



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.



A  
C R I T I C A L  
I N Q U I R Y

I N T O T H E  
O P I N I O N S and P R A C T I C E

O F T H E

*Ancient Philosophers,*

C O N C E R N I N G T H E  
Nature of the SOUL and a FUTURE STATE  
And their Method of teaching by the  
D O U B L E D O C T R I N E.



In which are examin'd  
The Notion of Mr. JACKSON and Dr. SYKES  
concerning these Matters.

With a P R E F A C E  
By the Author of the DIVINE LEGATION, &c.

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed for C. DAVIS against Grays-Inn, Holborn.  
M D C C X L V I I .

[Price Two Shillings.]

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that this is crucial for the company's financial health and for providing a clear picture of its operations to stakeholders.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the data collection process, from identifying the sources of data to the actual collection and storage of the data.

3. The third part of the document describes the analysis of the data. It explains how the data is processed and analyzed to identify trends and patterns. This part also includes a discussion of the various statistical methods used in the analysis.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the results of the analysis. It provides a detailed overview of the findings and discusses their implications for the company. This part also includes a discussion of the various factors that may have influenced the results.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the conclusions drawn from the analysis. It provides a summary of the key findings and discusses the implications for the company's future operations. This part also includes a discussion of the various factors that may have influenced the results.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the recommendations for future research. It provides a list of specific areas that need to be further explored and discusses the various methods that can be used to conduct this research.

7. The seventh part of the document discusses the limitations of the study. It provides a list of the various factors that may have influenced the results and discusses the implications for the study's findings.

8. The eighth part of the document discusses the conclusions drawn from the study. It provides a summary of the key findings and discusses the implications for the company's future operations. This part also includes a discussion of the various factors that may have influenced the results.

9. The ninth part of the document discusses the recommendations for future research. It provides a list of specific areas that need to be further explored and discusses the various methods that can be used to conduct this research.

10. The tenth part of the document discusses the limitations of the study. It provides a list of the various factors that may have influenced the results and discusses the implications for the study's findings.

---



---

# P R E F A C E.

**T**HE following Sheets, written by a Gentleman whose Modesty would not suffer him to put his Name to them, were communicated to me as they came from the Press. As I have bidden adieu to Controversy, I was not displeas'd to find an important Truth so well defended. In endeavouring as I did, in the *Divine Legation*, to expose the *vain Babblings* of the *Greek Philosophy*, I imagin'd I had effectually serv'd the Interests of Revelation, and vindicated the Censures of the Propagators of it. The great Characteristic of our holy Faith is the Doctrine of *Life and Immortality*. Now there were two great Errors (explained in the *Divine Legation*, and defended in the following Treatise) in the *metaphysical* Speculations of the *Greek Philosophers*, concerning the Nature of *GOD*, and of the *SOUL*, which necessarily kept them from giving Credit to a Doctrine, highly probable in itself, and rendered so, even by themselves, from many moral Considerations perpetually preach'd up by them to the People. But it was their ill Fate to be determin'd, in their Opinions, rather by *metaphysical* than *moral* Arguments. Hence we see the Reason that, whenever the holy Apostles speak of, or hint at, the

Philosophers or Philosophy of *Greece*, which is not seldom, they always do it in Terms of Contempt and Abhorrence. On this Account I was neither ashamed nor afraid to shew at large, that the Reasons they had for so doing were just and weighty. Nor did I think myself at all concerned to manage the Reputation of a Set of Men, who, on the first Appearance of *Christianity*, most virulently opposed it by all the Arts of Sophistry and Injustice: “ And when, “ by the Force of its superior Evidence, they “ were at length driven into it, were no sooner “ *in* than they began to deprave and corrupt it. “ For, from their *profane and vain Babblings*, “ *Tertullian* assures us, every Heresy took its “ Birth. *Ipsi illi SAPIENTIÆ PROFESSORES,* “ *de quorum ingeniis omnis hæresis animatur* <sup>a</sup>. “ And, in another Place he gives us their *Genealogy*. *Ipsæ denique Hæreses à PHILOSOPHIA subornantur. Inde Æones & formæ nescio quæ, & trinitas hominis apud Valentinum: PLATONICUS fuerat. Inde Marconis Deus melior de tranquillitate, a STOICIS venerat; & uti anima interire dicatur, ab EPICUREIS observatur: ET UT CARNIS RESTITUTIO NEGETUR, DE UNA OMNIUM PHILOSOPHORUM SCHOLA SUMITUR: Et ubi materia cum Deo æquatur,*

<sup>a</sup> *Adv. Marc. l. i.* The Author of a Fragment concerning the *Philosophers* going under the Name of *Origen*, says the same thing: ἀλλ' ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς [Αἱρετικοῖς] τὰ δοξαζόμενα ἀρχὴν μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλήνων σοφίας λαβόντα, ἐκ δογμάτων φιλοσοφημένων, καὶ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΝ ἐπιχειρημένων καὶ ἀστρολόγων ἐμβρομένων.

P R E F A C E.

v

“ ZENONIS *Disciplina est*: Et ubi aliquid de  
 “ igneo Deo allegatur, HERACLITUS inter-  
 “ venit. Eædem Materiæ apud Hæreticos &  
 “ Philosophos volutantur; iidem retractatus im-  
 “ plicantur. Unde malum, & quare? & unde  
 “ homo, & quomodo? & quod proximè Valen-  
 “ tinus proposuit, unde Deus? Scilicet & de En-  
 “ thymesi, Ectromate inserunt ARISTOTELEM,  
 “ qui illis Dialecticam instituit, artificem stru-  
 “ endi & destruendi, versipellem in sententiis co-  
 “ actam, in conjecturis duram, in argumentis  
 “ operariam, contentione molestam, etiam sibi ipsi  
 “ omnia retractantem, nequid omnino tractaverit.  
 “ Hinc illæ fabulæ & genealogiæ indeterminabi-  
 “ les, & quæstiones infructuosæ & SERMONES  
 “ SERPENTES VELUT CANCER, a quibus nos  
 “ Apostolus refrænans<sup>b</sup>, &c. One would al-  
 “ most imagine, from these last Words, that  
 “ Tertullian had foreseen that Aristotle was to  
 “ be the Founder of the School Divinity.”

He observes, that the Heresy which *denies the Resurrection of the Body* arose out of the whole School of *Gentile Philosophy*. But he omits another, which we have shewn in the *Divine Legation* stood upon as wide a Bottom, namely, that which holds *the human Soul to be of the same Nature and Substance with God*; espoused, before his time, by the *Gnostics*; and afterwards, as we learn, by the following Words of St. *Austin*, by the *Manichæans* and *Priscillians*: “ Priscillianistæ, quos in Hispania  
 “ Priscillianus instituit, maxime Gnosticorum

<sup>b</sup> *De præsc. adv. Hæret.* p. 70, 71. Ed. Par. 1580.

“ & Manichæorum dogmata permixta sectan-  
 “ tur. Quamvis et ex aliis hæresibus in eas  
 “ sordes tanquam in sentinam quandam horri-  
 “ bili confusione confluerint. Propter occul-  
 “ tandas autem contaminationes & turpitudines  
 “ suas habent in suis dogmatibus, & hæc ver-  
 “ ba, Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli. *Hi*  
 “ *animas dicunt ejusdem naturæ atque substan-*  
 “ *tia, cujus est Deus*.”— Why the *Heathen*  
 Philosophers of our times should be so much  
 displeased to see their ancient Brethren shewn  
 for *Knives* in Practice and *Fools* in Theory, is  
 is not difficult to conjecture: But why any  
 Friend to Revelation should be offended at the  
 Force and Fidelity of the Drawing, I confess  
 I cannot yet see. For a stronger Proof of  
 the Necessity of the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*  
 would be hard to find than what I have there  
 given, That the *Sages of Greece*, with whom  
 all human Wisdom was supposed to be depo-  
 sited, had philosophized themselves out of the  
 most evident and useful Truth with which  
 Mankind hath any Concern. And what  
 more honourable Regard could be shewn to  
 the Authority of the Sacred Writers, than to  
 justify their Censure of the *Greek Philosophy*,  
 which both *Deists* and *Fanatics* have concur-  
 red to represent as a Condemnation of human  
 Learning in general!

But as we have often seen Writers deceived  
 in their Representations of *Pagan Antiquity*;  
 and while zealously busy in giving *such* as they

<sup>c</sup> *Aug. de Hæresibus.*



imagined favourable to *Christianity*, they have been all the time dis-serving it: Lest I too should be suspected to have fallen into the same Delusion, I shall beg leave to shew, that it is just such a Representation of *Antiquity* as is given in the *Divine Legation* which can possibly be of Service to our holy Religion. And that, consequently, if what we have there given be the *true*, it does much Service to it.

“ This will best appear by considering the  
 “ two usual Views Men have had, and the  
 “ consequent Methods they have pursued, in  
 “ bringing in *Pagan Antiquity* into the Scene.

“ Their Design has been either to illustrate  
 “ the *Reasonableness*, or to shew the *Necessity* of  
 “ *Christianity*.

“ If the *first*, their Way was to represent  
 “ *Antiquity*, as comprehending all the funda-  
 “ mental Truths, concerning God and the Soul,  
 “ which our holy Religion hath revealed. But  
 “ as greatly as this Representation was supposed  
 “ to serve their Purpose, the Infidels, we see,  
 “ have joined Issue with them; and from their  
 “ own *Fact*, have endeavoured to shew, with  
 “ much Plausibility of Reasoning, that there-  
 “ fore *Christianity* was not *necessary*: And this  
 “ very Advantage, *Tindal* (under Cover of a  
 “ Principle, which some modern Divines seemed  
 “ to afford him, of *Christianity's* being only a  
 “ Republication of the the Religion of Nature)  
 “ obtained against some Writers of great Name.

“ If their Design was to shew the *Necessity*  
 “ of *Christianity*, they have then taken the other  
 “ Course,

“ Course, and (perhaps, out of a Sense of the  
 “ former Mischief) run into the opposite Ex-  
 “ treme; in representing Antiquity as quite  
 “ ignorant of the first Principles of Religion,  
 “ and moral Duty. Nay, not only that it knew  
 “ nothing, but that nothing could be known :  
 “ For that human Reason was too weak to  
 “ to make Discoveries in these Matters. Con-  
 “ sequently, that *there was never any such thing*  
 “ *as natural Religion* : And what Glimmerings  
 “ of Knowledge Men had of this kind, were  
 “ only the dying Sparks of primitive Traditi-  
 “ on. Here again the Infidels turned their own  
 “ Artillery upon them, in order to dismount  
 “ that boasted *Reasonableness of Christianity*, on  
 “ which they had so much insisted : And in-  
 “ deed what room was there left to judge of  
 “ it, after human Reason had been represented  
 “ as so weak and blind ?

“ Thus while they were contending for the  
 “ *Reasonableness*, they destroyed the *Necessity* ;  
 “ and while they urged the *Necessity*, they risk-  
 “ ed the *Reasonableness of Christianity*. And  
 “ these Infidel Retortions had an almost irre-  
 “ sistible Force on the Principles our Advo-  
 “ cates seemed to go upon ; namely, *that Chri-*  
 “ *stianity was only a Republication of a primitive*  
 “ *Religion*.

“ It appears then, that the only View of  
 “ Antiquity which gives solid Advantage to the  
 “ *Christian Cause*, is such a one as shews na-  
 “ tural Reason to be *clear* enough to perceive  
 “ Truth, and the *Necessity* of its Deductions  
 “ when

“ when *propofed* and fhewn ; but not generally  
“ *ftong* enough to *discover* it, and draw right  
“ Deductions from it. Juft fuch a View we  
“ have given of Antiquity, as far as relates to  
“ the Point in queftion ; which we prefume to  
“ be the *true*, not only in that Point, but like-  
“ wife with regard to the State of natural Re-  
“ ligion in general : Where we find human  
“ Reason could penetrate very far into the ef-  
“ fential Difference of Things ; but wanting the  
“ true Principles of Religion, the Ancients nei-  
“ ther knew the Origin of Obligation, nor the  
“ Confequence of Obedience. *Revelation* has  
“ difcovered thofe Principles, and we now  
“ wonder, that fuch Prodigies of Parts and  
“ Knowledge could commit the grofs Abfurdi-  
“ ties, that are to be found in their beft Trea-  
“ tifes of Morality. Which yet does not hin-  
“ der us from falling into a greater and worfe  
“ Delufion. For having feen of late feveral ex-  
“ cellent Systems of Morals, under the Title of  
“ *The Principles of natural Religion*, that dif-  
“ claim the Aid of Revelation, we are apt to  
“ think them indeed the Discoveries of natural  
“ Reason ; and fo to regard their Excellencies  
“ as an Objection to the *Necessity* of any farther  
“ Light. The Pretence is plaufible ; but fure,  
“ there muft be fome Miftake at Bottom ; and  
“ the great Difference in point of Perfection,  
“ between thefe *imaginary* Productions of Rea-  
“ fon, and thofe *real* ones of the moft learned  
“ Ancients, will increafe our Suspicion. The  
“ Truth is, thefe modern System Writers had  
“ Aids,

“ Aids, which as they do not acknowledge, so,  
 “ I will believe, they did not perceive. These  
 “ Aids were the true Principles of Religion,  
 “ delivered by *Revelation*: Principles so clear  
 “ and evident, that they are now mistaken to  
 “ be amongst our first and simplest Ideas: But  
 “ those who have studied Antiquity, know the  
 “ Matter to be far otherwise.”

For, to conclude with the remarkable Words  
 of *Cicero*, “ Nam neque tam est acris acies in  
 “ naturis hominum & ingeniis, ut res tantas  
 “ quisquam, nisi monstratas, possit videre: ne-  
 “ que tanta tamen in rebus obscuritas, ut eas  
 “ non penitus acri vir ingenio cernat, si modo  
 “ adspexerit.”

Notwithstanding all that can be said, much  
 Clamour will ever attend Novelties, tho' never  
 so strongly proved, and tho' never so well di-  
 rected. But Truth seldom thrives the worse for  
 unreasonable Opposition: And it would seem  
 not to be far from its Establishment, when such  
 Writers as the following appear in it's Defence.  
 I could wish indeed he had had an Adversary  
 more worthy him: However, he has made the  
 best of a bad Reasoner. The Nature of his  
 Design has confined him rather to confute Mr.  
*Jackson's* Sentiments, than to explain his own;  
 yet he hath established those he undertook to  
 defend with such Extent of Learning, and  
 Force of good Argument, that I dare become  
 responsible for all he says; and am willing that  
 those of my Opinions here debated, may stand  
 or fall by the Strength or Invalidity of this  
 Defence.

A

CRITICAL INQUIRY  
INTO THE  
OPINIONS and PRACTICE  
OF THE  
ANCIENT PHILOSOPHERS, &c.

THE learned Mr. *Jackson*, in his two late Pamphlets, has undertaken to attack several Parts of the *Divine Legation*<sup>a</sup>. As to the Merit of the first Piece, we have the following Account of it in his own Words: “ I “ have opposed many Paradoxes of this Author “ [Mr. *Warburton*] advanced and supported, as he “ thought, with much Learning. All which I have “ confuted within a few Pages, and shewn to be “ nothing but bold Assertions, destitute of Evi- “ dence and Truth; and that with all his Glare

<sup>a</sup> The first of these Pieces is intitled, *The Belief of a Future State proved to be a Fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews; and the Doctrine of the Ancient Philosophers concerning a Future State, shewn to be consistent with Reason, and their Belief of it demonstrated.*

The second is called, *A Defence of a Book intitled, The Belief of a Future State proved to be a Fundamental Article of the Hebrews, &c.*

B

“ and

“ and Pretences, he has not shewed a Taste of real Learning in any one of all the Points he has treated of.” Again; “ I could easily shew (if it was worth while) the Weakness and Absurdity of every other Notion advanced in our Remarkers’s Writings <sup>b</sup>.”

A complete Victory indeed! not to leave *one single Truth* in the two Volumes. What will become then of those Points which are maintained by Mr. Jackson himself, in common with his learned Adversary? Are the very same Notions plain and clear Truths in his own Writings, and yet *bold Assertions, destitute of all Evidence*, when found in the *Divine Legation*? Or is the learned Writer so desperately enamoured and fond of Controversy, that, rather than spare his Adversary, he will even answer and confute himself?

“ I could (says he) easily shew the Weakness and Absurdity of every other Notion advanced in our Remarkers’s Writings.” But, alas! this is no Time to talk of *new Conquests*; it may better become the learned Gentleman to review what is already past. However, I shall make no Exception to what he here says; I do really believe that he could confute every Position in the two Volumes, in as effectual a Manner as he has done any single Point that he has hitherto attacked.

In the following Sheets I shall treat this Gentleman with all the Decency and Respect which are due to his Character in the learned World: If I differ from him with Regard to some ancient Facts, ’tis only because he seems, to me at least, to differ from Antiquity itself; ’tis only because I cannot prevail with myself to embrace an Hypothesis, however confidently asserted, when I find

<sup>b</sup> Pag. 51. 59. of the second Piece, or *Defence*.

it contrary to plain Fact and the clear Testimony of the best Writers.

---

## C H A P. I.

*That the Philosophers did not invariably profess their Belief of a future State; and this Inconstancy of Profession shewn to be a Proof that they did not really believe it.*

**I**N his first Piece the learned Writer undertakes to *demonstrate* that the Philosophers believed a future State. 'Tis Pity but he had given us his Demonstration in a more regular and exact Form. He brings several Passages, (p. 94, 5, 6, 7.) in which, according to him, the ancient Sages profess their Belief of another Life. But the Circumstance which he principally insists upon, is, *that they were constant and uniform in this Profession.* This he asserts in more than one Place; p. 73. speaking of a future State, he says, "Surely it is very unreasonable to charge Men with Infidelity in a Point, which they *constantly* and *invariably* profess to believe." Again: "The Philosophers did undoubtedly believe, as well as *constantly* profess a future State of Happiness and Misery," p. 75. And it is remarkable that all his Testimonies are brought to prove this very Point. He ushers them in with these Words: "I shall therefore add, for the more full Satisfaction of the Reader, a few other Passages besides those before set down in these Papers, to shew their (the Philosophers) *constant Profession and Belief* of this most important Doctrine of Religion." p. 94.

Upon what then does the learned Writer build his Demonstration? Why, upon the *constant* and *uniform* Profession of the Philosophers upon this Subject. Hence he infers their real Belief of another Life; hence he thinks it as unreasonable to charge them with Infidelity in this Point, as the most sincere Believers of *Christianity* itself, p. 99.

Had he represented them as various and inconstant in their teaching on this Head; this, I presume, would have greatly weakened the Force of what he calls his *Demonstration*. To give it therefore the most plausible Appearance, to set it off in the best Colours, he roundly affirms, that they were *uniform* and *constant*, fix'd and *invariable* in their teaching on this Point. Here then I readily join Issue with him, and take upon me to assert, that this *constant* and *uniform* Profession is all a mere Invention of his own, contrived only to serve an Hypothesis; that it has no Foundation in Truth or History; that, to use his own Words, "'tis a bold Assertion, destitute of Evidence and Truth."

Let us examine it with regard to the School of *Pythagoras*. The learned Writer has mention'd two of his Followers, as really believing a future State, *Empedocles* and *Epicbarmus*, p. 91. It is not my Design to dispute with him, whether they professed this Notion: The only Question will be, whether they were fixed and settled, *constant* and *invariable* in the Profession of it. The learned Gentleman must say they were; but then he must say it at the Expence of Truth; in direct Contradiction to the Voice of Antiquity, which plainly and evidently speaks against him. *Plutarch*, in his fifth Book *De Placitis*, gives the following Account of the Doctrine of *Empedocles*. *Empedocles* held Death to be a Separation of the  
fiery



fiery Substance from the other Parts, *and therefore supposed that Death was common to the Soul and Body* <sup>c</sup>. The same Charge is fixed on *Epicharmus*, in Terms too strong to be possibly evaded: “ It is evident that *Epicurus* stole his Principles from the Poets. As to that famous Tenet of his, that *Death is nothing to us*, he borrow’d it from *Epicharmus*, who says, I neither look upon the Act of dying, nor the State that succeeds it, as of any Consequence and Importance to me.” <sup>d</sup> The very Language of *Epicurus* himself. *Teles*, another Follower of *Pythagoras*, speaks strongly to the same Purpose. He considers Death as the very End and Period of our Being; compares the State which succeeds it to that which precedes our Birth. He thus addresses himself to one grieved and afflicted for the Loss of a deceased Friend. “ You complain (says he) that your Friend will never exist more; but remember that he had no Existence ten thousand Years ago, that he did not live in the time of the *Trojan War*, nor even in much later Periods. This, it seems, does not move you; all your Concern is, because he never will subsist for the future <sup>e</sup>.” How would *Epicurus* have accosted his Friend on the same Occasion? Why, in the very same Language,

<sup>c</sup> Ἐμπειρόκλης τὸν θάνατον γενέσθαι διαχώρισμον τῶ πυρώδους, ἐξ ὧν ἡ σύγκρισις τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ συνεσάθη. ὥστε κατὰ τὸ το κοινὸν εἶναι τὸν θάνατον σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς. c. 25.

<sup>d</sup> Ὁ δὲ Ἐπίκουρος φησὶ τὰ κρείτιστα τῶν δογμάτων παραποιητῶν ἀνησπακῶς.—τὸν δὲ θάνατον, ὅτι εἶδέν ἐστι πρὸς ἡμᾶς, Ἐπίχαρμος αὐτῷ προσμεμήνυκεν, εἰπὼν, ἀποθανεῖν ἢ τεθνᾶναι ἔ μοι διαφέρει. *Sextus Empiricus ad Grammaticos*, sect. 273.

<sup>e</sup> *Stobæus Mor. Ecl. c. 106.*

*Respice item quam nil ad nos anteaeta vetustas  
 Temporis æterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante.  
 Hoc igitur nobis speculum natura futuri  
 Temporis exponit, post mortem denique nostram.*

Lucretius.

So much for *Pythagoras* and his Followers. The learned Writer undertakes to *demonstrate* their Belief of another Life: And for this he appeals to their *constant* and *invariable* Professions on this Head. But, in Opposition to this, we have shewn that they were far from being uniform and consistent in what they taught on this Point. Having therefore overturned the very Foundation on which he builds, we need give our selves no farther Trouble; we may now leave his pretended Demonstration to shift for itself, to provide for its own Support as it best may.

Let us go next to *Aristotle* and his Disciples: And here the learned Writer gives us but one Testimony, and that from the Piece *De Mundo*. “*Aristotle* says, Justice is always the Attendant  
 “ of God, to punish those who depart from the  
 “ divine Laws: Whoever therefore will be blef-  
 “ fed and happy (hereafter) ought immediately in  
 “ the Beginning of his Life to be Partaker of  
 “ her,” p. 96. But does not Mr. *Jackson* know that this very Piece has been discarded and set aside, by Men of the first Name in the learned World, as not really belonging to *Aristotle*? Have not the two *Scaligers*, *J. Casaubon*, *Salmasius*, *Dan. Heinsius*, *Gassendi*, with several other Critics of the first Rank, long since endeavoured to prove that it is no Treatise of his? And if others have declared for the contrary Opinion, yet surely the Point is not yet determined in their Favour, nor is the Book in Dispute commonly received

ceived as the Work of *Aristotle*. He introduces it thus, “*Aristotle* says.” Would not any one now imagine that he appeals to some real and undoubted Work of *Aristotle*? As his Argument rests on this single Authority, would not any one have presumed it should have been so circumstanced, that no reasonable Exception could lie against it?

With Regard then to *Aristotle*, where has he proved his *constant Profession* of another Life? So far from it, he has not hitherto proved that that he ever professed it.

And as he has not yet proved, so we may, without Presumption, venture to affirm that he never will prove the Point in Question. He must first set aside the Authority of *Aristotle* himself. The following Passages will prove this, and therefore may serve to shew that he pursues a desperate Adventure, whenever he engages in an Undertaking of this Kind. *Aristotle* proposes it as a Problem, “Whether any Man can be happy after Death?” And asks, “Whether this would not be strangely absurd, according to his own System, which supposes that Happiness consists in Operation<sup>f</sup>.” He tells us too, “that it may fairly be disputed, whether the Dead are capable of any Good or Evil.” He here speaks with some Diffidence and Distrust, with more than one would expect from a Writer, who firmly and *constantly* believed another Life. But he afterwards throws off all Caution and Reserve. § “Death

<sup>f</sup> Ἄρα γε καὶ ἔστιν εὐδαιμόνων τότε ἰπεὶδαν ἀποθάνῃ; ἢ τὸτό γε παντελῶς ἀτοπον, ἄλλως τε καὶ τοῖς λέγουσιν ἡμῖν ἐνεργειάν τινα τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν; *Ethic. Nicom. l. i. c. 10.*

Μᾶλλον δ' ἴσως τὸ διαπορεῖσθαι περὶ τῆς κερμηκότας, εἴ τις ἀγαθῶν κοινωνῆσιν, ἢ τῶν ἀντικειμένων. *c. 11.*

§ *Divine Legation, vol. 1. p. 391.*

“ (says

“ (says he) is of all things the most terrible ; for  
 “ it is the final Period of Existence, and beyond  
 “ that it appears that there is neither Good nor  
 “ Evil for the dead Man to dread or hope.”  
 Would we know what several of his Followers  
 thought of this Point, *Stobæus* shall inform us.  
 Now he tells us very plainly, “ that they supposed  
 “ the Soul to be a mere Quality ; that it would at  
 “ Death be resolved *εις τὸ μὴ εἶναι*, or sunk into a  
 “ State of Non-existence <sup>h</sup>.”

Let us come to the Stoics. And they too, we  
 shall find, have often proclaim'd their Disbelief of  
 another Life, in the most absolute and strong  
 Terms. The following Testimonies will prove  
 this beyond all Exception ; and so may serve to  
 inform us, that the learned Author has all along  
 been imposing a fanciful Hypothesis, as contrary  
 to the Evidence of all Antiquity, as it is to the  
 Principles of the *Divine Legation*. *Quid hoc est,*  
*inquam ; tam sæpe mors experitur me ? Faciat : at*  
*ego illam jam diu expertus sum. Quando, inquis ?*  
*Antequam nascerer. Mors est non esse : id quale sit,*  
*jam scio. Hoc erit post me, quod ante me fuit. Si*  
*quid in hac re tormenti fuit, necesse est et fuisse,*  
*ante quam prodiremus in lucem. Atqui nullam sen-*  
*simus tunc vexationem. Nos quoque accendimur &*

<sup>h</sup> Εἰ δὲ ὡς δύναμις ὑποκειμένη, ὡςπερ δὲ ἀρμονία λύρας ἢ τελειότης προαφίσταται τῷ σώματι, ἐν τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν ἡ ψυχὴ προφθείρεται μὲν ἐδαμῶς, ἐδὲ γὰρ διὰ κινήσεως πρόβεισιν Εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐξαιφνης Εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἀφίσταται ἀχρόνως καὶ ἀνευ φθορᾶς, ὡςπερ δὲ καὶ εἶναι ὅτ' εἶσι, ἀθρόως, οἷον ἀστραπῆς, ἐλλαμπέσης, ——— ΗΣ ΠΟΛΛΟΙ ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΗΤΙΚΟΙ ΔΟΣΗΣ ΠΡΟΕΙΣΤΗΚΑΣΙΝ. *Phys. Ecl. p. 116.*

*Grotius* was so far from suspecting that *Aristotle* believed a future State, that he puts him on the same Foot with *Epicurus* himself in this Respect. Speaking of this Doctrine, he says,  
 “ *Gentes vero nullam habebant ea de re divinam Revelati-*  
 “ *onem. Epicurus et Aristoteles nihil ejus credebant. Ephes.*  
 ii. 12.

