TWO

DISSERTATIONS:

The *FIRST* on

The TREE OF LIFE in PARADISE,

With ſome Obſervations on

The CREATION and FALL of MAN;

The *SECOND* on

The OBLATIONS of CAIN and ABEL.

By BENJAMIN KENNICOTT, of *Wadham* College.

——— Εδεξαντο τον λογον μετα πασης προθυμιας, το καθ' ημεραν ανακρινοντες τας Γραφας, ει εχοι ταυτα ΟΥΤΩΣ. ACT. APOST. 17. 11.

OXFORD,

Printed at the THEATRE, for the AUTHOR: and Sold by Mr. *Clements*, in *Oxford*; Mr. *Birt* and Meſſ. *Rivington*, in *London*; Mr. *Thurlbourn*, in *Cambridge*; Mr. *Leake*, in *Bath*; and Mr. *Score*, in *Exeter*.

MDCCXLVII.

Imprimatur,

EUS. ISHAM,

Vice-Can.

Mar. 2. 1746-7.

TO

KELLOND COURTENAY Esq;

The Honourable Mrs ELIZABETH COURTENAY.

The Honourable Mrs BARBARA CAVENDISH.

RALPH ALLEN Esq;	HEN. FOWNES LUTTRELL Esq;
JOHN ANDREW M. D.	The Rev. Mr. WM. MARSHALL.
The Rev. Mr. Ph. ATHERTON.	NORTON NELSON Esq;
The Rev. Mr. Archdn. BAKER.	WILLIAM NEYLE Esq;
The Rev. Mr. AARON BAKER.	WILLIAM OLIVER M. D.
HEN. LANGFORD BROWN Esq;	THOMAS TAYLOR Esq;
Rev. Mr. Fr. CHAMPERNOWNE.	Mr. JOHN TAYLOR.
The Rev. Mr. GEO. COSTARD.	GEORGE TREBY Esq;
The Rev. Mr. WILL. DADDO.	BROWSE TRIST Esq;
Mr. PETER GAYE.	The Rev. Mr. ROBERT WIGHT.
The Rev. Dr. THOMAS HUNT.	The Rev. Dr. GEO. WYNDHAM.

My Honoured BENEFACTORS,

THERE is ſcarce any Pleaſure more agreeable to the Human Mind, than that which ariſes from reflecting on Favours received, when there is a power of expreſſing a proportionable Gratitude. But You have rendered that almoſt impoſſible, by the meaſure as well as nature of Your Conde-

ſcenſion and Liberality; Condeſcenſion --- ſuch, as ſhews that Pride is the fartheſt removed from true Nobility of Soul; and Liberality --- ſuch, as not only relieves, but makes the Receiver happy.

Charity indeed is become the reigning Virtue of our Country; its tutelar defence, its brighteſt ornament. And therefore every one, who has experienced the benevolence of Britiſh Virtue, and the greatneſs of its Publick Spirit, ſhould be careful to encourage, by acknowledging it, with a pious Gratitude. And if this be a Duty incumbent upon all that are obliged, 'tis peculiarly ſo on Me; who have felt a very uncommon ſhare of Favour, and have found many Fathers, where I could not preſume to expect Friends.

'Tis to You I think my ſelf bound to expreſs this ſenſe of my preſent Happineſs; You, who have raiſed the cha-

racter

racter even of Beneficence it ſelf --- by contending who ſhould exert it in the moſt obliging manner, and yet confer the leaſt obligation. 'Tis to ſome of You I ſtand indebted for that generous Subſcription, which has placed me in this Theatre of Learning; and to others of You for that Favour and Condeſcenſion, by which my Situation here has been rendered ſtill more happy and delightful.

I beg Your Acceptance therefore of my warmeſt Thanks, thus publickly offered, for the many inſtances of Your Goodneſs, ſo publickly conferred; and eſpecially for Your Leave to honour my ſelf with the mention of Your Names, in my preſent appearance before the World. An Appearance this --- ariſing only from the perſuaſions of Some of You, to whoſe Judgment I pay a profound Deference; and from the fondneſs of an opportunity to make known

that

that Duty to You All, which (if Kindneſs, if Charity can at all oblige) You have ſo richly deſerved; and which will, I hope, be the Characteriſtic of my Life, 'till Ingratitude become a Virtue.

You are entitled, by the ſtrongeſt claim, to the Labours as well as the Acknowledgments of my Life; and have abundantly more Right to the Production now before You, than to the Fruit of a Tree tranſplanted into Your own Garden. I have the greateſt reaſon to wiſh there may be found ſomething uſeful, and therefore agreeable, in the following Diſſertations; on Your account, as well as on my own. And as I doubt not of their containing ſome Miſtakes, it may be decent to obſerve---that many of You have not yet peruſed what is here preſented You; and therefore have condeſcended to be the Patrons of the Author only, and not of his Performance.

The

The Subjects however will appear, I presume, of consequence; and to be worthy of a careful consideration. This indeed is evident from the first view of them in themselves; and it may be farther strengthened and ascertained by observing---that our great Countryman Mr. MEDE had minuted them both down for his consideration; but Death deprived the World of his valuable explanation of them.

What this celebrated Writer proposed, I have ventured to consider. The principal Observations, on which the main part of each Dissertation turns, occurred to me in considering the Original Text; and I humbly submit the whole, that is here built upon them, to the Judgment of Your Selves, and the rest of the Learned World; hoping for Your Favour, and their Pardon.

May this little Present, offered only as an Earnest of my grateful Wishes, be thought

thought not unworthy Your Acceptance! The Design You will approve, from that principle of Religion, which animates Your Actions; and forgive the Manner of its Execution, from that principle of Candor, which I have so frequently experienced in the Favours received from You All. And may the Giver of every good and perfect Gift, who alone is able to recompense such a profusion of Goodness, reward You an Hundred-fold for Every Act of Generosity conferred on

Your very dutiful

and most obliged

humble Servant,

BENJAMIN KENNICOTT.

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

TREE OF LIFE in PARADISE,

With ſome Obſervations on

The CREATION and FALL of MAN.

DISSERTATION

THE FIRST.

WHILE the Enemies of Reveal'd Religion make it their buſineſs and ambition to revile the Sacred Book, in which it is contain'd; 'tis certainly the duty of its Friends to ſhew an equal warmth in the vindication and defence of it. And as the cavils of Unbelievers are frequently founded on the Miſtranſlation of particular Paſſages, it may be proper for every one, who (from his acquaintance with the Original Languages) can ſolve any of theſe Difficulties, whether real or pretended, to contribute ſo far his Mite to that great Work, which has of late years been ſo frequently and ſo ſucceſsfully undertaken. A Glorious Work this! —To clear up the difficulties of the Sacred Writings, and reconcile the inconſiſtencies objected to the accounts which they contain; that ſo the Word of God may ſhine forth

in its native and commanding ſplendour, and become the admiration of all the ſons of Men.

This indeed ſhould be the buſineſs, becauſe it is the duty of All; 'tho, more properly, of the Preachers of this Revelation. And theſe, it muſt be confeſs'd, have a task arduous indeed; not to be diſcharg'd but with the utmoſt zeal, temper'd with the cooleſt diſcretion. For they muſt, in theſe days, like the Workmen of old in Nehemiah [a], build up the Wall of Jeruſalem with one hand, and hold a weapon in the other to repel the Enemy of their Labours.

The preſent then is an endeavour to vindicate ſome part of the Hiſtory of Moſes; and Moſes, whether we conſider him as the earlieſt Hiſtorian, or as the Jewiſh Legiſlator, does under both theſe characters lay a ſtrong claim to our reſpect and veneration. For as from him we have the only true account of the Creation and Origin of the World, ſo upon the ſtrength of his Hiſtory, and the Prophets which ſucceeded him, Chriſtianity riſes like a fair Superſtructure, regular and beautiful; and conſequently every attempt to detract from, or add to the credit of the former, is an attempt to ſhake, or eſtabliſh the honour of the latter.

Now among all the places pick'd out for ridicule and cenſure, we cannot eaſily find one,

a Nehemiah IV. 17.

that

that has occasion'd more triumph to the insulting Infidel, and more frequently escap'd the understanding of the serious Believer, than the account of the Two peculiar and remarkable Trees in Paradise—*The Tree of Life*, and *the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.* The latter of these has been lately clear'd up, (and the objections that might be made to his solution of it consider'd) by the celebrated Author of the Essay on Virtue [b]; and the business of this undertaking is to attempt a rational account also of the former. It may not then be improper first to place together, in one view, the account of Both from the English Translation, as it is from thence the objections have been drawn; which done, I shall endeavour to clear the sacred relation from the absurdity imputed to it.

Gen. II. 8. *And the Lord God planted a Garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the Man, whom he had formed.* 9. *And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every Tree that is pleasant to the Sight, and good for Food; the Tree of Life also in the midst of the Garden, and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil.* 15. *And the Lord God took the Man, and put him into the Garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it.* 16. *And the Lord God commanded the*

b Dr. Rutherforth, page 273.

Man, ſaying, Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayeſt freely eat. 17. *But of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou ſhalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die.* Chap. III. 1. *Now the Serpent was more ſubtle than any beaſt of the field, which the Lord God had made; and he ſaid unto the Woman, Yea, hath God ſaid, Ye ſhall not eat of every Tree of the Garden?* 2. *And the Woman ſaid unto the Serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the Trees of the Garden.* 3. *But of the fruit of the Tree, which is in the midſt of the Garden, God hath ſaid, ye ſhall not eat of it, neither ſhall ye touch it, leſt ye die.* 4. *And the Serpent ſaid unto the Woman, Ye ſhall not ſurely die.* 5. *For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes ſhall be opened; and ye ſhall be as Gods, knowing Good and Evil.* 6. *And when the Woman ſaw that the Tree was good for food, and that it was pleaſant to the eyes, and a Tree to be deſired to make one wiſe; ſhe took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave alſo unto her Husband with her, and he did eat.*—Then follows the divine examination of the offenders, with their ſeveral ſentences; after which we read, in Verſe the 22.—*And the Lord God ſaid, Behold, the Man is become as one of us, to know Good and Evil. And now leſt he put forth his hand, and take alſo of the Tree of Life, and eat, and live for ever.* 23. *Therefore the Lord God ſent him*

him forth from the Garden of Eden to till the ground, from whence he was taken. 24. *So he drove out the Man; and he placed, at the eaſt of the Garden of Eden, Cherubims and a flaming Sword, which turned every way to keep the way of the Tree of Life.*

Now tho' the objections, that have been made to the Hiſtory of Moſes, have fallen, perhaps, more plentifully on this part than any other; yet the principal intention of this Diſſertation (as before obſerv'd) is to obviate thoſe objections, which have frequently been urg'd againſt what is here ſaid with regard to the TREE OF LIFE.

It is agreed then, among the Friends of this Hiſtory, that the uſe of the Tree of Life was —*to render, or preſerve the firſt Pair immortal.* But in what manner this Immortality was to be effected by their eating of it—whether the Tree was to communicate ſo ſurprizing an effect by being *frequently*, or by being *once* taſted—or whether *abſolutely*, and by its own inherent virtue; or *conditionally*, and by a virtue ſacramentally convey'd from God;—theſe points (with others on this head) have generally divided thoſe, who have attempted to explain them [c]. For whoever examines carefully into

c Well therefore might Mr. Salkeld obſerve—That tho' almoſt all the Writers and Fathers of the Greek and the

the whole of this matter will find an uncommon diverſity in opinion, among the wiſeſt Expoſitors; and that there are few, who agree in any ſingle method of interpretation, notwithſtanding ſo many, with a laudable deſign, have attempted a rational illuſtration of it. From hence it is evident, that ſome conſiderable *difficulty*, if not *miſtake*, muſt be at the bottom, which occaſions ſuch remarkable *uncertainty*; and therefore it may be preſum'd, that any new attempt to clear the Hiſtory in this particular will, if honeſtly intended, be pardon'd by ſuch, as may think it to fall ſhort of the deſign of it; and be well receiv'd by ſuch (if there ſhould be any ſuch) as may think it a proper and well-grounded explanation.

I ſhall therefore propoſe ſome of thoſe objections, which have been made, and ſeem to lie againſt the generally-receiv'd opinions about the Tree of Life; and that upon each of the different interpretations before enumerated. After which, in order to obviate the force of ſuch objections, I ſhall endeavour at a rational and conſiſtent ſenſe of thoſe texts, where the Tree of Life is mention'd; which, I imagine, may be done by a careful attention to the Original Hiſtory, in a manner not yet attempted.—For

Latin Church agree, that the effect of this fruit was Immortality; yet in the manner, *how*, they do not agree. See his Treatiſe on Paradiſe, p. 58.

tho'

tho' it has been taken for granted, that Moſes tells us of one particular Tree of Life in Paradiſe; yet, as the ſuppoſal of ſuch a Tree exiſting or not exiſting ſeems to affect no other part of the ſacred pages; as alſo the aſſerting its real exiſtence has been frequently objected to as abſurd, and is allow'd to be very difficult of explanation — it may be worth while to conſider, whether the account of Moſes may not be fairly underſtood, without admitting ſuch a particular Tree; by rendring the phraſe עץ חיים TREES OF LIFE, in the ſenſe of *Trees for food in general*. If ſo, all cavils about *a Tree of Life* diſappear of courſe; and alſo the character of Moſes, which the Deiſts attack with peculiar bitterneſs, will appear in this one reſpect, as it certainly is in all, invulnerable by their keeneſt ſatyr.

To begin then with the Objections to this particular of the Moſaic Hiſtory, as generally underſtood. And here it may be firſt obſerv'd — that if there was in Paradiſe one Tree of Life, which was to render the firſt Pair immortal; ſuch an effect muſt have been produced either by their eating of its fruit *frequently*, or by their taſting of it *once* only.

That the Immortality of the firſt Pair was not to be the conſequence of their *frequent* eating of this Tree, ſeems to appear from the following conſiderations. The Garden of Eden had

had been furniſh'd by God with all the various ſorts of Trees, that were good for food; and Adam had receiv'd an order, or licence, to eat of all, or each of them, as he pleas'd (excepting only the Tree of Knowledge) for the ſupport of his animal life. But if there was in the Garden one particular Tree, which by an extraordinary operative quality was to be the ſupport of human life, or the antidote againſt mortality; this had been ſufficient to preſerve Adam from Death, while the uſe of all the other Trees of food had been thereby ſuperſeded: and if ſo, may not theſe be ſaid to have been given in vain? But we know that God does nothing without the wiſeſt contrivance; and therefore it ſhould ſeem, as if the Trees of food in Paradiſe (eſpecially as every ſpecies of Fruit-Trees was planted together in this one Garden) that *theſe*, I ſay, were for the nutriment and ſupport of Adam's Life; ſince there appears no other uſe ariſing from their being planted in Paradiſe.

Now if the Tree of Life was only — a Tree, whoſe fruit being eaten *frequently* was to render the eaters of it immortal; ſuch an effect muſt have been produced either by *its own ſingle* and *ſeparate* virtue, or by a virtue *in conjunction* with that of the other Trees in the Garden. But if we ſay—It was by *its own ſingle* virtue, then we make uſeleſs the other Trees; and if we ſay

—By

—By its virtue *in conjunction*, then we bring it down from any pretenſions to ſuperior excellence, it ſettles upon the ſame level in uſe and honour with the other Trees its companions, and conſequently all the *Trees of food* in the Garden become equally *Trees of life*.

It was this difficulty, perhaps, which has induced many [d] to aſcribe the Immortality ariſing from this Tree to its being eaten of but *once* only. And thus the celebrated Dr. Jenkin, in his Reaſonableneſs of the Chriſtian Religion [e] — Since God has endued our ordinary food with a power of nouriſhment, no man can reaſonably doubt, but that he might endue this fruit with ſuch a virtue, that it ſhould have made men immortal to taſte of it; and we may well ſuppoſe, *ſays he*, that if they had *once* taſted of this fruit, they ſhould have ſuffer'd no decay, but have liv'd in conſtant vigour here, tho' partaking afterwards only of other nouriſhment.

The Interpreters of this ſort ground their opinion on the reaſon, which God gives for his driving Adam out of Paradiſe; namely, —*Leſt he put forth his hand, and take alſo of the Tree of Life, and eat, and live for ever* [f]. It is

d Thus Rupertus affirms — Quod fructus arboris vitæ, *ſemel ſumptus*, vitam præſtitiſſet immortalem. Salkeld on Paradiſe, p. 68.

e Vol. II. p. 260.

f Gen. III. 22.

 certain,

certain, that this text ſeems a better ſupport for the laſt interpretation, than any other interpretation can be furniſh'd with from the Hiſtory it ſelf. This I ſay, upon the common acceptation of the words. For who, that reads this clear and expreſs paſſage, and ſees God baniſhing Adam, after eating of the Tree of Knowledge, leſt he ſhould take alſo of the Tree of Life, and eat, and live for ever; who can read this, and not conclude, that if Adam *had* taken, and eaten of the Tree of Life, he *would* have liv'd for ever? This, according to the receiv'd opinion, ſeems the only concluſion from the words; and they are the words of God himſelf. But this ſenſe, however confirm'd by the preſent Verſions of the Text, will probably ſoon appear indefenſible; and if ſo, the Original Words will certainly yield us another interpretation.

But before we proceed to any arguments againſt this opinion, let us previouſly lay down Two Obſervations; which, as they are the ground-work of the Hiſtory it ſelf, muſt be alſo of all the Explications of it: and theſe are —That of every Tree in the Garden, excepting that of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, God had given Man liberty to eat freely; and —That, upon the Fall, Man forfeited Immortality, and became ſubject to Death.

Firſt

Firſt then; ſuppoſing in Paradiſe a Tree of Immortality, of which Adam was allow'd to eat, we may reaſonably ſuppoſe that he was *acquainted* with ſo extraordinary a Tree; and, if ſo, that he made a ready uſe of it, as the great ſecurity and privilege of his condition. But if Adam did eat of this immortalizing Tree, how came he preſently mortal? How could he, who, on the preſent ſuppoſition, had render'd himſelf immortal by eating of the Tree of Life, become mortal by eating of the Tree of Knowledge?

Secondly; ſuppoſing Adam *not acquainted* with the virtue of this Tree, yet as he had liberty to eat of all the Trees, but one, in the Garden, and this among the reſt; we muſt grant, that he *might* have taſted it. And therefore, if the Tree was endued with a power of conferring Immortality by being *once* taſted of, the effect muſt have been the ſame, if Adam had taſted it, whether he was preacquainted with this virtue of it, or not.

Thirdly; Adam was created either abſolutely immortal, abſolutely mortal, or conditionally immortal. If he was created abſolutely immortal, he could not have died; but die he did. If he was created abſolutely mortal, he could not but die; and therefore was not a Candidate for Immortality. But if he was created conditionally immortal, and this conditio-

nal Immortality hung (as we are aſſur'd it did) on his eating or not eating of the Tree of Knowledge; it ſeems impoſſible he could be allow'd by God free liberty to eat of a Tree of Life, which would render him immortal, and conſequently not mortal in caſe of his violating the divine command.

Fourthly; it ſeems as if ſuch a Tree would have been altogether unneceſſary. Adam, we have ſeen, was created conditionally immortal; in conſequence of which, if he ſinn'd, he was to die. But what if he did not ſin? Was he ſtill to die? No; the contrary is certain, and in general underſtood in the following manner — that Adam was not to have had an Eternity of exiſtence on this Earth; but that his Body would have continued free from diſſolution, till God ſhould have thought fit to tranſlate him, without Death, to ſome happier Region, for the enjoyment of Eternity [g]. If Adam then, while innocent, could not have died; what need was there for a Tree of Immortality to preſerve his Life?—It was *by Sin* (as we are aſſur'd by St. Paul [h]) that *Death enter'd into the World*; and conſequently all thoſe Pains, Diſeaſes and Decays of Nature, which are only

g Two Inſtances of ſuch a Tranſlation from Earth to Heaven, without dying, we meet with in the caſes of Enoch and Elijah. See 2 Kings II. 11; and Gen. V. 24, explain'd by St. Paul in Heb. XI. 5.

h Rom. V. 12.

(the

(the *Mortis prælibamina*, or) the foretaſtes of our Diſſolution, enter'd by the ſame channel. And as Adam, while innocent, could not have known Death, or Diſeaſe; the fruits of the Trees in general, which God gave him to eat, certainly would, in their original perfection, have been a ſufficient ſupport to his animal part; without the intervention of a Miracle, when he could not poſſibly ſtand in need of it. For tho' it ſhould be properly ſaid by Dr. John Clarke [i] — That Death, or the diſſolution of the Body, is the neceſſary conſequence of thoſe laws by which the Body is fram'd; yet it is as properly obſerv'd by A-Bp King [k] — That from the neceſſary Mortality of Bodies ſince the Fall no argument can be drawn for the ſame neceſſity before the Fall. The reaſon indeed of ſuch a difference this great Writer leaves us unacquainted with; but, poſſibly, that may appear hereafter.

And Fifthly; if the firſt Pair had this ſuppos'd liberty of rendring themſelves immortal, it is ſcarce poſſible but the Serpent would have put them in mind of it, as an effectual confirmation of what he ſo roundly aſſerted — *Ye ſhall not ſurely die.* For we may reaſonably ſuppoſe a Tempter, of much leſs ſubtilty than the Old Serpent, would readily have ſaid — If,

i See his Serm. Boyle's Lect. Vol. 3. p. 201.
k See his Origin of Evil; Ch. 4. Sect. 3.

when

when ye have tasted this Tree of Knowledge, and are become *equal to God* [1], ye imagine Death will be the consequence; ye have at hand a Tree of Life: repair to that, and ye shall be then equal to God both in Knowledge and Immortality. And it is still less possible to be conceiv'd, why Adam, (supposing such a Tree with such a virtue) when he had broke the divine injunction, when he saw his shame, and trembled under the expectation of divine Justice; why he had not then repair'd instantly to the Tree of Life, to secure himself from that Death, which was the sanction of the divine restraint. Whereas, instead of thinking of such a ready and obvious means of safety, (had there been any such) we find him going for Fig-Leaves to twist round him, and conceal his shame.

These Arguments then may suffice to shew, that very considerable difficulties attend the attributing Immortality to this Tree of Life, consider'd as producing this effect by being *once* eaten of. And the consideration of it, as producing such an effect by being *frequently* eaten of, has been before shewn to be attended with no slender objections. So that if these consi-

1 Gen. III. 5. Drusius in locum — Moneo locum verti *sicut Deus*; nam Elohim tam Deum significat, quam Deos: Tom. I. pag. 20. See also Dr. Rutherforth, in his Essay on Virtue, p. 279.

derations

derations are of weight, and ſhould appear concluſive, as perhaps they may; then this Tree of Life was not to communicate Immortality *abſolutely*, and by its own inherent virtue [m]. And if thus much be allow'd, then (ſuppoſing it to convey ſuch Immortality) it muſt have been deſign'd to convey it *conditionally*, and by way of Sacrament; for this is a neceſſary conſequence, and the only part of the Alternative.

This latter Opinion then is now to be conſider'd; and I ſhall introduce it in the words of Mr. Willet, in his Hexapla on Geneſis [n]—The Tree of Life, ſays he, was not ſo call'd, becauſe it was able to give Immortality, and preſerve from Death for ever; nor only becauſe it was able to preſerve Man from Death, till ſuch time as he ſhould be tranſlated to Immortality. For it is evident, that this Tree had no power to give Immortality at all by the taſte of the fruit of it — Firſt; becauſe no corruptible food can make the Body incorruptible—Secondly; Man had, by his Creation, power gi-

m Le Clerc in Gen. III. 22. — Quis credat Arborem fuiſſe ullam, quæ nativâ virtute vitam in æternum hominibus conſervare potuerit?

Lequien, in his Edition of Johannes Damaſcenus, in his Note on the Tree of Life, ſays — Maximus utrumque Lignum figurato ſenſu intelligit, propter difficultates quæ ex Scripturæ Literâ conſequi videntur. Tom. 1. Lib. 2. cap. 11.

n Page 27.

ven

ven him not to die, if he had not ſinn'd; wherefore Immortality was the gift of his Creation, not the effect of his eating of this Tree—Thirdly; if it could have given Immortality, it muſt have had a power to preſerve from Sin; otherwiſe it was no more the Tree of Life, in regard of the effect, than any other Tree in the Garden: for if he had not ſinn'd, he ſhould not have died, what fruit ſoever he had eaten of, the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil only excepted. Our opinion then, *ſays he*, is this — that it was call'd the Tree of Life, not ſo much for the *operation*, (tho' it might give ſtrength and virtue alſo to the Body) but chiefly for the *ſignification*, becauſe it was *a Sign of Life receiv'd from God.* And herein we approve rather the opinion of St. Auſtin, who thinks it was call'd the Tree of Life, not effectively, but ſignificatively; as a Sign of true Immortality, which he ſhould receive of God, if he continued in obedience.

But I preſume, that this latter Opinion lies expos'd to as conſiderable oppoſition, as either of the two before mention'd. For if the Tree of Life was to communicate this uncommon virtue, not inherently and primarily, but mediately and ſecondarily; or (as it is, perhaps, more generally expreſs'd on this occaſion) if it was not to communicate it abſolutely and naturally of it ſelf, but conditionally and ſupernaturally

turally from God; then it muſt have had the nature of a *Sacrament*. And this is what ſome conſiderable Authors, leaving the other Explanation, (probably on account of the before-mention'd difficulties) have determin'd and adher'd to; or, at leaſt, have hung fluctuating between the two, not determining for either, but leaving the Reader to chooſe which he could reliſh beſt.

Thus A-Bp King affirms [o]—that the Tree of Life was truly *Sacramental*, an outward and viſible Sign, and means of Grace; which, *ſays he*, is the true notion of a Sacrament. Thus the famous Dr. Clarke [p]—The Tree of Life was the ancient and original *Emblem* of Immortality—By the uſe of the Tree of Life (*whatever is implied under that expreſſion*) Adam was to have been preſerv'd from dying—By Sin Adam was juſtly excluded out of the Paradiſe of God, and put out of the reach of the Tree of Life, this *miraculous* means of being preſerv'd from Death. Mr. Taylor, in his Treatiſe on Original Sin [q], tells us — The Tree of Life can be conſider'd, with any ſhew of truth, only as either *a pledge* and *ſign* of Immortality, or as an appointed *means* of preventing the decay of the human frame, ſuppoſing Adam had continued

o Page 78 of the Supplement to the Origin of Evil.
p Serm. 135. p. 123. Vol. 2. Edit. Fol.
q Page 18.

obedient. And Mr. Stackhouse[r], tho' with the learning of the present and past Ages before him, is uncertain *how much*, and *what kind* of *power* to ascribe to this Tree; for he acquaints us — that the Body of Adam was to enjoy the privilege of Immortality, either by a power continually proceeding from God, whereof the Tree of Life was the divine *Sign* and *Sacrament*; or by the inherent virtue of the Tree it self, perpetually repairing the decays of nature.

But in answer to these, and all Explanations of the same kind, it may be observ'd first — that there is not the least ground in the text for making the Tree of Life a *Sacrament*, or a Tree design'd to convey Life sacramentally. Yet, not to urge the want of foundation for this opinion, the opinion it self seems easy to be refuted. For if the Tree of Life was a Sacrament, it had the properties of a Sacrament; and if it had the properties of a Sacrament, then the *Fruit* of it was appointed *by God* to be the outward and *visible Sign* to *Man* of *something* inward and *invisible*, to be conferr'd by the *former* on the *latter*. And as in all Sacraments there are certain terms or conditions necessary to be perform'd by Man, in order to his thus receiving benefits from God; so, upon the very supposition, when these terms or con-

r Hist. of the Bible, Vol. I. pag. 36. and 44.

ditions

ditions are either neglected or violated on the part of Man, the benefits on the part of God are suspended: in so much that if Man should then continue to partake of the *Sign*, he could no longer partake of the *thing* originally *signified*. This is evident; let us apply it then to the present case. The Tree of Life, we are told, was a Sacrament; the Fruit of it the outward Sign; a Life-giving Power to be communicated by God to Adam the thing signified; and the Condition, on which this Power or Virtue was to be thus communicated, was Innocence, or Adam's continuing in his original Uprightness.

Hence it appears, that Adam, after his Fall, could no longer receive Life or extraordinary Support from the Sign; because the Condition, on which he was to receive the thing signified, was broken [s]: and therefore, had he continued in Paradise, this Tree of Life, in the present view of it, could have been of no peculiar service or assistance to him. But this, we know, is contrary to the express meaning of those words — *And now, lest he put forth his hand,*

s Thus, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, tho' a Man receives the outward elements of Bread and Wine, he cannot receive the inward or spiritual benefits thereby signified — that is, the *Bread* will not be to him the *Bread of Life* (John 6. 48.) nor will the *Wine* be virtually to him the *Blood of Christ* (Matth. 26. 28.) unless he receives with a proper Faith, and in such a disposition of Mind, as is necessary on that solemn Occasion.

(after his Transgression) *and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat, and live for ever.* Wherefore we must conclude, that the same virtue or use (whatever it be suppos'd) continued in this Tree after, as before Adam's Transgression.

It would be as endless as it is unnecessary to cite all the various Opinions, which have appear'd upon this Subject; it may not, however, be improper to subjoin two, of a different kind from the foregoing. We have already then consider'd the Tree of Life, as conferring Immortality, by being *frequently*, and by being *once* eaten of; as design'd to preserve the human Body from Death *absolutely* of it self, and *conditionally* by a virtue deriv'd from God after the manner of a Sacrament: and so far we have seen, that the explications of this matter are attended with their several difficulties.

There are some Writers then, who have ascrib'd other purposes to this Tree of Life, and among these Mr. Worthington, in his late Essay on Man's Redemption, tells us [t] — The design of the Tree of Life was to repair all Decays, *Natural* and *Moral*; and tho' it seems to have been capable of conferring Immortality, after the eating of the Tree of Knowledge, yet that it was design'd only for repairing Bodily Decays, is surely too low a notion

t Page 18.

of

of it; its ſanative virtue muſt have reach'd alſo to the Soul. This opinion, not at all appearing to be ſupported by the Hiſtory, ſeems not to require a particular conſideration.

There are, laſtly, others, and theſe a numerous Body, who have aſſerted, that this Tree of Life was not at all deſign'd for the ſupport of Adam's Bodily or Preſent Life; but have reſolv'd the whole uſe of it into *Allegory*, making it to repreſent the Future and Celeſtial Life, with which Adam was to be rewarded for his Obedience [u]. Among the various Authors of this figurative opinion, I ſhall ſelect the following teſtimony of the learned Heidegger [w], — The Tree of Life was dignified by that name, not becauſe it had implanted in it a power of conferring Eternal Life on Man, or becauſe it was healthy or fruitful beyond the other Trees of the Garden; but becauſe it was given Man for a certain *Pledge* of that *Eternal Life*, which he was to *obtain*, after a courſe of *perfect Obedience*. For, *ſays he*, as to *I know not what phyſical effect*, to afford Man a preſent Remedy againſt Diſeaſes and Infirmity, which many attribute to this Tree — this is by no means to be

u Arbor vitæ ſignum & ſigillum vitæ cœleſtis æternæ, Adamo ex fœdere operum promiſſæ, ſub conditione perſeverantiæ in obedientiâ. Cloppenburg, in Sacrif. Patriarchal. Schola Sacra; p. 10.

w See his Hiſtor. Patriarcharum; Tom. 1. Exercit. 4. Sect. 49.

admitted.

admitted. For if you imagine this done by the force of the Aliment, then the other Trees were in vain given to Adam for his Food; and if by a medicinal virtue, Adam, while innocent, had no internal principle or cause of Disease, which might want to be restrain'd by the power of Medicine. Wherefore *(he concludes that)* it deriv'd its Name, not from the Temporal Life, but the Life Celestial and Eternal.

But to this may be oppos'd the more rational and judicious opinion of Dr. Robinson on this Subject [x]; which seems sufficient to set aside not this only, but all other Allegorical [y], Symbolical, and Mystic Interpretations of the Tree of Life. Many of our Divines, *says he*, will have this Tree of Life to be a Sacrament; but a Sacrament of *What*, they themselves are not agreed — Some affirm it to have been a Sign and Seal of the *Life Present*, which was to be preserv'd, in case of continued Innocence — Others of a *better Life*, to be exchang'd — Others of the *Life Eternal*, to be *given by Christ* — Others of the *Heavenly* and *Eternal Life*, *pro-*

x Annales Mundi, p. 44.

y — Nil opus esset, ut hanc cautelam interponerem, nisi ut intra certos limites coercerem *Allegorizandi* licentiam; quæ in immensum exire solet, & seculis nonnullis ipsam Legis *Literam* prorsus obscuravit — Multi nullum quantumvis legis apicem prætereunt, cui non allegoricum, forsan & anagogicum sensum assuunt. Spencer de legibus Heb. Tom. 1. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. Sec. 2.

mis'd

mis'd to Adam by the *Covenant of Works*—Others of that *Grace* or Favour, by which Adam was to *live for ever*, in caſe of his *Obedience*. But, *as he obſerves*, all that has been ſaid of Sacraments, and of an allegorical and myſtical ſenſe of this point, ſeems too *obſcure* to agree with the *perſpicuity*, too *labour'd* to be of a piece with the *ſimplicity*, ſo remarkable thro' the whole Moſaic Narration.

Theſe Opinions then may ſerve to ſhew, as well the ſurprizing *Oppoſition* and *Uncertainty* [z], which have ſo remarkably diſtinguiſh'd Interpreters on this ſubject; as alſo the *Difficulties*, to which their ſeveral interpretations ſtand expos'd.

z Dr. Burnet in his excellent Illuſtration of the Moſaic Hiſtory, ſeems not at all ſatisfied as to the Tree of Life. *We are told* of a Tree of Life, *ſays he*, which we may reaſonably think might be intended as a Preſervative againſt all Decays of Nature—*if any ſuch can be ſuppos'd* in ſo pure and perfect a State of Being. And again—*If the Tree of Life was of ſuch a Nature, as to keep from dying* &c. See Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 3. p. 431. 514.

The ſame Uncertainty is remarkable in the firſt Volume of the Univerſal Hiſtory; for the celebrated Author, ſpeaking of Paradiſe, ſays — In the midſt of this Garden were two Trees of a very peculiar, and, *it ſeems*, contrary nature; one call'd the Tree of Life, the fruit of which had the virtue of rendering thoſe who eat it, *in ſome degree at leaſt*, immortal &c. And — The Tree of Life, *it is ſaid*, had the virtue to prolong life conſiderably, if not for ever. See Book I. Ch. 1. p. 110. 124. Ed. 8vo. See alſo Mr. Stackhouſe, Hiſt. Bible, at the bottom of p. 44. And Dr. Sam. Clarke, whoſe words are cited, p. 17.

But

But besides the Difficulties already taken notice of, as encumbring the several *particular Explanations* of the Tree of Life; there are three, which seem to lie against the *Existence* of the Tree it self: and as these are not inconsiderable, they may be properly added here, at the conclusion of the Objections, which may be urg'd against the prevailing Opinion.

The First of these Difficulties then arises from the necessity we are laid under by the receiv'd acceptation, of supposing God to have imparted such a virtue to the Tree of Life, as he could neither recall nor alter; and therefore that he drove out the Man from Paradise, lest, by eating of it, he should (contrary to the divine will) acquire *Immortality*; which (from the present version of Gen. III. 22.) seems to have been annex'd to the Tree of Life by an *irrevocable Decree* [a].

The Second Difficulty is—That if we suppose only one Tree, by which human life was particularly to have been supported; how could Adam's Posterity (supposing him and them to have continued innocent) have been able to come from the various parts of the Earth, and gather Fruit from it? Or how could this one Tree of Life have sufficed all Mankind?

a See A-Bp King's 2d Serm. at the end of his Origin of Evil.

The

The laſt Difficulty which I ſhall here take notice of, and which will be allow'd to be of ſome *weight* againſt the receiv'd Opinion, is this —On the ſuppoſition of one peculiar Tree of Life in Paradiſe, and that the danger was only on account of that one Tree; why was the Guard of Angels plac'd at the *Extremity* of the Garden [b], to ſecure the Tree of Life in the *Middle* of it; when this Tree might have been watch'd with much more ſafety and convenience, if the Guard had been ſtation'd cloſe by the Tree it ſelf? This it ſeems no eaſy matter to account for upon the receiv'd Opinion; but if the Interpretation, here offer'd, be admitted, the reaſon will be evident.

And now, whoever ſhall think the *Difficulties* before enumerated to be *conſiderable*, and the *preceding Explanations* of the Tree of Life to be *not ſufficiently rational* or *well-grounded*; will readily excuſe this farther Attempt to render the Sacred Hiſtory, in this reſpect, more defenſible. For ſuch is the intention and de-

b That this was the caſe is evident from the Hebrew Text; for in Gen. III. 24. we read וינרש את האדם וישכן מקדם לגן עדן את הכרבים ואת להט החרב המתהפכת לשמר את דרך עץ החיים: It is the more neceſſary to attend to the Original of this verſe, becauſe the LXX have evidently miſtook the ſenſe of it; rendring it—Και εξεβαλε τον Αδαμ, και κατωκισεν αυτον απεναντι τε παραδεισε της τρυφης· και ταξε τα χερεβιμ, και τον φλογινον ρομφαιαν, την τρεφομενην φυλασσειν τον οδον τε ξυλε της ζωης.

ſign of theſe Papers; and yet even the Interpretation, here propos'd, is offer'd only by way of *Conjecture*.

To be the more clear then in this important Endeavour, let us ſtep back to the Creation of our firſt Parents, and accompany the Hiſtory down to their expulſion from Paradiſe; for by this method only we ſhall be able to judge of the conſiſtency of the preſent, or any other Explanation of this matter. And after having given what ſeems to be the meaning of the whole (with ſome new Obſervations interſperſed) I ſhall endeavour to anſwer the Objections, that may be made to what is *New* with regard to the *Tree of Life*.

When God Almighty, in his infinite Goodneſs, and the conſequent complacency he muſt take in communicating Happineſs, had determin'd upon the Creation of this World; and the World, in obedience to the Creator's Will, aroſe from Nothing — we learn from the genuine and only Hiſtory of this mighty Operation, that it was compleated in Six revolutions of Night and Day [c]. A World! form'd with ſuch perfect ſymmetry, and adjuſted in ſuch amazing beauty, as proclaim'd the hand of the Divine Geometrician.

c Gen. I. 31. See alſo the Coſmogony, at the beginning of the Univerſal Hiſtory; p. 100. Edit. 8vo.

But

But as an Inanimate, or merely Animate Creation could not be the narrow purpóſe of infinite contrivance, nor render the Tribute of Wonder and Acknowledgment ſo eminently due to the Great Creator; MAN was introduced to compleat the Scheme of Providence. The World indeed, and all its magnificent Apparatus, were but for the accommodation of this great Inhabitant, and his Poſterity; the Theatre was prepar'd, with all the Decorations that could improve the Scene, and then God brought forth that Maſter-piece of his Works —to act the noble part of a Free and Rational Agent—to offer up, as the High-Prieſt of Nature, the Incenſe of Thanks for the leſs perfect race of Beings—and by compleat Holineſs to advance the Glory of his Maker, and ſecure the fruition of his own Happineſs. Here was a Scheme, which none but a God, equally infinite in Goodneſs as in Wiſdom and Power, could firſt meditate, and then carry into execution. A Scheme! which the more we contemplate, the more we muſt admire; and the more we admire, the more we muſt adore: eſpecially when we conſider Our Selves the happy Beings thus wonderfully provided for. —*Lord, What is Man, that thou ſhouldeſt be ſo gracious unto him! That thou ſhouldeſt create him but little lower than the Angels, and thus crown him with Glory and Honour* [d]!

d Pſalm VIII. 4, 5.

 What

What *Man* is, is now the point in which we are concern'd; and his original condition will appear from the hiſtory of his Creation in the Book of Geneſis. We read then in Chap. I. 26, 27.—*And the Lord God ſaid, Let Us make Man in our Image, after our Likeneſs; ſo God created Man in his own Image, in the Image of God created he him: Male and Female created he them.* And in Chap. II. 7.—*And the Lord God formed Man of the duſt*[e] *of the ground, and breathed into his noſtrils the breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul.* This is the conciſe, but full Account of our Father Adam's noble Origination.

But before we proceed to conſider the Nature of Man, in more particular terms, it may be neceſſary that ſome notice be taken of that peculiar form, in which the hiſtory of his creation is here introduced. For we find, that God did not merely order Man to exiſt, and he exiſted; in the method he had taken with the other parts of his creation; but forms (as

e The Original words are עפר האדמה; on which Heidegger has this Obſervation — Inſinuare voluit divinus Scriptor, non ſolum Terram eſſe Materiam, ex quâ factus homo; ſed etiam *hominem nihil aliud* eſſe quam *Pulverem* de terrâ ſumptum, qui inſoleſcendi proinde cauſas nullas habeat. Unde etiam χοικον *pulverem* primum hominem inſignivit Apoſtolus, 1 Corinth. XV. 47. Hiſt. Patriarch. Exercitat. 4. Sect. 17.

it

it were) *a Divine Consultation* [f], before he enter'd on this noblest part and finishing stroke of his design.

What this Consultation means, or of whom it was intended by the Sacred Historian, has been matter of warm Controversy. But if we drop all prepossession and party-attachment (for there is such a thing in Religion, as well as in Politics; and in each of them, like a false Light, it will certainly mislead the man, who resolves to walk by its direction) it seems easy to find what Moses would have us here understand. God, being about to create Man, is introduc'd saying — *Let Us make Man, in Our Image, after Our Likeness*; in consequence of which the Historian tells us — *so God created Man in his own Image, in the Image of God created he him.* It is evident then, that God created Man in his own Image; this is mention'd thrice by way of Emphasis, and to prevent, if possible, all possibility of misconstruction.

