wise lead us to conclude more. The Apostle elsewhere tells us of the Gentiles he spake of, that, That which may be

(v) Rom. ii. 14, 15.
known of God was manifest in them, for that God had shewed it unto them (z): The Question is, how had God shewed it? Had God planted it innate in their Hearts? This was not the Sentiment of St. Paul: Rather, he tells us, that God had shewed it unto them; For or because the invisible Things of Him from the Creation of the World, are clearly seen, being understood by the Things which are made (a): The Gentile Nations, of whom the Apostle here and elsewhere treats, had so far read the Volume of the Book of Nature, had so far either heard of, or known and considered the Works of God, as to be without Excuse (b), if the thence apparent Duties of their Natures were not collected by them: But we should be in Fact mistaken, and err from the Meaning of St. Paul, if we should expect to find implanted in Mens Hearts real Characters of their Duties further than the Book of Nature has been read and considered by them; or they have attained a Knowledge of them, more or less perfect, as they have happened to hear of, and be instructed from some of the Revelations which God has made to the World: And consequently speaking rationaly of Adam,

(z) Rom. i. 19. (a) Ver. 20. (b) Ibid.
whilst he had as yet heard and seen but a very few of God's Works, and those few had not been so repeatedly examined by him, and compared with Things that in Time followed, as to give him a various Trial, and an enlarged and corrected Judgment; he cannot be thought to have attained a great Extent of any Kind of Knowledge: All natural Science has grown amongst Men, as Observation has gradually increased it: And therefore to say of Adam, that as soon as he lift up his Eyes, after he was created, and saw the Sun and Moon and Stars, which gave Light upon the Earth, he instantaneously knew that these Lights of Heaven were to be for Signs and for Seasons, for Days and for Years (c), is to talk very irrationally: He cannot be supposed to have known, before his first Evening showed it, that the Sun was to have a going down; nor can we imagine that the next Morning told him of the rising Day, what would have enabled him to have said with the Poet,

\[ \textit{aliusque et idem \ Hor.} \]

He could not have told, whether the rising

(c) Gen. i. 14.
Sun of his second Day was a new One, or the same which had the Day before shone upon him. In Time he formed a better Judgment of these and other Appearances: But as Ages passed, many of them abounding in all Kinds of learned Disquisitions, before it was apprehended that the Sun did not move round the Earth, it must be a wild Notion to think, that in the Beginning of the World our first Father was possessed of an innate Astronomy: All Notions of his innate Knowledge of the Nature of the Animals, must, if thus considered, fall likewise to the Ground: He could know nothing of them until he observed them: And then, nothing farther than what he observed, or concluded from Observations made of them. And, of God, he knew that he had received an audible Injunction not to eat of one Tree: And he had heard from the same Voice other Particulars: And in the Formation of Eve, he had had a sensible Conviction, that he that spake to him had great Power to make or create, and consequently to destroy: And he hence, as soon as he had disobeyed him, reasoned, that he might justly be afraid: He was afraid, and bid himself (d): But having had nothing yet told or

(d) Gen. iii. 10.
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shewed him, whereby he might consider the Omnipresence of God, the Imperfection of his own Sight led him to imagine he might get out of God's Sight, if he hid himself behind the Cover of a few Trees: Of Himself he had experienced, that he saw, and heard, and felt and lived; that he tasted the Food he was to eat; that it revived his Spirits, and strengthened his Heart (e): And tho' I cannot but think that he had a clear Intellect to reason and conclude of Things as far, tho' no farther, than they appeared to him, or he had Experience of them; yet, hitherto he could have made no Advance of Knowledge, that could shew him whether there were or were not Juices in the Fruit of a particular Tree, which might literally cheer both God and Man (f); give fresh Life and Spirits to the Body, and to the Mind Wisdom and Understanding also: And therefore he did not hereupon know enough to argue and refute the Falseness which the Imagination of Eve seems to have proposed (g), that the Tree was to be desired to make one wise.

It will, I am sensible, be here said by some, that they do not assert Adam and Eve to have

(e) Psal. civ. 15. (f) Judges ix. 13. (g) Gen. iii. 6.
had innate any actual Knowledge: But that they apprehend Both our first Parents to have been created with such Powers of Capacity, that they would naturally form just and true Notions of Things, as they came under their Inspection and Observation; so as not really to want any further Instruction concerning any Thing which they ought or could be obliged to know, than what might naturally arise to them from their own Senses and Understanding. Our modern Rationalists think, that they cannot only support this Notion from Reason, but that they can bring Scripture also to confirm it. They argue, that "Moses says, that "God created Man in his own Image (b), and "that Solomon tells us, that God made Man "upright (i); the Meaning of both which "Expressions taken together imports, they say, "that Man was endued with rational moral "Faculties, resembling the moral Perfections "of his Creator; was made perfect in his "Kind, capable to know and fulfil the Duties, and attain the End of his Creation, by "a right Use of his rational Faculties, which "were given him to be the Guide and Rule "of his Life and Actions: And therefore that

(b) Gen. i. 17. (i) Ecclef. vii. 29.
"the Reason which God gave, must have
been sufficient to direct him to those Duties
which God required of him, and to con-
duct him to that Happiness, which is the
natural Effect, or by God's Will the ap-
pointed Reward of the Performance of it."

The Writer, from whom I have cited these
Words, did, I dare say, conceive himself to
have guarded his Expressions, in a Manner
liable to no Exception: But he has, I think,
the Misfortune common to these Writers, not
to hit the least Tittle of the Meaning of the
Texts cited by them.

God, he says from Moses, created Man in
his own Image. It cannot, I think, be dis-
pputed, but that in a most obvious Sense of the
Words, Man's being created in the Image of
God, may refer to the Make of his Body,
and intimate, that he was formed not after the
Fashion of any other of the living Creatures,
but was made in a Pattern higher than they: a
more excellent Form than theirs was given to
him,

Pronoque cum speulant animalia cattera Terras,
Os homini sublime dedit, caulumque sueri
Suffit, et erectos ad stida tollere vultus. Ov. Met.(k)
It is an Expression not unfrequent in the Hebrew-Scriptures, to say of Things, that they are of God, if they are in Quality eminent above others, which have no more than common Perfections: In this Manner of speaking, Trees of a prodigious Growth are called Trees of God, or the Trees of the Lord: Such were the Cedars of Lebanon; so greatly flourishing and full of Sap, as to be for that Reason called the Trees of the Lord, Trees which he had planted (l): And thus Man might be said to be made in the Image of God: His outward Form was of a different Make; far more respectable, superior to the Make of all other Creatures of the World, and accordingly to speak suitably of it, the Expression is used, which in the Language of Moses Times was commonly said of any Thing, that was so superlatively excellent as to have nothing like to, or to be compared with it: No Image of any Thing in the World was equal to, or like that of Man; and therefore Man was said to be created in the Image of God.

(l) Psal. civ. 16.
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I would observe, that St. Paul appears to confirm to us, that the Expression of Moses may carry this Meaning: A Man, he says, ought not to cover his Head, forasmuch as he is the Image and Glory of God: But the Woman is the Glory of the Man (m): The Apostle is here inquiring, not into the Dignity of the Mind or Soul of the Man or the Woman, but considering what ought to be the outward Appearance or Dress of their Persons: And he would not have the Man’s Head covered, because the Man was the Image of God: His Form was original, not the Copy of another; and therefore to express its original Superiority above all others, is said to be of God: But the Woman herein was inferior; she was made after the Likeness and Similitude of Man: She therefore, in the Sentiment of the Apostle, ought to wear a Covering upon her Head, in Acknowledgment of her not being esse Formae, the original Pattern of the Make she was of; she was herein inferior to the Man (n), in that the Glory or Dignity of her Make was his;

(m) 1 Cor. vii.  (n) I should here observe, that in the ancient Times, contrary to our modern Customs, the having the Head free, or without the Incumbrance of being covered, was a Mark of Dignity and Superiority; and on the contrary, to wear a Covering on the Head was a Token of Inferiority and Subjection.
she was the *Glory of the Man*, the high Excel-
ence of her Make was but a Copy of what he
the Man was made in before her.

But the Words of *Moses* bear also a further
Sense, and yet not that which the Writer I
have cited would put upon them. *God created
Man to be immortal, and made him an Image
of his own Eternity* *(o)*: Herein a great origi-
nal Difference may appear to have been in-
tended between the *Spirit of Man* that goeth
upward, and the *Spirit of the Beast* that goeth
downward *(p)*: And that *Moses* had in View
this Particular, when he said of Man, that he
was created *in the Image of God*, seems agree-
able to the Reason given for the early Law
pronounced against Murder: *Who so sheddeth
Man’s Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed;
for in the Image of God made he Man* *(q)*:
God so made Man to be immortal, that it is
an high Insult and Violence against the Design
of God’s Creation, to put an End by Murder
to the Life of Man: And therefore *surely, at
the Hand of every Man’s Brother will God re-
quire the Life of Man* *(r)*: And this explains
our Saviour's calling the Devil a *Murderer*

(r) Ver. 5.
The Creation and from the Beginning (s); a Murderer; he had acted contrary to the Design of God concerning the Life of Man, in that when God had created Man in his own Image; to be in Image of his own Eternity; to be immortal; Nevertheless, thro’ Envy of the Devil, Death came into the World (t).

Thus if we explain the Text of Moses, without going beyond what was the intended Meaning of it, we shall find, that this Text says no more, than that Man was originally made to be of a more excellent Form than all other Creatures, and that he was made to be immortal; had not, what God did not make for Man (u), Death thro’ Sin come into the World (x): But there is so little Foundation to infer from this Text, that Moses had any Thought to represent, that Man was made to resemble his Maker in his Powers of Knowledge (y), that such a Thought appears not only

---

(s) John viii. 44. (t) Wisdom ii. 24. (u) Wisdom i. 11. (x) Rom. v. 12. (y) If we examine what the Heathen Enquirers argued upon this Subject, we shall find them greatly more correct than our modern Reafoners. They All indeed, except a more Sensual Sect, Epicurus and his Followers, Cic. de Nat. Deor. i. 1. c. 18. saw plainly, that Man could no wise resemble God in his outward Form and Figure; and therefore would have understood Moses’s Expression of Man being made in the Image of God, as to Man’s outward Form, no higher Sense than I have above mentioned; namely, the Man was of an extraordinary and singular Make, eminent above
FALL of MAN.

only not deducible from this Text, but absolutely a Contradiction to what Moses expresses upon the Subject: For their Desire to be [Cod: Elshim] as, or like to God in knowing,

above other Creatures, of a Form appropriated to Man. As to his inward Powers, they saw in them what was far more worthy than his outward Person to be compared to God. Tu—
os habeo non esse te mortalem, sed corpus hoc. Nec enim is, quem Forma ssa declarat, sed Mens cujusque is est Quis—
que: Non in Figura, quasi Digito demonstrari potest: Denim te igi—
tor sese sse, squire Deus est, qui vicit, qui sinuit, qui movit, qui providet, qui tuam regit et moderat te et mover id corpus cui pra—
visus est, quam bunc Mundum Ille Princeps Deus. Cic. Somn. Scipi—
onis. But however they thus thought in general Terms of a Resemblance in Man of the divine Nature, they always, when the Subject called for it, so explained themselves, as not looly to affect, that in Man, natura ssa est Cognitionium, acumen, lep—
ta, quam Rationem vocamus. Cic. de Nat. Deor. Lib. 3. c. 27.
the mere Faculty of human Reason made Man like to God, rather they argued, The Likeness of Man to God, to arise from this Faculty so managed and conducted as to pious us of Virtue. Ad similitudinem Dei proprius accedebat humana Virtus quia in—
figura. Cic. de Nat. Deor. l. i. c. 34. And thus Plato, non—
num adhuc dominatoris venit. Non enim non quem Deus atque a mortuis atque a mortuis. Plat. in Theophr. Thus again, ομαλλος ἐστι—
—Διακοινοις, εδομος μετα εις χρησκοσεις γενομενος. Id. Ibid. Pla—
ton, ο μυς σειρεν εμφαν εις εις ζωον εμφαν εις εις δε μη—
τεχνην φησιν δερμην εις εις δερμην εις εις αισθησεως. Pla. de Legib. 4. We are here to observe that these Ancients, in no wise like our modern Rationalists, crudely affirm Man to be endowed with moral Faculties resembling the moral Perfections of his Creator; but they distinguished the Faculties of Man, then only to render us like to God when they are so conducted as to make us right, as truly wise, as to be really virtuous. They did not determine our Likeness to God to confit in our barely having a Faculty of free Reason, but they considered, that we could then only be like God when we made ourselves just and good, ἰδρυται εις όμοιο μετα ἐξαρχαις, or in other Words, when we attained a right Understanding to depart from Iniquity.
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ing (z), was the Mistake that became our first Parent's Ruin.

Let us now see how the other Text will answer the Purpose designed to be served by it: God, said Solomon, made Man upright (a): The Words of Solomon are, God made the Man [Yashar], we might render the Word aright: God implanted in him nothing that was wrong. Adam, before the Fall, had not in him the evil Inclinations of a corrupt Nature, and the not having these was the Rèctitude in which he was created. When the Sentence of Death passed upon him, He, who before was an Image of God's Eternity, was now become mortal, his Body became corruptible, and a corruptible Body pressed down the Soul (a).

---

They observed the Difference between Reason and right Reason. They pointed out an Height of Reason, which all that are endowed with may in all Things act intuitively aright, but this they allowed to be above Man: Quadrus autem Gradus et altissimorum qui Naturœ boni sapientiægigiamtur, quibus à Prinzipis nofitur Ratio reæ, consistente, quæ supra hominem putanda est, Deque tribuenda, Cic. lib. 2. c. 13. Herein they stated the great Difference between the human Nature and divine: They allowed God to be the Standard of all Rèctitude and Truth; but they affirmed Man in no wise to be so; but to want a Mēmer or Rule to adjust his Judgment by, in order to act aright. ὃν Ὁ διὰ πάντων γνώσις ἐξηγεῖτο ἐν ἰδίῳ μέλησα, ἐν μᾶλλον ἐν τε τις, ἐς ζεύς, ἀνθρώπῳ, Plato de Leg. Lib. 1. Which one Point, duly considered, is that Sobriety of knowing and estimating ourselves, which will lead us to admit but the Sentiments I above observe Mēmer to hint to us, and what endeaour to build upon it. (z) Gen. ii. 22. (a) Wifl. ix. 15.
He now began to have sensual Appetites and Desires, which created him many Inclinations which he had to strive against, if he would strive against Sin: He was now fallen into the Imperfection in which we all labour,

—Video meliora proboque,
Deteriora sequor ———

He might now many times see and approve the Things that are most excellent, and yet have an Heart that might cause him often to be such as we, the best of us are, who, as there is no Man upon Earth that sinneth not (b), do in many Things offend all (c): But tho' before he became corruptible he had not in him those evil Appetites, which are since grown so powerful in our Nature, yet it will not follow that God originally gave him such a Beam of unerring Understanding, as to place him in Light that would not admit of Mistake and Error.

Decipimur specie Recti ——— Hor.

To this Failure Adam was subject in his first Estate: And herein it was that he fell from it: Both Eve and He judged what the

(b) 1 Kings viii. 46. (c) James iii. 2.
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Tempter proposed to them to be very right, altho' it was grossly wrong, and in the Error of their Judgment they went astray: Their Appetites were not the Strength that prevailed against them: In their Judgment lay their Weakness; they were misled, they were deceived. Thus St. Paul speaks of their Transgression, not imputing it to their corrupt Inclinations, but to their erring in their Understanding; the Serpent beguiled Eve through his Subtlety (d): The Infusion of the Tempter became too subtle for them. Herein therefore the Writers who use the Text of Solomon with the View abovementioned, mistake the true Meaning of Solomon: From Solomon's asserting, that God made Man upright, they would infer, that God gave Adam a Perfection of actual Understanding, by which he might without further Direction have devised his own Way aright, to complete himself in every moral Virtue; whereas Solomon says no more, than that God made Man [Jasbar] Rehum, i. e. not crooked or perverse; or, as we render it in English, upright, i. e. not inclined, or propensit to Evil: Solomon speaks Adam to have had originally a Rectitude of Heart or Incl-

(d) 2 Cor. xi. 3.
nation: But these Writers would infer, that he had a Perfection of Head, an unerring Judgment, whereas these are two very different Things: I can apprehend Adam to have had a natural Capacity quick and lively, far greater than we have; but as he had far less Acquaintance with, and Information of the Natures of Things, than even we have had, his actual Knowledge at the Time of his being seduced, must have been less than our Knowledge is: And consequently it happened in Fact, that he erred in a Matter, wherein no one of a moderate Share of improved Understanding would have been so grossly mistaken.

But may we not correct a little the Expressions used in setting forth the pretended rational Scheme contended for, and query upon the Subject as follows? Is not the Spirit of Man the Candle of the Lord (e)? Is there not a Spirit in Man (f) created with Abilities of Reasoning suited to his State? Is there not herein a natural Inspiration of the Almighty to give Man Understanding (g) as soon as we grow

(e) Prov. xx. 27.  (f) Job xxxii. 8.  (g) Ibid. I think I need not here observe, that the Word הַנָּשָׂא here used, which we translate Inspiration, is the Word used by Moses Gen. ii. 7. 10
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grow up to know the Use of it? And if Adam was created not a Child, but a Man; if he was created upright, having a right Heart not biassed by evil Appetites, must he not have had all the Powers of a sound Mind? And what can we say or think he could want more? Would not Things have gradually appeared to him in their true Light? His Mind not corrupted would have admitted them to have been rationally considered, and his Knowledge, as it grew and increased, being sincere and unbiaffed, would have led him in a right Use of his Reason (b) unto true Sentiments of his Duty, as the Relations of Life came to be known by him; so as that he might by his own natural Light have gone wisely and virtuously thro' the World. I might cite many Passages from the best and most virtuous Heathen Writers, to shew, that they seem to have sometimes thought the human Ability of this Sort (i): But I might again cite other Places from signify, the Inspiration, or Breath of Life: And that therefore we may justly here take it to mean, not what we Christians call the Grace of God, but rather that original Ability of Man, which God has given unto Man. (b) ἀνίκα τὰ σχέσ τὰν ἱκίαν τῶν ὑγιάννων σωματικῶν, διὰ θεραπείαν ὑπὸ γρακίαν ὀ λύθω τὸ Ἀναγνώστε ὅτοις. Hierocles. (i) Efl. quidem verae La Ricia Ratio, Nature congruens, diffusa in omnes, conficiat, si pri- terna, quae vocet ad officium jubendo; vetando a Fraude detest.
from them, which lay a Foundation for not being positive in this nice Disquisition: And herein they preserved a Sincerity of Inquiry, far more to be respected than the arrogant Forwardness of our modern Contenders for the Sufficiency of human Reason: These latter seldom fail to shew an unwarrantable Disposition to assume, without proving, that God

Cic. de Rep. Lib. 3. in Fragment. *Erat enim Ratio profecta a Rerum Naturae et ad rei sociandum impellens et a Dei iudicio avocans*. Id. de Leg. Lib. 2. (k) *Si tales nos Natura gemisset, ut com ipsam intueri et perficire, cõtamenque optimæ Duce cursum voce conficeremus; haud erat sanè quod quisquam Rationem ac Divinitam requiritet: Nunc parvulos nobis dedit igniculos quos celeriter mals moribus opinionibusque deprivati sic restringimus, ut nusquam naturae Lusus apparcat*. Cic. Tus. Qüest. Lib. 3. in Init. — *Est profecti Animis Medicina Philosophia* — Id. ibid. This able Writer appears to me here to allow, that Men by Nature are not so made as to look at once to the Bottom and Truth of Things, to see without further Information, than the prompt Suggestion of their own Reasonings, the true Relations of Things and the moral Duties of their Lives. Had he known what we do from Moses, of the true Origin of Mankind, he would, I dare say, have allowed, that it might be necessary for Man, when he first came into the World, not to be left absolutely to himself, to be guided by the parvulos igniculos, as he calls them, which God had given him; he would have considered Man, as not admitted naturam ipsam intueri, but so far only endowed, as that tho' he had received Rationem a Deo, yet he might make it bonam aut non bonam a seipsa. [The Reader may find this Sentiment suggested by one of the Disputants, in Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. 3.] And therefore he would have rejoiced in the clear Light he would have had, of Man's having all the Rationem et Disciplinam, which he supposes him to want, from the Directions, which over and above his Reason, God began as soon as Man came into Being, by express Revelation to give unto him.
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gave no Revelation; until Men had first de-
parted from the Guidance of their Reason,
and wanted to be brought back, to be told the
Use and the Light of it. And they hastily
conclude, that if human Reason at first was
not in itself a sufficient Guide and Direction
for Man, it will follow, that God did not
sufficiently provide for him. They tell us,
“that God at first left Men to the Guidance
of natural Light, by a due Use of Reason
“to discover what best became the Station
“they were placed in, and what Duties were
“incumbent upon them, in the Relation they
“stood to God as their Creator, and to one
“another as Fellow-creatures; expecting no
“Service from them, but what their own
“Reason would suggest, and the very Nature
“and Circumstances of their Being would
“have recommended——;” And they add,
that “God did not interpose until Man had
“herein greatly failed.”—— But all this is
directly contrary to what Moses informs us:
According to Moses, after Adam was created,
before he had had Time to do, I might say,
to think, of Good or Evil; the Voice of
God commanded him saying, Of every Tree
of the Garden thou mayest freely eat, but of
the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil,
thou shalt not eat of it: For in the Day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die (l): A Command was here given, such as the Reason of Man would not have investigated, had not the Voice of God appointed it to him: And consequently, a Service or Observation was herein expected from him, other than what his own Reason would have suggested: But these Writers will perhaps say of this particular Command, that it is Allegory and not a Fact: Let us then proceed, and we shall find, that as soon as Eve was created, Adam and she were both told, that a Man should leave his Father and his Mother, and should cleave unto his Wife, and that they should be one Flesh: This Command, as Moses states it, was, our Saviour tells us, spoken to them by the Voice of God: Herein then there is no Allegory; herein we have the Witness of a greater than Moses, that Moses related what was really Fact: And it is a Testimony, which, duly considered, will prove, that both our Saviour used, and the Jews also to whom our Saviour spake, received the Accounts of what Moses relates to have been done in the Beginning, not as Allegory and Fable; but to be read and cited as

(l) Gen. ii. 16, 17.
The Creation and true History: God, in Fact, declared to Adam and Eve, what was to be the inseparable Union of Man and Wife, and therefore herein they were not left at first to the Guidance of Natural Light, by a due Use of Reason to discover, what best became the Station they were placed in to one another, but received a special Direction by an audible Voice from their Maker concerning this Relation of Life, before they had in any One Thing failed in the Use of their Reason.

What these Writers say further, that to suppose Reason, the Reason of Man, in itself in any State or Circumstances an insufficient Guide, is directly to impeach the Author of Reason; is to say, that God did not give Man sufficient Abilities to know and do his Duty—this is equally dogmatical; contradictory to what we are informed by Moses was in Fact, the Manner in which, and the Abilities with which Adam and Eve were brought into the World. Moses does not say, that God originally gave Adam a Sufficiency of Knowledge, for him to depend solely upon it; but he abundantly shews us, that Man was not left insufficiently


(m) Have ye not read? said our Saviour, appealing to Fact, to what was recorded in Moses's Writings. See Matt. xix. 4, &c. above cited.
provided for, because he shews us how God would by his Voice have directed him, as Directions would be necessary for him. Upon the Whole: The Texts of Scripture above cited, for there being in Man a Light of Reason, do in no wise determine to what Degree it is given; and therefore are not in themselves conclusive against the Necessity of Revelation: And whatever else has been offered, may at best be but the Conceits of mere human Imagination, and therefore intrinsically vain: So that I should apprehend, if we would proceed as we ought in this Enquiry, it may pertinently be examined, whether in the Reason of Things it may not be right, that the infinite Creator should make a Rank of rational Beings, so far endow'd with Reason, as to be above the Restraint and Confinement of Instinct, and yet not endued with so unerring a Beam of Reason, as not to want a further Direction, than what would arise from the Intimations of their own Breasts: After which Enquiry carefully made, we may consider whether Man was the Creature made in this Rank; and whether the Directions said by Moses to have been originally given to the Man, may not be apprehended to have been the most proper Means to supply his Defects, to make
The Creation and
make him perfect, thoroughly furnished unto
every Thing necessary to his answer ing the
great End of his Creation and Being.

CHAP. VI.
Concerning the Points above stated.

The Creation of God, as far as we can examine it, in the Things that may be known by us, shews us a wonderful Connection of all Things to one another: If we go to what I would call the lowest, the most dead and inorganical Parts of Matter, it is a Question, whether a vegetative Life does not subsist in all; so flow indeed in some, as that it will escape our first Inspection; but Stones and Minerals in Time shew enough of it to apprize us, tho' it be hard to conceive how small its first Beginnings are, that probably there is not any Thing in the natural World wherein it really is none: We may trace a gradual Increase of the Circulation of it, from the more inert Parts, as it were, of Matter, to the Trees and Shrubs and Plants and Flowers, whose living Growths are more and more conspicuous, daily ornamented with new Appearances of accrescent Variety and Alteration:
FALL of MAN.
	eration: And how near do some of these come to almost a visible Connection unto the Animal World? It is difficult to ascertain how much more Sensation there is in an Oyster, if there really are not living Animals of less Sensation than an Oyster, of whose Motion we can hardly say more, than that it opens its Shell, to take in the Water and Soil that is to feed it, and shuts at the Approach of any Thing that may more sensibly affect it, than in those Plants which open their Flowers to the soft and warm Air, but will instantly close up and shrivel if any großer Object be admoved almost near enough to touch them. If we enter and proceed thro' the innumerable Varieties of animal Life, until we come to those Beings in whom the Breath of it is most conspicuous; if we consider the Differences of the Discernments of these, and carry on the Progression until we enter the rational World, we may find, says an ingenious Writer (o), that there are some Brutes that seem to have as much Reason and Knowledge, as some that are called Men; so that the animal and rational Creation do so nearly approach, that if you take the highest of the one, and compare it with the lowest of

the other, there will scarce be perceived a Difference between them. The Variety of the Capacities of Men considered, will carry us over a vast Field, and bring us to the Borders of the Angelic State: For Man was made but a little lower than the Angels (p): How far, had Sin not come into the World, and Death by Sin; the highest and most perfect of Men might have improved and come near to the lowest of the Angels, we cannot say: But if, from what we can see of the Creation of the World, we may reason concerning the Things that are invisible; supposing that God created the first Man with the highest Capacity, that could belong to the Rank of Being he was of, yet knowing, that he was made a little lower than the Angels; that the lowest of these Intelligences was made greater than he; we cannot place Man higher, than upon an Ascent, next between the Animal and more Intellectual State: And considering, how it answers to the Analogy of Things, that all the intellectual Powers should each rise gradually, one Order above another, to complete a Fullness in God’s Creation of the Heavens and of the Earth (q); it will be no unreasonable Sen-

(p) Heb. ii. 7. (q) Without this Plato thought the Heavens would be imperfect. ἓκατον ἄξιολος ἄξιος ἐστι, τὰ δὲ ἀξιώματα ἐξ ἀξιώματος.
timent, that God created Man, with such Powers indeed of Reason, as to be above all that can be come up to by the animal Life; but yet, not with so masterly a Light of Reason, as absolutely to want no assistent Information. Mr. Pope has excellently well expressed what I am aiming at. In the Creation of God, he observes, that as

— All must full, or not coherent be,
And all that rises rise in due Degree,
Then in the Scale of Life and Sense 'tis plain,
There must be somewhere such a Rank as Man.
Plac'd on the Isthmus of a middle State,
A Being darkly wise and rudely great (r).

There must be somewhere in the Ascents up from Sense to the Heights of Reason, a Rank of Creatures above the Confinements and Limitations of Instinct, but not so perfect in their Powers of Reason, as to stand in Need of none other than their own Direction.

Of this Rank the Poet deemed Man, estimating him made,

*With too much Knowledge for the Sceptic Side,*
*With too much Weakness for the Stoic's Pride.* (5)

---

(i) Ibid. Ep. 2, ver. 5.
The Creation and to have Light enough to see how he may, with a sufficient Certainty, from known Premises draw many important Conclusions, but not Light enough absolutely to rest satisfied in the Sufficiency of his own Wisdom (t). The Poet gives us many rational Intimations, that Man must originally have been formed in this Line of Being, that there might be a just Gradation in the Works of God:

— that progressive Life may go
Around its Width, its Depth extend below,
Vast Chain of Being, which from God began,
Nature's æthereal, human, Angel, Man,
Beast, Bird, Fish, Insect! what no Eye can see,
No Glass can reach! from infinite to thee,
From thee to Nothing. —— (u)

The Poet further expatiates upon the Subject,

Far as Creation's ample Range extends
The Scale of sensual, mental Powa's ascends:
Mark how it mounts, to Man's imperial Race,
From the green Myriads in the peopled Graz!
How Infinite varies in the groveling Swine,
Compar'd half-reasing Elephant! with thine:

(t) The Stoic's Pride here hinted at, is, I think, what is expressed in the latter Part of the following Sentence. Vide Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. c. 36. (u) Ep. 1. ver. 199.
Fall of Man.

'Twixt that and Reason what a nice Barrier,
For ever sep'rate, yet for ever near: (w)

And he further hints to us, that we ought not to think it wrong, that Man made to be of this Order, has not a larger Share of Reason to guide him.

— say not Man's imperfect, Heav'n in Fault,
Say rather Man's as perfect as he ought:
His Being measur'd to his State and Place.

Presumptuous Man! the Reason wouldst thou find,
Why form'd so weak, so little, and so blind;
First, if thou canst, the harder Reason guesst,
Why form'd no weaker, blinder, and no less.

What would this Man? would he now upward soar?
And little less than Angel would he more?

—— on superior Powers
Were we to press, inferior must on ours;
Or in the full Creation leave a Void.
Where one Step broken the great Scales destroy'd.
The general Order since the Whole began,
Is kept in Nature, and is kept in Man. (x)

These Sentiments do, I think, most clearly lead us to see, that in the Reason of Things, there must be somewhere in the Universe a

(w) Pope's Essay, Ep. i. ver. 199. (x) Id. ibid. ver. 35, 253, 163.

Being
The Creation and Being of such, and no greater Powers of Reason, than are here supposed to belong to Man; and that this is our true Standard has been the Opinion of the best Writers (y), and has been confirmed in Fact by the Experience of all Ages (z); so that for Man to talk of his having unerring Reason, or of our wanting no further Instruction (a) than a careful Attendance to the Result of our own Judgment, is a Vanity that might sufficiently be exposed in the Sentiment offered us in the Book of Job: Vain Man would be wise, though Man be born like a wild Ass's Colt (b): Such an In dependence of understanding is an Height, that we were not made for: We may think of ourselves as we please; but from the Beginning

(y) It is the Sentiment expressed by Cicero, that we are Creatures made able by Nature, Naturam ipsam intueri et se specere, eademque optimae Duce cursum Vitae confeceris, but that we want for this Purpose, what he calls Rationem ac Doctrinam, having only igniculos, which if not properly fed and cherished, will fail and be extinguished. See Cic. Tusc. Quaest. Lib. 3. à Princip. sup. cit. Quartus autem Gradus et altissimus eorum est, qui Naturae boni sapientesque gignuntur: quibus a Principio nasceritur Ratio, et a consciensae, quae supra hominem patente, Deoque tribuenda. Cic. de Nat. Deor. Lib. 2. c. 13. (z) Our Scriptures rightly tell us, that there is no Man that finneth not, 1 Kings viii. 4. There is not a just Man upon Earth, that doth God and finneth not, Eccles. vii. 20. The Philosophers say, Sapientes nemo affertur. Vide Cic. de Nat. Deor. Lib. 3. c. 32. (a) Nisi ut nihil interist, utrum nemo valdeat, an nemo possit valdeat, sed intellego, quid interist, utrum nemo sit sapient, an nemo sit phi. Vide Cic. ibid. (b) Job xi. 12.
to this Time, from the Time that Adam was brought into the World, until now, be that has thus absolutely trusted in his own Heart (c) has been a Fool: What a Propriety then has it to the Nature of Man, that God, as soon as he was created, made to him, as Moses relates, an especial Revelation? If the Perfection of Man could have come merely from his Reason, without Doubt no such Revelation would have been given him; for the All-wise God does nothing superfluously in vain (d): And therefore since a Revelation was in Fact made to Man in the Beginning, hence know we, that it was necessary, and that his original Reason was not alone sufficient for him. For as to those who say, that the Narration of a Revelation made to the first Man is a mere Allegory and Fable; let not these pretend to argue that, if the Original Reason of Man was not alone a sufficient Guide, then it must follow, that God did not sufficiently provide for the Creature made thus imperfect; for the Answer hereto is, that the Revelation given

(c) Prov. xxviii. 26. (d) The Argument used by the Apostle concerning the Law, might, I think, be justly accommodated to the Topic before us, in Words as follow: For if there had been Reason given unto Adam, such as, or so sufficient, that it might have given him Life, verily his Righteousness would have been by his Reason. See Gal. iii. 21.

