



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 N
A P P E N D I X
T O T H E
Second Dissertation :
B E I N G A
Farther Enquiry into the *Mosaick*
Account of the F A L L.



ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following additional Dissertation was drawn up some Years since, and was intended as an Examination of the Objections made to the History of the Fall by the Author of the literal Scheme of Prophecy. That Author has been dead some Years, and I have now nothing to say to him; and have therefore considered the Objections not as his, but as common to all, who call in question or are offended with the History of the Fall, as it stands recorded by Moses.



A P P E N D I X

T O

DISSERTATION II.

TH E main Difficulty consists in determining what we are to understand by the *Serpent*, who is represented by *Moses* as the *Tempter* and *Deceiver* of our first *Parents*. In order to this, we must consider distinctly what is ascribed to *this Serpent*.

This Serpent, we are told, *was more subtle than any Beast of the Field, which the Lord God had made, Gen. iii. 1.* The Comparison here being made between *this Serpent* and the

A Beast

Beast of the Field intimates to us, that *this Serpent* was really a *Beast of the Field*; for between the *Beast of the Field* and Beings of an higher Order no Comparison properly lies in respect to their Subtlety and Understanding.

Again: The Curse denounced against *this Serpent* is adapted to the State and Condition of a natural Serpent, and is literally applicable to no other kind of Being: *Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all Cattle, and above every Beast of the Field; upon thy Belly shalt thou go, and Dust shalt thou eat all the Days of thy Life. And I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed; it shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel, Gen. iii. 14, 15.*

These are the Circumstances in the History, which lead us to conclude, that a real Serpent had Part in this Transaction. On the other Side,

This Serpent appears to have the Use of *Language*, and of *Reason*; nor is it said, that these Faculties were conveyed to him upon this Occasion, (which is the Case of *Balam's Ass*, it being expressly noted in the

the

the Text, that *the Lord opened the Mouth of the Aſs*) Numb. xxii. 28. but theſe Faculties are mentioned as natural to *this Serpent*. When he talks and reaſons with *Eve*, *Moses* relates this Fact as an Hiſtorian.

This Serpent talks and reaſons, not upon ſuch trivial Things, of which we may ſuppoſe the Beaſt of the Field (if they have any Reaſon) to have ſome Notion; but he reaſons upon the Nature of *God* and of *Man*, upon the Knowledge of *Good* and of *Evil*; upon the Nature and Tendency of the Law given to Man: he looks back and *reflects* upon the Policy in which that Law was founded, and the Art of the Governor in keeping his Subjects in Ignorance and blind Obedience; he looks forward and *foretels* the happy Conſequences of throwing off this Yoke, and perſwades the Woman, that ſhe and her Husband *ſhould be as Gods*, if they could have the Courage to break through the Reftraint of this iniquitous Law.

What think you now? Are theſe the Properties of a mere brute Creature? Or is there any Inſtance of an Author, who ever ſeriously introduced the Beaſt of the Field thus reaſoning, and thus diſcourſing?

And yet there are who suppose *this Serpent* to be a mere Beast of the Field, and no more, and reckon that *Moses* recounting this Story, intended to relate what passed between a mere natural Serpent and *Eve*, as the most plain Matter of Fact. We are told too, that this Interpretation is suited to the Notions of the Antients, who thought Beasts had, in the first Ages of the World, the use of Speech; in which Remark the truly Antient are much abused. For *these Antients*, as they are called, were indeed Moderns with respect to the Times of which they give Judgment; and there is not the least Footstep of Evidence, that ever there was such an Opinion in the World. Men of later Ages, misled by the antient Way of Writing, may have imputed such an Absurdity to the Times long before their own; but that ever any Age, or any reasonable Man in any Age, had really such a Persuasion, there is not the least Pretence to affirm. The Story of *Balaam's Ass* is pretended to be a Proof that the Antients had such a Notion; but consult the Text, and you will see this Story is recorded, not as a most plain, but as a MOST MIRACULOUS Matter of Fact: And wherever antient History reports as
Mat-

Matter of Faët, that any brute Creature spoke, the Thing is always treated as a Prodigy, and the Effect of some supernatural Power; and the Story commonly ends in Consultation of the Oracle among the *Greeks*, and the *Sibylline Books* among the *Romans*, to know how the Omen was to be averted and the Gods appeas'd, who were ever thought concerned in such surprizing Events.

We read in Scripture, that *the Trees went forth at a time to anoint a King over them, and they said unto the Olive-tree, reign thou over us, &c. Judges ix. 8.* This I suppose will not be taken for another *most plain Matter of Faët*, and construed as if the Antients had a Notion that Trees also could speak in the first Ages of the World. But if we must depart from the literal Meaning in this Case, what are the Rules of Criticism that oblige us to maintain it in the principal Case before us? Surely it is not more unnatural for Trees to hold a Council for the choice of a King, than for a mere Serpent to treat with *Eve*, upon the Subject of her Obedience to God, and the Nature and Tendency of the Law of Paradise.

But we are so used to *Fables*, and this of the *Trees* is so evidently such, that we may perhaps imagine we see a Difference in these two Cases, without troubling ourselves to examine the Grounds of such Judgment. Let us see then whether this way of literal Interpretation will suit other Places better. We read in *Numbers*, that *a Star shall come out of Jacob*, &c. Numb. xxiv. 17. *Jacob* literally means the Patriarch so called; but he had been long dead before this Saying was heard; and had he been living, the same Difficulty would occur in ascertaining the literal Sense of the Word *Star*. It is said of God, in the Book of *Psalms*, *Thou breakest the Heads of the Dragons in the Waters*, Ps. lxxiv. 13. and the Prophet *Isaiah* threatens *Leviathan the piercing Serpent*, with Judgments from God. If. xxvii. 1. Must we suppose that the *Psalmist* is singing the Triumphs of God's Victory over a *Dragon*, and that the Prophet is foretelling the Destruction of a *mere Serpent*? Or shall we resign this literal Meaning to the Dictates of common Sense, the Evidence of History, and God's own Exposition in the Prophet *Ezekiel*? *The Word of the Lord came unto me saying, Son of Man, set thy Face against Pharaoh King of Egypt,*
 ---speak

---speak and say, thus saith the Lord God, behold I am against thee, Pharaoh King of Egypt, the great Dragon that lieth in the Midst of his Rivers, Ezek. xxix. 1, 2, 3. If it shall be said, that the Psalms and Prophets are of too late a Date to determine the Use of Language in the Time of *Moses*, the Author of the Book of *Genesis*; why then, let the Author of the Book of *Genesis* speak for himself, and tell us, whether by the Term *Serpent* he always means a natural Serpent. *Dan* (they are the Words of *Genesis*) shall be a Serpent in the Way, an Adder in the Path; that biteth the Horses Heels, so that his Rider shall fall backward, Gen. xlix. 17. Here is a Serpent described by that very Character which is urged as determining the *Serpent* of the Fall to be a natural Serpent. "The very Words of the Curse, we are told, imply or foretel a perpetual War between Man and that Beast of the Field, the Serpent; and that such a War, wherein Men by walking with naked Feet and Heels, as they do in the Eastern Countries, were very liable to the Attacks of Serpents, that were very venemous and numerous there."