Now what God did, was certainly the same that he propos'd to do; God created Man in his own Image, that is, in the Image of the Godhead, and therefore God propos'd to create him in the Image of the Godhead. But if God propos'd to create him in the Image of the

f See the Cosmogony, at the beginning of the Univ. History, p. 91. Edit. 8vo.

Godhead,

Godhead, the propoſal muſt have been made to the Godhead; becauſe the words are—*Let Us make Man in Our Image*. And if the propoſal be here made by God to the Godhead, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe it made to the ſame Perſon, that makes it; and conſequently reaſonable to think it made to the other two Perſons in the Unity of the Godhead [g]. For we have certain evidence from the New Teſtament, that the *Three* Divine *Perſons* are *One God*; and that Each took upon himſelf a diſtinct part, and ſeparate character, in the grand ſcheme of Man's Redemption: and if *intereſted* ſo much at his *Redemption*, we may ſafely conclude them not *unconcern'd* at his *Creation* [h].

g See this important Point farther explain'd in Dr. Knight's firſt Serm. and Mr. Ridley's ſecond Serm. at Moyer's Lectures.

h That God did not here addreſs the Angels, appears —from the words themſelves; Let Us make Man in *our* image, ſo God created Man in *his own* image—from the ſame manner of expreſſion in verſe the 22d of the third Chapter, where the words are evidently confin'd to the Deity—and from God's diſclaiming any Conſultation with inferior Beings, in theſe words of Iſaiah XL. 12, 13, 14. *Who hath meaſur'd the Waters in the hollow of his hand? and meted out Heaven with the ſpan, and comprehended the duſt of the Earth in a meaſure, and weighed the Mountains in ſcales, and the Hills in a balance? Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his Counſellor hath taught him? With whom took he Counſel, and who inſtructed him?*—And that God did not ſpeak here, in the manner of Kings, of himſelf in the plural number, is plain; becauſe theſe are given as the very words of God, at the creation of the firſt Man. Yet

To

To return now to the Nature of the first Man, who was form'd in consequence of this Consultation. His Material part then was the Dust of the Earth, work'd up into an organiz'd Body, to be sustain'd upon the common principles of Nutrition. And this Body was actuated by an Immortal Spirit; which was not made, like the Body, out of pre-existing Matter, but created out of nothing by the great *Father of Spirits*, and infused or breathed into the human composition; and, by this, *Man became a living Soul*, or was advanced into a Being capable of Life and Immortality.

This Compound Being God created *in his own Image, after his Likeness*; and as great stress is laid by the divine Historian on God's creating him in this manner, it may be proper to attend to the meaning of the words, which are evidently of some importance. The word צלם is here rightly translated *Image*; and signifies a *just picture* or *compleat representation*. But lest this should be too sublime a boast for any Creature, the Expression is immediately soften'd by the word דמות, which signifies

supposing Moses to write here according to the custom of his own times, the opinion of Kings speaking *then* of themselves in the plural number is without foundation; for Melchizedeck, Abimelech, Pharaoh, and Balak, speak all in the singular number; and we find Saul, David, and even Solomon in all his glory, delivering themselves in the same stile. See also Grossius Tom. I. 14.

likeness

likeneſs or *reſemblance*; and this is render'd ſtill more faint by the prefix'd prepoſition, which ſignifies *according to* and *in ſome agreement with*. Man therefore was created in the Image of God; not indeed in the expreſs and full Image, but after the Likeneſs or according to the Reſemblance of that unequal'd and ſupream Being [i]. So that as Man was by his Body allied to the Earth, and was to partake of the productions of that to envigorate his animal Nature; ſo by his Soul he was allied to Heaven, and was bleſs'd (in the degree a Creature of his order can be bleſs'd) with all the communicable Attributes of the Deity; becoming, as it were, the middle Creature in the ſcale of Beings. The Original Likeneſs or Reſemblance then, which Adam bore to God, was in the enjoying ſuch Excellencies in an inferior degree, as in God are abſolute and perfect—Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Power, and Immortality.

The Body of the firſt Man, ſays Dr. Burnet [k], was perfect, not only in its integrant parts, but in the moſt vigorous conſtitution and natural firmneſs, the moſt regular craſis and diſpoſition of the Blood, the moſt equal motion of the animal Spirits; and all this, in the moſt

i Theodotion's Verſion of this paſſage is — Faciamus hominem *in imagine* noſtrâ, *quaſi in ſimilitudine* noſtrâ. Orig. Hexapl. Edit. Montfaucon.

k Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 3. p. 423.

finiſh'd

finiſh'd proportion, capable of living for ever in its original Perfection. This then, with all its Faculties and Powers, Appetites and Senſes exactly ſuited to their ſeveral Objects was the *Natural Perfection* of the Body. And this Body was alſo perfectly ſubject to the Soul; ſo as not to be naturally carried towards any thing that Reaſon diſallow'd, nor in any other manner or meaſure than as Reaſon approv'd; and this was its *Moral Perfection*.

But as all derivative Perfection is finite, it muſt be attended with ſome degree of Imperfection; and what is in ſome degree imperfect, muſt be capable of miſcarrying. The State, as well as Glory, of Human Nature was conſequently *Free-Agency*; and, from the nature of Free-Agency, Man being capable of chooſing Good, he muſt be alſo capable of chooſing Evil. 'Tis this Power, and a wiſe enjoyment of it, that conſtitutes Virtue; and as the Happineſs of Man, however great, was only to correſpond with his Holineſs (between which there is an inſeparable connexion) ſo his Holineſs or Obedience could not be made appear, but by ſomething enjoin'd him, to which he might be diſobedient. It is alſo evident, that none can be independent but God; Man therefore, being neceſſarily a dependent Creature, muſt naturally expect ſome mark of his Dependency. This then God gave him, but in a Reſtriction

the moſt mild and gracious; and as the ſame thing was to be the Teſt alſo of his Obedience, it was couch'd in the cleareſt and moſt ſelf-evident Terms. And here we may obſerve, that no Moral Precept could have been at all proper on this occaſion, as there was then ſcarce a poſſibility of his tranſgreſſing any ſuch; it muſt have been therefore ſome indifferent action, neither good nor evil in it ſelf, but ſo far only as it was commanded or forbidden [l]. What then ſo natural, what ſo agreeable to the ſtate of our firſt Parents, conſidering they were to live all their Lives in a Garden, as the forbidding them to eat of the fruit of a certain Tree in that Garden; a Tree, near at hand, and therefore giving them a conſtant opportunity of ſhewing Obedience to the divine Authority, by their abſtaining from it [m]? This, the Hiſtorian tells us, was really the caſe; and the Tree, which God ſelected for this purpoſe, was remarkably ſituated in the very middle of the Garden, the better to guard againſt miſtake. This Tree, when choſen, God called—*the Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil*; not that its fruit would make the eaters of it more knowing, or that this appellation of it was intended to imply any change, which, by their eating the

l See Mr. Mede, Book I. Diſcourſe 41. page 222.

m See Univerſal Hiſtory, Book I. Chap. 1. p. 131. Edit. 8vo.

fruit

fruit of it, would be made in their intellectual faculties [n]. But the Original Words עץ הדעת טוב ורע may be tranſlated — *The Tree, which is the Teſt of Good and Evil* — the Tree, by which God would try them, and by which it ſhould appear, whether they would be good or evil — whether or no they would own the Sovereignty of their Maker, and obey or diſobey his Commands. For in the verſes, which immediately follow the account of Man's formation, we read — Gen. II. 8. *And the Lord God planted a Garden eaſtward in Eden; and there he put the Man, whom he had formed.* After which the hiſtory proceeds to the firſt mention of what is call'd the Tree of Life; and therefore I ſhall here lay before the learned Reader the Text it ſelf. Verſe the 9. — ויצמח יהוה אלהים מן האדמה כל עץ נחמד למראה וטוב למאכל ועץ החיים בתוך הגן ועץ הדעת טוב ורע: Which words may be render'd thus—*Et germinare fecit Jehova Deus è terra omnem arborem deſiderabilem ad aſpectum, & bonam ad cibum & arborem vitæ* [o]; *& in medio horti* (or—in medio horti etiam) *arborem cognoſcendi bonum & malum.* In Engliſh thus — *And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every Tree that was deſireable*

n See Dr. Rutherforth's Eſſay on Virtue, p. 273.

o That theſe two Expreſſions are ſynonimous, or that the latter is only exegetical of the former will appear hereafter.

to the Sight, and that was good for Food and a Tree of Life; and in the middle of the garden the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Leaving the vindication of this Construction to its proper place [p], I shall proceed regularly with the History. Accordingly, in Verse the 16th. we read — *And the Lord God commanded the Man, saying, Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat.* 17. *But of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of that; for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* Here then was the Test of the Obedience of our First Parents, and this the Covenant God was pleas'd to establish with them in their state of Innocence; the Condition was only one, and on this hung their Happiness and Immortality.

For we may reasonably maintain, says the learned and pious Dr. Stanhope [q], that not only actual Death, or a *necessity* of dying, but even Mortality it self, and the very *capacity* of dying, was properly a Penalty, and introduced by our first Parents Fall. Had they not fallen, it had not been so much as possible for them to have died. And with regard to this conditional Impossibility, Man may be truly said, in respect of Body as well as Soul, to have been made

p See the Answer to the Last Objection, at the conclusion of this Dissertation.

q Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 1. p. 696.

after

after the likeneſs of the Immortal God. But now, becauſe his Body was compounded of Materials *capable* in themſelves *of*, tho' not originally *liable to*, Corruption; and becauſe his Soul was endued with a principle of Freedom, which by making a good or bad choice might determine him to the conſequences ordain'd by God for either; in this ſenſe, and abſolutely ſpeaking, it was poſſible for him to *die*, becauſe it was poſſible for him to *ſin*: ſo that Man originally *might not*, and, ſuppoſing him not to have offended, *never could* have died. Thus ſtood the Immortality of Adam, and his Innocence was the Tenure by which he held his Happineſs.

This was ſuch a Scene as might naturally be ſuppos'd to move the envy and attention of Satan, that Prince of the degraded Beings, the Evil Angels. For theſe, being alſo created Free-Agents of an higher order and capacity, had, for ſome act of Rebellion againſt the Higheſt, been caſt down from their native Habitations of Light and Joy [r]. Man therefore being now created, and being with his Progeny

r See 2 Pet. II. 4. Jude VI. The Coſmogony at the beginning of the Univerſal Hiſtory, p. 105. 8vo. Iſaiah XIV. 12.—*How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning!* 13. *For thou haſt ſaid in thine heart I will aſcend into Heaven, I will exalt my Throne above the Stars of God.* 14. *I will aſcend above the Clouds, I will be like the moſt High.* 15. *Yet thou ſhalt be brought down to Hell.*

(if

(if found worthy) design'd, perhaps, to fill up the ſeveral Orders in the Celeſtial Kingdom, vacated by theſe Apoſtate Spirits; what wonder if theſe Spirits ſhould contrive the Fall alſo of theſe terreſtrial Beings, in order to involve them in equal blackneſs with themſelves, and ſo fruſtrate the gracious purpoſes of this New Creation?

But whatever other deſigns God might have in creating Man, we may ſafely conclude him created for *his own Happineſs*, and *his Maker's Glory*; and theſe purpoſes were too great and important not to raiſe the fury of the Evil Angels, and induce them to contrive his Ruin [s]. Not that any Apoſtate Spirit could act by command or irreſiſtible impulſe; and conſequently be an *independent ſupream Principle of Evil*. No: the power of ſuch was limited, and *Temptation* was all that was allow'd, or could properly belong to it. And to have permitted the temptation of our firſt Parents, can be no impeachment of the divine Goodneſs; becauſe, without a Trial, there had been no Virtue; nor could there, without an Attack, have been a poſſibility of Victory. 'Tis true, God permitted them to be tempted by the Devil, but they had ſtrength enough to withſtand the force of his Words; eſpecially as God did not permit him to tempt them under an Angelic Ap-

s Univerſal Hiſtory, Book I. Ch. I. p. 125. Edit. 8vo.

pearance,

pearance, that so the Quality of the Speaker might not recommend his Rhetoric [t].

And now, *what could have been done more to this Vineyard of the Lord, that the Lord had not done in it?—For this Vine, which his own right hand so eminently planted, and the Branch that he made so strong for himself? But, when he look'd* (when he might reasonably expect) *that it should bring forth Grapes, it brought forth Wild-Grapes.* What wonder then, if *God look down from Heaven, and behold, and visit this Vine?* What wonder, if *it be burnt with fire, and cut down, and perish at the rebuke of his countenance* [u]?

But, to drop from the loftiness of prophetic Language, let us take a literal view of this important Transaction.—The Chief of the fallen Spirits [w] (as we may infer from Scripture, and the reason of the thing) having selected the Serpent, as being the most subtle among the Beasts of the Field [x], and evidently therefore

t See Scripture vindicated; p. 16.

u Psalm LXXX. and Isaiah V.

w In St. John VIII. 44. *the Devil* is said by our Saviour to have been *a Murderer from the beginning*; which is plainly an allusion to this seduction of our first Parents, and the Mortality thereby introduced. In Rev. XII. 9. the Devil is call'd *the Old Serpent.* And the Author of the Book of Wisdom, who was well acquainted with the doctrines of the Jewish Church, tells us—*By the envy of the Devil came Death into the World*; Wisd. II. 24.

x Gen. III. 1. *The Serpent was more subtle than any Beast of the field.* And our Saviour exhorts his Disciples to be *wise as Serpents*; but to be *harmless as Doves.* Matt. X. 16.

the

the moſt proper for his purpoſe, makes that the Inſtrument thro' which he might form his attempt on the Virtue of our firſt Parents [y]; and as their happy Immortality depended on the not eating of the Tree in the middle of the Garden, *there* was of neceſſity to be his Plot.

Having therefore got a proper opportunity, the Serpent began to queſtion the Woman about the nature of the divine Prohibition. More words, perhaps, had previouſly paſs'd; which, not being material to the Hiſtorian's brief deſign, are omitted, and we are led directly to the point. Chap. III. 1. *And the Serpent ſaid unto the Woman, Indeed! hath God ſaid, Ye ſhall not eat of every Tree in the garden?* 2. *And the Woman ſaid unto the Serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the Trees of the Garden.* 3. *But of the Fruit of the Tree, which is in the midſt of the Garden, God hath ſaid, Ye ſhall not eat of that, neither ſhall ye touch it, leſt ye die.* Here then was a fair acknowledgment of the divine Prohibition; and therefore the Tempter had nothing left to do, but to endeavour to

y Milton IX. 91.———For in the wily Snake
Whatever Sleights none would ſuſpicious mark,
As from his Wit and native Subtilty
Proceeding; which, in other Beaſts obſerv'd,
Doubt might beget of Diabolic pow'r
Active within beyond the ſenſe of Brute.

And in 2 Cor. XI. 3. we read — that *the Serpent beguiled Eve thro' his Subtilty.*

perſuade

perſuade her of her having been miſinform'd; and that ſhe ſhould not die, whatever ſhe might have been threaten'd with to keep her in awe and ſubjection. Wherefore he immediately replies — 4. *Ye ſhall not ſurely die:* And, to give weight to his aſſertion, he cunningly alludes to the Expreſſion of עץ הדעת טוב ורע, made uſe of by God in a very different ſenſe; and, quite in Character [z], perverts it to his own purpoſe in the following manner. 5. So far from dying, ſays he, that *God knoweth* (he hath told you himſelf in the very *name* of the Tree) *that in the day ye eat thereof, then your Eyes ſhall be open'd; and ye ſhall be equal to God* ידעי טוב ורע *knowing good and evil.*

Thus artfully was the Bait prepar'd; and we find that it went down, after ſome little deliberation. The Woman probably was taken with the beautiful appearance of the Serpent; was agreeably ſurpriz'd to hear him ſpeak articulately; and was prejudiced ſtrongly in his favour, becauſe he had ſo ſeeming a Concern for her better welfare. 'Tis alſo probable, that the Serpent eat of the fruit of this Tree firſt himſelf, and made that eating of his an argument againſt the Mortality they had been taught to expect from eating it — I have eaten (*he*

z John VIII. 44. — *The Devil was a Murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the Truth, becauſe there is no Truth in him; for he is a Liar, and the Father of it.*

might ſay) and you ſtill ſee me eat, but I die not; nay my capacity is enlarg'd: I ſpeak! I reaſon! How greatly then ſhall *Ye* be exalted! *Ye* ſhall be like God, knowing all the principles of good and evil; and ſo be on an equality with that Deity, who would invidiouſly keep you dependent on himſelf, and prevent your greater Happineſs [a].

From the Serpent's eating the fruit of this Tree then the Woman takes encouragement; and therefore Moſes lays down *this* as the firſt principle on which ſhe reaſons. The ſecond is, that *it was pleaſant to the eye*; and the laſt, that *it was* (as ſhe was now inform'd) *a Tree deſireable to make her wiſe.* 'Twas this, the laſt inducement, that ſtruck her deepeſt;—to be on a level with God — to know good and evil —were powerful incitements; but had ſhe given due weight to the conſideration of her Creator's Prohibition (as doubtleſs it muſt have occurr'd frequently to her mind) ſhe had been effectually ſecur'd. But, however fatal the conſequence, *equal to God* ſhe would be; and ſo

a That the *Serpent did eat* of this fruit is probable becauſe we read, that *the Woman ſaw the Tree was good for Food.* Now as the word *ſaw* muſt be underſtood here as an act of the Mind, and is frequently ſo us'd, it had been better render'd *conſider'd.* But the Woman could not conſider, or form any inference, that this Tree was good for Food, unleſs ſhe had ſeen it taſted by ſome one; and this, in the preſent caſe, could be no other than the Serpent.

preſently

presently eat, to put herself in possession of superior greatness: tho' she had no farther assurance of obtaining it, than the word of a Creature very inferior to herself, and that in express contradiction to the command of her Creator[b].

Hurried and heated by the rash action, and so full of expectation as to leave no room for reflection, she seeks her Husband; to make him partaker of her New Food, that so they might share the imaginary Happiness. The Arguments, by which she had been captivated were, no doubt, laid forth in all their forcible engagements; but we have reason to think, that Adam, more cautious and cool, was better fortify'd by the Command of his Creator. Yet, however guarded he was, or whatever expostulations he may be suppos'd to have made with his fallen Wife; we are inform'd, that *he also eat with her*, or *as she had done before him* (for the words will signify either) and by this fatal conjunction in the Sin, became a necessary companion in the Punishment.

b Milton IX. 896.

O fairest of Creation, last and best
Of all God's Works; Creature, in whom excell'd
Whatever can to Sight or Thought be found
Holy, Divine, Good, Amiable or Sweet!
How art thou lost! how on a sudden lost!
Defac'd, deflowr'd; and now to Death devote!

We might be induced to believe, that the arguments of his Wife, with which ſhe had been furniſh'd by the Serpent, had ſome influence on his compliance; and that the ſubtle Tempter choſe to attack him thus at ſecond hand, by making the Wife the ſeducer of the Husband; as every word from one he ſo dearly lov'd would come with double force, and a much ſtronger probability of perſuaſion. But there is a remarkable aſſertion of St. Paul's, in his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy [c]; where, among the reaſons for the Superiority of the Man over the Woman, he gives this — *Eve, being deceiv'd, was in the Tranſgreſſion; but Adam was not deceiv'd.* Now, if Adam was not deceiv'd, he muſt have eaten with a full conviction of the conſequence, and out of love and affection for his miſerable Wife [d]. But it ſeems moſt rational to ſuppoſe the Apoſtle here to mean — that Eve was firſt deceiv'd, and that immediately by the Serpent; but that Adam eat, without ſeeing the Serpent, after the deception was finiſh'd; and therefore that he was partly induced by the arguments, and partly by the ſolicitations of Her, with whom, as he had ſha-

c 1 Tim. II. 14.

d Milton IX. 997. ——— He ſcrupled not to eat
Againſt his better Knowledge; not deceiv'd,
But fondly overcome with female Charm.
1165 Who might have liv'd, and joy'd immortal Bliſs,
Yet willingly choſe rather Death with Thee.

red

red in Happineſs, he reſolv'd alſo to ſhare in Miſery [e].

Thus fell the firſt happy Pair, forfeiting at once their title to Happineſs and Immortality; for the terms of the Covenant, as before obſerv'd, were — that they ſhould continue Immortal as long, and only as long as they continued Obedient. How long indeed the golden age of Innocence did continue, is not certain; nor, perhaps, relative to the caſe in hand. But that they did not immediately tranſgreſs the divine command, and eſpecially on the day of their creation (as has been ſometimes imagin'd) ſeems clear from this — that (beſides the ſhortneſs of *one day* for the *ſeveral actions* done by Adam *before his Fall*) God himſelf, after the ſixth day was paſt, declared every thing to be *very good*; which he could not have done, if Sin, that *greateſt Evil*, had then enter'd into the world [f].

But leaving the Time of their Uprightneſs, which is impoſſible to be determin'd, we are aſſur'd of this — that they fell; and the firſt thing we read concerning them as fallen is an

e James I. 13, 14, 15. *Let no man ſay, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with Evil, neither tempteth he any man; but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own Luſt, and enticed. Then when Luſt hath conceived, it bringeth forth Sin; and Sin, when it is finiſhed, bringeth forth Death.*

f Univerſal Hiſtory, Book I. Ch. I. p. 121. Edit. 8vo.

obſervation

obſervation of the Hiſtorian — that *the Eyes of them both were open'd* [g]. The Serpent, as we have ſeen, had before told them, that their Eyes ſhould be open'd, and that they ſhould be equal to God; and therefore the firſt thing Moſes ſays of them is — *The Eyes of them both* (*indeed*) *were open'd, but* [h] *they knew that they were naked.* And as this was the only Knowledge they acquir'd; ſo, in compliance with this recent ſenſe of Shame, *they platted a few Leaves of the Fig-Tree together, and made themſelves Coverings.*

To account rationally for this ſenſe of Bodily Shame, which we are expreſsly told they were affected with now, and not before the Fall; it may (perhaps) be properly obſerv'd — that this Tranſgreſſion of theirs was an *undue Election*; and that by this undue Election the Aſcendant or Over-Balance was gain'd by the natural Appetites and Affections, which had been now *indulg'd*, above the powers of Reaſon, which had been arbitrarily *controll'd*, and brought into Subjection by a lawleſs Uſurpation. So that we ſee how the inward Rectitude of Man was loſt, as well as what is meant by *Original Corruption*; and may conſequently account, why Adam ſhould become ſenſible of Shame, and

g Gen. III. 7.

h The frequent neceſſity of thus rendering the Particle ו appears from Noldius; See his Particulæ Hebraæ Part. ו Signif. 59.

be

be agitated with irregular Paſſions, as ſoon as his governing Power was dethron'd, and he had loſt that original influence, which before kept all the faculties of the Body and appetites of Nature in perfect order.

The next thing, and what we might naturally expect to follow, is the appearance of *Jehova, whoſe Voice they heard, as it came* [i] *louder and louder thro' the garden, in the evening of the Day.* Upon the firſt ſound of this awful voice (for 'tis probable God call'd to them more than once [k]) the Criminals, not knowing readily what to offer on their own behalf, *hid themſelves from the preſence of the Lord among the Trees of the Garden.* But tho' God, whoſe

i That the word מתהלך may be applied to the *Voice* of God, is plain from its being uſed in Exod. XIX. 19. in conjunction with the ſame word קול; and that it muſt be ſo applied here, appears from Gen. III. 10.

k This ſeems evident from Adam's own words, Chap. III. 10. — *I heard thy Voice in the garden, and I was afraid — and hid my ſelf.* The caſe then ſeems to be this — In the evening of the day God calls upon Adam to appear before him, and the Voice of God is ſaid (in the majeſty of the Hebrew phraſe) *to walk towards him* in the garden; and perhaps לרוח היום may be render'd— *in the Wind of the day*, that is, the Voice of God came to him waving in the wind or breeze of the day. But Adam, inſtead of anſwering, endeavours to conceal himſelf. Upon this, God ſummons him *again*; and now, leſt he ſhould aggravate his guilt by a longer ſilence, he anſwers—that, upon hearing God's voice at firſt, he was ſtruck with confuſion; and had therefore endeavour'd to retire from him.

Eyes

Eyes (in the Prophet's Stile [l]) *run to and fro thro' the whole Earth*, ſaw well the Subterfuge, which Adam had weakly choſen, and the cauſe alſo of his flying thus unuſually [m] from his preſence; yet, to increaſe his confuſion, he calls unto him—*Where art thou?* In anſwer to which dreadful Summons the trembling Sinner reply'd —*I heard thy Voice in the Garden, and I was afraid, becauſe I was naked; and I hid my ſelf.*

Here it may be obſerv'd, that Le Clerc, and thoſe who with him would have the word *Naked* here to ſignify—*that he had ſinned*, do not ſeem to write conſiſtently with the Text. For how ſtrange would it appear, if, when Adam had ſaid —*I heard thy Voice in the Garden, and I hid my ſelf, becauſe I have ſinned*, that God ſhould anſwer — *Who told thee that thou waſt Naked? Haſt thou eaten* &c. that is, (if theſe Interpreters are conſiſtent with themſelves) after Adam had *confeſs'd* his having *ſinned*, God is ſuppos'd to ſay — *Who told thee that thou haſt ſinned? Haſt thou ſinned?*—This certainly is inconſiſtent enough; for God knew that Adam could not want an information that he had ſinned, eſpecially when his fearful conduct ſo loudly proclaim'd it, and even Adam himſelf had that moment confeſs'd it.

l Zech. IV. 10.

m Milton IX. 1080. ——How ſhall I henceforth behold
The Face of God or Angel, erſt with Joy
And Rapture oft beheld?——

But

But the ſenſe ſeems to be this—Adam, while innocent, was naked and not aſhamed; when guilty, he became ſenſible of Shame; which was owing (as before obſerv'd) to the Aſcendant which his Paſſions gain'd over his Reaſon, at the time of his tranſgreſſion. For then, as theſe Paſſions were become ſuperior in him, he began to feel the effects of their inſtigation, and ſo from a ſenſe of Shame cover'd his Waiſt with Fig-Leaves. This *ſenſe* of *Nakedneſs* then was the *effect* of his *Sin*; and therefore it is no wonder he fled from the Lord among the Trees of the Garden, to conceal (if poſſible) the Fig-Leaves he had twiſted round him.

Let us now reconſider the Text. *And the Lord God ſaid—Where art thou? And he ſaid—I heard thy Voice in the Garden, and I was afraid becauſe I was Naked; and I hid my ſelf.* He ſeems here to bear off from the *confeſſion* of the *Cauſe*, by *acknowledging* only the *Effect*; and owns ſo far, that he hid himſelf becauſe he had found himſelf to be Naked. But God, who knew that this diſcovery, or ſenſe of his Nakedneſs, could only ariſe from his Tranſgreſſion, interrogates him again thus — *Who told thee that thou waſt Naked?* No one could ſhew thee this—this muſt be thy own diſcovery, and is a ſtrong preſumption of thy loſs of Innocence. — *Haſt thou then eaten of the Tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou ſhouldeſt not eat?* Or,

as it is more ſpirited in the Original [n], *What! Of the Tree, which I commanded thee not to eat, of THAT haſt thou eaten?* The Man, confounded with the thunder of this enquiry, and expecting inſtant Death, if he could not offer ſomething in his own Excuſe, throws the blame upon his Wife; which, however, he did not intend ſhould reſt there, but recoil back upon his Creator. *I have eaten*, ſays he, *but the Woman gave me of the Tree*; even the Woman, *whom Thou gaveſt to be with me*, or to be my conſtant Companion. Upon this God addreſs'd himſelf to the Woman, ſaying, *What is this that Thou haſt done?* The Woman, who had now ſtill more to fear from the unexpected impeachment of her Husband, paſſes her guilt off upon the Serpent; *the Serpent*, ſays ſhe, *beguiled me, and I did eat*.

The Criminals having thus confeſs'd their Tranſgreſſion, with the only poor Plea which each of them had to offer; God proceeds to pronounce their ſeveral Sentences. That the Tempter, the grand Criminal, was preſent is very reaſonable to ſuppoſe; whether we conſider his ſtay as voluntary, to enjoy the fruits of his Victory and Triumph, and overhear the doom of the fallen Pair; or whether we conſider it as involuntary, and that he was detain'd

n Gen. III. 11. המן העץ אשר צויתיך לבלתי אכל ממנו אכלת:

or

or recall'd by almighty and omnipresent Agency. Yet tho' the Tempter was present, God does not interrogate *him*, but begins with the denunciation of *his* punishment. The Serpent indeed had been only the Instrument made use of; but as the Tempter had been a Serpent in appearance, God, in his curse upon this Tempter, uses such expressions as suited entirely with the nature of the *Serpent*; yet at the same time the Curse was such as affected the *evil Spirit* conceal'd under that appearance. And this it seems reasonable to suppose our first Parents might have some notion of, on the following account — They had very sadly experienced the *assurances* of this Creature to be *false*, and instead of a *Friend* they had met with a most deceitful *Enemy*; wherefore they must suppose, from the *power* of his *assault*, that he was something *more* than a *Brute*, and, from the *malice* of his *deception*, that he was of an *evil Nature*: and farther, perhaps, they could not then reason.

But even this is not certain. We know that there was a necessity for God's making Revelations to Adam in Paradise, and that a frequent intercourse between the Creator and Creature must have subsisted before the Fall [o]. This then

o See Dr. Burnet's Demonstration, Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 3. p. 454. Mr. Stackhouse, in the Apparatus to his History, page 8. Bp Sherlock on Prophecy, Discourse the IIId. p. 53.

being granted, we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that God had made known to the firſt Pair ſo important a tranſaction as *the Apoſtacy and Puniſhment of the Rebel Angels.* Eſpecially as this might be a very uſeful information, and be ſet forth before them for an Example, leſt they alſo ſhould fall under the ſame condemnation; and they might thereupon reaſon — *If God ſpared not the Angels of Heaven, how much leſs will he ſpare us the low inhabitants of Earth?* It appearing then that ſuch an information might have been uſeful, we may preſume it was actually made; ſince God certainly neglected no information that might conduce to the Benefit of his Creatures. On this ſuppoſition then all the Inconſiſtency, imputed by ſome to this Sentence on the Serpent, will be taken away; and we ſhall ſee it ſhine forth in the ſtricteſt conformity with reaſon. It is cloathed in the form of a *Parable* or *Similitude*, in the manner of the Eaſtern ſtile; and as the *neceſſity of the preſent caſe* requir'd. The nature of a Parable or Similitude is — to mean more than is expreſt; and no juſt Critic will condemn ſuch a Parable or Similitude, if it ſhould not hold in minute circumſtances, ſo long as the important parts of it correſpond and mutually reflect Light upon each other.

Being thus far prepar'd, we come now to the Judgment of the Offenders, which is (if any thing

thing can be ſuppos'd to be) ſolemn and auguſt. We ſee aſſembled together God, in his Shechinah, as the Judge; the Devil, veil'd under a Serpent, as the Deceiver; and the firſt human Pair, who thro' his deceit were become Tranſgreſſors. The Serpent (in appearance) having been the firſt in miſchief, is doom'd firſt, and in the following words — *Becauſe thou haſt done this, be thou curſed above all Cattle, and above every Beaſt of the Field; upon thy Belly ſhalt thou go* [p], *and Duſt ſhalt thou eat all the Days of thy Life: And I will put Enmity between Thee and the Woman, and between Thy Seed and Her Seed* [q]; *this ſhall bruiſe thy Head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his Heel.*

Now if we conſider this as a Sentence on the Serpent only, it will appear trifling and ridiculous [r]; if as a Sentence on the Devil only, there are ſome circumſtances ſcarce applicable to that ſignification. And if we ſay it was a Sentence upon both (as it is very frequent in Scripture-Prophecy to vail a more important meaning under a leſs important meaning) then we ſhall be ask'd, how Adam could be ſenſible of that, when he knew nothing of the nature of the Evil Angels; and if he was not ſenſible

p See Mr. Mede, Diſcourſe the 41ſt. p. 231.

q Galat. III. 16. — *He ſaith not unto Seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy Seed, which is Chriſt.*

r See Bp Sherlock on Prophecy, Diſcourſe 3d. p. 62.

of

of that, the chief meaning in it could be of no uſe or conſolation to him. In ſhort, it ſeems only explainable, (and very rationally explainable then) on the Suppoſition before laid down — that Adam had, by way of caution and to ſerve other great purpoſes, particularly the preſent, been pre-acquainted with the nature of the Fallen Angels; and, aſſiſted by ſuch an information, he muſt have eaſily apprehended the full meaning of this Sentence.

In a *Literal Senſe*, he heard the Curſe pronounced in the cleareſt terms upon the *Serpent*, which had been the Inſtrument in this deception. And that this Creature was here a proper Object of puniſhment appears from this — that, ſince all the Brute Creatures *are and were created* for the Benefit of Man, the Benefit of Man was intended by this puniſhment on the Serpent [s]; as it was in all Ages to continue a living viſible Evidence of God's diſpleaſure againſt Sin, and of the certainty of the Fall, from the otherwiſe unaccountable Enmity ſubſiſting thro' the World between Man and the Serpent [t].

s See Mr. Mede, Diſcourſe the 41ſt. p. 230.

t The wiſeſt Naturaliſts among the Heathens (proper Witneſſes in the preſent caſe) have agreed that there is a mortal Enmity between the Human and the Serpentine ſpecies. See, among others, Pliny, in his Natural Hiſtory, VII. 2; and Lucretius, IV. 642.

In

In a *Parabolical Sense* the Curse has been fulfill'd with equal exactness, so far as the justness of a compleat Parable requires it: and in this view we are now to consider it, as a Sentence also on the *Devil* [u]. The nature of this evil Spirit we have suppos'd Adam pre-acquainted with; and therefore he must infer, after the event, that this was the Being which seduced him, and consequently the Being to be now sentenced before him. — The Devil then, with his Adherents, was here cursed by God, and became a greater object of the divine displeasure and of human hatred, than all the other Orders of Beings — he was probably condemned to greater present anguish, and more dreadful expectations hereafter — he was already become the profess'd Enemy of the Woman and her Posterity; and therefore one, to be born of the Woman, was to enter the lists against him, and with irreconcileable opposition pursue him and all his black Associates — the effect of which grand contest was to be, the Devil's bruising the Heel, or pursuing to Death him that was to be born emphatically his Enemy; but that this Seed of the Woman was to bruise his Head, break the power, and lay waste the kingdom of darkness — and as the Deceiver was only to touch the material and inferior part of his Adversary, the Redeemer was

u See Mr. Mede, Discourse the 41st. p. 229.

to

to crush the potency of his spiritual Foe, and bind him in everlasting Chains [w].

To this Explanation I beg to add a passage from Dr. Burnet [x]. — Bruising the Serpent's Head, says he, implies the defeating his contrivances against Mankind. For first; as he thought, by seducing the first Pair, to have brought on their Death, and so have made an end of the whole Species at once; God promises that the Woman should live to have Seed. Secondly; as he seduced the Woman under the specious pretence of Friendship, while he intended her Ruin; a War is declared against the Devil and his Party, which should end in the ruin of them and their devices. And thirdly; as the Devil thought by drawing them into Sin and under the wrath of God, to bring them under a certainty of Death, and deprive them of the Happiness they were made for; God declares the Devil's Policy should be defeated by the Seed of the Woman: in which is implied a positive Promise—that Mankind, tho' by the envy of the Devil become *sinful* and therefore *mortal*, should receive thro' the Seed of the Woman *Forgiveness of Sins*, the *Resurrection of the Body*, and *Life everlasting*.

I have been the more minute in the Explication of this first and most important Prophecy,

w See Bp Sherlock on Prophecy, Discourse 3d. p. 70.
x Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. III. p. 516.

as

as it is the very Groundwork and Foundation-Stone, on which our Redemption is built. And it has been prov'd by Bp Sherlock, in his very excellent Book on Prophecy [y], that Prophecy muſt have been an eſſential part of ſuch a Sinner's Religion. For, ſays that great Author, had our firſt Parents been doom'd only to Trouble and Mortality, without any well-grounded hope or confidence in God; they muſt have look'd on themſelves as rejected by their Maker, as deliver'd up to ſorrow in this world, and as having no hope in any other. Upon this footing there could have been no Religion; for a ſenſe of Religion without Hope is a ſtate of phrenzy and diſtraction, void of all inducements to Love and Obedience. *They would* (in the language of the Pſalmiſt [z]) *have ſat down in darkneſs and in the ſhadow of Death, being faſt bound in miſery and iron; becauſe they had rebell'd againſt the word of the Lord, and lightly regarded the counſel of the moſt Higheſt. Then had their heart been brought down thro' heavineſs; becauſe, when they fell, there was none to help them.* If therefore God intended to preſerve them as Objects of his Mercy, if he intended they ſhould look upon him in a milder light than as an Almighty Being cloathed with Terrour; it was abſolutely ne-

y Diſcourſe 3d. p. 53.
z Pſalm CVII. 10, 11, 12.

ceſſary he ſhould communicate ſo much hope to them, as might be a rational foundation for their future endeavours to reconcile themſelves to him by a better obedience. And this was exactly the caſe here in this Prophecy and Promiſe of a Redeemer [a].

But probably one Objection may be ſtill rais'd here, which is this — Suppoſing Adam, from a pre-acquaintance with the nature of the Fallen Angels, might ſee the *Devil* ſentenced in the parabolical ſenſe of this Prophecy; how could he poſſibly conceive ſo clearly the oppoſite Character of the *Redeemer*, which, in the nature of things, could not have been reveal'd to him before? I anſwer, that the words of this Prophecy will evidently ſupport us in ſay-

a That this Prophecy was meant of a Redeemer, and was fulfill'd in *Chriſt* alone, in the compleat ſenſe, is granted by all Chriſtians except the Roman Catholicks. For it may be proper to obſerve here, that their Vulgate Verſion makes it a Prophecy of the *Virgin Mary*, and in oppoſition to Senſe and Grammar reads it — *Inimicitias ponam inter te & Mulierem, & Semen tuum & Semen illius; IPSA conteret caput tuum, & tu inſidiaberis calcaneo ejus.* But that the Original will not bear this, will appear to any capable examiner; and a concern for the honour of our Redeemer ſhould make us abhor ſo blaſphemous a Corruption. For this Verſion is more than authoriz'd by Popiſh Infallibility; and Epiſcopius (Oper. Theol. 276.) is favourable in his cenſure, when he ſays—Concilium Tridentinum *perperam* egiſſe, quando eam (Vulg. Verſ.) *authenticam* fecit, & ipſis Hebræis Græciſque fontibus *præferendam* eſſe judicavit. See alſo Groſſius, Tom. I. p. 35.

ing

ing — that Adam might certainly from them infer and expect *A Redeemer*; one, to be born born of the Woman, who ſhould re-inſtate them in the poſſeſſion of Happineſs, and recover by his victory what they had loſt by being defeated. And we may advance a ſtep farther, and ſay—that Adam, probably ſoon after the divine Sentences were paſs'd, was acquainted with the very *manner* of this promis'd *Redemption*; namely—that this Seed of the Woman ſhould *die*, to atone for the Sins of him and his poſterity; and by virtue of his Blood they ſhould, tho' now become mortal, riſe again to everlaſting Life.

For I hope to prove in the following Diſſertation, that *Sacrifice* was *inſtituted by God* juſt *at this time*; and if Sacrifice, then certainly the *Nature* and *End* of Sacrifice; and if the Nature and End of Sacrifice (which was *the Shadow of good things to come*) was at that time made known, certainly *the Death of the Redeemer* was then actually promis'd. Tho' in *what Age* this Sacred Power was to ariſe, and with what peculiar *circumſtances* his Birth and Death were to be attended, the firſt Pair might not be inform'd; it being more than probable that they expected this Redeemer in the perſon of one of their own Sons. And had they known this Happineſs was to have been poſtpon'd for four thouſand Years, they would

probably (notwithſtanding the encouragement they had receiv'd) have ſunk into extream deſpair [b].

I ſhall now go on to the Sentences on our firſt Parents—And can a more intereſting, a more affecting Scene be diſplay'd before us their Children? We ſee our great Progenitors ſtand trembling to receive their doom; ſomewhat however rais'd from the depth of fear by that merciful vengeance, which God had manifeſted in the Sentence on their Deceiver [c]. And here we may conceive infinite Juſtice demanding Satisfaction, and the Death of the Offenders, while infinite Mercy interceded for their Pardon; and who but a Being equally infinite in Wiſdom could have acted here to the Honour of all his Attributes?—But ſuch is God! He had already bid the human Pair, in his Mercy, not to deſpair under the preſent evidence of his indignation; ſince one was to be born of the Woman, who ſhould bruiſe the head of that Serpent, which had thus betray'd them into Miſery. But that they might not go

b See Dr. Delaney's Revelation examin'd with candour; Vol. I. p. 103.

c Bp Sherlock, on Prophecy, Diſcourſe 3d.—It could not therefore but be ſome comfort to them to hear the Serpent firſt condemn'd; and to ſee, that however he had prevail'd againſt *them*, he had gain'd no Victory over *their Maker*, who was able to aſſert his own Honour, and to puniſh this great Author of Iniquity.

unpuniſh'd

unpuniſh'd for ſo high a tranſgreſſion, he, in his Juſtice, pronounces the following Sentences; which are weighty, and worthy the mouth of him from whom they proceed.