H to
The Creation and to Adam, and intended to have been continued over and above his natural Reason, would have been sufficient for Man's natural Weakness, and have thoroughly instructed him more and more unto every good Work, if it had not been set aside and disregarded by him.

CHAP. VII.

Some further Considerations of the original State of our first Parents; of the Nature of the first Command, or Prohibition made to him, and wherein consisted the Sin of their not serving it.

The Point we considered in the before going Chapter was, how far we may reasonably conjecture, from the Rank and Order of Being Man was formed in, that he was made a Creature not of absolute independent Understanding, I would here observe, that a most excellent Writer has hinted to us this very Thing: The Author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus enumerates the Endowments with which, and the Direction under which God thought fit to bring our first Parents into the World. The Lord, he says, created Man of the Earth — They received the Use of the first Operation
Operations of the Lord; and in the sixth Place he imparted them Understanding, and in the seventh Speech, an Interpreter of the Cogitations thereof: Counsel, and a Tongue, and Eyes, Ears, and a Heart gave he them to understand (e). In these and the three following Verses, he remarks, how God gave unto Man his five Senses, his Ability of Speech and Understanding: But he had before observed, that when God made Man in the Beginning, he left him in the Hand of his Counsel (f): The Question is, whose Counsel was Man now left in the Hand of? The Latin Version says sui consilii, his own Counsel, but very absurdly: The Greek Text is ἄφικεν αὐτὸν ἐν καθ' ἅπασι διὰ θελεία αὐτῆς not ἐαυτῷ his own, but ἑαυτῆς his, i.e. God’s Counsel: And this truly agrees to what follows in the next Verse, if Man would have conformed to it: His Duty was to have kept the Commandments, ὅ ἔστιν ὁμοίως δίδωμις (g): He was to have paid unto God [ὑπακολε τῆς ἐφεσίας] the Obedience of Faith: The Intimation is no other than what is the Substance of all revealed Religion; that without Faith it was impossible Man should

(e) Ecclus. xvii. 1—9.  (f) Ibid. xv. 14.  (g) Ibid.

H 2 please
please God (b); for that not to follow absolutely the Counsels of Man's own Heart (i); but to fear God, and to keep his Commandments, this was to have been the Whole of Man (k); And this is what Moses sets before us: He tells us, that God made Man; but over and besides making him a living Soul, and creating him as Solomon speaks, 'fasbar, aright, having nothing in him not meet for an Intelligence of his Order and Rank of Being; having given him Senses and Understanding in such Measure as his Maker thought fit to bestow upon him (l), over and above all, he gave

(b) Heb. xi. 6. (i) The following our own Counsels, is in Scripture: Meaning, the departing or departing from what God has revealed, to do what seemeth right in our own Eyes. See Psal. lxxi. 11. &c. and many other Places that might be cited. (k) Ecclef. xii. 13. (l) Ibid. vii. 20. His imperfect Reason would have been the Occasion of no Evil, if he had not departed from observing the Commandments of God. Adam's Ability of Reason was such as it ought to be in One of his Rank of Being, and the important Thing to him was, to
Know thy own Point, this Kind, this due Degree Of Blindness, Weakness, Heav'n bestows on thee.

Pope, ubi sup.

He ought not to have aimed to be knowing as God, but obeying what God commanded, thereby to have learned and done the Duties of his Life, but

In reasoning Pride our Error lies,
All quit their Sphere, and rush into the Skies:
Men would be Angels, Angels would be Gods:
Aspiring to be Gods, if Angels fell,
Aspiring to be Angels, Men rebel:
And who but wishes to invert the Laws
Of Order, sins against the Eternal Cause. Pope, ubi sup. him
him a Commandment, which, if he would have faithfully kept to and observed, would have led him unto every Thing sufficient for him. But,

The Difficulty which Objectors raise against interpreting literally what Moses relates of the Command here said to be given, lies in their conceiving the Command to be in itself in no wise rationally conducing to Man's Perfection: It is impossible, they think, that such a Being as God is, should appoint so great a Weight, of the Happiness or Misery of Mankind, to depend upon a Matter in itself of so little real Importance, as the eating or not eating of the Fruit of a particular Tree (d): Here I confess they start, what ought to be examined very considerately, and is not to be so hastily determined as some imagine, who I think add to, instead of removing the Stumbling-block by their unaccountable Ratiocinations: They say, "God had laid the whole Stress and Weight of his Authority upon this One Command: If, say they, you suppose a Case so circumstanced, that if a Son's Disobedience to a Father, in some

(d) Id utique videtur gravissimum et aseptimum quod Gentem humanam plexisse, imò perdidisse dicatur Deus, ob Rem exiguum — Burnet Archæol. p. 296.
"one Particular, in itself of no Moment, will infer not merely a Neglect, but even a Con- tempt of his Parent's Authority; be the Matter of the Offence what it will, will it not deserve the severest Resentment? What the Son thinks a trivial Thing, and in com- mon Estimation may pass as such, he will presume the Father will think so too: But had the Father expressly laid the whole Weight of his Authority upon this one Thing; had he expressly said before-hand: Son, whatever else you may think to do to please or shew Regard to me, shall have no Acceptance, unless in this One easy Thing, which I make and appoint to be the Test of your Duty, you carefully obey me: For upon your Failure herein, I will most absolutely treat you as a Rebel; should the Son after all this presume to offend in this One Point, would any reasonable Man plead it to be excusable?" I confess, such a Defence as this shocks me exceedingly: It is obvious that the Unbeliever will readily reply: "Should a Man build the most magnificent Habitation in the World, and add to it in Estate every desirable Possession, but in some One Room of his House should set up a Piece of Wood, with this strict Pro-"
"habition to his Son: As a Mark of my Au-
"thority, as a Test of your Obedience to me
"your Father, I command that this One Piece
"of Wood be never touched by you: For I
"have made it my Will, that if ever you
"touch it, an absolute Disinherit shall take
"Place against you and your Posterity for
"ever." Should the Son now offend herein,
I will not, says the Free-Thinker, ask so
much as a Question about the Son: I give
him up for a Fool, to receive the Fruits of his
trifling Impertinence: But I must inquire con-
cerning the Father: What may Posterity, con-
sidering such a Ruin of a whole Family unto
all Generations, think of him, who made so
trifling an Injunction so peremptory and so
penal?

It will not be admitted, that we write
worthily of God, if we suppose him to have
given Adam a Commandment of no real Mo-
ment, only to make his Neglect of it, if he
should happen to neglect it, most terribly de-
suctive: God is not Man, that he should lay
the Strefs of his Authority in Caprice; upon
a matter of no Moment, whether it be ob-
served or no: And therefore, if we would
give unto him the Honour due unto his Name,
it will be proper to consider, whether such as

H 4  God
The Creation and God had made to be the Nature of Man; for a Command, as Mofes describes in the Prohibition of the forbidden Tree, was not necessary to be given. But it could otherwise be in the Reason and Na-
fit, I might lay necessary to be given him. And whether, this Command being broken, he could otherwise be in the Reason and Na-
fit, I might lay necessary to be given him. And whether, this Command being broken, he could otherwise be in the Reason and Na-
fit, I might lay necessary to be given him. And whether, this Command being broken, he could otherwise be in the Reason and Na-
fit, I might lay necessary to be given him. And whether, this Command being broken, he could otherwise be in the Reason and Na-
fit, I might lay necessary to be given him. And whether, this Command being broken, he could otherwise be in the Reason and Na-
Legal Institutions were to discipline and to exercise the Jews to obey God: In like manner, when God thought fit to make the Covenant of Circumcision with Abraham, the declared Design of what was instituted was, that Abraham should walk before God, and thereby be perfect (g): And we are thus to consider the Commandment given to Adam concerning the forbidden Tree; not as if God spake to him concerning a Tree, merely to preserve that inviolate; but he herein commanded him this One Thing, namely, obey my Voice indeed; to do whatever I shall declare to be the Duties of thy Life: Not that God required, that Man should obey his Voice purely for the sake of, and to lay a Stress upon his own Authority; but, because it was necessary for Man, not to be left to his own Guidance, but to be kept in the Hand of God's Counsel: Adam, when created, was not so made as that Directions absolutely right in themselves would arise to him from his own Judgment of Things, for the whole Guidance of his Life; and therefore God gave him a Command not to eat of a particular Tree, as he afterwards gave to Abraham the Command of Circumcision: As

(g) Gen. xvii. 1.
Abraham received the Command of Circumcision to be the Sign, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith (b), so Adam received the Command of not eating of the forbidden Tree to be a Sign, an Attestation, a standing and inviolate Memorial, that he was not to follow his own Inventions, but truly and faithfully to obey God.

If we consider the Commandment concerning the forbidden Tree in this Light, the Narration of it will be greatly cleared of the Difficulties surmised to be in what Moses has said of it. In every Revelation which God has made unto Men it is observable, that some Positive Institution or Institutions are enjoined, for the Receivers of such Revelations truly to pay unto God in obeying them the Obedience of Faith, i.e. to believe and to do whatever God is pleased to declare to them, or demand of them: It is thus that we receive the two Ordinances, which Christ has appointed us in the New Testament, Baptism, and the Communion of Bread and Wine: It was thus that the Jews were bound to observe the Rites, and to make the Sacrifices of the Law by Moses; even as Abraham before received the

(b) Rom. iv. 11.
Command of Circumcision (i): And thus unto Adam was given the Injunction not to eat of the particular Tree, that was called the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil: Of which Command we can no more say, that God did not literally enjoin our first Parents not to eat of that Tree, than we can say, that he did not literally enjoin Abraham the Circumcision of the Flesh; or the Israelites to offer the Sacrifices which are directed in the Law; or us Christians the washing of Water in Baptism, and the eating of Bread and drinking of Wine in Remembrance of our Saviour, as they are enjoin'd by him. Upon the whole: The interpreting literally what Moses says of the prohibited Tree, and afterwards of the Tree of Life, does not make the Texts that speak of them ἵνα ἐπιλύεινος (k); sets up no singular or peculiar Notion in Religion, which has nothing like it in the other Scriptures; but rather it is so truly ή εἰκονογίαν ἐκκειτός (l), has such an Agreement with what is read of a like Nature from Faith to Faith, in all the subsequent Revelations which God has been pleased to make unto Men, that it approves itself in shewing the Way of God to lead Man

(i) Rom. iv. 11. (k) 2 Pet. i. 20. (l) Rom. xii. 6.
tho' the World to have been in this Point none other than one and the same in Principle, tho' diversified in Circumstances, as the different Circumstances of different Ages might require, from the very Beginning of Man down to these last Times, and is to continue the same until our State here be fulfilled.

The Objectors to a literal Interpretation of Moses's Account of the two particular Trees of the Garden, do therefore vainly think themselves to have a Difficulty insuperable in asking; How could there be in Nature Trees that could bear such Fruits, as seem by a literal Interpretation of Moses to be ascribed to the Tree of Knowledge, and to the Tree of Life? For if any one should ask us concerning Baptism, what sort of Water can that be, which can give the Washing of Regeneration? or concerning the Lord's Supper; what can we conceive of the natural Nourishment or Juices of that Bread and that Wine, from the eating and drinking of which we may be made Partakers of the Body and of the Blood of Christ? Would any one, who thinks soberly upon the Benefits ascribed to the doing these Things, as God has commanded them, find himself at a Loss to answer in these Matters? or would he apprehend the Things commanded to be a mere
mere Allegory; and that we are not injoined literally to use real Water, or to eat and drink real Bread and real Wine? Rather, how much more reasonably may we see and apprehend, that as we eat the Bread and drink the Wine, which God has commanded in Assurance of the Faith, that if we obey God, it will be unto us according to his Word, to give us eternal Life, to raise us up at the last Day (m), even so might Adam having done the Will of God, when God should direct it, have literally put forth his Hand, and taken of the Tree of Life, and eaten and have lived forever (n): And as we are to be washed with Water as Christ has required, and God will give us of his holy Spirit, both to think and to do, above what we otherwise will be able of our own Sufficiency, presumptuously assuming to stand in our own Strength without him; so ought Adam, literally speaking, not to have eaten of the forbidden Tree, and he would have continued in the Hand of God's Counsel, and not have corrupted himself, and his Way before God: Not that Meat, or the Abstaining from any Meat recommendeth unto God; not that the washing or not washing

(m) John vi. 54.  (n) Gen. iii, 22.
with Water is in itself any Thing; rather, we may, and Adam and Eve might have eat, or not eat, and therein have been neither the better nor the worse, had there not been the Commandment of God. The Tree prohibited was, I apprehend, like other Trees of the Garden, pleasant to the Eyes and good for Food; but the Point to have been considered was, whether in observing the Prohibition not to eat of this One Tree, the Man was not to keep himself in the Hand of God's Counsel, not to take upon himself to be his own independent Director; but to have obeyed absolutely, wherein forever, God was pleased to give him special Directions, to live according to every Word which should proceed from the Mouth of God. If Man had persevered herein, as God gave him One Law for a relative Duty, he would in like manner, as Occasions required, have given him others also, which otherwise thro' Man's Inexperience of the Natures of Things he would have erred in investigating for himself; until God's Word having thus been a Lantern to his Feet, and a Light to his Paths, Man might, thro' it, have

(nn) Deut. viii. 3. Matt. iv. 8. (o) I have before observed, that God gave our first Parents the Law, that Man and Wife should not be twain, but one Flesh, Mark x. 8. Vide quae sup. attained
attended a right Understanding, and having as long as, and wherein soever he might want them, been guided by God's Counsels (p), be thereby made gradually wise, meet, and fit to be received unto God into Glory: But, on the other Hand, Man rejecting this the Counsel of God towards him, and taking upon himself to judge absolutely for himself; it hence came to pass, that not having a Light of actual Knowledge of his own sufficient to preserve him from Error, he would find, that however God had created him [Yasbar] able, under the Directions designed him, to go aright into the Duties of his Life; yet now not keeping himself within this Guidance, but becoming a Follower of his own Cogitations, he would become a Creature full of Error, and be in the End both wicked and vain. God must be conceived not to see us only, but to see thro' us; to know us, and to know the Point upon which will turn the Issues of our Lives: He thus knew the Israelites, when he commanded them to expel the Canaanites out of their Land; that if this one Thing was not carefully observed to be performed by them, however they might resolve to keep his

(p) Pfal. lxxiii. 24.

Law,
Law, yet they certainly would be drawn away into Idolatry by the Remains of that People: The Israelites would not apprehend this, but made the Experiment: The Event came out to the full of what had been foretold to them (q): In like manner, how obvious is it to see? that God might know, that the active and busy Faculty he had given our first Parents, which we call Reason, not given in a greater Measure than he had endowed them with it (r), would never have been kept within its proper Bounds, unless at first exercized under some such especial Command as he thought fit to give them, and therefore gave such Command to them, to be the standing inviolate Memento of their Lives; that whether they eat, or whether they drank, or whatsoever they did (s), they should in nothing turn aside from what God commanded, to the right Hand, or to the left (t).

(q) See Exodus xxiii. 33. Judges ii. &c. (r) Motum itum celerem Cognitionis, acumen, folertiam, quam Rationem vocamus — Cic. de Nat. Deor. Lib. 3. c. 27. (s) 1 Cor. x. 31. (t) Deut. v. 32.
THE Writers who contend, that Moses only designed an instructive Apologue, and not a real History, would represent, that his very Description of the Situation of the Garden of Eden hints this to us. They set before us the Variety of Opinions, which different Writers have had concerning the Situation of this Garden (p), and would thence argue, that most probably no such Spot of Ground ever really existed. Plato, they tell us, signified Διος ηντον, a Jupiter's Garden, where he relates how Porus and Penia became the Parents of Eros (q): Plato formed a Mythologic Tale of the Origin of the Principle he termed Eros or Love, and supposes a Garden, which he calls Jupiter's, to have been the Scene of the Fable narrated by him: Of this Sort they would have Moses’s Garden of Eden; a fictitious Scene, the supposed Place where

(p) Dr. Middleton justly remarks, that it would be tedious to collect the strange Variety of Conceits which have been invented about the single Article of a Paradise: The Reader may find enough of them in Burnet's Theory, both the Latin and English. (q) Plato in Symposium.
Moses’s mythological Account of the Origin of Sin was transacted; no more a real Spot of Ground, than Jupiter’s Garden, in which Plato represented Love to have had its first Original. They say diverse of the early Fathers of the Christian Church understood Moses in this manner, and they cite a very learned one, Eusebius in particular, for this Opinion: To which we may well answer; what Sentiments some of the Fathers sometimes had of diverse Parts of Moses Writings is not very material: Our Enquiry is, What we may reasonably admit the Scriptures to inform us of the Matter before us. However, I would observe of Eusebius, that he certainly did not mean what is inferred from him. We find in our Editions of him these Words, Μώσεως τινάς α’τορρήτης λόγοι—τίνα ἀξιόθρησκον γεγονέναι φαίνης—(r), from hence it is said Eusebius represents Moses to have wrote of his Paradise mythologically, whenas I apprehend, that whoever will duly examine Eusebius, will see, that he here hinted Plato’s Sentiment of

Moses, but not his own. Eusebius represents Plato to have been an allegorical Writer, and the Passage cited from him has some Defect(s), or is obscurely worded, but seems to me to say of him, that he aimed to set himself διά τις Μωσέως; in a Point of View over-against Moses; to appear such a Writer as he [Plato] took Moses to have been before him; and accordingly, tho' Plato changed the Facts related by Moses (t); did not narrate the very time which he read in Moses's Writings, but adopted others; yet he thought himself to write as elegantly of Porus and Penia as he deemed Moses to have wrote of Adam and Eve, reposing Moses as well as himself, φαντάζοντας απορρίπτεις λόγους, to have wrote not as an Historian, but in the mythic Stile of Allegory: The Sentiment of the whole Period cited from Eusebius is different, if we understand Μωσέως φαντάζοντας to mean, that Moses really wrote in Allegory; that Eusebius so thought of him; from what it would appear taking those Words to refer to Plato, and to

---

(i) I should suspect that Eusebius wrote Μωσέως: ὁς κατά τις απορρίπτεις λόγους — quod: secundum quodam sensum Loquentis: The Meaning of the Place would thus be clear, but perhaps the unskilful Transcriber dropped the second ὃς, not seeing the Meaning of it. (t) τὸ ἐνεματαπαντεῖς ὤν Πλάτων.
intend only that Plato so thought of Moses: The Greek Sentence may, I think, admit the latter Sense (u): An English Reader may be apt to catch the former: And Dr. Burnet hereupon endeavours, in a Manner unworthy a Scholar, to palm the former upon us. We may fully see Eusebius’s Opinion of Plato’s imitating Moses in the Chapter following what is cited: Eusebius tells us, how Plato formed his Fable of the Androgynes from what Moses had related of God’s making the Woman out of the Man (w): Plato changed the Fact related by Moses, and used a Fiction, as he thought similar to it, and reputed it as warrantable; opining Moses herein as well as himself to have wrote Allegory: But Eusebius hereupon tells us expressly, that Plato did not understand Moses’s Intention (x), was ignorant of his Way of speaking (y): Here then we come to Eusebius’s Sentiment both of Plato and Moses: He plainly shews us that he knew

Moses to have wrote Fact, and History, but thought Plato to mistake him, and to imagine him an Allegorist, and that in writing in that Style, he was an Imitator of him; and accordingly, we ought so to construe what was before cited from Eusebius, as to make it agree with what is thus plainly declared by him.

But to return from whence I have digressed: The Writers, who are not for admitting in a literal Sense, what Moses relates of the Garden of Eden, remark to us, that the Ignorance all Ages have been in of the true Place and Situation of it, must be deemed a considerable Argument, that no such real Place ever existed (a): It is not likely, they say, but that some of Adam's early Posterity must have found in the World some Traces of the Mansions of their first Parents, if any so remarkable a Place of their Abode had ever been; but if it be in Fact true, that, choose we where we will, we can hear of no Spot of Ground so situate and bounded as Moses describes, why should we think his Garden any other than a mere Scene of Fancy, which no real Geography could ever mark out upon the

(a) See Middleton's Essay upon the allegorical and literal Interpretation.
Face of the (zz) whole Earth? But these Writers are in all this guilty of the most shameful Inobservation. They first call for an Inquiry, whether any of Adam's Posterity could ever trace out any Marks of the Situation of the Place where Adam first lived, and then overlooking, that Ages after Adam, Moses gave his Contemporaries a very particular Description of it, they run away to a modern Disquisition, whether we can now find Charts of the World, that may perfectly agree to Moses's Descriptions. But the best Method we can take to clear the whole of this Inquiry will be to examine, I. Whether we can reasonably admit, that any Situations of Places in the World before the Flood, could possibly be found the same in the post-diluvian Earth. II. To examine whether Moses does, or does not settle the Boundaries of his Garden, such as they were known to be after the Flood. III. Whether it appears that the Site of the Garden, as Moses describes it, was known in the World, before, in and after Moses's Times. IV. To determine what his Description of it precisely is. V. Whether there has not hap-

(zz) Middleton's Examination of the Lord Bishop of London's Discourses, p. 133.
pened since his Times such Alterations of the Countries bordering upon its Situation, as may be admitted to give us Reason not to think we can now ascertain the local Spot described by him; but how far, notwithstanding all the Changes of the Face of the World, we may still find the Country in which Moses's Garden of Eden may be reasonably concluded to have had its Situation.

I. Our first Inquiry ought to be, Whether any Spot of Ground in the first World, could possibly be found again after the Flood? And here we have to combat with two Opinions: One, that the first World was made so very different from the post-diluvian Earth, that it cannot be thought there was such a Situation in it as Moses describes: The other, that if there had been originally such a primitive Situation, the Earth must have suffered such Alteration by the Flood, that after that Cata-

(a) Theory, B. I. c. 5.

...
which he would not have fallen into, had he kept to what he proposed should conduct his Inquiries, namely, the Light he might have had from the holy Scriptures (b): The sacred Writers have ever reputed Mountains and Hills to be coeval with the World: The Writer of the Book of Job was of this Opinion: He speaks of the first Man as made before the Hills (c); not meaning before them, in Point of Time; the Expression is, made in the Sight of the Hills (d); that is, when as yet not Men, but the Hills only were Spectators of his coming into Being: The Expression intimates what the Psalmist also suggests, that the Mountains were brought forth as soon as the Earth was made; for to these he appeals as to the most ancient of Things, to argue from them, of him, who was before them, that he is God: Before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the Earth, even from Everlasting to Everlasting thou art God (e): Agreeably hereto Moses speaks of Hills, that had not their Rise from the Deluge, but were more ancient; were the Heights

(b) Adducamus in Concilium Naturam et Rationem, quam semper, quia licet, sacrarum Literarum Lumine, Tell. Theor. lib. I. c. 5.  
(c) Job. xv. 6.  
(d) Ibid.  
(e) Psal. xc. 2.
of the Earth, over and above the loftiest of which the Waters of the Flood, he tells us, prevailed fifteen Cubits upwards, to cover all the high Hills that then were under Heaven (f). But it was in Dr. Burnet's Imagination, that a fluid Mass rolled round upon its Axis might gradually throw outward its earthy Particles, and become incrusted over an huge Body of Waters, and growing more and more firm and compact, have its Surface naturally formed in an even Oval (g): But how small a Mote became here a Beam in our Author's Eye, from his not considering the Greatness of this Work of God? He does not treat (tho' he is not willing to allow his Conceptions to be so narrow (gg)), his mundane Egg suitably to the real Amplitude of the World (h): Geometry shews us of the highest Mountains of the Earth, that the Height of any of them bears no greater Measure to a Semidiameter of our Globe, than to be in Proportion to it as about 1 to 860 (i); so that, tho' to us many of the Mountains are vast

(f) Gen. vii. 19.  (g) Theory, Vol. I. c. 4.  (gg) Id. c. 11.  
(h) Theory, Vol. I. c. 5.  'Tis the Doctrine of the Mundane Egg: I do not know any symbolical Doctrine so universally entertained by the Musæ, Id. Book II. c. 8.  (i) Varen. Geogr. Seft. III. c. IX. Prop. VII.

Objects,
Objects, as they take up great Room in, or if we approach them, more than fill the little Orb of our Sight; yet they are in Truth no greater Prominences on the Face of the World, than an Excrecence of about the one hundred and forty third Part of an Inch high, would be upon a Ball a Yard round: Our Sight is not minute enough to reach so insensible an Irregularity; and were our Sight large enough to comprehend a View of a whole Hemisphere of the Earth, it would not have a Ken, that could spy so little an Object as the (k) huge Mountain. Had our Author thus considered the Bigness of the Earth, Cavities for the Seas impressed upon the formed Orb of it, to receive the Gatherings together of the Waters, which were to run from amongst the Hills, and the Mountains and Hills raised upon the Face of the antediluvian Globe, might have been deemed by him to be no more than the ὅσες γεωμετρῶν, the divine Workmaster, who gave every Thing its due Weight and Measure, might know to be proper to balance the Parts of the Earth one against another, to give a due Libration to our Globe.

(k) Varenius's Proposition is, Montium Altitudo ad Semidiameter Telluris non habet senilem Proportionem, sed exiguum, ut Rotunditati Telluris non magis officiat, quam Punctum in Globi artificialis superficie notatum.
Fall of Man.

But the other Opinion is, that if the Earth was indeed originally made such, as to have Hills and Rivers like to what are mentioned by Moses, yet that such Alterations of our Globe must have happened from the universal Deluge, that any the same Mountains and Rivers that were before the Flood, cannot be supposed to have remained, to be found after it: A Sentiment thought supportable either by considering, 1. What a Fracture must have happened to the Earth, to bring forth the Abyss of Waters produced by God's breaking up the Fountains of the Deep (k), or 2. The Strata of the Relics of a Flood, which are said to lie every where deep in all Parts of the present Earth.

1. Moses tells us, that at the Deluge, all the Fountains of the great Deep were broken up (l). Our ingenious Theorist having observed what a Quantity of Water must otherwise have been created, to fill a Sphere extended fifteen Cubits every way higher than the Summit of the highest Hills (m), represents the old World to have been arched over a vast Abyss of Waters inclosed around its Center,

laid up here as in a Store-house (n), contained as in a Bag (o) against the Time, when God called them forth to have the World, that then was, perish in them. God then, he says, broke up the Fountains of this Deep; caused the Compass of the World set over it (p); the (q) Earth established upon these Floods to be broken down, and in huge Fragments to fall into this vast Cavern, whereby the Waters forced out of it, were added to the Rain of forty Days, to drown the World. He adds in lively Descriptions, that the Face of the present Earth, overspread with broken Mountains, craggy Precipices, and ragged and unshapen Rocks, looks apparently such a World of Ruins; shews us, that we live upon the Remains of a thus fractured Globe. And he concludes, that if we admit his Hypothesis, of such a Disruption of the Earth, we cannot expect to find Rivers now, as they were before; the general Source is, he says, changed, and their Channels are all broke up (r): It is surprizing that this ingenious Author should not reflect, that even his own Hypothesis does not make it certain that the Ruins he supposes

occupied the Face of the whole Earth: Might not diverse enormous Fragments fall into the Abyss represented by him, in many different Parts of the World, and for vast and extensive Tracts of Country together, and yet in other Parts vast Plains, and a well-watered Campaign, such as are to be found, and have been found in all Ages in many Countries have remained not disfigured, as not having suffered in these Ruins? The Disruption of the World was local, here and there in Places, as the rocky Precipices are found to be, which are scattered over, but do not every where cover the whole Face of the Earth: And if Moses's Eden was in a Tract of Country, that did not break and fall in Fragments so disjointed into the Deep, its primitive Situation might remain, and be well described by him in the postdiluvian World. In like Manner,

2. If we examine what is offered by others, concerning the several Strata in the Bowels of the Earth, occasioned, as they represent, by an universal Deluge, we shall find nothing in their Speculations, that can prove that Moses might not be able to describe the local Situation of the Garden of Eden, by such Boundaries as might really exist in the postdiluvian Earth.
The Creations and Exuviae of Fishes, of Teeth and Bones of some Animals, often found buried under the Surface; many Times deep in the Bowels of the present Earth; sometimes inclosed even within the Mass of the most solid Stones, or Beds of Minerals; apprehend the Earth at the universal Deluge, to have been so long soaked in the Water that overflowed it, that the Crustation or Concretion of all its Parts was absolutely loosened, and the whole Orb liquidated into an universal Fluor; in which Trees, and Animals, Fishes, and all sorts of Vegetables, not of a Contexture, such as that Water was a proper Menstruum to dissolve them, were variously tossed about and carried, until, when God was pleased to have the Floods quieted, and the Agitations of the Waters become a dead Calm, Things began regularly to subside; the Earth to concrete again, and the Bodies rolling here and there in the turbid and thick Waters, to sink and lodge regularly; deeper or nearer the Surface of the accruing Earth, as their specific Gravities might rest them higher in, or sink them lower into the Mud that surrounded them: That the Bed of Earth, in which they became thus situated, hardening daily, suitably to the Na-
ure of its respective Soil, some Stratas becoming in Time a Chalk; others vegetating and concocting to Stone; to Ore of Minerals, in Concretions of various Sorts, such as might be formed according to the different Nature of the Parts they were compounded of; the undissolved Bodies that subsided in them, and rested where the surrounding Matter answered their Gravity and sustained them, became, as that hardened, inclosed in it; and are therefore, wherever the Earth is ransacked down to the Beds they lie in, found sometimes whole and intire, where no Air has been introduced to loosen the Contexture of their Parts, or any Menstruum has been generated, that could corrode and dissolve them: And many Times, where the Shells or the Animals are dissolved and gone, such a Print appears to have been taken of them in the yielding and soft Substance, whilst pliable, of the Strata they lay in, as to exhibit to us even in what now are the hardest Stones Impressions of various Kinds, more perfect than the best Matrices which the highest Art of Foundery could ever have made to cast their Forms in: In this Manner they suppose the liquidated Earth full of all that perished in it, to have gradually become again a round Lump, precipitated to the Center of the Waters it was
was immersed in: And they say, that after this Subsidence God raised the Earth again above the Waters by breaking the round Orb, and elevating some Parts into Hills, making deep Channels for Rivers and Seas, and thereby draining great Tracts to be dry Land for a new habitable World: And they remark this to be the Reason, why in some Mountains, and Sides of Hills, the Reliques are found to lie in Lines perpendicular, and not, as in other Parts of the Earth, in horizontal Strata (s): These Mountains, they say, were raised up from their flat and recumbent Situation, set as it were on Edge, so as to have what originally was their horizontal Surface now posited, sloping or perpendicular to the Horizon, and accordingly to have their whole Contents in a like Situation. In this Manner we are apt to think ourselves able speculatively to destroy and make a World: But whether in Fact these Things were thus done, must be more than doubted by any one that attends to Moses's History. If the Earth within six Generations of Adam was found to abound in such Ore of Metals, as could employ every Artificer in Brass and Iron, of which we read Tubal-Cain

(s) See Woodward's Theory.
was an early Instructor (t), there can be no conception of the whole Globe's having been at the Flood of so loose and dissoluble a constitution, as that forty Days Rain, and the Waters that came from the great Deep, should altogether melt it away: And if, as an ingenious Friend observed to me in a Conversation upon this Subject, the Dove which Noah sent out, the second Time from the Ark, came to him in the Evening, and lo, in her Mouth was an Olive Leaf plucked off, so Noah knew that the Waters were abated; Trees, some at least, that were before the Flood, stood their Ground, and therefore their Ground was not absolutely washed away from them. Their Summits or Tops of Boughs appeared as the Flood decreased, for the Dove to alight on, and to bear away the Spoils of them.