*extin-*

*extinguimur, medio illo tempore aliquid patimur. Utrumque vero alta securitas est. In hoc enim, mi Lucili, nisi fallor, erramus, quod mortem judicamus sequi, quum illa & præcesserit, & secutura sit. Quicquid ante nos fuit, mors est. Quid enim refert utrum non incipias an desinas, cum utriusque rei hic sit effectus, non esse? Seneca Ep. 55.*

*Brevis morbus & præceptis alterutrum faciet, aut extinguetur aut extinguet. Quid autem interest, non sit, an non sim? utroque finis dolendi est. Ep. 79.*

*Illud potius admone, nullum mali sensum ad eum, qui perit, pervenire: nam si pervenit, non perit. Nulla, inquam, res eum lædit qui nullus est. Vivit, si læditur. Ep. 100<sup>i</sup>.* Strange Language from these *constant*, these *invariable* Teachers of another Life. Innumerable Passages might be alledged from *Seneca, Epictetus, Antoninus*, equally pertinent and strong with those already cited. To transcribe all the Declarations of the Stoics against a future State, would be to transcribe all their Writings. As far as I can at present recollect, their Declarations against it are more numerous than those for it.

What now becomes of the *constant* and *invariable* Profession, so often repeated by the learned Author? And no Wonder he should often repeat it; 'tis the very Ground and Foundation, on which he labours to erect his projected Demonstration. But as to this Ground and Foundation, as he has not yet established it, so we may be certain that he never can establish it. Antiquity plainly declares against him; and, while the Testimonies above cited are allowed to be genuine

<sup>i</sup> He goes on thus, *Utrum putas illi male esse, quod nullus est, an quod est adhuc aliquis. Atqui nec ex eo potest ei tormentum esse, quod non est: quis enim nullius sensus est? Nec ex eo quod est: effugit enim maximum incommodum mortis, non esse.*

and authentic, the Inference is plain and undeniable, *that the Ancients were not fixed and settled, constant and uniform in their Professions for another Life.*

But to proceed : Should we then allow Mr. *Jackson* that all the Testimonies, produced by him, to shew that the Philosophers did profess the Doctrine of a future State, are strictly and properly to the Purpose ; what would he gain by it ? All he could collect from thence is, that they sometimes declared for another Life. But then let it be remember'd that they sometimes did likewise declare against it. The real Fact therefore is, that they were very fickle and unsteady, very various and inconsistent in their Professions, I do not mean in their Opinions, on this Head. This is a certain and undoubted Fact, but never mentioned by the learned Mr. *Jackson*. I am not indeed surpris'd that he did not mention it : For, in whatever Light it is viewed, it will furnish an unanswerable Argument against his own Hypothesis.

As to these various and contradictory Accounts ; they must either be charged to the Fickleness and Inconstancy of Opinion in the ancient Sages ; or to the Practice of the double Doctrine. If the learned Author imputes them to the first, he must allow that the Philosophers were very wavering and unsettled, with regard to their Notions of another Life : He must hold that they often rejected, as well as that they often maintained this Doctrine ; in short, he must no longer tell us, That they *constantly* and *invariably* declared for it. And yet he undertakes to *demonstrate* their Belief of a future State. But how can he do this, when his own Doctrine will oblige him to acknowledge, that they had no fixed  
and

and settled Principles in this particular? All he can pretend to demonstrate, is, that they sometimes did believe it: But then, by the very same Arguments, his Adversaries will be enabled to demonstrate, in their Turn, that they sometimes did not believe it.

But perhaps he may have Recourse to the double Doctrine, in order to clear the Philosophers from this Charge. Here then I desire to know, whether the Passages above cited make part of the popular and external, or of the secret and internal Doctrine. He will undoubtedly give them to the second <sup>k</sup>; and yet this very Concession will of itself be sufficient and effectual to overturn every thing he himself has said, with regard to this Doctrine.

The secret Doctrine, he tells us, affects only the Circumstances, and not the Reality of a future State; it excludes the popular and fabulous Accounts, but then it goes no farther; it does not remove and discard all future Rewards and Punishments whatsoever. Now the present Passages strike much deeper; they represent Death as the very End and Extinction of our Being; they exclude every possible Mode and Notion of future Rewards and Punishments. The *Pythagoreans*, we see, give us the very Doctrine of *Epicurus*; and did *Epicurus* reject only the vulgar and poetical Accounts of another Life? Does not *Aristotle* strike at the very Essence and Being of a future State, when he tells us, “that Death is the ultimate Period of our Being”? And the Stoics

<sup>k</sup> 'Tis allowed on all Hands, that the public Doctrine did inculcate future Rewards and Punishments; but it is evident that these Passages exclude them in the most clear and open Manner.

fully express themselves in as full a Manner as any of the rest<sup>1</sup>.

What shall we do then with these various and contradictory Accounts of the old Philosophers? If they are supposed to deliver their real Sentiments in every Passage, it will be impossible to demonstrate their Belief of another Life. In this Case it is evident that they could have no fixed and settled Principle, with regard to this Article. If they are said to practise the double Doctrine, this will effectually overthrow every thing Mr. *Jackson* has advanced on that Head.

How unlucky, then, was our Author, when he fixed on these Professions, to prove that the Philosophers believed another Life! He pretends, indeed, but we have confuted the Pretension, that they never varied in their Doctrine on this Point; that they always taught a future State of Rewards and Punishments. The Testimonies abovementioned disprove this, and so fully overthrow what he fondly calls his *Demonstration*.

But we have done more; we have shewn that the very Principle, on which he builds, is entirely destructive of his own Scheme. He builds on the Professions of the ancient Sages: Now these, when taken in their full Extent, will either prove, that they had no fixed and settled Principles, with regard to another Life; or, on Supposition that they had such Principles, will shew that the secret

<sup>1</sup> *Nos quoque accendimur & extinguimur, medio illo tempore aliquid patimur. Utrunque vero alta securitas est.—Brevis morbus aut extinguetur aut extinguet: in utroque finis dolendi est.—Admone nullum mali sensum ad eum qui perit pervenire.* Will any one pretend that these Expressions relate only to the common and popular Accounts of a future State? If they have any Meaning, they strictly and properly exclude all future Rewards and Punishments whatsoever.

and



and internal Doctrine did really exclude all future Rewards and Punishments. And if the secret Doctrine did really and actually exclude all future Rewards and Punishments, it will not surely be denied that the Philosophers themselves did disbelieve them.

Again, as the Philosophers were thus various and inconsistent in their Declarations on this Head; this will furnish Matter for another Observation. If they firmly believed another Life, whence, let me ask, comes it, that they so often disclaim and disavow it? what Motive could they have to deny it, contrary to the real Sense and Conviction of their own Minds? I would not suggest that they always spoke their real Thoughts. I know very well that they held it lawful to lie, and deceive the People for the public Good. But this Principle could not operate in the present Case. As to the Notion of another Life, they deemed it to be of the utmost Use and Importance to Society<sup>m</sup>. Why then, I ask once more, *did they so often declare against it?* they must do this contrary to the Sense and Persuasion of their own Minds; they must do it, without any View to the public Good; they must indeed do it out of pure Wantonness, a Conduct, which one would not willingly ascribe to a set of serious and thinking Men; in a Matter which themselves held to be of the utmost Consequence. And yet Mr. Jackson must ascribe it to them, if he still insists that they

<sup>m</sup> *Diogenes Laertius* carries the Matter so far, as to say that *Plato* himself taught this Doctrine chiefly for its Utility and Use. l. iii. § 79, 80.

Ut aliqua in vitâ formido improbis esset posita, apud Inferos ejusmodi quædam illi antiqui supplicia improbis *constituta esse voluerunt*: Quod videlicet intelligebant, his remotis, non esse mortem ipsam pertimescendam. *Cicero Orat. iv. in Catilin.*

entertained a firm and constant Persuasion of another Life.

But to conclude this Article : If this Matter is to be tried by the common Rules of Logic ; if no new Laws of judging are to be established in Mr. *Jackson's* Favour ; these opposite and contrary Professions of the ancient Sages will be plain Proofs that they did not believe a future State. In this, I say no more than what is contained in that general Rule, which the Critics give us, to fix and determine the Meaning of Authors, when they speak variously on the same Subject. *Quotiescunque scriptor quispiam loquetur ex sententia & consuetudine vulgo recepta, non est semper putandus cum vulgo sentire ; præsertim si periculosum sit dissentium eâ in re testari ; aut ambiguae sint locutiones ; ac si ab eâ sententiâ aut usitatis formulis aliquando manifeste recedat, tum vero ex animi sententia loqui censendus erit.* Le Clerc, *Ars Critica*, vol. iii. p. 56. If this be a good Rule, the Professions of the Philosophers against a future State, will be stronger Proofs that they did not believe it, than their Declarations on the other Side will be that they did believe it ; the first indeed will be sufficient to shew that they did not believe it. So far therefore as we may judge by their Professions, we have Reason to think that they did not hold this Notion ; and yet, on the Strength of these very Professions, the learned Gentleman undertakes to *demonstrate* that they did hold it.

In the foregoing Chapter I have brought scarce any of the Testimonies cited by the Author of the *Divine Legation* : And that, to shew he did not collect the Passages he has quoted with Pains and Difficulty ; to shew too, that the Professions of the Philosophers against a future State are far  
more

more numerous than the learned Writer I have to do with seems to have imagined.

So much for his general Demonstration: Let us now descend to the particular Account of future Happiness, which he gives us as really believed by the ancient Sages.

## C H A P. II.

*The State of future Happiness, which Mr. Jackson gives us as believed by the Philosophers.—That it has no Relation to the present Argument.—That this was the popular and external, not, as he supposes, the secret and esoteric Notion of a future State.—That it was not really and actually believed by the Philosophers themselves.*

WHAT then is the Doctrine of future Rewards, which he gives us as really entertained by the old Philosophers? Why, he tells us, their Notion was, “ that the Souls of virtuous and  
 “ godly Men, after Death, resided in some lumi-  
 “ nous Orb, which was the Mansion of their Hap-  
 “ piness, and where they enjoyed the Society of  
 “ celestial Beings and other holy Persons who  
 “ had lived on Earth; and, by divine Knowledge,  
 “ Faith, and Virtue, were united to and had  
 “ Communion with God, and were blessed with  
 “ the Beatific Vision of the divine Perfections.”  
*Defence, p. 8.*

This is indeed a very fine and pompous Account of a State of future Happiness; but then let it be remembered that this State of future Happiness  
 was

was to be enjoyed *in Heaven*; that *Heaven* is assign'd as the Region of all this future Bliss and Glory: There needs no Pains to prove this; the learned Author himself, I dare say, will not deny it. He speaks of *luminous Orbs, celestial Beings, beatific Vision*.

I will throw together a few Passages of Antiquity, which may serve to give a more full and perfect Account of this future State; and at the same time shew that it is nothing to the Purpose of our present Question.

*Cicero* speaks much of this State; but then he speaks of it as belonging only to Persons of peculiar Excellence and Worth; to Men of singular and uncommon Merit. He speaks "of certain Seats in Heaven, which were assigned all those, who should greatly distinguish themselves in the Service of their Country." Again, He gives it only to those, *qui præstantibus ingeniis in vita humana divina studia coluerunt*. And, in another Place, *magnis & præstantibus viris*<sup>n</sup>. *Lucan*, speaking of these Abodes, says,

*Quodque patet terras inter lunæque meatus  
Semidei manes habitant, quos ignea virtus  
Innocuos, vitæ patientes Ætheris imi  
Fecit, & æternos animam collegit in ignes. L. ix.*

To the Testimonies of *Cicero* and *Lucan*, I will next add that of *Josephus*. *Titus*, in a Speech to his Soldiers, speaks of this future Happiness; but then he confines it to Heroes and Dæmons. "Who does not know (says he) that the Souls of those brave Men, who die in Battle, will be

<sup>n</sup> Omnibus qui patriam conservarint, adjuverint, auxerint, certum esse in cælo definitum locum, ubi beati ævo sempiterno fruuntur. *Somn. Scip.* 3. 5. 7.

“ raised and exalted to the Regions of the purest  
 “ Æther, and there be stationed amongst the  
 “ Stars? and that they themselves will become  
 “ *Heroes and Dæmons* ° ? ”

*Seneca* too mentions this future Happiness; but then he mentions it in such a Manner as plainly shews that he thought it peculiar to the Souls abovementioned. Speaking of one, whom he supposes to be raised and advanced to this very State, he says, *ad excelsa sublatus, inter felices currit animas, accipitque illum cætus sacer, Scipiones Catonesque*<sup>p</sup>.—*Parens tuus, Martia, illic nepotem suum, quanquam illic omnibus omne cognatum est, applicat sibi, nova luce gaudentem, & vicinorum syderum meatus docet.* I said that he confined these Regions to the Souls abovementioned; and this is evident from the *Scipio's* and the *Cato's*, to whom he here gives it; it is evident too from the Confession of *Lipsius* himself, who says, *Cordum loquentem inducit mortuum, & inter Heroas*<sup>q</sup>.

Once more; *Cicero*, in his first *Tusculan*, is very express for this Distinction: He tells us, “ That the *Caschi*, or old Inhabitants of *Italy*, did  
 “ not conceive Death to be a State of mere Ex-  
 “ tinction; they supposed it to be a Change or  
 “ Migration from one Life to another. They  
 “ thought that *Persons of great and eminent*  
 “ *Qualifications would be raised and exalted*  
 “ *into Heaven*; while all the rest were left  
 “ to grovel in these lower Regions.” Amongst those to be thus exalted, he reckons *Romulus*,

<sup>a</sup> Τίς γὰρ ἐκ οἷδε τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ὅτι τὰς μὲν ἐν παρατάξει ψυχᾶς, σιδήρῳ σαρκῶν ἀπολυθείσας τὸ καθαρώτατον σοιχειῖον αἰθῆρς ξυνοδόχων ἄστροις ἐγκαθιδρύει; δαίμονες δ' ἀγαθοὶ, καὶ ἥρωες εὐμενέες, ἰδίοις ἐκγόνοις ἐμφανίζονται. *De Bello Jud.* l. vi. 1.

<sup>p</sup> *Ad Martiam*, cap. ult.

<sup>q</sup> *Physiol. Stoicorum*, l. iii. *Differ.* 11.

*Hercules, Bacchus, the Sons of Tyndarus* †, &c. — We here again see that these Mansions of Bliss and Immortality in *Heaven* were given only to Persons of illustrious and uncommon Worth: The List of Worthies just recited, proves this beyond all Exception. As for the rest of Mankind, *i. e.* the Bulk of the Species, they were to be excluded hence and confined to the World below.

'Tis evident that these Passages relate to a State of future Happiness in *Heaven*; but then 'tis equally evident that they do not conclude the Souls of good Men in general; that they confine these Seats of Bliss and Glory to a few choice and select Spirits; to such as had distinguished themselves by their public Services, or some way greatly contributed to the Advantages of human Life. To those, according to *Cicero, qui patriam conservarint, auxerint, adjuverint*; to *Romulus, Hercules*, and other Worthies of the same Class. *Lucan*, speaking of these Seats, says, *Semidei manes habitant*; *Josephus* declares in very express and direct Terms, that these Regions were inhabited by *Dæmons* and *Heroes*. And, I presume, we need not remark, that *the Bulk of good Men*, that virtuous and godly Souls *in general* are not to be ranked amongst these.

† Itaque unum illud erat insitum priscis illis, quos *Casos* appellat Ennius, esse in morte sensum, neque excessu vitæ sic deleri hominem, ut funditus interiret. — Mortem non interitum esse omnia tollentem atque delentem, sed quamdam quasi migrationem commutationemque vitæ: quæ in *claris viris & feminis dux in cœlum solet esse, in cæteris humi retineretur, & permaneret tamen*. Ex hoc & nostrorum opinione *Romulus in cælo cum Dis agit ævum*, — & apud Græcos, indeque perlapsus ad nos, & usque ad Oceanum, *Hercules* tantus & tam præfens habetur deus. Hinc *Liber* deus, *Semele* natus, eademque famæ celebritate *Tyndaridæ fratres, &c.* *Tusc.* i. 12.

All I aim to prove, is, that the State of Happiness, here described, was not to be shared by good Men in common; that it was confined to Souls of extraordinary and uncommon Worth. And if this be so, what becomes of Mr. Jackson's Argument? When the Author of the *Divine Legation* affirms, that the Philosophers disbelieved a State of future Happiness, he means such a State as was to include the Body of good Men; in which every virtuous and righteous Man was to be rewarded. The Question then is, whether the Philosophers held a future State of Rewards for good Men *in general*; and the learned Writer decides upon it, by sending us to a State that belongs only to *the very Flower of this Order*. The Point is, whether *all* good Men were to be happy; and he, to support the Affirmative, refers us to a State, that was not to be the Portion of *good Men in common*; but only of *a small and select Number*.

2dly, He very gravely affirms, that this was the secret and esoteric Notion, in respect to future Happiness. He may, if he pleases, believe this; but why should he be so unreasonable, as to expect that his Readers should believe it too? Does not *Titus*, in the Passage just recited, mention this State of future Happiness? But then he speaks of it in the most public and open Manner; in a Speech address'd to the Body of his Army. And would he upon this Occasion have fetch'd his Arguments from the *secret* and *bidden* Doctrines of the Schools? Would he have insisted upon such Topics, as the Bulk of his Audience had never before heard of? I may say, upon such Topics, as, by Mr. Jackson's own Account, they were not capable of *receiving* and understanding:

for this is the very Character and Description which he himself gives of the *secret Doctrine*.

Again; *Plato* says, “ That Rewards ought to be decreed to all who behave well in War; that those, who die in the Service of their Country, should be treated with particular Marks of Honour and Respect; that, after Death, they should be considered as *Dæmons* and *Demi-Gods*; as Guardians of Mankind, who were to superintend and preside over this lower World.” And he afterwards subjoins, “ That every one, who arrived at any exalted and uncommon Pitch of Virtue, should be intitled to the same Honour.”

He here tells us, that brave Men, and, indeed, all Men of singular Worth and Merit were to be raised and erected into *Dæmons*: there can then be no Question but that he here speaks of the State of future Happiness in *Heaven*. But does he deliver this as a private and esoteric Doctrine? The very End and Purpose of his Writing will not suffer us to believe this. His Design was to make Men useful Members of Society; to spur and incite them to acts of Heroism and uncom-

Ἐπὶ τῶν δὲ ἀποθανόντων ἐπὶ στρατείας, ὅς ἂν εὐδοκίμησας τελευτήσωσι, ἅρ' ἔστω μὲν φηρομένη τῷ χρύσει γένος εἶναι; πάντων γε μά-  
λιστα. Ἀλλ' ἔστω πεισόμεθα Ἡσιόδῳ; ἐπειδὴν τινες τῷ τοιαύτῳ γένος  
τελευτήσωσιν, ὡς ἄρα,

Οἱ μὲν, δαίμονες ἅγιοι ἐπιχθόνιοι τελέθουσιν,  
Ἔσθλοί, ἀλεξικακοί, φύλακες μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

πεισόμεθα μὲν οὖν. διαπυθόμενοι ἄρα τῷ Θεῷ, πῶς χρὴ τὸς δαιμονί-  
αυς τε καὶ θεῖας τιθέναι, καὶ τινι διαφορῶ, ἔγωγε καὶ ταύτην δίδομεν  
ἢ ἀνεξηγηταί. τί δ' ἔστω μέλλομεν; καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν δὴ χρόνον, ὡς δαι-  
μόνων, ἔγωγε θεραπεύσομεν τε καὶ προσκυνήσομεν αὐτῶν τὰς θήκας·  
ταῦτα δὲ ταύτην νομιζόμεν, ὅταν τις γῆρας ἢ τινι ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ τελευ-  
τήσῃ τῶν ἔσοι ἂν διαφερόντως ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἀγαθοὶ κριθῶσι. De Rep.  
l. 5.



mon Virtue. And how could his Doctrine be supposed to do this, unless it was taught and preached up to the World at large? And if it was taught and preached up to the World at large, the Inference is certainly just, that it was a public, and not a private Doctrine.

This too appears from the following Passage of *Cicero*. “ It may be easily understood, that the Reason, why most Cities prosecuted the Memory of their valiant Men with divine Honours, was to spur up their Citizens to Virtue, that every the most deserving of them might encounter Dangers with the greater Willingness for the Sake of his Country. This was the very Inducement the *Athenians* had to deify *Eretheus* and his Daughters<sup>t</sup>.”

We are here told of the Consecration of dead Men, and the Reason of it. And does not this very Reason necessarily suggest that this must have been a public Notion? For what Impression could it be supposed to make on the Body of the People? how could it be supposed to work them up to gallant and heroic Actions, if, like the *secret Doctrines* of the Schools, it was all the time absolutely unknown to them?

Lastly, we find that the Body of the People was really and actually possess'd of this very Doctrine. *Cicero* himself gives this Account of the *Casci*, or the rude and barbarous Inhabitants of old *Italy*. “ They did not, it seems, consider Death as the End and Destruction of their Be-

<sup>t</sup> *Divine Legation*, vol. i. p. 94. Atque adeo in plerisque civitatibus intelligi potest, *acuendæ virtutis gratiâ*, quo libentius reipublicæ causâ periculum adiret optimus quisque, virorum fortium memoriam honore Deorum immortalium consecratam: ob eam enim ipsam causam *Eretheus* Athenis filixque ejus in numero Deorum sunt. *Nat. Deor.* l. iii. 19.

“ ing,

“ ing, but as a Change and Migration to another  
 “ Life. They thought that Men of great and sin-  
 “ gular Qualifications, that Persons famous and  
 “ excellent in their Generations, would be raised  
 “ and exalted into Heaven ; while all the rest  
 “ were left to grovel in the World below.” But  
 now is not this here represented as a popular and  
 common Notion? We are told that the very  
 lowest of the People were actually in Possession of  
 it. Now if this be true, as it certainly is, what  
 possible Ground can there be for what the learned  
 Writer so often repeats and asserts, *viz.* that this  
 was a *secret* and *hidden* Doctrine, imparted by the  
 Philosophers to their Disciples only, and carefully  
 concealed from the Body of the People ?

3dly, Let us now see whether the Philosophers  
 believed any thing of this State of future Happi-  
 ness. That we may be the better able to judge  
 of this, let us attend to their own Account of it.  
 They give it only to Persons of illustrious and  
 signal Worth ; they talk much of *the Society and*  
*Assembly of the Gods*. And who, pray, after all,  
 were these Gods? Why, certain Sons of Men,  
 who, for their eminent Services to their Fellow-  
 Creatures, were said to be erected into a kind of  
 Deities. *Plato* tells us, “ That they were to be-  
 “ come Dæmons ; that they were to receive di-  
 “ vine Honours ; and exercise a Providence over  
 “ this lower World.” *Cicero* too, in a Fragment  
 of his preserved by *St. Austin*, insists much on the  
 Divinity of *Romulus*, and brings a particular Ar-  
 gument to maintain and defend it<sup>v</sup>. And when  
 he

<sup>v</sup> Magis est in Romulo admirandum, quod cæteri, qui Dii ex  
 hominibus facti esse dicuntur, minus eruditibus hominum sæculis  
 fuerunt, ut fingendi proclivior esset ratio, cum imperiti facile  
 ad credendum impellerentur. Romuli autem ætatem minus  
 his

he designed to consecrate his Daughter, he speaks in this Manner, “ That as the Wisdom of the  
 “ Ancients had consecrated and deified many excellent Persons of both Sexes, whose Temples  
 “ were then remaining, the Progeny of *Cadmus*,  
 “ of *Amphitryon*, of *Tyndarus* ; so he would perform the same Honour to *Tullia*, who, if any  
 “ Creature ever deserved it, was of all the most  
 “ worthy of it : I will do it therefore, says he,  
 “ and consecrate thee, thou best and most learned  
 “ of Women, *now admitted into the Assembly of the*  
 “ *Gods*, to the Regard and Veneration of all  
 “ Mortals\*.” These learned Ancients speak of the State of Happiness in Heaven ; and what do they say of it ? Why, a few excellent Persons are to be admitted to the *Society and Assembly of the Gods*. But then did the Philosophers themselves believe any thing of this *Society and Assembly of the Gods*, of which they have said so much ? The very elegant and polite Writer of the History of the Life of *Cicero* says, “ But it was not *Cicero*’s  
 “ real thought, after all, to exalt his Daughter into  
 “ a Deity ; he knew it to be absurd, as he often  
 “ declares, to pay divine Honours to dead Mortals ; and tells us how their very Publicans had  
 “ decided that Question in *Bæotia* ; for when the  
 “ Lands of the *immortal Gods* were excepted out  
 “ of their Lease, *by the Law of the Censors*, they  
 “ denied, *that any one could be deemed an immortal*  
 “ *God, who had once been a Man ; and so made*  
 “ *the Lands of Amphiaraus and Trophonius pay*  
 “ *the same Taxes with the rest*. Yet in a political  
 “ View he sometimes recommends the Worship

his sexcentis jam inveteratis Literis, atque Doctrinis, omnique illo antiquo ex inculta hominum vita errore sublato fuisse cernimus. *De Civ. Dei*, l. xxii. 6.

\* History of the Life of *M. Tullius Cicero*, vol. ii. p. 189.

“ of

“ of those Sons of Men, whom their eminent  
 “ Services to Mankind had advanced to the Rank  
 “ of inferior Gods <sup>y</sup>.” *Sigonius* declares the same; whose Words are so very much to our Purpose, that I cannot forbear inserting them. “ I do not  
 “ know (says he) but those learned Men are in  
 “ the right, who think that several excellent and  
 “ brave Persons have been consecrated and deified,  
 “ in order to incite Men to Acts of Heroism,  
 “ and that they may encounter Dangers with  
 “ more Readiness in the Service of their Coun-  
 “ try.” And he adds, “ That several Persons  
 “ were consecrated in Old Greece with this very  
 “ View <sup>z</sup>.” And however this false *Cicero* may fail in other Points, there can be no Question, but that he here copies the true and real Sentiments of *Cicero* himself; who, in one of the Passages above cited, declares, that these Deifications were made, *acuendæ virtutis gratiâ, quo libentius reipublicæ causa periculum adiret optimus quisque.*

The Sum then of our Argument is this: The Philosophers mention a State of future Happiness in Heaven; they say, that some few excellent Persons shall be admitted into *the Society and Assembly of the Gods*. But then this *Society and Assembly of the Gods* was all a pure Fable and Fiction of their own. As therefore they believed nothing

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 190.

