Hoare pinx. *Wm. Hall sculp. 1784*

From the ORIGINAL PICTURE *in Gloucester Palace.*

THE

WORKS

OF THE

RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM WARBURTON,

LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOLUME THE FIRST.

LONDON,

PRINTED BY JOHN NICHOLS:

AND SOLD BY T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND.

MDCCLXXXVIII.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader will expect ſome account of the *Life, Writings*, and *Character* of the Author to be prefixed to this complete edition of his Works. He is therefore informed, that a Diſcourſe to that effect hath been prepared, and will be publiſhed; but not now, for reaſons that will be ſeen hereafter. However, it may be proper to add, that the purchaſer of this edition will be entitled to a Copy of the Diſcourſe, whenever it comes out, on his producing a ticket, which for that purpoſe will be delivered to him by the Bookſeller.

All I have to ſay, at preſent, of the Author's WORKS, is, That they have been printed carefully from his laſt corrections and improvements; and arranged in that order, which was judged moſt convenient.

Of the new tracts, included in this edition, the moſt conſiderable is, The NINTH BOOK of the Divine Legation; printed, ſo far as it goes, by the Author himſelf, but

left unfiniſhed. This Diſcourſe muſt be intereſting to the reader; but will not appear to have all the novelty which he may expect. The reaſon is, that the Author had laid aſide all thoughts of compleating this book for many years, and had, in the mean time, employed ſome parts of it in his other Works. From theſe, when he at length reſumed that intention, he extracted many paſſages, which are now again inſerted in their place.

Thus much I thought fit to ſay of this additional Book, that the Reader may come the better prepared to the peruſal of it. For the reſt, he is referred to the Author's LIFE, at large.

Great Ruſſel-Street,
Bloomſbury,
Feb. 6, 1788.

R. WORCESTER.

THE

A

DISCOURSE,

BY WAY OF

GENERAL PREFACE

TO THE QUARTO EDITION OF

BISHOP WARBURTON'S WORKS,

CONTAINING SOME ACCOUNT OF THE

LIFE, WRITINGS, AND CHARACTER OF THE AUTHOR.

LONDON,
PRINTED BY JOHN NICHOLS.
M DCC XCIV.

CONTENTS OF THE AUTHOR'S LIFE.

SECTION I.

From his birth, in 1698, *to his being appointed Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, in* 1746.

His family—birth—education—and preparatory ſtudies—entrance into holy orders—and preferment of Brandt-Broughton—extraordinary application to his ſtudies—Alliance between Church and State—account of that work—and its reception.—Publiſhes the firſt volume of the Divine Legation—his friendſhip with the biſhops Hare and Sherlock—Vindication of himſelf againſt Webſter—His acquaintance with Dr. Middleton—his conduct towards him—Recommendation of him by Biſhop Hare to Queen Caroline—death of that Princeſs—Continuance of his ſtudies at Brandt-Broughton—Vindicates the Eſſay on Man againſt Crouſaz—acquaintance with Mr. Pope—publiſhes a ſecond edition of D. L.—Connection with Sir Thomas Hanmer—death of Biſhop Hare—and character—Publiſhes the ſecond volume of D. L.—idea of that work—further account of Dr. Middleton—intimate friendſhip with Mr. Pope—effects of it—Mr. Pope's death—Introduction to Mr. Murray and Mr. Allen—characters of thoſe eminent perſons—defends the D. L. againſt ſeveral writers—declines going to Ireland with Lord Cheſterfield—his marriage—and appointment to the Preacherſhip of Lincoln's Inn.

SECTION II.

To his being promoted to the See of Glouceſter, in 1760.

Publiſhes Shakeſpear's works—reception and character of that edition—Vindicates Mr. Pope againſt Lord Bolingbroke—Digreſſion, on Mr. Addiſon's treatment of Mr. Pope—Publiſhes his Julian—how received at home and abroad—Death and character of Dr. Middleton—His edition of Mr. Pope's works—His ſermons at Lincoln's-Inn, and character of them—Some account of his preferments—Death of Lord Bolingbroke—publication of his philoſophy—and refutation of it—His ſentiments of Mr. Hume's eſſays, and Natural Hiſtory of Religion—his animadverſions on the latter—a new and correct edition of the firſt volume of D. L.—anſwers ſome objections of Abp. Secker—character of that Prelate—and of his friend Biſhop Butler—Promotion to the Deanery of Briſtol, and to the Biſhoprick of Glouceſter.

SECTION III.

To his Death, in 1777.

Reflections on his advancement to the epiſcopate—his conduct in that ſtation—Sermon on the 30*th of January—Cenſure of Lord Clarendon's Hiſtory—and Neal's Hiſtory of the Puri-*

Puritans—and of Tindal's Chriſtianity as Old as the Creation—Reviſes his Sermons—reprints his Diſcourſe on the Lord's Supper—publiſhes his Doctrine of Grace—new edition of the ſecond volume of D. L. addreſſed to Lord Mansfield—remarkable appendix to this edition—character of Biſhop Lowth—New edition of the Alliance—applies himſelf to the completion of the ninth book of D. L.—account of this work—why undertaken ſo late, and left unfiniſhed—founds his lecture on Prophecy—loſes his ſon—decline of his health and parts—his death.

SECTION IV.

His Character.

Moral virtues—love of letters—idea of him, as a WRITER; *particularly a controverſial writer; vindication of him in that reſpect—and as a* DIVINE, *properly ſo called—His companionable qualities—private friendſhips—Characters of Mr. Town and Dr. Balguy—his foibles, of what ſort, and to what owing—Brief account of this edition—Concluſion.*

Appendix to the Life.

Containing Letter to Mr. Pope [A].
to Mrs. Cockburn [B].

CORRECTIONS.

P. 26. l. 17. for *in* read *him.*
P. 108. note, laſt line but one, for *unica* r. *unico.*
P. 110. l. 14. for *predeceſſor's* r. *predeceſſors.*
P. 125. l. 4. for *repreſenting* r. *repreſſing.*
P. 143. l. 2. for p. 24. r. p. 30.

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

FIRST PRINTED IN 1794.

WILLIAM WARBURTON was deſcended from an antient and very conſiderable family in Cheſhire, at the head of which is the preſent Sir Peter Warburton, baronet, of Arley, in that county.

I leave the reſt to the Genealogiſt; and go no farther back in his pedigree than to his grandfather, of the ſame name, who diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the civil wars of the laſt century. He was of the Royal party, and ſhewed his zeal and activity in that cauſe by ſerving under Sir George Booth at the affair of Cheſter. I mention this little circumſtance chiefly for the uſe I ſhall make of it elſewhere. All that I know more of him, is, That he married Frances, daughter of Robert Awſield of Etſon, in the county of Nottingham, by whom he had three ſons; the ſecond of whom, GEORGE, was Mr. Warburton's father.

It ſeems probable that upon this marriage he removed into Nottinghamſhire. His reſidence was at Shelton, a village about ſix miles from Newark, where he died.

Mr. George Warburton, the ſecond ſon, as I obſerved, of William Warburton, Eſq. of Shelton, was bred to the law. He ſettled at Newark, where he practiſed as an attorney, and was particularly eſteemed for his integrity in that profeſſion.

He married Elizabeth, daughter of William Hobman, Alderman of Newark, and had by this marriage five children, George, William, Mary, Elizabeth, and Frances.

George died very young. William (the ſubject of this memoir) was born at Newark, Dec. 24, 1698. He was firſt put to ſchool there under Mr. Twells, whoſe ſon afterwards married his ſiſter, Elizabeth: but he had the chief part of his education at Okeham, in Rutlandſhire, under Mr. Wright. Here he continued till the beginning of the year 1714; when his couſin, Mr. Warburton (who alſo bore the name of William), being made head maſter of the ſchool at Newark, he returned to his native place, and was, for a ſhort time, under the care of that learned and reſpectable perſon, of whom more will be ſaid preſently. I only now add; that he was father to the reverend Mr. Thomas Warburton, the preſent very worthy Archdeacon of Norfolk, to whom I am indebted for the particulars here mentioned, concerning his family.

I cannot, I confeſs, entertain the reader of this narrative with thoſe encomiums which are ſo commonly laviſhed on the puerile years of eminent men. On the beſt enquiry,

quiry, I have been able to make, I do not find that, during his ſtay at ſchool, he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by any extraordinary efforts of genius or application. My information authorizes me to go no further than to ſay, That he loved his book, and his play, juſt as other boys did. And, upon reflexion, I am not diſpleaſed with this modeſt teſtimony to his merit. For I remember what the beſt judges have thought of premature wits. And we all know that the mountain-oak, which is one day to make the ſtrength of our fleets, is of ſlower growth than the ſaplings, which adorn our gardens.

But, although no prodigy of parts or induſtry in thoſe early years, with a moderate ſhare of each, he could not fail of acquiring by the age of ſixteen (the time when he left ſchool) a competent knowledge of Greek and Latin under ſuch maſters, as thoſe of Okeham and Newark.

It had been his misfortune to loſe his father very early. He died in 1706; and the care of his family devolved, of courſe, upon his widow; who, as we have ſeen, gave her ſon the beſt ſchool-education; and, in all reſpects, approved herſelf ſo good a woman, as well as parent, that her children paid her all poſſible reſpect: her ſon, in particular (all whoſe affections were naturally warm), gave her every proof of duty and obſervance, while ſhe lived, and, after her death, retained ſo tender a regard to her memory, that he ſeldom ſpake of her but with tears.

The circumſtances of the family could be but moderate; and when Mr. Warburton had now finiſhed his education at ſchool, he was deſtined by his friends to that profeſſion, which is thought to qualify men beſt for the management of their own affairs, and which his father had followed with ſo much credit in that neighbourhood.

He was accordingly put out clerk to Mr. Kirke, an eminent attorney of Great Markham, in Nottinghamſhire, in April, 1714, and continued with that gentleman five years, *i. e.* till the ſpring of the year 1719. Tradition does not acquaint us, how he acquitted himſelf in his clerkſhip. Probably, with no ſignal aſſiduity. For now it was that the bent of his genius appeared in a paſſionate love of reading, which was not leſſened, we may believe, but increaſed, by his want of time and opportunity to indulge it.

However, in ſpite of his ſituation, he found means to peruſe again and digeſt ſuch of the claſſic authors as he had read at ſchool, with many others which he underſtood to be in repute with men of learning and judgement. By degrees he, alſo, made himſelf acquainted with the other elementary ſtudies; and, by the time his clerkſhip was out, had laid the foundation, as well as acquired a taſte, of general knowledge.

Still, the opinion and expectation of his friends kept him in that profeſſion, to which he had been bred. On the expiration of his clerkſhip, he returned to his family at Newark;

Newark; but whether he practiſed there or elſewhere as an attorney, I am not certainly informed. However the love of letters growing every day ſtronger in him, it was found adviſeable to give way to his inclination of taking Orders: the rather, as the ſerioufneſs of his temper and purity of his morals concurred, with his unappeaſible thirſt of knowledge, to give the ſureſt preſages of future eminence in that profeſſion.

He did not venture, however, all at once to ruſh into the church. His good underſtanding, and awful ſenſe of religion, ſuggeſted to him the propriety of making the beſt preparation he could, before he offered himſelf a candidate for the ſacred character. Fortunately for him, his relation, the Maſter of Newark School, was at hand to give him his advice. And he could not have put himſelf under a better direction. For, beſides his claſſical merit (which was great), he had that of being an excellent Divine, and was a truly learned as well as good man.

To him then, as ſoon as his reſolution was taken of going into Orders, he applied for aſſiſtance, which was afforded him very liberally. "My father (ſays Mr. Arch-"deacon Warburton in a letter to me) employed all the "time he could ſpare from his ſchool in inſtructing him, "and uſed to ſit up very late at night with him to aſſiſt "him in his ſtudies." And this account I have heard confirmed by his pupil himſelf; who uſed to enlarge with

pleaſure

'The circumſtances of the family could be but moderate; and when Mr. Warburton had now finiſhed his education at ſchool, he was deſtined by his friends to that profeſſion, which is thought to qualify men beſt for the management of their own affairs, and which his father had followed with ſo much credit in that neighbourhood.

He was accordingly put out clerk to Mr. Kirke, an eminent attorney of Great Markham, in Nottinghamſhire, in April, 1714, and continued with that gentleman five years, *i. e.* till the ſpring of the year 1719. Tradition does not acquaint us, how he acquitted himſelf in his clerkſhip. Probably, with no ſignal aſſiduity. For now it was that the bent of his genius appeared in a paſſionate love of reading, which was not leſſened, we may believe, but increaſed, by his want of time and opportunity to indulge it.

However, in ſpite of his ſituation, he found means to peruſe again and digeſt ſuch of the claſſic authors as he had read at ſchool, with many others which he underſtood to be in repute with men of learning and judgement. By degrees he, alſo, made himſelf acquainted with the other elementary ſtudies; and, by the time his clerkſhip was out, had laid the foundation, as well as acquired a taſte, of general knowledge.

Still, the opinion and expectation of his friends kept him in that profeſſion, to which he had been bred. On the expiration of his clerkſhip, he returned to his family at Newark;

Newark; but whether he practiſed there or elſewhere as an attorney, I am not certainly informed. However the love of letters growing every day ſtronger in him, it was found adviſeable to give way to his inclination of taking Orders: the rather, as the ſerioufneſs of his temper and purity of his morals concurred, with his unappeaſible thirſt of knowledge, to give the fureſt preſages of future eminence in that profeſſion.

He did not venture, however, all at once to ruſh into the church. His good underſtanding, and awful ſenſe of religion, ſuggeſted to him the propriety of making the beſt preparation he could, before he offered himſelf a candidate for the ſacred character. Fortunately for him, his relation, the Maſter of Newark School, was at hand to give him his advice. And he could not have put himſelf under a better direction. For, beſides his claſſical merit (which was great), he had that of being an excellent Divine, and was a truly learned as well as good man.

To him then, as ſoon as his reſolution was taken of going into Orders, he applied for aſſiſtance, which was afforded him very liberally. "My father (ſays Mr. Arch-"deacon Warburton in a letter to me) employed all the "time he could ſpare from his ſchool in inſtructing him, "and uſed to ſit up very late at night with him to aſſiſt "him in his ſtudies." And this account I have heard confirmed by his pupil himſelf; who uſed to enlarge with

pleaſure

pleaſure on his obligations to his old tutor; and has celebrated his theological and other learning in a handſome Latin epitaph, which he wrote upon him after his death.

At length he was ordained Deacon the 22d of December, 1723, in the cathedral of York, by Archbiſhop Dawes: and even then he was in no haſte to enter into Prieſt's Orders, which he deferred taking till he was full twenty-eight years of age, being ordained Prieſt by Biſhop Gibſon in St. Paul's, London, March the 1ſt, 1726-7.

Some will here lament that the precious interval of nine years, from his quitting ſchool in 1714 to his taking Orders, was not ſpent in one of our univerſities, rather than his private ſtudy, or an attorney's office. And it is certain, the diſadvantage to moſt men would have been great. But an induſtry, and genius, like his, overcame all difficulties. It may even be conceived, that he derived a benefit from them. As his faculties were of no common ſize, his own proper exertion of them probably tended more to his improvement, than any aſſiſtance of tutors and colleges could have done. To which we may add, that living by himſelf, and not having the faſhionable opinions of a great ſociety to bias his own, he might acquire an enlarged turn of mind, and ſtrike out for himſelf, as he clearly did, an original caſt both of thought and compoſition;

Faſtidire lacus et rivos auſus apertos:

while

while his ſuperior ſenſe, in the mean time, did the office of that authority, which, in general, is found ſo neceſſary to quicken the diligence, and direct the judgement, of young ſtudents in our univerſities.

The fact is, that, without the benefit of an Academical education, he had qualified himſelf, in no common degree, for Deacon's Orders in 1723: and from that time till he took Prieſt's Orders in the beginning of the year 1727, he applied himſelf diligently to complete his ſtudies, and to lay in that fund of knowledge, which is requiſite to form the conſummate Divine. For to this character he reaſonably aſpired; having that ardour of inclination, which is the earneſt of ſucceſs, and feeling in himſelf thoſe powers which invigorate a great mind, and puſh it on irreſiſtibly in the purſuit of letters.

The fruits of his induſtry, during this interval, appeared in ſome pieces, compoſed by him for the improvement of his taſte and ſtyle, and afterwards printed (moſt of them without his name) to try the judgement of the publick. As he never thought fit to reprint or reviſe them, they are omitted in this edition. But they are ſuch as did him no diſcredit; on the contrary, they ſhewed the vigour of his parts, and the more than common hopes, which might be entertained of ſuch a writer.

Among theſe *bloſſoms of his youth* (to borrow an expreſſion from Cowley) were ſome notes, communicated to

Mr.

Mr. Theobald, and inſerted in his edition of Shakeſpear; which ſeems to have raiſed a general idea of his abilities, before any more important proof had been given of them. But of this ſubject more will be ſaid in its place.

It was, alſo, in this ſeaſon of early diſcipline, while his mind was opening to many literary projects, that he conceived an idea, which he was long pleaſed with, of giving a new edition of Velleius Paterculus. He was charmed with the elegance of this writer; and the high credit in which emendatory criticiſm (of which Paterculus ſtood much in need) was held in the beginning of this century, occaſioned by the dazzling reputation of ſuch men as Bentley and Hare, very naturally ſeduced a young enterprizing ſcholar into an attempt of this nature. How far he proceeded in this work, I cannot ſay: but a ſpecimen of it afterwards appeared in one of our literary journals, and was then communicated to his friend, Dr. Middleton; who adviſed him very properly to drop the deſign, *as not worthy of his talents and induſtry, which*, as he ſays, *inſtead of trifling on words, ſeems calculated rather to correct the opinions and manners of the world.*

Theſe juvenile eſſays of his pen, haſty and incorrect, as they were, contributed, no doubt, very much to his own improvement. What effect they had on his reputation, and how ſoon they raiſed it to a conſiderable height among his friends, will be ſeen from the following curious fact.

In the year 1726, a difpute arofe among the lawyers about the judicial power of the Court of Chancery. It is immaterial to obferve on what points the controverfy turned, or with what views it was agitated. It opened with a tract, called, *The Hiftory of the Chancery; relating to the Judicial Power of that Court, and the Rights of the Maſter*; printed without a name; but written, as was generally known, by a Mr. Burrough; and fo well received by the Lord Chancellor King, that he rewarded the Author of it, the fame year, with a Maſterfhip in Chancery.

To this book an anfwer prefently appeared, under the name of, *A Difcourfe of the Judicial Authority of the Maſter of the Rolls*; and fo well compofed, that they who favoured the caufe of the *Hiſtorian*, faw it muft fuffer in his hands, if it were not fupported by fome better writer than himfelf, who was evidently no match for the *Difcourfer*.

In this exigency, he was advifed by one of his friends (I forget, or never heard, his name) to have recourfe to Mr. Warburton, as a perfon very capable of fupplying his defects. Accordingly, when he had prepared the proper materials for a reply, he obtained leave to put them into Mr. Warburton's hands, and afterwards fpent fome time with him in the country; where, by their joint labours, the whole was drawn out and digefted into a fizable volume, which came out in 1727, and was entitled, *The Legal Judicature in Chancery ſtated*. This book was fo manifeftly

 fuperior

Mr. Theobald, and inſerted in his edition of Shakeſpear; which ſeems to have raiſed a general idea of his abilities, before any more important proof had been given of them. But of this ſubject more will be ſaid in its place.

It was, alſo, in this ſeaſon of early diſcipline, while his mind was opening to many literary projects, that he conceived an idea, which he was long pleaſed with, of giving a new edition of Velleius Paterculus. He was charmed with the elegance of this writer; and the high credit in which emendatory criticiſm (of which Paterculus ſtood much in need) was held in the beginning of this century, occaſioned by the dazzling reputation of ſuch men as Bentley and Hare, very naturally ſeduced a young enterprizing ſcholar into an attempt of this nature. How far he proceeded in this work, I cannot ſay: but a ſpecimen of it afterwards appeared in one of our literary journals, and was then communicated to his friend, Dr. Middleton; who adviſed him very properly to drop the deſign, *as not worthy of his talents and induſtry, which*, as he ſays, *inſtead of trifling on words, ſeems calculated rather to correct the opinions and manners of the world.*

Theſe juvenile eſſays of his pen, haſty and incorrect, as they were, contributed, no doubt, very much to his own improvement. What effect they had on his reputation, and how ſoon they raiſed it to a conſiderable height among his friends, will be ſeen from the following curious fact.

In the year 1726, a diſpute aroſe among the lawyers about the judicial power of the Court of Chancery. It is immaterial to obſerve on what points the controverſy turned, or with what views it was agitated. It opened with a tract, called, *The Hiſtory of the Chancery; relating to the Judicial Power of that Court, and the Rights of the Maſter*; printed without a name; but written, as was generally known, by a Mr. Burrough; and ſo well received by the Lord Chancellor King, that he rewarded the Author of it, the ſame year, with a Maſterſhip in Chancery.

To this book an anſwer preſently appeared, under the name of, *A Diſcourſe of the Judicial Authority of the Maſter of the Rolls*; and ſo well compoſed, that they who favoured the cauſe of the *Hiſtorian*, ſaw it muſt ſuffer in his hands, if it were not ſupported by ſome better writer than himſelf, who was evidently no match for the *Diſcourſer*.

In this exigency, he was adviſed by one of his friends (I forget, or never heard, his name) to have recourſe to Mr. Warburton, as a perſon very capable of ſupplying his defects. Accordingly, when he had prepared the proper materials for a reply, he obtained leave to put them into Mr. Warburton's hands, and afterwards ſpent ſome time with him in the country; where, by their joint labours, the whole was drawn out and digeſted into a ſizable volume, which came out in 1727, and was entitled, *The Legal Judicature in Chancery ſtated.* This book was ſo manifeſtly

 ſuperior

ſuperior to the *Hiſtory*, that ſuch of the profeſſion as were not in the ſecret, wondered at Mr. Burrough's proficiency in the art of writing; and the Lord Chancellor King, as much as any body. The author of the *Diſcourſe* ſaw it concerned him to take notice of ſuch an adverſary, and in 1728 re-printed his work "with *large additions*—together "with a *Preface* occaſioned by a book entitled, *The Legal* "*Judicature in Chancery ſtated.*" And with this reply, I believe, the diſpute cloſed.

Many years afterwards (the ſecret being now of no conſequence) Mr. Warburton chanced to mention, in converſation, to Mr. Charles Yorke, the part he had taken in this ſquabble: when Mr. Yorke ſmiled, and ſaid he fancied he was not aware who had been his antagoniſt; and then named his father, the Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, who, though Attorney General at the time, had undertaken to plead the cauſe of his relation, Sir Joſeph Jekyll, then Maſter of the Rolls.—But I have dwelt, perhaps, too long on this little anecdote.

Upon Mr. Warburton's taking Prieſt's Orders, Sir Robert Sutton procured for him the ſmall vicarage of Grieſley, in Nottinghamſhire; and in 1728 preſented him to the rectory of Brand-Broughton, in the dioceſe of Lincoln. He was, alſo, the ſame year, and, I ſuppoſe, by the ſame intereſt, put upon the King's liſt of Maſter of Arts, created on his Majeſty's viſit to the univerſity of Cambridge.

Brand-

Brand-Broughton was a preferment of ſome value, and, from its ſituation in the neighbourhood of Newark, pleaſed him very much. Here then he fixed himſelf, with his family, and ſpent the beſt part of his life, that is, from 1728 to 1746.

They who are unacquainted with the enthuſiaſm which true genius inſpires, will hardly conceive the poſſibility of that intenſe application, with which Mr. Warburton purſued his ſtudies in that retirement. Impatient of any interruptions, he ſpent the whole of his time that could be ſpared from the duties of his pariſh, in reading and writing. His conſtitution was ſtrong, and his temperance extreme. So that he needed no exerciſe but that of walking; and a change of reading, or ſtudy, was his only amuſement.

His mother and ſiſters, who lived with him and were apprehenſive of the hurt he might do himſelf by this continued induſtry, would invite themſelves to drink coffee with him in his ſtudy after dinner, and contrive to lengthen their ſtay with him as much as they could. But when they had retired, they ſaw no more of him that evening; and his ſiſter, Mrs. Frances Warburton, told me, that he uſually ſate up a great part of the night. What is moſt extraordinary, the vigour of his parts was ſuch, that his inceſſant labour neither wearied his ſpirits, nor affected his health.

In this way it was, that he acquired that habit of deep thinking, with that extenſive erudition, which afterwards aſtoniſhed the reader in his works; and made himſelf acquainted with the whole range of polite and elegant learning, in the way of diverſion, and in the interval of his graver ſtudies.

I expreſs myſelf with exact propriety. For it was his manner at this time (and the habit continued with him through life) to intermix his literary purſuits in ſuch ſort as to make the lighter relieve the more ſerious; and theſe again, in their turn, temper and correct the other. He was paſſionately fond of the more ſublime poets, and (what is very uncommon) had almoſt an equal reliſh for works of wit and humour. One or other of theſe books he had always lying by him, and would take up when he found himſelf fatigued with ſtudy; and, after ſpending ſome time in this ſort of reading, was ſo much refreſhed by it, that he returned with new life to the work he was upon; and ſo made theſe amuſements, which are apt to get the maſtery of common minds and to exhauſt their whole force, only ſubſervient to his more important meditations.

And this humour (to obſerve it by the way) of aſſociating the ſo different powers of reaſon and fancy in the courſe of his ſtudies, paſſed into his ſtyle, and indeed formed one diſtinctive character of it. For in all his wri-

tings, on whatever ſubject, you ſee him, occaſionally, ennoble his expreſſion by pictureſque imagery, or enliven it by ſtrokes of wit: And this (though the practice be againſt rule) with ſo much eaſe, and with ſo little affectation, that none but a very captious, or very dull, reader can take offence at it.

With that paſſion for letters, which, as I obſerved, tranſported Mr. Warburton at this time, the ſobriety of his judgement is to be admired. The little taſte he had had of fame in the early publications, before alluded to, did not corrupt his mind, or ſeduce him into a premature ambition of appearing as an author in form, till he had fully qualified himſelf, by the long courſe of reading and meditation, now mentioned, to ſuſtain that character. It was not till the year 1736 that he publiſhed the firſt of thoſe works, on which his great reputation is raiſed. This was, THE ALLIANCE BETWIXT CHURCH AND STATE: the occaſion, and end, and ſubſtance of which work cannot be expreſſed in fewer or clearer terms, than his own.

After a ſhort hiſtorical view of religious parties in England, from the Reformation downwards; of the diſcordant notions entertained of Religious eſtabliſhments; and of the heats and animoſities which thoſe notions had produced: he proceeds thus ——

" In this ferment, and in this embroiled condition, the " Author of the *Alliance between Church and State* found " the

" the ſentiments of men concerning religious Liberty and " Eſtabliſhments, when he propoſed his *Theory* to their " conſideration : a Theory, calculated to vindicate our pre- " ſent happy Conſtitution ON A PRINCIPLE OF RIGHT, by " adjuſting the preciſe bounds of either Society ; by ſhew- " ing how they come to act in conjunction ; and by ex- " plaining the nature of their union : and from thence, " by natural and neceſſary conſequence, inducing, on the " one hand, an ESTABLISHED RELIGION, with all its rights " and privileges, ſecured by a TEST LAW ; and on the " other, a full and free TOLERATION to all who diſſented " from the national worſhip.

" He firſt ſhewed the uſe of Religion to Society, from " the experience and practice of all ages : He inquired " from whence the uſe aroſe, and found it to be from cer- " tain original defects in the very eſſence and plan of " Civil Society. He went on to the nature of Religion ; " and ſhewed how, and for what cauſes, it conſtituted a " Society : And then, from the natures of the *two Societies*, " he collected, that the object of the Civil, is only the " *Body* and its intereſts ; and the object of the Religious, " only the *Soul*. Hence he concluded, that both Societies " are Sovereign, and Independent ; becauſe they ariſe not " out of one another ; and becauſe, as they are concerned " in contrary provinces, they can never meet to claſh ; " the ſameneſs of *original*, or the ſameneſs of *adminiſtration*,

" being

" being the only cauſes which can bring one, of two diſ-
" tinct Societies, into natural ſubjection to the other.
" To apply Religion therefore to the ſervice of Civil
" Society, in the beſt manner it is capable of being ap-
" plied, he ſhewed it was neceſſary that the two Societies
" ſhould UNITE: For, each being ſovereign and inde-
" pendent, there was no other way of applying the ſer-
" vice of Religion in any ſolid or effectual manner. But
" no ſuch union could ariſe but from *free compact* and
" convention. And free convention is never likely to
" happen, unleſs each Society has its mutual motives, and
" mutual advantages. The Author therefore, from what
" he had laid down of the natures of the two Societies,
" explained what theſe motives and advantages were.
" Whence, it appeared that all the rights, privileges, and
" prerogatives of the two Societies, thus united, with the
" Civil Magiſtrate at their head, were indeed thoſe very
" rights, privileges, and prerogatives, which we find
" eſtabliſhed and enjoyed under our preſent happy Con-
" ſtitution in Church and State: The reſult of this was
" that an ESTABLISHED CHURCH and a free TOLERATION
" are made perfectly to agree by the medium of a TEST
" LAW. This Law therefore the Author in the laſt place
" proceeded to vindicate, on the ſame general principles of
" the law of Nature and Nations.

" This

" This is a true, though ſhort analyſis of the *Alliance*
" *between Church and State* *."

This work made a great impreſſion on the beſt judges. One † of them, to whom he had ſent a preſent of his book, expreſſes himſelf thus ——

" I had formerly been very agreeably entertained with
" ſome emendations of your's on Shakeſpeare, and was ex-
" tremely pleaſed to find this work was by the ſame hand.
" Good learning, great acuteneſs, an ingenious working
" head, and depth of thought, will always pleaſe in an
" author, though we are not entirely in the ſame ways of
" thinking."—And, in the cloſe of it, he adds—" You
" have not, Sir, only my thanks for what you have done,
" but my ſincere wiſhes, that what was intended for the
" ſervice of the publick may prove alſo to be for your
" own, to which my endeavours, in any proper way, ſhall
" not be wanting."

This was candid and generous, conſidering that the eminent perſon was not altogether in the author's ſentiments on the ſubject of his book. But he was ſtruck with his great abilities, and became from this moment his ſincere friend.

The truth is, no ſort of men, either within or without the Church, was prepared, at that time, for

* Vol. VI. p. 781—3.

† Biſhop Hare.

an

an indifferent reception of this new theory, which reſpected none of their prejudices. It was neither calculated to pleaſe the High-Church Divines, nor the Low; and the Layity had taken their ſide with the one or the other of thoſe parties.

However, though few at that time were convinced, all were ſtruck by this eſſay of an original writer, and could not diſſemble their admiration of the ability, which appeared in the conſtruction of it. There was indeed a reach of thought in this ſyſtem of Church-policy, which would prevent its making its way all at once. It required time and attention, even in the moſt capable of its readers, to apprehend the force of the argumentation; and a more than common ſhare of candour to adopt the concluſion, when they did. The author had therefore reaſon to be ſatisfied with the reception of his theory, ſuch as it was: and having thoroughly perſuaded himſelf of its truth, as well as importance, he continued to enlarge and improve it in ſeveral ſubſequent editions; and in the laſt, by the opportunity, which ſome elaborate attempts of his adverſaries to overturn it, had afforded him, he exerted his whole ſtrength upon it, and has left it in a condition to brave the utmoſt efforts of future criticiſm *.

Some

* An eminent writer has delivered his opinion of it in theſe terms— "Biſhop Warburton, in his *Alliance between Church and State*, hath ſhewn "the general good policy of an Eſtabliſhment, and the neceſſity of A TEST

"for

Some indeed, have taken offence at the idea of an *Alliance*; but without cauſe: for the meaning is this, That our Church-Eſtabliſhment is ſuch as in equity it muſt have been, had the terms of it been ſettled by mutual agreement between the two parties. Which, in other words, is only ſaying, That thoſe terms are juſt and reaſonable.

The idea of an Alliance was conceived, in preference to any other mode of conducting the argument, becauſe the theory of civil government had been formed on the like notion of a contract between Prince and People. This way of reaſoning, therefore, without being leſs concluſive, had the advantage of being more popular, than any other, and as ſuch was very properly adopted by our author.

Notwithſtanding this management, the *Alliance*, as I obſerved, was not generally underſtood. But he did not wait for the reward of public favour to encourage him in the reſolution he had taken of dedicating his great talents to the ſervice of religion. In the cloſe of this firſt edition of *The Alliance*, he announced his next and greateſt work, THE DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES; which he had now planned, and in part compoſed. For, when ſuch a writer

" for its ſecurity, upon principles which Republicans themſelves cannot " eaſily deny.—His work is one of the fineſt ſpecimens, that are to be found " perhaps in any language, of ſcientific reaſoning applied to a political " ſubject." Dr. HORSLEY's *Review of the Caſe of the Proteſtant Diſſenters.* PREF. *London*, 1787.

as

as this, has by a long courſe of ſtudy laid in the proper materials for invention to operate upon, and has, by one vigorous eſſay, aſſured himſelf of his own ſtrength, his progreſs to perfection is rapid, and almoſt inſtantaneous; like the pace of Homer's Gods, whoſe firſt ſtep reaches to Olympus, and the ſecond, to the ends of the earth.

It had been pretended by thoſe who called themſelves Deiſts, and, in the modeſty of free-thinking which then prevailed, had, or affected to have, a reſpect for the natural doctrine of a future ſtate, That the omiſſion of this doctrine in the Moſaic law was a clear deciſive proof of its impoſture, as no inſtitute of religion, coming from God, could be without that principle.

The author of the *Alliance* ſaw the *omiſſion* in another light; and was ſo far from admitting the Deiſt's concluſion, that he thought himſelf able to prove, in the cleareſt manner, and with the evidence of what is called *Moral* demonſtration, the divinity of the Moſaic Law from that very circumſtance.

Such then was the ſubject and ſcope of Mr. Warburton's capital work, *The Divine Legation of Moſes demonſtrated on the principles of a religious Deiſt.* But in the conduct of this new and paradoxical argument, ſo many prejudices and objections, both of believers and unbelievers, were to be removed; and ſo many collateral lights to be let in upon it; that the diſcourſe extended itſelf far and wide,

and took in all that was moſt curious in Gentile, Jewiſh, and Chriſtian antiquity.

In the beginning of the year 1738, the firſt volume of this work appeared, and immediately drew all eyes upon it. Some were too weak, and ſome, too much dimmed or diſtorted by prejudices, to take a full and diſtinct view of its contents. No wonder then if ſuch readers miſconceived of the writer's purpoſe, and miſrepreſented it. Yet few were ſo blind, as not to admire the execution. "I hear nobody ſpeak of your book," ſays the Biſhop of Chicheſter, "who do not expreſs themſelves highly en-"tertained with it; though they think the principal point "which remains to be proved, a paradox *." And what the Biſhop himſelf thought of it, before publication, when the ſheets were ſent to him from the preſs, he tells the author in theſe words—"I can ſay, without any compli-"ment, that your papers have given me high delight. "So many beautiful thoughts, ſuch ingenious illuſtrations "of them, ſuch a clear connection, ſuch a deduction of "notions, and ſo much good learning upon ſo uſeful a "ſubject, all expreſſed in proper and fine language, cannot "but give an intelligent reader the greateſt ſatisfaction †."

And to much the ſame purpoſe another learned friend, the Biſhop of Saliſbury ‡—"Laſt night I received ſome

* MS Letters, Feb. 21, 1737-8.
† Oct. 18, 1737.
‡ Dr. Sherlock.

" ſheets of your book, and ran them over with great " pleaſure, though not with the attention, which the ſub- " ject and your way of treating it demand *." And in another letter, when he had taken time to conſider the contents of this volume—" The learning and ability of the " author of the D. L. are not called in queſtion; and the " firſt part has raiſed a great deſire and expectation of the " ſecond †."

I quote theſe paſſages ſo particularly, becauſe the Biſhops, Hare and Sherlock, were, without doubt, among the ableſt of his judges, and becauſe their temper was far enough from inclining towards an officious and laviſh civility to their friends.

After authorities of ſo much weight, I ſhould not think it worth while to take notice of what was objected to him by ordinary writers, but that he thought fit to anſwer one ‡ of them, in a ſtyle ſo ſoft and elegant, that they who have a taſte for the gentler polemics will read it with great pleaſure.

The real ground of the abuſe caſt upon him, though other cauſes were pretended, was the handſome manner in which he had ſpoken of Dr. Middleton, in his preface to the firſt volume. This ingenious man (of whom more will be ſaid, as we go along) had written ſome things,

* MS Letters, Oct. 18, 1737. † March 2, 1737-8.
‡ Dr. Webſter. See Vol. VI. p. 3.

which

which gave occaſion to ſuſpect him of a leaning towards infidelity. Mr. Warburton was perſonally acquainted with him, and had a real eſteem for him. He wiſhed therefore, if poſſible, to draw his friend off from that bias, which his paſſions, rather than his judgement, he conceived, had impreſſed upon him, by putting the faireſt conſtructions on his writings, and by affecting to underſtand them in the moſt favourable ſenſe. But, inſtead of clearing his friend, by this means, from the guilt of heterodoxy, the effect was to involve himſelf in the ſuſpicion of it: And it was thought proper that he ſhould diſclaim and repel ſo groundleſs an imputation. This it was not difficult for him to do, ſo far as reſpected his own character; but that of his friend required managing, and he would not juſtify himſelf at his expence.

In theſe delicate circumſtances, he acquitted himſelf with dexterity, yet with perfect good faith, and to the ſingular ſatisfaction of his friends. "I received yeſterday," ſays Biſhop Hare, "your Vindication, which I read twice over "with great ſatisfaction—The part that relates to Dr. Mid-"dleton, we think extremely well done. It was the only "difficult part, and it cannot but pleaſe every candid rea-"der to ſee you do juſtice to yourſelf, and yet not do it at "his expence, nor ſay a word, that either he or his friends "can be offended at, or that is in the leaſt giving up a

"man,

" man, with whom you live in friendſhip. Here is cou-
" rage and integrity very agreeably joined *."

The Biſhop here gives a very juſt account of the *Vindication*, and indeed of Mr. Warburton's general conduct towards Dr. Middleton; as appears from the whole of his intercourſe with him, which began in 1736, and was carried on, by a frequent exchange of friendly and affectionate letters from that time to 1741, when it ſeems to have ceaſed, or to have been interrupted at leaſt, for reaſons which will be mentioned hereafter.

In the whole courſe of theſe letters, which I have in my hands, every ſort of polite inſinuation is employed to ſoften and remove his prejudices againſt revealed religion; by joining with him, ſometimes, in his graver complaints of bigoted divines, and, ſometimes, in his ridicule of their pretended orthodoxy; but in taking for granted, every where, his reſpect for revelation, and his real belief of it, and in ſeeming to think that, if other opinions were entertained of him, they had proceeded from an ignorance of his true character.

But the friendlineſs of his views will beſt appear from his own words.

He had taken occaſion to acquaint Dr. Middleton with the manner in which he meant to addreſs the Free-thinkers, in his dedication to them, prefixed to the firſt volume

* March 23, 1737-8.

of

of the D. L. and with his purpoſe of making reſpectful mention of him in it. To this information Dr. Middleton replies, Sept. 22, 1737, "I am pleaſed with the manner " of your addreſs to the Free-thinkers, and obliged to you " for your friendly intentions with regard to myſelf; and " though I ſhould be as proud to have the teſtimony of " your judgement and good opinion, as of any man, yet " I would have you conſider, how far ſuch a declaration of " it may expoſe you to a ſhare of that envy, which has lain, " and ſtill lies very heavy upon me."

This was handſome on his part, but was not likely to divert his friend from the meaſures he had taken. Accordingly in a letter, dated Dec. 23, 1737, after telling him that his book was coming out, and that he had ordered a copy of it to be ſent him, he proceeds thus, with a manifeſt alluſion, in the concluding ſentence, to Dr. Middleton's letter—"I have your pardon to aſk for the " liberty I have taken of deſigning you, by your charac- " ter, in one place of the body of the book, as well as in " the dedication to the Free-thinkers. For I would fain " contribute to abate an *unjuſt prejudice*, that might lie in " the way of thoſe honours which wait for you, and are " ſo much your due. *And I ſhall reckon it for nothing, in* " *ſo honeſt an attempt, to run the riſk of ſharing that pre-* " *judice with you.*"

And

And again, writing to him March 18, 1737-8, on the ſubject of his anſwer to the author of the Weekly Miſcellany, he ſays, "I am to thank him for the agreeable "neceſſity of vindicating you (by a quotation in one of "the defences that paſs for yours) from his *falſe accu-* "*ſation* of denying the inſpiration of ſcripture; and from "his *imagination* (which is the ground of this clamour) "that you defend Revelation, not as true, but only uſe- "ful; and that, as to other points, you and I can differ "without breach of common humanity, friendſhip, and "Chriſtian charity."

I have put theſe things together, becauſe I would not interrupt the recital of what concerns the firſt appearance of thoſe two capital works, The Alliance, and Divine Legation (ſo cloſely connected with each other that the former, in the original deſign, was but a chapter of the latter); the reception they met with from the publick; and the occaſion they gave him of juſtifying an obnoxious friend, as well as explaining his own ſentiments.

I muſt now go back a little to mention a circumſtance in his life, which does the parties concerned too much honour to be omitted by me, and which happened in the latter end of the year 1737. The Alliance had now made the author much talked of at Court; and the Biſhop of Chicheſter, on whom that work had impreſſed, as we have ſeen, the higheſt ideas of his merit, was willing to

take that favourable opportunity of introducing him to the Queen. Her Majeſty, it is well known, took a pleaſure in the diſcourſe of men of learning and genius; and chancing one day to aſk the Biſhop, if he could recommend a perſon of that deſcription to be about her, and to entertain her, ſometimes, with his converſation, the Biſhop ſaid, he could, and mentioned the author of The Alliance between Church and State. The recommendation was graciouſly received, and the matter put in ſo good a train, that the Biſhop expected every day the concluſion of it, when the Queen was ſeized with a ſudden illneſs, which put an end to her life the 20th of November, 1737.

I find this tranſaction alluded to in a letter from the Biſhop, dated Nov. 11, that is, nine days before that unhappy event. His lordſhip thanks Mr. Warburton for ſome ſheets of the firſt volume of the Legation, which were juſt then ſent in from the preſs, and, after making ſome remarks upon them, takes notice of a ſtroke of pleaſantry, which, it ſeems, had eſcaped him, on Mr. Wollaſton's famous book on *The Religion of Nature*, and which he adviſes him to ſtrike out, *as it would give great offence to the admirers of that book. I have beſides*, continues his Lordſhip, A PARTICULAR REASON *for adviſing you to alter that paſſage, which you ſhall know at a proper time.*

And, afterwards, in the ſame letter—*I would adviſe, not only the cancelling that leaf, but the doing it* IMMEDIATELY,

that it may not get into many hands. When I ſee you, I am perſuaded, you will allow this is right advice from a FRIEND.

The ſecret was, that he was then endeavouring to ſerve his friend with the Queen, and was apprehenſive that the freedom he had taken with that work, which She much admired, might hurt him in her Majeſty's opinion, and defeat his deſign.

This diſappointment, when he came to know it, did not abate his ardour in proſecuting his ſtudies at Brand-Broughton. After publiſhing the *Vindication*, before mentioned, early in the year 1738, he applied himſelf with great induſtry to compoſe the ſecond volume of his work, notwithſtanding the clamours, which had been raiſed, and now grew louder, againſt the firſt. "I go ſteadily on," ſays he in a letter to Dr. Middleton, Nov. 12, 1738, "amidſt much ill treatment. If you aſk, what it is that "ſupports me, I will tell you, my excellent friend: It is "the love of truth, and a clear conviction of the reality of "the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Revelations."

Animated with theſe principles, he went on with his great deſign, and ſeems to have ſpent the two or three ſucceeding years upon it. Only, in 1739, he drew up and publiſhed a ſhort defence of Mr. Pope's Eſſay on Man, againſt Mr. de Crouſaz, who had written a book to ſhew that it was conſtructed on the principles of Spinoſa, and contained a dangerous ſyſtem of irreligion. But though

this was a ſlight thing, and took up little of his time, yet as it reſpected ſo eminent a perſon, and had great conſequences with regard to himſelf, it will be proper to enlarge upon it.

It has been objected to Mr. Warburton, that, in his earlier days, he had himſelf entertained a prejudice againſt Mr. Pope, and had even expreſſed it in very ſtrong terms. The offence taken had probably been occaſioned by a ſevere reflexion, in one of his ſatires, on Mr. Warburton's friend and patron, Sir Robert Sutton. And, in that caſe, it is likely that he might expreſs himſelf of the poet, with too much warmth. For I will not conceal or diſguiſe the infirmity of my friend. When his moral feelings were touched, he was apt to be tranſported into ſome intemperance of expreſſion, and was not always guarded, or even juſt, in his cenſures or commendations. But a mind, naturally great, does not long retain this fervour, and, when cooled by reflection, is in haſte to make amends for its former exceſſes. It is impoſſible, indeed, that, under any provocation, he ſhould be blind to ſo much merit, as our great poet poſſeſſed; and what he ſaw of this ſort in any man, he was not backward to declare to others. In his Vindication of himſelf, laſt year, he had ſhewn how much he admired Mr. Pope, by quoting a fine paſſage from him, and applying it to himſelf in a way, that ſhewed an eſteem of his morals, as well as poetry.

Since

Since that time, he had ſuffered ſo much abuſe himſelf from angry zealots, and felt ſo ſtrongly, in his own caſe, what it was for a well-meaning man to have his religious ſentiments miſrepreſented, that this attack of M. de Crouſaz would naturally find him in a diſpoſition to reſent it.

Add to all this, that he ſaw with concern the ill uſe which ſome were ready to make of the ſuppoſed fataliſm of Mr. Pope, and how hurtful it was to religion to have it imagined, that ſo great a genius was ill-inclined towards it.

Theſe reaſons, working together, ſeem to have determined him to take the part of the injured poet; as indeed he explains the matter himſelf in a letter of July 16, 1739, to Dr. Middleton :—"A certain great man is very "angry with me for ſpeaking of you in the manner I did. "I make no queſtion but another ſort of thoſe they call "*great* men will hold themſelves outraged by me in my "vindication of Mr. Pope againſt M. de Crouſaz in ſome "letters which are going to be collected together and pub-"liſhed. But I cannot forbear ſhewing my eſteem of "merit, and my contempt of their calumniators, or think-"ing that it is of uſe to Religion to prove ſo noble a genius "is a friend to it."

Theſe letters were much read, and gave a new luſtre to Mr. Warburton's reputation. They ſhewed the elegance of his taſte in polite literature, as well as his penetration into moral ſubjects. Mr. Pope was ſupremely ſtruck with them,

them *, and might now exult, as his predeceſſor Boileau had done, when he cried out, in the face of his enemies—

"Arnauld, le grand Arnauld, fait mon apologie."

From this time there was an intimate acquaintance formed between the poet and his commentator. The effects of this union will be taken notice of preſently. I now only add, that it was ſtrongly cemented by a mutual profeſſion of eſteem, and a conſtant interchange of letters.

Among theſe I find one which Mr. Warburton addreſſed to his friend, in vindication of Sir Robert Sutton; written, as appears, with the view of prevailing with him to ſtrike that gentleman's name out of his ſatires. As it ſets the author in an amiable light, and ſeems to confirm my conjecture, that his former diſſatisfaction with Mr. Pope had ariſen from this circumſtance, I ſhall give it in the Appendix [A].

Towards the end of this year [1739] he publiſhed a new and improved edition of the firſt volume of the D. L., and ſent it to his friend Biſhop Hare; who, in a kind letter of Dec. 1, 1739, returns his thanks for it, and adds—"I hope not only poſterity, but the preſent age, "will do juſtice to ſo much merit, and do aſſure you, it "ſhall not be my fault if it do not." Which I mention to ſhew that the envy which was then riſing very faſt

* See his Letter in his Works, April 11, 1739.

againſt

againſt the author of the D. L. and which was ſuppoſed to have the countenance of ſome conſiderable Churchmen, had made no alteration in the ſentiments of that great prelate, or leſſened his eſteem of him. Indeed on all occaſions he expreſſed his regard for Mr. Warburton in the friendlieſt manner, of which the following inſtance muſt not be omitted.

Sir Thomas Hanmer, who was a man of buſineſs, and had been Speaker of the Houſe of Commons in Queen Anne's time, grew ambitious, in the latter part of his life, to be taken notice of as a critick on Shakeſpeare. He had ſeen ſome notes on his favourite poet by Mr. Warburton in Mr. Theobald's edition: And as he was now preparing one of his own, which he afterwards printed at the Clarendon preſs, he very juſtly conceived that the aſſiſtance of Mr. Theobald's co-adjutor might be of ſervice to him in the execution of that project.

With this view he got himſelf introduced to Mr. Warburton by the Biſhop of Saliſbury, Dr. Sherlock, and managed ſo well as to draw from his new acquaintance a large collection of notes and emendations, which were, in confidence, communicated to him in a ſeries of private letters.

What followed upon this, and what uſe he made of thoſe friendly communications, I need not repeat, as the account

account is given by Mr. Warburton himſelf in the lively preface to his and Mr. Pope's edition of Shakeſpeare, of which ſomething more will be ſaid in its place. It is enough to ſay here, that he very reaſonably reſented this uſage, and complained of it to his two friends, the Biſhops of Saliſbury and Chicheſter. The *former* expreſſes his concern at this ill-treatment, and the more ſo, he ſays, *as he had in ſome meaſure been the occaſion of it*; i. e. by bringing Mr. Warburton and Sir Thomas Hanmer together.

The *latter* tells him, in a letter of May 9, 1739—"Sir "Thomas Hanmer's proceeding with reſpect to Shakeſpeare "is very extraordinary.—I think you do very well to get "your own papers out of his hands: 'tis pity, they have "been ſo long in them, ſince 'tis probable he has ſqueezed "what he could out of them; which is moſt ungenerous "treatment." He concludes with ſaying—"I hope you "will find leiſure to give the world a Shakeſpeare, your-"ſelf, which the ſooner 'tis made known the better."

And thus ended this trifling affair, which I ſhould ſcarcely have mentioned but to do juſtice to the friendly temper of Biſhop Hare, who intereſted himſelf ſo kindly in all his concerns; and to ſhew that Mr. Warburton's conduct was not directed by caprice or petulance, but was that of a man of ſenſe and honour, and as ſuch was approved by his moſt judicious friends.

Mr.

Mr. Warburton was ſo taken up with his ſtudies, and found ſo much delight in them, that he rarely ſtirred from home; which he would often ſay there was no good reaſon for doing, except neceſſary buſineſs, and the ſatisfaction of ſeeing a friend. What the world calls amuſement from a change of the ſcene, paſſed for nothing with him, who was too well employed to be tired of his ſituation, or to have a thought of running away from himſelf; which, after all, they, who are inceſſantly making the experiment, find impoſſible to be done. Yet he ſometimes found himſelf obliged to go to London; as he did in the ſpring of the year 1740; and he took that opportunity of making his firſt viſit to Mr. Pope, of which he immediately * gave Dr. Middleton the following account.

"I paſſed about a week at Twickenham in the moſt "agreeable manner. Mr. Pope is as good a companion, "as a poet; and what is more, appears to be as *good* a "man."

The laſt was indeed the conſideration, that ſo much indeared Mr. Pope to him. He found him an honeſt and well-principled man; zealous to promote the intereſts of virtue, and impreſſed with an awful ſenſe of religion, natural and revealed. In ſhort, he found an image of himſelf in his new acquaintance: no wonder then, their

* May 6, 1740.

eſteem and affection grew ſo faſt as to give umbrage, in no long time, to a certain nobleman, who had taken to himſelf the honour of being the *guide and philoſopher* of Mr. Pope.

The acquiſition of this new friend came very ſeaſonably to ſupport Mr. Warburton under the loſs of another, the excellent Biſhop Hare, who died after a ſhort illneſs the 6th of April this year.

How he felt that loſs, the publick has been informed by himſelf in the preface to the ſecond volume of the D. L., and with a flow of ſentiment and expreſſion, which only the trueſt friendſhip, operating on a mind like his, could inſpire. But we are better pleaſed to hear him expreſs his ſenſe of it in a private letter to a friend. Speaking of the Biſhop's death to Dr. Middleton, in the letter above mentioned of May 6, 1740, he ſays—"He has not "left his fellow behind him for the love and encourage-"ment of learning. I have had a great loſs in his death. "He honoured me with his eſteem and friendſhip. This "I eſteemed a great obligation. I never ſought to increaſe "it by any other dependance upon him; and by the terms "on which we kept up a correſpondence, he did me the "juſtice to believe, I expected no other."

This freedom of correſpondence does honour to both parties; and was obſerved, with addreſs, in this letter to Dr. Middleton, who had conceived Biſhop Hare to have

taken a prejudice againſt himſelf, for his liberty in profeſſing ſome ſentiments, not conformable to his Lordſhip's. He therefore inſinuates there was no ground for ſuch a ſuſpicion, for that he himſelf, ſo much and ſo long in the Biſhop's favour, had lived with him on the ſame free terms. He knew very well, that nothing could recommend his patron or himſelf to his friend's good opinion more, than ſuch liberality on the one part, and ſo manly a conduct on the other.

But the truth is, though Mr. Warburton very properly *ſought not* to increaſe his obligation to Biſhop Hare, he would certainly have received the higheſt, had it been in the Biſhop's power; which very probably ended with the Queen's death.

In May, 1741, was publiſhed the ſecond volume of the D. L. which completed the argument, although not the entire plan of that work. A work! in all views, of the moſt tranſcendant merit, whether we conſider the invention, or the execution.

A plain ſimple argument, yet perfectly new, proving the divinity of the Moſaic Law, and laying a ſure foundation for the ſupport of Chriſtianity, is there drawn out to a great length by a chain of reaſoning, ſo elegantly connected, that the reader is carried along it with eaſe and pleaſure; while the matter preſented to him is ſo ſtriking for its own importance, ſo embelliſhed by a lively fancy,

n d illuſtrated, from all quarters, by exquiſite learning and the moſt ingenious diſquiſition, that, in the whole compaſs of modern or antient theology, there is nothing equal or ſimilar to this extraordinary performance.

Such is the general idea of the Divine Legation of Moſes. But for a more diſtinct conception of its frame; to ſee at once

—" the bearings and the ties,
" The ſtrong connections, juſt dependencies;"

the reader is referred to the recapitulation at the end of the VIth book *, where the author himſelf has drawn up a brief comprehenſive view of his whole ſcheme, with great ſpirit.

This year, but ſomething earlier, came out Dr. Middleton's famous *Hiſtory of the Life of Cicero*; which was received by the publick, as it deſerved to be, with great applauſe. Mr. Warburton took the firſt occaſion to compliment his friend upon it; And, as in the concluding part of that work Dr. Middleton had controverted the account given of Cicero's philoſophical opinions in the firſt volume of the D. L. he takes notice, that *he had a more particular pleaſure in the laſt ſection, as he was more particularly intereſted in it*; and then proceeds to moralize in the following manner—" We perhaps ſhall neither of us be " eſteemed orthodox writers. But this we ſhall do, we

* See Vol. III. p. 467.

" ſhall

" ſhall give an example to the world, which orthodox " writers rarely do, and perhaps of more uſe to mankind, " than moſt of the refined ſubjects they engage in, that " we can differ in many important points, and publicly " avow our difference, without the leaſt interruption of " the declared friendſhip and eſteem, we bear to each " other. And the Life of Tully, and the D. L., will be " a rule, which few have ſet us and perhaps few will fol- " low, how men, who eſteem and love each other, ſhould " comport themſelves when they differ in opinion. So " that whichever is right or wrong in *opinion*, the honeſt " part of the world will judge both of us to be right in " *ſentiment* *."

To whom Dr. Middleton replies, with great complacency, in the ſame ſtrain—" As to the circumſtance, from " which you draw ſo juſt and uſeful a leſſon, of our dif- " fering from each other in ſome particular opinions, as " I was always perſuaded that it could not have any other " effect upon you, ſo I have the comfort to aſſure you, " that I never felt the leaſt impreſſion from it diſadvanta- " geous to our friendſhip. It is the neceſſary conſequence " of that privilege of our nature on which all men of ſenſe " ſet the higheſt value, the liberty of judging for our- " ſelves; yet ſince it would be a great ſatisfaction to me

* April 29, 1741.

" in

" in all caſes to find my judgement confirmed by yours,
" ſo, when you are at full leiſure, I ſhould be glad to
" know the particular reaſons which force you to differ
" from me on the ſubject of Cicero's opinions; to which
" alone our difference in the preſent caſe is to be referred,
" that as far as is poſſible we may come ſtill nearer to each
" other *."

Thus theſe two ingenious men; and the ſame ſpirit breathes through the reſt of their letters: So that their whole temper ſeems to have reſolved itſelf into a principle of general candour. Yet, within a month or two, a freſh difference of opinion taking place (though on a ſubject of no more importance than the other about Cicero, reſpecting only the origin of popiſh ceremonies) and neither ſide giving way, our two candid friends cooled inſenſibly towards each other, and ſeem, thenceforward, to have diſcontinued their correſpondence; for I find no letters, that paſſed between them, of a later date, than thoſe of this year which touch upon that difference. A memorable inſtance of our common weakneſs! which ſhews how little ſtreſs is to be laid on thoſe profeſſions of candour, with which our letters and converſations overflow; and how impoſſible it is for any laſting friendſhip to ſubſiſt between men of oppoſite principles and perſua-

* Cambridge, April 5, 1741. I ſuppoſe a miſdate for May 5th, or Mr. Warburton's letter is miſdated.

ſions,

ſions, however their feelings may for a time be diſſembled, or diſguiſed even to themſelves, by a ſhew of good breeding.

For a contrary reaſon, the conformity of their ſentiments, the friendſhip between Mr. Warburton and Mr. Pope became every day cloſer and more confidential. In the beginning of this ſummer, when the buſineſs that had called him to London, on the publication of his book, was over, he went down again to Twickenham, and paſſed ſome weeks with Mr. Pope there, and in a country-ramble, which led them at laſt to Oxford. The univerſity was naturally pleaſed at the arrival of two ſuch ſtrangers, and ſeemed deſirous of inrolling their names among their graduates. The degree of Doctor of Divinity was intended for the Divine, and that of Doctor of Law for the Poet, as a teſtimony of their great reſpect for each. But intrigue and envy defeated this ſcheme; and the univerſity loſt the honour of decorating, at the ſame time, the two greateſt geniuſſes of the age, by the fault of one or two of its members *. Mr. Pope retired with ſome indignation to Twickenham, but conſoled himſelf and his friend with this ſarcaſtic reflexion—"We ſhall take our "degree together in Fame, whatever we do at the uni-"verſity †."

* Pope's Works, Vol. IX. Lond. 1753. Letter CVII.
† Sept. 20, 1741.

The

The time they ſpent together this ſummer gave occaſion to ſome intereſting converſations. Mr. Warburton ſuggeſted many alterations and improvements of Mr. Pope's moral writings, and particularly adviſed him to ſtrike out *every thing in them that might be ſuſpected of having the leaſt glance towards fate or naturaliſm*, which he conſented to, we are told, *with extreme pleaſure* *. It was, alſo, at this time that he concerted with him the plan of the IVth book of the Dunciad †.

Mr. Pope loſt no time in carrying it into execution. In November following he preſſes his friend to meet him at Prior-Park, on the invitation of Mr. Allen, with whom he then was, and tells him it was there that he ſhould find moſt leiſure to profit by the advice he had given him "to reſume the ſtudies, which he had almoſt laid aſide by perpetual avocations and diſſipations."

Here accordingly they met: a great part of the new poem was read and highly approved: the reſt was finiſhed in the courſe of the year 1742, and a project formed for making Mr. Warburton the Editor of the IV books complete; which was executed very early in 1743; and ſo much to the author's ſatisfaction, that he afterwards engaged him to ſuſtain the like office with regard to the reſt of his Works ‡.

* Pref. to his Works.
† Pope's Works, Vol. IX. Letter CX. note.
‡ Letters 112, 113, 114, 115.

I ſhall

I ſhall find a fitter place, in the courſe of theſe reflexions, to ſpeak my own ſentiments of the edition of Mr. Pope's works. All I have now to add on this intereſting part of Mr. Warburton's life, is, that the moſt unreſerved confidence continued between the two friends till Mr. Pope's death in May, 1744: and with what warmth of affection on both ſides, appears from the laſt will and teſtament of the latter, and from the zeal of the former to fulfill his intention and to do all poſſible honour to his memory.

It muſt, indeed, be regretted that this memorable friendſhip commenced ſo late, and ended ſo ſoon. We might otherwiſe have ſeen the moſt valuable fruits of it. Their hearts and heads were exactly attuned to each other; and, had the life and health of Mr. Pope permitted, this harmonious agreement in the powers and purpoſes of two ſuch men could not have failed to produce many a noble deſign in favour of virtue and religion.

The death of our great poet, was an event that could not fail of putting the ſpirits of the ingenious in motion, and of exciting an emulation, among the lovers of polite literature, to adorn his memory and virtues. It accordingly produced Mr. Brown's *Eſſay on Satire*, which was addreſſed to Mr. Warburton, and ſo far approved by him, as to be prefixed to nis edition of Mr. Pope's works. It alſo brought on the dawn of Mr. Maſon's genius, in *The*

Monody, entitled Muſæus; which gave ſo ſure a preſage of his future eminence in poetry, and ſo advantageous a picture of his mind, that Mr. Warburton, on the ſight of it,

"With open arms received one poet more."

Soon after Mr. Pope's death, Mr. Warburton received a letter from a learned and ingenious lady, Mrs. Cockburne, lamenting that event, and making ſome enquiry after Mr. Pope's works; but the real purpoſe of the letter-writer was to draw Mr. Warburton into an explanation of his ſyſtem concerning *Moral Obligation*, as delivered in the firſt volume of the D. L., it being different from one eſpouſed by herſelf, which was that of Dr. Samuel Clarke.

His anſwer to this Lady is written with great civility and politeneſs, and was ſo well received, that, when, a year or two afterwards, ſhe drew up her confutation of Dr. Rutherforth's Eſſay on Virtue, ſhe ſent the manuſcript to Mr. Warburton; who was extremely pleaſed with it, and wrote a ſhort preface in recommendation of that work. His Letter may be ſeen in the Appendix [B].

But to return to what I was ſaying of Mr. Pope's friendſhip for Mr. Warburton.

Next to the enjoyment itſelf of ſuch a friendſhip, the chief benefit Mr. Warburton derived from it, was the being introduced by his means to his principal friends; particularly Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ALLEN; two of the greateſt

greateſt and beſt men of the age. As I had myſelf the honour of being well acquainted with theſe excellent perſons, and very much obliged to them, I may the rather be allowed to indulge myſelf in the recollection of their virtues.

Mr. MURRAY, afterwards Earl of Mansfield and Lord Chief Juſtice of England, was ſo extraordinary a perſon, and made ſo great a figure in the world, that his name muſt go down to poſterity, with diſtinguiſhed honour, in the public records of the nation. For his ſhining talents diſplayed themſelves in every department of the ſtate, as well as in the ſupreme Court of Juſtice, his peculiar province; which he filled with a luſtre of reputation, not equalled perhaps, certainly not exceeded, by that of any of his predeceſſors.

Of his conduct in the Houſe of Lords, I can ſpeak with the more confidence, becauſe I ſpeak from my own obſervation. Too good to be the leader, and too able to be the dupe, of any party, he was believed to ſpeak his own ſenſe of public meaſures; and the authority of his judgement was ſo high that, in regular times, the Houſe was uſually determined by it. He was no forward, or frequent ſpeaker; but reſerved himſelf, as was fit, for occaſions worthy of him. In *debate*, he was eloquent as well as wiſe; or rather, he became eloquent by his wiſdom. His countenance and tone of voice imprinted

the ideas of penetration, probity, and candour; but what ſecured your attention and aſſent to all he ſaid, was his conſtant good ſenſe, flowing in apt terms and the cleareſt method. He affected no ſallies of the imagination, or burſts of paſſion; much leſs would he condeſcend to perſonal abuſe or petulant altercation. All was clear, candid reaſon, letting itſelf ſo eaſily into the minds of his hearers as to carry information and conviction with it. In a word, his public ſenatorial character reſembled very much that of Meſſala, of whom Cicero ſays, addreſſing himſelf to Brutus—

"Do not imagine, Brutus, that, for worth, honour, "and a warm love of his country, any one is comparable "to Meſſala: So that his eloquence, in which he won-"derfully excells, is almoſt eclipſed by thoſe virtues. And "even in his diſplay of that faculty, his ſuperior good "ſenſe ſhews itſelf moſt: with ſo much care and ſkill "hath he formed himſelf to the trueſt manner of ſpeak-"ing! His powers of genius and invention are confeſſ-"edly of the firſt ſize; yet he almoſt owes leſs to them, "than to the diligent and ſtudious cultivation of his judge-"ment *."

* "Cave putes probitate, conſtantiâ, curâ, ſtudio reipublicæ, quid-"quam illi ſimile eſſe; ut eloquentia, quâ mirabiliter excellit, vix in eo "locum ad laudandum habere videatur. Quanquam in hâc ipſâ ſapientia "plus apparet: ita gravi judicio multâque arte ſe exercuit in veriſſimo "genere dicendi. Tanta autem induſtria eſt, tantumque evigilat in ſtu-"dio, ut non maximè ingenio, quod in eo ſummum eſt, gratia habenda "videatur." Cic. ad Brutum, I. 15.

In

In the commerce of private life, he was eaſy, friendly, and agreeable, extremely ſenſible of merit in other men, and ready on all occaſions to countenance and produce it. From his early youth, he had attracted the notice, and obtained the friendſhip and applauſe, of our great poet.

Mr. ALLEN was a man of plain good ſenſe, and the moſt benevolent temper. He roſe to great conſideration by farming the croſs-poſts; which he put into the admirable order in which we now find them; very much to the public advantage, as well as his own. He was of that generous compoſition, that his mind enlarged with his fortune; and the wealth he ſo honourably acquired, he ſpent in a ſplendid hoſpitality, and the moſt extenſive charities. His houſe, in ſo public a ſcene as that of Bath, was open to all men of rank and worth, and eſpecially to men of diſtinguiſhed parts and learning; whom he honoured and encouraged; and whoſe reſpective merits he was enabled to appreciate, by a natural diſcernment and ſuperior good ſenſe, rather than any acquired uſe and knowledge of letters. His domeſtic virtues were above all praiſe. With theſe qualities he drew to himſelf an univerſal reſpect; and poſſeſſed, in a high degree, the eſteem of Mr. Pope, who, in one of his moral eſſays, has done juſtice to his modeſt and amiable character.

To theſe two incomparable perſons Mr. Pope was eſpecially anxious to introduce his friend; and it was not

long before he experienced the moſt ſubſtantial benefits from this recommendation.

In the mean time, his attention was turned towards that numerous hoſt of anſwerers, which the D. L. of Moſes had brought down upon him. The extenſive argument, and miſcellaneous nature of that work, had led him to declare his ſentiments on a multitude of queſtions, on which he thought differently from other writers, and of courſe to cenſure or confute their opinions. Whole bodies of men, as well as individuals of the higheſt reputation, were attacked by him; and his manner was to ſpeak his ſenſe of all with freedom and force. So that moſt writers, and even readers, had ſome ground of complaint againſt him. Not only the free-thinkers and unbelievers, againſt whom the tenour of his book was directed, but the heterodox of every denomination were treated without much ceremony; and of the orthodox themſelves ſome tenet or other, which till then they had held ſacred, was diſcuſſed and reprobated by him. Straggling hereſies, or embodied ſyſtems, made no difference with him; as they came in his way, no quarter was given to either: "his end and manner of "writing," as Dr. Middleton truly obſerved, "being to pur- "ſue truth, wherever he found it, and, from the midſt "of ſmoke and darkneſs, to ſpread light and day around "him *."

* Letter VII. in Dr. Middleton's Works, vol. II.

Such

Such a writer (independently of the envy, which ever attends ſuperior genius) muſt needs have innumerable enemies. And as all could not receive, nor the greater part deſerve, his notice, he determined to ſelect a few of the more reſpectable, out of the groſs body of aſſailants, and to quit his hands of them at once, in a general comprehenſive anſwer. This was done by *Remarks on ſeveral occaſional Reflexions*, in two parts; the *former* publiſhed in 1744, and the *ſecond* (which he ſtyles the *laſt*) in 1745; and both, executed in ſuch a manner as was not likely to invite any freſh attacks upon him.

Yet the rage of his anſwerers was not preſently ſubdued. Writing to a confidential friend from Prior-Park the year following [July 15, 1746] he tells him—"I have a deluge of writers againſt me. But two great men have made me promiſe to anſwer none of them. They ſaid—'You imagine the world takes as much notice of your anſwerers, as you yourſelf do. You are miſtaken. The names of none of them were ever heard of in good company. And the world wonders you ſhould ſo miſemploy your time.' To this I ſaid, "It was true. But that there was another body to which ſome regard ſhould be had, the inferior Clergy." They ſaid, if ſuch writers miſled them, it was in vain for me to think of them. And indeed I begin to think Ariſtotle miſtaken when he defined man to be a rational animal. Not but I know the

ſource

ſource of all this oppoſition is rather to be attributed to a bad heart, than a bad head. And you would be ſurprized at the inſtances of envy I could give you. Had I the complaiſance to die to-morrow, it would all be over, before the end of the week. I am in this condition of a dead man, already, with regard to the Indies, there being at this immenſe diſtance no room for envy, as you will ſee by the following extract of a letter I received from one of the governors of Virginia :"

" I never had ſo much profit from any book, except " the Bible, as from your's. The flood of infidelity has " reached us. The bleſſing of GOD upon your excellent " pen will, I hope, preſerve us from the evil influence. " Pennſylvania ſeems to be over-run with Deiſm. The " Quakers are generally infected, and it being their con- " ſtitution to have no eſtabliſhed religion, their too-uni- " verſal toleration receives all without diſtinction. And " they who worſhip GOD, and they who do not, are in " the ſame eſteem.

" Your firſt and ſecond volumes of the Divine Legation " came over to their public library. I recommended it " ſtrongly. It ſoon became the ſubject of all converſa- " tion. Never were ſuch ſtruggles about any book, who " ſhould firſt read it. The reaſonable were convinced ; " the obſtinate were aſtoniſhed. A friend of mine " of learning and ſtation there ſpoke of it with the

" warmeſt

" warmeſt praiſe: he ſaid, it had made him ten times " more a Chriſtian, than he had ever been."—

Theſe reflexions were conſolatory to him, and made him bear with more temper the petulance of his adverſaries; whom he ſeems to have neglected, till one of high fame and confident pretenſions forced him again into the field of controverſy. But this was not till ſome years afterwards.——I now go on with my narrative from 1745.

Mr. Pope had very early introduced his friend to the notice of Lord Cheſterfield; who going this year Lord Lieutenant to Ireland, was deſirous of taking Mr. Warburton with him, as his firſt Chaplain. He had his reaſons for declining this offer; but he had a proper ſenſe of the civility, and made his public acknowledgements for it in a dedication of the *Alliance*, reprinted with many corrections and improvements in 1748. The ſtyle of compliment in this piece will perhaps be cenſured as too high. But the truth is, that ſpecious nobleman had the fortune to be better thought of, in his life-time, than he has been ſince. The general opinion therefore (which came confirmed to him by Mr. Pope) very naturally inflamed the expreſſion of his gratitude, in that panegyrical epiſtle.

After an acquaintance of ſome years, Mr. Allen had, now, ſeen ſo much of his friend, that he wiſhed to unite him ſtill more cloſely to himſelf by an alliance of marriage with an accompliſhed Lady of his own family *.

* Miſs Gertrude Tucker, Mr. Allen's favourite niece.

This event took place in the beginning of the year 1746; and ſoon after, the preacherſhip of Lincoln's-Inn happening to become vacant, Mr. Murray, then Solicitor General, eaſily prevailed with the learned Bench to invite ſo eminent a perſon, as Mr. Warburton, to accept that office.

II.

From the time of his marriage, Mr. Warburton reſided chiefly at Prior-Park. In ſo agreeable, or, rather, ſplendid a retreat, he enjoyed health, affluence, and leiſure; the beſt company, when he choſe to partake of it; and every other accommodation, which could be acceptable to a man of letters. His ambition was, alſo, gratified with the higheſt perſonal reputation; and, in due time, he ſucceeded to the chief honours of his profeſſion. All this he could not but be ſenſible of. Yet, I have heard him ſay, that the moſt delicious ſeaſon of his life was that which he had ſpent at Newark and Brand-Broughton. So delightful are the ſpringing hopes of youth! and ſo enchanting the ſcenes which open to a great genius, when he comes firſt to know himſelf, and to make trial of his powers! The impreſſion, theſe left upon him, is very agreeably deſcribed in a letter to Mr. C. Yorke, ſo late as the year 1758. Mr. Yorke had acquainted him with an excurſion he had been making into Nottinghamſhire. In his anſwer from P. P. Oct. 2, 1758, he ſays—"I am

" glad

" glad to underſtand you have amuſed yourſelf agreeably
" with a ramble into Nottinghamſhire. It would have
" been the greateſt pleaſure to have chopped upon you at
" Newark: And I would have done ſo, on the leaſt in-
" timation. I could have led you through delicious walks,
" and picked off, for your amuſement in our rambles, a
" thouſand notions which I hung upon every thorn, as I
" paſſed, thirty years ago."

But to return from this reflexion.

The Preacherſhip of Lincoln's-Inn had been offered him in ſo handſome a manner, that it could not be refuſed. Otherwiſe, the thing was not agreeable to him.

In a letter to Dr. Taylor * from Prior-Park, May 22, 1746, he ſays—" I think I told you in my laſt, that the
" Society of Lincoln's-Inn had made me an unanimous
" offer of the Preacherſhip; which therefore I could not
" refuſe, though I would gladly have done it. For it will
" require five or ſix months attendance. And the advan-
" tage of the thing itſelf you may judge of, by this:
" Mr. Allen would have me take a houſe, for which I pay
" as much rent, as the whole preacherſhip is worth. This
" only to you. And don't think I ſpeak with any affectation
" when I tell you in your ear, that nothing can be more

* The phyſician—firſt of Newark, afterwards of London; very eminent in his profeſſion, and from his early youth a friend of Mr. Warburton's.

" diſagreeable to me, than this way of life. But I hope " and determine that it ſhall not continue long. Don't " you pity me? I ſhall be forced to write ſermons: and " God knows what will become of the D. L. But if I " can do any good in this new ſtation, I ſhall know how " to bear the diſagreements of it, and that's all. How " capricious is the fate of mortals! Any other clergyman " would think himſelf happy in ſuch an honour as the " Society has done me. I believe it is the firſt * has been " done to their Preacher. Yet I have no joy in it."

The truth is, the attendance on the term broke in upon his leiſure; and, what was worſe, the neceſſity he was under of compoſing ſermons, with which he was but ſlenderly provided, diverted him from other things, for which he judged himſelf better qualified, and which he had more at heart.

The fruits of his induſtry in this new office there will be occaſion to ſpeak of, and to appreciate hereafter. For the preſent, it is true, his greater deſigns received ſome interruption, and particularly, as he intimates, that of the D. L.; although other reaſons concurred to make him defer (indeed much too long) the proſecution of that noble work.

In the year 1747 appeared his edition of Shakeſpeare's works, which he had undertaken at the inſtance of Mr.

* He means, by the *unanimous* offer of their preacherſhip.

Pope.

Pope. "He was deſirous"—the editor ſpeaks in his own perſon—"I ſhould give a new edition of this poet; and "that his edition ſhould be melted down into mine. In "memory of our friendſhip, I have therefore made it our "joint edition *."

As the public envy was now at its height, from the riſing fortune, as well as fame, of the author, this edition awakened a ſpirit of criticiſm, which haunted him in every ſhape of dull ridicule, and ſolemn confutation. Happening to ſpeak of this, in a letter written to him 1749 (for by that time I had the honour of being perſonally acquainted with him) he replies to me in the following lively manner—"I have, as you ſay, raiſed a ſpirit with-"out deſigning it. And, while I thought I was only con-"jecturing, it ſeems I was conjuring. So that I had no "ſooner evoked the name of Shakeſpeare from the rotten "monument of his former editions, than a crew of ſtrange "devils, and more groteſque than any he laughs at in "the old farces, came chattering, mewing, and grinning "round about me †."

The outcry againſt him was, indeed, pretty much what is here ſo pleaſantly deſcribed. His illuſtrations of the poet's ſenſe were frequently not taken; and his corrections of the faulty text, not allowed. And, to ſpeak candidly,

* Preface to Shakeſpeare.

† Prior Park, Sept. 28, 1749.

it

it could ſcarce be otherwiſe. For, though all pretend to be judges of poetry, few have any idea of poeticalcriticiſm. And, as to what concerns the emendation of the text, the abler the critic, the more liable he is to ſome extravagance of conjecture (as we ſee in the caſe of Bentley himſelf); it being dullneſs, and not judgement, that beſt ſecures him from this ſort of imputation *.

For the reſt, ſuch is the felicity of his genius in reſtoring numberleſs paſſages to their integrity, and in explaining others which the author's ſublime conceptions, or his licentious expreſſion, had kept out of ſight, that this fine edition of Shakeſpeare muſt ever be highly

* The apology, which an eminent French writer makes for Joſeph Scaliger, may ſerve for all Commentators of his ſize:

" Je ne ſçay ſi on ne pourroit pas dire que Scaliger avoit trop d'eſprit, " et trop de ſcience, pour faire un bon commentaire; car à force d'avoir " de l'eſprit, il trouvoit dans les auteurs qu'il commentoit, plus de fineſſe " et plus de genie, qu'ils n'en avoient effectivement; et ſa profonde lité- " rature étoit cauſe qu'il voyoit mille rapports entre les penſées d'un auteur, " et quelque point rare d'antiquité. De ſorte qu'il s'imaginoit que ſon " auteur avoit fait quelque alluſion à ce point d'antiquité, et ſur ce pied-là il " corrigeoit un paſſage. Si on n'aime mieux s'imaginer que l'envie d'eclaircir " un miſtere d'érudition inconnu aux autres critiques, l'engageoit a ſuppoſer " qu'il ſe trouvoit dans un tel ou tel paſſage. Quoiqu'il en ſoit, les com- " mentaires qui viennent de lui, ſont pleins de conjectures hardies, in- " génieuſes, et fort ſçavantes, mais il n'eſt gueres apparent que les auteurs " ayent ſongé à tout ce qu'il leur fait dire. On s'éloigne de leur ſens auſſi " bien quand on a beaucoup d'eſprit, que quand on n'en a pas, &c."

Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, Juin, 1684.

valued by men of ſenſe and taſte; a ſpirit, congenial to that of the author, breathing throughout, and eaſily atoning, with ſuch, for the little miſtakes and inadvertencies, diſcoverable in it.

Mr. Warburton very properly neglected all attacks on his own critical fame. But of one, that was made ſoon after on the moral character of his friend, he took more notice. In 1749 an inſignificant pamphlet, under the name of *A Patriot King*, was publiſhed by Lord Bolingbroke, or by his direction, with a preface to it, reflecting highly on Mr. Pope's honour. The provocation was ſimply this. The manuſcript of that trivial declamation had been intruſted to the care of Mr. Pope, with the charge (as it was pretended) that only a *certain* number of copies ſhould be printed. Mr. Pope, in his exceſſive admiration of his Lordſhip (which was the chief foible of his character) took that opportunity, for fear ſo invaluable a treaſure of patriot-eloquence ſhould be loſt to the publick, to exceed his commiſſion, and to run off more copies, which were found, after his death, in the printer's warehouſe; but with ſo little ſecreſy that ſeveral of his friends, and in particular Mr. Allen (as he told me) was apprized of it at the time, and by Mr. Pope himſelf. This charge, however frivolous, was aggravated beyond meaſure; and, notwithſtanding the proofs Lord Bolingbroke had received of Mr. Pope's devotion to him, envenomed with

with the utmoſt malignity. Mr. Warburton thought it became him to vindicate his deceaſed friend; and he did it ſo effectually, as not only to ſilence his accuſer, but to cover him with confuſion.

And here let me have leave to pauſe a little, while, in emulation of this generous conduct of my friend towards one great man, I endeavour to perform the ſame office towards another; the moſt amiable of his time; who has ſuffered, in the public opinion, by a charge of immoral meanneſs brought againſt him by Mr. Pope himſelf, and, as I am perſuaded, without the leaſt foundation. The perſon I mean is Mr. Addiſon, in whoſe good name, as in that of Mr. Pope, Virtue herſelf has an intereſt. He and Mr. Pope were, likewiſe, friends; and this relation between them brings the two caſes into a ſtill nearer reſemblance with each other.

The charge, I allude to, is briefly this—Mr. Addiſon had uniformly * adviſed and encouraged Mr. Pope's tranſlation of the Iliad, from the year 1713, when the deſign of that work was firſt communicated to him. He had even been zealous to promote the ſubſcription to it; and in May, 1716, when a conſiderable progreſs had been made in the tranſlation, and ſome parts of it publiſhed, he ſpeaks of it in the Freeholder, N° 40, in the following manner:

* See Letters to and from Mr. Addiſon, in Mr. Pope's Works.

" When

" When I conſider myſelf as a Britiſh freeholder, I am " in a particular manner pleaſed with the labours of thoſe " who have improved our language with the tranſlation " of old Latin and Greek authors; and by that means " let us into the knowledge of what paſſed in the famous " governments of Greece and Rome. We have already " moſt of their hiſtorians in our own tongue: and what " is ſtill more for the honour of our language, it has " been taught to expreſs with elegance the greateſt of their " poets in each nation. The illiterate among our coun- " trymen may learn to judge from Dryden's Virgil of the " moſt perfect Epic performance: and thoſe parts of Homer " which have already been publiſhed by Mr. Pope, give us " reaſon to think the Iliad will appear in Engliſh with as " little diſadvantage to that immortal poem."

Notwithſtanding all this, Mr. Pope believed, and his friends, as was natural, believed with him, that in 1715 Mr. Addiſon either tranſlated himſelf, or employed Mr. Tickell to tranſlate, the firſt book of the Iliad, in oppoſition to him.

If we aſk on what grounds this extraordinary charge is brought againſt ſuch a man as Mr. Addiſon, we are only told of ſome ſlight and vague ſuſpicions, without any thing that looks like a proof, either external or internal. What there is of the *latter* tends to confute the charge. For whoever is acquainted with Mr. Addiſon's ſtyle and

manner, muſt be certain that the tranſlation was not *his own*, though Steele in a peeviſh letter, written againſt Tickell *, has, it ſeems, inſinuated ſome ſuch thing. And for *external* proof, we have abſolutely nothing but a report from hear-ſay evidence, that Mr. Addiſon had expreſſed himſelf civilly of Tickell's performance; whence it is concluded that this tranſlation was, at leaſt, undertaken by Mr. Addiſon's advice and authority, if not made by himſelf.

Still, it will be owned, that ſo generous a man as Mr. Pope muſt believe he had ſome proof of this charge againſt his friend: and I think, I have, at length diſcovered what it was.

I have ſeen a printed copy † of Tickell's tranſlation, in which are entered many criticiſms and remarks in Mr. Pope's own hand. And from two of theſe, compared together, I ſeem to collect the true ground of the ſuſpicion. But the reader ſhall judge for himſelf.

* Dedication of the Drummer to Mr. Congreve.

† It was then in Mr. Warburton's hands. It was afterwards ſold, by miſtake, among the other books which he had at his houſe in town, to Mr. T. Payne, and came at length into the poſſeſſion of Iſaac Reed, Eſq. of Staple-Inn; who was ſo obliging as to make me a preſent of it, to be kept in the library at Hartlebury (in which that of Mr. Pope is included), where it now remains.

To

To the tranſlation, are prefixed a DEDICATION, and ADVERTISEMENT. The *latter* is in theſe words—"I muſt "inform the reader, that, when I began this firſt book, "I had ſome thoughts of tranſlating the whole Iliad: but "had the pleaſure of being diverted from that deſign, by "finding the work was fallen into a much abler hand. "I would not therefore be thought to have any other view "in publiſhing this ſmall ſpecimen of Homer's Iliad, than "to beſpeak, if poſſible, the favour of the Public to a "tranſlation of Homer's Odyſſeis, wherein I have already "made ſome progreſs."

To the words in this advertiſement—*when I began this firſt book*—Mr. Pope affixes this note—*See the firſt line of the Dedication.*

Turning to the dedication, we find it begin thus—"When I firſt entered upon this tranſlation I was ambitious of dedicating it to the late Lord Halifax.—Over againſt which words is, likewiſe, entered, in Mr. Pope's hand, the following note. *The tranſlator was firſt known to him* [Lord Halifax] *four months before his death. He died in May*, 1715.

Now, from comparing theſe two notes together, one ſees clearly how Mr. Pope reaſoned on the matter. He concluded from Tickell's ſaying—*when he firſt entered on this tranſlation*, that is, *began this firſt book*, *he thought of dedicating his work to Lord Halifax*—that he could not have

entertained this thought, if he had not at that time been *known* to Lord Halifax. But it was certain, it ſeems, that Mr. Tickell was *firſt* known to that Lord only *four months* before his death, in May, 1715. Whence it ſeemed to follow, that *this firſt book* had been written within, or ſince, that time.

Admitting this concluſion to be rightly made by Mr. Pope, it muſt indeed be allowed that he had much reaſon for his charge of inſincerity on Mr. Addiſon, who, as a friend that had great influence with the tranſlator, would not have adviſed, or even permitted, ſuch a deſign to be entered upon and proſecuted by him at this juncture. But there ſeems not the leaſt ground for ſuch a concluſion. Lord Halifax was the great patron of wits and poets: and if Tickell had formed his deſign of tranſlating the Iliad long before Mr. Pope was known to have engaged in that work, he might very well be ſuppoſed to think of dedicating to this Mæcenas, as much a ſtranger as he then was to him. Nothing is more common than ſuch intentions in literary men; although Mr. Pope might be diſpoſed to conduct himſelf, in ſuch a caſe, with more delicacy or dignity.

I ſee, then, no reaſon to infer from the premiſes, that Mr. Tickell began *his firſt book* but four months before Lord Hallifax's death. For any thing that appears to the contrary, he might have *begun*, or even *finiſhed* it, four years

years before that event, and have only relinquiſhed the thoughts of proſecuting his tranſlation from the time that he *found this work had fallen*, as he ſays, *into an abler*, that is, Mr. Pope's, *hand*.

Theſe paſſages, however, of the *Advertiſement* and *Dedication*, reflected upon and compared together, furniſhed Mr. Pope, as I ſuppoſe, with the chief of thoſe *odd concurring circumſtances*, which, as we are told *, convinced him that this tranſlation of the firſt book of the Iliad was publiſhed with Mr. Addiſon's participation, if not compoſed by him. If the work had been begun but *four* months before its appearance, it muſt have been at leaſt by his allowance and participation: if before that time (Mr. Tickell's acquaintance with Lord Halifax not being of ſo early a date) it was, moſt probably, his own compoſition. And to this latter opinion, it ſeems, Mr. Pope inclined.

How inconcluſive theſe reaſonings are, we have now ſeen. All that remains therefore is to account for the publication at ſuch a time. And for this, I ſee not why Mr. Tickell's own reaſon may not be accepted as the true one—*that he had no other view in publiſhing this ſpecimen, than to beſpeak the favour of the publick to a tranſlation of the Odyſſeis, in which he had made ſome progreſs.*

The time, it muſt be owned, was an unlucky one. But if Mr. Addiſon had reaſon to believe his friend's

* In the notes on Epiſtle to Dr. Arbuthnot.

motive

motive to be that which he profeſſed, he might think it not fit to divert him from a work which was likely to ſerve his intereſt (poetical tranſlation being at that time the moſt lucrative employment of a man of letters), and though it had leſs merit than Mr. Pope's, to do him ſome credit. And for the civility of ſpeaking well of his tranſlation afterwards, or even of aſſiſting him in the reviſal of it, this was certainly no more than Mr. Addiſon's friendſhip for the tranſlator required.

That Mr. Addiſon had, in fact, no unfriendly intention in the part he had taken in this affair, is certain from the paſſage before cited from the Free-holder, where he ſpeaks ſo honourably, in May 1716, of Mr. Pope's tranſlation, after all the noiſe that had been made about Mr. Tickell's firſt book in the ſummer of 1715. We may indeed impute this conduct to fear, or diſſimulation: but a charge of this nature ought ſurely not to be made, but on the cleareſt and beſt grounds.

I have the rather introduced theſe obſervations into the account of my friend's life, as he himſelf had been led by Mr. Pope's authority to credit the imputation on Mr. Addiſon, and, on more occaſions than one, had given a countenance to it. And it is but juſtice to him to aſſure the reader that when, ſome years before his death, I ſhewed him this Vindication, he profeſſed himſelf ſo much ſatiſfied

fied with it, as to ſay, if he lived to ſee another edition of Mr. Pope's works, he would ſtrike out the offenſive reflexions on Mr. Addiſon's character.

To return now to our ſubject.

We left Mr. Warburton illuſtrating the works of one of our great poets, and vindicating the moral character of another. But whatever amuſements, or friendly offices, might employ his pen, he never loſt ſight of what he had moſt at heart, the defence of religion. And a controverſy then carrying on, concerning the miraculous powers of the Chriſtian Church, between Dr. Middleton and his opponents, and ſo managed, on both ſides, as to hurt the cauſe of Chriſtianity itſelf, gave him occaſion to explain his own ſentiments on the ſubject in an admirable book, entitled JULIAN; or, *A Diſcourſe concerning the earthquake and fiery eruption which defeated that emperor's attempt to rebuild the temple at Jeruſalem.* This work was publiſhed in 1750, and is written throughout in the genuine ſpirit of its author.

It is introduced by an exquiſite preface on the literary character of the Fathers, and on the condition of moral ſcience before, and after, the appearance of Chriſtianity.

This excellent book had the fate of the author's other writings, to be cenſured at home. In a letter from Prior-Park to Dr. Balguy, Jan. 17, 1751-2,—"They tell me," ſays he, "there are ſome remarks publiſhed againſt my "Julian.

" Julian. I don't know the nature of them, nor ever
" ſhall. That matter intereſts every clergyman, that is to
" ſay, every Chriſtian, in England, as much as myſelf.
" Beſides, I have long ſince bid adieu to controverſy. I
" give my ſentiments to the publick, and there's an end.
" If any body will oppoſe them, he has my leave. If any
" body will defend them, he has my thanks. I propound
" them freely: I explain them as clearly and enforce them
" as ſtrongly, as I can. I think I owe no more either to
" myſelf or truth. I am ſure I owe no more to the publick.
" Beſides, I know a little (as you will ſee by the new edi-
" tion of the firſt and ſecond volumes of D. L.) how to
" correct myſelf; ſo have leſs need of this aſſiſtance from
" others: which you will better underſtand, when you
" ſee that I have not received the leaſt aſſiſtance from the
" united endeavours of that numerous band of anſwerers,
" who have ſpared no freedoms in telling me of my faults."

Again, ſome months afterwards, writing to the ſame friend—Bedford Row, May 12, 1752, he obſerves,

—" I think you judge rightly of the effects of Lord
" Bolingbroke's writings, as well as of their character. As
" to his diſcourſe on the Canon of Scripture, I think it
" below all criticiſm, though it had mine. He mentions
" (and I believe, with good faith) that fooliſh rabbinical
" fable of Eſdras' reſtoring the whole loſt canon by Inſpi-
" ration; and argues from it. However the redoubtable

" pen

" pen of Sykes, though now worn to the ſtumps, is drawn
" upon him; or, at leaſt, threatened to be drawn. He
" threatened, too, to draw it upon poor Julian, but he left
" the execution to another. And who do you think that
" other proves? Somebody or other, by far more curious
" than myſelf, would unearth this vermin: And he is
" found to be one Nichols, which your univerſity ſome
" time ago proſecuted for ſtealing their books, or rather
" ſhould have proſecuted. Have I not reaſon to blame
" you for your ill-timed clemency? Had they hanged
" him, as Juſtice called upon them to do, my book had
" been ſafe. It is true, he has not fulfilled the old
" proverb, but rather contributed to a new one, "Save a
" rogue from the gallows, and——he will endeavour to
" ſave his fellow. I had gibbeted up Julian, and he
" comes by night to cut him down."—The pleaſantry of theſe reflexions has drawn me into a citation of them. Otherwiſe, it was ſcarce worth while to tell the reader what ſome of our own prejudiced countrymen thought of Julian. For the learned abroad were generally much taken with this work. Among others, the preſident Monteſquieu*,

* " Quand vous verrez Mr. le Docteur Warburton, je vous prie de lui
" dire l'idée agréable que je me fais de faire plus ample connoiſſance avec
" lui; d'aller trouver la ſource du ſçavoir, et de voir la lumiere de l'eſ-
" prit: ſon ouvrage ſur Julien m'a enchanté, quoique je n'aie que de très
" mauvais lecteurs anglois, et que j'ai preſque oublié tout ce que j'en
" ſçavois."

who, it ſeems, was then meditating a viſit to his friends in England, writes thus to Mr. Charles Yorke from Paris, June 6, 1753: "When you ſee Dr. Warburton, pray let "him know the ſatisfaction I propoſe to myſelf in making "a further acquaintance with him, and in taking a nearer "view of his great talents. *His Julian charms me*; al- "though I have but indifferent Engliſh readers, and have, "myſelf, forgotten a great deal of what I once knew of "that language."

And ſpeaking of this work ſome years afterwards, in a letter to me, Mr. Warburton ſays, "My Julian has had a "great effect in France, where Free-thinking holds its head "as high as in England. This is a conſolation to me, as "my ſole aim is to repreſs that infernal ſpirit." And again, —"It has procured me the good will of the beſt and "greateſt man * in France, while there is hardly a noble- "man in England knows I have written ſuch a book †."

* Duc de Noailles.—The intelligence was communicated to the author by his friend, M. de Silhouette: who was a great admirer of his writings, and tranſlated ſome of them. See Preface to *Alliance*.

† In planning his treatiſe on Julian, he had propoſed, as the title-page ſets forth, to *enquire into the nature of that evidence, which will demand the aſſent of every reaſonable man to a miraculous fact*. But this part of his plan he reſerved for another diſcourſe. The ſubject was, in fact, reſumed, and has been ſufficiently explained in the diſcourſe on the Reſurrection, vol. V. P. 473.

This

This admirable work, as I obſerved, took its riſe from Dr. Middleton's Inquiry concerning the miraculous powers in the Chriſtian Church. That ingenious man died towards the end of this year; and although ſome difference had ariſen between them in 1741, and ſeems to have kept them aſunder for the reſt of Dr. Middleton's life, yet no change appears to have been made, by this miſadventure, in Mr. Warburton's opinion or even eſteem of him, (ſo conſtant was he in his friendſhips!) as the reader will ſee in the following extract from a letter, which he wrote to me juſt before the Doctor's death: "Prior-Park, July 11, "1750.—I hear Dr. Middleton has been at London (I ſup- "poſe to conſult Dr. Heberden * about his health) and is "returned in an extreme bad condition.—I am much con- "cerned for the poor man, and wiſh he may recover, "with all my heart. Had he had, I will not ſay, piety, "but greatneſs of mind enough, not to ſuffer the pre- "tended injuries of ſome Churchmen to prejudice him "againſt Religion, I ſhould love him living, and honour

* Dr. Heberden had been well known to Dr. Middleton at Cambridge, where he flouriſhed in great reputation for ſeveral years, and then removed to London. He has now [1794], for ſome time paſt, declined all buſineſs; but, through the whole courſe of his practice, was the moſt univerſally eſteemed, of any phyſician I have known, not only for his ſkill, but generoſity, in the exerciſe of his profeſſion.—My own perſonal obligations to him muſt be my excuſe for the liberty I take in paying this ſmall tribute of reſpect to his merit and character.

" his memory, when dead. But, good GOD, that man,
" for the diſcourteſies done him by his miſerable fellow-
" creatures, ſhould be content to diveſt himſelf of the true
" viaticum, the comfort, the ſolace, the aſylum from all
" the evils of human life, is perfectly aſtoniſhing! I
" believe no one (all things conſidered) has ſuffered more
" from the low and vile paſſions of the high and low
" amongſt our brethren, than myſelf. Yet GOD forbid, it
" ſhould ever ſuffer me to be cold in the Goſpel-intereſts!
" which are indeed ſo much my own, that without it I
" ſhould be diſpoſed to conſider humanity, as the moſt
" forlorn part of the creation."

What this letter tenderly hints at, was the exact truth. Dr. Middleton was an elegant ſcholar, and very fine writer: but, his vanity having engaged him early in religious controverſy on a ſubject which he did not underſtand, he had given juſt offence to ſome conſiderable Churchmen, and yet would not condeſcend to recover their good opinion by retracting what he had haſtily and unwarily advanced. Hence, the obſtruction to his views of preferment; which by degrees ſoured his temper ſo much, that his beſt friends (as Mr. Warburton found by experience) could not calm his reſentments, or keep them from breaking out into ſome unhappy prejudices againſt Religion itſelf. This miſ-adventure was the effect of his paſſion, not judgement: for his knowledge of theology was but ſlight, and his talents

not

not thoſe which qualified him to excell in that ſcience. The bent of his genius and ſtudies lay another way, and had raiſed him to great eminence in polite literature; of which his *Letter from Rome*, and his *Life of Cicero*, are ſhining inſtances. His other works are of much leſs value, and will ſoon be forgotten.

Nothing ſhews the extent of Mr. Warburton's genius, and the command he had of it, more, than his being able to mix the lighteſt with the moſt ſerious ſtudies, and to paſs, as his friend ſpeaks,

"From grave to gay, from lively to ſevere,"

with ſo much grace and facility: a ſtriking inſtance of which power we have, here, in finding *Julian* between our two poets. For in the very next year [1751] he appeared again, as a critic and commentator, in the noble edition he gave of Mr. Pope's works. And, as here there was no room for emendatory criticiſm, of all others the eaſieſt to be miſapplied or miſconſtrued, ſo the public found very little to cenſure on this occaſion. Indeed the main object of the edition being to do juſtice to his friend, it was natural for him to exert his whole force upon it; and as none can *divine* ſo happily of a poet's meaning, as the well-exerciſed critic, if he be at the ſame time of a congenial ſpirit with his author, it is no wonder that he made this (what I formerly ſaid of it, and ſtill think it to be) *the beſt edition that was ever given of any claſſick*.

But,

But, admirable as Mr. Warburton was in this elegant ſpecies of literature, we are now to take our leave of him under that character; his editions of Shakeſpear and Pope being, as he himſelf expreſſed it to me, *amuſements, which his fondneſs for the works of one poet, and for the perſon of another, had engaged him in.* We are, henceforth, to ſee him only in his proper office of Divine; which he reſumed, when Mr. Pope's volumes were out of his hands, and ennobled by a ſet of Sermons, preached by him at Lincoln's-Inn, and entitled *Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion, in two volumes*; the former publiſhed in 1752, and the other in 1754; to which he added a *third* in 1767, conſiſting chiefly of occaſional diſcourſes.

I bring his works of this ſort together under one view, that I may conſider them at once, and give the reader an idea of their true character.

He had uſed himſelf very little to write ſermons, till he came to Lincoln's-Inn. His inſtructions to his pariſh had either been delivered without notes, or extracted from the plaineſt diſcourſes of our beſt preachers. In his preſent ſituation, he found it neceſſary to compoſe his ſermons, and with care; his audience conſiſting wholly of men of education, and thoſe accuſtomed to reaſoning and inquiry. Here was then a ſcene, in which his learning and knowledge might be produced with good effect; and it was in this kind of diſcourſe, that his taſte and ſtudies had qualified

lified him to excell. His ſermons are accordingly, all of them, of this caſt; not ſlight harangues on ordinary ſubjects, but cloſe, weighty, methodical diſcourſes, on the moſt momentous doctrines of natural and revealed religion; opening the grounds of them, and ſupporting them againſt objections; expreſſed in that ſtyle of nervous eloquence, which was natural to him, and brightened occaſionally, but without affectation, by the livelieſt ſtrokes of imagination. In ſhort, they were written for the uſe of men of parts and learning, and will only be reliſhed by ſuch. They are maſterly in their way; but fitter for the cloſet, than the church; I mean, thoſe mixt auditories, that are uſually to be expected in that place.

There had been a friendſhip of long ſtanding between Mr. Warburton and Mr. Charles Yorke; cultivated with great affection and eſteem on both ſides; the fruit of which appeared in 1753, in the offer of a prebend in the church of Glouceſter, by the Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. In acknowledgement of this favour Mr. Warburton addreſſed the firſt volume of the D. L. to his Lordſhip, when he gave the next edition of that work. Some, who were curious in obſerving coincidencies, and meant to do honour both to the patron and client, took notice that the ſtall, to which Mr. Warburton was preferred, was the ſame in which the Lord Chancellor Nottingham, that great patron of all the learned Churchmen in his time, had placed Dr. Cudworth:

worth: Such a ſimilitude was there apprehended to be between the two Magiſtrates; and, ſtill more ſtrikingly, between the two Divines, authors of *The Intellectual Syſtem*, and *The Divine Legation!*

But what idea of Dignity ſoever might be annexed to this prebend, he exchanged it, a year or two after, for one of more value in the church of Durham, which Biſhop Trevor (who did himſelf honour by the diſpoſal of his preferments) very obligingly gave him at the requeſt of Mr. Murray (now Attorney General) in 1755.

He had been made Chaplain to the King, the year before; and that promotion, as well as the preſent, making it decent for him to take his Doctor's degree, the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, Dr. Herring, very wiſely took to himſelf the honour (which the Univerſity of Oxford had unhappily declined) of conferring that diſtinction upon him.

But while his friends were vying with each other in their good offices and attempts to ſerve him, a matter far more intereſting to him, than any preferment, engaged his attention during the courſe of theſe two years.

Lord Bolingbroke died in 1751, and his philoſophical works were publiſhed in 1753. Every one knows the principles and preſumption of that unhappy nobleman. He was of that ſect, which, to avoid a more odious name, chuſes to diſtinguiſh itſelf by that of *Naturaliſm*; and had boaſted in private, what feats he ſhould be able to perform

perform, in the attack, he had long threatened, on *all our metaphyſics and theology*; in other words, on natural and revealed religion.

Some had the ſimplicity to believe him on his word; and others, it may be, wiſhed him ſucceſs. All ſerious men ſtood aghaſt at the loud vaunts of this Goliah of the infidel party; and, prepoſſeſt with the ideas of conſequence, which the fond applauſes of his friends, and (what muſt ever be lamented) of his *tuneful* friend, had thrown about him, waited with anxiety for the event.

In the mean time, as that friend ſaid divinely well (for ſurely, in this inſtance, he propheſied, as well as ſang)

" Heaven with loud laughter the vain toil ſurveys,
" And buries madmen in the heaps they raiſe."

Dr. Warburton had very early penetrated the views of Lord Bolingbroke; and, obſerving ſome tincture of his principles (but without the knowledge of the author, who could not be truſted with the ſecret) artfully inſtilled into the *Eſſay on Man*, had incurred his immortal hatred by making the diſcovery, and, in conſequence of it, by *reaſoning Mr. Pope out of his hands* *. It was eaſy to foreſee what would follow from this vigilant and able Divine, when his Lordſhip's godleſs volumes ſhould come forth; and the dread of it ſeems to have kept them back, for the

* Works, Vol. VII. p. 839.

remainder of his life. The interval, however, was made good uſe of, in ſeaſoning them with poignant invectives againſt the Alliance and Divine Legation, and with whole pages of the groſſeſt perſonal abuſe. So that, when they appeared, Dr. Warburton was provoked, as well as prepared, to give them a ſtrict examination, and was animated to the undertaking by a juſt reſentment, as well as religious zeal.

And theſe two principles (the moſt operative in our nature) were never exerted to better purpoſe, or with greater effect. He planned the VIEW of his Philoſophy in *Four Letters to a Friend**, and in writing it has ſurpaſſed himſelf; the reaſoning and the wit being alike irreſiſtible, the ſtrongeſt and keeneſt that can be conceived. He himſelf was not a little pleaſed with this work, and ſays in confidence to a friend †, "I have given to it all the finiſh-
"ing in my power; and reckon, if any thing of mine
"ſhould ſtumble down to poſterity, it will have as good a
"chance as any. And now—*Cœſtus artemque repono.*"

Some of Dr. Warburton's friends (ſuch of them, I mean, as had been the friends of Mr. Pope) had, of courſe, been acquainted with Lord Bolingbroke; and were very naturally in the common opinion of his parts and abilities, without knowing much, or perhaps any thing, of his

* Mr. Allen of Prior-Park.

† Dr. Balguy.

religious

religious ſentiments. Theſe were likely to take offence at the freedom of the *View*, which was to ſhew him in a light very different from that in which the world had hitherto ſeen him. The conſequence to himſelf was clearly foreſeen, and with no ſmall concern.

Writing from P. P. to Mr. C. Yorke, Aug. 24, 1754, while theſe letters were drawing up, he ſays—" I am buſy " with my ſecond volume of Sermons, which I propoſe to " publiſh early in the winter. I amuſe myſelf too with " another thing, which, were you here, you would be " plagued with: becauſe I never like my things ſo well " as while you are reading them. I have a better reaſon " for your reading them. But, to tell you the truth, this " flatters me moſt. The thing will be without my name, " and a ſecret. I wiſh it may in no degree diſpleaſe one " I have ſo much reaſon to value, as our friend; nay, I " would not have it diſpleaſe any of his friends, on his " account. You will aſk me then why I venture upon it? " I will tell you ſincerely. I think it my duty; for I am " a Chriſtian. I think I was deſigned to be the declared " enemy of Infidelity; for I am a little fanatical."

In a letter alſo to me, Sept. 7, 1754, he ſays—" As to " my View of Bolingbroke, I tell it you in confidence, I " am apprehenſive of diſpleaſing ſome by it whom I moſt " honour, and at a critical time. So that I ſolemnly aſſure " you, nothing but the ſenſe of indiſpenſable duty, as a

" Chriſtian and a Clergyman, could have induced me to
" run the hazard of doing myſelf ſo much injury. But
" *jacta eſt alea.* All other conſiderations are now paſt
" with me; and I let Providence take its courſe without
" any ſolicitude on my part."

And again, Dec. 10, 1754, ſome time after the two firſt letters were publiſhed, and while he was preparing the two laſt—" I go on puſhing this grand enemy of God
" and Godlineſs. But what I predicted to you, I am ſorry
" to tell you, I have experienced to be true; that I tread
" *per cineres doloſos.* However, my duty tells me, this is
" a capital caſe, and I muſt on."

What he alludes to, is an anonymous letter, ſent him by the poſt, and expoſtulating with him, but in the friendlieſt terms, on the manner in which he had treated the ſubject of the *View*, in the parts already printed. He gueſſed at the writer *, and had the higheſt reſpect for him. He reſolved, therefore, to make his apology to him, and (as he was denied the opportunity of a private explanation) in a public anſwer to his letter. Accordingly, in 1755, he printed the two concluding letters of the View, with an *Apology for the two firſt*; which now ſtands in this edition, as it did in the ſubſequent ones of the View in the author's life-time, as a prefatory diſcourſe in vindication of the whole work. The occaſion of the ſubject fired the

* Mr. Murray.

writer.

writer. His very ſoul came out in every ſentence, and is no where ſeen to more advantage than in this Apology; which is written throughout with a peculiar glow of ſentiment and expreſſion, and is, at once, the moſt intereſting, and the moſt maſterly of all his works.

It had the effect, which was natural, on the ſo much reſpected letter-writer; who thought fit to preſerve an inviolable ſilence in regard to this apology, but, by a ſignal act of friendſhip, done to the author very ſoon after, ſhewed how entirely ſatisfied he was with him.

As to the View itſelf, it was univerſally read and admired. The followers of Lord Bolingbroke and his philoſophy hung their heads: the friends of religion took heart: and theſe big volumes of impiety ſunk immediately into utter contempt.

After this complete triumph over the great Chieftain of his party, it would ſcarce be worth while to celebrate his ſucceſſes againſt inferior adventurers, if *one* of them had not publiſhed his own ſhame; and if what I owe to Dr. Warburton's memory did not require me to explain a trifling matter, in which I happened to be concerned.

Mr. Hume had given an early ſpecimen of his free-thinking philoſophy in ſome ſuper-ſubtile lucubrations of the metaphyſical kind: which however did no great miſchief to religion; and, what chagrined him almoſt as much, contributed but little to his own fame, being too

ſublime,

ſublime, or too dark, for the apprehenſions of his readers. For ſo good a purpoſe as that of aſſiſting in the common cauſe of impiety, he thought fit to come out of the clouds, and to attempt a popular vein of writing, as the more likely to get himſelf read and talked of in the world. In 1749 he therefore gave the publick a haſh of his ſtale notions, ſerved up in the taking form and name of Eſſays, and with a ſtronger, at leaſt a more undiſguiſed, mixture of Atheiſm than before.

Dr. Warburton, who was then ſending his Julian to the preſs, ſaw theſe Eſſays, and had thoughts of cloſing that work with ſome ſtrictures upon them. In a letter of Sept. 28, of that year, to a friend at Cambridge, he ſays, —"I am tempted to have a ſtroke at Hume in parting. " He is the author of a little book called *Philoſophical* " *Eſſays:* In one part of which he argues againſt the being " of a GOD; and in another (very needleſsly, you will ſay) " againſt the poſſibility of miracles. He has crowned the " liberty of the preſs. And yet he has a conſiderable " poſt under the government. I have a great mind to do " juſtice on his arguments againſt miracles, which I think " might be done in few words. But does he deſerve this " notice? Is he known amongſt you? Pray, anſwer me " theſe queſtions. For if his own weight keeps him down, " I ſhould be ſorry to contribute to his advancement to any " place, but the pillory."

No

No encouraging anſwer, I ſuppoſe, was returned to this letter; and ſo the author of the Eſſays eſcaped, for this time. His next effort was to diſcredit Religion by what he calls, its *natural hiſtory*. This book came out early in 1757, and falling into the hands of Dr. Warburton, provoked him, by its uncommon licentiouſneſs, to enter on the margin, as he went along, ſuch remarks as occurred to him. And when that was too narrow to contain them all, he put down the reſt on looſe ſcraps of paper, which he ſtuck between the leaves. In this ſtate the book was ſhewn to me (as I chanced at that time to be in London with the author) merely as matter of curioſity, and to give me an idea of the contents, how miſchievous and extravagant they were. He had then written remarks on about two thirds of the volume: And I liked them ſo well, that I adviſed him, by all means, to carry them on through the remaining parts of it, and then to fit them up, in what way he thought beſt, for public uſe, which I told him they very well deſerved. He put by this propoſal ſlightly; but, when I preſſed him again on this head, ſome time after, in a letter from Cambridge, he wrote me the following anſwer.

"As to Hume, I had laid it aſide ever ſince you were
"here. I will now, however, finiſh my ſkeleton. It
"will be hardly that. If then you think any thing can
"be made of it, and will give yourſelf the trouble, we
"may

" may perhaps between us do a little good, which I dare
" ſay we ſhall both think will be worth a little pains. If
" I have any force in the firſt rude beating out the maſs,
" you are beſt able to give it the elegance of form and
" ſplendour of poliſh. This will anſwer my purpoſe, to
" labour together in a joint work to do a little good. I
" will tell you fairly, it is no more the thing it ſhould be,
" than the Dantzick iron at the forge is the gilt and painted
" ware at Birmingham. It will make no more than a
" pamphlet; but you ſhall take your own time, and make
" it your ſummer's amuſement, if you will. I propoſe it
" bear ſomething like this title—' Remarks on Mr. Hume's
" late Eſſay, called, *The natural hiſtory of Religion*, by a
" Gentleman of Cambridge, in a Letter to the Rev. Dr.
" Warburton.'—I propoſe the addreſs ſhould be with the
" dryneſs and reſerve of a ſtranger, who likes the method
" of the Letters on Bolingbroke's philoſophy, and follows
" it here, againſt the ſame ſort of writer, inculcating the
" ſame impiety, Naturaliſm, and employing the ſame kind
" of arguments. The addreſs will remove it from me;
" the author, a gentleman of Cambridge, from you; and
" the ſecrecy of printing, from us both."

I ſaw by this letter, he was not diſpoſed to take much trouble about the thing. Accordingly his papers were ſoon after ſent down to me at Cambridge, pretty much in the ſtate I had ſeen them in at London, ſo far as they then

then went, only with additional entries in the latter part of the book. However, in this careleſs detached form, I thought his obſervations too good to be loſt. And the hint of the *Addreſs* ſuggeſted the means of preſerving them, without any injury to his reputation, and indeed without much labour to myſelf. Having, therefore, tranſcribed the Remarks * with little alteration, I only wrote a ſhort introduction and concluſion, merely to colour the propoſed fiction; and in this form, ſent them to the preſs.

When Dr. Warburton ſaw the pamphlet, he ſaid, I ſhould have done much more, and worked up his haſty remarks in my own way. He doubted, alſo, whether the contrivance, as I had managed it, would not be ſeen through. But in this he was miſtaken; for the diſguiſe, as thin as it was, anſwered its purpoſe in keeping the real author out of ſight.

Mr. Hume in particular (underſtanding, I ſuppoſe, from his bookſeller, who was alſo mine, that the manuſcript came from me) was the firſt to fall into the trap. He was much hurt, and no wonder, by ſo lively an attack upon him, and could not help confeſſing it in what he calls his *own Life*; in which he has thought fit to honour me with greater marks of his reſentment, than any other of the

* They are given in this edition [Vol. VI. p. 847.] in their original form.

writers againſt him: nay the ſpiteful man goes ſo far as to upbraid me with being a *follower* (indeed a cloſer, in this inſtance, than he apprehended) *of the Warburtonian ſchool.*

This idle ſtory would not have been worth the telling, but for the reaſon already given, That I could not, in juſtice to the author, take the merit of ſo fine a work to myſelf. And yet in diſclaiming it, the reader ſees, I make but an aukward figure, as being obliged to open the ſecret of our little ſtratagem, in which the grace of it mainly conſiſts.

Dr. Warburton had now, for ſome time, been preparing, and in 1758 he printed, a correct and improved edition of the firſt volume of the D. L. The notes to this edition are numerous and large; ſome of which are anſwers to objections made to him by Archbiſhop Secker. "Where you find me, ſays he in a Letter to one of his "friends [P. P. April 19, 1758], ſpeaking, in the notes, "of objections that have been made, underſtand them of "the preſent Archbiſhop's, who formerly gave me ſome "ſheets of them, which I have ſtill by me, and have in "this edition conſidered all I thought worth obſerving."

Dr. Secker was a wiſe man, an edifying preacher, and an exemplary Biſhop. But the courſe of his life and ſtudies had not qualified him to decide on ſuch a work, as that of the D. L. Even in the narrow walk of literature he

he moſt affected, that of criticizing the Hebrew text, it does not appear that he attained to any great diſtinction. His chief merit (and ſurely it was a very great one) lay in explaining clearly and popularly, in his ſermons, the principles delivered by his friend, Biſhop Butler, in his famous book of *The Analogy*, and in ſhewing the important uſe of them to Religion.

Of this laſt admirable prelate, what Dr. Warburton's ſentiments were, appears from a letter he wrote to Dr. Balguy on his death, which happened in 1752—"You "have heard of the death of the poor Biſhop of Durham. "The Church could have ſpared ſome other prelates "much better; and, in its preſent condition, could but ill "ſpare him. For his morals and ſerious ſenſe of religion "(to ſay nothing of his intellectual endowments) did ho-"nour to his ſtation. His death is particularly unhappy "for his chaplain, Dr. Forſter. He is my friend, whom "I much value, as one of great worth, and whoſe ill luck "I much lament. He has not only ſeen his hopes drop "through, when he was every thing but in the very "poſſeſſion of them, but has loſt a patron, who deſerved "the name of *friend*, which goes much harder in the ſepa-"ration than the other." [P. P. June 21, 1752.]

In the memoirs of ſuch a life, as I am now writing, nothing, I am ſenſible, intereſts the reader leſs than the chapter of preferments. Yet theſe muſt not be wholly

overlooked. Towards the end of the year 1757 Dr. Warburton had been promoted to the Deanery of Briſtol. And in the beginning of the year 1760, by Mr. Allen's intereſt with the miniſter, Mr. Pitt, he was advanced to the Biſhoprick of Glouceſter.

III.

In the common eſtimation, this laſt was a preferment ſuitable to his merit. Mr. Pitt himſelf gloried in it, as what did honour to his adminiſtration. I remember to have ſeen a letter of his, in which he ſaid—*that nothing of a private nature, ſince he had been in office, had given him ſo much pleaſure, as his bringing Dr. Warburton upon the bench.* This virtuous ſelf-gratulation became the miniſter; and others may be of his mind. But I have ſometimes doubted with myſelf, whether the proper ſcene of abilities, like his, be not a private ſtation, where only great writers have the leiſure to do great things.

Here, at leaſt, it was that THE ALLIANCE and DIVINE LEGATION were written: And here, too, was compoſed the immortal work of ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, which, in the end, proved ſo fatal to our *Engliſh Diſciplinarians*; now riſing again in the ſhape of *Levellers* and *Socinians*; but to fall again, in good time, by one or other of our learned clergy, going forth againſt them, in the ſpirit of order

order and orthodoxy, from the cool invigorating ſhade of private life *.

But let me not be miſunderſtood. When I ſay that great men ſhould not be taken from their privacy, I ſpeak of great men *indeed*. The Church is, no doubt, much benefited and adorned by a learned prelacy. The paſtoral functions cannot well be diſcharged by any other. But a genius of the high order, here mentioned, is given by a gracious Providence, now and then, in a courſe of ages, *to correct*, as Dr. Middleton obſerved, *the ſentiments and manners of mankind*.

Such a man as this, is leſſened by elevation: he is, in himſelf, methinks, too great to be advanced.

But be this, as it may; it muſt be allowed that religion and learning ſuffered ſomewhat by his promotion, as it interrupted thoſe deſigns which he had formed for the ſervice of both, and would have executed, if his whole time had been at his command. He himſelf lamented this inconvenience of his public ſtation; and, after all, was not able (ſuch was the root his former habits of ſtudy had taken in him) to be ſo active in it as he wiſhed.

* Soon after I had hazarded this prediction, I had the pleaſure to ſee one half of it completely fulfilled. See Dr. Horſley's *Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of St. Alban's*, and his unanſwerable *Letters*, in vindication of it.—This able Divine was deſervedly advanced to the ſee of St. David's in 1788; and has ſince [1793] been tranſlated to that of Rocheſter.

He performed the ordinary duties of his office with regularity; but further than this he could not prevail with himſelf to go. And perhaps, on the whole, it was better that he did not; as the leiſure he thus procured to himſelf, was ſpent to more advantage in defending Religion, than it could have been in a vain endeavour to ſupport that diſcipline, which the ſpirit of the times has utterly overthrown.

They who ſtood at a diſtance from him, and knew him only by the report of ſuch as had no kindneſs for him, concluded, at leaſt, that he would take an active part in the Houſe of Lords. I have heard of a certain miniſter, who dreaded his promotion on this account, and thought he ſaw a ſecond Atterbury in the new Biſhop of Glouceſter. But all ſuch were egregiouſly miſtaken. Alas, he had neither talents nor inclination for parliamentary intrigue or parliamentary eloquence. He had other inſtruments of fame and conſideration in his hands, and was infinitely above the vanity of being caught

"With the fine notion of a buſy man,"

as one of our poets * well expreſſes it.

On the 30th of January, 1760, ten days after his conſecration, he preached the cuſtomary ſermon before the Lords. I mention this only, becauſe his ſermon, which of courſe was printed, is one of the beſt he ever wrote,

* Dryden.

and

and the beſt, without queſtion, that ever was preached on that day. It could not be any other, ſince, beſides his great abilities, as a writer, he poſſeſſed a perfect knowledge of our hiſtory, and of that period of it in particular. I have heard him ſay, there was ſcarce a pamphlet or memoir, publiſhed between 1640 and 1660, which he had not read. This predilection for the hiſtory of the rebellion, ſeems to have been occaſioned by a circumſtance juſt touched by me in the entrance of this diſcourſe. I obſerved that his grandfather had been active in that ſcene. His grandmother, a woman of ſenſe and ſpirit, lived to a great age, and would often (as I have heard him ſay) take a pleaſure to relate to him, when a boy, ſuch paſſages of thoſe times as ſhe remembered and was well acquainted with. This taſte of thoſe tranſactions, made intereſting to him by the part which his family had taken in them, raiſed an eager curioſity in him, as he grew up, to know more of the ſubject. And thus, he not only acquired an early inſight into that part of our hiſtory, but continued through life to be ſo fond of it, that he had thoughts, at one time, of writing the hiſtory of the civil wars; and would without doubt have done it with ſupreme ability, and, as the tenour of his ſermon ſhews, with equal candour, if the ſtudies of his own profeſſion had left him at leiſure to engage in ſo great a work.

Lord

Lord Clarendon was one of his favourite characters, as well as writers; he honoured the man, and admired his hiſtory of the Grand Rebellion in the higheſt degree. Yet there is a copy of that work, now extant and in the hands of his family, in which he has entered marginal notes containing ſo minute a cenſure of all that is blameable in it, that a ſtranger who had heard nothing of his predilection for Lord Clarendon, would be apt to think him an enemy to the noble perſon's writings and reputation. With ſuch wonderful impartiality is the cenſure made * !

Another inſtance of his ſkill in the ſtory of thoſe times, and of his fairneſs in repreſenting it, may be mentioned. When he was one ſummer in reſidence at Durham, he found Neal's hiſtory of the Puritans in their library, and for his amuſement took it with him to his own houſe, and *ſcribbled enough upon the margins of the ſeveral volumes* (I uſe his own words in a letter to me), *to expoſe and confute the miſtakes and miſrepreſentations of the writer*. By the favour of a friend, I have obtained a correct copy of thoſe notes, and believe the reader will agree with me, that they deſerve a place in this complete collection of his works †.

* Since I wrote this paragraph, the valuable copy, alluded to, of Lord Clarendon's hiſtory has been very obligingly put into my hands, to be preſerved in Hartlebury Library.

† Vol. VI. p. 891.

To

To put things of a ſort together, I will here mention another book, which he has rendered valuable by ſome manuſcript animadverſions. Writing to me from Weymouth, where Mr. Allen had a houſe, and where he generally paſſed ſome part of the year with his family, he tells me how his hours of leiſure were employed at that place. The letter is dated Sept. 3, 1758. "If you were "here, you would ſee how I have ſcribbled over the "margins of Tindal's *Chriſtianity as Old as the Creation.* "I think I have him as ſure as I had Collins. That is, I "overturn the *pillars* of this famous edifice of impiety: "which all the writers againſt him hitherto have left "ſtanding: buſying themſelves only to untile his roof. "This is my preſent amuſement for a fortnight at Wey-"mouth *."

The Biſhoprick of Glouceſter was the more agreeable to him (as the Deanery of Briſtol had been for the ſame reaſon) on account of its ſituation, being in the neighbourhood of Prior-Park. At ſo ſmall a diſtance from his dioceſe, he could perform the duties of it without much trouble, or loſs of time in journeys, which were always irkſome to him. Yet ſome months in the ſummer he uſually paſſed at Glouceſter, and reſided there altogether after Mrs. Allen's death.

* This book is alſo in my poſſeſſion, and will be found in the Library at Hartlebury.

Wherever he was, he chiefly employed himſelf in reviſing his printed works, with the view of making them as complete and uſeful as he could.

Among others, he ſpent ſome time on his *Sermons*; and in 1761 he reprinted one of them, which he took to be of importance, in a ſmall ſize, that it might be more known, than it was likely to be in the larger volume. This was a well-conſidered and elaborate diſcourſe on *the Lord's Supper*: a ſubject, which had been ſo embroiled by two eminent writers of oppoſite principles, that it became neceſſary to take it out of their hands, and to guard the publick from being bewildered and miſled, either by a Popiſh or Socinian comment. In a moderate compaſs (for he never dealt in the verbiage of ordinary writers) he has refuted the ſyſtem of either party, and explained his own notion of the ſacrament (which was, alſo, that of the great Cudworth) in ſo clear a manner, that few men of ſenſe and judgement will now queſtion where the truth lies.

But the good Biſhop was always meditating ſomething for the benefit of religion. What is called Methodiſm, had now ſpread among the people. It was a new ſpecies of Puritaniſm, or rather the old one revived under a new name. This ſect firſt appeared at Oxford, where two fellows of colleges, Mr. George Whitefield and Mr. John Weſley, were its chief promoters and ſupports. They were both of them, it may be, frank enthuſiaſts at ſetting out.

out. The former is ſaid to have been a weak, the latter was unqueſtionably a ſhrewd, man.

Mr. Weſley had rambled through a part of Germany and North America, as well as Great Britain and Ireland, pretending every where to a ſort of Apoſtolic miſſion: and, at a convenient diſtance of time from theſe peregrinations, his manner was to print journals of them, for the edification of his followers. The Biſhop of Glouceſter had watched his motions with care for ſome years; and now thought he had gained ſuch an inſight into his views and character from his journals, which he conſtantly read, as to be able to give a fair and full account of him to the publick.

It ſeems to have been principally for this reaſon that he altered and enlarged what he had written on the influence of the Holy Spirit, in the ſecond volume of his Sermons: or rather, he compoſed that diſcourſe anew, and with many improvements moulded it into a regular treatiſe on the ſubject; which he publiſhed in 1762, under the name of *The Doctrine of Grace: or, The Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit vindicated from the inſults of Infidelity, and the abuſes of Fanaticiſm*, in two ſmall volumes, 12mo *.

He deſigned this work, as the title ſhews, for a vindication of that moſt important Chriſtian doctrine from the

* See Vol. V. of this edition, p. 535, &c.

abuſes of libertine as well as fanatical writers. The former he confuted with his uſual energy and preciſion. The latter, as not being acceſſible on the ſide of reaſon, he attacked with ridicule, in holding up to view and expoſing their leader and architype, John Weſley, out of the materials, largely furniſhed to him in that adventurer's own journals. This diſcourſe, like Paſcal's Letters, and for the ſame reaſon, the ſingular merit of the compoſition, will be read, when the ſect, that gave occaſion to it, is forgotten; or rather the ſect will find a ſort of immortality in this diſcourſe.

As to the grave and reaſoning part of this work, that alſo, as I ſaid, is written with great weight and authority. But I think I ſee a degree of labour, in the expreſſion of ſome parts, which ſhews his pen had now loſt ſomething of its wonted freedom and facility, though it retained its force.

From this time, he ſeems to have planned no new work of difficulty and length, but to have confined himſelf very properly to the ſingle purpoſe of giving the laſt finiſhing* to his former writings.

* The Biſhop grew very exact and critical in giving the later editions of his works; ſo that he would review the ſame ſheet ſeveral times, and, of courſe, gave the compoſitor no ſmall trouble. Which made his learned printer, Mr. Bowyer, whom he much eſteemed for his friendly qualities, as well as merit in his profeſſion, ſay pleaſantly to him on a certain occaſion—'Thoſe were fine times, when you never blotted a line, but allowed me to print your copy as faſt as it came to hand, and without interruption.'

Ac-

Accordingly in 1765 he publiſhed a new edition of the *Second* Part of the D. L. in three volumes; and, as it had now received his laſt hand, he preſented it to his great friend, Lord Mansfield; as he had done the *former* part, when finiſhed to his mind, to Lord Hardwicke. But there was this difference in the character of the two Dedications. That to the Lord Chancellor, was reſpectful and ceremonious, being little more than a letter of thanks to his patron: this other to the Chief Juſtice, was ſublime and pathetic, in ſhort, the overflowing of an affectionate heart to a generous and much-eſteemed friend.

The ſubject, too, of the latter is of that high importance which a great writer chuſes, when he would conſult his own and his friend's dignity, and tranſmit them both, with advantage, to ſucceeding times. It ſets before him the ſtate of religion in England for half a century paſt, and, with a confidential freedom, deduces the cauſes of that alarming neglect, into which it had fallen, and by which indeed the author had been induced to project this defence of it, and to put it into his Lordſhip's hands. The information is intereſting; and the manner in which it is conveyed, ſolemn and awful. It will be read hereafter with no ſmall attention; and the time will come, when this diſcourſe will be reckoned among the chief honours of the noble perſon addreſſed.

This

This edition of 1765, beſides many other improvements, with which it was enriched, is further diſtinguiſhed by a remarkable diſcourſe, printed at the cloſe of the laſt volume, and entitled, *An appendix concerning the book of Job*; In this ſhort piece (which is exquiſitely written) he repells an attack made upon him by Dr. Lowth. The diſpute was managed, on both ſides, with too much heat; but, on the part of the Biſhop, with that ſuperiority of wit and argument, which, to ſay the truth, in all his controverſial writings, he could not well help.

Dr. Lowth, afterwards Biſhop of London, was a man of learning, and ingenuity, and of many virtues: but his friends did his character no ſervice, by affecting to bring his merits, whatever they were, into competition with thoſe of the Biſhop of Glouceſter. His reputation, as a writer, was raiſed chiefly on his Hebrew literature, as diſplayed in thoſe two works—*his Latin Lectures on Hebrew poetry—and his Engliſh Verſion of the Prophet Iſaiah.* The *former* is well and elegantly compoſed, but in a vein of criticiſm not above the common: The *latter*, I think, is chiefly valuable, as it ſhews how little is to be expected from Dr. Kennicott's work (which yet the learned Biſhop pronounces to be *the greateſt and moſt important, that has been undertaken and accompliſhed ſince the revival of letters* *), and from a new tranſlation of the Bible, for public uſe.

* Prel. Diſſ. p. 62.

On

On the ſubject of his quarrel with the Biſhop of Glouceſter, I could ſay a great deal; for I was well acquainted with the grounds and the progreſs of it. But, beſides that I purpoſely avoid entering into details of this ſort, I know of no good end that is likely to be anſwered by expoſing to public cenſure the weakneſſes of ſuch men.

In the next year, 1766, he gave a new and much-improved edition of *The Alliance*; meaning to leave theſe two great works, now wrought up to all the perfection he could beſtow upon them, as legacies to the publick; or rather as monuments to poſterity of his unwearied love of the Chriſtian religion, and (for the ſake of ſo dear an intereſt) of the Church of England.

With a third volume of Sermons, already alluded to, and printed in 1767, he cloſed his literary courſe: except that he made an effort towards publiſhing the IXth and laſt book of the Divine Legation; on a ſubject, he had much at heart; which he had long and diligently conſidered; and which now, for ſome years, he had been labouring to digeſt and explain in the beſt manner he could. But of this matter it will be expected that I give the reader a more particular account.

The argument of the D. L. properly ſo called, was completed in ſix books: but the plan of it required three more; in which the author propoſed, as he tells us, "To "remove all conceivable objections againſt the concluſion, "and

" and to throw in every collateral light upon the pre-
" miſes *."

But the argument itſelf was ſo ill received and ſo violently oppoſed by many of the clergy, that he grew diſguſted at the treatment he met with, and could not be prevailed upon to finiſh his deſign in ſupport of it. His letters are full of complaints on this head. In 1741, ſome time before he publiſhed the ſecond volume, he ſays to one of his friends—" I am ſtill condemned to drudge
" in the mines of antiquity. I may well give it that ſlaviſh
" appellation, while I am ſo uſed by my maſters, the
" clergy, for whoſe eaſe and profit I am working." And writing to another in 1754, when the two firſt letters of the View were coming out, he obſerves with indignation—
" You will ſee there is a continued apology for the clergy:
" yet they will neither love me the more, nor forgive me
" the ſooner, for all I can ſay in their behalf †."

And ſo on a hundred other occaſions. The truth is, his reſentment at the eſtabliſhed clergy for their long and fierce oppoſition to his favourite work, was the greateſt weakneſs I ever obſerved in him. The number of books and pamphlets, that appeared againſt him for twenty years together, was, indeed, very great. But, the nature of his work conſidered, and his own freedom in diſſenting from all others, as occaſion offered, what leſs could be expected?

* Vol. III. p. 504.

† MS Letters in my hands.

And

And when he had given two or three of his principal adverſaries, as he did, a complete anſwer, he ſhould not have ſuffered the clamour of the reſt to divert him from the great deſign, he had projected. But his conduct in this inſtance was not that which might have been expected from his uſual magnanimity. When I ſometimes expoſtulated with him upon it, his anſwer was—"I ſurely "have reaſon to think myſelf very ill uſed. The enemies "of Revealed Religion and of the Church of England I "have treated as they deſerved, and am neither ſurprized "nor hurt at their reſentments againſt me. To their "cenſures or commendations I can be equally indifferent. "But that my brethren, the eſtabliſhed clergy, the friends "of religion, and fellow-members of that ſociety whoſe "cauſe I am pleading, that theſe ſhould ſet themſelves "againſt me with ſo much rancour, is what I cannot ſo "well bear. If indeed the publiſhed volumes of the D. L. "be ſo weak or ſo miſchievous, as they ſuppoſe, I will not "add to the offence given them by adding any more."

One ſees what was at the bottom of the good man's mind. He loved the Church of England and its miniſters, and had ſhewn his zeal for them on all occaſions. He was therefore hurt at not receiving that return of good-will from them, which his life and conſcience told him, he might expect, and had deſerved. Yet, as much as he felt the injury, and complained of it, he was never moved

by it (as many others, with leſs provocation, and of leſs irritability, have been) to retract his good opinion of them, or to alter his conduct towards them in any reſpect.

He only withheld the ſequel of his capital work from them; and unhappily he perſiſted in this reſolution till time had ſoftened their paſſions, and, of courſe, his own. At length, the orthodoxy of his ſentiments ſeemed gradually to be acknowledged; his own reſentments proportionably abated; and, from the time he had given the corrected edition of his D. L. in 1765, he was in earneſt about reſuming ſo much at leaſt of his long-neglected work, as he had meant to comprize in the laſt or IXth book. The VIIth and VIIIth (though the materials for them, too, were at hand) he had long ſince deſpaired of compoſing: but this laſt, being an attempt to give a *rationale* of Chriſtianity, he anxiouſly wiſhed, for the importance of the ſubject, to leave behind him complete.

But the time was now paſt. Not only the buſineſs of his ſtation broke in upon his leiſure: The infirmities of age came inſenſibly upon him. His faculties, hitherto ſo bright and vigorous, ſuffered ſome eclipſe and diminution of their force, from his growing indiſpoſitions. "I read "ſtill," he would often ſay to me, "with the uſual plea-"ſure. But I compoſe with leſs eaſe, and with leſs ſpirit." In a letter to me from Glouceſter, Sept. 4, 1769, he writes in the following manner.

"I have

"I have received your kind letter of *advice* *.——You
" know, by experience, how difficult it is, when we have
" once got into a wicked habit of thinking, to leave it off.
" All I can promiſe is, if that will ſatisfy you, to *think to*
" *no purpoſe*: And this I know, by experience, I can do;
" having done ſo for many a good day.

" I think you have heard me ſay, that my delicious
" ſeaſon is the autumn; the ſeaſon, which gives moſt life
" and vigour to my mental faculties. The light miſts, or,
" as Milton calls them, the *ſteams*, that riſe from the fields
" in one of theſe mornings, give the ſame *relief* to the
" views, that the blue of the plumb (to take my ideas from
" the ſeaſon) gives to the appetite. But I now enjoy little
" of this pleaſure, compared to what I formerly had in an
" autumn-morning, when I uſed, with a book in my
" hand, to traverſe the delightful lawns and hedge-rows
" round about the town of Newark, the *unthinking* place of
" my nativity."

And again, July 11th, 1770—"Hunter ſent me his
" View of Lord Bolingbroke's character. He is a good
" man; but in this book, I think, he has ſhewn himſelf
" very abſurd and indiſcreet: abſurd, in a florid declama-
" tion; and indiſcreet, as well as very injudicious, in the
" moſt extravagant encomium of Bolingbroke's parts that

* Not to purſue his ſtudies too cloſely.

" ever was, even to ſay—*he reaſoned with the pride of a*
" *ſuperior ſpirit, and I had almoſt ſaid with the faculties of*
" *an angel.*

" This diſpoſed me to look again into the reaſoning of
" this *ſuperior ſpirit*, this *angelic man*, as I have collected
" together the beſt he has, in my View of his Philoſophy.
" I have done it juſtice. But this retroſpect is accom-
" panied with a mortifying conviction, that the time is now
" paſt when I was able to write with that force. Expect to
" find in my future writings the marks of intellectual decay.
" But ſo much for that matter."

In my anſwer to this letter from Thurcaſton, July the 23d, to ſooth the mind of my friend under this unwelcome diſcovery, and to prevail upon him, if I could, to relax thoſe efforts in compoſition, which, not being ſo eaſy to him as they had been, might affect his health and ſpirits, I wrote as follows—" As to what you ſay of your not
" writing with the *force*, you formerly did, it may very
" well be, and yet be no ſubject of mortification. For,
" beſides that you can afford to abate ſomething of your
" antient force and yet have enough left, *force* itſelf has
" not, in all periods of life, the ſame grace. The cloſe of
" one of theſe long and bright days has not the flame and
" heat of noon, and would be leſs pleaſing if it had. And
" I know not why it may not be true, in the *critical* as well
" as moral ſenſe of the poet's words,

" Lenior et *melior* fis accedente ſenectâ."

" But

" But what I would chiefly ſay, on the ſubject, is this, " That, whether with force, or without it, I would only " wiſh your future writings to be an amuſement to you, " and not a labour; and this I think is the proper uſe to " be made of your obſervation, if it be ever ſo well " founded."

In ſhort, I continued to expreſs myſelf in this way to him and his family with ſo little reſerve, that he ſaw my intention was to draw him off, by degrees, from writing at all; which he takes notice of in a letter of the next year, June 2, 1771, though with ſome little chagrin, as was but too natural, at this plain dealing.

" I never believed I ſhould feel ſo tenderly for —— as " I now do. A ſuffering friend's good qualities, in ſuch a " condition, ſeparate themſelves, and riſe ſuperior to his " failings, which we are inſenſibly diſpoſed to forget. If this " be the caſe of common acquaintance, in certain ſeaſons, " what muſt be our conſtant ſentiments of a real friend, at " all ſeaſons; who loſes no occaſion of expreſſing every " mode of tenderneſs towards thoſe he loves! I fell into " this train of thinking by what my wife told me, with " much pleaſure, a little before I left London. She ſaid " that Dr. Hurd aſſured her, that I would write no more. I " received this news, which gave her ſo much ſatisfaction, " with an approving ſmile. I was charmed with the ten- " derneſs of friendſhip which conveyed, in ſo inoffenſive a

" manner,

" manner, that fatal ſecret which Gil Blas was incapable " of doing, as he ought, to his patron the Archbiſhop of " Granada."

I inſert theſe extracts, chiefly in reference to the IXth book of the D. L., which twenty years before would have been finiſhed in a few weeks, and with that flame of genius which irradiates the former books, but which now lay under his hands many years, was written by ſnatches and with difficulty, and left incomplete by him at laſt *. An unwelcome part this of the little hiſtory I am writing! yet not unuſeful, if it may admoniſh ſuperior writers to place a juſt confidence in themſelves, and little ones to treat them with ſomething more reſpect. Cudworth and Warburton are memorable and inſtructive inſtances, to either purpoſe.

The misfortune, in the caſe of the latter, was, that although he had digeſted in his own mind, long ago, the ſubſtance of the IXth book, and was perpetually meditating upon it, yet he had committed very little of it to paper; his way being to put down in writing only ſhort notes of what he intended to enlarge upon, and to work them up

* Yet it may be concluded from the ſubject, which is a general view of God's moral diſpenſations from Adam to Chriſt [See Vol. III. p. 505 and 612], that very little is wanting to complete the author's deſign; only, what he had propoſed to ſay on the apocalyptic prophecies, and which may be ſupplied from the diſcourſe on Antichriſt.

only when he was preparing to ſend his copy to the preſs. This, in his beſt days, was ſo eaſy to him, that, in printing ſome of his elaborate works, he had not in his hands two ſheets together, but ſent the copy to his printer as faſt as it was compoſed.

I know indeed that many perſons, from the compaſs and variety of his learning, imagined that he drew the materials of it from a voluminous common place. The fact was juſt otherwiſe. His memory was ſo tenacious, that he truſted every thing to it: or, if he may be ſaid to have kept a common-place, it was nothing more than a ſmall interleaved pocket-almanack, of about three inches ſquare; in which he inſerted now and then a reference to a curious fact or paſſage, that he met with in his reading, but chiefly ſhort hints of ſentiments and reflections, which occaſionally ſtruck him, and might ſome time or other be put to uſe. At the end of every year, he tore out of his almanack ſuch leaves as contained any of thoſe reflections, and put them together under general heads, that he might recur to them, on occaſion, the more readily. Of theſe papers, or rather collections of papers, I have many in my hands, relative to the ſubjects of the three laſt books of the D. L.; and from theſe the IXth book, ſuch as he left it, was compoſed.

Another inconvenience, attending the late compoſition of this book, was, That he had occaſionally delivered, in his

his ſermons, and other printed works, ſome of the leading principles contained in it. Thus, he had, in effect, anticipated a good part of his ſubject. Nor was this all. Finding the labour of compoſing troubleſome to him, he quoted from himſelf very freely; and ſuch paſſages, as had found a place elſewhere, when the purpoſe of completing the laſt book was ſuſpended or laid aſide, were now inſerted in it, without much alteration, in order to carry on the thread and order of his diſcourſe.

From both theſe cauſes therefore (his not having reduced to form the materials he had provided for the IXth book, and his having already worked up ſome part of them) it is eaſy to ſee the diſadvantage with which he came, in the cloſe of his long life, to the compoſition of this work. His memory and invention were not what they had been; his facility and variety of expreſſion was not the ſame; and, what was worſt of all, the grace of novelty in the ſubject was in ſome meaſure gone off.

It was therefore matter of deliberation with me, for ſome time, whether I ſhould inſert the IXth book (though printed, ſo far as it goes, by himſelf) entire and in its own form, or only ſome fragments of it. But, on further conſideration, I judged it right to give that work exactly as the author left it: eſpecially, as the ſubject is highly intereſting, and even new, unleſs where anticipated by himſelf; the method, clear and exact; and the whole caſt

caſt of compoſition, maſterly; his reaſonings being carried on, if not with the ſplendid eaſe and perſpicuity of his beſt manner, yet with a force and ſpirit, both in the ſentiment and expreſſion, which may well excite our admiration, when the circumſtances, under which he wrote, are conſidered.

In a word, this IXth book of the D. L. under all the diſadvantages with which it appears, is the nobleſt effort that has hitherto been made to give a *Rationale* of Chriſtianity. How far it may ſatisfy thoſe who have ſo long and ſo loudly called for it, will be now ſeen: without doubt, no farther, than as it may agree (if, in any reſpects, it ſhould agree) with *their* reaſon. In the mean time, the inveſtigation is made with the beſt deſign:

"To juſtify the ways of GOD to man;"

and, let me add, in a way that entitles it to another ſort of regard, than is due to theories, conſtructed, as they uſually are, on fanciful ſuppoſitions, and arbitrary aſſumptions: Since every thing, here, is advanced on the ſure grounds of natural and revealed religion: the one, eſtimated by the pureſt reaſon; the other, interpreted with an awful reverence of the written word, and according to the rules of the ſoundeſt and ſobereſt criticiſm.

While the good Biſhop was thus exerting his laſt ſtrength in the cauſe of religion, he projected a method by which he hoped to render it effectual ſervice after his death. This

was by the inſtitution of a Lecture on PROPHECY; a ſubject, which he conceived had not been conſidered with the care it ought; and from a thorough diſcuſſion of which, he aſſured himſelf, much additional force would ariſe to the proof of the Chriſtian religion. He had himſelf opened a way to the ſucceſsful inveſtigation of the general ſubject, in ſome principles delivered in the D. L., and in his confutation of Collins's book by means of thoſe principles. But ſome particular prophecies had ſtruck his attention, as furniſhing the moſt deciſive argument for the truth of Chriſtianity. In the preface to his remarks, part II. printed ſo long ago as 1745, he ſays—"I have ever "thought, the prophecies relating to Antichriſt, inter-"ſperſed up and down the New and Old Teſtament, the "moſt convincing proof of the truth of the Chriſtian re-"ligion, that any moral matter is capable of receiving." And again—"This queſtion (namely, what individual "power is meant in the prophecies) is one, on the right "determination of which alone, I am fully perſuaded, one "might reſt the whole truth of the Chriſtian religion *."

Under this perſuaſion then in 1768 he gave £. 500. in truſt to Lord Mansfield, Sir Eardley Wilmot, and Mr. Charles Yorke, for the purpoſe of founding a Lecture at Lincoln's Inn, in the form of a ſermon, 'To prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Chriſtian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies in the Old

* See Vol. VI. p. 383.

and

and New Teſtament, which relate to the Chriſtian Church, eſpecially to the apoſtacy of Papal Rome.'

The ſubject is infinitely curious, and of vaſt extent: for thoſe who have taken it to be too much narrowed by ſpecifying the prophecies concerning Antichriſt, ſeem not to have underſtood the compaſs of the controverſy, nor the terms of the inſtitution itſelf. The truth is, there is more danger that Lecturers will be wanting to the inſtitution, than that it will not afford matter and ſcope enough for their diſcuſſion. He was anxious to leave this important truſt in the beſt hands. And while it continues in ſuch as have had the management of it, there is no doubt that the beſt ſupply, which the age furniſhes, will be provided for this lecture. And, if I had not myſelf preached the firſt courſe of theſe ſermons, I ſhould add that, hitherto, their choice of lecturers has afforded no ſignal cauſe of complaint.

It was afterwards in the Biſhop's contemplation to double the original endowment. But he was diverted from this deſign (though with ſome difficulty) by thoſe who repreſented to him, that the ſum given was ſufficient to anſwer his purpoſe of engaging men of ability to read his lecture if they were influenced by ſuch motives as became them, a regard for their own honour and a zeal for the ſervice of religion; and that more could anſwer no good purpoſe, nay might eaſily be abuſed to bad ones, if they were not.

The laſt years of the Biſhop's life were clouded with misfortune, as well as indiſpoſition. He had for ſome time been ſo ſenſible of his declining health, that he read little, and wrote leſs. But, in the courſe of the year 1776, the loſs of a favourite ſon and only child *, who died of a

* He had been placed, much to his father's ſatisfaction, under the care of Dr. Haliſax; then an eminent tutor of Trinity Hall at Cambridge, and the king's profeſſor of law in that univerſity; who in 1782 was advanced to the ſee of Glouceſter, and tranſlated in 1789 to that of St. Aſaph. He died March 4, 1790.—His diſtinguiſhed worth and ability deſervedly raiſed him to the high rank he held in the church.—But his character is given more at large in the following elegant inſcription, compoſed by his father-in-law, the Reverend Dr. William Cooke, dean of Ely, and provoſt of King's College, Cambridge, and engraved on his monument in the church of Warſop in Nottinghamſhire; of which church the biſhop was rector, and in which, for the reaſon aſſigned in the two firſt lines of the inſcription, he was buried.

" Hic juxta filiolum dulciſſimum acerbo olim fato
Præreptum paternas exuvias deponi voluit vir
reverendiſſimus Samuel Halifax LL. D. & S. T. P.
Ex hac vicinia oriundus primiſque literis imbutus in
academiâ protenus Cantabrigienſi floruit juris civilis
prælector publicus & profeſſor regius in curiâ prærogativâ
Cantuarienſi facultatum regiſtrarius in hâc eccleſiâ
rector in eccleſiâ cathedrali Gloceſtrienſi primò deinde
Aſaphenſi epiſcopus quæ per omnia officia ingenio claruit
& eruditione & induſtriâ ſingulari ſumma in eccleſiam
Anglicanam fide concionum vi ac ſuavitate flexanima
Scriptorum nitore & elegantiâ vitâ inſuper id quod primarium ſibi ſemper
habuit inculpabili
Natus eſt apud Mansfield Jan 18, 1733, calculo oppreſſus properata
morte obiit Martii 4, 1790, ætatis eheu 57. Catharina conjux cum filio
unica & ſex filiabus ſuperſtes relicta in aliquod deſiderii ſui ſolamen
mœrens P."

conſumption in his 18th year, when every hope was ſpring-ing up in the breaſt of a fond parent, to make amends, as it were, for his want of actual enjoyment—this ſudden af-fliction, I ſay, oppreſſed him to that degree, as to put an end to his literary labours, and even amuſements, at once. From that diſaſtrous moment, he lived on indeed for two or three years; but, when he had ſettled his affairs, as was proper, upon this great change in his fa-mily, he took no concern in the ordinary occurrences of life, and grew ſo indifferent to every thing, that even his books and writings ſeemed, thenceforth, to be utterly diſregarded by him. Not that his memory and faculties, though very much impaired, were ever wholly diſabled. I ſaw him ſo late as October, 1778, when I went into his dioceſe to confirm for him. On our firſt meeting, before his family, he expreſſed his concern that I ſhould take that journey, and put myſelf to ſo much trouble, on his ac-count. And afterwards, he took occaſion to ſay ſome per-tinent and obliging things, which ſhewed, not only his uſual friendlineſs of temper, but the command he had of his attention. Nor was this all. The evening, before I left him, he deſired the family to withdraw, and then entered into a confidential diſcourſe with me on ſome pri-vate affairs which he had much at heart, with as much pertinence and good ſenſe, as he could have done in any former part of his life. Such was the power he had over

his

his mind, when rouzed to exert himſelf by ſome intereſting occaſion! But this was an effort, which could not be ſuſtained very long. In leſs than half an hour, the family returned, and he relapſed into his uſual forgetfulneſs and inattention.

In this melancholy ſtate he languiſhed till the ſummer following, when he expired at the Palace in Glouceſter, on the 7th of June, 1779, and was buried in his cathedral, at no great diſtance from the Weſt door, and near to the grave of one of his predeceſſor's, Biſhop Benſon.

A neat mural monument has been put up there to his memory, with the following inſcription:

"TO THE MEMORY
OF WILLIAM WARBURTON, D. D.
FOR MORE THAN 19 YEARS BISHOP OF THIS SEE:
A PRELATE
OF THE MOST SUBLIME GENIUS, AND EXQUISITE LEARNING:
BOTH WHICH TALENTS
HE EMPLOYED, THROUGH A LONG LIFE,
IN THE SUPPORT
OF WHAT HE FIRMLY BELIEVED,
THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION,
AND
OF WHAT HE ESTEEMED THE BEST ESTABLISHMENT OF IT,
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND."

IV.

It only remains for me to draw together the ſeveral parts of the Biſhop's character, and to preſent them to the reader in one view; which I ſhall now attempt, with the affection of a friend, no doubt, yet on the whole, with as much ſeverity as I ought. For I remember the wiſe and humane reflexion of the great biographer, who in his life of Cimon expreſſeth himſelf to this purpoſe: "When a "painter undertakes to give us the portrait of a beautiful "perſon, if there be any ſmaller blemiſhes in his ſubject, "we do not expect him to omit them altogether; for then "the picture would be unlike: nor to expreſs them with "too much care; for then it becomes diſguſting.

"In like manner, it being difficult, or rather impoſſible, "to find a faultleſs character, the writer of a great man's "life will lay himſelf out in delineating his good qualities, "and not dwell with pleaſure, or an anxious diligence, on "his foibles; out of a reſpectful tenderneſs to human na-"ture, which unhappily is not capable of attaining abſo-"lute perfection *."

And with this little apology for myſelf, I proceed to give the outline of my friend's character.

* Plutarch. Cimon. ſub init.

HE

HE poſſeſſed thoſe virtues, which are ſo important in ſociety, Truth, Probity, and Honour, in the higheſt degree; with a frankneſs of temper, very uncommon; and a friendlineſs to thoſe he loved and eſteemed, which knew no bounds: not ſuſpicious or captious, in the leaſt; quick, indeed, in his reſentment of real manifeſt injuries; but then again (as is natural to ſuch tempers) of the utmoſt placability.

He had an ardent love of Virtue, and the moſt ſincere zeal for Religion; and that, the freeſt from all bigotry and all fanaticiſm, that I have ever known. He venerated the civil conſtitution of his country, and was warmly attached to the Church of England. Yet he was no party-man, and was the ſincereſt advocate for toleration. It was not his manner to court the good opinion of our Diſſenters. But he had nothing of prejudice or ill-will towards them: he converſed familiarly with ſuch of them as came in his way; and had even a friendſhip with ſome of their more noted miniſters *; who did not then glory in Socinian impieties, or indulge themſelves in rancorous invectives againſt the Eſtabliſhed Church.

I know, indeed, that he ſpoke his ſenſe of men and things, occaſionally, with force, which in the language of ſome perſons will be termed bigotry. And the truth is,

* See a *Collection of Letters to and from Dr. Doddridge of Northampton*; publiſhed by T. Stedman, M. A. vicar of St. Chad's, Shrewſbury, 1790.

he never indulged his candour ſo far as to treat all opinions and all characters alike. On the contrary, he held profane and licentious writers to be fit objects of public reproof: and though civil penalties ſhould not be applied to the coercion of miſtaken, or even, to a certain degree, of hurtful opinions, yet literary chaſtiſement, he thought, ſhould; an equal acceptance of *all* being the ready way to introduce Scepticiſm, under the ſpecious name of Liberality, or rather irreligion itſelf, under the maſk of charity. And if this zeal may be abuſed, as without doubt every thing may, at moſt, he had only to anſwer for that abuſe: The uſe itſelf being ſurely unqueſtionable, if there be truth or meaning in the Apoſtle's aphoriſm, "That it is "always good to be zealouſly affected in a good matter." But the reader, if he thinks fit, may ſee his own vindication of himſelf in the Apology for his *View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philoſophy*.

Indeed his conduct had been always uniform, in this reſpect. Even in the year 1738, when the firſt volume of the D. L. was publiſhed, he makes a full and frank declaration of his character. For, in his Dedication to the Free-Thinkers, ſpeaking of the advantage he ſhould have, in that addreſs, of not being called upon to diſgrace himſelf, or them, by a ſtyle of adulation, he goes on thus— "Not but I muſt own you have been managed, even by "ſome of our order, with very ſingular complaiſance.

" Whether it was that they affected the fame of moderation,
" or had a higher ambition for the honour of your good
" word, I know not; but I, who neither love your cauſe,
" nor fear the abilities that ſupport it, while I preſerve
" for your perſons that juſtice and charity which my pro-
" feſſion teaches to be due to all, can never be brought to
" think otherwiſe of your character, than as the deſpiſers
" of the Maſter, whom I ſerve, and as the implacable
" enemies of that order, to which I have the honour to
" belong. And as ſuch, I ſhould be tempted to glory in
" your cenſures; but would certainly refuſe your com-
" mendations."