The World, such as it subsided during the Increase of the Flood, such it appeared again in the Parts where the Ark rested, rising by Degrees out of the Waters: The Summits of Trees upon the Hills, from one of which Noah's Dove pluck'd an Olive Leaf, emerged first; the Tops of Hills became next Visible; the Earth, and what was upon it came gra-

(t) Gen. iv. 22.
dually into Sight, until the Face of the Ground was dry: The Heathen Poet seems to have described this great Event, more suitably to what the Providence of God caused to be the Fact, than our Philosophers: Ovid tells us, that upon the abating of the Flood,

Flumina subsidunt, colles exire videntur,
Surgit Humus: crescent Loca decrescentibus undis;
Postque diem — nudata Cacumina Silvae,
Ostendunt, Limunque tenent in Frondes relision,

The World was restored to the Remains of Mankind, not a new World, created over again, upon a total Dissolution of the former, but a Globe, which, however the Waters left every where sufficient Marks of an Inundation, was in no wise so entirely stripped of its Trees, its Herbs, and all its other Garniture, that the Sons of Noah could not know it to be the same, or could think it absolutely another Earth.

We may well account for all the Phenomena our Naturalists are so full of, without running the Lengths of their Imaginations for a Solution of them. If we consider the Accounts and Effects of many lesser Inundations that have happened in diverse Parts of the World,
WORLD, we may explain Effects, such as are mentioned by the Poet,

Vidi eam, quae quondam fuerat solidissima Tellus
Esse Fretum, vidi factas ex æquore Terras:
Et procul à Pelago concha jacuere marina,
Et certa inventa est in Montibus Anchora summis:
Quodque sit Campus Vallem Decursus Aquarum
Fecit, et Eluvie Mons est deductus in æquor.

Ovid. Met. Lib. 15.

Great Tracts, that were formerly dry Land, may be now in the Sea: And much of what the Waters covered anciently, is in many Parts of the World become dry and habitable Ground: The Shells of Sea-Fish are often seen in Parts very remote from any Mention or Memory of Seas, and ancient Anchors have been found upon the Tops of Mountains: A Flow of Waters have gulle Plains into deep Valleys, and Hills have been washed down, and borne away into the Ocean.

Our own Country might afford many Illustrations of Facts of this Nature. In the Levels of Cambridgeshire, there are many Reasons to think, that there was anciently a Surface that now lies buried some Yards deep under the present Soil: The bottoming of some of their

K 2 Rivers
Rivers shew it (y): And in setting down a Sluice, there has been found, sixteen feet deep, a Smith's Forge, and the Tools thereunto belonging, with several Horse-shoes: At Whittlesey, in that County, in digging thro' the Moor at eight Feet deep, they came, we are told, to a perfect Soil of Sword-Ground or Gras: Timber-Trees of several Kinds are said, in other Places, to lie deeply buried; and in some Parts Skeletons of Fishes, whole and intire, lie many Feet under Ground in a Silt: From all which Appearances our Naturalist inform us, with great Shew of Probability, that some ancient Land-Floods have brought down from the higher Countries, a prodigious Wash of Soil, along with their Waters; that their Waters, not finding a sufficient Outlet to run off with a strong Current, spread over the whole Level the adventitious Earth brought along with them, which in Time hardened and incrusted to a new Surface over the old Ground, covering whatever was overflowed upon the former Lands, and containing the Exuviae of whatever Fishes or Animals were chok'd and buried in the Silt of it. From these lesser Effects of lesser Causes, we may,  

(y) See Dugdale's History of Inbanking.
FALL of MAN.

I think, well trace the greater Effects of greater. If an Inundation of so small a Country, as an inland Level, heaped a Soil over the face of it Yards deep, why might not the universal Deluge of the World, in Places where the Drain from them might let away the Water, but retain the Sediment, lodge vast and mountainous Tracts of adventitious Earth? In which might be buried all the Layers of the Exuviae, which are the noted Curiosities of their Strata, and over which the Earths they were buried in, were at first but wet Mud, loose Mould, gritty Sand, Lome or Marl; little Particles of stony Substance; some of all Aptitudes for all sorts of Accretion, Concoction, and Vegetation, and which have accordingly, in the Maturation of Ages, remained sandy and fabulous, earthy in all Kinds, or become Rocks or Minerals, Veins of Metals, or Quarries of all sorts of Stone, according to the respective Natures of their component Particles and Constitution: The Hills, as the Waters surmounted all, might in many Places, where their Summits were plain and extensive, and the Fall from them but little, have their Tops hugely heaped, and their Sides every way loaded with these Incrustations, and in Countries where a great Fall was open.
open for the Waters from high Hills, and a spacious Outlet for their Currents into the Sea, Mountains of this adventitious Soil might be carried off thro' the Channels of large Rivers, deepned by the Torrents born thro' them, and the Face of the adjacent Lands, scouried indeed of some of its own Surface, might have its Boundaries left much the same after as before such Deluge.

The Depths to which the Labour of Man has, or ever can explore the Earth, are, comparatively speaking, a mere Span; for how little do the deepest Mines approach towards the Center of our Globe? It may probably be true, after all our Naturalists have offered upon these Subjects, that none of the Shells and Exuviae they talk of, such as really are, or have been what they take them for, have ever been found any where in the Earth, but where the Deluge heaped and left the Soil they are found in: In other Parts of the World, wherein the Flood did not make a new Ground, if these Parts were dug and opened to proper Depths, undoubtedly we should find different Layers or Strata of Earth, Quarries of Stones, or Veins of Minerals, such as may have been forming from the Original of Things, but no such Exuviae in these as
F A L L  o f  M A N.

are found in like Beds in the other Places: And where the Exuviae are found to lie perpendicularly, or a-slope, and not in horizontal Lines, I should suspect, that Earthquakes, since the Deluge, may have variously broken up these Places from their deepest Foundations; subverted the old, and made a new Position of huge Fragments of them. And

If thus examining all that has been suggested, we can, after all, find a Situation in the present World so far such as Moses describes, as to have all Appearance of its being the Tract, wherein he marked out the Boundaries of his Land of Eden, and its Garden; I cannot but conceive, that if those Parts were dug up, and explored, Exuviae of the Flood would not be so found in them, as to give us Reason to think otherwise than that the Spot of Ground described by Moses, such as he describes it, has existed both upon the antediluvian and postdiluvian Earth. But let us consider,

II. Whether the Description of Moses does not plainly tell us what were the Marks or Bounds of his Garden of Eden in the first World; and also as plainly, that these Boundaries remained, but had new Names, and were well known in the second: A River, he tells
tells us, went out of Eden to water the Garden, and it was a River of four Heads (b): This was the Run and Streams of the River of Eden, when the Garden was first planted, and the Man put into it: The Words of Moses must have this, they can have no other Intention. But Moses does not rest his Description here, he proceeds to tell us what these Rivers were called, and what Countries they wash’d upon in after Ages: He calls the first of the Rivers Pison, the second Gihon, the third Hiddekel, and the fourth Euphrates (c): And tells us of the first River, that it compasseth the whole Land of Havilah (d), a Country noted for its Gold and precious Stones (e): of the second, that it compasseth the whole Land of Ethiopia, or Cush (f): of the third, that it runs East into Assyria (g): of the fourth, that it is the Euphrates (b). These Names of the River here mentioned by Moses, three of them a

(b) Gen. ii. 10. (c) Ver. 11—14. Moses having told us the Garden was watered by a River from four Heads; proceeds here to make as it were a new Terrar of it, by giving its Streams, and the Countries they wash’d upon, those Names they were called by after the Flood, &c. (d) Gen. ii. 11. (e) Ibid. (f) The Word which we translate Ethiopia is C: in the Hebrew, Gen. ii. 15. See Connect. Sac. & Proph. ii. 2 Vol. i. Book III. p. 166. (g) Gen. ii. 14. (h) Ibid.
least, are not, that I know of, mentioned any where by the prophane Geographers, but the most ancient of these are mere Moderns, comparatively speaking, with regard to the ancient Scripture Geography (i): The Author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus mentions both Pison and Gibon (k), and hints both to have been Rivers, that at particular Seasons of the Year abounded in their Flow of Waters (l), and as not unworthy of being named with the Tigris and Euphrates (m); so that we may think that in his Day they were noted, and in no wise inconsiderable Streams: The Pison, Moses tells us, encompassed the whole Land of Havilab (o); a Country, well known by this Name, from after Abraham's Days (p); and in the Times of Saul (q); altho' not thus called in the antediluvian World; for it must have been thus denominated from its having been planted after the Flood, by Havilab one of the Sons of Joktan (r), or perhaps originally by Havilab a Son of Cush (s): We can find no more of Gibon, than that it compassed the whole Land of Ethiopia, or Land of Cush (t): The

---

(i) Vide quæ post. (k) Ecclus. xxiv. 25, 27. (l) Ibid. (m) Ibid. (a) Gen. ii. ubi sup. (p) Gen. xxv. 18. (q) i Sam. xv. 7. (r) Gen. x. 29. (s) Ver. 7. See Connect. Vol. I. B. III. (t) Gen. ii. ubi sup.
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The Creation and

Country called the Land of Cush, was what the Sons of Cush first planted (w), most probably Babylonia (x), undoubtedly not called the Land of Cush, until after the Flood, when Cush the Son of Ham, and Grandson of Noah, had been an Inhabitant of it. The River Hiddekel was known to Daniel: It was a great River in his Days; one of the Visions he saw, was made to him in the third Year of Cyrus King of Persia, upon the Banks of it (y): The fourth River of Moses's Eden was the Perath, or Euphrates (z), a River so known as to want only to be named, to be sufficiently distinguished from all others: It was called by way of Eminence, The great River, in Abraham's Days (a); again so in like manner by Moses at the Exit out of Egypt (b): It is well known throughout the whole Scriptures by the same Name (c); and the Heathen Geographers are all very large and full in their Accounts of it (d). In this Manner therefore Moses writes his Situation of the Garden of Eden, not as if he thought the Flood had

washed it away, that the Place of it could no where be found; but he remarks what Names the Rivers of it had from after the Times of the Sons of Noab, what Countries they bounded, and he so remarkably observes it to have been situate in the Neighbourhood of the most known River in the World, the River Euphrates; that it must be evident, he had no Thought of placing it in some obscure Corner, which surely he would have done, if he had intended a mere Fiction: And I should apprehend, considering him as describing a real Place, he would have added more, if he had not thought what he wrote clear enough to leave no Doubts, at the Time he wrote, concerning the Situation described by him.

But,

III. The Site of the Garden of Eden, as Mosés describes it, seems to have been well known in the World, both before, and in, and after Mosés Times: The Scriptures are generally concise; every Part confined to the Matter it treats of: And therefore the Garden of Eden being situate beyond the Euphrates, and near the River, upon whose Banks Daniel was, in his Captivity at Babylon, it must at first Sight be obvious, that the Land and Garden of Eden were in the Neighbourhood of
The Creation and of Babylonia: But the History of the Bible, from after Abraham's Days to about the Times of the Captivity, has no Accounts relating to any Thing beyond the Euphrates; and therefore it is no Wonder, if we meet nothing remarkably relating to Places of this Country in all this Interval: But Abraham and Lot came into Canaan, from Haran (e); and before they dwelt in Haran, they had left a further Part of the Country of the Chaldees, they had come from Ur (f): They were not young Men (g) when they left these Parts, but may be well supposed to have been no Strangers to a Country they and their Fathers had for many Generations lived in: We accordingly find them readily agreeing in a material Point concerning the Subject of our Inquiry: They sojournded together in Canaan, between Bethel and Hai; their Flocks and Herds were so large, that they could not conveniently live together, but were now to separate (b); and Lot, we read, chose to live in the Plain of Jordan, because it was every where well watered, even as the Garden of the Lord, and

(e) Gen. xii. 5.  (f) xi. 31.  (g) See Connect. Vol. I. B. 5. Abraham was 70 Years old, when his Father removed from Ur to Haran, and 75 when he came into Canaan.  
(b) Gen. xiii.
like the Land of Egypt (i): Abraham and Lot had been together in Egypt; so that this Country was well known to them (k); and from the whole course of their Travels, it must appear, that they could have seen no Parts of the World so well watered as the Plains of Jordan, except the Lands upon the Waters of the Nile, and the Waters of Babylon: The One they speak of expressly; and the Garden of the Lord in the Country of the other, they agree to, without any further Mention than its Name, as being a Place familiarly known to both of them (l); and the comparing

(i) Gen. xiii. 10. (k) Ver. 1. (l) It may seem to us a great Retrospect, for Abraham to look back for Adam's first Habitation: But if we consider the Length of Mens Lives from Adam to Abraham; Adam lived to see Lamech 50 Years old; see the Table of Antediluvian Lives according to the Hebrew Chronology. Connect. Vol. I. B. I. Lamech appears to have been a Person, that had much considered the State of his Forefathers, the Labours they had from the Ground, in God's having cursed it. He therefore knew what had been the Error of Adam's Life, and was enabled to assure his Contemporaries, upon the Birth of his Son Noah, that this Child of his should obtain them a Relief of their Difficulties, see Gen. v. 29. Lamech lived to within five Years of the Flood, see the Table above-cited. Shem, the Son of Noah, was 100 Years old two Years after the Flood, see Gen. xi. 10. and therefore was born 97 Years before the Beginning of the Flood, and 92 Years before the Death of his Grandfather Lamech. Shem lived 502 Years after the Flood, see Gen. xi. 10. i.e. the Flood happening A. M. 1656. See Connect. Vol. I. B. I. Shem lived to A. M. 2158. Abraham was born A. M. 2308, see Connect. Vol. I. B. 5. so that Shem lived to see Abraham 150 Years old. Abraham therefore might con vene
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comparing the Plains of Jordan with the Spot of Ground watered by these Rivers said by Moses to be the Rivers of Eden, was so just a Sentiment, that the Writer of the Book of Ecclesiasticus afterwards agreed to its being true: The Waters of Tigris, and Pison, and Geon, and Euphrates, are by him, as Abraham and Lot long before agreed them, very properly compared with the Waters of Jordan (m).

But if it may be doubted whether by the Garden of the Lord, mentioned by Lot to Abraham, was meant the Garden of Eden, described by Moses; let us consider how far this Place's retaining this very Name in the Countries where it was situate, down to the Captivity, may be of Weight to clear this Matter. Ezekiel, in his Prophecy against Tyre, whose Merchants traded to all Parts of the Earth, observes of them, that they had been at the Garden of God (n): Where now was the Place so called? in what Land? He plainly tells us,

---

(m) Eccles. xxiv. ubi sup. (n) Ezek, xxviii. 15.
it was in Eden (o): I would observe what the Merchandize was, which the Tyrians brought thence; it was, the Prophet observes, many precious Stones, and amongst them the Onyx Stone, and Gold (p); the very Commodities which Moses tells us were the Produce of this Country (q): Shall we doubt where the Prophet imagined the Situation of this Country of Eden, and this Garden of God? We may see he placed it near to Babylon, and amongst the Domains of the Assyrian Empire: Eden seems to have been beyond Haran and Cam-thab, near to Shebah, and Asbur (r), all which well agrees with Daniel’s being upon the Banks of the River Hiddekel, one of Moses’s Rivers of Eden, when he was of the Children of the Captivity of Babylon (s): These are very directing Hints, of which if any one will say they do not amount to a Demonstration, I shall not herein contend with him; but I think at the same Time, I may venture to offer it to be seriously considered, whether they do not concur more reasonably to induce us to admit, that the Garden of God, in Eden, was a Place, well known by that Name, to

---

(o) Ezek. xxviii. 13.  (p) Ibid.  (q) Gen. ii. 11, 12.  
(r) Ezek. xcvii. 23.  (s) Dan. ubi sup.  See iii. & v. Chapters.  

Abraham
Abraham and Lot, and many Ages after by the Jews in the Days of their Captivity, and known to be situate not very far from the Waters of Babylon, and in a Situation very well agreeing to Moses's Description of it, than all the Suggestions, in Comparison very trifling, that can be offered to cause us to think otherwise. Let us

IV. Consider, what Moses's Description of the Land and Garden of Eden precisely is. And if we attend carefully to Moses's Narration, we shall find it plainly to offer us the following Particulars. 1. That a River went out of Eden and watered the Garden (t): Eden then was the Country higher up the Stream than the Garden; for the River ran down from Eden to the Garden. 2. And from thence it was parted (u): After the River had run past, i.e. at, or below the farther End of the Garden, it was parted: The Meaning of the Words is sufficiently clear: The River, after it came out of the Land of Eden, was one single or undivided Stream to and all along the Garden; but when it had passed the Garden, then it divided, and branched into more Streams. But 3. what next follows seems

(t) Gen. ii. 10.  (u) Ibid.
more confused: It became into four Heads (w): Heads of Rivers are the Springs or Origin from whence they have their Waters: So that no say of Rivers, that the Current of their stream proceeds, and becomes into four Heads, or comes to four Heads seems to be an Inversion of Nature, a kind of describing them to run upwards, to their Fountains, when on the contrary all Streams must run down from, and not to or into their Heads. The Hebrew Particle used by Moses, and which we translate into, is indeed [Le] (x), which generally signifies to, or unto; but the Translators ought to have observed, that it sometimes also signifies from, and so it ought to have been rendered in this Place. In the Book of Chronicles we read, when Solomon was made King, he, and all the Congregation with him, went [לֹ֗בֵֽמְחָד] to the high Place that was at Gibeon; for there was the Tabernacle of the Congregation of God, which Moses the Servant of the Lord had made in the Wilderness (y): Here the Particle Le is prefixed to Amah, and signifies to or unto the high Place: but in the 13th Verse we are told, Then

---

(w) Gen. ii. 10. (x) הֵלִיבָּד Heb. Text. (y) 2 Chron.
Solomon came [ר𫞩לנ] (the same Prefix and Word is again used): Our English Version says, from his Journey to the high Place, that was at Gibeon to Jerusalem: But the Hebrew Text has no Words for from his Journey: The Vulgar Latin therefore renders the Passage more truly, Venit ergo Solomon ab excelso Gibeon in Jerusalem: The Septuagint say, Ἐλθεῖς Σαλομών ὐπὸ βαρέα τῆς ἐν Γαζαλῶν εἰς Ἰεροσολύμη: The Fact was: Solomon had been at the high Place at Gibeon, he was now to return back again to Jerusalem, and this the Hebrew Text expresses by, Then Solomon came [labbamah] from the high Place that was at Gibeon, to Jerusalem: Here the Particle [ל] prefixed to Bamah signifies from, tho' it is a plain, that in the 3d Verse prefixed in like manner to the same Word, it signifies to or unto, i.e. this Particle in the Hebrew Tongue may have either of these Significations, and the necessary Sense of the Place must guide us when to give it the one, and when the other: and under this Direction in the Text of Moses which we are considering, it must signify from and not into: The Words of Moses are, [אֶל hajab le arbanah Rashi] (z) they should be
FALL of MAN.

And it was from four Heads. This then is the express Account Moses gives of the River of Eden. It came from Eden to water the Garden; from thence it parted; from Eden downwards to the Garden it was but one Stream; beyond the Garden it parted, and branched into more Streams: Moses does not say of these, how many they were, nor what their Courses were, where they ran to; but returns to give Account of the One Stream that ran down to the Garden, and this he tells us was made by the Confluence of four Rivers, afterwards named by him, Pison, Gibon, Hiddekel and Euphrates (a): We are,

V. To consider whether there have not happened such Alterations of the Face of the Country and Rivers of Moses’s Eden since his Times, as may make it impossible to trace every Mark of the Garden or Land of Eden as he bounded it, but to inquire nevertheless, how far we may find sufficient Marks of the Situation of it.

(a) We may here observe of Dr. Burnet, that he most egregiously mislook Moses’s Expression. He asks insulting, Dic ubi in Terris — quattuor Fluvii nascuntur ab uno Fonte, Archæol. p. 287, 288. In his English Work: Where are these four Rivers in our Continent, that come from one Head? Theory of the Earth, Vol. I. B. II. c 7. He would infinicate Moses to have been guilty of supposing an Absurdity: But he did not understand Moses: The Absurdity is his own.
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It was evidently near to or upon the Euphrates (b), upon the Hiddekel (c), a River not far from ancient Babylon (d): It was in the Country, where the mighty Empires of Assyria had their Seat, their Height of Grandeur and their Ruin: And we can hardly think of the amazing Works performed by the Powers that ruled in these Countries; in their Alterations of the Courses of Rivers; building and removing even great Cities; all which are since become no better than a vast Tract of tremendous Ruins, without seeing that it must be impossible to think of finding in these Parts any Face of Things, to a minute Degree such as Moses described, Ages before what has been their Glory in the Variety of all the Works of Art, and Labours of Empire which adorn’d them, and which are now their Desolation.

The two great Rivers of these Countries are the Tigris and the Euphrates: These have been Rivers always noted by all Geographers, that have wrote of these Parts of the World: The Euphrates is not doubted to have been Moses’s Perath, and we may well allow the Tigris to have been his Hiddekel, considering it remarked to have been called by Daniel the

(b) Gen. ii. ubi sup. (c) Ibid. (d) Dan. x, ubi. sup.
great River (e), the eminent Title of the Eu-
phrates (f), and not likely to be given to any
leffer Stream, not competently to be compared
with it. But can we offer, as much to find
out what River was the Gibon or the Pison of
Moses? I confess I think not. The Me-
mony of both these Rivers seems to have been
distingibly kept up, to the Times of the Author
of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, who, according
to Dean Prideaux, wrote in Hebrew about
250 Years before Christ (g) what his Grand-
son above a Century later turned into Greek :
This Writer appears to refer to all the four (i)
Rivers mentioned by Moses as well known in
his Times, and known to have their extraor-
dinary Flows, like to the River Jordan, an-
nually; but the Geographical Writers we have
now extant, are but Moderns in comparison of
the Age of even this Author, none of them
so old by above two hundred Years, and some
that are often cited as old Writers, falling short
of him many Centuries. A vast Change

(e) Daniel x. ubi sup. (f) Gen. xv. ubi sup. (g) Prideaux
Conneft. Part. II. B. V. Anno ante Christum 132. At this time
the learned Dean says it was translated into Greek: It was, he
says, originally written in Hebrew by the Author of it, about
the Time that Onias, the second of that Name, was High
Priest at Jerusalem, which was about Anno ante Christum 250.
See his Conneft. Part II. B. II. (i) Eclclus. xxiv. 25—27.
began to be made in the Face of this Country about a Century before the Writing of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, when Seleucus built Seleucia on the Tigris, to the desolating old Babylon (b): What the Rivers of this Country were before the Province where Babylon had stood began to become an Heap of deserted Ruins, might be recollected when the Writer of Ecclesiasticus made mention of them; but be lost in a good deal of Confusion, before the earliest Writers of Geography after his Times, whose Works are now extant, made their Inquiries into the State of the World. For I think Strabo's is the most ancient Work, at least of any Figure, we have of this Kind, and this was not compos'd before the Time of Tiberius. If Dionysius Periegetes was about the same Age, Pliny and Ptolomy were much later, and the Nubian Geography still more modern. And it is observable, that whatever more ancient Writers Strabo, or any that fol- lowed him, had to collect from, even these had Difficulties about the Waters of Babylon: They had no clear Accounts what were the original ancient Rivers that might here concur, and what were artificial Lakes, Streams, and

(b) See Pridaux Conoct. Part I. B. VIII.
Pazars, cut from and into the *Euphrates*, for
the Ornament or Convenience of that superb,
and beyond Comparison great and populous
City (i): In the Confusion hence arising, and
in Length of Time growing inexplicable, we
may reasonably allow all Knowledge of the
true Channels of the Rivers *Pison* and *Gibbon*
to have been lost, and we should greatly trifle
were we now to pretend to a Curiosity to find
them: The material Point is, whether we
have not enough left, indisputably certain, to
lead us to think *Moses*’s Description not such
a Romance as our modern *Allegoristes* would ima-
gine.

The Garden of *Eden* bordered upon a River
made up of a Confluence of four Streams, one
of which was the *Euphrates*, the other the
*Hiddekel* (k): The Question is, Is there a
Place in the World where these two Rivers
and other Streams join? I answer, There is,
viz. at the South-east Extent of the Province

---

(i) Qualis Facies *Euphratis* fuerit, priusquam manu facitis
Fossis et Alveis ditterheretur, difficile est delineare: Nam et
ille Fossae antiquiores plerque sunt, quam Graeci, a quibus et
Nature Rerum, aut ab hominibus gellarum Memoriam habemus,
ad scribendum et Historias componendas, aut Res nature tradendas se componuerunt. Cellarum Geogr. Lib. 3. c. 16. *Strabo*
makes many Complaints of the Incorrectness of the *Greek* Ge-
ographers in many Parts of his Work. (k) Gen. ii. ubi. sup.
of the now Irak Arabi of the Turkish Empire, which was the ancient Chaldaea; at the Place where the Turks now have a Fortification called Korna, at which Place the Hiddekel or Tigris and Euphrates, with some other large Streams, fall in and make one River. Let us inquire further, Do these Rivers thus join continue to run in one Stream, as Moses mentions his River of Eden to have run down from Eden to the Garden of God? I answer, They run in one undivided Channel down to E fora: From hence they are parted, and in Streams navigable even by large Ships, different Channels into the Persian Gulf. Inspection of the Map I have here inserted will exhibit what I offer in the clearest View.

Whether these Rivers were so large as Moses's Time as they now are, I do not pretend to say; tho' it is observable, that Hiddekel was a great River in Daniel's Days (1) and the Euphrates (m) was reputed eminently so in the Times of Abraham; and it was the Tale of Moses's Days to esteem a Ground well watered, which lay, as the Land of Egypt did, upon the Confiness of a great and overflowing River, so as that a Man might water it with his
A Plan of the present Channels of the Rivers Hiddekel or Tigris and Euphrates exhibiting the Site of Moses Garden and River of Eden.
not (n), might trace out Furrows, or
nels, that might be filled with the Flow
and convey Water to the Plants, where-
he might desire to design Lines for its
stance: But leaving the Reader to con-
und determine, as he thinks fit, whether
first World, there were any Snows-
ing, in their Season, the Hills or Moun-
whence these Rivers take their Rise,
there were not, whether their Flow-
t not be lefs, and their Channels not so
and deep in Adam's Days, as they be-
afterwards, when greater Currents made
Way thro' them; I might remark, that
Augmentation of their Waters may, in
Hand of Providence, have been one
s of keeping their Channels open and
ven even until now, and likely to continue
to the End of the World.

e Course of the Euphrates is to be traced
oted Writers of Geography: And it is
ly to be seen, in all the Tracts of the
try it passes thro', that in no Point, but
one, I have mentioned, it can be found
ome to a Confluence with other Rivers, to

Deut. xvi. 10. Thus Ezekiel hints a Vine so planted in
Soil by great Waters, that it might be watered by the
ws of her Plantation. Ezek. xvii. 7.
make one Stream as *Moses* describes; and to part again, before it runs into the Sea. And if, as I measure it from *Korna* to *Bassora*, be not above 60 Miles, we bring our Inquiry after the earthly Paradise within a narrow Compass, and however inconsiderately some may be disposed to ridicule the Inquiry, we may reasonably conclude we cannot be far from the Spot which was the Garden of *Eden*, anywhere in the Confiness of the Flow of the River between *Korna* and *Bassora*.

**CHAP. IX.**

Conceiving the Temptation that happened unto Eve from the Serpent: and concerning her and Adam's eating of the forbidden Tree.

We left Adam and Eve in the Garden of *Eden*: The Day after their Creation was a Sabbath; to be employed in considering the Bounty and Goodness of their Creator; what Expectations he had given them; what Duties injoined them, and how they might perform them: And it is most unnatural to think, that when this Day was over, and they began to employ themselves in what God had appointed them to do, namely, to dress its Garden.
Garden and to keep it, they should go out to their Work not desirous to see and consider the Creation of God, and fully purposing to revere and obey him, in every thing he had said, or should farther speak to them. Dr. Bur- net supposes, that the Temptation, which they submitted to, befell them instantly on the very Day of their Creation (p): But it is observ- able, that, altho’ the Narration of Mofès is very concise,

Semper ad Eventum festinat —— Hor.

although he has related to us only a few Events, upon which all the whole Affairs of the first World turned; and relates them in their Or- der as they were done, omitting all that was intermediate between the Particulars recorded by him; yet the Intervals of Time between the Facts recorded by him, must have been filled up in a Manner reasonably agreeing to the Nature of the Things related, and

the Character of the Persons concerned in them.

Both a just Writer, and a judicious Reader,

Reddere Personae scit convenientia cuique

Hor.

will know how to say, and where it is not necessary to be expressed, how to think what is suitable to every Character: But it is hard to think of God, that he should permit a Temptation, of so great Consequence, to break forth upon our first Parents, before they had had Time to form any Sort of Thoughts of the Things about them: And we give Adam and Eve no Character at all, if we imagine, that, whilst the Voice of God, strictly charg- ing them not to eat of the Tree, had scarce ceased speaking to them, they would eat, because they heard a Serpent say they might safely do it. If Moses had expressly told us, that they thus instantly fell into the Sin which became their Ruin, he had, I think, laid before us a great Rock of Offence against his Narration: For to suppose, that as soon as God gave the Prohibition, Adam and Eve would immediately transgress it, implies not only a Want absolutely of all Consideration in our first Parents, but something incredibly prone not.
not to regard him, who only had shewed him-
sel proper to be regarded by them: But
Dr. Burnet takes up the Sentiment only that
he may tragically complain of Moses Nara-
tion (q): Had not this Bias possessed him, he
would have seen, that, notwithstanding any
Thing said by Moses, many Days might in-
tervene between Adam and Eve’s Creation,
and their breaking the Commandment of
God.