Let this Observation be carried to the 49th Chapter of *Genesis*, and the Passage from thence quoted. There you will find a Serpent, that *bites Horses by the Heels*, so that the Rider falls backward. What wants there more to prove this a *natural* Serpent? And yet, the Author of this Passage tells us, that he meant *Dan*, or the *Tribe of Dan*, by the *Serpent* and the *Ad-der*; and consequently, by *biting of the Horses Heels*, he did not mean that *Dan* would, in the *literal* Sense, *bite Horses by the Heels*, but he intended by this metaphorical Expression, to describe the subtle and mischievous Practices of that Tribe. There will be Occasion to mention this Passage again: The Use now made of it is only to shew, that the Circumstance of the Serpent's *bruising the Heel* of the Woman's Seed, in the History of the Fall, does by no Means determine the *Serpent* there mentioned to be a *mere natural Serpent*.

But Respect, perhaps more than enough, has been paid to this Opinion, of which the learned *Pirerius* has left this Censure; *Qua nihil profecto dici cogitarive potest incredibilius et absurdius. In Genes. p. 192.*

Let

Let us come then to the true Import and Meaning of the Prophecy, and examine whether any real Difficulty lies in the way of a reasonable Enquirer.

1. If there be any Truth at all in this History, we must necessarily suppose the *Tempter* to be a *rational Agent*; for if *reasoning* will not be allowed to be a certain Characteristick of a *rational Being*, there must be an End of all reasoning upon the Point.

2. If upon the Foot of natural Religion it must be maintained, that the Author of all Things is a *good Being*, it necessarily follows, that the *Tempter* was an *evil Being*. For he acts in direct Opposition to the *Creator*; he charges him with *Malice* and *Envy* towards his Creatures; he attempts, and succeeds in his Attempt, to draw his Subjects into Disobedience; and for this no Reason can be assigned, but the mere Pleasure of affronting God, and making Man miserable.

3. This *Tempter* being mentioned under the Name and Character of a Serpent, there have been various Opinions in accounting for this Circumstance of the History. Among these, the most considerable,

as

as they appear to me, are the two following:

First, That which supposes a real Serpent to have appeared, under the Management of the evil Being, and as his Instrument in the Fraud.

Secondly, That which supposes the evil Being to have transacted the whole himself, (under what Form or Appearance this Opinion pretends not to determine) and that the Term *Serpent* is used *metaphorically* to denote immediately this wicked Being. I will state the Reasons of these Opinions as clearly as I can.

Both of them have some Support from the Text, and both have Difficulties from the Text which lie in their Way. But then it is to be observed, that neither the Substance of History, nor any one Conclusion that can be drawn from it, is in the least affected by this Difference in Opinion as to this Circumstance. For it being agreed on both Sides, that an evil Being was the Tempter, it signifies little in this respect, whether he was only *called a Serpent*, or whether he made *Use of a Serpent*, as the Instrument of his Deceit. Let any Man try what Objections he can raise from one
Opi-

Opinion, or from the other, against any known Conclusion from this History. If he can raise none, it is evident this Point of Difference does not affect any Thing in which Religion can be concerned.

If a real Serpent was concerned in this Case, then the Expressions of *Moses* are *literal*, and represent *historically* all that passed *visibly*. But these literal Expressions necessarily lead us to conceive that another, and much higher Being than a Serpent was concerned ; for, however literally true these Expressions may be of *that* Serpent, yet naturally they cannot be true of *any* mere Serpent. The Rod of *Moses* was a Piece of real Wood, and 'tis literally said, that this Rod divided the Red Sea, and yet 'tis naturally impossible it should do so ; but not more so, than that a mere Serpent should argue, reason, tempt, and seduce, *Eve*.

If no real Serpent was concerned, then the History remains the same, but the Language is *metaphorical*. The same evil Being argues, reasons, tempts, and seduces *Eve* ; and being not known among the *Jews* by any Name peculiar to himself, or perhaps being well known by this very Name at the time the History was written, he is called
ed

ed *Serpent*. And 'tis to be observ'd, that the Name *Satan*, by which this evil Being is afterwards known in the *Jewish* Books, was given him in Consequence of the *Enmity* he shewed to Man in this and other Temptations: And therefore before the Temptation it does not appear that he had a proper Name by which the Historian could denote him.

Those who are for a literal Sense urge, that the Narration here is historical, and that we ought not to suppose a Metaphor to run through the Character of a Person chiefly concerned; that however this may be admitted in the poetic and prophetic Style, yet in the historical 'tis absurd: That the Tempter is not only called a Serpent, but he is treated as such: He is said to be *wiser* than the *Beasts* of the Field: He is doomed to *eat Dust*; to creep on his Belly; and is described by a natural Property of the Serpent, *the biting Men by the Heels*.

To which others, otherwise minded, reply, that the Tempter had no proper Name known to the Persons to whom the History is directed; that it was necessary either to omit his Story, or to speak of him under a bor-

borrowed Name: That the Historian has intimated the Reason why he called him *Serpent*, because the Serpent is the most *subtle* in its kind, and is therefore the most natural Emblem of a *Deceiver*; that he has in his Account of this Deceiver, sufficiently declared who he was, it not being possible for a Serpent to do, what the History ascribes to the Tempter: That the Punishment of the Deceiver being conceived in Terms applicable to the Serpent, is no more than was to be expected, since a Metaphor once introduced must be pursued; that being necessary in this Case, which *Horace* prescribes in another,

———*Servetur ad imum*
Qualis ab incepto.

That for the same Reason *Dan* being called a *Serpent*, it follows, that he should *bite the Horses Heels*.

