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LORD FINCH, BARON of Daventry,
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and one of His MAJESTIES most
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MY LORD,

THE many Favours I have formerly Received from You, as they might justly challenge, whenever I had a fit opportunity, a Publick and Thankfull Acknowledgment; so have they encourag'd me at this time, to the Presumption of this Dedication to Your Lordship. Whom, as Your Perspicacious Wit, and Solid Judgment, together with Your Acquired Learning, render every way a most Accomplish'd and Desirable Patron; so did I persuade my self, that Your Hearty Affection to Religion, and Zeal for it, would make You not Unwilling, to take that into Your Protection, which is written wholly in the Defence thereof; so far forth, as its own Defects, or Miscarriages, should not render it incapable of the
Nor can I think it probable, that in an Age of so much Debauchery, Scepticism, and Infidelity, an Undertaking of this kind, should be judged by You, Useless or Unreasonable. And now, having so fit an Opportunity, I could most willingly expatiate in the large Field of Your Lordship's Praises; both that I might doe an Act of Justice to Your self, and provoke others to Your Imitation. But I am sensible, that as no Eloquence, less then that of Your own, could be fit for such a Performance; so the Nobleness and Generosity of Your Spirit is such, that You take much more pleasure in Doing Praise-worthy things, then in Hearing the Repeated Echo's of them. Wherefore in stead of pursuing Encomiums, which would be the least pleasing to Your self, I shall Offer up my Prayers to Almighty God, for the Continuation of Your Lordship's Life and Health; That so His MAJESTY may long have such a Loyal Subject and Wise Counsellour; the Church of England, such a Worthy Patron; the High Court of Chancery, such an Oracle of Impartial Justice; and the whole Nation, such a Pattern of Virtue and Piety. Which shall ever be the Hearty Desire of,

MY LORD,

YOUR LORDSHIP'S

Most Humble and

most Affectionate

Servant,

R. Cudworth.
THOUGH, I confess, I have seldom taken any great pleasure, in reading other mens Apologies, yet must I at this time make some myself. First therefore, I acknowledge, that when I engag'd the Press, I intended onely a Discourse concerning Liberty and Necessity, or to speak out more plainly, Against the Fatal Necessity of all Actions and Events; which upon whatsoever Grounds or Principles maintain'd, will (as We Conceive) Serve The Design of Atheism, and Undermine Christianity, and all Religion; as taking away all Guilt and Blame, Punishments and Rewards, and plainly rendering a Day of Judgment, Ridiculous: And it is Evident that some have pursued it of late, in order to that End. But afterwards We consider'd, That this which is indeed a Controversy, concerning The True Intellectual System of the Universe, does, in the full Extent thereof, take in Other things; the Necessity of all Actions and Events being maintained by Several Persons, upon very Different Grounds, according to that Tripartite Fatalism, mentioned by us in the beginning of the First Chapter. For First, The Democritick Fate, is nothing but The Material Necessity of all things without a God: it supposing Senseless Matter, Necessarily Moved, to be the onely Original and Principle of all things: Which therefore is called by Epicurus, The Physiological; by us, the Atheistick Fate. Besides which, The Divine Fate is also Bipartite; Some Theifts supposing God, both to Decree and Doe all things in us, (Evil as well as Good) or by his Immediate Influence to Determine all Actions, and so make them alike Necessary to us. From whence it follows, That his Will is no way Regulated or Determined, by any Essentiall and Immutable Goodness, and Justice; or that he hath nothing of Morality in his Nature, be being onely Arbitrary Will Omnipotent. As also That all Good and Evil Morall, to us Creatures are
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neer Theticall or Positive things; *κατα κατα, by Law or Command onely, and not by Nature. This therefore may be called, The Divine Fate Immorall, and Violent. Again, There being other Divine Fatalists, who acknowledge such a Deity, as both suffers other things, besides it self, to Act, and hath an Effentials Goodness and Justice in its Nature; and consequentlty, That there are things, Juft and Unjuft to us Naturally, and not by Law and Arbitrary Constitution onely; and yet nevertbeliefs take away from men, all such Liberty, as might make them capable of Praife and Dispraife, Rewards and Punishments, and Objects of Distributive Justice: they conceiving Necessity to be Intrinsecall to the Nature of every thing, in the Actions of it; and nothing of Contingency to be found any-where; from whence it will follow, That nothing could possibly have been Otherwise, in the whole World, then it Is. And this may be called The Divine Fate Morall, (as the other Immorall,) and Naturall, (as the other Violent;) it being a Concatenation, or Implexed Series of Causes, all in themseves Necessarly, depending upon a Deity Morall, (if we may so speake) that is, such as is Effentially Good, and Naturally Juft, as the Head thereof; the First Contriver and Orderer of all. Which kind of Divine Fate, hath not onely been formerly aserred by the Stoicks, but also of late, by divers Modern Writers. Wherefore of the Three Fatalisms, or False Hypotheses of the Univerfe, mentioned in the beginning of this Book; One is Absolute Atheism: Another Immorall Atheism, or Religion without any Naturall Justice and Morality: (all Juft and Unjuft, according to this Hypothesis, being meer Theticall or Factitious things, Made by Arbitrary Will and Command onely:) The Third and Last, such a Atheism, as acknowledges not onely a God, or Omnipotent Understanding Being, but also Natural Justice and Morality, Founded in him, and Derived from him; nevertbeliefs no Liberty from Necessity anywhere, and therefore no Distributive or Retributive Justice in the World. Whereas these Three Things are, (as we conceive) the Fundamentals or Essencials of True Religion. First, That all things in the World, do not Float without a Head and Governour; but that there is a God, an Omnipotent Understanding Being, Presiding over all. Secondly, That this God being Effentially Good and Juft, there is *κατα *κατα, κατα δικαιος, Something in its own Nature, Immutably and Eternally Juft, and Unjuft; and not by Arbitrary Will, Law, and Command onely. And Lastly, That there is Something *σαμων, or, That we are so far forthe Principles or Masters of our own Actions, as to be Accountable to Justice for them, or to make us Guilty and Blame-worthy for what we doe Amiss, and to Deserve Punishment accordingly. Which Three Fundamentals
of Religion, are Intimated by the Author to the Hebrews, in these Words; He that Cometh to God, must Believe that He is, and That He is a Rewarder of those who seek him out. For to Seek out God here, is nothing else, but to Seek a Participation of his Image, or the Recovery of that Nature and Life of his, which we have been Alienated from. And these Three Things, namely, That all things do not Float without a Head and Government; but there is an Omnipotent Understanding Being Preiding over all: That this God, hath an Essential Goodness and Justice, and That the Differences of Good and Evil Morall, Honest and Dishonest, are not by meer Will and Law only, but by Nature; and consequently, That the Deity cannot A3, Influence, and Neceffitate men, to such things as are in their Own Nature, Evil: and Lastly, That Neceffity is not Intrinfeall to the Nature of every thing; But that men have such a Liberty, or Power over their own Actions, as may render them Accountable for the same, and Blame-worthy when they doe Amifs; and consequently, That there is a Justice Distributive of Rewards and Punishments, running through the World: I say, These Three, (which are the most Important Things, that the Mind of man can employ it self upon) taken all together, make up the Wholenefs and Entirenes of that, which is here called by us, The True Intellectual System of the Universe; in such a Sense, as Atheifm may be called, a Falle System thereof: The Word Intellectual, being added, to distinguish it from the other, Vulgarly so called, Systems of the World, (that is, the Visible and Corporeal World) the Ptolemaick, Tyconick, and Copernican; the Two Former of which, are now commonly accounted Falle, the Latter True. And thus our Prospect being now Enlarged, into a Threefold Fatalifm, or Spurious and Falle Hypothefis of the Intellectual System, making all things Neceffary upon several Grounds; We accordingly Deigned the Confutation of them all, in Three Several Books. The First, Against Atheifm, (which is the Democritick Fate) wherein all the Reafon and Philosophy thereof is Refelled, and the Exiftence of a God Demonstrated; and fo that θὰ μὴν ἄνδρας, or Material Neceffity of all things, Overthrown. The Second, For such a God as is not meer Arbitrary Will Omnipotent, Decreeing, Doing, and Neceffitating all Actions, Evil as well as Good; but Essentially Moral, Good and Just; and For a Natural Discrimen Honelforum & Turpium; where- by another Ground of the Neceffity of all Humane Actions will be Removed. And the Third and Laft, Against Neceffity Intrinfeall and Essential to all Actions, and for such a Liberty, or Sui-Poefias, in Rational Creatures, as may render them Accountable, capable of Rewards and Punishments, and fo Objects of Distributive or Retributive Justice:
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by which the now onely remaining Ground, of the Fatal Necessity of all Actions and Events, will be Taken away. And all these Three under that One General Title, of The True Intellectual System of the Universe. Each Book having besides, its own Particular Title: as, Against Atheism; For Natural Justice and Morality, Founded in the Deity; For Liberty from Necessity, and a Distributive Justice of Rewards and Punishments in the World. And this we conceive may fully satisfy, concerning our General Title, all those, who are not extremely Critical or Captious, at least as many of them as have ever heard of the Astronomical Systems of the World: so that they will not think us hereby Obliged, to Treat of the Hierarchy of Angels, and of all the Several Species of Animals, Vegetables, and Minerals, &c. that is, to write De Omni Ente, of whatsoever is Contained within The Complexion of the Universe. Though the Whole Scale of Entity is here also taken notice of; and the General Ranks of Substantial Beings, below the Deity, (or Trinity of Divine Hypotheses) Consider'd: which yet, according to our Philosophy, are but Two; Souls of several Degrees, (Angels themselves being included within that Number) and Body or Matter: as also the Immortality of those Souls Proved. Which notwithstanding is Suggested by us, only to Satisfy some mens Curiosity. Nevertbeless we confess that this General Title, might will have been here spared by us, and this Volume have been Presented to the Reader's View, not as a Part or Piece, but a Whole Complete and Entire thing by it self, bad it not been for Two Reasons; First, Our beginning with those Three Fatalisms, or False Hypotheses of the Intellectual System, and Promising a Confutation of them all, then when we thought to have brought them within the Compass of One Volume; and Secondly, Every other Page's, throughout this whole Volume, accordingly bearing the Inscription, of Book the First, upon the Head thereof. This is therefore that which in the First place, we here Apologize for, our Publishing One Part or Book alone by it self; We being surprized in the Length thereof; Whereas we had otherwise Intended Two more along with it. Notwithstanding which, there is no Reason, why this Volume should therefore be thought Imperfect and Incomplete, because it hath not All the Three Things at first Designed by us; it containing All that belongeth to its own Particular Title and Subject, and being in that respect no Piece, but a Whole. This indeed must needs beget an Expectation, of the Two following Treatises, (especially in such as shall have receiv'd any Satisfaction from this First;) concerning those Two other Fatalisms, or False Hypotheses mentioned; to make up our Whole Intellectual System Compleat: The One, to Prove, That God is not mere Arbitrary Will Omnipotent, (without any Essential Goodness and Justice) Decreeing
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ing and Doing all things in the World, as well Evil as Good; and thereby making them alike Necessary to us; from whence it would follow, that all Good and Evil Moral, are meer Thetical, Positive, and Arbitrary things, that is, not Nature, but Will; Which is the Defence of Natural, Eternal, and Immutable Justice, or Morality: The Other, That Necessity is not Intrinical to the Nature of Everything, God and all Creatures, or Essentiaall to all Action; but, That there is Something else, or, That we have Free Liberty, or Power over our own Actions: Which is the Defence of a Distributive or Retributive Justice, disp ning Rewards and Punishments throughout the whole World. Wherefore we think fit here to advertize the Reader concerning these, That though they were, and still are, really intended by us; yet the Compleat Efinishing and Publication of them, will notwithstanding depend upon many Contingencies; not only of our Life and Health, the Latter of which, as well as the Former, is to us very Uncertain; but also of our Leisure, or Vacancy from other Necessary Employments.

In the next place, We must Apologize also, for the Fourth Chapter; inasmuch as, through in regard of its Length, it might rather be called a Book, than a Chapter; yet it doth not Answer all the Contents Prefixed to it. Here therefore must we again, confess our selves Surprized; who when we wrote those Contents, did not suspect in the least, but that we should have Satisfied them all within a lesser Compass. And our Design then was, besides Answering the Objection, against the Naturality of the Idea of God, from the Pagan Polytheism, (we having then so fit an Occa-
sion,) to give such a further Account of the Idolatry and Religion of the Gentiles, as might prepare our way for a Defence of Christianity, to be subjoin'd in the Close: it being not onely agreeable to the Sense of Ancient Doctors, but also expressly declared in the Scripture, That One Design of Christianity, was to abolish and extirpate the Pagan Polytheism and Idolatry. And our Reasons for this Intended Defence of Christianity, were. First; Because we had Oberved, that some Professed Opposers of Atheism, had either incurred a Suspcion, or at least suffered under the Imputation, of being meer Theists, or Natural Religionists only, and no hearty Believers of Christianity, or Friends to Revealed Religion. From which either Suspcion or Imputation therefore, we thought it Justice to free our selves, we having so Unshaken a Belief, and firm Assurance, of the Truth of the whole Christian Doctrine. But, Secondly and Principally; Because we had further Oberved it, to have been the Method of our Modern Atheists, to make their First Assault against Christianity, as thinking that to be the most Vulnerable; and that it would be an easy Step for them from thence, to Demolish all Religion, and

Theism.
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Theism. However, since the Satisfying the Former Part of those Contents, had already taken up so much Room, that the Pursuit of the Remainder, would have quite Excluded, our principally Intended Conci- tation of all the Atheistick Grounds; the forementioned Objection being now sufficiently Answered; there was a necessity, that we should there break off, and leave the further Account of the Pagan Idolatry and Religion, together with our Defence of Christianity, to some other more convenient Opportunity.

And now we shall Exhibit to the Reader's view, a Brief and General Synopsia, of the whole following Work, together with some Particular Reflexions upon several Parts thereof; either for his better Information concerning them, or for their Vindication: some of which therefore, will be of greater Use, after the Book has been read, then before. The First Chapter, is an Account of the Atomick Physiology, as made the Foundation of the Democritick Faith. Where the Reader is to under- stand, that this Democritick Faith, which is One of the Three Falle Hypotheses of the Intellectual System, there Mentioned, is the very Self- same thing with the Atomick Atheism; the only Form of Atheism, that hath publicly appeared upon the Stage, as an Entire Philosophick System; or hath indeed been much taken notice of in the World, for these Two Thousand years past. For, Though it be true, That Epicurus, (who was also an Atomick Atheist, (as is afterwards declared,) hav- ing, in all probability, therefore a Mind to Innovate Something, that he might not seem to have borrowed all from Democritus,) did by violence introduce Liberty of Will, into his Hypothesis; for the Salving whereof, he ridiculously deviz'd, That his Third Motion of Atoms, called by Lu- cretius,

---Exiguum Clinamen Principiorum:
Yet was this, as Cicero long since observed, a most Heterogeneous Patch, or Ablument of his, and altogether as Contradictitious to the Tenour of his own Principles, as it was to the Doctrine of Democritus himself.

There can be nothing more Absurd, then for an Atheist to assert Liberty of Will: but it is most of all Absurd, for an Atomick One. And there- fore our Modern Atheists do here plainly disclaim Epicurus, (though otherwise so much Admired by them;) and declare open War against this Liberty of Will: they Apprehending that it would unavoidably In- troduce Incorporeal Substance; as also well Knowing, that Necessity, on the contrary, Effectually overthrows all Religion; it taking away Guilt and Blame, Punishments and Rewards; to which might be added also, Prayers and Devotions.

And as there was a necessity for us here, to give some Account of that Ancient
Ancient Atomick Physiology, with which Atheism now became thus Blended and Complicated; so do we in this First Chapter, chiefly insist upon Two things concerning it. First, That it was no Invention of Democritus nor Leucippus, but of much greater Antiquity: not only from that Tradition transmitted by Po’donius the Stoick, That it derived its Original from one Mo’schus a Ph’ancian, who lived before the Trojan Wars, (which plainly makes it to have been Mosaicall;) but also from Aristotle’s Affirmation, That the greater part of the Ancient Philosophers entertained this Hypothesis; and further because it is certain, that divers of the Italicks, and particularly Empedocles, before Democritus, Physiologized Atomically: which is the Reason, he was so much applauded by Lucretius. Besides which, it is more then a Presumption, that Anaxagoras his Homeomery or Similar Atomology, was but a Degeneration from the True and Genuine Atomology of the Ancient Italicks; that was an Anomeomery, or Doctrine of Diffimilar and Unqualified Atoms. Wherefore all that is True concerning Democritus and Leucippus, is onely this, That these men were indeed, the First Atheizers of this Ancient Atomick Physiology, or the Inventors and Broachers of the Atomick Atheism. Which is Laertius his True meaning, (though it be not commonly understood,) when he recordeth of them, that they were the First, who made Unqualified Atoms, the Principles of all things in the Universe without exception; that is, not onely of Inanimate Bodies, (as the other Ancient Religious Atomists, the Italicks, before had done;) but also of Soul and Mind.

And whereas we conceive this Atomick Physiology, as to the Essentials thereof, to be Unquestionably True, viz. That the only Principles of Bodies, are Magnitude, Figure, Site, Motion, and Rest; and that the Qualities and Forms of Inanimate Bodies, are Really nothing, but several Combinations of these, Causing several Phancies in us: (Which excellent Discovery therefore, so long agoe made, is a Notable Influence of the Wit and Sagacity of the Ancients;) So do we in the Next place, make it Manifester, that this Atomick Phylogeny rightly understood, is so far from being either the Mother or Nurse of Atheism, or any ways Favourable thereunto, (as is Vulgarly supposed;) that it is indeed, the most directly Opposite to it of any, and the greatest Defence against the same. For, First, we have Discovered, That the Principle, upon which this Atomology is Founded, and from whence it Sprung, was no other then this, Nothing out of Nothing, in the True Sense thereof; or, That Nothing can be Caused by Nothing: from whence it was concluded, that in Natural Generations, there was no new Real Entity produced, which was not before: the Genuine Consequence whereof was Two-fold;
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That the Qualities and Forms of Inanimate Bodies, are no Entities Really distinct from the Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion of Parts; and, That Souls are Substances Incorpooreal, not Generated out of Matter. Where we have shewed, That the Pythagorick Doctrine, of the Præ-Existence of Souls, was founded upon the very same Principle, with the Atomick Physiolozy. And it is from this very Principle rightly understood, that ourselves afterwards, undertake to Demonstrate, The Absolute Impossibility of all Atheism. Moreover, we have made it undeniably Evident, That the Intrinsick Constitution of this Atomick Physiolozy also is such, as that whosoever admits it, and rightly understands it, must needs acknowledge Incorpooreal Substance; which is the Absolute Overtrow of Atheism. And from hence alone, is it certain to us, without any Testimonies from Antiquity, that Democritus and Leucippus, could not possibly be the First Inventors of this Philosophy, they either not rightly understanding it, or else wilfully depraving the same: and the Atomick Atheism, being Really nothing else, but a Rape committed upon the Atomick Physiolozy. For which Reason, we do by no means here Applaud Plato, nor Aristotle, in their Rejecting this most Ancient Atomick Physiolozy, and Introducing again, that Unintelligible First Matter, and those Exploded Qualities and Forms, into Philosozy. For though this were probably done by Plato, out of a Disguft and Prejudice against the Atomick Atheists, which made him not so well Consider nor Understand that Physiolozy; yet was he much disappointed of his Expectation herein; That Atomology which be Exploded, (rightly understood,) being really the Greatest Bulwark against Atheism; and on the contrary, Those Forms and Qualities which be Esposed, the Natural Seed thereof; they, besides their Unintelligible Darkness, bringing Something out of Nothing, in the Impossible Sense; which we shew to be, the Inlet of all Atheism. And thus in this First Chapter, have we not only quite Disarmed Atheism of Atomicism, or shewed that the Latter, (rightly understood,) affordeth no manner of Shelter or Protection to the Former; But also made it manifest, that it is the greatest Bulwark and Defence against the same. Which is a thing afterwards further insinifie on.

As to the Second Chapter, we have no more to say, but only this; That here we took the Liberty, to Reveal the Arcane Mysteries of Atheism, and to Discover all its Pretended Grounds of Reafon, that we could find anywhere suggested in Writings; those only excepted, that are peculiar to the Hylozoick Form, (which is directly contrary to the Atomick;) and that to their best advantage too: neverthelees to this end, that these being afterwards, all Baffled and Confuted, Theifm might by this means, Obtain the Greater and Juster Triumph over Atheism.
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In the Third Chapter, we thought it necessary, in order to a fuller Confutation of Atheifm, to consider all the other Forms thereof, besides the Atomick. And here do we first of all, make a Discovery of a certain Form of Atheifm, never before taken notice of, by any Modern Writers, which we call the Hylozoick: which notwithstanding, though it were long since started by Strato, in way of Opposition to the Democritick and Epicurean Hypothesis; yet because it afterwards slept in perfect Silence and Oblivion, should have been here by us passed by Silently; had we not had certain Knowledge of its being of late Awakened and Revived, by some, who were so sagacious, as plainly to perceive, that the Atomick Form could never doe their business, nor prove Defensible: and therefore would attempt to carry on this Cause of Atheifm, in quite a different way, by the Life and Perception of Matter: as also that this in all probability, would ere long publicly appear upon the Stage, though not Bare-faced, but under a Disguise. Which Atheiftick Hypothesis, is partly Confuted by us, in the Close of this Third Chapter, and partly in the Fifth.

In the next place, it being certain, that there had been other Philofophick Atheifts in the world before those Atomicks, Epicurus and Democritus; we declare, out of Plato and Ariftotle, what that most Ancient Atheiftick Hypothesis was; namely, the Education of all things, even Life and Understanding it Self, out of Matter, in the way of Qualities; or as the Pallions and Affections thereof, Generable and Corruptible. Which Form of Atheifm is styled by us, not onely Hylopathian, but also Anaximandrian: however we grant some probability of that Opinion, That Anaximander held an Homoeomery of Qualified Atoms, as Anaxagoras afterwards did; the difference between them being only this, that the Latter asserted an Unmade Mind, whereas the Former Generated all Mind and Understanding, out of those Qualified Atoms; Hot and Cold, Moift and Dry, Compounded together: because we judged this Difference not to be a sufficient Ground to multiply Forms of Atheifm upon. And here do we give notice, of that strange kind of Religious Atheifm, or Atheiftick Theogonism, which asserted, not onely other Understanding Beings, Superior to Men, called by them Gods; but also amongst those, one Supreme or Jupiter too; nevertheless Native, and Generated at First out of Night and Chaos, (that is, Sensles Matter) as also Mortal and Corruptible again into the same.

Besides which, there is yet a Fourth Atheiftick Form taken notice of, out of the Writings of the Ancients, (though perhaps Junior to the rest, it seeming to be but the Corruption and Degeneration of Stoicifm) which concluded the whole World, not to be an Animal, (as the Pagen Theifts
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Theits then generally Supposed) but only One Huge Plant or Vegetable, having an Artificial, Plantal, and Plastick Nature; as its Highest Principle, Orderly disposing the Whole, without any Mind or Understanding. And here have we set down, the Agreement of all the Atheistick Forms, (however differing so much from one another) in this One General Principle, viz. That all Animality, Conscious Life and Understanding, is Generated out of Sensless Matter, and Corruptible again into it.

Wherefore in the Close of this Third Chapter we insist Largely, upon an Artificial, Regular and Plastick Nature, devoid of express Knowledge and Understanding, as subordinate to the Deity: Chiefly in way of Confutation, of those Cosmo-Plastick, and Hylozoick Atheisms. Though we had a further Design herein also, for the Defence of Theism: forasmuch as without such a Nature, either God must be supposed to Do all things in the world Immediately, and to Form every Gnat and Fly, as it were with his own hands; which seemeth not so Becoming of him, and would render his Providence, to Humane Apprehensions, Laborious and Distraffious; or else the whole System of this Corporeal Universe, must result only from Fortuitous Mechanism, without the Direction of any Mind: which Hypothesis once admitted, would Unquestionably, by degrees, Supplant and Undermine all Theism. And now from what we have declared, it may plainly appear, that this Digression of ours, concerning an Artificial, Regular and Plastick Nature, (Subordinate to the Deity) is no Wen, or Excrefescency, in the Body of this Book; but a Natural and Necessary Member thereof.

In the Fourth Chapter; After the Idea of God fully declared, (where we could not omit his Essential Goodness and Justice, or (if we may so call it) the Morality of the Deity; though that be a thing properly belonging to the Second Book, The Confutation of the Divine Fate Immoral) There is a large Account given of the Pagan Polytheism; to satisfy a very considerable Objection, that lay in our way from thence, Against the Naturality of the Idea of God, as Including Oneines and Singularity in it. For had that, upon enquiry, been found True, which is so commonly taken for granted, That the generality of the Pagan Nations, had constantly, Scattered their Devotions, amongst a multitude of Self-Existent, and Independent Deities, they acknowledging no One Sovereign Numen; This would much have Stumbled the Naturality of the Divine Idea. But now it being on the Contrary, clearly Proved, That the Pagan Theologers all along, acknowledged One Sovereign and Omnipotent Deity, from which all their other Gods were Generated or Created; we have thereby not only Removed the forementioned Objection out of the way; but also Evinced, That the Generality of mankind, have
have constantly had a certain Prolepsis or Anticipation in their Minds, concerning the Actual Existence of a God, according to the True Idea of him. And this was the rather done Fully and Carefully by us; because we had not met with it sufficiently performed before: A. Steuchus Eugubinus, Having laboured most in this Subject: from whose profitable Industry though we shall no way detract; yet whoever will compare, what he hath written, with ours, will find no Just Cause to think ours Superfluous and Unnecessary; much less, a Transcription out of his. In which, besides other things, there is no Account at all given, of the Many Pagan, Poetical and Political Gods, what they were; which is so great a part of our Performance, to prove them Really to have been, but the Polyonymy of one God. From whence it follows also, That the Pagan Religion, though sufficiently Faulty, yet was not altogether so Nonsensical, as the Atheists would represent it, out of design; that they might from thence infer, all Religion to be nothing but a mere Cheat and Imposture: they worshipping only One Supreme God, in the several Manifestations of his Goodness, Power, and Providence throughout the World, together with his Inferior Ministers. Nevertheless we cannot deny, that being once engaged in this Subject, we thought our Selves the more Concerned, to doe the business thoroughly and effectually, because of that Controversy lately Agitated, concerning Idolatry, (which cannot otherwise be Decided, then by giving a True Account of the Pagan Religion;) and the so Confident Affirmations of some, That none could possibly be Guilty of Idolatry, in the Scripture Sense, who Believed One God the Creator of the whole world: Whereas it is most certain on the contrary, that the Pagan Polytheism and Idolatry, consisted not in worshipping Many Creators, or Uncreated, but in giving Religious Worship to Creatures, besides the Creator; they directing their Devotion, (as Athanasius plainly affirmed of them,) to one or more Gods, To One Uncreated only; but besides him, to many Created Gods. But as for the Polemic Management of this Controversy, concerning Idolatry, we leave it to other Learned Hands, that are already engaged in it.

Moreover, We have in this Fourth Chapter, largely Insisted also upon the Trinity. The Reason whereof was, Because it came in our way; and our Contents engaged us thereunto, in order to the giving a full Account of the Pagan Theology: it being certain; that the Platonicks and Pythagoreans at least, if not other Pagans also, had their Trinity, as well as Christians. And we could not well avoid, the Comparing of these Two together: Upon which Occasion we take notice of a Double Platonick Trinity; the One Spurious and Adulterated, of some latter Platonists; the Other True and Genuine, of Plato himself, Parmenides, and the Ancients. The Former of which, though it be Opposed by us to the Christian Trinity, and Confuted;
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futed; yet betwixt the Latter and that, do we find a Wonderfull Correspondence: which is Largely Pursued, in the Platonick Christians Apology. Wherein notwithstanding, nothing must be lookt upon, as Dogmatically Asserted by us, but only Offered, and Submitted to the Judgment of the Learned in these Matters; We confining our selves, in this Mysteries Point of the Holy Trinity, within the Compa's of those its Three Essentials declared: First, That it is not a Trinity of Names and Words, or of Logical Notions only: But of Persons or Hypotheses. Secondly, That none of those Persons or Hypotheses, are Creatures, but Uncreated. And Lastly, That they are all Three, Truely and Really One God. Nevertheless we acknowledge, That we did therefore, the more Copiously insist upon this Argument, because of our then Designed, Defence of Christianity; we conceiving that this Parallelism, betwixt the Ancient or Genuine Platonick, and the Christian Trinity, might be of some use to satisfy those amongst us, who Boggle so much at the Trinity, and look upon it as the Chok-pear of Christianity; when they shall find, that the Freest Wits amongst the Pagans, and the Best Philosophers, who had nothing of Superstition, to Determine them that way, were so far from being Soby of such an Hypothesis, as that they were even Fond thereof. And that the Pagans had indeed such a Cabbala amongst them, (which some perhaps will yet hardly believe, notwithstanding all that we have said,) might be further convinced, from that memorable Relation in Plutarch, of Thelpusius Solensis, who after he had been lookt upon as Dead for Three days, Reviving; Affirmed amongst other things, which he thought he saw or heard in the mean time in his Ecstasy, This, Of Three Gods in the Form of a Triangle, pouring in Streams into one another; Orpheus his Soul, being said to have arrived so far; accordingly as from the Testimonies of other Pagan Writers, we have proved, that a Trinity of Divine Hypotheses, was a part of the Orphick Cabbala. True indeed, our Belief of the Holy Trinity, is Founded upon no Pagan Cabbala's, but openly Scripture Revelation: it being that which Christians are, or should be, all Baptized into: Nevertheless these things are Reasonably noted by us to this end; That that should not be made a Prejudice Against Christianity, and Revealed Religion; nor lookt upon as such an Affrightfull Bugbear or Morrow in it; which even Pagan Philosophers themselves, and those of the most Accomplished Intellectuals, and Uncaptivated Minds, though having neither Councils, nor Creeds, nor Scriptures; had so great a Propensity and Readines to entertain, and such a Veneration for.

In this Fourth Chapter, We were necessitated by the Matter it self, to run out into Philology and Antiquity; as also in the other Parts of the Book, we do often give an Account, of the Doctrine of the Ancients: which however some Over-severe Philosophers, may look upon Fastidiously, or Underval-
to the Reader.

Yet, as we conceived it often Necessary, so possibly may the Variety thereof not be Ungratefull to others; and this Mixture of Philology, throughout the Whole, Sweeten and Allay the Severity of Philosophy to them: The main thing which the Book pretends to, in the mean time, being the Philosophy of Religion. But for our parts, we neither call Philosophy, nor yet Philosophy, our Mistress; but serve our selves of Either, as Occasion requireth.

As for the Last Chapter, Though it Promise only a Confutation of all the Atheiftick Grounds; yet do we therein also Demonstrate, the Absolute Impossibility of all Atheism, and the Actual Existence of a God. We say Demonstrate; not A Priori, which is Impossible and Contradic- tions; but by Necessary Inference, from Principles altogether Undenia- ble. For we can by no means grant to the Atheists; That there is no more, then a Probable Persuasion, or Opinion to be bad, of the Existence of a God; without any Certain Knowledge or Science. Nevertheless it will not follow from hence, That whoever shall Read these Demon- strations of ours, and Understand all the words of them, must therefore of Necessity, be presently Convinced, whether he will or no, and put out of all manner of Doubt or Hesitancy, concerning the Existence of a God. For we Believe That to be True, which some have Affirmed, That were there any Intereft of Life, any Concernment of Appetite and Passion, against the Truth of Geometrical Theorems themselves; as of a Triangle's Having Three Angles Equall to Two Right; whereby mens Judg- ments might be Clouded and Bribed; Notwithstanding all the Demon- strations of them, many would remain, at least Sceptical about them. Wherefore meer Speculation, and Dry Mathematical Reason, in Minds Un- purified, and having a Contrary Intereft of Carnality, and a heavy Load of Infidelity and Difficult finking them down; cannot alone beget an Unha- ken Confidence and Assurance of so High a Truth as this, The Existence of One Perfect Understanding Being, the Original of all things. As it is cer- tain also on the contrary, That Minds Cleaned and Purged from Vice, may without Syllogistical Reasonings, and Mathematical Demonstrations, have an Undoubted Assurance of the Existence of a God, according to that of the Philofopher; that πάντα πάντα γινομεν τὸ ἐπί ζάς τοίς, Purity Pol- lutes men with an Assurance of the Best things: Whether this Assurance be called a Vaticination or Divine Sagacity; (as it is by Plato and A- ristotle) or Faith, as in the Scripture. For the Scripture, Faith, is not a meer Believing of Historickall Things, and upon Inartificall Argu- ments, or Testimonies only; but a Certain Higher and Diviner Power in the Soul, that peculiarly Correspondeth with the Deity. Notwith- standing which, Knowledge or Science, added to this Faith, a coc- ding
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(ending to the Scripture Advice) will make it more Firm and Stedfast; and the better able to resist those Assaults of Sophistickal Reasonings, that shall be made against it.

In this Fifth Chapter, as sometimes elsewhere, we thought Our selves concerned, in Defence of the Divine Wisdom, Goodness, and Perfection, against Atheists, to maintain, (with all the Ancient Philosophick Theists,) the Perfection of the Creation also; or that the Whole System of things taken all together, could not have been Better Made and Ordered then it is. And indeed, This Divine Goodness and Perfection, as Displaying and Manifesting itself in the Works of Nature and Providence, is supposed in Scripture, to be the very Foundation of our Christian Faith; when that is Defined, to be the Substance and Evidence Rerum Spen- darum; that is, Of Whatsoever is (by a Good man) to be hoped for. Notwithstanding which, it was far from our Intention, therefore to Conclude, That Nothing neither in Nature nor Providence, could be Other-wise then it is; or, That there is Nothing left to the Free Will and Choice of the Deity. And though we do in the Third Section, insist largely, upon that Ancient Pythagorick Cabbala, That Souls are always United to some Body or other; as also, That all Rational and Intellectual Creatures, consist of Soul and Body; and suggest several things, from Reason and Christian Antiquity, in favour of them both: yet would we not be Underflood, to Dogmatize in either of them, but to Submit all to better Judgments.

Again, we shall here Advertise the Reader, (though we have Caution'd concerning it, in the Book itself) That in our Defence of Incorporeal Substance against the Atheists, however we thought our selves concerned, to say the utmost that possibly we could, in way of Vindication of the Ancients, who generally maintained it to be Unextended, (which to some seems an Absolute Impossibility;) yet we would not be supposed Ourselves, Dogmatically to Affert any more in this Point, then what all Incorporalists agree in, That there is a Substance Specifically distinct from Body; namely such, as Consisteth Not of Parts Separable from one another; and which can Penetrate Body; and Lastly, is Self-Active, and hath an Internal Energy, distinct from that of Locall Motion. (And thus much is undeniabley Evinced, by the Arguments before proposed.) But whether this Substance, be altogether Unextended, or Extended otherwise then Body; we shall leave every man to make his own Judgment concerning it.

Furthermore, We think fit here to Suggest, That whereas throughout this Chapter and Whole Book, we constantly Oppose the Generation of Souls, that is, the Production of Life, Cognition and Understanding, out of Dead and Sensible Matter; and assert all Souls to be as Substantial as Matter
it self; This is not done by us, out of any fond Addictedness to Pythagorick Whimseys, nor indeed out of a meer Particular regard to that Cause of Theism neither, which we were engaged in, (though we had great reason to be tender of that too;) but because we were enforced thereunto, by Dry Mathematicall Reason; it being as certain to us, as anything in all Geometry, That Cognition and Understanding, can never possibly Result out of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Local Motions, (which is all that ourselves can allow to Body) however Compounded together. Nor indeed in that other way of Qualities, is it better Conceiveable, how they should emerge out of Hot and Cold, Moiſt and Dry, Thick and Thin; according to the Anaximandrian Atheism. And they who can persuade themselves of the Contrary, may Believe, That anything may be Caused by anything; upon which Supposition, we confess, it is Impossible to us, to prove the Exisſence of a God, from the Phænomena.

In the close of this Fifth Chapter, Because the Atheists do in the Last place Pretend, Theism and Religion to be Inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty; we were necessitated, briefly to Unravel and Confute, all the Atheistick Ethicks and Politicks, (Though this more properly belong to our Second Book Intended:) Where we make it plainly to appear, That the Atheists Artificial and Factitious Justice, is Nothing but Will and Words; and That they give to Civil Sovereigns, no Right nor Authority at all, but only Belluine Liberty, and Brutish Force. But on the contrary, as we Affert Justice and Obligation, not Made by Law and Commands, but in Nature; and Prove This, together with Conſcience and Religion, to be the only Basis of Civil Authority; so do we also maintain, all the Rights of Civil Sovereigns; giving both to Caesar, the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's.

And now, having made all our Apologies and Reflexions, we have no more to add, but only the Retraction or Retraction of one Passage, Page 761. Where mentioning that Opinion of a Modern Atheistick Writer, That Cognition is nothing else but Local Motion, we could not think Epicurus and Democritus to have sunk to such a Degree, either of Sottifhness or Impudence, as this; whereas we found Cause afterwards, upon further Consideration, to Change our Opinion herein, Page 846. Forasmuch as when Epicurus Derived Liberty of Will in men, meerly from that Motion of Senſeſſe Atoms Declining Uncertainly from the Perpendicular; it is Evident, that according to him, Volition it self must be really Local Motion. As indeed in the Democritick Fate, and Material Neceffity of all things, it is Implied, That Humane Cognitions are but Mechanism and Motion. Notwithstanding which, both Democritus and Epicurus supposed, That the World was made without Cognition, though by Local Motion. So

***

that
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that the meaning of these Befotted Atheists, (if at least they had any meaning) seems to have been this, That all Cogitation is Really Nothing else but Local Motion; nevertheless all Motion, not Cogitation; but one-
ly in such and such Circumstances, or in Bodies so Modified.

And now we are not Ignorant, That some will be ready to condemn this whole Labour of ours, and of others in this Kind, Against Atheism, as alto-
gether Useless and Superfluous; upon this Pretence, that an Atheist is a mere Chimera, and there is no such thing anywhere to be found in the World.
And indeed we could heartily wish, upon that condition, that all this La-
bour of ours, were Superfluous and Useless. But as to Atheists, These so
confident Exploders of them, are both Unskilled in the Monuments of An-
tiquity, and Unacquainted with the Present Age, they live in; others
having found too great an Assurance, from their own Personal Con-
verse, of the Reality of Them. Nevertheless this Labour of ours, is not
Intended only for the Conversion of Downright and Professed Atheists,
(of which there is but Little Hope, they being sunk into so great a degree of Sottishness;) but for the Confirmation of Weak, Staggering, and Scepti-
call Atheists. And unless these Exploders of Atheists, will affirm also,
that all men have constantly, an Unshaken Faith, and Belief of the Ex-
itence of a God, without the least mixture of Doubtfull Distrust, or Hes-
tancy, (which if it were so, the world could not possibly be so bad as now it is;) they must needs Grant, such Endeavours as these, for the Confirming
and Establishing of mens Minds in the Belief of a God, by Philosophick
Reasons, in an Age so Philosophicall, not to be Superfluous and Useless.
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Book I.

Chap. I.

1. The Fatal Necessity of all Humane Actions and Events maintained upon three several Grounds, which are so many false Hypotheses of the Intellectual System of the Universe. 2. Concerning the Mathematical or Astrallogical Fate. 3. Concerning the Opinion of those who suppose a Fate superior to the Highest Deity. 4. The Moderation of this Discourse. 5. The Atheistical Hypothesis or Democritical Fate, being founded upon the Atomalical Physiology; the necessity of giving an Account of it, and that first briefly described. 6. The Antiquity of this Physiology, and the account which is given of it by Aristotle. 7. A clear and full record of the same Physiology in Plato that hath not been taken notice of. 8. That neither Democritus, nor Leucippus, nor Protagoras, nor any Atheists were the first Inventours of this Philosophy; and of the Necessity of being thoroughly acquainted with it, in order to the confutation of Atheism. 9. The Tradition of Ptolemonius the Stoick, that Moschus an ancient Phenician was the first Inventour of the Atomalical Physiology. 10. That this Moschus the Inventour of the Atomalical Physiology was probably the same with Mochus the Physiologer in Jamblichus, with whose Successours, Priests and Prophets, Pythagoras convers'd at Sidon. 11. Other Probabilities for this, that Pythagoras was acquainted with the Atomalical Physiology. 12. That Pythagoras his Monads were Atoms. 13. Proved plainly that Empedocles, who was a Pythagorean, Physiologized Atomalically. 14. The same further convinced from Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch & Stobæus. 15. That Anaxagoras was a spurious Atomist, or unskilful Imitator of that Philosophy. 16. That Ecphantus the Pythagorean, Zenoocrates, Heraclides, Diidorus and Metrodorus Chius were all ancient Asserters of the Atomalical Physiology; together with Aristotle's Testimony that the ancient Physiologers generally went that way. 17. How Aristotle is to be reconciled with himself, and the credit of other Writers to be salved, who
impute this Philosophy to Leucippus and Democritus; That they were the first Atheizers of it, or the Founders of that Philosophy which is
Atheistically Atomical. 18. That the Atomists before Democritus
were Asserters of a Deity and Substance Incorporeal. 19. A confu-
tation of those Neotericks, who deny that Incorporeal Substance was
ever affected by any of the Ancients, and the Antiquity of that Do-
trine proved from Plato, who himself professedly maintained it.
20. That Aristotle likewise asserted Incorporeal Substance. 21. That
Epicurus endeavoured to confute this Opinion, as that which Plato
and others of the Ancients had maintained. 22. That all those
Philosophers who held the Immortality of the Soul and a Deity distinct
from the World, held Incorporeal Substance, and that besides Thales,
Pythagoras was a grand Champion for the same, who also asserted a
Divine Triad. 23. Parmenides an Asserter of Incorporeal Substance,
together with all those who maintained that all things did not flow, but
something stand. 24. Empedocles vindicated from being either
an Atheist or Corporealists at large. 25. Anaxagoras a plain Asserter
of Incorporeal Substance. 26. Inferred that the Ancient Atomists
before Democritus were both Theists and Incorporealists. 27. That
there is not only no Inconsistency between Atomology and Theology,
but also a Natural Cognition, proved from the Origine of the Atomi-
cal Physiolog, and first a general account thereof. 28. A more par-
ticular account of the Origine of this Philosophy from that Principle
of Reason, That in Nature, Nothing comes from Nothing, nor goes to
Nothing. 29. That the same Principle which made the Ancients
discard Substantial Forms and Qualities, made them also to assert In-
corporeal Substance. 30. That from the same Ground of Reason also
they asserted the Immortality of Souls. 31. That the Doctrine of
Preexistence and Transmigration ofSouls had its original from hence
also. 32. That the Ancients did not confine this to Humane Souls
only, but extend it to all Souls and Lives whatsoever. 33. All this
proved from Empedocles, who asserted the Preexistence as well as the
Postexistence of all Souls upon that Ground. 34. A Censure of this
Doctrine, that the Reason of it is irrepealable for the Post-Eternity of
all Humane Souls, and that the Hypothesis of the Creation of Humane
Souls, which saves their Immortality without Preexistence, is Rational.
35. A new Hypothesis to solve the Incorruptibility of the Souls of Brutes
without their Postexistence and successive Transmigrations. 36. That
this will not prejudice the Immortality of Humane Souls. 37. That
the Empedoclean Hypothesis is more Rational than the Opinion of
those that would make the Souls of Brutes Corporeal. 38. That the
Constitution of the Atomical Physiolog is such, that whoever enters
it, and thoroughly understands it, must needs hold Incorpore-
real Substance, in fine Particulars. 39. Two general Advantages of
the Atomical or Mechanical Physiolog, first that it renders the Corpo-
real World intelligible. 40. The second Advantage of it, that it
prepares an easy and clear way for the Demonstration of Incorporeal
Substance. 41. Concluded, That the ancient Moschical Philosophy
consisted of two Parts, Atomical Physiolog, and Theology or Nemato-
ology. 42. That this entire Philosophy was afterwards mangled and
dismembered, some taking one part of it alone, and some the other.

43. That
HE Y that hold the Necessary of all humane Actions and Events, do it upon one or other of these two Grounds; Either because they suppose that Necessity is inwardly essential to all Agents whatsoever, and that Contingent Liberty is impossible or Contradictory, which can have no Existence any where in Nature; The fence of which was thus expressed by the Epicurean Poet,

—Quid res quaeque Necessum
Intestinum habeat cunctis in rebus agendis, &c.

That every thing Naturally labours under an Intensive Necessity: Or else, because though they admit Contingent Liberty not only as a thing Possible, but also as that which is actually Existent in the Deity, yet they conceive all things to be so determin’d by the Will and Decrees of this Deity, as that they are thereby made Necessary to us. The former of these two Opinions, that Contingent Liberty is possible, such a Thing as can have no Existence in Nature, may be maintained upon two different Grounds; Either from such an Hypothesis as this, That the Universe is nothing else but Body, and Local motion, and Nothing moving it self, the Action of every Agent is determined by some other Agent without it; and therefore that

Plotinus makes another Distribution of Fatalists, which yet in the Conclusion will come to the same with the Former, Ωθέων ἐν τὶς Ἀκόλουθος τοστὶς ἑν ἐν τῇ Ἀναμνήσε ἐπωθεσθαιν, ὅπερ ἔσται ἐν εἰση τῆς πάντως Ἀναφέρεσιν. Σοὶ ἐν εἴτω Α man (saith he) will not do amiss that will divide all Fatalists first into these two General Heads, namely, That they derive all things from One Principle, or Not; The former of which, may be called Divine Fatalists, the latter Atheistical. Which Divine Fatalists he again subdivides into such as First make God by Immediate Influence to do all things in us; as in Animals the Members are not determined by themselves, but by that which is the Hegemonick in every one: And Secondly, such as make Fate to be an Implexed Series or Concatenation of Causes, all in themselves Necessary, whereof God is the chief. The Former seems to be a Description of that
very Fate that is maintained by some Neoterick Christians; the latter is the Fate of the Stoicks.

Wherefore Fatalists that hold the Necessity of all Humane Actions and Events may be reduced to these Three Heads; First, such as ascribing the Deity, suppose it irrespectively to Decree and Determine all things, and thereby make all Actions necessary to us; Which kind of Fate, though Philosophers and other ancient Writers have not been altogether silent of it, yet it has been principally maintained by some Neoterick Christians, contrary to the Scope of the Ancient Church. Secondly, such as suppose a Deity, that acting Wifely, but Necessarily, did contrive the General Frame of things in the World; from whence by a Series of Causes doth unavoidably resuit whatsoever is now done in it. Which Fate is a Concatenation of Causes, all in themselves Necessary, and is that which was ascribed by the Ancient Stoicks Zeno and Chrysippus, whom the Jewifh Eftes seen seemed to follow. And Lastly, such as hold the Material Necessity of all things without a Deity; which Fate Epicurus calls τὴν τοῦ φυσικοῦ εἰκονομῆν, The Fate of the Naturalists, that is, indeed, the Atheists, the Assertors whereof may be called also the Democritical Fatalists. Which three Opinions concerning Fate, are so many several Hypotheses of the Intellectual System of the Universe. All which we shall here propose, endeavouring to shew the Falseness of them, and then substitute the true Mundane System in the Room of them.

II. The Mathematical or Astrological Fate so much talked of, as it is a thing no way considerable for the Grounds of it, so whatsoever it be, it must needs fall under one or other of those two General Heads in the Plotinical Distribution last mentioned, so as either to derive all things from one Principle, or Not. It seems to have had its first Emerion amongst the Chaldeans, from a certain kind of blind Polytheism (which is but a better sort of diguiled Atheism) but it was afterwards Adopted and fondly nurtured by the Stoicks in a way of Subordination to their Divine Fate. For Manlius, Firmicus and other Masters of that Sect were great Promoters of it. And there was too much attributed to Astrology also, by those that were no Fatalists, both Heathen and Christian Philosophers, such as were Plotinus, Origen, Simplicius and others: Who though they did not make the Stars to necessitate all Humane Actions here below, yet they suppos’d that Divine Providence (fore-knowing all things) had contrived such a strange Coincidence of the Motions and Configurations of the Heavenly Bodies with such Actions here upon Earth, as that the former might be Prognosticks of the latter. Thus Origen determines that the Stars do not Make but Signifie; and that the Heavens are a kind of Divine Volume, in which Characters they that are skilled, may read or spell out Humane Events. To the fame purpose Plotinus, ἐγκαθέσθω μὴ τῶντα κατ’ ἐνατοθεία ἀστερόστημα ἀστεροστήματα πολλά, so ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ ἀστεροστήματος ἀστεροστήματος ὁ θεὸς πολλά ἄστερα πολλά πολλά ἐστιν ἀστεροστήματα, ἂν πολλά ἀστεροστήματα πολλά ἄστερα πολλά ἄστερα, ἂν πολλά πολλά ἄστερα ἄστερα πολλά πολλά ἄστερα. The Motion of the Stars was intended for the Physical Good of the
the whole, but they afford also another Use collaterally in order to Prognostication, namely, that they who are skilled in the Grammar of the Heavens may be able from the several Configurations of the Stars, as it were, to spell out future Events, by making such Analogical Interpretations as they use to do in Angury: As when a Bird flies high, to interpret this of some High and Noble Exploit. And Simplicius in like manner, οὐκεκαλυμμένοις τῶν ἁρματῶν τῷ συμβεβεβαίωσεν οὐκ ἂν ἐφεξῆς τινα ἐφεξής, εἰς τὸν οὐκοῦν τὸν ἐμπροσθενμένον διὰ τὴν χειραύνην τῆς τάσεως, οὐκεκαλυμμένοις τῶν ἁρματῶν τφεξῆς τινα ἐφεξής. The Fatal Conversion of the Heavens is made to correspond with the Production of Souls into Generation at such and such times, not Necessitating them to will this or that, but conspiring agreeably with such Appetites and Volitions of theirs. And these Philosophers were the rather inclined to this Perswasion from a Superstitious Conceit which they had, that the Stars being animated, were Intellectual Beings of a far higher Rank than Men. And since God did not make them, nor any thing else in the World, singly for themselves alone, but also to contribute to the Publick Good of the Universe, their Physical Influence seeming inconsiderable, they knew not well what else could be worthy of them, unless it was to portend Humane Events. This indeed is the best Sence that can be made of Astrological Prognostication; But it is a busines that stands upon a very weak and tottering, if not Impossible Foundation.

III. There is another Wild and Extravagant Conceit which some of the Pagans had, who thought they Verbally acknowledged a Deity, yet suppos'd a certain Fate superiour to it, and not only to all their other Petty Gods, but also to Jupiter himself. To which purpose is that of the Greek Poet, Latin'd by Cicero, Quod fore paratum est id summum exuperat Jovem; and that of Herodotus, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνεπορεύουσαν ψυχὴν τοῖς θεοῖς. It is impossible for God himself to avoid the destin'd Fate; and θεοὶ θεοῖσιν κατείπει, God himself is a Servant of Necessity. According to which Conceit, Jupiter in Homer laments his Condition, in that the Fates having determined that his beloved Sarpedon should be slain by the Son of Menctius, he was not able to withstand it. Though all these Passages may not perhaps imply much more than what the Stoical Hypothesis itself import'd; for that did also in some sense make God himself a Servant to the Necessity of the Matter, and to his own Decrees, in that he could not have made the smallest thing in the World otherwise than now it is, much less was able to alter any thing. According to that of Seneca, Eadem Necessitas & Deos alligat. Irrevocabilis Divina pariter atque Humana cursum vehit. Ide tæs omnium Conditoris & Reftor seripit quidem Fata sed sequitur. Semper pariet semel jusstit. One and the same Chain of Necessity ties God and Men. The same irreconcilable and unalterable Course carries on Divine and Humane things. The very Maker and Governor of all things that writ the Fates follows them. He did but once command but be always obeys. But if there were this further meaning in the Passages before cited, that a Necessity without God, that was invincible by him, did determine his Will to all things; this was nothing but a certain Confused and Contradictory Jumble of Atheifm and Theifm both together; or an odd kind of Intimation, that however
The Name of God be used in compliance with Vulgar Speech and Opinion, yet indeed it signifies nothing, but Material Necessity; and the blind Motion of Matter is really the Highest Numen in the World. And here that of Balbus the Stoick in Cicero is opportune: Non est Natura Dei Præpotens & Excellens, sicutem ea subiecta est ei vel Necessitati vel Nature quâ Calum, Maria, Terraque reguntur. Nihil autem est praestantius Deo. Nulliigitur est Nature obedient aut subiectus Deus. God would not be the most Powerful and Excellent Being, if he were subject to that either Necessity or Nature, by which the Heavens, Seas and Earth are governed. But the Notion of a God implies the most Excellent Being. Therefore God is not Obedient or Subject to any Nature.

IV. And now we think fit here to suggest, that however we shall oppose those three Fatalisms before mentioned, as so many false Hypotheses of the Mundane System and Oeconomy, and endeavour to exclude that severe Tyrannies (as Epicurus calls it) of Universal Necessity reigning over all, and to leave some Scope for Contingent Liberty to move up and down in, without which neither Rational Creatures can be blame worthy for any thing they do, nor God have any Object to display his Justice upon, nor indeed be justified in his Providence; Yet, as we vindicate to God the glory of all Good, so we do not quite banish the Notion of Fate neither, nor take away all Necessity; which is a thing the Clazomenian Philosopher of old was taxed for; Affirming, ἂν δὲ τὸν πνεύματος γίνεται καθ' ἐμαμέλειαν, ἀλλὰ ἐὰν κενὸν τῶν τένων Ἐκείνοις. That Nothing at all was done by Fate, but that it was altogether a vain Name. And the Sadduceans among the Jews have been noted for the same: Τὸν μὲν ἐκαρδήλων ἀναμικαὶ δὲν ἐνὶ ταύτῳ ἀξιότητι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἀνάπτυξις τῆς λαμπράντας ἁπαντάς ἐστὶν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς πιθανές. They take away all Fate, and will not allow it to be any thing at all, nor to have any Power over Humane Things, but put all things entirely into the hands of Mens own Free-Will. And some of our own, seem to have approached too near to this Extreme, attributing, perhaps, more to the Power of Free-Will, than either Religion or Nature will admit. But the Hypothesis that we shall recommend, as most agreeable to Truth, of a Placable Providence, of a Deity Essentially Good, prefiding over all, will avoid all Extremes, affording to God the Glory of Good, and freeing him from the Blame of Evil; and leaving a certain proportionate Contemplation and Commixture of Contingency and Necessity both together in the World: As Nature requires a mixture of Motion and Rest, without either of which there could be no Generation. Which Temper was observed by several of the Ancients; as the Pharisaick Sect amongst the Jews who determined πάντα γ' εἰς ἑαυτόν ἐκαρδήλως ἐναὶ ἐν γ' τινα ἐπὶ τινὰ ἐμαμέλειαν, That some things and not all were the Effects of Fate, but some things were left in Mens own Power and Liberty. And also by Plato amongst the Philosophers, πάντων τις ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἐκαρδήλως ἐν τῷ ἐνθέωροις ἔτι γ' ἐναὶ λειτουργίας ἐναὶ ἑαυτὸς κοινωνεῖας ἐν γ', τιν' παρ' ἑαυτ' ἐμαμέλειαν. Plato infers something of Fate into Humane Lives and Actions, and he joyes with it Liberty of Will also. He doth indeed suppose Humane Souls to have within themselves the Causes of their own Changes to a Better or Worse State, & every where declares God
Chap. I. The Atheistical or Decorical Fate.

God to be blameless for their Evils, and yet he somewhere makes the three Fatal Sires notwithstanding, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos, to be but in about them also. For according to the fence of the Ancients, Fate is a Servant of Divine Providence in the World, and takes place differently upon the different Actings of Free-willed Beings: And how Free a thing soever the Will of Man may seem to be, some, yet I conceive it to be out of Question, that it may contrast upon it Self such Necessities and Fatalities, as it cannot upon a sudden rid it Self of at pleasure. But whatsoever is said in the Sequel of this Discourse by way of Opposition to that Fatalism of the Neoterick Christians, is intended only to vindicate what was the constant Doctrine of the Christian Church in its greatest purity, (as shall be made manifest) and not to introduce any New-fangled conceit of own.

V. We must now proceed to give a more full and perfect account of these three several Fates, or Hypotheses of the Mundane System before mentioned, together with the Grounds of them, beginning first with that which we Principally intend the Confutation of, the Atheistical or Decorical Fate. Which as it is a thing of the most dangerous Consequence of all, so it seems to be most spreading and infectious in these latter times.

Now this Atheistical System of the World that makes all things to be Materially and Mechanically Necessary, without a God, is built upon a peculiar Phyiological Hypothesis, different from what hath been generally received for many Ages; which is called by some Atomical or Corporeal, by others Mechanical: of which we must therefore needs give a full and Perfect Account. And we shall do it first in General, briefly, not descendin to those minute Particularities of it, which are disputed amongst these Atomists themselves, in this manner.

The Atomical Physiolog supposes that Body is nothing else but that is, Extended Bulk, and resolves therefore that nothing is to be attributed to it, but what is included in the Nature and Idea of it, viz. more or less Magnitude with Divisibility into Parts, Figure, and Position, together with Motion or Rest, but so as that no part of Body can ever Move it Self; but is always moved by something else. And consequently it supposes that there is no need of anything else besides these simple Elements of Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion (which are all clearly intelligible as different Modes of extended Substance) to save the Corporeal Phenomena by; and therefore, not of any Substantial Forms distinct from the Matter; nor of any other Qualities really existing in the Bodies without, besides the Results, or Aggregates of those simple Elements, and the Disposition of the Ineffible Parts of Bodies in respect of Figure, Site and Motion; nor of any Intentional Species or Senses, propagated from the Objects to our Senses; nor, lastly, of any other kind of Motion or Action really distinct from Local Motion (such as Generation and Alteration) they being neither Intelligible, as Modes of extended Substance, nor any ways necessary. Forasmuch as the Forms and Qualities
Qualities of Bodies may well be conceived, to be nothing but the Result of those simple Elements of Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion, variously compounded together; in the same manner as Symbols and Words in great variety result from the different Combinations and Conjunctions of a few Letters, or the simple Elements of Speech; and the Corporeal Part of Sensation, and particularly that of Vision, may be salved only by Local Motion of Bodies, that is, either by Corporeal Effluvia (called Simulachra, Membranes, and Exuviae) streaming continually from the Surface of the Objects, or rather, as the later and more refined Atomists conceived, by Prefuure made from the Object to the Eye, by means of Light in the Medium. So that as the body of the Sea, the Air, the Fire, the Water, and the Earth at all times is, either by whole or by small pieces, or by the whole and by small pieces, by the unsubstantial and by the substantial, or by the visible and by the invisible, so, and to the same purpose, in the Sun as well as in the Earth, in the fixed and in the Mobile, in all the Planets, and in all the Stars, are always generated the same four Elements of which the World is made; viz. Fire, Earth, Water, and Air, and these Elements are to each other as much as the parts of Countries to each other.