<sup>z</sup> Atque haud scio an rectè senserint viri doctissimi, quorum ea fuit opinio, viros *claros & fortes idcirco deorum immortalium honore consecratos*, ut incitaretur virtus acrius, & acuerentur vehementius ad obeunda pericula, qui patriæ amore studioque tenebantur. — Quod optime agnovit & diutissime retinuit, omnium literarum præclara custos & altrix Græcia, quæ multos habet virtutis gratia factos ex hominibus Deos, quorum alios fatentur novos; alios multis jam sæculis receptos in cœlum, consecratosque contendunt. *De Consolatione.*

of the *Society and Assembly* into which these excellent Persons were to be admitted, 'tis impossible that they should believe any thing of the *Admission itself*.

Again ; it is remarkable, the learned Gentleman every where allows that the Stories of the *Elysian Fields* were considered as mere Fictions ; and here I cannot for the Life of me conceive, what it is which induces him to think that the State of future Happiness in Heaven was not viewed in the very same Light. For, let me ask him, whence does he conclude that the Philosophers believed nothing of *Elysium* ? Is it because it made part of the popular and external Doctrine ? Because 'tis sometimes mentioned as an Engine of Policy, contrived only for the Sake of Government ? And does he think we will not say the same for the State of future Happiness in Heaven ? Have we not indeed proved from History and real Fact, that this was the very Case of the last Doctrine ?—But, perhaps, he may infer their Disbelief of *Elysium* from another Circumstance ; from the *Fables and Histories* with which it is intermixed, and which, 'tis notorious and allowed on all hands, were not believed by the Philosophers themselves. For as to the *Judges of Hell, the Society and Assembly of the Gods* in the infernal Regions ; these were considered by all Men of Sense as merely political, as invented only to keep the People in Order. But, pray, now does not this very Reason equally conclude against their Belief of the State of future Happiness in Heaven ? The *Society and Assembly of the Gods* ; their *Banquets, Entertainments* <sup>a</sup> and *Marriages*, are

<sup>a</sup> Illa autem Deorum vita, five Apotheosis, gemino capite præcipuè continebatur : *Convictu Jovis, & Deæ alicujus conjugio.*

are the principal Circumstances we find recorded of this State. But were not these as gross and rank Fables, as any that were feigned of the *Elysian Fields*? With regard then to the Philosophers, we have proved their Disbelief of this State of Happiness in Heaven, on the very same Principles, and in the very same Manner 'tis usual to prove their Disbelief of *Elysium*: Which the learned Writer, I am persuaded, had saved us the Trouble of doing, had he not been unluckily misled by the Ambiguity of Terms. *Elysium*, in whatever Sense you take it, is confessedly a fabulous and imaginary Place. But *Heaven*, in the Christian System, being a Reality, the good Man did not reflect that, in the Pagan Theology; its Existence was as visionary as that of *Elysium* itself; and the very same in *Greece* and *Italy*, as *Odin's Hall* amongst the Northern Nations.

Upon the Whole; could the learned Author prove that they believed a future State thus circumstanced, yet I would not advise him to triumph too soon, lest his Adversaries should reply that it is nothing to the Purpose, as it was not supposed to include the Body of good Men. If we add to this, that this Notion was merely popular and external; that it never was entertained by the Philosophers themselves; we shall, I dare say, hear no more of it; at least in way of Opposition to the Doctrine of the *Divine Legation*.

*jugio*. Sic apud Horatium, l. iv. od. 8. Herculis Divinitas inde statuitur, quod, *Jovis interest optatis epulis impiger Hercules*. Idemque, ut notum est, Heben, juventutis Deam accepit in conjugem. *Ruæus in Virgil. Ecl. iv. Dearum connubio & Deorum convivio dii efficiuntur. Servius in Æneid. i.*

Tu mihi quodcunque hoc regni, tu sceptrâ, Jovemque Concilias; tu das *epulis accumbere Divûm. Æneid. i.*

Nec Deus hunc mensâ, Dea nec dignata cubili est. *Ec. iv.*

## C H A P. III.

*That Mr. Jackson, in his first Piece, gives the Re-union of the Soul with God, as the only Notion of future Happiness entertained by the old Philosophers. His Account of it examined and confuted. That this Re-union and the State of Happiness in Heaven, were conceived by the Ancients to be very different and distinct things.*

SO much for the State of future Happiness in Heaven. And here I cannot but take Notice that the learned Writer himself gives a very different Account of this Matter in his first Pamphlet. He there tells us, “ That the Re-union of the “ Soul, or its Return to God, was conceived to “ be the peculiar Recompence and Reward of “ good Men after Death ; he gives this as the “ *only Notion* of future Happiness, really believed “ by the Philosophers themselves.” Since then he lays so much Stress on this Re-union, it may not be amiss to consider what he has advanced on this Head. He every where represents it as a State of the most *absolute and perfect Happiness* <sup>b</sup>. This would be very much to his Purpose, could he prove it. I do indeed find that he asserts it again and again ; but alas ! all these Assertions will not amount to one Proof. However, in Support of this Notion, he refers us to *Jamblichus*, p. 89, 90. This is the sole Authority produced by him ; and this, unluckily, in the present Case turns out to be no Authority at all. Does not

<sup>b</sup> Page 71.

Mr. *Jackson* know that the Argument of the *Divine Legation* relates to the Sentiments of those Philosophers, who lived before our Saviour?

“ Such was the general Doctrine on this Point,  
 “ before the coming of Christianity. But then  
 “ those Philosophers, who held out against its  
 “ Truth, new modelled both their Philosophy  
 “ and Religion, making their Philosophy more  
 “ religious, and their Religion more philosophi-  
 “ cal : Of which we have given several occasional  
 “ Instances in the Course of this Work. So  
 “ amongst the many Improvements of *Paganism*,  
 “ the softening this Doctrine was one ; the mo-  
 “ dern *Platonists* confining the Notion of the  
 “ *Soul's being part of the divine Substance*, to those  
 “ of Brutes. *Every irrational Power*, says Por-  
 “ phyry, *is resolved into the Life of the Whole*.  
 “ And it is remarkable that then, and not till  
 “ then, the Philosophers really began to believe  
 “ the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and  
 “ Punishments.” (*Divine Legation*, vol. i. p.430.)

When the Question is thus plainly confined to the Period before our Saviour, why are we referred to *Jamblichus*, who lived so long after it? This surely looks like Distress. For why this *poaching* in *unlicensed Authors*, if the Gentleman could have started his Game like a fair Sportsman? But let him answer directly to this plain Question; were the Doctrines of the Philosophers the same, in the Days of *Jamblichus*, as in the times before our Saviour?—Were the Notions of the human Soul the same in these two Periods? It is certain that he must answer in the Negative; and what clearer Proof can there be than this, that the Testimony of *Jamblichus* is of no Force in the present Question?



It may be said that I consider the Re-union of the Soul, and the State of Happiness in Heaven, as different and distinct things; whereas the learned Writer I have to do with, all along supposes that they were one and the same State. — I believe he does; however, I chuse rather to follow the Ancients, who always considered them as very separate and distinct things, than this great Modern, who hath been pleased to mix and confound them. *Seneca* says, *Magnus animus deo pareat, & quicquid lex universi jubet sine cunctatione patiatur; aut in meliorem emittitur vitam, lucidius, tranquillius inter divina mansurus, aut certe sine ullo futuro incommodo. Naturæ suæ remiscebitur & revertetur in totum* \*. It will not be denied that the first Part relates to the State of Happiness *in Heaven*, and the second to the Resurrection of the Soul. But then are they not plainly and directly opposed to each other? must they not therefore have been considered as very separate and distinct States?

The same Author, in another Place, confirms the same thing: He speaks of the Bliss and Happiness of Heaven, but then he speaks of it, as previous to the Resurrection of the Soul<sup>c</sup>. *Nos quoque felices animæ & æterna sortitæ, cum deo visum erit ista iterum moliri, labentibus cunctis, & ipsi parva ruinæ ingentis accessio, in antiqua elementa vertemur*; or, as *Lipsius* on the Place says, shall be resolved into *the universal Soul*<sup>d</sup>. There can surely be no Question but these were thought to be different and distinct States, as the one was supposed both opposite to, and prior to the other. The Re-union was to begin at the very Time, when the State of Happiness in Heaven was conceived to end.

\* Epist. 72.

<sup>c</sup> Cap. ul. ad Martiam.

<sup>d</sup> Animæ igitur tunc omnes iterum ad mundi animam, i. e. ad Jovem — resolvuntur. *Physiol. Stoicor. l. iii. c. 11.*

Again;

Again; Mr. *Jackson* gives the Re-union to the Souls of good Men in general: But I have proved that the State of Happiness *in Heaven* was reserved only for Men of great and exalted Merit; for those, whose eminent Services to Mankind had raised and advanced them above the rest of their Fellow-Creatures.

Having established this Difference, let us now see how it affects our present Question. The learned Author, in his *first* Piece, sends us to the Re-union, as *the only Notion* of future Rewards, really entertained by the old Philosophers. In the *second* he refers us to a State of Bliss and Happiness *in Heaven*, as the *only Doctrine* really believed by them. Did he then conceive these to be one and the same State? If he did; he may probably, by this time, be convinced that he was mistaken.

Did he conceive them to be separate and distinct States? If he did, the Doctrine of his first and second Pieces, are directly opposite and contradictory to each other. In the first, the Philosophers supposed all future Happiness to consist barely in the Re-union of the Soul. In the second, they believed a State of Happiness in Heaven, distinct from this Re-union.

Let us just recapitulate the real State of the Question: The learned Writer pretends to give us the *only* Notion of future Happiness actually believed and entertained by the Philosophers themselves. By this Means he brings the Dispute between us into a narrow Compass: For in this Case, what have we to do, but to consider this very Doctrine; to examine into the real State of it; and as it does not appear from hence that the Philosophers believed a State of future Happiness, it follows of Course, from his own Principles, that  
we

we have hitherto no Proof, that they believed any future Rewards whatsoever.

---

#### C H A P. IV.

*That the Philosophers did not believe a future State of Punishments.*

LET us come now to that Part of the Question, which relates to their Belief of future Punishments. And here I shall confine myself to one single Argument: It has been indeed before mentioned in the *Divine Legation*; and, from its being yet unanswered, I shall not scruple to affirm, that 'tis effectual, and decisive of the Point in Question. It is grounded on a Passage of *Cicero*, where he declares, *that the common and popular Accounts of another Life were the only Foundation and Support of future Punishments*. Now it is allowed, even by *Mr. Jackson* himself, that the Ancients did not believe these common and popular Accounts: And therefore, with his Leave, I would conclude, *upon the Authority of Cicero*, that they believed no future Punishments whatsoever.

But let us review the Passage: It is taken from the Oration for *Cluentius*. *Nam nunc quidem, quid tandem illi mali mors attulit? Nisi forte ineptiis ac fabulis ducimur, ut existimemus illum apud Inferos impiorum supplicia perferre, &c. Quæ si falsa sunt, ID QUOD OMNES INTELLIGUNT, quid ei tandem aliud mors eripuit præter sensum doloris?* Our Argument supposes that these common Stories were the only Foundation and Support of future  
 ture

ture Punishments. And does not *Cicero* himself suppose the same? “ If these (says he) are false, “ as all Men see they are, what has Death deprived him of besides *a Sense* of Pain?” Does not this Reasoning evidently suppose that there was a necessary Connexion between these popular Fables, and the Doctrine of future Punishments? If then a future State was not believed under these Representations, is it not manifest that it could not be believed at all?

And here let me ask, what has the learned Writer said to this Argument of the *Divine Legation*? Why, not one Syllable. But will not every Reader reflect on what he should have said? He may perhaps tell us, that it was too trivial to deserve his Notice; but he must excuse me, if I ascribe his Silence to a very different Cause. This is not his usual Way of managing Objections, whenever he but dreams he can answer to the Purpose.

But, to resume our Argument: The learned Author allows that the Ancients did not believe the vulgar and poetical Accounts of future Punishments; and I ask no more to prove *that they believed no future Punishments at all*.

The Question then is, whether the Ancients had any Notion of future Punishments, not founded on the Fables of the Populace; whether they had any Conception of separate and distinct Punishments, in which the Stories of *Styx*, *Acheron*, and *Cocytus*, had nothing to do. The Author of the *Divine Legation*, in Support of the Negative, brought the Passage from *Cicero* abovementioned; I will here point out some other Testimonies, in which the very same thing has been maintained and asserted by other Writers of Antiquity. *Cogita nullis defunctum malis affici. Illa, quæ nobis*  
I Inferos

*Inferos faciunt terribiles, fabula est. Nullas imminere mortis tenebras, nec carcerem, nec flumina flagrantia igne, nec oblivionis annem, nec tribunalia, nullos in illa reos libertate tam laxa, nullos iterum tyrannos. Mors omnium dolorum solutio est & finis. Ultra quam mala nostra non exeunt<sup>e</sup>.*

The Dead, we see, were subject to no Pain and Misery; and why? because the vulgar Accounts of another Life were fabulous and false. Is it not evident from hence, that these were the only Foundation and Support of future Punishments? Otherwise why might not the Dead be subject to Pain and Misery, tho' these Stories were false and groundless?

<sup>f</sup> *Mors contemni debet magis quam solet: Multa enim de illa credimus. Multorum ingeniis certatum est ad augendam ejus infamiam. Descriptus est carcer Infernus, & perpetua nocte oppressa regio, in qua*

——— *ingens fanitor orci,*  
*Ossa super recubans antro semesa cruento,*  
*Æternum latrans, exanguis terreat umbras.*

*Sed etiam cum persuaseris istas fabulas esse, nec quicquam defunctis superesse quod timeant, subit alius metus, æque enim timor ne apud Inferos sint, quam ne nusquam.* He here mentions the poetical and fabulous Accounts of another Life; if these were false, the Consequence, you see, was that there could be no future Punishments at all. *Sed etiam cum persuaseris istas fabulas esse, nec quicquam defunctis superesse quod timeant.*

Again: *Non sum tam ineptus ut Epicuream cantilenam hoc loco persequar, & dicam, vanos esse Inferorum metus, nec Ixionem rota volvi, nec saxum*

<sup>e</sup> Seneca ad Martiam, c. 19.

<sup>f</sup> Seneca Ep. 83.

*humero Sisyphi trudi in adversum, nec ullius viscera & renasci posse quotidie, & carpi. Nemo tam puer est ut Cerberum timeat, &c.—Mors nos aut consumit, aut exuit. Emissis meliora restant, onere detracto: Consumptis nihil restat, bona pariter malaque submota sunt* §.

If there was no *Cerberus*, the Soul must either be extinguished, or raised to a State of Happiness. But why so, if there were future Punishments in Store, which did not derive their Credit and Authority from the common Fables?

*Cicero*, in his first *Tusculan*, undertakes to confute the Doctrine, *which makes Death an Evil*. But then, in this Confutation, he confines himself to two Points; the Notion of infernal Torments, and the Mortality of the Soul. The last, he tells us, is a State of Non-existence, and not attended with any positive and real Misery; *and the first was a pure Fiction*. Hence he infers that Death was no Evil. What a ridiculous and absurd Inference had this been, if there had been any Notion of positive and real Punishments besides those taught the Populace? *Tusc. i. c. 5, 6, 7, 8.*

My Reasoning stands thus: As *Cicero*, in this very Book, undertakes to answer all the Arguments, which could be brought to prove that Death is a real Evil; it was his Business to open and explain the several Circumstances, which were supposed to make Death an Evil. Now it is remarkable that he confines himself to the Doctrine of infernal Torments, and the Mortality of the Soul. Hence I conclude that he knew of no single Circumstance besides, that could make Death terrible or frightful to Mankind.

But tho' he has only disproved the common and popular Accounts of future Punishments, he

§ Seneca, Ep. 24.

yet ventures to affirm, that Death could not be a State of Misery and Sorrow. *Quid, hoc dasne aut manere animos post mortem, aut morte ipsa interire? A. Do vero; quod si maneant, beatos esse concedo; sin intereant, non esse miseros, quoniam ne sunt quidem.* c. 11.

The learned Doctor *Davies* confirms what I have here said, that all future Punishments are rejected in the Passage just cited. And, upon the Place, he observes, *ita argumentati sunt Ethnici, quod Poetarum dicta de pœnis apud Inferos pro nugis habuerint, They rejected all future Punishments.* And what was the Reason of this? The learned Critic tells us, it was *because they disbelieved the poetical and fabulous Accounts of another World.*

I will next give a Testimony, as I find it cited in the *Divine Legation*, tho' not immediately to the Purpose of my present Argument; for this, like many other Passages there quoted, may serve to illustrate and support more than one Part of that incomparable Work. 'Tis brought from *Epictetus*, who, speaking of Death, says, "But  
 "whither do you go? No where to your Hurt:  
 "You return from whence you came: To a friendly  
 "ly Consociation with your kindred Elements:  
 "What there was of the Nature of Fire in your  
 "Composition, returns to the Element of Fire;  
 "what there was of Earth, to Earth; what of  
 "Air, to Air; and of Water, to Water. *There*  
 "*is neither Hell, Acheron, Cocytus, or Pyriphle-*  
 "*thon.*" *Divine Legation*, vol. i. p. 292.

"Upon Death you go no where to your Hurt:  
 "And why? because there is no Hell, Acheron,  
 "Cocytus, or Pyriphlegethon." If therefore these were removed, all future Punishments were supposed to be removed with them.

The same thing is confirmed by those celebrated Lines of Ovid,

*O Genus attonitum stolidæ formidine mortis,  
Quid Styga, quid tenebras, & nomina vana timetis,  
Materiem vatum, falsique pericula mundi?  
Morte carent animæ, semperque, priore relicta  
Sede, novis domibus vivunt, habitantque receptæ.*

Met. L. xv.

'Tis the Design and Purpose of *Pythagoras*, who here speaks, to teach Men to despise the Terrors of Death; and he thinks it sufficient for this Purpose, to arm them against the Fears of *Styx*, *Acheron*, &c. A plain Proof, he had no Conception of any future Punishments besides the popular ones.

Here then I could wish Mr. *Jackson* would reflect that his Argument is levelled at the learned Ancients above mentioned, as well as at the Author of the *Divine Legation*. For what has Mr. *Warburton* done more than repeated the Inference, which they had before made? Now if this Reasoning be just and logical in their Writings; how happens it to commence at once ridiculous and absurd, when transferred into the *Divine Legation*? Has he or his Books so malignant an Influence as to poison and blast every thing, which comes within their Reach?

But, whatever the Ancients themselves say, Mr. *Jackson* insists that they had a Notion of future Punishments separate and distinct from those taught the Populace. If this was the true and real Sentiment of Antiquity, whence comes it, that it escaped the Notice of the learned Writers above cited? They give us the common Fables as the *single*, the *only* Support of future Punishments. They must therefore have been entire Strangers to  
the



the Doctrine, which the learned Writer would obtrude upon us as their own. Wherever therefore he got this Notion, we may be certain that he had it not from Antiquity : And if he did not draw it from thence, we need not be solicitous how he came by it.

But to close this Article : What has been said is, I think, sufficient to confute all the learned Gentleman has advanced on this Head ; and that by the most effectual and decisive way of Confutation, the plain and necessary Consequences of his own Principles. He allows that the Ancients did not believe the *common and popular* Doctrine of future Punishments ; and I have shewn, *upon their own Authority*, that they had *no other* to believe. With his Permission therefore, I would conclude that they believed no future Punishments at all.

## C H A P. V.

*That the Stoics did not believe a future State.*

**I**T would take up more time than all the Opposition to this part of the *Divine Legation* deserves, to examine the various and particular Opinions of all the Philosophers with Regard to a future State : I will therefore confine myself to that Sect, which was the most famed for the Study of Logic and Morality of any in the ancient World ; I need not say that I mean the *Stoics*. And here I shall proceed in the following Order. I will first consider the Testimonies alledged by the learned Writer, to prove that the *Stoics* did believe another Life.—I will next shew, from his own Principles, that they neither did nor could believe it.

In

In his Testimonies Mr. *Jackson* insists much upon the Notion of a general Renovation; he gives it as a clear and certain Proof, that the *Stoics* really believed a future State. To this Purpose he urges the following Words of *Chrysippus*.  
 “It was the Opinion of the *Stoics*, that it was by  
 “no Means impossible (*i. e.* that it was proba-  
 “ble) that, after Death and some determined Pe-  
 “riods of time, we shall be restored again to the  
 “same State in which we now are.”

Again: “After the general Conflagration, the  
 “*Stoics* believed a new State of things would fol-  
 “low, and a Restoration of all things (Men, A-  
 “nimals, &c.) which had existed before to a new  
 “State of Life and Being. This made some  
 “Christian Writers think that the Opinion of the  
 “*Stoics* was not much different from the Christian  
 “Doctrine of the Resurrection.”

Before we enter upon this Argument, it will be necessary to say something of those Changes and Revolutions of Nature, so often mention'd by the *Stoics*. They held then that the present Frame of Things would subsist for a certain Period of time; at the Conclusion of which it was to be dissolved and consumed by a general Conflagration. But, after the Destruction of the present World, another was to rise up in its Stead; this was to remain for a fixed and stated time, was after that to be dissolved, and succeeded by a new one. Thus a Series of Worlds were to revolve in a regular and successive Order; the Duration of each was limited to a certain Age, beyond which it could not pass. The present Question is confined to the next Revolution, or that new World, which, after the Dissolution of the present, was to be reared up and erected in its Stead. Mr. *Jackson* presents us with this new  
 State

State of things, in order to confirm and establish his Opinion, that the *Stoics* believed the Doctrine of another Life; as if this Doctrine was plainly and necessarily contained in the Notion of the general Renovation. I, for my part, can find, in this Renovation, no Strokes, no Resemblance of the religious Doctrine of a future State. First,

Antiquity gives us two very different Accounts of this Matter. We are sometimes told that this new World was to be stocked and replenish'd *with the very same Men*, who had before lived in this. But then there are Writers, who endeavour to persuade us, that the Inhabitants of this new World were to be as fresh and new as the World itself; that they were not the self same Persons, who had lived before in this, but others, who were to resemble them in a very particular and exact Manner. We need not stay to determine which of these Accounts is most authentic; for whichever Way the Question is decided, whichever of the two Opinions is allowed this learned Writer to make his best of, we shall be enabled effectually to overthrow every thing he has advanced on this Head. First, there are Authors who tell us, that the Inhabitants of the old World were not to be restored at the general Renovation; but that the new Scene was to be filled and occupied by a new Race of Men. “ The *Stoics* “ suppose these Revolutions not only with regard “ to Mankind, but even the Gods and immortal “ Beings. For after the general Conflagration, “ which has happen'd an infinite Number of “ times in past Ages, and will happen as often “ hereafter, the same Face and Order of things, “ from the Beginning to the End, has been, “ and ever will be preserved. Now the *Stoics*, “ endeavouring to remove this Absurdity, say “ that

“ that the Persons, who are to live in these  
 “ future Revolutions, will bear the most near  
 “ and strict Resemblance to those who lived in  
 “ the preceding ones. It was not the same So-  
 “ crates, who was to appear and rise again, but  
 “ some one exactly like him,—he was not to  
 “ marry the same *Xantippe*, but one, who was  
 “ to resemble her most exactly in all her good  
 “ Qualities; he was not to be accused by the  
 “ same Sycophants *Anytus* and *Melitus*, but by  
 “ others of the very same Stamp and Cha-  
 “ racter <sup>h</sup>.”

*Stoicis tamen non eadem quæ nunc sunt renasci-  
 tura, sed illis similia tantum (non eundem, verbi  
 gratia, Socratem, sed huic & virtute & fortuna  
 geminum) videtur potius placuisse* <sup>i</sup>.

If now we admit this Opinion, which assigns this new World to different Men; the learned Writer will never be able to prove from hence, that the *Stoics* believed another Life, or that they held a future State, in which Men were to be rewarded, and punished in Proportion to the Merit and Demerit of their Actions in the present Life. For the Doctrine of a future State supposes that *the self same Persons* are to appear again in the next World; but the *Stoics* assign this new World to *different Per-*

<sup>h</sup> Στωϊκῶν οἱ πλείους εἰ μόνον τὴν τῶν θνητῶν περίοδον τοιαύτην εἶναι φασίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀθανάτων καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰς θεῶν μετὰ γὰρ τὴν τῆ παντὸς ἐκπύρωσιν ἀπειρακίς γενομένην, καὶ ἀπειρακίς ἐσομένην, ἢ αὐτὴ τάξις ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους πάντων γενογέ τε καὶ ἔσται πειρώμεοι μέντοι θεραπεύειν πῶς τὰς ἀπεμφάσεις οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς, ἐκ οἷδ' ὅπως, ἀπαράλλακτος φασίν εἶσεσθαι κατὰ περίοδον ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν προτέρων περιόδων πάντας ἵνα μὴ Σωκράτης πάλιν γένηται, ἀλλ' ἀπαράλλακτός τις τῷ Σωκράτει, γαμήσων ἀπαράλλακτον τὴν Ξανθίππην, καὶ κατηγορηθῆσόμενος ὑπὸ ἀπαράλλακτων Ἀνύτω καὶ Μελίτῳ. Origenes contra Celsum, l. iv. Ed. Spen.

<sup>i</sup> Annotationes D' Acerianæ in Mar. Antonin. l. x. c. 31.

*sons.* They strike therefore at the very Essence and Foundation of another Life; they cut off all Possibility of Rewards and Punishments, as they do not introduce the *same Persons* into this new State. So much for the Diversity of Persons. But let us now suppose that the very same Persons were to revive and appear again; and then let us see whether this might be considered as a future State of Rewards and Punishments. When we speak of such a State, we mean a State, which is to rectify the Disorders, and correct the Inequalities of the present Life; where good Men are to be happy, and the wicked miserable. But was this the Case in these future Revolutions? The very contrary. The Righteous were to suffer, and the Wicked to flourish and triumph, just as they do on this Side the Grave. Thus, “*Socrates* was  
 “ at the next general Revolution to live again in  
 “ the very same Circumstances,—to be born of the  
 “ same Parents, to be educated in the same City,  
 “ to apply himself to the same Studies, and to  
 “ undergo the same matrimonial Discipline. He  
 “ was to be accused by the same Sycophants; con-  
 “ demned by the same Judges, and then to submit  
 “ to the same Fate<sup>k</sup>.”

This general Restoration is described by *Nemesis* in much the same Manner. He says, “ that  
 “ at a certain Period the World would be de-  
 “ stroyed: That it would be afterwards restored,

<sup>k</sup> Origenes contra Celsum, l. v. p. 244, 5. Φασὶ τῇ ἐξῆς περιόδῳ τοιαῦτα ἴσασθαι, καὶ Σωκράτην πάλιν Σωφρονίσκου υἱὸν καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἴσασθαι. — Καὶ Ἄνυτος καὶ Μέλιτος ἀναστήσονται, πάλιν Σωκράτους κατήγοροι, καὶ ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴ καλαδικεύσεται τὸν Σωκράτην. — And he adds, that *Phalaris* and *Alexander* were to rise again at this general Renovation, and to exercise the very same Acts of Tyranny and Cruelty, as they had done before.

“ that all things would happen in the very same  
 “ Order as they had done before : That *Socrates*  
 “ and *Plato*, and every one else, would be again  
 “ called into Being, live with the very same  
 “ Friends and Citizens, and in every Particular  
 “ meet with the same Adventures : That this  
 “ Restitution was not to be made once only, but  
 “ often ; that it was to be repeated at certain Pe-  
 “ riods, without End, and to all Eternity : That  
 “ the Face of things would be no ways diversified  
 “ and changed, not even with regard to the most  
 “ particular and minute Circumstance. Some (he  
 “ says) pretend that the Christians borrowed their  
 “ Notion of another Life from this Doctrine :  
 “ But (he adds) *they are grossly* mistaken. For the  
 “ Scriptures teach that the Dead will be *once* re-  
 “ stored to Life ; and not that this will be re-  
 “ peated at certain Periods<sup>1</sup>.”