To the Woman, firſt in the tranſgreſſion, he ſays—*I will greatly multiply thy Sorrow and thy Conception, in Sorrow thou ſhalt bring forth Children; and thy Deſire ſhall be to thy Husband, and he ſhall rule over thee.* However flatly ſome may think of this Sentence, and treat it as immaterial and of little conſequence; it is really ſo ſevere, that (we are told by Naturaliſts) the Pains of a Woman ariſing from bearing and bringing forth Children are much greater than thoſe of any Brute Creature in the ſame Circumſtances. This ſeems a Chaſtiſement great indeed for one, who has a Sovereignty over the Beaſts, and is of a far ſuperior nature. And the latter part of the Sentence has been generally look'd upon, by theFemale part of the human ſpecies, as a Puniſhment very grievous to be born. The ſenſe of this *Sentence* (which is not a *Curſe*, as the Serpent's was) may, perhaps, be more properly given thus — *Multiplying I will multiply thy Sorrow and thy Conception,* (or — the Sorrow of thy Conception [d]) *in Pain ſhalt thou bring forth Children; and to thy Huſ-*

d An *Hendyades*, a figure very frequently made uſe of in the Sacred as well as Profane Authors.

band

band shall be thy Obedience [e], *for* [f] *he shall rule over thee.* Or, perhaps, the latter part may be more properly translated thus—*In pain shalt thou bring forth Children, yet* [g] *thy desire shall be unto thy Husband; and he shall rule over thee.* As to the conclusion of this Sentence on the Woman, A-Bp King observes [h], that it was very equitable; the Woman, *says he*, had attempted to shake off the Government of God, and therefore God lays her under a double Subjection—to himself, and also to her Husband.

The Judgment closes with the Sentence upon Adam, which was as follows—*Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy Wife, and hast eaten of the Tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, thou shalt not eat of it; Cursed is the Ground for thy sake* [i], *in Sorrow shalt thou eat of*

e See Le Clerc upon this place.

f See Nold. Heb. Partic. ל Signif. 37.

g Ibid.——————————9 & 65.

h See his Sermon at the end of the Origin of Evil, Vol. II. p. 72.

i Hesiod thus describes the happiness of the golden Age, in his Εργ. και Ημερ. Βιβλ. α.

Χρυσεον μεν πρωτιστα γενος (μεροπων) ανθρωπων.
Ωστε θεοι δ' εζωον, ακηδεα θυμον εχοντες,
Νοσφιν ατερ τε πονων και οιζυος· ουδε τι δειλον
Γηρας επιω, αιει δε κομων εκτοθεν απαντων.
————Καρπον δ' εφερε ζειδωρος αρουρα
Αυτοματη, πολυν τε και αφθονον————

And Virgil has given us the condition of the Earth after the Curse, in words that seem to be a Paraphrase of the Sacred Passage before us—

it

it all the days of thy Life. Thorns also and Thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the Herb of the Field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat Bread, 'till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; for Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return. Let us now see what is also observable in this Sentence on our Father Adam; the reason of whose punishment being previously laid down, God proceeds to pronounce the Punishment it self—Because thou hast hearken'd to the Voice of thy Wife, in direct contempt of my authority, and hast eaten of the fruit of that Tree, which I commanded thee not to eat of; Cursed therefore shall be the Ground for thy sake, and the punishment of thy transgression; in sorrowful reflection and with great labour shalt thou eat of that, all the days of thy future Life. For it shall bring forth Thorns and Weeds in such abundance, as will (unless rooted up with

Georg. I. 127.——————Ipsaque *Tellus*
Omnia liberius, *nullo poscente*, ferebat.
Ille malum virus *Serpentibus* addidit atris——
Tum variæ *venere artes*, *Labor* omnia vincit
Improbus, & *duris* urgens *in rebus Egestas*.——
Mox & frumentis labor additus, ut mala culmos
Esset rubigo, segnisque horreret in arvis
Carduus; intereunt Segetes, subit aspera sylva,
Lappæque, Tribulique; interque nitentia culta
Infelix lolium & steriles dominantur avenæ.——
——————Sic omnia Fatis
In pejus ruere, ac retro sublapsa referri.

continual

continual pains) overſpread the Land, and leave thee but little room for that which is henceforth to be thy Suſtenance. For know, that, inſtead of the luxuriancy of Paradiſe, and the delicious Fruits of the Trees I here gave thee; thou ſhalt now feed on the Herb of the Field, and the produce of the Earth. The Ground, thus become leſs fertil [k], will call for ſo much culture and manuring to enable it to yield thee Fruit; that thou ſhalt not eat Bread, but in the ſweat of thy Brow. This henceforth ſhall be thy way of life, 'till thou return unto the Ground, out of which thou waſt at firſt created. For, tho' Death is not immediately inflicted upon thee, yet thou art become mortal; and as thy compoſition is Duſt, ſo after a period of days thou ſhalt return unto Duſt again.

How ſevere, how awful is this Sentence; and yet how mild, how mix'd with Mercy, in compariſon to what Adam might reaſonably, and probably did expect from his offended God! Wherefore we may now ſuppoſe Adam, with uplifted hands to Heaven, to have broke

k God made this Earth amiable and ſweet, and the World a Scene of Happineſs to a Creature that was to continue in it; but when Sin introduced Death, God in his Goodneſs curs'd the Earth by a diminution of its excellence, to make the World leſs deſireable to a Creature, who was now ſo ſoon to leave it. Dr. Delaney's Revelation examin'd with candour, Vol. I. p. 77.

forth

forth into ſtrains of Gratitude like the following of the devout King David—*Praiſe the Lord, O my Soul; and forget not all his Benefits! The Lord is full of Compaſſion and Mercy, long-ſuffering, and of great Goodneſs! He hath not dealt with Us after our Sins, nor rewarded Us according to our Wickedneſſes! For look how high the Heaven is in compariſon of the Earth, ſo great is his Mercy! Look how wide alſo the Eaſt is from the Weſt, ſo far hath he ſet our Sins from Us! In the multitude of the ſorrows I had in my heart, thy Comforts have refreſhed my Soul! The* SNARES *of* HELL *overtook me; but the* LORD *is become my* SALVATION! *Thro' the greatneſs of thy power ſhall thine Enemy be found a* LIAR *unto thee! Who then is he among the Clouds, that ſhall be compared unto the Lord! The Right-Hand of the Lord hath the* PREEMINENCE; *the Right-Hand of the Lord bringeth mighty things to paſs! The Lord hath chaſtened and corrected me, but he hath not given me over unto immediate Death! As long then as I live, I will magnify thee on this manner, and lift up my Hands in thy Name!*

The Offenders being now ſentenced, we might naturally expect to ſee them inſtantly driven forth from Paradiſe. But there are two things the Hiſtorian mentions as previous to that baniſhment, which are well worthy our conſideration. The firſt is—*And Adam called his Wife's name Eve, becauſe ſhe was the mother*

of all living[1]. 'Tis a matter of ſome ſurprize, that Le Clerc ſhould make this paſſage a preſumption of the Hiſtorian's breaking the order of time; when nothing could poſſibly come on more regularly, and ſtrike us more agreeably than this Incident, in this place. God had threaten'd Adam, that if he eat of the forbidden Tree, he ſhould ſurely die. He did eat, and what could he expect? Deſpair, we know, is the natural attendant upon Guilt; and Adam could not think to eſcape Death, which is only a Natural Evil, when he had introduced Sin, that Moral Evil, into the World. How pleaſing then muſt be the ſurprize, when he found that thro' the divine clemency he was ſtill to live for ſome time; and that his Wife was to bring forth Children, one of which was to break in pieces his Oppreſſor, and redeem the World! And conſequently, what more natural to follow, than that Adam ſhould be entirely reconcil'd to his Wife; who, having been the cauſe of his Happineſs loſt, was alſo to be the cauſe of his Happineſs regain'd? He had before call'd her *Woman*, as her common Name, or a Name for her and all her Sex, becauſe ſhe was taken out of Man; and now he call'd her *Eve*, becauſe he had found ſhe was ſtill to be the Mother of all living. Or, as ſome interpret it, becauſe in her Fall (and his conſequent

1 Gen. III. 20.

on

on hers) all Men being become mortal, in her Seed all Men were to be made alive. This Nomination of his Wife then may be look'd upon as an *Act of Faith*, exercis'd by Adam upon the words of God just deliver'd in the Sentence on the Serpent. But the propriety of either of the Names, given by Adam to his Wife, can only appear to a person acquainted with Hebrew Learning.

The other Incident previous to the Banishment of our first Parents is —*Unto Adam also, and to his Wife did the Lord God make Coats of Skins, and cloathed them*; or, as it may be render'd —*Moreover the Lord God made for Adam and for his Wife Coats of Skins, and cloathed them* [m]. This, however unconcerning an Information it may appear to some, would not have been inserted in the middle of this solemn History, unless something of moment were contain'd in it. The Prophecy our first Parents had heard, in the sentence on the Serpent, was doubtless, at the instant of its delivery, like *a Light shining in a Dark place*; just sufficient to banish the Darkness, and enliven the Breast with a gleam of Hope and Expectation. But here the comfortable Dawn breaks forth, and *the Day-Star* may be said (with a beautiful propriety) to *arise in their Hearts*. For now, as God knew the Prophecy abovementioned could

m Gen. III. 21.

not as yet be properly underſtood, he inſtituted Animal Sacrifice, farther to illuſtrate and unfold this grand event—to be a continual viſible Prophecy of the ſame future Redemption—that, by the preſent vicarious Sacrifice, Man might confeſs the Death he himſelf had deſerv'd to ſuffer — and laſtly, as *without ſhedding Blood* there was to be *no Remiſſion* [n], (and as, in conſequence thereof, Adam's Repentance would not have been ſufficient without an Atonement) that he and his Poſterity might have recourſe by Faith, for the remiſſion of their Sins, to this Inſtitution; as being typical of *the Lamb of God*, virtually *ſlain from the foundation of the World* [o].

What appears indeed in this verſe, at firſt ſight, is only this — that Adam and his Wife were now cloath'd with Garments made of the Skins of Beaſts [p]; which it would be abſurd to

n Heb. IX. 22.

o Rev. XIII. 8. See Bp Weſton's Serm. Vol. II. p. 192.

p There are ſome, who will have the word עור in this place to refer to the Skin of Adam and his Wife, and the meaning to be — *And the Lord God made for the firſt Pair Coats, or Coverings, of their Skin.* But the Hebrew word would probably have been then עורם, with the Pronoun ſuffix'd to it. Yet, ſetting aſide this remark, when we have prov'd Sacrifice to have been divinely inſtituted, and at this very time, (as will appear in the ſecond Diſſertation) I think there can remain no doubt about this paſſage. Eſpecially as Cloppenburg (in his Sacrificiorum Patriarchal. Scholâ, p. 13.) has inform'd us that — In Scrip-

ſuppoſe

ſuppoſe meant any thing more than that ſuch Skins were conveniently faſten'd round their Bodies [q]. But as they could not have ventur'd upon this method of cloathing themſelves without an order or leave from God, (they having naturally no power over the Lives of Animals [r]) we are here told, that *God made* theſe *Coats* for them; that is, he gave them leave to kill the Animals, and perhaps direction how to adapt their Skins to the parts of their Bodies: for it is certain, that God is frequently ſaid *to do* that, which *is done by his order* and appro-

turâ vox Heb. עור *nuſquam* reperitur *aliâ* ſignificatione, quam pro *externâ animalium pelle* uſurpata. To which he ſubjoins this Obſervation — Deinde videtur hìc eſſe prima origo legis illius, quæ exſtat Lev. VII. 8; quâ Sacerdos, qui offert holocauſtum, habebit pellem ejus; ubi eſt eadem vox עור. There is indeed one place, where the word עור *ſeems* to ſignify *the Skin of Man*; Ex. XXII. 27. הוא שמלתו לערו במה ישכב: I ſay *ſeems*, becauſe All the Verſions are not agreed to give it that meaning here; the Samaritan referring the word to the Skin of *a Beaſt*, and rendring the place — *Hæc veſtis ejus eſt pro* PELLE *ſuâ in quâ dormit.* Yet if we underſtand the word to ſignify in this place *Human Skin*, it is us'd here ſo differently from what it is in Gen. III. 21. (having both the ל before and the Pronoun after it) that but little Service can ariſe from the Obſervation.

q Le Clerc obſerves here — Ut verum fatear, hìc non *Veſtes*, ſed *Tabernaculum* pellibus contectum intelligendum ſuſpicor. But why care ſhould be taken *by God* to make a Tent or Habitation *in Paradiſe*, when in the very next words we read of *God's* turning the firſt Pair *out of Paradiſe*, ſeems very unaccountable.

r See Dr. Burnet, Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 3. p. 447.

bation.

bation. Now the queſtion is — Whence theſe Skins, of which the Coats or Garments, here mention'd, were made? This has employ'd the invention of former Interpreters, but ſeems now to be almoſt univerſally reſolv'd into this —that they were the Skins of Beaſts offer'd up in Sacrifice. For theſe Skins (as we cannot ſuppoſe any Animals died of themſelves, ſo ſoon after their Creation) were therefore moſt probably the Skins of Beaſts ſlain; and if ſo, theſe Beaſts were certainly ſlain either for Food, or in order to make theſe Coats, or for Sacrifice. For Food they could not be ſlain, becauſe the Fleſh of Animals made no part of human Suſtenance 'till after the Flood [s]. Neither is it poſſible to ſuppoſe that Adam, after the Sentence juſt paſt upon him for Sin, would have dared to kill God's Creatures without his Order or Permiſſion; which, it may be preſum'd, God would not have given only for ſuch a Uſe, when there were yet ſo few Creatures in the world. Wherefore as they muſt be ſlain for Sacrifice, Sacrifice was then certainly inſtituted [t]. Theſe then ſeem to be eaſy conſe-

s This is clearly inferr'd from the Grant of Animal Fleſh to Noah in theſe words (Gen. IX. 3.) *Every Moving Thing, that liveth, ſhall be Meat for You; even as the green Herb* (which was your former food) *have I* (now) *given you all things.*

t Theſe Animals being Holocauſts, their Skins only could fall to the ſhare of Man; and by giving theſe for

quences,

quences, and the Sacred Writer might think them ſufficient for the preſent, in this place; where he is haſtning on, with the Baniſhment of our firſt Parents from Paradiſe full before him.

The account, which Moſes gives us of this expulſion from Paradiſe, is uſher'd in, in a very ſolemn manner [u] — *And the Lord God ſaid, Behold! the Man is become as One of Us*; or, as the words may, perhaps, be better render'd *Behold! the Man* (הִיה) *hath been, or behaved, as if he were equal to One of Us* [w], *as to* [x] *the Teſt of Good and Evil.* Theſe words, as Bp Patrick obſerves, plainly inſinuate a Plurality of Perſons in the Godhead; all other Explications

Coats to our firſt Parents, God ſeems peculiarly to have intended to remind them conſtantly of their Sin—their deſert of Puniſhment by Death—and the divine Goodneſs in the ſubſtituted Satisfaction; ſo that Adam might have ſaid, in the words of St. Paul (Gal. VI. 17.) — *Henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear on my Body the marks of my Redeemer.*

u Gen. III. 22.

w *As if he were equal to one of us* — that is, ſays Dr. Rutherforth, He hath diſown'd our Authority, ſet himſelf up for a proper Judge of Good and Evil, and put himſelf on a level with One of Us; by throwing off our Government, and refuſing ſubmiſſion to our Command. That the particle כ is us'd for *equality in ſtate and dignity* appears from Ruth II. 13. Eſſay on Virtue, p. 229.

x That the particle ל, here prefix'd to דעת, ſignifies *quod attinet ad* is prov'd from that uſe of it in 1 Sam. IX. 20; and Pſalm XVII. 4. See more inſtances in Noldius, Partic. ל Signif. 30.

ſeeming

ſeeming forced and unnatural: and this famous Text, compar'd with that other in Gen. I. 26 &c. (explain'd in page 28.) will readily aſſiſt and throw light upon each other. It has been frequently indeed aſſerted, that the words *Behold! the Man is become as One of Us, to know Good and Evil* — are ſpoken by way of Irony or Sarcaſm. But this is very ſtrange, tho' the reaſon of ſuch a refuge is evident; namely, the difficulty of rationally explaining the words (as they ſtand there) in a literal and plain ſenſe. But this difficulty, I preſume, is entirely remov'd by the different verſion before given, and the ſenſe of the words as here explain'd. I ſhall only, previous to this explanation, obſerve — that God was at this time determining the fate of a World; that he had juſt before made his fallen Creatures the promiſe of a Redeemer, as an evidence of his Mercy; and was now about to drive them out of Paradiſe, as an evidence of his Juſtice: and certainly this of all ſeaſons was the moſt unlikely for God to expreſs himſelf (as obſerv'd before) in Irony or Sarcaſm. On the contrary, as we ſhould be extreamly cautious of aſcribing ſuch methods of expreſſion to the Deity, eſpecially on an occaſion the moſt important; let us, conſiſtently with the dignity of the Subject and the nature of the Text, underſtand the Addreſs here made, as made by one to the other

other two Persons subsisting in the Unity of the Godhead.

And now, as the following Verses seem to give the fairest appearance of argument for one real Tree of Life or Immortality, I shall insert such a Paraphrase, as may help to take away the prepossession in favour of such an acceptation, and at the same time vindicate the Translation here given; which, tho' new in some parts, will still be found literally render'd from the Original.

Verse the 22d.—*And the Lord God said, Behold! The Man has been,* (or *behav'd*) *like One of Us, as to the Test of Good and Evil.* Behold! the Man, whom we so lately created in our own Image, and in such happy Circumstances, has shook off our Authority, as to that Tree by which it was to appear whether he would be good or evil; and by thus slighting our Prohibition, he has acted as if he were our Equal, and sat up for Independency.

And now lest he put forth his hand, and take again of the Trees of Life, and eat, and so live on all his Days—What then remains of his punishment for this high Transgression? He has been sentenced to Mortality, and to a Life of Pain and Trouble for his future hard subsistence. And now, that he may not live in opposition to this sentence, by stretching forth his hands with the same ease and happiness as before, and

take again of the fruit of thoſe Trees of Life, which I gave him here to feed upon; leſt he eat for the future, as in time paſt, without that Labour to which he ſtands doom'd, and ſo live on happy all his days — Let us baniſh him from Paradiſe.

23. *Therefore the Lord God ſent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the Ground from whence he was taken.* In conſequence then of this divine deliberation, God ſent forth the guilty Man from the Garden of Eden, that ſeat of perfection and delight; to till, for his future maintenance, the accurſed Ground, which might conſtantly remind him both of his Origin and Diſſolution; for from the Ground he was but lately taken, and after ſome time he was to return thither.

24. *So he drove out the Man, and placed at the eaſt of the Garden of Eden Cherubim and a pointed Flame* [y], *which waved it ſelf to and fro, to guard the paſſage to the Trees of Life.* Thus God expell'd the Man from Paradiſe; and at the eaſt of the Garden [z] (on which ſide probably was the only Acceſs) he placed a Guard of Angels. And theſe, being by their office Mi-

y Pſalm CIV. 4. *He maketh his Angels Spirits, and his Miniſters a flaming Fire.* So that the Sacred Writer evidently expreſſes himſelf here by an *Hendyades*; uſing the double Expreſſion of *Cherubim* and *a flaming Sword* (or *a pointed flame*) inſtead of *Angels in a fiery Appearance.*

z See page 25.

niſters

nisters of the Divine Pleasure, took their station there; and patroll'd in a fiery Appearance, to prevent the return of Man, from Labour and a painful Subsistence, to Paradise and the Trees of Life.

AND now, if we look back, and think over this important piece of History, it may perhaps be allow'd to be rational and consistent; without admitting the existence of a single Tree of Life, or one particular extraordinary Tree, whose Fruit was capable of rendring the eaters thereof Immortal. But the present Explication will be entitled to a more favourable acceptance, when several Objections, which lie against it, are remov'd; and to attempt this shall be the business of the remainder of this Dissertation.

I. The first then, and perhaps most weighty Objection with some to the foregoing account, may be this — That it does not yet sufficiently appear, upon rational principles, how Adam in Paradise was immortal, especially without the use of a Tree of Life; and how he became naturally mortal, after he was expell'd Paradise.

This Diversity in the Nature of Adam is indeed the hinge on which the matter principally turns; and tho', with some, enough may have

been already ſaid to eſtabliſh theſe two Propoſitions — that Adam was *conditionally immortal* before the Fall — and *naturally mortal* after it; yet I ſhall here treat this caſe a little more at large, beginning with a quotation from Dr. John Clarke, who maintains the contrary opinion. Man, *ſays he*[a], was originally made mortal, and the threatning of Death to him in caſe of Diſobedience does not at all imply, but that he might have been mortal in his ſtate of Innocence; whether he ſhould actually have died or no, while innocent, the Scripture is ſilent, and we have no natural means of knowing. To this determination the Dr. adds his opinion of Mortality, on the following philoſophical principles — That ſo long as the Nouriſhment is proper to aſſimilate itſelf to the ſeveral parts of the Body, as it approaches them in its ſeveral channels; or ſo long as the ſolid particles, ſuppoſe of Salts, retain their form and texture; ſo long Life is preſerv'd and maintain'd: and when the Nouriſhment becomes unfit to aſſimilate it ſelf, or the ſaline particles loſe their power of attracting the Fluids; in either of theſe caſes all their motion will ceaſe, and end in corruption, confuſion and death.

But that Mortality was not the condition of human nature at firſt, ſeems evident from the words of St. Paul, and the nature of the Cove-

a Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 3d. p. 200.

nant

nant made with Adam at his Creation. St. Paul tells us— [b] *By one man Sin entered into the world, and Death by Sin*; consequently, if there had been no Sin, there could have been no Death; and where there is no possibility of Death, there can be no Mortality. Again; the Apostle by an elegant Catachresis calls Death, which is the Punishment, the Wages of Sin —[c] *the Wages of Sin is Death.* But if there be an inseparable connexion between Sin and Death (as is extreamly evident) there must be, in the reason and nature of things, the same inseparable connexion between Holiness and Life, or Innocence and Immortality.

The Covenant with Adam was— [d] *In the day thou eatest of the Tree of probation thou shalt surely die.* Now a Law, made with a punishment annex'd to the violation of it, is an implicit Covenant, that none, but the disobedient to that Law, shall suffer the Sanction or Penalty of it. And does not Reason write it with a Sun-Beam, that, in the case before us, Adam, while obedient to the divine Law, could not have felt or suffer'd Death, which was to be his punishment for the violation of that Law? The Threatnings as well as Promises of God are conditional, and imply their contraries; and

b Rom. V. 12.
c Ibid. VI. 23.
d Gen. II. 17.

this

this with regard to the present point, is illustrated with ease and beauty by Dr. Turner [c], in the following manner — Would not a Son think, if his Father should threaten to disinherit him in case of Disobedience, that he should prevent that misfortune, and secure his Inheritance by a continued and uniform Obedience? The case is exactly similar; and withal so plain, that to mention the contrary opinion seems to confute it.

As the Immortality of Man before, and the Mortality of Man after his Fall, appear therefore plain from Scripture, and the reason of things; let us now see, whether this diversity can be accounted for on principles of Nature; and how it will appear, that as God governs all things according to their Natures, so here he left natural causes to produce natural effects.

Dr. Clarke has here assisted us with the following Maxim in Physics—That so long as the Nourishment receiv'd into the Body is proper to assimilate it self to the several parts of the Body, so long Life is preserv'd and maintain'd. Now the Food, yielded by the Fruits of those Trees which Adam was to eat in Paradise, was doubtless the most proper for Nutrition; and therefore the most proper to assimilate it self to the several parts of the Body, for the support of which it was intended; consequently

c Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 2d. p. 357.

as

as long as he had eaten of this Food, he had, upon the above principle, been immortal. For we muſt ſuppoſe, that his Inſtinct as an Animal, and much more his Reaſon as an Intelligent Being, would have always induced him to obey the call of Hunger, which is an effect of meer ſenſitive nature.

The Dr's Counter-poſition then is this—that when the Nouriſhment becomes unfit to aſſimilate it ſelf to the ſeveral parts of the Body, the motion of the Fluids will in time ceaſe, and the conſequence will be corruption, confuſion and death. Now we are aſſur'd, that, immediately after the Fall, the nature of human Food was alter'd for the worſe; that the Ground and its Productions were curs'd, for a puniſhment on Man; and that he was, from that time, to eat the Herb of the Field. This ſeems to imply, that the fruits of Trees were no longer to be his ſuſtenance; frequent changes being made in human food, by the expreſs command of God, during the infancy of the world. And thus Grotius explains the matter, in his comment on Gen. III. 18. — Herba, quæ & Frumentum in ſe comprehendit, opponitur illis beatarum Arborum fructibus. But ſuppoſing the fruits of the Trees did continue to be eaten, they were to be now but Part of human food; and were certainly affected by the Curſe upon the Ground, with which they

were

were ſo inſeparably connected. So that we may fairly conclude, that as our firſt Parents had render'd themſelves obnoxious to Death by their Diſobedience, this change made by God in their food was to bring about their diſſolution in a natural way. And as the food they were to make uſe of, immediately from the date of their Sentence, was of a different and worſe nature; 'tis plain that the aliment, now ſo different from that before the Fall, would not be productive of the ſame but a different effect; and therefore being become leſs fit to aſſimilate it ſelf to the ſeveral parts of the body, the motion of the Fluids would in time ceaſe, and conſequently the ſtrong original compoſition of Man would ſink at laſt into corruption, confuſion, and death.

With how critical an exactneſs then was fulfill'd the divine Covenant made with Adam in Paradiſe, and couch'd in theſe words — *In the day thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die!* For tho' it is generally ſaid, that theſe words were fulfill'd by Adam's then becoming mortal, tho' he did not die in nine hundred Years after; yet the words are expreſs—*In the day thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die.* For this reaſon it ſeems preferable to render the words (which are remarkably adapted to the caſe in hand) as follows — *In the day, thou eateſt thereof, dying thou ſhalt die.* This is the literal verſion, and it

it is here ſtrong and beautiful; for we find that in the very day he tranſgreſs'd, the Ground was curs'd, his Food was alter'd and impair'd; and, tho' his Life was not to *expire* till after many years, he then *began to die*, and every ſucceeding day led him a ſtep forward to the Grave: ſo that he might be truly ſaid, in the language of St. Paul, to *die daily* [f].

II. The Second Objection probably may be — that the word עץ *a Tree*, which is ſingular, is here uſed twice in the plural number; being render'd *Trees*, in explaining the 23d and 24th verſes of the third chapter. To vindicate this manner of tranſlating it in thoſe two places, it ſeems ſufficient to obſerve — that the ſame Noun, in the ſingular number in the original, is by our Engliſh Tranſlators themſelves twice render'd *Trees* in this very chapter, and cannot be render'd otherwiſe. The places are Verſe the 2d, in which the Woman ſays to the Serpent — *We may eat of the fruit of the Trees in the Garden* &c. And Verſe the 8th, where we read — that *Adam and his Wife hid themſelves from the preſence of the Lord amongſt the Trees of the Garden*; or more literally, *in the middle of the Trees of the Garden*. No one, I ſuppoſe, will object to the propriety of the Tranſlation in theſe two places; the neceſſity of it in both

f 1 Cor. XV. 31.

being very clear and obvious. The truth is, that the Noun עץ ſignifies more properly *Lignum* than *Arbor*; and thro' this hiſtory of the Creation and Fall is uſed plurally, or for the whole Genus of Trees: unleſs where it is confin'd by the emphatic article, or a neceſſary reſtriction in the ſenſe. And therefore, in Verſe the ſecond [g] above-mention'd, we firſt find the word evidently ſignifying plurally; and immediately after, when reſtrain'd by the article, properly tranſlated in the ſingular number.

It may alſo be obſerv'd, that in Chap. II. 9. the word ſeems only brought forward a ſecond time, to introduce the word following it; the Hebrew Language having very few Adjectives. And therefore the Hiſtorian, inſtead of a word ſignifying *conducive to Life*, probably call'd forth the word *Tree* from the former part of the ſentence, and expreſs'd himſelf thus — *Out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every Tree, that was deſireable to the Sight, and that was good for Food and a Tree of Life* — inſtead of — *and a Tree conducive to Life*. And we find the ſame word, meaning the ſame thing, repeated in Chap. III. 6. without any farther uſe than the ſtrength of the Sentence — *And when the Woman*

g Gen. III. 2. — מפרי עץ הגן נאכל *We may (or ſhall) eat of the fruit of the Trees of the Garden.* 3. ומפרי העץ אשר בתוך הגן *But of the fruit of the Tree, which is in the middle of the Garden — God hath ſaid, ye ſhall not eat thereof.*

ſaw

saw that the Tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the Eyes, and a Tree to be desired &c. And this may obviate any objection to the version of the word in the above-mention'd place; as if there was a necessity for its signifying something different from the same word just before it, because of its being repeated.

III. A Third Objection may be made to the present rendring of the word לעלם in Chap. III. 22.—that it is made to signify *the days of Adam's Life only*, and not *for ever*. In answer to this I observe, that the word עולם is used as often, perhaps, finitely as infinitely; and that it can signify nothing more than the Age or Life of Man, in places where our Translators have frequently render'd it *for ever*. Thus Exod. XXI. 6.—*Then his Master shall bring him unto the Judges, and he shall bore his ear through with an Awl, and he shall serve him for ever.* And 1 Sam. I. 22.—*But Hannah went not up; for she said, I will not go up until the Child be weaned; and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and there abide for ever.*

IV. A Fourth Objection may be brought against the rendring the particle גם, in Chap. III. 22. by—*Again*. This conjunctive particle is well known to have various significations;

but among all that the Critics have given it, none ſeems to flow more naturally from it, than the tranſlating it by—*inſuper*, *iterum*, and *etiam atque etiam* [h]. The radix of it is loſt among the Hebrew words, but the Arabians have preſerv'd it, and it is جم *multus fuit*, *abundavit*, *auxit adjecto cumulo*, &c. And therefore may with the greateſt propriety be render'd in Engliſh—*again*, or *frequently*. And thus we meet with it, in 1 Sam. XXIV. 12; where David, having cut off the skirt of Saul's Coat, while he lay in the Cave of En-gedi, brings it forth to him after his going out of the Cave, and beſeeches him to look upon it, and to look upon it again, and to conſider it well, as the ſtrongeſt confirmation of his innocent intentions towards him; and, in the midſt of his beautiful Addreſs, he thus artfully beſpeaks him — ואבי ראה גם ראה את כנף מעילך בידי Et vide, mi pater, etiam atque etiam vide oram pallii tui in manu meâ.

V. A Fifth Objection may be made to what has been before obſerv'd; namely, that the only food of Man, before the Fall, ſeems to have been the fruits of the Trees. But this is not of conſequence to the principal point; however, as it carries probability with it, I ſhall offer a few obſervations in defence of it.

h See Koerber's Heb. Particles, p. 15.

We

We read in Gen. I. 29. — *And God ſaid, Behold I have given you every Herb bearing ſeed, which is upon the face of all the Earth; and every Tree, in the which is the fruit of a Tree yielding ſeed, to You it ſhall be for meat.* This, at firſt ſight, may perhaps appear unfavourable; but let us take in the following verſe—*And to every Beaſt of the Earth, and to every Fowl &c. have I given every green Herb for meat; and it was ſo.* The ſenſe now ſeems clear, — that Man was to eat of the fruits of the Trees; and that Birds, Beaſts and Reptiles were to eat of the produce of the Earth. The Engliſh Verſion may therefore be corrected thus —*And God ſaid, Behold, I have (indeed) given you every Herb bearing ſeed, which is upon the face of all the earth: but every Tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding ſeed, ſhall be to You for meat; and to every Beaſt of the earth have I given every green Herb for meat; and it was ſo.*

God ſeems here to have inform'd Adam of ſomething deſerving his peculiar attention —Obſerve, ſays he, that I have given you the Dominion over all the Creation, and conſequently every Herb of the field is in your power; but this is not to be Your Food: Your food is to be from the Trees, and therefore remember — that the Herb of the field is my bounty to the Animal Creation, and of this ſuſtenance no power of Yours ſhall deprive them:

them: and it was ſo; that is — this was the original Conſtitution of things, and ſo it continued 'till the Fall. For after the Fall we find God *condemning* Adam, as a part of his *puniſhment*, to the *eating the Herb of the field*; and it does not appear likely, that God ſhould condemn Adam, when guilty, to eat the Herb of the Field, if he had eaten that before, while innocent.

Perhaps then it may be allow'd, that Adam at firſt was to eat of the fruits of the Trees; and, after the Fall, of the Herb of the Field. And the reaſon of the divine Injunction, ſo different in theſe two reſpects, (if I may be allow'd the liberty of a Conjecture) ſeems to to have been this — God might intend, that Man in Paradiſe ſhould eat nothing but from on high, the fruits of the Trees only; that ſo, while he was ſuſtaining his Body, he might behold the Heavens, whither, after an age of Innocence, he was to be tranſlated[i]: but after his Fall, being degraded in his food, he was condemn'd to ſtoop to the Earth for ſuſtenance; that ſo he might not forget his original from the Duſt, and his ſpeedy return thither.

VI. It may be objected alſo — that if there was in Paradiſe no Tree of Immortality, but

i Tull. de Nat. Deor. 2.—Cum cæteras animantes *abjeciſſet ad paſtum*, ſolum hominem *crexit*, ad *Cœlique* quaſi cognationis & *Domicilii* priſtini *conſpectum excitavit*.

all

all the Trees there were only for the ſupport of Life, in the way of common nouriſhment; why was a Guard placed, to prevent the return of the firſt Pair into Paradiſe? To this ſeveral Anſwers may be given, and I hope the following are ſatisfactory. The Garden of Eden was prepar'd with peculiar ornament and beauty, as a worthy habitation for Beings of innocence and virtue [k]. When God therefore had ſo richly furniſh'd this delightful Garden, it may not be abſurd to ſuppoſe, that it continued free from that Curſe, which, upon the fall, affected all the future habitation as well as food of Adam. And that when Man, for his Sin, was expell'd this happy place, and driven forth into a world render'd unfruitful for his puniſhment; Paradiſe, with its fruits, might flouriſh in its native perfection, 'till the Deluge put an end to all diſtinction between that and other places, and made them equal in one general deſolation [l]. Suppoſing this, we preſent-

k For when the Sacred Writers would expreſs the exceeding fruitfulneſs and pleaſure of a Country, 'tis to Paradiſe they have recourſe for the ſublime Idea. Thus Gen. XIII. 10. — *And Lot lift up his Eyes, and beheld all the Plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every where, even as the Garden of the Lord.* And Joel II. 3. *The Land is as the Garden of Eden before them, and behind them a deſolate Wilderneſs.*

l Salkeld on Paradiſe, p. 39. — It ſeemeth much more probable, that Paradiſe was deſtroy'd by the general Deluge. And thus Milton deſcribes the Deluge, II. 824.—

ly

ly ſee a reaſon for reſtraining Adam, under puniſhment for his Rebellion, from re-entring Paradiſe. I ſay, re-entring Paradiſe; becauſe it is the opinion of ſome men of the firſt claſs [m], that Adam was created out of Paradiſe, and introduced into it by his Maker. Granting this (which is founded partly on theſe words —*And the Lord God planted a Garden, and there he put the man whom he had formed* [n]) granting this, we ſhall ſee the preſent ſolution in a ſtronger light. For if Adam was created out of the Garden, and then, to influence his gratitude, admitted into it, as a place very ſuperior in beauty to what he had before ſeen, and yielding Fruits of a much richer flavour than he had before taſted; we may eaſily account for the Guard's being placed to prevent his enjoyment of it, after his tranſgreſſion.

So that if we ſuppoſe, there were in Paradiſe Fruits of a different kind and richer nature than out of it, with other peculiar circum-

——————— All the Cataracts
Of Heav'n ſet open on the Earth ſhall pour
Rain day and night, till Inundations riſe
Above the higheſt hills—then ſhall this Mount
Of Paradiſe by might of waves be mov'd
Out of his place, puſh'd by the horned flood,
With all his Verdure ſpoil'd, and Trees adrift.

m See Bp Patrick in his Commentary; Dr. Delaney in his Revelat. exam. Vol. I. p. 4; And Mr. Sale in the Univerſ. Hiſtory, Book I. Ch. I. p. 121. Edit. 8vo.

n Gen. II. 8.

ſtances

ſtances of happineſs; or that the Curſe, which affected the Trees and their Fruits out of Paradiſe, might not extend to thoſe within—I apprehend the preſent Objection may be ſolv'd either way; and both Suppoſitions appear to be of ſome weight. For, as to the latter; God, we are aſſur'd, does nothing in vain; and no end could have been anſwer'd by his curſing Paradiſe as a puniſhment on Man, when he was not to re-enter it, and conſequently could not be affected by the alteration. And if any one ſhould be ſtill inclin'd to aſſert, that Paradiſe was curs'd with the reſt of the Earth, I would beg to ask in return—Why was a Guard placed at Paradiſe? For if the Ground and Fruits of Paradiſe ſuffer'd in one common Curſe with the reſt of the Earth, doubtleſs the Tree of Life (above all things [o]) was impair'd with the reſt, and render'd incapable of producing its former (ſuppos'd) extraordinary effects, for which there was now no longer occaſion.

And as to the former Suppoſition—that the Trees in Paradiſe were preferable to all others, and peculiar in uſe and beauty; this is confirm'd from ſeveral paſſages in Scripture, particularly in that noble paſſage of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chap. XXXI. *Speak unto Pharaoh*,

o Becauſe (as Mr. Sale obſerves) it was now grown not only *uſeleſs*, but *inconſiſtent* with the Curſe and Puniſhment of Man. Univ. Hiſt. B. I. Ch. I. p. 129. Ed. 8vo.

and unto his multitude, Whom art thou like in thy Greatneſs? Behold! the Aſſyrian was a Cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, of an high ſtature; the waters made him great; the deep ſet him up on high; his heart was exalted above all the Trees of the field; the Cedars in the very Garden of God could not overtop him; the Fir-Trees were not like his boughs, and the Cheſnut-Trees were not like his branches; not any Tree even in the Garden of God was like unto him in his beauty; I have made him fair by the multitude of his branches, ſo that all the Trees of Eden, that were in the Garden of God, might envy him. The Gradation here (in this beautiful illuſtration of Greatneſs) from all the Trees of the Field to the Cedars of Paradiſe in particular, and the inſiſting ſo much that the Trees in Eden, in the very Garden of God, were not only unequal to it but might even envy its excellence—ſeems evidently to point out a ſuperiority of nature in the Trees of Paradiſe to all others in the world.

It may be alſo proper to remember here, that Adam was now ſentenced to hard Labour, and condemn'd to eat of the Herb of the Field in the ſweat of his Brow; and this conſideration is alone ſufficient to account, why God ſhould place a Guard at Paradiſe — leſt Adam ſhould return to thoſe Trees, planted together by God in Paradiſe, of which he had ſo happily eaten before; and which had ſupported, and would

would ſupport him ſtill, without the toil which he was otherwiſe under a neceſſity of experiencing.

VII. Another Objection may be — that Alluſions to this Tree of Life or Immortality are made in other parts of Scripture, and therefore ſuch a Tree muſt have exiſted. But it may be obſerv'd, that meer probable Alluſions will prove nothing; and unleſs we can find plain references to the very Tree of Life ſaid to be deſcribed by Moſes, it will not affect the preſent argument. It may not however be improper to conſider the places, where theſe Alluſions are ſuppos'd; and theſe are only, I believe, in the book of Proverbs and the Apocalypſe.

We read in Prov. III. 18. — *She is a Tree of Life to them that lay hold upon her, and happy is every one that retaineth her.* Theſe words are ſpoken of Wiſdom, under a beautiful, but very uſual and eaſy Metaphor. That Wiſdom is attended with Fruits, and to taſte the Fruits of Wiſdom— this was always, and continues to be an approv'd method of expreſſion. But Solomon here carries the figure one ſtep farther; and as Wiſdom yields the ſweeteſt and moſt deſireable *Fruits*, he calls her *a Tree:* and what kind of Fruit could he aſcribe to this Tree, ſo charming and deſireable as that

of *Life*. *Wisdom* then, he tells his Son, is a *Tree of Life* [p]; and that whoever lays hold on her, will be improv'd in his Mind, in the same degree as his Body would receive benefit from such Fruits, as envigorate his Animal Life.

But the Royal Writer could not here allude to the suppos'd Tree of Life in the Mosaic History, because the allusion would have been injurious to his design. For he tells us, that as *Wisdom is a Tree of Life to them that lay hold upon her*, so *happy is every one that retaineth her*; but *Adam*, upon the receiv'd opinion, would have been *unhappy*, had he eaten and *retain'd the Tree of Life*; and therefore God is said to have drove him out of Paradise in *Mercy*, that he might not be immortal in his misery [q].

As to the Revelation of St. John, it may be observ'd — that an Argument from thence to

p That there is nothing peculiar here intended by *the Tree of Life* is evident from considering that in Solomon's Language any thing that is *desireable* is call'd *Life*; and therefore we read Chap. X. 11.—*The Mouth of the righteous is a Well of Life*. —XIII. 12. 14; *When Desire cometh, it is a Tree of Life — The Law of the Wise is a Fountain of Life* —XV. 4; *A wholesom Tongue is a Tree of Life*—XVI. 22; *Understanding is a Well-Spring of Life* &c.

q God (says Dr. Delaney) is represented by Moses as deliberating, and assigning the most gracious reason imaginable for removing our first Parents from Paradise; even lest they should eat of *the Tree of Life*, and *live for ever*, which doubtless in their condition had been the greatest curse they were capable of. Revel. exam. Vol.I. Dissertat. 6.

prove

prove or illuſtrate any other part of the Sacred Writings, will (without a direct reference) be leſs readily admitted, than from the other Books of the New Teſtament. Theſe are all written in a ſtile clear and ſimple, but yet noble and ſublime; we read, admire, and confeſs their Divinity ſtamp'd in the moſt ſhining characters. Not that we have reaſon to doubt the Authority of this book of the Revelation of St. John; as it was acknowledg'd genuine by the Synod of Carthage, and eſtabliſh'd by the ſanction of the Sixth General Council [r]. But the argument of it is in general ſo obſcure, and its ſignification ſo myſtical, that no proof can be well drawn from it, to affect any other part of the Bible, unleſs it refers clearly to the point in queſtion. That the places mentioning a Tree of Life in this book of St. John, do not refer to the Moſaic Hiſtory, ſeems plain; becauſe the Copy, ſuppoſing it ſuch, would be very unlike to the Original.