Again, Generation and Corruption may be sufficiently explained by Concretion and Secretion, or Local Motion, without Substantial Forms and Qualities. And lastly, those sensible Ideas of Light and Colours, Heat and Cold, Sweet and Bitter, as they are distinct things from the Figure, Site and Motion of the insensible Parts of Bodies, seem plainly to be nothing else but our own Phantasies, Passions and Sensations however be vulgarly mistaken for Qualities in the Bodies without us.

V I. Thus much may suffice for a General Accompct of the Atomical Phyiology. We shall in the next Place consider the Antiquity thereof, as also what notice Aristotile hath taken of it, and what Account he gives of the same. For though Epicurus went altogether this way, yet it is well known that he was not the first Inventor of it. But it is most commonly fathered on Democritus, who was Senior both to Aristotile and Plato, being reported to have been born the year after Socrates; from whose Fountains Cicero faith that Epicurus watered his Orchards, and of whom Sex. Empiricus and Laertius testify that he did χρεστάνει πασι ποιήσεις, καθ'ήκασι και πληθυσις, that he made the first Principles of the whole Universe αὐτοίς αἱμίνας, αἱμίνας, Ατομας devid of all Qualities and Passions. But Laertius will have Leucippus, who was somewhat Senior to Democritus, to be the first Inventor of this Philosophy, though he wrote not so many Books concerning it as Democritus did. Aristotile who often takes notice of this Philosophy, and ascribes it commonly to Leucippus and Democritus jointly, gives us this description of it in his Metaphysics: οὕτως ἀνδρότητος τοῖς αὐτοῖς αἰσθήματα μέτοχος χάρις τοῖς πάγεις καὶ τοῖς ἁρμονίς φαντασμα μεταφερέται σέ πλεον τοῖς μεταφερέται σέ πλεον, καὶ τοῖς αἰσθήματα μεταφερέται σέ πλεον τοῖς ἁρμονίς χάρις τοῖς αἰσθήματα μεταφερέται σέ πλεον. Leucippus and his Companion Democritus make the first Principles of all things to be Plenum and Vacuum (Body and Space) whereof one is Ens the other Non-ens, and the differences of Body, which are only Figure, Order and Position, to be the Causes of all other things. Which Differences they call by these Names Rhythm, Diaphagite and Trope. And in his Book De Anima, having declared that Democritus made Fire and the Soul to consist of Round Atoms, he describes those
those Atoms of his after this manner, δοὺς εἴ τις "δὲ τοῖς καλὸν ὥσυν σύμμετρα ὕποτεινα ἑπάλλοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς πράξεως σκέπασμα Ἀντιπροφέρεται Ἀντιλημβάνει ἑπάλλοις. They are (as he) like those Ramenata or dusty Particles which appear in the Sun-Beams, an Omnifarious Schola of that which Democritus makes to be the first Elements of the whole Universe, and doth Leucippus likewise. Elsewhere the same Aristotle tells us, that these two Philosophers explained Generation and Alteration without Forms and Qualities by Figures and Local Motion. Σαρκωμένων ὡς ἂν Λάβεσθαι τῷ ἀλλοτριῷ αὐτῷ τῷ τῆς σάρκος εἰς τόπην ποιεῖται, διόκεισαν μὲν ὡς καὶ συνελήσαν οὕτων ἄλλον, τοίχου δὲ τῇ Ἀπώλεσι Democritus and Leucippus having made Figures, (or variously figured Atoms) the first Principles, make Generation and Alteration out of these; namely Generation together with Corruption, from the Concretion and Secretion of them, but Alteration from the change of their Order and Position. Again he elsewhere takes notice of that Opinion of the Atomists, that all Sense was a kind of Touch, and that the Sensible Qualities of Bodies were to be resolved into Figures, imputing it not only to Democritus, but also to the Generality of the old Philosophers, but very much disliking the same: δοὺς οἵον χρησιμολογόν ἀπαρατατὸν πεῖρας, πάλιν γὰρ τῇ ἀλήθεια ἀπόκτησε. ποιεῖται καὶ ὡς λοιπα. ἀναγεγραμμένως Δημοκρίτου and most of the Physiologists here commit a very great Absurdity, in that they make all Sense to be Touch, and resolve sensible Qualities into the Figures of insensible Parts or Atoms. And this Opinion he endeavours to confute by these Arguments. First, because there is Contrariety in Qualities, as in Black and White, Cold and Hot, and in the other Qualities, but there is no Contrariety in Figures; for a Circular Figure is not Contrary to a Square or Multangular, and therefore there must be Real Qualities in Bodies distinct from the Figure, Site and Motion of Parts. Again, the variety of Figures and Dispositions being Infinite, it would follow from thence, that the Species of Colours, Odours, and Tastes should be Infinite likewise, and Reducible to no certain Number. Which Arguments I leave the Professioned Atomists to answer. Furthermore Aristotle somewhere also cenures that other Fundamental Principle of this Atomical Physiology, That the sensible Ideas of Colours and Tastes, as Red, Green, Bitter and Sweet, formally considered, are only Passions and Phantasies in us, and not real Qualities in the Object without. For as in a Rainbow there is really nothing without our sight, but a Rorid Cloud diversely refracting and reflecting the Sun-Beams, in such an Angle, nor are there really such Qualities in the Diaphanous Prisme, when refracting the Light, it exhibits to us the same Colours of the Rainbow: whence it was collected, that those things are properly the Phantasms of the Sentient, occasioned by different Motions on the Optick Nerves: So they conceived the Sun to be the same in all other Colours, and that both the Qualities of the Prisme and Rainbow were as real as other Colours, and all other Qualities as Phantastical as they were: And then by parity of Reason they extended the business further to the other Sensibles. But this Opinion Aristotle condemns in these words, οἱ περὶ τῶν φυσικῶν πρὶν τὸν τὰς καλὰς ἐλέγον ὁμοίως οὕτως ἐν ἑπτὰν ἐν τῇ μεθανίαν ἐν τῷ σαρκωμένῳ ἐν τῷ γαστρῷ. The former Physiologists were generally out in this, that they
they thought there was no Black, or White without the Sight, nor no Bitter or Sweet without the Taste. There are other Passages in Aristotle concerning this Philosophy, which I think superfluous to insert here; and I shall have occasion to cite some of them afterward for other Purposes.

VII. But in the next place it will not be amiss to shew that Plato also hath left a very full Record of this Mechanical or Atomical Physiology (that hath hardly been yet taken notice of) which notwithstanding he doth not impute either to Democritus (whose name Lactins thinks he purposely declined to mention throughout all his Writings) or to Leucippus, but to Protagoras. Wherefore in his Theaeetus, having first declared in general that the Protagorean Philosophy made all things to consist of a Commixture of Parts (or Atoms) and Local Motion, he represents it, in Particular concerning Colours, after this manner.

V. But Black and White and every other Colour, is caused by different Motions made upon the Eye from Objects differently modified: so that it is nothing either in the Agent nor the Patient absolutely, but something which arises from between them both. Where it follows immediately, υσ ὑμὶς ἄνευ ἐν ἰ ὕμις ὅ ἤς φαθεται ἐκάναι φαιήμα καίγιμαν, έν ὑπήν οὐκαν εἶναι φαιήμα ὁπήν ὅ ἤς ποτέ ἀναφερται πρὸς τὸ προςαίσθαλον ὅπερ τὸ προςαίσθαλον ὅπερ μεταξύ τοῦ ἐνοίκου ἐνοίκος. First as to that which belongs to the Sight, you must conceive that which is called a White or a Black Colour not to be any thing absolutely existing either without your Eyes or within your Eyes; but Black and White and every other Colour, is caused by different Motions made upon the Eye from Objects differently modified: so that it is nothing either in the Agent nor the Patient absolutely, but something which arises from between them both. Where it follows immediately, υσ ὑμὶς ἄνευ ἐν ἰ ὕμις ὅ ἤς φαθεται ἐκάναι φαιήμα καίγιμαν, έν ὑπήν οὐκαν εἶναι φαιήμα ὁπήν οὐκαν εἶναι φαιήμα. Can you or any man else be Confident, that as every Colour appears to him, so it appears just the same to every other Man and Animal, any more than Tastes and Touches, Heat and Cold do? From whence it is plain that Protagoras made Sensible Qualities, not to be all absolutes things existing in the Bodies without, but to be Relative to us, and Passions in us: and so they are called presently after τίνα ἢ ἀρίστη μάρασμα, certain Phanimes, Seemings, or Appearances in us. But there is another Passage in which a fuller Account is given of the whole Protagorean Doctrine, beginning thus: Άρεστ ἤ ἐπὶ τίνα ὑπὸ ἀναφέρειν. τοῦ ἐνοίκου, οἶκος τοῦ καθὼς ὕμις ἄρης ἢ ἀρίστη φαιήμα. Can you or any man else be Confident, that as every Colour appears to him, so it appears just the same to every other Man and Animal, any more than Tastes and Touches, Heat and Cold do? From whence it is plain that Protagoras made Sensible Qualities, not to be all absolutes things existing in the Bodies without, but to be Relative to us, and Passions in us: and so they are called presently after τίνα ἢ ἀρίστη μάρασμα, certain Phanimes, Seemings, or Appearances in us. But there is another Passage in which a fuller Account is given of the whole Protagorean Doctrine, beginning thus: Άρεστ ἤ ἐπὶ τίνα ὑπὸ ἀναφέρειν. τοῦ ἐνοίκου, οἶκος τοῦ καθὼς ὕμις ἄρης ἢ ἀρίστη φαιήμα. Can you or any man else be Confident, that as every Colour appears to him, so it appears just the same to every other Man and Animal, any more than Tastes and Touches, Heat and Cold do? From whence it is plain that Protagoras made Sensible Qualities, not to be all absolutes things existing in the Bodies without, but to be Relative to us, and Passions in us: and so they are called presently after τίνα ἢ ἀρίστη μάρασμα, certain Phanimes, Seemings, or Appearances in us. But there is another Passage in which a fuller Account is given of the whole Protagorean Doctrine, beginning thus: Άρεστ ἤ ἐπὶ τίνα ὑπὸ ἀναφέρειν. τοῦ ἐνοίκου, οἶκος τοῦ καθὼς ὕμις ἄρης ἢ ἀρίστη φαιήμα.
proportionate object meet together, both the αἰσθήσις and the αἴσθησις, the sensible idea of white and black, and the sense of seeing are generated together, neither of which would have been produced if either of those two had not met with the other. Καὶ τὸ ἀλάκτος ἐπὶ ἴμαρπεσιν ἐκ τῆς ἀἴσθησις 
καὶ τό τι τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀμφίς καὶ πάλιν ἠτίνοις. The like is to be conceived of all other sensible things, as Hot and Cold, etc. that none of these are absolute things in themselves, or real qualities in the object without, but they are begotten from the mutual congress of agent and patient with one another, and that by motion: so that neither the agent has any such thing in it before its congress with the patient, nor the patient before its congress with the agent. Εἰς τοῖς ἀνακριβεῖς τὸν ισχὺς καὶ τό τι τῶν ἀλλῶν 
καὶ τό τι τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀμφίς καὶ πάλιν ἠτίνοις. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔννοια αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπὸς καὶ 
τὸν ὁδίκεν ἔννοια τῷ ἁλλοτε. But the agent and patient meeting together, and begetting sensation and sensible, both the object and the sentient are forsooth made to be so and so qualified, as when honey is tasted, the sense of tasting and the quality of sweetness are begotten both together, though the sense be vulgarly attributed to the taster and the quality of sweetness to the honey. The conclusion of all which is summed up thus ὁδίκεν ἔν

VIII. We have now learnt from Plato, that Democritus and Leucippus were not the sole Proprietaries in this philosophy, but that Protagoras, though not vulgarly taken notice of for any such thing (being commonly represented as a Sophost only) was a forerunner in it likewise: which Protagoras indeed Laertius and others affirm to have been an auditor of Democritus 3 and so he might be, notwithstanding what Plutarch tells us, that Democritus wrote against his taking a-
way the Absolute Natures of things. However we are of Opinion that neither Democritus, nor Protagoras, nor Leucippus was the first Inventor of this Philosophy; and our reason is, because they were all three of them Atheists (though Protagoras alone was banished for that Crime by the Athenians) and we cannot think that any Atheists could be the Inventors of it, much less that it was the Genuine Spawn and Brood of Atheism itself, as some conceive, because however these Atheists adopted it to themselves, endeavouring to serve their turns of it, yet if rightly understood, it is the most effectual Engine against Atheism that can be. And we shall make it appear afterwards, that never any of those Atheists, whether Ancient or Modern (how great Pretenders forever to it) did thoroughly understand it, but perpetually contradicted themselves in it. And this is the Reason why we insist so much upon this Philosophy here, not only because without the perfect knowledge of it, we cannot deal with the Atheists at their own Weapon; but also because we doubt not but to make a Sovereign Antidote against Atheism, out of that very Philosophy, which so many have used as a Vehiculum to convey this Poyfon of Atheism by.

IX. But besides Reason, we have also good Historical probability for this Opinion, that this Philosophy was a thing of much greater Antiquity than either Democritus or Leucippus: and first, because Ptolemy, an Ancient and Learned Philosopher, did (as both Empiricus and Strabo tell us) avouch it for an old Tradition, that the first Inventor of this Atomical Philosophy was one Moses a Phenician, who, as Strabo also notes, lived before the Trojan Wars.

X. Moreover it seems not altogether Improbable, but that this Moses a Phenician Philosopher, mentioned by Ptolemy, might be the same with that Moehus a Phenician Phylologer in Jamblicbus, with whose Successors, Priests and Prophets, he affirms that Pythagoras, sometimes sojourning at Sidon (which was his native City) had conversed: Which may be taken for an Intimation, as if he had been by them instructed in that Atomical Physiology which Moses or Moehus the Phenician is said to have been the Inventor of. Moses or Moehus is plainly a Phenician Name, and there is one Moehus a Phenician Writer cited in Athenaeus, whom the Latin Translator calls Moehus; and Mr. Selden approves of the Conjecture of Arceius, the Publisher of Jamblicbus, that this Moehus was no other than the Celebrated Moses of the Jews, with whose Successors the Jewish Philosophers, Priests and Prophets, Pythagoras conversed at Sidon. Some Plataick Atomists perhaps would here catch at this, to make their Philosophy to stand by Divine Right, as owing its Original to Revelation, whereas Philosophy being not a Matter of Faith but Reason, Men ought not to affect (as I conceive) to derive its Pedigree from Revelation, and by that very pretence seek to impose it Tyrannically upon the minds of Men, which God hath here purposely left Free to the use of their own Faculties, that so finding out Truth by them, they might enjoy that Pleasure and Satisfaction.
Satisfaction which arises from thence. But we aim here at nothing more, than a Confirmation of this Truth, That the Atomi- cal Philosophy was both older than Democritus, and had no such Atheistical Original neither. And there wants not other Good Authority for this, That Pythagoras did borrow many things from the Jews, and translate them into his Philosophy.

XI. But there are yet other Considerable Probabilities for this, that Pythagoras was not unacquainted with the Atomi- cal Philosophy. And first from Democritus himself, who as he was of the Stobcean, or Pythagorick Succession; so it is recorded of him in Laertius, that he was a great Emulator of the Pythagoreans, and seemed to have taken all his Philosophy from them: Infomuch that if Chronology had not contradicted it, it would have been concluded, that he had been an Auditor of Pythagoras himself; of whom he testified his great admiration in a Book entitled by his Name. Moreover some of his Opinions had a plain Correspondency with the Pythagorick Doctrines, forasmuch as Democritus did not only hold, Adonit àtâmu αν τογ δεικνύων, That the Atoms were carried round in a Vortex: but also together with Leucippus, τω γε αυειδου ας το μέσου διεξεχθα, That the Earth was carried about the Middle or Centre of this Vortex (which is the Sun) turning in the mean time round upon its own Axis; And just so the Pythagorick Opinion is expressed by Arisotle, τω γινεται πως οικτόν νεκρόν φασματοι απειρο αν το μέσου νόμο [unreliably transcribed], That the Earth, as one of the Stars (that is a Planet) being carried round about the Middle or Centre (which is Fire or the Sun) did in the mean time by its Circumvagination upon its own Axis make day and night. Wherefore it may be reasonably from hence concluded, that as Democritus his Philosophy was Pythagorical, so Pythagoras his Philosophy was likewise Democritical or Atomical.

XII. But that which is of more Moment yet: we have the Authority of Ecphantus a famous Pythagorean for this, that Pythagoras his Monads, so much talked of, were nothing else but Corporeal Atoms. Thus we find it in Stobcean, τοις πυθαγορευς μονας μονάδας ἐκ τοις περι γε ἀπαραίσιο σοματιδων, Ecphantus (who himself asserted the Doctrine of Atoms) first declared that the Pythagorick Monads were Corporeal, i.e. Atoms. And this is further confirmed from what Arisotle himself writes of these Pythagoreans and their Monads, τοις μονάδας ἐπικαλομένου αύτον μεγαλοι συμπεριλαμβάνεισαι τοις. They suppose their Monads to have Magnitude: And from that he elsewhere makes Monads and Atoms to signify the same things, ὡς το διαφέρει μονάδας λέγειν καὶ σωματία εμαξαι. Its all one to say Monads or small Corpuscula. And Gajfendus hath observed out of the Greek Epigrammatist, that Epicurus his Atoms were sometimes called Monads too;
XIII. But to pass from Pythagoras himself; That Empedocles, who was a Pythagorean also, did Physiologize Atomically, is a thing that could hardly be doubted of, though there were no more Proof for it than that one Passage of his in his Philosophick Poems;

Nature is nothing but the Mixture and Separation of things mingled; or thus, There is no production of anything anew, but only mixture and separation of things mingled. Which is not only to be understood of Animals, according to the Pythagorick Doctrine of the Tranmigration of Souls, but also, as himself expounds it, Universally of all Bodies, that their Generation and Corruption is nothing but Mixture and Separation; or as Aristotle expresses it, σύνθεσις καὶ διάθεσις, Concretion and Secretion of Parts, together with Change of Figure and Order. It may perhaps be objected, that Empedocles held four Elements, out of which he would have all other Bodies to be compounded; and that as Aristotle affirms, he made those Elements not to be transmutable into one another neither. To which we reply, that he did indeed make four Elements, as the first general Concretions of Atoms, and therein he did no more than Democritus himself, who, as Laertius writes, did from Atoms moving round in a Vortex πάντα συνέκμελάν̃α γεννάν τού πάντα ύπό τῆς γής, ἐν οἷς ἀνακαίνωμη ἀτόμων ποιεῖν καταλύουσιν. Generate all Concretions, Fire, Water, Air and Earth, these being Systems made out of certain Atoms. And Plato further confirms the same; for in his Book De Legibus he describes (as Hypotheses) that very Atheistical Hypothesis of Democritus, though without mentioning his Name, representing it in this Manner; That by the Fortuitous Motion of Sensible Matter were first made those four Elements, and then out of them afterward Sun, Moon, Stars and Earth. Now both Plutarch and Stobæus testify, that Empedocles compounded the four Elements themselves out of Atoms. Εμπεδόκλης δὲ καὶ μικρότερον ἑκάσταν στιχεῖον συνῆκεν αὐτῷ ἐπί τινι ἑλάχιστον, καὶ οἰονικὰ στιχεῖα στιχεῖαν. Empedocles makes the Elements to be compounded of other small Corpuscula, which are the least, and as it were the Elements of the Elements. And the same Stobæus again observes, ἐμπεδόκλης πέρι τῶν ποιόνων στιχεῶν δειμνομασμένα ἑλάχιστα. Empedocles makes the smallest Particles and Fragments of Body (that is, Atoms) to be before the four Elements. But whereas Aristotle affirms that Empedocles denied the Transmutation of those Elements into one another, that must needs be either a slip in him, or else a fault in our Copies; not only because Laertius, who was better versed in that Philosophy, and gives a particular Account of Empedocles his Doctrine (besides many others of the Ancients) affirms the quite contrary; but also because himself, in those Fragments of his still preferred, expressly acknowledges this Transmutation:
Besides all this, no less Author than Plato affirms, that according to Empedocles, Vision and other Sensations were made by ἀπορροή χρυσάτων, the Defluxions of Figures, or Effluvia of Atoms, (for fo Democritus his Atoms are called in Aristotlē χρυσὰ, because they were Bodies which had only Figure without Qualities) he supposing that some of those Figures or Particles corresponded with the Organs of one Sense, and some with the Organs of another. "Ουκέτα λέγει ἀπορροθέν πάσας τῷ οἴνων ἑπετειπχήλα, καὶ πόρος εἰς ες, καὶ ἄλλοι αἱ ἀπορροθέν πορολογία, καὶ ἔτι ἀπορροθέν τάς μὲν ἀρµόζεν ἔν τοι ἐξομολογεῖται πόροι, τάς ξέλαξεν ἡ μείζων ὑποίσταιν. For say then according to the Doctrine of Empedocles, that there are certain Corporeal Effluvia from Bodies of different Magnitudes and Figures, as also several Pores and Meatuses in us diversly Corresponding with them: So that some of those Corporeal Effluvia agree with some pores, when they are either too big or too little for others. By which it is evident, that Empedocles did not suppose Sensations to be made by intentional Species or Qualities; but as to the Generality, in the Atomical way; in which notwithstanding there are some differences among those Atomists themselves. But Empedocles went the same way here with Democritus, for Empedocles's ἀπορροή χρυσάτων, Defluxions of figured Bodies, are clearly the same thing with Democritus's ὑεῖα όνομα αὐτοῦ, Infinitions of Simulachra, or Exuvious Images of Bodies. And the same Plato adds further, that according to Empedocles, the Definition of Colour was this, ἀπορροθέν χρυσάτων ὑδάτων μετέχειν καὶ εὐδοκίαν, The Defluxion of Figures, or figured Corpuscula (without Qualities) Commensurate to the Sight and Sensible. Moreover, that Empedocles his Physiologous was the very same with that of Democritus, is manifest also from this Passage of Aristotlē, οἱ μὲν οὖν ἑπετειπχήλα καὶ δυνάμεις δόν λαμβάνοντας αὐτοί χωμάτοις, ἔχουσιν ες ἀληθῶν ποιέσεις, ἀλλὰ φαινομένων χρίστες ἐντεφάνεις ἡ ἑνωμενοίσι πάσης ἡ φανῆς ἀξίωσις, ἢ διὰ σῆμαστός ὡς ἡμέρας ἡμῖν πάντων ἡν. Empedocles and Democritus deceiving themselves, unaware destroy all Generation of Things out of one another, leaving a seeming Generation only: For they say that Generation is not the Production of any new Entity, but only the Seaition of what was before Inexistant; as when divers kinds of things confounded together in a Vessel, are separated from one another. Lastly, we shall confirm all this by the clear Testimony of Plutarch, or the Writer de Placitis Philosophorum: ἑπετειπχήλα καὶ ἐνυπάκουσι καὶ πάσης ὑπὸ χρυσάτων ὑπὸ λειψανοσииν κασάματον κασάματον, σύνεκεις μὲν καὶ διάκεις χώματος, χωμάτων ἡ καὶ φαινομένως ἡ κακομετάντως ἡ χρυσάτως, ὡς ὑπὸ πάντως ὑπὸ συνεκέσιαν τοιοῦτος γείναισθαι. Empedocles and Epicurus, and all those that compounded the World of small Atoms, introduce Concretions and Secretions, but no Generations or Corruptions properly so called; neither would they have those to be made according to Quality by Alteration, but only according to Quantity by Aggregation. And the same Writer sets down the Order and Method, of the Composition according to Empedocles, ἑπετειπχήλα καὶ μὲν οὖν τοῖς πρῶτοι διαλεγομέναι, εὕρεται ες τὸ οὖς.
Anaxagoras a Spurious Atomist. Book I.

X V. As for Anaxagoras, though he Philosophized by Atoms too, substituting Concretion and Secretion in the Room of Generation and Corruption, infilling upon the same Fundamental Principle that Empedocles, Democritus and the other Atomists did; which was (as we shall declare more fully afterward) That Nothing could be made out of Nothing, nor reduced to Nothing; and therefore that there were neither any new Productions nor Destructions of any Substances or Real Entities: Yet, as his Homecomer is represented by Aristotle, Lucretius and other Authors, that Bone was made of Bony Atoms, and Fleth of Flethy, Red things of Red Atoms, and Hot things of Hot Atoms; these Atoms being supposed to be ended originally with so many several Forms and Qualities Essential to them, and Inseparable from them, there was indeed a wide difference betwixt his Philosophy and the Atomical. However, this seems to have had its Rise from nothing else but this Philosophers not being able to understand the Atomical Hypothesis, which made him decline it, and substitute this Spurious and Counterfeit Atomism of his own in the room of it.

X VI. Lastly, I might add here, that it is recorded by Good Authors concerning divers other Ancient Philosophers, that were not addicted to Democriticism or Atheism, that they followed this Atomical way of Phylogizing, and therefore in all probability did deriveth from those Religious Atomists before Democritus. As for Example; Ephorus the Syracusian Pythagorist, who, as Stobæus writes, made Πασε άδιαντα εκ γάρ και το άνεν άδια νονες, Indivisible Bodies and Vacuum the Principles of Phylogize, and as Theodotus also testifies, taught οι δε άτομα σωματων & κιον, That the Corporeal World was made up of Atoms; Zenocrates that made μεγάλα αδιαντά, Indivisible Magnitudes the first Principles of Bodies; Heraclides that resolved all Corporeal things into άδια νονες & διαμορφωματων ομιλίων, certain smallest Fragments of Bodies; Aellepiades, who supposed all the Corporeal World to be made έις αδιαντα και ανενομων ομιλιων, not of Similar Parts (as Anaxagoras) but of Dissimilar and inconcinn Molecule, i. e. Atoms of different Magnitude and Figures; and Diodorus that
that salved the Material Phenomena by \( \Delta \mu \varepsilon \gamma \nu \tau \varepsilon \iota \lambda \chi \iota \chi \alpha \), the smallest Indivisibles of Body. And lastly, Metrodorus (not Lampsacus, but) Oblius, who is reported also to have made Indivisible Particles and Atoms the first Principles of Bodies. But what need we any more proof for this, that the Atomical Physiology was anc-
cienter than Democritus and Leucippus, and not confined only to that Sect, since Aristotele himself in the Paffages already cited doth expressly declare, that besides Democritus, the Generality of all the other Physiologists went that way; \( \Delta \mu \varepsilon \gamma \nu \tau \varepsilon \iota \lambda \chi \iota \chi \alpha \) and \( \varepsilon \nu \\beta \iota \alpha \mu \eta \gamma \varepsilon \). Democritus and the most of the Physiologists make all Sense to be Touch, and resolve sensible Qualities, as the Tastes of Bitter and Sweet, &c. into Figures. And again he imputes it generally to all the Physiologists that went before him, \( \alpha \iota \mu \varepsilon \iota \gamma \kappa \iota \varepsilon \sigma \nu \) (without any exception) said not well in this, that there was no Black and White without the Sight, nor Bitter and Sweet without the Taste. Wherefore, I think, it cannot be reasonably doubted, but that the Generality of the Old Physiologists before Aristotele and Democritus, did pursue the Atomical way, which is to resolve the Corporeal Phenomena, not into Forms, Qualities and Species, but into Figures, Motions and Phancies.

XVII. But then there will seem to be no small difficulty in re-
conciling Aristotele with himself, who doth in so many places plainly impute this Philosophy to Democritus and Leucippus, as the first Source and Original of it: As also in salving the Credit of Laeritus, and many other ancient Writers, who do the like: Democritus having had for many Ages almost the general cry and vogue for Atoms. However, we doubt not but to give a very good account of this Bifiness, and reconcile the seemingly different Testimonies of these Ancient Writers, so as to take away all Contradiction and Repug-
nancy between them. For although the Atomical Physiology was in use long before Democritus and Leucippus, so that they did not Make it but Find it; yet these two with their confederate Atheists (whereof Protagoras seems to have been one) were undoubtedly the first that ever made this Physiologyst be a complete and entire Phi-
losophy by its Self, so as to derive the Original of all things in the whole Universe from femail F atoms, that had nothing but Figure and Motion, together with Vacuum, and made up such a System of it, as from whence it would follow, that there could not be any God, not so much as a Corporeal one. These two things were both of them before singly and apart. For there is no doubt to be made, but that there hath been Atheism lurking in the minds of some or other in all Ages; and perhaps some of those Ancient Atheists did endeavour to Philosophize too, as well as they could, in some other way. And there was Atomical Physiology likewise before, without Atheism. But these two thus complicated together, were never before Atomical-Atheism or Atheistical Atomism. And there-
fore Democritus and his Comrade Leucippus need not be envied the glory of being reputed the first Inventors or Founders of the Atomical Philosophy Atheized and Adulterated.
X VIII. Before Leucippus and Democritus, the Doctrine of Atoms
was not made a whole entire Philosophy by it self, but look'd upon
only as a Part or Member of the whole Philosphick System, and
that the meanest and lowest part too; it being only used to ex-
plain that which was purely Corporal in the World; besides which
they acknowledged something else, which was not meer Bulk and
Mechanick, but Life and Self Activity, that is, Immaterial or Incor-
poral Substance; the Head and Summity whereof is a Deity dis-

tinct from the World. So that there has been two Sorts of Ato-

mists in the World, the One Atheistical, the Other Religious. The
first and most ancient Atomists holding Incorporeal Substance, used
that Phylogey in a way of Subordination to Theology and Met-

aphysics. The other allowing no other Substance but Body, made
fensible Atoms and Figures, without any Mind and Understanding
(i.e. without any God) to be the Original of all things; which
latter is that which was vulgarly known by the Name of Atomical
Philosophy, of which Democritus and Leucippus were the Source.

X IX. It hath been indeed of late confidently asserted by some,
that never any of the ancient Philosphers dream'd of any fuch
thing as Incorporeal Substance; and therefore they would bear
men in hand, that it was nothing but an upstart and new fangled
Invention of some Bigotical Religionists; the fallacy whereof we shall
here briefly make to appear. For though there have been doub-
les in all Ages such as have disbelieved the Existence of any thing
but what was Sensible, whom Plato describes after this manner;
'oí διατεθοντ' ἐν πάν ὁμ ὑπ διανοι ἡ κεφαλ συμψιλη ὡσιν, ὡς δείκνυτον τὸ ἀ神τόν ἢ. That would contend, that whatsoever they could not feel or
grasp with their hands, was altogether nothing; yet this Opinion
was professedly opposed by the best of the Ancient Philosphers
and condemned for a piece of Sottishness and Stupidity. Where-
fore the same Plato tells us, that there had been always, as well as
then there was, a perpetual War and Controversie in the World; and
as he calls it, a kind of Gigantomachy bewitx these two Parties
or Sects of men; The one that held there was no other Substance
in the World beides Body; The other that asserted Incorporeal
Substance. The former of these Parties or Sects is thus described by
the Philosopher; οἱ μὲν εἰς γῆν εἰς ἀρχήν καὶ τὸ ὁπέκτω πάντα ὑπάρχον ἄ
κεφαλ εδεκτην ἐπέεικα καὶ ὅσα σκαλαμακρονίσσαντες, ὥσος τὸν τοῦτον ἐρασθήκα\nπάθος, δημοκρινομένοι τὸν ἐκάνε μοιον ὁ παρέχει περισσοτέρων καὶ ἐπερχόμε\n
ναι, ταύταν τάσιμο καὶ ὅσα ἐρμητὰ εἰς ἐνόχον ἐπάνω τοῖς ὁιῖς ὁμιλοὺ τῷ ἐνόχοι

καθιστομένα τὸ παρεῖπον καὶ ἐρμητὰ ἔπιλεοτέρᾳ ἐννοεῖν ἄκοεν. These (fare he)
pull all things down from Heaven and the Invisible Region, with their
hands to the Earth, laying hold of Rocks and Oaks; and when they
grap all these hard and gros things, they confidently affirm, that that
only is Substance which they can feel, and will resist their Touch, and they
conclude, that Body and Substance are one and the self same thing; and
if anyone chance to speak to them of something which is not Body, i.e. of
Incorporeal Substance, they will altogether despeire him, and not
hear a word more from him. And many such the Philosopher there
says
CHAP. I. Incorporeal Substance asserted by the Ancients. 19

says he had met withal. The other he represents in this manner,

οἷς καὶ ἀλλήλων ἀμφιβολίαις μάλα. Εἰ δεινέτως δέναι ἢ δοκίματε τοῦτον ἀναγκαία λείψας νοῦς ἢ μὴν καὶ ἀκατάστατον, προχρήσασθε τινὶ ἀληθινῷ ἵναι εἰκὸς. οὐ μὴν γὰρ τούτων ἀμφιβολίων μάθης τὰς αἰτίας. The Adversaries of these Corporealists do cautiously and piously assault them from the Invisible Region, fetching all things from above by way of Descent, and by strength of Reason convincing, that certain Intelligible and Corporeal Forms are the true or First Substance, and not Sensible things. But between these two there hath always been (faith he) a great War and Contention. And yet in the Sequel of his Discourse he adds, that those Corporealists were then grown a little more modest and flame-faced than formerly their great Champions had been, such as Democritus and Protagoras; for however they still persisted in this, that the Soul was a Body, yet they had not (it seems) the Impudence to affirm, that Wisdom and Virtue were Corporeal Things, or Bodies, as others before and since too have done. We see here that Plato expressly affirms a Substance distinct from Body, which sometimes he calls οὐσίαν ἀκάλλυν, Incorporeal Substance, and sometimes οὐσίαν νοητόν, Intelligible Substance, in opposition to the other which he calls οἰκείως Sensible. And it is plain to any one, that hath had the least acquaintance with Plato’s Philosophy, that the whole Scope and Drift of it, is to raise up men’s Minds from Sense to a belief of Incorporeal Things as the most Excellent: τασ οὐσίαν ἀκάλλυν ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγάλη ὅμοιόν ύπερ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλῳ, παρά οἰκείως, as he writes in another place. For Incorporeal Things, which are the greatest and most excellent things of all, are (faith he) discoverable by Reason only and nothing else. And his Subterraneous Cave, so famously known, and so elegantly described by him, where he supposes men tied with their backs towards the Light, placed at a great distance from them, so that they could not turn about their Heads to it neither, and therefore could see nothing but the shadows (of certain Substances behind them) projected from it, which Shadows they concluded to be the only Substances and Realities, and when they heard the Sounds made by those Bodies that were betwixt the Light and them, or their reverberated Echo’s, they imputed them to those shadows which they saw. I say, all this is a Description of the State of those Men, who take Body to be the only Real and Substantial thing in the World, and to do all that is done in it; and therefore often impute Sense, Reason and Understanding, to nothing but Blood and Brains in us.

XX. I might also shew in the next place, how Aristotle did not at all dissent from Plato herein, he plainly affirming ἄλλων ἑπεξεργασμένων ἀκατάστατον, another Substance beside Sensibles, οἷς ἐπεξεργασμένοι, a Substance separable and also actually separated from Sensibles, ἀκατάστατον ἐπεξεργασμένον, an Immovable Nature or Essence (subject to no Generation or Corruption) adding that the Deity was to be sought for here: Nay such a Substance in μεγάλοις ἑπεξεργασμένοις ἑκάστῳ, ἀλλὰ ἐμποτιζόμενοι καὶ ἀνθρωποοικός ἐστι, as hath no Magnitude at all, but is Impartible and Indivisible. He also blaming Zeno (not the Stoick, who was Junior to Aristotle, but an ancientest Philosopher of that Name) for making God to be a Body, in these words; "οὐτὼς γὰρ σώματα λεγόμενα and others that made incorporeal and incorpo- real Forms the sole and true Substance.
Proved clearly that Incorporeal
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PLATON'S conceptions of an incorporeal substance
groundly opposed by Epicurus.

Wherein he is underfooted to describe the Divine Eternity. However, it plainly appears from hence, that according to Aristotle's sense, God was {\textit{αισθητικά}}, an Incorporeal Substance distinct from the World.

XXI. Now this Doctrine, which Plato especially was famous for affecting, that there was {\textit{οὐδέν}}, Incorporeal Substance, and that the Souls of Men were such, but principally the Deity; Epicurus taking notice of it, endeavoured with all his might to confute it, arguing sometimes after this manner: There can be no Incorporeal God (as Plato maintained) not only because no man can frame a Conception of an Incorporeal Substance, but also because whatever is Incorporeal must needs want Sense, and Prudence, and Pleasure, all which things are included in the Notion of God; and therefore an Incorporeal Deity is a Contradiction. And concerning the Soul of Man, it is {\textit{οὐδέν}}; {\textit{οὐδὲν}} the Deity. They who say that the Soul is Incorporeal, in any other sense, than as that word may be used to signify a Subtil Body, talk Vainly and Foolishly; for then it could neither be able to Do nor Suffer any thing. It could not be used upon any other thing, because it could Touch nothing; neither could it Suffer from anything, because it could not be Touch'd by anything; but it would be just like to Vacuum or Empty Space, which can neither Do nor Suffer any thing, but only yield Bodies a Passage through it: From whence it is further evident, that this Opinion was professedly maintained by some Philosophers before Epicurus his time.

XXII. But Plato and Aristotle were not the first Inventors of it: For it is certain, that all those Philosophers who held the Immortality of the Humane Soul, and a God distinct from this Visible World, (and so properly the Creator of it and all its parts) did really affect Incorporeal Substance. For that a Corporeal Soul cannot be in its own Nature Immortal and Incorruptible, is plain to every one's Understanding, because of its parts being separable from one another; and whoever denies God to be Incorporeal, if he make him any thing at all, he must needs make him to be either the whole Corporeal...
poreal World, or else a part of it: Wherefore if God be neither of these, he must then be an Incorporeal Substant. Now Plato was not the first who asserted these two things, but they were both maintained by many Philosophers before him. Pherecydes Syrus, and Thales, were two of the most ancient Philosophers among the Greeks; and it is said of the former of them, that by his Lectures and Disputes concerning the Immortality of the Soul, he first drew off Pythagoras from another Course of life to the study of Philosophy. Pherecydes Syrus (faith Cicero) Primus dixit animus hominum esse semipernos. And Thales in an Epistle directed to him, congratulates his being the First that had designed to write to the Greeks concerning Divine Things, which Thales also (who was the Head of the Ionick Succession of Philosophers, as Pythagoras of the Italick) is joined with Pythagoras and Plato, by the Writer De Placitis Philosophorum, after this manner. Eten pulvris ol peptuser, &oii eonofiat tiv ßoc- chos Euphiasiw fowd lepovos autonixion cal soain voniw. All these determined the Soul to be Incorporeal, making it to be Naturally Self-moving (or Self-active) and an Intelligible Substance; that is, not Sensible. Now he that determines the Soul to be Incorporeal, must needs hold the Deity to be Incorporeal much more. Aquam dixit Thales esse ininitum rerum (faith Cicero) Domn autem cam Mentem que ex aqua cunctis fingeret. Thales said that Water was the first Principle of all Corporeal things, but that God was that Mind which formed all things out of Water. For Thales was a Phenician by Extraction, and accordingly seemed to have received his two Principles from thence, Water, and the Divine Spirit moving upon the Waters. The First whereof is thus expressed by Sanchuniathon in his Description of the Phenician Theology, ας ξυλετο, ἐπεαδε, a Turbid and Dark Chaos; and the Second is intimated in these words, η γαθα νη το πέπλω ζτον αγων, the Spirit was affected with love towards its own Principles, perhaps expressing the Force of the Hebrew word Merachepeth, and both of them implying an Understanding Prolifical Goodness, Forming and Hatching the Corporeal World into this perfection; or else a Plaftick Power, subordinate to it. Zeno (who was also originally a Phenician) tells us, that Hefiod's Chaos was Water; and that the Material Heaven, as well as Earth was made out of Water, (according to the Judgment of the best Interpreters) is the genuine fence of Scripture, 2 Pet. 3, 5. by which water some perhaps would understand, a Chaos of Atoms confusedly moved. But whether Thales were acquainted with the Atomical Physiology or no; it is plain that he asserted, besides the Soul's Immortality, a Deity distinct from the Corporeal World.

We pass to Pythagoras whom we have proved already to have been an Atomist; and it is well known also that he was a professed Incorporealift. That he asserted the Immortality of the Soul, and consequently its Immateriality, is evident from his Doctrine of Pre-existence and Transmigration: And that he likewise held an Incorporeal Deity distinct from the World, is a thing not questioned by any. But if there were any need of proving it, (because there are no Monuments of his Extant) perhaps it might be done from hence, because...
Pythagoras and Parmenides. Book I.

Because he was the chief Propagator of that Doctrine amongst the Greeks, concerning Three Hypothesæ in the Deity.

For, that Plato and his Followers held τεις ἄψυχες ὑπόθεσις, Three Hypothesæ in the Deity, that were the first principles of all things, is a thing very well known to all. Though we do not affirm that the Platonick Hypothesæ are exactly the same with those in the Christian Trinity. Now, Plato himself sufficiently intimates this not to have been his own Invention; and Plotinus tells us, that it was παλαιὸς ἀγές, an Ancient Opinion before Plato's time, which had been delivered down by some of the Pythagoricks. Therefore, I conceive, this must needs be one of those Pythagorick Monstrosities, which Xenophon covertly taxes Plato for entertaining, and mingling with the Socratic Philosophy, as if he had thereby corrupted the Purity and Simplicity of it. Though a Corporealift may pretend to be a Theift; yet I never heard, that any of them did ever affert a Trinity, respectively to the Deity, unless it were such an one, as I think not fit here to mention.

XXIII. That Parmenides, who was likewise a Pythagorean, acknowledged a Deity distinct from the Corporeal World, is evident from Plato. And Plotinus tells us also, that he was one of them, that afferted the Triad of Divine Hypothesæ. Moreover, whereas there was a great Controversie amongst the Ancient Philosophers before Plato's time, between such as held all things to Flow, (as namely Heraclitus and Cratylus;) and others who afferted that some things did Stand, and that there was ἄκινητος και ἁκός, a certain Immutable Nature, to wit, an Eternal Mind, together with Eternal and Immutable Truths, (amongst which were Parmenides and Melissus;) the former of these were all Corporealists, (this being the very Reason why they made all things to Flow, because they supposed all to be Body) though these were not therefore all of them Atheists. But the latter were all both Corporealists and Theists; for who-soever holds Corporeal Substance must needs (according to Reason) also affert a Deity.

And although we did not before particularly mention Parmenides amongst the Atomicl Philosophers, yet we conceive it to be manifest from hence, that he was one of that Tribe, because he was an eminent Affirter of that Principle, ἄξιωμα εἶναι τὰ ἀληθινά, That no Real Entity is either Made or Destroyed, Generated or Corrupted. Which we shall afterwards plainly shew, to be the grand Fundamental Principle of the Atomicl Philosophy.

XXIV. But whereas we did evidently prove before, that Empedocles was an Atomicl Physiologer, it may notwithstanding with some Colour of Probability be doubted, whether he were not an Atheist, or at least a Corporealift, because Aristotle accuses him of these following things. First, of making Knowledge to be Sense, which is indeed a plain sign of a Corporealift; and therefore in the next place also, of compounding the Soul out of the four Elements, making
To the first of these we reply, that some others who had also read Empedocles’s Poems, were of a different Judgment from Aristotle as to that, conceiving Empedocles not to make Sense, but Reason the Criterion of Truth. Thus Empiricus informs us: Others say that according to Empedocles, the Criterion of Truth is not Sense but Right Reason; and also that Right Reason is of two sorts, the one Divine, the other Empedoclean, or Humane: Of which the Divine is inexpressible, but the Humane declarable. And there might be several Passages cited out of those Fragments of Empedocles his Poems yet left, to confirm this, but we shall produce only this one.

Τινος πιστεύει ότι Πλούταρχος ἐκεῖνος ἦν ἁκανος.

To this Seneca, suspend thy Assent to the Corporeal Sense, and consider every thing clearly with thy Mind or Reason.

And as to the Second Crimination, Aristotle has much weakened his own Testimony here by accusing Plato also of the very same thing, ἡνεπίτιταν την ἁθήνω τοὺς ἐκεῖνοι ποιεῖν, γιὰδόκησεν τοὺς ἐρμικνους τοὺς πασχόμενα καὶ τοὺς ἄρη ἐκεῖνοι. Plato compounds the Soul out of the four Elements, because Like is known by Like, and things are from their Principles. Wherefore it is probable that Empedocles might be no more guilty of this fault (of making the Soul Corporeal, and to confound of Water, Earth, Air, and Fire) than Plato was, who in all mens Judgments was as free from it, as Aristotle himself, if not more. For Empedocles did in the same manner, as Pythagoras before him, and Plato after him, hold the Transmigration of Souls, and consequently both their Future Immortality and Preexistence; and therefore must needs affect their Incorporeity: Plutarch rightly declaring this to have been his Opinion: Εἰκιν καὶ τοὺς μᾶρκα ζωοντας καὶ τοὺς ἄρη πασχόμενα: That as well those who are yet Unborn, as those that are Dead, have a Being. He also afferts Humane Souls to be here in a Lapped State, μιχάλισθαι, καὶ ἔλεγεν, καὶ φιλοδικεῖ, Wanderers, Strangers, and Fugitives from God; declaring, as Plotinus tells us, that it was a Divine Law, ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνοι παῦν ἐκτὸς, that Souls sinning should fall down into these Earthly Bodies. But the fullest Record of the Empedoclean Philosophy concerning the Soul is contained in this of Hierocles: Καταφέρησαν καὶ ἀναπίπτεται δὴ διάφανος ὁ ἀναπήλτως, ἐκ ἑρποδωλίας φυσιν ἐν πνεύματος, φυσικός ἁθήνω καὶ αληθίνες μεταμορφώμεθα πίστις, ἀλλ’ ἐν δὲ καὶ τῷ ἀφχλείν ἡμῖν ἀπαλαμβάνεται.
Empedocles vindicated from being

Chapter I.

Empedocles

"Εἰς ὅστις τὰς ζωὰς γὰρ τὸν τὸν ἄλλον ζῆσαν,
Εἶναι φώναι τὸ κόσμον τὶ καὶ ἅμα μὲν ἐνωπῶν.

By JWT and J. W. W. S.

His doctrine of the souls falling in the earthly sphere and arising from the cosmos.

Now from what hath been already cited it is sufficiently manifest, that Empedocles was so far from being either an Atheist or Corporal, that he was indeed a Rank Pythagorian, as he is here called. And we might add hereunto, what Clemens Alexandrinus observes, that according to Empedocles, in óstas καὶ διὰς διεισεξώμεθα, καὶ καθάπερ ἔκτοτε δὲ μετὰ τῷ ἣν ἔστοι ἀπανακοιλήθη καὶ ἔχον τώ ἀλλοικῶν ἔχοντες, ἰδίᾳ οὖν ἁμα ἀκαπάλωδον διεπληθεί, ἀναφαίτης ἀλλοιον ὁμοῦς, ἐν οἷς τε τετευλεῖμαι τε. If we live boly and justly, we shall be happy here, and more happy after our departure hence, having our Happiness not necessarily confined to time, but being able to rest and fix it to all Eternity; Feasting with the other Immortal Beings, &c. We might also take notice, how, besides the Imortal Souls of men, he acknowledged Demons or Angels; declaring that some of these fell from Heaven, and were since prosecuted by a Divine Nemesis, or thefe in Plutarch are called, οἱ Ἠχολειτοὶ καὶ ἔρωμοι ἐν τῷ ἐμπεδολτεῖς θαλάμες: Those Empedoclean Demons lapped from Heaven, and pursued with Divine Vengeance; Whose restless Torment is there described in several Verses of his. And we might observe likewise how he acknowledged a Natural and Immutable Justice, which was not Topical and confined to Places and Countries, and Relative to particular Laws, but Catholic and Universal, and every where the same, through Infinite Light and Space; as he expresses it with Poetick Pomp and Bravery.

Ἀλλα τὸ μὴν μάλιν νόμον δίκης Ταυτάκις
Αἰσθήσ, ἐνεκάς τίταν δίκης ἄλητε νομισθ.

And the asserting of Natural Morality, is no small Argument of a Theist.

But...
But what then shall we say to those other things which Empedocles is charged with by Aristotle, that seem to have so rank a smell of Atheism? Certainly those Mongrel and Biforme Animals, that are said to have sprung up out of the Earth by chance, look as if they were more akin to Democritus than Empedocles, and probably it is the fault of the Copies that it is read otherwise, there being no other Philosopher that I know of, that could ever find any such thing in Empedocles his Poems. But for the rest, if Aristotle do not misrepresent Empedocles, as he often doth Plato, then it must be granted, that he being a Mechanical Physiologer, as well as Theologer, did something too much indulge to Fortituous Mechanism: which seems to be an Extravagancy that Mechanical Philosophers, and Atomists, have been always more or less subject to. But Aristotle doth not charge Empedocles with resolving all things into Fortituous Mechanism, as some Philosophers have done of late, who yet pretend to be Theists and Incorporealists, but only that he would explain some things in that way. Nay he clearly puts a difference betwixt Empedocles and the Democritick Atheists in those words subjoined, εις δε τικα, &c. which is as if he should have said, Empedocles resolved some things in the Fabrick and structure of Animals into Fortituous Mechanism; but there are certain other Philosophers, namely Leucippus and Democritus, who would have all things whatsoever in the whole World, Heaven and Earth and Animals, to be made by Chance and the Fortituous Motion of Atoms, without a Deity. It seems very plain that Empedocles his Philia and Nictos, his Friendship and Discord, which he makes to be the ἀρχὴ φύσεως, the Active Cause, and Principle of Motion in the Universe, was a certain Placitick Power, superiour to Fortituous Mechanism: and Aristotle himself acknowledges somewhere as much. And Plutarch tells us, that according to Empedocles, The Order and System of the World is not the Result of Material Causes and Fortituous Mechanism, but of a Divine Wisdom, assigning to every thing ἐκ ἐν ἡ φύσις διὰν φανεροὶ, ἀλλ ἐν ἡ περὶ το κοινῷ ἀγαθῷ πολεῖ συν- τασις. Not such a Place as Nature would give it, but such as is most convenient for the Good of the whole. Simplicius, who had read Empedocles, acquaints us, that he made two Worlds, the one Intellectual, the other Sensible; and the former of these to be the Exemplar and Archetype of the latter. And so the Writer De Placitiss Philosophe- rum observes, that Empedocles made defender, τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ κόσμου, Two Suns, the one Archetypal and Intelligible, the other Apparent or Sensible.

But I need take no more pains, to purge Empedocles from those two Imputations of Corporealist and Atheist, since he hath so fully confuted them himself, in those Fragments of his still extant. First, by expressing such a hearty Renouncement of the Excellency of Piety, and the Wretchedness and Sottishness of Atheism in these Verces.

ολεον ἡς ἡθον προτόχον ἐκλαυτοτ πλετεν,
δειλος ὦ ὁ σκευοσκη ἦν πεξε ἄξια μέμελεν.

D To
To this Sence: He is happy who hath his mind richly fraught and stored with the Treasures of Divine Knowledge; but he miserable, whose mind is Darkened, as to the Belief of a God. And, Secondly, by denying God to have any Humane Form, or Members,

'ou μὴ ἔχειν κεφαλὴν εἶναι νέκασω, &c.

Or otherwise to be Corporeal,

'ουκ ἦσαν πέλασσαι ἡμών ἄφθαρταν ἄφθαρτοι

And then positively affirming what he is,

Ἀλλὰ φεύλω ἴσως καὶ ἀκρατὸς ἐκτεταμένος,

Only a Holy and Ineffable Mind, that by Swift Thoughts agitates the whole World.

XX V. And now we shall speak something also of Anaxagoras, having chewed before that he was a Spurious Atomist. For he likewise agreed with the other Atomists in this, that he asserted Incorporeal Substance in general as the Active Cause and Principle of Motion in the Universe, and Particularly, an Incorporeal Deity distinct from the World. Affirming, that there was besides Atoms, ἄλογος ἄνασις μένων ὑποκείμενον, as it is expressed in Plato) An Ordering and Disposing Mind that was the Cause of all things. Which Mind (as Aristotle tells us) he made to be μένων, ὅπως ἐπιφονέως καὶ συμφαυλάζων, The only Simple, Unmixed, and Pure thing in the World. And he supposed this to be that which brought the Confused Chaos of Omnifarious Atoms into that Orderly Compages of the World that now is.

XX VI. And by this time we have made it evident that those Atomical Physiologers, that were before Democritus and Lencippus, were all of them Incorporealists; joyning Theology and Pneumatology, the Doctrine of Incorporeal Substance and a Deity, together with their Atomical Physiology. This is a thing expressly noted concerning Ecphantus the Pythagorean in Stobaeus. Ἐκφαντος ἐν μὲν τοῖς αὕτην συνεστάξας τὸν ἔνοχον, διακοινοῦσα χαίρε ἀπὸ προνοίας. Ecphantus held the Corporeal World to consist of Atoms, but yet to be Ordered and Governed by a Divine Providence, that is, he joyned Atomology and Theology both together. And the same is also observ'd of Arcesilas, or perhaps Archelus, by Sidonius Apollinaris;

Φιλὶς ἀρχελοῦσ Διονύσιος Μοντε παρατάμενος

Conjicit hanc Molem, confection Partibus illis

Now, I say, as Ecphantus, and Archelus, asserted the Corporeal World
World to be made of Atoms, but yet notwithstanding held an Incorputeous Deity distinct from the same, as the First Principle of Activity in it; so in like manner did all the other ancient Atomists generally before Democritus, joyn Theology and Incorporealism with their Atomical Physiolog. They did Atomize as well as he, but they did not Atheize; but that Atheistical Atomology was a thing first set on foot afterward by Leucippus and Democritus.

XXVII. But because many seem to be so strongly possesed with this Prejudice, as if Atheism were a Natural and Necessary Append to Atomism, and therefore will conclude that the same persons could not possibly be Atomists, and Incorporealists or Theists, we shall further make it Evident, that there is not only, no Inconsistency betwixt the Atomical Physiolog and Theology, but also that there is on the Contrary, a most Natural Cognition between them.

And this we shall do two manner of ways; First, by inquiring into the Origin of this Philosophy, and considering what Grounds or Principles of Reason they were, which first led the Antients into this Atomical or Mechanical way of Physiologizing. And Secondly, by making it appear that the Intrinsical Constitution of this Physiolog is such, that whosoever entertains it, if he do but thoroughly understand it, must of necessity acknowledge that there is something else in the World besides Body.

First therefore, this Atomical Physiolog seems to have had its Rise and Origin from the Strength of Reason exerting its own Inward Active Power and Vigour, and thereby bearing it self up against the Prejudices of Sense, and at length prevailing over them, after this manner. The Ancients considering and revolving the Ideas of their own Minds, found that they had a clear and distinct Conception of Two things, as the General Heads and Principles of whatsoever was in the Univerfe; the one whereof was Passive Matter, and the other Active Power, Vigour and Virtue. To the Latter of which belongs both Cognition, and the Power of Moving Matter, whether by express Concioufness or no. Both which together, may be called by one General Name, of Life; so that they made these two General Heads of Being or Essence, Passive Matter or Bulk, and Self Activity or Life. The Former of these was commonly called by the Ancients, the πάν, that which suffers and receives; and the Latter the τό ζωή, the Active Science. The One, that from whence Motion Springs, the other from reason. The change being two general know passive matter and active power, which cause the general constitution of the universe and the power of moving matter.

In vernum Natura (faith Cicero) according to the General Sense of the Ancients) Duo quaedam sunt Unum, que Materia est, ex qua quaeque res efficiatur; Alterum, quae res est que quicquae Efficiat: There are two things to be enquired after in Nature; One, what is the Matter, out of which every thing is made; Another, what is the Active Cause or Efficient. To the same purpose Seneca; Effes debet aliquid; Unde sit, deinde a quo sit; hoc est Cana, illud Materia: There D 2
must be something Out of which a thing is made, and then some-
thing By which it is made; the Latter is properly the Cause,
and the Former the Matter. Which is to be understood of Cor-
poral things and their Differences, that there must be both
Matter, and an Active Power, for the production of them. And so
also that of Aristotle, ἔστει αἰτίας μᾶς μᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχῶν ἐκ τοῦ
κατεστήσαντος, μᾶς θείο τοῦ πάνω. That from whence the Principle of Motion
is, is one Cause, and the Matter is another. Where Aristotle gives
that name of Cause to the Matter also, though others did appro-
riate it to the Active Power. And the Writer de Placitis Philo-
sophorum expresses this as the General Sence of the Ancients, ἀρκ
volent ἀρχῶν ὑπὸν ὑπὸν τὸν ὑπὸν ἐπὶ τὸν πάνοπτον ὑποπτοπτον, εἰδικά καὶ τὸ πάνο
πάνοπτον ἐπὶ ὑποπτοπτοπτον, ὅπως ἄριστος ἀριστὸς πρὸς τὸ ὑπάρχον γενζόντων ἐν μί
και τῷ πάνω ἐν τῷ πάνω, τοῦτον ἀριστοτέρον, ἄριστος καὶ ἑαυτῷ τῇ ἐκλογῇ καὶ τῷ
ἐπὶ, καὶ τῷ ἐπί κτισί. It is impossible that Matter alone should be the
sole Principle of all things, but there must of necessity be supposed also
an Agent or Efficient Cause. As Silver alone is not sufficient to make
a Cup, unless there be an Artificer to work upon it. And the same is to
be said concerning Brass, Wood, and other Natural Bodies.