And *Tatian* gives much the same Account :  
 “ We must reject the Doctrine of *Zeno*, which  
 “ teaches, that, after the general Conflagration,  
 “ the same Men will appear again, and be in-  
 “ gaged in the same Actions.—*Anytus* and *Meli-*  
 “ *tus* will again accuse the Innocent ; *Busiris* will

<sup>1</sup> Cap. 38. Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπων.—Ἐκαστον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ πε-  
 ριόδῳ γενόμενον ἀπαραλλάκτως ἀποτελεῖσθαι ἔσεσθαι πάλιν Σωκ-  
 ράτην, καὶ Πλάτωνα, καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν ἀνθρώπων σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ φί-  
 λοις καὶ πολιταῖς. καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πείσεσθαι καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ μετα-  
 χειρῆσθαι, καὶ πᾶσαν πόλιν, καὶ κώμην, καὶ ἀγρὸν ὁμοίως ἀποκαθίγα-  
 σθαι· γίνεσθαι δὲ τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῶ πάντων οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ  
 πολλάκις. μᾶλλον δὲ εἰς ἄπειρον καὶ ἀτελεύτητον τὰ αὐτὰ ἀποκα-  
 θίγασθαι· τοὺς δὲ θεοὺς τοὺς μὴ ὑποκειμένους τῇ φθορᾷ ταύτῃ  
 παρακολουθήσαντας μιᾷ περιόδῳ γινώσκειν ἐκ ταύτης πάντα τὰ  
 μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐξῆς περιόδοις. ἔδεν γὰρ ξένον ἔσεσθαι  
 παρὰ τὰ γενόμενα πρότερον, ἀλλὰ πάντα ὡσαύτως ἀπαραλλάκτως  
 ἄχρι καὶ τῶν ἐλαχίστων. καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν, φασὶ τινες  
 τοὺς χριστιανὸς τὴν ἀνάστασιν φανταζέσθαι πολὺ πλανηθέντες· εἰς  
 ἅπαξ γὰρ τὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ οὐ κατὰ περίοδον ἔσεσθαι, τὰ τῆ  
 Χριστοῦ δοξάζει λόγια.

“ again

“ again sacrifice Strangers, and *Hercules* will un-  
 “ dergo his former Labours <sup>m</sup>.”

And what was all this but a Revival of the old Scene, a bare Repetition of the former Life without any the least Difference in the most particular and minute Circumstance? The Identity of the Person will not therefore contribute much to support the Conformity which is here supposed between the Stoical Doctrine of a general Renovation, and the common Notion of a future State. If it be the self same *Socrates*, who is to appear and rise again; let it be remember'd that he is to marry the self same *Xantippe*, to be arraigned by the same Sycophants, and to be condemned by the same Judges. No Glympse or Shadow of any Retribution: Happiness and Misery are to be dispensed in the same unequal Measure as they are at present.

The very Passage produced by Mr. *Jackson* from *Chrysippus*, in Support of his own Notion, will of itself prove this. “ It was the Opinion of  
 “ the *Stoics*, that after Death and some deter-  
 “ mined Periods of Time, *we shall be again re-*  
 “ *stored to the State, in which we now are.*” Had I searched all Antiquity for a Passage to establish and confirm the Doctrine I am here maintaining, I could not have found one more pertinent, and decisive of the Point I would support, than this, which the learned Writer brings with a professed Design to confute and overthrow it; “ We shall  
 “ be restored again to the State in which we now  
 “ are.” And can a Restoration to a State *like the present* be compared to the common Doctrine of

<sup>m</sup> Tatiani Oratio ad Græcos, l. v. Τὸν γὰρ Ζήνωνα διὰ τῆς ἐκπυρώσεως ἀποφαινόμενον ἀνάσσειν πάλιν τὰς αὐτὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς, λέγων Ἄνυλον καὶ Μέλιον ἐπὶ τῶν κατηγορειν, Βάσιριν δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν χειροκλονειῶν, καὶ Ἡρακλῆα πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀθλειῶν, παραιτηθέν.

another Life? Are a State of *Retribution*, and a State destitute of Rewards and Punishments, one and the same thing?

Again; with regard to these several Renovations, whether of the *Stoics* or other Sects, we may observe that they were all purely *physical and fatal*; and therefore what Force can they have in the present Question, which is confined to a State of Retribution, that is allowed to be *free and moral*? *Origen*<sup>n</sup>, speaking of the Followers of *Plato* and *Pythagoras*, says, “ They affirm that  
 “ at certain fixed and stated Periods, the Stars will  
 “ return to the same Order and Position which  
 “ they had before; and that then the Face and  
 “ Appearance of things upon Earth will be just  
 “ the same, as when the heavenly Bodies were  
 “ before in this Situation. When therefore the  
 “ Stars return to the same Places, in which they  
 “ were situated in the times of *Socrates*, the necessary Consequence is that *Socrates* shall undergo  
 “ the same Sufferings, be accused by the same  
 “ Persons, and condemned by the same Court of  
 “ Justice.” *Servius* confirms the same; he explains the Opinion of the Philosophers in this manner. “ At the Conclusion of the *great Year*,  
 “ the Stars will return to the very same Points,  
 “ from which they originally moved; and then  
 “ are to revolve again in the same Order. *And if*  
 “ *the Stars revolve in the same Order, all things, that*

<sup>n</sup> Τῶν γὰρ ἀστέρων κατὰ τινας περιόδους τεταγμένας τὰς αὐτὰς σχηματισμὸς καὶ σχέσεις πρὸς ἀλλήλους λαμβανόντων, πάντα τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς ὁμοίως ἔχειν τοῖς ὅτε τὸ αὐτὸ σχῆμα τῆς σχέσεως τῶν ἀστέρων περιεῖχεν ὁ κόσμος. ἀνάγκη τοίνυν κατὰ τῆτον τὸν λόγον, τῶν ἀστέρων ἐκ μακρᾶς περιόδου ἐλθόντων ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν σχέσιν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ὅποιαν εἶχον ἐπὶ Σωκράτους, πάλιν Σωκράτη γενέσθαι ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ παθεῖν κατηγορέμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βελῆς. *Contra Cellsum, lib. v.*



“ *have been, must be again repeated. For all things  
depend intirely on the Motion of the Stars* °.”

It is remarkable that *Servius* speaks of the Philosophers in general, and does not confine himself to any one Sect. But *Nemesius* gives this very Doctrine to the *Stoics* in the most direct and express Terms. “ The *Stoics*, says he, assert that when  
“ the Planets shall return to the very same Points  
“ in the Heavens, in which they were originally  
“ placed, when the World was made ; a general  
“ Conflagration will arise and consume all things.  
“ But then the World will be restored again to its  
“ former State ; and, *since the Stars are to move in  
“ the very same Order as they did before*, every  
“ Transaction and Event of the preceding State,  
“ will be again repeated in the very same Man-  
“ ner. *Plato and Socrates* will live again in the  
“ same Country, converse with the same Citizens  
“ and Friends, &c. P ”

If then the learned Writer could prove that the very *same* Men were to be restored at the general Renovation ; that they were to be happy and miserable in *Proportion* to the Merit and Demerit of their former Lives ; he would be still on the wrong Side the Post : For as all this would

° Dixit etiam finitis sæculis omnia revocari, quod & philosophi ita colligunt; quod, exacto magno anno, omnia sydera in ortus suos redeunt; & rursus referuntur eodem motu. Si igitur idem est syderum motus, omnia quæ fuerunt, habebunt reiterationem. Nam universa ex astrorum motu pendent. *Virgil. Eclog. iv.*

P Οἱ δὲ Στωϊκοὶ φασιν ἀποκαθισταμένως τὰς πλανήτας εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ σημεῖον κατὰ τε μῆκος καὶ πλάτος, ἔνθα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἕκαστος ἦν, ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον ὁ κόσμος συνέστη, ἐν ῥηλαῖς χρόνων περιόδοις ἐκπύρωσιν καὶ φθορὰν τῶν ὄντων ἀπεργάζεσθαι καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ὑπάρχεις εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἀποκαθίστασθαι. ΤῶΝ ΑΣΤΕΡῶΝ ΟΜΟΙΩΣ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΩΝ, ἕκαστον ἐν τῇ προτέρα περιόδῳ γενόμενον ἀπαρραλλάκτως ἀποτελεῖσθαι. And then follows the Passage above cited, *Nemesius de Fato, c. xxxviii.*

have

have been ascribed to pure *Necessity and Fate*, it would be quite wide of the present Question.

Again: Not content to demonstrate that the Philosophers believed another Life, he affirms too in his Title Page, that their Doctrine of it was CONSISTENT WITH REASON. In his second Piece he repeats the same, and tells us<sup>q</sup>, “ That he has “ shewn at large the REASONABLENESS of their “ Doctrine on this Head.” But if their Notion of a future State was such as he here gives it, upon the Authority of *Chrysippus*, its *Reasonableness*, I presume, may fairly be disputed. Is it *reasonable* that the Sufferings of the Righteous, and the Prosperity of the Wicked should be again repeated in another Life? Is it *reasonable* that Happiness and Misery should for ever be dispensed with the same Inequalities as they are now? For that they were *for ever* to be dispensed in the same Manner, was the clear and unquestioned Doctrine of the *Stoics*. Thus *Numenius* informs us, “ that these Revolutions were to succeed each other in a *perpetual* “ *and endless Circle*”.

But as the *Reasonableness* of their Doctrine is so much insisted on by this learned Gentleman, I must beg leave to mention another Circumstance, which seems to me intirely destructive both of his Reason and theirs. Observe then in what Manner they introduce Men into this new Scene. *Veniet iterum qui nos in lucem reponet dies, quem multi recusarent, nisi oblitos reduceret. Seneca Ep. 36.*

Strange Preparative for a future State of Rewards and Punishments! they were, you see, to

<sup>q</sup> Page 58.

<sup>r</sup> Τῶν τοιούτων περιόδων ΕΞ ΑΙΔΙΟΥ γινομένων ἀναπαύσεως. *Eusebius. Præp. Evang. l. xv. c. 19.* And *Nemesius* told us, in very plain and direct Terms, that these Revolutions were to continue to all Eternity.

be stript of all Memory and Sense of their preceding Lives; they were to be dragged into Existence, under a perfect Ignorance and Oblivion of all that had hitherto happened to them; they were not so much as to know that they had existed before. In this Situation, it was impossible for them to consider their State and Condition in this new World, whatever it was, as the Reward and Punishment of their Actions in the preceding State: And what Judge ever thought of keeping the Objects of his Tribunal perpetually ignorant of their Sentence? Whether the learned Writer reflected upon this Circumstance, when he talked of the *Reasonableness* of the Philosophers' future State, I won't pretend to say: Or whether he considered that the very EPICUREANS themselves would go Snacks in his Compliment, is as little worth deciding. Yet we must do Justice to this illustrious Sect: For they too held it possible that the same Men after Death might appear again; that they might again be brought into Being in some distant Age. But then, as they were to be divested of Sense and Memory of their former Lives, they not look upon themselves as at all interested and concerned in the State and Condition of this future Life.

*Nec si materiam nostram conlegerit ætas  
Post obitum, rursumque redegerit ut sita nunc est,  
Atque iterum nobis fuerint data lumina vitæ,  
PERTINEAT QUIDQUAM TAMEN AD NOS ID  
QUOQUE FACTUM,  
INTERRUPTA SEMEL CUM SIT REPETENTIA  
NOSTRA.* *Lucretius.*

And should we say that they held the very same Renovations with the *Stoics* themselves, we have the Authority of *St. Jerom* to justify us in this Point \*.

\* *Nec putemus signa atque prodigia, & multa quæ arbitrio Dei*

And now the learned Author, with the best Grace in the World, proceeds. “ This made  
 “ some Christian Writers think that the Opi-  
 “ nion of the *Stoics* was not much different  
 “ from the Christian Doctrine of the Resurrec-  
 “ tion.” And for this we are referred to *Clemens*  
 of *Alexandria* and *Nemesius*. As for *Clemens*, that  
 he was, upon all Occasions, (as was the common  
 Failing of his time) fond of finding out some Re-  
 semblance between the Doctrine of the Scriptures  
 and the Pagan System ; that he was ever ready to  
 strain and warp things, in order to give the better  
 Colour to this imaginary Likeness, is an evident  
 Fact, and known to all, who are the least con-  
 versant in the Writings of this great Man. Thus  
*Plato*, if we may believe him, stole his Notion of  
 the Ideal World from Chap. xxii. of the Book of  
*Genesis*. (*Strom.* v. p. 583.) Now, after such a  
 Discovery, we shall hardly be surpris'd to find him  
 comparing the future Revolutions of the *Stoics* to  
 the Scripture Doctrine of a future State. All we  
 shall be surpris'd at, is, that he should at this time  
 of day be cited to prove, not only against the Pri-  
 mitive Writers abovementioned, but even against  
*Chrysippus* himself, that this Renovation was con-  
 sidered as a State of future Rewards and Punish-  
 ments. And, what increases the Surprise, is, that  
 the learned Mr. *Jackson* could not but know, that  
 this very Passage had been objected to *Clemens* on  
 this Score ; that he had hence been charged with  
 supposing a Likeness between the Doctrines of  
 Philosophy and the Gospel, without the least  
 Foundation in Truth and real Fact †.

Dei nova in mundo fiunt, in prioribus sæculis esse jam facta,  
 & locum invenire Epicurum, qui asserit per innumerabiles perio-  
 dos eadem & iisdem in locis, & per eosdem fieri. Alioquin &  
 Judas crebro prodidit, & Christus sæpe passus est pro nobis, &c.  
 In *Ecclesiast.* c. i.

† Le Clerc's *Epistolæ Criticæ*, p. 14.

The Authority of *Clemens* will then, I fear, add very little Weight to this other Side of the Question. The Cause must surely be near expiring, or the learned Gentleman would never have had Recourse to such discredited Evidence.

For Proof of this he appeals too to *Nemesius de Fato*, c. xxxviii. Would not any one now imagine that *Nemesius*, or some *Christian Writer* had declared in this Place, “ that this Opinion of the *Stoics* was not much different from the Scripture Doctrine of a future State? ” But *Nemesius* is so far from affirming this, that he affirms the direct contrary, that is, he asserts the very thing I contend for, *that the two Doctrines were very different.*

He does indeed say, that *some* imagined the Scripture Doctrine to be borrowed from this Principle of the *Stoics*; but then he does not say with Mr. *Jackson* that these were *Christian Writers*. And if it was an Infidel Objection, 'tis nothing to the Purpose of our present Argument. However he does say, in direct Contradiction to Mr. *Jackson*, that they who talked in this manner, *were grossly mistaken.* But I have already given the whole Passage from *Nemesius*; and if the Reader can find any thing in it, in Favour of the Doctrine I am here opposing, I shall readily take upon *myself* the Shame of having endeavoured to support my Point by a Testimony, that makes directly against it.

As to this Notion of future Renovations, whether borrowed from the *Stoics* or other Sects, 'tis certain that it infected the Christian Church in the first Ages. St. *Jerom* charges it on *Origen*. *Origeni tuo licet tractare μετεμψύχωσιν, innumera- biles mundos introducere, & rationabiles creaturas aliis atque aliis vestire corporibus; Christumque*  
H
dicere

dicere sæpe passum, & sæpius passurum<sup>v</sup>. There cannot, I think, be a more clear and convincing Proof, that these general Restorations were very different from the Scripture Doctrine of another Life : How horridly must we pervert and misrepresent Scripture, before we can make it give any Countenance to the execrable Doctrine I have here mentioned ?

And here, again, we see, as Mr. *Warburton* observes, the fatal Effects of too close an Attachment to the Pagan Systems ; how grossly it led Men to pervert and corrupt the Gospel in the early Ages.

It is, I find, after all, the Opinion of some learned Men, that these several Revolutions, which make so much Noise in Antiquity, do really bear a strong Resemblance to the Scripture Doctrine of another Life. Mr. *Jortin*, in his late very rational *Discourses*, seems to have considered them in this Light. He speaks of them as a *Restitution to a happier State ; a Restitution of things to their ancient Beauty and Perfections*, p. 102, 3. But in what did this *Perfection, Beauty, and Happiness* consist<sup>x</sup> ? The material World was to be framed in the very same manner as it now is. If the moral World was to be restored to its ancient Beauty and Perfection, in this it had no Advantage over the present State. The first Ages were indeed to be distinguished by the Purity and Simplicity of their Manners, much in the same Manner, as the first Inhabitants of this World were said to have been before them. But then it was supposed that they would soon sink into the same De-

<sup>v</sup> Apologia ad Ruffinum.

<sup>x</sup> Ita relinqui nihil præter ignem, a quo rursus animante ac Deo renovatio mundi fieret, atque idem ornatus oriretur. Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, l. ii. c. 46.

pravity and Corruption, which so much prevails in the present State of things<sup>y</sup>.

This Sameness of the several succeeding Worlds was held likewise by *Pythagoras* and *Plato*. “ At certain fixed and stated times, every thing which had before appeared, was to revive and rise again; but nothing new, absolutely new, was ever to be<sup>z</sup>.”

*Plutarch* confirms the same, “ That at the general Restoration there would be the very same Appearance of Things and Persons; the same Men were to be engaged in the same Scenes of Life, to discharge their several Offices in the same manner, and to share the same Fortune, without the least Vicissitude or Change<sup>a</sup>.”

*Celsus* too declares, “ That several Worlds were to succeed each other in a regular and fixed Order; that, at certain Periods, there would always be the same State and Condition of things in this new World<sup>b</sup>.” This is the true State of the Affair, and let Divines make the best of it; but without forgetting, that there is something due to Truth and Scripture, as well as to System.

But to return to the Question, having shewn the Weakness and Insufficiency of all *Mr. Jackson*

† *Omne animal ex integro generabitur, dabiturque terris homo inscius scelerum, & melioribus auspiciis natus. Sed illis quoque Innocentia non durabit, nisi dum novi sint; cito nequitia surrepit. Seneca, Nat. Quæst. l. iii.*

<sup>z</sup> “Οτι κατὰ περιόδους τινὰς τὰ γινόμενά ποτε πάλιν γίνεσθαι, ΝΕΟΝ Δ’ ΟΥΔΕΝ ΑΠΛΩΣ ΕΣΤΙ. Porphyrius de vita Pythagoræ.

<sup>a</sup> Πάλιν τοίνυν επειδὴν ἡ αὐτὴ ἀφίκηται αἰτία, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως οἱ αὐτοὶ γεόμενοι πράξουσιν, ἔτω δὲ καὶ πάντες ἄνθρωποι, καὶ τὰ γὰρ ἐξῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐξῆς αἰτίαν γινήσεται καὶ πραχθήσεται, καὶ πανθ’ ὅσα κείτται, κατὰ μίαν τὴν ὅλην περίοδον καὶ καθ’ ἑκάστην τῶν ὅλων ὡσαύτως ἀποδοθήσεται. *Plutarch de Fato.*

<sup>b</sup> Ὁμοίᾳ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος εἶναι ἢ τῶν θνητῶν περίοδος, καὶ κατὰ τὰς τετασμένας ἀνακυκλήσεις ἀνάγκη τὰ αὐτὰ αἰεὶ καὶ γιγνέσθαι, καὶ εἶναι, καὶ ἴσασθαι ἐν τῇ τῶν θνητῶν περιόδῳ. *Origen. cont. Cels. l. iv.*

has advanced with regard to this general Renovation.

Let us now proceed to his other Testimonies. That from *Chrysippus* is immediately followed by this from *Arius Didymus*. "Their (the *Stoics*)  
 "Notion was, that the Soul was generated and  
 "corruptible, but did not immediately perish  
 "when it departed out of the Body, but con-  
 "tinued to exist for a certain term of Duration.  
 "That the Souls of good Men existed till the ge-  
 "neral Conflagration and Dissolution of the Uni-  
 "verse; but those of the wicked continued only  
 "to a certain Period." p. 97, 8.

Never sure were two Passages joined together so inconsistent with and utterly destructive of each other. Yet are they produced by this learned Man to prove that the *Stoics* believed a future State of Rewards and Punishments. The first refers us to the general Renovation for these Rewards and Punishments; but the second plainly tells us, that the Souls of good Men would be extinct and lost long before this Period; and that the Souls of the Wicked would perish even before them. For whom then were these future Rewards and Punishments reserved? For Mr. *Jackson's Defence* of the ancient Philosophers. It was done like a Workman to tell us, the *Stoics* said that Men should be punished and rewarded at the general Revolution; and then, in Confirmation of it, to give us another Passage, which says that they will cease to exist before that Period?

His other Testimony runs thus: *Esse inferos Zeno Stoicus docuit, & sedes piorum ab impiis esse discretas; & illos quidem quietas & delectabiles incolere regiones, hos vero luere pœnas in tenebrosis locis atque in cœni voraginibus horrendis.* This Passage evidently relates to the popular Account of a fu-



a future State; and therefore it is impossible to know with what View it is here brought, unless it be to confute the Passage from *Chryſippus* cited above. *Chryſippus*, if we allow Mr. *Jackson's* Interpretation, ſays that theſe Punishments and Rewards were not to begin till after the general Conflagration: But *Zeno* as plainly tells us that they were to be over, and intirely ceaſe at this very Period; for this was the Caſe of the infernal Torments, and the Happineſs of *Elyſium*: But few indeed of the Righteous would then be found in *Elyſium*, as their Continuance there was limited to a thouſand Years. But that the infernal Regions themſelves were to be deſtroyed at the general Conflagration, we have the expreſs Teſtimony of *Seneca*, who ſays, in *Hercules Octæus*,

*Jam jam legibus obrutis*  
*Mundo cum veniet dies,*  
*Cæli regia concidet,*  
*Certos atque obitus trahet,*  
*Atque omnes pariter Deos*  
*Perdet mors aliqua, & Chaos.*  
*Discedet via Tartari,*  
*Stratis ut pateat polis.*  
*Pontum, Sydera, Tartara,*  
*Regna unus capiet tria.*

The learned Writer will pardon me, if I ſay that this laſt Teſtimony of *Zeno* is inconſiſtent with the ſecond as well as with the firſt Paſſage. In the ſecond, he plainly ſuppoſes that the Souls of the Wicked *will not ſubſiſt till the general Conflagration*: In the third, he as plainly ſuppoſes that *they will*. It never was imagined that the Punishments of *Tartarus* would end before this time.

So much for the firſt Point; or the Teſtimonies brought by Mr. *Jackson* to prove that the

*Stoics* believed another Life. There needs, we see, no great Pains to answer and confute them; they are indeed chosen in so singular a manner, as even to answer and confute themselves. But had they been ever so consistent, what would he have gained by them? All they would prove, is, that the *Stoics* sometimes declared for another Life; and who ever denied this? But then let it be remember'd, that they did often declare against it. Let the learned Writer take in this Consideration, and then shew how the Professions of the *Stoics* make any thing in Favour of his pretended Demonstration.

2dly, I am now to prove from a Principle, which we both allow to be truly *Stoical*, that this Sect neither did nor could believe a future State. The Principle is this; that the Soul, after its Departure from the Body, was to be *resolved* into the divine Nature, or God. This I conceive to be destructive of all future Rewards and Punishments. The learned Writer considers it in a very different Light. He every where represents it as a State of the most absolute and perfect Bliss; gives it as the *esoteric* Doctrine, or *only* Notion of future Happiness really entertained by the ancient Sages. If then we shew, that the Sense he puts upon the Principle is a mere Novel Refinement unknown to Antiquity, there is an End of him and his Argument.

Let us attend to his own Words. “ They (the  
 “ Philosophers) taught that the human Soul was  
 “ congenial with the Soul of the World, and that  
 “ the Happiness of it after Death consisted in its  
 “ Return to and intimate Union with the divine  
 “ Nature or God, from whom it was derived:  
 “ On the other hand, that the Misery of it con-  
 “ sisted in being excluded from this Union with  
 “ God, &c. &c. All agreed, that as Happiness  
 “ consisted

“ consisted in the Improvement of the intelligent  
 “ or rational Soul in divine Knowledge and Vir-  
 “ tue, so in the future State the Soul, they con-  
 “ stantly believed, was rendered more perfect in  
 “ Knowledge and Virtue, by its Union and Com-  
 “ munion with the divine Substance, or Deity.  
 “ This was a rational and exalted Notion of a  
 “ future State, and very agreeable to the Doctrine  
 “ of it taught by Revelation. This was the eso-  
 “ teric Doctrine of the Philosophers concerning a  
 “ future State.” In his second Piece he says,  
 “ that the Souls of the Virtuous were to be united  
 “ to God by *divine Knowledge, Faith, and Virtue* ;  
 “ were to have *Communion* with him ; and were to  
 “ to be blessed with the beatific Vision of the di-  
 “ vine Perfections.” p. 8. Thus, we see, he every  
 where gives us this Resurrection as a State of the  
 most perfect and complete Happiness. He talks  
 much of *Communion* with God, *beatific Vision*, and  
 so forth. This is indeed the Language of our  
 modern Mystics ; and the ingenious Mr. *W. Law*  
 has retailed a System of the rankest *Spinozism* un-  
 der these fine Words ; but the following Observa-  
 tions will perhaps shew that it is not very nearly  
 allied to that of the old *Stoics*. As to this Resur-  
 rection, first, It was not supposed to be peculiar to  
 the human Soul. The *Stoics* held that their infe-  
 rior Gods would all share the same Fate. “ *Chry-*  
 “ *sippus* and *Cleantes*, when they filled the Hea-  
 “ vens, the Earth, the Air, and Sea with Gods,  
 “ held that none of these was immortal and in-  
 “ corruptible but *Jupiter*. They held that all the  
 “ rest were to be absorbed and consumed into him.  
 “ He therefore must destroy others, which implies  
 “ the same Imperfection, as if he was to be de-  
 “ stroyed himself. For as it is a Mark of Imper-

“ *The Belief of a future State, &c.* p. 72.

“ fection

fection to perish by being dissolved into another Being, so it is an Imperfection for a Being to be nourished and supported by the Dissolution of others into it. And this is not, like many other Absurdities charged upon them, a mere Consequence of their own Principles, but a Doctrine openly proclaimed and asserted by them, in their Books concerning the Gods, Providence, Fate, and Nature; where they say that the Gods were generated and will be destroyed by Fire, *as if they would be melted*, like Substances of Wax or Lead<sup>d</sup>.”

Again: “*Chrysippus* in his first Book on Providence, affirms, That *Jupiter* will *increase and be enlarged*, till he has *absorbed all things* into himself. For since Death consists in the Departure of the Soul from the Body, and the Soul of the World never does depart, but is *augmented continually till every thing is consumed into it*; we cannot say that the Soul dies<sup>e</sup>.”