They say farther, that those who are for the literal Sense, and suppose the Serpent to be the Instrument of an evil Being, have not so easy and natural an Account to give of the mention that is made of the Serpent's Subtlety. For since in their Scheme it was
the

the Subtlety of the *evil one*, and not of the *Serpent*, which deceived *Eve*, to what Purpose is the Subtlety of the Serpent at all mentioned in a Case where it had nothing to do? The most stupid Creature might have served the same Purpose under the same Management; and it was quite foreign to the Purpose to take any Notice of the Cunning of the Instrument, on which nothing depended.

They add farther, that either antecedently to the writing this History, or by a Figure introduced upon the Foundation of this Story, it was usual in the *Jewish* Language to describe great and oppressive Powers, and particularly the Power of the Devils, under the Figure and Image of Serpents. Be the Case as it will, it affords an Evidence how the Word *Serpent* was understood in this History by the *Jewish* Church. When our Saviour's Disciples told him, that *even the Devils were subject to them*, he replies, in Language as plain to be understood, (for known Figures have an ascertained Meaning) *I give unto you Power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the Power of the Enemy, Luke* x. 19.

To

To this last Interpretation it is objected,
 “ That it supposes the most plain Matter
 “ of Fact to be Fable, or Parable, or Al-
 “ legory.”

Fable, Parable and *Allegory*, are Words thrown out at random, and without Distinction. Metaphorical Representations bear some Resemblance to *Fable* and *Parable*, as both owe something to Imagination; but in other Respects they differ widely. In *Fables* and *Parables* the very subject Matter is feigned History: In *Metaphors* the subject Matter may be something real, and the Expression only is borrowed from Imagination. The feigned Matter of a Parable or Fable may be related without the Use of one Metaphor; and the feigned Language of Metaphors, mixed in historical Narrations, may be expounded by the Rules of Grammar and Rhetorick, so as to represent a History real in every Circumstance. Metaphors and Parables are, indeed, in the Sense of Rhetoricians, *Allegories*; and so is every Figure of Speech, *ubi aliud dicitur aliud intelligitur*. But an *Allegory*, in the Language of Divines, is quite another thing; it is not τῆς φωνῆς, but τῆς πράγματος μεταφορά, a Change not of Language, but of the very Substance

B

of

of a Narration from one Thing to another. Such Allegories have no relation to Figures of Speech, and oftentimes have been introduced, where the Story, which is the Ground-work of the Allegory, is told in the simplest Terms, without the Mixture of a Metaphor, or any other Figure. The Works of *Cicero* abound in Metaphors, and other Figures of Rhetorick; will you therefore call the Interpreters, who give his true Sense in plain Words, Allegorizers? Or is there any more of the allegorical Spirit to be discovered in expounding the Metaphors of the Bible, than in expounding the Metaphors of *Cicero*?

As to myself, how doubtfully soever I expressed myself formerly, the more I consider this Case, the more inclined I am to think, that a real Serpent was seen by *Eve*. Here are three Agents concerned, *Adam*, *Eve*, and the Serpent; the Words addressed to *Adam* and *Eve*, in pronouncing Sentence upon them, are not metaphorical; and what Reason is there to suppose, that in condemning the third, the Style should change, and Sentence be passed upon another Being, with whom *Adam* or *Eve* had no Intercourse? If neither of them had seen or con-

versed

versed with a Serpent, how could they account for a Serpent's being doomed to go upon his Belly, and to eat Dust, because some other Being had deceiv'd them? Besides, if we can render a Reason for calling the Tempter Serpent, and so far account for the Metaphor in the *Mosaick* History; yet can we suppose, that *Moses* has taken the same Liberty with the very Words of God, and changed the real Sentence upon the Tempter into a metaphorical Punishment on a metaphorical Person, introduced to represent him? And if *Moses* has given us the real Words of God, in pronouncing Sentence on the Tempter, there can be but little Doubt, that the Tempter appeared and acted as a Serpent; and a Judgment passed upon the visible Agent in this Fraud, was a Judgment upon the Deceiver himself, whoever he was, and could no otherwise be understood at the Time.

As to the Language of Scripture, calling evil and wicked Men Serpents and Scorpions, and particularly as to the Words of *Jacob*, representing the Tribe of *Dan* as a *Serpent in the Way*, &c. they are so far from proving, that there was no real Serpent concerned in the Fall, that the very Reason

why they are called Serpents, is, because the first Deceiver was a *Serpent*, and left his Name to all Deceivers who came after him. For allowing this Expression with respect to *Dan* and others to be metaphorical, yet all Metaphors have relation to something real; and a real Serpent acting in the first and great Deceit, all other Deceivers are called Serpents, as properly as strong Men are often styled *Sampsons*, or *Goliaths*; Names that never would have been thought of, had they not been born by Men remarkable for real and extraordinary Strength.

Against this Interpretation an Objection is formed, from the kind of Punishment inflicted on the Woman and the Serpent. The Woman's Sorrow in Conception was to be multiplied, and the Serpent was to go on his Belly; and these are so far from being admitted to be Punishments, that we are told they are necessary Consequences of their original Make and Formation. That Women bring forth with Pain, and that Serpents move on the Belly, is known to every body, and so far this State of Things answers directly to their respective Judgments; and supposing such Judgment to have been passed by God, the present State
of

of the Woman and the Serpent could not possibly be otherwise than they are : So that from the present State of Things, no possible Objection can be raised against the Truth, or even the Probability of the *Mosaick* History. Where is the Difficulty then : Why, it is said, that their State was always the same, as well before as after the Fall? But how do you know this? Who could inform you of it?

If you argue from a Fact of which you have neither Knowledge nor Information, what Support have you? Will you say that God, who created all Beings, cannot alter the State or Condition of any Being in any respect from what it was originally? This is such a Limitation on the Power of God, as is directly inconsistent with our Notions of the Divine Attributes; and it will be very easy to shew, in the Particulars of several Species of Animals, as great Deviations from the original Course of Nature, as these now under Consideration are; and why cannot God do that in the whole Species, if he sees Reason to do it, which he manifestly does in many particular Cases? How the original State and Formation of the Woman and the Serpent differed from

the present State, or how the Change was effected, I neither know, nor shall enquire.