Now as they apprehended a Necessity of these two Principles, so
they conceived them to be such, as could not be confounded together
into one and the same Thing or Substance; they having such distinct
Ideas, and Essential Characters from one another: The Stoicks being
the only Persons, who offering Violence to their own apprehensions,
rudely and unskilfully attempted to make these two distinct things
to be one and the same Substance. Wherefore as the First of these,
viz. Matter, or Passive Extended Bulk, is taken by all for Sub-
stance, and commonly called by the name of Body; so the other,
which is far the more Noble of the Two, being that which acts up-
on the matter and hath a Commanding Power over it, must needs be
Substance too, of a different kind from Matter or Body; and
therefore Immaterial or Incorporeal Substance. Neither did they
find any other Entity to be conceivable, besides these two, Pass-
ive Bulk or Extension, which is Corporeal Substance; and In-
ternal Self-Activity or Life, which is the Essential Character of
Substance Incorporeal; to which Latter belongs not only Cogita-
tion, but also the Power of Moving Body.

Moreover, when they further considered the First of these, the
Material or Corporeal Principle, they being not able clearly to
conceive any thing else in it, besides Magnitude, Figure, Site, and
Motion or Reft, which are all several Modes of Extended Bulk,
concluded therefore according to Reason, that there was Really
nothing else existing in Bodies without, besides the various Com-
plexions and Conjugations of those Simple Elements, that is, no-
thing but Mechanism. Whence it necessarily followed, that what-
soever else was supposed to be in Bodies, was, indeed, nothing but
our Modes of Sensation, or the Phancies and Passions in us begot-
ten from them, mistaken for things really existing without us. And
this is a thing so obvious, that some of those Philosophers who had
taken little notice of the Atomical Physiology, had notwithstanding
ing a suspicion of it; as for Example Platonius, who writing of the Criteri-
on Truth, and the power of Reason, hath these words, Kαι το ἐκδήλω τῇ αἰσθήσει καὶ τῇ διαλεύκη πίνα ἐξ οὐκοροδεστίαιν, ἀκίνηται μᾶλλον ἡ ἐν τοῖς ὑποκει-
σοις, αὐλοὶ ὡς τοις παθήσεωσι τῷ ὑποδείγματι, καὶ ὡς τῇ διάλειξαι τῇ 
κατηχίᾳ. Though the things of Sense seem to have so clear a Certainty, 
yet notwithstanding it is doubted concerning them, whether (the Qual-
ities of them) have any Real Existence at all in the things without 
us, and not rather a Seeming Existence only, in our own Passions: 
and there is need of Mind or Understanding to judge in this Case, and
to determine the Controversy, which Sense alone cannot decide. But 
the ancient Physiologists concluded without any hesitancy, ἐπὶ τῷ 
αιτεί τῷ μενὶ τῇ γλυκοποὶκα μεγαὶ, ἐπὶ το ἀμώλην τῇ πικροποὶκαν, That the 
Nature of Honey in itself, is not the same thing with my being sweet-
ened, nor of Wormwood with that Sense of bitterness which I have from 
it; διαφερέντα ὡς τῷ ποταμῳ τῷ ζεληδί ὑποκειμένος, κατὰ τας αἰσθάνος, τῷ μέγα 
ἴκτις ὑποκειμένα ἐκ καταλαμβανόν, μενα ὡς ἡ ἄρρη ὡς τῷ αὐτῷ ποικίλῳ. 
But that the Passion of Sense differ'd from the Absolute Nature of the thing 
it self without, the Sensations not comprehending the Objects themselves, 
but only their own Passions from them.

I say therefore, that the Ancients concluded the Absolute 
Nature of Corporeal things in themselves, to be nothing but a cer-
tain Disposition of Parts, in respect of Magnitude, Figure, Site, 
and Motion, which in Tales causeth us to be differently affected with 
those Senses of Sweetness and Bitterness, and in Sight with those 
Phancies of Colours, and accordingly in the other Senses with other 
Phancies; and that the Corporeal World was to be explained by 
these Two things, whereof one is Absolute in the Bodies without 
us, the various Mechanism of them, the other Relative only to us, 
the different Phancies in us, caused by the respective Differences of 
them, in themselves. Which Phancies or Phantastick Idea's are 
no Modes of the Bodies without us, but of that only in our selves 
which is Cogitative or Self-Active, that is, Incorporeal. For the Sen-
sible Idea's of Hot and Cold, Red and green, &c. cannot be clearly 
conceived by us as Modes of the Bodies without us, but they may 
be easily apprehended as Modes of Cognition, that is, of Sensation, 
or Sympathetical Perception in us.

The Result of all which was; That whatsoever is either in Our 
Selves, or the Whole World, was to be reduced to one or other of 
these two Principles; Passive Matter, and Extended Bulk, or Self-
Active Power and Virtue; Corporeal or Incorporeal Substance; Me-
chanism or Life; or else to a Complication of them both toge-
ther.

XXVIII. From this General Account, which we have now 
given of the Origin of the Atomical Physiology, it appears that 
the Doctrine of Incorporeal Substance sprung up together with it. 
But this will be further manifest, from that which follows. For we 
shall in the next place shew, how this Philosophy did, in especial 
manner, owe its Original, to the Improvement of one Particular 
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Principle of Reason, over and besides all the rest; namely, that famous Axiom, so much talked of amongst the Ancients,

**De Nihilo Nihil, in Nibilum Nil posse reverti;**

That Nothing can come from Nothing, nor go to Nothing. For though Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius abused this Theorem, endeavouring to carry it further than the Intention of the first Atomists, to the disproving of a Divine Creation of any thing out of Nothing by it; *Nullam rem a Nihilo signi Divinius inquam*; and consequently of a Deity: Yet as the meaning of it was at first confined and restricted, That Nothing of it self could come from Nothing nor go to Nothing, or that according to the Ordinary Course of Nature (without an Extraordinary Divine Power) Nothing could be rais'd from Nothing, nor reduc'd to Nothing; it is not only an undoubted Rule of Reason in itself, but it was also the Principal Original of that Atomical Physiologice, which, discarding Forms and Qualities, acknowledged really nothing else in Body besides Mechanism.

Wherefore it was not in vain, nor to no purpose that Laertius in the Life of Democritus takes notice of this as one of his *Dogmata, μεθαν εκ τω μω οντος μιν, και το μη εις το μω οντος μιν. That Nothing was made or Generated out of Nothing, nor Corrupted into Nothing, This being a Fundamental Principle, not only of his Atheism, but also of that very Atomical Physiologise it self, which he purfued. And Epicurus in his Epistle to Herodotus plainly fetches the beginning of all his Philosophy from hence. *Πρωτων μον φιλ εκ αυτων γενεσθαι εκ τω μω οντος, και αυτων φιλεῖται εις το μω οντος, και μονομαι αυτος εις το μω οντος, και τω μω οντος φιλεῖται*; *we fetch the beginning of our Philosophy (faith he) from hence, that Nothing is made out of Nothing or destroy'd to Nothing; for if things were made out of Nothing, then every thing might be made out of every thing, neither would there be any need of Seeds. And if whatsoever is Corrupted were destroy'd to Nothing, then all things would at length be brought to Nothing. Lucretius in like manner beginning here, infuits more largely upon those Grounds of Reason hinted by Epicurus: And first, That Nothing can be made out of Nothing he proves thus;*

**Namsi de nihilo fierent, ex omnibus rebus**

**Omne Genera nasci possent: Nil Semine egeret:**

**E mare primium Homines & terra posset oriri Squamigerum Genus, &c.**

**Nec Frutus idem Arboribus consolare solerent:**


In
In like manner he argues, to prove that Nothing is Corrupted into Nothing.

In which Passages, though it be plain that Lucretius doth not immediately drive at Atheism, and nothing else; but primarily at the establishing of a peculiar kind of Atomical Phylogony, upon which indeed these Democriticks afterward endeavoured to graft Atheism; yet to take away that suspicion, we shall in the next place shew, that generally the other Ancient Physiologers also, who were Theists, did likewise build the structure of their Philosophy upon the same Foundation, that Nothing can come from Nothing, nor go to Nothing: As for Example, Parmenides, Melissus, Zeno, Xenophanes, Anaxagoras and Empedocles; of Parmenides and Melissus, Aristotle thus writes, οὐδὲν οὐδὲ γενότοι οὐκ ἔσται γενέσθαι τῷ ὄντων. They say that no Real Entity is either Generated or Corrupted, that is, made anew out of Nothing or destroy'd to Nothing. And Simplicius tells us, that Parmenides gave a notable Reason for the Confirmation of this Assertion, that Nothing in Nature could be Made out of Nothing, αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν πάντως ἐξ ὕπόθεσις γενέσθαι τῷ ὄντων, Ἀναξαγὸς ὁ Παραρχικὸς περιευκρίνος, ἠλος γὰρ φησί, εἰ ὅτι τὸ μὴ ὑπόθεσις, ἢ ἀποκολύφα τὸ τὸν γινώσκει ὑπὸ γινωσκόν, ἀλλὰ μὴ περιπετεία η ὑπερβολή. Because if any thing be made out of Nothing, then there could be no cause why it should be then made, and neither sooner nor later. Again Aristotle testifies of Xenophanes and Zeno, that they made this a main Principle of their Philosophy: Μὴ ἀπεκτέσθαι γενέσθαι μὴν ἐκ μηδενος. That it cannot be that any thing should be made out of Nothing: And of this Xenophanes, Sextus the Philosopher tells us, that he held ὅτι οὐκ ἔχει καὶ ἄλλον κατὰ ὑπόθεσιν ὁμολογεῖ. That there was but one God, and that he was Incorporeal, speaking thus of him:

εἰς θεὸν ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου μέγας ὁ, ὁ ἐν θεοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὁμολογεῖ, εἰς νομικόν.

Aristotle also writes in like manner concerning Empedocles, ἀποθετά τινα καὶ ἄλλον ὁμολογεῖ ότι οὐκ ὁ θεός οὐ μὴν ἄλλον ὁμολογεῖ τῷ γινώσκειν, τῷ τῷ ὑπὸ ἐξολοθρεύσαν ἀνθρώπον καὶ ἁρματον. Empedocles acknowledges the very same with other Philosophers, that it is impossible any thing should be made out
out of Nothing or Perish into Nothing. And as for Anaxagoras, it is sufficiently known to all, that his Honevomemia or Doctrine of Similar Atoms, (which was a certain Spurious kind of Atomism) was nothing but a superstructure made upon this Foundation. Besides all which, Aristotle pronounces universally concerning the Ancient Physiologers without any exception, that they agreed in this one thing, that the Atoms, being composed of a few origin of Every 3 or 4 Chicago, or of the same, unite to produce the heaven. The Physiologists generally agree in this (laying it down for a grand Foundation) that it is Impossible that any thing should be made out of Nothing. And again he calls this common Opinion of Naturalists; intimating also, that they concluded it the greatest absurdity, that any Physiologer could be guilty of, to lay down such Principles, as from whence it would follow, that any Real Entity in Nature did come from Nothing and go to Nothing.

Now it may well be supposed, that all these Ancient Physiologers (the more of which were also Theists) did not keep such a fir about this busines for nothing; and therefore we are in the next place to shew, what it was that they drove at in it. And we do affirm that one thing, which they all aimed at, who infilpted upon the forementioned Principle, was the establishing some Atomical Physiology or other, but most of them at such as takes away all Forms and Qualities of Bodies (as Entities really distinct from the Matter and Substance) and resolves all into Mechanism and Phancy. For it is plain, that if the Forms and Qualities of Bodies be Entities really distinct from the Substance, and its various Modifications, of Figure, Site, and Motion, that then in all the Changes and Transmutations of Nature, all the Generations and Alterations of Body, (those Forms and Qualities being supposed to have no Real Existence anywhere before) something must of necessity be Created or produced miraculously out of Nothing; as likewise reduced into Nothing in the Corruptions of them; they having no Being anywhere afterward. As for Example; when ever a Candle is but lighted or kindled into a flame, there must needs be a new Form of fire, and new Qualities of Light and Heat, really distinct from the Matter and Substance, produced out of Nothing, that is, Created, and the flame again Reduced into Nothing, or Annihilated, when the flame is extinguished. Thus, when Water is but Congealed at any time into Snow, Hail, or Ice, and when it is again Dissolved; when Wax is by Liquefaction made Soft and Transparent, and changed to most of our Senses; when the same kind of Nourishment taken in by Animals, is turned into Blood, Milk, Fleth, Bones, Nerves, and all the other Similar Parts; when that which was in the Form of bright Flame, appears in the Form of dark Smoak; and that which was in the Form of Vapour, in the Form of Rain or Water, or the like; Nay, that in all the Mutations of Bodies there must needs be something made out of Nothing. But that in all the Protean Transformations of Nature, which happen continually, there should be Real Entities thus perpetually produced out of Nothing and reduced to Nothing, seemed to be so great a Paradox
Paradox to the Ancients, that they could by no means admit of it. Because as we have already declared, First they concluded it clearly impossible by Reason, that any Real Entity should of itself rise out of Nothing; and Secondly, they thought it very absurd to bring God upon the Stage, with his Miraculous extraordinary Power, perpetually at every turn; As also, that every thing might be made out of every thing, and there would be no Cause in Nature, for the Production of one thing rather than another, and at this time rather than that, if they were Miraculously made out of Nothing. Wherefore they sagaciously apprehended, that there must needs be some other Mystery or Intrigue of Nature, in this business, than was commonly dream'd of, or suspected; which they concluded to be this, That in all those Transformations, there were no such Real Entities of Forms and Qualities distinct from the Matter, and the various Disposition of its Parts, in respect of Figure, Site and Motion (as vulgarly supposed) Produced and Destroyed; but that all these Feats were done, either by the Concretion and Secretion of actually Inexistent Parts, or else by the different Modifications of the same Preexistent Matter, or the Infenstein parts thereof. This only being added hereunto, that from those different Modifications of the small Particles of Bodies, (they being not so distinctly perceived by our Senfes) there are begun in us, certain confused Phantasms, or Phantasmata, Apparitions, Phancies, and Passions, as of Light and Colours, Heat and Cold, and the like, which are those things, that are vulgarly mistaken for real Qualities existing in the Bodies without us; whereas indeed there is Nothing Absolutely in the Bodies themselves like to those Phantastick Ideas that we have of them; and yet they are wisely contriv'd by the Author of Nature, for the Adorning and Embellifhing of the Corporeal World to us.

So that they conceived, Bodies were to be considered two manner of ways, either as they are Absolutely in themselves, or else as they are Relatively to us: And as they are absolutely in themselves, that so there never was any Entity really distinct from the Substance, produced in them out of Nothing, nor Corrupted or Destroyed to Nothing, but only the Accidents and Modifications altered. Which Accidents and Modifications are no Entities really distinct from their Substance; for as much as the same Body may be put into several Shapes and Figures, and the same Man may successively Stand, Sit, Kneel and Walk, without the production of any new Entities really distinct from the Substance of his Body. So that the Generations, Corruptions and Alterations of Inanimate Bodies are not terminated in the Production or Diftruction of any Substantial Forms, or real Entities distinct from the Substance, but only in different Modifications of it. But secondly, as Bodies are considered Relatively to us, that so besides their different Modifications and Mechanical Alterations, there are also different Phancies, Seemings and Apparitions begun in us from them; which unwary and unskillful Philosophers mistake for Absolute Forms and Qualities in Bodies themselves. And thus they concluded, that all the Phanomens of Inanimate Bodies, and their various Transformations, might be

from the different modifications of the small particles of Bodies, their own abusively begotten, in our opinion confused phantastick and passions, for the embellishing of the corporeal world.
be clearly resolved into these two things. Partly something that is Real and Absolute in Bodies themselves, which is nothing but their different Mechanism, or Disposition of Parts in respect of Figure, Site and Motion; and partly something that is Phantastical in the Sentient.

That the Atomical Physiology did emerge after this manner, from that Principle of Reason, that Nothing comes from Nothing, nor goes to Nothing, might be further convinced from the testimony of Aristotle, writing thus concerning it: *Ex t¹ živai el xaloukou τ'ακεσία ενυπήκον ἀρχήν* or *πῶν τοι γενέσθαιν ακάθαρτα καὶ εἰ ὥσιν μὴ ἔχων τέσσαρα β' υπὸ τὸ μιᾶ, ἐξ μιᾷ ὥσιν γενέσθαι, ἢ ἀναλθεῖ, ἢ πεπεπατειν ὁμογενεῖα παρὰ σκέφτω τοῦ τοποῦ, ἢ ποιεῖν μὴ γενέσθαι, διὸ τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἀναλθεῖν τινας τινας τοις ἁναλθητικώς ἡμῖν, ἢ πεπεπατειν τινας τινας καὶ ἀναλθητικώς ἡμῖν.* The ancient Physiologists concluded, that because Contraries were made out of one another, that therefore they were before (one way or other) inexistent, Arguing in this manner. That if whatsoever be made, must needs be made out of Something or out of Nothing, and this latter (that any thing should be made out of Nothing) is Impossible, according to the general Consent of all the ancient Physiologists; then it follows of Necessity, that all Corporeal things are Made or Generated, out of things that were really before and Inexistent; though by reason of the smallness of their Bulk, they were Inexensible to us. Where Aristotle plainly intimates that all the ancient Philosophers, whosoever insisted upon this Principle, that Nothing comes from Nothing, nor goes to Nothing, were one way or other Atomical, and did resolve all Corporeal things into δύνας πνεύματα, yet ἦν τὰς κατὰ τινὰς ὑμῖν. Certain Molecule or Corpuscula which by Reason of their smallness were inexensible to us, that is, into Atoms. But yet there was a difference between these Atomists, forasmuch as Anaxagoras was such an Atomist, as did notwithstanding hold Forms and Qualities, really distinct from the Mechanical Modifications of Bodies. For he not being able (as it seems) well to understand that other Atomical Physiology of the Ancients, that, expounding Qualities, salved all Corporeal Phenomena by Mechanism and Phancy; and yet acknowledging, that that Principle of theirs which they went upon, must needs be true, That Nothing could of itself come from Nothing nor go to Nothing; framed a new kind of Atomology of his own, in supposing the whole Corporeal World or Mass of Matter, to consist of Similar Atoms, that is, such as were originally endowed with all those different Forms and Qualities that are vulgarly conceived to be in Bodies, some Bony, some Flethy, some Firie, some Watery, some White, some Black, some Bitter, some Sweet, and the like, so that all Bodies whatsoever had some of all sorts of these Atoms (which are in a manner Infinite) specifically differing from one another in them. πῶν εἰ πνεύματα μείζων, ἢ ποιεῖν πών ἢ πνεύματα πνεύματι. Greek Lettera, διὰ ταύτα ἀναλθητικά ὑμῖν, ἢ πεπεπατειν τινας τινας, καὶ πεπεπατειν τινας τινας τοις ἁναλθητικώς. That all things were in every thing mingled together, because they saw that everything was made of every thing; but that things seemed to differ from one another and were denominated to be this or that, from those Atoms which are most predominant in the Mixture, by reason of their
Atomical Philosophy.

Chap. I. their Multiplicity: Whence he concluded that all the Generations, Corruptions and Alterations of Bodies were made by nothing but the Concretions and Secretions of Inexistent and Preexistent Atoms of different Forms and Qualities, without the Production of any new Form and Qualitie out of Nothing, or the Reduction of any into Nothing. This very account Aristotle gives of the Anaxagorean Hypothesis. οικα, ἀναξαγόρας ἑαυτῷ ἀνακόψαζεν, οἵναι πρὸς τὸν τόπον, διὸ τε πρὸς τὸν τόπον, εἰς τὸν κόσμον τὸ σεληνικὸν διὰ τοῦ φυσικῶν τὸν αὐτὸν αὐτῷ, ὡς ὁ γενέτης ἐν τῷ πάλιν τέινον. Anaxagoras seemeth therefore to make Infinite Atoms ended with several Forms and Qualities to be the Elements of Bodies, because he supposed that Common opinion of Physiologers to be true, that Nothing is Made of Nothing. But all the other ancient Physiologers that were before Anaxagoras, and likewise those after him, who infilling upon the same Principle of Nothing coming from Nothing did not Anaxagorize, as Empedocles, Democritus and Protegoras, must needs make οὐκές ἀνικακάδες, δισσίμοι μοιεύοντας, άτομα ἀνήφαρμα καὶ άνθρώπας, Ατομα unformed and unqualified, otherwise than by Magnitude, Figure and Motion, to be the Principles of Bodies, and clasifying Forms and Qualities (as real Entities distinct from the Matter) resolve all Corporeal Phenomena into Mechanism and Phancie. Because, if no Real Entity can come from Nothing, nor go to Nothing, then one of these two things is absolutely Necessary, that either these Corporeal Forms and Qualities, being real Entities distinct from the Matter, should exist before Generations and after Corruptions, in certain infensible Atoms originally such, according to the Anaxagorean Doctrine; or else, that they should not be Real Entities distinct from the Matter, but only the different Modifications and Mechanisms of it, together with different Phancies. And thus we have made it evident that the genuine Atomical Physiology did spring originally from this Principle of Reason, that no Real Entity does of itself come from Nothing nor go to Nothing.

XXIX. Now we shall in the next place show how this very same Principle of Reason which induced the Ancients to reject Substantial Forms and Qualities of Bodies, and to Physiologize Atomically, led them also unavoidably to asser Incorporal Substances, and that the Souls of Men and Animals were such, neither Generated nor Corrupted. They had argued against Substantial Forms and Qualities as we have shewed, in this manner, that since the Forms and Qualities of Bodies are supposed by all to be Generated and Corrupted, made anew out of Nothing and destroyed to Nothing, that therefore they could not be Real Entities distinct from the Substance of Matter, but only different Modifications of it in respect of Figure, Site and Motion, causing different Sensations in us; and were all to be resoluted into Mechanism and Phancie. For as for that Conceit of Anaxagoras, of Pre and Post-existent Atoms, ended with all those several Forms and Qualities of Bodies Ingeniously and Incorruptibly; it was nothing but an Adulteration of the genuine Atomical Philosophy, and a mere Dream of his, in which very few follow'd him. And now they argue contrariwise for the Souls of Men and Animals, in this manner; Because they are plain-
ly Real Entities distinct from the Substance of Matter and its Modification, and Men and Brutes are not mere Machines, neither can Life and Cognition, Sense and Consciousness, Reason and Understanding, Appetite and Will, ever result from Magnitudes, Figures, Sites and Motions, that therefore they are not Corporeally Generated and Corrupted, as the Forms and Qualities of Bodies are. "Ανάθυτον γίνεσθαι οὐ μενοδίνεις περιήπαξι. It is impossible for a real Entity to be made or Generated from Nothing preexisting. Now there is Nothing of Soul and Mind, Reason and Understanding, nor indeed of Cognition and Life, contained in the Modifications and Mechanism of Bodies; and therefore to make Soul and Mind to rise out of Body whenever a man is generated, would be plainly to make a real Entity to come out of Nothing, which is impossible. I say, because the Forms and Qualities of Bodies are Generated and Corrupted, Made and Unmade, in the ordinary course of Nature, therefore they concluded, that they were not real Entities distinct from the Substance of Body and its various Modifications: but because Soul and Mind is plainly a real Entity distinct from the Substance of Body, its Modification and Mechanism; that therefore it was not a thing Generated and Corrupted, Made and Unmade, but such as had a Being of its own, a Substantial Thing by itself. Real Entities and Substances are not Generated and Corrupted, but only Modifications.

Wherefore these Ancients apprehended that there was a great difference betwixt the Souls of Men and Animals, and the Forms and Qualities of other inanimate Bodies, and consequently betwixt their several Productions. Forasmuch as in the Generation of Inanimate Bodies there is no new real Entity acquired distinct from the Substance of the thing itself, but only a peculiar Modification of it. The Form of Stone, or of Timber, of Blood, Flesh and Bone, and such other Natural Bodies Generated, is no more a distinct Substance or Entity from the Matter, than the Form of an House, Stool or Table is: There is no more new Entity acquired in the Generation of Natural Bodies, than there is in the Production of Artificial ones. When Water is turn'd into Vapour, Candle into Flame, Flame into Smoak, Gras into Milk Blood and Bones, there is no more miraculous Production of Something out of Nothing, than when Wool is made into cloth, or Flax into Linen, when a rude and Unpolish'd Stone is hewn into a beautiful Statue, when Brick, Timber and Mortar, that lay together before disorderly, is brought into the Form of a stately Palace; there being Nothing neither in one nor other of these but only a different Disposition and Modification of preexistent Matter. Which Matter of the Universe is always Substantially the same, and nothing more nor less, but only Proteanly transformed into different Shapes. Thus we see that the Generation of all Inanimate Bodies is nothing but the change of Accidents and Modifications, the Substance being really the same both before and after. But in the Generations of Men and Animals, besides the new disposition of the Parts of Matter and its Organization, there is also the Acquisition and Conjunction of another Real Entity or Substance distinct from the Matter,
ter, which could not be Generated out of it, but must needs come into some other way. Though there be no Substantial difference between a Stately House or Palace standing, and all the Materials of the same ruinated and demolifhed, but only a difference of Accidents and Modifications; yet between a living Man and a dead Carcasse, there is besides the Accidental Modification of the Body, another Substantial difference, there being a Substantial Soul and Incorporeal Inhabitant, dwelling in the one and acting of it, which the other is now deferted of. And it is very observable that Anaxagoras himself, who made Bony and Fleshy Atoms, Hot and Cold, Red and Green, and the like, which he supposed to exist before Generations and after Corruptions, alwaies immutably the fame, (that to Nothing might come from Nothing and go to Nothing) yet he did not make any Animalish Atoms Sensitived and Rational. The Reason whereof could not be because he did not think Sense and Understanding to be as Real Entities as Hot and Cold, Red and Green; but because they could not be supposed to be Corporeal Forms and Qualities, but must needs belong to another Substance that was Incorporeal. And therefore Anaxagoras could not but acknowledge, that all Souls and Lives did Pre and Post-exist by themselves, as well as those Corporeal Forms and Qualities, in his Similar Atoms.

XXX. And now it is already manifest, that from the same Principle of Reason before mentioned, That Nothing of it self can come from Nothing nor go to Nothing, the Ancient Philosophers were induced likewise to asfert the Soul's Immortality, together with its Incorpority or Distinctness from the Body. No Substantial Entity ever vanifheth of it self into Nothing; for if it did, then in length of time all might come to be Nothing. But the Soul is a Substantial Entity, Really distinct from the body, and not the mere Modification of it; and therefore when a Man dies, his Soul must still remain and continue to have a Being somewhere else in the Universe. All the Changes that are in Nature, are neither Accidental Transformations and different Modifications of the same Substance, or else they are Conjunctions and Separations, or Anagrammatical Transpositions of things in the Universe; the Substance of the whole remaining alwaies entirely the same. The Generation and Corruption of Inanimate Bodies, is but like the making of a House, Stool or Table, and the Unmaking or Marring of them again, either different Modifications of one and the same Sub stance, or else divers Mixtures and Separations, Concretions and Secretions. And the Generation and Corruption of Animals is likewise nothing but

--- μης τε διαλλαξει τη μυστικων,

The Conjunction of Souls together with such Particular Bodies, and the Separation of them again from one another, and so as it were the Anagrammatical Transposition of them in the Universe. That Soul and Life that is now fled and gone, from a lifeless Carcasse, is only
Immortality of Souls asserted
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a loss to that particular Body or Compages of Matter, which by means thereof is now disanimated; but it is no loss to the whole, it being but Transposed in the Universe, and lodged somewhere else.

XXXI. It is also further evident that this same Principle which thus led the Ancients to hold the Souls Immortality, or its Future Permanency after Death, must needs determine them likewise to maintain its Preexistence, or Preexistance, and consequently its Preexistence, or Transformation. For that which did preexist before the Generation of any Animal, and was then somewhere else, must needs Transmigrate into the Body of that Animal where now it is. But as for that other Transformation of Human Souls into the Bodies of Brutes, though it cannot be denied but that many of these Ancients admitted it also, yet Timeus Locus, and divers others of the Pythagoreans, rejected it, any otherwise than as it might be taken for an Allegorical Description of that Beastly Transformation, that is made of Mens Souls by Vice. Aristotle tells us again, agreeably to what was declared before, that mankind were subjected to such a state as it were a generated, or in generis, &c. That the Ancient Philosophers were afraid of Nothing more, than this one thing, that any thing should be made out of Nothing Preexistent: And therefore they must needs conclude, that the Souls of all Animals Preexistent before their Generations. And indeed it is a thing very well known that according to the Sense of Philosophers, these two things were always included together, in that one opinion of the Soul's Immortality, namely its Preexistence as well as its Postexistence. Neither was there ever any of the Ancients before Christianity, that held the Souls future Permanency after Death, who did not likewise affer its Preexistence; they clearly perceiving, that if it were once granted, that the Soul was Generated, it could never be proved but that it might be also Corrupted. And therefore the Assertors of the Souls Immortality, commonly begun here; first, to prove its Preexistence, proceeding thence afterward to establish its Permanency after Death. This is the Method used in Plato, who says: "The Living Soul of each, ever in this life, with a most admirable power, and in such a manner, that it never ceases to exist in the present Human Form, and from thence it appears to be Immortal, and so as will subsist after Death." And the chief demonstration of the Soul's Preexistence to the Ancients before Plato was this, because it is an Entity Really distinct from Body or Matter and the Modifications of it; and no real Substantial Entity can either spring of it fell out of Nothing, or be made out of any other Substance distinct from it, because Nothing can be made *ex nihilo* from nothing either existing or preexisting; all Natural Generations being but the various Dispositions and Modifications of what was before existent in the Universe. But there was Nothing of Soul and Mind, Inexisting and Preexisting in Body before, there being Nothing of Life and Cognition in Magnitude, Figure, Sitra, and Motion. Wherefore this must needs be, not a thing Made or Generated, as Corporeal Forms and Qualities are, but such
From the same Ground with Atoms.

as hath a Being in Nature Ingenerably and Incorruptibly. The Mechanism of Humane Body was a thing Made and Generated, it being only a different Modification of what was before existent, and having no new Entity in it distinct from the Substance: And the Totum or Compositum of a Man or Animal may be said to be Generated and Corrupted, in regard of the Union and Disunion, Conjunction and Separation of those two parts, the Soul and Body. But the Soul itself, according to these Principles, is neither a thing Generable nor Corruptible, but was as well before the Generation, and will be after the Deaths and Corruptions of men, as the Substance of their Body, which is supposed by all to have been from the first Creation, and no Part of it to be annihilated or lost after Death, but only scatter'd and dispersed in the Universe. Thus the Ancient Atomists concluded, That Souls and Lives being Substantial Entities by themselves, were all of them as old as any other Substance in the Universe, and as the whole Mass of Matter, and every smallest Atom of it also. That is, they who maintained the Eternity of the World, did consequentially affirm also Eternitatem Animorum (as Cicero calls it) the Eternity of Souls and Minds. But they who conceived the World to have had a Temporary Beginning or Creation, held the Coevity of all Souls with it, and would by no means be induced to think that every Atom of Sensible Matter and Particle of Dust, had such a Privilege and Preeminency over the Souls of Men and Animals, as to be Senior to them. Sympathetho as a Christian, yet having been educated in this Philosophy, could not be induced by the hopes of a Bilboprick, to hide or dissemble the Sentiment of his Mind, omnes enim animos esse omnium: I shall never be persuaded to think my Soul to be younger than my Body, but such, it seems, was the temper of those times, that he was not only dispens'd withal as to this, but also as to another Heterodoxy of his, concerning the Resurrection.

XXXII. It is already plain also, that this Doctrine of the Ancient Atomists concerning the Immateritaty and Immortality, the Pre-exist and Post-exist of Souls, was not confined by them to Humane Souls only, but extended universally to all Souls and Lives whatsoever. It being a thing that was hardly ever called into doubt or question by any, before Cartesius: whether the Souls of Brutes had any Sense, Cognition or Consciousness in them or no. Now all Life, Sense and Cognition was undoubtedly concluded by them, to be an Entity Really distinct from the Substance of Body, and not the mere Modification, Motion or Mechanism of it; Life and Mechanism being two distinct Ideas of the Mind, which cannot be confounded together. Wherefore they resolved that all Lives and Souls whatsoever, which now are in the World, ever were from the first Beginning of it, and ever will be; that there will be no new ones produced which are not already, and have not alwayes been, nor any of those which now are, destroyed, any more than the Substance of any Matter will be Created or Annihilated. So that the whole System of the Created Universe, Consisting of Body, and particular Incorporeal Substances or Souls, in the successte
five Generations and Corruptions, or Deaths, of Men and other Animals, was according to them, Really nothing else, but one and the same thing perpetually Anagrammatized, or but like many different Syllables and Words variously and successively composed out of the same preexistent Elements or Letters.

XXXIII. We have now declared how the same Principle of Reason which made the Ancient Physiologers to become Atomists, must needs induce them also to be Incorporealists; how the same thing which persuaded them that Corporeal Forms were no Real Entities distinct from the Substance of the Body, but only the different Modifications and Mechanisms of it, convinced them likewise, that all Cogitative Beings, all Souls and Lives whatsoever, were Ingenerable and Incorruptible, and as well Preexistent before the Generations of Particular Animals, as Postexistent after their Deaths and Corruptions. Nothing now remains but only to shew more particularly, that it was de falso thus, that the same persons did from this Principle (that Nothing can come from Nothing and go to Nothing) both Atomize in their Physiology, taking away all Substantial Forms and Qualities, and also Theologize or Incorporealize, afferting Souls to be a Substance really distinct from Matter and Immortal, as also to preexist; and this we shall do from Empedocles, and first from that Passage of his cited before in Part.

"Αλλα δή σοι έχεις φως κενός καθ' εκείνος ου χρειαζομαι

Επιρρήματα, συνάψας έκ διάλεξις τον εικόνα

Έστε φως κ' έν τοις ου κατάρτιοις κατάξισι.

Which I find Latin'd thus,

As alius dico nihil est Mortalibus Ortus,

Eis nihil Interitus, qui rebus morte paratur

Miftia sed solum est, & Conciliatio verum

Miftilium; hoc dici solita est Mortalibus Ortus.

The full Sense whereof is plainly this, That there is no φως or Production of any thing which was not before, or new Substance Made, which did not really Preexist; and therefore that in the Generations and Corruptions of Inanimate Bodies, there is no Form or Quality really distinct from the Substance produced and destroyed, but only a various Composition and Modification of Matter. But in the Generations and Corruptions of Men and Animals, where the Souls are Substances really distinct from the Matter, that there, there is Nothing but the Conjunction and Separation of Souls and particular Bodies, existing both before and after, not the Production of any new Soul into Being which was not before, nor the absolute Death and Destruction of any into Nothing. Which is further expressed in these following Verstes.
To this Sense; That they are Infants in Understanding, and short-sighted, who think any thing to be Made, which was Nothing before, or any thing to Die, so as to be Destroyed to Nothing. Upon which Plutarch glosses after this manner: the ancient giveth, all the thing it in my opinion makes such fumes, all the thing to witness, the to the to in upon everything. Empedocles does not here destroy Generation, but only such as is out of Nothing, nor Corruption, but such as is into Nothing. Which, as we have already intimated, is to be understood differently in respect to Inanimate and Animate things: for in things Inanimate there is Nothing Produced or Destroyed, because the Forms and Qualities of them are no Entities really distinct from the Substance, but only diverse Mixtures and Modifications. But in Animate things, where the Souls are real Entities really distinct from the Substance of the Body, there is Nothing Produced nor Destroyed neither, because those Souls do both exist before their Generations, and after their Corruptions; which business, as to Men and Souls, is again more fully expressed thus;

That Good and Ill did First us Here attend, And not from Time Before, the Soul Descend; That here alone we live, and when Hence we depart, we forthwith then, Turn to our old Non-entity again; Certe's ought not to be believe'd by Wise and Learned Men.

Wherefore, according to Empedocles, this is to be accounted one of the Vulgar Errors, That Men then only have a being and are capable of Good and Evil, when they live here that which is called Life; But that both before they are Born, and after they are Dead, they are perfectly Nothing.

And besides Empedocles, the same is represented by the Greek Tragedian also, as the Sense of the ancient Philosophers.

That Nothing Dies or utterly perisheth; but things being variously Concreted and Secreted, Transposed and Modified, change their Form and Shape only, and are put into a New Dress.
Agreeably whereunto, Plato also tells us, that it was παλαις λέγοντας an ancient Tradition or Doctrine before his Time, τός ἡμεῖς ἐν ἡμῖν τούτων γιγαντίων, ἦτοι ἐν ζωὴν ἔτη τέσσερα εἰς τό πάντως. That as well the Living were made out of the Dead, as the Dead out of the Living, and that this was the constant Circle of Nature. Moreover the same Philosopher acquaints us, that some of those Ancients were not without fulspection, that what is now called Death, was to Men more properly a Nativity or Birth into Life, and what is called Generation into Life, was comparatively rather to be accounted a linking into Death; the Former being the Soul's Ascent out of these Gross Terrestrial Bodies, to a Body more Thin and Subtil, and the Latter its Decent from a purer Body to that which is more Crafts and Terrestrial. οὗ οἶον εἰ τοῦ ζῶν μὲν ἐνεργεῖ, τὸ χαρακτῆρον ἣ τοῦ ζῶν. Who knows whether that which is called Living be not indeed rather Dying, and that which is called Dying, Living?

Moreover, that this was the Doctrine of Pythagoras himself, that no Real Entity perisheth in Corruptions, nor is produced in Generations, but only new Modifications and Transpositions made; is fully expressed by the Latin Poet, both as to Inanimate, and to Animal Things. Of the first thus:

Nec perit in tanto quiequam (mibi credites) mundo,
Sed variat, faciemque novat: Nasci, quem vocatur
Inciere eft alius, quam quod fuit ante; Morire
Definere illud idem. Cum fint Huc forfitan Ilia,
Hec Translatis Illuc: Summis, tamem omnia constant.

Of the Second, that the Souls of Animals are Immortal, did preexist and do transmigrate, from the same Ground, after this manner:

Omnia mutantur; Nihil interit: Errat & illinc,
Huc venit, hic illuc, & quoslibet occupat artus,
Spiritus, igitur Erat Humane in Corpora tranfit,
Incipere est alius, quam quod fuit ante; Morire
Definire idem. Cum fint Huc forfitan Ilia,
Hec Translatis Illuc: Summis, tamem omnia constant.

Wherefore though it be a thing which hath not been commonly taken Notice of, of late, yet we conceive it to be unquestionably true, that all those ancient Philosophers, who insisted so much upon this Principle, οὕτως ἂν ἄλλο νομίζον, οὕτως ὅπως ἄλλο νομίζον. That no Real Entity is either Generated or Corrupted, did therein at once drive at these two things: First, the establisning of the Immortality of all Souls, their Pre and Post-existence, forasmuch as being Entities Really distinct from the Body, they could neither be Generated nor Corrupted; and Secondly, the making of Corporeal Forms and Qualities to be no Real Entities distinct from the Body and the Mechanism.
Upon the same Basis with Atoms.
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chanism thereof, because they are things Generated and Corrupted, and have no Pre and Post-existence. Anaxagoras in this Latter, being the only Difcounter of those Forms and Qualities to be real Entities likewise, distinct from the Substance of Body, therefore attributed Perpetuity of Being to them also, Pre and Post-existence, in Similar Atoms, as well as to the Souls of Animals.

And now we have made it sufficiently evident that the Doctrine of the Incorporeity and Immortality of Souls, we might add also, of their Preexistence and Transmigration, had the same Original and stood upon the same Basis with the Atomical Pythology; and therefore it ought not at all to be wondered at (what we affirmed before) that the same Philosophers and Pythagoreans affected both those Doctrines, and that the Ancient Atomists were both Theists and Incorporealists.

XXXIV. But now to declare our Sense freely concerning this Philosophy of the Ancients, which seems to be so prodigiously paradoxical, in respect of that Pre-existence and Transmigration of Souls: We conceive indeed that this Ratiocination of theirs from that Principle, That Nothing Naturally, or of it self, comes from Nothing, nor goes to Nothing, was not only firmly conclusive against Substantial Forms and Qualities of Bodies, really distinct from their Substance, but also for Substantial Incorporeal Souls, and their Ingenuity out of the Matter; and particularly for the future Immortality or Post-existence of all Humane Souls. For since it is plain, that they are not a mere Modification of Body or Matter, but an Entity and Substance really distinct from it, we have no more reason to think, that they can ever of themselves vanish into Nothing, than that the Substance of the Corporeal World or any part thereof, can do so. For that in the Consummation of Bodies by Fire, or Age, or the like, there is the destruction of any real Substance into Nothing, is now generally exploded as an Idiatical conceit, and certainly it cannot be a jot less Idiatical to suppose that the Rational Soul in Death is utterly extinguished.

Moreover we add also, that this Ratiocination of the Ancients would be altogether as firm and irrefragable likewise, for the Preexistence and Transmigration of Souls, as it is for their Post-existence and future Immortality; did we not (as indeed we do) suppose Souls to be Created by God immediately, and infused in Generations. For they being unquestionably, a distinct Substance from the Body, and no Substance according to the ordinary Course of Nature, coming out of Nothing, they must of Necessity either Preexist in the Universe before Generations, and Transmigrate into their respective Bodies, or else come from God immediately, who is the Fountain of all, and who at first created all that Substance that now is in the World besides himself. Now the latter of these was a thing which those Ancient Philosophers would by no means admit of; they judging it altogether incongruous, to bring God upon the Stage perpetually, and make him immediately interpole every where, in the

Genera-
Generations of Men and all other Animals, by the Miraculous production of Souls out of Nothing. Notwithstanding which, if we well consider it, we shall find that there may be very good reason on the other side, for the successive Divine Creation of Souls; namely, that God did not do all at first, that ever he could or would do; and put forth all his Creative Vigour at once in a moment, ever afterwards remaining a Spectator only of the consequent Results, and permitting Nature to do all alone, without the least Interposition of his at any time, just as if there were no God at all in the World. For this may be, and indeed often hath been, the effect of such an Hypothesis as this, to make men think, that there is no other God in the World but Blind and Dark Nature. God might also for other good and wise Ends, unknown to us, reserve to himself the continual exercise of this his Creative power, in the successive Production of new Souls. And yet these Souls nevertheless, after they are once brought forth into being, will notwithstanding their Jurisdiction, continue as firmly in the same, without vanishing of themselves into Nothing, as the Substance of Senseless Matter: that was Created many thousand years before, will do.

And thus our Vulgar Hypothesis, of the new Creation of Souls, as it is Rational in itself, so it doth sufficiently falsify their Incorporeity, their future Immortality or Post-eternity, without introducing those offensive Absurdities of their Preexistence and Transmigration.

XXXV. But if there be any such, who rather than they would allow a future Immortality or Post-existence to all Souls, and therefore to those of Brutes, which consequent must have their Successive Transmigrations, would conclude the Souls of all Brutes, as likewise the Sensitive Soul in Man, to be Corporeal, and only allow the Rational Soul to be distinct from Matter: To these we have only thus much to say: That they who will attribute Life, Sense, Cognition, Consciousness and Self-enjoyment, not without some footsteps of Reason many times, to Blood and Brains, or mere Organized Bodies in Brutes, will never be able clearly to defend the Incorporeity and Immortality of Humane Souls, as most probably they do not intend any such thing. For either all Conscious and Cogitative Beings are Corporeal, or else nothing can be proved to be Corporeal. From whence it would follow also, that there is no Deity distinct from the Corporeal World. But though there seem to be no very great reason, why it should be thought absurd, to grant Perpetuity of Duration to the Souls of Brutes, any more than to every Atom of Matter, or Particle of Dust that is in the whole World; yet we shall endeavour to suggest something towards the easing the minds of those, who are so much burthened with this difficulty; viz. That they may, if they please, suppose the Souls of Brutes, being but so many particular Emissions or Efluses from that Source of Life above, whenever and wherefover there is any fitly prepared Matter capable to receive them, and to be Actuated by them; to have a sense and fruition of themselves.
themelves in it, so long as it continues such, but as soon as ever those Organized Bodies of theirs, by reason of their Indisposition, become incapable of being further acted upon by them, then to be resumed again and retrac'ted back to their Original Head and Fountain. Since it cannot be doubted, but what Creates any thing out of Nothing, or sends it forth from it self, by free and voluntary Emanation, may be able either to Retrac't the same back again to its original Source, or else to Annihilate it at pleasure.

And I find that there have not wanted some among the Gentile Philosophers themelves, who have entertained this Opinion, whereof Porphyry is one: *μετα ικαστο διανοιας ἀλογος εἰς τὸν ἐναλλ ζωὸν τὸ παλιος. Every irrational Power is resolved into the Life of the Whole.

XXXVI. Neither will this at all weaken the future Immortality or Post-eternity of Humane Souls. For if we be indeed Theifts, and do in very good Earnest believe a Deity, according to the true Notion of it, we must then needs acknowledge, that all created Being whatsoever, owes the Continuation and Perpetuity of its Existence, not to any Necessity of Nature without God, and Independently upon him, but to the Divine Will only. And therefore though we had never so much Rational and Philosophical assurance, that our Souls are Immaterial Substances, diftant from the Body, yet we could not for all that, have any absolute certainty of their Post-eternity, any otherwize than as it may be derived to us, from the Immutability and Perfection of the Divine Nature and Will, which always is that which is Best. For the Essential Goodnes and Wisdom of the Deity is the only Stability of all things. And for ought we Mortals know, there may be good Reaon, why that Grace or Favour of future Immortality and Post-eternity, that is indulged to Humane Souls, ended with Reaon, Morality, and Liberty of Will, (by means whereof they are capable of Commendation and Blame, Reward and Punishment) that so they may be Objects for Divine Justice to display it self upon after this Life, in different Retributions; may notwithstanding be denied to those lower Lives and more contemptible Souls of Brutes, alike devoid both of Morality and Liberty.

XXXVII. But if any for all this will still obstinately contend for that ancient Pythagorick and Empedoclean Hypothef, That all Lives and Souls whatsoever are as old as the first Creation, and will continue to Eternity, or as long as the World doth; as a thing more Reasonable and Probable than our Continual Creation of new Souls, by means whereof they become Juniors both to the matter of the World and of their own Bodies, and whereby also (as they pretend) the Divine creative Power is made too Cheap and Prostituted a thing, as being Famulative alwais to Brutes, and many times to unlawful Lufts and undue Conjunctions; but especially that the Continual Decreation and Annihilation of the Souls of Brutes; we shall not be very unwilling to acknowledge thus much to them,

That...
That indeed of the two, this Opinion is more Reasonable and Tol-
erable than that other Extravagancy of those, who will either make all Souls to be Generated and consequently to be Corporeal, or at least the Sensitive Soul both in Men and Brutes. For besides the Monstrosity of this latter opinion, in making two distinct Souls and Perceptive Substances in every Man, which is a thing sufficiently confuted by Internal Sense, it leaves us also in an absolute Impos-
sibility, of proving the Immortality of the Rational Soul, the In-
corporeity of any Substance, and by consequence the Existence of any Deity distinct from the Corporeal World.

And as for that Pretence of theirs, that Senfeles Matter may as well become Sensitive, and as it were kindled into Life and Cogitation, as a Body that was devoid of Light and Heat, may be Kindled into Fire and Flame; this seems to argue too much Ignorance of the Doctrine of Bodies, in men otherwise Learned and Ingenious. The best Naturalists having already concluded, That Fire and Flame is nothing but such a Motion of the Insensible Parts of a Body, as whereby they are violently agitated, and many times dissipated and scattered from each other, begetting in the mean time those Phancies of Light and Heat in Animals. Now there is no difficulty at all in conceiving that the Insensible Particles of a Body, which were before quiescent, may be put into Motion; this « being nothing but a New Modification of them, and no Entity really distinct from the Substance of Body; as Life, Sense and Cogitation are. There is nothing in Fire and Flame, or a Kindled Body, different from other Bodies, but only the Motion or Mecha-
nism, and Phancy of it. And therefore it is but a crude conceit, which the Atheists and Corporealists of former times have been always so fond of; That Souls are nothing but Fire or Flam-
meous Bodies. For though Heat in the Bodies of Animals be a Necessary Instrument for Soul and Life to act by in them, yet it is a thing really distinct from Life; and a Red hot Iron hath not therefore any nearer approximation to Life than it had before, nor the Flame of a Candle than the extinguish'd Snuff or Tallow of it; the difference between them being only in the Agitation of the Insen-
sible Parts. We might also add, that according to this Hypothesis, the Souls of Animals could not be Numerically the same through-
out the whole Space of their Lives: Since that Fire that needs a Voluum to prey upon, doth not continue alwayes one and the same Numerical Substance. The Soul of a new born Animal could be no more the same, with the Soul of that Animal several years after, than the Flame of a new lighted Candle is the same with that Flame that twinkles last in the Socket. Which indeed are no more the same than a River or Stream is the same, at several Distances of time. Which Reason may be also extended further to prove the Soul to be no Body at all, since the Bodies of all Animals are in a perpetual Flux.

XXXVIII. We have now sufficiently performed our first Task which was to shew from the Origin of the Atomical Physiology, That
that the Doctrine of Incorporeal Substance must needs spring up
together with it. We shall in the next place make it manifest, that
the Inward Constitution of this Philosophy is also such, that who-
soever really entertains it, and rightly understands it, must of ne-
cessity admit Incorporeal Substance likewise. First therefore, the
Atomical Hypothecis, allowing nothing to Body, but what is either
included in the Idea of a thing Impenetrably extended, or can clearly
be conceived to be a Mode of it, as more or less Magnitude
with Divisibility, Figure, Site, Motion and Rect., together with
the Refults of their several Combinations; cannot possibly make
Life and Cognition to be Qualities of Body, since they are nei-
ther contained in those things before mentioned, nor can result from
any Synthesis or Conjunctions of them. Wherefore it must needs be
granted, that Life and Cognition are the Attributes of another Sub-
stance distinct from Body, or Incorporeal.

Again, since according to the Tenour of this Physiology, Body
hath no other Action belonging to it but that of Local Motion,
which Local Motion as such, is Essentially Heterokinetic, that which
never springs originally from the thing itself moving, but always
from the Action of some other Agent upon it: That is, since no Body
could ever move it itself; it follows undeniably, that there must be some-
thing else in the World besides Body, or else there could never
have been any Motion in it. Of which we shall speake more
afterwards.

Moreover, according to this Philosophy, the Corporeal Phenomena
themselves cannot be falsified by Mechanism alone without Phancie.
Now Phancie is no Mode of Body, and therefore must needs be a
Mode of some other kind of Being in our selves, that is Cogitative
and Incorporeal.

Furthermore it is evident, from the Principles of this Phi-
losophy, that Senfe itself is not a mere Corporeal Passion from Bod-
ies without, in that it supposeth that there is nothing really in
Bodies like to those Phantastick Ideas that we have of Sensible
things, as of Hot and Cold, Red and Green, Bitter and Sweet,
and the like, which therefore must needs owe their Being to some
Activity of the Soul itself, and this is all one as to make it In-
corporeal.

Lastly, from this Philosophy, it is also manifest, that Senfe
is not the Subject of Truth concerning Bodies themselves, it
confidently pronouncing that those supposed Qualities of Bodies,
represented such by Senfe, are merely Phantastical things; from
whence it plainly follows, that there is something in us superior to
Senfe, which judges of it, detects its Phantastry, and condemns its Im-
politure, and determines what really is and is not, in Bodies without us,
which must needs be a higher Self-active Vigour of the Mind, that
will plainly speake it to be Incorporeal.

XXXIX. And
XXXIX. And now this Atomic R Physiology of the Ancients seems to have two Advantages or Preeminences belonging to it, the first whereof is this: That it renders the Corporeal World Intelligible to us; since Mechanism is a thing that we can clearly understand, and we cannot clearly and distinctly conceive any thing in Bodies else. To say that this or that is done by a Form or Quality, is nothing else but to say that it is done we know not how, or, which is yet more absurd, to make our very Ignorance of the Cause, disguised under those Terms of Forms and Qualities, to be it self the Cause of the Effect.

Moreover, Hot and Cold, Red and Green, Bitter and Sweet, &c. formally considered, may be clearly conceived by us as different Phancies and Vital Passions in us, occasioned by different Motions made from the objects without, upon our Nerves; but they can never be clearly understood as absolute Qualities in the Bodies themselves, really distinct from their Mechanical Dispositions; nor is there indeed any more reason why they should be thought such, than that, when a Man is pricked with a Pin, or wounded with a Sword, the Pain which he feels should be thought to be an Absolute Quality in the Pin or Sword. So long as our Sensible Ideas are taken either for Substantial Forms or Qualities in Bodies without us, really distinct from the Substance of the Matter, so long are they perfectly unintelligible by us. For which Cause TImeus Lover Philopohizing (as it is commonly) after this manner, did confentaneously thereunto determine, That Corporeal things could not be apprehended by us, otherwise than 

Moreover, by Reason of the smallnes of Entity that is in them, below the Understanding, and not having so much ονησις as ψηλός, Essence as Generation, which indeed is Fine Phancie. Wherefore we must either, with these Philosophers, make Sensible things to be ονησισια and ονησισια, altogether Incomprehensible and Incapable by our Humane Understandings, (though they be able in the mean time clearly to conceive many things of a higher Nature) or else we must entertain some kind of favourable Opinion concerning that which is the Anciendst of all Physiologies, the Atomical or Mechanical, which alone renders Sensible things Intelligible.

XL. The Second Advantage, which this Atomic Physiology seems to have, is this, That it prepares an easie and clear way for the Demonstration of Incorporeal Substances, by settling a Distinct Noti-
of Body. He that will undertake to prove that there is something
else in the World besides Body, must first determine what
Body is, for otherwise he will go about to prove that there is something
besides He-knows-not-what. But now if all Body be made
to consist of two Substantial Principles, whereof one is Matter
devoid of all Form; (and therefore of Quantity as well as Qualities)
from whence these Philosophers themselves conclude that it is Incor-
poral; the other, Form, which being devoid of all Matter,
must needs be Incorporeal likewise. And thus Stoics sets down
the joint Doctrine both of Plato and Aristotle in the way of
Platonism, that Qualities are Incorporeal, as if they were so many
Spirits possessing Bodies; I say, in this way of Philosopizing,
the Notions of Body and Spirit, Corporeal and Incorporeal, are so
confounded, that it is Impossible to prove any thing at all con-
cerning them. Body it self being made Incorporeal (and therefore
every thing Incorporeal) for whatsoever is wholly compounded
and made up of Incorporeals, must needs be it self also Incorporeal.

Furthermore, according to this Doctrine of Matter, Forms and
Qualities in Body; Life and Understanding may be supposed to be
certain Forms or Qualities of Body. And then the Souls of men
may be nothing else but Blood or Brains, endued with the Quali-
ties of Senfè, and Understanding, or else some other more Subtle,
Sensible and Rational Matter, in us. And the like may be said of
God himself also; That he is nothing but a certain Rational, or
Intellectual, Subtle and Firie Body, pervading the whole Universe;
or else that he is the Form of the whole Corporeal World, together
with the Matter making up but one Substanct. Which Conceits
have been formerly entertained by the best of those Ancients, who
were captivated under that dark Infirmity of mind, to think that there
could be no other Substanct besides Body.

But the ancient Atomical Philosophy, setting a distinct Notion of
Body, that it is θύοματον ἀδίττονον, a Thing Impenetrably extended,
which hath nothing belonging to it, but Magnitude, Figure, Site,
Ref, and Motion, without any Self-moving Power; takes away all
Confusion; shews clearly how far Body can go, where Incorporeal
Substanct begins; as also that there must of necessity be such a
Thing in the World.

Again, this discovering not only that the Doctrine of Qualities
had its Original from mens mistaking their own Phancies, for Absol-
ute Realities in Bodies themselves; but also the that the Doctrine of Mat-
The doctrine of matter, or abstraction of the mind, in taking logical notions, and our modes of conceiving, for modes of being, and real entities in things without us; it shaping likewise, that because there is nothing else clearly intelligible in body, besides magnitude, figure, site, and motion, and their various conjugations, there can be no such entities of forms and qualities really distinct from the substance of body; makes it evident, that life, cogitation and understanding can be no corporeal things, but must needs be the attributes of another kind of substance distinct from body.

XLI. We have now clearly proved these two things; first, that the physiology of the ancients, before, not only Aristotle and Plato, but also Democritus and Leucippus, was atomical or mechanical. Secondly, that as there is no inconsistency between the atomical physiology and theology, but indeed a natural cognition; so the ancient atomists before Democritus were neither atheists nor corporealists, but held the incorporeity and immortality of souls, together with a deity distinct from the corporeal world. Wherefore the first and most ancient atomists did not make ἀτόμας ἄρχος τοῦ ἄλοχος, they never endeavoured to make up an entire philosophy out of atomology; but the doctrine of atoms was to them only one part or member of the whole philosophick system, they joining thereunto the doctrine of incorporeal substance, and theology, to make it up complete: Accordingly as Aristotle hath declared in his metaphysics, that the ancient philosophy consisted of these two parts, ψυχολογία, and φυσιολoγία, or ἡ πρώτη φιλοσοφία, physiology, and theology or metaphysics. Our ancient atomists never went about, as the blundering Democritus afterwards did, to build up a world out of mere passive bulk, and sluggish matter, without any ἀρχεῖα, any active principles, or incorporeal powers; understanding well, that thus, they could not so much as motion, mechanism, or generation in it; the original of all that motion that is in bodies springing from something that is not body, that is, from incorporeal substance. And yet if local motion could have been supposed to have risen up, or sprung in upon this dead lump and mass of matter, no body knows how, and without dependence upon any incorporeal being, to have actuated it fortuitously; these ancient atomists would still have thought it impossible for the corporeal world it self, to be made up, such as now it is, by fortuitous mechanism, without the guidance of any higher principle. But they would have concluded it, the greatest impudence or madness, for men to assert that animals also consisted of mere mechanism; or, that life and sense, reason and understanding, were really nothing else but local motion, and consequently that themselves were but machines and automata. Wherefore they joined both active and passive principles together, the corporeal and incorporeal nature, mechanism and life, atomology and pneumatology, and from both these united, they made up one entire system of philosophy, correspondent...
correspondent with, and agreeable to, the true and real World without them. And this System of Philosophy, thus consisting of the Doctrine of Incorporeal Substance (whereof God is the Head) together with the Atomic and Mechanical Physiology, seems to have been the only Genuine, Perfect, and Complete.