We read in Revelat. XXII. 1, 2. — *And he ſhewed me a pure River of Water of Life, clear as Chryſtal &c. In the midſt of the Street of it, and of either ſide of the River was there a Tree of Life, which bare twelve manner of Fruits, and yielded her Fruit every month; and the Leaves of the Tree were for the healing of the Nations.* But that this Image is not borrow'd from Ge-

r See Veneer on the 39 Articles, Vol. I. p. 187.

neſis,

neſis, ſeems evident from hence — that here is firſt *a River of Water of Life*, which is not in the Hiſtory of Moſes — that here are at leaſt *Two Trees of Life*, one on each ſide of the River; whereas in the Moſaic account there was (upon the receiv'd opinion) but one, and no River that we read of as running near it — that *each Tree* here bore *twelve* manner of *Fruits* is a circumſtance certainly miraculous, and ſuch as we have not the leaſt reaſon for ſuppoſing in the Garden of Eden; for in *that* all the Trees were doubtleſs created ſo, as to yield each one peculiar kind of Fruit, according to its ſeparate Law, and the nature of that Seed, which it contain'd in it ſelf — and that the *Leaves* of theſe Trees were for the *healing of the Nations* ſeems to confirm the contrariety. For the ſuppos'd Tree of Life in Geneſis could not be for the *healing* or cure of the firſt Pair, to recover them either from *Diſeaſe*, in a literal ſenſe; or *Misfortune*, in a figurative: the firſt they could not ſuffer, while they continued innocent; and as ſoon as they experienced the ſecond, they were cut off from what had been (in ſuch a caſe) their infallible remedy.

So that we may fairly conclude, that St. John had not here, (and if not here, then not in other places, where the ſuppos'd alluſion is leſs particular; eſpecially as the *whole* is *one continued Viſion*, and therefore certainly *carried on* under

under the *ſame Ideas*) that St. John, I ſay, had not here any view to the Deſcription of Moſes. But the Alluſion is here evidently made to the Deſcription given us by Ezekiel, in which the Trees are expreſsly call'd *Trees of Meat*, and not *Trees of Life*; tho' St. John uſes the latter phraſe as ſynonimous, and exegetical of the former. This Opinion is confirm'd by Mr. Lowth, in his Commentary on this Prophet — Ezekiel, ſay he, being at Babylon, is in this viſion made acquainted with the form of the Second Temple, which was to be built after their return from Captivity; and St. John, in the Revelation not only deſcribes the Heavenly Sanctuary by Repreſentations taken from the Jewiſh Temple, but likewiſe tranſcribes ſeveral of Ezekiel's Expreſſions —and among theſe the Commentator mentions particularly this place of Revelat. XXII. 1, 2.

That this is the caſe will immediately appear, upon comparing the two places; and the Compariſon will be greatly ſerviceable to the illuſtration of the preſent Argument. Ezekiel XLVII. 1.—*Afterward* HE (the Angel) BROUGHT ME *again unto the door of the houſe; and behold,* WATERS ISSUED OUT *from under the threſhold of the houſe eaſtward.* 7. *And behold, at the bank of the River were* VERY MANY TREES, ON THE ONE SIDE AND ON THE OTHER. 9.—*And every thing ſhall* LIVE, *whither the* RIVER *cometh.*

12. *And*

12. *And* BY THE RIVER, *upon the bank thereof*, ON THIS SIDE AND ON THAT SIDE, *shall grow* ALL TREES FOR MEAT — or, as the words [s] may be render'd— EVERY TREE OF MEAT; *it shall bring forth* NEW FRUIT *according to* ITS MONTHS — *the Fruit thereof shall be for Meat, and the* LEAF *thereof for* MEDICINE.

This then is part of the Vision describ'd by Ezekiel; let us now see how St. John has copied from it. Revel. XXII. 1. — *And* HE (the Angel) SHEWED ME *a pure* RIVER OF WATER OF LIFE, — PROCEEDING OUT OF *the throne of God and of the Lamb.* 2. *In the midst of the Street of it, and* OF EITHER SIDE OF THE RIVER, *was there the* TREE OF LIFE—or, as the words [t] may be render'd—*were there* TREES OF LIFE; *which bare* TWELVE *manner of Fruits, yielding their* FRUIT *every* MONTH; *and the* LEAVES *of the Trees were for the* HEALING *of the Nations.*

We see then that St. John has transcrib'd almost every remarkable Circumstance set down by the Prophet; and there is the utmost reason

s כל עץ מאכל

t ξυλον ζωης. For that ξυλον, which answers exactly to עץ in signification, may be construed plurally —appears, not only from the Observations above laid down, but from the LXX using it in that manner, Gen. III. 2. —Απο καρπου του ξυλου του παραδεισου φαγομεθα. And in verse the 8th — Και εκρυβησαν ο τε Αδαμ και η γυνη αυτου εν μεσω του ξυλου του παραδεισου.

therefore

therefore to conclude — that the former had the latter carefully in view, in this deſcription. From this Compariſon it may be proper and uſeful to draw a few Obſervations. Firſt; that by St. John's uſing the words *Tree of Life* inſtead of what Ezekiel calls *Tree of Food*, it is evident that the Terms are ſynonimous, and of the ſame ſignification. Secondly; that in both deſcriptions there is a neceſſity of underſtanding *more* Trees of Life, or Food, *than one*; the plurality is expreſsly mention'd by Ezekiel, and muſt be inferr'd from St. John, becauſe the Tree in *his* deſcription is *on each ſide* of the River. Thirdly; the Prophet tells us of *very many Trees*; and therefore the Evangeliſt muſt deſign the ſame *very many Trees*, as his appears to be ſo exact a Tranſcript. And laſtly; if Ezekiel ſhould be thought to have fetch'd his deſcription from Paradiſe (as may be perhaps imagin'd from the parallel expreſſions of —*Every Tree of Food*, Ezek. XLVII. 12; and —*Every Tree that was good for Food*, Gen. II. 9;) then from the words of Ezekiel explain'd by St. John it will appear ſtill in a ſtronger light, that there was not in Paradiſe One particular Tree of Life, but that *All the Trees of Food* in the Garden were called *Trees of Life* in general.

VIII. The laſt Objection that is likely to be made to what is before laid down, is this

— that, after all, the genius of the Hebrew Language ſeems to require, that the words עץ חיים *Tree (or Trees) of Life*, in Ch. II. 9, ſhould be connected with the words בתוך הגן *in the middle of the Garden.* To this I anſwer, that the conjunctive particle Vau (*and*) is ſometimes found in Scripture prefix'd to one word in a ſentence, when it muſt neceſſarily be tranſpos'd in tranſlation, and be given in the ſenſe before two or more words which immediately precede it: and if ſo, the ſame liberty of language will be allow'd here, of which there is a neceſſity in other places. An inſtance of this we find in Gen. XXII. 4. The third Verſe runs thus — *And Abraham roſe up early in the morning, and ſaddled his Aſs, and took two of his young men with him, and Iſaac his Son, and clave the wood for the burnt-offering, and roſe up, and went towards the place of which God had told him.* After which it follows in the original ביום השלישי וישא אברהם את עיניו וירא את המקום מרחק: Which Words, literally render'd, are — Tertio die & elevavit Abrahamus oculos ſuos, & vidit ipſum locum è longinquo; And muſt be render'd in Engliſh — *And on the third day Abraham lift up his eyes, and ſaw the place afar off.* Here then we ſee a neceſſity for conſtruing the Vau, tho' prefix'd to the verb, before the words preceding that verb. For the two firſt words cannot be join'd to the end of the

the third verſe, this is evident; and therefore they muſt be connected with the words following in the fourth verſe; which they can only be, by conſtruing the particle at the beginning of the firſt word, tho' it is prefix'd to the third word in the ſentence.

This inſtance then being expreſs, and the force of it evident, there is already ſufficient authority for tranſpoſing the ſame particle, in the ſame manner, in any other place where the Senſe requires it. But one inſtance more has occurr'd to me, which I ſhall take notice of; not doubting but many others may be found of the ſame nature. This is in Gen. XXVIII. 6. —*When Eſau ſaw that Iſaac had bleſſed Jacob, and ſent him away to Padan-Aram, to take him a Wife from thence*; בברכו אתו ויצו עליו *And that, as he bleſſed him, he gave him a Charge* &c. [u]

u There is a remarkable paſſage, in 2 Corinth. XII. 7, which requires the ſame tranſpoſition of the particle; and this will clear up the Senſe, and free it from the innumerable attempts that have unſucceſsfully been made for want of it. It is Εδοθη μοι σκολοψ τη σαρκι αγγελος Σατανα ινα με κολαφιζη. The general rendring of which words at preſent (ſee, among other inſtances, the Nova Acta Erudit. Lipſ. 1743. p. 284.) is, that there was given to the Apoſtle a thorn in the fleſh, the meſſenger of Satan, to buffet him. But ſurely as this σκολοψ τη σαρκι was given by God, it cannot well be call'd the meſſenger of Satan; and if we attend to the hiſtory, we ſhall find it impoſſible, becauſe it was given for the glory of God, in oppoſition to Satan. St. Paul, having been receiv'd up into the third Heaven, and honour'd more than all the Apoſtles with

Theſe two Examples being produced as Authorities, let us now take a view of the paſſage in queſtion; which is בתוך הגן ועץ הדעת טוב ורע *And in the middle of the Garden the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.* So that it appears there is nothing new attempted here, by way of violence to the words; but only a method of Interpretation is applied, which muſt be obſerv'd in other places in the ſame book of Geneſis. Thus much then may be ſufficient, by way of critical ſolution, in anſwer to the preſent Objection.

But there are a few other things neceſſary to be obſerv'd in this place. And firſt; if the words *in the middle of the Garden* be taken in a ſtrict ſenſe, they muſt be connected with the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. The neceſſity of this ariſes from attending to Chap. III. 3, where we find the Woman thus deſcribing the Tree of Knowledge to the Serpent — *We may eat of the Fruit of the Trees of the Garden; but of the Fruit of the Tree, which is*

the abundance of Revelation; God renders him contemptible by *ſome bodily Infirmity* — Firſt, that the greatneſs of the divine Power might be the more illuſtrious in the weakneſs of the Inſtrument, and that the Apoſtle's pride might be prevented by the inſults of falſe Teachers. For the *Meſſenger of Satan* means here a falſe Teacher, in oppoſition to a true Apoſtle call'd *the Meſſenger of God*; (Gal. IV. 14.) and therefore the ſentence ſhould be render'd — *There was given me a thorn in the fleſh, that ſo the Meſſenger of Satan might inſult me.*

in

in the midſt of the Garden, God hath ſaid, ye ſhall not eat thereof. So that the Tree, which claim'd the Center of the Garden (if we take the words in a ſtrict ſenſe) and was very properly placed there to prevent Miſtake, was the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil; and conſequently, in verſe the ninth of the preceding Chapter, the words *in the middle of the Garden* cannot be connected with the Tree of Life, whatever is meant by that expreſſion.

If it be ſaid, that the words *in the middle of the Garden* are to be underſtood in a laxe Senſe; as ſignifying only *in*, or *near*, or *about the middle of the Garden*; then they may be applicable to what goes before, and to what comes after, in the following manner—*And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every Tree that was pleaſant to the Sight, and good for Food; but the Trees for Life* (or, but every Tree of Life) *in the midſt of the Garden, and alſo the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.*

The Argument then is ſafe ſtill. For tho' the Trees, that were deſign'd for ornament and were deſireable to the ſight, might be diſpers'd thro' the ſeveral parts of the Garden, ſo as beſt to anſwer the beauty and perfection of the whole; yet the Trees for Food might be placed together in the middle, near each other, for the readier ſupport and more eaſy choice of thoſe, who had free liberty to take of what

ſort

ſort they pleaſed. And if we grant this, the Tree of Probation will appear ſtill with greater propriety in the Center, with all the other Fruit Trees around it; becauſe the firſt Pair could not then paſs thro' the choice of their Food, without having in their eye that Tree, which ſtood full before them, which way ſoever they approach'd it; and was therefore a conſtant teſt of their Obedience or Diſobedience. — Of their Obedience, if they ſhould eat of all but that, in conformity to the divine Prohibition; and of their Diſobedience, if they preſum'd to eat of that one Tree, when they had around them ſo many others equally conducive to all the purpoſes of eating, and differing only in this that they were not forbidden.

THUS have I endeavour'd to vindicate this remarkable particular in the Moſaic Hiſtory from inſult and objection; and to fix the ſenſe of it in a manner, not only rational, but conſiſtent alſo with that Simplicity and literal Plainneſs, which is the noble Characteriſtic of the Scripture Account of Paradiſe. I have alſo conſider'd what Objections may probably be urg'd againſt the preſent Explanation; to which are ſubjoin'd ſuch Anſwers, as ſeem to ſolve their ſeveral Difficulties. And, I preſume, if the account here given of what is generally

generally call'd *the Tree of Life* be thought satisfactory; we are freed from all the Infidel Wit hitherto spent upon it, and from the charge of accounting for Natural Things by the introduction of Supernatural Agency. For surely Divinity, as well as Poetry, will admit this standing Rule—

Ne Deus intersit, nisi dignus Vindice nodus
Inciderit ——————

It may not be improper then, by way of Conclusion, to give a regular Translation of the History, so far as concerns these Trees, according to the present Solution; freed from the interruption of (what was before necessary) the several intervening Explanations. And, by this method, the Consistency of the History, upon the Principles here laid down, may be judg'd of at one View.

GEN. II. 8. *And the Lord God planted a Garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the Man, whom he had formed.* 9. *And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every Tree that was pleasant to the Sight, and that was good for Food and a Tree of Life; and in the middle of the Garden the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil.* 16. *And the Lord God commanded the Man, saying — Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat, excepting the Tree of the knowledge*

ledge of good and evil: thou shalt not eat of that; for in the day, thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die. Chap. III. 1. *Now the Serpent was more subtle than any Beast of the Field, which the Lord God had made; and he said unto the Woman — Indeed! Hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every Tree of the Garden?* 2. *And the Woman said unto the Serpent — We may eat of the fruit of the Trees of the Garden;* 3. *Excepting the fruit of the Tree, which is in the middle of the Garden: God hath said, Ye shall not eat of that, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.* 4. *And the Serpent said unto the Woman — Ye shall not surely die.* 5. *But God knoweth, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your Eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be equal to God, knowing Good and Evil.* 6. *And when the Woman considered, that the Tree was good for Food, and that it was pleasant to the eye, and a Tree to be desired to make them wise, She took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and gave also unto her Husband with her, and he did eat.* 7. *And the Eyes of them both indeed were opened, but they knew that they were naked; and they twisted Fig-Leaves together, and made themselves Coverings.* —— 22. *And the Lord God said — Behold! the Man hath behaved, as if he were equal to One of Us, as to the Test of Good and Evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take again of the Trees of Life, and eat, and so live on all his days —*

23. *Therefore*

23. *Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the Ground; for from thence he was taken.* 24. *So he drove out the Man, and placed at the East of the Garden of Eden Cherubim and a pointed Flame, which turned to and fro, to guard the passage to the Trees of Life.*

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

OBLATIONS

OF

CAIN and ABEL.

DISSERTATION

THE SECOND.

THE Hiſtory of the Oblations of Cain and Abel, tho' conciſely deliver'd by the divine Hiſtorian, has been always look'd upon as deſerving the cloſe attention of Mankind [a]. And yet, however intereſting the ſubject, however labour'd the diſquiſition of it has been, there ſeems to be one conſiderable article in the caſe of Abel remaining yet unobſerv'd; and the other particulars of this Hiſtory have not been, perhaps, ſo happily explain'd, as to render any farther attempt towards their illuſtration needleſs.

This of Cain and Abel is the firſt Act of Worſhip, recorded in ſacred Scripture; and was attended with a very remarkable contrariety of event to the two Worſhippers — Ac-

a This piece of Hiſtory (ſays Bp Sherlock) is all the account we have of the Religion of the Antediluvian World. Diſcourſe III. p. 75.

ceptance

ceptance to the one, and Rejection to the other. It muſt be therefore matter of uſeful ſpeculation to ſee clearly into the cauſe of ſuch a difference; which, as it was made by God, had certainly for its foundation ſome equitable and important reaſon. And in order to the right underſtanding this piece of Hiſtory, there ſeems to be requir'd a careful conſideration of the *Offerers*, the *Time of their Offering*, and the *Nature of their different Oblations:* all which circumſtances are regularly contain'd in the following Verſes of the fourth Chapter of Geneſis —

1. *And Adam knew Eve his Wife; and ſhe conceived, and bare Cain; and ſaid, I have gotten a man from the Lord.* 2. *And ſhe again bare his brother Abel: and Abel was a keeper of Sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the Ground.* 3. *And in proceſs of time it came to paſs, that Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground an Offering unto the Lord.* 4. *And Abel, he alſo brought of the Firſtlings of his Flock, and of the Fat thereof. And the Lord had reſpect unto Abel, and to his Offering.* 5. *But to Cain, and to his Offering he had not reſpect.*

In conformity to the method before propos'd, and the regularity of the Hiſtory, I ſhall begin with the conſideration of the *Perſons offering:*

offering: and these, we read, are *Cain* the First-born, and *Abel* the Second Son of the Original Human Pair; whose circumstances, both before and after their Fall, have been consider'd in the preceding Dissertation.

The third chapter of Genesis concludes with the Expulsion of this first Pair from the Garden of Eden; and down to that period we have already accompanied the Mosaic History. Let us now regularly proceed with it, from the beginning of this fourth chapter; which opens with the birth of Cain, the first Child that was born into the World.

Concerning the distance of time, from the Creation to this birth of Cain, there are various Opinions. But, as it is impossible to determine how long the Parents continued in Paradise; so it is, for that reason, impossible to determine how long they had lived, when this Son was born to them out of Paradise. That he was born out of Paradise — is certain; and that he was begotten out of Paradise too —seems probable from the history. Had this Child been born, while the first Pair were happy, upright and immortal in Paradise, he had been born in the same rectitude and purity of Nature he had receiv'd from his Parents; and consequently would have been (when advanced in years) a Man in the same situation, and in the same circumstances, as his Father when

when firſt created. But we have Reaſon, as well as Scripture, to convince us, that he was not born in the original Purity, but under a Corruption of Human Nature. And God, by permitting his wicked mind to operate ſo ſtrongly, and his paſſions to riſe to that pitch of turbulency and diſorder, ſeems to convince us — that Man did not come *thus* out of the hands of his Creator; but that ſuch behaviour was the effect of ſome alteration, introduced into the human compoſition by the defection of our firſt Parents from their innocence [b].

This being premis'd, we come to the Name of *Cain*, which has been variouſly accounted for. But the reader of the Bible, by a little acquaintance with the Original, muſt have obſerv'd the manner of deriving proper Names in

b Dr. Conybeare, in his Defence of Reveal'd Religion, p. 112 — It is obſervable, and acknowledg'd by the beſt and wiſeſt men we know of, that there is, in the preſent circumſtances of our Nature, a ſtrong tendency and propenſion to things in themſelves wrong. Thoſe who have conſider'd matters, with no better light than human Reaſon could give them, have been apt to conclude, that our Nature was not always in the ſame ſtate, in which we find it now;—that as it came pure out of the hands of our Maker, our Underſtanding muſt have been clearer and more extenſive, and our Affections or Paſſions more governable. Of this, which could only be conjectur'd by natural Light, the Sacred Writings have given us a diſtinct account; informing us, that our Nature, originally upright, hath been deprav'd and corrupted by the Tranſgreſſion of our firſt Parents.

the

the firſt ages of the world; how they frequently are given from ſome remarkable circumſtance attending the Birth or Life of the perſon ſo nam'd, and generally have that meaning expreſs'd in words near the place, where the Name is firſt mention'd. And this is evidently the caſe with reſpect to Cain; for we read in Gen. IV. 1. ותהר ותלד את קין ותאמר קניתי איש את יהוה: So that the Name *Cain* was certainly deriv'd from the verb *canithi* (I have gotten,) and ſignifies *Acquiſition*; and this word *canithi* (with the words following it to compleat the Senſe) is expreſsly given by Eve, as the reaſon for her calling her Son by that name—*And ſhe conceived, and bare Cain; for* [c] *ſhe ſaid, I have gotten a Man from the Lord.*

The Name of Cain being thus aſcertain'd, let us attend to thoſe other words, here accompanying it, about which there has been ſo much warm diſputation; namely — קניתי איש את יהוה which our Engliſh Tranſlators have render'd — *I have gotten a Man from the Lord.* The Critics, that have conſider'd theſe words, may be divided into two claſſes; into thoſe who imagine Eve to have expected the Redeemer in this Son, and thoſe who imagine the contrary: and each of theſe claſſes may be variouſly ſub-divided, according to the many different expoſitions, which each perſon has

c See Noldius, Partic.], Signif. 37.

given to ſupport his own determination. But the learned world is ſo well acquainted with theſe various explanations, or rather attempts towards an explanation, that I ſhall only offer that Opinion, which ſeems to come the beſt recommended by the words themſelves and the circumſtances of the hiſtory.

In the ſentence, which God before paſs'd upon the Serpent, a Promiſe had been given (for the puniſhment of the Deceiver, and the conſolation of the fallen Pair) that *the Seed of the Woman ſhould bruiſe the Serpent's Head.* From theſe words then Adam and his Wife might naturally expect *A Redeemer*; one, who was to be born of the Woman, and to recover for them the Favour of God and that Happineſs, which by their Sin they had forfeited. In what manner this mighty Operation was to be accompliſh'd, they might not know; otherwiſe than that it was to be done by the Redeemer's Death: and this, if Sacrifice was inſtituted by divine command to Adam, they muſt know from the typical nature of that inſtitution. Now as the Perſon and Time of this Redeemer were not ſpecified, they were at liberty to expect him in the Perſon of their Firſt Son; and, this being the moſt obvious and natural acceptation of *the Seed of the Woman*, 'tis probable they took the Promiſe in this ſenſe.

This

This being premis'd, let us consider the Text — *And Eve conceived and bare Cain; for she said, I have gotten a Man from the Lord.* But the original words may be render'd — *I have gotten a Man according to the Lord*; and *according to the Lord* is, by all the rules of speaking, equivalent to — *according to the word of the Lord.* And indeed the learned Translators of Queen Elizabeth's Bible acknowledg'd this version, having their marginal reading — *According to the Lord's Promise.* This rendring of the particle את is authoriz'd by Noldius, and confirm'd by the following passage. Hagg. II. 4, 5. *I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts* (את הדבר) *according to the word that I covenanted with you.* Upon this interpretation then the whole verse will run thus — *And Adam knew Eve his Wife, and she conceived, and bare Cain; for she said, I have gotten the Man, according to the word of Jehova.*

Having offer'd this explication of the first verse, with respect to Cain, let us consider the second, with respect to Abel; and tho' there have been still more opinions about this Name than the former, yet a fresh solution may be yet wanting here to give satisfaction. The Name *Abel* will admit various Interpretations the more easily, because the sense of it is not ascertain'd in the text: that it is not, is very remarkable in the present case; since his Mo-

ther's two Names *Woman* and *Eve*, the Names of his elder brother *Cain* and his younger brother *Seth*, are all clearly defin'd in the context, where they are firſt mention'd.

This Name of *Abel* has been generally ſaid to ſignify *Vanity* or *Trouble*; but as theſe Significations ſeem only embraced for want of a more appoſite Etymology, I ſhall offer a new one, after previouſly laying down a few obſervations. Firſt, that Names were not always impos'd at Birth. Or, ſuppoſing the contrary to this to be true; yet, Secondly, that another Name was frequently ſuperinduced from ſome extraordinary circumſtance attending the Life of the Perſon ſo nam'd: which latter Name aboliſh'd the former, and became the only Name, by which ſuch perſon was afterwards ſpoken of and recorded.

This being then frequently the caſe [d], why may we not imagine the Name of *Abel* to have been ſuperinduced alſo, on ſome very remarkable occaſion? Suppoſing therefore that the ſame allowance may be made in this, as in other caſes, I ſhall at preſent take it for granted — that *Abel* was the Name given to Eve's Second Son, from ſome extraordinary circum-

d To give a few Inſtances — *Eve*, *Abraham*, *Sarah*, *Paul* and *Peter* were Names, not given to theſe perſons at their Births, but ſuperinduced perhaps about the middle, or towards the decline of their Lives.

ſtance

ſtance attending him, long after his nativity. Now we know, that Abel was the *firſt* of the human ſpecies that *died*; and that, as his *Life* was remarkably *pious*, his *Death* was peculiarly *unhappy*; being *privately* and *inſidiouſly murder'd* by his own brother, in the *bloom* of his life [e], on account of the preference God had given to his Oblation. It may be thought very likely then, if a Verb can be found that contains the idea of each of theſe particulars, that *Abel* (or, as it ſhould be writ *Habel* or *Hebel*) muſt be deriv'd from that root, and be a Name given him in conſequence of his unfortunate end.

We have accordingly, in the Arabic Language, the verb هبل *habal*, ſignifying primarily—*Orba nato fuit Mater, & morte amiſit eum*; and alſo—*quæ neceſſaria eſſent quæſivit — properus fuit — machinatus, inſidiatus fuit contra aliquem — obſervavit ut obruere poſſet, & captavit opportunitatem* — Significations theſe, ſo wonderfully applicable to the caſe of righteous Abel, treacherouſly murder'd in his youth by his own brother, and ſo expreſſive of the affliction of his Mother conſequent on ſuch a Murder; that it ſeems to carry conviction at

e 'Tis generally imagin'd, that Abel was murder'd in the 129th Year of Adam's Life, becauſe Seth was born in the 130th; and that Seth was born ſoon after the Death of Abel ſeems eaſily inferr'd from the Name of *Seth*, and the circumſtances of the Hiſtory.

firſt

firſt ſight. It being an Arabic Etymology can be no objection to it, becauſe the Arabic Language is a Dialect of the Hebrew; and many entire verbs, with ſome ſignifications of other verbs, having been loſt in the ſcantineſs of the latter (as the Bible is the only book pure in that Language) have deſcended to us in the copiouſneſs of the former [f].

Thus then we may preſume the word *Abel* was deriv'd; and that, tho' it is uſed by the Hiſtorian as his name *during* his *life*, yet it was given him immediately *after* his *death*, and became the only name by which he was thenceforth known and recorded. The cuſtom of doing this in other inſtances has been obſerv'd before, and it is confirm'd by a careful attention to the hiſtory in this chapter. For we have no ſooner read of the birth of the firſt Son, whom his Mother nam'd *Cain*, but we read of the birth of the ſecond Son, which the Hiſtorian tells us was *Abel*; but we don't find, that this was the name given him by either of his Parents, in the form obſerv'd as to the preceding and ſucceeding Son. On the contrary (which is remarkable) he is not call'd *Abel* in any Speech made either *of* him, or *to* him dur-

f See Dr. Hunt's celebrated Oration on the Antiquity &c. of the Arabic Language; p. 53. Ockley's Introduction to the Oriental Languages; p. 117. And Polyglott. Bible, Prolegom. 14; p. 94.

ing

ing his life. I ſhall only obſerve farther, that when Eve had brought forth the third Son, which the Scripture mentions, it is ſaid — *She called his Name Seth; for God*, ſays ſhe, *hath appointed me another Seed inſtead of Abel, whom Cain ſlew*; or, as it ſhould have been render'd, *for Cain hath ſlain him* — Words! ſo remarkably determining the meaning of Abel's Name in the ſenſe before given, that poſſibly it may be now admitted as a ſatisfactory account of it.

The Names of theſe Brothers being thus ſettled, we come to the next thing obſervable in their hiſtory, which calls for no Explanation, as the words carry their own determinate meaning — *And Abel was a keeper of Sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the Ground.* The care of Adam is here remarkable, in his bringing up his two Sons to the ſeparate offices of an *Husbandman* and a *Shepherd*; Cain, the firſt-born, being appropriated to that employment which was the moſt neceſſary, in order to raiſe Food from the unfertil Earth; and Abel to what was uſeful in the ſecond place, whether we conſider Cattle with regard to their Wool and Skins for Cloathes, or to their Bodies for the purpoſes of Sacrifice: and thus, ſays the great Ld Bacon, were thoſe Brothers dedicated, the one to the *active*, and the other to the *contemplative* ſcenes of Life.

But

But the care of Adam appears moſt conſpicuous in his concern for their behaviour towards God; and we ſhall find, I hope, by what will be offer'd hereafter, that he inſtructed them (as they grew up) in the nature of their obligations to the Being who had created them —the nature alſo of his own Tranſgreſſion, and the univerſal conſequences thence ariſing. It is alſo very probable, that Adam and his Wife were ſo aw'd by reflecting on the greatneſs of their firſt Offence, and led ſo ſincerely to repentance by the goodneſs of God, that thro' the remainder of their days they endeavour'd to conciliate the favour of God by their own pious behaviour, and a religious education of their Children.

But as Children are not capable of performing the higher Acts of Worſhip, which are adapted to Men of age and conſideration; 'tis probable that Sacrifice, which was inſtituted before this time (as will be prov'd hereafter) was conſtantly offer'd up by Adam for himſelf and family, 'till his Sons became qualified for the Office, without his farther ſuperintendency. And as each of them had been probably a long time married, they might be now firſt adviſed to meet and offer for themſelves and their families; as was the conſtant Oeconomy of the Patriarchal times. We may therefore reaſonably ſuppoſe, that when Age and Circumſtances appear'd

appear'd firſt to require it, Adam appointed that his Sons ſhould, with a brotherly affection, come together, and offer their Oblations to the ſame God, in the ſame Manner, and at the ſame Time they had always ſeen *him* offer; in ſtrict conformity to the divine Will, and the nature of their own Neceſſities.

As to the *Time*, which their Father had always obſerv'd for the ſolemnizing ſuch ſacred Services, it ſeems reaſonable to conclude—that it was *ſome Stated Time*, regularly returning. This, I ſay, it is eaſy to infer from Reaſon; and we aſſert farther from Revelation — that this Stated Time was the return of *every Seventh Day*, from the finiſhing the Creation; which, by the expreſs command of God, Adam was to ſanctify and keep holy. For we read in Gen. II. 1, 2, 3. — *Thus the Heavens and the Earth were finiſhed, and all the Hoſt of them. And on the Seventh Day God ended his Work, which he had made; and he reſted on the Seventh Day from all his Work, which he had made. And God bleſſed the Seventh Day, and ſanctified it; becauſe that in it he had reſted from all his Work, which God created and made.*

This Subject being very important in its conſequences, and the Second Point which I have in view in the preſent Diſſertation; I ſhall here endeavour to prove the four following Propoſitions—which, however foreign they

may at firſt ſight appear to the Subject in hand, will be found (I hope) to be of ſome affinity; or, at leaſt, be pardon'd, on account of ſome New Obſervations probably contain'd in them.

Propoſition the I. That this Bleſſing and Sanctifying the Seventh Day contain'd an Order from God to Adam and his Poſterity, to obſerve a Weekly Sabbath, or one day in ſeven after an holy manner.

II. That tho' this Command was reinforced by a more awful delivery of it from Mount Sinai; yet it was expreſsly obſerv'd by the Children of Iſrael, before that delivery of it from Mount Sinai.

III. That this Obſervation of theirs muſt have been in obedience to ſome poſitive Inſtitution; and as there is no intermediate or ſecond Inſtitution, it could be only in obedience to this firſt Inſtitution, which conſequently continued in force down to the delivery of the Law from Sinai.

IV. That the ſame Inſtitution was obſerv'd, during the Ante-Moſaic Oeconomy; and that this Sabbath was the Day, on which Cain and Abel came together to offer their Oblations to the Deity.

Firſt then—that this Bleſſing and Sanctifying the Seventh Day contain'd an Order from God

to

to Adam and his Posterity to observe a Weekly Sabbath, or one day in seven after an holy manner. Let the words of the Institution be here repeated—*Thus the Heavens and the Earth were finished, and all the Army of them; and on the Seventh Day God had compleated his work, which he made* (on the other six,) *and he rested on the Seventh Day from all his work, which he had made: and God blessed the Seventh Day, and sanctified it; because on that day he rested from all his work, which God created and made.* This second chapter of Genesis begins with a review of the preceding: and, as God, at the finishing his Creation, is describ'd as surveying the whole, and pronouncing it *very good*, the Historian seems to copy his example; and looking back with pleasure on his account of so wonderful an Operation, he here enters on a more particular detail of what most concerns Man, at this interesting conjuncture.

Thus then, says he, in the number of Days and the Order before set down, *were the Heaven and the Earth compleated, with the whole Army that was assigned to each of them.* But as the history of the other Planets of the Solar System (suppos'd with good reason, by some [g], to be part of the Creation describ'd in the preceding chapter) was beyond the commission of Moses; and as the Inhabitants of this Earth

g See the Universal History, p. 85. Edit. 8vo.

are only concern'd in the account of their own Origin and Character — as Beings of ſuch and ſuch an Order — created under ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances — and whoſe Happineſs was to be the reſult of ſuch and ſuch Services; ſo Moſes ſeems only to hint at the *Army* or *Inhabitants* of *Heaven* in the Planetary Worlds, and confines his narration to his Companions here, the Co-partners of Human Nature. He therefore goes on to tell us, what was the next act of the Deity, after finiſhing his Creation; namely — that, *having ended his Work on the Sixth day, he bleſſed the Seventh day, and ſanctified it.*

And here let the original words be as differently render'd as they can be, without violence to their meaning, they muſt ſignify thus much — that when God had in Six days finiſh'd the Creation, he commanded the ſucceeding, or Seventh Day to be obſerv'd by the firſt human Pair, as a day of peculiar holineſs. For as no one, I ſuppoſe, will aſſert — that this Sanctification of the Seventh Day was to be obſerv'd by GOD; or, that a Being eſſentially (and therefore always) infinite in Holineſs, could be more holy on this than the preceding days; this Act of Holineſs muſt be referr'd to MAN. And how Man was to behave, in conſequence of this injunction, will appear from the Nature of the Words, and the peculiar Time of their delivery. The

The Words are ויברך אלהים את יום השביעי ויקדש אתו the English Version of which is — *And God bleſſed the Seventh Day, and ſanctified it.* The verb ברך carries with it a double Idea; firſt of *Bleſſing*, ſecondly of *Worſhipping*, and that in the particular manner of bowing on the Knees. Theſe two ſenſes may be united, when ſpoken of Man; but the firſt only can be underſtood, when confin'd to God. If then we ſuppoſe this Verb to be in the Conjugation Pihel [h], the ſenſe will be — *God bleſſed the Seventh Day*, or *honoured it with peculiar marks of his favour.* But the word ויברך may be here better underſtood in Hiphil; and then, from the known power of that Conjugation (which is to make, or order to do a thing [i]) it will ſignify — *God ordered to bleſs and worſhip by adoration.* And as the Particle את may, by the authority of Noldius [k], be render'd *Upon*, the ſenſe will be expreſsly thus — *And God ordered (Man) to bleſs and worſhip on the Seventh Day.* The other verb ויקדש may be alſo underſtood

h *Intenſivam ſignificationem* verba in Piel habent, quæ in Kal ſunt activa; tum enim ſtudium & continuatio actionis hìc ſuperadditur. Glaſſii Philol. Sacr. Lib. 3. Tract. 3. Can. 26.

i Quæ verba in Kal activa ſunt, in Hiphil tranſlationem actionis in aliud ſubjectum agens ſignificant; & (ex Erpenio) Hiphil verbis Kal addit cauſam, cujus virtute, impulſu, *juſſu*, vel permiſſione fit actio. Glaſſii Philol. Sacr. Lib. 3. Tract. 3. Can. 27.

k See Noldius, Partic. את, Signif. 10.

in

in Hiphil, and will then be — *and ordered to sanctify*, or *set apart for sacred uses*[1]; and the whole will consequently run thus — *And God rested on the Seventh Day from all his Work, which he had made; and God caused (Man) to bless and worship on the Seventh Day, and ordered (him) to sanctify it.* This Interpretation, as it seems conformable to Grammar, and expresses the Sense best (tho' the other amounts to the same, but with less clearness) I humbly offer to the judgment of the Learned.

But as this seems an Alteration of some consequence, I beg to vindicate the liberty of making it, before I leave this point. The Reader, who is happily acquainted with the Original Language, will grant it, I believe, with little hesitation; as he knows the words may be construed either way, so as to be most consistent with the context; and as he knows also, how frequently this Alteration should be made in the English Version of the Bible, to improve the Sense of it. One instance of this kind has occurr'd to me, which I shall here observe; that, as the necessity of correcting the Version in that place seems evident, I may be the better supported in making the alteration abovementioned.

1 See this sense of the verb establish'd by Mr. Mede, Book I. Disc. 2.

The

The place is in Gen. XXIV. 35 — *And the Lord hath bleſſed my Maſter greatly, and he is become great, and he hath given him Flocks and Herds* &c. How perplex'd is this Sentence from the confuſion of the nominative caſe *He!* The Lord hath bleſſed — he (my Maſter) is become — he (the Lord) hath given him (my Maſter) Flocks and Herds &c. But the Original is clear of this ſtrange mixture, and flows ſmoothly on in a beautiful uniformity of perſon ויהוה ברך את אדני מאד ויגדל ויתן לו צאן ובקר which is — *And the Lord hath bleſſed my Maſter exceedingly, and he hath made (him) great, and he hath given him Flocks and Herds* &c. This Sentence being produced as an Authority for the preceding alteration, let us now ſee how this Injunction, for the ſanctifying a Seventh Day, ſtood, with reſpect to the firſt human Pair.

Adam and his Wife had been both created on the Sixth Day; and with them God finiſh'd the work of his Creation. It is therefore highly reaſonable to ſuppoſe, when God had, on the remainder of that day, given them a view of their Situation, their Circumſtances, and their Relation to himſelf and to each other, that he ſhould command them to devote the day following (as the *Firſt-Fruits* of their Time) to a grateful acknowledgment of that Goodneſs, which gave them ſo happy an exiſtence: and that,

that, as he himſelf, after making the World in ſix days, reſted on the ſeventh; ſo they, in a devout remembrance of it, ſhould then forbear what was afterwards to be their Employment, and give up that one day to Thankſgiving and the Adoration of their Creator. After this manner was the Day appointed; and doubtleſs it was carefully obſerv'd, and kept holy to the Lord.

The obſervation of this firſt Sabbath being thus determin'd, with the Holineſs exercis'd thereon by our firſt Parents; it follows to be prov'd — that this holy Obſervation of the Seventh Day could not be confin'd to that ſingle day; but that it was inſtituted likewiſe to be continued in the ſame manner, upon every ſucceſſive revolution of Seven Days [m]. For it will be allow'd a concluſive Maxim—that every *wiſe Inſtitution* muſt be *deſign'd to laſt* as long as the

m *De publico cultu Dei, cujus maxime causâ creatus homo eſt, ut primum eſt creatus, moneri hominem par fuit.* Hic autem quia peragi commodè niſi *ſtatis* quibuſdam *diebus* non potuit, ne hominibus fortaſſe vel non conveniret omnibus de tempore, vel minus idoneum eligeretur; Deo ipſi placuit diem, qui futurus erat huic negotio aptiſſimus, paulo poſt principia rerum deſignare. Cum enim poſtularet ipſa res, ut *quam primum* de Cultûs ejus Tempore conſtaret, propter quem & humanum genus præcipue conditum, ipſeque Mundus videtur; quis putet hoc a Deo non niſi *poſt annos* 2500 *demum uni* traditum *genti*, quod *hominum* intererat *omnium* cognoſcere? Annal. Mund. Robinſon S.T.P. Lib. I. p. 58.

uſefulneſs

usefulness of that Institution *continues*; consequently, if the usefulness of a Sabbath continued, the Sabbath must have been design'd to continue also, and to be in force after its first Observation.

Now the Use of the Sabbatical Institution, no doubt, was — that Adam, by a regular return of such a Sacred Day, might be reminded of the divine Goodness and Mercy in his own Creation—that, while innocent, he might employ the Seventh part of his Time, in the grateful tribute of Praise and Acknowledgment —and that, if guilty, he might not only continue to remember himself as the Creature, or visible production of an invisible God; but under the enlarg'd Character of a necessitous and guilty Creature.

Besides: tho' *Words*, by divine appointment, convey'd fix'd Ideas to the minds of the first human Pair and their Family; yet *Letters*, under the amazing brevity of an Alphabet, certainly were not the invention of this first Age of the world. And therefore, as *Oral Tradition* was then the only possible method of conveying down Informations [n], the Institution of a Sab-

n And, considering the longevity of the Patriarchs, a true account of things was easily handed down this way from Adam to Moses, the author of the Pentateuch. For Adam died only 126 years before the birth of Noah; Noah lived more than 50 years after the birth of Abraham; Abraham is suppos'd to have lived with Jacob;

bath was greatly ſerviceable in theſe farther particulars—That Adam, convening his Family on the regular returns of that day, might declare the wonderful manner of the World's Creation—that *the Sea was God's, and he made it; and that his hands prepared the Dry-Land* —that *it was He that made* THEM, *and not They* THEMSELVES; and therefore to him they were to pay their Thanks for being Human Creatures—that as all they enjoy'd was the effect of his Bounty, a return of part was expected from them by way of Euchariſt and grateful Acknowledgment — that they were to conſider themſelves as endow'd with the principle of Free-Agency, and conſequently as accountable for their Behaviour here—that all the ſhining Beings they beheld above, and the beautiful Creatures ſurrounding them below, were the Productions of Almighty Power — that he himſelf was created in perfect Innocence, and compleat Happineſs; and tho' he had by Sin forfeited the privileges of his Birth, yet God had graciouſly promis'd him a Redeemer, one who ſhould recover the Happineſs of Mankind, and triumph over their common Enemy—that tho' he himſelf was become ſubject to, and they were born under, a depravation of Human

Jacob with Levi; and Levi with his grandſon Amram, who was the Father of Moſes. Bp Williams, Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. I. p. 165.

