

n^o 4
CRITICAL REMARKS ✓

Upon the late

Lord Viscount *BOLINGBROKE*'s

LETTERS

ON THE

Study and Use of HISTORY,

As far as they regard

SACRED HISTORY.

Humbly Inscribed to His Pious Executor, and
Posthumous Editor, *D. M. Esq.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN WOODYER, at *Cæsar's Head*,
the Corner of *Serjeant's Inn*, *Fleet-Street*.

M,DCC,LIV.

[Price One Shilling.] B

2-814



Upon the late

Lord Viscount BOLINGBROKE

LETTERS

ON THE

Study and Use of HISTORY

SIR,

As far as they regard

SACRED HISTORY

THESE Annotations can
justly be addrested to no
Man besides you. It is you
that have doubled the

World with these Letters and Frag-
ments of Lord Bolingbroke. It is you
that (in Defence of all Kind of
Laws) boldly endeavour for the
Sake of Truth and no doubt
for filthy Lucre to spread the Bo-
lshockism around the Land. As
I Price One Shilling I
you



TO
Mr. M-----.

S I R,



THESE Annotations can justly be addressed to no Man beside you: It is you that have troubled the World with these Letters and Fragments of Lord *Bolingbroke*: It is you, that (in Defiance of all Kind of Laws) boldly endeavour, for the Sake of Truth, and, no doubt, not for filthy Lucre, to spread the *Bolingbrokiana* around the Land. As

D E D I C A T I O N.

you have therefore fostered these
 posthumous Abortions of his Lord-
 ship's Brain, the Mischief done by
 such Infant *Maximins*, lies at your
 Door. You might possibly think it
 a Pity to stifle or destroy such *Cæ-
 sarian* Fætuses, and though request-
 ed. as it is said to stop your Hand,
 have, most obstetrically, helped
 them into all the Light which they
 are capable of. We may now wish
 you Joy of the Brats, and when
 Monsieur *Voltaire* departs, he knows
 not whither, he may intrust his Es-
 tericks to the same impartial Hand.
 I am equally, with the Rest of the
 Christian World,

Your obliged,

humble Servant,

PREFACE,

DEDICATION.

P R E F A C E.

WHEN these cursory Reflections were wrote, Mr. M----- had not printed off the Rest of his *Genius's* Fragments. They now appear, and I'm afraid not to the Credit of Author or Editor. It is indeed a new Method of publishing Works, which the Author is ashamed or afraid of venting himself. But let no One be too greatly concerned at their Contents; for Controversies when carried on by Arguments, and not Blooms, are sure at last to illustrate, instead of defacing our holy Religion. Lord Bolingbroke expected that his crude Notions would be examined; they will be so: And all the Misfortune is, that by this cowardly Way of bequeathing Writings to be printed after the Author's Death, the Author cannot be at all benefited or set right in any Errors. As to the Pamphlet before you, it does not interfere with any former Answers, especially the learned Bishop of Clogher's; most
of

P R E F A C E.

of whose Remarks are so justly esteemed, and
 same are here referred to. All that was aimed
 at here, was to expose the Conceit and Ignorance
 of the Letter-Writer, more minutely in his
 first three Letters. And this Part may be fol-
 lowed by a Second; and perhaps a Third will
 be hereafter added, concerning the disputed
 Chronology of the Assyrian Kings, which seems
 capable of being farther cleared up than it has
 been yet. The Writer's Name was thought
 unnecessary to be prefixed to an Answer to One
 who is deceased; but he begs Leave, having no
 better Opportunity to refer the abovementioned
 Prelate to Kircher's Oedipus Ægyptiacus,
 (Vol. II.) where his Lordship will find more
 Inscriptions copied from the Rocks in the De-
 serts of Arabia: And there is another Autho-
 rity, beside the Tract of the Prefetto, to prove
 that more remain still uncopied there: For the
 same Thomas a Novaria, who transcribed those
 in Kircher, told Pietro della Valle (who him-
 self saw only one of them, viz. that at the Foot
 of Mount Horeb, being unapprized of any
 more) that he copied these Six or Seven out of
 many which he saw, "ex multis quas vidit"
 this is taken from a Letter of Della Valle, and
 proves that there is no Reason to doubt the Ex-
 istence of such "written Mountains" but that
 his

PREFACE

his Lordship and the Antiquarian Society may meet with Success, upon their sending a Person properly qualified to take exact Copies of the Characters, and at the same Time import some valuable Manuscripts from the neighbouring Countries of Egypt and Syria.

be hereafter added, concerning the disputed Chronology of the Assyrian Kings, which seems capable of being further cleared up than it has been yet. The Writer's Name was thought unnecessary to be prefixed to my Answer to One
Westminster, March
17, 1754

better Opportunity to refer the abovementioned Preface to Kircher's *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, (Vol. II.) where his Lordship will find more Inscriptions copied from the Rocks in the Deserts of Arabia: And there is another Authority, beside the Tract of the Preface, to prove that more remain still uncopied there: For the same Thomas a Novalis, who translated those in Kircher, told Pietro della Valle (who himself saw only one of them, viz. that at the Foot of Mount Horch, being unprovided of any more) that he copied both six or seven out of many which he saw, "ex multis quas vidit." This is taken from a Letter of Della Valle; and proves that there is no Reason to doubt the Existence of such "written Mountains," but that

PREFACE

THE EDITOR of this volume has been
 very much interested in the study of
 the history of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.

He has been particularly interested
 in the study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.

He has been particularly interested
 in the study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.

He has been particularly interested
 in the study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.

He has been particularly interested
 in the study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.

He has been particularly interested
 in the study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.

He has been particularly interested
 in the study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.

He has been particularly interested
 in the study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century. He has been
 particularly interested in the
 study of the English language
 and of the literature of the
 last century.



CRITICAL REMARKS
UPON
LETTERS
ON THE
STUDY of HISTORY,
By the late
Lord Viscount *BOLINGBROKE*.

LETTER I.



THE Date of these Letters, Nov. 6, 1735, which are directed to the late Lord *Hyde* (then Lord *Cornbury*) from *Chantelou*, a Seat of the Writers in *Touraine*, in *France*, may help to shew us the Truth of a Remark made by Mr. *Pope*, in one of his
B Letters

Letters to Dean *Swift*, viz. That this universal Genius could never rest from Politicks. He was always abjuring them in the most stoical Manner, and always meddling with them, whether in *France* or *England*. His Affectation only convinced every Body that Ambition was still predominant, and he found no one that would believe his strongest Renunciations. Page 1. (of the first Edition 1752) He begins with telling Lord *Cornbury*, "I practis'd in those Days (formerly) as much as *Business* and *Pleasure* allow'd me Time to do, the Rules that seem'd to me necessary to be observ'd in the Study of History." *Business* of Parliament no doubt he means, interspersed by Mr. S--- Y---, with a good deal of the Pleasures of two kinds of Debauchery, as all the Memoirs of those Times inform us; all which were extremely good Qualifiers for the Study of History. Page 2. "But this neither gave me then nor since any Distrust of them," that is, the Writers on the same Subject. His Lordship's Method of studying History is certainly, though he says he "does not affect Singularity," very singular. He would introduce not an absolute Pyrrhonism
indeed

indeed (though his Rules tend that Way) but a Rejection of at least all antient History both sacred and prophane. My Lord's Faith, it seems, was only in modern History, and that very narrowly confined; from the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century: But he imagines, (Page 122.) " That History has been "*purposely* and systematically falsified in all " Ages; and that Partiality and Prejudice " have occasioned both *voluntary* and involuntary Errors even in the *Best*;" which are bold Words, and nothing else. We shall see how this Manager makes out these Articles of Impeachment against all his Forefathers.

PAGE 2. " On the contrary, I think, that " a *due Deference* is to be paid to *received* " Opinions, and that a *due Compliance* is to " be held with *received Customs*, though absurd or ridiculous," which he calls an " outward Servitude," and extends no further than to those which " cannot be opposed, or deviated from, without Hurt or " Offence to Society." We understand his Lordship; he could himself bow to *Rimmon* with an *occasional* Conformity.

PAGE 3. He complains of the Want of "many Books; and calls his Letter an imperfect Sketch." But what should his Lordship do with *many* Books? His Life-Writer gives us an excellent Reason or Excuse for Lord *Bolingbroke's* want of *reading* many Books, from his own Mouth, which was, that he had so *accomplished* a Memory, that he was afraid of stuffing it with too many Materials; and, as Bishop *Clayton* observes, this imperfect Sketch lay before his Friends for their Correction a long time. But I doubt, after all, that every one of his Lordship's Writings will be thought imperfect Sketches of Politicks, History, and Religion.

PAGE 4. Among the Readers of History he places those "in the lowest Forms" who "store their Minds, with crude unruminated Facts and Sentences, and hope to supply "by *bare Memory* the want of Imagination "and *Judgment*." This, methinks, bears a little too hard upon Talkers and Writers of accomplished Memories after what has been just now remarked.

PAGE 4. " The Obligation to these Men," who " make fair Copies of foul Manuscripts, " give the Signification of hard Words, and " take a great deal of other grammatical " Pains, would be *great indeed*, if, in *general* (N. B.) they were *able* to do any thing " better, and submitted to this Drudgery, " for the Sake of the Publick." His Lordship will not thank these Copiers and Editors, unless they are able to do more than what they pretend to: a hard Taskmaster! but he owns, that " some of them " have been otherwise able Men ; but " not *later*, " I think, than about the Time of the Resurrection of Letters." Wonderful ! that the Revival of learned Authors should not have been earlier than the Revival of Learning, which was occasioned by these Editors !