XLIII. But it did not long continue thus; for, after a while, this entire Body of Philosophy came to be Mangled and Dismembered, some taking one Part of it alone, and some another; some snatching away the Atomic Physiology, without the Pneumatology and Theology; and others, on the contrary, taking the Theology and Doctrine of Incorporeals, without the Atomic or Mechanical Physiology. The former of these were Democritus, Leucippus, and Protagoras, who took only the dead Carcass or Skeleton of the old Mechanical Philosophy, namely the Atomic Physiology; the latter Plato and Aristotle, who took indeed the better Part, the Soul, Spirit, and Quintessence of it, the Theology and Doctrine of Incorporeals, but Unbodied, and Devested of its moft Proper and convenient Vehicle, the Atomic Physiology, whereby it became exposed to fundry Inconveniences.

XLIII. We begin with Leucippus and Democritus; who being Atheistically inclined, quickly perceived, that they could not in the ordinary way of Physiologizing, sufficiently secure themselves against a Deity, nor effectually urge Atheism upon others; forasmuch as Heraclitus and other Philosophers, who held that all Substance was Body, as well as themselves, did notwithstanding affect a Corporeal Deity, maintaining that the Form of the whole Corporeal World was God, or else that he was οἶκος ἀνεξ ἐκστάσεως, a certain kind of Body or Matter, as (for Example) a Methodical and Rational Fire, pervading (as a Soul) the whole Universe; the particular Souls of men and Animals being but, as it were, so many pieces, cut and sliced out of the great Mundane Soul; so that according to them, the whole Corporeal Universe, or Mass of Body, was one way or other a God, a most Wise and Understanding Animal, that did frame all Particularities within it self in the best manner possible, and providently govern the same. Wherefore those Atheists now apprehending, upon what ticklish and uncertain Terms their Atheistical Philosophy then stood, and how that those very Forms and Qualities, and the Self-moving power of Body, which were commonly made a Sanctuary for Atheism, might notwithstanding chance to prove, contrariwise, the Latium and Asylum of a Deity, and that a Corporeal God (do what they could) might lie lurking under them, assaulting mens minds with doubtful Fears and Jealousies; Understanding moreover, that there was another kind of Physiology fast on foot, which banishing those Forms and Qualities of Body, attributed nothing to it but Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion, without any Self-moving Power; they seemed presently to apprehend some great Advantage to themselves and Caufe from it; and therefore greedily entertained this Atomic or Mechanical Physiology, and violently cutting it off from that other part, the Doctrine of Incorporeals.
The abandoned between as which it was Naturally and Vitally united to, endeavoured to serve their turns of it. And now joining these two things together, the Atomical Physis which supposes that there is nothing in body, but Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion, and that Prejudice or Prepossession of their own Minds, that there was no other Substance in the World besides Body; between them both, they begat a certain Mongrel and Spurious Philosophy, Atheistically-Atomical, or Atomically-Atheistical.

But though we have so well proved, that Leucippus and Democritus were not the first Inventors, but only the Depravers and Adulterators of the Atomical Philosophy; yet if any will notwithstanding obstinately contend, that the first Invention thereof ought to be imputed to them, the very Principles of their Atheism seeming to lead them naturally to this, to strip and deject Body of all those Forms and Qualitics, it being otherwise Impossible for them, fully and safely to exclude a Corporeal Deity; yet so, as that the Wit of these Atheists was also much to be admired, in the managing and carrying on of those Principles in such a manner, as to make up so Entire a System of Philosophy out of them, all whose parts should be so coherent and consistent together; We shall only lay thus much; That if those Atheists were the first Inventors of this Philosophy, they were certainly very unhappy and unsuccessful in it, whilst endeavouring by it to secure themselves from the Possibility and Danger of a Corporeal God, they unawares laid a Foundation for the clear Demonstration of an Incorporeal one, and were indeed so far from making up any such coherent Frame as is pretended, that they were forced everywhere to contradict their own Principles; so that Non-fence lies at the bottom of all, and is interwoven throughout their whole Atheistical System. And that we ought to take notice of the invincible power and Force of Truth, prevailing irresistibly against all Endeavours to oppose it; and how desperate the Cause of Atheism is, when that very Atomical Hypothesis of theirs, which they would erect and build up for a strong Castle to garrison themselves in, proves a most Effectual Engine against themselves, for the battering down of all their Atheistical Structure about their Ears.

XLIV. Plato's Mutilation and Interpolation of the old Mosaic Philosophy, was a great deal more excusable, when he took the Theology and Metaphysics of it, the whole Doctrine of Incorporeals, and abandoned the Atomical or Mechanical way of Physiologizing. Which, in all Probability, he did, partly because those forementioned Atheists having so much abused that Philosophy, adopting it as it were to themselves, he thereupon began to entertain a Jealousie and Suspicion of it; and partly, because he was not of himself so inclinable to Physiolog as Theology, to the study of Corporeal as of Divine things; which some think to be the reason why he did not attend to the Pythagoric System of the Corporeal World, till late in his old Age. His Genius was such, that he was Naturally more addicted to Ideas's than to Atoms, to Formal and Final than to Material.
Material Causes. To which may be added, that the way of Physiologizing by Matter, Forms and Qualities, is a more Hufie and phænefall thing than the other; and lastly, that the Atomical Physiology is more remote from Senfè and vulgar Apprehension, and therefore not so eaily understood. For which caufe many learned Greeks of later times, though they had read Epicurus his Works, and perhaps Democritus his too, yet they were not able to conceive how the Corporeal and Sensible Phenomena could possibly be salved without Reall Qualities. One Instance whereof might be given in Plutarch, writing against Colotes the Epicurean. Wherefore Plato, that was a zealous Afferter of an Incorporeal Deity, distinct from the World, and of Immortal Souls, seriously Physiologized only by Matter, Forms and Qualities, Generation, Corruption and Alteration; and he did but play and toy sometimes a little with Atoms and Mechanism. As where he would compound the Earth of Cubical, and Fire of Pyramidal Atoms, and the like. For that he did therein imitate the Atomical Physiology is plain from these words of his; παλάς ἐν δέι ταῦτα διανείμειν αμφιπλάστω ἡτῶ. ὡς καὶ ἐν ἱεροτητικον ὑπ’ ἔμαθιν, σωματικῶς, ἁπάντως. τὸς ὅποιαν αὐτῆς ὁδόν: All these Cubical and Pyramidal Corpuscula of the Fire and Earth are in themselves so small, that by reason of their remote; none of them can be perceived singly alone, but only the Aggregations of many of them together.

XLV. And Aristotle here trode in Plato’s footsteps, not only in the better part, in asserting an Incorporeal Deity, and an Immutable first Mover; but also in Physiologizing by Forms and Qualities, and rejecting that Mechanical way by Atoms, which had been so generally received amongst the Ancients. Wherefore though the Genius of these two Persons was very different, and Aristotle often contradicted Plato, and really differs from him in several Particulars; yet, so much I think may be granted to those Reconcilers (Porphyry, Simplicius, and others) that the main Essentials of their two Philosophies are the same.

Now I say the whole Aristotelical System of Philosophy is infinitely to be preferred before the whole Democritical; though the former hath been so much disparaged, and the other cried up of late amongst us. Because, though it cannot be denied but that the Democritical Hypotheses doth much more handily and intelligibly salve the Corporeal Phenomena, yet in all those other things which are of far the greatest moment, it is rather a Madness than a Philosophy. But the Aristotelick System is right and sound here, as to those greater things; it ascertaining Incorporeal Substance, a Deity distinct from the World, the Naturality of Morality, and Liberty of Will. Wherefore though a late Writer of Politicks do exceedingly disparage Aristotle’s Ethicks, yet we shall do him this right here to declare, that his Ethicks were truly such, and answered their Title; but that new Mod of Ethicks, which hath been obtruded upon the World with so much Faltufity, and is indeed nothing but the old Democritick Doctrine revived, is no Ethicks at all, but a mere Cheat, the undermining

and
and subversion of all Morality, by substituting something like it in the Room of it, that is, a mere Counterfeit and Changeling. The Design whereof could not be any other than to debauch the World.

We add further, that Aristotle's System of Philosophy seems to be more consistent with Piety, than the Cartesian Hypothesis it implies, which yet plainly supposes an Incorporeal Substance. For as much as this latter makes God to contribute nothing more to the Fabric of the World, than the Turning round of a Vortex or Whirlpool of Matter; from the fortuitous Motion of which, according to certain General Laws of Nature, must proceed all this Frame of things that now is, the exact Organization, and successive Generation of Animals, without the Guidance of any Mind or Wisdom. Whereas Aristotle's Nature is no Fortuitous Principle, but such as doth Nothing in Vain, but all for Ends, and in every thing pursues the Best; and therefore can be no other than a Subordinate Instrument of the Divine Wisdom, and the Manuai Opisfer or Executioner of it.

However, we cannot deny, but that Aristotle hath been taxed by fundry of the Ancients, Christians and others, for so explicitly, asserting these two things, the Immortality of Humane Souls, and Providence over men, as he ought to have done, and as his Matter Plato did. Though to do him all the right we can, we shall observe here, that in his Nicomachian Ethics, he speaks favourably, for the Latter, ει δε τος Θεωμηλη της ανδρεπολον προς Σως γενετηριον, ης της δοκει, και του θεον εκδηλων αυτου της αεισεληνης και της περαιτερων (θετο δε ειν αυτου, εις τον αεικαις, και της απαντης μελετης της της περαιτερων περαιτερου, δη τους φιλαν αυτως θεωμηλημενους, δοκεις τη καλες περαιτερους); If God take any Care of Humane things, as it seems he doth, then it is reasonable to think also, that he is delighted with that which is the Best, and nearest akin to himself (which is Mind or Right Reason) and that he rewards those who most Love and Honour it (as taking care of such things as are most pleasing to him) in doing rightly and honestly. A very good Sentence, were it not Ufhered in with too much of Scepticism. And as for the Point of the Soul's Immortality; It is true, that whereas other Philosophers before Aristotle, afferrated the Preexistence, Incorporeity, and Immortality of all Souls, not only the Rational but the Sensitive also, (which in Men they concluded to be one and the same Substance) according to that of Plato's, υποτην ξω χατεος της, Every Soul is Immortal, they resolving that no Life nor Cognition could be Corporeal; Aristotle, on the contrary, doth expressly deny he Preexistence, that is, the Separability, Incorporeity and Immortality of all Sensible Souls, not in Brutes only, but also everywhere, giving his reason for it in these words; υτι μωδι έχ ουν της πολως προηντεχειν, φονεσεις λεγει εν την τοηταν, δην γετη λεγει αφενη οι ευγενες σωματικην, αλην συρνατηι, της πνευματικης πνευματικης, δην και των ανθρωπων αρωματων ανθρωπων, ει τω ατικετον των ανθρωπων αυτων, δη των ανθρωπων των ανθρωπων, ει των ανθρωπων των ανθρωπων, ης και των ανθρωπων των ανθρωπων. That all Souls cannot Preexist, is manifest from hence, because those Principles whose Addition is Corporeal, cannot possibly exist without the Body, as the Power of Walking without
withou the Feet: Wherefore it is impossible that thee Sensitive Souls (preexcisting) should come into the Body from without, since they can neither come alone by themselves naked and stript of all body, they being inseparable from it; neither can they come in with a Body, that is, the Seed. This is Aristotle’s Argument, why all Sensitive Souls must needs be Corporeal, because there is no Walking without Feet, nor Seeing without Eyes. But at the same time, he declares that the Mind or Intellect does Preexist and come in from without, that is, is Corporeal, Separable and Immortal, giving his Reason for it in like manner, 3 2 νόον μενον ιαμένον ιερόδεν ετειλαν, εκ θεον εικας μενον ενελθεν τε την ενεργειαν καταλαβα τωριν σωματικ την ενεργειαν: It remains that the Mind or Intellect, and that alone (preexcisting) enter from without and be only Divine; since its Energy is not blended with that of the Bodies, but it acts independently upon it. Notwithstanding which, Aristotle elsewhere distinguishing concerning this, Mind or Intellect, and making it to be twofold, Agent, and Patient, concludes the former of them only to be Immortal, but the latter Corruptible, την τυλικον ενεργειαν και αεικον, δε τη πασεις καιον ιαμενος. The Agent Intellect is only Immortal and Eternal, but the Passive is Corporeal, where some Interpreters that would willingly excuse Aristotle, contend that by the Passive Intellect, is not meant the Patient, but the Phantasie only, because Aristotle should otherwise contradict himself, who had before affirmed, the Intellect to be Separable, Unmixed and Inorganical, which they conceive must needs be understood of the Patient. But this Salvo can hardly take place here, where the Passive Intellect is directly opposed to the Agent. Now what Aristotle’s Agent Understanding is, and whether it be any thing in us, any Faculty of our Humane Soul or no, seems to be a thing very questionable, and has therefore caused much Dispute among his Interpreters; it being resolved by many of them to be the Divine Intellect, and commonly by others, a Foreign Thing. Whence it must needs be left doubtful, whether he acknowledged any thing Incorporeal and Immortal at all in us. And the rather because, laying down this Principle, That nothing is Incorporeal, but what acts independently upon the Body, he somewhere plainly determines, that there is no Intellect without Corporeal Phantoms. That which led Aristotle to all this; positively to affirm the Corporeity of Sensible Souls, and to stagger so much concerning the Incorporeity of the Rational, seems to have been his Doctrine of Forms and Qualities, whereby Corporeal and Incorporeal Substance are confounded together, so that the Limits of each could not be discerned by him. Wherefore we cannot applaud Aristotle for this; but that which we commend him for, is chiefly these Four things: First, for making a Perfect Incorporeal Intellect to be the Head of all; and Secondly, for resolving that Nature, as an Infrument of this Intellect, does not merely act according to the Necessity of Material Motions, but for Ends and Purposes, though unknown to it self; Thirdly, for maintaining the Naturality of Morality; and Lastly, for ascertaining the ηυς ιδιος, Autexousie, or Liberty from Necessity.
In this Chapter are contained all the pretended Grounds of Reason for
the Atheistic Hypothesis. 1. That the Democritic Philosophy which
is made up of these two Principles, Corporealism and Atomism com-
licated together, is Essentially Atheistical. 2. Though Epicurus, who
was an Atomical-Corporealist, pretended to assert a Democracy of
Gods, yet he was, for all that, an Absolute Atheist: And that Atheists
commonly Equivoicate and Disguise themselves. 3. That the Demo-
critical Philosophy is nothing else but a System of Atheology, or A-
theism flattering under the glorious Appearance of Philosophy. And
though there be another Form of Atheism which we call Stratonical,
yet the Democritic Atheism is only considerable; all whose Dark
Mysteries will be here revealed. 4. That we being to treat con-
cerning the Deity, and to produce all that Profane and Unhallowed
Stuff of Atheism in order to a Confutation, the Divine Absistence
and Direction ought to be impled. 5. That there are Two things here
to be performed: First, to shew what are the Atheist's pretended
Grounds of Reason against the Deity; and Secondly, how they ende-
vour either to Sate or Confute the Contrary Phenomena. The First
of these Grounds, That no man can have an Idea or Conception of
God, and that he is an Incomprehensible Nothing. 6. The Second
Atheistic Argument, That there can be no Creation out of No-
things, nor no Omnipotence, because Nothing can come from Nothing,
and therefore whatsoever Substantially is, was from Eternity Self-
existent, and Uncreated by any Deity. 7. The Third pretended
Reason against a Deity, That the Strictest Notion of a Deity implying
him to be Incorporeal, there can be no such Incorporeal Deity, because
there is no other Substance but Body. 8. The Atheist's Pretence, That
the Doctrine of Incorporeal Substances sprung from a Ridiculous Mis-
taking of Abstract Names and Notions for Realities. They Impudent-
ly make the Deity to be but the Chief of Spectres, and an Oberon or
Prince of Fairies and Phanties. Their Fourth Argument against a
Deity, That to suppose an Incorporeal Mind to be the Original of all
things, is but to make a mere Accident and Abstract Notion to be the
First Cause of all. 9. Their Fifth Argument; a Confutation of a
Corporeal Deity from the Principles of Corporealism itself; That Mat-
ter being the only Substance, and all other Differences of things no-
things but Accidents, Generable and Corruptible; no Living Under-
standing
standing Being can be Essentially Incorruptible. The Stoical God Incorruptible, only by Accident. 19. Their Sixth Ratiocination from a Complication of Atomicism 5 That the First Principle of all things whatsoever in the Universe, is Atoms or Corpulcula devoid of all Qualities, and consequently of Sense and Understanding, (which spring up afterwards from a certain Composition of them) and therefore Mind or Deity was not the First Original of all. 11. In the Seventh place they disprove the World's Animation, or its being govern'd by a Living Understanding Animalis Nature, presiding over the Whole ; Because Sense and Understanding are a Peculiar Appendix to Flesh Blood and Brains, and Reason is no where to be found but in Humane Form. 12. The Eighth Atheistical Ground, That God being taken by all for a most happy, Eternal and Immortal Animal, (or Living Being) there can be no such thing, because all Living Beings are Concretions of Atoms that were at first Generated, and are liable to Death and Corruption by the Dissolution of their Compages, and that Life is no simple Primitive Nature, but an Accidental Modification of Compounded Bodies, which upon the Diffusion of their Parts vanisheth into Nothing. 13. The Ninth pretended Atheistical Demonstration, That by God is meant a first Cause or Mover, which was not before moved by any thing else without it 5 But Nothing can move it self, and therefore there can be no Unmoved Mover, nor any First in the order of Causes, that is, a God. 14. Their further Proof of this Principle, That Nothing can move it self, with an Atheistical Corollary from thence, That no Thinking Being could be a First Cause, no Cognition arising of it self without a Cause; which may be reckoned a Tenth Argument. 15. Another Mystery of Atheism, That all Knowledge, and Mental Conception, is the Information of the things themselves known, existing without the Knower, and a Passion from them 5 and therefore the World must needs be before any Knowledge or Conception of it, and no Knowledge or Conception before the World, as its Cause. 16. The Twelfth Argumentation, That things could not be made by a God, because they are so Faulty and Ill made, that they were not contriv'd for the Good of Man, and that the Deluge of Evils, that overflows all, shews that they did not proceed from any Deity. 17. The Thirteenth Instance of the Atheists against a Deity, from the Defect of Providence, That in Humane Affairs all is Tolu and Bohn, Chaos and Confusion. 18. The Fourteenth Atheistical Ground, That it is not possible for any one Being to Animadvert and Order all things in the distant places of the whole World at once: But if it were possible, That such Infinite Negligency would be Absolutely Inconsistent with Happiness. 19. Several bold but flight Queries of Atheists, Why the World was not made sooner 5 and What God did before 5 Why it was made at all, since it was so long unmade 5 and, How the Architect of the World could rear up so huge a Fabrick 20. The Atheistical Pretence, That it is the great Interest of Mankind, That there should be no God; and that it was a Noble and Heroical Exploit of the Democraticks, to chase away that affrightful Spectre out of the World, and to free men from the continual Fear of a Deity and Punishment after Death, imbittering all the Pleasures of Life. 21. Another Pretence of theirs, That Theism is inconsistent with Civil Sovereign-
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Essentially Atheistical.

I. Having in the Former Chapter given an Account of the Genuine and Primitive Atomical Philosophy, which may be called the Mosheical; we are in the next place to consider the Democritical, that is, the Atheistical and Adulterated Atomology. Which had its Origin from nothing else but the joyning of this Heterogeneous and Contradictious Principle, to the Atomical Phylosophy, that there is no other Substance in the World besides Body. Now we say, That that Philosophy which is thus compounded and made up of these Two things, Atomicism and Corporealism complicated together, is essentially Atheistical, though neither of them alone be such. For the Atomical Phylosophy, as we have declared already, is in its own Nature sufficiently repugnant to Atheism. And it is possible for one who holds, That there is Nothing in the world besides Body, to be perwaded notwithstanding of a Corporeal Deity, and that the world was at first framed and is still governed by an Understanding Nature lodged in the Matter. For thus some of these Corporealists have phanched, The whole Universe itself to be a God, that is, an Understanding and Wise Animal, that ordered all things within it self, after the best manner possible, and providently governed the same. Indeed it cannot be denied, but that this is a very great Infinity of mind, that such Persons lie under, who are not able to conceive any other Substance besides Body, by which is understood, that which is Impenetrably Extended, or else in Plato’s Language, which hath περιπταλως, that thrusts against other Bodies and resists their impulse; or as others express it, which is τως ρησωμαιν, that so fills up place, as to exclude any other Body or Substance from Coexisting with it therein; and such must needs have not only very imperfect, but also Spurious and false Conceptions of the Deity, so long as they apprehend it to be thus Corporeal; but yet it does not therefore follow that they must needs be accounted Atheists. But whosoever holds these two Principles (before mentioned) together, That there is no other Substance besides Body, and that Body hath nothing else belonging to it but Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion, without Qualities, I say, whosoever is that confounded Thing, of an Atomist and Corporealst jumbled together, he is Essentially and Unavoidably that which is meant by an Atheist, though he should in words never to much disclaim it, because he must needs fetch the Original of all things
things from Sensible Matter, whereas to affect a God, is to maintain that all things sprung originally from a Knowing and Understanding Nature.

II. Epicurus, who was one of those Mongrel Things before mentioned, (an Atomical-Corporealift or Corporeal-Atomift) did notwithstanding profess to hold a Multifarious Rabble and Democracy of Gods, such as though they were ἁπλομοί σωμάτων, of Humane Form, yet were so Thin and Subtle, as that Comparatively with our Terrestrial Bodies they might be called Incorporeal; they having not so much Carneum as Quasi-carneum, nor Sanguineum as Quasi-sanguineum, a certain kind of Aereal or Ethereal Flesh and Blood: which Gods of his were not to be supposed to exist any where within the World, upon this pretence, that there was no place in it fit to receive them.

**Illud item non est posse credere Sedes
Esse Deum Sanandas, in Mundi partibus ullis.**

And therefore they must be imagined to Subsift in certain Intermundane Spaces, and Utopian Regions without the World, the Deliciousness whereof is thus Elegantly described by the Poet,

> Quas neque concutient Venti, neque Nubila nimbis
> Adpergunt, neque nix acri concreta pruina
> Cana cadens violat, semperque innubilus Æther
> Integit, & largè diffusō lumine ridet.

Whereunto was added, that the chief Happiness of these Gods consisted, *in Omnium Vocationes Munera*, in freedom from all Business and Employment, and doing nothing at all, that so they might live a Soft and Delicate life. And lastly, it was pretended, that though they had neither anything to do with us, nor we with them, yet they ought to be worshipped by us for their own Excellent Natures sake, and Happy State.

But whoever had the least Sagacity in him could not but perceive, that this Theology of Epicurus was but Romantical, it being directly Contrary to his avowed and professed Principles, to admit of any other Being then what was Concreted of Atoms, and consequently Corruptible; and that he did this upon a Politick Account, whereby to decline the Common Odium, and those Dangers and Inconveniences which otherwise he might have incurred by a downright denial of a God, to which purpose it accordingly served his turn. Thus *Pseudo*—dores rightly pronounced, *Nullo esse Deos Epicuro videri; quaeque is de Dies immortalibus dixerit, invidiae detestandae gratia dixisse.* Though he was partly Jocular in it also, it making no small Sport to him in this manner, to delude and mock the credulous Vulgar. *Deos jocandi cauā induxit Epicurus per lucidos & perfalibes, & habitantes quam qui inter duas Lucos, sic inter duas Mundos propter metum ruinarn. However if Epicurus had been never so much in Earnest in all this, yet by Gaffendi his leave, we should pronounce him to have been not a jot the lefs
An Absolute Atheist.

And as Epicurus so other Atheists in like manner, have commonly had their Vizards and Disguises; Atheism for the most part prudently chusing to walk abroad in Masquerade. And though some over-credulous Persons have been so far imposed upon hereby, as to conclude that there was hardly any such thing as an Atheist any where in the World, yet they that are Sagacious, may easily look through these thin Veils and Disguises, and perceive these Atheists oftentimes infinuating their Atheism even then, when they most of all profess themselves Theists, by affirming that it is impossible to have any Idea or Conception at all of God, and that as he is not Finite so he cannot be Infinite, and that no Knowledge or Understanding is to be attributed to him, which is in effect to say, that there is no such thing. But whoever entertains the Democritick Principles, that is, both rejects Forms and Qualities of Body, and makes all things to be Body, though he pretend never so much to hold a Corporeal Deity, yet he is not at all to be believed in it, it being a thing plainly Contradictious to those Principles.

III. Wherefore this Mongrel Philosophy, which Lucippus, Democritus and Protagoras, were the Founders of, and which was entertain'd afterwards by Epicurus, that makes (as Laertius writes) ἄνεκος δὲ τὸν ἀτομοὺς, Seneca's Atoms to be the first Principles, not only of all Bodies (for that was a thing admitted before by Empedocles and other Atomists that were Theists) but also of All things whatsoever in the whole Univerfe, and therefore of Soul and Mind too; this, I say, was really nothing else but a Philosophical Form of Atheology, a Gigantical and Titanical Attempt, to dethrone the Deity, not only by Salvating all the Phenomena of the World without a God, but also by laying down such Principles, from whence it must needs follow, that there could be neither an Incorporeal nor Corporeal Deity, It was Atheism openly Swaggering, under the glorious Appearance of Wisdom and Philosophy.
There is indeed another Form of Atheism, which (infiniting on the Vulgar way of Philosophizing by Forms and Qualities) we for diffi-
dition fake shall call Stratonical; such as being too modest and shame-
faced to fetch all things from the Fortuitous Motion of Atoms, would therfore allow to the several Parts of Matter, a certain Kind of Na-
tural (though not Animal) Perception, such as is devoid of Reflexive Con-
scionness, together with a Plastic, power, whereby they may be able
Artificially and Methodically to Form and Frame themselves to the
best advantage of their Respective Capabilities; something like to Ar-
tistotle's Nature, but that it hath no dependence at all upon any high-
er Mind or Deity. And these Atheists may be also called Hylozoic
(as the other Atomick) because they derive all things in the whole
Universe, not only Sensitive but also Rational Souls, together with the
Artificial Frame of Animals, from the Life of the Matter. But
this kind of Atheism seems to be but an unhapen Embryo of some
Dark and Cloudy Brains that was never yet digested into an entire
System, nor could be brought into any such tolerable Form, as to
have the confidence to shew it self abroad in full and open View.
But the Democritik and Atomick Atheism, as it is the boldest and rank-
eft of all Atheismis, it not only undertaking to solve all phenomena
by Matter Fortuitously moved, without a God, but also to demon-
strate that there cannot be so much as a Corporal Deity; so it is
that alone which pretending to an entire and coherent System, hath
publicly appeared upon the Stage, and therefore doth in a manner
only derive our Consideration.

And now we shall exhibit a full View and Prospect of it, and dis-
cover all its Dark Mysteries and Profundities; we being much of this
Periawson, that a plain and naked Reprefentation of them, will be
a great part of a Confutation; at least, not doubting but it will be
made to appear, that though this Monfter, big-swoln with a Puffy
shew of Wildom, frurrent and talk so Gigantically, and march with
such a kind of stately Philofophick Grandeur, yet it is indeed but
like the Giant Orgoglio, in our English Poet, a mere Empty Bladder,
blown up with vain Conceit, an Empusa, Phantafin, or Spectre, the
Off-spring of Night and Darknefs, non-fence and Contradiction.

And yet for all that we shall not wrong it the least in our Re-
prentation, but give it all possible Advantages of Strength and Plau-
bility, that so the Atheists may have no Caufe to pre-
tend (as they are wont to do in such Cases) that either we did
not understand their Mysteries nor apprehend the full strength of
their Caufe, or else did purpofely mothers and conceal it. Which
indeed we have been so far from, that we muft confess we were not
altogether unwilling, this buffenes of theirs, should look a little like
something that might derfire a Confutation. And whether the
Atheists ought not rather to give us Thanks for Mending and Im-
proving their Arguments, then complain that we have any way Em-
paired them, we shall leave it to the Cenfure of impartial Judgments.

IV. Plato
IV. *Plato* tells us that even amongst those Pagans in his time, there was generally such a Religious Humor, that whoever was in the heady heat of a controversy, whether great or small, they would always invoke the Deity for Assistance and Direction. Adding moreover that himself should be very faulty, if in his *Times*, when he was to treat about so grand a point, concerning the whole World, to *neglect* it, whether it were made or unmade, he should not make his Entrance thereinto by a Religious Invocation of the Deity. Wherefore certainly, it could not be less than a piece of Impiety in a Christian, being to treat concerning the Deity itself, and to produce all that Prophane and Unhallowed stuff of Atheists, out of their Dark Corners, in order to a Confusion, and the better Confirmation of our Faith in the Truth of his Existence, not to implore his Direction and Assistance. And I know no Reason but that we may well do it in the same Litany of *Plato's*, τοις προθμοίς μικρός μοιλικός ἐπουραγός ιύδιν εἴποι, that we may first speak agreeably to his own mind or becomingly of his Nature, and then confentaneously with our Selves.

V. Now there are these two things here to be performed by us. First, to discover and produce the Chief Heads of Arguments or Grounds of Reason, insistent on by the Atheists to disprove a Deity, evincing withall briefly the Ineffectuallness and Falsenesse of them. And Secondly, to shew how they Endeavour either to Confute or Salve, consistently with their own Principles, all these Phenomena which are commonly urg'd against them, to prove a Deity and Incorporeal Substance; manifesting likewise the Invalidity thereof.

The grounds of Reason alleged for the Atheistical Hypotheses are chiefly these that follow. First, That we have no *Idea of God*, and therefore can have no Evidence of him, which Argument is further flourished and defended upon in this manner. That Notion or Conception of a Deity, that is commonly entertained, is nothing but a Bundle of Incomprehensibles, Unconceivables, and Impossibles; it being only a compleiment of all Imaginable Attributes of Honour, Courtship, and Complement, which the Confounded Fear, and Affrightment of Mens minds, made them huddle up together, without any Sence or Philosophick Truth: This seems to be intimated by a Modern Writer in these words; *The Attributes of God signify not True nor False, nor any Opinion of our Brain, but the Reverence and Devotion of our Hearts, and therefore they are not sufficient Premisses to infer Truth or convince Falshood. And the same thing again is further set out, with no small pretence to wit, after this manner; They that venture to dispute Philosophically or reason of God's Nature from these Attributes of Honour, losing their Understanding in the very first attempt, fall from one Inconvenience into another without end, and without number; In the same manner as when one ignorant of the Ceremonies of Court, coming into the presence of a greater Person, would
The second atheistical argument that nothing can be made from nothing and that all whatsoever was formless self-created, and not annexed by any Deity.

VI. Secondly, Another Argument much instilled on by the old Democritick Atheists, is directed against the Divine Omnipotency and Creative Power, after this manner. By God is always understood a Creatour of something or other out of Nothing. For however the Theists be here divided amongst themselves, Some of them believing that there was once Nothing at all existing in this whole Space which is now occupied by the World, besides the Deity, and that he was then a Solitary Being, so that the Substantie of the whole Corporeal Universe had a Temporary Beginning, and Novity of Existence, and the Duration of it hath now continued but for so many years only. Others perceiving themselves, that though the Matter and Substancie at least, (if not the Form also) of the Corporeal World, did exist from Eternity, yet nevertheless, they both as like proceeded from the Deity by way of Emanation, and do continually depend upon it, in the same manner as Light, though coehe with the Sun, yet proceeded from the Sun, and depends upon it being always, as it were, Made A-new by it; Wherefore, according to this Hypothesis, though things had no Antecedent Non-Entity in Time, yet they were as little of themselves, and owed all their Being as much to the Deity, as if they had been once Actually Nothing, they being as it were perpetually Created out of Nothing by it. Lastly, Others of those Theists resolving, that the Matter of the Corporeal Universe was not only from Eternity, but also Self-existent and Uncreated, or Independent upon any Deity as to its Being; But yet the Forms and Qualities of all Inanimate Bodies, together with the Souls of all Animals, in the successive Generations of them, (being taken for Entities distinct from the Matter) were Created by the Deity out of Nothing. We say, though there be such Difference amongst the Theists themselves, yet they all agree in this, that God is in some Sense or other, the Creatour of some Real Entity out of Nothing, or the Cause of that which otherwise would not have been Of it self, so that no Creation out of Nothing, (in that enlarged sense) no Deity. Now it is utterly impossible that
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any Substantice or Real Entity should be Created out of Nothing, it being Contradictitious to that indubitable Axiom of Reason, De Nihilo Nihil, From Nothing Nothing. The Argument is thus urged by Lucretius, according to the Minds of Epicurus and Democritus.

Principium hinc cujus nobis Exordia sumet, Nulla rerum est Nihilo gigni Divinitus inquam. Quoque et Formidob Mortales continer omnes; Quod multa in Terris fieri Calamque ventur, Quorum operum causas nullas rationem videre Possint; ac fieri Divino Numine ventur: Quas ob res, ubi viderimus Nilposse creari. De Nihilo, tum quod sequimur, iam tuis in indi Perspicueus, & unde quaeres queaque creari, Et quo quaque modo sint opera sine Divum.

It is true indeed that it seems to be chiefly level’d by the Poet against that Third and last sort of Theists before mentioned, such as Heracleitus and the Stoicks, (which latter were Contemporary with Epicurus) who held the Matter of the whole World to have been from Eternity of itself Uncreated, but yet the Forms of Mundane things in the successive Generations of them (as Entities distinct from the Matter) to be Created or made by the Deity out of Nothing. But the force of the Argument must needs lie stronger against those other Theists, who would have the very Substantice and Matter itself of the World, as well as the Forms, to have been created by the Deity out of Nothing. Since Nothing can come out of Nothing, it follows, that not so much as the Forms and Qualities of Bodies (conceiv’d as Entities really distinct from the Matter) much less the Lives and Souls of Animals, could ever have been Created by any Deity, and therefore certainly, not the Substantice and Matter itself: But all Substantice, and Real Entity, whatsoever is in the World, must needs have been from Eternity, Uncreated and Self-existent. Nothing can be Made or Produced but only the different Modifications of Preexistent Matter. And this is done by Motions, Mixtures and Separations, Concretions and Secretions of Atoms, without the Creation of any Real distinct Entity out of Nothing; so that there needs no Deity for the Effecting of it, according to that of Epicurus, unde Quidus perteque tandem mundi partum operis, No Divine Power ought to be call’d in, for the salving of those Phenomena. To Conclude therefore, if no Substantice, nor Real Entity can be made, which was not before, but all whatsoever Is, Will be, and Can be, was from Eternity Self-existent, then Creative Power, but especially, that Attribute of Omnipotence, can belong to nothing, and this is all one as to say, There can be no Deity.

VII. Thirdly the Atheists argue against the stricter and higher sort of Theists, who will have God to be the Creaatur of the whole Corporeal Universe and all its Parts out of Nothing, after this manner; That which Created the whole Mass of Matter and Body, cannot be itself Body; Wherefore this Notion of God plainly implies
him to be Incorporeal. But there can be no Incorporeal Deity, because by that word nothing needs to be understood, either that which hath no Magnitude nor Extent at all, or else that which is indeed extended; but otherwise than Body. If the Word be taken in the former sense, then nothing at all can be so Incorporeal, as to be altogether Unextended and devoid of Geometrical Quantity, because Extent is the very Essence of all Existents. Entity, and that which is altogether unextended is perfectly Nothing. There can neither be any Substance nor Mode or Accident of any Substance, no Nature whatsoever Unextended. But if the Word Incorporeal be taken in the latter sense, for that which is indeed Extended but otherwise than Body, namely so as to penetrate Bodies and coexist with them, this is also a thing next to Nothing, since it can neither act upon any other thing nor be acted upon by, or sensible of, any thing; It can neither do nor Suffer any thing.

Nam facere & fungi nisi Corpus nulla potest res.

Wherefore to speak plainly, this can be nothing else but empty Space, or Vacuum, which runs through all things, without laying hold on any thing, or being affected from any thing. This is the only Incorporeal thing, that is or can be in Nature, Space or Place; and therefore to suppose an Incorporeal Deity is to make Empty Space to be the Creator of all Things.

This Argument is thus proposed by the Epicurean Poet.

Quodcumque est esse aliquid debebit id ipsum
Augmine vel grandis vel parvo-
Cum sit Tacitus cret, quantvis levis exiguusque,
Corporum angustit nune, non Summamque sequatur.
Sic Intafile cret, nulla de parte quod ullam
Rem probibere quem per se transire mentem,
Quicquid hoc id cret Vacuus quod Inane vocamus.

Whatsoever is, is Extended or hath Geometrical Quantity and Mensurability in it; which if it be Tangible, then it is Body, and fills up a Place in the World, being part of the whole Mass; but if it be Intangible, so that it cannot resist the Passage of any thing thorough it, then it is nothing else but empty Space or Vacuum. There is no Third thing besides these Two, and therefore whatsoever is not Body, is empty Space or Nothing;

Præter Inane & Corpora Tertia per se,
Nulla potest rerum in numero Natura relinquiri.

Thus the Ancient Epicureans and Democriticks argued; there being nothing Incorporeal but Space, there can be no Incorporeal Deity.

But because this seems to give Advantage to the Theists, in making Space Something, or that which hath a Real Nature or Entity without
out our Conception, from whence it will follow, that it must needs be either it self a Substance, or else a Mode of some Incorporeal Substance, the Modern Democriticks are here more cautious, and make Space to be no Nature really existing without us, but only the Phantom of a Body, and as it were the Ghost of it, which has no Reality without our Imagination. So that there are not two Natures of Body, and Space, which must needs inhere two distinct Substances, one whereof must be Incorporeal, but only One Nature of Body. The Consequence of which will be this, That an Incorporeal Substance is all one with an Incorporeal Body, and therefore Nothing.

VIII. But because it is generally conceived that an Error cannot be sufficiently confuted, without discovering to exhibit the Cause of the Mistake, therefore the Atheists will in the next place undertake to shew likewise, the Original of this Doctrine of Incorporeal Substances, and from what Misapprehension it sprang, as also take occasion from thence, further to disprove a Deity.

Wherefore they say, that the Original of this Doctrine of Incorporeal Substances proceeded chiefly from the Abuse of Abstract Names, both of Substances (whereby the Essences of singular Bodies, as of a Man or an Horse, being Abstracted from those Bodies themselves, are considered Universally) as also of Accidents, when they are considered alone without their Subjects or Substances. The latter of which is a thing, that Men have been necessitated to, in order to the Computation or Reckoning of the Properties of Bodies, the Comparing of them with one another, the Adding, Subtracting, Multiplying and Dividing of them, which could not be done, so long as they are taken Concretely, together with their Subjects. But yet, as there is some Use of those Abstract Names, so the Abuse of them has been also very great: Forasmuch as, though they be really the Names of Nothing, since the Essence of this and that Man is not any thing without the Man, nor is an Accident any thing without its Substance, yet men have been led into a gross mistake by them, to imagine them to be Realities existing by themselves. Which Inchantment hath chiefly proceeded from Scholasticks, who have been so intemperate in the use of these Words, that they could not make a Rational Discourse of any thing, though never so small, but they must stuff it with their Quiddities, Entities, Essences, Haeceities and the like. Wherefore these are they, who being first deluded themselves, have also deluded the World, introducing an Opinion into the Minds of Men, that the Essence of every thing is something without that thing itself, and also Eternal, and therefore when any thing is Made or Generated, that there is no new Being produced, but only an Antecedent and Eternal Essence cloathed (as it were) with a new Garment of Existence. As also that the mere Accidents of Bodies may exist alone by themselves without their Substances. As for Example, that the Life, Sense and Understanding of Animals, commonly call'd by the Names of Soul and Mind, may exist without the Bodies or Substances of them by themselves, after the Animals are dead; which plainly makes them to be Incorporeal Substances, as it were the separate
Atheists dispute against, both

rate and Abstract Effences of Men. This hath been observed by a Modern Writer in these words; "Est Hominum Abstractorum tum in omni Vita, tum in Philosophia, magnum & Vos & Absus. Absus in co consiftit, quod cum sideant aliqui, considerari posse, id est, inferri in Rationes, Accidentium Incrementa & Decrementa, sine Consideratione Corporum, sine Subjectorum iurum, (id quod appellatur Abstractum) locuntur de Accidentibus, tanquam potest ab omni Corpore Separari; Hinc enim Originem trahunt quorumdam Metaphysicorum crafts Errorum. Nam ex eo, quod Considerari potest Cognition, sine consideratione Corporis, inferre solent non esse Opus Corporis Cognitantis. It is a great Abuse that some Metaphysicians make of these Abstract Names, because Cognition can be considered alone without the consideration of Body, therefore to conclude that it is not the Action or Accident of that Body that thinks, but a Sub stance by itself. And the same Writer elsewhere observes, That it is upon this Ground, that when a Man is dead and buried, they say his Soul (that is, his Life) can walk, separated from his Body, and is seen by night among the Graves. By which means the Vulgar are confirmed in their Superstitious Belief, of Ghosts, Spirits, Demons, Devils, Fairies and Hob-goblins, Invisible Powers and Agents, called by several Names, and that by those Persons whose work it ought to be, rather to free men from such Superstitions. Which Belief at first had another Original, not altogether unlike the former; Namely from mens mistaking their own Phancies for Things Really existing without them. For as in the sense of Vision, men are commonly deceived, in supposing the Image behind the Glass to be a Real thing existing without themselves, whereas it is indeed nothing but their own Phancy; In like manner when the Minds of Men strongly possefd with Fear, especially in the Dark, raise up the Phantasms of Spirits, Bug-bears, or Spectral Apparitions to them, they think them to be Objects really existing without them, and call them Ghosts and Spirits, whilst they are indeed nothing but their own Phancies; So the Phantasy or Phancy of a Deity (which is indeed the Chief of all Spectres) created by Fear, has upon no other Accompit, been taken for a Reality. To this purpose a Modern Writer, From the Fear that proceeds from the Ignorance it self, of what it is that hath the Power to do men Good or Harm, men are inclined to suppose and Feign to themselves, several kinds of Powers Invisible, and to stand in awe of their own Imaginations, and in time of Distress to invoke them, as also in the time of an expected good Success, to give them thanks, making the Creatures of their own Fancies, their Gods. Which though it be prudently spoken in the Plural Number, that so it might be diverted and put off to the Heathen Gods, yet he is very simple, that does not perceive the reason of it to be the same concerning that one Deity, which is now commonly worshipped, and that therefore this also is but the Creature of Mens Fear and Phancies, the Chief of all Phantastic Ghosts and Spectres, as it were an Oberon or Prince of Fairies and Phancies. This (we say) was the first Original of that Vulgar Belief of Invisible Powers, Ghosts, and Gods; mens taking their own Phancies for Things really Existing without them. And as for the Matter and Substance of these Ghosts, they could not by their own natural Cogitation fall into any other Conceit, but that it was the same, with
with that which appareth in a Dream to one that sleepeith, or in a Looking-glass to one that is awake, Thin Aerial Bodies, which may appear and vanish when they please. But the Opinion, that such Spirits were Incorporeal and Immaterial, could never enter into the minds of men by Nature, Unabused by Doctrine; but it sprang up from those deceiving and deceived Literati, Scholastics, Philosophers, and Theologers enchanting mens Understandings, and making them believe, that the Abstrack Notions of Accidents and Essences could exist alone by themselves without the Bodies, as certain Separat and Incorporeal Substances.

To Conclude therefore, To make an Incorporeal Mind to be one Cause of all things, is to make our own Phanie, an Imaginary Ghost of the World, to be a Reality, and to suppose the mere Abstrack Notion of an Accident, and a Separate Essence, to be not only an Absolute thing by itself, and a Real Substance Incorporeal, but also the first Original of all Substances, and of whatsoever is in the Universe. And this may be reckon'd for a Fourth Atheisticke Ground.

I X. Fifthly, the Atheists pretend further to prove, that there is no other Substance in the World besides Body, as also from the Principles of Corporealism it self, to evince that there can be no Corporeal Deity, after this manner. No man can devise any other Notion of Substance, than that it is a thing Extended, existing without the Mind, not Imaginary but Real and Solid Magnitude. For whatsoever is not Extended, is Nowhere and Nothing. So that Res Extensa, is the only Substance, the solid Basis and Substratum of all. Now this is the very selfsame thing with Body; For attribution, or Resstance seems to be a necessary Consequence and Result from Extension, and they that think otherwise, can show no reason why Bodies may not also penetrate one another, as some Corporealists think they do; from whence it is inferred, that Body or Matter is the only Substance of all things. And whatsoever else is in the World, that is, all the Differences of Bodies, are nothing but several Accidents and Modifications of this Extended Substance, Body or Matter. Which Accidents, though they may be sometimes call'd by the names of Real Qualities, and Forms, and though there be different apprehensions concerning them amongst Philosophers, yet generally they agree in this, that there are these two Properties belonging to them: First, that none of them can subsist alone by themselves, without Extended Substance or Matter, as the Basis and Support of them; and Secondly, that they may be all destroyed without the Destruction of any Substance. Now as Blackness and Whiteness, Heat and Cold, so likewise Life, Sense and Understanding, are such Accidents, Modifications or Qualities of Body, that can neither exist by themselves, and may be destroyed without the Destruction of any Substance or Matter. For if the Parts of the Body of any Living Animal be disunited and separated from one another, or the Organical Disposition of the Matter alter'd, those Accidentes, Forms or Qualities, of Life and Understanding, will presently vanish away to Nothing, all the Substance of the Matter still remaining one where or other.
other in the Universe entire, and Nothing of it loth. Wherefore the Substance of Matter and Body, as distinguished from the Accidents, is the only thing in the world that is Uncorruptible and Undestroyable. And of this it is to be understood that Nothing can be made out of Nothing, and Destroyed to Nothing, (i.e.) that every entire thing that is Made or Generated, must be made of some preexistent Matter; which Matter was from Eternity, Self-existent and Unmade, and is also Undestroyable, and can never be reduc'd to Nothing. It is not to be understood of the Accidents themselves, that are all Makeable and Destroyable, Generable and Corruptible. Whosoever is in the World is but ὃν χωρίς ἔχον, Matter so and so Modified or Qualified, all which Modifications and Qualifications of Matter are in their own nature Destroyable, and the Matter itself (as the Basis of them, not necessarily determin'd to this or that Accident) is the only ἀγνώστων ἔσον ἄμαλήσθαι, the only Necessarily Existent. The Conclusion therefore is, that no Animal, no Living Understanding Body, can be Absolutely and Essentially Uncorruptible, this being an Incommunicable Property of the Matter, and therefore there can be no Corporeal Deity, the Original of all things, Essentially Undestroyable.

Though the Stoicks imagined the whole Corporeal Universe to be an Animal or Deity, yet this Corporeal God of theirs was only by Accident Uncorruptible and Immortal, because they supposed, that there was no other Matter, which existing without this World, and making Inrodes upon it, could disunite the Parts of it or disorder its Compages. Which if there were, the Life and Understanding of this Stoical God, or great Mundane Animal, as well as that of other Animals in like Cases, must needs vanish into nothing. Thus from the Principles of Corporealism it self, it plainly follows that there can be no Corporeal Deity, because the Deity is supposed to be ἀγνώστων ἔσον ἄμαλήσθαι, a thing that was never made, and is Essentially Undestroyable, which are the Privileges and Properties of nothing but Sensible Matter.

X. In the next place, the Atheists undertake more effectually to confute that Corporeal God of the Stoicks and others, from the Principles of the Atomical Philosophy, in this manner. All Corporeal Theists who assert that an Understanding Nature or Mind, residing in the Matter of the whole Universe, was the first Original of the Mundane System, and did Intellectually frame it, betray no small Ignorance of Philosophy and the Nature of Body, in supposing Real Qualities, besides Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion, as Simple and Primitive things, to belong to it; and that there was such a Quality or Faculty of Understanding in the Matter of the whole Universe, coeternal with the same, that was an Original thing Uncompounded and Underived from any thing else. Now to suppose such Original Qualities and Powers, which are Really Distinct from the Substance of Extended Matter and its Modifications, of Divisibility, Figure, Site and Motion, is Really to suppose so many Distinct Substances, which therefore must needs be Incorporeal.
poral. So that these Philosophers fall unawares into that very thing which they are so abhorrent from. For this Quality or Faculty of Understanding, in the Matter of the Universel, Original and underiv'd from any other thing, can be indeed nothing else but an Incorporeal Substance. Epicurus suggested a Caution against this Vulgar Mistake concerning Qualities to this purpofe. Non sic cognitanda sunt Qualitates, quae fint quaedam per se existentes Natura seu Substantiae, sed quidem id mente aequi non licet; sed fieri modo ut variis modis se habendi Corporis, consideranda sunt.

Body, as such, hath nothing else belonging to the Nature of it, but what is included in the Idea of Extended Substance, Divisibility, Figure, Site, Motion or Rest, and the Results from the various Compositions of them, causing different Phancies; Wherefore, as vulgar Philosophers make their first Matter (which they cannot well tell what they mean by it) because it receives all Qualities, to be it self devoid of all Quality; So we conclude that Atoms (which are really the first Principles of all things) have none of those Qualities in them which belong to compounded Bodies; they are not absolutely of themselves Black or White, Hot or Cold, Moift or dry, Bitter or Sweet, all these things arising up afterwards, from the various Aggregations and Contextures of them, together with different Motions. Which Lucretius confirms by this reason, agreeable to the Tenour of the Atomical Philosophy, That if there were any such Real Qualities in the first Principles, then in the various Corruptions of Nature, things would at last be all reduc'd to Nothing:

\[
\text{Immutabile enim quiddam superare necesse est} \\
\text{Nec res ad Nihilum redigantur funditus omnes;} \\
\text{Prininde Colore cave contingas semina rerum,} \\
\text{Nec tibi res redeant ad Nihilum funditus omnes.}
\]

Wherefore he concludes, that it must not be thought, that White things are made out of White Principles, nor Black things out of Black Principles,

\[
\text{Nec ex Albis Alba rearis} \\
\text{Principis esse.}
\]

\[
\text{Aut ea quæ migrant, nigro de semine nata;} \\
\text{Nec eum quæ eorundem quæ sunt indulta colorum;} \\
\text{Propteræa gerere hunc credas, quod materiæ} \\
\text{Corpora confinuæ sunt ejus tintæ coloris;} \\
\text{Nullus enim Color est omnino materialis} \\
\text{Corporibus, neque par rebus, neque demique dispar.}
\]

Adding that the same is to be resolved likewise concerning all other Sensible Qualities as well as Colours.

\[
\text{Sed ne fortè putes solo spoliata colore} \\
\text{Corpora prima munere: etiam secreta Toporis} \\
\text{Sunt, ac Frigoris omnino, Calidique Toporis.}
\]
Lastly he tells us in like manner that the same is to be understood also concerning Life, Sense and Understanding, that there are no such simple Qualities or Natures in the first Principles, out of which Animals are compounded, but that these are in themselves altogether devoid of Life, Sense and Understanding.

All Sensible and Rational Animals are made of Irrational and Senseless Principles, which is proved by Experience, in that we see Worms are made out of putrid Dung, moistened with immoderate Showers.

Some indeed, who are no greater Friends to a Deity than our selves, will needs have that Sense and Understanding that is in Animals and Men, to be derived from an Antecedent Life and Understanding in the Matter. But this cannot be, because if Matter as such, had Life and Understanding in it, then every Atom of Matter must needs be a Distinct Percipient, Animal, and Intelligent Perfōn by itself; and it would be impossible for any such Men and Animals as now are, to be compounded out of them, because every Man would be, Variorum Animalculorum Acervo, a Heap of Innumerable Animals and Percipients.

Wherefore as all the other Qualities of Bodies, so likewise Life, Sense, and Understanding arise from the different Contextures of Atoms devoid of all those Qualities, or from the Composition of those simple Elements of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites and Motions, in the same manner as from a few Letters variously compounded, all that Infinite Variety of Syllables and Words is made.

From the Fortuitous Concretions of Senseless Unknowing Atoms, did rise up afterwards, in certain parts of the World called Animals, Soul, and
and Mind, Sense and Understanding, Counsel and Wisdom. But to think that there was any Animalis Nature before all these Animals, or that there was an antecedent Mind and Understanding, Counsel and Wisdom, by which all Animals themselves, together with the whole World, were made and contrived, is either to run round in a Senfeless Circle, making Animals and Animality to be before one another infinitely; or else to suppose an impossible Beginning of an Original Understanding Quality in the Matter. Atoms in their first Coalitions together, when the World was a making, were not then directed by any previous Counsel or preventive Understanding, which were things as yet Unborn and Unmade,

Nam certè negò consilìo Primordia rerum
Ordine sequeque atque agacì mente locòrunìt,
Nec quos quæque darent mutus, pepígere profeìb.

Mind and Understanding, Counsel and Wisdom did not lay the Foundations of the Universe, they are no Archical things, that is, they have not the Nature of a Principle in them, they are not Simple, Original, Primitive and Primordial, but as all other Qualities of Bodies, Secondary, Compounded and Derivative, and therefore they could not be Architectonical of the World. Mind and Understanding is no God, but the Creature of Matter and Motion.

The fence of this whole Argument is briefly this: The first Principle of all things in the whole Universe is Matter, or Atoms devoid of all Qualities, and consequently of all Life, Sense and Understanding, and therefore the Original of things is no Understanding, Nature, or Deity.

XI. Seventhly, The Democritick Atheists argue further after this manner: They who affect a Deity, suppose ἐμφύτων ἐστιν τὸ οὐδέπω, the whole World to be Animated, that is, to have a Living, Rational and Understanding Nature prefiding over it. Now it is already evident from some of the premised Arguments, that the World cannot be Animated, in the fence of Platonists, that is, with an Incorporeal Soul, which is in order of Nature before Body, it being proved already that there can be no Substance Incorporeal; as likewise that it cannot be Animated neither in the Stoical fence, so as to have an Original Quality of Understanding or Mind in the Matter; But yet nevertheles, some may possibly imagine, that as in our Selves and other Animals, though compound of Senfeless Atoms, there is a Soul and Mind, resulting from the Contexture of them, which being once made, domineers over the Body, governing and ordering it at pleasure; so there may be likewise such a Living Soul and Mind, not only in the Stars, which many have supposed to be lesser Deities, and in the Sun, which has been reputed a principal Deity; but also in the whole Mundane System, made up of Earth, Seas, Air, Ether, Sun, Moon, and Stars all together; one General Soul and Mind, which though resulting at first from the Fortuitous Motion of Matter, yet being once produced, may
may rule, govern and sway the Whole, Understandingly, and in a more perfect manner than our Souls do our Bodies, and so long as it continues, exercise a Principality and Dominion over it. Which although it will not amount to the full Notion of a God, according to the strict sense of Theists, yet it will approach very near unto it, and endanger the bringing in of all the same Inconveniences along with it. Wherefore they will now prove that there is no such Soul or Mind as this, (resulting from the Contexture of Atoms) that presides over the Corporeal Universe, that so there may not be so much as the Shadow of a Deity left.

It was observed before, that Life, Sense, Reason and Understanding are but Qualities of Concreted Bodies, like those other Qualities of Heat, and Cold, &c. arising from certain particular Textures of Atoms; Now as those first Principles of Bodies, namely single Atoms, have none of those Qualities in them, so neither hath the whole Universe any (that it can be denominated from) but, only the Parts of it. The whole World is neither Black nor White, Hot nor Cold, Pellucid nor Opake, it containing all those Qualities in its several Parts: In like manner, the whole has no Life, Sense, nor Understanding in it, but only the parts of it, which are called Animals. That is, Life and Sense are qualities that arise, only from such a Texture of Atoms as produce the soft Flesh, Blood, and Brains, in Bodies organized, with Head, Heart, Bowels, Nerves, Muscles, Veins, Arteries and the like:

—— Sensus jungitur omnis
Visceribus, Nervis, Venis, quaecumque videmus,
Mollia mortali consistere Corpore creta;

And Reason and Understanding, properly so called, are peculiar Appendices to humane Shape; Ratio nusquam esse potest nisi in hominis figura. From whence it is concluded that there is no Life, Soul nor Understanding acting the whole World, because the World hath no Blood nor Brains, nor any Animalish or Humane Form. Qui Mundum ipsum Animantem sapientemque esse dixerunt, nullo modo viderunl Animis Naturam, in quam Figuram cadere poffet. Therefore the Epicurean Poet concludes upon this Ground, that there is no Divine Sense in the whole World,

Dispositum videtur ubi esse & crescere poffit
Scepsis Animali atque Animalium, tanto magis insiciandum,
Totum posse extra Corpus Formandum Animalem,
Putrebis in gibus terrarum, aut Solis in Igni,
Aut in Aqua durare, aut altis Aetheris oris.
Haud igitur constant Divino pradita Sensu,
Quandoquidem negante vitaliter esse Animata.

Now if there be no Life nor Understanding above us, nor round about us, nor any where else in the World, but only in our selves and Fellow-Animals, and we be the highest of all Beings; if neither the
the whole Corporeal System be Animated, nor those greater parts of it, Sun, Moon nor Stars, then there can be no danger of any Deity.

XII. Eightly, the Democritick Atheists dispute further against a Deity in this manner: The Deity is generally supposed to be ζηγός μακάκιον το άραφοτον, a perfectly Happy Animal, Incorruptible and Immortal. Now there is no Living Being Incorruptible and Immortal, and therefore none perfectly Happy neither. For according to that Democritick Hypothesis of Atoms in Vacuity; the only Incorruptible things will be These three: First of all, Vacuum or Empty Space, which must needs be such, because it cannot suffer from any thing, since it is plagarum experis.

Et manet intactum, movab igitur bilum.

Secondly, the Single Atoms, because by reason of their Parvitude and Solidity, they are Indivisible; And lastly, the Summa summarum of all things, that is the Comprehension of all Atoms dispersed every where throughout Infinite Space.

Quia nullis locis stat copia certum
Quod quisque possit discedere dissolvique.

But according to that other Hypothesis of some modern Atomists (which also was entertained of old by Empedocles) that supposeth a Plenity, there is nothing at all Incorruptible, but the Substance of Matter itself. All Systems and Compages of it, all σωφροσύνα and ἄνοιξις, all Concretions and Coagulations, of Matter divid-ed by Motion; together with the Qualities resulting from them, are Corruptible and Destroyable: Quod etsi coagulationis rerum non dissolubilis? Death destroys not the Substance of any Matter; for as no Matter came from Nothing but was Self-eternal, so none of it can ever vanish into Nothing; but it dissolves all the Aggregations of it.

Non sibi interimit Mors res ubi Materiae
Corpora conficiat, sed cernit disjuncta ollis.