Nature;

Nature, and (from the ascendancy of their Passions over their Reason) with a propensity to act amiss; yet they had power to prevent, and at the same time a possibility of Pardon for not preventing, such Misbehaviour—that therefore they were to expect the reconciliation and favour of God, upon a devout application for Forgiveness; which was however only to be obtain'd by virtue of their future Redeemer's Death, a constant Faith in which they were to exercise and represent before God, by observing the typical Institution of animal Sacrifice — that this Sacrificial Service, instituted by divine command, was to continue, 'till the Redeemer should lay down his Life for them and their Posterity, by the Oblation of himself once for all [o] — And lastly, that each of his Sons should afterwards, in their Families, discharge the same threefold Character, as he, their Father had done before them; i. e. of a *King*, to govern and regulate the behaviour of his

o Luke I. 68. *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people* — 70. *As he spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets, which have been* SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN. And Acts III. 18. — *But those things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled*—20. *And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto You* — 21. *Whom the Heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of* ALL *his holy Prophets,* SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN.

Children; of a *Priest*, to assemble them, and offer up their sacred Oblations; and of a *Prophet*, to instruct them in the great Events already past, and the wonderful things reveal'd by God, and remaining yet unaccomplish'd [p].

These then are some of the important Lessons, which Adam may reasonably be suppos'd to have taught his Children, and which his Sons were to teach their Children [q]; in order to preserve them all from Irreligion and Idolatry. And as a Sabbath-day, or a Weekly day of Rest from Labour, in order to assemble for the giving and receiving these Informations, and to perform these Acts of Worship, was the wisest, and indeed (as far as appears

p Adamum eo fine condiderat Deus, ut virtutum operumque suorum *testis*, *præco*, atque *laudator* esset; &, uti communis humani generis magister, filios nepotesque moneret, quid in hâc vitâ & post eam sperandum metuendumve habeant. Witsii Ægyptiac. Lib. II. cap. 15.

q Fuerunt sane Patriarchæ *Doctores publici*, qui cœlestis doctrinæ veritatem tradiderunt suis, & sedulâ repetitione altè infixerunt: nec Doctores tantum fuerunt, sed etiam *Prophetæ*, latentes & abditos eventus divinarum rerum consciâ mente explicantes. Heidegger Exercit. 3. Sec. 7. Immo mihi verum videtur, quod alicubi memini a Cl. Pearsono notatum esse, *Noachum* a S. Petro (in Epistolâ secundâ II. 5.) *Octavum Prædicatorem Justitiæ* dici, quanquam Moses nusquam dixerit quinam fuerint septem Justitiæ præcones, qui illo fuerint priores: credendum est tamen, & Deum in terris *semper* habuisse *Ecclesiam*, & in Ecclesiâ semper extitisse *Justitiæ Præcones*, & septem quidem Noacho quadantenus similes. Bp Cumberland, de Legibus Patriarcharum, p. 419.

to

to us) the only method likely to accomplish such great Ends; we may conclude from all our ideas of an infinitely wise and good Being, that he instituted the Sabbath-Day, in order to a continual observation. So that the Patriarchs might have used Words like those of the Psalmist [r], and said of the Sabbath — *We have heard and known, and our Fathers have told us, that we should not hide it from the Children of the Generations to come; but to shew the Honour of the Lord, his mighty and wonderful* WORKS *that he hath done: he made a Covenant with Adam, and gave him a Law, which he commanded that our Forefathers should teach their Children; that their Posterity might know it, and the Children which were yet unborn; to the intent that when they came up, they might shew their Children the same; that so they might not forget the* WORKS *of God, but keep his Commandments.*

It may be proper also to observe—that there seems to have been the same *necessity* for the institution of a Sabbath under the Patriarchal Oeconomy, as when the Israelites were gone forth into the Wilderness. The Argument, wherein the great strength of the Objectors to the Patriarchal Sabbath lies, is this — that a Sabbath was given to the Israelites at Sinai to preserve them from Idolatry. This indeed is conclusive for the Israelites; but can it be ex-

r Psalm LXXVIII.

clusive

cluſive of the Patriarchs? The Iſraelites, it may be ſaid, were going to inhabit among Idolatrous Nations. True: but did not the Patriarchs dwell among ſuch as were equally Apoſtates from the Worſhip of the True God? And was not the Religion of the latter equally therefore in danger with that of the former? And was it not, at ſome times, as nearly perverted [s]? It will be ſaid alſo, that the Iſraelites, having liv'd in Egypt for many years, had given into the Cuſtoms of their Idolatrous Maſters; and therefore a Sabbath was inſtituted to heal them of that inveterate Diſtemper. But is it not more for the honour of God, that he be ſuppos'd to have inſtituted a Sabbath, by way of Prevention, rather than by way of Cure? That, as he foreſaw the future falling off of Mankind from his Worſhip, he ſhould rather promulge a Law *preventive* of ſuch Apoſtacy?

s Plerique quidem non dubitant, quin Idololatriam in Patriarcharum domos invexerit primus Serugus filius Reu ſeu Rhagau; ſic & Euſebius. Eutychius primordia Idololatriæ refert ad tempora Kahtanis ſeu Joctanis, qui frater Phalegi fuit; & Idololatriæ incrementum refert ad tempora Serugi. Ut de origine Idololatriæ *ipſe* dicam, id certum eſt, tempore Therachi falſis Diis litatum & inſervitum eſſe. Nec Therachum ipſum auctorem eſſe dici poteſt, quum falſos Deos dicuntur coluiſſe ii, qui trans flumen habitârunt מעולם *a ſeculo*: Quin igitur inter *Semum* benedictum & *Therachum* in familias Patriarcharum irrepſerit, ambiguum non eſt. Heidegg, Hiſt. Patriarch. Exer. 1. Sec. 32.

And

And do we not find that this was actually the case? — Let us not then confine the Mercy of God; or disown his Goodness, as not extended to all his Creatures. The Sacred Historian has expressly assur'd us, that, at the finishing the Creation, God commanded the observation of a Sabbath, in remembrance of the Creator and his Works; and certainly such a Command must extend, and must have extended, to all Mankind, because they all are Creatures [t].

It is indeed asserted by some—that the Text in Gen. II, commanding a Sabbath, is a *Prolepsis*; and mention'd there only by way of *Anticipation* of *the Jewish Sabbath*, instituted about Two Thousand Five Hundred Years after. But the Uniformity of the History, and the Regularity of the Narration, are sufficient to set aside so forced an Interpretation [u]. I shall,

t It may be observ'd, that our Saviour tells us (Mark II. 27.) *The Sabbath was made* (or instituted) *δια τον ανθρωπον, for the sake of* MAN; not for one particular *Nation*, but for the benefit of *Mankind*. And therefore we may apply St. Paul's words in Rom. III. 29; and say — *Was the Sabbath then for the* JEWS *only, or is it for the* GENTILES *also? Yea, for the* GENTILES *also.*

u — Mihi quidem hoc pro certo statuitur, ad *Destinationes* atque *Anticipationes* non esse fugiendum in Scriptis Divinis, nisi cum sensus verborum occurrit impeditus, qui ferat præ se vel falsum aliquid, vel absonum & alienum: at nihil hìc ejusmodi. Vera & perspicua sunt omnia; & cur hic locus eodem quo narratur temporis ordine non sit intelligendus, equidem nihil perspicio. Annal. Mund. a Robinson, p. 57.

however

however, for a fuller confutation of it, draw a few obſervations from the Fourth Commandment it ſelf [w].

The intent of the Firſt Table of the Decalogue confeſſedly was to ſecure the Worſhip of the True God, after a proper manner. But tho' the Firſt precept of this Table may be well thought the moſt important, as being the foundation of the reſt; yet the Fourth precept only begins with the word *Remember*. Were not the Iſraelites then equally, or rather more carefully to remember, to have no other Gods but one? Were they not, at leaſt equally, to remember that this one God was not to be worſhipp'd under any viſible Repreſentation? Yes, certainly; and therefore as this *Remembrance*, ſo peculiarly prefix'd to the Fourth Commandment, does not infer any Superiority in that Commandment, it muſt refer to the previous Inſtitution of the Sabbath, which it enjoin'd. For God tells them by the whole tenour of that Commandment, that it was only a Renewal of what he had enjoin'd at his finiſhing the Creation, and what had been before obſerv'd. And therefore they were to *remember*—that the ſame ſacred Inſtitution was continued and incorporated into that Syſtem of Laws, which he then gave them. For the words זכור את יום השבת לקדשו are not (as they are ſometimes ren-

w Exod. XX. 8.

der'd)

der'd) *Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath Day*; but—*Remember the Sabbath Day, to keep that holy.*

Thus God begins the Commandment with referring them to a *prior* obſervation; and then he lays down the *manner* and *extent* of the Obligation of it — *Six days ſhalt thou labour, and do all thy work; and the Seventh Day is the Sabbath* (not *of*, but) *to the Lord thy God* (a Reſt from Labour to attend upon the Worſhip of God) *on that thou ſhalt not do any work; Thou, nor thy Son &c. nor the Stranger that is within thy Gates.* This mention of the *Stranger's* being to obſerve a Sabbath is a Proof that the Command of a Sabbath is not merely Jewiſh, as has frequently been aſſerted [x]. No Stranger could join in eating the Paſſover, without being firſt circumcis'd, and thereby initiated into Judaiſm [y]; but a Stranger might, nay was oblig'd (we find) to keep the Sabbath, tho' he had not been circumcis'd. The reaſon of which remarkable diſtinction is — that Cir-

x The following Obſervation of Bp Cumberland confirms this point—Sumo pro conceſſo, ſeu manifeſtâ veritate, quod omnia Sacrificia quæ *Peregrini* e gentibus aliis permittebantur offerre Deo, in lege Moſaicâ, ea omnia licita fuerunt, *virtute legum Patriarchalium* & Naturalium; *nullaque a Moſaicis legibus data eſſe iis Privilegia*, præter ea, quæ *ante legem* ex jure gentium *ad omnes homines* pertinebant. De Leg. Patriar. in Orig. Gent. antiq. p. 464.

y Exod. XII. 43, 44,

cumcision was a *National*, and the Sabbath an *Universal* Institution; the former given in command to Abraham, and obligatory only on his Descendants; while the latter was given in command to Adam, the Father of all Mankind.

After this clause concerning the Stranger, follows the Reason of the Command, exactly the same with what was deliver'd at its first Institution — *Because in Six Days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and rested on the Seventh Day; therefore the Lord blessed the Seventh Day and hallowed it*; or — *therefore the Lord caused Man to worship on the Seventh Day, and ordered him to sanctify it.* Thus the very Letter of the Precept tells us, that as the Sanctification of one day in seven was (by way of Analogy to, and in Remembrance of the Creation) given in command to Adam, the Parent of Mankind, and only re-authoriz'd at Sinai; all Mankind must have been, and must be, oblig'd by virtue of the Sabbatical Institution.

Thus much may be thought sufficient to prove the First Proposition; which will, however, receive additional strength and confirmation from arguments that will be introduced hereafter.

The Second Proposition now offers it self to our thoughts; which is — that, tho' this Command of a Sabbath at the Creation was reinforced

forced by a more awful delivery of it from Mount Sinai; yet it was expresly observ'd by the Children of Israel, before that delivery of it from Sinai.

We read in the history of the Travels of the Israelites, that they came to the Wilderness of *Sin*, which is *between Elim and Sinai*, on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of Egypt — that *from the Wilderness of Sin* they went to *Rephidim*—and *from Rephidim* they came to the Wilderness of *Sinai*, in the third month[z]. The intermediate time, between the fifteenth day of the second month and their arrival at Sinai in the third month, was spent at Sin, where they murmur'd and were fed with Manna; and, after that, at Rephidim, where they murmur'd again, and were satisfied with Water, and where they fought the Amalekites. And therefore whatever was done and observ'd, in the Wilderness of Sin, must have been done and observ'd before they came to Mount Sinai, and consequently before the delivery of the Law from thence.

Now we read in Exod. XVI. 1 — *And all the Congregation of the Children of Israel came unto the Wilderness of Sin.* 2. *And they murmured against Moses in that Wilderness.* 3. *And said, You have brought us forth into this Wilderness, to kill this whole Assembly with hunger.* 4. *Then*

z Exod. XVI. 1. XVII. 1. XIX. 1, 2.

said the Lord unto Moses — Behold! I will rain Bread from Heaven unto you; and the people shall gather a certain rate every day. 5. *And on the Sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.* —— 22. *And on the sixth day they gathered twice as much Bread, two Omers for one Man; and all the Rulers of the Congregation came and told Moses.* 23. *And he said unto them, This is what the Lord hath said, To morrow being the Rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord, bake what ye will bake to day, and seethe what ye will seethe; and that which remaineth lay up until the morning.* 24. *And they laid it up until the morning, as Moses bade.* 25. *And Moses said, Eat that to day; for this day being the Sabbath unto the Lord, to day ye shall not find it in the field.* 26. *Six days ye shall gather it; but on the Seventh day, which is the Sabbath, on that there shall be none.* 27. *Yet there went out some on the Seventh day to gather, but they found none.* 28. *And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my* COMMANDMENTS *and my* LAWS? 29. *See! Because the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth Day the Bread of two Days, abide ye then every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the Seventh Day.* 30. SO THE PEOPLE KEPT THE SABBATH ON THE SEVENTH DAY.

This

This Chapter then, being expreſs, is abundantly ſufficient to eſtabliſh the Second Propoſition — that the Iſraelites obſerv'd a Sabbath Day before the giving of the Law from Sinai [a]. And it is remarkable, that all the expreſſions, mentioning a Sabbath in the above-cited verſes, ſpeak of it, not as a novel Inſtitution, but as an Inſtitution the people were very well acquainted with. To morrow, ſays Moſes to the Rulers, is the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord; and therefore, as he knew them perfectly ſenſible of that, he only tells them, how they were to act at that time with regard to the miraculous gift of Bread from Heaven; which was not to fall on the Seventh day, as it did on the other ſix, that ſo the deſtination of that one

a This then is a ſufficient anſwer to that Objection, drawn from a paſſage in Nehemiah, which Dr. Spencer and others inſiſt upon as of great conſequence in the argument againſt a Patriarchal Sabbath. The words are in Nehemiah IX. 13, 14. *Thou cameſt down alſo upon mount Sinai, and ſpakeſt with them from Heaven, and gaveſt them right Judgments, and true Laws, good Statutes and Commandments; and madeſt known unto them thy holy Sabbath.* For it appears that a Sabbath was actually commanded, and obſerv'd by the Iſraelites, before they came to Sinai; and therefore a Sabbath could not be firſt commanded the Iſraelites from Sinai. So that the word הודעת ſhould be render'd *agnoſcere, animadvertere, attendere, curare, curam gerere eos feciſti.* For theſe are its ſignifications; and the word implies here that ſolemn and awful reinforcement of the Sabbath, which God made at Sinai, puniſhing the violation of it with Death. Numb. XV. 35.

day

day to ſacred uſes might not be render'd uſeleſs and ineffectual.

Having thus ſhewn, that the Sabbath was obſerv'd by the Children of Iſrael, before the delivery of the Fourth Commandment from mount Sinai; I ſhall proceed to prove the Third Propoſition; which is—that this Obſervation of theirs muſt have been in obedience to ſome Poſitive Inſtitution; and as there is no intermediate or ſecond Inſtitution, it could be only in obedience to the firſt Inſtitution given in command to Adam.

I ſhall introduce what I have to offer here with a quotation from the celebrated Author of the Religion of Nature delineated [b]. We ſhall find ourſelves bound, *ſays he*, to worſhip God in the beſt manner we can. And to do this, theſe things may in general be ſaid to be requir'd; an intent Mind, a proper form of Words, a proper Poſture, a proper Place, and a proper Time. As to this laſt Article it muſt be here obſerv'd, that all times cannot be equally proper; and therefore, for private Worſhip, the compos'd hour and the ſofter ſeaſon of Retreat and Silence ought to be ſought, and, as far as fairly may be, contriv'd. But there ought alſo to be a Publick Worſhip of the Deity. For a Man may be conſider'd as

b Sect. V.

a

a Member of a Society; and, as ſuch, he ought to worſhip God publickly, if he has Capacity and Opportunity. Or, the Society may be conſider'd as *One Body*, that has *common* Intereſts and Concerns; and, as ſuch, is oblig'd to worſhip the Deity, and offer up one *common* Prayer. And farther, toward keeping Mankind in order, it is neceſſary there ſhould be ſome Religion profeſt and even eſtabliſh'd, which cannot be without ſome Publick Worſhip; and were it not for that ſenſe of Virtue, which is principally preſerv'd (ſo far as it is preſerv'd) by National Forms and Habits of Religion, Men would ſoon loſe it all, run wild, and act like the worſt of Savages [c].

If then there is a Neceſſity for *Publick Worſhip* [d], there muſt be alſo a Neceſſity for fixing on ſome *Stated Time* for the exerciſe of this

c The true Religion, notwithſtanding the ten Perſecutions and all the artifices of cruelty which Hell and Heatheniſm could contrive, grew and increas'd by means of a *Weekly Aſſembly*, and the duties then perform'd; and *this* Julian the Apoſtate was ſo ſenſible of, that, when all his Wits had been at work for reſtoring the Heatheniſh Impiety, he could not think of any way more effectual, than ordering all his Philoſophers to *preach it up weekly to the People*. Dr. Prideaux's Connect. Part I. Book 6.

d Id ſcilicet naturalis Ratio dictat, quum Homo ſit animal ομιλητικον και πολιτικον non privatim ſolum Deum colendum eſſe, ſed & publicè atque in cœtu: ad eam rem neceſſariam eſſe deſignationem certorum locorum, *ubi* conventus fiat, & condictionem temporis *quando*. Porro qui dies Numinis cultui ſacrati erant, iis hoc eſſe agendum,

Publick

Publick Worſhip; and this, as it is a ſelf-evident Truth, the Oppoſers of Religious Inſtitutions have the ingenuity to aſſent to, as *the voice of Reaſon*. The Author of the Leviathan tells us [e] — Reaſon directeth not only to worſhip God *in Secret*, but alſo, and *eſpecially in Publick* and in the ſight of Men; for without that, (what in Honour is moſt acceptable) the procuring others to honour him, is loſt. And the Author of Chriſtianity as old as the Creation ſays [f] — It is the voice of Nature, that God ſhould be *publickly* worſhipp'd; and that Men ſhould do this in the moſt convenient way, by appointing amongſt themſelves Time, Place, Perſons, and all other things which require ſpecial determination.

The conceſſion, which this Writer found himſelf oblig'd to make, holds ſtrongly in favour of the point before us; but we muſt guard againſt his inference—God muſt be publickly worſhipp'd, and in the moſt convenient way; therefore MEN ſhould *appoint* among

atque *huic uni rei* operandum. Sic volunt Leges Atticæ, ſic Romanæ; habebat tamen illa ωφελιμος Lex ſuam *quandam exceptionem*, quam dictabat æquitas: nam (apud Macrobium eſt) Umbro negabat eum pollui, qui *opus* vel *ad Deos pertinens* Sacrorumve causâ feciſſet, vel aliquid ad *urgentem vitæ utilitatem* reſpiciens actitaſſet. Witſ. Ægyptiac. Lib. 2. Cap. 16. Sec. 5.

e Chap. XXXI. p. 171.

f Page 115, 116.

themſelves

themſelves *Time* &c. This deduction he was neceſſitated to draw from his disbelief of Revelation; for as God muſt be publickly worſhipp'd, and at ſome ſtated Time, if God has not reveal'd that Time, Man muſt appoint it.

But (Thanks be to God!) We have, and acknowledge a Divine Command, *whereunto we do well that we take heed, as unto a Light that ſhineth in a dark place*[g]. For had this Appointment of the publick return of Divine Worſhip been only of, and from Man; how vague and uncertain, how remiſs or violent, how wild and changeable had been the various Inſtitution in various places; and how diſtracted the exerciſe of all Publick Sacred Solemnities! The World had been a Theatre of Reliligious Diſcord; or rather, Religion had been loſt in the tumult. The different Forces, impreſs'd on all ſides to give it each its peculiar direction, would, when at once applied, have anſwer'd the ſame purpoſe, as the Principle inherent in Matter; which is remarkable for its oppoſition to Life and Motion. And therefore, to prevent ſuch a Quieſcence of Publick Worſhip, it was neceſſary, that God ſhould impreſs his Authority on ſome Stated Time for the obſervation of it, by the force of which the World might uniformly agree in celebrating the appointed time; as the Planetary Bodies

g 2 Pet. I. 19.

revolve in harmony and order, by the power of those Principles, which are impress'd upon them by the God of Nature.

Human *Wisdom* then being *too weak to ascertain* what portion of our Time should be devoted to Publick Worship, and human *Power unable to establish* an uniform Obedience; God, *the God of Order*, has been pleas'd to make known his Will, and fix the observation of an holy Sabbath. One Day in Seven he has appointed, on which Men may abstract themselves from Labour, and the common Businesses of Life; and be employ'd in the sublime Contemplation of the Creator, and Themselves his Creatures; and consequently exercise the proper Acts of Worship arising from so interesting a Relation [h]. The Words of this Institution have been before consider'd; and as a Weekly Sabbath was evidently design'd for a perpetual Remembrance of the Creator, and was usher'd in at his compleating the Creation; so, from

h Philo, on this Subject, has a Passage which is truly noble, and therefore very worthy of our Observation. — Εκειλυσιν ο Θεος τυς μελλοντας εν ζωντι τη κοσμυ πολιτεια ζην, καθαπερ εν τοις αλλοις, και κατα τυτο επιδαν Θεω, ωστε μιαν ιερα τεσσαρακοντα εφ' ημερας εξ, ανεχοντας δε και φιλοσοφυντας τη εδομη, και θεωριας μεν των της φυσεως σχολαζοντας· επισκοπυντας δε και ει τι μη καθαρως εν ταις ωθεσεσι εσεσαχθη· λογοι και δυθωσας αν ειποι η εδρασεν παρ εαυτων λαμβανοντας εν τω της ψυχης βυλευτηριω· συνιδρυοντων και συνεξεταζοντων των νομων, εις τε τιμω των παραδοθεντων κατορθωσιν, και ωστε τιμω τυ μηδεν αυθις εξαμαρτανειν ωθοφυλακιω. De decem Oraculis Tom. II. p. 197.

the

the reaſon of the thing, it muſt be commenſurate to and of equal continuance with the Creation.

Where then is the Wonder, if no Second Inſtitution of this Sabbath be any where recorded, when there evidently was no need of it; as the Firſt continued, and ever will continue, in full force and obligation? Upon the coming up of his choſen People from Egypt indeed, God incorporated this among the other Laws he gave them, written with his own Finger; that ſo he might (as it were) ſet his Seal to what he originally deliver'd in command to Adam, the more ſtrongly to enforce their obedience. He alſo bound this Precept upon them, with a ſtrictneſs peculiar to that People, and for a double reaſon too — the remembrance of the *Creation*, and the additional bleſſing of their *Delivery* from *Egyptian Bondage*. But that there is no Inſtitution of the Sabbath, between that to Adam and this Confirmation of it at Sinai, ſeems clear upon a due Enquiry. The only place, which has been ſuppos'd to look that way, or which ſome would willingly have wreſted to that ſenſe, is in Exod. XV. 25; which I ſhall therefore now carefully conſider.

The Iſraelites were come forth from Egypt, and having paſs'd the Red Sea were arriv'd at Marah; and there they murmur'd at the bit-

ternesſ of the Waters. For we read, Verſe the 23d — *And when they came to Marah, they could not drink of the Waters of Marah, for they were bitter.* 24. *And the people murmured againſt Moſes, ſaying, What ſhall we drink?* 25. *And he cried unto the Lord, and the Lord ſhewed him a Tree, which when he had caſt into the Waters, the Waters were made ſweet; there he made for them a Statute and an Ordinance, and there he proved them.* 26. *And ſaid, if thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his ſight, and wilt give ear to his Commandments, and keep all his Statutes; I will put none of thoſe Diſeaſes upon Thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee.*

It is ſurprizing to obſerve what an heap of Commandments ſome Jews, and ſome Chriſtians too, have affirm'd to be contain'd in thoſe few words — *there he made for them a Statute and an Ordinance.* In Seder Olam [i] we are aſſur'd, that *Ten Precepts* were here given to the Iſraelites, Seven of which were the Precepts of the Sons of Noah; and to theſe were added the *Sabbath*, the *Judgments*, and the *Honour* to be paid to *Parents*. Salomon Jarchi tells us [k] — There was given at Marah to the

i Meyer's Seder Olam, p. 101.
k See Selden de Jure Nat. & Gent. Lib. I. Cap. 10.

Iſraelites

Israelites *part* of the *Chapters* of the *Law*, in which they might exercise themselves; namely, concerning the *Sabbath*, the *Red Heifer*, and the *Judgments*. But does not this method of interpretation rather provoke our aversion, than raise our approbation? Certainly it does: and therefore Manasseh Ben Israel, the celebrated President of the Amsterdam Synagogue, censures these Interpreters very freely—What, says he [1], if some of the old Writers do assert that the Precept of a Sabbath was given at Marah? And what if they do produce those words for their Authority? Mr. Selden observes, that he leaves the point undetermin'd; but says that great man—Manasseh Ben Israel was not the only Master among the Jews, who rejected the opinion of a Sabbatical Institution at Marah.

The Truth seems to be, that some Jews were desirous at any rate to have the honour of the Sabbath to themselves, and some Christians were very ready to yield up their claim; and therefore Both seem to have been willing to fix the Institution of it at Marah, to prevent the Doctrine of its *Universality*; which would otherwise follow of course, because it was observ'd before the giving of the Law. But the Institution of a *Sabbath* is as difficult to be extracted from the word *Statute*, as the form of

1 See Selden de Jure Nat. & Gent. Lib. 3. Cap. 9.

the

the Jewiſh *Civil Government* is from the word *Ordinance* or *Judgment*; tho' both have been ſo frequently aſcrib'd to the virtue of theſe two words.

Let us conſider the place carefully, with the context — *There made for them a Statute and an Ordinance* — Who made? The Original gives us no nominative caſe; which it certainly would have done, had there been ſuch mighty conſequences depending; eſpecially as the nominative caſe generally abounds in the Hebrew Language. Beſides: there is not the appearance of a reaſon for the Inſtitution of a Sabbath in this place, rather than another. The Iſraelites were now very near to Sinai, from whence they were to receive their Law; and, if a Sabbath was never yet inſtituted, 'tis ſcarce poſſible to think that God would promulge *one* important precept of that Law, about *a fortnight* before the *reſt*; and that, when promulg'd, it ſhould lie ſo deeply conceal'd under the word *Statute*.

But it may be proper to obſerve, that the words *Statute*, and *Judgment* or *Ordinance* are us'd very indiſcriminately thro' the Bible, and frequently ſignify nothing more than the *word of God* in general [m]. Thus in Pſalm CXIX. 5. — *Oh! that my Ways were ſo direct, that I might*

m See the Prolegom. to the Polyglott Bible, Idiotiſm the 14, p. 45.

keep

keep thy Statutes — 20. *My Soul breaketh out for the very fervent desire it hath alway unto thy Judgments* — and 116. *Oh! teach me thy Judgments.* So that the words — *there he proposed to them a Statute and an Ordinance, and there he tried them* — seem to signify, that there either God, or Moses by his order, propos'd the following general Covenant to the Israelites—that *if they would obey him, he would be their God, and preserve them from evil.* And this he did to try them, whether or no they were willing to regulate their future behaviour according to his Will, and to receive him as their Lawgiver.

For it is evident that the words do not of themselves imply either the Institution of a Sabbath (which was instituted before,) or of their Civil Government (which was instituted after;) and therefore the sense of the place, regularly consider'd, will certainly determine us against such a forced construction. The Israelites were now come to Marah; and complain'd against God and their Leader Moses, on account of the bitterness of the waters. They were apprehensive, that such an apparent scarcity of what was necessary both for meat and drink, in those Desarts of Arabia, would immediately reduce them to various Sicknesses, and soon to Death. To abate, therefore, their murmurings for the present, God works a Miracle to sweeten the waters; and to silence their

their complaints, and eaſe them of future fears, he takes occaſion from the preceding circumſtance to propoſe the following tryal of their Obedience — *If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and do that which is right in his ſight, and wilt give Ear to his Commandments, and keep all his Statutes; I will put none of thoſe Diſeaſes upon Thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the Lord that healeth thee* (or, that am ready and able to remove Plagues and Diſeaſes from thee [n].) So that the *Statute and Ordinance*, which he *made*, or rather *propos'd* to them at Marah to try them, was expreſsly contain'd in the words above-cited; unleſs we will tear in pieces the Sentence, by inſerting what has not the leaſt agreement with the argument; and diſſolve that Unity, by which it is ſo firmly connected — *And when the Waters were made ſweet, there he propoſed to them a Statute and an Ordinance, and there he tried them; for he ſaid, If thou wilt diligently hearken &c. I will put no Diſeaſes upon thee &c. I am the Lord &c.* [o] —

n See the Prolegom. to the Polyglott Bible, Idiotiſms the 57 and 58, p. 47.

o Dr. Shuckford tells us (Connect. Vol. III. p. 1.) that this Statute and Ordinance was given to *Moſes*, and that God here made trial of *his* Obedience, and not that of *the people of Iſrael*: for this, *he ſays*, muſt be the ſenſe of the place. But, (with deference to ſo great a Name) the contrary ſeems evident from the tenor of the whole paſ-

But

But laſtly; what will put this point (and it is a point of Moment) out of all doubt, is the following paſſage from the Prophet Jeremiah, which refers directly to this place. Chap. VII. 22, 23. *I ſpake not unto Your Fathers, nor commanded them, at the time that I brought them out of the Land of Egypt, concerning the matters of Burnt-Offering or Sacrifice; but only this very thing commanded I them, ſaying; Obey my Voice, and I will be your God, and ye ſhall be my People; and walk ye in all the Ways, that I ſhall command* (not, as in our Engliſh Verſion — *that I have commanded*) *You, that it may be well unto You.* The Prophet cannot, in this celebrated Paſſage, refer either to the preciſe time of the *departure* of the Iſraelites out of *Egypt*, or to what was tranſacted at *Sinai*; for at the firſt time he inſtituted *the Paſſover*, which is fre-

ſage, and in particular from the antitheſis in it between the *Iſraelites* and the *Egyptians* — *I will put none of thoſe Diſeaſes on* THEE, *which I have brought upon the* EGYPTIANS. The Dr. indeed obſerves, that the *Affix* uſed by Moſes does not ſignify *them*, but *him*; and therefore Moſes was here ſpoken of, and not the Iſraelites. The obſervation is true, but the inference from it can be of no force for this undeniable reaſon — becauſe God very frequently ſpeaks of the *Iſraelites* collectively, as *one Body*, or *Perſon*, and addreſſes himſelf to them in the *ſingular* number. Among many inſtances, one in Exodus (XX. 2.) will eſtabliſh this aſſertion; for God certainly there ſpeaks to all the Iſraelites, and yet the Affix is ſingular — *I am the Lord thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the houſe of Bondage.*

quently term'd *a Sacrifice*; and the ſame Hebrew Word, which the Prophet here makes uſe of, is twice applied to the Paſſover by Moſes himſelf [p]. Nor can he be underſtood of what paſs'd at Sinai; for there God ſpake to the Iſraelites concerning the *whole of Burnt-Offerings and Sacrifices*: and therefore he muſt refer to this Tranſaction at Marah, which was juſt after their coming forth from Egypt; when God tried them, to know whether they would agree to walk in all the ways, not which he did then command them, but which (as Jeremiah here explains it) he was ſoon to command them from Mount Sinai.

Upon the reſult then of this Enquiry it ſeems fully to appear, that a Sabbath was not inſtituted in any part of theſe words; and if not in theſe words, I believe there is no other intermediate place, between Gen. II. and Exod. XX. that can, with any appearance of Argument, be cited to that purpoſe. And if this be true, it will of conſequence follow from the whole — that as the obſervation of a Weekly Sabbath, recorded of the Iſraelites in the Wilderneſs of Sin, before they came to Sinai, was in obedience to a divine poſitive Inſtitution; ſo that muſt have been the very Inſtitution given in command to Adam, becauſe there is

p Deut. XVI. 5, 6. זבח Dr. Stanhope, in his Note on Charron of Wiſdom; Vol. II. p. 728.

no

no intermediate Inſtitution. And, laſtly, it is from hence evident— that that original Inſtitution was not valid for one day only, but continued in force down to the delivery of the Law from Sinai.

I proceed now to the Fourth and laſt thing propos'd upon this Subject, which was to prove —That the Inſtitution of a Sabbath was obſerv'd, during the Ante-Moſaic Oeconomy; and that this Sabbath was the Day, on which Cain and Abel came together to offer their Oblations to the Deity.

Before I offer any arguments on this head, I ſhall prepare the way, by anſwering a very common Objection; which is — That if the Patriarchs had obſerv'd a Sabbath, ſome mention of it would have been found in the hiſtory of their times; and therefore, as the Objectors affirm there is no ſuch obſervation mention'd, they conclude againſt the obſervation in *their* Days. To this, I hope, a ſatisfactory Anſwer may be given, by obſerving—That the Silence of a Hiſtory, as to the continuance of a Cuſtom once inſtituted therein, is no Argument againſt the continuance of that Cuſtom, provided the reaſon of its obſervation ſtill ſubſiſts. But that there is mention made of ſuch an obſervation will, probably, appear hereafter. Yet, ſuppoſing the contrary; the Objection, deduced

from ſuch a Silence in the Hiſtory, may be entirely confuted by asking and anſwering the following Queſtion. — Was the *Rite* of *Circumciſion* obſerv'd by the Iſraelites, after they were ſettled in the Land of Canaan? I ſuppoſe it will readily be anſwer'd in the Affirmative; becauſe Circumciſion was the great Sign of God's Covenant with their Father Abraham, and the Characteriſtic Mark of the peculiar people of God.

If this then be the Anſwer, as it indubitably muſt, I believe the Objectors will be unable to find one Text recording the particular obſervation of Circumciſion, from the ſettling of the Iſraelites in Canaan down to the Circumciſion of our Saviour Chriſt; which is from Joſhua Chap. V, to St. Luke Chap. II, and contains the ſpace of one thouſand four hundred and fifty Years. Wherefore, as Circumciſion was conſtantly obſerv'd by the Iſraelites, tho' not mention'd in the Sacred Hiſtory; ſo might the Sabbath by the Patriarchs, tho' we have no continued information of it [q].

q Quotieſcunque publici conventus (inter Patriarchas) agi poterant, conſentaneum eſt ut credamus, & Sabbatum fuiſſe toties ritè celebratum; quamvis de utroque Moſes conticeſcat in primo ſuorum; quemadmodum in libris, qui poſt Moſen ſequuntur ſex, Sabbatum non legimus obſervatum, nec inde tamen colligimus neglectum. Annal. Mund. Robinſon S.T.P. p. 58.

The

The Reaſon in theſe caſes ſeems to be this —The Hiſtorian, having once given the origin and cauſe of ſuch and ſuch an Inſtitution, as was always to be obſerv'd, and therefore could not be forgotten; thought it needleſs to mention the repeated times of its obſervation, which every one, from the words of the Inſtitution it ſelf, muſt otherwiſe be well acquainted with.

After this previous Remark, I preſume, we may fairly conclude—that tho' we have few, or ſhould have no notices, of the Patriarchs obſerving a Sabbath; yet that will not conclude againſt their obſervation of it. But, I hope, we are not without Arguments, even here; which will appear, firſt, by conſidering the *early obſervation* of WEEKS among all Nations, and the *foundation* of that Cuſtom.

When Adam was at firſt introduced into Being, we may with reaſon ſuppoſe him to have look'd around, and admir'd the various goodneſs diſplaid over the face of the Creation; the Earth, no doubt, won upon his love, while the Heaven excited his wonder. He might, nay he muſt have obſerv'd the two great Luminaries, ſhining with peculiar eminence in the canopy that cover'd him; the one now riſing, now ſetting; the other now encreaſing, now decreaſing, in a regular and harmonious manner. From the apparent journey

of

of the Sun, and the ſuperior light conſequent on his appearance, he might meaſure the boundaries of Day; and, from the milder radiance of the Moon, he might fix the limits of Night: or, rather, he might define *Day* to be the *preſence*, and *Night* the *abſence*, of the *Sun*: and thus, doubtleſs, the firſt exiſtence of Time was meaſur'd. But he might alſo compute by a collective number of Days; from a new to a full, and from a full to a new Moon; and ſo form a *Lunar Month*. And farther, 'tis poſſible, that he might fix upon the meaſure of a *Year* alſo. But it ſeems probable, that, *of theſe*, the Cuſtom of meaſuring Time by *Days* only was all that took place in the firſt ages of the world. I ſay *of theſe*, becauſe there was another method of computation, i. e. *by a revolution of* SEVEN DAYS, which prevail'd in the infancy of the world, and afterwards travell'd with mankind thro' the ſeveral parts of it.

That ſuch a Revolution of Time was thus obſerv'd, is plain from *Prophane* as well as *Sacred Hiſtory*. As to the former, the Teſtimonies ſubjoin'd are very full and expreſs; which I have therefore deliver'd in the words of their ſeveral Authors [r].

r GROTIUS tells us (De Verit. Chriſt. Relig. Lib. I. Sect. 16.)—Intra ſeptem dies peracti operis memoria ſervata non apud Græcos tantum & Italos, honore diei ſeptimi, quod ex Joſepho, Philone, Tibullo, Clemente Alex-

The

The Question here arising then will be — How early this observation of Weeks pre-

andrino & Luciano discimus (nam de Hebræis notissimum) sed & apud Celtas & Indos, quibus omnibus per *hebdomadas* digesta tempora; quod nos docent Philostratus, Dion Cassius, Justinus Martyr, & vetustissima dierum nomina. With this agrees the testimony of HUETIUS, (Demonstrat. Evangel. Prop. 4. Cap. 11. p. 264.) — Per *hebdomadas* dierum discreta fuerunt Ægyptiis temporum spatia, Græcis, nec non & Brachmanibus Indis, & Gallis nostris, & Germanis, nec non & Britannis, & ipsis etiam barbaris Americanis. To these words of Huetius, BUDDÆUS (Selecta Jur. & Gent. p. 234.) gives his Consent, and strongly confirms the validity of his Opinion. SCALIGER (De Emendatione Temp. p. 9.) informs us — Ex diebus fiunt συστήματα καὶ ὁμάδες, quæ notationes temporum constituunt; *primum* συστήμα ex diebus dicitur *Septimana*, res omnibus quidem Orientis populis ab ultimâ usque antiquitate usitata. JOSEPHUS (In Lib. 2do contra Appion. Cap. 29.) says — Οὐδ' ἐστὶν ἡ πόλις Ἑλλήνων ἡδέσθη, οὐδὲ βαρβάρων, οὐδὲ ἐν ἔθνεσι, ἐνθα μὴ τὸ τῆς ἑβδομάδος, ἣν ἀργεῖν ἡμεῖς, τὸ ἔθος ἐκφεύγει. This famous passage, so often brought to prove the *universal observation of a weekly Sabbath*, is allow'd by SELDEN (Jus Nat. & Gent. Lib 3. cap. 22.) to prove the *universal computation of Time by Weeks*; which is sufficient to entitle it to a place among the Authorities *here* produced. That the observation of Weeks was in use among the *Egyptians* from remote antiquity, is allow'd on all hands, and appears from those words of HERODOTUS (Lib. 2. Cap. 82.) — Καὶ τάδε ἄλλα Αἰγυπτίοισι ἐστὶ εὑρεθέντα· μείς τε καὶ ἡμέρη ἑκάστη θεῶν ἑστί — Which words Commentators understand of the Seven Days of the Week, dedicated by the Egyptians to the Seven Planets. But that the Egyptians (tho' they might be, and probably were the first inventors of the *planetary title of each Day*) were not the first who observ'd a *septenary revolution of Days*, seems evident from the best Authorities, and a due con-

vail'd

vail'd in the world. And here it muſt be remember'd, that, with regard to the Heathen Nations, the Origin of Weeks among them (as Heathens) is impoſſible to be determin'd. For ſuch a method of computation appears in ſome of their oldeſt Hiſtories [s], and therefore muſt be ſuppos'd to have been obſerv'd antecedently to the writing ſuch Hiſtories; but how long before is the point. And here it is alſo to be remember'd — That whatever *Cuſtom* has prevail'd over the world, among Nations the

ſideration of the Univerſality of the Obſervation. For Mr. SELDEN affirms (Jus Nat. & Gent. Lib. 3. Cap. 22.) —In Sinenſium ipſorum paganiſmi faſtis, & civili temporis calculo, obſervationem vetuſtiſſimam, hodieque eſſe *hebdomadis* recurrentis eodem modo ac ordine, quo apud alias gentes.

s Their ancient Poets alſo afford us light, upon the preſent Subject; for thus Æſchylus, in his Επτα επι Θηβαις, ſays—

Τας δ' εβδομας ο σεμνος ΕΒΔΟΜΑΓΕΤΑΣ
ΑΝΑΞ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ ειλετ' ——— 807.