PAGE 5. " *Littleton*, he is pleased to say, " exerted all the Genius he had, when he " made a Dictionary, though *Stephens* did " not ; " perhaps his Lordship did not know that there were more *Stephens's* than one, and that Doctor *Littleton* published more Works beside his Dictionary: Though, even

in that Dictionary, he has exerted more than ordinary Skill and Judgment in several Parts of it, and is far from being a mere Compiler, particularly in his prefatory Dissertations to the Latin Part, where he does "presume to Reason," though Lord *Bolingbroke* is offended at it.

PAGE 6. He next falls foul upon Chronology, in these nice Terms, "A Man must be as indifferent as I am to common Censure or Approbation to avow a thorough Contempt for the whole Business of these learned Lives, for all the Researches into Antiquity, for all the Systems of Chronology and History that we owe to the immense Labours of a *Scaliger*, a *Bockart*, a *Petavius*, an *Usher*, and even a *Marsham*." And why all this? Because, 1. Their "Materials are few." 2. They are "extremely precarious, as some of these learned Persons confess." 3. "There is a moral Impossibility that they should ever have more." This last Assertion is extremely precarious, I think, until we have perused more of the ancient Histories of the Eastern Nations which yet lie hid and untranslated into any *European* Tongue.

Tongue. But to look at those, which we have already, and the very accurate Authors here named, (Note first, that Three of the Five were Ecclesiasticks, viz. Monsieur Bochart, Archbishop Usher, and F. Petau, tho' P. 185, he twits our Divines with not making "due Application to these Studies.")

THESE few Materials then are the *Jewish* Chronicles (for at present we only consider *Genesis*, and the other Scriptures, as mere History.) The *Grecian* Histories of *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, *Xenophon*, (for which Two latter he professes Respect afterwards) *Polybius*, *Diodorus Siculus*, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, and all those older Writers from whom they compiled their own Histories; and each of these now remaining take up, one with another, at least one Folio in Print, besides all the *Oriental* Writers: For I do not name the *Roman* Historians, because even Lord *Bolingbroke* sometimes gives them (especially *Livy*, *Sallust* and *Tacitus*, his Favourite) a good Word. He afterwards pretends to have studied the *Greek* and *Roman* Authors deeply; but who will believe his Lordship? He sets up visibly, with only a little *Latin*, more

French, and some *Italian*; and between " his " Buſineſs and Pleaſures" had very ſhort Intervals for Study ; which is the Reaſon, we preſume, that he quotes his *Greek* from *Latin* Tranſlations, and his *Hebrew* Authors from the *Engliſh*. And no wonder, therefore, that his Lordſhip frequently blunders (I aſk Pardon ; his Quality requires the Word " trips," or makes " faux pas") in citing ſuch antiquated Authors. He hopes, poſſibly, that his high Rank may be allowed to chuſe Hiſtorians, that do not mind the Unities of Time or Place required even in Plays ; and he avowedly deſpiſes all that preſume to ſet him right in Geography or Chronology : So that provided a Romancer calls his " imperfect Sketch," a Hiſtory, and inserts good ethical or political Remarks upon the Actions of his Heroes ; 'tis no matter if he brings in *Heſtor* of *Troy*, and *Alexander* of *Macedon* together, and *Hannibal* joining in Leagues with *Pyrrhus* to invade *Italy* ! or like *Fontenelle* in his Dialogues of the Dead, *Mary de Medicis* with *Sappho* and Queen *Elizabeth*, laying Schemes to rule *Europe* !

I can-

I cannot end this Note without observing two Things, 1. that after this thorough Contempt passed by Lord *Bolingbroke* here upon Chronologers, in Page 18, he is extremely nice in adjusting the Year of *Aristotle's* Birth, in order to pick a Hole in *Seneca's* Coat, that he thinks wanted Darning. And yet, whether "*Socrates* died two Years according to some, or Four according to others, before the Birth of *Aristotle*," was Nothing to *Seneca's* Purpose; any other Name of one of *Socrates's* Scholars would do as well as *Aristotle's* to prove, that they "profited more by his Example than his Discourse."

THE other is, that whereas I have asserted, that his Lordship's Head was not troubled with Greek, upon looking into later Editions of these Letters, I spied some Greek at the Bottom of a Page about *Moso*: This alarmed me, as I had not taken Notice of it before, till reviewing the first Edition, I still missed it there, and must ascribe that whole curious Greek Scrap, copied from *Suidas's* Dictionary, to the faithful Editor's own Dexterity,

Dexterity, as will appear to any one who will compare it with my Lord's Latin in the Text, and his other Citation of *Solon's* Greek Verse, done into a wretched Latin one (Page 146) at the Beginning of Letter V, which inverts the Original, and spoils the Sense.

I must place to the same Gentleman's Account the Correction of an Erratum of *Aristides*, instead of *Phocion*, in the Reflections upon Exile.

IN Page 7. "*Julius Africanus, Eusebius* and *George the Monk*, opened the principal "*[N. B. not all, he durst not say all]* Sources of all this Science." "Well; then "*we may surely thank them? No, for 'They* "*corrupted the Waters. How? 'to make* "*profane History agree with Sacred.'-----* "*These Writers digested the ancient Monu-* "*ments according to the System they were* "*to maintain."*

How could they do otherwise in writing any Chronicle or History? But "None of these "*Monuments were delivered down in their* "*original*

" original Form and genuine Purity." A heavy Charge, and if false, it recoils somewhere. But does Lord *Bolingbroke* mean, that they did not copy out the Whole of each of the former Writers? Perhaps not. For when did ever any Historian or other Writer, even his *Tacitus*, or *Davila*, copy *verbatim* all their Memoirs? So that the Charge must be, that they did it not " in " their genuine Purity". And how miserably he proves this from *Eusebius's* Usage of *Manetho*, see Bishop *Clayton's* Answer. For that we have no more " of *Manetho* than " in *Eusebius's* Chronicon," no Scholar will say. *Josephus* quotes *Manetho*, and *Eusebius* quotes Both in another most admirable Work, *De Preparatione Evangelicâ*. But " We have no other Authority for the " *Codex Alexandrinus*." I suppose he means the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*.

BUT " *George the Monk*, and Sir *John Marsham* uses it," what Harm is there in this? If *Georgius Syncellus* preserved an ancient Monument, and others build upon it, when they find it conformable to other Histories? But " Sir " *John Marsham* uses it to reduce the immense " Antiquity

" Antiquity of the *Ægyptians* within the
 " Limits of the *Hebraic* Calculation." Very rightly; for *Manetho's* Dynasties are otherwise inexplicable, and he thinks the short Limits that his Lordship found in dating the human Inventions of Writing and History, as well as all other Arts, might reconcile him to the short *Hebraic* Calculation of the World's Age: For only such long Dynasties, (though by the Way *Manetho* owns, under an *Egyptian* Disguise, in the Remains we have of him, the Truth of a material Part of the *Jewish* History) as the *Ægyptian*, *Chinese*, and the Millions of Years of *Indian* Chronology, are, " the enchanted Castles, which vanish at the Touch of a true Historian, or Critic's Pen." For if we once neglect Chronology, and treat it merely as " a Science, that is, only " a *Limine salutandâ*," Page 9, all the narrative Part of History must run into Confusion, as it did in the ignorant papal Ages, and then we shall not distinguish the " Anecdotes concerning the Giant *Albion*, *Samothes* the Son, or *Brito*, the Grandson of " *Japhet*, or *Brutus*, Page 151." with his " Colony of true *Trojans*," from the historical
 Accounts

Accounts of his admired *Thucydides*, or *Tacitus*, or even from his Lordship's so often threaten'd Work, which was to be " a Kind
 " of History from Queen *Ann's* Accession to
 " the [glorious] Peace of *Utrecht*," Page 135.
 for all are not of his Lordship's Taste: Lord
Bolingbroke is so very indifferent, that " he
 " had rather take the *Darius* in *Alexander's*
 " Time for the Son of *Hystaspes*, and make
 " as many Anachronisms, as a Jewish Chrono-
 " nologer." By his Instances in Page 103,
 we should read here as " the modern Talmu-
 " dists, and such ignorant peddling Jews as
 " *Ben-Gorion*, &c. (but by no Means form'd
 " on the Scriptures," as he asserts, and we beg
 Leave to deny.) Yet he'd rather " swallow
 " all those, and with them he must swallow
 " all the History that belongs to them, than
 " sacrifice half his Life to collect all the learned
 " Lumber that fills the Head of an Antiquary."
 But are we driven to this Dilemma at all?
 Antient History is by no Means so very in-
 tricate, as to require so many Years to ad-
 just its Chronology; it may be done by the
 Studios to their great, if not entire Satis-
 faction, in most Points, in much shorter
 Time. But Study requires Pains, and to
 take

take Pains was what his Lordship's " Buſi-
 " neſs, or Pleaſure," continually hindered, 'till,
 he grew in Age to dogmatize for himſelf, and
 had Systems of his own (I would hope not
 " ſystematical Lying," as he taxes moſt of his
 Brother-Hiſtorians) to maintain and embel-
 liſh. But Death, I doubt, cut off one Sys-
 tem, viz. of the promis'd Hiſtory of his own
 Time, and left theſe " imperfect Sketches"
 (drawn from Notes without Book, P. 198.)
 of Inveſtives againſt all Hiſtory, ſacred and
 prophane, to be poſthumouſly publiſhed, in
 Diſhonour to his Lordſhip's Memory. But
 ſurely, as ſaid *Archilochus*,

Τοις μὲν Τεθνεώσιν Ἐλεος ἐπιεικής Θεός
 Τοις Ζωσὶδ' ἔτερον ἀνοσιώλατον φθόνος·

*'Tis foolish Pity guards the wicked Dead,
 While Envy marks the living Hero's Head.*

L E T T E R II.