Such were his early, as well as late notions, of *candour*. They who affect to puſh them ſtill farther, may do well to reflect, whether they be their own dupes, or the dupes of others: I mean, whether they have indeed any principle themſelves; or can be content to ſerve the views of thoſe, whoſe intereſt it is, that men of principle *ſpeak* and *act*, as if they had not any.

His love of letters was extreme, and his diſpoſition to countenance all thoſe in whom he perceived any kind or degree of literary merit, the moſt prompt and generous; as appeared by his inceſſant recommendation of them to his great friends, when his own ſcanty patronage (as he would oft and vehemently complain) denied him the means of rendering them any ſervice himſelf.

If

If we conſider him as a WRITER, and a DIVINE, it is not eaſy to find terms that will do juſtice to his merit.

His reading was various and extenſive; and his diſcernment exquiſite. He ſaw and ſeized what was juſt and uſeful in every ſcience which he cultivated, and in every book he read. The lumber and the refuſe he ſhook off, and left to others. Perhaps, no learned writer ever dealt leſs in ordinary quotation. Even the more familiar paſſages, unleſs when cited by him as direct authorities, take an air and turn in his application of them, which makes them in a manner new. The ſame obſervation may be extended to his reaſonings; which are either purely his own, or appear to be ſo, by his management of them. So that it ſeems a natural queſtion which one * of his friends put to him, on the receipt of a volume of his ſermons—*how do you manage always to ſay ſomething new upon old ſubjects, and always in an original manner?*

To ſay all in a word, he poſſeſſed, in an eminent degree, thoſe two qualities of a great writer, SAPERE ET FARI; I mean, ſuperior ſenſe, and the power of doing juſtice to it by a ſound and manly eloquence. It was an ignorant cavil, that charged him with a want of taſte. The objection aroſe from the originality of his manner; but he

* Mr. C. Yorke, in one of his letters, Feb. 2, 1767.

wrote, when he thought fit, with the greateſt purity and even elegance, notwithſtanding his ſtrength and energy, which frequently exclude thoſe qualities.

The character of his ſtyle, is freedom and force united. Nobody underſtood the philoſophy of grammar better: yet in the *conſtruction* of his terms he was not nice, rather he was ſomewhat negligent. But this negligence has no ill effect in works of reaſoning, and of length; where the writer's mind is ſuppoſed intent on the matter, and where a certain degree of irregularity gives the appearance of eaſe and ſpirit.

In his uſe of the *terms* themſelves, eſpecially of what are called *mixt modes*, and in the nice adjuſtment of the *predicate* to the *ſubject* (in which the accuracy of ſtyle chiefly conſiſts) he was of all writers the moſt ſcrupulouſly exact. It was by this ſecret in his expreſſion (ſo far as it depended on art and deſign) that he is never ſtiff or languid in his ſtyle, but every where free and nervous. It never flattens upon you, not being over-laboured in the phraſe, or too general in the terms. There is the appearance of freedom, with the utmoſt energy and preciſion.

For the reſt, the higher excellences of his ſtyle were owing to the ſtrength of his imagination, and a clear conception of his ſubject; in other words, to his ſublime genius.

Thus his ſtyle was properly his own, and what we call, *original*. Yet he did not diſdain to draw what aſſiſtance he might

might from the beſt critics; among whom, Quinctilian was his favourite.

By this union of art and nature, he ſucceeded, of courſe, in all ſorts of compoſition. But in one, eſpecially, the CONTROVERSIAL, he was ſo much ſuperior to himſelf, that barely to ſay he excelled in it, would be a poor and ſcanty praiſe.

From his firſt entrance on theological ſtudies, he had applied himſelf with care to the reading of our beſt writers in controverſy, ſuch as Hooker, Chillingworth, and Locke; of whom he was ſo fond, that he had their works bound up in ſmall detached pieces, for the convenience of carrying them with him in his hand or pocket, when he travelled, or walked abroad by himſelf. Of theſe, I have ſeveral in my poſſeſſion, which appear to have been much uſed. It is no wonder, he ſhould have this taſte; for, beſides that controverſy was then in vogue, he diſdained to oppoſe the enemies of religion in any other way, than that of logical confutation; and *againſt thoſe*, to uſe his own words in a letter to me, *he had denounced eternal war, like Hannibal againſt Rome, at the altar.*

Thus diſciplined, he came with advantage to the uſe of his arms, when he found himſelf obliged, as he ſoon was, to take them up. Uſe and habit did the reſt. So that he became conſummate in this mode of writing, and at the ſame time original. For to the authority of Hooker,

the

the acuteneſs of Chillingworth, and the perſpicuity of Locke, he added more than all their learning; together with a force of ſtyle, and poignancy of wit, of which we had hitherto ſeen no example in theological controverſy.

With theſe talents and qualifications, he was the terror of the infidel world, while he lived, and will be their diſgrace to future ages. His ſublime reaſon, aided by his irreſiſtible wit, drove them from their old faſtneſſes of logick and philoſophy, and has forced them to take ſhelter in the thin cover of hiſtory and romance; whence we now ſee them ſhoot their arrows, dipt in irony and badinage; to the annoyance indeed of ſome witleſs paſſengers; but to the wary and well-appointed, who take a fancy to ramble into thoſe paths, perfectly harmleſs and inſignificant.

But, when I mentioned his making war on our free-thinking philoſophers, let me be underſtood to mean, not the minute, and plebeian, but the more conſiderable, and, as one may ſay, *fixeable* men of that party; ſuch as pretended to erudition; and reaſoned at leaſt, though weakly or perverſely. For, as to thoſe inſect-blaſphemers, of whatever condition, which the faſhion, rather than the philoſophy of the age has generated, and ſent forth in ſwarms over a great part of modern Europe, he regarded them but as the ſummer flies, which teize a little by their murmurings (for ſtings, he would ſay, they have none) and are eaſily bruſhed away by any hand, or vaniſh of themſelves.

Next

Next to infidels profeſſed, there was no ſet of writers he treated with leſs ceremony, than the Socinian; in whom he ſaw an immoderate preſumption, and ſuſpected not a little ill faith. For, profeſſing to believe the divine authority of the Scriptures, they take a licence in explaining them, which could hardly, he thought, conſiſt with that belief. To theſe free interpreters of the word, he was ready to ſay, as St. Auſtin did to their precurſors, the Manichæans—" *Tell us plainly, that ye do not at all believe the Goſpel of Chriſt: for ye who believe what ye will in the Goſpel, and diſbelieve what ye will, aſſuredly believe not the Goſpel itſelf, but yourſelves only* *."

It is true, he himſelf would reaſon on revealed truths farther than ſome may ſeem neceſſary; but he never reaſoned *againſt* them. It was his principle, and his practice, to follow the Apoſtolic rule of *caſting down all imaginations, that exalt themſelves againſt the knowledge of God* †:" which, when clearly revealed, he held it an extreme impiety in any Chriſtian, not only to queſtion directly, but to elude by any forced interpretation. In ſhort, he regarded Socinianiſm (the idol of our ſelf-admiring age) as a ſort of infidelity in diſguiſe, and as ſuch he gave it no quarter.

* " Apertè dicite non vos credere Chriſti Evangelio: nam qui in Evan-
" gelio quod vultis creditis, quod vultis non creditis, vobis potius quam
" Evangelio creditis." *Contr. Faust.* L. 17. c. 3.

† 2 Cor. x. 5.

Other

Other religioniſts he would confute, as occaſion offered, with his uſual vivacity: but he made allowance for their prejudices, and, when no malevolence intervened, treated their perſons with reſpect. But enough, you ſay, of his controverſial merits: let us hear ſomething of his *defects*.

"He was arrogant, and impatient of contradiction."—It is true, he knew his own ſtrength, and confided enough in it. But then, as that quality made him incapable of envying his opponents, it ſhould have made him careleſs of being cenſured by them. Still, it muſt be owned, that he had the common infirmity of being better ſatisfied with ſuch as adopted his opinions, than with thoſe who rejected them. I ſay the *common* infirmity: for, I doubt, it adheres to our very nature, and that we ſhall in vain ſeek for a man diſpaſſionate enough to be indifferent to contradiction; eſpecially, when direct, and public; and urged, too, with ſome degree of eagerneſs, or rather ſharpneſs, which is ſcarcely ſeparable from controverſy.

"But he was *violent* in his reſentments, and exceſſively ſevere in his expreſſion of them."—As to this charge, hear, firſt, his own apology for himſelf.—"The paper I "ſend you *, is the introductory note to ——. I need "not explain it to you. You will underſtand every word. "What I want to know is whether ſome parts of it be "not too ſevere. Whatever there is of this kind, I ſhall

* In a Letter to me, Jan. 18, 1757.

"gladly

" gladly ſtrike out. For though I have had provocation
" enough, I can aſſure you, I have no reſentments. I
" perhaps may not be thought the beſt judge of my own
" temper in this matter, and reaſonably. But why I ſay
" I have ſo little reſentment, I collect from hence, that
" there is not one word in this volume againſt them [his
" adverſaries], which I could not with the greateſt in-
" difference ſtrike out, either with reaſon or without. I
" do not expect the world ſhould do me this juſtice, becauſe
" they are to judge by appearances; and appearances are
" againſt me; for there are cauſtic ſtrokes enough againſt
" the ignorance and ill faith of my adverſaries. But, if
" this be reſentment, it is the reſentment I ſhould ſhew in
" the caſe of any other honeſt man."

His reſentment then was impartial: and that it was ſo he ſhewed in his vindication of Mr. Pope, and in other inſtances. But I take upon me to go farther, and to aſſert, that the ſeverity objected to him, was the effect of his genius, and of no vindictive ſpirit. For the difference between him, and ordinary writers, who ſeem to be at their caſe in diſputing, whether on religion or any other ſubject, is merely this—He felt ſtrongly and wrote forcibly: They are incapable of doing either. This is the ſimple truth, if it may be told; and hence it is, that the ſame complaint has been made of every great genius in controverſy, from Jerom down to our author.

Not but another conſideration may be worth attending to. The end of controverſy is either to convince the perſon you diſpute with, or ſimply to confute his opinions. When the *former* is the object, without doubt the ſofteſt words are the beſt. But, the *other* is beſt done by vigorous expreſſion; becauſe it ſhews the diſputant to be in earneſt, and ſets the error, contended againſt, in the ſtrongeſt light; the likelieſt means, to prevent others from being infected with it: And ſuch was the Biſhop's view in moſt of the controverſies, in which he engaged. The ſame obſervation may be extended to what has been called his *dogmatic manner* of writing; which is only the firm tone of one who believes what he ſays, and is indeed very different from the careleſs unconcerned air of the Sceptick.

But, laſtly, I muſt obſerve, that the charges of *impatience*, and *ſeverity*, in the ſenſe intended by thoſe that urge them, are not true. When no unfriendlineſs appeared in thoſe who differed from him, he heard their reaſons as patiently, confuted them as calmly, or gave way to them as readily, as other men. Which I may the rather affirm, having had the experience of it on many occaſions. Our ſentiments, no doubt, agreed in the main: there could not, otherwiſe, have been ſo entire a friendſhip between us, as there was. But I never took greater liberties with any man, than with him, nor with leſs offence; and that, in matters of no ſmall delicacy;

as the reader will ſee from the following example, among many others which I could eaſily give him.

Voltaire had ſpent a great part of his miſerable life in railing againſt the Jewiſh law and its Divine Author. His complete ignorance of the ſubject diſpoſed men of learning, very generally, to treat his cenſures with neglect. But the Biſhop of Glouceſter, obſerving the impreſſion they made on a licentious publick, thought it might be of uſe to ſhew this faſhionable blaſphemer in his true light; to ſtrip his ſophiſtical reaſonings of the little plauſibility they had; and, for the reſt, to turn his favourite weapon of ridicule againſt him.

With this view, he had been at the pains to plan a work of ſome length, in *three Diſſertations*, which would take in the whole of that ſubject, and give him occaſion to expoſe, with much force, Voltaire's libertine gloſſes upon it. When he had ſketched out the contents of this diſcourſe, he ſent it to me, and deſired to know what I thought of it, and whether he ſhould proceed in the deſign, or no. I told him very frankly, "That, although I thought his plan an excellent one, and could truſt him with the execution of it, yet, upon the whole, I wiſhed him to proſecute his deſign no farther. I ſaid, there was no end of confuting every ſhallow, though faſhionable ſcribbler againſt religion; that he had done enough already in expoſing ſo many others of that family, and, very lately,

the noble writer that was at the head of it in England, to the juſt ſcorn of thinking men; that to go on in this agoniſtic courſe, was not only needleſs, but would bring a ſtorm of envy upon him from all quarters, and that even his friends would, many of them, conſider him as too fond of controverſy, and as indulging himſelf too freely in the talent he had for it.—I added other conſiderations, and particularly this, That I thought it beneath him to commit himſelf with a perſon ſo little acquainted, as Voltaire confeſſedly was, with the matter in queſtion; and that for *him* to anſwer ſuch a writer in form, would be like *breaking a butterfly upon a wheel*, according to his friend Pope's ingenious illuſtration of ſuch atchievements.

In concluſion, I preſſed him earneſtly to leave this man of merriment to his own ſerious reflections, if he ever had any; and to reſerve his force for ſome better occaſion, than that of repelling the ſlight cavils of ignorant and ill-informed men."

This free remonſtrance was not ill taken. He anſwered me without heſitation, and in one word—"In the matter "of Voltaire, your advice will have its uſual weight with "me."—The plan was accordingly laid aſide, and forgotten.

After ſuch an example of facility in taking advice, the Biſhop of Glouceſter will not be thought that impracticable man, he has been ſometimes repreſented to be. Many perhaps

perhaps will think, with more reaſon, that his eaſineſs went too far in this inſtance; for that his *Three Diſſertations* on the Jewiſh law and hiſtory would have been highly entertaining, at leaſt; and perhaps as uſeful in repreſenting the petulance of the French poet, as the *Four Letters* had been in diſmounting the arrogance of the Engliſh philoſopher. And upon theſe grounds, I might indeed have repented me of the free advice I gave him, but for the pleaſure I have ſince had in ſeeing the ſame deſign undertaken, and executed with great elegance and ability, by another hand *.

But perhaps I have miſemployed my pains in ſetting the controverſial character of my friend in a juſt light. There are thoſe, I know, who will regard this praiſe, whatever it be, as injurious to the learned prelate, rather than honourable to him; who will be ready to tell us that controverſial writings are out of date; that they never did any good, and are now at length fallen into general and juſt contempt.

To theſe wiſe men I ſhould have much to ſay, if I could find means to do it without diſgracing myſelf, and diſguſting them, by an air of controverſy. And would to God that religious controverſy were now of no uſe in this manly age of the world! I ſhould then be for laying it aſide with other childiſh things. But is this the fact? and when all

* See *Lettres de quelques Juifs, &c.* in 3 *tom.* 12*mo. Par.* 1776.

quarters,

quarters, beſides, reſound with controverſy, is there no demand for it in the ſchools of religion? After all, the reader ſees what is aimed at by this affected contempt of theological altercation. A hint, in paſſing, is more than enough on a ſubject, which the Biſhop himſelf has treated at ſome length, and with his uſual force *.

I apprehend therefore no diſcredit to my friend or myſelf, in having dwelt ſo long on the virtues of the *Controverſial writer*. They were eminently conſpicuous in him; and exerted for a juſt purpoſe, that of confuting error, and repreſſing calumny. Not that I am concerned to deny all mixture of frailty in my friend's exerciſe of his polemic talents. It will be found in our beſt performance of the beſt things. And it is credible enough, that the abundance of his wit, the vivacity of his temperament, and the petulance of his adverſaries, may have ſharpened his ſtyle too much in ſome inſtances. Yet, on the whole, he might apologize for himſelf, as Eraſmus has done in a fine letter to his friend Sadolet—"*Some of my opponents*, ſays he, "*becauſe they deſerved no better of me, I have* EXPOSED, "*perhaps, rather than confuted: yet with more temper, as I* "*think, myſelf, than they attacked me. Although I am ſen-* "*ſible, that paſſion may have biaſſed my judgement. For I* "*muſt confeſs that I am eaſily warmed by ill uſage; but ſo,*

* See Volume IV. p. 707.

"*as*

" *as not to retain the reſentment of it long, and to forget* " *injuries as ſoon as any man* *."

As a DIVINE, properly ſo called, he filled and adorned that character with the higheſt ability.

Strength of reaſon, exquiſite learning, a critical knowledge of antiquity, an enlarged view of the ſcheme of Revelation, a wonderful ſagacity in diſcovering the ſenſe of Scripture, and in opening the probable grounds of its clearly revealed doctrines, with the profoundeſt ſubmiſſion of his underſtanding to them, whether thoſe grounds of reaſon were apparent to him or not—Theſe rare and admirable qualifications ſhone out in him with greater luſtre, than in any other ornament of our church, Stillingfleet, and Barrow, and Taylor himſelf not excepted. To which I muſt add that firſt and nobleſt quality, of all, A perfect honeſty of mind, and ſincere love of truth, which governed his pen in all his religious inquiries †.

After

* " Quoſdam, quia ſic merebantur, IRRISI veriùs quàm confutavi, " nuſquam non temperatior his à quibus laceſſebar, ut mea quidem fert " opinio; nam fieri et poteſt et ſolet, ut meo judicio imponat affectus; " atque is ſum fateor, qui poſſem laceſſitus incandeſcere, ſed nec iræ pertinacis, et injuriarum oblivioſus, ut ſi quis alius." Ep. MXCIV. Ed. Cler. L. B. 1703.

† Conſidering him in this view, I mean as a CONSUMMATE DIVINE, one cannot but lament the fate of a work he had projected, but never executed,

After mentioning to me, in one of his letters *, ſome intereſting meditations, he was then engaged in, he ſtops ſhort,

executed, at leaſt in the manner intended by him, *On theological ſtudies, for the uſe of young people:* a plan of which he had digeſted in his own mind, and communicated to me, by letter, ſo early as the year 1750.

The principal heads were,

1. The right ſtate and diſpoſition of mind to make proper improvements—in this were to be conſidered the natures of ſcepticiſm, dogmaticalneſs, enthuſiaſm, ſuperſtition, &c.

2. The previous ſtudies of morality and natural religion from their firſt principles and foundations; and of antiquity, critical, hiſtorical, and philoſophical.

3. The ſtudy of the Scriptures.

4. Fathers and modern Divines.

5. Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory.

6. Sermonizing, or the art of preaching.

This work he reſerved for the amuſement of his declining years. But, as what is deferred ſo long, is rarely executed at all, and never ſo well as at an earlier ſeaſon, ſo this noble deſign, which required the exertion of his beſt faculties in their full vigour, was not wholly neglected

* Jan. 12, 1757.

ſhort, and aſks—"But what is man! A fit of the ſpleen, "a fit of illneſs, and laſtly death, may wipe out all theſe "glorious viſions, with which my brain at preſent is painted "over: as LAW ſaid, it once was with hieroglyphics. But "I hope the beſt; becauſe I only aim at the honour of "GOD and good of men. When I ſay this I need not per-"haps add (as I do with the utmoſt ſerioufneſs) *that I "ſhall never wittingly advance one falſehood, nor conceal or "diſguiſe one truth.*"

So that thoſe, if any ſuch there were, who thought he wrote for a party, with the views of intereſt, for the ſake glected indeed, but ſlightly attempted by him, a few years before his death: as I find from a brief ſketch of it among his papers, which appears to have been drawn up haſtily for the uſe of a friend, and was afterwards made to ſerve by way of charge to his clergy.

Such as it is, I have judged it worth preſerving. The reader will be pleaſed to ſee the thoughts of ſo great a man on this ſubject; and will, without doubt, make the proper allowances for their being laid before him in this imperfect ſtate; without the detail, which was intended, and without thoſe embelliſhments of ſtyle and compoſition, which, in his beſt time, he could ſo eaſily have beſtowed upon them.

This diſcourſe, under the name of *Directions for the Study of Theology*, will be found in volume V. page 601. of his Works.

of reputation, or, in ſhort, from any other cauſe than conviction, and the pureſt zeal for the advancement of truth, knew nothing of his character, and did him great wrong.

But to take him out of his ſtudy, and to conſider him in the common walks of life.

He was of a chearful temper; yet ſubject, at times, to fits of abſence, and, if we may believe himſelf, even of melancholy. For ſo he paints his own complexional habit in two remarkable letters, addreſſed to a friend, and lately made public *.

In one of theſe, dated Feb. 14, 1742-3, he writes thus: —" We have all ſomething to make us think leſs compla-
" cently of the world. Religion will do great things. It
" will always make the bitter waters of Marah wholeſome
" and palatable. But we muſt not think it will uſually
" turn water to wine, becauſe it once did ſo. Nor is it fit
" it ſhould, unleſs this were our place of reſt, where we
" were to expect the Bridegroom. I do the beſt I can, and
" ſhould, I think, do the ſame, if I were a mere Pagan,
" to make life paſſable. To be always lamenting the
" miſeries, or always ſeeking after the pleaſures of it,
" equally takes us off from the work of our ſalvation. And
" though I be extremely cautious what ſect I follow in
" religion, yet any in philoſophy will ſerve my turn, and

* In the Collection before mentioned, p. 77.

" honeſt

" honeſt Sancho Panca's is as good as any; who on his " return from an important commiſſion, when aſked by " his maſter, whether they ſhould mark the day with a " *black* or a *white* ſtone; replied, 'Faith, Sir, if you will " be ruled by me, with neither, but with good *brown* " *ochre*.' What this philoſopher thought of his commiſ- " ſion, I think of human life in general, *good brown ochre* " is the complexion of it."

The other letter, I hinted at, is dated Feb. 2, 1740, and is of a ſtill darker caſt. For, ſpeaking of what had made him delay ſo long the ſecond volume of his D. L., he proceeds in the following manner—" I would not have " you think that natural indolence alone makes me thus " play the fool. Diſtractions of various kinds, inſeparable " from human life, joined with a *naturally melancholy habit*, " contribute greatly to increaſe my indolence, and force " me often to ſeek in letters, nothing but mere amuſe- " ment. This makes my reading wild and deſultory: and " I ſeek refuge from the uneaſineſs of thought from any " book, let it be what it will, that can engage my atten- " tion. There is no one whoſe good opinion I more " value than yours. And the marks you give me of it " make me ſo vain, that I was reſolved to humble myſelf " in making you this confeſſion. By my manner of wri- " ting upon ſubjects, you would naturally imagine they " afford me pleaſure, and attach me thoroughly. I will

" aſſure you, No. I have amuſed myſelf much in human
" learning, to wear away *the tedious hours inſeparable from*
" *a melancholy habit.* But no earthly thing gives me
" pleaſure, but the ties of natural relation, and the friend-
" ſhip of good men. And for all views of happineſs, I
" have no notion of ſuch a thing, but in the proſpects
" which revealed religion affords us."

Theſe letters appear to have been written, the latter of them eſpecially, in a ſplenetic moment. But what is ſaid of a *melancholy habit* means no more (for there was no gloom of melancholy in the tenour of his life or converſation) than that, being of an inventive turn, or, in the language of his friend Biſhop Hare, having an *ingenious working head* *, the driving of his thoughts ſometimes wore his mind too much, and forced him to relieve it by changing the object of his attention. Hence the *deſultory reading*; which, however, ſtored his memory with images of all ſorts, and, as I before obſerved †, while it repaired the vigour of his mind, threw a richneſs and variety of colouring over all his writings.

But to go on with what I propoſed to ſay of his companionable qualities.

In mixed companies he was extremely entertaining; but leſs guarded than men of the world uſually are; and diſpoſed to take to himſelf a ſomewhat larger ſhare of the

* P. 16. † P. 12, 13.

con-

converſation, than very exact breeding is thought to allow. Yet few, I believe, wiſhed him to be more reſerved, or leſs communicative, than he was. So abundant was the information, or entertainment, which his ready wit and extenſive knowledge afforded them! In private with his friends, he was natural, eaſy, unpretending; at once the moſt agreeable and moſt uſeful companion in the world. You ſaw to the very bottom of his mind on any ſubject of diſcourſe; and his various literature, penetrating judgement, and quick recollection, made him ſay the liveliеſt, or the juſteſt things upon it. In ſhort, I was in thoſe moments affected by his converſation, pretty much as Cato was by that of Maximus Fabius, and may ſay, as he does in the dialogue on *Old Age*—" *I was ſo fond of his diſcourſe,* " *and liſtened to it ſo eagerly, as if I had foreſeen, what in-* " *deed came to paſs, that when I loſt him, I ſhould never* " *again meet with ſo inſtructive a companion* *."

I ſpoke of his *private friendſhips*. They were with men of learning and genius; chiefly, with clergymen of the Eſtabliſhed Church; and thoſe, the moſt conſiderable of the time. It would be invidious to give a liſt of theſe. I ſhall only mention, by way of ſpecimen, the learned Archdeacons of Stow and Wincheſter.

* " Ejus ſermone ità tum cupidè fruebar, quaſi jam divinarem id, quod " evenit, illo extincto, fore, undè diſcerem, neminem." *Cic. de Senectute*, C. IV.

The former of theſe, Mr. Towne, was of his early acquaintance, when he lived in Lincolnſhire, and much reſpected by him to his death. He was an ingenious and learned man, and ſo converſant in the Biſhop's writings, that he uſed to ſay of him, "He underſtood them better than himſelf." He publiſhed ſome defences of the Divine Legation, in which, with a glow of zeal for his friend, he ſhewed much logical preciſion and acuteneſs *.

The latter, Dr. Balguy, was a perſon of extraordinary parts, and extenſive learning; indeed of univerſal knowledge; and, what is ſo precious in a man of letters, of the moſt exact judgement: as appears from ſome valuable diſcourſes †, which, having been written occaſionally on important ſubjects, and pub-

* The following is, I believe, an exact liſt of them:

1. Critical Inquiry into the Practice and Opinions of the antient Philoſophers concerning the Soul, &c. Lond. 1748.
2. Expoſition of the Orthodox Syſtem of Civil Rights, and Church Power; addreſſed to Dr. Stebbing.
3. Argument of the D. L. fairly ſtated. Lond. 1751.
4. Free and Candid Examination of Biſhop Sherlock's Sermons, and Diſcourſes on Prophecy. Lond. 1756.
5. Diſſertation on the antient Myſteries. Lond. 1763.
6. Remarks on Dr. Lowth's Letter to Biſhop Warburton. Lond. 1766.

† Theſe diſcourſes, with ſome others, were afterwards collected into one volume in 1785, and preſented, with a handſome Dedication, to his Majeſty.

liſhed

liſhed ſeparately by him, had raiſed his reputation ſo high, that his Majeſty, out of his ſingular love of merit, and without any other recommendation, was pleaſed in 1781 to make him the offer of the Biſhoprick of Glouceſter. Dr. Balguy had a juſt ſenſe of this flattering diſtinction; but was unhappily prevented by an infirm ſtate of health from accepting it.

With theſe, and ſuch as theſe, the Biſhop was happy to ſpend his leiſure hours. A general converſation he never affected, or rather took much pains to avoid, as what he juſtly thought a waſte of time in one of his temper, talents, and profeſſion.

But to draw to an end of this long, and, as it may ſeem to thoſe who knew little of him, too fond a character of my friend.

He had his foibles, no doubt; but ſuch as we readily excuſe, or overlook, in a great character. With more reſerve in his writings and converſation, he had paſſed through the world with fewer enemies (though no prudence could have kept a genius, like his, from having many); and, with a temper leſs irritable, he would have ſecured a more perfect enjoyment of himſelf: But theſe were the imperfections of his nature, or rather the excreſcences of his ruling virtues, an uncommon FRANKNESS OF MIND, and SENSIBILITY OF HEART. Theſe qualities appear in all his writings, eſpecially in his private letters;

in which a warm affection for his friends, and concern for their intereſts, is every where expreſſed. But his tenderneſs for his family, and, above all, his filial piety, ſtrikes us with peculiar force.

In a letter to me from Durham, July 12, 1757, he writes thus—"I am now got (through much hot weather "and fatigue) to this place. I hurried from the heat of "London at a time, and under circumſtances, when a "true Court Chaplain would never have forgiven himſelf "the folly of preferring the company of his friends and "relations, to attendance on the Miniſter. But every one "to his taſte. I had the pleaſure of finding you well at "Cambridge; I had the pleaſure of finding a ſiſter and a "niece well at Broughton, with whom I ſpent a few "days with much ſatisfaction. For, you muſt know, I "have a numerous family: perhaps, the more endeared to "me, by their ſole dependance on me.

"It pleaſed Providence that two of my ſiſters ſhould "marry unhappily: and that a third, on the point of ven-"turing, ſhould eſcape the hazard, and ſo engage my "care only for herſelf.—I reckon this a lucky year: For "I have married a niece to a reputable grocer at York, "and have got a commiſſion for a nephew in the regiment "of artillery. Theſe are pleaſures," &c.

What

What his filial piety was, will be ſeen from the following extracts.

" I am extremely obliged to you" (ſays he to a confidential friend *) " for your remembrance of my deareſt, " my incomparable mother, whom I do more than love, " whom I adore. No mortal can ever merit more of me, " than ſhe has done.—Her decline of life poſſeſſes me with " anxiety; and I have no ſupport for this but in the " thoughts of that laſt meeting, which excludes all farther " chance of ſeparation. But I muſt break off. You have " had long experience what pain it is to me to ſpeak of " ſubjects that affect me moſt."

And, again, to the ſame perſon, on occaſion of her death in 1748—" You ſhould have heard from me ſooner, " but that the afflictive news of my dear mother's death, " which met me at this place †, made me incapable of " writing, or indeed of doing any thing but grieve for the " loſs of the moſt admirable woman that ever was. She " was the laſt of her family; and had in herſelf alone " more virtues than are generally poſſeſſed by whole fami- " lies throughout the whole courſe of their exiſtence. " My extreme ſorrow for her death can only give place to " my inceſſant meditation on her virtues and adoration of " her memory. This is one of thoſe loſſes that nothing

* Dr. Taylor. May 22, 1746.

† Prior Park.

" can repair, and only time can alleviate. For I ſhall " never enjoy that happineſs as in the days when you and " I were converſing together, while ſhe was giving us our " coffee. At preſent, I can think of nothing," &c.

But I grow prolix again (for the reader's ſake I will not ſay, *tedious*) while I indulge myſelf in extracting theſe tender paſſages from his letters.

To conclude at length, in one word.

How differently ſoever men might think of him in his life-time, all are, or will be, agreed in their opinions of him, now he is dead. For, as a Divine of his own ſize, and one after his own heart, ſaid excellently well—" When " great prelates are living, their authority is depreſſed by " their perſonal defaillances, and the contrary intereſts of " their contemporaries; which diſband, when they are " dead, and leave their credit entire upon the reputation of " thoſe excellent books and monuments of learning and " piety, which are left behind them *."

What that *credit* of our great prelate is, this collection of his works will ſhew; and will, if I miſtake not, deliver him down to poſterity as the ableſt Divine, the greateſt Writer, and the firſt Genius of his age. They are faithfully printed from the laſt editions of the author, and

* Biſhop Taylor, L. P. p. 210. 8vo. Lond. 1709.

thoſe

thoſe in many places corrected by his own hand. In one reſpect only, I have ſome apology to make to the reader. Several of his friends had obſerved to him (and he was, himſelf, convinced of it) that he had filled the margin of the *Alliance* and *Divine Legation* with too many notes; and had ſwelled thoſe volumes too much by large extracts under the name of Poſtſcripts, or Appendices, from his controverſial tracts. The longer NOTES occupy the reader too much, and divert him from the main argument, which, as it lies in the text of the Divine Legation eſpecially, is drawn out to a ſufficient length: otherwiſe, they are infinitely curious and learned, and deſerve to be read with great care. They are now, therefore, printed together at the end of each book, and referred to in the text. By this diſpoſition, the reader's convenience is conſulted, and the dignity of thoſe capital works is preſerved. As for ſuch of the POSTSCRIPTS, as are extracted from his controverſial works, theſe I ought, perhaps to have withdrawn: but, as hereafter they may have their uſe in ſeparate editions of the Alliance and Divine Legation, I have permitted them to keep their place. I did this the rather, becauſe theſe diſcourſes are not merely repetitions, but have received many corrections and alterations from the author; while the controverſial treatiſes, from which they are taken, were never retouched by him, but left in their original ſtate.

Thoſe CONTROVERSIAL PIECES themſelves could by no means be ſuppreſſed, or altered in the leaſt, as they preſent the livelieſt image of the writer's character and genius, and derive a peculiar grace from being ſeen in that connection of thought, and glow of colouring, which they took, in the heat of compoſition, from his careleſs and rapid hand.

Some of his private letters (ſuch as had been printed in his life-time by himſelf, or others) conclude the laſt volume; and ſhew how much he excelled in this ſort of compoſition, for which he was indeed ſingularly qualified by the characteriſtic virtues both of his head and heart. The reader will therefore wiſh for a larger collection of them; and he may, in due time, be gratified with it, out of the Editor's long correſpondence with him.

It may be proper to add, that this elegant edition of his works is given at the ſole expence of his widow, now Mrs. Stafford Smith of Prior Park: who alſo erected the monument, before ſpoken of, to his memory in the church of Glouceſter.

I have now, as I found myſelf able, and in the manner I judged moſt fit, diſcharged my duty to this incomparable man: a duty, which he ſeemed to expect would be paid to him by one or other of his ſurviving friends, when, in the cloſe of his preface to Mr. Pope's works, he has theſe affecting words—"And I, when envy and calumny take "the ſame advantage of my abſence (for, while I live, I

"will

" will truſt it to my life to confute them) may I find a " friend as careful of my honeſt fame, as I have been of " his."—I have, I ſay, endeavoured to do juſtice to his memory; but in ſo doing I have taken, the reader ſees, the beſt method to preſerve my own. For, in placing myſelf ſo near to him in this edition of his immortal works, I have the faireſt, perhaps the only chance of being known to poſterity myſelf. Envy and Prejudice have had their day: And when his name comes, as it will do, into all mouths, it may then be remembered, that the writer of this life was honoured with ſome ſhare of his eſteem; and had the pleaſure of living in the moſt entire and unreſerved friendſhip with him, for near THIRTY YEARS.

Hartlebury-Caſtle,
Aug. 12, 1794.

R. WORCESTER.

APPENDIX TO THE LIFE.

LETTER [A] P. 24.

—"I HAVE known this Gentleman about twenty years. I have been greatly and in the moſt generous manner obliged to him. So I am very capable, and you will readily believe, very much diſpoſed to apologize for him. Yet for all that, if I did not really believe him to be an honeſt man, I would not venture to excuſe him to you. Nothing is more notorious than the great character he had acquired in the faithful and able diſcharge of a long embaſſy at Conſtantinople, both in the public part, and the private one of the merchants affairs. The firſt reflexion on his character was that unhappy affair of the Charitable-corporation. I read carefully all the reports of the committee concerning it: And as I knew Sir Robert Sutton's temper and character ſo well, I was better able than moſt to judge of the nature of his conduct in it. And I do in my conſcience believe that he had no more ſuſpicion of any fraud, carrying on by ſome in the direction, than I had. That he was guilty of neglect and negligence, as a Director, is certain: but it was only the natural effect of his temper (where he has no ſuſpicion) which is exceedingly indolent."

And he ſuffered ſufficiently for it, not only in his cenſure, but by the loſs of near £. 20,000. And at this very juncture he loſt a conſiderable ſum of money (through his negligence) by the villainy of a land-ſteward, who broke and run away. Dr. Arbuthnot knew him well; and I am fully perſuaded, though I never heard ſo, that he had the ſame opinion of him in this affair that I have. But parties ran high, and this became a party matter. And the violence of parties no one knows more of than yourſelf. And his virtue and integrity have been ſince fully manifeſted. Another prejudice againſt him, with thoſe who did not know him perſonally, was the character of his brother, the General, as worthleſs a man, without queſtion, as ever was created. But you will aſk, why ſhould a man in his ſtation be engaged in any affair with ſuch dirty people? 'Tis a reaſonable queſtion; but you, who know human nature ſo well, will think this a ſufficient anſwer. He was born to no fortune, but advanced to that ſtation in the Levant, by the intereſt of his couſin Lord Lexington; beſides the ſtraitneſs of his circumſtances, the uſual and conſtant buſineſs of that embaſſy gave him, of courſe, a mercantile turn. He had ſeen in almoſt every country, where he had been, ſocieties of this kind, ſubſiſting profitably to themſelves, and beneficially to the public. For not to think he came amongſt them with a view to his own profit principally, would indeed be abſurd. Yet I am ſure

with

with a view of an honeſt profit. For he is very far from an avaricious man. He lives up to his fortune, without being guilty of any vice or luxury. He is an extreme good and faithful huſband, and with reaſon indeed, for it is to one of the fineſt women in England. He is a tender and indulgent father to very hopeful children; a kind maſter, and one of the beſt landlords to his tenants. I ſpeak all this of my own knowledge. He has a good eſtate in this place. My pariſhioners are good people. The times (till very lately) for this laſt fifteen years have been extreme bad for the graſiers; I got of him, for them, two abatements, in their rents, at two ſeveral times. I will only beg leave to give you one more inſtance that relates to myſelf, and is not equivocal in his character. I chanced to know him, when I was very young, by means of my neighbourhood to Lord Lexington (whom I never knew) where he oft came. And, without any conſideration to party or election-intereſt, he ſeemed to have entertained an early eſteem for me. He had two good livings, on eſtates he had lately bought: and without the leaſt intimation or ſolicitation he told me I ſhould have the firſt that fell. He was as good as his word. But this was not all. As ſoon as I became poſſeſſed of the living, he told me, that (from what he had been informed by my predeceſſor, who at his death was going to commence a ſuit for his juſt dues) the living was much injured by a low and illegal compoſition. That

he thought I ought to right myſelf, and he would join with me againſt the other freeholders (for his eſtate is ſomething more than one half of the pariſh). I replied, that as he paid all the tithes for his tenants, the greateſt loſs, in my breaking the compoſition, would fall upon himſelf, who muſt pay me half as much more as he then did. He ſaid, he did not regard that; I was his friend, and it was my due. I anſwered, that, however, I could not do it yet, for that the world would never conceive it to be done with his conſent, but would ſay that I had no ſooner got his living, than I had quarrel'd with him. But, when I came to my pariſh, I found them ſo good a ſort of people, that I had as little an inclination to fall out with them. So (though to my great injury) I have deferred the matter to this day. Though the thing in the opinion of Sir R. Raymond, who gave it on the caſe, as drawn up by the pariſhioners themſelves, is clear and indiſputable; yet they won't give it up without a law-ſuit. In a word, there is nothing I am more convinced of than the innocence of Sir R. S. in the caſe of the Charitable Corporation, as to any fraud, or connivance at fraud. You, who always follow your judgement, free from prejudice, will do ſo here. I have diſcharged my duty of friendſhip both to you and him."—

LET-

LETTER [B] p. 42.

GOOD MADAM, *Newark, Jan.* 26, 1744-5.

I HAD the honour of your obliging letter of the 25th of laſt Auguſt, ſent me to Bath, where I then was. After ſome ſtay there, where my time was taken up more than I could have wiſhed, I went to London, where I was ſtill leſs in my own power. I am juſt now returned home; and the firſt thing I thought of was to make my acknowledgements for that favour.

I do not wonder that the goodneſs of your heart, and your love of letters, ſhould make you ſpeak with ſo much tenderneſs of poor Mr. Pope's death; for it was a great loſs both to the literary and moral world. In anſwer to your obliging queſtion, what works of Mr. Pope have been publiſhed with my commentaries and notes? I am to inform you, they are the *Dunciad* in quarto, and the *Eſſay on Man* and on *Criticiſm*, in the ſame ſize. Which affords me an opportunity to beg the favour of you to let me know into whoſe hands in London I can conſign a ſmall parcel for you: For I have done myſelf the honour of ordering theſe two volumes to be ſent to you, as I believed you would with difficulty get them of your booksellers ſo far North; and I hope you will forgive this liberty.

Towards the concluſion of your letter, you have ſent me one of the politeſt cartels imaginable. I think, his anſwer was generally commended, who told the Emperor, when he preſſed him, that he never would diſpute with a man who had twenty legions at his beck. And do you think I will enter the liſts with a lady, whoſe writings have twenty thouſand charms in them? If I confided in myſelf, and aimed at honour, I could not indeed do better: for the caſe is there, as in the works of the Italian poets; who have, with great decorum, when they introduced female warriors, made the overcoming one of them the higheſt point of valour and addreſs in their heroes. Beſides, to ſpeak out of a figure, we differ in what is the true foundation of morality. I have ſaid all I have to ſay on the ſubject. And though it be hard to gueſs when a writer ſo much the miſtreſs of her ſubject has ſaid all, yet if I believed what you have ſaid was *all*, I might perhaps be in ſome meaſure excuſeable; as I ſee you ſay ſo much more than any writer of your ſide the queſtion had done before you.

One thing, and only one, you will give me leave, Madam, to obſerve: that I am a little ſurprized at the conſequence drawn from my poſition—"that, as without a God there could be no obligation, therefore the Atheiſt who believes there is none (and might deduce that truth concerning obligation from the principles of right reaſon) would have no *tye* upon him." Hence

Hence I concluded, and I thought rightly, that Atheiſm was highly injurious to ſociety. But how any one could conclude from this (for this is the amount of what I ſaid on that ſubject) that, on my principles (for as to my opinion, I believe no one would queſtion that) *an atheiſt is not accountable in a future ſtate for any enormities he may commit here*, I do not ſee. And my reaſon for ſaying ſo is this. It is a principle, I ſuppoſe, agreed on, "That "crimes committed *upon wrong principles* are equally pu- "niſhable with thoſe committed *againſt right*; for that the "falling into this wrong principle was occaſioned by ſome "puniſhable fault in the conduct." Now I have not ſaid one ſingle word, throughout the diſcourſe, that tends to invalidate this principle: Conſequently all I have ſaid cannot affect that truth, That *an Atheiſt is accountable*. I aſk your pardon, Madam, for this trouble. It is what I have not given to any other; though ſeveral have made the ſame objection. They deſerved nothing at my hands; and you deſerve every thing.

You inquire with great civility concerning the third volume of the Divine Legation. Several offices of friendſhip, ſeveral offices of domeſtic piety and duty, wearineſs with contradiction of *ſinners* both againſt ſenſe and grammar (for ſuch have been my adverſaries) have prevented me doing any thing at the laſt volume, ſince the publication of the ſecond. But now being juſt upon the point

of, not waſhing, but drying, my hands of controverſy, I am about to ſit down in earneſt to the concluſion of the work.

I beg, Madam, not only my beſt reſpects and ſervices to Mr. Cockburn, who, I preſume, is your ſpouſe, but, in that caſe, my congratulations with him, for his honour and happineſs in ſuch a conſort.

I am, Madam,

With the greateſt regard and eſteem,

Your very obliged and obedient humble ſervant,

W. WARBURTON.

THE

DIVINE LEGATION

OF

MOSES

DEMONSTRATED.

IN NINE BOOKS.

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΟΝ ΤΟΥΣ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥΣ ΜΟΥ

ΚΑΙ

ΚΑΤΑΝΟΗΣΩ ΤΑ ΘΑΥΜΑΣΙΑ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΝΟΜΟΥ ΣΟΥ.

PSAL.

THE

DIVINE LEGATION

OF

MOSES.

IN NINE BOOKS.

VOLUME THE FIRST:

CONTAINING

BOOKS I. and II.

DEDICATION

TO A NEW EDITION OF

BOOKS I. II. III. in 1754.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

PHILIP EARL OF HARDWICKE,

LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF GREAT BRITAIN.

MY LORD,

YOUR Lordſhip having ſo far approved of the good intentions of my endeavours for above twenty years paſt, in the cauſe of RELIGION, as to confer upon me a diſtinguiſhing mark of your favour, I am proud to lay hold of the firſt public opportunity which I have had, of deſiring leave to make my moſt grateful acknowledgments.

I take the liberty to inſcribe to your Lordſhip a new Edition of a work tending to ſhew and illuſtrate, by a new argument, the *Divine Legation of Moſes*; which in our own, as well as former times, the moſt celebrated Champions of Infidelity have cunningly, for their own purpoſes, laboured with all their might, to overthrow.

If I have ſucceeded, or as far as I have ſucceeded, or may hereafter ſucceed, in the further proſecution of this attempt, I ſhall ſtrengthen one foundation of Chriſtianity.

As an author, I am not ſolicitous for the reputation of any literary performance. A work given to the world, every reader has a right to cenſure. If it has merit, it will go down to poſterity: if it has none, the ſooner it dies and is forgot the better.

But I am extremely anxious that no good man ſhould miſtake the view with which I write; and therefore cannot help feeling, perhaps too ſenſibly, when it is miſrepreſented.

So far as any cenſure can ſhew that my poor labours are not calculated to promote *Letters* or *Learning*, to advance *Truth*, or, above all, to ſerve the cauſe of *Religion*, which I profeſs as a Chriſtian and a Member of the Church of *England*, I own, I have miſſed my end; and will be the firſt to join with the cenſure which condemns them.

In the mean time, the firſt book of this work, ſuch as it is, is here humbly commended to your Lordſhip's protection. For to whom does it ſo properly belong to patronize an argument ſhewing the UTILITY of Religion to Society, as to that great Magiſtrate, Legiſlator, and Stateſman, who is beſt able to recommend and apply the ſubject, by his being convinced of the TRUTH of Religion; and by his giving the moſt exemplary proof of his belief, in a ſteddy regard to it's dictates in his life and actions?

It is this which makes me preſume on your Lordſhip's protection, not any thing extraordinary in the work itſelf. It is enough for your Lordſhip to find in thoſe you favour a real zeal for the intereſts of Virtue and Religion. The effectual ſervice of thoſe intereſts depends on ſo many accidents, reſpecting both the ability of the Writer and the diſpoſition of the Reader, that your Lordſhip's humanity and candour, inlarged, and not (as it often happens) diminiſhed, by your great knowledge of mankind, will always diſpoſe you to eſtimate merit by a better rule than the ſucceſs.

I am,

MY LORD,

With the utmoſt Gratitude,

Your Lordſhip's moſt obliged,

and devoted Servant,

W. WARBURTON.

London, Nov. 5, 1754.

DEDICATION

TO THE

FIRST EDITION OF

BOOKS I. II. III. in 1738.

TO

THE FREE-THINKERS.

GENTLEMEN,

AS the following diſcourſe was written for your uſe, you have the beſt right to this addreſs. I could never approve the cuſtom of dedicating books to men, whoſe profeſſions made them ſtrangers to the ſubject. A diſcourſe on the Ten Predicaments, to a leader of armies, or a ſyſtem of caſuiſtry to a miniſter of ſtate, always appeared to me a high abſurdity.

Another advantage I have in this addreſs, is that I ſhall not lie under any temptations of flattery; which, at this time of day, when every topic of adulation has been exhauſted, will be of equal eaſe and advantage to us both.

Not but I muſt own you have been managed, even by ſome of our Order, with very ſingular complaiſance. Whether it was that they affected the fame of moderation, or had a higher ambition for the honour of your good word, I know not; but I, who neither love your cauſe, nor fear the abilities that ſupport it, while I pre-

ſerve

ſerve for your perſons that juſtice and charity which my profeſſion teaches to be due to all, can never be brought to think otherwiſe of your character, than as the deſpiſers of the Maſter whom I ſerve, and as the implacable enemies of that Order, to which I have the honour to belong. And as ſuch, I ſhould be tempted to glory in your cenſures; but would certainly refuſe your commendations.

Indeed, were it my deſign, in the manner of modern dedicators, to look out for powerful protectors, I do not know where I could ſooner find them, than amongſt the gentlemen of your denomination: for nothing, I believe, ſtrikes the ſerious obſerver with more ſurprize, in this age of novelties, than that ſtrange propenſity to infidelity, ſo viſible in men of almoſt every condition; amongſt whom the advocates of Deiſm are received with all the applauſes due to the inventors of the arts of life, or the deliverers of oppreſſed and injured nations. The *glorious liberty of the Goſpel* is forgotten amidſt our clamours againſt church-tyranny; and we ſlight the fruits of the reſtored *Tree of Knowledge*, for the ſake of gathering a few barren leaves of Free-thinking, miſgrafted on the old prolific ſtock of Deiſm.

But let me not be miſunderſtood; here are no inſinuations intended againſt liberty: for, ſurely, whatever be the cauſe of this epidemic folly, it would be unjuſt to aſcribe it to the freedom of the Preſs, which wiſe men have ever held one of the moſt precious branches of national Liberty. What, though it midwifes, as it were, theſe brain-ſick births; yet, at the ſame time that it facilitates the delivery, it lends a forming hand to the miſhapen iſſue: for, as in natural bodies, become diſtorted by ſuffering in the conception, or by too ſtrait impriſonment in the womb, a free unreſtrained expoſition of the parts may, in time, reduce them nearer to their natural rectitude; ſo crude and rickety notions, enfeebled by reſtraint, when permitted to be drawn out and examined, may, by the reform of their obliquities, and the correction of their virulency, at length acquire health and proportion.

Nor leſs friendly is this liberty to the generous advocate of religion: for how could ſuch a one, when in earneſt convinced by the evidence of his cauſe, deſire an adverſary whom the laws had before diſarmed; or value a victory, where the Magiſtrate muſt triumph with him? Even I, the meaneſt in this controverſy, ſhould have been aſhamed of projecting the defence of the great Jewiſh Lawgiver, did not I know that the ſame liberty of thinking was impartially indulged to all. And if my diſſenting in the courſe of this defence from ſome received opinions need an apology, I deſire it may be thought, that I ventured into this track the leſs unwillingly, to ſhew, by my not intrenching in authorized ſpeculations, that I put myſelf upon the ſame footing with you, and would claim no privilege that was not in common.

This liberty then may you long poſſeſs; may you know how to uſe; may you gratefully acknowledge! I ſay this, becauſe one cannot, without indignation, obſerve, that amidſt the full poſſeſſion of it, you ſtill continue, with the meaneſt affectation, to fill your prefaces with repeated clamours againſt the difficulties and diſcouragements attending the exerciſe of Free-thinking: and, in a peculiar ſtrain of modeſty and reaſoning, employ this very liberty to perſuade the world you ſtill want it. In extolling liberty, we can join with you; in the vanity of pretending to have contributed moſt to its eſtabliſhment, we can bear with you; but in the low cunning of pretending ſtill to groan under the want of it, we can neither join nor bear with you. There was indeed a time, and that within our own memories, when ſuch complaints were ſeaſonable and even uſeful; but, happy for you, Gentlemen, you have out-lived it: all the reſt is merely Sir Martin *; it is continuing to fumble on the lute, though the muſick has been long over. For it is not a thing to be diſguiſed, that what we hear from you, on this head, is but an aukward, though envenomed imitation of an original work of one, whoever he was, who appears to have been amongſt the

* In a comedy of Dryden's.

greateſt,

greateſt, and moſt ſucceſsful of your adverſaries. It was publiſhed at an important juncture, under the title of *The difficulties and diſcouragements which attend the ſtudy of the Scripture.* But with all the merit of this beautiful ſatire, it has been its fortune not only to be abuſed by your bad imitations, but to be cenſured by thoſe in whoſe cauſe it was compoſed; I mean the friends of religion and liberty. An author of note thus expreſſes himſelf: * "Nor was this the worſt: "men were not only diſcouraged from ſtudying and revering the "Scriptures by—but alſo by being told that this ſtudy was difficult, "fruitleſs, and dangerous; and a public, an elaborate, an earneſt "diſſuaſive from this ſtudy, for the very reaſons now mentioned, "enforced by two well-known examples, and believed from a per-"ſon of great eminence in the church, hath already paſſed often "enough through the preſs, to reach the hands of all the clergy-"men in Great-Britain and Ireland: God in his great mercy for-"give the author †." Seriouſly it is a ſad caſe! that one well-meaning man ſhould ſo widely miſtake the end and deſign of another, as not to ſee by the turn and caſt of the *Difficulties and diſcouragements*, that it is a thorough irony, addreſſed to ſome hot bigots then in power, to ſhew them what diſmal effects that inquiſitional ſpirit, with which they were poſſeſſed, would have on literature in general, at a time when public liberty looked with a very ſickly face! Not, I ſay, to ſee this, but to believe, on the contrary, that it was really intended as *a public, an elaborate, an earneſt diſſuaſive from the ſtudy of the Scriptures!* But I have ſo charitable an opinion of the great author, for a great author without doubt he was, as to believe that had he foreſeen that the liberty, which animates this fine-turned piece of raillery, would have given ſcandal to any good man, he would, for the conſolation of ſuch, have made any reaſonable abatement in the vigour of his wit and argument.

But you, Gentlemen, have a different quarrel with him: you pretend he hath ſince written on the other ſide the queſtion. Now though

* Revelation Examined with Candour, in the preface.

† The author was the excellent Dr. Hare, late Biſhop of Chicheſter.

though the word of his accuſers is not apt to go very far with me, yet, I muſt own, I could be eaſily enough brought to believe, that an author of ſuch talents of literature, love of truth, and of his country, as this appears to have been, would as freely expoſe the extreme of folly at one end, as at the other; without regarding what party he oppoſed or favoured by it. And it is well known, that, at the time this is pretended to have been done, another intereſt being become uppermoſt, ſtrange principles of licence, which tended to ſubvert all order, and deſtroy the very eſſence of a Church, ran now in the popular ſtream. What then ſhould hinder a writer, who was of no party but that of truth, to oppoſe this extravagance, as he had done its oppoſite? And if he pleaſed neither bigot nor libertine by his uniformity of conduct, it was for his honour.

How public a bleſſing is ſuch a virtue! which, unawed by that *fatal enemy of ſenſe*, as the poet calls it, the *danger of offending*, dares equally oppoſe itſelf to the different follies of Party in extremes.

But to return to our ſubject: The poor thread-bare cant of *want of liberty*, I ſhould hope then you would be, at length, perſuaded to lay aſide; but that I know ſuch cant is amongſt your arts of controverſy; and that ſomething is to be allowed to a weak cauſe, and to a reputation that requires managing. We know what to underſtand by it, when after a ſucceſsleſs inſult on religion, the reader is intreated to believe that you have a ſtrong reſerve: but till the door of liberty be ſet a little wider, you have not room to diſplay it.

Thus, at the very entrance of your works you teach us what we are to expect. But I muſt beg your patience, now I am got thus far, to lay before you your principal abuſes of that liberty indulged to you for better purpoſes; or, to give them the ſofteſt name I can, in an addreſs of this nature, your ARTS OF CONTROVERSY.

By this I ſhall at once practiſe the charity I profeſs, and juſtify the opinion I have paſſed upon you.

Your writers, I ſpeak it, Gentlemen, to your honour, offer your conſiderations to the world, either under the character of petitioners

for oppreſſed and injured truth; or of teachers to ignorant and erring men. Theſe ſure are characters that, if any, require ſerioufneſs and gravity to ſupport them. But ſo great ſtrangers are we to decorum, on our entry on the ſtage of life, that, for the moſt part, like Bayes's actor in the Rehearſal, who was at a loſs to know whether he was to be ſerious or merry, melancholy or in love, we run giddily on, in a mixt and jumbled character; but have moſt an end, a ſtrong inclination to make a farce of it, and mingle buffoonry with the moſt ſerious ſcenes. Hence, even in religious controverſy, while the great cauſe of eternal happineſs is trying; and men and angels, as it were, attending the iſſue of the conflict, we can find room for a merry ſtory; and receive the advocate of infidelity with much welcome *, if he comes with but a diſpoſition to make us laugh: though he brings the tidings of *death*, and ſcatters round him the poiſon of our *hopes*, yet, like the dying aſſaſſin †, we can laugh along with the mob, though our own deſpair and agonies conclude the entertainment.

This quality making a writer ſo well received, yours have been tempted to diſpenſe with the ſolemnity of their character; as thinking it of much importance to get the laugh on their ſide. Hence RIDICULE is become their favourite figure of ſpeech; and they have compoſed ſad treatiſes to juſtify its uſe, and very merry ones to evince its utility. But to be fair with you, it muſt be owned, that this ſtrange diſpoſition towards unſeaſonable mirth, drives all parties upon being witty where they can, as being conſcious of its powerful operation in controverſy: RIDICULE having, from the hands of a ſkilful diſputant, the ſame effect in barbarous minds, with the new invented darts of Marius ‡, which, though ſo weak as to break in the

* Hence Anthony Urceus, ſurnamed Codrus, as vain and impious as any Free-thinker alive, being aſked the reaſon (as we are told by Blanchini, the writer of his life) why he mixed ſo much buffoonry in his works, replied, "That nature had formed mankind "in ſuch a manner, as to be moſt taken with buffoons and ſtory-tellers."

† Balthazar Gerard, who murthered the Prince of Orange. See his ſtory.

‡ See Plut. Vit. Mar. tom. II. p. 766, 767. Edit. Cruſerii, 8vo.

throw,

throw, and pierce no farther than the ſurface, yet ſticking there, they more intangle and incommode the combatant, than thoſe arms, which fly ſtronger, and ſtrike deeper. However, an abuſe it is, and one of the moſt pernicious too, of the liberty of the Preſs. For what greater affront to the ſeverity of reaſon, the ſublimity of truth, and the ſanctity of religion, than to ſubject them to the impure touch of every empty ſcurrilous Buffoon? The politeneſs of Athens, which you pretend ſo much to admire, ſhould be here a leſſon to you; which committed all queſtions of this nature, when they were to be examined, to their graveſt and ſevereſt court, the Areopagus: whoſe judges would not ſuffer the advocates for either party to apply to the paſſions, ſo much as by the common rules of the chaſteſt rhetoric *. But a prepoſterous love of mirth hath turned you all into Wits, quite down from the ſanguine writer of *The Independent Whig*, to the atrabilaire blaſphemer of the miracles †. Though it would be but charity to tell you a plain truth, which Cicero told your *illuſtrious predeceſſors* long ago, when infected with the ſame diſtemper: "Ita ſalem iſtum, quo caret VESTRA NATIO in irridendis "nobis, nolitote conſumere. Et mehercule, ſi me audiatis, ne ex- "periamini quidem: non decet; NON DATUM EST; non poteſtis." However, if you will needs be witty, take once more your example from the fine author of *The difficulties and diſcouragements*, and learn from him the difference between Attic irony and elegance of wit, and your intemperate ſcurrility and illiberal banter.

What a noiſe, you will ſay, for a little harmleſs mirth. Ah, Gentlemen! if that were all, you had my leave to laugh on: I would ſay with the old comic,

Utinam male qui mihi volunt, ſic rideant.

But low and mean as your buffoonry is, it is yet to the level of the people; who are as little ſolicitous, as capable, of the point of

* Exemplo legis Atticæ, Martiique judicii cauſæ Patronis denuntiat Præco neque principia dicere, neque miſerationem commovere. Apul. Lib. X. Aſin. Aur. p. 827. Lugd. 1587. 8vo.

† Woolſton.

argument, ſo they can but catch the point of wit. Amongſt ſuch, and to ſuch, you write; and it is inconceivable what havoc falſe wit makes in a fooliſh head: "The rabble of mankind," as an excellent writer well obſerves, "being very apt to think, that every thing "which is laughed at, with any mixture of wit, is ridiculous in "itſelf *." Few reflect on what a great wit † has ſo ingenuouſly owned, *That wit is generally falſe reaſoning*. But one, in whom your party moſt glories, hath written in defence of this abuſive way of *wit and raillery*, on ſerious ſubjects. Let us hear him then ‡: "Nothing is ridiculous, except what is deformed; nor is any thing "proof againſt raillery, except what is handſome and juſt; and "therefore it is the hardeſt thing in the world to deny fair honeſ- "ty the uſe of this weapon; which can never bear an edge againſt "herſelf. One may defy the world to turn bravery or generoſity "into ridicule: a man muſt be ſoundly ridiculous, who, with all "the wit imaginable, would go about to ridicule wiſdom, or laugh "at honeſty or good manners." Yes, ridiculous, indeed, to laugh at bravery, generoſity, wiſdom, honeſty, or good manners, as ſuch: and I hardly think, gentlemen, as licentious as ſome of you are, you will be ever brought to accept of his defiance. And why need you, when it is but ſhewing them, with overcharged and diſtorted features, to laugh at your eaſe? Call them but temerity, prodigality, gravity, ſimplicity, foppery, and as you have often experienced, the buſineſs is done, and the ridicule is compleat. And what ſecurity will the noble writer give us, that they ſhall not be ſo called? I am perſuaded, if you are never to be thought *ridiculous* till you become ſo, in the way this gentleman marks out, you may go ſafely on in the FREEDOM OF WIT AND HUMOUR, till there be never a virtue left, to laugh out of countenance.

* Mr. Addiſon's Works, vol. iii. p. 293. Quarto.

† Mr. Wycherley to Mr. Pope, Letter XVI.

‡ Characteriſtics, vol. I. Eſſay on the freedom of wit and humour.

But

But he will ſay, he means ſuch clear virtue as hath no equivocal mark about her, which a prevaricator can lay hold on. Admit this: the man of wit will then try to make her ridiculous in her equipage, if he cannot make her ſo in her perſon.

However, will he ſay, it ſhews at leaſt, that nothing can be done againſt her, till ſhe be diſguiſed. A mighty conſolation this to expiring Virtue, that ſhe cannot be deſtroyed till you have put her on a fool's coat. As if it were as hard to get that *on*, as Hercules's *off!* The compariſon holds better in the converſe, that when once *on*, it ſticks as cloſe as the envenomed one of old, and often laſts her to her funeral.

But if this noble writer means that truth cannot be obſcured, however diſguiſed; nor conſequently, be made ridiculous, however repreſented; the two celebrated examples, which follow, ſeem to ſhew he was miſtaken. Where, in the firſt, it is ſeen, that nothing was ſtronger than the ridicule, nor, at the ſame time more open and tranſparent than the diſguiſe; in the latter, nothing more clouded and obſcured than the beauty of the truth ridiculed, nor more out of ſight than the fallacy in the repreſentation. Which together may teach us, that any kind of diſguiſe will ſerve the turn; and, that witty men will never be at a loſs for one.

Of all the virtues that were ſo much in this noble writer's heart, and in his writings, there was not one he more revered than *love of public liberty*; or which he would leſs ſuſpect ſhould become liable to the impreſſions of buffoonry. Methinks I hear him ſay, "One may defy the world to turn the love of public liberty into ridicule: a man muſt be ſoundly ridiculous, who, with all the wit imaginable, would go about it."

However, once on a time, a great Wit ſet upon this taſk; he undertook to laugh at this very virtue; and that too, ſo ſucceſsfully, that he ſet the whole nation a laughing with him. What mighty engine, you will aſk, was employed, to put in motion ſo large a body, and for ſo extraordinary a cauſe? In truth, a very ſimple one: a *diſcourſe*, of which all the wit conſiſts in the title; and that too

ſculking,

ſculking, as you will ſee, under one unlucky word. *Mrs. Bull's vindication of the indiſpenſable duty of* CUCKOLDOM, *incumbent upon wives, in caſe of the tyranny, infidelity, or inſufficiency of huſbands* *. Now had the merry reader been but wiſe enough to reflect, that reaſon was the teſt of ridicule, and not *ridicule the teſt of truth*, he would have ſeen to rectify the propoſition, and to ſtate it fairly thus: *The indiſpenſable duty of* DIVORCE, *etc.* And then the joke had been over, before the laugh could have begun.

And now let this noble writer tell us, as he does, that *fair honeſty can never bear an edge againſt herſelf, for that nothing is ridiculous but what is deformed*; and a great deal to the ſame purpoſe, which his Platonic manners ſupplied.

But very often the change put upon us is not ſo eaſily diſcernible. Sulpicius tells Cicero, that returning by ſea from Aſia, and ſeeing in his courſe Ægina, Megara, the Piræus, and Corinth in ruins, he fell into this very natural, and humane reflexion: "And ſhall "we, ſhort-lived creatures as we are, bear with impatience the "death of our fellows, when in one ſingle view we behold the car-"caſes of ſo many lately flouriſhing cities †?" What could be juſter or wiſer than the piety of this reflexion? And yet it could not eſcape the ridicule of a celebrated French buffoon. "If neither "(ſays he ‡) the Pyramids of Egypt, nor the Coloſſeum at Rome, "could

* Hiſtory of John Bull, part I. chap. xiii.

† Ex Aſia rediens, cum ab Ægina Megaram verſus navigarem, cœpi regiones circumcirca proſpicere. Poſt me erat Ægina; ante Megara; dextra Piræeus; ſiniſtra Corinthus: quæ oppida quodam tempore florentiſſima fuerunt, nunc proſtrata, & diruta ante oculos jacent. Cœpi egomet mecum ſic cogitare: Hem! nos homunculi indignamur, ſi quis noſtrum interiit, aut occiſus eſt, quorum vita brevior eſſe debet, cum uno loco tot oppidum cadavera projecta jaceant? Sulpicius M. T. Ciceroni, lib iv. ep. 5.

‡ *Superbes monumens de l'orgueil des humains,*
Piramides, Tombeaux, dont la vaine ſtructure
A temoigné que l'art, par l'adreſſe des mains
Et l'aſſidu travail, peut vaincre la nature!
Vieux palais ruinez, chef d'œuvres des Romains,

Et

" could withſtand the injury of time; why ſhould I think much " that my black waiſtcoat is out at elbows?" Here, indeed, the firſt thing to be obſerved is the ſuperior reſiſtance of truth.

The buffoon, before he could throw an air of ridicule on this admirable ſentiment, was forced to change the image; and in the place of Ægina, Megara, etc. to ſubſtitute the *Pyramids* and *Coloſſeum*, monuments of human pride, and folly; which, on that account, readily ſubmitted to the rude touch of buffoonry: while thoſe free cities, the nobleſt effort of human wiſdom, the nurſeries of arts and commerce, could not eaſily be ſet in a ridiculous or an idle light.

But then, how few of his readers were able to detect the change put upon them, when it is very probable the author himſelf did not ſee it? who, perplexed at the obſtinate reſiſtance of *truth*, in the various arrangement of his ideas turned the edge of his raillery, before he was aware, againſt the phantaſm, and was the firſt that fell into his own deceit.

Hence may be ſeen what the noble writer ſeems to have ſpoken at random, at leaſt, not at all to the purpoſe of the queſtion he was upon, that ſuch indeed is the inflexible nature of truth, that all the wit in the world can never render it ridiculous, till it be ſo diſtorted as to look like error, or ſo diſguiſed as to appear like folly. A circumſtance which, though it greatly recommends the *majeſty of virtue*, yet, as it cannot ſecure it from inſult, doth not at all ſhew the *innocence of ridicule*; which was the point he had to prove.

Et les derniers efforts de leur architecture,
Colliſée, où ſouvent *ces peuples inhumains*,
De s'entr' aſſaſſiner ſe donnoient tablature,
Par l'injure des ans vous eſtes abolis,
Ou du moins la plus part vous eſtes demolis:
Il n'eſt point de ciment que le temps ne diſſoude,
Si vos marbres ſi durs ont ſentis ſon pouvoir,
Dois-je trouver mauvais, qu'un meſchant pourpoint noir,
Qui m'a duré deux ans, ſoit percé par le coude?

SCARRON.

But to ſee what little good is to be expected in this way of *wit and humour*, one may go further; and obſerve, that even the ridicule of *falſe* virtue, which ſurely deſerves no quarter, hath been ſometimes attended with very miſchievous effects. The Spaniards have lamented, and I believe truly, that Cervantes's juſt and inimitable ridicule of *knight-errantry* rooted up, with that folly, a great deal of their *real honour*. And it was apparent, that Butler's fine ſatire on *fanaticiſm* contributed not a little, during the licentious times of Charles II. to bring *ſober piety* into diſrepute. The reaſon is evident: there are many lines of reſemblance between Truth and its Counterfeits: and it is the province of *wit* only to find out the *likeneſſes* in things; and not the talent of the *common admirers of it* to diſcover the *differences*.

But you will ſay, perhaps, Let Truth, when thus attacked, defend itſelf with the ſame arms; for why, as your maſter aſks, ſhould *fair honeſty be denied the uſe of this weapon?* Be it ſo: come on then, and let us impartially attend the iſſue. We have, upon record, the moſt illuſtrious example of this contention that ever was. The diſpute I mean, was between Socrates and Ariſtophanes. Here *truth* had all the advantage of place, of weapons, and of judges: Socrates employed his whole life in the cauſe of virtue: Ariſtophanes, only a few comic ſcenes againſt it. But, heavens! againſt what virtue! againſt the pureſt and brighteſt portion of it that ever enlightened the *gentile* world. The wit of the comic writer is well known: that of the philoſopher was in a ſupreme degree, juſt, delicate, and forceable; and ſo habitual, that it procured him the title of the *Attic buffoon*. The *place* was the politeſt ſtate in the politeſt time, Athens in its glory; and the *judges* the grave ſenators of Areopagus. For all this, the comic poet triumphed: and with the coarſeſt kind of buffoonry, little fitted, one would think, to take ſo polite a people, had the art to tarniſh all this virtue; and, what was more, to make the owner reſemble his direct oppoſite, that character he was moſt unlike, that character he moſt hated, that very character he had employed all his wit to detect,

lay

lay open, and confound; in one word, the SOPHIST. The conſequences are well known.

Thus will *raillery*, in defence of vice and error, be ſtill an overmatch for that employed on the ſide of truth and virtue. Becauſe *fair honeſty* uſes, though a ſharp, yet an untainted weapon; while knavery ſtrikes with one empoiſoned, though much duller. The honeſt man employs his wit as correctly as his logic: whereas the very definition of a knave's raillery is a ſophiſm.

But, indeed, when a licentious buffoonry is once appealed to, and encouraged; its effects have no dependance on the fit choice of its object. All characters fall alike before it. In the diſſolute times of Charles II, this *weapon*, with the ſame eaſe, and indeed in the ſame hands, completed the ruin of the beſt, and, of the very worſt Miniſter of that age. The hiſtorians tell us, that Chancellor Hyde was brought into his maſter's contempt, by this court-argument. They mimicked his walk and geſture, with a fire-ſhovel and bellows, for the mace and purſe. The ſame ingenious ſtroke of humour was repeated on Secretary Bennet, and, by the happy addition of his black patch, with juſt the ſame ſucceſs. Thus, it being the repreſentation, and not the object repreſented, which ſtrikes the fancy, Vice and Virtue muſt fall indifferently before it *.

I hope

* The author of a late book called Elements of Criticiſm, ſpeaking of men's various opinions concerning the *uſe of ridicule*, proceeds againſt what is here ſaid, in the following manner—"This diſpute has produced a celebrated queſtion, *Whether Ridicule be, or be not, a teſt of Truth?* Which (ſays he) ſtated in ACCURATE TERMS, is, *Whether the* SENSE *of Ridicule be the proper teſt for diſtinguiſhing ridiculous objects from thoſe that are not ſo? To anſwer the queſtion with* PRECISION, I muſt premiſe that Ridicule is not a ſubject of reaſoning but of SENSE or TASTE." Vol. ii. p. 55. The Critic having thus changed the queſtion, which he calls *ſtating it in accurate terms*; and obſcured the anſwer, which he calls, giving it *with preciſion*, he concludes, that *Ridicule is not only the beſt, but the only, teſt of Truth.*

But what is all this to the purpoſe? Is the Dealer in Ridicule now debarred the liberty of doing what he has ſo often done, putting his object in a falſe light; and, by that means, making Truth appear like Error? As he is not, I inferred, againſt Lord

I hope then, Gentlemen, you will in time be brought to own, that this method is the moſt unfair in itſelf, and moſt pernicious in its conſequences: that its natural effect is to miſlead the judgment, and to make the heart diſſolute.

It is a ſmall matter, that the State requires of you, ſobriety, decency, and good manners, to qualify you for the noble employment of thinking freely, and at your eaſe. We have been told this, you will ſay, before: But, when it came to be explained; By, *ſober writing* was meant, writing in the *language of the Magiſtrate.* It may be ſo; but then, remember, it was not till you yourſelves

Shafteſbury, *That Ridicule is not a teſt of Truth.* How does our Critic addreſs himſelf to prove the contrary? Not by ſhewing, that *ridicule* is ſuch a teſt: but that *the* TASTE *of ridicule is the teſt of what is ridiculous.* Who doubts that? It is the very thing complained of. For when our *taſte* for ridicule gives us a ſenſible pleaſure in a ridiculous repreſentation of any object, we do not ſtay to examine whether that repreſentation be a true one, but conclude it to be ſo, from the pleaſure it affords us.

His ſecond change of the queſtion is a new ſubſtitution, viz. *Whether Ridicule be a talent to be uſed or employed at all?* Of which he ſuppoſes me to hold the negative. What elſe is the meaning of theſe words? "To CONDEMN A TALENT FOR RIDICULE, becauſe "it may be converted to wrong purpoſes, is not a little ridiculous. Could one forbear "to *ſmile* if A TALENT FOR REASONING WAS CONDEMNED, becauſe it alſo may be per-"verted?" p. 57. He has no reaſon to *ſmile* ſure, at his own miſrepreſentation. I never *condemned a talent for ridicule* becauſe it may be abuſed; nor for any other reaſon. Though others, perhaps, may be diſpoſed to *ſmile* at his abſurd inference, that we may as well *condemn a talent for reaſoning.* As if *reaſon* and *ridicule* were of equal importance for the conduct of human life.

He may then perhaps aſk, "If I do not *condemn* the *uſe* of Ridicule, on what em-"ployment I would put it, when I have excluded it from being *a teſt of truth?*" Let him not be uneaſy about that. There is no danger that the *talent for ridicule* ſhould lie idle, for want of proper buſineſs. When *reaſon*, the only *teſt of truth* I know of, has performed its office, and unmaſked *hypocriſy and formal error*, then *ridicule*, I think, may be fairly called in, to quicken the operation. Thus, when Dr. S. Clarke had, by ſuperior reaſoning, expoſed the wretched ſophiſtry which Mr. Collins had employed to prove the Soul to be only a quality of Body; Dr. Arbuthnot, who very rarely miſemployed his inimitable *talent for ridicule*, followed the blow, and gave that fooliſh and impious opinion up to the contempt and laughter it deſerved, in a chapter of the Memoirs of Scriblerus. But to ſet Ridicule on work before, would be as unfair, indeed as ſcandalous, as to beſtow the language due to convicted Vice, on a character but barely ſuſpected.

had led the way to the abuſe of words; and had called calumny, plain dealing; and a ſcurril licence, urbanity. Happy for you, that you are in times when liberty is ſo well underſtood. Had you lived in the boaſted days of claſſic freedom, he amongſt you who had eſcaped beſt, had been branded with a character, the ancient Sages eſteemed moſt infamous of all, AN ENEMY TO THE RELIGION OF HIS COUNTRY. A very candid and reſpectable author, ſpeaking of the ancient *reſtraints* on free-thinking, ſays, "Theſe "were the maxims, theſe the principles, which the light of nature "ſuggeſted, which reaſon dictated *." Nor has this fine writer any cauſe to be aſhamed of his acknowledgment; nor his adverſaries any pretence that he muſt needs eſteem it the meaſure for the preſent times. For, as a great Ancient well obſerves, "It is one "thing to ſpeak of truth, and another to hear truth ſpeak of her-"ſelf †." It was CHRISTIAN TRUTH and CHARITY, the truth and charity you ſo much inſult, which only could take off thoſe reſtraints; and require no more of you than to be *as* FREE, *but not uſing your liberty for a cloak of maliciouſneſs* ‡.

I have now done with your buffoonry; which, like chewed bullets, is againſt the law of arms; and come next to your ſcurrilities, thoſe ſtink-pots of your offenſive war.

As the CLERGY of the eſtabliſhed church have been more *particularly* watchful in what is yet the common cauſe of all, the intereſts of *Chriſtianity*, and moſt ſucceſsful in repelling the inſults of its enemies, they have fallen under the heavieſt load of your calumny and ſlander. With unparalleled licence, you have gone on, repreſenting them as debauched, avaricious, proud, vindictive, ambitious, deceitful, irreligious, and incorrigible. "An order of men profligate and abandoned to wickedneſs, inconſiſtent with the good of

* Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 52, *&ſeq.*

† Ἄλλως τὶς περὶ ἀληθείας λέγει, ἢ ἀλήθεια ἑαυτὴν ἑρμηνεύει.

‡ 1 Pet. ii. 16.

ſociety, irreconcileable enemies to reaſon, and conſpirators againſt the liberty and property of mankind *."

To fill up your common place of ſlander, the moſt inconſiſtent qualities have been raked together to deform them: qualities that could never ſtand together but in idea; I mean, in the misſhapen ideas of a Free-thinker.

The Order is now repreſented as moſt contemptible for their politics; ever in the wrong, and under a fatality of continued blunders, attending them as a curſe: But anon, we are told of their deep-laid ſchemes of a ſeparate intereſt, ſo wiſely conducted, as to elude the policy of Courts, and baffle all the wiſdom of Legiſlatures.

Now they are a ſet of ſuperſtitious bigots, and fiery zealots, prompt to ſacrifice the rights of humanity to the intereſts of Mother-Church: but now again, they are *Tartufes without religion; Atheiſts and Apoſtates without faith or law.*

This moment, ſo united in one common confederacy, as to make their own Church-policy the cauſe of God: But, the next, ſo divided, that every man's hand is againſt his brother, *tearing and worrying one another*, to the great ſcandal of the charitable author of the *Diſcourſe of Free-thinking*.

But it is to be hoped, as the evidence is ſo ill laid together, the accuſation may be groundleſs.

But why do I talk of the Clergy, when there is not one, however otherwiſe eſteemed by, or related to you, that can eſcape your ſlander, if he happen to diſcover the leaſt inclination for that cauſe, againſt which you are ſo virulently bent? Mr. Locke, the honour of this age, and the inſtructor of the future, ſhews us, in the treatment he received from his FRIEND and from his PUPIL, what a believer is to expect from you. It was enough to provoke their reſentment, that he had ſhewn *the reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*; and had placed all his *hopes* of happineſs in *another life*.

* Rights of the Chriſtian Church, and Chriſtianity as old as the Creation, paſſim.

The

The intimacy between him and Mr. Collins is well known. Mr. Collins ſeemed to idolize Mr. Locke while living; and Mr. Locke was *confident* Mr. Collins would *preſerve his memory when dead**. But he chanced to be miſtaken: For no ſooner was he gone, than Mr. Collins publickly † inſults a notion of his *honoured friend* concerning the *poſſibility of conceiving how matter might firſt be made and begin to be*: And goes affectedly out of the way to ſhew his good will to his memory.

The noble author of *the Characteriſtics* had received ‡ part of his education from that great philoſopher: And it muſt be owned, that this Lord had many excellent qualities, both as a man and a writer. He was temperate, chaſte, honeſt, and a lover of his country. In his writings he hath ſhewn how largely he had imbibed the deep ſenſe, and how naturally he could copy the gracious manner of Plato. How far Mr. Locke contributed to the cultivating theſe qualities, I will not enquire: But that inveterate rancour which he indulged againſt *Chriſtianity*, it is certain, he had not from his maſter. It was Mr. *Locke's* love of it that ſeems principally to have expoſed him to his pupil's bittereſt inſults. One of the moſt precious remains of the piety of that excellent man, are his laſt words to Mr. Collins: "May you live long and happy, "*&c.* all the uſe to be made of it is, *that this world is a ſcene of* "*vanity, that ſoon paſſes away, and affords no ſolid ſatisfaction*, but "the conſciouſneſs of well doing, and the HOPES OF ANOTHER "LIFE. This is what I can ſay by experience, and what you "will find when you come to make up your account ||." One would think, that if ever the parting breath of pious men, or the laſt precepts of dying philoſophers, could claim reverence of their ſurvivors, this noble monument of friendſhip, and religion, had

* "I know you loved me living, and will preſerve my memory now I am dead," ſays he in his letter to be delivered to Mr. Collins at his death.

† Anſwer to Dr. Clarke's third Defence of his Letter to Mr. Dodwell, at the end.

‡ See Bibl. Choiſie, tom. vi. p. 343.

|| Amongſt his Letters publiſhed by Deſmaizeaux.

been

been ſecure from outrage. Yet hear, in how unworthy, how cruel a manner, his noble diſciple apoſtrophizes him on this occaſion: "*Philoſopher!* let me hear concerning life, what the right notion "is, and what I am to ſtand to upon occaſion; that I may not, "when life ſeems retiring, or *has run itſelf out to the very dregs* *, "cry VANITY! condemn the WORLD, and at the ſame time com- "plain that LIFE IS SHORT AND PASSING. For why ſo *ſhort* in- "deed, if not found *ſweet?* Why do I complain both ways? Is "*vanity*, mere vanity, a happineſs; or can miſery *paſs away* too "ſoon †?" Here the polite author had the noble pleaſure of ridiculing the *philoſopher* and the *Pſalmiſt* ‡ together. But I will leave the ſtrange reflexions, that naturally ariſe from hence, to the reader; who, I am ſure, will be before-hand with me in judging, that Mr. Locke had reaſon to *condemn a world* that caſt him upon ſuch a *friend* and *pupil* ||.

But

* Mr. Locke was then in his 73d year.

† Characteriſtics, vol. i. p. 302. 3d ed.

‡ *Man is like to vanity: His days are as a ſhadow that paſſeth away.* PSAL. cxliv. 4.

|| The noble writer did not diſdain to take up with thoſe vulgar calumnies which Mr. *Locke* had again and again confuted. "Some even (ſays he, *Charact.* vol. i. p. 80. 3d "ed.) of our moſt admired modern philoſophers had fairly told us, that virtue and "vice had, after all, no other law or meaſure than mere faſhion and vogue." The caſe was this: When Mr. *Locke* reaſoned againſt *innate ideas*, he brought it as one argument againſt them, that virtue and vice, in many places, were not regulated by the nature of things, which they muſt have been, were there ſuch *innate ideas*; but by mere faſhion and vogue. Is this then *fairly told* of *our admired modern philoſopher?* But it was crime enough that he laboured to overthrow *innate ideas*; things that the noble author underſtood to be the foundation of his *moral ſenſe*. (See vol. iii. p. 214.) In vain did Mr. Locke inceſſantly repeat, that "the divine law is the only true touchſtone of moral rec- "titude." This did but increaſe his pupil's reſentment, who had all his faculties poſſeſſed with the MORAL SENSE, as "the only true touchſtone of moral rectitude." But the whole Eſſay itſelf, one of the nobleſt, and moſt original books in the world, could not eſcape his ridicule: "In reality (ſays he, vol. i. p. 299.) how ſpecious a ſtudy, how "ſolemn an amuſement, is raiſed from what we call philoſophical ſpeculations! The "formation of ideas! their compoſitions, compariſons, agreement, and diſagreement!—

"Why

But to go on, and conſider the nature of this abuſe of the Clergy: It is not only an affront to *Religion*, which, by your practice, you ſeem to regard as one of the eſſential branches of literary liberty; but likewiſe, an inſult on *civil Society*. For while there is ſuch a thing as a *Church eſtabliſhed by law*, its Miniſters muſt needs bear a *ſacred*, that is, a *public* character, even on your own principles *. To abuſe them, therefore, as a body, is inſulting the State which protects them. It is highly injurious likewiſe, becauſe a Body-politic cannot preſerve the reverence neceſſary for the ſupport of government, longer than its public officers, whether civil or religious, are treated with the regard due to their reſpective ſtations †. And here, your apology, when accuſed of uſing holy Writ irreverently, is out of doors. You pretend that the Charge is diſingenuous, becauſe it takes for granted the thing in diſpute. But in the caſe before us, it is agreed, that the Miniſters of the eſtabliſhed worſhip have a *ſacred*, that is, a *public* character.

Out of your own mouths likewiſe, are you condemned. A few inſtances there are in the firſt ages of *Chriſtianity*, of ſomething reſembling this miſconduct; where the intemperance of private zeal now and then gave the affront to the national religion. But who are they that ſo ſeverely cenſure this diſorder ‡? that raiſe ſuch tragic outcries againſt the factious ſpirit of primitive *Chriſtianity*?

"Why do I concern myſelf in ſpeculations about my ideas? What is it to me, for in-
"ſtance, to know what kind of idea I can form of ſpace? Divide a ſolid body, *etc.*" and ſo he goes on in Mr. Locke's own words: And leſt the reader ſhould not take the ſatire, a note at the bottom of the page informs us, that "theſe are the words of the particular "author cited." But the invidious Remark on this quotation ſurpaſſes all credit. *Thus the atomiſt, or* EPICUREAN.

* They alſo that have authority to teach, *etc.* are *public miniſters*." *Leviathan*, p. 124. London, 1651. 4to.

† Ἄρχουσιν ἡ ὀφειλομένη αἰδὼς, καὶ τιμὴ φυλασσομένη, κόσμον σώζει πόλιως, καὶ διατηρέει. Ant. Scrip. apud Stob. de rep. Serm. 41. p. 270. Figuri, 1559, fol. circa finem.

‡ "The liſt of Martyrs conſiſted, I believe, of thoſe who ſuffered for breaking the "Peace. The *primitive clergy* were, under pretence of Religion, a very Lawleſs Tribe." L. Bolingbroke, vol. iv. p. 434.

Who,

Who, Gentlemen, but Yourſelves! The very men who, out of ſpite and wantonneſs, daily perſiſt in doing what a miſguided devotion, now and then, though rarely, betrayed a martyr to commit *.

But would you read *Chriſtian* antiquity with equal minds, you would not want examples of a better conduct. For in general the Apologiſts for the *Chriſtian* faith obſerved a decency and moderation becoming the truth and importance of the cauſe they had to ſupport. We need only look into *Lactantius* for the modeſty of their conduct in this reſpect.

This eloquent Apologiſt, who wrote in an age which would have indulged greater liberties, giving in his *divine inſtitutions*, the laſt ſtroke to expiring paganiſm; where he confutes the *national Religion*, ſpares as much as poſſible the *Prieſts*; but in expoſing their *Philoſophy*, is not ſo tender of their *Sophiſts*: For theſe laſt having no public character, the State was not concerned to have them managed. Such, I ſay, was the general behaviour of the firſt *Chriſtians*.

Nor can you plead, in your excuſe, any other neceſſity, than that inſeparable from a weak cauſe, of committing this violence. The diſcovery of truth is ſo far from being advanced by it, that, on the contrary, it carries all the marks of deſign to retard the ſearch, when you ſo induſtriouſly draw off the reader's attention from the *Cauſe*, by diverting him at the expence of the *Advocate*.

It is true, that at what time the Clergy ſo far forgot the nature of their office, and of the cauſe they were appointed to defend, as to call in the ſecular arm to ſupport their arguments againſt wrong opinions, we ſaw, without much ſurpriſe or reſentment, You, Gentlemen, in like deluſion, that any means were lawful in ſup-

* In the LXth canon of the council of Eliberis, held about twenty years before the council of Nice, it is decreed, that they who were ſlain by the Gentiles for breaking down their idols, ſhould not be received by the church into the number of Martyrs, ſince neitheir the precepts of the Goſpel nor the practice of the Apoſtles gave any countenance to ſuch licentious behaviour.

port of truth, falling without ſcruple to affront the Public (then little diſpoſed to give you an equal hearing) by the abuſe of a Body, whoſe *private* intereſts the State had indiſcreetly eſpouſed. For where was the wonder, when Government had aſſumed too much, for thoſe who were oppreſſed by it, to allow it too little? You thought this a fair return; and your candid enemies confeſſed, that ſome indulgence was to be given to the paſſions of men, raiſed and enflamed by ſo unequal a treatment. But now, that the *State* hath withdrawn its power, and confined the Adminiſtration within its proper office; and that this *learned Body* hath publicly diſclaimed its aſſiſtance; it will ſurely be expected, that You, likewiſe, ſhould return to a better mind, and forſake a practice inſolently continued, without any reaſonable pretence of freſh provocation.

Your laſt abuſe, Gentlemen, of the liberty of the preſs, is a certain diſſolute habit of mind, regardleſs both of truth and falſhood, which you betray in all your attacks on Revelation. Who that had not heard of your ſolemn profeſſions *of the love of liberty, of truth, of virtue, of your aim at the honour of God, and good of men*, could ever believe you had any thing of this at heart, when they ſee that ſpirit of levity and diſſipation which runs through all your writings?

That you may not ſay I ſlander you, I will produce thoſe marks in your works, on which I have formed my accuſation of this illiberal temper.

1. The firſt is an unlimited buffoonry; which ſuffers no teſt or criterion to your ridicule, to ſhew us, when you are in jeſt, and when in earneſt.

2. An induſtrious affectation in keeping your true character out of ſight; and in conſtantly aſſuming ſome new and fictitious perſonage.

3. To ſupport your chicane, an unnatural mixture of the Sceptic and Dogmatiſt.

And here, Gentlemen, in illuſtrating theſe three circumſtances of your guilt, one might detect all your *arts of controverſy*, and eaſily reveal the whole myſtery of modern *Free-thinking*. But the

limits of this addreſs will only permit me in few words to deſcribe the general nature of each; in order to ſhew, how certain an indication they are of the turn of mind of which I accuſe you.

1. The illimited, UNDISTINGUISHABLE IRONY, which affords no inſight into the author's meaning, or ſo much room as to gueſs what he would be at, is our firſt note. This, which is your favourite figure of ſpeech, your noble Apologiſt owns to be "a dull "ſort of wit which amuſes all alike *." Nay, he even ventures to pronounce it "a groſs, immoral, and illiberal way of abuſe, foreign "to the character of a good writer, a gentleman, or man of worth †." What pity, if he ſhould chance to fall under his own cenſure! Yet this is certain, he hath ſo managed his *good humour*, that his admirers may always find a handle either to charge us with credulity, or want of charity, determine as we will of his *true* and *real* ſentiments. However, the noble writer hath not aggravated this folly, in the character he hath given of it: For, here forgetful of your own precepts, (your common-place topic againſt public inſtructors) while you preſcribe ridicule to be ſo managed, *as to ſhew it tends to a ſerious iſſue*; you practiſe it ſo indiſcriminately, as to make one believe you were all the time in jeſt. While you direct it *to unmaſk formal hypocriſy*, you ſuffer it to put ſober truth out of countenance; and while you claim its aid, *to find out what is to be laughed at in every thing*, you employ it to bring in every thing to be laughed at.

That a RESTRAINT on free inquiry, will force writers into this vicious manner, we readily allow. Under theſe circumſtances, ſuch a key to ridicule as juſt writing demands being unſafe; and the only way men have to eſcape perſecution being to cover and intrench themſelves in obſcurity; it is no wonder that *ridicule* ſhould degenerate into the *buffoonry which amuſes all alike*: As in *Italy*, which gave birth to this degenerate ſpecies of writing, it is the only way, in which the *poor crampt thinking wretches can diſcharge a free thought*.

* Charact. vol. i. tract ii. part i. § 2.

† Vol. iii. miſcel. iv. c. 2.

But

But in *Great Britain*, happily for Truth, and You, PHILOSOPHY is at her eaſe; and you may lead her ſafely back to Paganiſm, through all the ancient modes of doubting, objecting, and refuting.

It is difficult, therefore, to aſſign any other likely cauſe of this extravagance, than that vicious levity of ſpirit I have charged upon you. For as Man is formed by nature with an incredible appetite for Truth; ſo his ſtrongeſt pleaſure, in the enjoyment, ariſes from the actual communication of it to others. Without this, it would be a cold purchaſe, would abſtract, ideal, ſolitary Truth; and poorly repay the labour and fatigue of the purſuit. Amongſt the Ancients, who, you will allow, had high notions of this SOCIAL SENSE, it was a ſaying recorded by *Cicero* with approbation, "that "even heaven would be no happineſs, to him who had not ſome "companion or *ſocial Spirit* to ſhare with him in the pleaſure of "contemplating the great truths of nature there revealed unto him." "Si quis in cœlum aſcendiſſet, naturamque mundi, et pulchritudi-"nem ſiderum perſpexiſſet, inſuavem illam admirationem ei fore; "quæ jucundiſſima fuiſſet, ſi aliquem, cui narraret, habuiſſet*." *Seneca* goes yet further: "Nec me ulla res delectabit, licet ex-"imia ſit et ſalutaris, quam mihi uni ſciturus ſim. Si cum hac "exceptione detur ſapientia, ut illam incluſam teneam, nec enun-"ciem, rejiciam: nullius boni, ſine SOCIO, jucunda poſſeſſio eſt †." It was this paſſion which gave birth to writing, and brought literary compoſition to an art; whereby the Public was made a ſharer in thoſe important truths, which particulars had with ſo much toil excogitated for its uſe and entertainment. The principal object therefore of an author, while his paſſions are in their right ſtate, muſt needs be to deliver his ſentiments and opinions with all poſſible clearneſs; ſo that no particular caſt of compoſition, or turn of expreſſion, which he held conducive to the embelliſhment of his

* De Amicitia. Edit. Oxon. 4to, T. III. p. 349 et 50.

† Ep. vi.

work, be ſuffered to throw an ambiguity on his propoſitions, which might miſlead the reader in judging of his real ſentiments. To ſuch a one, nothing can be a greater mortification than to find that this his principal purpoſe was defeated.

But when, on the contrary, we ſee a writer, ſo far from diſcovering any thing of this care, that an air of negligence appears in every thing he delivers; a viſible contempt of his reader's ſatisfaction; to which he prefers a dull malicious pleaſure of miſguiding him in the obſcurity of an illimited ridicule; we cannot poſſibly avoid concluding that ſuch a one is far gone in this wretched depravity of heart.

2. Another mark, is Your perpetually aſſuming ſome PERSONATED CHARACTER, as the exigence of chicane requires. For the diſpute is to be kept on foot; and therefore, when in danger of coming to an iſſue, a new perſonage is to be aſſumed, that the trial of ſkill may be fought over again with different weapons. So that the modern Free-thinker, is a perfect *Proteus*. He is now a Diſſenter, or a Papiſt; now again a Jew, or a Mahometan; and, when cloſely preſſed and hunted through all the ſhapes, he at length ſtarts up in his genuine form, an INFIDEL confeſſed *.

Indeed where the Magiſtrate hath confined the liberty of free debate, to one or two Profeſſions of belief, There an unlicenced writer hath no way of publiſhing his ſpeculations, but under the cover of one of theſe authorized Sects. But to affect this practice when the neceſſity is over, is licentious and immoral. For the perſonated character, only arguing *ad hominem*, embroils, rather than directs us, in the ſearch of truth; has a natural tendency to promote ſcepticiſm; and if not this, yet it keeps the diſpute from ever coming to an iſſue; which is attended with great public inconveniencies. For though the diſcovery of ſpeculative truth be of much importance to the perfection of man's nature, yet the ſtudious lengthening out literary debates is pernicious to Society, as Societies

* Mr. Collins.

are

are generally formed. Therefore, though the good of mankind would ſet an honeſt man upon publiſhing what he ſuppoſes to be diſcoveries in truth; yet the ſame motive would oblige him to take the faireſt, and moſt direct road to their reception.

But I would not have it thought, by this, that I condemn the aſſuming a *perſonated character* on all occaſions whatſoever. There are ſeaſons when it is fair and expedient. When the diſpute is about the PRACTICAL application of ſome truth to the good of a particular ſociety; there it is prudent to take up a ſuitable character, and to argue *ad hominem*. For there, the end is a benefit to be gained for that ſociety; and it is not of ſo great moment on what principles the majority is prevailed upon to make the ſociety happy, as it is, that it ſhould ſpeedily become ſo. But in the diſcovery of ABSTRACT SPECULATIVE truth, the affair goes quite otherwiſe. The buſineſs here is *demonſtration*, not *perſuaſion*. And it is of the eſſence of truth, to be made appear and ſhine out only by its own luſtre.

A familiar example will ſupport this obſervation. Our great *Britiſh* philoſopher, writing for *religious liberty*, combats his *intolerant* adverſary, all the way, with his own Principles; well knowing that, in ſuch a time of prejudices, arguments built on received opinions would have greateſt weight, and make quickeſt impreſſion on the body of the People, whom it was his buſineſs to gain. But the method he employed in defending mere ſpeculative truth was very different. A Prelate of great name, was pleaſed to attack his *Eſſay concerning human underſtanding*; who, though conſummate in the learning of the Schools, yet happened at that time to apply his principles ſo very aukwardly, as gave our Philoſopher the moſt inviting opportunity of turning them againſt him. An advantage moſt to the taſte of him who contends only for victory: but he contended for truth; and was too wiſe to think of eſtabliſhing it on falſhood; and too honeſt to affect triumphing over Error by any thing but by its Oppoſite.

You ſee then, Gentlemen, you are not likely to eſcape by this diſtinction; the diſpute with you is about *ſpeculative truth:* Yourſelves

ſelves take care to give the world repeated information of it, as often as you think fit to feign an apprehenſion of the Magiſtrate's reſentment.

But of as little uſe as this method, of the *perſonated character*, is, in itſelf, to the juſt end of controverſy, you generally add a double ſhare of diſingenuity in conducting it. Common ſenſe, as well as Common honeſty, requires, that he who aſſumes a *perſonated character* ſhould fairly ſtick to it, for that turn, at leaſt. But we ſhall be greatly deceived, if we preſume on ſo much condeſcenſion: the late famous author of *The Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion*, took it into his head to perſonate a *Jew*, in the interpretation of ſome propheſies which he would perſuade us are not applicable to *Jeſus*. The learned Prelate, who undertook to anſwer him, having ſhewn that thoſe propheſies had no completion under the *Jewiſh* diſpenſation, concludes very pertinently, *that if they did not belong to* Jeſus, *they belong to no one*. What ſays our impoſtor *Jew* to this? One would be aſtoniſhed at his reply: *Suppoſe they do not*, ſays he, *I am not anſwerable for their completion*. What! not as a *Jew?* whoſe perſon he aſſumes, and whoſe argument he borrows: which argument is not founded on this, That the characters of completion, according to the *Chriſtian* ſcheme, do not coincide and quadrate; to which, indeed, the above anſwer would be pertinent; but on this, that there are complete characters of the completion of the propheſies, under the *Jewiſh* œconomy; and therefore, ſays the *Jew*, you are not to look for thoſe marks under the *Chriſtian*. The only reaſonable way then of replying to this argument, is to deny, that there are ſuch marks under the *Jewiſh* œconomy; which if the *Jew* cannot prove, his objection, founded on a *prior completion*, is intirely overthrown. Inſtead of this, we are put off with the cold buffoonry of, *I am not obliged to find a meaning for your propheſies*.

3. The third mark of this abandoned ſpirit, is that unnatural MIXTURE OF THE SCEPTIC AND DOGMATIST, which ſo monſtrouſly

ſtrouſly variegates your misſhapen works. I do not mean by it, that unreaſonable temper of mind, which diſtinguiſhes the whole claſs of Free-thinkers; and ſuffers you, at the ſame time that you affect much *ſcepticiſm* in rejecting Revelation, to *dogmatize* very poſitively on ſome favourite points of civil tradition. The noble author, your Apologiſt, could not forbear to ridicule his party for this foible *. "It muſt certainly, ſays he, be ſomething elſe than incredulity "which faſhions the taſte and judgment of many Gentlemen, "whom we hear cenſured as Atheiſts. Who, if they want a true "*Iſraelitiſh* faith, can make amends by a *Chineſe* or *Indian* one.— "Though *Chriſtian* miracles may not ſo well ſatisfy them, they "dwell with the higheſt contentment on the prodigies of *Mooriſh* "and *Pagan* countries."

This is ill enough; but the perverſity, I ſpeak of, is much worſe: and that is, when the ſame writer, on different occaſions, aſſumes the *Dogmatiſt* and *Sceptic* on the ſame queſtion; and ſo abuſes both Characters, in all the perverſity of ſelf-contradiction.

For inſtance, how common is it for one of Your writers, when he brings *Pagan* antiquity to contradict and diſcredit the *Jewiſh*, to cry up a Greek hiſtorian as an evidence, to which nothing can be objected? An imperfect hint from *Herodotus*, or *Diodorus*, though one lived a thouſand, and the other fifteen hundred years after the caſe in queſtion, picked up from any lying traveller the one met with in his rambles, or the other found in his collections, ſhall now outweigh the circumſtantial Hiſtory of *Moſes*, who wrote of his own People, and lived in the times he wrote of. But now turn the tables, and apply the teſtimony of theſe Writers, and of others of the beſt credit of the ſame nation, to the confirmation of the *Jewiſh hiſtory*, and then nothing is more uncertain and fallacious than claſſical Antiquity. All is darkneſs and confuſion: then we are ſure to hear of,

——Quicquid Græcia mendax
Audet in hiſtoria.——

* Characteriſtics, vol. i. p. 345. edit. 3.

Then

Then *Herodotus* is a lying traveller, and *Diodorus Siculus* a taſteleſs collector.

Again, when the choice and ſeparation of the *Iſraelites* for God's peculiar People, is to be brought in queſtion, and made ridiculous, they are repreſented as the vileſt, the moſt profligate, and perverſe race of men: then every indiſcreet paſſage of a *declamatory Divine* is raked up with care to make them odious; and even the hard fate of the great hiſtorian *Joſephus* pitied, that he had "no better a ſubject than ſuch an illiterate, barbarous, and ridiculous people*."

But when the Scripture-account of the treatment, which the Holy *Jeſus* met with from them, is thought fit to be diſputed; theſe *Jews* are become an humane and wiſe Nation; which never interfered with the teachings of ſects, or the propagation of opinions, but where the public ſafety was thought to be in danger by ſeditious doctrines.

But ſo it is, even with the BIBLE itſelf, and its beſt interpreter, HUMAN REASON. It is generally allowed that the Author of *the Diſcourſe of Free-thinking*, and of *the Grounds and Reaſons of the* Chriſtian *Religion*, was one and the ſame perſon. Now it being to this man's purpoſe in the firſt pamphlet, to blaſt the credit of the book in general, as a *rule of faith*, the Bible is repreſented as a moſt obſcure, dark, incomprehenſible collection of multifarious tracts. But in his diſcourſe of *The Grounds*, etc. where † he is to obviate the reaſon of the difficulty in explaining ancient Propheſies, drawn from the genius of the Eaſtern ſtyle, ſentiment, and manners; this very book is, on a ſudden, become ſo eaſy, plain, and intelligible, that no one can poſſibly miſtake its meaning.

Again, the ſame Writer, where, in his *Eſſay concerning the Uſe of Reaſon*, he thinks fit to diſcredit the doctrine of the ever bleſſed Trinity, and other myſteries of the *Chriſtian Faith*, repreſents hu-

* Diſcourſe of Free-thinking, p. 157.

† Diſcourſe of Free-thinking, p. 68. and of the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion, p. 81, 82.

man

man reaſon as omniſcient, and the full meaſure of all things: but when the proof of the *immateriality of the ſoul*, from the qualities of MATTER and SPIRIT, is to be obſtinately oppoſed, the ſcene is ſhifted, and we are preſented with a new face of things: then Reaſon becomes weak, ſtaggering, and impotent: then we know not but one quality may be another quality; one mode, another mode; Motion may be conſciouſneſs; and Matter ſentient *.

Theſe, Gentlemen, are the ſeveral ways in which you have abuſed the LIBERTY OF THE PRESS. One might defy you, with all your good will or invention, to contrive a new one, or to go further in the old; You have done your worſt. It is time to think of growing better. This is the only inference I would draw from your bad conduct. For I am not one of thoſe who ſay you ſhould be disfranchiſed of the Rights you have ſo wantonly and wickedly abuſed. *Natural* rights were leſs precariouſly beſtowed: the *Civil*, indeed, are frequently given on the condition of the Receiver's good behaviour. And this difference, in the ſecurity of the poſſeſſion, is founded in the plaineſt reaſon. *Natural* rights are ſo neceſſary to our Being, that, without them, Life becomes miſerable; but the *Civil* only contributing to our eaſier accommodation, in ſome circumſtances of it, may be forfeited without injury to our common Nature.

In a word then, all that we deſire is your amendment; without any ſiniſter aim of calling upon the Magiſtrate to quicken your pace. So I leave you, as I dare ſay will *He*, to yourſelves. Nor let any good man be above meaſure ſcandalized at your faults; or more impatient for your reformation, than mere charity demands. I do not know what panic the preſent growth of Infidelity may have thrown ſome of us into: I, for my part, confide ſo much in the goodneſs of our Cauſe, that I too could be tempted to *laugh* in my turn, while I think of an old ſtory told us by *Herodotus* †, of

* See his Anſwers to Dr. Clarke.

† Lib. ii. c. 14. Vid. Plutarch. Symp. l. iv. Prob. 5. The learned Gale cannot be reconciled to this kind of huſbandry. He is therefore for having the word ἄρουρα, uſed by *Herodotus*,

of your favourite EGYPTIANS; of whom you are like to hear a great deal in the following work. With this tale I ſhall beg leave to conclude my long addreſs unto you.

He tells us then, that at what time their Deity, the NILE, returns into his ancient channel; and the huſbandman hath committed the *good ſeed* to the opening glebe, it was their cuſtom to turn in whole droves of SWINE; to range, to trample, root up, and deſtroy at pleaſure. And now nothing appeared but deſolation, while the ravages of the obſcene herd had killed every chearful hope of future plenty. When on the iſſue, it was ſeen, that all their perverſity and dirty taſte had effected, was only this; that the SEED took better root, incorporated more kindly with the ſoil, and at length ſhot up in a more luxuriant and abundant harveſt.

I am,

GENTLEMEN, *etc.*

rodotus, not to ſignify *ſwine*, but *cows* or *heifers*. His authority for this uſe of the word is *Heſychius*. But *Plutarch* is a much better for the other ſignification, who in his *Symp.* quoted above, ſpeaking to the queſtion Πότερον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι σεβόμενοι τὴν ὗν, *etc.* mentions this very circumſtance of tillage from *Herodotus*, and underſtands by ὗς *ſwine*. The truth of the matter ſeems to be this, *Heſychius* found that ὗς, in ſome obſcure province or other, meant a *Heifer*, as κάπρος amongſt the *Tyrrhenians*, we are told, meant a *goat*, and ſo put it down to inrich his dictionary with an unuſual ſignification.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT

TO THE

DEDICATION

TO

THE FREE-THINKERS,

IN THE EDITION OF 1766.

A POET and a Critic *, of equal eminence, have concurred, though they did not ſtart together, to cenſure what was occaſionally ſaid in this *Dedication* (as if it had been addreſſed to them) *of the uſe and abuſe of Ridicule*. The Poet was a follower of Lord Shafteſbury's fancies; the Critic a follower of his own. Both Men of TASTE, and equally anxious for the well doing of RIDICULE. I have given ſome account of the latter in a note of the *Dedication* †. The other was too full of the ſubject, and of himſelf, to be diſpatched with ſo little ceremony: he muſt therefore undergo an examination apart.

Since it is (ſays he) *beyond all contradiction evident, that we have a* natural ſenſe or feeling *of the ridiculous, and ſince ſo good a Reaſon may be aſſigned to juſtify the ſupreme Being for beſtowing it*; ONE CANNOT WITHOUT ASTONISHMENT *reflect on the conduct of thoſe Men who imagine it for the ſervice of true Religion to vilify and blacken it* WITHOUT DISTINCTION, *and endeavour to perſuade us, that it is never applied but in a bad cauſe* ‡. The Reaſon here given, to ſhew, that

* See Pleaſures of Imagination, and Elements of Criticiſm.

† Page xvii.

‡ Pleaſures of Imagination, p. 105, 106.

Ridicule and *Buffoonry* may be properly employed on ſerious and even ſacred ſubjects, is admirable: it is becauſe we have *a natural ſenſe or feeling of the ridiculous*, and becauſe *no ſenſation was given us in vain*; which would ſerve juſt as well to excuſe *Adultery* or *Inceſt*. For have we not as *natural a ſenſe or feeling* of the *voluptuous*? Yes, he will ſay, but this *ſenſe* has its proper object, *virtuous love*, not *adulterous* or *inceſtuous*: And does he think, I will not ſay the ſame of his *ſenſe of the ridiculous*? Its proper objects are, not weighty and Sacred matters, but the civil cuſtoms and common occurrences of life. For he ſtretched a point when he told the Reader, I *vilified and blackened it without diſtinction*. The thing I there oppoſed, was *the abuſive way of art and raillery on religious Subjects*. With as little regard to Truth did he ſay, that *I endeavoured to perſuade the Public, that it is never applied but in a bad cauſe*: For, in that very place, I apologized for an eminent writer who had applied it in a *good* one.

Ridicule (ſays he) *is not* [i. e. ought not to be] *concerned with mere ſpeculative Truth and Falſhood*. Certainly. And, for that very reaſon I would exclude it from thoſe Subjects. What need? he will ſay, for when was it ſo employed? When, does he aſk? —When his Maſter ridiculed the *Subject* of Mr. Locke's ESSAY OF HUMAN UNDERSTANDING, in the manner there mentioned. When the ſame noble perſon ridiculed REVELATION, in the merry Story of the travelling Gentlemen, who put *a wrong bias on their Reaſon* in order to believe right *.——

He goes on, *It is not in abſtract Propoſitions on Theorems, but in Actions and Paſſions, Good and Evil, Beauty and Deformity, that we find Materials for it; and all theſe Terms are relative, implying Approbation or Blame.* The reaſon here given, why, not *abſtract Propoſitions*, &c. but *Actions and Paſſions*, &c. are the ſubject of *ridicule* is, becauſe theſe latter are *relative Terms implying Approbation and Blame.* But are not the former as much *relative Terms, im-*

* Charact. vol. III. Miſc. 2. c. 3. p. 99.

plying Aſſent and Denial? And does not an abſurd Propoſition as frequently afford materials for Ridicule as an abſurd Action? Let the Reader determine by what he finds before him.—*To aſk then,* (ſays he) *whether Ridicule be a Teſt of truth, is, in other words, to aſk whether that which is ridiculous can be morally true; can be juſt and becoming: or whether that which is juſt and becoming can be ridiculous. A queſtion that does not deſerve a ſerious anſwer.* However, in civility to his Maſter, or rather indeed to his Maſter's Maſters, the ancient *Sophiſts*, who, we are told * in the *Characteriſtics*, ſaid ſomething very like it, I ſhall give it a *ſerious anſwer.* For how, I pray, comes it to paſs, that to aſk, *whether ridicule be a teſt of truth, is the ſame thing as to aſk whether that which is ridiculous can be morally true?* As if, whatever thing the *teſt of Ridicule* was applied to, muſt needs be *ridiculous.* Might not one aſk, *Whether the Copel* † *be a teſt of gold,* without incurring any abſurdity in queſtioning, Whether the matter to which the Copel is applied be ſtandard gold. But he takes a *teſt of truth* and a *detection of error* to be one and the ſame thing; and that nothing is brought to *this teſt* but what was known beforehand, whether it was *true* or *falſe.* His Maſter ſeems much better verſed in the uſe of things ‡. *Now, what rule or meaſure* (ſays he) *is there in the world, except in conſidering the real temper of things, to find which are truly ſerious, and which ridiculous? And how can this be done, unleſs by applying the ridicule* TO SEE WHETHER IT WILL BEAR?

But if the Reader be curious to ſee to the bottom of this affair, he muſt go a little deeper. Lord Shafteſbury, we find, was willing to know, as every honeſt man would, Whether thoſe things, which had the appearance of ſerioufneſs and ſanctity, were indeed what they appeared. The way of coming to this knowledge had been hitherto by the *teſt of reaſon.* But this was too dull and tedious a road for this lively genius. He would go a ſhorter and a

* It was a ſaying of an ancient ſage, "that humour was the only teſt of ridicule." Vol. I. p. 74.

† *Copella*, It. in Engliſh, a *teſt*. ‡ Charact. vol. I. p. 12.

pleaſanter

pleaſanter way to work, and do the buſineſs by *ridicule*; given us, as his Diſciple tells us, *to aid the tardy ſteps of reaſon.* This the noble Author would needs *apply*, to ſee *whether the appearances would bear the Touch.* Now it was this ingenious expedient, to which I thought I had cauſe to object. For when he had applied this *Touch*, and that that, to which it was applied, was found to endure it, what reparation could he make to Truth, for thus placing her in a ridiculous and idle light, in order only, as he pretended, to judge rightly of her? Oh, for that, ſaid his Lordſhip, ſhe has the amends in her own hands: Let her railley again; *for why ſhould fair Honeſty be denied the uſe of his Weapon* *?* To this ſo wanton a liberty with ſacred Truth, I thought I had many good reaſons to oppoſe; and ſo, it ſeems, thought our Poet likewiſe: Or why did he endeavour to excuſe his Maſter, by putting another ſenſe on *the application of ridicule as a Teſt*, which implies that the Truth or Falſhood of the thing tried, is *already known.* But the ſhift is unlucky; for while it covers his Maſter, it expoſes himſelf. For now it may be aſked, what need of ridicule at all, after the Truth is *known*; ſince the ſole uſe of a *teſt*, according to his Maſter, conſiſts in enabling us to *diſcover* the true ſtate of things?

But now he comes to the *Philoſophy* of his Criticiſm on my abſurdity. FOR *it is moſt evident* (ſays he) *that as in a metaphyſical Propoſition offered to the Underſtanding for its aſſent, the faculty of Reaſon examines the terms of the Propoſition; and finding one Idea, which was ſuppoſed equal to another, to be in fact unequal, of conſequence rejects the Propoſition as a falſhood: So in Objects offered to the Mind for its eſteem or applauſe, the faculty of ridicule feeling an incongruity in the claim, urges the Mind to reject it with laughter and contempt.* And now, how does this ſublime account, of Reaſon and Ridicule, prove the foregoing Propoſition to be abſurd? Juſt as much, I ſuppoſe, as the height of St. Paul's proves GRANTHAM Steeple to ſtand awry.

* Charact. vol. I. p. 128.

However,

However, if it cannot *prove* what precedes, he will try to make it *infer* what follows: *When* THEREFORE (says he) *we obſerve ſuch a claim obtruded upon Mankind, and the inconſiſtent circumſtances carefully concealed from the eye of the Public, it is our buſineſs, if the matter be of importance to Society, to drag out thoſe latent circumſtances, and, by ſetting them full in view, convince the World how ridiculous the Claim is; and thus a double advantage is gained; for we both detect the moral Falſhood ſooner than in the way of ſpeculative enquiry, and impreſs the minds of Men with a ſtronger ſenſe of the vanity and error of its Authors. And this, and no more, is meant by the application of Ridicule.* A little *more*, if we may believe his Maſter: who ſays, it is not only to *detect Error*, but to *try Truth*, that is, in his own expreſſion, to ſee *whether it will bear*. But why all this a-do? for now, we ſee, nobody miſtook what was *meant by the application of Ridicule*, but himſelf.—As to what he ſaid before, that when *Objects are offered to the Mind for its eſteem and applauſe, the faculty of Ridicule, feeling an incongruity in the Claim, urges the Mind to reject it with laughter and contempt*; it is ſo expreſſed, as if he intended it not for the deſcription of the *Uſe*, but the *eſſence of Ridicule*. But the dealers in this Traſh frequently *urge the Mind to reject* many things with *laughter and contempt*, without *feeling* any other *incongruity*, than in their own pretenſions to Truth and Honeſty. And this, our Poet ſeems to be no ſtranger to.

For now he comes to the point.—*But it is ſaid the practice is dangerous, and may be inconſiſtent with the regard we owe to Objects of real dignity and excellence. I anſwer, the practice,* FAIRLY MANAGED, *can never be dangerous.* Who ever thought any thing FAIRLY MANAGED to be dangerous? The danger is in the *abuſe* or *unfair management*. The uſe of Stilleto's and Poiſons, FAIRLY MANAGED, can never be dangerous. And yet this has not hindered all wiſe States, whenever they have found a violent propenſity to the handling of theſe things, to forbid their promiſcuous uſe, under the ſevereſt penalties, to prevent abuſe and *unfair management*.

However,

However, he allows at length, that *Men may be diſhoneſt in obtruding circumſtances foreign to the Object*; *and we may be inadvertent in allowing thoſe circumſtances to impoſe upon us*; *but*——but what? Why *the* SENSE OF RIDICULE ALWAYS JUDGES RIGHT. And, he had told us before, that this is a *natural ſenſe, and beſtowed upon us by the ſupreme Being, to aid our tardy ſteps in purſuit of Reaſon.* Why, as he ſays, who can withſtand this? Nothing can be clearer! Writers may be diſhoneſt; Readers may be miſled; and, the Public judge wrong. But what then, the *ſenſe of Ridicule always judges right*. And while we can ſupport our *Platonic Republic* of *Ideas*, it ſignifies little what becomes of the People, the *Fæces Romuli*. And ſo again it is in the uſe of Poiſons: *Men may be diſhoneſt in obtruding them*; *and we inadvertent enough* to be *impoſed upon*. But what then? The Virtue of Poiſon always does its kind. *It is a natural power, and beſtowed upon it by the ſupreme Being, to aid our tardy ſteps in purſuit of Vermin.*—In truth, one would imagine, by this extraordinary argument, that the queſtion was not *of the injury to Society* by the abuſe of Ridicule, but *of the injury to Ridicule itſelf*.

But let us hear him out: *The* Socrates *of* Ariſtophanes *is* (it will be ſaid) *as truly a ridiculous character as ever was drawn. True*; *but it is not the character of* Socrates, *the divine Moraliſt, and Father of ancient Wiſdom*. Indeed!—But then, if, like the true *Soſia*, in the other Comedy, *he* muſt bear the blows of his fictitious Brother, what reparation is there to injured Virtue, to tell us, that he did not deſerve them?

Again,—*What then? Did the ridicule of the Poet hinder the Philoſopher from detecting and diſclaiming thoſe foreign circumſtances which he had falſely introduced into his character, and thus rendering the Satiriſt doubly ridiculous in his turn?* See here again! all his concern, we find, is, leſt good Raillery ſhould be beat at its own weapons. No, indeed, I cannot ſee how it could poſſibly *hinder the Philoſopher from detecting and diſclaiming*. But *this* it did, which ſurely deſerves

deſerves a little conſideration, it hindered the *People* from *ſeeing* what he had *detected and diſclaimed*——A mighty conſolation, truly, to the illuſtrious Sufferer, that he *diſclaimed* the Fool's Coat they had put upon him!

But what is the Sacrifice of a SOCRATES now and then to ſecure to us the *free* uſe of that ineſtimable bleſſing, BUFFOONRY? So thinks our Poet; when all the Anſwer he gives to ſo natural, ſo compaſſionate an objection as this,—*it nevertheleſs had an ill influence on the minds of the People*,—is telling us a ſtory of the Atheiſt Spinoza; while the godlike Socrates is left deſerted, in the hands of his Judges; whither RIDICULE, this noble guide of Truth, had ſafely brought him.

But let us hear the concluding anſwer which the *reſpectable* Spinoza is employed to illuſtrate.——*And ſo* (ſays he) *has the reaſoning of* Spinoza *made many Atheiſts; he has founded it indeed on Suppoſitions utterly falſe; but allow him theſe, and his Concluſions are unavoidably true. And if we muſt reject the uſe of* Ridicule *becauſe, by the impoſition of falſe circumſtances, things may be made to ſeem ridiculous, which are not ſo in themſelves, Why we ought not in the ſame manner to reject the uſe of* Reaſon, *becauſe, by proceeding on falſe Principles, concluſions will appear true which are impoſſible in Nature, let the* vehement and obſtinate Declaimers *againſt Ridicule determine.*

Nay, we dare truſt it with any one; whoſe common ſenſe is not all run to *Taſte*. What! becauſe REASON, the guide of Life, the ſupport of Religion, the inveſtigator of Truth, muſt be ſtill uſed though it be continually ſubject to abuſe; therefore RIDICULE, the paultry buffoon Mimic of REASON, muſt have the ſame indulgence! becauſe a KING muſt be intruſted with Government, though he may miſuſe his power; therefore the King's FOOL ſhall be ſuffered to play the Madman! But upon what footing ſtandeth this extraordinary Claim? Why, we have a *natural ſenſe of the Ridiculous*; and the *Ridiculous has a natural feeling of the Incongruous*; and then——who can forbear LAUGHING? If to this, you add *Taſte*, *Beauty*, *Deformity*, *Moral-ſenſe*, *Moral-rectitude*,

Moral-falſhood; you have then, I think, the whole Theory of the RIDICULOUS. But who would have imagined, that while he was defending Ridicule from the charge of ABUSE, he ſhould be adding freſh exceptions to his own Plea? Not indeed, that the comment diſgraced the Text; or that there was much *Incongruity* in pleading for a fault he was juſt then committing. But ſo it is, that, where he is poetically marſhalling the follies of human Life, he places the whole *body of the Chriſtian Clergy* in the foremoſt rank. Amongſt ſuch, who, he tells us, *aſſume ſome deſirable quality or poſſeſſion which evidently does not belong to them* *.

"Others, of graver Mien, behold; adorn'd
"With holy Enſigns, how *ſublime* they move,
"And, bending oft their *ſanctimonious* Eyes,
"Take homage of the *Simple-minded Throng*,
"AMBASSADORS OF HEAV'N †."

——But let it go for what it is; A poor joke of his Maſter's ‡, and ſpoil'd too in the telling. The *dulneſs* of the *Ridicule* will ſufficiently atone for the *abuſe* of it.

* Page 49. † Page 96. ‡ Charact. Vol. III. p. 336.

PREFACE

PREFACE

TO

THE FIRST EDITION IN MDCCXXXVIII.

THE following ſheets make the *firſt volume* of a work, deſigned to prove the DIVINE ORIGIN OF THE JEWISH RELIGION. As the author was neither indebted, nor engaged to the Public, he hath done his Readers no injury in not giving them more; and had they not had *this*, neither he nor they, perhaps, had eſteemed themſelves loſers. For writing for no Party, it is likely he will pleaſe none; and begging no Protection, it is more likely he will find none: and he muſt have more of the confidence of a modern Writer than falls to his ſhare, to think of making much way with the feeble effort of his own reaſon.

Writers, indeed, have been oft betrayed into ſtrange abſurd concluſions, from I can't tell what obſolete claim, which LETTERS have to the patronage of the GREAT: a relation, if indeed there ever were any, long ſince worn out and forgotten; the *Great* now ſeeming reaſonably well convinced, that it had never any better foundation than the rhetorical importunity of Beggars.

But however this claim of Patronage may be underſtood, there is another of a more important nature; which is the Patronage of RELIGION. The Author begs leave to aſſure Thoſe who have no time to ſpare from their attention on the Public, that the Protection

of Religion is indiſpenſably neceſſary to all Governments; and for his warrant he offers them the following volume; which endeavours to ſhew the neceſſity of RELIGION in general, and of the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE in particular, to civil Society, from the nature of things and the univerſal conſent of Mankind. The proving this, I make no queſtion, many Politicians will eſteem ſufficient: But thoſe who are ſolicitous to have Religion TRUE as well as USEFUL, the author will endeavour to ſatisfy in the following volumes.

THE

THE DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES DEMONSTRATED.

BOOK I.

SECT. I.

THE Writers, in defence of revealed Religion, diſtinguiſh their arguments into two ſorts: the one they call the INTERNAL, and the other the EXTERNAL Evidence. Of theſe, the firſt is, in its nature, more ſimple and perfect; and even capable of demonſtration: while the other, made up of very diſſimilar materials, and borrowing aid from without, muſt needs have ſome parts of unequal ſtrength with the reſt; and, conſequently, lie open to the attacks of a willing adverſary. Beſides, the *internal* evidence is, by its nature, perpetuated; and ſo fitted for all ages and occaſions: while the *external*, by length of time, weakens and decays. For the nature and genius of the religion defended affording the proofs of the firſt kind, theſe materials of defence are inſeparable from its exiſtence; and ſo throughout all ages the ſame. But Time

may,

may, and doth, efface memorials independent of that exiſtence; out of which the *external* evidence is compoſed: which evidence muſt therefore become more and more imperfect, without being affected by that whimſical and partial calculation, to which a certain *Scotchman* * would ſubject it †. Nay, of ſuch uſe is the *internal* evidence, that, even the very beſt of the *external* cannot ſupport itſelf without it: for when (for inſtance) the ſupernatural facts done by the founders of our holy faith, are unqueſtionably verified by human teſtimony, the evidence of their divinity will not follow till the nature of that doctrine be examined, for whoſe eſtabliſhment they were performed. Indeed, in the inſtance here given, they muſt be inforced in conjunction before any concluſion can be drawn for the truth of the Revelation in queſtion. But were there no other benefit ariſing from the cultivation of the *internal* evidence than the gaining, by it, a more perfect knowledge of God's word; this, ſure, would be enough to engage us in a vigorous proſecution of it. That this is one of its fruits I need not tell ſuch as are acquainted with its nature. And it is not without occaſion I take notice of this advantage: for who, in this long controverſy between us and the Deiſts, hath not applied to certain advocates of Revelation, what was formerly ſaid of *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*, *that they undertook the defence of Chriſtianity before they underſtood it?* A misfortune which

* Craig, Theologiæ Chriſt. Principia Mathematica, London, 1699, 4to.

† This gradual weakening of the *external evidence* hath in fact actually happened; and was occaſioned by the loſs of ſeveral ancient teſtimonies, both Pagan and Chriſtian, for the truth of Revelation; which learned men, on ſeveral occaſions, have frequently lamented. This is the only way, I ſuppoſe, the *external evidence* can weaken.—As it is of the nature of *true Religion* to ſuffer by time, ſo it is of the nature of the *falſe* to gain by it. "L'Antiquité convient à la Religion (ſays the learned Preſident *de Monteſquieu*) "parce que ſouvent nous croyons plus les choſes à meſure qu'elles ſont plus reculées; "car nous n'avons pas dans la tête des idées acceſſoires tirées de ces temps-la, qui puiſ- "ſent les contradire." *L'Eſprit des Loix*, lib. xxvi. c. 2. For whatever Religion, thus circumſtanced, the Writer had then in his thoughts, he muſt needs ſuppoſe it to be a falſe one; it being nonſenſe to ſuppoſe the true ſhould ever be attended with any *external evidence* which argued it of falſehood.

probably,

probably, the more careful ſtudy of the *internal* evidence would have prevented; becauſe no one, well verſed in *that*, could have continued ignorant of ſo important a principle, as that THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION IS OF THE VERY ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY. Notwithſtanding theſe ſuperior advantages, it hath ſo happened, that the *internal* evidence hath been hitherto uſed as an introduction only to the *external*: and while by the *latter*, men have proved our Religion actually divine, they have gone no further with the *former*, than to ſhew it worthy indeed of ſuch original.

What may have occaſioned this neglect, is not ſo eaſy to ſay. Perhaps it was becauſe Writers have, in general, imagined that the difficulties of proſecuting the *internal* method to effect, are not ſo eaſily ſurmounted as thoſe which attend the other; as ſuppoſing that the Writer on the *external* evidence hath only need of the uſual proviſion of church-hiſtory, common diligence, and judgement, to become maſter of his ſubject; while the reaſoner on the *internal* proof, muſt, beſides theſe, have a thorough knowledge of human Nature, civil Policy, the univerſal hiſtory of Mankind, an exact idea of the *Moſaic* and *Chriſtian* Diſpenſations cleared from the froth and grounds of ſchool-ſubtilties, and church-ſyſtems; and, above all, ſhould be bleſſed with a certain ſagacity, to inveſtigate the relations of human actions, through all the combinations of natural, civil, and moral complexities. What may ſuggeſt this concluſion is, their reflecting, that, in the *external* evidence, each circumſtance, that makes for the truth of revealed Religion, is ſeen to do ſo, as ſoon as known: ſo that the chief labour, here, is to ſearch and pick out ſuch, and to place them in their proper light and ſituation; but that, in proſecuting the *internal* evidence, the caſe is widely different: a circumſtance in the frame and compoſition of this Religion, which perhaps, ſome time or other, may be diſcovered to be a Demonſtration of its divinity, ſhall be ſo far from being generally thought aſſiſtant in its proof, that it ſhall be eſteemed, by moſt, a prejudice againſt it: of which, I ſuppoſe, the ſubject of the following diſcourſe will afford a remarkable example.

And

And no wonder, that a Religion of divine original, conſtituted to ſerve many admirable ends of Providence, ſhould be full of ſuch complicated myſteries, as filled the learned Apoſtle with aſtoniſhment. On the other hand, this Religion being for the uſe of man, we need not deſpair, when we have attained a proper knowledge of man's nature, and the dependencies thereon, of making ſtill growing diſcoveries, on the *internal* evidence, of the divinity of its original.

Now, though all this may be true; and that, conſequently, it would appear a childiſh arrogance in an ordinary writer, after having ſeen the difficulties attending this method, to hope to overcome them, by the qualities here ſaid to be required; yet no modeſt ſearcher after truth need be diſcouraged. For there are, in revealed Religion, beſides thoſe interior marks of truth, above deſcribed, which require the delicate operation of a great Genius and Maſter-workman to bring out and poliſh, others alſo, no leſs illuſtrious, but more univocal marks of truth, which God hath been pleaſed to impreſs upon his Diſpenſations; which require no great qualities, but humility, and love of truth, in him, who would from thence attempt *to vindicate the ways of God to man.*

The Subject of this Diſcourſe is one of thoſe illuſtrious marks: from which, the diſcoverer claims no merit from any long, learned, or laborious ſearch. It is honour enough for him that he is the firſt who brings it out to obſervation; if he be indeed the firſt. For the demonſtration is ſo ſtrong and beautiful, and, at the ſame time, appears to be ſo eaſy and ſimple, that one cannot tell whether the pleaſure of the diſcovery, or the wonder that it is now to make, be the greater.

The Medium, I employ, is the Omiſſion of the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, in the laws and religion *Moſes* delivered to the *Jewiſh* people. By this, I pretend to carry the *internal* evidence much further than uſual; even to the height of which it is capable, moral demonſtration.

Why

Why I chuſe to begin with the defence of *Moſes*, is from obſerving a notion to have ſpread very much of late, even amongſt many who would be thought *Chriſtians*, that the truth of Chriſtianity is independent of the *jewiſh* Diſpenſation: a notion, which was, 'till now, peculiar to the *Socinians*; who go ſo far as to maintain *, *that the knowledge of the Old Teſtament is not abſolutely neceſſary for Chriſtians*: and, thoſe who profeſs to think more ſoberly, are generally gone into an opinion that the truth of the *jewiſh* Religion is impoſſible to be proved but upon the truth of the *Chriſtian*. As to the firſt ſort of people, if they really imagine Chriſtianity hath no dependence on Judaiſm, they deſerve our compaſſion, as being plainly ignorant of the very elements of the Religion they profeſs; however ſuitable the opinion may be to a modern faſhionable notion, not borrowed from, but the ſame with, the *Socinian*, that *Chriſtianity is only the republication of the religion of Nature*. As for the more ſober, it is reaſonable to think, that they fell into the miſtake from a view of difficulties, in the *jewiſh* Diſpenſation, which they judged too ſtubborn to be removed. I may pretend then to their thanks, if I ſucceed, by coming ſo ſeaſonably to their relief; and freeing their reaſonings from a vicious circle, which would firſt prove the *chriſtian* by the *jewiſh*; and then the *jewiſh*, by the *chriſtian* Religion.

Why I chuſe this medium, namely, *the omiſſion of a future ſtate in the jewiſh Diſpenſation*, to prove its divine original, is, *Firſt*, for the ſake of the DEISTS: being enabled hereby to ſhew them, 1. That this very circumſtance of *Omiſſion*, which they pretend to be ſuch an imperfection, as makes the Diſpenſation unworthy the Author to whom we aſcribe it, is, in truth, a Demonſtration that God only could give it. 2. That thoſe ſeveral important paſſages of Scripture, which they charge with obſcurity, injuſtice, and contradiction, are, indeed, full of light, equity, and concord. 3. That their high notions of the antiquity of the Religion and Learning

* Cuper, adverſ. Tract. Theol. Polit. lib. i.

of the *Ægyptians*, which they inceſſantly produce, as their *palmary argument*, to confront and overturn the hiſtory of *Moſes*, do, in an invincible manner, confirm and ſupport it.

Secondly, For the ſake of the JEWS; who will, at the ſame time, be ſhewn, that the nature of the THEOCRACY here delivered, and the OMISSION of the doctrine of a future ſtate in that Diſpenſation, evidently obliges them to look for a more perfect revelation of God's Will.

Thirdly, For the ſake of the SOCINIANS; who will find, that *Chriſtianity* agrees neither with itſelf, nor with *Judaiſm*; neither with the Diſpenſations of God, nor the declared purpoſe of his Son's Miſſion, on their principle, of its being only a *republication of the religion of Nature*.

In this Demonſtration, therefore, which we ſuppoſe very little ſhort of mathematical certainty, and to which nothing but a mere phyſical poſſibility of the contrary can be oppoſed, we demand only this ſingle *Poſtulatum*, that hath all the clearneſs of ſelf-evidence; namely,

"That a ſkilful Lawgiver, eſtabliſhing a Religion, and civil Po-
"licy, acts with certain views, and for certain ends; and not
"capriciouſly, or without purpoſe or deſign."

This being granted, we erect our Demonſtration on theſe three very clear and ſimple propoſitions:

1. "THAT TO INCULCATE THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF
"REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, IS NECESSARY TO THE WELL
"BEING OF CIVIL SOCIETY.

2. "THAT ALL MANKIND, ESPECIALLY THE MOST WISE AND
"LEARNED NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY, HAVE CONCURRED IN
"BELIEVING AND TEACHING, THAT THIS DOCTRINE WAS OF
"SUCH USE TO CIVIL SOCIETY.

"3. THAT

3. "THAT THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND "PUNISHMENTS IS NOT TO BE FOUND IN, NOR DID MAKE "PART OF, THE MOSIAC DISPENSATION."

Propoſitions ſo clear and evident, that, one would think, we might directly proceed to our Concluſion,

THAT THEREFORE THE LAW OF MOSES IS OF DIVINE ORIGINAL.

Which, one or both of the two following SYLLOGISMS will evince.

I. Whatſoever Religion and Society have no future ſtate for their ſupport, muſt be ſupported by an extraordinary Providence.
The *Jewiſh* Religion and Society had no future ſtate for their ſupport:
Therefore, the *Jewiſh* Religion and Society were ſupported by an extraordinary Providence.

And again,

II. The ancient Lawgivers univerſally believed that ſuch a Religion could be ſupported only by an extraordinary Providence.
MOSES, an ancient Lawgiver, verſed in all the wiſdom of *Egypt*, purpoſely inſtituted ſuch a Religion.
Therefore, *Moſes* believed his Religion was ſupported by an extraordinary Providence.

But ſo capricious are men's paſſions, now for PARADOX, and now for SYSTEM, that theſe, with all their evidence, have need of a very particular defence; Libertines and Unbelievers denying the MAJOR propoſitions of both theſe *Syllogiſms*; and many Bigots amongſt Believers, the MINOR of the firſt. Theſe paſſions, however different with regard to the objects that excite them, and to the ſubjects in which they are found, have this in common, that they never riſe but on the ruins of Reaſon. The buſineſs of the Religioniſt being to eſtabliſh, if his Underſtanding be too much narrowed,

rowed, he contracts himself into *System*: and that of the Infidel, to overturn; if his Will be depraved, he, as naturally, runs out into *Paradoxes*. Slavish, or licentious thinking, the two extremes of free enquiry, shuts them up from all instructive views, or makes them fly out beyond all reasonable limits. And as extremes fall easily into one another, we sometimes see the opposite writers change hands: the Infidel, to shew something like coherence in his *paradoxes*, represents them as the several parts of a *system*; and the Religionist, to give a relish to his *system*, powders it with *paradoxes*: in which arts, two late *Hibernians* *, the heroes of their several parties, were very notably practised and distinguished.

It was not long then before I found, that the discovery of this important truth would ingage me in a full dilucidation of the *Premisses* of the two *Syllogisms*: the *Major* of both requiring a severe search into the civil Policy, Religion, and Philosophy of ancient times; and the *Minor*, a detailed account of the nature and genius of the *jewish* Dispensation. The present volume is destined to the first part of this labour; and the following, to the second. Where, in removing the objections which lie in our way, on both sides, we shall be obliged to stretch the inquiry high and wide. But this, always, with an eye to the direction of our great master of reason †, *to endeavour, throughout the body of this discourse, that every former part may give strength unto all that follow, and every latter bring some light unto all before.*

SECT. II.

THE first proposition, THAT TO INCULCATE THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS IS NECESSARY TO THE WELL BEING OF CIVIL SOCIETY, I shall endea-

* See the discourse called Nazarenus—An Epistolary Discourse concerning the Immortality of the Soul.——Dissertationes Cyprianicæ, &c.

† Hooker.

vour to prove, from the nature of man, and the genius of civil ſociety.

The general appetite of ſelf-preſervation being moſt indiſpenſable to every animal, nature hath made it the ſtrongeſt of all. And though, in the rational, this faculty alone might be ſuppoſed ſufficient to anſwer the end, for which that appetite is beſtowed on the others, yet, the better to ſecure that end, nature hath given man, likewiſe, a very conſiderable ſhare of the ſame inſtinct, with which ſhe hath endowed brutes ſo admirably to provide for their preſervation. Now whether it was ſome *plaſtic Nature* that was here in fault, which *Bacon* ſays, *knows not how to keep a mean* *, or, that it was all owing to the perverſe uſe of human liberty, certain it is, that, borne away with the luſt of gratifying this appetite, man, in a ſtate of nature, ſoon ran into very violent exceſſes; and never thought he had ſufficiently provided for his own being, till he had deprived his fellows of the free enjoyment of theirs. Hence, all thoſe evils of mutual violence, rapine, and ſlaughter, which, in a ſtate of nature, where all are equal, muſt needs be abundant. Becauſe, though man, in this ſtate, was not without a law, which exacted puniſhment on evil doers, yet, the adminiſtration of that law not being in common hands, but either in the perſon offended, who being a party would be apt to inforce the puniſhment to exceſs; or elſe in the hands of every one, as the offence was againſt all, and affected the good of each not immediately or directly, would be executed remiſſly. And very often, where both theſe executors of the law of nature were diſpoſed, the one to be impartial, and the other not remiſs in the adminiſtration of juſtice, they would yet want ſufficient power to enforce it. Which together would ſo much inflame the evils above mentioned, that they would ſoon become as general, and as intolerable, as the *Hobbeiſt* repreſents them in that ſtate to be, were it not for the reſtraining principle of RELIGION, which kept men from running into the confuſion neceſ-

* Modum tenere neſcia eſt. Augm. Scient.

ſarily conſequent on the principle of inordinate ſelf-love. But yet Religion could not operate with ſufficient efficacy, for want, as we obſerved before, of a common Arbiter, who had impartiality fairly to apply the rule of right, and power to enforce its operations. So that theſe two PRINCIPLES were in endleſs jar; in which, Juſtice generally came by the worſt. It was therefore found neceſſary to call in the CIVIL MAGISTRATE as the Ally of *Religion*, to turn the balance.

Jura inventa metu injuſti, fateare neceſſe eſt,
Tempora ſi faſtoſque velis evolvere mundi.

Thus was *Society* invented for a remedy againſt injuſtice; and a *Magiſtrate*, by mutual conſent, appointed, to give a ſanction "to that common meaſure, to which, reaſon teaches us, that "creatures of the ſame rank and ſpecies, promiſcuouſly born to "the ſame advantages of nature and to the uſe of the ſame fa-"culties, have all an equal right *." Where it is to be obſerved, that though ſociety provides for all thoſe conveniences and accommodations of a more elegant life, which man muſt have been content to have lived without, in a ſtate of nature; yet it is more than probable that theſe were never thought of when Society was firſt eſtabliſhed †; but that they were the mutual violences and injuſtices, at length become intolerable, which ſet men upon contriving this generous remedy: Becauſe Evil felt hath a much ſtronger influence on the mind than Good imagined; and the means of removing the one is much eaſier diſcovered, than the way to procure the other. And this, by the wiſe diſpoſition of the Creator; the avoiding pain being

* Locke.

† Though the judicious Hooker thinks thoſe advantages were principally intended, when man firſt entered into ſociety: *this was the cauſe*, ſays he, *of mens uniting themſelves at firſt into politique ſocieties*. Eccl. Pol. l. i. § 10. pag. 25. l. 1. His maſter Ariſtotle, though extremely conciſe, ſeems to hint, that this was but the ſecondary end of civil ſociety, and that That was the firſt, which we make to be ſo. His words are: γινομένη μὲν ἕνεκεν τοῦ ζῆν ἔστιν, οὖσα δὲ τοῦ εὖ ζῆν. Pol. lib. i. cap. 2. p. 396. B. Tom. III. Paris. 1639. fol.

being neceſſary to our nature; not ſo, the procuring pleaſure. Beſides, the idea of thoſe unexperienced conveniencies would be, at beſt, very obſcure: and how unable men would be, before trial, to judge that Society would beſtow them, we may gueſs by obſerving, how little, even now, the generality of men, who enjoy theſe bleſſings, know or reflect that they are owing to ſociety, or how it procures them; becauſe it doth it neither immediately nor directly. But they would have a very lively ſenſe of evils felt; and could ſee that Society was the remedy, becauſe the very definition of the word would teach them how it becomes ſo. Yet becauſe *civil Society* ſo greatly improves human life, this improvement may be called, and not unaptly, the *ſecondary end* of that Convention. Thus, as *Ariſtotle* accurately obſerves in the words below, that which was at firſt conſtituted for the ſake of *living*, is carried on for the ſake of *happy living*.

This is further ſeen from fact. For we find thoſe ſavage nations *, which happen to live peaceably out of ſociety, have never once entertained a thought of coming into it, though they perceive all the advantages of that improved condition, in their civilized neighbours, round about them.

Civil Society thus eſtabliſhed, from this time, as the poet ſings,

abſiſtere bello
Oppida cæperunt munire, & ponere leges,
Ne quis fur eſſet, neu latro, neu quis adulter.

But as before bare RELIGION was no preſervative againſt moral diſorders: ſo now, SOCIETY alone, would be equally unable to prevent them.

I. 1. For *firſt*, its laws can have no further efficacy than to reſtrain men from open tranſgreſſion; while what is done amiſs in

* See § V. iv. 2. where it is ſhewn, how it might happen that men, in a ſtate of nature, might live together in peace: though we have there given the reaſons why they very rarely do.

private,

private, though equally tending to the public hurt, eſcapes their animadverſion; and man, ſince his entering into Society, would have greatly improved his practice in this ſecret way of miſchief. For now an effectual ſecurity being provided againſt *open violence*, and the inordinate principle of ſelf-love being ſtill the ſame, *ſecret craft* was the art to be improved; and the guards of Society inviting men to a careleſs ſecurity, what advantages this would afford to thoſe hidden miſchiefs which civil laws could not cenſure, is eaſy to conceive.

2. But, *ſecondly*, the influence of civil Laws cannot, in all caſes, be extended even thus far, namely, to reſtrain *open* tranſgreſſion. It cannot *then*, when the ſevere prohibition of one irregularity threatens the bringing on a greater: and this will always be the caſe when the irregularity is owing to the violence of the ſenſual appetites. Hence it hath come to paſs, that no great and opulent Community could ever puniſh *fornication*, in ſuch a ſort as its ill influence on Society was confeſſed to deſerve: becauſe it was always found, that a ſevere reſtraint of this, opened the way to more flagitious luſts.

3. The very attention of civil Laws to their principal object occaſions a further inefficacy in their operations. To underſtand this we muſt conſider, that the care of the State is for the WHOLE, under which *individuals* are conſidered but in the ſecond place, as acceſſaries only to that *whole*; the conſequence of which is, that, for the ſake of the Aggregate, individuals are ſometimes left neglected; which happens when *general*, rather than *particular* views ingroſs the public attention. Now the care of *Religion* is for PARTICULARS; and a *Whole* has but the ſecond place in its concern. But this is only touched upon to ſhew, in paſſing, the natural remedy for the defects here explained.

4. But this was not all, there was a further inefficacy in human Laws: the Legiſlature, in enquiring into the mutual duties of Citizens, ariſing from their equality of condition, found thoſe duties

to be of two kinds: the firſt, they intituled the duties of PERFECT OBLIGATION; becauſe civil Laws could readily, and commodiouſly, and were, of neceſſity, required to enforce their obſervance. The other they called the duties of IMPERFECT OBLIGATION; not, that morality does not as ſtrongly exact them, but becauſe, civil Laws could not conveniently take notice of them; and, that they were ſuppoſed not ſo immediately and vitally to affect the being of Society. Of this latter kind are *gratitude*, *hoſpitality*, *charity*, &c. Concerning ſuch, civil Laws, for theſe reaſons, are generally ſilent. And yet, though it may be true, that theſe duties, which human Laws thus overlook, may not ſo directly affect Society, it is very certain, that their violation brings on as fatal, though not ſo ſwift deſtruction, as that of the duties of *perfect obligation*. A very competent judge, and who alſo ſpeaks the ſentiment of Antiquity in this matter, hath not ſcrupled to ſay: "Ut "ſcias per ſe expetendam eſſe *grati animi adfectionem*, per ſe fu- "gienda res eſt *ingratum* eſſe: quoniam nihil æque concordiam hu- "mani generis diſſociat ac diſtrahit quam hoc vitium *."

5. But ſtill further, beſides theſe duties both of *perfect* and *imperfect* obligation, for the encouraging and enforcing of which civil Society was invented; Society itſelf begot and produced *a new ſet of duties*, which are, to ſpeak in the mode of the Legiſlature, of *imperfect obligation*: the firſt and principal of which is that antiquated forgotten virtue called the LOVE OF OUR COUNTRY.

6. But *laſtly*, Society not only introduced a new ſet of duties, but likewiſe increaſed and inflamed, to an infinite degree, thoſe inordinate appetites, for whoſe correction it was invented and introduced: like ſome kind of powerful medicines, which, at the very time they are working a cure, heighten the malignity of the diſeaſe. For our wants increaſe, in proportion as the arts of life advance. But in proportion to our wants, ſo is our uneaſineſs;—to our uneaſineſs, ſo our endeavours to remove it—to our endeavours, ſo the weakneſs of *human reſtraint*. Hence it is evident, that in

* Seneca de Benef. lib. iv. cap. 18.

a STATE OF NATURE, where little is conſulted but the ſupport of our being, our wants muſt be few, and our appetites, in proportion, weak; and that in CIVIL SOCIETY, where the arts of life are cultivated, our wants muſt be many, and our appetites, in proportion, ſtrong.

II. Thus far concerning the imperfection of civil Society, with regard to the adminiſtration of that power which it hath, namely of *puniſhing* Tranſgreſſors. We ſhall next conſider its much greater imperfection with regard to that power which it wanteth; namely of *rewarding* the Obedient.

The two great ſanctions of all Law and Command are REWARD and PUNISHMENT. Theſe are generally called the two hinges, on which all kinds of Government turn. And ſo far is certain, and apparent to the common ſenſe of mankind, that whatever laws are not enforced by both theſe ſanctions, will never be obſerved in any degree ſufficient to carry on the ends of civil Society.

Yet, I ſhall now ſhew, from the original conſtitution and nature of this Society, that it neither had, nor could enforce, the SANCTION OF REWARD.

But, to avoid miſtakes, I deſire it may be obſerved, that by *reward*, muſt needs here be meant, *ſuch as is conferred on every one for obeying the laws of his country*; not ſuch as is beſtowed on particulars, for any eminent ſervice: as by *puniſhment* we underſtand *that which is inflicted on every one for tranſgreſſing the laws*; not *that* which is impoſed on particulars, for neglecting to do all the ſervice in their power.

I make no doubt but this will be called a paradox; nothing being more common in the mouths of politicians*, than *that the ſanctions of reward and puniſhment are the two pillars of civil government*; and all the modern *Utopias* and ancient ſyſtems of ſpeculative po-

* Neque ſolum ut Solonis dictum uſurpem, qui & ſapientiſſimus fuit ex ſeptem, & legum ſcriptor ſolus ex ſeptem. Is *rempublicam duabus rebus contineri dixit, præmio & pœnâ.* Cic. ad Brutum, Ep. 15. Edit. Oxon. 4to. T. IX. p. 85, 86.

litics

litics derive the whole vigour of their laws from theſe two ſources. In ſupport then of my aſſertion, permit me to inforce the two following propoſitions:

I. That, by the *original conſtitution* of civil Government, the ſanction of rewards *was not* eſtabliſhed by it.

II. That by the very *nature* of civil Government they *could not* be eſtabliſhed.

I. The truth of the firſt propoſition appears from hence. On entering into Society, it was ſtipulated, between the Magiſtrate and People, that *protection* and *obedience* ſhould be the reciprocal conditions of each other. When, therefore, a citizen obeys the laws, that debt on Society is diſcharged by the protection it affordeth him. But in reſpect to diſobedience, the proceeding is not analogous; (though protection, as the condition of obedience, implies the withdrawing of it, for diſobedience;) and for theſe reaſons: The effect of withdrawing protection muſt be either expulſion from the Society, or the expoſing the offender to all kind of licence, from others, in it. Society could not practiſe the firſt, without bringing the body politic into a conſumption; nor the latter without throwing it into convulſions. Beſides, the firſt is no puniſhment at all, but by accident; it being only the leaving one Society to enter into another: and the ſecond is a very inadequate puniſhment; for though all obedience be the ſame, and ſo, *uniform protection* a proper return for it; yet diſobedience being of various kinds and degrees, the withdrawing protection, in this latter ſenſe, would be too great a puniſhment for ſome crimes, and too ſmall for others.

This being the caſe, it was ſtipulated that the tranſgreſſor ſhould be ſubject to pecuniary mulcts, corporal infliction, mutilation of members, and capital ſeverities. Hence aroſe the Sanction, and the *only ſanction* of civil Laws: for, that protection is no reward, in the ſenſe which theſe are puniſhments, is plain from hence, that the one is of the eſſence of Society itſelf; the other an occaſional adjunct. But this will further appear by conſidering the oppoſite to protection, which is *expulſion*, or baniſhment; for this is the

natural conſequence of withdrawing protection. Now this, as we ſaid, is no puniſhment but by accident: and ſo the State underſtood it; as we may collect, even from their manner of employing it *as a puniſhment* on offenders: for baniſhment is of univerſal uſe, with other puniſhments, in all ſocieties. Now where withdrawing protection is inflicted as a puniſhment, the practice of all States hath been to retain their right to obedience from the baniſhed member; though, according to the nature of the thing, conſidered alone, that right be really diſcharged; obedience and protection, as we obſerved, being reciprocal. But it was neceſſary all ſtates ſhould act in this manner when they inflicted exile as a puniſhment, it being no puniſhment but by accident, when the claim to ſubjection was remitted with it. They had a *right* to act thus; becauſe it was inflicted on an *offender*; who by his very offence had forfeited all claim of advantage from that *reciprocal condition.*

II. The ſecond propoſition is, that by the nature of civil government, *the ſanction of rewards could not be enforced by it*: My reaſon is, becauſe Society could neither diſtinguiſh the objects of its favour; nor reward them, though they were diſtinguiſhed.

I. Firſt, *Society could not diſtinguiſh the objects of its favour.* To inflict puniſhment, there is no need of knowing the *motives* of the offender; but judicially to confer reward on the obedient, there is.

All that civil judicatures do in puniſhing is to find whether the act was *wilfully* commited. They enquire not into the intention or motives any further, or otherwiſe than as they are the marks of *a voluntary act:* and having found it ſo, they concern themſelves no more with the man's motives or principles of acting; but puniſh, without ſcruple, in confidence of the offender's demerit. And this with very good reaſon; becauſe no one of a ſound mind, can be ignorant of the principal offences againſt right, or of the malignity of thoſe offences, but by ſome ſottiſh negligence which hath hindered his information; or ſome brutal paſſion which hath prejudiced

judiced his judgment; both which are highly faulty, and deserve civil punishment.

It is otherwise in rewarding abstinence from trangression. Here the motive must be considered; because as *merely doing ill*, i. e. without any *particular* bad motive, deserves punishment, a crime in the case of wrong judgment being ever necessarily inferred; so *merely abstaining from ill*, i. e. without any *particular* good motive, cannot, for that very reason, have any merit.

In *judicially rewarding*, therefore, the *motives* must be known, but human judicatures cannot know them but by accident: it is only that tribunal, which searches the heart, that can penetrate thus far. We conclude, therefore, *that reward cannot, properly, be the sanction of human laws.*

If it should be said, that though rewards cannot be equitably administred, as punishments may, yet, nothing hinders but that, for the good of Society, all who observe the laws should be rewarded, as all who transgress the laws are punished? The answer will lead us to the proof of the second part of this proposition.

2. That *Society could not* reward, *though it should* discover *the objects of its favour*; the reason is, because no Society can ever find a fund sufficient for that purpose, without raising it on the people as a tax, to pay it back to them as a reward.

But the universal practice of Society confirms this reasoning, and is explained by it; the sanction of *punishments* only having, in all ages and places, been employed to secure the observance of civil laws. This was so remarkable a fact, that it could not escape the notice of a certain admirable Wit and studious observer of men and manners; who speaks of it as an universal defect: *Although we usually* (says he) *call reward and punishment the two hinges, upon which all government turns, yet I could never observe this maxim to be put in practice by any nation except that of* Lilliput *. Thus he introduceth an account of the laws and customs of an *Utopian* Constitution

* Gulliver's Travels, vol. i. p. 97.

tution of his own framing; and, for that matter, as good, perhaps, as any of the reſt: and, had he intended it as a ſatire againſt ſuch chimerical Commonwealths, nothing could have been more juſt. For all theſe political romancers, from *Plato* to this Author, make civil rewards and puniſhments *the two hinges of government.*

I have often wondered what it was, that could lead them from fact, and univerſal practice, in ſo fundamental a point. But without doubt it was this: The deſign of ſuch ſort of writings is to give a perfect pattern of civil Government; and to ſupply the fancied defects in real Societies. The end of government coming firſt under conſideration; and the general practice of Society ſeeming to declare this end to be only, what in truth it is, *ſecurity to our temporal liberty and property*; the ſimplicity of it diſpleaſed, and the plan appeared defective. They imagined, that, by enlarging the bottom, they ſhould ennoble the ſtructure; and, therefore, formed a romantic project of making civil Society ſerve for all the good purpoſes it was even accidentally capable of producing. And thus, inſtead of giving us a true picture of civil Government, they jumbled together all ſorts of Societies into one; and confounded the *religious*, the *literary*, the *mercantile*, the *convivial*, with the CIVIL. Whoever reads them carefully, if indeed they be worth reading carefully, will find that the errors they abound in are all of this nature; and that they ariſe from the loſing, or never having had, a true idea of the ſimple plan of civil Government: a circumſtance which, as we have ſhewn elſewhere *, hath occaſioned many wrong judgments concerning it. No wonder, then, that this miſtake concerning the *end* of civil Society, drew after it others, concerning the *means*; and this, amongſt the reſt, that *reward was one of the ſanctions of human laws.*

On the whole then, it appears, that civil Society hath not, in itſelf, the *Sanction of rewards*, to ſecure the obſervance of its laws. So true, in this ſenſe likewiſe, is the obſervation of St. *Paul*, that

* See The Alliance between Church and State.

THE

THE LAW WAS NOT MADE FOR THE RIGHTEOUS, BUT FOR THE UNRULY AND DISOBEDIENT.