When *Zacharias*, Father of *John* the Baptist, was stricken dumb instantaneously, can you tell what Change was made in his Organs of Speech, or how this Alteration was effected? But suppose that the same Change had been made universally, would not the World have been speechless? And can you doubt whether the same Power could do this in every Man's Case, which was done in the Case of *Zacharias*? Would not this have been a Curse upon Man, as extensive and as fatal as the Curse of the Fall was to the Woman or to the Serpent, and as contrary to what we call the Course of Nature, and as hard to be accounted for? And if we consider rightly Nature is nothing: All Powers are the Gift of the Creator, and every Being subsists, not by the Law and Appointment of Nature, but by the Law and Appointment of God, who is Master of his own Laws and Appointments, and can change them whenever he pleases; and Nature will follow and obey his Command, and ever be what he intends it should be. But to proceed :

That

That our Saviour understood the Devil to be the Tempter, appears plainly from the Parable of the Tares and his Exposition of it. The Parable is this: *The Kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a Man which sowed good Seed in his Field. But while Men slept his Enemy came, and sowed Tares among the Wheat, and went his Way. But when the Blade was sprung up, and brought forth Fruit, then appeared the Tares also. So that the Servants of the Householder came and said unto him: Sir, didst not thou sow good Seed in thy Field? From whence then hath it Tares? He said unto them, an Enemy hath done This. The Servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay: lest while ye gather up the Tares, ye root up also the Wheat with them. Let both grow together until the Harvest; and in the Time of Harvest, I will say to the Reapers, gather ye together first the Tares, and bind them in Bundles to burn them; but gather the Wheat into my Barn, Matt. xiii. 24, 25, &c.*

The Householder, you see, being asked, whence hath the Field Tares, gives this short Answer, *An Enemy hath done this.*

As to the Manner and Method of doing it, he is silent ; it was a Point in which the Servants had no Concern.

Our Saviour explains this Parable, and applies it to God's Government of the World, for the Instruction of his Disciples, to whom it was given, *to know the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven*. The Field is the World, the good Seed are the Children of the Kingdom, the Tares are the Children of the wicked one. — Here then our Saviour had the great Point before him ; *How came Evil into the World?* All the Answer he gives to it is, the Enemy that sowed the Tares is the *Devil*. Could our Lord be ignorant of the History of the Fall, and of the first Introduction of Evil into the World ? Or could he forget it when he was accounting for the Work of Providence, with respect to the Beginning of Evil, that every where abounded ? He does not indeed enter into the curious Questions relating to the Origin of Evil, but he tells us who first brought it in, the *Devil*. The Devil, therefore, was that very *Serpent* who tempted *Eve*, that Enemy who sowed those Tares, which have overspread the World.

When

When our Lord tells us, that the good Seed was sown by *the Son of Man*, and that the good Seed are the *Children* of the *Kingdom*, and that the *Tares* are the *Children* of the *wicked one*, can we doubt whether he had in View that part of the Prophecy, *I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed.* As our Lord has expressly told us, that the Enemy who brought Evil into the World, was the *Devil*, he has as clearly, if attended to, told us, that the Restorer of Righteousness, was that very Seed, promised to the Woman, who was to bruise the Serpent's Head. The good Seed he says was sown by *the Son of Man*. Who is this Son of Man? Every Man, every Son of Man is not a Sower of good Seed: far otherwise. *The Son of Man* then must denote some particular Person, distinguish'd from all other Children of Men: Let us see who this must be. Every Man is undoubtedly a *Son of Man*, and may be so stiled; but *THE Son of Man* emphatically, and distinguished from other Sons of Men, is a Title never applied to any other Person but to our Saviour. That it is emphatically, and in a peculiar Sense applied to him, may be seen in

in

in considering what is ascribed to him in the Gospel in Virtue of this Character : *The Son of Man hath Power to forgive Sins, Matt. ix. 6.* And in the Exposition of the Parable now before us, we read, *the Son of Man shall send forth his Angels, and they shall gather out of his Kingdom all Things that offend, and them which do Iniquity, and shall cast them into a Furnace of Fire, &c. Matt. xiii. 41, 42.* *The Son of Man shall sit on the right Hand of the Power of God, Luke xxii. 69.* and to mention but one Place more : *God hath given him Power to execute Judgment, because he is the Son of Man, John v. 27.*

Can any of these Things be affirmed of any other Son of Man ? Can every or any Son of Man forgive Sins ? or judge the World ? and yet this Judgment is committed to him, BECAUSE *he is the Son of Man.* Considering him then as a Man, and yet entitled to be stiled emphatically *the Son of Man*, what is there to distinguish him from all other *Sons of Men* ? If he is indeed *that Seed* promised to the Woman, who was to bruise the Serpent's Head, through whom were to be established all the Expectations of Mercy and Judgment raised by the an-
 tient

tient Prophets ; we see a plain Reason why he is stiled *the Son of Man*, being that *very Son* foretold, on whom the Hopes of the World rested from the Beginning.

As our Saviour, being the Seed of the Woman, is stiled the Son of Man, so the Devil acting (as probably he did) under the Form of a Serpent, is for the same reason stiled the Serpent ; and wicked Spirits and Men are stiled *Serpents* and *Scorpions*, and are characterized as *Powers of the Enemy*. The Tempter himself, the *great Dragon*, the *old Serpent*, is called the *Devil and Satan who deceiveth the whole World*, Rev. xii. 9. You see then, that the Contest between true Religion and Idolatry, between Righteousness and Wickedness, has from the Beginning been carried on by the Serpent and his Seed on one Side, and the Son of Man, the Seed of the Woman, on the other, agreeable to the antient Prophecy given after the Fall. As the Devil is called the Evil One, so Christ is called the Just One. The Serpent under the Influence of the Evil One, and the Son of Man, have had perpetual Strife to condemn, or to save the World.

It has been Matter of Doubt, as I observed before, whether the Tempter appeared to
Eve

Eve in the Form of a Serpent, or not ; but if we consider how great an Instrument of Idolatry the Serpent has been in all Times, it will add some Weight in Favour of their Opinion, who think that the Devil made Use of the Serpent in his first Deceit, as he has since undoubtedly done in a thousand others in After-times. I need not prove how great an Object of Idolatry the Serpent has been. It is well known what the Case was in *Egypt*, in the Eastern Country, in *Greece* and *Rome*, and elsewhere. This Species of Idolatry, however it came there, was found in *America*, upon the first Discovery of that Country. *Garcilasco de'l Viga*, who wrote the History of the *Incas* of *Peru*, tells us, that the *Spaniards*, forcing into the Recept of one of their Temples, found there the Image of a great Dragon, placed as the Deity of the Temple, and the Object of religious Worship. Other Instances in abundance might be produced from modern as well as antient History.