I PASS over his Lordship's Declamation in Praise of History and the Force of Example with his "Men of great Note," as he calls (Page 19,) *Metrodorus*, *Hermachus* and *Polyænus*, who loll'd with *Epicurus* and his Whore in a Garden, for "School" he had none for them to "frequent," (though his Lordship would have us understand he had) except the Grammar-School, where he once taught Boys their A B C: And all who ever read his long Dissertation-Epistles, that now are remaining (and somewhat resemble *other People's Letters*) upon Subjects of Philosophy, will agree, that he should have continued his first Employment (which is in our Times devolv'd chiefly upon elderly Matrons) even to his Dying-Day. But, the gentle Reader may say, let *Epicureans* praise *Epicurus*; Lord *Bolingbroke* talks of Patriotism, Virtue, and good Example. But, good Reader, *Epicurus* himself, though he refused to serve his Country, by executing Offices of the State, would sometimes write about Virtue, and virtuous Pleasure; and
boasted,

boasted, when dying, of his Bravery in bearing the Disorder that kill'd him.

In the next Page (20) Lord *Bolingbroke* compares the several Uses of History, Experience and Genius, which latter he "prefers to both the other Two," and what follows of "Genius, without Improvement," may be considered and applied by his Lordship's Admirers. "It is what Comets once were thought to (Page 21.) be, a blazing Meteor, *irregular* in his Course and *dangerous* in his Approach, of no Use to any System, and able to destroy any," though few will allow, that Genius is so strong, whether in a *W---ton*, a *Shaftsb---*, [Father or Son] or a *B-----*, as to be quite able to destroy every Kind of Government or Religion that they are pleased to attempt. But as his Friend *Pope* more truly sings, "Heav'n buries Madmen in the Heaps they raise," as appears in every one of these Instances, and in all the *Achitophels*, *Clodius's* and *Curio's* of antient and modern Times.

PAGE 20. In enumerating the necessary Qualifications of a Statesman, Lord *Bolingbroke*,

broke, after praising History, Experience and Genius, very remarkably forgets another, without which "the Man, who has all Three, will be (Page 21.) neither an Honour to his Country, nor a public Blessing." 'Tis no less a Matter than a good Judgment, which has been always thought an essential, and was much more esteem'd in Lord *Clarendon* (his Instance in the same Period) than his Genius.

PAGE 23. He finds fault with *Tully's* Encomium of *Lucullus*, "in *Asiam* factus Imperator venit, cum esset Româ profectus rei militaris rudis," as too sudden a Change; but notwithstanding all his Harangue against *Tully*, and his Self-conceit, which is of late grown the modish Topic, if the Reader will turn to Sir *Robert Naunton's* Character of Lord *Mountjoy*, (in his *Fragmenta Regalia*) he may see the same Panegyrick verified in one of our own Countrymen.

PAGE 32. "The Story of *Abgarus's* wild Beasts did pass upon *Josephus*;" for "in him he believes he read it." I cannot read it there; but tho' he ascribes it here to *Josephus*, and

(in his Reflections on Exile) to *Procopius*, it is in neither, but in *Eusebius*.

PAGE 34. I use *Casaubon's* Translation of *Polybius*: What? That "Modern Pedant "*Casaubon*," (Page 22.) His *Latin* Translation? Why would not his Lordship vouchsafe an *English* Version from the Greek Original. I doubt that there is an unmannerly Reason, why we must not expect Accuracy in Lord *Bolingbroke's* Citations of *Philo*, *Josephus*, *Plutarch*, *Herodotus*, *Strabo*, or *Dionysius* of *Halicarnassus*, or, "That "laborious Compiler, *Diodorus Siculus*," (Page 81.) for all these wrote not in *Latin*, *French*, or *Italian*; neither did *Eusebius*, nor *St. Cyril*, nor *Justin Martyr*, (Page 89.) nor even poor *Suidas*, all of whom he claims acquaintance with, and the last too is quoted in *Latin*, (Page 90.) where the Whole Criticism on *Moso* depends upon a grammatical Gender in the *Greek* and *Hebrew*. But the Reader may please to observe, that those his Lordship calls "*Greek* Historians," (among whom he seems merrily to place *Annius*, the Monk of *Viterbo*, (Page 82.) who knew little beside his vulgar Bible, though he

says

says he was soon detected, are written in Latin (and commonly filed) Translations of the Greek, and are not always faithful Ones.

PAGE 35, and 36. In Justice to Lord Bolingbroke, we should read his Character of an ancient Heathen Roman; it is too truly drawn, and much of it would fit an ancient Grecian as well. But what are we to infer from it, except that we owe great Thanks to Christianity, that the Bounds of Virtue and Vice are now so much better settled, and we know how to distinguish the Madman and Villain from the Heroe and Statesman? That is, *real Patriots* from *false Ones*? As in the Cases of *Regulus's* Rashness and Obstinacy, and of *Cato's* Choice to murder himself, and hazard the Lives of his Friends and Party, rather than submit to an Usurper, who had conquered him; or in *Lucan's* stoical, but impious Phrase, to the Pleasure of the Gods, which pleased not *Cato*. *Victrix causa Deis placuit sed victa Catoni.*

PAGE 48. His Lordship's Advice to the Parliament concerning the Revenue, I meddle not with: It is much more proper for *their* Attention and mature Deliberation.

PAGE 49. If it be true, that *Philo* and *Josephus*, and Lord *Bacon* in *Lib. 2. De Augm. Scient.* as from them assert this Prerogative of Divine History, that "the Narration " may be before the Fact?" 'Tis no Matter; their Authority is not produced by us in Matters of Faith but of Fact. Besides, the Assertion is true, if spoken of propheticall Narration, as for Instance, when *Isaiab* says, that a King, called *Cyrus*, shall arise and rule over certain Nations.

HEADS to daily Sexton, I'll point out two
 REVEREND LETTER
 was no Preacher to officers. And since some
 them of the Abbeys only, for Secrecy
 mean of the Court-Guards only, and among
 " of the Gentles. Lord Belvidere must
 PAGE 22. " Sexton, the first Apostle

LETTER III. PAGE 53.

PAGE 53. "Vice, says Lord *Bolingbroke*, is no more than the Excess, Abuse and " Misapplication of Appetites, Desires and " Passions, natural and *innocent*, nay useful " and necessary. Virtue consists in the Mo- " deration, and Government in the Use and " Application of these Appetites, Desires and " Passions according to the Rules of Reason, " and therefore *often* in Opposition to their " own *blind* Impulse." How shall we recon- cile the *Innocence* of Passions to *their own blind Impulse*, which Reason is *often* obliged to *op- pose*? And if their Impulse be so *often* blind, what becomes of the Sneer in Page 98, (if it be a Sneer) at the Thesis of original Sin, the only Source of this Blindness?

PAGE 55. " *Socrates*, this first Apostle " of the *Gentiles*." Lord *Bolingbroke*, must mean of the *Gentile-Greeks* only, and among them of the *Athenians* only, for *Socrates* was no Preacher to others. And since some *quaint Gentry* of late have taken it into their Heads to deify *Socrates*, I'll point out two

or three gross Errors in this Pattern of Heathen Philosophers. 1. He was a Worshipper of Idols of *Jupiter*; and the Rest of the Crew; and 2. advised *Xenophon* to consult the Oracle of *Apollo*, (no *Good-Dæmon*) at *Delphi*. 3. He aimed indeed at reducing Men from Researches in natural Philosophy and Sophistry to the Study of Morality, but durst not openly (as the true Apostle of the *Gentiles* *St. Paul* did) oppose the Superstitions of his Countrymen, much less of the other *Greek* States and foreign Nations. 4. He threw away, like *Regulus*, his Hopes of Life by his Obstinacy in refusing to let Orators plead for him, when they offered themselves, or to plead himself; and by irritating his Judges with Claims to a public Maintenance in the *Prytaneum*. 5. His last Words to his Friend were, when dying of the Publick Poison, "Remember, that I owe the Sacrifice of a Cock to *Æsculapius*." Words serious enough, and that (in Spite of Explanations of an unseasonable Facetiousness, which neither *Plato*, *Xenophon* or *Tully*, could ever find out) shew a rooted Superstition, even in this extraordinary Pagan. For, after all, he was a Man of great Virtues, at least,

least, his Scholars say so, for 6. He left no Precepts in Writing, nor directed any to be wrote: So that we have Nothing of his, but in his Scholars' fictitious Dialogues, one of which *Socrates* himself saw and reprehended.

PAGE 62M "The *Deii* devoted themselves to Death, in Compliance with a Superstition that bore great Analogy to a Ceremony practised in the old *Egyptian* Church, and added afterwards as many others of the same Origin were, to the Ritual of the *Israelites*."