But it being evident, that the joint ſanctions of rewards and puniſhments are but juſt ſufficient to ſecure the tolerable obſervance of Right (the miſtaken opinion, that theſe are the two hinges of government, ariſing from that evidence) it follows, that, AS RELIGION ONLY CAN SUPPLY THE SANCTION OF REWARDS, WHICH SOCIETY NEEDS, AND HATH NOT; RELIGION IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Thus, on the whole we ſee, I. That Society, by its own proper power, cannot provide for the obſervance of above one third part of moral duties; and of that third, but imperfectly. We ſee likewiſe, how, by the peculiar influence of its nature, it enlarges the duty of the Citizen, at the ſame time that it leſſens his natural ability to perform it.

II. We ſee, which is a thing of far greater conſequence, that Society totally wants one of thoſe two ſanctions which are owned by all to be the neceſſary hinges on which government turns, and without which it cannot be ſupported.

To ſupply theſe wants and imperfections, ſome other coactive power muſt be added, (which hath its influence on the mind of man) to keep ſociety from running back into confuſion. But there is no other than the power of RELIGION; which, teaching an over-ruling Providence, the Rewarder of good men, and the Puniſher of ill, can oblige to the duties of *imperfect obligation*, which human laws overlook: and teaching alſo, that this Providence is omniſcient, that it ſees the moſt ſecret actions and intentions of men, and hath given laws for the perfecting their nature, will oblige to thoſe duties of *perfect obligation*, which human laws cannot reach, or ſufficiently enforce.

Thus have we explained in general the mutual aid, *religion* and *civil policy* lend to one another: not unlike that which two Allies, in the ſame quarrel, may reciprocally receive againſt a com-

common enemy: While one party is closely pressed, the other comes up to its relief; disengages the first; gives it time to rally and repair its force: By this time the assisting party is pushed in its turn, and needs the aid of that which it relieved; which is now at hand to repay the obligation. From henceforth the two parties act in conjunction, and, by that means, keep the common enemy at a stand.

Having thus proved the service of Religion in general, to Society; and shewn after what manner it is performed, we are enabled to proceed to the proof of the proposition in question: For by what hath been said, it appears that Religion doth this service solely, *as it teacheth a Providence, the rewarder of good men, and the punisher of evil:* so that although it were possible, as I think it is not *, that there could be such a thing as a Religion not founded on the doctrine of a Providence; yet, it is evident, such a Religion would be of no manner of use to Society. Whatsoever therefore is necessary for the support of this doctrine is mediately necessary for the well-being of Society. Now the doctrine of A FUTURE STATE of rewards and punishments is absolutely and indispensably necessary for the support of the general doctrine of providence, under its present dispensations in this life; as we shall now shew.

Religion establishing a Providence, the rewarder of virtue, and the punisher of vice, men naturally expect to find the constant and univocal marks of such an administration. But the history of mankind, nay even of every one's own neighbourhood, would soon inform the most indiligent observer, that the affairs of men wear a face of great irregularity: the scene, that ever and anon presents itself, being of distressed virtue, and prosperous wickedness; which unavoidably brings the embarrassed Religionist to the necessity of giving up his belief, or finding out the solution of these untoward

* St. Paul supposes there can no more be a Religion without a Providence, than without a God: *He that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.* Hebr. xi. 6.

appearances.

appearances. His firſt reflexion might perhaps be with the poet *:

omnia rebar
Conſilio firmata Dei; qui lege moveri
Sidera, qui fruges diverſo tempore naſci,——
Sed cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
Adſpicerem, lætoſque diu florere nocentes,
Vexarique pios, rurſus LABEFACTA CADEBAT
RELIGIO.

But, on ſecond thoughts, Reaſon, that, from the admirable frame and harmony of the material univerſe, taught him that there muſt needs be a ſuperintending Providence, to influence that order which all its parts preſerve, for the ſake of the Whole, in their continued revolutions, would ſoon inſtruct him in the abſurdity of ſuppoſing, that the ſame care did not extend to Man, a creature of a far nobler nature than the moſt conſiderable of inanimate beings. And therefore human affairs not being diſpenſed, at preſent, agreeably to that ſuperintendence, he muſt conclude, that Man ſhall exiſt after death, and be brought to a future reckoning in another life, where all accounts will be ſet even, and all the preſent obſcurities and perplexities in the ways of Providenceu nfolded and explained. From hence Religion acquires reſiſtleſs force and ſplendor; and riſes on a ſolid and unſhaken baſis †.

* Claud.

† Hear an unexceptionable evidence to this whole matter: Et quidem (ſays the free-thinking Lord Herbert) præmium bonis, & ſupplicium malis, vel hac invita, vel poſt hanc vitam dari, ſtatuebant Gentiles.—Nihil mage congruum naturæ divinæ eſſe docuerant, tum philoſophorum, tum theologorum Gentilium præcipuorum ſcholæ, quam ut bona bonis, mala malis remetiretur Deus. Cæterum quum id quoque cernerent, quemadmodum viri boni calamitatibus miſeriiſque oppreſſi heic jacerent; mali improbique e contra lautitiis omnibus affluerent; certiſſimis ex juſtitia bonitateque divina argumentis deductis, bonis poſt hanc vitam præmium condignum, malis pœnam dari credebant: SECUS ENIM SI ESSET, NULLAM NEQUE JUSTITIÆ NEQUE BONITATIS DIVINÆ RATIONEM CONSTARE POSSE. *De religione Gentilium*, cap. *Præmium vel pœna*.

Now this doctrine of a FUTURE STATE being the only ſupport of Religion under the preſent and ordinary diſpenſations of providence, we conclude (which was what we had to prove) that the *inculcating this* doctrine *is* NECESSARY *to the well-being of Society.*

That it was the general ſentiment of mankind, we ſhall ſee hereafter; where it will be ſhewn, that there never was, in any time or place, a civilized People (the *jewiſh* only excepted) who did not found their Religion on this doctrine, as being conſcious it could not be ſuſtained without it. And as for the neceſſity of Religion itſelf to Society, the very enemies of all Religion are the loudeſt to confeſs it: For, from this apparent truth, the Atheiſt of old formed his famous argument againſt the divine origin of Religion; which makes ſo great a figure in the common ſyſtems of infidelity. Here then, even on our adverſary's confeſſion, we might reſt our cauſe; but that we find (ſo inconſtant and perverſe is irreligion) ſome modern Apologiſts for Atheiſm have abandoned the ſyſtem of their predeceſſors, and choſen rather to give up an argument againſt the divine original of religion, than acknowledge the civil uſe of it; which with much frankneſs and confidence they have adventured to deny.

Theſe therefore having endeavoured to cut away the very ground we ſtand upon, in proof of our propoſition, it will be proper to examine their pretenſions.

SECT. III.

THE three great Advocates for this paradox are commonly reckoned POMPONATIUS, CARDAN, and BAYLE; who are put together, without diſtinction: whereas nothing is more certain than that, although *Cardan* and *Bayle* indeed defended it, *Pomponatius* was of a very different opinion: but *Bayle* had entered him into this ſervice; and ſo great is *Bayle's* authority, that nobody perceived the

the deluſion. It will be but juſtice then to give *Pomponatius* a fair hearing, and let him ſpeak for himſelf.

This learned *Italian*, a famous Peripatetic of the fifteenth century, wrote a treatiſe * to prove that, on the principles of *Ariſtotle*, it could not be proved that the ſoul was immortal: But the doctrine of the mortality of the ſoul being generally thought to have very pernicious conſequences, he conceived it lay upon him to ſay ſomething to that objection. In his xiiith chapter, therefore, he enumerates thoſe conſequences; and in the xivth, gives diſtinct anſwers to each of them. That which ſuppoſeth his doctrine to affect ſociety, is expreſſed in theſe words: "*Obj.* 2. In the ſecond place, "a man perſuaded of the mortality of the ſoul ought in no caſe, "even in the moſt urgent, to prefer death to life: And ſo, forti-"tude, which teaches us to deſpiſe death, and, when our coun-"try, or the public good requires, even to chuſe it, would be no "more. Nor on ſuch principles ſhould we hazard life for a friend: "on the contrary, we ſhould commit any wickedneſs rather than "undergo the loſs of it: which is contrary to what *Ariſtotle* teacheth "in his Ethics †." His reply to this, in the following chapter, is that *virtue requires we ſhould die for our country or our friends; and that virtue is never ſo perfect as when it brings no dower with it:* But then he ſubjoins, "Philoſophers, and the learned, only know

* De Immortalitate Animæ, printed in 12mo, An. 1534. It is of him chiefly that the celebrated Melchior Canus ſeems to ſpeak, in the following words: "Audivimus Italos "quoſdam, qui ſuis & *Ariſtoteli* & Averroï tantum temporis dant, quantum ſacris literis "ii, qui maximè ſacra doctrina delectantur; tantum vero fidei, quantum Apoſtolis & "Evangeliſtis ii qui maximè ſunt in Chriſti doctrinam religioſi. Ex quo nata ſunt in "Italia peſtifera illa dogmata *de mortalitate animi*, & divina circa res humanas *improvi-*"*dentia*, ſi verum eſt quod dicitur." *Opera*, l. x. c. 5. p. 446. *Colon.* 1605, 8vo.

† Secundò, quia ſtante animi humani mortalitate, homo in nullo caſu, quantumcunque urgentiſſimo, deberet eligere mortem: & ſic removeretur fortitudo, quæ præcipit contemnere mortem, & quod pro patria & bono publico debemus mortem eligere: neque pro amico deberemus exponere animam noſtram; imo quodcunque ſcelus & nefas perpetrare magis quam mortem ſubire: quod eſt contra Ariſt. 3 Ethic. & 9 ejuſdem. P. 99.

" what pleaſures the practice of virtue can procure; and what mi-
" ſery attends ignorance and vice:—but men not underſtanding the
" excellence of virtue, and deformity of vice, would commit any
" wickedneſs rather than ſubmit to death: To bridle therefore their
" unruly appetites, they were taught to be influenced by hope of
" reward, and fear of puniſhment *."—This is enough to ſhew what *Pomponatius* thought of the neceſſity of Religion to the State. He gives up ſo much of the objection as urges the ill conſequence of the doctrine of the mortality to mankind in general; but in ſo doing hath not betrayed the cauſe he undertook: which was to prove that the belief of the mortality of the ſoul would have no ill influence on the practice of a learned Peripatetic: he pretends not that it would have no evil influence on the groſs body of mankind to the prejudice of Society. This appears from the nature and deſign of the treatiſe; written entirely on peripatetic principles, to explain a point in that philoſophy: by the force of which explanation, whoever was perſuaded of the mortality of the ſoul, muſt give his aſſent on thoſe principles; principles only fitted to influence learned men. It was his buſineſs therefore to examine, what effects this belief would have on ſuch, and on ſuch only. And this, it muſt be owned, he hath done with dexterity enough. But that this belief would be moſt pernicious to the body of mankind in general, he confeſſes with all ingenuity. And as his own words are the fulleſt proof that he thought with the reſt of the world, concerning the influence of Religion, and particularly of the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, on Society, I ſhall beg leave to tranſcribe them at large. " There are
" ſome men of ſo ingenuous and well framed a nature, that they

* Soli enim philoſophi & ſtudioſi, ut dicit—Ariſt. 6 Ethic. ſciunt quantam delectationem generent virtutes, & quantam miſeriam ignorantia & vitia.—Sed quod homines non cognoſcentes excellentiam virtutis & fœditatem vitii, omne ſcelus perpetrarent, priuſquam mori: quare ad refrænandum diras hominum cupiditates, data eſt ſpes præmii & timor punitionis. P. 119.

" are

" are brought to the practice of virtue from the ſole conſideration " of its dignity; and are kept from vice on the bare proſpect of its " baſeneſs: but ſuch excellent perſons are very rare. Others there " are of a ſomewhat leſs heroic turn of mind; and theſe, beſides " the dignity of virtue, and the baſeneſs of vice, are worked upon " by fame and honours, by infamy and diſgrace, to ſhun evil and " perſevere in good: Theſe are of the ſecond claſs of men. Others " again are kept in order by the hope of ſome real benefit, or the " dread of corporal puniſhment; wherefore that ſuch may follow " virtue, the Politician hath contrived to allure them by dignities, " poſſeſſions, and things of the like nature; inflicting mulcts, de- " gradations, mutilations, and capital puniſhments, to deter them " from wickedneſs. There are yet others of ſo intractable and " perverſe a ſpirit, that nothing even of this can move them, as " daily experience ſhews; for theſe, therefore, it was, that the " Politician invented *the doctrine of a future ſtate*; where eternal re- " wards are reſerved for the virtuous, and eternal puniſhments, " which have the more powerful influence of the two, for the " wicked. For the greater part of thoſe who live well, do ſo, " rather for fear of the puniſhment, than out of appetite to the " reward: for miſery is better known to man, than that immea- " ſurable good which Religion promiſeth: And therefore as this " laſt contrivance may be directed to promote the welfare of men " of all conditions and degrees, the Legiſlator, intent on public " good, and ſeeing a general propenſity to evil, eſtabliſhed the " doctrine of the IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL. Little ſolicitous for " *truth*, in all this, but intent only on *utility*, that he might draw " mankind to virtue. Nor is he to be blamed: for as the phyſician " deceives his patient in order to reſtore his health, ſo the lawgiver " invents apologues to form the manners of his people. Indeed " were all of that noble turn of mind with thoſe enumerated under " the firſt claſs, then would they all, even on the ſuppoſition of " the ſoul's mortality, exactly perform their mutual duties to one " another.

" another. *But as there are, upon the matter, none of this diſpoſition,* " he muſt, of neceſſity, have recourſe to arts *, more fitted to the " general diſpoſition."

After all this, it is ſurprizing that Mr. *Bayle* ſhould ſo far miſtake this book, as to imagine the author argues in it *againſt the uſefulneſs of religion to ſociety:* eſpecially, when we conſider that Mr. *Bayle* appears to have examined the book ſo nearly as to be able to confute a common error concerning it, namely, *that it was wrote to prove the mortality of the ſoul:* Whereas he ſhews, that it was wrote only to prove, that, on the principles of *Ariſtotle*, neither that, nor the contrary, could be demonſtrated. But let us hear him; " That which *Pomponatius* hath replied to the reaſoning " borrowed from hence, that the doctrine of the mortality of the " ſoul would invite men to all ſort of crimes, deſerves to be con-

* Aliqui ſunt homines ingenui, & bene inſtitutæ naturæ, adeo quod ad virtutem inducuntur ex ſola virtutis nobilitate, & a vitio retrahuntur ex ſola ejus fœditate: & hi optimè diſpoſiti ſunt, licet perpauci ſunt. Aliqui vero ſunt minus bene diſpoſiti; & hi præter nobilitatem virtutis, & fœditatem vitii, ex præmiis, laudibus, & honoribus; ex pœnis, vituperiis, & infamia, ſtudioſa operantur, & vitia fugiunt: & hi in ſecundo grádu ſunt. Aliqui vero propter ſpem alicujus boni, & timore pœnæ corporalis ſtudioſi efficiuntur: quare, ut tales virtutem conſequantur, ſtatuunt politici vel aurum, vel dignitatem, vel aliquid tale; ut vitia vero fugiant, ſtatuunt vel in pecunia, vel in honore, vel in corpore, ſeu mutilando membrum, ſeu occidendo puniri. Quidam vero ex ferocitate & perverſitate naturæ, nullo horum moventur, ut quotidiana docet experientia; ideo poſuerunt virtuoſis in alia vita præmia æterna, vitioſis vero æterna damna, quæ maxime terrerent: majorque pars hominum, ſi bonum operatur, magis ex metu æterni damni quam ſpe æterni boni operatur bonum, cum damna ſunt magis nobis cognita, quam illa bona æterna: & quoniam hoc ultimum ingenium omnibus hominibus poteſt prodeſſe, cujuſcunque gradus ſint, reſpiciens legiſlator pronitatem viarum ad malum, intendens communi bono, ſanxit animam eſſe immortalem, non curans de veritate, ſed tantum de probitate, ut inducat homines ad virtutem. Neque accuſandus eſt politicus: ſicut namque medicus multa fingit, ut ægro ſanitatem reſtituat; ſic politicus apologos format, ut cives rectificet.—S omnes homines eſſent in illo primo gradu enumerato, ſtante etiam animorum mortalitate, ſtudioſi fierent; ſed quaſi nulli ſunt illius diſpoſitionis; quare aliis ingeniis incedere neceſſe fuit.—Pag. 123, 124, 125.

" ſidere.]

"ſidered *." And then he produces thoſe arguments of *Pomponatius*, which we have given above, *of the natural excellence of virtue, and deformity of vice; that happineſs conſiſts in the practice of the one, and miſery in that of the other, &c.* Theſe he calls *poor ſolutions:* Indeed *poor* enough, had it been, as Mr. *Bayle* ſuppoſes, *Pomponatius's* deſign to prove that the doctrine of the *mortality* of the ſoul did not invite the generality of men to wickedneſs: for the account given by *Pomponatius* himſelf of the origin of the contrary doctrine, ſhews, that, but for this, they would have run headlong into vice, But ſuppoſing the Peripatetic's deſign to be, as indeed it was, to prove that the doctrine of the *mortality* would have no ill influence on the learned followers of *Ariſtotle*, then theſe arguments, which Mr. *Bayle* calls *poor ones*, will be found to have their weight. But he goes on, and tells us, *that* Pomponatius *brings a better argument from fact, where he takes notice of ſeveral, who denied the immortality of the ſoul, and yet lived as well as their believing neighbours.* This is indeed a good argument to the purpoſe, for which it is employed by *Pomponatius*; but whether it be ſo to that, for which, Mr. *Bayle* imagined, he employed it, ſhall be conſidered hereafter, when we come to meet with it again in this later writer's apology for atheiſm. But Mr. *Bayle* was ſo full of his own *favourite queſtion*, that he did not give due attention to *Pomponatius's*; and having, as I obſerved above, refuted a vulgar error with regard to this famous tract, and imagining that the impiety, ſo generally charged on it, was ſolely founded in that error, he goes on inſulting the enemies of *Pomponatius* in this manner: "If the charge of impiety, of which *Pomponatius* hath been "accuſed, was only founded on his book *of the immortality of the* "*ſoul*, we muſt needs ſay there was never any accuſation more "impertinent or a ſtronger inſtance of the iniquitous perverſity of

* Ce que Pomponace a repondu à la raiſon empruntée de ce que le dogme de la mortalité de l'ame porteroit les hommes à toutes ſortes de crimes, eſt digne de conſideration. Dict. Hiſt. & Crit. Art. POMPONACE, Rem. (H.)

"the

" the perſecutors of the philoſophers *." But *Pomponatius* will not be ſo eaſily ſet clear: For let him think as he would concerning the ſoul, yet the account he gives of the origin of Religion, as the contrivance of ſtateſmen, here produced, from this very tract *De immortalitate animæ*, is ſo highly impious, that his enemies will be hardly perſuaded to give it a ſofter name than downright atheiſm. Nor is it impiety in general, of which, we endeavour to acquit him, but only that ſpecies of it, which teaches *that Religion is uſeleſs to Society*. And this we think we have done; although it be by ſhewing him to have run into the oppoſite extreme, which would inſinuate it was *the creature of politicks*.

Cardan comes next to be conſidered: and him nobody hath injured. He, too, is under *Bayle's* deluſion, concerning *Pomponatius*: For, writing on the ſame ſubject †, he borrows the Peripatetic's arguments to prove that *Religion was even pernicious to Society*. This was ſo bold a ſtroke, that Mr. *Bayle*, who generally follows him pretty cloſely, drops him here: Nor do I know that he ever had a ſecond, except it was the unhappy philoſopher of *Malmſbury*; who, ſcorning to argue upon the matter, imperiouſly pronounced, that he who preſumed to propagate Religion in a Society, without leave of the Magiſtrate, was guilty of the crime of *Leſe Majeſty*, as introducing a power ſuperior to the *Leviathan's*. But it would be unpardonable to keep the reader much longer on this poor lunatic *Italian*, *in whom*, as Mr. *Bayle* pleaſantly obſerves, *ſenſe was, at beſt, but an appendix to his folly* ‡. Beſides, there is little in that tract,

* Si l'on n'a fondé les impietez, dont on l'accuſe, que ſur ſon livre *de l'immortalité de l'ame*, il n'y eut jamais d'accuſation plus impertinente, que celle-la, ni qui ſoit une marque plus expreſſe de l'entetement inique des perſecuteurs des philoſophes.

† *De immortalitate animorum liber*, Lugd. ap. Gryph. 1545; et Opera omnia, fol. Lugduni, 1663, Tom. II. p. 458.

‡ The charming picture he draws of himſelf, and which he excuſes no otherwiſe than by laying the fault on his STARS, will hardly prejudice any one in favour of his opinions. How far it reſembles any other of the brotherhood, they beſt know, who have examined the

tract, but what he ſtole from *Pomponatius*; the ſtrength of which, to ſupport *Cardan's* paradox, hath been conſidered already; or what Mr. *Bayle* hath borrowed from him; the force of which ſhall be conſidered hereafter: But that little is ſo peculiarly his own, that as no other can claim the property, ſo no one hath hitherto uſurped the uſe. Which yet, however, is remarkable: for there is no traſh ſo worthleſs, but what ſome time or other finds a place in a Free-thinker's ſyſtem. We will not deſpair then but that this paltry rubbiſh may one day or other have an honourable ſtation in ſome of theſe faſhionable fabricks. And, not to hinder its ſpeedy preferment, I ſhall here give it the reader in its full force, without anſwer or reply. He brings the following argument to prove that the doctrine of the *immortality* of the ſoul is even deſtructive to ſociety;—"From this flattering notion of a FUTURE STATE, ill "men get opportunity to compaſs their wicked deſigns: and, on "the ſame account, good men ſuffer themſelves to be injuriouſly "treated. Civil laws, relying on this fanciful aſſiſtance, relax their "neceſſary ſeverity; and *thus* is the opinion productive of much "miſchief to mankind *." And then, by another argument as good, he ſhews the benefits accruing to the ſtate from the belief of the ſoul's *mortality*: "Thoſe who maintain that the ſoul dies with "the body, muſt needs be, by their principles, honeſter men than "others, becauſe they have a peculiar intereſt in preſerving their re-"putation; this being the only future property they pretend to:

the genius of modern infidelity. However, thus he ſpeaks of his own amiable turn of mind: "In diem viventem, nugacem, religionis contemptorem, injuriæ illatæ memorem, "invidum, triſtem, inſidiatorem, proditorem, magum, incantatorem, ſuorum oſorem, "turpi libidini deditum, ſolitarium, inamœnum, auſterum; ſponte etiam divinantem, "zelotypum, obſcœnum, laſcivum, maledicum, varium, ancipitem, impurum, calumniatorem, &c." We have had many *Free-thinkers*, but few ſuch *Free-ſpeakers*. But though theſe ſort of writers are not uſed to give us ſo *direct* a picture of themſelves, yet it hath been obſerved, that they have unawares copied from their own tempers, in the ungracious drawings they have made of HUMAN NATURE and RELIGION.

* *De immortalitate animorum*, cap. ii.

" And the Profeſſion of the Soul's mortality being generally eſteemed " as ſcandalous as that of uſury, ſuch men will be moſt exact and " ſcrupulous in point of honour, as your uſurer, to keep up the " credit of his calling, is of all men the moſt religious obſerver of " his word *."

SECT. IV.

MR. BAYLE, the laſt ſupporter of this paradox, is of a very different character from theſe *Italian* Sophiſts: A writer, who, to the utmoſt ſtrength and clearneſs of reaſoning, hath added all the livelineſs, and delicacy of wit: who, pervading human nature at his eaſe, ſtruck into the province of PARADOX, as an exerciſe for the unwearied vigour of his mind: who, with a ſoul ſuperior to the ſharpeſt attacks of fortune, and a heart practiſed to the beſt philoſophy, had not yet enough of real greatneſs to overcome that laſt foible of ſuperior minds, the temptation of honour, which the ACADEMIC EXERCISE OF WIT is conceived to bring to its profeſſors.

A writer of this character will deſerve a particular regard: for *paradoxes*, which in the hands of a *Toland* or a *Tindal* end in rank offenſive impiety, will, under the management of a BAYLE, always afford ſomething for uſe or curioſity: Thus, in the very work we are about to examine †, the many admirable obſervations on the nature and genius of polytheiſm, happen to be a full anſwer to all which the Author of *Chriſtianity as old as the Creation* hath advanced againſt the uſe of revelation. For a ſkilful chemiſt, though diſappointed in his *grand magiſterium*, yet often diſcovers, by the way, ſome uſeful and noble medicament; while the ignorant pretender to the art, not only loſes his labour, but fills all about him with the poiſonous ſteams of *ſublimate*.

* Cap. xxxiii. ejuſd. tract.

† Penſées diverſes, ecrites à un docteur de Sorbonne à l'occaſion de la comete qui parût au mois de Decembre, 1680. &—Continuation des Penſées diverſes, &c. ou Reponſe à pluſieurs difficultez, &c.

The

The *profeſſed* deſign of Mr. *Bayle's* work is to enquire, *which is leaſt hurtful to mankind, ancient idolatry, or modern atheiſm:* And had he confined himſelf to that ſubject, we had had no concern with him, but ſhould have left him in the hands of Meſſ. *Jacquelot* and *Bernard.* I freely own they are both ſtark naught: All the difference is, that Atheiſm directly excludes and deſtroys the *true* ſenſe of moral right and wrong; and Polytheiſm ſets up a *falſe* ſpecies of it.

But the more particular, though leſs avowed, purpoſe of this elaborate treatiſe is to prove, that *Atheiſm is not deſtructive of Society*; and here he falls under our notice; no diſtinct anſwer, that I know of, having been yet attempted to this part of his performance.

His arguments in ſupport of this Paradox, are occaſionally, and ſo without any method, interſperſed throughout that large work: But, to give them all the advantage they are capable of, I have here collected and diſpoſed them in ſuch order, that they mutually ſupport, and come in to the aid of one another.

It had been generally eſteemed a proof of the deſtructive nature of Atheiſm to Society, that *this principle excludes the knowledge of moral good and evil*; ſuch knowledge being, as will be ſeen, poſterior to the knowledge of a God. His firſt argument therefore for the *innocence of Atheiſm* is,

I. "That an Atheiſt may have an idea of the moral difference "between good and evil, becauſe Atheiſts, as well as Theiſts, may "comprehend the firſt principles of morals and metaphyſics, from "which this difference may be deduced. And in fact (he ſays) both "the *Epicurean* atheiſt, who denied the providence of God, and the "*Stratonic* atheiſt, who denied his Being, had this idea *."

This often repeated argument is ſo looſely expreſſed, that it is capable of many meanings; in ſome of which the aſſertion is true, but not to the purpoſe; in others to the purpoſe, but not true.

* Voiez les Penſées diverſes, cap. clxxviii. & ſuiv. & l'addition à ces Penſées cap. iv. Reponſe à la 10 & à la 13 objections, & la Continuation des Penſ. div. cap. cxliii.

Therefore before any preciſe anſwer can be given to it, it will be neceſſary to trace up moral duty to its firſt principles. And though an enquiry of this ſort ſhould not prove the moſt amuſing either to myſelf or my reader, it may be found however to deſerve our pains. For a ſpirit of diſpute and refinement hath ſo entangled and confounded all our concluſions on a ſubject, in itſelf, very clear and intelligible, that I am perſuaded, were MORALITY herſelf, of which the *ancients* made a Goddeſs, to appear in perſon amongſt men, and be queſtioned concerning her birth, ſhe would be tempted to anſwer as *Homer* does in *Lucian*, that her commentators had ſo learnedly embarraſſed the diſpute, that ſhe was now as much at a loſs as They to account for her original.

To proceed therefore with all poſſible brevity: Each animal hath its *inſtinct* implanted by nature to direct it to its greateſt good. Amongſt theſe, man hath his; to which modern philoſophers have given the name of

1. The MORAL SENSE: whereby we conceive and feel a pleaſure in right, and a diſtaſte and averſion to wrong, prior to all reflexion on their natures, or their conſequences. This is the firſt inlet to the *adequate idea of morality*; and plainly, the moſt extenſive of all; the Atheiſt as well as Theiſt having it. When inſtinct had gone thus far,

2. The *reaſoning faculty* improved upon its dictates: For, men led by reflexion to examine the foundation of this *moral ſenſe*, ſoon diſcovered that there were real eſſential differences in the qualities of human actions, eſtabliſhed by nature; and, conſequently, that the love and hatred excited by the *moral ſenſe* were not capricious in their operations; for, that in the eſſential properties of their objects there was a SPECIFIC DIFFERENCE. Reaſon having gone thus far (and thus far too it might conduct the *Stratonic* atheiſt) it ſtopped; and ſaw that ſomething was ſtill wanting whereon to eſtabliſh the MORALITY, properly ſo called, OF ACTIONS, that is, an OBLIGATION on men to perform ſome, and to avoid others; and that,

that, to find this ſomething, there was need of calling in other principles to its aſſiſtance: Becauſe nothing can thus *oblige* but,

3. A *ſuperior* WILL: And ſuch a *will* could not be found till the being and attributes of God were eſtabliſhed; but was diſcovered with them.

Hence aroſe, and only from hence, a MORAL DIFFERENCE. From this time human actions became the ſubject of *obligation*, and not till now: For though INSTINCT felt a difference in actions; and REASON diſcovered that this difference was founded in the nature of things; yet it was WILL only which could make a compliance with that difference a DUTY.

On theſe three Principles therefore, namely *the moral ſenſe*, *the eſſential difference in human actions*, and the *will of God*, is built the whole edifice of *practical morality*: Each of which hath its diſtinct motive to enforce it; Compliance with *the moral ſenſe* exciting a pleaſurable ſenſation; compliance with the *eſſential differences of things* promoting the order and harmony of the univerſe; and compliance with the *will of God* obtaining an abundant reward.

This, when attentively conſidered, can never fail of affecting us with the moſt lively ſenſe of God's goodneſs to Mankind, who, graciouſly reſpecting the imbecillity of Man's *nature*, the ſlowneſs of his *reaſon*, and the violence of his *paſſions*, hath been pleaſed to afford three different excitements to the practice of Virtue; that men of all ranks, conſtitutions, and educations, might find their account in one or other of them; ſomething that would hit their *palate*, ſatisfy their *reaſon*, or ſubdue their *will*. The firſt principle, which is the *moral ſenſe*, would ſtrongly operate on thoſe, who, by the exact temperature and balance of the paſſions, were diſengaged enough to feel the delicacy of it's charms; and have an elegance of mind to reſpect the nobleneſs of its dictates. The ſecond, which is the *eſſential difference*, will have its weight with the ſpeculative, the abſtract and profound reaſoners, and on all thoſe who excel in the knowledge of human nature. And the third, which reſolves itſelf into the *will of God*, and takes in all the

the conſequences of obedience and diſobedience, is principally adapted to the great body of Mankind.

It may perhaps be objected, to what is here delivered, *that the true principle of morality ſhould have the worthieſt motive to enforce it: Whereas the Will of God is enforced by the view of rewards and puniſhments; on which motive, virtue hath the ſmalleſt merit.* This character of the true principle of morality is perfectly right; and agrees, we ſay, with the principle which we make to be the true: For the legitimate motive to virtue, on that principle, is *compliance with the Will of God*; a compliance which hath the higheſt degree of merit. But this not being found of ſufficient power to take in the Generality, the conſequences of compliance or non-compliance to this Will, as far as relates to rewards and puniſhments, were firſt drawn out to the people's view. In which they were dealt with as the teachers of mathematics treat their pupils; when, to engage them in a ſublime demonſtration, they explain to them the uſe and fertility of the theorem.

To theſe great purpoſes ſerve the THREE PRINCIPLES while in conjunction: But now, as in the *civil world* and the affairs of men, our pleaſure, in contemplating the wiſdom and goodneſs of Providence, is often diſturbed and checked by the view of ſome human perverſity or folly which runs acroſs that Diſpenſation; ſo it is here, in the *intellectual*. This admirable proviſion for the ſupport of virtue hath been, in great meaſure, defeated by its pretended advocates; who, in their eternal ſquabbles about the true foundation of morality, and the obligation to its practice, have ſacrilegiouſly untwiſted this THREEFOLD CORD; and each running away with the part he eſteemed the ſtrongeſt, hath affixed that to the throne of God, as the golden chain that is to unite and draw all unto it.

This man propoſes to illuſtrate the doctrine of the MORAL SENSE; and then the morality of actions is founded only in that *ſenſe:* with him, metaphyſics and logic, by which the *eſſential difference*, in human actions, is demonſtrated, are nothing but *words, notions, viſions; the empty regions and ſhadows of philoſophy.* The profeſſors of

of them are *moon-blind wits*; and *Löcke* himſelf is treated as a ſchool-man *. To talk of reward and puniſhment, conſequent on the *will of a ſuperior*, is to make the practice of virtue mercenary and ſervile; from which, pure human nature is the moſt abhorrent.

Another undertakes to demonſtrate THE ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCES OF THINGS, and their natural fitneſs and unfitneſs to certain ends; and then *morality* is ſolely founded on thoſe differences; and God and his Will have nothing to do in the matter. Then the Will of God cannot make any thing morally good and evil, juſt and unjuſt; nor conſequentiy be the cauſe of any obligation on moral Agents: becauſe the eſſences and natures of things, which conſtitute actions good and evil, are independent on that Will; which is forced to ſubmit to their relations like weak Man's. And therefore, if there were no natural juſtice; that is, if the rational and intellectual nature were, of itſelf, undetermined and unobliged to any thing, and ſo deſtitute of *morality* properly ſo called, it were not poſſible that any thing ſhould be made morally good or evil, obligatory or unlawful, or that any moral obligation ſhould be begotten by any Will or poſitive command whatſoever.—And then our knowledge of moral good and evil is ſolely acquired by abſtract reaſoning: And to talk of its coming any other way into the mind, is weak and ſuperſtitious, as making God act unneceſſarily and ſuperfluouſly.

A third, who propoſes to place *morality* on *the will of a ſuperior*, which is its true bottom, acts yet on the ſame exterminating model. He takes the other two Principles to be merely viſionary: The *moral ſenſe* is nothing but the impreſſion of education; the *love of the ſpecies* romantic; and invented by crafty knaves, to dupe the young, the vain, and the ambitious. Nature, he ſaith, hath confined us to the narrow ſphere of *ſelf-love*; and our moſt pompous pretences of pure diſintereſtedneſs, but the more artful diſguiſe of

* Characteriſtics, paſſim.

that

that very paſſion. He not only denies all *moral difference* in actions, antecedent to the Will of God, which (as we ſhall ſhew anon) he might well do; but likewiſe, all *ſpecific difference*: will not ſo much as allow it to be a RULE to direct us to the performance of God's will; for that the *notions* of fit and unfit proceed not from that *difference*, but from the arbitrary impoſitions of *Will* only; that God is the free cauſe of Truths as well as Beings; and then, conſequently, if he ſo wills, two and two would not make four. At length his ſyſtem ſhrinks into a vile and abject ſelfiſhneſs; and, as he degrades and contracts his nature, he ſlips, before he is aware, quite beſides his foundation, which he profeſſes to be the *Will of God.*

Thus have men, borne away by a fondneſs to their own idle ſyſtems, preſumptuouſly broken in upon that TRIPLE BARRIER *, with which God has been graciouſly pleaſed to cover and ſecure Virtue; and given advantage to the cavils of Libertines and Infidels; who on each of theſe three Principles, thus advanced on the ruins of the other two, have reciprocally forged a ſcheme of Religion independent on Morality †; and a ſcheme of Morality independent

* St. Paul might have taught them better; who, collecting together and enforcing all the motives for the PRACTICE OF VIRTUE, expreſſeth himſelf in this manner: "*Finally*, "*brethren*, *whatſoever things are* true, *whatſoever things are* honeſt, *whatſoever things are* "juſt"—Τὸ λοιπὸν, ἀδελφοὶ, ὅσα ἐστὶν ΑΛΗΘΗ, ὅσα ΣΕΜΝΑ, ὅσα ΔΙΚΑΙΑ—ἀληθῆ evidently relating to the *eſſential difference of things*; σεμνὰ (implying ſomething of worth, ſplendour, dignity) to the *moral ſenſe* which men have of this difference; and δίκαια, *juſt*, is relative to *Will* or Law. The Apoſtle proceeds—"*whatſoever things are* pure, *whatſoever things are* "lovely, *whatſoever things are of* good report"—ὅσα ἁγνὰ, ὅσα προσφιλῆ, ὅσα εὔφημα. In theſe three latter characters marking the nature of the three preceding: ἁγνὰ *pure*, referring to *abſtract truth*; προσφιλῆ *lovely*, amiable, to *innate or inſtinctive honeſty*; and εὔφημα *of good report*, reputable, to the obſervation of *Will* or Law. He concludes, "*If* "*there be any* virtue, *and if there be any* praiſe, *think of theſe things.*" εἴ τις ἀρετὴ, καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, ταῦτα λογίζεσθε. That is, If the moral ſenſe and the eſſential difference of things can make the practice of morality, a *virtue*; or obedience to a *ſuperior Will*, matter of *praiſe*, *think of theſe things.*

† See The Fable of the Bees, and confer the *enquiry into the original of Moral virtue*, and the *ſearch into the nature of ſociety*, with the body of the book.

on

on Religion *; who, how different ſoever their employments may appear, are indeed but twiſting the ſame rope at different ends: the plain deſign of both being to overthrow RELIGION. But as the Moraliſt's is the more plauſible ſcheme, it is now become moſt in faſhion: So that of late years a deluge of moral ſyſtems hath overflowed the learned world, in which either the *moral ſenſe*, or the *eſſential difference*, rides alone triumphant; which like the chorus of clouds in *Ariſtophanes*, the Αέναοι Νεφέλαι, the ETERNAL RELATIONS, are introduced into the ſcene, with a gaudy outſide, to ſupplant *Jupiter*, and to teach the arts of fraud and *ſophiſtry*; but in a little time betray themſelves to be empty, obſcure, noiſy, impious Nothings.

In a word, with regard to the ſeveral ſorts of *Separatiſts*, thoſe, I mean, who are indeed friends to Religion, and who deteſt the Infidel's abuſe of their principles, I would recommend to their interpretation the following oracle of an ancient ſage. ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΥΡΕΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗΣ ΑΛΛΗΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ ΟΥΔΕ ΑΛΛΗΝ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΝ, Η ΤΗΝ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΔΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΚΟΙΝΗΣ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ.

This noble truth, *that the only true foundation and original of morality is the Will of God interpreted by the moral ſenſe and eſſential difference of things*, was a *random* thought of *Chryſippus* the *Stoic*. I give it this term, 1. Becauſe the ancient philoſophy teaches nothing certain concerning the true ground of moral obligation. 2. Becauſe *Plutarch's* quoting it amongſt *the repugnances of the Stoics*, ſhews it to be inconſiſtent with their other doctrine. And indeed, the following the ancient philoſophers too ſervilely, hath occaſioned the errors of modern moraliſts, in unnaturally ſeparating the three principles of practical morality, *Plato* being the patron of the *moral ſenſe*; *Ariſtotle* of the *eſſential differences*; and *Zeno of arbitrary will*.

* See the fourth Treatiſe of the Characteriſtics, intituled, "An Enquiry concerning Virtue and Merit."

And now, to come more directly to our Adverſary's argument: We ſay then,

1. That the Atheiſt can never come to the knowledge of the MORALITY of actions properly ſo called.
2. That though he be capable of being affected with the *moral ſenſe*, and may arrive to the knowledge of the real *eſſential differences* in the qualities of human actions; yet this *ſenſe* and theſe *differences* make nothing for the purpoſe of Mr. *Bayle's* argument: becauſe theſe, even in conjunction, are totally inſufficient to influence ſociety in the practice of virtue: which influence is the thing in queſtion.

Both theſe concluſions, I preſume, have been clearly proved from what hath been ſaid above, of *the origin of Society*; and, juſt before, of *the foundation of moral virtue*: But that nothing may be wanting to the argument, I ſhall crave leave to examine the matter with a little more exactneſs.

1. And firſt, *that an Atheiſt, as ſuch, can never arrive to the knowledge of the morality of actions properly ſo called*, ſhall be further made good againſt the reaſoning which Mr. *Bayle* brings to prove, *that the Morality of human actions may be demonſtrated on the principles of a* Stratonicean, or atheiſtic Fataliſt; whom he perſonates in this manner: "The * beauty, ſymmetry, regularity, and order, ſeen "in the univerſe, are the effects of a blind unintelligent Nature; "and though this Nature, in her workmanſhip, hath copied after "no ideas, ſhe hath nevertheleſs produced an infinite number of "ſpecies, with each its diſtinct eſſential attribute. It is not in "conſequence of our opinion, that fire and water differ in ſpecies, "and that there is a like difference between love and hatred, affir-"mation and negation. Their ſpecific difference is founded in "the nature of the things themſelves. But how do we know

* La beauté, la ſymétrie, la regularité, l'ordre que l'on voit dans l'univers, ſont l'ouvrage d'une nature qui n'a point de connciſſance, & qu'encore, &c. Contin. des Penſées diverſes, c. cli.

"this?

" this? Is it not by comparing the eſſential properties of one of " theſe beings with the eſſential properties of another of them? " But we know, by the ſame way, that there is a ſpecific difference " between truth and falſhood, between good faith and perfidiouſ- " neſs, between gratitude and ingratitude, *&c.* We may then be " aſſured, that vice and virtue differ ſpecifically by their nature, " independent of our opinion." This, Mr. *Bayle* calls their being *naturally* ſeparated from each other: And thus much we allow. He goes on: " Let * us ſee now by what ways *Stratonic* atheiſts " may come to the knowledge of vice and virtue's being *morally* " as well as *naturally* ſeparated. They aſcribe to the ſame neceſſity " of nature the eſtabliſhment of thoſe relations which we find to " be between things, and the eſtabliſhment of thoſe rules by " which we diſtinguiſh thoſe relations. There are rules of rea- " ſoning independent of the will of man: It is not becauſe men " have been pleaſed to fix the rules of ſyllogiſm, that therefore " thoſe rules are juſt and true: they are ſo in themſelves, and all " the endeavours of the wit of man againſt their eſſence and their " attributes would be vain and ridiculous." This likewiſe we grant him. He proceeds: " If then there are certain and immutable " rules for the operation of the underſtanding, there are alſo ſuch " for the determinations of the will." But this we deny. He would prove it thus: " The † rules of theſe determinations are not " altogether arbitrary; ſome of them proceed from the neceſſity of " nature; and theſe impoſe an indiſpenſable obligation. The moſt " general of theſe rules is this, *that man ought to will what is moſt* " *conformable to right reaſon:* For there is no truth more evident " than this, that it is fit a reaſonable creature ſhould conform to " right reaſon, and unfit that ſuch a creature ſhould recede from it."

* Voions comment ils pouvoient ſavoir qu'elles etoient outre cela ſeparées moralement. Ils attribuoient, &c. Idem ibid.

† Les regles de ces actes-là ne ſont pas toutes arbitraires: il y en a qui emanent, &c. Idem ibid.

This is his argument. To which I reply, that from thence, no *moral difference* can ariſe. He contends that *things are both naturally and morally ſeparable*. He ſpeaks of theſe ideas as very different (as indeed they are) and proves the truth of them by different arguments. *The natural eſſential difference of things* then, if we mean any thing by the terms, hath this apparent property; that it creates a *fitneſs* in the agent to act agreeably thereto: As the *moral difference* of things creates, beſides this *fitneſs*, an *obligation* likewiſe: When therefore there is an *obligation* in the agent, there is a *moral difference* in the things, and ſo on the contrary, for they are inſeparable. If then we ſhew, that right reaſon alone cannot properly *oblige*, it will follow that the knowledge of what is agreeable to right reaſon doth not induce a *moral difference*: Or that a Stratonicean is not under any *obligation* to act agreeably to right reaſon; which is the thing Mr. *Bayle* contends for.

1. Obligation, neceſſarily implies an Obliger: The Obliger muſt be different from, and not one and the ſame with, the obliged: To make a man at once the Obliger and obliged, is the ſame thing as to make him treat or enter into compact with himſelf, which is the higheſt of abſurdities. For it is an unqueſtioned rule in law and reaſon, that whoever acquires a right to any thing from the obligation of another towards him, may relinquiſh that right. If therefore the Obliger and obliged be one and the ſame perſon, in that caſe all obligation muſt be void of courſe; or rather no obligation would have commenced. Yet the *Stratonic* atheiſt is guilty of this abſurdity, when *he* talks of actions being *moral* or *obligatory*. For what *Being* can be found whereon to place this obligation? Will he ſay *right reaſon?* But that is the very abſurdity we complain of; becauſe *reaſon* is only an attribute of the perſon obliged, his aſſiſtant to judge of his obligations, if he hath any from another Being: To make *this* then the Obliger, is to make a man oblige himſelf. If he ſay, he means by *reaſon* not every man's particular reaſon, but *reaſon in general*; I reply, that *this* reaſon is a mere

a mere abſtract notion, which hath no real ſubſiſtence: and how that which hath no real ſubſiſtence ſhould *oblige*, is ſtill more difficult to apprehend.

2. But farther, *moral obligation*, that is, the obligation of a free agent, implies a *Law*, which enjoins and forbids; but a *Law* is the impoſition of an intelligent ſuperior, who hath power to exact conformity thereunto. But blind unintelligent Nature is no lawgiver, nor can what proceeds neceſſarily from thence come under the notion of a Law: We ſay indeed, in common ſpeech, the *law of neceſſity*, and *the law of reaſon and nature*; but theſe are merely popular expreſſions: By the firſt, we mean only to inſinuate, that *neceſſity* hath, as it were, one property of a *law*, namely that of *forcing*; and by the ſecond, we mean the rule which the ſupreme Lawgiver hath laid down for the judging of his Will. And while this light and direction of *reaſon* or *nature* is conſidered as a rule only, given by the *God of nature*, the term may be allowed: Thoſe who ſo conſidered the term were the firſt who ſo uſed it. After-writers retained the name; but, by a ſtrange abſurdity, ſeparated the *Law-giver* from his *Law*; on a fancy of its being of virtue to *oblige* by its own intrinſic excellence, or by the good of which it is productive. But how any thing except a Law, in the proper philoſophic ſenſe, can oblige a dependent reaſonable Being endued with will, is utterly inconceivable. The fundamental error in Mr. *Bayle's* argument ſeems to be this: He ſaw the eſſential difference of things; he found thoſe differences the adequate object of the *underſtanding*; and ſo too haſtily concluded them to be the adequate object of the *will* likewiſe. In this he was miſtaken: they are indeed the adequate object of the underſtanding; becauſe the *underſtanding* is paſſive in its perceptions, and therefore under the ſole direction of theſe neceſſary differences. But the *will* is not paſſive in its determinations: for inſtance, that three are leſs than five, the underſtanding is neceſſitated to judge, but the will is not neceſſitated to chuſe five before three: Therefore the eſſential differences of things are not the

adequate

adequate object of the *will*; the Law of a Superior muſt be taken in to conſtitute *obligation* in choice, or *morality* in actions.

Hobbes ſeems to have penetrated farther into this matter, than the *Stratonicean* of Mr. *Bayle*; he appeared to have been ſenſible that *morality* implied *obligation*, and obligation a *law*, and a law a *Lawgiver*: Therefore, having (as they ſay) expelled the Legiſlator of the univerſe, that morality of actions might have ſome foundation, he thought fit to underprop it with his earthly God, the *Leviathan*; and to make him the creator and ſupporter of *moral right* and *wrong*.

But a favourer of Mr. *Bayle's* paradox may perhaps object, that as he was allowed a *fit eſs*, and *unfitneſs* in actions, diſcoverable by the eſſential difference of things; and as this fitneſs and unfitneſs implies benefit and damage to the actor, and others; it being in fact ſeen, that the practice of virtue promotes the happineſs of the Individual, or at leaſt of the Species, and that vice obſtructs it; it may be ſaid, that this will be ſufficient to make *morality*, or *obligation*, in the *Stratonic* ſyſtem; if not in the ſtrict ſenſe of the word, yet as to the nature of the thing. To this I reply, that in that Syſtem, whatever advanced human happineſs, would be only a natural good; and virtue as merely ſuch, as food and covering: and, that which retarded it, a natural evil, whether it was vice, peſtilence, or unkindly ſeaſons. *Natural*, I ſay, in contradiſtinction to *moral*, or ſuch a good as any one would be *obliged* to ſeek or promote. For 'till it be made appear that Man hath received his being from the *will* of another; and ſo depending on that other, is accountable to him for it; he can be under no *moral obligation* to prefer good to evil, or even life to death. From the *nature* of any action, MORALITY cannot ariſe; nor from its *effects*: Not from the firſt, becauſe, being only reaſonable or unreaſonable, nothing follows but a *fitneſs* in doing one, and an *abſurdity* in doing the other: Not from the ſecond, becauſe, did the good or evil produced make the action *moral*, brutes, from whoſe actions proceed both good and evil, would have *morality*.

If

If it be farther urged, that the obſervance of theſe eſſential differences is promoting the perfection of a particular ſyſtem, which contributes, in its concentration, to the perfection of the univerſe; and that therefore a reaſonable creature is OBLIGED to conform thereto: I anſwer, firſt, that (on the principles before laid down) to make a reaſonable creature *obliged* in this caſe, he muſt firſt be enforced by the Whole, of which he is part. This enforcement cannot here be by intentional command, whoſe object is free agency, becauſe the *Stratonic* Whole, or univerſal Nature, is blind and unintelligible. It muſt force then by the neceſſity of its nature; and this will, indeed, make men obliged as clocks are by weights, but never as free agents are, by the command of an intelligent Superior, which only can make actions *moral*. But ſecondly, an uniform perfect Whole can never be the effect of blind fate; but is the plain image and impreſſion of one intelligent ſelf-exiſtent Mind. In a word, as it is of the nature of the *independent* firſt Cauſe of all things to be obliged only by his own *wiſdom*; ſo it ſeems to be of the nature of all *dependent* intelligent beings to be obliged only by the *will* of the firſt Cauſe.

"All things therefore (ſays the great Maſter of reaſon) do work, "after a ſort, according to Law: All other things according to a "LAW, whereof, ſome SUPERIOR, to whom they are ſubject, is "Author; only the works and operations of God have him both "for their worker, and for the Law whereby they are wrought. "The Being of God is a kind of Law to his working; for that per-"fection which God is giveth perfection to that he BOTH *."

Nor does this contradict what we have aſſerted, and not only aſſerted, but proved, in ſpeaking of moral obligation, *that nothing, but Will, can oblige:* Becauſe our whole reaſoning is confined to *man's obligation*. And if there be any thing certain, in the firſt principles of law or reaſon, this muſt be confeſſed to be of the number, *that a man can neither oblige himſelf, nor be obliged by names*

* Hooker's Eccl. Pol. B. I. Sect. 2. p. 3. circa finem.

and

and notions; ſo that, to create an obligation, the *Will* of ſome other being muſt be found out. A principle, which the common conceptions of man, and the univerſal practice of human life confirms. But, as in our diſcourſe of God, the weakneſs of our intellects conſtrains us to explain our conceptions of his nature by human ideas, therefore when we ſpeak of the *morality* of *his* actions, finding them to be founded in no other, or ſuperior Will, we ſay, he is *obliged only by his own wiſdom: Obligation*, when applied to God, meaning no more than *direction:* for, that an *independent* being can be ſubject to obligation in the ſenſe that a *dependent* being is ſubject, is, by the very terms, an high abſurdity. *Obligation*, therefore, when applied to man, being *one* thing; when applied to God *another*; the ſtricteſt rules of logic will allow different attributes to be predicated of each. It is confeſſed, we have a clear and adequate idea of *obligation*, as it relates to man; of *this* obligation, we have affirmed ſomething plain and evident: It is likewiſe confeſſed we have a very obſcure and inadequate idea of *obligation*, as it relates to God: of *this* obligation, too, we have affirmed ſomething, whoſe evidence muſt needs partake of the imperfection of its ſubject. Yet there have been found Objectors ſo perverſe, who would not only have *clear* conceptions regulated on *obſcure*; but what is *ſimply predicated* of God, to deſtroy what hath been *proved* of man.

But to ſet this matter in a fuller light, I will juſt mention two objections (*not peculiar* to the *Stratoniceans*) againſt morality's being founded in will.

Obj. 1. It is ſaid, "That, as every creature neceſſarily purſues "happineſs, it is *that* which obliges to moral obſervance, and not "the Will of God; becauſe it is to procure happineſs that we obey "command, and do every other act: and becauſe, if that Will "commanded us to do what would make us unhappy, we ſhould "be forced to diſobey it." To this I anſwer, that when it is ſaid *morality is founded on Will*, it is not meant that every Will obliges, but that nothing but Will can oblige. It is plain the Will of an inferior

inferior or equal cannot be meant by it *: It is not ſimply Will then, but Will ſo and ſo circumſtanced: And why it is not as much Will which obliges, when it is the *Will of a ſuperior ſeeking our good*, as the *Will of a ſuperior ſimply*, I am yet to learn. To ſay then that happineſs and not Will makes the obligation, ſeems like ſaying, that when in mechanics a weight is raiſed by an engine, the *wheels* and *pullies* are not the cauſe, but that univerſal affection of matter called *attraction*. *Obj.* 2. If it be ſtill urged, "that *one* can no more be called the obliger than the *other*; becauſe "though happineſs could not oblige without Will, on the other "hand, Will could not oblige without happineſs;" I reply, this is a miſtake. Will could not indeed oblige to unhappineſs; but it would oblige to what ſhould produce neither one nor the other, though all conſiderations of the conſequence of obeying or diſobeying were away.

Obj. 3. It is ſaid, "That if, according to the modern notions of "philoſophy, the will of God be determined by the eternal relations of "things, they are properly thoſe relations (as Dr. *Clarke* would have "it) which oblige, and not the will of God. For if A impel B; and "B, C, and C, D; it is A and not C that properly impels D." But here I ſuſpect the objection confounds *natural cauſe and effect* with *moral agent and patient*; which are two diſtinct things, as appears, as on many other accounts, ſo from their effects; the one implying *natural neceſſity*, the other, only *moral fitneſs*. Thus, in the caſe before us, the eternal relations are, if you will, the *natural cauſe*, but the will of God is the *moral agency*: And our queſtion is, not *of natural neceſſity* that reſults from the former, but, of *moral fitneſs* that reſults from the latter. Thus that which is not properly the natural cauſe of my acting, is the moral cauſe of it. And ſo on the contrary.

* "Whence comes the reſtraint [of the Law of Nature]? From a higher Power; "nothing elſe can bind. I cannot bind my ſelfe, for I may untie my ſelfe again; nor "an equal cannot bind me, for we may untie one another. It muſt be a ſuperior "power, even God Almighty." SELDEN's Table Talk, art. LAW OF NATURE.

On the whole, then, it appears, that *Will*, and *Will only*, can conſtitute *obligation*; and, conſequently, make actions *moral*, *i. e.* ſuch as deſerve *reward* and *puniſhment*. Yet when men reflect on the affections of their own minds, and find *there* a *ſenſe* of *right* and *wrong* ſo ſtrongly impreſſed as to be attended with a *conſciouſneſs* that the one deſerves *reward* and the other *puniſhment*, even though there were no God; this ſo perplexes matters, as to diſpoſe them, in oppoſition to all thoſe plain *deductions*, to place morality in the *eſſential difference* of things. But would they conſider that *that very ſenſation*, which ſo much miſleads us in judging of the true foundation of morality, is the plaineſt indication of WILL, which, for the better ſupport of virtue*, ſo framed and conſtituted the human mind; a conſtitution utterly inconceivable on the ſuppoſition of *no God*; would they, I ſay, but conſider this, the difficulty would intirely vaniſh.

But ſo it hath happened, this evident truth, that *morality is founded in will*, hath been long controverted even among *Theiſts*. What hath perplexed their diſputes is, that the contenders for this

* We have explained above the admirable diſpoſition of things, by the God of nature, for the ſupport of virtue. And it was from this view that an able writer, who is for moderating in the diſpute about *moral obligation*, calls the *eſſential difference of things*, diſcoverable by reaſon, the *internal obligation*, and the *will of God*, the *external*. J'entends (dit-il) par *obligation interne* celle qui eſt uniquement produite par notre propre raiſon, conſiderée comme la regle primitive de notre conduite, et en conſequence de ce qu'une action a, en elle-meme, de bon ou de mauvais. Pour l'*obligation externe* ce ſera celle qui vient de la volonté de quelque être, dont on ſe reconnoit dependant, et qui commande ou defend certaines choſes, ſous la menace de quelque peine. *Burlamaqui, Principes du droit naturel*, p. 76.

If he had called the firſt, *the improper obligation*, and the other the *proper*, his terms had been a great deal more exact. For it being of the eſſence of the relative term, *obligation*, to have an outward reſpect, or external relation, *internal obligation* muſt be a very *figurative*, that is to ſay, a very abſurd expreſſion, when applied to man. Perhaps, indeed, that ruling Nature which draws all MACHINES, whether *brutal* or *rational* (if there be any of the latter kind) to purſue *happineſs*, may, in a *philoſophic* ſenſe, be called the *internal obligation*; but, ſurely, when applied to *man*, ſuppoſed a free-agent, the terms are mere jargon.

truth

truth have generally thought themſelves obliged to deny the *natural eſſential differences* of things, antecedent to a Law; ſuppoſing, that the *morality* of actions would follow the conceſſion. But this is a miſtake, which the rightly diſtinguiſhing between things *naturally* and *morally* ſeparable (as explained above) will rectify. That the diſtinction hath not been made or obſerved, is owing to the unheeded *appetite* and *averſion* of the *moral ſenſe*: And their adverſaries being in the ſame deluſion, that the *one* inferred the *other*, never gave themſelves any farther trouble, but when they had clearly demonſtrated the *natural eſſential difference*, delivered *that* as a proof of the *moral difference*, though they be, in reality, two diſtinct things, and independent of each other. More than one of our ableſt writers have not eſcaped this deluſion. Dr. S. Clarke going on the Principle, that Obligation was founded in the nature of things, to ſupport it, was perpetually forced to confound *moral* and *natural* fitneſſes with one another; which makes him, contrary to his character, very inaccurate and confuſed *: And Mr. Wollaſton †, diſſatisfied with all the principles, from which the preceding writers of his party had deduced the morality of actions, when he had demonſtrated, with greater clearneſs than any before him, *the natural eſſential difference of things*, unluckily miſtook it for the *moral difference*; and thence made *the formal ratio of moral good and evil, to conſiſt in a conformity of mens actions to the truth of the caſe, or otherwiſe*. For it is a principle with him, that things may be denied or affirmed to be what they are, by *deeds* as well as *words*. But had both parties been pleaſed to conſider *this natural eſſential difference of things*, as, what it muſt be confeſſed by both to be, THE DIRECTION WHICH GOD HATH GIVEN HIS CREATURES TO BRING THEM TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF HIS WILL; AND THE RULE OF THAT WILL; the diſpute had been at an end: and they had employed *this difference*, not as the atheiſt does, for the *foundation* of morality; but, as

* Evidence of natural and revealed Religion, 6th Ed. p. 5—27.

† The Religion of Nature delineated.

all true theiſts ſhould do, for the *medium* to bring us to that only ſound foundation, the *will* and command of God. Thoſe who imagine, as the author of *the principles of natural law* ſeems to do, that this is only a diſpute about words*, are much deceived. The man who regards the eſſential difference of things as a command or a Law properly ſo called, hath a very different idea of it, from him who regards it only as a Rule or a Law improperly ſo called. And the reaſon is plain, becauſe theſe relative terms have an eſſential difference; a *Rule*, referring ſingly to thoſe directed by it; but a *Law* has a double reference; to thoſe governed by it, and to the Lawgiver who gave it. He therefore who regards it as a *Rule*, ſtops ſhort, and reſts obligation there, where no obligation can abide: But he who regards it as a *Law* properly ſo called (for thoſe who conſider it as a *mere rule* give it the name of *law*, becauſe they make *obligation* to ariſe from it) reſts obligation in a Lawgiver, and purſues it to its true ſource, the throne of God. The diſpute, therefore, is not about *words*, but *things*: Or if we will needs have it to be about words, it is of the *proper* and *improper* uſe of them, which intimately concerns *things*; indeed TRUTH itſelf and COMMON SENSE. We ſay a *ſound is ſweet*, or a *colour hot*; and as nobody is miſled by theſe expreſſions, we hold it fooliſh to diveſt them of their figure, and formally to contend that (ſtrictly and philoſophically ſpeaking) inconſiſtent properties are aſcribed to them. But ſhould it once be aſſumed that a *ſound* may be the ſubject of *taſte* and a *colour* the ſubject of *touch*, it would be time, I ſuppoſe, to rectify an abſurdity which tends to confound all our *ideas of ſenſation*: Juſt ſo it is, in the expreſſions of *truth* or *happineſs*, OBLIGING: While theſe were conſidered as the *rule* or *reward* of

* Je conclus—que les differences qui ſe trouvent entre les principaux ſyſtemes ſur la nature & l'origine de l'obligation, ne ſont pas auſſi grandes qu'elles le paroiſſent d'abord. Si l'on examine de pres ces ſentimens, l'on verra que des differentes idées, reduites à leur juſte valeur, loin de ſe trouver en oppoſition, peuvent ſe rapprocher—*Burlamaqui*, p. 75, 76.

actions,

actions, given and impoſed by a Maſter on his ſervants, by a Creator on his creature, the figure was neither forced nor inelegant; and did not deſerve to be quarrelled with. But when the queſtion was of *real obligation*, in a metaphyſic ſenſe, then, ſeriouſly to contend, that it ariſes from *truth* or *happineſs*, or from any thing but WILL, is the very philoſophy of *taſting ſound* and *feeling colour*; and equally tends to the confuſion of all our *ideas of reflexion*.

On the whole then we ſee, that an Atheiſt, as ſuch, cannot arrive to the knowledge of MORALITY *.

2. We now come to our ſecond concluſion againſt Mr. *Bayle's* argument, "that the idea of the *moral ſenſe*, and the knowledge of "the *natural eſſential difference of things*, are, even in conjunction, "inſufficient to influence Communities in the practice of virtue:" But we muſt previouſly obſerve, that the arguments, which we allow to be concluſive for the *Stratonic* atheiſt's comprehenſion of the natural eſſential difference of things, take in only that ſpecies of atheiſm: the *other*, which derive all from chance and hazard, are incapable of this knowledge; and muſt be content with only the *moral ſenſe* for their guide. Let us therefore *firſt* enquire what this *moral ſenſe* is able to do alone, towards influencing virtuous practice; and *ſecondly*, what new force it acquires in conjunction with the knowledge of the *natural eſſential difference of things*.

1. Men are miſled by the name of *inſtinct* (which we allow the *moral ſenſe* to be) to imagine that its impreſſions operate very ſtrongly, by obſerving their force in brute animals. But the caſes are widely different: In Beaſts, the inſtinct is invincibly ſtrong, as it is the ſole ſpring of action: In Man, it is only a friendly monitor of the

* One would not have imagined any body could be ſo wild to aſſert, that, on theſe principles, it could not be proved, that a vicious Atheiſt deſerved puniſhment at the hand of God. To ſuch ſhrewd diſcerners, I would recommend the following caſe. Your ſervant gets drunk; and, in that condition, neglects your orders, forgets your relation to him, and treats it as an impoſture. Does he, or does he not, deſerve puniſhment? When this is reſolved, the point in queſtion will be ſo too.

judgment:

judgment; and a conciliator, as it were, between Reaſon and the ſenſual appetites; all which have their turn in the determinations of the Will. It muſt conſequently be much weaker, as but ſharing the power of putting upon action with many other principles. Nor could it have been otherwiſe without deſtroying human liberty. It is indeed of ſo delicate a nature, ſo nicely interwoven into the human frame and conſtitution, and ſo eaſily loſt or effaced, that ſome have even denied the exiſtence of a quality, which, in moſt of its common ſubjects, they have hardly been able to obſerve. Inſomuch that one would be tempted to liken it to that *candid appearance*, which, as the modern philoſophy has diſcovered to us, is the reſult of a mixture of all kinds of primitive *colours*: where, if the ſeveral ſorts be not found in fit proportions, no whiteneſs will emerge from the compoſition. So, unleſs the original paſſions and appetites be rightly tempered and balanced, the *moral ſenſe* can never ſhew itſelf in any ſtrong or ſenſible effect. This being the ſtate of *moral inſtinct*, it muſt evidently, when alone, be too weak to influence human practice.

When the *moral ſenſe* is made the rule, and eſpecially when it is the only rule, it is neceſſary that its rectitude, as a rule, ſhould be known and aſcertained: But this it cannot be by an Atheiſt: For till it be allowed there was deſign in our production, it can never be ſhewn that one appetite is righter than another, though they be contrarious and inconſiſtent. The appetite therefore, which, at preſent, is moſt importunate to be gratified, will be judged to be the right, how adverſe ſoever to the *moral ſenſe*. But, ſuppoſing this *moral ſenſe* not to be ſo eaſily confounded with the other appetites; but that it may be kept diſtinct, as having this peculiar quality ſo different from the reſt, that it is objective to a *whole*, or entire ſpecies; whereas the others terminate in *ſelf*, or in the private ſyſtem (though, as to *whole* and *parts*, an Atheiſt muſt have very ſlender and confuſed ideas); granting this, I ſay, yet national Manners, the iſſue of *thoſe appetites*, would, in time, effectually, though inſenſibly,

inſenſibly, efface the idea of the *moral ſenſe*, in the generality of men. Almoſt infinite are the popular Cuſtoms, in the ſeveral nations and ages of mankind, which owe their birth to the more violent paſſions of fear, luſt, and anger. The moſt whimſical and capricious, as well as the moſt inhuman and unnatural, have ariſen from thence. It muſt needs therefore be, that cuſtoms of this original ſhould be as oppoſite to the *moral ſenſe*, as thoſe appetites are, from whence they were derived. And of how great power, Cuſtom is to eraſe the ſtrongeſt impreſſions of Nature, much ſtronger than thoſe of the *moral ſenſe*, we may learn from that general practice, which prevailed in the moſt learned and polite countries of the world, of EXPOSING THEIR CHILDREN *; whereby the ſtrong inſtinctive affection of Parents for their offspring was violated without remorſe.

This would lead one into a very beaten common place. It ſuffices that the fact is too notorious to be diſputed. And what makes more particularly for my argument is, that *Cuſtom* is a power which oppoſes the *moral ſenſe* not partially, or at certain times and places, but univerſally. If therefore Cuſtom in the politeſt States, where a Providence was taught and acknowledged, made ſuch havock of Virtue; into what confuſion muſt things run, where there is no

* Of all the moral painters, TERENCE is the man who ſeems to have copied human nature with moſt exactneſs. Yet, his Citizen of univerſal benevolence, whom he draws with ſo much life, in that maſterly ſtroke, *homo ſum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*, is the ſame perſon who commands his wife to expoſe her new-born daughter, and falls into a paſſion with her for having committed that hard taſk to another, by which means the infant eſcaped death,—*ſi meum imperium exequi voluiſſes, interemptam oportuit.* Hence even the divine PLATO reckons the expoſing of infants, if not amongſt the dictates of nature, yet amongſt the preſcripts of right reaſon: For in his *book of laws*, which he compoſed for the reformation of popular prejudices and abuſes in human Policies, he decrees, that if the parents had children, after a certain age, they ſhould *expoſe* them; and that ſo effectually, he ſays, that they ſhould not eſcape dying by famine. Chremes therefore ſpeaks both the dictates of Philoſophy and Cuſtom, when he characterizes ſuch who had any dregs of this natural inſtinct remaining, as perſons—*qui neque jus, neque bonum atque æquum ſciunt.*

other

other barrier than the feeble idea of the *moral ſenſe?* Nor can it be replied, that the cuſtoms here ſpoken of, as ſo deſtructive to the *moral ſenſe*, are the product of falſe Religions; which ſpring and fountain-head of evil, Atheiſm at once dries up: For the inſtance here given is of a Cuſtom merly civil; with which Religion had no manner of concern. And ſo are a vaſt number of others that are carefully collected by the two writers mentioned above.

2. But now, ſecondly, for our *Stratonic* Atheiſt; in whom, we ſuppoſe, the *moral ſenſe*, and the *knowledge of the eſſential difference of things* act in conjunction to promote virtuous practice. And in conjunction, they impart mutual ſtrength to one another: For as ſoon as the *eſſential difference* is eſtabliſhed and applied, it becomes a mark to diſtinguiſh the *moral ſenſe* from the other appetites, which are irregular and wrong. And, the *moral ſenſe* being thus carefully kept up and ſupported, the mind, in its metaphyſical reaſonings on the *eſſential difference*, is guarded from running into viſionary refinements.

The queſtion then is, "Whether a clear conviction of right and "wrong, abſtracted from all Will and Command, and conſequently, "from the expectation of reward and puniſhment, be ſufficient to "influence the generality of Men in any tolerable degree?" That it is not, will, I ſuppoſe, be clearly ſeen by the following conſideration. All, who have conſidered human nature attentively, have found *, that it is not enough to make men follow Virtue, that it be owned to be the *greateſt* good; which, the *beauty*, *benefit*, or *reaſonableneſs* of it may evince. Before it can raiſe any deſire in them, it muſt firſt be brought home to them; and conſidered by them as a good that makes a neceſſary part of their happineſs. For it is not conceived needful, that a man's happineſs ſhould depend on the attainment of the greateſt poſſible good; and he daily forms ſchemes of complete happineſs without it. But the gratification of craving appetites, moved ſtrongly by ſelf-love, being thought to

* See Locke's Eſſay, Chap. Of Power, § 71.

contribute

contribute much to human happineſs, and being at the ſame time ſo oppoſite to, and inconſiſtent with Virtue, the generality will never be brought to think, that the uniform practice of it makes a neceſſary part of human happineſs. To balance theſe appetites, ſomething, then, more intereſting muſt be laid in the ſcale of Virtue; and this can be only rewards and puniſhments, which Religion propoſes by a *morality founded in Will*.

But this may be farther underſtood by what hath been obſerved above, concerning the nature and original of civil Society. *Self-intereſt*, as we there ſhew, ſpurring to action by hopes and fears, cauſed all thoſe diſorders amongſt men, which required the remedy of civil Society. And *ſelf-intereſt*, again, operating by hopes and fears in Society, afforded means for the redreſs of thoſe firſt diſorders; ſo far forth as Society could carry thoſe hopes and fears. For to combat this univerſal paſſion of *ſelf-love*, another, at leaſt as ſtrong, was to be oppoſed to it; but ſuch a one not being to be found in human nature, all that could be done was to turn this very Paſſion in an oppoſite direction, and to a contrary purpoſe. Therefore, becauſe Society failed (from the natural deficiency of its plan) in remedying the diſorders it was inſtituted to correct, and conſequently was obliged to call in the aid of Religion, as is above explained; it is evident it muſt proceed *ſtill* on the ſame principles of *hopes and fears*. But, of all the three grounds of Morality, the third only thus operating, and an Atheiſt not having the third, Religion, which only can give it, muſt be unavoidably neceſſary for Society. Or in other words, the *moral ſenſe*, and the knowledge of the *natural eſſential difference of things* in conjunction, will be altogether inſufficient to influence the generality in virtuous practice.

SECT. V.

BUT Mr. *Bayle*, who well underſtood the force of this Argument, is unwilling to reſt the matter here; and ſo caſts about for a motive of more general influence. This, he thinks, he finds

in that ſtrong appetite for glory, praiſe, and reputation, which an Atheiſt muſt needs have as well as other men. And this makes his ſecond Argument.

II. "It is moſt certain *, (ſays he) that a man devoid of all Re-
"ligion may be very ſenſible of worldly honour, and very cove-
"tous of praiſe and glory. If ſuch a one find himſelf in a country
"where ingratitude and knavery expoſe men to contempt, and gene-
"roſity and virtue are admired, we need not doubt but he will
"affect the character of a man of honour; and be capable of re-
"ſtoring a truſt, even where the Laws could lay no hold upon him.
"The fear of paſſing for a knave would prevail over his avarice.
"And as there are men, who expoſe themſelves to a thouſand in-
"conveniencies, and a thouſand dangers, to revenge an affront,
"which perhaps they have received before very few witneſſes, and
"which they would readily pardon, were it not for fear of incur-
"ring infamy amongſt thoſe with whom they had to do; ſo I be-
"lieve the ſame here; that this perſon, whom we ſuppoſe devoid
"of Religion, would, notwithſtanding all the oppoſition of his
"avarice, be capable of reſtoring a truſt, which it could not be
"legally proved he had withheld; when he ſees that his good
"faith will be attended with the applauſes of the whole place
"where he reſides; while his perfidy might, ſome time or other,
"be objected to him, or at leaſt ſo ſtrongly ſuſpected, that he could
"not paſs in the world's opinion for an honeſt man: For it is
"that inward eſteem in the minds of others, which we aſpire at,
"above all things. The words and actions, which mark this eſteem,
"pleaſe us on no other account, than as we imagine them to
"be the ſigns of what paſſes in the mind: A machine ſo ordered
"as to make the moſt reſpectful geſticulations, and to pronounce
"the cleareſt articulate ſounds, in all the detours of flattery, would
"never contribute to give us a better opinion of ourſelves, becauſe

* Il eſt—fort certain, qu'un homme deſtitué de foi, peut être fort ſenſible a l'honneur du monde, &c. Penſ. div. c. 179.

"we

" we ſhould know they were not ſigns of eſteem in the mind of " another. On theſe accounts therefore, he, of whom I ſpeak, might " ſacrifice his avarice to his vanity, if he only thought he ſhould " be ſuſpected of having violated a truſt. And though he might " even believe himſelf ſecure from all ſuſpicion, yet, ſtill, he could " eaſily reſolve to prefer the honourable part to the lucrative, for " fear of falling into the inconvenience, which has happened to " ſome, of publiſhing their crimes themſelves, while they ſlept, or " in the tranſports of a fever. *Lucretius* uſes this motive to draw " men, without Religion, to virtue."

To this, I reply, 1. That it is indeed true, that commendation and diſgrace are ſtrong motives to men to accommodate themſelves to the opinions and rules of thoſe, with whom they converſe; and that thoſe rules and opinions, in a good meaſure, correſpond, in moſt civilized countries, with the unchangeable rule of right, whatever *Sextus Empiricus* and *Montaigne* have been pleaſed to ſay to the contrary. For virtue evidently advancing, and vice as viſibly obſtructing the general good, it is no wonder, that *that* action ſhould be encouraged with eſteem and reputation, wherein every one finds his account; and *that*, diſcountenanced, by reproach and infamy, which hath a contrary tendency. But then we ſay, that ſeeing this good opinion of the world may be almoſt as ſurely gained, certainly with more eaſe and ſpeed, by a well acted hypocriſy than by a ſincere practice of virtue, the Atheiſt, who lies under no reſtraints with regard to the moral qualities of his actions, will rather chuſe to purſue *that* road to reputation, which is conſiſtent with an indulgence of all his other paſſions; than *that* whereby they will be at conſtant war with one another; and where he will be always finding himſelf under the hard neceſſity of *ſacrificing*, as Mr. *Bayle* well expreſſes it, *his avarice to his vanity*. Now this inconvenience he may avoid by reſolving to be honeſt only before company, which will procure him enough of reputation; and to play the rogue in ſecret, where he may fully indulge his avarice, or what other paſſion he is moſt diſ-

poſed to gratify. That this will be his ſyſtem, who has no motive, but popular reputation, to act virtuouſly, is ſo plain, that Mr. *Bayle* was reduced to the hardeſt ſhifts imaginable to invent a reaſon why an Atheiſt, thus actuated by the love of glory, might poſſibly behave himſelf honeſtly, when he could do the contrary without ſuſpicion.— "And though he might believe himſelf ſecure from all ſuſpicion, "yet ſtill he could eaſily reſolve to prefer the honourable part to the "lucrative, for fear of falling into the inconvenience which hath "happened to ſome, of publiſhing their crimes themſelves, while "they ſlept, or in the tranſports of a fever." *Lucretius*, ſays he, *uſes this motive to draw men, without religion, to virtue.* It had been to the purpoſe to have told us, what man, from the time of *Lucretius* to his own, had been ever *ſo drawn.* But they muſt know little of human nature, who can ſuppoſe, that the conſideration of theſe remote, poſſible indeed, but very unlikely accidents, hath ever any ſhare in the determination of the Will, when men are deliberating on actions of importance, and diſtracted by the ſhifting uncertain views of complicated Good and Evil. But granting it to be likely, or common; the man, Mr. *Bayle* deſcribes, could never get clear of the danger of that contingency, which way ſoever he reſolved to act. Let us ſuppoſe him to take the honourable part, even then, ſleep or a fever might as eaſily deprive him of the reputation he affects: For I believe there is no man, of this turn, but would be as aſhamed to have it known, that all his virtuous actions proceeded from a ſelfiſh vanity, as to be diſcovered to have ſtretched a point of juſtice, of which civil laws could not take cognizance. It is certain, the *firſt* makes a man as contemptible, and much more ridiculous in the eyes of others, than the *latter*; becauſe the advantage aimed at is fantaſtical: And one diſcovery ſleep or a fever is as likely to make as the other.

But, 2. Suppoſing our Atheiſt to be of ſo timid a complexion, as to fear that, even in a courſe of the beſt-acted hypocriſy, he may riſque the danger of being diſcovered, yet as this practice, by which he

he ſo well covers all the lucrative arts of fraud, enables him to provide well for himſelf, he will be eaſily brought to hazard all the inconveniences of a detection, to which, indeed, the courſe is liable, but which it can ſo eaſily repair: for he has ample experience that though indeed eſteem is generally annexed to apparent good actions, and infamy to bad; yet that there is no virtue which ſo univerſally procures popular Opinion as *riches and power*, there being no infamy which they will not efface or cover: and this being a road to Opinion which leads him, at the ſame time, to the gratification of his other paſſions; there is no doubt but it will be his choice *.

After many detours, Mr. *Bayle* is, at length, brought to own, that Atheiſm is, indeed, in its natural tendency, deſtructive of Society; but then, he inſiſts upon it, that it never in fact becomes ſo.

III. *Becauſe* (and this is his next argument) *men do not act according to their principles*, nor ſet their practice by their opinions. He owns this to have very much of a myſtery; but for the fact he appeals to the obſervation of mankind: "For if it were not ſo," ſays he †, "how is it poſſible that Chriſtians, who know ſo clearly "by a Revelation, ſupported by ſo many miracles, that they muſt "renounce vice, if they would be eternally happy, and avoid eter-"nal miſery; who have ſo many excellent preachers—ſo many "zealous directors of conſcience—ſo many books of devotion; how "is it poſſible, amidſt all this, that Chriſtians ſhould live, as they "do, in the moſt enormous diſorders of vice?" And again ‡, agreeably to this obſervation, he takes notice, "that *Cicero* hath "remarked, that many *Epicureans*, contrary to their principles, "were good friends and honeſt men; who accommodated their "actions, not to their principle, the deſire of pleaſure, but to the

* — Πλούτῳ δ' ἀρετὴ καὶ κῦδος ὀπηδεῖ.
Δαίμονι δ' οἷος ἔησθα—— Heſiod. Oper. & Dies, verſus 311, 312.

† —Si cela n'etoit pas, comment, &c. Penſées diverſes, cap. cxxxvi.

‡ Cicéron l'a remarqué à l'égard de pluſieurs Epicuriens, &c. c. clxvii.

"rules

" rules of reaſon." Hence he concludes: " That thoſe lived better " than they talked; whereas others talked better than they lived. " The ſame remark," ſays he, " hath been made on the conduct " of the *Stoics:* their principle was, that all things arrived by an " inevitable neceſſity, which God himſelf was ſubject to. Now " this ſhould naturally have terminated in inaction; and diſpoſed " them to abſtain from exhortations, promiſes, and menacing. On " the contrary, there was no ſect of philoſophers more given to " preaching; or whoſe whole conduct did more plainly ſhew, that " they thought themſelves the abſolute maſters of their own deſ- " tiny." The concluſion he draws from all this, and much more to the ſame puroſe, is *, that " therefore Religion doth not do that " ſervice towards reſtraining vice as is pretended; nor Atheiſm " that injury in encouraging it: while each profeſſor acts contrary " to his proper principle."

Now from this concluſion, and from words dropped up and down †, of the myſterious quality of this phænomenon, one would ſuſpect Mr. *Bayle* thought that there was ſome ſtrange Principle in man, that unaccountably diſpoſed him to act in oppoſition to his opinions, whatſoever they were. And indeed, ſo he muſt needs ſuppoſe, or he ſuppoſes nothing to the purpoſe: for if it ſhould be found, that this Principle ſometimes diſpoſes men as violently to act *according to* their opinions, as at other times it inclines them to act *againſt* them, *it* will do Mr. *Bayle's* argument no ſervice. And if this Principle ſhould, after all, only prove to be the violence of the irregular appetites, *it* will conclude directly againſt him. And by good luck, we have our Adverſary himſelf confeſſing, that

* Contin. des Penſ. div. cap. cxlix.

† Je conçois que c'eſt une choſe bien étrange, qu'un homme qui vit bien moralement, & qui ne croit ni paradis, ni enfer. Mais j'en reviens toujours-là, que l'homme eſt une certaine creature, qui avec toute ſa raiſon, n'agit pas toujours conſequement à ſa creance; ce ſeroit une choſe plus infinie que de parcourir toutes les bizarreries de l'homme. Une Monſtre plus monſtrueux que les Centaures & que la Chimera de la fable. Penſées diverſes, cap. clxxvi.

this

this is indeed the caſe: for though, as I ſaid, he commonly affects to give our perverſe conduct a myſterious air, the neceſſary ſupport of the ſophiſtry of his concluſion; yet, when he is off his guard, we have him declaring the plain reaſon of it; as where he ſays, "The * general idea we entertain of a man, who believes a God, a "heaven and a hell, leads us to think, that he would do every "thing which he knows agreeable to the will of God; and avoid "every thing which he knows to be diſagreeable to it: But the life "of man ſhews, he does the direct contrary. The reaſon is this: "Man does not determine himſelf to one action rather than another "by the general knowledge of what he ought to do, but by the "particular judgement he paſſes on each diſtinct caſe, when he is "on the point of proceeding to action. This particular judgement "may, indeed, be conformable to thoſe general ideas of *fit* and "*right*; but, for the moſt part, it is not ſo. *He complies* "*almoſt always, with the reigning paſſion of the heart, to the bias of* "*the temperament, to the force of contracted habits*," &c. Now if this be the caſe, as in truth it is, we muſt needs draw from this Principle the very contrary concluſion, That, if *men act, not according to their opinions*, and that it is the force of the irregular appetites which cauſes this perverſity, a Religioniſt will *often act againſt his principles*; but an Atheiſt, *always conformably to them*: becauſe an Atheiſt indulges his vicious paſſions, while he acts *according to his* principles, in the ſame manner that a Religioniſt does, when he acts *againſt his*. It is therefore only *accidental* that men act contrary to their opinions; then, when they oppoſe their paſſions: or in Mr. *Bayle's* words, when *the general knowledge of what one ought to do, doth not coincide with the particular judgement we paſs on each diſtinct caſe*; which judgement is generally directed by the paſſions: But that coincidence always happens in an Atheiſt's determination of himſelf to action: ſo that the matter, when ſtripped of the parade of eloquence, and cleared from the perplexity of the abounding verbage, lies open to this eaſy anſwer.

* L'idée générale veut que, &c. Penſ. div. c. cxxxv.

We

We allow, men frequently act contrary to their opinions, both *metaphyſical* and *moral*, in the caſes Mr. *Bayle* puts.

1. *In metaphyſical*, where the Principle contradicts common ſentiments, as the *ſtoical fate*, *and chriſtian predeſtination* * : there, men rarely act in conformity to their opinions. But this inſtance doth not at all affect the queſtion, though Mr. *Bayle*, by his manner of urging it, would inſinuate, that an Atheiſt might be no more influenced in practice, by his ſpeculative opinion of *no God*, than a Fataliſt, by *his*, of *no liberty*. But the caſes are widely different: for, as the exiſtence of God reſtrains all the vicious appetites by enforcing the duties of morality, the diſbelief of it, by taking off that reſtraint, would ſuffer, nay invite, the Atheiſt to act according to his principles. But the opinion of *fate* having no ſuch effect on the morality of actions, and at the ſame time contradicting common ſentiments, we eaſily conceive how the maintainers of it are brought to act contrary to their principles. Nay, it will appear, when rightly conſidered, that the Atheiſt would be ſo far from not acting according to his opinions, that were his principle of *no God*, added to the fataliſt's of *no liberty*, it would then occaſion the fataliſt to act according to his opinions, though he acted contrary to them before; at leaſt, if the cauſe Mr. *Bayle* aſſigns for men's not conforming their practice to their principles, be true: for the ſole reaſon why the fataliſt did not act according to his opinions, was, becauſe they could not be uſed, while he was a Theiſt, to the gratification of his paſſions; becauſe, that though it appeared, if there were no liberty, men could have no merit; yet believing a God, the rewarder and puniſher of men, as if they had merit, he would act likewiſe as if they had. But take away from him the belief of a God, and there would be then no cauſe why he ſhould not act *according* to his principle of *fate*, as far as relates to moral practice.

* Penſ. div. c. clxxvi.

2. Next,

2. Next, *in morals*. We own that men here likewiſe frequently act contrary to their opinions: For the view (as we obſerved above) of the greateſt confeſſed poſſible good, which, to a religioniſt, is the practice of virtue, will never, till it be conſidered as making a neceſſary part of our happineſs, excite us to the purſuit of it: and our irregular paſſions, which are of a contrary nature, while they continue importunate, and while one or other is perpetually ſoliciting us, will prevent us from thus conſidering virtue as making a neceſſary part of our happineſs. This is the true cauſe of all that diſorder in the life of man, which Philoſophers ſo much admire; which the Devout lament; and for which the Moraliſt could never find a cure: Where the appetites and reaſon are in perpetual conflict; and the man's practice is continually oppoſing his principles. But, on the other hand, an Atheiſt, whoſe opinions lead him to conclude, *ſenſual pleaſure to be the greateſt poſſible good*, muſt, by the concurrence of his paſſions, conſider it as making a neceſſary part of *his* happineſs: and then nothing can prevent his acting *according to his principles*.

We own, however, that the Atheiſt, Mr. *Bayle* deſcribes, would be as apt, nay apter, to act againſt his opinions than a Theiſt: but they are only thoſe ſlender opinions concerning *the obligation to virtuous practice* which Mr. *Bayle* hath given him: for if men do not purſue the greateſt confeſſed poſſible good, till they conſider it as making a neceſſary part of their happineſs; I aſk, which is the likelieſt means of bringing them ſo to conſider it? Is it the reflection of *the innate idea of the lovelineſs of virtue*; or the more abſtract contemplation on its *eſſential difference* to vice? (and theſe are the only views in which an Atheiſt can conſider it) or is it not rather the belief, that the practice of virtue, as religion teaches it, is attended with an infinite reward? To thoſe opinions, I ſay, an Atheiſt is like enough to run counter: but his principles of impiety, which cheriſh his paſſions, we muſt never look to find at variance with his actions: for our adverſary tells us, that the reaſon why practice and principle ſo much differ, is the violence of human

appetites: from which a plain diſcourſer would have drawn the contrary concluſion; that then, there is the greater neceſſity to enforce religion, as an additional curb to licentiouſneſs; for, that a curb it is, at leaſt in ſome degree, is agreed on all hands.

And here, at parting, it may not be amiſs to obſerve, how much this argument weakens one of the foregoing: *There* we are made to believe, that the *moral ſenſe* and *eſſential differences* are ſufficient to make men virtuous: *Here* we are taught, that theſe, with the *ſanction of a Providence* to boot, cannot do it in any tolerable degree.

As to the lives of his *Epicureans*, and other Atheiſts, which we now come to; the reader is firſt of all deſired to take notice of the fallacy he would here obtrude upon us, in the judgement he makes of the nature of the two different principles, by ſetting together the effects of *Atheiſm*, as they appear in the majority of half a ſcore men; and thoſe of *Religion*, as they appear in the majority of infinite multitudes: A kind of ſophiſm, which ſmall ſects in religion have perpetually in their mouths, when they compare their own morals with thoſe in large communities, from which they diſſent. And now, to come to his palmary argument taken from fact. For,

IV. In the laſt place, he ſays *, "that the lives of the ſeveral "Atheiſts of antiquity fully ſhew, that this principle does not ne- "ceſſarily produce depravity of morals." He inſtances "in *Diago-* "*ras*, *Theodorus*, *Euemerus*, *Nicanor*, and *Hippon*: "whoſe virtue "appeared ſo admirable to a Father of the Church, that he would "enrich Religion with it, and make Theiſts of them, in ſpite of "all Antiquity." And then deſcends to "*Epicurus*, and his fol- "lowers, whom their very enemies acknowledged to be unblameable "in their actions, as the *Roman Atticus*, *Caſſius*, and the elder "*Pliny*:" and cloſes this illuſtrious catalogue with an encomium on the morality of *Vanini* and *Spinoſa*: But this is not all; for he tells us farther †, of whole nations of Atheiſts, "which modern

* Penſ. diver. c. clxxiv. & Contin. des Penſ. diver. c. cxliv.

† Contin. des Penſ. div. c. lxxxv. & c. cxliv.

"travellers

"travellers have diſcovered in the iſlands or continents of *Afric* and "*America*, that, in point of morals, are rather better, not worſe, "than the idolaters who live around them. It is true, that theſe "Atheiſts are ſavages, without laws, magiſtrate, or civil policy: "but this (he ſays) * ſupplies him with an argument *à fortiori*: for "if they live peaceably together out of civil ſociety, much rather "would they do ſo in it, where equal laws reſtrain men from in-"juſtice." He is ſo pleaſed with this argument, that he reduces it to this enthymeme †:

> "Whole nations of atheiſts, divided into independent families, "have preſerved themſelves from time immemorial without "law.

"Therefore, much ſtronger reaſon have we to think they would "ſtill preſerve themſelves, were they under one common maſter, "and one common law, the equal diſtributer of rewards and pu-"niſhments."

In anſwer to all this, I ſay (having once again reminded the reader, that the queſtion between us is, *whether atheiſm would not have a pernicious effect on the body of a people in ſociety*) 1. That as to the lives of thoſe philoſophers, and heads of ſects, which Mr. *Bayle* hath thought fit ſo much to applaud, nothing can be collected from thence, in favour of the general influence of atheiſm on morality. We will take a view of the ſeveral motives thoſe men had to the practice of virtue: for thereby it will be ſeen, that not one of theſe motives (peculiar to their ſeveral characters, ends, and circumſtances) reaches the groſs body of a people, ſeized with the infection of this principle. In *ſome* of them it was the *moral ſenſe*, and the *eſſential difference of things*, that inclined them to virtue: but we have fully ſhewn above, that theſe are too weak to operate on the generality of mankind; though a few ſtudious, contempla-

* Contin. des Penſ. div. c. cxviii.

† Des peuples athées diviſes en familles independantes ſe font, &c.

tive Men, of a more refined imagination and felicity of temperament, might be indeed influenced by them. In *others* it was a warm paſſion for fame, and love of glory. But though all degrees of men have this paſſion equally ſtrong, yet all have it not equally pure and delicate: ſo that though *reputation* is what all affect, yet the groſs body of mankind is little ſolicitous from whence it ariſes; and reputation, or at leaſt the *marks* of it, which is all the people aſpire to, we have ſhewn, may be eaſily gained in a road very far from the real practice of virtue: in which road too, the people are moſt ſtrongly tempted to purſue it. Very ſmall then is the number of thoſe, on whom theſe motives would operate, as even *Pomponatius*, in his ample confeſſion taken above, hath acknowledged: and yet theſe are the moſt extenſive motives that theſe philoſophic Atheiſts had to the practice of virtue: for, in the *reſt*, the motive muſt be owned to have been leſs legitimate, and reſtrained to their peculiar ends or circumſtances; as concern for the credit of the ſect they had founded, or eſpouſed: which they endeavoured to ennoble by this ſpurious luſtre. It is not eaſy for a Modern to conceive, how tender they were of the honour of their Principles: The conference between *Pompey* and *Poſidonius* the Stoic, is a well-known ſtory *: and if the fear of only appearing ridiculous by their principles were ſtrong enough to make them do ſuch violence to themſelves, what muſt we believe the fear of becoming generally odious would do, where the principle has a natural tendency, as we ſee *Cardan* frankly confeſſed, to make the holder of it the object of public abhorrence? But if the ſenſe of ſhame were not ſtrong enough, ſelf-preſervation would force theſe men upon the practice of virtue: for though, of old, the Magiſtrate gave great indulgence to philoſophic ſpeculations; yet this downright principle of atheiſm being univerſally underſtood to be deſtructive to Society, He frequently let looſe his ſevereſt reſentment againſt the maintainers of it: ſo that ſuch had no other way to diſarm his vengeance, than in perſuading him by

* Tuſc. Diſp. l. ii. c. 25. Edit. Oxon. 4°. t. II. p. 297.

their

their lives, that the principle had no ſuch deſtructive tendency. In a word then, theſe motives being peculiar to the leaders of ſects, we ſee that the virtuous practice ariſing from thence makes nothing for the point in queſtion.

2. But he comes much cloſer to it, in his next inſtance; which is of whole nations of modern Savages, who are all atheiſts, and yet live more virtuouſly than their idolatrous neighbours. And their being yet unpolicied, and in a ſtate of nature, makes, he thinks, the inſtance conclude more ſtrongly for him. Now, to let the truth of the fact paſs unqueſtioned; though *Homer* ſeemed to have a very different opinion of the matter, when he makes the atheiſtical *Cyclops* to be the moſt unjuſt and violent, as well as moſt brutal, race of men upon earth. And what faith might be expected from ſuch a people, the poet gives us to underſtand, in that fine circumſtance, where one of them was accoſted by *Ulyſſes*, who was then a ſtranger to their Principles. This wary hero, imploring the aſſiſtance of a *Cyclop*, tells him with great openneſs who he was, whence he came, and the ſum of his adventures. But no ſooner had the Monſter profeſſed himſelf a thorough FREE-THINKER, than the experienced traveller loſt all hopes of faith or juſtice from him; and, from that moment, put himſelf upon his guard, and would not truſt him with one word of truth, more.

Ἀλλά μιν ἄφρονα ποσσὶ ἔην δολίοις ἐπέεσσι.

But I ſay, to let this paſs, I ſhall endeavour to detect the ſophiſtry of his concluſion (which I had before obviated in the ſecond ſection *, concerning the inſufficiency of human Laws alone) in a fuller explanation of that reaſoning.

It is notorious, that man in Society, is inceſſantly giving the affront to the public laws. To oppoſe which, the Community is as conſtantly buſied in adding new ſtrength and force to its ordinances. If we enquire into the cauſe of this perverſity, we ſhall find it no

* See p. 55.

other

other than the number and violence of the appetites. The appetites take their birth from our real or imaginary wants: our REAL wants are unalterably the ſame; and, as ariſing only from the natural imbecillity of our condition, extremely few, and eaſily relieved. Our FANTASTIC wants are infinitely numerous, to be brought under no certain meaſure or ſtandard; and increaſing exactly in proportion to our improvements in the arts of life. But the arts of life owe their original to Society *: and the more perfect the Policy, the higher do thoſe improvements ariſe; and, with them, are our wants, as we ſay, proportionably increaſed, and our appetites inflamed. For the violence of theſe appetites, which ſeek the gratification of our imaginary wants, is much ſtronger than that raiſed by our real wants: not only becauſe thoſe wants are more numerous, which give conſtant exerciſe to the appetites; and more unreaſonable, which make the gratification proportionably difficult: and altogether unnatural, to which there is no meaſure; but, principally, becauſe vicious cuſtom hath affixed a *kind of reputation* to the gratification of the fantaſtic wants, which it hath not done to the relief of the real ones. So that when things are in this ſtate, we have ſhewn above, that even the moſt provident Laws, without other aſſiſtance, are inſufficient. But in a ſtate of nature, unconſcious of the arts of life, men's wants are only real; and theſe wants, few, and eaſily ſupplied. For food and covering are all which are neceſſary to ſupport our Being. And Providence is abundant in its proviſions, for theſe wants: and while there is more than enough for all, it can hardly be, that there ſhould be diſputes about each man's ſhare.

* There is one remarkable circumſtance in the *Moſaic* hiſtory, that I ſhould fancy, muſt needs give our *free-thinkers* a high idea of the *veracity* or *penetration* of the author. It is, where, having repreſented *Cain* as the firſt who built a city, or made advances towards civil ſociety, he informs us, that his poſterity were the inventors of the arts of life, in the inſtances he gives of *Jabal*, *Jubal*, and *Tubal-Cain*.

And

And now the reader ſees clearly how it might well be, that this rabble of Atheiſts ſhould live peaceably in a ſtate of nature, though the utmoſt force of human Laws, in the improved condition of Society, could not hinder them from running into mutual violence. But the ſophiſtry of this enthymeme is further ſeen from hence. Not even Mr. *Bayle* himſelf would pretend, that theſe Atheiſts, who live peaceably in their preſent ſtate, without the reſtraint of human laws, would live peaceably without this reſtraint, after they had underſtood and practiſed the arts of life in credit amongſt a civilized people. In Society therefore, which the arts of life inſeparably accompany, an impoſed curb, he will own, would be neceſſary. I then argue thus, If a people, who out of Society could live peaceably without the curb of Law, could not live peaceably without that curb in Society; you have no reaſon to believe, that though out of ſociety they might live peaceably without the curb of religion, they could live peaceably, without that curb, in Society? The anſwer to this muſt bring on again the queſtion, How ſtrong the curb on man, in Society, ſhould be? which we have fully examined in another place. This argument, therefore, proves nothing but the folly of pretending to conclude, concerning man in Society, from what we ſee of his behaviour, out of it

And here, in concluſion, once for all, it may not be amiſs to obſerve, the uniform ſtrain of ſophiſtry which runs through all Mr. *Bayle's* reaſonings on this head. The queſtion is, and I have been frequently obliged to repeat it, he ſo induſtriouſly affecting to forget or miſtake it, *Whether Atheiſm be deſtructive to the body of a Society?* And yet he, whoſe buſineſs it is, to prove the negative, brings all his arguments from conſiderations, which either affect not the groſs body of mankind, or affect not that body, in Society: in a word, from the lives of *Sophiſts* or *Savages*; from the example of a few ſpeculative men far above the view of the common run of *citizens*; or from *that* of a barbarous crew of *ſavages* much farther below it. All his facts and reaſonings then being granted, they ſtill fall ſhort and wide of his concluſion.

But

But the laſt ſtroke of his apology is more extravagant than all the reſt: for having proved atheiſm very conſiſtent with a ſtate of nature, leſt it ſhould happen to be found not ſo conſiſtent with civil ſociety, but that one of them muſt riſe upon the ruins of the other, he gives a very palpable hint which of the two he thinks ſhould be preſerved; by making it a ſerious queſtion, diſcuſſed in a ſet diſſertation *, WHETHER CIVIL SOCIETY BE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF MANKIND †? and very gravely reſolving it in the negative.—And here let me obſerve, that theſe PHILOSOPHERS (as Meſſ. *Voltaire* and *D'Alembert* call all thoſe who deſpiſe Religion) never ſuffer a good hint to lye unimproved. The famous citizen of *Geneva* building upon this before us, hath ſince written a large Diſcourſe to ſhew, that CIVIL SOCIETY IS EVEN HURTFUL TO MANKIND.

SECT. VI.

I Have here given, and to the beſt advantage, all the arguments Mr. *Bayle* hath employed to prove Religion not neceſſary to civil Society; by which it may be ſeen, how little the united force of wit and eloquence is able to produce for the ſupport of ſo outrageous a paradox.

The reader will imagine, that now nothing can hinder us from going on to our *ſecond* propoſition; after having ſo ſtrongly ſupported the *firſt*. But we have yet to combat a greater monſter in morals before we can proceed.

As the great foundation of our propoſition, *that the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments is neceſſary to civil ſociety*, is this, *that religion is neceſſary to civil ſociety*; ſo the foundation of this latter propoſition is, *that* VIRTUE *is ſo*. Now, to the laſting opprobrium of our age and country, we have ſeen a writer publicly

* Contin. des Penſ. div. c. cxviii.

† Si les ſocietéz ſont abſolument neceſſaires pour conſerver le genre humain.

maintain,

maintain, in a book ſo intituled, that PRIVATE VICES were PUBLIC BENEFITS. An unheard-of impiety, wickedly advanced, and impudently avowed, againſt the univerſal voice of nature: in which *moral virtue* is repreſented as the invention of knaves; and *chriſtian virtue* as the impoſition of fools: in which (that his inſult on common ſenſe might equal what he puts on common honeſty) he aſſures his reader, that his book is a ſyſtem of moſt exalted morals and religion: And that the *juſtice of his country*, which publicly accuſed him *, was pure calumny.

But I ſhall undertake to ſhew, and that in very few words, to the admirers of the low buffoonry and impure rhetoric of this wordy declaimer, that his whole fabric is one confuſed heap of falſhoods and abſurdities.

I. *Firſt* then, it is to be obſerved, that though his general poſition be, *that private Vices are public benefits*, yet, in his proof of it, he all along explains it by *Vice only in a certain meaſure, and to a certain degree.* And, as all other writers have deduced the neceſſity on private men in ſociety, to be virtuous, and on the magiſtrate ſeverely to puniſh vice, from the *malignity of the nature of Vice*; ſo he enforces this neceſſity, on both, from the *malignity of its exceſs*. And indeed he had been only fit for Bedlam had he not given this reſtriction to the general ſenſe of his propoſition.

However, this is full enough to expoſe the falſhood of that aſſertion, which his whole book is written to ſupport, namely, *that vice is abſolutely neceſſary for a rich and powerful Society.* For whatſoever is *abſolutely neceſſary* to the well-being of another in matter of morals, muſt be ſo, by its eſſential properties; the uſe of which thing will be, then, in proportion to its degree. And this the common moraliſts obſerve of Virtue with regard to the State. But whatſoever is uſeful to another, only when in a certain degree, is not ſo by its eſſential properties; if not by its eſſential properties,

* By the Grand-jury of Middleſex.

then, of courſe, by accident only; and, if by accident, not neceſſary.

The firſt part of the former aſſertion may be proved thus. If A be abſolutely neceſſary to B, it is, becauſe neither C, nor D, nor any thing but A, can ſupply the wants of B. But if nothing but A can ſupply theſe wants, it is becauſe the ſupplial is afforded by the *eſſential* properties of A; which eſſential properties are incommunicable to all other beings; the communication of them to C, D, *&c.* making C and D the ſame as A, which is abſurd: for if the ſupplial of the wants of B were cauſed by what was not *eſſential* to A, but *accidental*; then might theſe wants as well be ſupplied by C, D, *&c.* as by A; becauſe that which is *accidental* only, may belong in common to ſeveral different beings. The ſecond part may be proved thus: Theſe *eſſential qualities can never be exceſſive*; as for inſtance, There can never be too much *Virtue* in a ſtate. *Specific* Virtues, indeed, may be puſhed to exceſs; but then they loſe their nature, and become *Vices*; in which ſtate of things, Society will be ſo far from having too much, that it will have too little Virtue. It is not ſo with *generic* Virtue; therefore that *eſſential* Quality in A, which in a lower degree profits B, muſt in a higher degree be ſtill more uſeful to B. On the other hand, *accidental Qualities may be exceſſive*; ſo that, that *accidental* Quality in A, which profiteth B in a lower degree, may injure B in a higher. This is the caſe of REAL LUXURY, in its effects on Society; as will be ſhewn in the progreſs of this ſection: for though a ſpecific Virtue carried to an exceſs becomes Vice, yet a Vice, ſo puſhed on, never becomes Virtue; but, on the contrary, by advancing in malignity, more clearly evinces it's true nature, and expoſes its baleful effects.

From all this, it appears, that a great and powerful Community, which is, in itſelf, a natural good, and, as ſuch, deſirable, may procure and preſerve its grandeur without Vice, though Vice ſo frequently produces and ſupports it: becauſe this utility of Vice not

not ariſing from its eſſential qualities, but from ſome accidental circumſtances attending it, may be ſupplied by ſomething that is not Vice, attended with the ſame circumſtances. As for inſtance, the conſumption of the *products of art and nature* is the circumſtance which makes States rich and flouriſhing. Now if this conſumption may be procured by actions not vicious, then may a State become great and powerful without the aſſiſtance of Vice. That it may, in fact, be thus procured, ſhall now be ſhewn.

II. The Author, deſcending to the enumeration of his proofs, appears plainly to have ſeen, that Vice in general was only *accidentally* productive of good; and therefore avoids entering into an examination of particulars; but ſelects, out of his favourite tribe, LUXURY, to ſupport his execrable paradox; and on this alone reſts his cauſe. By the aſſiſtance of this ambiguous term, he keeps ſomething like an argument on foot, even after he hath left all the reſt of his City-crew to ſhift for themſelves. And it muſt be owned, there is no word more inconſtantly and capriciouſly applied to particular actions; or of more uncertain meaning, when denominating ſuch actions, than the term *Luxury*. For, unapplied, it has like all other moral modes, an exact and preciſe ſignification; and includes in it, *the abuſe of the gifts of Providence*. The difficulty is only to know when this queſtion is abuſed. Men have two ways of deciding: the one, by the *principles of Natural religion*; the other, by the *poſitive inſtitutions of Revealed*. In thoſe *Principles*, all men are reaſonably well agreed; but, concerning theſe *Inſtitutions*, when taken ſeparately, and independent on thoſe *Principles*, there are various opinions, which ſuperſtition and fanaticiſm have greatly diſtorted: conſequently, thoſe who eſtimate *Luxury* by this latter rule, (where obſcurity and, of courſe, confuſion, are ſo difficult to be avoided) will diſagree extremely about it: and amongſt ſuch diverſity of notions, it would be ſtrange indeed, if ſome or other had not ideas of *Luxury*, which would ſerve the wildeſt hypotheſis; and

much ſtranger, if ſo corrupt a Writer did not take advantage of them. He has done it like a maſter: and with a malice and cunning to intitle him, though he be but a follower, to be a Leader of a ſect.

Firſt, in order to perplex and obſcure our idea of *Luxury*, he hath laboured in a previous diſſertation, on *the origin of moral virtue*, to deſtroy thoſe very principles, by whoſe aſſiſtance we are only able to clear up and aſcertain that idea: where he decries and ridicules the eſſential difference of things, the eternal notions of right and wrong; and makes VIRTUE, which common moraliſts deduce from thence, the offspring of craft and pride.

Nothing now being left to fix the idea of *Luxury*, but the poſitive precepts of *Chriſtianity*, and he having ſtript theſe of their only true and infallible interpreter, the principles of *natural Religion*; it was eaſy for him to make thoſe precepts ſpeak in favour of any abſurdities that would ſerve his purpoſe, and as eaſy to find ſuch abſurdities ſupported by the ſuperſtition and fanaticiſm of ſome or other of thoſe many Sects and Parties of *chriſtianity*, who, deſpiſing the principles of the Religion of Nature as *the weak and beggarly elements*, ſoon came to regard the natural appetites, as the graceleſs furniture of *the old man, with his affections and luſts*.

Having got CHRISTIANITY at this advantage, he gives us for Goſpel, that meagre Phantom begot by the hypocriſy of *Monks* on the miſanthropy of *Aſcetics*: which cries out, AN ABUSE! whenever the gifts of Providence are uſed, further than for the bare ſupport of nature. So that by this rule every thing becomes *Luxury* which is more than *neceſſary*. An idea of *Luxury* exactly fitted to our Author's hypotheſis: for if no State can be rich and powerful while its members ſeek only a bare ſubſiſtence, and, if what is more than a bare ſubſiſtence be *Luxury*, and *Luxury* be *Vice*; the conſequence, we ſee, comes in pat, PRIVATE VICES ARE PUBLIC BENEFITS. Here you have the ſole iſſue of all this tumour of words.

But

But it is difficult to think, that a Writer of ſuch depravity of heart, had not farther ends in this wicked repreſentation of *natural* and *revealed* Religion. We cannot doubt his purpoſe, when we reflect upon his gains, which are, the fixing of his followers in a propenſity for *Vice*, and in a prejudice againſt *Chriſtianity*. For what can be more in favour of *Vice*, than, that there is no moral duty? What more in diſcredit of *Chriſtianity*, than, that all the enjoyments of life are condemned by it as evil?

III. But the GOSPEL is a very different thing from what Bigots and Fanatics are wont to repreſent it. It enjoins and forbids nothing in moral practice, but what natural Religion had before enjoined and forbid. Neither indeed could it, becauſe one of God's Revelations, whether ordinary or extraordinary, cannot contradict another; and becauſe God gave us the firſt, to judge of others, by it. Accordingly we find, that though it be indeed one of the great ends of *Chriſtianity* (but not the main and peculiar end) to advance the practice of moral virtue amongſt men, yet the New Teſtament doth not contain any regular or complete ſyſtem or Digeſt of moral laws; the detached precepts enforced by our divine Maſter in it, how excellent and perfect ſoever, ariſing only from the occaſions and circumſtances which gave birth to thoſe diſcourſes or writings, in which ſuch precepts are delivered. For the reſt, for a general knowledge of the ſyſtem of moral-duty, the founders of our Religion hold open to us the great Pandect of the law of nature, and bid us ſearch and ſtudy that. *Finally*, ſays the apoſtle Paul, *whatſoever things are true, whatſoever things are honeſt, whatſoever things are juſt, whatſoever things are lovely, whatſoever things are of good report, think on theſe things.* But where vicious cuſtom, or perverſe Interpreters, had depraved the Religion of Nature, there, particular care was taken to remove the rubbiſh of time and malice, and to reinſtate the injured moralities in their primitive dignity and ſplendor.

The *Religion of Nature*, then, being reſtored, and made the rule to explain and interpret the occaſional precepts of *Chriſtianity*; what

is *Luxury* by *natural* Religion, that, and that only, muſt be *Luxury* by *revealed.* So that a true and preciſe definition of it, which this Writer (triumphing in the obſcurity which, by theſe arts, he hath thrown over the idea) thinks it impoſſible to give, ſo as not to ſuit with his hypotheſis, is eaſily ſettled. Luxury *is the uſing the gifts of Providence, to the injury of the Uſer, either in his perſon or fortune; or to the injury of any other, towards whom the Uſer ſtands in any relation, which obliges him to aid and aſſiſtance.*

Now it is evident, even from the inſtances this Writer brings of the public advantages of conſumption, which he indiſcriminately, and therefore falſly, calls *Luxury*, that the utmoſt conſumption may be made, and ſo all the ends of a rich and powerful Society ſerved, without injury to the Uſer, or any one, to whom he ſtands related: conſequently without *Luxury*, and without *Vice.* When the conſumption is attended with ſuch injury, then it becomes *Luxury*, then it becomes a *Vice.* But then, let us take notice, that *this Vice*, like all others, is ſo far from being advantageous to Society, that it is the moſt certain ruin of it. It was this *Luxury* which deſtroyed *Rome.* And the very definition given above, informs us of the manner how it came to paſs: namely, by enervating the body, debauching the mind, beggaring the fortune, and bringing in the practice of univerſal rapine and injuſtice. But the wretched abſurdity of ſuppoſing *Luxury* beneficial to ſociety, cannot be better expoſed, than by conſidering, that, as *Luxury* is the abuſing the gifts of Providence, to the injury of himſelf and of thoſe to whom we ſtand related; and as the *Public* is that, to which every man ſtands neareſt related; the conſequence is, that *Luxury* is, at one and the ſame time, beneficial and injurious to the Public. Nor can the abſurdity I here charge upon him, be evaded by ſaying it is deduced from a propoſition of his, and a definition of mine, ſet together: Becauſe, however we may differ whether the uſe of things, where no one is injured, be *Luxury*; yet we both agree in this, that where there is that injury in the uſe, it is *Luxury*; and *Luxury*, in this ſenſe, he holds to be beneficial to Society.

The

The caſe I here put, of *Luxury's* injuring the PUBLIC, by depriving the ſtate of that aid and aſſiſtance from particulars, which, the relation they ſtand in to it, requires them to give, is no imaginary or unlikely ſuppoſition. This effect of *Luxury* it was which contributed, more immediately than any other, to the deſtruction of the Roman Commonwealth. For in the laſt ſtruggles for liberty by a FEW, againſt the humour of a debauched *luxurious* people, when nothing but a ſufficient fund was wanting to enable thoſe godlike men to reſtore the Republic, the richeſt citizens, who yet wiſhed well to their Country, could not be prevailed upon to retrench from their private Luxury, to ſupport the Public in this critical exigency: which therefore, having been long ſhaken by the *Luxury* of its enemies, fell now a ſacrifice to the *Luxury* of its friends. Thus the great *Roman patriot* deſcribes the fatal condition of thoſe times; *Nos habemus* LUXURIAM, *atque avaritiam*; *publice egeſtatem*, *privatim opulentiam*.

In a word then, it is not *Luxury*, but the *conſumption* of the products of art and nature, which is of ſo high benefit to Society. That this *conſumption* may well be, without *Luxury*, appears plainly from the definition given above. All the difference is, and that a very eſſential one, when the *conſumption* is made without *Luxury*, infinitely greater numbers ſhare in it; when it becomes *Luxury*, it is confined to fewer. The reaſon of this, and the different effects this different conſumption muſt have on the Public, is very evident. Had the conſumption of the commodities and products of Greece when conquered (which indeed were neceſſary to render the Romans polite and wealthy) been more equally made by that people, it would have been extremely beneficial. But being unjuſtly claimed by one part, excluſive of the reſt, "omnia virtutis præmia ambitio "poſſidebat," it became luxury and deſtruction. The Hiſtorian ſhews us how it was brought about: "There (ſays he) the Roman "people firſt began to intrigue, to debauch, to affect a taſte for ſta-"tues, pictures, and high-wrought plate. To come at which,

"they

" they oppreſſed the private, plundered the public, violated the " temples of the Gods, and polluted and confounded every thing " both ſacred and prophane*." Till at length,

" Sævior armis
" Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulciſcitur orbem."

HAVING endeavoured to ſhew in this and the two following Books, *that* the Priests and Lawgivers of former times all concurred in ſupporting the belief of a future state, I am ſtopped in the midſt of my courſe, by a late noble Writer, who hath taken advantage of this notorious truth, to repreſent the labours of thoſe Moderns, who have trode in the ſame ſteps, as a confederacy between Divines and Atheists to dishonour and degrade the God of the Universe.

" After pleading the cauſe of natural and revealed Religion, (ſays " his Lordſhip) I am to plead the cauſe of God himſelf, againſt " Divines and Atheists in confederacy †.

" The conduct of Chriſtian Divines has been ſo far from de- " fending the Providence of God, that they have joined in the cla- " mour againſt it. Nothing has hindered, even thoſe who pretend " to be his Meſſengers, his Embaſſadors, his *Plenipotentaries*, from " renouncing their allegiance to him, (as they themſelves have " the front to avow,) but the hypotheſis of a future state. " On *this hypotheſis alone*, they inſiſt; and therefore, if this will not " ſerve their turn, God is diſowned by them, as effectually as if " he was ſo, in terms ‡." " Divines, if not Atheiſts, yet are " abetters of Atheiſm §."

* Ibi primum inſuevit exercitus populi Romani amare, potare, ſigna, tabulas pictas, vaſa cælata mirari, ea privatim ac publice rapere, delubra ſpoliare, ſacra profanaque omnia polluere.

† Lord Bolingbroke's Works, vol. V. p. 305.

‡ Vol. V. p. 487, 8. § Vol. V. p. 485.

—" Divines

"That there were ſome men who knew not God in all ages, "may be true: but the ſcandalous taſk uf COMBATING HIS EXIS-"TENCE under the maſk of Theiſm, was reſerved for Metaphyſi-"cians and Theologians *."

"——Divines are ſtill more to be blamed. A CONFEDERACY "WITH ATHEISTS becomes ill the profeſſors of Theiſm. No matter. "They PERSIST, and have done their beſt, in concert with their "allies, to DESTROY the belief of the GOODNESS of God:—They "endeavour to DESTROY that of his GOODNESS, which is a farther "article of their ALLIANCE †."

"The CONFEDERACY between Atheiſts and Divines appears to "have been carried VERY FAR—Nay the Atheiſt will appear, to "that reaſon, to which they both appeal, more conſiſtent in his "abſurdity than the Divine ‡." "Divines UPBRAID God's GOOD-"NESS, and CENSURE his JUSTICE §."—"INJUSTICE is, in this "life, aſcribed to God, by Divines ||."

"The whole Tribe of Divines, like Wollaſton and Clarke, do, "in effect, RENOUNCE the God whom you and I adore, as much "as the rankeſt of the Atheiſtical Tribe. Your Prieſts and our "Parſons will exclaim moſt pathetically, and RAIL OUTRAGEOUSLY "at this aſſertion. But have a little patience, and I will prove it "to their ſhame to be true **."

The Reader will give me leave, in a few words, to vindicate the body of Divines from the horrid calumny of this imaginary Confederacy.

He may be pleaſed then to underſtand, that ATHEISM has ever endeavoured to ſupport itſelf, on a FACT, which has indeed all the certainty that the evidence of ſenſe and experience can give it; namely, *the unequal diſtribution of moral good and evil, here below.*

"Cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
"Adſpicerem, *lætoſque diu florere nocentes,*
"*Vexarique pios*——LABEFACTA CADEBAT
"RELIGIO,"——

* Vol. V. p. 307. † Vol. V. p. 393. ‡ Vol. V. p. 345. a.
§ Vol. V. p. 417. || Vol. V. p. 541. ** Vol. V. p. 485.

was the common language of the impatient ſufferer. From hence the Atheiſt inferred, that the Univerſe was without an intelligent Ruler; and that all things were driven about by that Fate or Fortune, which firſt produced them. DIVINES oppoſed this *Concluſion*; for they did not venture to be ſo paradoxical as (with his Lordſhip) to call in queſtion *the Premiſſes*, a phenomenon which objected itſelf to all their Senſes. They firſt demonſtrated, ſtrictly demonſtrated, the Being of a God, and his MORAL ATTRIBUTES: and then ſhewed, that if the whole of man's exiſtence were included within this life, the preſent diſtribution of good and evil would contradict that Demonſtration. They, therefore, inferred, on their part, that the whole of man's exiſtence was not included within this life: but that he was reſerved for an after-reckoning; in which, an *equal diſtribution of rewards and puniſhments* would amply vindicate the providence of a righteous Governor.

But *Atheiſts* were not the only enemies whom *Divines* had to deal with. There was a ſet of men, who allowed an intelligent firſt Cauſe, endowed with thoſe MORAL ATTRIBUTES, which the Divines had demonſtrated: and, on that account, called themſelves DEISTS. Yet they agreed ſo far with *Atheiſm*, as to confine the whole of man's exiſtence to the preſent life. Theſe, the *Divine* combated, in their turn; and with the ſame arms; but in an inverted order. In diſputing with the ATHEISTS, the principle held in common was *the preſent unequal diſtribution of Good and Evil.* So that to cut off their concluſion from it, of NO GOD, he *demonſtrated* the Being and Attributes: and from that proof inferred that the inequality would be ſet right. With DEISTS, the common principle was *the Being and Attributes of God.* Therefore, to bring them to the allowance of a FUTURE STATE, he appealed to the preſent *unequal diſtribution of good and evil*, (which theſe Men, as well as his Lordſhip, were very backward to allow and very induſtrious not to ſee;) and from that inequality inferred, that there muſt be ſuch a State.

This is a ſhort and true account of the DIVINE's conteſt with ATHEISTS and DEISTS, ſo far as the ſubject of *a future ſtate* came in queſtion:

queſtion: In both controverſies that *ſtate* is deduced from *the moral attributes*: only with this difference. In the diſpute with Atheiſts, the demonſtration of thoſe attributes is *made*; in the diſpute with Deiſts, it is *allowed*. The final purpoſe againſt Atheiſm is to prove the BEING AND ATTRIBUTES of God; the final purpoſe againſt Deiſm is to prove a FUTURE STATE: For neither *natural* nor *revealed* Religion can ſubſiſt without *believing that God* IS, *and that he is a* REWARDER *of them that ſeek him* *. Thus, we ſee, the *queſtion*, in each controverſy, being different; the *premiſſes*, by which each propoſition was to be proved, muſt needs be different. The difference is here explained; the premiſſes, in the argument againſt Atheiſts, were the *moral attributes*; the premiſſes, in the argument againſt Deiſts, were the *unequal diſtribution* of good and evil.

What Enemy to Religion now, could ever hope to ſee a Calumny either thrive or riſe on ſo unpromiſing a ground? or flatter himſelf with the expectation of an Advocate bold enough to tell the World, that this conduct of the DIVINES was a CONFEDERACY WITH ATHEISTS, *to decry God's Providence*; *to blot out his Attributes of goodneſs and juſtice*; *to combat his Government*; *and to deny his very Exiſtence?* The RIGHT HONOURABLE Author does all this: And more;—he expects to be believed. It is true, this is a fine believing age: Yet I hardly think he would have carried his confidence in our credulity ſo far, had he ſeen his way clear before him.—His Lordſhip is always ſublime, and therefore often cloudy; commonly, at too great a diſtance to look into the detail of things, or to enter into their *minuteneſs:* (for which, indeed, he is perpetually felicitating his Genius.) So that, in his *general view* of Theologic matters, he has jumbled theſe two Controverſies into one; and, in the confuſion, hath commodiouſly ſlipped in one Fact for another. He, all the way, repreſents Divines as making *a future State* THE PROOF *of God's moral attributes:* Whereas, we now ſee, on the very face of the controverſy, that they make *the moral attributes* A PROOF *of*

* St. Paul. Hebr. xi. 6.

a future State. Let us conſider how the diſpute ſtands with the *Atheiſt.* Theſe men draw their argument againſt a God, from the condition of the moral world: The Divine anſwers, by demonſtrating *God's Being and Attributes:* and, on that demonſtration, ſatisfies the objection. Conſider how it ſtands with the *Deiſt.* Here, God's Being and Attributes is a common principle: And on this ground the Divine ſtands, to deduce a *future ſtate* from the unequal diſtribution of things.—But his miſrepreſentation was to ſupport his ſlander of a CONFEDERACY: there was no room to pretend that God's Being was made precarious by proving a *future ſtate* from his Attributes; but could he get it be believed, that Divines proved the Attributes from a *future ſtate,* he would eaſily find credit with his kind Reader, for all the reſt.

Well then, the whole amount of his CHIMERICAL CONFEDERACY comes to this, That *Divines and Atheiſts hold a principle in common*; but, in common too with all the reſt of mankind; namely, that there are irregularities in the diſtribution of good and evil here below. And did any thing forbid *Divines* to employ this common principle, in ſupport of Religion againſt *Atheiſm and Deiſm!* But whatever his Lordſhip might think proper to diſguiſe in this reaſoning, there is one thing, the moſt careleſs Reader will never overlook; which is, that, under all this pomp of words and ſolemnity of accuſation, you ſee lurking that poor ſpecies of a Bigot's calumny, which, from *one* principle held in common with an obnoxious Party, charges his Adverſary, with *all* the follies or impieties which have rendered that Party odious. This miſerable artifice of impoſture, had now been long hiſſed out of learned controverſy, when the noble Lord took it up; and, with true political ſkill, worked it into a SHAM PLOT; to make RELIGION diſtruſt it's beſt Friends, and take refuge in the FIRST PHILOSOPHY.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST BOOK.

BOOK I.

PROVES the neceſſity of the doctrines of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments to civil ſociety, from the nature of the thing, p. 45—124.

SECT. I.

THE introduction, the nature of internal evidence; the occaſion of this diſcourſe, and the propoſition, p. 45—52.

SECT. II.

OF the original of civil ſociety; the cauſes of its defective plan: that this defect can be only ſupplied by religion: that religion, under the preſent diſpenſation of providence, cannot ſubſiſt without the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments; therefore that doctrine neceſſary to civil ſociety, p. 52—66.

SECT. III.

THE arguments of thoſe who deny the neceſſity of religion to ſociety conſidered: Pomponatius *falſely ranked in that number, and vindicated:* Cardan *characterized and cenſured,* p. 66—74.

SECT.

SECT IV. and V.

Mr. Bayle, *the great defender of this paradox in his apology for atheiſm, examined. His arguments collected, methodized, and confuted. In the courſe of this diſputation, the true foundation of morality enquired into, and ſhewn to be neither the* eſſential difference of things, *nor the* moral ſenſe, *but the* will of God. *The cauſes of the contrary errors ſhewn: and the objections againſt morality's being founded in the* will of God, *anſwered*, p. 74—112.

SECT. VI.

THE Author of the Fable of the Bees, *who contends that it is* Vice, *and not* Virtue, *that is uſeful to ſociety, examined, expoſed, and confuted*, p. 112—124.

BOOK

BOOK II.

SECT. I.

HAVING now proved the firſt PROPOSITION, *That inculcating the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments is neceſſary to the well-being of Society*, by conſiderations drawn from the *nature of Man*, and the *genius of civil Society*; and cleared it from the objections of licentious Wits;

I proceed to the *ſecond*; which is, THAT ALL MANKIND, ESPECIALLY THE MOST WISE AND LEARNED NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY, HAVE CONCURRED IN BELIEVING AND TEACHING, THAT THIS DOCTRINE WAS OF SUCH USE TO CIVIL SOCIETY.

This I ſhall endeavour to prove,

I. From the conduct of Lawgivers, and Inſtitutors of civil policy.

II. From the opinions of all the Learners and Teachers of wiſdom in the ſchools of ancient philoſophy.

I. FROM THE CONDUCT OF LAWGIVERS, AND INSTITUTORS OF CIVIL POLICY: who never omitted to propagate and confirm Religion, where-ever they eſtabliſhed Laws; RELIGION, I ſay, which was always firſt in their view, and laſt in their execution. They uſed it as the inſtrument to collect a body politic; and they applied it as the bond to tye and keep that body together: they *taught* it in civilizing man; and *eſtabliſhed* it to prevent his return to barbarity and a ſavage life. In a word, ſo inſeparable, in the ancient World,

World, were the ideas of LAWGIVING and RELIGION, that Plutarch (in his paradoxical preference of atheiſm to ſuperſtition) ſuppoſes no other Origin of divine worſhip than what was the work of the Lawgiver. "How much happier had it been (ſays he) for the "Carthaginians, had their firſt Lawgiver been like Critias or Dia-"goras, who believed neither Gods nor Demons, rather than ſuch "a one as enjoined the public ſacrifices to Saturn.* !"

That the Magiſtrate, as ſuch, hath taken the greateſt care and pains to inculcate and ſupport Religion, we ſhall prove at large: That this care and pains muſt ariſe, and was employed, on account of its confeſſed and experienced utility to the State, will need no proof.

But here it will be neceſſary to remind the reader of this previous truth, *That there never was, in any age of the world, from the moſt early accounts of time, to this preſent hour, any civil-policied nation or people, who had a Religion, of which the chief foundatiou and ſupport was not the doctrine of a* FUTURE STATE *of rewards and puniſhments*; *the* JEWISH PEOPLE *only excepted.* This, I preſume, our adverſaries will not deny. Mr. *Bayle*, the indulgent foſter-father of Infidelity, confeſſeth it in the fulleſt manner, and with the utmoſt ingenuity: "Toutes les religions du monde, tant la vraie que "les fauſſes, roulent ſur ce grand pivot, qu'il y a un juge inviſi-"ble qui punit & qui recompenſe, *apres cette vie*, les actions de "l'homme tant exterieures qu'interieures. C'eſt de la que l'on "ſupoſe que decoule la principale utilité de la religion:" and thinks, it was the utility of this doctrine which ſet the Magiſtrate upon inventing a Religion for the State: "C'eſt le principal motif qui eut "animé ceux qui l'auroient inventée †."

* Τί δὲ Καρχηδονίοις ἐκ ἐλυσιτέλει Κριτίαν λαβεῖν ἢ Διαγόραν νομοθέτην ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, μήτε τινὰ θεῶν μήτε δαιμόνων νομίζειν, ἢ τοιαῦτα θύειν οἷα τῷ Χρόνῳ ἔθυον;—Περὶ δεισιδ.

P. 171. tom. II. fol. 1599. Francof.

† Dict. Crit. & Hiſt. Art. SPINOZA, Rem. (E.)

This

This truth, we beg the reader always to have in mind: So that when, in the ſequel of this diſcourſe, he meets with ancient teſtimonies for the neceſſity of RELIGION to Society, he may be ſure, that the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE of rewards and puniſhments, was the chief idea included in that term. And on this account it is, that frequently, where the Ancients ſpeak of the *ſource* of thoſe utilities, which can proceed only from the doctrine of a *future ſtate*, they give it the common name of *Religion*: as, on the other hand, they often call *Religion* by the reſtrictive name of a *future ſtate*: On which account, I have not ſcrupled, throughout this diſcourſe, to uſe the ſame liberty of applying the generic or ſpecific term, one for the other, without any apprehenſion of being thought not to underſtand my argument, or of being miſunderſtood by my reader: Who, when he ſees me bring facts and opinions of Antiquity, which ſhew the utility of Religion in general, to prove the utility of the doctrine of a future ſtate in particular, will underſtand that I ſpeak home to my purpoſe, and to the full proof of my ſecond propoſition.

So that, had I done no more than produce *ſuch facts and opinions*, I had done all that was neceſſary. But ſince the bare *neceſſary* is eſteemed almoſt as poor and unhandſome a thing in literature as in civil life, I have employed the greateſt part of the preſent and following books to ſhew, from ancient facts and opinions, the more than ordinary care and concern of all the wiſe and learned for perpetuating the ſpecific doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments.

Having premiſed thus much to prevent miſtakes, I proceed in the firſt place,

1. To ſhew, *in general*, the civil Magiſtrate's care in this matter.

The popular doctrine of a Providence, and, conſequently, of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, was, as we have ſaid, ſo univerſally received in the ancient world, that we cannot find any

civilized country where it was not of national belief. The moſt ancient *Greek* poets, as *Muſæus* *, *Orpheus* †, *Homer*, *Heſiod*, *&c.* who have given ſyſtems of theology and religion, on the popular creed of ſuch nations, always reckon the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments as a fundamental article: And all ſucceeding writers have given teſtimony to the ſame concerted plan. *Æſchylus*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Ariſtophanes*, whoſe profeſſion it was to repreſent the manners and opinions of all civilized people, whether *Greeks* or thoſe whom the *Greeks* called *Barbarians*, are full and expreſs to the ſame purpoſe. Further, it is recorded in the works of every ancient hiſtorian and philoſopher, which it would be endleſs to recite. But *Plutarch*, the moſt knowing of them all, ſhall ſpeak for the reſt: "Examine ‡," ſays he, in his tract againſt *Colotes* the *Epicurean*, "the face of the globe, and you may find "Cities unfortified, unlettered, without a regular Magiſtrate, or "appropriated habitations; without poſſeſſions, property, or the "uſe of money, and unſkilled in all the magnificent and polite arts "of life: But a City without the knowledge of a God, or the prac-"tice of Religion: without the uſe of vows, oaths, oracles, and "ſacrifices to procure good, or of deprecatory rites to avert evil, "no man can or ever will find." And in his conſolation to *Apollonius*, he declares it § was ſo ancient an opinion *that good men ſhould be recompenſed after death, that he could not reach either to the author or original of it.* To the ſame purpoſe had *Cicero* and *Seneca*

* Plato Rep. lib. xi. p. 364. E. T. II. Edit. Steph. 1578. fol.

† Plutarch, Vita Lucul.

‡ —εὕροις δ' ἂν ἐπιὼν καὶ πόλεις ἀτειχίστους, ἀγραμμάτους, ἀβασιλεύτους, ἀοίκους, ἀχρημάτους, νομίσματος μὴ δεομένας, ἀπείρους θεάτρων καὶ γυμνασίων· ἀνιέρου δὲ πόλεως καὶ ἀθέου, μὴ χρωμένης εὐχαῖς, μηδὲ ὅρκοις, μηδὲ μαντείαις, μηδὲ θυσίαις ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς, μηδὲ ἀποτροπαῖς κακῶν, ὐδείς ἐστιν οὐδ' ἔσται γεγονὼς θεαλής.
Edit. Francf. fol. T. II. p. 1125. E.

§ —Καὶ ταῦθ' ὕτως ἀρχαῖα καὶ παλαιὰ διαλελεῖ νενομισμένα παρ ἡμῖν ὥστε τὸ παράπαν ὐδεὶς οἶδεν ὐδὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτε τὸν θεῖα πρῶτον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄπειρον αἰῶνα τυγχάνωσι διὰ τέλους ὕτω νενομισμένα.
Edit. Steph. 8°, 1572. T. I. p. 201.

declared

declared themſelves before him. The firſt in theſe words; "* As our innate ideas diſcover to us that there are Gods, whoſe "attributes we deduce from reaſon; ſo, *from the conſent of all na-* "*tions and people, we conclude that the ſoul is immortal.*" The other thus: "When † we weigh the queſtion of the immortality of the "ſoul, *the conſent of all mankind, in their fears and hopes of a future* "*ſtate*, is of no ſmall moment with us."

In a word, *Sextus Empiricus*, when he would diſcredit the argument for the being of a God, brought from univerſal conſent, obſerves that it would prove too much; becauſe it would prove the truth of the *poetic fables of hell*, in which there was as general a concurrence ‡.

But of all nations, the EGYPTIAN was moſt celebrated for its care in cultivating Religion in general, and the doctrine of a future ſtate in particular: inſomuch that one of the moſt ancient *Greek* hiſtorians affirms, *They were the firſt who built altars and erected ſtatues and temples to the Gods* §.—*The firſt who taught that the ſoul of man was immortal.* And *Lucian* tells us ||, *That they were ſaid to be the firſt who had the knowledge of the Gods.* Which only amounts to this, that they were the firſt and wiſeſt civil-policied people: as will appear preſently.

But, at preſent, to prove *the Magiſtrate's care from hence.*—— For this account of the antiquity and univerſality of Religion is not given to evince its *truth*; for which purpoſe other writers have

* —Ut Deos eſſe naturâ opinamur, qualeſque ſint ratione cogniſcimus; ſic permanere animos arbitramur conſenſu nationum omnium. Tuſcul. Diſp. l. i. c. 16. in initio, Ed. Oxon. 4°. T. II. p. 245.

† Cum de animarum æternitate diſſerimus, non leve momentum apud nos habet conſenſus hominum, aut timentium inferos, aut colentium. Ep. 117.

‡ Adv. Phyſicos, l. viii. c. 2. Comment.

§ Βωμές τε καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ νηὸς θεοῖσι ἀπονεῖμαι σφέας πρώτους. Herod. Euterpe, c. 4.—Πρῶτοι δὲ καὶ τόνδε τὸν λόγον Αἰγύπτιοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰπόντες ὡς ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ ἀθάνατός ἐστι. Id. ib. c. 123.

|| Πρῶτοι μὲν ἀνθρώπων Αἰγύπτιοι λέγονται θεῶν τε ἔννοιαν λαβεῖν. De Dea Syria, § 2. Edit. Reitzii.

often and ſucceſsfully employed it; but to manifeſt its USE; which will be beſt done by inquiring what ſhare the Magiſtrate had in it.

I. Now though no civilized nation was ever without a Religion in general, and this doctrine in particular; and though it was of general belief even before civil policy was inſtituted amongſt mankind; yet were there formerly, as now there are, many ſavage nations, that when firſt diſcovered, appeared to have long loſt all traces of Religion: A fact which implies ſome extraordinary care in the Magiſtrate for its ſupport and preſervation. For if Religion hath been ſupported in all places, at all times, and under all circumſtances, where there was a magiſtrate and civil policy; and ſcarce in any place, or under any circumſtance, where theſe were wanting; what other cauſe than the Magiſtrate's care and contrivance can be aſſigned for its ſupport?

If it ſhould be ſaid, which, I think, is the only plauſible thing can be ſaid, that the reaſon why the Citizen had religion, and the Savage none, might be, that, amongſt the advantages of civil life, the improvement and cultivation of the mind is one; and this neceſſarily brings in the knowledge of God and religious obſervance: It is ſufficient to reply, that all the national Religions of the ancient and modern Gentile world are ſo groſs and irrational, that they could not be the product of reflection or improved reaſon, but were plainly of the Magiſtrate's fitting up, adapted to the capacity of minds yet rude and uncultivated, which could bear nothing of a finer texture than what was made out of the ſtuff he found, the genius of the Nation and the nature of the Government.

To give the proof of what we have been ſaying: The *Mexicans* and *Peruvians* in the South, and the people of *Canada* in *North America*, were on a level with regard to ſpeculative knowledge. Or, if there were any natural advantage, the *Canadians* had it. Theſe, when diſcovered, ſeemed to have no rudiments of Religion: The *Mexicans* and *Peruvians* had one formed, digeſted, and eſtabliſhed: but ſuch a religion as diſcovered ſomething worſe than mere ignorance,

ignorance, but never could be the result of improved thinking: However a religion it was which taught the great articles of the worſhip of a God, a providence, and a future ſtate. Now how happened it that theſe two great empires had a Religion, and the *Canadians* none, but that the Lawgivers of the former ſaw it neceſſary to countenance, add to, and perpetuate what they found *, for the benefit of the ſtate? which advantage the *Canadians* wanting, they loſt, in courſe of time, the very foot-ſteps of Religion. If this will not be allowed, it will be difficult to aſſign a reaſon.

Let us ſuppoſe, according to the objection, that *gentile* Religion owes its birth to the improved and cultivated mind. Now, if we make collections from the nature of things, it will be found more likely that theſe northern Savages ſhould longer preſerve the notions of God, and the practices of Religion, than the ſouthern Citizens, uninfluenced by their Magiſtrates.

The way of getting to the knowledge of a God, beſt ſuited to the common capacity of man, is that very eaſy one, the contemplation of the works of nature: For this employment the Savage would have fitter opportunities given him by his vacant and ſedentary life; and by his conſtant view of nature, which all his labours, and all his amuſements, perpetually preſented to him naked and unſophiſticated. The *Comte de Boulainvilliers*, a writer by no means prejudiced in favour of religion, gives this reaſon why the *Arabians* preſerved ſo long, and with ſo much purity, their notions of the Divinity †.

On the other hand, Nature, by which we come to the knowledge of a firſt Cauſe, would be quite hid from the ſouthern Citizen, buſied in the works of barbarous arts, and inhuman practices; or taken up with the ſlaviſh attendance on the will, and a more ſlaviſh imitation of the manners of a cruel and capricious Tyrant.

* See Book III. Sect. 6. II. 1. and pag antepenult.

† La Vie de Mohammed, p, 147. Ed. Amſt. 1731. Je reviens volontiers à la louange de la ſolitude des Arabes. Elle a conſervé chez eux plus longtems, & avec moins de mêlange, le ſentiment naturel de la veritable divinité, &c.

Nor,

Nor, if we may credit the relations of travellers, do the northern people any more neglect to exercise their reason than the southern: It is constant, they are observed to have sounder intellects than those nearer the sun: which, being owing to the influence of climes, is found to hold all the world over. Notwithstanding this, the issue proved just the contrary; and, as we said, the *Peruvians* and *Mexicans* had a Religion, the *Canadians* none at all.

Who then can doubt but that this was owing to the care and contrivance of the Magistrate? But indeed (which makes this instance the more pertinent) the *fact* confirms the *reasoning*. The Founders of these two monarchies pretended to be the messengers and offspring of the Gods; and, in the manner of the Grecian, and other Legislators (of whom more hereafter) pretended to inspiration, established Religion, and constituted a form of worship.

II. But not only the *existence*, but the *genius* too of pagan Religion, shews the Magistrate's hand in its support.

First, From the *origin* of their Gods.

Secondly, From the *attributes* given to them; and

Thirdly, From the *mode of publick worship*.

First, The idolatry of the gentile States was chiefly the worship of dead men; and these, Kings, Lawgivers, and Founders of civil policy. The benefit accruing to the State both from the *consecration* and the *worship* of such Gods, shews it to be a contrivance of the Lawgiver. For, 1. Nothing could be a greater excitement to good government than to shew the Magistrate that the public benefits, which he should invent, improve, or preserve, would be rewarded with an immortality of fame and glory? *Cicero* gives this as the original of the civil apotheosis. "It may be easily understood, that "the reason, why most Cities prosecuted the memory of their va- "liant men with divine honours, was to spur up their Citizens to "virtue, that every the most deserving of them might encounter "dangers with the greater chearfulness, in the service of his country. "And for this very cause it was that, at Athens, Erectheus and his

"daughters

" daughters were received into the number of the Gods *." 2. Nothing could make the people ſo obſervant of their Laws, as a belief that the makers, framers, and adminiſtrators of them were become Gods; and did diſpenſe a peculiar providence for their protection and ſupport.

The records of antiquity ſupport this reaſoning. The EGYPTIANS were the firſt people who perfected Civil-policy, and eſtabliſhed Religion: And they were the firſt, too, who deified their kings, lawgivers, and publick benefactors †; as we may collect from the paſſage of *Herodotus*, quoted above, which ſays, *they were the firſt who built altars, and erected* STATUES *and temples to the Gods*: For the erecting *ſtatues* was, by this hiſtorian, eſteemed a certain mark that the worſhipers believed the Gods had *human natures*; as appears from the reaſon he gives why the Perſians had no *ſtatues* of their Gods, namely, *becauſe they did not believe as the Greeks, that the Gods had human natures* ‡, that is, they did not believe the Gods were dead men deified: This, as we ſay, was a practice, invented by the *Egyptians*; who, in proceſs of time, taught the reſt of the world their myſtery §. So when arts and civil policy were brought into *Greece* by *Cadmus* and *Ceres* (the firſt, though a *Phenician* by birth, being an inhabitant of *Thebes* in *Egypt*; and the other, though coming immediately from *Sicily*, was yet a natural

* Atque in pleriſque civitatibus intelligi poteſt, augendæ virtutis gratiâ, quo libentiùs reipublicæ cauſa periculum adiret optimus quiſque, virorum fortium memoriam honore deorum immortalium conſecratam. Ob eam enim ipſam cauſam Erechtheus Athenis filiæque ejus in numero deorum ſunt. Nat. Deor. l. iii. c. 19. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. II. p. 503.

† Ἄλλους δ' ἐκ τούτων ἐπιγενέσθαι φασὶν, ὑπάρξαντας μὲν θνητὰς, διὰ δὲ σύνεσιν καὶ κοινὴν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν τετυχηκότας τῆς ἀθανασίας ὧν ἐνίους καὶ βασιλεῖς γεγονέναι καὶ τὸν Αἴγυπτον. Diod. Sic. l. i. p. 8. Steph. Ed.

‡ Ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρωποφυέας ἐνόμισαν τοὺς θεοὺς, καθάπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες εἶναι. Clio. L. 131. And ſee note [A], at the end of this Book.

§ Προδιαρθρῶσαι δὲ ἀναγκαῖον πρὸς τὴν αὖθις σαφήνειαν, καὶ τὴν τῶν μετὰ μέρος διάγνωσιν, ὅτι οἱ παλαιόταλοι τῶν βαρβάρων, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ Φοίνικές τε καὶ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΟΙ, παρ' ὧν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ παρέλαβον ἄνθρωποι, θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον μιγίστους τοὺς τὰ πρὸς τὴν βιωτικὴν χρεῖαν εὑρόντας, ἢ καταά τι εὖ ποιήσαντας τὰ ἔθνη. εὐεργέτας τε τότους καὶ πολλῶν αἰτίους ἀγαθῶν ἡγήσαντο, ὡς θεοὺς προσεκύνουν. Philo Bibl. apud Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. ii. c. 9.

Egyptian)

Egyptian) then, and not till then, began the cuſtom of deifying dead men; which ſoon over-ran all *Greece* and the reſt of *Europe* *.

2. *The attributes and qualities aſſigned to their Gods*, always correſponded with the nature and genius of the government. If this was gentle, benign, compaſſionate, and forgiving; goodneſs and mercy were moſt eſſential to the Deity: But if ſevere, inexorable, captious, or unequal; the very Gods were Tyrants; and expiations, atonements, luſtrations, and bloody ſacrifices compoſed the ſyſtem of religious worſhip. In the words of the great Poet,

"Gods partial, changeful, paſſionate, unjuſt,
"Whoſe attributes were rage, revenge, and luſt,
"Such as the ſouls of cowards might conceive,
"And form'd like tyrants, tyrants would believe †."

But 3. *The mode of public worſhip* was alone ſufficient to betray the Mover of the whole machine. The *object* of what we call *Religion*, being God, conſidered as the creator and preſerver of a ſpecies of rational beings, the *ſubject* of it muſt needs be each individual of that ſpecies. This is that idea of Religion, which our common reaſon approves. But now, in ancient paganiſm, *Religion* was a very different thing: It had for its *ſubject* not only the *natural man*, that is, each Individual; but likewiſe the *artificial man*, Society; by and for whom, all the *public* rites and ceremonies of it were inſtituted and performed. And while that part of pagan Religion, whoſe *ſubject* were individuals, bore an inferior part, and was con-

* Sir Iſaac Newton, who, probably, had not this matter in his thoughts, hath yet a remarkable paſſage to this purpoſe in his *Chronology of the Greeks*: "Idolatry (ſays he) "began in *Chaldæa* and *Egypt*.—The countries upon the *Tigris* and the *Nile* being ex-"ceeding fertile, were firſt frequented by mankind, and grew firſt into kingdoms; and "THEREFORE began firſt to adore their dead kings and queens:—Every city ſet up the "worſhip of its own founder and kings, and by alliances and conqueſts they ſpread this "worſhip, and at length the *Phœnicians* and *Egyptians* brought into *Europe* the practice "of deifying the dead." Pag. 161.

† Eſſay on Man.

feſſed

feſſed to be under an unequal Providence, the conſideration of which brought in the doctrine of a future ſtate for the ſupport of God's government; the other, whoſe ſubject was the artificial man, Society, taught a more equal Providence, adminiſtred to the State. The conſequence of which was, that Religion and Government ran into one another; and prodigies and portents were as familiar as civil edicts; and as conſtantly bore their ſhare in the public adminiſtration: For the Oracles, without which nothing was projected or executed, always denounced them as rational directions, declarative of divine favour, or diſpleaſure; in which *particulars*, as ſuch, were not at all concerned: So that to accept or to avert the omen; to gratulate the mercy, or deprecate the judgment, the conſtant method was the revival of *old rites*, or the inſtitution of *new*. A reformation of manners, or enforcement of ſumptuary laws, never made part of the ſtate's atonement to the Gods.

The oddneſs and notoriety of this fact ſo forceably ſtruck Mr. *Bayle's* imagination, that, miſtaking this for the whole of Paganiſm, he too haſtily concluded, that *the worſhip of falſe Gods in the ancient world, did not at all influence morals* *: And from thence formed an argument to ſupport his favourite queſtion in behalf of Atheiſm. This was a ſtrange concluſion: For though it be indeed true, that the *public* part of pagan Religion had no influence on morals, it is utterly falſe that the *private* part had not: For in the doctrine of a future ſtate, which was the foundation of, and inſeparable from, this ſounder part of pagan Religion whoſe ſubject was the *individual*, the merit and demerit, to which rewards and puniſhments were annexed, was virtue and vice only. This will be proved at large in the fourth ſection of the preſent book: Though I am ready to allow, that the nature and adminiſtration of the public part of pagan Religion did lead *individuals* into many wrong concluſions concerning the efficacy of exterior acts of worſhip.

* Penſées diverſes ſur un comete, &c. And Reponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial. And Continuation des Penſées diverſes, &c.

But what ſeems to have occaſioned Mr. *Bayle's* miſtake (beſides his following the Fathers, who in their *declamations* againſt paganiſm have ſaid a great deal to the ſame purpoſe *) was his not reflecting that ancient Hiſtory only preſents us with *one* part of the influence of Paganiſm, that which it had on the Public as a body: The *other*, the influence it had on individuals, it paſſes over in ſilence, as not its province.

Whoever now conſiders the genius of Paganiſm in this view, (and unleſs he conſiders it in this view he will never be able to judge truly of it †) can hardly doubt but that the civil magiſtrate had a great hand in modelling *Religion*. What it was which enabled him

* Yet St. Auſtin himſelf cannot but own that the Mysteries however (of which the Reader will hear a great deal in the 4th Section of this Book) were principally inſtituted for the promoting of virtue and a good life, even where he is accuſing *Paganiſm* in general for its neglect of moral virtue: "Nec nobis neſcio quos ſuſurros pauciſſimorum auribus "anhelatos & arcana velut religione traditos jactent, quibus vitæ probitas caſtitaſque "diſcatur."—Civ. Dei, l. ii. c. 6.—"Iidem ipſi Dæmones—perhibentur in adytis ſuis, "ſecretiſque penetralibus dare quædam bona præcepta de moribus quibuſdam velut "electis ſacratis ſuis—Proinde malignitas dæmonum niſi alicubi ſe, quemadmodum "ſcriptum in noſtris litteris novimus, transfiguret in angelos lucis, non implet negotium "deceptionis. Foris itaque populis celeberrimo ſtrepitu impietas impura circumſonat, "& intus paucis caſtitas ſimulata vix ſonat: præbentur propatula pudendis, & ſecreta "laudandis: decus latet, & dedecus patet." &c. c. 26.

† What is here ſaid of the genius of Paganiſm well accounts for a circumſtance in ancient hiſtory, which very much embarraſſes the modern critics. They cannot conceive how it happened, that the beſt ancient hiſtorians, who underſtood ſo well what belonged to the nature of a Compoſition, and how to give every ſort of work its due form, and were beſides free from all vulgar ſuperſtition, ſhould abound ſo much in deſcriptions of religious rites and ceremonies; and in relations of omens, prodigies, and portents. Many an idle hypotheſis hath been framed to give a ſolution of this difficulty; and many a tedious work compiled to juſtify theſe ancient hiſtorians, upon mere modern ideas. But now a plain and eaſy anſwer may be given to it. *This part* of pagan Religion was ſo interwoven with the tranſactions of State, that it became *eſſential* to civil hiſtory. And how much ſoever it may be ſuppoſed to have deformed ancient ſtory, yet the Critic and Philoſopher gain by what diſguſts the delicacy of the Politician; the Greek and Roman hiſtory being the repoſitory of all that concerns the *public part* of pagan religion.

to

to give this extraordinary caſt to Paganiſm, is not difficult to diſcover: It could be nothing but that *popular diſpoſition* ariſing from, and the neceſſary conſequence of, thoſe general notions, which, by his contrivance and encouragement, had overſpread the heathen world? 1. That there were local tutelary Deities, who had taken upon themſelves, or were intruſted with, the care and protection of particular Nations and People; (of which, more hereafter.) 2. That thoſe great benefactors of mankind, who had reduced the ſcattered tribes and clans into civil Society, were become Gods. 3. and laſtly, That their ſyſtems of Laws and civil Inſtitutes were planned and digeſted by the direction of the legiſlator's patron-Deity *.

On the whole then, The foregoing conſiderations of the *preſervation* of Religion in general; the *origine* of the pagan Gods; their *attributes*; and the *mode of public worſhip*, will, I am perſuaded, incline the reader to think that, for the *univerſality of religious belief*, the world was chiefly indebted to the civil Magiſtrate; how much ſoever the illegitimate or unnatural conſtitution of particular States, or the defective views of particular Lawgivers, contributed to deprave the true Religion of *nature*; or, if you will, the *patriarchal*. The learned St. *Auſtin*, who excelled in the knowledge of antiquity, ſeems to have been determined by this way of thinking, when he gives it, as the reſult of his enquiries; that the civil Magiſtrate had a large ſhare in pagan ſuperſtition. His words are theſe †, "—Which indeed ſeems to have been done "on no other account but as it was the buſineſs of princes, out of "their wiſdom and civil prudence, to deceive the people in their "Religion—princes, under the name of religion, perſuaded the

* See the beginniug of the next ſection.

† —Quod utique non aliam ob cauſam factum videtur, niſi quia hominum principum velut prudentium & ſapientium negotium fuit populum in religionibus fallere—Homines principes ea, quæ vana eſſe noverint, religionis nomine populis tanquam vera ſuadebant: Hoc modo eos civili ſocietati velut arctius alligantes, quo ſubditos poſſiderent. De Civit. Dei, l. iv. c. 32.

" people to believe thoſe things true which they themſelves knew to " be idle fables. By this means, for their own eaſe in government, " tying them the more cloſely to civil Society."

But if now it ſhould be objected, that it was natural for the people, left to themſelves, to run into thoſe ſuperſtitions, we may readily grant it without prejudice to the argument: For they are always ſuch notions as are apt to be entertained and cheriſhed by vulgar minds, whoſe current the wiſe Magiſtrate is accuſtomed to turn to his advantage. For to think him capable of new modelling the human mind, by *making* men religious whom he did not *find* ſo, is, as will be ſhewn hereafter, a ſenſeleſs whimſy, entertained by the Atheiſt to account for the origin of Religion. And, when it is ſeen that all theſe various modes of ſuperſtition concurred to promote the Magiſtrate's purpoſe, it can hardly be doubted but he gave them that general direction. The *particular* parts of gentile Religion, which further ſtrengthen and confirm this reaſoning, are not here to be inſiſted on. Their original will be clearly ſeen, when we come to ſhew the ſeveral methods which the Magiſtrate employed for this great purpoſe. What theſe methods were, the courſe of the argument now leads us to conſider.

SECT. II.

IT hath been ſhewn in general, from the EFFECT, that Lawgivers and founders of civil policy did indeed ſupport and propagate Religion. We ſhall now endeavour to explain the CAUSES of that effect, in a particular enumeration of the arts they employed to that purpoſe.

I. The FIRST ſtep the Legiſlator took, was to pretend a Miſſion and revelation from ſome God, by whoſe command and direction he had framed the Policy he would eſtabliſh. Thus *Amaſis* and *Mneves*, lawgivers of the *Egyptians* (from whence this cuſtom ſpread over *Greece*

Greece and *Aſia)* pretended to receive their laws from *Mercury*; *Zoroaſter* the lawgiver of the *Bactrians*, and *Zamolxis* lawgiver of the *Getes*, from *Veſta*; *Zathrauſtes* the lawgiver of the *Arimaſpi*, from a good ſpirit or genius; and all theſe moſt induſtriouſly and profeſſedly propagated the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. *Rhadamanthus* and *Minos* lawgivers of *Crete*, and *Lycaon* of *Arcadia*, pretended to an intercourſe with *Jupiter*; *Triptolemus* lawgiver of the *Athenians*, affected to be inſpired by *Ceres*; *Pythagoras* and *Zaleucus*, who made laws for the *Crotoniates* and *Locrians*, aſcribed their inſtitutions to *Minerva*: *Lycurgus* of *Sparta*, profeſſed to act by the direction of *Apollo*; and *Romulus* and *Numa* of *Rome* put themſelves under the guidance of *Conſus*, and the Goddeſs *Egeria* *. In a word, there is hardly an old Lawgiver on record, but what thus pretended to revelation, and the divine aſſiſtance. But had we the loſt books *of Legiſlators* written by *Hermippus*, *Theophraſtus*, and *Apollodorus* †, we ſhould have had a much fuller liſt of theſe inſpired ſtateſmen, and doubtleſs, many further lights on the ſubject. The ſame method was practiſed by the founders of the *great outlying empires*, as Sir *William Temple* calls them. Thus the firſt of the *Chineſe* monarchs was called *Fagfour* or *Fanfur*, the *ſon of Heaven*, as we are told by the jeſuits, from his pretenſions to that relation. The *royal commentaries of Peru* inform us, that the founders of that empire were *Mango Copac*, and his wife and ſiſter *Coya Mama*, who proclaimed themſelves the ſon and daughter of the *Sun*, ſent from their father to reduce mankind from their ſavage and beſtial life, to one of order and ſociety. *Tuiſco* the founder of the German nations pretended to be ſent upon the ſame meſſage, as appears from his name, which ſignifies the interpreter ‡, that is, of the Gods. *Thor* and *Odin*, the lawgivers of the *Weſtern*

* Diod. Sic. l. i. & v. Ephorus apud Strabonem, l. x.—teſte veteri ſcriptore apud Suidam in [Αυκάων]—Ariſt. apud Schol. Pind. ad. Olymp. x.