The Scholiaſt, on the word Εβδομαγετας ſubjoins — τον Απολλωνα λεγει, ος, εν εβδομη ημερα τε μηνος γενηθεις, εκληθη Εβδομαγετας· But this *Birth* of Apollo, or the Sun, on the *Seventh* day of the month (ſo celebrated among the Heathens) evidently took its riſe at firſt from the cuſtom of computing *Time* by *ſeven days*, of which *the day of the* SUN was the *principal*. Indeed the word Εβδομαγετας gives us the idea, not only of the *chief*, but the *firſt* of the Seven Days; and implies THE DAY OF THE SUN *ſtanding at the head of the other ſix*, and leading them on in order. And Mr. Selden aſſures us, that *Sunday* was the *firſt* day of the Week, in the Eaſt, from the remoteſt antiquity. Jus Nat. & Gent. Lib. 3. Cap. 22.

moſt

moſt oppoſite in Polity and Cuſtoms in general, Nations not united by Commerce or Communication (when that Cuſtom has nothing in nature or the reaſon of things to give it birth, and eſtabliſh to it ſelf ſuch a currency) it muſt be deriv'd from ſome *Revelation*; which Revelation may in certain places have been forgotten, tho' the Cuſtom, introduced by and founded on ſuch Revelation, ſtill continued. And farther — this Revelation muſt have been made antecedent to the Diſperſion at Babel; when all Mankind, being but one Nation, and living together in the form of one large Family, were of one Language, and govern'd by the ſame Laws and Cuſtoms; which Laws and Cuſtoms were carried by the various Families of Mankind into all thoſe parts of the world, where they ſeverally ſettled upon their Separation, and ſo were deliver'd down regularly to their Poſterity [t].

t Abraham was the fifth from Peleg, and all mankind liv'd together in Chaldea, under the government of Noah and his Sons, until the days of Peleg: ſo long they were of one language, one ſociety, and one religion: and then they divided the Earth, being forced to leave off building the tower of Babel: and from thence they ſpread themſelves into the ſeveral Countries which fell to their ſhares, *carrying along with them the Laws, Cuſtoms and Religion, under which they had 'till thoſe days been educated and govern'd.* Sir Iſ. Newton's Chronology, p. 186.

This will certainly be found to have been the caſe with the Cuſtom of *computing Time by Weeks*. And the ſingle, but celebrated Teſtimony of *Theophilus Antiochenus*, in his Epiſtle to Autolycus [u], is ſufficient to confirm the application — Επι μεν και περι της εβδομης ημερας, ην παντες μεν ανθρωποι ονομαζουσιν· οι δε πλειους αγνοουσιν, οτι παρ' Εβραιοις ο καλειται ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ Ελλησι ερμηνευεται ΕΒΔΟΜΑΣ· η τις εις παν γενος ανθρωπων ονομαζεται μεν, δι' ην δε αιτιαν καλουσιν αυτην ου πυνθανται.

But here it may be ſaid, as it is by *Le Clerc* [w] and ſome others — that the Cuſtom of computing time by Seven Days might take its riſe from the *Seven Planets*; and therefore, having its foundation in Nature, was not a Cuſtom introduced by Revelation. This however ſeems rather to have been ſaid for the ſake of ſerving a favourite Hypotheſis, than for any real ſtrength the Argument contains [x]. For the day of the Sun, the day of the Moon, the day of Jupiter, Saturn &c. were certainly Names given to the Seven Days of the Week, long after the

u Lib. II.

w See his Note on Grotius de Verit. Chriſt. Relig. Lib.I. Cap. 16. p. 42.

x Thus Bp Leng — The Reaſon of the compoſition of Days intoWeeks, fetch'd from the ſeven Planets, ſeems to be an invention of Idolaters long after the thing it ſelf was ſettled in practice, but the true reaſon loſt. Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. 3. p. 56.

Week

Week was form'd and obſerv'd; conſequently the Week was not form'd, and the Days of it firſt nam'd from the obſervation of thoſe Planets. It would be almoſt as good an Argument for the Year's not being divided into, or obſerv'd under the ſucceſſive revolution of twelve Months, before the time of the Julian Kalendar; becauſe each Month then receiv'd a new Name, which has continued among the European Nations ever ſince. No: the *Year*, we know, was a computation of time in uſe every where long before; and the computation of time by *Weeks* alſo was in uſe long before Mankind were acquainted with our Solar Syſtem, or (more properly) with the Planets that for ſome Ages were thought to compoſe it.

We are told in a late learned Treatiſe, the Author of which has made very deep Searches into the Riſe of Aſtronomy [y] — That to ſuppoſe the Obſervations of the Babylonians not to go higher than Seven or Eight Hundred Years before Chriſt, has all the evidence that can be expected in ſo intricate a Subject, at this diſtance of time. But that Abraham introduced Aſtronomy into Egypt (as Joſephus will have it) or that it was even known there in his time, may very deſervedly be queſtion'd:

y A Letter to Martin Folkes Eſq; on the Riſe and Progreſs of Aſtronomy, by the Rev. Mr. Geo. Coſtard; p. 20.

much leſs probable ſtill is it, that the immediate Deſcendants of Seth were the Authors of this wonderful and complex Science. And Sr Iſaac Newton informs us [z] — that, in the Year before Chriſt 1048, the Edomites were conquer'd and diſpers'd by David; and ſome of them fled into Egypt: and that theſe Edomites carried with them their Arts and Sciences, among which were their Navigation and *Aſtronomy*. The ſame great Author tells us farther — that, 14 years after this, Ammon reign'd in Egypt, and was the firſt that built long and tall Ships; for the enabling which to croſs the Seas without ſeeing the Shore, the Egyptians *began, in his days*, to obſerve the Stars, and from this beginning Aſtronomy had its riſe.

If then Obſervations upon the Planets were not made till ſo many Years after the Diſperſion, the cuſtom of computing by Seven Days could not ariſe from the nice obſervation of the Seven Planets; if that cuſtom was much earlier, and obſerv'd not only ſoon after, but long before the Diſperſion. That this was the caſe will appear to any one that peruſes the beginning of the Book of Geneſis; from which I ſhall hereafter draw a ſtrong confirmation, in the hiſtory of Noah.

But the World is, I believe, generally agreed that the computation of Time by Weeks was

z See his Chronology, p. 12. 14. 208.

one

one certain method of meaſuring it, before as well as after the Diſperſion. And therefore, as this computation could not be deriv'd from any Planetary Obſervations, at a time when Mankind muſt be ſuppos'd unacquainted with the Number of the Planets in our Syſtem; and as the calculating from one to ſeven Days, and then recalculating from one to ſeven Days, and ſo on, has no more foundation in nature than a calculation from one to ſix, eight or ten: therefore this Cuſtom of meaſuring Time by Seven Days, ſo very early in uſe, and ſo prevailing thro' the World, muſt have owed its birth to ſomething out of Nature — that is, to ſome divine Inſtitution, which introduced the Cuſtom, when it had no inherent fitneſs to introduce it ſelf [a].

And here we are furniſh'd at once with an Inſtitution, coeval with the Exiſtence of Adam, which will afford us the brighteſt evidence, and without which we ſhall be ſtill bewilder'd in darkneſs. It has been already obſerv'd, that

a Nolim præfractè negare denominationem dierum a 7 Planetis Ægyptiorum eſſe ἀυξημα; ipſa tamen Septimanæ obſervatio originem longe ſanctiorem atque antiquiorem habet. Pulchre admodum Johannes Philoponus, a Photio laudatus (de Mund. Creat. Lib. 7. Cap. 14.) Εκειτο γε μθν συμπεφωνηταϊ πασιν ανθρωποις, επ'ια μονας ειναι ημερας, ειτινες εις ταυ'ας ειακυκλωμθναι τον ολον ποιωσι χρονον· τινα ων τουτω λογον εστιν ειπειν ετερον, η μονον ον ειρηκε Μωυσης. Witſ. Ægyptiac. Lib. III. Cap. 9. Sec. 2.

at

at the finiſhing the Creation God commanded the Seventh Day, from the beginning of the Creation, to be kept holy; and this on every return of the Seventh Day. And it has, I hope, been prov'd from Fact that it was obſerv'd afterwards, in obedience to this Command. Wherefore *the Origin of Weeks* muſt of neceſſity be owing to this Inſtitution, and *the weekly celebration of an Holy Sabbath.*

Having thus ſeen that the computation of Time by Weeks was introduced by the inſtitution and obſervation of a Sabbath, we may obſerve here — that as the *continued obſervation* of a *Sabbath* proves the *origin* of *Weeks*, ſo the *origin* of *Weeks* proves the *continued obſervation* of a *Sabbath*. For a Sabbath muſt have been *twice* obſerv'd at leaſt, in order to conſtitute the intermediate Six Days, and compleat a Week. And from hence it alſo follows — that the deſign of the Command, given by God to Adam, was not only for one day of Reſt and Holineſs (it being impoſſible that Adam could be ſaid to *reſt*, when he had not yet began to *work*) but for a weekly and continued obſervation of a Day, excepted from Labour, and devoted to ſacred Employments; a Day to be obſerv'd by all, as it concerns all, from the beginning to the end of the World.

This then appearing to be the Deſign of the Inſtitution, we may preſume that a proper uſe

was

was made of it by the great Fathers of the Human Race, in a pious obedience to the divine Command. For it seems to be certain, that the Patriarchs had *fix'd Places* [b] for assembling for Publick Worship — that they actually

b Gen. XII. 8. *And Abram removed from thence unto a mountain on the east of Beth-El — and there he builded an Altar, and called upon the Name of the Lord.* After this he went down into Egypt; and upon his return we read, Chap. XIII. 3—*And he went on his Journeys from the South, even unto Beth-El, unto the place where his tent had been at the beginning—unto the place of the Altar, which he had made there at the first; and there Abram called on the Name of the Lord.* So that we find the Patriarch pitch'd again in the *same Place*, made use of the *same Altar*, and perform'd the *same Worship* — by calling *on the Name of the Lord*; or, as some render it —by calling upon his Family and Servants בשם יהוה *in the Name of the Lord.* This last sense seems confirm'd from Chap. XVIII. 19; where God says of Abraham — *I know him, that he* (יצוה) *constantly commands his Children and his houshold after him, and they shall* (or, *that they shall*) *keep the way of the Lord* &c. That יצוה may be thus render'd, see Leusden's Edit. of Buxtorf's Gram. p.49. This *Place* then, selected thus by Abraham, we find remarkably distinguish'd in Chap. XXVIII. 17. *This is none other but the House of God* — 18. *And Jacob took the Stone that he had put for his pillow, and poured Oil upon the top of it.* 19. *And he called the name of that place Beth-El.* 22. *And said—this Stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be* GOD'S HOUSE. On these last words Heidegger observes—Locus lapidem continens futurus sit Domus Dei, sanctificatione & applicatione; quia ibi Deus ab hominibus vult coli, & gratiosam suam præsentiam effectis testari. Recte igitur Abenezra notat hic insinuari Locum fixum precibus. Exercit. 16. Sect. 23.

held

held *Sacred Assemblies* [c] — and that they had *Priests* [d] to officiate in these Assemblies. The consequence of which is — that they must also have had a *stated Time*; for *When*, as well as *Where*, is absolutely necessary to be determin'd, in order to form a regular Publick Assembly. And what time can we so rationally conceive

c We read, for instance, that Cain and Abel *brought* their Offerings together to the same place; and, that they offer'd in the presence of a Company (which must be their own Families) seems plain — First, because Cain, had he only been with his Brother, would certainly have slain him upon the spot; and not have stifled his resentment, till he had afterwards invited him into the fields, and so have murder'd him in cold Blood. And Secondly, St. Paul (Hebr. XI. 4.) tells us, that God gave a *publick testimony*, or *called Witnesses*, that he accepted Abel's Offerings — *μαρτυρουντος επι τοις δωροις αυτου του Θεου.*

d The Sacerdotal Office was perform'd at the first by the Fathers and principal Persons in the Patriarchal Families; and the first person we find distinguish'd by the title of *a Priest* was Melchizedek, *the Priest of the most high God*; Gen. XIV. 18. In Exod. XIX. 22. we find Priests among the Israelites, before the giving of the Law. Jethro also was a Priest of the true God, as may be inferr'd from Exod. XVIII. 1. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. And in Gen. XLI. 50, we read that Joseph married a daughter of Potipherah, Priest of On; who was probably a Priest to those in that part of Egypt, who were as yet untainted with Idolatry. Heidegger observes of this Father-in-Law of Joseph's — *Sacerdotem* hunc esse liquet ex usu verbi כהן 47. 22, ubi legitur quod Josephus pepercit לכהנים *Sacerdotibus.* Hac voce *Sacerdotes* intellexerunt antiquissimi Interpretes; Græci, qui reddunt ἱερεις; & Paraphrastes Chaldæus Onkelosus, qui pro כהנים habet כומריא *Hierophantas.* Exercit 20. Sect. 17.

to

to have been appropriated to this uſe, as the Day appointed by God himſelf?

It may be proper now to conſider—whether ſuch an obſervation of a Weekly Sabbath may not be found in the hiſtories of ſome of the *Patriarchs*, either expreſsly, or by a fair induction.

Let the firſt example then be that of holy JOB; which will appear, perhaps, to be corroborative of the preſent argument: eſpecially as we have the authority of *Origen* for aſſerting Job's obſervation of a Sabbath Day [e]. For tho' it is not agreed among the Learned, in what age the divine Poem bearing his Name was penn'd; ſome great Authorities appearing for the Age before, or during the Egyptian Slavery; and others for the Age before, or during the Babyloniſh Captivity: yet if, with Bp *Sherlock* [f], we approve the former opinion, and ſuppoſe the Book of Job to be the oldeſt Book in the world—then an argument may be drawn from the beginning of that Book, to confirm Job's obſervation of a Sabbath as well as of Sacrifice.

That Job was a Worſhipper of the true God, is indubitable; and that he held a regular Aſſembly for Divine Worſhip, is plain from thoſe

e Origen affirms that Job obſerv'd a Seventh Day. See Smith on the Lord's Day, p. 283.

f Diſſertat. II. p. 206.

places in which it is obſerv'd—that himſelf, his Family, and his Friends too came together to preſent themſelves before the Lord—And that he ſent for his Sons, after their days of Feaſting were expir'd, and ſanctified them; offering Burnt Sacrifice for any Sins which they might have committed in the days of their Jollity. That by *the Sons of God* in Gen. VI. 2. is meant *Perſons profeſſing the true Religion*, is granted by all; except a few Commentators, that will have them to be *Angels*, or *Demons*, or *Incubi*, or any thing but what they ſhould be, conſiſtently with ſenſe and reaſon. The ſame phraſe ſeems to carry the ſame ſenſe here[g]; and, if St. *Chryſoſtom*'s aſſertion be

g For if we allow, that the *Aſſembly*, here deſcrib'd, was *real*; and ſhould affirm that by *the Sons of God* are here meant *the Angels of Heaven*; it will be difficult, perhaps, to aſſign the *Place* of this Aſſembly. If we ſay—it was in *Heaven*, it may be ask'd—how could Satan aſcend thither, and be readmitted among the Bleſſed Angels, from whoſe company he had been baniſh'd for ever, by a divine decree? If we ſay—it was on *Earth*; it will not be eaſy to explain, or conceive the manner *how*, and the occaſion *why*, this Aſſembly (of God, Angels and Satan) was held. Whereas, on the Suppoſition that *the Sons of God* mean here *Perſons profeſſing the true worſhip of God*, the Paſſage will, perhaps, be much clearer, and more agreeable to Reaſon as well as Scripture: for both theſe inform us—that the Tempter is more diligent in his attempts upon Mankind, at their ſolemn times of Devotion; and therefore the Son of Sirach adviſes (Ecclus Chap. II. 1.) *My Son, if thou come to ſerve the Lord* (υἱε προσερχῃ δουλευειν Κυριῳ Θεῳ. Sept.) *prepare thy Soul for Temptation.*

true

true [h] — that the *Angels* are no where call'd the *Sons of God* in Scripture, this must be the sense of the words in this place. And if so, these persons cannot be the Sons of Job *only*; because, after the destruction of Job's Family, the Sons of God assembled *a second time* to perform their Religious Services [i]. So that here we find a regular Assembly of People, of different Families, twice met to present themselves before the Lord; or, for the solemn performance of Publick Worship. And as Job thus continued uncorrupted in his Religion, and express'd his sense of it by a careful observation of Sacrifice (which was then the great instituted means of conciliating the divine Favour) he was, doubtless, equally careful to perform these Sacred Services on the Sabbath Day. For the Institution of *that* must have descended to him with the Institution of *Sacrifice*; both being enjoin'd by the same Authority, and both observ'd by those Patriarchs, from whom his Religion was handed down. In a word — we seem to find this very matter so recorded in the Text; for in Chap. I. 6. we read ויהי היום ויבאו בני האלהים להתיצב על יהוה

h Φασι γαρ οτι ου περι ανθρωπων τουτο ειρηται, αλλα περι αγγελων· τουτους γαρ υιους Θεου προσηγορευσι. Και πρωτον μεν δειξωσι που αγγελοι υιοι Θεου προσηγορευθησαν· ανθρωποι μεν γαρ εκληθησαν υιοι Θεου, αγγελοι δε ουδαμως. Chrysostom in Homil. 22 in Gen. cap. 6.

i Job II. 1.

which words may be render'd—*And it was the Day, and the Sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord:* which significant Phrase is repeated, in the same words, upon the Second religious Assembly, related in the beginning of the Second Chapter.

From JOB let us ascend to ABRAHAM, the Father of the Faithful; and on him God bestows this ennobling Character [k] — *Abraham hath obeyed my Voice, and kept my Charge, my Commandments, my Statutes, and my Laws.* From these words is it not obvious to infer —that, as *God* had *commanded* the Observation of a *Sabbath*, and *Abraham observed all God's Commandments*, therefore *Abraham observed the Commandment of the Sabbath Day?* Mr. Selden informs us [l], that most of the Jews drew that inference; and he produces many Authorities for his assertion. Here then (so far as this inference from the Text will lead us, and the Testimonies of some of the most considerable Jewish Writers can be of Service) we have *Abraham*, the Friend of God, observing the Institution of a Weekly Sabbath.

Let us now consider a part of the history of NOAH. We read in Gen. VII. 1. — *And the Lord said unto Noah, Come Thou &c. into the*

k Gen. XXVI. 5.

l De Jure Nat. Gent. Lib. III. Cap. 13 & 14.

Ark.

Ark. Mr. *Bedford* obſerves[m], that all the ſpecial Communications, which Man held with his Creator in the firſt Ages of the World, were probably made upon the Sabbath, or weekly day of Holineſs; and therefore that this Command to Noah was given on the Sabbath-Day. During the Six Days following the Sabbath then he enters the Ark, and takes in with him his Seven Human Companions, and the Beaſts and Fowls; with Proviſions for the whole Society. This being compleated, we read in verſe the tenth &c.—*And it came to paſs, after Seven Days, the Waters were upon the Earth; in the ſix hundredth year of Noah's Life, in the ſecond month, the ſeventeenth day of the month; the ſame day were all the fountains of the Deep broken up* &c.

The day then, on which the Deluge began, being the Sabbath, Noah kept it in the Ark; for being cloſe confin'd, and his Labour finiſh'd, he was at liberty to obſerve it as a Day of Reſt, and had the utmoſt reaſon to devote it to holy purpoſes. In verſe the twenty fourth we read, that the Waters prevail'd over the Earth an hundred and fifty Days; and therefore the Ark reſted on the ſeventeenth day of the ſeventh Month. On the firſt day of the tenth Month were the tops of the mountains ſeen; and this day happening, in a regular progreſ-

m Scripture Chronology, p. 29 &c.

ſion

ſion of Weeks, to be the Sabbath Day, we may preſume that God choſe on this day to give Noah an Earneſt of that Deliverance he was then piouſly requeſting.

At the end of forty days after this, which was the twelvth day of the eleventh Month, and *the Day before the Sabbath*, Noah ſent forth the Raven, to diſcover, whether the Earth was yet dry. And this, it is highly probable, he did on that day, that he might the better know how to adapt his Devotions on *the day following* (which was the Sabbath;) either by praying to God for ſome farther Token of his Loving-kindneſs, or by praiſing him for the Tokens already vouchſaf'd him. At the end of another Week, on the day before the Sabbath, Noah ſent forth a Dove; and the Dove, finding no place to reſt, return'd into the Ark; by which Noah knew that the Waters were yet upon the Earth, and therefore probably ſpent the next day (the Sabbath) in praying for their abatement. Noah ſtaid *yet other Seven Days*; and again he ſent forth the Dove, no doubt with the ſame view as before: and in the Evening, the beginning of the Sabbath, the Dove return'd with an Olive-Leaf, that thenceforth celebrated Emblem of Peace and Safety. Af- this Noah ſtaid *yet other Seven Days*, and ſent forth the Dove, on the day before the Sabbath as uſual; but the Dove return'd not unto him any more.

Upon

Upon this, Noah, resolving to be an Eye-Witness of the State of the World, pitches upon the first day of the New Year for this surprizing Prospect; and, removing the covering of the Ark, he sees the Face of the Ground dry. This survival of the general destruction was so wonderful a Display of the divine Mercy to him and his Family, that he doubtless employ'd the next Day (which was the weekly Sabbath) in acts of gratitude and praise: and a noble opportunity he had to commemorate at once the goodness of God, in finishing the Creation of the World at first; and the mercy of God, in giving that World a miraculous Re-existence.

But tho' the Face of the Ground was dry, on the first day of the first month, yet the Earth was not dry 'till the twenty seventh day of the second month; and on the next day, which was again the Sabbath, God spake unto Noah, and gave him his command to leave the Ark, as he had before to enter into it. And as Noah spent six days, or the time between one Sabbath and another, in going into the Ark with all the Creatures; so probably the same time was spent in bringing them out again. Noah's labour being therefore again ended on the day before the Sabbath, and himself set ashore safe upon the New World; he, the next day, put together a few stones for an

Altar

Altar unto the Lord, and with a grateful heart offer'd a Sacrifice to God his Deliverer. And God accepted the Burnt-Offering of the pious Noah, and appear'd on the ſame day to him and his Sons, bleſſed them, made a Covenant with them, and eſtabliſh'd the Rainbow as a Sign of that Covenant for ever.

This piece of Hiſtory is ſo important, and the particulars of it ſo concluſive — for Noah's obſervation of a *Sabbath*, as well as his computation of time by *Weeks*; that the length of it will probably be pardon'd; eſpecially as it could not be eaſily contracted.

'Tis time now that the caſe of CAIN and ABEL be conſider'd; to which all that has been before obſerv'd on the Sabbath is only, tho' neceſſarily, *introductive*. For, I hope, it has been prov'd — that God's bleſſing the Seventh day in Geneſis (Chapter the Second) contain'd an Order to Adam and his Poſterity to obſerve one day in ſeven after an holy manner — that tho' this Order was reinforced at Sinai, yet a Sabbath was obſerv'd by the Iſraelites before they came to Sinai — that this obſervation of theirs muſt have been in obedience to this firſt original Inſtitution — and that this Inſtitution was obſerv'd during the Patriarchal Oeconomy. It remains then only to infer from all the above obſervations—that, in virtue of ſuch an Inſtitution,

Institution, so set apart for sacred uses, so observ'd by Job, Abraham, Noah &c. Cain and Abel also came together, and offer'd their Oblations to God, on the same Sabbath Day.

But besides this *presumptive* Proof, which (all circumstances consider'd) may possibly be thought convincing; there is a strong *positive* Proof to be here superadded, the force of which will, upon a due consideration, be probably acknowledg'd.

Our English Version tells us, Gen. IV. 3. —*And in process of time it came to pass that Cain brought* &c. But if we examine the Original, we shall find it ויהי מקץ ימים *And it was at the End of Days*, ויבא קין *And Cain brought* &c. The Question then is,—What is here meant by this *End of Days?* And tho' the general Stream of Interpreters runs for its implying no more than *after some time*, or *in process of time*; yet perhaps the Expression will appear more determinate in its meaning [n].

It has been observ'd, that the first Vau, with the three words adjoin'd, is an entire Sentence —*And it was at the End of Days*; and the next Vau begins another entire Sentence—*And Cain brought* &c.—and that this, and such like Expressions refer always each to *some stated time*, according to the times or things the Author is

n *At the end of Days* is *at some stated Time.* Mr. Romaine's Serm. before the Lord Mayor, p. 15.

then ſpeaking of. The Noun קץ, it is certain, ſignifies the extremity by which any continued quantity is ſeparated; and, when applied to time, the concluſion of ſo much time, as the word adjoin'd to it, ſpecifies. And therefore *Fagius*, commenting on this place, tells us—It ſeems entirely rational, that by this phraſe —*the End of Days*—be underſtood ſome certain and appointed time, on which they met for the Worſhip of God; for there was always, even before the Law, an Order in the Church of God, by the means of diſtinguiſh'd times: and this opinion, ſays he, is confirm'd by the word קץ, which does not ſimply ſignify *an End*, but *an End certain, preciſe, and determinate.*

The point then now is — What determinate portion of time is meant by the word ימים *Days*; and it ſeems neceſſary that it ſhould here ſignify either a *Week* or a *Year*. The latter is the opinion moſtly, I believe, indulg'd; tho' perhaps without the greateſt reaſon, as may appear from the following Conſiderations.

'Tis plain that the Hiſtorian gives theſe as *his own* words; and therefore had he intended to ſignify — *at the end of the Year*, he probably would not have us'd the word ימים *Days*, but שנה *a Year*, which he ſo frequently uſes in the very next Chapter; and which is us'd by God himſelf, Gen. XVII. 21. Or he would have us'd that other Phraſe בצאת שנה *in the end of the*

the Year, which we meet with in Exod. XXIII. 16. But what may be urg'd with greater force, the very phrase מקץ שנה is us'd by this same Author in Exod. XII. 41. Wherefore his not using either of these expressions, especially the latter, but expressing himself by the former, seems to prove the one chosen in opposition to the others.

Besides: I don't find that the very phrase מקע ימים signifies *at the end of the Year* any where in the Bible; it occurs indeed but in one other place, as in the text here disputed, and that is in 1 Kings XVII. 7; and there is no possible reason for confining the expression to *a Year* in that Place. Wherefore we may conclude, with the learned *Gussetius* [o] — that neither is there any reason why we should think a *Year* intended in this place: for, *says he*, on the contrary rather, the revolution or course of the *Year* will scarce agree with the affair in hand; for if you should begin the Year from the month Tisri, those Oblations would have been *too late*, and if you begin with Nisan they had been *too soon*, there not being at that time Fruits to offer.

As there is nothing then in the words implying the End of the Year, but (if the observation of this last Critical Author be just) rather the contrary; let us see, whether there be

o Commentar. Ling. Ebraicæ, p. 314.

any reaſon to determine us for the other ſenſe — that it came to paſs at, or after the concluſion of a Week; that is, on the Sabbath Day.

It has been already obſerv'd — that one day in ſeven was commanded by God to be kept holy—that in conſequence of this Command to Adam a Weekly Sabbath was kept holy — and, it may be added, that the word ימים ſignifies ſuch a determinate ſtated time, as beſt agrees with the circumſtances of the context where it occurs. Wherefore, as the Sabbath Day was the Day on which Sacred Rites were to be perform'd, in the days of Cain and Abel; there can be no doubt but that this *End of Days*, on which theſe Brothers came with their Oblations, was the Sabbath Day, at or after the concluſion of the Week.

This will be farther ſtrengthen'd by conſidering how early in the world this was perform'd; it being the *firſt Act* recorded of the *firſt Son* of Adam; at a ſeaſon, when it is extreamly probable there was no other computation of time, than that of *Days* from Nature, and that of *Weeks* from the Sabbatical Inſtitution and Obſervation [p]. Or, ſuppoſing *Years* then in uſe, the word שנה was appropriated to

p Ex Syncelli Chronologiâ obſervavit Salmaſius, priuſquam ratio computandi per *Menſes* & *Annos* ab Aſtrologis inventa fuiſſet, veteres illos Patres diſtinxiſſe *tantum* per SEPTIMANAS. Witſii Ægyptiac. Lib. 3. Cap. 9. Sec. 1.

that

that ſignification; as we find in Gen. I. 14. And therefore, as the word יום (a Day) did, in the plural number (when without a numeral Adjective adjoin'd, to confine it to *Days*) ſignify *a Week*, as the only *collective body of Days* then in uſe, or known under the name of ימים *Days*; ſo we find the word plainly uſed for a Week, in Gen. XXIV. 55.

For Abraham's Servant, having ſucceeded in his Journey, to take a Wife for Iſaac, at the houſe of Bethuel; is importunate with Rebecca's Parents to ſet out with her immediately on his return, after ſo long an abſence. But her Relations, being deſirous of her company for a ſhort time, at leaſt for a *Week* (the uſual *time* of celebrating the *Nuptial Feaſt* [q]) ſay to the Servant — תשב הנער אתנו ימים או עשור which words may be well render'd by that very appoſite phraſe in uſe among us — *Let the*

q Gen. XXIX. 27. *Fulfill her Week*—that is, as Abarbanel rightly explains it — Exple cum Leâ *ſeptem dies nuptiales*, & mox ego & uxor mea dabimus tibi etiam Rachelem: ſic Syrus aliique Interpretes *convivium* intelligunt, neque in hiſtoriâ *hebdomadi annorum* locus eſt. Seder Olam, p. 264. And to the ſame purpoſe Heidegger— *Hebdomadum Annorum* mentio non eſt niſi *in Scriptis Poeticis de rebus futuris*, non item in hiſtoricis & ubi de contractibus agitur. Tum ſolennitatem nuptialem definitam fuiſſe tempore hebdomadæ dierum, ſeu 7 dierum, ſatis colligi poteſt ex Judic. XIV. 12; & ex ratione legalis conjugii, & ex rerum geſtarum ordine, & ex ſacrâ *Chronologiâ*. Exercit. 15. Sect. 11.

Damſel

Damſel abide with us a Week, or Ten Days. For it is plain, that the word ימים cannot in this place ſignify *a Year*; ſince it would then be —*Let the Damſel abide with us a Year, or Ten*; which, all things conſider'd, had been a Requeſt very ſtrange and unaccountable. Neither can the words ſignify, as in our Engliſh Verſion — *Let the Damſel abide with us a few days, at the leaſt ten*; becauſe the particle או, as appears by Noldius, never ſignifies *at leaſt* in the whole Bible. So that the above — *Let the Damſel abide with us a Week, or Ten Days*—is the only rational explication that remains to be given; and (conſidering that a Week was the ſtated time of celebrating the Nuptial Feaſt) it is ſo natural and eaſy, as to want no farther recommendation.

To ſtrengthen the force of this Inſtance, I ſhall add another, of ſtill greater weight, from Gen. XXIX. 20; where we read ויהיו בעיניו כימים אחדים *Et fuerunt in oculis ejus quaſi dies uni.* The ſenſe of the context is this — Jacob agreed to ſerve Laban ſeven years for Rachel, Laban's daughter; and Rachel's beauty was ſo great, and Jacob's love ſo ſtrong, that the ſeven Years of ſervitude for her ſake were in his eyes but as — What? This is the point of difficulty, if there be any in it; but notwithſtanding the different rendrings of the place, the nature of the Compariſon and the livelineſs of

of the Antithesis will oblige us to call it *Seven Days — And the* SEVEN YEARS *were in his opinion but as* SEVEN DAYS, or (which is the same) *as* ONE WEEK. So that as יום in the plural Number then signified Seven Days, or a Week; the word אחרים, the plural of אחד (which strictly answers to *ἑις* and unus, and essentially signifies *One)* is here added, and confines it to *One Week.* For, I believe, it will be allow'd to be an invariable rule in writing — that a Noun Adjective, in sense unalterably singular, can in the plural number be only connected with such a Substantive, as in the plural number signifies singularly, or collectively under a singular denomination.

See Ge 27: 44

In short then—As Adam was commanded to devote every seventh day to sacred offices, and as his Posterity were to do, and did the same, working the other six days — and as the word ימים *Days* appears, from the two instances just cited, expressly to have signified *a Week* in the infancy of the world; certainly this *End of Days*, after which Cain and Abel met to offer their Oblations, will be allow'd to signify the *End of the Week*, on the Seventh or Sabbath day, after the other six days were finish'd, and the Week from the last Sabbath expir'd [r].

r There is a material Objection, or two, still remaining to the doctrine of a Patriarchal Sabbath, to which it may be necessary to subjoin an Answer. And first—as to

Having

Having thus, with all the brevity I could on ſo extenſive a ſubject, conſider'd *the Time*, on

the Sabbaths being called a Sign to the Jews — it may be obſerv'd, that the word *Sabbaths* is a general name, including the other Jewiſh Feſtivals. But even *the Sabbath*, or weekly day of Holineſs, might well be call'd a *Sign* to the *Jews*, without excluding the *Patriarchs*. For the Jewiſh Sabbath was a Sign, as being founded on a double reaſon; the ſecond of which (the Egyptian deliverance) evidently diſtinguiſh'd that people from all others; and was therefore, as a Sign, conſtantly to remind them of the particular care of Heaven, and what uncommon returns of goodneſs they were to make for ſo ſingular a deliverance. But there is great reaſon to believe, that the *Sabbath* of the Iſraelites was alter'd, with their *Year*, at their coming forth from Egypt; and a ſhort attention to this point may not be here improper. The caſe then ſeems to be this —At the finiſhing the Creation God ſanctified the ſeventh day—this ſeventh day, being the firſt day of Adam's Life, was conſecrated, by way of *Firſt-Fruits*, to God; and therefore Adam may reaſonably be ſuppos'd to have *began* his computation of *the days of the Week* with the *firſt whole day* of his own exiſtence. Thus the Sabbath became the firſt day of the Week. But when Mankind fell from the worſhip of the true God, they firſt ſubſtituted the worſhip of the Sun in his place; and, preſerving the ſame weekly day of worſhip, but devoting it to the Sun, the *Sabbath* was thence call'd SUN-DAY. For that *Sunday* was originally the *firſt* day of the Week, and is ſo ſtill in the Eaſt, is prov'd by Mr. Selden, Jus Nat. & Gent. Lib. 3. cap. 22. Thus the *Sabbath* of the *Patriarchs* continued to be the *Sunday* of the *Idolaters*, 'till the coming up of the Iſraelites out of Egypt; and then, as God alter'd the beginning of their Year, ſo he alſo chang'd the day of their Worſhip from *Sunday* to *Saturday*. The firſt reaſon of which might be — that as Sunday was the day of Worſhip among the

which

which Cain and Abel came together to offer their Oblations; I proceed to the Third and

Idolaters, the Israelites would be more likely to join with them, if they rested on the *same* day; than if they were to work on that day, and serve *their* God upon *another*. But a second reason certainly was—in order to perpetuate the memory of *their deliverance on that day from Egyptian Slavery*. For Moses, when he applies the fourth Commandment to the particular case of his own people, (Deut. V. 15.) does not enforce it, (as in Exod. XX. 11.) by the consideration of *God's resting on the seventh day*, which was the Sabbath of the Patriarchs; but binds it upon them by saying—REMEMBER *that thou wast a Servant in Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out Arm; therefore the Lord thy God hath commanded* THEE *to keep* THIS SABBATH DAY. Allowing then the preceding Observations, we immediately see how the Sabbath of the Christians naturally reverted to Sunday, after the abolition of Judaism, without any express Command for the alteration. Bp Cumberland (Orig. Gent. Antiq. p. 400.) tells us—Gentes omnes, post Christi præcipuè tempora, in eandem cum Patriarchis Ecclesiam Catholicam fuerint vocandæ. And that the Christian and Patriarchal Sabbaths are the same is evidently affirm'd by Justin Martyr, in the following passage —Τῇ δὲ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἡμέρᾳ κοινῇ πάντες τῶν συνοικούντων ποιούμεθα· ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας ΚΟΣΜΟΝ ἐποίησε· καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμετέρος Σωτὴρ, ΤΗ ΑΥΤΗ ΗΜΕΡΑ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. Apolog. prim. Edit. Thirlby, p. 98.

But here it will be objected, that the *Fathers* in general, and *Justin Martyr* in particular, have asserted—that the Patriarchs did not observe a Sabbath. To this, tho' a boasted Argument with some, I hope the following observations from JUSTIN MARTYR will be a sufficient Answer. He asserts indeed that the Patriarchs did not sabbatize, or keep the Sabbaths (p. 174;) but he also asserts, that neither did they make Oblations (p. 183,) or offer Sa-

Principal Point in view in this Dissertation, namely—*the Nature of their Oblations*, and the Foundation of that Difference which God manifested between them, by rejecting the one, and accepting the other.

First then, let us take a view of the Offering brought by the elder brother Cain. We read in Verse the 3d—ויבא קין מפרי האדמה מנחה ליהוה which the English Translators have render'd—*And Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground an Offering to the Lord*; but the

crifice (p. 222.) But he must know that they did make Oblations, and offer Sacrifice; and therefore can only mean, that they did not offer or sacrifice *after the Mosaic Ritual*, and according to the form of the Jewish Ceremonies. For his dispute with Trypho the Jew evidently turns upon the Obligation, or Non-Obligation of the Jewish Law on Christians; and therefore he must speak of *Jewish Sacrifices*; and if of Jewish Sacrifices, consequently *of Jewish Sabbaths also*: otherwise his argument against the necessity of observing the Jewish Sabbaths and Sacrifices among Christians, drawn from the non-observation of them among the holy Patriarchs, had been of no force. It may be added—that Trypho *charges* Justin with *not observing the Sabbath* (p.156;) and yet Justin *affirms*, that he *observ'd the Sunday Sabbath*; which, he says, was the day on which God had finish'd the World (p. 98:) so that the Sabbath meant by the Jew must be *the Saturday Sabbath*, which was *peculiar* to the Jewish Nation; and was enjoin'd, as Justin observes (p. 175,) *that the Jews might know and remember that God had redeem'd them out of Egypt.* —So that, for any thing contain'd in these Objections to the contrary, the doctrine of a Patriarchal Sabbath remains still upon a firm foundation.

Original

Original is — *And Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground a Mincha to Jehova.* And here two words offer themselves for explanation — פרי *Fruit*, and מנחה *Mincha*; the first of which would need none, had not Grotius made it necessary by a strange conjecture on its meaning in this place. For he tells us, that perhaps מפרי האדמה *of the Fruit of the Ground* means nothing more than what the Heathens, many ages after, understood by their *Sagmen*; which was *a sort of Turf, cut out of sacred ground, and carried sometimes in the hand of a Roman Ambassador.*

But what possible agreement can be discern'd between this custom, and the case of Cain? — Yet even supposing a parallel, the words can never signify any such thing. For the word פרי, when join'd with אדמה, has always the sense of *Fruit that is eatable and good for food*; and certainly the Fruit of the Ground, especially when presented for an Offering unto the Lord, will be always thought to mean something more than a little Earth and Grass. Indeed this thought of Grotius is so very unaccountable, that I don't find he has been follow'd by a single Commentator [s]; and there-

s Grotius seems here to deserve the censure pass'd on him by the learned Heidegger—Sæpe vir, cætera magnus, ex paganis ritibus talia, obtorto collo, ad explicationem rerum sacrarum rapit; quæ, si propius intueare, nec cœlum nec terram attingunt. Exerc. 5. 19.

fore we may conclude, according to the obvious information of the words in the text—that Cain's Offering was of the Fruit, or eatable Fruits, of the Ground; the particular ſpecies of Fruit indeed is not defin'd, and therefore we muſt be ſatisfied with that general idea which the words afford us.

Let us now proceed to the other word *Mincha*; which muſt be carefully conſider'd, as great weight will be laid upon the ſenſe of that hereafter. A *Mincha*, ſays BUXTORF, when applied to Civil Life, ſignifies a Preſent, indeterminately; but when applied to things Sacred, it ſignifies determinately Sacrum Frumentaceum, an Offering of Corn or Bread. GUSSETIUS tells us [t] — When a *Mincha* is given by man to man, it denotes ſome great dignity in the receiver, of which ſuch gift is an acknowledgment; and it denotes ſubjection, at leaſt ſubmiſſion in the giver: but when a Mincha is preſented by Man to God, it *always* ſignifies an *Unbloody Oblation*, and there is not one inſtance of its being uſed for an Animal Oblation, thro' the Bible. RELAND, in his Treatiſe of Sacrifices [u], informs us — All Oblations, which according to the divine will were conſum'd, after having been conſecrated by certain rites, are call'd by the general name of

t Commentar. Ling. Ebraicæ, p. 473.
u Antiquitates Sacræ vet. Hebræor. Par. 3. pag. 141.

Oblations;

Oblations; and as they consist either of Animals, or of Meal, Oil, Wine and Frankincense, they are divided into two sorts, the *Bloody* and the *Unbloody*. The *Bloody* or Animal Oblations are call'd *Mactations*, and the *Unbloody* Oblations of Corn or Meal *Minchas*; the rest being call'd *Libations*; and to the *second species* Reland himself refers the Oblation here brought by Cain. Dr. OUTRAM agrees exactly with these celebrated Authors, and observes [w]—that the Oblations which were consum'd in a sacred rite (such only as were esteem'd Sacrifices by the Jews) were either of things *inanimate* or *animate*; that Offerings of the former kind were in Scripture term'd *Minchas* (in Latin, *Ferta*, *Dona* or *Dapes*;) and the latter *Mactations* (in Latin, *Victimæ* or *Hostiæ*.) To these human Authorities I shall only add that of Mr. MEDE, who says [x]—All the Offerings in the Law were either holy or most holy Oblations; the first were call'd *Terumoth*, the second *Korbanim*. These last were of two parts or kinds, *Zebach*, and *Mincha*; the former being the slaughter and shedding the blood of Beasts, and the latter the burning and ascending of inanimate things, as Meats and Drinks; and this *Mincha* was for the most part *join'd* to the *Zebach* or bloody Sacrifice [y].

w De Sacrificiis, p. 84.
x See his Works, Fol. p. 286 and 287.
y Ibid.——————358.