Here we see with what Purpose and Design the Gods and other Substances were to be dissolved

<sup>d</sup> Plutarch adver. Stoicos, p. 1075. Ed. Xyl.—Χρυσίππος ἢ Κλειάνδης ἐμπειρηκότες τῶ λόγῳ θεῶν τῶν οὐρανῶν, τὴν γῆν, τὸν αἶρα, τὴν θάλατταν, οὐδὲνα τῶν τοσούτων ἀφθαετοι εἰδὲ αἰδιον ἀπολεοίπασθαι, πλὴν μόνου τῷ Διὶ· εἰς ὃν πάντας καταναλίσκῃσι, τῆς ἄλλης· ὥστε ἢ τῆτω τὸ φθείρειν προσεῖναι τῷ φθείρεσθαι μὴ ἐπιεικέστερον· ἀσθενεῖα γάρ τι καὶ τὸ μεταβάλλον εἰς ἕτερον φθείρεται, καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰς ἑαυτὸ φθειρομένοισι τρεφόμενον σώζεται· ταῦτα δὲ οὐχ ὡς ἄλλα πόλλα τῶν ἀτόπων συλλογιζόμενα ἔχει τὰς ὑποδείξεις αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῖς δόγμασιν ἔπεται, ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ μέγα βοῶντες ἐν τοῖς περὶ θεῶν, καὶ προνοίας εἰμαρμένης τε καὶ φύσεως γραμμῆσι, διαρρήδην λέγουσι τῆς θεῆς ἀπαντας εἶναι γεγονότας καὶ φθαρσομένους ὑπὸ πυρός, τρετὸς κατὰ αὐτῆς, ὡσπερ κρηνοῦς ἢ κατῆτερον ὄντας.

<sup>e</sup> Plutarch de Stoicorum Repug. p. 1052.—Ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ προνοίας τὸν Δία φησὶν αὐξῆσθαι, μέχρις ἂν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπαντα καταναλώσῃ· ἐπὶ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος μὲν εἰς ψυχῆς χωρισμὸς ἀπὸ τῆ σώματος, ἢ δὲ τῷ κόσμῳ ψυχὴ ἢ χωρίζεται μὲν, αὐξῆται δὲ συνεχῶς, μέχρις ἂν εἰς αὐτὴν ἐξαναλώσῃ τὴν ὕλην, οὐ ἔτιον ἀποδύσκειν τὸν κόσμον.

into

into the *Anima Mundi*, or supreme God of this Sect. It was only in order to nourish and support it, to recruit its Losses, and to prevent it from consuming and wasting into nothing.

*Antoninus* gives much the same Account of this Refusion; the human Soul was indeed to be changed by it: But then this Change was purely physical. It was not wrought with any moral Purpose and Design, but was only to support the Order and Harmony of the Universe. We have already seen that the Gods themselves were to be dissolved, like so many Pieces of Wax or Lead, into the *Anima Mundi* for this very Purpose; why therefore might not the human Soul? But to come to *Antoninus*, “I consist (says he) of Form  
“and Matter, or of Soul and Body. As neither  
“of these Parts was made out of nothing, so nei-  
“ther of them will be annihilated or reduced to  
“nothing. Every Part of me therefore will by a  
“Change be resolved into another, and so on in  
“*infinitum*.”

“Consider that in a short time you will cease  
“to be; all things which subsist now, must be  
“changed, altered, and destroyed, that they may  
“serve for the Production of others.”

Lib. x. § 1. he speaks of God or the Universal Soul, “as containing all things that are dissolved  
“into him, in order that others of the same kind  
“may again be generated out of him.”

<sup>f</sup> Ἐξ αἰτιῶδες καὶ ὑλικῆ συνίστηκα· οὐδέτερον δὲ τῶν εἰς τὸ μὴ ὄν φθαρήσεται· ὥσπερ ἔδδ' ἐκ τῆ μη ὄντος ὑπέστη· ἕκην καταταχθήσεται πάλιν μέρος ἑμὸν κατὰ μεταβολὴν εἰς μέρος τι τῆ κόσμου· καὶ πάλιν ἐκεῖνο εἰς ἕτερον μέρος τῆ κόσμου μεταβαλεῖ· καὶ ἤδε εἰς ἄπειρον. I. 5. 13.

<sup>g</sup> Ὅτι, μετ' ἑποχῶν, ἕδεις ἑδάμῃ ἔση· ἀπαντα γὰρ μεταβάλλειν, καὶ τρίπλοθαι καὶ φθειροῦθαι πέφυκεν, ἵνα ἕτερα εφεσῆς γενήσονται. I. 12. 21.

<sup>h</sup> L. 10. 1. Πάντα περιέχοντος [θεῦ] καὶ περιλαμβανόντος διαλυόμενα εἰς γενεσίν ἕτερον ὁμοίων.

He tells us too “ that the World is to be  
 “ perpetually renewed by these Revolutions and  
 “ Changes; that some Things must die *that others*  
 “ *may arise out of them*.<sup>i</sup>”

As to the Consequence and Effect of this Change  
 it is very clearly described by him in another  
 Place<sup>k</sup>. “ The things thus changed do not re-  
 “ ceive any Prejudice or Hurt by it; and as to  
 “ those which are produced by this Change, they  
 “ have no Benefit or Advantage from it.” It  
 could not therefore be a Translation to a State of  
 Happiness or Misery; or be consider’d with any  
 moral View. It is indeed evident that Souls were  
 sent into the *Anima Mundi*, barely to furnish it  
 with Materials; purely to supply what might be  
 wanting for the Production of new Beings. *Plu-*  
*tarch* tells us, “ that it was to be *nourished* and  
 “ *supported* by the Dissolution of other Beings  
 “ into it,” that “ it would *augment* continually  
 “ till all things were consumed into it.” And does  
 not *Antoninus* say the same? He tells us, “ that  
 “ all things were dissolved into God, that others  
 “ of the same Nature might again be generated  
 “ out of him<sup>k</sup>.”

Having thus explained the Nature and End,  
 the Purpose and Design of this Re-union of the  
 Soul with the universal Substance; I may surely  
 presume so far upon the Privilege of common  
 Sense as to take it for granted that this Re-fusion

<sup>i</sup> 7. 25.

<sup>k</sup> Οὐδέν ἐστι κακὸν τοῖς ἐν μεταβολῇ γινομένοις· ὡς ἐστὶ ἀγαθὸν ἐκ με-  
 ταβολῆς ὑφισταμένοις. l. 4. 42.

<sup>l</sup> Habent aliquid Stoici Dogmati Pythagorico affine, quod  
 ex animarum materiâ quasi conflatâ & recoctâ novas produci &  
 produci statuunt. Verum hac ratione non magis animæ quam  
 corpori Immortalitatem asserunt; non minus animæ quam cor-  
 pori corruptionem & mortalitatem adscribunt. *Gataker on Anto-*  
*ninus*, l. iv. § 21.

will no longer be considered as a *State of perfect and complete Happiness*. Will any Man pretend that there is the least Conformity between this Reunion and the Scripture Doctrine of future Happiness? That there is any Trace or Footstep of the *beatific Vision*; the *Communion with God*; which the learned Mr. *Jackson* pretends to discover in it? In short, will any one but himself say, that “this was a rational and exalted Notion of a “future State?”

2dly, Who, but would imagine from his Description, that this Refusion was conceived to be a Privilege peculiar to the Righteous and Innocent? That it was reserved for *them only*, as a Reward for their Integrity and Virtue? But Antiquity gives us a very different Account of this Matter; it tells us, that this Refusion was given to the Souls of the Good and Bad without Distinction. *Numerius*, speaking of some *Stoics*, declares “that, according to them, the Soul of the Universe “would be eternal, but that *all others* would upon “Death be blended and mixed with it.”

“Every Body (says *Antoninus*) will be lost and “buried in the universal Substance. *Every Soul* “will be absorbed and sunk into the universal Nature,” or God. Here this Refusion is given promiscuously to the Souls of the Good and Bad. This single Consideration may serve to inform us that it was not looked on as a State of Rewards and Happiness.—But what becomes now of future Punishments? Mr. *Jackson* makes them consist in an Exclusion from the Union with the divine Nature. But it appears that the old *Stoics* did not

\* Eusebius Præpat. Evan. l. xv. c. 20. “Ἐνιοὶ δὲ τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν τῷ ὅλῳ, αἰδίῳ. ΤΑΣ ΔΕ ΛΟΪΠΙΑΣ ΣΥΜΜΙΓΝΥΣΘΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΕΛΕΥΤῆ ΕΙΣ ΕΚΕΙΝΗΝ.

† Πᾶν τὸ ἔνυλον ἐναφανίζεται τάχιςα τῇ τῶν ὄλων ἕσεια ἢ πᾶν αἴτιοι εἰς τὸν τῶν ὄλων λόγον τάχιςα ἀναλαμβάνεται. l. vii. § 10.

hold any such Exclusion ; that they admitted the Souls of the Good and Bad indifferently to this Union ; and therefore, according to *him*, they could not believe any future Punishments. I shall here spend a Word or two more on another Circumstance, which seems to bear hard on the Opinion maintained by the learned Writer. It is this ; the Soul, after its Separation from the Body, was immediately to return to the divine Nature. *Nu- menius* says, it would be re-united to God upon *Death*. *Antoninus* declares ; “ it would be resumed “ into the universal Nature τὰχιστα, or immediate- “ ly.” I take this to be a considerable Objection to the Hypothesis I am here examining. For, if the Refusion was immediate upon the Separation of Soul and Body ; what Room or Possibility, according to Mr. *Jackson*, for future Punishments ?

It may be said, that, to compliment their *wise Man*, they taught that his Soul would hold out till the general Conflagration. “ By this, says Mr. “ *Warburton*, we shall see they meant just nothing “ when we come to speak of their Opinion con- “ cerning the Nature and Duplicity of the Soul.”  
<sup>2</sup> But, not to insist on this, this very Objection would be no light Confirmation of the Notion I am here establishing. The Stoics taught that the Soul of their *wise Man* was to subsist till the general Conflagration. But then it was not to rejoin the divine Nature till this Period ; it was in the mean time to exist separate and distinct from it. Now this will of itself overthrow every thing, which the learned Gentleman has advanced on this Point. For, had this Refusion been considered as a State of the highest Perfection, would the *Stoics* have excluded their *wise Man* from it till the End of the World ; while the Bulk of Mankind were ad-

<sup>2</sup> *Divine Legation*, vol. i. third Edition, p. 391.

mitted



mitted to it, immediately upon the Dissolution of the Body? Had the Exclusion from it been considered as a State of Punishment, would they have sentenced and condemned their *wise Man* to it for so long a Period?

But thirdly, we meet with very plain and open Descriptions of the State and Condition of the Soul after its Return to God. But to what do they amount? Why, to no very high Degree of Happiness and Perfection: All the Advantage they give the Soul, is, that it should be exempt from Pain and Misery; and it was to be exempt from Pain and Misery, only because it was deprived of Perception, and had lost its separate and distinct Existence.

The *Stoics*, I say, did not consider this Reunion, as a State of perfect and complete Happiness. And this may appear from the cold and lifeless Manner, in which they deliver themselves on this Head. *Reverti eo unde veneris, quid grave est* <sup>a</sup>?

*Epietetus*, speaking of Death, says, “But whither do you go? *No where to your Hurt*; you return from whence you came, to a friendly Con-  
“fociation with your kindred Elements; what there  
“was of the Nature of Fire in your Composition,  
“returns to the Element of Fire; what there was  
“of Earth, to Earth; what of Air, to Air; and  
“Water, to Water. There is neither *Hell, Ache-*  
“*ron, Cocytus, or Pyriphlegethon* <sup>b</sup>.” *Magnus*  
*animus Deo pareat, & quicquid Lex Universi jubet,*  
*sine cunctatione patiatur. Aut in meliorem emittitur*  
*vitam, lucidius tranquilliusque inter divina mansu-*  
*rus, aut certe sine ullo futuro incommodo, na-*  
*turae suae remiscebitur & revertetur in totum* <sup>c</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Seneca de Tranquillitate, c. xi.

<sup>b</sup> Divine Legation, vol. i. p. 392.

<sup>c</sup> Seneca, Ep. 72.

In the two first Passages the Notion of this Refusion, is, we see, stated in a very different Light, from that in which it is represented by the learned Gentleman, whose Sentiments I am here considering. All that can be collected from them, is, that the Soul, after its Refusion, will not be attended with any painful and uneasy Circumstance; that it will not be subject to any actual and real Misery: The very Language which they use, when they describe Death as a State of Extinction and Non-existence<sup>d</sup>. But that it will enjoy the least Degree of positive and real Happiness, is more than can be deduced from these Passages.

The third Citation seems to speak more fully to our Purpose: "The Soul, after its Separation  
" from the Body, will either be exalted to a State  
" of Happiness; or, without any troublesome  
" Circumstance attending it, will rejoin the Sub-  
" stance, from which it was originally taken." This Re-union could not be considered as a State of positive and real Happiness, because it is clearly and directly opposed to such a State.

It was indeed a common Saying, "The Soul  
" after Death will either be happy or not be at  
" all." *Mors nos aut consumit, aut emittit. Emis-  
sis meliora restant.* And is not the Passage I am here examining of the very same Nature; and if it be of the same Nature, must not the Refusion here mentioned answer to that Part in the other Passage<sup>e</sup>, in which the Soul is said to be no more?

But what was to be the State and Condition of the Soul after its Resolution into the divine Being? Why, he says *sine ullo futuris est Incommodo.* The very Description, which he gives of Death,

<sup>d</sup> *Mors nullum habet incommodum, esse enim debet aliquid, cujus fit incommodum. Seneca.*

<sup>e</sup> *Seneca.*

when

when he considers it as a State of mere Extinction. *‡ Mors nullum habet Incommodum. Esse enim debet aliquid, cujus sit Incommodum.* To tell us then that this Refusion was considered as a State of absolute and perfect Happiness, is in Effect to tell us that the Ancients knew nothing of their own Doctrine; for they are so far from representing it in this Light, that they in direct and express Terms oppose it to this very State.

4thly, All then the Soul could gain by this Refusion, was that it would be exempt from Pain and Misery: And this only because it was deprived of Perception, by its retaining no longer a separate and distinct Existence. The following Passages will not suffer us to doubt, but this was the very Case. *Quod si tanta Cupiditas longioris ævi te tenet, cogita nihil eorum, quæ ab oculis abeunt, & in rerum naturam, ex qua prodierunt & mox processura sunt, reconduntur, consumi; desinunt ista, non pereunt. Et mors, quam pertimescimus & recusamus, intermittit vitam, non eripit. Veniet iterum qui nos in lucem reponet dies, quem multi recusarent, nisi oblitos reduceret.* It is evident that he here speaks of the State and Condition of Men, after they rejoin and are resolved into the universal Nature. And his Description may suffice to shew, that, in the Opinion of the old Stoics, they were now deprived of all Perception, that they were supposed to lose their peculiar and distinct Existence. *Desinunt ista, non pereunt. Mors intermittit vitam, non eripit.*

They were to rise again after the general Restoration; but in the mean time, Life and all the Faculties of it were to be intirely suspended. Antoninus, speaking of Men departed out of this Life, says, “they will be no more for a very long

‡ Seneca, Ep. 34.

“ Period g.” They were to be no more till the general Renovation. Must they not therefore till then be supposed to be deprived of all Sense and distinct Existence ?

In another Place <sup>h</sup>, speaking on a certain Supposition, he declares “ that the Souls of the Dead, “ after they had remained for some time in the “ Air, would be absorbed by the divine Substance, “ and there be *changed, melted, and burnt.*” *Plutarch* applies these very Expressions to the inferior Gods ; but then he evidently supposes, as will be shewn hereafter, that their separate and distinct Existences would be quite sunk and lost by the Resolution here mentioned. This will be proved on the Authority of *Cudworth* ; but it is indeed plain from the very Words of *Plutarch*, who says, “ that the several Beings, which return to the universal Soul, were to be *melted and dissolved into* “ *it, like so many Substances of Wax and Lead.*

*Cleanthes* himself, as we are informed by *Stobæus* <sup>i</sup>, said “ that all things were made out of “ one, and would be again resolved into one.” But if all things were to become one, what room for separate Perception, or distinct Existence ? That the Soul was to be thus changed and resolved with the rest, will not be denied. “ You have as yet “ existed as a Part (or have had a particular Sub- “ sistence) you will afterwards be absorbed and lost “ in the Substance, which produced you ; or you “ will be resumed into the divine Nature, or the “ spermatic Reasons.” The Soul was no longer to subsist as a Part, or to retain a distinct Ex-

<sup>g</sup> Οὕτως γὰρ συνεχῶς θεάσθη τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, καπνὸν, καὶ τὸ μηδὲν μάλιστα εἰάν συμμημονεύσης, ὅτι τὸ ἀπαξ μεταβαλὸν οὐκέτι ἔσται ἐν τῷ ἀπέριφ χρόνῳ. l. x. 31.

<sup>h</sup> Μεταβάλλεσι, καὶ κεονταί, καὶ ἐξάπτονται, εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων σπερματικὸν λόγον ἀναλαμβάνομεναι. l. iv. 21.

<sup>i</sup> Eclog. Phys. c. xx.

istence,

istence, because it would be resumed into the universal Nature. Is not the *Refusion* here plainly opposed to a separate and distinct Existence<sup>k</sup>?

So much for this *Refusion*. What must we think now of the Doctrine that would obtrude it upon us as a State of absolute and perfect Happiness? What Appearance, let me once more ask, that the Souls of good Men were to be united to the *Anima Mundi*, by divine *Knowledge, Faith, and Virtue*? What Mark or Trace of the *beatific Vision*? We have shewn that the End and Purpose of this Refusion was *merely physical*; that it was designed only to repair the Losses and Decays of the universal Soul; that Gods, Men, and all other Substances were to be resolved into it with this only View. Besides, this Refusion was given to the Souls of the Good and Bad without Distinction. It was clearly and directly opposed to a State of future Happiness, it was described so as plainly to exclude all personal and distinct Existence.

Strange and extravagant as this Notion may appear to Mr. *Jackson*, it is confirmed by Writers, whose Rank and Distinction in the learned World, may at least serve to screen them, from his Insults and Contempt. The learned *Cudworth* speaks of this Refusion, as destroying the personal and distinct Existence of those Beings, who were supposed to rejoin the universal Nature. “ The Stoical  
 “ Pagans maintained, that all their other Gods,  
 “ save *Jupiter* alone, were not only Γεγονότες, but  
 “ also Φθαρησόμενοι, such as should be as well corrupted as they were generated, and this so also, as  
 “ that their very Personalities should be utterly abolished and annihilated: All the Stoical Gods

<sup>k</sup> ΕΝΥΠΙΕΣΤΗΣ, ΩΣ ΜΕΡΟΣ ΕΝΑΦΑΝΙΣΘΗΣΗ ΤΩ ΓΕΝΝΗΣΑΝΤΙ μάλλον δὲ ἀναληφθήσῃ εἰς τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τὸν σπειρωματικὸν κατὰ μεταβολήν. Antoninus, l. iv. 14.

“ in the Conflagration being as it were *melted and confounded into one*<sup>1</sup>.” Even the Gods themselves were to lose their separate and distinct Existence, after their Return to the universal Soul; they were to be *melted down into it*; the very Phrase applied by *Antoninus* to the human Soul.

*Accessere ad eundem de refusione animarum errorem etiam Stoici, quatenus existimantes animari mundum suo illo Igne, quem dixerunt Jovem, censuerunt nostras animas particulas ex illo deductas, & in eundem cito tardeve reduci, aut reducendas certe esse in generali conflagratione, quâ in unum Jovem universa reconstabuntur*<sup>m</sup>.

The learned *Le Clerc*, who was far from being prejudiced in Favour of the Argument I am here maintaining, speaks fully to our Purpose. He would vindicate *Euripides* from the Charge of holding the Soul to be mortal: He owns that his Author did assert the Re-union of the Soul; but then he insists that this Re-union, according to some Philosophers, did not destroy its personal Existence. However, with regard to the *Stoics*, he very frankly and readily acknowledges that it did destroy it<sup>n</sup>.

Dr. *Burnet*, the learned Master of the *Charterhouse*, charges the *Stoics* home with this Sentiment: He indeed, and rightly, extends the same Charge to other Sects; declares that in their Systems all things were considered as so many several Emanations

<sup>1</sup> Intellectual System, first Edition, p. 425.

<sup>m</sup> Gassendi Animadversiones in decimum librum Diogenis Laertii, p. 551.

<sup>n</sup> Quoi qu'il en soit, dire que les ames vont dans l'Æther, ou, si l'on veut, à Dieu, ne signifie pas qu'elles perdent leur Existence séparée, comme une goutte d'Eau se perd dans l'Océan, lors qu'elle y est jettée; & rien ne nous oblige de croire qu'Euripede a été précisément dans les mêmes Idées, que les Stoïciens ont suivies depuis. Bibliothèque Choisie, vol. vi. p. 247.

tions from the Deity ; from whom they were supposed to be taken, and into whom they were again to be resolved ; but, as he strongly expresses it, *sine omni distinctione individuorum* °.

It is with singular Pleasure that I find this Notion of the Refusion confirmed by the worthy and learned Mr. *Fortin*, in his judicious Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion. “ Some, who in Words acknowledge the “ Immortality of the Soul, seem in reality to have “ taken it away, by imagining that the Soul was “ a Part of the Soul of the World, of the Deity, “ and that, upon its Separation from the Body, it “ was re-united to it.” p. 247. He mentions the Refusion as destructive of a future State : And this is all I quote him for.

I have, I hope, by this time sufficiently made good the Point I undertook to prove : Mr. *Jackson* lays it down as an unquestioned Truth, (and in this I entirely agree with him) that the Souls of good Men were to be resolved into the divine Nature. The Merits of the Dispute between us lie therefore within a narrow Compass ; the Souls of good Men must be rewarded in and by this Refusion, or they cannot be rewarded at all. I have shewn that the *Stoics* (and my Argument is confined to them) did not consider this as a State of Retribution and Reward. I have therefore, so far as I am now concerned, effectually confuted his Hypothesis.

And here it is remarkable, that this Notion is destructive of future Punishments, in the very Sense, in which Mr. *Jackson* contends for them.

° *Archæol. Phil.* c. vii. Speaking of things before their Appearance in this World, and after their Departure out of it, he says, *habebant semper suum modum subsistendi in divina natura, licet sine omni distinctione individuorum.*

He makes them consist in an Exclusion of the wicked from the divine Nature. But we have shewn, that the old *Stoics* did, in Reality, suppose no such Exclusion, but that the Souls of the Good and Bad were to be admitted indifferently to this Refusion.

---

## C H A P. VI.

*That the Philosophers believed the Soul to be of the very same Nature and Substance with God himself. That this Notion of the Soul was inconsistent with the Belief of a future State. These two Points proved on the Authority of the primitive Writers of the Christian Church.*

I Shall open this Chapter with the following Passage from the learned Writer, whose Sentiments I am here examining. Speaking of Mr. *Warburton*, he says, “ I desire he will try his Talents against any thing I have wrote, and that he will let the Public see whether he understands *the Scriptures, and the primitive Writers of the Christian Church*, any better than he does *Plato* and *Virgil*; for had he understood the former, he would not have said that the Philosophers neither did nor could believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments.”

But why is he invited to *try his Talents*? This was never his Motive in Writing. And if it was, he would chuse a very different kind of Men to write against. He contents himself to demonstrate that the Philosophers did not believe a future State: And willingly leaves it to Mr. *Jackson* to persist

<sup>c</sup> Mr. *Jackson's* Defence, p. 52.



in affirming that the *Sacred* and *Primitive* Writers did not believe a *Trinity*.

However, we now find that the Assertion, which gives so much Offence to the learned Writer, is, *that the Philosophers could not believe, or that their Notion of the Soul was inconsistent with the Belief of a future State*. And here we are told, that, had not Mr. *Warburton* been an utter Stranger to the primitive Writers of the Christian Church, he never could have fallen into so gross and palpable a Blunder. Now, after all, should it turn out that several of these speak for him; that they charge the Philosophers with the very same Notion, in respect to the human Soul; that they arraign this Notion of the Soul as inconsistent with the Belief of a future State; if this, I say, should appear to be the Case; what must we think of the learned Gentleman, who thus insults his Adversary with his Ignorance of ecclesiastical Antiquity; and sends him to these very Authors, for a full Confutation of all he has advanced on this Head? That this however was the real Fact, I shall now undertake to prove, how certain soever to incur the Censure and Contempt of this wonderfully learned Man.

The first Absurdity charged upon these ancient Sages, by the Author of the *Divine Legation*, is, that they maintained the Soul to be really and actually a part of God; that they believed it to be of the very same Nature and Substance with God himself. This has been represented as a fanciful and idle Notion; as unsupported by every thing but a Fondness to weaken and destroy the Credit of the old Philosophers. But groundless and chimerical as this Notion may appear to Mr. *Jackson*, it is countenanced and avowed by those very Writers, to whose Authority he here refers us. *Tertullian* charges *Plato* with

with holding the Divinity of the Soul in so very plain and strong Terms, as to leave no room for Cavil and Dispute. *Primo quidem oblivionis capacem animam non cedam*, quia tantam illi concessit divinitatem, ut Deo adæquetur<sup>d</sup>. *Arnobius*, ridiculing the Folly and Extravagance of this same Notion, says, *Nunquam, inquam, crederent typho & arrogantia sublevati*, prima esse se numina, & æqualia principis dignitati<sup>e</sup>. *St. Jerom* confirms the same in respect to the Followers of *Pythagoras*. *Juxta Pythagoricorum dogmata, qui hominem exæquant Deo, & de ejus dicunt esse substantia*<sup>f</sup>. *St. Austin* charges them home with the same Sentiments, *Cedant & illi quos quidem puduit dicere Deum corpus esse, veruntamen ejusdem naturæ, cujus ille est, animos nostros esse putaverunt; ita non eos movit tanta mutabilitas animæ, quam Dei naturæ tribuere nefas est*<sup>g</sup>. Thus far these learned Fathers;

<sup>d</sup> De Anima, c. xxiv.

<sup>e</sup> Adver. Gentes, l. ii.

<sup>f</sup> Ctesiphon. adver. Pelagianos.

<sup>g</sup> *De Civ. Dei.* 8. 5. I had designed to close this Head with the Citations abovementioned; but as the learned Writer insults us with the Authority of the Fathers, I must beg leave to recommend to his Notice, the following Passages of *St. Austin*. *Ergo & Jovem, ut Deus sit, & maximè, ut rex Deorum, non alium possunt existimare quam Mundum, ut in diis cæteris secundum istos suis partibus regnet. In hanc sententiam etiam quosdam versus Valerii Sorani exponit Varro, in eo libro, quem seorsum ab istis de cultu Deorum scripsit. Qui versus hi sunt,*

*Jupiter omnipotens, regum rex ipse, Deusque,  
Progenitor Genitrixque Deum, Deus unus & omnis.*

Exponuntur autem in eodem libro, ita ut eum marem existimarent. qui semen emitteret, scæminam quæ acciperet, Jovemque esse Mundum, & eum omnia semina ex se emittere, & in se recipere; qua causa, inquit, scripsit Soranus, Jupiter Progenitor Genitrixque. Nec minus cum causa unum & idem esse omnia. (*De C. D.* 9. 7.) And do not these last Words give us the very Language of *Spinoza*?

• Again:

Fathers ; and what has the Author of the *Divine Legation* said more than they ?