† Athen. l. xiv. D. Laertius.

‡ Vide Sheringham, De Anglorum gentis origine, p. 86.

Goths,

Goths, laid claim likewiſe to inſpiration and even to divinity *. The *Revelations* of *Mahomet* are too well known to be inſiſted on. But the race of theſe inſpired Lawgivers ſeems to have ended in *Genghizcan* the founder of the *Mogul empire* †.

Such was the univerſal cuſtom of the ancient world, to make *Gods* and *Prophets* of their firſt kings and lawgivers. Hence it is, that *Plato* makes *legiſlation* to have come from God, and not from man ‡: and that the conſtant epithets to kings, in *Homer*, are ΔΙΟΓΕΝΕΙΣ *born of the Gods*, and ΔΙΟΤΡΕΦΕΙΣ *bred* or *tutored by the Gods* §.

From this general pretence to revelation we may collect the ſentiments of the ancient lawgivers concerning the uſe of Religion to Society. For we muſt always have in mind what *Diodorus Siculus* ſo truly obſerves, *That they did this, not only to beget a veneration to their laws, but likewiſe to eſtabliſh the opinion of the ſuperintendency of the Gods over human affairs* ||. One may venture to go farther, and

* Olim quidam magicæ artis imbuti, Thor videlicet & Othinus, — obtentis ſimplicium animis, divinitatis ſibi faſtigium arrogare cœperunt.—Adeo namque fallaciæ eorum effectus percrebuit, ut in ipſis cæteri quandam numinum potentiam venerantes, eoſque deos, vel *deorum complices* autumantes veneficiorum auctoribus ſolennia vota dependerent, & errori ſacrilego reſpectum ſacris debitum exhiberent. Saxo-Gram. l. vi. Hiſtor. p. 93. Francof. 1576. fol.

† Ils ont attribué des revelations à *Genghizcan*; & pour porter la veneration des peuples auſſi loin qu'elle pouvoit aller, ils lui ont donné de la divinité. Ceux qui s'intereſſoient à ſon elevation eurent même l'inſolence de le faire paſſer pour fils de Dieu. Sa mere plus modeſte, dit ſeulement qu'il etoit FILS DU SOLEIL. M. Petit de la Croix, le pere, Hiſtoire du Genghizcan, c. 1.

‡ Θεὸς ἤ τις ἀνθρώπων ὑμῖν, ὦ ξένοι, εἴληφε τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τῶν νόμων διαθέσεως; ΚΑ. Θεὸς, ὦ ξένε, θεὸς, ὡς γε τὸ δικαιότατον εἰπεῖν. De Leg. l. i. lin. i.

§ Θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐν διοτρεφέϊ βασιλῆϊ. Il. B'. ver. 196. which title of διοτρεφέϊ is not given, ſays Euſtathius on the place, to ſignify that ſuch a one is deſcended from Jupiter, but that he receives his honour and authority from him. Ἑρμηνεύει διατί ΔΙΟΓΕΝΕΙΣ καὶ ΔΙΟΤΡΕΦΕΙΣ τὰς βασιλεῖς λέγει, οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ Διὸς τὸ γένος ἔλκουσι, ἀλλ' ὅτι ΕΞ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ Η ΤΙΜΗ.

‖ Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν παλαιὰν τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον βίων καλάσιν, τὴν μυθολογουμένην γενέσθαι ἐπί τε τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῶν ἡρώων, πεῖσαι φασὶ πρῶτον ἀγραύλοις νόμοις χρήσασθαι τὰ πλήθη βίον τὸν Μινύην, ἀνδρα καὶ

and ſay, that to *eſtabliſh this ſuperintendency* was their principal and direct aim, in all their pretenſions to inſpiration.

The reader may obſerve, that *Diodorus* does not ſo much as ſuſpect them of having a third end, diſtinct from theſe two; that is to ſay, the advancement of their own private intereſt. And this with great judgment. He knew well the difference between a LAWGIVER and a TYRANT; though the World ſoon after ſeems to have loſt the memory of that diſtinction *. Such views became not the former; they deſtroyed his character, and changed him into his direct oppoſite; who applied every thing to his own intereſt; and this amongſt the reſt. *Ariſtotle*, in his maxims for ſetting up, and ſupporting a tyranny, lays this down for one, *to ſeem extremely attached to the worſhip of the Gods, for that men have no apprehenſion of injuſtice from ſuch as they take to be religious and to have a high ſenſe of providence. Nor will the people be apt to run into plots and conſpiracies againſt thoſe, whom they believe the Gods will, in their turn, fight for, and ſupport* †. And here it is worth noting, that, anciently, *Tyrants*, as well as Lawgivers, gave all encouragement to Religion; and endeavoured to eſtabliſh their irregular Wills, not by convincing men that there was no juſt nor unjuſt in actions; but by perſuading

καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ μέγαν καὶ τῷ βίῳ κοινόταλον τῶν μεμηχανευμένων, προσποιηθῆναι δὲ αὐτῷ τὸν Ἑρμῆν δεδωκέναι τοῦτο, ὡς μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος ἐσομένης παθάπερ παρ' Ἕλλησι ποιῆσαι φασὶν ἐν μὲν τῇ Κρήτῃ Μινῶα παρὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοις Λυκοῦργον· τὸν μὲν παρὰ Διὸς, τὸν δὲ παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος φήσαντα τοῦτο εἰσηνέγκαι· καὶ παρ' ἑτέροις δὲ πλείοσιν ἔθνεσι παραδέδοται τοῦτο τὸ γένος τῆς ἐπινοίας ὑπάρξαι, καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν αἴτιον γενέσθαι τοῖς πεισθεῖσιν—

—εἴτε καὶ πρὸς τὴν ὑπεροχὴν καὶ δύναμιν τῶν εἰρεθέντων λεγομένων, τὸν νόμον ὑποβλέψαντα τὸν ὄχλον, μᾶλλον ὑπακούσεσθαι διαλαβόντας. L. i. p. 59. Edit. Steph.

* Quintilian L. VIII. C. 6. (pag. 415. Edit. Oxon. 1693, 4to). *de Tropis*, ſays that *Paſtor Populi*, though uſed by Homer, is ſo POETICAL that he would not venture to uſe it in an oration: and ranks it with Virgil's—*Volucres pennis remigare*. What could occaſion ſo ſtrange a piece of Criticiſm, but that when Quintilian wrote under the *Tyrants* of Rome, the People had loſt the very idea of the *Kingly Office*?

† Ἔτι δὲ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς φαίνεσθαι ἀεὶ σπουδάζοντα διαφερόντως, ἦθος τε γὰρ φοβεῖται, τὸ πάθειν τι παράνομον ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων, ἂν δεισιδαίμονα νομίζωσιν εἶναι τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ προνοεῖσθαι τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐπιβουλεύουσιν ἧττον, ὡς συμμάχους ἔχοντι καὶ τοὺς θεούς. Polit. l. v. c. 11. T. III. p. 547. D. E. Edit. Pariſ. fol. 1639.

them

them that the privilege of *divine right* exempted the Tyrant from all moral obligation. Hence may be ſeen the abſurdity of *Hobbes's* ſcheme of Politics, who, for the ſake of the Magiſtrate, was for eradicating Religion. But the ancients knew better; and ſo too did ſome of the moderns *.

The queſtion then is, whether theſe pretenſions of the ancient Lawgivers were feigned in *the firſt intention*, for the ſake of Society or of Religion? For it is no queſtion, but that what we here ſhew was contrived by the Magiſtrate for the ſervice of Religion, was done *ultimately* for the ſake of Civil Government. Or in other words, the queſtion, I ſay, is, Whether this pretence to inſpiration was made to eſtabliſh a *civil* or a *religious* Society? If a *civil*; the ends aimed at muſt be the *reception of his policy*, or *proviſion for its perpetuity*. I ſpeak not here of that third end, *the ſecuring a veneration, for them, to poſterity*; and for a good reaſon, becauſe *this* is the very thing I contend for; ſuch *veneration* being only to be procured by the influence of Religion; the peculiar mode of which, the pretended inſpiration introduces. The ends then in queſtion, are *reception for the policy*; *or* proviſion for the perpetual *duration* of it.

1. For the *reception*, there would be ſmall need of this expedient. 1. Civil laws are ſeen by all to be ſo neceſſary for the well being of every individual, that one can hardly conceive any need of the belief of divine command or extraordinary aſſiſtance to bring men to embrace a ſcheme for aſſociating, or to manifeſt the right they have of ſo doing. *For* (as the great *Geographer* ſays) *Man was born with this inclination to aſſociate. It is an appetite common both to* Greeks *and* Barbarians: *for, being by nature a civil animal, he lives readily under one common policy or law* †. Beſides ſeveral of theſe

* Et non è coſa piu neceſſaria à parere d'havere che queſta ultima qualita [religione] perche gli huomini in univerſale giudicano piu a gli occhi che alle mani, perché tocca à vedere a ciaſcuno a ſentire à pochi. Machiavel del Principe, c. 18.

† Πέφυκε γὰρ ὕτω. Καὶ κοινὸν ἐνιδρῦτο καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησι καὶ τοῖς Βαρβάροις· Πολιτικοὶ γὰρ ὄντες, ἀπὸ σπαργάνων κοινῇ ζῶσιν. Strabo, Geogr. l. xvi. Edit. Caſaub. p. 524. lin. 16.

Legiſlators

Legiſlators gave laws to a *willing people*, on the ſtrength of their perſonal character of virtue and wiſdom; and were called upon to that office, in which nothing was wanting to beget the neceſſary veneration to him who diſcharged it. And though it might poſſibly have happened to a people to be ſo far ſunk into brutality, as to be diſinclined towards the recovery of a reaſonable nature, like thoſe with whom it is ſaid *Orpheus* had to deal; who (*being* ſavages, *without the knowledge of morality or law*) reduced them into ſociety, *by recommending to them piety to the Gods, and inſtructing them in the ways of ſuperſtition* *: yet this was not the caſe of the generality of thoſe with whom theſe Lawgivers were concerned: and therefore if we would aſſign a cauſe *of this pretence to revelation* as extenſive as the fact, it muſt be that which is here given. But, 2dly, we find, that where Religion was previouſly ſettled, no inſpiration was pretended. On this account neither *Draco* nor *Solon*, Lawgivers of Athens, laid claim to any: for they found Religion well ſecured by the inſtitutions of *Triptolemus* and *Ion*. And we know, that, had *pretended inſpiration* been only, or principally, for the eaſier introduction and reception of civil policy, the ſanguinary laws of *Draco* had ſtood in more need of the ſanction of a revelation, than any other of antiquity. Indeed, *Maximus Tyrius* goes ſo far as to ſay, that *Draco* and *Solon* preſcribed nothing in their laws, concerning the Gods, and their worſhip †; which, if true, would make as much againſt us, on the other hand. But in this he is miſtaken. *Porphyry* quotes an expreſs law of *Draco's* concerning the mode of divine worſhip. *Let the Gods and our own country heroes be publicly worſhipped, according to the eſtabliſhed rites; when privately, according to every man's abilities, with terms of the greateſt regard and reverence; with the firſt fruits of their labours,*

* —Ὅτι θηριώδεις ὄντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ὅτε ἄθη, ὅτε νόμους, εἰδότας εἰς δεισιδαιμονίαν ἀγαγών, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ εὐσεβεῖν παρακαλέσας. Heraclit. de Incred. c. 23.

† Πῶς γὰρ Ἀθηναίοις συνιέναι,—τὸ μὲν τὸ δαιμόνιον, πῶς δὲ τιμητέον; εἰ γὰρ τῷ κινάμῳ λαχόντες δίναται χίλιοι ταῦτα ἐξελάζεσιν, ἀλλὰ Σόλωνος τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γέγραφεν, ἀλλὰ οἱ Δράκοντος σεμνοὶ νόμοι. Dilſert. xxxix. p. 383. Edit. Lugd. 1630, 8vo.

and with annual libations *. *Andocides* † quotes another of *Solon*, which provides for the due and regular celebration of the ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES. *Athenæus* does the ſame. And how conſiderable a part theſe were of divine worſhip, and of what importance to the very eſſence of religion, we ſhall ſee hereafter.

2. As to *a proviſion for the perpetuity of national laws and inſtitutions*; This entered not into the intention of the old *Greek* legiſlation; nor, if it had, could it have been obtained by giving them a divine original. Amongſt the wild projects of the barbarous eaſtern policy, one might find, perhaps, ſomething like a ſyſtem of *immutable* laws; but the *Grecian* Lawgivers were too well acquainted with the nature of man, the genius of Society, and the viciſſitude of human things, ever to conceive ſo ridiculous a deſign. Beſides, the *Egyptian* legiſlation, from which they borrowed all their civil wiſdom, went upon very different principles. It directed public laws to be occaſionally accommodated to the variety of times, places, and manners. But had they aimed at perpetuity, the belief of a divine impoſition would not have ſerved the turn; for it never entered their heads, that civil inſtitutes became irrevocable by their iſſuing from the mouth of a God; or that the divinity of the ſanction altered the mutability of their nature: the honour of this diſcovery is due to certain modern writers, who have found out that divine authority reduces all its commands to one and the ſame ſpecies. We have a notable inſtance of this in the conduct of *Lycurgus*. He was the only exception to the general method, and ſingular in the idle attempt of making his laws perpetual. For his whole ſyſtem being forced and unnatural, the ſenſe of that imperfection, it is probable, put him upon the expedient of tying them

* Θεὸς τιμᾶν τὸ Ἥρωας ἐξαρίους ἐν κοινῷ, ἑπομένως νόμοις παλαίοις, ἰδίᾳ καλὰ δύναμιν σὺν εὐφημίᾳ καὶ ἀπαρχαῖς καρπῶν, καὶ τελάνοις ἐπετείοις. De Abſt. l. iv. § 22. (Edit. Cantabr. 1655, 8vo.) according to the emendations of Petit and Valentinus.—The law is thus introduced, Θεσμὸς αὐτὸς τοῖς Λιβιέως νεμομένοις, Κύριος τὸν ἄπαλλα χρόνον.

† Orat. Περὶ Μυστηρίων, apud Decem Orat.

On

on an unwilling people. But then *he did not apply* divine authority to this purpose; for, though he pretended to inspiration like the rest, and had his revelations from *Apollo*, yet he well knew that the authority of *Apollo* would not be thought sufficient to change the nature of positive laws: and therefore he bound the People by an oath, to observe his policy till his return from a voyage, which he had determined beforehand never to bring to that period.

Having shewn that there was no need of a pretence to revelation, for the establishment of *civil Policy*, it follows, that it was made for the sake of *Religion*.

SECT. III.

THE SECOND step the Legislators took to propagate and establish *Religion*, was to make the general doctrine of a Providence (with which they prefaced and introduced their laws) the great sanction of their institutes. To this, *Plutarch*, in his tract against *Colotes* the *Epicurean*, refers, where he observes, that *Colotes himself praises it; that, in civil Institutes, the first and most important article is the belief of the Gods. And so it was* (says he) *that, with vows, oaths, divinations, and omens,* Lycurgus *sanctified the* Lacedemonians, Numa *the* Romans, *ancient* Ion *the* Athenians, *and* Deucalion *all the* Greeks *in general: And by* HOPES *and* FEARS *kept up amongst them the awe and reverence of religion* *. On this practice was formed the precept of the celebrated *Archytas* the *Pythagorean*; which sect, as we shall see hereafter, gave itself up more professedly to legislation; and produced the most famous founders of civil policy. This Lawgiver in the fragments of his work *de lege*, preserved by *Stobæus*, delivers himself in this manner: *The first law*

* —Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἥ γε κ᾽ Κολώτης ἐπαινεῖ διαλάξεως τῶν νόμων, πρῶτόν ἐστιν ἡ περὶ θεῶν δόξα, κ᾽ μέγιστον. ἡ κ᾽ Λυκοῦργος Λακεδαιμονίες, κ᾽ Νόμας Ῥωμαίες, κ᾽ Ἴων ὁ παλαιὸς Ἀθηναίες, κ᾽ Δευκαλίων Ἕλληνας ὁ͂ς τοι πάλαι καθωσίωσαν εὐχαῖς, κ᾽ ὅρκοις, κ᾽ μαντεύμασι, κ᾽ φήμαις, ἐμπαθεῖς πρὸς τὸ δεισιδαιμονεῖν ἅμα κ᾽ φόβων παλαιήσαντες. Edit. Francof. fol. 1599. p. 1225. D.

of the Conſtitution ſhould be for the ſupport of what relates to the Gods, the Dæmons and our Parents, and, in general, of whatſoever is good and venerable *. And in this manner, if we may believe Antiquity, all their civil inſtitutes were prefaced; its conſtant phraſe being, when ſpeaking of a Lawgiver, ΔΙΕΚΟΣΜΕΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑΝ ΑΠΟ ΘΕΩΝ ΑΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ.

The only things of this kind now remaining, are the PREFACES to the laws of ZALEUCUS and CHARONDAS, Lawgivers of the *Locrians* and of the *Chalcidic* cities of Italy and Sicily, contemporaries with Lycurgus †. Theſe, by good fortune, are preſerved in Diodorus and Stobæus. A great Critic has indeed arraigned their authority; declared them ſpurious; and adjudged them for an impoſture of the *Ptolomaic* Age ‡. And were it as he ſuppoſes, the fragments would be rather ſtronger to our purpoſe: for, in that caſe, we muſt needs conclude, the very learned SOPHISTS who forged them had copied from the general practice of antiquity: And that very learned they were, appears both from the excellence of the compoſition, and the age of the pretended compoſers. Whereas, if the fragments be genuine, they do not ſo directly prove the *univerſality*, as the *antiquity*, of the practice. But as my aim is truth, and truth ſeeming to bear hard againſt this learned Critic's determination, we muſt hold to the common opinion, and examine what hath been offered in diſcredit of it.

The univerſal current of antiquity runs in favour of theſe remains, and for the reality of their author's legiſlative quality. Ariſtotle, Theophraſtus, Tully, Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch, the moſt learned and inquiſitive writers of their ſeveral ages, declare for their being genuine. However, TIMÆUS thought fit to deny that *Zaleucus* had given laws to the *Locrians*; nay, that there was

* Δεῖ τὸν νόμον τὰ περὶ θεὺς καὶ δαίμονας καὶ γονέας, καὶ ὅλως τὰ καλὰ καὶ τίμια πρῶτα τίθεσθαι. Stob. de Rep. Serm. xli. p. 269. l. 13. Tiguri, fol. 1599.

† Ariſt. l. ii. c. 12. p. 449. Edit. Du Val.

‡ Diſſert. on the Epiſtles of Phalaris, with an Anſwer to the objections of Mr. Boyle.

ever

ever ſuch a Lawgiver exiſting. We ſhall be the leſs ſurpriſed at this paradox, when we come to know the character and ſtudies of the man: he was by profeſſion an hiſtorian, but turned his talents to invent, to aggravate, and expoſe the faults and errors of all preceding writers of name and reputation. Polybius, Strabo, and Diodorus Siculus, three of the wiſeſt and moſt candid hiſtorians of Greece, have concurred to draw him in the moſt odious colours. The firſt ſpeaks of him in this manner: *How he came to be placed amongſt the principal writers of hiſtory, I know not.—He deſerves neither credit nor pardon of any one; having ſo manifeſtly tranſgreſſed all the rules of decency and decorum in his exceſſive calumnies, ſpringing from an innate malignity of heart* *. This envious rabid temper, joined to a perverſity of mind, delighting in contradiction, gained him the title of EPITIMÆUS, the CALUMNIATOR. And, what is a certain mark of a baſe and abject heart, he was as exceſſive in his flattery; as when he makes *Timoleon greater than the greateſt Gods* †. He took ſo much pleaſure in contradicting the moſt received truths, that he wrote a long treatiſe, with great fury and ill language, to prove that the bull of Phalaris was a mere fable. And yet Diodorus and Polybius, who tell us this, tell us likewiſe, that the very bull itſelf was exiſting in their time: To all which, he was ſo little ſolicitous about truth, that Suidas ſays, he was nicknamed ΓΡΑΟΣΥΛΛΕΚΤΡΙΑ, *a compoſer of old wives fables. Polybius* informs us with what juſtice it was given him. *In cenſuring the faults of others, he puts on ſuch an air of ſeverity and confidence, as if he himſelf were exempt from failings, and ſtood in no need of indulgence. Yet are his own hiſtories ſtuffed with dreams and prodigies, with the moſt wild and improbable fables. In ſhort, full of old wives*

* Οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐκφέρεται δόξαν, ὡς ἔλκων τὴν τούτου συγγραφέως προσασίαν,—Ἐκεῖνο δ' ἂν οὐκ εἰκότως τυγχάνοι συγγνώμης ὐδὲ πίστεως ὑπ' ὐδενὸς, διὰ τὸ προφανῶς ἐν ταῖς λοιδορίαις ἐκπίπτειν τῆ καθήκοντος, διὰ τὸν ἔμφυτον πικρίαν. Excerpt. ex l. xii. Hiſt.

† Suidas in Timæo. Τίμαιος δὲ μείζω ποιεῖν Τιμολέοντα τῶν ὑπερκειμένων Θεῶν.

wonders,

wonders, and of the loweſt and baſeſt ſuperſtition *. Agreeable to all this, Clemens Alexandrinus gives him as the very pattern of a fabulous and ſatyric writer. And he appeared in every reſpect of ſo ill a character to Mr. Bayle, that this excellent Critic did not ſcruple to ſay, that, "in all appearance, he had no better authority "when he denied that *Zaleucus* had given laws to the *Locrian* †." To ſay all in a word, he was the Oldmixon ‡ of the Greeks; and yet this is the man whom the learned writer hath thought fit to oppoſe to all antiquity, againſt *Zaleucus's* legiſlation and exiſtence. It appears the more extraordinary, becauſe he himſelf hath furniſhed his reader with a violent preſumption againſt Timæus's authority, where he ſays §, *That* Polybius *charges him with falſe repreſentations relating to the* Locrians. He adds indeed *that nothing is now extant that ſhews* Polybius *thought* Timæus *miſtaken concerning* Zaleucus. But ſince Polybius quotes a law as a law of *Zaleucus*, it ſeems a proof, in ſo exact a writer, of his being well aſſured that, amongſt Timæus's falſhoods concerning the *Locrians*, one was his denying *Zaleucus* to be their Lawgiver.

Timæus's reaſons are not come down to us from Antiquity: But the fragments of Polybius ||, mentioning his outrageous treatment of Ariſtotle concerning the origin of the *Locrians*, ſpeak of one Echecrates a *Locrian*, from whom Timæus boaſted he had received information on certain points in queſtion: Hence the learned Critic, as it would ſeem, concludes this to have been a part of the *Locrian's* intelligence, *that there was no ſuch man as Zaleucus* **. As if,

* Οὕτω γὰρ ἐν μὲν ταῖς τῶν πέλας καθηγορίαις πολλὴν ἐπιφαίνει δεινότητα καὶ τόλμαν· ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀποφάσεσιν ἐυπιστίαν καὶ περάτων καὶ μυθῶν ἀπιθάνων, καὶ συλλήδην καὶ δεισιδαιμονίας ἀγεννοῦς καὶ τεραλείας; γυναικώδης ἐστὶ πλήρης. Excerpt. de Virt. & Vit. ex l. xii.

† Et apparemment il ne fut pas mieux fondé, quand il nia que Zaleucus eût donné des loix à ce peuple, [les Locriens.] Timée, Rem. F.

‡ See Clarendon and Whitlock compared.

§ Differt. upon Phalaris, p. 337.

‖ Excerpta ex Polybio de Virt. & Vitiis, ex l. xii.

** P. 336. Differt. upon Phalaris.

becauſe

becauſe Timæus relied on Echecrates's information in the diſpute between him and Ariſtotle, therefore Echecrates muſt, of neceſſity, ſupport all his paradoxes concerning that people. But admit Echecrates to have been of the ſame opinion with Timæus, in this matter; Is he, who, for aught we know, might be as ſingular and as whimſical, in his love of contradiction, as Timæus himſelf, an evidence to be oppoſed to Cicero's? who tells us, that his Clients the *Locrians* had, in his time, a Tradition of *Zaleucus's* legiſlation *. And we may well preſume, that Cicero, inquiſitive, and even curious, as he was in matters of antiquity, would examine this point with care: and, had their archives reclaimed it, he had hardly thought it worth his while to mention their Tradition. But, ſays the learned Critic, *if* Echecrates, *in that age, did not believe there was any* Zaleucus, *he is certainly as credible as* Cicero's Locrians, *who came ſo many generations afterwards, after ſo many revolutions and changes in their Government* †. This reaſoning has ſmall force, becauſe, from the ſame premiſes, we may argue juſt the other way, and ſay, that if the Tradition kept its ground through all thoſe changes and revolutions of State, it would ſeem to have had a very ſtrong foundation.

The authority then of Timæus againſt the exiſtence and legiſlation of *Zaleucus* in general, is of no weight. Let us next ſee what the learned Critic hath to urge againſt the authenticity of thoſe laws which go under *Zaleucus's* name. His arguments are of two ſorts: the one drawn from the *dialect*, and from the uſe of ſeveral *words*, which are indeed later than his time; the other, from *Zaleucus's* being no Pythagorean.

1. The *words* objected to, are theſe; Ἁπλᾶς καὶ παχείας — ἰσομιλήσιον — Κόσμον — Τραγῳδίας. This, and the fragments being written in the *common dialect*, inſtead of the *Doric*, are, in the Critic's opinion, ſufficient evidence of the forgery.

* De Legibus, l. ii. c. 6. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 141.

† P. 336. Diſſert. upon Phalaris.

He

He has employed a deal of good * learning, to prove the *words* to be all later than the time of *Zaleucus*.

Let us ſee then the moſt that can be made of this ſort of argument. And becauſe it is the beſt approved, and readieſt at hand, for the detection of forgery, and ſuppoſed by ſome not a little to affect the ſacred writings themſelves, we will enquire into its force in general.

It muſt be owned, that an inſtrument offered as the writing of any certain perſon, or age, which hath words or phraſes poſterior to its date, carries with it the deciſive marks of forgery. A public Deed, or Diploma, ſo diſcredited, is loſt for ever. And to ſuch, was this canon of criticiſm firſt applied with great ſucceſs. This encouraged following critics to try it on writings of another kind; and then, for want of a reaſonable diſtinction, they began to make very wild work indeed. For though in compoſitions of *abſtract ſpeculation*, or of *mere fancy and amuſement*, this touch might be applied with tolerable ſecurity, there being, for the moſt part, no occaſion or temptation to alter the diction of ſuch writings, eſpecially in the ancient languages, which ſuffered ſmall and ſlow change, becauſe one ſort of theſe works was only for the uſe of a few learned men; and the principal rarity, and often the beauty, of the other ſort, conſiſted in the original phraſe; yet in public and practical writings of Law and Religion, this would be found a very fallacious teſt: It was the matter only which was regarded here. And, as the matter reſpected the whole people, it was of importance that the words and phraſes ſhould be neither obſcure, ambiguous, nor equivocal: This would neceſſitate alterations in the ſtyle, both as to words and phraſes. Hence it appears to me, that the anſwer, which commentators give to the like objection againſt the PENTATEUCH, is founded in good ſenſe, and fully juſtified by the ſolution here attempted. The Religion, Law, and

* From p. 346 to 356 of the Diſſertation.

Hiſtory

History of the Jews were incorporated; and conſequently, it was the concern of every one to underſtand the Scriptures. Nor doth the ſuperſtitious regard, well known to have been long paid to the *words*, and even *letters* of ſcripture, at all weaken the force of this argument: for that ſuperſtition aroſe but from the time when the maſoret doctors fixed the reading, and added the vowel points. I have taken the opportunity, the ſubject afforded me, to touch upon this matter, becauſe it is the only argument of moment, urged by Spinoſa, againſt the antiquity of the *Pentateuch*; on which antiquity the general argument of this work is ſupported.

The application of all this is very eaſy to the caſe in hand: The fragment of *Zaleucus* was part of a body of Laws, which the people were obliged to underſtand; ſo that a change of old words and obſolete phraſes would be neceſſary: and to make *this* an argument againſt the antiquity of the fragment, would be the ſame good reaſoning as to ſuppoſe, that the remains of the *Twelve Tables*, or the earlier laws in our common *Statute books*, were the forgeries of later times, becauſe full of words unknown to the reſpective ages in which thoſe laws were compoſed and enacted. But, indeed, the change of obſcure words, or obſolete phraſes, for others more clear and intelligible, was a common practice amongſt the Pagan writers. Porphyry, making a collection of heathen oracles, profeſſes to have given them juſt as he found them, without the leaſt alteration; except, ſays he, changing an obſcure word, now and then, for one more clear: a practice, which, for its fairneſs and frequency, he ranks with amending a corrupted word, or reforming the metre *. But this licence was not confined to the Ancients; for, being encouraged by the reaſon of things, it was likely enough (as is, in fact, the caſe) that all times ſhould

* ἐπεὶ κἀγώ τι θεὸς μαθρύρομαι, ὡς οἶδεν ὅτε προσέθεικα, ὅτι ἄφελον τῶν χρησθέντων νοημάτων· εἰ μή που λέξιν ἠμαθρημένην διώρθωσα, ἢ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟ ΣΑΦΕΣΤΕΡΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΒΕΒΛΗΚΑ, ἢ τὸ μεῖρὸν ἐλλεῖπον ἀνεπλήρωσα, ἤ τι τῶν μὴ πρὸς τὴν προθεσιν συνθεινόντων διέγραψα. Porph. apud Euſeb. Præp. Evang. lib iii. cap. 7.

afford examples of it. One of the editors of *Froiſſart*, ſpeaking of his author's text, ſays, "touchant le ſtile, & ancienne maniere " d'eſcrire de noſtre auteur, je ne doute point qu'il n'ayt eſté " quelques autrefois changé & aucunement renouvellé ſelon les " temps *." All the Editions of Jomville's life of St. Louis bear teſtimony to the ſame practice; which was ſo general that Paſquier ſays, " s'il y eut un bon livre compoſé par nos Ancêtres, lorſqu'il " fut queſtion de le tranſcrire, les Copiſtes le copioient non ſelon la " naïfe langue de l'Auteur, ains ſelon la leur †."

As to the change of *dialect*, the great Critic thus expreſſes himſelf: *The laſt argument I ſhall offer againſt the Laws of* Zaleucus, *is this, that the Preface of them, which* Stobæus *has produced, is written in the common dialect, whereas, it ought to be in the* Doric, *for that was the language of the* Locri.—*The Laws of* Zaleucus *therefore are commentitious, becauſe they are not in* Doric ‡.

What hath been ſaid above will ſhew this argument to have ſmall force; but it is urged with a peculiar ill grace by the learned Critic, who, in his *diſſertation upon Phalaris*, hath diſcovered, that Ocellus Lucanus wrote the treatiſe *Of the nature of the univerſe* in *Doric* §: and from thence rightly concludes, it ought *to be acknowledged for a genuine work, which hitherto learned men have doubted of, from this very buſineſs of its being writ in the* common *dialect. For we now ſee that every word of the true book is faithfully preſerved; the* Doric *being only changed into the ordinary language, at the fancy of ſome copier* ||. Now, ſurely, the raſh ſuſpicions of thoſe *learned men* in the caſe of Ocellus Lucanus, ſhould have made him more cautious in indulging his own. He ſhould have concluded, if this liberty was taken with books of mere ſpeculation, it was more likely to be indulged in works ſo neceſſary to be underſtood as a body of

* Dennis Sauvage, Avertiſement aux Lecteurs.

† Rech. L. viii. c. 3. ‡ P. 135, and 358.

§ P. 47. ‖ P. 49.

laws;

laws; especially when he had observed (after Porphyry) *that the* Doric *is always clouded with obscurity* *.

Hence, doubtless, *trans-dialecting* was no rare practice. For, besides this instance of Ocellus Lucanus, we have another, in the poems going under the name of Orpheus: which, Jamblichus says, were written in the *Doric* dialect. But now the fragments of these poems, left us by those who did not write in *Doric*, are in the common dialect. It is plain then, they have been *trans-dialected.*

2. The learned Critic's other argument for the imposture runs thus: *The Report of* Zaleucus *being a* Pythagorean, *was gathered from some passages in the system of laws ascribed to him, for where else could they meet with it? so that, if it can be proved he was more ancient than* Pythagoras, *this false story of his being a* Pythagorean *being taken from that system, must convict it of being a cheat* †. He then proceeds to prove him more ancient than Pythagoras; which he does, on the whole, with great force of learning and reasoning, though his arguments are not all equally well chosen. As where he brings this for a proof that *Zaleucus* was no scholar of Pythagoras, "Because he ascribed all his laws to Minerva, from whom he "pretended to receive them in dreams: which (in the learned "Critic's opinion) has nothing of a Pythagorean in it. For Py-"thagoras's scholars ascribed every thing to their master: it was "always αὐτὸς ἔφα with them, *he said it.* Therefore, if *Zaleucus* "had been of that society, he would certainly have honoured his "master, by imputing his laws to his instructions ‡." But this argument is of no weight: for, 1. From what has been said above of the genius of ancient legislation, it appears, that the general practice required, and the nature of the thing disposed the Lawgiver to ascribe his laws to the inspiration of some God. 2. As to the famous αὐτὸς ἔφα, it was not peculiar to the Pythagoreans, but common to all the sects of *Greece*, *jurare in verba magistri.* A de-

* P. 317. † P. 337. ‡ P. 338.

vice to keep them diſtinct and ſeparate from each other; and a compendious way of arguing amongſt thoſe of the ſame ſchool. It would then have been ridiculous to have urged its authority to any out of the ſect; more ſo, to the common people; and moſt of all, to them, upon public and practical matters; the αὐτὸς ἔφα being uſed only in points of ſpeculation, and in the ſchools of philoſophy. Indeed, ſo unlucky is this argument, that, on the contrary, the reader will be apt to conclude, that this very circumſtance of *Zaleucus's* aſcribing his laws to Minerva, was one of the things that gave riſe and credit to the report of his being a Pythagorean. And, doubtleſs, it would have much weight with thoſe who did not carefully enough attend to the chronology. For *Zaleucus*, in this, might be thought to follow both the example and the precept of Pythagoras, who himſelf pretended to be inſpired by Minerva; and taught it to his ſcholars as the moſt efficacious way of eſtabliſhing civil juſtice, *to propagate the opinion of the Gods having an intimate intercourſe with mankind* *.

But notwithſtanding the defect of this argument, the learned critic, as we ſaid, proves his point with great clearneſs, that *Zaleucus* was earlier than Pythagoras: and, in concluſion, draws the inference abovementioned, in theſe terms: *It was generally reported* Zaleucus *was a* Pythagorean; *it is proved he was not. This will refute the book itſelf. For if any intimation was given in the book that the author was a* Pythagorean, *the impoſture is evident.* "*And yet* "*it is hard to give any other reaſon, that ſhould induce the later* "*writers to call him a* Pythagorean." *Some impoſtor, therefore, made a ſyſtem of laws under the name of* Zaleucus, *and in it gave a broad hint that he was a ſcholar of* Pythagoras.

Here he reſts his point. *If, then, it be not hard to give another reaſon, that ſhould induce the later writers to call him a Pythagorean,* his long diſcourſe to prove *Zaleucus* the earlier of the two, is of no

* See Jamblichus's Life of Pythagoras, p. 147. edit. Kuſt.

kind

kind of uſe to convict the pretended laws of impoſture. I have already hinted at another not improbable reaſon, which was his having the ſame inſpiring Goddeſs with Pythagoras: And this will be much ſtrengthened by the obſervation, that Minerva became the peculiar patroneſs of the Pythagorean Lawgivers, on account of the aſſiſtance ſhe had given to their maſter. To which we may add theſe further circumſtances, that the laws were in *Doric* (and ſuppoſing them genuine, they certainly were ſo) which idiom was peculiar to the Pythagoric ſchool *: and, that the whole proem of *Zaleucus's* laws was formed agreeably to the precepts of Pythagoras in this matter; who directs, that, next after the worſhip of the Gods, *Dæmon*, and *Parent* worſhip ſhould be enjoined †. Now, later writers, ſeeing theſe two viſible marks of a Pythagorean, might, without further reflexion, be reaſonably diſpoſed to think *Zaleucus* of that ſect. But, as the learned critic has well made out, from ſure chronological evidence, that this was a miſtake, we muſt ſeek for ſome other cauſe of the uniformity between them; which I take to be this: *Zaleucus*, when Pythagoras flouriſhed, was in the higheſt repute in Greece for legiſlation; which might incline this philoſopher to imitate him, both in his inſpiring Goddeſs, and in the proem of his laws: ſo that poſterity only miſtook the copy for the original. This they might very well do; for Pythagoras and his ſect had ſoon engroſſed all the glory in the practice of lawgiving: and this leads me to another probable cauſe of the common opinion of *Zaleucus's* being a Pythagorean: The character of this ſect, as will be ſeen hereafter, was ſo great for legiſlation, that after-ages thought nothing could be done to purpoſe in that way, which had not a Pythagorean for its author. So, beſides *Zaleucus*, the ancients ſuppoſed Charondas, Numa ‡, Zamolxis §, Phytius, Theocles,

* See note [B], at the end of this book.

† Μετὰ δὲ τὸ θεῖόν τε καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον, πλεῖστον ποιεῖσθαι λόγον γονέων. Jamb. Vit. Pyth. c. xxx. p. 148.

‡ Quinetiam arbitror propter *Pythagoreorum* admirationem, Numam quoque regem *Pythagoreum* à poſterioribus exiſtimatum. Tull. Tuſc. Diſp. lib. iv. c. 1. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. II. p. 331.

§ Herod. lib. iv. c. 95. Edit. Gale.

Elicaon,

Elicaon, Ariſtocrates, nay the very Druids *, the legiſlators of Gaul, and, in a word, all the eminent Lawgivers who lived any where about the time of Pythagoras, to be inſtructed by him. But will the learned Critic ſay, that, *therefore*, all theſe Legiſlators were imaginary perſons, and did not give laws to their ſeveral cities? This notion, ariſing from Pythagoras's great character and reputation, was nurſed up and improved by his followers themſelves, to beget honour to their maſter; as, in fact, appears from ſeveral paſſages in Jamblichus's life of that Philoſopher. So that was there no more in it than this; as *Zaleucus's* Inſtitutions were in great repute, we might very naturally account for the miſtake.

But, laſtly, it is, indeed, very true, (as the learned Critic ſuſpected) that the principal ground *of the report of* Zaleucus *being a* Pythagorean, *was from ſome paſſages in the ſyſtem of laws aſcribed to him.* He is only too haſty in his concluſion, that therefore *theſe muſt needs convict the ſyſtem of a cheat.* What hurried him on, was his ſuppoſing, that no ſuch *report could be gathered from paſſages in the ſyſtem*, but ſuch as muſt be *an intimation that the author was a Pythagorean:* and that there is no difference between *giving* and *taking* an intimation. If, then, this report might be gathered from paſſages which contained no *intimation*, and if the reader might underſtand that to be ſuch which the writer never intended; the conſequence will be, that the credit of theſe fragments will remain unſhaken, though we grant the learned Critic his whole premiſes, and all the facts he contends for.

It ſeems, then, to be certain, that the report of *Zaleucus's* being a Pythagorean aroſe principally from a paſſage in his ſyſtem of laws. And it was not difficult to diſcover what it was. *Zaleucus* in his preface ſpeaks of an EVIL GENIUS or *Dæmon*, ΔΑΙΜΩΝ ΚΑΚΟΣ, as influencing men to wickedneſs. This, though a notion of the higheſt † antiquity, whoſe origin and author are much

* Ammian. Marcell. lib. xv. c. 9. p. 75. Edit. Gronov. fol. 1693.

† Ἀριστόξενος δ' ἐν πρώτῳ περὶ φιλοσοφίας, καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι (Μάγους) τῶν Αἰγυπτίων· καὶ δύο κατ' αὐτοὺς εἶναι ἀρχὰς, ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα, καὶ ΚΑΚΟΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΑ. Diog. Laert. Vit. Phil. Procem. Seg. 8. Edit.

much diſputed, yet became at length the diſtinguiſhing doctrine of the Pythagoreans. Plutarch, ſpeaking of Pythagoras's opinion of the firſt principle, ſays, that that philoſopher called the *Monad*, God, and *Duad*, the EVIL GENIUS *. Which *Duad* the Pythagoreans uſed extremely to vilify, as the cauſe of all evil, under the name of the BAD PRINCIPLE, as Plutarch would make us believe †. The application of this doctrine I ſuppoſe Pythagoras might borrow from *Zaleucus*, and here again poſterity be miſtaken only in the original author. However, we may collect from the ſame Plutarch, that that opinion was cultivated by all the ancient Lawgivers. For this learned man, who favoured the notion of TWO PRINCIPLES, the one good, the other evil, affects, I obſerve, to draw every ancient writer, who but mentions an *evil dæmon*, into his own ſect. In his treatiſe of Iſis and Oſiris, he ſpeaks to this purpoſe, "That "it was a moſt ancient opinion, delivered as well by LAWGIVERS "as Divines, that the world was neither made by Chance, neither "did one Cauſe govern all things, without oppoſition ‡."

Edit. Amſtel. 1692, 4to. Οὐκ οἶδα μὴ τῶν ΠΑΝΥ ΠΑΛΑΙΩΝ τῶν ἀτοπώταλον ἀναγκασθῶμεν προσδέχεσθαι λόγον ὡς τὰ φαῦλα δαιμόνια καὶ βάσκανα, περισφοιτᾶλα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν καὶ ταῖς πρόξεσιν ἀνιάμενα, ταραχὰς καὶ φόβους ἐπάγει, σείοντα καὶ σφάλλοντα τὴν ἀρετήν· ὡς μὴ διαμεινάντες ἁπλῶτες ἐν τῷ καλῷ καὶ ἀκέραιοι, βελτίονος ἐκείνων μοίρας μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν τύχωσιν· Plut. Vita Dionis, in initio.

* Πυθαγόρας τῶν ἀρχῶν τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεὸν, καὶ τ' ἀγαθὸν ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς φύσις, αὐτὸς ὀνομάζει· τὴν δ' ἀόριστον δυάδα, ΔΑΙΜΟΝΑ, καὶ τὸ ΚΑΚΟΝ, περὶ ἣν ἐστι τὸ ὑλικὸν πλῆθος. De Plac. Phil. lib. i. c. 7. p. 1624. E. S. (T. II. p. 881. D. Edit. Francof. 1599, fol.)

† Οἱ μὲν Πυθαγορικοὶ διὰ πλειόνων ὀνομάτων κατηγορέσι, τοῦ μὲν ἀγαθοῦ τὸ ἓν περιττόν, τὸ μένον, τὸ εὐθὺ, τὸ περισσὸν, τὸ τετράγωνον, τὸ δεξιὸν, τὸ λαμπρόν· τοῦ δὲ ΚΑΚΟΥ, τὴν ΔΥΑΔΑ, τὸ ἄπειρον, τὸ φερόμενον, τὸ καμπύλον, τὸ ἄρρεν, τὸ ἑτερόμηκες, τὸ ἄνισον, τὸ ἀριστερὸν, τὸ σκολεινόν· ὥστε ταύτας ἀρχὰς γενέσεως ὑποκειμένας· Περὶ ΙΣ. καὶ ΟΣΙΡ. p. 660. St. Ed. I ſuppoſe the reaſon, why Δυὰς was amongſt the ill names ſaid to be given by the Pythagoreans, to the *bad principle*, was, becauſe, in their ſuperſtitious deſignations of the various qualities of numbers, this Δυὰς is very heavily loaded. Ὅτι ἡ μὲν ΜΟΝΑΣ καλὰ τὴν ἰσότητα καὶ τὸ μέτρον λαμβάνεται· ἡ δὲ Δυὰς καθ' ὑπερβολὴν καὶ ἔλλειψιν. Anon. de Vita Pythag. apud Photium. Edit. Hæſchelii, fol. 1612. pag. 1314.

‡ Διὸ καὶ παμπάλαιον αὕτη κάτεισιν ἐκ Θεολόγων καὶ ΝΟΜΟΘΕΤΩΝ—ὡς ὅτ' ἄνευ καὶ ἄλογος καὶ ἀκυβέρνητον αἰωρεῖται τῷ αὐτομάτῳ τὸ πᾶν, ὅτε εἷς ἐστιν ὁ χραίων καὶ καθευθύνων, ὥσπερ οἴαξιν ἢ τισι πειθηνίοις χαλινοῖς λόγος. Ibid. de Iσ. et Oσιρ. p. 658.

This

This notion therefore, delivered in the proem of *Zaleucus's* law, might be very well *taken* for an *intimation of the author's being a* Pythagorean, and yet, not being ſo *given*, it has not the leaſt tendency to diſcredit the compilation.

On the whole then, I preſume, it appears, that the credit of theſe remains ſtands unſhaken by any thing the learned Critic has advanced to the contrary; and that we may ſafely produce them as of the antiquity they lay claim to.

Thus *Zaleucus* begins his preface: "Every inhabitant, whether "of town or country, ſhould firſt of all be firmly perſuaded of "the being and exiſtence of the Gods: which belief he will be "readily induced to entertain, when he contemplates the heavens, "regards the world, and obſerves the diſpoſition, order, and harmony of the univerſe; which can neither be the work of blind "chance, nor of man. Theſe Gods are to be worſhipped as the "cauſe of all the real good we enjoy. Every one therefore ſhould "ſo purify, and poſſeſs his mind, as to have it clear of all kinds of evil; "being perſuaded that God is not honoured by a wicked perſon, nor "acceptably ſerved, like miſerable man, with ſumptuous ceremonies, or taken with coſtly ſacrifices, but with Virtue only, and "a conſtant diſpoſition to good and juſt actions. On which account, every one ſhould labour all he can to become good, both "in practice and principle, whereby he will render himſelf dear "and acceptable to God; ſhould fear more that which leads to "ignominy and diſhonour, than that which leads to loſs of wealth "and fortune; and eſteem him the beſt Citizen, who gives up his "worldly goods, rather than renounce his honeſty and love of "juſtice: But thoſe, whoſe headſtrong appetites will not ſuffer them "to be reſtrained within the limits of theſe things, and whoſe "hearts are turned with a natural bias towards evil, whether they "be men or women, citizens or ſojourners, ſhould be told, to have "the Gods always in mind, to think upon their nature, and of the "judgments they have in ſtore for wicked men; to *ſet before themſelves*

"*ſelves*

" *ſelves the dreadful hour of death*, a period they muſt all arrive at;
" *when the memory of evil actions paſt will ſeize the ſinner with remorſe,*
" *accompanied with the fruitleſs wiſh, that he had ſubmitted his actions*
" *to the rules of juſtice.* Every one, therefore, ſhould ſo watch
" over his behaviour, *as if that hour were ſtill preſent with him*, and
" attended all his motions: which will be the way to keep up in
" himſelf an exact regard to right and juſtice. BUT IF THE WICKED
" DEMON BE INSTANT TO INFLUENCE HIM TO EVIL, let him fly to
" the altars and temples of the Gods, as the ſureſt aſylum from that
" crueleſt and wickedeſt of tyrants, EVIL, and implore their aſſiſ-
" tance to drive her far from him. To this end, let him alſo have
" recourſe to thoſe, whoſe reputations are high for probity and
" virtue *; whom he may hear diſcourſe of the happineſs of good,
" and the vengeance attending evil men †."

* Meaning the men ſet apart for the ſervice of religion, ſuch as Virgil deſcribes in his Elyſium, Æneid. L. vi. p. 265. l. 21. Edit. Venet. 8vo, 1638.

Quique ſacerdotes caſti, dum vita manebat;
Quique pii vates & Phœbo digna locuti.

Which not only ſhews the Legiſlator's ſenſe of their uſe, but of the neceſſity of their practiſing what they teach to others.

† Τὰς καλοικἀγαθίας τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν, πάντας πρῶτον πειπείσθαι χρὴ, καὶ νομίζειν θεὰς εἶναι, καὶ ἀναβλέπειν εἰς οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὸν κόσμον, καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς διακόσμησιν, καὶ τάξιν· ἃ γὰρ τύχης, οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων εἶναι δημιουργήματα σέβεσθαι δεῖ τούτους καὶ τιμᾶν, ὡς αἰτίους ὄντας ἁπάντων ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν, τῶν καθ' λόγον γιγνομένων. Ἕκαστον δὲν ἔχειν καὶ παρασκευάζειν δεῖ τὴν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν, πάντων τῶν κακῶν καθαράν· ἃς ἂν τιμάται θεὸς ὑπ' ἀνθρώπου φαύλου, οὐδὲ θεραπεύεται δαπάναις, οὐδὲ τραγῳδίαις τῶν ἁλισκομένων, καθάπερ μοχθηροὶ ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ἀρετῇ καὶ προαιρέσει τῶν καλῶν ἔργων καὶ δικαίων. Διὸ ἕκαστον δεῖ εἰς δύναμιν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, καὶ πράξει καὶ προαιρέσει τὸν μέλλοντα ἕσεσθαι θεοφιλῆ· καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὰς εἰς χρήματα ζημίας μᾶλλον τῶν εἰς αἰσχύνην τεινόντων· καὶ πολίτην ἀμείνονα ὀνομάζειν τὸν τὴν θυσίαν προϊέμενον μᾶλλον τῷ καλῷ καὶ δικαίῳ· ὅσοις δὲ μὴ ῥᾴδιον πρὸς ταῦτα τὴν ὁρμὴν πεπεῖσθαι, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἔχουσιν εὐκίνητον πρὸς ἀδικίαν, ὧδ' ἡμῖν παρηγγέλθω· πᾶσι τοῖς τοιούτοις πολίταις, καὶ πολίτισι καὶ ξενοίκοις μεμῆσθαι θεῶν ὡς ὄντων, καὶ δίκας ἐπιπεμπόντων τοῖς ἀδίκοις καὶ τίθεσθαι πρὸ ὀμμάτων τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, ἐν ᾧ γίνεται τὸ τίλος ἑκάστῳ τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ ζῆν· πᾶσι γὰρ ἐμπίπτει μεταμέλεια τοῖς μέλλουσι τελευτᾶν, μεμνημένοις ὧν ἀδικήκασι, καὶ ὁρμὴ τοῦ βούλεσθαι πάντα πεπράχθαι δικαίως αὐτοῖς· Διὸ δεῖ ἕκαστον παρ' ἑκάστην πρᾶξιν ἀεὶ συνοικειοῦν τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, ὡς δὴ παρόντα· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν μάλιστα τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ δικαίου φρονήσειν· ἐὰν δέ τῳ παρασῇ ΔΑΙΜΩΝ ΚΑΚΟΣ τρέπων πρὸς ἀδικίαν διαλοιδορεῖν πρὸς ναοὺς καὶ βωμοῖς καὶ τεμένεσι, φεύγοντα τὴν ἀδικίαν ὡς δίσποιναν ἀσεβεστάτην καὶ χαλεπωτάτην ἐλεύθοντα τοὺς θεοὺς συναπολέπειν αὐτήν· εἶναι δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρας δόξαν ἔχοντας ἐπ' ἀνδραγαθίᾳ ἀκεσόμενον περὶ εὐδαίμονα βίον, καὶ κακῶν ἀνδρῶν τιμωρίας ἵνα ἀπολέπῃ τῶν ἀδίκων ἔργων. Apud Stobæum, Serm. xlii. p. 279. lin. 13. Tiguri, fol. 1559.

One would wonder, that any man, who had attentively conſidered this admirable fragment, could think it the forgery of a Sophiſt. It is plain, the author of it underſtood human nature and ſociety at another rate. He hath not only given us an exact portrait of natural Religion; but, in applying it to the State, hath explained the uſe and ſubſerviency of its parts to the three great claſſes of mankind. He hath recommended the intrinſic excellence of virtue, and compliance with the *Will* and example of the Gods, to thoſe who are of ſo ingenuous and well framed a nature as to be always diſpoſed to embrace truth and right: to others, of a leſs heroic turn of mind, ſuch who idolize their *honour*, he holds out fame and ignominy, as the inſeparable attendants of good and evil actions: and, to the common run of more intractable and perverſe tempers, he preaches up the doctrine of *future rewards and puniſhments* *. I will only obſerve, it appears to have been from hence, that POMPONATIUS borrowed the beautiful paſſage, which is quoted at large, in the firſt book of this diſcourſe.

Thus ZALEUCUS. And much in the ſame faſhion does CHARONDAS introduce his Laws.

In imitation of the practice, PLATO likewiſe, and CICERO both preface their *Laws* with the ſanctions of Religion. And though theſe two great men were not, ſtrictly ſpeaking, Lawgivers in form; yet we are not to ſuppoſe that what they wrote in this ſcience, was like the dreams of the Sophiſts, for the amuſement of the idle and curious. They were both well practiſed in affairs, and deeply converſant in human nature; and they formed their ſpeculative Inſtitutes on the plan, and in the ſpirit and views of ancient legiſlation: the foundation of Plato's being the *Attic Laws*; and the foundation of Cicero's, the *Twelve Tables*: who himſelf takes care to warn us of this particular. "In imitation of Plato, the moſt "learned, and, at the ſame time, the wiſeſt of the philoſophers, "who wrote beſt † of a republic, and likewiſe, ſeparately, of the "laws

* See note C, at the end of this Book.

† I read here, with Turnebus, *qui princeps de rep. conſcripſit.* Lambin objects to this reading, becauſe we gather from Ariſtotle, that *Plato was not the firſt who wrote of a republic*; he

" laws thereof, I think it will be proper, before I give the law it-
" ſelf *, to ſay ſomewhat in recommendation of it: which, I ob-
" ſerve, was the method of Zaleucus and Charondas. For their
" ſyſtem of laws was not an exerciſe of wit, or deſigned for the
" amuſement of the indolent and curious, but compoſed for the uſe
" of the public in their ſeveral cities. *Theſe, Plato imitated*; as
" thinking this likewiſe to be the buſineſs of Law; to gain ſome-
" what of its end by the gentler methods of perſuaſion, and not
" carry every thing by mere force and fear of puniſhment †."

he ſuppoſing *princeps* ſignified *primus*, whereas it means *optimus*. This was Tully's opinion of Plato, as may be gathered from many places in his writings. And in this ſenſe, Turnebus, without doubt, underſtood the word; a ſenſe familiar to his author, as in *Ver.* lib. iv. cap. 49. " in qua [*Patria*] multis virtutibus & beneficiis floruit PRINCEPS." But the word *primus* itſelf is ſometimes uſed in *this* ſenſe of *princeps*; as in Virgil,

Prima quod ad Trojam———

* " Ut priuſquam ipſam *legem* recitem, de ejus legis *laude* dicam." This paſſage is not without its difficulty. If by LEX be meant the whole ſyſtem of his laws, which the tenor of the diſcourſe leads one to ſuppoſe; then, by LAUS, the *recommendation* of it, we are to underſtand his ſhewing, as he does in the following chapter, that the Gods intereſted themſelves very much in the obſervance of civil laws; which implies, that they were indeed their laws: and ſo Tully calls them, in the 4th chapter of this book: " Ita principem legem illam, & ultimam, mentem eſſe dicebant, omnia ratione aut co-
" gentis, aut vetantis Dei; ex qua illa lex quam Dii humano generi dederunt, recte
" eſt LAUDATA." And the ſhewing that civil laws came originally from the Gods, was the higheſt recommendation of them. But if by LEX we are to underſtand only the *firſt* law of the ſyſtem, which begins, " Ad Divos adeunto caſte," &c. then by LAUS is meant his ſhewing, as he does likewiſe in the following chapter, the uſe and ſervice of religion to civil ſociety.

† Sed, ut vir doctiſſimus fecit Plato, atque idem graviſſimus philoſophorum omnium, qui princeps de republica conſcripſit, idemque ſeparatim de legibus ejus, id mihi credo eſſe faciendum; ut priuſquam ipſam legem recitem, de ejus legis laude dicam. Quod idem & Zaleucum & Charondam feciſſe video; cum quidem illi non ſtudii & delectationis, ſed reipublicæ cauſa leges civitatibus ſuis ſcripſerunt. Quos imitatus Plato, videlicet hoc quoque legis putavit eſſe, perſuadere aliquid, non omnia vi ac minis cogere. De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 6. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 141.

Here, we ſee, he intimates, that Plato and himſelf had the ſame view, in writing laws, with Zaleucus and Charondas: namely, the ſervice of a Public. The difference between them was, that the two Originals were employed by their country; and the two Copieſts generouſly undertook an office they were not called to.

However, Plato and Cicero are the greateſt authorities antiquity could afford, and the moſt deſerving to be heard in this matter. Plato makes it the neceſſary introduction to his laws, to eſtabliſh the *being and providence of the Gods* by a law againſt SACRILEGE. And he explains what he means by *ſacrilege*, in the following words: "Either the denial of the being of the Gods; or, if that be owned, "the denial of their providence over men; or, thirdly, the teach-"ing, that they are flexible, and eaſy to be cajoled by prayer and "ſacrifice *." And afterwards; "It is not of ſmall conſequence, "that what we here reaſon about the Gods, ſhould, by all means, "be made probable; as, that they ARE; and, that they are GOOD; "and that their concern for juſtice takes place of all other human "conſiderations. For this, in our opinion, ſeems to be the nobleſt "and beſt PREFACE that can be made to a body of laws †." In compliance with this declaration, Cicero's *Preface* to his laws, is conceived in the following terms: "Let our citizen then be firſt of all "firmly perſuaded of the government and dominion of the Gods; "that they are the lords and maſters of the world; that all things "are diſpoſed by their power, direction, and providence; and that "the whole race of mankind is in the higheſt manner indebted to "them; that they are intimately acquainted with every one's ſtate "and condition; that they know what he does, what he thinks; with

* ἀλλὰ ἓν δή τι τῶν τριῶν πάσχων, ἢ τοῦτο——οὐχ ἡγούμεθα, ἢ τὸ δεύτερον ὄντας, οὐ φροντίζειν ἀνθρώπων, ἢ τρίτον, εὐπαραμυθήτους εἶναι, θυσίαις τε καὶ εὐχαῖς παραλομένους. De Legg. lib. x. p. 885. B. Tom. II. Edit. H. Steph. fol.

† διαφέρει δ' οὐ σμικρὸν ἁμωσγέπως πιθανότητά τινα τοὺς λόγους ἡμῶν ἔχειν, ὡς θεοί τ' εἰσι, καὶ ἀγαθοὶ, δίκην τιμῶντες διαφερόντως ἀνθρώπων· σχεδὸν γὰρ τοῦτο ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων τῶν νομῶν κάλλιστόν τε καὶ ἄριστον προοίμιον ἂν εἴη. Id. ibid.

"what

" what diſpoſition of mind, and with what degree of piety he per-
" forms the acts and offices of religion; and that, accordingly, they
" make a diſtinction between the good and bad. The mind being
" imbued with theſe opinions, will never deviate from TRUTH
" and UTILITY. And what *truth* is more evident than this, that
" no one ſhould be ſo ſtupidly arrogant, as to ſuppoſe, there is
" Mind and Reaſon in himſelf, and yet none in the Heavens and
" the World; or, that thoſe things, whoſe uſes and directions can
" ſcarce be comprehended with the utmoſt ſtretch of human fa-
" culties, may yet perform their motions without an underſtanding
" Ruler? But, He whom the courſes of the heavenly bodies, the
" viciſſitudes of day and night, the orderly temperature of the
" ſeaſons, and the various bleſſings which the earth pours out for
" our ſuſtenance and pleaſure, will not excite, nay compel to gra-
" titude, is unfit even to be reckoned in the number of men. And
" ſince things endowed with reaſon, are more excellent than thoſe
" which want it; and that it is impiety to ſay, any particular is
" more excellent than the univerſal Nature: we muſt needs confeſs
" this Nature to be endowed with reaſon. That theſe opinions are
" likewiſe *uſeful*, who can deny, when he conſiders what ſtability
" is derived to the Public from within, by the religion of an oath;
" and what ſecurity it enjoys from without, by thoſe holy rites
" which affirm national treaties and conventions: how efficacious
" the fear of divine puniſhment is, to deter men from wickedneſs;
" and what purity of manners muſt reign in that Society, where
" the immortal Gods themſelves are believed to interpoſe both as
" judges and witneſſes? Here you have the PROEM of the law: for
" ſo Plato calls it *."

And

* Sit igitur jam hoc a principio perſuaſum civibus, dominos eſſe omnium rerum ac moderatores Deos, eaque quæ gerantur, eorum geri, ditione, ac numine, eoſdemque optime de genere hominum mereri; & qualis quiſque ſit, quid agat, quid in ſe admittat, qua mente, qua pietate colat religiones, intueri; piorumque & impiorum habere rationem,

And then follow the laws themſelves; the firſt of which is conceived in theſe words: "Let thoſe who approach the Gods, be pure "and undefiled; let their offerings be ſeaſoned with piety, and all "oſtentation of pomp omitted: the God himſelf will be his own "avenger on tranſgreſſors. Let the Gods, and thoſe who were ever "reckoned in the number of Celeſtials, be worſhiped; and thoſe "likewiſe, whom their merits have raiſed to heaven; ſuch as Her-"cules, Bacchus, Æsculapius, Castor, Pollux, and Ro-"mulus. And let chapels be erected in honour to thoſe qualities, "by whoſe aid mortals arrive thither, ſuch as Reason, Virtue, "Piety, and Good-faith *."

SECT. IV.

THE next ſtep the Legiſlator took, was to ſupport and affirm the general doctrine of a Providence, which he had delivered in his laws, by a very circumſtantial and popular method of inculcating the belief of a *future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments.*

nem. His enim rebus imbutæ mentes, haud ſane abhorrebunt ab utili, & a vera ſententia. Quid eſt enim verius, quàm neminem eſſe oportere tam ſtulte arrogantem, ut in ſe rationem & mentem putet ineſſe, in cœlo mundoque non putet? aut ut ea, quæ vix ſumma ingenii ratione comprehendat, nulla ratione moveri putet? Quem vero aſtrorum ordines, quem dierum noctiumque viciſſitudines, quem menſium temperatio, quemque ea, quæ gignuntur nobis ad fruendum, non gratum eſſe cogant, hunc hominem omnino numerari qui decet? Cumque omnia, quæ rationem habent, præſtent iis, quæ ſint rationis expertia, nefaſque ſit dicere, ullam rem præſtare naturæ omnium rerum: rationem ineſſe in ea confitendum eſt. Utiles eſſe autem opiniones has, quis neget, cum intelligat, quàm multa firmentur jurejurando, quantæ ſalutis ſint fœderum religiones, quàm multos divini ſupplicii metus a ſcelere revocarit; quamque ſancta ſit ſocietas civium inter ipſos, Diis immortalibus interpoſitis tum judicibus tum teſtibus. Habes legis proœmium; ſic enim hoc appellat Plato. De Legg. lib. ii. c. 7. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 141, 42.

* Ad divos adeunto caſtè; pietatem adhibento; opes amovento. Qui ſecus faxit, Deus ipſe vindex erit.——Divos, & eos qui cœleſtes ſemper habiti, colunto: & ollos, quos endo cœlo merita vocaverint, Herculem, Liberum, Æſculapium, Caſtorem, Pollucem, Quirinum. Aſt olla, propter quæ datur homini adſcenſus in cœlum, mentem, virtutem, pietatem, fidem, earumque laudum delubra ſunto. De Legg. lib. ii. c. 8. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 142, 43.

This

This was by the inſtitution of the MYSTERIES, the moſt ſacred part of pagan Religion; and artfully framed to ſtrike deeply and forcibly into the minds and imaginations of the people.

I propoſe, therefore, to give a full and diſtinct account of this whole matter: and the rather, becauſe it is a thing little known or attended to: the Ancients, who wrote expreſly on the *Myſteries*, ſuch as Melanthius, Menander, Hiceſius, Sotades, and others, not being come down to us. So that the modern writers on this ſubject are altogether in the dark concerning their origine and end; not excepting Meurſius himſelf: to whom, however, I am much indebted, for abridging my labour in the ſearch of thoſe paſſages of antiquity, which make mention of the ELEUSINIAN *Myſteries*, and for bringing the greater part of them together under one view *.

To avoid ambiguity, it will be proper to explain the term. Each of the *pagan* Gods had (beſides the *public* and *open*) a *ſecret worſhip* † paid unto him: to which none were admitted but thoſe who had been ſelected by preparatory ceremonies, called INITIATION. This *ſecret worſhip* was termed the MYSTERIES.

But though every God had, beſides his *open* worſhip, the *ſecret* likewiſe; yet this latter did not *every where* attend the former; but only *there*, where he was the patron God, or in principal eſteem. Thus, when in conſequence of that intercommunity of paganiſm, which will be explained hereafter, one nation adopted the Gods of another, they did not always take in at the ſame time, the *ſecret worſhip* or *Myſteries* of that God: ſo, in Rome, the public and open worſhip of Bacchus was in uſe long before his *Myſteries* were admitted. But, on the other hand again, the worſhip of the ſtrange God was ſometimes introduced only for the ſake of his *Myſteries*:

* Eleuſinia: ſive de Cereris Eleuſinæ ſacro.

† Strabo, in his tenth book of his Geography, p. 716, Gron. Ed. writes thus: Κοινὸν δὴ τοῦτο, καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐστὶ, τὸ τὰς ἱεροποιίας μετὰ ἀνέσεως ἑορτασικῆς ποιεῖσθαι, τὰς μὲν σὺν ἐνθουσιασμῷ, τὰς δὲ χωρίς· καὶ ταῖς μὲν μετὰ μυστικῆς, τὰς δὲ μή· ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΜΕΝ ΜΥΣΤΙΚΩΣ, ΤΑΣ ΔΕ ΕΝ ΦΑΝΕΡΩι· καὶ τοῦθ ἡ φύσις ὕτως ὑπαγορεύει.

as,

as, in the ſame city, that of Iſis and Oſiris. Thus ſtood the caſe in general; the particular exceptions to it, will be ſeen in the ſequel of this diſſertation.

The firſt and original *Myſteries*, of which we have any ſure account, were thoſe of Iſis and Oſiris in EGYPT; from whence they were derived to the GREEKS *, under the preſidency of various Gods †, as the inſtitutor thought moſt for his purpoſe: Zoroaſter brought them into Perſia: Cadmus and Inachus into Greece at large ‡; Orpheus into Thrace: Melampus into Argis; Trophonius into Bœotia; Minos into Crete; Cinyras into Cyprus; and Erechtheus into Athens. And as in Egypt they were to Iſis and Oſiris; ſo in Aſia they were to Mithras; in Samothrace to the Mother of the Gods; in Bœotia to Bacchus; in Cyprus to Venus; in Crete to Jupiter; in Athens to Ceres and Proſerpine; in Amphiſſa to

* Diod. Sic. lib. i. Eudoxus ſaid, as Plutarch informs us, that the Egyptians invented this fable concerning Jupiter Ammon, or the Supreme God,—That his Legs being unſeparated, very ſhame drove him into ſolitude; but that Iſis ſplit and divided them, and by that means ſet him at liberty to walk about the World. Φησὶ περὶ τοῦ Διὸς ὁ Εὔδοξος, μυθολογεῖν Αἰγυπτίους, ὡς τῶν σκελῶν συμπεφυκότων αὐτῷ μὴ δυνάμενος βαδίζειν, ὑπ' αἰσχύνης, ἐρημίαν διέτριβεν. Ἡ δὲ Ἶσις διατεμοῦσα καὶ διαρήσασα τὰ μέρη ταῦτα τοῦ σώματος, ἀρτίποδα, τὴν πορείαν παρέσχεν. De Iſ. &. Oſir. Vol. I. pag. 670. Edit. Steph. 8vo. The moral of the fable is plainly this, as we ſhall ſee more plainly hereafter, That the FIRST CAUSE was kept unknown, till the Egyptian *Myſteries* of Iſis revealed him amongſt their ἀπόῤῥητα; which *Myſteries* were communicated to the Greeks, and, through them, to the reſt of mankind. But the Image under which the fable is conveyed, was taken from the form of the Egyptian Statues of the Gods, which the workmen made with their Legs undivided. When the Greek Artiſts firſt ſhewed them how to form their Gods in a walking Poſture, the attitude ſo alarmed their Worſhipers, that they bound them with Chains, leſt they ſhould deſert their own Country. For the People imagined that their Gods, on the leaſt ill humour or diſguſt, had a ſtrange propenſity to ſhew them a fair pair of heels.

† Ὅτι δὲ τῶν Διονυσίων, καὶ τῶν Παναθηναίων, καὶ μέντοι καὶ τῶν Θεσμοφορίων, καὶ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων τὰς τελετὰς Ὀρφεὺς, ἀνὴρ Ὀδρύσης, εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐκόμισεν, καὶ εἰς ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΝ ἀφικόμενος, τὰ τῆς Ἴσιδος καὶ τοῦ Ὀσίριδος εἰς τὰ τῆς Δηοῦς καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου μεταθέσθαι ἔοικεν ὄργια. Theodoretus, Therapeut. i.

‡ Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀρχὴν ἔσχε τὰ παρ' Ἕλλησι μυστήριά τε καὶ τελεταί· πρότερον παρ' ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΟΙΣ, καὶ παρὰ Φρυξὶ, καὶ Φοινιξὶ, καὶ Βαβυλωνίοις, κακῶς ἐπινενοημένα μεταενεχθέντά τε εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΩΝ χώρας ὑπὸ Κάδμου καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰνάχου. Ἄτιτος πρότερον κληθέντος, καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντος τὴν Μέμφιν. Epiphan. adv. Hær. lib. i. Hæreſ. iv.

Caſtor,

Caſtor and Pollux; in Lemnos to Vulcan, and ſo to others, in other places, the number of which is incredible *.

But their end, as well as nature, was the ſame in all; to teach the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE. In this, Origen and Celſus agree; the two moſt learned writers of their ſeveral parties. The firſt, minding his adverſary of the difference between the *future life* promiſed by the Goſpel, and that taught in Paganiſm, bids him compare the Chriſtian doctrine with what all the ſects of Philoſophy, and all the *Myſteries*, amongſt Greeks and Barbarians, taught concerning it †: And Celſus, in his turn, endeavouring to ſhew that chriſtianity had no advantage over paganiſm in the efficacy of ſtronger ſanctions, expreſſes himſelf to this purpoſe: "But now, "after all, juſt as you believe eternal puniſhments, ſo do the Mi- "niſters of the ſacred rites, and thoſe who initiate into, and preſide "in the *Myſteries* ‡."

They continued long in religious reverence: ſome were more famous and more extenſive than others; to which many accidents concurred. The moſt noted were the ORPHIC, the BACCHIC, the ELEUSINIAN, the SAMOTHRACIAN, the CABIRIC, and the MITHRIAC.

* Poſtulat quidem magnitudo materiæ, atque ipſius defenſionis officium, ut ſimiliter cæteras turpitudinum ſpecies perſequamur: vel quas produnt antiquitatis hiſtoriæ, vel myſteria illa continent ſacra, quibus initiis nomen eſt, & quæ non omnibus vulgo, ſed paucorum taciturnitatibus tradi licet. Sed *Sacrorum innumeri ritus*, atque aſſixa deformitas ſingulis, corporaliter prohibet univerſa nos exequi. Arnob. adv. Gentes, lib. v. p. 165. Edit. Plantini, 8vo, 1582.

† —Καθ' ἑκάστην φιλοσόφων αἵρεσιν ἐν Ἕλλησιν ἢ Βάρβαροις ἢ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΔΗ. Orig. cont. Celſ. lib. iii. p. 160. Sp. Ed.

‡ Μάλιστα μὲν, ὦ βέλτιστε, ὥσπερ σὺ κολάσεις αἰωνίους νομίζεις· ὕτω καὶ οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκείνων ἐξηγηταὶ τιλεταί τε καὶ μυσταγωγοί, lib. viii. p. 408. And that nothing very heterodox was taught in the myſteries concerning a future ſtate, I collect from the anſwer Origen makes to Celſus, who had preferred what was taught in the Myſteries of Bacchus on that point, to what the Chriſtian Religion revealed concerning it—περὶ μὲν ἓν τῶν Βακχικῶν τιλετῶν εἴτε τίς ἐστι σωτηρὸς λόγος, εἴτε μηδεὶς τοιοῦτος—lib. iv. p. 167.

Euripides makes Bacchus ſay, in his tragedy of that name *, that the *Orgies* were celebrated by all foreign nations, and that he came to introduce them amongſt the Greeks. And it is not improbable, but ſeveral barbarous nations might have learned them of the Egyptians long before they came into Greece. The Druids of Britain, who had, as well as the Brachmans of India, divers of their religious rites from thence, celebrated the *Orgies* of Bacchus, as we learn from Dionyſius the African. And Strabo having quoted Artemidorus for a fabulous ſtory, ſubjoins, "But what he ſays of Ceres "and Proſerpine is more credible, namely, that there is an iſland "near Britain, where they perform the ſame rites to thoſe two "Goddeſſes as are uſed in Samothrace †." But, of all the Mysteries, thoſe which bore that name, by way of eminence, the Eleusinian, celebrated at Athens in honour of Ceres, were by far the moſt renowned; and, in courſe of time, eclipſed, and almoſt ſwallowed up the reſt. Their neighbours round about very early practiſed theſe *Myſteries* to the neglect of their own: in a little time all Greece and Aſia Minor were initiated into them: and at length they ſpread over the whole Roman empire, and even beyond the limits of it. "I inſiſt not," ſays Tully, "on thoſe ſacred and "auguſt rites of Eleusis, where, from the remoteſt regions, men "came to be initiated ‡." And we are told in Zoſimus, that "theſe moſt holy rites were then ſo extenſive, as to take in the "whole race of mankind §." Ariſtides calls Eleuſis, *the common temple of the earth* ||. And Pauſanias ſays, the rites performed there

* Act. II.

† Περὶ δὲ τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ τῆς κόρης ὑστέρα· ὅτι φησὶν εἶναι νῆσον πρὸς τῇ Βρεττανικῇ, καθ' ἣν ὅμοια τοῖς ἐν Σαμοθράκῃ περὶ τὴν Δήμητραν καὶ τὴν Κόρην ἱεροποιεῖται. Strabonis Geogr. lib. iv. p 137. lin. 26. Edit. Caſaub. The nature of theſe Samothracian rites is explained afterwards.

‡ Omitto Eleusinam ſanctam illam & auguſtam: ubi initiantur gentes orarum ultimæ. Nat. Deor. lib. i. c. 42. Edit. Ox. 4°. T. ii. p. 432.

§ Τὰ δὲ ὅσια τὸ ἀνθρώπειον μέχρι ἁγιώταται μυστήρια. lib. iv.

|| Ὅτι, ὡς κοινόν τι τῆς γῆς τέμενος τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα ἡγεῖτο. Ariſtidis Eleuſinia, in initio.

for

for the promotion of piety and virtue, as much excelled all other rites, as the Gods excelled the Heroes *.

How this happened, the nature and turn of the People, who introduced theſe *Myſteries*, will account for. Athens was a city the moſt devoted to Religion of any upon the face of the earth. On this account their poet Sophocles calls it *the ſacred building of the Gods* †, his figure of ſpeech alluding to its fabulous foundation. Nor was it a leſs compliment St. Paul intended to pay the Athenians, when he ſaid, Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ ‡. And Joſephus tells us, that *they were univerſally eſteemed the moſt religious people of Greece* §. Hence, in theſe matters, Athens became the pattern and ſtandard to the reſt of the world.

In diſcourſing, therefore, of the MYSTERIES in general, we ſhall be forced to take our ideas of them chiefly from what we find practiſed in the *Eleuſinian*. Nor need we fear to be miſtaken; the END of all being the ſame, and all having their common ORIGINAL from Egypt.

To begin with the general purpoſe and deſign of their Inſtitution. This will be underſtood, by ſhewing what they *communicated* promiſcuouſly to all.

To ſupport the doctrine of a PROVIDENCE, which, they taught, governed the world ||, they inforced the belief of a FUTURE STATE of rewards and puniſhments **, by every ſort of contrivance. But

* Οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαιότεροι τῶν Ἑλλήνων τελετὴν τὴν Ἐλευσινίαν πάντων ὁπόσα ἐς εὐσέβειαν ἥκει, τοσούτῳ ἦγον ἐντιμοτέραν, ὅσῳ καὶ τὰς θεὰς ἐπιπροσθὲν ἡρώων. Phocica, l. x. c. 31. p. 876. In this elegant ſimilitude he ſeems plainly to allude to the *ſecret* of the *myſteries*; which, as we ſhall ſee, conſiſted in an explanation of the *origin of hero-worſhip*, and the *nature of the deity*.

† Electra, act. ii. ſc. i. ΑΘΗΝΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΜΗΤΩΝ.—

‡ Act. Apoſt. xvii. 22.

§ —εὐσεβέστατος τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἅπασιν λέγεται Cont. Ap. lib. ii. tom. II. edit. Oxon. folio, 1720. cap. 15. pag. 1373. lin. 12.

‖ Plutarch. de Iſ. & Oſir.

** [Myſteriis] neque ſolum, &c.—Sed etiam cum SPE MELIORE MORIENDI. Tull. de Legg. lib. ii. c. 14. Edit. Ox. 4°. t. III. p. 148.

as this did not quite clear up the intricate ways of Providence, they added the doctrine of a METEMPSYCHOSIS, or the belief of a *prior ſtate:* as we learn from Cicero, and Porphyry *; the latter of whom informs us, that it was taught in the *Myſteries* of the Perſian Mithras. This was an ingenious ſolution, invented by the Egyptian Lawgivers, to remove all doubts concerning the moral attributes of God †; and ſo, by adding a *prior* to a *future ſtate*, to eſtabliſh the firm belief of his Providence. For the Lawgiver well knew how precarious that belief was, while the moral attributes of God remained doubtful and uncertain.

In cultivating the doctrine of a *future life*, it was taught, that the *Initiated* ſhould be happier in that ſtate than all other mortals: that while the ſouls of the profane, at their leaving the body, ſtuck faſt in mire and filth, and remained in darkneſs, the ſouls of the *Initiated* winged their flight directly to the happy iſlands, and the habitations of the Gods ‡. This doctrine was as neceſſary for the ſupport of the *Myſteries*, as the *Myſteries* were for the ſupport of the doctrine. But now, leſt it ſhould be miſtaken, that *initiation* alone, or any other means than a virtuous life, intitled men to this future happineſs, the *Myſteries* openly proclaimed it as their chief buſineſs, to reſtore the ſoul to its original purity. "It was the end "and deſign of *initiation*," ſays Plato, "to reſtore the ſoul to that "ſtate, from whence it fell, as from its native ſeat of perfection §."

* Καὶ γὰρ δόγμα πάλαι ἐστὶ τῶν πρώτων, τὴν ΜΕΤΕΜΨΥΧΩΣΙΝ εἶναι· ὃ καὶ ἐμφαίνειν ἐοίκασιν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μυστηρίοις. De Abſt. lib. iv. § 16. Edit. Cantabr. 1655, 8vo.

† So Tully. Ex quibus humanæ vitæ erroribus & ærumnis ſit, ut interdum veteres illi ſive vates, ſive in ſacris INITIISQUE tradendis divinæ mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua ſcelera ſuſcepta in vitâ ſuperiore, pœnarum luendarum cauſſa, natos eſſe dixerunt, aliquid vidiſſe videantur. Fragm. ex lib. de Philoſophia.

‡ Plato in Phædone, p. 69. C. p. 81. A. t. I. Edit. Henr. Stephani.—Ariſtides Eleuſiniâ, t. I. p. 454. Edit. Canteri, 8vo. & apud Stobæum, Serm. 119, &c. Schol. Ariſt. in Ranis. Diog. Laert. in vita Diog. Cynici.

§ Σκοπὸς τῶν τελετῶν ἐστιν, εἰς τέλος ἀναλαγεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκεῖνο ἀφ' ὃ τὴν πρώτην ἐποιήσαντο κάθοδον, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. In Phædone.

They

They contrived that every thing ſhould tend to ſhew the neceſſity of virtue; as appears from Epictetus. "Thus the *Myſteries* become "uſeful; thus we ſeize the true ſpirit of them; when we begin to "apprehend that every thing therein was inſtituted by the Ancients, "for inſtruction and amendment of life *." Porphyry gives us ſome of thoſe moral precepts, which were inforced in the Myſteries, as *to honour their parents, to offer up fruits to the Gods, and to forbear cruelty towards animals* †. For the accompliſhment of this purpoſe, it was required in the *Aſpirant* to the Myſteries, that he ſhould be of a clear and unblemiſhed Character, and free even from the ſuſpicion of any notorious crime ‡. To come at the truth of his Character, he was ſeverely interrogated by the Prieſt or Hierophant, impreſſing on him the ſame ſenſe of obligation to conceal nothing, as is now done at the roman Confeſſional §. Hence it was, that when Nero, after the murder of his mother, took a journey into Greece, and had a mind to be preſent at the celebration of the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*, the conſcience of his parricide deterred him from attempting it ‖. On the ſame account, the good emperor

* Οὕτως ὠφέλιμα γίνεται τὰ μυστήρια· ὅτως εἰς φαντασίαν ἐρχόμεθα· ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδίᾳ κ᾽ ἐπανορθώσει τοῦ βίου καλεσάθη πάντα ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν. Apud Arrian. Diſſert. lib. iii. cap. 21. My reaſon for tranſlating εἰς φαντασίαν, in this manner, was, becauſe I imagined the author, in this obſcure expreſſion, alluded to the cuſtom in the Myſteries of calling thoſe who were initiated only in the leſſer, Μύται; but thoſe, in the greater, Ἐπόπται.

† Γονεῖς τιμᾷν, Θεοὺς καρτοῖς ἀγάλλειν, ζῶα μὴ σίνεσθαι. De Abſt. lib. iv. § 22. Edit. Cant. 1655, 8vo.

‡ Οὗτοι γὰρ τό τ᾽ ἄλλα καθαροῖς εἶναι τοῖς μύσαις ἐν κοινῷ προαγορεύουσιν, οἷον τὰς χεῖρας τὴν ψυχὴν —εἶναι. Libanius Decl. xix. p. 495. D. Edit. Morelli, fol. 1606.

§ As appears from the repartee which Plutarch records, in his Laconic apophthegms of Lyſander, Edit. Francof. 1599. t. II. p. 229. D. when he went to be initiated into the Samothracean myſteries; Ἐν δὲ Σαμοθράκῃ χρηστηριαζομένῳ αὐτῷ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκέλευσεν εἰπεῖν ὅ, τί ἀνομώτατον ἔργον αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βίῳ πέπραχται; πότερον ἂν σὺ τοῦτο κελεύσαντος ἢ τῶν θεῶν, τοῦτο δεῖ ποιεῖν; ἐπηρώτησε. Φαμενόν δὲ, τῶν θεῶν, Σὺ τοίνυν, ἔφη, ἐκποδὼν μὲν κατάστηθι, κἀκείνοις ἱερᾷ ἐλθὼν συνβάινωλαι— Why initiation into theſe Myſteries is called, enquiring of the oracle, will be ſeen afterwards.

‖ Peregrinatione quidem Græciæ, Eleuſiniis ſacris, quorum initiatione impii & ſcelerati voce præconis ſubmoverentur, intereſſe non auſus eſt. Sueton. Vita Neron. cap. 34. § 12. Edit. Pitiſci.

M. Au-

M. Antoninus, when he would purge himſelf to the world of the death of Avidius Caſſius, choſe to be initiated into the *Eleuſinian Myſteries* * ; it being notorious, that none were admitted into them, who laboured under the juſt ſuſpicion of any heinous immorality. And Philoſtratus tells us, that Apollonius was deſirous of being initiated in theſe *Myſteries* ; but that the Hierophant refuſed to admit him, becauſe he eſteemed the Aſpirant to be no better than a Magician : for the *Eleuſinian* ſtood open to none who did not approach the Gods with a pure and holy worſhip †. This was, originally, an indiſpenſable condition of *initiation*, obſerved in common, by all the Myſteries ; and inſtituted by Bacchus, or Oſiris himſelf, the firſt inventer of them ; who, as Diodorus tells us, initiated none but pious and virtuous men ‡. During the *celebration* of the Myſteries, they were enjoined the greateſt ſanctity, and higheſt elevation of mind. " When you ſacrifice or pray (ſays " Epictetus in Arrian) go with a prepared purity of mind, and with " diſpoſitions ſo previouſly ordered, as are required of you when " you approach the ancient *rites and Myſteries* §. And Proclus tells us that the Myſteries and the Initiations drew the ſouls of men from a material, ſenſual, and merely human life, and joined them in *communion* with the Gods ‖ . Nor was a leſs degree of purity required of the Initiated for their *future* conduct **. They were

* Jul. Capit. Vita Ant. Phil and Dion Caſſ.

† Ο δὲ ἱεροφάντης οὐκ ἐβούλετο παρεῖχεν τὰ ἱερὰ. μὴ γὰρ ἄν ποτε μυῆσαι γόητα μὴ δὲ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα ἀνοῖξαι ἀνθρώπῳ μὴ καθαρῷ τὰ Δαιμόνια. De Vita Apollonii Tyanenſis, l. iv. c. 18. Edit. Olearii, fol.

‡ —καὶ δείξαι δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς, καὶ μεταδοῦναι τῶν μυστηρίων τοῖς εὐσεβέσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ δίκαιον βίον ἀσκοῦσι. Lib. iii. p. 138. St. Ed.

§ Καὶ μετὰ θυσίας δὲ, καὶ μετ' εὐχῶν, καὶ προπλυνεκότα, καὶ προδιακείμενον τῇ γνώμῃ, ὅτι ἱεροῖς προσελεύσει καὶ ἱεροῖς παλαιοῖς. Arrian. Differt. lib. iii. cap. 21.

‖ Τά τε μυστήρια καὶ τὰς τελετὰς ἀπάγειν μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνύλου καὶ θνητοειδοῦς ζωῆς τὰς ψυχὰς, καὶ συνάπτειν τοῖς θεοῖς. In Remp. Plat. lib. i.

** Καὶ τῶν μυστηρίων ἀξιοθεὶς ἐδεόμην καὶ τῆς παρ' ὑμῶν ἀρίστης παιδεύσεως. Quidam apud Sopatrum, in Div. Quæſt.

obliged

obliged by ſolemn engagements to commence a new life of ſtricteſt piety and virtue; into which they were entered by a ſevere courſe of penance, proper to purge the mind of its natural defilements. Gregory Nazianzen tells us, that "no one could be initiated into the "*Myſteries of Mithras*, till he had undergone all ſorts of mor-"tifying trials, and had approved himſelf holy and impaſſible *." The conſideration of all this made Tertullian ſay, that, in the *Myſteries*, "Truth herſelf took on every ſhape, to oppoſe and "combat Truth †." And St. Auſtin, "That the devil hurried "away deluded ſouls to their deſtruction, when he promiſed to "*purify* them by thoſe ceremonies, called INITIATIONS ‡."

The *initiated*, under this diſcipline, and with theſe promiſes, were eſteemed the only happy amongſt men. Ariſtophanes, who ſpeaks the ſenſe of the people, makes them exult and triumph after this manner: "On us only does the ſun diſpenſe his bleſſings; "we only receive pleaſure from his beams: we, who are *initiated*, "and perform towards citizens and ſtrangers all acts of piety and "juſtice §." And Sophocles, to the ſame purpoſe, "LIFE, only "is to be had there: all other places are full of miſery and evil ||." "Happy (ſays Euripides) is the man who hath been initiated into "the greater *Myſteries*, and leads a life of piety and religion **."

* ἐδεὶς δὲ δύνασθαι τελεῖσθαι τὰς τῦ Μίτρυ τελετὰς, εἰ μὴ διὰ πασῶν τῶν κολάσεων παρέλθοι, καὶ δείξει ἑαυτὸν ἀπαθῆ καὶ ὅσιον. 1 Orat. cont. Julian.

† Omnia adverſus veritatem, de ipſa veritate conſtructa ſunt. Apol. cap. 47.

‡ Diabolum—animas deceptas illuſaſque præcipitaſſe—quum polliceretur purgationem animæ per eas, quas ΤΕΛΕΤΑΣ appellant. De Trinitate, lib. iv. c. 10.

§ Μόνοι, γὰς ἡμῖν ἥλιος
Καὶ φέγος ἱλαρόν ἐσιν,
Ὅσοι μεμυήμεθ', εὐ-
σεβῆ τε διήγομεν
Τρόπον, περί τε ξένες
Καὶ τὰς ἰδιώτας. Chorus in Ranis, act. i. in fine.

|| Τοῖς δὲ μόνοις ἐκεῖ
Ζῆν ἐσι· τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πανθ' ὁμοίως κακά.

** Ὦ μάκαρ ὅσις εὐδαίμων τελετὰς θεῶν
Εἰδὼς, βιοτὰν ἁγισεύει. Bacch.

And

And the longer any one had been *initiated*, the more honourable was he deemed *. It was even ſcandalous not to be initiated: and however virtuous the perſon otherwiſe appeared, he became ſuſpicious to the people: As was the caſe of Socrates, and, in after-times, of Demonax †. No wonder, then, if the ſuperior advantages of the *Initiated*, both here and hereafter, ſhould make the *Myſteries* univerſally aſpired to. And, indeed, they ſoon grew as comprehenſive in the numbers they embraced, as in the regions and countries to which they extended: men, women, and children ran to be initiated. Thus Apuleius ‡ deſcribes the ſtate of the Myſteries even in his time: "Influunt turbæ, ſacris divinis initiatæ, "viri fœminæque, omnis ætatis & omnis dignitatis." The Pagans, we ſee, ſeemed to think *initiation* as neceſſary, as the Chriſtians did *baptiſm*. And the cuſtom of initiating children appears from a paſſage of Terence §, to have been general.

"Ferietur alio munere, ubi hera pepererit;
"Porro autem alio, ubi erit puero natalis dies,
"Ubi INITIABUNT."

Nay they had even the ſame ſuperſtition in the adminiſtration of it, which ſome Chriſtians had of Baptiſm, to defer it till the approach of death; ſo the honeſt farmer Trygæus, in the *Pax* of Ariſtophanes:

Δεῖ γὰρ μυηθῆναί με πρὶν τεθνηκέναι.

The occaſion of this ſolicitude is told us by the ſcholiaſt on the *Ranæ* of the ſame poet. "The Athenians believed, that he who "was initiated, and inſtructed in the *Myſteries*, would obtain

* Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀξιοτελὴς μύστης ἀτιμότερος τοῦ πάλαι μύστου. Ariſtidis in Orat. περὶ παραφθέγματος.

† Lucian. Vit. Dem. t. II. p. 374, et ſeq. Edit. Reitzii, 4°, Amſtel. 1743.

‡ Met. lib. xi. pag. 959. Edit. Lugd. 1587, 8vo.

§ Phorm. act. i. ſc. i. And Donatus, ou the place, tells us, the ſame cuſtom prevailed in the Samothracian myſteries: "Terentius Apollodorum ſequitur, apud quem "legitur, in inſula Samothracum à certo tempore pueros initiari, more Athenienſium."

celeſtial

" celeſtial honour after death: and THEREFORE all ran to be ini-
" tiated*." Their fondneſs for it became ſo great, that at ſuch times as the public Treaſury was low, the Magiſtrates could have recourſe to the *Myſteries*, as a fund to ſupply the exigencies of the State. " Ariſtogiton (ſays the commentator on Hermogenes) in a great " ſcarcity of public money, procured a law, that in Athens every " one ſhould pay a certain ſum for his *initiation* †."

Every thing in theſe rites was myſteriouſly conducted, and under the moſt ſolemn obligations to ſecrecy ‡. Which how it could agree to our repreſentation of the *Myſteries*, as an inſtitution for the uſe of the people, we ſhall now endeavour to explain.

They were hidden and kept ſecret for two reaſons:

I. Nothing excites our curioſity like that which retires from our obſervation, and ſeems to forbid our ſearch. Of this opinion we find the learned Syneſius, where he ſays, " The people will de-
" ſpiſe what is eaſy and intelligible, and therefore they muſt always
" be provided with ſomething wonderful and myſterious in Religion,
" to hit their taſte, and ſtimulate their curioſity §." And again,
" The ignorance of the myſteries preſerves their veneration: for
" which reaſon they are entruſted only to the cover of night ||."

* Λέγω γὰρ ἑορτὴν παρ' Ἀθηναίοις, ὡς ὁ τὰ μυστήρια διδαχθείς, μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν θείας ἠξιώθη τιμῆς· διὸ καὶ πάντες πρὸς τὴν μύησιν ἔσπευδον.

† Ἀριστογείτων ἐν σπάνει χρημάτων, γράφει νόμον, παρ' Ἀθηναίοις μυεῖσθαι. Syrianus.

‡ Cum ignotis hominibus Orpheus ſacrorum ceremonias aperiret, nihil aliud ab his quos initiabat in primo veſtibulo niſi juriſjurandi neceſſitatem, & cum terribili quadam auctoritate religionis, exegit, ne profanis auribus inventæ ac compoſitæ religionis ſecreta proderentur. Firmicus in limine lib. vii. Aſtronom.—Nota ſunt hæc Græcæ ſuperſtitionis Hierophantis, quibus inviolabili lege interdictum erat, ne hæc atque hujuſmodi Myſteria apud eos, qui his ſacris minimè initiati eſſent, evulgarent.—Nicetas in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orat. εἰς τὰ ἅγια φῶτα. This obligation of the initiated to ſecrecy was the reaſon that the *Egyptian hieroglyphic* for them, was a graſs-hopper, which was ſuppoſed to have no mouth. See Horapollo Hieroglyph. lib. ii. cap. 55. Edit. Pauw, 1727, 4to.

§ Τὸ δὲ ῥᾷστον καταγελάσεσθαι ὁ δῆμος· δεῖται γὰρ παραμυθίας. To the ſame purpoſe, Nicephorus Gregoras, Hiſt. lib. v. p. 72. Edit. Baſil. fol. 1562. Τὰ γὰρ τοῖς πολλοῖς πρόχειρα κάτω που ἴσχει, καὶ ἀχρηστίαν σφίσιν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ περιπέχυται.

|| Ἄγνωσία σεμνότης ἐστὶ τελετῶν· καὶ νυξὶ τοῦτο πιστεύεται τὰ μυστήρια. Libro de Providentia.

"The veil or miſt (ſays Clemens Alex.) through which things are "only *permitted to be ſeen*, renders the truths contained under it "more venerable and majeſtic *." On theſe principles the *Myſteries* were framed. They were kept ſecret, to excite curioſity: They were celebrated in the night, to impreſs veneration and religious horror †: And they were performed with variety of ſhews and repreſentations (of which more hereafter) to fix and perpetuate theſe impreſſions ‡. Hitherto, then, the *Myſteries* are to be conſidered as invented, not to *deter*, but to *invite* the curioſity of the people. But,

II. They were kept ſecret from a neceſſity of teaching the Initiated ſome things, improper to be communicated to ALL. The learned Varro in a fragment of his book *Of Religions*, preſerved by St. Auguſtin, tells us, that "There were many truths, which it "was inconvenient for the State to be generally known; and many "things, which, though falſe, it was expedient the People ſhould "believe; and that therefore the Greeks ſhut up their MYSTERIES "in the ſilence of their ſacred incloſures §."

Now to reconcile this ſeeming contradiction, in ſuppoſing the *Myſteries* to be inſtituted to invite the People into them, and, at the ſame time, to keep them from the People's knowledge, we are to obſerve, that in the *Eleuſinian rites* there were two celebrations of the Myſteries, the GREATER and the LESS ||. The end of the *leſs*

* ἄλλως τε καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα διὰ τίνος παρακαλύμματος ὑποφαίνεται, μείζονά τε καὶ σεμνοτέραν δείκνυσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Strom. L. v. pag. 419. lin. 3. Edit. Sylburgh.

† Euripides, in the Bacchantes, act ii. makes Bacchus ſay, that the orgies were celebrated in the night, becauſe darkneſs has ſomething ſolemn and auguſt in it, and proper to fill the mind with ſacred horror.

‡ Διὸ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἐν ΑΛΛΗΓΟΡΙΑΙΣ λέγεσθαι, πρὸς ἔκπληξιν καὶ φρίκην, ὥσπερ ἐν ΣΚΟΤΩι, καὶ ΝΥΚΤΙ· ἔοικε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀλληγορία τῷ σκότῳ καὶ τῇ νυκτί. Demet. Phalereus de Elocutione, § 110.

§ Multa eſſe vera, quæ vulgo ſcire non ſit utile; multaque, quæ, tametſi falſa ſint, aliter exiſtimare populum expediat. Et ideo Græcos TELETAS ac MYSTERIA taciturnitate parietibuſque clauſiſſe. Civ. Dei, lib. iv. cap. 31.

|| Ἦσαν τὰ μὲν μεγάλα τῆς Δήμητρος· τὰ δὲ μικρὰ Περσεφόνης τῆς αὐτῆς θυγατρός. Interp. Græc. ad Plut. Ariſtophanis.

muſt

muſt be referred to what we ſaid of the Inſtitutor's intention to invite the people into them; and of the *greater*, to his intention of keeping ſome truths from the people's knowledge. Nor is this ſaid without ſufficient warrant: Antiquity is very expreſs for this diſtinction. We are told that the *leſſer Myſteries* were only a kind of preparatory purification for the *Greater* *, and might be eaſily communicated to all †. That four years ‡ was the uſual time of probation for thoſe *greater* Myſteries; in which (as Clemens Alexandrinus expreſly informs us) the SECRETS were depoſited §.

However, as it is very certain, that both the *greater* and *leſſer* Myſteries were inſtituted for the benefit of the State, it follows, that the DOCTRINES taught in both, were equally for the ſervice of Society; only with this difference; ſome without inconvenience might be taught promiſcuouſly, others could not.

On the whole, the ſecret in the *leſſer* Myſteries was principally contained in ſome hidden *rites and ſhews* to be kept from the open view of the people, only to invite their curioſity: And the ſecret in the *greater*, ſome hidden *doctrines* to be kept from the people's knowledge, for the very contrary purpoſe. For the *Shews* common both to the *greater* and *leſſer myſteries*, were only deſigned to engage the attention, and raiſe their devotion.

But it may be worth while to enquire more particularly into the HIDDEN DOCTRINES of the *greater* Myſteries: for ſo religiouſly was the ſecret kept, that the thing ſeems ſtill to lie involved in darkneſs. We ſhall, therefore, proceed cautiouſly; and try, from the obſcure hints dropped up and down in Antiquity,

"Pandere res alta terra & caligine merſas."

* Ἔστι τὰ μικρὰ ὥσπερ προκάθαρσις, καὶ προάγνευσις τῶν μεγάλων. Schol. ad Plut. ſecund. Ariſtoph.

† Ἐπενόησαν μυστήρια εὐμειδάδλα. Schol. Ariſtoph.

‡ —Cùm epoptas ante quinquennium inſtituunt, ut opinionem ſuſpendio cognitionis ædificent. Tertul. adv. Valentinianos, in initio.

§ Μετὰ ταῦτα δέ ἐστι τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια, διδασκαλίας τινὰ ὑπόθεσιν ἔχοντα, καὶ προπαρασκευὴν τῶν μελλόντων· τὰ δὲ μεγάλα περὶ τῶν συμπάντων ὰ μανθάνειν ἔτι ὑπολείπεται, ἐποπτεύειν δὲ, καὶ περινοεῖν τὴν τε φύσιν, καὶ τὰ πράγματα. Strom. v. pag. 424. C. Edit. Sylburgii.

Firſt, as to the general nature of theſe *hidden doctrines*, it appears, they muſt needs be ſuch which, if promiſcuouſly taught, would bring prejudice to the State; Why elſe were they ſecreted? and, at the ſame time, benefit, if communicated with caution and prudence; Why elſe were they taught at all?

From their general nature, we come by degrees to their particular. And firſt,

I. To the certain knowledge of what they were not: which is one ſtep to the knowledge of what they were.

1. They were not the common doctrines of a Providence and future ſtate; for ancient teſtimony is expreſs, that theſe doctrines were taught promiſcuouſly to all the initiated; and were of the very eſſence of theſe Rites —Theſe doctrines were not capable of being hid and ſecreted, becauſe they were of univerſal credit amongſt the civilized part of mankind. There was no need to hide them; becauſe the common knowledge of them was ſo far from being detrimental to Society, that, as we have ſhewn, Society could not even ſubſiſt without their being generally known and believed.

2. Theſe ſecret doctrines could not be the metaphyſical ſpeculations of the Philoſophers concerning the *Deity*, and the *human ſoul*. 1. Becauſe this would be making the *hidden doctrines* of the *ſchools* of Philoſophy, and of the *myſteries* of Religion, one and the ſame; which they could not be, becauſe their ends were different: the end of pagan Philoſophy being only Truth; the end of pagan Religion, only Utility. Theſe indeed were their profeſſed ends. But Both being ignorant of this imporatnt verity, *That Truth and general Utility do coincide* *, they Both, in many caſes, miſſed ſhamefully of their end. The Philoſopher, while he neglected *utility*, falling into the moſt abſurd and fatal errors concerning the nature of God and of the Soul †: And the Lawgiver, while ſo little ſolicitous of

* See B. III. Sect. 2.

† See B. III. Sect. 4.

truth,

truth, encouraged a Polytheiſm very miſchievous to Society. However, as we ſhall now ſee, he invented and ſucceſsfully employed theſe *Myſteries* to remedy the diſorders ariſing from it.—2. Becauſe revealing ſuch metaphyſical ſpeculations to the members of civil Society, with what caution ſoever, would be injurious to the State, and productive of no good to Religion; as will be ſeen when we come, in the third book, to examine what thoſe metaphyſical ſpeculations were.—3. Becauſe ſuch ſpeculations (as we ſhall then ſee) would overthrow every thing taught to ALL, in the *Myſteries*, concerning a Providence, and a future ſtate: And yet we are told by the Ancients, that the doctrines of a Providence, and future ſtate, were the FOUNDATION of the more *ſecret* ones, after which we are now enquiring.

I have been the more particular in refuting this notion, that the ſecret doctrines of the *Schools*, and of the *Myſteries* might be the ſame; becauſe I find it to be an error, into which ſome, even of the moſt knowing of the Ancients, were apt to fall. What miſled them, was, 1. That the *Schools* and *Myſteries* both pretended *to reſtore the ſoul to its original purity and perfection*. We have ſeen how much the *Myſteries* pretended to it. As to the Philoſophers, Porphyry, ſpeaking of Pythagoras, tells us, that "he profeſſed philo-"ſophy, whoſe end is to free and vindicate the ſoul from thoſe "chains and confinements, to which its abode with us hath made "it ſubject*." 2. That the Schools and Myſteries had each their *hidden* doctrines, which went under the common name of ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ; and that, which had a common name, was underſtood to have a common nature. 3. And chiefly, that the Philoſopher and Lawgiver, being frequently in one and the ſame perſon, and, conſequently, the Inſtitutions of the *Myſteries* and the Schools eſtabliſhed by the ſame hand, it appeared reaſonable to think, that the ἀπόῤῥητα, in both, were the ſame; they not diſtinguiſhing the twofold

* Φιλοσοφίαν δ' ἐφιλοσόφησεν, ἧς ὁ σκοπὸς, ῥύσασθαι καὶ διελευθερῶσαι τῶν τοιούτων εἱρμῶν τε καὶ συνδέσμων τὸν καλακεχωρισμένον ἡμῖν νοῦν. De Vita Pythag. Edit. Cantabr. 1655, 8vo. pag. 201.

twofold character of the ancient Sage, which ſhall be explained hereafter *.

II. Having, from the diſcovery of the general end and purpoſe of theſe SECRETS, ſeen what they could not be, we ſhall now be enabled to find what, in fact, they were.

To begin with a paſſage of Clemens Alexandrinus.—"After theſe "(namely, luſtrations) are the LESSER *Myſteries*, in which is laid "the FOUNDATION of the *hidden doctrines*, and preparations for "what is to come afterwards †." From a knowledge of the *foundation*, we may be able to form an idea of the *ſuperſtructure*. This foundation (as hath been ſhewn) was the belief of a Providence, and future ſtate; and, its conſequence on practice, inducement to a virtuous life. But there was one inſuperable obſtacle to a life of purity and holineſs, the vicious examples of their Gods. EGO HOMUNCIO HOC NON FACEREM ‡? was the abſolving Formula, whenever any one was reſolved to give a looſe to his appetit §. But the miſchief went ſtill farther; They not only thought themſelves excuſed by the example, but even drawn, by a divine im-

* See B. III. Sect. 2.

† Μιὰ ταῦτα δέ ἐϛι τὰ μικρὰ μυήϛια, διδασκαλίας τινὰ ὑπόθεϲιν ἔχοντα, καὶ παρασκευὴν τῶν μελλόντων. Strom. v. pag. 424. Ἀγὼν γὰρ καὶ ὁ παράγων, καὶ μυήϛια τὰ πρὸ μυηϛίων. Strom. i. pag. 203. lin. 7. Edit. Sylburgh.

‡ Terence, Eun. act. iii. ſc. vi—Euripides puts this argument into the mouth of ſeveral of his ſpeakers, up and down his tragedies. Helen, in the fourth act of the Trojan Dames, ſays, "How could I reſiſt a Goddeſs, whom Jupiter himſelf obeys?" Ion, in his play of that name, in the latter end of the firſt act, ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe: and in the fifth act of Hercules Furens, Theſeus comforts his friend by the examples of the crimes of the Gods. See likewiſe his Hippolytus, act ii. ſc. ii. The learned and ingenious Mr. Seward, in his tract of the Conformity between Popery and Paganiſm, has taken notice of a difficult paſſage in this tragedy, which he has very ably explained, on the ſyſtem here delivered of the detection of Polytheiſm in the ſacred *Myſteries*.

§ —ὁ δὲ πολὺς καὶ ἀφιλοσόφηϛος ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὰ χείρω λαμβάνειν φιλεῖ τὰς περὶ αὐτῶν λόγους, καὶ πάσχει θάτερον, ἢ καλαφρονεῖν τῶν θεῶν, ὡς ἐν πολλῇ κακοδαιμονίᾳ κυλινδεμένων· ἢ τῶν αἰσχίϛων τε καὶ παρανομωτάτων ἡδέως ἀπέχεται, θεοῖς ὁρῶν αὐτὰ προσκείμενα. Dion. Halicar. apud Euſeb. Præp. Evang. lib. ii. cap. 8.

pulſe

pulſe of their Gods. When the young man in the Aulularia of Plautus apologiſes to Euclio for having debauched his Daughter, he ſays,

" Deus mihi IMPULSOR fuit, Is me ad illam ILLEXIT *."

And by a paſſage in his Amphitruo, where he makes Mercury joke upon the office of a Paraſite in the deſcription he gives of his own obſequiouſneſs to his father Jupiter, we ſee it was grown up into an avowed Principle:

" Amanti [patri] ſupparaſitor, hortor, aſto, admoneo, gaudeo.
" Siquid patri volup' eſt, voluptas ea mihi multo maxima eſt.
" Amat, ſapit: recte facit, animo quando obſequitur ſuo †."

He then addreſſes himſelf to the audience, and tells them gravely, that men, in like manner, after the example of Jupiter, ſhould indulge their paſſions, where they can do it decently.——

" Quod omnes homines facere OPORTET, dum id modo fiat bono."

And the licentious rites, in the OPEN worſhip of their Gods, gave ſtill greater encouragement to theſe concluſions. Plato, in his book *Of Laws*, forbids drinking to exceſs; unleſs, ſays he, during the feaſts of Bacchus, and in honour of that God ‡. And Ariſtotle, in his *Politics*, having blamed all lewd and obſcene images and pictures, excepts thoſe of the Gods, which Religion had ſanctified. When St. Auſtin § had quoted the *Ego hominem hoc non facerem*, to ſhew his adverſaries what miſchief theſe ſtories did to the morals of the people; he makes the defenders of Paganiſm reply, that it was true; but then (ſay they) theſe things were only taught in the Fables of the poets, which, an attention to the MYSTERIES

* Act. 4. Sc. 10.
† Act. iii. Sc. iv.
‡ Lib. vi.
§ Civ. Dei, L. II. Cap. 7. in fine, et 8. in initio.

would

would rectify: "At enim non traduntur iſta SACRIS deorum, ſed "; Fabulis poetarum *."

For the *Myſteries* profeſſed to exact nothing difficult, of the initiated †, which they would not aſſiſt him to perform. It was neceſſary, then, to remedy this evil; which they did, by ſtriking at the root of it. So that, ſuch of the *Initiated* as were judged capable, were made acquainted with the whole deluſion. The MYSTAGOGUE taught them, that Jupiter, Mercury, Bacchus, Venus, Mars, and the whole rabble of licentious Deities, were only DEAD MORTALS; ſubject, in life, to the ſame paſſions and infirmities with themſelves; but having been, on other accounts, Benefactors to mankind, grateful Poſterity had deified them; and, with their virtues, had indiſcreetly canonized their vices. The fabulous Gods being thus routed, the ſupreme cauſe of all things naturally took their place. HIM they were taught to conſider as the Creator of the Univerſe, who pervaded all things by his virtue, and governed all by his power. But here it muſt be obſerved, that the diſcovery of this *ſupreme Cauſe* they made to be conſiſtent with the notion of local tutelary Deities, Beings ſuperior to men, and inferior to God, and by him ſet over the ſeveral parts of his creation. This was an opinion univerſally holden by learned Antiquity, and never brought into queſtion by any Theiſt. What the ἀπόῤῥητα overthrew in their reformed theology, was the vulgar polytheiſm, the worſhip of dead men. From this time, the initiated had the title of ΕΠΟΠΤΗΣ, by which was meant *one that ſees things as they are, and without diſguiſe*; whereas, before, he was called ΜΥΣΤΗΣ, which has a contrary ſignification.

* This the *Father* could not deny; but obſerves, however, that in the THEN *corrupt ſtate* of the *Myſteries* the remedy was become part of the diſeaſe: "Nolo dicere ILLA "MYSTICA quam iſta *theatrica* eſſe turpiora."

† Ἀλλ' ἔσομαι διὰ τὴν τελετὴν πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἑτοιμότατος· Sopat. in Div. Quæſt. Καθάπερ ἄλλῳ μυστηρίῳ παρυλισθεὶς τῇ σωτηρῇ, τῶν ἄλλων ἁμαρτημάτων λοιπὸν τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ βίον ἐκάθαιρον, πρὸς τὴν θείαν τῶν θεῶν τελετὴν ἑτοιμάζων, ἐκκλίνειν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐσπούδαζον. Sopat. ibidem.

But,

But, beſides the prevention of vice, their bringing the Initiated acquainted with the national Gods had another important uſe, which was to excite them to HEROIC VIRTUE, by ſhewing them what honours the benefactors of nations had acquired, by the free exerciſe of it. And this (as will be ſhewn hereafter) was the chief reaſon why Princes, Stateſmen, and Leaders of colonies and armies, all aſpired to be partakers of the GREATER MYSTERIES.

Thus we ſee, how what was taught and required in the *leſſer Myſteries*, became the foundation of inſtruction in the GREATER: the obligation to a good life *there*, made it neceſſary to remove the errors of vulgar polytheiſm *here*; and the doctrine of a Providence taught previouſly in *thoſe*, facilitated the reception of the ſole cauſe of all things, when finally revealed in *theſe*.

Such were the TRUTHS which Varro, as quoted above, tells us it was inexpedient for the People to know: for indeed he ſuppoſed, the error of vulgar Polytheiſm to be ſo inveterate, that it was not to be expelled without throwing Society into convulſions. But Plato ſpoke out: he owned it to be "difficult to find the Father and "Creator of the univerſe: and, when found, impoſſible to diſco-"ver him to all the world *."

Beſides, there was another reaſon why the Inſtitutors of the *Myſteries*, who were LAWGIVERS, ſhould be for ſecreting this truth. They themſelves had the chief hand in the riſe of vulgar Polytheiſm †. They contrived it for the ſake of the State; and to keep the people in awe, under a greater veneration for their laws. *This* Polytheiſm, the poets had depraved, by inventing or recording vicious ſtories of the Gods and Heroes, which the Lawgivers were willing ſhould be ſtifled ‡. And they were only *ſuch* ſtories, that, in their opinion, (as may be ſeen in Plato) made Polytheiſm hurtful to the State.

Scævola,

* Τὸν μὲν ὃν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τῆδε τῆ πᾶντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον, καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν. In Timæo.

† See the ſecond Section of this Book.

‡ Plato has a remarkable paſſage to this purpoſe. Speaking, in the beginning of his twelfth Book Of Laws, concerning theft, and fraud, and rapine, he takes notice of the popular

Scævola, that moſt learned Pontifex, as St. Auſtin calls him, gives this very account of the matter, where he ſays, There were three Syſtems concerning the Gods, the *Poetic*, the *Philoſophic*, and the *Civil:* the firſt, he ſays, was *nugatory*, and therefore hurtful to the virtue of the State: the ſecond *incongruous* to public eſtabliſhments, by creating diſorder and confuſion in the ſpeculative opinions of the People; ſuch as the teaching them, promiſcuouſly, that the Popular Gods were dead men deified. The directors of the *third* ſyſtem therefore prevented the miſchiefs of the *firſt* by ſuch a partial communication of the *ſecond* Syſtem, as was neceſſary for that purpoſe *.

That this account of the Secret, in the *greater Myſteries*, is no precarious hypotheſis, ſtanding on mere conjecture, I ſhall now endeavour to ſhew,

Firſt, from the clear evidence of Antiquity, which expreſly informs us of theſe two particulars; That the Errors of Polytheism were detected, and the Doctrine of the Unity was taught and explained in the *Myſteries*. But here it is to be obſerved, that when the Ancients ſpeak of *Myſteries* indefinitely, they generally mean the *greater*.

popular ſtories told of Mercury, as if he delighted in ſuch things, and patronized thoſe who did; the philoſopher ſays they are not true; and cautions men from being led away by ſuch pretended examples. However, to make all ſure, he takes up the method of the *myſteries*, and adds, that if, indeed, Mercury did, or encouraged ſuch things, he was neither a God, nor of celeſtial original.—κλοπὴ μὲν χρημάτων, ἀνελεύθερον, ἁρπαγὴ δὲ, ἀναίσχυντον· τῶν Διὸς δὲ υἱεῶν ἀδεὶς ἔτε δόλοις, ἔτε βίᾳ χαίρων ἐπιλετήδευκε τάτοιν ἀδετερον· μηδεὶς ἂν ὑπὸ ωοιηλῶν, μηδ' ἄλλως ὑπὸ τινῶν μυθολόγων, ωλημμελῶν ωερὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐξαπαλώμενθ· ἀναπειθέσθω. μὴ κλέπλων ἢ βιαζόμενθ, οἰέσθω μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν ωοιεῖν, ἀλλ' ἅπερ αὐτοὶ θεοὶ δρῶσιν· ἔτε γὰρ ἀληθὲς, ἔτ' εἰκὸς· ἀλλ' ὅτις δρᾷ τοιῦτον ωαρανόμως, ἔτε θεὸς ἔτες ωαῖς ἐσί ωόλε θεῶν.

* Relatum eſt in literis, doctiſſimum Pontificem Scævolam diſputaſſe tria genera tradita Deorum; unum a poetis, alterum a philoſophis, tertium a principibus civitatis. Primum genus nugatorium dicit eſſe—Secundum non congruere civitatibus, quod habeant aliqua—quæ obſint populis noſſe—Quæ ſunt autem illa quæ prolata in multitudinem nocent? "Hæc, inquit; non eſſe deos Herculem, Æſculapium, Caſtorem, "Pollucem: proditur enim a doctis, quod homines fuerint, & humana conditione de-"fecerint."—Auguſtin. De Civit. Dei, lib. iv. cap. 27. in initio.

It

It hath been ſhewn, that the Grecian and Aſiatic *Myſteries* came originally from Egypt. Now of the EGYPTIAN, St. Auſtin giveth us this remarkable account.—" Of the ſame nature, too, are thoſe " things which Alexander of Macedon wrote to his mother, as re- " vealed unto him by one LEO *, chief Hierophant of the Egyptian " *Myſteries:* whereby it appeared, that not only ſuch as Picus, and " Faunus, and Æneas, and Romulus, nay Hercules, and Æſcu- " lapius, and Bacchus the ſon of Semele, and Caſtor, and Pollux, " and all others of the ſame rank, had been advanced, from the " condition of mortal Men, into Gods; but that even thoſe Deities " of the higher order, the *Dii majorum gentium*, thoſe whom Cicero, " without naming, ſeems to hint at, in his *Tuſculans*, ſuch as " Jupiter, Juno, Saturn, Neptune, Vulcan, Veſta, and many " others (whom Varro endeavours to allegorize into the elements " or parts of the world) were, in truth, only deceaſed mortals. " But the Prieſt being under great fears and apprehenſions, while " he was telling this, as conſcious that he was betraying the " SECRET OF THE MYSTERIES, begged of Alexander, when he " found that he intended to communicate it to his mother †, that " he

* It is not unlikely but this might be a name of office. Porphyry, in his fourth book Of Abſtinence, § 16. Edit. Cantabr. 1655, 8vo, informs us, that the prieſts of the *Myſteries* of Mithras were called *Lions*; the prieſteſſes *Lioneſſes*; and the inferior miniſters, *Ravens*. Τὰς μὲν αὐτῶν ὀργίων μύστας, Λέοντας καλεῖν· τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας, Λεαίνας· τοὺς δὲ ὑπηρετοῦντας, Κόρακας: for there was a great conformity, in the practices and ceremonies of the ſeveral *Myſteries*, throughout the whole pagan world. And this conjecture is ſupported by a paſſage in Eunapius, which ſeems to ſay, that it was unlawful to reveal the *name* of the Hierophant.——τῷ δὲ Ἱεροφάντῃ, κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ὅστις ἦν τοὔνομα ἔξεστι λέγειν—*in Maximo*, p. 74. Edit. Comelini, 8vo, 1616.—It looks as if the corruptions and debaucheries of ſome of the *Myſteries*, in later times, had made this further proviſion for *ſecrecy*.

† I ſuppoſe this communication to his Mother, might be with a purpoſe to let her underſtand, that he was no longer the dupe of her fine ſtory of Jupiter's invaſion, and the intrigue of his divine original. For Eratoſthenes, according to Plutarch, Edit. Francof. fol. 1599. T. I. p. 665, E. ſays, that Olympias, when ſhe brought Alexander on

" he would enjoin her to burn the letter, as ſoon as ſhe had read " it *."

To underſtand the concluding part, we are to know, that Cyprian (who has alſo preſerved this curious anecdote) tells us, it was the dread of Alexander's power which extorted the ſecret from the hierophant †.

But Tully brings the matter home to the ELEUSINIAN *Myſteries* themſelves. " What (ſays he) is not almoſt all Heaven, not to " carry on this detail any further, filled with the Human race? " But if I ſhould ſearch and examine Antiquity, and from thoſe " things which the Grecian writers have delivered, go to the bottom " of this affair, it would be found, that even thoſe very Gods

his way to the army, in his firſt military expedition, acquainted him, in private, with this ſecret of his birth: and exhorted him to behave himſelf as became the ſon of Jupiter Hammon. This, I ſuppoſe, Alexander might boaſt of to the Prieſt, and ſo the murder came out.

* In eo genere ſunt etiam illa—quæ Alexander Macedo ſcribit ad matrem, ſibi a magno antiſtite ſacrorum Ægyptiorum quodam LEONE patefacta: ubi non Picus & Faunus, & Æneas & Romulus, vel etiam Hercules & Æſculapius, & Liber Semele natus, & Tyndaridæ fratres, & ſi quos alios ex mortalibus pro diis habent; ſed ipſi etiam majorum gentium dii, quos Cicero in Tuſculanis, tacitis nominibus, videtur attingere, Jupiter, Juno, Saturnus, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Veſta, & alii plurimi, quos Varro conatur ad mundi partes ſive elementa transferre, homines fuiſſe produntur. Timens enim & ille quaſi revelata myſteria, petens admonet Alexandrum, ut cum ea matri conſcripta inſinuaverit, flammis jubeat concremari. De Civit. Dei, lib. viii. cap. 5.

† —metu ſuæ poteſtatis proditum ſibi de diis hominibus a ſacerdote SECRETUM. De Idol. Ven. *circa initium*. But this is a miſtake, at leaſt it is expreſſed inaccurately. What was extorted by the dread of Alexander's power, was not the *ſecret* (which the initiated had a right to) but the Prieſt's conſent that he ſhould *communicate* the ſecret to another, which was contrary to the laws of the *Myſteries*. Plutarch, in his life of Alexander, Edit. Francof. fol. 1599, p. 680. E. appears to refer to this very Epiſtle of Alexander to his Mother, where he ſays,—Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν ἐπιſολῇ πρὸς τὴν μητέρα, φησὶν γεγονέναι τινὰς ἀπορρήτους μυήſεις, ἃς ἐπανελθὼν φράσει πρὸς μόνην ἐκείνην. " Alexander in the Epiſtle ſays that there were certain Oracular Myſteries imparted to him, which on his return he would communicate to her under the ſame ſeal of ſecrecy." For at this time the *Myſteries* foretold the future, as well as revealed the paſt.

" themſelves

" themſelves who are deemed the *Dii majorum gentium*, had their " original here below; and aſcended from hence into Heaven. " Enquire, to whom thoſe Sepulchres belong, which are ſo com- " monly ſhewn in Greece *. REMEMBER, for you are initiated, " WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN TAUGHT IN THE MYSTERIES; YOU " WILL THEN AT LENGTH UNDERSTAND HOW FAR THIS MATTER " MAY BE CARRIED †." Indeed, he carries it further himſelf; for he tells us, in another place, that not only the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*, but the *Samothracian* likewiſe, and the *Lemnian*, taught the error of polytheiſm, agreeably to this ſyſtem; which ſuppoſes all the *Myſteries* derived from the ſame original, and inſtituted for the ſame ends. " What think you (ſays he) of theſe who aſſert, that " valiant, or famous, or powerful men have obtained divine ho- " nours after death; and that theſe are the very Gods, now become " the object of our worſhip, our prayers, and adoration? EUHEME- " RUS tells us, when theſe Gods died, and where they lie buried. " *I forbear to ſpeak of the ſacred and auguſt rites of* ELEUSIS—*I paſs* " *by* Samothrace, *and the* Myſteries *of* Lemnos, *whoſe hidden rites* " *are celebrated in darkneſs, and amidſt the thick ſhades of groves and* " *foreſts* ‡."

* Alluding to that of Jupiter in Crete.

† Quid? totum prope cœlum, ne plures perſequar, nomine humano genere completum eſt? Si vero ſcrutari vetera, & ex his ea, quæ ſcriptores *Græciæ* prodiderunt, eruere coner; ipſi illi, majorum gentium Dii qui habentur, hinc a nobis profecti in cœlum reperiuntur. Quære, quorum demonſtrantur ſepulchra in *Græcia*: REMINISCERE, QUONIAM ES INITIATUS QUÆ TRADANTUR MYSTERIIS; TUM DENIQUE QUAM FOC LATE PATEAT, INTELLIGES. Tuſc. Diſp. lib. i. cap. 12, 13. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. II. p. 243. See note D, at the end of this book.

‡ Quid, qui aut fortes, aut claros aut potentes viros tradunt, *poſt mortem ad Deos veniſſe*, coſque eſſe ipſos, quos nos colere, precari, venerarique ſoleamus—Ab Euhemero *& mortes & ſepulturæ demonſtrantur deorum*—Omitto *Eleuſinam* ſanctam illam & auguſtam—

Prætereo *Samothraciam*, eaque, quæ

Lemni nocturno aditu occulta coluntur

Silveſtribus ſæpibus denſa. De Nat. Deor. lib. i. cap. 42. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. II. p. 432, 33. See note E, at the end of this Book.

Julius

Julius Fermicus ſpeaks much to the ſame purpoſe, and even more directly, "Adhuc ſuperſunt aliæ ſuperſtitiones, quarum ſecreta "pandenda ſunt Liberi & Liberæ, quæ omnia ſacris ſenſibus veſtris "ſpecialiter intimanda ſunt, ut in iſtis profanis religionibus ſciatis "MORTES ESSE HOMINUM CONSECRATAS. *Liber* itaque, Jovis fuit "filius, regis ſcil. Cretici, &c *."

What hath been here ſaid, will let us into the meaning of Plutarch's hint, in the following words of his tract *Concerning the ceaſing of oracles.* "As to the *Myſteries*, in whoſe repreſentations the "true NATURE OF DEMONS is clearly and accurately held forth, "a ſacred ſilence, to uſe an expreſſion of Herodotus, is to be ob-"ſerved †." All this well illuſtrates a paſſage in Lucian's *Council of the Gods*; when, after Momus had ridiculed the monſtrous Deities of Egypt, Jupiter replies, "It is true, theſe are abomi-"nable things, which you mention of the Egyptian Worſhip. But "then, conſider, Momus, that much of it is *enigmatical*; and ſo, "conſequently, a very unfit ſubject for the buffoonry of the Pro-"phane and Uninitiated." To which, the other anſwers with much ſpirit, "Yes, indeed, we have great occaſion for the MYSTERIES, "to know that Gods are Gods, and monſters, monſters ‡."

Thus far in detection of the vulgar Polytheiſm.—With regard to the other part of the SECRET, the *doctrine of the* UNITY, Clemens Alexandrinus informs us, that the Egyptian Myſtagogues taught it amongſt their *greater ſecrets.* "The Egyptians (ſays he) did not "uſe to reveal their *Myſteries* indiſcriminately to all, nor expoſe "their truths concerning their Gods to the Prophane, but to thoſe "only who were to ſucceed to the adminiſtration of the State: and

* De errorre profan. relig. cap. vi. Edit. Oxon. 1662, 16mo, pag. 9.

† Περὶ τῶν μυστικῶν ἐν οἷς τὰς μεγίστας ἐμφάσεις καὶ διαφάσεις λαβεῖν ἐστι τῆς περὶ δαιμόνων ἀληθείας, εὔσημά μοι σιγᾶσθω, καθ' Ἡρόδοτον. P. 742. lin. 3. Steph. edit.

‡ Αἰσχρὰ ὡς ἀληθῶς ταῦτα φὴς τὰ περὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ὅμως δ' ἔστι, ὦ Μῶμε, τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν αἰνίγματά ἐστι καὶ ὐ πάνυ χρὴ καταγελᾶν ἀμύητον ὄντα· ΜΩΜ. Πάνυ γᾶν ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΝ, ὦ Ζεῦ, δεῖ ἡμῶν, ὡς εἰδέναι θεὰς μὲν τὰς θεάς· κυνοκεφάλους δὲ τοὺς κυνοκεφάλους. Edit. Reitzii, T. III. p. 534.

"to

" to ſuch of the Prieſts as were moſt approved, by their education,
" learning, and quality *."

But, to come to the Grecian *Myſteries*. Chryſippus, as quoted by the author of the *Etymol. magnum*, ſpeaks to this purpoſe. " And Chryſippus ſays, that the ſecret doctrines concerning divine " matters, are rightly called TEΛETAI, for that theſe are the laſt " things the initiated ſhould be informed of: The ſoul having " gained an able ſupport; and, being poſſeſſed of her deſires †, " can keep ſilent before the Uninitiated and Prophane ‡." To the ſame purpoſe, Clemens: " The doctrines delivered in the *greater* " *Myſteries*, are concerning the UNIVERSE. Here all inſtruction " ends. Things are ſeen as they are; and Nature, and the things " of Nature, are given to be comprehended §."

Strabo having ſaid ||, that *Nature dictated to men the inſtitution of the Myſteries*, as well as the other rites of Religion, gives this remarkable reaſon for his aſſertion, " that the ſecret celebration of " the *Myſteries* preſerves the majeſty due to the Divinity, and, at " the ſame time, imitates its nature, which hides itſelf from our " ſenſes **." A plain intimation of what kind the *ſecret* was.

* Αἰγύπλιοι δὲ τοῖς ἐπιλυχθῆσι τὰ παρὰ σφίσιν ἀνειλύθλο μυςήρια· ὃ μὲν βιβλὸς τὴν τῶν θείων εἴδησι' ἐξέφερον, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνοις γε τοις μι· ·ασι' ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν πρίνοι· καὶ τὸν ἱερέων τὸν κριθησιν εἶναι δοκιμαλάτοις ἀπὸ τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τῆς παιδείας καὶ τῦ γένες. Strom. lib. v. p. 566. edit. Lat. [p. 413. l. 16. Edit. Sylburg.]

† i. e. miſtreſs of herſelf.

‡ Χρύσιππ☉ δὲ φησὶ, τὰς περὶ τῶν θείων λόγυς εἰκότως καλεῖσθαι τελετάς· χρῆναι γὰρ τύτυς τελευταίυς, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι διδάσκεσθαι· τῆς ψυχῆς ἐχύσης ἔμμα, καὶ κεκραλαιώσης, καὶ τηρεῖν τὰς ἀμυήτυς σιωπᾶν δυναμένης· μέγα γὰρ εἶναι τὸ ἄθλον, ὑπὲρ θεῶν ἀκέσαί τε ὀρθὰ, καὶ ἐγκρατεῖ γενέσθαι αὐτῶν. Etymol. Auctor, in TEΛETH.

§ Τὰ δὲ μεγάλα περὶ τῶν συμπάντων· ἃ μανθάνει ἔτι ὑπολείπεται, ἰσοπλιύειν δὲ καὶ περινοεῖν τὴν τε φύσιν καὶ τὰ πράγματα. Strom. v. p. 424. C. Edit. Sylburgh.

|| ἡ φύσις ὅτως ὑπαγορεύει. lib. x. p. 467. Edit. Pariſ. 1620, fol.

** ἤτε κρύψις ἡ μυσικὴ, τῶν ἱερῶν σημνοποιεῖ τὸ θεῖον, μιμεῖ ἐνη τὴν φύσιν αὐτῦ ἐκφεύγυσαν ἡμῶν τὴν αἴσθησιν. Ibid. Here Strabo takes in all that is ſaid, both of the *Gods*, and of *nature*, in the two preceding paſſages from Chryſippus and Clemens; and ſhews that by *nature* is not meant the *coſmical* but *theological* nature.

But

But had there been any ambiguity, he preſently removes it, where, ſpeaking of the different faculties exerciſed in the different rites of Religion, he makes *Philoſophy* to be the object of the *Myſteries* *. Plutarch expreſly ſays, that the FIRST CAUSE of all things is communicated to thoſe who approach the temple of Iſis with prudence and ſanctity †. By which words he means, the *neceſſary qualifications for Initiation.*

We have ſeen Tully expreſly declaring, that the *Eleuſinian* and *Samothracian Myſteries* were partly employed in detecting the error of Polytheiſm. We ſhall now find Galen intimating, not obſcurely, that the doctrine of the divine nature was taught in thoſe very *Myſteries.* In his excellent tract *Of the uſe of the parts* of the human body, he has theſe words—"The ſtudy, therefore, of *the uſe of* "*the parts*, is not only of ſervice to the mere phyſician, but of "much greater to him who joins Philoſophy to the art of heal-"ing; and, in order to perfect himſelf in this *Myſtery*, labours "to inveſtigate the *univerſal Nature.* They who *initiate* themſelves "here, whether private men or bodies, will find, in my opinion, "nobler inſtruction than in the rites either of ELEUSIS or SAMO-"THRACE ‡." By which he means, that the ſtudy of the *uſe of the parts of animals*, leads us eaſier and ſooner up to the knowledge of the FIRST CAUSE, than the moſt venerable of the *Myſteries*, ſuch as the *Eleuſinian* and *Samothracian.* A clear implication, that to lead men thither was their ſpecial buſineſs.

But this ſeems to have been ſo well known to the learned in the time of EUSEBIUS, that where this writer takes occaſion to obſerve,

* —καὶ τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν.

† —ὀνομάζεσθαι γὰρ Ἴσιον ὡς εἰσόμενον τὸ ὄν, ἂν μετὰ λόγου καὶ ὁσίως εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ παρέλθωμεν τῆς θεοῦ. ΙΣ. καὶ ΟΣ. Edit. Franc. fol. 1599. T. II. p. 352. A. in initio libri.

‡ ἐκ ἂν ἰατρῷ μόνον ἡ περὶ χρείας μορίων ἐστὶ παραγματεία χρησίμη, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον ἰατρῷ φιλοσόφῳ, τῆς ὅλης φύσεως ἐπιστήμην κτήσασθαι σπεύδοντι, καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν χρὴ τελεῖσθαι τὴν τελευτὴν, ἅπαντας γὰρ, ὡς οἶμαι, καὶ κατ' ἔθνη, καὶ κατ' ἀριθμὸν ἀνθρώπους, ὅσοι τι μυοῦσιν ἑαυτοὺς, οὐδὲν ὅμοιον ἔχουσιν Ἐλευσινίοις τε καὶ Σαμοθρακίοις ὀργίοις. Gal. De uſu part. lib. xvii. c. 1. p. 702. E. F. Edit. Charterii, Fol. Pariſ. 1679. Petit, inſtead of ὅσοι τιμῶσιν ἑαυτοὺς, reads very ingeniouſly ὅσοι τι μυοῦσιν ἑαυτούς. Charterius, ὅσοι τιμῶσι θεούς.

that

that the Hebrews were the only people whose object, in their *public and national worſhip*, was the GOD OF THE UNIVERSE, he ſuits his whole expreſſion, by one continued metaphor, to the uſages of the *Myſteries*. "For the Hebrew people alone (ſays he) was re-"ſerved the honour of being INITIATED into the knowledge of "God the Creator of all things, and of being inſtructed in the "practice of true piety towards him *." Where, ΕΠΟΠΤΕΙΑ, which ſignifies *the inſpection of the ſecret* ΘΕΩΡΙΑ, the *contemplation* of it; and ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΣ, the *Creator*, the ſubject of it, are all words appropriated to the *ſecret* of the *greater Myſteries*.

JOSEPHUS is ſtill more expreſs. He tells Appion, that that high and ſublime knowledge, which the Gentiles with difficulty attained unto, in the rare and temporary celebration of their *Myſteries*, was habitually taught to the Jews, at all times. And what was this ſublime knowledge, but the doctrine of the UNITY? "Can any "Government (ſays he) be more holy than this? or any Religion "better adapted to the nature of the Deity? Where, in any place "but in this, are the whole People, by the ſpecial diligence of the "Prieſts, to whom the care of public inſtruction is committed, ac-"curately taught the principles of true piety? So that the body-"politic ſeems, as it were, one great *Aſſembly*, conſtantly kept to-"gether, for the celebration of ſome ſacred *Myſteries*. For thoſe "things which the Gentiles keep up for a few days only, that is, "during thoſe ſolemnities they call MYSTERIES and INITIATIONS, "we, with vaſt delight, and a plenitude of knowledge, which ad-"mits of no error, fully enjoy, and perpetually contemplate through "the whole courſe of our lives. If you aſk (continues he) the na-"ture of thoſe things, which in our ſacred rites are enjoined and "forbidden; I anſwer, they are ſimple, and eaſily underſtood. The

* μόνῳ δὲ τῷ Ἑβραίων γένει τὴν ΕΠΟΠΤΕΙΑΝ ἀναθιβιῶσθαι τῆς ΘΕΩΡΙΑΣ τῇ τῶν ὅλων ποιητῇ καὶ ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΣ Θεῷ, καὶ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας. Præp. Evang. lib. i. cap. 9. See note F, at the end of this book.

" firſt inſtruction relates to the DEITY, and teaches that GOD CON-
" TAINS ALL THINGS, and is a Being every way perfect and happy:
" that he is ſelf-exiſtent, and the SOLE CAUSE of all exiſtence; the
" beginning, the middle, and the end of all things *," &c.

Nothing can be more explicit than the teſtimony of this learned Jew. He not only alludes to the *greater Myſteries*, by the direct terms of τελετῆς and μυσήρια, but uſes ſeveral expreſſions relative to what the gentile *Myſtagogues* taught therein; ſuch as ἀλλόφυλοι φυλάτ]ειν ἃ δύναν]αι, referring to the unfitneſs of the doctrine of the unity for general inſtruction: ſuch as μετὰ ϖολλῆς ἡδονῆς, in contradiction to what they taught of the labours, pain, and difficulties to be encountered by thoſe who aſpired to the knowledge of the firſt cauſe; ſuch as ἁπλαῖ ϗ γνώριμοι, in contradiction to what they taught of the great intricacy and obſcurity of the queſtion; and ſuch, again, as ὁ Θεὸς ἔχει τὰ ϖάν]α, the characteriſtic of the ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΣ of the *Myſteries*.

Thus, I think, it appears, that the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, in the *greater myſteries*, were the detection of the origine of vulgar *Polytheiſm* †; and the diſcovery of the doctrine of the *Unity* ‡.

But now I have gone thus far, I will venture one ſtep further; and undertake to give the very HISTORY repeated, and the very HYMN ſung, on theſe occaſions, to the *initiated*. In the *firſt* of which was delivered the true origine and progreſs of VULGAR POLYTHEISM; and in the *other*, the doctrine of the UNITY.

* Τίς ἂν ἓν ἀρχὴ γένοι]ο ταὐτης ὁσιωτέρα; τίς δὲ Θεῷ τιμὴ μᾶλλον ἁρμόζουσα, ϖανὶὸς μὲν τῷ ϖλήθυς καλεσκευασμένῳ ϖρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν, ἐξαίρε]ον δὲ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν ἱερέων ϖεπισ]ευμένων, ὥσϖερ δὲ τελετῆς τινος τῆς ὅλης ϖολι]είας οἰκονομουμένης; ἃ γὰρ ὀλίγων ἡμερῶν ἀριθμὸν ἐϖι]δεύονί]ες ἀλλόφυλοι φυλάτ]ειν ἃ δύναν]αι, μυσήρια ϗ τελετὰς ὀνομάζονί]ες, ταῦτα με]ὰ ϖολλῆς ἡδονῆς ϗ γνώμης ἀμε]αϖείσῳ φυλάτ]ομε, ἡμεῖς διὰ τῆ ϖαντὸς αἰῶνος· τίνες ἂν εἰσιν αἱ ϖροῤῥήσεις ϗ ἀϖαγ]ρεύσεις; ἁπλαῖ τε ϗ γνώριμοι· ϖρώτη δ' ἡγεῖ]αι ϖερὶ Θεοῦ, λέγουσα, ὁ Θεὸς ἔχει τὰ ϖάν]α ϖανε]ὴς ϗ μακάριος, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ϗ ϖᾶσιν αὐτάρκης, ἀρχὴ ϗ μέσα, ϗ τέλος ϖάντων. Cont. Ap. lib. ii. cap. 22. pag. 1379, lin. 30.

† See note G, at the end of this book.

‡ See this account ſupported, and the objections to it clearly confuted, in a well reaſoned tract lately printed, intitled, A Diſſertation on the ancient Pagan Myſteries.

For

For I am much miſtaken, if that celebrated fragment of SANCHONIATHO, the Phœnician, tranſlated by Philo-Byblius, and preſerved by Euſebius, containing a genealogical account of the firſt ages, be not that very HISTORY; as it was wont to be read to the *initiated*, in the celebration of the *Egyptian* and *Phœnician Myſteries*. The purpoſe of it being to inform us, that their popular Gods (whoſe chronicle is there given according to their generations) were only dead men deified.

And as this curious and authentick *record* (for ſuch we ſhall find it was) not only ſerves to illuſtrate the ſubject we are now upon, but will be of uſe to ſupport what is ſaid hereafter of the riſe, progreſs, and order of the ſeveral ſpecies of ancient idolatry, it may not be improper to give a ſhort extract of it in this place.

I. He tells us then, that, "of the two firſt mortals, Protogonus and Æon, (the latter of whom was the author of ſeeking and procuring food from foreſt-trees) were begotten Genos and Genea. Theſe, in the time of great droughts, ſtretched their hands upwards to the SUN, whom they regarded as a God, and ſole ruler of the heavens. From theſe, after two or three generations, came Upſouranios and his brother Ouſous. One of them invented the art of building cottages of reeds and ruſhes; the other the art of making garments of the ſkins of wild beaſts. In their time, violent tempeſts of wind and rain having rubbed the large branches of the foreſt-trees againſt one another, they took fire, and burnt up the woods. Of the bare trunks of trees, they firſt made veſſels to paſs the waters; they conſecrated two pillars to FIRE and WIND, and then offered bloody ſacrifices to them as to Gods *." And here let

* Αἰῶνα καὶ Πρωτόγονον θνητοὺς ἄνδρας, οὕτω καλουμένους· εὑρεῖν δὲ τὸν Αἰῶνα τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων τροφήν. ἀφ' τούτων τοὺς γενομένους κληθῆναι Γένος, καὶ Γενεάς—αὐχμῶν δὲ γενομένων, τὰς χεῖρας ἀρέξαι εἰς οὐρανὸν πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον, τοῦτον γάρ, φησὶ, θεὸν ἐνόμιζον μόνον ἁρχαῖον κύριον—εἶτά φησι τὸν Ὑψουράνιον οἰκῆσαι Τύρον, καλύβας τε ἐπινοῆσαι ἀπὸ καλάμων, καὶ θρύων, καὶ παπύρων· τοῦτον δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Οὐσωὸν· ὃς σκέπην τῷ σώματι πρῶτος ἐκ δερμάτων ὧν ἴσχυσε συλλαβεῖν θηρίων εὗρε, ῥαγδαίων δὲ γινομένων ὄμβρων καὶ πνευμάτων παραλιβέντα τὰ ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ δένδρα πῦρ ἀνάψαι, καὶ τὴν αὐτόθι ὕλην καταφλέξαι. δένδρου δὲ λαβόμενον τὸν Οὐσωὸν καὶ ἀποκλαδεύσαντα πρῶτον τολμῆσαι εἰς θάλασσαν ἐμβῆναι· ἀπερᾶσαι δὲ δύο σχήματα; πυρί τε καὶ πνεύματι καὶ προσκυνῆσαι, ἅμα τε σπένδειν αὐταῖς, ἐξ ὧν ἤγρευε θηρίων.

it be obſerved, that this *worſhip of the Elements* and heavenly Bodies is truly repreſented as the FIRST ſpecies of idolatry.

II. "After many generations, came Chryſor; and he likewiſe invented many things uſeful to civil life; for which, after his deceaſe, he was worſhipped as a God *. Then flouriſhed Ouranos and his ſiſter Ge; who deified and offered ſacrifices to their father, Upſiſtos, when he had been torn in pieces by wild beaſts †. Afterwards Cronos conſecrated Muth his ſon, and was himſelf conſecrated by his ſubjects ‡." And this is as truly repreſented to be the SECOND ſpecies of idolatry; the *worſhip of dead men*.

III. He goes on, and ſays, that "Ouranos was the inventor of the Bætylia, a kind of animated ſtones, framed with great art §. And that Taautus formed allegoric figures, characters, and images of the celeſtial Gods and elements ||." In which is delivered the THIRD ſpecies of idolatry, *ſtatue and brute worſhip*. For by the animated ſtones, is meant ſtones cut into a human ſhape **; brute, unformed ſtones being before this invention conſecrated and adored. As by Taautus's invention of allegoric figures, is inſinuated (what was truly the fact) the origine of brute worſhip †† from the uſe of HIEROGLYPHICS.

This is a very ſhort and imperfect extract of the *Fragment*; many particulars, to avoid tedioufneſs, are omitted, which would much

* ——ἐξ ὧν γενέσθαι δύο ἀδελφὰς σιδήρᾳ εὑρέλας, καὶ τῆς τέχνης ἐργασίας· ὧν θάτερον τὸν Ἥφαιστον. εἰρεῖν δὲ καὶ ἀγκιστρον, καὶ δίκελλαν, καὶ ὀρμιὰν, καὶ σχεδίαν· πρῶτόν τε πάντων ἀνθρώπων πλεῦσαι. διὸ καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν μετὰ θάνατον ἐσεβάσθησαν.

† Ὁ δὲ τούτων παῖς ὁ Ὕψιστος ἐκ συμβολῆς θηρίων τελευτήσας ἀφιερώθη, ᾧ καὶ χοὰς καὶ θυσίας οἱ παῖδες ἐτέλεσαν.

‡ —Καὶ μετ' ὀ πολὺ, ἕτερον αὐτῷ παῖδα ἀπὸ Ῥέας ὀνομαζόμενον Μῦθ ἀποθανόντα ἀφιεροῦ—Κρόνον τοίνυν, βασιλεύων τῆς χώρας, καὶ ὕστερον μετὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτὴν εἰς τὸν τοῦ Κρόνου ἀστέρα καθιερωθείς.

§ Ἔτι δὲ, φησὶν, ἐπινόησε Θεὸς Οὐρανὸς Βαιτύλια, λίθους ἐμψύχους μηχανησάμενος——

|| —μετὰ δὲ τούτων θεὸς Τααυτὸς μιμησάμενος τὸν Οὐρανὸν τῶν θεῶν ἄψεις, Κρόνου τε καὶ Δαγῶνος, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν διέξωσεν τὰς ἰδέας τῶν στοιχείων χαρακτῆρας, &c.

** So when the Egyptians firſt ſaw the Grecian artiſts ſeparate the legs of their ſtatues, they put fetters on them, to prevent their running away.

†† See Div. Leg. book iv. § 4.

ſupport

ſupport what we are upon, particularly a minute detail of the principal arts invented for the uſe of civil life. But what has been ſelected on this head will afford a good comment to a celebrated paſſage of Cicero, quoted, in this ſection, on another occaſion.—As the two important doctrines, taught *in ſecret*, were the detection of *Polytheiſm*, and the diſcovery of the *Unity*; ſo, the two capital doctrines taught more *openly*, were the origine of Society with the arts of life, and the exiſtence of the ſoul after death, in a ſtate of reward or puniſhments. Theſe latter doctrines Tully hints at in the following words: "—mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur " Athenæ peperiſſe—tum nihil melius illis *Myſteriis*, quibus ex " AGRESTI immanique vita EXCULTI ad humanitatem & mitigati " ſumus:—neque ſolum cum lætitia vivendi rationem accepimus, " ſed etiam cum ſpe meliore moriendi *." The Fragment explains what Tully meant by *men's being drawn by the Myſteries from an irrational and ſavage life, and tamed, as it were, and broken to humanity*. It was, we ſee, by the information given them, concerning the origine of SOCIETY, and the Inventors of the ARTS OF LIFE; and the rewards they received from grateful Poſterity, for having made themſelves Benefactors to mankind. Tully, who thought this a ſtrong excitement to public virtue, provides for it in his *Laws*:— " Divos, & eos, qui cæleſtes ſemper habiti, colunto: & illos, quos " endo cælo MERITA vocaverint Herculem, Liberum, Æſculapium †," &c.

The reaſons which induce me to think this Fragment the very *Hiſtory* narrated to the Ἐποπτα, in the celebration of the *greater Myſteries*, are theſe:

1. It bears an exact conformity with what the Ancients tell us that *Hiſtory* contained in general, namely, an inſtruction, that all the national Gods, as well thoſe *majorum* (ſuch as Hypſiſtus, Ou-

* De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 14. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 148.

† De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 8.

ranos,

ranos, and Cronos) as thoſe *minorum gentium*, were only dead men deified: together with a recommendation of the advantages of civil life above the ſtate of nature, and an excitement to the moſt conſiderable of the initiated (the *ſummatibus viris*, as Macrobius calls them) to procure it. And theſe two ends are ſerved together, in the hiſtory of the riſe and progreſs of idolatry as delivered in this Fragment. In the date it gives to the origine of idolatry, they were inſtructed that the two firſt mortals were not idolaters, and conſequently, that idolatry was the corruption of a better Religion; a matter of importance, where the purpoſe was to diſcredit Polytheiſm. The Hiſtory ſhews us too, that this had the common fate of all corruptions, of falling from bad to worſe, from *elementary* worſhip to *human*, and from *human* to *brutal*. But this was not enough; it was neceſſary too to expoſe the unreaſonableneſs of all theſe modes of ſuperſtition. And as this could be only done by ſhewing what gave birth to the ſeveral ſpecies's, we are told that not any occult or metaphyſic influences of the heavenly or elementary Bodies upon men, but their common phyſical effects felt by us, occaſioned the firſt worſhip to be paid unto them: that no imaginary Divinity in the minds of patriarchs and heroes occaſioned Poſterity to bring them into the number of the Gods; but a warm ſenſe of gratitude for what they had invented for the introduction and promotion of civil life: and that even *brute-worſhip* was brought in without the leaſt conſideration to the animal, but as its figure was a ſymbol only of the properties of the two other ſpecies's. Again, in order to recommend civil life, and to excite men to promote it's advantages, a lively picture is given of his miſerable condition; and how obnoxious he was, in that ſtate, to the rage of all the elements, and how imperfectly, while he continued in it, he could, with all his induſtry, fence againſt them, by food of acorns, by cottages of reeds, and by garments of ſkins: a matter the *Myſteries* thought ſo neceſſary to be impreſſed, that we find, by Diodorus Siculus, there was a ſcenical repreſentation of this ſtate exhibited in their SHEWS.

And

And what ſtronger excitement had heroic minds, than to be taught, (as they are in this Fragment) that public benefits to their fellow-creatures were rewarded with immortality. As all theſe things, therefore, ſo eſſential to the inſtruction of the *Myſteries*, are here taught with an art and diſpoſition peculiarly calculated to promote thoſe ends, we have reaſon to conclude, that this Hiſtory was compoſed for the uſe of the *Myſteries*.

2. My ſecond reaſon for ſuppoſing it to be that very Hiſtory, is our being told, that Sanchoniatho tranſcribed the account from ſecret records, kept in the penetralia of the temples, and written in a ſacred ſacerdotal character, called the Ammonean *, from the place where they were firſt depoſited; (which, as Marſham reaſonably ſuppoſes, was Ammonno, or Thebes, in Egypt †) a kind of writing employed, as we have ſhewn elſewhere, by the Hierophants of the *Myſteries*.

3. Thirdly, we are informed, that this ſacred commentary was compoſed by the CABIRI, at the command, and by the direction, of Thoth ‡. Now Theſe were the principal Hierophants of the *Myſteries*. The name CABIRI is, indeed, uſed by the Ancients, to ſignify indifferently three ſeveral perſons; the GODS, in whoſe honour the *Myſteries* were inſtituted; the INSTITUTORS of the *Myſteries*; and the principal HIEROPHANTS who officiated in them. In the firſt ſenſe we find it uſed by Herodotus, who ſpeaks of the images of the *Cabiri* in the Egyptian temples §; and by the ſcholiaſt on Apollonius, who tells us, there were four ſamothracian *Cabiri*, Axieros, Axiokerſa, Axiokerſos, and Caſmilus; that is to ſay, Ceres, Proſer-

* —ὁ δὲ συμβαλὼν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων εἰρισθεῖσαν ἀποκρύφοις Ἀμμωνίοις γράμμασι συγκειμένοις, ἃ δὴ οὐκ ἦν πᾶσι γνώριμα, τὴν μάθησιν ἁπάντων αὐτὸς ἤτκισε.

† Chron. Can. p. 234. Lond. edit.

‡ Ταῦτα δὲ, φησὶ, πρῶτοι πάντων ὑπεμνηματίσαντο οἱ ἑπτὰ Σιδῆν παῖδες ΚΑΒΕΙΡΟΙ, καὶ ὄγδοος αὐτῶν ἀδελφὸς Ἀσκληπιὸς, ὡς αὐτοῖς ἐνετείλατο θεὸς Τααυτός.

§ Καμβύσης—ἰσῆλθε δὲ καὶ ἐς τῶν Καβείρων τὸ ἱρὸν, ἐς τὸ ἐ θεμιτόν ἐστι ἐσιέναι ἄλλον γε ἢ τὸν ἱρέα. ταῦτα δέ τ' ἀγάλματα καὶ ἐνέπρησε, πολλὰ καταγελάσας. lib. iii. cap. 37. p. 176. Edit. Gale.

pine,

pine, Pluto, and Mercury. Pauſanias, in his *Beotics*, uſes the word in the ſecond ſenſe, where he makes mention of the *Cabiri* Prometheus and his ſon Ætnæus, to whom was committed the ſacred depoſit of the *Myſteries* by Ceres *. And Strabo uſes it in the third ſenſe, where he ſpeaks of the *Cabiri* as Miniſters in the ſacred *Myſteries* †. It is no wonder there ſhould be this difference amongſt the ancients in their accounts of theſe Wights. *Cabiri* was a ſacred appellation, which was transferred from the *God* of the Myſteries, through the *Inſtitutors* of them, down to the *Miniſters* who officiated in them. And in this laſt ſenſe it is uſed by Sanchoniatho. The ſame kind of confuſion, and proceeding from the ſame cauſe, we find in the ancient accounts concerning the founder of the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*, as we ſhall ſee hereafter; Some aſcribing the inſtitution to Ceres or Triptolemus, the Gods in whoſe honour they were celebrated; others, to Erectheus, who indeed founded them: others again, to Eumolpus and Muſæus, the firſt who miniſtred there in the office of Hierophants.

4. But, fourthly and laſtly, We are told, that when this genealogical hiſtory came into the hands of a certain ſon of Thabion, the firſt Hierophant on record amongſt the Phœnicians, he, after having corrupted it with allegories, and intermixed phyſical and coſmical affections with hiſtorical (that is, made the one ſignificative of the other) DELIVERED IT TO THE PROPHETS OF THE ORGIES, AND THE HIEROPHANTS OF THE MYSTERIES; who left it to their ſucceſſors (one of which was Oſiris) and to the Initiated ‡. So

* Πόλιν γάρ φασιν ἐν τούτῳ φασὶν εἶναι τῷ χωρίῳ, καὶ ἄνδρας ὀνομαζομένους Καβείρους. Προμηθεῖ δὲ ἐκ τῶν Καβειραίων καὶ Αἰτναίᾳ τῇ Προμηθέως ἀφικομένην Δήμητραν εἰς γνῶσιν παραδιδόναι σφίσιν. ἥτις μὲν δὴ ἦν ἡ παράδοσις, καὶ τὰ εἰς αὐτὴν γενόμενα, οὐκ ἐφαίνετο ὅσιόν μοι γράφειν. Δημήτρος γὰρ Καβειραίοις δῶρόν ἐστιν ἡ τελετή. Bæot. lib. ix. cap. 25. pag. 758, 59. Edit. Kuknii, fol. Lipſ. 1696.