Our English Poet took a View of the Sub-
ject in a better Temper and Disposition: And
accordingly, tho’ what he supposes is a mere
Fiction of his own; not at all warranted by
Moses, or suggested by any inspired Writer;
nor do I think it in Fact true; yet I would
observe, it seemed natural to him, to imagine
the Angel Gabriel to have spent half a Day
with Adam and Eve, after the Night in which
he represents Eve to have had a troublesome
Dream (r), and that the Temptation happened

(q) Intra unius Diei spatium hae omnia confecta est quibus magna et multiformia Negotia. Sed ardeo dolore, cum tentillo Tem-
pe rem omnia inversa et perturbata videor, totamque Rerum naturam
sixtam compossum et adornatum ante primum solis occasum, ad Inte-
ritum ruere et deorsum. Mane Diei Deus dixit, Omnia esse bona:
ufusque omnia sunt execrabilia. Quam fluxa est Rerum crea-
torum Gloria! Opus elaboratum per sex Dies, idque omnipotenti
(r) See Milton’s Paradisa Lost, Book V. &c.

the
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the Day after the Angel left them (s); He
tells us, that on the Day the Angel visited
them, they had in the Morning said,

Their Orisons each Morning duly paid
In various Style. — (t)

which implies his conceiving them to have had
diverse Mornings, in which they had diversi-
ﬁed their Devotions: I cannot tell how any
one that will think reasonably upon the sub-
ject, can be satisﬁed in so shocking a View of
it, as Dr. Burnet sets before us: But, as I be-
fore hinted, it is obvious to see what milled
him, namely, his Disposition to represen:
Moses’s Narration to intimate, that the Works
of God’s inﬁnite Wisdom displayed for six
Days together in creating and forming a won-
derful System of Things in the Fabric of a
World, were all ruin’d and undone by a low
Reptile, a Serpent, in as few Hours(u): The
Reﬂexion is so offensive, that if some Strange
Perversion has not taken away our Hearts, it
must check us to consider, whether what is
thus said was indeed thus done: And we shall
be easily hence led to remark, that the Ruin

(s) Paradise Lost, Book IX. (t) Ibid. Book V. ver. 14;
(u) Burnet, sup. citat.
that happened was not so absurdly precipitate as our Author represents it.

Our first Parents went out daily to the Care of their Garden, and made their Observations of the Things, that occurred to them: They named the living Creatures as they found Opportunities of seeing and considering them: And upon the Serpent's coming in their Way, and being observed by them, he in an human Voice spake unto Eve (w): They were now not such Novices, as not to have remarked that no other Creature could thus speak, which occasioned them to think, what is recorded, that the Serpent was more subtil than any Beast of the Field which the Lord had made (x): Had the Serpent's speaking to them been so early in the Beginning of their Life, as to be before they had made Observations of the other Creatures, they would have had no Notion of the Serpent's being herein superior to other Animals; for they might have expected, that all other Animals might have spoken to them in like manner: Many Days therefore may reasonably be hence inferred to have passed between their Creation and the Serpent's thus speaking to them; as many as we can judge

(w) Gen. iii. 1.  (x) Ibid.
must have intervened, before they could know in the general concerning the living Creatures, that none of them, the Serpent only excepted, had any Power to speak to them: But we ought to remark, that they were not as yet Masters of so much Science, as to know, that thus to speak could not be within the natural Powers of a Brute Creature, for it gave them neither Fear nor Amazement: Had they apprehended the Serpent’s speaking, to have been an Incident miraculous and unnatural, they would, as Moses did, when he saw the Bush burned with Fire, and was not consumed (y), have turned aside to see this great Sight: They would have been greatly confounded at what could be the Meaning of so unnatural a Prodigy: But, as Moses represents, they heard what was said to them, as undisturbed and unmoved as they would have been by any other new, but ordinary Incident, that could have come under their Observation; so agreeably hereto we ought to fix the Time of Eve’s being tempted: It was not until she and Adam had observed in the general of the Animal Creation, that none of them had the Gift of Speech, and they could not have

(y) Exod. iii. 3.
observed this of the several Species of Creatures in the World, in a very few Days. It happened, before they knew it to be a miraculous Thing for an Animal to speak, and therefore it unquestionably did happen early in their Lives (z).

Moses calls the Serpent Ῥῆν, Nachasf (a): It is the general Word for a Serpent used throughout the old Testament, and was perhaps the original Name which Adam gave this Animal, if we make Allowance for some Variation of pronouncing the Word, after

(z) Synellus cites some Minutes of the Book of Genesis which suppose seven Years to have passed, before the Transgression. The Passage cited by Synellus is in these Words, under the Title of Ἐξ τῶν Κυριακῶν Γενέσεως: Τὸ ἐγείροντο ἦτε σαρίγνη [Ἀδήμ], καὶ τὸ γηδόν ἐξερήσαμη τῷ ἁγιάσσω, ἐς φυσίν, µὴ ἔκαµψεν; ἀπὸ τῆς παράγεσις τῷ ἁγιασμῷ, ἐς τὴν ἐπτυκτή τῶν Πλέρων. Synellus, p. 8. What may be the Authority or Antiquity of this Fragment, or whether it was originally written in a Language more ancient than its present Greek, I cannot say, but by its mentioning the Pliades, I should think it in no Language to have been as old as Moses's Times: For however early Astrisms, or Combinations of Plurality of Stars were formed, as they certainly were very early, for we have mention of such in the Book of Job, yet Moses hinting nothing like them in his Books, I think we must look for this Astronomy in Times later than his Days. This Citation then can be no Authority to warrant our saying seven Years to have passed before Adam's Transgression; tho' the Reason of Things will compel us to allow, that a Competent Time must have passed, before our first Parents could know enough to be able to kindle in their Heart even a Conceit of desiring to be wise, or a Notion of becoming so, without or in opposition to their Maker. (a) ὑερ.
Words became of more Syllables than one (b) The Word signifies an Augur, Diviner, or Foreteller of Things to come (c): It appears to have been Adam’s Manner in naming Things, to consider some Particular observed of them, and from that to name them: Thus knowing Eve to have been made out of him, himself being Aisb (d), Man, he called her Aishab (e), which we render Woman. And thus he afterwards gave her another Name, and called her Chaiab, or Chevah, Eve; as soon as he was told she was to bear Children, and be the Mother of all [Chai] of all Living (f); of all their Descendents who were to derive Life from them: So here the Serpent in his speaking, foretelling that they should have their Eyes opened, and be as Gods (g), Adam called him the Diviner, or Foreteller of what was to come; [Nachash]: If this may be admitted, it will further hint Adam to have lived some Time before the Temptation; for in the first Instants of Life, before he had had any Kind of Practice both of Eyes and Un
d(1) See Connect. Vol. I. Book II. (c) The Verb ḫīh, from which the Word denoting the Serpent is derived, signifies when it is used in the Old Testament, Auguratus est, Augustum fecit, divinavit, ominatus est: certas Conjecturas habuit. (d) Gen. ii. 23. See Connect. Vol. II. B. IX. (e) Gen. ii.; (f) Gen. iii. 20. (g) Gen. iii. 5.
standing, to consider the Difference between seeing and knowing immediate Objects, and considering and pronouncing Things that afterwards should be, he would not have been able in any wise to give the Serpent a Name implying such a considered Sentiment concerning him.

Milton represents Eve to have been alone, without Adam present with her, when the Serpent spake to her (b): But we ought to observe, that Moses does not say this; nor is there any Thing any where hinted by the sacred Writers, which may oblige us to admit it. Milton's Design was to make

Ex nolo fictum carmen —— Hor.

Milton took the Fact, as far as Moses related it, as the Ground of his Poem; but ornamented it his own way, in a Variety of Episodes, such as he thought might naturally coincide with what Moses had related, and have the Uses, both of edifying as well as entertaining his Reader. And he has no where in his Performance work'd up a Scene more natural, than what he represents of the Vanity of Eve to desire to work apart, alone by her-

(b) Paradise Lost, Book IX.
The Creation and

self; of the Manner of the Temptation, and the Success of it; of her Address to Adam after she had eaten of the forbidden Fruit; of his seeing better than she had done, the Ruin she was fallen into; the fond, but rash Resolution he had, rather to perish with her, than to live without her; the turbulent Scenes of Passion and Disgust, of mutual Accusations and Refsentments that soon arose, when both of them were become guilty; elegantly expressing, how surely there is in the being Partakers in Sin, what will not satisfy but disturb the Soul: But however Milton may have elegantly represented these Things; if we would truly judge of the Subject, as Moses relates it, we must distinguish, that all this is Milton's Imagination, and not Moses's History: Moses does not hint that Eve had to go any where from the Place where she had eaten, to carry of the Fruit of the Tree to her Husband: But she took of the Fruit of the Tree and did eat, and gave also unto her Husband with her (hb), and he did eat. The Point treated proceeds without any Discontinuance: Her Husband was with her at the Time she eat: She eat and reached to him, and he partook of

(hb) Gen. iii. 6.
what she had taken (i), and eat also. The Serpent indeed spake to Eve only, and she only replied to him: She admitted his Temptation, and added a Sentiment of her own to strengthen it: The Serpent told her she should in eating become wise: She had no Fear of being over-wise, tho' the Danger threatened was, that she should therein destroy her self, but professed herself to see, that the Tree was good for Food, and that it was pleasant to the Eyes, and a Tree to be desired to make one wise; she considered not, not knowing, that there could be no Wisdom, nor Understanding, nor Counsel against God: And Adam, we read, hearkned unto the Voice of his Wife (k). Thus far we may say Adam was not deceived, in the Words of the Apostle (l), not meaning as the Poet intimates, that Adam had superior Sense and Judgment beyond Eve, absolutely to have rejected the Temptation, if after she had eaten, and was thereby ruined, he had not rather chose to die with her than to live without her (m); for this is entirely Milton's Fiction:

(i) If she had carried Fruit to her Husband, he not being upon the Spot, to eat at the same Time with her, this would have required other Words, than those used by Moses, to express it.
(k) Gen. iii. 6—17. (l) 1 Tim. ii. 14. (m) Parad. Lost, B. IX. ver. 896, &c.
But the Woman being deceived was in the transgression: The Serpent thro' his Subtlety deceived Eve (n). The Words spoken by the Serpent were all the Subtlety they knew of him: These took the Imagination of Eve first: Adam was first formed, then Eve (o), but Adam was not deceived, the Apostle means Adam was not deceived first: Here Eve unhappily took the Preheeminence, and by what she added to what the Serpent had said, led her Husband to be deceived also. This I take to be the true Meaning of what the Scriptures declare to us upon the Subject. But it will be said, There are much greater Points, than what I have mentioned, that ought here to be well explained; as,

I. How is it possible that a Serpent should speak, as Moses supposes? I answer: We have to clear a Judgment of the natural Capacity and Abilities of the Brute-Creation, that I may be allowed to say, 1. That the Serpent could not, of himself, be able to speak the Words, which Moses relates to have come from him. But, 2. The Tongue of the Serpent might be so vibrated, if some superior invisible Agent moved it, as to utter the Sound.

(n) 1 Tim. ii. 14. 2 Cor. xi. 3. (o) 1 Tim. ubi sup.
or Words, coming from, or out of its Mouth, which Moses tells us Eve heard from him. This, I think, must readily be allowed by any one who will consider, how the Tongue of Balaam's Ass was moved, speaking in Man's Voice to forbid the Madness of that Prophet (p): But, 3. I would add here, what I considered more at large upon that Case (q); that there can be no Reason to imagine, that the Serpent here speaking to Eve, any more than the Ass there speaking to Balaam, understood the Meaning of any one Word spoken by him: Both their Tongues were moved, otherwise, than of themselves they would have moved them: They were so moved, that Sounds proceeded from them, such as were significant Words, to the Person who heard them, and understood such Words when spoken, but they were Sounds of no Meaning to the Serpent, or to the Ass, both of whom I apprehend to have spoken without any Kind of Apprehension of the Intention of the Sounds that came from them: In all which that there was a Miracle is plain; that the Thing was impossible, cannot reasonably be asserted; unless we can assert, that the Air could not, by

the Power of any Agent whatsoever, be, or that Motion, to cause what Words such Agent designed to be founded by it. But, 4. Was it then God, who miraculously caused the Tongue of the Serpent to utter the Words spoken? In the Case of Balaam, the Text tells us, that the (rr) Lord opened the Mouth of the Ass: Shall we here say, the Lord God opened the Mouth of the Serpent in like Manner? I answer, No: The deceiving our first Parents by a Miracle, cannot be deemed a Work worthy of God: It looks more suitable to belong to him, whom our New Testament denominates that old Serpent called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole World (r): The Fallhoods spoken by the Serpent unto Eve seem natural enough to come from him, who when he speaketh a Lye, speaketh of his own, he being the original Author of Fallhood; for he is a Liar, and the Father of it (s), and our blessed Saviour hints, that he was the real Person who deceived Eve; for he was the Murderer from the Beginning (t): It was by him, that Death came into the World (u):
Such Intimations therefore have we, that it was not God, but Satan or the Devil, who spake unto our first Parents by the Serpent: But the Question that will here occur is, 5. Can we then say, that there is any Power in the Universe, except the Power of Him who is God over all blessed for ever, that can make Alteration of the natural Faculties of any Creature, cause a mere Serpent to be heard speaking in Man’s Voice, whatever he may purpose to have spoken: If we say there may be any such Power, it will be queried, whether, in supposing it, we do not set up two opposite and contending Powers, each able, beyond our being capable to distinguish their Limitations, to create or to give Things new Natures contrary to their true ones? and do we not hereby lay a Foundation for a great Confusion of Sentiment concerning God, and his Power over the World?

I answer, 1. I apprehend here was no Change made of the Nature of the Serpent in his speaking to Eve from what in every Respect he was before: He was the same Reptile; went upon his Belly, even then as a Serpent now does (w); had the same Mouth, and Tongue the Instru-

(w): Vide quae posita.
ment of Speech as a Serpent still uses: His Tongue was indeed moved in a Way he had not been accustomed to move it, and made such Sounds as he indeed never made before nor after: And Adam and Eve who heard him thus speak, and understood what he spake, but did not yet know that it was not natural for a Serpent to have this Faculty, readily apprehended from it, as indeed they well might, not knowing by what Power he spake to them, that he was a Creature of greater Sagacity, than all other Creatures of the animal World; all the rest appearing to them to be dumb, and not capable of such Conversation: But all this while, I cannot conceive, that the Serpent was at all wiser when he was speaking, than whilst he was dumb: For, as the Vibrations of Tongue which gave the Sounds he uttered, were as involuntary and unconceived by him, as any mechanical or convulsive Motions can be; the Serpent knew no more what his Tongue had uttered, than if the Words spoken had been blown across him by a Wind, that was not of him at all. 

2. That Satan, the Devil, that spiritual Being, who in the new Testament is stiled the Prince of the Air, may have a Power to make in the Air, by the Tongue of any Bird, Beast, or Animal, Sounds of
of significant Words, if God shall think fit to permit it, does not, as far as I conceive, contradict any Principle of true Philosophy; any more, than that he might inflict (x) on Job, or may inflict on any of us, Boils, Sickness, or many other Evils, if Permission is given to him: But herein the Dependance of all Powers upon God is preserved and acknowledged: Herein we guard against all Notions of two independent Principles, the one Good and the other Evil; in that we shew in all that has been done by the great Agent of Evil, that no one Thing was ever done by him, but just so far as God permitted him to go, but no further. Of our great Adversary, who seduced our first Parents, let us consider all that was done by him: Did he speak to them from Heaven, in a Voice, as God spake to them? No: Why did he not? He was not per-

(x) The Author of the Book of Samuel, had this Notion of the Agency of the Wicked One, that he could do nothing, but under the Permission and Control of God, and accordingly says of David's numbring the People, that God moved him to do it, 2 Sam. xxiv. when in Fact the Inflation came immediately, not from God, but from Satan, see 1 Chron. xxi. 1. But the Author of the Book of Samuel intended to establish it as an universal Truth, that God was supreme, that nothing could be done without him. Had God not permitted, Satan herein could have done nothing; and this, and nothing but this, was intended in his saying, that he, the Lord, moved David to number the People.
mitted to speak in this manner. Did he appear to them in Person; in a Similitude that might carry Dignity, and create himself Respect? No; any Thing of this sort was not allowed him. Did he make some noble and respectable Creature of the World to propose his Insinuations? This he was not suffered to do. Did he create even a Serpent, to have it suit the Intention he designed to serve by it? This can in no wise be pretended. He was allowed indeed to use a Creature of this very low Species, but not to use it, but at a Time, when the Persons tempted by him, did not so know the Nature of a Serpent, as to think it at all a miraculous Thing, to hear one speaking: And when he had Liberty to use this Animal, was he able to make it speak elegantly, what great Parts and Capacity would have invented upon the Subject? Not at all—What Milton has intimated to us may abundantly shew a Field that might have been (y)

(y) Milton carries on the Temptation in a fine Process of Reasoning, supposed by him to have been artfully used by the Serpent; any Part of which must have been infallibly too much for our first Parents, in the State of their Knowledge of the Reason of Things, to be able to gainsay or contradict: But all this is Milton's Fancy: Moses in no wise represents them to have been thus tempted above what they were able: See Milton, B.IX. ver. 532—732.
Fall of Man.
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expatiated in, if the Tempter had been suffered to argue copiously upon the Point proposed: But the Fact was, the Tempter was only permitted to bring, from the Mouth of his Agent, little more than a bare Negation of what had been affirmed by the Voice of God: In the Event indeed, little as he said, he said enough; for he succeeded: But all this while an impartial Examiner must allow, that no Temptation was suffered to befall our first Parents that could have had Weight with them, unless they gave up the great Principle, without which nothing could be wise or strong in them; namely, that they were indeed to obey God: They had heard him, that made them, say they should not eat: They heard a Serpent, a low and creeping Creature, vauntly beneath themselves, say they might eat: They apprehended nothing wonderful in this Animal’s Speaking, so that no Thought of a Miracle had any Weight with them: What then determined them? We are told Adam hearkened to the Voice of his Wife (z); and it is plainly to be seen of Eve, that tho’ the Serpent was the Occasion of her falling, yet her judging for herself, contrary to the Direction

(z) Gen. iii. 17.
of God, that as the Tree was pleasant to the Sight, good for Food, so it was to be desired to make one wife; this was that which made the Temptation too hard for her: But the Apostle tells us, the Serpent beguiled Eve by his subtility (a): Is the Expression here used by the Apostle absolutely coinciding with what I have been saying? I answer, Perfectly so: The Apostle only represented a plain and real Fact, as it was most evidently done: And it is a very proper Way thus to speak Things to be done as they are evidently seen to be, without always entering to the Bottom into the true Springs and Causes of them. Moses relates, that the Serpent was subtle and said—his Speaking was the Subtlety, remarked of him: From his speaking to her, Eve received Sentiments which became a Deceit to her: What now could be said with more Propriety of Diction, than that the Serpent, who really and truly spake to her, beguiled her: The Apostle was no more obliged to discuss here, whether the Serpent spake sua, or nicely distinguishing non sua verba; whether the Subtlety used by him was of his own natural Sagacity, or of another's Suggestion:

(a) 2 Cor. xi. 3.
or whether the Persons beguiled by him did not add Sentiments of their own to his Intimations, than if his Converts had suffered what he was afraid of, namely, their being corrupted from the Simplicity of the Gospel by any one speaking to them Things contrary thereto, he must, if he had charged the Person so speaking with having corrupted them, have strictly determined whether what such Person said to them was his own Contrivance, or only Words dictated to him by some other, and whether no Improvement of what he said came into the Minds of those who were seduced by him. This might be a Matter proper to be considered, if the Nature of the Guilt of him who had deceived them, was the Subject inquired into; but was in no wise necessary, if the Fact only was to be related, viz. by whom they had been deceived. The Serpent beguiled Eve thro’ his Subtlety (b): The Apostle barely recognizes a Fact, really done, as Moses had recorded it: The Words which Eve had heard from the Serpent, were all she knew of the Serpent’s Subtlety: And therefore we carry the Apostle’s Words to a View further than he designed, if we suppose

(b) 2 Cor. xi. 3.
him to be deciding from whom originally, and by what manner of Reasoning the Temptation offered to Eve, proceeded; he only reminds us from whose Mouth the Words actually came, which ministr’d the Temptation that was her Ruin. But the next Point may have greater Difficulties: For,

II. Can it be conceived, that the infinitely good God——, the God, not of all Power only, but of all Truth and all Rectitude, should admit, as it were, the Throne of Iniquity to have Fellowship with him, to frame Mischief by a Law (c)? Can we think, that God

(c) Psal. xciv. 20. There are Passages in the Book of Psalms, which, tho’ we may inattentively overlook them, hint at and refute ancient absurd and erroneous Notions, which obtained amongst the Sages of the World, who were not in the true Religion. One of these Sentiments recorded by Theopompus to have been Tenet of the ancient Magi, that αὐτοὶ ἀνθρώποι, καὶ τὰ υἱὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιλατισμοὶ ἡμῶν. See Diogen. Laert. &c. in Procem. seems to be considered and refuted in Psal. xlix. in what the Psalmist offers, in a due Observation, how wise Men die, likewise the Fool, and its brutishe Person perish, and leave their Wealth to others; contrary to what he intimates to be the inward Thought of some, who seem to have opined, that, their Houses should continue for ever, and their Dwelling-places to all Generations, and they call the Lands after their own Names—— &c. In like Manner; as its Power of God and of Satan in the Affairs of the World appears to have been a Subject not unthought of, in and before David’s Times, see Job i. & ii. 2 Sam. xxiv. compar’d with 1 Cor. xiv. above cited; I cannot determine, whether the Throne of Iniquity, mentioned by the Psalmist, and what is said of it, had a View only to wicked earthly Rulers, as the Commentators seem to
God would make a Law intrinsically of no Importance, and then suffer a Throne of Wickedness, a Power or Principality of Darkness, the Devil or any of his Angels to frame Mischiefs from it; to contrive to have it broken, only to bring thereby Labour and Sorrow, Sin and Misery and Death unto Men? Can we think that God, having made a Rank of Creatures of a lower Degree of Light and Understanding, but such, that if not tempted by some other, they would have persevered in their Obedience to him, and been happy, he should permit a wicked Spirit, of higher Abilities than they, to attack these Creatures in a Way, in which, without his Permission, he could not have had Access to them, and thereby beguile and insnare them into Ruin? Should we not rather think it more reasonable, that if God gave our first Parents such a Law as has been mentioned, and if being left to themselves they would not have swerved from it, he should not have permitted any Agent to have herein perverted them? The Objection
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The Creation and has in it a Variety, that ought to be considered in several Parts, if we would fully and truly answer it.

C H A P. X.

The Objection last stated considered and refuted.

The Objection above stated will, I think, require us to consider,

I. Whether it can be reasonable that our first Parents should be permitted to be tempted, by any Being of a superior Intelligence above themselves, in any Manner whatsoever: But if we determine this in the Negative, how greatly may we err, not seeing sufficiently into the Creation of God.

He, who thro' vast Immensity can pierce,
See Worlds on Worlds compose one Universe;
Observe how System into System runs,
What other Planets, and what other Suns,
What vary'd Being peoples ev'ry Star,
May tell why Heav'n made all Things as they are.
But of this Frame, the Bearings and the Tis,
The strong Connections, nice Dependencies; Pop.

The Knowledge of them may not lie within our Reach, and we may therefore determine
very wrong of much of what we can only partially consider in forming our Judgment:

Respecting Man, whatever Wrong we call, May, must be right, as relative to all. Pope.

The Circle of our own Agency wonderfully operating over and by the Powers of the Creatures beneath us, tho' in all they do, they have an Intention of their own distinct from us, may reasonably argue to us, that,

When the proud Steed shall know why Man restrains His fiery Course, or drives him o'er the Plains; Then shall Man's Pride and Dulness comprehend His Action's, Passion's, Being's, Use and End: Why doing, suff'ring, check'd, impell'd—; Pope.

An Analogy to one another runs thro' the Powers of all the Intelligences of the Creation: The Universe is but one Whole in the Hand of God: We are not independent Principals unconnected unto others: Rather, the Variety of the Spheres of Action of all the innumerable Orders of intelligent Spirits, that have Being amongst the Works of the supreme God, are to have, under his Direction and Control, their Line, their Weight and Measure, to affect and be affected by one another: And the Event of all is to afford a true Judg-
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ment of all; when all the Evil that may hence have come in, shall have had its Course, and be cast out, and the Sum of all be found the greatest possible Good of the Whole to the Creator's Glory.

In human Works, tho' labour'd on with Pain,
A thousand Movements scarce one Purpose gain,
In God's, one single can its End produce,
Yet serves to second too some other Use:
So Man, who here seems Principal alone,
Perhaps acts second to some Sphere unknown.
Touched some Wheel, or verges to some Goal,
'Tis but a Part we see, and not a Whole. Pop.

We in no wise see the Scene of the Demerit of apostate Spirits; nor how far it may be requisite they should be permitted to fill up their own Measure, within just and wise Limitations (and such we find the Tempter of Eve greatly restrained in) to answer the great Ends of the infinite and eternal Providence. Sin indeed and Death have hereby come into our present State, and Death must reign upon all, until the State we are in be accomplished: But let us

Wait the great Teacher Death —— Pop.

and we shall in Time be able,
To look thro' Nature up to Nature's God;
Pursue the Chain, which links th' immense Design,
Joins Heav'n and Earth, and mortal and divine.
Pope.

We shall then see beyond what we are now able to conceive, that all that has befallen us will display a most amazing Height, and Depth, and Length, and Breadth of the Wisdom, and Power, and Goodness, and Glory of Him, who will hence bring those of us, who shall be meet to be Partakers of it (d), thro' the one Man, whom he has ordained, Jesus Christ, to the Kingdom prepared for Man from the Foundation of the World (e), and the Wicked, whether they have been Men or Angels, shall go to their own Place. But,

II. It may be said: What if it was fit, and might answer great Ends, that an Evil Spirit of Intelligence higher than they, should be permitted to tempt our first Parents? Is there not a natural Impropriety in supposing the particular Access of such a Spirit to them to have been as Moses describes, and the Temptation to have been of the sort recorded by him? To imagine that an intellectual Spirit, not visible to our first Parents, should speak to them,

(d) Col. i. 12. (e) Acts xvii. 31. Matt. xxv. 34.
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not in a Voice that might have been thought his own; but by the Tongue of a Serpent seen by them, and this, to persuade them to do a Thing in itself neither good nor evil, to eat of the Fruit of a Tree, only because God had bidden them not to eat of it; is there any Thing, that bears a natural Face or Appearance in this Procedure? has it the Colour of a rational Endeavour to bring moral Evil into the World? If our Adversary the Devil had been permitted, as he is a Spirit, to have had a spiritual Access to the Minds of our first Parents, to put into them evil Thoughts and evil Desires, to fill them by degrees with all Uncleanliness, to bring them to Destruction both of Body and Soul—; This would have seemed a reasonable Procedure for such a Spirit of Darkness: He has for Ages thus worked, and even still worketh thus in the Children of Disobedience (f). But to suppose the Almighty to have set as it were a Spell over our first Parents, to require them not to eat of a particular Tree; to have determined, that whilst they would keep within this Injunction, no Evil Spirit should get within them to hum them; but that if they would be seduced to

(f) Eph. ii. 2.
break thro' it, neither they nor their Posterity should ever after be able to be Proof against the Evil One ——; does this look to be the Way of the Supreme Understanding, according to the Reason and Nature of Things, and therefore to be the Way of God unto Man? I have, I think, given this Objection all the Strength it is capable of, I am sure I have endeavoured it: If I knew how to find Words that would express it more advantageously, I would use them; for I take it, in Truth, to be the whole Hinge upon which all that is to be said against the Religion of the Bible can turn: Let us now attentively consider how far we can answer it.

And here the material Point to be considered is; Whether the particular manner of the Temptation objected to, was not in Reality exactly suited to the Oeconomy, or Manner and Measure in which the Creator had made Man? God, the divine Workmaster, could not but so order his Dispensations, as to have them suited to the Measure and Nature of his Works they were designed for: Such as he made Man, as to such he dispensed to him; that Man,

Qualis ab incepto procederet. —— Hor. N 4 might
might have the Progress and Procedure of his Being exactly suited, to what were his original native Powers and Endowments. Had God made Man such a Being, as that a true and right Intelligence of the Nature of Things would at all Times instantly have appeared upon his Mind to give him a right Judgment of all Things (a), the Natural Way of Temptation to such a Being, might have been to admit a perverted Spirit to try his better Judgment, to draw him if he could from his own right Sentiments into Evil: But if God at first made Man with lessor Powers, such a Permission would have submitted Man to an unequal Conflict indeed: However reasonable it may be that the Wicked One may be permitted to attempt to catch away that which is sown in our Hearts (b), when there is that sown, so as that we need not lose it, if we will preserve it; it cannot follow, that it could be fit, that he should be admitted before any Thing was sown in the Heart of Man, to possess the Heart, to make it naturally impossible to have any good Thing find a Ground in it. Had God made Man at first, such as

(a) Si tales nos Natura genuisset, ut eam ipsam interiaret spicere, eademque optima Duce cursum Vitae conficeret. — Cic. Tusc. Quest. I. 3.  
(b) Matt. xiii. 19.
our Rationalists assert, left absolutely to the Guidance of natural Light, to discover thereby the Duties of his Life; expecting no Service from him, but what his own Reason would suggest; it would seem unnatural, I might say, a Contradiction to assert, that before Man had done, or even thought Good or Evil, God should interpose to give him a Law, which no Reason of his own could, without God's interposing, have laid before him, and to have him tempted by the Voice of a Serpent to break this Law, absolutely to defeat all he might otherwise have done, in pursuing what his natural Powers would have led him to see to be the Reason, and reasonable Conduct of his Life: But if, on the contrary, we may establish from what is written by Moses, that God did not create Man with this Beam of actual Understanding, but gave him only the Information of his Senses, and a Capacity of Mind, free, as not being under an over-ruling Instinct, and yet not having the Power to be so perfect, as to want no external Information; and that God designed, wherever Man should want it, to give him this Information, by making him to hear his Voice from Heaven; requiring him to have Faith in him; to believe and obey whatever
whatever he should thus hear from his Maker; it is absolutely consistent with this Oeconomy, that he might give Man, thus far, but no farther endowed, such a Command as Moses mentions, to be to him both a Sign of what he was to expect from God, for the Direction of his Life, and an inviolate Standard and Remembrancer, to pay unto God, in every Thing he should command, the Obedience of Faith: And the Faith of Man in believing God, being thus to come of hearing (c), it could not be meet, to have the Temptation to disobey come to him otherwise than by hearing; that unless he would choose to pervert himself, no other should have a more intimate Admittance to corrupt him: And if the Temptation were thus to come to him only by hearing, surely we must allow, that what he heard from God and all that he heard to tempt him from obeying God, must appear, in all the Circumstances of both, to have been very sufficiently distinguished, to leave our first Parents without Excuse, for their not strictly adhering to obey the one and reject the other. And thus the whole apparent Reasonableness, seeming Contrariety to the Reason of Things.