WHAT Ceremony this was among the *Egyptians* I do not now recollect, though the *Massilians* in *Gaul*, (and nearer *Chantelou*,) had a wicked Custom analogous to it: But the Name of a *Massilian Church*, (as he calls the *Egyptian* out of Ignorance, of what a Church signifies,) would not suit his Purpose, which was to tell you, that this and many others were added to the Ritual of the *Israelites*, afterwards in Imitation of the *Egyptians*. A Point that his Lordship's Admirers (if any now remain) are desired and

called upon to prove, as well as assert, nay, on the contrary, we assert, that the *Egyptians* borrowed them from the *Israelites*. For I must warn them before-hand, that the Tales told to honest *Herodotus* and others, by *Egyptian* Priests, come many Hundreds of Years too Late for any Authority to be gathered from them, as every Scholar may know, who does not avow so utter a Contempt for the Study of Chronology, as Lord *Bolingbroke* affected to entertain. The *Jewish* Ceremony, here hinted at, was, I imagine, that of the Scape-Goat let loose into the Wilderness upon the Day of Attonement. But the Analogy will hardly hold with the *Roman* Instance of the *Decii*; unless devoting a Man to certain Death be the same as devoting a Goat, and letting him escape alive and unhurt into a foreign Land? And unless Time of Peace, and the Time of War, be confounded and undistinguished? Thus his Comparison will not bear Examination; and yet I must not leave off without acquainting the Reader, that Lord *Bolingbroke* has indeed hit upon Part of the Truth; which is, that the *Roman* Priests, or rather the *Hetruscan*, (from whom they borrowed

almost

almost all their sacrificial Rites, and most of their Customs, as well as their Language) might probably have taken their Original of devoting Victims for Atonement from the very *Israelites*; for it has been discovered by the truly noble and learned Marquis *Scipio Maffei*, and before him by *Postellus*, (and the Discovery is since pursued by many others) that the *Ettruscans* did actually descend from some of the Nations of *Canaan*, who for their Wickedness were ordered to be expelled by the *Hebrews*.

PAGE 63. "When Heaven was piously
 "thought to delight in Blood, and even
 "human Blood was shed under wild No-
 "tions of Atonement, Propitiation, Purga-
 "tion, Expiation and Satisfaction." This
 Clause, though immediately referred by the
 Letter-Writer to "the early Days of the
 "*Athenian* and *Roman* Government, when
 "the Credit of Oracles and all Kinds of Su-
 "perstition prevailed," will, by the Genera-
 lity of his Readers, be thought intended as a
 Side-Glance at the Doctrine of Christ's Ex-
 piation, which is a Fundamental of the
 Christian Religion; and Lord *Bolingbroke's*
 using

using the theological Terms of Atonement &c. encourages the Notion: For however guilty the Heathens were, and particularly the *Canaanites*, of sacrificing even Men, and their own Sons and Daughters to *Moloch*, yet his Lordship's Words are more general, and include *all Expiation* of Sin by Blood: "Heaven, or (to speak in unpoetical Strain) the *God of Heaven*, does not indeed de-light in shedding Blood", and yet Sacrifices of Beasts might be, and were exceeding proper and useful to put Men in Mind of their Guilt, and God's Abhorrence of Sin; besides, that they all were first instituted by Revelation to the Forefathers of Mankind, as the Learned have long agreed, with Reference to the great last Sacrifice of the Christ to come, and as such were deemed expiatory of common Sins. But, perhaps, his Lordship thought, as many have fancied, that God is only a God of Mercy and Favour, without Regard to his other Attributes of Justice, Holiness and Truth: His Deity might sit, like *Epicurus's*, at Ease in Heaven, unmindful of, or conniving at, the Villanies of Men. For otherwise how can we suppose (in Contradiction to almost every Nation on Earth, who all used Sacrifices) that

that there is no Need of atoning his Wrath? And what Satisfaction can come so near a Personal One, as the Sacrifices of Animals? So that these were not such "wild Notions" as he would insinuate. For if Men are, and stand guilty before God, and there is no Expiation to be found for them, What terrible Consequences will not be inferred by every reasonable Person? It is indeed the Glory of our holy Religion, and shews it to be the only true One, that it points out to us a Sacrifice for the Sins of the whole World, it becomes thus a Catholick Religion, not a National One only, and this sufficiently distinguishes it from the proud Imposture of *Mohammed*, or any other. Our Sacrifice is not of a Beast, or a mere Man, but of him who was likewise the Son of God, and was, by his high Dignity before all Worlds, a proper Person to make the noblest Satisfaction equivalent to all the Sins of Men.

of London, in his little Abridgment of Universal History. And both the Bishop and
On the STATE of Ancient Prophecy
 History.

PAGE 75. "We have none (authentic
 "Materials) concerning the Originals of
 "any of those Nations that actually subsist;
 the Quibble lies here, in what his Lordship
 will be pleased to own for authentic; for we
 have considerable Materials in most of the
 Roman Authors, especially his favourite *Ta-*
citus. And as to the ancient Kingdoms, be-
 sides the first *Greek* Historians, we have an
 invaluable Treasure in the older *Hebrew*
 Chronicles, in the very oldest Book, by
 many Ages, that we know of in the World,
 the Book of *Genesis*.

PAGE 76. "If he (*Herodotus*) wrote *Assy-*
 "riacs, we have them not; but we are sure
 "that this Word was used proverbially to fig-
 "nify fabulous Legends soon after, &c." This
 Opinion of the *Assyriaca*, Lord Bolingbroke
 takes, (I must not say, steals,) from Monsieur
Bossuet, the famous, though not perhaps
 justly applauded, Bishop of *Meaux*, and after
 of

of *Condom*, in his little Abridgment of Universal History. And both the Bishop and my Lord *Bolingbroke* are out in it. For Monsieur *Bossuet* cites *Aristotle* for it, who intended no more than a Censure, not upon *Herodotus*, but his Cotemporary *Ctesias*'s Book, of the *Assyrian* Affairs. But it was no proverbial Phrase, as he would have it. Nor did *Herodotus*, or other good Historians, lose their Credit by *Ctesias*, the Physician's stuffing his Books with all the romantic Tales he could pick up at the Court of *Persia*. The fabulous or credulous *Ctesias* was immediately exposed; whilst the impartial inquiring *Xenophon*, who wrote about the same Time, was honoured and esteemed.

PAGE 77. " He laughs at an old Woman's Tale of a King (he means *Candaules* of *Lydia*) who lost his Crown for shewing his Wife naked to his Favourite (*Gyges*). " *Candaules* was killed by his Queen's Contrivance with *Gyges*; not only lost his Crown by Deposition. But sure his Lordship had met with many such seemingly little Accidents that occasioned great Commotions: Some are to be read in Lord *Clarendon*'s History; and he had

had himself mentioned (Page 65.) ²²⁰¹⁹ minute and scarce-perceivable Circumstances, according to which the Success of Affairs, ²²⁰²⁰ even the greatest, is mostly determined.

PAGE 78. "He tells us of a much better
 " Authority than that of *Josephus*," meaning
Strabo the Geographer, a Passage from whose
 Book of Geography, (for it is no more, nor a
 History) his Lordship narrates in his own Man-
 ner, the Sum of which is, "that some Points of
 " the History of *Cyrus's* War with the *Scythians*
 " *Messageter*, and *Alexander's* Conquests, were
 " not exact; nay, that [*credat Epicurus in*
 " *hortis*] *Hesiod* and *Homer*, or any of the
 " Tragedy-writers, were more to be relied
 " on than the professed Historians." Now,
 if this be not as arrant a Rant as any Fustian
 of the Stage, or Hyperbole of Orators, even
 though a *Strabo* should drop it, or a Lord
Bolingbroke attempt to persuade us that 'tis
 literally true, let the next Reader judge.
 But *Strabo* (says his Lordship) is of much
 better Authority than *Josephus*. Why?
 " Because he (*Strabo* the Geographer) had
 " no Prejudice to bias him," and 'twould
 be strange if he had, in writing a mere List
 of the Names and the Boundaries of
 his I
 Places

Places in the then known World; unless, perhaps, he had served a *Louis XIV.* who is said to have forced his very Geographers to lie for the Sake of his Grandeur, and prove him a greater Monarch than he was, by extending the Sea Coasts of *France* far into the *British* Channel on one Side, and into the *Mediterranean* on the other, as may be yet seen in *Monfieur Sanfon's* Maps. But *Strabo* had probably "no particular Cause to defend," nor System of ancient History to defend." No; for he did not write History. And why must not *Josephus* be credited, if he draws up professedly the *Jewish* History? He and every Writer (besides a very few extraordinary evil Geniuses) must be of some Religion, and therefore have some ancient History to defend. However, it happens that *Josephus* was no Bigot, as appears from what Lord *Bolingbroke* says, (Page 91.) "of his applying to *Vespasian* the "Prophecies of the Messiah, and his accompanying *Titus* to the Siege of *Jerusalem*." *Strabo*, (continues he, in Opposition to *Josephus*) "had all the Helps, as well as Talents "necessary to make him a competent Judge." In the first Place, how shall we know what were *Strabo's* Helps and Talents? Who can, if he Was often out, contradict him? But, as

I said

I said before, these Helps and Talents are at-
tended only for Geography, not a History, which
requires much greater Abilities, and better
Mannerings; and which may with as much
Ease, and ought with equal Truth, to be at-
tributed to *Josephus*; for he was a Nobleman,
and well instructed in all Learning, and his
Historical Writings (whatever Lord *Boling-
broke* says to the contrary) quickly gained
him very great Reputation and Estimation
throughout all the Roman Empire: And
what is more, his History and Antiquities
have come down to us, though very large
Works, more compleat, that is, with more
Care and Concern, than either of my Lord's
Favourites, *Livy* or *Tacitus*.