Now this prepares us for the chief Point which I propose to establish on the Authority of the primitive Writers of the Christian Church ; and that is, *that the Philosophers could not believe a future State*. When I say that the Philosophers *could not believe a future State*, I mean consistently with their Notions of the human Soul. This, I know, has been treated as a strange Paradox.—What ! could the Philosophers hold the Immortality of the Soul, and yet reject a future State ? Nay, what is most extraordinary, were they obliged to deny the last, barely because they believed the first ? This is indeed the Doctrine of the *Divine Legation* ; and, what is more, 'tis the Doctrine of those very primitive Writers, to whom the learned Gentleman so gravely sends us for Information on this Head. And since they charge the Philosophers with giving the Soul the very same Nature and Substance with God himself ; with making it immortal in the same Sense with

Again : Attendant ;—*Si Mundi animus Deus est, eique animo Mundus ut corpus est, ut sit unum animal constans ex animo & corpore ; atque iste Deus est sinus quidam naturæ, in seipso continens omnia, ut ex ipsius anima, qua vivificatur tota ista moles vitæ atque animæ cunctorum viventium, pro cujusque nascentis sorte sumantur, nihil omnino remanere posse, quod non sit pars Dei. Quod si ita est, quis non videat quanta impietas & irreligiositas consequatur. Ut quod calcaverit quisque, partem Dei calcet, & in omni animante occidendo pars Dei trucidetur.*  
Again : — De ipso rationali animante, i. e. homine, quid infelicius credi potest, quam *Dei partem vapulare, cum puer vapulat ? Jam vero partes Dei fieri lascivas, iniquas, impias atque omnino damnabiles, quis ferre possit nili qui prorsus insaniat ? Postremo, quid irascitur iis, a quibus non colitur, cum a suis partibus non colatur.* (*De C. D. iv. 12, 13.*)

him ;

him<sup>h</sup>; or, which is the same, affigning it a Necessary and Self-existence; what Wonder that they should accuse this Doctrine of the Soul, as inconsistent with the Belief of a future State? But to come to the Fact I am engaged to support; some of the Fathers, I say, agree with the Author of the *Divine Legation* in this Notion. *Justin Martyr*, speaking of the Philosophers, says, “Some of them, holding the Soul to be *incorporeal* and *immortal*, did not conceive that they should be punished for their wicked and immoral Actions; for that a Substance, which was not corporeal, must of Course be incapable of suffering, and a Substance, which was immortal, must be independent of God<sup>i</sup>.”

Again: “The Soul cannot properly be stiled *immortal*, for if it be immortal, ’tis evident that it must likewise be *uncreated*.” And soon after he adds, “Now if our Souls were *uncreated*, they would not sin, nor abound with Folly, nor be subject to Fear, &c. nor would they voluntarily migrate into the Bodies of other Animals, as Dogs, Serpents, &c. and they could not be compelled to do this, contrary to their own Inclination, as they are uncreated. For one uncreated Being is equal to and the same with another; nor is one superior to the other either in

<sup>h</sup> Vultis homines istum typhum, superciliumque deponere, qui Deum vobis adsciscitis Patrem, & cum eo contenditis immortalitatem habere vos unam. Arnobius adver. Gentes, l. ii.

<sup>i</sup> Dialogus cum Tryph. p. 139. Ed. Thirlb.

ἄλλοι δὲ τινες, ὑποσησάμενοι ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀσώματον τὴν ψυχὴν, ἔτι κακὸν τι δράσαντες ἠγῶνται δώσειν δίκην, ἀπαδὲς γὰρ τὸ ἀσώματον, ἔτι, ἀθάνατε αὐτῆς ὑπαρχέσης, δέονται τι τῷ θεῷ ἔτι.

“Dignity

“*Dignity or Power*.” His Reasoning runs thus, If the Soul be immortal, it must be uncreated; if it be uncreated, it will be equal to God; and therefore incapable of ever suffering.

*Arnobius*, speaking of this Doctrine of the Immortality, declares that it gave too much Encouragement to all Sorts of Wickedness and Licentiousness: that there would be nothing to restrain Men from Vice, as they must be persuaded, from the very Nature of the Soul, that it was secure from all Punishment. *Non denique omnia suis Cupiditatibus largiatur, quæ libido impotens jusserit, impunitatis præterea etiam libertate munita? Quid enim prohibebit, quo minus hæc faciat? Metus supernæ potestatis, judiciumque divinum? Et qui poterit territari formidinis alicujus horrore, cui fuerit persuasum, tam se esse immortalem, quam ipsum Deum primum? Nec ab eo judicari quicquam de se posse; cum sit una Immortalitas in utroque, nec in alterius altera conditionis possit æqualitate vexari*<sup>1</sup>.

Again: He threatens the Pagans with the Punishment of another Life, and bids them not flatter themselves with the Hopes of escaping it, *because their Souls were immortal. Neque illud obrepit, aut spe vobis aëria blandiatur, quod a Sciolis nonnullis, & plurimum sibi arrogantibus dicitur; Deo esse se natos, nec fati obnoxios legibus*, p. 86.

The famous Passage in *Synesius* may be very

<sup>k</sup> Οὐδὲ μὴν ἀθάνατοι χερὶ λέγειν αὐτὴν ὅτι εἰ ἀθάνατός ἐστι, καὶ ἀγέννητος δηλαδὴ.

Ἐπεὶ εἰ ἀγέννητοι ἦσαν, ἔτ' ἂν ἐξημάρτανον, ἔτε ἀφροσύνης ἀνάπλεω ἦσαν, ἐδὲ δεῖλαι καὶ θρασεῖαι πάλιν, ἀλλ' ἐδὲ ἐκῆσαι ποτε εἰς σύας ἐχώρουν, καὶ ὄφεις, καὶ κύριαι, ἐδὲ μὴν ἀναγκάζεσθαι αὐτὰς θέμις, εἴπερ εἰσὶν ἀγέννητοι· τὸ γὰρ ἀγέννητον τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ ὁμοίῳ ἐστὶ, ἴσον, καὶ ταυτὸν, καὶ ἔτε δυνάμει, ἔτε τιμῇ προκριθεῖν ἂν θατέρη τὸ ἕτερον. 147, 8, 9. 50.

<sup>1</sup> See *Divine Legation*, vol. I. p. 423. — *Arnob. Adver. Gent.* l. ii.

pertinently applied to the present Case. “ *I can never prevail with myself to think that the Soul was made after the Body. I will never affirm that the World, and all its Parts will be one Day destroyed. I conceive that the Resurrection contains some very holy and profound Mystery; I am far from thinking with the vulgar on this Point* <sup>m</sup>.” This learned Ancient could not prevail with himself to embrace the Scripture Doctrine of another Life; and this, because he believed that the Soul existed before the Body, or was immortal in a proper and strict Sense. Yet, for all this, the learned Modern tells us, “ That the Pagan Notion of a future State was very agreeable to the Doctrine taught by Revelation <sup>n</sup>.” True it is, that *Synesius* could not discover it. He was so far from thinking the two Notions nearly allied, that he consider’d them as plainly opposite and repugnant to each other. But what then? This is not the first Discovery, by a many, which *Mr. Jackson* has made of the Opinions of Antiquity, in Spite of all itself could say to the contrary. Tho’ Cavilers may still make it a Question, whether the *Old* or the *New Platonist* was the ablest Judge of this Point; for, as they assert Facts directly contrary to each other, ’tis impossible that both of them should be in the right.

Let us just recollect what has been here said. *Mr. Warburton* tells us, that the Ancients held a Principle inconsistent with the Doctrine of a future State. *Mr. Jackson* undertakes to be their Advocate; contemns all Objections as slight and trivial; imputes them to the mere Ignorance and Blunders of his Adversary, and, in Support of his own Notion, thinks proper to appeal to primitive

<sup>m</sup> Epistle cv.

<sup>n</sup> The Belief of a future State, &c.

Antiquity.

Antiquity. But what has been the Issue of this Appeal? Why this; the primitive Writers give all the Sanction and Authority that Words are capable of giving, to the very Doctrine they are brought to censure and oppose; those Parts of the *Divine Legation* which seem most doubtful and exceptionable, have received the clearest and fullest Confirmation from these very Writers. Whatever it was therefore that led Mr. *Warburton* into this Opinion, it could not be his Ignorance of, or want of Reverence for ecclesiastical Antiquity; and the Reader, I hope, will be soon sensible that it could not be his Ignorance of the Pagan Systems. But here I must desire him to recollect the real State of the Question; which does not turn on the *Truth* or *Falshood* of what the primitive Writers have said, but on the single Fact, *whether they have said it or no*. If the Reader will be so kind as to take this Observation along with him, and apply it to the Passages above cited, I need be in no Pain for the Judgment he will pass on this Part of the Controversy.

## C H A P. VII.

*Of the Spinozism of the old Philosophers.*

**M**R. *Jackson*, speaking of his Adversary, says, "So he has nothing to charge the Philosophers with, as the ground of their pretended Unbelief of this Doctrine, (a future State) but only their Philosophy, which he calls metaphysical Whimsies concerning God and the Soul, *merely because he does not understand it*." I meet with nothing here but hard Words: Which,

\* Mr. *Jackson's* Defence, p. 7, 8.

for want of a better Name, one may call, *Mr. Jackson's Logic*. One of the Whimsies charged upon the Philosophers by *Mr. Warburton*, is, that they maintained the *Soul* to be strictly and properly a *Part of God*. I do not find that his learned Adversary undertakes to confute the several Arguments alledged by him, in Support of this Charge: And with good Reason; for there can, I think, be no Question, but that this Principle, impious and detestable as it is, was really held by the ancient Sages.

To confirm this, I shall not go thro' the Opinions of the several Sects, but content myself with a few Remarks on one or two of the greatest Importance; we have already seen what the Fathers thought of this Matter; and what follows will not only serve to vindicate the Author of the *Divine Legation*, but *the Fathers themselves*, who, we now see, are equally involved with him in this Charge.

We find that the Works given to *Hermes* abound with the most gross and rank Spinozism<sup>p</sup>: “The  
“ Soul is not *cut off* from the divine Substance,  
“ but is, as it were, a *Diffusion* or *Extension* of  
“ him.” I shall transcribe another Passage as I find it in *Cudworth*, wherein God is said to be all things, not only *actual* but *possible*. “For what shall I  
“ praise thee? because I am my own as having  
“ something proper and distinct from Thee?  
“ Thou art whatsoever I am; thou art whatsoever  
“ I do or say; for thou art all things, and there  
“ is nothing which thou art not. Thou art that  
“ which is made, and thou art that which is not  
“ made.” In the same Place, before things  
were

<sup>p</sup> Ὁ νῆς ἐκ ἐστὶν ἀποτεταμημένος τῆς ἐσιότητος τῆς θεῶ, ἀλλ' ὡσπερ ἠπλωμένος καθάπερ τὸ τῆς ἡλίου φῶς.

<sup>q</sup> *Intellectual System*, p. 347. 1st Ed. This too is the Language of the famous *Asclepian* Dialogue. *Nonne hoc dixi omnia*



were made, God is said to *contain and hide them within himself*: When they are made, he is said to *reveal and manifest them from himself*.

Here then I appeal to every Reader, whether it be possible for Testimonies to be more explicate and precise than these: I am sure this Notion is not express'd by any modern Spinozist in more plain, positive, and direct Terms than it is here. Let it be remembered too that these Books, according to *Jamblichus* †, speak the *Language of the Philosophers*; and then, I think, it cannot be denied but that Spinozism must be ranked amongst the Principles of the old *Grecian Sages*, and, from thence, plainly transfused into the following Lines, without losing any thing of its Force or Energy.

*Quicquid est hoc, omnia animat, format, alit, auget, creat,*

*SEPELIT RECIPITQUE in sese omnia, omniumque idem est Pater:*

*Indidemque eademque oriuntur de integro, atque eodem occidunt* ‡.

We are told here that all things will be lodged and buried in God, or the universal Substance; and that they will afterwards emerge and rise out of it again. The very Language of the Books of *Hermes*,—there God is said to *hide things within himself*, and here, *Sepelit recipitque in sese omnia*. If then the Books of *Hermes* are supposed to con-

*unum esse, & unum omnia; utpote quia in Creatore fuerint omnia, antequam creasset omnia. Nec immerito unus est dictus omnia, cujus membra sunt omnia.*

Idcirco non erant, quando nata non erant, sed in eo jam tunc erant, unde nasci habuerunt. *Apuleius*, p. 582. 594. *Ed. Par.*

† De Mysteriis.

‡ De Divin. l. i. c. 57.

tain the rankest Spinozism †, and one of the more sensible Writers against the *Divine Legation* readily allows that they do contain it, it will be difficult to shew that the Doctrine of these Verses is orthodox and innocent in this Point.

When *Cicero* has given us the Lines above-cited, he immediately subjoins, *Quid est igitur, quum domus sit omnium una, quumque animi hominum semper fuerint, futurique sint, cur it, quid ex quoque eveniat, & quid quamque rem significat, perspicere non possint?* He here declares that the Soul was strictly and properly eternal; and he declares it to be strictly and properly so, in Consequence of the Doctrine laid down in these Verses. What then was this Doctrine? Why, that the Soul was taken originally from God. And if it was declared to be eternal *a parte ante*, in Consequence of this, we may be certain that it was understood to be taken from God in the most exact and proper Sense.

But to come to particulars, I will begin with *Empedocles*, a Follower of *Pythagoras*. We all know that, according to his System, the active Principle, which was to produce and frame all things, was called *Union or Friendship*. But then *Aristotle* tells us that this Principle was *passive* as well as *active*; he tells us †, “ That it was

† *Bott's Answer to the Divine Legation*, p. 227.—Deum esse, aliquo modo, omnia, multoties & multifariam innuunt Platonici; & per *Emanationes vel Irradiationes sui* mundum produxisse. Crediderunt veteres cujuscunque ordinis, quantum mihi constat, *ex nihilo nihil fieri*, neque aliquid in nihilum reverti posse.—*quasi ante mundum ortum*, aut post ultimam abolitionem, non essent prorsus nihil rerum essentia, sed haberent semper suum modum subsistendi in natura Divina, licet sine omni Distinctione Individuorum. Burnet. Archæol. Phil. c. vii.

† Ἀτόπως δὲ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς. Τὴν γὰρ Φιλίαν ποιεῖ τὸ ἀγαθόν· αὐτὴ δ' ἀρχὴ καὶ ὡς κινῆσα (συνάγει γὰρ) καὶ ὡς ὕλη· μῆριον γὰρ τῆ μίγματος. *Metaphys.* I. xii. c. 10.

“to unite and join things together, and was itself  
 “part of the things thus united and joined.” Now  
 is not this in Effect telling us, that the *same Prin-*  
*ciple* was both *Cause* and *Effect*? Must not then  
*Empedocles* take away all Distinction between the  
 Creator and the Creature? Must he not identify  
 the Maker and the thing made; in the very same  
 manner with Spinoza himself?

The following Passage will furnish some very plain  
 and conclusive Proofs, in Support of this Charge  
 against the Philosophers. *Pythagoras qui censuit ani-*  
*imum esse per naturam rerum omnium intentum & com-*  
*meantem, non vidit distractione humanorum animorum*  
*discerpi & lacerari Deum. Et cum miseri animi es-*  
*sent, quod plerisque contingeret, tum Dei partem esse*  
*miseram, quod fieri non potest. Cur autem quidquam*  
*ignoraret animus hominis, si esset Deus*<sup>x</sup>. It is  
 hardly in the Power of Language to speak in a  
 more accurate and precise manner. *Non vidit di-*  
*stractione humanorum animorum discerpi & lacerari*  
*Deum.* How could the Deity be supposed to be  
*mangled* and *torn* by the Discerption of the human  
 Soul, if the Soul was not held to be a Particle or  
 Portion of him in the most rigorous and strict  
 Sense? *Et cum miseri animi essent,—tum Dei par-*  
*tem esse miseram.* How absurd and ridiculous must  
 this Objection have appeared, if the Soul had  
 been called a Portion of the Deity, only in a me-  
 taphorical and figurative Sense, as created by him?  
*Cur autem quidquam ignoraret animus hominis, si*  
*esset Deus?* Here a divine Attribute is ascribed to  
 the human Soul, in Consequence of the Opinion,  
 which declares it to be a Part of God.

We will go now to *Plato* and his Followers.  
*Plutarch* explains their Doctrine in the following

<sup>x</sup> Cicero de N. D. l. i. c. 11.

manner γ. “The Soul is not so much the *Work* and *Production* of God, as a *Part* of him;—nor is it made *by* him, but *from* him, and *out of* him.” Let us attend to the first *Part*.—“The Soul is not so much the *Work* and *Production* of God, as a *Part* of him.” If it was called a *Part* of God only in a figurative or popular Sense, why might it not have been considered as the *mere Work and Production of God*? Nay, how could it have been considered otherwise? For figurative Expression relates not to the *Nature of Things*, but only to the *Mode of conveying our Ideas*. When therefore it is called a *Part* of God, and, on that very Account, opposed to the *Works and Productions* of God, what *Way* have we to understand the Phrase but as strictly literal? — Let us come now to the second *Part*: “It was not made *by* him, but *from* him, and *out of* him.” Is not God here represented as the *material Cause*, *out of* which the Soul is formed? And does not this necessarily imply that the human Soul was really and properly a *Part of God*?

*Philo*, a Man all over *Platonized*, speaking of the Excellence and Perfections of the human Soul, declares that it could not have possessed these great Talents, “unless it had been a *Portion* of the divine Soul; but such a *Portion* as could not be *separated* and *divided* from it. For no *Part* of the divine Nature is *cut off by Division*, but is only *diffused* and *extended*. Wherefore the Soul, *sharing the Perfections of the divine Nature*, launches out into the *Universe*, and does not confine itself within any *Bounds*.” Let us attend to this *Passage*:

γ Ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ—ἐκ ἔργου ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ μέρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέρος—  
ἐδ’ ἵπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἂπ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆ γέγονεν. *Platonicae*  
*Questiones*, Ed. Xyl. p. 1001.

“ But

“ But such a Portion, as could not be *separated* “ and *divided* from it<sup>z</sup>.” Why does he talk of *Separation* and *Division*, but to imply that the Soul was really and properly a Part of God? “ It “ was not *cut* off from, but was only an *Extension* “ of the divine Substance.” Does not this Language suppose it to be a *Part* of God? It is indeed the very Language of the Books of *Hermes*; and these, I think, are allowed to contain the rankest Spinozism. Lastly, the Soul is said to *share* the divine Perfections, in Consequence of this very Doctrine.

*Plotinus* tells us<sup>a</sup>, “ that our Soul is of the “ *same Species* with the Soul of the Universe. That “ if we view it, as it is in itself, stript and divested “ of every thing foreign to it, we shall find that “ it equally deserves our *Veneration* and *Esteem*.”

*Alcinous* says, “ the Souls of Men and the U- “ niverse do both partake of the *same Mixture*<sup>b</sup>.”

*Stobæus*, speaking of *Numenius*, *Plotinus*, and *Porphyrius*, explains their Doctrine of the Soul, and then adds, “ according to this Opinion the Soul

<sup>z</sup> Εἰ μὴ τῆς θείας καὶ εὐδαίμονος ψυχῆς ἐκείνης ἀπόσπασμα ἦν εἰ διαίρετον τέμεται γὰρ ἕδὴ τῆ θείας κατ' ἀνάγκησιν, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐκτείνεται διὸ μεμοιραμένος τῆς ἐν τῷ παντὶ τελειότητος, &c. Quod det. poti. infid. soleat, p. 172.

<sup>a</sup> Enn. l. i. c. 12. ὍΜΟΕΙΔΗΣ καὶ ἡμετέρα, καὶ ὅταν ἀνευ τῶν προσελθόντων σκοπῆς εὐρήσεις τὸ αὐτὸ τέμνον ὃ ἦν ψυχὴ. *Le Clerc*, speaking of the *Platonists*, says, *Ils ont aussi souvent des Expressions peu exactes, comme quand Plotin dit que nos ames sont de la même espece que l'ame du monde, qui est seulement leur sœur aînée. C'est confondre la Créature avec le Créateur, & ouvrir la porte à l'Idolatrie.* *Bibliothèque Choisie*, tome iii. p. 94. What this learned Critic means by *peu exacte*, amounts to no more than their Notions do not agree with his: Tho' the Words insinuate that they did not express their own meaning with Precision; which (whatever he might think) was not the Case.

<sup>b</sup> *Stanley's Lives of the Philosophers*, p. 190. 1st Ed.

“ does not really differ from the Mind, the Gods,  
“ and the celestial Natures <sup>c</sup>.”

Another of the Followers of *Plato* declared,  
“ that the Soul *had the same Substance* with  
“ God <sup>d</sup>.”

It appears from these Passages that the Soul was supposed to be of the very same Nature and Substance with God himself. It must therefore either have been conceived to be a Part of him, or a separate and distinct Substance, equal to him. But *Mr. Jackson* himself insists *that they did not hold any separate and distinct Substance to be equal with God <sup>e</sup>*; and therefore, by his Leave, I would conclude, that they believed the Soul to be a Part of him.

The Reader will not be displeas'd to see this Reasoning confirm'd by almost as able a Judge of Antiquity, as *Mr. Jackson*. *Intelliges rursus quo sensu Plato voluerit, discere nihil aliud esse, quam reminisci; nempe quatenus anima mundi est omniscia, & quaelibet ejus particula, tanquam homogenea, ejusdemque conditionis cum tota, omniscia similiter est: Tametsi quo momento demergitur in Corpus, obfuscetur & quasi lethæum bibens poculum, obliviscatur omnia, variè deinceps per sensus excitanda, & in memoriam revocanda <sup>f</sup>*: To the Testimony of *Gassendi*, I shall just add that of *Sigonius*, speaking of some old Philosophers, he says, *Quorum opinio constans fuit,*

<sup>c</sup> *Phys. Ec. p. 108:* Κατὰ δὴ ταύτην εἶς τῶν ΘΕΩΝ ἢ τῶν πρεσβύτων γενῶν εἶδεν ἢ ψυχὴν διέτηροχε ΚΑΤΑ ΓΕ ΤΗΝ ΟΛΗΝ ΟΥΣΙΑΝ.

<sup>d</sup> *Theodorus Afinaeus, inter Platonicos non obscurus Philosophus, animam humanam Deo ipsi ΟΜΟΟΥΣΙΟΝ esse voluit. Gale's Preface to Jamblichus de Mysteriis.*

<sup>e</sup> Page 8. of his *Defence*.

<sup>f</sup> *Gassendus in l. x. Diogenis Laertii, p. 551.*

*demitti animos e cælo, divinæque mentis eos esse non solum munus, sed etiam partem præcipuam ac propriam.* “The Soul is not only a Gift of God, “but even a Part of him.” If the last part of the Sentence be not understood in the most literal and strict Sense, the former Part can be understood in no Sense at all: For it is evident that the Soul may very properly be said to be *only a Gift* of God, if it be *not* really and properly *a Part* of him. I need not say that I take the Passage, just recited, from the Piece going under the Title of *Consolation*, which we commonly see in the Collection of *Cicero’s* Writings.

These Passages are surely very much to the Purpose, if any thing can be to the Purpose that is urged against a favourite Hypothesis. It would be endless to run through the several Arguments and Authorities, that might be produced in Favour of the Doctrine here supported. But enough surely has been said in Answer to the Little, the *Nothing*, I may say, that has hitherto been brought against this Part of the *Divine Legation*. For what, after all, has Mr. *Jackson* given us on this Point? Has he fairly examined any single Reason or Testimony alledged by his learned Adversary? No, not one, all he gives is the Ribaldry of ill Language. He charges Mr. *Warburton* with giving this Account of the old Philosophy, *merely because he did not understand it*. But what will the learned Gentleman say to *Aristotle, Cicero, Plutarch*, and the other numerous Authorities abovementioned? Will he say that they too were all *pure Smatterers in Learning*? *That they were not versed in the Schools of the ancient Philosophers of Greece and Italy*? That they charged the old Systems with these Principles, purely because *they did not understand them*?

## C H A P. VIII.

*That the Doctrine of another Life was delivered in the Mysteries in the most fabulous and gross Manner.*

LET us proceed:—The learned Author in the next Passage says, “ And yet he allows that these Philosophers constantly professed their Belief of this Doctrine, as well as the Legislators did; and they had the same Instructions concerning God and the Soul in the Mysteries, as the Legislators had, who there learned the Truth of this Doctrine and believed it; and which was no other than a more rational Explication of it divested of Fable, than that which was taught to the People<sup>s</sup>”. He falsifies the Doctrine of the Divine Legation; which says, *that the Legislators TAUGHT the truth of this Doctrine in the Mysteries, not that they LEARNED it there.* But I shall concern myself only with the last Words. Therefore pray, Sir, where are your Authorities to prove this very extraordinary Fact? You do indeed pronounce “ *that the Doctrine of another Life, as delivered in the Mysteries, was divested of all Fable.*” But, Sir, the Confidence of your Assertion will not supply the Modesty of your Evidence, which is silent upon this Head. Why did you conceal from your Reader, that the *Divine Legation* tells us that the Ancients have given a very different Account of this Matter? Or have you really forgot it? Give me leave then to refresh your Memory. *Plato*, speaking of those who established the Mysteries, declares “ that they were excellent Persons,—that they there taught that all who died before Initiation,

<sup>s</sup> Mr. Jackson's Defence, p. 8. 9.

“ would



“ would descend into the infernal Regions, and there  
 “ be condemned to grovel in Filth and Mire. But  
 “ that all who had been initiated, would, upon  
 “ their Arrival at the same Place, be translated to  
 “ the Habitations of the Gods <sup>h</sup>.”

When *Antisthenes* was initiated, the Priest told him “ that all who were admitted to the Myste-  
 “ ries, would be intitled to great Happiness in  
 “ the *infernal Regions* <sup>i</sup>. Thus, Sir, in direct  
 Contradiction to what you maintain, some of the  
 best Writers of Antiquity assure us, that the Do-  
 ctrine of another Life was delivered in the Myste-  
 ries in the most popular and gross Sense; they were  
 so far from refining on the common Ideas, that  
 they give us those very Ideas as the whole of the  
 Matter. The Reader will make a proper Reflection  
 on a Fact thus roundly asserted, contrary to the clear  
 and express Evidence of the Ancients themselves.

## C H A P. IX.

*That the Refinements of the Philosophers on  
 the common Notion of a future State, went  
 much farther than the learned Writer ima-  
 gines.—The Metempsychosis of Pythagoras  
 explained, and shewn to be destructive of  
 all future Rewards and Punishments.*

“ **S**upposing, says this learned Man, that the  
 “ Philosophers, in their Explanations, re-  
 “ fined upon this Doctrine, which was both rea-  
 “ sonable in itself, and taught in the Mysteries

<sup>h</sup> In Phædone.

<sup>i</sup> Diogenes Laertius, l. vi. Μνούμενάς ποτε τὰ Ὀρφικά, τοῦ  
 ἑερέως εἰπάστος ἔστι οἱ πάντα μνούμενοι πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἘΝ ΑΔΟΥ με-  
 τίσχουσι, τί οὖν, ἔφη, οὐκ ἀποθνήσκεις;

<sup>k</sup> Defence, p. 9.