† —τῶν μὲν, τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῖς Κορήσι τοὺς Κορύβαντας καὶ ΚΑΒΕΙΡΟΥΣ καὶ Ἰδαίους Δακτύλους, καὶ Τελχῖνας ἀποφαινόντων· τῶν δὲ συγγενεῖς ἀλλήλων, καὶ μικράς τινας αὐτῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορὰς διασταλόντων. lib. x. p. 466. C. Edit. Pariſ. folio. 1620.

‡ Ταῦτα πάντα ὁ Θαβίωνος παῖς, πρῶτος τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος γεγονότων Φοινίκων ἱεροφάντης ἀλληγορήσας, τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν ἀναμίξας παρέδωκε τοῖς ΟΡΓΙΩΣΙ καὶ ΤΕΛΕΤΩΝ καθάρχουσι ΙΕΡΟΦΗΤΑΙΣ. οἱ δὲ τὸν τύφον αὔξειν ἐκ παιδὸς ἐπιτηδεύσαντες, τοῖς αὐτῶν διαδόχοις παρέδωσαν καὶ τοῖς ἐπεισάκτοις. ὧν εἷς ἦν Ὄσιρις.

that

that now we have an expreſs teſtimony for the fact here advanced, that this was the very *hiſtory* read to the ΕΠΟΠΤΑΙ in the celebration of the *great Myſteries*.

But one thing is too remarkable to paſs by unobſerved: and that is, Sanchoniatho's account of the corruption of this Hiſtory with *allegories* and *phyſical affections*, by one of his own countrymen; and of it's delivery, in that ſtate, to the Egyptians, (for Iſiris is the ſame as Oſiris) who corrupted it ſtill more. That the Pagan Mythology was, indeed, thus corrupted, I have ſhewn at large, in ſeveral parts of this work: but I believe, not ſo early as is here pretended; which makes me ſuſpect that Sanchoniatho lived in a later age than his interpreter, Philo, aſſigns to him. And what confirms me in this ſuſpicion, is that mark of national vanity and partiality, common to after-times, in making the *Myſteries* of his own country original, and conveyed from Phœnicia to Egypt. Whereas it is very certain, they came firſt from Egypt. But of this elſewhere. However, let the reader take notice, that the queſtion concerning the *antiquity* of Sanchoniatho does not at all affect our inference concerning the nature and uſe of this Hiſtory *.

We now come to the HYMN celebrating the Unity of the Godhead, which was ſung in the *Eleuſinian Myſteries* by the Hierophant, habited like the CREATOR †. And this, I take ‡ to be the little OR-

* See note II, at the end of this book.

† Ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατ' ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΑ μυηρίοις, ὁ μὲν Ἱεροφάνης εἰς εἰκόνα τῦ δημιεργῦ ἐσκευάζεται. Euſeb. Præp. Evang. lib. iii. A paſſage in Porphyry well explains this of Euſebius, and ſhews by what kind of perſonage the *Creator* was repreſented; and that this, like all the reſt, was of Egyptian original; and introduced into theſe ſecret myſteries, for the reaſon above explained. Τὰ δὲ τῶν ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΩΝ πάλιν τοιαῦτά φησιν ἴχειν σύμβολα. Τὸν ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΝ, ὃν Κνὴφ, οἱ Αἰγύπλιοι προσαγορεύουσιν ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΕΙΔΗ, τὴν δὲ χροιὰν ἐκ κυανῦ μέλανος ἔχοιλα, κραλῆνλα ζώνην κ᾽ σκῆπλρον· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς, πλερὸν βασίλειον περικείμενον, ΟΤΙ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΔΥΣΕΥΡΕΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΕΚΡΥΜΕΝΟΣ, ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΦΑΝΟΣ, κ᾽ ὅτι ζωοποιὸς, κ᾽ ὅτι βασιλεὺς, κ᾽ ὅτι νοερῶς κινεῖται· διὸ ἡ τῦ πλερῦ φύσις ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κεῖται. Apud Euſeb. Præp. Evang. lib. iii. cap. 11.

‡ M. Voltaire, in his remarks on his fine Tragedy of Olympia, has done me the honour of advancing this conjecture into a certainty; and what is more, of a known and acknowledged fact. "On chantait (ſays he) *l'Hymne de Orphée*"—and then gives it as he finds it here.——

PHIC poem quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus * and Eusebius †; which begins thus: "I will declare a SECRET to the Initiated; but "let the doors be shut against the profane. But thou, O Musæus, "the offspring of bright Selene, attend carefully to my song; for "I shall deliver the truth without disguise. Suffer not, therefore, "thy former prejudices to debar thee of that happy life, which the "knowledge of these sublime truths will procure unto thee: but "carefully contemplate this divine Oracle, and preserve it in purity "of mind and heart. Go on, in the right way, and contemplate "THE SOLE GOVERNOR OF THE WORLD: HE IS ONE, AND OF HIM-"SELF ALONE; AND TO THAT ONE ALL THINGS OWE THEIR "BEING. HE OPERATES THROUGH ALL, WAS NEVER SEEN BY "MORTAL EYES, BUT DOES HIMSELF SEE EVERY ONE ‡."

The reasons which support my conjecture are these: 1. We learn from the scholiast on Aristophanes and others, that hymns were sung in the mysteries, and what were the subject of them. And Dion. Chrys. in his Oration De divina Civitate aut Gubernatione, says expressly, that in the Mithriac Mysteries the Magi sung an awful Hymn in which the glories of the supreme God who governs all things were celebrated §—And further says, that this knowledge of the *One supreme* was kept a SECRET amongst the *initiated* Per-

* Admonitio ad gentes, pag. 36. B. Edit. Sylburgh.

† Præp. Evang. lib. xiii.

‡ Θθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστι, θύρας δ' ἐπίβεσθε βεβήλοις
Πᾶσιν ὁμῶς, σὺ δ' ἄκουε· φαεσφόρου ἔκγονε μήνης,
Μουσαῖ, ἐξερέω γὰρ ἀληθέα, μηδέ σε τὰ πρὶν
Ἐν φρεσὶ φαινόμενα φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμέρσῃ·
Εἰς δὲ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας, τούτῳ προσέδρευε,
Ἰθύνων κραδίης νοερὸν κύτος· εὖ δ' ἐπίβαινε
Ἀθανάτων, μῦθον δ' ἰσόρροπον κόσμοιο ἄνακτα.
Εἷς δ' ἐς αὐτογενὴς, ἑνὸς ἔκγονα πάντα τέτυκται,
Ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς περιναίεται· οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
Εἰσοράᾳ θνητῶν, αὐτὸς δέ γε πάντας ὁρᾶται.

§ μῦθος ἐν ἀπορρήτοις τελεταῖς ὑπὸ Μάγων ἀνθρῶν ἄδεται Θαυμαζόμενος. οἱ τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον ὕμνοισιν ὡς ἄριστον καὶ πρῶτον ἠνίοχον τῆς τελειοτάτης ἁρμαλῆς.

sians.

ſians. 2. Orpheus, as we have ſaid, firſt brought the *Myſteries* from Egypt into Thrace, and even Religion itſelf: hence it was called Θρησκεία, as being ſuppoſed the invention of the Thracian. 3. The verſes, which go under the name of Orpheus, are, at leaſt, more ancient than Plato and Herodotus; though ſince interpolated. It was the common opinion, that they were genuine; and thoſe who doubted of that, yet gave them to the earlieſt Pythagoreans *. 4. The ſubject of them are the *Myſteries*, under the ſeveral titles of † Θρονισμοὶ μῆρῶοι τελεῖαὶ, ἱερὸς λόγ☉, and ἡ εἰς ᾅδε καῖάβασις. 5. Pauſanias tells us, that Orpheus's hymns were ſung in the rites of Ceres, in preference to Homer's though more elegant, for the reaſons given above ‡. 6. This hymn is addreſſed to Muſæus, his diſciple, who was ſaid, though falſely, to inſtitute the *Myſteries* at Athens, as his maſter had done in Thrace §; and begins with the *formula* uſed by the Myſtagogue on that occaſion, warning the PROPHANE to keep at diſtance: and in the fourth line, mentions that *new life* or *regeneration*, to which the Initiated were taught to aſpire. 7. No other original than ſinging the hymns of Orpheus in the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*, can be well imagined of that popular opinion, mentioned by Theodoret, that Orpheus inſtituted *thoſe Myſteries* ||, when the Athenians had ſuch certain records of another Founder. 8. We are told that one article of the Athenians' charge againſt Diagoras for revealing the

* Laertius in Vita Pythag. and Suidas, voce Ὀρφεύς.

† The following paſſage of Dion. Chryſ. will explain the meaning of this Θρονισμὸς— Καθάπερ εἰώθασιν ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ ΘΡΟΝΙΣΜΩ, καθίσαντες τὸν μυούμενον οἱ τελοῦντες, κύκλῳ περιχορεύειν. Orat. xii.

‡ Ὅτις δὲ περὶ ποιήσεως ἐπολυπραγμόνησεν, ἤδη τὸς Ὀρφέως ὕμνους οἶδεν ὄντας, ἕκαστόν τε αὐτῶν, ἐπὶ βραχύταῖον, καὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἐκ ἐς ἀριθμὸν πολὺν πεποιημένους. Λυκομῆδαι δὲ ἴσασί τε καὶ ἐπᾴδουσι τοῖς δρωμένοις· κόσμῳ μὲν δὴ τῶν ἐπῶν διεῖρεῖα φέροιτο ἄν, μᾶλλον Ὁμήρου γε τοὺς ὕμνους· τιμῆς δὲ ἐκ τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἐς πολὺ ἐκείνων ἔχουσι. Pauſan. lib. ix. cap. 30. ſub fin. pag. 770. Edit. Kuhnii, fol. Lipſ. 1696. and again, to the ſame purpoſe, cap. 27.

§ Tertull. Apol.

‖ See note p. 123.

Myſteries, was his making the *Orphic-ſpeech*, or hymn, the ſubject of his common converſation *. 9. But laſtly, the account, which Clemens gives of this hymn, ſeems to put the matter out of queſtion: his words are theſe: "But the Thracian Myſtagogue, who "was at the ſame time a poet, *Orpheus*, the ſon of Oeager, after "he had opened the *Myſteries*, and ſung the whole THEOLOGY OF "IDOLS, recants all he had ſaid, and introduceth TRUTH. The "Sacreds then truly begin, though late, and thus he enters upon "the matter †." To underſtand the force of this paſſage, we are to know, that the Myſtagogue explained the repreſentations in the *Myſteries*; where, as we learn from Apuleius ‡, the ſupernal and infernal Gods paſſed in review. To each of theſe they ſung an hymn; which Clemens calls the *theology of images*, or *idols*. Theſe are yet to be ſeen amongſt the works aſcribed to Orpheus. When all this was over, then came the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, delivered in the HYMN in queſtion. And, after that, the Aſſembly was diſmiſſed, with theſe two barbarous words, ΚΟΓΞ ΟΜΠΑΞ, which ſhews the *Myſteries* not to have been originally Greek. The learned Mr. Le Clerc well obſerves, that this ſeems to be only an ill pronunciation of *kots* and *omphets*, which, he tells us, ſignify in the Phœnician tongue, *watch and abſtain from evil* §.

Thus the reader is brought acquainted with the end and uſe both of the *greater* and *leſſer Myſteries*; and ſees that, as well in what they *hid*, as in what they *divulged*, all aimed at the benefit of the State. To this end, they were to draw in as many as they could to their general participation; which they did by ſpreading abroad

* Διαγόρα μὲν γὰρ εἰκότως ἐνεκάλεν Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ μόνον τὸν ΟΡΦΙΚΟΝ εἰς μέσον καταλιθέντι ΛΟΓΟΝ, καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, καὶ τὰ τῶν Καβείρων δημεύοντι μυστήρια. Athenagoras in Legat.

† Ὁ δὲ Θρᾴκιος ἱεροφάντης καὶ ποιητὴς ἅμα, ὁ τοῦ Οἰάγρου Ὀρφεύς, μετὰ τὴν τῶν Ὀργίων ἱεροφαντίαν, καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν θεολογίαν, παλινῳδίαν ἀληθείας εἰσάγει, τὸν ἱερὸν ὅλως ὀψέ ποτε, ὅμως δ' ὖν ᾄδων λόγον. Admon. ad Gentes, pag. 36. A. Edit. Sylburgh.

‡ Acceſſi confinium mortis, deos inferos, & deos ſuperos acceſſi coram, & adoravi de proximo. Met. lib. xi. p. 1000. circa finem. Edit. Lugd. 1587. 8vo.

§ Bibl. Univ. tom. vi. p. 86.

the

the doctrine of a Providence, and a future ſtate; and how much happier the Initiated ſhould be, and what ſuperior felicities they were intitled to, in another life. It was on this account that Antiquity is ſo full and expreſs in this part. But then, they were to make thoſe, they had got in, as virtuous as was poſſible; which they did, by diſcovering, to ſuch as were judged capable of the *ſecret*, the whole deluſion of Polytheiſm. Now this being ſuppoſed the ſhaking of foundations, was to be done with all poſſible circumſpection, and under the moſt tremendous ſeal of ſecrecy *. For they taught, that the Gods themſelves puniſhed the *revealers of the* SECRET; and not them only, but the *hearers* of it likewiſe †. Nor did they altogether truſt to that alone: for, more effectually to curb an ungovernable curioſity, the State decreed capital puniſhment againſt the betrayers of the *Myſteries*, and inflicted it with mercileſs ſeverity ‡. The caſe of Diagoras, the Melian, is too remarkable to be omitted. This man had revealed the *Orphic* and *Eleuſinian Myſteries*: and ſo, paſſed with the people for an Atheiſt: which at once confirms what hath been ſaid of the object of the *ſecret doctrines*, and of the miſchief which would attend an indiſcreet communication of them. For the charge of ATHEISM was the common lot of all thoſe who communicated their knowledge of the *one only God*; whether they learnt it by natural light, or were afterwards taught it by *Revelation*. He likewiſe diſſuaded his friends from being initiated into theſe rites: the conſequence of which was, that the city of Athens proſcribed him, and ſet a price upon his head §. While

* See cap. 20. of Meurſius's Eleuſinia.

† —Quæras forſitan ſatis anxie, ſtudioſe lector, quid deinde dictum, quid factum? Dicerem, ſi *dicere* liceret; cognoſceres, ſi liceret *audire*; ſed parem noxam contraherent *aures & linguæ temerariæ curioſitatis*. Apul. Met. lib. xi. p. 1000. Edit. Lugd. 8vo, 1587.

‡ Si quis arcanæ myſteria Cereris ſacra vulgâſſet, lege morti addicebatur. Τὸν ἐξειπόντα τὰ μυστήρια τεθνάναι. Meminit hujus legis Sopater in Diviſione quæſtionis. Sam. Petit, in Leges Atticas, p. 33.

§ Suidas, voce Διαγόρας ὁ Μήλιος——& etiam Athenagoras in Legatione.

Socrates,

Socrates, who preached up the latter part of this doctrine (and was on that account a reputed Atheiſt likewiſe) and Epicurus, who taught the former (and was a real one) were ſuffered, becauſe they delivered their opinions only as points of philoſophic ſpeculation, amongſt their followers, to live a long time unmoleſted. And to avoid the danger of thoſe laws, which ſecured the *ſecret* of the Myſteries, was perhaps the reaſon why Socrates declined initiation *. And this appearing a ſingular affectation, expoſed him to much cenſure †. But he declined it with his uſual prudence. He remembered, that Æſchylus ‡, on a mere imagination of his having given a hint of ſomething in the *Myſteries*, had like to have been torn in pieces on the ſtage by the people; and only eſcaped by an appeal to the Areopagus: which venerable court acquitted him of this dangerous Charge, on his proving that he had never been initiated. The famous EUHEMERUS, who aſſumed the ſame office of Hierophant to the People at large, with more boldneſs than Socrates, and more temper than Epicurus, employed another expedient to ſcreen himſelf from the laws, though he fell, and not (like the reſt) undeſervedly §, under the ſame imputation of *Atheiſm*. This man gave a fabulous relation of a voyage to the imaginary iſland of Panchæa ||, a kind of ancient Utopia; where, in a temple of Jupiter, he found a genealogical record, which diſcovered to him the births and deaths of the greater Gods; and, in ſhort, every thing that the Hierophant revealed to the Initiated on this ſubject. Thus he too avoided the ſuſpicion of a *betrayer of the Myſteries*. A character infamous in ſocial life. And to this the Son of Sirach

* For that he had a good opinion of the *Myſteries* appears from the *Phædo* of Plato.

† Κατηϛοξῦνλες — ὅτε ἐμυήθη μόνος ἁπάντων ταῖς Ἐλευσινίαις. Lucianus, Demonacte, T. II. p. 380. Edit. Reitzii, 4to. Amſtel. 1743.

‡ Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. pag. 283. B. Edit. Sylburg. & Ariſt. lib. iii. cap. 1. Nicom. Eth.

§ See note I, at the end of this book.

‖ Euſeb. Præp. Evang. lib. ii. cap. 2.

alludes,

alludes, where he ſpeaks of this ſpecies of infidelity in general *— "Whoſo diſcovereth SECRETS [μυςήρια], loſeth his credit, and ſhall "never find friend to his mind." This, therefore, is the reaſon why ſo little is to be met with, concerning the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ. Varro and Cicero, the two moſt inquiſitive perſons in antiquity, affording but a glimmering light. The *firſt* giving us a ſhort account of the *cauſe* only of the SECRET, without mentioning the *doctrine*; and the *other*, a hint of the *doctrine*, without mentioning the *cauſe*.

But now a remarkable exception to all we have been ſaying, concerning the *ſecrecy* of the *Myſteries*, obtrudes itſelf upon us, in the caſe of the CRETANS; who, as Diodorus Siculus aſſures us, celebrated their *Myſteries* OPENLY, and taught their ἀπόῤῥητα without reſerve. His words are theſe: "At Cnoſſus in Crete, it was "provided for, by an ancient law, that theſe *Myſteries* ſhould be "ſhewn openly to all: and that thoſe things, which in other "places were delivered in ſecret, ſhould be hid from none who "were deſirous of knowing them †." But, as contrary as this ſeems to the principles delivered above, it will be found, on attentive reflection, altogether to confirm them. We have ſhewn, that the *great ſecret* was the detection of Polytheiſm; which was done by teaching the original of the Gods; their birth from mortals; and their advancement to divine honour, for benefits done to their Country, or Mankind. But it is to be obſerved, that the Cretans proclaimed this to all the world, by ſhewing, and boaſting of the tomb of Jupiter himſelf, the *Father of Gods and Men*. How then could they tell that as a ſecret in their *Myſteries*, which they told to every one out of them? Nor is it leſs remarkable that the Cretans themſelves, as Diodorus, in the ſame place, tells us, gave this very

* ὁ ἀποκαλύπλων ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΑ, ἀπώλεσε πίςιν, κ) ὃ μὴ εὕρη φίλον πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῦ. Cap. xxvii. ver. 17.

† Καλὰ δὲ τὴν Κρήτην ἐν Κνωσσῷ νόμιμον ἐξ ἀρχαίων εἶναι φανερῶς τὰς τελετὰς ταύτας πᾶσι παραδίδοσθαι, κ) τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ παραδεδομένα, παρ' αὐτοῖς μηδένα κρύπλειν τῶν βελομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα γινώσκειν. Biblioth. lib. v.

circumſtance

circumſtance of their celebrating the *Myſteries openly* as a proof of their being the firſt who had conſecrated dead mortals. "Theſe "are the old ſtories which the Cretans tell of their Gods, who, "they pretend to ſay, were born amongſt them. And they urge "this as an invincible reaſon to prove that the adoration, the "worſhip, and the MYSTERIES of theſe Gods were firſt derived "from Crete to the reſt of the world; for, whereas, amongſt "the Athenians, thoſe moſt illuſtrious *Myſteries* of all, called the "*Eleuſinian*, thoſe of Samothrace, and thoſe of the Ciconians in "Thrace, of Orpheus's inſtitution, are all celebrated in SECRET: "yet in Crete *"——and ſo on as above. For it ſeems the Cretans were proud of their invention; and uſed this method to proclaim and perpetuate the notice of it. So when Pythagoras, as Porphyry † informs us, had been initiated into the *Cretan myſteries*, and had continued in the *Idean* cave three times nine days, he wrote this epigram on the tomb of Jupiter,

Ὧδε θανὼν κεῖται Ζᾶν, ὃν Δία κικλήσκουσιν.
Zan, whom men call Jupiter, lies here deceaſed.

It was this which ſo much exaſperated the other Grecians againſt them; and gave birth to the common proverb of ΚΡΗΤΕΣ ΑΕΙ ΨΕΥΣΤΑΙ ‡, *The Cretans are eternal liars.* For nothing could more

* Περὶ μὲν δὴ τῶν θεῶν οἱ Κρῆτες τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς λεγομένων γεγενῆσθαι τοιαῦτα μυθολογοῦσι· τὰς δὲ τιμὰς καὶ θυσίας καὶ τὰς περὶ τὰ μυστήρια τελετὰς ἐκ Κρήτης εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους παραδεδόσθαι λέγοντες, τοῦτο φέρουσιν, ὡς οἶονται, μέγιστον τεκμήριον· τήνδε γὰρ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι γινομένην τελετὴν, ἐπιφανεστάτην σχεδὸν ὅσαν ἁπασῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐν Σαμοθρᾴκῃ, καὶ τὴν ἐν Θρᾴκῃ ἐν τοῖς Κικόσιν (ὅθεν ὁ καταδείξας Ὀρφεὺς ἦν) μυστικῶς παραδίδοσθαι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Κρήτην——

† De vita Pythag. n. xvii.

‡ Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται· κὰ ΓΑΡ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, σεῖο
Κρῆτες ἐτεκλήναντο. Callim. Hymn. in Jovem.

And Nonnus;

Οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ παρέμιμνε Διὸς ΨΕΥΔΗΜΟΝΙ ΤΥΜΒΩι.
Τερπομένη Κρήτεσσιν, ἐπεὶ πέλον ἠπεροπῆες. Dionyſ. lib. viii.

And Lucan;

Tam mendax Magni tumulo, quam Creta Tonantis. lib. viii.

affront

affront theſe ſuperſtitious idolaters than aſſerting the fact, or more diſpleaſe the politic protectors of the *Myſteries* than the divulging it *.

The MYSTERIES then being of ſo great ſervice to the ſtate, we ſhall not be ſurprized to hear the wiſeſt of the Ancients ſpeaking highly in their commendation; and their ableſt Lawgivers, and reformers, providing carefully for their ſupport. "Ceres (ſays "Iſocrates) hath made the Athenians two preſents of the greateſt "conſequence: corn, which brought us out of a ſtate of brutality; "and the MYSTERIES, which teach the initiated to entertain the "moſt agreeable expectations touching death and eternity †." And Plato introduceth Socrates ſpeaking after this manner; "In my "opinion, thoſe who eſtabliſhed the MYSTERIES, whoever they "were, were well ſkilled in human nature. For in theſe rites it "was of old ſignified to the aſpirants, that thoſe who died with-"out being initiated, ſtuck faſt in mire and filth: but that he who "was purified and initiated, ſhould, at his death, have his habita-"tion with the Gods ‡." And Tully thought them of ſuch uſe to Society, for preſerving and propagating the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, that in the law where he forbids nocturnal ſacrifices offered by women, he makes an expreſs exception for the *Myſteries* of Ceres, as well as for the ſacrifices to the GOOD GODDESS. "Nocturna mulierum ſacrificia ne ſunto, præter "olla, quæ pro populo rite fiant. Neve quem initianto, niſi, ut "aſſolet, Cereri, Græco ſacro." Which law he thus comments:— "*M.* But now, Titus, as to what follows, I would fain know how "you can give your aſſent, or I blame you for with-holding it?

* See note K, at the end of this Book.

† Δήμητρος——δύσης δωρεὰς διτὰς, αἴπερ μέγισται τυγχάνουσιν ὄσαι· τάς τε καρπὰς οἱ τῷ μὴ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἡμᾶς αἴτιοι γεγόνασι, καὶ τὴν τελετὴν, ἧς οἱ μετέχοντες περί τε τῆς τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς, καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰῶνος ἡδίους τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχουσιν. Panegyr.

‡ Καὶ κινδυνεύουσι κ᾽ οἱ τὰς τελετὰς ἡμῖν ἔτοι καταστήσαντες, ὡ φαῦλοί τινες εἶναι ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι πάλαι αἰνίττεσθαι, ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀμύητος, κ᾽ ἀτέλεστος, εἰς ᾅδου ἀφίκηται, ἐν βορβόρῳ κείσεται· ὁ δὲ κεκαθαρμένος τε κ᾽ τετελεσμένος, ἐκεῖσε ἀφικόμενος, μετὰ θεῶν οἰκήσει. In Phædone.

" *A.* What is that, I pray you? *M.* The law concerning the noc-
" turnal ſacrifices of women. *A.* I aſſent to it, eſpecially as there
" is an expreſs exception to the public and ſolemn ſacrifice.
" *M.* What then will become of our *Eleuſinian Rites*, thoſe re-
" verend and auguſt *Myſteries*, if, indeed, we take away nocturnal
" celebrations? *For our laws are calculated, not only for the Roman,*
" *but for all juſt and well eſtabliſhed policies.* *A.* I think you except
" thoſe, into which we ourſelves have been initiated. *M.* Doubtleſs I
" do: for as, in my opinion, your Athens hath produced many ex-
" cellent and even divine inventions, and applied them to the uſe
" of life: ſo has ſhe given nothing better than thoſe *Myſteries*,
" by which we are drawn from an irrational and ſavage life,
" and tamed, as it were, and broken to humanity. They are
" truly called INITIA, for they are indeed the beginnings of
" a life of reaſon and virtue. From whence we not only re-
" ceive the benefits of a more comfortable and elegant ſubſiſtence
" here, but are taught to *hope for, and aſpire to a better life hereafter*,
" But what it is that diſpleaſes me in nocturnal rites, the comic
" poets will ſhew you *. Which liberty of celebration, had it been
" permitted at Rome, what wickedneſs would not HE † have
" attempted, who came with a premeditated purpoſe of indulging
" his luſt, to a Sacrifice where even the miſbehaviour ‡ of the eye
" was deeply criminal §."

We

* See note L, at the end of this Book.

† See note M, at the end of this Book.

‡ The Ancients eſteemed *that* to be the greateſt miſbehaviour of the eye, where the ſight of *men* obtruded, though only by accident, upon thoſe *Myſteries*, which it was only lawful for *women* to behold.

§ *M.* At vero, quod ſequitur, quomodo aut tu aſſentiare, aut ego reprehendam, ſane quæro, Tite. *A.* Quid tandem id eſt? *M.* De nocturnis ſacrificiis mulierum. *A.* Ego vero aſſentior, excepto præſertim in ipſa lege ſolemni ſacrificio ac publico. *M.* Quid ergo aget Iacchus Eumolpidæque veſtri [noſtri *alii*], & auguſta illa myſteria, ſiquidem ſacra nocturna tollimus? non enim populo Romano, ſed omnibus bonis firmiſque populis leges damus. *A.* Excipis, credo, illa, quibus ipſi initiati ſumus. *M.* Ego vero excipiam.

We have ſeen, that the other exception to this law againſt nocturnal ſacrifices, was in favour of the rites performed to the GOOD GODDESS, called *the public and ſolemn ſacrifice*. This was offered *pro populo*, for the ſafety of the people. So that Cicero, ranking the *Eleuſinian* with theſe rites, appears to have thought them in the number of ſuch as were celebrated for the public ſafety. Solon, the famous lawgiver of Athens, long before him, had the ſame high opinion of theſe *Myſteries*, as is ſeen by the care he took of their regulation; and ſo had Prætextatus, a moſt accompliſhed Roman Magiſtrate, long after him: For when his maſter, Valentinian, had divided the Empire with his brother, and projected a general reform of the laws, and, amongſt the reſt, had forbid NOCTURNAL SACRIFICES; he was perſuaded by Prætextatus, who governed for him in Greece, to make an exception for the *Myſteries of Ceres*; which had been brought to Rome very early *, and incorporated into the national worſhip †, and long afterwards regulated anew by the wiſe emperor Hadrian ‡.

Zoſimus tells the ſtory in this manner: "The ſupreme power "being thus divided, Valentinian entered on his new command "with a more ſerious attention to his office. He reformed the

excipiam. Nam mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur Athenæ tuæ peperiſſe, atque in vita hominum attuliſſe, tum nihil melius illis myſteriis, quibus ex agreſti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem, & mitigati ſumus; *initiaque*, ut appellantur, ita revera principia vitæ cognovimus; neque ſolum cum lætitia vivendi rationem accepimus, ſed etiam cum ſpe meliore moriendi. Quid autem mihi diſpliceat IN NOCTURNIS, Poëtæ indicant Comici. Qua licentia Romæ data, quidnam egiſſet ille, qui in ſacrificium cogitatam libidinem intulit, quo ne imprudentiam quidem oculorum adjici fas fuit? De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 14. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 148, 49.

* As appears by Tully's Oration for Corn. Balbus, and by a paſſage in his ſecond book, cap. 24. Of the nature of the Gods, quoted above; and likewiſe from Dionyſ. Hal. lib. i. cap. 33. Antiq. Ἱδρύσαντο δὲ καὶ Δήμητρος ἱερὸν, καὶ τὰς θυσίας αὐτῇ διὰ γυναικῶν τε καὶ παρθένων ἔθυσαν, ὡς Ἕλλησι νόμος, ὧν ἐδέησεν ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς πόλεμος χρόνου.

† Suetonius, Vita Aug. cap. 93. T. I. p. 354. Edit. Pitiſci, 1714, 4to.

‡ Aurel. Victor. in Hadr.

" Magiſtracy, he regulated the Revenue, and, by a rigid exaction " of the Duties, ſecured the pay of the ſoldiery, which aroſe out " of that fund: and having determined likewiſe to new model and " promulge the imperial Inſtitutes, *beginning*, as they ſay, from " the foundation, he forbad the celebration of all NOCTURNAL rites " and ſacrifices; with deſign to obviate the enormities which the " opportunity of theſe ſeaſons gave birth to, and enflamed. But " when Prætextatus, a man adorned with every virtue both of " public and private life, who then governed Greece in quality of " proconſul, had given him to underſtand that this law would oc- " caſion great diſorders in Greece, and even throw the inhabitants " into deſpair, when they ſhould find that they were forbidden to " celebrate, according to ancient cuſtom, thoſe moſt holy *Myſte-* " *ries*, which had now taken in the whole race of mankind, he " gave leave to a ſuſpenſion of his law, with regard to Theſe; on " condition, however, that every thing ſhould be reduced to the " primitive purity and ſimplicity *." Thus the ELEUSINIAN MYS-TERIES got a reprieve, till the reign of Theodoſius the elder, when they were finally aboliſhed. The terms Prætextatus uſed to ſhew the ill conſequence of the ſuppreſſion, are very remarkable: he ſaid, the Greeks would, from thenceforth, lead ΑΒΙΩΤΟΝ ΒΙΟΝ, *a comfortleſs lifeleſs life*. But this could not be ſaid, with any truth, or propriety, of the taking away a mere religious rite, how venerable ſoever it was become by its antiquity. To apprehend the force of the expreſſion, we muſt have in mind what hath been ſaid of the doctrines taught in thoſe Rites, namely, a *Providence*,

* Τῆς τοίνυν ἀρχῆς ἔτω διαιρεθείσης ὁ Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ἐμβριθέστερον τῇ ἀρχῇ προσελθὼν, ἄρχοντάς τε ἐν κόσμῳ προῆγεν, καὶ περὶ τὰς εἰσπράξεις τῶν εἰσφορῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐκ τούτων χορηγουμένας στρατιωτικὰς σιτήσεις, ἀκριβέστατα· ἦν· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ νόμων εἰσφορὰς ἐγνώκει ποιήσασθαι, ἀφ' ἑστίας ὥσπερ ἀρξάμενος, τὰς νυκτερινὰς ἐκώλυε θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, τοῖς μυσαρῶς μὲν ἅπαν πραττομένοις ἐμποδὼν διὰ τοῦ τοιοῦδε νόμου γενέσθαι βουλόμενος· ἐπεὶ δὲ Πραιτέξτατος, ὁ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν ἀνθύπατον ἔχων ἀρχὴν, ἀνὴρ ἐν πάσαις διαπρέπων ταῖς ἀρεταῖς, τέτον ἔφη τὸν νόμον ΑΒΙΩΤΟΝ τοῖς Ἕλλησι καταστήσειν τὸν ΒΙΟΝ, εἰ μέλλοιεν κωλύεσθαι τὰ συνέχοντα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος ἁγιώτατα μυστήρια καὶ θεσμὸν ἐπιτελεῖν ἐπέτρεψεν, ἀργοῦντος τοῦ νόμου· πρέπειν δὲ πάντα καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πάτρια. Lib. iv. Hiſt. Novæ.

and

and a *future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments*, on whoſe ſole account the Rites were inſtituted. Now theſe doctrines being in themſelves of the moſt engaging nature; taught here in the moſt intereſting manner; and receiving from hence their chief credit; it was no wonder that the Greeks ſhould eſteem the abolition of the MYSTERIES as the greateſt evil: the life of man being, indeed, without the comfort and ſupport of theſe doctrines, no better than a *living death*: hence it was, that the ſage Iſocrates called the MYSTERIES, *the thing, human nature principally ſtands in need of* *. And that Ariſtides ſaid *the welfare of Greece was ſecured by the Eleuſinian Myſteries alone* †. Indeed the Greeks ſeemed to place their chief happineſs in them: ſo Euripides makes Hercules ſay ‡, *I was bleſt when I got a ſight of the myſteries*: and it was a proverbial ſpeech, when any one thought himſelf in the higheſt degree happy, to ſay, *I ſeem as if I had been initiated in the higher myſteries* §.

1. But now, ſuch is the fate of human things, Theſe MYSTERIES, venerable as they were, in their firſt inſtitution, did, it muſt be owned, in courſe of time, fearfully degenerate; and thoſe very proviſions made by the State, to enable the *Myſteries* to obtain the end of their eſtabliſhment, became the very means of defeating it. For we can aſſign no ſurer CAUSE of the horrid abuſes and corruptions of the *Myſteries* (beſides time, which naturally and fatally depraves and vitiates all things) than the SEASON in which they were repreſented; and the profound SILENCE in which they were buried. For NIGHT gave opportunity to wicked men to attempt evil actions; and SECRECY, encouragement to perpetrate them; and the inviolable nature of that ſecrecy, which encouraged abuſes, kept them from the Magiſtrate's knowledge ſo long, till it was too late to reform them. In a word, we muſt own, that theſe *Myſ-*

* Οὗ πρῶτον ἡ φύσις ἡμῶν ἐδεήθη. Panegyr.

† μόνοις Ἐλευσινίοις ἠγάπηνεν ἡ Ἑλλάς. Eleuſ.

‡ Τὰ μυσῶν δ' ὅρσι εὐτύχησ' ἰδών. Herc. furens, ver. 613.

§ Ἐποπτεύειν μοι δοκῶ.

teries,

teries, ſo powerful in their firſt inſtitution for the promotion of VIRTUE and KNOWLEDGE *, became, in time, horribly ſubſervient to the gratification of LUST and REVENGE †. Nor will this appear at all ſtrange after what hath been ſaid above. A like corruption, from the ſame cauſe, crept even into the CHURCH, during the pureſt ages of it. The primitive chriſtians, in *imitation*, perhaps, of theſe pagan rites, or from the *ſame kind of ſpirit*, had a cuſtom of celebrating VIGILS in the night; which, at firſt, were performed with all becoming ſanctity: but, in a little time, they were ſo over-run with abuſes, that it was neceſſary to aboliſh them. The account Bellarmine gives of the matter, is this: "Quoniam occaſione noc-"turnarum vigiliarum abuſus quidam irrepere cœperant, vel potius "flagitia non raro committi, placuit eccleſiæ nocturnos conventus "& vigilias proprie dictas intermittere, ac ſolum in iiſdem diebus "celebrare jejunia ‡." And the ſame remedy, Cicero § tells us, Diagondas the Theban was forced to apply to the diſorders of the *Myſteries*.

2. However, this was not the only, though it was the moſt powerful cauſe of the depravation of the *Myſteries*. Another doubtleſs was their being ſometimes under the patronage of thoſe Deities, who were ſuppoſed to inſpire and preſide over ſenſual paſſions, ſuch as Bacchus, Venus, and Cupid; for theſe had all their *Myſteries*: And where was the wonder, if the *Initiated* ſhould be ſometimes inclined to give a looſe to thoſe vices, in which the patron God was ſuppoſed to delight? And in this caſe, the HIDDEN DOCTRINE came too late to put a ſtop to the diſorder. However, it is remark-

* ——Τὰ μυςήρια—ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ καὶ ἐπανορθώσει τῦ βίυ καλεῖσθη πάλα ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν.

† Ἡ γὰρ τεκνοφόνος ΤΕΛΕΤΑΣ, ἢ ΚΡΥΦΙΑ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΑ, ἢ ἐμμανεῖς ἐξ ἄλλων θεσμῶν κώμος ὑγιλες, Οὔτε βίυ ἔτε γάμυς καθαρὰς ἔτι φυλάσσυσιν, ἕτερ⊕ δ' ἕτερον ἢ ΛΟΧΩΝ ΑΝΑΙΡΕΙ, ἢ ΝΟΘΕΥΩΝ ΟΔΥΝΑ. Wiſdom of Solomon, xiv. 23, 24.

‡ De Eccl. Triumph. lib. iii. cap. ult.

§ —Atque omnia nocturna, ne nos duriores forte videamur, in media Græcia Diagondas Thebanus lege perpetua ſuſtulit. De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 15. Edit. Ox. 4to. Tom. III. p. 149.

able,

able, and confirms what hath been ſaid concerning the origin of the *Myſteries*, and of their being invented to perpetuate the doctrine of a future ſtate, that this doctrine continued to be taught even in the moſt debauched celebrations of the Myſteries of Cupid * and Bacchus †. Nay, even that very flagitious part of the myſterious rites when at worſt, *the carrying the* ΚΤΕΙΣ *and* ΦΑΛΛΟΣ *in proceſſion*, was introduced but under pretence of their being *emblems* ‡ of the myſtical regeneration and new life, into which the Initiated had engaged themſelves to enter.

3, The laſt *cauſe* to which one may aſcribe their corruption, was the Hierophant's withdrawing the *Myſteries* from the care and inſpection of the civil Magiſtrate; whoſe original Inſtitution they were: and, therefore, in the purer ages of Greece, the deputies of

* Ἀγαθὸν μέν, ὦ ἑταῖρε, τῆς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τελετῆς μετασχεῖν, ἐγὼ δὲ ὀρῶ τοὺς ΕΡΩΤΟΣ ὀργιαστὰς καὶ μύσαις ἐν ᾅδου βελτίονα μοῖραν ἕξειν. Plutarchus Ἐρωτικῶ.

† Κέλσος—οἶδεν γε ἐπὶ θάμβει τῶν ἰδιωτῶν ταῦθ' ἡμᾶς ποιεῖν, ἀρχὴ δὲ τελετῆ περὶ κολάσεων λέγοντας ἀναγκαίων τοῖς ἡμαρτηκόσι· διότερ ἐοικότως ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἐν ταῖς ΒΑΚΧΙΚΑΙΣ τελεταῖς τὰ φάσματα καὶ δείματα παρεισάγουσι. Orig. contra Celſum, lib. iv. p. 167 Sp.

‡ Καὶ γὰρ αἱ τελεταὶ, καὶ τὰ ὄργια, τὰ τούτων εἶχεν ΑΙΝΙΓΜΑΤΑ. τὴν κλεῖδα μὲν ἡ Ἐλευσὶς, ἡ φαλλαγωγία δὲ τὸν Φαλλόν. Theodoret, Therapeut. lib. i. He the father uſes the word αἰνίσματα ironically, and in deriſion of the Pagans, who pretended, that theſe proceſſions were myſtical, ſymbolical, and enigmatical; otherwiſe he had uſed the word improperly; for the κλεὶς and φαλλὸς could never be the αἰνίγματα of the pollutions committed by them: αἴνισμα ſignifying the obſcene imitation of a thing repreſented by a *different* image.—So Tertullian againſt the Valentinians ſays, "Virile membrum totum "eſſe MYSTERIUM." Jamblichus gives another reaſon for theſe things: διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τε κωμῳδίαις καὶ τραγῳδίαις ἀλλότρια πάθη θεωροῦντες, ἴσμεν τὰ οἰκεῖα πάθη, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀπεσβεσμένα, καὶ ἀποκαθαίρομεν· ἔν τε τοῖς ἱεροῖς, διάφασί τισι καὶ ἀκέσμασι τῶν αἰσχρῶν, ἀπολυόμεθα τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀπ' αὐτῶν συμπιπλώσης βλαβης. De myſteriis, § i. cap. 11. However, in common life, *figuram pudendi virilis ad faſcini omne genus expugnandum multum valere credebant*. A ſuperſtition, which, without doubt, roſe from its *enigmatic* ſtation in the *myſteries*; and to this day keeps its hold amongſt the common people in Italy.—On les portoit comme des préſervatifs contre les charmes, les mauvais regards & les enchantements.—Cette practique ſuperſtitieuſe ne s'en eſt pas moins conſervée juſqu'à preſent dans le bas Peuple du Royaume de Naples. L'on m'a fait voir pluſieurs de ces Priapes, que des gens ont la ſimplicité de porter au bras ou ſur la poitrine. Winkelman ſur les decouvertes d'Herculaneum, p. 41.

the

the States preſided in them: and, ſo long, they were ſafe from notorious abuſes. But in after-times it would happen, that a little prieſt, who had borne an inferior ſhare in theſe rites, would leave his ſociety and country, and ſet up for himſelf; and in a clandeſtine manner, without the allowance or knowledge of the Magiſtrate, inſtitute and celebrate the *Myſteries* in private Conventicles. From rites ſo managed, it is eaſy to believe, many enormities would ariſe. This was the original of thoſe horrid impieties committed in the *Myſteries of Bacchus* at Rome; of which the hiſtorian Livy has given ſo circumſtantial an account: for, in the beginning of his ſtory, he tells us, the miſchief was occaſioned by one of theſe prieſts bringing the *Myſteries* into Etruria, on his own head, uncommiſſioned by his ſuperiors in Greece, from whom he learnt them; and unauthorized by the State, into which he had introduced them. The words of Livy ſhew that the *Myſteries* were, in their own nature, a very different affair; and invented for the improvement of Knowledge and Virtue. "A Greek of mean ex-" traction (ſays he *) a little prieſt and ſoothſayer, came firſt into "Etruria, WITHOUT ANY SKILL OR WISDOM IN MYSTERIOUS "RITES, MANY SORTS OF WHICH, THAT MOST IMPROVED "PEOPLE HAVE BROUGHT IN AMONGST US, FOR THE CULTURE "AND PERFECTION BOTH OF MIND AND BODY †." It is farther obſervable, that this prieſt brought the *Myſteries* pure with him out of Greece, and that they received their corruption in Italy; for, as Hiſpala tells the ſtory to the Conſul, at firſt WOMEN only celebrated the Rites; till Paculla Minia Campana became prieſteſs; who, on a ſudden, as by order of the Gods, made a total altera-

* Græcus ignobilis in Etruriam primum venit, NULLA CUM ARTE EARUM, QUAS MULTAS AD ANIMORUM CORPORUMQUE CULTUM NOBIS ERUDITISSIMA OMNIUM GENS INVEXIT, ſed ſacrificulus & vates. Hiſt. lib xxxix.

† What Livy means by the *culture of the body*, will be ſeen hereafter, when we come to ſpeak of the probationary and toilſome trials undergone by thoſe *aſpirants* to the *Myſteries*, called the SOLDIERS OF MITHRAS.

tion

tion in the Ceremonies, and initiated her SONS; which gave occaſion to all the debaucheries that followed *. The conſequence of this diſcovery was the abolition of the *Rites of Bacchus* throughout Italy, by a decree of the Senate †.

However, it is very true, that in Greece itſelf the *Myſteries* became abominably abuſed ‡: a proof of which we have even in the conduct of their Comic writers, who frequently lay the action of the Drama (ſuch as the rape of a young girl, and the like) at the celebration of a religious *Myſtery*; and from that *Myſtery* denominate the Piece §. So that, in the time of Cicero, the terms *myſteries* and *abominations* were almoſt ſynonymous. The *Academic* having ſaid they had ſecrets and *Myſteries*, Lucullus replies, "Quæ ſunt tandem iſta MYSTERIA? aut cur celatis, quaſi TURPE "aliquid, veſtram ſententiam ||?" However, in ſpite of all occaſions and opportunities, ſome of theſe *Myſteries*, as the ELEUSINIAN particularly, continued for many ages pure and undefiled. The

* Hiſpala's confeſſion will fully inſtruct the reader in the nature and degree of theſe corruptions.—"Tum Hiſpala originem ſacrorum expromit. Primo ſacrarium id fœ-"minarum fuiſſe, nec quemquam virum eo admitti ſolitum.—Paculiam ſacerdotem "omnia, tanquam Deûm monitis, immutâſſe: nam & viros eam primam ſuos filios ini-"tiaſſe: & nocturnum ſacrum ex diurno, & pro tribus in anno diebus quinos ſingulis "menſibus dies initiorum feciſſe. Ex quo in promiſcuo ſacra ſint, & permiſti viri fœ-"minis, & noctis licentia acceſſerit; nihil ibi facinoris, nihil flagitii prætermiſſum; "plura virorum inter ſeſe, quam fœminarum eſſe ſtupra. Si qui minus patientes dede-"coris ſint, & pigriores ad facinus, pro victimis immolari: nihil nefas ducere. Hunc "ſummam inter eos religionem eſſe; viros velut mente capta cum jactatione fanatica "corporis vaticinari—Raptos a Diis homines dici, quos machinæ illigatos ex con-"ſpectu in abditos ſpecus abripiant; eos eſſe, qui aut conjurare, aut ſociari facinoribus, "aut ſtuprum pati noluerint Multitudinem ingentem, alterum jam prope populum eſſe: "in his nobiles quoſdam viros, fœminaſque. Biennio proximo inſtitutum eſſe, ne "quis major viginti annis initiaretur; captari ætatis & erroris & ſtupri patientes."

† See note N, at the end of this Book.

‡ See Clemens Alexandrinus, in his Admonitio ad Gentes.

§ See Fabricius's Notitia comicorum deperditorum, in his firſt volume of the Bibl. Græc. lib. ii. cap. 22.

|| Acad. Quæſt. lib. i.

two capital corruptions of the Myſteries were MAGIC and IMPURITIES. Yet, ſo late as the age of Apollonius Tyan; the *Eleuſinian* kept ſo clear of the firſt imputation, that the hierophant refuſed to initiate that impoſtor, becauſe he was ſuſpected to be a Magician *. And, indeed, their long-continued immunity, both from one and the other corruption, will not appear extraordinary, if we conſider, that, by a law of Solon, the ſenate was always to meet the day after the celebration of theſe Myſteries, to ſee that nothing had been done amiſs during the performance †. So that theſe were the very laſt that ſubmitted to the common fate of all human inſtitutions ‡.

It is true, if uncertain report were to be believed, the *Myſteries* were corrupted very early: for Orpheus himſelf is ſaid to have abuſed them §. But this was a figment which the debauched *Myſtæ* of later times invented to varniſh over their enormities; as the deteſtable Pæderaſts of after-ages ſcandalized the blameleſs Socrates. Beſides, the ſtory is ſo ill laid, that it is detected by the ſureſt records of Antiquity: for, in conſequence of the crime which they fabled Orpheus committed in the *Myſteries*, they pretended, that he was torn in pieces by the women: whereas it appeared from the inſcription on his monument at Dium in Macedonia, that he was ſtruck dead with lightning, the envied death of the reputed favourites of the Gods ||.

And here the chriſtian FATHERS will hardly eſcape the cenſure of thoſe who will not allow high provocation to be an excuſe for an unfair repreſentation of an adverſary. I ſay, they will hardly

* Ὁ δὲ Ἱεροφάνλης ὰκ ἐβέλελο παρέχειν τὰ ἱερὰ, μὴ γὰρ ἂν ποῖε μυήσαι γόηλα, μὴ δὲ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα ἀνοίξαι ἀιθρώπῳ μὴ καθαρῷ τὰ δαιμόνια. Philoſt. lib. iv. cap. 18.

† ἡ γὰρ βελὴ ἐκεῖ καθεδεῖσθαι ἔμελλε, κατὰ τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον, ὃς κελεύει, τῇ ὑςεραίᾳ, τῶν μυςηρίων ἔδραν ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ. Andoc. Orat.

‡ See note O, at the end of this Book.

§ See Diog. Laert. Proœmium, Segm. 5.

‖ Idem, ibid.

eſcape

eſcape cenſure, for accuſtoming themſelves to ſpeak of the *Myſteries* as groſs impieties and immoralities in their very original *. Clemens Alexandrinus, in a heat of zeal, breaks out, "Let him "be accurſed, who firſt infected the world with theſe impoſtures, "whether it was Dardanus—or—*&c.* Theſe I make no ſcruple to "call wicked authors of impious fables; the fathers of an exe- "crable ſuperſtition, who, by this Inſtitution, ſowed in human "life the ſeeds of vice and corruption†." But the wiſeſt and beſt of the pagan world invariably hold, that the *Myſteries* were inſtituted pure; and propoſed the nobleſt end, by the worthieſt means. And even though the expreſs teſtimony of theſe writers, ſupported by the reaſon of the thing, ſhould be deemed inſufficient, yet the character and quality of their Inſtitutor muſt put the matter out of all doubt. This Inſtitutor, as will be ſeen preſently, was no other than the Lawgiver, or CIVIL MAGISTRATE himſelf. Wherever the *Myſteries* found public admittance, it was by his introduction; and as oft as ever they were celebrated, it was under his inſpection. Now virtue is as eſſential to the preſervation, and vice to the deſtruction of that Society, over which he preſides, as obedience and diſobedience are to his office and authority. So that to conceive him diſpoſed to bring in, and to encourage, immoral practices under the maſk of Religion, is the ſame thing as to ſuſpect the Phyſician of mixing Poiſons with his antidotes.

The truth of the matter was this: the *Fathers* bore a ſecret grudge to the *Myſteries* for their injurious treatment of Chriſtianity on its firſt appearance in the world. We are to obſerve, that ATHEISM, by which was meant a contempt of the Gods, was reckoned, in the *Myſteries*, amongſt the greateſt crimes. So, in the ſixth book of the *Æneis* (of which more hereafter) the hotteſt

* See note P, at the end of this book.

† Ὀλλοῖο ἓν ὁ τῆσδε ἀρξας ἀπάτης ἀνδράποις· εἴτε ὁ Δάρδανος—εἴτε —τούτους ἐγώγ' ἂν ἀρχικακὸς φήσαιμι μύθων ἀθέων, καὶ δεισιδαιμονίας ὀλεθρίου πολέμας, σπέρμα κακίας καὶ φθορᾶς ἐγκαλλωπισάμενος τῷ βίῳ τὰ μυστήρια. Admonitio ad Gentes, pag. 8. A. B. Edit. Sylburg.

ſeats in Tartarus are allotted to the Atheiſt, ſuch as Salmoneus, Tityus, and the Titans, &c. Now the Chriſtians, for their contempt of the national Gods, were, on their firſt appearance, deemed Atheiſts by the people; and ſo branded by the Myſtagogue, as we find in Lucian *, and expoſed amongſt the reſt in Tartarus, in their ſolemn ſhews and repreſentations. This may be gathered from a remarkable paſſage in Origen, where Celſus thus addreſſes his adverſary: "But now, as you, good man, believe eternal puniſh-" ments, even ſo do the interpreters of theſe holy *Myſteries*, the " Hierophants and Initiators; you threaten others with theſe pu-" niſhments: THESE, on the contrary, THREATEN YOU †." This explains a paſſage in Jerom's catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers; and will be explained by it. The Father, ſpeaking of Quadratus, ſays; "Cumque Hadrianus Athenis exegiſſet hiemem inviſens Eleuſinem, " & omnibus pene Græciæ ſacris initiatus, dediſſet occaſionem iis, " qui Chriſtianos oderunt, abſque præcepto Imperatoris vexare cre-" dentes, porrexit ei librum pro religione noſtra." Now what *occaſion* was afforded at this juncture to the enemies of Chriſtianity, but only this, That, the Grecian *Myſteries* repreſenting the Faithful in an odious light, the Emperor (who but juſt then had been initiated into almoſt all of them) might be reaſonably thought eſtranged and indiſpoſed towards Chriſtianity; and ſo the eaſier drawn to countenance, or connive at, any injuſtice done unto it?

This, without doubt, was what ſharpened the Fathers againſt the *Myſteries*; and they were not over tender in loading what they did not approve. On this account they gave eaſy credit to what had been told to them of the abominations in the *Myſteries*; and the rather, perhaps, on account of the *ſecrecy* with which they

* Καὶ ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ [τῆς τελείης ἡμέρᾳ] πρόῤῥησις ἦν, ὥσπερ Ἀθήνησι, τοιαύτη· εἴ τις ἄθεος, ἢ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ, ἢ Επικούρειος, ἥκει καλάσκοπος· τῶν ὀργίων φευγέτω—Pſeudomantis, T. II. pag. 244. Edit. Reitzii, 4to. Amſtel. 1743.

† Μάλιστα μὲν, ὦ βέλτιστε, ὥσπερ σὺ κολάσεις αἰωνίους νομίζεις· οὕτω καὶ οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκείνων ἐξηγηταὶ τελεταί τε καὶ μυσταγωγοί· ἃς σὺ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπειλεῖς, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ σοί. lib. viii.

were

were celebrated. The ſame *Secrecy* in the Chriſtian Rites, and the ſame language introduced by the Fathers in ſpeaking of them, as we ſee below, procured as eaſy credit to thoſe calumnies of murder and inceſt charged upon them by the Pagans. Nay, what is ſtill more remarkable, thoſe ſpecific enormities, in which their own *Myſteries* were known to offend, they objected to the Chriſtians. "Alii eos [Chriſtianos] ferunt ipſius Antiſtitis ac Sacerdotis colere "genitalia *."" But here comes in the ſtrange part of the ſtory; that, after this, they ſhould ſo ſtudiouſly and formally tranſfer the terms, phraſes, rites, ceremonies, and diſcipline of theſe *odious Myſteries* into our holy Religion; and, thereby, very early vitiate and deprave, what a pagan writer † could ſee, and acknowledge, to be ABSOLUTA & SIMPLEX, as it came out of the hands of its Author. Sure then it was ſome more than ordinary veneration the People had for theſe *Myſteries*, that could incline the Fathers of the Church to ſo fatal a counſel: however, the thing is notorious ‡, and the effects have been ſeverely felt.

We have all along ſuppoſed the *Myſteries* an invention of the Lawgiver: and, indeed, we had nothing to do with them, but in that view. Now though, from what hath been ſaid, the intelligent reader will collect, we have not ſuppoſed amiſs, yet ſince the pertinency of the whole diſcourſe, as here applied, depends upon it, he may perhaps expect us to be a little more particular.

That the *Myſteries* were invented, eſtabliſhed, and ſupported by LAWGIVERS, may be ſeen,

1. From the place of their original; which was EGYPT. This, Herodotus, Diodorus, and Plutarch, who collect from ancient teſtimonies, expreſly affirm; and in this all Antiquity concurs: the *Eleuſinian* Myſteries, particularly, retaining the very *Egyptian* Gods, in whoſe honour they were celebrated; Ceres and Triptolemus

* Cæcil. apud Minut. in Octav.

† Amm. Marcellinus, lib. xxi. cap. 16. Hiſt.

‡ See note Q, at the end of this Book.

being

being only two other names for Iſis * and Oſiris: as we have ſeen above from Theodoret: and ſo Tibullus,—

Primus aratra manu ſollerti fecit Osiris,
Et teneram ferro ſollicitavit humum †.

Hence it is, that the UNIVERSAL NATURE, or the *firſt Cauſe*, the object of all the *Myſteries*, yet diſguiſed under diverſe NAMES, ſpeaking of herſelf in Apuleius, concludes the enumeration of her various myſtic rites, in theſe words,—"Priſcaque doctrina pollentes "ÆGYPTII, CEREMONIIS me prorſus PROPRIIS ‡ percolentes, "appellant VERO NOMINE reginam ISIDEM §."

But the ſimilitude between the Rites practiſed, and the Doctrines taught in the Grecian and Egyptian *Myſteries*, would be alone ſufficient to point up to their original: ſuch as the *ſecrecy* required of the Initiated; which, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, peculiarly characterized the Egyptian teaching; ſuch as the doctrines taught of a *metempſychoſis*, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, which the Greek writers agree to have been firſt ſet abroach by the Egyptians ||; ſuch as *abſtinence* enjoined from domeſtic fowl, fiſh, and beans **, the peculiar ſuperſtition of the Egyptians; ſuch as the Ritual compoſed in *hieroglyphics*, an invention of the Egyptians ††. But

* Ἶσις δέ ἐστι καλὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν Δημήτης. Herodot. lib. ii. cap. 59. And again cap. 156. Δημήτης δὲ Ἶσις.

† See note R, at the end of this Book.

‡ See note S, at the end of this Book.

§ Metam. lib. xi.

|| Timæus the Locrian, in his book Of the ſoul of the world, ſpeaking of the neceſſity of inculcating the doctrine of future puniſhments, calls them TIMΩPIAI ΞENAI, FOREIGN TORMENTS: by which name both Latin and Greek writers generally mean, *Egyptian*, where the ſubject is Religion.

** See Porphyrius De Abſtin.

†† Senex comiſſimus ducit me protinus ad ipſas fores ædis ampliſſimæ, rituque ſolenni aſperſionis celebrato myſterio, ac matutino peracto ſacrificio, de opertis adyti profert quoſdam libros, literis ignorabilibus prænotatos; partim FIGURIS CUJUSCEMODI ANIMALIUM,

But it would be endleſs to reckon up all the particulars in which the Egyptian and Grecian Myſteries agreed: it ſhall ſuffice to ſay, that they were in all things the ſame *.

Again; nothing but the ſuppoſition of this common original to all the Grecian *Myſteries* can clear up and reconcile the diſputes which aroſe amongſt the Grecian States and Cities, concerning the original of theſe rites; every one claiming to be the Prototype to the reſt. Thus Thrace pretended that they came firſt from thence; Crete conteſted the honour with thoſe barbarians; and Athens claimed it from both. And at that time, when they had forgotten the true original, it was impoſſible to ſettle and adjuſt their differences: for each could prove that he did not borrow from others; and, at the ſame time, ſeeing a ſimilitude in the Rites †, would conclude that they had borrowed from him. But the owning EGYPT for their common Parent, clears up all difficulties: by accounting for that general likeneſs which gave birth to every one's pretenſions.

Now, in Egypt, all religious Worſhip being planned and eſtabliſhed by Statesmen, and directed to the ends of civil policy, we muſt conclude, that the *Myſteries* were originally invented by LEGISLATORS.

2. The Sages who brought them out of Egypt, and propagated them in Aſia, in Greece, and Britain, were all Kings or Lawgivers; ſuch as Zoroaſter, Inachus, Orpheus ‡, Melampus, Trophonius, Minos, Cinyras, Erectheus, and the Druids.

ANIMALIUM, CONCEPTI SERMONIS COMPENDIOSA VERBA SUGGERENTIA, partim nodoſis, & in modum rotæ tortuoſis, capreolatimque condenſis apicibus. Apul. Metam. lib. xi.

* Ἱρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ τελεταὶ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ταύτης τῆς θεᾶς [Δήμητρος] τότε καταδείχθηναι ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, τά τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς ἀρχαιότητας ἴσως ἀνωτάτω ἔχειν Ἀθηναίους καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. Diod. Sic. lib. i. † —— Καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τρόπον τινὰ κοινοποιοῦσι· τινὰ τά τε, καὶ τῶν Σαμοθρᾳκίων, καὶ τὰ ἐν Λήμνῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πολλά· διὰ τὸ τὰς προσπόλους λέγεσθαι τὰς αὐτάς. Strabo, lib. x. p. 466. D. Edit. Pariſ. 1620. fol.

‡ Of whom Ariſtophanes ſays, Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετὰς ἡμῖν καταδείξε, φόνων τ' ἀπέχεσθαι· "Orpheus taught us the Myſteries, and to abſtain from murder," i. e. from a life of rapine and violence, ſuch as men lived in the *ſtate of nature*.

3. They

3. They were under the ſuperintendence of the State. A Magiſtrate intitled ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, or King, preſided in the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*. Lyſias informs us, that this King was to offer up the public prayers, according to their country Rites; and to ſee that nothing impious or immoral crept into the celebration *. This title given to the Preſident of the *Myſteries*, was, doubtleſs, in memory of the firſt Founder: to whom were joined four officers, choſen by the people, called ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΤΑΙ or Curators †; the prieſts were only under-officers to theſe, and had no ſhare in the direction: for this being the Legiſlator's favourite inſtitution, he took all poſſible care for its ſupport; which could not be done more effectually, than by his watching over it himſelf. On the other hand, his interfering too openly in religious matters would have defeated his end; and the people would ſoon have come to regard this high ſolemnity as a mere engine of State; on which account he carefully kept behind the curtain. For though it be now apparent that the *Myſteries* were the invention of the Civil Magiſtrate, yet even ſome Ancients, who have mentioned the *Myſteries*, ſeemed not to be apprized of it; and their ignorance hath occaſioned great embroilment in all they ſay on this ſubject. The reader may ſee by the ſecond chapter of Meurſius's *Eleuſinia*, how much the Ancients were at a loſs for the true founder of thoſe *Myſteries*; ſome giving the inſtitution to Ceres; ſome to Triptolemus; others to Eumolpus; others to Muſæus; and ſome again to Erectheus. How then ſhall we diſengage ourſelves from this labyrinth, into which Meurſius hath led us, and in which, his guard of Ancients keep us incloſed? This clue will eaſily conduct us through it. It appears, from what has been ſaid, that Erectheus, KING of Athens, eſtabliſhed the *Myſteries* ‡; but that the people unluckily confounded

* —Καὶ εὔχας εὔξεσθαι καλὰ τὰ πάτρια —ὅπως ἂν μηδεὶς, ἀδικῇ, μηδὲ ἀσεβῇ περὶ τὰ ἱερά— in Andoc.

† See Meurſius's Eleuſinia, cap. xv.

‡ And ſo ſays Diodorus Siculus, lib. i. Bibl.

the

the Inſtitutor, with the PRIESTS, Eumolpus and Muſæus, who firſt officiated in the rites; and with Ceres and Triptolemus, the DEITIES, in whoſe honour they were celebrated. And theſe miſtakes were natural enough *: the poets would be apt, in the licence of their figurative ſtyle, to call the Gods, in whoſe name the *Myſteries* were performed, the Founders of thoſe *Myſteries*; and the people, ſeeing only the miniſtry of the officiated prieſts (the Legiſlator keeping out of ſight) in good earneſt believed thoſe Myſtagogues to be the founders. And yet, if it were reaſonable to expect from Poets or People, attention to their own fancies and opinions, one would think they might have diſtinguiſhed better, by the help of that mark, which Erectheus left behind him, to aſcertain his title; namely, the erection of the officer called βασιλεὺς, or *King*.

4. But this original is ſtill further ſeen from the qualities required in the aſpirants to the *Myſteries*. According to their original inſtitution, neither *ſlaves* nor *foreigners* were to be admitted into them †. Now if the *Myſteries* were inſtituted, primarily for the ſake of teaching religious truths, there can be no reaſon given why every man, with the proper moral qualifications, ſhould not be admitted: but ſuppoſing them inſtituted by the State for civil purpoſes, a very good one may be aſſigned; for *ſlaves* and *foreigners* have there, neither property nor country. When afterwards the Greeks, by frequent confederations againſt the Perſian, the common enemy of their liberties, began to conſider themſelves as one people

* They were committed where no Myſtery was affected, in what concerned the open worſhip of their Gods. Tacitus, ſpeaking of the Temple of the Paphian Venus, ſays, "Conditorem Templi Regem Aërian vetus memoria, quidam ipſius Deæ nomen id perhibent." Hiſt. lib. ii.

† — ἦλθε [Ἡρακλῆς] πρὸς Εὔμολπον εἰς Ἐλευσῖνα, βουλόμενος μυηθῆναι· ἦν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ΞΕΝΟΙΣ τότε μυεῖσθαι—Schol. Hom. Il. Θ. It was the ſame in the Cabiric Myſteries, as we learn from Diodorus Siculus, lib. v. who ſpeaks of the like innovation made there.—δοκεῖ δὲ οὗτος πρῶτος ΞΕΝΟΥΣ μυῆσαι. As to ſlaves, hear Ariſtophanes in his Θεσμοφόριαζ.

——— σὺ δ' ἄπιθι· ὦ Θρᾷττ' ἐκποδών
ΔΟΥΛΟΙΣ γὰρ οὐκ ἔξεστ' ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων.

and Community, the *Myſteries* were extended to all who ſpoke the Greek language. Yet the Ancients, not reflecting on the original and end of their inſtitution, were much perplexed for the reaſons of an excluſion ſo apparently capricious. Lucian tells us, in *The life of* his friend *Demonax*, that this great philoſopher had the courage, one day, to aſk the Athenians, why they excluded barbarians from their *Myſteries*, when Eumolpus, a barbarous Thracian, had eſtabliſhed them *. But he does not tell us their anſwer. One of the moſt judicious of our modern critics was as much at a loſs; and therefore thinks the reſtraint ridiculous, as implying, that the Inſtitutors ſuppoſed that ſpeaking the Greek tongue contributed to the advancement of piety †.

5. Another proof of this original may be deduced from what was taught promiſcuouſly to all the Initiated; which was, *the neceſſity of a virtuous and holy life, to obtain a happy immortality.* Now this, we know, could not come from the ſacerdotal warehouſe: the prieſts could afford a better penny-worth of their Elyſium, at the eaſy expence of oblations and ſacrifices: for, as our great Philoſopher well obſerves (who, however, was not aware of this extraordinary inſtitution for the ſupport of virtue, and therefore concludes too generally) "The Prieſts made it not their buſineſs to teach the "people virtue: if they were diligent in their obſervations and cere-"monies, punctual in their feaſts and ſolemnities, and the tricks "of religion, the holy tribe aſſured them that the Gods were

* Ἐτόλμησε δέ ποτε καὶ Ἀθηναίους ἐρωτῆσαι δημοσίᾳ, τῆς προρρήσεως ἀκούσας, διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν ἀποκλείουσι τοὺς βαρβάρους· καὶ ταῦτα τοῦ τὴν τελετὴν αὐτοῖς καταστησαμένου Εὐμόλπου, βαρβάρου καὶ Θρᾳκὸς ὄντος. But the fact, that they were not a *grecian* but a *foreign*, that is, barbarous invention, is proved by their very name, μυσήρια, from the eaſtern dialect, *miſtor*, or *miſtur*, res aut locus abſconditus.

† Auctor eſt Libanius in Corinthiorum actione, myſtagogos ſumma diligentia initiandos ante omnia monuiſſe, ut manus puras animumque ſibi ſervarent purum: καὶ τὴν φωνὴν Ἕλληνας εἶναι; *& ut in voce* ſive *ſermone Græcos ſe præſtarent:* hoc quidem profecto ridiculum, quaſi faceret ad veram pietatem, Græca potius quam alia lingua loqui. Iſ. Caſauboni Exercit. xvi. ad Annales Eccl. Baron.

"pleaſed,

" pleaſed, and they looked no further: few went to the ſchools of " Philoſophers, to be inſtructed in their duty, and to know what " was good and evil in their actions: the Prieſts ſold the better penny- " worths, and therefore had all the cuſtom: for luſtrations and ſacri- " fices were much eaſier than a clean conſcience and a ſteddy courſe " of virtue; and an expiatory ſacrifice, that atoned for the want of " it, much more convenient than a ſtrict and holy life *." Now we may be aſſured, that an Inſtitution, which taught the neceſſity of a ſtrict and holy life, could not but be the invention of Law-givers, to whoſe ſchemes moral virtue was ſo neceſſary.

6. Another ſtrong preſumption of this original is the great uſe of the *Myſteries* to the State: ſo amply confeſſed by the wiſeſt writers of antiquity, and ſo clearly ſeen from the nature of the thing itſelf.

7. But, laſtly, we have the teſtimony of the knowing Plutarch for this original; who, in his treatiſe *Of Iſis and Oſiris*, expreſly tells us, that it was " a moſt ancient opinion, delivered down, " from LEGISLATORS and Divines, to Poets and Philoſophers, the " author of it entirely unknown, but the belief of it indelibly eſta- " bliſhed, not only in tradition, and the talk of the vulgar, but in " the MYSTERIES and in the ſacred offices of religion, both amongſt " Greeks and Barbarians, ſpread all over the face of the globe, " That the Univerſe was not upheld fortuitouſly, without Mind, " Reaſon, or a Governor to preſide over its revolutions †."

It is now ſubmitted to the candid reader, Whether it be not fairly proved, that the MYSTERIES *were invented by the* LEGISLATOR, *to affirm and eſtabliſh the general doctrine of a Providence, by*

* Locke's Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity.

† Διὸ καὶ παμπάλαιόν αἴτημα κάτισιν ἐκ θεολόγων καὶ ΝΟΜΟΘΕΤΩΝ εἰς τε ποιητὰς καὶ φιλοσόφους δόξα, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀδέσποτον ἔχουσα, τὴν δὲ πίστιν ἰσχυρὰν καὶ δυσεξάλειπτον, οὐκ ἐν λόγοις μόνον, οὐδὲ ἐν φήμαις, ἀλλὰ ἔν τε ΤΕΛΕΤΑΙΣ, ἔν τε θυσίαις, καὶ βαρβάροις καὶ Ἕλλησι πολλαχῆ περιφερομένην, ὡς ὅτ' ἄνων καὶ κόσμον καὶ ἀκυβέρνητον αἱρεῖται τῷ αὐτομάτῳ τὸ πᾶν.—— Edit. Francof. fol. T. II. p. 369. B.

incul ating the belief of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. Indeed, if we may believe a certain Ancient, who appears to have been well verſed in theſe matters, they gained their end, by clearing up all doubts concerning the righteous government of the Gods *.

We have ſeen in general, how fond and tenacious ancient Paganiſm was of this extraordinary Rite, as of an Inſtitution ſupremely uſeful both to SOCIETY and RELIGION. But this will be ſeen more fully in what I now proceed to lay before the Public; an examination of two celebrated pieces of Antiquity, the famous SIHTH BOOK OF VIRGIL'S ÆNEIS, and the METAMORPHOSIS OF APULEIUS: The firſt of which will ſhew us of what uſe the *Myſteries* were eſteemed to SOCIETY; and the ſecond, of what ſupport to RELIGION.

An inquiry into Æneas's adventure to the Shades, will have this farther advantage, the inſtructing us in the *ſhews and repreſentations of the* MYSTERIES; a part of their hiſtory, which the form of this diſcourſe hath not yet afforded us an opportunity of giving. So that nothing will be now wanting to a perfect knowledge of this moſt extraordinary and important Inſtitution.

For, the deſcent of Virgil's Hero into the infernal regions, I preſume, was no other than a figurative deſcription of an INITIATION; and particularly, a very exact picture of the SPECTACLES in the ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES; where every thing was done in ſhew and machinery; and where a repreſentation † of the hiſtory of Ceres afforded opportunity of bringing in the ſcenes of heaven, hell, elyſium, purgatory, and whatever related to the future ſtate of men and heroes.

* Ὁ δὲ τοῖς μυστικοῖς ἐγκαρδιεῦσαι παραγγέλμασιν ὑπομείνας, καὶ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς αἰτὰς εὐσεβὴς καθὸ δεισιδαίμων γενόμενος· περὶ ἀδενὸς ἔτι τὴν περὶ τὲς θεὲς ἔχει θρησκείαν ἀμφίβολον. Sopater in Diviſ. Quæſt.

† —ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Πλεθιεὺς τὴν Κόρην ἥρπασε· καὶ ἡ Δήμητρα ἀλωμένη κατὰ τὰς ἐρήμες τὸ τέκνον ἐζήτει. καὶ τᾶτον τὸν μύθον εἰς ὕψος ἤγαγε τὸ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τῦρ. Juſt. Mart. Orat. ad Græc. prope init. Δηὼ δὲ καὶ Κόρη δρᾶμα ἤδη ἐγενέσθην μυστικόν· καὶ τὴν πλάνην, καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν, καὶ τὸ πένθος αὐταῖν Ἐλευσὶς δαδεχεῖ. Clemens Alex. in Protreptico, p. 7. E. Edit. Sylburgh.

But

But to ſoften this paradox all we can, it may be proper to enquire into the nature of the *Æneis*.

Homer's two poems had each a plain and entire ſtory, to convey as plain and ſimple a moral: and in this, he is juſtly eſteemed excellent. The Roman poet could make no improvements here: the Greek was complete and perfect; ſo that the patrons of Virgil, even Scaliger himſelf, are forced to ſeek for his ſuperior advantages in his epiſodes, deſcriptions, ſimilies, and in the chaſtity and correctneſs of his thoughts and diction. In the mean time they have all overlooked the principal advantage he had over his great Exemplar.

Virgil found the epic poem in the firſt rank of human compoſitions; but this was too narrow a circuit for his enlarged ambition: he was not content that its ſubject ſhould be to inſtruct the world in MORALS; much leſs did he think of PHYSICS, though he was fond of natural enquiries, and Homer's Allegorizers had opened a back-door to let in the Philoſopher with the Poet; but he aſpired to make it a SYSTEM OF POLITICS. On this plan he wrote the *Æneis*; which is, indeed, as compleat an inſtitute in verſe, by EXAMPLE, as the *Republics* of Plato and Tully were in proſe by PRECEPT. Thus he enlarged the bounds, and added a new province to epic poeſy. But though every one ſaw that AUGUSTUS was ſhadowed in the perſon of ÆNEAS, yet it being ſuppoſed that thoſe political inſtructions, which the poet deſigned for the ſervice of mankind, were ſolely for the uſe of his Maſter, they miſſed of the true nature of the poem. And in this ignorance, the ſucceeding epic writers, following a work whoſe genius they did not underſtand, wrote worſe than if they had only taken Homer, and his ſimpler plan, for their direction. A great modern Poet, and beſt judge of their merit, aſſures us of this fact; and what has been ſaid will help us to explain the reaſon of it: "The other epic poets "(ſays this admirable writer) have uſed the ſame practice [that of "Virgil, of running two fables into one] but generally carry it "ſo

" ſo far, as to ſuperinduce a multiplicity of fables, deſtroy the unity " of action, and loſe their readers in an unreaſonable length of " time *."

Such was the revolution Virgil brought about in this nobleſt region of poeſy; an improvement ſo great, that the trueſt poet had need of all the aſſiſtance the ſublimeſt genius could lend him: nothing leſs than the joint aid of the Iliad and Odyſſes being able to furniſh out the execution of his great idea: for a *ſyſtem of Politics* delivered in the example of a great Prince, muſt ſhew him in every public adventure of life. Hence Æneas was, of neceſſity, to be found voyaging, with Ulyſſes, and fighting, with Achilles.

But if the improved nature of his ſubject compelled him to depart from that ſimplicity in the fable, which Ariſtotle, and his beſt interpreter, Boſſu, find ſo divine in Homer †; he gained conſiderable advantages by it in other circumſtances of the compoſition: for now, thoſe ornaments and decorations, for whoſe inſertion the critics could give no other reaſon than to raiſe the *dignity* of the Poem, become *eſſential* to the Subject. Thus the choice of Princes and Heroes for his perſonages, which were, before, only uſed to grace the ſcene, now conſtitute the nature of the action ‡: and the machinery of the Gods, and their intervention on every occaſion, which was to create the MARVELLOUS, becomes, in this improvement, an indiſpenſable part of the poem. A *divine interpoſi-*

* Preface to the Iliad of Homer.

† Nous trouverons point, dans la fable de l'Eneide, cette ſimplicité qu'Ariſtote a trouvée ſi divine dans Homére. Traité du poeme epique, lib. i. cap. xi.

‡ —" Le retour (ſays Boſſu) d'un homme en ſa maiſon, & la querelle de deux au- " tres, n'ayant rien de grand en ſoi, deviennent des actions illuſtres & importantes, " lorſque dans le choix des noms, le poete dit que c'eſt l'Ulyſſe qui retourne en Itha- " que, & que c'eſt Achille & Agamemnon qui querellent."—He goes on, " Mais il y " a des actions qui d'elles mêmes ſont très importantes, comme *l'eſtabliſſement, ou la ruine* " *d'un etat, ou d'une religion.* Telle eſt donc l'action de l'Eneide." lib. ii. cap. 19. He ſaw here a remarkable difference in the ſubjects; it is ſtrange this ſhould not have led him to ſee that the *Æneis* is of a different ſpecies.

tion

tion is in the very ſpirit of ancient legiſlation; where, we ſee, the principal care of the Lawgiver was to poſſeſs the people with the full belief of an over-ruling Providence. This is the true reaſon of ſo much machinery in the Æneis: for which, modern critics impeach the author's judgment, who, in a poem written in the refined and enlightened age of Rome *, followed the *marvellous* of Homer ſo cloſely. An excellent writer, ſpeaking of Virgil in this view, ſays, "If there be any inſtance in the Æneid liable to exception upon "this account, it is in the beginning of the third book, where "Æneas is repreſented as tearing up the myrtle that dropped blood. "This circumſtance ſeems to have the *marvellous* without the pro- "bable, becauſe it is repreſented as proceeding from natural cauſes "without the interpoſition of any God, or rather, ſupernatural "power capable of producing it †." But ſurely this inſtance was ill choſen. The poet makes Æneas ſay, on this occaſion,

Nymphas venerabar agreſtes,
Gradivumque patrem, Geticis qui præſidet arvis,
Rite ſecundarent viſus OMENque levarent ‡.

Now *omens* were of two kinds §, the natural and ſupernatural. This in queſtion, was of the latter ſort, produced by the intervention of the Gods, as appears by his calling this adventure, MONSTRA DEUM: it was of the nature of thoſe *portentous ſhowers of blood* ſo frequently occurring in the Roman hiſtory. And the poet was certainly within the bounds of the probable, while he told no more than what their graveſt writers did not ſcruple to record in their annals.

But this was not done merely to raiſe admiration. He is here (as we obſerve) in his legiſlative character; and writes to poſſeſs the

* Ce qui eſt beau dans Homére pourroit avoir été mal reçû dans les ouvrages d'un poete du tems d'Auguſte. Idem, lib. iii. cap. 8. *De l'admirable.*

† Mr. Addiſon's Works, vol. iii. p. 316. quarto edit. 1721.

‡ Lib. iii.

§ See note T, at the end of this book.

people

people of the interpoſition of the Gods, in OMENS and PRODIGIES. This was the method of the old Lawgivers. So Plutarch, as quoted above, tells us, "that with divinations and OMENS, Lycurgus ſanc-"tified the Lacedemonians, Numa the Romans, Ion the Athenians, "and Deucalion all the Greeks in general; and by hopes and fears "kept up in them the awe and reverence of Religion." The ſcene of this adventure is laid, with the utmoſt propriety, on the uncivilized inhoſpitable ſhores of Thrace, to inſpire horror for *barbarous manners*, and an appetite for ſocial life. On this account it is that our poet here deſerts the Mythologiſts, and makes the age of CIVIL POLICY, (the time when men were firſt brought out of a ſtate of nature) *the golden age*, and SATURN to govern in it. Thus Evander ſays,

Hæc nemora indigenæ fauni nymphæque tenebant——
Queis neque mos, neque cultus erat; neque jungere tauros,
Aut componere opes norant, aut parcere parto:
Sed rami atque aſper victu venatus alebat.
Primus ab ætherio venit SATURNUS Olympo—
Is genus indocile, ac diſperſum montibus altis,
COMPOSUIT, LEGESQUE DEDIT *.

Whereas Ovid, who ſpeaks the ſenſe of the Mythologiſts, makes the *golden age* to be *the ſtate of nature*, and SATURN to govern there, before the erection of *civil policy*.

Aurea prima ſata eſt ætas, quæ, vindice nullo,
Sponte ſua, SINE LEGE fidem rectumque colebat.
Pœna metuſque aberant: NEC VERBA MINACIA FIXO
Ære legebantur: nec ſupplex turba timebant
JUDICIS ora ſui.——
Ipſa quoque immunis raſtroque intacta, nec ullis
Saucia vomeribus, per ſe dabat omnia tellus:
Contentique cibis nullo cogente creatis,
Arbuteos fœtus, montanaque fragra legebant,

* Lib. viij.

Cornaque

Cornaque & in duris hærentia mora rubetis,
Et quæ deciderant patula Jovis arbore glandes.
Ver erat æternum——
Poſtquam SATURNO tenebroſa in Tartara miſſo—
Tum primum lubiere domos——
Semina tum primum longis Cerealia ſulcis
Obruta ſunt, preſſique jugo gemuere juvenci *.

For it ſerved the grave purpoſe of the philoſophic Poet to decry the ſtate of nature; and it ſuited the fanciful paintings of the mythologic Poet to recommend it.

But every thing in this poem points to great and public ends. The turning *the ſhips into ſea-deities*, in the ninth book, has the appearance of ſomething infinitely more extravagant, than the *myrtle dropping blood*, and has been more generally and ſeverely cenſured; and indeed, if defended, it muſt be on other principles. The philoſophic commentators of Homer's poem, had brought the fantaſtic refinement of Allegory into great vogue. We may eſtimate the capacity of Virgil's judgment in not catching at ſo alluring a bait, by obſerving that ſome of the greateſt of the modern epic poets, who approached neareſt to Virgil in genius, have been betrayed by it. Yet here and there, our poet, to convey a political precept, has employed an ingenious allegory in paſſing. And the adventure in queſtion is, I think, of this number. By the transformation of the ſhips into ſea-deities, he would inſinuate, I ſuppoſe, the great advantages of cultivating a naval power; ſuch as extended commerce, and the dominion of the Ocean; which, in poetical language, is becoming *deities of the ſea.*

Mortalem eripiam formam, magnique jubebo
Æquoris eſſe Deas——

He explains the allegory more clearly in the following book, where he makes theſe transformed ſea-nymphs accompany Æneas, and his fleet of auxiliaries, through the Tyrrhene ſea.

* Metam. lib. i.

Atque illi medio in ſpatio chorus, ecce, ſuarum
Occurrit comitum: nymphæ, quas alma Cybele
Numen habere maris, nymphaſque e navibus eſſe
Juſſerat——
Agnoſcunt longe regem luſtrantque choreïs.

This Miniſterial hint was the more important and ſeaſonable, as all Octavius's traverſes, in his way to Empire, were from his want of a ſufficient naval Power; firſt in his War with Brutus and Caſſius, and afterwards with Sextus, the ſon of Pompey the Great. Nor was it, at this time, leſs flattering to Auguſtus; to whom the Alexandrians erected a magnificent Temple, Porticoes, and ſacred Groves, where he was worſhiped under the title of CÆSAR THE PROTECTOR AND PATRON OF SAILORS. So he became a *Sea-God* and at the head of theſe *Goddeſſes*. For as one of his Flatterers ſaid,

"Præſenti tibi MATUROS largimur honores:
"Jurandaſque TUUM PER NOMEN ponimus aras."

As the not taking the true ſcope of the *Æneis*, hath occaſioned miſtakes, to Virgil's diſadvantage, concerning the *plan and conduct* of the poem; ſo hath it likewiſe, concerning the *Characters*. The PIETY of Æneas, and his high veneration for the Gods, ſo much offends a celebrated French writer *, that he ſays, *the hero was fitter to found a religion* † *than a monarchy*. He did not know, that the image of a perfect Lawgiver is held out to us in Æneas: and had he known that, he had perhaps been ignorant, that it was the office of ſuch a one to found *religions* and colleges of prieſts ‡,

* Monſieur de St. Evremond.

† i. e. a community of monks.

‡ Ἔνθα Προμηθεὺς,
Ἰαπετιονίδης ἀγαθὸν τέκε Δευκαλέωνα,
Ὃς πρῶτος ΠΟΙΗΣΕ ΠΟΛΕΙΣ καὶ ΕΔΕΙΜΑΤΟ ΝΗΟΥΣ
ΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΙΣ, πρῶτος δὲ καὶ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕΝ.

as well as ſtates and corporations. And Virgil tells us this was the office of his hero,

Dum conderet URBEM,
Inferretque DEOS Latio——

On the other hand Turnus, whoſe manners are contraſted with thoſe of our Hero, is, on his very firſt appearance, marked out by his irreverence to the Prieſteſs of Juno. But the humanity of Æneas offends this critic as well as his piety; he calls him a mere St. Swithin, always raining. The beauty of that circumſtance eſcaped him. It was proper to repreſent a perfect Lawgiver as quickly touched with all the affections of humanity: and the example was the rather to be inforced, becauſe vulgar Politicians are but too generally ſeen diveſted of theſe common notices; and the habit of vulgar heroiſm is apt to induce paſſions very oppoſite to them. Thus Virgil having painted Turnus in all the colours of Achilles, and Æneas in thoſe of Hector (for the ſubject of the *Iliad* being the deſtruction of a vicious and corrupt Community, the fitteſt inſtrument was a brutal warrior, *acer*, *iracundus*, ſuch as Achilles; and the ſubject of the *Æneid* being the erection of a great and virtuous Empire, the fitteſt inſtrument was a pious patriot, like Hector,) Turnus, I ſay, was to be characteriſed as one delighting in blood and ſlaughter.

Sævit amor ferri, & SCELERATA inſania belli,
Ira ſuper *——

And, to make this paſſion the more deteſtable, the Poet tells us it was inſpired into him by a Fury. But when he repreſents Æneas as accepting the favourable ſigns from Heaven, which puſhed him on to war, he draws him, agreeable to ſuch a character, compaſſionating the miſeries which his very enemies, by their breach of faith, were to ſuffer in it.

* Lib. vii. v. 461.

Heu, quantæ miſeris cædes Laurentibus inſtant!
Quas pœnas mihi, Turne, dabis! quam multa per undas
Scuta virûm, galeaſque, & fortia corpora volves,
Tibri pater! poſcant acies, & fœdera rumpant *.

But the circumſtances of his Miſtreſs, as well as thoſe of his Rival, are artfully contrived to ſet off His Piety. On excuſing his departure to the enraged Queen of Carthage, as forced by the command of the Gods, ſhe is made to anſwer him with this Epicurean ſcoff,

Scilicet is ſuperis LABOR eſt, ea *cura* QUIETOS
SOLLICITAT †——

very properly put into the mouth of a Woman immerſed in voluptuous pleaſures. Yet the Poet takes care to tell us, that her impiety, like Turnus's delight in blood and ſlaughter, was inſpired by the Furies.

Heu! Furiis incenſa feror———

But there is a further beauty in this circumſtance of the Epiſode. Theſe two Lovers are made the Founders of the two Hoſtile States of Rome and Carthage. So, this was to inſinuate (in ſupport of the author's main purpoſe) That it was want of religion which occaſioned the *Punica Fides*; and the pious culture of it, which created the

Alta Moenia Romæ.

Again, the Hero was to be drawn no leſs maſter of himſelf, under the charms of the ſofter paſſions, than under the violence of the rougher and more horrid. M. Voltaire ſays,

Virgile orne mieux la raiſon,
A plus d' art, autant d' harmonie;
Mais il s' epuiſe avec Didon,
Et rate à la fin Lavinie.

* Lib. viii. v. 537. † Lib. iv.

But

But this ingenious man did not conſider, that the Epiſode of Dido and Æneas, was not given to ornament his poem with an amuſing tale of a love adventure, but to expoſe the public miſchiefs which ariſe from Rulers' indulging themſelves in this voluptuous weakneſs, while they become

Regnorum immemores, turpique cupidine captos.

The Poet therefore had defeated his own deſign, if when he had recovered his Hero from this weakneſs, and made him ſay of his deſtined Empire in Italy,

—hic Amor, hæc Patria eſt——.

if when he had perfected his Character, and brought him to the end of his labours, he had ſtill drawn him ſtruggling with this impotent and unruly paſſion.

Nor is the view, in which we place this poem, leſs ſerviceable to the vindication of the Poet's other characters. The learned author of the *Enquiry into the life and writings of Homer*, will allow me to differ from him, in thinking that thoſe *uniform manners* in the Æneis, which he ſpeaks of, was the effect of deſign, not, as he would have it, of cuſtom and habit: "Virgil, ſays he, had ſeen "much of the ſplendor of a court, the magnificence of a palace, "and the grandeur of a royal equipage: accordingly his repreſenta- "tions of that part of life, are more auguſt and ſtately than Ho- "mer's. He has a greater regard to decency, and thoſe poliſhed "manners, that render men ſo much of a piece, and make them "all reſemble one another in their conduct and behaviour *." For the Æneis being a ſyſtem of Politics, what this writer calls *the eternity of a government*, *the form of a magiſtrature*, *and plan of dominion*, muſt needs be *familiar with the Roman poet*; and nothing could be more to his purpoſe, than a repreſentation of *poliſhed manners*; it being the Legiſlator's office to tame and break men to humanity; and to make them diſguiſe, at leaſt, if they cannot be brought to lay aſide, their ſavage habits.

* Page 325.

But

But this key to the Æneis not only clears up many paſſages obnoxious to the critics, but adds infinite beauty to a great number of incidents throughout the whole poem; of which take the following inſtances, the one, in *Religion*, and the other, in *civil Policy*.

1. Æneas, in the eighth book, goes to the Court of Evander, in order to engage him in a confederacy againſt the common enemy. He finds the king and his people buſied in the celebration of an annual ſacrifice. The purpoſe of the voyage is diſpatched in a few lines, and the whole epiſode is taken up in a matter altogether foreign to it, that is to ſay, the ſacrifice, the feaſt, and a long hiſtory of Hercules's adventure with Cacus. But it is done with great art and propriety; and in order to introduce, into this political poem, that famous inſtitute of Cicero, (in his book Of Laws) deſigned to moderate the exceſs of labouring ſuperſtition, the *ignotæ ceremoniæ*, as he calls them, which at that time ſo much abounded in Rome—"Divos & eos, qui cœleſtes ſemper habiti, colunto, "& ollos, QUOS ENDO COELO MERITA VOCAVERINT, HERCULEM, "Liberum, Æſculapium, Caſtorem, Pollucem, Quirinum"—Thus copied by Virgil, in the beginning of Evander's ſpeech to Æneas.

Rex Evandrus ait: Non hæc ſolemnia nobis,
Has ex more dapes, hanc tanti numinis aram
VANA SUPERSTITIO VETERUMQUE IGNARA DEORUM
Impoſuit. *Sævis* hoſpes Trajane, *periclis*
Servati facimus, MERITOSQUE novamus HONORES——

A leſſon of great importance to the pagan Lawgiver. This *Vana ſuperſtitio ignara veterum deorum* was, as we have ſhewn, a matter he took much care to rectify in the *Myſteries*; not by deſtroying that ſpecies of idolatry, the worſhip of dead men, which was indeed his own invention, but by ſhewing *why* they paid that worſhip; namely, for benefits done to the whole race of mankind, by thoſe deified Heroes.

Quare agite, o juvenes! *tantarum in munere laudum*, &c.

The

The concluſion of Evander's ſpeech,

COMMUNEMQUE VOCATE DEUM, & date vina volentes,

alludes to that other inſtitute of Cicero, in the ſame book Of Laws. "SEPARATIM nemo habeſſit Deos: neve NOVOS, neve advenas, "niſi publice adſcitos, PRIVATIM colunto." Of which he gives the reaſon in his comment, "ſuoſque Deos, aut Novos aut Alie-"nigenas coli, confuſionem habet religionum, & ignotas cere-"monias."

Nor ſhould we omit to obſerve a further beauty in this epiſode; and, in imitation, ſtill, of Cicero; who, in his book Of Laws, hath taken the beſt of the Roman Inſtitutes for the foundation of his ſyſtem: For the worſhip of HERCULES, as introduced by Evander, and adminiſtred by the POTITII on the altar called the ARA MAXIMA, was, as Dion. Hal. and Livy tell us, the oldeſt eſtabliſhment in Rome; and continued for many ages in high veneration, To this the following lines allude,

Hanc ARAM luco ſtatuit, quæ MAXIMA ſemper, &c.
—Jamque ſacerdotes, primuſque POTITIUS, ibant.

But Virgil was ſo learned in all that concerned the Roman ritual, that it was a common ſaying, (as we collect from Macrobius) *Virgilius noſter Pontifex maximus videtur*: And that writer not apprehending the reaſon of ſo exact an attention to ſacred things, being ignorant of the nature of the poem, ſays, MIRANDUM eſt hujus poetæ et circa noſtra et circa externa ſacra doctrinam *.

2. In the *ninth* book we have the fine epiſode of Niſus and Euryalus; which preſents us with many new graces, when conſidered (which it ought to be) as a repreſentation of one of the moſt famous and ſingular of the Grecian Inſtitutions. CRETE, that ancient and celebrated School of legiſlation, had a civil cuſtom, which the Spartans firſt, and afterwards all the principal cities of *Greece* †,

* Saturn. l. iii. c. 6.

† See note U, at the end of this Book.

borrowed

borrowed from them, for every man of diſtinguiſhed valour or wiſdom to adopt a favourite youth, for whoſe education he was anſwerable, and whoſe manners he had the care of forming. Hence Niſus is ſaid to be

ACERRIMUS ARMIS,

Hyrtacides;

And Euryalus,

Comes Euryalus, quo PULCHRIOR alter
Non fuit Æneadum, Trojana neque induit arma;
Ora PUER prima ſignans INTONSA JUVENTA.

The Lovers (as they were called) and their youths always ſerved and fought together;——ſo Virgil of theſe:

His amor unus erat, pariterque in bella ruebant,
Tum quoque communi portam ſtatione tenebant.

The Lovers uſed to make preſents to their favourite youths.—So Niſus tells his friend:

Si, TIBI, quæ POSCO promittunt (nam *mihi* facti
Fama ſat eſt) &c.

The ſtates of Greece, where this Inſtitution prevailed, reaped ſo many advantages from it, that they gave it the greateſt encouragement by their laws: ſo that Cicero, in his book *Of a republic*, obſerved, "opprobrio fuiſſe adoleſcentibus ſi amatores non haberent?" Virgil has been equally intent to recommend it by all the charms of poetry and eloquence. The amiable character, the affecting circumſtance, the tenderneſs of diſtreſs, are all inimitably painted.

The youth ſo educated, were found to be the beſt bulwark of their country, and moſt formidable to the enemies of civil liberty. On which account, the Tyrants, wherever they prevailed, uſed all their arts to ſuppreſs an Inſtitution ſo oppoſite to private intereſt and ambition. The annals of ancient Greece afford many examples of the bravery of theſe Bands, who chearfully attempted the moſt hazardous

hazardous adventures *. So that Virgil did but follow the cuſtom of the beſt policied States (which it was much for his honour to do) when he put theſe two friends on one of the moſt daring actions of the whole war; as old Aletes underſtood it:

Dî patrii, quorum ſemper ſub numine Troja eſt,
Non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis,
Cum tales animos juvenum, & tam certa tuliſtis,
Pectora.

Plutarch, ſpeaking of the Thebans, in the *Life of Pelopidas*, ſays, that "Gorgias firſt enrolled the SACRED BAND, conſiſting of three "hundred choſen men; and that this corps was ſaid to be com-"poſed of LOVERS and their FRIENDS. It is reported, ſays he, "that it continued unconquered till the battle of Chæronea; and "when, after that action, Philip was ſurveying the dead, and came "to the very ſpot where theſe three hundred fell, who had charged "in cloſe order ſo fatally on the Macedonian lances, and obſerved "how they lay heaped upon one another, he was amazed, and be-"ing told, that this was the band of *Lovers* and their *Friends*, he "burſt into tears, and ſaid, *Accurſed be they who can ſuſpect that* "*theſe men either did or ſuffered any thing diſhoneſt.* But certainly "(continues my author) this inſtitution of Lovers did not ariſe in "Thebes, as the poets feigned, from the PASSION of Laius, but "from the WISDOM of Legiſlators †." Such was the Friendſhip our poet would here repreſent, where he ſays,

Niſus AMORE PIO pueri—

* See note X, at the end of this Book.

† Τὸν δ' ἱερὸν λόχον, ὥς φασιν, συνέλαξαλο Γοργίδας πρῶτος, ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ἐπιλέκτων τριακοσίων,—ἔνιοι δέ φασιν ἐξ ἐρασῶν καὶ ἐρωμένων γενέσθαι τὸ σύστημα τοῦτο.——λέγεται δὲ διαμεῖναι μέχρι τῆς ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχης ἀήττητον· ὡς δὲ μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐφορῶν τοὺς νεκροὺς ὁ Φίλιππος. ἔστι καὶ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον, ἐν ᾧ συνελήλυθασι κεῖσθαι τοὺς τριακοσίους ἐναντίους ἀπαντικρὺ ταῖς σαρίσσαις ἄπαντας ἐν τοῖς σφετέροις ὅπλοις, καὶ μετ' ἀλλήλων ἀναμεμιγμένους, θαυμάσαντα, καὶ πυθόμενον ὡς ὁ τῶν ἐρασῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρωμένων οὗτος εἴη λόχος δακρύσαι, καὶ εἰπεῖν, Ἀπόλοιντο κακῶς οἱ τούτους τι ποιεῖν ἢ πάσχειν αἰσχρὸν ὑπονοοῦντες. Ὅλως δὲ τῆς περὶ τοὺς ἐρασὰς συνηθείας, οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσι, Θηβαίοις τὸ Λαΐου πάθος ἀρχὴν παρέσχεν, ἀλλ' οἱ ΝΟΜΟΘΕΤΑΙ. Tom. I. p. 287. B. et E. Francof. Edit. fol. 1599. (Vol. II. p. 218, 219. ed. Brian.)

and where he makes Aſcanius call Euryalus,

VENERANDE puer—

The one dies in defence of the other; revenges his death; and then falls with him, like the Lovers in the SACRED BAND:

moriens animam abſtulit hoſti.
Tum ſuper exanimem ſeſe projecit AMICUM
Confoſſus, placidaque ibi demum morte quievit.

And here let it be obſerved, that, as this epiſode is given for a picture of this Inſtitution in it's purity; ſo, in the Enemies' quarter, he hath given another drawing of it, in it's degeneracy and corruption: for the SACRED BAND, like the MYSTERIES, underwent the common fate of time and malice.

—Tu quoque flaventem prima lanugine malas
Dum ſequeris Clytium infelix, nova gaudia Cydon
Dardania ſtratus dextra ſecurus amorum
Qui juvenum tibi ſemper erant, miſerande jaceres *.

The poet hath obſerved the ſame conduct, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, with regard to the *pure* and the *corrupt* MYSTERIES.

Before I leave theſe previous circumſtances. permit me only to take notice, that this was the *ſecond ſpecies* of the EPIC POEM; our own country-man, Milton, having produced the *third:* for juſt as Virgil rivaled Homer, ſo Milton was the emulator of both. He found Homer poſſeſſed of the province of MORALITY; Virgil of POLITICS: and nothing left for him, but that of RELIGION. This he ſeized, as ambitious to ſhare with them in the Government of the poetic world: and by means of the ſuperior dignity of his ſubject, hath gotten to the head of that Triumvirate which took ſo many ages in forming. Theſe are the *three ſpecies* of the Epic poem; for its largeſt ſphere is HUMAN ACTION; which can be only conſidered in a *moral*, a *political*, or *religious* view: and theſe

* L. x. ver. 324.

the

the three great MAKERS; for each of their Poems was ſtruck out at a heat, and came to perfection from its firſt eſſay. Here then the grand Scene was cloſed: and all farther improvements of the Epic at an end.

It being now underſtood, that the Æneis is in the ſtyle of ancient legiſlation, it would be hard to think that ſo great a maſter in his art, ſhould overlook a DOCTRINE, which, we have ſhewn, was the foundation and ſupport of ancient Politics; namely a *future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments.* Accordingly he hath given us a complete ſyſtem of it, in imitation of his models, which were Plato's *viſion of Erus*, and Tully's *dream of Scipio.* Again, as the Lawgiver took care to ſupport this *Doctrine* by a very extraordinary Inſtitution, and to commemorate it by a RITE, which had all the allurement of ſpectacle; and afforded matter for the utmoſt embelliſhments of poetry, we cannot but confeſs a deſcription of ſuch a Scene would add largely to the grace and elegance of his work; and muſt conclude he would be invited to attempt it. Accordingly, we ſay, he hath done this likewiſe, in the allegorical deſcent of Æneas into Hell; which is no other than an enigmatical repreſentation of his INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES.

Virgil was to repreſent an Heroic Lawgiver in the perſon of Æneas; now, INITIATION into the *Myſteries* was what ſanctified his Character and enobled his Function. Hence we find all the ancient Heroes and Lawgivers were, in fact, initiated *. And it was no wonder the Legiſlator ſhould endeavour by his example to give credit to an inſtitution of his own creating.

Another reaſon for the Hero's initiation was the important inſtructions the founders of Empire received in matters that concerned their office †, as we may ſee in the ſecond ſection of the third book.

* Δεῖξεν Τριπτολέμῳ τε Διόκλεῖ τε Πολυξείνῳ
Εὐμόλπῳ τε βίη, κελέῳ θ' ἡγήτορι λαῶν,
Δρησμοσύνην ἱερῶν, καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὄργια πᾶσιν.
Homeri Fragm. Hymn. in Cer. apud Paul. Corinth.

† —γίνεσθαι δέ φασι καὶ εὐσεβεστέρους καὶ δικαιοτέρους καὶ κατὰ πάντα βελτίονας ἐκείνων τοὺς τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνήσαντας· διὸ καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἡρώων τε καὶ ἡμιθέων τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους φιλοτιμῆσθαι μεταλαβεῖν τῆς τελετῆς· καὶ γὰρ Ἰασίωνα καὶ Διοσκούρους, ἔτι δ' Ἡρακλέα καὶ Ὀρφέα μυηθέντας ἐπιτυχεῖν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πραξεσιν, διὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν τούτων ἐπιφάνειαν. Diod. p. 224.

A third reaſon for his initiation, was their cuſtom of ſeeking ſupport and inſpiration from the God who preſided in the *Myſteries* *.

A fourth reaſon for his initiation, was the circumſtance in which the poet has placed him, unſettled in his affairs, and anxious about his future fortune. Now, amongſt the uſes of initiation, the advice and direction of the ORACLE was not the leaſt: and an oracular bureau was ſo neceſſary an appendix to ſome of the *Myſteries*, as particularly the *Samothracian*, that Plutarch, ſpeaking of Lyſander's initiation there, expreſſes it by a word that ſignifies *conſulting the oracle*, Ἐν δὲ Σαμοθράκῃ χρησηριαζόμενος, &c. On this account, Jaſon, Orpheus, Hercules, Caſtor, and (as Macrobius ſays †) Tarquinius Priſcus, were every one of them initiated into the *Myſteries*.

All this the poet ſeems clearly to have intimated in the ſpeech of Anchiſes to his ſon:

Lectos juvenes fortiſſima corda,
Defer in Italiam.—Gens dura atque aſpera cultu
Debellanda tibi Latio eſt. Ditis tamen ante
INFERNAS *accede* DOMOS—
Tum genus omne tuum, &, *quæ dentur mœnia*, DISCES ‡.

A fifth reaſon was the conforming to the old popular tradition, which ſaid, that ſeveral other Heroes of the Trojan times, ſuch as Agamemnon and Ulyſſes, had been initiated §.

A ſixth and principal was, that AUGUSTUS, who was ſhadowed in the perſon of Æneas, had been initiated into the ELEUSINIAN *Myſteries* ||.

* Lib. ii. cap. 4.

† The rhetor Sopater, in his Διαιρέσεις ζητημάτων, makes Pericles ſay, Πιστεύω ταῖς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι θειαῖς, τοῦτόν μοι ἐκβεβηκέναι τὸν νοῦν, καὶ τὸ στραλάγημα τοῦτο ἐξ ἀνακλίσεων δοῦναι τῶν μυστικῶν.

‡ Æn. v. ver. 729, & ſeq.

§ Ἀγαμέμνονά φασι μεμυημένον, ἐν ταραχῇ ὄντα πολλῇ καὶ τὰ Τροίαν, διὰ ἀκαλασίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, παῦσαι τὴν στάσιν, πορφυρίδα ἔχοντα—Ὀδυσσέα φασὶ μεμυημένον ἐν Σαμοθράκῃ χρήσασθαι τῷ κρηδέμνῳ ἀντὶ ταινίας. Scholia Apollon. Rhod. Arg. lib. i. ver. 916.

Ὄφρα δαέντες
Ἀρρήτοις ἀγανῇσι τελεσφορίῃσι θεμίστας——

‖ Suet. Oct. c. xciii. See note Y, at the end of this Book.

While

While the *Myſteries* were confined to Egypt, their native country, and while the Grecian Lawgivers went thither to be initiated, as a kind of deſignation to their office, the ceremony would be naturally deſcribed, in terms highly allegorical. This was, in part, owing to the genius of the Egyptian manners; in part, to the humour of Travellers; but mo t of all, to the policy of Lawgivers; who, returning home, to civilize a barbarous people, by Laws and Arts, found it uſeful and neceſſary (in order to ſupport their own characters, and to eſtabliſh the fundamental principal of a FUTURE STATE) to repreſent *that* initiation, in which, was ſeen the condition of departed mortals in machinery, as AN ACTUAL DESCENT INTO HELL. This way of ſpeaking was uſed by Orpheus, Bacchus, and others; and continued even after the *Myſteries* were introduced into Greece, as appears by the fables of Hercules, Caſtor, Pollux, and Theſeus's *deſcent into hell.* But the allegory was generally ſo circumſtanced, as to diſcover the truth concealed under it. So Orpheus is ſaid to get to hell by the power of his harp:

Threïcia fretus citharа, fidibuſque canoris:

that is, in quality of Lawgiver; the harp being the known ſymbol of his laws, by which he humanized a rude and barbarous people. So again, in the lives of Hercules and Bacchus, we have the true hiſtory, and the fable founded on it, blended and recorded together. For we are told, that they were in fact initiated into the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*; and that it was juſt before their deſcent into Hell, as an aid and ſecurity in that deſperate undertaking *. Which, in plain ſpeech, was no more, than that they were initiated into the *leſſer Myſteries* before they were admitted into the *greater*. The ſame may be ſaid of what is told us of Theſeus's adventure. Near Eleuſis there was a Well, called Callichorus; and, adjoining to that, a *ſtone*, on which, as the tradition went, Ceres ſat down,

* —Καὶ τὰς περὶ Ἡρακλέα τε καὶ Διόνυσον, καλιόπας εἰς ᾅδου, πρότερον λόγῳ εἰδέναι μυηθῆναι, καὶ τὸ θάρρος τῆς ἐκεῖσε πορείας παρὰ τῆς Ἐλευσινίας ἐναύσασθαι. Auctor Axiochi.

fact

ſad and weary, on her coming to Eleuſis. Hence the ſtone was named Agelaſtus, the *melancholy ſtone* *. On which account it was deemed unlawful for the Initiated to ſit thereon. "For Ceres (ſays "Clemens) wandering about in ſearch of her daughter Proſerpine) "when ſhe came to Eleuſis, grew weary, and ſat down melancholy "on the ſide of a well. So that, to this very day, it is unlawful "for the Initiated to ſit down there, leſt they, who are now become "perfect, ſhould ſeem to imitate her in her deſolate condition †." Now let us ſee what they tell us concerning Theſeus's deſcent into hell. "There is alſo a ſtone (ſays the ſcholiaſt on Ariſtophanes) "called by the Athenians, Agelaſtus; on which, they ſay, Theſeus "ſat when he was meditating his deſcent into hell. Hence the "ſtone had its name. Or, perhaps, becauſe Ceres ſat there, weep-"ing, when ſhe ſought Proſerpine ‡." All this ſeems plainly to intimate, that the *deſcent* of Theſeus was his *entrance* into the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*. Which entrance (as we ſhall ſee hereafter) was a fraudulent intruſion.

Both Euripides and Ariſtophanes ſeem to confirm our interpretation of *theſe deſcents into hell*. Euripides, in his Hercules furens, brings the hero, juſt come from hell, to ſuccour his family, and deſtroy the tyrant Lycus. Juno, in revenge, perſecutes him with the Furies; and he, in his tranſport, kills his wife and children, whom he miſtakes for his enemies. When he comes to himſelf, he is comforted by his friend Theſeus; who would excuſe his exceſſes by the criminal examples of the Gods: a conſideration which,

* Ἀγέλαστος πέτρα. So Ovid:

Hic primum ſedit gelido mœſtiſſima ſaxo;
Illud Cecropidæ nunc quoque *triſte* vocant.

† Ἀλωμένη γὰρ ἡ Δηὼ καὶὰ ζήτησιν τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς κόρης, περὶ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα,—αὐτοκάμνει, καὶ φρέατι ἐπικαθίζει λυπουμένη. Τοῦτο τοῖς μεμυημένοις ἀπαγορεύεται εἰσέτι νῦν, ἵνα μὴ δοκοῖεν οἱ τελειωμένοι μιμεῖσθαι τὴν ὀδυρομένην. Clemens Protrept. pag. 10. A. Edit. Sylburg.

‡ Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἀγέλαστος πέτρα καλουμένη παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ὅπου καθίσαι φασὶ Θησέα μέλλοντα καταβαίνειν εἰς ᾅδου· ὅθεν καὶ τοὔνομα τῇ πέτρᾳ· ἢ ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐκάθισεν ἡ Δημήτης κλαίουσα, ὅταν ἐζήτει τὴν κόρην. Schol. Equit. Ariſtoph. l. 782.

as I have obſerved above, greatly encouraged the people in their irregularities; and was therefore obviated in the Myſteries, by the detection of the vulgar errors of polytheiſm. Now Euripides ſeems plainly enough to have told us what he thought of the fabulous deſcents into hell, by making Hercules reply, like one juſt come from the celebration of the Myſteries, and entruſted with the ἀπόῤῥητα. "The examples (ſays he) which you bring of the Gods, "are nothing to the purpoſe. I cannot think them guilty of the "crimes imputed to them. I cannot apprehend, how one God can "be the ſovereign of another God.—A God, who is truly ſo, ſtands "in need of no one. Reject we then theſe idle fables, which the "poets teach concerning them." A *ſecret*, which we muſt ſuppoſe, Theſeus (whoſe entrance into the *Myſteries* was only a fraudulent intruſion) had not yet learnt.

The comic poet, in his *Frogs*, tells us as plainly what he too underſtood to be the ancient heroes' deſcent into hell, by the equipage, which he gives to Bacchus, when he brings him in, enquiring the way of Hercules. It was the cuſtom at the celebration of the *Eleuſinian* myſteries, as we are told by the ſcholiaſt on the place, to have what was wanted in thoſe rites, carried upon aſſes. Hence the proverb, *Aſinus portat myſteria*: accordingly the poet introduces Bacchus, followed by his buffoon ſervant Xanthius bearing a bundle in like manner, and riding on an aſs. And, leſt the meaning of this ſhould be miſtaken, Xanthius, on Hercules's telling Bacchus, that the inhabitants of Elyſium were the Initiated, puts in, and ſays, "And I am *the aſs carrying Myſteries*." This was ſo broad a hint, that it ſeems to have awakened the old dreaming ſcholiaſt; who, when he comes to that place, where the Chorus of the Initiated appear, tells us, we are not to underſtand this ſcene as really lying in the ELYSIAN FIELDS, but in the ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES *.

* ἰστέον δὲ, ὅτι εἰ μὴ διὰ τὰς ἐν ᾅδου μύσεις τὰς φαινομένας λέγει, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀληθινὰ διὰ τὰς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, ἐνταῦθα μὴ ὑφίσαλο ἡ σκηνὴ τῷ ᾅδῃ. in ver. 357.

Here

Here then, as was the caſe in many other of the ancient fables, the pomp of expreſſion betrayed willing poſterity into the *marvellous*. But why need we wonder at this in the genius of more ancient times, which delighted to tell the commoneſt things in a highly figurative manner, when a writer of ſo late an age as Apuleius, either in imitation of Antiquity, or perhaps in compliance to the received phraſeology of the *Myſteries*, deſcribes his *initiation* in the ſame manner. "Acceſſi confinium mortis; & calcato Proſer-"pinæ limine, per omnia vectus elementa remeavi: nocte media "vidi ſolem candido coruſcantem lumine, Deos inferos & deos ſu-"peros. Acceſſi coram, & adoravi de proximo *." Æneas could not have deſcribed his night's journey to his companions, after he had been let out of the ivory gate, in properer terms, had it been indeed to be underſtood of a journey into Hell.

Thus, we ſee, Virgil was obliged to have his Hero initiated; and he actually had the authority of Antiquity to call this initiation *A Deſcent into Hell*, Ἡ ΕΙΣ ΑΔΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΒΑΣΙΣ. Hence ſome of the pretended Orphic odes, ſung at the celebration of the *Myſteries*, bore this title, a name equivalent to ΤΕΛΕΤΑΙ, or ἹΕΡΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ. And ſurely he made uſe of his advantages with great judgment; for ſuch a fiction animates the relation, which, delivered out of allegory, had been too cold and inſipid for epic poetry.

We ſee, from Æneas's urging the example of thoſe Heroes and Lawgivers, who had been initiated before him, that his requeſt was only for an *initiation*:

Si potuit manis arceſſere conjugis Orpheus,
Threïcia fretus cithara fidibuſque canoris:
Si fratrem Pollux alterna morte redemit,
Itque reditque viam toties: quid Theſea magnum,
Quid memorem Alciden? & mi genus ab Jove ſummo.

It is to be obſerved, that Theſeus is the only one of theſe ancient Heroes not recorded in hiſtory to have been initiated, though we have

* Lib. xi. prope finem.

ſhewn

ſhewn that *his deſcent into hell* was, like that of the reſt, only a view of the *Myſteries*. The reaſon is, his entrance was a violent intruſion.

Had an old poem, under the name of Orpheus, intituled, A DESCENT INTO HELL, been now extant, it would, probably, have ſhewn us, that no more was meant than Orpheus's *initiation*; and that the idea of this ſixth book was taken from thence.

But further, it was cuſtomary for the poets of the Auguſtan age to exerciſe themſelves on the ſubject of the *Myſteries*, as appears from Cicero, who deſires Atticus, then at Athens, and *initiated*, to ſend to Chilius, a poet of eminence *, an account of the *Eleuſinian* myſteries; in order, as it would ſeem, to inſert into ſome poem he was then writing †. Thus it appears, that both the ancient and contemporary poets afforded Virgil a pattern for this famous epiſode.

Even Servius ſaw thus far into Virgil's deſign, as to ſay, that *many* things were here delivered *according to the profound learning of the Egyptian theology* ‡. And we have ſhewn, that the doctrines taught in the *Myſteries*, were invented by that people. But though I ſay this was our poet's general deſign, in this famous epiſode, I would not be ſuppoſed to mean, that he followed no other guides in the particular circumſtances of it. Several of them are borrowed from Homer: and ſeveral from the philoſophic notions of Plato: ſome of theſe will be taken notice of, in their place.

The great Agent in this affair is the SIBYL: and, as a Virgin, ſhe ſuſtains two principal and diſtinct parts: that of the inſpired *Prieſteſs*, to pronounce the ORACLE (whoſe connexion with the *Myſteries* is ſpoken of above); and that of *Hierophant*, to conduct the Initiated through the whole CELEBRATION.

* See lib. i. ep. 16. ad Atticum, Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 23.

† Chilius te rogat & ego ejus rogatu ΕΥΜΟΛΠΙΔΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΙΑ. lib. i. epiſt. 9. ad Atticum, Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III p. 9. On which Victorius obſerves, "πάτρια fere omnes excuſi, "quemadmodum eſt in antiquis, habent: ut intelligat ritus patrios & inſtitutiones "illius ſacræ familiæ, & auguſta myſteria, ut inquit Cicero, ii. De legg."

‡ Multa per altam ſcientiam theologicorum Ægyptiorum.

Her firſt part begins,

Ventum erat ad limen, cum Virgo, *Poſcere fata.*
Tempus, ait. Deus, ecce, Deus—
O tandem magnis pelagi defuncte periclis, *&c*,

and ends,

Ut primum ceſſit furor, & rabida ora quierunt.

Her ſecond part begins at,

Sate ſanguine divûm,
Tros Anchiſiade, *&c.*

and continues through the whole book. For as we have obſerved, the Initiated had a guide or conductor, called Ἱεροφάντης, Μυσταγωγὸς, Ἱερεὺς, indifferently of either ſex *, who was to inſtruct him in the preparatory ceremonies, and lead him through, and explain to him, all the ſhews and repreſentations of the *Myſteries*. Hence Virgil calls the Sibyl MAGNA SACERDOS, and DOCTA COMES, words of equivalent ſignification: and this, becauſe the *Myſteries* of Ceres were always celebrated in Rome by female prieſts †. And as the female *Myſtagogue*, as well as the male ‡, was devoted to a ſingle life, ſo was the Cumæan Sibyl, whom he calls *Caſta Sibylla*. Another reaſon why a Prieſteſs is given to conduct him, is, becauſe Proſerpine preſides in this whole affair. And the name of the

* Τὰς ἱερείας [Δήμητρος] Μελίσσας ἐκάλουν οἱ ποιηταί. Schol. Eurip. Hippol. Μελίσσας κυρίως τὰς τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερείας φησί. Schol. Pind. Pythion.

† So the ſatyriſt,

Paucæ adeo Cereris vittas contingere dignæ. Juv. Sat. vi.

‡ Hierophanta apud Athenas eviratur virum, & æterna debilitate fit caſtus. Hieron. ad Geron. De Monogamia. Cereris ſacerdotes, viventibus etiam viris, & conſentientibus, amica ſeparatione viduantur. Tertul. De Monogamia, ſub finem. Καὶ τὸν ΙΕΡΟΦΑΝΤΗΝ καὶ τὰς ΙΕΡΟΦΑΝΤΙΔΑΣ, καὶ τὸν δᾳδοῦχον, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἱερείας μυρρίνης ἔχειν στέφανον· διὰ ἃ καὶ τῇ Δήμητρι προσθέσθαι ταύτην φησί. Schol. Sophocl. Oedip. Col. v. 674.—It was for this reaſon that theſe female Hierophants were called Μέλισσαι, as is well obſerved by the Schol. on Pind. in Pyth. the Bee being, among the ancients, the ſymbol of chaſtity:

Quod nec concubitu indulgent, nec corpora ſegnes
In Venerem ſolvunt.

Prieſteſs

Prieſteſs in the *Eleuſinian Myſteries* ſhews that ſhe properly belonged to Proſerpine, though ſhe was alſo called the Prieſteſs of Ceres. "The Ancients (ſays Porphyrius) called the Prieſteſſes of Ceres "Μέλισσαι, as being the miniſters or Hierophants of the ſubterra-"neous goddeſs; and Proſerpine herſelf, Μελιτώδης *." And Æneas addreſſes her in the language of the Aſpirant, to the Hierophant:

Potes namque omnia: nec te
Nequidquam lucis Hecate præfecit Avernis.

and ſhe anſwers much in the ſtyle of thoſe ſacred Miniſters,

Quod ſi tantus amor, *&c.*
& INSANO juvat indulgere labori;
Accipe quæ peragenda prius.

For *inſanus* is the ſame as ὀργιαστικὸς, and this, as we are told by Strabo, was an inſeparable circumſtance in the celebration of the *Myſteries* †.

The firſt inſtruction the Prieſteſs gives Æneas, is to ſearch for the GOLDEN BOUGH, ſacred to Proſerpine;

Aureus & foliis & lento vimine ramus,
Junoni infernæ ſacer.

Servius can make nothing of this circumſtance. He ſuppoſes it might poſſibly allude to a tree in the middle of the ſacred grove of Diana's temple in Greece; where, if a fugitive came for ſanctuary, and could get off a branch from the tree, which was carefully guarded by the prieſts, he was to contend in ſingle combat with one of them; and, if he overcame, was to take his place ‡. Though nothing can be more foreign to the matter in queſtion than this

* Τὰς Δήμητρος ἱερείας, ὡς χθονίας θεᾶς μύστιδας, Μέλισσας οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκάλουν, αὐτήν τε τὴν Κόρην Μελιτώδη. De Antro nymph.

† Τῇ Δήμητρι καὶ Διὶ τὸ ΟΡΓΙΑΣΤΙΚΟΝ πᾶν, καὶ τὸ Βακχικὸν, καὶ τὸ χορικὸν, καὶ τὸ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς μυστικόν. lib. x. p. 468. B. Edit. Pariſ. 1620. fol.

‡ See note Z, at the end of this Book.

rambling account, yet the Abbé Banier is content to follow it *, for want of a better †. But the truth is, under this *branch*, is figured the *wreath of myrtle*, with which the Initiated were crowned, at the celebration of the *Myſteries* ‡. 1. The *golden bough* is ſaid to be ſacred to Proſerpine, and ſo, we are told, was the *myrtle*: Proſerpine only is mentioned all the way; partly, becauſe the *Initiation* is deſcribed as an actual deſcent into hell; but principally, becauſe, when the RITES of the *Myſteries* were performed, Ceres and Proſerpine were equally invoked; but when the SHEWS were repreſented, as in the firſt part of this Epiſode, then Proſerpine alone preſided. 2. The quality of this *golden bough*, with its *lento vimine*, admirably deſcribes the *tender branches of myrtle*. 3. The doves of Venus are made to direct Æneas to the tree:

Tum maximus heros
Maternas agnoſcit *aves*.

They fly to it, and delight to reſt upon it, as their miſtreſs's favourite tree.

Sedibus optatis gemina ſuper arbore ſidunt.

For the *myrtle*, as is known to every one, was conſecrated to Venus. And there is a greater propriety and beauty in this diſpoſition, than appears at firſt ſight. For not only the *myrtle* was dedicated to Proſerpine as well as Venus, but the *doves* likewiſe, as Porphyry informs us §.

But the reader may aſk, why is this myrtle-branch repreſented to be of *gold?* not merely for the ſake of the *marvellous*, he may be aſſured. A *golden bough* was literally part of the ſacred equipage in the *ſhews*, a burthen which the *Aſs*, *who carried the myſteries*, we may be ſure, was chiefly proud of. This branch was

* Explicat. hiſtor. des fables, vol. ii. p. 133. Ed. 1715.

† See note AA, at the end of this Book.

‡ Μυρσίνης στεφάνῳ ἐστεφανῶθαι οἱ μεμυημένοι. Schol. Ariſtoph. Ranis.

§ Τῆς δὲ Φερεφάττης, παρὰ τὸ φέρεσθαι τὴν φάτταν, φασὶν οἱ πολλοὶ τὔνομα τῶν θεολόγων. ἱερὸν γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ φάττα. Porph. De Abſt. lib. iv. § 16.

ſometimes

ſometimes wreathed into a crown, and worn on the head; at other times, it was carried in the hand. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us *, from Dionyſius Thrax the grammarian, that it was an Egyptian cuſtom to hold a branch in the act of adoration. And of what kind *theſe branches* were, Apuleius tells us, in his deſcription of a proceſſion of the Initiated in the *Myſteries* of Iſis. "Ibat tertius, "attollens PALMAM AURO SUBTILITER FOLIATAM, nec non mer-"curialem etiam CADUCEUM †." The *Golden branch*, then, and the *Caduceus* were related. And accordingly Virgil makes the former do the uſual office of the latter, in affording a free paſſage into the regions of the dead. Again, Apuleius, deſcribing the fifth perſon in the proceſſion, ſays, "Quintus auream vannum AUREIS "congeſtam RAMULIS ‡." So that a *golden bough*, we ſee, was an important implement, and of very complicated intention in the SHEWS of the *Myſteries*.

Æneas having now poſſeſſed himſelf of the GOLDEN BOUGH, a paſſport as neceſſary to his *deſcent* as a *myrtle crown* to *initiation*,

(Sed non ante datur telluris operta ſubire,
Auricomos quam quis decerpſerit arbore fœtus,)

carries it into the Sibyl's grot:

Et vatis portat ſub tecta ſibyllæ.

And this was to deſign initiation into the *leſſer Myſteries*: for Dion Chryſoſtom § tells us, it was performed ἐν οἰκήμαϛι μικρῷ, in a little narrow chapel, ſuch a one as we muſt ſuppoſe the Sibyl's grot to be. The *Initiated* into theſe rites were called ΜΥΣΤΑΙ.

He is then led to the opening of the deſcent:

Speluncæ *alta* fuit, *vaſtoque immanis hiatu*
Scrupea, tuta lacu nigro nemorumque tenebris.

* —παρὰ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ τὸ τῶν θαλλῶν τῶν διδομένων τοῖς προσκυνοῦσι. Strom. lib. v. p. 568. p. 414, D. Edit. Sylburg.

† Metam. lib. xi. p. 383. ‡ Ibid. § Orat. 12.

And

And his reception is thus deſcribed:

Sub pedibus mugire ſolum & juga cœpta moveri
Sylvarum; viſæque canes ululare per umbram,
Adventante dea.

All this is exactly ſimilar to the fine deſcription of the poet Claudian, where he profeſſedly, and without diſguiſe, ſpeaks of the tremendous entry into theſe myſtic Rites:

Jam mihi cernuntur trepidis delubra moveri
Sedibus, & claram diſpergere fulmina lucem,
Adventum teſtata Dei. Jam magnus ab imis
Auditur fremitus terris, *templumque remugit*
Cecropium; *ſanctaſque faces attollit* ELEUSIN;
Angues Triptolemi ſtridunt, & ſquamea curvis
Colla levant attrita jugis—
Ecce procul ternas Hecate variata figuras
Exoritur *.

Both theſe deſcriptions agree exactly with the relations of the ancient Greek writers on this ſubject. Dion Chryſoſtom, ſpeaking of *initiation* into the *Myſteries*, gives us this general idea of it: Juſt ſo "it is, as when one leads a Greek or Barbarian to be initiated in a "certain myſtic dome, excelling in beauty and magnificence; "where he ſees many myſtic ſights, and hears in the ſame manner "a multitude of voices; where darkneſs and light alternately af-"fect his ſenſes; and a thouſand other uncommon things preſent "themſelves before him †."

Our poet next relates the fanatic agitation of the *Myſtagogue*, on this occaſion:

Procul, o procul eſte, profani,
Conclamat Vates, totoque abſiſtite luco.
Tantum effata furens antro ſe immiſit aperto.

* De raptu Proſerp. ſub initio.

† Σχεδὸν ἂν ὅμοιον, ὥσπερ εἴτις ἄνδρα Ἕλληνα, ἢ Βάρβαρον μυεῖσθαι παραδιδοὺς εἰς μυστικόν τινα οἶκον, ὑπερφυῆ κάλλει καὶ μεγέθει, πολλὰ μὲν ὀρῶντα μυστικὰ θεάματα, πολλῶν δὲ ἀκούοντα τοιούτων φωνῶν, σκότος τε καὶ φῶς ἐναλλὰξ αὐτῷ φαινομένων, ἄλλων τε μυρίων γινομένων. Orat. 12.

So

So again, Claudian, where he counterfeits the raptures and aſtoniſhment of the *Initiated*, and throws himſelf, as it were, like the Sibyl, into the middle of the ſcene:

Greſſus removete, profani,
Jam furor humanos noſtro de pectore ſenſus
Expulit.

The PROCUL, O PROCUL ESTE, PROFANI of the Sibyl, is a literal tranſlation of the formula uſed by the Myſtagogue, at the opening of the *Myſteries*:

ΕΚΑΣ, ΕΚΑΣ ΕΣΤΕ, ΒΕΒΗΛΟΙ.

But now the poet having determined to accompany his Hero through all the myſterious rites of his *initiation*, and conſcious of the imputed impiety, in bringing them out to open day, ſtops ſhort in his narration, and breaks out into this ſolemn apology:

Dii, quibus imperium eſt animarum, umbræque ſilentes;
Et Chaos & Phlegethon loca nocte ſilentia late,
Sit mihi fas audita loqui: ſit numine veſtro
Pandere res alta terra & caligine merſas—

And here let me obſerve, that this pretended apprehenſion of the Ancients, that they were doing an unlawful thing when they revealed the ſecrets of the *Realm of Dis*, aroſe from the cuſtom of the Myſteries, where theſe ſights were repreſented. For they had none of theſe ſcruples where they ſpeak of the Habitations of the Celeſtial Gods. Claudian, who (as we have obſerved) profeſſes openly to treat of the *Eleuſinian* Myſteries, at a time when they were in little veneration, yet, in compliance to old cuſtom, excuſes his undertaking in the ſame manner:

Dii, quibus in numerum, *&c.*
Vos mihi ſacrarum penetralia pandite rerum,
Et veſtri ſecreta poli, qua lampade Ditem
Flexit Amor, quo ducta ferox Proſerpina raptu
Poſſedit dotale Chaos; quantaſque per oras
Sollicito genetrix erraverit anxia curſu;

Unde

Unde datæ populis leges, et, glande relicta,
Ceſſerit inventis Dodonia quercus ariſtis *.

Had the revealing the *Myſteries* been as penal at Rome, as it was in Greece, Virgil had never ventured on this part of his poem. But yet it was eſteemed impious †; and what is more, it was infamous.

—vetabo qui Cereris ſacrum
Vulgarit arcanæ, ſub iiſdem
Sit trabibus fragilemque mecum.
Solvat phaſelum—— Hor.

He therefore does it covertly; and makes this apology to ſuch as ſaw into his meaning.

The Hero and his Guide now enter on their journey:

Ibant obſcuri ſola ſub nocte per umbras:
Perque domos Ditis vacuas, & inania regna.
Quale per incertam lunam ſub luce maligna
Eſt iter in ſylvis: ubi cœlum condidit umbra
Jupiter, & rebus nox abſtulit atra colorem.

This deſcription will receive much light from a paſſage in Lucian's dialogue of *the Tyrant*. As a company made up of every condition of life are voyaging together to the other world, Mycillus breaks out and ſays; "Bleſs us! how dark it is! What is become of the "fair Megillus? In this ſituation, who can tell, whether Sim-"miche or Phryne be the handſomer? Every thing is alike, and "of one colour; there is no room for comparing Beauties. My "old cloak, which but now preſented to your eyes ſo irregular "a figure, is become as honourable a wear as his Majeſty's purple. "They are, indeed, both vaniſhed ‡, and retired together under "the

* De raptu Proſerpinæ, lib. i. ſub init.

† Athenis initiatus [Auguſtus] cum poſtea Romæ pro tribunali de privilegio ſacerdotum Atticæ Cereris cognoſceret, & quædam ſecretoria proponerentur, dimiſſo concilio & corona circumſtantium, ſolus audiit diſceptantes. Sueton. lib. ii. Octav. Aug. cap. 93.

‡ The original has a peculiar elegance. ΑΦΑΝΗ γὰρ ἄμφω, &c. alludes to the ancient Greek notions concerning the *firſt matter*, which they called ἀφανὴς, *inviſible*, as being without

" the ſame cover. But my friend, the Cynic, where are You!
" give me your hand: *you are initiated in the* ELEUSINIAN MYS-
" TERIES. *Tell me now, do you not think this very like the blind*
" *march the good company make there?* CY. *Oh, extremely: and ſee,*
" *here comes one of the Furies, as I gueſs by her equipage, her torch,*
" *and her terrible looks* *."

The Sibyl, on their approach to the mouth of the cave, had adviſed Æneas to ſummon up all his courage, as being to undergo the ſevereſt trial:

Tuque invade viam, vaginaque eripe ferrum:
Nunc animis opus, Æenea, nunc pectore firmo.

Theſe trials were of two ſorts: the encountering *real* labours and difficulties; and the being expoſed to *imaginary and falſe* terrors. This latter was objected to all the Initiated in general: the other was reſerved for Chiefs and Leaders. On which account, Virgil deſcribes them both, in their order; as they were both to be undergone by his Hero. The real labours are figured under theſe words:

Veſtibulum ante ipſum, primiſque in faucibus Orci,
Luctus & ultrices poſuere cubilia Curæ:
Pallenteſque habitant Morbi †, triſtiſque Senectus,

without the qualities of *form* and *colour*. The inveſting Matter with theſe qualities, was the production of bodies, the τὰ φαινόμενα: and their diſſolution, a return to a ſtate of *inviſibility*.—εἰς ΑΦΑΝΕΣ χωρεῖ τὰ διαλυόμενα, as the pretended Merc. Triſmag. has it, cap. xi. *Matter*, in this ſtate of inviſibility, was, by the earlier Greeks, called ΑΔΗΣ. Afterwards, the ſtate itſelf was ſo called; and at length it came to ſignify the abode of departed ſpirits.

* ΜΙ. Ἡράκλεις τῶ ζόφω· πῶ νῦν ὁ καλὸς Μέγιλλος, ἢ τῷ διαγνῷ τις ἐνταῦθα εἰ καλλίων Φρύνης Σιμίχη, πάνυ γὰρ ἴσα, καὶ ὁμόχροα, καὶ ὀδὸν ὅτε καλὸν, ὅτε καλλίον· ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τὸ τριβώνιον, πρότερον τέως ἄμορφον εἶναι δοκῶν, ἰσότιμον γίγνεται τῇ πορφυρίδι τῶ βασιλέως· ἀφανῆ γὰρ ἄμφω, καὶ ὑπὸ τῷ αὐτῷ σκότῳ καταδεδυκότα. Κυνίσκε, σὺ δὲ πῶ πότε ἄρα ὢν τυγχάνεις;—ἔμβαλέ μοι τὴν δεξιάν· εἰπέ μοι, ἐτελέσθης γὰρ, ὦ Κυνίσκε, τὰ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΑ, ἢ ΟΜΟΙΑ τοῖς ἐκεῖ ἐνθαδί σοι δοκεῖ; ΚΥΝ. εὖ λέγεις· ἰδὲ μὴ προσέχειν δαδουχῶσά τις, φοβερόν τι, καὶ ἀπαίσιον προσβλέπουσα· ἢ ἄρα πῶ Ἐρινύς; ἔστιν; Luciani Cataplus, T. I. p. 643. Edit. Reitzii, 4°, Amſtel. 1743.

† Quint. is miſtaken in ſuppoſing pallentesque, &c. a *metonomy*. Had this been the deſcription of an *Hoſpital* he had been right: For then, indeed, in theſe words, the *cauſe* would have been put for the *effect*.

Et metus, & maleſuada Fames, & turpis Egeſtas:
Terribiles viſu formæ; Lethumque, Laboſque:
Tum conſanguineus Lethi Sopor, & mala mentis
Gaudia, mortiferumque adverſo in limine Bellum,
Ferreique Eumenidum thalami, & Diſcordia demens——

To underſtand the force of this deſcription, it will be neceſſary to tranſcribe the account the ancients have left us of the probationary trials in the *Myſteries* of MITHRAS, whoſe participation was more particularly aſpired to, by Chiefs and Leaders of armies; whence theſe Initiated were commonly called the SOLDIERS OF MITHRAS *. "No one, ſays Nonnus, could be initiated into theſe *Myſteries* [of "Mithras] till he had paſſed gradually through the probationary "labours [by which he was to acquire a certain *apathe* and ſanc-"tity.] There were eighty degrees of theſe labours, from leſs to "greater: and when the aſpirant has gone through them all, he is "initiated. Theſe labours are—to paſs through fire, to endure cold, "hunger, and thirſt, to undergo much journeyings; and, in a "word, every toil of this nature †."

The ſecond ſort of trial were the *panic terrors*, of the *Myſteries*; and theſe, Virgil repreſents next. And to diſtinguiſh them from the figurative deſcription of the *real labours* preceding, he ſeparates the two accounts by that fine circumſtance of the *tree of dreams*, which introduces the ſecond ſort:

In medio ramos annoſaque brachia pandit
Ulmus opaca, ingens: quam ſedem ſomnia vulgo

* Erubeſcite, Romani commilitones ejus, jam non ab ipſo judicandi, ſed ab aliquo MITHRÆ MILITE: qui cum initiatur in ſpelæo, &c. Tertull. De corona militis.

† ὁ δύναῖαι ἂν τις εἰς αὐτὸν τελεσθῆναι, εἰ μὴ πρότερον διὰ τῶν βαθμῶν τῶν κολάσεων παρέλθοι. βαθμοὶ δὲ εἰσι κολάσεων τὸν μὲν ἀριθμὸν ὀγδοήκοντα, ἔχοντες δὲ ὑπόβασιν καὶ ἀνάβασιν· κολάζονται γὰρ πρῶτον τὰς ἐλαφροτέρας, εἶτα τὰς δραστικωτέρας. καὶ εἶθ' ὅτω μετὰ τὸ παρελθεῖν διὰ πασῶν τῶν κολάσεων, τότε τελεῖται ὁ τελούμενος· αἱ δὲ κολάσεις εἰσὶ τὸ διὰ πυρὸς παρελθεῖν, τὲ διὰ χεύες, διὰ πείνης καὶ δίψης, διὰ ὁδοιπορίας πολλῆς, καὶ ἁπλῶς διὰ πασῶν τῶν τοιούτων. Nonnus, in Secundam Nazianz. Steleuticam. And again he ſays, ἀδεὶς δὲ δύναῖαι τελεῖσθαι τὰς τῦ Μίθρυ τελετὰς, εἰ μὴ διὰ πασῶν τῶν κολάσεων παρέλθοι, καὶ δείξοι ἑαυτὸν ἀπαθῆ τινα καὶ ὅσιον, &c.

Vana

Vana tenere ferunt, foliisque ſub omnibus hærent.
Multaque præterea variarum monſtra ferarum,
Centauri in foribus ſtabulant, Scyllæque biformes,
Et centum geminus Briareus & bellua Lernæ;
Horrendum ſtridens, flammiſque, armata Chimæra:
Gorgones, Harpyæque, & forma tricorporis umbræ.

Theſe *terribiles viſu formæ* are the ſame which *Pletho*, in the place quoted above, calls ἀλλόκοτα τὰς μορφὰς φάσματα, as they were ſeen in the entrance of the *Myſteries*; and which Celſus tells us, were likewiſe preſented in the Bacchic rites; τοῖς ἐν ταῖς Βακχικαῖς Τελεταῖς τὰ φάσματα καὶ δείματα προεισάγουσι *.

But it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that though theſe things had the uſe here aſſigned to them, it was ſome circumſtance in the recondite phyſiology of the Eaſt, which preferred them to this ſtation. We are to conſider then this dark entrance into the *Myſteries*, as a repreſentation of the CHAOS, thus deſcribed:

Ibant obſcuri ſola ſub nocte per umbram,
Perque domos Ditis *vacuas* & *inania* regna.

And amongſt the ſeveral Powers invoked by the Poet, at his entrance on this ſcene, CHAOS is one:

Dî, quibus imperium eſt animorum umbræque ſilentes:
Et CHAOS & Phlegethon, *loca nocte tacentia late*.

Now a fragment of Beroſus, preſerved by George Syncellus, deſcribes the ancient CHAOS, according to the phyſiology of the Chaldeans, in this manner,—"There was a time, they ſay, when "all was water and darkneſs. And theſe gave birth and habitation "to MONSTROUS ANIMALS OF MIXED FORMS AND SPECIES. For "there were men with two wings, others with four, and ſome "again with double faces. Some had the horns of goats, ſome "their legs, and ſome the legs of horſes; others had the hind-

* Origen. contra Celſ. lib. iv. p. 167.

" parts of horſes, and the fore-parts of men, like the hippocen-
" taurs. There were bulls with human heads, dogs with four
" bodies ending in fiſhes, horſes with dogs heads; *and men, and*
" *other creatures with the heads and bodies of horſes, and with the*
" *tails of fiſhes.* And a number of animals, whoſe bodies were a
" MONSTROUS COMPOUND of the diſſimilar parts of beaſts of various
" kinds. Together with theſe, were fiſhes, reptiles, ſerpents, and
" other creatures, which, by a reciprocal tranſlation of the parts to
" one another, became all portentouſly deformed: the pictures and
" repreſentations of which were hung up in the temple of Belus.
" A woman ruled over the whole, whoſe name was Omoroca, in
" the Chaldee tongue Thalath, which, in Greek, ſignifies the Sea;
" and (on account of their powerful connexion) the Moon *."
This account ſeems to have been exactly copied in the *Myſteries*, as appears from the deſcription of the poet:

Multaque præterea variarum monſtra ferarum
Centauri in foribus ſtabulant, Scyllæque biformes,
Et centum geminus Briareus, & belluæ Lernæ
Horrendum ſtridens, flammiſque armata Chimæra:
Gorgones, Harpyiæque, & forma TRICORPORIS umbræ.

The CANINE figures have a conſiderable ſtation in this region of monſters: And he tells us,

—viſæque CANES ululare per umbram:

* Γενίσθαι φησὶ χρόνον, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πᾶν, σκότος καὶ ὕδωρ εἶναι, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ζῶα τερατώδη, καὶ εἰδιφυεῖς τὰς ἰδέας ἔχοντα ζωογονεῖσθαι. Ἀνθρώπους γὰρ διπλέρους γεννηθῆναι, ἐνίους δὲ καὶ τετραπλέρους, καὶ διπροσώπους.—τοὺς μὲν αἰγῶν σκέλη καὶ κέρατα ἔχοντας, τοὺς δὲ ἱππόποδας, τοὺς δὲ τὰ ὀπίσω μὲν μέρη ἵππων, τὰ δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἀνθρώπων, ὃς ἱπποκενταύρους τὴν ἰδέαν εἶναι. Ζωογονηθῆναι δὲ καὶ ταύρους, ἀνθρώπων κεφαλὰς ἔχοντας· καὶ κύνας τετρασωμάτους, οὐρὰς ἰχθύος ἐκ τῶν ὄπισθεν μερῶν ἔχοντας, καὶ ἵππους κυνοκεφάλους, καὶ ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἕτερα ζῶα, κεφαλὰς μὲν καὶ σώματα ἵππων ἔχοντα, οὐρὰς δὲ ἰχθύων καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ζῶα παντοδαπῶν θηρίων μορφὰς ἔχοντα. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, ἰχθύας, καὶ ἑρπετὰ, καὶ ὄφεις, καὶ ἄλλα ζῶα πλείονα θαυμαστὰ καὶ παρηλλαγμένα τὰς ὄψεις ἀλλήλων ἔχοντα, ὧν καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας, ἐν τῷ τοῦ Βήλου ναῷ ἀνακεῖσθαι. Ἄρχειν δὲ τούτων πόλεως γυναῖκα, ᾗ ὄνομα Ὁμορωπά. Εἶναι δὲ τοῦτο Χαλδαϊστὶ μὲν Θαλάθ, ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ μεθερμηνευόμενα Θάλασσα, καλὰ δὲ ἰσόψηφον Σελήνην. Georg. Syncel. Chronogr.

which

which Pletho explains in his ſcholia on the magic oracles of Zoroaſter. "It is the cuſtom, in the celebration of the *Myſteries*, to "preſent before many of the Initiated, phantaſms of a CANINE "figure, and other monſtrous ſhapes and appearances *."

The woman, whoſe name *Thalath* coincides with that of the *Moon*, was the *Hecate* of the Greeks, who is invoked by Æneas on this occaſion:

Voce vocans HECATEN *cælo Ereboque* potentem.

Hence terrifying viſions were called *Hecatea* †. The reaſon why Hecate, or the Moon, came to be one of the Governeſſes in theſe rites, was, becauſe ſome had placed Elyſium in the Moon; the Elyſian fields being from thence called the *fields of Hecate*. The ancients called Hecate, *Diva* TRIFORMIS. And Scaliger obſerves that this word *Thalath*, which Syncellus, or Beroſus, ſays, was equivalent to the Moon, ſignifies TRIA.

And now we ſoon find the Hero in a fright;

Corripit hic ſubita trepidus formidine ferrum
Æneas, ſtrictamque aciem venientibus offert.

With theſe affections the Ancients repreſent the *Initiated* as poſſeſſed on his firſt entrance into theſe holy Rites. "Entering now into the "myſtic dome (ſays Themiſtius) he is filled with horror and "amazement. He is ſeized with ſolicitude, and a total perplexity: "he is unable to move a ſtep forward, and at a loſs to find the en-"trance to that road which is to lead him to the place he aſpires to. "Till the Prophet [the *vates*] or Conductor, laying open the veſ-"tibule of the temple ‡"—To the ſame purpoſe Proclus: "—As

* Εἴωθε τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν τελουμένων φαίνεσθαι κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς κυνώδη τινὰ, καὶ ἄλλα, ἀλλόκοτα τὰς μορφὰς φάσματα.

† Schol. Apollon. Argon. l. iii. v. 859.

‡ Ὁ μὲν ἄρτι προσιὼν τοῖς ἀδύτοις, φρίκης τε ἀνεπίμπλαται καὶ ἰλίγγου· ἀδημονίᾳ τὶ ἴσχνα καὶ ἀπορίᾳ συμπάσῃ, οὐδὲ ἴχνους λαβέσθαι οἷός τε ὢν, ὅτε ἀρχῆς ἡγησόμενον ἐπιλήξασθαι εἴσω φερούσης ὑπύτε δὲ ὁ προφήτης ἐκπῖπτον· ἀναπετάσας τὰ προπύλαια τοῦ νεώ. Orat. in Patrem.

"in

" in the moſt holy *Myſteries*, before the ſcene of the myſtic viſions, " there is a terror infuſed over the minds of the Initiated, ſo," &c *.

The adventurers come now to the banks of Cocytus. Æneas is ſurprized at the crowd of ghoſts which hover round it, and appear impatient for a paſſage. His Guide tells him they are thoſe who have not had the rites of ſepulture performed to their manes, and ſo are doomed to wander up and down for a hundred years, before they be permitted to croſs the river :

Nec ripas datur horrendas, nec rauca fluenta
Tranſportare prius, quam ſedibus oſſa quierunt.
Centum errant annos, volitantque hæc litora circum.
Tum demum admiſſi ſtagna exoptata reviſunt.

We are not to think this old notion took its riſe from the vulgar ſuperſtition. It was one of the wiſeſt contrivances of ancient politics ; and came originally from Egypt, the fountain-head of legiſlation. Thoſe profound maſters of wiſdom, in projecting for the common good, found nothing would more contribute to the ſafety of their fellow citizens than the public and ſolemn interment of the dead; as without this proviſion, private murders might be eaſily and ſecurely committed. They therefore introduced the cuſtom of pompous funeral rites: and, as Herodotus and Diodorus tell us, were of all people the moſt circumſtantially ceremonious in the obſervance of them. To ſecure theſe by the force of Religion, as well as civil cuſtom, they taught, that the deceaſed could not retire to a place of reſt, till theſe rites were performed. The notion ſpread ſo wide, and fixed its roots ſo deep, that the ſubſtance of the ſuperſtition remains, even to this day, in moſt civilized countries. By ſo effectual a method did the Legiſlature gain its end, the ſecurity of the citizen. There is a circumſtance in claſſical antiquity

* Ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς ἀγιωτάταις τελεταῖς πρὸ τῶν μυστικῶν θεαμάτων ἔκπληξις τῶν μυουμένων, οὕτω — In Plat. Theol. lib. iii. cap. 18.

which

which will ſufficiently inform us of how great moment theſe rites were eſteemed. HOMER, SOPHOCLES, and EURIPIDES, are confeſſed to be the greateſt maſters of their art, and to have given us the beſt models of it. Yet, in the judgement of modern critics, the funeral rites for Patroclus, in the Iliad, and for Ajax and Polynices, in the Ajax and the Phœnicians, are a vicious continuation of the ſtory, which violates the *unity of the action*. But they did not conſider, that funeral rites were anciently deemed an inſeparable part of the Hero's ſtory: And therefore thoſe great maſters of deſign could not underſtand the action to be complete, till that important office to the dead was diſpatched *. Nay ſo dreadful was the apprehenſion of the want of *funeral Rites*, that the Hiſtorians tell us, it was one of the principal cauſes of the Spartan baſhfulneſs, in that War in which *Tyrtæus* was employed to reſtore them to their ancient Spirit. Who when he had diſſipated this ſuperſtitious terror by the magic of his martial numbers, they ruſhed on to the charge with a reſolution to conquer or to die.

But the Egyptian Sage found, afterwards, another uſe in this opinion; and by artfully turning it to a puniſhment on inſolvent debtors, ſtrengthened public credit, to the great advantage of commerce, and conſequently of civil community. For, inſtead of that general cuſtom of modern barbarians to bury inſolvents alive, this polite and humane people had a law of greater efficacy, which denied burial to them when dead. And here the learned Marſham ſeems to be miſtaken, when he ſuppoſes, that the Grecian opinion of the wandering of unburied ghoſts aroſe from this interdiction of ſepulchral rites †. On the contrary it appears, that the law was

* Προσεθῆναι δὲ ἔτι τούτῳ τῷ νομῳ τόνδε, τὸν διδόντα τὸ χρέος, καὶ ἀπάσης κρατέειν τῆς τοῦ λαμβάνοντος θήκης· τῷ δὲ ὑποθέντι τοῦτο τὸ ἐνέχυρον τόνδε ἐπεῖναι ζημίην, ἢν μὴ βουλομένῳ ἀποδόναι τὸ χρέος, μηδὲ αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ, τελευτήσαντι εἶναι ταφῆς κυρῆσαι μήτ' ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ πατρώῳ τάφῳ, μήτ' ἐν ἄλλῳ μηδενὶ, μήτ' ἄλλον μηδένα τὸν ἐωυτοῦ ἀπογενόμενον θάψαι. Herod. lib. ii. cap. 136. Edit. Gale, p 142. lin. 8.

† Ab interdictæ apud Ægyptios ſepulturæ pœnâ, inolevit apud Græcos opinio inſepultorum corporum animas à Charonte non eſſe admiſſas. Canon Chronicus, Seculum xi. ſec. 3.

founded

founded on the opinion, originally Egyptian, and not the opinion on the law; for the law had no other ſanction than the opinion.

In a word, had not our poet conceived it a matter of much importance, he had hardly dwelt ſo long upon it, or returned again to it *, or laid ſo much ſtreſs on it, or made his hero ſo attentively conſider it:

Conſtitit Anchiſa ſatus, & veſtigia preſſit,
Multa Putans.

But having added,

—Sortemque animo miſeratus *iniquam*;

and Servius commented, "Iniqua enim ſors eſt puniri propter alte-"rius negligentiam: nec enim quis culpa ſua caret ſepulchro;" Mr. Bayle cries out †, "What injuſtice is this! was it the fault of "theſe ſouls, that their bodies were not interred?" But neither of them knowing the origin of this opinion, nor ſeeing its uſe, the latter aſcribes *that* to the blindneſs of Religion, which was the iſſue of wiſe Policy. Virgil, by his *ſors iniqua*, means no more than that in this, as well as in ſeveral other civil inſtitutions, *a public benefit was often a private injury.*

The next thing obſervable is the ferry-man, Charon; and he, the learned well know, was a man of this world, an Egyptian of a well-known Character. This People, like the reſt of mankind, in their deſcriptions of the other world, uſed to copy from ſomething they were well acquainted with in this. In their funeral rites, which, as we obſerved, was a matter of greater moment with them than with any other people, they uſed to carry their dead over the Nile, and through the marſh of Acheruſia, and there put them into ſubterraneous caverns; the ferry-man employed in this buſineſs being, in their language, called Charon. Now in their *Myſteries*, the deſcription of the paſſage into the other world was borrowed,

* Ver. 373. & ſeq.

† Reſponſ. aux Queſt. d'un Provincial, p. iii. cap. 22.

as

as was natural, from the circumſtances of their funeral rites. So that the Charon *below* might very well refuſe to charge his Boat with thoſe whom his nameſake *above* had not admitted. And it might be eaſily proved, if there was occaſion, that the Egyptians themſelves transferred theſe realities into the ΜΥΘΟΣ, and not the Greeks, as later writers generally imagine.

Charon is appeaſed at the ſight of the *golden bough*:

Ille admirans venerabile donum
Fatalis virgæ, LONGO POST TEMPORE viſum.

But it is repreſented as the paſſport of all the ancient Heroes who had deſcended into hell; how then could it be ſaid to be *longo poſt tempore viſum*, Æneas being ſo near the times of thoſe Heroes? To explain this, we muſt have in mind what hath been ſaid above of a perfect Lawgiver's being held out in Æneas, and of Auguſtus's being delineated in the Trojan chief. So that here Virgil is pointing to his Maſter; and what he would inſinuate, is, that the Roman emperor, initiated in the Eleuſinian rites, ſhould, in a later age, rival the fame of the firſt Grecian Lawgivers.

But Æneas hath now croſſed the river, and is come into the proper regions of the dead. The firſt Apparition that occurs is the dog Cerberus:

Hæc ingens latratu regna trifauci
Perſonat, adverſo recubans immanis in antro.

This is plainly one of the phantoms of the *Myſteries*, which, Pletho tells us above, was in the ſhape of a dog, κυνώδη τινά. And in the fable of Hercules's deſcent into hell, which, we have ſhewn, ſignified no more than his Initiation into the *Myſteries*, it is ſaid to have been, amongſt other things, for fetching up the dog Cerberus.

The Propheteſs, to appeaſe his rage, gives him a medicated cake, which caſts him into a ſlumber:

Cui vates, horrere videns jam colla colubris,
Melle ſoporatam et medicatis frugibus offam
Objicit.

In the *Myſteries* of Trophonius (who was ſaid to be nurſed by Ceres*, that is, as I underſtand it, to derive his rites from the Eleuſinian) the Initiated carried the ſame ſort of medicated Cakes to appeaſe the ſerpents he met with in his paſſage †. Tertullian, who gives all *Myſteries* to the devil; and very equitably, as the good man makes *him* the author of all that is done there, mentions the offering up of theſe cakes, *celebrat et panis oblationem* ‡. This in queſtion was of *poppy-ſeed*, made up with honey; and ſo I underſtand *medicatis frugibus*, here, on the authority of the poet himſelf, who, in the fourth book, makes the prieſteſs of Venus prepare the ſame treat for the *dragon* who guarded the Heſperian fruit:

Spargens humida mella ſoporiferumque papaver.