PAGE 78. " If more Histories had come
down to us,---we should find that *Acusi-
latus* rejected the Traditions of *Hesiod*, that
Hellanicus contradicted *Acusilatus*, that
Ephorus accused *Hellanicus*, that *Timæus*
accused *Ephorus*, and all posterior Writers
of *Timæus*." This he professedly takes from
and then immediately after abuses *Josephus*.
But what does it prove? The Falshood of
the Old Historians? Not at all; but rather
on the contrary, their Accuracy and Ex-
actness

actness, and their Delicacy in chusing their Materials, in doing of which they scrupled not to attack one another, like any modern State-Writers; for please to take this Sentence with some Names of *English* Historians to it, and see if it will hurt the Credit of any Writer that he found fault with, and corrected those who went before him, viz. *William of Malmfbury* rejected the "Traditions of *Geoffrey, of Monmouth*; (quite "as authentick a Writer in Prose, as the "Poet *Hesiod* in Verse.) *Leland* contra-
 "dicted *William of Malmfbury*, Mr. *Milton*
 "accused *Leland*, Monsieur *Rapin* accu-
 "sed Mr. *Milton*; and all posterior Writers,
 "as *Salmon, Carte, &c.* serve Monsieur
 "*Rapin* with the same Sauce." But what
 is all this to the Purpose? An *Englishman*
 will enquire after *Gildas, Bede, the Saxon*
Annals, Ingulf, Mathew Paris, and other
 good authentic Writers, down to Lord *Clare-*
ndon's Time; and a Student in antient *Greek*
 History will ask what is become of *Herodotus,*
Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus,
Polybius, &c. down to Lord *Bolingbroke's*
 own dear *Tacitus*, who each of them scru-
 tinized and examined into the first State
 of Nations?

PAGE 82. Concerning what he says of *Berosus*, and Lord *Balingbroke's* Ignorance of the Years of *Nabonassar*, see Bishop *Clayton's* Remark.

PAGE 82. "For thus I reason. Had they
 "(*Berosus* and *Manetho*, Writers of the An-
 "tiquities of *Babylon* and *Aegypt*) given par-
 "ticular and historical Accounts conform-
 "able to the Scriptures of the Jews, *Jose-*
 "phus, *Julius Africanus* and *Eusebius*, would
 "have made quite other Extracts from their
 "Writings, and would have altered and con-
 "tradicted them less. The Accounts they
 "gave therefore were repugnant to Sacred
 "Writ, or they were defective." His
 Lordship is extremely unhappy at a Dilem-
 ma; here is one Instance, and a second will
 soon occur. "Their Accounts," might be
 neither repugnant to Sacred Writ, nor de-
 fective; for they might be concerning Af-
 fairs that no Way related to the History of
 the *Israelites*: So this Dilemma's Horns
 are avoided; and they may be broken; for
 there are many Particulars taken out of their
 Histories, which notwithstanding the Pagan
 Prejudices, with which they wrote, help to
 confirm

confirm the Accounts of Several Nations, which are delivered in the Sacred Writings. But there is another Horn that may gore his Lordship's own Side; for he accuses three eminent Writers, *Josephus*, *Julius Africanus*, and *Eusebius*, of altering the Text of *Berosus* and *Manetho*, a Charge that should have been never brought, or else proved, and which may puzzle leanneder Critics than Lord *Bolingbroke* to maintain.

We come now to his more immediate Reflexions on Sacred History, where he pours out so many Mistakes, and daring Assertions, without the least Proof, that we must be more particular with his Lordship.

PAGE 83. "What Memorials therefore remain to give us Light into the Originals of antient Nations, and the History of those Ages we commonly call the first Ages? The Bible it will be said." His Lordship *thinking* very *freely* and *vainly*, that he had destroyed the Credit of all antient profane History, aims now directly at the Bible; and gives us to understand, that we might possibly be out in believing those to have been the first Ages of Mankind and

the World, which the Books of *Moses* determine to be so. But since he did not think proper to bring one single Proof of what he intimates, we need not to be alarmed, till the Bramins of *Indostan* can settle their Millions of Years before *Adam's* Time, which they are extremely profuse in reckoning, though they cannot fill them up with the least Jot of good History. I say nothing of the *Chinese*, for in their fabulous Times, that is, all before *Confusius*, or 500 Years before Christ, they are more modest.

PAGE 83. "Even these Divine Books, must be reputed insufficient to the Purpose." If his Lordship's Purpose was to know the Politics, Arts and Sciences of the *Antediluvians*, together with a compleat Detail of their State-Intrigues, for above 1600 Years; no Wonder if he was disappointed: This was not (as we shall presently see) the Design of those Divine Books. But, that "the Genealogies, and Histories of the Old Testament, are, in no Respect, sufficient Foundations for a Chronology from the Beginning of Time," as he asserts in Page 98, will never be granted, to him, because it is notorious that Systems
of

of Chronology have been framed from them, and they are continually appealed to upon this very Account: So that his Lordship must not hope to unsettle the Minds of Men in this Article, who are pretty well agreed both at Home and abroad in all the great Periods of Time from the Creation; and our own *Marshall, Usher, Simson, Pearson,* and *Lloyd*, have gained universal Applause by their learned Labours in adjusting minute Differences.

PAGE 83. "For what are they? (That is, the Divine Books.)" Take his Lordship's own Answer to his Question, at the Distance of a few Leaves in Page 109, omitting one Word, that will be considered in its Place. "The Design of *Moses*---was "to inform the People of *Israel* of their "Descent from *Noah* by *Sem*, and of *Noah's* "from *Adam* by *Seth*; to illustrate their "Original; to establish their Claim to the "Land of *Canaan*, and to justify---the "Conquest of the *Canaanites*." I add too, that it was, "to let them, and by them, all "the World know the Lapsed State of Man- "kind, and the Promises of a *Messiah*, "who was to restore them to Happiness by

“ the Seed of the Woman, as limited to the
 “ Seed of *Abraham*, and particularly to the
 “ Tribe of *Judah*, and Family of *David*.”

PAGE 83. “ And how came they to us?

“ At the Time when *Alexander* carried his
 “ Arms into *Asia*, a People of *Syria*, till

“ then unknown, became known to the
 “ *Greeks*: The *Jews* were indeed a

“ People of *Syria*, if we take *Syria* for
 that whole Space of Land, which was usually

known by three distinct Names of three
 different Kingdoms, which were *Syria*,

Coele-Syria and *Palæstine*. But my Lord
Bolingbroke is not very exact in these Sort of

Minutiae, as he would call them, and would
 not, in the same Manner, scruple to term

the *English* Nation, a People of *Britain*.
 They are so, and the chief People of *Britain*,

just as the *Israelites* were of *Syria*, since
 he will needs, though most ungeographically,

thus describe that Part of *Asia*. “ A People
 “ of *Syria*, till then unknown, became

“ known to the *Greeks*.” The Epithet “ till
 “ then unknown” may be interpreted, either

with Regard to all other Nations, or to the
Greeks only: And in both Ways the Account

is far from being true; As to other Nations,
 Lord

Lord Bolingbroke says in the next Words, "That they had been Slaves to the Egyptians, Assyrians, Medes and Persians," the most civilized of all Nations "as these several Empires prevailed." The Jews must therefore have been thoroughly known to Them, And the Greeks had a constant Intercourse of Trade with the Phœnicians of Tyre and Sidon, who were the Remains of the old Canaanites, who had been expelled to make Room for the Israelitish Nation. They could not, therefore, be absolutely unknown to the Greeks long before Alexander's Time. But 2. The Jews had served, as is plain from the Description of their Persons and Names in the Poem of Chærilus, as Auxiliaries or Tributaries to Xerxes, in that vast Army which was to have overrun all Greece. And 3. they are expressly mentioned by several Greek Historians before Alexander's Expedition, particularly by the First of them, Herodotus, who describes their Customs, Rites, and the very Dimensions of Jerusalem, their capital City, which he calls Cadutis, a Name derived from קדש, i. e. "the Holy City," and by which the Turks still revere it, for by them it is now called Cadefa (or in Syriack Cadeta) and with the Article Al-Kads. 4. The I have already said enough to

shew, that the *Greeks* were acquainted with the *Israelites*; let me subjoin one more Proof that will carry the Matter several Ages yet higher, viz. *Cadmus's* bringing and settling a Colony in *Greece*; for he carried with him lasting Marks and Monuments of an Acquaintance, at least, if not much more, with the *Hebrew Nation*. This *Cadmus* by the exactest Calculation lived about the Time of *Joshua*, and some of the Judges of *Israel*, when they first settled in *Canaan*, and this same *Cadmus* introduced the Letters of the first *Greek Alphabet* into *Greece*; whose Names and Figures after all Changes would otherwise (if the *Greeks* had pretended to stifle the Truth, which yet they constantly owned) betray their Original from the *Hebrew Letters*. So that the *Jews* were not only known to the *Greeks* before *Alexander's* Time, but as early as the *Greeks* themselves began to be a Nation, or to know any thing.

PAGE 84. " They had been Slaves to the *Egyptians*, &c." His Lordship, I fancy, hardly knew that this was an old Heathen Objection, and that it was often confuted by the Old Christian, as well as Jewish Apologists. Let us now see what it will prove. The " *Jews* were Slaves to other Nations at seve-

"ral Times, therefore they were not fit to
 "teach Religion and Morals to other Na-
 "tions." The same may be said of the
Greeks; "They were often enslaved, there-
 "fore they were not fit to teach Laws or
 "Philosophy to a free People like the Ro-
 "mans;" and it will sound as well from the
Turk's Mouth, for they are of a Nation that
 was never conquered; and consequently, by this
 Way of arguing, are now the properest Folks
 to instruct Men in Arts and Sciences. The
 Reader may, perhaps, think I am in jest; but
 there is another Author in great Esteem, who
 has urged this very Argument seriously; that
 we should beware of learning any thing from
 the politest Nations, if they have had the
 Misfortune to lose their own Liberties; as if
 the Truth and Reason of Things depended
 upon the Liberty or Slavery of the Speaker
 or Teacher. And as to the *Israelites*, they
 retained the same Laws, and acknowledged
 the same Divine Authority of *Moses*, under
 and after all their Captivities; but with this
 remarkable Difference, that their Captivities
 served constantly to heighten their Zeal for
 the same Laws, and made them so much the
 more rigid in performing every Tittle of
 them.