Life is no Substantial thing, nor any Primitive or Simple Nature; it is only an Accident or Quality arising from the Aggregation and Contexture of Atoms or Corpuscula, which when the Compages of them is disunited and dissolved, though all the Substance still remain scattered and dispersed, yet the Life utterly perishes and vanishes into Nothing. No Life is Immortal; there is no Immortal Soul; nor Immortal Animal, or Deity. Though this whole Mundane System were it self an Animal, yet being but an Aggregation of Matter, it would be both Corruptible and Mortal. Wherefore since no living Being can possibly have any security of its future Permanency; there is none that can be perfectly Happy. And it was rightly determined by our Fellow-Atheists, the Hedonicks and Cyrenicks, ἡλικομονοι κακοπάθοι, Perfect Happiness is a mere Notion, a Romantick Fiction, a thing which can have no Existence any where. This is recorded to have been one of Democri-
XIII. A Ninth pretended Demonstration of the Democritick Atheists is as followeth. By God is understood a First Cause or Mover, which being not before acted upon by any thing else, but acting originally from itself, was the beginning of all things. Now it is an indubitable Axiom, and generally received amongst Philosophers, that Nothing can move itself, but Quicquid movetur ab ali movetur. Whatsoever is moved is moved by something else; nothing can act otherwise than it is made to act, by something without it, acting upon it. The necessary Consequence whereof is this, That there can be no such thing as any First Mover, or First Cause, that is, no God. This Argument is thus urged by a Modern Writer, agreeably to the Sense of the Ancient Democriticks; Ex eo quod nihil potest movere seipsum, non infertur, id quod inferri solet, nempe Aeternum Immobile, sed contra Aeternum Motum, quidem ut verum est, nihil moveri a seipso, etiam verum est nihil moveri nisi a Motu. From hence, that Nothing can move itself, it cannot be rightly inferred, as commonly it is, that there is an Eternal Immutable Mover (that is, a God) but only an Eternal Moved Mover; or that one thing was moved by another from Eternity, without any first Mover. Because as it is true that nothing can be Moved, but from itself, so it is likewise true, that nothing can be moved but from that which was itself also moved by something else beforehand; and so the progress upwards must needs be infinite, without any Beginning or first Mover. The plain Drift and Scope of this Rationalization, is no other then this, to shew that the Argument commonly taken from Motion, to prove a God, (that is, a First Mover or Cause) is not only Ineffectual and Inconcluhsive, but also that on the contrary, it may be demonstrated from that very Topick of Motion; that there can be no Absolutely First Mover, No First in the order of Causes, that is, no God.

XIV. Tenthly, because the Theists conceive that though no Body can move itself, yet a perfect Cogitative, and Thinking Being might be the Beginning of all, and the first Cause of Motion; the Atheists will endeavour to evince the contrary, in this manner. No man can conceive how any Cogitation which was not before, should rise up at any time, but that there was some cause for it, without the Thinker. For else there can be no reason given, why this Thought rather than that, and at this time rather than another, should start up. Wherefore this is univerally true, of all Motion and Action whatsoever, as it was rightly urged by the Stoicks, that there can be no moivas quantas, no Motion without a Cause, i.e. no Motion which has not some Cause without the Subject of it. Or, as the same thing is expressed by a modern Writer, Nothing taketh Beginning from itself, but from the Action of some other Immediate Agent without it. Wherefore no Thinking Being could be a First Cause, any more than an Automaton or Machin could. To this, it is further argued, that
these two Notions, the one of a Knowledge Understanding Being, the other of a Perfectly Happy Being, are Contradictitious, because all Knowledge Essentially implies Dependence upon something else, as its Cause; Scientia & Intellectus signum est Potentia ab aliis Dependentis, id quod non est Beatusse. They conclude that Cognition and all Action whatsoever, is really nothing else but Local Motion, which is Essentially Heterokinetic, that which can never rise of its own, but is caused by some other Agent without its Subject.

XV. In the Eleventh place, the Democritick Atheists reason thus: If the World were made by any Antecedent Mind or Understanding, that is, by a Deity; then there must needs be an Idea, Platform and Exemplar of the whole World before it was made, and consequently Actual Knowledge, both in order of Time and Nature, before Things. But all Knowledge is the Information of the things themselves known, all Conception of the Mind is a Passion from the things Conceived, and their Activity upon it; and is therefore Junior to them. Wherefore the World and Things, were before Knowledge and the Conception of any Mind, and no Knowledge, Mind or Deity before the World as its Cause. This Argument is thus proposed by the Atheistic Poet;

Exemplum porro gignundis rebus, & ipsa
Notities hominum Divis unde infra primam,
Quidvolent facerre ut scierent, animo viderent
Quoque modo est unquam Vis cognita Principiorum
Quidnam inter se permittato Ordine posset
Si non ipsa dedit specimen Naturae creandi?

How could the supposed Deity have a Pattern or Platform in his Mind, to frame the World by, and whence should he receive it? How could he have any Knowledge of Men before they were made, as also what himself should will to do when there was nothing? How could understand the Force and Possibility of the Principles, what they would produce when variously combined together, before Nature and Things themselves, by Creating, had given a Specimen?

XVI. A Twelfth Argumentation of the Democritick and Epicurean Atheists against a Deity, is to this purpose: That things could not be made by a Deity that is supposed to be a Being every way Perfect; because they are so Faulty, and so ill made: The Argument is thus propounded by Lucretius;

Quid si jam rerum ignotem primordia quae sint
Hoc tamen ex ipsis Celi Rationibus ausim
Confirmare, alisque ex rebus reddere multis,
Necquaquam nobis Divinitus esse paratam
Naturam rerum, tantâ fiat prædita Culpa.

This Argument, a Celi Rationibus, from Astronomy, or the Constitution of the Heavens, is this: That the Mundane Sphere is so framed, in respect
Atheists contend that the World is Ill-made. Book I.

respects of the Disposition of the Equator and Ecliptick, as renders the greatest part of the Earth uninhabitable to Men and most other Animals; partly by reason of that excess of Heat in the Torrid Zone (containing all between the Tropicks) and partly from the Extremity of Cold in both the Frigid Zones, towards either Pole. Again, whereas the Stoical Theists Contemporary with Epicurus concluded, that the whole World was made by a Deity, only for the sake of Men,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horum omnium causâ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitutas Deum singunt—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is urged on the contrary, that a great part of the Habitable Earth is taken up by Seas, Lakes and Rocks, barren Heaths and Sands, and thereby made useless for Mankind; and that the remainder of it yields no fruit to them, unless expugned by obstinate Labour, after all which, men are often disappointed of the Fruits of those Labours, by unseasonable Weather, Storms and Tempests. Again, that Nature has not only produced many noxious and poisonous Herbs, but also Destructive and Devouring Animals, whose Strength surpasseth that of Mens; and that the Condition of Mankind is so much Inferiour to that of Brutes, that Nature seems to have been but a Step-mother to the former, whilst the hath been an Indulgent Mother to the latter. And to this purpose, the manner of mens coming into the World is thus aggravated by the Poet:

Tum porro puer, ut sevis projecit us ab undis
Navita, nudus humijacet, insans, indigus omnis.
Vitae auxilio, cum primum in luminis oras
Nixibus ex albo matris natura profudit.
Vagitique locum lugubri compleci, ut equum,*
Quo tantum in vita resulet transire malorum.

But on the contrary, the Comparative Advantages of Brutes and their Privileges, which they have above men, are described after this manner:

At variâ crescent pecudes, armenta, ferereque:
Nec creptacla eis opinunt, nec quod quam adhibenda est
Alma nutricis Blanda atque Infraopta loquela;
Nec varias quærent vestes pro tempore celis.
Denique non aruis opus est, non manibus altis,
Quae sua tuteantur, quando omnibus omnia largè
Tellus ipsa parit, naturaque Dei bona rerum.

And Lastly, The Topick of Evils in General, is insinuated upon them, not those which are are called Culpe, Evils of Fault (for that is a Thing which the Democratick Atheists utterly explode in the Genuine Sense of it) but the Evils of Pain and Trouble; which they dispute concerning, after this manner. The Supposed Deity and Maker of the World, was either Willing to abolish all Evils,
but not Able, or he was Able but not Willing; or Thirdly, he was neither Willing nor Able; or else Lastly, he was both Able and Willing. This Latter is the only thing that answers fully to the Notion of a God. Now that the supposed Creator of all things was not thus both Able and Willing to abolish all Evils, is plain, because then there would have been no Evils at all left. Wherefore since there is such a Deluge of Evils overflowing all, it must needs be, that either he was Willing and not Able to remove them; and then he was Impotent, or else he was Able and not Willing, and then he was Envious, or Lastly he was neither Able nor Willing, and then he was both Impotent and Envious.

XVII. In the Twelfth Place, the Atheists further dispute in this manner. If the World were made by any Deity, then it would be governed by a Providence, and if there were any Providence, it must appear in Humane Affairs. But here it is plain, that all is Tobu and Boku, Chaos and Confusion: Things happening alike to all, to the Wife and Foolish, Religious and Impious, Virtuous and Vicious. (For these Names the Atheist cannot chuse but make use of, though by taking away Natural Morality, they really destroy the Things.) From whence it is concluded, that all things float up and down, as they are agitated and driven by the Tumbling Billows of Careless Fortune and Chance. The Impieties of Dionysius, his scoffing, Abuses of Religion, and whatsoever was then Sacred, or worshipt under the Notion of a God, were most notorious; and yet it is observed, that he fired never a jot the worse for it. 

Hunc nec Olympius Jupiter fulmine percussit, nec Asculapius misero diuturnoque morbo tabescens interemit, verum in suo leetulo mortuus, in Tympanidis rogum illatus est, eique potesstatem quam ipse per seclus nactus erat, quasi justam & legitimam, hereditatis loco tradidit: Neither did Jupiter Olympus strike him with a Thunder-bolt, nor Asculapius inflict any languishing Disease upon him, but he died in his bed, and was honourably interred, and that Power which he had wickedly acquired, he transmitted, as a Just and Lawful Inheritance, to his Posterity. And Diogenes the Cynick, though much a Theist, could not but acknowledge, that Harpalus a famous Robber or Pirate in those times, who committing many Villainous actions, notwithstanding lived prosperously, did thereby Testimonium dicere contra Deos, bear testimony against the Gods. Though it has been objected by the Theists, and thought to be a strong argument for Providence, that there were so many Tables hung up in Temples, the Monuments of such as having prayed to the Gods in Storms and Tempests, had escaped Shipwreck; yet as Diogoras observed, Namquam pieti sunt qui Nausfragium fecernunt, there are no Tables extant of those of them who were Shipwreckt. Wherefore it was not considered by these Theists, how many of them that prayed as well to the Gods, did notwithstanding suffer Shipwreck; as also how many of those, which never made any Devotional Address at all, to any Deity, escaped equal Dangers of Storms and Tempests.
Moreover, it is consentaneous to the opinion of a God, to think that Thunder ratling in the Clouds with Thunderbolts, should be the immediate Significations of his wrath and displeasure; whereas it is plain, that these are flung at random, and that the Fury of them often lights upon the Innocent, whilst the notoriously guilty escape untouched, and therefore we understand not, how this can be answered by any Theists.

Why, quibus incantum Scelus aversabile cunque est,
Non facinant id, qui flammatis fulguris balent,
Perio fore proximo; non quidem Mortalibus acer?
Et potius nulla sibi turpis Consens us revi,
Veloctur in flammis innoxius, inque peditur,
Turbine caelesti, fubito correpit, & igni?

Now the force of this Argument appears to be very powerful, because it hath not only staggered and confounded Theists in all Ages, but also hath effectually transformed many of them into Atheists. For Diogoras Melinus himself was once a Superstitious Religionist; in so much that being a Dithyrambic Poet, he began one of his Poems with these words, 'ος, ταλαμων τοι βαλεια τελεκται, All things are done by God and Fortune. But being injured afterwards by a Perjured Person, that suffered no Evil nor Disaster thereupon, he therefore took up this contrary Perwision, that there was no Deity. And there have been innumerable others, who have so far wrought upon by this Consideration, as if not absolutely to disclaim and discard a Deity, yet utterly to deny Providence, and all Care of Humane Affairs by any Invisible Powers. Amongst whom the Poet was one, who thus expressed his Sense.

Sed cum res hominum tantà caligine voluer
Aspiceremus, let us seek to find a clearer view,
Vexarique pios, cursed be those that set it in vain
Kelligio, casseque viam non sponte sequerur
Alterius, vacue, que currerem Semina motum
Affirmat, magnanime novas per Inane Figuras,
Fortunà non Arte regi, que Numine sensus
Ambiguo vel Nulla putat, vel Nescia nosieri.

XVIII. A thirteenth Argumentation of the Democritick and Epicurean Atheists is to this purpose; that whereas the Deity is supposed to be such a being, as both knows all that is done everywhere in the most distant Places of the World at once, and doth himself immediately Order all things; this is, First, impossible for any one Being, thus to animadvert and order all things in the whole Universe,

Quis regere immensum Summam, quis habere profundi
Indu marm validas potis est moderanter habendas?
Quis pariter calos omnes convertere? & omnis

Ignibus
And Secondly, if it were suppos'd to be possible, yet such infinite Negotiosity would be absolutely inconsistent with a Happy State; for could such a Deity ever have any quiet Enjoyment of himself, being Perpetually filled with Tumult and Hurlibrity, 

Nor could such a Deity ever have any quiet Enjoyment of himself, being Perpetually filled with Tumult and Hurlibrity, 

but because he had been so long unmade, why did he make it at all? Cur mundi Aedificator repente extiterit, innumerabili ante secula dormuerit? How came this Builder and Architect of the World, to start up upon a sudden, after he had slept for infinite Ages, and bethink himself of making a World? For, certainly, if he had been awake all that while, he would either have made it sooner, or not at all; because there was either something wanting to his Happiness, before, or nothing; if there had been any thing wanting before, then the World could not have been so long unmade; but if he were completely Happy in himself without it, then wanting nothing, be would have left the World unsatisfied. All desire of Change and Novelty, argues a Fastidious Satiety, proceeding from Defect and Indigency.
Did this Deity, therefore light up the Stars, as so many Lamps or Torches, in that vast Abyfs of infinite Darkness, that himself might thereby have a more comfortable and cheerfull Habitation? Why would he then content himself from Eternity, to dwell in such a Melancholick, Horrid, and Forlorn Dungeon?

*An Credo in tenebris vitâ & mæore jacbat,*
*Dumce diluxit verum Genitalis Origo.*

Was Company and that Variety of Things, by which Heaven and Earth are distinguished, desirable to him? Why then would he continue Solitary so long, wanting the pleasure of such a Spectacle? Did he make the World and men in it to this end, that himself might be worshipp'd and adored, feared and honoured by them? But what could he be the better for that, who was sufficiently happy alone in himself before? Or did he do it for the Sake of Men, to gratifie and oblige them?

---

*At quid immortalis atque beatâ*
*Gratia nostra quae largirir emolumenti,*
*Ut nostrâ quicquam causâ gerere aggregiatriut?*

Again, if this were done for the Sake of Men, then it must be either for Wife Men or for Fools; if for Wife men only, then all that Pains was taken but for a very few; but if for Fools, what reason could there be, why the Deity should seek to deserve so well at their hands? Besides this, what hurt would it have been to any of us, (whether Wife or Foolish) never to have been made?

*Quidve mali fuerat nobis non esse creatum?*
*Natus enim debet quicunque est, velle manere*
*In vita, donec retinebit blandâ voluptas :*
*Qui nunquam vero vita gustavit amorem,*
*Nec fruit in numero, quid obedit non esse creatum?*

Lastly, if this Deity must needs go about moli'minosily to make a World, *tegete eamque, réx Eó loves,* like an Artificer and Carpenter, what Tools and Instruments could he have to work withall; what Ministers and Subservient Opificers? what Engins and Machins for the rearing up of so huge a Fabrick? How could he make the Matter to understand his meaning, and obey his beck; how could he move it and turn it up and down? For if Incorporeal, he could neither touch nor be touched, but would run through all things, without fastening upon any thing: but if Corporeal, then the same thing was both Materials and Architect, both Timber and Carpenter, and the Stones must hew themselves, and bring themselves together, with discretion, into a Structure.
XX. In the last Place, the Atheists argue from Interest (which proves many times the most effectual of all Arguments) against a Deity; endeavouring to persuade, that it is, First, the Interest of Private Persons, and of all Man-kind in General; and Secondly, the Particular Interest of Civil Sovereigns, and Commonswealths; that there should neither be a God, nor the Belief of any such thing entertained by the minds of Men; that is, no Religion. First, they say therefore, that it is the Interest of Mankind in General; Because so long as men are persuaded, that there is an Understanding Being infinitely Powerful, having no Law but his own Will; (because he has no Superior) that may do whatever he pleases at any Time to them, they can never Securely enjoy themselves or any thing, nor be ever free from disquieting Fear and Solicitude. What the Poets Fable of Tantalus in Hell, being alwaies in fear of a huge stone hanging over his Head, and ready every Moment to tumble down upon him, is nothing to that true fear which men have of a Deity, and Religion, here in this Life, which indeed was the very thing mythologized in it.

Nec miser impendens magnum timet aere Saxum
Tantalus, ut fama est, caffà formidina torpens:
Sed magis in vita, Divum Metus urget inanis
Mortales, casimque timent, quemcumque ferat Fors.

For besides mens Insecurity, from all manner of present Evils, upon the Supposition of a God, the Immortality of Souls can hardly be kept out, but it will crowd in after it, and then the fear of Eternal Punishments after Death will unavoidably follow thereupon, perpetually embittering all the Solaces of Life, and never suffering men to have the least sincere Enjoyment.

si certam sinus esse viderent
Ærnum aromum hoines, aliqu^ ratione valerent,
Religionibus, atque minis obstiteri Vatum.
Num re ratio nulla est restandi, nulla facultas:
Æternas quoniam Penas in morte timendum,
Ignoratur enim que sit natura Animai,
Nata sit, an contra nascentibus insnesetur;
Et simul interesat nobiscum morte dirempta,
An Tenebras Orci visat vastoae Lacunas.

Wherefore it is plain, that they who first introduced the Belief of a Deity and Religion, whatever they might aim at in it, deserved very ill of all Mankind, because they did thereby infinitely debase and depress mens Spirits under a Servile Fear,

Efficient animos humiles, formidime Divum,
Depressisque premunt ad Terram:
As also cause the greatest Grievs and Calamities that now disturb Hu-
mane Life,

Quantos
Atheists pretend that Theism is Book I.

Quantos tum gemitus ipsi sui, quantatq, nobis
Puiner, quas lacrymas peperere Minoribignstris?

There can be no comfortable and happy Living, without banishing from our Mind, the belief of these two things, of a Deity and the Souls Immortality,

Et metus ille foras precept Acheruntis agendus
Funditus, humanam qui vitam turbat ab imo,
Omnia suffundens Mortis Nigro, neque ullan
Effo voluptatem Liquidam, Furdamque relinquit.

It was therefore a Noble and Heroical Exploit of Democritus and Epicurus, those two good-natured Men, who seeing the World thus oppressed under the grievous Yoke of Religion, the Fear of a Deity and Punishment after death, and taking pity of this sad Condition of Mankind, did manfully encounter that affrightful Spectre or Empyrea, of a Providential Deity; and by clear Philosophick Reasons, chase it away, and banish it quite out of the World; laying down such Principles, as would save all the Phenomena of Nature without a God;

Quae bene cognita sint tenero, Natura videtur
Libera continuo, Dominis privata Superbis,
Ipsa sit per se sponte, Omnia Dis agere expers.

So that Lucretius does not without just Cause, erect a Triumphal Arch or Monument to Epicurus, for this Conquest or Victory of his, obtained over the Deity and Religion, in this manner;

Humana ante oculos fde quum vita jaceret,
Intermis oppressa gravis sub Religione,
Quae caput a Cali regionibus offendebat,
Horribili super aspevea mortalibus insanit
Primium Grains homo mortales tendere contra
Est oculos auxes, primisque obscurae contra
Quem nec sana Deum nec fulmina, nec mimitanti
Murmure compressit calum, &c.

XXI. That it is also the Interest of Civil Sovereigns and of all Common-wealths, that there should neither be Deity nor Religion, the Democritick Atheists would perforce in this manner; A Body Politick or Common-wealth is made up of parts, that are all naturally Dissociated from one another, by reason of that Principle of private Self-love, who therefore can be no otherwise held together than by Fear; Now if there be any greater Fear than the Fear of the Leviant, and Civil Representative, the whole Structure and Machin of this great Colossus must needs fall a-pieces, and tumble down. The Civil Sovereign reigns only in Fear, wherefore unless his Fear be the King and Sovereign of all Fears, his Empire and Dominion ceases,
ceases. But as the Rod of Moses devoured the Rods of the Magi-
canes, so certainly will the fear of an omnipotent Deity, that can pu-
nish with eternal Torments after Death, quite swallow up and de-
vour that comparatively Petty Fear of Civil Sovereigns, and con-
sequently destroy the Being of Commonwealths, which have no Foun-
dation in Nature, but are mere Artificial Things, made by the En-
chantment and Magical Art of Policy. Wherefore it is well observed by 
a Modern Writer, That men ought not to suffer themselves to be ab-
used, by the Doctrine of Separated Essences and Incorporeal Substanties, 
(such as God and the Soul) built upon the vain Philosophy of Aristotle, 
that would fright men from obeying the Laws of their Country, with 
Empty Names, (as of Hell, Damnation, Fire and Brimstone) as men 
fright Birds from the Corn, with an empty Hat, Doublet, and a crooked 
Stick. And again; If the fear of Spirits (the chief of which is the 
Deity) were taken away, men would be much more fitted than they are 
for Civil Obedience.

Moreover, the Power of Civil Sovereigns is perfectly Indivisible; 
tis either All or Nothing, it must be Absolute and Infinite, or else tis 
none at all; now it cannot be so, if there be any other Power equal 
to it, to share with it, much less if there be any Superior (as that 
of the Deity) to check it and control it. Wherefore the Deity 
must of Necessity be removed and displaced, to make room for the 
Leviathan to spread himself in.

Lastly, 'Tis perfectly inconsistent with the Nature of a Body Pol-
tick, that there should be any Private Judgment of Good or Evil, 
Lawful or Unlawful, Just or Unjust allowed; but Conscience (which 
Theism and Religion introduces) is Private Judgment concerning Good 
and Evil; and therefore the Allowance of it, is contradictory to Civil 
Sovereignty and a Commonwealth. There ought to be no other 
Conscience (in a Kingdom or Commonwealth) besides the Law of 
the Country; the allowance of Private Conscience being, ipso facto, a 
Dilution of the Body Politick, and a Return to the State of Na-
ture. Upon all these accounts it must needs be acknowledged, 
that those Philosophers who undermine and weaken Theism and 
Religion, do highly deserve of all Civil Sovereigns and Common-
wealths.

XXII. Now from all the premised Considerations, the Democrati-
ticks confidently conclude against a Deity; That the System and Com-
pages of the Universe, had not its Original from any Understanding 
Nature, but that Mind and Understanding itself, as well as all things 
else in the World, sprung up from Senseless Nature and Chance, or from 
the unguided and undirected Motion of Matter. Which is therefore 
called by the Name of Nature, because whatsoever moves is moved 
by Nature and Necessity, and the mutual Occurrences and Encounters 
of Atoms, their Plaice, their Strakes and Dalhings against one an-
other, their Reflexions and Recurrencies, their Cohesions, Implexi-
ons, and Entanglements, as also their Scattered Dispersion and Di-
vulsions, are all Natural and Necessary; but it is called also by the
name of Chance and Fortune, because it is all unguided by any Mind, Counsel or Design.

Wherefore Infinite Atoms of different sizes and figures, devoid of all Life and SenCe, moving Fortuitously from Eternity in infinite Space, and making successively several encounters, and consequently various Implexions and Entanglements with one another; produced first a confused Chaos of these Omnifarious Particles, jumbling together with infinite variety of Motions, which afterward by the tugging of their different and contrary forces, whereby they all hinders and abated each other, came, as it were by joint Conspiracy, to be Conglomerated into a Vortex or Vortices; where after many Convolutions and Evolutions, Molitions and Eflays (in which all manner of Tricks were tried, and all Forms imaginable experimented) they chanced in length of time here to settle, into this Form and System of things, which now is, of Earth, Water, Air and Fire; Sun, Moon and Stars; Plants, Animals and Men; So that Senseless Atoms, fortuitously moved, and Material Chaos, were the first Original of all things.

This Account of the Cosmopœia, and first Original of the Mundane System, is represented by Lucreius according to the mind of Epicurus, though without any mention of those Vortices, which yet were an essential part of the old Democritic Hypothesis.

Sed quibus ille modis conjunctus materiœ
Fundarit coelum, ac terram, pontique profunda,
Solis, lunæ cursum, ex ordine ponam.
Nam certè negque confilio primordia rerum,
Ordine quæque atque sagaci mente locarunt:
Nec, quosque darent motus, pepigeræ profectò
devincta multa modis multis primordia rerum,
Ex infinito jam tempore percita plagiis,
Ponderibusque suis convertant concita ferri,
Omni modificaque coire, atque omnia pertinent,
Quæcumque inter se possent congressa creare: 
Propterèa fit, uti magnum volgata per æum,
Omnigenus cœlus, & motus experiundo,
Tandem ca conveniant, que ut convenire, repente
Magnarum rerum sient exordia sepe,
Terræ, Maris, & Celi, generalis Animantium.

But because some seem to think that Epicurus was the first Founder and Inventor of this Doctrine, we shall here observe, that this fame Ateistick Hypothesis was long before described by Plato, when Epicurus was, as yet unborn; and therefore doubtlefs according to the Doctrine of Leucippus, Democritus and Protagoras; though that Philosopher, in a kind of disdain (as it seems) refused to mention either of their Names, πῶς έκ βασιν ήγο, γινώς ήτε, φοινικί πάντα έιναι αύτά 
τούχι φασίν τέχνη ή έυθύς τότε, ή τι μεία τούτα α'υπό σόμιαται, γινόμεν τε ή
tούχι τι σεληνος, δεησον τε πέξα, δια τότεν γαρένειν, παθελας διόντας α'υγναν.

τούχι
Chap. II. All sprung from Nature and Chance.

The Atheists say that Fire, Water, Air and Earth (i.e. the four Elements) were all made by Nature and Chance; and none of them by Art or Mind (that is, they were made by the fortuitous Motion of Atoms, and not by any Deity). And that those other Bodies, of the Terrestrial Globe, of the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars (which by all, except those Atheists, were, in those times, generally supposed to be Animated, and a kind of inferior Deities), were afterwards made out of the foresaid Elements, being altogether Inanimate. For they being moved fortuitously or as it happened, and so making various commixture together, did by that means, at length produce the whole Heavens and all things in them, as likewise Plants and Animals here upon earth, all which were made by Mind, nor by Art, nor by any God; but, as we said before, by Nature and Chance. Art and Mind it self, rising up afterwards from the same Senseless Principles in Animals.
CHAP. III.

An Introduction to the Confutation of the Atheistick Grounds; i.e. which is contained a particular Account of all the several Forms of Atheism. 1. That the Grounds of the Hylozoick Atheism could not be insisted on in the former Chapter, together with those of the Atomick, they being directly contrary each to other, with a further Account of this Hylozoick Atheism. 2. A Suggestion, by way of Caution, for the preventing of all mistakes, That every Hylozoist must not therefore be condemned for an Atheist, or a mere Counterfeit Historical Theist. 3. That nevertheless, such Hylozoists as are also Corporealists, can by no means be excused from the Imputation of Atheism, for Two Reasons: 4. That Strato Lamplaccenus, commonly called Platicus, seems to have been the first Afferter of the Hylozoick Atheism; he holding no other God but the Life of Nature in Matter. 5. Further proved, that Strato was an Atheist, and that of a different Form from Democritus, he attributing an Energetic Nature, but without Sense and Animality, to all Matter. 6. That Strato not deriving all things from a mere Fortuitous Principle, as the Democritick Atheists did, nor yet acknowledging any one Platick Nature to preside over the Whole, but deducing the Original of things from a Mixture of Chance and Platick Nature both together, in the several parts of Matter, must therefore needs be an Hylozoick Atheist. 7. That the famous Hippocrates was neither an Hylozoick nor Democritick Atheist, but rather an Heraclitick Corporeal Theist. 8. That Plato took no Notice of the Hylozoick Atheism, nor of any other, then what derives the Original of all things from a mere Fortuitous Nature; and therefore either the Democritical, or the Anaximandrian Atheism, which latter will be next declared. 9. That it is hardly imaginable, there should have been no Philosophick Atheists in the World before Democritus and Leucippus, there being in all Ages, as Plato observes, some or other Sicks of the Atheistick Disease. That Arisotle affirms many of the first Philosophers, to have assign'd only a Material Cause of the Mundane System, without either Efficient or Intending Cause; They supposing Matter to be the only Substance, and all things else nothing but the Pallions and Accidents of it, Generable and Corruptible. 10. That the Doctrine of these Materialists will be more fully understood from the Exceptions which Arisotle makes against them; His first Exception,
tion, That they assigned no Cause of Motion, but introduced it into the World unaccomplibly. 11. Aristotle's second Exception, That these Materialists did assign no Cause τις ὡς Ὀ, ἔκχει γε, of Well and Fit, and give no account of the Orderly Regularity of things. That Anaxagoras was the first Ionick Philosopher who made Mind and Good a Principle of the Universe. 12. Concluded, That Aristotle's Materialists were downright Atheists, not merely because they held all Substance to be Body, since Heraclitus and Zeno did the like, and yet are not therefore accsupposing their Fiery Matter to be Originally Intellectual, and the whole World to be an Animal) but because these made Stupid Matter, devoid of all Understanding, and Life, to be the only Principle: 13. As also, because they supposed every thing besides the Substance of Matter, Life and Understanding, and all Particular Beings, to be Generable and Corruptible; and consequently that there could be no other God, then such as was Native and Mortal. That those ancient Theologers, who were Theogonists, and Generated all the Gods out of Night and Chaos, were only Verbal Theists but Real Atheists: Senfles Matter being to them the highest Numen. 14. The great difference observed between Aristotle's Atheistical Materialists, and the Italick Philosophers: the former determining all things, besides the Substance of Matter, to be Made or Generated, the latter that no Real Entity was either Generated or Corrupted; thereupon both destroying Qualities and Forms of Body, and ascertaining the Ingenerability and Incorporety of Souls. 15. How Aristotle's Atheistical Materialists endeavoured to baffle and elude that Axiom of the Italick Philosophers, That Nothing can come from Nothing nor go to Nothing, And that Anaxagoras was the first amongst the Ionicks who yielded so far to that Principle, as from thence to assert Incorporeal Substance, and the Pre-existence of Qualities and Forms in Similar Atoms, forasmuch as he conceived them to be things, really distinct from the Substance of Matter. 16. The Error of some Writers, who because Aristotle affirms, that the Ancient Philosophers did generally conclude the World to have been Made, from thence infer, that they were all Theists, and that Aristotle contradicted himself in representing many of them as Atheists. That the Ancient Atheists did generally suppose, as Aristotle supposed, the World to have been Made, or have had a Beginning; as also some Theists did maintain its Eternity, but in away of Dependency upon the Deity. That we ought here to distinguish between the System of the World, and the Substance of the Matter, all Atheists assenting the Matter to have been, not only Eternal, but also and independently upon any other Being. 17. That Plato and others concluded this Materialism or Hylopathian Atheism, to have been at least as old as Homer, who made the Ocean (or fluid Matter) the Father of all the Gods. And that this was indeed the Ancientst of all Atheisms, which verbally acknowledging Gods, yet derived the Original of them all from Night and Chaos. The description of this Atheistical Hypothesis in Aristophanes, That Night and Chaos first laid an Egg, out of which sprung forth Love, which afterwards mingling with Chaos begat Heaven and Earth, Animals and all the Gods. 18. That notwithstanding this, in Aristotle's judgment, Parmenides, Hesiod, with others, who made Love in like man-
ner, Senior to all the Gods, were to be exempted out of the number of Atheists; they understanding this Love to be an Active Principle, or Cause of Motion in the Universe, which therefore could be no Egg of the Night, nor Offspring of Chaos, but something in Order of Nature before Matter. Simmias Rhodius his Wings, a Poem in honour of this Heavenly Love. This not that Love which was the Offspring of Penia and Porus in Plato. In what reified sense it may pass for true Theology, that Love is the Supreme Deity and Original of all things. 19. That though Democritus and Leucippus be elsewhere taxed by Aristotle, for this very thing, that they assigned only a Material Cause of the Universe; yet they were not the Persons intended by him in the fore-cited Accusation, but certain Antient Philosophers, who also were not Atomists but Hylopathians. 20. That Aristotle's Atheistic Materialists were all the first Ionick Philosophers before Anaxagoras, Thales being the Head of them. But that Thales is acquitted from this Imputation of Atheism by several good Authors (with an Account how he came to be thus differently represented) and therefore that his next Successor Anaximander is rather to be accounted the Prince of this Atheistic Philosophy. 21. A Passage out of Aristotle objected, which, at first sight, seems to make Anaximander a Divine Philosopher, and therefore hath led both Modern and Ancient Writers into that mistake. That this Place well considered, proves the contrary, That Anaximander was the Chief of the old Atheistic Philosophers. 22. That it is no wonder, if Anaximander called Senfles Matter the ἄθανατος, or God, since to all Atheists, that must needs be the highest Nomen; Also how this is said to be Immortal, and to Govern all; with the concurrent Judgment of the Greek Scholiasts upon this Place. 23. A further Account of the Anaximandrian Philosophy, manifesting it to have been purely Atheistical. 24. What ill Judges the Vulgar have been of Atheists and Atheism; as also that learned men have commonly supposed fewer Atheists than indeed there were. Anaximander and Democritus Atheists both alike, though Philosophising different ways. That some Passages in Plato respect the Anaximandrian Form of Atheism, rather than the Democritical. 25. Why Democritus and Leucippus new model'd Atheism into the Atomick Form. 26. That besides the Three Forms of Atheism already mentioned, we sometimes meet with a Fourth, which supposes the Universe though not to be an Animal, yet a kind of Plant or Vegetable, having one Plastick Nature in it, devoid of Understanding and Sense, which disposes and orders the Whole. 27. That this Form of Atheism which makes one Plastick Life to preside over the Whole, is different from the Hylozoick, in that it takes away all Fortuitousness, and submits all to the Fate of one Plastick Methodical Nature. 28. Though it be possible that some in all ages might have entertained this Atheistical Conception, that things are disposed by one Regular and Methodical but Unknowning Sensibles Nature; yet it seems to have been chiefly affected by certain Spurious Heraclichicks and Stoicks. And therefore this Form of Atheism, which supposes one Cosmoplastic Nature, may be called Pseudo-Zeno-nian. 29. That, besides the Philosophick Atheists, there have been always Enthusiastic and Fanatical Atheists, though
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in some sense all Atheifts may be said also to be both Enthusiasts and Fanaticks, they being led by an ἐρωτικός or Irrational Impetus.

30. That there cannot easily be any other Form of Atheifm, besides those four already mentioned, because all Atheifts are Corporealists, and yet all Corporealists not Atheifts, but only such as make the first Principle of all things, not to be Intellectual.

31. A Distribution of Atheifts, producing the former Quaternio, and showing the Difference between them. 32. That they are but Bunglers at Atheifm, who talk of Sensitive and Rational Matter; and that the Canting Astrological Atheifts are not at all considerable, because not understanding themselves.

33. Another Distribution of Atheifts; That they either derive the Original of things from a Merely Fortuitous Principle, the Unguided Motion of Matter, or else from a Plaftick and Methodical, but Senflefs Nature. What Atheifts denied the Eternity of the World, and what affected it. 34. That of these four Forms of Atheifm, the Atomick or Democritical, and the Hylozoick or Stratonical are the chief, and that these two being once confuted, all Atheifm will be confuted.

35. These two Forms of Atheifm, being contrary to one another, how we ought in all reason to infift rather upon the Atomick; but that afterwards we shall confute the Hylozoick also, and prove against all Corporealists, that no Cogitation nor Life belongs to Matter.

36. That in the mean time, we shall not neglect any Form of Atheifm, but confute them all together, as agreeing in one Principle; as also shew, how the old Atomick Atheifts did sufficiently overthrow the Foundation of the Hylozoifs. 37. Observed here, that the Hylozoifs are not condemned merely for affirming a Plaftick Life, distinct from the Animal, (which with most other Philosophers we judge highly probable, if taken in a Right Sense) but for grossly misunderstanding it, and attributing the same to Matter.

The Plaftick Life of Nature largely explained.

38. That though the Constatation of the Atheiftick grounds, according to the Laws of Method, ought to have been referred for the last part of this Discourse, yet we having reasons to violate those Laws, crave the Readers Pardon for this Prepofterousness. A Considerable Observation of Plato's, that it is not only Moral Vitioity which inclines men to Atheize, but also an Afflication of seeming wiser than the Generality of Mankind; As likewise that the Atheifts, making such pretence to Wit, it is a Scandalously undertaking to evince that they fumble in all their Ratiocinations. That we hope to make it appear, that the Atheifts are no Conjurers; and that all Forms of Atheifm are Non-sence and Imposibility.

In if we have now represented the Grand Mysteries of Atheifm, which may be also called the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Darkness; though indeed some of them are but briefly hinted here, they being again more fully to be infifted on afterward, where we are to give an account of the Atheifts Endeavours to Salve the Phenomenon of Cogitation. We have represented the chief Grounds of Atheifm in General, as also of that most Notorious Form of Atheifm in particular, that is called Atomical; but whereas there hath been already mentioned,
Further explained.

mentioned, another Form of Atheifm, called by us Hylozoical; the Principles hereof could not possibly be insifted on in this place, where we were to make the most Plausible Plea for Atheifm; they being directly contrary to those of the Atomical, so that they would have mutually destroyed each other. For, whereas the Atomick Atheifm supposes, the Notion or Idea of Body to be nothing but Extended Ref- 
senting Bulk, and consequently to include no manner of Life and co-
gitation in it; Hylozoifm on the contrary makes all Body, as such, and therefore every finallst Atom of it, to have Life Essentially belonging to it (Natural Perception, and Appetite) though without any Animal Sense or Reflective Knowledge, as if Life, and Matter or 
Extended Bulk, were but two Incomplete and Inadequate Conceptions, of one and the fame Substance, called Body. By reason of which Life (not Animal but only Phaffical) all parts of Matter being suppos- ed able, to form themselves Artificially and Methodically (though without any Deliberation or Attentive Consideration) to the great- 
est advantage of their present respective Capabilities, and therefore also sometimes, by Organization to improve themselves further, into Sense and Self-enjoyment in all Animals, as also to Universal Rea-
son and Reflective Knowledge in Men; it is plain that there is no Neces-
sity at all left, either of any Incorpostral Soul in Men to make them 
Rational, or of any Deity in the whole Universe to save the Regular-
ty thereof. One main difference betwixt these two Forms of Atheifm is this, that the Atomical supposes all Life whatsoever to be 
Accidental, Generable and Corruptible: But the Hylozoick admits of a 
certain Natural or Modelick Life, Essential and Substantial, Ingenerable 
and Incorruptible, though attributing the fame only to Matter, as sup-
pofing no other Substance in the World besides it.

II. Now to prevent all Mistakes, we think fit here by way of 
Caution to suggest; That as every Atomifir is not therefore necelfa-
arily an Atheifir, so neither must every Hylozoifir needs be accounted 
such. For who ever fó holds the Life of Matter, as notwithstanding to affert another kind of Substance also, that is Immaterial and Incor-
poral, is no way obnoxious to that foul Imputation. However we 
ought not to difemble, but that there is a great Difference here be-
twixt these two, Atomifim and Hylozoifim, in this regard; That the 
former of them, namely Atomifim (as hath been already declared) 
hath in it self a Natural Cognition and Conjunction with Incorpo-
realism, though violently cut off from it by the Democritick Atheifir; whereas the latter of them, Hylozoifim, seems to have altogether as 
close and intimate a Correspondence with Corporealism; Because, as 
hath been already signified, if all Matter, as such, have not only such 
a Life, Perception and Self-active Power in it, as whereby it can Form 
it self to the best advantage, making this a Sun and that an Earth or 
Planet, and fabricating the Bodies of Animals most Artificially; but 
also can improve it self into Sense and Self-enjoyment; it may as well 
be thought able to advance it self higher, into all the Acts of Reason 
and Understanding in Men: So that there will be no need either of an 
Incorporeal Immortal Soul in Men, or a Deity in the Universe. Nor 
indeed is it easily conceivable, how any should be induced to admit 
such
such a Monstrous Paradox as this is, That every Atom of Dust or other Sensible Matter, is Wiser than the greatest Politician and the most acute Philosopher that ever was; as having an Infallible Omniscience of all its own Capabilities and Congruities, were it not by reason of some strong Proposition, against Incorporeal Substance and a Deity, there being nothing so extravagant and Outrageously Wild, which a Mind once infected with Atheistical Sottishness and Disbelief, will not rather greedily swallow down, than admit a Deity, which to such is the highest of all Paradoxes imaginable, and the most affrightful Bug-bear. Notwithstanding all which, it may not be denied, but that it is possible for one, who really entertains the belief of a Deity and a Rational Soul Immortal, to be persuaded, first, that the Sensitive Soul, in men as well as Brutes, is merely corporeal; and then that there is a Material Plastick Life in the Seeds of all Plants and Animals, whereby they do artificially form themselves; and from thence afterward to descend also further, to Hylozoism, that all matter, as such, hath a kind of Natural, though not Animal Life in it; in consideration whereof, we ought not to Censure every Hylozoist, professing to hold a Deity and a Rational Soul Immortal, for a mere Disguised Atheist, or Counterfeit Hiftorical Theist.

III. But though every Hylozoist be not therefore necessarily an Atheist, yet whatsoever is an Hylozoist and Corporealist both together, he that both holds the Life of Matter in the Sense before declared, and also that there is no other Substance in the World besides Body and Matter, cannot be excused from the Imputation of Atheism, for Two Reasons. First, because though he derive the Original of all Things, not from what is perfectly Dead and Stupid, as the Atomick Atheist doth, but from that which hath a kind of Life or Perception in it, nay an Infallible Omniscience, of whatsoever it self can Do or Suffer, or of all its own Capabilities and Congruities, which seems to bear some Semblance of a Deity; yet all this being only in the way of Natural and not Animal Perception, is indeed nothing but a Dull and Drowsie, Plastick and Spermatic Life, devoid of all Conscioness and Self-enjoyment. The Hylozoists Nature, is a piece of very Mysteries Non-sence, a thing perfectly Wise, without any Knowledge or Consciousness of it self; Whereas a Deity, according to the true Notion of it, is such a Perfect Understanding Being, as with full Consciousness and Self-enjoyment, is completely Happy. Secondly, because the Hylozoick Corporealists, supposing all Matter, as such, to have Life in it, must needs make Infinite of those Lives, (far as much as every Atom of Matter has a Life of its own) Coordinate and Independent on one another, and consequently, as many Independent first Principles, no one Common Life or Mind ruling over the Whole. Whereas, to assert a God, is to derive all things από τῶν τῶν, from some one Principle, or to suppose one Perfect Living and Understanding Being, to be the Original of all things, and the Architect of the whole Universe.

Thus we see that the Hylozoick Corporealists is really an Atheist, though carrying more the Semblance and Disguise of a Theist, than other
other Atheists, in that he attributes a kind of Life to Matter. For
indeed every Atheist must of necessity call some of the Incommu-
nicable Properties of the Deity, more or less, upon that which is
not God, namely Matter: and they who do not attribute Life to
it, yet must needs bestow upon it Necessary Self-existence, and make
it the First Principle of all things, which are the Peculiarities of the
Deity. The Nomen which the Hylozoick Corporealifh pays all his
Devotions to, is a certain blind Shee-god or Goddef, called Nature or
the Life of Matter; which is a very great Mystery, a thing that
is Perfectly Wise, and Infallibly Omnifcient, without any Knowledge
or Consciounee at all. Something like to that αλλόν αϊστυμω
t (in* Plato) ὁτί ἦν διάφορον βοόες ἐκ τῶν θεῶν, that vulgar Enigm or
Riddle of Boys, concerning an Eunuch fliting a Bat, A Man and not a
Man, Seeing and not Seeing, did Strike and not Strike, with a Stone
and not a Stone, a Bird and not a Bird &c. The Difference being only this;
that this was a thing Intelligible, but humorouslly expressed,
whereas the other seems to be perfect Non-fence, being nothing but
a misunderstanding of the Plastick Power, as shall be shewed after-
wards.

IV. Now the First and Chief Affertour of this Hylozoick Athe-
ifm was, as we conceive, Strato Lampfacenus, commonly called
also Physicus, that had been once an Auditor of Theophrastus and a
famous Peripatetic, but aftewards degenerated from a Genuine Pe-
ripatecic, into a new-formed kind of Atheif. For Velleius, an Es-
picurean Atheist in Cicero, reckoning up all the several forts of The-
iifs, which had been in former times, gives such a Character of this
Strato, as whereby he makes him to be a strange kind of Atheiftical
Theift, or Divine Atheif, if we may use such a contradistinctive Expre-
ffion his words are thefe, *Nee audicendus Strato, qui Physicus appellatur,
qui omnem Viun Divinam in Natura fiam esse cenetus, que Canfas gignedit,
augendi ministerv habeat, sed caret omni Senfo; Neither is Strato, com-
monly called the Naturalist or Physicifh, to be heard, who places all
Dioevity in Nature, as having within it self the Canfes of all Genera-
tions, Corruptions and Augmentations, but without any manner of Senfo.
Strato's Deity therefore was a certain Living and Active, but Sensible
Nature. He did not fetch the Original of all things, as the Demo-
critick and Epicurean Atheiffts, from a mere Fortituous Motion of
Atoms, by means whereof he bore some flight Semblance of a Theift,
but yet he was a down-right Atheift for all that, his God being no
other than such a Life of Nature in Matter, as was both devoid of
Sensf and Consciounee, and also multiplied together with the fe-
veral parts of it. He is also in like manner described by Se-
neca in St. Auginfine*, as a kind of Mongrel thing, betwixt an A-
theift and a Theift; Ego fermum aut Platonem, aut Peripateticum Strato-
inem, quorum alter Denim fine Corporefacit, alter fine Animu? Shall I
endure either Plato, or the Peripatetic Strato, whereof the one made
God to be without a Body, the other without a Mind? In which words
Seneca taxes thefe two Philosophers, as guilty of two contrary Ex-
tremes; Plato, because he made God to be a pure Mind or a perfectly
incorporeal Being; and Strato, because he made him to be a Body
without
without a Mind, he acknowledging no other Deity than a certain Stupid and Plastick Life, in all the several parts of Matter, without Sense. Wherefore this seems to be the only reason, why Strato was thus sometimes reckoned amongst the Theists, though he were indeed an Atheist, because he disflected from that only form of Atheism, then so vulgarly received, the Democritick and Epicurean, attributing a kind of Life to Nature and Matter.

V. And that Strato was thus an Atheist, but of a different kind from Democritus, may further appear from this Passage of Cicero's*, Strato Lampacenus negat operâ Deorum se uti ad fabricandum Mundum, quaeque sunt docet omnia esse Efficía Natura, nec ut ille, qui apertis, & levisibus, & hamatis uncinatique Corporibus Concreta haec esse dicat, interire Isani; Solum confet haec esse Democriti, non docetis sed optantis: Strato denies that he makes any use of a God, for the fabricating of the World, or the solving the Phenomena thereof; teaching all things to have been made by Nature, but yet not in such a manner as he who affirmed them to be all Concreted out of certain rough and smooth, hokey and crooked Atoms, but nothing but the mere Dreams and Dotes of Democritus, not teaching but willing. Here we see that Strato denied the World to be made by a Deity or perfect Understanding Nature, as well as Democritus, and yet that he disflected from Democritus notwithstanding, holding another kind of Nature, as the Original of things, than he did, who gave no account of any Active Principle and Cause of Motion, nor of the Regularity that is in Things. Democritus his Nature was nothing but the Fortuitous Motion of Matter, but Strato's Nature was an Inward Plastick Life in the several Parts of Matter, whereby they could Artificially frame themselves to the best advantage, according to their several Capabilities, without any Conscientious or Reflexive Knowledge. Quidquid aut sit aut fiat, (says the same Author) Naturalibus fieri, aut factum esse dicit ponderebus et motibus: Strato teaches whatsoever is, or is made, to be made by certain inward Natural Forces and Activities.

VI. Furthermore it is to be observed, that though Strato thus attributed a certain kind of Life to Matter, yet he did by no means allow of any one Common Life, whether Sentient and Rational, or Plastick and Spermatick only, as Ruling over the whole mafs of Matter and Corporeal Universe; which is a thing in part affirmed by Pלוטarch*, and may in part be gathered from these words of his; ηδέ, ἐφέσων οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεκτοῦ τοῦ ὁμοίου, ἐξίσου τὸν ἀνθρώπον τὸν ἀνθρώπον τὸν ἀνθρώπον, οὗτο εἰ ἐντονεῖται τοῦ ἐντονεῖται τοῦ ἐντονεῖται. Strato affirmeth that the World is no Animal (or God) but that what is Natural in every thing, follows something Fortuitous antecedent, Chance first beginning, and Nature acting consequently thereupon. The full sense whereof seems to be this, that though Strato did not derive the Original of all Mundane things from mere Fortuitous Mechanism, as Democritus before him had done, but supposed a Life and Natural Perception in the Matter, that was directive of it, yet not acknowledging any one Common Life, whether Animal or Plastick, as governing
VII. It may perhaps be suspected by some, that the famous Hippocrates, who lived long before Strato, was an Affulor of the Hylozoick Atheism, because of such Passages in him these, ἀναλύομεν τοῦ φυσικοῦ, πρὸς τὰ σεληνίων, τῶν ἁπατῶν τοῖς ἀνακριβέσσεις τῆς φύσεως ἐκ τὰ διάλογα. Nature is Unlearned or Untaught, but it learneth from itself what things it ought to do; And again, ἀναλύομεν ἀνακριβέσσεις τῆς φύσεως ἐκ τὰ διάλογα. Nature faineth out ways to itself, not by Ratiocination. But there is nothing more affirmed here concerning Nature by Hippocrates, than what might be affirmed likewise of the Aristotelick and Platonick Nature, which is supposed to act for Ends, though without Consultation and Ratiocination. And I must confess, it seems to me no way misbecoming of a Theist, to acknowledge such a Nature or Principle in the Universe, as may act according to Rule and Method for the sake of Ends, and in order to the Best, though it self do not understand the reason of what it doth; this being still supposed to act dependently upon a higher Intellectual Principle, and to have been first set a work and employed by it, it being otherwise Non-fence. But to affect any such Plastick Nature, as is Independent upon any higher Intellectual Principle, and so itself the first and highest Principle of Activity in the Universe, this indeed must needs be, either that Hylozoick Atheism, already spoken of, or else another different Form of Atheism, which shall afterwards be describ'd. But though Hippocrates were a Corporealist, yet we conceive he ought not, to lie under the suspicion of either of those two Atheisms; forasmuch as himself plainly affirrs a higher Intellectual Principle, than such a Plastick Nature, in the Universe, namely a Heraclitick Corporeal God, or Understanding Fire, Immortal, pervading the whole World, in these words: διότι τά ναοί, ὃ ἔχοντο ἄντροπων ἱεραρχίας, ἀνακριβέσσεις τῇ ἀνάλυσι, ἔχουσιν πολὺς ἁρμόνια, ἄφθονος, ἀληθῶς ἄνευν πάντως τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, τῇ μελέτῳ ἀνεξανθρώπως. It seems to me, that that which is called Heat or Fire, is Immortal, and Omniscient, and that it sees, hears, and knows all things, not only such as are present, but also future. Wherefore we conclude, that Hippocrates was neither an Hylozoick nor Democritick Atheist, but an Heraclitick Corporeal Theist.
VIII. Possibly it may be thought also, that Plato in his Sophist intends this Hylomorphic Atheism, where he declares it as the Opinion of many, τιν ψυχον παθηναι αναι τα εις αιτιας αυτοταιτικον, και εκει διαφοναι. That Nature generates all Things from a certain Spontaneous Principle, without any Reason and Understanding. But here the word αυτοταιτικον may be as well rendered Fortuitous, as Spontaneous; however there is no necessity, that this should be understood of an Artificial or Methodical Unknowing Nature. It is true indeed that Plato himself seems to acknowledge a certain Plastick or Methodical Nature in the Universe, Subordinate to the Deity, or that perfect Mind which is the supreme Governor of all things, as may be gathered from these words of his, τοι τιν ευεξοι και προηγουσιν. That Nature does rationally (or orderly) together with Reason and Mind, govern the whole Universe. Where he supposes a certain Regular Nature to be a Partial and Subordinate Cause of things under the Divine Intellect. And it is very probable that Aristole derived that whole Doctrine of his concerning a Regular and Artificial Nature which acts for Ends, from the Platonick School. But as for any such Form of Atheism, as should suppose a Plastick or Regular, but Sensible Nature either in the whole World, or the several parts of Matter by themselves, to be the highest Principle of all things, we do not conceive that there is any Intimation of it to be found any where in Plato. For in his De Legibus, where he professedly disputes against Atheism, he states the Doctrine of it after this manner, τα πολλα μενεται ταν λαλησαν αληθως εξωφολεσαν μενεται ταξιν, τα δε ειναι ειτου μελαιν. That Nature and Chance produced all the first, greatest and most excellent things, but that the smaller things were produced by Humane Art. The plain meaning whereof is this, that the First Original of things, and the frame of the whole Universe, proceeded from a mere Fortuitous Nature, or the Motion of Matter unguided by any Art or Method. And thus it is further explained in the following words, τιν εν αληθω αυτοταιτικον. That the first Elements, Fire, water, Air and Earth, were all made by Nature and Chance, without any Art or Method, and then, that the bodies of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and the whole Heavens, were afterward made out of those Elements, as devoid of all manner of Life, and only fortuitously moved and mingled together; and lastly, that the whole Mundane System, together with the orderly Seasons of the year, as also Plants, Animals and Men did arise after the same manner, from the mere Fortuitous Motion of sensles and stupid Matter. In the very same manner does Plato state this Controversie again, betwixt Theists and Atheists, in his Philebus, ποτεν γαρ προτατος καταιμπατης, η το λαλησαν αληθως, η το προτατος φαινεται η το προτατος μενεται. Whether shall we say, O Protagoras, that this whole Universe is disposed and ordered, by a mere Irrational, Temperarious and Fortuitous Principle, and so as it happens; or contrariwise, (as our fore-fathers have instructed us) that Mind, and a certain Wonderful Wisdom, did at first frame, and does still govern all things?

Where-
Wherefore we conclude that Plato took no notice of any other Form of Atheism, as then set on foot, than such as derives all things from a mere Fortunatus Principle, from Nature and *Chance*, that is the unguided Motion of Matter, without any Plastick Artificialnes or Methodicalnes, either in the whole Universe, or the parts of it. But because this kind of Atheism, which derives all things from a mere Fortunatus Nature, had been managed two manner of ways; by Democritus in the way of Atoms, and by Anaximander and others in the way of Forms and Qualities; (of which we are to speak in the next place) therefore the Atheism which Plato opposes, was either the Democritick or the Anaximandrian Atheism; or else (which is most probable) both of them together.

I X. It is hardly imaginable that there should be no Philosophick Atheists in the world before Democritus and Leucippus. Plato long since concluded, that there have been Atheists, more or less, in every Age, when he bespeaks his young Atheist after this manner, ou ou μιθή σοι φιλέ πρώτοι κύ πρώτων πάυτων δέχον ἢδῶς Σωκράτης, γινομαι ἣ γεί πλειός ἡ ἔλαχος τάυτον τὴν ἐνόσον ἱκονές. The full fence whereof seems to be this; Neither you (my Son) nor your friends (Democritus, Leucippus and Protagoras) are the first who have entertained this Opinion concerning the Gods, but there have been always some more or less, sick of this Atheistical Disease. Wherefore we shall now make a diligent search and enquiry, to see if we can find any other Philosophers who Atheized before Democritus and Leucippus, as also what Form of Atheism they entertained.

Aristotle in his Metaphysickes, speaking of the Quaternio of Causes, affirms that many of those who first Philosophized, affigned only a Material Cause of the whole Mundane System, without either Intending or Efficient Cause. The reason whereof he intimates to have been this, because they ascertained Matter to be the only Substance, and that whatsoever else was in the World, besides the Substance or bulk of Matter, were all nothing else but τὰ ἄτομα, different Passions and Affections, Accidents and Qualities of Matter that were all Generated out of it, and Corruptible again into it, the Substance of Matter always remaining the same, neither Generated nor Corrupted, but from Eternity unmade; Aristotles words are *therefore*: τὰ πρῶτα φιλοσ. *Lib.ιν.κβ* φυσικωτέρα τὰς Ὑπὸ ὄντων ἄτομα τὰ ἄτομα ἄτομα τὰ ἄτομα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἄτομα ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα τὸ ἄτομα. Most of those who first philosophized took notice of no other Principle of things in the Universe, than what is to be referred to the Material Causes, for that out of which all things are, and out of which they are first made, and into which they are all at last corrupted and refolved, the Substance always remaining the same, and being changed only in its Passions and Qualities; This they concluded to be the first Original and Principle of all things.
X. But the meaning of these old Material Philosophers will be better understood, by those Exceptions which Aristotle makes against them, which are Two: First, that because they acknowledged no other Substance besides Matter, that might be an Active Principle in the Universe, it was not possible for them to give any account of the Original of Motion and Action. For, though they have, as it were, a principle, and that to move, which is acknowledged, and in which Aristotle and his School were in such a manner-grounded, as if it were grounded in the souls of all things, and in the souls of things, it is true, that the Mind, as it were, being the soul of the world, is the cause of the motions of the world, as has been sufficiently explained. Though all Generation be made never so much out of something as the Matter, yet the question still is, by what means this cometh to pass, and what is the Active Cause which produceth it? because the Subject-matter cannot change itself. For example, neither Timber, nor Brasse, is the cause that either of them are changed, for Timber alone does not make a Bed, nor Brasse a Statue, but there must be something else as the Cause of the Change; and to enquire after this is to enquire after another Principle, besides Matter, which we would call that from whence Motion springs. In which words Aristotle intimates that these old Material Philosophers shuffled in Motion and Action into the World unaccountably, or without a Cause; forasmuch as they acknowledged no other Principle of Things besides Passive Matter, which could never move, change or alter it self.