But

But a few paſſages of divine Authority will fix the meaning of this word *Mincha*, beyond diſpute; by evincing — that, when applied to a Sacred Oblation, it always ſignifies an *Unbloody*, and *not* a *Bloody*, *Oblation*. The firſt place, in which the word occurs, is the Text before us, which expreſsly tells us — *that Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground a Mincha to Jehova.*

In Exod. XXIX. 38 &c. we have the inſtitution of the perpetual Morning and Evening Oblation, in the following words—*Now this is that which thou ſhalt offer upon the Altar; two Lambs of the firſt year, day by day continually. The firſt Lamb thou ſhalt offer in the Morning, and the other Lamb thou ſhalt offer at Even; and with the firſt Lamb* A TENTH DEAL OF FLOUR MINGLED WITH THE FOURTH PART OF AN HIN OF BEATEN OIL; *and the fourth part of an hin of Wine for a Drink Offering. And the other Lamb thou ſhalt offer at Even, and ſhalt do thereto, according to the* MINCHA (or Meat-Offering) *of the Morning, and according to the Libation* (or Drink-Offering) *thereof.* So that the Flour mingled with Oil is expreſsly call'd the *Mincha* or *Meat-Offering*. But it muſt be here obſerv'd, that as we now in general appropriate the word *Meat* to *Fleſh*, the *Mincha* ſhould no longer be render'd the *Meat-Offering*, but the *Bread-Offering*.

In

In Levit. II. 1 &c. we have a particular description of the word *Mincha*, and its invariable meaning in things Sacred; for we read—*If any will offer a Mincha to the Lord, his Offering shall be fine Flour, and he shall pour Oil upon it, and put Frankincense thereon—And if thou bring an Oblation of a Mincha baken in the Oven, it shall be unleavened Cakes of fine Flour mingled with Oil—And if thy Oblation be a Mincha baked in a Pan, it shall be fine Flour unleavened, mingled with Oil; thou shalt part it in pieces, and pour Oil thereon:* מנחה הוא *this is a Mincha.* Here then we have the *very Definition* and precise meaning of the *Mincha*, as expressly given us as words can give it. And this determines the sense of the word absolutely, at least *in the five Books of Moses*; because the inspir'd Author, *wherever* he mentions the word *Mincha*, as a Sacrifical Term, certainly uses it *in the same sense:* especially when he appears so minutely to have *fix'd* its meaning. And therefore, as the Book of Genesis was undoubtedly writ by Moses in the Wilderness, *after* the delivery of the Law and the divine appointment of the Sacred Rites contain'd in this book of Leviticus; the word *Mincha*, when used sacrifically, must be suppos'd to carry the *same idea in Genesis, which had been settled upon it by God himself, before Genesis was compos'd.*

But

But there ſeems to be no poſſibility of miſtaking it; and therefore I ſhall only obſerve farther—that the *Firſt-Fruits of the Ground* are included under the word *Mincha* in this Chapter, Verſe the 12th; and in Numbers, Chap. V. 15, *an Offering of Barley-Meal*, without Oil or Frankincenſe, is alſo called a *Mincha*. So that from theſe Texts (to which many others equally clear might be added) it is extreamly evident—that *the Mincha* was Sacrum Frumentaceum, *an Offering of the Fruit of the Ground*, in oppoſition to an Animal Oblation, from which it is carefully diſtinguiſh'd.

Cain then *brought of the Fruit of the Ground a Mincha to Jehova; and Abel, he alſo brought of the Firſtlings of his Flock, and of the Fat thereof.* Grotius tells us, in his Commentary, that Abel's Offering conſiſted of *Wool and Milk*, and that it was not an Animal Sacrifice. For as the word מבכרות ſometimes ſignifies *of the beſt in its kind*, as well as *of the Firſt by birth*, he will have it to mean here — that Abel brought of the *beſt* of his Flock; that is, ſays he, of the *Wool* of the beſt of his Flock. But (beſides the impoſſibility of finding *Wool* in this Word or Sentence) was ever *Wool* known to be a *proper Oblation* to the Deity? Yet ſuppoſing, but not granting it, it will ſoon appear that ſuch an Interpretation is not only extreamly harſh, but will never ſuit the Words; for if it

be

be allow'd by all, that *Cain's bringing* OF THE *fruit of the Ground* means his bringing THE *fruit of the Ground*; certainly *Abel's bringing* OF THE *firſtlings* (or beſt) *of his Flock* muſt mean *his bringing* THE *firſtlings* (or beſt) *of his Flock*. For if the remarkable Sameneſs in the Original Phraſe be not preſerv'd in the Senſe, and if both parts be not conſtrued by the ſame rule; Words may ſignify what every Expoſitor chooſes to have them, and Accuracy in ſtile is of no farther ſervice. But there is no occaſion to dwell upon an Abſurdity, which it is ſufficient to have mention'd. — Abel then brought the Firſtlings of his Flock an Offering to the Lord; and if for an Offering, certainly for a Sacrifice, which was the only way of offering Animals to the Lord. And if Abel brought Animals for a Sacrifice, the following word ומחלבהן cannot be render'd (as Grotius would have it) *and of the Milk thereof*[z]; but muſt be render'd (as

z Grotius pervertit ſimplicitatem orationis Moſaicæ. Nam ubi de Sacrificio ſermo eſt, & oblatum dicitur מחלב, ne unus locus ſcripturæ oſtendi poterit, in quo חלב habeat ſenſum *Lactis*: tum talia Sacrificia in populo Dei nunquam fuerint uſitata. Præterea Paulus Sacrificium Abelis vocat θυσιαν; quid opus θυσια, *ſacrificio mactato*, ſi *Lac* tantum & *Lana* offerri debuerint? Aliud eſt θυσια, aliud αποθυσις; quæ poſterior vox uſurpari ſolet de oblatione rerum inanimatarum. Quod ſi חלב ſit Lac, *ubi igitur mentio Lanæ?* Denique quàm frivolum eſt, eo loco qui agit de Sacrificiis, quæ potiſſima laus fuit capere ex Primogenitis, בכרות interpretari non de Primogenitis,

in our Engliſh Verſion) *and of the Fat thereof:* becauſe *Milk* was not, and the *Fat* always was a part of a regular animal Sacrifice. But as theſe Animals were Holocauſts, the word may, perhaps, be better underſtood here in the *concrete*, than in the *abſtract*; as ſignifying — *and of the fatteſt, or beſt of them.* For it is frequently us'd in this manner in other parts of Scripture [a]; and the ſenſe of the whole will be then — *And Abel, he alſo brought of the Firſtlings of his Flock, and of the fatteſt of thoſe Firſtlings.*

Perhaps there is ſcarce any ſhort Hiſtory in the Bible, concerning which more irrational Stories have been feign'd, and about the particulars of which Interpreters are leſs reconcil'd, than this of Cain and Abel.

There is however a general harmony in aſſerting — that this Offering of Cain's was *the Fruit of the Ground*, and Abel's *an Animal Sacrifice*; that each brought a *ſingle* and diſtinct *Preſent*, *this* a *Bloody*, *that* an *Unbloody* Oblation: and farther than this it does not appear that any Expoſitor has gone. Yet if we conſider the Original Text with cloſeneſs and attention, probably we ſhall find reaſon to believe — that *Abel*'s was a *double Oblation*; an

ſed de iis quæ eximiæ ſunt magnitudinis! Heidegger Exerc. 5. Sect. 20.

a See Numb. 18. 12. Gen. 45. 18. Pſ. 147. 14 &c.

Oblation,

Oblation, not only of *an Animal Sacrifice* peculiar to himself, but of *the Fruit of the Ground*, in common with his Brother. And this Observation, tho' I presume it was never yet publickly made, will possibly help to set this important article of Sacred History in a more advantageous point of view, than it has yet appear'd in.

Let us observe the words of the Original Text, which only can be decisive in the present case; and these it may be proper to produce here at length, that the nature of the Argument may be the more conveniently determin'd. We read in the Third and following Verses — ויבא קין מפרי האדמה מנחה ליהוה: והבל הביא גם הוא מבכרות צאנו ומחלבהן וישע יהוה אל הבל ואל מנחתו: ואל קין ואל מנחתו לא שעה: Which Words, literally render'd, are — *And Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground a Mincha to Jehova; and Abel brought, he also of the Firstlings of his Flock, and of their Fat. And Jehova had respect to Abel, and to his Mincha; but to Cain, and to his Mincha he had not respect.* Here then we find, that the Lord had respect to Abel, and to his Mincha; but if the Lord had respect to Abel's Mincha, Abel certainly brought a Mincha; and if Abel brought a Mincha, he certainly brought of the Fruit of the Ground. For Mincha, when applied to a Sacred Obla-

tion, is found to be explain'd by, and put for, an Oblation of the Fruit of the Ground; or an Unbloody, in oppoſition to a Bloody, Sacrifice. *Mincha* then having this determin'd Signification, (as is evident from the Authority of Scripture and thoſe great Men before cited) and Cain's Offering of the Fruit of the Ground being expreſsly term'd *a Mincha*; Abel's bringing *a Mincha*, at the ſame time, muſt have been his bringing of the Fruit of the Ground, in common with his Brother.

From hence it is evident, that Abel's was truly and properly a DOUBLE OBLATION — an *Animal Sacrifice*, expreſsly; and *the Fruit of the Ground*, by a neceſſary deduction. The turning alſo of the Sentence favours us very remarkably in the preſent caſe — *Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground a Mincha to Jehova; and Abel brought, he alſo* &c. And Abel brought —what? No doubt, *of the Fruit of the Ground*, juſt before mention'd, is here underſtood as if repeated. And thus the LXX very juſtly render this place — Και Αβελ ηνεγκε, και αυτος· απο των πρωτοτοκων &c. In this Verſion the particle και, being repeated, evidently ſeparates the ſentence; and ſo in the Original, the particle גם cannot be join'd to the Verb immediately before it, from the nature of the poſition, and its connection with a ſecond nominative caſe. Neither will the Senſe ſuffer us to ſay — *Cain brought*

brought of the Fruit of the Ground, and Abel brought alſo a Sacrifice; but the original words are very remarkably placed, and the repetition of the nominative caſe plainly demands a different rendring.

The Words therefore are literally — *Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground a Mincha to Jehova; and Abel brought* (the ſame) *he alſo* (brought) *of the Firſtlings of his Flock, and of their Fat.* And the words being thus explain'd, it very regularly follows — *And Jehova had reſpect to Abel, and to his Mincha; but to Cain, and to his Mincha he had not reſpect.*

To this Obſervation — that Cain brought a ſingle, and Abel a double Oblation, the Author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews (generally allow'd to be St. Paul [b]) gives an extraordinary teſtimony. For in Chap. XI. 4. we read — πιστει πλειονα θυσιαν Αβελ παρα Καιν προσηνεγκε τω Θεω, δι' ης εμαρτυρηθη ειναι δικαιος, μαρτυρουντος επι τοις δωροις αυτου του Θεου· και δι' αυτης αποθανων επι λαλειται. Our Engliſh Verſion of which is — *By Faith Abel offered unto God a more acceptable Sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained Witneſs that he was righteous, God teſtifying of his Gifts; and by it he being dead yet ſpeaketh.* But the words πλειονα θυσιαν may be better render'd — a greater, or fuller Oblation (— a Sacrifice exceeding that of Cain, ſays Dr. Hammond) — an Oblation that

b See Chapman's Euſebius, Vol. II. Preface p. 19.

was

was *greater* or *more* in *Number*, rather than in *Value*. For tho' the positive πολυς does sometimes signify *excellens*, *præstans* &c. yet none of the best Lexicographers [c] give it that sense in the other degrees of comparison; but πλειων has constantly the sense of *plus*, *amplior*, *copiosior & numerosior*. And it appears from H. Stephans's Greek Concordance, that πλειων has not the sense of *præstantior* thro' the whole New Testament. Indeed the idea of Number strikes us at once; and the modern Translators have injur'd their translation in this place, by not attending to the history here alluded to. I say, the modern Translators; for in *Wickliff*'s Translation in the thirteenth Century, we find the proper meaning of the word here preserv'd —**by feith abel offride a mych more sacrifice than caym to god, by whiche he gat witnessyng to be just, for god bare witnessyng to hise ghiftis; and by that feith he deed spekith ghit.** But as *a much more Sacrifice* was found, upon the improvement of the English Language to be a little uncouth; in Queen Elizabeth's Version it was alter'd for—*a greater Sacrifice*, which also preserves the true sense of the word πλειων, especially in this place.

There is another word in this Verse, which will farther confirm the Observation before

c See the several Lexicons of Budæus, Constantine, Gesner, Gilliu-, Hederic, Leigh, Scapula and Stephens.

made,

made, and that is — δωροις GIFTS — *God testifying of* ABEL'S GIFTS — by which a plurality is plainly and expresly confirm'd; as this Act of Abel, which we are considering, can be the only one here referr'd to by the Apostle.

Thus much may suffice to shew the *Nature* of the *Oblations* of Cain and Abel; and to prove, that the former brought the single Offering of the Fruit of the Ground, and the latter the double Oblation of the Fruit of the Ground and an Animal Sacrifice.

The next point is to consider — What Inducement these Brothers had to the making their Oblations; after which, it will be proper to fix the foundation of that difference, which God manifested between them, by rejecting the Oblation of Cain, and accepting that of Abel.

The Offering of Cain appears to have been of the Fruit of the Ground — *Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground an Offering to the Lord.* This sort of *Oblation*, tho' falling within the meaning of the word *Sacrifice*, (as that, in its original Sense, is the offering a thing by *Man* to *God*, or making that *Sacred* which before was *Common*) yet in general is now call'd *an* OFFERING; in opposition to that sort of Oblation, which was of Animals, and is generally term'd *a* SACRIFICE.

The

The firſt Queſtion then is — What Inducement Cain might have to bring ſuch an Offering to the Lord. The Anſwer to this ſeems clear; as it is agreed that this Act of Cain's might be in obedience to the voice of Reaſon [d]. For how widely ſoever the Learned have diſagreed about the origin of Animal Sacrifices; and however warmly the Advocates for the *Divine Inſtitution* inſiſt upon the neceſſity of a Revelation in this latter caſe; they allow—that Nature might inform Men of a duty incumbent upon them to worſhip God—that the common dictates of Gratitude might put them upon applying *part* of their ſubſtance to the honour and ſervice of him, who gave them the *whole* — and that, as Offerings of the Fruit of the Ground were always accounted, and diſtinguiſh'd by the title of, *Euchariſtic Offerings* [e]; ſuch an Euchariſtic Offering might be made, and probably therefore was made by Cain, out of a conviction of the Divine Superintendency, and as an acknowledgment of the Divine Bleſſing. Had Cain been void of all religious ſentiments, he had not brought an Offering; but his bringing a Mincha, and offering it up unto the Lord, points out ſome Gratitude in the Offerer, and inſinuates a Belief — that every

d See Dr. Nicholls, in his Conference with a Theiſt, Part II. p. 295.

e See Deut. XXVI. 1—12.

Gift,

Gift, conducive to the happineſs of human life, deſcended from above.

But tho' this *Offering of Cain*'s might be the reſult of rational deduction only, the *Sacrifice of Abel* muſt evidently be aſcrib'd to another and higher principle of Influence. For tho' the *Human Inſtitution of Animal Sacrifice* had formerly many, in the laſt Century ſome, and perhaps in this Age a few Advocates; yet the generality of the Learned are at preſent agreed in aſſerting the *Divine Inſtitution:* and the Arguments of the oppoſite ſide have been ſo judiciouſly and fully anſwer'd, that there ſeems but little room for ſtrengthning the force of what they have offer'd to the world.

I ſhall therefore, for the more regular conducting the preſent deſign, offer ſome Arguments, which are uſually urg'd to vindicate the *Divine Inſtitution* of Animal Sacrifices; and which, receiving additional ſtrength from a few Obſervations here added, may perhaps eſtabliſh that controverted and important point. After which, I ſhall endeavour to draw from thence a proper illuſtration of the hiſtory before us.

That Animal Sacrifices were not inſtituted by Man, ſeems extreamly evident — from the *acknowledg'd Univerſality* [f] of the Practice —

f By the moſt exact accounts taken from thoſe who

from the *wonderful Sameneſs* of the manner, in which the whole World offer'd theſe Sacrifices — and from that *Merit and Expiation* which were conſtantly ſuppos'd in, and to be effected by them.

Now Human Reaſon, even among the moſt ſtrenuous Opponents of the Divine Inſtitution, is allow'd to be incapable of pointing out the leaſt *Natural Fitneſs or Congruity* between *Blood* and *Atonement*, between *the killing of God's Creatures* and *the receiving a pardon for the violation of God's Laws.* This conſequence of Sacrifices, when properly offer'd, was the invariable opinion of the Heathens, but not the whole of their opinion in this matter: for they had alſo a traditionary Belief among them, that theſe Animal Sacrifices were not only *Expiations*, but vicarious *Commutations*, and ſubſtituted *Satisfactions*; and they called the Animals, ſo offer'd, their αντιψυχα, or the Ranſoms for their own Souls [g].

But if theſe notions are ſo remote from, nay ſo contrary to any leſſon that Nature teaches,

have liv'd upon the ſpot with the Hottentots, and have had the beſt opportunity of knowing their cuſtoms, we learn, that they pray to a Being that dwells above, and offer Sacrifice of the beſt things they have, with eyes lifted up to Heaven. And theſe people are by all allow'd to be the moſt degenerate of the Human Species, and to have ſurviv'd the common inſtincts of Humanity. *Ovington's Voyage to Surat*, pag. 498.

g Dr. Stanhope's Serm. Boyle's Lect. Vol. I. p. 790.

as

as they confeſſedly are; how came the whole World to practiſe the Rites founded upon them? 'Tis certain that the wiſeſt Heathens — Pythagoras, Plato, Porphyry, and others [h], ſlighted the religion of ſuch Sacrifices; and wonder'd, how an Inſtitution ſo diſmal (as it appear'd to them) and ſo big with abſurdity, could diffuſe it ſelf thro' the World. They ſaw that ſo it was, but how it was — this was the matter of their aſtoniſhment.

The diſcloſing this grand ſecret then is ſufficient (one would think) to recommend the Book of Revelation to ſome honour among Mankind; ſince that Book only can teach us why the Heathens do, and why their Foreſathers did, offer up Animals in Sacrifice. And further — it might ſoberly be expected, that the Men of *Reaſon* would ceaſe to boaſt of its *Sufficiency* in *Religious Matters*; when they find a Religious Inſtitution, obſerv'd thro' the world, inexplicable on the mere principles of Reaſon; and only to be ſeen thro' by that light, which (deſcending from above to guide us into all truth) is convey'd to us in the ſacred pages.

But theſe Unbelievers, finding their Oracle of Reaſon ſilenc'd in the preſent point, hit luckily upon an expedient to clear themſelves from this diſtreſs; and it came out at laſt—that *Sacrifice* was *the Invention of Prieſt-Craft.* A

h See Spencer de Leg. Heb. Lib. 3. Cap. 1. Sec. 3.

ſad reſource this! And ſuch as diſplays at once the wretchedneſs of that cauſe, and the obſtiſtinacy of its votaries. It has been allow'd by one of the great Doctors of Infidelity [i] — that the firſt Sacrifices were offer'd (as they certainly were) by Fathers and Heads of Families; and — that the *acceptableneſs* of the Sacrifice conſiſted in the *dearneſs* and *value* of it to the Owner or Offerer.

But how came theſe Fathers and Heads of Families, ſo naturally intereſted in, and preſiding over, the welfare of their ſeveral Families, ſo willingly to part with their Flocks, to create to themſelves ſuch a conſtant expence, and to offer ſo continued an injury to their Families? Where can be the Prieſt-Craft here? For either theſe Fathers of Families, who firſt inſtituted ſuch Sacrifices, were Prieſts, or they were not: if they were, then the Prieſts practis'd their craft to their own ſole detriment, which was ſurely a very ſtrange kind of policy; and if they were not Prieſts, it is ſomewhat hard to place the invention of them to the ſcore of Prieſt-Craft [k].

Another Advocate for the Sufficiency of Reaſon [l] ſuppoſes — the Abſurdity prevail'd by de-

i The Moral Philoſopher, p. 210 and 235.

k Dr. Delaney, Revel. examin'd, Vol. I. p. 128.

l Author of Chriſtianity as old as the Creation, cited by Mr. Ridley in his Treatiſe on the Chriſtian Paſſover, p. 4.

grees;

grees; and the Priests, who shared with their Gods and reserv'd the best Bits for themselves, had the chief hand in this gainful Superstition. But it may be well ask'd—Who were the Priests in the Days of Cain and Abel? Or what Gain could this Superstition be to them, when the one gave away his Fruits, and the other his Animal Sacrifice, without being at liberty to taste the least part of it? And certainly the practice of these Sons of Adam may be here cited, upon the credit of Moses, as an ancient and valuable, if not a divine Historian; and 'till older and better Evidence be produced against him, the Facts, which he attests, may be insisted upon as produced by a great Authority. But it is worth remarking, that what this Author wittily calls *the best Bits*, and appropriates to the Priests, appears to have been the *Skin* of the Burnt-Offering among the Jews [m], and the *Skin and Feet* among the Heathens [n].

Dr. *Spencer* observes [o], that Sacrifices were look'd upon as *Gifts*, and that the general opinion was—that Gifts would have the same effect with God, as with Man; would appease wrath, conciliate favour with the Deity, and testify the gratitude and affection of the Sacri-

m Lev. VII. 8.

n See Potter's Antiquities, Vol. I, Book 2, Chap. 3.

o Lib. III. Ch. 3. Sec. 2.

ficer:

ficer: and that from this principle proceeded expiatory, precatory and eucharistical Offerings. This is all that is pretended from Natural Light to countenance this Practice. But how well soever the comparison may be thought to hold between Sacrifices and Gifts, yet the opinion that *Sacrifices would* prevail with *God*, must proceed from an observation that *Gifts had* prevail'd with *Men*; an Observation this, which *Cain and Abel* had little opportunity of making [p]. And, if the Coats of Skins, which God directed Adam to make, were the remains of Sacrifices (as observ'd in the preceding Dissertation [q]) sure Adam could not sacrifice from this observation, when there were no Subjects in the World, upon which he could make such observation. Besides: if Offerings to God were made upon this Principle, then Cain and Abel offer'd on the *same wrong* Principle; and if upon the same wrong Principle, tho' differently express'd, *why* did God respect the latter, and reject the former?

Yet even supposing Men to have instituted such a worship, and to have chose such a service for their Creator — supposing them so fallen from the true ideas of the Divine Being, as to imagine him capable of being blinded by gifts and corrupted by bribery, and that he

p Ridley on the Christian Passover, p. 6.
q Page 68 &c.

would

would *eat the flesh of Bulls and drink the blood of Goats* — (which are certainly propositions as wild as are easily supposable) yet can it be suppos'd — that God would have testified his acceptance of such a service, by fire from Heaven — that Abel, Noah &c. could have obtain'd his favour by it — that he would have made it a Sign of his Covenant with Abraham — that he would have constituted it as the Whole, almost, of the Mosaic Service — and that he would have sent down his own Son to die a Sacrifice, in compliance with, and to compleat such an unmeaning and sanguinary Institution?

Let it be added — that no Being has a right to the Lives of other Beings, but the Creator, or those on whom he confers that right; and it is certain, that God had not given Abel a right to the Creatures, even for necessary food, much less for unnecessary cruelty. And therefore, if God had not empower'd him to take away their Lives, and appropriate their Bodies to the purposes of Sacrifice; Abel certainly had not been accepted, and *the imagination of their Hearts*, who sacrificed after him, *had been only evil before the Lord continually*: or at least God would have said to such rash Worshippers — *By what Authority do ye these things, and Who gave ye this Authority? In vain do ye worship Me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.*

There

There are indeed ſome paſſages of Scripture, which are generally cited to prove, that God himſelf *diſowns* the Inſtitution of Sacrifices; and the chief of theſe are Iſaiah II. 11, 12, and Jeremiah VII. 21, 22, 23. The firſt is —*To what purpoſe is the multitude of your Sacrifices unto Me, ſaith the Lord? I am full of the Burnt-Offerings of Rams, and the Fat of fed Beaſts; and I delight not in the blood of Bullocks, or of Lambs, or of He-Goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand to tread my Courts?* Now this Paſſage is evidently intended for a reproof to the Hypocriſy of the Jews [r], and a Check to that Confidence they repos'd in thoſe ritual performances, tho' void of that real Devotion, that ſincere Repentance, and that inward Purity, which alone are acceptable to God, and to promote which theſe Rites were inſtituted. The Context—*bring no more* VAIN *Oblations* &c. proves this to have been the deſign of the Prophet; and the want of comparative degrees in the Hebrew Language will not ſuffer great ſtreſs to be laid here on the negative form of ſpeech. The known inſtances of — *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice* — *Whoever hateth not his Father* &c. are a proper and ſufficient Key to this and the like paſſages [s]. For theſe kind

r See Mr. Mede's Works, p. 352.
s See Polyglott Bible, Prolegom. Idiotiſm 6.

of

of Negatives, in the Hebrew Idiom, do not absolutely exclude the thing denied, but only imply a preference of the thing set in opposition to it. And the words of Samuel to Saul (1 Sam. XV. 22.) are a beautiful Comment upon this passage of the Prophet Isaiah — *Hath the Lord as great delight in Burnt-Offerings and Sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold! to obey is better than Sacrifice, and to hearken than the Fat of Rams.*

The passage from Jeremiah is — *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel; put your Burnt-Offerings unto your Sacrifices, and eat Flesh: for I spake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded them, in the Day that I brought them out of the Land of Egypt, concerning Burnt-Offerings or Sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my Voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my People.* But these words cannot possibly be understood of God's disowning the institution of Sacrifice, for reasons mention'd in page 153; and 'tis plain, that they refer to the Transaction at Marah, and the Proposal there made by God to the Israelites, soon after their coming forth from Egypt; which Proposal is couch'd in almost the same words with those of the Prophet here appeal'd to. And therefore, either this passage has not the least view to the original Institution of Animal Sacrifices; or, at most, it cannot be under-

ſtood in the ſenſe contended for by the Advocates for the Human Inſtitution.

It may be proper, before I leave this point, to ſubjoin the following Argument, with which Reaſon furniſhes us *againſt* the Human Inſtitution. — Whatever practice has obtain'd univerſally in the World, muſt have obtain'd from ſome dictate of *Reaſon*, or ſome demand of *Nature*, or ſome principle of *Intereſt*; or elſe from ſome powerful *Influence* or *Injunction* of ſome Being of *univerſal Authority*. Now the practice of Animal Sacrifice did not obtain from *Reaſon*; for no reaſonable notions of God could teach men, that he could take delight in Blood, or in the Fat of ſlain Beaſts; nor will any man ſay, that we have any *Natural Inſtinct* to gratify, in ſpilling the Blood of an innocent Creature; nor could there be any temptation from *Appetite* to do this in thoſe ages, when the whole Sacrifice was conſum'd by Fire; or when, if it was not, yet men wholly abſtain'd from Fleſh; and conſequently this practice did not owe its origin to any principle of *Intereſt*. Nay, ſo far from any thing of this, that the deſtruction of innocent and uſeful Creatures is evidently againſt *Nature*, againſt *Reaſon*, and againſt *Intereſt*; and therefore muſt be founded in an *Authority*, whoſe Influence was as powerful as the Practice was univerſal; and that could be none but the *Authority* of *God* the

the Sovereign of the World, or of *Adam* the founder of the human race. If it be ſaid, *of Adam*; the queſtion ſtill returns — What motive determin'd *him* to the practice? It could not be *Nature*, *Reaſon*, or *Intereſt*, as has been ſhewn; and therefore it muſt have been the *Authority* of his *Sovereign*. And had Adam enjoin'd it to his Poſterity, 'tis not to be imagin'd that they would have obey'd him, in ſo extraordinary and expenſive a rite, from any other motive than *the Command of God* [t].

If then the ſtrongeſt arguments for the Human Inſtitution of ſuch Sacrifices prove ſo inconcluſive, we may reaſonably infer—that they were inſtituted not by *Man* but *God*. But let us ſee, what information Scripture affords on this ſide the queſtion; and whether we have not evidence enough to give us ſatisfaction here. The Book of Geneſis, indeed, directly favours neither the one nor the other opinion; and this firſt mention of Sacrifice, in the caſe of Abel, is not to give us an account of Sacrifice, *how* or *when* it was inſtituted, much leſs is it any evidence that there was *none before*; but is only occaſionally related in the hiſtory of transferring the Seniority, or right of Primogeniture (and ſo the Parentage of the Meſſiah) from Cain into a younger line; which was ab-

t Revelat. examin'd with candour; Vol. I. Differ. 8.

ſolutely neceſſary to be known [u]. The truth, however, of the *Divine Inſtitution* may with great ſafety be collected from ſeveral paſſages; and particularly from thoſe that regard Abel's Sacrifice, with which at preſent we are more immediately concern'd.

We read that *Cain brought of the Fruit of the Ground an Offering unto the Lord*; and we have ſeen that Abel was not behind in this expreſſion of his Gratitude, for *he alſo brought an Offering of the Fruit of the Ground.* Yet Abel not only equall'd, but excell'd his Brother; for we read, that HE *brought* MOREOVER *of the Firſtlings of his Flock, and of their Fat.* Upon this the Hiſtorian informs us — that *the Lord had reſpect unto Abel, and to his Mincha; but to Cain, and to his Mincha he had not reſpect.*

There is in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews a remarkable paſſage (before quoted) which will throw great light upon this place. For the inſpir'd Author of that Epiſtle aſſures us, it was *by Faith* that *Abel offered a greater Sacrifice than Cain*; i. e. that Cain, having not Faith, brought only of the Fruit of the Ground; but Abel, having Faith, brought of the Fruit of the Ground, and an Animal Sacrifice. If then Faith was the principle, that influenced Abel to bring the Animal Sacrifice, he certainly did not bring it from the dictates of Reaſon only.

u Moſes's ſine principio, p. 216.

For

For we have the expreſs teſtimony of the Apoſtle—that *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God* [w]; the conſequence of which is, that Abel offer'd this Sacrifice in obedience to *the word of God*, which evidently means *the word of God reveal'd.*

There is another definition of Faith, in the firſt Verſe of the Chapter before appeal'd to [x]; and of that very Faith, for which St. Paul celebrates his liſt of Worthies, at the head of whom ſtands Abel — *Faith*, ſays he, *is the ſubſtance* (or, as ſome render it, the ſubſiſtence) *of things hoped for, and the evidence* (or demonſtration) *of things not ſeen.* It has been very properly remark'd [y] — that all the Heroes and pious Men, produced as actuated by this divine principle, of Faith, render'd themſelves thus renown'd by a belief of ſomething declar'd, and, in conſequence of ſuch belief, the performance of ſome action enjoin'd them by God. —*By Faith, Noah, being warned by God, prepared an Ark*; i. e. he believ'd the warning which God gave him, and obediently made the Ark which he had appointed him to make. — *By Faith, Abraham, when called to go into a ſtrange Land, which God promiſed to give him for an inheritance, obeyed*; i. e. he believ'd that God would

w Romans X. 17.
x Hebrews XI. 1.
y Shuckford's Connection, Vol I. Book 2. p. 86.

give

give him what he had promis'd, and, in consequence of that belief, did what God commanded him. And thus it was, that *Abel by Faith offered a greater Sacrifice than Cain*; because *he believed* what God had promis'd, *that the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's head*; and, in consequence of that belief, offer'd such a Sacrifice for his sins, as God had appointed to be offer'd *until the Seed should come*.

St. Paul also tells us in the same Chapter [z], —that *Abel died in Faith, not having received* (the completion [a] of) *the Promises* [b], *but having*

z Heb. XI. 13.

a Acts XIII. 32, 33 — *And we declare unto You glad tidings, how that* THE PROMISE, *which was made unto the Fathers, God hath* FULFILLED *the same unto us their Children.*

b That these Promises include the *Promise of the Messiah*, is plain — first, because *that* is THE *Promise*, peculiarly and emphatically so call'd throughout the Scripture — and secondly, that temporal Promises, or the Assurances of God as to bringing the Seed of Abraham into the Land of Canaan, (call'd frequently *the Land of Promise*) are not entirely, if at all meant here, appears fully from this very place; for the Apostle says of *all* the Patriarchs, whom he had mention'd in the beginning of this chapter—*These* ALL *died in Faith, not having received the Promises*; but Abraham is one of the Patriarchs mention'd, and of *him* it is expresly said — that *he sojourned* IN THE LAND OF PROMISE. From all which it follows, that some other Promise must be here intended. And as Abel, Enoch and Noah (three of the Patriarchs included in the word ALL) had not receiv'd the Promise of *entering the Land*

seen

ſeen them afar off; and was perſuaded of them, and embraced them [c]. This belief then of Abel's in ſome Promiſe made before by God, but then unaccompliſh'd, was Abel's Faith; and by the virtue of this Faith Abel was induced to offer an Animal Sacrifice, thereby teſtifying his firm belief in the future completion of that Promiſe, with which the offering of Animal Sacrifice was intimately connected. What this Promiſe means will be ſoon ſeen at large; but 'tis previouſly to be here obſerv'd — that the Apoſtle's certifying, that Faith induced Abel to offer an Animal Sacrifice, proves Abel's motive to the obſervation of that Rite to have been not from Reaſon, but Revelation.

of Canaan, it muſt have been *ſome other* Promiſe, made in the firſt Ages, and frequently repeated, to which the Apoſtle here alludes — and *what* Promiſe can that be, but *the Promiſe of a future Redeemer*, made to Adam, and commemorated in the Patriarchal Sacrifices? — *Bleſſed be the Lord God of Iſrael, for he hath viſited and redeemed his people, and hath raiſed up an horn of* SALVATION *for us — as he ſpake by the mouth of his Prophets, which have been ſince the world began.* Luke I. 68 &c.

c Our Church, in the ſecond part of the Homily on Faith, makes this uſe of the 11th Chapter of the Hebrews — All theſe Fathers, Martyrs, and other holy Men, had their Faith ſurely fix'd on God; they look'd for all the Benefits of God the Father, *thro' the Merits of his Son Jeſus Chriſt*, as we now do; and altho' they were not nam'd Chriſtian Men, yet it was a Chriſtian Faith, which they had; they look'd *when Chriſt ſhould come*, and we be in the time *when he is come.*

The

The fourth chapter of Geneſis furniſhes us with a very remarkable paſſage, which probably will give an additional illuſtration to the preſent Argument; and it is the Expoſtulation of God with Cain, after the rejection of him and his Fruit-Offering—*If thou doeſt well, ſhalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doeſt not well, Sin lieth at the door* [d]. Theſe words have receiv'd as great a variety of Interpretations, as moſt paſſages in the Bible; but I ſhall only produce one, which ſeems to clear all the difficulty, and, for its harmony with the Context, to merit our approbation. It has been very rightly obſerv'd — that the word חטאת, here render'd *Sin*, frequently ſignifies *a Sin-Offering*, or *an Animal to be ſacrificed for Sin*; and therefore ſhould be ſo render'd in this place. The neceſſity and cuſtom of this verſion of the word will appear from the following paſſages—Levit. IV. 21. 29; VI. 25. And from theſe and other paſſages in the *Old* Teſtament, the Expreſſion is transferr'd into the *New*; in 2 Corin. V. 21; Heb. IX. 28 [e].

From theſe inſtances it is evident, that the word חטאת muſt be, and is, frequently render'd a *Sin-Offering*; and if we render it ſo in the place under conſideration, we ſhall immediately ſee the Paſſage clear and conſiſtent with

d Gen. IV. 7.

e See Chapman's Euſeb. Vol. I. p. 322.

the

the Context. For—Cain had brought a Mincha to the Lord — Abel had done the ſame, adding an Animal Sacrifice—God rejected Cain, and accepted Abel—Cain was therefore very wroth — Upon which God expoſtulates with him thus — *Why art thou wroth* &c. *If thou doeſt well, ſhalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doeſt not well, a Sin-Offering lieth even at thy door.* As if he had ſaid—Why art thou ſo angry at the preference ſhewn to thy Brother, as if it were an inſtance of Partiality in me; whereas it is only the effect of Laws, which I had before declared: for knoweſt thou not, that if thou diſchargeſt thy Duty fully, thou ſhalt be accepted; and that if thou faileſt therein, I have appointed an Atonement for Sin, by the Sacrifice of an Animal, that is entirely in thy power, near at hand, and that *coucheth* or lieth down even before thy door? — Here then we have God himſelf enforcing the obſervation of Animal Sacrifice; and commanding it, as the known Remedy then provided for the Lapſes of Mankind.

It may be proper to obſerve, at the concluſion of this head, that no argument can be fairly drawn againſt the Divine Inſtitution of Sacrifice before the Law, becauſe ſuch Inſtitution is not mention'd 'till the giving of the Law. For whoever conſiders carefully, will find that *the Law*, is, in part, *a Republication*

of antecedent Revelations, and Commands long before given to Mankind. For how otherwise came the distinction of *Beasts*, into *clean* and *unclean*, to be establish'd in the days of *Noah* [f]? Nature did not teach it; and therefore, tho' the Distinction was not register'd 'till we come down to Deuteronomy [g], it certainly was introduced by God at the same time that he instituted Sacrifice. Another instance will sufficiently confirm this Observation, and that is — the Law of *Leviration*, as it is call'd; or that Law, by which one Man, upon the decease of his Brother without Children, was oblig'd to take his Brother's Wife. We find this Law first commanded by God in the book of Deuteronomy [h], but it certainly must have been instituted, and by the same Authority, long before; because in Genesis [i] we have an account of a Man destroy'd by God himself, for disobeying it. Wherefore, as these Institutions were *before* made, tho' not recorded; so might Sacrifice, as (I hope) it fully appears to have been.

We have now seen, that Abel offer'd an Animal Sacrifice, and that his motive to this kind of Oblation could not be from Reason or Na-

f Gen. VII. 2.
g Deut. XIV. 3 &c.
h Deut. XXV. 5.
i Gen. XXXVIII. 10.

ture,

ture, becauſe the one acknowledges the Rite abſurd, and the other cruel and inhuman. And as it remains that the Sacrificing Animals muſt have been *divinely* inſtituted, we have ſeen that it abſolutely was ſo — from ſeveral Teſtimonies of holy Scripture in the caſe of Abel, and from the Expoſtulation of God with Cain.

Let us proceed then to obſerve *why* and *when* God inſtituted this Rite; after which the *Foundation* of that *Difference*, which God made between the Oblations of the two Brothers, will eaſily appear.

Adam was created happy and immortal, and being a Free-Agent had it in his power to ſecure the continuance, or incur the forfeiture, of thoſe Bleſſings. Innocence preſerv'd was the tenure, by which he held his high priviledges; and to the preſervation of that Innocence God had contributed every thing he could, conſiſtently with the freedom of human action. In his infinite wiſdom he laid one poſitive and eaſy reſtraint on him, to preſerve in his mind a due ſenſe of that dependency, which muſt be the character, and indeed is the happineſs of created Beings: and what in his wiſdom he thus propos'd, for the trial of human duty, his holineſs was concern'd to prevent the violation of. Hence that awful denunciation

— *In the day thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die.*

God having thus, by an eſtabliſh'd law, denounced Death to Sin, the execution of that law, one way or other, became as neceſſary to the vindication of the divine Attributes, as the firſt enacting it. For tho' the Mercy of God is a gracious concern for his Creatures, and their Welfare; yet the Juſtice of God is a jealous concern for Himſelf, and his own Glory: and therefore it was become neceſſary, that the Puniſhment ſo threaten'd to Sin, ſhould be inflicted, in caſe of Sin; and no deliverance granted, but on ſuch conditions as the Deity offended ſhould think equivalent to the Puniſhment of the Offender, and therefore worthy his acceptance [k]. This is what Divines properly call *Satisfaction*, *Expiation* and *Atonement*; the neceſſity of which ariſes from the neceſſity of Puniſhment, the neceſſity of Puniſhment from the divine denunciation of Miſery and Death to Sin, and that denunciation from the infinite Holineſs (or, which is the ſame, the infinite Averſion to Sin) in the Deity.

Now Adam and his Wife fell — and therefore, the Covenant being broke, their Happineſs loſt with their Innocence, and their Lives forfeited by their Tranſgreſſion, the conſe-

k See Dr. Turner, Boyle's Lect. Serm. Vol. II. p. 373.

quence

quence might be reaſonably expected to be the immediate deſtruction of the Offenders. But God, *whoſe thoughts are not as our thoughts*, even here found a method to puniſh, and yet preſerve; *in the midſt of Judgment remembring Mercy*. The Offenders loſt their Happineſs, yet did not become miſerable; they became mortal, but did not die immediately.

For tho' the juſt demerit of their Tranſgreſſion was — that their *Bodies* ſhould die, or be immediately diſſolv'd, without the poſſibility of a Reſurrection; and — that their *Souls* ſhould be conſign'd over to Remorſe and Torment, which for its greatneſs is term'd the Second Death, and for its duration Eternal Death; yet God (ſo adoreable is his clemency!) was pleas'd to ſave the Offenders, as monuments of his grace, and objects even of his favour. They had no ſooner been ſeduced to Sin, but he promis'd them a Saviour, to counter-act the ruinous deſign of their hoſtile Seducer; a Saviour — who, by reſcuing their *Bodies* from the Grave, ſhould give them a Second and Eternal *Life*, at the general Reſurrection; and, by redeeming their *Souls*, ſhould put it in their power to make that Second and Eternal Life, a Life of *Eternal Happineſs*.

But as the Life of the Firſt Pair was thus abſolutely forfeited; and as, in the divine Appointment of things, *without ſhedding of Blood*

there

there was to be no Remiſſion; it became neceſſary, that *Blood*, which is *the Life*, ſhould be ſhed, in order to the *Remiſſion* of their Tranſgreſſion: and this Blood or Life muſt have been either the Blood or Life of themſelves, or of ſome other in their ſtead. The rigour of the Law could have been only executed in the very Letter of the Sanction; and ſince that ordain'd the Malefactor's *own* Death, all ſhort of that was the Lawgiver's departing from his Right: and as God, the Lawgiver, was at full liberty to depart ſo far as he judg'd convenient, he might chooſe what Compenſation he pleas'd, and upon what conditions; and *why*, and *when* the effects of his goodneſs ſhould be ſtill ſuſpended. For any thing leſs than the abſolute forfeiture of the Life of the Offender muſt be look'd upon as the act of infinite grace and mercy.