When you reflect how extensive this kind of Idolatry has been, how it has spread over the whole World, you may judge perhaps that the first Prophecy has been more literally accomplished, than has been
gene-

generally supposed; and that the old Serpent in his old Form with his Seed, and the Son of Man the Seed of the Woman, have been in perpetual Enmity, and will be, till the appointed Time comes for destroying the Power of the Evil One.

But to return to the History of the Fall. In Opposition to what I said with regard to the Hopes given to *Adam* and his Posterity by the Sentence on the Serpent, it has been said, that there is not the *least Intimation of any Victory of Man over the Serpent*. Now, if no Intimation of Advantage be given to Man over the Serpent in the literal Sense, there is no Ground to infer by Analogy any Advantage to the Man over the evil Being, the Tempter and Seducer. Let us then consider this. Naturalists are agreed that the Head of a Serpent is the tenderest Part, and that Wounds there, if they are such as bruise or break the Head, are incurable. Upon this Ground the Scripture, elsewhere representing great and evil Powers under the Image of Dragons and Serpents, relates or foretels their certain Ruin by the same Figure of bruising or breaking their Heads. Thus
the

the Destruction of *Pharaoh* and his Host in the Red Sea, is described in these Terms : *Thou breakest the Heads of the Dragons in the Waters, Pſ. lxxiv. 13.* A Man wounded in the Heel by a Serpent may or may not die ; for Nature has provided, and Experience has found out ſo many Remedies for this Evil, that few ſo wounded periſh, and thoſe for want of Care and proper Application. True it is, that Serpents as long as they are Serpents, will bite Men by the Heels, and Men will return the Evil on their Heads : Here is then a perpetual Enmity declared, but with unequal Succeſs ; on one Side Pains and Wounds, on the other Death and Deſtruction. Thus it is between Men and the Serpents of the Earth ; and I am at a Loſs to account for the Aſſertion, that here is not the leaſt Intimation of any final Victory of the Man over the Serpent. Take this out of the Metaphor, and apply it to the evil Being, the Tempter and Betrayer of our firſt Parents, and thus much at leaſt appears to be intended : That Man, though greatly injured, and greatly to be injured by the Seducers poiſonous Inſinuations, ſhall at the laſt prevail and deſtroy the Power and Tyranny of the wicked Spirit.

rit. Man shall suffer in the Contest, but for him there are Remedies prepared. The Evil One shall receive a Wound, a Wound that knows no Cure.

This Exposition will not necessarily lead us farther, nor shew us all the Circumstances of this Contest, nor the certain Means of Victory; but a little Reflection will open the View: And since all was lost by Disobedience to God, surely it is no far-fetch'd Consequence to infer, that nothing can be regained but through his Favour; unless there be one more mighty than he to rescue us out of his Hands. Is it then reconcilable to the Notion of God, to suppose that Sinners can recover his Favour by any other Means than those of Righteousness and Obedience? If not, then the Chain of Consequences deduced in the former Part of this Treatise must hold firm; and there is no Way to break through it, but by supposing the History of the Fall to be a mere Fiction of Antiquity, which was introduced by a Strength of Imagination in some early Age, and through a Weakness of Judgment has been believed and admitted in those which followed.

It

It is a material Enquiry, and connected to the History of the Fall, and affecting no less a Matter, than the Foundation of all Religion, to know upon what Ground we have Hope towards God.

That Hope towards God is a necessary Foundation of Religion, without which it cannot subsist, seems to be a Thing agreed.

The Question then is, whence these Hopes are derived? From Revelation and the Promises of God, say I; from natural Reason contemplating the Attributes of God, say others, who are of Opinion that the Attributes of God are a sufficient Foundation, from whence Man, poor weak Man, may learn to hope for certain Mercy from him.

I want not to be convinced that the present Condition of Mankind affords great Arguments for Pity and Compassion, and consequently good Grounds for Hope from the Mercy of God. Whoever views Mankind in their present State, into which they came by no voluntary Act of their own, but placed in it by him who is their Maker, and will be their Judge; subject to Ignorance and Superstition by a kind of Necessity of Birth and Education; surrounded with many natural Infirmities and Passions, arising from

from no Crime of which they are conscious ; and at the same Time considers the Benignity of the divine Nature, and the Love of God towards his Creatures, of which the Affection of natural Parents is but a feint Resemblance, will easily see, that the Condition of Man pleads strongly for Mercy, that Nature with unutterable Groans calls for Help and Deliverance for her Children, and that there is great Reason to expect from the Goodness of God that he will not be deaf to these Cries.

This, I suppose, is meant when we are told, that “ the Attributes of God are a just
 “ Foundation from whence Man, poor weak
 “ Man, may learn to hope for certain Mer-
 “ cy from him.”

But what is this to the Case before us, or to the main Question concerning the Foundation of Religion ; which had a Beginning before so much as one *poor weak Man* was born into the World, to plead the Misery of his Condition as a Motive for Mercy ? At the time of the Fall there were but two in the World, and they both Sinners, without the Plea of Ignorance or natural Infirmary to excuse their Iniquity. They had incur'd the Sentence of immediate Death, were

conscious that they deserved it, and had Reason every Moment to expect the Execution. Tell me now upon what Ground they could conceive Hope: Could they plead the Misery of their Condition? If so, then every Sinner who renders himself miserable by his Iniquity, has a Title to Mercy. Could any Reasoning of theirs upon the Attributes of God give a just Foundation for Hope, against the express Declaration of God himself, *In the Day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die?*

Supposing these Sinners had died in their Sin, according to the Terms of the Law given them, what Complaint could have been formed on their Behalf? And where then would have been the Men, *the poor weak Men*, whose Condition affords such certain Grounds for Hope? None such would have come into the World. That there are such in the World now, is the Effect of God's Mercy to our first Parents; a Consequence of that Promise which first gave them Confidence *towards God*.

It is one thing to view the World in its present Circumstances; another to view it in its original. God would not have suffered the World to have been filled with
weak

weak miserable Creatures, had he not intended them for Objects of his Mercy. No Wonder therefore if they appear to be what he intended they should be. But *Adam* and *Eve* came not into the World in this miserable State, and therefore the original Hopes of Religion after the Fall, which are certainly as old as *Adam*, owe not their Rise to that Condition, in which he was no Sharer.