Page 84. " Ten Parts in Twelve of them
 " (the *Israelites*) had been transplanted,
 " melted down and lost in the East." This,
 tho' nothing to the Purpose (for a large Nation
 still remained to carry on the Designs of
 God's Providence, and to transmit their His-
 tory) is most unfairly and invidiously ex-
 press'd: By the Ten Parts, we are to under-
 stand the Ten Tribes, or the Kingdom of
Israel, distinct from that of *Judah*. But we
 should observe, that though only the Two
 whole Tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin* are
 named as belonging to the latter, yet great
 Part of the other Tribes, especially of *Levi*,
 adhered to it; and their Numbers and Forces
 were always, after the Division of the King-
 dom, so well balanced, that neither could
 the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes conquer
 the other Two, nor that of *Judah* recover
 the Dominion of all the rest. Again, the
 Ten Tribes do not appear to have been to-
 tally " lost" in their *Assyrian* Captivity; for,
 beyond all doubt, great Numbers of them
 returned with their Brethren from *Babylon*
 and *Media* under *Ezra* and *Nehemiah's* Pro-
 tection, and afterwards; and we find, ac-
 cordingly, that several Families are mention'd

as Inhabitants of *Judea*, after the Captivity, who were descended from some of those ten Tribes of the Kingdom of *Israel*.

PAGE 84. "This Captivity (of the two other Tribes) lasted so long,--that the Captives forgot their Country and even their Language, the *Hebrew* Dialect, at least, and Character." Most strange Jews were these! who could, in seventy Years only, (for the Captivity lasted no longer) forget their own Language, Character, and even their Country! Who would have thought it? When we have Numbers of *French* Refugees, who have voluntarily lived in *England* for more than seventy Years, and yet, neither they, nor their Children have forgotten either their Country or Language. But did the Jews, indeed, forget any one of these? To begin with the Least, their Character, or the old *Hebrew* Letters; Could these be lost at *Babylon* in seventy Years? If so, the Captives had lost either their Memories or their Fingers. His Lordship possibly had heard, that the Jews changed their old Alphabet, for the *Chaldean* Letters, and thence imagined that they must have forgotten the old One. But unfortunately

nately for him, we even to this Day have Specimens of their former Letters, and can assure his Readers, that they were exactly of the same Number, Sound, and almost all of the same Configuration as the *Chaldaean* are. The greatest Difference between the two Alphabets consists only in the superior Neatness and Elegancy of the Lines, which compose the *Chaldaic* Letters; which appears plainly to have been the genuine Reason of the Exchange, as is confessed by some of the Rabbis themselves. — A similar Answer will serve in Respect of the Alteration of their *Hebrew* Dialect; Lord *Bolingbroke* could not say, that they had changed their *Hebrew* “*Tongue*” during the seventy Years Captivity in *Chaldea*: (That would have sounded too grossly) but their “*Dialect*” of the same Language. And this was as slight an Alteration as the other: Perhaps but little more than would have happened in the same Time, if they had remained at Home in *Palæstine*. However, we cannot suppose that they had forgotten their own “*Dialect*,” for it is known among them at present, and Numbers of Books have been written in it. When, therefore, *Ezra* read the Law in the old Dialect, and

interpreted

interpreted it in the *Chaldaean*, this was for the Use of the ignorant and vulgar Part of his Hearers, for afterwards the Jews did not use the *Chaldaean* Tongue, but that which is called commonly the *Syriac*, and is so very like the old *Hebrew*, that in the New Testament it has retained the Name of *Hebrew*. Let us now observe how the Charge of forgetting their Country is supported. "A Few of them only could be wrought upon by the Zeal of some particular Men to return Home, &c." So Few, that they rebuilt the Temple and City of *Jerusalem*, and repeopled all the Country! So Few, that Lord *Bolingbroke* in the same Breath owns, that though "this Remnant did not continue long entire," yet there was enough for "another great Transmigration" into *Egypt*, besides the Body of the Nation which staid at Home.

PAGE 84. "The Jews that settled under the Protection of the *Ptolemys*, forgot their Language in *Egypt*, as the Forefathers of these Jews had forgot theirs in *Chaldea*." We have seen how truly this is said of their Forefathers in *Chaldea*: Let us follow the Posterity of some of them into *Egypt*. It does

does not at all appear from History, that any great Number of the Jews settled voluntarily in *Ægypt*; some Few fled thither for Shelter, and many Thousands were forced and compelled to live at *Alexandria* by the First of the *Ptolemys*; so that they had not forgot their Country, nor chose to go from it by any Means. They did indeed, in a Number of Ages, forget (at least the vulgar Part did) their old Language, and learned (not the *Ægyptian* but) the *Greek* Tongue, which was spoken at *Alexandria*. However, their Writers retained the *Hebrew* a long Time after, as is plain from the *Hebrew* Original of the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, which was translated by his Grandson at *Alexandria* into the *Greek* which we now have: And the Case of these *Alexandrian* Jews disusing their Country-Language is extremely different from that of the Captives in *Babylon*. These were Captives only seventy Years, and in a Place where the Language had a good Deal of Similarity with their own; whereas the Jews of *Ægypt* staid there from Generation to Generation, and after translating the Books of *Moses* and the Prophets into *Greek*, had little Occasion for the *Hebrew* Tongue.

PAGE 85. "More attached to their Religion in *Ægypt*—than their Ancestors had been in *Chaldea*." This does not anywhere appear to have been fact; for in the *Chaldean* Captivity both King and People were extremely humbled; and attributing their Misfortunes to the true Cause, repented of their Iniquities, and grew very zealous of the Law of *Moses*. See the last Book of *Kings* and *Chronicles*, and King *Manasseh's* Prayer, and *Psalms* cxxxvii.

PAGE 85. "More attached however in *Ægypt* than their Ancestors in *Chaldea*, a Version of their sacred Writings was made into *Greek* at *Alexandria* not longer after the Canon of these Scriptures had been finished at *Jerusalem*." That their Attachment in *Ægypt* was greater than in *Chaldea* cannot be inferred from this Version of the Scriptures; the sole Reason of this Translation, beside King *Ptolemy's* Curiosity, being their much longer Abode in *Ægypt* than at *Babylon*; they had no Occasion for a *Chaldean* Version, when they were sure to return in Seventy Years to their own Country, where the Original was the vulgar Tongue.

PAGE 85. "These holy Romances slid
 "into Tradition, and Tradition became His-
 "tory: the Fathers of our Christian Church
 "did not disdain to employ them." Poor
Aristeas, and all the old Stuff of the *Alexan-*
drian Cells, is here conjured up to abuse the
 Fathers, and yet his first Instance in St. *Je-*
rom flatly contradicts himself; for "St. *Je-*
rom laughed at the Story," and all he can
 blame him for, is, that he took *Aristeas* to
 have been a real Personage, in which prob-
 ably St. *Jerom* was in the Right. But he
 proceeds, "in this he shewed great Pru-
 "dence and better Judgment than that zea-
 "lous but weak Apologist *Justin*," it has of
 late been so much the Fashion for witty
 Writers to raise a horse-laugh at the least
 Trip of any antient Father of the Church,
 that even *Justin*, a learned Man, a Philoso-
 pher, and at last a Martyr for his Religion,
 cannot escape their base, posthumous Perse-
 cution. Let him argue ever so closely, and
 with the nicest Judgment in a thousand In-
 stances, yet if he only mentions a doubtful
 Story, or is mistaken, as without the Help
 of Inspiration he sometimes must be, there
 these candid Critics, the *Middletons*, and S-

ſ—s fix their Claws, and like Leaches try to drain them of their beſt Blood, out of the minuteſt Vein, and through the moſt narrow Pore about them. And thus St. *Juſtin* is here repreſented as a zealous and weak Apologiſt, though a very learned Philoſopher, and as “ endeavouring to *impoſe* “ a Story on Mankind,” though in the Line before ’tis owned that “ He believed it “ himſelf.”

PAGE 87. “ A ſuperſtitious People, “ among whom the Cuſtom and Art of “ pious Lying prevailed remarkably.” This is a very round Accuſation of the whole *Jewiſh* Nation, and calls for Proofs as well as Assertions. “ A ſuperſtitious People;” What ſingle Inſtance has he brought of this? Pleaſe to remember that we are now treating of the ancient *Jews* before the Reign of *Ptolemy*. If to adhere to the God of their Fathers, and to the Law, which he gave them by *Moses*, be Superſtition, then is all Diſtinction thrown down between true Piety and Superſtition; but this is a good Sign that they believed their own Sacred Writings, and took great Care in preſerving them as uncorrupted as was poſſible. And

if they thus believed that these Books were Sacred, What Occasion was there for bringing up "a Custom and Art of pious Lying?" This Custom too, and this Art should have been *proved* to have "prevailed" among them, which had been easy for Lord Bolingbroke to do, if it "prevailed" "remarkably." And by the Introduction of "Thus you see my Lord," one would imagine he had done it before, though all I can find is, Page 85, that the "Hellenist Jews," Men, who lived many Ages after, "reported as many marvellous Things" of the Greek Translation, (meaning the late Forgeries and exploded Tales of the Cells, &c.) "as the other Jews had reported" "about *Esdras* who began, and *Simon* the *Just* who finished the Canon of their Scriptures." What other *Jews* his Lordship means, who *had* reported so, that is, before the Hellenist *Jews*, I cannot conceive; and never heard of such Tales, but from Apocryphal Authors, and Talmudistical Rabbins, who are all too late Livers for such a Date, nor did ever impose upon one Man of Sense. Yet this is all the sandy and rotten Foundation of his Lordship's Invective against the whole *Jewish* Nation: From hence

hence he concludes, that "among them a Custom and Art of Lying prevailed remarkably," and with the same Truth of Reasoning he might have said, that "there is no such Thing as a Scrap of other true History in the World," because there are certain Writers, who "have a Custom or Art of Lying most remarkably" in Novels, Romances, Memoirs, Travels, Missionary Letters, and *Histories of their own Administrations*.