“ by

“ by Priests who were also Philosophers, would  
 “ would any Writer but this Author draw such a  
 “ weak and absurd Inference, as that they neither  
 “ did nor could believe it ? ” What is the *Refine-*  
*ment* here meant ? Why, that they had stript the  
 Doctrine of another Life of the common Fables  
 of *Styx*, *Acheron*, and *Cocytus*. In this Case, says  
 Mr. *Jackson*, “ Would any Writer but such an  
 “ Author, draw such a weak and absurd Inference,  
 “ &c.” Why, yes, Sir ; the same *Inference* has  
 been drawn by other Writers. I have shewn as plain-  
 ly as Words and *Fact* can do it, that the *Inference*,  
 with respect to future Punishments, was made by  
*Cicero* and *Ovid*, *Seneca* and *Epictetus* ; and will you  
 prove from *Reason* that it could not be made ? Or  
 will you *insultingly* tell us, that none but *such Au-*  
*thors* could have made it ? It is indeed happy for  
 Mr. *Warburton* that so many learned Ancients must  
 incur your Censure before it reaches him, or he  
 had been in a sad Pickle. However it must needs  
 be a Reflection on his *Wit*, if not on his Judg-  
 ment, and a Proof of his *Dullness*, if not of his  
 Ignorance, that he represents ancient Facts just as  
 he finds them, without one Dram of *Invention*, or  
 systematical Imbelishment.

But as the learned Gentleman talks of *Refine-*  
*ments*, I will beg leave to give another Instance,  
 which, in my Opinion, bears hard upon the No-  
 tion he is here maintaining : I mean the *physical*  
 and natural Metempsychosis ; this excludes all *mo-*  
*ral* Purpose and Design, all future Rewards and  
 Punishments, in the strict and proper Meaning of  
 those Terms. The common and popular Opinion  
 was, that the Soul, after its Departure from the  
*present*, would successively pass into *other*, Bodies ;  
 this Migration was purely moral ; it <sup>1</sup> was confi-

<sup>1</sup> Divine Legation, vol. i. p. 377.

dered as a State of future Retribution. “ The  
 “ Coward was to be thrust ignominiously into the  
 “ Body of a Woman; the Murderer imprisoned  
 “ within the Fur of a Savage; the lascivious con-  
 “ demned to animate a Boar or Sow.” And this,  
 as *Timæus* says, *ποτι κόλασιν, by way of Punish-*  
*ment*, for the Demerit of their preceding Lives.  
 But then this *moral* Purpose and Design was dis-  
 tinguished and explained away in the secret Do-  
 ctine on this Subject. A Metempsychosis was  
 taught which could not be considered in this  
 Light. *Aristotle*, speaking of some old Philoso-  
 phers, says, “ They only attempt to explain the  
 “ Nature of the Soul, but state and define nothing  
 “ with regard to the Body, in which it is to be  
 “ lodged, as if it was possible, *according to the*  
 “ *Fables of Pythagoras*, that Souls should pass in-  
 “ differently into all kind of Bodies, or that every  
 “ Soul might descend into every Body without  
 “ *Distinction* <sup>m</sup>.” Now is not this directly con-  
 trary to the Notion given us by *Timæus*? accord-  
 ing to him, the Soul was to pass into other Bodies  
*ποτι κόλασιν, by way of Punishment*: And, for this  
 Purpose, proper and peculiar Bodies were assigned  
 it, such as were best suited to punish and torture  
 the Soul itself; but, according to this other ac-  
 count of the *Pythagoric* Doctrine, Souls were to  
 pass into all Bodies without *Distinction*; every  
 Soul might pass into every Body.

*Diogenes Laertius* confirms the same. In his  
 Life of *Pythagoras* he tells us, “ that he was re-  
 “ ported to be the first who taught the Migration  
 “ of the Soul, from one Body to another by a *Phy-*

<sup>m</sup> Οἱ δὲ μόνον ἐπιχειροῦσι λέγειν, ποῖόν τι ἡ ψυχὴ περὶ τῶ δεξο-  
 μένου σώματος οὐδὲν ἔτι προσδιορίζουσιν, ὩΣΠΕΡ ἘΝΔΕΧΟΜΕ-  
 ΝΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΙΚΟΥΣ ΜΥΘΟΥΣ, ΤΗΝ ΤΥΧΟΥ-  
 ΣΑΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΕἰΣ ΤΟ ΤΥΧΟΝ ἘΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΣΩΜΑ. *De ani-*  
*ma*, l. iii.

“*fatal Necessity*” And to the same Purpose *Servius* speaks of a Transmigration, which was supposed to be made only *propter Fati Necessitatem*°. *Seneca*, speaking of this Notion of *Pythagoras*, seems to suppose the Migration of the Soul to be as *purely physical* and *necessary*, as the Motion of the heavenly Bodies. *Non credis, inquit, animas in alia corpora atque alia describi? Et migrationem esse quam dicimus esse mortem? Non credis in his Pecudibus ferisve aut aqua merfis illum quondam hominis animum morari? Non credis nihil perire in hoc mundo, sed mutare regionem?* Nec tantum cœlestia per certos circuitus verti, sed animalia quoque per vices ire, & animos per orbem agi. (Ep. 109.) Does he not put the several Revolutions of the Soul on the same Foot with those of the heavenly Bodies? And was not the Motion of the last supposed to be purely natural?

I will close this Head with those famous Lines of *Ovid*,

*O Genus attonitum stolidæ formidine mortis!  
 Quid Styga, quid tenebras, & nomina vana timetis,  
 Materiem vatum, falsique pericula mundi?  
 Corpora sive rogos flamma, seu tabe vetustas  
 Abstulerit, mala posse pati non ulla putetis.  
 Morte carent animæ, semperque, priore relicta  
 Sede, novis domibus vivunt habitantque receptæ* P.

These Words are here given to *Pythagoras* himself; it is certain that they contain his Notion; and it is equally certain that the Transmigration

° Πρῶτον δὲ φασὶ τοῦτον ἀποφῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν, ΚΥΚΛΟΝ ΑΝΑΓΚΗΣ ΑΜΕΙΒΟΥΣΑΝ, ἄλλοτε ἄλλοις εἰδεῖσθαι ζώοις. L. viii.

§ 14.

° *Divine Legation*, vol. i. p. 387.

P *Metamor.* l. xv.

here described was barely *physical and necessary*. This appears from the Purpose for which these Verses were introduced ; and that was *Seriem evolvere Fati* 9.

2dly. It is so far from being consider'd in a *moral* View, that it is directly oppos'd to the common Doctrine of another Life. It will be to no Purpose to reply, that it strikes only at the poetical and fabulous Accounts of future Punishments : If it destroys these, *we have proved* that it must, of course, destroy all future Punishments whatsoever.

We see then, the *Refinements* of the Philosophers went much further than the learned Writer seems willing to allow ; they went indeed so far as to destroy the proper Notion of a future State.

Let us now go to the DOUBLE DOCTRINE. Whether the Philosophers did actually practise it, Mr. *Jackson* may, if he pleases, dispute : But after what has been said of their Notions concerning the human Soul, it will hardly be denied but that they really wanted it. For we see that they held Principles, which would have been very dangerous and hurtful to Society, if they had been publish'd and divulg'd to the World at large. We know too from their own Professions, from their great Regard and Tenderness for the Interests of Society, that they never would impart these Notions to the Vulgar. When therefore they were oblig'd to

9 ——— *Juvat ire per alta  
Astra ; juvat, terris & inerti sede relictis,  
Nube vebi ; validique humeris insistere Atlantis :  
Palantesque animos passim, ac rationis egentes  
Despectare procul, trepidosque obitumque timentes  
Sic exhortari ; SERIEMQUE EVOLVERE FATI :*

And then follow the Lines I have just quoted.

speak on these Points, what was left for them, but *to profess one thing, while they believed another?*

And, on the other Side, if they actually said one thing when they thought another; if they practised the *double Doctrines* in that Extent, in which it is charged upon them by the Author of the *Divine Legation*, we may be certain that they entertained some very hurtful and pernicious Notions. Why else were they so studious to cover and conceal them from the Body of the People?

## C H A P. X.

*Mr. Jackson's Notion of the Double Doctrine examined.—His Objections to the Divine Legation, on this Point, explained and confuted.*

**L**ET us first examine what Mr. *Jackson's* Notion of the double Doctrines is; and here let him be heard in his own Words. “The Exoteric and Esoteric Philosophy had only a Reference to the Difference of the vulgar and political from the philosophical Notions of the future State, and not at all to the Reality and Belief of it, which was always believed in different ways of Explication by the Learned and Unlearned; by the Poets and Philosophers, as well as by the common People,” p. 93.

Having said that the Philosophers taught the common and fabulous Doctrines of a future State, he adds, “as they themselves had more rational Notions concerning a future State, they taught their Disciples a different Doctrines about the Soul, and the Happiness and Misery of the State

“ State after Death. This was called the esoteric  
 “ or secret Doctrine, in Distinction to the exoteric,  
 “ or public and vulgar Opinion,” p. 71.

“ They taught that the human Soul was con-  
 “ genial with the Soul of the World; and that  
 “ the Happiness of it after Death consisted in  
 “ its Return to and intimate Union with God,  
 “ from whom it was derived; on the other hand  
 “ that the Misery of it consisted in being excluded  
 “ from the Union with God, and having no Com-  
 “ munication with him.” He expresses himself to  
 the same Purpose, p. 89, 90, and tells us, “ that  
 “ after Death the Wicked and Ungodly were to  
 “ be for ever miserable, by being separated and  
 “ alienated from the blessed Communion and Fel-  
 “ lowship of the immortal Gods.”

In his second Piece he tells us, “ that the Souls  
 “ of virtuous Men were to reside in some luminous  
 “ Orb, were to enjoy the Society of celestial Beings;  
 “ were to be united with and have Communion  
 “ with God; were to be blessed with the beatific  
 “ Vision of the divine Perfections. That the Souls  
 “ of wicked and ungodly Men after Death were  
 “ banished from the Communion both of God  
 “ and all holy Persons; were associated with evil  
 “ Dæmons, and condemned to a State of Misery  
 “ and Punishment. These were the Doctrines  
 “ concerning God and the Soul, which were  
 “ taught in the Mysteries, and were the esoteric  
 “ Doctrines of the old Philosophers.” p. 8.

In the last Passage the learned Writer under-  
 takes to give us the secret or esoteric Doctrine  
 with regard to future Punishments; “ The wick-  
 “ ed, it seems, were to be banished from the So-  
 “ ciety and Assembly of the Gods.” This was, ac-  
 cording to him, the Substance of that Doctrine.  
 But does he then think that this Exclusion from

the Seats and Assemblies of the Gods was a *secret* and *bidden* Notion? *Cicero*, speaking of the old *Casci*, says, “ they did not look upon Death as a “ State of Non-existence, they considered it only as “ a Change of one Life for another. They thought “ that Persons of great and singular Accomplish- “ ments would be raised and exalted into Hea- “ ven, *while all the rest were fixed and confined “ to these lower Regions.*” We are here told, that the Bulk of Mankind was to be banished and excluded from the Society and Assembly of the Gods. We are told too that this was the general and received Notion of the old *Casci*. Was then this barbarous and illiterate People actually possessed of this Opinion? If so, the Inference is certain, that this was a *popular* and *exoteric*, not a *private* and *secret* Doctrine.

But what is still worse, this will, when examined, be found to be no Doctrine of future Punishments at all. We are told in the Passage just recited, that all but Men of great and eminent Endowments, were to be excluded from the Assembly of the Gods. And if so, the Body of good Men must be excluded too. Now what plainer Proof can there be that this was not considered as a State of Punishment? For surely most good Men were not sentenced and condemned to a State of future Punishments promiscuously with the wicked.

2dly. Another thing advanced in the last Citation, is, *that the secret Doctrines of the Schools of Philosophy and Mysteries of Religion, are one and the same thing.* I meet indeed with a very different Account of this matter in the *Divine Legation*. But different as that Account is, 'tis confirmed by what Mr. *Jackson* himself has, in the Heat of Opposition, advanced on this Head.



The Mysteries, he tells us, taught “that the wicked and ungodly should be for ever miserable.” But what say the Philosophers? did they too embrace this Notion of *eternal Punishments*? Cicero, speaking of the Souls of the wicked, after their Departure from the Body, says, *Corporibus elapsi circum terram ipsam volutantur, nec hunc in locum [Cælum] nisi multis exagitati seculis, revertuntur*<sup>r</sup>. And Mr. Jackson himself speaks of the *Stoics* as believing that *the Souls of good Men would exist till the general Conflagration, but that those of the wicked would continue only to a certain Period*<sup>s</sup>.

He will therefore suffer me, if not on Mr. Warburton's, yet on his own Authority, to distinguish between the hidden Doctrines of the Schools of Philosophy, and those of the Mysteries of Religion. He himself tells us, that the Mystagogues taught the Eternity of future Punishments. But did the Philosophers teach the same? I have proved by very clear and full Authorities that they did not.

So far on Mr. Jackson's own Notion; on the Supposition that the hidden Doctrines of the Schools included the Belief of future Punishments. In this very Case the hidden Doctrines of the Schools and the Mysteries of Religion, would be very separate and distinct things; as separate and distinct as the Doctrines, which teach *temporal* and *eternal* Punishments.

I have often wondered that the learned Writer should represent the Ancients as actually believing *eternal* Punishments. If this was their firm and real Persuasion, the Doctrine of temporary Punishments must be considered as merely political and civil. Now it is highly improbable or incre-

<sup>r</sup> Somn. Scip. c. ix.

<sup>s</sup> *The Belief of a future State, &c.* p. 98.

dible rather, that this should be the Case. Mr. *Jackson* allows that the public Doctrine was contrived for the Sake of the Populace; that it was cloathed with all those Terrors and Fictions, which were most likely to strike their Imaginations. And what more effectual for this Purpose, than the *eternal Duration of future Punishments*? Can we conceive that they would have stript the popular Doctrine of this Circumstance, had they thought it to be strictly and really true? The learned Gentleman must therefore pardon me, if I cannot agree with him, that they really and actually believed *eternal*, and yet preached up only *temporary Punishments*.

3dly. Mr. *Jackson* himself furnishes another unanswerable Argument to prove, that the secret Doctrines of the Philosophers, and the Mysteries of Religion, were not one and the same thing. The *esoteric Philosophy*, according to him, taught a State of future Rewards and Punishments; but divested of those Fables and fictitious Circumstances with which this Doctrine was delivered to the People. Did it so? Why then we may be certain it did not teach the same Notion of another Life with the *Mysteries*. For will any one say that the Notion of another Life, as delivered in the *Mysteries*, was stript of these Fables? Mr. *Jackson* has indeed said it. But then he opposes his own Authority to the Testimonies of *Plato* and *Diogenes Laertius*. And what Adversary could wish him in a worse Case?

And here it may not be unpleasant to observe, how the Scene is now changed. The learned Writer tells us, that the *external* Doctrine taught future Rewards and Punishments in the most *popular and gross Sense*. This is, it seems, the distinguishing Mark and Character of that Doctrine. But has it  
not

not been shewn that the *Mysteries* taught another Life, *after the very same Manner*? It will therefore unavoidably follow from his own Description of the popular or external Doctrine, that this was the very Doctrine of the Mysteries.

What then, after all, has this formidable Writer proved? What mighty Feats or Wonders has he wrought, to justify so much Haughtiness and Contempt? As for his own Hypothesis, there is nothing in *Antiquity*, *Reason*, or the *Nature of things* to countenance and uphold it. With regard to *Antiquity*, it is not only unsupported by proper Evidence, but contrary to the plain and direct Testimony of *Cicero* himself: Mr. *Jackson* gives us that for a *Secret*, which *Cicero* plainly shews to have been a *public* and external Doctrine. And what is more unlucky still, this, when examined, proves to have been *no* Doctrine of future Punishments. Nor is his Hypothesis grounded on Probability of *Reason*; it supposes the future Punishments taught and preached up to the Populace to have been *barely temporary*, while those confined to the Schools of Philosophy were *eternal*: A Position, which the very Nature and Design of the *double Doctrine* will not suffer us to admit. Again; he sets out with a Distinction between the *philosophical* and *vulgar* Notion of a future State. But when he sends us to the Mysteries for the *first*, he must suppose them both to be the same. Strange Inconsistencies! first to distinguish between the two Doctrines, and then immediately to consider them as one; first to make their Difference consist *in the particular Fables* annexed to the one, and then to assign these very Fables to both Doctrines.

There is something as gross and flagrant in what he says with respect to a State of future Happiness.

piness. In his first Piece the secret Doctrine places it in the *Refusion into the divine Nature*, p. 71. But in the second he speaks another Language; “The Souls of good Men were to reside in some luminous Orb; to enjoy the Society of celestial Beings, &c.” p. 8. Now is it not a little inconsistent to give two such opposite and contrary Accounts of this *secret Doctrine*? I say, opposite and contrary Accounts; for that these here mentioned, were conceived by the Ancients to be very different and distinct States, has been already proved. In this Case, the secret Doctrine would have been as different from *itself*, as the learned Author supposes it to have been from the public and external Doctrine.

But, not to insist strictly on this Contradiction, let him give us which he pleases as the *secret Doctrine*. If he sends us to the *Refusion of the Soul*, I must beg leave to remind him, that he has not proved, that this was considered as a State of Rewards: That therefore it does not appear that the secret Doctrine included the Belief of future Happiness. We have indeed only examined this Notion with regard to one Sect; and then it was considered as equivalent to a State of Non-existence. If he refers us to the *State of Happiness in Heaven*; I reply, this is nothing to the Purpose of our present Argument, as it was not supposed to include the Body of good Men.

But, after all, what is most unlucky, this was not a *private*, but a *public* Doctrine; it was taught openly in order to incite Men to Acts of heroic and uncommon Bravery. And as to the Philosophers, we have shewn, upon their own Authority, that they made it their Business to preach it up to the World at large.

But

But to convince Mr. *Jackson* that this was a *public* Doctrine, I shall now offer an Authority, which, I dare say, he will not dispute: I mean his own. For he himself, in direct Opposition to his whole System, asserts the very thing. “ In the “ *Egyptian vulgar* and *political* Theology also, “ the human Soul was taught to be immortal, “ and to subsist after Death; and those which “ were pure and religious were believed *to reside* “ *amongst the Gods*; and wicked Souls were be- “ lieved to pass through various Degrees of Pu- “ nishment by a Transmigration, &c.” p. 70.

Having examined the Merit of his own Hypothesis, let us now see what he objects to the Author of the *Divine Legation*.

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

\* Mr. *Jackson’s* Defence, &c. p. 54.

“ Our Remarker’s Explication is all a mere “ Blunder.” I could wish the learned Writer had expressed himself with more Civility : Not for the Sake of Mr. *Warburton*. For how, alas ! can any thing of this kind be supposed to affect him ? But with regard to his own Character as a Writer. For, after all, what is it that he objects to the Author of the *Divine Legation* ? Why, it seems, that, out of *pure Ignorance and Blunder*, he has given two contrary Propositions to the two Doctrines ? And has not Mr. *Jackson* himself done the same ? It appears from his own Citations, that the one taught *temporary*, the other *eternal* Punishments. If so, must they not proceed upon contrary Propositions ? As certainly as *temporal* and *eternal* are not one and the same thing. If then the giving two contrary Propositions to the two Doctrines, was so egregious a Blunder, it will fall as heavy on the learned Mr. *Jackson* as on the Author of the *Divine Legation*. He does indeed assign to each Doctrine a different Proposition from Mr. *Warburton* : But still he assigns contrary Propositions to the two Doctrines. Why then all this ill Language ? If not to shew his Talent at *Billingsgate*, it must be to disguise his Theft, in the following Accounts he gives of the Mysteries. And such Writers seldom rob but they abuse.

“ And this was the Case with respect to Theology in general.” Would any one now imagine that the learned Mr. *Jackson* himself had shewn, in these very Treatises, that this *was not the Case in respect of Theology in general* ; that the vulgar and philosophical Theology did really and actually proceed upon contrary Propositions ? And yet, if he has proved any thing he has proved this.  
The

“ The grand Design of all the ancient *Phœnician*,  
 “ *Egyptian*, and *Chaldæan* Mysteries, seems origi-  
 “ nally to have been to discover to those, who  
 “ were initiated in them, *that the Gods, whom*  
 “ *the vulgar worshipped, were no other than dead*  
 “ *Men:—And to teach that the true Object of*  
 “ *Adoration was the one supreme God and Author*  
 “ *of Nature* †.”

He here tells us, *that the Gods, whom the vul-  
 gar worshipped, were no other than dead Men.*—  
 In another Place he says, the Populace were  
 “ taught “ that the Gods they worshipped had  
 “ once lived amongst Men.” This was the *vul-  
 gar* Theology.

But the more knowing and enlighten'd Pagans  
 were taught, that the one supreme God was the  
 true Object of Adoration.

If now the *vulgar* were taught that deceased Mor-  
 tals were the proper Objects of Adoration; must  
 not their Theology have been contrary and oppo-  
 site to that which taught that the one supreme God  
 was the proper Object of Adoration? Will the  
 learned Writer insist that these were only *different*  
*Explanations of the same Notion?* He must first  
 prove that the one true, and the many false Gods,  
 were one and the same Object.

Again: “ The *Egyptian* Priests indeed had  
 “ more Sense than to believe there was any real  
 “ Divinity in their Symbolic Images or sacred  
 “ Animals; but then they let the People go on  
 “ in their gross and senseless Superstition, and en-  
 “ couraged it by their own Practice and Example.  
 “ They made and consecrated their Gods for  
 “ them; and pretended by Amulets, Divinations,  
 “ and magical Charms, to animate the Images

† *The Belief of a Future State, &c.* p. 89.

‡ Page 69.

“ with *Genii* and *Dæmons*, and to confine them  
 “ to their Symbols, and make them propitious  
 “ to the Worshippers of them.” p. 109.

And here again, how easy is it to turn his own  
 small Arms upon him? “ The Priests pretend to  
 “ animate the Images with *Genii* and *Dæmons*,”  
 and yet, “ they have too much Sense to imagine  
 “ that there was any real Divinity in these very  
 “ Images,” If so, is it not necessary to suppose  
 that they *professed* one thing when they *thought*  
 another; or, that the two Doctrines were, in this  
 Case grounded upon Principles, directly opposite  
 and repugnant to each other? Will the learned  
 Gentleman say, that the Notion which *asserted*,  
 and that which *denied* the *Divinity* of the Images,  
 did contain only one and the same Proposi-  
 tion?

---

## C H A P. XI.

*Doctor Sykes's main Objection to the Double  
 Doctrine, as explained in the Divine Le-  
 gation, considered and confuted.*

**B**UT as this is a Matter of Importance in  
 the present Controversy, we will add a  
 Word or two more before we dismiss it. The  
 Writers against the *Divine Legation* seem all to  
 concur in one Point; they urge and insist that the  
 two Doctrines were only Explanations of the same  
 Notion; and that they did not go upon opposite  
 and repugnant Principles. Mr. *Jackson* alone is the  
*Drawcansir* of the Cause: And, as he is in the  
 Humour, sometimes *confirms* this Point against his  
 Adversary, and sometimes *confutes* it against him-  
 self.



self. It may therefore be worth while to dwell a little longer on this Article. And I do it with the greater Pleasure, as the learned Dr. *Sykes* has given us a long Discourse on this very Subject. We have his main and principal Objection in the following Words. WHAT PROOF NOW CAN BE PRODUCED, — THAT IN THE TWOFOLD DOCTRINE, THEY (the Philosophers) *actually said one thing and believed another*. WHAT INSTANCE IS, OR CAN BE PRODUCED OF THIS FACT<sup>x</sup>? Here then we join Issue; if such an Instance can be produced, the Doctor, I am persuaded, according to his own Reasoning, will allow the Mistake to lie on his Side. If it *cannot* I readily give up the Doctrine of the *Divine Legation* as chimerical and groundless.

For it does indeed charge both *Legislators* and Philosophers with this Practice. Now it were easy to produce several Instances with regard to the *first* which every reasonable Man must allow to be decisive. But at present I will confine myself to one only. As to *their Laws*, they are so far from representing them as the mere Suggestions of human Policy and Wisdom<sup>y</sup>, that they every where assert their divine Origin; *they impute them to the Invention of the Gods*. Here then let the learned Doctor tell us, did they themselves believe this to be the real Fact? did they suppose that their Laws were dictated and framed by some Deity? Or was this, after all, a pure Fiction and Contrivance of their own? He must say say that it was a Fable of

<sup>x</sup> Dr. *Sykes's* Examination, p. 124.

<sup>y</sup> Mr. *Warburton* had said that the old Law-givers "pre-  
tended an extraordinary Revelation from some God." To this, the Doctor replies; "that many of the Heathen Legislators  
"did this, is certain." *Sykes's* Examination, p. 61.

their

their own Invention. And therefore it is certain, by his own Confession, that the Ancients in this Case *did say one thing, when they believed another.*

Let us come to the Philosophers. The learned Gentleman affirms, that they never *teach one thing and think another.* Pray, what then was *Pythagoras* doing, when he gave out that he had descended into the infernal Regions; that he had visited the Seats and Abodes of departed Souls; that he had seen with his own Eyes the Tortures and Punishments inflicted on the Wicked<sup>z</sup>? Must he not in this Case have employed the very Fiction, which the *Divine Legation* ascribes to the double Doctrine? And that *he said one thing and believed another.*

I will now proceed to another Instance in the same Sect. The common Doctrine taught that the Souls of Men were doomed to pass into other Bodies, as a Punishment for their Sins in this Life. The Philosophers themselves sometimes inculcate this Notion; but then they sometimes give a very different Account of the Doctrine; Souls are to migrate into other Bodies, by a mere *physical* and *natural* Necessity, and not by way of Punishment. Here then are two contrary Notions of a future State; the one supposes a moral Purpose and Design; the other gives all to *pure Necessity.* Must not these Doctrines be founded on opposite and repugnant Principles? Must not the Philosophers, when they preach up the popular Notion, *say one thing and believe another?*

With regard to these two Migrations, it may perhaps be said (for what is there that hath not been *said*, and what is there that hath been *proved*

<sup>z</sup> *Diogenes Laertius*, l. viii. or his Life by *Porphyry* or *Jamblichus*.

on the Occasion) how do we know which was the popular and external, which the secret and internal Doctrine? But surely the very Nature of the Doctrines is sufficient to point out this Distinction. The *physical* Migration was of no real Use and Service to Society, nay, was entirely destructive of it, and so could be only taught because it was really and actually believed. The *moral* Migration was so eminently useful to the State, that the Philosophers would not have scrupled to teach it, tho' they had disbelieved it. And that this was the real Case, we have the express Testimony of *Timæus Locrus*, who mentions this last as an Opinion that was cultivated *merely on the Score of its Utility*<sup>a</sup>.

And that the *physical* Migration was a Secret and hidden Doctrine, is evident from the manner, in which it is introduced by *Ovid*.