(c) Rom. x. 17.
in Moses Relation, taken to be historically true, depends upon whether it be Fact that God did at first create Man to guide his own Life as himself should devise, left absolutely to himself to find out the Reason of the Duties he should investigate and practise; or whether God made Man to hear his Voice, in order to be directed by it; to receive whatever God should by external Revelation make known to him; to make this the Rule and Guide of his Actions: And this therefore is the Point so material, so really the Whole of Man, that I hope I do not digress from the Intention of this Undertaking, if I now and then repeatedly endeavour to prove that this ought to have been the ruling Principle of our first Parents in their Lives. But,

It is asked, was the Prohibition a sort of Spell, that whilst our first Parents observed it, so preserved them, that the Evil One could have, although he was a Spirit, no Approach to hurt them, nor they any Fall into Evil, so their Undoing: But, that as soon as they had broke thro’ this Charm, they became so able to all Evil, from both without and from within, that henceforth All Men inevitably would sin, and a Freedom from Guilt would be now no more? I answer, the Dressing up
up a Proposition in Terms of *Ridicule* is not a just and reasonable Way to discover what is true, or to detect what is false (d): It is raising an inconsiderate Contempt, of what ought to be brought to the Bar of a more deliberate Examination, to be there approved or rejected, as a right and well-weighed Judgment of Things may appear for or against it. And if, instead of using frivolous Words upon the Occasion, which prove nothing, we take the Point to be here considered, under a due Inquiry, we shall see the Prohibition given to our first Parents, as *Moses* relates it, to be no *Spell* or *Charm*, but to be what was naturally both necessary and sufficient for them: Our first Parents were made *living Souls*; they had outward Perception and inward Understanding, but both only in such a Degree, that if in using them, they would admit the Voice of God to direct them, wherever they should see they wanted Direction, hereby they would be kept *in the Hand of God’s Counsel*, not to fall into any Error to their Undoing: Their Knowledge of Life, and Experience of their Being, could as yet not shew them their moral Situation: How suitable then was it for

(d) See Mr. Brown’s very excellent Essay on Ridicule.
them to have some one plain Inhibition to teach them that they were not to do any Thing whatever, which God should think fit by his express Voice to prohibit? And as God was pleased to add hereto his express Commands, injoining them the Duties of their Lives (e), what now could they have wanted, if they would truly have (f) made this their Wisdom, this their Understanding, to keep and observe all that the Lord their God should declare to them? The natural Event of their herein preserving themselves, could be no other, than that using all the Powers of their own Minds, wherein soever God did not think fit specially to interpose; but strictly conforming to whatever he directed, Man, however made with lower Powers of Reason than Angels, might gradually have advanced, ripening himself, and guided by his Creator unto all Truth: But when instead of thus proceeding, our first Parents deviated from obeying the Voice of God, to hearken to the Words of a lower Speaker, and to break the

(e) God's adding to the Prohibition of not eating of the Tree, this Command for the relative Duty of Man and Wife, Gen. ii. 24. shews in what Manner he would have been pleased to inform them, as Time and the Incidents of their Lives should require in other their moral Duties. (f) See Deut. iv. 6.
Commandment of him that made them, because it seemed to be pleasant to their Eyes to do so, and a Thing to be desired to make them wise; what else did they herein, but take themselves out of the Hand of God's Counsel, into the Hands of their own? And what could this possibly lead to, unless they had been created with greater actual Knowledge, or with the Powers of a more unerring Understanding, but to all Mistake, and by Degrees unto every evil Work.

Another Part of the Objection is, that if our first Parents had not been tempted from without by a Deceiver, they would not have broken the Commandment of their God: But we see Things superficially indeed, if we do not see enough to apprize us, that if we say this in our Heart, we certainly do not inquire wisely into this Matter. That in Fact, a Serpent speaking in Man's Voice, occasioned in our first Parents (whilst they two were the All of Mankind as yet in the World) a Sentiment, that what God had prohibited was both pleasant, and desirable in the Reason of the Thing to be done, to make them wise, is indeed true: And that this Sentiment was too hard for them: But it can in no wise follow, that, had it not been thus incidentally occasioned,
FALL of MAN.

fioned, earlier perhaps, than otherwise, they might have thought of it, it would never have had Rise in the Heart of Man: If we consider the Nature of it, no Thought here took hold of them, but what is common to Man (g); for it has in all Ages been a captivating Point in human Theory, that what seems to us contrary to what we surmise to be Wisdom, may not be a real Revelation from God: And if the breaking the Commandment of the forbidden Tree had not happened, until our first Parents had gradually formed their Hearts more deliberately to reject it; how know we, that a Cogitation would not have been raised in them, which could never be changed (b) in the Way and Manner in which it must be ever fit, that God should govern, not absolutely to force the moral World: Or that had it not taken Effect, until the Sons of Men were many, until Mankind were multiplied upon the Earth, can we say, whether the Fall of Mankind would, in the Measure and the Manner of it, have been so suited to the great and deep Purpose in the hidden Counsel of God, to bring Man out of all his Evil at length to Salvation (i)? The Nature

(g) See Conneø, Vol. III. B. XI. (b) Wîâd. xii. 10. (i) See Eph. i. 4—12. iii. 11. Rom. v. 12—19.

of
of Virtùe or Vice in moral Agents must re-
quire, that it be really in our own Chōice to
do the one or the other; but the Times and
Seasons when the Incidents shall happen, that
may give us an Opportunity of standing or
falling by our own Choice, are best left unto
God, to have them ministred to us as he sees
to be most proper: The Jews were permitted
to complete our Saviour’s Death, whilst yet
they protested, that if he would have come
down from the Cross, they would have be-
lieved in him (k): Whether they really would
or no, we cannot say: But if God knew they
would not, it was a Mercy to them that he
let their Transgression be finished, whilst yet
it might be prayed for (l): That Mankind
would not so govern that Spark of Reason
wherewith God had endowed them, as not
through it to break away from the Depen-
dance which they ought to have on him, was
undoubtedly foreseen by God; before the
Worlds were; which, duly considered, will
open to us to think, that if we could be per-
mitted to see the Whole of the Counsel of
God, we might find, that in permitting Se
and Death to come by one Man into the

World, as is related by Moses, he best knew how to link and connect his Design of bringing, by the Obedience of One, Mankind unto Salvation.

But there remains one Suggestion more, which I think a few Observations may very clearly refute. It will be said, What if our first Parents did break this positive Command concerning the Tree, of which no Reason could tell them it was intrinsically good or evil; will it follow, that they therefore would have disobeyed God in any one moral Law, that he would have been pleased to make known to them? We do not see, altho' Adam and Eve did not keep inviolate the Observance not to eat of the Tree; that they proceeded, or had any Desire to think of breaking the Law concerning Man and Wife which God declared to them (m), might they not have been as punctual in observing every moral Law for the Duties of their Lives, whenever such Laws should have been made known to them? I answer, We may judge very rashly in this great Matter, and in all we thus say of it only darken the Counsels of the most High, by Words without Knowledge (n): The

---

(m) Gen. ii. 24. ut sup. (n) Job xxxviii. 2.
Israelites, I question not, believed, that both they and their Posterity would keep their solemn Resolution (o) to serve their own God, and not to be corrupted to go after the Idols of Canaan, although they did not so strictly expel the Canaanites out of their Land, as (p) God had commanded them: But the Event soon shewed their Imagination to be but vain; God, who sees into us and sees through us, knows best what Observances may be necessary to exercise us to our Duties, and could best judge, whether, whenever our first Parents would go beyond the Restraint he had prescribed them, they would not therein begin a Cogitation, that would naturally fill apace every Measure of Error, and heap it up, to run over into their Bosom. The Principle intended to be established by the Command concerning the Tree, was, as I have said, that our first Parents, having no actual Science of Life, should proceed in the Hand, under the Direction of God's Counsel, to make it their Wisdom and Understanding, whatsoever God should injoin them, strictly to do thereafter; And the Consequence of rejecting to be under

(o) Josh. xxiv. 21—25. (p) See Judges i. Numb. iii: 52, 55.
this Direction, to follow instead thereof what seemed agreeable in their own Eyes, and desirable in their own Judgment, might naturally plant in them the Root, from whence have come all the Shoots, that have been the great Perversion of human Life; which duly considered, must lead us, not to think of the positive Command given our first Parents, that it was a Thing indifferent or of no real Moment; rather, to use the Words of St. Paul, equally applicable to this the Beginning of Revealed Religion, as to the End and Completion of it, God, in giving our first Parents the Law of the prohibited Tree, abounded towards them in all Wisdom and Prudence (q), to give them, such Creatures as he had made them, a Law, which observed as it ought, would in its natural Event have been their Life and Salvation,

We may speculate at Random as we please upon the Subject; but if what has been Fact is at all to guide us, we cannot but observe that this Beginning of Error, being once admitted, notwithstanding God's immediately proceeding to denounce and ascertain the terrible Punishment he had declared should be

(q) Eph. i. 8.
the Wages of it, yet the Error itself did not cease, although it could not be again committed in the same Fact that was Adam's Transgression; rather it grew in the World luxuriant and abounded. We read of one Person in the first World, that most eminently walked with God (r), in the Obedience of Faith: Enoch so herein pleased God as to be translated (s); others there were who were found faithful in their Generations, in what had been revealed to them (t); but in the general the Principle of doing what seemed right in their own Eyes, appears to have so greatly prevailed, that Lamech, a Descendant from Cain, some Centuries before Adam died (u), thought so differently from what God had most expressly commanded concerning Man and Wife (w), that he introduced Polygamy (x): And the World in general, in little more than the then Age, and half an Age of a Man, was become so corrupt in Man's departing from God and his Laws (y), to follow the Imag...
nations of their own Hearts (z), that to pre-
serve Right and Truth from perishing from
off the Face of the Earth, it became the
Wisdom of God, eight Persons only saved,
to destroy the World.

C H A P. XI.
The immediate Consequences of our first Parents
casting of the forbidden Tree, and the Sen-
tence which God passed upon the Serpent upon
Account of their Transgression.

No sooner had our first Parents eat of the
Tree forbidden them, but we are told
their Eyes were opened, and they knew they
were naked (a): We cannot but here ask,
what Sentiments could our first Parents receive
from what they had done, to affect them in
this Manner? And it is amazing how many
Writers have most absurdly trifled upon this
Topic (b).

(z) Gen. v. 5. Job. xxii. 17. (a) Gen. iii. 7. (b) Videtur
ingenerasse, nefcio quo succo, vel quâ alia Virtute, novos sen-
fus Pudoris et Modestiae, vel Nuditatis ut dicitur; quâs nul-
lum Pudorem habuissent in Rebus Venereis ante Lapsum, Hodie
tamen in Rebus illiusmodi innocuos maximè comitatur Pudor.
If we would know truly what Mosēs here intended, we must carefully attend to what he himself has expressed. And here let us observe, that Mosēs does not say, that what the Serpent had promised our first Parents was fulfilled to them: They understood the Serpent to tell them that some great Advantage of Sight would be given them (e): But the Event certainly did not answer their Expectations: The Serpent had said unto them, Your Eyes shall be opened: Mosēs observes that their Eyes were opened; so indeed they were, according to a true Meaning of Mosēs’s Expression, tho’ not at all according to what they hoped for: A Fact related by a Heathen Historian, may shew us the Manner of speaking here made use of by Mosēs, in the Case of our first Parents.

When the Lacedaemonians consulted the Oracle at Delphos, whether they should make War upon the Arcadians, Herodotus tells us, that the Oracle answered them,

Δωσω τοι Τενεων πουσικέοτον ορχήσας,
Και καλὸν ὑπὲρον γενίν διαμυησόμενος.

That he would give them to march over th'
Country of the Tegeans, and to measure its fair Plains with a Line (f): The Lacedæmonians expected that they should over-run and absolutely conquer Tegea, and divide and set out their Lots in that Country as they pleased: But the Event that happened was, the Lacedæmonians were beaten and taken Prisoners by the Tegeans, and were employed by them as their Slaves, to measure their Lands and to labour in them; And, says the Historian, measured with their Line the Tegean Plains: A Remark severe, but true in Fact, though not in the Manner it had been expected. And thus was Moses's Observation upon our first Parents, their Eyes were indeed opened in a true Sense of Moses's Expression, but in a Manner very different from what they had conceived would have befallen them.

What Moses here intended to say was the real Event which happened to our first Parents, must be gathered from the Use he makes elsewhere of the Expression, Eyes being opened. We find it remarkably used in the Case of Hagar in the Wilderness of Beer-sheba (g): She had wandered there with her Son Ishmael (h): The Water she had brought with

---

(f) Herodot. Lib. i. c. 66.  (g) Gen. xxiii.  (h) Ver. 14.
her in a Bottle was all spent, and both she and her Child were in Danger of perishing for Want of a Supply —. But Moses tells us, the Lord opened her Eyes, and she saw a Well (k): We are not to suppose a Miracle here done; the Well is not said at this Time to have been created; undoubtedly it was in the same Place before she saw it, as it was afterwards; and her Eyes might be in reality as open before she saw the Well, as when she espied it: But she now turned her Eyes to the Place where the Well was, and saw what before she had not observed, and this, in Moses's Expression, was having her Eyes opened. And in this Sense Moses writes it of our first Parents: After eating of the Tree, their Eyes were opened; they saw a Circumstance of their Condition, which before they had not remarked, and which led them to a Thought as new to them, They knew that they were naked (l).

The Question now is, In what Sense did they know themselves to be naked? And here both later Commentators and many ancient and grave Writers, have, as I above hinted, immodestly trifled. It is generally thought, that

Nakedness now first became a Shame: But Moses in no wise gives any such Intimation: He tells us of a very different Passion here raised by it; it gave them Fear: Adam was not ashamed, but afraid because he was naked, and therefore hid himself (m): And it is obvious to see the just Reason he had for this Sense of his Condition: The Word which we render naked, has indeed in the general this its most obvious Signification; but it is used in other Senses by a sort of Metaphor in many Places of the Scriptures: And in the Place before us particularly we ought to take it, as it is used in the Book of Job: Hell, says that Writer, is [Narom] naked before him, and Destruction has no Covering (n): i.e. Hell and Destruction lie open, not concealed from the Eye, nor in any way covered from the Vengeance of God: This is a Sense of the Place, just and elegant, free of the shameful Folly-ries which Writers, not carefully considering, have ingrafted upon it. Adam and Eve had taken upon them, not to rest satisfied in what God had commanded, but to begin to think for themselves, contrary to what God had said to them. And their Thoughts taking this

(m) Gen. iii. vii.  
(n) Job xxvi. 6.
Turn, one Sentiment brought on another: They were now to be wife for themselves, without, nay against their Maker: And how natural was it for them, going in the Paths of this Theory, to be reminded to consider, how to guard against him, who had severely threatened what they had committed? Alas! their Eyes now told them they had no Covering; neither could they think how to find a Shelter, that might protect them: However they attempted to do the best they could, They sewed Fig-leaves together, and made themselves Aprons (o).

They made themselves Aprons. — Here again Moses is supposed to say, what no one would have any Thought of, unless he imagined our first Parents had Reasons of Shame to cover some particular Parts of their Bodies: But Moses hints nothing like it: His Words are, [Vajithperu Naleb Teenab, Vejanasbu lehem Chaggroth] (p): We may observe, that the

---

(o) Gen. iii. 7.
(p) Vellimenta circumligata sibi et fecerunt Fides solitarum i.e. i.e. i.e.

As the Text may be thus construed, Dr. Burnet’s low Ridicule of the Beginning of the Art of a Seamstress, of their having neither Thread or Needle, is without Foundation. En! say
Word which we render Leaves, is in the Text not plural but singular: And I apprehend, that both here, and in some other Places of Scripture, it should be rendred not Leaves, but a Foliature, or Intertwining of Leaves, and that the whole Paragraph should be thus translated; They wreathed together a Foliature of the Fig-tree, and made themselves Enwrappments; i.e. they wrapped themselves up in them: What they wanted was to hide themselves from God: An Apron, or a Girdle about their Wastes would in no wise answer this Purpose, and therefore they could have no Thought of so partial a Covering; but the Casing themselves up within Boughs full of Leaves, to look like Trees, and thereby to escape his Observation—, this might be a Sentiment not too weak for a first Thought of Persons, who, when they found their Investments inconvenient or insufficient, were still so ignorant and foolish before God, as to conceive, that behind the Trees of the Garden, they might possibly be hid from him.

*Primordia Artis Sutoriae: Sed unde illis Acus, unde Filum?* Archæol. p. 293. There was no Want of any Instruments to try to intwine tender Boughs into one another, and it cannot but look a very natural Thought for them to attempt a Work of this Nature.
What Moses therefore relates, thus explained, is highly natural: They had broke the Commandment of the Lord their God: It now came into their Minds, How shall we escape his Observation? Will he not soon see us? and when he sees us, will he not punish? Every Thought of themselves now was a new Terror: Their Eyes were opened, and they saw they had no Cover: Their Hearts were alarmed, they considered they had nothing wherewith they might protect themselves against him: Whither now could they fly from his Presence? or what should they do to ward off his Displeasure? Had they now known the World, and the Hiding-places that are therein, they would have gone into the Dens and Rocks of the Mountains, and said to the Mountains and Rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the Face of Him, and from his Wrath to come (q): But they had as yet been little farther than the Compass of their Garden, and knew of no thicker Covert than the Leaves and Shelter of their Trees; with some of these therefore they tried to wrap up and disguise themselves, as well as they could, and herein they seem to have amused themselves.

(q) Rev. vi. 16.
until towards the Evening of the Day: They then heard the Voice of God moving from one Part of the Garden to the other (r): This struck them with a fresh Confusion: Their Fears came now upon them like an armed Man: They were not able to abide in the Way of the Voice of God, but gat themselves into the closest Thicket of Trees they could find, and here they hoped to lie hid: But the Voice of God, calling now more peremptorily, Adam, Where art thou? darted Terrors quite through him; he could no longer support a Thought that he was concealed, but came forth confessing, that he was afraid, because he was naked, and had therefore hid himself (s): The Transaction is a most natural Progress of conscious Guilt, and the Words Adam now spake, are as natural, and a deep Humiliation of himself before God. They are, as if he had said, I was afraid, and hid myself; but I see I am naked, I have no Cover from thine Eye; I know also I am further naked, unarmed against, having nothing to oppose to, to protect me from thy Power; I submit, Lord, do unto me as thou wilt.

(r) Gen. iii, 8—10. (s) Ver. 10.
It is very obvious to remark, how our Translators and Commentators came to have a Notion of Adam and Eve's Shame for their Nakedness. In the last Verse of the second Chapter of Genesis we have this Observation, that, They were both naked, the Man and his Wife, and were not ashamed: It being here observed, that no Shame attended their being naked before they eat of the Tree, it was concluded, that a Shame of being naked entred with Sin into the World: But I would hereupon offer to the Reader's Consideration,

1. That what is expressed in this 25th Verse of the second Chapter of Genesis, is an Observation that has no Manner of Reference and Connection to any Thing before said, that might give Occasion for it, nor does it any way lead to introduce what follows it in beginning the next Chapter. It seems, in its obvious Sense, quite an independent Remark, that might indeed be made by any one that considered, that at that Time they were not clothed: But had Mankind never worn Clothes at all, nothing was as yet said that would have occasioned such an Observation. Every Thing that Moses had related, or proceeded to relate, would have been as full and complete without it as with it.

2. There
2. There are several Observations of this Sort, in many Parts of the Old Testament, and in this Book of Genesis particularly, which the Learned agree not to have been originally in the Text, but to have been Hints wrote (f) in the Margin of ancient Copies, as Observations from or upon the Text, and that Transcribers from Copies so wrote upon, not carefully distinguishing, took them into the Text; that such Transcribers, not being modern, but more ancient than any printed Copies, or indeed any Manuscript Bibles now extant, we may now have no Copies that have not in the Text these Insertions. If indeed the Meaning of the Verse we are treating was, that Adam and Eve were not ashamed at their wearing no Clothing, and I could have any Warrant from any one Copy for omitting it, I should be inclined to think it an Insertion of this Nature. But,

3. I apprehend the Truth to be, that this Verse was not intended at all to speak of their being naked as to Clothing. As the Word naked has metaphorical Senses in some Passages of the Old Testament; so also has the

Word, which we here translate ashamed (t); it is far from signifying in all Places being affected with what we call the Passion of Shame; it often means being confounded or destroyed. The Word here used is a Termination of the Verb [Bعوض, ישל], and this is the Verb used by Isaiah, where recollecting how God had destroyed the Kings of Canaan before the Israelites, and laid waste their fenced Cities into ruinous Heaps; he tells us, that their Inhabitants were of small Power; they were dismayed, [שבר, ועسبوع], he does not here mean that they literally had the Passion of Shame affecting them, but were confounded; were, as he proceeds, as the Grass of the Field, and as the green Herb, as the Grass on the House Tops, and as Corn blasted before it is grown up (u). And this was Moses's Meaning in the Word here used; a Meaning of it perfectly coinciding with what afterwards appeared to be his Sentiment of Man's standing personally to hear the Voice of God. Moses elsewhere speaks it to be no ordinary Mercy, that a Man should hear the Voice of God and live (w), and therefore he might here learn

(t) The Hebrew Text is ישבבונינא יקרא. (u) 2 Kings xix. 3. Isaiah xxxvii. 26. (w) See Deut. iv. 33.
us this Observation concerning our first Parents; that God spake to them, and that, altho' they stood *naked* before him, *i.e.* in his more immediate Presence under no Coverture, *nigh to* him, to hear the Voice of his Words talking to them, they experienced what Moses always reputed a very extraordinary Thing, that *God did talk with Man,* and they were not *confounded,* but lived 

Thus far we have no Difficulty: We are now to consider, what the Voice of God said to *Adam* upon his confessing himself thus naked before him: *And he [i.e. God] said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the Tree, whereof I commanded thee, that thou shouldest not eat* (y)? The Words point very clearly to what I have explained to be the Meaning of *Adam's* thinking himself *naked:* Had Adam intended by that Expression that he was ashamed to appear before God, upon Account of his having no Clothes, here would have been something said hugely rising, and no way pertinent to any Circumstance of his Condition: But take him to mean by *naked, not covered* from the Sight of God, and *without any Defence or Protection* 

---

(x) Deut. v. 24. (y) Gen. iii 11.
against his Power, and the Reply from God here is, as if it had been said, You say you are without Cover from, and without Defence against me; have you never been so before me until now? Have you hitherto wanted any Cover or Defence? Who tells you, that you now want them? I never threatened you, but for one Thing; art thou afraid? Hast thou done that One Thing to be afraid of me? This now speaks itself to be the Reason and Explanation of what God was pleased to say to Adam, and refers evidently to what Adam had done to occasion this being said to him. Adam hereupon denied not, but confessed his Guilt: The Woman, said he, whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the Tree, and I did eat (z). The Woman being interrogated, answered without Evasion, The Serpent beguiled me, and I did eat (a). All this, I think, can want no Comment; we may therefore proceed to examine the Sentence which God hereupon passed upon the Offenders.

And here we read, that the Lord God said unto the Serpent: Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all Cattle, and above every Beast of the Field: Upon thy Belly shalt thou
Fall of Man

Go, and Dust shalt thou eat all the Days of thy Life (b). The Objectors hereupon ask—Shall we say, that the Nature of the Serpent was now changed? that, before the Serpent had done what he is here made criminal for, he was an Animal that walked upright (c), and moved in a Manner very different from that he now moves in: Were his whole Make and Shape and Powers of moving, upon the Sentence now passed upon him, totally altered? If they were not, he was before this Sentence just the same Reptile, as he was after it; and if so, then no Punishment was inflicted: If we say God changed his Make and Form, and degraded him to a low Reptile for the Mischief he had done; how can this be (d)? For, where there was no Fault, how should God punish? If, as I have observed, the Words which came to Eve from the
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Mouth of the Serpent, were in Reality not the Serpent's Words; were Words he in no wise intended, nor had any Sense of, or Meaning in them (c), wherein could the Serpent be criminal? and if he was not criminal, why should he be so execrated and degraded? They who oppose our understanding Moses in a literal Sense, seem here to triumph, and I cannot say, that those who answer them do speak so clearly as might be wished in this Particular. The true Fact in what had been done, undoubtedly was, that the Serpent had been no moral Agent in the Affair, had really done nothing; for he was but a mere Tool, an Instrument in the Use of an Agent invisible; and therefore cannot be thought either accountable, or deserving to be punished for any Thing that had happened; so that we ought carefully to examine the Words of Moses, whether he says any Thing that intimates God to have really called the Serpent here to any Account, or inflicted any Punishment upon him.

It is indeed observable, that not our English only, but all Versions of the Text of Moses, do render the Place, as if great Guilt was im-

(c) Vide quæ sup.
puted to the Serpent, and Punishment thereupon denounced against him; but if the Reader be apprised how the Hebrew Particle Ci in the Text, which we translate Because, ought to have been rendred not Because, but Although, the Passage will appear to have a very different Meaning (f).

The Words used by Moses are [ci nasbitha zaath (g)], we render them Because thou hast done this: The Particle [Ci] has often this Signification, and possibly may be thus taken where Adam is spoken to in the 17th Verse, [Ci šamanta (b)] Because thou hast hearkened unto the Voice of thy Wife ——: But it must be rendred otherwise in other Places. In Gen. viii. 21. The Lord God said, I will not curse the Ground any more for Man’s sake; for, [Ci] the Imagination of Man’s Heart is evil from his Youth: Had we here rendred the Particle [Ci] Because, we had darkened the Sense extremely; the translating it for does not in- tirely clear it: The Words truly rendred are as follows, I will not curse the Ground any more—although the Imagination of Man’s Heart

(f) The Arabic Version seems to specify, that the Serpent designedly beguiled Eve; cum feceris hoc sietenter in the Latin Version of the Place. But how groundless is this Fancy? (g) רעייתו צאתי (b) Gen iii. 17.
is evil — : This is the true Meaning of the Words: God was pleased to determine not to curse the Ground any more, although the Wickedness of Man was such as deserved its being again cursed. And thus again in another Place: Israel stretched out his right Hand, and laid it upon Ephraim’s Head, who was the younger, but he laid his left Hand upon Manassch’s Head; [ci] we say for Manassch was the first-born (i): Surely the Reason intimated is a little confused: But if we rendred the Words, although Manassch was the first-born, the Expression would be just and significant. And thus in Psal. xxv. Pardon mine Iniquity, [ci] we say, for it is great (k); we should better express the Psalmist’s Meaning, if we translated it, although it is great. Our Version has in one Place given the Particle this its true Meaning: God led them not through the Land of the Philistines; we here render the Particle [ci] justly although it was near (l).

And thus the Verse concerning the Serpent ought to have been translated: And the Lord God said unto the Serpent, although the

haft done this, thou art cursed above all Cattel, and above every Beast of the Field: upon thy Belly shalt thou go, and Dust shalt thou eat all the Days of thy Life. The Words in no wise imply, that a Change of the Nature of the Serpent was now inflicted on him: He remained the same Animal he was before created: But they are, as it were, an Apostrophe to the Serpent, in the Hearing of Adam and Eve, designed to evince to them, what a Folly, as well as Crime, they had been guilty of, in being deceived by so low a Seducer. The Words are, as if God had said to the Serpent: "Although thou haft done this great Mischief, yet thou art no lofty and respectable Creature: Thou art one of the meanest of all Animals: Thou art not raised to any high Form, but art a mere Reptile, and shalt always continue to be so: Upon thy Belly thou art made to go; and shalt feed low all the Days of thy Life, in the very Dust." Adam and Eve had conceived high Notions of the Serpent, above all the Beasts of the Field, which the Lord had made (q); but God here reprehends their foolish Fancy, and sets before them, what their own Eyes

(q) Gen. iii, 1.
might have told them, that the Serpent was a Creature, made only for a very low Life, and that no such Elevation as they imagined should ever belong to him (qq).

The Translators of the Bible were, I dare say, led to think a Punishment was here inflicted upon the Serpent, from the Expression of his being cursed above every Beast of the Field: To be cursed may be to have some signal Mischief or great Evil, either wished to, or inflicted upon the Person cursed: This is indeed the general Signification of the Word: But it ought to be considered, whether it is contrary to the Nature of the Hebrew Tongue, to call a Thing cursed, when such Circumstances belong to it as are so extremely bad, that it might be deemed as unhappy a Thing even as a most severe Curse, to be under them, tho' they be not inflicted as a particular Judgment: In this Sense the Jews, in our Saviour's Time, called their vulgar or common People, who they thought could not know

(qq) The ancient Naturalists have largely considered the Propriety of the Motion of a Serpent, to its whole Make, and Constitution of the Nature of its Body; ὑπὸ τοῦ χῶν ἔρειν, ὅτι τὸ ἐναίμων ὅσα καὶ ὑπὲρ σώματερ ἄριστος ἠμῶν ἀξίω τοῦ σώματος τούτου, καθήπτερ οἱ ὅσει, ὅσει τε ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὃν ἔστων ἔτη, καὶ. Aristotle, Lib. de Animalium Incessu. c. viii.
the Law, cursed (r): We cannot suppose them here to mean that the Body of their People were under any particular Curse or Judgment of God, which deprived them of all Possibility of knowing their Duties; rather they thought of them in the Sentiment of the Prophet: Surely these are poor; they are foolish, for they know not the Way of the Lord, nor the Judgment of their God: I will get me to the great Men, and will speak unto them, for they have known the Way of the Lord (s). The Prophet here looks upon the Poor, not as particularly cursed of God; for this he could not think (t), but they were in such Circumstances as might not have afforded them any considerable Information concerning their Duties, and he therefore said, he would get him to the Great, as reputed it more likely to find them ready to hear and understand: And in this Way the Jews held their Estimation of their common People: They imagined it not likely these should know the Law; and therefore they deemed them so despicably ignorant, that tho' no particular Judgment of God was in the Case, yet they held them in no kind of

(r) John vii. 49.  (s) Jerem. v. 4, 5.  (t) See Prov. xxii. 1, Deut. xv. 11.

Regard,
Regard, but as in a cursed or most contemptible Condition. It is no unnatural Way of speaking to say of poor, barren, and unprofitable Land, that it is cursed Ground, not only where God may have been pleased to make a fruitful Land barren, for the Wickedness of them that dwell therein (u), as was particularly the Case of the Earth thus cursed upon our first Parents having sinned (uu), but also when the Land is very sterile and unfruitful, tho’ no particular Curse of God has ever been denounced against it. In the Hebrew Tongue we often find Things eminently excellent in their Kind said therefore to be of God; Cedars of Lebanon, highly flourishing, to be for that Reason of God’s planting; so on the contrary the Word cursed may as reasonably be used, as it were in contrast, where God had given no Appearance of a Blessing. Adam and Eve were thinking highly of the Serpent: The Design of what God now said was to shew them, that he was a Creature deserving their lowest Notice: They thought him above any Beast of the Field which the Lord had made: The Words here spoken were to tell them that he was not above, but

(u) Psal. cvii. 34. (uu) Gen. iii. 17.
beneath all others; so creeping and abject, that his Make and Form might be spoken of in Terms, as if they were a Curse upon him (w). But,

The Words that next follow have greater Difficulties: *And I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed: It shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel* (x). The Inquiries I would make concerning these Words are, I. Whether *Adam* and *Eve* understood them? II. Whether they conceived them to have any Reference to the Animal, the Serpent from whose Mouth they had heard the words which had beguiled *Eve*? III. What may be the true and literal Meaning of them?