Honey, as we have ſhewn above, was ſacred to Proſerpine, who on that account was called Μελιτώδης; and the *poppy* was conſecrated to Ceres: "Cereale Papaver," ſays Virgil; on which words Servius thus comments: "Vel quod eſt uſui, ſicut frumentum, vel quo "Ceres uſa eſt ad oblivionem doloris; nam ob raptum Proſerpinæ "vigiliis defatigata, guſtato eo acta eſt in ſoporem §."

But, without doubt, the images, which the ſpiſcated juice of poppy preſents to the fancy, was one reaſon why this drug had a place in the ceremonial of the SHEWS: not improbably, it might be given to ſome at leaſt of the *Initiated*, to aid the impreſſion of thoſe myſtic viſions which paſſed before them. For that ſomething like this was done, that is, giving medicated drugs to the Aſpirants, we are informed by Plutarch; who ſpeaks of a ſhrub called Leucophyllus uſed in the celebration of the *Myſteries* of *Hecate*, which drives men into a kind of frenzy, and makes them confeſs all the

* Δήμητρι—τῷ Τροφωνίῳ εἶναι τροφόν. Pauſan. Bœot. c. 39. pag. 790. Edit. Kuhnii, folio, Lipſ. 1696.

† Μελιτοῦντας ἐπάγουσι ἐν ταῖν χερσῖν, μελίσματα ἱερεῖων.——Philoſ. Vit. Apoll. l. viii. c. 15.

‡ De præſcr. adver. hæret.

§ Ad lib. i. Georg. ver. 212.

wick-

wickedneſs they had done or intended. And *confeſſion* was one neceſſary preparative for initiation.

The regions, according to Virgil's Topography, are divided into three parts: 1. PURGATORY. 2. TARTARUS. 3. ELYSIUM. For Deiphobus (in the firſt) ſays,

Diſcedam, EXPLEBO numerum, reddarque tenebris *.

And, in the ſecond, it is ſaid of Theſeus,

Sedet, ÆTERNUMque ſedebit
Infelix Theſeus.——

The *Myſteries* divided them in the ſame manner. So Plato, in the paſſage † quoted above (where he ſpeaks of what was taught in the *Myſteries*) talks of ſouls ſticking faſt in mire and filth, and remaining in darkneſs, till a long ſeries of years had purged and purified them; and Celſus, in *Origen* ‡, ſays, that the *Myſteries* taught the doctrine of eternal puniſhments.

Of all the three States this of Tartarus only was *eternal*. There was, indeed, another, in the ancient pagan theology, which had the ſame relation to Elyſium, that Tartarus had to Purgatory, the extreme of reward, as Tartarus of puniſhment. But then this ſtate was not in the infernal regions, but in Heaven. Neither was it the lot of common Men, but reſerved for *heroes* and *dæmons*; Beings of a ſuperior order, ſuch as Hercules, Bacchus, &c. who became Gods on their admiſſion into Heaven, where *eternity* was the conſequence of their deification.

Cicero diſtinguiſhes the two orders of ſouls, according to the vulgar Theology, in this manner: "Quid autem ex hominum "genere conſecratos, ſicut Herculem & cæteros coli lex jubet, in"dicat *omnium* quidem *animos immortales* eſſe: FORTIUM BONORUM"QUE DIVINOS §."

* But the nature and end of this purgatory the poet deſcribes at large, from ver. 736, to ver. 745.

† See note (‡) p. 209.

‡ See note (†) p. 220.

§ De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 12.

And here it is to our purpoſe to obſerve, that the Virtues and Vices, which ſtock theſe three Diviſions with inhabitants, are ſuch as more immediately affect Society. A plain proof that the poet followed the views of the Legiſlator, the inſtitutor of the *Myſteries.*

PURGATORY, the firſt diviſion, is inhabited by ſuicides, extravagant lovers, and ambitious warriors: And, in a word, by all thoſe who had indulged the violence of their paſſions; which made them rather wretched than wicked. It is remarkable that amongſt theſe we find one of the *Initiated:*

Cererique ſacrum Polybœten.

This was agreeable to the public doctrine of the *Myſteries*, which taught, that initiation with virtue procured men great advantages over others, in a future ſtate; but that without virtue, it was of no avail.

Of all theſe diſorders, the poet hath more diſtinctly marked out the miſery of SUICIDE:

Proxima deinde tenent mœſti loca, qui ſibi lethum
Inſontes peperere manu, lucemque peroſi
Projecere animas. Quam vellent æthere in alto
Nunc & pauperiem & duros perferre labores!

Here he keeps cloſe to the myſteries; which not only forbad *ſuicide*, but taught on what account it was criminal. "That "which is ſaid in the MYSTERIES (ſays Plato) concerning theſe "matters of man's being placed in a certain watch or ſtation, which "it is unlawful to fly from, or forſake, is a profound doctrine, "and not eaſily fathomed *." *Inſontes*, ſays the Poet, to diſtinguiſh Suicides (properly ſo called) from thoſe whom the Laws condemned to be their own Executioners: for this inhuman treat-

* Ὁ μὲν ἔν ἐν ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΟΙΣ λεγόμενος περὶ αὐτῶν λόγος, ὡς ἔν τινι φρουρᾷ ἐσμὲν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ οὐ δεῖ δὴ ἑαυτὸν ἐκ ταύτης λύειν, οὐδ' ἀποδιδράσκειν, μεγάς τε τις μοι φαίνεται καὶ οὐ ῥᾴδιος διϊδεῖν. Phæd. p. 62. Ser. ed. tom. i. See note BB, at the end of this Book.

ment

ment was amongſt the capital inflictions, in the Criminal Code of the Ancients.

Hitherto all goes well. But what muſt we ſay to the poet's putting *new-born infants*, and *men falſely condemned*, into his purgatory? For though the *faith and inquiſition* of modern Rome ſend many of both ſorts into a place of puniſhment, yet the genius of ancient paganiſm had a gentler aſpect. It is, indeed, difficult to tell what theſe inmates have to do here. Let us conſider the caſe of the *infants*; and if we find it can only be cleared up by the general view of things here given, this will be conſidered as another argument for the truth of our interpretation of the DESCENT:

Continuo *auditæ voces, vagitus et ingens,*
Infantumque animæ flentes in limine primo:
Quos dulcis vitæ exortes, & ab ubere raptos
Abſtulit atra dies, & *funere* merſit *acerbo*.

Theſe appear to have been the *cries and lamentings* that, Proclus tells us, were heard in the Myſteries *. So that we only want to know the original of ſo extraordinary a circumſtance. Which I take to have been juſt ſuch another proviſion of the Lawgiver for the ſecurity of INFANCY, as that about *funeral rites* was for the ADULT. For nothing could more engage Parents in the care and preſervation of their young, than ſo terrible a doctrine. Nor are we to imagine, that their natural fondneſs needed no inforcement, or ſupport: for that moſt degenerate and horrid practice among the ancients, of EXPOSING INFANTS, was univerſal †; and had almoſt eraſed *mortality* from the minds of the beſt inſtructed, and *inſtinct* from the breaſts of the moſt tenderly affected ‡. St. Paul ſeems to have had this in his eye, when he accuſed the pagan world of being WITHOUT

* Καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις τὰς μυστικὰς ΘΡΗΝΟΣ μυστικῶς παραλήψαμεν. In Comment. in Platonis Remp. lib. x.

† See note CC, at the end of this Book.

‡ See what has been further ſaid on this ſubject B. I. Sect. 4.

NATURAL

NATURAL AFFECTION *. It needed therefore the ſtrongeſt and ſevereſt check: and I am well perſuaded it occaſioned this counterplot of the Magiſtrate, in order to give inſtinct fair play, and call back baniſhed nature. Nothing, indeed, could be more worthy of his care: for the deſtruction of children, as Pericles finely obſerved of youth, is *like cutting off the ſpring from the year*. Accordingly we are told by Diodorus, that the Egyptians had a law † againſt this unnatural practice, which law he numbers amongſt the ſingularities of that highly policied nation. "They are obliged (ſays he) to bring up "all their children, in order to render the country populous; this "being eſteemed the beſt means of making ſtates flouriſhing and "happy ‡." And Tacitus ſpeaks of the prohibition as no leſs ſingular amongſt the Jews: "Augendæ multitudini conſulitur. Nam "& NECARE QUEMQUAM EX GNATIS, NEFAS §."

Here again Mr. Bayle is much ſcandalized: "The firſt thing "which we meet on the entrance into the other world, is the ſta-"tion aſſigned to INFANTS, who cried and lamented without "ceaſing; and next to that, the ſtation of men unjuſtly condemned "to death. Now what could be more ſhocking or ſcandalous than "the puniſhment of thoſe little creatures, who had yet committed "no ſin, or of thoſe perſons whoſe innocence had been oppreſſed "by calumny ||?" The firſt difficulty is already cleared up: the ſecond ſhall be conſidered by and by. But it is no wonder Mr. Bayle could not digeſt this doctrine of the *infants*; for I am much miſ-

* 1 Cor. i. 31.

† See note DD, at the end of this Book.

‡ Καὶ τὰ γεννώμενα πάνλα τρέφουσιν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἕνεκα τῆς πολυανθρωπίας ὡς ταύτης μέγιστα συμβαλλομένης πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν χώρας τε καὶ πόλεων. Lib. i. Hiſtor.

§ Tacit. Hiſt. lib. v.

|| La premiere choſe que l'on rencontroit à l'entrée des Enfers, étoit la ſtation des petits enfans, qui ne ceſſoient de pleurer, & puis celle des perſonnes injuſtement condamnées à la mort. Quoi de plus choquant, de plus ſcandaleux, que la peine de ces petites creatures, qui n'avoient encore commis nul péche; ou que la peine de ceux, dont l'innocence avoit été opprimée par la calomnie. Reſponſ. aux Quæſt. d'un Prov. p. 3. cap. xxii.

taken,

taken, if it did not ſtick with Plato himſelf; who, relating the *Viſion of Erus, the Pamphilian*, concerning the diſtribution of rewards and puniſhments in another life, when he comes to the condition of infants, paſſes it over in theſe words: ——"But of chil-"dren who died in their infancy, he reported certain other things "NOT WORTHY TO BE REMEMBERED *." Erus's account of what he ſaw in another world, was a ſummary of what the Egyptians taught in their *Myſteries* concerning that matter. And I make no doubt but the thing *not worthy to be remembered*, was the doctrine of *infants in purgatory*: which appears to have given Plato much ſcandal, who did not, at that time at leaſt, reflect upon its original and uſe. But here let us take notice, for the honour of HUMANITY, that while Pagans both old and new could be ſhocked at this puniſhment, modern papiſts, to the eternal diſgrace of SUPERSTITION, can condemn unbaptiſed Infants, without remorſe, to infinitely greater.

But now, as to the FALSELY CONDEMNED, we muſt ſeek another ſolution:

Hos juxta, falſo damnati crimine mortis;
Nec vero hæ ſine ſorte datæ, ſine judice ſedes.
Quæſitor Minos urnam movet: ille ſilentum
Conſiliumque vocat, vitaſque & crimina diſcit.

This deſignment appears both iniquitous and abſurd. The *falſely accuſed* † are not only in a place of puniſhment, but, being firſt delivered under this ſingle predicament, they are afterwards diſtinguiſhed into two ſorts; ſome as blameable, others as innocent. To clear up this confuſion, it will be neceſſary to tranſcribe an old ſtory, told by Plato, in his *Gorgias*:——"This law, concerning "mortals, was enacted in the time of Saturn, and is yet, and ever "will be, in force amongſt the Gods; that he who had lived a juſt

* Τῶν δὲ ἄλλων γενομένων, ἐν ὀλίγον χρόνον βιόντων περὶ ἄλλα ἔλεγεν ΟΥΚ ΑΞΙΑ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ. De rep. lib. x. p. 615. Serr. edit.

† Servius, on the place, characterizes them in this manner—"qui ſibi per ſimplici-"tatem adeſſe nequiverunt."

"and

" and pious life, ſhall, at his death, be carried into the iſlands of " the bleſſed, and there poſſeſs all kinds of happineſs, untainted " with the evils of mortality: but that he who had lived unjuſtly " and impiouſly, ſhall be thruſt into a place of puniſhment, the " priſon of divine juſtice, called Tartarus. Now the judges, with " whom the execution of this law was intruſted, were, in the time " of Saturn, and under the infancy of Jove's government, *living* " *men, ſitting in judgment on the living*; and paſſing ſentence on " them, upon the day of their deceaſe. This gave occaſion to unjuſt " judgments: on which account, Pluto, and thoſe to whom the " care of the happy iſlands was committed, went to Jupiter, and " told him, that men came to them *wrongfully judged, both when* " *acquitted, and when condemned.* To which the Father of the " Gods thus replied: I will put a ſtop to this evil. Theſe wrong " judgments are partly occaſioned by the corporeal covering of the " perſons judged; for they are tried while living: now many have " their corrupt minds hid under a fair outſide, adorned with birth " and riches; and, when they come to their trial, have witneſſes " at hand, to teſtify for their good life and converſation; this per- " verts the proceſs, and blinds the eyes of juſtice. Beſides, the " judges themſelves are encumbered with the ſame corporeal co- " vering: and eyes and ears, and an impenetrable tegument of fleſh, " hinder the mind from a free exertion of its faculties. All theſe (as " well their own covering, as the covering of thoſe they judge) are " bars and obſtacles to right judgment. In the firſt place then, ſays " he, we are to provide that the foreknowledge which they now " have of the day of death, be taken away; and this ſhall be given " in charge to Prometheus; and then provide, that they who come " to judgment, be quite naked *; for from henceforth they ſhall " not be tried, till they come into the other world. And as they

* This evidently refers to the old Egyptian cuſtom, when the judges beheld and examined their kings naked; ὅτω καὶ ὁ Ἄρχων δικαστὴς ὢν ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς χρόνοις, γυμνὸν ἐθεώρει τὸν βασιλέα. Horapollinis Hierogl. lib. i. cap. 40.

" are

" are to be thus ſtripped, it is but fit their judges ſhould await them
" there in the ſame condition; that, at the arrival of every new
" inhabitant, ſoul may look on ſoul, and all family relation, and
" every worldly ornament being dropt and left behind, RIGH-
" TEOUS JUDGEMENT may at length take place. I, therefore, who
" foreſaw all theſe things before you felt them, have taken care
" to conſtitute my own ſons to be the judges: two of them, Minos
" and Rhadamanthus, are Aſiatics; the third, Æacus, an Euro-
" pean. Theſe, when they die, ſhall have their tribunal erected in
" the ſhades, *juſt in that* part of the highway, where the two roads
" divide, the one leading to the happy iſlands, the other to Tar-
" tarus. Rhadamanthus ſhall judge the Aſiatics, and Æacus the
" Europeans; but to Minos I give the ſuperior authority of hearing
" appeals, when any thing obſcure or difficult ſhall perplex the
" others' judgments; that every one may have his abode aſſigned
" him with the utmoſt equity *."

* Ἦν ἓν νόμῳ ὅδε περὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ Κρόνου, καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐστὶν ἐν θεοῖς. τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν μὲν δικαίως τὸν βίον διελθόντα καὶ ὁσίως, ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσῃ, εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀπιόντα, οἰκεῖν ἐν πάσῃ εὐδαιμονίᾳ ἐκτὸς κακῶν· τὸν δὲ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀθέως, εἰς τὸ τῆς τίσεώς τε καὶ δίκης δεσμωτήριον, ὃ δὴ τάρταρον καλοῦσιν, ἰέναι. Τούτων δὲ δικασταὶ ἐπὶ Κρόνου, καὶ ἔτι νεοστὶ τοῦ Διὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντος, ζῶντες ἦσαν ζώντων, ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ δικάζοντες ἢ μέλλοιεν τελευτᾶν· κακῶς ἓν αἱ δίκαι ἐκρίνοντο. Ὅτε ἓν Πλούτων καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ ἐκ μακάρων νήσων ἴοντες, ἔλεγον πρὸς τὸν Δία, ὅτι φοιτῶεν σφὶν ἄνθρωποι ἀναξίως ἐπαίροντες ἀνάξιοι, εἶπεν ἓν ὁ Ζεύς, Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ (ἔφη) παύσω τοῦτο γιγνόμενον· νῦν μὲν γὰρ κακῶς αἱ δίκαι δικάζονται. ἀμπεχόμενοι γὰρ (ἔφη) οἱ κρινόμενοι κρίνονται· ζῶντες γὰρ κρίνονται, Πολλοὶ ἓν ψυχὰς πονηρὰς ἔχοντες, ἠμφιεσμένοι εἰσὶ σώματά τε καλὰ, καὶ γένη καὶ πλούτους· καὶ ἐπειδὰν ἡ κρίσις ᾖ, ἔρχονται αὐτοῖς πολλοὶ μάρτυρες, μαρτυρήσαντες ὡς δικαίως βεβιώκασιν. Οἱ ἓν δικασταὶ ὑπό τε τούτων ἐκπλήττονται, καὶ ἅμα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀμπεχόμενοι δικάζουσι, πρὸ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ὦτα καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα προκεκαλυμμένοι· ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῖς πάντα ἐμπρόσθιον γίγνεται, καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν ἀμφιέσματα, καὶ τὰ τῶν κρινομένων. Πρῶτον μὲν ἓν (ἔφη) παυστέον ἐστὶ προειδότας αὐτὰς τὸν θάνατον· νῦν γὰρ προΐσασι· τοῦτο μὲν ἓν καὶ δὴ εἴρηται τῷ Προμηθεῖ, ὅπως ἂν παύσῃ αὐτῶν· ἔπειτα γυμνοὺς κρίσιον ἀπάντων τούτων. τεθνεῶτας γὰρ δεῖ κρίνεσθαι· καὶ τὸν κρίνοντα δεῖ γυμνὸν εἶναι, τεθνεῶτα, αὐτῇ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχὴν θεωρεῖν, ἐξαίφνης ἀποθανόντος ἑκάστου, ἔρημον πάντων τῶν συγγενῶν· καταλιπόντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πάντα ἐκεῖνον τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα δικαία ἡ κρίσις ᾖ. Ἐγὼ μὲν ἓν ταῦτα ἐγνωκὼς πρότερος ὑμεῖς, ἐποιησάμην δικαστὰς υἱεῖς ἐμαυτῷ. δύο μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, Μίνω τε καὶ Ῥαδαμάνθυν· ἕνα δὲ ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης, Αἰακόν· Οὗτοι ἓν ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσωσι, δικάσουσιν ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι, ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ, ἐξ ἧς φέρουσι τὼ ὁδὼ, ἡ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἡ δ' εἰς τάρταρον· καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας Ῥαδαμάνθυς κρινεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης Αἰακός. Μίνῳ δὲ πρωτεῖα δώσω, ἐπιδιακρίνειν, ἐὰν ἢ ἀπόρρητόν τι τῷ ἑτέρῳ, ἵνα ὡς δικαιοτάτη ἡ κρίσις ᾖ περὶ τῆς πορείας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Tom. i. p. 523. Serr. Edit.

The matter now begins to clear up; and we ſee plainly, that the circumſtance of the *falſely condemned* alludes to this old fable: ſo that by *falſo damnati crimini mortis* (if it be the true reading) VIRGIL did not mean, as one would ſuppoſe, *innocentes addicti morti ob injuſtam calumniam*, but *homines indigne et perperam adjudicati*; not *men falſely condemned*, but *wrongfully judged*, whether to acquittal or conviction; but condemnation being ofteneſt the ſentence of juſtice, the greater part is put figuratively for the whole.

He who thinks this too licentious a figure, will perhaps be inclined to believe, that the poet might write,

Hos juxta, falſo damnati TEMPORE mortis:

which not only points up to the fable, but hints at the original of it; and beſides, agrees beſt with the context. But as the words *tempore mortis* are only to be explained by this paſſage of Plato, a tranſcriber might be eaſily tempted to change them to ſomething more intelligible.

One difficulty only remains; and that, to confeſs the truth, hath ariſen rather from a miſtake of Virgil, than of his reader. We find theſe people yet unjudged, already fixed, with other criminals, in the aſſigned diſtrict of purgatory. But they are miſplaced, through an overſight of the poet; which, had he lived to perfect the Æneis, he would probably have corrected: for the fable tells us they ſhould be ſtationed on the borders of the three diviſions, in that part of the high road, which dividing itſelf in two, leads, the one to Tartarus, the other to Elyſium, thus deſcribed by the poet:

Hic locus eſt, partes ubi ſe via findit in ambas,
Dextera, quæ Ditis magni ſub mœnia tendit:
Hic iter Elyſium nobis; at læva malorum
Exercet pœnas, & ad impia Tartara mittit.

It only remains to conſider the origin or moral of the fable; which, I think, was this: it was an Egyptian cuſtom, as we are told by *Diodorus Siculus*, for judges to ſit on every man's life, at the time of

of his interment; to examine his paſt actions, and to condemn and acquit according to the evidence before them. Theſe judges were of the prieſthood; and ſo, it is probable, taught, like the prieſts of the church of Rome, that their decrees were ratified in the other world. Partiality and corruption would, in time, pervert their decrees; and ſpite and favour prevail over juſtice: As this might ſcandalize the people, it would be found neceſſary to teach, that the ſentence which was to influence every one's final doom, was reſerved for a future judicature. However, the Prieſt took care that all ſhould not go out of his hands; and when he could ſit no longer *Judge*, he contrived to find his account in turning *Evidence*: as may be ſeen by the ſingular caſt of this ancient inſcription: "Ego "Sextus Anicius Pontifex TESTOR honeſte hunc vixiſſe: manes "ejus inveniant quietem *."

How much this whole matter needed explaining, we may ſee by what a fine writer makes of it, in a diſcourſe written to illuſtrate Æneas's deſcent into hell: "There are three kinds of perſons (ſays he) "deſcribed as being ſituated on the BORDERS; and I can give no "reaſon for their being ſtationed there in ſo particular a manner, "but becauſe none of them ſeem to have had a proper right to a "place among the dead, as not having run out the thread of their "days, and finiſhed the term of life that had been allotted them "upon earth. The firſt of theſe are the ſouls of infants, who are "ſnatched away by untimely ends; the ſecond are of thoſe who "are put to death wrongfully and by an unjuſt ſentence; and the "third, of thoſe who grew weary of their lives, and laid violent "hands upon themſelves †."

After this, follow the epiſodes of Dido and Deïphobus, in imitation of Homer; where we find nothing explanatory of the true nature of this epiſode, but the ſtrange deſcription of Deïphobus; whoſe mangled phantom is drawn according to the philoſophy of

* Fabius Celſus Inſcript. Antiq. lib. iii.

† Mr. Addiſon's Works, vol. ii. p. 300, quarto edit. 1721.

Plato; which teaches that the dead not only retain all the paſſions of the mind, but all the marks, and blemiſhes of the body *. A wild doctrine, which Lucian agreeably rallies in his *Menippus*; who is made to ſay, that he ſaw Socrates in the Shades, buſied at his old trade of *Diſputation:* but that his legs yet appeared ſwelled, from the effects of his laſt deadly potion †.

Æneas, having paſſed this firſt diviſion, comes now on the confines of TARTARUS; and is inſtructed in what relates to the crimes and puniſhments of the inhabitants.

His guide here more openly declares her office of HIEROPHANT, or interpreter of the *Myſteries:*

Dux inclyte Teucrûm,
Nulli fas caſto ſceleratum inſiſtere limen:
Sed ME *cum lucis* HECATE PRÆFECIT *avernis*,
Ipſa Deûm pœnis DOCUIT, *perque omnia* DUXIT—

It is remarkable, that Æneas is led through the regions of Purgatory and Elyſium; but he only ſees the ſights of Tartarus at a diſtance, and this could not well be otherwiſe in the ſhews of the *Myſteries*, for very obvious reaſons.

The criminals deſtined to eternal puniſhment, in this diviſion, are,

1. Thoſe who had *ſinned ſo ſecretly as to eſcape the animadverſion of the Magiſtrate:*

Gnoſſius hæc Rhadamanthus habet duriſſima regna:
Caſtigatque auditque dolos, SUBEGITQUE FATERI
Quæ quis apud ſuperos, FURTO lætatus inani,
Diſtulit in ſeram commiſſa piacula mortem.

* Μαγιγίας αὖ εἴτις ἦν, καὶ ἴχνη εἶχε τῶν πληγῶν ἀλλὰς ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἢ ὑπὸ μαστίγων ἢ ἄλλων τραυμάτων ζῶν, καὶ τεθνεῶτος τὸ σῶμά ἐστιν ἰδεῖν ταῦτα ἔχον· καλεσάγοτα εἴτε ἦν μέρη, ἢ διεστραμμένα ζῶντος, καὶ τεθνεῶτος ταῦτα ἔνδηλα· ἐνὶ δὲ λόγῳ οἷος εἶναι παρεσκεύασο τὸ σῶμα ζῶν, ἔνδηλα ταῦτα καὶ τελευτήσαντος ἦν πάντα, ἢ τὰ πολλὰ ἐπί τινα χρόνον. Georg. p. 524.

† ἔτι μέντοι ἐπεφύκει αὐτῷ, καὶ διῳδήκει ἐκ τῆς φαρμακοποσίας τὰ σκέλη. T. I. p. 481. Edit. Reitzii, 4°, Amſtel. 1743.

And

And it was principally on account of ſuch crimes that the Law-giver inforced the doctrine of a future ſtate of puniſhment. But it is worth while to obſerve, that, according to the teaching of the *Myſteries*, the RACK TO EXTORT CONFESSION, came originally from THE PLACE OF THE DAMNED, where only it could be equitably applied.

2. Thoſe whoſe principles diſſolve the firſt bonds of aſſociation, and ſociety, the ATHEISTS and *deſpiſers of God and religion:*

Hic genus antiquum terræ Titania pubes.

This was agreeable to the laws of Charondas, who ſays: "Be "the contempt of the Gods put in the number of the moſt flagi-"tious crimes *," The poet dwells particularly on that ſpecies of impiety which affects divine honours:

Vidi & crudeles dantem Salmonea pœnas,
Dum flammas Jovis & ſonitus imitatur Olympi.

And this without doubt, was an oblique caſtigation of the APOTHEOSIS, then beginning to be paid and received at Rome.

3. The *infringers of the duties of* IMPERFECT *obligation, which civil laws cannot reach:* ſuch as thoſe without natural affection to brothers, duty to parents, protection to clients, or charity to the poor:

Hic quibus inviſi fratres, dum vita manebat;
Pulſatuſve parens; & fraus innexa clienti †;
Aut qui divitiis ſoli incubuere repertis,
Nec partem poſuere ſuis; quæ maxima turba eſt.

4. Thoſe peſts of public and private peace, the TRAYTOR and the ADULTERER; with all their various ſpawn, of *perjury* and *inceſt:*

* Ἐγω δὲ μέγιστα ἀδικήματα θεῶν καταφρόνησις. Apud Stobæi Serm. xlii. p. 290. lin. 34. Tiguri, fol. 1559.

† So the law of the Twelve Tables: PATRONUS SI CLIENTI FRAUDEM FECERIT, SACER ESTO.

Quique

Quique ob adulterium cæſi, quique arma ſecuti
Impia, nec veriti dominorum fallere dextras—
Vendidit hic auro patriam, dominumque potentem
Impoſuit; fixit leges pretio, atque refixit.
Hic thalamum invaſit natæ, vetitoſque hymenæos.

It is obſervable, he does not ſay, ſimply, *adulteri*, but *ob adulterium cæſi*; as implying, that the greateſt civil puniſhment pleads for no mitigation of this crime at the bar of divine juſtice.

5. The INVADERS AND VIOLATERS OF THE HOLY MYSTERIES, held out in the perſon of Theſeus, make the fifth and laſt claſs of offenders:

Sedet, æternumque ſedebit
Infelix Theſeus; Phlegyaſque * miſerrimus omnes
Admonet, & magna teſtatur voce per umbras:
DISCITE JUSTITIAM MONITI, ET NON TEMNERE DIVOS.

The fable ſays, that Theſeus and his friend Pirithous formed a deſign to ſteal Proſerpine from hell; but being taken in the fact, Pirithous was thrown to the dog Cerberus, and Theſeus kept in chains †, till he was delivered by Hercules: which without doubt means the death of one, and the impriſonment of the other, for their clandeſtine intruſion into the *Myſteries*. We have already offered ſeveral reaſons, to ſhew that the deſcent of Theſeus into hell, was a *violation of the Myſteries*: to which we may add what the ancients tell us of the duration of his impriſonment, which was four years; the interim between the celebrations of the greater *Myſteries*. So Seneca the tragedian makes him ſay:

* The Phlegyæ here mentioned, I take to be thoſe people of Bœotia ſpoken of by Pauſanias, who attempting to plunder the temple of Apollo at Delphi, were deſtroyed by lightning, earthquakes, and peſtilence; hence Phlegyæ, I ſuppoſe, ſignified impious, ſacrilegious perſons in general; and is ſo to be underſtood in this place.

† Καλασχεθέντων δὲ αὐτῶν, Πειρίθοον μὲν ἐδάφθη
Τῷ τρικεφάλῳ τῷ κυνὶ, Θησεὺς δ' εἱρκτῇ κατεδέθη.

Jo. Tzetzes, C. ii. cap. 51.

Tandem

Tandem profugi noctis æternæ plagam,
Vaſtoque manes carcere umbrantem polum.
Ut vix cupitum ſufferunt oculi diem!
Jam QUARTA *Eleuſis* dona Triptolemi ſecat,
Paremque toties Libra compoſuit diem;
Ambiguus ut me ſortis ignaræ labor
Detinuit inter mortis & vitæ mala *.

This may reconcile the contradictory accounts of the fable concerning Theſeus; ſome of which ſay he was delivered from hell; others, that he was eternally detained there. The *firſt* relates to the liberty given him by the preſident of the *Myſteries* at the enſuing celebration: the other, to what the *Myſteries* taught he and all would ſuffer in the other world for *violating* them. This leads us to a circumſtance which will much confirm the general interpretation of this famous Epiſode. In Æneas's ſpeech to the Sibyl, Theſeus is put amongſt thoſe heroes who went to, and returned from, hell:

Quid Theſea magnum,
Quid memorem Alciden?——

But in the place before us he is repreſented as confined there eternally. Julius Hyginus, in his *Commentaries on Virgil* †, thinks this a groſs contradiction; which Virgil would have corrected, had he lived to finiſh the poem. But can it be ſuppoſed, the poet was not aware of this, in two paſſages ſo near one another, in the ſame book? In truth, his employing theſe differing circumſtances, confirms the general interpretation; and the general interpretation helps to reconcile the difference. Æneas wanted to be initiated; and when he ſpeaks to the Sibyl, or *Myſtagogue*, he enumerates thoſe heroes who had been initiated before him; that is, ſuch who had ſeen the *ſhews* of the *Myſteries*, of which number was Theſeus, though he had intruded violently. But when Virgil

* Hippol.

† A. Gellii Noct. Att. lib. x. cap. 16.

comes

comes to deſcribe theſe *Shews*, which were ſuppoſed to be a true repreſentation of what was done and ſuffered in Tartarus, Theſeus is put among the *damned*, that being his ſtation in the other world.

This will remind the learned reader of a ſtory told by Livy. "The Athenians (ſays he) drew upon themſelves a war with "Philip, on a very ſlight occaſion; and at a time when nothing "remained of their ancient fortune, but their high ſpirit. Two "young Acarnanians, during the days of INITIATION, themſelves "*uninitiated*, and ignorant of all that related to that ſecret worſhip, "entered the temple of CERES along with the crowd. Their diſ-"courſe ſoon betrayed them; by making ſome abſurd enquiries "into the meaning of what they ſaw: ſo being brought before the "Preſident of the *Myſteries*, although it was evident they had en-"tered ignorantly and without deſign, they were put to death, as "guilty of a moſt abominable crime *."

The office Theſeus is put upon, of admoniſhing his hearers againſt IMPIETY, could not, ſure, be diſcharged in theſe *ſhews* by any one ſo well, as by him who repreſented the Violator of them. But the critics, unconſcious of any ſuch deſign, conſidered the taſk the poet has impoſed on Theſeus, of perpetually ſounding in the ears of the damned, this admonition:

DISCITE JUSTITIAM MONITI, ET NON TEMNERE DIVOS,

as a very impertinent employment. For though it was a ſentence of great truth and dignity, it was preached to very little purpoſe amongſt thoſe who were never to hope for pardon or remiſſion.

Even the ridiculous Scarron hath not neglected to put it in this

* Contraxerant autem cum Philippo bellum Athenienſes haudquaquam digna cauſa, dum ex vetere fortuna nihil præter animos ſervant. Acarnanes duo juvenes per initiorum dies, non initiati, templum Cereris, imprudentes religionis, cum cetera turba ingreſſi ſunt. Facile eos ſermo prodidit, abſurde quædam percunctantes; deductique ad antiſtites templi cum palam eſſet per errorem ingreſſos, tanquam ob infandum ſcelus, interfecti ſunt. Hiſt. lib. xxxi.

abſurd

abſurd light * ; and it muſt be owned, that, according to the common ideas of Æneas's deſcent into hell, it can hardly be ſeen in any other.

But, ſuppoſe Virgil to be here relating the admonitory maxims delivered during the celebration of theſe MYSTIC SHEWS, and nothing could be more juſt or uſeful : for then the diſcourſe was addreſſed to the *vaſt multitude of living ſpectators.* Nor is it a mere ſuppolition that ſuch diſcourſes made part of theſe repreſentations. Ariſtides expreſsly ſays †, that in no place were more aſtoniſhing words pronounced or ſung, than in theſe *Myſteries.* The reaſon, he tells us, was, that the *ſounds* and the *ſights* might mutually aſſiſt each other in making an impreſſion on the minds of the Initiated. But, from a paſſage in Pindar, I conclude, that in theſe ſhews (from whence men took their ideas of the infernal regions) it was cuſtomary for each offender, as he paſſed by, in machinery, to make an admonition againſt his own crime. "It is reported (ſays Pindar) that "Ixion, by the decrees of the Gods, while he is inceſſantly turning "round his rapid wheel, calls out upon MORTALS to this effect, "That they ſhould be always at hand to repay a benefactor for "the ſervices he had done them ‡." Where the word BPOTOI, *living men,* ſeems plainly to ſhew that the ſpeech was at firſt made before men in this world.

The poet cloſes his catalogue of the damned with theſe words:

Auſi omnes immane nefas, AUSOQUE POTITI.

* Cette ſentence eſt bonne & belle,
Mais en Enfer de quoi ſert-elle ?

† Τίνι δ' ἄλλῳ χωρίων, ἢ μύθων φῆμαι θαυμαστότερα ἐφύμνησαν, ἢ τὰ δρώμενα μείζω ἴσχυ τὴν ἔκπληξιν, ἢ μᾶλλον εἰς ἐφαμίλλον καθίστη ταῖς ἀκοαῖς τὰ δρώμενα ; Eleuſ.

‡ Θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖσιν
Ἰξίονα φασὶ ταῦτα
Ῥιπᾶς λέγειν, ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῷ
Πανὶὰ κυλινδόμενον,
Τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς ἀμοιβαῖς
Ἐποιχομένοις τίνεσθαι. 2 Pyth.

For the antients thought that an action was ſanctified by the ſucceſs; which they eſteemed a mark of the favour and approbation of the Gods:

Victrix Cauſa Diis PLACUIT, ſed victa Catoni.

As this was a very pernicious doctrine, it was neceſſary to teach, that the imperial villain who trampled on his country, and the baffled plotter who expired on a gibbet, were equally the objects of divine vengeance.

Æneas has now paſſed *Tartarus*; and here end the LESSER MYSTERIES. Their original explains why this ſort of *ſhews* was exhibited in them. We are told, they were inſtituted for the ſake of Hercules, when about to perform his eleventh labour, of fetching Cerberus from hell *, and were under the preſidency of *Proſerpine* †.

The Hero advances to the borders of ELYSIUM, and here he undergoes the *luſtration*:

Occupat Æneas aditum, *corpuſque recenti*
Spargit aqua, ramumque adverſo in limine figit.

"Being now about to undergo the luſtrations (ſays Sopater) which "immediately precede initiation into the *greater Myſteries*, they "called me happy ‡."

Accordingly, Æneas now enters on the GREATER MYSTERIES, and comes to the abodes of the bleſſed:

Devenere locos lætos, & amœna vireta
Fortunatorum nemorum, ſedeſque beatas:
Largior hic campos æther, & lumine veſtit
Purpureo: ſolemque ſuum, ſua ſidera norunt.

* οἱ Ἐλευσίνιοι ἐπ' αὐτῷ τὰ μικρὰ ἐποιήσαντο μυστήρια——Ἐμυήθη ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τὰ δι' αὐτὸν [Ἡρακλέα] λεγόμενα ΜΙΚΡΑ μυστήρια. Tzetz. in Lycoph.

† τὰ δὲ μικρὰ Περσεφόνης——Schol. Ariſtoph. ad Plut. ſecund.

‡ Μέλλων δὲ τοῖς καθαρσίοις, τοῖς πρὸ τῆς τελετῆς, ἐπεύχεσθαι, ἐκάλεσεν εὐδαίμονα ἐμαυτόν. In Diviſ. Quæſt.

Theſe

Theſe two ſo different ſcenes of Tartarus and Elyſium explain what Ariſtides meant, when he called the ſhews of *Eleuſinian Myſteries, that moſt ſhocking, and, at the ſame time, moſt raviſhing repreſentation* *.

The Initiated, who till now only bore the name of Μύσαι, are called ΕΠΟΠΤΑΙ, and this new viſion, ΑΥΤΟΨΙΑ. "The Αὐτοψία "or the ſeeing with their own eyes (ſays Pſellus) is when he who "is initiated beholds the divine lights †."

In theſe very circumſtances Themiſtius deſcribes the Initiated, when juſt entered upon this ſcene. "It being thoroughly purified, "he now diſcloſes to the Initiated, a region ‡ all over illuminated, "and ſhining with a divine ſplendor. The cloud and thick dark-

* τῶτον φρικαλέϛαλόν τε καὶ φαιδρόταλον. Eleuſ.

† Αὐτοψία ἐϛὶν, ὅταν αὐτὸς ὁ τελούμενος τὰ θεῖα φῶτα ἴδῃ. In Schol. in Orac. Zoroaſt.

‡ This which was *all over illuminated*, and which the prieſt had *thoroughly purified*, was ἄγαλμα, an image. The reaſon of transferring what is ſaid of the illumination of the *image*, to the illumination of the region, is, becauſe this image repreſented the appearances of the divine Being, in one large, uniform, extenſive light. Thus Jamblichus De myſteriis: Μία δὴ ταῦτα τῶν αὐτοφανῶν ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΩΝ λόγως ἀφορισόμεθα· ἐκεῖν ἐν μὲν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ΑΥΤΟΨΙΑΙΣ, ἐνεργέϛερα καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας ὁρᾶται τὰ θεάματα, ἀκριβῶς τε διαλάμπει, καὶ διηρθρωμένα λαμπρῶς ἐκφαίνεται.—And again, Ὡσαύτως τοίνυν καὶ ἐπὶ τῦ ΦΩΤΟΣ· τὰ μὲν τῶν θεῶν ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΑ φωτὸς πολέως ἀϛράπτει—τὸ μὲν τῶν θεῶν πῦρ, ἄτομον, ἀφθεγκτὸν ἐκλάμπει· καὶ πλήρει τὰ ὅλα βάθη τῦ κόϛμυ πυρίως, ἀλλ' ὡ περικοσμίως. § ii. cap. 4. He ſays, too, that it was *without figure*, ψυχῆς δὲ τῆς μὲν ὅλης, καὶ ἐν εἴδει τῶν καλὰ μέρος εἴδει καλλιχρωμένης πῦρ ὁρᾶται ἀνείδεον—cap. 7. To this image, the following lines in the Oracles of Zoroaſter allude:

Μὴ φύσεως καλέϛης ΑΥΤΟΠΤΟΝ ΑΓΑΛΜΑ,
Οὐ γὰρ χρὴ κείνης σε βλέπειν πρὶν σῶμα ΤΕΛΕΣΘΗι.

"Invoke not the ſelf-conſpicuous image of nature, for thou muſt not behold theſe "things before thy body be purified by initiation." This αὐτοπτον ἄγαλμα was only a diffuſive ſhining light, as the name partly declares, thus deſcribed preſently after, in the ſame Oracles:

Ἠίκα βλέψῃς μορφῆς ἔτις εἰλίχιον πῦρ,
Λαμπόμενον ϛιβαδὸν ὅλε κατὰ βένθεα κόϛμυ,
Κλῦθι ψυχὴς ζωήν.

And the *ſight* of this divine ſplendor was what the Myſteries called, ΑΥΤΟΨΙΑ.

" neſs are diſperſed * ; and the mind emerges, as it were, into day, " full of light and chearfulneſs; as before, of diſconſolate obſcu- " rity †."

Let me obſerve, that the lines,

Largior hic campos æther, & lumine veſtit
Purpureo: SOLEMque ſuum, ſua ſidera norunt,

are in the very language of thoſe, who profeſs to tell us what they ſaw at their *initiation into the greater Myſteries*. " Nocte media " vidi SOLEM *candido* coruſcantem lumine ‡," ſays Apuleius on that occaſion: for *candido* and *purpureo lumine* ſignify the very ſame thing.

Here Virgil, by leaving his Maſter, and copying the amiable paintings of Elyſium as they were repreſented in the *Myſteries*, hath artfully avoided a fault, too juſtly objected to Homer, of giving ſo dark and joyleſs a landſcape of the *fortunata nemora*, as could raiſe no deſire or appetite for them: his favourite Hero himſelf, who inhabited them, telling Ulyſſes, that he had rather be a day-labourer above, than command in the regions of the dead. Such a repreſentation defeats the very intent of the Lawgiver, in propagating the doctrine of a future ſtate. Nay, to mortify every excitement to noble actions, the Greek poet makes reputation, fame, and glory, the great ſpur to virtue in the pagan ſyſtem, to be viſionary and impertinent. On the contrary, Virgil, whoſe aim, in this poem, was the ſervice of Society, makes the love of

* Pletho tells us with what theſe clouds were accompanied, viz. thunder and lightning, and other meteoric appearances. Τὰ δὲ τελεμίοις φαινόμενα, περαυνοὶ, καὶ πῦρ, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο, σύμβολα ἄλλως ἐστὶν, ἃ θεῖ τῆς φυσις. In Schol. ad Orac. Mag. Zor. He ſays they were ſymbols, but not of the nature of the deity: and this was true; for the ſymbol of this Nature was the αὐτοπλον ἄγαλμα which followed. Hence, as we ſee above, it was *without figure*.

† —ἀποσμήξας παλαχόθεν, ἐπεδείκνυ τῷ μυουμένῳ μαρμαρύσσον τε ἦδη, καὶ αὐγῇ καλαλαμπόμενον θεοπεσίῃ, ἥτε ὁμίχλη ἐκείνη, καὶ τὸ νέφος ἀθρόον ὑπερρήγνυτο· καὶ ἐξιφαίνετο ὁ νοῦς ἐκ τοῦ βάθους, φέγγος ἀνάπλεως καὶ ἀγλαΐας ἀπὸ τοῦ πρότερον σκότου. Orat. in Patrem.

‡ Met. lib. xi.

glory

glory ſo ſtrong a paſſion in the other world, that the Sibyl's promiſe to Palinurus, that his NAME ſhould be affixed to a promontory, rejoices his ſhade even in the regions of the unhappy:

Æternumque locus Palinuri *nomen* habebit:
His dictis curæ emotæ, pulſuſque parumper
Corde dolor triſti; GAUDET COGNOMINE TERRA.

They were the licentious ſtories of the Gods, and this ungracious deſcription of Elyſium (both ſo pernicious to ſociety) which made Plato drive Homer out of his Republic.

But to return. The poet having deſcribed the climate of the happy regions, ſpeaks next of the amuſements of its inhabitants:

Pars in graminis exercent membra palæſtris;
Contendunt ludo, & fulva luctantur arena.

Beſides the obvious alluſion, in theſe lines, to the philoſophy of Plato, concerning the duration of the paſſions, it ſeems to have a more ſecret one to what he had all the way in his eye, the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*; whoſe celebration was accompanied with the GRECIAN GAMES *. On which account too, perhaps, it was that, in the diſpoſition of his work, his fifth book is employed in the *Games* as a prelude to the *Deſcent* in the ſixth.

1. The firſt place, in theſe happy regions, is aſſigned to LEGISLATORS, *and the founders of Society, who brought men from a ſavage to a civil life.*

Magnanimi Heroës, nati melioribus annis.

At the head of theſe is Orpheus, the moſt renowned of the European Lawgivers; but better known under the character of Poet: for the firſt laws being written in meaſure, to allure men to learn them, and, when learnt, to retain them, the fable would have it,

* Ἐνδοξόταῖοι πάντων οἱ καλὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀγῶνες· καὶ μὴν τάττων πρεσβύταῖος ὁ τῶν Παναθηναίων· εἰ δὲ βέλει, ὁ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων. Ariſtides Panath.—Μυηθῆναι δὲ ξένων πρώτους Ἡρακλέα, καὶ Διοσκόρους· ἀγῶνά τε γυμνικὸν γενέσθαι πρῶτον Ἐλευσῖνι τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Idem Eleuſin.

that

that by the force of harmony, he ſoftened the ſavage inhabitants of Thrace:

Threïcius longa cum veſte ſacerdos
Obloquitur numeris ſeptem diſcrimina vocum.

But he has the firſt place; becauſe he was not only a Legiſlator, but the Introducer of the *Myſteries* into that part of Europe.

2. The next is allotted to PATRIOTS, *and thoſe who died for the ſervice of their country:*

Hic manus, ob patriam pugnando vulnera paſſi.

3. The third to *virtuous and pious* PRIESTS:

Quique ſacerdotes caſti, dum vita manebat:
Quique pii vates & Phœbo digna locuti.

For it was of principal uſe to Society, that religious men ſhould lead holy lives; and that they ſhould teach nothing of the Gods but what was agreeable to the divine nature.

4. The laſt place is given to the INVENTORS OF ARTS *mechanical and liberal:*

Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes:
Quique ſui memores alios fecere merendo.

The order is exact and beautiful. The firſt claſs is of thoſe who FOUNDED Society, heroes and lawgivers: the ſecond, of thoſe who SUPPORTED it, patriots and holy prieſts: and the third, of thoſe who ADORNED it, the inventors of the arts of life, and the recorders of worthy actions.

Virgil has all along cloſely followed the doctrine of the *Myſteries*, which carefully taught that virtue only could entitle men to happineſs; and that rites, ceremonies, luſtrations, and ſacrifices would not ſupply the want of it.

Nor has he been leſs ſtudious in copying their *ſhews* and *repreſentations*; in which the figures of thoſe heroes and heroines, who were

were moſt celebrated in the writings of the ancient Greeks, paſſed in proceſſion *.

But, notwithſtanding this entire conformity between the poet's ſcenes and thoſe repreſented in the *Myſteries*, ſomething is ſtill wanting to complete the proofs: and that is, the famous SECRET of the *Myſteries*, THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD, of which ſo much hath been ſaid above. Had Virgil neglected to give us this characteriſtic mark, though, even then, we could not but ſay, his intention was *to repreſent an Initiation*; yet we muſt have been forced to own he had done it but imperfectly. But he was too good a painter, to leave any thing ambiguous; and hath therefore concluded his hero's *Initiation*, as was the cuſtom, with inſtructing him in the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, or the doctrine of the UNITY. Till this was done, the *Initiated* was not arrived to the higheſt ſtage of perfection; nor, in the fulleſt ſenſe, intitled to the appellation of ΕΠΟΠΤΗΣ.

Muſæus, therefore, who had been *Hierophant* at Athens, takes the place of the Sibyl (as it was the cuſtom to have different Guides in different parts of the celebration) and is made to conduct him to the receſs, where his Father's ſhade opens to him *the doctrine of Truth*, in theſe ſublime words:

> Principio cœlum, ac terras, campoſque liquentes,
> Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque aſtra
> SPIRITUS INTUS ALIT, totamque infuſa per artus
> MENS agitat molem, & magno ſe corpore miſcet.
> Inde hominum pecudumque genus, vitæque volantum,
> Et quæ marmoreo fert monſtra ſub æquore pontus.

This was no other than the doctrine of the old Egyptians, as we are aſſured by Plato; who ſays they taught that Jupiter was the SPIRIT WHICH PERVADETH ALL THINGS †.

* —ὅσα μὲν δὴ θέας ἐχόμενα εἶδοι γενεαὶ παμπληθεῖς εὐδαιμόνων ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀῤῥήτοις φάσμασιν· ἃ δ' εἰς τὸ μέσον ποιηταὶ, καὶ λογοποιοὶ καὶ συγγραφεῖς πάντες ἐμνῆσι.—Ariſtid.

† Ἴδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ τούτων παλαίτατα· ἦν δὲ τὰ Αἰγύπτια· τὴν Ἶσιν φασὶ, &c.—καὶ Δία μὲν, τὸ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΧΩΡΟΥΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ. In Cratylo.

We

We ſhall ſhew how eaſily the Greek Philoſophy corrupted this *principle* into (what is now called) SPINOZISM *. Here Virgil has approved his judgement to great advantage. Nothing was more abhorrent from the *Myſteries*, than Spinoziſm, as it overturned † the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, which the *Myſteries* ſo carefully inculcated; and yet the principle itſelf, of which Spinoziſm was the abuſe, was cheriſhed there, as it was the conſequence of the doctrine of the Unity, the grand ſecret of the *Myſteries*. Virgil, therefore, delivers the principle, with great caution, and pure and free of the abuſe; though he underſtood the nature of Spinoziſm, and (by the following lines in his fourth *Georgic*, where he delivers it) appears to have been infected with it:

——Deum namque ire per omnes
Terraſque tractuſque maris, cœlumque profundum.
Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum
Quemque ſibi tenues naſcentem arceſſere vitas.
Scilicet HUC REDDI DENIQUE AC RESOLUTA REFERRI
OMNIA——

But the *Myſteries* did not teach the doctrine of the Unity for mere ſpeculation; but, as we ſaid before, to obviate certain miſchiefs of polytheiſm, and to ſupport the belief of a Providence. Now, as a *future* ſtate of rewards and puniſhments did not quite remove the objections to its inequalities here, the *Myſteries* added to it the doctrine of the METEMPSYCHOSIS, or the belief of a prior ſtate ‡. And this, likewiſe, our poet has been careful to record. For after having revealed the great ſecret of the Unity, he goes on to ſpeak of the *Metempſychoſis*, or tranſmigration, in this manner:

Has omnes, ubi mille rotam volvere per annos,
Lethæum ad fluvium Deus evocat agmine magno
Scilicet immemores ſupera ut convexa reviſant,
Rurſus & incipiant in corpora velle reverti.

* Book iii. Sect. 4. † See Book iii. Sect 3. & 4.

‡ Vid. Porph. de Abſt. l. iv. ſect. 16. & Cic. Fragm. ex lib. de Philoſophia.

And

And thence takes occaſion to explain the nature and uſe of a Popiſh PURGATORY, which, in his hero's paſſage through that region, had not been done: this affords him too an opportunity for that noble epiſode, the proceſſion of the hero's poſterity, which paſſes in review before him: And with this the ſcene cloſes. One might well allow Virgil the uſe of ſo important a digreſſion, (conſidering whom it was he celebrated under the character of Æneas) though it had been foreign to the nature of the *Myſteries* he is deſcribing. But indeed he was even here following their cuſtoms very cloſely. It was then, and had been for ſome time, the practice of the *Myſteries*, when communicated to any aſpirant of diſtinguiſhed quality, to exhibit to him, in their *ſhews* and *repreſentations*, ſomething ORACULAR, relating to his own fortune and affairs. Thus Himerius tells us, that Olympia, on her upriſing, after the birth of Alexander, was initiated into the Samothracian *Myſteries*; Where, in the *ſhews*, ſhe ſaw her huſband Philip, at that time in Potidæa *.

In attending the hero's progreſs through the three eſtates of the dead, I have ſhewn, at almoſt every ſtep, from ſome ancient writer or other, the exact conformity of his adventures to thoſe of the Initiated in the *Myſteries*. We ſhall now collect theſe ſcattered lights to a point; which will, I am perſuaded, throw ſuch a luſtre on this interpretation, as to make the truth of it irreſiſtible. To this purpoſe, I ſhall have nothing to do, but to tranſcribe a paſſage from an ancient writer, preſerved by Stobæus; which profeſſes to explain the exact conformity between DEATH, or a real deſcent to the infernal regions, and INITIATION, where the repreſentation of thoſe regions was exhibited. His words are theſe: THE MIND IS AFFECTED AND AGITATED IN DEATH, JUST AS IT IS IN INITIATION INTO THE GRAND MYSTERIES. AND WORD ANSWERS TO WORD AS WELL AS THING TO THING: FOR TEAETAN IS TO

* Λέγεται πολλὰ καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα, τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου τόκοις, εὐδαίμονα ὀργιάζουσαν τὰ Καβείρων ἐν Σαμοθρᾴκῃ μυστήρια, ἰδεῖν καλὰ τὴν τελεθὴν τὸν Φίλιππον. In Eclog. Declam. apud Photium, Cod. 165. 243.

DIE; AND ΤΕΛΕΙΣΘΑΙ, TO BE INITIATED. THE FIRST STAGE IS NOTHING BUT ERRORS AND UNCERTAINTIES; LABORIOUS WANDERINGS; A RUDE AND FEARFUL MARCH THROUGH NIGHT AND DARKNESS. AND NOW ARRIVED ON THE VERGE OF DEATH AND INITIATION, EVERY THING WEARS A DREADFUL ASPECT: IT IS ALL HORROR, TREMBLING, SWEATING, AND AFFRIGHTMENT. BUT THIS SCENE ONCE OVER, A MIRACULOUS AND DIVINE LIGHT DISPLAYS ITSELF; AND SHINING PLAINS AND FLOWERY MEADOWS OPEN ON ALL HANDS BEFORE THEM. HERE THEY ARE ENTERTAINED WITH HYMNS, AND DANCES, WITH THE SUBLIME DOCTRINES OF SACRED KNOWLEDGE, AND WITH REVEREND AND HOLY VISIONS. AND NOW BECOME PERFECT AND INITIATED, THEY ARE FREE, AND NO LONGER UNDER RESTRAINTS; BUT CROWNED AND TRIUMPHANT, THEY WALK UP AND DOWN THE REGIONS OF THE BLESSED; CONVERSE WITH PURE AND HOLY MEN; AND CELEBRATE THE SACRED MYSTERIES AT PLEASURE *.

* Τὸ δέ πάσχειν πάθος, οἷον οἱ τελεῖται μεγάλαις καθεργιαζόμενοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα τῷ ῥήματι, καὶ τὸ ἔργον τῷ ἔργῳ τὸ τελευτᾶν καὶ τελεῖσθαι προσέοικε, πλάναι τὰ πρῶτα καὶ περιδρομαὶ κοπώδεις, καὶ διὰ σκότους τινὲς ἄπορροι πορεῖαι καὶ ἀτέλεστοι· εἶτα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους αὐτῷ τὰ δεινὰ πάντα, φρίκη, καὶ τρόμος, καὶ ἱδρώς, καὶ δάμβος· ἐκ δὲ τούτου, φῶς τι θαυμάσιον ἀπαντήσεται, ἢ τόποι καθαροὶ, καὶ λειμῶνες ἐδέξαντο, φωναὶ καὶ χορεῖαι καὶ σεμνότητες ἀκουσμάτων ἱερῶν, καὶ φαντασμάτων ἁγίων ἔχουσιν· ἐν οἷς ὁ παυλὸς ἤδη καὶ μεμυημένος ἐλεύθερος γεγονὼς, καὶ ἄφθονος περιὼν ἐστεφανωμένος ὀργιάζει καὶ σύνεστιν ὁσίοις καὶ καθαροῖς ἀνδράσι. Sermo cxix. p. 605. lin. 33. Tiguri, fol. 1559. The Son of Sirach, who was full of Grecian ideas, and hath embellished his admirable work of ECCLESIASTICUS with a great deal of Gentile learning, hath plainly alluded, though in few words, to these circumstances of INITIATION, where encouraging men to seek after *wisdom*, he says:—"At first she will walk with him by CROOKED ways, and bring FEAR and DREAD "upon him, and TORMENT HIM WITH HER DISCIPLINE, until she may TRUST his soul, "and TRY him by her laws. Then will she return the STRAIGHT way unto him, and "COMFORT him, and shew him her SECRETS."—διεξαμένως πορεύσεται μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν πρώτοις· ΦΟΒΟΝ δὲ καὶ ΔΕΙΛΙΑΝ ἐπάξει ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ ΒΑΣΑΝΙΣΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΝ ΠΑΙΔΙΑ ΑΥΤΗΣ, ἕως ἂν ΕΜΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ΠΕΙΡΑΣΕΙ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν αὐτῆς. Καὶ πάλιν ἐπανήξει κατ' εὐθείαν πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ΕΥΦΡΑΝΕΙ αὐτὸν, καὶ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΕΙ αὐτῷ τὰ ΚΡΥΠΤΑ αὐτῆς. Chap. iv. ver. 17, 18.

The

The progreſs finiſhed, and every thing over, Æneas and his Guide are let out again to the upper regions, through the *ivory gate* of DREAMS. A circumſtance borrowed from Homer, and very happily applied to this ſubject; for, as Euripides elegantly expreſſes it,

"ΥΠΝΟΣ τὰ ΜΙΚΡΑ τῦ θανάτυ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΑ.

A DREAM is the LESSER MYSTERIES of *death*.

But, beſides this of *ivory*, there was another of *horn*. Through the firſt iſſued *falſe* viſions; and through the latter, *true*.

Sunt geminæ Somni portæ: quarum altera fertur
Cornea, qua *veris* facilis datur exitus umbris:
Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto;
Sed *falſa* ad cœlum mittunt inſomnia manes.
His ubi tum natum *Anchiſes*, unaque Sibyllam
Proſequitur dictis, *portaque emittit eburna*.

Servius, with the rank ſpirit of a grammarian, who ſeldom finds any thing to ſtop at but a ſoleciſm in expreſſion, ſays very readily, "Vult autem intelligi, falſa eſſe omnia quæ dixit. He would have "you underſtand by this, that all he has been ſaying is falſe and "groundleſs." The following critics give the ſame ſolution. Ruæus, one of the beſt, may ſpeak for them all: "Cum igitur "Virgilius Æneam eburnea porta emittit, indicat profecto, quid-"quid a ſe de illo inferorum aditu dictum eſt, in fabulis eſſe nu-"merandum." This interpretation is ſtrengthened by Virgil's being an Epicurean; and making the ſame concluſion in his ſecond *Georgic*:

Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoſcere cauſas,
Atque metus omnes & inexorabile fatum
Subjecit pedibus, *ſtrepitumque Acherontis avari!*

But Virgil wrote, not for the amuſement of women and children over a winter's fire, in the taſte of the *Mileſian fables*; but for the

uſe of men and citizens; to inſtruct them in the duties of humanity and ſociety. The purpoſe, therefore, of ſuch a writer, when he treats of a FUTURE STATE, muſt be to make the doctrine intereſting to his reader, and uſeful in civil life: Virgil hath done the firſt, by bringing his Hero to it through the moſt perilous atchievement; and the ſecond, by appropriating the rewards and puniſhments of that ſtate to *virtue* and to *vice* only. Now if we will believe theſe critics, when the poet had laboured through a whole book, and employed all his art and genius to compaſs this important end, he fooliſhly defeats his whole deſign with one wanton daſh of his pen, which ſpeaks to this effect: "I have laboured, "countrymen, to draw you to virtue, and to deter you from vice, "in order to make particulars and ſocieties flouriſhing and happy. "The truths inforced to this purpoſe, I have endeavoured to re-"commend by the example of your anceſtor and founder, Æneas; "of whom (to do you the more credit) I have made an accom-"pliſhed hero; and have ſet him on the moſt arduous and illuſ-"trious undertaking, the eſtabliſhment of a civil community: and "to ſanctify his character, and add reverence to his laws, I have "ſent him upon the errand you ſee here related. But, leſt the "buſineſs ſhould do you any ſervice, or my hero any honour, I "muſt inform you, that all this talk of a *future ſtate* is a childiſh "tale, and Æneas's part in it, only a fairy adventure. In a word, "all that you have heard, muſt paſs for a lenten dream, from "which you are to draw no conſequences, but that the poet was "in a capricious humour, and diſpoſed to laugh at your ſuper-"ſtitions." Thus is Virgil made to ſpeak in the interpretation of ancient and modern critics *. And this the concluſion he was pleaſed to give to the maſter-piece of all his writings.

* This abſurdity did not eſcape the learned Dacier, who, in his note on porta fugiens eburna, l. iii. Od. xxvii. of Horace, ſays,—Mais ce qu'il y a d'etonnant, c'eſt que Virgile fait ſortir Anchiſe par la porte d'yvoire, qui eſt celle des faux ſonges; par la il detruit toutes les grandes choſes qu'il a dites de Rome & d'Auguſte.

The

The truth is, the difficulty can never be gotten over, but by ſuppoſing THE DESCENT TO SIGNIFY AN INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES. This will unriddle the enigma, and reſtore the poet to himſelf. And if this was Virgil's purpoſe, it is to be preſumed, he would give ſome private mark to aſcertain his meaning: for which no place was ſo proper as the concluſion. He has, therefore, with a beauty of invention worthy of himſelf, made this fine improvement on Homer's ſtory of the *two gates*; and by imagining that of horn for true viſions, and that of ivory for falſe, inſinuates, by the firſt, the *reality* of another ſtate; and by the ſecond, the *ſhadowy* repreſentations of it in the ſhews of the *Myſteries*: ſo that, not the things themſelves, but only the pictures of them, objected to Æneas, were falſe; as the Scene did not lye in HELL, but in the TEMPLE OF CERES. This repreſentation being called ΜΥΘΟΣ, κατ' ἐξοχήν. And this we propoſe as the true meaning of,

Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto:
Sed FALSA ad cœlum mittunt inſomnia manes.

For *falſa inſomnia* do not ſignify *lying*, but *ſhadowy dreams*. Thus the Roman widow, in the famous ſepulchral inſcription *, begs the Dii manes to be ſo indulgent to her huſband's ſhade, that ſhe may ſee him in her dreams; that is, ſeem to ſee him, as the ſhade of Hector was ſeen by Æneas,

In ſomnis ecce ante oculos mœſtiſſimus Hector
Viſus adeſſe mihi——

and this, in diſtinction to what the Roman Widow makes the other part of her prayer, to be *really* joined to him in the other world.

* ITA PETO VOS MANES
SANCTISSIMI
COMMENDATVM HABEATIS
MEVM CONIVGEM ET VEL-
LITIS
HVIC INDVLGENTISSIMI ESSE
HORIS NOCTVRNIS
VT EVM VIDEAM
ET ETIAM ME FATO SVADERE
VELLIT VT ET EGO POSSIM
DULCIVS ET CELERIVS
APVD EVM PERVENIRE.

Apud Grut. p. 786.

But

But though the viſions which iſſued from the ivory gate were *unſubſtantial*, as being only repreſentative; yet I make no queſtion, but the ivory gate itſelf was *real*. It appears, indeed, to be no other than the ſumptuous door of the temple, through which the *Initiated* came out, when the *celebration* was over. This temple was of an immenſe bigneſs, as appears from the words of Apuleius: "Senex comiſſimus ducit me protinus ad ipſas fores ÆDIS AMPLIS-"SIMÆ *. Strabo is more particular: Next (ſays he) is Eleuſis, "in which is the temple of the Eleuſinian Ceres, and the myſtic "cell built by Ictinus, CAPABLE OF HOLDING AS LARGE A NUM-"BER AS A THEATRE †." But Vitruvius's deſcription of it is ſtill more curious: "ELEUSINÆ Cereris & Proſerpinæ cellam IMMANI "MAGNITUDINE Ictinus Dorico more, ſine exterioribus columnis "*ad laxamentum uſus ſacrificiorum*, pertexit. Eam autem poſtea, "cum Demetrius Phalereus Athenis rerum potiretur, Philon ante "templum in fronte columnis conſtitutis Proſtylon fecit. *Ita* "*aucto veſtibulo laxamentum initiantibus operiſque ſummam adjecit* "*autoritatem* ‡." And Ariſtides thought this the moſt extraordinary circumſtance in the whole affair: "But the thing moſt wonderful and divine was, that of all the public aſſemblies of Greece, "this was the only one which was contained within the walls of "one edifice §." Here was room, we ſee, and ſo purpoſely contrived, for all their SHEWS and REPRESENTATIONS.

And now, having occaſionally, and by parts only, ſaid ſo much of theſe things, it will not be amiſs, in concluſion, to give one general and conciſe idea of the whole. I ſuppoſe the ſubſtance of the celebration to be a kind of drama of the hiſtory of Ceres; as thoſe under the patronage of the other Gods repreſented their Hiſtory;

* Metam. l. xi. p. 996. Edit. Lugd. 8vo, 1587.

† Εἶτ' Ἐλευσὶν πόλις, ἐν ᾗ τὸ τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερὸν τῆς Ἐλευσινίας· καὶ ὁ μυστικὸς σηκός, ὃν καλισκεύασεν. Ἰκτῖνος, ὄχλον θεάτρῳ δέξασθαι δυνάμενον.—lib. ix. Geog. Edit. Caſaub. p. 272. lin. 30.

‡ De Architect. Præf. ad l. vii.

§ Τὸ δὲ δὴ μέγιστον καὶ θειότατον, μόνην γὰρ ταύτην πανηγύρεων εἰς οἶκος συλλαβὼν εἶχε. Eleuſin. Orat.

So

ſo HERCULES and MYTHRAS, who protected the oppreſſed from the ravages of wild Beaſts or more cruel Men, had their labours in *war* and *hunting* dramatically held out. The Story of Ceres afforded opportunity to repreſent the three particulars, about which the myſteries were principally concerned. 1. *The riſe and eſtabliſhment of civil ſociety.* 2. *The doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments.* 3. *The error of polytheiſm, and the principle of the unity.* The Goddeſs's legiſlation in Sicily and Attica (at both which places ſhe was ſaid to civiliz the ſavage manners of the inhabitants) gave birth to the *firſt* *. Her ſearch for her daughter Proſerpine in hell, to the *ſecond*; and her reſentments againſt the Gods for their permiſſion of, or connivance at, the rape, to the *third* †. My ſuppoſition, of the dramatic nature of the ſhews, is not made without good authority. Lucian, in his *Alexander*, where he gives a large account of the impoſtures of that falſe prophet, ſpeaking of the *Myſteries* which he inſtituted, in honour of his new-found God, Glyco; ſays, they were celebrated (after the uſual propatory rites of torch-bearing, initiation, and public notice to the prophane to keep at a diſtance) by a three Days feſtival: "On the "firſt day was repreſented the labour of Latona and the Nativity "of Apollo; the nuptials of Coronis; and the birth of Æſculapius. "On the ſecond, the appearance of Glyco, and the generation of "the god: and on the third, the marriage of Podalirius with the "mother of Alexander ‡." Every thing in theſe rites being performed, as the turn of the learned author's relation neceſſarily im-

* Teque, Ceres & Libera, quarum SACRA — a quibus initia vitæ, atque victus, legum, morum, manſuetudinis, humanitatis exempla hominibus et civitatibus data, ac diſpertita eſſe dicuntur. Cic. in Verr. v. c. 72. Edit. Ox. 4°. T. IV. p. 478.

† This circumſtance Apollodorus informs us of. His words are theſe: — Μαθοῦσα παρ' ἑρμηνέων, ὅτι Πλούτων αὐτὴν ἥρπασεν, ΟΡΤΙΖΟΜΕΝΗ ΘΕΟΙΣ ΑΠΕΑΙΠΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝ· εἰκαθίσασα δὲ γυναικὶ, ἦκεν εἰς Ἐλευσῖνα.

‡ Λητῦς ἐγίνετο λοχεία, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος γοναὶ, καὶ Κορωνίδος γάμος, καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸς, ἐτίκτετο· ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ Γλυκῶνος ἐπιφάνεια καὶ γένεσις τοῦ θεοῦ. Τρίτῃ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ, Ποδαλειρίου τε ἦν καὶ τῆς μητρὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου γάμος, &c. T. II. pag. 245. Edit. Reitzii, Amſtel. 1746. 4°.

plies,

plies, in imitation of ancient uſage. But here let it be obſerved, that the ſecrets of the *Myſteries* were unfolded both by *words* and *actions*: of which Ariſtides, quoted above, gives the reaſon; "That "ſo the *ſounds* and *ſights* might mutually aſſiſt each other in "making an impreſſion on the minds of the *Initiated*." The *error of polytheiſm* therefore was as well expoſed by the *dark wanderings* in the ſubterraneous paſſages through which the Initiated began his courſe, as by the information received from the Hierophant: and the *unity* as ſtrongly illuſtrated by the αὐτοπτον ἄγαλμα, the *ſelf-ſeen image* *, the diffuſive *ſhining light*, as by the *hymn of Orpheus* †, or this *ſpeech of Anchiſes*.

On the whole, if I be not much deceived, the view in which I place this famous epiſode, not only clears up a number of difficulties, inexplicable on any other ſcheme; but likewiſe heightens and ennobles the whole poem; for now the epiſode is ſeen to be an eſſential part of the main ſubject, which is THE ERECTION OF A CIVIL POLICY and A RELIGION; cuſtom having made *initiation into the Myſteries* a neceſſary preparative for that arduous undertaking.

But there is no place in this admirable Poem, even to the SHIELD OF ÆNEAS, which will not inſtruct us how conſiderable a ſtation the MYSTERIES held in poblic life; and how neceſſary they were ſuppoſed to be, to compleat the equipage of a Hero.

The ornaments on this ſhield repreſent two famous Hiſtories of different periods, and very differently executed. The firſt, a looſe ſketch of the foundation and early fortunes of Rome; the ſecond, a highly finiſhed picture of the victory of Actium. Theſe ſo diſſimilar pieces ſeem to be as oddly connected; by a ſudden jump unto the other world.

Hinc procul addit
Tartareas etiam ſedes, alta oſtia Ditis;
Et ſcelerum pœnas, & te, Catilina, minaci
Pendentem ſcopulo, Furiarumque ora trementem;
Secretoſque pios; his dantem jura Catonem ‡.

* See note (‡) p. 283. † See p. 202. ‡ Lib. viii.

But

But there is more in this diſpoſition than appears at firſt ſight. The ſeveral parts make an uniform and connected Syſtem. The firſt of the two principal parts, we have obſerved, is a view of the foundation and firſt eſtabliſhment of ancient Rome. Now Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus tells us, that this city was in nothing more excellent, or worthy of imitation, than in the genius of its national Religion; which was ſo conſtructed, as to be always ready to render ſervice to the State. Hence, Virgil, when he has brought us to the time in which their CIVIL eſtabliſhment was perfectly ſecured by the ſlaughter and diſperſion of the Gauls,

(Scutis protecti corpora longis),

goes on to the RELIGIOUS conſtitution:

Hic exultantes Salios, nudoſque Lupercos,
Lanigeroſque apices, & lapſa ancilia cœlo
Excuderat: caſtæ ducebant ſacra per urbem
Pilentis matres in mollibus——

Now Strabo obſerves, that the ancient pagan religion conſiſted of two parts, the OPEN and the SECRET *. The *open*, Virgil hath given us in the Salian and Lupercal rites. What remained was the *ſecret*, and this he preſents to us in an oblique deſcription of the *Myſteries*; where (as we have ſhewn) the ſcenes of a future ſtate were exhibited to the Initiated.

Hinc procul addit
TARTAREAS etiam SEDES, alta oſtia Ditis;
Et ſcelerum pœnas, & te, Catilina, minaci
Pendentem ſcopulo, Furiarumque ora trementem;
SECRETOSQUE PIOS; his dantem jura Catonem.

So that, as before, a particular INITIATION into the *Myſteries* was meant by Æneas's deſcent to the infernal regions; here, the general CELEBRATION of them is to be underſtood by this contracted view of Tartarus and Elyſium.

* Lib. x. p. 467. C. Edit. Paris, 1620. fol.

As this meaning ſeems neceſſary to give common propriety to the deſcription of the ſhield, there is reaſon, I think, for receiving it. And if we allow, that the MYSTERIES are here repreſented under the idea of the *infernal regions*, we gain a new argument in favour of the interpretation of the ſixth book.

If it be aſked why Cato is put, as it were, in the place of Minos; and Catiline, of Tityus: the anſwer will let us into another beauty. It is a fine inſinuation, that theſe foreign rites of Eleuſis deſerved to be naturalized at Rome. In which he only followed the opinion of Cicero *.

Here it may not be improper to take notice of a vulgar miſtake, as old at leaſt as Servius, that Cato the cenſor, and not Cato of Utica, is meant in this place; as if the Court-poet would not dare to celebrate the profeſſed enemy of the Julian houſe. This made the critics ſeek out for a Cato of a diſtant age, to brave Catiline in Hell; when they might have ſeen it could be no other than his great contemporary, who had before withſtood him in Rome. The laſt line,

SECRETOSQUE pios; his dantem jura Catonem,

was probably a compliment to Cato in his little ſenate of Utica.

All this conſidered, we ſee the reaſon, the great artiſt had to call his picture, his portraiture on the ſhield,

——Clypei NON ENARRABILE textum;

an ÆNIGMATICAL picture.

And now the nature and purpoſe of the *ſixth* book being further ſupported by this collateral circumſtance, it will enable us to diſcover and explain another beauty in the *ſeventh*; which depending on this principle, could not be ſeen till it was eſtabliſhed.

If the recommendation of the *Myſteries* was of ſuch importance in an epic poem of this *ſpecies*; and if, at the time of writing, many of the *Myſteries* were become abominably corrupt, we can

* See p. 209.

hardly

hardly believe but that the poet, after he had ſo largely expatiated in praiſe of thoſe that were holy and uſeful, would take care to ſtigmatize ſuch as were become notoriouſly profligate: becauſe this tended equally with the other, to vindicate, what he had in view, the honour of the inſtitution. And what ſtrengthens this conjecture, is the ſimilar conduct of another great writer of antiquity upon the ſame ſubject, whom we are now coming to, APULEIUS of Madaura, whoſe *Metamorphoſis* is written altogether in this view of *recommending the Pagan Myſteries*; in which, as we ſhall find, he hath been no leſs circumſtantial in reprobating the corrupt *Myſteries* of the SYRIAN GODDESS than in extolling the pure rites of the EGYPTIAN ISIS. A conduct ſo much alike, that the two caſes will ſerve mutually to ſupport what is here ſaid of either.

This then ſeemed a neceſſary part in the plan of Virgil's Poem. But it was no eaſy matter to execute it. Another allegory would have been without grace; nor was there any repoſe in the latter part of the action of the poem, as in the former, to admit a digreſſion of ſuch a length. On the other hand, to condemn all *corrupt Myſteries*, in the plain way of a judiciary ſentence, did not ſuit the nature of his poem: nor, if it had ſuited, could it have been uſed, without hurting the uniform texture of the work: after the *pure rites* had been ſo covertly recommended under figures and fictions.

The poet, therefore, with admirable invention, hath contrived, in the next book, to render the moſt corrupt of the *Myſteries*, the ſecret rites of BACCHUS, very odious, by making them the inſtrument to traverſe the deſigns of Providence, in the eſtabliſhment of his Hero, and by putting a FURY on the office of exciting the *aſpirants*, to the *celebration* of them. Amata, the mother of Lavinia, in order to violate the league and alliance between Æneas and Latinus, contrives, at the inſtigation of Alecto, to ſecrete her daughter; and to devote and conſecrate her to Bacchus, in an *initiation* into one of his abominable rites:

SIMULATO numine BACCHI
Majus adorta NEFAS, majoremque orſa furorem,
Evolat, & *natam* frondoſis montibus ABDIT *;
Quo thalamum eripiat Teucris, tedaſque moretur:
Evoë, Bacche! fremens SOLUM TE VIRGINE DIGNUM *
Vociferans——
Fama volat: Furiiſque accenſas pectore *matres*,
Idem omnis ſimul ardor agit, nova quærere tecta
Deſeruere domos——
Clamat: Io, matres——
Solvite crinales vittas, capite orgia mecum.
Talem inter ſylvas, inter deſerta ferarum
Reginam ALECTO STIMULIS AGIT UNDIQUE BACCHI †.

The Myſteries of Bacchus were well choſen for an example of corrupted Rites, and of the miſchiefs they produced; for they were early and flagrantly corrupted. But his principal reaſon for this choice, I ſuppoſe, was a very extraordinary ſtory he found in the Roman annals, of the horrors committed in that city, during the clandeſtine celebration of the *Bacchic rites*; which Livy has tranſcribed very circumſtantially into the thirty-ninth book of his *Hiſtory*.

Nor did the poet think he had done enough in repreſenting the *corrupt Myſteries* under theſe circumſtances of diſcredit, without ſpecifying the miſchiefs they produced; nor that he had ſufficiently

* Livy, we have ſeen, in his account of theſe rites of Bacchus, ſays, "Raptos a Diis "homines dici, quos machinæ illigatos ex conſpectu in abditos ſpecus abripiant."

† Lib. vii.—Plutarch deſcribes theſe corrupt Myſteries, in the ſame manner; but adds, that they were not celebrated in honour of any of the Gods, but to prevent miſchief from EVIL DEMONS, whom, by ſuch ſort of Rites, they would appeaſe and render innocuous.—ἰορλὰς δὲ καὶ θυσιὰς ὥσπερ ἡμέρας ἀποφράδας καὶ σκυθρωπὰς ἐν αἷς ὠμοφαγίαι καὶ διασπασμοὶ, νηστειαί τε καὶ κοπετοὶ, πολλαχοῦ δὲ πάλιν αἰσχρολογίαι πρὸς ἱεροῖς, μανίαι τε ἄλλαι ἀρινόμεναι ψιθαύχενι σὺν κλόνῳ, θεῶν μὲν οὐδενὶ, ΔΑΙΜΟΝΩΝ δὲ ΦΑΥΛΩΝ, ἀποτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ' ἂν τελεῖν μειλιχία καὶ παραμυθία.—περὶ τῶν ἐκλελοιπότων χρηστηρίων. Edit. Francof. fol. 1599. T. II. B. 417. C.

diſtinguiſhed

diſtinguiſhed them from the *pure*, without ſhewing thoſe miſchiefs to be ſuch as the *pure* had taken care to obviate.

The next news, therefore, we hear of Amata, after her celebration of the rites of Bacchus, is her SUICIDE, and a ſuicide of the moſt ignominious kind:

Purpureos moritura manu diſcindit amictus,
Et nodum *informis leti* trabe nectit ab alta.

This diſaſter, the poet makes Jupiter charge upon Juno; who, by the miniſtry of Alecto, excited Amata to an *initiation*:

Terris agitare vel undis
Trojanos potuiſti: infandum accendere bellum,
DEFORMARE DOMUM, & luctu miſcere hymenæos.

Suicide, as we learn by Plato*, the *holy myſteries* expreſly forbad and condemned. On which account our poet, in his allegorical deſcription of what was repreſented in the *Eleuſinian*, has placed theſe criminals in a ſtate of miſery:

Proxima deinde tenent mœſti loca, qui ſibi lethum——

Thus nobly hath Virgil completed his deſign on the ſubject of the MYSTERIES. The hero of the poem is initiated into the moſt pure and holy of them; his capital Enemy, into the moſt impure and corrupt; and the ſchemes and intrigues of each party have a correſpondent iſſue.

To conclude, the principles here aſſumed, in explaining this famous poetical fiction, are, I preſume, ſuch as give ſolidity, as well as light, to what is deduced from them; and are, perhaps, the only Principles from which any thing reaſonable can be deduced in a piece of criticiſm of this nature. For, from what I had ſhewn was taught, and repreſented in the *Myſteries*, I infer that Æneas's DESCENT INTO HELL ſignifies an INITIATION; becauſe of the exact conformity, in all circumſtances, between what Virgil relates of his Hero's adven-

* See above, p. 268.

ture,

ture, and what antiquity delivers concerning the SHEWS and DOCTRINES of thoſe MYSTERIES, into which Heroes were wont to be initiated. On the contrary, had I gratuitouſly ſuppoſed, without any previous knowledge of what was practiſed in the *Myſteries*, that the *deſcent* was an *initiation*, merely becauſe Auguſtus (who was ſhadowed under the perſon of Æneas) was initiated; and thence inferred, that the *Myſteries* did exhibit the ſame ſcenes which the Poet hath made *Hell* to exhibit to his Hero, my explanation had been as devoid of any ſolid inference, as of any rational principle. And yet, if authority could ſupport ſo impertinent a conduct, one might have ventured on it. A celebrated writer *, in a tract intitled *Reflections on the character of Iapis in Virgil*, goes altogether on this gratuitous kind of criticiſm. Without any previous knowledge of the life and fortunes of ANTONIUS MUSA, the phyſician of Auguſtus, he ſuppoſes that Virgil meant this perſon by IAPIS, merely becauſe Auguſtus was meant by Æneas. And then, from what the poet tells us of Iapis's hiſtory, the critic concludes it muſt have made part of the hiſtory of Muſa; and ſo, inſtead of explaining a fable by hiſtory, he would regulate hiſtory on a fable. Whereas the principles of true criticiſm ſhould have directed him to inquire previouſly what Antiquity had left us, concerning the perſon of Antonius Muſa: and if, on comparing what he found there, with what Virgil has delivered concerning Iapis, any ſtrong reſemblance was to be found; then, and not till then, his ingenious conjecture, that *Iapis* was *Muſa*, would ſtand upon a reaſonable bottom. It was not thus that an able critic † lately explained Virgil's noble allegory, in the beginning of the *third* GEORGIC; where, under the idea of a magnificent Temple, to be raiſed to the Divinity of Auguſtus; the poet promiſes the famous epic poem which he afterwards erected in his honour; or, as our Milton ſays,

——— "built the lofty rhime."

* Dr. Atterbury, Biſhop of Rocheſter. [See his Epiſtolary Correſpondence, 1783, vol. I. p. 329.]

† See Hor. Ep. ad Auguſtum, with an Engliſh Commentary, and Notes, p. 36.

But

But had the exiſtence of ſuch a poem never come to our knowledge, I am perſuaded, this excellent writer had never troubled the world with ſo ſlender a conjecture that a Temple ſignified an epic poem: and therefore that Virgil executed, or at leaſt intended, ſuch a work. In truth, Critics ſhould proceed in theſe enquiries about their author's ſecret meaning, with the ſame caution and ſobriety which Courts of Juſtice employ in the detection of concealed criminals; who take care, in the firſt place to be well aſſured of the *corpus delicti*, before they venture to charge the fact upon any one.

Thus far concerning the *uſe* of the MYSTERIES to SOCIETY. How *eſſential* they were eſteemed to RELIGION, we may underſtand by the METAMORPHOSIS OF APULEIUS; a book, indeed, which from its very firſt appearance hath paſſed for a trivial fable. Capitolinus, in the life of Clodius Albinus, where he ſpeaks of that kind of tales which diſconcert the gravity of philoſophers, tells us that Severus could not bear with patience the honours the Senate had conferred on Albinus; eſpecially their diſtinguiſhing him with the title of *learned*, who was grown old in the ſtudy of old-wives-fables, ſuch as the Mileſian-Punic tales of his countryman and favourite, Apuleius: "Major fuit" (ſays Severus, in his letter to the ſenate on this occaſion) "dolor quod illum pro *literato* laudandum plerique "duxiſtis, quum ille næniis quibuſdam anilibus occupatus *inter* "*Mileſias Punicas Apuleii ſui* et ludiera literaria conſeneſceret." That poor, modern-ſpirited critic Macrobius, talks too of Apuleius in the ſame ſtrain.——"Nec omnibus fabulis Philoſophia repugnat, "nec omnibus acquieſcit—Fabulæ, aut tantum conciliandæ auri- "bus voluptatis aut adhortationis quoque in bonam frugem gratia "repertæ ſunt, auditum mulcent; velut comœdiæ; quales Me- "nander ejuſve imitatores agendas dederunt: vel argumenta "fictis caſibus amatorum referta; quibus vel multum ſe *Arbiter* "exercuit, vel APULEIUM nonnunquam *luſiſſe* MIRAMUR. Hoc "totum fabularum genus, *quod ſolas aurium delicias profitetur, e ſa-* "*crario ſuo in nutricum cunas ſapientiæ tractatus eliminat* *."—How-

* Lib. i. c. 2.

ever

ever he ſeems to wonder that Apuleius ſhould trifle ſo egregiouſly: and well he might. For the writer of the *Metamorphoſis* was one of the graveſt and moſt virtuous, as well as moſt learned, philoſophers of his age. But Albinus appears to have gone further into the true character of this work, than his rival Severus. And if we may believe Marcus Aurelius, who calls Albinus "homo exer-"citatus, vita triſtis, gravis moribus *," he was not a man to be taken with ſuch trifling amuſements as Mileſian fables. His fondneſs therefore for the *Metamorphoſis* of Apuleius ſhews, that he conſidered it in another light. And who ſo likely to be let into the author's true deſign, as Albinus, who lived very near his time, and was of Adrumetum in the neighbourhood of Carthage, where Apuleius ſojourned and ſtudied, and was honoured with public marks of diſtinction! The work is indeed of a different character from what ſome Ancients have repreſented it; and even from what modern Critics have pretended to diſcover of it. Thoſe Ancients, who ſtuck in the outſide, conſidered it, without refinement, as an idle fable: the Moderns, who could not reconcile a work of that nature to the gravity of the author's character, have ſuppoſed it a thing of more importance, and no leſs than a general ſatire on the vices of thoſe times: "Tota porro hæc metamorphoſis Apuleiana (ſays "Mr. Fleuri †) & ſtylo & ſententia, ſatyricon eſt perpetuum, ut "recte obſervavit Barthius, Adverſ. lib. ii. cap. 11. in quo magica "deliria, ſacrificulorum ſcelera, adulterorum crimina, furum & "latronum impunitæ factiones palam differuntur." But this is far ſhort of the matter. The author's main purpoſe was not to ſatyrize the ſpecific *vices of his age* (though, to enliven his fable, and for the better carrying on his ſtory, he hath employed many circumſtances of this kind) but to recommend PAGAN RELIGION as the only cure for *all vice whatſoever*.

To give what we have to ſay its proper force, we muſt conſider the real character of the writer. Apuleius, of Madaura in Afric,

* Capitolinus, in Claud. Alb.

† Ed. Ap. in uſ. Delph.

was

was a devoted Platoniſt; and, like the Platoniſts of that age, an inveterate enemy to Chriſtianity. His zeal for the *honour of philoſophy* is ſeen in that ſolemn affirmation, when convened before a court of juſtice, "Philoſophiæ honorem qui mihi ſalute mea anti-" quior eſt, nuſquam minui *." His ſuperſtitious attachment to the *Religion of his country* is ſeen in his immoderate fondneſs for the MYSTERIES. He was initiated, as himſelf tells us, into almoſt all of them: and, in ſome, bore the moſt diſtinguiſhed offices. In his Apology before the proconſul of Africa, he ſays, "Vin' dicam, " cujuſmodi illas res in ſudario obvolutas, laribus Pontiani commen-" darim? Mos tibi geretur. *Sacrorum pleraque Initia in Græcia par-" ticipavi.* Eorum quædam ſigna & monumenta tradita mihi a ſa-" cerdotibus ſedulo conſervo. Nihil inſolitum, nihil incognitum " dico: vel unius Liberi Patris Symmiſtæ, qui adeſtis, ſcitis, quid " domi conditum celetis, & abſque omnibus profanis tacite venere-" mini. *At ego, ut dixi, multijuga ſacra et plurimos ritus, varias " ceremonias,* STUDIO VERI *et officio erga Deos, didici.* Nec hoc ad " tempus compono: ſed abhinc ferme triennium eſt, cum primis " diebus quibus OEam veneram, publice *differens de* ÆSCULAPII " MAJESTATE eadem iſta præ me tuli, & quot ſacra noſſem percen-" ſui. Ea diſputatio celebratiſſima eſt; vulgo legitur; in omnium " manibus verſatur; non tam facundia mea, quam mentione Æſ-" culapii religioſis OEenſibus commendata.——Etiamne cuiquam " mirum videri poteſt, cui ſit ulla memoria religionis, *hominem tot " Myſteriis Deûm conſcium* quædam ſacrorum crepundia domi adſer-" vare †?" His attachment to the *open* worſhip of Paganiſm was not inferior to that of the *ſecret*, as appears by what follows from the ſame Apology:——" Morem mihi habeo, quoquò eam, ſimu-" lacrum alicujus Dei inter libellos conditum geſtare: eique diebus " feſtis thure & mero & aliquando victimis ſupplicare ‡." His

* Apologia, p. 114. Ed. Pricæi, Par. 1635. 4to. in fine.

† Ibid. p. 63—4.

‡ Ibid. p. 72. lin. 5.

great devotion to Paganiſm, therefore, muſt needs have been attended with an equal averſion to Chriſtianity; and it is more than probable, that the oration he ſpeaks of as made in honour of Æſculapius, was in the number of thoſe INVECTIVES, at that time ſo well received by the enemies of our holy faith. For, not to inſiſt on the ſucceſs of his oration, which, he tells us, was in every body's hands, a thing common to diſcourſes on ſubjects that engage the public attention, but rarely the fortune of ſuch ſtale ware as panegyrics on a God long worn into an eſtabliſhment; not, I ſay, to inſiſt upon this, we may obſerve that Æſculapius was one of thoſe ancient heroes *, who were employed, by the defenders of Paganiſm, to oppoſe to JESUS; and the circumſtances of Æſculapius's ſtory made him the fitteſt of any in fabulous antiquity, for that purpoſe. Ovid, who lived before theſe times of danger to the pagan Gods, and indeed, before the coming of that Deliverer who gave occaſion to ſo many impious compariſons, hath yet made Ochirröe, in contemplation of his future actions, propheſy of him in ſuch ſtrains as preſented to his excellent Tranſlator the image of the *true-phyſician of mankind*; and thereby enabled him to give a ſublime to his verſion, which is not borrowed from his original:

Ergo ubi vaticinos concepit mente furores,
Incaluitque Deo, quem clauſam pectore habebat;
Aſpicit infantem, totique ſalutifer orbi
Creſce puer, dixit: tibi ſe mortalia ſæpe
Corpora debebunt: animas tibi reddere ademptas
Fas erit. Idque ſemel, dîs indignantibus, auſus,
Poſſe dare hoc iterum flamma prohibebere avitâ:
Eque deo corpus fies exſangue; deuſque,
Qui modò corpus eras, & bis tua fata novabis. OVID.

Once as the ſacred infant ſhe ſurvey'd,
The God was kindled in the raving maid,

* Juſtin Martyr. Apol. 2.——ὅτε δὲ πάλιν ἔμαθον προφητευθέντα θεραπεύσειν ἀυτὸν νόσον, καὶ νεκρὰς ἀνεγερεῖν, τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν παρήνεγκαν. ——See Cyrill. cont. Julian. l. vi.

And

And thus ſhe utter'd her prophetic tale:
" Hail, great phyſician of the world, all hail;
" Hail, mighty Infant, who in years to come,
" Shalt heal the nations and defraud the tomb;
" Swift be thy growth, thy triumphs unconfin'd
" Make kingdoms thicker, and increaſe mankind.
" Thy daring art ſhall animate the dead,
" And draw the thunder on thy guilty head:
" Then ſhalt thou die.——But from the dark abode
" Riſe up victorious, and be twice a God." ADDISON.

But the Reformers of Paganiſm having lately reſolved all the Popular Gods into the Attributes and Manifeſtations of the FIRST CAUSE, Æſculapius bore a very diſtinguiſhed rank in this new Model. Pauſanias tells us, that in Phocis there was a celebrated Temple dedicated to him, where he was worſhiped, as *the Author and original of all things* *.

Having ſeen what there was in the common paſſion of his Sect, and in his own fond mode of ſuperſtition, to indiſpoſe Apuleius to *Chriſtianity*; let us inquire what private provocation he might have to prejudice him againſt it; for, a private provocation, I am perſuaded, he had; occaſioned by a perſonal injury done him by one of THIS PROFESSION; which, I ſuppoſe, did not a little contribute to exaſperate his bigotry. He had married a rich widow, againſt the good liking of her firſt huſband's Relations; who endeavoured to ſet aſide the marriage on pretence of his employing ſorcery and enchantments to engage her affections. Of this, he was judicially accuſed by his wife's brother-in-law, Licinius Æmilianus, before the Procunſul of Africa. Now his Accuſer, if I am not much miſtaken, was a CHRISTIAN, though this intereſting circumſtance hath eſcaped the notice of his commentators. However, let us hear the

* Σταδίοις δὲ ἀπωτέρω Τιθορέας ἐστὶν ἱερὸν νεὼς Ἀσκληπιοῦ, καλεῖται δὲ Ἀρχαγέτας. Τιμὰς δὲ παρὰ ἀστῶν ἔχει Τιθορέων, καὶ ἱκέσιος παρὰ Φωκέων τῶν ἄλλων. Lib. x. c. xxxii. pag. 879, Edit. Kuhnii, fol. Lipſ. 1696.

character Apuleius himſelf gives of his Party.—" Atqui ego ſcio nonnullos, et cum primis *Æmilianum* iſtum, *facetiæ* ſibi habere *res divinas deridere.* Nam, ut audio, percenſentibus iis qui iſtum novere, NULLI DEO *ad hoc ævi ſupplicavit* ; *nullum templum frequentavit.* Si fanum aliquod prætereat, NEFAS HABET ADORANDI GRATIA MANUM LABRIS ADMOVERE. Iſte vero nec diis rurationis, qui eum paſcunt ac veſtiunt, ſegetis ullas aut vitis aut gregis primitias impartit; nullum in villa ejus delubrum ſitum, nec locus aut lucus conſecratus. At quid ego de luco aut delubro loquor? *Negant vidiſſe ſe, qui fuere, unum ſaltem in finibus ejus aut lapidem unctum, aut ramum coronatum.* Igitur agnomenta ei duo indita: *Charon,* ob oris et animi *diritatem*: ſed alterum, quod LIBENTIUS AUDIT, ob deorum contemptum, *Mezentius* *." And now let us ſee how this agrees with what Arnobius tells us, the Pagans objected to his Sect—" In hac enim conſueſtis parte crimen nobis maximum *impietatis* affigere, quod neque *ædes ſacras venerationis* ad Officia conſtruamus, *nec Deorum alicujus ſimulacrum* conſtituamus, aut formam: non *altaria fabricemus,* non aras, non cæſorum ſanguinem animantium demus, *non tura, non frugas ſalſas,* non denique vinum liquens paterarum effuſionibus inferamus. Quæ quidem nos ceſſamus non ideo vel exædificare, vel facere *tanquam impias geramus & ſceleroſas mentes, aut aliquem ſumpſerimus temeraria in Deos deſperatione* CONTEMPTUM: ſed quod, &c. †" Again, where Apuleius apoſtrophiſes his Adverſary in another place, he ſays, agreeably to the Character before given of him——SI QUID CREDIS, Æmiliane ‡! and again, after explaining a ſpiritual doctrine of Plato, he adds with a ſneer——attamen ſi audire VERUM velis, Æmiliane §! But the repetition of this characteriſtic word with an ironical emphaſis in his conſtant formula when he addreſſes Æmilianus, longe a VERO aberraſſe neceſſe habeat confiteri ‖——Immo ſi VERUM velis ** ——plane quidem ſi VERUM velis ††. 1. Now, irreligion and atheiſm, we know, were the names Chriſtianity at

* Apol. p. 64, 5. † Arnob. adver. Gentes. L. vii. ſub init.
‡ P. 26. § P. 14. ‖ P. 77. ** P. 98. †† P. 108.

that

that time went by, for having dared to renounce the whole family of the gentile Gods together. To this opprobrium, Origen alludes, when he retorts it on Polytheiſm, in this elegant manner—οἱ περὶ ἀγαλμάτων καὶ τῆς ΛΘΕΟΥ πολυθεότητος. Æmilianus we ſee had made ſuch clear work, that there was not ſo much as an *anointed ſtone*, or a *tree adorned with conſecrated garlands*, to be found throughout his whole Farm. That the Atheiſm of Æmilianus was of this ſort, and no *courtly* or *philoſophic* impiety, appears from his Character and Station. He was neither a fine Gentleman, nor a profound Inquirer into nature; characters indeed which are ſometimes found to be above Religion; but a mere Ruſtic, in his life and manners. Now plain, unpoliſhed men, in ſuch a condition of life, are never without ſome Religion or other: When therefore, we find Æmilianus not of the *eſtabliſhed*, we muſt needs conclude him to be a *Sectary* and a CHRISTIAN. 2. His neglect of his country Gods was not a mere negative affront of forgetfulneſs. He gloried in being their deſpiſer; and took kindly to the name of MEZENTIUS, as a title of honour——*alterum, quod libentius audit, ob deorum contemptum, Mezentius*, which I would conſider as a further mark of a *Chriſtian, convict.* 3. He even held it an *abomination* ſo much as to put his hand to his lips, (according to the mode of adoration in thoſe times) when he paſſed by an Heathen Temple; nefas habet, adorandi gratia, manum labris admovere, the moſt characteriſtic mark of a *primitive Confeſſor*, by which he could never be miſtaken; nor, one would think, ſo long overlooked *. 4. By the frequent and ſarcaſtical repetition of the word *verum*, Apuleius ſeems to ſneer at that general title which the Faithful gave their *Religion*, of THE TRUTH.

Æmilianus, it ſeems, had miſ-repreſented a little image of *Mercury*, which Apuleius uſed to carry about with him, as a *ſqualid magical* figure. On which occaſion the Accuſed, in great rage, deprecates his Accuſer——"At tibi, Æmiliane, pro iſto mendacio, duat Deus

* See note EE, at the end of this Book.

iſto,

iſte, Superum & Inferum commeator utrorumque Deorum malam gratiam, ſemperque obvias ſpecies mortuorum, quidquid Umbrarum eſt uſquam, quidquid Lemurum, quidquid Manium, quidquid Larvarum, oculis tuis oggerat: *Omnia noctium occurſacula, omnia Buſtorum formidamina, omnia ſepulcrorum terriculamenta.*"—This was the common curſe and ſuppoſed to be the common puniſhment of impiety and *Atheiſm*. But it has here a peculiar elegance as denounced againſt Æmilianus. The Buſta, or Repoſitory of dead bodies, ſo abhorred by the Pagans, were the very places in which the Chriſtians aſſembled for nocturnal Worſhip.

The averſion, therefore, which Apuleius had contracted to his Chriſtian accuſer, (and we ſee, by what is here ſaid, it was in no ordinary degree) would without doubt increaſe his prejudice to that Religion. I am perſuaded he gave the Character of the Baker's wife, in his *Golden Aſs*, for no other reaſon than to outrage our holy faith. Having drawn her ſtained with all the vices that could deform a Woman; to finiſh all, he makes her a Chriſtian.——"Nec "enim vel unum vitium nequiſſimæ ille feminæ deerat: ſed omnia "prorſus, ut in quandam cœnoſam latrinam, in ejus animam flagi-"tia confluxerant, ſæva, virioſa, ebrioſa, pervicax, in rapinis tur-"pibus avara, in ſumptibus fœdis profuſa: inimica fidei, hoſtis "pudicitiæ. *Tunc ſpretis atque calcatis divinis numinibus*, IN VICEM "CERTÆ RELIGIONIS MENTITA SACRILEGA PRÆSUMPTIONE DEI, "QUEM PRÆDICARET UNICUM, CONFICTIS OBSERVATIONIBUS, "VACUIS, fallens omnes homines, *&c.* *" So again in the fourth book, deſcribing certain magnific Shews exhibited to the people by one Democharès; when he comes to ſpeak of the criminals thrown to wild-beaſts, he expreſſes himſelf in this manner:——Alibi noxii, PERDITA SECURITATE, ſuis epulis beſtiarum ſaginas inſtruentes [p. 72.] The Oxf. MS. for *ſecuritate* reads *ſeveritate*: on which *Price* obſerves, *ego nec hoc nec illud intellectum habeo*. Apuleius by *noxii* apparently meant the *condemned Chriſtians*; and *perdita ſecuri-*

* Met. l. ix. p. 186. Ed. Pricæi.

tate,

tate, which is the true reading, cenſures either their reaſonable hope of a happy immortality, or their falſe confidence that the beaſts would not hurt them.

Let us ſee now how this would influence his writings. There was nothing the PHILOSOPHERS of that time had more at heart, eſpecially the *Platoniſts* and *Pythagoreans*, than the ſupport of ſinking Paganiſm. This ſervice, as hath been occaſionally remarked, they performed in various ways and manners: ſome by *allegorizing their Theology*; ſome by *ſpiritualizing their Philoſophy*; and ſome, as Jamblicus and Philoſtratus, by writing the *lives of their Heroes*, to oppoſe to that of CHRIST; others again, as Porphyry, with this view *collected their oracles*; or as Melanthius, Menander, Hiceſius, and Sotades, *wrote deſcriptive encomiums on their* MYSTERIES. Which laſt, as we ſhall now ſhew, was the province undertaken by Apuleius; his *Metamorphoſis* being nothing elſe but one continued RECOMMENDATION of them.

But to give what we have to ſay it's proper force; let us, 1. enquire into the motives our Author might have for entering at all into the defence of Paganiſm: 2. His reaſons for chuſing this topic of defence, *the recommendation of the Myſteries*.

1. As to his defence of paganiſm in general, we may obſerve, 1. That works of this kind were very much in faſhion, eſpecially amongſt the Philoſophers of our author's Sect. 2. He was, as we have ſeen, moſt ſuperſtitiouſly devoted to pagan worſhip: and, 3. He bore a perſonal ſpite and prejudice to the Chriſtian profeſſion.

2. As to his making the defence of the *Myſteries* his choice, ſtill ſtronger reaſons may be aſſigned. 1. Theſe were the Rites to which he was ſo peculiarly devoted, that he had contrived to be *initiated* into all the *Myſteries* of note, in the Roman world; and in ſeveral of them had borne the moſt diſtinguiſhed offices. 2. The *Myſteries* being at this time become extremely corrupt, and conſequently, in diſcredit, needed an able and zealous Apologiſt: both of which qualities met eminently in Apuleius. The corruptions were of two kinds,

kinds, Debaucheries and Magic. The *Debaucheries* we have taken notice of, above: their *Magic* will be conſidered hereafter. But, 3. Our author's cloſe attachment to *Myſterious rites* was, without queſtion, the very thing that occaſioned all thoſe ſuſpicions and reports, which ended in an accuſation of *Magic*: And, conſidering what hath been ſaid of the corrupt ſtate of the *Myſteries*, the reader will not wonder that it ſhould.

Such then being the general character of the *Myſteries*, and of this their great Devotee, nothing was more natural than his projecting their defence; which, at the ſame time that it concurred to the ſupport of Paganiſm in general, would vindicate his own credit, together with an Inſtitution of which he was ſo immoderately fond. And the following conſiderations are ſufficient to ſhew, that the *Metamorphoſis* was written after his *Apology*: for, 1. His accuſers never once mention the fable of the *Golden Aſs* to ſupport their charge of Magic, though they were in great want of proofs, and this lay ſo ready for their purpoſe. For, we are not to ſuppoſe that he alludes to the *Metamorphoſis* in the following words of the Apology,——Aggredior enim jam ad ipſum crimen *Magiæ*, quod ingenti tumultu, ad invidiam mei, accenſum, fruſtrata expectatione omnium, per *neſcio quas anileis fabulas* deflagravit. p. 29, 30. The *idle tales* here hinted at, are the goſſiping ſtories which went about of him, and which he afterwards expoſes in the courſe of this defence. 2. He poſitively aſſerts before the tribunal of Maximus Claudius that he had never given the leaſt occaſion to ſuſpect him of *Magic*: "*Nuſquam* paſſus ſum *vel exiguam* ſuſpicionem *magiæ* "conſiſtere *."

Now Antiquity conſidered initiation into the Mysteries as *a delivery from a living death of vice, brutality, and miſery; and the beginning of a new life of virtue, reaſon, and happineſs* †. This, therefore, was the very circumſtance which our Author choſe for the ſubject of his recommendation.

* P. 100, lin 11.

† See what hath been ſaid above, in the diſcourſe of the Myſteries.

And

And as in the *Myſteries*, their moral and divine truths were repreſented in *ſhews* and *allegories*, ſo, in order to comply with this method of inſtruction, and in imitation of the ancient Maſters of wiſdom *, who borrowed their manner of teaching from thence, he hath artfully inſinuated his doctrine in an agreeable Fable; and the fitteſt, one could conceive for his purpoſe, as will be ſeen when we come to examine it.

The foundation of this Allegory was a *Mileſian Fable*, a ſpecies of polite trifling then much in vogue, and not unlike the modern *Arabian tales*. To allure his readers, therefore, with the promiſe of a *faſhionable* work, he introduces his Metamorphoſis in this manner: *At ego tibi ſermone iſto Mileſio varias fabulas conſeram*, AURESQUE TUAS *benevolas lepido ſuſurro* PERMULCEAM; plainly intimating that there was ſomething of more conſequence at bottom. But the *faſhionable* people took him at his word; and, from that day to this, never troubled their heads about a further meaning. The OUTSIDE engaged all their attention, and ſufficiently delighted them; as we may gather from the early title it bore of ASINUS AUREUS. And, from the beginning of one of Pliny's epiſtles, I ſuſpect that AUREÆ was the common title given to the *Mileſian*, and ſuch like tales as Strolers uſed to tell for a piece of money to the rabble in a circle. Pliny's words are theſe—aſſem para, et accipe AUREAM fabulam †. Unleſs we will rather ſuppoſe it to have been beſtowed by the few intelligent readers in the ſecret; for, in ſpite of the Author's repeated preparation, a ſecret it was, and ſo, all along continued.

Upon one of theſe popular Fables, he choſe to ingraft his inſtruction; taking a celebrated Tale from the *collections* of one

* Strabo acquaints us with the inducements which the ancients had to practice this method of Inſtruction.—"Οτι δὲ ϖ αὐτῇ ϛ τὸ θαυμαϛὸν ϗ τὸ τερατῶδες, ἐπιτείνει τὴν ἡδονὴν, ἥπερ ἐϛὶ τὸ μαλάττων φίτρον. Διδαχὴ μὲν ἂν ἀνάγκη τοιούτοις διελθεῖν χρῆϛαι· ϖερισούϛης δὲ τῆϛ ἡλικίας ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὅλων μάθηϛιν ἄγειν, ἤδη τῆϛ διανοίας ἠρωμένης, ϗ μηκέτι δεομένης κολάκων. Καὶ ἰδιώτης δὲ ϖᾶϛ ϗ ἀπαίδευτος, τρόϖοι τινὲϛ ϖαί ϵἰϛι, φιλομυθέϛατοί τε ἁπάντων. Geog. l. i. p 19. A. Edit. Paril. fol. 1620.

† L. ii. Ep. 20.

Lucius of Patræ; who relates his transformation into an Aſs, and his adventures under that ſhape. Lucian has epitomiſed this ſtory, as Apuleius ſeems to have paraphraſed it: and the ſubject being a METAMORPHOSIS, it admirably fitted his purpoſe; as the METEMPSYCHOSIS, to which that ſuperſtition belongs, was one of the fundamental doctrines of the *Myſteries*. But from Photius's account of Lucius Patrenſis one would be inclined to rank him amongſt thoſe who compoſed books of *Metamorphoſis* [ſee B. iii. Sect. 3.] according to the popular Theology, rather than a writer of Mileſian fables. He entitles Lucius's work μεταμορφώσεως λόγοι διάφοροι. And after having ſaid that Lucian borrowed his *Aſs* from thence, to ridicule pagan religion, he goes on *; "but Lucius giving a more ſerious turn to his Metamorphoſis, and treating as realities theſe changes of Men into one another, of Men into Beaſts, and ſo on the contrary, hath weaved together theſe and many other of the trifles and abſurdities of the Ancient Mythology, and committed them to writing for the entertainment of the Public." This will account for the oddneſs of Apuleius's expreſſions, with which he introduces his *Fable*——Et figuras fortunaſque hominum in alias imagines converſas et in ſe rurſum MUTUO NEXU refectas, ut miſeris, exordior,——words by no means ſuiting with the ſingle tranſformation, and ſtory of the *golden aſs*, but very expreſſive of the nature of ſuch a work as that of Lucius Patrenſis, according to the idea which Photius gives us of it. From whence I conclude, that Apuleius might tranſlate theſe very words from his original author.

The Fable opens with the repreſentation of a young man, perſonated by himſelf, ſenſible of the advantages of *virtue* and *piety*, but immoderately fond of PLEASURE, and as curious of MAGIC. Apuleius takes care to keep up the firſt part of this character as he

* ὁ δὲ Λευκίος σπουδάζων τε, καὶ πιστὰς νομίζων τὰς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀλλήλους μεταμορφώσεις, τάς τε ἐξ ἀλόγων εἰς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἀνάπαλιν· καὶ τὸν ἄλλον τῶν ΠΑΛΑΙΩΝ ΜΥΘΩΝ ὕθλον καὶ φλήναφον γραφῇ παραδίδωσι ταῦτα, καὶ συνίφαινον. Bibl. Ed. Gen. p. 311.

gocs

goes along, *familiaris* CURIOSITATIS *admonitus*, l. iii. *familiari* CURIOSITATE *attonitus*, l. ix. And *Curioſus* and *Magus* were uſed by the Antients as Synonymous. So Apuleius himſelf.—*At ego* CURIOSUS *alioquin, ut primum* ARTIS MAGICÆ *ſemper optatum nomen audivi*, p. 24. Hence it is that he is repreſented as having been initiated in all the *corrupt Myſteries*, where Magic was profeſſedly practiſed. *Fotis*, the inferior Prieſteſs in the magic rites of the Incantreſs, *Pamphile*, enjoining him ſilence, ſays, *ſacris pluribus initiatus*, profecto nôſti ſanctam ſilentii fidem *. As to the ſecond, we have his adventure with *Byrrhena* and *Pamphile*, which ſeems to be borrowed from Prodicus's fable of the conteſt between *Virtue* and *Pleaſure* for the young *Hercules*. Byrrhena meets our adventurer, pretends to be his relation †, and tells him that ſhe brought him up from his infancy: by which is intimated that virtue was moſt natural to him. She leads him home to her houſe, which is deſcribed as a magnificent palace: one of its principal ornaments is the hiſtory of Diana ‡; where the puniſhment of Actaon is not forgotten §, as a ſeaſonable leſſon againſt *vicious curioſity*. And to keep him to herſelf, ſhe promiſes to make him heir of all her fortunes. Then taking him apart, ſhe warns him to beware of the miſchievous practices of his hoſteſs Pamphile. "Per hanc, inquit, "Deam (Dianam) ô Luci cariſſime, ut anxie tibi metuo, et, utpote "pignori meo, longe proviſum cupio, cave tibi, ſed *cave fortiter*, a "malis artibus, et facinoroſis illecebris Pamphiles illius,—MAGA "primi nominis, et omnis carminis ſepulcralis magiſtra creditur: "quæ furculis et lapillis, et id genus frivolis inhalatis, omnem iſtam "lucem mundi ſideralis imis Tartari, et in vetuſtum chaos ſubmer-

* P. 53.

† Ego te, o Luci, meis iſtis manibus educavi: quidni? parentis tuæ non modo ſanguinis, verum alimoniarum etiam ſocia fui, p. 23.

‡ Ecce lapis Parius in Dianam factus tenet libratum totius loci medietatem, ſignum perfecte luculentum,—introeuntibus obvium, & majeſtate numinis venerabile, &c. p. 22.

§ Inter medias frondes lapidis Actæonis ſimulacrum, curioſo obtutu in dorſum proje&tus, &c. p. 23.

" gere novit. Nam cum quemquam conſpexerit ſpecioſæ formæ " juvenem, venuſtate ejus ſumitur: et illico, *&c.*"

But Lucius makes a choice very different from that of Hercules. He had promiſed to obſerve *Byrrhena's* admonitions, and to return to her again: but a circumſtance of immoderate mirth intervening, he found in himſelf a more than ordinary averſion to keep his word. Ad hæc ego formidans et procul perhorreſcens etiam ipſam domum ejus, *&c.* * This is a fine circumſtance, nothing being ſo great an enemy to modeſty and chaſtity (figured in the perſon of Byrrhena) as immoderate mirth. He gives a looſe to his vicious appetite for *Pleaſure* and *Magic:* and the crimes and follies into which they lead him ſoon ends in his transformation to a BRUTE.

This contrivance of the introductory part is artful; and finely inſinuates the great moral of the piece, THAT BRUTALITY ATTENDS VICE AS IT'S PUNISHMENT: and puniſhment by actual transformation was keeping up to the popular opinion †. His making a paſſion for *Magic* contribute to this dreadful change is no leſs ingenious, as it cleared both *himſelf* and the *Myſteries* from that imputation; for it appeared that *Magic* was ſo far from being innocent, that in his opinion, it was attended with the ſevereſt puniſhment; ſo far from being encouraged by the *Myſteries*, that they only could relieve men from the diſtreſſes which this vicious curioſity brought upon it's votaries; as is ſhewn by the cataſtrophe of the Piece.

St. Auſtin permitted himſelf to doubt whether Apuleius's account of his change into an ASS was not a true relation.—*Sicut Apuleius, in libris quos Aſini aurei titulo inſcripſit, ſibi ipſi accidiſſe, ut accepto veneno, humano animo permanente, aſinus fieret,* AUT INDICAVIT *aut finxit* ‡. I ſhall ſay nothing to ſo extravagant a doubt, but only obſerve, that it appears from hence, that St. Auſtin eſteemed Apuleius a profligate in his manners, and addicted to the ſuper-

* P. 51. † See B. iii. Sect. 3.

‡ Civ. Dei, l. xviii. c. 18.

ſtitions

ſtitions of *Magic*. And yet it is by no means credible, that he who took ſo much pains, in a very ſerious and public way *, to free himſelf from theſe imputations, ſhould afterwards wantonly undo all he had ſo ſucceſsfully performed in ſupport of a doubtful reputation, by an unneceſſary narrative of his own early debaucheries. But it may be ſaid, that all this happened in his youth; and that his ſubſequent *Initiations* had purified his manners: But neither will his APOLOGY admit of this ſuppoſition; for there he expreſly inſiſts on the virtue of his youth. "De eloquentia vero, "ſi qua mihi fuiſſet, neque mirum, neque invidioſum deberet "videri, ſi *ab ineunte ævo* unis ſtudiis litterarum ex ſummis viribus "deditus, omnibus aliis ſpretis voluptatibus *ad hoc ævi*, haud "ſciam anne ſuper omneis homines impenſo labore, diuque noctu-"que, cum deſpectu et diſpendio bonæ valetudinis, eam quæſiſſem "—Quis enim me hoc quidem pacto eloquentior vivat? quippe "qui nihil *unquam* cogitavi quod eloqui non auderem. Eundem "me aio facundiſſimum; nam *omne peccatum* ſemper nefas habui. "Eundem diſertiſſimum; quod nullum meum factum vel dictum "extet, de quo differere publice non poſſim †." What have we then to conclude but that the repreſentation of himſelf in this *Fable*, under a debauched character, is entirely feigned? Yet ſtill it would be as abſurd to imagine that a grave and moral Philoſopher ſhould chuſe to exhibit himſelf to the public in the odious, and falſe light of a *Magician* and *Debauchee*; and take a pleaſure in dwelling upon the horrors of ſo deteſtable a Character, for no other purpoſe than to amuſe and entertain a ſet of diſſolute readers. We muſt needs therefore go a ſtep further, and conclude that he aſſumed it only for the ſake of the GENERAL MORAL, and the better to carry on his Allegory; which was, to recommend the MYSTERIES as the certain cure for all the DISORDERS OF THE WILL.

This being his end, he was but too much encouraged by the example of the moſt moral of the ancient Satiriſts, to particularize

* His Apology. † P. 6. lin. ic.

the

the various maladies to which he was applying a remedy. Let this, and his copying only what he found in his original Author, ſtand for ſome kind of excuſe in a wretched Pagan; and it is the beſt we have, for all the obſcenities with which his Fable abounds.

But to proceed with his plan. Having now ſhewn himſelf thoroughly brutalized by his crimes; he goes on to repreſent at large the miſeries of that condition, in a long detail of his miſadventures; in the courſe of which he fell, by turns, under the dominion of every vicious paſſion; though the incidents are chiefly confined to the miſchiefs of unlawful love: And this, with much judgment, as one of the principal ends of the *Myſteries* was to curb and ſubdue this inordinance, which brings more general and laſting miſery upon Mankind than all the other. And as it was the great moral of his piece to ſhew *that pure religion* (ſuch as a platonic Philoſopher eſteemed pure) *was the only remedy for human corruption*; ſo, to prevent the abuſe or miſtake of this capital Principle, he takes care to inform us, *that an attachment to ſuperſtitious and corrupt Religion does but plunge the wretched victim into ſtill greater miſeries.* This he finely illuſtrates, in the hiſtory of his adventures with the BEGGING PRIESTS OF CYBELE, whoſe enormities are related in the eighth and ninth books; and whoſe CORRUPT MYSTERIES are intended as a contraſt to the PURE RITES OF ISIS: With which, in a very ſtudied deſcription and encomium, he concludes the *Fable.*

In the mean time, matters growing from bad to worſe, and Lucius plunged deeper and deeper in the ſink of vice, his affairs come to a criſis. For this is one great beauty in the conduct of the Fable, that every change of ſtation, while he remains a brute, makes his condition ſtill more wretched and deplorable. And being now (in the *ninth* book) about to perpetrate one of the moſt ſhocking enormities; NATURE, though ſo deeply brutalized, REVOLTS; he abhors the idea of his projected crime; he evades his keepers; he flies to the ſea-ſhore; and, in this ſolitude, begins to reflect more ſeriouſly on his loſt condition. This is finely imagined; for

we

we often ſee men, even after a whole life of horrors, come ſuddenly to themſelves on the hideous aſpect of ſome Monſter vice too frightful even for an hardened Reprobate to bear. Nor is it with leſs judgment that the Author makes theſe beginnings of reformation confirmed by ſolitude; when the unhappy victim of PLEASURE hath broken looſe from the companions and partakers of his follies.

And now, a more intimate acquaintance with his hopeleſs condition obliges him to fly to Heaven for relief. The MOON is in full ſplendour; and the awful ſilence of the night inſpires him with ſentiments of Religion.—" Video præmicantis Lunæ candore nimio " completum orbem,—nactuſque opacæ noctis ſilentioſa ſecreta, " certus etiam SUMMATEM DEAM præcipua majeſtate pollere, reſ- " que prorſus humanas ipſius regi *providentia*, etc *." He then purifies himſelf in the manner preſcribed by PYTHAGORAS †; the Philoſopher moſt addicted to *Initiations* of all the early Sages, as Apuleius, of all the later; and ſo makes his prayer to the *Moon* or ISIS; invoking her by her ſeveral names of the *Eleuſinian Ceres*, the *celeſtial Venus*, *Diana* and *Proſerpine*: when betaking himſelf to repoſe, ſhe appears to him in a dream ‡. This was not a circumſtance of the Fabuliſt's mere invention. Pauſanias tells us " that in Phocis there was a Chapel conſecrated to Iſis, of all the " places of worſhip, which the Greeks erected to this Egyptian " Goddeſs, by far the moſt holy: that to this ſacred place it was " not lawful for any to approach, but ſuch whom the Goddeſs had

* P. 238.

† —neque protinus, purificandi ſtudio, marino lavacro trado: ſeptieſque ſubmerſo fluctibus capite, quod eum numerum præcipue religioni aptiſſimum divinus ille Pythagoras prodidit—p. 238.

‡ Artemidorus ſays, that for a man to dream that Ceres, Proſerpine, or Bacchus appears to him, betokens ſome extraordinary good fortune to happen to him. Δημήτης καὶ Κόρη καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἴακχος τοῖς μεμυημένοις ταῖς θείαις ἀγαθόν τι καὶ ἀπὸ τὸ τύχον ἐσόμενον σημαίνουσι. l. iv. c. 44. The ancient ONIROCRITICS, as we have obſerved, B. iv. Sect. 4. were not founded on the arbitrary fancies of the impoſtors who profeſſed that art, but on the cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions of the times, and with a principal reference to the Egyptian HIEROGLYPHICS and MYSTERIES.

" invited,

" invited, and appeared to, in a *Dream*, for that purpoſe *." Here ſhe appears under the SHINING IMAGE ſo much ſpoken of by the *Myſtics*, as repreſenting the divine nature in general †. " Necdum " ſatis conniveram: et ecce pelago medio, venerandos Diis etiam " vultus attollens, emergit *divina facies*, ac dehinc paulatim toto " corpore PER LUCIDUM SIMULACRUM, excuſſo pelago, ante me " conſtitiſſe viſum eſt. Ejus mirandam ſpeciem ad vos etiam re- " ferre conabar—Corona multiformis, variis floribus ſublimem diſ- " tinxerat verticem: cujus media quidem ſuper fronte *plana rotun-* " *ditas*, candidum lumen emicabat. Dextra lævaque ſulcis *inſurgen-* " *tium viperarum* cohibita, *ſpicis* etiam *Cerealibus* deſuper porrectis. " —Et quæ longe longeque etiam meum confutabat obtutum, *palla* " nigerrima, ſplendeſcens atro nitore; quæ circum circa remeans,— " per intextam extremitatem, et in ipſa oræ planitie, *ſtellæ* diſperſæ " coruſcabant: earumque media ſemeſtris Luna flammeos ſpirabat " ignes.—Dextera quidem ferebat *æreum crepitaculum:* cujus per an- " guſtam laminam in modum balthei recurvatam, trajectæ mediæ " paucæ virgulæ, criſpante brachio tergeminos jactus, reddebant, " argutum ſonitum ‡." Theſe ſeveral ſymbolic Attributes, the *lucid Round*, the *ſnakes*, the *ears of corn*, and the *ſiſtrum*, repreſent the tutelar Deities of the *Hecataean*, *Bacchic*, *Eleuſinian* and *Iſiac* MYSTERIES. That is, MYSTIC RITES IN GENERAL; for whoſe ſake the allegory was invented. As the black Palla in which ſhe is wrapped, embroidered with a ſilver-moon, and ſtars, denotes the TIME, in which the Myſteries were celebrated, namely the dead of NIGHT; which was ſo conſtant and inſeparable a circumſtance, that the author calls *initiation*, NOCTIS SOCIETAS.

In her ſpeech to Lucius ſhe gives this extraordinary account of herſelf, " En aſſum, tuis commota Lucî precibus, RERUM NATURA

* Τῷ δὲ Ἀσκληπιῷ περὶ τετσαράκοντα ἀπέχει σταδίους περίβολος, ἐν ᾧ ἄδυτόν ἐστιν Ἴσιδος ἀγυ- ἅλιον ὁπόσα Ἕλληνες θεῷ τῷ Διονύσῳ πεποιήκασι. Οὔτε γὰρ περιοικεῖν ἐνταῦθα οἱ Τιθορεῖς νομίζουσιν, ἔστι δὲ ἔσοδος ἐς τὸ ἄδυτον ἄλλοις γε ἢ ἐκείνοις ἐστὶν, ὃς ἂν ἀεὶ προλιμήσασα ἡ Ἶσις καλέσῃ σφᾶς δι' ὀνείρων. Lib. x. c. 32. p. 880. Edit. Kuhnii, Lipſ. fol. 1696.

† See above, p. 283. note (I.) ‡ P. 239, 240.

" PARENS,

" PARENS, elementorum omnium Domina, fæculorum progenies " initialis, Summa numinum, Regina manium, Prima cœlitum, " Deorum Dearumque facies uniformis : quæ cœli luminoſa culmina, " maris ſalubria flamina, inferorum deplorata ſilentia nutibus meis " diſpenſo. Cujus numen unicum, multiformi ſpecie, ritu vario, " nomine multijugo totus veneratur orbis—priſcaque doctrina pol- " lentes ÆGYPTII, ceremoniis me prorſus PROPRIIS percolentes, " appellant vero nomine reginam ISIDEM *." This was exactly adapted to the deſign of the *Myſteries* ; and preparatory to the communication of the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ. It had likewiſe this further uſe, to patch up and recommend the PAGAN RELIGIONS ; by ſhewing that their *Polytheiſm* conſiſted in nothing elſe than in giving the SUPREME GOD various NAMES, merely expreſſive of his various ATTRIBUTES. This was the faſhionable colouring, which, after the appearance of Chriſtianity, the advocates of paganiſm employed to blanch their IDOLATRY. I will only obſerve further, that the words, *Ægyptii ceremoniis me prorſus propriis percolentes*, inſinuate, what was true, that all MYSTERIOUS WORSHIP came firſt from ÆGYPT ; this people having penetrated furtheſt into the nature of the Gods : As the calling HER, who repreſents the *Myſteries in general*, RERUM NATURA PARENS, ſhews plainly what were the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ of them all.

PARENT NATURE then reveals to Lucius the means of his recovery. Her feſtival was on the following day ; when there was to be a Proceſſion of her Votaries. The Prieſt who led it up (ſhe told him) would have a chaplet of ROSES in his hand, which had the virtue to reſtore him to his former ſhape. But as breaking through a habit of vice is, of all things, the moſt difficult ; ſhe adds encouragements to her promiſes, " nec quidquam rerum mearum re- " formides, ut arduum. Nam hoc eodem momento, quo tibi venio, " ſimul et ibi PRÆSENS, quæ ſunt conſequentia ſacerdoti meo per " quietem facienda præcipio †." Alluding to what was taught in

* P. 241. † P. 242.

the *Myſteries*, that the *aſſiſtance of Heaven* was always *preſent* to ſecond the efforts of virtue. But in return for the favour of releaſing him from his brutal ſhape, i. e. of reforming his manners by *Initiation*, ſhe tells him ſhe expected the ſervice of his whole life; And this, the *Myſteries* required: Nor ſhould her ſervice (ſhe ſaid) go unrewarded, for he ſhould have a place in ELYSIUM hereafter; And this, too, the *Myſteries* promiſed. "Plane memineris, et penita "mente conditum ſemper tenebis, *mihi reliqua vitæ tuæ curricula*, "ad uſque terminos ultimi ſpiritus *vadata*. Nec injurium, cujus "beneficio redieris ad homines ei totum debere quod vives. Vives "autem *beatus*, vives, in mea tutela, *glorioſus*: et cum ſpatium ſe"culi tui permenſus ad inferos demearis; ibi quoque in ipſo ſub"terraneo ſemirotundo, me, quam vides Acherontis tenebris inter"lucentem, ſtygiiſque penetralibus regnantem, CAMPOS ELYSIOS "*incolens ipſe*, tibi propitiam frequens adorabis *."

Lucius is at length confirmed in his reſolution of *aſpiring* to a life of virtue. And on this change of his diſpoſitions, and intire conqueſt of his paſſions, the Author finely repreſents all Nature as putting on a new face of chearfulneſs and gaiety. "Tanta hilari"tudine præter peculiarem meam geſtire mihi cuncta videbantur; "ut pecua etiam cujuſcemodi, et totas domos, et ipſum diem ſerena "facie gaudere ſentirem †." And to enjoy Nature, in theſe her beſt conditions, was the boaſted privilege of the *Initiated*, as we may ſee from a Chorus in the *Frogs* of Ariſtophanes ‡.

And now the Proceſſion, in honour of ISIS, begins. Where by the way, we muſt obſerve, that the *two firſt days* of the celebration of the *Eleuſinian Myſteries* are plainly deſcribed: the one called ΑΓΥΡΜΟΣ, from the multitude aſſembled; the other ΑΛΑΣΕ ΜΥΣΤΑΙ, from the Proceſſion made to the ſea-ſhore. "Tunc influunt

* P. 242.

† P. 243.

‡ Μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἥλιος.
Καὶ φέγγος ἱλαρόν ἐστιν
Ὅσοι μεμυήμεθ'—Act. i.

"*Turbæ*

"*Turbæ* ſacris divinis initiatæ *—jam *ripam maris* proximamus †." The Prieſt or Hierophant of the Rites leads up the train of the Initiated with a garland of Roſes in his hand. Lucius approaches, devours the Roſes, and, according to the promiſe of the Goddeſs, is reſtored to his native Form: by which, as we have ſaid, no more was meant than a change of Manners, from vice to virtue. And this the author plainly intimates by making the Goddeſs thus addreſs him under his brutal Figure, "peſſimæ mihique deteſta-"bilis jamdudum beluæ iſtius corio te protinus exue ‡." For an Aſs was ſo far from being *deteſtable*, that it was employed in the celebration of her rites; and was ever found in the retinue of Oſiris or Bacchus. The *garland* plainly repreſents that which the aſpirants were crowned with at their *initiation*: juſt as the *virtue* of the Roſes deſigns the *Myſteries*. At his transformation he had been told, that ROSES were to reſtore him to Humanity: ſo that, amid' all his adventures, he had ſtill this remedy in view. Particularly in a circumſtance of great diſtreſs, he met with a ſpecies of them called *roſa laurea*; but on examining its properties, he found that, inſtead of a reſtorative, it was a deadly poiſon to all kind of cattle—"quarum cuncto pecori cibus lethalis eſt." Who can doubt then, but by this *roſe-laurel* was meant all *debauched, magical, and corrupt Myſteries*, ſuch as thoſe of the SYRIAN GODDESS, whoſe Miniſters he repreſents in ſo abominable a light §; in oppoſition to what he calls "ſobriæ religionis obſervatio:" and in thoſe Rites, *initiation* was ſo far from promoting a life of virtue, that it plunged the deluded Votary into ſtill greater miſeries. Theſe *emblematic Roſes* were not of our author's invention. For the ROSE, amongſt the Ancients, was a ſymbol of SILENCE, the requiſite quality of the *Initiated*. And therefore the ſtatues of Iſis or Diana Multimammea, (images conſecrated to the uſe of the *Myſteries*) are crowned with chaplets of Roſes; deſigning what we now mean, when we ſay, in proverbial ſpeech, UNDER THE ROSE.

* P. 245. † P. 249. ‡ P. 242. § L. viii. p. 174.

Our Author proceeds to tell us, that the people wondered at this inſtantaneous Metamorphoſis. Populi mirantur, *religioſi venerantur* tam evidentem maximi numinis potentiam—et *facilitatem reformationis* *. For the *Myſteries* boaſted the power of giving a ſudden and entire change to the mind and affections: And the advocates of Paganiſm againſt Chriſtianity uſed to oppoſe this boaſt to the real and miraculous efficacy of GRACE.

As ſoon as Lucius had recovered the integrity of his nature, by *initiation*, the Prieſt covers him, naked as he was, with a LINEN garment †: A habit always beſtowed upon the Aſpirant, on his admiſſion to the *Myſteries*; the *rationale* of which, Apuleius himſelf gives us in his Apology ‡.

When all was over, the Prieſt accoſts his Penitent in the following manner. "Multis et variis exantlatis laboribus, magniſ-
"que Fortunæ tempeſtatibus, et maximis actis procellis, ad portum
"quietis et *aram Miſericordiæ* tandem, Lucî, veniſti: nec tibi na-
"tales, ac ne dignitas quidem vel ipſa, qua flores, uſquam doctrina
"profuit: ſed lubrico virentis ætatulæ, *ad ſerviles delapſus voluptates*,
"CURIOSITATIS IMPROSPERÆ ſiniſtrum præmium reportâſti. Sed
"utrinque Fortunæ cæcitas dum te peſſimis periculis diſcrutiat, *ad*
"*religioſam iſtam habitudinem* improvida produxit malitia. Eat nunc,
"et ſummo furore ſæviat, et crudelitati ſuæ materiam quærat aliam.
"Nam in eorum vitas, *quorum ſibi ſervitium Deæ noſtræ majeſtas*
"*vindicavit*, *non habet locum caſus inſeſtus*. Quid latrones, quid
"feræ, quid ſervitium, quid aſperrimorum itinerum ambages reci-
"procæ, quid metus mortis quotidianæ nefariæ Fortunæ profuit?

* P. 247, 248.

† Sed ſacerdos, utcunque *divino monitu cognitis ab origine cunctis cladibus meis*, quamquam et ipſe inſigni permotus miraculo, nutu ſignificato prius præcipit, tegendo mihi LINTEAM dari LACINIAM. P. 248.

‡ *Lana* ſegniſſimi corporis excrementum, pecori detracta, jam inde Orphei et Pythagoræ ſcitis, profanus veſtitus eſt. Sed enim mundiſſima LINI ſeges, inter optimas fruges terræ exorta non modo *indutui et amictui ſanctiſſimis Ægyptiorum ſacerdotibus*, ſed opertui quoque in *rebus ſacris* uſurpatur. Apol. p. 64. l. 17.

"in

" in tutelam jam receptus es FORTUNÆ, *ſed* VIDENTIS; *quæ* SUÆ " LUCIS SPLENDORE *ceteros etiam deos illuminat.* Sume jam vultum " lætiorem, *candido iſto habitu tuo* congruentem; comitare pompam " Deæ SOSPITATRICIS innovanti gradu; VIDEANT IRRELIGIOSI: " VIDEANT, ET ERROREM SUUM RECOGNOSCANT. En ecce priſ- " tinis ærumnis abſolutus, ISIDIS *magnæ* PROVIDENTIA *gaudens* " *Lucius de ſua fortuna triumphat* *." "

Here the MORAL OF THE FABLE is delivered in plain terms; and, in this *moral*, all we have advanced, concerning the purpoſe of the work, fully confirmed. It is expreſly declared, that VICE and inordinate CURIOSITY were the cauſes of Lucius's diſaſters; from which the only relief was INITIATION into the MYSTERIES. Whereby the Author would inſinuate, that nothing was more abhorrent from thoſe holy rites than DEBAUCHERY and MAGIC; the two enormities they were then commonly ſuſpected to encourage.

It hath been obſerved above, that by Lucius's return to his proper Form, was meant his *initiation*; and accordingly, that return is called (as *initiation* was) *the being born again*—ut RENATUS quodammodo, and—ſua providentia quodammodo RENATOS; but this was only to the LESSER, not the GREATER *myſteries.* The firſt was to *purify* the mind: hence it was called by the Ancients, Καθαίρεσιν, a *ſeparation from evil*: the *ſecond* was to *enlighten* it, when purified, and to bring it to the knowledge of divine ſecrets, as Hierocles ſpeaks, ἔπειτα ἔτω ἐπιβάλλει τῇ τῶν θειοτέρων γνώσει. Hence they named the one ΚΑΘΑΡΣΙΝ, and the other ΤΕΛΕΙΟΤΗΤΑ, PURIFICATION and PERFECTION. The *firſt* is here repreſented in the incident of Lucius's being reſtored to humanity by the uſe of *roſes*: The *ſecond*, as the matter of chief importance, the Author treats more circumſtantially.

He begins with making the Prieſt take occaſion, from the benefit already received, to preſs Lucius to enter into the GREATER MYSTERIES of Iſis. " Quo tibi tamen tutior ſis, atque munitior;

* P. 248, 249.

" da

" da nomen huic *ſanctæ militiæ*, cujus olim ſacramento etiam læta-
" beris; teque jam nunc obſequio religionis noſtræ dedica, et miniſ-
" terii jugum ſubi voluntarium. *Nam, cum cæperis Deæ ſervire,*
" *tunc magis ſenties fructum tuæ libertatis* *." But at the ſame time makes him inform the Candidate, that nothing was to be precipitated: for that not only many previous Rites and Ceremonies, concerning religious diet, and abſtinence from prophane food, were to be obſerved; but that the Aſpirants to theſe *higher Myſteries* were to wait for A CALL. " Quippe cum aviditati contumaciæque ſumme
" cavere, et utramque culpam vitare, ac neque vocatus morari, nec
" non juſſus feſtinare deberem. Nec tamen eſſe quemquam de ſuo
" numero tam perditæ mentis, vel immo deſtinatæ mortis, qui non
" ſibi quoque ſeorſum, jubente Domina, temerarium atque ſacrile-
" gum audeat miniſterium ſubire, noxamque letalem contrahere.
" Nam et infêrum clauſtra, et ſalutis tutelam in Deæ manu poſita
" ipſamque traditionem ad inſtar voluntariæ mortis et præcariæ ſa-
" lutis celebrari †." Accordingly, he is initiated into the GREATER MYSTERIES. The ceremony is deſcribed at large ‡; and we find it to agree exactly with what, we have ſhewn, other ancient writers more profeſſedly deliver concerning it.

The Author, by the doubts and apprehenſions which retarded his *initiation*, firſt gives us to underſtand, that the higheſt degree of ſanctity was required of thoſe who entered into the *Myſteries*.—
" At ego, quamquam cupienti voluntate præditus, tamen religioſa
" formidine retinebar. Quod enim ſedulo percontaveram, *difficile*
" *religionis obſequium, et caſtimoniorum abſtinentiam ſatis arduam, cau-*
" *toque circumſpectu vitam, quæ multis caſibus ſubjicet, eſſe munien-*
" *dam* §." Theſe difficulties now ſurmounted, he is *initiated* with the accuſtomed Ceremonies. He then makes his Prayer, in which the grand ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ of the *Myſteries* is ſtill ‖ more plainly re-

* P. 249. † P. 253, 254. ‡ P. 255, 256, 257. § P. 252.

‖ See the quotation above.—*Fortunæ Videntis, quæ ſuæ lucis ſplendore ceteros etiam Deos illuminat.*

ferred

ferred to. "Tu quidem ſancta et humani generis SOSPITATR X per-
"petua, ſemper fovendis mortalibus munifica, dulcem matris af-
"fectionem miſerorum caſibus tribuis.—TE SUPERI COLUNT; OB-
"SERVANT INFERI; TU ROTAS ORBEM; LUMINAS SOLEM; REGIS
"MUNDUM; CALCAS TARTARUM; TIBI RESPONDENT SIDERA *;
"GAUDENT LUMINA; REDEUNT TEMPORA; SERVIUNT ELE-
"MENTA; TUO NUTU SPIRANT FLAMINA; NUTRIUNTUR NU-
"BILA; GERMINANT SEMINA; CRESCUNT GERMINA; TUAM
"MAJESTATEM PERHORRESCUNT AVES COELO MEANTES; FERÆ
"MONTIBUS ERRANTES; SERPENTES SOLO LATENTES; BELUÆ
"PONTO NATANTES †."

The affair thus over, and the honour attendant on *initiation* into the *greater Myſteries* being marked out in the words—*cominabar ſacrarium*; *totæ civitati notus ac conſpicuus, digitis hominum nutibuſque notabilis* ‡; the Author, in the next place, takes occaſion, agreeably to his real practice and opinions, to recommend a MULTIPLICITY OF INITIATIONS. He tells us how *Iſis* counſelled him to enter into the *Myſteries* of *Oſiris*: how, after that, ſhe invited him to a third *initiation*: and then rewarded him for his accumulated Piety with an abundance of temporal Bleſſings.

All this conſidered, we can no longer doubt but that the true deſign of his work was to recommend INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES, IN OPPOSITION TO THE NEW RELIGION. We ſee the Cataſtrophe of the piece, the whole Eleventh Book, entirely taken up with it; and compoſed with the greateſt ſerioufneſs and ſuperſtition.

And, ſurely, nothing could be better conceived, to recommend the *Myſteries*, than the idea of ſuch a plan; or better contrived than his execution of it. In which he omits no circumſtance that might

* *Reſpondent ſidera.* This, I ſuppoſe, relates to the *muſic of the ſpheres.* The image is noble and ſublime. It is taken from the *conſent* in the lyre, to anſwer to, and obey the hand of the Maſter who had put them into tune.

† P. 257, 258. ‡ P. 249.

be plauſibly oppoſed to CHRISTIANITY; or that might recommend the MYSTERIES with advantage to the Magiſtrate's protection: as where he tells us, that in theſe Rites, *they prayed for the proſperity of all Orders in the* STATE—" fauſta vota præfatus principi magno, " ſenatuique et equiti, totique populo Romano."

This interpretation will throw new light on *every part* of the GOLDEN ASS. But I have been ſo long upon the ſubject, that I have only time to give one inſtance; and this, chiefly becauſe it reflects light back again on my general interpretation of the Fable.

In the fifth and ſixth books is the long epiſode of CUPID and PSYCHE; viſibly allegorical throughout; and entirely foreign to all the reſt of the work, conſidered as a mere Mileſian fable; but very applicable to the Writer's purpoſe, if he had that moral to inculcate which we have here aſſigned unto him.

There was no man, though he regarded the *golden Aſs* as a thing of mere amuſement, but ſaw that the ſtory of CUPID and PSYCHE was a *philoſophic allegory of the progreſs of the ſoul to perfection, in the poſſeſſion of divine love and the reward of immortality.* The Amour of Cupid and Pſyche was a ſubject which lay in common amongſt the Platonic writers. And though originally founded on ſome obſcure tradition of the *Fall of Man*, yet every one faſhioned this agreeable fiction (as our Author has done here) according to the doctrines he had to convey under it. By this means it could not but become famous. The remaining monuments of ancient ſculpture convince us that it was very famous; in which, nothing is ſo common as the figures of CUPID and PSYCHE in the various circumſtances of their adventures. Now we have ſhewn at large, that the profeſſed end of the *Myſteries*, in the later ages of their celebrity, was to reſtore the ſoul to it's ORIGINAL RECTITUDE, and, in every age, to encourage good men with the promiſes of *happineſs in another life.* The fable, therefore, of *Cupid and Pſyche*, in the fifth and ſixth books, was the fineſt and moſt artful preparative for the ſubject of the eleventh, which treats profeſſedly of the *Myſteries.*

But

But if we look more nearly into this beautiful Fable, we ſhall find that, beſides it's general purpoſe, it has one more particular. We have obſerved that the *corrupt ſtate* of the *Myſteries*, in the time of Apuleius, was one principal reaſon of his undertaking their apology. Theſe corruptions were of two kinds, DEBAUCHERIES and MAGIC. Their *debaucheries* have been taken notice of above. Their MAGIC was of three ſorts: 1. The Magic of invocation or NECROMANCY. 2. The Magic of transformation or METAMORPHOSIS. 3. And the Magic of divine communication under a viſible appearance or THEÜRGY. The ORACULAR RESPONSES, introduced late into the *Myſteries*, ſeem to have given birth to the firſt: The Doctrine of the METEMPSYCHOSIS taught therein, to the ſecond: and the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ concerning the DIVINE NATURE, to the third. The abomination of the two firſt ſorts was ſeen by all, and frankly given up as criminal: but the fanatic Platoniſts and Pythagoreans of the latter ages, eſpouſing the third, occaſioned it to be held in eſteem and reverence. So that, as Heliodorus tells us, the Egyptian prieſts (between whoſe fanaticiſm and that of the Platoniſts there was, at this time, a kind of coalition *) affected to diſtinguiſh between the MAGIC of *Necromancy* and the magic of *Theürgy*; accounting the firſt infamous and wicked; but the laſt very fair, and even commendable. For now both thoſe philoſophic Enthuſiaſts had their *myſterious Rites*, which conſiſted in the practice of this THEÜRGIC MAGIC. Theſe were the *Myſteries*, to obſerve it by the way, of which the Emperor Julian was ſo fond, that he placed his principal felicity (in what the Chriſtians placed his principal crime) their celebration. But our Author, who had imbibed his Platoniſm, not at the muddy ſtreams of thoſe late Fanatics, but at the pure fountain head of the Academy itſelf, well underſtood how much this ſuperſtition, with all it's plauſible pretences, had polluted the *Myſteries*; and, therefore, as in the courſe of the adventures of his *golden Aſs*, he had ſtigmatized the two other kinds of

* See Book iii. Sect. iv. towards the end.

Magic, he compoſed this celebrated tale (hitherto ſo little underſtood) to expoſe the Magic of THEÜRGY. It is, as we ſaid, *a philoſophic Allegory of the progreſs of the Soul to perfection, in the poſſeſſion of Divine Love and the reward of immortality*, delivered in the adventures of PSYCHE, or the *Soul:* whoſe various labours and traverſes in this *Progreſs*, are all repreſented as the effects of her indiſcreet paſſion for that ſpecies of *magic* called THEÜRGY.

To underſtand this, we muſt obſerve, that the fanatic Platoniſts, in their purſuit of the SUPREME GOOD, the *Union with the Deity*, made the completion and perfection of it to conſiſt in the *Theürgic* Viſion of the Αὐτοπτον Αγαλμα or SELF-SEEN IMAGE, i. e. ſeen by the ſplendour of its own light. Now the ſtory tells us, there were three Siſters, the youngeſt of whom was called PSYCHE; by which we are to underſtand, the *three peripatetic ſouls*, the *ſenſitive*, the *animal*, and the *rational*; or in other words, *ſenſe*, *appetite*, and *reaſon*.

That the two elder Siſters, *Senſe* and *Appetite*, were ſoon diſpoſed of in marriage; but that the younger, PSYCHE or the *rational Soul*, was of ſo tranſcendant and divine a beauty, that though men forſook the altars of the Gods to follow and worſhip her *, having paid her their full homage of admiration, not ſo much as one aſpired to a cloſer union with her: intimating the general preference given to temporal things above ſpiritual:

Virtus laudatur & alget.

However, amidſt this neglect, ſhe is happily contracted to, and poſſeſſes, the *celeſtial Cupid*, or DIVINE LOVE, who cohabits with her INVISIBLY amidſt a ſcene of paradiſaical pleaſures and enjoyments. But is warned by Cupid not to hearken to the pernicious counſel of her ſiſters, whoſe envy at her happineſs, from their own choice of huſbands diſeaſed and avaricious †, the lot of thoſe under the do-

* Apuleii Met. ed. Pricæi, p. 85. Interea Pſyche, cum ſua ſibi præcipua pulchritudine nullum decoris ſui fructum percipit. Spectatur ab omnibus; laudatur ab omnibus, nec quiſquam — cupiens ejus nuptiarum petitur accedit.

minion

minion of their appetites, would ſoon bring them to attempt her ruin, in perſuading her to get a ſight of her *inviſible* ſpouſe. Againſt which SACRILEGIOUS CURIOSITY, as what would deprive her of all her happineſs *, and to which her ſiſters would endeavour to inflame her mind, he carefully warns her. By all which the Author would inſinuate, that they are the irregular paſſions and the ungovernable appetites which ſtir up men's *curioſity* to this ſpecies of *magic*, the THEÜRGIC VISION. However, Pſyche falls into the ſnare her ſiſters had laid for her, and againſt the expreſs injunction of the God, ſacrilegiouſly attempts this *forbidden* ſight; though he aſſured her †, that if ſhe kept the religious ſecret, the child to be born of them ſhould be immortal; but if ſhe prophaned it, the child would be mortal, intimating, that Theürgic Magic was ſo far from rendering the participants divine, that it loaded them with impiety. In a word, ſhe indulges her inordinate appetite, and is undone: *Divine Love* forſakes her; the happy ſcenes of her abode vaniſh; and ſhe finds herſelf forlorn and abandoned, ſurrounded with miſeries, and purſued with the vengeance of heaven by its inſtrument the *Celeſtial Venus*.

In this diſtreſs ſhe firſt comes to the temple of CERES for protection; by which is meant the cuſtom of having recourſe to the *Myſteries* againſt the evils and diſaſters of life, as is plainly intimated in the reaſon given for her application—"nec ullam vel dubiam "SPEI MELIORIS viam volens omittere ‡." *Spes melior* being the common appellation for what was ſought for in the *Myſteries*, and what they promiſed to the participants. With theſe ſentiments ſhe addreſſes *Ceres* in the following obſervation': "Per ego te frugiferam tuam dextram iſtam deprecor—per *tacita ſacra ciſtarum*—per—per, et cetera *quæ ſilentio tegit Eleuſinis Atticæ ſacrarium*——§" But

* Identidem monuit, ac ſæpe terruit, ne quando ſororum pernicioſo conſilio ſuaſa, de *forma Mariti* quærat: neve ſe SACRILEGA CURIOSITATE de tanto fortunarum ſuggeſtu peſſum dejiciat; nec ſuum poſtea contingat amplexum. P. 92.

† Infantem—ſi texeris noſtra ſecreta ſilentio, divinum; ſi profanaveris, mortalem, P. 96. ‡ P. 112. § P. 111.

Pſyche is denied any protection both here and at the temple of *Juno:* for the purer *Myſteries* diſcouraged all kind of magic, even the moſt ſpecious. However, ſhe is pitied by both. The reaſon Ceres gives her for not complying with her requeſt is remarkable. She had entered, ſhe ſaid, into an ancient league with Venus, which ſhe could not violate*. By which is intimated, that all the *Myſteries* had one and the ſame end. And Pſyche, ſhe ſaid, had reaſon to thank her that ſhe did not ſeize on her and detain her priſoner †; alluding to the obligation that all were under to bring to puniſhment the violaters of the *Myſteries*.

Juno excuſes herſelf, from imparting any aſſiſtance, "out of reverence to the Laws, which forbid any one to entertain another's runaway ſervant ‡." For thoſe who had violated the *Myſteries* of one God could not be admitted to thoſe of another.

In this diſtreſs Psyche reſolves at laſt to render herſelf to the offended Parties, and implore their pardon. Venus impoſes on her a long and ſevere penance; in which the author ſeems to have ſhadowed out the trials and labours undergone by the aſpirants to the *Myſteries*, and the more ſevere in proportion to the delinquencies of the aſpirants, intimated in the words of Venus to her.—Sed jam nunc ego ſedulo periclitabor an oppido ferti animo, ſingularique prudentia ſis prædita §.

During the courſe of theſe trials Psyche falls once more into diſtreſs by her raſh curioſity ||, and would be undone but for the divine aſſiſtance, which all along ſupports and aids her in her difficulties. In which the author hints at the promiſes made to the aſpirants on theſe occaſions.—Nec Providentiæ bonæ graves oculos innocentis anima latuit ærumna. In her greateſt diſtreſs, in the repetition of her firſt capital fault, ſhe is relieved by Cupid himſelf;

* —cum qua etiam antiquum foedus amicitiæ colo. P. 111.

† quod a me retenta cuſtoditaque non fueris optimi conſule. P. 112.

‡ —tunc etiam Legibus, quæ ſervos alienos profugos, invitis Dominis, vetant ſuſcipi, prohibeor. P. 112.

§ P. 118. || Mente capitur TEMERITATE CURIOSITATÆ, p. 119.

intimating,

intimating, that nothing but the divine aid can overcome human weakneſs; as appears from theſe words of Cupid to his ſpouſe—Et ecce, inquit, *rurſum* perieras miſella *ſimili curioſitate.* Sed interim quidem tu provinciam, quæ tibi matris meæ precepto mandata eſt, exequere gnaviter: *cetera egomet videro* *. When in theſe trials the aſpirant had done his beſt, the Gods would help out the reſt.

With this aſſiſtance, ſhe performs her penance, is pardoned, and reſtored to favour: put again into poſſeſſion of DIVINE LOVE, and rewarded with IMMORTALITY, the declared end of all the MYSTERIES.

There are many other circumſtances in this fine Allegory equally ſerving to ſupport the ſyſtem here explained: as there are others which allude to divers beautiful platonic notions, foreign to the preſent diſcourſe. It is enough that we have pointed to its chief, and peculiar purpoſe; which it was impoſſible to ſee while the nature and deſign of the whole Fable lay undiſcovered.

But now perhaps it may be ſaid, "That all this is very well. An Allegory is here found for the GOLDEN ASS, which, it muſt be owned, fits the Fable. But ſtill it may be aſked, Was it indeed made for it? Did the Author write the tale for the moral; or did the Critic find the moral for the tale? For an Allegory may be drawn from almoſt any ſtory: and they have been often made for Authors who never thought of them. Nay, when a rage of allegorizing happens to prevail, as it did a century or two ago, the Author himſelf will be either tempted or obliged, without the Commentator, to encourage this deluſion. *Arioſto* and *Taſſo*, writers of the higheſt reputation, one of whom wrote after the *Gothic* Romances, as the other after the *Claſſic* Fables, without ever concerning themſelves about any other moral than what the natural circumſtances of the ſtory conveyed; yet, to ſecure the ſucceſs of their poems, they ſubmitted, in compliance to faſhion and falſe taſte, to the ridiculous drudgery of inventing a kind of poſthumous

* P. 123.

Allegory,

Allegory, and ſometimes more than one; that the reader himſelf might ſeaſon their Fables to his own taſte. As this has been the caſe, To ſhew that I neither impoſe upon myſelf nor others, I have reſerved the Author's own declaration of his having an *Allegoric meaning*, for the laſt confirmation of my ſyſtem. It is in theſe words,

> At ego tibi ſermone iſto Mileſio
> Varias Fabulas conſeram, aureſque tuas
> Benevolas lepido ſuſurro permulceam;
> Modo ſi PAPYRUM ÆGYPTIAM ARGUTIA
> NILOTICI CALAMI INSCRIPTAM, non ſpreveris
> Inſpicere *——

A direct inſinuation of its being replete with the profound *Ægyptian wiſdom*; of which, that Nation, by the invention of the MYSTERIES, had conveyed ſo conſiderable a part to the *Greeks*.

Before I totally diſmiſs this matter it may not be improper to obſerve, that both VIRGIL and APULEIUS have repreſented the genuine MYSTERIES, as Rites of perfect ſanctity and purity; and recommended only ſuch to their Countrymen; while they expoſe impure and impious Rites to the public execration; for it was their purpoſe to ſtigmatize the reigning corruptions, and to recommend the ancient ſanctity. On the other hand, a man attached by his office to the recommendation of the *Myſteries*, as then practiſed, was to do the beſt he could, when deprived of the benefit of this diſtinction; and was to endeavour to give fair colours to the fouleſt things. This was the caſe of JAMBLICHUS. His friend *Porphyry* had ſome ſcruples on this head. He doubts whether thoſe Rites could come from the Gods, which admitted ſuch a mixture of lewdneſs and impurity. Such a mixture *Jamblichus* confeſſes; but, at the ſame time, endeavours to account for their divine

* In init. Fab.

original,

original, by ſhewing, that they are only the emblems of natural Truths; or a kind of moral purgation of the inordinate paſſions *. You will ſay, he might have given a better anſwer; That they were *modern* abuſes and corruptions. He aſks your pardon for that. Such a confeſſion would have been condemning his own Platonic fanaticiſm; that very fanaticiſm which had brought in theſe abominations. He was reduced therefore to the neceſſity of admitting that they were no after-corruptions, but coeval with the Rites themſelves. And this admiſſion of ſo learned a Hierophant, is, as far as I am able to collect, the only ſupport which any one can now have for ſaying, that *the Myſteries were impure and abominable, even from their firſt Inſtitution.*

Hitherto we have conſidered the Legiſlator's care in perpetuating the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE. And if I have been longer than ordinary on this head, my excuſe is, that the topic was new †, and the doctrine itſelf, which is the main ſubject of the preſent inquiry, much intereſted in it.

A very remarkable circumſtance (for which we are indebted to the obſervation of modern travellers) may convince us, that Rulers and Governors cultivated the belief of this doctrine with a more than common aſſiduity. Many barbarous nations have been diſcovered in theſe later times, on the coaſts of Africa, which,

* De myſteriis, Sect. i. cap. xi.