XI. And Aristotle's second Exception against these old Material Philosophers is this; that since there could be no Intending Causality in Senseless and Stupid Matter, they which they made to be the only Principle of all things, they were not able to assign to it any Cause of Well and Fit, and so could give no account of the Regular and Orderly Frame of this Mundane System; to which end, besides the other objections which Aristotle hath raised against them, he saith, That things partly are so well in the World, and partly are made so well, cannot be imputed either to Earth or Water, or any other Senseless Body; much less is it reasonable to attribute so noble and Excellent an Effect as this, to mere Chance or Fortune. Whereupon Aristotle again intimates, that as these Material Philosophers shuffled in Motion into the world without a Cause, so likewise they must needs suppose this Motion to be altogether Fortuitous and Unguided and thereby in a manner make Fortune, which is nothing but the absence or defect of an Intending Cause, to supply the room both of the Active and Intending Cause, that is, Efficient and Final. Whereupon Aristotle subjoyns a Commendation of Anaxagoras, as the first of the Ionick Philosophers, who introduced Mind or Intellect for a Principle in the Universe; that in this respect, he alone seemed to be sober and in his wits, comparatively with those others that went before him, who talked so idly and Atheistically. For Anaxagoras his Principle was such, that Aristotle, as was 

Aristotle's Old Material Book I.
XII. And now we think it is sufficiently evident, that these old Materialists in Aristotle, whoever they were, were downright Atheists, not so much, because they made all Substance to be Body or Matter, for Heraclitus first, and after him Zeno, did the like, deriving the Original of all things from Fire, as well as Anaximenes did from Air, and Thales is supposed by Aristotle to have done from Water, and that with some little more seeming plausibility, since Fire being a more Subtle and Moveable Body than any other, was therefore thought of some of those Ancients to be ἀσωματικός, the most Incorporeal of all Bodies, as Earth was for that cause rejected by all those Corporeal Philosophers, from being a Principle, by reason of the grollines of its parts. But Heraclitus and Zeno, notwithstanding this, are not accounted Atheists, because they supposed their Fiery Matter, to have not only Life, but also a perfect Understanding Originally belonging to it, as also the whole World to be an Animal: Whereas those Materialists of Aristotle, made Sensible and Stupid Matter, devoid of all Understanding and Life, to be the first Principle and Root of all things. For when they supposed, Life and Understanding, as well as all other Differences of Things, to be nothing but mere Passions and Accidents of Matter, Generable out of it, and Corruptible again into it, and indeed to be produced, in a Secondary way, from the Fortuitous Commixture of those first Elementary Qualities, Heat and Cold, Moist and Dry, Thick and Thin, they plainly implied the substance of Matter in itself to be devoid of all Life and Understanding. Now if this be not Atheism, to derive the Original of all things, even of Life and Mind itself, from Dead and Stupid Matter, Fortuitously Moved, then there can be no such thing at all.

XIII. Moreover, Aristotle's Materialists concluded every thing besides the Substance of Matter, (which is in itself indifferent to all things,) and consequently all particular and determinate Beings, to be Generable and Corruptible. Which is a thing that Plato takes notice of as an Atheistic Principle, expressing it in these words: καὶ μὴ ὅσα ἐσητε ἕνα, καὶ τὰ γίγαντο, that Nothing ever is, but every thing
thing is Made and Generated. Forasmuch as it plainly follows from hence, that not only all Animals and the Souls of men, but also if there were any Gods, which some of those Materialists would not stick, at least verbally, to acknowledge, (meaning thereby certain Understanding Beings superior to men) these likewise must needs have been all Generated, and consequently be Corruptible. Now to say that there is no other God, than such as was Made and Generated, and which may be again Unmade, Corrupted and Die, or that there was once no God at all till he was made out of the Matter, and that there may be none again, this is all one as to deny the thing it self. For a Native and Mortal God is a pure Contradiction. Therefore whereas Aristotle in his Metaphysics, tells us of certain Theologers, of the words πάντα γενόμενα, such as did Generate all things (even the Gods themselves) out of Night and Chaos, we must needs pronounce of such Theologers as these, who were Theogonists, and Generated all the Gods (without exception) out of Sensiles and Stupid Matter, that they were but a kind of Atheistical Theologers or Theological Atheists. For though they did admit of certain Beings, to which they attributed the Name of Gods, yet according to the true Notion of God, they really acknowledged none at all, (i.e. no Understanding Nature as the Original of things) but Night and Chaos, Sensiles and Stupid Matter, Fortuitously Moved, was to them the highest of all Natures. So that this Theology of theirs, was a thing wholly founded in Atheistical Non-sence.

XIV. And now we think it seafonable, here to observe, how vast a difference there was betwixt these old Materialists in Aristotle, and those other Philosophers, mentioned before in the first Chapter, who determined, ἐὰν εἴη γνωσθῇ ἐὰν ἡφαίσθηται ἄν οὕτως ἐστὶν That no Real Entity at all was Generated or Corrupted, for this reason, because Nothing could be made out of Nothing. These were chiefly the Philosophers of the Italick or Pythagoric Succession, and their design in it was not, as Aristotle was pleased somewhere to affirm, ὁπλίδων πίνακα τὸ γένεσιν, to contradict common sense and experience, in denying all Natural Generations and Alterations; but only to interpret Nature rightly in them, and that in way of opposition to those Atheistical Materialists, after this manner; That in all the Mutations of Nature, Generations and Alterations, there was neither any new Substance Made, which was not before, nor any Entity really distinct from the Preexistent Substances, but only that Substance which was before, diversely Modified; and so Nothing Produced in Generations, but new Modifications, Mixtures, and Separations of preexistent Substances.

Now this Doctrine of theirs drove at these Two things; First, the taking away of such Qualities and Forms of Body, as were vulgarly conceived to be things really distinct from the Substance of extended Bulk, and all its Modifications of more or less Magnitude, Figure, Site, Motion or Rest; Because, if there were any such things as these, produced in the Natural Generations and Alterations of Bodies, there would then be some Real Entity Made οἷς μονάδες ἐν πολλοῖς ἐν πολλοῖς. But
The Second thing which this Doctrine aimed at, was the establishing the Incorporiety and Ingenerability of all Souls. For since Life, Cognition, Sense and Understanding, could not be resolved into those Modifications of Matter, Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion, or into Mechanism and Phænecie, but must needs be Entities really distinct from Extended Bulk, or Dead and Stupid Matter; they concluded, that therefore Souls could not be Generated out of Matter, because this would be the Production of some Real Entity out of Nothing Incexisting or Preexisting; but that they must needs be another kind of Substance Incorporeal, which could no more be Generated or Corrupted, than the Substance of Matter itself; and therefore must either Preexist in Nature, before Generations, or else be Diversity Created and Infused, in them.

It hath been already proved in the First Chapter, that the Upshot of that Pythagorick Doctrine, That Nothing could be Generated out of Nothing Preexisting, amounted to those Two things mentioned, viz. the Asserting of the Incorporiety and Ingenerability of all Souls, and the Rejecting of those Phantasstick Entities of Forms and Real Qualities of Bodies, and resolving all Corporeal Phenomena, into Figures or Atoms; and the different Apparitions or Phanecies caused by them; but the latter of these, may be further confirmed from this Passaige of Aristotle's, where after he had declared that Democritus and Leucippus made the Soul and Fire, to consist of round Atoms or Figures; like those τῶν ἄνευ ξύσματος, those Ramenta that appear in the Air when the Sun-beams are transmitted through Granes; he adds ξυσματα ταῦτα προϊδον άρπαγοι βουλείς τινας αὐτῶν ἔηαν διάηχον, ᾿αρκαν γῆς τε νυμν άνν, ξυσματα ταῦτα προϊδον άρπαγοι βουλείς τινας αὐτῶν ἔηαν διάηχον. And which is said amongst the Pythagoreans, seems to have the same Sense, for some of them affirm, that the Soul is those very ξύσματα, Ramenta or Atoms; but others of them, that it is That which Moves them; which latter Doubtless were the genuine Pythagoreans. However, it is plain from hence, that the old Pythagoreans Physiologized by ξύσματα, as well as Democritus; that is, Figures and Atoms, and not Qualities and Forms.

But Aristotle's Materialists, on the contrary, taking it for granted that Matter or Extended Bulk is the only Subsistance, and that the Qualities and Forms of Bodies, are Entities really distinct from those Modifications of Magnitude, Figure, Site, Motion or Rest; and finding also by experience, that these were continually Generated and Corrupted, as likewise that Life, Sense and Understanding were produced in the Bodies of such Animals, where it had not been before, and
and again extinguished at the Death or Corruption of them, concluded, that the Souls of all Animals, as well as those other Qualities and Forms of Bodies, were Generated out of the Matter, and Corrupted again into it, and consequentely that every thing that is in the whole World, besides the Substance of Matter, was Made or Generated, and might be again Corrupted.

Of this Atheistick Doctrine, Aristotle speaks elsewhere, as in his Book de Caelo, "cai \\
This page contains a passage from a book discussing the doctrine of matter and its transformation through death and corruption. The text refers to Aristotle, who believed that souls and forms translated to other substances upon death. This edition is from the 17th century and includes a discussion on the nature of the world and the substance of matter, which was a topic of contention during that time.
The fience whereof is this; And therefore as to that Axiom of some Philosophers, That Nothing is either Generated or Destroyed, those Materialists admit it to be true in repect of the Substance of matter only, which is always preferred the fame, as, say they, We do not say that Socrates is simply or absolutely Made, when he is made either Handsom or Musical, or that he is Destroyed, when he lofeth those Dispositions, because the Subject Socrates still remains the fame; so neither are we to say that any thing else is absolutely either Generated or Corrupted, because the Substance or Matter of every thing always Continues. For there must needs be some certain Nature, from which all other things are Generated, that still remaining one and the fame.

We have noted this Passage of Aristotle’s the rather, because this is just the very Doctrine of Atheifts at this day. That the Substance of Matter or Extended Bulk is the only Real Entity, and therefore the only Unmade thing, that is neither Generable nor Creatable, but Necessarily Existent from Eternity; But whatever else is in the World, as Life and Animality, Soul and Mind, being all but Accidents and Affections of this Matter (as if therefore they had no Real Entity at all in them) are Generable out of Nothing and Corruptible into Nothing, so long as the Matter in which they are, still remains the same. The Refult of which is no less than this, That there can be no other Gods or God, than such as was at first Made or Generated out of Sensible Matter, and may be Corrupted again into it. And here indeed lies the Grand Mystery of Atheifm, that every thing besides the Substance of Matter is Made or Generated, and may be again Unmade or Corrupted.

However Anaxagoras, though an Ionick Philofopher, and therefore, as shall be declared afterward, Successior to those Atheiftick Materialifts, was at length so far Convinced by that Pythagorick Doctrine, That no Entity could be naturally Generated out of Nothing, as that he departed from his Predecessors herein, and did for this reason acknowledge Mind and Soul, that is, all Cogitative Being to be a Substance really distinct from Matter, neither Generable out of it nor Corruptible into it; as also that the Forms and Qualities of Bodies (which he could not yet otherwise conceive of than as things really distinct from those Modifications of Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion) must for the fame cause pre-exift before Generations in certain Similar Atoms, and remain after Corruptions, being only Secreted and-Concreted in them. By means whereof he introduced a certain Spurious Atomifm of his own; For whereas the Genuine Atomifts before his time had suppos’d άρνικες δαμαίκεις, Diffimilar Atoms devoid of all Forms and Qualities to be the Principles of all Bodies, Anaxagoras substituted in the room of them his διαφορέων, his Similar Atoms, endued from Eternity with all Manner of Forms and Qualities Incorruptibly.

XVI. We have made it manifest that those Material Philosophers, described by Aristotle, were absolute Atheifts, not merely because they made Body to be the only Substance, though that be a thing which Aristotle himself justly reprehends them for also in these
That all Atheists held the Eternity
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Metaph. I. 10. those words of his, οὖτι μὴ εἶναι τὸ πᾶν ἢ μὲν εἶναι τὶνα φύσιν; δὲ ἔλθων τοιοῦτα, ὡς ταύτην σώματιν, ἢ μέγεθος ἐξήρετο, ὅτι ἦν τοὺς πολλάς ἐμφανίσεως, τῇ οὖσα λεγόμενη τῷ σωματίῳ τῷ ἄλλω μέγεθος τῷ, εἴπερ εἰς ἀκαμόντιν. They who suppose the World to be one uniform thing, and acknowledge only one nature as the matter, and this Corporeal or indeed with Magnitude, it is evident that they err in many ways, and particularly in this, that they set down only the Elements of Bodies, and not of Incorporeal things, though there be also things incorporeal. I say, we have not concluded them Atheists, merely for this reason, because they denied Incorporeal Substance, but because they deduced all things whatsoever from Dead and Stupid Matter, and made every thing in the World, besides the bare Substance of Matter, devoid of all Quality, Generable and Corruptible.

Now we shall take notice of an Objection, made by some late Writers, against this Aristotelick Accusation of the old Philosophers, founded upon a passage of Aristotle's own, who elsewhere in his Book De Ccelo, speaking of the Heaven or World, plainly affirms, γινόμενον μὴ εἶναι ἄλλα ἄλλα φύσειν, that all the Philosophers before himself, did assert the World to have been Made, or have had a Beginning. From whence these Writers infer, that therefore they must needs be all Theists, and hold the Divine Creation of the World, and consequently, that Aristotle contradicts himself, in representing many of them as Atheists, acknowledging only one Material Principle of the whole Universe, without any Intending or Efficient Cause. But we cannot but pronounce this to be a great Error in these Writers, to conclude all those who held the World to have been Made, therefore to have been Theists, whereas it is certain on the contrary, that all the First and most Ancient Atheists did (in Aristotle's language) καὶ ναοὺς ἢ κόσμον, Make or Generate the World, that is, suppose it not to have been from Eternity, but to have had a Temporary Beginning; as likewise that it was Corruptible, and would sometime or other, have an End again. The sense of which Atheistick Philosophers is represented by Lucretius in this manner:

Et quoniam docuit, Mundi Mortalia Temple
Esse, & Nativum conficere Corpore Celum,
Et quaeque in eo sunt, sicutque, necesse
Esse ca Difjolvi.

And there seems to be indeed a Necesity, in reason, that they who derive all things from a Fortuitous Principle, and hold every thing besides the Substance of Matter to have been Generated, should suppose the World to have been Generated likewise, as also to be Corruptible. Wherefore it may well be reckoned for one of the Vulgar Errors; That all Atheists held the Eternity of the World.

Moreover, when Aristotle subjoins immediately after, ἄλλα γενόμενα, of μὴ εἶναι τοῦ, of ἐμφανίζειν, that though the Ancient Philosophers all held the World to have been Made, yet notwithstanding, they were divided in this, that some of them supposed for all that, that it would con-
time to Eternity such as it is, others, that it would be Corrupted again; the former of these, who conceived the World to be singular, butMade, and Eternal, were none of them Atheists, but all Theists. Such as Plato, whom Aristotle seems particularly to perstringe for this, who in his Timeus introduceth the Supreme Deity bespeaking those Inferiour Gods, the Sun, Moon and Stars (supposed by that Philosopher to be Animated) after this manner δι έτη γινεσθαι, &c. Time.p.44. λητον, ειρηνα κτισθαι το μη ει δειν πως λυθη την μω και της θεου ηκοτου, και ποιεσθαι και ποιεινινει και διησεωνει. δι διεικοναι, Λυκειος και η η γινεσθαι, ειρηνα και κόσμον και έδραν ειναι, ονδε κτιστοι πολυπλισθαι ει πολυ δω λυθησθαι γει, τω ενδοθει της Φυσιος μοιχαι ζητεθαι, μελλονος μετα και και και εις λακτης λαχανης: Those things which are made by me are Indissoluble by my will, and though everything which is computed, be in its own nature dissoluble, yet it is not the part of one that is good, to will the dissolution or destruction of any thing, that was once well made. Wherefore though you are not absolutely Immortal, nor altogether Indissoluble, yet notwithstanding, you shall not be dissolved, nor ever die. My will being a stronger Band to hold you together, than any thing else can be to loosen you. Philo and other Theists followed Plato in this, ascertaining that though the world was Made, yet it would never be Corrupted, but have a Post-ternity. Whereas all the Ancient Atheists, namely those who derived the Original of things from Nature and Fortune, did at once deny both Eternities to the World; Past and Future. Though we cannot say that none but Atheists did this, for Empedocles and Heraclitus, and after ward the Stoicks, did not only suppose the World likewise Generated, and to be again Corrupted, but also that this had been, and would be done over and over again, in Infinite vicissitudes.

Furthermore, as the World’s Eternity was generally opposed by all the Ancient Atheists, so it was maintained also by some Theists, and that not only Aristotle, but also before him, by Ocellus Lucanus at least, though Aristotle thought not fit to take any notice of him; as likewise the latter Platonists universally went that way, yet so, as that they always supposed the World to have as much depended upon the Deity, as if it had been once Created out of Nothing by it.

To conclude therefore; neither who ascertained the world’s Generation and Temporarv Beginning, were all Theists; nor they who maintained its Eternity, all Atheists; but before Aristotle’s time, the Atheists universally, and most of the Theists, did both alike conclude the World to have been Made; the difference between them lying in this, that the one affirmed the World to have been Made by God, the other by the Fortuitous Motion of Matter.

Wherefore if we would put another difference betwixt the Theists and Atheists here, as to this particular, we must distinguish betwixt the System of the World and the Substance of the Matter: For the Ancient Atheists, though they generally denied the Eternity of the World, yet they supposed the Substance of the Matter, not only to have been Eternal, but also Self-existent and Independent upon any other Being; they making it the first Principle and Original of all things.
things, and consequently the only Namens. Whereas the Genuine Theists, though many of them maintained the Worlds Eternity, yet they all concluded, both the Form and Substance of it, to have always depended upon the Deity, as the Light doth upon the Sun. The Stoicks with some others being here excepted.

XVII. Aristophile tells us, some were of opinion, that this Atheistick Philosophy, which derives all things from sensibles and stupid Matter, in the way of Forms and Qualities, was of great Antiquity, and as old as any Records of Time amongst the Greeks; and not only so, but also that the Ancient Theologers themselves entertained it. 

X. But theie asserting the gods Patitors, they say the Deity and Chaos was the first made, this was the ocean, and Tethys. The Deity, which is the same as the Father, being the first made, is the Ocean. Therefore, as they made the Ocean and Tethys to have been the Original of Generation; and for this cause the oath of the Gods is said to be by water (called by the Poets Styx) as being that from which they all derived their original. For an Oath ought to be by that which is most Honourable; and that which is most Ancient, is most Honourable. In which words it is very probable that Aristophite aimed at Plato; however, it is certain that Plato in his Theetetus affirms this Atheistick Doctrine to have been very ancient. 

The Father of all Gods, the Ocean is,

Tethys their Mother.

Wherefore these indeed seem to have been the ancientest of all Atheists, who though they acknowledged certain Beings superiour to men, which they called by the Name of Gods, did notwithstanding really deny a God, according to the true Notion of him, deriving the Original of all things whatsoever in the Universe, from the Ocean, that is, Fluid Matter, or, which is all one, from Night and Chaos; and supposing all their Gods to have been Made and Generated, and consequently to be Mortal and Corruptible. Of which Atheistick Theology, Aristophanes gives us the description, in his * Aes, after this manner: That at first was nothing but Night and Chaos, which laying an Egg, from thence was produced Love, that mingling again with Chaos, begot Heaven, and Earth, and Animals, and all the Gods.

* F. 573.
First all was Chaos, one confused Heap,  
Darkness enwrapt the disagreeing Deep,  
In a mixt crowd, the Jumbled Elements were,  
Nor Earth, nor Air, nor Heaven did appear;  
Till on this horrid vast Abyss of things,  
Teeming Night spreading o'er her cole-black Wings,  
Laid the first Egg; whence, after times due course,  
She did forth Love (the World's Prolific Source)  
Glistering with golden Wings; which fluttering o'er  
Dark Chaos, gendred all the numerous store  
Of Animals and Gods, &c.

And whereas the Poet there makes the Birds to have been begotten between Love and Chaos before all the Gods; though one might think this to have been done Jocularly by him, merely to humour his Plot; yet Salmasius conceives, and not without some reason, that it was really a piece of the old Atheistick Cabala, which therefore seems to have run thus. That Chaos or Matter confusedly mov'd, being the first Original of all; Things did from thence rise up gradually, from lesser to greater Perfection. First Inanimate things as the Elements, Heaven, Earth and Seas, then Brute-animals, afterwards Men, and laft of all the Gods. As if not only the Substance of Matter, and thofe Inanimate Bodies of the Elements, Fire, Water, Air and Earth, were, as Arifotole somewhere speaks, according to the fenc of thofe Atheistick Theologers, * * De Gen. 6  
Con. Lib. 2. 6,  
God, as being themselves also Gods, but alfo Brute-animals at leaft, if not men too. And this is the Atheistick Creation of the World, Gods and all, out of Sensiles and Stupid Matter, or Dark Chaos, as the only Original Numen; the perfectly Inverted order of the Universe.

XVIII. But though this Hypothesis be purely Atheistical, that makes Love, which is supposed to be the Original Deity, to have it self sprung at first from an Egg of the Night; and consequently that all Deity was the Creature or Offspring of Matter and Chaos, or Dark Fortuitous Nature; yet Arifotole somewhere conceives that not only Parthenides, but alfo Hefiod, and some others, who did, in like manner make Love the Supreme Deity, and derive all things from Love and Chaos, were to be exempted out of the number of thofe Atheistick Materialists before described; forasmuch as they seemed to understand by Love; an Active Principle, and Cause of Motion in the Universe; which therefore...
Some who made Love the
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fore could not spring from an Egg of the Night, nor be the Creature of Matter, but must needs be something Independent on it, and in order of Nature before it, ut praetulles & alius in his Hesiod hæmatog, euncturum in toto, tnon ei oun, oun & theûleri, ei tnon eon ei &i ònoi oun &i aghai, aon &i Paralambèca. Kai ye oun contexts uñuoxov tóva tò poutec χάτων

πράπτων μιμο (φθον) ἔσται Θεός μυπτίατο πάντων.

'Ησιόδος ἦ,

πάντων μιμο πράπτων χάσος γινετ, αὐτος ἔσται

Γαλί Ἀντίφαλος,

'Ην ἄρα, ἐς πάντων μεταπρέτα ἀναμάνοις.

ας ἰδον τοις έαν ὑπάρχει τινα εἰδών,  ὑποικοὶ ἑς συνέει τα πραγματεύτα τότες μιμο τος πρός κχι δικτιμα σφετ τας πράτες, ἐξαφν κρίνην λέγειν. One would suppose that Hesiod, and if there be any other who made Love or Desire, a Principle of things in the Universe, aimed at this very thing, (namely, the setting of another Active Principle besides Matter:) For Parmenides, describing the Generation of the Universe, makes Love to be the Senior of all the Gods, and Hesiod, after he had mentioned Chaos, introduced Love, as the supreme Deity. As intimating here-in, that besides Matter, there ought to be another Cause or Principle, that should be the Original of Motion and Activity, and also hold and conjoin all things together. But how these two Principles are to be ordered, and which of them was to be placed first, whether Love or Chaos, may be judged of afterwards. In which latter words Aristophanes seems to intimate, that Love, as taken for an Active Principle, was not to be suppos'd to spring from Chaos, but rather to be in order of Nature before it; and therefore by this Love of theirs must needs be meant the Deity. And indeed Simmias Rhodius in his Wines, a Hymn made in Honour of this Love, that is Senior to all the Gods, and a Principle in the Universe, tells us plainly, that it is not Cupid, Venus's soft and effeminate Son, but another kind of Love

Οὔτί γά κύπεσσα τοίς

'Αμπέτας Ά οὑτε έρος καλέμαιναι.

Οὔτι γάρ ἐκείναι μιαῖς, ἀριστα το πεθώ

ταύτα. Ἡμαςάτας τα μωρια, ἐραίνου πάς τα ἕς μοι ἐνεραίνει.

Τω 5 ν ἐγὼν συννορισάμαι λιγυρον συναφείαν, συναφείαν τε σφι άμιστα.

I'm not that Wanton Boy,

The Sea-broath Goddes's only Joy.

Pure Heavenly Love I bight, and my

Soft Magick Charms, not Iron Bands, fast yce

Heaven, Earth and Seas. The Gods themselves do readily

Stoop to my Laws. The whole World dannes to my Harmony.

Moreover, this cannot be that Love neither, which is descibed in Plato's Symposium (as some learned men have conceived) that was begotten between Penia and Porus, this being not a Divine
Chap. III. Supreme Deity, no Atheists.

Divine but Demoniack thing (as the Philosopher there declares) no God but a Daemon only, or of a Middle Nature. For it is nothing but φιλοσοφία, or the Love of Pulchritude, as such, which though right-ly used, may perhaps Wing and Inspire the Mind, to Noble and Generous Attempts, and beget a scornful disdaine in it, of Mean, Dirty, and Sordid things; yet it is capable of being abused also, and then it will strike downward into Brutishnes and Senfuality. But at best it is an Affecion, belonging only to Imperfect and Parturient Beings; and therefore could not be the Firft Principle of all things. Where-fore we fee no very great reason, but that in a Rectified and Qualified fence, this may pass for true Theology; That Love is the Supreme Deity and Original of all things; namely, if by it be meant, External, Self-originated, Intellectual Love, or Essential and Substan-tial Goodnes, that having an Infinite overflowing Fulnes and Fecundity, dispenses it self Uninviviously, according to the best Wis-dom, Sweetly Governs all, without any Force or Violence (all things being Naturally subjed to its Autority, and readily obeying its Laws) and reconciles the whole World into Harmony. For the Scripture telling us, that God is Love, seems to warrant thus much to us, that Love in some rightly Qualified fence, is God.

XIX. But we are to omit the Fabulous Age, and to descend to the Philosophical, to enquire there, who they were among the pro-fessed Philosophers, who Atheized in that manner, before described. It is true indeed, that Aristotle in other Places, accuses Democritus and Leucippus of the very same thing, that is, of affiling only a Ma-terial Cause of the Universe, and giving no account of the Original of Motion; but yet it is certain that these were not the Persons intended by him here; Those which he speaks of, being τόῖς περὶ πεποιητων φιλοσοφιαυτῶν, some of the first and most ancient Philosophers of all. Moreover it appears by his Description of them, that they were such as did not Philosophize in the way of Atoms, but resolved all things whatsoever in the Universe, into ὕλη, and πάθη τῆς ὕλης, Matter, and the Passions or Affections, Qualities and Forms of Matter; so that they were not Atomical, but Hylopathian Philosophers. These two, the old Materialists and the Democriticks, did both a like derive all things from Dead and Stupid Matter, fortuitoustly Moved; and the Difference between them was only this, that the Democriticks manag'd this business in the way of Atoms, the other in that more vulgar way of Qualities and Forms: So that indeed, this is really but one and the same Atheistical Hypothesis, in two several Schemes. And as one of them is called the Atomick Atheism, the other, for Distinctions sake, may be called the Hylopathian.

XX. Now Aristotle tells us plainly, that these Hylopathian Atheists of his, were all the first Philosophers of the Ionick Order and Suc-cesion, before Anaxagoras. Whereof Thales being the Head, he is contentantly thenceunto by Aristotle, made to be ἡγέτης τῶν ἑνὶς φιλοσοφιῶν, the Prince and Leader of this kind of Atheistical Philo-sophy, he deriving all things whatsoever, as Homer had done before him, from Water, and acknowledging no other Principle but the Fluid Matter.
Notwithstanding which Accusation of Aristotle's, Thales is far otherwise represented by good Authors; Cicero telling us, that beside Water, which he made to be the Original of all Corporeal things, he affirmed also Mind for another Principle, which formed all things out of the Water; and Laertius and Plutarch recording, that he was thought to be the first of all Philosophers who determined Souls to be Immortal; He is said also to have affirmed, that God was the Father of all things, and that the World was made by the Workmanship of God; Clemens likewise tells us that being asked whether he believed Theolos to be the Word or Logos, or God or Somewhere, or not, he replied, not so much as any Thought. Moreover Laertius further writes of him, that he held Water to be Animated, and full of Demons. Lastly Aristotle himself elsewhere speaks of him as a Theist, 

Whether any of these Actions could be concealed from the Deity & he replied, not so much as any Thought. Moreover Laertius further writes of him, that he held Water to be animated, and full of Demons. Lastly Aristotle himself elsewhere speaks of him as a Theist, &c. But to whom of times Jesus made him speak? He tells us he told us that he did not say that he was full. Some think (faith he) that Soul and Life are mingled with the whole Universe, and thence perhaps was that of Thales, that all things are full of Gods. Wherefore we conceive that there is very good reason, why Thales should be acquitted from this Accusation of Atheism. Only we shall observe the occasion of his being thus differently represented, which seems to have been this; Because as Laertius and Themistius intimate, he left no Philosophick Writings or Monuments of his own behind him, (Anaximander being the first of all the Philosophick Writers;) Whence probably it came to pass, that in after times some did interpret his Philosophy one way, some another, and that he is sometimes represented as a Theist, and sometime again as a down-right Atheist.

But though Thales be thus by good Authority acquitted, yet his next Successor Anaximander can by no means be excused from this Imputation, and therefore we think it more reasonable to ascribe that Title upon him, which Aristotle bestows on Thales, that he was the Prince and Founder of this Atheistic Philosophy; who derived all things from Matter, in the way of Forms and Qualities, supposing a certain Infinite Materia Prima, which was neither Air nor Water nor Fire, but indifferent to every thing, or a mixture of all, to be the only Principle of the Universe, and leading a Train of many other Atheists after him, such as Hippo, named by Simplicius and others, Anaximenes, and Diogenes Apolloniat, and many more; who though they had some petty Differences amongst themselves, yet all agreed in this one thing, that Matter devoid of Understanding and Life, was the first Principal of all things; till at length Anaxagoras stopped this Atheistic Current, amongst these Ionick Philosophers; introducing Mind as a Principle of the Universe.

XXI. But there is a Passage in Aristotle's Physics, which seems at first sight, to contradict this again; and to make Anaximander also, not to have been an Atheist, but a Divine Philosopher. Where having
having declared that several of the Ancient Physiologers, made \( \alpha \pi \gamma \nu \) or Infinite to be the Principle of all things, he subjoyns these words, *Lib. 3, c. 4.*

But this was contrary to the opinion of Democritus, who taught that all things were infinite. As for the etymology of the word, it is supposed to be derived from the word \( \alpha \nu \theta \) (to be), from the idea of \( \alpha \nu \theta \) (the Infinite), and from the word \( \alpha \nu \theta \) (to be), as \( \alpha \nu \theta \) (the Infinite) and \( \alpha \nu \theta \) (to be) are the same thing.

Moreover, Democritus being linked in the Context with Anaximander, as making both of them alike, \( \tau \eta \) \( \alpha \nu \theta \) \( \alpha \nu \theta \) (to be), or Infinite, to be the First Principle of all; it might as well be inferred from this Place, that Democritus was a Genuine Theist, as Anaximander. But as Democritus
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mocritus his only Principle, was Infinite Atoms, without any thing of Mind or Plastick Nature; so likewise was Anaximander's, an Infinity of Senselss and Stupid Matter; and therefore they were both of them Atheists alike, though Anaximander, in the cited words, had the Honour (if it may be so called) to be only named, as being the most ancient of all those Atheistical Physiologers, and the Ringleader of them.

XXII. Neither ought it at all to seem strange, that Anaximander, and those other Atheistical Materialists should call Infinite Matter, devoid of all Understanding and Life, the το Θέον, the Deity or Numen, since to all those who deny a God, (according to the true Notion of him) whatsoever else they substitute in his room, by making it the First Principle of all things, though it be Senselss and Stupid Matter, yet this must needs be accounted the Only Numen, and Divinest thing of all.

Nor is it to be wondred at neither, that this Infinite, being understood of Matter, should be said to be, not only Incorruptible, but also Immortal, these two being often used as Synonymous, and Equivalent Expressions. For thus in Lucretius, the Corruption of all Inanimate Bodies is called Death,

---Mors ejus quod suit ante---

And again,

Quando aliud ex alio reficit Natura, nec ullans
Rem Gigni patitur, nisi Morte adjutam aliend.

In like manner Mortal is used by him for Corruptible,

Nam siquid Mortale a curdiis partibus effet,
Ex oculis res queaque repente crepta periret.

And this kind of Language was very familiar with Heraclitus, as appears from these Passages of his, πῦρ ἄκατος, ἀέας γάλας, ἀεας ἀέας, ἄκατος γάλας: The Death of Fire, is Generation to Air; and the Death of Air, is Generation to Water, that is, the Corruption of them. And again, ἄκατος ἐκαταρκός, ἀέας γάλας ἄκατος ἀέας καταρκός, γὰρ γάλας: It is Death to Vapour or Air, to be made Water; and Death to Water, to be made Earth. In which Heraclitus did but imitate Orpheus, as appears from this Verse of his, cited by Clemens Alexand.

'Εστιν ὅσαν ἄκατος, ἄκατος δ' οὐκ ἀταρκόν ἀταρκόν.

Besides which, there are many Examples of this use of the word ἄκατος, in other Greek Writers, and some in Aristoile himself, who speaking of the Heavens, attributes ἄταρκος and ἀταρκής to them,
XXIII. But to make it further appear, that Anaximander's Philosophy was purely Atheistical; we think it convenient to shew what account is given of it by other Writers. Plutarch in his Placita Philosophorum, does at once briefly represent the Anaximandrian Philosophy, and Censure it after this manner. "Anaximandrus, sait, Lib. 1. c. 3. ἐκεῖνος τίνος ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἄναρχον, ὡς τὸ τάπητα γίνεται, ἵνα εἰς τὸ τάπητα φέρῃ ζωήν, ἵνα κοίταζον ἀκρίματα μισθώσ, ὡς παλαιοὶ φιλόσοφοι λέγει ἐν διὰ τὰ ἀναρχαὶ καὶ, ἵνα μὴ ἐπιλείψου τοὺς μόνους ἀριστουργημένους ἑαυτοῖς. Anaximander the Atheist affirmes, Infinite to be the First Principle. And that all things are Generated out of it, and Corrupted again into it, and therefore
therefore that Infinite Worlds, are successively thus Generated and Corrupted. And he gives the reason why it is Infinite, that so there might be never any Fail of Generations. But he ereth in this, that assigning only a Material Cause, he takes away the Active Principle of things. For Anaximander's Infinite, is nothing else but matter; but Matter can produce nothing, unless there be also an Active Cause. Where he shews also, how Anaximenes followed Anaximander herein, in assigning only a Material Cause of the Universe, without any Efficient; though he differed from him, in making the First Matter to be Air, and deriving all things from thence, by Rarefaction and Condensation. Thus, we see, it is plain, that Anaximander's Infinite, was no Infinite Mind, which is the true Deity, but only Infinite Matter, devoid of any Life or Active Power. Eusebius is more particular in giving an account of Anaximander's Cosmopoeia. He affirms, Infinite (Matter) to be the only Cause of the Generation and Corruption of all things. And that the Heavens, and Infinite Worlds, were made out of it, by way of Separation or Segregation. Also that those Generative Principles of Heat and Cold, that were contained in it from Eternity, being Segregated, when this World was made, a certain Sphere of Flame or Fire, did first arise and encompass the Air, which surrounds this Earth, (a sa Bark doth a Tree) which being afterwards broken, and divided into smaller Spherical Bodies, constituted the Sun and Moon and all the Stars.

Which Anaximandrian Cosmopoeia, was briefly hinted by Aristotle in these words, οϊ δὲ οὕτως ὁμοιοτος, ὧστες τὰς ἀντιπόθεννας, ἀπεκτέθην, ὡς ὁ Ἀναξιμάνδρος εἶχεν. Some Philosopher Generates the World, by the Separation and Segregation of inexistent Contrarieties, as Anaximander speaks.

And elsewere in his Metaphysics, he takes notice of Ἀναξιμανδρὸς τὸ μήγα, Anaximander's Mixture of things. Whence we conclude, that Anaximander's Infinite, was nothing else but an Infinite Chaos of Matter, in which were either Actually, or Potentially, contained all manner of Qualities; by the Fortuitous Separation and Segregation of which, he supposed Infinite Worlds to be successively Generated and Corrupted. So that we may now easily guess, whence Leneippus and Democritus had their Infinite Worlds, and perceive how near a kin, these two Atheistic Hypotheses were. But it will not be amiss to take notice also of that Particular Conceit, which Anaximander had, concerning the First Original of Brute Animals, and Man-kind. Of the Former Plutarch gives us this account; Ἀναξιμανδρὸς ὑπὲρ ὑπομοιωσίας τὰ πρῶτα γένα, φλοιὸν ἀπὸ ἄλλιν προφανείᾳ ἀκολούθησεν, πρὸς ὑπομοιωσίας τὰ ὑπόλοιπα, ἀποδεδιδὸν ἀπὸ τὸ ὑπομοιωτὸν, ὡς ἀκολούθησεν ὑπὸ τὸ φλοιὸν, ἐν οἷς ἄλλον κεχρυμα μετατέθη. That the First Animals were generated in Moisture, and encompass'd about with certain Thorny Barks, by which they were guarded and defended, which after further growth, coming to be more Dry and Cracking, they issued forth, but lived only a short time after. And as for the first Original of Men, Eusebius represents
represents his Sense, thus: 'εξ ἀλχανθών ἔσχων ὁ κτιστήρος ἐγεννήθη, εἰς Ἐ. Π. ι., τῷ τὰ μήδε ἄλλα δι' ἵματος πάχους γεμέων, μέλον τ' ἀνιχθονον πολυκρατειν ἄλοχων τις, ὡς ἐγεννήσετο, δό κοτ' αὐξησίς εἰς ἀντοτε πτωτον ὀντος ἰκνως ζωήν.'

Men were at first generated in the Bellies of other Animals, forasmuch as all other Animals, after they are brought forth, are quickly able to feed and nourish themselves, but Man alone needs to be nursed up a long time; and therefore could not be preferred at first, in any other way. But Plutarch expresseth this somewhat more particularly. 'Ἀναξιμανδρὸς συμπλήρωσιν τοιαύτην το πρώτων ἀνθρώπων απεφαίνεται, τ' ἄρτος αὐξήσεις ἐποιεῖν εἰς ἦν τοιοῦτον ἔσχον ἰκνως ζωήν.' Anaximander concludes that Men were at first Generated in the Bellies of Fishes, and being there nourished, till they grew strong, and were able to stand for themselves, they were afterward cast out upon Dry Land. Lastly, Anaximander's Theology, is thus both represented to us, and cenured, by Velleius the Epicurian Philosopher in Cicero: 'Anaximandri opinio est, quod ciuitas Deorum, longior intervallis Orientes Occidentique, esse inscram nuper mundos, sed nos Deum nisi sempiternam intellectur quod possimus?' Anaximander's Opinion is, that the Gods are Native, rising and vanishing again, in long periods of time; and that these Gods are Innumerable Worlds; but how can we conceive that to be a God, which is not Eternal? We learn from hence, that Anaximander did indeed so far comply with Vulgar Opinion, as that he retained the Name of Gods, but however that he really denied the Existence of the thing itself, even according to the judgment of this Epicurean Philosopher. Forasmuch as all his Gods were Native and Mortal, and indeed nothing else, but those Innumerable Worlds, which he supposed in certain periods of time, to be successively Generated and Destroyed. Wherefore it is plain, that Anaximander's only Real Name, that is, his First Principle, that was Ingenerable and Incorruptible, was nothing but Infinite Matter, void of all Understanding and Life, by the Fortuitous Secretion of whose inexistente Qualities and Parts, he supposed, First, the Elements of Earth, Water, Air and Fire, and then, the Bodies of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and both Bodies and Souls of men and other Animals, and lastly, Innumerable or Infinite such Worlds as these, as so many Secondary and Native Gods, (that were also Mortal) to have been Generated, according to that Atheistical Hypothesis described in Plato.

XXI V. It is certain that the Vulgar in all Ages have been very ill Judges of Theists and Atheists; they having condemned many heartily Theists, as guilty of Atheism, merely because they differed from them, in some of their Superstititious Rites and Opinions. As for example, 'Anaxagoras the Clazomenian, though he was the first of all the Ionick Philosophers, (unless Thales ought to be excepted) who made an Infinite Mind to be a Principle, that is, alett a Deity, according to the true Notion of it, yet he was notwithstanding, generally cried down for an Athieith, merely because he affirmed the Sun to be μελέτω διάστημα, a Mast of Fire, or a Fiery Globe, and the Moon to be an Earth, that is, because he denied them to be Animated, and ended with Understanding, and consequently to be Gods. So likewise Socrates was both accused, and condemned, for Atheistical
cal Impiety, as denying all Gods, though nothing was pretended to be proved against him, but only this, that he did πάντα διδάξα τινὰ νομίζειν, ὥς ἡ πάντως νομίζειν, ἢ γὰρ δειμένων κανῶν εἰσαφέρειν. Teach that these were not true Gods which the City worshiped, and in the room thereof introduce other new Gods. And lastly, the Christians in the Primitive times, for the same reason, were vulgarly traduced for Atheists, by the Pagans, as Justin Martyr declares in his Apology, ἦσαν εξελεξάταις, ές ελευθεροποιεῖ τὴν τοὺς νομίζοντων Σωτήρ έπειτα. We are called Atheists, and we confess our selves such, in respect of those Gods which they worship, but not of the true God. And as the Vulgar have unjustly condemned many Theists for Atheists, so have they also acquitted many Rank Atheists from the Guilt of that Crime, merely because they externally complied with them, in their Religious Worship, and Forms of Speech. Neither is it only the Vulgar that have been imposed upon herein, but also the Generality of Learned men, who have been commonly so superficial in this business, as that they have hardly taken notice of above three or four Atheists that ever were in former times, as namely, Diogenes, Theodorus, Eunomus, and Protagoras; whereas Democritus and Anaximander, were as rank Atheists, as any of them all, though they had the wit to carry themselves externally, with more Cautiousness. And indeed it was really one and the self-same Form of Atheism, which both these entertained, they deriving all things alike, from Dead and Stupid Matter Fortuitously Moved, the Difference between them being only this, that they managed it two different ways; Anaximander in the way of Qualities and Forms, which is the more Vulgar and Obvious kind of Atheism; but Democritus in the way of Atoms and Figures, which seems to be a more learned kind of Atheism.

And though we do not doubt at all, but that Plato, in his Tenth De Legibus, where he attacks Atheism, did intend the Confutation as well of the Democritick as the Anaximandrian Atheism; yet whether it were, because he had no mind to take any notice at all of Democritus, who is not so much as once mentioned by him any where, or else because he was not so perfectly acquainted with that Atomick way of Physiologizing, certain it is, that he there describes the Atheistick Hypotheses more according to the Anaximandrian than the Democritick Form. For when he represents the Atheistick Generation of Heaven and Earth, and all things in them, as resulting from the Fortuitous Commixture of Hot and Cold, Hard and Soft, Moiit and Dry Corpuscles; this is clearly more agreeable with the Anaximandrian Generation of the World, by the Secretion of Inexistent Contrarieties in the Matter, than the Democritick Cosmopoeia, by the Fortuitous Concourse of Atoms, devoid of all manner of Qualities and Forms.

Some indeed seem to call that Scheme of Atheism, that deduces all things from Matter, in the way of Qualities and Forms, by the name of Peripatetick or Aristotelick Atheism; we suppose for this reason, because Aristotle Physiologized in that way of Forms and Qualities, deducing them out of the Power of the Matter. But since Aristotle himself
himself cannot be justly Taxed for an Atheist, this Form of Atheism ought rather, as we conceive, to be denominated from Anaximander, and called the Anaximandrian Atheism.

XXV. Now the Reasons why Democritus and Lucretius New-modelled Atheism, from the Anaximandrian and Hylapathian, into the Atomick Form, seem to have been chiefly these: First, because, they being well instructed in that Atomick way of Phylogologizing, were really convinced, that it was not only more Ingenious, but also more agreeable to Truth; the other by Real Qualities and Forms, seeming a thing Unintelligible. Secondly, because they foresaw, as Lucretius intimates, that the Production of Forms and Qualities out of Nothing, and the Corruption of them again into Nothing, would prepare an Easie way, for mens Belief of a Divine Creation and Annihilation. And lastly, because, as we have already suggested, they plainly perceived, that these Forms and Qualities of Matter were of a doubtful Nature, and therefore, as they were sometimes made a Shelter for Atheism, so they might also prove, on the contrary, an Argument for Corporeal Theism; in that it might possibly be supposed, that either the Matter of the whole World, or else the more Subtle and Fiery Part of it, was Originally endued with an Understanding Form or Quality, and consequently the Whole an Animal or God. Wherefore they took another more Effectual Course, to secure their Atheism, and exclude all Possibility of a Corporeal God, by deriving the Original of all things from Atoms, devoid of all Forms and Qualities, and having nothing in them, but Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion, as the First Principles; it following unavoidably from thence, that Life and Understanding, as well as those other Qualities, could be only Accidental and Secondary Results from certain Fortuitous Concretions and Contextures of Atoms; so that the World could be made by no Previous Counsel or Understanding, and therefore by no Deity.

XXVI. We have here represented, Three several Forms of Atheism, the Anaximandrian, the Democritical and the Stratonical. But there is yet another Form of Atheism, different from them all, to be taken notice of, which is such, as supposes one kind of Plastick and Spermatick, Methodical and Artificial Nature, but without any Senfe or Conscious Understanding, to predile over the whole World, and dispose and conserver all things, in that Regular Frame in which they are. Such a Form of Atheism as this, is hinted to us in that doubtful Passage of Seneca’s; Sive Animal est Mundus, (for so it ought to be read, and not Animus) sive Corpus Naturae Gubernante, ut Arbores, ut Satia; Whether the whole World be an Animal (i.e. endued with one Sentient and Rational Life) or whether it be only a Body Governed, by (a certain Plastick and Methodical, but Sensible) Nature, as Trees, and other Plants or Vegetables. In which words are two several Hypotheses, of the Mundane System, Sceptically proposed, by one who was a Corporealist, and took it for granted that all was Body. First, that the whole World, though having nothing but Body in it, yet was notwithstanding an Animal, as our Humane Bodies are, endued with one Sentient.
ent or Rational Life and Nature, one Soul or Mind, governing and ordering the Whole. Which Corporeal Cosmo-zoism we do not reckon amongst the Forms of Atheism, but rather account it for a kind of Spurious Theism, or Theism disguised in a Paganick Dress, and not without a Complication of many false apprehensions, concerning the Deity, in it. The Second is, that the whole World is no Animal, but as it were, one Huge Plant or Vegetable, a Body endued with one Plastic or Spermatick Nature, branching out the whole, Orderly and Methodically, but without any Understanding or Sense. And this must needs be accounted a Form of Atheism, because it does not derive the Original of things in the Universe, from any clearly Intellectual Principle or Conscious Nature;

XXVII. Now this Form of Atheism which supposes the Whole World (there being nothing but Body in it) not to be an Animal, but only a Great Plant or Vegetable, having one Spermatick Form, or Plastick Nature, which without any Conscious Reason or Understanding, orders the whole, though it have some nearer Correspondence with that Hylozoick Form of Atheism before described, in that it does not suppose Nature to be a mere Fortuitous, but a kind of Artificial thing; yet it differs from it in this, that the Hylozoick supposing all Matter, as such, to have Life, Essentially belonging to it, must therefore needs attribute to every part of Matter (or at least every Particular Totum, that is one by Continuity) a Distinct Plastick Life of its own, but acknowledge no one Common Life, as ruling over the whole Corporeal Universe, and consequently impute the Original of all things (as hath been already observed) to a certain Mixture of Chance, and Plastick or Methodical Nature, both together. Whereas the Cosmo-plastick Atheism, quite excludes Fortune or Chance, subjecting all things to the Regular and Orderly Fate, of one Plastick or Plantal Nature, ruling over the Whole. Thus that Philosopher before mentioned concludes, that whether the World were an Animal (in the Stoicall sense) or whether it were a mere Plant or Vegetable, Ab initio eum fugum ad exitum, quicquid facere, quicquid pati debeat, inclusum est. Ut in Semine, omnis futuri ratio hominis comprehendatur. Et legem Barbae & Canorum, nondum natus Infans habet. Totius enim Corporis, & sequens estatis, in parvo occultaque, Lineamenta fuit. Sic Origo Mundi, non magis Solem & Lunam, & Vices Syderum, & Animalium Orbus, quanquam mutuvatum Ferreua, continuat. In his futu Inundatio, quae non sequitur quam Hyems, quam Astas, Lege Mundi venitat. Whateuer, from the beginning to the end of it, it can either Do or Suffer, it was all at first included in the Nature of the whole; As in the Seed is contained the Whole Delineation of the Future man, and the Embryo or Unborn infant, hath already in it, the Law of a Beard and Gray Hairs. The Lineaments of the whole Body, and of its following age, being there described as it were in a little and obscure Compendium. In like manner, the Original and First Rudiments of the World, contained in them, not only the Sun and Moon, the Courses of the Stars, and the Generations of Animals, but also the Vicissitudes of all Terrestrial things. And every Deluge or Inundation of Water, comes to pass no less, by the Law of the World (its Spermatick or Plastick Nature) than Winter and Summer doth.

XXVIII. We
XXVIII. We do not deny it to be possible, but that some in all Ages might have entertained such an Atheistical Conceive as this. That the Original of this whole Mundane System was from one Artifical, Orderly and Methodical, but Sensible Nature lodged in the Matter; but we cannot trace the footsteps of this Doctrine any where so much as among the Stoicks, to which Sec Seneca, who speaks so waveringly and uncertainly in this point, (Whether the World were an Animal or a Plant:) belonged. And indeed divers learned men have suspected, that even the Zenonian and Heraclistic Deity it self, was no other than such a Plastick Nature or Spermatic Principle in the Universe, as in the Seeds of Vegetables and Animals, doth frame their respective Bodies, Orderly and Artificiell. Nor can it be denied, but that there hath been just cause given for such a suspicion; forasmuch as the best of the Stoicks, sometimes confounding God with Nature, seemed to make him nothing but an Artifical Fire, Orderly and Methodically proceeding to Generation. And it was Familiar with them, as Laetnus tells us, to call God θεόν λόγον τίχνων, the Spermatic Reason or Form of the World. Nevertheless, because Zeno and others of the chief Stoical Doctors, did also many times assert, that there was φαντασματικόν λόγον τίχνων, a Rational and Intellectual Nature (and therefore not a Plastick Principle only) in the Matter of the Universe; as likewise that the whole World was an Animal, and not a mere Plant: Therefore we incline rather, to excuse the generality of the first and most ancient Stoicks from the imputation of Atheism, and to account this Form of Atheism which we now speak of, to be but a certain Degeneracy from the right Heraclistic and Zenonian Cabal, which seemed to contain these two things in it: First, that there was an Animalish, Sentient and Intellectual Nature, or a Conscious Soul and Mind, that presided over the whole World, though lodged immediately in the Fiery Matter of it: Secondly, that this Sentient and Intellectual Nature, or Corporeal Soul and Mind of the Universe, did contain also under it, or within it, as the inferior part of it, a certain Plastick Nature or Spermatic Principle which was properly the Fate of all things. For thus Heraclitus defined Fate λόγον τίχνων της παλιος δινοσιας ὑ ἀληθεος ου κοσμικας μενομεναι. A certain Reason passing through the Substance of the whole World, or an Ethereal Body, that was the Seed of the Generation of the Universe. And Zeno's first Principle, as it is said to be an Intellectual Nature, so it is also said, to have contained in it χωριος τες στηθισμον καις λόγος καινους και εις εκάσων και εις ενεκλίσια γενεσαι, All the Spermatic Reasons and forms, by which every thing is done according to Fate. However, though this seem to have been the genuine Doctrine, both of Heraclitus and Zeno; yet others of their Followers afterwards, divided these two things from one another, and taking only the latter of them, made the Plastick or Spermatic Nature, devoid of all Animality or Conscious Intellectuality, to be the highest Principle in the Universe. Thus Laetnus tells us, that Boethus, an eminent and famous Stoical Doctor did plainly deny the World to be an Animal, that is, to have any Sentient, Conscious or Intellectual Nature preceding over it, and consequently must needs make it to be but Corpus Naturæ governans; ut Arbores, ut Sata, A Body govern-
ed by a Plastick or Vegetative Nature, as Trees, Plants and Herbs. And as it is possible that other Stoicks and Heracliticks, might have done the like before Boethus, so it is very probable that he had after him many Followers; amongst which, as Plinian Secundus may be reckoned for one, so Seneca himself was not without a doubtful Tincture of this Atheism, as hath been already shewed. Wherefore this Form of Atheism, which supposes one Plastick or Spermatick Nature, one Plantal or Vegetative Life in the whole World, as the Highest Principle, may, for distinction sake, be called the Pseudo-Stoical or Stoical Atheism.

XXIX. Besides these Philosophick Atheists, whose several Forms we have now described, it cannot be doubted, but that there have been in all Ages many other Atheists that have not at all Philosophipied, nor pretended to maintain any particular Atheistic System or Hypothesis, in a way of Reafon, but were only led by a certain dull and foolish, though confident, Disbelief of whatsoever they could not either See or Feel: Which kind of Atheists may therefore well be accounted Enthusiastical or Fanatical Atheists. Though it be true in the mean time, that even all manner of Atheists whatsoever, and those of them who most of all pretend to Reafon and Philosophy, may in some sense be justly stiled also both Enthusiasts and Fanatics. For almost as they are not led or carried on, into this way of Atheizing, by any clear Dictates of their Reafon or Understanding, but only by an oμιον ανθρόπος, a certain Blind and Irrational Impetus, they being as it were Inspired to it, by that lower Earthly Life and Nature, which is called in the Scripture-oracles το πνεῦμα τῆς φύσεως, the Spirit of the World, or a Mundane Spirit, and is opposed to the το πνεῦμα το εκ τῆς θεοῦ, the Spirit that is of God. For when the Apostle speaks after this manner, We have not received the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit that is of God, he seems to intimate thus much unto us; That as some men were Led and Inspired by a Divine Spirit, so others again are Inspired by a Mundane Spirit, by which is meant the Earthly Life. Now the former of these Two, are not to be accounted Enthusiasts, as the word is now commonly taken in a Bad Sence, because the Spirit of God is no Irrational thing, but either the very self same thing with Reafon, or else such a thing as Aristotle (as it were Vaticinating concerning it) somewhere calls λόγος τι μεθένων, a certain Better and Divineer thing than Reafon, and Plutinum οίκον λόγων, the Root of Reafon. But on the contrary, the Mundane Spirit, or Earthly Life, is Irrational Sottishness; and they who are Atheistically Inspired by it (how abhorrent forer ever they may otherwise seem to be from Enthusiasts and Revelations) are notwithstanding really no better, than a kind of Bewitched Enthusiasts and Blind Spiritists, that are wholly ridden and acted by a dark, narrow and captivated Principle of Life, and, to use their own Language, In-blown by it, and by it bereft, even in Speculative things, of all Free Reafon and Understanding. Nay they are Fanatics too, however that word seem to have a more peculiar respect to something of a Deity: All Atheists being that Blind Goddess, Nature's Fanatics.

XXX. We have described four several Forms of Atheism; First, the
the Hylopathian or Anaximandrian, that derives all things from Dead and Stupid Matter in the way of Qualities and Forms, Generable and Corruptible: Secondly, the Atomical or Democritical, which doth the same thing in the way of Atoms and Figures: Thirdly, the Cosmoplastic or Stoical Atheism, which supposes one Plastic and Methodical but Sensible Nature, to preside over the whole Corporeal Universe:

And lastly, the Hylozoic or Stratonical, that attributes to all Matter, as such, a certain Living and Energetic Nature, but devoid of all Animality, Sense and Concupiscence. And as we do not meet with any other Forms or Schemes of Atheism, besides these Four, so we conceive that there cannot easily be any other excogitated or devised: and that upon these two following Considerations. First, because all Atheists are mere Corporealists, that is, acknowledge no other Substance besides Body or Matter. For as there was never any yet known, who alleging Incorporeal Substance, did deny a Deity; so neither can there be any reason, why he that admits the former should exclude the latter. Again, the same Dull and Earthly Disbelief or confounding Sottishness of Mind, which makes men deny a God, must needs incline them to deny all Incorporeal Substance also. Wherefore as the Physicians speak of a certain Disease or Madness, called Hydrophobia, the Symptome of those that have been bitten by a mad Dog, which makes them have a monstrous Antipathy to Water; so all Atheists are possetted with a certain kind of Madness, that may be called Pneumatophobia, that makes them have an irrational but desperate Abhorrence from Spirits or Incorporeal Substances, they being acted also, at the same time, with an Hylomania, whereby they Madly dote upon Matter, and Devoutly worship it, as the only Newton.

The Second Consideration is this, because as there are no Atheists but such as are mere Corporealists, so all Corporealists are not to be accounted Atheists neither: Those of them, who notwithstanding they make all things to be Matter, yet suppose an Intellectual Nature in that Matter, to preside over the Corporeal Universe, being in Reason and Charity to be exempted out of that number. And there have been always some, who though strongly captivated under the power of gross Imagination, as that an Incorporeal God seemed to them, to be nothing but a God of Words (as some of them call it) a mere Empty Sound or Contradictious Expression, Something and Nothing put together; yet notwithstanding, they have been possetted with a firm belief and persuasion of a Deity, or that the System of the Universe depends upon one Perfect Understanding Being as the Head of it; and thereupon have concluded that ὦ ὁ πᾶς ἔχων, a certain kind of Body or Matter, is God. The grotest and most littish of all which Corporeal Theists, seem to be those, who contend that God is only one particular Piece of Organized Matter, of Humane Form and Bigness, which ended with Perfect Reason, and Understanding, exercised an Universal-Dominion over all the rest. Which Hypotheses, however it hath been entertained by some of the Christian Profession, both in former and later times, yet it hath seemed very ridiculous, even to many of those Heathen Philosophers themselves, who were mere Corporealists, such as the Stoicks, who exploded it with a kind of Indig-
nation, contending earnestly μή ἐνεαθαναστήκειν, That God (though Corporeal) yet must not be conceived to be of any Humane Shape. And Xenophanes, an Ancient Philosophick Poet, expreseth the Childishness of this Conceit after this manner;

"All enneæ Ψεῦδος γ' ἔχει πάντες ἐν λαβίνες, Εν γεγονα κεῖσθαι, κεῖσθαι τελέων ἐναρ ἐνδορες, καὶ τοιαύτα οὖν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἴδεμεν ἰχθος
Τοιαύτα οὖν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἴδεμεν ἰχθος ὁμοιοίαν."