I. Are we sure that *Adam* and *Eve* understood what God now spake to them (y): They are Words, which, I hope I shall be

---

(w) I do not know whether I might not observe, that the Death of being hanged on a Tree, was said to be a cursed Death in this Sense of the Word. See Deut. xxi. 22, 23. There were other Deaths inflicted by the Laws of God; such asstoning with Stones till a Man died, Levit. xx. 2, 27, &c. Whoever came under the Sentence of this, or any other Death inflicted by God’s Law, was as really accursed of God, as he that was hanged on a Tree; but the Ignominy of this Death was despicable beyond others: It had a Shame belonging to it, hard to get over and despise; it was stigmatized, low, and base beyond other Punishments; and therefore had peculiarly this Term of Reproach annexed to it. (x) Gen. iii. 15. (y) Ver. 15.
able reasonably to explain, and shew to be the first Prophecy that was made to the World: I call them Prophecy, as speaking of Events to come; and that for many Days to come, referring to what was to be accomplished in Times that were afar off (z): And therefore, tho' it seems obvious that Adam and Eve might understand from what was spoken, that the Enemy who had hurt them would at length be conquered; yet it does not appear that they were precisely informed who this Enemy was, nor what the Contest was that should be with him and against him; nor how, or by whom in particular he should be subdued. What had been said in their Hearing, concerning the cursed or very low and groveling Nature of the Serpent, must have apprized them, that they had been much mistaken in their Notions of this Animal: Whether it caused them to reflect, although they did not before think so, that the Serpent did not perhaps speak of himself; but that they had some greater Enemy whom they had not seen, nor known, I cannot say: But that our first Parents, tho' their experimental Knowledge

(z) Ezek. xii. 27. See Dan. xii. 8, 9, 13, x. 14. viii. 26, 7; vii. 28.
could as yet be but little, were not of slow parts, but able to turn every thing hinted to them over in their Minds, to conceive of it all that a lively Imagination would, as far as they could know Things, present to them, must I think be admitted as unquestionable: and that they henceforward acquitted the Serpent of all Guilt towards them, seems to me to appear from what I shall presently consider, viz. that we have no Hints in History, that either they, or their immediate Descendants commenced any particular Enmity or Hostility against the Animals called Serpents, any more than against any other of the Animals of the World. But, that Adam or Eve knew the real Meaning of what was here said to them, any more than the ancient Prophets perfectly understood what was revealed to them, to be by them declared unto the World, is what I see no Reason to conclude: Are we to think, that Daniel, after he had wrote down what had been revealed unto him concerning the seventy Weeks determined upon his People (a), could have exactly determined what Manner of Time was here signified before Hand; or how that which was testified, was to be ful-

(a) Dan, ix. 24—27.
filled in the Sufferings of Christ, and the Glory that should follow (aa)? or shall we think that David, to whom it had been foreshewn, that his Soul (b) should not be left in Hell, neither should God's holy One see Corruption, could have hence been able to declare, that Jesus Christ, or even any One of his, David's Descendants, should be dead and buried, and on the third Day be raised from the Dead? Or that even Moses, who recorded the Words which God had thus spoken to our first Parents; and afterwards, that in Abraham's Seed all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed (c); and afterwards, that Shiloh should come of the Tribe of Judah (d); and further, that God would give the Israelites a Prophet from among their Brethren like unto him, that they should bear him (e); can we say, that Moses could have explained, as St. Paul was able afterwards to shew, who the particular Person was, that was to be this Seed of the Woman; the Seed of Abraham; the Shiloh; the Prophet who was to come; and in what (f) particular Manner all that had been foretold should be fulfilled? Prophecy was designed to

(aa) 1 Pet. i. 11.  (b) Psal. xvi. 10.  Acts ii. 25—
(c) Gen. xxiii. 18.  (d) Gen. xlvii. 10.  (e) Deut. xviii. 15
(f) Gal. iii. 14—16.
point before-hand to something which was afterwards more fully to be revealed; to create in those unto whom it was given, Expectations of Things not yet fully explained to them; which Things were in the Process of Ages to be further added to and opened, as God should think fit more and more to shew the Contents of them; until, when the Time was come that the whole was fulfilled, they unto whom the Things foretold were accomplished, might look back, and by seeing from the Beginning what had been said, before any one but God knew how these Things should be; might hereby have a surer Word (g), than could possibly have been contrived for cunningly devised Fables, to shew them, that the Things thus foretold, and thus accomplished, were of God: And such is that Series of Promises or Predictions began in the Words now spoken by God to our first Parents; enlarged, and more specified as to their Meaning by some farther Prophecies given in after Ages; until at the End of about 4000 Years, a Person appeared, in whose Life and Death, Resurrection and Glory, the whole of what had been foretold, was clearly seen to be ful-

(g) 2 Pet. i. 19.
filled truly and literally; but yet so foretold and so fulfilled, as that no one before the Things were come to pass, ever so understood the Prophecies, as to think, that thus would be the Event of them: Whereby it was the more demonstrably proved, that the whole was God's Work: For, as he only could declare the End from the Beginning (b), mark out truly before-hand the Traces of his own deep Counsels and Designs; so what had been foretold by him, was always so imperfectly understood, as to be look'd for by Men quite otherwise than it came to pass: And therein it became evident, when it was come to pass, that no human Contrivance was in the fulfilling it, any more than in the foretelling it; for had there been human Contrivance in it, it would have been brought about to have been fulfilled in quite another Manner. The Words therefore before us now spoken by God are, as a most excellently able and learned Prelate has pointed out to us (i) the first of "a Chain of Prophecies reaching through several thou-

(b) Remember the former Things of old, for I am God, and there is none else: I am God, and there is none like me: Declaring the End from the Beginning, and from ancient Times the Things that are yet done: Saying, My Counsel shall stand, and I will do all my Pleasure. Isa. xlvi. 9, 10. (i) Bishop Sherlock's Preface to the third Edition of The Use and Intent of Prophecy.
"and Years, manifestly subservient to, and gradually opening one and the same Administration of Providence from Beginning to End," of which our first Parents knew no more, than to think that they literally had Hopes herein, so far seen by them as to give them Reason to trust and depend upon God; but not enough explain’d to them, to shew them what the particular Things were which they were to hope for, or how or when they were to be accomplished. But,

II. Did our first Parents apprehend any Thing here said, to concern or relate to the Animal, to the Serpent from whose Mouth the Guile came, which had deceived them? I answer: I think they did not: Had Adam and Eve understood God to mean, that there should be continual War between Mankind and Serpents; that the Serpents should bite the Heels of Men, and that Men should crush and bruise to Pieces the Heads of Serpents, would not ancient History have given some Account of the Endeavours of Mankind, in the first Ages, to destroy these their Enemies? It is observable, that God does not speak of the Serpent as a Creature of enormous Size, but rather as so contemptible, that Adam could have no Reason to be afraid of it,
it (a), but might easily have perhaps stamped it under his Feet: How came it then to pass, that neither Adam nor Eve, if they understood that they were to destroy Serpents, did instantaneously bruise the Head of this their Enemy? Or if it may be said, having no Weapons, they might be afraid he should bruise their Heel, is it not wondrous they should never afterwards contrive how to afflict this hostile Creature? and that it did not become the Heroism of the first Generations of the World to commence a sort of religious War against these devoted Animals, to extirpate the whole Breed of them from off the Face of the Earth? In after Ages, and in Countries where

(a) We are told by Heathen Writers of Serpents of a most incredible Size: Pliny relates from Livy, that when Regulus commanded the Roman Forces in Africa, he was infested by a Serpent 120 Feet long, and so invulnerable, its Scales being impenetrable, and its Breath so infectious, that he was forced to use the Military Engines, which they used against Towers and the Walls of Towns, before they could subdue it, and that the Skin of it was hung up at Rome, and remained there until the War with Numantia, i.e. about 100 Years. Vide Plin. Nat. Hist. Lib. 8. c. 14. Liv. Hist. Lib. 18. c. 15, 16. And the fact Naturalist speaks of Serpents 20 Cubits long in other Places. Vide Nat. Hist. Lib. 31. c. 2. And of so large a Size as to drive away Oxen and Stags whole, Vide I. 18. Whether these Accounts did not exceed what was strictly the Truth, ought to be considered. The Scriptures hint Serpents in Moses's Time to have been of a more common Measure, such as might lie in the Way, and bite the Heels of Horses, Gen, xlix. 17. And we have no Reason to suppose the Serpent that spake to Eve to have been larger.
The clearing them of Serpents was thought a public Good, Exploits of this Kind had their Glory:

— diram qui contudit Hydram       Hor.

The subduing a Serpent was one of the Labours of Hercules (b); nay, he was said to have killed two Serpents in his very Cradle (c); a Story that implies, that the killing Serpents was at this Time of such public Utility, and therefore so highly estimated, that no greater Thing could be said of this Hero, to give high Expectations of his future Achievements, or to evince his Origin to be more than mortal: Can we then think, in the first World, of which the History, tho' very short, is not so imperfect, but that the Inventors of useful Arts (d), of the Entertainments of Life (e), as well as the Names of those who were eminent for Religion are come down to us (f); if one great Instance of performing what God had declared, had consisted in destroying Serpents, we should not have had the Name of some one Worthy at least, who had exerted himself in this Warfare? But in Truth the

---

(c) Apollodor. ubi sup.  
(d) Gen. iv. 20, 22.  
(e) Ver. 21.  
(f) Ver. 26.
Animals called Serpents were as yet little in Size, contemptible in Figure, not understood to be marked out by God, for Men to make it their Employment to destroy them; and accordingly nothing more is told us, of the Serpent’s having to do with Man, or Man with the Serpent, until the Flood came, and took away Man and Beast from off the Earth. The Serpent that tempted Eve is reckoned amongst the Beasts of the Field, and not a Water Animal (b); and therefore we may suppose his Kind

(b) Gen. iii. 1. Water-Snakes are mentioned in all Writers. The two Serpents related in Virgil to have killed Laocon, are described to have come over the Sea.

*Ecce! antem gemini a Tenedo tranquilla per alta,*

*(Horresco referens) immensis Orbibus Angues*

*Incumbunt Pelago pariterque ad Littora tendunt:*

*Pectora quorum inter Flacidus arrecta jubequae*

*Sanguinea experant Undas: Pars caetera Pontum*

*Pone legit, situatque immensa Volumine Terga.*

*Fit sonitus pluvium Salo: Jamque arva tenebant:*

*Ardentesque Oculos suffusib; Sanguine et Igni*

*Sibila lambebant Linguis vibrantibus ora.*  *Virg. Aen. 2.*

The Annotators observe, that the Latinis called the Water-Snakes, Angues; the Land-Snakes, Serpentes; and when the Animals were consecrated and in Temples, Dracones: And in Aquarum sunt, Serpentes Terrarum, Templorum Dracones: And in Virgil stiles these very Serpents when they were said to be hid at the Feet of Pallais,

*At geminis Lapha Delubra ad summa Dracones*

*Effugiant, saecoque petunt Tritonis Arcos,
Sub pedibusque Deae clypeique sub Orbe leguntur.*

*Id. ibid. ver. 225.*

The Hebrews had a different Word for Serpents of the Water from that which they used for the Land Kind: The River Serpent.
Kind to have been preserved in the Ark, and accordingly to have come to Noah (k) as innocuous to Men, and to have been as well received and dismissed by him as any other living Creature of the World; so that I do not see the least Ground to imagine that Adam apprehended in what God now said, any Thing to be intimated, that there should subsist between Men and Serpents a perpetual Enmity, to be always biting and destroying one another.

If we look into the Ages after the Flood, we find that Serpents were before Mosès’s Days become noxious Animals (l), and Men when Mosès lived were in the general afraid of them (m): There might, ere this Time be

---

(k) Gen. vi. 20. vii. 9.
(l) Gen. xlix. 17. (m) Exod. iv. 3.

poisonous
poisonous Juices in many of the Herbs and Plants that grew on the Earth: The same Alteration (o) of the World, which began from the Flood, and conduced to the shortening the Lives of Men, might cause such an Alteration in many Herbs, that Men might not perhaps now find every green Herb and Tree as wholesome, as they had found all in the first World: And the Nourishment of some in the Concoction of some Animals, might breed in them, what to Man and other Creatures might be malignant Poison. At the going out from the Ark, the living Creatures of the World appear to have been none of them hurtful or destructive to Man: But Time produced in many a Ferocity, and in others other Qualities which made them terrible, and Serpents were in general such Objects of Terror in Moses's Days, that when the Miracle which God gave him to assure him, that he sent him to Egypt took Effect, Moses, we read, when he saw his Rod turned into a Serpent, fled from before it (p). But notwithstanding any Thing that may be said of Men's natural Fears, from their Apprehensions of the Venom of Serpents, a Thought of God's

(o) See Connect. Vol. I. B. I.  (p) Exod. iv. 3. having
having ever given any Order in particular for Man to destroy Serpents, looks to be a mere modern Imagination. We can find no Traces of such a Sentiment in all Antiquity: Rather the Sages of the early Times, who searched into Antiquity, and added to it what they thought the Religion of Nature (q), to be above the common Notions of the Vulgar, held Serpents in high Honour, had introduced them into their Temples (r), delineated their

(qi See Conne. Vol. III. B. XI. The Sentiments that led them to their Notions of the Divinity of the Serpent, are said to be, πετριμωτατον το ζων ταξιαν ή τη ερτσιν η συ-

ηδες — συραβιθιν, παραβ ο τη χωτικη αντερθηγων συν

τη ανωτερθη, χαριτων, ως εσπερων και χερων η άλλα

πες η δε σαβεω, ή εν τα λαταν. Ο ζων πας νησας ποιητι.

ης σμαλα οματων τυχες θαπελε, ης κατα τη πορεια ελημο

ενε απο θα σεφε τε ρελε, τη τη χωτικης χαριτων οπλι

τως εσπερων η σαβεω, ης και οματων, τα λαταν, αν

δε σαβεω, ης εν τα λαταν, ης οματων, τα λαταν.

(r) Euleb. Praep. Evang. Lib. 1. c. 10. We cannot sufficiently despise the beggarly Elements of this Philosophy; but yet it ought to be observed, that it was reputed an Height of Wisdom in its Day: a plain

Demonstration, what may be the Trifles of mere human Reasoning, that has not been inlightened by any better Information. But

my Intention in the Citation above was to shew, that no Notions had traditionally prevailed to intimate the Serpent to have been originally a cursed Creature, appointed everywhere for Men to destroy them, for that the most ancient speculative and more curious Inquirers had no Bias against Theories which might represent them to be Representatives of the most high God.
The Creation and their Figures in their ancient Tables and Formularies of Worship (s), and gave many, such as they thought Reasons, for thinking them endowed with a Kind of divine Nature (t): And what is remarkable, they had no Notion of the Serpents being the Representative of an Evil Being in Opposition to the good God; for the Egyptians, we are told, reputed the Serpent to be an Emblem of their God Cneph (w), by which Word they meant the Δημιουργός (w), we might render it the Workmaner (x), or Maker of all Things. The Phænicians translated it ἀγαθὸν Δαίμων, the good Deity (y), and from their most ancient Symbols they may be thought to have intended to represent in their χιματα, or mystic Figures of the Serpent, what some of them called the σωσαλινον (z); I might ren-
der, it, the Power by which all Things do consist.

I do not pretend to trace the exact Time of the Rise of these Heathen Superstitions; they were brought out of one Country into another: They were thought to have been introduced into Greece by Pherecydes (b), who was contemporary with Thales (c), and did not flourish there earlier than about 1000 Years after Moses (d); but Pherecydes had them from the Phœnicians (e), and the Phœnicians from the Books of the Egyptian Taaetus (f):

And, I think, I may represent these Notions of the Serpent to have been in Vogue in Egypt in and before Moses's Times; for it is much to be observed, that tho' Moses, when he first saw his Rod turned into a Serpent, was terrified and fled from it, until God bad him put forth his Hand and take it (g); yet, when

(b) ἀπὸ φοίνικας ἐὰν ἕφερεν ὘ν ἡμῶν τὰς ἀρχώμες ἐθνολόγιαν ἢ τῷ παρ᾽ ἑνδο λεγομένα Οἰσίνως Ὁ ἤ τῶν ὘ρίων ἢ. Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 10. (c) Pherecydes was thought to flourish about the 59th Olympiad, Thales to have died in about the 58th. (d) Moses died A.M. 2554. The 59th Olympiad was about A.M. 3555. (e) Euseb. ubi sup. (f) ΤάουτΤ οἱ Ἄργυριοι ἦσαν περσαγορεύοι — τῶι μν ὡν τῇ Δαίδαλοι θρίσον ἢ, τῶν Ὀρεών ἄνω ιεθείασεν ὁ ΤάουτΤ, ἕ μετ᾽ ἑνδο ἄνθις Φοίνικες — Euseb. ubi sup. We are to observe of Δαίδαλος, that a Serpent was called Draco when consecrated, put into a Temple. Vide quæ sup. (g) Exod. iv. 3, 4.
The same Rod was in like manner turned into a Serpent before Pharaoh, and when all the Rods of his Magicians were turned into Serpents likewise, neither Pharaoh nor his Magicians appear to have been under any Consternation (gg): They knew the Arcana of their Temples, that Serpents were at this Time amongst the Sacra in their Worship, and reputed the Representatives not of a malign, but of their good God: They might therefore think, that their Gods were come down amongst them (bb), to support them against the Demand made by Moses, and that the wonderful Phænomena before them portended them great Assistance and Good, but no Evil to give them any Terror. It ought only to be observed, that when they saw Moses's Rod swallow up all the Rods of their Magicians (b), they ought hence to have been instructed in the Way of their own Speculations, that a Power appeared for Moses which literally executed Judgment against the Gods of Egypt (i), annihilating and destroying the most wonderful Appearances they could imagine of

---

(gg) See Exod. vii. 10, 13.  (bb) Thus the Men of Lystra, upon seeing a Miracle, thought of Barnabas and Paul, according to their Superstition, Acts xiv. 11.  (b) Exod. vii. 13.  (i) Exod. xii. 12.
their Gods, to gainsay what by Moses was required of them.

As what I have observed does, I think, hint to us, that there were in the World no Notions of Serpents antecedent to Moses's writing his History, which can in any wise speak Mankind to have had any remarkable Enmity against, or to have thought themselves under any Command to destroy them; so I might observe further from what follows in the Books of Moses, that Serpents were not, from any Thing said by him, devoted to either such Odium or Destruction; for I should think if they had been so devoted, it is not likely God would have appointed a Serpent to have been set up in the Wilderness for the (k) People to look up to, in order to be cured of the Plague he then inflicted upon them: Any other Sign, if God had appointed it, would have been as salutary: And it does not seem agreeable to any End of a divine Dispensation, to have a Prophet make the Figure of a Creature an Emblem of Health and Life, if he had designed the same Prophet to proscribe the whole Species of that Creature to be abominated and destroyed. But the Fact was, the

(k) Numb. xxi.

Serpent
Serpent spake to Eve, as the As did to Balaam, both, as to themselves, ignorantly and without Intention; and neither was the one ordered to be honoured for what he said, nor the other to be disgraced and destroyed: It was fit Adam and Eve should be apprised how mean an Animal they had admitted to be the Instrument of deceiving them; And God was pleased very emphatically to tell them this in what he said to them of the Serpent, as I have above explained it: It was in no wise reasonable they should henceforth be employed to become Killers of Serpents, and agreeably hereto the Words further spoken do in no wise order, nor were or could be understood by them to order them this Service, as will more evidently appear by considering

III. The true literal Meaning of the Words,

And I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed: I shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel. Upon which Words I would remark, 1. That nothing is said, which in any wise employed Adam: It was not said, I will put Enmity between the Man and the Woman and Thee, and between thy Seed and their Seed: They shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise their Heels: But the Enmity was put between
between the Woman only and the Person here spoken of, and between his Seed, and her Seed: Adam was not the Woman, nor of the Seed of the Woman; for the Woman was made out of him: He was made first, and then the Woman: So that whatever this Enmity was, we see that Adam was remarkably not made a Party to engage in it: An Incident, that could not but occasion him to reflect, that the Matter here intended could not be the hating and killing the Animal called a Serpent; for if that had been designed, a Slaughter of the then Serpent would have been seen to be what might more likely have been instantly accomplished by Adam, than by Eve and her future Posterity.

But I would observe, that in this Particular, there appears plainly what must, with all reasonable Thinkers, for ever silence all Pretence of reconciling an allegorical Interpretation to the real Meaning of this Scripture: The allegorical Interpreters say, that the Serpent is the Symbol of Lust and sensual Pleasure (1): that Adam and Eve’s being tempted by the Serpent means, that they were drawn away

(1) See Middleton’s Essay on the allegorical and literal Interpretation, p. 132.
away and inticed of their own Lufts and Appetites; That the Fact in Truth was, that they were originally formed to a State of Happiness and Perfection, which they lost and forfeited by following their Lufts and Passions in opposition to the Will of their Creator (m): If now this be the true Way of interpreting Moses, it must follow, that the Enmity appointed against the Serpent means an Opposition to the Insinuations of sinful Appetites, a striving against Sin: And the Event declared of this Contest must be, that our sinful Appetites and Lufts will often hurt us; but that, if we will press forwards, tho' in many Steps we take, we may sometimes meet Defeat, yet in the End we shall capitally wound and subdue them. I promise myself no candid Allegorist will accuse me of having herein falsified or injured his System: Herein then is summed up all that is so highly boasted of as rational: But how obvious is it to see of all this, that it does not touch the Matter related by Moses? The Enmity declared by Moses to be put, was, I observed, such, that Adam was assigned no Part of it: Eve only, and her Seed, were the Parties in this Warfare: And

(m) See Middleton, Id. ibid. 131.
shall we now say, that Nothing more was in-
tended, than the Duty of striving against and
conquering sinful Appetites? Was Adam then,
after the Fall, to have no such Appetites as
well as Eve, and all that were to be born of
her? Or was he to have no Struggle against
such like Passions with other Men? Was he to
be given up to a reprobate Mind, to do what-
ever he should lust? This I take to be a plain
Fact, which all the Art and Subtilty of our
pretended Reasoners will never be able to
reconcile and clear up. To this therefore
I would earnestly call the Reader’s strictest
Attention; I would beg to have this one
Point taken into the severest Examination;
for I cannot but think, if it be found to be as
I have represented, the Allegory must here
meet its Bane: It will be so clearly evident,
that there is something in the Text before us,
which the allegorical Interpretation cannot
reach, that no one that is truly ingenuous will
any more contend for it.

But 2. We ought to observe, that in the
Words here related by Moses to have been
heard from God, it was not said, that Man-
kind and Serpents should have a general
Enmity against each other; But the Hebrew
Words, if truly interpreted, denote, that
some one Person should be descended from the Woman, who should capitaly conquer and subdue the great Enemy of Mankind. If I were forced to allow, that we have now so far lost the perfect Understanding of the Idiom of the Hebrew Tongue, as not to see that the Words here used by Moses must carry this restrictive Sense, yet from the Septuagint Version of the Place it appears, that when that Translation was made, the Hebrew Words were known to have that Meaning (o). The Septuagint Version of the Passage is thus: Καὶ ἔχον τὴν ἡμῶν ἀνδρὸν μέσον σῇ καὶ ἀνδρὸν σῷ ἀναθήματος σῇ καὶ αὐτῶν τῷ ἀνδρὸν τῷ ἀναθημάτῳ αὐτῶν. ΑΥΤΟΣ οἱ περισσοτεροί κακόλαγε τῷ τελεῖ σὺ τηρήσεις αὐτῷ Πέτραν ἰ. Ὁ ἄνδρος. And I will put Enmity between thee and between the Woman, and between thy Seed, and between the Seed of her: He shall bruise his Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel: The Point to be observed in this Translation is; that it does not say I shall bruise thy Head, the Pronoun does not refer to the Word Seed; but it is He shall bruise, the Pronoun being Personal, and Masculine, not agreeing with

(o) The Septuagint Translation of the Books of Moses made about 277 Years before Christ, about A. M. 3727. So Archbishop Usher's Annals. Prideaux's Connex. Part. II. B. I.
the Word 

the Word \( \omega \varepsilon \gamma \nu \alpha \), Seed, which is neuter; but denoting some one Person to be the Seed, and that He should bruise the Head of the Enemy here spoken of. Had the Greek Interpreters thought the Text to mean that the Woman's Seed or Offspring in the general were here intended, they would have said \( \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \), to agree with \( \omega \varepsilon \gamma \nu \alpha \), as we say it in our English; but they more correctly rendered the Place \( \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \, \epsilon \), apprehending some one particular Person to be here intended, and not the Offspring of the Woman in the general.

But may it not be said that the \( \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \) here used is a Mistake, that the Septuagint did perhaps not take the true Meaning of the Hebrew Expression; that they should have wrote not \( \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \) but \( \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \), it, not he? I answer, we, who believe the Scriptures, have the Authority of St. Paul to assure us, that the Septuagint Version is most judiciously right in this Particular; that Apostle having remarked to us of a similar and subsequent Expression to that which is here used; that God therein spake not of Seeds, as of many, but of Seed, as of one, and hereby intended Christ (p): Thus absolutely certain therefore are we, that

\( (p) \) See Gal. iii. 16.
the Septuagint Translators have, in the Peculiariy of the Pronoun ἄντως, given us the true Meaning of the Text; for we have an inspired Apostle testifying to us, that they have therein given us what was really the Mind of God. But I would consider in the next Place the Hebrew Text, whether that does not speak the very same Thing.

The Hebrew Words here used are [Hua jēssūph ka Rōsh (g)] which signify, not it, but He himself shall bruise thee in the Head (r): The Hebrew Text may not at first Sight appear so remarkably to point out what the Greek Version clearly intimates; for in the Hebrew, the Word [Zeran] Seed is masculine, not neuter as the Word ἀργῶς in the Greek; and therefore the Pronoun Hua in the Hebrew does not, like ἄντως in the Greek, directly vary in Gender from the Noun it should be referred to: But we should here consider that the Hebrew Pronoun Hua is specifically restrictive, to intimate what is said to belong to some one Person, or one Thing; and thus the Septuagint took the Place to speak of Seeds, as of many, but of one.

(g) The Hebrew Words are שָׁנָה קִבָּשׁ מֶבּוּל
           caput conteret te Iple

(r) Gen. iii. 15.
I do not say that the Pronoun [Hua] in Hebrew may never be used, where in Greek, or in other Languages, we would use a neutral Pronoun, ἡ in English, Illud in Latin, or ἄντο in Greek; but I think, where [Hua] is used, it naturally speaks the Thing intended in the singular Number, and not referring to a Noun of Multitude as plural: Thus Leviticus x. 3. Hua after dibber Jebovah (s), we say, This is that the Lord spake, which I think is deficient of the true Emphasis expressed in the Hebrew: The Words were designed to shew the Error of Nadab and Abihu’s offering strange Fire, which the Lord commanded them not, i.e. had not commanded them, and they should be translated, this is the One Thing, or the Thing itself which the Lord spake: The Words were intended to lay down one special or specific Rule, that was the Principle in all the Laws given; They strictly required one Thing only, namely, nothing to be done, but what God directed, to sanctify him, and him only, in them that come nigh him (t): We may, I think, put in itself, him or her self in the singular Number where [Hua] is used; And thus in the Text before

---

(t) Levit. x. 3. as above.
us, [Hua Jesuphka Rosb] cannot mean it, her Seed shall bruise thee in the Head, taking the Word Seed as a Noun of Multitude to intend many, for in such Case the Hebrew Language would have been, They shall bruise thee in the Head; But [Hua jesuphka], if we rightly translate the Hebrew, must be he himself, intending one Person and no more: And thus the Translators of the Septuagint rendred the Place, without Inspiration, and before any Prophet or Apostle had directed any such Interpretation, by being only true Masters of the Hebrew Tongue, so as not to lose or vary from the precise Meaning of a very significant Expression in it. But I must still remark, that if I should be judged wrong in all I have here said of the Hebrew Expression, the Authority of St. Paul will still remain, to give us the true Meaning of the Place; For, in that the Apostle, an inspired Writer, informs us, that in the Word Seed was intended not many, but one, and that one, Christ; God has not left himself without a Witness to us, what was the Intention of the Words before us spoken to our first Parents. And,

If what St. Paul explains to be the Meaning of the Word spoken to our first Parents, was the real Intention of God's Purpose in them,
them, we cannot but admit, that God, when he caused Adam and Eve to hear the Words from him, caused them so far to know the Intention of the Words spoken to them, as not to imagine from them, that he designed an idle and insignificant War between Eve, and her Children, and Serpents, but he promised them [Hua] him, one Person of her Seed, altho' he did not tell them who that one Person was, who was to be the Captain of our Salvation (u), the Conqueror here foretold to subdue him, who had deceived them.

And this was all they could possibly, as yet, know of this Matter, no more than this being, as I have said, told them: Who the particular Person promised was; what the Warfare he should accomplish; who the very Enemy was, to be conquer'd by him, when, and where, and in what Manner he should appear; none of these Things can be said to have been discovered to them: And therefore as Joseph and Mary, when our Saviour, upon coming home with them from the Temple, said to them, Wist ye not, that I must be about my Father's Business? understood not the Saying

(u) Heb. ii. 10.
which he spake unto them; but his Mother kept all these Sayings in her Heart (w); so our first Parents did not understand the whole Meaning of what God here intended; but they carefully treasured up the Words in their Hearts; formed Hopes from them, the Extent of which they could not as yet determine; preserved the Words, to have their Children know them; to the Intent that they also might shew their Children the same, that the Generations to come might see the whole of what God had spoken, to observe what might farther arise in the fulfilling it.

We who live in these last Days of the World, unto whom, in the Gospel, the Kingdom of God is come, may greatly see, what that Purpose of God is, which was hid from Ages from the Foundation of the World; but is now made more manifest (uu): We may see Jesus Christ, a Man ordained of God (ww), of the Seed of the Woman, most literally speaking, as born of a Virgin (x) ; descended from David (y), who was of the Seed of

(ww) Luke ii. 49, 50.  (uu) See Coloss i. 26.  (ww) Acts xvii. 31.  (x) Isa. vii. 14. Matt. i. 18, 24, 25. Luke i. 34, 35; (y) St. Luke, as he tells us Chap. ii. ver. 4. that Joseph was of the House and Lineage of David, so also Chap. i. 27. informs us, that the Virgin Mary also was a Descendant from David.
Abraham (z), a Descendant of our first Parents; and may know of this one Person, that he is to conquer that old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole World (a), of whom we may consider the Words to have come that were spoken by the Serpent to Eve; tho' our first Parents saw him not, neither understood that they came from him. We may further understand, that by the Power of Christ this the great Enemy of Mankind will be cast down (b), whereby will finally be accomplished in a most literal and true Sense, all that the Text before us first intimated, and all that has been since said pursuant thereto, either by immediate Revelation from God himself, or by the Mouth of all his Prophets since the World began.

This, I think, is a true Consideration of the Words I have endeavoured to explain: And in the Whole of what I have gone thro', as in what is to follow, I shall I hope be allowed to stand clear of what the Objectors impute to all that write upon this Subject; I do not sometimes adhere to a literal Narration, and sometimes have Recourse to Allegory, forced to allow some Part of what was said or done not

(z) See Matt. i.  (a) Rev. xii. 9.  xx. 10.  (b) Ibid.
to have been as is historically told us; but I
endeavour to shew, that there is no Allegory in
the Whole, or in any Part of Moses’s Rela-
tion: And that a material Part of what he re-
lates; that important Part, in which the Al-
legorist must absolutely lose his Point, if he
cannot make it out to be Allegory, cannot
possibly agree to an allegorical Interpretation at
all: I contend, that a real, a natural Serpent
as truly spake to Eve, as a real Asf spake to
Balaam (b): But I apprehend, from what we
may be apprized of from other Scriptures,
and from considering the Nature of the Thing,
we may know, that neither the Asfs nor the
Serpent spake of (c) themselves; neither knew
they what the Words were that were spoken
by them, altho’ our first Parents could not

(b) Numb. xxii. That the Asfs speaking to Balaam was a
real Fact, and not a Trance, or Vision of the Prophet’s, see
Gen. xv. Vol. III. B. XII. p. 270. (c) Dr. Burnett trifles most
egregiously in this Particular: His Words are, Adnum nempe, fab
hoc Serpentis latuisse Diabolum, vel malum Daemonem, qui hujus ani-
malis ore et organis usus esset Freminam voce quae humanaest;
se d quo sess, quo Author hoc dicitur? Non id præ se fert Litera Mo-
sis, cujus illi adeo sunt tenaces. Burnett’s Archæol. p. 29c. A plain
Ansuer to all this is, The Letter of Moses says, that the Ser-
pent really spake to Eve: This unquestionably was Fact: Moses
does not say, that he spake of himself, or of any Ability of his
own, nor does he say the contrary: We see no Reason to think
our first Parents, at first at least, apprehended him not to speak
of himself: But we have many Hints from the New Testament
who it was that spake by; or thro’ him: Will these now conclude,
that no Voice came literally from the Serpent?
know this to be true of the Serpent at the Time he spake to them. I take the Words contained Gen. iii. 14 and 15, to have been literally spoken by the Voice of God; that the former Part of them were in the way of Apo-

Prophecy to the Serpent, but for the Instruction of Adam and Eve; for that the Serpent did not know the Words, nor the Meaning of them, nor was in any wise affected by them; but that Adam and Eve were herein remon-

strated to, and informed, how basely they had been deceived, and by hearkning to how ab-

ject and contemptible an Animal. It will be allowed me, that the invisible Agent, whose Words the Serpent had spoken, was at this Time present before God; for in Truth, all Persons and all Things may at all Times be present before him, in what Manner he pleases; and I take the latter Part of what was spoken, the 15th Verse, to be a Conversion of the Speaker to this wicked Spirit, den-

ouncing to him, what should literally be the Doom unto which he was reserved; spoken in the Hearing of Adam and Eve, tho' they did not apprehend the full Meaning of it, yet so spoken as that they must have considered it could not concern the Animal they had heard to speak, but had a further Intention, and was
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a Declaration, which they ought to ponder in their Hearts, and transmit to their Children; And that from this the first, and from several other Prophecies which have followed, more enlarged and more directing, as God has thought fit to give them in the several Ages of the World, there has been a sure Path laid, to lead from Faith to Faith (c), from one revealed Declaration to another, those unto whom such Prophesies have come; so as that we, and the Posterities that are to be, may, if we will carefully attend to the Information, have over and besides all other Arguments for the Truth of it, what may shew us of the Gospel, that it is that One Purpose of the Wisdom and Power of God, which he foretold, and therefore designed from the Beginning of the World. In all which I trust I do not theologize with those, whose Schemes are inconsistent to Reason and themselves; but, saying none other Things than what Reason, fairly considering, must admit to be possible, and Revelation warrants to be true; What I offer may be more fit to be impartially considered, than all the Speculations of human Wisdom, which cannot be truly reconciled with the holy Scriptures.