The not making this Distinction between the original Hopes of Nature, and the Hopes which may be derived from the present State of the World, has, I am persuaded, been a great Prejudice in many Minds, as well against revealed Religion as against those who defend it. Divines are thought to have no Sense, or no Bowels, when they call in Question the Foundation of those Hopes which natural Reason conceives from a View of the Perfections of God, and the Imperfections of Man. Revelation is looked on as an Imposition, and Abridgment of our natural Right, when it offers that Mercy upon Terms and Conditions, to which Nature seems to lay so just a Claim upon her own Account.

Yet neither does the Gospel, nor they that defend it, pretend to say, that Man in his present Condition is not an Object of Mercy. So far from it, that they assert that God permitted Men to come into this Condition, that they might be Objects of his Mercy, and for the clear Manifestation of his Goodness.

There is one Difficulty, which attends upon every Scheme of natural Religion, of which I think every considering Man, who follows his Enquiries up to the Original of Things, must be sensible. The Case is this; the Religion and Morality, which Nature teaches, is such as Nature in the present weak Condition cannot perform. Reason teaches us what is right; but alas! it wants no Proof to shew that the best of us fall short of this Perfection. Whence comes this Inconsistency, this Contradiction in Nature? Why had we not less Discernment to see what is right, or more Power to follow the Dictates of Reason? To mend this Matter, the Mercy of God is called into the Assistance of Man's Weakness; and in good Truth there is Reason enough for it; this Help is not asked before it is wanted. But as the Application to Mercy is in every
Case

Case an After-game, and the very Call for Mercy and Pardon shews the original Duty and Obligation to have been transgressed; this Application to Mercy, however in our present Circumstances reasonable and necessary, can be no Part of the original Religion of Nature, unless we are naturally and originally formed Offenders. No Subject wants the Prince's Mercy, till he has broken his Laws; and to suppose a Government in which every Subject should *originally* stand in need of the Prince's Mercy, is a Contradiction: For the very Supposition makes every Subject an Offender; and the supposing him an Offender infers a Law *antecedent* to this supposed *original* State.

The Necessity therefore which every Man fees of supporting Religion in the present Circumstances of the World, by the Hopes of God's Mercy and Pardon, is the Voice of Nature concurring with the sacred History, to shew us that we are fallen from the State in which God first placed us. For nothing perfect *in suo genere* is an Object of Pity and Compassion; and if the whole Race of Men taken collectively are in their present Circumstances, as every Scheme of Religion asserts they are, an Object of divine

Compassion, they must be considered as imperfect *in suo genere*, and consequently not in that State in which God created them, who made nothing in its kind imperfect. The View of the World in its present Circumstances, surrounded with Ignorance, Folly, Wickedness and Misery; and the Necessity of grounding the Hopes of all Religion on the Mercy of God, leads us plainly to the Preacher's Conclusion, *Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made Man upright, but they have sought out many Inventions, Eccles. vii. 29.*

Far am I then from thinking that *weak Man* is not an Object of Mercy, or that there is not Mercy in store for him. I see too much, nay I feel too much of the Infirmities of Nature, to read so ill a Lesson against myself. But where were all those Pleas, when *Adam* sinned? He was no poor weak Man, but created upright, and made poor and weak by his own Choice. From what Principle of Reason could he certainly conclude, that God would not execute the Sentence of Death upon him immediately? All that we read of him is, that conscious of his Guilt, *he hid himself from the Presence of the Lord God amongst the Trees of the Garden*, hoping (as there is nothing more
irra-

irrational than Fear) to escape the All-seeing Eye of his Maker. In this State, what Comfort could he have but from the Promise of God? And indeed were it not for a just Expectation from the Promises of God, that all the Miseries and Confusions in the World shall finally end to the Glory of God, and the Good of those who continue with Patience in well doing, it had been far greater Mercy to have put an End to two wretched Lives, than to continue them for the Propagation of Wickedness and Misery to a thousand Generations. Through Mercy then, and for the Sake of shewing Mercy, does the present World subsist; and the Origin of this Mercy must be traced from an higher Principle, than the present Weakness and Misery of human Nature. I have said, "it was necessary to convey Hope to *Adam* to be the Foundation of Religion, and that Hope was conveyed when Sentence was passed upon the Offenders." I am answered, No; the Necessity of revealing Hopes of Mercy is plainly not complied with; and no Hopes of Mercy, or even Colour for such Hopes, are contained in this Transaction.

For these Assertions no Reasons are given, but what are found in a mere literal Interpretation

tion of the History which has been already considered: And it seems to me, that it does not upon that Scheme do Justice to the Text; for it makes no Difference between a Bruise on the Heel and a Bruise on the Head. But this also has been considered.

It may seem strange perhaps to some, that we should imagine any Blessing at all to be contained in this Proceeding, which is plainly a judicial Proceeding against Offenders, and where nothing but their Punishment is to be expected. Stranger still that we should search for this Blessing upon the Man, not in the Part in which he himself was principally concerned, but in the Part which was directed to the Serpent, and contains God's Curse against him for his Deceit. A severe Sentence against one Offender is seldom intended to be a Pardon to another: And to this Difficulty the Interpretation is subject, which draws the *Blessing* upon Man from the *Curse* upon the Serpent.

To clear this, let it be considered,

1. Though a Sentence formed upon the Rigour of the Law contains no Mercy, yet every Sentence which exacts less than the Law demands, is to some Degree an Act of Grace. A Sentence of Fine and Imprisonment,

ment, against a Man guilty of Death, though it be directly a judicial Proceeding against an Offender, and in itself a Sentence of Punishment, yet is it virtually a Pardon for Life. There have been Instances (perhaps too many) where a Verdict against a Criminal for Manlaughter, has been in Effect a Pardon for Murder.

Now in the principal Case, the Law was, *in the Day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.* By the Sentence on *Adam* his Death was respited, and he was to live to eat (though to eat in Sorrow) of the Fruits of the Ground. By the Sentence on *Eve*, she was to live to bring forth Children, though the Sorrows of Conception were multiplied. By the Sentence on the Serpent, a perpetual Enmity was declared between his and the Woman's Seed, and the Event on each Side foretold : *It shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel.*

Could *Adam*, comparing his present Case upon the Foot of these Sentences with the Penalty of the Law against which he had offended, possibly doubt whether God had dealt graciously with him? No more surely, than a Criminal doomed to live in Imprisonment, when he might have been hang-
ed

ed by the Law, can doubt of his Prince's Goodness to him.