If Oxen, Lions, Horses and Asses, had all of them a Sense of a Deity, and were able to Limn and Paint, there is no question to be made, but that each of these several Animals would paint God according to their respective Forms & Likeness, and contend that he was of that Shape & no other. But that other Corporeal Theism, seems to be of the two, rather more Generous and Gentile, which supposes the whole World to be one Animal, and God to be a certain Subtile and Ethereal, but Intellectual Matter, pervading it as a Soul; which was the Doctrine of others before the Stoicks, τι πλὴν ἐπικλεφθην οὐκαίνας το δ μελασφίνης το δ ἐρείως ἕπικλεφτης, Hippasus of Metapontus and Heraclitus the Ephesian suppos'd the Fiery and Ethereal Matter of the World to be God. However, neither these Heracliticks and Stoicks, nor yet the other Anthropomorphites, are by us condemned for downright Atheists, but rather look'd upon as a sort of Ignorant, Childish and Unskilful Theists.

Wherefore we see that Atheists are now reduced into a narrow Compass, since none are concluded to be Atheists, but such as are mere Corporealists, and all Corporealists must not be condemned for Atheists neither, but only those of them who assert, that there is no Conscious Intellectual Nature, presiding over the whole Universe. For this is that which the Adepti in Atheism, of what Form soever, all agree in, That the first Principle of the Universe, is no Animalis, Sentient and Conscious Nature, but that all Animality, Sense and Consciousness, is a Secondary, Derivative and Accidental thing, Generable and Corruptible, arising out of particular Concretions of Matter organized and dissolved together with them.

XX XI. Now if the First Principle and Original of all things in the Universe, be thus supposed to be Body or Matter, devoid of all Animality, Sense and Consciousness, then it must of necessity be either perfectly Dead and Stupid, and without all manner of Life, or else endowed with such a kind of Life only, as is by some called Platistic, Spermatical and Vegetative, by others the Life of Nature, or Natural Perception. And those Atheists who derive all things from Dead and Stupid Matter, must also needs do this, either in the way of Qualities and Forms, and these are the Anaximandrian Atheists; or else in the way of Atoms and Figures, which are the Democritical. But those who make Matter endowed with a Platistic Life, to be the first Original of all things, must needs suppose either One such Platistic and Spermatick Life only, in the whole Mass of Matter or Corporeal Universe, which are the Stoical Atheists; or else all Matter as such to have
have Life and an Energetick Nature belonging to it (though without any Animal Sense or Self-perception) and consequently all the Particular Parts of Matter, and every Totum by Continuity, to have a distinct Plastick Life of its own, which are the Stratonick Atheists. Wherefore there does not seem to be any room now left, for any other Form of Atheism, besides these Four, to thrust in.

And we think fit here again to inculcate, what hath been already intimated, That one Grand Difference amongst these several Forms of Atheism is this, That some of them attributing no Life at all to Matter, as such, nor indeed acknowledging any Plastick Life of Nature, distinct from the Animal, and supposing every thing whatsoever is in the world, besides the above, the bare Substance of Matter considered as devoid of all Qualities, (that is, mere extended Bulk) to be Generated and Corrupted, consequently resolve, that all manner of Life whatsoever is Generable and Corruptible, or reducible out of Nothing and reducible to Nothing again, and these are the Anaximandrian and Democritick Atheists. But the other, which are the Stoical and Stratonical, do on the contrary suppose some Life to be Fundamental and Original, Essential and Substantial, Ingenerable and Incorruptible, as being a First Principle of things. Nevertheless, this not to be any Animal, Conscious and Self-perceptive Life, but a Plastick Life of Nature only; all Atheists still agreeing in those Two forementioned Things; First, that there is no other Substance in the World besides Body; Secondly, that all Animal Life, Sense and Self-perception, Conscious Understanding and Peronality are Generated and Corrupted, successively Educed out of Nothing and Reduced into Nothing again.

XXXII. Indeed we are not ignorant, that some, who seem to be Well-wishers to Atheism, have talk’d sometimes of Sensitivè and Rational Matter, as having a mind to suppose, Three several sorts of Matter in the Universe, Specifically different from one another, that were Originally such, and Self-existent from Eternity; namely Sensifìs, Sensitivè and Rational: As if the Mundane System might be conceived to arise from a certain Jumble of these Three several sorts of Matter, as it were scuffling together in the Dark, without a God, and so producing brute Animals and Men. But as this is a mere Precarious Hypothesis, there being no imaginable attempt to be given, how there should come to be such an Essential Difference betwixt Matters, or why this Piece of Matter should be Sensitivè, and that Rational, when another is altogether Sensifìs; so the Suggetors of it are but mere Novices in Atheism, and a kind of Bungling Well-wishers to it. First, because, according to this Hypothesis, no Life would be Produced or Destroyed in the successive Generations and Corruptions of Animals, but only Concreted and Secreted in them; and consequently all humane Personalities must be Eternal and Incorruptible: Which is all one, as to avert the Pre and Post-existence of all Souls, from Eternity to Eternity, a thing that all Genuine and Thorow-pac’d Atheists are in a manner as abhorrent from, as they are from the Deity itself. And Secondly, because there can be no imaginable Reason given by them, Why there might not be as well, a certain Divine Mat
ter perfectly Intellectual and Self-existent from Eternity, as a Sensitive
and Rational Matter. And therefore such an Hypothesis as this, can
never serve the turn of Atheists. But all those that are Masters of the
Craft of Atheism, and thorougly Catechized or Initiated in the Dark
Mysteries thereof, (as hath been already inculcated) do perfectly a-
gree in this, That all Animal, Sentient and Conscious Life, all Souls
and Minds, and consequently all humane Personals, are Generated
out of Matter, and Corrupted again into it, or rather Educed out of No-	hing and Reduced into Nothing again.

We understand also that there are certain Canting Astrological At-
heists, who would deduce all things from the Occult Qualities and
Influences of the Stars, according to their different Conjunctions, Op-
positions and Aspects, in a certain blind and unaccomptable manner.
But these being Persons devoid of all manner of Sense, who neither
so much as pretend to give an Accompt of those Stars, whether they
be Animals or not, as also whence they derive their Original,
(which if they did undertake to do Atheistically, they must needs re-
solve themselves at length into one or other of those Hypotheses al-
ready proposed) therefore, as we conceive, they deserve not the leaft
Consideration. But we think fit here to observe, that such Devotees
to the heavenly Bodies, as look upon all the other Stars as petty Dei-
ties, but the Sun as the Supreme Deity and Monarch of the Univers-
e, in the mean time conceiving it also to be Perfectly Intellectual, (which
is in a manner the same with the Cleantean Hypothesis) are not so much
to be accoempted Atheists, as Spurious, Paganical and Idolatrous Theists.
And upon all these Considerations we conclude again, that there is no
other Philosophick Form of Atheism, that can easily be devis'd, besides
these Four mentioned, the Anaximandrian, the Democritical, the Sto-
ical and the Stratonical.

XXXIII. Amongst which Forms of Atheism, there is yet another
Difference to be observed, and accordingly another Distribution to be
made of them. It being first premised, that all those forementioned
Sorts of Atheists (if they will speak consistently and agreeably to
their own Principles) must needs suppose all things to be one way or
other Necessary. For though Epicurus introduced Contingent Liberty,
yet it is well known, that he therein plainly contradicted his own
Principles. And this indeed, was the First and Principal thing intend-
ed by us, in this whole Undertaking, to confute that Falsr Hypothesis
of the Mundane System, which makes all Actions and Events Necessary
upon Atheistic Grounds, but especially in the Mechanick way. Where-
fore in the next place we must observe, that though the Principles of
all Atheists introduce Necessity, yet the Necessity of these Atheists
is not one and the same, but of two different kinds; some of them
supposing a Necessity of Dead and Stupid Matter, which is that which is
commonly meant by Natura Naturae, or Material Necessity, and is also call-
ed by Aristotele, an Absolute Necessity of things: Others the Necessity of
a Plastick Life, which the same Aristotele calls an Hypothetical Necessity.
For the Anaximandrian and Democritical Atheists do both of them af-
fert a Material and Absolute Necessity of all things; one in the way of
Qualities,
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Qualities, and the other of Motion and Mechanism: But the Stoical and Stratonical Atheists allert a Physical and Hypothetical Necessity of things only.

Now one grand Difference betwixt these two Sorts of Atheisms and their Necessitics lies in this, That the Former, though they make all things Necessary, yet they suppose them also to be Fortuitous; there being no Inconsistency between these Two. And the Sence of both the Anaximandrian and Democritick Atheisms seems to be thus described by Plato. ουδε τῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν συμβαίνειν, All things were mingled together by Necessity according to Fortune. For that Nature from whence these Atheists derived all things, is at once both Necessary and Fortuitous. But the Plaftick Atheists suppose such a Necessary Nature, for the First Principle of things, as is not merely Fortuitous, but Regular, Orderly and Methodical, the Stoical excluding all Chance and Fortune universally, because they subject all things to One Plaftick Nature ruling over the whole Universe, but the Stratonical doing it in part only, because they derive things, from a Mixture of Chance and Plaftick Nature both together.

And thus we see that there is a Double Notion of Nature amongst Atheists, as well as Theists; which we cannot better express than in the words of Balbus the Stoick, perforated by Cicero: Alii Naturam confent efse Vm quamdam sine Ratione, cintentem motus in corporibus necessarios; Alii autem Vm participem Ordinis, tanquam Vtā probregidentem. Cujus Solertiam, nulla Ars, nulla Manna, necmo Opifex, confeqüent potefk imitando: Seminis enim Vm effe tantum, ut id quamquam perexigitum, nādumque fit Materiam, quà ali áugerique posuit, ita fingat & effeciat, in suo quidque genere, partim ut per stirpes alantur fias, partim ut mouere ctiam possint, & eis fe similia sui generare. Some by Nature mean a certain Force without Reason and Order, exciting Necessary Motions in Bodies, but others understand by it, such a Force as participating of Order, proceeds as it were Methodically. Whose exquisitene$s$, no Art, no Hand, no Opifer can reach to by Imitation. For the Force of Seed is such, that though the Bulk of it be very small, yet if it get convenient Matter for its nourishment and increase, it so Forms and Frames things in their several kinds, as that they can partly through their Stocks and Trunks be nourished, and partly Move themselves also, and Generate their like. And again, Sunt qui omnia Natura Nomine appellent, ut Epicurus: Sed nos, cum dicimus Naturæ confarare administrantis; Mundum, non ita dicimus, ut Glebam, aut Fragmentum Lapidis, aut aliquid ejfjunde, nulla cohaerenti Natura; Sed ut Arborem, ut Animalia, in quibus nulla Temeritas, sed Ordo appareat $&$ Artis quædam Similitudo. There are some who call all things by the name of Nature, as Epicurus: But we, when we say that the World is administered by Nature, do not mean such a Nature as is in Clods of Earth and Pieces of Stone, but such as is in a Tree or Animal, in whose Constitution there is no Temerity, but Order and Similitude of Art.

Now according to these Two different Notions of Nature, the Four forementioned Forms of Atheism may be again Dichotomized after this manner; into such as derive all things from a mere Fortuitous and Temerarious Nature, devoid of all Order and
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and Methodicalnes 5 and such as deduce the Original of things from a certain Orderly, Regular and Artificial, though Sensible Nature in Matter. The former of which are the Anaximandrian and Democritick Atheisms, the latter the Stoical and Stratonical.

It hath been already observed, that those Atheisms that derive all things from a mere Fortitious Principle, as also suppose every thing besides the bare Substance of Matter or Extended Bulk, to be Generated and Corrupted; though they ascertained the Eternity of Matter, yet they could not, agreeably to their own Hypotheses, maintain the Eternity and Incorruptibility of the World. And accordingly hereunto, both the Anaximandrian and Democritick Atheisms did conclude the World to be γενομένου, φασαντικός, such as was at first Made and should be again Corrupted. And upon this account, Lucretius concerns himself highly herein, to prove both the Novity of the World, and also its Future Dissolution and Extinction, that

Tutum Nationum Mortali Corpore confit.

But instead of the Worlds Eternity, these Two sorts of Atheists, introduced another Paradox, namely an ἐκτέλεσθαι, an Infinity of Worlds, and that not only Successive, in that space which this World of ours is conceived now to occupy, in respect of the Infinity of Past and Future Time, but also a Contemporary Infinity of Coexistent Worlds, at all times throughout Endless and Unbounded Space.

However it is certain, that some Persons Atheisticalcally inclined, have been always apt to run out another way, and to suppose that the Frame of things, and System of the World, ever was from Eternity, and ever will be to Eternity, such as now it is, dispensed by a certain Orderly and Regular, but yet Sensible and Unknowing Nature. And it is Prophefed in Scripture, that such Atheists as these should especially abound in these latter days of ours; There shall come in the last days (καινας χρονιας) Atheistical Scoffers, walking after their own Lusts and saying, Where is the promise of his Coming? For since the Fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation. Which latter words are spoken only according to the received Hypotheses of the Jews, the meaning of these Atheists being quite otherwise, that there was neither Creation nor Beginning of the World; but that things had continued, such as now they are, from all Eternity. As appears also from what the Apostle there adds by way of Confutation, That they were wilfully Ignorant of this, that by the word of God the Heavens were old, and the Earth standing out of the Water and in the Water; and that as the World that then was, overflowed with Water perished, so the Heavens & Earth which now are, by the same word are kept in store, and reserved unto Fire against the day of Judgment & Perdition of Ungodly men. And it is evident, that some of these Atheists at this very day, march in the garb of Enthusiastical Religionists, acknowledging no more a God than a Chrift without them, and Allegorizing the day of Judgment and future Conflagration, into a kind of seemingly Mystical, but really Atheistical Non-sense. These, if they did Philosophize, would resolve themselves into one or other of those Two Hypotheses before mentioned.
But the Stoical Atheists, who made the whole World to be dispensed by one Orderly and Plastick Nature, might very well, and agreeably to their own Hypothec, maintain, besides the Worlds Eternity, one Constant and Invariable Course or Tenor of things in it, as Plinius Secondus doth, who, if he were any thing, seems to have been one of these Atheists; Mundum & hoc quod nomine alio Dunum appelhare libuit, (cujus circumflexum rexintur cundita) Nomen esse, credi par est, Aeternum. Numen neque Genitum neque Interitum—— Ideo versus Natura Opus, & versus ipsa Natura; The World, and that which by another name is called the Heavens, by whose Circumgyration all things are governed, ought to be believed to be a Numen, Eternal, Numine, such as was never Made, and shall never be Destroyed. Where by the way, it may be again observed, that these Atheists who denied a God according to the True Notion of him, as a Conscios, Understanding Being, predating over the whole World, did notwithstanding look upon either the World it self, or else a mere Senles Plastick Nature in it, as a kind of Numen or Deity, they supposing it to be Ingenerable and Incorruptible. Which same Pliny, as upon the grounds of the Stoical Atheism, he maintained against the Anaximandrians and Democricksthe Worlds Eternity and Incorruptibility; so did he likewise in way of Opposition to that ἡσύχας ἀσθένεια, that Infinity of Worlds of theirs, assert that there was but One World, and that Finite. In like manner we read concerning that Famous Stoick Boethus, whom Laertius affirms, to have denied the World to be an Animal (which according to the language and sense of those times was all one as to deny a God) that he also maintained, contrary to the received Doctrine of the Stoicks, the Worlds Ante-Eternity and Incorruptibilitiy; phale, in his Treateise ἡσύχας ἀσθένεια or the Incorruptibilitiy of the World testifying the same of him. Nevertheless
Nevertheless it seems, that some of these Stoical Atheists did also agree with the Genericity of the other Stoical Theists, in supposing a successive Infinity of Worlds Generated and Corrupted, by reason of intervening Periodical Conflagrations; though all dispersed by such a Stupid and Sensible Nature as governs Plants and Trees. For thus much we gather from those words of Seneca before cited, where describing this Atheistical Hypothesis, he tells us, that though the World were a Plant, that is, governed by a Vegetative or Plantick Nature, without any Animality, yet notwithstanding, ab initio ejus usque ad exitum, &c. it had both a Beginning and will have an End, and from its Beginning to its End, all was dispersed by a kind of Regular Law, even its Successive Conflagrations too, as well as those Inundations or Deluges which have sometimes happened. Which yet they understood after such a manner, as that in these several Revolutions and Successive Circuits or Periods of Worlds, all things should be exactly alike, to what had been Infinitely before, and should be again Infinitely afterwards. Of which more elsewhere.

XXXIV. This Quadripartite Atheism which we have now represented, is the Kingdom of Darkness Divided, or Labouring with an Intestine Sedition War in its own Bowels, and thereby destroying it self. Insomuch that we might well save our selves the labour of any further Confutation of Atheism, merely by committing these several Forms of Atheism together, and dashing them one against another; they opposing and contradicting each other, no less than they do Theism itself. For first, those two Pairs of Atheism, on the one hand the Anaximandrian and Democritick, on the other the Stoical and Stratonical, do absolutely destroy each other; the Former of them supposing the First Principle of all things to be Stupid Matter devoid of all manner of Life, and contending that all Life as well as other Qualities is Generable and Corruptible, or a mere Accidental thing, and looking upon the Plantick Life of Nature as a Figment or Phantaetick Caprice, a thing almost as formidable and altogether as impossible as a Deity; the other on the contrary, founding all upon this Principle, That there is a Life and Natural Perception Essential to Matter, Ingenerable and Incorruptible, and contending it to be utterly impossible to give any account of the Phænomena of the World, the Original of Motion, the Orderly Frame and Disposition of things, and the Nature of Animals, without this Fundamental Life of Nature.

Again, the Single Atheisms belonging to each of these several Pairs, quarrel as much also between themselves. For the Democritick Atheism explodes the Anaximandrian Qualities and Forms, demonstrating that the Natural Production of such Entities out of Nothing, and the Corruption of them again into Nothing, is of the two, rather more impossible, than a Divine Creation and Annihilation. And on the other side, the Anaximandrian Atheist plainly discovers, that when the Democriticks and Atomicks have spent all their Fury against these Qualities and Forms, and done what they can to subvert the Phænomena of Nature, without them another way, themselves do notwithstanding like
like drunken men reel and stagger back again into them, and are unavoidably necessitated at last, to take up their Sanctuary in them.

In like manner the *Stoical* and *Stratonical* Atheists, may as effectually undo and confute each other; the Former of them urging against the Latter, That besides that Prodigious Absurdity, of making every Atom of Senseless Matter *Infallibly Wise* or * Omniscient*, without any *Consciousness*, there can be no reason at all given by the *Hylzoists*, why the Matter of the whole Universe, might not as well *Conspire* and *Conferate* together into One, as all the single Atoms that compound the Body of any Animal or Man, or why one *Conscious Life* might not as well result from the *Totum* of the former, as of the latter; by which means the *whole World* would become an *Animal* or *God*. Again, the Latter contending, that the *Stoical* or *Cosmo-plastic* *Atheist* can pretend no reason, why the whole World might not have one *Sensitive* and *Rational*, as well as one *Plastic Soul* in it, that is, as well be an *Animal* as a *Plant*. Moreover, that the Sensitive Souls of Brute Animals, and the Rational Souls of Men, could never possibly emerge out of one *Single*, *Plastic* and *Vegetative Soul* in the whole Universe. And lastly, that it is altogether as impossible, that the whole World should have *Life* in it, and yet none of its Parts have any *Life* of their own, as that the whole World should be White or Black, and yet no part of it have any Whiteness or Blackness at all in it. And therefore that the *Stoical Atheists*, as well as the *Stoical Theists*, do both alike deny *Incorporeal Substance*, but in words only, whilst they really admit the thing itself; because *One* and the fame *Life*, ruling over all the distant parts of the Corporeal Universe, must needs be an *Incorporeal Substance*, it being all in the Whole, and all acting upon every part, and yet none of it in any part by itself; for then it would be many and not one. From which it may be concluded, That Atheism is a certain strange kind of Monster, with *Four Heads*, that are all of them perpetually biting, tearing and devouring one another.

Now though these several Forms of Atheism do mutually destroy each other, and none of them be really Confiderable or Formidable in it self, as to any strength of Reason which it hath; yet as they are compared together among themselves; some of them may be more confiderable than the rest. For first, as the Qualities and Forms of the *Anaximandrian Atheist*, supposed to be really distinct from the Substances, are things unintelligible in themselves; so he cannot, with any colour or pretence of Reason, maintain the Natural Production of them out of *Nothing*, and the Reduction of them again into *Nothing*, and yet withstand a Divine Creation and Annihilation, as an Impossibility. Moreover the *Anaximandrian Atheist*, is as it were swallowed up into the *Democritic*, and further improved in it, this latter carrying on the same Design, with more seeming Artifice, greater Plausibilty of Wit, and a more pompous Show of Something where indeed there is Nothing. Upon which account, it hath for many Ages past beaten the *Anaximandrian*
drian Atheism, in a manner quite off the Stage, and reigned there alone. So that the Democritick or Atomick Atheism, seems to be much more considerable of the Two, than the Anaximandrian or Hylopathian.

Again; as for the two other Forms of Atheism, if there were any Life at all in Matter, as the First and Immediate Recipient of it, then in reason this must needs be suppos'd to be after the same manner in it, that all other Corporeal Qualities are in Bodies, so as to be Divisible together with it, and some of it be in every part of the Matter; which is according to the Hypothesys of the Hylozoists: Whereas on the contrary the Stoical Atheists supposing one Life only in the whole Mass of Matter, after such a manner, as that none of the parts of it by themselves should have any Life of their own, do thereby no less than the Stoical Theisfs, make this Life of theirs to be no Corporeal Quality or Form, but an Incorporeal Substance; which is to contradict their own Hypothesys. From whence we may conclude, that the Cosmoplastic or Stoical Atheism, is of the two, thes inconsiderable than the Hylozoick or Stratonical.

Wherefore amongst these Four Forms of Atheism, that have been propounded, these Two, the Atomick or Democritical, and the Hylozoick or Stratonical are the Chief. The former of which, namely the Democritick Atheism, admitting a true Notion of Body, that (according to the Doctrine of the first and most Ancient Atomists) it is nothing but Resisting Bulk, devoid of all manner of Life; yet because it takes for granted, that there is no other Substance in the World besides Body, does therefore conclude, that all Life and Understanding in Animals and Men, is Generated out of Dead and Stupid Matter, though not as Qualities and Forms (which is the Anaximandrian way) but as resulting from the Contextures of Atoms, or some peculiar Composition of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites and Motions, and consequently that they are themselves really nothing else but Local Motion and Mechanism: Which is a thing, that sometime since, was very Pertinently and Judiciously both observed and persiftred, by the Learned Author of the Exercitatio Epistolica, now a Reverend Bishop. But the latter, namely the Hylozoick, though truly acknowledging on the contrary, that Life, Cogitation and Understanding are Entities really distinct from Local Motion and Mechanism, and that therefore they cannot be Generated out of Dead and Stupid Matter, but must needs be somewhere in the World, Originally, Essentially, and Fundamentally; yet because they take it also for granted, that there is no other Substance besides Matter, do thereupon adulterate the Notion of Matter or Body, blending and confounding it with Life, as making them but two Inadequate Conceptions of Substance, and concluding that all Matter and Substance as such, hath Life and Perception or Understanding Natural and Inconscient, Essentially belonging to it; and that Sense and Conscious Reason or Understanding in Animals arises only from the Accidental Modification of this Fundamental Life of Matter by Organization.
We conclude therefore, that if these Two Atheistick Hypotheses, which are found to be the most Considerable, be once Confuted, the Reality of all Atheism will be ipso facto Confuted. There being indeed nothing more requisite, to a thorough Confutation of Atheism, than the proving of these Two things; First, that Life and Understanding are not Essential to Matter as such; and Secondly, that they can never possibly rise out of any Mixture or Modification of Dead and Stupid Matter whatsoever. The reason of which Assertion is, because all Atheists, as was before observed, are mere Corporealisists, of which there can be but these Two Sorts; Either such as make Life to be Essential to Matter, and therefore to be Generable and Incorruptible; or else such as suppose Life and Every thing besides the bare Substance of Matter, or Extended Bulk to be merely Accidental, Generable or Corruptible, as rising out of some Mixture or Modification of it. And as the Proving of those Two Things will overthrow all Atheism, so it will likewise lay a clear Foundation, for the demonstrating of a Deity distinct from the Corporeal World.

XXXV. Now that Life and Perception or Understanding, should be Essential to Matter as such, or that all Substance Matter should be Perfectly and Infallibly wise (though without Conscioufness) as to all its own Congruities and Capabilities, which is the Doctrine of the Hylozoists; This I say, is an Hypothesis so Prodigiously Paradoxical, and so Outragedly Wild, as that very few men ever could have Atheistick Faith enough, to swallow it down and digest it. Wherefore this Hylozoick Atheism hath been very obscure ever since its first Emercion, and hath found so few Fauors and Abettors, that it hath look’d like a forlorn and deserted thing. Neither indeed are there any Publick Monuments at all extant, in which it is avowedly Maintained, Stated and Reduced into any System. Infomuch that we should not have taken any notice of it at this time, as a Particular Form of Atheism, nor have Conjured it up out of its Grave, had we not Understood, that Strato’s Ghost had begun to walk of late, and that among some Well-wishers to Atheism, despairing in a manner of the Atomick Form, this Hylozoick Hypothesis, began already to be look’d upon, as the Rising Sun of Atheism, Et tanguam Spes aliarum Trojæ, it seeming to smile upon them, and flatter them at a distance, with some fairer hopes of supporting that Ruinous and Desperate Cause.

Whereas on the Contrary, that other Atomick Atheism, as it infilts upon a True Notion of Body, that it is nothing but Reffling Bulk; by which means we, joyning illue thereupon, shall be fairly conducted on to a clear Decision of this present Controversie, as likewise to the disintangling of many other points of Philosophy; so it is that which hath filled the World with the Noise of it, for Two Thouland years past; that concerning which several Volumes have been formerly written, in which it hath been stated and brought into a kind of System; and which hath of late obtainea A Refurrection amongst us, together with the Atomick Physiology, and been recommended to
the World anew, under a Specious Shew of Wit and profound Philosophy.

Wherefore as we could not here insift upon both these Forms of Atheifm together, because that would have been to confound the Language of Atheifts, and to have made them like the Cadmean Offspring, to do immediate Execution upon themselves; so we were in all reasone obliged to make our Firft and Principal Assault upon the Atomick Atheifm, as being the only considerable, upon this accoount, because it is that alone which publickly confronts the World; and like that proud Uncircumjeited Philifhine, openly defies the Hosts of the Living God. Intending nevertheless in the Clofe of this whole Discours, (that is, the Laft Book) where we are to determine the Right Intellectual System of the Universe, and to alſert an Incorpooreal Deity, to demonſtrate, That Life, Cognition and Understanding do not Eſſentially belong to Matter, and all Šubſtance as such, but are the Peculiar Attributes and Characterifticks of Šubſtance Incorpoſed.

XXXVI. However since we have now started these Several Forms of Atheifm, we shall not in the mean time neglect any of them neither. For in the Anſwer to the Second Atheiftick Ground, we shall Confute them all together at once, as agreeing in this One Fundaſmental Principle, That the Original of all things in the Universe is Sensiles Matter, or Matter devoid of all Animality or Conscious Life. In the Reply to the Fourth Atheiftick Argumentation, we shall briefly hint the Grounds of Reafon, from which Incorporeal Šubſtance is Demonstrated. In the Examination of the Fifth, we shall confute the Anaximandrian Atheifm there propounded, which is as it were, the Firſt Šciography, and Rude Delineation of Atheifm. And in the Confutation of the Ŝixth, we shall shew, how the ancient Atomick Atheifts, did preventively overthrow the Foundation of Hylοziſm. Besides all which, in order to a Fuller and more Thorough Confutation, both of the Cosmo-Plaſtick and Hylοziſtick Atheifts, we shall in this very place take occasion to insift largely upon the Plaſtick life of Nature, giving in the Firſt Place, a True Accoſmt of it; and then afterwards ſhewing, how groſly it is misunderstood, and the Pretence of it abused by the Aſſertiſers of both theſe Atheiftick Hypoſeſes. The Heads of which Larger Digreſſion, because they could not be so conveniently inserted in the Contents of the Chapter, shall be repreſented to the Readers View, at the End of it.

XXXVII. For we think it here to observe, that neither the Cosmo-Plaſtick or Stoicall, nor the Hylοziſtick or Stratonian Atheifts are therefore condemned by us, because they ſuppoſe ſuch a thing, as a Plaſtick Nature, or Life distinct from the Animal; albeit this be not only exploded, as an Abſolute Non-entity, by the Atomick Atheifts, who might possibly be afraid of it, as that which approached too near to a Deity, or else would hazard the introducing of it; but also utterly discarded by some Prefeſted Theists of later times; who might notwithstanding have an Undiscerned Tang of the Mechanick Atheifm.
Atheism, hanging about them, in that their so confident rejecting of all Final and Intending Causality in Nature, and admitting of no other Causes of things, as Philosophical, have the Material and Mechanical only. This being really to banish all Mental, and consequently Divine Causality, quite out of the World; and to make the whole World to be nothing else, but a mere Heap of Dust, Fortuitously agitated, or a Dead Cadaverous thing, that hath no Signatures of Mind and Understanding, Counsel and Wisdom at all upon it; nor indeed any other Vitality acting in it, than only the Production of a certain Quantity of Local Motion and the Conservation of it according to some General Laws; which things the Democritick Atheists take for granted, would all be as they are, though there were no God. And thus *Aristotle describes this kind of Philosophy. That it made the whole World to consist, εκ σωμάτων μόνων, τοι ζωον τάξιν μεδί εν ευρέων, τοι γαρ τοι πεμπτων, of nothing but Bodies and Monads (that is, Atoms or Small Particles of Matter) only ranged and disposed together into such an order, but altogether Dead and Inanimate.

2. For unless there be such a thing admitted as a Plastick Nature, that acts *ενεργωτα, for the sake of something, and in order to Ends, Regularly, Artificially and Methodically, it seems that one or other of these Two Things must be concluded, That Either in the Effermation and Organization of the Bodies of Animals, as well as the other Phænomena, every thing comes to past Fortuitously, and happens to be as it is, without the Guidance and Direction of any Mind or Understanding; Or else, that God himself doth all Immediately, and as it were with his own Hands, Form the Body of every Gnat and Fly, Insect and Mite, as of other Animals in Generations, all whose Members have so much of Contrivance in them, that Galen professed he could never enough admire that Artifice which was in the Leg of a Fly, and yet he would have admired the Wisdom of Nature more, had he been but acquainted with the Use of Microscopes.) I say, upon Supposition of no Plastick Nature, one or other of these Two things must be concluded; because it is not conceived by any, that the things of Nature are all thus administered, with such exact Regularity and Constancy every where, merely by the Wisdom, Providence and Efficiency, of those Inferior Spirits, Demons or Angels. As also, though it be true that the Works of Nature are dispensed by a Divine Law and Command, yet this is not to be understood in a Vulgar Sense, as if they were all effectually by the mere Force of a Verbal Law or Outward Command, because Inanimate things are not Commandable nor Governable by such a Law; and therefore besides the Divine Will and Pleasure, there must needs be some other Immediate Agent and Executioner provided, for the producing of every Effect; since not so much as a Stone or other Heavy Body, could at any time fall downward, merely by the Force of a Verbal Law, without any other Efficient Cause; but either God himself must immediately impel it, or else there must be some other subordinate Cause in Nature for that Motion. Wherefore the Divine Law and Command, by which the things of Nature are administered, must be conceived to be the Real Appointment of some Energetic, Effectual and Operative Cause for the Production of every Effect.
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3. Now
3. Now to assert the Former of these Two things, that all the Effects of Nature come to pass by Material and Mechanical Necessity, or the mere Fortuitous Motion of Matter, without any Guidance or Direction, is a thing no less Irrational than it is Impious and Atheistical. Not only because it is utterly Unconceivable and Impossible, that such Infinite Regularity and Artificial, as is ev're where throughout the whole World, should constantly result out of the Fortuitous Motion of Matter, but also because there are many such Particular Phenomena in Nature, as do plainly transcend the Powers of Mechanism, of which therefore no Sufficient Mechanical Reasons can be devised, as the Motion of Respiration in Animals; as there are also other Phenomena that are perfectly Cors to the Laws of Mechanism: as for Example, that of the Distant Poles of the Equator and Eclipse, which we shall insist upon afterward. Of both which kinds there have been other Instances proposed, by my Learned Friend Dr. More in his Enchiridion Metaphysicum, and very ingeniously improved by him to this very purport, namely to Evince that there is something in Nature besides Mechanism, and consequently Substance Incorporeal.

Moreover those Theists, who Philosophy after this manner, by resolving all the Corporeal Phenomena into Fortuitous Mechanism, or the Necessary and Unguided Motion of Matter, make God to be nothing else in the World, but an Idle Spectator of the Various Results of the Fortuitous and Necessary Motions of Bodies, and render his Wisdom altogether Useless and Insignificant, as being a thing wholly Inclosed and shut up within his own breast, and not at all acting abroad upon any thing without him.

Furthermore all such Mechanists as these, whether Theists or Atheists, do, according to that Judicious Cenure pasted by Aristotle, long since upon Democritus, but substitute as it were  Xiex yiaiivos  tivdovos, a Carpenters or Artificers Wooden Hand, moved by Strings and Wires, in stead of a Living Hand. They make a kind of Dead and Wooden World, as it were a Carved Statue, that hath nothing neither Vital nor Magical at all in it. Whereas to those who are Confiderative, it will plainly appear, that there is a Mixture of Life or Plastick Nature together with Mechanism, which runs through the whole Corporeal Universé.

And whereas it is pretended, not only that all Corporeal Phenomena may be sufficiently salved Mechanically, without any Final, Intending and Directive Casualty, but also that all other Reasons of things in Nature, besides the Material and Mechanical, are altogether Unphilosophical, the fame Aristotle ingeniouly expose the Ridiculouyness of this Pretence after this manner; IT is just as if a Carpenter, Joyner or Carver should give this accompt, as the only Satisfactory, of any Artificial Fabrick or Piece of Carved Imagery,  to  tivdovos  tiv  mhd  moven  1ynden,  tivd  1Hnden,  that because the Instruments, Axes and Hatchets, Plains and Chisels, happened to fall
fall so and so upon the Timber, cutting it here and there, that therefore it was hollow in one place, and plain in another, and the like, and by that means the whole came to be of such a Form. For is it not altogether as Absurd and Ridiculous, for men to undertake to give an account of the Formation and Organization of the Bodies of Animals, by mere Fortuitous Mechanism, without any Final or Intending Caufity, as why there was an Heart here and Brains there, and why the Heart had so many and such different Valves in the Entrance and Outlet of its Ventricles, and why all the other Organick Parts, Veins and Arteries, Nerves and Muscles, Bones and Cartilages, with the Joints and Members, were of such a Form? Because forsooth, the Fluid Matter of the Seed happened to move so and so, in several places, and thereby to cause all those Differences, which are also divers in different Animals; all being the Necessary Result of a certain Quantity of Motion at first indifferently impressed, upon the small Particles of the Matter of this Universe turned round in a Vortex. But as the fame Aristotel adds, no Carpenter or Artificer is so simple, as to give such an Account as this, and think it satisfactory, but he will rather declare, that himself directed the Motion of the Instruments, after such a manner, and in order to such Ends: *πελετλον ο ταυτω, α χοιαν έσαι αυτη, το ταυτω επειν, ωτι έμπεστον το θεον, εκ, αλλα διετι τω πληγω επωπαττο τοιαύτας, ή τυχος ένεκα, ήρει τω ουτων, έπως ταυτω η τοιαυτω των μορφων γλώσσα: A Carpenter would give a better account than so, for he would not think it sufficient to say, that the Fabrick came to be of such a form, because the Instruments happened to fall so and so, but he will tell you that it was because himself made such strokes, and that he directed the Instruments and determined their motion after such a manner, to this End that he might make the Whole a Fabrick fit and useful for such purpoifes. And this is to assign the Final Caus. And certainly there is scarcely any man in his Wits, that will not acknowledge the Reason of the different Valves in the Heart, from the apparent Usefulness of them, according to those particular Structures of theirs, to be more Satisfactory, than any which can be brought from mere Fortuitous Mechanism, or the Unguided Motion of the Seminal Matter.

4. And as for the Latter Part of the Disjunction, That every thing in Nature should be done Immediately by God himself; this, as according to Vulgar Apprehension, it would render Divine Providence Ope"rof, Sollicitous and Difftrac"ous, and thereby make the Belief of it to be entertained with greater difficulty, and give advantage to Atheits; so in the Judgment of the Writer De Mundo, it is not so Decorous in respect of God neither, that he should προεξοθει ἀναπώ, let his own Hand, as it were, to every Work, and immediately do all the Meanest and Triflingest things himself Drudgingly, without making ufe of any Inferior and Subordinate Instruments. *Ειπο προεξοθει ἀναπώ
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self, much less can this be thought decorous in respect of God. But it seems far more August, and becoming of the Divine Majesty, that a certain Power and Virtue, derived from him, and passing through the Universe, should move the Sun and Moon, and be the Immediate Cause of those lower things done here upon Earth.

Moreover it seems not so agreeable to Reason neither, that Nature as a Distinct thing from the Deity, should be quite Superfeded or made to Signifie Nothing, God himself doing all things Immediately and Miraculously; from whence it would follow also, that they are all done either Forcibly and Violently, or else Artificially only, and none of them by any Inward Principle of their own.

Lastly, This Opinion is further Confuted, by that Slow and Gradual Process that is in the Generations of things, which would seem to be but a Vain and Idle Pomp, or a Trifling Formality, if the Agent were Omnipotent; as also by those ἦλθον τοις ἡμετέροις (as Aristotle calls them) those Errors and Bungles which are committed, when the Matter is Imperfect and Contumacious; which argue the Agent not to be Irresistible, and that Nature is such a thing, as is not altogether uncapable (as well as Humane Art) of being sometimes frustrated and disappointed, by the Indisposition of Matter. Whereas an Omnipotent Agent, as it could dispatch its work in a Moment, so it would always do it Infallibly and Irresistibly; no Ineptitude or Stubbornness of Matter, being ever able to hinder such a one, or make him Bungle or Fumble in any thing.

5. Wherefore since neither all things are produced Fortuitously, or by the Unguided Mechanism of Matter, nor God himself may reasonably be thought to do all things Immediately and Miraculously; it may well be concluded, that there is a Platfick Nature under him, which as an Inferior and Subordinate Instrument, doth Drudgingly Execute that Part of his Providence, which consists in the Regular and Orderly Motion of Matter: yet so as that there is also besides this, a Higher Providence to be acknowledged, which prediding over it, doth often supply the Defects of it, and sometimes Overrule it; forasmuch as this Platfick Nature cannot act Electively nor with Discretion. And by this means the Wisdom of God will not be shut up nor concluded wholly within his own Breast, but will display it self abroad, and print its Stamps and Signatures every where throughout the World; so that God, as Plato (after Orpheus) speaks, will be not only the Beginning and End, but also the Middle of all things, they being as much to be ascribed to his Causality, as if himself had done them all Immediately, without the concurrent Instrumentality of any Subordinate Natural Cause. Notwithstanding which, in this way it will appear also to Humane Reason, that all things are Disposed and Ordered by the Deity, without any Sollicitous Care or Distractive Providence.

And indeed those Mechanick Theists, who rejecting a Platfick Nature, affect to concern the Deity as little as is possible in Mundane Affairs, either for fear of debasing him and bringing him down too
too mean Offices, or else of subjecting him to Sollicitous Encumberment, and for that Cause would have God to contribute nothing more to the Mundane System and Economy, than only the First Impressing of a certain Quantity of Motion, upon the Matter, and the After-conferning of it, according to some General Laws: These men (I say) seem not very well to understand themselves in this. Forasmuch as they mult of necessity, either suppose thes their Laws of Motion to execute themselves, or else be forced perpetually to concern the Deity in the Immediate Motion of every Atom of Matter throughout the Universe, in order to the Execution and Observation of them. The Former of which being a Thing plainly Absurd and Ridiculous, and the Latter that, which these Philosophers themselves are extremely abhorrent from, we cannot make any other Conclusion than this, That they do but unskilfully and unawaresestablish that very Thing which in words they oppose; and that their Laws of Nature concerning Motion, are Really nothing else, but a Plastick Nature, acting upon the Matter of the whole Corporal Universe, both Maintaining the Same Quantity of Motion always in it, and also Dispensing it (by Transferring it out of one Body into another) according to such Laws, Fatally Imprest upon it. Now if there be a Plastick Nature, that governs the Motion of Matter, every where according to Laws, there can be no Reafon given, why the same might not also extend further, to the Regular Disposal of that Matter, in the Formation of Plants and Animals and other things, in order to that Apt, Coherent Frame and Harmony of the whole Universe.

6. And as this Plastick Nature is a thing which seems to be in it self most Reasonable, so hath it also had the Suffrage of the best Philosophers in all Ages. For First, it is well known, that Aristotle concerns himself in nothing more zealously than this, That Mundane things are not Effected, merely by the Necessary and Unguided Motion of Matter; or by Fortuitous Mechanism, but by such a Nature as acts Regularly and Artificially for Ends; yet so as that this Nature is not the Highest Principle neither, or the Supreme Numen, but Subordinate to a Perfect Mind or Intelligenc; he affirming, that ιός οίτιον υ'η φεος τοι η τοιος, That Mind together with Nature was the Cause of this Universe; and that Heaven and Earth, Plants and Animals were framed by them both; that is, by Mind as the Principal and Directive Cause, but by Nature as a Subservient or Executive Instrument; and elsewhere joining in like manner God and Nature both together, as when he concludes, That God and Nature do nothing in Vain.

Neither was Aristotle the First Broacher or Inventor of this Doctrine; Plato before him having plainly asserted the same. For in a Passage already cited, he affirms that Nature together with Reason, and according to it, orders all things; thereby making Nature, as a Distinct thing from the Deity, to be a Subordinate Cause under the Reason and Wisdom of it. And elsewhe he resolves, that there are ιός οίτιον υ'η φεος τοι η τοιος Κατηγοριαν οι οιτες, Certain Causes of a Wife and Artificial Nature, which the Deity uses as Subservient to itself; as also, that there are ιός οίτιον υ'η φεος τοι η τοιος, Co-causes which God makes use of, as Subordinately Cooperative with himself.
Moreover before Plate, Empedocles Philosopher also, in the same manner, when supposing Two Worlds, the one Archetypal, the other Ex- typal, he made φίλος and φίλον. Friendship & Discord, to be the ἀγαθὰ θεῖα ἐπίσκοπος, the Active Principle and Immediate Operator in this Lower World. He not understanding thereby, as Plutarch and some others have conceived, Two Substantial Principles in the World, the one of Good, the other of Evil, but only a Plastick Nature, as Aristotle in fundry places intimates: which he called by that name, partly because he apprehended that the Refult and Upshot of Nature in all Generations and Corruptions, amounted to nothing more than Mixtures and Separations, or Concretion and Secretion of Preexistent things, and partly because this Plastick Nature is that which doth reconcile the Contrarieties and Enmities of Particular things, and bring them into one General Harmony in the Whole. Which latter is a Notion that Plotinus, describing this very Seminary Reason or Plastick Nature of the World, (though taking it in something a larger fentence, than we do in this place) doth ingeniously pursue after this manner: αὐτίδες ἢ ἀνέλλοια τὰ μὲν τὰ πάντα ἐναρμάζει, πάλιν ἢ μάρτυς ἡμῶν ἡ γένεσις ἐγέρεσθαι. ἢ οὕτως ἡ ἀνεσθείς πάσι; ἢ μὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἡ λείψανον ἢ ἐσωτέρα τοὺς μέρους πολέμου, οὕτως ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐκ πελαίον. ἀσαφεῖ ἢ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἡ λείψανον ἢ τῇ διαφήμῳ, ἢ ἦν ἢ αὐτῇ πολλάς μάρτυσι. τὸ μὴ αὐτῷ σφάκα τὰ μέμια χάριθρα, οὐδὲν ἡ μίαν ἀμέμαν, ἀλλὰ χρησμον. ἢ τὸ μὴ μάλλον ἢ τίτλης ἀμέμανα τῇ καλοκαθαρίᾳ ἐναρμάζει. The Seminary Reason or Plastick Nature of the Universe, opposing the Parts to one another and making them severally Indigent, produces by that means War and Contention. And therefore though it be One, yet notwithstanding it consists of Different and Contrary things. For there being Hostility in its Parts, it is nevertheless Friendly and Agreeable in the Whole; after the same manner as in a Dramatick Poem, Clashings and Contentions are reconciled into one Harmony. And therefore the Seminary and Plastick Nature of the World, may fitly be resembled to the Harmony of Disagreeing things. Which Plotinick Doctrine, may well pass for a Commentary upon Empedocles, accordingly as Simplicius briefly represents his fentence, ὁ ἐπισκόπος ὃς πᾶσας συμφέρει, ἢ μὲν ἐναρμόζει ἢ νοτίω, ἢ τὰς διαφημίους διάφορας ἢ συγκαταλείπει, ἢ τὰς τέσσαρες καθό τινα τινες διάφορας. Empedocles makes Two Worlds, the one United and Intelligible, the other Divided and Sensible; and in this lower Sensible World, he takes notice both of Unity and Discord.

It was before observed, that Heraclitus likewise did affect a Regular and Artificial Nature, as the Fate of things in this Lower World; for his Reason passing thorough the Substance of all things, or Ethereal Body, which was the Seed of the Generation of the Universe, was nothing but that Spermatick or Plastick Nature which we now speak of. And whereas there is an odd Passage of this Philosophers recorded, ὃς τινα τῶν τῆς ἁμαρτιῶν ἐνοχίτης, that neither any God nor Man made this World, which as it is justly derided by Plutarch for its Simplicity, so it looks very Atheistically at first sight yet because Heraclitus hath not been accompanied an Atheist, we therefore conceive the meaning of it to have been this, That the World was not made by any whatsoever, after such a manner as an Artificer makes an House, by
by Machines and Engins, acting from without upon the Matter, Cumberomly and Moliminoitly, but by a certain Inward Plastick Nature of its own.

And as Hippocrates followed Heraclitus in this (as was before declared) to did Zeno and the Stoicks also, they supposing besides an Intellectual Nature, as the Supreme Architect and Matter-builder of the World, another Plastick Nature as the Immediate Workman and Operatour. Which Plastick Nature hath been already described in the words of Bulbus, as a thing which acts not Fortuitously but Regularly, Orderly and Artificially, and Laertius tells us, it was defined by Zeno himself after this manner, ἀναφεροντες την ἐπιγενεσις τοις ἀνθρωποις τίς συμμετέχοις λόγις, ἀποτελεσματικας την ζωην, και την ἀνθρωπον τίς ἄνυμνης ἐκ τις ἅπαντος ἐκ τοις ἀνθρωποις. This Nature is a Habit moved from itself according to Spermatic Reasons or Seminal Principles, perfecting and containing those several things, which in determinate times are produced from it, and acting agreeably to that from which it was secreted.

Lastly, as the Latter Platonists and Peripatetics have unanimously followed their Masters herein, whose Vegetative Soul also is no other than a Plastick Nature; so the Chyndens and Paracelines insist much upon the same thing, and seem rather to have carried the Notion on further, in the Bodies of Animals, where they call it by a new name of their own, the Archens.

Moreover, we cannot but observe here, that as amongst the Ancients, They were generally condemned for down-right Atheists, who acknowledged no other Principle besides Body or Matter, Neecearily and Fortuitously moved, such as Democritus and the first Ionicks, so even Anaxagoras himself, notwithstanding that he was a professed Theist, and plainly asserted Mind to be a Principle, yet because he attributed too much to Material Necessity, admitting neither this Plastick Nature nor a Mundane Soul, was severely cenured, not only by the Vulgar (who unjustly taxed him for an Atheist) but also by Plato and Aristotles, as a kind of spurious and imperfect Theist, and one who had given great advantage to Atheism. Aristotles in his Metaphysics thus represents his Philosophy, Αναφέροντες την μικρη χρησιν περι της προς την κοινωνίαν, ή της ατομικής δια την ατελείαν, της αξιολογίας συν, τοις έκτοις αντιπόντων, δε της αλλακός πελάτοις μαθητηιν αιτητοι γνωστοι. Anaxagoras with Mind and Intellect, that is, God, as a Machine in the Cosmopoeia, and when he is at a loss to give an acconnt of things by Material Necessity, then and never but then, does he draw in Mind or God to help him out; but otherwise he will rather assign any thing else for a Cause than Mind. Now if Aristotles cenure Anaxagoras in this manner, though a professed Theist, because he did but seldom make use of a Mental Cause, for the salving of the Phenomena of the World, and only then when he was at a loss for other Material and Mechanical Causes (which it seems he sometimes confesseb himself to be) what would that Philosopher have thought of those our so confident Mechanists of later times, who will never vouchsafe so much
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as once to be beholding to God Almighty, for any thing in the Economy of the Corporeal World, after the first Impression of Motion upon the Matter?

Plato Likewise in his Phædo and elsewhere, condemns this Anaxagoras by name, for this very thing, that though he acknowledged Mind to be a Cause, yet he seldom made use of it, for falving the Phenomena; but in his twelfth de Legibus, he perlingseth him Unnamed, as one who though a professed Thēist, had notwithstanding given great Encouragement to Atheism, after this manner: * λέγεσθαι δὲ τὸν ὅμιλον πολλὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ κατ' ἁρμονία, οὗτος ἤ τελείως ἀμαλαγαίως ἀφῆλεν φιλότε, ἦ το προδρέμενον ἐν σωμάτων, ἀπόκειται δὲ εἰπεν ἔτσι, ἀνεκτικαν πολλαί, τὸ γὰρ ἤ πρὸ τοῦ ὁμιλαν πολιά, εὔτεικαν εἰρήνα, κατ' ἢ ἀρετὴν φαινομέν, μετὰ ἐνα λίθῳ, ἡ γὰρ ἐπεί πολλὰ ἄλλαν κατέποιησαν σωμάτων, διακατέκακαν τὰς αὐτίκας κατὰς τῶν κόσμων, τούτῳ τινὶ πολλῷ εξερευνήσαν πολλὰς Ἀθειστάς. Some of them who had concluded, that it was Mind that ordered all things in the Heavens, themselves erring concerning the Nature of the Soul, and not making it Older than the Body, have overturned all again for Heavenly Bodies being supposed by them, to be full of Stones, and Earth, and other Inanimate things (dispensing the Causes of the whole Universe) they did by this means occasion much Atheism and Impiety.

Furthermore the same Plato there tells us, that in those times of his, Astronomers and Physiologers commonly lay under the prejudice and suspicion of Atheism amongst the vulgar, merely for this reason, because they dealt so much in Material Causes, οἱ πολλοί διατηρεῖον τὸ τὰ τοιαύτα μείναντα, ἀτομικὰ τὰ τοῖς μετα τοιάς ἀναλαλωσιμαί πάλιαν πέξας, ἀρκεῖ γνώσεις, καταρρέωσαν δὲ ἵππο γεγομένα ἀνάλαλωσιμα πρὸς ἄλλος, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτίκαις μείνασαν ἀρχαῖα πεσέναλ τέχνας. The Vulgar think that they who addid themselves to Astronomy and Physiology, are made Atheists thereby, they seeing as much as is possible how things come to pass by Material Necessities, and being thereby disposed to think them not to be ordered by Mind and Will, for the sake of Good. From whence we may observe, that according to the Natural Apprehensions of Men in all Ages, they who resolve the Phenomena of Nature, into Material Necessity, allowing of no Final nor Mental Causality (dispensing things in order to Ends) have been strongly suspected for Friends to Atheism.

7. But because some may pretend, that the Plastick Nature is all one with an Occult Quality, we shall here show how great a Difference there is betwixt these Two. For he that afferts an Occult Quality, for the Cause of any Phenomenon, does indeed affign no Cause at all of it, but only declare his own Ignorance of the Cause; but he that afferts a Plastick Nature, affigns a Determine and proper Cause, nay the only Intelligible Cause, of that which is the greatest of all Phenomena in the World, namely the τὸ ἐν ἡ ἄλλης, the Orderly, Regular and Artificial Frame of things in the Universe, whereof the Mechanick Philosophers, however pretending to salve all Phenomena by Matter and Motion, affign no Cause at all. Mind and Understanding...
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is the only true Cause of Orderly Regularity, and he that affords a
Plaftick Nature, affords Mental Caufes in the World; but the Port
taneous Mechanicks, who exploding Final Caufes, will not allow Mind
and Understanding to have any Influence at all upon the Frame of
things, cannever possibly aſſign any Caufes of this Grand Phenome
non, unless Confufion may be laid to be the Caufe of Order, and Fortune or
Chance of Constant Regularity and therefore themselves must resolve
it into an Occult Quality. Nor indeed does there appear any great
reason why such men should affert an Infinite Mind in the World, for
they do not allow it to act any where at all, and therefore must needs
make it to be in Vain.

8. Now this Plaftick Nature being a thing which is not without
some Difficulty in the Conception of it, we hall here endeavour to
do these Two things concerning it; First, to set down a right Repre
fentation thereof, and then afterwards to show how extremely the
Notion of it hath been Miftaken, Perverted and Abused by those
Atheifts, who would make it to be the only God Almighty, or First Prin
ciple of all things.

How the Plaftick Nature is in general to be conceiv'd, Arifotle inſtruc
t us in these words, "ο θ' θεον θ' ἀναλογίαν ἐμπορον ὑπὸ τοῦ φυσικοῦ ἐποιεία.
If the Naipageal Art, that is the Art of the Shipwright, were in the Tim
ber it self, Operatively and Effectually, it would there act just as Nature
doth. And the Cafe is the same for all other Arts; If the Oecodomi
cal Art, which is in the Mind of the Architect, were supposed to be
transferred into the Stones, Bricks and Mortar, there acting upon
them in such a manner, as to make them come together of themselves
and range themselves into the Form of a complete Edifice, as Amphi-
con was laid by his Harp, to have made the Stones move, and place
themselves Orderly of their own accord, and so to have built the
Walls of Thebes: Or if the Musical Art were conceived to be imme
diately in the Instruments and Strings, animating them as a Living
Soul, and making them to move exactly according to the Laws of
Harmony, without any External Impulse. These and such like In
stances, in Arifotle's Judgment, would be fit Iconisms or Representa
tions of the Plaftick Nature, That being Art it self acting Immediately
upon the Matter as an inward Principle in it. To which purpose the
same Philosopher adds, that this thing might be further illustrated
by an other Instance or Refemblence, μᾶλλον ἡ φύλος, ἔταντις
ιαθημένοις ἰσώτις ἐποιεῖ, τόνῳ ἔτοιμω Ἠ φύσης Nature may be yet more clearly
Resembled to the Medicinal Art, when it is imploied by the Physician,
in curing himself. So that the meaning of this Philosopher is, that
Nature is to be conceived as Art Acting not from without and at a
Diftance, but Immediately upon the thing it self which is Formed by
it. And thus we have the firft General Conception of the Plaftick
Nature, That it is Art it self, acting immediately on the Matter, as an
Inward Principle.

9. In the next Place we are to obferue, that though the Plaftick
Nature be a kind of Art, yet there are some Considerable Preeminen
ces which
which it hath above Human Art, the First whereof is this; That whereas Human Art cannot act upon the Matter otherwise than from without and at a distance, nor communicate it self to it, but with a great deal of Tumult and Hurliburly, Noise and Clatter, it using Hands and Axes, Saws and Hammers, and after this manner with much ado, by Knockings and Thrustings, slowly introducing its Form or Idea (as for Example of a Ship or House) into the Materials. Nature in the mean time is another kind of Art, which Insinuating it self Immediately into things themselves, and there acting more Commandingly upon the Matter as an Inward Principle, does its Work Easily, Cleverly and Silently. Nature is Art as it were Incorporated and Imbodied in Matter, which doth not act upon it from without Mechanically, but from within Vital] and Magically, &c. Wherefore, whereas the former Work, being Hands, nor Feet, nor any Instrument, Constate or Adventitious, there being only need of Matter to work upon and to be brought into a certain Form, and Nothing else. For it is manifest that the Operation of Nature is different from Mechanism, it doing not its Work by Trajion or Pulison, by Knockings or Thrustings, as if it were without that which it wrought upon. But as God is Inward to every thing, so Nature Acts Immediately upon the Matter, as an Inward and Living Soul or Law in it.

to. Another Preeminence of Nature above Human Art is this; That whereas Human Artists are often to seek and at a los, and therefore Consult and Deliberate, as also upon second thoughts mend their former Work; Nature, on the contrary, is never to seek what to do, nor at a stand; and for that Reason also (besides another that will be Suggested afterwards) it doth never Consult nor Deliberate. Indeed Aristotle Intimates, as if this had been the Grand Objection of the old Atheistick Philosophers against the Plastick Nature, That because we do not see Natural Bodies to Consult or Deliberate, therefore there could be Nothing of Art, Counsel or Contrivance in them, but all came to pass Fortuitously. But he confutes it after this manner:* Ανακεριντά τά μα θεσσαλαν ενεκ το γνωσθεί, εκεν μα ιδον τονι παλαιατεσθείων, καθως εξ ου τεχνη ενίσχυται. It is absurd for Men to think nothing to be done for Ends, if they do not see that which moves to consult, although Art itself doth not Consult. Whence he concludes that Nature may Act Artificially, Orderly and Methodically, for the sake of Ends, though it never Consult or Deliberate. Indeed Human Artists themselves do not Consult properly as they are Artists, but when ever they do it, it is for want of Art, and because they are to seek, their Art being Imperfect and Adventitious: but Art itself or Perfect Art, is never to seek, and therefore doth never Consult or Deliberate. And Nature is this Art, which never hesitates nor studies, as unresolved what to do, but is always readily prompted; nor does it ever repent afterwards of what it hath formerly done, or go about, as it were upon second thoughts, to alter and mend its former Course, but it goes on in one Constant, Unremitting Tenor, from Generation to Generation, because it is the Stamp or Impres of that Infallibly Omnipi-
And thus we have seen the Difference between Nature and Humane Art; that the Latter is Imperfect Art, acting upon the Matter from without, and at a Distance; but the Former is Art itself or Perfect Art, acting as an Inward Principle in it. Wherefore when Art is said to imitate Nature, the meaning thereof is, that Imperfect Humane Art imitates that Perfect Art of Nature, which is really no other than the Divine Art itself, as before Aristotle, Plato had declared in his Sophist, in these words, τι φθωρά λεγόμενα ποιήσω θέσιν ἄρχων. Those things which are said to be done by Nature, are indeed done by Divine Art.