This Compenſation then God firſt promis'd the Offenders themſelves, and in the fulneſs of time accepted at the hands of his own Son; for the Son of God, voluntarily offering his own Life a Victim to the Divine Juſtice, the Father accepted it as a vicarious Ranſom. The *Equity* of this *Commutation*, or *Satisfaction*, has been often demonſtrated [1]; and the *Fitneſs* and *Propriety* of it are equally conſpicuous. For Death being the Puniſhment of Sin, an

1 See Dr. Stanhope's Serm. Boyle's Lect. Vol. I. p. 794.

Atonement

Atonement for Sin could not be made by a Sinner, whose Life (as such) was forfeited to the Divine Justice; and, consequently, could not have the least pretence to Merit and Expiation. Hence the impossibility of our being redeem'd by *Man*. Christ therefore, who did no Sin, when he suffer'd the Punishment of Sin, became a proper and meritorious Sacrifice for Sinners. Again: as the Sins to be aton'd for were not only those of our First Parents, but of the whole Human Race; and as every Sin is the greatest affront to an infinitely holy Being; so the Atonement was requir'd to be of infinite value, which could only arise from the infinite Dignity of the person so atoning. And hence the impossibility of our being redeem'd by *Angels*. The Redeemer therefore, who appear'd in behalf of Mankind, seems to have been the only one that could cancel their Debts, and offer a plenary Satisfaction; and being both *God* from all Eternity, and becoming *Man* in the fulness of time, he was *partaker* of the *perfect Nature* of those Beings *for whom*, and of that Being *to whom*, he was to make Atonement; and consequently could clearly expiate the Guilt of the former, and fully satisfy the Justice of the latter [m].

In this short view of the nature of our Redemption, we see all the Attributes of the

m See Dr. Turner's Serm. Boyle's Lect. Vol. II. p. 393.

Deity

Deity glorified; *Mercy and Truth meeting together, Righteousness and Peace kissing each other:* the whole — a Scheme of the most righteous Mercy, and the most merciful Vengeance! We see the necessity of a mighty Ransom, and (tho' we acknowledge and adore the *Free* Grace of God herein displaid) we assert — that this Ransom was *fully* discharg'd by the meritorious Death of Christ, the Lamb of God, that expiated the Guilt and took away the Sins of the World. Not that this taking away Sin was *literally* or in a natural sense true, so that Sins committed were render'd uncommitted, (which is physically impossible) but *legally* or in a judicial sense; so that the Offenders were absolv'd from the guilt, and freed from the punishment of their past Sins; and remain'd, *upon their Repentance and future Obedience*, fit Objects of the Divine Favour [n].

Such then was the Redemption, which rescued lost Mankind, and was promis'd our first Parents in those few but comprehensive words — *The Seed of the Woman shall bruise the Serpent's Head.* But tho' the infinite goodness of God admitted the virtue of this Redemption to commence and operate from the Æra of this Promise; his infinite wisdom decreed that

n See Dr. Turner's Serm. Boyle's Lectures, Vol. II. p. 374.

about

about four thouſand years ſhould paſs away, before it was to be in fact accompliſh'd [o].

Hence then aroſe the Inſtitution of Animal Sacrifices; namely—to keep alive in the world, thro' this long ſucceſſion of ages, the belief of and reliance upon the *future* Redemption; while every innocent Animal, ſo ſlain, was to be a ſtanding *Prophecy* of the great immaculate Sacrifice afterwards to be offer'd up once for all. —An Inſtitution this ſo expreſſive of the thing

o Heb. IX. 25, 26. *Nor yet that Chriſt ſhould offer himſelf often, as the High Prieſt entereth into the holy place every year, with the Blood of others*; (FOR THEN MUST HE OFTEN HAVE SUFFERED SINCE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD:) *but now, once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himſelf.* On theſe words Bp Weſton obſerves—that from the oppoſition preſs'd here, and elſewhere, between Animal Sacrifices and the Sacrifice of Chriſt, (as to the Space to which their virtues could be extended) one may be determin'd to interpret the ETERNAL *Redemption obtained for us* by Chriſt (Heb. IX. 12.) to be ſuch as reaches to *all Times* and *Ages* of Men; ſince the Original does very well agree to it. We conſtrue it therefore (ſays that learned Prelate) *the Redemption of Ages*, of *All* Ages and Generations; available to redeem them from their Sins thro' every period of each of them. For as to the Generations, which paſſed *before* the Blood of this Redemption was ſhed; we ſay, that every Perſon of them, that obtain'd Forgiveneſs, obtain'd it *ſolely* in virtue of that *future* Blood-ſhedding; and that *all the Sacrifices for Sin* of the *Patriarchs*, BEFORE, or after *the Flood*, and thoſe appointed by the *Law*, had no acceptance, but for *the ſake* of that *One* Oblation, which they ſhadow'd and foreſhew'd. Serm. Vol. II. p. 189 &c.

thereby ſignified, that it demands a wiſdom more than human to contrive it; and could only be, as a Type, appointed by him, who alone foreknew the nature of the Antitype.

Reaſon indeed teaches us to maintain with St. Paul — *that the blood of Bulls and of Goats could not take away Sin*; but then, what that could not effect by any *inherent fitneſs*, might be effected by a divine poſitive appointment of it, as a *medium of conveyance:* and therefore the Blood of ſuch Animals, when offer'd up to God, was to be eſteem'd by Men as expreſſive of, and typifying, for a time, the Blood of the True Redeemer; by the actual effuſion of which all its prophetic and ſymbolical repreſentations were to be done away — Like the Moon, which having no intrinſic brightneſs, ſhines only by a light borrow'd from a nobler Body; and diſappears, at the riſing of the Sun, as being no longer of ſervice to Mankind.

We have now ſeen that Animal Sacrifice was inſtituted *by God*, for *what reaſon*, and at *what period of time*; but, with regard to the latter, it may be proper to ſubjoin a few obſervations more. That this Rite was enjoin'd ſoon after the Tranſgreſſion of our firſt Parents in Paradiſe, appears evident now from various conſiderations. In particular, it may be ask'd — What was the *end* of ſuch Sacrifice? Was is not the

the instituted means of procuring *pardon for Sin?* And was not Adam the *first Sinner?* And was not the Transgression in Paradise the *first Sin?* Certainly no point of time then can be fix'd upon as more proper, rather none so proper, for the institution of a Rite typifying the future Death of the Redeemer of Mankind, as when the Redeemer was first promis'd, and when Mankind began to want the benefits of his Death, and the means of Reconciliation. It has been already prov'd, that Abel brought an Animal Sacrifice, when his Father was not yet one hundred and thirty years old; and every reason that can be given for the Divine Institution in command to *him at that time*, will be much stronger for its being given in command to *his Father at the Fall.* And that his Father actually did Sacrifice seems now clearly deducible from the divine history, and that remarkable passage in it — *of God's making for the first Pair Coats of Skins.* But this has been consider'd at large in the preceding Dissertation [p].

If then God commanded Adam to offer Animal Sacrifice, and the practice of this Rite was design'd to be of such eminent service as well as consolation, not to him only, but his sons after him; we may reasonably suppose that he was careful to inform his sons of the Divine In-

p Page 68 &c.

ſtitution, Uſe, and Neceſſity of it; that ſo *they alſo might be Heirs of the Promiſe.* But we have not only probability for our ſupport here; for we read, that Abel, Adam's ſecond ſon, *did* offer an Animal Sacrifice, and conſequently muſt have been made acquainted with the Inſtitution by his Father; and, no doubt, he had ſeen his Father frequently perform the ſacred ſolemnity. But if Abel was thus happy in the leſſons, and inſtructed by the example of his Father; certainly his elder brother enjoy'd the ſame opportunities, and had heard the importance of the Rite as frequently inculcated.

The queſtion therefore is — Why did not Cain alſo offer an Animal Sacrifice? He had been told, that God inſtituted it — he had ſeen his Father perform it — he ſaw his Brother perform it — and why did He himſelf neglect it? That there was a communication of Subſtance or Property between the two Brothers, is plain; for if *Abel* brought of the Fruit of the Ground, which *Cain* preſided over, as being the *Huſbandman*; certainly *Cain* might have brought of the Firſtlings of the Flock, which *Abel* had the care of, as being the *Shepherd.* The reaſon then, why Cain neglected it, muſt be either — becauſe he did not think himſelf a *Sinner*; and ſo had no *need* of a *Sacrifice*; or, becauſe he did not believe the *Uſe* and *Efficacy* of that *Divine Inſtitution.* But as there is no Man, who

who liveth, and ſinneth not; ſo no Man can be inſenſible that he has ſometimes ſinn'd. Wherefore, as he could not neglect this Rite from a perſuaſion of his being Sinleſs; it remains, that he muſt have neglected it, thro' a disbelief of its Uſe and Efficacy. Tho', perhaps, both ſuppoſitions may be better united; and Cain will then appear to have taken *little* notice of his Sins, and *leſs* of the method inſtituted by God for the expiation of them.

The Offering, which Cain brought, has been conſtantly look'd upon as an Act of Piety, for the time when offer'd; and it is generally agreed, that it would have been accepted by God, had the Offerer been unblameable in the other circumſtances of his Oblation [q]. And if this be true, St. John, when he tells us [r], that *Cain's behaviour* on this occaſion *was evil*, muſt be underſtood to mean — that Cain ſinn'd, not in bringing what he brought, but in neglecting what he ſhould have brought; evidencing thereby a flagrant diſreſpect of the divine goodneſs, in the violation of ſo gracious a command. Approach God he did, and with an appearance of duty ſeem'd to exerciſe the virtue of Gratitude; but, having not Faith, he

q Lege latâ, Deus inſtituit Oblationes ex Primitiis, minimè id facturus, ſi iis ritè peractis nullo modo oblectabatur. Heidegger Exerc. 5. Sec. 22.

r 1 John III. 12.

paid

paid no regard to the Inſtitution of Animal Sacrifice, tho' enjoin'd his Father by God himſelf. And ſurely his Offering, tho' made as an acknowledgment of dependence on God for the good things of this life, cannot be ſuppos'd acceptable to God; when the Sinner, that offer'd it, dar'd be confident of his Maker's favour, tho' he deſpis'd his Inſtitution; and to appear as ſerene as Innocence could make him, when his Mind was corrupted by Pride, and blacken'd by Infidelity.

Whereas Abel, with a decent gratitude and humble piety, brings his Offering, as a *dependent* Creature; and a Sacrifice alſo, as a *Sinner* [s]: and ſo compleated what was afterwards (under the Jewiſh Law) eſteem'd as a perfect and compleat Oblation — a *Mincha*, or unbloody Offering, added to a *Mactation*, or bloody Sacrifice [t]. Abel was deeply ſenſible, that all he enjoy'd was the gift of God; and he acknowledg'd the beneficence of the Donor, by conſecrating a Part as a thankſgiving for the Whole. Conſcious alſo of his own frailty, he acknowledg'd his Life forfeited by a defective obedience to the divine Will; and there-

s In cultu Spirituali, non debet a gratiarum actione abeſſe ſupplicatio pro beneficiorum continuatione; neque a Supplicatione gratiarum actio. Cloppenburg Sacrif. Patriarchal. Schola Sacra, p. 5.

t Levit. XXIII. 10 &c.

fore

fore, in the full assurance of Faith, offer'd up an Animal Oblation, to obtain Pardon for his Misconduct, and conciliate the divine Favour.

There is in the Epistle of St. Jude [u] a short passage, which has greatly perplex'd the Interpreters of it; but which may probably receive light from, and reflect light upon the Subject we are now considering. The words are—*Wo unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain.* Let us therefore see, whether a meaning may not be affix'd to *the way of Cain*, that will coincide with the Apostle's argument, and illustrate the character of Cain, agreeably to those ideas we have just been forming of him. It is plain from the whole of the Epistle, that St. Jude is cautioning his Christian Brethren against such false Teachers, as then infested the Church, and perverted the doctrines of the Gospel; Teachers, that were at the same time *Mockers*, and denied with derision that fundamental article of Christianity — the Redemption of the World by Jesus Christ. For in Verse the 3d we read — *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common Salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you, that you contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints.* 4. *For there are certain Men crept in unawares, ungodly Men, turning the Grace of God into Lasciviousness, and denying*

u Verse the 11th.

the

the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ—or, as it may, perhaps, be render'd more consistently with the Apostle's Design — *And denying Jesus Christ, our only Master, God and Lord.*

Now as it is against Men of this Character that the Apostle exerts himself, we may observe a propriety in his adding — *Wo unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain.* For Cain, we have seen, slighted the Promise of a Redeemer, which was reveal'd to his Father; despis'd the Institution of Sacrifice, which was typical of that Redeemer; and so rejected him that was to come, even *the Seed of the Woman*, that was to *bruise the Serpent's Head.* And as Cain was too proud to acknowledge his own Sins, and so self-sufficient, as to despise and mock at the doctrine of a Saviour; he seems to have preach'd the same infidel and conceited notions to his Children. For St. Jude here assures us, that *Enoch, who was the Seventh from Adam* (and whose Prophecies were therefore deliver'd on account of the impious principles of the Sons of Cain) *prophesied, saying* [w] —*Behold! the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their*

w See Bp Sherlock's Opinion on this passage, Dissertat. I. p. 189. And Bp Cumberland, Orig. Gent. Antiq. p. 406.

ungodly

ungodly deeds, and of all their hard ſpeeches which ungodly ſinners have ſpoken againſt him [x]. So that we may fairly conclude — that the Apoſtle here conſider'd the character of Cain in the ſame light, in which we have before view'd it.

We have before us then, in theſe Brothers, two Perſons eſſentially diſtinguiſh'd in their characters by their different behaviour towards God; and therefore it is conſonant to reaſon, that God ſhould diſtinguiſh in his behaviour towards them: how otherwiſe is the honour of God inviolate? The Patriarch Abraham's expoſtulation with the Deity [y] may be here urg'd with propriety—*That be far from Thee, to treat the Righteous as the Wicked; and that the Righteous ſhould be as the Wicked, that be far from Thee! ſhall not the Judge of all the Earth do right?* And what Equity can be greater, what Juſtice ſhine forth more illuſtriouſly, than for God to *reject* the Offering of *an haughty Cain*, when he disbelieves the uſe, and deſpiſes the benefit of Animal Sacrifice—a divine Rite, in-

x Quilibet autem hæc examinans ratiocinetur accuratius —, an non Cain ita dura contra Deum fuerit locutus, quod contra hoſce ritus Sacrificiorum protervè egerit, peccatum ſuum non ſatis agnoverit, non magnifecerit uſum Pœnitentiæ, non confirmationem Remiſſionis peccatorum, non Gratiam divinam in futuro Meſſiâ promiſſam. Franzii Schola Patriarcharum, p. 46.

y Gen. XVIII. 25.

ſtituted for his own Salvation; and to *accept* the ſame Offering from *an humble Abel*, becauſe accompanied with an Animal Sacrifice, in a ready compliance with the divine Injunction? *Righteous is the Lord in all his ways, and juſt in all his dealings with the Children of Men*; and therefore *the Lord had reſpect unto Abel, and alſo to his Mincha*, or Offering, becauſe accompanied with a Sacrifice; *but unto Cain, and to his Mincha*, or Offering, *he had not reſpect*, becauſe he brought no Sacrifice.

The FOUNDATION then of this DIFFERENCE, which God manifeſted *between theſe two Offerers*, ſeems now clear and rational; and to be a Difference, not ariſing from any arbitrary deciſion or Partiality in the Deity, but laid deep in the very Nature of the Oblations, and grounded upon Reaſon and Equity. And this Interpretation will, I hope, appear with ſome ſmall advantage, after the various unſatisfactory accounts already given; the greateſt part of which have been thought to conduce but little to, however calculated for, the Credit of the Sacred Hiſtory.

Such, for inſtance, is the Opinion, which commonly prevail'd of old, that the Difference here ſhewn by God was occaſion'd by *a different kind of Diviſion*, which the two Brothers made of their Oblations. This notion, tho' grounded on the tranſlation which the LXX have given

given of the ſeventh Verſe in this fourth Chapter, does not ſeem to have a proper foundation in the original account of this matter. And therefore the Emperor Julian, that cunning and avow'd Enemy of Revelation, laid hold of this Opinion in order to expoſe the Hiſtory. For he puts this very queſtion to a Chriſtian, with whom he was diſputing — Why, *ſays he*, did God accept Abel, and reject Cain? The Anſwer was, that Abel *divided* his Offering *better* than Cain. Upon which he asks, Wherein that better Diviſion conſiſted—urging it with an impious confidence, becauſe he knew ſuch an opinion could not be defended to ſatiſfaction: and indeed his Opponent took the wiſeſt way of anſwering him — by ſilence; chooſing to drop, what he had no rational foundation for defending [z]. This then is one of the many Opinions, which have diſcredited the Hiſtory before us.

Such alſo is the Opinion—that God accepted Abel, and rejected Cain; becauſe the one was a good, and the other a bad Man. But, tho' it is true that *the Sacrifice of the Wicked is an abomination to the Lord*, yet 'tis evident that the divine approbation and rejection were here occaſion'd, not by the antecedent Lives of the

z See Julian's Words in *Cyrill. contra Julian.* Lib. X. p. 347. Edit. Spanhem. Lipſiæ.

Offerers, but the nature and concomitant circumſtances of their preſent Oblations.

For this reaſon others (and theſe indeed a numerous body) have aſſerted, that this Difference was made, becauſe the elder Brother did not bring of the Firſt or Beſt of his Fruits, as the younger did of the Firſtlings of his Flock. But this Opinion ſeems alſo very weakly grounded, and inadequate to the explication of the Hiſtory; for whether Cain did or did not bring of his Firſt-Fruits cannot be determin'd from the Original, and therefore neither ſuppoſition can ſupport an argument on the caſe before us. Beſides: this account (ſuppoſing it better grounded than it really is) cannot take place, becauſe it oppoſes the ſolution of it, which is given by St. Paul.

It has been alſo ſaid—that Cain was rejected, becauſe he came with an intention againſt his Brother's Life; but ſurely this is ſtrange enough, when it is as clear as the Sun, that his reſolution againſt his Brother's Life was not antecedent to, but the very conſequence of his being rejected, when he found his Brother accepted by God.

It would be as endleſs, as it is unneceſſary, to produce more of the ſtrange accounts given of the point before us; becauſe it is not, ſo immediately, the buſineſs of this Attempt to point out the abſurd Comments upon it, as to ſearch

after

after a rational Interpretation of it. There are indeed ſome, whoſe Obſervations on this important piece of hiſtory well deſerve the Thanks of Mankind; but it does not ſeem to appear — that All the Particulars had been obſerv'd, and uniformly explain'd together.

This therefore the preſent Diſſertation endeavours to perform; with what ſucceſs, muſt be ſubmitted to the Judgment of others. It may, however, be preſum'd—that there appears from the preceding Obſervations to ariſe a proper foundation for the diſtinction made by God on this occaſion: ſince the grateful Offering and Thanks of Abel, accompanied with the proper marks of his Repentance, and Obedience to the Divine Commands, muſt be ſuppos'd acceptable to God; when the ſame Gratitude of Cain might be rejected, becauſe not accompanied with Sorrow for his Sins, or Faith in the Method inſtituted by God for his Forgiveneſs.

The New Teſtament gives us two remarkable Characters, which, for their ſimilitude to the two former, and the ſame contraſt in both, may be here properly ſubjoin'd; eſpecially as they mutually illuſtrate each other — and theſe are the Characters of the PHARISEE and the PUBLICAN, as deſcrib'd by St. Luke. Theſe Two, it ſeems, went up into the Temple together, as did Cain and Abel to their place of

Sacred

Sacred Aſſembly. The *Phariſee*—a Man highly opinionated of his own Righteouſneſs, advances, like *Cain*, to offer up not a Prayer, but a Thankſgiving—he could not ſtoop to the low acknowledgment of Sin; but exalts his own Character, by dwelling on the guilt and wretchedneſs of his Companion. While the *Publican*, like *Abel*, with a pious Penitence and a graceful Humility, dwells upon his own unfitneſs to approach the Deity; and, ſmiting upon his Breaſt, utters this powerful Petition — *God be merciful to me, a Sinner!* Our Saviour's Inference alſo is applicable to the caſe before us — *I tell you, that this Man went down to his houſe juſtified, rather than the other*; that is (when freed from the Hebrew Idiom) — *this Man returned juſtified* (or eſteem'd righteous) *and not the other*. For the words of Solomon are expreſs — *He that covereth his Sins, ſhall not proſper; but whoſo confeſſeth and forſaketh them, ſhall have Mercy.* And let us alſo remember that ſtanding Rule in the Divine Oeconomy, deliver'd by a greater than Solomon—*He, that exalteth himſelf, ſhall be abaſed; but he, that humbleth himſelf, ſhall be exalted.*

St. Paul draws an Obſervation from the Behaviour of Abel before conſider'd, which is well worth our notice; namely — that *Abel, being dead, yet ſpeaketh.* And as Abel's Example is held

held out to us by the Apoſtle, to excite not only our Praiſe, but our Imitation; it may not be improper to conclude with a few ſhort, but weighty Leſſons, which this Preacher of Righteouſneſs ſpeaketh to us from the Grave. And theſe are — that with a decent Solemnity we obſerve the Weekly Return of an Holy Reſt unto the Lord — that we cultivate in our Minds, and evidence in our Actions, a conſtant Gratitude to God and Man — that we reſt not however in the exerciſe of Moral Virtues, but pay a dutiful and devout obedience to thoſe Poſitive Inſtitutions, which are enjoin'd by the Word of God — that we exerciſe as lively a Faith in the Redeemer now come, as he did before his coming; and let this divine Faith equally influence our Conduct — that True Religion has always ſubſiſted upon the ſame Principles of Faith and Obedience; tho' differently expreſs'd, according to the different exigencies of different Ages — and that the Holy Scriptures contain a regular and conſiſtent Hiſtory of Providence, ſuperintending for the Salvation of Mankind, and bleſſing the World with gradual diſcoveries of Knowledge; ſo that what in the firſt Ages was a promiſing Dawn brighten'd up into a glorious Morning, and is now eſtabliſh'd in a perfect Day.

FINIS.

A N

A P P E N D I X

TO THE

TWO DISSERTATIONS

LATELY PUBLISH'D

By Benjamin Kennicott of *Wadham* College:

OXFORD.

AN APPENDIX TO THE TWO PRECEDING DISSERTATIONS.

PAge 12. Line 20. Let it be once granted, *ſays Bp. Bull*, that Man, if he had continued obedient, ſhould have enjoy'd an everlaſting Life; and any man of reaſon, that ſhall more cloſely conſider the matter, will preſently collect — that this Life ſhould not, could not in any congruity be perpetuated in the Earthly Paradiſe: and therefore the Man was, in the deſign of God, after a certain period of time, to have been tranſlated to a higher State, i. e. a celeſtial Bliſs. *See his Works*, Vol. 3. p. 1079.

18 — 11. To theſe Authors it may be proper to add one, whoſe Judgment is univerſally allow'd and admir'd; and it is the great Bp. Bull, juſt before cited. The Tree of Life, *ſays he*, was ſo call'd, becauſe it was EITHER A SACRAMENT *and divine Sign*, OR ELSE A NATURAL MEANS *of Immortality*; that is, becauſe he, that ſhould have us'd it, would (either by

the natural Virtue of the Tree it ſelf continually repairing the Decays of Nature, or elſe by the Power of God) have liv'd for ever.

Here then we ſee the ſame perplexity, which has ſo remarkably diſtinguiſh'd other Writers on the ſame ſubject. But it is worth obſerving, that the Bp, tho' he ſpeaks with ſuch uncertainty in the words juſt mention'd, ſeems ſenſible that — to underſtand the Tree of Life as deſign'd to operate *as a Natural Means* of Immortality — was not ſufficiently defenſible. For, mentioning this Tree a ſecond time, he refers its virtue *entirely and ſolely to the Power of God*; It is evident, *ſays he*, from the Scriptures and the perpetual Tradition of the Church, that the Firſt Man ſhould by the Grace of God and by a certain divine Power (*of which the Tree of Life was a Sacrament*) have perſever'd in a bleſſed Immortality; and never have died, if he had not ſinn'd. Vol. 3. pag. 1069, 1177. It appears from hence, that the Bp. gave up one part of his Alternative, i. e. that the Tree of Life was *a Natural Means* of Immortality; and that it could not be deſign'd to convey Life *Sacramentally*, ſufficiently appears (I preſume) from page the 18th &c. of the Firſt Diſſertation.

24 — 27. Indeed the Rabbinical Commentators, with their uſual Acuteneſs and Sagacity, have endeavour'd to provide againſt an Objection of this kind; by making the Tree of

Life ſo large, that it would take a man 500 Years to travel round the Trunk of it. But tho' the abſolute Abſurdity of this is ſo glaring, I ſhall give the words of *R. Juda*, as they are quoted in *Bereſchit Rabba R. Moſeh*—עץ החיים מהלך חמש מאות שנה ולא סוף גופו מהלך תק שנה אלא אפילו קורתו מהלך חמש מאות שנה: Lignum Vitæ iter quingentorum annorum obtinet; & non ſolum finis *climatis* (perhaps rather *clematis* — κληματος) ſui obtinet iter quingentorum annorum, ſed etiam ſola groſſities *Stipitis* occupat ſpatium itineris quingentorum annorum. *Raymund's Pugio Fidei*, p. 567.

25—15. There is another Difficulty attending this point, which ariſes from the common conſtruction of ולקח גם מעץ החיים *and take alſo of the Tree of Life.* Adam, *it is ſaid*, eat of the Tree of Knowledge, and was thereupon expell'd Paradiſe, leſt he ſhould eat *Alſo* of the Tree of Life. Does not this imply, that he had not eaten of the Tree of Life before? And if he had not, certainly he never did eat of it; and if he never did eat of it, then the creation of it was of no manner of uſe or ſervice to him.

69—13. Cloppenburg appears here to have been miſtaken; for עור ſignifies *a Man's Skin* in Job 19, 26; and Lam. 5, 10. But the argument does not want this ſupport; it being (as I conceive) capable of recommending itſelf

from the nature of the words, and the very early Institution of Animal Sacrifice. As to the Observation on the Samaritan Version, I have had the Honour of being inform'd by a Person of very eminent Character that the Samaritan Word is as doubtful in its signification as the Hebrew, and leaves the Sense equally undetermin'd.

73 — 24. That חיה sometimes carries with it the Idea of *Happiness*, appears from the use of it in Psalm 38, 19; where the Psalmist, after complaining of his own Sufferings, says ואיבי חיים עצמו *But mine Enemies, living happily, are become mighty* — or; *But mine Enemies live happily, and are become mighty.* For the Antithesis is not between David's dying and their living, but his miserable and their flourishing Condition. And thus Bp. Patrick paraphrases the words — *And what cannot they do, who, while I lie in this weak and miserable condition, are flourishing and prosperous, strong and mighty?* Piscator renders חיים here by *vitam lætam degunt*; and Gejerus, quoted in Poole's Synopsis on Ps. 22, 27, says חיים *est pro vitâ felici.*

97 — 27. There is another Passage in the Revelation of St. John, which has been thought to deserve some notice; and it is — *To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God:* ch. 2, 7. An Answer to this is implied in the

Diſſertation, p. 94 &c. but I ſhall however obſerve here — that Ezekiel ſaw on each ſide of the River very many Trees of Food — that St. John, tranſcribing Ezekiel's Deſcription, (ch. 22, 2.) ſays, he ſaw on each ſide of the River ξυλον ζωης — that as ξυλον muſt frequently be render'd *Trees*, and as St. John copies Ezekiel, the word ſhould be render'd *Trees* here — that St. John therefore evidently ſpeaks of more Trees of Life than one — and that if he meant *Trees of Life* by ξυλον ζωης in ch. 22, he certainly meant the ſame by it in ch. 2d; for, that being part of the ſame Viſion, the ſame Phraſe muſt be intended to convey the ſame Ideas. Hence the conſtruction of the Paſſage is evident — *To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Trees of Life, which are in the midſt of the Paradiſe of God.* Now if St. John alludes to Ezekiel, and Ezekiel to Moſes; then we have a fair Proof — that the Trees of Food in Paradiſe were the Trees of Life. It may be alſo obſerv'd — that בתוך and εν μεσω do not always ſignify *in the middle*, but ſometimes only *in*; as will ſufficiently appear hereafter. That St. John ſo meant, appears from comparing the above-mention'd two Places; and, as the Tree of Life, ſuppoſing the Phraſe ſingular, could not be plac'd in the very center of the Garden, ſo neither could the Trees of Life, if we take the Phraſe plurally. Wherefore we may conclude — that the

Trees of Life were plac'd *in the Garden*, and not *in the middle of it*; or, at moſt, only *near* or *around the middle*, which may be admitted without prejudice to the preſent Argument.

99 — 20. This Tranſpoſition of the Particle ινα is very remarkably juſtified by a neceſſity of tranſpoſing the very ſame Particle in the beginning of the very ſame Verſe — Και τη υπερβολη των αποκαλυψεων ινα μη υπεραιρωμαι —. See alſo Rom. 11, 31. 1 Cor. 9, 15. 2 Cor. 2, 4. and Galat. 2, 10.

102 — 16. If any Difficulty ſhould be ſtill imagin'd to ariſe from the conſtruction of ch. 2. 9, which has been here given; there is another way of rendring the words (conſiſtently with the Scheme of this Diſſertation) which probably will clear it up, and is, perhaps, the true Interpretation of the place. For this Obſervation I moſt readily acknowledge myſelf oblig'd (as I am for the whole of my acquaintance with Hebrew Letters) to Dr. Hunt, the very worthy Profeſſor of the Hebrew and Arabic Languages.

Gen. 2. 9. *And the Lord God cauſed to ſpring up out of the Ground* (in general) *every Tree that is deſireable to the Sight and good for Food; and every Tree of Life*, or—*and the Trees of Life* (he cauſed to ſpring up) *in the Garden, and the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.* In this view then we are to conſider the firſt part of the Verſe as referring to the Creation of Trees

thro' all the reſt of the world, and the ſecond as referring to the Trees of Paradiſe only: and this for the following Reaſons — 1ſt. The Hiſtorian in this 2d Chapter, recapitulating and enlarging upon ſome things only mention'd in the firſt Chapter, treats of the Creation of *Plants* and *Herbs* in the 5th Verſe; but he takes no notice of the *Trees*, 'till he comes to the 9th Verſe, which we may therefore ſuppoſe intended for an account of the creation of Trees in general. 2dly. The word אדמה *Adamah* ſeems, thro' this and the next chapters, to ſignify the Earth or Ground OUT OF the Garden, in oppoſition and contradiſtinction TO the Garden.

Both theſe Points will probably appear, if we attend carefully to the Hiſtory. — Chap. 2. 4. *Theſe are the Generations of the Heavens and the Earth, when they were created; in the day that the Lord God made the Earth and the Heavens;* 5. *and every* PLANT *of the Field, before it was in the Earth; and every* HERB *of the Field, before it grew. For the Lord God had not cauſed it to rain upon the Earth, and there was not a Man to till the Ground* (Adamah); 6. *nor had there aſcended a Miſt from the Earth, and watered the whole face of the Ground* (Adamah). 7. *And the Lord God formed Man of the Duſt of the Ground* (Adamah; which *Adamah* was out of Paradiſe, as appears from Verſes the 8th and 15th of this Chapter, and Verſe the 23d of the next) —

8. *And the Lord God planted a Garden in Eden; and there he put the Man, whom he had formed* (without the Garden.) 9. *And out of the Ground* (Adamah) *had the Lord God caused to grow every Tree that was pleasant to the Sight, and good for Food; and in the Garden every Tree* (or, *the Trees*) *of Life, and the Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil.* 15. *And the Lord God took the Man, and put him into the Garden of Eden* — 16. *and commanded him, saying, Of every Tree* (כל עץ) *of the Garden thou mayest freely eat*; (here was a direct reference to one part of the description of Paradise in verse the 9th.) 17. *but of the Tree of Knowledge — thou shalt not eat*; (here the other part of the description is referr'd to.) 19. *And out of the Ground* (*Adamah*, meaning *the Ground in the several parts of the world*) *the Lord God formed every Beast of the Field, and every Fowl of the Air; and he* CAME *to Adam, to see what he would call them.* Chap. 3. 17. — *Cursed be the Ground* (Adamah, the Earth in general) *for thy sake* — 23. *Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden to till the Ground* (Adamah) *out of which he had been taken.*

Now as *Adamah* is thus us'd to signify *the Ground out of the Garden*, as distinct from and oppos'd to *the Garden*; we may fairly consider the first part of verse the 9th, which speaks of Trees of all sorts as created out of *Adamah*, to

mean the Trees which were created throughout the world; and the ſecond part to mean the Trees of Paradiſe. And if ſo, as there were Trees of Food in the Garden for the ſupport of Adam's Life, the phraſe עץ חיים muſt ſignify thoſe Trees of Food.

I ſhall obſerve here, that in Gen. 2. 7, we read ויפח באפיו נשמת חיים ויהי האדם לנפש חיה and, agreeably to the Senſe given to theſe words by the learned and ingenious Mr. Warburton, we have another argument in favour of the point before us. This Author renders נפש חיה *a living Animal* (confirm'd by Gen. 1. 20.) and נשמת חיים *the Breath of Life*; and paraphraſes the whole—*He breathed into this Statue the Breath of Life, and the Lump of Clay became a living Creature.* Div. Legat. Vol. 2. pag. 556. Edit. 3. Wherefore, if the *Breath* of חיים, with which God animated or inſpir'd the Clay or Body of Adam, ſignifies God's communicating to him *Animal Life*; the *Trees* of חיים were certainly the *Trees of Food*, which God appointed for the preſervation of *the ſame Animal Life*. It may be alſo obſerv'd here—that whereas ſome, from the duality (as they imagine) of the Noun חיים, would have the words נשמת חיים to be render'd *the Breath of* LIVES, as ſignifying the temporal and eternal Life, or the power of Exiſting in this and a future world; this is by no means inferr'd from the word, which evidently ſignifies nothing

more than *Life*, and is expresly confin'd to this mortal Life in the next Chapter, ver. 17th; *Cursed be the Ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days* (חייך) *of thy Life.*

There is indeed one thing to be vindicated in the preceding Explanation of Ch. 2. 9, and that is the rendring בתוך הגן IN *the Garden.* That בתוך does not always signify *in the middle*, but sometimes only *in*, has been observ'd before; but I shall here produce some of the many Instances that evidently prove it. Gen. 18. 24, 26 — Abraham, interceding with God for Sodom, says — *Peradventure there be fifty righteous* בתוך העיר IN *the City*; for certainly the least degree of judgment will convince any one, that Abraham could here mean nothing but *in the whole City*: and so in God's Answer we find the same phrase as evidently us'd in the same extent, verse the 26th. In Deut. 11. 3, we read ואת אתתיו ואת מעשיו אשר עשה בתוך מצרים לפרעה מלך מצרים ולכל ארצו: *And his Miracles, and his Acts which he did* IN *Egypt, unto Pharaoh King of Egypt, and unto all his Land.* Now that בתוך מצרים cannot be here render'd *in the midst of Egypt* is plain — because the Miracles, here spoken of were wrought by God *throughout all the Country of the Egyptians*; and so indeed we read in this very place — *Which he did not only unto Pharaoh, but also unto all his Land.* 1 Kings 11. 20 — *Whom Tahpenes weaned* בתוך בית פרעה IN *Pharaoh's House.* Zech. 8. 8 —

And I will bring them (THE JEWISH PEOPLE) *and they shall dwell* בתוך ירושלם IN *Jerusalem.* For *in the midst of Jerusalem* seems a very improper rendring, as the Inhabitants were to be the whole Jewish People. These Hebrew Instances then are express; and that the same use of this Phrase obtains also in Greek and Latin Authors, is well known to such as are acquainted with those Languages.

115 — 7. If *according to the word of the Lord* be not admitted as a proper Translation of את יהוה, perhaps we may properly render the words *according to the Lord*, in the sense in which David is said to be a Man *according to God's Heart*, Act. 13, 22; especially, as the New Man is said to be created κατα Θεον; Eph. 4, 24. And, in this sense also, the Phrase will be very expressive of that Hope, which Eve probably entertain'd of her Son's being born a Friend of God and the Redeemer of Mankind.

126 — 11. Tho' this Interpretation has by some been thought strictly defensible, yet as it has not by others (especially on account of the phrase ברך יהוה את יום השבת ויקדשהו Exod. 20, 11;) I shall observe here — that the words *God blessed the Seventh Day and sanctified* or *separated it for holy purposes* evidently imply, if they do not express, a Divine Command for the observation of a Weekly Sabbath; which is sufficient for the purpose of the present Argument.

183 — 20. There is another Paſſage, which is alſo very remarkably ſtrong in favour of ימים ſignifying *a Week*, as well as *a Year*. The Sacred Hiſtorian (Num. 9. 15 &c.) mentions the Cloud, which regulated the motions of the Iſraelites; informing us, that when the Cloud ſtopp'd, they pitch'd their tents; and when that advanc'd, they reſum'd their march. In verſe the 19th. he ſays — *When the Cloud continued over the Tabernacle* ימים רבים MANY DAYS (indeterminately) *then the Iſraelites journeyed not.* 20. *And ſo it was* (the ſame rule was obſerv'd) *when the Cloud was over the Tabernacle* ימים מספר (ημερας αριθμω Sept.) DAYS IN NUMBER i.e. any ſet number, or ſtated revolution of days. 22. או ימים או חדש או ימים *Whether it were for a* WEEK (the leſſer *Yamim*) *or for a* MONTH, *or for a* YEAR (the greater *Yamim*;) *they journeyed not.* So that here we have the Three great Diviſions or Periods of time expreſsly enumerated; aſcending in a regular gradation from the firſt or ſhorteſt to the ſecond or middle Cycle of Days, and from the ſecond or middle to the third or longeſt Cycle of Days — *Whether it were for a Week, or for a Month, or for a Year.*

198 — 10. πλειον indeed ſeems to ſignify more excellent in Matt. 12; 41, 42; but, as it is πλειον and not πλειων, the ſenſe even there is not clear, becauſe πλειον in the firſt caſe may agree with κηρυγμα. Yet, allowing the neceſſity

of it in these two verses, perhaps the word gives us the idea of *Quality* no where else in the New Testament; and the idea of *Quantity* (Number and Magnitude) is allow'd to be the leading, if not the only, idea arising from this Comparative.

206—22. To this Argument of Dr. Spencer's — that Sacrifices, consider'd as Gifts, might be owing to the observation of the prevalence of Gifts among Men — another Answer may be given, taken from the Rise of *Private Property*; and if *this* was not establish'd in the days of Cain and Abel, *Gifts* could not have been then in use. But for the ingenious Observations, which support this Answer, the Reader is indebted to Dr. Rutherforth, who was pleas'd to communicate them to me in the most obliging manner.

It seems reasonable to suppose, that Adam and his Sons preserv'd at first a Community of Goods; that while one took care of one article necessary for the support of Life, another a different, and a third a distinct from both &c. — the Fruits of the Earth were deposited in one common Granary, which supplied the wants of all. At first, while these wants were few, they might be satisfy'd without much labour; especially as the few then in the world had the whole world to range in, and what they did not meet with upon one spot they might find upon another. From this

Simplicity the Posterity of Cain seem first to have departed. The fears, which these were under, lest the guilt of their Parent might be punish'd by the rest of mankind, engag'd them (we find, Gen. 4. 17.) to unite together for their defence, and to build a City, where they might shut themselves up, and avoid the vengeance which was due to their Ancestor for the murder of his Brother. This Union of theirs form'd the first Society, and civiliz'd human Nature; for among these men we find the Inventors of Arts and Elegance; Tubalcain first instructing Artificers in Brass and Iron, and Jubal inventing Instruments of Music. But this Union, as it improv'd Mankind, so it necessarily encreas'd their Wants; for having but a small compass to range in, they could not so easily provide for themselves out of a common Stock as formerly. Hence hard Labour became unavoidable; that so, by improving their scanty Materials, they might answer those demands, which the close Confinement of all, and the attendance of some on other Employments, had of course introduc'd. Now we may infer from Scripture, that the Posterity of Cain were not much more virtuous than their Parent, with whom they liv'd; and therefore they had probably neither Industry, nor Justice, nor Benevolence enough to qualify them for providing equitably, and subsisting amicably upon one common Bottom.

For these reasons we may expect to find Private Property, or an Exclusive Right, first established in the Family of Cain. And accordingly we do find (Gen. 4. 22.) that *Jabal* was the Father or First Inventor of מקנה; which our English Translators (as if the Expression was Elliptical) have render'd — *The Father of such as have Cattle.* But Jabal could not be the First of such as had Cattle, because Abel was a Keeper of Sheep long before; and therefore, as the word מקנה signifies *Possession* of any sort however acquir'd (and is so render'd in the Syriac Version) the Historian seems to point out Jabal as the first man, who introduc'd Private Property or Possession properly his own.

The giving and receiving Gifts then could not be in use, before Property was introduc'd; for the notion of a Gift is absolutely unintelligible without admitting an exclusive Right in the Giver, as the Receiver is otherwise only presented with what was his own before. But if Private Property was introduc'd by Jabal, it did not exist in the days of Cain and Abel; and if not, it is impossible they should infer — that *Sacrifices*, as *Gifts*, might appease the Deity and procure his Favour, because *Gifts* had been observ'd to appease the Anger and procure the Favour of Men.