PAGE 87. "We may be allowed to doubt, whether greater Credit is to be given to what they tell us concerning the Original,—than we know,—that we ought to give to what they tell us concerning the Copy." One would by the Current of this Period imagine, that "They" were the same Persons who told us concerning the Copy, as concerning the Original: But it is no such Matter, They who tell us concerning the *Greek Copy* were in Page 84. the "Hellenist *Jews*" of *Aegypt*: But they who tell us concerning the Original *Hebrew* were "the *Other Jews*" after *Esdras*, and *Simon the Just*. But what at last are these great Pieces of important History about which his Lordship is so zealous

lous to draw us into Suspensions of their Veracity? Not that there was not either an Original, or a Translation; nor that the whole National Body of the *Jews* did not preserve these Books with the greatest Reverence. But "what They," that is, a Parcel of late silly Hellenist *Jews* of *Egypt*, or still worse Authors, if possible, the Authors of the Talmud, long since the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and such like modern *Jews* of *Spain*, or *Germany*, have invented, and "tell us concerning" *Esdras*, and *Simon*, who had put these Original Books together into one Canon after the Captivity, and concerning the seventy-two Men who translated them into *Greek*; so that Lord *Bolingbroke* is squabbling about that which concerns nobody to maintain, but modern *Jews*.—

— *In tenui Labor est;*
Egregias verò Laudes & Spolia ampla reportat!

BUT his Lordship interweaves a worse Insinuation, because the Original was "compiled in their own Country, and as it "were out of the Sight of the rest of the "World." And where would he suppose it could, or ought to have been compiled, but in their own Country? Where should
any

any Legislator publish his Laws, or where should the Laws be collected into Volumes, if not in the City or State by the People of which they were to be observed? The other Criticism, that "it was as it were out of the Sight of the rest of the World" is as empty as the first: For I have before shewn, that the *Jews* were so considerable a Nation, that almost every Heathen Historian took notice of them: They could not indeed lie hid or concealed, for the Peculiarity of most of their Customs, as well as their Wars with other Nations, naturally raised the Curiosity of their Neighbours to enquire, Who they were? And notwithstanding what has been pretended by Monsieur *Voltaire*, [an Acquaintance of Lord *Bolingbroke's*,] in his History of the *Crusades*, the Kingdom of *Israel* was then both a fertile Soil, and of a large Extent from the River of *Euphrates*, quite to the Frontiers of *Egypt*: It included almost all *Syria*, all *Palestine*, or *Phœnicia*, (except Five Cities) all *Idumœa*, and some Towns upon the Red Sea. For tho' Extent of Conquests was never designed for them, yet God blessed them for many Years with the utmost Prosperity and Affluence, so

that Silver and Gold (which in those Ages were scarce Metals) flowed in plentifully through their Commerce and Navigation. The Honour of which last Article the *Egyptians* endeavoured afterwards to attribute to their own Kings.

PAGE 87. " We do not find, that the
 " Authority of these Books prevailed, or
 " even that they were much known among
 " the Pagan World." And in Page 90.
 " Certain it is, that the *Jews* continued to
 " be as much despised, and their History
 " to be as generally neglected, nay, al-
 " most as generally unknown for a long
 " Time at least after the Version was made
 " at *Alexandria*, as they had been before." The Reader will readily take notice of those little Words " almost," and " at least", which are cast in for Salvo's in this latter Clause, as they lay more concealed in the former, under the ambiguous Words " prevailed," and " much known." For my Lord *Bolingbroke* could not disown " the
 " Use a particular Writer here and there
 " might occasionally make of the Scrip-
 " tures" long before the Time of *Ptolemy*, and the Septuagint Version. And it is certain, that

that the Books were not only heard of, but their Authority prevailed upon *Many* who were Converts and Profelytes to the Law of *Moses*. His Lordship perhaps would have us think, that by all the Pagan World, we must mean only the *Greeks*: For so he goes on; "the Reason of this cannot be, that the *Greeks* admired," &c. But besides the *Greeks*, (a small Nation too by the Way, nay, less than either of the two Kingdoms of *Israel* or *Judah*) many other Kingdoms had their Writers and Historians before *Ptolemy*. I will instance only in the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians*, because they were great Nations and Learned ones, and surrounded, as it were, the Nation in Question. *Berosus*, the *Babylonian*, *Abydenus*, who wrote the *Assyrian* History, *Manetho*, the *Egyptian*, or at least those from whom he took his Materials, and perhaps even the Apocryphal *Sanhoniatho*, all knew of this *Hebrew* Nation, and their Laws; and among the *Greeks* it appears, that not only their Historians, but their chief Philosophers, *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, *Aristotle*, &c. knew, and conversed with the *Jews*. And after *Ptolemy's* Time, and the Version at *Alexandria*, they were as much known, at least, as any

Nation, beside the *Greeks* and *Romans*. Why the *Jews* were despised? is quite another Point, and can only be accounted for from their opposite Religion and Manners, so different from the Idolatrous *Greeks* and *Romans*, as *Tacitus* rightly deduces it. And yet we find, that they grew into great Repute at *Rome*, and had Interest with *Pompey*, *Julius Cæsar* and *Augustus*. But since Lord *Bolingbroke* insists so much upon the Books of *Moses* being unknown before the Septuagint Version, suppose we should let his few Admirers into what is probably a great Secret to them at present, I mean, that there were in the World, and among others, besides *Jews*, two other Translations or Copies of these Books, long before the Version at *Alexandria* in *Ptolemy's* Reign. For very certain it is, that the *Assyrians*, who repeopled *Samaria* (and were called *Samaritans*) in the Time of the *Assyrian* Monarchs, before *Cyrus* and the *Persian* Empire, (which preceded that of *Alexander* and the *Greeks*) These Colonists, who were very numerous, had the Books of *Moses* among them, and followed the Law in almost every Respect: Nay, their Descendants, though reduced to a few Families,

still keep what are called the *Samaritan* Copies, besides a *Samaritan* Translation or Paraphrase, in their Hands. And another *Greek* Version is taken Notice of by *Aristobulus*, a philosophical Jew, in his Address to King *Ptolemy Philometor*, and is cited in a Book of *Eusebius*, that Lord *Bolingbroke* plainly refers to in his next Page, concerning *Alexander Polyhistor*, though he either never read, or it pleased him, either to slip over or forget that Passage. There *Aristobulus* expressly declares, that the Books of the *Jewish* Law, and of their Settlement in the Land of *Canaan*, were interpreted and translated before *Demetrius's* (the *Phalerian*) Time, by others, ὑφ' ἑτέρων, nay, “ before the Empire of *Alexander* and the *Persians*,” which, he supposes, *Plato* had seen and made use of; his Words are

Πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατίας.

Eusebii Præp. Evang. IX.

PAGE 88. “ *Josephus* pretended that “ *Theopompus*,” &c. This Story of *Theopompus* is not *Josephus's*, but *Aristæus's*, as is plain from the Original quoted in the same Work of *Eusebius*, Book VIII.

PAGE 89. " We are told that *Hecataeus*
 " *Abderita* writ a History favourable to the
 " *Jews.*" *Hecataeus* the *Abderite* wrote, a
 particularly Book about the *Jewish* Nation,
 and spoke with the greatest Reverence of
 them, and of their City Temple and Laws;
 and there are some Remains of it extant.

PAGE 89. " And not to multiply In-
 " stances, though I might easily do it." If
 so, how could these *Jews* and their Laws
 remain *unknown* when such *multiplied In-*
stances of Authors, who wrote of them, are
easily to be had?

PAGE 89. " Even *Alexander Polyhistor* is
 " called in. He is quoted by *Josephus*, praised
 " by *Eusebius*, produced by *St. Cyril* and
 " *Justin* the Martyr, among those who men-
 " tion *Moses* as a Leader and Prince of the
 " *Jews.*" All these Authors my Lord *Bo-*
lingbroke opposes with one rare Exception
 from the half modern Dictionary-Writer
Suidas, as follows; " though this *Polyhistor*,
 " if I remember right what I think I have
 " met with in *Suidas*, spoke only of a Wo-
 " man he called *Moso*, *cujus scriptum sit lex*
" Hebraeorum."