2. As to our supposing a Blessing upon the Man to be contained in the Curse on the Serpent, this is to be said: That the Passage we refer to has undeniably a Relation both to the Woman and the Serpent, and might have been declared (for ought that appears from the Subject Matter) as well to one as the other. Now had it been said to the Woman instead of the Serpent, *I will put Enmity, &c. It shall bruise thy Heel, and thou shalt bruise his Head*, there had been no Ground for this Objection; and I cannot conceive that the Words carry any other Sense by being spoken to the Serpent, than they would have had, supposing them to have been spoken to the Woman.

There is a like Instance in the Sentence on the Woman. It is the Prerogative of the Man, that he is Head of the Woman; but this Superiority is not conveyed to him by express Grant or Concession, but the Subjection is laid on the Woman as a Penalty.

And indeed, whenever a Punishment affects a Man in the relation he bears to others, the Case must ever be, as it is here supposed

fed to be. When *Canaan* was cursed with Servitude, in Consequence of that Curse, his Brethren became Lords over him. When *Reuben* for his Iniquity lost his Birthright, the Advantage necessarily went to some other of the Sons of *Jacob*. And since the Woman and the Serpent were declared to be Enemies, the Destruction of the Serpent must necessarily be the Exaltation of the Woman. And since these Words declaring a perpetual Enmity and Contest between the Woman and the Serpent are made part of the Sentence on the Serpent, it is a clear Indication that the Serpent was to suffer most in the Struggle, otherwise they could not stand as Part of his Curse. For the same Reason the Man's Superiority over the Woman is left to be collected from the Penalty on the Woman. A Grant of this Superiority would have come very improperly in as Part of a Sentence against the Man; but the Subjection on the other Side came properly as Part of the Sentence against the Woman. Thus then the Case stands: The Enmity between the Serpent and the Woman was a Curse on the Serpent, and not on the Woman, and therefore the Advantage of the Contest was necessarily to be on the Woman's

man's Side. So that this Circumstance, duly considered, is a great Confirmation of the Hopes we ground from the Curse laid on the Serpent.

If we consider that the Tempter has no Power over Man but by drawing him into Evil, bruising the Heel seems plainly to intimate to us the Progress of Idolatry and Wickedness in the World, which are the Engines of the wicked One to keep Mankind in Subjection, Slavery and Misery. And as his chief and main Strength consists in these, the *bruising his Head* intimates to us, that these shall be destroyed, and the Power of the Devil over Mankind together with them, by the Seed of the Woman.

There is another Prophecy of antient Date, so like to this in Language and Idea, and into which the Hope of Salvation has so plain Relation, that comparing the two together may perhaps reflect a new Light upon each. The Prophecy intended is to be found in the 49th of *Genesis*, among the Blessings and Predictions of *Jacob* given to his Sons just before his Death, and relates to the Tribe of *Dan*. *Dan shall be a Serpent by the Way, an Adder in the Path, that biteth the Horse's Heels, so that his Rider*

der shall fall backward. I have waited for thy Salvation, O Lord! The Difficulty here, at least the main Difficulty, is to give any tolerable Account of the Propriety of this passionate Wish for Salvation. It has evidently relation to the Prophecy concerning *Dan*, and the Exposition ought to shew and preserve the Relation; and yet according to the common Interpretations, this Passage might as well stand after the Blessing of *Gad*, *Asher*, *Naphtali*, or any other of the Tribes, as after this Prophecy concerning the Tribe of *Dan*. They who refer the Salvation here mentioned to the Deliverance wrought by *Samson* descended from the House of *Dan*, do also expound the Prophecy to relate to him, and his Victory; so far judging right, that the Prophecy and the *Epiphonema* ought to terminate in the same Point of View. But how comes *Samson* to be thus distinguished? *Israel* had many other Judges and Deliverers descended from other Tribes, many of them, in all Respects, (bodily Strength only excepted) preferable to this strong *Danite*; of them there is no Notice taken in the Prophecy of *Jacob*, nor of the Salvation which God by their Means wrought in *Israel*. Besides, in
what

what Sense had *Jacob* waited for *this* Salvation? And how for this rather than for twenty others of the same Kind which happened to his Posterity? The Words plainly imply him to speak of something which had been long the Object of his Heart's Desire; the Thought of which came strong upon him when he prophetically beheld the Fortune of this Tribe. Further, the Images here used, of *Serpent* and *Adder*, are odious, and very improper to describe a brave or gallant Man in any Circumstance of Life; nor are they, as I remember, ever so used in the sacred Writers. It cannot be reasonable therefore to look for the Accomplishment of this Prophecy among the Actions of the Tribe of *Dan* deserving Honour and Praise; for the Ideas by which the Prediction is conveyed, point out Actions of another Kind; and lead us to expect, in the History of this Tribe, an Account of some very dishonourable and perfidious Transaction. The History will justify this Expectation. For though the House of *Israel* stands recorded for a wilful and disobedient People, whose Heart was not right with their God, yet it is the peculiar Infamy of the House of *Dan*, to be the Ringleaders in Idolatry,
the

the first who erected publickly a molten Image in the Land of Promise, and by their Example and Perseverance in this Iniquity infected all the Tribes of *Israel*. This Idolatry began soon after the Days of *Joshua*, and continued until the Day of the Captivity of the Land, *Judges* xviii. 30, 31. *

Supposing this to be the View before the Prophet's Eyes, in what Terms more proper could he describe this new Tempter and Seducer, than by those which were commonly used to describe the first? If the first Tempter deserved the Name of a *Serpent*, for drawing *Adam* and *Eve* from their Obedience to the original Law, in Virtue of which they held the Possession of Paradise, did *Dan* deserve it less for drawing the People of *Israel* from Obedience to the divine Law, in Virtue of which they had but even then taken Possession of the Land of Promise? If the Mischiefs brought upon the Race of *Adam*, were justly represented by the *Serpent's bruising the Heel of the Woman's Seed*, did not the Mischiefs brought upon the House of *Israel* by the Idolatry of *Dan* well deserve to be painted in Colours of the same kind? And when *Jacob* saw,

* Compare with Bishop *Usher's Annals*.

saw, that the Venom of the old Serpent was not yet spent, but that it would work again in one of his own Sons, to the utter Ruin of his Posterity, could he help looking back upon God's Promise of Deliverance, and the Hope given that the *Serpent's Head* should be *bruised*? Could this View, and this Reflection together, be attended with any other Sentiments than those which close this Prophecy? *I have waited for thy Salvation, O Lord.*

This Prophecy, considered in this Light, affords a very antient Evidence of the Expectation of Deliverance from the Curse of the Fall. The Hope of Salvation here manifestly relates to the Mischief wrought by a Serpent biting the Heels. And tho' this Image is used to foretel a Mischief then to come, and tho' the Salvation itself was still to come, yet the Hope was older than *Jacob*, *had been* his Comfort all along, and *was* his Comfort under the sad Prospect he had of his Children's Iniquity.