† A well-known writer, Mr. Jackſon (not to ſpeak at preſent of Others of a later date) who had long and ſcurrilouſly railed at the author of the D. L. in a number of miſerable pamphlets, hath at length thought fit in a Thing, called Chronological Antiquities, to borrow from this book, without any acknowledgment, all he had to give the public concerning the pagan MYSTERIES; and much, concerning the HIEROGLYPHICS and origin of idolatry. But this is the common practice of ſuch ſort of writers: and is only mentioned here to ſhew the reader to what claſs they belong. The treatment theſe volumes have met with from ſome of the moſt worthleſs of my Countrymen, made me think it expedient to contraſt their behaviour with that of the moſt learned and reſpectable foreign Divines and Critics of France, Germany, and Holland, in their animadverſions on this work, occaſionally inſerted in the notes.

in,

in the diſtractions of Government, and tranſmigrations of People, have, it is probable, fallen from a *civilized* to a *ſavage* ſtate of life. Theſe are found to have little or no knowledge of a God, or obſervance of Religion. And yet, which is a ſurpriſing paradox, they ſtill retain the ſettled belief and expectation of a FUTURE STATE. A wonder to be accounted for no other way than by what hath been ſaid above of the Legiſlator's principal concern for the ſupport of this Doctrine; and of the deep root, which by its agreeable nature, it takes in the Mind wherever it has been once received. So that though, as it hath been obſerved, *no Religion ever exiſted without the doctrine of a Future State*, yet the doctrine of a Future State hath, it ſeems, ſometimes exiſted without a Religion.

APPEN-

APPENDIX

TO BOOK II.

WE have ſeen with what art, and care in contrivance, the Sages of the GENTILE World endeavoured, by the intervention of the MYSTERIES, to prevent the memory of THE FIST CAUSE of all things from being totally obliterated from the minds of men; while the perverſe conſtitution of the National Idolatries prevented the true God's being received into any PUBLIC Worſhip. To the SECRET of the *Myſteries* it was, that theſe Pſeudo Evangeliſts invited their more capable Diſciples, awfully admoniſhing them *to give heed unto it, as unto a light ſhining in a dark place.* For it was no more than ſuch a glimmering, till the *riſing of the day-ſtar* of the Goſpel, in the *hearts* of the Faithful.

But if the late noble Author of THE FIRST PHILOSOPHY deſerves credit; all this care was as abſurd as it was fruitleſs.

The Inſtitutors of the *Myſteries* imparted this SECRET, as the true and only ſolid foundation of RELIGION; for the FIRST CAUSE was, in their ideas, a God whoſe ESSENCE indeed was incomprehenſible, but his ATTRIBUTES, as well moral as natural, diſcoverable by human reaſon. Such a God was wanted for that foundation: for *unaſſiſted* reaſon taught *them*, as, in its moſt *aſſiſted* ſtate, it had taught St. PAUL, *That he who cometh to God, muſt believe that he is; and that he is a* REWARDER *of them who diligently ſeek him.* Thus Plato, in his *Book of Laws*, ſpeaking of Religion, and it's uſe to civil Society, ſays, "It is not of ſmall conſequence, that what we here "reaſon about the Gods, ſhould, by all means and methods, be made "probable; as that they ARE, and that they are GOOD *." Hence, though their miſtaken *mode* of teaching deprived the pagan world of the *fruit* of the Doctrine, the purpoſe however was laudable and rational.

* ὡς θεοί τ' εἰσι, καὶ ἀγαθοί.

But now comes a modern Sage *—Philosopher and Statesman like the Ancient, (in all things else how unlike!) who tells us "that they made the Basis of Religion far too wide; that men have no further concern with God than TO BELIEVE THAT HE IS, which his *physical Attributes* make fully manifest; but, That he is *a rewarder of them who diligently seek him*, Religion doth not require us to believe, since this depends on God's MORAR ATTRIBUTES, of which we have no conception." In this manner, by the turn of a hand, hath our Noble Philosopher changed *Natural Religion* into Naturalism; and made this care of the ancient Sages as ridiculously conceived as it was ineffectually prosecuted.

But to do justice to the weak endeavours of those Friends and Servants of Mankind, who surely deserve a grateful memory with Posterity, I shall take the liberty to examine his Lordship's reasoning on this branch of his FIRST PHILOSOPHY; which casts so malignant a shade over the whole religious World.

He pretends to prove *That we have* NO ADEQUATE *ideas of God's moral attributes, his* GOODNESS *and* JUSTICE, *as we have of his natural, his Wisdom and Power.* Here let me observe, that his Lordship uses the words, *inadequate ideas*, and, *no ideas*, as terms of the same import. And I think, not improperly. I have therefore followed him in the different use of either expression. For the reason of his calling our ideas of God's *moral attributes* INADEQUATE, is, because he denies that goodness and justice in God, and goodness and justice amongst Men, are the same IN KIND. But if not the *same in kind*, we can have NO IDEA of them; because we have no idea of any *other kind* of goodness and justice.

He lays down these three Propositions.

1. That, by METAPHYSICS, or by reasoning *a priori*, we can gain no knowledge of God at all.

2. That our knowledge of his *Attributes* is to be acquired only by a contemplation on his WORKS, or by the reasoning *a posteriori*.

3. That in *this* way, we can only arrive at the knowledge of his NATURAL Attributes, not of his MORAL.

"It is from the CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD ALONE (says his Lordship) and from the state of mankind in it, that we can *acquire any ideas* of the divine attributes, or a *right to affirm any thing about them* †."

* Lord Bolingbroke.

† Vol. V. p. 331.

"The

" The knowledge of the Creator is, on many accounts, neceſſary to ſuch " a creature as man: and therefore we are made able to arrive by a proper " exerciſe of our mental faculties, *from a knowledge of God's works to a know-* " *ledge of his exiſtence*, and of that infinite POWER and WISDOM which are " demonſtrated to us in them. OUR KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING GOD GOES " NO FURTHER *."

" Artificial Theology connects by very problematical reaſoning *a priori*, " MORAL ATTRIBUTES, ſuch as we conceive them, and ſuch as they are re- " latively to us, with the *phyſical attributes* of God; though there be no " ſufficient foundation for this proceeding, nay, though *the phænomena are* " *in ſeveral caſes repugnant* †."

Having thus aſſured us that the ideas of God's *moral attributes* are to be got by no conſequential reaſoning at all, either *a priori* or *a poſteriori*, the two only ways we have to knowledge; He rightly concludes, that if Man hath ſuch ideas, they were not FOUND but INVENTED by him. And therefore, that nothing might be wanting to the full dilucidation of this curious point, he acquaints us who were the Authors of the FICTION, and how ſtrangely the thing came about.

" Some of the Philoſophers (ſays his Lordſhip) having been led by a " more full and accurate contemplation of Nature to the knowledge of a " ſupreme ſelf-exiſtent Being of infinite *power and wiſdom*, and the firſt " Cauſe of all things, were not contented with this degree of knowledge. " They MADE A SYSTEM of God's MORAL as well as *phyſical* ATTRIBUTES, " BY WHICH TO ACCOUNT FOR THE PROCEEDINGS OF HIS PROVIDENCE ‡."

Theſe Philoſophers then, it ſeems, invented the ſyſtem of God's *moral attributes*, in order to account for the difficulties ariſing from the view of God's *moral government*. If the World till now had been ſo dull as to have no conception of theſe Attributes; his Lordſhip's Philoſophers, we ſee, made amends; who were ſo quick-witted to conceive, and ſo ſharp-ſighted to find out, the obliquities of a *crooked* line before they had got any idea of a *ſtraight* one. For juſt to this, neither more nor leſs, does his Lordſhip's obſervation amount, that——*they made a Syſtem of God's moral attributes, by which to account for the proceedings of his Providence.* 'Till now, none of us could conceive how any doubts concerning *moral Government* could ariſe but on the previous ideas of the *moral attributes* of the *Go-*

* Vol. IV. p. 86. † Vol. V. p. 316. ‡ Vol. IV. p. 48.

vernor.

vernor. This invention of his Lordſhip's old Philoſophers puts me in mind of an ingenious Modern, the curious SANCHO PANCHA; who, as his hiſtorian tells us, was very inquiſitive to diſcover the author of that very uſeful invention we call SLEEP: for, with this worthy Magiſtrate, Sleep and good Cheer were the FIRST PHILOSOPHY. Now the things ſought after by Sancho and his Lordſhip, were at no great diſtance; for if *Sleeping* began when men firſt ſhut their eyes, it is certain the *idea of God's Goodneſs* appeared as ſoon as ever they opened them.

Dr. Clarke's Demonſtration of the *moral attributes a priori*, I ſhall leave, as his Lordſhip is pleaſed to do, in all it's force. If the Doctor's followers think their Maſter's honour concerned, where his arguments are not, they have a large field and a ſafe to ſhew their proweſs. I rather chuſe to undertake the NOBLE PHILOSOPHER on his own terms, without any other arms than the arguments *a poſteriori*. For he is ſuch a Champion for the good Cauſe, that he not only appoints his Adverſaries the Field, but preſcribes to them the uſe of their weapons.

But his Lordſhip, like other great men, is not eaſily approached; and when he is, not always fit to be ſeen. You catch his FIRST PHILOSOPHY, as Butler's Hero did Ariſtotle's FIRST MATTER, *undreſſed, and without a rag of form*; however flaunting and fluttering in FRAGMENTS. To ſpeak plainly, his Lordſhip's entire neglect or ignorance of Method betrays him into endleſs *repetitions:* and, in theſe, whether for want of preciſion in his ideas, propriety in his terms, or art in his compoſition, the queſtion is perpetually changing; and rarely without being new-covered by an equivocal expreſſion. If you add to this, the perpetual *contradictions* into which he fails, either by defect of memory, exceſs of paſſion, or diſtreſs of argument, you will allow it to be no eaſy matter to take him fairly, to know him fully, and to repreſent him to the beſt advantage: in none of which offices would I be willingly defective. Indeed, when you have done this, the buſineſs is over; and his Lordſhip's reaſoning generally confutes itſelf.

When I reflect upon what this hath coſt me, the reading over two or three bulky volumes to get poſſeſſion of a ſingle argument; which now you think you hold, and then again you loſe; which meets you full when you leaſt expect it; and ſlips away from you the very moment it promiſes to do moſt: when, I ſay, I reflect upon all this, I connot but lament the hard luck of the *Engliſh* CLERGY, who, though apparently leaſt fit, as being made Parties; certainly the leaſt concerned as there is nothing that

can

can impoſe on a Scholar, though a great deal that may miſlead the People, are likely to be the men moſt engaged with his Lordſhip in this controverſy. Time was, when if a Writer had a diſpoſition to ſeek objections againſt Religion, though he found them hardly, and urged them heavily, yet he would digeſt his thoughts, and methodize his reaſoning. The Clergy had then nothing to do but to anſwer him, if they found themſelves able. But ſince this ſlovenly cuſtom (as Lord SHAFTESBURY calls it) has got amongſt our Free-thinkers, of *taking their phyſic in public*, of throwing about their looſe and crude indigeſtions under the name of FRAGMENTS, things which in their very name imply not ſo much the *want*, as the *excluſion* of all *form*, the Advocate of Religion has had a fine time of it: he muſt work them into conſiſtence, he muſt mould them into ſhape, before he can ſafely lay hold of them himſelf, or preſent them handſomely to the Public. But theſe Gentlemen have provided that a Clergyman ſhould never be idle. All, he had of old to attend, was the ſaving the ſouls of thoſe committed to his care. He muſt now begin his work a great deal higher; he muſt firſt convince his flock that they have ſouls to be ſaved. And the ſpite of all is, that at the ſame time his kind maſters have doubled his taſk, they appear very well diſpoſed to leſſen his wages.

We have obſerved, that the DENIAL of God's *moral attributes* is the great barrier againſt Religion in general: but it is more eſpecially ſerviceable in his Lordſhip's idioſyncratic terrors, the terrors of a *future State*. To theſe we owe his famous book of FRAGMENTS, compoſed occaſionally, and taken as an extemporaneous cordial, each ſtronger than the other, to ſupport himſelf under his frequent paroxyſms. For, ſet the *moral attributes* aſide, and we can neither form any judgment of the *end* of man, nor of the *nature* of God's government. All our knowledge will be confined to our *preſent* ſtate and condition *. It is by the *moral attributes*, we learn, that man was made for *happineſs*: and that God's diſpenſation to us *here* is but *part* of a general ſyſtem: This naturally extends our views to, and terminates our knowledge in, *Futurity*.

The fate of all Religion therefore being included in the queſtion of God's *moral attributes*, I hold it of much importance to prove againſt his Lord-

* One of his Lordſhip's Corollaries therefore from the Propoſition of *no moral attributes*, is this, "Our Knowledge concerning God goes no further than for the neceſſary uſe of "human life." Vol. IV. p. 486.

ſhip,

ſhip, that MEN MAY ACQUIRE ADEQUATE IDEAS OF THEM in the ſame way, and with equal certainty, in which they acquire the knowledge of God's *natural attributes*: And the knowledge of theſe latter his Lordſhip deduces from its original in the following words.

" All our knowledge of God (ſays he) is derived from his works. Every " part of the immenſe Univerſe, and the order and harmony of the Whole, " are not only conformable to our ideas or notions of WISDOM and POWER, " but theſe ideas and notions were impreſſed originally and principally by " them, on every attentive mind; and men were led to conclude, with the " utmoſt certainty, that a Being of infinite *wiſdom* and *power* made, preſerv- " ed, and governed the ſyſtem. As far as we can diſcover, we diſcern theſe " in all his works; and where we cannot diſcern them, it is manifeſtly due " to our imperfection, not to his. This now is real knowledge, or there " is no ſuch thing as knowledge. We acquire it immediately in the ob- " jects themſelves, in God, and in Nature, the work of God. We " know what *wiſdom* and *power* are: we know both intuitively, and by " the help of our ſenſes, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they " appear in the Work: and therefore we know demonſtratively that ſuch " they are in the Worker *."

All this is mighty well: and on theſe very grounds I undertake to prove that men may get as clear and preciſe ideas of God's GOODNESS and JUSTICE.

But, to prevent, or, indeed, now things are gone thus far, rather to *redreſs* all ambiguity in the terms, and equivocation in the uſe of them; it will be proper to explain what TRUE PHILOSOPHY means by GOD'S WORKS, whether *phyſical* or *moral*.

Now, it means, if I am not much miſtaken, that CONSTITUTION OF THINGS which God hath eſtabliſhed, and directed to a plain and obvious end: no regard being had to theſe impediments or obſtructions in it's courſe, which the Author of nature hath permitted to ariſe from any part of the *material*, or *intellectual* Creation.

Thus, when we conſider his *phyſical* works, in order to make our eſtimate of his *wiſdom* and *power*, we conceive them as they are in themſelves; and in the perfection of their firſt conſtitution; though the greater portions of the *phyſical* ſyſtem may, from the intractability of Matter, be ſubject to ſome *inconſiderable irregularities*; which, as the TRUE PHILOSOPHER † ob-

* Vol. V. p. 524.

† Newton.

ſerves,

ſerves, *will be apt to increaſe till this Syſtem wants a reformation:* and though the ſmaller Portions of it, ſuch as the bodies of animals, may, from various accidents in their conception and birth, often want that convenient form in the adaption of their parts, from the wonderful contrivance of which, in the various bodies of animals in general, ariſes ſo illuſtrious an evidence of the *wiſdom* and *power* of the Creator.

Surely, then, common ſenſe guided by equitable meaſure requires us to eſtimate God's *moral Works* on the ſame ſtandard; to conſider what the *moral conſtitution is in itſelf:* and (when the queſtion is of God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice)* to keep that conſideration diſtinct; and not ſuffer it to be diſturbed by the view of any interruptions occaſioned by the perverſe influence of the paſſion or action of material or immaterial Beings. For, here, Both concur to violate the Conſtitution: In the *natural* ſyſtem, man's *Free-will* hath no place: in the *moral*, the abuſe of *Free-will* occaſions the greateſt of it's diſorders.

In proſecuting this queſtion, therefore, As, in order to acquire and confirm our ideas of God's *wiſdom* and *power*, we conſider the *natural ſyſtem* ſo far forth only as it's order and harmony is ſupported by the *general Laws* of matter and motion; ſo, in order to acquire and confirm our ideas of his *goodneſs* and *juſtice*, we ſhould regard the *moral ſyſtem* ſo far forth only as it's order and harmony is ſupported by that GENERAL LAW, which annexes *happineſs to virtue, and to vice, miſery, and ruin.*

Thus much, and only thus much, is *God's Work* in either ſyſtem: and it is from *God's Work*, he tells us, we are to demonſtrate his *Attributes.* The reſt (where diſorders real or apparent obtrude themſelves to obſtruct our views in theſe diſcoveries) proceed from *Matter* and *Mind.*

And it is not to be forgotten, that the concluſion, Religioniſts draw from hence, in ſupport of their *adequate* ideas of God's *moral* attributes, hath the greater ſtrength upon his Lordſhip's own principles; who holds, that this Conſtitution ariſes *ſolely from the* WILL of God: For then we are ſure that the WILL, which annexes happineſs to virtue, and miſery to vice, muſt ariſe from God's *moral* rather than from his *phyſical* nature.

Having premiſed thus much; no more, indeed, than neceſſary to obviate one continued SOPHISM, which runs through all his Lordſhip's reaſonings, againſt the *moral attributes* (where, the *courſe and operation of that moral Conſtitution*, as it appears under the diſturbances occaſioned by man's free-

free-will, is perpetually put for the *Conſtitution itſelf)* I now proceed to ſhew, that, from God's works, we have as preciſe ideas of his goodness and justice as of his *power* and *wiſdom.*

His Lordſhip obſerves, that *from every part of the immenſe Univerſe, and from the harmony of the Whole, men are led to conclude, with the utmoſt certainty, that a Being of infinite* wisdom *and* power *made, preſerved, and governed the Syſtem.* This, he obſerves in favour of the *natural* attributes. And what ſhould hinder men from making the ſame obſervation in favour of the *moral*, viz. That the happineſs and miſery by the very conſtitution of nature, attendant on Virtue and on Vice, lead men to conclude, with equal certainty, that a Being of infinite goodness and justice made, preſerves, and governs the ſyſtem?

The exiſtence of this *moral Conſtitution* in the natural connexion between vice and miſery, virtue and happineſs, his Lordſhip amply acknowledges. Let us conſider it, therefore, both as it reſpects bodies of men, and individuals.

That *Communities* are always happy or miſerable in proportion as their Manners are virtuous or vicious, his Lordſhip himſelf is, on all occaſions, ready to demonſtrate. If ſuch a Conſtitution of things do not beſpeak the Author of it, *good* and *juſt*, how is it poſſible to conclude any thing of the character of the Creator, from his Works? His Lordſhip thinks, "that from the marks of wiſdom and power in the *phyſical ſyſtem* we learn with the utmoſt certainty that God is *wiſe* and *powerful*; and he ſays, that we acquire this knowledge immediately, as it were, by our ſenſes." Are there not the ſelf ſame marks of goodneſs and juſtice in this part at leaſt of the *moral ſyſtem* which reſpects Communities? And do not we come to know as immediately by our ſenſes, and as certainly by our reaſon, that God is *good* and *juſt?*

If we conſider the *moral Conſtitution*, as it reſpects *Particulars*, we ſee virtue and vice have the ſame influence on our happineſs and miſery. Here, indeed, we find more interruptions, in the *means* to the *end*, than in the other part. Our material and our intellectual Natures are here of more force, to diſorder the harmony of the Syſtem. In *Communities*, it can rarely be diſturbed, but by a Peſtilence, or that other, moral, Plague, a Hero or a Conqueror. Amongſt *Particulars*, indeed, phyſical evil and the abuſe of free-will operate more ſtrongly: But when once the demon-

ſtration

ſtration of the *moral attributes* is clearly made from that part of the Conſtitution which regards *Communities*, it can never afterwards be ſhaken by the diſorders in that other part which regards *Particulars*. The eſtabliſhed truth is now a Principle for further diſcoveries; and all we can fairly deduce from theſe diſorders is the CERTAINTY of a *future State*. But this by the way.

What I inſiſt upon at preſent is, that, to decide the queſtion concerning God's *Attributes*, we are to conſider the Conſtitution of things, as it is in itſelf. This is, properly, *God's work*. The diſorders in it, occaſioned by the abuſe of man's *free-will*, is not his work, but man's. This, his Lordſhip too, upon another occaſion, namely, when he combats the argument of a *future ſtate*, from an unequal Providence, is perpetually repeating. So that theſe diſorders muſt, even on his Lordſhip's own principles, be excluded from the account, when we eſtimate God's Nature and *Attributes*, from his *Works*.

" But we ſee not thoſe diſorders in the *natural* world, which we both ſee and feel in the *moral*." This would be ſome objection did God in the *moral*, as in the *natural* ſyſtem, direct immediately, or conſtitute things mechanically; or had Free-will the ſame influence on the *natural* as on the *moral* ſyſtem.—Did God direct, immediately or mechanically in both Conſtitutions, or did he direct immediately and mechanically in neither, and that yet the *moral* remained more ſubject to diſorder than the *natural*, it might indeed follow that we had not ſo clear ideas of God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice* as of his *wiſdom* and *power*: But ſince He has thought fit to leave man, FREE; and hath been pleaſed to ſuffer the abuſe of free-will to affect the *moral* ſyſtem, and not the *natural*; as this, I ſay, is the caſe, the greater irregularities in the *one* do not take off from the equal clearneſs of the demonſtration, which reſults from the nature of *both one and the other* Conſtitution. This difference is not to be aſcribed to a contrary conduct in the Governor of the two Syſtems, but to the contrary natures of the Subjects. Paſſive matter being totally inert, it's reſiſtance to the Laws impreſſed upon it, muſt be extremely weak: and conſequently the diſorders ariſing from that reſiſtance, proportionably ſlow and unheeded: while that active ſelf-moving principle, the Mind, flies out at once from the centre of its direction, and can every moment deflect from the line of truth and equity. Hence moral diſorders began early, became exceſſive, and have continued, through all ages, to diſturb the harmony of the Syſtem.

What is here ſaid will, I ſuppoſe, be ſufficient to to confute the following aſſertions; and to detect the miſtake on which they ariſe.

" Every thing (ſays his Lordſhip) ſhews the *wiſdom* and *power* of God " conformably to our ideas of wiſdom and power in the *phyſical* world and " in the *moral*. *But every thing does not ſhew in like manner the* juſtice *and* " goodneſs *conformably to our ideas of theſe attributes in either. The phy-* " *ſical attributes are in their nature more glaring and leſs equivocal* *."

And again; " There is *no ſufficient foundation* in the phænomena of Na- " ture to connect the moral attributes with the phyſical attributes of God. " *Nay, the phænomena are in ſeveral caſes repugnant* †."

But ſince he goes ſo far as to talk of the *want of a foundation*, and even a *repugnancy*; Before I proceed with the main branch of my reaſoning, I will juſt urge one ſingle argument for the reality and full evidence of the *moral attributes*: and it ſhall be taken from his own conceſſions, and ſhall conclude on his own principles.

He tells us, that ſuch as he, " who apply themſelves to the *firſt Philo-* " *ſophy*, apply themſelves to the nobleſt objects that can demand the attention " of the mind—To the ſignification of GOD'S WILL, concerning the du- " ties we owe to him, and to one another ‡."

And again, " It is ſufficient to eſtabliſh our *moral* obligations that we " conſider them relatively to our own ſyſtem. From thence they ariſe: and " ſince they ariſe from thence, it muſt be the WILL of that Being who " made the ſyſtem, that we ſhould obſerve and practiſe them §."

Let me aſk then, Whence it is that we collect this WILL from the objects which his Lordſhip allows us to contemplate, namely, his WORKS *in this ſyſtem?* He will ſay from certain *qualities* in thoſe objects—What are thoſe qualities? He will reply, the *fitneſſes* of means to ends.—— Who was the Author of theſe fitneſſes? He hath told us, the *God of nature*——It was God's *will* then, that we ſhould uſe the *means*, in order to obtain the *ends*. Now, in the moral Syſtem, the means are virtuous practice; the end, happineſs. Virtue therefore muſt needs be pleaſing to him; and Vice, as it's contrary, diſpleaſing. Well, but then, as to this approbation and diſlike; it muſt be either capricious, or it muſt be regulated on the nature of things. *Wiſdom*, which his Lordſhip condeſcends to give his Maker, will not allow us to ſuppoſe it capricious. It is regu-

* Vol. V. p. 524. † Vol. V. p. 316. ‡ Vol. V. p. 447. § Vol. V. p. 452.

lated

lated therefore on the nature of things. But if the *nature of things* be, as his Lordſhip holds it is, the *conſtitution of God*, and dependent on his *will*, then he who is pleaſed with virtue, and diſpleaſed with vice, muſt needs be himſelf *good* and *juſt*.

To proceed now with the principal branch of our reaſoning. His Lordſhip goes on thus. *But men not only might collect God's natural attributes from the phyſical ſyſtem, but in effect they did; and all men, at all times, had theſe notions ſo ſtrongly impreſſed on them, that they were led to conclude with the utmoſt certainty for a Being of infinite power and wiſdom.*

I deſire to know in what time or place it ever happened, before his Lordſhip philoſophiſed at Batterſea, *and could find no foundation, in the phænomena of nature, to connect the moral with the phyſical attributes of God*, that a Man, who believed God's infinite wiſdom and power, did not with equal confidence believe his infinite goodneſs and juſtice? In truth, theſe two ſets of ideas, the *phyſical* and *moral* attributes of the Deity, were equally extenſive, they were equally ſteddy, and, till now, they were always inſeparable.

He ſays, that *as far as we can diſcover, we diſcern infinite wiſdom and power in all God's works: and where we cannot diſcern them, it is manifeſtly due to our imperfection, not to his.*

What his Lordſhip here ſays will deſerve to be conſidered. A compariſon is inſinuated between our diſcovery of infinite power and wiſdom from the *phyſical* works of God; and our diſcovery of infinite goodneſs and juſtice from his *moral* works; in which, the advantage is given to the former. Now, in order to come to a juſt deciſion in this point (omitting at preſent the notice of his general Sophiſm which operates in this obſervation, as in the reſt) we muſt diſtinguiſh between the *means of acquiring* the knowledge of God's Attributes, and that *knowledge when acquired.*

As to the firſt, (the *means of acquiring*,) there ſeems to be ſome advantage on the ſide of God's PHYSICAL works. For, as his Lordſhip rightly obſerves, *where we cannot diſcern wiſdom and power in the phyſical works it is due to our imperfection, not to his: for as men advance in the knowledge of nature, we ſee more and more of wiſdom and power.* And he inſinuates, we cannot ſay the ſame concerning the difficulties in the *moral* ſyſtem. It is true, we cannot. But then let me tell him, neither can we ſay the contrary. The reaſon is, The phyſical ſyſtem lies open to our enquiries;

and by the right application of our ſenſes to well-tried experiments, we are able to make conſiderable advances in the knowledge of Nature. It is not ſo in the *moral* ſyſtem; all we know here are a few general principles concerning its Conſtitution; and further than this, human wit or induſtry is unable to penetrate. Theſe general principles are, indeed, amply ſufficient to deduce and eſtabliſh the *moral attributes* from the *moral ſyſtem*; but not ſufficient to remove all difficulties that ariſe from what we ſee of the actual adminiſtration of that Syſtem. So that, though *we* cannot ſay, that *as we advance in the knowledge* of the moral ſyſtem *we ſee more and more of goodneſs and juſtneſs*; So neither can *his Lordſhip* ſay (though his words ſeem to inſinuate he could) that as we advance, we ſee *leſs and leſs*. Whereas the truth is, beyond thoſe general principles, we cannot advance at all.

But then, as to the ſecond part in the diſtinction (the *knowledge of the attributes, when acquired*) I hold the advantage, and a great one it is, lies altogether on the ſide of the MORAL. And thus I argue: Though the idea of God's *natural* attributes be as clear in the abſtract, as that of his *moral*, yet the idea of his moral attributes is, in the concrete, more adequate than that of his natural. The reaſon ſeems convincing. The moral relation in which we ſtand to God, as free agents, is juſt the ſame whether man exiſts alone, or whether he be but a link in the chain of innumerable orders of intelligences ſurrounding the whole Creation. Hence we muſt needs have a full knowledge of our duty to him, and of his diſpoſition towards us: on which knowledge is founded the exactneſs of our conceptions of his moral attributes, his *juſtice* and *goodneſs*. But the natural relation in which we, or any of God's creatures, ſtand towards him, as material Beings, is not the ſame when conſidered ſimply, as when conſidered to be a portion of a dependent and connected Whole. Becauſe whenever ſuch a Whole exiſts, the harmony and perfection of it muſt firſt of all be conſulted. This harmony ariſeth from the mutual ſubſerviency and union of its parts. But this ſubſerviency may require a miniſtration of government, with regard to certain portions of Matter thus allied, different from what might have followed had thoſe portions ſtood alone, becauſe that preciſe diſpoſition, which might be fit in one caſe, might be unfit in the other. Hence we, who know there is a Whole, of which our material ſyſtem is a Part; and yet are totally ignorant both of its nature and extent, can have but a very confuſed idea of that phyſical relation

relation in which we ſtand towards God: ſo that our conceptions of his *natural* attributes, his *power* and *wiſdom*, which are founded on that idea, muſt in the concrete be proportionably vague and inadequate.

But it may be aſked, perhaps, Whence ariſes this reciprocal advantage which the *moral* and the *natural*, attributes have over one another, in the *means of acquiring* the knowledge of the *Attributes*, and the preciſion of *that knowledge when acquired?* I will tell the Reader in two words. Of *our own phyſical* ſyſtem, we know many particulars (that is, we diſcover much of the *means*, but nothing of the *end)*; and of the *univerſal* phyſical ſyſtem we are entirely ignorant. On the other hand, we know but few particulars of *our own moral* ſyſtem (that is, we diſcover only the *end*, and not the *means)*; and of the *univerſal* moral ſyſtem we underſtand the general principles.

His Lordſhip proceeds. *This now* [the knowledge of God's *natural* attributes] *is real knowledge; or there is no ſuch thing as knowledge. We acquire it immediately in the objects themſelves,* IN GOD, *and in nature the work of God.*

What his Lordſhip means by, *in God*, in diſtinction from the *work of God*, I confeſs I do not underſtand: Perhaps it may be intended to inſinuate, in honour of the *natural attributes*, that they may be even proved *a priori*; for this is not the firſt time by many, when, after having heartily abuſed a thing or perſon, he has been reduced to ſupport himſelf on the authority, or the reaſoning they afford him. Or perhaps, it was only uſed to round the period, and ſet off his eloquence. However, I agree with him, that this is *real knowledge*. And ſo too, I think, is the knowledge of the *moral* attributes, ſo gained. Why truly, ſays his Lordſhip, *I do allow juſt ſo much goodneſs and juſtice in God as we ſee in that* CONSTITUTION, *which annexes happineſs to virtue, and miſery to vice. But this*, ſays he, *I think, had better be called* WISDOM. I think ſo too, if by *ſo much*, he means no more than what concerns God's *natural Government*: and that he means no more is plain from his making the *natural* conſequence of vice and virtue the only ſanction of the moral Law. But I will venture to go further, and ſay, that, from what we ſee in this *Conſtitution*, we may collect PERFECT GOODNESS AND JUSTICE. *Matter* and man's *Free-will* diſturb the Syſtem: But if the *Conſtitution* be the effect of God's *Will*, as his Lordſhip holds it is; and the mark of his *Wiſdom*, as all mankind hold with him; Does not that *Wiſdom* require that his *Will* ſhould not

not be defeated? Would it not be defeated, if the diſorders occaſioned by the perverſity of his creatures were not remedied and ſet right? And is not A REMEDY the cleareſt mark of *perfect goodneſs* and *juſtice?*

Take it in another light. Free-will croſſes that *Conſtitution*, which God, by eſtabliſhing, ſhews he intended ſhould take place. This *preſent* diſturbance could not have been prevented, becauſe, according to my Lord and his ill-uſed Poet, it was neceſſary to the ſchemes of divine wiſdom, that there ſhould be ſuch a creature as MAN:

" For in the ſcale of reaſoning life, 'tis plain
" There muſt be, ſomewhere, ſuch a rank as man."

The conſequence is, that the diſorder will be *hereafter* rectified.

Had Man indeed been made *unneceſſarily*; and had this Man broke in upon God's general Syſtem, his Lordſhip might have had ſome pretence to ſay, as he does, that GOD MEANT THE SYSTEM SHOULD NOT BE FURTHER PURSUED; that is, that the ſcheme which annexes happineſs to virtue, and miſery to vice, ſhould remain in its preſent condition of an incomplete Diſpenſation, to all eternity. But ſince Man is acknowledged to be a *neceſſary* part of a general Syſtem, complete in all its members, it is nonſenſe to talk of *God's not meaning the particular Syſtem ſhould be further purſued*, when that *further purſuit* is only to bring it to its natural period; ſhort of which, it would remain unfiniſhed, nay, unformed.

He goes on. *We know what* WISDOM *and* POWER *are. We know both intuitively, and by the help of our ſenſes, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the* WORK; *and therefore we know demonſtratively that ſuch they are in the* WORKER.

And do we not know what GOODNESS and JUSTICE are? And by the very ſame means? Do we not *intuitively*, and by the *help of our ſenſes know*, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the WORK, namely, in that *conſtitution of things*, which, his Lordſhip tells us, annexes happineſs to virtue, and miſery to vice? And may we not *demonſtratively* collect from thence that ſuch they are in the WORKER? ſince this *Conſtitution*, his Lordſhip tells us again, is the effect of God's WILL. On his own principles, therefore, applied to his own ſtate of the reaſoning *a poſteriori*, it appears, that God is of *infinite goodneſs* and *juſtice*, as well as of *infinite wiſdom* and *power*.

But

But to give AUTHORITY to his partial reaſoning (the uſual ſupport of all partialities), he makes *Anaxagoras* inſtruct us, what we are to think of this matter. "Should you aſk *Anaxagoras* (ſays he) what *goodneſs* is, or "*juſtice?* He might bid you, perhaps, turn your eyes inward, firſt; "then, ſurvey mankind; obſerve the wants of individuals, the benefits of "ſociety, and, from theſe particulars, frame the general notions of *good-* "*neſs* and *juſtice*. He might go a ſtep further: and add, this is *human* "goodneſs and *human* juſtice, ſuch as we can comprehend, ſuch as we can "exerciſe, and ſuch as the ſupreme mind has made it both our duty and "intereſt to exerciſe, by the conſtitution of the human ſyſtem, and by "the relations which ariſe in it: from all which our notions of *goodneſs* "and *juſtice* reſult, and are compounded."

We know then, according to our mock Anaxagoras, what *goodneſs* and *juſtice* are, as certainly as what *Wiſdom* and *Power* are: Since this quaternion of Attributes are all known by the ſame means and by no other: *we know both intuitively and by the help of our ſenſes, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the work.* For he bids us *turn our eyes inward*; then *ſurvey mankind*; and laſtly, obſerve how *reaſon*, from the *conſtitution of human nature*, confirms our *intuitive* knowledge, and that which we gain by the *help of our ſenſes*.—But what does all this ſignify, if *Anaxagoras* or his Lordſhip be in an humour of concluding againſt their own premiſſes? Hear then how the ſpeech ends.—"Of *divine goodneſs* "and divine juſtice, might this Philoſopher conclude, I AM UNABLE TO "FRAME ANY ADEQUATE NOTIONS *." What? Unable to *frame* thoſe notions which God, by his *moral Conſtitution*, has put into our hands; and by the declaration of his WILL has taught us to *apply?* Yes, he bids us conclude, that we are *unable to frame any adequate notion of divine* GOODNESS *and* JUSTICE, and yet, on the force of the very ſame reaſoning, to conclude as ſteadily, that we are *able to frame an adequate notion of divine* WISDOM *and* POWER.—This old *Philoſopher*, I ſuppoſe, was not brought in to be laughed at, like his drunken Church-HELOTES †; yet, he plays

* Vol. IV. p. 116, 117.

† —"far be it from me to wiſh (ſays his Lordſhip) that the race of Metaphyſicians "and Caſuiſts ſhould increaſe.—But ſince there will be ſuch men, it is very reaſonable "to wiſh that they may ſerve to the ſame good purpoſe that the Helotes, the drunken "ſlaves, did at Sparta," &c. Vol. V. p. 446.

the

the fool to admiration.—*We* DO KNOW, ſays Anaxagoras, *what* Goodneſs *and* Juſtice *are: we know both intuitively, and by the help of our ſenſes, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the* WORK; *and* THEREFORE *we* DO NOT KNOW *that ſuch they are in the* WORKER.

Might I be permitted to addreſs myſelf to this Renegado Sophiſt, I would ſay,—Your brethren, the antient Philoſophers, reaſoned *a poſteriori* in this manner, "Can you think there is *wiſdom* and *power* in you, and none in your Maker?"—By no means. They reaſoned well.—Let me aſk you then, is there *goodneſs* and *juſtice* in you, and none in your Maker?" His anſwer, I ſuppoſe, would be the ſame. But, prompted by his Lordſhip, into whoſe ſervice he is now entered, he adds, That, from *human goodneſs* and *juſtice* we cannot come to the NATURE of the *divine*. What ſhould hinder us, I pray you? Is it not from our *intuitive conception* of our own *wiſdom* and *power* that we gain an adequate idea of God's? Are *wiſdom* and *power* MORE PERFECT, as they are found in man, than *goodneſs* and *juſtice?* If therefore the IMPERFECTION of theſe attributes in Man hinder our acquiring an adequate idea of thoſe in God, we can have no adequate idea of his *wiſdom* and *power:* If the IMPERFECTION does not hinder, then we may have an adequate idea of his *goodneſs* and *juſtice*.

But, the inference to God's *power* and *wiſdom*, his Lordſhip ſays, is ſupported by what men ſee of the effects of them, in his Works; the order and harmony of the *phyſical* Syſtem. Do we not ſee likewiſe the effects of God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice*, in the order and harmony of the *moral*, in the happineſs that naturally attends virtue, and the miſery conſequent on vice? And is not the *moral* Syſtem as much *God's Work*, as the *phyſical?*

Thus, we ſee, that by the very reaſoning, his Lordſhip EMPLOYS to prove the *natural* attributes, and by the very method he PRESCRIBES to us for proving the *moral* attributes, we have demonſtrated the *moral* with a preciſion and a certainty, at leaſt equal to the *natural*. His Lordſhip ſeems to have been aware of the event; and therefore when he had ſet us at defiance, he tried to put the change upon us, under pretence of reminding us, that the *moral attributes* ſhould be examined by, or *applied to*, THE CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD AND THE STATE OF MANKIND IN IT *. I had full as much reaſon to be aware of his Lordſhip. And therefore in ſtating

* Vol. V. p. 331.

the

the queſtion, at my entrance on the ſubject, I obviated this miſerable Sophiſm. I call it by no better name, becauſe it is not *the conſtitution of the world or the ſtate of mankind in it*, but the CONSTITUTION OF THE MORAL SYSTEM, or the nature of Virtue and Vice as they naturally operate to produce happineſs and miſery, by which God's *moral attributes* are to be tried and aſcertained. But this, which, by a ſteady light, gives us an uniform view, he would have us turn from; to contemplate that obſcure, diſturbed, and ſhifting ſcene, the actual ſtate of vice and virtue, of miſery and happineſs, amongſt men. That is, he would have us conclude concerning God's nature, not from his VOLUNTARY CONSTITUTION of things, but from the BREACHES in that Conſtitution made by the abuſe of man's free-will: which yet (when he is arguing *for an equal providence)* he again and again confeſſes ought not to be charged upon God; and declaims violently againſt the folly of thoſe who impute the effects of that abuſe to him. Though here (in his various attempts to blot out *the idea of God's moral attributes)* he be full of the diſorders of the moral Syſtem, conſidered as part of God's deſign.

But ſince I have mentioned his arguments for an *equal providence*, I ſhould be unjuſt to my argument, if I concealed from the Reader, another of his contradictions.—He had Man's *future State* as well as *God's moral attributes* to throw out of the religious World; or, to ſpeak more properly, he had RELIGION to overturn, by taking away its very ESSENCE: and as the *irregularities* in the preſent adminiſtration of God's moral Providence ſtood in the way of his firſt attempt; and the *conſiſtency* of the *moral Syſtem itſelf* in the way of the other; when he argues againſt a FUTURE STATE, You would think there were no *irregularities*; and when he argues againſt the MORAL ATTRIBUTES, You would think there was no *conſiſtency*.

We now come to his Lordſhip's particular objections againſt the *moral attributes*. One of them is that they are BOUNDED.

" They [the Divines] go further. As God is perfect, and man very
" imperfect, they talk of his *infinite goodneſs* and *juſtice*, as of his infinite
" wiſdom and power; though the latter may preſerve their nature without
" any conceivable bounds, and the former muſt ceaſe to be what they are,
" unleſs we conceive them BOUNDED. Their nature implies neceſſarily a
" limitation in the exerciſe of them. Thus then the *moral attributes*, ac-
" cording to this Theology, requires infinitely more of God to man than

" men are able, or would be obliged if they were able, to exerciſe to one " another: greater profuſion in beſtowing benefits and rewards, greater " rigour in puniſhing offences *."

You have here his Lordſhip's own words; and nothing leſs could induce any one to think ſo diſadvantageouſly of this Philoſopher of the firſt head, as they neceſſarily imply. Let us conſider the *premiſſes*, and examine the *inferences* both *implied* and *expreſſed*.

He ſays, 1. That the *moral attributes are bounded*; 2. That the *natural are not bounded*. Let us ſee to what the firſt propoſition amounts; and how much truth there is in the ſecond.

1. The *moral attributes* are conſidered by us as relative to *intelligent* creatures: The *natural* are not ſo conſidered. Thus, the goodneſs and juſtice when relative to man, are greatly *bounded*; a certain low degree of reward ſuffices for his *good*; a certain low degree of puuiſhment for his *evil* actions. Let God's goodneſs and juſtice reſpect a higher rank of intelligent Beings, and they will be then *leſs bounded*; for greater rewards and puniſhments will be required: and ſo on, to the higheſt rank of intelligent creatures. Yet as the higheſt is at infinite diſtance from the Creator, the exerciſe of the moral attributes, as they bear relation to his intelligent creatures, muſt be ſtill *bounded*.

2. His ſecond propoſition is, that *the natural attributes are not bounded*. It is true, theſe cannot be conſidered as relative to God's *intelligent* creatures; yet ſince, in their exerciſe, they muſt be conſidered as relative to his Creation at large; and ſince Creation, however immenſe, is not infinite, the natural attributes ſo conſidered are not infinite: but if not infinite, they are *bounded*. There is no difference therefore, in *the exerciſe* of God's attributes, between the *moral* and the *natural*, ſave only in the degree.

But if we conſider God's *moral* and *natural* attributes more abſtractedly, not as they are *in the exerciſe*, and relative to intelligent Beings, and to actual Creation, but as they are in his nature, then they are both *unbounded*. Thus we ſee his Lordſhip's notable diſtinction is both imaginary and uſeleſs.

However, let us give him all he aſks; and then ſee what he will be able to infer from it.

* Vol. V. p. 528.

1. His

1. His firſt *inference* ſeems to be this: "As the moral attributes are bounded, and not infinite like the natural, our idea of them muſt be *obſcure* and *inadequate*." What! becauſe they are better adapted to human contemplation? as things *bounded* certainly are better adapted than things *infinite*. Our idea of ſuch of God's attributes as bear relation to a Being, whoſe nature and properties we know, namely MAN, muſt needs be more adequate and better defined than the idea of ſuch attributes as bear relation to Beings, whoſe nature and properties we know not, namely the groſs of thoſe which make up the UNIVERSE.

2. His other *inference*, is expreſſed in theſe words: *Thus then the moral attributes, according to this Theology, requires infinitely more of God to man than men are able, or would be obliged if they were able, to exerciſe to one another*. To ſay, the moral attributes, according to Chriſtian Theology, or, as he is pleaſed to call it, *artificial Theology*, requires INFINITELY *more*, is an extravagant hyperbole. To ſay, it *requires more*, is true. And for this plain reaſon: the relation between Creator and Creature is much more intimate than that, between Fellow-creatures; therefore the divine *goodneſs* is more abundant: The relation betwwen Lord and Servant is more appropriate than that between Fellow-ſervants; therefore the divine *juſtice* is more ſevere. And had it not been deemed too preſuming to refer his Lordſhip to Scripture for inſtruction (eſpecially in a matter where the abuſe of Scripture was chiefly intended) I might there have pointed to a *Parable* which would have ſet him right: and has always kept *artificial Theology*, whatever he might think, from going wrong. But *infinite*, when applied to the *exerciſe* of a moral attribute in reference to Man, is his Lordſhip's nonſenſe, with due reverence be it ſpoken, not the *nonſenſe of artificial Divines*. They were not ignorant, that the rule *infirmiorem vel deteriorem partem ſequitur conſequentia*, held as well in *Morals* as in *Logic*. Though God be infinite, man is finite; and therefore, with reſpect to man, the exertion of a *moral* attribute is finite, not infinite. His Lordſhip himſelf ſaw ſomething of this, as appears by his own words. *The nature of the moral attributes implies neceſſarily a limitation in the uſe of them*. And why would he ſuppoſe, Divines could not ſee as far into this matter as himſelf?

But if there be an error in *artificial Theology* he is as ſure, at one time or other, to eſpouſe it; as he is ready at all times to calumniate the Divine who holds it. Men, in their ill adviſed zeal to defend the Scripture doc-

trine of the Son's Divinity, were not always ſufficiently careful in ſelecting their arguments. Amongſt ſuch as had perhaps been better let alone, they employed this; That as man's offence was againſt an infinite Being, it required an infinite ſatisfaction; which none but ſuch a Being could give. Now his Lordſhip, we ſee, eſpouſes this very principle to diſcredit God's moral attributes, and the *artificial Theology* of Jeſus Chriſt; which ſpeaks, indeed, of *infinite* rewards; but not as matter of *due*, but of *grace*.

As the being *bounded* is one of his Lordſhip's objections againſt the moral attributes, ſo the being merely HUMAN, is another.

"After Dr. CLARKE (ſays he) has repeated over and over, that all the "*moral attributes* are the ſame in God as in our ideas; and that he, who "denies them to be ſo, may as well deny the divine *phyſical attributes*, "the Doctor inſiſts only on two of the former, on thoſe of *juſtice* and "*goodneſs*. He was much in the right to contract the generality of his "aſſertion. The abſurdity of aſcribing TEMPERANCE, for inſtance, or "FORTITUDE, to God, would have been too groſs, and too viſible even to "eyes that prejudice had blinded the moſt. But that, of aſcribing *juſtice* "and *goodneſs* to him, according to our notions of them, might be better "covered, and was enough for his purpoſe, THOUGH NOT LESS REALLY "ABSURD *."

Which ſhall we moſt admire: His *Knowledge* or his *Ingenuity?* Or ſhall we follow the advice of his own Motto †, and *Wonder at nothing?*

When men contemplate what they call, moral virtue, or the attributes of Humanity, they divide them into two claſſes, perfectly diſtinct from one another. In the firſt are comprized thoſe which belong to man under the idea of a free intelligent Being, ſuch as *goodneſs* and *juſtice:* in the ſecond, thoſe which belong to him under the idea of a creature of his own frail ſpecies, ſuch as *temperance* and *fortitude*. The firſt belong to all free intelligent Beings; the latter, only to ſuch a Being as man: *Thoſe* ariſe out of the nature of free intelligence, and ſo are common to all: *Theſe*, from the imperfections of a very inferior creature, and ſo are peculiar to Humanity; for we eaſily conceive a higher Order of free created Intelligences, in which the moral virtues of the ſecond claſs have no place. They are ſuperior to the impreſſions of fear, and ſo have no room to exert

* Vol. V. p. 311.

† Nil admirari.

for-

fortitude: They are removed from the temptation of excefs, and fo have no need to exercife *temperance.* Now when CLARKE, after other Divines, had faid that *the moral attributes are the fame in God as in our ideas,* What Attributes could they poffibly mean but thofe of the *firft clafs*; thofe which belong to Beings under the idea of free Intelligences? STUPID as his Lordfhip is pleafed to make Divines, they could never *blunder* at fuch a rate as to conceive, that thofe virtues or *moral attributes,* which proceed from the *imperfection* of the Creature, might belong in any manner to the Creator, whom they fuppofed to be *all perfect.* They held, with his Lordfhip, and they will hold without him, that the great God is *infinitely* wife and powerful. Were they then in any danger to give him *temperance,* which implied his being obnoxious to *folly*; or *fortitude,* which argued *impuifance?* Infinite wifdom, therefore, and infinite power, exclude from God the very ideas of *temperance* and *fortitude.* But do infinite wifdom and infinite power exclude from God the ideas of *goodnefs* and *juftice?* On the contrary, his Lordfhip, as we fhall fee prefently, is reduced to the poor fhift of owning *goodnefs* and *juftice* to be contained in infinite *wifdom* and *power*; after he had faid, as here he does, *That the afcribing goodnefs and juftice to God is* NO LESS REALLY ABSURD *than the afcribing temperance and fortitude to him.*

—But CLARKE *contracted the generality of the affertion to ferve a purpofe.* I think he did: and for one of the beft *purpofes* in the world, that of COMMON SENSE. Had his Lordfhip been pleafed to *contract* himfelf on the fame principle, he might have paffed, perhaps, for a greater Philofopher; though he had certainly been a lefs Writer.

But then, if you afk, *What purpofe* his Lordfhip had *to ferve,* when he ufed the equivocal word ALL, (which may fignify either *all* of one kind, or *all* of every kind) where he obferves, Clarke holds, *that* ALL *the moral attributes are the fame in God,* &c? I anfwer, it was to give himfelf the poor pretence to fay, that Clarke afterwards *contracted his generality,* or, in other words, that he contradicted himfelf.

A third objection againft the *moral attributes* is, "That PASSIONS and AFFECTIONS mix with our goodnefs and juftice; which therefore cannot be fuppofed to be *the fame in kind* with GOD's; though our wifdom and power, with which no paffions or affections mix, muft be the *fame in kind* with his."

Were

Were paſſion and affection *inſeparable* from human goodneſs and juſtice, the objection might ſeem to have ſome force; indeed, not much even then. But how miſerable muſt the objection appear to thoſe who ſee, as all men may, that they are *ſeparable?* Separable, I mean, in practice as well as ſpeculation: (Of which we have at preſent * one great Example at leaſt, in a high Tribunal where they ſhine the moſt.) So that the true idea even of human goodneſs and juſtice excludes all paſſion and affection. What hinders then our riſing, from that idea, to Divine goodneſs and juſtice, any more than our riſing, from the idea of human wiſdom and power, to the Divine wiſdom and power; and from perceiving, that as well the *moral*, as the *natural* attributes, are the ſame in kind, both in God and man?

But this is not all that may be fairly ſaid in favour of our adequate idea of God's *moral attributes*, when compared with the *natural*. For though PASSION mixes not with the human attributes of wiſdom and power, yet ſomething elſe does, much more difficult to be ſeparated than *paſſion*, from the human attributes of goodneſs and juſtice, I mean the INSTRUMENTALITY OF MATTER. We can conceive nothing of *human power* without the uſe of ſuch an inſtrument: yet this, by his Lordſhip's own confeſſion, does not hinder us from riſing from the idea of our own wiſdom and power, to the wiſdom and power of God; nor from ſeeing that they are the ſame *in kind*. Why then ſhould the other foreign combination hinder us from ſeeing that goodneſs and juſtice are the ſame *in kind?*

Still, further. The MANNER *of knowing* in God, on which depends his natural attribute of WISDOM, is confeſſedly different from what it is in man; and, at the ſame time, is a thing of which we have no conception: yet this, according to his Lordſhip's account, does not hinder our attaining to an adequate idea of *divine wiſdom*, though it riſes only from what we ſee of the *human*.

How happens it then, that, in both theſe caſes, notwithſtanding the foreign mixture of the *inſtrumentality of matter*, and the *manner of knowing*, we attain an adequate idea of God's wiſdom and power? His Lordſhip will tell you, it is by ſeparating what is foreign, from what is native to the ideas of wiſdom and power. And ſhall not I have as much credit with my Reader, when I tell him, we acquire an adequate idea of God's good-

* 1765.

neſs

neſs and juſtice, by ſeparating from the idea of human goodneſs and juſtice the foreign mixture of *paſſion* and *affection?*

But his Lordſhip has a greater quarrel than all this, with the MORAL ATTRIBUTES. They give riſe to embarraſſed queſtions, diſhonourable to God, and miſchievous to Religion.

" As they [the Divines] modeled God's government on a human plan, " ſo they conceived his perfections, *moral* as well as phyſical, by human " ideas.—Thus God was ſaid to be the FIRST GOOD: but then the general " notion or abſtract idea of this *good* was not only taken from human " goodneſs, but was conſidered too with little or no other relation than to " man—A queſtion aroſe therefore on theſe hypotheſes, *How could evil* " *come into a ſyſtem of which God was the author?*—this queſtion made a " further hypotheſis neceſſary; another firſt God, another coeternal and " coequal principle was introduced to ſolve it; *a firſt cauſe of all evil*, as the " other was *of all good* *."

The falſe repreſentation of this fact I reſerve for another occaſion: the falſe inference from it is what I now propoſe to conſider.

His Lordſhip ſuppoſes, that the notion of God's *moral attributes* gave birth to an inſoluble queſtion concerning *the origin of evil*; and that this occaſioned the invention of the miſchievous hypotheſis of the *two Principles*. Who would have ſuſpected all this evil to ariſe from the FIRST GOOD! Yet ſo it was: And therefore the notion of ſuch a GOOD muſt be *falſe*; or at leaſt, very *hurtful*.

I. As to the firſt, if his Lordſhip's inference be right, it will unſettle all uſeful knowledge; becauſe there is no great principle, either in *phyſics*, or in *natural Theology*, but which, if we be not on our guard, and wiſe enough to ſtop at the extent of our ideas, will lead us into inextricable difficulties: As one might inſtance in a point that ariſes out of both the ſciences, phyſics and morals together—*The agreement between free-will and preſcience*. This is a well-known caſe: And as his Lordſhip pretends to untie this knot, which hath ſo long kept the learned world intangled, let us examine his great talents on what is worthy of them. " Our ideas (ſays " he) of divine intelligence and wiſdom may be neither *fantaſtical* nor " *falſe*, and yet God's MANNER of knowing may be ſo different from ours, " that fore-knowledge, as we call it *improperly in him*, may be conſiſtent

* Vol. IV. p. 88.

" with

" with the contingency of events; although that which we call *properly* " fore-knowledge *in ourſelves*, be not ſo *."

I have two or three remarks to make on theſe words.

1. Our ideas of God's moral attributes, his *goodneſs* and *juſtice*, he makes *fantaſtical* and *falſe*, on account of difficulties ariſing from them: yet God's natural attributes, his *intelligence* and *wiſdom*, *may*, he ſays, *be neither fantaſtical nor falſe*, though a difficulty as great ariſes from them; namely, the apparent diſcordancy between free-will and preſcience.

2. My ſecond remark is, that his ſolution is more *fantaſtic* and *falſe* than the wildeſt chimera of School-metaphyſics. The difficulty in reconciling God's preſcience to man's free-will does not ariſe from our ignorance in God's MANNER OF KNOWING, but from God's ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE.

3. My third remark is, that his Lordſhip, who is here ſo penetrating, that he can eaſily reconcile *preſcience* and *free-will*, is yet, in another place, ſo cloudy, that he cannot ſee how an " *equal providence* and *free agency* may " ſtand together †."

4. My laſt remark is (and it riſes out of the foregoing) that where Religion is not concerned, his Lordſhip ſees no difficulty in any part of the ſyſtem of Creation: But as ſoon as ever Religion appears, then difficulties ſtart up by dozens. Of this, take an inſtance from, as it will lead us back to, the caſe in hand. Our ideas of God's *moral attributes*, he ſays, muſt needs be falſe, becauſe the conceiving of them by human goodneſs and juſtice raiſes up the queſtion of the *origin of evil*, conſidered *morally*. Well. And does not the conceiving of God's *phyſical attributes*, by human wiſdom and power, lead to the queſtion of the *origin of evil*, conſidered *naturally?* Yet our ideas of the phyſical attributes are neither *falſe nor fantaſtical*. But to this, his Lordſhip replies, Evil, conſidered *naturally*, is not real, but apparent only. Why ſo? Becauſe it contributes to the greater good of the whole. May not the ſame thing be ſaid of Evil, conſidered *morally?* Nay, hath it not been actually ſaid, and proved too, on the ſame principles? It follows then, that they are either both *real*, or both *fantaſtic*.

In a word, the truth is no more than this, Preſumptuous man knows not where to ſtop: he would penetrate even to the Arcana of the Godhead:

" For Fools ruſh in, where Angels fear to tread."

* Vol. V. p. 525.

† See my obſervations on this Propoſed difficulty in the Appendix to the Fifth Book of the Divine Legation.

And

And this impious humour it was which gave birth to the abſurd hypotheſis of TWO PRINCIPLES. But is the folly to be charged upon our idea of the *moral attributes?* Ridiculous! We ſee it's *cauſe* is in vanity and ſelf-conceit: paſſions that operate alike on all Syſtems; and find materials to gratify their extravagance, equally in the *phyſical* as in the *moral* attributes of the Deity.

II. As to his Lordſhip's ſecond inference, that *this* idea is at leaſt productive of much *miſchief*, and therefore it would be better to have none at all; Let me obſerve, that the idea of God's very exiſtence is productive of much miſchief, even all the miſchiefs of Superſtition. Is it therefore better to be without a God? Who beſides his Lordſhip would ſay ſo *? Why then ſhould we think it better to be without the idea of the *moral attributes*, even though the evils it produced were *neceſſary?* But that is not the caſe. They are *caſual* only: the iſſue of pride and preſumption; which the idea of the *moral attributes* does not at all influence.

III. HOWEVER, theſe, if not hurtful, are USELESS; and this is his next cavil. "Infinite *wiſdom* and *power* (ſays his Lordſhip) have made things "as they are: how *goodneſs* and *juſtice* required they ſhould be made is "neither *coram judice*, nor to any rational purpoſe to enquire †." To inquire how the *univerſe of things ſhould be made*, which refers to God's *power* and *wiſdom*, ſerves indeed to *no reaſonable purpoſe*. But to inquire concerning our own ſtate and condition in this Univerſe, which refers to God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice*, is either *coram judice*, or we were ſent into the world to no purpoſe. His Lordſhip's ſophiſtry ſeems to confound two things that plain ſenſe hath always diſtinguiſhed; viz. *our own buſineſs from other men's*. When the King holds a Seſſion of juſtice, 'tis not for every Particular to inquire into all his meaſures; but every Particular, who is ſummoned to attend the Court, is much concerned to know how he himſelf ſhall be dealt with. His Lordſhip, indeed, is ready to ſay, We are not *ſummoned*; that is, we are not *accountable creatures*. But this is begging the queſtion.

Again, to *inquire*, much more to preſcribe, *how things ſhould be made*, in any particular Syſtem, has all the folly, preſumption, and impiety, which his Lordſhip charges upon it: Becauſe the Parts having a relation

* He indeed ſays, *he had rather be an Atheiſt than acknowledge the Chriſtian Theology*; and we may believe him. See vol. iv. p. 34.

† Vol. V. p. 363.

to the Whole, an all-wiſe Architect makes them in conformity to that Whole, of which, we know nothing; and therefore our only concluſion ſhould be, that the Part we do know, is conſtituted for the beſt. But it is another thing to ſay (which is all that Divines have ſaid, how differently ſoever his Lordſhip is pleaſed to repreſent the matter) that God will act equitably with his rational Creation, by diſtributing good and evil to them according to their deſerts; becauſe this does not depend upon any Whole, of which we know nothing, but on his attributes of goodneſs and juſtice, of which, we know enough to determine with certainty concerning his final dealing with every rank of free and reaſonable Beings. In this caſe to paſs our judgment is ſo far from folly or impiety, that not to do it would be ſtupidity or hypocriſy. To call this proceeding, as his Lordſhip does, the patching or botching up one Syſtem with another, is a groſs miſrepreſentation.

At length, he ends juſt where he ſet out, That we have no ideas of the moral attributes at all. "Upon the whole matter (ſays he) we may "conclude ſafely from error, and in direct oppoſition to Clarke, that "*goodneſs and juſtice in God cannot be conceived, without manifeſt preſumption* "*and impiety, to be the ſame as in the ideas we frame of theſe perfections when* "*we conſider them in men, or when we reaſon about them abſtractedly in them-* "*ſelves*; but that in the ſupreme Governor of the World they are ſomething "transcendent, and of which we cannot make any true judgment, nor "argue with any certainty about them *." It was for jargon like this that a famous Schoolman got the name of the transcendent Doctor. Yet he aſſures us that he is juſtified by the authority of St. Paul and Dr. Barrow. *Theſe two great Divines* (ſays he) *are on my ſide* †. Two noble pporters, (it muſt be confeſſed) to his Lordſhip's Atchievements! One thing I have obſerved, which may be worth reflecting on—A ſtrange propenſity in Free-thinkers to miſtake their enemies for their friends, and as ſtrange a propenſity in the Clergy to miſtake their friends for their enemies. This different turn is odd enough: and, at firſt view, ſeems a little myſterious; when, perhaps, there may be no more in it than this.—Free-thinkers have invented the trick, to amuſe the Clergy, in order to raiſe their ſuſpicions, and excite their jealouſy againſt their beſt Friends: And, unhappily, the Clergy have, now and then, fallen into the ſnare.

* Vol. V. p. 359. † Vol. V. p. 362.

But,

But, after all, who would expect that *the leather-dreſſing Pontiff** of all men ſhould have been thought worthy to ſupport the *firſt Philoſophy!* What has St. PAUL done at laſt to deſerve this honour? Why, in anſwer to the objections againſt God's diſpenſations in the religious World, the Apoſtle refers us, "for intire ſatisfaction, to the incomprehenſible wiſdom of God, "who frequently in the courſe of his providence ordereth things in me-"thods tranſcending our abilities to diſcover or to trace †." This ſolution, which is here extolled for its great *modeſty*, is referred to, in another place, for it's greater IMPUDENCE ‡.

But St. PAUL ſays, *we muſt have recourſe to the incomprehenſible wiſdom of God.* In good time. But how does this prove that, in Paul's opinion, we have no adequate idea of the *moral attributes?* Unleſs the *quality* of an Agent, and his *action*, be one and the ſame thing.

Dr. BARROW, I preſume, will ſtand his Lordſhip in no better ſtead than St. Paul. "As the dealings of every wiſe man (ſays the Doctor) are ſome-"times founded upon maxims, and admit juſtifications not obvious or pe-"netrable by vulgar conceit; ſo may God act according to rules of wiſdom "and juſtice, which it may be quite impoſſible by our faculties to appre-"hend, or with our means to deſcry. As there are natural modes of Being "and operation, ſo there may be prudential and moral modes of pro-"ceeding, far above our reach, peculiar objects of divine wiſdom not to "be underſtood by any creature, eſpecially by creatures who ſtand in the "loweſt form of intelligence; one remove from beaſts. In fine, thoſe "rules of equity and experience which we in our tranſactions with one "another do uſe, if they be applied to the dealings of God will be found "very incongruous or deficient, the caſe being vaſtly altered from that in-"finite diſtance in nature and ſtate between God and us, and from the "immenſe difference which his relations towards us have from our rela-"tions to one another §." What now has all this (which relates only to the *incomprehenſible nature of God's providence*) to do with our *inadequate ideas of his moral attributes?* At leaſt, if his Lordſhip will contend, that the man who thinks God's providence *incomprehenſible*, muſt needs think our ideas of his moral attributes *inadequate*, he muſt go a ſtep further, and confeſs, that Barrow ſuppoſed our ideas of the *natural* attributes to be *inadequate* like-

*This is the title with which he dignifies SAINT PAUL, in his IVth vol. p. 423. What Pity was it, his Lordſhip did not know that *Theodoret* had called him a downright COBLER.

† Vol. V. p. 360. ‡ Vol. III. p. 307. § Vol. V. p. 361, 362.

wiſe; for he puts both on the ſame footing. *As there are* NATURAL *modes of Being and operation* (ſays the Doctor), *ſo there may be prudential and* MORAL *modes proceeding far above our reach.* But as this would be going too far; farther than the FIRST PHILOSOPHY will allow of, I ſuppoſe his Lordſhip would be content to give up this quotation from Barrow, as nothing to the purpoſe.

AT LAST, and when you would leaſt expect it, Common-ſenſe and Common-ſentiments return. And God's moral attributes, after much ado, are allowed to be in Nature. "Where Religions (ſays his Lordſhip) which "pretend to be revealed, prevail, a new character of God's *goodneſs* ariſes— "an *artificial goodneſs* which ſtands often in the place of the NATURAL *." And this, after he had ſo often told us, that we have no adequate idea of any goodneſs at all. Well, but as aukwardly as God's *natural goodneſs* comes (and, in every ſenſe) *a poſteriori*, yet it comes, and deſerves to be made welcome. "All the knowledge (ſays he) that God has given us "the means to acquire, and therefore all he deſigned we ſhould have of "his phyſical and MORAL nature and attributes, is derived from *his works*, and "from the TENOUR OF THAT PROVIDENCE by which he governs them †." You will obſerve the words—*the tenour of that Providence*——I have detected the ſophiſtry of them before, where I have ſtated the meaning of the terms, *God's works*. I bid you obſerve them now, to judge of the following climax (if I may ſo call it), or his walk down ſtairs. 'The *wiſdom* "is not ſo often diſcernible by us [in God's works] as the power of God, "nor the *goodneſs* as the wiſdom ‡." As ſcanty and ſlender as the knowledge is of God's moral attributes, which his Lordſhip here allows us to collect from his works, yet it flatly contradicts what his Syſtem had obliged him over and over to maintain; particularly in the following words— *Of divine goodneſs and divine juſtice* (ſays his Lordſhip in the perſon of Anaxagoras) *I am unable to frame any adequate notions* §, *from God's works*.

This Mock-conceſſion is again repeated, and as carefully guarded. "By natural Theology (ſays his Lordſhip) we are taught to acknowledge "and adore the infinite *wiſdom* and *power* of God, which he has mani- "feſted to us in ſome degree or other in every part, even the moſt minute, "of his Creation. *By that too, we are taught to aſcribe* GOODNESS *and* "JUSTICE *to him, wherever he intended we ſhould ſo aſcribe them*, that is,

* Vol. V. p. 431.
† Vol. V. p. 523, 524.
‡ Vol. V. p. 335.
§ Vol. IV. p. 116, 117.

"wherever

" wherever either his works, or the diſpenſations of his providence, do as " NECESSARILY communicate theſe notions to our minds, as thoſe of wiſ- " dom and power are communicated to us, in the whole extent of both *."

What his Lordſhip would have you infer from this is, that we are NO WHERE taught to aſcribe *goodneſs* and *juſtice* to God; ſince the *diſpenſations of his providence* do NO WHERE, in his Lordſhip's opinion, NECESSARILY *communicate theſe notions.* But allow him his premiſes, that neither God's Works nor Diſpenſations do NECESSARILY communicate to us the notions of God's goodneſs and juſtice; Would his concluſion follow, that therefore we are no where taught in theſe works and diſpenſations to aſcribe thoſe attributes unto him? Suppoſe theſe works and diſpenſations did only PROBABLY communicate theſe notions to our minds; will not this probability teach us to aſcribe goodneſs and juſtice to him? God hath ſo framed the conſtitution of things, that man, throughout his whole conduct in life, ſhould be neceſſarily induced to form his judgment on appearances and probable arguments. Why then not in this, as well as the reſt? or rather, why not in this, above the reſt? if ſo be God indeed had not (as I have ſhewn he hath) neceſſarily communicated theſe notions——But ſtill, what is this to our *adequate* idea of the moral attributes, the point in queſtion? God's not *neceſſarily communicating*, affects only the *reality*, not the *preciſion* of the idea. All therefore we learn by the obſervation, which would thus put the change upon us, is, that his Lordſhip has a very ſtrong inclination, that God ſhould have neither *goodneſs* nor *juſtice*; ſo far as they carry with them any DISPOSITION to *reward* or *puniſh*. For as to the Attributes *themſelves*, diveſted of their conſequences; and undiſturbed by our IMPIOUS IMITATION †, he has little or no quarrel with them. His Lordſhip certainly never intended to *teach* the common Reader more of the ſecrets of his Philoſophy than what NECESSARILY ariſes from his *profeſſions*. But to make God treat Mankind in this manner, to communicate to their minds the appearance of Attributes which he has not, is drawing an image of the Deity from his Lordſhip's own likeneſs; the very fault he ſo much cenſures in Divines. But if it muſt needs be, that God is to be repreſented either after Them, or after his Lordſhip, I ſhould chuſe to have the

* Vol. V. p. 527.

† OUR OBLIGATION TO IMITATE GOD IS A FALSE AND PROFANE DOCTRINE. Vol. V. p. 65.

Clergy's

Clergy's God, though made out of no better ſtuff than ARTIFICIAL THEOLOGY (becauſe this gives him both *goodneſs* and *juſtice*), rather than his Lordſhip's God, which has neither; although compoſed of the more refined materials of the FIRST PHILOSOPHY. In the mean time, I will not deny but He may be right in what he ſays, That men conceive of the Deity, *more humano*; and that his Lordſhip's God and the Clergy's God are equally faithful copies of themſelves.

In a word, if God *teaches*, whether clearly or obſcurely, he certainly intended, we ſhould *learn*. And what we get even by appearances, is real knowledge, upon his Lordſhip's own principles. For if TRUTH be, as he aſſures us it is, of ſo precarious a nature as to take it's Being from our own Syſtem, it muſt be *real* as far as it *appears*. "Our knowledge (ſays "this great Philoſopher) is ſo dependent on our own ſyſtem, that a great "part of it would not be *knowledge* perhaps, but *error* in any other *."

It is thus he involves himſelf in perpetual contradictions: And it will be always thus, when men diſpute (for believe they cannot †) againſt common notices, and the moſt obvious truths; ſuch as *liberty of will*; the *certainty of knowledge*; and this, which (I reckon) obtrudes itſelf upon us as forcibly as either, the MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF THE DEITY.

But the game is now on foot, let us follow it cloſe. We have unravelled him through all his windings; and we may ſoon expect to ſee him take ſhelter in the thick cover of God's incomprehenſible Nature; and rather than allow (more than in jeſt) the *moral attributes* of the Deity, ready to reſolve all his Attributes, both *natural* and *moral*, into one INDEFINITE PERFECTION.

But ſoft. Not yet. We muſt come to it by degrees and regular advances. Firſt, the *moral attributes* are to be *reſolved* into the *natural*.

——"If they [the *natural* and *moral* attributes] may be conſidered "ſeparately, as we are apt to conſider them; and if the LATTER, and every "thing we aſcribe to theſe, are not to be RESOLVED *rather into the* "*former*; into his infinite intelligence, wiſdom, and power ‡."——It is yet, we ſee, but a queſtion; and that only, whether the *moral* attributes are not

* Vol. iii. p. 356.

† Hear what he himſelf ſays of FREE-WILL. *The free-will of man no one can deny he has, without* LYING, *or renouncing his intuitive knowledge.* Vol. V. p. 406.

‡ Vol. V. p. 523, 524.

to

to be reſolved into the *natural*. In the next paſſage the matter is determined. "I think (and what he thinks, he holds it but reaſonable we "ſhould all think) that the *moral* attributes of the ſupreme Being are "*abſorbed in his wiſdom*; that we ſhould conſider them only as different "modifications of this *phyſical* attribute *."

We are not yet near the top. However, before we go any higher, let us ſet together his INCONSISTENCES, as they appear in this ſituation. Sometimes *the ideas of divine wiſdom are better determined than thoſe of divine goodneſs* †: Sometimes *we have no ideas at all of divine goodneſs* ‡: And ſometimes again (as in the place before us), the *divine goodneſs is the ſame as wiſdom*, and therefore, doubtleſs, (notwithſtanding his Lordſhip) the idea of it as well defined. Now, of all theſe aſſertions, to which will he ſtick? To which, do you aſk? To none of them, longer than they will ſtick to him: And ſtraggling, undiſciplined Principles, picked up at adventures, are not apt to ſtick long to any ſide: As ſoon as they begin to incline towards the enemy, he has done with them.——Come, if you will needs have it, you ſhall. The ſecret is this. The attributes are mere NAMES; and there is an end of them. All that remains, worth ſpeaking of, is one undefined ETERNAL REASON: and ſo the Farce concludes.

"The moral ATTRIBUTES (ſays he) are *barely* NAMES that we give to "various manifeſtations of the infinite wiſdom of one *ſimple uncompounded* "*being* §."

"Of divine goodneſs and divine juſtice I am unable to frame any ade-"quate notions; and inſtead of conceiving ſuch diſtinct moral attributes in the "ſupreme Being, *we ought, perhaps, to conceive nothing more than this*, that "THERE ARE VARIOUS APPLICATIONS OF ONE ETERNAL REASON, WHICH "IT BECOMES US LITTLE TO ANALYZE INTO ATTRIBUTES ‖."

To this miſerable refuge is his Lordſhip reduced, to avoid DIVINE JUSTICE. But why, the Reader will ſay, did he not ſpeak out at firſt, and end his quarrel with the *moral attributes* at once? Your humble ſervant for that. Barefaced NATURALISM has no ſuch charms as may make her received when and wherever ſhe appears. There is need of much preparation, and not a little diſguiſe, before you can get her admitted even to what is called *good company*.——But then, you will ſay, after he had re-

* Vol. V. p. 335. † Vol. V. p. 341. 526. ‡ Vol. IV. p. 116, 117.
§ Vol. V. p. 453. ‖ Vol. IV. p. 117.

ſolved

ſolved to ſpeak out, Why did he ſtop again in his career; and, when his premiſſes are general againſt *all* attributes, his concluſion became particular, againſt the *moral* only? Not without reaſon, I aſſure you. He had need of the *natural* attributes, to ſet up againſt the *moral*; and therefore had himſelf *analyzed* this *eternal reaſon* into the ſpecific attributes of *wiſdom* and *power*. But when he ſaw his Adverſaries might, by the ſame way, *analyze* it into *goodneſs and juſtice*, he then thought fit to pick a quarrel with his own method: But it was to be done obliquely. And hence ariſes all this embarraſs and tergiverſation. He would willingly, if his Readers would be ſo ſatisfied, analyze the *eternal reaſon* into *wiſdom* and *power*: but there he would ſtop; and leave the other ſide of the *eternal reaſon*, unanalyzed: and if *goodneſs* and *juſtice* ſhould chance to ſtart out, he has a trick to *reſolve* and *abſorb* them into wiſdom and power, as only *different modifications of the phyſical attributes*. But if this ſhould revolt his Readers, and they expect equal meaſure; then, rather than give them back the *goodneſs* and *juſtice* which he has been at all this pains to proſcribe, he will throw *wiſdom* and *power* after them, and *reſolve* all into the ONE ETERNAL REASON.

Baſhful NATURALISM has now thrown aſide her Veil; and is, we ſee, ready to face down and defy her Rival; whom till now ſhe was content to counterfeit. Give me leave, therefore, to repreſs this laſt effort of her inſolence and of his Lordſhip's ſuperior Wiſdom. He now tells us, "that theſe pretended attributes, as they are commonly ſpecified, and diſtinguiſhed into *natural* and *moral*, are a mere human fiction; invented, by aid of analogy from the actions, paſſions, and qualities obſervable in man: and that the ſimple nature of Deity is one uniform perfection; of which, Infinity being the baſe, we can have no diſtinct idea or conception."

To this I reply, that it is indeed true, that theſe ſpecific attributes, from which we deduce all our knowledge of the nature and will of God, are formed on analogy, and bear relation to ourſelves. But then we ſay ſuch attributes are not on that account the leſs real or eſſential. The light of the SUN is not in the orb itſelf, what we ſee it in the RAINBOW. There it is one candid, uniform, perfect blaze of glory: here we ſeparate it's Perfection into the various attributes of red, yellow, blue, purple, and what elſe the ſubtle optician ſo nicely diſtinguiſhes. But ſtill the *ſolar* light is not leſs real in the Rainbow, where it's rays become thus untwiſted, and each diſfering

fering thread diſtinctly ſeen in its effect, than while they remained united and incorporated with one another in the Sun. Juſt ſo it is with the divine Nature: it is one ſimple individual Perfection in the Godhead himſelf: but when refracted and divaricated, in paſſing through the medium of the human mind, it becomes power, juſtice, mercy; which are all ſeparately and ADEQUATELY repreſented to the underſtanding. But that his Lordſhip ſo frequently diſcards his own principles, I ſhould hope he would ſubmit to this illuſtration, ſince he owns *that we ſee the Deity in a reflected, not in a direct light* *.

It is a true light then, and not a falſe: and the knowledge which it conveys is real, not fantaſtic: For mirrors are not wont to reflect the ſpecies of the mind's viſions, but things exterior and ſubſtantial. To turn us, therefore, from God's *attributes*, (though the indirect, yet the well-defined, Image of him) becauſe they diſcover ſomething to us we may not like, a HELL and a FUTURE JUDGMENT, to turn us, I ſay, from theſe, to the *undefined eternal reaſon*, is doing like certain French Philoſophers, who, when they quarrelled with Newton's Theory of light and colours, contrived to break the Priſm by which it was demonſtrated.

And now, Reader, let me aſk, Who is there that deſerves the name of MAN, and will not own, that they are the MORAL ATTRIBUTES of the Deity which make him AMIABLE; juſt as the *natural attributes* make him *revered?*—What is his Lordſhip's quarrel with the God of MOSES and PAUL, but that he is made *unamiable*, and repreſented without *goodneſs* or *juſtice? Their God*, therefore, he expreſly tells us, *ſhall not be his God* †. Well then: He has his God to make. And who would not expect to find him, when made by ſuch a Workman, a God of infinite goodneſs and juſtice? No ſuch matter: Theſe qualities come not out of his Lordſhip's hands; ſo, cannot enter into the compoſition of his God: They are *barely* NAMES *that men give to various manifeſtations of the infinite wiſdom of one ſimple uncompounded Being*. The pretended want of them in the God of the Jews afforded his Lordſhip a commodious cavil; for he had RELIGION to remove out of his way: But when he came to erect NATURALISM in it's ſtead, it had been very inconvenient to give them to his own Idol.

* Vol. V. p. 524.

† "Can any man preſume to ſay, that the God of Moſes or the God of Paul is the true God? &c." Vol. V. p. 567.

Honeſt Plutarch, though a Prieſt, was as warm an enemy to PRIEST-CRAFT as his Lordſhip. He derives all the evils of Superſtition from men's not acquiring the idea of a God *infinitely good and juſt*. And propoſes this knowledge as the only cure for Superſtition. This is conſiſtent. But what would the ancient World have thought of their Philoſopher, had his remedy, after hunting for it through a hundred volumes, been a God without any goodneſs and juſtice at all?

NATURE tells us, that the thing moſt deſirable is the knowledge of a God whoſe goodneſs and juſtice gives to every man according to his works. His LORDSHIP tells us, that REASON or NATURAL RELIGION diſcovers to us no ſuch God. Now, if both ſpeak truth, How much are we indebted to REVELATION! Which, when *natural Religion* failed us, brings us to the knowledge of a God infinitely good and juſt; and gives us an adequate idea of thoſe attributes! I ſay no more than his Lordſhip has confeſſed.—*Chriſtianity*, ſays he, DISCOVERS *the love of God to man*; *his infinite* JUSTICE *and* GOODNESS *.

Is this a bleſſing to be rejected? His Lordſhip has no room to ſay ſo, ſince the diſcovery is made in that very way, in which, upon his own Principles, it only could be made. He pretends, "We have no other natural way of coming to the knowledge of God but from his *works*. By theſe, *he ſays*, we gain the idea of his *phyſical attributes*; and if there be any thing in his *works* which ſeems to contradict thoſe attributes, 'tis only ſeeming: For as men advance in the knowledge of nature, the difficulties vaniſh. It is not ſo, he ſays, with regard to the *moral attributes*. There are ſo many *phænomena* which contradict theſe, and occaſion difficulties never to be cleared up, that they hinder us from acquiring an *adequate* idea of the *moral attributes*." Now admitting all this to be true, (for generally, his Lordſhip's aſſertions are ſo extravagant, that they will not even admit a ſuppoſition of their truth, though it be only for argument's ſake,) What does it effect but this, the giving *additional credit to Revelation?* The *phyſical difficulties* clear up as we advance in our knowledge of *Nature*, and we advance in proportion to our diligence and application. But the *moral difficultics* never clear up, becauſe they riſe out of the *Whole Syſtem* of God's moral diſpenſation; which is involved in clouds and darkneſs, impenetrable to mortal ſight: and all the force of human wit alone will never be able to

* Vol. V. p. 532.

draw

draw the veil. The aſſiſtance muſt come from another quarter. It muſt come, if it comes at all, from the Author of the Diſpenſation. Well; *Revelation* hath drawn this veil, and ſo, removed the darkneſs which obſtructed our attaining an *adequate* idea of the *moral* attributes. Shall we yet ſtand out? And, when we are brought hither upon his Lordſhip's own principles, ſtill with-hold our aſſent? Undoubtedly you muſt. Beware (ſays he) of a pretended Revelation. Why ſo? "Becauſe the Religion of nature "is perfect and abſolute: and therefore Revelation can teach nothing but "what Religion hath already taught *." Strange; Why, *Revelation* teaches thoſe *moral* attributes! which you, my Lord, own, *natural Religion* does not teach——Here we ſtick.

> "Dic aliquem ſodes, dic, Quintiliane, colorem:
> Hæremus——"

And here, we are like to ſtick. His Lordſhip leaves us in a Riddle. Will you have the ſolution? It is fooliſh enough; as the ſolution of ſuch kind of things generally are. But if the Reader hath kept his good humour, which, I confeſs, is difficult amidſt all theſe provocations of impiety, it is enough to make him laugh. I ſaid before, that his Lordſhip borrowed all his reaſoning againſt Revelation, from ſuch as Tindal, Toland, Collins, Chubb, and Morgan. This ſolemn argument particularly, of the PERFECTION OF NATURAL RELIGION, and the ſuperſeded uſe of Revelation, he delivers to us juſt as he found it in Tindal. Now Tindal, who pretended to hold that natural Religion taught both the *moral attributes* and a *future ſtate*, had ſome pretence for ſaying that *it was perfect and abſolute*. But what pretence has his Lordſhip to ſay it after him, who holds that natural Religion taught neither one nor the other? The truth is, he refuſed no arms againſt REVELATION; and the too eager purſuit of this his old enemy through thick and thin has led him into many of theſe ſcrapes.

To ſee his Lordſhip uſe TINDAL'S ARGUMENTS *againſt Revelation, and for the perfection of Natural Religion*, along with his OWN PRINCIPLES of *no moral attributes* and *no future State*, muſt needs give the Reader a very uncommon idea of his abilities: for the firſt of theſe principles makes one entire abſurdity of all he borrows from Tindal againſt Revelation; and the ſecond takes away the very pretence for *perfection* in natural Religion.

* Vol. V. p. 544.

His Lordſhip's friend, *Swift*, has ſomewhere or other obſerved, that no ſubject in all Literature but Religion could have advanced TOLAND and ASGILL into the claſs of reputable Authors. Another of his friends ſeems to think that no ſubject but Religion could have ſunk his Lordſhip ſo far below it: IF EVER LORD BOLINGBROKE TRIFLES (ſays *Pope*), IT WILL BE WHEN HE WRITES ON DIVINITY *. But ſuch is the fate of Authors, when they chuſe to write upon ſubjects for which they were not qualified either by *nature* or *grace*. For it is with authors as with Men: Who can gueſs *which Veſſel was made for honour, and which for diſhonour?* when ſometimes, one and the ſame is made for both. Even this choice Piece of the FIRST PHILOSOPHY, his Lordſhip's ſacred pages, is ready to be put to very different uſes, according to the different tempers in which they have found his few Admirers on the one ſide, and the Public on the other; like the china Utenſil in the DUNCIAD, which one Hero uſed for a p—pot, and another carried home for his Head-piece.

* Pope's Works, V. IX. Lett. xiv.

NOTES

NOTES

ON THE SECOND BOOK.

P. 135. [A]. *Valla* explains the word ἀνθρωποφυίας by *ex hominibus ortos*; and, I think, rightly. But our learned *Stanley*, in his notes to the *Perſians* of *Æſchylus*, underſtands it otherwiſe: and that it rather ſignifies *humana forma præditos*. I ſuppoſe it appeared harſh to him, that any one could imagine the Gods had *human natures*; but the meaning is explained above. Yet the ingenious writer of the *Letters concerning mythology*, p. 217. ſides with our country-man, and underſtands ἀνθρωποφυὴς to ſignify,—*made like a man*—or, *of the ſhape and figure of a man*. But if we regard the literal meaning of the two ſimples which make up this compound, we cannot avoid underſtanding it to ſignify, *being of man's nature*. How then does this learned writer ſupport his criticiſm? By a paſſage from Hecatæus; who, on pretty much the ſame occaſion, uſes (as he ſuppoſes) ἀνθρωπόμορφος, in the place of ἀνθρωποφυὴς; and ἀνθρωπομόρφος, he thinks, all will agree, muſt ſignify, *of the ſhape and figure of a man*. No, not if his own method of interpretation be right: for, if ἀνθρωποφυὴς (transferrred from the literal, to the figurative ſenſe) muſt ſignify of man's *form*, then ἀνθρωπόμορφος ſo transferred, muſt ſignify *of man's nature*. But it is not true, that Hecatæus uſes ἀνθρωπόμορφος in the place of ἀνθρωποφυής. The propoſitions of Herodotus and Hecatæus are different, and therefore we may well ſuppoſe theſe two words, in the predicate of each, to be different. Herodotus, ſpeaking of the PERSIANS, ſays, they had no ſtatues of their Gods, becauſe they did not believe, with the Greeks, that the Gods had *human natures* [ἀνθρωποφυέας]. And Hecatæus, ſpeaking of MOSES, ſays, he permitted no images of the Gods, becauſe he did not hold, with the Gentiles, that God had a *human form* [ἀνθρωπέμορφον]. And their uſe of different words, as we ſhall now ſee, was with accuracy and diſcernment; for they were aſſerting different things. The queſtion between the *Perſians* and the *Greeks* (who wor-

worſhiped many gods in common) was, whether theſe Gods were *partakers of human nature*, ἀνθρωποφυέας; that is, whether they were dead men deified. But the queſtion between *Moſes* and the Gentiles, was, whether the God of the univerſe had a *human form*, ἀνθρωπόμορφος; not whether *the gods had human natures*; for theſe Gods, the Jews had nothing to do with; they worſhiped only the one God: and ſeveral of the Gentiles, who had ſome knowledge of this one God, imagined he might have a *human form*. So that we ſee, the uſe of theſe two terms, on the *ſame* occaſion, is ſo far from ſhewing their ſignification to be the *ſame*, as the learned writer ſuppoſes, that the occaſion demonſtrably ſhews their ſignification to be *different*. Let me only obſerve, it appeared ſo evident to Euſebius, that the cuſtom of making the ſtatues of the Gods in *human form* was an indication of their original from mortality, that he ſays, ὃ γέ τοι ἀληθὴς λόγος βοᾷ καὶ κέκραγε, μονονοὺχὶ φωνὴν ἀφιεὶς, θνητὸς ἄνδρας μαρτυρῶν γεγονέναι τὸς δηλωμένους. Euang. προπαρ. β. γ.

P. 157. [B]. This we are told by *Jamblichus*: his words are, λέγεται τοίνυν ὡς φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ ἑκάστοις παρήγγελλον, Vit. Pythag. 194. Kuſt. Ed. Dr. Bentley underſtands them to ſignify, that *every one ſhould uſe his own mother-tongue*. And, indeed, without reading the context, one could ſcare avoid giving this ſenſe to the paſſage. Vizzanius,—*that every one ſhould uſe the mother-tongue of Crotona*; which was *the Doric*. *Of theſe*, the learned Critic ſays, *which is the true, perhaps all competent readers will not be of one mind*, p. 386. But I believe there will be no great difference of opinions amongſt thoſe who weigh the following reaſons: 1. Jamblichus adds, τὸ γὰρ ξενίζειν οὐκ ἐδοκίμαζον; by which I underſtand him to mean, that *the* Pythagoric *ſect did not approve of a foreign or ſtranger dialect*. For if he meant, not the ſect in general, but the particulars of which it was compoſed, the ſeveral provincial *Greeks* who entered into it, no *dialect* could be called *foreign* to one or other of them: if he meant the Sect, which we may ſuppoſe had a *dialect* peculiar and conſecrated to the Community, all, but that, was *foreign* to it; and the expreſſion becomes proper and pertinent. 2. *Jamblichus*, in the ſame place, tells us, that Pythagoras valued the *Doric* above the other Greek Dialects, as moſt agreeable to the laws of harmony, Τὴν δὲ Δωρίαν διάλεκτον ἐναρμονίαν εἶναι: Now having made the eſſence of the ſoul to be harmony, it was no wonder he ſhould chuſe a dialect, which he ſuppoſed approached neareſt to its nature; that the mind and tongue might go together. 3. Pythagoras ſeems here to have imitated his

maſter

maſter Orpheus, from whom, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, he borrowed much of his philoſophy; for Jamblichus tells us, that the old writings that went under the name of Orpheus, were compoſed in *Doric*. 4. But, laſtly, a paſſage in Porphyry's *Life of Pythagoras* ſeems alone ſufficient to determine this matter: Porphyry giving the cauſes of the decay of the Pythagoric philoſophy, aſſigns this for one, that *their commentaries were written in* Doric. Ἐπειδὴ διὰ το καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα Δωρίδι γεγράφθαι, p. 49. Kuſt. Ed. This is the cleareſt comment on the words in queſtion, and determines them to the ſenſe contended for. One would wonder, indeed, that ſo learned a Critic could take them in any other. But the ſecret was this, Dr. Bentley having pretended to diſcover, that Ocellus Lucanus did not write his book in the common dialect, as it is now extant, but in *Doric*; (*Diſſert. upon Phalaris, &c.* p 47.) his adverſaries (*Diſſert. examined*, p. 54.) charge him with having ſtolen this diſcovery from *Vizzanius*. This, Dr. Bentley flatly denies; (*Diſſert. defended*, p. 184.) But the only proof he gives of his innocence, is, that the Greek paſſage, quoted above from Jamblichus, on which both he and *Vizzanius* had founded their diſcoveries, is differently tranſlated by them. "The thing, as I ſaid it (ſays the Dr.) is thus; the "*Pythagoreans* enjoined all the *Greeks* that entered themſelves into the ſo- "ciety, to uſe every man his mother tongue (φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ.) *Ocellus*, "therefore, being a *Dorian* of *Lucania*, muſt have writ in the *Doric*. This "I *took* to be Jamblichus's meaning. But *Vizzanius* has repreſented it "thus: that they enjoined all that came to them to uſe the mother-tongue "of Crotona, which was the *Doric*.—Whether *Vizzanius* or I have hit "upon the true meaning of Jamblichus, perhaps all competent readers "will not be of a mind." The diffidence of this concluſion would make one ſuſpect the Dr. was now convinced, that *Vizzanius's* was the right meaning. Yet, I will venture to ſay, that the words of Jamblichus, as quoted by *Vizzanius* without the context, would have been underſtood by every man, ſkilled, as Dr. Bentley was, in Greek, in the different ſenſe he has given to them. From whence I conclude, that, when Dr. Bentley wrote his *Diſſertation on Phalaris*, he had ſeen the words of Jamblichus no where but in *Vizzanius*.

P. 162. [C]. Some have affected not to underſtand, where it is, in the foregoing paſſage, that Zaleucus inculcates this doctrine. The place, methinks, was not hard to find: it is, where *wicked men* are bid *to ſet before*

before themſelves the dreadful hour of death. For how ſhould a picture of this ſcene allure men to virtue, or deter them from vice, but as it opens to them a view of thoſe rewards and puniſhments they are juſt going to receive? Hence, too, we learn what thoſe *hopes and fears* were, which Plutarch, in the paſſage p. 165, ſays the *ancient lawgivers* impreſſed upon the minds of the people, to keep up the awe and reverence of religion: for Plato aſſures us it was their general practice, to inculcate the diſtinction between ſoul and body; and to teach, that, at their ſeparation, the ſoul ſurvived the body; and this, ſays he, we ſhould believe upon their word, unleſs we would be thought to be out of our ſenſes.—πιςεύειν δ' αὖ καὶ τοῖς ΝΟΜΟΘΕΤΟΥΣΙ ταῦθ' ὅτως ἔχειν, ἅνπερ μὴ παιλάπασιν ἄφρονες φαίνωνλαι. De Legg. lib. xi. But, in his next book, he informs us, more at large, why the ancient Lawgivers inculcated that *diſtinction.* It was, in order to build upon it the belief of *a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments:* for he ſays, the Lawgivers were to be believed, when they teach the total difference between ſoul and body, that the former is immortal, and that when it is on the point of departing for the regions of immortality (where it muſt give an account of its conduct in the body) the good man will meet death with courage and conſtancy, and the evil man with affright and terrour. And then takes occaſion to mention the puniſhments reſerved for the latter: πειθεσθαι δ' ἐςὶ τῷ νομοθέτῃ χρεὼν τάτε ἄλλα, καὶ λέγονλι ψυχὴν σώμαλ@ εἶναι τὸ παν διαφέρσαν.—τὸν δὲ ὄνλα ἡμῶν ἕκασον ὅλως ἀθάναλον εἶναι, ψυχὴν ἐπονομαζόμενον, παρὰ θεὸς ἄλλες ἀπιέναι δώσονλα λόγον, καθάπερ ὁ νόμ@ ὁ πάτρι@ λέγει, τῷ μὲν ἀγαθῷ θαῤῥαλέον, τῷ δὲ κακῷ μάλα φοβερὸν—ἀτιμώτηρ@ ἂν κακῶν ἁμαρλημάτων ἐγίγνελο τῶν μελὰ τὸν ἐνθάδε βίον. De Legib. L. XII. T. II. pag. 959. A. B. C. Edit. H. Steph. fol. And here let me obſerve, that Plato, in the words τῷ ἀγαθῷ θαῤῥαλέον, &c. ſeems to have had the very paſſage of Zaleucus in his eye, τίθεσθαι πρὸ ὀμμάτων τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, &c.——But this cavil had been obviated, Sect. I. of this Second Book, p. 127.

P. 189. [D]. *Paul Erneſt Jablonſki*, a learned German Divine, in his book called *Pantheon Ægyptiorum, ſive de Diis eorum Commentarius*, having taken it into his head, for ſome reaſon or other, to contend that the Ægyptian Gods were not *dead men deified*, thought rightly that this account of the *Myſteries* ſtood in his way. "Inter omnia argumenta (ſays he) quibus utuntur viri docti, ad probandum, Ægyptios coluiſſe homines, poſt mortem divinis honoribus, donatos illud ſine dubio primum meretur locum, quod

quod ex MYSTERIIS Græcorum et ipſorum quoque Ægyptiorum petitum eſt. Obſervavit nempe Theologus Anglus præſtantiſſimus, omnique doctrinæ genere cultus, in Myſteriis Græcorum, hanc etiam initiatis doctrinam tradi conſueviſſe, Deos illos, quos vulgo adorarent omnes, re ipſa mortales extitiſſe homines, idque teſtimoniis quibuſdam e CICERONE perquam opportune allatis demonſtraſſe, et extra omnem dubitationis aleam poſuiſſe videtur. He then quotes this paſſage of the *Tuſcular queſtions*, and the following from the firſt book, *of the nature of the Gods*: and thus proceeds—Cui quidem loco ex priori, lux eſt accendenda. Jubebantur ergo omnes, initiati Græcorum Myſteriis, credere Deos quos Græcia coleret cunctos, in lucem hanc aliquando editos fuiſſe, inter homines vixiſſe et tandem mortem quoque oppetiiſſe. All this is ſaid with the candour of a true ſcholar. How unlike to that miſerable chicane lately publiſhed at home on this queſtion! Where things are denied no leſs inconteſtible than that two and two make four. However the learned Doctor *Jablonſki* muſt not deſert his Syſtem. His firſt evaſion therefore of the force ariſing from my account of the *Myſteries* is this,——I had repreſented them as the invention of Legiſlators; and had ſhewn that it was the practice of ancient Lawgivers and Philoſophers to teach one doctrine openly and another ſecretly. Having got me at this advantage, Who knows then, ſays he, Whether theſe Inſtitutors of the *Myſteries* believed what they taught? But hear him in his own words—" At quæri non immerito poteſt, fuerintne Legiſlatores & Conditores Myſteriorum, de eo, quod credere volebant alios, ipſi certo perſuaſi. Docere nos voluit ingenioſus ille Auctor, qui arcana Myſteriorum Eleuſiniorum nobis non ſine ſucceſſu explicare conatus eſt, Legiſlatores et Philoſophos veteres permulta ſuis inculcaſſe, et vehementer commendaſſe, quæ credebant hominibus fore utilia, etiamſi ea reipſa judicarent eſſe falſa. *Quid vetat nos credere* ex illorum numero fuiſſe etiam doctrinam in *Myſteriis* traditam de mortalibus ad honores divinos evectis——*Prolegom.* Sect. xii.—Nay I know of nothing that *hinders us from believing*, but common ſenſe: Which aſſures us, that if theſe Men practiſed the method of the *double doctrine*, one ſet of opinions taught publicly to all, and another ſecretly to a few ſelect Auditors, in whom they could particularly confide, the opinions *believed* by them were certainly the latter. But he has another evaſion, in ſupport of his Syſtem. Though the *Grecian Myſteries* taught the human nature of the National Gods, how does it appear that the

Egyptian Myſteries taught the ſame? I anſwer, From the *Grecian Myſteries* being borrowed from the *Egyptian*, and from a thouſand teſtimonies beſides; particularly from the famous tranſaction between Alexander the Great and Leo the Egyptian prieſt. This the learned Writer conſiders as a fable, a very ready way of getting rid of difficulties which obſtruct our Syſtems.—He endeavours to prove, that in the accounts which *Minutius Felix* and *Athenagoras* give of this matter, there were ſome circumſtances inconſiſtent with the avowed hiſtory of Alexander: and from thence he concludes—" Ita ad conſtituendam illam Fabellam, mendaciis meriſque figmentis opus erat." Sect. xv. But if this be ſufficient to convict the adventure of impoſture, the beſt atteſted facts of Antiquity will be in danger; ſuch, for inſtance, as the defeat of Julian's impious purpoſe to rebuild the Temple of Jeruſalem; to the true circumſtances of which defeat, the Relators of it have added many very fabulous and abſurd. However he acknowleges, that if Alexander did write ſuch a Letter to his mother, the Fact will admit no further controverſy. But the Letter, he ſays, was a forgery of ſome indiſcreet Chriſtian Writers, who being notorious Trickſters, and at the ſame time got into the general Opinion that the *national Gods of the Pagans were dead men*—what then?—" Eſtne igitur mirum Tenebrionem *neſcio quem*, in eorum gratiam talem Alexandri Epiſtolam confinxiſſe, eamque poſtea certatim alios in uſum ſuum convertiſſe." Sect. xvi. Falſarys, of whatever time or profeſſion, I ſuppoſe never forge but to ſupply ſome imaginary or real want. Thus theſe Chriſtian Falſarys (as this learned writer obſerves) forged ſome *Sibylline Oracles* and books of *Hermes Triſmegiſtus*. But why did they ſo? Becauſe they fooliſhly imagined the FAITH wanted ſome ſupport from the Prophecies and doctrines of the Pagans themſelves. But with regard to the Opinion that *their Gods were dead men deified*, the Prophane Writings of beſt Authority were now full. Nothing therefore can be leſs founded than this ſuſpicion. His next argument againſt the authenticity of the EPISTLES is indeed a pleaſant one. If, ſays he, the ancient Philoſophers had known any thing of this *Epiſtle*, their eternal diſputations concerning the eſſence, nature and origine of the *Egyptian Gods* muſt have been at an end. " Si Epiſtola illa, quam Patres laudant, genuina eſſet, tum quæſtio de eſſentia, natura, & origine Deorum Ægyptiorum quæ veteres Philoſophos tantopere exercuit, ſic deciſa et penitus finita fuiſſet, ut nemini amplius dubium ſupereſſe potuerit." Sect. xvi.

Did

Did not the ancient Philoſophers diſpute full as much concerning the Eſſence, nature and origin of the *Grecian Gods?* And yet this learned Writer confeſſes that the Grecian Myſteries taught that they were *dead men deified.* He muſt know little of the temper of the ancient Philoſophers, who ſuppoſes that even an ORACLE, whether without or within the walls of the *Myſteries* (for oracular Reſponſes were given there as well as at Delphi), could ſtop them in the career of Diſputation. Cicero (we know), who is the Repreſentative of them all, did not ſuffer his knowlege of what the *Eleuſinian Myſteries* taught, to debar him from advancing a hundred different tenets and conjectures concerning the eſſence, nature and origin both of the *Egyptian* and *Grecian* GODS.

But, continues the learned Doctor, "none of the prophane Writers, Greek or Roman, ever mention this Epiſtle." "Non certe videmus unquam aliquem ad hoc oraculum confugere, aut ejus vel leviſſimam mentionem facere; non Varronem—non Ciceronem—non Diodorum Siculum—non Plutarchum"—Sect. xvi. Nothing indeed is more common, yet nothing is more ſophiſtical, than to argue againſt a fact recorded by one ſingle Ancient, or by one ſet of Ancients, becauſe we cannot find it in any other. As if we had all Antiquity before us, and did not know that a few fragments only, of that rich Cargo remain, of the Wreck of Barbarous Times. Beſide, the ſilence (on this head) in thoſe fragments we have gathered up, may be naturally accounted for. What the *Myſteries* every where taught was ſo well known to the Learned, from numerous and authentic teſtimonies, concerning the *Eleuſinian* and others, that it was nothing ſtrange that neither Varro, Cicero, nor Diodorus Siculus ſhould take any particular notice of this EPISTLE. I do not put *Plutarch* into the number of the ſilent, becauſe the learned Dr. himſelf is forced to confeſs that, in the opinion of ſome learned men, this Ancient hath alluded to the Epiſtle in queſtion. The words of Plutarch quoted above run thus, *Alexander in his Epiſtle to his mother ſays, that there were certain Oracular Myſteries imparted to him, which, on his return, he would communicate to her under the ſame ſeal of Secrecy.* Our learned Dr. thinks otherwiſe: and that what is ſaid, in the *Epiſtle* quoted by Plutarch, means the reſponſe of a *Common Oracle*; while the *Epiſtle* mentioned by the Chriſtian Writers refers to what Alexander learnt in the *Myſteries.* "Verum an dices, obſecro, hanc eſſe Epiſtolam illam, quam Patres laudant? Sed in hac agebatur de *doctrinis Myſticis Theologiæ*

ologiæ Ægyptiorum, ante non auditis, in illa, Sermo tantum eſt de *divinitionibus et prædictionibus ſibi divinitus factis*," &c. Sect xvi. This ſlender reaſoning, is ſpun out of his ignorance, that the words, μυήσεως ἀπόῤῥητος, here uſed by Plutarch, can only ſignify *Oracles delivered in the celebration of the Myſteries*. The caſe was this, The Hierophants of the Myſteries had by this time, to invite cuſtom, erected *their* Oracles alſo, like to thoſe at the other public Shrines of the Gods: Of which, an account is given elſewhere.

P. 189. [E.] The words that follow, are, " Quibus explicatis ad rationemque revocatis, rerum magis natura cognoſcitur, quam Deorum." Which M. Pluche, in his *Hiſtoire du Ciel*, brings to prove, that the purpoſe of the *Myſteries* was not to explain the nature of the Gods; and tranſlates thus, " Quand ces myſteres ſont expliqués & ramenés à leur vrai " ſens, il ſe trouve que c'eſt moins la nature des Dieux, qu'on nous y " apprend, que la nature des choſes mêmes, ou des vérités dont nous avons " beſoin." P. 401. Hiſt. du Ciel, ſeconde edit. But had he attended to the diſpute carried on in the dialogue, from whence theſe words of Cicero are quoted, he could hardly have thus groſly miſtaken the ſenſe of his author. The reader has now the whole paſſage before him; in which it is ſaid, that Euhemerus taught the nature of the Gods; that they were dead men deified: and in which, it is clearly enough intimated, that the *Eleuſinian* and *Samothracian Myſteries* taught the ſame doctrine. Yet, according to this tranſlator, Tully immediately adds, that, " when theſe *Myſ-* " *teries* are explained and brought back to their true ſenſe, it is found, " that not ſo much the nature of the Gods is taught in them, as the nature " of things, or thoſe truths which our wants require us to be inſtructed in." That is, the Myſteries *did*, and they *did not* teach the nature of the Gods. But it is not for ſuch kind of prate that Cicero has been ſo long admired. The words, *quibus explicatis, ad rationemque revocatis*, &c. have a quite different meaning. Velleius, the Epicurean, had undertaken to explain the nature of the Gods. Cotta, the Academic, ſhews, in his anſwer, that, under pretence of teaching the nature of the Gods, he, Velleius, took away all Religion; juſt as thoſe did, who ſaid, the notion of the Gods was invented by Politicians, for the uſe of Society; juſt as Prodicus Chius did, who ſaid, men made Gods of every thing they found beneficial to them; juſt as Euhemerus did, who ſaid, they were dead men deified:

I forbear

I forbear (ſays Cotta) to ſpeak of what is taught in the *Myſteries:* and then follow the words in queſtion: "Quibus explicatis, ad rationemque revo-
" catis, rerum magis natura cognoſcitur quam deorum." That is, "If
" you will weigh (ſays Cotta) and conſider all theſe opinions, ſo like your
" own, they will lead you to the knowledge, not of the nature of the
" Gods, which you, Velleius, propoſed to diſcourſe of, but to the nature
" of things, which is quite another conſideration." Or, in clearer terms, it was, he tells us, Velleius's drift to bring men from *Religion* to *Natu-raliſm.* This obſervation is to the purpoſe; and ſhews that Velleius had deviated from his argument. But what M. Pluche makes him ſay, is to nobody's purpoſe but his own. In a word, *quibus explicatis*, &c. relates to all that Cotta had ſaid of the Epicureans—of thoſe who made religion the invention of Stateſmen—of Prodicus Chius—of Euhemerus, and of the *Myſteries.* But M. Pluche makes it relate only to the *Myſteries.* It had hardly been worth while to mention this M. Pluche, had it not been evident, that his purpoſe in this interpretation of Cicero was to diſguiſe the liberty he took of tranſcribing the general explanation of the MYSTERIES, as delivered in the firſt edition of this volume, printed in 1738, into the *ſecond* edition (for when he publiſhed the *firſt*, he knew nothing of the matter) of his book, called *Hiſtoire du Ciel*, printed 1741, without the leaſt notice or acknowledgment. But for a further account of this piece of plagiariſm, I refer the reader to a diſcourſe, intitled *Obſervations ſur l'explication que M. l' Abbé Pluche donne des myſteres & de la mythologie des payens dans ſon Hiſtoire du Ciel*, written with much judgment and ſolidity, by M. de Silhouette: who has intirely ſubverted M. Pluche's fanciful ſyſtem, as well as proved, that he took his idea of the *Myſteries* from the *Divine Legation.* It is in the fifth diſſertation of a work, intitled *Diſſertations ſur l'union de la religion, de la morale, & de la politique.*

P. 193. [F.] *Euſebius* ſays, Scripture tells us this, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ οἱ ἱεροὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς διδάσκουσι λόγοι. And ſo indeed it does even in the general tenor of its hiſtory. But I am perſuaded this learned writer had his eye on ſome particular paſſage; probably on the xlvth chapter of *Iſaiah*, where the prophet, foretelling the conqueſts of *Cyrus*, and the exaltation of his Empire, apoſtrophizes the God of *Iſrael* in this manner, *Verily thou art a God* THAT HIDEST THYSELF, *O God of* Iſrael, *the Saviour*, ver. 15. This was ſaid with great propriety of the Creator of all things, the ſubject of the ΑΠΟΡ-

ΦΗΤΑ,

PHTA, or *Secret*, in all the *Myſteries* throughout the *Gentile* World; and particularly of thoſe of *Mithras*, in that country which was the ſcene of the prophecy. That this is the true ſenſe of this obſcure paſſage, appears from the following words of the ſame chapter, where God himſelf addreſſeth the Jewiſh people: *I have not ſpoken* IN SECRET, IN A DARK PLACE *of the earth: I ſaid not unto the ſeed of* Jacob, *Seek ye me* IN VAIN, ver. 19. This was ſaid, to ſhew that he was taught amongſt them in a different way from that participation of his Nature to a *few ſelect Gentiles*, in their *Myſteries*; celebrated *in ſecret, and in dark* ſubterraneous *places*; which not being done in order to give him glory, by promoting his public and general worſhip, was done *in vain*. Theſe were the two places (explained by one another) which, I preſume, furniſhed *Euſebius* with his obſervation, *That for the* Hebrew *people alone was reſerved the honour of being initiated into the knowledge of God the Creator of all Things, and of being inſtructed in the practice of true piety towards him.*—This naturally leads us to the explanation of thoſe oracles of *Apollo*, quoted by *Euſebius* [*Præp. Evang.* l. ix. c. x.] from *Porphyry*; the ſenſe of which neither thoſe ancient writers, nor our Sir *John Marſham*, ſeem rightly to have underſtood. The firſt is in theſe Words,

Αἰπεινὴ γὰρ ὁδὸς μακάρων, τρηχεῖά τε πολλὸν,
Χαλκοδέτοις τὰ πρῶτα διοιγομένη πυλεῶσιν.
Ἀτραπιτοὶ δὲ ἴασσιν ἀθέσφατοι ἐγγεγαυῖαι,
Ἃς πρῶτοι μερόπων ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πρῆξιν ἔφυσαν
Οἱ τὸ καλὸν πίνοντες ὕδωρ Νειλώτιδος αἴης.

The Way to the Knowledge of the Divine Nature is extremely rugged, and of difficult Aſcent. The Entrance is ſecured by brazen gates, opening to the adventurer; and the winding roads, to be paſſed through, impoſſible to be deſcribed. Theſe, to the vaſt benefit of mankind, were firſt marked out by the EGYPTIANS.

The ſecond is as follows:

Μοῦνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίαν λάχον ἠδ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι,
Αὐτογένεθλον ἄνακτα σεβαζόμενοι Θεὸν ἁγνῶς.

True wiſdom was the lot only of the CHALDEANS *and* HEBREWS, *who worſhip the Governor of the world, the ſelf-exiſtent Deity, with pure and holy rites.*

Marſham,

Marſham, ſuppoſing after *Euſebius*, that the SAME THING was ſpoken of in both the Oracles, ſays, *Certe nulla eſt controverſia quin* περὶ μοναρχίας, *de unius regimine ſive de unica Deo, reverens fuerit & rectiſſima Ebræorum, non item recta Egyptiorum exiſtimatio.* And again,—*Verum Apollo parum ſibi conſtans* [*Canon. Chron.* p. 255, 256. edit. *Fr.*], becauſe in the one Oracle, the *Egyptians* are ſaid to be the *firſt*; and in the other, the *Chaldeans* and *Hebrews* the *only* People who knew the true God. But they are very conſiſtent; they treat of DIFFERENT THINGS: The firſt, of the *Knowledge* of the true God; and the ſecond, of his *public Worſhip.* This appears by the different terms in which the Oracles are delivered: The *Hebrews*, whom the Oracle calls *Chaldæans*, were well known to be the *only* people who *publicly worſhiped* the true God. But the *knowledge* of him being likewiſe taught, though to *few*, all over the *Gentile* world, and only in the *Myſteries*, and the *Myſteries* coming, as we have ſhewn, originally from *Egypt*, the Oracle ſays, that the *Egyptians firſt taught men the knowledge of the divine Natures.* But that it was in *this way*, his words plainly intimate:

Ἀτραπιτοὶ δὲ ἔασσιν ἀθέσφατοι ἐγγεγαυῖαι,

which exactly deſcribe the embarraſſed and perplexed condition of the *Initiated* before they came to the participation of this knowledge. But when the ſame Oracle ſpeaks of the *Hebrews'* knowledge of God, he uſes a very different language,

σεβαζόμενοι Θεὸν ἁγνῶς,

evidently reſpecting the calm and ſettled ſtate of public worſhip. I will only obſerve, that the frights and terrors to which the initiated were expoſed, gave birth to all thoſe metaphorical terms of *Difficulty* and *Danger* ſo conſtantly employed by the *Greek* writers, whenever they ſpeak of the Communication of the true God.

P. 194. [G] What hath been ſaid will give light to a ſtrange ſtory told by Thucydides, Plutarch, Cornelius Nepos, Juſtin, and others, of a debauch and night-ramble of Alcibiades, juſt before his expedition to Syracuſe. In which, they ſay, he revealed to, and acted over with, his companions, the *Myſteries of Ceres*: that he aſſumed the office of *Hierophant*, and called ſome of thoſe he initiated Μύσαι, and others, Ἐποπταί: and that, laſtly, they broke all the ſtatues of Hermes. Theſe are mentioned by the Hiſtorians as diſtinct actions, and unconnected with one another. But now we ſee

their

their relation, and how one aroſe from the other: for Alcibiades having revealed the origin of Polytheiſm and the doctrine of the Unity to his companions, nothing was more natural than for men, heated with wine, to run forth, in a kind of religious fury, and break the ſtatues of their idols. For, what he acted over, was the celebration of the *greater myſteries*, as appears from Plutarch's calling them the *Myſteries of Ceres*, ſhe preſiding in the *greater*, as Proſerpine preſided in the *leſſer*; and from Alcibiades's calling ſome Ἐπόπται, the name of thoſe who participated of the *greater Myſteries*.

P. 201. [H] A criticiſm of that very knowing and ſagacious writer, Father Simon of the Oratory, will ſhew the reader how groundleſs the ſuſpicions of learned men are concerning the genuineneſs of this Fragment. Father Simon imagines that Porphyry forged the hiſtory of Sanchoniatho, under the name of a tranſlation by Philo Byblius; and conjectures that his purpoſe in ſo doing was to ſupport Paganiſm; by taking from it, its *Mythology* and *Allegories*, which the Chriſtian writers perpetually objected to it. "Il ſe peut faire—pour repondre aux objections qu'on leur faiſoit "de toutes parts, ſur ce, que leur Theologie etoit une pure Mythologie— "ils remonterent juſques aux tems qui avoient precedé les allegories & les "fictions des ſacrificateurs." Bib. Crit. vol. I. p. 140. But this learned man totally miſtakes the matter. The Chriſtians objected to vulgar Paganiſm, that the ſtories told of their Gods, were *immoral*. To this their Prieſts and Philoſophers replied, that theſe ſtories were only *mythologic Allegories*, which veiled all the great truths of *Theology*, *Ethics*, and *Phyſics*. The Chriſtians ſaid, this could not be; for that the ſtories of the Gods had a *ſubſtantial foundation in fact*, theſe Gods being only dead men deified, who, in life, had like paſſions and infirmities with other mortals. For the truth of which they appealed to ſuch writers as Sanchoniatho, who had given the Hiſtory both of their mortal and immortal ſtations and conditions. How then could ſo acute an adverſary as Porphyry, deeply engaged in this controverſy, ſo far miſtake the ſtate of the queſtion, and grounds of his defence, as to forge a book in ſupport of his cauſe, which totally overthrew it?

P. 206. [I] Some modern Critics think, with *Theophilus*, that Euhemerus was rightly charged with Atheism; ſome think, with *Clemens Alex.* that he was not. There is a circumſtance in the caſe which ſeems to me deciſive, and would incline one to conclude, concerning him, with the generality

generality of the Ancients: It is this, that the earlier policy of the *Myſteries* and the later of the *Philoſophers* concurring to think it expedient for the ſake of Religion to keep that truth a ſecret which Euhemerus divulged, He who, by divulging it, overthrew Paganiſm, and never troubled himſelf to ſubſtitute any other ſcheme of Public Worſhip in its room, might fairly be ſuppoſed to intend the deſtruction of Religion in general.

P. 209. [K] The celebrated French Poet, in a late work intituled, La Philoſophie de l'Hiſtoire, c. 37. Des Miſteres de Ceres Eleuſine, hath done me the honour of giving his Reader an exact abridgement of all that is here ſaid on the ſubject of the Myſteries: not as collected from the *Divine Legation*, but as the reſult of his own reſearches in Antiquity; ſave that when he ſpeaks of the Sixth Book of Virgil, he ſays: "De tres ſavants "hommes ont prouvé que le ſixiéme livre de l'Enéide n'eſt que la peinture "de ce qui ſe pratiquait dans ces ſpectacles [des Miſteres de Ceres Eleuſ.] "ſi ſecrets & ſi renommés:" and when he ſpeaks of the unity of the Godhead revealed in theſe Myſteries he ſays, "Le ſavant Eveque Warburton, "quoique *tres injuſte dans pluſieurs de ſes deciſions audacieuſes*, donne beau"coup de force à tout ce que *je viens de dire* de la neceſſité de cacher le "dogme de l'unité, &c."

My *audacious deciſions*, I ſuppoſe, are nothing elſe than my unmaſking the ignorance and ill faith of thoſe moderns, which he and his Colleague D'Alembert conſtantly call THE PHILOSOPHERS, meaning thereby all kind of Unbelievers whatſoever.

P. 210. [L] The common reading, in which all the MSS. agree, is, *Quid mihi diſpliceat*, INNOCENTES *poetæ indicant comici*. Victorius conjectured, that, inſtead of *innocentes*, Tully wrote IN NOCTURNIS, which is certainly right. By the *poetæ comici*, I ſuppoſe, Cicero meant the writers of the NEW COMEDY. The abuſes he hints at, as perpetrated in the *Myſteries*, were of a libidinous kind: which occaſioned an intrigue proper for the new comedy. And we may ſee by Fabricius's *Notitia comicorum deperditorum*, *Bibl. Græc.* lib. II. cap. 22. how frequently the writers of the new comedy laid the ſcene of their plots in a religious feſtival or *Myſtery*. Plautus, who copied from them, opens the ſubject of his *Aulularia* in theſe words,

——Senex
Is adoleſcentis illius eſt avunculus,
Qui eam ſtupravit noctu Cereris vigiliis.

P. 210. [M] By *ille* is here meant P. Clodius, the mortal enemy of Cicero. So that his reaſoning ſeems to ſtand thus—"I allow an exception for the Eleuſinian myſteries, on account of their great uſe to civil life. But yet their celebration in the night is attended with ſtrange inconveniencies, as appears from the comic poets. And had this liberty of celebrating nocturnal rites by men and women promiſcuouſly, as in the Eleuſinian *Myſteries*, been practiſed in Rome, what enormities muſt we believe ſuch a one as Clodius would have committed, who contrived to violate the nocturnal rites of the GOOD GODDESS, to which only women were admitted?" For that the Grecian *Myſteries* were thus promiſcuouſly celebrated, appears from what Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis obſerves of the purity of the early Roman worſhip; where no nocturnal vigil (ſays he) was kept promiſcuouſly by men and women, in the celebration of their *Myſteries*. —ὁ διαπαννυχιασμὸς ἐν ἱεροῖς θεῶν, ἀνδρῶν σὺν γυναιξὶν—.

P. 217. [N] After I had thus diſtinguiſhed, as here, and elſewhere (in my diſcourſe on the Sixth Æneis and on the Golden Aſs of Apuleius) the PURE from the CORRUPT *Myſteries*, the reader will be ſurprized at the following paſſage of the very learned and candid Chancellor *Moſheim*—"Pererudite non ita pridem, quanquam non tam ſemper feliciter quam ingenioſe, de MYSTERIIS diſputavit Wilhelmus Warburtonus libro celeberrimo, 'The Divine Legation of Moſes demonſtrated.' Cenſet vir eruditiſſimus, ad humanarum mentium immortalitatem docendam omnia inſtituta fuiſſe MYSTERIA. Dederim, in *nonnullis* religionis illius, quam recta ratio tradit, præcepta inculcata, & publicarum religionum vanitatem patefactam fuiſſe: *omnium vero hanc rationem fuiſſe, nunquam ſibi perſuadebit, qui vel* BACCHI MYSTERIA *cogitaverit, quæ teſte* LIVIO Romani ferre nolebant. *De rebus Chriſtianorum ante Conſtantinum M. Commentarii.* Cap. i. Sect. 13. not. (***). But as to the pure and uncorrupt *Myſteries* of Bacchus, authorized by the magiſtrate, the learned Writer might have ſeen, p. 169, note (‡), that Celſus expreſly affirms, even theſe taught a future ſtate; which truth his adverſary Origen confeſſes.

P. 218. [O] This ſhort hiſtorical deduction of the riſe and fall of the *Myſteries* will afford much light to the following paſſage of St. Paul, ſpeaking of the *leaders* and *inſtructors* of the Gentile world,—"So that they are "without excuſe: becauſe that *when they knew God, they glorified him not* "*as God*, neither were thankful; but became *vain in their imaginations*, "and their fooliſh heart was darkened. Profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe, "they

" they became fools: and *changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an* " *image made like a corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts, and* " *creeping things.* Wherefore God gave them up to *uncleanness*, through " the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between " themselves. Who changed the *truth of God into a lie*, and worshiped " and *served the creature more than the Creator*, who is blessed for ever, " amen. For this cause God gave them up *unto vile affections*," *&c. Rom.* i. 20, *& seq.* In these words, the holy apostle evidently condemns the foolish policy of the Gentile sages, who, *when they knew God* (that is, discovered God, as Paul intimates, by the light of nature) yet *glorified him not as God*, by preaching him up to the people; but, carried away, in the *vanity of their imagination*, by a mistaken principle of politics, that a vulgar knowledge of him would be injurious to society, shut up his *glory* in their MYSTERIES, and gave the people, in exchange for an *uncorruptible God*, *an image made like to corruptible man and birds*, *&c.* Wherefore God, in punishment for their thus *turning his truth into a lie*, suffered even their *Mysteries*, which they erected (though on these wrong principles) for a school of virtue, to degenerate into an odious sink of vice and immorality; *giving them up unto all uncleanness and vile affections.* That this was the apostle's meaning, appears not only from the general tenor of the passage, but from several particular expressions; as where he speaks of *changing the glory of God to birds, beasts, and creeping things:* for this was the peculiar superstition of Egypt: and Egypt we have shewn to be the first inventress of the *Mysteries.* Again, he says, *they worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator*, παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα. This was strictly true with regard to the MYSTERIES: the CREATOR was there acknowledged by a small and select number of the Participants; but the general and solemn worship even in these celebrations was to their national idols. In the OPEN worship of paganism, either *public* or *particular*, it was not at all true, for there the CREATURE was the sole object of adoration.

P. 219. [P] What hath been said above, shews that M. Le Clerc hath gone into the other extreme of party prejudice, when he contends (*Bibl. Univ.* tom. vi. p. 73.) that the *Mysteries* were not corrupted at all. I can conceive no reason for so violent a paradox, but as it favoured an accusation against the *Fathers*, who have much insisted on the corruption of them—" Les peres ont dit qu'on commettoit toute sorte d'ordures dans ces " c éremonies: mais quoi qu'ils disent, il n'est pas croiable que toute la

" Grece, quelque corrompuë qu'elle ait été, ait jamais conſenti que les " filles & les femmes ſe proſtituaſſent dans les myſteres—Mais quelques " auteurs chrétiens n'ont fait aucune difficulté de dire mille choſes peu " conformes à la verité, pour diffamer le paganiſme : de peur qu'il n'y " eût que les payens à qui ou pût reprocher leur calomnies." Bibl. Univ. tom. vi. p. 120.

P. 221. [Q] The reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here an exact account of this whole matter, extracted from a very curious diſſertation of Iſ. Caſaubon, a great and unexceptionable writer, in his Sixteenth Exercitation on the Annals of Baronius.—" Pii patres quum intelligerent, quo facilius ad veritatis amorem corruptas ſuperſtitione mentes traducerent; & " verba ſacrorum illorum quamplurima, in ſuos uſus tranſtulerunt; & " cum doctrinæ veræ capita aliquot ſic tractarunt, tum ritus etiam nonnullos " ejuſmodi inſtituerunt; ut videantur cum Paulo dicere gentibus voluiſſe, " ἃ ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, ταῦτα καταγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν. Hinc igitur eſt, quod ſacramenta patres apellarunt *myſteria*, μυήσεις, τελετὰς, τελειώσεις, ἐποπτείας, ſive " ἐποψείας, τελεσήρια; interdum etiam ὄργια, ſed rarius: peculiariter vero " euchariſtiam τελετῶν τελετήν. Dicitur etiam antonomacite τὸ μυστήριον, aut numero multitudinis τὰ μυστήρια. Apud patres paſſim de ſacra communione leges φρικτὰ μυστήρια vel τὸ εὐπόρρητον μυστήριον; Gregorio Magno, *magnum & pavendum yſterium*. Μυεῖσθαι in veterum monumentis ſæpe leges pro cœnæ dominicæ fieri particeps; μύησιν pro ipſa actione; μύστης eſt ſacerdos, qui etiam dicitur ὁ μυσταγωγῶν & ὁ ἱεροτελεστής. In liturgiis Græcis & alibi etiam ἡ ἱερὰ τελετὴ, & ἡ κρυφία καὶ ἐπίφοβος τελετὴ, eſt euchariſtia. " Quemadmodum autem gradus quidem in myſteriis paganicis ſervati ſunt, ſic Dionyſius univerſam τῶν τελετῶν τὴν ἱερουργίαν, traditionem ſacramentorum diſtinguit in tres actiones, quæ & ritibus & temporibus erant diviſæ: prima eſt κάθαρσις, *purgatio*; altera μύησις, *initiatio*; tertia, τελείωσις, " *conſummatio*; quam & ἐποψίαν ſæpe nominat. Spem meliorem morientibus attuliſſe myſteria Attica dicebat paulo ante M. Tullius. Patres contra, certam ſalutem & vitam æternam Chriſti myſteria digne percipientibus afferre, confirmabant: qui illa contemnerent, ſervari non poſſe: finem vero & fructum ultimum ſacramentorum θέωσιν, *deificationem*, dicere non dubitarunt, quum ſcirent vanarum ſuperſtitionum auctores, ſuis *epoptis* eum honorem audere ſpondere. Paſſim igitur legas apud Patres, τῆς ἱερᾶς μυσταγωγίας τέλος εἶναι θέωσιν, finem ſacramentorum eſſe, ut qui vera fide illa perciperent, in futura vita dii evadant. Athanaſius

" verbo

" verbo διοποιῆσθαι in eam rem eſt uſus; quod mox ab eodem explicatur,
" *participatione ſpiritus conjungimur deitati.* De ſymbolis ſacramentorum,
" per quæ divinæ illæ ceremoniæ celebrantur, nihil attinet hoc loco dicere;
" illud vero, quod eſt & appellatur fidei ſymbolum, diverſi eſt generis, &
" fidelibus teſſeræ uſum præſtat, per quam ſe mutuo agnoſcunt, qui pie-
" tati ſacramento dixerunt; cujuſmodi teſſeras fuiſſe etiam in paganorum
" myſteriis oſtendimus. Formulæ illi in myſteriis peragendis uſurpatæ,
" *Procul eſte profani*, reſpondet in liturgia hæc per diaconos pronuntiari
" ſolita; ὅσοι κατηχούμενοι προέλθετε; vel, ἔξω περιπατεῖτε ὅσοι ἐνεργούμενοι, ὅσοι ἀμύητοι;
" *omnes catechumeni, foras diſcedite, omnes poſſeſſi, omnes non initiati.* Noctu
" ritus multi in myſteriis peragebantur; noctu etiam initiatio Chriſtianorum
" inchoabatur: Gaudentio nominatur *ſplendidiſſima nox vigiliarum.* Quod
" autem dicebamus de ſilentio in ſacris opertaneis ſervari a paginis ſolito,
" id inſtitutum veteres chriſtiani ſic probarunt, ut religioſa ejus obſerva-
" tione myſtas omnes longe ſuperarint. Quemadmodum igitur dicit
" Seneca, ſanctiora ſacrorum ſolis initiatis fuiſſe nota, & Jamblichus de
" Philoſophia Pythagoreorum in τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα, quæ efferri non poterant, &
" τὰ ἔκφορα, quæ foras efferre jus erat; ita univerſam doctrinam chriſtianam
" veteres diſtinguebant in τὰ ἔκφορα, id eſt, ea quæ enuntiari apud omnes
" poterant, & τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα arcana temere non vulganda; τὰ δόγματα, inquit
" Baſilius, σιωπᾶται· τὰ δὲ κηρύγματα δημοσιεύεται, *dogmata ſilentio premuntur*;
" *præconia publicantur.* Chryſoſtomus, de iis qui baptizantur pro mortuis:
" *Cupio quidem perſpicue rem dicere; ſed propter non initiatos non audeo: hi*
" *interpretationem reddunt nobis difficiliorem; dum nos cogunt, aut perſpicue*
" *non dicere, aut arcana, quæ taceri debent, apud ipſos efferre.* Atque ut
" ἐξορχεῖσθαι τὰ μυστήρια dixerunt pagani, de iis qui arcana myſteriorum
" evulgabant; ita dixit Dionyſius, *Vide ne enunties, aut parum reverenter*
" *habeas ſancta ſanctorum.* Paſſim apud Auguſtinum leges, *Sacramentum*
" *quod norunt fideles.* In Johannem tract. xi. autem ſic; *Omnes catechumeni*
" *jam credunt in nomine Chriſti*, SED JESUS NON SE CREDIT EIS. MOX *In-*
" *terrogemus catechumenum, Manducas carnem filii hominis? neſcit quid dici-*
" *mus.* Iterum, *Neſciunt catechumeni quid accipiant chriſtiani: erubeſcant*
" *ergo quia neſciunt.*" But the worſt part of the ſtory is ſtill behind, which the concluding words of the quotation will not ſuffer me to paſs over in ſilence. Theſe Fathers uſed ſo ſtrange a language, in ſpeaking of the *laſt Supper*, that it gave occaſion to a corrupt and barbarous Church, in after-times, to ingraft upon it a doctrine more ſtupendouſly abſurd and blaſ-

blaſphemous than ever iſſued from the mouth of a Pagan Prieſt. What is further to be lamented in the affair is this, that the Fathers, who ſo complaiſantly ſuffered themſelves to be miſled by theſe *Myſteries*, in their repreſentation of the Chriſtian Faith, would not ſuffer the *Myſteries* to ſet them right in the meaning of a term frequently found in the New Teſtament, and borrowed from thoſe Rites, namely the very word itſelf, MYSTERY: which, amongſt the men from whom it was taken, did not ſignify the revealing of a thing incomprehenſible to human reaſon; but the revealing of a thing kept hid, and ſecreted, which yet, in its nature, was very plain and intelligible.

P. 222. [R] Mr. Le Clerc owns, that Plutarch, Diodorus, and Theodoret, have all ſaid this; yet the better to ſupport his ſcheme in the interpretation of the hiſtory of Ceres, he has thought fit to contradict them; but his reaſon is very ſingular:—"C'étoit la coûtume des payens de dire "que des divinitez étoient les mêmes, lors qu'ils avoient remarqué quelque "legere reſſemblance entre elles, *dans la fauſſe penſée où ils etoient que les "plus grands de leurs dieux ſ'étoient fait connoître dans toute la terre:* au "lieu qu'il n'y en avoit aucun qui ne fut TOPIQUE, c'eſt à dire particulier "à un lieu—On en trouvera divers exemples dans le petit traité *De la "deeſſe de Syrie.*" *Bibl. univ.* tom. vi. p. 121. It is very true, that the Gods of the Pagans were local deities; but to think the Ancients could be ignorant of this, when it is from the nature and genius of Paganiſm, as delivered by them, that we come to know it, is a very extraordinary conceit. Indeed the Moderns, poſſeſſed with their own ideas, were and are generally unattentive to this truth; and ſo have committed many errors in their reaſonings on the ſubject. But that principle of the *intercommunity of worſhip* in ancient paganiſm (explained in another place) would have the ſame effect in ſpreading the worſhip, as if their Gods were univerſal and not local; which ſhews the Ancients not miſtaken in the point in queſtion. Yet Mr. Le Clerc, in another place, could ſee that Aſtartè was certainly Iſis, as Adonis was Oſiris; and this, merely from the ſimilitude, or rather, identity of their ceremonies.

Ibid. [S] There is a remarkable paſſage in Syncellus relating to this ſubject, which hath been little underſtood. This Writer ſpeaking, from Africanus, of the very early Egyptian King, Suphis, ſays, Ἅτος δὲ καὶ ΠΕΡΙΟΠΤΗΣ ἐις θεὸς ἐγένετο καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν συνέγραψε βίβλον, *This King was a Contemplator of the Gods, and wrote a ſacred Book.* The Reader may ſee, by what

Sir

Sir J. Marſham hath ſaid on this paſſage [Can. Chron. p. 53.] how much it wants explaining. What increaſes the difficulty is the contrary account which Euſebius, in Syncellus, gives of this matter. He ſays that *this King was a Contemner of the Gods, and that on his repentance he wrote a ſacred book*; ὃς καὶ ΥΠΕΡΟΠΤΗΣ ἐις θεὸς γέγονεν, ὡς μεταγνόσαντα αὐτὸν τὴν ἱερὰν συγγράψαι βίβλον. Theſe obſcure and inconſiſtent tracts of Hiſtory can be only explained and reconciled by what is here delivered concerning the *Myſteries* (originally Egyptian) which had for their grand *ſecrets* or ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ the detection of Polytheiſm, and the doctrine of the firſt Cauſe. I regard therefore this paſſage of Africanus, as a remarkable piece of hiſtory, which conveys to us the memory of the firſt Inſtitutor of the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ of the *Myſteries*. The term περίοπτης peculiar to theſe Rites, and the ἱερὰ βίβλος, the name of that book which was read to the Initiated, very much ſupport this interpretation. To which let me add this further circumſtance :— Suphis, according to Marſham, died about forty years after Abraham. The Patriarch without queſtion inſtructed the idolatrous Egyptians in the knowledge of the true God. Suphis therefore might take advantage of that knowledge (which he found amongſt the prieſts, with whom Abraham, as Damaſcenus in Euſebius informs us, had many diſputes and conferences about Religion) and apply it to this purpoſe: And then Euſebius's account that Suphis was *a contemner of the Gods* will be ſo far from giving us any trouble to reconcile it to Africanus's, who calls this ſame Suphis a *Contemplator* of them, that they jointly tend to elucidate the general ſubject. For if Suphis inſtituted ἀπόῤῥητα in his *Myſteries*, which expoſed and diſgraced Polytheiſm, he certainly would be eſteemed, by all thoſe who had heard it, as an ATHEIST or *Contemner of the Gods*; the character given to all who oppoſed Polytheiſm both in the earlier and later times of Paganiſm. Now Euſebius finding this charged upon Suphis, by the ſame authority which ſays he *wrote a ſacred Book*, not apprehending to what the thing referred, and not conceiving how a *prophane* man ſhould be diſpoſed to *write a ſacred Book* or a Ritual of Worſhip, he tried to reconcile matters, by ſuppoſing that the Monarch repented of his *impiety* before he wrote his *book*. Laſtly, to confirm all that hath been here ſaid, we may obſerve, that the mode of ſpeech here uſed concerning Suphis, is the very ſame which the Egyptian Chroniclers employ when they ſpeak more plainly of the INITIATIONS of their ſucceeding Kings. Joſephus from Manetho, ſpeaking of Amenophis, hath a remarkable paſſage to this

this purpoſe. Φησὶ τοῦτον ἐπιθυμῆσαι Θεῶν γενέσθαι ΘΕΑΤΗΝ, ὥσπερ Ὧρος εἷς τῶν πρὸ αὐτὸν βεβασιλευκότων· ἀνενεγκεῖν δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὁμωνύμῳ μὲν αὐτῷ Ἀμενώφει, παιδὸς δὲ Παάπιος ὄντι, θείως δὲ δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέναι φύσεως, κατά τε σοφίαν καὶ πρόγνωσιν τῶν ἐσομένων· εἰπεῖν δ' ἂν αὐτῷ τοῦτον τὸν ὁμώνυμον, ὅτι δυνήσεται Θεοὺς ΙΔΕΙΝ, εἰ καθαρὰν ἀπό τε λεπρῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μικρῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν χώραν ἅπασαν ποιήσειεν. [*Cont. Apion.* l. i. c. 26.] "He ſays, that Amenophis *deſired to be made a Contemplator* " of the Gods, as was Orus one of his Predeceſſors in the Kingdom: and " that he communicated this deſire to his nameſake Amenophis, the ſon " of Papis, who, by his wiſdom and preſcience of futurity, was under- " ſtood to have *participated of the Divine Nature.* His nameſake hereupon " told him that he might have the Privilege of *ſeeing the Gods*, if he would " *purge* the whole country from leprous and *unclean* perſons." We ſee plainly that what was here deſired by Amenophis, of his nameſake, was an INITIATION. This ſon of Papis appears to have been the HIEROPHANT of the *Myſteries*, and under that character celebrated for his ſkill in *divining*. The requeſt is enforced by the favour granted to his Predeceſſor, Orus, as Æneas's requeſt to the Sibyl, that he might viſit the infernal Regions, by the example of Orpheus, Hercules, &c.

" Si potuit Manis arceſſere conjugis Orpheus, &c."

The propoſed adventures are related in the high terms of *ſeeing the Gods* and *viſiting the infernal Regions*, agreeably to what has been, and will preſently be further explained concerning this ſublime phraſeology, ariſing partly from the high veneration paid to *initiation* into the *Myſteries*, and partly from the amazement occaſioned by the *Shews* and the *Machinery* exhibited in the celebration of them. The *Aſpirant* is required by his nameſake the *Hierophant*, to purify the land from the *unclean*, in conformity to thoſe previous ceremonies of luſtration which we have ſhewn were to be performed before admiſſion to the *Myſteries*. And now we ſee of how little avail, to the ſervice of infidelity, that *Parallel* is, which Sir J. Marſham has drawn between all theſe paſſages from Africanus and Manatho, and Moſes's *Viſions of God* at the *Buſh* and in the *Mount*.

P. 231. [T] Ulyſſes, in Homer, mentions both theſe ſorts in the following lines,

Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἴ μ'——
Φήμην τίς μοι φάσθω ἐγειρομένων ἀνθρώπων
Ἔνδοθεν, ἔκλυσθεν δὲ Διὸς τέρας ἄλλο φχνήτω.

The

The word *omen* in its proper ſenſe ſignifies *futuræ rei ſignum, quod ex ſermone loquentis capitur.* Tully ſays, lib. i. *Divin.* "Pythagorei non ſolum voces "deorum obſervarunt, ſed etiam hominum, quæ vocant omina." This ſort of omen was ſuppoſed to depend much upon the will of the perſon concerned in the event. Hence the phraſes *accepit omen, arripuit omen.* This, as we ſay, was its firſt and proper ſignification. It was afterwards applied to *things*, as well as *words*. So Paterculus, ſpeaking of the head of Sulpicius on the roſtrum, ſays it was *velut omen imminentis proſcriptionis.* And Suetonius of Auguſtus: "Auſpicia quædam & omina pro certiſſimis "obſervabat. Si mane ſibi calceus perperam, ac ſiniſter pro dextero in- "duceretur, ut dirum." It was uſed ſtill in a larger ſenſe to ſignify an *augury*, as by Tully, *De Div.* lib. i.

Sic aquilæ clarum firmavit Jupiter *omen.*

And laſtly, in the moſt general ſenſe of all, for a portent or *prodigy* in general, as in the place before us.

P. 239. [U] The Etruſci ſeem to have had the ſame cuſtom, in which the public repoſed its laſt confidence. Livy tells us, that in the 444th year of Rome, when the affairs of this people were grown deſperate by the repeated defeats of their armies, they had recourſe to the *lex ſacra*, as their laſt refuge. Of which the hiſtorian gives this ſuccinct and obſcure account,—"ad Vadimoniis lacum Etruſci *lege ſacrata* coacto exercitu, "quum *vir virum legiſſet*, quantis nunquam alias ante ſimul copiis, ſimul "*animis* dimicarunt," &c. lib. ix. The commentators are at a loſs for the meaning of this *ſacred law*, in raiſing an army where every ſoldier was to chuſe his fellow. I certainly think it to be the Inſtitution in queſtion: the Etruſci were deſcended from the Pelaſgi, and had afterwards civilized and poliſhed themſelves by Grecian cuſtoms, as one may well ſuppoſe from the character Livy gives of them in this book—"Cære educatus "apud hoſpites, Etruſcis inde literis eruditus erat:—habet autores, vulgo "tum Romanos pueros, ſicut nunc Græcis, ita *Etruſcis literis* erudiri ſoli- "tos." But, in general, the giving a traditive original even to the moſt characteriſtic cuſtoms, is very fallacious. MAHOMET, who certainly did not BORROW from the ancient Grecian practices, yet eſtabliſhed the ſame kind of Fraternity amongſt his followers, in the firſt year of the Hegira. See Abul-feda *De vita Mahommedis*, cap. 26. init. *De Fraternitate inſtituta inter Moſlemos.* And, what is ſtill more extraordinary, the Miſſion-

aries assure us, that it is one of the most sacred Institutions amongst the warrior-nations of the free people in North America. Which, because it so exactly resembles the Grecian in all its circumstances, I shall give, as I find it described by one of their best writers. "Chacun parmi eux a un "ami à peu pres de son age, auquel il s'attache, et qui s'attache à lui par "des liens indissolubles. Deux hommes ainsi unis pour leur intérêt com- "mun, doivent tout faire & tout risquer pour s'entr'aider, & se secourir "mutuellement: *la mort même, à ce qu'ils croyent, ne les separe que pour un* "*tems: ils comptent bien de se rejoindre dans l'autre monde pour ne se plus* "*quitter*, persuadés qu'ils y auront encore besoin l'un de l'autre.—On "ajoute, que ces amis, quand ils se trouvent eloignés les uns des autres, "s'invoquent reciproquement dans les périls, ou ils se recontrent; ce "qu'il faut sans doute entendre de leurs genies tutélaires. *Les* PRESENS "*sont les noeuds de ces associations*, l'intérêt & le besoin les fortifient; c'est "un secours sur lequel on peut presque toujours compter.—*Quelques uns* "*pretendent qu'ils s'y glisse du desordre*; mais j'ai sujet de croire qu'au moiens "cela n'est pas general." Journal d'un Voyage dans l'Amerique Septentrio- nale par le P. de Charlevoix, tome vi. p. 14.

P. 241. [X] One can hardly account for that strange mistake of the Abbé Velly in his elegant History of France, where speaking of these *fraternities in arms* amongst the *Northern* Nations (for nature dictates the same practice to all, in the same circumstances), he says—"On n'en trouve "AUCUN VESTIGE chez ces fieres Republiques qui s'etoient attribué l'esprit "et la politesse à l'exclusion de tout autre Peuple: mais elles sont de toute "ancienneté chez les Nations Septentrionales, que la Grece et l'Italie "plutôt civilisées ont juge àpropos de nommer Sauvages et Barbares." Tom. v. p. 58.

P. 244. [Y] Hence the reader will be able to judge of the delicacy of taste, and accuracy of discernment, in a late Writer; who, in a book called *Elements of Criticism*, corrects Virgil's want of judgement in this part of the *Æneis*, after having given instances of defects full as notorious, in the *Georgics*. "An episode in a narrative Poem (says this Man of Taste) "being, in effect, an Accessory, demands not that strict union with the "principal subject, which is requisite betwixt a whole and its constituent "parts. The relation, however, of *Principal* and *Accessory* being pretty in- "timate, an Episode LOOSELY connected with the principal subject will

"never

" never be graceful. I GIVE FOR AN EXAMPLE *the deſcent of Æneas into* " *Hell*, which employs the Sixth Book of the Æneid. The Reader IS NOT " PREPARED for this important event. No CAUSE IS ASSIGNED that can " make it appear NECESSARY, or even natural, to ſuſpend, for ſo long a " time, the principal action," &c. &c. vol. I. p. 38.—The Critic having told us that *a ſtrict union is not required between the Principal and Acceſſory*, finds fault with the *Acceſſory*, that no cauſe is given to make it appear, that it is NECESSARY to the *principal*. However, I ought not to be too ſevere on this great Critic, ſince the Obſervation was certainly made on purpoſe to recommend my interpretation of this *deſcent into Hell*; which ſhews, if not the *neceſſity*, yet the infinite grace and beauty of this noble *Acceſſory*, and the cloſe and *natural* connexion it has with its *Principal*.

P. 251. [Z] But Servius, in his explanation of the *branch*, went upon the abſurd ſuppoſition that Æneas's deſcent into hell was the ſame with that of Ulyſſes, in Homer, *a necromantic incantation* by ſacrifice, to call up the ſhadows of the dead. " Ramus enim neceſſe erat, ut & unius cauſa " eſſet interitus, unde & ſtatim mortem ſubjungit Miſeni: & ad ſacra " Proſerpinæ accedere, niſi ſublato ramo non poterat. Inferos autem ſub- " ire, hoc dicit ſacra celebrare Proſerpinæ." And again, ad ver. 149. " *Præterea jacet exanimum tibi corpus amici.* Ac ſi diceret; Eſt & alia op- " portunitas deſcendendi ad inferos, id eſt, Proſerpinæ ſacra peragendi. " Duo enim horum ſacrorum genera fuiſſe dicuntur; unum NEKYOMAN- " TIÆ, quod Lucanus exſequitur; & aliud SCIOMANTIÆ, id eſt, divina- " tionis per umbras; σκία enim umbra eſt, & μαντεία, vaticinium, quod in " *Homero, quem Virgilius ſequitur*, lectum eſt."

P. 252. [AA] The learned Selden, in his comment on the ninth book of *Poly-olbion*, ſeems to approve the abſurd conjecture of P. Crinitus, that the *golden-bough* ſignifies *miſletoe:* and would confirm it by that very reaſon, which abſolutely overthrows it; viz. that Virgil COMPARES it to the *miſletoe:* for it is contrary to all the rules of good writing, whether ſimply figurative, or allegoric, to make the *compariſon to the cover, the contents of the cover*; a COMPARISON neceſſarily implying, that the thing, to which another is compared, ſhould be different from that other.

P. 268. [BB] The very learned Mr. Dacier tranſlates ἐν ἀπορρήτοις, *dans les Myſteres*; and this agreeably to his knowledge of antiquity. For ἀπόρρητα was uſed by the ancients, to ſignify not only the grand ſecret taught in the

Myſteries, but the *Myſteries* themſelves; as appears from innumerable places in their writings. Yet the celebrated French tranſlator of Puffendorf's *Law of Nature and Nations*, lib. ii. cap. 4. § 19. note (1), accuſes him of not underſtanding his author: "Mr. Dacier fait dire à Platon que "*l'on tenoit tous les jours ces diſcours au peuple dans les ceremonies & dans* "*les Myſteres*. Il ſeroit à ſouhaiter qu'il eût allégué quelque autorité pour "etablir un fait ſi remarquable. Mais il s'agit ici manifeſtement des in- "ſtructions ſecrétes que les Pythagoriciens donnoient à leurs initiez, & "leſquelles ils decouvroient les raiſons les plus abſtruſes, & les plus par- "ticuliers des dogmes de leur philoſophie. Ces inſtructions cachées s'ap- "pelloient ἀπόῤῥητα——Ce que Platon dit un peu auparavant de Philolaus, "philoſophe Pythagoricien, ne permit pas de douter que la raiſon, qu'il "rapporte ici comme trop abſtruſe & difficile à comprendre, ne ſoit celle "que donnoient les Pythagoriciens." He ſays, *it were to be wiſhed Dacier had ſome authority for ſo remarkable a fact*. He hath this very paſſage, which is ſufficient; for the word ἀπόῤῥητα can mean no other than the *Myſteries*. But thoſe who want further authority, may have enough of it, in the nature and end of the *Myſteries*, as explained above.—He ſays, "It "is evident, Plato is here talking of the ſecret inſtructions which the "Pythagoreans gave to their Initiated, in which they diſcovered their "moſt abſtruſe and particular doctrines." This cannot be ſo, for a very plain reaſon. The philoſophy of the Pythagoreans, like that of the other ſects, was divided into the *exoteric* and *eſoteric*; the *open*, taught to all; and the *ſecret*, taught to a ſelect number. But the *impiety of ſuicide* was in the firſt claſs, as a doctrine ſerviceable to ſociety: "Vetatque Pythagoras in- "juſſu imperatoris, id eſt, Dei, de præſidio & ſtatione vitæ decedere," ſays Tully, in his book *Of old age*; who, in his *Dream of Scipio*, written in the *exoteric* way, condemns *ſuicide* for the very ſame reaſon; but in an epiſtle to a particular friend, which certainly was of the *eſoteric* kind, he approves of it; "Ceteri quidem, Pompeius, Lentulus tuus, Scipio, Afra- "nius, fœde perierunt. At Cato PRÆCLARE. Jam iſtuc quidem, cum "volemus, licebit." lib. ix. ep. 18. It could not be, therefore, that the impiety of *ſuicide* ſhould be reckoned amongſt the ἀπόῤῥητα of philoſophy, ſince it was one of their *popular* doctrines. But this will be fuller ſeen, when we come to ſpeak of the philoſophers, in the next book. Mr. Barbeyrac concludes, that, "as Plato had ſpoken of Philolaus a little before, "it cannot be doubted but that he ſpeaks of the reaſon againſt *ſuicide*, "as

"as a doctrine of the Pythagorean philoſophy." What has been ſaid above, utterly excludes this interpretation. But though it did not, there is nothing in the context which ſhews, Plato thought of Philolaus in this place. It is allowed, this was a doctrine of the Pythagoric ſchool, though not of the *eſoteric* kind. The *Myſteries*, and that School, held a number of things in common; this has been ſhewn, in part, already: and when we come to ſpeak of Pythagoras, it will be ſeen how it happened.

P. 269. [CC] We may well judge it to be ſo, when we find it amongſt the CHINESE (ſee *M. Polo.* lib. ii. cap. 28.) and the ARABIANS, the two people leaſt corrupted by foreign manners, and the vicious cuſtoms of more civilized nations. The Arabians, particularly, living much in a ſtate of nature, where mens wants are few, and conſequently where there is ſmall temptation to this unnatural crime, yet were become ſo prone to it, that their lawgiver Mahomet found it neceſſary to exact an oath of the Arabian women, not to deſtroy their children. The form of this oath is given us by Gagnier, in his notes on Abel-feda's *Life of Mahomet*, and it is in theſe words; "—Ne deo rem ullam aſſocient; ne furentur; ne fornicen-"tur; NE LIBEROS SUOS OCCIDANT [metu paupertatis uti habetur, *Sur* "vi. v. 151.] neque inobedientes ſint Apoſtolo Dei, in eo quod juſtum eſt." p. 41. n. (a).

P. 270. [DD] The Egyptian laws were ſaid to have been of Iſis's own appointment. This will ſhew us with what judgment and addreſs Ovid has told the tale of Lidgus the Cretan, in his *Metamorphoſis*; (of the nature and art of which Work more will be obſerved hereafter.) Lidgus (in the ixth book, fab. 12.) is repreſented as commanding his pregnant wife, Telethuſa, to deſtroy the expected infant, if it proved a female. Yet is this Cretan thus characterized,

vita fideſque
Inculpata fuit——

in a word, juſt ſuch another as Terence's man of univerſal benevolence, (mentioned above) the Author of the famous maxim, *homo ſum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*, and of the very ſame command of infanticide to his Wife; who for not obeying it is reckoned by him, amongſt thoſe, *qui neque jus neque bonum atque æquum ſciunt.* Telethuſa, however, as common as ſuch a command was, and as indifferent as it was eſteemed, is much alarmed with the apprehenſion of falling into the cruel ſituation of being

obliged

obliged to execute it. In this diſtreſs Iſis appears to her in a dream, promiſes her aſſiſtance, and orders her to deceive her huſband, and bring up whatever the Gods ſhould ſend :

Pone graves curas, mandataque falle mariti;
Nec dubita, cum te partu Lucina levârit,
Tollere quicquid erit——

Ovid's moral of his tale is this, " That Egypt had oppoſed very wiſe and " humane laws to the horrid practice of INFANTICIDE, now become ge- " neral, and continuing unchecked by all other civil inſtitutions."

P. 309. [EE]. On what is here ſaid concerning the Character of Æmilianus the moſt learned Chancellor Moſheim obſerves as follows : " Platonicis Chriſtianam Religionem aſtu ſubvertere ſtudentibus, APULEIUM non ita pridem addidit vir ingenio æque magnus atque doctrina, *Guil. Warburtonus* in *Demonſtratione divinæ Legationis Moſis*. Hunc enim in notiſſima illa de aureo Aſino fabula ſeu *Metamorphoſi* id egiſſe putat, ut *Myſteria* Deorum ſumma virtute ad ſanandas & purgandas hominum mentes eſſe prædita, ſacriſque Chriſtianis idcirco longe anteferenda, demonſtraret, hominem nempe imprimis ſuperſtitioſum, Chriſtianiſque et publico Sectæ, quam probabat, & privato nomine inimicum. Obſervavit Vir egregius qua eſt ſagacitate, rerumque veterum peritia, in Apuleio nonnulla nemini ante ipſum obſervata : in quibus id placet maxime, quod LICINIUM ÆMILIANUM, qui APULEIUM apud Africæ Proconſul *Magiæ* accuſaverat CHRISTIANUM fuiſſe ex *Apologia*, quæ extat, accuſati, non ſine magna veri ſpecie ſuſpicatur. De conſilio vero *Fabulæ de Aſino*, quod commentationem *Myſteriorum* et Chriſtianæ Religionis contemtionem vir doctiſſimus eſſe conjicit, dubitare mihi liceat, quum nihil afferri videam ex ea, quod difficulter in aliam partem accipi poſſit." *De rebus Chriſt. ante Conſtant. M. Commentarii* Seculum tert. Sect. 21. not. (***) The Engliſh of which concluſion amounts to this, " That another interpretation might be given of the *Golden Aſs*." I believe ſo. It might be ſhewn to contain a proceſs for the diſcovery of the *Philoſopher's Stone*. And a certain German Chymiſt, if I be not miſtaken, has extracted this ſecret out of the *Fable*.

CONTI-

CONTINUATION OF BOOK II.

SECT. V.

HITHERTO we have ſhewn the Magiſtrate's care in PROPAGATING the belief of a God—of his Providence over human affairs—and of the way in which that Providence is chiefly diſpenſed; namely, by rewards and puniſhments in a *future ſtate*. Theſe things make the eſſence of Religion, and compoſe the body of it.