"*Hebræorum.*" Most admirably remember'd (for his Lordship remembers by his Note-book, Page 198, and Page 101, and is pretty exact as far as that will go, especially whenever "he thinks he remembers it," as he frequently does.) But, alas! for my Lord! poor *Suidas* wrote in *Greek* not in *Latin*; and this pitiful Objection is owing to *Polybistor's* own Note-book. This *Alexander*, called *Polybistor*, from his writing so many Histories, was a *Milesian*, or *Phrygian* of *Cotyæa*, and taken Prisoner by *Sylla*; but being a kind of Prisoner at large, or confined only to *Italy*, employed his Studies at *Laurentum*, in History, and probably meeting with *Jews* there after *Pompey's* Conquests in *Asia*, wrote a great deal from their Mouths, or rather, as it seems, from their Books of *Moses*. Now although he had often spoke of *Moses* as their Prince, and wrote a particular Book "concerning the *Jews*," wherein he quoted *Melion's* Book that had been written against them with these very Words, "*απο τριτος τριτος*" "*Μωσιν*, that *Moses* was the Third Man in "*Descent from Joseph*." Yet this same *Polybistor* had in a Book, "concerning the City "*of Rome*," (written, no doubt, before the other, and when he knew but little of the *Jews*)

Jeru) dropped this simple Sentence, that
 “*Moso* was a Woman;” a Mistake that ap-
 parently arose from the Hebrew משה, which
 was capable of being terminated like the Name
 of King Solomon שלמה, *Shelomô*; this having
 the same final Letter with the other; and
Alexander Polyhistor writing in the Greek Lan-
 guage, in which many Female Names had the
 same final Vowel; as *Sapphô*, *Theânô*, *Myriô*,
Clîô, *Gorgô*, &c. might imagine *Moso* like-
 wise to be the Name of a Woman, until he
 learned better. All this is said on the Sup-
 position that *Suidas* himself is not mistaken,
 which may be questioned; but this is left to
 the Reader’s Discernment. But, after all,
 if *Polyhistor* had said so in all his Books, it
 would have been of no more Consequence
 than if *William* of *Malmesbury* had mistook
 King *Alfred* for his Sister *Ethelfled*, which
 would have reflected on the Historian, but
 scarce have hurt the Credit of the *Saxon*
History, Lord *Bolingbroke* himself im-
 mediately after owns, even more than this
 to be true, for he asserts in his dogmati-
 cal Manner, that “ Had the *Greek* Histo-
 rians been conformable to the Sacred, I
 cannot see that their Authority, which
 was not Cotemporary, would have been
 of

"of Weight;" and thus he carries
 the Argument a great deal too far on the
 other Side. For, surely, After-Writers (es-
 pecially when they are the very first Histo-
 rians that can be heard of, as it happens
 here to be the Case among the *Greeks*) may
 be allowed to give their Evidence, that they
 hear of, and see, certain Customs and Institu-
 tions observed by a Foreign Nation, who
 derive these Observances from their Fore-
 fathers, and declare that they have *their*
Ancestors Books in their Custody: Which
 is all that we want to know from them.
 But "they might have copied *Moses*, and
 "so they did *Ctesias*." This is acutely said,
 if not truly; but not quite so fast my Lord:
 These *Greek* Historians were not such Igno-
 ramus's as to follow the Romancing Physician
Ctesias, they despised him, and sometimes
 too much; for every Thing that he wrote
 does not appear to be invented, either by
 Him, or his Informers: They certainly *did*
not however Copy *Ctesias*. "They might
 "have copied *Moses*"; yes, they might
 have taken the *Greek* Pentateuch Word for
 Word, and so they might have copied their
 own Laws of *Solon*, or *Lycurgus*. But the
 Historians never did the one nor the other,
 because

because it seemed extremely unnecessary, to transcribe such Publick Laws *verbatim*. They did not chuse to fill up Volumes of History in so useless a Manner, nor do I know one Writer, antient or modern, who ever did. But then they satisfied the Curiosity of Readers by mentioning the chief Heads of Laws, and the most remarkable Ceremonies or Customs of the People they treated of, and have given the like Accounts of the *Jews*.

PAGE 91. "*Apion* wrote purposely against them, and *Josephus* attempted afterwards, but *Apion* was then dead, to refute him." His Lordship is pleased here to balance *Apion* " a vain, noisy Egyptian Pedant, tho' curious, laborious and learned, a Cabalistical or Superstitious Man, and a Flatterer" of that Viper of the Empire *Caligula*, against the Noble, the learned, the brave, but unfortunate *Josephus*: And this excellent Historian is to yield to a declaiming Grammarian, only because " he was introduced into *Nero's* Court by *Aliturus* a Player," when Lord *Eclingbroke* must know, that *Nero* Favoured Players,

Players, and this *Aliturus* was a *Jew*, and *Josephus's* Countryman, and *Josephus* had, by his Means and of others, Interest enough to gain the Release of some of the *Jewish* Priests, whom *Felix*, Governor of *Judea*, had sent in Chains to *Nero*, nay, returned with them Home, but not without Presents from the Empress: Or because *Josephus* was mistaken in "applying the Prophecies, concerning the MESSIAH, to *Vespasian*," and was carried to the Roman General, *Titus*, (*Vespasian's* Son) after being made a Prisoner of War, "to the Siege of *Jerusalem*!"

BUT "*Apion* was then dead", when *Josephus* confuted his Book: I hope this will not be thought a Reason against publishing Answers, to bold, false and impious Writers, if they happen to die, in the mean Time; Especially if they are not afraid of "Anathema's," Page 174, from the East and West, and from all the Christian Clergy, that they dare not vent their wicked Trash in their Life-time, but confine their Traffick, as the Quakers are said to do, only to their own Intimates. No Doubt, *Josephus* had a Right to publish an Antidote against the Poison of *Apion*, and to confute the Scandal and Calumnies, thrown upon the
Jewish

Jewish Nation. And all Sorts of Christians, Clergy and Laity, will take the same Liberty with *Lord Bolingbroke's* Memory, notwithstanding these Letters come out after he is dead. The Grave will not be allowed to screen Some Kind of Offenders; they must, like *Regicides*, if they do not stay long enough to be punished alive, be dug up from their Graves, and their rotten Carcases hung to publick View upon Pinnacles. The Liberty of the Press, we hope, extends fully as much to Christians as to Free-thinkers; and an equal Freedom may be used towards the latter, as they take with the Holy Scriptures. Their Persons are safe by our good Laws: But why should their Writings be untouched? Their Arguments, if they have any, are equally strong, whether the Authors are living or dead, and will, if calculated to deceive, do equal Mischief: There is equal Reason therefore, for replying to, and, if necessary, exposing the Weakness of their Malice, though, like "the vain, curious and noisy *Apion*," they are gone first out of the World.

F I N I S.

A P P E N D I X.

AS Lord *Bolingbroke* has found out, as he thinks, one Fault in Mr. *Abbadie's* Book, and the Bishop *Gibson's* Third pastoral Letter, it may be soon examined here.

PAGE 177. They say, "That St. *Matthew's* Gospel is cited by *Clemens*, Bishop of *Rome*, a Disciple of the Apostles, and by *Barnabas*, and is received by *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*. And the same Fathers testify likewise for St. *Mark*." I presume the Fact advanced by the Minister and the Bishop, is a Mistake," for "two Reasons," one is, that "If the Fathers of the first Century do mention some Passages that are agreeable to what we read in our Evangelists it will not follow that they had the same Gospels before them." Which is so far true, that it will only be very probable: But we assert that they quote Passages, not only agreeable,

F but

APPENDIX.

but the *self-same* with those in the Gospels, and quote them as *the Word of God*, which will likewise answer his second Objection, that "the Fathers do not expressly name the "Gospels we have of St. Matthew, &c." that is, do not always in quoting their Words, add the Evangelist's Name, neither does Lord *Bolingbroke* in those very Letters, always name either the particular Book of Scripture, the Chapter or Verse, nor use the Name of *Tully* or *Horace* in quoting Passages out of each. Lord *Bolingbroke* adds that Bishop *Gibson* and Monsieur *Abbadie* are "inexcusable, as they knew, or should know, that these Fathers of the first "Century made use of other Gospels where "in such Passages might be contained, or "they might be preserved in unwritten "Tradition." This last Story of what might be traditionally quoted, is next to impossible in such great Numbers of express Quotations, and the Assertion of other Gospels, being used by those or any other Fathers of that Age, as the Writings of Apostles is as monstrously false, as it is new: His ensuing "terrible Dilemma" is Nothing but one old Popish Objection against the Bible, as a sufficient Rule of Faith and Manners

APPENDIX.

Manners, (because some Scholasticks have tried to screw the plain Words of the New Testament, to their own visionary Doctrines; Which should be rather an Argument for shewing to all Christians the whole Scripture in their own Tongue, that they may judge for themselves. Which has been over and over again confuted) and another Protestant Objection against such oral Traditions as would contradict the written Laws of God: And I must take Leave to think so very differently from him, as to be thoroughly perswaded that Christianity has been ever since the Revival of Letters, so far from "decaying," that since, as his Lordship confesses, "The Defence has been better made by modern Divines," the Citadel must be rendered more impregnable, and neither "the Gates of Hell," nor the Arts of its Pioneers can ever prevail against the Heavenly Jerusalem.

APPENDIX

Masters, (because some Schoolmasters have
 tried to know the true Word of the New
 Testament, to their own wisdom, judgment,
 which should be subject to Argument for
 showing to all Christians the whole scrip-
 ture is their own Tongue, that they may
 judge for themselves, which has been over-
 and over again mentioned) and another Pro-
 testant Objection against such oral Tradition
 as would contradict the written Laws of
 God. And I must needs leave to think to
 very differently from him, as to be thorough-
 ly persuaded that Christianity has been ever
 since the Revival of Letters, so far from
 "decaying," that since as his I will
 confess, "The Defence has been Advan-
 ced by modern Divines," the Church
 must be rendered more unquenchable, and
 brighter "the Gates of Hell," nor the Arts
 of its Enemies can ever prevail against the
 heavenly Kingdom.