Lay these Circumstances together, and it is impossible to imagine any Salvation that can answer to these Ideas, but that only which arose from the Promise, that the
Seed

Seed of the Woman *should bruise the Serpent's Head.*

This Expectation, so earnestly and so warmly expressed by the old Patriarch, led some Interpreters to apply it to the Hopes of Salvation thro' the Messias, as the only Object of Worth and Dignity sufficient to engage his last Thoughts, and to be the Comfort and Support of his last Hour; though they did not consider the Prophecy itself as leading to this Hope, but referred it to a temporal Deliverance, to be brought about by one of the Sons of *Dan*. *

But that this Prophecy was antiently understood to fix a Mark of Infamy upon *Dan*, and not to sing the Triumph of the Tribe, appears by an old Tradition grounded on this Prophecy, *that Anti-Christ should proceed from the Tribe of Dan.* † For which Opinion, what other Ground could there be, but this, that the Terms in which *Dan* is described, are the very same made Use of

D in

* Adest huic expositioni Thargum Hierosolymitanum—
Dixit Pater noster Jacob. — *Expecto redemptionem Messiae Filii DAVID, qui venturus est ut adducat sibi Filios Israel, cujus redemptionem expectat et desiderat Anima mea.* Eademque habentur in paraphrasi Chaldaica Editionis Complutensis. *Pererius in locum.*

† See *Calmet's Dictionary* under the Title *Dan*.

in describing the Tempter, that *first* and *great* Anti-Christ who was to have perpetual Enmity with the Seed of the Woman, and to wage continual War with the Saints, and often to prevail to the bruising their Heel.

Some Intimation of this Sort seems to be given in the Revelation of St. *John*, Ch. vii. One would think that *Dan* was rejected and accounted as the Seed of the Serpent, by the leaving all of this Tribe out of the Number of those who were sealed with the Seal of the living God. It seems to be the original Purpose of Providence to settle the House of *Israel* under twelve Heads, and yet *Levi* had no Share of the Inheritance in the Land of *Canaan*, as the other Tribes had, God having provided another Maintenance for him; *Numb.* xviii. 14. *Josh.* xiv. 3. and xiii. 33. nor had *Dan*, in the Revelation of St. *John*, any Share allotted him in the Kingdom of the Messias. In both Cases the two Tribes of the House of *Joseph* are admitted to compleat the Number : So that in the temporal Covenant made with *Abraham*, which gave him the Inheritance of the Land of *Canaan*, *Levi* had no Share ; in the Promise,

to



BOOKS Printed for *John Whiston*, at
Mr. *Boyle's* Head in *Fleetstreet*.

I. **T**HE Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of
Jesus, the twelfth Edition, corrected. Price
1s 6d.

N. B. *Not only Mr. Woolston's Objections in his
sixth Discourse on our Saviour's Miracles, but
those which others have published are here consi-
dered.*

II. Thoughts on Religion, and other curious Sub-
jects, written in *French*, by that celebrated Genius
Monfr. Pascal, translated into *English* by *Basil Kennet*,
D. D. Price bound 4s.

III. Twenty Sermons preached to a Society of *Bri-
tish* Merchants at *Leghorn*. By *Basil Kennet*, D. D.
late President of *Corpus Christi* College in *Oxford*, the
third Edition, corrected. Price bound 4s.

IV. Twenty-six Sermons on various Subjects, by
Adam Batty, M. A. late Rector of *St. John's Clerken-
well*, and Lecturer of *St. Dunstan's* in the West, in two
Volumes. Price bound 8s.

V. Twenty-seven Sermons, chiefly on the Parables
and Miracles of our Saviour, by *Abraham Markland*,
D. D. late Prebendary of *Winchester*, and Master of
St. Cross, the two Volumes bound in one. Price 5s.

VI. Twenty-four Sermons on practical Subjects,
by *Edward Littleton*, D. D. late Fellow of *Eton* Col-
lege, and Chaplain to his Majesty. Printed on a very
large Letter and fine Paper. Price 7s. bound in two
Vols. 6s. in one.

Books Printed for J. Whiston, &c.

VII. Seventy-three Sermons on moral and religious Subjects, by *Edward Waple*, B. D. late Vicar of *St. Sepulchre*, London, in 3 vol. 8vo. Price 10s 6d bound.

VIII. Twelve Sermons on practical Subjects, by *William Talbot*, late Lord Bishop of *Durham*. Price 4s bound.

IX. The Expedition of *Cyrus* against his Brother *Artaxerxes*, and the Retreat of the ten thousand *Greeks*, written by *Xenophon*, with Notes historical and critical, by *Edward Spelman*, Esq; 2 Vols. Price 8s.

X. *Isocratis* opera omnia Græce & Latine, Notas Wolfii suasque adjecit, *Gulielmus Battie*, M. D. Coll. Reg. Lond. Socius, in 2 Vol. . Pret. 12s.

XI. The Elements of *Euclid*, with select Theorems out of Archimedes, by the learned *Andrew Tacquet*. To which are added, Practical Corollaries, shewing the Uses of many of the Propositions, and illustrated with Copper-plates. The sixth Edition, corrected. Price 4s. 6d.

XII. Astronomical Principles of Religion, natural and revealed: With a large Preface of the Temper of Mind necessary for the Discovery of divine Truth, and of the Degree of Evidence that ought to be expected in divine Matters. The second Edition. Price 5s.

XIII. Astronomical Lectures, read in the publick Schools at *Cambridge*: Whereunto is added, a Collection of astronomical Tables, by Mr. *Flamsteed*, Dr. *Halley*, Mons^r *Cassini*, and Mr. *Street*, corrected. The second Edition. Price 5s.

XIV. Historical Memoirs of the Life and Writings of *Samuel Clarke*, D. D. late Rector of *St. James's Westminster*, including certain Memoirs of several of his Friends. To which is added, Dr. *Sykes's* Elogium, and Mr. *Emlyn's* Memoirs of the Life and Sentiments of Dr. *Clarke*. The Third Edition. Price 2s. 6d.

XV. An Account of the Demoniacs, and the Power of casting out Demons among the antient Christians. Price 1s. 6d. All by *William Whiston*, M. A.