(c) Rom. i. 17.
The Sentence passed upon Adam and Eve, and the Consequences of their Transgression considered.

The Sentence passed upon Eve was, that it should henceforth be specially her Duty, to be governed by and obey her Husband (d); that she should bear Children (e), be the Mother of all Living (f); but have herein a Multiplicity of Sorrow (g): Adam henceforth was to find his Tillage of the Ground a necessary but laborious Employment (b), In or by the Sweat of his Face, he was to eat his Bread.

It seems natural to think, that whilst there were yet but two Persons in the World, a sufficient Produce for two only might more easily be obtained from the Fruits of the Trees, of the Shrubs, and from the Herbs of the Ground. Might not our first Parents, notwithstanding it pleased God to have the Earth now not so kindly fruitful, but apt to abound in Thorns and Thistles, unless duly cultivated.
cultivated for a better Produce (i), for some Time at least, as to their Diet, find the early Days, which the Heathen Poets ascribed to their golden Age,

**Contentique cibis nullo cogente creatis,**

**Arbuteos Fatus montanaque Fraga legebant,**

Ovid. Met.

excluded the Garden, wherever they wandered into the adjacent Country, may we not suppose the Earth to have afforded them Fruits of diverse Trees, Nuts and Berries, Grain of all Sorts, Corn of several Kinds, and all Salads; every Thing that grew and had Seed within itself, being at first created and made to spring out of the Earth (k)? And might they not hence gather daily what we may suppose no hard and uncomfortable Living, without finding a great Pressure of Want and Distress? I answer: We read Moses too hastily, if we do not observe 1. However our first Parents were allowed within the Garden to eat of every Tree except one (l), and the Trees of the Earth, as well as the Herb upon the Face of all the Earth, were given them for Meat (m); yet upon their Expulsion out

---

(i) Gen. iii. 18. (k) i. 12. (l) ii. 16, 17. (m) i. 29.
of the Garden, their Living would be thenceforth chiefly of the Ground (n): Are we to think, because God planted or created within that particular Spot of Ground, which he had distinguished from all others to be called The Garden, Trees of whatever Perfection he was pleased to give them, that therefore all Trees were of their full Growth, and abounded in their Fruits all over the World? Rather, may we not apprehend, that the Earth, in many Parts, was made only to put forth its Shoots, which grew gradually up to their Perfection: When Adam and Eve therefore were driven out of the Garden, Fruits of Trees, Acorns, and great Plenty of Berries, might be more rare than we may hastily imagine; a Point I think hinted, in that at first the Fowls of the Air, as well as every Beast of the Earth, were to live not so remarkably of the Fruit of Trees, as of the green Herb; distinguished from the Trees, and said to grow upon the Face of all the Earth: It was of a lower Growth, nearer to, and more closely covering the Ground (o). But 2. We cannot form an exact Theory of the Labours of our first Parents Lives, because we cannot ascertain how

(n) Gen. iii. 17.  (o) i. 29.
long they lived in their first Habitation, before they committed the Transgression that caused them to be driven from it: We may observe, that one Part of their Employment in the Garden was [lenabdah (p)] to dress it (q): It is the same Word which is used, where we are told, that God sent Adam forth from the Garden [lanavod] to till the Ground, from whence he was taken (r): Adam was now put out of the Garden into the adjacent Country, where God created him (s): His Tillage, expressed by the same Word as his dressing the Garden, seems to have been the same Employment, only to be exercised upon a different Soil: And if we may suppose him to have been exercised long enough in the Garden, to know what the Employment was which God had given him in it, we cannot think him quite a Novice as to what was now to be his Labour: Nothing, in Truth, confounds us in forming our Conceptions concerning our first Parents, except the imagining the Fall to have happened instantly, before they had lived long enough to have some Experience of Living: Let us but suppose it not so early; but that

(p) לְעָכֵרָה הָאָרֶץ   (q) Gen. ii. 15.  (r) עֹזִיר הָאָרֶץ   (s) Ibid.
they might have had some Months to observe of the Herbs of the Garden what they liked best to eat, and how they might cultivate them, to give them a due Growth; and we may imagine them sent forth into the World, with this Care, to find Places here and there, where there were such Produces as they had eaten of; to cultivate and to preserve them, to weed out the Thistles which soon began to grow amongst them, to defend and keep them from the Cattle; that enough of them might be had within such Distances as they could go to for the Sustenance of their Lives; and this Labour, if duly considered, will be allowed to have been a Burden they had not felt whilst they lived in the Garden; and to be sufficient, altho' at first, before both Beasts and Cattle, and Mankind were multiplied on the Earth, it would be not absolutely too much for them. The first Husbandry was no more than Gardening (e); and the Grounds most commodious for the early Tillage were reputed to be such Spots as might be made Gardens of Herbs (u), and the easiest and hap-

piest Situation for these was accounted such as that a Man might water them with the greatest Ease (w); and such Spots of Ground abounded out of the Garden, all along the Land of Eden, on the Borders of its Rivers (x), and upon some of these, I conceive, Adam bestowed his first Pains, and by a diligent Care cultivated and preserved in them enough for him and Eve, of what they had often before eat within the Garden: When Mankind came to multiply, it would be necessary for them to look for further Provision; And before Adam was 130 Years old, Cain, one of his Sons, began Improvements of Tillage (y): And the Iron or Brass was not yet found out, and consequently no Instruments for Tillage were made of any Metals, it would require no extraordinary Imagination to conceive that this early Age might, by sharp Stones (z), cut

(w) Ibid. Vide quaæ sup. 
(y) Adam was 130 Years old at the Birth of Seth, after the Death of Abel, Gen. iv. 25. v. 3. Abel was killed by Cain. 
(z) The Time they each of them brought an Offering unto God from the Improvement of their respective Employments, 130 Years, I suppose, before the Birth of Seth, Gen. iv. 25.

Ages of all Countries, might be collected from all that have wrote of the American Nations: And it might be observed, that even the use of them, to cut as with a Knife, was not in these improved Countries laid aside even in Moses's Times, see Ex. iv. 25.
Wood, and frame Tools of diverse Sorts, such as would serve well enough to perform their less improved Agriculture:

— pri mi cuncis scindebant fissile Lignum.

Virgil.

Or we may suppose the first Men soon able to contrive how to pull off, or to cut from young Trees such Twigs as might be scraped, and reduced to fit the Uses they had Occasion to make of them, before they knew how in a Workman-like Manner to take down a whole Tree, or wanted, or even had large Trees for greater Occasions: Arts and Improvements grew and had their Progress: Abel began to be a Keeper of Sheep: And a Descendant of Cain's; Jabol, in the sixth Descent from him, set up Booths or Tents in the Fields, and began to order Herds of the greater Cattel: And Tubal Cain, about the same time, found out and instructed others to be Artificers in Brass and Iron (a). And how we may apprehend the Tillage of the Earth received an Increase of Improvements:

Mox et Frumentis Labor additus —

Virgil.

(a) Gen. iv. 20, 22.
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The Garden-Tillage would not afford a sufficient Produce for the increased Multitudes of Mankind, nor could large Tracts be managed with the insufficient Implements of the most early Husbandry; but, as they wanted (b) them, human Art and Industry contrived better: And Agriculture grew and increased gradually, as the Necessities of Mankind called for farther and larger Improvements of it: Of all which, one Observation only is material, that the Sentence of God upon Man was in all these Ages enough felt, to keep them sensible of that Part of the Punishment denounced which concerned the Labour of their Lives (c). Our first Parents had not such enlarged Wants as their more numerous Polite-rity, but having less Knowledge how to supply their lesser Demands; sufficient for their Day was the Labour thereof; tho', as the gracious Purpose of God was not instantly to destroy Man, but to have him ripened thro' a mortal Life for an happier State, no Wants were made to take hold of him, but what he might by Industry and Labour get the better

---

(b) ——> Tum variæ vocere Artes. Virg. Georg. 1.
(c) ——> Pater ipse colendi
Hand facultem esse Viam voluit ——>
———> curis aequas mortalia corda. Id. 81.
of (d): Yet we do not find that any Improvements of Husbandry made in the first World were so great, but that the most experienced in its later Times acknowledged themselves sensible of the heavy and universal Burden of their Lives, of the great Toil and Work of their Hands before it was granted them to make Use of animal Food, for a further Supply, than what they could reap from the Ground (e). But,

The last Part of the Sentence denounced upon the Man was that he should die; that as he had been taken out of the Ground, so he should, after a laborious Life, return unto the Ground again, and become no better than his primitive Dust (f).

This Sentence we may observe is not so particularly repeated against Eve, as against the Man. But as all Experience testifies that the Woman is in no wise exempted from Death, it cannot but be remarked, that enough was said in the Original Denunciation of Death (g), as well as acknowledged by Eve herself (b), to shew, that having transgressed, and the Sen-

(d) Labor omnia vincit

Improbus, et duris urgens in Rebus Egeflas, Virg. Georg. i.

(e) Gen. v. 29. (f) iii. 19. (g) ii. 17. (b) iii. 3.

S2
tence of Death against such Transgression being in no wise reversed, it could not be imagined, that she could think it should not proceed against her. But there appears an evident Reason, why the Sentence of Death should be thus repeated, and as it were reestablished against Adam: He had thought, and offered it as a Mitigation of his Fault, that he was not first in the Transgression; for that the Woman had misled him to eat (i): God therefore denounced more particularly to him, that he should not escape the Punishment that had been declared against what he had done; to tell him, that his Plea was no Excuse; for that, (k) although he had been misled by hearkning unto the Voice of his Wife; yet, as he had done what had been commanded that he should not do, he also should surely die.

It has been thought by some, that the Death declared against the Sin of our first Parents, ought, according to the plain Intendment of the Words in which it was denounced, to have proceeded to an immediate Execu-

(i) Gen. iii. 12. (k) It may be observed, that the Particles Ci may be even here rendered not Because, but more elegantly although, as I have before observed it must be sometimes translated. Vide quæ sup. p. 213.
tion. In the Day that they eat of the Tree, they were surely to die (l): Can it be said with any Propriety, that when Adam died nine (m) hundred and thirty Years afterwards, that he died in the Day that he eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil? But this is a Cavil too trifling to want a Confutation: Every one, that reads the Hebrew Bible, must see a manifest Difference between the general Expression [bejom (n)] in the Day, and [bejom kachb (o)] in that very Day, or [bejom habua] in the same Day (p): Had either of the latter Expressions been used in the 17th Verse of the second Chapter of Genesis, it might have signified that in the very Day of their eating, they should without further Delay have been put to Death: But the general Expression in the Day, may very obviously claim to have a larger Signification, and intend no more, than that from the Time of their Transgression they should become mortal; have in themselves the Sentence of Death (q) sure to take Effect and be executed in its Time, which he who made them would appoint for it.

---

(l) Gen. ii. 17. (m) v. 5. (n) הָיָה Gen. ii. 17. (o) הָיָה וְחָבָב. Gen. vii. 11. (p) נָתַן הָיָה Gen. xv. 12. (q) See Gen. xvii. 23, 26. Exod. v. 6. xii. 1. Levit. xxiii. 29. iia. vii. 22. et in alibi ubique. (g) 2 Cor. i. 9.
It was now determined, that they should inevitably die; but the Instant, Hour, or Day when, was still left in God's Power, and we may easily apprehend great and wise Reasons why God was not pleased to bring our first Parents, and their immediate Descendants, to a more early Dissolution: God in no wise made Man for nought (r): And altho' he made not Death for us (s), but Man sought it out in the Error of his Life (t), yet herein God's abundant Goodness has provided for us: It could not be, consistent with the Liberty of Reason, and the Freedom of our Natures, that he should absolutely force upon us either Wisdom or Virtue; such Creatures as he intended us, it was more suitable for us to be admitted to grow up if we would, as our Faculties were capable of Improvements in both, under the universal Influence of his Spirit, in and by which, agreeably to their respective Natures, all Things are and do consist (n): And consequently Time would be necessary for our increasing in all Knowledge as well as Virtue. What I shall here offer, shall chiefly concern the former.

(r) Psal. lxxxix. 27.  (s) Wisd. i. 13.  (t) Ver. 11.
(n) See and consider John i. 9.  Job xxxii. 8.  2 Cor. iii. 17.
FALL of M A N.

We now have indeed Lives as but a Shadow, short as a Dream in comparison to the Duration of the first Men: But we stand in the Height of the Experience of Ages; all the Knowledge we want for Life is not so far from us as it was from them, who lived in the Beginning: Had our first Parents, and their immediate Descendants, came to Decline as precipitately as we do, their Knowledge of Life would have been cut down too fast, for any Shoots to be made that might yield a Produce of Arts and Sciences necessary for the Improvement of the World: So that if we will duly think of Mankind, what we came from, and how we are come up to what we now are, we may see as well of our present Life, that it is long enough, ordinarily speaking, for what is to be our Work in the World (w), as that the early Ages could not but require a more extended Period, for human Attainments to be gradually opened and displayed; that what Man was made capable of, if he might have Time to come up to it, he might not absolutely be cut off from, by not being allowed a sufficient Term to attain it. The Complaint, that Life is not long

(w) See Sherlock upon Death, c. 3. §. 2.
enough for Man to reap all the Fruits (x) of his Labours under the Sun, might be as sensibly felt by our earliest Forefathers, as it is by us. They lived, as I might say, nearer the Ground: Their Prospects were not so raised, (Things not having been tried for the common Use and Benefit) as our Sights of Things are: The Schools of Literature, or the Shops of Artificers, can at once put us, even in our younger Years, upon a Rise of Science above what they could come near to in all their Centuries; and excepting, that if they would fear God, and keep his Commandments, they had herein all that they wanted for a Life to come; and we in all our Attainments, more than this, have nothing worthy to be compared with it; they could not but feel of their Life when over, though they did not feel it so soon as we do, that in comparison to what they might have hoped from it, few after all, and evil, were the Days of their Pilgrimage (y): A Pilgrimage it was, which, however long we may think it to have been in

(x) We commonly say, Ars longa, Vita brevis.  (y) Job said this of his Days, when he was 130 Years old, Gen. xlv. 9. And can we think if he had lived to the Days of the Years of the Life of his Progenitors, he would have found in the human Life, to use Tully's Language, the quod est diu. Cit. de Seneclute.
counting over the Days of the Years of it, unquestionably seem’d to them, when they had passed through it, but as a Tale that was told; and brake off at last, short of that human Perfection, which they might see to be far larger than what they had attained: and that had their Lives been shorter, they would not have had Room to lay the Foundations of what God intended they should contribute to the human Science and Improvement of the World.

In the Day that our first Parents eat of the Tree, they died, or became mortal: It is frivolously inquired by some, Whether the Food of the Tree was not of a deadly or poisonous Nature; deceitful to the Eye; appearing to be good for Food (z), but inwardly a

— fallax Herba Veneni.  

Virg. (a)

treacherously

(z) Gen. iii 6. (a) The Epithet, fallax, here used by Virgil, I think peculiar: I do not remember any Herb described by the Naturalists to be remarkably tempting to the Eye or Tast, and inwardly a treacherous and deceitful Poison; but this seems the Intention of Virgil’s Epithet. Mr. Pope well enough calls it the Herb that conceals Poison, see the Notes on his Eclogue, Mis-fare: Had he had a Word that would have hinted the Herb to have been tempting to induce Men to be deceived to be poisoned, he had more fully come up to Virgil’s Expression. The Annotators upon Virgil say, fallax herba, quia Mortalis falsiter in tentatur: I do not see the Spirit of Virgil’s Poetry in this Explanation: it rather creeps to human Artifice in the Ufe of the Medicine,
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trachery of full of malignant Juices, that would have a natural Effect to cause Mortality. I should rather think, that as yet, every Thing that God had made was intrinsically good (b); that there was nothing naturally no
cent and baneful; nothing that would hurt or destroy (c): And the Mortality of Man is in no wise hinted by Moses, to have been the na
tural Event of his having eaten of the Tree: He rather suggests, that the Frame Man was built of, would of course not be eternal, un
less God was pleased further to make it so en

Medicine, to represent the Deceit of it, than gives a lively Hint, that the Herb itself had an innate Quality, both to be, and to tempt to be deceived to Ruin, those who should be in
clined to use it: The Learned generally suppose Virgil to have wrote his Pollio upon hints taken from some prophetic Poems amongst the Romans, which had originally been formed for some Sentiments taken out of the Jewish Scriptures. And a Virgil introduces the Serpent in the same Line, accidit et Serpe et fallax Herba venit; If it may be supposed that any fragment, or sacred Book of the Heathens had hinted any Things a Serpent’s having deceived Mankind by eating, what he had offered to them, or if Virgil had, by any Search after the Notions of the Jewish Literature, formed any Thought of such ancient Sentiment, he may be conceived very poetically to have thence wrote his fallax Herba venit.

(b) Gen. i. 2
(c) Things were, I apprehend, at first univerally innocuous; in the Prophetic Writings, and best Comments upon them; e. g. Isa. ii. 4. xi. 6, 7, 8, 9. lxv. 25, &c. hint they will in this Time be restored to be; of which happy State of Things a come, Virgil had collected many Sentiments almost Verbatim and thought them an Ornament to his Poem. See Pope’s Notes on his Messiah; and more particularly Bishop Chandler’s Dyes of Christianity.
Fall of Man.

During: Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt return (d), was the Declaration now made to Adam: undoubtedly he who upholds all Things by the Word of his Power, in whom we live, move, and have our Being, and by whom all Things do consist (e), could have spoken the Word, and the Mortal of our first Parents would have put on Immortality, and of this he gave them a Sign, in the Appointment of the Tree of Life (f): But this Word was not as yet spoken; for they had not yet, under the Direction of it, taken and eat of the Tree of Life to live for ever (g), and this not being done, God was now pleased to prevent their doing it (h): And accordingly, they were henceforward to have their Houses of Clay, whose Foundations were but Dust, stand only until Time would moulder them, and bring them by a gradual Decay down again to the Ground.

And this, rightly understood, must instruct us to say of the Tree of Life also, that it could have no natural Effect, to give to them who should eat it eternal Life: No such Power in Nature could be in it: God only hath Immortality,

(d) Gen. iii. 19.  (e) Heb. i. 3. Acts xvii. 28. Col. i. 17.  
(f) Gen. ii. 9.  (g) iii. 22.  (h) Ibid. 23, 24.
mortality (i), and he can give to have Life in himself to whomsoever, to whatsoever, and in what Manner soever he will: If he appointed that our first Parents should, whenever he commanded it, have taken and eaten of a particular Tree, and from thenceforth be immortal, the Command is to berationally understood, as we understand our eating Bread and drinking Wine in our Sacrament, in order to be Partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ (k): The outward Action would profit nothing (l), were it not the Commandment of God: But the doing, with a faithful Heart, what God has expressly commanded, as a Memorial, and in Acknowledgment, that we receive the Benefits we hope for, not as coming of ourselves, but as they in Truth are the Gift of God, may be both a Reason, and an

(i) 1 Tim. vi. 16.  (k) See Common-Prayer Communion Office. John vi. 51—58. (l) The flesh profits nothing: they that are of the flesh cannot please God. John vi. 63. These Words of our Saviour do, I think, plainly hint to us, that the Notion of a transformed Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, as the Papists hold it, is a Fable not groundless only, but in itself insignificant and vain, for that as the Words our Saviour spake, the Commandment gave was not meant thus grossly, but intended in a spiritual Sense, the Flesh would profit nothing: the eating the Body and drinking the Blood of Christ really in his Flesh, if they could do it, not being what he commanded, would be of no Moment at all.

Assurance,
FALL of M A N.

Assurance, that they shall be given us, according to our believing and doing his Word: And herein we may see, why Man having forfeited the Hope of Immortality, which he was to have become a Partaker of, in eating of the Tree of Life; the Liberty to eat of that Tree was now denied him: We cannot be so absurd as to imagine, that if Adam and Eve, as soon as they had eaten of the forbidden Tree, before God had prevented them, had taken also and eat of the Tree of Life, they would thereby have defeated the Purpose of God, and notwithstanding what God had denounced, would have escaped Death, by having eat of it: The Text of Moses neither speaks nor hints any such Thing.

The Words of Moses are: And now lest he put forth his Hand, and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat [vechai lenolam (m)]: Moses does not here use the Verb [vachajab], which would be rightly rendred, and live, as we translate [vecaal (n)], and eat: But the Words used by Moses are, the Particle Ve and the Participle Chai: And Ve in many Passages of Scripture signifies not and, but as, quasi or

sicut
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scut in Latin (o), and [ve chai] strictly rendred signifies as living: And the expression of Moses rightly translated is, And now left he put forth his Hand, and take also of the Tree of Life as one living, i.e. as if he was one that was to live for ever: The Sense of the Place thus rendred is clear and reasonable, free of the trifling Insinuations we may otherwise deduce from it. It was not fit that God should leave our first Parents the Use of the Sign of Immortality, when the Thing signified was taken from them: And therefore God now ordered them to remove out of the Garden, and placed at the East of the Garden of Eden Cherubims and a flaming Sword, which turns every way to keep the Way of the Tree of Life (p), to deter and prevent their Approach to it: God now gave them a visible Evidence, such as he afterwards shewed the Jesu in the holy Place of Sinai (q), that he was greater to be feared, than it had as yet entered their poor Imaginations to conceive; that he had Hosts in Heaven to execute his Word; Angels that were his Ministers, and a Flame of Fire (r).

(o) See 1 Sam. xii. 15. 2 Sam. xv. 24. et in al. loc. Noldius. partic. 162. (p) Gen. v. 24. (q) Exod. xix. 16—18. (r) Phil. lxviii. 17. (r) Heb. i. 7.
The Facts we have considered can, I think, want no farther Examination. There are undoubtedly other Inquiries, which may be started. It may be asked: Why, or how came it to pass, that the all-good and all-merciful God, did not admit our first Parents to Mercy, to repent and be forgiven, especially if they sinned no more in the like Manner; but became thenceforth absolutely obedient to his Word; to be restored to his Favour, to have without dying, eternal Life? Would not this have more clearly answered our reasonable Apprehensions of the Nature of the Goodness of God, than that he should purpose to allot us to go through a Life of many Sins, and much original and acquired Infirmity, at last indeed to have a Way through Death, unto this (t) Immortality? I answer: An inspired Writer has suggested an Answer to this Query: If, says he, we believe not, yet be abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself (u): If God had denounced, that Man should die, unless he would keep the Commandment that had been injoined him, it could not be, that he for whom it is impossible to die (w), should, after our first Parents had herein transgressed, still

---

(t) Matt. xxv. 34.  (u) 2 Tim. ii. 13. (w) Heb. vi. 18.

admit
admit them not to know that Death, which he had most expressly declared against such Transgression: And to this we may unquestionably add further; that if it had not been most fit, in the Reason and Nature of Things, that Man now should die, the unerring Goodness and Wisdom of God would not have threatened nor appointed this Punishment: This, I think, is suggested by Moses: *Behold the Man is become as one of us, to know Good and Evil: And now, lest—he live for ever* (x). The Meaning of the Words will, I dare say, by none be thought, that the Man by eating the forbidden Tree, was actually become wise as God is wise; knowing, as God is knowing: This in Fact was not true: This, in the Nature of the Thing, was impossible: But they point out to be considered; that the Man, whom God had made so as that he ought to be kept in the Hand of God's Counsel, had now taken upon him to be guided, contrary to God's Directions by his own: The Creature not made intrinsically allwise, not endowed with a Beam of unerring Wisdom; not capable of being to himself a steady Dictator of every Thing that was right, for the

(x) Gen. iii. 22. Guidana
Guidance of his Life (y); The Creature able indeed to reason, but liable often to reason not a right (z), had now set up himself to judge, without Dependance upon what God had said or should say to him, what should be his Good and what his Evil: And now lest — be live for ever: — The Point here intimated seems to be, whether it could be meet this Creature now subject to Vanity, should be indulged a peccant Immortality? And here how ought we to consider, that to

Snatch from God’s Hand the Balance —
to venture to define, contrary to what is, what we may think might better have been his Distributions to his Creatures; to

Rejudge his Justice, be the God of God,
     Pope.

is a most blind Employment: Rather examining, what is declared to have been in Fact, his Purpose towards us; and considering, how, altho’ he made Man upright (a),

(y) Quartus Gradus et altissimus eorum, qui naturâ boni sapientésque gignuntur, quibus a Principio innaécitur Ratio, recta confundique quae supra hominem putanda est, Deoque tribuenda. Cic. de Nat. Deor. ubi sup.
(z) Wisdom ii. 1.
(a) Eccles. vii. 29.
consistently with his being a free Agent —; I say, considering, that although Man was thus created, yet that God, foreknowing how our first Parents would abuse their Liberty, did verily fore-ordain before the Foundation of the World a Man to be the Power and Wisdom of God unto our Salvation (b), we may reasonably apprehend, however apt we may be to judge otherwiser, that if God had not known that our first Parents in eating of the Tree, had began a Cogitation, which (they and their Posterity remaining free Agents) would not be so changed as we may imagine, he would not have denounced nor executed upon Man that Sentence of Death, which obtains against us; observing further, that if this is indeed the Appointment of God, as we have all Reason to say of all that is so,

Whatever is is right, Pope.

(b) See Rom. i. 26. 1 Cor. i. 24. 1 Pet. i. 20.
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so it must unquestionably be true, that if there might have been some better Way provided for us, than that which is appointed, such better Way would have been given to us: But seeing this is the Way, and being able to prove from the Scriptures, that we may if we will, through this Dispensation of God to us, come at length to the Life eternal (c), we hence rightly conclude, that altho' it doth not yet appear what we shall be (d), nor how every Particular of God's Appointments doth conspire to connect and make up the one universal Design of him, of whom the whole Family of the Heavens and the Earth is named (e); yet Nothing can be so warrantable in us, as to believe and confess, that both great and marvellous are thy Works, Lord God Almighty, and just and true are thy Ways, thou King of Saints (f).

(c) As in Matters of Speculation and philosophical Inquiry, the only Judge of what is right or wrong, is Reason and Experience; so in Matters either of human Testimony or divine Revelation, the only certain Rule of Truth is the Testimony or the Revelation itself. Clark's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, introductory. (d) 1 John iii. 2. (e) Ephes. iii. 15.

Man, who here seems Principal alone,
Perhaps ads second to some Sphere unknown,
Teaches some Wheel, or verges to some Goal,
'Tis but a Part we see, and not a whole. Pope.

(f) Rev. xv. 17.
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A Consequence of the Fall, I apprehend, must have been, that a Depravity of the Mind of Man gradually arose, and was occasioned from it. God at first made Man upright ['Jashar], not inclined to any Evil (g); but Man was, when thus upright, to be immortal (gg): After the Transgression, our first Parents were to die: They had now in the Body what would by degrees bring them to decline, and in the End effect their Dissolution: And a Body become thus corruptible pressed down the Soul (b);

praegravat und
Atque affigit humo divinam Particulam Aure.

Hor.

will introduce Affections grosser and less pure, irregular and distempered; other than they might have known, had they never been incumbered with such a decaying Tabernacle: The Sages of the Heathen World would readily have admitted this Truth: St. Paul himself, in describing the State of the unregenerate Man, speaking in his Person, I know, says he, that in me, that is, in my Flesh, dwelleth no good Thing: For to will is present

(g) Sup. 8o. &c. (gg) Vide qua sup. (b) Wilt. ix. 15.
with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not; but the Evil which I would not, that I do (i); is hardly more express than Plato (k): As long, says Plato, as we have the Body, and our Soul is intermixed with such an Evil, we shall never satisfactorily possess our selves even of what we desire. The Philosopher, we see, and others that followed him, would easily have allowed it to be of the utmost Consequence to a divine Spirit, whether it be joined to a mortal or an immortal Body (l): Our first Parents might have had in the Heart, in that which was not corruptible (n), what might render them, superior in Affections and Inclinations, to what naturally became their Appetites, when a Bondage of Corruption began to work in them a Nature below the Liberty of the Sons of God (o): We may easily reconcile herein the Scriptures and

---

true Philosophy, for the Body and the Soul are so intimately joined in our Composition, that they both must have a considerable Influence the one upon the other: And having herein intimated what our first Parents now became, it is obvious to consider, that as was the Tree, such must be the Branches; that henceforth there would be no natural Descendant from these now Mortals, who would not have in him a Sensuality of Nature \( p \), such as must render it very reasonable, not only to a Master in Israel \( q \); but to any one that duly estimates the Composition of Man, to admit what our Saviour argued, namely, that we must be born again, if we would see the Kingdom of God \( r \): Our first Parents now came to have, and their Descendants to be born to, that Duplicity of Nature elegantly described by Plato \( s \), as well as considered

\( p \) XXXIX Articles, see Art. ix. \( q \) See John iii. 10. \( r \) Ibid. ver. 3. \( s \) Νηπίους τὸ ἁμαρτινῶς εἰδεν τὸ κρεῖττον καὶ γένος ἐπὶ ζωὴν τοῖς τοῖς, ὁ ἀνέπαιρεν νεκρόλογον ἀλής ἄποτε ἡ σὰρκας ἐμφυτέως ἔστη οὐδὲν ἐμφυτέως ἐμφυτεύεις, ἵνα ἀναστῇ καὶ τὸ μη πεποίητο, τὸ ἀπίτι τῷ σώματι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρῶτον μὲν ἐκεῖνος ἀναστήσεται ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τάσιν ἐκεί βιώσαν πανθηματίν έμφυτφυίν γην ἐπέκειναι οὐδὲν εὐφράτεις πρὸς τὰς ὑδάτις τὰς ἐν υἱῷ κατασκηνώσας, ἐν διότι ξυπερήν τε, κατασκηνώθεις ὓσσον. Plato in Timaeo.
by St Paul (t), Mankind came now to have Inclinations arising from the Body, which would often run contrary to the better Sense of the Mind; and give every one the Unhappiness to know of himself in looking back upon his Life, that he had done, thought, and said, so many Things, below what his own Mind and Sentiments would tell him, ought and might have been his Conduct (w), as to see in himself as clearly as in a Glass, that we greatly want to be delivered from a Body of Sin (w): In this Point therefore Reason and Revelation agree, and bear Testimony to one another; that we are in Fact imperfect, not in our Knowledge only, but still more imperfect in oftentimes having a Will not to act so well as we know to be our Duties. And this Moses's History proceeds to shew in the Actions of Men; and particularly, that cre Adam came to be 130 Years old, Evil had got such an Ascendant, where it had been

(t) Rom. vii. 23. (w) 1 Kings viii. 46. James iii. 2. 1 John i. 8.