His next care was for the SUPPORT of Religion, ſo propagated. And this was done by UNITING it to the State, taking it under the civil protection, and giving it the rights and privileges of an ESTABLISHMENT. Accordingly we find that all ſtates and people, in the ancient world, had an ESTABLISHED RELIGION; which was under the more *immediate* protection of the civil Magiſtrate, in contradiſtinction to thoſe which were only TOLERATED.

How cloſe theſe two Intereſts were united in the Egyptian Policy, is well known to all acquainted with Antiquity. Nor were the politeſt Republics leſs ſolicitous for the common intereſts of the two Societies, than that ſage and powerful Monarchy (the nurſe of arts and virtue) as we ſhall ſee hereafter, in the conduct both of Rome and Athens, for the ſupport and preſervation of the *eſtabliſhed* worſhip.

But

But an *eſtabliſhed Religion* is the voice of Nature; and not confined to certain ages, people, or religions. That great voyager and ſenſible obſerver of men and manners, J. Baptiſte Tavernier, ſpeaking of the kingdom of Tunquin, thus delivers himſelf concerning this univerſal policy, as he ſaw it practiſed, in his time, both in the Eaſt and Weſt: "I come now to the political deſcrip-" tion of this kingdom, under which I comprehend the religion, " which is, *almoſt every where, in concert with the civil government*, " *for the mutual ſupport of one another* *."

That the Magiſtrate *eſtabliſhed* Religion, united it to the State, and took it into his immediate protection for the ſake of civil Society, cannot be queſtioned; the advantages to Government being ſo apparent.

But the neceſſity of this union for procuring thoſe advantages, as likewiſe the number and extent of them, are not ſo eaſily underſtood. Nor indeed can they be underſtood without a perfect knowledge of the nature of an ESTABLISHED RELIGION, and of thoſe principles of equity, on which it ariſeth. But as this maſterpiece of human policy hath been of late, though but of late, called in queſtion, after having from the firſt inſtitution of Society, even to the preſent age, been univerſally practiſed by the Magiſtrate, and as univerſally approved by philoſophers and divines; and as our queſtion is the conduct of Lawgivers, and legitimate Magiſtrates, whoſe inſtitutions are to be defended on the rules of reaſon and equity; not of Tyrants, who ſet themſelves above both; it will not be improper to examine this matter to the bottom; eſpecially as the enquiry is ſo neceſſary to a perfect knowledge of the civil advantages, reſulting from an *eſtabliſhed religion*.

We muſt at preſent then lay aſide our ideas of the ancient modes of civil and religious ſocieties; and ſearch what they are in themſelves, by nature; and thence deduce the inſtitution in queſtion.

* Je viens à la deſcription politique de ce royaume, dans laquelle je comprens la religion, qui eſt *preſque en tous lieux de concert avec le gouvernement civil pour l'appuy reciproque de l'un et de l'autre*. Relation nouvelle du Royaume de Tunquin, c. x. à la fin.

I ſhall

I ſhall do this in as few words as poſſible; and refer thoſe, who deſire a fuller account of this matter, to a ſeparate diſcourſe, intituled, THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

In the beginning of the firſt book, where we ſpeak of the origin of civil Society, the reader may remember we have ſhewn the natural deficiency of its plan; and how the influence and ſanction of *Religion* only can ſupply that defect.

Religion then being proved neceſſary to Society; that it ſhould be ſo uſed and applied, and in the beſt way, and to moſt advantage, needs no proof. For it is as inſtinctive in our nature to improve, as to inveſtigate and purſue Good: and with regard to the improvement of this in queſtion, there is ſpecial reaſon why it ſhould be ſtudied. For the experience of every place and age informs us, that the coactivity of *civil Laws and Religion*, is little enough to keep men from running into diſorder and mutual violence.

But this improvement is the effect of art and contrivance. For all natural Good, every thing conſtitutionally beneficial to man, needs man's induſtry to make it better. We receive it at the provident hand of Heaven, rather with a capacity of being applied to our uſe, than immediately fitted for our ſervice. We receive it indeed, in full meaſure, but rude and unprepared.

Now, concerning this technical improvement of moral good, it is in *artificial* bodies as in *natural*; *two* may be ſo eſſentially conſtituted, as to be greatly able to adorn and ſtrengthen one another: But then, as in this caſe, a mere juxta-poſition of the parts is not ſufficient; ſo neither is it in that: ſome union, ſome coalition, ſome artful inſertion into each other will be neceſſary.

But then again, as in natural bodies the artiſt is unable to ſet about the proper operation, till he hath acquired a competent knowledge of the nature of thoſe bodies, which are the ſubject of his ſkill; ſo neither can we know in what manner Religion may be beſt applied to the ſervice of the State, till we have learned the real

and eſſential natures both of a *State* and a *Religion*. The *obvious* qualities of both ſufficiently ſhew, that they muſt needs have a good effect on each other, when properly applied; (as our artiſt, by his knowledge of the obvious qualities of two natural bodies, we ſuppoſe, may make the like concluſion) though we have not yet got ſufficient acquaintance with them to make the proper application.

It behoves us therefore to gain a right knowledge of the nature both of a *civil* and of a *religious* Society.

I. To begin with *civil Society*: It was inſtituted either with the purpoſe of attaining all the good of every kind, it was even accidentally capable of producing; or only of ſome certain good, which the Inſtitutors had in view, unconcerned with, and unattentive to any other. To ſuppoſe its end to be the vague purpoſe of acquiring all poſſible accidental good, is, in politics, a mere ſoleciſm; as hath been ſufficiently ſhewn by the writers on this queſtion *. And how untrue it is in fact, may be gathered from what hath been ſaid in the beginning, of the origin of Society. Civil ſociety then, I ſuppoſe, will be allowed to have been inſtituted for the attainment of ſome certain end or ends, excluſive of others: and this implies the neceſſity of diſtinguiſhing this end from others. Which diſtinction ariſes from the different properties of the things pretending. But again, amongſt all thoſe things, which are apt to obtrude, or have, in fact, obtruded upon men, as the ends of civil government, there is only this difference in their properties, as ends; *That, one of them is attainable by civil Society only, and all the reſt are eaſily obtained without it.* The thing then with that property or quality muſt needs be the genuine end of *civil Society*. And this end is no other than SECURITY TO THE TEMPORAL LIBERTY AND PROPERTY OF MAN. For this end (as we have ſhewn) civil Society was invented; and *this*, civil Society alone is

* See Locke's Defences of his Letters on Toleration. This appears to have been Ariſtotle's opinion——*φύσει μὲν ὃν διώρισαι τὸ θῆλυ, καὶ τὸ ἄῤῥεν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἡ φύσις ποιεῖ τοιοῦτον, οἷον χαλκοτύποι τὴν Δελφικὴν μάχαιραν ποικιλῶς, ἀλλ' ἓν πρὸς ἕν*, &c. Polit. l. i. c. 2.

able

able to procure. The great, but ſpurious rival of this end, the SALVATION OF SOULS, or the ſecurity of man's *future* happineſs, belongs therefore to the other diviſion. For *this* not depending on outward accidents, or on the will or power of another, as the body and goods do, may be as well attained in a ſtate of nature, as in civil ſociety; and therefore, on the principles here delivered, cannot be one of the cauſes of the inſtitution of civil government; nor, conſequently, one of the ends thereof. But if ſo, the promotion of it comes not within the proper province of the Magiſtrate.

II. *Secondly*, as to religious Society, or a Church. This being inſtituted to preſerve purity of faith and worſhip, its ultimate end is the SALVATION OF SOULS: From whence it follows,

1. That *the religious Society muſt needs be* SOVEREIGN, and INDEPENDENT ON THE CIVIL. Natural dependency of one Society on another, ariſes either from the *law of nature*, or *of nations*. Dependency by the *law of nature*, is from *eſſence* or *generation*. Dependency from *eſſence* there can be none. For this kind of dependency being a mode of natural union and coalition; and coalition being only where there is an agreement *in eodem tertio*; and there being no ſuch agreement between two Societies eſſentially different, as theſe are, there can poſſibly be no dependency. Dependency from *generation* is where one Society ſprings up from another; as corporations, colleges, companies, and chambers, in a city. Theſe, as well by the conformity of their ends and means, as by their charters of incorporation, betray their original and dependency. But *religious Society*, by ends and means quite different, gives internal proof of its not ariſing from the State; and we have ſhewn by external evidence *, that it exiſted before the ſtate had any being. Again, no dependency can ariſe from the *law of nations*, or the *civil law*. Dependency by this law is, where one and the ſame people compoſing two different Societies, the *imperium* of the

* See Book III. ſect. 6.

one clashes with the *imperium* of the other. And, in such case, the lesser Society becomes, by that law, dependent on the greater; because the not being so, would make that absurdity in politics, called *imperium in imperio*. But now *civil* and *religious* Society, having ends and means entirely different; and the means of *civil* Society being *coercive* power, which power therefore the *religious* hath not; it follows, that the administration of each Society is exercised in so remote spheres, that they can never meet to clash: And those Societies which never clash, necessity of state cannot bring into dependency on one another.

2. It follows, *That this independent religious Society hath not, in and of itself, any coactive power of the civil kind:* Its inherent jurisdiction being, in its nature and use, entirely different from that of the State. For if, as hath been proved, *civil Society* was instituted for the attainment of one species of good (all other good, requisite to human happiness, being to be attained without it) and that *civil Society* attains the good, for which it was ordained, by the *sole* mean of coercive power; then it follows, that the good, which any other kind of Society seeks, may be attained without that power; consequently, *coercive* power is unnecessary to a *religious Society*. But that mean, which is *unnecessary* for the attainment of any end, is likewise *unfit*; in all cases, but in that, where such mean is rendered unnecessary by the use of other means of the same kind or species. But *religious society* attains its end by means of a different kind; therefore *coercive* power is not only unnecessary, but unfit. Again, Ends, in their nature different, can never be attained by one and the same mean. Thus in the case before us: *coercive* power can only influence us to outward practice; by outward practice only, is the good which *civil Society* aims at, immediately effected; therefore is *coercive* power peculiarly fit for *civil Society*. But the good, which *religious Society* aims at, cannot be effected by outward practice; therefore *coercive* power is altogether unfit for *this* Society.

Having

Having thus by a diligent enquiry found,

I. Firſt, *That the care of the civil Society extends only to the body, and its concerns; and the care of the religious Society only to the ſoul:* it neceſſarily follows, that the civil Magiſtrate, if he will improve this natural influence of Religion by human art and contrivance, muſt ſeek ſome UNION or ALLIANCE with the *Church.* For his office not extending to the *care of ſouls,* he hath not, in himſelf, power to enforce the influence of religion: and the *Church's* province not extending to the *body,* and conſequently being without coactive power, ſhe has not, in herſelf alone, a power of applying that influence to *civil* purpoſes. The concluſion is, that their joint powers muſt co-operate thus to apply and inforce the influence of *religion.* But they can never act conjointly but in *union* and *alliance.*

II. *Secondly,* having found *that each ſociety is ſovereign, and independent on the other,* it as neceſſarily follows, that ſuch *union* can be produced only by FREE CONVENTION AND MUTUAL COMPACT: becauſe, whatever is ſovereign and independent, can be brought to no act without its own conſent: but nothing can give birth to a *free convention,* but a ſenſe of mutual wants, which may be ſupplied; or a view of mutual benefits, which may be gained by it.

Such then is the nature of that *Union* which produceth a RELIGION BY LAW ESTABLISHED: and which is, indeed, no other than *a public league and alliance for mutual ſupport and defence.* For the *State* not having the *care of ſouls,* cannot inforce the influence of *religion*; and therefore ſeeks the concurring aid of the *Church:* and the *Church* having no *coercive power* (the conſequence of its care's not extending to *bodies*) as naturally flies for protection to the *State:* this being of that kind of *Alliance* which Grotius calls FOEDUS INÆQUALE——"Inæquale fœdus (ſays he) hic intelligo quod ex "ipſa vi pactionis *manentem prælationem* quandam alteri donat: hoc "eſt, ubi quis tenetur alterius imperium ac majeſtatem conſervare

"UT

"UT POTENTIORI PLUS HONORIS, INFIRMIORI PLUS AUXILII DE-
"FERATUR *."

An *Alliance*, then, *by free convention*, being in its nature ſuch that each party muſt have its motives for contracting; our next enquiry will be,

I. What thoſe motives were, which the State had for *ſeeking*, and the Church for *accepting*, the offers of an union: And,

II. The *mutual benefits* and advantages thereby ariſing.

The motives the Magiſtrate had to ſeek this *alliance*, were theſe:

I. To preſerve the eſſence and purity of religion.

II. To improve its uſefulneſs, and apply its influence in the beſt manner.

III. To prevent the miſchief which, in its natural independent ſtate, it might occaſion to civil ſociety.

I. The Magiſtrate was induced to ſeek it, 1. *As the neceſſary means of preſerving the being of religion.* For though (as hath been ſhewn in the treatiſe of *the Alliance* †) religion conſtitutes a Society; and though this Society will indeed, for ſome time, ſupport the exiſtence of religion, which, without it, would ſoon vaniſh from amongſt men; yet, if we conſider that religious Society is made up of the ſame individuals which compoſe the civil; and deſtitute likewiſe of all coercive power; we muſt needs ſee, that a Society, abandoned to its own fortune, without ſupport or protection, would, in no long time, be ſwallowed up and loſt. Of this opinion was a very able writer, whoſe knowledge of human nature will not be diſputed: "Were it not, ſays he, for that ſenſe of "virtue, which is principally preſerved, ſo far as it is preſerved, "BY NATIONAL FORMS AND HABITS OF RELIGION, men would "ſoon loſe it all, run wild, prey upon one another, and do what "elſe the worſt of ſavages do ‡."

* De Jure Belli et Pac. l. I. c. 3. § 21.

† Book I. § 5.

‡ Wollaſton's Religion of Nature delineated, p. 124. Quarto Edit. 1725.

2. But

2. But of whatever uſe an *Alliance* may be thought, for preſerving the *being* of religion, the neceſſity of it, for preſerving its *purity*, is moſt evident: for if *truth*, and *public utility* coincide, the nearer any religion approacheth to the truth of things, the fitter that religion is for the ſervice of the State. That they do coincide, that is, that truth is productive of utility, and utility indicative of truth, may be proved on any principles, but the atheiſtic; and therefore we think it needleſs, in this place, to draw out the argument in form *: Let us then conſider the danger religion runs of deviating from truth, when left, in its natural ſtate, to itſelf. In thoſe circumſtances, the men of higheſt credit, are ſuch as are famed for greateſt ſanctity. This *ſanctity* hath been generally underſtood to be then moſt perfect, when moſt eſtranged from the world, and all its habits and relations. But this being only to be acquired by feceſſion and retirement from affairs; and that feceſſion rendering man ignorant of civil Society, and of its rights and intereſts; in place of which will ſucceed, according to his natural temper, the deſtructive follies either of ſuperſtition or fanaticiſm, we muſt needs conclude, that religion, under ſuch directors and reformers, (and God knows theſe are generally its lot) will deviate from truth; and conſequently from a capacity, in proportion, of ſerving civil Society. I wiſh I could not ſay, we have too many examples to ſupport this obſervation. The truth is, we have ſeen, and yet do ſee religious Societies, ſome grown up, and continuing unſupported by, and *ununited* with the State; others, that, when ſupported and *united*, have by ſtrange arts brought the ſtate into ſubjection, and become its tyrants and uſurpers; and thereby defeated all the good which can ariſe from this *alliance*; ſuch Societies, I ſay, we have ſeen, whoſe religious doctrines are ſo little ſerviceable to civil Government, that they can proſper only on the ruin and deſtruction of it. Such are thoſe which teach *the holineſs*

* See Book III. § 6.

of

of celibacy and aſceticiſm, the ſinfulneſs of defenſive war, of capital puniſhments, and even of civil magiſtracy itſelf.

On the other hand, when religion is in *Alliance* with the State, as it then comes under the Magiſtrate's direction, thoſe holy leaders having now neither credit nor power to do miſchief, its purity muſt needs be reaſonably well ſupported and preſerved; for truth and public utility coinciding, the civil Magiſtrate, as ſuch, will ſee it for his intereſt to ſeek after, and promote truth in religion: and, by means of public utility, which his office enables him ſo well to underſtand, he will never be at a loſs, where ſuch truth is to be found: ſo that it is impoſſible, under this civil influence, for religion ever to deviate far from truth; always ſuppoſing (for on ſuch ſuppoſition this whole theory proceeds) a LEGITIMATE government, or civil policy, eſtabliſhed on the principles of the natural rights and liberties of man: for an unequal and unjuſt Government, which ſeeks its own, not public utility, will always have occaſion for error: and ſo, muſt corrupt religion both in principle and practice, to promote its own wrong intereſts.

II. Secondly, the Magiſtrate was induced to ſeek this Alliance, *as the neceſſary means to improve the uſefulneſs, and to apply in the beſt manner the influence of religion for his ſervice.* And this an *Alliance* does by ſeveral ways.

1. *By beſtowing additional reverence and veneration on the perſon of the civil* MAGISTRATE, *and on the* LAWS *of the ſtate.* For, in this alliance, where the religious Society is taken into the protection of the State, the ſupreme Magiſtrate, as will be ſhewn hereafter, is acknowledged HEAD *of the religion.* Now nothing can be imagined of more efficacy for ſecuring the obedience of the people. Thoſe two great maſters in politics, Ariſtotle and Machiavel, as we have ſeen, thought it of force enough to gain reverence and ſecurity to a tyrant. What then muſt we ſuppoſe its efficacy in a legitimate Magiſtrature? The ſame veneration will extend itſelf over the *Laws* likewiſe: For while ſome of them are employed by the

the State for the *ſupport of the Church*, and others *lent* to the Church to be employed in the *ſervice of the State*, and all of them enacted by a *legiſlature, in which churchmen have a* conſiderable *ſhare* (all theſe things being amongſt the conditions of *Alliance* *) laws under ſuch direction, muſt needs be regarded with the greateſt reverence.

2. *By lending to the* CHURCH *a coactive power.*—It may be remembered, that, in ſpeaking of the innate defects of civil Society, we obſerved, that there were ſeveral ſorts of duties which civil laws could not inforce; ſuch as the duties of IMPERFECT OBLIGATION; which a religious Society, when endowed with *coercive power*, to invigorate the influence of religion, is capable of exacting: and SUCH likewiſe of the duties of PERFECT OBLIGATION; whoſe breach is owing to the intemperance of the ſenſual appetites; the ſevere prohibition of which threatens greater and more enormous evils: for while theſe unruly paſſions overflow, the ſtopping them in one place is cauſing them to break out with greater violence in another: as the rigorous puniſhment of fornication hath been generally ſeen to give birth to unnatural luſts. The effectual correction therefore of ſuch evils muſt be begun by moderating and ſubduing the paſſions themſelves. But *this*, civil laws are not underſtood to preſcribe†; as puniſhing thoſe paſſions only when they proceed to *act*; and not rewarding the attempts to *ſubdue* them: it muſt be a tribunal regarding irregular intentions as criminal, and good deſires as meritorious, which can work this effect; and this can be no other than the tribunal of religion. When that is once done, a coactive power of the civil kind may be applied to good purpoſe; but not till then: And who ſo fit to apply it as that Society, which prepared the ſubject for its due application and reception? ‡ Again, it

* See the Alliance between Church and State, Book II. c. 3.

† See note [FF] at the end of this Book.

‡ A juriſdiction ſomewhat reſembling this we find in the famous court of AREOPAGUS at Athens: which city was once the model of *civil prudence* as well as of *religion*, to the improved part of mankind. Iſocrates ſpeaking of this branch of juriſdiction in the

it hath been obſerved *, that the State puniſhes deviations from the rule of right as *crimes* only; and not as *ſuch deviations*, or as *ſins*; and, on the idea of crimes, proportions its puniſhments; by which means ſome very enormous deviations from the rule of right, which do not immediately affect ſociety, and ſo are not conſidered as *crimes*, are overlooked by the civil tribunal: yet theſe, being, though *mediately*, very pernicious to the ſtate, it is for its intereſts they ſhould be brought before ſome capable tribunal. But, beſides the civil, there is no other than the eccleſiaſtical, endowed with coactive power. *Hence may be deduced the true, and only, end and uſe of* SPIRITUAL COURTS. A church tribunal then, with coactive power, being neceſſary in all theſe caſes; and a *religious* Society having, in itſelf, no ſuch power, it muſt be borrowed from the State: but a State cannot lend it, without great danger to itſelf, *but* on the terms of an *Alliance*; a State therefore will be induced to ſeek this Alliance, in order to improve the natural efficacy of religion.

3. *By conferring on the State the* application *of the efficacy of religion, and by putting it under the Magiſtrate's direction.*——There are certain junctures when the influence of religion is more than ordinarily ſerviceable to the State: and theſe, the civil Magiſtrate only knows. Now while a Church is in its natural ſtate of independency, it is not in his power to improve thoſe conjunctures to the advantage of the State, by a proper application of religion: but when the *Alliance* is made, and conſequently the Church under his direction, he hath then authority to preſcribe ſuch public exerciſes of religion, and at ſuch times, and in ſuch manner, as he finds the exigencies of State require.

4. *By engaging the Church to apply its utmoſt endeavours in the ſervice of the State.* For an *Alliance* laying an obligation on the

Areopagus, ſays, "It was not exerted to PUNISH crimes, but to PREVENT them—— ἀ τῦτο πρῶτον ἐσκόπεν, δι' ὧν κωλάσωσι τὰς ἀκοσμίας, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν ἂν καλασκευάσωσι μηδὲν αὐτὰς ἄξιον ζημίας βελήσεσθαι ἁμαρτάνειν· ἡγῦντο γὰρ τῦτο μὲν αὐτῶν ἔργον εἶναι. ΑΡΕΙΟΠ. ΛΟΓ.

* See the Alliance, Book I. § 4.

State

State to protect and defend the Church, and to provide a ſettled maintenance for its miniſters, ſuch benefits muſt needs produce the higheſt love and eſteem for the benefactor: which will be returned, out of motives both of gratitude and intereſt, in the moſt zealous labours for the ſervice of civil government.

III. Laſtly, *the State was induced to ſeek this Alliance, as the only means of preventing the miſchiefs, which the Church, in its natural independent condition, might occaſion to civil Society.* For, in this ſtate the Church having, of itſelf, a power of aſſembling for religious worſhip, factious men may commodiouſly, under that cover, hatch and carry on deſigns againſt the peace of civil government: and the influence which popular and leading men gain over the conſciences of ſuch aſſemblies, by the frequency of occaſional harangues, may eaſily ripen theſe contrivances into act, when ſtrengthened with the ſpecious pretext of religion: all which evils are effectually remedied by this *Alliance.* For then, the civil Magiſtrate being become protector of the Church, and, conſequently, ſupreme HEAD and director of it, the miniſtry is moſtly in his power; that mutual dependency, between the clergy and people, being, by means of a ſettled revenue, quite broken and deſtroyed. He admits and excludes to the *exerciſe* of their function, as he ſees fit; and grants it to none, but ſuch as give a previous ſecurity for their allegiance to him: by which means, all that influence, which the miniſters and leaders in a Church had over it before the Alliance, *as the protectors of religion,* is now drawn off from them, and placed ſolely in the civil Magiſtrate.

Another miſchief there is in this *unallied* condition of the Church, ſtill as certain and fatal, whenever more than one religion is found in a State. For in theſe latter ages, every ſect thinking itſelf the only *true* church, or, at leaſt, the *moſt perfect,* is naturally puſhed on to advance its own ſcheme upon the ruins of the reſt: and where argument fails, civil power is brought in, as ſoon as ever a party can be formed in the *public adminiſtration*: and we find,

they have been but too ſucceſsful in perſuading the Magiſtrate that his intereſts are concerned in their religious differences. Now the moſt effectual remedy to the dangerous and ſtrong convulſions, into which States are ſo frequently thrown by theſe ſtruggles, is an *Alliance*, which eſtabliſhes *one church*, and gives *a full toleration to the reſt*; only keeping ſectaries out of *the public adminiſtration*: From a heedleſs admiſſion into which, theſe diſorders have ariſen.

Having now ſhewn the principal motives which engaged the State to *ſeek* an *alliance* with the Church;

I come, in the next place, to conſider the motives which the Church had to *accept* of it. For this being, as is obſerved, a FREE CONVENTION, unleſs the Church, as well as State, had its proper views, no *Alliance* could have been formed. To diſcover theſe motives, we muſt recollect what hath been ſaid of the nature and end of a *religious Society*: for the benefits adapted to that nature and end, muſt be her legitimate motive: but if ſo, this benefit can be no other than SECURITY FROM ALL EXTERNAL VIOLENCE. The State indeed could not juſtly offer it, had no Alliance been made: but this is no reaſon why the Church ſhould not think it for its intereſt to ſecure its natural right by *compact*; any more than that one State ſhould not ſtipulate with another not to do it violence, though *that other* was under prior obligations, by the law of nature and nations, to forbear.

But by this *Alliance* between the two Societies, the State does more: it not only promiſes not to injure the *Church* confederated, but to ſerve it; that is, to protect it from the injuries of other religious Societies, which then exiſt, or may afterwards ariſe in the State. How one religious Society may be injuriouſly affected by another, hath been ſhewn juſt before; how great thoſe injuries may prove, will be ſhewn hereafter. It muſt needs then be the firſt care of a Church, and a reaſonable care, to preſerve itſelf, by all lawful ways, from outward violence. A State then, as hath been ſaid, in order to induce the Church's acceptance of this offer, muſt

muſt propoſe ſome benefit by it: and becauſe this is the only *legitimate* benefit the Church can receive, it muſt propoſe *this*: which, therefore, being conſiderable, will be the Church's *motive for Alliance.*

There are only two other conſiderations that can be eſteemed *motives*: the one, *to engage the State to propagate the eſtabliſhed religion by force*: and the other, *to beſtow honours, riches, and powers upon it.* Now, on recurring to the nature and end of the two Societies, the *firſt* motive will be found *unjuſt*; and the *ſecond, impertinent.* It is *unjuſt* in the Church to require the engagement; becauſe the performing it would be violating the natural right every man hath of worſhipping God according to his own conſcience. It is *unjuſt* in the State to engage in it; becauſe, as we have ſhewn, its juriſdiction extendeth not to opinions.

It is *impertinent* in a Church to aim at riches, honours, and powers, becauſe theſe are things which, as a Church, ſhe can neither uſe nor profit by; for they have no natural tendency to promote the *ultimate* end of this Society, *ſalvation of ſouls*; nor the *immediate* end, *purity of worſhip.* "Nihil eccleſia ſibi niſi fidem "poſſidet *," ſays St. Ambroſe. We conclude, therefore, that the only legitimate motive ſhe could have, was *ſecurity and protection from outward violence.*

On theſe mutual motives was formed this FREE ALLIANCE; which gave birth to a CHURCH BY LAW ESTABLISHED.

Now as from the nature of the two Societies is diſcovered what kind of union only they could enter into; ſo from that conſideration, together with the motives they had in uniting, may be deduced, by neceſſary inference, the reciprocal TERMS and conditions of that union.

From the mutual motives inducing thereunto, it appears, that the great *preliminary and fundamental article* of *Alliance* is this,

* Epiſt. contra Symmachum.

THAT

THAT THE CHURCH SHALL APPLY ITS UTMOST INFLUENCE IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE; AND THAT THE STATE SHALL SUPPORT AND PROTECT THE CHURCH.

But in order to the performance of this agreement, there muſt be a *mutual communication of their reſpective powers*: for the province of each Society being naturally diſtinct and different, each can have to do in the other's, but by mutual conceſſion.

But again, theſe Societies being likewiſe as naturally independent one on the other, a mutual conceſſion cannot be ſafely made, without one of them, at the ſame time, giving up its INDEPENDENCY: from whence ariſes what Grotius, we ſee, called MANENS PRÆLATIO: which, in his *Fœdus inæquale*, the more powerful Society hath over the leſs.

Now from theſe two concluſions, which ſpring neceſſarily from *the great fundamental article of union*, we deduce all the terms, conditions, mutual grants, and conceſſions, which complete this *Alliance*.

For, from this obligation on the Church *to apply its influence in the ſervice of the State*, ariſe a SETTLED MAINTENANCE FOR THE MINISTERS OF RELIGION; and an ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION with *coactive* power: which things introduce again, on the other ſide, the DEPENDENCY OF THE CLERGY ON THE STATE. And from the State's obligation *to ſupport and protect the Church*, ariſeth the ECCLESIASTICAL SUPREMACY OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE; which again introduceth, on the other hand, the right of CHURCHMEN to PARTAKE OF THE LEGISLATURE.

Thus are all theſe Rights and Privileges cloſely interwoven and mutually connected by a neceſſary dependence on each other.

But to be more particular in the grounds and reaſons of each grant and privilege, we will now, in a different and more commodious order for this purpoſe, examine,

I. What the CHURCH RECEIVES from the State.

II. What the Church GIVES to it.

Which

Which will preſent us with *a new view of the two Societies, as they appear under an Eſtabliſhment*; and leave nothing wanting to enable us to form a perfect judgement of their natures.

I. What the Church *receives* from the ſtate by this *Alliance*, is,

I. Firſt, *A public and ſettled endowment for its miniſters.* The reaſons of it are, 1. To render the religious Society, whoſe aſſiſtance the State ſo much wants, more firm and durable. 2. To invite and encourage the clergy's beſt ſervice to the State, in rendering thoſe committed to their care, virtuous. But, 3. and principally, in order to deſtroy that mutual dependency between the clergy and people, which ariſes from the former's being maintained by the voluntary contributions of the latter; the only maintenance the clergy could have, before the two Societies were allied; and which dependence, we have ſhewn to be productive of great miſchiefs to the State. Add to all this, that as the clergy are now under the Magiſtrate's direction, and conſequently become a public Order in the ſtate, it is but fit and decent, that the State ſhould provide them with a public maintenance.

2. The ſecond privilege the Church receives from this Alliance is, *a place for her repreſentatives in the Legiſlature.* For, as it neceſſarily follows, from that *fundamental article of Alliance* of the *State's ſupporting and protecting the Church*, that the Church muſt, in return, *give up its independency to the State*, whereby the State becomes empowered to determine in all church-matters, ſo far as the Church is conſidered under the idea of a Society; as this, I ſay, neceſſarily follows, the Church muſt needs have its repreſentatives in the Legiſlature, to prevent that power, which the State receives in return for the protection it affords, from being perverted to the Church's hurt: for the giving up its independency, without reſerving a right of repreſentation in the legiſlature, would be making itſelf, inſtead of a *ſubject*, a *ſlave* to the State. Beſides, without theſe Repreſentatives no laws could be reaſonably made concerning the Church: becauſe no free man, or body, can be bound by laws,

to

to which they have not given their conſent, either in perſon, or by repreſentative. So that, as the Church when ſhe entered into alliance, cannot *juſtly*, we may preſume ſhe did not *willingly*, give up her independency without the reſervation of ſome ſuch prerogative.

3. The third and laſt privilege is, *a juriſdiction, inforced by civil coactive power*, FOR REFORMATION OF MANNERS. It is one of the *preliminary* articles of this *Alliance*, that *the Church ſhould apply its beſt influence in the ſervice of the State*. But there is no way in which it can be ſo effectually inforced as by a juriſdiction of this kind. It hath been ſhewn above, that there are a numerous ſet of duties, both of *imperfect obligation*, which civil laws could not reach; and ſeveral of *perfect obligation*, which, by reaſon of the intemperance of the ſenſual paſſions, from whence the breach of thoſe duties proceeds, civil laws could not effectually inforce; as their violence yielded only to the influence of Religion; both which, however, the good of the Community requires ſhould be inforced; and which an eccleſiaſtical tribunal, intruſted with coactive power, is only able to inforce. And, indeed, the ſenſe of thoſe wants and defects, which theſe courts do ſupply, was the principal motive of the State's ſeeking this *Alliance*. On the other hand, the Church having now given up her ſupremacy, ſhe would without the acceſſion of this authority, be left naked and defenceleſs, and reduced to a condition unbecoming her dignity, and dangerous to her ſafety.

II. Let us now ſee, what the Church *gives* to the State. It is, in a word, this: *The reſigning up her independency; and making the civil Magiſtrate her* SUPREME HEAD, *without whoſe approbation and allowance ſhe can adminiſter, tranſact, or decree nothing in quality of a policied Society*. For as the State, by this *Alliance*, hath undertaken the protection of the *Church*; and as no Society can ſafely afford protection to another over which it hath no power, it neceſſarily follows that the *civil Magiſtrate muſt be ſupreme*. Beſides, when

when the State, by this convention, covenanted to afford protection to the Church, that contract was made to a particular Church of one denomination, and of ſuch determined doctrine and diſcipline. But now, that protection, which might be advantageous to the State in union with ſuch a Church, might be diſadvantageous to it, in union with one of a different doctrine and diſcipline: therefore, when protection is given to a Church, it muſt be at the ſame time provided, that no alteration be made in it, without the State's approbation and allowance. Farther, the State having *endowed its clergy*, and beſtowed upon them a *juriſdiction with coactive power*, theſe privileges might create an *imperium in imperio*, had not the civil Magiſtrate, in return, the *ſupremacy of the Church*. The neceſſity of the thing, therefore, inveſts him with this right and title.

Thus have we ſhewn the mutual privileges *given* and *received* by Church and State, in entering into this famous *convention*: the aim of the State being, agreeably to its nature, UTILITY; and the aim of the Church, agreeably to its nature, TRUTH. From whence we may obſerve, that as theſe privileges all took their riſe, by neceſſary inference, from the fundamental article of the convention, which was, *that the Church ſhould ſerve the State*; *and the State protect the Church*; ſo they receive all poſſible addition of ſtrength from their mutual connection with, and dependency on, one another. This we have cauſe to deſire may be received as a certain mark that our *plan of Alliance* is no precarious arbitrary hypotheſis, but a *theory*, founded in reaſon, and the invariable nature of things. For having, from the real eſſence of the two Societies, collected the *neceſſity* of allying, and the *freedom* of the compact; we have, from the *neceſſity*, fairly introduced it; and from its *freedom*, conſequentially eſtabliſhed every mutual term and condition of it. So that now if the reader ſhould aſk, *where this charter or treaty of convention for the union of the two Societies, on the terms here delivered, is to be met with*; we are enabled to anſwer him. We ſay,

it may be found in the ſame archive with the famous ORIGINAL COMPACT between magiſtrate and people, ſo much inſiſted on in the vindication of the *common rights of ſubjects*. Now, when a ſight of this *compact* is required of the defenders of civil liberty, they hold it ſufficient to ſay, that it is enough for all the purpoſes of fact and right, that ſuch *original compact* is the only legitimate foundation of civil Society: that if there were no ſuch thing *formally* executed, there was *virtually*: that all differences between magiſtrate and people, ought to be regulated on the ſuppoſition of ſuch a *compact*; and all Government reduced to the principles therein laid down: for, that the happineſs, of which civil Society is productive, can only be attained, when formed on thoſe principles. Now ſomething like this we ſay of our ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

Hitherto we have conſidered this *Alliance* as it produceth an *eſtabliſhment*, under its moſt ſimple form; *i e.* where there is but *one* Religion in the State: but it may ſo happen, that, either at the time of convention, or afterwards, there may be *more than one*.

1. If there be *more than one at the time of convention*, the State allies itſelf with the *largeſt* of the religious Societies. It is *fit* the State ſhould do ſo, becauſe the larger the religious Society is (where there is an equality in other points) the better enabled it will be to anſwer the ends of an *Alliance*; as having the greateſt number under its influence. It is *ſcarce poſſible* it ſhould do otherwiſe; becauſe the two Societies being compoſed of the ſame individuals, the greatly prevailing religion muſt have a majority of its members in the aſſemblies of State; who will naturally prefer their own religion to any other. With *this* Religion is the *alliance* made; and a full TOLERATION given to all the reſt; yet under the reſtriction of a TEST LAW, to keep them from hurting that which is *eſtabliſhed*.

2. If theſe different religions ſpring up *after* the Alliance hath been formed; then, whenever they become conſiderable, a *teſt law* is

is neceſſary, for the ſecurity of the *eſtabliſhed church*. For amongſt diverſities of ſects where every one thinks itſelf the *only true*, or at leaſt the *moſt pure*, every one aims at riſing on the ruins of the reſt; which it calls, *bringing into conformity* with itſelf. The means of doing this, when reaſon fails, which is rarely at hand, and more rarely heard when it is, will be by getting into the public adminiſtration, and applying the civil power to the work. But when one of theſe Religions is the *eſtabliſhed*, and the reſt under a *toleration*; then envy, at the advantages of an *eſtabliſhment*, will join the *tolerated churches* in confederacy againſt it, and unite them in one common attack to diſturb its quiet. In this imminent danger, the *allied church* calls upon the State, for the performance of its contract; which thereupon gives her a TEST LAW for her ſecurity: whereby, the entrance into the Adminiſtration of public affairs (the only way, the threatened miſchief is effected) is ſhut to all but members of the *eſtabliſhed church*.

Thus a TEST LAW took its birth, whether *at* or *after* the time of *Alliance*. That the State is under the higheſt obligations to provide the Church with this ſecurity, we ſhall ſhew,

1. By the *Alliance*, the State promiſed to protect the Church, and to ſecure it from the injuries and inſults of its enemies. An attempt in the members of any other church to get into the adminiſtration, in order to deprive the *eſtabliſhed church* of the covenanted rights which it enjoys, either by ſharing thoſe advantages with it, or by drawing them from it to itſelf, is highly injurious. And we have ſhewn, that where there are diverſities of religions, this attempt will be always making. The State then muſt defeat the attempt: but there is no other way of defeating it, than by hindering its enemies from entering into the Adminiſtration: and they can be hindered only by a *teſt law*.

2. Again, this promiſe of protection is of ſuch a nature as may, on no pretence, be diſpenſed with. For protection was not ſimply a condition of *Alliance*, but, on the Church's part, the only condi-

tion of it. We have ſhewn, that all other benefits and advantages are foreign to a Church, as ſuch, and improper for it. Now, not performing the *only condition* of a contract, virtually breaks and diſſolves it: eſpecially if we conſider that this only condition is both *neceſſary* and *juſt*. *Neceſſary*, as a free convention muſt have *mutual* conditions; and, but for this condition, one ſide would be without any: *Juſt*, as the convention itſelf is founded on the laws of nature and nations; and *this* the only condition which ſuits the nature of a Church to claim. If it be pretended that debarring good ſubjects from *places of honour and profit*, in the diſpoſal of the Magiſtrate, is *unjuſt*; I reply, that the aſſertion, though every where taken for granted, is falſe; it being founded on the principle, that *reward is one of the ſanctions of civil laws*, which I have ſhewn to be a miſtake *; and that all, a member of Society can *claim*, for the diſcharge of his duty, is *protection*. So that, farther reward than this, no ſubject having a *right* to, all *places of honour and profit* are free donations, and in the abſolute diſpoſal of the Magiſtrate.

3. But again, the Church, in order to enable the State to perform this *ſole condition* of protection, conſented to the giving up its ſupremacy and independency, to the civil Sovereign: whence it follows, that, whenever the enemies of the *eſtabliſhed* Church get into the magiſtrature, to which, as we have ſaid, the ſupremacy of the Church is transferred by the *Alliance*, ſhe becomes a prey, and lies entirely at their mercy; being now, by the loſs of her ſupremacy, in no condition of defence, as ſhe was in her natural ſtate, unprotected and independent; ſo that the not ſecuring her by a *teſt law*, is betraying, and giving her up bound to her enemies.

4. But laſtly, had no promiſe of protection been made, yet the State would have lain under an indiſpenſable neceſſity of providing a *teſt law*, for its own peace and ſecurity. It hath been obſerved, that wherever there are diverſities of religion, each ſect, believing its

* See Book I. ſect. 2.

own

own the true, ſtrives to advance itſelf on the ruins of the reſt. If this doth not ſucceed by dint of argument, theſe partiſans are apt to have recourſe to the coercive power of the State: which is done by introducing a party into the public adminiſtration. And they have always had art enough to make the State believe that its intereſts were much concerned in the ſucceſs of their religious quarrels. What perſecutions, rebellions, revolutions, loſs of civil and religious liberty, theſe inteſtine ſtruggles between ſects have occaſioned, is well known to ſuch as are acquainted with the hiſtory of mankind. To prevent theſe miſchiefs was, as hath been ſhewn, one great motive for the State's ſeeking *Alliance* with the Church: for the obvious remedy was the *eſtabliſhing one church*, and giving a *free toleration to the reſt*. But if, in adminiſtring this cure, the State ſhould ſtop ſhort, and not proceed to exclude the *tolerated* religions from entering into the public adminiſtration, ſuch imperfect application of the remedy would infinitely heighten the diſtemper: for, before the *Alliance*, it was only a miſtaken aim in propagating truth, which occaſioned theſe diſorders: but now, the zeal for opinions would be out of meaſure inflamed by envy and emulation; which the temporal advantages, enjoyed by the eſtabliſhed church, excluſive of the reſt, will always occaſion: And what miſchiefs this would produce, had every ſect a free entry into the adminiſtration, the reader may eaſily conceive. If it be ſaid, that, would men content themſelves, as in reaſon they ought, with enjoying their own opinions, without obtruding them upon others, theſe evils, which require the remedy of a *teſt law*, would never happen. This is very true: and ſo, would men but obſerve the rule of juſtice in general, there would be no need to have recourſe to civil Society, to rectify the violations of it.

In a word, an ESTABLISHED RELIGION WITH A TEST LAW is the univerſal voice of Nature. The moſt ſavage nations have employed it to civilize their manners; and the politeſt knew no other way to prevent their return to barbarity and violence.

Thus

Thus the city of Athens, ſo humane and free, exacted an oath of all their youth for the ſecurity of the eſtabliſhed religion: for, Athens being a democracy, every citizen had a conſtant ſhare in the adminiſtration. A copy of this oath, the ſtrongeſt of all *teſts*, is preſerved by Stobæus, who tranſcribed it from the writings of the Pythagoreans, the great ſchool of ancient politics. It is conceived in theſe words: "I will not diſhonour the *ſacred arms* *, nor de-"ſert my comrade in battle: I will DEFEND AND PROTECT MY "COUNTRY AND MY RELIGION, whether alone or in conjunction "with others: I will not leave the public in a worſe condition "than I found it, but in a better: I will be always ready to obey "the ſupreme magiſtrate, with prudence; and to ſubmit to the "eſtabliſhed laws, and to all ſuch as ſhall be hereafter eſtabliſhed "by full conſent of the people: and I will never connive at any "other who ſhall preſume to deſpiſe or diſobey them; but will re-"venge all ſuch attempts on the ſanctity of the republic, either "alone or in conjunction with the people: and laſtly, I WILL CON-"FORM TO THE NATIONAL RELIGION. So help me thoſe gods "who are the avengers of perjury †."

Here we ſee, that after each man had ſworn, *to defend and protect the religion of his country*, in conſequence of the obligation the State lies under to protect the *eſtabliſhed worſhip*, he concludes, *I will conform to it*; the directeſt and ſtrongeſt of all *teſts*.

* Ὅπλα τὰ ἱερὰ, the *ſacred arms*, by what follows, ſeems to mean thoſe which the lovers preſented to their favourite youths. Concerning this inſtitution, ſee what is ſaid in the explanation of Virgil's epiſode of Niſus and Euryalus, in ſect. iv. of this book.

† Οὐ καλαισχυνῶ ὅπλα τὰ ἱερὰ, οὐδ' ἐγκαλαλείψω τὸν παρασάτην ὅτῳ ἂν στοιχήσω· ΑΜΥΝΩ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΥΠΕΡ ΙΕΡΩΝ, καὶ ὑπὲρ ὁσίων καὶ μόνος, καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν. τὴν πατρίδα δὲ οὐκ ἐλάσσω παραδώσω, πλείω δὲ καὶ ἀρείω, ὥσην ἂν παραδέξομαι· καὶ εὐνοήσω τῶν αἰεὶ κρινόντων ἐμφρόνως, καὶ τοῖς θεσμοῖς τοῖς ἱδρυμένοις πείσωμαι, καὶ ὅς τινας ἂν ἄλλος τὸ πλῆθος ἱδρύσηται ὁμοφρόνως· καὶ ἄν τις ἀναιρῇ τὰς θεσμὰς ἢ μὴ πείθηται, οὐκ ὑπερέψω, ἀμυνῶ δὲ καὶ μόνος, καὶ μετὰ πάντων· καὶ ΙΕΡΑ ΤΑ ΠΑΤΡΙΑ ΤΙΜΗΣΩ· ἵστορες θεοὶ τέτων.
Joan. Stobæi *de Rep. Serm.* xli. p. 243, Lugd. Ed. 1608.

But

But a teſt of conformity to the eſtabliſhed worſhip, was not only required of thoſe who bore a ſhare in the civil adminiſtration, but of thoſe too who were choſen to preſide in their religious rites. Demoſthenes hath recorded the oath which the prieſteſſes of Bacchus, called Γεραιραὶ, took on entering into their Office. "I ob- "ſerve a religious chaſtity, and am clean and pure from all other "defilements, and from converſation with man: AND I CELEBRATE "THE THEOINEIA AND IOBACCHIA TO BACCHUS, ACCORDING TO "THE ESTABLISHED RITES, AND AT THE PROPER SEASONS *."

Nor were the ROMANS leſs watchful for the ſupport of the *eſtabliſhed* religion, as may be ſeen by a ſpeech of the conſul Poſthumius in Livy, occaſioned by ſome horrid abuſes committed, through the clandeſtine exerciſe of foreign worſhip. "How often, "ſays he, in the times of our fathers and forefathers, hath this "affair been recommended to the Magiſtrates; to prohibit all "foreign worſhip; to drive the prieſts and ſacrifices from the "cirque, the forum, and the city; to ſearch up, and burn books "of prophecies; and to aboliſh all modes of ſacrificing, differing "from the Roman diſcipline? For thoſe ſage and prudent men, "inſtructed in all kind of divine and human laws, rightly judged "that nothing tended ſo much to overthrow religion, as when men "celebrated the ſacred rites, not after their own, but foreign "cuſtoms †."

* Ἁγιστεύω, καὶ εἰμὶ καθαρὰ, καὶ ἁγνὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ὑ καθαρευόντων, καὶ ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς συνουσίας, καὶ τὰ Θοίνια, καὶ Ἰοβαχχεῖα γεραίρω τῷ Διονύσῳ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑ ΠΑΤΡΙΑ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις. *Orat. cont. Neæram.*

† Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium eſt magiſtratibus datum, ut ſacra externa fieri vetarent; ſacrificulos, vateſque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent; vaticinos libros conquirerent, comburerentque; omnem diſciplinam ſacrificandi, præterquam more Romano, abolerent? Judicabant enim prudentiſſimi viri omnis divini humanique juris, nihil æque diſſolvendæ religionis eſſe, quam ubi non patrio, ſed externo ritu ſacrificaretur. Hiſt. lib. xxxix.

But

But when I ſay all regular policied ſtates had an *eſtabliſhed religion*, I mean no more than *he* would do, who, deducing Society from its true original, ſhould, in order to perſuade men of the benefits it produceth, affirm that all nations had a civil policy. For, as this writer could not be ſuppoſed to mean that every one conſtituted a free State, on the principles of public liberty (which yet was the only Society he propoſed to prove was founded on truth, and productive of public good) becauſe it is notorious, that the far greater part of civil policies are founded on different principles, and abuſed to different ends; ſo neither would I be underſtood to mean, when I ſay all nations concurred in making this UNION, that they all exactly *diſcriminated the natures*, and fairly *adjuſted the rights* of BOTH SOCIETIES, on the principles here laid down; though an ESTABLISHMENT reſulting from this diſcrimination and adjuſtment, be the only one I would be ſuppoſed to recommend. On the contrary, I know this *union* hath been generally made on miſtaken principles; or, if not ſo, hath degenerated by length of time. And, as it was ſufficient for that writer's purpoſe, that thoſe Societies, good or bad, proved the ſenſe, all men had of the benefits reſulting from civil policy in general, though they were oft miſtaken in the application; ſo it is ſufficient for *ours*, that this univerſal *concurrence* in the TWO SOCIETIES TO UNITE, ſhews the ſenſe of mankind concerning the *utility* of ſuch union. And laſtly, as that writer's principles are not the leſs true on account of the general deviation from them in forming civil Societies; ſo may not ours, though ſo few ſtates have ſuffered themſelves to be directed by them in *practice*, nor any man, before, delivered them in *ſpeculation*.

Such then is the *Theory* here offered to the world; of which, whoever would ſee a full account, and the ſeveral parts cleared from objections, may conſult the treatiſe mentioned before, intituled, *The Alliance between Church and State*; in which we pretend to

to have discovered a plain and simple truth, of the highest concernment to civil Society, long lost and hid under the learned obscurity arising from the collision of contrary false principles.

BUT it is now time to proceed with our main subject. We have here given a short account of the true nature of the *Alliance between Church and State*; both to justify the conduct of the ancient Lawgivers in establishing religion; and to shew the infinite service of this institution to civil Society. Another use of it may be the gaining an exacter knowledge of the *nature* of the established religions in the *pagan world*: for, having the true *theory* of an Establishment, it serves as a straight line to discover all the obliquities to which it is applied.

I shall therefore consider the *causes*, which facilitated the *establishment of religion* in the ancient world: and likewise *those* causes which prevented the *establishment* from receiving its due form.

I. Ancient pagan religion consisted in the worship of local tutelary Deities; which, generally speaking, were supposed to be the authors of their civil Institutes. The consequence of this was, that the *State*, as well as *particulars*, was the SUBJECT of religion. So that this religion could not but be *national and established*; that is, protected and encouraged by the civil Power. For how could that religion, which had the *national God* for its *object*; and the *State*, as an artificial man, for its *subject*, be other than *national* and *established*?

II. But then these very things, which so much promoted an *established religion*, prevented the union's being made upon a just and equitable footing. 1. By giving a wrong *idea* of *civil Society* 2. By not giving a right *form* to the *religious*.

1. It is nothing strange, that the ancients should have a wrong idea of *civil Society*; and should suppose it ordained for the cognizance of *religious*, as well as of *civil* matters, while they believed in a local tutelary Deity, by whose direction they were formed

into Community; and while they held that Society, as ſuch, was the *ſubject* of religion, contrary to what has been ſhewn above, that the *civil* Society's offer of a voluntary alliance with the *religious*, proceeded from its having no power in itſelf to inforce the influence of religion to the ſervice of the State.

2. If their *religion* conſtituted a proper Society, it was yet a Society dependent on the State, and therefore not *ſovereign*. Now it appears that no voluntary alliance can be made, but between two independent ſovereign Societies. But, in reality, Pagan religion did not conſtitute any Society at all. For it is to be obſerved, that the unity of the object of faith, and conformity to a formula of dogmatic theology, as the terms of communion, are the great foundation and bond of a religious Society *. Now theſe things were wanting in the ſeveral national religions of Paganiſm: in which there was only a conformity in public Ceremonies. The *national Pagan* religion therefore did not properly compoſe a *Society*; nor do we find by Antiquity, that it was ever conſidered under that idea; but only as *part of the State*; and in that view, indeed, had its particular Societies and Companies, ſuch as the colleges of Prieſts and Prophets.

Theſe were ſuch errors and defects as deſtroyed much of the utility, which reſults from *religious Eſtabliſhments*, placed upon a right bottom. But yet *religious Eſtabliſhments* they were; and, notwithſtanding all their imperfections, ſerved for many good purpoſes: ſuch as *preſerving the being of Religion:—beſtowing additional veneration on the perſon of the Magiſtrate, and on the laws of the State:—giving the Magiſtrate the right of applying the civil efficacy of religion:—and giving Religion a coactive power for the reformation of manners.* And thus much for ESTABLISHMENTS.

* See The Alliance between Church and State, Book I. § 5.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

THE laſt inſtance to be aſſigned of the Magiſtrate's care of religion, ſhall be that univerſal practice, in the ancient world, of religious TOLERATION; or the permitting the free exerciſe of all religions, how different ſoever from the *National* and *Eſtabliſhed*. For though the very nature and terms of an *Eſtabliſhed* religion implied the Magiſtrate's peculiar favour and protection; and though in fact, they had their *Teſt-laws* for its ſupport, wherever there was diverſity of worſhip; yet it was ancient policy to allow a large and full TOLERATION. And even in the *extent* of this allowance they ſeem generally to have had juſter notions than certain of our modern Advocates for religious Liberty. They had no conception that any one ſhould be indulged in his preſumption of extending it to *Religious Rites and practices hurtful to Society, or diſhonourable to Humanity.* There are many examples in Antiquity of this ſage reſtriction. I ſhall only mention the univerſal concurrence in puniſhing *Magical Rites*, by which the health and ſafety of particulars were ſuppoſed to be injuriouſly affected. And Suetonius's burning the ſacred grove in Angleſea*, in which human ſacrifices were offered up by the Druids, was but the beginning of what thoſe modern Advocates, above mentioned, would call a *Perſecution* againſt the Order itſelf, whoſe obſtinate perſeverance in this infernal practice could not be overcome but by their total extirpation.

Two principal cauſes induced the *ancient Lawgivers* to the ſage and reaſonable conduct of a large and full toleration.

* — "Præſidium poſthac impoſitum victis, exciſique Luci, SAEVIS ſuperſtitionibus ſacri. Nam cruore captivo adolere aras, et hominum fibris conſulere deos fas habebant." Tac. Ann. l. xiv. c. 30.——*Superſtition* amongſt the Greeks and Romans had its free courſe. But the *ſævæ ſuperſtitiones*, the *ſavage and cruel Rites*, injurious and diſhonourable to human nature and civil Society, were rigorouſly forbidden.

I. They conſidered that Religion ſeldom or never makes *a real impreſſion* on the minds of thoſe who are *forced* into a profeſſion of it: and yet, that all the ſervice Religion can do to the State, is by working that *real impreſſion* *. They concluded, therefore, that the profeſſion of Religion ſhould be FREE.

Hence may be underſtood the ſtrange blindneſs of thoſe *modern Politicians*, who expect to benefit the State by forcing men to outward conformity; which only making hypocrites and atheiſts, deſtroys the ſole means religion hath of ſerving the State. But here, by a common fate of Politicians, they fell from one blunder into another. For having firſt, in a tyrannical adherence to their own ſcheme of Policy, or ſuperſtitious fondneſs for the eſtabliſhed Syſtem of Worſhip, infringed upon religious Liberty; and then beginning to find, that diverſity of Sects was hurtful to the State, as it always will be, while the rights of Religion are violated; inſtead of repairing the miſtake, and reſtoring religious Liberty, which would have ſtifled this pullulating evil in the ſeed, by affording it no further nouriſhment, they took the other courſe; and endeavoured, by a thorough diſcipline of *Conformity*, violently to rend it away: and with it they rooted up and deſtroyed all that good to Society, which ſo naturally ſprings from Religion, when it hath once taken faſt hold of the human mind.

II. This was the moſt legitimate principle they went upon, and had the moſt laſting effect. They had another, which, though leſs ingenuous, was of more immediate influence; and this was the keeping up the warmth and vigour of religious impreſſions, by the introduction and toleration of new Religions and foreign Worſhip. For they ſuppoſed that "piety and virtue then chiefly in-

* In ſpecie autem fictæ ſimulationis, ſicut reliquæ virtutes, ita PIETAS ineſſe non poteſt; cum qua ſimul et ſanctitatem et religionem tolli neceſſe eſt: quibus ſublatis, perturbatio vitæ ſequitur et magna confuſio. Atque haud ſcio, an PIETATE adverſus deos ſublata fides etiam, et ſocietas humani generis, et una excellentiſſima virtus, juſtitia tollatur. Cic. De nat. deor. l. I. c. 2.

"fluence

" fluence the mind, while men are buſied in the performance of " religious Rites and Ceremonies *;" as Tully obſerves, in the words of Pythagoras, the moſt celebrated of the pagan Lawgivers. Nor does this at all contradict the Roman maxim, as delivered by Poſthumius in Livy [ſee p. 423.] For *that* maxim relates to *public Religion*, or the Religion of the State; *this* concerns *private Religion*, or the religion of Particulars. Now vulgar Paganiſm being not only falſe, but highly abſurd, as having its foundation ſolely in the fancy and the paſſions; variety of Worſhips was neceſſary to ſuit every one's taſte and humour. The genius of it diſpoſing its followers to be inconſtant, capricious, and fond of novelties; weary of long-worn Ceremonies, and immoderately fond of new. And in effect we ſee amongſt the ſame people, notwithſtanding the univerſal notion of tutelary Deities, that, in *this* age, one God or mode of worſhip, in *that*, another mode had the vogue. And every new God, or new ceremony, rekindled the languid fire of Superſtition: juſt as in modern Rome, every laſt Saint draws the Multitude to his ſhrine.

For, here it is to be obſerved, that in the Pagan world, a *tolerated Religion* did not imply *diſſention* from the *eſtabliſhed*, according to our modern ideas of *toleration*. Nor indeed could it, according to the general nature and genius of ancient Idolatry. *Tolerated* Religions there are rather ſubſervient to the *eſtabliſhed*, or ſupernumeraries of it, than in oppoſition to it. But then they were far from being on a footing with the *eſtabliſhed*, or partakers of its privileges.

But men going into Antiquity under the impreſſion of modern ideas, muſt needs form very inaccurate judgements of what they find. So, in this caſe, becauſe few *tolerated Religions* are to be met with in Paganiſm, according to our ſenſe of *toleration*, which is

* — Siquidem et illud bene dictum eſt a Pythagora, doctiſſimo viro, tum maxime et pietatem et religionem verſari in animis, cum rebus divinis operam daremus.
De Leg. l. II. c. 11.

the

the allowance of a Religion OPPOSED to the *national*; and conſequently, becauſe no one is watched with that vigilance which ours demand, but all uſed with more indulgence than a Religion, reprobating the *eſtabliſhed*, can pretend to; on this account, I ſay, a falſe opinion hath prevailed, that, *in the Pagan world, all kinds of Religion were upon an equal footing, with regard to the State.* Hence, we hear a noble writer perpetually applauding * *wiſe* Antiquity, for the full and free liberty it granted in matters of Religion, ſo agreeable to the principles of truth and public utility; and perpetually arraigning the UNSOCIABLE HUMOUR OF CHRISTIANITY for the contrary practice; which, therefore, he would inſinuate, was built on contrary principles.

On this account, it will not be improper to conſider, a little, the genius of Paganiſm, as it is oppoſed to, what we call, *true Religion:* Which will ſhew us how eaſily the civil Magiſtrate brought about that Toleration, which he had ſuch great *reaſons of State* to promote; and at the ſame time, teach theſe objectors to know, that the good effect of this general tolerance, as far as the genius of Religion was concerned in its promotion, was owing to the egregious falſhood and abſurdity of Paganiſm: and that, on the other hand, the evil effects of intolerance under the Chriſtian religion, proceeded from its truth and perfection; not the natural conſequence, as theſe men would inſinuate, of a *falſe* Principle, but the abuſe of a *true* one.

Ancient Paganiſm was an aggregate of ſeveral diſtinct Religions, derived from ſo many pretended revelations. Why it abounded in theſe, proceeded, in part, from the great number of Gods of human invention. As theſe Religions were not laid on the foundation, ſo neither were they raiſed on the deſtruction of one another. *They were not laid on the foundation of one another*; becauſe, having given to their Gods, as local tutelary Deities †, contrary natures

* See the Characteriſtics, paſſim.

† See note [GG] at the end of this Book.

and

and diſpoſitions, and diſtinct and ſeparate intereſts, each God ſet up, on his own bottom, and held little in common with the reſt*. *They were not raiſed on the deſtruction of one another*; becauſe, as hath been obſerved, the ſeveral Religions of Paganiſm did not conſiſt in matters of belief, and dogmatic theology, in which, where there is a contrariety, Religions deſtroy one another; but in matters of practice, in Rites and Ceremonies; and in theſe, a contrariety did no harm: For having given their Gods different natures and intereſts, where was the wonder if they claſhed in their commanded Rites; or if their worſhippers ſhould think this no mark of their falſe pretenſions?

Theſe were horrible defects in the very eſſence of Pagan theology: and yet from theſe would neceſſarily ariſe *an univerſal toleration*: for each Religion admitting the other's pretenſions, there muſt needs be a perfect harmony and INTERCOMMUNITY amongſt them. Julian makes this the diſtinguiſhing character of the pagan Religion. For the imperial Sophiſt writing to the people of Alexandria, and upbraiding them for having forſaken the religion of their country, in order to aggravate the charge, inſinuates them to be guilty of ingratitude, as having forgotten thoſe happy times when *all Egypt worſhipped the Gods* IN COMMON, — χὴ ἀκ εἰσέρχεϑαι μνήμη τῆς ϖαλαιᾶς ὑμᾶς ἐκείνης εὐδαιμονίας, ἡνίκα ἦν ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ μὲν ϖρὸς Θεὸς Αἰγύπϖῳ τῇ ϖάσῃ, ϖολλῶν δὲ ἀπελαύομεν ἀγαθῶν. And, in his book againſt the Chriſtian Religion, he ſays, there were but two commands in the Decalogue, that were peculiar to the Jews, and which the Pagans would not own to be reaſonable, namely, the obſervation of the Sabbath, and the *having no other Gods but the Creator of all things*. Ποῖον ἔθνος ἐςὶ (ſays he) ϖρὸς τῶν Θεῶν ἐξω τᾶ, Οὐ ϖροσκυνήσεις Θεοῖς ἑτέροις, χὴ τᾶ, Μνήσθηι τῶν σαββάτων, ὃ μὴ τὰς ἄλλας οἴεϑαι χρῆναι φυλάτϑειν ἐνϑολάς †. The Firſt Cauſe of all things, we ſee, was acknowledged by the Gentile Sages: what ſtuck with

* See note [HH] at the end of this Book.

† Ap. S. Cyril. cont. Julian. l. v.

them

them was the not worſhipping other Gods IN COMMON.——For according to the genius of Paganiſm, as here explained, no room was left for any other diſputes, but whoſe God was moſt powerful; except where, by accident, it became a queſtion, between two nations inhabiting the ſame country, who was truly the TUTELAR Deity of the place. As once we are told happened in Egypt, and broke out into a religious war:

Inde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum
Odit uterque locus, cum SOLOS CREDIT HABENDOS
Eſſe deos, quos ipſe colit *.

Here the queſtion was not, which of the two worſhipped a Phantom, and which a God, but whoſe God was the *tutelar* God of the place. Yet to inſult the *tutelar* Gods of the place was a thing ſo rare, and deemed ſo prodigious, that Herodotus thinks it a clear proof of Cambyſes's incurable madneſs that he outraged the Religion of Egypt, by ſtabbing their God Apis and turning their monkey Deities into ridicule †. Notwithſtanding a late noble writer, from this account of Juvenal, would perſuade us ‡, that *intolerance* was of the very nature and genius of the Egyptian theology, from whence all Paganiſm aroſe. "The common heathen religion (ſays "he) was ſupported chiefly from that ſort of enthuſiaſm, which "is raiſed from the external objects of grandeur, majeſty, and what "we call auguſt. On the other hand, the Egyptian OR SYRIAN "religions, which lay moſt in myſtery and concealed rights, *having* "*leſs dependance on the Magiſtrate*, and leſs of that decorum of art, "politeneſs, and magnificence, ran into a more puſillanimous, fri-"volous, and mean kind of ſuperſtition; the obſervance of days, "the forbearance of meats, and the contention about traditions, ſe-"niority of laws, and priority of godſhips.

* Juvenal, Sat. xv.

† Καμβύσης δὲ, ὡς λέγουσι Αἰγύπτιοι, διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἀδίκημα ἀυλίκα ἐμάνη, ἐὼν ἀδὲ πρότερον φρενήρης. Thalia, c. 30. *in initio.*

‡ Characteriſtics, vol. iii. Miſcel. 2.

"Summus

" Summus utrimque
" Inde furor vulgo, *&c* *."

Well might he ſay, he ſuſpected " that it would be urged againſt " him, that he talked at random and *without book* †." For the very contrary of every thing he here ſays, is the truth. And his ſuppoſing the Egyptian and Syrian religions had leſs dependence on the Magiſtrate than the Roman; and that the Egyptian, and *Syrian* (as he is pleaſed to call the *Jewiſh*) were the ſame, or of a like genius, is ſuch an inſtance of his knowledge or ingenuity, as is not eaſily to be equalled. However, ſince the noble writer hath made ſuch uſe of the Satiriſt's relation, as to inſinuate that the Ombites and Tentyrites acted in the common ſpirit and genius of the Egyptian theology, and became the model of *intolerance* to the Jewiſh and Chriſtian world, it may not be amiſs to explain the true original of theſe religious ſquabbles, as Antiquity itſelf hath told the ſtory: whereby it will appear, they had their birth from a very particular and occaſional fetch of civil policy, which had no dependence on the general Superſtition of the Pagan world.

The inſtance ſtands almoſt ſingle in Antiquity. This would incline one to think that it aroſe from no common principle: and if we enquire into the *nature* of the Egyptian theology, it will appear impoſſible to come from *that*. For the common notion of local and tutelary deities, which prevents all *intolerance*, was originally, and peculiarly, Egyptian, as will be ſeen hereafter. It may then be aſked how this miſchief came about? I believe a paſſage in Diodorus Siculus, as quoted by Euſebius, will inform us. A certain king of Egypt, finding ſome cities in his dominions apt to plot and cabal againſt him, contrived to introduce the diſtinct worſhip of a different animal into each city; as knowing that a reverence for their own, and a neglect of all others, would ſoon proceed to an EXCLUSION; and ſo bring on ſuch a mutual averſion, as would never ſuffer them to unite in one common deſign. Thus, was

* Vol. III. p. 41. † P. 82.

there at firſt as little of a *religious war on the principles of intolerance* in this affair of the Ombites and Tentyrites, as in a drunken ſquabble between two trading Companies in the church of Rome about their patron ſaints. But Diodorus deſerves to be heard in his own words: who, when he had delivered the fabulous accounts of the original of brute-worſhip, ſubjoins that which he ſuppoſed to be the true. "But ſome give another original of the worſhip of "brute animals: for the ſeveral cities being formerly prone to "rebellion, and to enter into conſpiracies againſt Monarchical "government, one of their Kings contrived to introduce into each "city the worſhip of a different animal: ſo that while every one "reverenced the Deity which itſelf held ſacred, and deſpiſed what "another had conſecrated; they could hardly be brought to join "cordially together in one common deſign, to the diſturbance of "the Government *."

But to return: ſuch then was the root and foundation of this SOCIABILITY of Religion in the ancient world, ſo much envied by modern Pagans. The effect of their abſurdities, as *Religions*; and of their imperfections, as *Societies*. Yet had univerſal cuſtom made

* Αἰτίας δὲ καὶ ἄλλας φασί τινες τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων τιμῆς· τῷ γὰρ πλήθει τὸ παλαιὸν ἀφισαμένῳ τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ συμφρονεῖν εἰς τὸ μηκέτι βασιλεύεσθαι, ἐπινοῆσαί τινα διάφορα σεβάσματα αὐτοῖς τῶν ζώων παρασχεῖν, ὅπως ἐπάστω τὸ μὲν παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμενον σεβομένων· τῷ δὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀφιερωμένῳ καταφρονούντων, μηδέποτε ὁμονοῆσαι δύνωνται πάντες οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον. Euſeb. Præp. Evang. p. 32. ed. Rob. Steph. Plutarch gives us an account of another of theſe ſquabbles (if indeed it was not the ſame with Juvenal's) which happened much about the ſame time, between the Oxyrynchitæ and the Cynopolitæ; and confirms what is here ſaid of the original of this mutual hatred.—Ἄλλοι δὲ τῶνδε τῶν δεινῶν τινα καὶ παναίργων βασιλέων ἱστοροῦσι, τὰς Αἰγυπτίους καταμαθόντα τῇ μὲν φύσει κύφους καὶ πρὸς μεταβολὴν καὶ νεωτερισμὸν ὀξυῤῥόπους ὄντας, ἄμαχον δὲ καὶ δυσκάθεκτον ὑπὸ πλήθους δύναμιν ἐν τῷ σωφρονεῖν καὶ κοινοπραγεῖν ἔχοντας, ἀίδιον αὐτοῖς ἐν καταστορᾷ δείξαντα δεισιδαιμονίαν διαφορᾶς ἀπαύστου πρόφασιν· τῶν γὰρ θηρίων ἃ προσέταξεν ἄλλοις ἄλλα τιμᾶν καὶ σέβεσθαι. δυσμενῶς καὶ πολεμικῶς ἀλλήλοις προσφερομένων, καὶ τροφὴν ἑτέραν ἑτέρους προσίεσθαι πεφυκότας, ἀμύνοντας, ἀεὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις ἕκαστοι καὶ καλιπῶς ἀδικουμένοις φέροντες, ἐλάνθανον τὴν τῶν θηρίων ἔχθραις συνελκόμενοι καὶ συνεκπολεμούμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους· μόνοι γὰρ ἔτι νῦν Αἰγυπτίων Λυκοπολῖται πρόβατον ἐσθίουσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ λύκον, ὃν θεὸν νομίζουσιν· οἱ δὲ Ὀξυρυγχῖται καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν Κυνοπολιτῶν τὸν ὀξύρυγχον ἰχθὺν ἐσθιόντων, κύνας συλλαβόντες καὶ θύσαντες, ὡς ἱερεῖον καθίφαγον· ἐκ δὲ τούτου καταστάντες εἰς πόλεμον, ἀλλήλους τὴν διέθηκαν κακῶς, καὶ ὕστερον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων κολαζόμενοι διελέθησαν. Περὶ ΙΣ. καὶ ΟΣ. 676, 677. Steph. ed.

this

this principle of INTERCOMMUNITY, ſo eſſential to Paganiſm, that when their Philoſophers and men of learning, on the ſpreading of Chriſtianity, were become aſhamed of the groſſneſs of Polytheiſm, and had ſo refined it by allegorical interpretations of their Mythology, as to make the ſeveral Pagan deities but the various attributes of the one only God; they ſtill adhered to their darling principle (for Paganiſm ſtill continued to be without a dogmatic theology, or formulary of faith) and contended, that this diverſity was harmony, a muſical diſcord, well pleaſing to the God of heaven and earth. "It is but reaſonable for us (ſays Symmachus*) to ſup-
"poſe, that it is one and the ſame BEING whom all mankind
"adores. We behold the ſame ſtars; we live under the influence
"of one common heaven; we are incompaſſed by the ſame uni-
"verſe. What matters it, what device each man uſes in his ſearch
"after truth? ONE road is plainly too narrow to lead us into the
"initiation of ſo GRAND A MYSTERY." Elegantly alluding to the *ſecret* of the *greater Myſteries*, where, after the Hiſtory of the Popular theogony had been delivered to the Initiated, the orphic Hymn, revealing the doctrine of the *Unity*, concluded the entertainment. "The great lord and governor of the earth (ſays The-
"miſtius) ſeems to be delighted with theſe diverſities of Reli-
"gions. It is his Will that the Syrians worſhip him one way, the
"Greeks another, and the Egyptians yet another †." The reader ſees that the foundation of this way of thinking, was the old principle of *intercommunity* in the worſhip of local tutelary Deities. But, what is remarkable, it appears even to this day, to be eſſential to Paganiſm. Bernier tells us, that the Gentiles of Hindouſtan defended their religion againſt him in this manner: "They gave

* Æquum eſt, quicquid omnes colunt unum putari; eadem ſpectamus aſtra; commune cœlum eſt; idem nos mundus involvit: *Quid intereſt quâ quiſque prudentiâ verum requirat?* UNO *itinere non poteſt perveniri ad tam* GRANDE SECRETUM, Lib. x. Ep. 61. *ad Valent. Theod. et Arcad. Augg.*

† Ταύτῃ νόμιζε γάννυσθαι τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τὸν τῶ παντὸς Ἀρχηγέτην· ἄλλως Σύρους ἐθέλει θρησκεύειν, ἄλλως Ἕλληνας, ἄλλως Αἰγυπτίους. Orat. XII.

"me (ſays he) this pleaſant anſwer; that they did not at all pre-
"tend that their Law was univerſal—that they did not in the leaſt
"ſuſpect that *ours* was falſe: it might, for what they knew, be
"a good Law for us, and that GOD MAY HAVE MADE MANY DIF-
"FERENT ROADS TO LEAD TO HEAVEN; but they would by no
"means hear that *ours* was general for the whole world, and *theirs*
"a mere fable and invention *." Bernier indeed ſpeaks of this as a peculiar whimſey, which had entered the head of his Brachman. But had he been as converſant in hiſtory and Antiquity, as he was in modern philoſophy, he would have known that this was a principle which accompanied Paganiſm through all its ſtages.

Let us now ſee the nature and genius of thoſe Religions which were founded, as we ſay, in TRUE REVELATION. The firſt is the JEWISH; in which was taught the belief of one God, the Maker and Governor of all things, in contradiſtinction to all the falſe gods of the Gentiles: This neceſſarily introduced a DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. So that the followers of this Religion, if they believed it true, in the ſenſe it was delivered to them, muſt needs believe all others to be falſe. But it being inſtituted only for themſelves, they had, *directly*, no further to do with that falſhood, than to guard themſelves againſt the contagion of it, by holding no fellowſhip or communion with the Gentiles.

Yet ſo ſtrong was this general prejudice of INTERCOMMUNITY, that all the proviſions of the Law could not keep this brutal people from running into the idolatries of the Nations: For their frequent defections, till after the Babylonian Captivity, were no other than the joining foreign Worſhip to the Worſhip of the God of Iſrael.

After this Religion, comes the CHRISTIAN, which taught the belief of the ſame God, the ſupreme Cauſe of all things: and being a Revelation, like the other, from Heaven, muſt needs be built upon that *other*; or at leaſt on the ſuppoſition of its truth. And, as this latter was not national, like the other, but given to

* See note [I I] at the end of this Book.

all

all mankind. For that reaſon, but eſpecially for ſome others, which will be fully conſidered in their place, it had a MORE COMPLETE ſyſtem of dogmatick theology. The conſequence of this was, that its followers muſt not only think Paganiſm falſe, and Judaiſm aboliſhed, and ſo refuſe all fellowſhip and communion with both; but muſt endeavour to propagate *their* Religion throughout the world, on the deſtruction of all the reſt. And their dogmatic theology teaching them that TRUTH (and not UTILITY *, as the Pagans, who had only public Rites and Ceremonies, ſuppoſed) was the end of Religion; it was no wonder, their averſion to *falſhood* ſhould be proportionably increaſed. And ſo far all was right. But this averſion, cheriſhed by piety, unhappily produced a blind, ungovernable zeal; which, when arguments failed, hurried them on to all the unlawful uſe of force and compulſion. Hence the evils of PERSECUTION, and the violation of the laws of humanity, in a fond paſſion for propagating the Law of GOD †.

This is a true repreſentation of the ſtate of things, both in the Pagan, and in the Believing world. To give it the utmoſt evidence, we will next conſider the reception true Religion met with amongſt idolaters.

The Pagan world having early imbibed this inveterate prejudice concerning *intercommunity of worſhip*, men were but too much accuſtomed to new Revelations, when the JEWISH appeared, not to acknowledge its ſuperior pretences. Accordingly we find by the hiſtory of this People, that it was eſteemed a *true one* by its neighbours. And therefore they proceeded, in their uſual way, to join it, on occaſion, to their own: as thoſe did, whom the king of Aſſyria ſent into the cities of Iſrael in the place of the ten Tribes. Whereby it happened (ſo great was the influence of this Principle) that in the ſame time and country, the Jews of Jeruſalem

* For this the reader may ſee Dion. Harlicarnaſſeus's diſcourſe of the religion which Romulus introduced in his republic; and for his reaſon, ſee Book III. and IV.

† See note [KK], at the end of this Book.

added

added the Pagan idolatries to their Religion; while the Pagans of Samaria added the Jewiſh religion to their idolatries.

But when this people of God, in conſequence of having their *dogmatic Theology* more carefully inculcated to them after their return from the Captivity, became rigid in pretending not only that their Religion was true, but the only true one; then it was, that they began to be treated by their Neighbours, and afterwards by the Greeks and Romans, with the utmoſt hatred and contempt for this THEIR INHUMANITY AND UNSOCIABLE TEMPER. To this cauſe alone we are to aſcribe all that ſpleen and rancour which appears in the hiſtories of theſe latter Nations, concerning them. Celſus fairly reveals what lay at bottom, and ſpeaks out, for them all: "If the Jews, on theſe accounts, adhere to their own Law, "it is not for *that*, they are to blame: I rather blame thoſe who "forſake their own country religion to embrace the Jewiſh. But "if theſe People give themſelves airs of ſublimer wiſdom than the "reſt of the world, and on that ſcore refuſe all COMMUNION with it, "as not equally pure;—I muſt tell them that it is not to be believed "that they are more dear, or agreeable to God, than other na-"tions *." Hence, amongſt the Pagans, the Hebrew People came to be diſtinguiſhed from all others by the name of GENUS HOMINUM INVISUM DEIS †, and with good reaſon ‡.

This was the reception the Jews met with in the world: but not pretending to obtrude their Religion on the reſt of mankind, as it was given properly to the Poſterity of Abraham, they yet, for the moſt part, eſcaped perſecution.

When CHRISTIANITY aroſe, though on the foundation of Juda-iſm, it was at firſt received with great complacency by the Pagan world. For they were ſuch utter ſtrangers to the idea of one Re-

* Εἰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ ταῦτα περιτέλλοιεν Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν ἴδιον νόμον, ὦ μακάριε αὐτῶν· ἐκείνων δὲ μᾶλλον τῶν καταλιπόντων τὰ σφέτερα, καὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίων προσποιουμένων· εἰ δ' ὥς τι σοφώτερον εἰδότες σεμνύνονταί τε, καὶ τὴν ἄλλων κοινωνίαν ὑπ' ἐξ ἴσου καθαρῶν ἀποτρέπονται — ὦ μὴν οὐδ' εὐδοκιμεῖν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τίργεσθαι διαφόρως τι τῶν ἄλλων τούτους εἰκός. Orig. cont. Celſum, l. v. p. 259.

† Tacit. Hiſt. l. v. ‡ See note *, p. 441.

ligion's

ligion's being built, or dependent on another, that it was a long time before they knew this connection between them. Even Celſus himſelf, with all his ſufficiency, ſaw ſo little how this matter ſtood, that he was not ſatisfied whether the Jews and Chriſtians worſhiped the ſame God;—was ſometimes inclined to think they did not. This ignorance, which the propagators of our Religion were not too forward to remove *, for fear of hindering the progreſs of the Goſpel, prevented the prejudice which the Pagans had to Judaiſm, from indiſpoſing them to Chriſtianity. So that the Goſpel was favourably heard. And the ſuperior evidence, with which it was inforced, inclined men, long habituated to pretended Revelations, to receive it into the number of the Eſtabliſhed. Accordingly we find one Roman emperor introducing it amongſt his cloſet Religions †; and another propoſing to the Senate ‡, to give it a more public entertainment §. But when it was found to carry its pretenſions higher ||, and to claim, like the Jewiſh, the title of the ONLY TRUE ONE, then it was that it began to incur the ſame hatred and contempt with the Jewiſh. But when it went ſtill further, and urged a neceſſity for all men to forſake their national Religions, and embrace the Goſpel, this ſo ſhocked ** the Pagans, that it ſoon brought upon itſelf the bloody ſtorms which followed. Thus you have the true origin of *perſecution for Religion* (though not of the *intolerant principle*, as we ſhall ſee before we come to the end of this ſection). A perſecution not committed, but undergone, by the Chriſtian Church.

Hence we ſee how it happened, that ſuch good Emperors as Trajan and M. Antonine came to be found in the firſt rank of

* See note [LL], at the end of this Book.

† Alexander Severus. Lampridii, c. 29.

‡ Tiberius retulit ad ſenatum ut INTER CETERA SACRA reciperetur. Hier. See note [MM], at the end of this Book.

§ See note [NN], at the end of this Book.

‖ See note [OO], at the end of this Book.

** See note [PP], at the end of this Book.

perſecutors.

perſecutors. A difficulty that hath very much embarraſſed the enquirers into eccleſiaſtical antiquity; and given a handle to the Deiſts, who empoiſon every thing, of pretending to ſuſpect that there muſt be ſomething very much amiſs in primitive Chriſtianity, while ſuch wiſe magiſtrates could become its perſecutors. But now the reaſon is manifeſt *: the Chriſtian pretences overthrew a fundamental principle of Paganiſm, which they thought founded in nature; namely, *the friendly intercommunity of worſhip.* And thus the famous paſſage of Pliny the younger becomes intelligible. "For I did not in the leaſt heſitate, but that whatever "ſhould appear on confeſſion, to be their faith, yet that their fro-"wardneſs and *inflexible obſtinacy* would certainly deſerve puniſh-"ment †." What was this *inflexible obſtinacy?* It could not conſiſt in profeſſing a *new Religion:* that was a thing common enough. It was the refuſing all communion with Paganiſm; refuſing to throw a grain of incenſe on their altars. For we muſt not think, as is commonly imagined, that this was at firſt enforced by the Magiſtrate to make them renounce their Religion: but only to give a *teſt* of its *ſocial and hoſpitable* temper. It was indeed, and rightly, underſtood by the Chriſtians to be a renouncing of their Religion; and ſo, accordingly, abſtained from. The misfortune was, that the Pagans did not conſider this *inflexibility* as a mere *error*, but as an *immorality* likewiſe. The *unſociable*, *uncommunicable* temper, in matters of religious worſhip, was eſteemed by the beſt of them, as *a hatred and averſion to mankind.* Tacitus, ſpeaking of the burning of Rome: "Haud perinde in crimine incendii quam "ODIO HUMANI GENERIS convicti ſunt ‡ [Chriſtiani]." *Convicted*, he ſays, *of hate to all mankind.* But how? The confeſſion of the Pagans themſelves, concerning the purity of the Chriſtian morals, ſhews this could be no other than a *conviction* of their rejecting all

* See note [QQ], at the end of this Book.

† Neque enim dubitabam, *qualecunque eſſet* quod faterentur, certe, pertinaciam et *inflexibilem obſtinationem* debere puniri. Lib. x. Ep. 97.

‡ Ann. xv. Sect. 44.

intercommunity

intercommunity of Worſhip; which, ſo great was their prejudice, they thought could proceed from nothing but *hate to mankind*. The like character the ſame hiſtorian gives of the Jews: "Apud "ipſos FIDES OBSTINATA, ſed adverſus omnes alios HOSTILE "ODIUM *." *Now the Jews and Chriſtians* had nothing in common but this *unſociable and uncommunicable temper* in religious matters, this *obſtinata fides* which gave ſo much offence to Paganiſm. We are not to imagine, theſe excellent Pagan moraliſts ſo blind as not to ſee all the merit of *a firm and fixed reſolution of keeping a good conſcience*. They did ſee and own it, as appears by the famous "Juſtum et tenacem propoſiti virum," &c. of one of their moral poets. But, unluckily for truth, they did not ſee the *pervicacia et inflexibilis obſtinatio* of the Chriſtians in that light. Though it was nothing more than ſuch a *fixed reſolution*, as one who moſt ſeverely cenſured them for it, the good emperor Marcus Antoninus, fairly confeſſes. In his book of *Meditations*, ſpeaking of a wiſe man's readineſs to die, he ſays, "He ſhould be ſo prepared, that his readineſs "may be ſeen to be the effect of a well-weighed judgement, not of "MERE OBSTINACY, like that of the Chriſtians †." This is a very heavy charge on the primitive Martyrs. But he himſelf removes it in his Conſtitution to the *Community of Aſia*, given us by Euſebius. "I know, ſays he, the Gods are watchful to diſcover ſuch ſort of "men. For it is much more fit that they themſelves ſhould puniſh "thoſe who REFUSE TO WORSHIP THEM, than that we ſhould "interfere in it ‡." Why then was it called *mere obſtinacy?* The reaſon is ſeen above: univerſal prejudice had made men regard a refuſal of this *intercommunity* as the moſt brutal of all diſſociability. And the emperor Julian, who underſtood this matter the beſt of any, fairly owns, that the Jews and Chriſtians brought the exe-

* See note [RR], at the end of this Book.

† See note [SS], at the end of this Book.

‡ Ἐγὼ μὲν οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπιμελὲς ἐστι μὴ λανθάνειν τοὺς τοιούτους· πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐκεῖνοι κολάσαιεν ἂν τοὺς μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς προσκυνεῖν ἢ ἡμεῖς. Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l. iv. c. 13.

cration of the world upon them by their averſion to the Gods of Paganiſm, and their refuſal of all communication with them *.

On this occaſion, it may not be improper, once for all, to expoſe the ignorance and malice of thoſe, whom the French call PHILOSOPHERS, and we Engliſh, FREE-THINKERS; who, with no more knowledge of Antiquity, than what the *modern ſenſe* of a few Latin and Greek words could afford them, have his *odium humani generis* perpetually in their mouths, to diſgrace the choſen People of God, or rather the Author of their Religion. Their favorite author, Tacitus himſelf, by extending the abuſe, diſcountenances it. He makes this *odium humani generis* the characteriſtic *both of Jews and Chriſtians*; and by ſo doing, ſhews us, in what it conſiſted. Nor do the Ancients in general, by affixing it as the common brand to theſe two *inhoſpitable* Religions, contribute to this calumny, any otherwiſe than by the incapacity of our *Philoſophers* to underſtand them. Diodorus Siculus, ſpeaking † of Antiochus's profanation of the *Jewiſh Temple*, and his contemptuous deſtruction of the *Sacred Books*, applauds the Tyrant's exploits, as thoſe Books contained τὰ μισόξενα νόμιμα, *Laws, which bore hate and enmity to all the reſt of Mankind.* This pretended *odium humani generis*, we find then, was not any thing in the perſonal temper of the Jews, but in the nature and genius of their LAW. Theſe Laws are extant and lie now before us; and we ſee, the only *hate* they contain is the *hate of Idols.* With regard to the *race of Mankind*, nothing can be more endearing than the Moſaic account of their *common original*; nothing more benign or ſalutary than the legal directions to the Jews concerning their treatment of all, *out of the* COVENANT. Whatever there might be of this *odious temper* fairly aſcribed to the Jews, by our *Philoſophers*, it received no counte-

* Ἀλλὰ τὸ, ὃ προσκυνήσεις θεοῖς ἑτέροις· ὃ δὴ μέγα τῆς περὶ τὸν Θεόν φησι διαβολῆς· Θεὸς γὰρ ζηλωτής φησι——ἄφελε τοῦτον τὸν λῆρον, καὶ μὴ τηλικαύτην ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἕλκειε βλασφημίαν. Apud Cyrill. cont. Jul. l. v.

† Eclog. I. ex Diod. Sic. l. 31.

nance.

nance from the LAW, and is expreſsly condemned by the Almighty Author of it, when it betrayed itſelf amongſt certain corrupt and apoſtate members of that Nation. Theſe, indeed, the Prophet Iſaiah deſcribes, as ſaying to all others,—*Stand by thyſelf, come not near me; for I am holier than thou* *. And leſt this ſhould be miſtaken for the fruits of *the unhoſpitable genius of the Law*, he takes care to inform us that theſe men were the rankeſt and moſt abandoned Apoſtates.——*A rebellious People who ſacrifice in gardens, and burn incenſe upon Altars of Brick——who remain amongſt the graves, and lodge in the monuments, which eat ſwine's fleſh*, &c †. that is, a People thoroughly paganized.

Thus have I endeavoured to explain the true origin of that univerſal TOLERATION (as far as Religion influenced it) under *Paganiſm*; and the accidental cauſes of its violation under *Chriſtianity*. The account will be further uſeful to many conſiderable purpoſes, as will be ſeen hereafter. At preſent I ſhall only take notice how well it obviates one ſpecious objection againſt Chriſtianity. "If this Religion, ſay the Deiſts, were accompanied with ſuch illuſtrious and extraordinary marks of truth, as is pretended; how happened it, that its truth was not ſeen by more of the beſt and wiſeſt of thoſe times? And if it were ſeen (as it certainly was), how could they continue Pagans?" The anſwer is eaſy. The conviction of the truth of a *new* Religion was not deemed a ſufficient reaſon, by men, overrun with the generai prejudice of INTERCOMMUNITY, to quit their *old* ones.

The caſe indeed was different in a Jew, who held none of this *intercommunity*. If ſuch a one owned the truth of Chriſtianity, he muſt needs embrace it. We conclude, therefore, that the paſſage of Joſephus (who was as much a Jew as the Religion of Moſes could make him) which acknowledges, *Jeſus to be* THE CHRIST ‡,

* Iſai. c. lxv. ver. 5. † Ver. 2, 3, 4.

‡ —Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ· εἴγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή· ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής. Διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων, τῶν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων.—Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΗΝ.—Ἔφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν· τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτα, καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Antiq. xviii. 3. 3.

is a rank forgery, and a very ſtupid one too *. But it hath been ſaid, that Joſephus was a *Jewiſh Convert*. If ſo, it muſt be *to* Judaiſm, and not *from* it. For where he affirms, againſt Apion, that *there ought to be but one Temple for one God* †, he ſpeaks the very ſpirit of the LAW.

We have now ſeen the motives the civil Magiſtrate had to *tolerate*:——Of what nature that *toleration* was:——And how eaſily it was brought about.

But then, leſt the People ſhould abuſe this right of worſhipping according to their own will, to the detriment of the State, in private and clandeſtine conventicles (which right the Magiſtrate ſupported for the civil benefit of it), he took care that ſuch worſhip ſhould have the public approbation and allowance, before it was received on the footing of a *tolerated Religion*. So, by the laws of ATHENS, no *ſtrange God*, nor *foreign Worſhip* was permitted, till approved and licenſed by the Court of AREOPAGUS. This is the reaſon why St. Paul, who was regarded as the bringer in of *foreign Gods*, ΞΕΝΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ, was had up to that Tribunal. Not as a criminal ‡, but rather as a public benefactor, who had a *new Worſhip* to propoſe to a people, *religious above all others*, ΟΣ ΔΕΙΣΙΔΑΙΜΟΝΕΣΤΕΡΟΙ; moſt addicted, as Strabo tells us, to the recognition of *foreign Worſhip* §; and "of all the Greeks, as "Julian obſerves, moſt devoted to Religion, and moſt hoſpitable "to ſtrangers ||." Tully ** makes Solon the founder of this Court. But the Arundel marbles, and Plutarch in his life of that Lawgiver ††, contradict this opinion; and the latter, in ſupport of his

* See a further proof of it, vol. II. Book V. ſect. 4. † Lib. II.

‡ See note [TT], at the end of this Book.

§ Ἀθηναῖοι ὥσπερ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλοξενώτατοι διαμένουσιν, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τὰς θεούς· πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν ξενικῶν ἱερῶν παρεδέξαντο. Geogr. l. x.

‖ —— ὡς καὶ φιλόθεοι μάλιστα πάντων εἰσὶ, καὶ δίκαιοι πρὸς τοὺς ξένους. Miſopog.

** De Officiis, lib. i. c. 22.

†† Vitæ parall vol. i. p. 194. edit. Bryan.

own,

own, quotes a law of Solon's, which makes mention of the Areopagus as already exiſting. The difficulty is how to reconcile theſe accounts. I imagine this might be the caſe: Solon, we know, was employed by the Athenians to new-model their Commonwealth, by reforming the ill Conſtitutions, and ſupplying ſuch as were defective. So that in the number of his regulations, this might be one; The adding, to the Court of Areopagus, the peculiar juriſdiction in queſtion; as of great moment to public utility. And having thus enlarged and ennobled its Juriſdiction, he was afterwards regarded as its founder. A paſſage in Æſchylus ſeems, at firſt ſight indeed, not to favour this opinion; but to inſinuate, that this Juriſdiction was coëval with the Court. In the fifth act of his *Eumenides*, he makes the worſhip of the *Furies*, or the *venerable Goddeſſes*, as they were called, to be received and recognized in Athens, by a decree of Minerva, as head of the college of Areopagus, which the poet feigns ſhe had juſt then inſtituted. But this plainly appears to have been contrived only for the ſake of a poetical embelliſhment: and Æſchylus ſeems to employ one circumſtance in this ſcene, deſignedly to inform us of the order of time, in which the Court received its two different juriſdictions. It is, where he makes the *criminal* cauſe of Oreſtes, the firſt which was judged at that Tribunal; and the *religious* one, of the reception of the Eumenides, but the ſecond. However this be, the Areopagus was, by far, the moſt formidable judicature in the republic. And it is obſervable, that Ariſtophanes, who ſpares neither the fleets, the armies, the Courts of juſtice, the perſon of the ſupreme Magiſtrate, the Aſſemblies of the people, or the Temples of the Gods themſelves, does not dare to hazard the leaſt injurious reflection on that venerable body.

The ROMANS had a law to the ſame purpoſe; which, as often as it was violated, was publicly vindicated by the authority of the State: as appears from the words of Poſthumius in Livy, quoted in the laſt ſection: "Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium

"eſt

" eſt magiſtratibus datum, ut ſacra externa fieri vetarent, ſacrificu-
" los vateſque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent, vaticinos libros con-
" quirerent * ?" &c. Which ſhews their care to have all *tolerated* religions under the Magiſtrate's inſpection. And, if I am not much miſtaken, Tully, in his *Books of Laws*, the ſubſtance of which is taken from the *Twelve tables*, gives us that very law; whereby, as we ſaid, all foreign and clandeſtine worſhip, unauthorized by the civil magiſtrate, was forbid. SEPARATIM NEMO HABESSIT DEOS: NEVE NOVOS, NEVE ADVENAS, NISI PUBLICE ADSCITOS, PRIVATIM COLUNTO †. "No man ſhall worſhip the
" Gods clandeſtinely, or have them ſeparately to himſelf: nor
" ſhall any new or foreign God be worſhipped by particulars, till
" ſuch God hath been legally approved of, and tolerated by the
" magiſtrate." The comment, as conciſe, and conſequently as obſcure as the text, follows in theſe words: SUOSQUE DEOS, AUT NOVOS, AUT ALIENIGENAS COLI, CONFUSIONEM HABET RELIGIONUM, ET IGNOTAS CEREMONIAS: NON A SACERDOTIBUS, NON A PATRIBUS ACCEPTOS DEOS, ITA PLACERET COLI, SI HUIC LEGI PARUERANT IPSI ‡. "For each man to have his Gods in pecu-
" liar, whether *new* or *ſtranger* Gods, without public allowance,
" tends to defeat and confound all religion, and introduce clan-
" deſtine worſhip: and had the prieſts and our forefathers had a
" due regard to this law, we ſhould never have approved of that
" kind of worſhip which we now pay to the Gods they introduced
" amongſt us."

But notwithſtanding all this, Mr. Bayle, from the words above quoted from the ſpeech of Poſthumius in Livy, would perſuade us §, that the Romans did not admit or tolerate foreign worſhip; and that the care of the Magiſtrate, there taken notice of by the Conſul,

* Lib. xxxix. Hiſt.

† See note [UU], at the end of this Book.

‡ See note [XX], at the end of this Book.

§ Penſ. div. c. 221.

was

was to prohibit all religions, but the *eſtabliſhed*: an opinion which the whole Roman hiſtory diſcredits; where we find the Magiſtrate, from time to time, *tolerated* all foreign religions with the utmoſt facility. The care then, which Poſthumius meant, was ſurely that of preventing all clandeſtine worſhip, unlicenſed by the Magiſtrate: This appears even from that other paſſage brought by Mr. *B. from Livy* to ſupport his aſſertion: "Nec corpora modo "affecta tabo, ſed animos quoque multiplex religio et pleraque ex- "terna invaſit, novos ritus ſacrificando, vaticinando *inferentibus in* "*domos, quibus quæſtui* ſunt capti ſuperſtitione animi*:" But more particularly from the very affair, Poſthumius was here engaged in. At this juncture, the State was above meaſure exaſperated by the monſtrous enormities committed in the clandeſtine rites of Bacchus: yet it is obſervable, that, in the edict paſſed in the very height of their reſentment, the right of *toleration* was preſerved inviolate: the Decree of the Senate forbidding "any cele- "bration of the *Bacchanals* either in Rome or Italy. But that if "any one ſhould be poſſeſſed with a belief that this ſort of rite was "due by cuſtom, and neceſſary; and that he could not omit the "celebration of it without irreligion and impiety, he ſhould lay "his caſe before the city Pretor; the Pretor ſhould conſult the "Senate, when there was not leſs than an hundred in council, to "know if they approved of it. Theſe cautions obſerved, the rites "might be celebrated, provided that not more than five aſſiſted at "the ſacrifice, that they had no *common purſe*, no *prieſt*, nor a *maſ-* "*ter of the ſolemnities* †."

* Lib. iv. Hiſt.

† — Ne qua Bacchanalia Romæ, neve in Italia eſſent. Si quis tale ſacrum ſolenne et neceſſarium duceret, nec ſine religione et piaculo ſe id omittere poſſe apud Prætorem urbanum profiteretur; Prætor ſenatum conſuleret, ſi ei permiſſum eſſet, quum in ſenatu centum non minus eſſent, ita id ſacrum faceret, dum ne plus quinque ſacrificio intereſſent, neu qua pecunia communis, neu quis magiſter ſacrorum, aut ſacerdos eſſet. Lib. xxxix.

As

As here, the Magiſtrate's care, in expelling foreign religions, was to prevent clandeſtine worſhip amongſt the *tolerated*; ſo at other times, the ſame care was employed in preventing thoſe foreign religions from mixing with the *eſtabliſhed*, as we are informed by Valerius Maximus *. But neither in that caſe, nor in this, was the liberty of *particulars*, to worſhip as they thought fit, at all infringed, or impaired.

Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus plainly diſtinguiſhes between their *eſtabliſhed* and *tolerated* religions. The paſſage is curious; and will not only ſerve to confute Mr. B.'s notion, but will afford us an opportunity of explaining what is further neceſſary to clear up this embarraſſed ſubject. The words of this diligent enquirer into the Roman Conſtitution are theſe: "What, above all things, raiſed "my admiration was, that, notwithſtanding the vaſt multitudes "which throng from all parts to Rome, who muſt there, conſe-"quently, worſhip their own country Gods, according to their "country rites; yet the city never adopted any of theſe foreign "worſhips into the PUBLIC religion; as hath been the cuſtom for "many other ſtates to do †." Whence it appears, 1. That all ſtrangers might freely worſhip in Rome according to their own way; the being debarred of that liberty, was not deemed, by him, a conceivable caſe: That ſuch *particulars* as were ſo diſpoſed, might join with them; and that, beſides theſe *tolerated* religions, there was one *public*, and *eſtabliſhed*, which admitted of no foreign mixtures. 2. We are not to underſtand the author as if his wonder was cauſed by the Romans having an *eſtabliſhed* religion diſtinct from the *tolerated*; but, for that they mixed, or introduced into the *eſtabliſhed* few or no foreign rites; which was the cuſtom in the cities of Greece: for theſe are the *other ſtates*, which the hiſtorian hints at. But modern writers not adverting to this, when

* Lib. i. c. 3.

† Καὶ ὁ πάντων μάλιστα ἔγωγε τεθαύμακα, καίπερ μυρίων ὅσων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπεληλυθότων ἐθνῶν, οἳ πολλὴ ἀνάγκη σέβειν τὸς πατρίους θεὸς τοῖς οἴκοθεν νομίμοις, ἐθεσὸς εἰς ζῆλον ἐλήλυθε τῶν ξενικῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἡ πόλις δημοσίᾳ, ὃ πολλοῖς ἤδη συνίδη παθεῖν. Antiq. lib. II.

they

they read of the Roman practice of admitting no *foreign* worſhip into their *public* religion, concluded wrongly, that they allowed no *toleration:* and when they read of the Greek practice of naturalizing *foreign* religions, by adopting them into their public worſhip, concluded, as wrongly, that they had no *eſtabliſhments*. 3. The words Η ΠΟΛΙΣ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ, are remarkable: He does not ſay, the city rejected foreign worſhip, but, that it admitted not of it PUBLICLY; that is, did not bring it into the *public* religion of the State. For, as we obſerved before, Paganiſm had two parts, the one public, the other private: the *State*, as ſuch, was the ſubject of the one; and *Particulars*, as ſuch, of the other. But they admitted of foreign rites *privately*; that is, allowed *particulars* to uſe them, after the Magiſtrate's licence had been obtained for that purpoſe. So that the *eſtabliſhed* religion, every where, related to the *public* part of Paganiſm; and the *tolerated*, to the *private* part. 4. The hiſtorian obſerves, that, in this conduct, Rome differed from many other cities, meaning the Grecian. And indeed, it was leſs a wonder than he ſeems to make it: For Rome, riſing on her own foundation, independent on, and unrelated to any other State, and early poſſeſſed with the high enthuſiaſm of diſtinction and empire, would naturally eſteem her tutelary Gods as her own peculiar; and therefore would reject all foreign mixtures. On the contrary, the Grecian States, related to, and dependent on one another, would more eaſily admit of an aſſociation and combination amongſt their national Deities.

Such was the nature of TOLERATION in the Pagan world; and this the wiſe proviſion of ancient Policy, while Civil liberty could keep its own. But when now Government began to degenerate, and ALL, prepoſterouſly to ſubmit to the will of ONE; when the Magiſtrate came to have a good, diſtinct from that of the People; and civil peace was eſtimated, not by the bleſſings it produced, but by the degree of ſubjection it was able to inflict; then the faſhionable ſcheme of Politics began to turn ſolely on the mainte-

nance of a Tyrant's power: and He having obſerved, that, though the *toleration* of religion, under the regulations above deſcribed, was evidently for the advantage of Society; yet, as thoſe regulations were too apt to be neglected, he thought it beſt, by an abſolute *intolerance*, and a thorough *uniformity*, to cut off all occaſions and opportunities of miſchief to himſelf, from private conventicles and conventions.

Agreeably to this ſyſtem of power, we find Mæcenas, in Dion Caſſius *, diſſuading Auguſtus from allowing any *toleration* of religion at all: as, an indulgence in this matter, would indiſpoſe men towards the Magiſtrate, and make them leſs fond of the civil and religious Conſtitutions of their country; from whence factions, and confederacies againſt the State would unavoidably ariſe. He concludes his advice againſt *toleration* in theſe remarkable words: ΑΠΕΡ ΗΚΙΣΤΑ ΜΟΝΑΡΧΙΑ ΣΥΜΦΕΡΕΙ; "as a thing by no means "agreeing with arbitrary power." And Tacitus informs us †, the uſurper followed it. Thus, we ſee, that the famous declaration of, ONE KING AND ONE RELIGION, is not a new maxim, for which we are indebted to French Politics.

So noble an original had the principle of INTOLERANCE: and ſo iniquitous are the adverſaries of our holy religion, to throw it upon the *Chriſtian Faith*; when it appears to have been the pure offspring of *civil Tyranny*; how well ſoever it may have been afterwards nurſed and fondled by ſome Fathers of the Church.

Thus have I attempted to give a plain account of the general methods uſed by ancient Policy to inculcate and ſupport Religion. Were I to ſpeak, as I once intended, of *thoſe* which particular Lawgivers and Magiſtrates employed for the uſe of their proper

* Lib. Hiſt. 52.

† Actum et de ſacris Ægyptiis Judaiciſque pellendis: factumque patrum conſultum, ut quatuor millia libertini generis ea ſuperſtitione infecta, quis idonea ætas, in inſulam Sardiniam veherentur, coercendis illic latrociniis, et ſi ob gravitatem cœli interiſſent, vile damnum: ceteri cederent Italia, niſi, certam ante diem profanos ritus exuiſſent. Tac. Annal. l. II. c. 85.

Societies,

Societies, I ſhould have it in my power to throw great light upon the argument. But this, though the moſt curious part of all, muſt be omitted at preſent, by reaſon of its length. In the mean time, I preſume, more than enough hath been ſaid, even in thoſe places which only ſhew the Legiſlator's care for religion in general, to prove the truth of the propoſition, *That, in the opinion of ancient policy, the doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments was indiſpenſably uſeful to civil Society*: For having ſhewn that the doctrine of a future ſtate was an inſeparable part of Pagan religion, and indeed the ſole ſupport of it, the proving their care for religion in general, proves their care for this doctrine in particular. Where, it is worth obſerving, that, though the ancient Lawgivers deviated from truth, and differed from one another, even in the moſt important points, concerning *property*, *marriage*, *dominion*, *&c.* yet they unanimouſly agreed in owning the uſe, and propagating the belief of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments: And what ſtronger proof would any one deſire of the *neceſſity* of that doctrine to RELIGION and SOCIETY?

We now ſee the cloſe connection between *Civil government* and *Religion*. The following obſervation will ſtill further explain the neceſſity of this union.

That benevolent ſpirit of Antiquity, deſcribed above, which ſet their Heroes upon poliſhing the barbarous manners of their fellow-creatures, and imparting to them the bleſſings of CIVIL LIFE, as divine as it appears, hath yet been far exceeded by the charity of theſe later ages, which ſends MISSIONARIES into the furtheſt regions of the eaſt and weſt, with the ineſtimable bleſſing of *the glad tidings of the Goſpel*. But nothing is matter of more grief to ſerious men than the conſtant ill ſucceſs of ſo charitable an undertaking. Something ſure muſt have been greatly amiſs, to defeat a deſign which all nature conſpires to advance. This would be accounted for. *Catholic* (as they call themſelves) and *Proteſtant* Miſſionaries go promiſcuouſly to either India. The *Catholics* have laboured

moſt in countries civilized; but, giving a commentitious ſyſtem for the goſpel of Chriſt, it is no wonder the Pagans ſhould not be greatly diſpoſed to change *old* fables for *new*. And though the *proteſtant* Miſſionaries carry the *genuine Goſpel* with them into America, yet they preach it to Savages, with no better ſucceſs. The reaſon ſeems to be becauſe they are *Savages*, without Government or Laws; and conſequently of very rude, uncultivated minds. Now Chriſtianity, plain and ſimple as it is, and fitted in its nature for what it was deſigned by its Author, requires an intellect above that of a mere Savage to underſtand *. Something then muſt be previous to it. And what is that ſomething but CIVIL SOCIETY? This is not at all to its diſhonour. And if it hath ſometimes happened, through the indefatigable labours of theſe Miſſionaries, both of the one and the other Communion, that numbers of ſavage converts have been made, they could never long preſerve, or propagate amongſt their tribes, the Chriſtianity they had been taught: but their ſucceſſors have always found the work was to begin anew, and in a little time, nothing left of the others labours to advance upon. And if what we have ſaid in this book be true, *That religion cannot long ſubſiſt without the aid of civil government*, we are not to wonder at it: for, from hence, we conclude, they began at the wrong end; and that to make our holy religion rightly underſtood, much more to propagate and perpetuate it, they ſhould firſt have taught theſe Savages the arts of life: from whence (beſides the benefit of that previous knowledge abovementioned) would have reſulted this further advantage, that men ſo ſenſibly obliged, would have given a more favourable attention to their benefactors. As it is, I am afraid, theſe Savages obſerving in the Miſſionaries (and they have ſenſe enough to obſerve that the Europeans keep many things from them which it would be uſeful for them to know) a total diſregard of their temporal concerns, would be hardly brought to think the matters preſſed upon them of much importance, or

* See note [YY] at the end of this Book.

the

the teachers greatly in earneſt. The civilizing a barbarous people is in itſelf a work of ſuch exalted charity, that to ſee it neglected, when a far nobler end than the arts of life may be procured by it, is matter of the utmoſt aſtoniſhment *. But it is partly owing to this, that many of both miſſions have had too much of that *fanaticiſm* in their temper, which diſpoſes men to an utter contempt of worldly things: they are therefore ſo far from preaching up the advantages of Society, and recommending civil Manners, that they are more diſpoſed to throw aſide their own; and have recourſe to the dried ſkins and parched corn of the Savages. While others of them, of a colder turn, and lower form of *ſuperſtition*, having taken it into their heads, that the vices of improved life would more *indiſpoſe* the Indians to the *precepts* of the Goſpel, than their preſent brutality *incapacitates* them from comprehending the *doctrines* of it, have concluded it beſt, upon the whole, to keep their eyes ſhut to the advantages of civil life †. But without doubt ſo fatal a conduct ariſes chiefly from the falſe and inhumane policy of the European Colonies, a policy common to every ſect and profeſſion, which makes them do all in their power to keep the natives in a ſavage ſtate; as ſuſpecting that the neighbourhood of a civilized people would be too unfriendly to their private intereſts. However, this policy, as bad as it is, has yet ſomething leſs diabolical in it than that other part of COLONY-RELIGION, which robs the oppoſite Continent of ſo many thouſands of our ſpecies, for a yearly ſacrifice to their great idol, Mammon, THE GOD OF GAIN. Theſe Coloniſts, indeed, pretend to obſerve a kind of averſion in the ſavages to a civilized State. And it is no wonder if they ſhould not be very forward to imitate the manners of their oppreſſors. But this is not the natural condition of things. Barbarians are never backward to partake of thoſe advantages of civil life which they underſtand; except where ill uſage has given them

* See note [ZZ] at the end of this Book.

† See note [AAA] at the end of this Book.

an abhorrence for their Inſtructors. The Goths and Vandals in Europe, together with the other benefits of their Conqueſts, joyfully embraced the Chriſtian Faith: And the Turks in Aſia, and other clans of Tartars in China, readily received Religion and Civility from the conquered nations. On the whole, however, I dare venture to foretel, that no great good will ever come of theſe Miſſions, till the two projects of *civilizing* and *ſaving* be joined in one.

As the matter ſtands at preſent, the foreſts of North and South America are good for little but to be made nurſeries for PHILOSOPHERS and FREE-THINKERS. The inhabitants, by following ſimple nature, are already in poſſeſſion of that bleſſing, which theſe illuſtrious Inſtructors ſo vainly wiſhed for at home; namely the removal of all RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES from the education of their children. A learned voyager, who has been lately on a mathematical miſſion to the Equator, deſcribes this happy and envied condition in very emphatic terms; which the reader may find below *. What crops of *Free-thinking* may not be expected from ſo happy a climate! But our *Philoſophers* perhaps, on reflection,

*—J'ai cru reconnoître dans tous [les Indiens Américains, quoique différentes en langues, mœurs, et coûtumes] un même fonds de charactère. L'inſenſibilité en fait le baſe. Je laiſſe à décider ſi on la doit honorer du nom d'apathie; ou l'avilir par celui de ſtupidité. Elle naît ſans doute du petit nombre de leurs idées, qui ne s'étend pas au delà de leurs beſoins. Gloutons juſqu'à la voracité, quand ils ont de quoi ſe ſatisfaire; ſobres, quand la neceſſité les y oblige, juſqu'à ſe paſſer de tout, ſans paroître rien deſirer; puſillanimes et poltrons à l'excès, ſi l'ivreſſe ne les tranſporte pas; ennemis du travail, indifférens à tout motif de gloire, d'honneur, ou de reconnoiſſance; uniquement occupés de l'objet préſent, et toujours déterminés par lui; ſans inquiétude pour l'avenir; incapables de prévoyance et de réflexion; ſe livrant, quand rien ne les gêne, à une joie puerile, qu'ils manifeſtent par des ſauts et des éclats de rire immodérés, ſans objet et ſans deſſein; ils paſſent leur vie ſans penſer, et ils vieilliſſent ſans ſortir de l'enfance, dont ils conſervent tous les défauts——on ne peut voir ſans humiliation combien l'homme abandonné à la ſimple nature, privé d'éducation et de ſocieté, differe peu de la bête. Relation d'un voyage dans l'Amerique meridionale, par M. de la Condamine, p. 51, et ſeq.

may

may think their favourite maxim here puſhed a little too far. However, this freedom from religious prejudices, in the purity of its ſtate here, may be of uſe, in diſpoſing our *Philoſophers* to review their favourite *maxim*; and to conſider whether they be well founded, in recommending it in that extent in which it is here practiſed. It is true, a ſuperſtitious education is productive of great evils. But what then? If, through theſe prejudices, the *Omaguas* of the ſouthern continent think it piety, at the birth of their children, to flatten their heads, like a cheeſe, between two boards, that their faces may reſemble their Deity, the *full moon*; Should the ridicule of this cuſtom make it thought abſurd in us, to bring up our children in the love of juſtice, of purity, and benevolence, that they may reſemble the God of the Chriſtians, whom we adore? Our *Philoſophers* will ſay, So far they are not unwilling to go. What they would have is, that the infant-mind be kept free from the deformed impreſſions of POSITIVE RELIGION. But they muſt pardon us if we think, that in ſuch minds, precepts are beſt enforced by *example*; and that the beſt example is that of the Deity in his diſpenſations to mankind, as delivered by *poſitive religion*.

Was the full definition of *man*, a GOOD PHILOSOPHER, and his only buſineſs, ſpeculative truth, ſomething might be ſaid in favour of preſerving his mind, a *raſa tabula*, till he was himſelf able to judge what was fit to be written on it. But as he was ſent into the world to make a GOOD CITIZEN, in the obſervance of all the relations of civil, ſocial, and domeſtic life; as he was born for practice and not for ſpeculation; I ſhould think that virtues, ſo neceſſary for the diſcharge of thoſe relations, could not be inſinuated too ſoon, or impreſſed too frequently; even though the conſequence might happen to be, the acquiring an obſtinate and unconquerable prejudice in favour of RELIGION.

On the whole, then, we ſee, that the ancient Lawgivers were as much ſuperior to the modern Miſſionaries in the *execution*, as Theſe are, to Them in the *deſign*. Thoſe Sages ſaw plainly that religion

religion and civil policy were inſeparable; and therefore they always taught them together. The experience of all ages juſtified their conduct; and the *truth*, on which they acted, gives us the moſt tranſcendent idea of Divine goodneſs, which hath ſo cloſely united our *temporal* to our *ſpiritual* happineſs. The ſum of all is this, that whoever would ſecure CIVIL GOVERNMENT, muſt ſupport it by the means of RELIGION; and whoever would propagate RELIGION, muſt perpetuate it by the means of CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

NOTES

NOTES on the Continuation of BOOK II.

P. 409. [FF] THESE were the conſiderations, doubtleſs, which induced the excellent author *De l'eſprit des loix* to ſay, "Il eſt aiſé de regler par des loix ce qu'on doit aux autres; il eſt difficile d'y comprendre tout ce qu'on ſe doit à ſoi-meme." Vol. I. p. 167. 4to.

P. 430. [GG] See Book IV.—Nay, ſo fond were they of this notion of local tutelary Deities, that they degraded even JUPITER himſelf, their *Father of gods and men*, into one of them, as appears by his ſeveral appellations of *Jupiter Ammon*, *Olympicus*, *Capitolinus*, etc. This deceived Dr. Bentley, who finding *Jupiter*, in the popular theology, to be a local Deity, concluded him not to be *one* but *many*. So that in the laſt edition of his excellent *Remarks* on that fooliſh book, called *A diſcourſe of free-thinking*, he reproves the tranſlator of Lucan for calling Jupiter Ammon, *this greateſt of the Gods, this mighty chief*:—"A Roman would never have ſaid that *Juppiter Ammon* "was as great as *Juppiter Capitolinus*; though the tranſlator took it for "granted *that all Juppiters muſt needs be the ſame*. But a known paſſage "in Suetonius may correct his notion of the heathen theology.—Auguſtus "had built a temple to *Juppiter Tonans*, within the area of the capitol: "whereupon he had a dream, that *Capitolinus Juppiter* complained his wor- "ſhipers were drawn away: Auguſtus, in his dream, anſwered, that he "had dedicated *Tonans* there, only as the other's porter: and accordingly, "when he waked, he hung (as a porter's badge) that temple round with "bells.—Now if *Capitolinus* would not bear the very *Thunderer* by him, but "in quality of his porter; much leſs would he have ſuffered poor beggarly "*Ammon* (for all he was his name-ſake) to be ſtyled the *mighty chief*." p. 281. Here he had *one* poet to contradict; who "thought" (he ſays) "all Jupiters the ſame." When he wrote his notes on Milton he had *another*

ther on his hands, who, it ſeems, did not think them to be the ſame, and he chuſes to contradict him, likewiſe.

" Ammonian Jove, or Capitoline, was ſeen
" He with Olympias, this with her who bore
" Scipio——" Par. Loſt, Book ix. 508.

On which, the Critic obſerves with ſome contempt—" Then he brings " more ſtories—and (ſomething ſtrange) TWO Jupiters." However in his former humour he will have it, that *according to the popular theology*, " all Jupiters were not the ſame." This will deſerve to be conſidered. The PEOPLE of Antiquity, in exceſs of folly and flattery, were ſometimes wont to worſhip their good kings and benefactors under the name of *Jupiter, the Father of gods and men*, who, by thus lending his titles, received, in a little time, from poſterity, all that worſhip which was firſt paid to the borrowers of his name; all their particular benefactors being ſwallowed up in him. And this was one principal reaſon of Jupiter's being a *tutelary deity*. But their PHILOSOPHERS, ſearching into the original of the Pagan theology, found out this loſt ſecret, That their kings had given occaſion to the worſhip of this local tutelary Jupiter; whom, therefore, they regarded, as different Jupiters; that is, as ſo many kings who had aſſumed his name. Hence Varro in Tertullian reckons up no leſs than three hundred. The reſult of all this was, that in the *popular theology* there was but ONE Jupiter; in the *philoſophic theogony* there were MANY. Juſt as, on the contrary, in the *popular mythology* there were *many* Gods; in the *philoſophic phyſiology*, but *one*.

What ſhall we ſay then to the ſtory from Suetonius, which is brought to prove that, according to the popular theology, *all Jupiters were not the ſame?* For ſurely the Romans regarded the Capitoline Jupiter and the Thunderer as the ſame perſon: If it be aſked, Why then, had they different names? Suetonius will inform us: who relates that Auguſtus conſecrated this temple to Jupiter Tonans, on his being preſerved from a dreadful flaſh of lightning, in his Cantabrian expedition. And ſo Minucius Felix underſtood the matter, where he thus addreſſes the Pagan idolators—Quid ipſe JUPITER veſter! modo imberbis ſtatuitur, modo barbatus locatur: et cum HAMMON DICITUR, habet cornua; et cum CAPITOLINUS, tunc gerit fulmina. Cap. 21. And Euſebius, who was perfectly well acquainted with the pagan theology, ſays expreſly, that Ammon was one

of

of the *Surnames* of Jupiter—Ἔτι δὲ Δία τὸν ὑπό τινων ΑΜΜΩΝΑ προσαγορευόμενον. *Præp. Evang.* l. iii. c. 3. And Cicero in his book of *the nature of the Gods* makes Cotta take it for granted, that the Capitoline and the Ammonian Jupiter were one and the ſame; for, ſpeaking of the form and figure of the Gods againſt Velleius, he ſays, *Et quidem alia* [ſpecies] *nobis Capitolini, alia Atris, Ammonis Jovis.* Where all the weight of the obſervation conſiſts in the ſuppoſition, that the *Capitoline* and *Ammonian* Jupiter were one and the ſame God. However, this muſt be confeſſed, that Capitolinus and Tonans appear to Auguſtus in a *dream*, as two different perſons, and are ſo conſidered by him when *awake*. The true ſolution of the difficulty is this: The Pagans worſhipped their Gods under a material viſible image. And their Statues, when conſecrated, were ſuppoſed to be informed by an Intelligence, which the God, to whoſe worſhip they were erected, ſent into them, as his Vicegerent. This general notion furniſhed Lucian with a pleaſant incident in his *Jupiter Tragicus*, who, calling a grand ſynod of the Gods, is made to ſummon all thoſe of gold, ſilver, ivory, ſtone, and copper. Now, in Auguſtus's dream, it was the *Intelligence*, or Vicegerent, in the ſtatue of Jupiter Capitolinus, who complained of his new brother, in that of Tonans, as getting all the cuſtom from him. This being the whole of the myſtery, Jupiter's popular unity remains unſhaken.

But what ſhall we ſay to the Critic? He cenſures Rowe, for not ſaying what Milton had ſaid; and afterwards cenſures Milton for not ſaying what Rowe had ſaid; and is yet ſo unlucky as to be doubly miſtaken. The caſe is this, Where Milton ſpeaks of two Jupiters, he is delivering the ſenſe of the *Philoſophers*; where Rowe ſays there was but one, he is delivering the ſenſe of the *people*; and both were right. But the Critic, being in a contradicting humour, will have both to be in the wrong.

P. 431. [HH] Denique et antequam commerciis orbis pateret, & antequam gentes ritus ſuos moreſque miſcerent, unaquæque natio conditorem ſuum, aut ducem inclytum, aut reginam pudicam ſexu ſuo fortiorem, aut alicujus muneris vel artis repertorem venerabatur, ut civem bonæ memoriæ. Sic et defunctis præmium, et futuris dabatur exemplum. *Minuc. Fel.* c. xx. Hence may be ſeen the falſhood, both in *fact* and *right*, of the foundation principle of the book called——*The grounds and reaſons of the Chriſtion Religion*; that "it was a *common* and *neceſſary* method for new Reve-

" lations to be built and grounded on precedent Revelations." Chap. iv. p. 20, 26. See this poſition confuted more at large in the ſecond volume of the Divine Legation, Book vi. ſect. vi.

P. 436. [II] Ils me donnoient cette reſponſe aſſez plaiſante; qu'ils ne pretendoient pas que leur Loi fût univerſelle—qu'ils ne pretendoient point que la nôtre fût fauſſe;—qu'il ſe pouvoit faire qu'elle fût bonne pour nous, et que DIEU POUVOIT AVOIR FAIT PLUSIEURS CHEMINS DIFFERENS POUR ALLER AU CIEL; mais ils ne veulent pas entendre que la nôtre tant generale pour toute la terre, la leur ne peut être que fable et que pure invention. *Voyages de Fr. Bernier*, tom. ii. p. 138. Friar William de Rubruquis, a French Minorite, who travelled into Tartary in the year 1253, tells us, c. xliii. that Mangu Chan, Emperor of Tartary, talking to him of religion, ſaid, " As God hath given unto the hand divers fingers, " ſo he hath *given many ways to men to come unto him*; he hath given " the Scriptures unto you; but he hath given unto us ſoothſayers, and " we do that which they bid us, and we live in peace." The Jeſuit Tachard tells us, that the king of Siam made much the ſame anſwer to the French embaſſador, who moved him, in his maſter's name, to embrace the Chriſtian religion—Je m'etonne que le roy de France mon bon ami s'intreſſe ſi fort dans une affaire qui regarde Dieu, où il ſemble que Dieu même ne prenne aucune intereſt, et qu'il a entiérement laiſſé à nôtre diſcretion. Car ce vray Dieu, qui a créé le ciel et la terre et toutes les creatures qu'on y voit et qui leur a donné des natures et des inclinations ſi differentes, ne pouvoit-il pas, s'il eût voulu, en donnant aux hommes des corps et des ames ſemblabes, leur inſpirer les mêmes ſentimens pour la religion qu'il faloit ſuivre, et pour le culte qui luy étoit le plus agreable, et faire naître toutes les nations dans une même loy? Cet ordre parmi les hommes et cette unité de religion dependant abſolument de la Providence divine, qui pouvoit auſſi aiſement introduire dans le monde que la diverſité des ſectes que s'y ſont etablies de tout tems; ne doit on pas croire que *le vray Dieu prend autant de plaiſir à eſtre honoré par des cultes et des ceremonies differentes*, qu'à eſtre glorifié par une prodigieuſe quantité de creatures qui le loüent chacune à ſa maniere? Cette beauté et cette varieté que nous admirons dans l'ordre naturelle, ſeroient elles moins admirables dans l'ordre ſurnaturel, ou moins dignes de la ſageſſe de Dieu? *Voyage de Siam*, l. v. p. 231, 232. Amſt. ed. 1688. The Abbé de Choiſi, a coad-

a coadjutor in this embaſſy, tells us, that the people were in the ſame way of thinking with their king.—Juſques ici ils [les miſſionnaires] n'ont pas fait grand choſe dans le royaume de Siam. Les Siamois ſont des eſprits doux, qui n'aiment pas à diſputer, et qui *croyent la plûpart de toutes les religions ſont bonnes. Journal du Voyage de Siam*, p. 200. ed. Amſt. 1688.

P. 437. [KK] M. Voltaire, in his *Le Siécle de Louis* XIV, having ſpoken of this perſecuting ſpirit amongſt the followers of Chriſt, and obſerved that it was unknown to Paganiſm, ſays very gravely, that "after having *long ſearched* for the cauſe of this difference between the two religions, both of which abounded with dogmatiſts and fanatics, he at length found it in the REPUBLICAN SPIRIT of the latter."—This was only miſtaking the *effect* for the *cauſe*; and was no great matter in a writer, who in the ſame place can tell us, not as problematical, but as a known and acknowledged truth, that the JEWS as well as Gentiles offered HUMAN ſacrifices.—Cette fureur fut inconnuë au Paganiſme. Il couvrit la terre de ténébres, mais il ne l'arroſa guerres que du ſang des animaux; et ſi quelquefois CHEZ LES JUIFS et chez les Païens on *devoua des victimes humaines*, ces devoemens, tout horribles qúils étaient, ne cauſérent point de guerres civiles.—J'AI RECHERCHE LONGTEMS comment et pourquoi cet eſprit dogmatique, qui diviſa les ecoles de l antiquité payenne ſans cauſer le moindre trouble, en a produit parmi nous de ſi horribles.—Ne pourrait-on pas trouver peut-être l'origine de cette nouvelle peſte qui a ravagé la terre, DANS L'ESPRIT REPUBLICAIN qui anima les premieres égliſes? Tom. ii. chap. 32. *Du Calviniſme*, p. 23 Strange! that he ſhould miſtake thus, when he had the true cauſe almoſt in view, as he had when he made the following obſervation: La religion des Païens ne conſiſtait que dans la morale et dans des fetes. And again, in his *Abregé de l'Hiſtoire Univerſelle*—la raiſon en eſt, que les Payens dans leurs erreurs groſſiéres *n'avoient point de dogmes*, p. 63. The firſt queſtion is, How he came by his obſervation? That it was no deduction of his own appears from his not ſeeing the conſequence of the fact contained in it, which was great *indifference* in Religion: for he goes on with that old encomium on Paganiſm, which our Free-thinkers (who did not ſee from whence the *indifference* aroſe) are always ready to give unto it. See p. 164. vol. I. of the Abregé. The ſecond queſtion is, How the Chriſtians came by their *republican ſpirit?* And this only is worth an anſwer. Without doubt it was the SPIRIT OF THEIR RE-

LIGION

LIGION which gave it to them, when the followers of Paganiſm had it not. Chriſtianity conſiſts in the belief of certain propoſitions neceſſary to ſalvation; which *peculiarity* virtually condemns all other Religions. So that theſe other having the civil power on their ſide, would endeavour to ſuppreſs ſo inhoſpitable a Novelty. And this directly violating conſcience, produced the *Republican ſpirit*, or the ſpirit of reſiſtance; whoſe natural aim goes no further than *Liberty*; not to *Dominion*. Agreeably hereto, as is obſerved above, the firſt perſecution for Religion was *borne*, not *inflicted*, by the Chriſtian Church.

P. 439. [LL] To this old Pagan blindneſs, ſome modern Chriſtians ſeem to have ſucceeded. They pretend, that what is ſaid in Scripture of the dependency and foundation of Chriſtianity on Judaiſm, is ſaid by way of ACCOMMODATION to the prejudices of the Jews; but that when the preachers of the Goſpel applied themſelves to the Gentiles, they preached up Jeſus ſimply, as a divine Meſſenger, omitting the Jewiſh characters of the Meſſiah. Now, though nothing can be more falſe, or extravagant; yet the method employed by the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel, to introduce Chriſtianity amongſt the Gentiles, gives this fooliſh Doctrine the little countenance it hath.

P. 439. [MM] This, the Father ſays on the authority of Tertullian and Euſebius. M. Le Clerc, in his *Hiſt. Eccl. ann.* xxix. rejects the whole ſtory, though it be as ſtrongly ſupported as a civil fact can well be. What he urges againſt it is fully obviated by the principles here delivered. Indeed the chief force of his objection ariſes from ſeveral *falſe additions* to the fact: A circumſtance, which may be found in, and hath been brought to the diſcredit of, the beſt atteſted facts of antiquity; ſuch as the defeat of Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple of Jeruſalem. See my diſcourſe on that ſubject.

P. 439. [NN] The not attending to the genius of Paganiſm, hath miſled ſome of the beſt Critics into a very lame judgement on the firſt Apologiſts; who, they pretend, have unſkilfully managed, in employing all their pains to evince what was ſo eaſy to be done, the falſhood of Paganiſm, rather than to prove the truth of their own Religion. For, ſay theſe critics, were Paganiſm proved falſe, it did not follow that Chriſtianity was true; but were the Chriſtian Religion proved true, it followed that the Pagan was falſe. But the matter, we ſee, was juſt otherwiſe;

and

and the Apologiſts acted with much good judgment. The truth of Chriſtianity was acknowledged by the Pagans; they only wanted to have the compliment returned. As this could not be done, there was a neceſſity to aſſign the reaſons of their refuſal. And this gave birth to ſo many confutations of idolatrous Worſhip. It is true, when their adverſaries found them perſiſt in their *unſociable* pretences, they paid this harſh treatment in kind; and accuſed Chriſtianity, in its turn, of falſhood: but this was not till afterwards, and then faintly, and only by way of acquit. For want of due reflection on theſe things, both FABRICIUS and L'ENFANT have been betrayed into this wrong judgment.—Facilius ſubſcribo (ſays the firſt) judicio viri celeberrimi atque eruditiſſimi Jacobi L'enfant, in Diario Londinenſi, *Hiſt. of the works of the Learned, A.* 1709. p. 284. Il y a long tems, qu'on a eu lieu de remarquer, que la religion Chrétienne eſt une bonne cauſe, qui de tout tems a été ſujette à être auſſi mal defenduë, que mal attaquée. Ses PREMIERS APOLOGISTES la ſoûtinrent mieux par leur zèle, par leur pieté, et par leurs ſoufrances, que par les Apologies, qu'ils nous en ont laiſſées.—*Delectus argum. et ſyllabus ſcript. qui relig. Chriſt. aſſer.* p. 209.

P. 439. [OO] This was not underſtood immediately by the Pagans, as appears from a remarkable paſſage of Lampridius in his life of Alexander Severus—Chriſto templum facere voluit [Alex. Severus] eumque inter deos recipere—Sed prohibitus eſt ab iis qui, conſulentes ſacra, repererant omnes Chriſtianos futuros ſi id optato eveniſſet, et templa reliqua deſerenda. Now thoſe who reſted this concluſion on an oracle, or divine premonition, could have no knowledge of the *nature* of Chriſtianity.

P. 439. [PP] The reader will not be diſpleaſed to hear a curious ſtory, from the life of St. Anſcharius, which tends much to illuſtrate what we ſay, concerning the genius of Paganiſm, and the reaſon of its averſion to Chriſtianity. This Saint travelling amongſt the people of the North, fell into the following adventure:—Pervenit ad Byrcam, ubi invenit regem et multitudinem populi nimio errore confuſam. Inſtigante enim Diabolo, contigit, eo ipſo tempore, ut quidam illo adveniens diceret, ſe in conventu deorum, *qui ipſam terram poſſidere credebantur* adfuiſſe, et ab iis miſſum, ut hæc regi et populis nuntiaret: Vos, inquiunt, nos vobis propitios diu habuiſtis, et terram incolatus veſtri cum multa abundantia noſtro adjutorio in pace et proſperitate longo tempore tenuiſtis. Vos quoque nobis ſacrificia.

ficia et vota debita perſolviſtis. At nunc et ſacrificia ſolita ſubtrahitis, et *vota ſpontanea ſegnius offertis*, et, quod magis nobis diſplicet, *alienum Deum* ſuper vos introducitis. Si itaque nos vobis propitios habere vultis, ſacrificia omiſſa augete, et vota majora perſolvite. Alterius quoque Dei culturam, *quæ contraria nobis docetur*, ne apud vos recipiatis, et ejus ſervitio ne intendatis. Porro ſi etiam *plures Deos habere deſideratis, et vobis non ſufficimus, Ericum quondam regem veſtrum nos unanimes in collegium noſtrum adſciſcimus, ut ſit unus de numero Deorum.* Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. Sæc. iv. p. 2. And how little theſe Pagans doubted of Chriſtianity's being a real Revelation from a God, we may ſee in another place of the ſame *Life*, where one of their piratical kings propoſes, according to their cuſtom, to enquire by divination what place they ſhould next invade:—Interim rex præfatus cum Danis agere cœpit, ut forte perquirerent, utrum voluntate deorum locus ipſe ab eis devaſtandus eſſet. Multi, inquit, ibi ſunt Dii potentes et magni, ibi etiam olim eccleſia conſtructa eſt, et cultura Chriſti à multis Chriſtianis ibi excolitur, qui *fortiſſimus eſt Deorum*, et poteſt ſperantibus in ſe quomodo vult auxiliari—Quæſitum eſt igitur ſortibus, etc. Cap. xvi.

P. 440. [QQ] The very learned and acute M. Moyle ſays, *it was the greateſt misfortune that could have befallen the Chriſtians to be perſecuted by ſo great and good a man* [M. Antonine.] *Poſt. Works*, v. ii. p. 274. And Lord Shafiesbury obſerves, *that nothing could have been a greater honour or advantage to Chriſtianity than to be perſecuted by a* Nero. Letter con. Enthuſ. Sect. III. We ſhall know what to think of theſe obſervations, when we have conſidered how the caſe ſtood with regard to *perſecuting* Emperors. In this claſs we find, on one ſide, Nero, Domitian, and the Maximiani; on the other, Trajan, the Antonines, and Valerian. Had the *Perſecutors* been all like the firſt ſet, Unbelievers would have ſaid, "No wonder that force and violence failed to root out the Chriſtian ſect, when employed by ſuch Monſters as were hated by Gods and Men." Had the *Perſecutors*, on the contrary, been all of the other kind, Unbelievers would then have ſaid, "There muſt needs have been ſomething very wrong in the Chriſtian practice, or very impudent in the impoſture of their pretences, to provoke the ſanguinary reſentments of Emperors ſo wiſe and clement." But now, to ſee Christianity *perſecuted* indifferently by the Good and Bad, is ſufficient

ſufficient to reduce the enemies of Revelation to ſilence upon this topic: and is enough to ſatisfy unprejudiced men, aſſiſted in their judgment by what has been ſaid above, that Providence appeared anxious (as it were) to ſhew, by this diſpoſition of things, that matters very foreign to the *merits of the caſe* ſet this violent machine a-going; whoſe iſſue, it was decreed, ſhould convince the World that all it's Power was weakneſs, when oppoſed to the progreſs of the GOSPEL.

P. 441. [RR]. St. Paul tells us in what this *hoſtile odium* conſiſted, where ſpeaking of their obſtinate adherence to the *Law* againſt all the conviction of the *Goſpel*, he ſays, *And they pleaſed not God, and are* CONTRARY TO ALL MEN, 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 15. They were not *contrary to all men* in their having different Rites; for each nation had rites different from one another: but in their condemning and reprobating all Rites but their own: which being (till the coming of Chriſtianity) peculiar to themſelves, was aſcribed to their *hatred of mankind.*

P. 441. [SS] τὸ δὲ ἕτοιμον τοῦτο, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως ἔρχηται, μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί. Lib. xi. § 3. But by this *mere obſtinacy*, no more poſſibly might be meant than *a rigid adherence to truth*, which was not one of the diſtinguiſhing virtues of this royal Philoſopher, as appears even from theſe *Meditations*. He repreſents *L. Verus*, his Colleague in the Empire, as a pattern of vigilance, ſobriety and decency; and his Wife *Fauſtina*, as exemplary for her conjugal tenderneſs and fidelity. Might not then the ſame STOICAL PRIDE which thought fit to cover Luxury and Luſt under the names of Temperance and Chaſtity, be ready to call the divine Heroiſm of the Chriſtian Martyrs a *brutal obſtinacy?*

P. 444. [TT]. St. Chryſoſtom ſuppoſed the Apoſtle was convened before the Areopagus as a CRIMINAL: and his authority hath made it the general opinion: From whence, the learned Author of a Tract intituled, *Obſervations on the converſion of St. Paul*, hath received it. I would rather think, that the *Philoſophers*, who *encountered* him, invited him thither as a PUBLIC BENEFACTOR, who had a new Worſhip to propoſe to the people. My reaſons are theſe:

1. St. Paul was taken up to this Court by the PHILOSOPHERS. Acts xvii. 19.—But the Philoſophers, *of that time*, abhorred the character of delators or perſecutors for Religion: this was a temper which ſprung up amongſt them with the progreſs of Chriſtianity. The worſt opinion they

had of Paul was his being a *babler*, as the Epicureans called him; though the Stoics thought more reverendly of his character, as *a ſetter forth of ſtrange gods*, ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεὺς, a diſcoverer of ſome *foreign* Gods; for their hoſpitality extended to all *ſtrangers*, (as Julian tells us) whether *Gods* or *Men*; and this could not but be a welcome office to a people diſpoſed to raiſe altars even to *Gods unknown*, v. 23.

2. Their addreſs to him, when they had brought him thither, [*may we know what this doctrine, whereof thou ſpeakeſt, is*, v. 19.] implies rather a requeſt to a Teacher than an interrogatory to a Criminal.

3. At leaſt, the reaſon they give for their requeſt goes no further than to imply a deſire of ſatisfaction concerning a doubtful matter——*For thou bringeſt certain ſtrange things to our ears*, v. 20. ξενίζοντά τινα, *certain foreign ceremonies or cuſtoms*. And Strabo, as we ſee, tells us, the Athenians were moſt addicted to *foreign worſhip*.

4. But the very words of the hiſtorian fully explain the whole matter; for having told us that theſe Philoſophers *took Paul, and brought him to Areopagus*, he ſubjoins the motive of their proceeding in theſe words,—*For all the Athenians, and ſtrangers which were there* [*i. e.* ſuch as reſided there for education, or out of love for the Athenian manners] *ſpent their time in nothing elſe but either to tell or to hear ſome new thing*. Now had the writer underſtood the *citation* to be of the criminal *form*, he would have given a more pertinent reaſon for their conduct; ſuch as jealouſy of danger to the State, or the eſtabliſhed Religion.

5. St. Paul's ſpeech to the Court hath not the leaſt air of an apology ſuiting a perſon *accuſed*; but is one continued information of an important matter, ſuch as befitted a Teacher or Benefactor to give.

6. Had he appeared as a Criminal, the charge againſt him would have been ſimply, *The ſetting forth of ſtrange Gods*. Now this charge of leſs importance he declines to anſwer; and yet confeſſes a much greater crime, of which he was not accuſed, namely a condemnation of their eſtabliſhed Worſhip——*And the times of this ignorance God winked at*, etc. v. 30.

7. The behaviour of the Court towards him ſhews he was not heard as a Criminal. He is neither acquitted nor condemned: but diſmiſſed as a man, *coram non judice.—And when they heard of the reſurrection of the dead, ſome mocked: and others ſaid, We will hear thee again of this matter*, v. 32.

8. He

8. He left the Court, as one *thus* diſmiſſed.—*So Paul departed from amongſt them*, v. 33. A ſtrange way of intimating a juridical acquittal: but very naturally expreſſing a reſentment for a ſlighted miſſion. For as ſome *mocked*, and others referred him to an indefinite time of audience, nothing was left him but to depart, and, according to his maſter's direction, *to ſhake the duſt from off his feet*.

9. The hiſtorian's reflection on the whole ſupports all the foregoing reaſons——*Howbeit, certain men clave unto him, and believed*, etc. v. 34. A very natural concluſion of the ſtory, if only a tranſaction within the ſphere of his Miſſion; for then, having related its ill ſucceſs in general, *ſome mocking, and others putting off the hearing*, he adds, that however it was not altogether without effect, for a few converts he did make, *etc.* But if we ſuppoſe it a narrative of a juridical proceſs, we ſhall not find in it one circumſtance of a proper relation. We are not ſo much as told whether he was acquitted or cenſured, or gave caution for a new appearance: But, as if ſo illuſtrious a proſecution (where the moſt learned of the Apoſtles was the *Criminal*, the Greek Philoſophers his *Accuſers*, and the Court of Areopagus his *Judges*) was below the hiſtorian's notice, we are told a thing quite foreign to the matter,—That he made but few converts.

In a word, take this hiſtory in the ſenſe here explained, and the whole narrative is ſimple, exact, and luminous: Take it in the other, and it ſcarce affords us one ſingle quality of a pertinent relation, but is obſcured from one end to the other, both by redundancies and omiſſions.

But had the interpreters not overlooked a plain fact, they would have given a different ſenſe to this adventure. When Chriſtianity firſt appeared, its two enemies, the Jews and Gentiles, had long adminiſtered their ſuperſtitions on very different principles. The Jews employed *perſecution*; but the Gentiles gave a free *toleration*. And, though, ſoon after, the latter went into the *intolerant* meaſures of the other, yet, at this time, they ſtill adhered to the ancient genius of Paganiſm. So that, of the many various perſecutions of the Chriſtian Teachers, recorded in *The Acts of the Apoſtles*, there is not one but what was begun and carried on by Jewiſh Magiſtrates, or at leaſt excited by their emiſſaries; if we except that at Philippi, which too was on pretence of an injury to private property.——tuB the good Father, like more modern Interpreters, was full of the ideas of his own times, when the Perſecution of the Chriſtian Faith was far advanced, rather than thoſe of St. Paul, when it was not yet begun. And ſo I leave it (as it is a miſtake) to be obſtinately perſiſted in.

P. 446. [UU]. Lib. ii. c. 8. Thus, I think, the words ought to be read and pointed. The common reading is, *ſeparatim nemo habeſſit deos neve novos: ſed ne advenas, niſi publice adſcitos, privatim colunto:* which is abſurd and unintelligible. The manuſcript quoted by Manutius reads, *neve novos ſive advenas.* In a word, this Law ſeems not have been underſtood by the critics, from their not apprehending the nature of Paganiſm, and the diſtinction between their *tolerated* and *eſtabliſhed* religions. By the firſt branch, *ſeparatim nemo habeſſit deos*, is meant that the Gods in general ſhould not be worſhipped in private CONVENTICLES, or be had, as it were, in propriety; (*Suos deos*, ſays the comment) but lie in common to all the Citizens. And by the ſecond branch, *neve novos, neve advenas, niſi publice adſcitos, privatim colunto*, is meant that PARTICULARS ſhould not worſhip any *new* or *foreign* god without licence and authority from the State. For we muſt remember what hath been ſaid, in the firſt ſection of this book, concerning the two parts of Pagan religion; the one public, and the other private; the one, which had the *State* for its ſubject; the other, *particulars.* Now the *State*, as ſuch, worſhipped only the country gods; and this was properly the *eſtabliſhed religion.* *Particulars*, as ſuch, frequently grew fond of new and foreign gods, and modes of worſhip: and theſe, when allowed by the ſtate, were their *tolerated religions.* *Privatim* therefore ſignifies [*by particulars*] not [*privately*], which latter ſenſe would make a contradiction in the ſentence: *Niſi publice adſcitos, privatim colunto:* "Let them not worſhip them PRIVATELY, unleſs they be PUBLICLY al-"lowed." For how could thoſe be ſaid to be *privately* worſhipped, that were *publicly* owned? By *deos* NOVOS, both here and in the comment, I ſuppoſe, is meant *gods newly become ſuch:* which in another place he calls —*quaſi* NOVOS *et adſcriptitios cives in cælum receptos.*—*De nat. deor.* l. iii. c. 15. For the *dii minorum gentium* were a kind of every-day manufacture: ſuch as Tully in the words immediately following thus deſcribes: *Ollos quos endo cælo merita vocaverint*; or, *thoſe who had newly diſcovered themſelves to men.* And by ADVENAS, the *known local gods of other countries.*

P. 446. [XX]. Lib. ii. c. 10. Thus I venture to correct the paſſage. The common editions have it—*Non a ſacerdotibus, non a patribus acceptos deos, ita* PLACET *coli, ſi huic legi* PARUERUNT *ipſi.* Gruter ſays: Ita me Deus amet, vix intelligo: hæreo, adhuc hæreo.——And none of the critics have pretended to make ſenſe of it, but Petit, in his comment on the Attic laws:

De

De advenis Diis *(ſays he)* ſibi facit objici Tullius, an non liceat acceptos a ſacerdotibus aut a patribus alienigenas Deos colere? Reſpondet Cicero, licere, ſi, prout hac cavebatur lege, publice ſint adſciti, non privata patrum aut ſacerdotum auctoritate. Hic igitur verborum Tullii ſenſus eſt, qui latet et lectores fugit, qui excidit interrogationis nota, loco ſuo reſtituenda et reponenda ad hunc modum. *Suoſque deos, aut novos aut alienigenas coli, confuſionemne habet religionum, et ignotas ceremonias. Non a ſacerdotibus, non a patribus acceptos deos? Ita placet coli, ſi huic legi* PARUERINT *ipſi.* But as plauſible as this appears, it cannot, I think, be the true interpretation. Cicero is made to object impertinently: for who, from the words *neve novos, neve advenas, niſi publice adſcitos, privatim colunto*, could form any ſuſpicion that, by this law, *the gods received by the prieſts or their fore-fathers* (which certainly had long enjoyed the public allowance) were forbid to be worſhipped? And thoſe not publicly allowed, were forbid, from whatever quarter they were brought in On the other hand, the propriety of the ſenſe, given above, is ſeen from hence: 1. That the obſervation is of the nature of an example to a precept. He delivers a *law* concerning the licenſing new religions by the Magiſtrate; and then takes notice that, had it been well obſerved in Rome, it had prevented a great deal of ſuperſtition. 2. The frequent breach of this *law* in Rome was a notorious fact; as appears by the ſpeech of Poſthumius in Livy, quoted above; and therefore very likely to be taken notice of by Tully, when he was upon this ſubject. And what St. Auſtin ſays, in his ſecond book of the *City of God*, concerning the actions told of the gods in their public worſhip at Rome, and the lubricity of that worſhip, ſhews the ſeaſonableneſs of this animadverſion. Further, as the general ſenſe of the *law* juſtifies the emendation in the *Comment*; ſo the words, *aut novos, aut alienigenas*, in the *Comment*, confirm the correction in the *law*.—By, *confuſionem religionum*, I ſuppoſe Tully meant, ſuch a confuſion of ceremonies, as would leave no diſtinction between the *eſtabliſhed* and the *tolerated* worſhip; and thereby reduce Religion to ſo impotent a ſtate, as to render it uſeleſs to civil Society: And by, *ignotas ceremonias*, rites, which the Magiſtrate, by reaſon of their celebration in private conventicles, could not take cognizance of: which might hurt the morals of ſociety, by their lewdneſs, as happened in the Bacchanals at Rome; or endanger its peace by cabals and factions, ſupported and encouraged by the ſecrecy of their celebration. In the remaining words, Cicero gives a plain intimation, that, had this law been obſerved,

obſerved, many ſuperſtitions both in the *eſtabliſhed* and *tolerated* religions had been avoided; which he hints had been introduced, without warrant from the State, by an intereſted Prieſthood and an ignorant Anceſtry. To conclude, the neglect of this law in Rome was very notorious: and, probably, owing to their having no ſtanding judicature, as at Athens, for that purpoſe.

P. 452. [YY]. An intelligent miſſionary ſeemed to ſee where the thing ſtuck, when he ſays, Pour ce qui eſt des converſions, qu'on peut faire de ces gens-là touchant l'Evangile, *on ne ſauroit faire aucun fond ſur eux.* Ces ſauvages, de même que tous ceux de l'Amerique, ſont fort peu diſpoſez aux lumieres de la foi, parce qu'ils ſont *brutaux et ſtupides*, et que leurs *mœurs ſont extremement corrompues*, et oppoſées au Chriſtianiſme. *Nouvelle Decouv. dans l'Ameriq. Sept. par le R. P. Louis Hennepin Miſſionaire Recollect et Notaire Apoſtolique*, à Utr. 1697. p. 221. The corrupt manners of the ſavages here complained of, as indiſpoſing them to the Goſpel, we find, from this writer and others, are of ſuch a kind as ariſe only from the want of civil government; and which civil government every where rectifies; ſuch as *rapine, cruelty*, and *promiſcuous mixtures.* Hans Egede, a Daniſh miſſionary, who had been five and twenty years in Greenland, in his deſcription of that country, ſpeaks to the ſame effect: "It is a matter "which cannot be queſtioned (ſays this ſenſible writer) that, if you will "make a man a Chriſtian out of a mere ſavage and wild man, you muſt "firſt make him a reaſonable man.—It would contribute a great deal to "forward their converſion, if they could, by degrees, be brought into a "ſettled way of life," &c. p. 211, 212.

P. 453. [ZZ]. This juſtice is due to the Jesuits, That they have been wiſer in their attempts on Paraguay, and on the coaſt of California; where they have brought the ſavage inhabitants to a love of agriculture and the mechanic arts. The miſſion in California was founded at the expence of a certain marquis de Valero; for which the reverend perſon, whoſe name was permitted to be put to the Account of *Lord Anſon's Voyage Round the World*, has ſuffered the Marquis to be called *a moſt magnificent Bigot.*

P. 453. [AAA]. This is the ſyſtem of *Charlevoix* in the following paſſage; which is well worth the reader's notice: After having ſpoken of the ſhocking miſeries attending the uncivilized condition of the Canadian ſavages, he goes on thus: Il faut néanmoins convenir que les choſes ont un

un peu changé ſur tous ces points, depuis notre arrivée en ce pays; J'en ai même vû chercher à ſe procurer des commodités, dont ils auront peut-être bientôt de la peine à ſe paſſer. Quelques-uns commencerent auſſi à prendre un peu plus leurs précautions pour ne pas ſe trouver au depourvû, quand la chaſſe leur manquera; et parmi ceux, qui ſont domiciliés dans la colonie, il y a bien peu à ajouter pour les faire arriver au point d'avoir un néceſſaire raiſonnable. Mais qu'il eſt à craindre que, quand ils en ſeront là, ils n'aillent *bientôt plus loin, et ne donnent dans un ſuperflu*, qui les rende plus malheureux encore, qu'ils ne ſont preſentement dans le ſein de la plus grand indigence. *Ce ne ſera pas au moins les miſſionnaires, qui les expoſerent à ce danger*; perſuadés qu'il eſt moralement impoſſible de bien prendre ce juſte milieu, et de s'y borner, ils ont beaucoup mieux aimé partager avec ces peuples ce qu'il y a de penible dans leur maniere de vivre, *que de leur ouvrir les yeux ſur les moyens d'y trouver des adouciſſemens*. Auſſi ceux-mêmes, qui ſont tous les jours temoins de leurs ſouffrances, ont-ils encore bien de la peine à comprendre comment ils y peuvent reſiſter, d'autant plus qu'elles ſont ſans relâche, et que toutes les ſaiſons ont leurs incommodités particulieres. *Journal Hiſtor. d'un Voyage dans l'Ameriq. Septent.* vol. VI. p. 57, 58.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND BOOK.

BOOK II.

PROVES the neceſſity of the doctrine of a future ſtate to ſociety, from the conduct of the ancient lawgivers, and founders of civil policy, p. 127—398.

SECT. I.

THE magiſtrate's care in cultivating religion, ſhewn, 1. *From the* univerſality *of it, amongſt all civil policied nations.* 2. *From the* genius *of* pagan *religion, both with regard to the* nature *of their gods, the* attributes *aſſigned to them, and the* mode of worſhip *in civil uſe amongſt them,* p. 127—140.

SECT. II.

THE particular *arts the legiſlator employed to this purpoſe: as,* 1. *the univerſal practice of pretending to inſpiration. It is ſhewn that this was done to eſtabliſh the opinion of the* ſuperintendency *of the gods over human affairs: not to ſecure the* reception *of their laws; nor to render thoſe laws* perpetual *and immutable when received,* p. 140—147.

SECT. III.

THE next art the legiſlator uſed was to preface his laws with the doctrine of a providence in its full extent. The prefaces to the laws of Zaleucus *and* Charondas, *the only remains of this kind, proved genuine againſt the arguments of a learned critic,* p. 147—166.

SECT. IV.

THE next art was the legislator's invention of the mysteries, *solely instituted for the propagation and support of the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. Their original and progress deduced: their nature and end explained: their* secrets *revealed: and the causes of the degeneracy accounted for. To give a compleat idea of this important institution, the sixth book of* Virgil *is examined, and the descent of* Æneas *into hell, shewn to be only an initiation into, and representation of the shews of the* mysteries, p. 166—336.

APPENDIX *and* NOTES *to the Four First Sections*, p. 337—398.

SECT. V.

THE next instance of the magistrate's care of religion, in establishing a national worship. That an established religion *is the universal voice of nature. The right of establishing a religion justified, in an explanation of the true theory of the* union between Church and State. *This theory applied as a rule to judge of the actual* establishments *in the* pagan *world. The causes that facilitated the establishment of religion amongst them; as likewise those causes that hindered their* establishments *from receiving their due form*, p. 399—426.

SECT. VI.

THE last instance of the magistrate's care for the support of religion; in the allowance of a general toleration: *the measure and cause of it: the nature of the ancient* tolerated *religions: how, under the supervision and direction of the magistrate: and how first violated and destroyed by civil tyranny*, p. 427—456.

NOTES *to the Fifth and Sixth Sections*, p. 457—471.

THE END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

ERRORS OF THE PRESS IN VOL. I.

Vol. I. P. 56. *l.* 4. from the bottom, for *far*, r. for.
96. *l.* 7. for *the two writers mentioned above*, r. Sextus Empiricus and Montagne
139. *l.* 5. after *world*, a period.
238. *l.* 10. from the bottom, after *fævis* a comma; and for Trajane, r. Trojane.
241. *l.* 7. after *tuliſtis* dele the comma.
242. *l.* 14. after *gaudia* and after *Cydon* add a comma.
250. *l.* 2. after *fata* dele the period.
260. *l.* 5. from the bottom for belluæ, r. bellua.
266. *l.* 9. from the bottom for ſpiſcated, r. ſpiſsated.
269. *l.* 4. from the bottom for mortality, r. *morality*.
274. *l.* 3. for crimini, r. crimine.
276. *l.* 15. for pœnis, r. pœnas.
l. 3. from the bottom for ſubegitque, r. ſubigitque.
306. *l.* 10. from the bottom, for clauſam, r. clauſum.
310. *l.* 18. for ille, r. illi.
314. *l.* 11. from the bottom for miſeris, r. mireris.
332. *l.* 9. from the bottom for ferti, r. ferti.
n. ||. for temeritate curioſitatæ, r. temerariâ curioſitate, for p. 119, r. 121
377. *l.* 7. for Tuſcular, r. Tuſculan.
388. *l.* 18. for antonomacite, r. antonomaſtice.
393. *l.* 21. for Vadimoniis, r. Vadimonis.
437. *l.* 1. for *mankind. For*, r. mankind, for.
442. *l.* 7. for *his* odium, r. this.
444. *l.* 7. from the bottom for ox, r. ωξ.
459. *l.* 6. for Atris, r. Aſtis.
460. *l.* 8. for nôtre tant, r. nôtre étant.