*Et quoniam Deus ora movet, sequar ora moventem  
Rite Deum, Delphosque meos, ipsumque recludam  
Æthera, & Augustæ referabo oracula mentis.  
Magna, nec ingeniis evestigata priorum,  
Quæque diu latuere, canam, &c. Metam. l. 15.*

We will go to the *Stoics* for a fourth Instance. As to the *Refusion* of the Soul, we have shewn that they supposed it to be a State of mere Insensibility. It is however allowed on all hands that this was the *secret* Doctrine with regard to a future State. If so, must not the private have been directly opposite and repugnant to the public Teaching? The one mentions a future State with Rewards and Punishments; the other a future State without them. Do we not again meet with con-

<sup>a</sup> Divine Legation, p. 377.

trary Propositions? Was it possible for the Philosophers, in this Case, *not to say one thing and think another?*

Again: We have shewn in the foregoing Sheets, that the Ancients sometimes make the Soul *God*; but it is likewise obvious that they sometimes urge and insist that the Soul is *not God*. Here then are two different Doctrines on the very same Subject; and is it not evident that they must of Course proceed on contrary Propositions? For the Fact, on which I build this Argument, I appeal to the following Passages of Cicero. *Mens cujusque is est quisque; non ea figura quæ digito demonstrari potest. Deum te igitur scito esse; siquidem Deus est qui viget, qui sentit, qui meminit, qui providet, qui tam regit & moderatur, & movet id corpus, cui præpositus est, quam hunc mundum ille princeps Deus<sup>b</sup>.*

In his first *Tusculan* he speaks another Language, *Ergo animus (qui, ut ego dico, divinus) est, ut Euripides dicere audet, Deus<sup>c</sup>.*

Do not the two Passages relate to the very same Subject? does not the last censure and arraign the Doctrine of the first? does not the one plainly assert, and the other as plainly deny the Divinity of the human Soul? Had I not therefore Reason to say, that the two Doctrines must necessarily go upon contrary Propositions? or, in other Words, that *Cicero* in this Case, must have said one thing and thought another?

I will now beg leave to inforce an Argument of Mr. *Warburton's*, which the learned Dr. *Sykes* has not vouchsafed to answer, or even to mention.

<sup>b</sup> Somn. Scip. c. viii.

<sup>c</sup> Tusc. i. c. 26.

But

But how light soever he may make of it, the Public may possibly be of Opinion, that it did not deserve to be treated with so much Neglect. However let the *Divine Legation* speak for itself.

“ We have seen the Philosophers of every Sect,  
 “ one while speaking directly for, and another  
 “ while as directly against a future State of Re-  
 “ wards and Punishments, without intimating  
 “ the least Change in their Principles, or mak-  
 “ ing the least Hesitation in their Professions;  
 “ so that either we must hold them guilty of the  
 “ most gross and visible Contradictions, which  
 “ their Characters will not suffer us to conceive  
 “ of them; or else admit the Explanation given  
 “ above of the *double Doctrine*, and the diffe-  
 “ rent Methods of the exoteric and esoteric Dis-  
 “ cipline <sup>d</sup>”.

The Doctor will not charge these *various Professions* to the Fickleness and Inconstancy of the old Philosophers. His Reverence and Regard for the Men will not suffer him to do this; besides, this would intirely defeat his own Scheme, as he undertakes to prove that the Philosophers believed a future State of Rewards and Punishments <sup>e</sup>.

He must then have Recourse to the *double Doctrine*. And here I would know what he will do with those Passages in which the Philosophers profess their Disbelief of another Life. They must either make part of the public or the private Doctrine. Will he assign them to the *first*? No: They contradict the very Purpose and Design of this Doctrine; as it used constantly to recommend and inforce the Notion of a future State. And yet if he gives them to the private Doctrine, he him-

<sup>d</sup> *Divine Legation*, vol. i. p. 403.

<sup>e</sup> See his *Principles and Connexion of Natural and Revealed Religion*.

self overturns his whole Argument; he himself gives a Proof that the Philosophers *actually said one thing and believed another*. For it is observable, that these Passages strike at the very Essence and Foundation of a future State; they do not only explode the common and popular Accounts; they not only discard the Fables of *Elysium, Styx, Acheron, and Cocytus*: They evidently go much further, they exclude *every possible Mode and Notion of another Life*<sup>f</sup>. If therefore he gives these to the private Doctrine, he must suppose that this Doctrine excludes the Belief of another Life; he must therefore suppose that it goes on a contrary Proposition, to what he himself calls the public Doctrine; or, in other Words, he must confess that there are several Instances, in which the Philosophers *actually said one thing and believed another*.—And yet he has challenged all the World to produce one such Instance; he has himself employed about eighty Pages, to prove that no such Instance can possibly be produced.

I have ever thought that these Passages, with others of the same Import, are clear Proofs that the two Doctrines did really go upon *contrary Propositions*; that they were not mere Explanations of the *same Notion*. The Gentlemen on the other Side allow, that the public Doctrine supposes the Reality of another Life; and will they say the same of these Passages? If not, why do they insist that the two Doctrines are barely an Explanation of one and the same Notion?

<sup>f</sup> *Epicarmus* represents Death as a State, in which he could have no possible Interest or Concern.—*Aristotle* says “that it is the final Period of Existence, and that there is neither Good nor Evil for the dead Man to dread or hope.” And as to the *Stoics*, their Language is, *Nullis defunctum malis adfici. Mors omnium dolorum & solutio est & finis*. Seneca ad Mar. c. xix.

But

But what have Dr. *Sykes* and Mr. *Jackson* replied to this? And here I am sorry to acquaint the Reader, that they have acted with more Art and Finess, than one would expect from Men whose *Minds were open to Conviction*. They all along argue on a Supposition that the Ancients have only disclaimed the common and fabulous Accounts of another Life; they take not the least Notice of those Passages, in which they deny the very Being and Reality of the Life itself. Strange, that these zealous Advocates for *Sincerity*, should act in so very disingenuous a Manner! But common *Answerers*, like common Women, do every Day those things which good Manners will not suffer us to call by the right Name.

The following Instance of *SYNESIUS* will, I apprehend, add great Light and Strength to our general Argument on this Head. As to his Philosophy, he was a determined *Platonist*, however it might be candied over by a Bishoprick: And adhered so closely to his System, that, in Consequence of it, he gave up some of the most clear and evident Articles of the Christian Faith. He did indeed set the Authority of *Plato* far above that of the inspired Penmen; he believed the Pre-existence of the Soul with the first, and therefore could not believe the Scripture Doctrine of the Resurrection with the latter. But let him be heard <sup>ε</sup> in his own Words

ε Epistle 105. Καλεπὸν ἔστιν, εἰ μὴ καὶ λίαν ἀδύνατον, εἰς ψυχὴν τὰ δι' ἐπιστήμης εἰς ἀπόδειξιν ἐλθόντα δόγματα σαλευθῆναι· οἶσα δ' ἔτι πολλὰ φιλοσοφία τοῖς θρυλλομένοις τούτοις ἀντιδιατάττεται δόγμασιν. ἀμέλει τὴν ψυχὴν οὐκ ἀξιῶσω ποτὲ σώματος ὕστερογενῆ νομίζειν. τὸν κόσμον ἔφῃσω καὶ τ' ἄλλα μέρη συνδιαφθείρεσθαι· τὴν καθωμιλημένην ἀνάγκασιν ἰερόν τι καὶ ἀπόρρητον ἡγήμαι, καὶ πολλὰ δέω ταῖς τῷ πλήθους ὑπολήψεσιν ὁμολογῆσαι· νοῦς ἔν φιλόσοφος ἐπόπιθης ὡν τὰ ληθοῦς συγχώρει τῇ χρεῖα τῷ ψεύδεσθαι· ἀνάλογον γάρ

Words. “ It is difficult, if not impossible, to  
 “ change and alter Opinions, which are fixed  
 “ in the Mind by the clearest and brightest Evi-  
 “ dence. You know that Philosophy contains  
 “ many things opposite and contrary to the com-  
 “ mon and received Notions. I can never prevail  
 “ with myself to think that the Soul did not exist  
 “ before the Body. I will never affirm that the  
 “ World and its several Parts will be one Day de-  
 “ stroyed. As to the Resurrection, I believe that  
 “ it contains some very venerable and holy My-  
 “ stery. I am far from acquiescing in the common  
 “ Doctrine. However, *Philosophy, when it has at-*  
 “ *tained the Truth, allows the Use of Lies and*  
 “ *Fictions.* For Light answers to Truth, and the  
 “ Eye to the People; the Eye would receive too  
 “ great a Quantity of Light to its own Prejudice  
 “ and Hurt. As Darkness is most proper and  
 “ commodious for those who have weak Eyes; *so*  
 “ *I hold that Lies and Fictions are useful to the Peo-*  
 “ *ple,* and that Truth would be hurtful to those,  
 “ who are not able to bear its Light and Splendour.  
 “ If the Laws of the Church will dispense with this,  
 “ I shall be ready to accept of the Bishopric; partly  
 “ philosophizing by myself at home, partly talk-  
 “ ing abroad in the common Train, and preach-  
 “ ing up the general and received Fables.”

It cannot surely be doubted, but that this In-  
 stance comes up to the very Point in Question;  
 that it exactly answers the Purpose for which it is  
 produced. It is brought to prove that it was the

ἔστι φῶς πρὸς ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ὄμμα πρὸς λήμνην καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς εἰς κελὸν  
 ἀπολαύσειεν ἀπλήρη φωτός. ἢ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖσι τὸ σκότος ὀφελιμώ-  
 τερον, ταύτη καὶ τὸ ψεῦδος ὄφελος εἶναι τίθεμαι δήμῳ, καὶ βλαβερόν  
 τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῖς ἐκ ἰσχύουσι ἐνατείνουσι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἐνέργειαν  
 εἰ ταῦτα καὶ οἱ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱερωσύνης συγχωροῦσιν ἔμοιγε μοι, δυ-  
 ναίμην ἱεραῶθαι, τὰ μὲν οἴκοι φιλοσόφων, τὰ δ' ἔξω φιλομύθων.

Custom



Custom of the Ancients to say one thing when they believed another. And was not this the very Case of Synesius? He does not scruple to acknowledge that he did not believe the *Creation of the Soul, the Destruction of the World, and the Doctrine of the Resurrection*. But no matter for that; *Philosophy allows the Use of Lies and Fictions*; he will think by himself at home, and in public preach up these very Fables. Was it not then necessary for him to profess one thing and think another?

It may be said, we have shuffled in a Christian Bishop on the Doctor for a Pagan Philosopher. But this Bishop went into the Church a *Platonist*, and *Platonist* he continued when he was there, as extravagant and absurd, as any he had left behind him. But be he what he will, it matters little, while he tells us what *Philosophy* was; where he says, that *it would allow the Use of Lies and Fictions in this Case*; and is not this telling us in Effect, that *Philosophy* allows all with which it is charged by the Author of the *Divine Legation*? If it would suffer him to preach up the *Creation of the Soul, the Destruction of the World, the Doctrine of the Resurrection*, while he believed them to be mere Fables, it is evident that it would dispense with his saying one thing when he believed another.

*Petavius*, in his Note on this Passage of *Synesius*, says, “*eleganter hanc διπλόην, et varietatem exprimit Cicero, ii. de fin. Quod si vultum, ait, tibi, si incessum fingeres quo gravior viderere, non esses tui similis; verba tu fingas, et ea dicas quæ non sentias, aut etiam ut vestitum, sic sententiam habeas aliam domesticam, aliam forensam, ut in fronte ostentatio sit, intus veritas occultetur, vide, quæso, rectumne sit.*”

But to close with an Instance above all Exception, even from this Doctor's own Writings;

nay, from that very Treatise in which he has exerted all his Strength and Learning to prove that no such Instance can possibly be produced. With regard to *Plato* he says,<sup>a</sup> “ Let him speak for the “ *popular Opinions* at some Times, and even laugh “ at them at other times, all that will follow is, that “ *Plato disbelieved the popular Opinions of the Gods*; “ not that he disbelieved the Being of a God : “ And so in the other Case, supposing that he “ did not believe the *popular Opinions* of a future “ State of Rewards and Punishments, that there “ were three Judges in *Hades*, &c. it will not “ follow that he did not believe a future State of “ real proper Rewards and Punishments.” Did he then speak sometimes for the *popular Opinions of the Gods*, or insist on the Divinity of *Hercules*, *Æsculapius*, &c. and yet at these very Times *disbelieve these opinions or this Divinity*? Here then is a plain Instance that *he said one Thing and thought another*. Should you, Sir, preach up the Divinity of a deceased Mortal; should you, for instance, in *China*, maintain that their *Fo* was really and actually a God; might you not be fairly charged with saying one thing and thinking another? and yet how would your Case differ from that of *Plato*, teaching the Divinity of *Æsculapius*, *Hercules*, &c?

“ All that will follow is, that *Plato* disbelieved “ the popular Opinions of the Gods, not that he “ disbelieved the Being of a God.” But what is this to the purpose; or how does it confute what *Mr. Warburton* has advanced on this Point? Has he any where said that *Plato* disbelieved the Being of a God, merely because he laughed at the popular Divinities? And yet the Argument of his learned Adversary receives all the little Force it has from that very Supposition. The Doctor might believe the Being of a God, at the very

Time

Time he preached up the Divinity of *Fo*; but would this prove that he did not say one thing and think another, when he insisted that *Fo* was truly and properly a God?

And here, let it be observed once for all, that when we say the Philosophers disbelieved the Divinity of *Hercules, Romulus, &c.* we do not bring this to prove that they did not believe the Being of a God; we only bring it to shew that they thought one thing, and spoke another, with respect to the national Gods. And must not this necessarily be the Case, if they asserted that these last were Gods, while they believed nothing of the matter? It will be to no purpose to reply, that they believed the Being of a God; if you would clear them from the present Charge, you must shew that they believed the Divinity of *Hercules, Romulus, &c.*

I am at a loss to conceive what clearer Proof can be required that the external and internal Doctrines were founded upon Propositions opposite and contrary to each other. It is agreed, that the Philosophers did inculcate the Worship of the true God, to their intimate and select Friends: It is agreed too, that, when they addressed themselves to the Populace, they taught and enforced the Worship of dead Men. Do they not therefore preach up one Object of Adoration to their Friends, and *another* to the People? And if the public and private Doctrines relate to these different Objects, must they not necessarily go upon contrary Propositions?

I cannot see what the learned Doctor will reply to this, unless he says that the Philosophers did really inculcate the Worship of the true God, under the Names of *Hercules, Romulus, &c.* Upon this Supposition, the two Doctrines would indeed contain only one and the same Proposition. But the

Supposition is false and groundless; we are as certain as History and Fact can make us, that the Philosophers, in their public teaching, endeavoured to advance these dead Men into real Deities; that they did not scruple to declare them to be true and proper Gods. This appears from the Passage of Cicero cited, p. 22, 23. *Magis est in Romulo admirandum, quod cæteri qui Dii ex hominibus facti esse dicuntur, minus eruditæ hominum sæculis fuerunt, ut fingendi proclivior esset ratio, cum imperiti ad credendum facile impellerentur. Romuli autem ætatem minus his sexcentis jam inveteratis literis, atque doctrinis, omnique illo antiquo ex inculta hominum vita errore sublato fuisse cernimus.* It is the whole Purpose of this Augument to assert and prove that *Romulus* was really and actually become a God. The Circumstances of the Time and Age, in which his Divinity was admitted, confine the Argument to him only.

Again, “ *Quod autem ex hominum genere consecratos, sicut Herculem et cæteros coli lex jubet, indicat omnium quidem animos immortalis esse; fortium bonorumque divinos.*” *Cicero de legg. ii. 12.* Does not this Passage clearly suggest, that *Hercules*, &c. were now erected into so many actual and real Gods? Is it possible to inculcate the Worship of dead Men in more plain and strong Terms?

“ And so in the other Case, supposing that he did not believe the *popular Opinions* of a future State, it will not follow that he did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments.” What Dependence the Doctrine of a future State had on the common Fables, has been considered already: I mean, (for my Argument confined me to that single Point) so far as regards future Punishments, That the Antients could not believe the first

the first and yet <sup>reject</sup> maintain the last, has been proved upon their own Authority. If the Doctor insists on the contrary, all he has to do, is to shew that *Cicero* and *Ovid*, *Seneca* and *Epietetus* knew nothing of the Matter; for, if they were right, the clear and inevitable Consequence is, that he must be wrong.

2dly. Why is he so industrious to stifle and suppress the Evidence against him? He all along supposes that the Testimonies alledged on the other Side, reject only what he calls the popular Opinions of a future State: But most of them go much deeper<sup>k</sup>. "Death is the final Period of Existence; beyond that there is neither Good nor Evil for the dead Man to dread or hope." *Brevis morbus aut extinguet, aut extinguetur. In utroque finis dolendi est.—Admone nullum mali sensum ad eum, qui perit, pervenire.*—Is the Scope and Tenour of these Passages consistent with the Belief of any future Rewards or Punishments whatsoever? If it be not, it is plain the esoteric Doctrine (for no Man surely will give these Passages to the exoteric) did really and effectually exclude the very Possibility of all future Happiness and Misery; the plain and necessary Consequence of which, is, that the learned Writer, in his Treatise on the *double Doctrine*, has all along been labouring to maintain an Hypothesis against Fact and plain Testimony.

But, before we conclude, it may be necessary to consider this Objection more at large, as the learned Writer often repeats it with an Air of uncommon Triumph and Complacency. He asks,

<sup>k</sup> These Passages have been already quoted from *Aristotle* and *Seneca*.

If the Philosophers disbelieved the popular Divinities, and yet really believed the Being of a God; why might they not reject the popular Opinions of a future State, and at the same time hold a future State of real Rewards and Punishments? “Now as they who did not believe *Hercules* and “*Æsculapius* to be Gods, did not for that Reason disbelieve the Existence of a governing Mind; so they that did not believe *Æacus* or “*Minos* to be Judges of Hell, did not for that Reason disbelieve all future Rewards and Punishments.” *Sykes’s Examination*, p. 98, 9. This is well put; and looks like Reason; which is more than we can say of any thing in Mr. *Jackson*. However, on Examination it will be found to have nothing in it; the two Cases being widely different.

*First.* When we explained their Doctrine of the Soul, we shew’d that they held a Principle inconsistent with the Belief of a future State. But will the learned Doctor undertake to point out any particular Notion or Sentiment of theirs, which cannot be reconciled to the Belief of a God?

*2dly.* At the very time that they condemn and arraign the popular Divinities, they declare for the Being of a God. Thus *Varro* says, “that *Hercules* and *Æsculapius*, *Castor* and *Pollux* were “not Gods:” But he says too, “they only seem “to have a right Notion of God, who conceive “him to be a Soul, actuating and governing all “things by his Wisdom<sup>1</sup>.” But was this the Case

<sup>1</sup> Quæ sunt autem illa, quæ prolata in multitudinem nocent? Hæc, inquit, non esse deos Herculem, Æsculapium, Castorem, Pollucem. Proditur enim a doctis, quod homines fuerint, & humanâ conditione defecerint.— But this same *Varro* says, Quod hi soli ei videantur animadvertisse, quid esset Deus, qui credi-

Case with regard to *Styx*, *Acheron*, and *Cocytus*? When they disclaim these, do they ever substitute, in their room any future Punishments; separate and distinct from ~~them~~<sup>these</sup>, in the infernal Regions? Will the learned Writer pretend they did? One would hardly believe him so adventurous but for some weak Efforts he makes, which look that Way.

3dly, As to the popular Stories of <sup>inf</sup> eternal Torments, they give us these as the *only Foundation and Support* of future Punishments. If therefore they explode these, they must of course explode all future Punishments whatsoever; and (what would we have more?) they tell us, that they did so. But was this the Case with regard to their popular Divinities? Do they ever represent these last as the *only Reason*, the *single Ground*, on which they could believe the Being of a Deity? The learned Writer will not say they do. Why then does he give these as Cases exactly parallel?

*Lastly*, We have brought several Passages, in which the Philosophers disclaim all future Rewards and Punishments whatsoever. But has the learned Author brought any in which they deny the Being of a God? No; all he shews is that they sometimes discard the popular Divinities, or reject the common Polytheism. What is there therefore that can excuse a candid Writer for representing these as parallel and like Cases? When he produces as plain Proofs of their Denial of the Being of a God as I have, of their Denial of a future State, it may be pertinent to consider how far this will affect our present Argument. But I predict, that this, and his *Openness to Conviction* will come together.

crediderunt eum esse animam, motu ac ratione mundam gubernantem. *Augustin de Civ. Dei*, l. iv. 27. 31.

O

I have

I have now passed through the several Articles, which I proposed to debate with these learned Writers. If I have any where mistaken their Meaning for want of Attention, (I am sure I have no where misrepresented it by Design) I shall be ready, upon Conviction, to make them all the Amends and Satisfaction, that they themselves can require. I fixed upon the particular Points here debated, because I thought the true stating them might be of Service to the Cause of Christianity. For if the *Philosophers* ran into these extravagant and absurd Notions concerning the *Soul and a future State*; if their favourite Doctrine, on these very important Points, was so flagitious and destructive of all Morality, that they did not dare to impart it to the People; this will surely vindicate all St. *Paul* has said of them, and at the same time will serve to demonstrate the Usefulness and Necessity of the Christian Revelation. “ It is  
 “ a very strong Proof of the *Necessity* of the Gos-  
 “ pel of *Jesus*, that the Sages of *Greece*, with  
 “ whom all the Wisdom of the World was sup-  
 “ posed to be deposited, had *philosophized* them-  
 “ selves out of one of the most evident and use-  
 “ ful Truths with which Mankind is concerned.  
 “ Nor need we seek any other Justification of the  
 “ Severity with which the holy Apostles always  
 “ speak of the Philosophers or Philosophy of  
 “ *Greece*, than this, the shewing it was directed  
 “ against these pernicious Principles; and not,  
 “ as both *Deists* and *Fanatics* have concurred to  
 “ represent it, a Condemnation of human Learn-  
 “ ing in general.” *Mr. Warburton’s Remarks*,  
 part i. pag. 91.

F I N I S.



---



---

 ADDENDA et ERRATA.

- P. 5.** the Passage from *Teles* runs thus: ἀλλ' ἐκ-  
 ἔτι ἔσαι. εἰδὲ γὰρ ἦν μυρισὸν ἔτθ, εἰδ' ἐπὶ τῷ  
 Τρωϊκῷ, εἰδὲ γὰρ καὶ τὰς προπάππας σα. σὺ δ' ἴππ  
 μὲν τῶτων σὺκ ἄχθη, ὅτι ἢ εἰς ὕπερον σὺκ ἔσαι, δυ-  
 χειραίνεις. What he here says, is, that it would  
 be as absurd to complain, that any one does not  
 subsist after Death, as that he did not exist be-  
 fore his Birth; as if we were no more interested  
 in the State which succeeds our Death, than in  
 that which precedes our Birth. An *Epicurean*  
 in *Cicero* delivers himself to the same Purpose:  
*Mortem contemnit, qua qui affecti sunt, in eadem*  
*causa sunt, qua antequam nati.* De Fin. l. i.
- P. 6. l. 16.** I pass on to *Aristotle*, because it is not  
 my Design to examine the Doctrine of *Plato* on  
 this Point.
- P. 7. l. 11.** *dele* that.
- P. 8. l. 6.** after Point put an Interrogation.
- P. 9. l. 10.** read, *in utroque finis, &c.*
- P. 10. l. 24.** *dele* the.
- P. 14. l. 25.** after these Words, they did not be-  
 lieve it, *add*, For was not the Notion of a fu-  
 ture State the common and established Doc-  
 trine? and do not the Philosophers, in the Pas-  
 sages above cited, reject and disclaim it? Now  
 this Rule says, that we are to look for a strict  
 Declaration of their real Sentiments, whenever  
 they speak against the general and received O-  
 pinions.

- P. 18. l. 12. for conclude read include.
- P. 27. l. 5. this Passage is taken from Mr. *J's* first Pamphlet, p. 71.
- P. 29 l. 13, 14, 15. read, sine ullo futuris incommodo, *naturæ suæ remiscebitur, &c.*
- P. 30. l. 34, 35. read, Examine into the real State of it?
- P. 33. l. 5, 6. *mors omnium dolorum solutio est & finis, ultra quam mala nostra non exeunt.*
- P. 35. l. 11, 12. read, pro nugis habuerint. l. 33. for no where read no whither.
- P. 38. these two Passages are taken from Mr. *J's* Pamphlet, p. 97, 98.
- P. 40. note<sup>h</sup>. this Passage is taken from p. 208, 9.
- P. 43. note<sup>m</sup>. for l. 5. read f. 5.
- P. 47. note<sup>s</sup>. this Testimony is designed for Mr. *J's* sole Use; 'tis hoped he will receive it with proper Deference and Respect, as it comes from one of those very Writers, to whom he sends us for Information on this Point.
- P. 56. after l. 4. add, that this is a plain and necessary Consequence, I appeal to a Writer, who will not be charged with Prejudice and Partiality in favour of the Argument of the *Divine Legation*. "It was a strange Notion, indeed, when  
 "one considers, that human Souls do much *Evil*  
 "here; that they are *ignorant*; that they  
 "are *miserable*; which cannot surely be said of  
 "God. How are they to be detrued into  
 "Swine, or any Animal, by way of *Punish-*  
 "ment? Is a Part of God, capable of being  
 "punished? and capable of deserving this by  
 "Misdemeanors? or how must one Part of God  
 "punish another Part of Him?" *Sykes's Con-*  
*nexion of Nat. and Rev. Religion, p. 394.* Let  
 it be observed, that I only cite this Authority  
 to

to shew, that this Notion of the Soul was inconsistent with the Doctrine of a future State; and not to prove, that the Philosophers really disbelieved another Life.

P. 57. To explain this Reasoning of *Justin Martyr*, we may observe, that when he here speaks of the *Immortality* of the Soul, he understands this Term in the proper and strict Sense, as including an eternal Existence *a parte ante*, as well as *a parte post*; and that it was considered by the Antients in this Light, *vid.* the late excellent Editor of *Hierocles in Aur. Car.* p. 137. and *Cudworth*, p. 38.

P. 58. the Passage of *Synefius* is quoted at length, p. 92.

P. 64. in the Citation from *Plutarch*, read ~~ἐξ~~ <sup>ἐξ</sup> *αἰνῶς*. EE

P. 66. l. 2. add, "as to its Nature and Substance."

P. 69. note<sup>s</sup>. for *μυεμένας* read *μυεμένους*.

P. 70. l. 1. *dele* would.

P. 71. the whole Passage from *Timæus* may be seen *Div. Leg.* vol. i. p. 377, 8.

P. 73. after l. 12. add, Besides, it was the Purpose of *Pythagoras*, in these Lines, to prove that Death was no Evil; and to do this, he must necessarily prove, that Death is not attended with any future Punishments whatsoever. If therefore his Argument does not exclude all possible Punishments, as well as those of the infernal Regions, it does not come up to the Point for which it is produced.

P. 75. l. 31. for, in the last Passage, read in the two last Passages.

P. 76. l. 10. after *banished* add "from Heaven." *Vid.* the Passage from *Cicero*, p. 18.

P. 81. l. 12. add, The Vulgar, by his own Account, were taught, that the Souls of good Men were

were to *reside amongst the Gods*. And does he not therefore in effect tell us, that this Exaltation to the Seats and Assemblies of the Gods, was a public and open Doctrine ?

*P. 83. l. 13. Vid. Mr. J. p. 69.*

*P. 86. l. 15. read,* Is it not necessary to imagine that he said one thing and believed another ?