'Αυτὸς ἀνεπ ἄγαθος, τὸτε Υδ. κακὸς, ἄλλοτε δὲ ἔσθις.

Πλεῖον μῆν ἄγαθον ἄγαθον ἄγαθον ἄλλοθες, οἷον τε μῆν τοι ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἔδέρχετο. Πλ. in Protag. (w) See Rom. vii. 24.

T 4 indulged
indulged (x), that one of Adam's Children became a Murderer and slew his Brother (y). But,

Moses mentions one Particular more, which I have not considered. He tells us, Unto Adam also, and to his Wife, did the Lord God make Coats of Skins, and clothed them (z): I would observe, 1. That the Word which we render Skins, is in the singular Number a Skin (a), not Skins in the plural: and that we have no Reason from the Hebrew Text to put in the Particle of: The Verse verbally translated is, And the Lord God made a Skin Coats for the Man and his Wife, and clothed them (b). The Fact was: God now appointed them to use the Skin of a Beast for Clothing, not, I apprehend manufactured into Coats: Improvements of this Sort undoubtedly were afterwards introduced: Our first

(x) Cain undoubtedly did not come at once to that outrageous Wickedness of killing his Brother: He had been a bad Man before in many evil Actions, so Moses hints in what he records God to expostulate unto Cain, Gen. iv. 7. and the Apostle further observes it 1 John iii. 12. Cain — slew his Brother, or wherefore slew he him? because his own Works were evil, and his Brothers righteous. (y) Gen. iv. (z) iii. 21. (a) De Pelle.

(b) The Hebrew Words of the Text are תְנוּנֵי עַל בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם דָּוִד דּוֹרִינִי et amicivit eos. De Pelle.
Parents did no more than put about them the Skin of some Beasts, as we read the early Inhabitants of other Countries, and in later Ages of the World did (c), whenever they wanted such a Clothing. 2. Altho’ the Verse we are now treating stands prior to God’s putting Adam and Eve out of the Garden, and the End of the Verse says, that God clothed them, yet I do not conceive Moses here to hint to us, that God instantly clothed them and sent them into the World: The Hebrew Word [כּֽעַלַּבַּשְּמָן] and clothed them (d), is the future Tense with Vau prefixed, which Prefix the Grammarians observe to turn such future Tense into a perfect, or to speak the Thing treated of to be actually done: I may observe all the Verbs used in this and the Verses following, he made Coats; clothed them; sent them forth; drove out the Man; are thus in the future Tense with Vau (e): May we not understand the Reason of the Piece of Grammar just above hinted? Some ancient Writers imagined, that our first Parents were permitted

---


(d) uti Pelibus, et corpus spolii usitare ferarum. Lucret. Lib. 5.

(e) המשׂ—וֹשֵׁבָהוּ—יָאָמָר—וְיִשְׂכַּה שִׁבְּשַׁנְּךָ to
to stay some little time in the Garden before they were put out of it into the World (f), may not these future Tenses with the Vau prefixed hint something of this Sort? the clothing them, the sending them out of the Garden, &c. were Things absolutely and actually done, but some Process of Time, to instruct and prepare them for it, might be taken up, before it was completed, and may not the future Tenses, with Vau prefixed, hint this to us? The Things spoken of had their Execution; but not instantly at once; but proceeded gradually to be effected, as God thought fit to have them dispatched. If we may take them in this Sense, we shall easily find an Answer, 3. to what is or may be queried upon the Occasion; How should our first Parents get Possession of the Skins of Beasts, and make them fit for the Uses they were to make of them? I answer: I apprehend God at this Time appointed Sacrifices (g); and if so, as he afterwards gave Moses Directions for the Passover, and for other Institutions of the Jewish Law (b); so he now might give our first Parents such Instructions as they could not be

(f) ἡμεῖς οὖν παραδόθην, &c. οὐ χω, μη τεσσερεῖν τοις μεθ' ἡμέρας παραδόθην τοῦ κόσμου. Syncl. p. 8. (g) See Consi. Vol. i. B. 2. p. 80. (b) See Exod. xii. &c.
want, and which might suggest all they wanted to know upon the Occasions now before them: However, I cannot but remark, in the general, that we consider things with a Judgment dull and unobserv ing, if we can allow the Mind of Man no Invention, but as we can trace and mark out the Steps that led to it: How Tubal Cain came to find out Brass and Iron, and the Ways of working them; or how Tubal became (i) a Master of Music, is not to be investigated in this Manner: Our Minds are too lively to be accounted for, by such stated Deductions: incidental Sentiments often stir in us, we know not whence nor how, and they lead us as often to Consequences as unexpected: They open to us Trials and Experiments, which produce what we had no Thought of, even whilst we were pursuing them; and many Times before we are aware, throw us upon what we had no Intention, or even Notion of seeking: The best Heathen Writers were ready to acknowledge the Rise of the useful and important Inventions of their Lives to (k) have been of God: And we can never reason of these Things, but shall find it to be the best Philosophy, as well as Reli-

(i) Gen. iv.  (k) Plato in Polit.
gion, not only to acknowledge every good and perfect Gift (l) in all our Endowments, to have come down from Him, in whom we live, move, and have our Being (m), but

— ἡμᾶς ἸΔίως περιχύμεθα θαύματε. Aratus.

He also, whose incorruptible Spirit is in all Things (n), is often the Author to us of many happy Turns of Mind, which lead us in what we are apt to call fortunate Thoughts, unto great and useful Discoveries, which if we had been without him in the World, might never have been made or conceived by us. But, 4. I cannot apprehend our first Parents to have been so unthinking, that common Sense would not have led them, after a very little Experience of their now Condition, both to know it decent to have, and to invent themselves a Covering: For what they did, when their Fears alarmed them to wish to hide themselves from (o) God, may suggest, what they naturally would have done, to have been clothed in the Sight of one another. Wreaths of Greens, Foliages, and Flowers, might be variously combined to have made them ornamental.

(o) Gen. iii. 7.
Habits, and we may indulge our Imagination to say, that even Solomon in all his Glory might not be arrayed, beyond what Eve, after a little Trial and Experience might be able to decorate herself in these: And the Climate they lived in might perhaps be such, that a Clothing of this Nature might be sometimes more agreeable, than to be always in a closer and warmer Covering: But if it be considered, how soon Leaves and Flowers would fade away; that a Dress of long Endurance could not be had from these Materials, and that the Labour and other Cares of their Lives would not admit them to lay out all their Time in this one Particular, not to say, that a Cover of this Sort might not serve in all Weathers, but at some Seafons at least a better Shelter must have been an happy, a necessary Accommodation; leaving our first Parents to add any Ornament they could like, as Circumstances might admit of any, the Provision God was pleased to make for them was such, that we cannot see how they could continue to live long without it.

I have now carried this Undertaking to the utmost Extent I proposed to give it. It contains, I think, an Account of all that Moses has related of the Creation and Fall of Man.
The Creation and Man. It will perhaps be asked, Did God clothe them only? Was his Care of them such as to provide for them in this lesser, and did he not instruct them in greater and more important Matters? I answer: Undoubtedly he did: And I apprehend both Moses to suggest, and subsequent Scriptures to confirm to us, that God gave them a Method, for their Repentance and obtaining Pardon of their Sins, and some time before Adam died, set before them Hopes of another World: But to proceed to treat of these would be to begin a new Subject: All I proposed herein, was to examine what Moses has said of the Creation and Fall, and what possible Objections may be made to his Narration: I think I have omitted none of any Moment: For of some that are pretended, we surely, consistently with the greatest Candour, may say, that they need not be mentioned, they are too frivolous to want an Answer: One at least of this Kind I find in Dr. Burnet: He asks, What if Adam had not sinned? Could all his Descendants have come from all Parts of (p) the World, in all Ages, to eat of the

(p) Prætereà, si ex una Arbore, vel ipsius Fruetu, perpetuo diffullet Longevitas vel Immortalitas Hominum, Quid si non peccasset Adamus? Quó potuissent ipsius posteri per totum Te...
One Tree of Life, planted in the Garden of Eden? Or could this One Tree have been sufficient unto all Times, and for all Nations? It is most obvious to see, 1. That we cannot say, if Adam had persevered to live according to the Word of God, until he should have been commanded to eat of the Tree of Life, whether, as now in Adam all have died, in such Case, all Mankind descended of immortal Parents would not have been immortal. Or 2. It must be evident, that as God knew beforehand, what Events would happen in all Things, 'tis undeniable, that he might foresee, when and how long it would be before our first Parents would transgress; and that the Appointments he had made would be sufficient for what would be the Duration of that State of Mankind for which they were appointed. 3. That if Mankind had not fallen, but proceeded to walk with God according to his Laws, until they had become so instructed in all Knowledge, and rooted in all Truth, as never to swerve from it; if the partaking of some Sign of Immortality had been thought fit to be commanded for them in using it to

walk humbly with God (q), not arrogating Immortality to themselves as their own; but receiving it, as it was indeed his Gift to them; as we have considered, that the Tree of Life had no innate Virtue in itself to give Life (r), but could be of Moment only as it was the Commandment of God; so God might, as Men multiplied and dispersed, have at sundry Times and in divers Manners, given other Commands, other Signs for this Purpose as necessary and beneficial, just as he should be pleased by his Word to appoint, according to what he saw most fit for distant and different Parts of the World, in the Counsel of his own Will.

I am aware that some may treat it as a Topic of Ridicule, to imagine that God made Man so weak a Creature as to want his Creator at every Turn an Admonisher at his Elbow (s), but it is obvious to reply, that to dress a Proposition in ludicrous Terms, and then to laugh at it, is laughing at the Dress we give it; but does not really affect, what ought not to be treated with so fancied a Levity. To consider rationally the Order and Gradation of God's

(q) Micah vi. 6.  (r) Vide quæ sup.  (s) Dr. Middlet. Inquiry, p. 132.
Works, will, I think, abundantly shew us, that Man ought to be (g), as Fact and Experience agree to testify, that he really is a Creature higher than and above the blinder Instinct of an animal Life: But to say hereupon, that Man was made so perfect, as to want no Guidance but his own, is a Step at once to an Height of Wisdom, which may be many Ranks above us in the intellectual World (b): That there are prodigious Differences between the Abilities of even different Men, is most apparent: And it is most evidently reasonable, that there should be so; that in the progressive Order of each Rank of Being above that which is beneath it, some should descend almost to the Species of those next below them, as others may on the other Hand be raised to a near Approach unto the Orb above them: There may be; There ought to be; There are, some Men, such, as that it were to be wished they never would act without an Admonisher at their Elbow; but, on the contrary, to say of the most intelligent of Men, of those who have the most exalted human Understanding,
ing, that they have a Self-sufficiency of Wisdom above all Want of superior Direction, this is

—— to think beyond Mankind; Pope.

It is to think ourselves to have Powers, which are over the Line, which is our Boundary: our Nature does not reach to this Height:

Our Reason raise o'er Instinct as you can,
In this 'tis God directs, in that but Man.

See Pope.

In our Degree we have real Perfections both of Body and Mind: The Body has its Eye, the Mind its Understanding; both of excellent Use and Direction: But to say of either, that they are so perfect, as not in any Point to want Aid, or Assistance, is to opine beyond our Father. The Eye of the Body is able, in many Cases, intuitively

——— curvo dignoscere Rectum. Hor.

to distinguish a straight Line from a crooked: But shall we say of any Man, that he has an Edge of Sight so unerring (however some may excel others in this Particular) as to be able, without Line, Rule, or Measure, by his Eye alone, to raise a various Fabric, just, straight, upright and regular in all true Dimensions? It is the same with the Understanding, the Eye of
of the Mind: We may be able by our Reason to deduce and judge aright of many moral Duties; but if we would say of the best human Reason, that it ever did, without any Rule but its own Direction, raise the true Fabric of all moral Virtue (i); we must produce something to warrant such Affertion, beyond what either the ancient Inquirers, or our modern Reasoners have been able to evince. The wisest Masters of the Greek Learning, could not fix the Criterion by which they might know what was only human Sentiment, and what more surely was real Truth (k); The Roman Philosophy was as indeterminate: The Quid est Virtus — the very Exemplar Honesti was what they were not able indisputably to ascertain (l): They wanted some Text, whereby they might settle, how to distinguish in the several Duties of Life, wherein Reason and Right Reason might happen to differ from

(i) Ut sineullo Errore dijudicare possimus, sequendo cum illo, quod hominem intelligimus, pragnare id timeditur, quod appellamus utile. Formula quaedam constituenda est, quam si sequeris in constructione Rerum, ab officio nunquam recedamus. Cic. de Offic. Lib. 3. c. 4. (k) ὃς οὐκ ἔχων καὶ οἷς ἄλλης ἔχων δόθη ὅτι ὁῦ γίνει —Plato in Timaeo. ἦκνος ἔνθητος βοῶς ἄλλης ἔχως ἐποτε μὴν δόθην —οὐκ ἄλλης, ἐποτε οὐκ ἄλλης. Plat. in Thracet. (l) Sentit Domus animaeque, sentit Forum, sentit curia, campi, socii, Provincias, ut simulmodo Ratione rečè stat, sic Ratione pecchetur. Cic. de Nat. Deor. l. 3. c. 27. The Author of the Book of Wisdom suggests the Difference. We may reason, but not rightly, Wisd. ii. 1.
one another (m): And it is as remarkable of all our modern Moralists (n), that, however they shew a great Want of Precision; of determinate and indisputable Direction each in one another’s Rule or Standard, they are every one at last exactly as deficient in their own (o).

The Word of God is Truth (p): This was to have been the Rule of Truth in all moral and religious Duty to our first Parents and their Descendants: And a good Understanding would have prevailed amongst them, if they would carefully have done thereafter (q): Through the Precepts of God, as they more and more improved in Knowledge, they would have seen the Error of every false Way, and in Time have been able to delineate the true Religion of our Nature according to it: But although God gave them

---

(m) The Text wanted is, By what shall we know when we reason aright, and when not? A Deo, says the Disputant in Tully, Ratioem habemus, bonam aut Non bonam a nobis. Cic. de Nat. Deor. I. 3. We want a Standard, whereby to judge when we make our Reason the one, and when the other.

(n) Mr. Brown, in his very excellent Essay on the Malevolent Virtue, rightly observes, that our modern Moralists have felt little more than what might be transcribed from the old Greek Philosophers, and from Tully after him, p. 122. (o) See Mr. Browne’s Essay. (p) See Psal. cxix. 142. John xvii. 17. (q) Psal. cxii. 10. cxix. 104.
Fall of Man.

his Instructions, we are not to represent, that he was minutely at their Elbow, to leave them in nothing to themselves, in Reason to consider Things; Moses in no wise writes of them in this Manner: God gave our first Parents one Command to be a Rule to them, how they were to walk humbly with him (r): He gave them one more to be the Foundation of their relative Duty to one another (s): He afterwards gave like Precepts in other Particulars: If now they would have made these their Faith; to receive and believe them, and to square their Lives according to them; Herein they would have had an abundant Direction, and would not have erred, if they would not vary and decline from it: To have added Knowledge to their Faith, as the Incidents arose, which might afford them Knowledge, would have been their reasonable Duty, as it is ours (t): And a great Field for them herein to exercise themselves must have opened daily unto them: For we cannot opine them to have been so insensible, as to think nothing to be their Duty, but barely to observe literally the Points commanded them, and no more: They were to

(r) Micah vi. 6. Gen. ii. 17. (s) Ver. 24. (t) 2 Pet. i. 5.

fee,
fee, and would see every Thing to be wrong, which would make their Lives run counter to the Intention of what was directed: The being forbidden to eat of one particular Tree, injoined our first Parents not only to abstain from the Fruit of a Tree (u), but in every Thing, whenever and wheresoever God commanded, they were to obey his Voice indeed; as the being obliged never to separate from one another (w), must shew it to be their Duty to consider, and be rationally such in their Conduct, as to live suitably to this indissoluble Tye; that what God had made the indispensable Condition, they should for themselves make the real Happiness of their Lives: And thus Revelation can in no wise be said to have superseded Reason, but from the Beginning to have been no more than the necessary Aid without which human Nature could not be made perfect: It was given to be

(u) If it could be conceived that our first Parents could have imagined, that if they but abstained from eating of the Tree, they duly observed the Law of God, tho' in other Points they did not live according to the Directions of their Maker, it is evident, they would herein have kept the Form of their Religion only, without admitting the Power and Influence of it than which nothing can be more contrary to Reason, or more severely reprimanded in the holy Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. See Canoniz. Vol. III. p. 129, &c.  
(w) Gen. ii. 24.
a Lamp to our Feet, and a Light to our Paths; to give us what in Tully’s Language we might say are the Formulee (x), to mark to us the Points, which, if we had been made Creatures of an higher Intellect, we might have intuitively seen for ourselves, in looking into the Natures of Things: But which, if they had not been given, such Creatures as we are; if we had had nothing to give us Judgment, but the Fruits of the Tree of our own Knowledge of Good and Evil; we should, not only from the now Bias of our Appetites, but from (what Man was subject to from the Beginning) Mistakes of Understanding, not have found or pursued, so as to be such as we ought, in this World; or be able justly to satisfy ourselves, how we might be meet for a better.

(x) Jura, Formulee de omnibus Rebus constitutae, nequis aut in Genere Injuriae, aut in Ratione Actionis errare posset. Cic. Orat. pro Q. Roscio Commodo.

THE END.
INDEX.

A

Bilities of Understanding ought to be different in different Men, why? Page 289
Adam, whereof made
where placed ibid.
what immediate Command he received from God ibid.
called to name the Creatures ibid.
how he instantly understood the Meaning of God's Voice 15
did not name the Creatures all at one Time 38
when first taught to use Sounds of his own for the Names of Things 40
learned the Use of Words by being called to name the Creatures 41
not directed what particular Names to give the Creatures ibid.
named the Woman 50
did not make the Reflection that the Man and his Wife were inseparably to live together ibid.
when he first began to think, did not abound instantly with a Variety of Conceptions 52
did not at first make long Soliloquies 22
placed at first in the midst of plain and few Objects 53
heard at first from God nothing but what was most obvious and intelligible ibid.
Adam.
Adam, his first Day, not a Day of Hurry and Confusion
the State of his original Knowledge 62
how he began to make Words 55
not endowed with a sudden Apprehension of the
Nature of the living creatures 63
had no such Knowledge of the animal World as
Milton supposes. 64
was no Philosopher ibid.
had no innate Science ibid.
nor innate Sentiments of Morality ibid.
all his Ideas from Sensation and Reflection 67
knew no more of God than what he had heard
or seen could occasion him to think of him ibid.

had no innate Knowledge of himself 61
had only a Capacity of attaining just Notions of
his Duty 61
not endowed with an innate Astronomy 71
his Judgment at first uninformed 71
how he became afraid of God 74
how created in the Image of God 74
not endowed with an unerring Understanding 81

his Capacity quick and lively 87
had all the Powers of a Sound Mind 87
sufficiently endowed, if he would have kept God's
Commandments 100
having done the Will of God, might by the Ten
of Life have lived for ever 93
with Eve, at the Time she eat of the forbidden
Fruit 16
not superior to Eve in Understanding to resist
the Temptation 16
afraid because naked, why ? 23
INDEX.

Adam not at first sensible of God's omnipresence 203
what he meant in the Words he spake unto God
concerning his being naked 205
not appointed to die the very Day he transgressed
by eating the forbidden Tree, did not become
wise as God is wise 272
Adam and Eve both made on the sixth Day 5
their first Notions of Things narrow and unimproved 18
how their Knowledge enlarged 19
how they formed their first language 21
why first employed in the Garden 60
the Opinion of Writers concerning their original
Knowledge, groundless 62
not surprized at hearing the Serpent speak with
Man's Voice 63
were both together when the Serpent spake to
Eve ibid.
believing the Serpent, a Proof of their Ignorance 66
whilst they did not eat the forbidden Fruit, they
continued in the Hand of God's Counsel 109
their eating, or not eating, in itself of no moment, but for the Commandment of God 110
expected great Advantage from their Eyes being opened 198
their Eyes, how opened after eating the forbidden
fruit ibid.
not opened as they expected ibid.
wanted to hide themselves from God 204
did not make themselves Aprons ibid.
their being naked, not meant as to their Clothing 207

X 2

Adam
INDEX.

Adam and Eve, their high Notions of the Serpent reprehended
knew not at first what Enemy had hurt them 220
might, from what God had said to them, reflect
that the Serpent did not speak of himself ibid.
knew not the full Meaning of what was said to
them concerning the Serpent did not apprehend what God said to belong merely
to the Animal from whom the Words came
which beguiled them
not immediately expelled the Garden could not have prevented their dying, after God's
Sentence, by eating of the Tree of Life Adversary who seduced our first Parents
the Manner in which he was permitted to tempt
them
Analogy runs through all the Intelligences of God's
Creation
Androgynes, whence the Fable of them
Animals of the World, not named all at one Time
no Names of them innate in Adam's Mind
nor dictated to him by the Voice of God
Appetites not the Cause of the first Sin
grosser arise from the corruptible Body
Appointments, God's do conspire to make up one
universal Design

B.

Body become mortal, 'tis fleeth down the Soul of what Sort; it is of great Consequence to
Spirit unto which it is joined
INDEX.

Body of Sin, we see in ourselves that we want to be delivered from it. p. 279
Born again, whence necessary we should be to 278

C.

Cain began Improvements in Tillage 256
Capacities of Men border upon the Angelic State

not such as to be an unerring Direction unto all Truth 84—90

Chrift, the Person who is to conquer the old Serpent 247
Circumcision, its Design 105

Coats of Skins, in what Manner appointed our first Parents 280

Command concerning the forbidden Tree suitable to what God had made Man 104
some positive one necessary to be given our first Parents 112

concerning the forbidden Tree, how to be understood 105

why such a Command given ibid.

Clothing, what our first Parents would naturally have thought of 285

that which God appointed our first Parents, necessary for them ibid.

Counsel, God's, not being observed by Adam, subjected him to all Error 111

The Creation shews a wonderful Connection of all Things to one another 90

X 3  Death,
INDEX.

D.

Death, Sentence repeated particularly against the Man only, why? p. 260
fit and proper, in the Reason of Things, after Man had sinned 274
Directions, our first Parents rejecting God's, was a great Perversion of human Life 105
Dispenations of God, how little able we are to determine contrary to them 273
Deluge, the universal, did not dissolve the whole Globe 126
Effects of it to be accounted for by considering the Effects of smaller Inundations 132
Strata, occasioned by it, accounted for 133

E.

Earth, originally produced nothing but by the Word of God 9
Eden, known by the Jews in the Days of their Captivity, to be situate not far from the Waters of Babylon 144
a Country higher up the Stream that watered the Garden, than the Garden ibid.
Egyptians, their Opinion of the original Product of the Earth 9
reputed the Serpent to be an Emblem of the good God 232
Employment of our first Parents in the Garden 248
Euseb. his true Opinion of Moses's History 11
Eve, what her first Idea of Death 15
had no Difficulty in understanding the Serpent why, and how? 24
Eve, so called, why? 57
INDEX.

Eve not tempted before she and Adam had observed in the general, that none of the Animal Creation had the Gift of Speech 160
tempted before she knew the Animals naturally could not speak ibid.
not alone, without Adam, when the Serpent spake to her 163
her Duty to be governed by, and obey her husband ibid.
declared to be the Mother of all living 251
Eyes, Adam’s and Eve’s opened, how? 197
Eye of the Body not able, without Rule or Measure, to raise a regular Building 290
of the Mind no more able, without Rule, to build us up in every Virtue 291

F.

Faith to come by Hearing 186
Obedience of it to be paid unto God ibid.
Fall, not immediately after the Creation 31

G.

Garden, that of the Lord mentioned by Lot to Abraham, was the Garden of Eden described by Moses 142
Geographers, the most ancient Heathen ones; moderns, with regard to the Scripture Geography 137
God caused our first Parents instantly to understand what he spake to them 16
on the sixth Day created both the Man and the Woman 5

X 4  God
I. N. D. E. X.

God caused Adam to understand what he spake to him, how? P. 15
as soon as Man was created made an especial Revelation to him 97
the Command which he gave to Adam called Adam to name the Creatures ibid. 11
did not direct Adam what to name the Creatures 41
injoined Man and Wife to live together did not confound Adam's first Thoughts with a 50
Variety of Objects did not endue Adam with an unerring Understanding. 53
his Sentence against our first Parents not to have been defeated by their eating of the Tree of Life 81
appointed our first Parents Clothing, in what Manner 269
the first Command he gave Adam, suitable to Man's Nature 280
his Command against eating of the forbidden Tree, how to be understood 105
his Word produced all Things his Prophecies to our first Parents enlarged by further Prophecies in After-ages 109
his Word the Rule of Truth 223

H.

Havilah, a Country well known in the Postdiluvian World 137
Heathens conjectured only the Beginning of Man-kind 2
acknowledg'd Man not to be a Creature of unerring Reason 85
Heathens


INDEX.

Heathens acknowledged Man not to be of perfect Virtue p. 85

to be greatly imperfect from the Imperfections of the Body ibid.

acknowledged the useful Inventions for the Benefit of Life to have been given them from God 283

Hiddekel, a River known to Daniel 138
Husbandry the first only Gardening 255

I.

Institutions legal, their Design 105
Intellect wanting no Guidance but its own, many Degrees above Man 298

K.

Knowledge, Adam’s own, not sufficient for him to depend upon 88

L.

Land of the Garden of Eden in the Neighbourhood of Babylonia 140
Life, the most dead Parts of Matter not intirely destitute of it 90

M.

Mankind not from Eternity how began to be known only from Moses's History ibid.

imperfect, wherein 279

had our first Parents not sinned, whether they might not have been born immortal 287

Man
Man cannot be placed higher than between the Animal and Angelic State p. 92
his Reason sufficient, if aided by the Counsel of God not to think he has unerring Reason 95
not made independent in Understanding ibid.
by obeying God's Voice, would have been made wife and fit for Glory 111
guided by his Creator, might have advanced unto all Truth 189
after the Fall born to a Duplicity of Nature 278
his Mind not so slow in Invention, as that we can always trace the Steps of it 283
a Creature a Degree above the Instinct of Animal Life 289
his Perfections both of Body and Mind to a Degree only 290
created with Reason above that of the Animal World, but not so endow'd as to want no assistant Information 93
Why required to obey God's Voice 105
Meat recommendeth not to God 109
Milton, his Notions of Adam when first created, poetical, but not likely to be true 54
his Relation how Adam named the Creatures, groundless 62
does not suppose Adam's and Eve's Transgression on the same Day of their Creation 158
Miracle, none performed when the Lord opened Hagar's Eyes 200
Moses wrote a real History of the Origin of the World and Mankind 12
differs from the Egyptian Philosophy 10
brings Adam into the World in a Manner very natural 53
INDEX.

Moses, his Relation of the first Beginning of Adam's and Eve's Life, not a Fable p. 61
shews that Man was not left insufficiently provided for 88
his Relation of the forbidden Tree literally interpreted is agreeable to all revealed Religion 107
his Garden of Eden not a fictitious Scene 113
speaks of Hills more ancient than the Deluge 120
his Eden might remain in its primitive Situation after the Flood 125
his Garden of Eden not placed in an obscure Corner of the Earth 139
his Description of the Garden of Eden considered 135
afraid of his Rod when turned into a Serpent 230
Mountains coeval with the World 120
the Height of the highest bears no sensible Proportion to the Semidiameter of our Earth 121

N.

Naturalists, their Phænomena of the Deluge, how to be accounted for 130

O.

Opinion, human, how hard to distinguish from real Truth 277

P.

Parents, our first had no Excuse for their Transgression 186
why not permitted to escape Death 271
not drove out of the Garden instantly after their Transgression 282

Parents,
Parents, our first, after the Fall, would naturally think it decent to be clothed: p. 284

Person, one to come from the Woman who should conquer the great Enemy of Mankind 240

Pharaoh, why not afraid of the Rods of the Magicians, when they were turned into Serpents 234

Philosophy, best, as well as Religion, will teach us to think the useful Inventions for human Life to have been given from God 283

Prophecies, the Design of them 223

Spoken by God to our first Parents, enlarged by the Prophecies in After-ages ibid.

full Event of them not known until fulfilled 224

R.

Reason, Test of it wanted, to shew wherein Reason and right Reason differ from one another 291

Rectitude in which Adam was created, what? 80

Religion, revealed, positive Institutions a Part of it 106

Revelation does not supersede, but aids our Reason without it, human Nature cannot be made perfect ibid.

Ridicule, not a just way to determine what is true, of what is false 188

Rivers Pison and Gibon, not inconsiderable ones 137

River that watered the Garden of Eden, its Description 144

Gibon and Pison known to the Author of ECC.

Stations 149

three of Moses’s Rivers of Eden, not mentioned by the prophane Geographers. 137

Sabbath,
INDEX.

S.

Sabbath, why instituted 60
Satan, his being permitted to have a Power to cause the Serpent to speak, contradicts no Principle of true Philosophy 171
Science, natural, grows by Experience and Observation 70
Scripture and Philosophy agree as to the Nature of Man 277
Sensuality of Nature in every natural Descendant of our first Parents 278
Serpent's Words to Eve, very few, besides what Adam and Eve had heard from God 28
his speaking not apprehended by Adam and Eve to be unnatural 160
its Name mentioned by Moses, probably its original Name 161
spake to Eve only 165
not able of himself to speak 166
understood not what he spake 167
thought by Adam and Eve to have more Sagacity than any other Creature 170
that which tempted Eve reckoned amongst the Beasts of the Field 228
after the Flood, became terrible to Mankind 229
not changed from his original Form 211
Spirits, apostate, the Scene of their Demerit not fully known unto us 180
Strata, those occasioned by the Deluge no Proof against Moses's Description of the Garden of Eden 125
Strabo's Geography, when composed 150

Texts
# Index

**T.**

Texts of Scripture cited and explained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verse(s)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>i.</td>
<td>ver. 17</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.</td>
<td>ver. 27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.</td>
<td>ver. 31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 8</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 9</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 10</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 15</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 16, 17</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ver. 19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 21</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 24</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 7</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 11</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 13</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 15</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 21</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>ver. 22</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>ver. 12, 16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>ver. 1</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>ver. 11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>ver. 9, 10, 12</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxiii.</td>
<td>ver. 8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numb.</td>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>ver. 22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg.</td>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>ver. 14</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Sam.</td>
<td>xxvi.</td>
<td>ver. 12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>ver. 13, 15, 16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job
Tillage of the Ground, a laborious Employment for Adam for our first Parents walking humbly with God

Tree, the forbidden, distinguished from all others by its Situation of Life, had our first Parents not sinned, would it have sufficed Mankind unto all Ages? Prohibition of the forbidden Tree, the Rule for our first Parents walking humbly with God

Truth, Word of God the Rule of it

Virtue
INDEX.

V.

Virtue and Vice cannot be where there is no Choice

191

W.

Words, in themselves, mere Sounds carry no Intention to us until we have learnt the Meaning of them ibid.
never before heard, could not naturally be understood at first hearing
of God not minutely directing every Particular of our Lives

293

World, not from Eternity how began to be known only from Moses's History not a different one after the Flood, from that before
not a new one created after the Flood not every where broken by the Deluge.

129

130

125