11. Notwithstanding which, we are to take notice in the next place, that as Nature is not the Deity itself, but a Thing very remote from it and far below it, so neither is it the Divine Art, as it is in it self Pure and Abstract, but Concrete and Embodied only; for the Divine Art considered in itself, is nothing but Knowledge, Understanding or Wisdom in the Mind of God: Now Knowledge and Understanding, in its own Nature is ἐπιστήμη ἀναφορὰ, a certain Separate and Abstract thing, and of so Subtil and Refined a Nature, as that it is not Capable of being Incorporated with Matter, or Mingled and blended with it, as the Soul of it. And therefore Aristotle's Second Inference, which he propounds as most pertinent to Illustrate this business of Nature by, namely of the Physicin's Art curing himself, is not so adequate thereunto; because when the Medicinal Art Cures the Physician in whom it is, it doth not there Act as Nature, that is, as Concrete and Embodied Art, but as Knowledge and Understanding only, which is Art Naked, Abstract and Unembodied, as also it doth its Work Ambiguously, by the Physician's Willing and Prescribing to himself, the use of such Medicaments, as do but conduce, by removing of Impediments, to help that which is Nature indeed, or the Inward Archetype to effect the Cure. Art is defined by Aristotle, to be ζητήσις τοῦ ἐναρκτείου, The Reason of the thing without Matter; and so the Divine Art or Knowledge in the Mind of God is Unembodied Reason; but Nature is Ratio Moxii & Confusa, Reason Immersed and Plunged into Matter, and as it were Fuddled in it, and Confounded with it. Nature is not the Divine Art Archetypal, but only Echypal, it is a living Stamp or Signature of the Divine Wisdom, which though it act exactly according to its Archetypes, yet it doth not at all Comprehend nor Understand the Reason of what it self doth. And the Difference between these two, may be refumbled to that between the λόγος ἐν ἀναφορᾷ, the Reason of the Mind and Conception, called Verbum Mentis, and the λόγος ἐπιστήμης, The Reason of External Speech; the Latter of which though it bear a certain Stamp and Impress of the Former upon it, yet it self is nothing but Articulate Sound, devoid of all Understanding and Sense. Or else we may Illustrate this business by another Similitude, comparing the Divine Art and Wisdom to an Architect, but Nature to a Manual Officer; the Difference between which two is thus set forth by Aristotle pertinently to our purpose; τῶν ἐπιστημῶν καὶ ἡ μαθήματι.
12. Wherefore as we did before observe the Preeminences of Nature above Humane Art, so we must here take Notice also of the Imperfections and Defects of it, in which respect it falls short of Humane Art, which are likewise Two; and the First of them is this, That though it Act Artificially for the sake of Ends, yet it self doth neither Intend those Ends, nor Understand the Reason of that it doth. Nature is not Master of that Conjunmate Art and Wisdom according to which it acts, but only a Servant to it, and a Drudging Executioner of the Dictates of it. This Difference betwixt Nature and Abstract Art or Wisdom is expressed by Plutarch in these words: 'τὰ δὲ τὰς λεγομένης Φυσικὰς Φεβίας ήδη, ήδη καὶ μόνον Φεβίαις πράττει, καὶ Φύσει γέγονεν, ἓναλέξει γὰρ Φυσικὰς καὶ Φύσει, ήδη λογικὰ ἔστωσεν ὅτι, ήδη καὶ ἐκ αὐτῆς ἐλαττωμάτων λογικόν ἔστωσεν. οὗτοι οἱ καὶ καθότι μάθεις διακόσμησις ἐκ Φυσικῶν ἀρχῶν ἢ τὰ Φυσικά τύπωσε ἐκδόχως μὴν ὅπος τὰ ἄνω, ἢ τὰ ἄνω ἢ ἄκοσμα ὅπος τὰ κατά, ὅπος οὖσα ἢ ἄκοσμα, μάθεις τούτοις. How doth Wisdom differ from that which is called Nature? Verily in this Manner, That Wisdom is the First Thing, but Nature the Last and Lowest; for Nature is but an Image or Imitation of Wisdom, the Last thing of the Soul, which hath the lowest Impress of Reason shineth upon it; as when a thick piece of Wax is thoroughly impressed upon by a Seal, that Impress which is clear and distinct in the superior Superficies of it, will in the lower side be weak and obscure and such is the Stamp and Signature of Nature, compared with that of Wisdom and Understanding, Nature being a thing which doth only Do, but not Know. And elsewhere the same Writer declares the Difference between the Spermatick Loge, or Reasons, and Knowledges or Conceptions of the Mind in this manner: 'Ποιέσθαι ἢ οἱ λόγοι Τοιούτους οἰον συνήχειαν; ἢ αὐτὰ πάντα τὰ τούτων ποίησαι; οὐ γὰρ λόγοι εἶναι ἐκλείποντες, ή τὰ ποίησαι φαινόμενα, ἢ νόημα, ἢ μόρφωσις, ἢ σύμμετρα, ἢ μάλλον τρεπόμενα πρὸς ἐπιστήμην, κατὰ τέλος, ἢ συμμετρατὰ μὲν ὅπος, οἱ οὖν τῷ καὶ ἑρμήνευσε οὐκ ἔχεται. Whether are these Platonic Reasons or Forms in the Soul Knowledges? But how shall it then Act according to those Knowledges? For the Platonic Reason or Form Acts or Works in Matter, and that which Acts Naturally is not Intelleltion nor Vision, but a certain Power of moving Matter, which doth not Know, but only Do, and makes as it were a Stamp or Figure in Water.

And with this Doctrine of the Ancients, a Modern Judicious Writer and Sagacious Inquirer into Nature, seems fully to agree, that Nature is such a Thing as doth not Know but only Do: For after he had admired
admired that Wisdom and Art by which the Bodies of Animals are framed, he concludes that one or other of these two things must needs be acknowledged, that either the Vegetative or Plastick Power of the Soul, by which it Fabricates and Organizes its own body, is more Excellent and Divine than the Rational; Or else, In Nature O mercu, Gen. peribas negis Prudentiam nec Intellectum inesse, sedita folium videri Conv. p. 49. ceptus nostrum, qui secundum Artes nostras & Articulации, non Exemplaria di nobis metibus mutata, de rebus Nature divinis judicamus; Quas Principia Naturee Artus, effectus suas co modo producere, quo nos opera nostra Artificialia solvemus; That in the Works of Nature there is neither Prudence nor Understanding, but only it seems to our Apprehensions, who judge of these Divine things of Nature, according to our own Arts and Faculties, and Patterns borrowed from our selves; as if the Active Principles of Nature did produce their Effects in the same manner, as we do our Artificial Works. Wherefore we conclude, agreeably to the Sense of the best Philosophers, both Ancient and Modern, That Nature is such a Thing, as though it Act Artificially and for the sake of Ends, yet it doth but Act and Mimick the Divine Art and Wisdom, it self not Understanding those Ends which it Acts for; nor the Reason of what it doth in order to them; for which Cause also it is not Capable of Conjunction or Deliberation, nor can it Act Electively or with Discretion:

13. But because this may seem strange at the first sight, that Nature should be said to Act in such a manner, and some way or other Artificially, and yet be it self devoid of Knowledge and Understanding, we shall therefore endeavour to persuade the Possibility, and facilitate the Belief of it, by some other Instances; and first by that of Habits, particularly those Musical ones, of Singing, Playing upon Instruments, and Dancing. Which Habits direct every Motion of the Hand, Voice, and Body, and prompt them readily, without any Deliberation or Studied Consideration, what the next following Note or Motion should be. If you jogg a sleeping Musician, and sing but the fift Words of a Song to him, which he had either himself composed, or learnt before, he will presently take it from you, and that perhaps before he is thoroughly awake, going on with it, and singing out the remainder of the whole Song to the End. Thus the Fingers of an exercised Lutenist, and the Legs and whole Body of a skilful Dancer, are directed to move Regularly and Orderly, in a long Train and Series of Motions, by those Artificial Habits in them, which do not themselves at all comprehend those Laws and Rules of Music or Harmony, by which they are governed: So that the same thing may be said of these Habits, which was said before of Nature, That they do not Know, but only Do. And thus we see there is no Reason, why this Plastick Nature (which is supposed to move Body Regularly and Artificially) should be thought to be an Absolute Impossibility, since Habits do in like manner, Gradually Evolve themselves, in a long Train or Series of Regular and Artificial Motions, readily prompting the doing of them, without comprehending that Art and Reason by which they are directed. The forementioned Philosopher illuates the Seminary Reason and Plastick Nature of the Universse, by this Q. 2 very
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very Instance: the reason whereof I have before hinted, and it is not the purpose of the present discourse to enlarge upon. The Energy of Nature is Artificial, as when a Dancer moves; for a Dancer resembles this Artificial Life of Nature, forasmuch as Art it self moves him, and so moves him as being such a Life in him. And agreeably to this Conject, the Ancient Mythologists represented the Nature of the Universe, by Pan Playing upon a pipe or Harp, and being in love with the Nymph Echo; as if Nature did, by a kind of Silent Melody, make all the Parts of the Universe every where Daunce in Measure & Proportion, it self being as it were in the mean time delighted and ravished with the Recoeching of its own Harmony. Habits are said to be an Advertisements and Acquired Nature, and Nature was before defined by the Stoicks to be "εν ήθος" or a Habit: so that there seems to be no other Difference between these two, than this, that whereas the One is Acquired by Teaching, Industry and Exercise; the other, as was expressed by Hippocrates, is "αυτα τας εν μορφαν, Unlearned and Untaught," and may in some sense also be said to be "ωυστως," Self-taught, though the be indeed always Inwardly Prompted, Secretly Whispered into, and Inspired, by the Divine Art and Wisdom.

14. Moreover, that something may Act Artificially and for Ends, without Comprehending the Reason of what it doth, may be further evinced from those Natural Infinits that are in Animals, which without Knowledge direct them to Act Regularly, in Order both to their own Good and the Good of the Universe. As for Example; the Bees in Melification, and in framing their Combs and Hexagonal Cells, the Spiders in spinning their Webs, the Birds in building their Nests, and many other Animals in such like Actions of theirs, which would seem to argue a great Sagacity in them, whereas notwithstanding, as Aristotle observes, "ετε την ετα ετη ετη, της μελετον ποιης, They do these things, neither by Art nor by Counsel nor by any Deliberation of their own, and therefore are not Masters of that Wisdom according to which they Act, but only Passive to the Infinits and Impresses thereof upon them. And indeed to affirm, that Brute Animals do all these things by a Knowledge of their own, and which themselves are Masters of, and that without Deliberation and Consultation, were to make them to be ended with a most Perfect Intellect, far transcending that of Humane Reason; whereas it is plain enough, that Brutes are not above Consultation, but below it, and that these Infinits of Nature in them, are Nothing but a kind of Fate upon them.

15. There is in the next place another Imperfection to be observed in the Plastick Nature, that as it doth not comprehend the Reason of its own Action, so neither is it Clearly and Expressly Conscious of what it doth; in which Respect, it doth not only fall short of Humane Art, but even of that very Manner of Acting which is in Brutes themselves, who though they do not Understand the Reason of those Actions, that their Natural Infinits lead them to, yet they are generally conceived to be Conscious of them, and to do them by Thancy; whereas the Plastick
Chapter III. Without express Consciosness.

Plastick Nature in the Formation of Plans and Animals, seems to have no Animal Fancie, no Express Conscioſsnes; Conſcience or Conſciouſneſs of what it doth. Thus the often Commeded Philofopher, ά υι υψος ανωτοκαιον ευς, ά ου ανωτοκαιον υπολογον, υπολογον μεταν ανιμως των, η εις νομισμα ετος ανιμως ανιμως ευς στην ευς. Nature hath not so much as any Fancie in it; As Inteſſion and Knowledge is a thing Superioır to Fancie, so Fancie is Superioır to the Impref of Nature, for Nature hath no Apprehension nor Conſciouſneſs Perception of any thing. In a Word, Nature is a thing that hath no such Self-perception or Self-enjoyment in it, as Animals have.

16. Now we are well aware, that this is a Thing which the Narrow Principles of some late Philofophers will not admit of, that there should be any Action distinct from Local Motion besides Express Conſcious Cognition. For they making the first General Heads of all Entity, to be Extension and Cognition, or Extended Being and Cogitative, and then supposing that the Essence of Cognition confinis in Express Conſciousneſs, must needs by this means exclude fuch a Plastick Life of Nature, as we ſpeak of, that is ſuppoſed to act without Animal Fancie or Express Conſciousneſs. Wherefore we conceive that the fuilt Heads of Being ought rather to be expreſſed thus; ſeeling or Aniſtrophic Extension, and Life, (i.e. Internal Energy and Self-activit) and then again, that Life or Internal Self-activity, is to be ſubdivided into ſuch as either acts with express Conſciousness and Synæſhes, or ſuch as is without it; the Latter of which is this Plastick Life of Nature: So that there may be an Action distinct from Local Motion, or a Vital Energy, which is not accompanied with that Fancie, or Conſciouſneſs, that is in the Energie of the Animal Life; that is, there may be a ſimple Internal Energy or Vital Autokineſse, which is without that Duplica‐tion, that is included in the Nature of υπολογον, Conſcience and Conſciouſneſs, which makes a Being to be Presenť with it ſelf, Attentive to its own Actions, or Animadverſive of them, to perceive it ſelf to Do or Šuffer, and to have a Ÿrvtion or Enjoyment of it ſelf. And indeed it must be granted, that what moves Matter or determines the Motion of it Vitally, must needs do it by some other Energy of its own, as it is Reasonable also to conceive, that it ſelf hath some Vital Šympathy with that Matter which it Acts upon. But we apprehend, that both these may be without Clear and Express Conſciousneſs. Thus the Philoſopher, πάν ηι ἐνεργεια, ηι η ἐνεργη, ἐνεργηα ηι ηι ηι ηι ηι ἐνεργηα, καθ μόν ηι ηι ηι ηι ηι ηι. Every Life is Energy, even the worst of Lives, and therefore that of Nature. Whole Energie is not like that of Fire, but such an Energie, as though there be no ſenfe belonging to it, yet it is not Temerarious or Fortunitous, but Orderly and Regular.

Wherefore this Controversie whether the Energy of the Plastick Nature, be Cognition, or no, seems to be but a Logomachy, or Conťention about Words. For if Clear and Express Conſciousneſs be ſuppoſed to be included in Cognition, then it must needs be granted that Cognition doth not belong to the Plastick Life of Nature: but if the Notion of that Word be enlarged so as to comprehend all Action distinct from Local Motion, and to be of equal Extent with Life, then the Energie of Nature is Cognition.
Nevertheless if any one think fit to attribute some Obsolete and Imperfect Sense or Perception, different from that of Animals, to the Energies of Nature, and will therefore call it a kind of Dwarf, Unawakened, or Astronibloic Cognition, the Philosopher, before mentioned, will not very much gain by it: *et was proponens sensing tuma o d'koum aoub fakwes, ey oion legyw o th' állow tum akhoun it tw' soun, óln' oion etis tum té tin te té y' y' y' kurov texture peoSwatwe. If any will needs attribute some kind of Apprehension or Sense to Nature, then it must not be such a Sense or Apprehension, as is in Animals, but something that differs as much from it, as the Sense or Cognition of one in a profound sleep, differs from that of one who is awake. And since it cannot be denied but that the Plutick Nature hath a certain Dull and Obsolete Idea of that which it Stamps and Prints upon Matter, the same Philosopher himself sticks not to call this Idea of Nature, ἀληθις and ἠθέλις, a Spectacle and Contemplation, as likewise the Energy of Nature towards it, ἰθέλετε, a Silent Contemplation: may he allows, that Nature may be said to be, in some Sence, φιλοτεκές, a Lover of Spectacles or Contemplation.

17. However, that there may be some Vital Energy without Clear and Express κωδικός, Con-sense and Consciouness, Animadversion, Attention, or Self-perception, seems reasonable upon several accounts. For first, those Philosopher themselves, who make the Essence of the Soul to confil in Cognition, and again the Essence of Cognition in Clear and Express Consciouness, cannot render it any way probable, that the Souls of Men in all profound Sleeps, Lethargies and Apoplexies, as also of Embryo's in the Womb, from their very first arrival thither, are never so much as one moment without Expressly Consciounous Cognitions; which if they were, according to the Principles of their Philosophy, they must, ipso factò, cease to have any Being. Now if the Souls of Men and Animals be at any time without Consciouness and Self-perception, then it must needs be granted, that Clear and Express Consciouness is not Essentiel to Life. There is some appearance of Life and Vital Sympathy in certain Vegetables and Plants, which however called Sentive Plants and Plant-animals, cannot well be supposed to have Animal Sense and Fancy, or Express Consciouness in them; although we are not ignorant in the mean time, how some endeavour to salve all those Phenomena Mechanically. It is certain, that our Humane Souls themselves are not always Consciounous, of whatever they have in them; for even the Sleeping Geometrian, hath at that time, all his Geometrical Theorems and Knowledges some way in him; as also the Sleeping Musician, all his Musical Skill and Songs: and therefore why may it not be possible for the Soul to have likewise some Vital Energie in it, which it is not Expressly Consciounous of? We have all Experience, of our doing many Animal Actions Non-attendingly, which we reflect upon afterwards as also that we often continue a long Series of Bodily Motions, by a mere Virtual Intention of our Minds, and as it were by Half a Cognition. That Vital Sympathy, by which our Soul is united and tied fast, as it were with a Knot, to the Body, is a thing that we have no direct Consciouness of, but only in its Effects. Nor can we tell how we come to be so different-
by affected in our Souls, from the many different Motions made upon our Bodies. As likewise we are not Conscious to our selves of that Energy, whereby we impress Variety of Motions and Figurations upon the Animal Spirits of our Brain in our Plastick Thoughts. For though the Geometrician perceive himself to make Lines, Triangles and Circles in the Dust, with his Finger, yet he is not aware, how he makes all those same Figures, first upon the Corporeal Spirits of his Brain, from whence notwithstanding, as from a Glass, they are reflected to him, Fancy being rightly concluded by Aristotle to be a Weak and Obscure Sense. There is also another more Interior kind of Plastick Power in the Soul (if we may so call it) whereby it is Formative of its own Cognitions, which it self is not always Conscious of 3 as when in Sleep or Dreams, it frames Interlocutory Discourses betwixt it self and other Persons, in a long Series, with Coherent Sense and Apt Conjunctions, in which oftentimes it seems to be surprized with unexpected Answers and Reparties; though it self were all the while the Poet and Inventor of the whole Fable. Not only our Nostations for the most part when we are awake, but also our Nocturnal Volutations in Sleep, are performed with very little or no Consciousnes. Respiration or that Motion of the Diaphragma and other Muscles which causes it (there being no sufficient Mechanical account given of it) may well be concluded to be always a Vital Motion, though it be not always Animal; since no man can affirm that he is perpetually Conscious to himself, of that Energy of his Soul, which does produce it when he is awake, much less when asleep. And Lastly, the Cartesian Attempts to save the Motion of the Heart Mechanically, seem to be abundantly confuted, by Autopsy and Experiment, evincing the Syphole of the Heart to be a Muscular Contraction, caused by some Vital Principle, to make which, nothing but a Pulls or Corporeal Quality in the Substance of the Heart itself, is very Unphilosophical and Absurd. Now as we have no voluntary Imperium at all, upon the Syphole and Diahole of the Heart, so are we not conscious to our selves of any Energy of our own Soul that causes them, and therefore we may reasonably conclude from hence also, that there is some Vital Energy, without Animal Fancy or Synearthes, express Consciousness and Self-perception.

18. Wherefore the Plastick Nature acting neither by Knowledge nor by Animal Fancy, neither Effectively nor Hormetically, must be concluded to act Fatally, Magically and Sympathetically. And thus that Curious and Diligent Inquirer into Nature, before commended, resolves, Natura non sequitur Fato, quodam, seu Mandato secundum Leges operante, movebat, Naturae motu ut ita fuerint, by a kind of Fate or Command, acting according to Laws. Fate, and the Laws or Commands of the Deity, concerning the Mundane Oeconomy (they being really the same thing) ought not to be looked upon, neither as Verbal things, nor as mere Will and Cognition in the Mind of God; but as an Energetic and Effectual Principle, constituted by the Deity, for the bringing of things decreed to pass. The Aphrodian Philosopher with others of the Ancients, have concluded, that Fate and Nature are but two different Names, for one and the same thing, and that

19. From what hath been hitherto declared concerning the Plaftick Nature, it may appear, that though it be a thing that acts for Ends Artificially, and which may be also called the Divine Art, and the Fate of the Corporeal World; yet for all that it is neither God nor Goddess, but a Low and Imperfect Creature. Forasmuch as it is not Master of that Reason and Wisdom according to which it acts, nor does it properly Intend those Ends which it acts for; nor indeed is it Expressly Conscious of what it doth; it not Knowing but only Doing, according to Commands & Laws impref. upon it. Neither of which things ought to seem strange or incredible, since Nature may as well act Regularly and Artificially, without any Knowledge and Confonnous of its own, as Forms of Letters compounded together, may Print Coherent Philosophick Sence, though they understand nothing at all; and it may also act for the sake of those Ends, that are not intended by itself, but some Higher Being, as well as the Saw or Hatchet in the hand of the Architect or Mechanick doth, in order that the end may be served, and the office of something, though it self does not ratiocinate, nor intend or design anything, but is only obedient to that which does so. It is true, that our Humane Actions are not governed by such exact Reason, Art, and Wisdom, nor carried on with such Constancy, Eaveneens and Uniformity, as the Actions of Nature are; notwithstanding which, since we act according to a Knowledge of our own, and are Masters of that Wisdom by which our Actions are directed, since we do not act Fatally only, but Electively and Intendingly, with Conversation and Self-perception; the Rational Life that is in us, ought to be accounted a much Higher and more Noble Perfection, than that Plaftick Life of Nature. Nay, this Plaftick Nature, is so far from being the First and Higheft Life, that it is indeed the Last and Lowest of all.
And though this Platistick Nature contain no small part of Divine Providence in it, yet since it is a thing that cannot act Electively nor with Diference, it must needs be granted that there is a Higher and Divine Providence than this, which also predizes over the Corporeal World it self, which was a thing likewise insulited upon by that Philosopher, which in the world, are not adninistered merely by Spermatick Reasons, but by Parilepticke (that is, Comprehensive Intellectual Reasons) which are in order of Nature before the other, because in the Spermatick Reasons cannot be contained that which is contrary to them, &c. Where though this Philosopher may extend his Spermatick Reasons further than we do our Platistick Nature in this place, (which is only confined to the Motions of Matter) yet he concludes, that there is a higher Principle prediding over the Universe than this. So that it is not Ratio mera & consifia, a Reason drowned in Matter, and confounded with it, which is the Supreme Governor of the World, but a Providence perfectly Intellectual, Abstrait and Released.

20. But though the Plastick Nature be the Lowest of all Lives, nevertheless since it is a Life, it must needs be Incorporeal; all Life being such. For Body being nothing but Artitipous Extension, or Filling Bulk, nothing but mere Outside, Allends extra Allind, together with Passive Capability, hath no Internal Energy, Self-activity, or Life belonging to it; it is not able so much as to Move it self, and therefore much less can it Artificially direct its own Motion. Moreover, in the Efformation of the Bodies of Animals, it is One and the self-same thing that directs the Whole; that which Contrives and Frames the Eye, cannot be a distinct thing from that which Frames the Ear; nor that which makes the Hand, from that which makes the Foot; the same thing which delineates the Veins, must also form the Arteries; and that which fabricates the Nerves must also project the Muscles and Joynts; it must be the same thing that designs and Organizes the Heart and Brain, with such Communications betwixt them; one and the self-same thing must needs have in it, the entire Idea.
Indeed Aristotle is severely cenured by some learned men for this, that though he talk every where of such a Nature as acts Regularly, Artificially and Methodically, in order to the Best, yet he does no where positively declare whether this Nature of his be Corporeal or Incorporeal, Substantial or Accidental, which yet is the least to be wondered at in him, because he does not clearly determine these same points concerning the Rational Soul neither, but seems to stagger uncertainly about them. In the mean time it cannot be denied, but that Aristotle's Followers do for the most part conclude this Nature of his to be Corporeal; whereas notwithstanding, according to the Principles of this Philosophy, it cannot possibly be such: For there is nothing else attributed to Body in it, besides these three, Matter, Form and Accidents; neither of which can be the Aristotlean Nature. First, it cannot be Matter; because Nature, according to Aristotle, is supposed to be the Principle of Motion and Activity, which Matter in itself is devoid of. Moreover Aristotle concludes, that they who assign only a Material Cause, assign no Cause at all ἣς καὶ ἄλλες, of well and fit, of that Regular and Artificial Frame of things which is ascribed to Nature; upon both which accounts, it is determined by that Philosopher, that is φωνα μᾶλλον ἄκρος καὶ ἄκρα, of all, Nature is more a Principle and Cause than Matter, and therefore it cannot be one and the same thing with it. Again, it is as plain, that Aristotle's Nature cannot be the Forms of particular Bodies neither, as Vulgar Peripatetickseem to conceive, these being all Generated and Produced by Nature, and as well Corruptible as Generable. Whereas Nature is such a thing as is neither Generated nor Corrupted, it being the Principle and Cause of all Generation and Corruption. To make Nature and the Material Forms of Bodies to be one and the self-same thing, is all one as if one should make the Seal (with the Stamper too) to be one and the same thing, with the Signature upon the Wax. And Lastly, Aristotle's Nature can least of all be the Accidents or Qualities of Bodies; because these at only in Vertue of their Substance, neither can they exercise any Active Power over the Substance it self in which they are; whereas the Plastic Nature is a thing that Dominets over the Substance of the whole Corporeal Universe, and which Subordinately to the Deity, put both Heaven and Earth into this Frame in which now it is. Wherefore since Aristotle's Nature can be neither the
21. Now if the Platonic Nature be Incorporeal, then it must of necessity, be either an Inferiour Power or Faculty of some Soul which is also Consciouis, Sensitive or Rational; or else a lower Substantial Life by it self, devoid of Animal Consciousness. The Platonists seem to affirm both these together, namely that there is a Platonic Nature lodged in all particular Souls of Animals, Brutes and Men, and also that there is a General Platonic or Spermatick Principle of the whole Universe distinct from their Higher Mundane Soul, though subordinate to it, and dependent upon it, *καταγγελοντάς* τινας προ¬
τορικὲς διανοητικὰς ηλικίας. That which is called Nature, is the Offspring of an higher Soul, which hath a more Powerful Life in it. And though Aristotle do not so clearly acknowledge the Incorpoerity and Substan¬
tiality of Souls, yet he concurs very much with this Platonic Do¬
ctrine, that Nature is either a Lower Power or Faculty of some Consci¬
ous Soul, or else an Inferiour kind of Life by it self, depending upon a Superior Soul.

And this we shall make to appear from his Book De Partibus Ani¬
malium, after we have taken notice of some considerable Prelimina¬
ry Pallages in it in order thereunto. For having first declared, that besides the Material Cause, there are other Causes also of Natural Generations, namely these two, ἥπερ εἰς ἐνέργειας ἡ ζωὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ, τοῦ ἐνυπόκτου, that for whose sake, (or the Final Cause) and that from which the Principle of Motion is, (or the Efficient Cause) he determines that the former of these Two, is the principal, φαίνεται ἐν πρώτῳ ἐν λυπομένῳ ἐνεχθέν τοιναποτοιν, ἁγιαὶ ἐξ οἱ ἐφόσον, ἄριστος ἀριστοκράτωσ, ἐντὸς τοῦ τέχνης τοῖς φυσικοῖς προσεχο

The chiefest of these two Causes seems to be the Final or the Intending Cause; for this is Reason, and Reason is alike a Principle in Artificial and in Natural things. Nay the Philosopher adds excellently, that there is more of Reason and Art, in the things of Nature, than there is in those things that are Artificially made by men, μᾶλλον δὲ ζητέται ἐν τῆς καλλίκτεραι τῶν φύσεων ἀρχής, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ τέχνης. There is more of Final or Intending Caufality and of the reason of Good, in the works of Nature than in those of Humane Art. After which he greatly complains of the first and most Ancient Physiologers, meaning thereby Anaximander, and those other Ionicks before Anaxagoras, that they considered only τῶν ὑμνῶν ἀρχῶν, the Material Principle and Cause of things, without attending to those Two other Causes, the Principle of Motion, and that which aims at Ends, they talking only, of Fire, Water, Air and Earth, and generating the whole World, from the Fruitious Concource of these Sensible Bodies. But at length Aristotle falls upon Democritus, who being Junior to those others before mentioned, Philosophized after the same Atheistical manner, but in a new way of his own, by Atoms; acknowledging no other Nature, neither in the Universe, nor in the Bodies of Animals, than that of Fortuitous Mechanism, and supposing all things to arise from the different Compositions of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions. Of which Democritick Philosphy, he gives his Con¬
sure in these following words, &c. καὶ οἷον τὰ ἁγματεῖα τὰ τῆς θερματίας ἔκαστον,
εἰς, δὲ τὰ δόγματα τῶν ἐμελετῶν, ἐκ τῆς ἀναμνήσεως καὶ ἔκτης
trans. 1. cap. 1.

If Animals and their several parts did consist of nothing but Figure and Colour, then indeed Democritus would be in the right: But a Dead man hath the same Form and Figure of Body, that he had before, and yet for all that he is not a Man; neither is a Brazen or Wooden Hand a Hand, but only Equivocally, as a Painted Physician, or Pipes made of Stone are so called. No member of a Dead Man's Body, is that which it was before, when he was alive, neither Eye, nor Hand, nor Foot. Wherefore this is but a rude way of Philosophizing, and just as if a Carpenter should talk of a Wooden Hand. For these Physiologers declare the Generations and Causes of Figures only, or the Matter out of which things are made, as Air and Earth. Whereat no Artificer would think it sufficient, to render such a Cause of any Artificial Fabric, because the Instrument happened to fall so upon the Timber, that therefore it was Hollow here and Plane there; but rather because himself made such strokes, and for such Ends, &c.

Now in the close of all, this Philosopher at length declares, That there is another Principle of Corporal things, besides the Material, and such as is not only 'the Cause of Motion, but also acts Artificially in order to Ends, εἰς τινὰ τοῦτον ὑπὸ τῇ καλέσμον φύσιν, there is such a thing as that which we call Nature, that is, not the Fortuitous Motion of Sensible Matter, but a Plaftick Regular and Artificial Nature, such as acts for Ends and Good; declaring in the same place, what this Nature is, namely that it is Ψυχή, ὡς Ψυχής μέρες, ὡς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, Soul, or Part of Soul, or not without Soul 5 and from thence inferring, that it properly belongs to a Physiologer, to treat concerning the Soul also. But he concludes afterwards, ὡς Πλαστική Ψυχή φύσιν, that the whole Soul is not Nature; whence it remains, that according to Aristotle's fence, Nature is Ψυχής μέρες, ὡς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, or not without Soul, that is, either a lower Part or Faculty of some Conscious Soul 5 or else an Inferiour kind of Life by it self, which is not without Soul, but Subordinate to it and dependent on it.

22. As for the Bodies of Animals Aristotle first resolves in General, that Nature in them is either the whole Soul, or else some part of it, φύσις ἐκ οἰκεῖας, ὡς τὸ τέλος τῆς ζωῆς, ἤτοι πάση ἡ Ψυχὴ, ὡς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, Nature as the Moving Principle, or at that which acts Artificially for Ends, (so far as concerns the Bodies of Animals) is either the whole Soul, or else some Part of it. But afterward he determines more particularly, that the Plaftick Nature is not the whole Soul in Animals, but only some part of it; and πάση ἡ Ψυχή φύσις, ὥσπερ τοίχων σωτηρίας, that is, Nature in Animals, properly so called, is some Lower Power or Faculty lodged in their respective Souls, whether Sensitive or Rational.

And that there is Plaftick Nature in the Souls of Animals, the fame Aristotle elsewhere affirms and proves after this manner: τῇ τὰ σώματα εἰς Γανάλια φακάων, τὸ πόρον, τὴν γνώσιν, διαστη-σθῆσθαι γὰρ εἰ μόνι μοι ὤν τὸ καλόν, εἰς ἠπαθή, τὸ τῆς γνώσεως, ἢ τὸ ἀληθῆν τῆς γνώσεως, τῆς φακᾶς. What is that which in the Bodies of Animals holds together
Lodged in the Souls of Animals.

Chap. III.

Together such things as of their own Nature would otherwise move contrary ways, and the under, as Fire and Earth, which would be distracted and dissipated, the one tending upwards, the other downwards, were there not something to hinder them: now if there be any such thing, this must be the Soul, which is also the Cause of Nourishment and Augmentation. Where the Philosopher adds, that though some were of Opinion, that Fire was that which was the Cause of Nourishment and Augmentation in Animals, yet this was indeed but evadition πας, και μης ἄνως γς επίκτην, ἀλλά μᾶλλον ή εὐξίς, only the Concourse or Instrument, and not simply the Cause, but rather the Soul. And to the same purpose he philosophizeth elsewhere, ἐνε ἐπι ταῖς ἐποίησις της Εὐξίς, ἀρκετον τοις ἑαυτῷ ἐν ταῖς Εὔξεις, ἄρτος Εὐξείνων ποταλε: Neither is Conciliation by which Nourishment is made in Animals done without the Soul, nor without Heat, for all things are done by Fire.

And certainly it seems very agreeable to the Phenomena, to acknowledge something in the Bodies of Animals Superior to Mechanism as that may well be thought to be, which keeps the more fluid parts of them constantly in the same Form and Figure, so as not to be enormously altered in their Growth by disproportionate nourishment; that which restores Flesh that was lost, consolidates dissolved Continuities, Incorporates the newly received Nourishment, and joins it Continuously with the preexistent parts of Flesh and Bone; which regenerates and repairs Veins consumed or cut off; which causes Dentition in so regular a manner, and that not only in Infants, but also Adult persons; that which calls off Excrements and dischargeth Superfluities; which makes things seem ungrateful to an Interior Sense, that were notwithstanding pleasing to the Taste. That Nature of Hippocrates, that is the Curatrix of Diseases, ἐλ. φυσικής ὧν ἐπιτρέπων ἦταν, and that Archon of the Chymists or Paracelsians, to which all Medicaments are but Subservient, as being able to effect nothing of themselves without it. I say, there seems to be such a Principle as this in the Bodies of Animals, which is not Mechanical but Vital, and therefore since Entities are not to be multiplied without necessity, we may with Aristotle conclude it to be μεσος or μεσον ανεβας, a certain part of the Soul of those Animals, or a Lower Inconscient Power lodged in them.

23. Besides this Plastick Nature which is in Animals, forming their several Bodies Artificially, as so many Microcosms or Little Worlds, there must be also a general Plastick Nature in the Microcosm the whole Corporeal Univerfe, that which makes all things thus to conspire every where, and agree together into one Harmony. Concerning which Plastick Nature of the Univerfe, the Author de Mundo writes after this manner, ἦν ἐγὼ ὁ πάντων ἐπισκόπων ηπιστήμων μάχαι Ὢ ὧν ὁ ποιήσας ὁ παράγοντας, One Power passing thorough all things, ordered and formed the whole World. Again he calls the same πνεύμα, ἐν πνεύμα, ἐν ἀτόμων σώμα, a Spirit, and a Living and Generative Nature, and plainly declares it, to be a thing distinct from the Deity, but Subordinate to it and dependent on it. But Aristotle himself in that ge-
nuine Work of his before mentioned, speaks clearly and positively concerning this Plastick Nature of the Univerfe, as well as that of Animals, in these words, *καθ' ἑαυτοῦ. ὡς τοῖς πε-
χωρείς οὖν ἡ πτέρνη, ὡς ἡ αὐτοί τοῖς πράγμασι ἄλλα τις ἁιχό ἡ σωτη
ία τοιαύτα ἐν ἰχθυί, καθάπερ τοῦ θησείου ἢ τοῦ ψαρίζου ἢ τοῦ πατέρας. Ξύ
μελλον εἰκὸς ἢ ἐρωτή μαχηθηκείν ὑπὸ τοιαύτας εἰςίας εἰ κρέναι, εἰ ἐνεβο
διὰ τοιαύτας εἰς τόμον μάκλον, ἢ τα ἐς το Θεωρ. τὸ γὰρ πειραθήκον εἰ ζεσ-
ελθὸν πολὶ μάκλον φανερέται εἰς τοὺς ἑγεμονίας, ἢ ἐκείμενον τοῦ ἑ ἀλλοτρ
ἀλλας, ἢ ἐς τοιχί, ξύλο τα θωτα μάκλον ὃ ἐνδο κέλαν ἑκάστων διάφορον πολὺν ἐκ
νομινών ἢ ἀρνημεῖον ἢ ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ τοὺς ἢ τὸ ἀνθρώπινο τοῖς ἢ τοῖς
ὁμών, ἢ ἀπὸ τοὺς ἢς ἄνδρας ἡ ἄνθρωπος ἡ ἄνθρωπος. It seems, that as
there is Art in Artificial things, so in the things of Nature, there is an-
other such like Principle or Cause, which we ourselves partake of; in
the same manner as we do of Heat, and Cold, from the Univerfe. Where-
fore it is more probable that the whole World was at first made by such a
Cause as this (if at least it were made) and that it is still conceived by
the same, than that Mortal Animals should be so: For there is much
more of Order and determinate Regularity, in the Heavenly Bodies than
in our selves; but more of Fortuitousness and inconstant Regularity among
these Mortal things. Notwithstanding which, some there are, who,
though they cannot but acknowledge that the Bodies of Animals were all
framed by an Artificial Nature, yet they will needs contend that the
System of the Heavens sprung merely from Fortune and Chance; although
there be not the least appearance of Fortuitousness or Tenuity in it.
And then he sums up all into this Conclusion, ἢς ἐν ἑαυτῷ παρεθέντι ἐς τι
τοῖς να ἣ καλεθερέσει. Wherefore it is manifest, that there is some
such thing as that which we call Nature, that is, that there is not only
an Artificial, Methodical and Plastick Nature in Animals, by which
their respective Bodies are Framed and Confervd; but also that there
is such a General Plastick Nature likewise in the Univerfe, by
which the Heavens and whole World are thus Artificially Ordered
and Disposed.

24. Now whereas Aristotle in the forecited Words, tells us, that
we partake of Life and Understanding, from that in the Univerfe, after
the same manner as we partake of Heat and Cold, from that Heat
and Cold that is in the Univerfe; It is observable, that this was a
Notion borrowed from Socrates; (as we understand both from Xenop-
phon and Plato) that Philosopher having used it as an Argumentation
to prove a Deity. And the Sence of it is represented after this man-
ner by the Latin Poet;

Principio Cælum ac Terram, Campsique Liquesentes,
Lucentium Globum Luna, Titanique Astra,
Spiritus intus alit, totidem Infusa per Arma,
Mens agitans Molem, & Magnae Corpora miscent.
Inde Hominum Pecudumque Genus, Vitæque Volantur.

From whence it may be collected, that Aristotle did suppose, this Plas-
tick Nature of the Univerfe to be, ἢ μέσον ζουτικόν, ἢ μή ἐναι ζουτικόν, Ei-
ther Part of some Mundane Soul, *that was also Conscious and Intelle-
tual,
ctual, (as that Plaftick Nature in Animals is) or at least some Inferior Principle, depending on such a Soul. And indeed whatever the Do-
ctrine of the modern Peripateticks be, we make no doubt at all, but that Ariftotle himfelf held the Worlds Animation, or a Mundane 
Soul; Forasmuch as he plainly declares himfelf concerning it, elfe-
where in his Book De Celo, after this manner; 

\[\text{L.2.6.1} \]

A Soul of the World.

There is indeed One Pageſage in the fame Book De Celo, which at 
first light, and lightly considered, may feem to contradifty this again, 
and therefore probably is that, which hath led many into a contrary 
Perfervation, that Ariftotle denied the Worlds Animation, \[\text{L.2.6.1} \]
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There is indeed One Pageſage in the same Book De Celo, which at 
first light, and lightly considered, may seem to contradict this again, 
and therefore probably is that, which hath led many into a contrary 
Perfervation, that Ariftotle denied the Worlds Animation, (which is positively affirmed by him elsewhere) but only by such a Soul, as should Violently and Forceibly agitate, or drive them round, contrary to their own Natural Inclination, whereby in the mean time, they tended downwards of themselves towards the Centre. And his fench, concerning the Motion of the
Heavens, is truly represented by Simplicius in this manner; τῷ ὕλῳ
φύσεως ην εἰσαγωγή, ὅποι ἥπερ γεγος κατάστασι, δια μένος τῶν φύσεων.
The whole World or Heaven, being as well a natural, as an Animal Body,
is moved properly by Soul, but yet by means of Nature also, as an Instrument,
so that the Motion of it is not Violent. But whereas Aristotle there intimates,
as if Plato had held the Heavens to be moved, by a Soul violently,
contrary to their Nature; Simplicius, though sufficiently addicted to
Aristotle, ingenuously acknowledges his Error herein, and vindicating
Plato from that Imputation, shews how he likewise held a Plastick
Nature, as well as a Mundane Soul; and that amongst his Ten
Instances of Motion, the Ninth is that of Nature, τὰ ἕργα ἐν κανονία,
η μεταβαλλομένων ταῖς κινήσεως ταῖς, which always moves another, being it
self changed by something else; as the Tenth, that of the Mundane Soul,
τὰ ἐν κανονία ψυχῶν ταῖς, that which originally both moves itself and
other things: as if his Meaning in that place were, That though Na-
ture be a Life and Internal Energy, yet it acts Subserviently to a Higher
Soul, as the First Original Mover.

But the Grand Objection against Aristotle's holding the Worlds An-
imation, is still behind; namely from that in his Metaphysics, where he determines the Highest Starry Heaven, to be moved by an
Immoveable Mover, commonly supposed to be the Deity it self, and
no Soul of the World; and all the other Spheres likewise, to be
moved by so many Separate Intelligences, and not by Souls. To
which we reply, that indeed Aristotle's First Immoveable Mover is no
Mundane Soul, but an Abstract Intellect Separate from Matter, and the
very Deity it self; whose manner of moving the Heavens is thus de-
scribed by him, καὶ μὰς ἐν τοιαίοις, Ἡ ἐν εἰσαγωγή, which
Mover only as being Loved: therefore besides this Supreme Unmoved Mover, that Philosopher supposed another Inferior Mover also, that is, a Mundane
Soul, as the Proper and Immediate Efficient Cause of the Heavenly
Motions; of which he speaks after this manner, καὶ μὲν ταῖς τοιαίοις,
that which it self being moved, (objectively, or by Appetite and De-
sire of the First Good) moves other things. And thus that safe and
sure-footed Interpreter, Alex. Aphrdisius, expounds his Masters
Meaning; That the Heaven being Animated, and therefore indeed
Moved by an Internal Principle of its own, is notwithstanding Origi-
inally moved, by a certain Immoveable and Separate Nature, which
is above Soul, τὰ δὲ τῶν τοιαίοις, that the Æthereal Æther,
both by its contemplating of it, and having an Appetite and Desire, of
assimilating it self therunto. Aristotle seeming to have borrowed
this Notion from Plato, who makes the Constant Regular Circum-
gration of the Heavens, to be an Imitation of the Motion or En-
ergy of Intellect. So that Aristotle's First Mover, is not properly
the Efficient, but only the Final and Objective Cause, of the Heaven-
ly Motions, the Immediate Efficient Cause thereof being Æthereal
Æther, Soul and Nature.

Neither may this be Confuted from those other Aristotelik Intelli-
gences of the Lesser Orbs; that Philosopher conceiving in like manner
concerning them, that they were also the Abstract Minds or Intellects of
certain
certain other inferior Souls, which moved their several respective Bodies or Orbs, Circularly and Uniformly, in a kind of imitation of them. For this plainly appears from hence, in that he affirms of these his inferior Intelligences likewise as well as of the supreme Moter, that they do move et tas, Move only as the end.

Where it is evident, that though Aristotle did plainly suppose a mundane Intellectual Soul, such as also contained, either in it, or under it, a Platonic Nature, yet he did not make either of these to be the supreme Deity, but resolved the first principle of things, to be One absolutely perfect Mind or Intellect, separate from Matter, which was absolutely &c. nature, an Immovable Nature, whose essence was its operation, and which moved only as being loved, or as the final cause: of which he pronounces in this manner, Dei in quibus actus esset &c. etiam illa est &c. ceterum qui deus. That upon such a principle as this, Heaven and Nature depends; that is, the animated Heaven, or mundane Soul, together with the Platonic Nature of the Universe, must of necessity depend upon such an absolutely perfect, and immovable Mind or Intellect.

Having now declared the Aristotelick Doctrine concerning the Platonic Nature of the Universe, with which the Platonick also agrees, that it is, in &c. &c., in &c. &c., either part of a mundane Intellectual Soul, (that is a lower power and faculty of it,) or else not without it, but some inferior thing depending on it; we think fit to add in this place, that though there were no such mundane Soul, as both Plato and Aristotle supposed, distinct from the supreme Deity, yet there might notwithstanding be a Platonic Nature of the Universe, depending immediately upon the Deity itself. For the Platonic Nature essentially depends upon Mind or Intellect, and could not possibly be without it; according to those words before cited, Dei in quibus actus esset &c. etiam illa est &c. Nature depends upon such an Intellectual principle; and for this cause that philosopher does elsewhere join &c. and &c. Mind and Nature both together.

25. Besides this general Platonic Nature of the Universe, and those particular Platonic powers in the souls of animals, it is not impossible but that there may be other Platonic Natures also (as certain lower lives, or vegetative souls) in some greater parts of the Universe; all of them depending, if not upon some higher conscious Soul, yet at least upon a perfect intellect, predominant over the whole. As for example; though it be not reasonable to think, that every plant, herb and pile of grass, hath a particular Platonic life, or vegetative soul of its own, distinct from the mechanism of the body; nor that the whole earth is an animal endowed with a conscious soul: yet there may possibly be, for ought we know, one Platonic nature or life, belonging to the whole terrestrial (or terraqueous) globe, by which all plants and vegetables, continuous with it, may be differently formed, according to their different seeds, as also minerals and other bodies framed, and whatsoever else is above the power of fortuitous mechanism effected, as by the immediate cause, though always
always Subordinate to other Causes, the chief whereof is the Deity. And this perhaps may ease the Minds of those, who cannot but think it too much, to impose all upon one Plastick Nature of the Universe.

26. And now we have finished our First Task, which was to give an Acccount of the Plastick Nature, the Sum whereof briefly amounts to this; That it is a certain Lower Life than the Animals, which acts Regularly and Artificially, according to the Direction of Mind and Understanding, Reason and Wisdom, for Ends, or in Order to Good, though itself do not know the Reason of what it does, nor is Master of that Wisdom according to which it acts, but only a Servant to it, and Drudging Executioner of the same; it operating Fatally and Sympathetically, according to Laws and Commands, prescribed to it by a Perfect Intellect, and impress upon it; and which is either a Lower Faculty of some Conscious Soul, or else an Inferior kind of Life or Soul by it self; but essentially depending upon an Higher Intellect.

We proceed to our Second Undertaking; which was to shew, how grossly those Two Sorts of Atheists before mentioned, the Stoical or Cosmo-plastick, and the Stratonical or Hylzoick, both of them acknowledging this Plastick Life of Nature, do mistake the Notion of it, or Pervert it and Abuse it, to make a certain Spurious and Counterfeit God-Almighty of it, (or a First Principle of all things) thereby excluding the True Omnipotent Deity, which is a Perfect Mind, or Consciously Understanding Nature, preëd'ring over the Universe; they substituting this Stupid Plastick Nature in the room of it.

Now the Chief Errors or Mistakes of these Atheists concerning the Plastick Nature, are these. Four following. First, that they make that to be the First Principle of all, and the Highest thing in the Universe, which is the Last and Lowest of all Lives; a thing Effentially Secondary, Derivative and Dependent. For the Plastick Life of Nature is but the mere Embrance of Intellectuality, a faint and shadowy Imitation of Mind and Understanding; upon which it doth as Effentially depend, as the Shadow doth upon the Body, the Image in the Glass upon the Face, or the Echo upon the Original Voice. So that if there had been no Perfect Mind or Intellect in the World, there could no more have been any Plastick Nature in it, than there could be an Image in the Glass without a Face, or an Echo without an Original Voice. If there be no, then there must be no; if there be a Plastick Nature, that acts Regularly and Artificially in Order to Ends, and according to the Best Wisdom, though itself not comprehending the reason of it, nor being clearly Conscious of what it doth; then there must of necessity be a Perfect Mind or Intellect, that is, a Deity upon which it depends. Wherefore Aristoëne does like a Philosopher in joinning no and no, Nature and Mind both together; but these Atheists do very Absurdly and Unphilosophically, that would make a Senseless and Inconscious Plastick Nature, and therefore without any Mind or Intellect, to be the First Original of all things.

Secondly, these Atheists augment the Former Error, in supposing thole
those Higher Lives of Sense or Animality, and of Reason or Understanding, to rise both of them from that Lower Sensible Life of Nature, as the only Original Fundamental Life. Which is a thing altogether as Irrational and Absurd, as if one should suppose the Light that is in the Air or Ether, to be the Only Original and Fundamental Light, and the Light of the Sun and Stars but a Secondary and Derivative thing from it, and nothing but the Light of the Air Modified and Improved by Condensation. Or as if one should maintain that the Sun and Moon, and all the Stars, were really nothing else, but the mere Reflections of those Images that we see in Rivers and Ponds of Water. But this hath always been the Sottish Humour and Guile of Atheists, to invent the Order of the Universe, and hang the Picture of the World, as of a Man, with its Heels upwards. Conscientious Reason and Understanding, being a far higher Degree of Life and Perfection, than that Dull Plastick Nature, which does only Do, but not Know, can never possibly emerge out of it; neither can the Duplication of Corporeal Organs be ever able to advance that Simple and Stupid Life of Nature into Redoubled Conscionfulness or Self-perception, nor any Triplication or indeed Millechputation of them, improve the same into Reasoning.

Thirdly; for the better Colouring of the Former Errors, the Hylozoists adulterate the Notion of the Plastick Life of Nature, confounding it with Wisdom and Understanding. And though themselves acknowledge, that no Animal-sense, Self-perception and Conscionfulness belongs to it, yet they will have it to be a thing Perfectly Wise, and consequently every Atom of Sensible Matter that is in the whole World, to be Infallibly Omniscient, as to all its own Capacities and Congruities, or whatsoever it self can Do or Suffer, which is plainly Contradictious. For though there may be such a thing as the Plastick Nature, that according to the Former Description of it, can Do without Knowing, and is devoid of Express Conscionfulness or Self-perception, yet Perfect Knowledge and Understanding without Conscionfulness, is Non-sence and Impossibility. Wherefore this must needs be condemned for a great piece of Sottishness, in the Hylozoick Atheists, that they attribute Perfect Wisdom and Understanding to a Stupid Inconceivable Nature, which is nothing but Hypothesis, the mere Drudging Instrument, or Mnemar Officer of Perfect Mind.

Lastly; these Atheists err in this, that they make this Plastick Life of Nature, to be a mere Material or Corporeal thing, whereas Matter or Body cannot move it self, much less therefore can it Artificially order and dispose of its own Motion. And though the Plastick Nature be indeed the Lowell of all Lives, yet notwithstanding since it is a Life, or Internal Energy, and Self-activity, distinct from Local Motion, it must needs be Incorporeal, all Life being Ellentially such. But the Hylozoists conceive grozly both of Life and Understanding, spreading them all over upon Matter, just as Butter is spread upon Bread, or Plaster upon a Wall, and accordingly slicing them out, in different Quantities and Bulks, together with it; they contending that they are
are but Inadequate Conceptions of Body, as the only Substance; and consequently concluding, that the Vulgarly received Notion of God, is nothing else but such an Inadequate Conception of the Matter of the Whole Corporeal Universe, mistaken for a Complete and Entire Substance by its self, that is supposed to be the Cause of all things. Which fond Dream or Oration of theirs, will be further confuted in due place. But it is now time to put a Period, to this long (though necessity) Digression, concerning the Plaftick Life of Nature, or an Artificial, Orderly and Methodical Nature.

XXXVIII. Plato gives an account, why he judged it necessary in those times, publicly to propose that Atheiftick Hypothesis, in order to a Contutation, as also to produce Rational Arguments for the Proof of a Deity, after this manner: ει μὴ καθίσμευον ὑμεῖς οἱ τάσσει λαγμα ἡ τῆς πάντων, ἃς ἐπερέ εἴτεν, άναθέτας, ἱδίων ἐν ἑκά τῶν επεμερουσίων ζών, ὡς οἱ Σοι, νῦν ἂ ναθίην. Had not these Atheiftick Doctrines been publicly divulged, and made known in a manner to all, it would not have been needful to have confuted them, nor by Reasons to prove a Deity; but now it is necessary. And we conceive that the same Necessity at this time, will justify our present undertaking likewise; since these Atheiftick Doctrines have been so boldly vented, and publickly asferted in this latter Age of ours, as ever they could be in Plato's time. When the severity of the Athenian Government, much needs a great check to such Defigns, Socrates having been put to death upon a mere falfé and groundlefs Accufation of Atheifm, and Protagoras, (who doubtles was a Real Atheift) having escaped the fame punifhment no otherwise than by flight, his Books being notwithftanding publicly burnt in the Market-place at Athens, and himself condemned to perpetual Exile, though there was nothing at that time proved against him, save only this one Sceptical Palflage, in the beginning of a Book of his, περὶ μὲν ἥν οὐκ ἕξεσθαι εἴτεν, ἦν ἀνεπείραθον ἃς τῆς εἴτεν, πολλὰ τῶν χαλκοθηλείων οὐκέτι ἐν αὐτὸς ἔπορος, μὴ γὰρ ἐστιν ἄλλα τῆς δωρίνης. Concerning the Gods, I have nothing at all to say, either that they be or be not; there being many things that hinder the knowledge of this Matter, both the Obscurity of the thing it self, and the Shortness of humane Life. Whereas Atheifm in this Latter Age of ours, hath been impudently asferted, and most indeftruously promoted: that very Atomick Form, that was first introduced (a little before Plato's time) by Leucippus, Protagoras and Democritus, having been afio Revived amongt us, and that with no small Pomp and Ostentation of Wisdom and Philosophy.

It was before observed that there were two several Forms of Atomical Philosophy; First, the moft Ancient and Genuine that was Religious, called Mofchical (or if you will Mofaical) and Pythagorical; Secondly, the Adulterated Atheiftick Atomology, called Leucippean or Democritical. Now accordingly, there have been in this Latter Age of ours, two several Succesive Reperfessions or Restitutions of those two Atomologies. For Rematus Cartesius first revived and restored the Atomick Philosophy, agreeably for the moft part, to that ancient Mofchical and Pythagorical Form, acknowledging besides Extended Substance
CHAP. III. Lately Revived.

Substance and Corporeal Atoms, another Cogitative Incorporated Substance, and joining Metaphysic or Theology, together with Phylo-
yogy, to make up one entire System of Philosophy. Nor can it well be
 doubted, but that this Physiology of his, as to the Mechanick part of
it, hath been Elaborated by the ingenious Author, into an Exactness
at least equal with the best Atomologies of the Ancients. Nevertheless,
this Cartesian Philosophy is highly obnoxious to Censure upon
some Accompns, the Chief whereof is this; That deviating from
that Primitive Mechanical Atomology, in rejecting all Plastick Nature,
it derives the whole System of the Corporeal Universe, from the Ne-
cessary Motion of Matter, only divided into Particles Insensibly small,
and turned round in a Vortex, without the Guidance or Direction of
any Understanding Nature. By means whereof, though it boalt of
Salving all the Corporeal Phenomena, by mere Fortuitous Mechanism,
and without any Final or Mental Causality, yet it gives no Accompt
at all of that which is the Grandest of all Phenomena, the \( \pi \omega \kappa \phi \alpha \lambda \kappa \),
The Orderly Regularity and Harmony of the Mundane System. The Oc-
casion of which Miscarriage hath been already intimated, namely
from the acknowledging only Two Heads of Being, Extended and
Cogitative; and making the Essence of Cognition to consist in Express
Consciousness; from whence it follows, that there could be no Plastick
Nature, and therefore either all things must be done by Fortuitous
Mechanism, or else God himself be brought Immediately upon the
Stage, for the falling of all Phenomena. Which Latter Absurdity, our
Philosopher being over careful to avoid, cast himself upon the For-
mer, the banishing of all Final and Mental Causality quite out of the
World, and acknowledging no other Philosophick Causes, beside
Material and Mechanical. It cannot be denied, but that even some of
the ancient Religious Atomists, were also too much infected with
this Mechanizing Humour; but Renatus Cartesius hath not only out-
done them all herein, but even the very Atheists themselves also, as
shall be thewcd afterward. And therefore as much as in him lies,
has quite disarmed the World, of that grand Argument for a Deity,
taken from the Regular Frame and Harmony of the Universe. To
which Grofs Miscarriage of his, there might be also another added,
That he seems to make Matter Necessarily Existent, and Essen-
tially Infinite and Eternal. Notwithstanding all which, we cannot en-
tertain that Uncharitable Opinion of him, that he really designed A-
theism, the Fundamental Principles of his Philosophy being such, as
that no Atheistick Structure can possibly be built upon them. But
shortly after this Cartesian Restitution of the Primitive Atomology that
acknowledgeth Incorporated Substance, we have had our Leucippus and
Democritus too, who also revived and brought again upon the Stage,
that other Atheistick Atomology, that makes \( \alpha \kappa \zeta \kappa \phi \lambda \overline{\omega} \kappa \alpha \nu \kappa \overline{\omega} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha \nu \kappa \overline{\omega} \kappa \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha \nu \), Sen-
lefs and Lifelefs Atoms, to be the only Principles of all things in the Uni-
verse, thereby necessarily excluding, besides Incorporated Substance and
Immorality of Souls, a Deity and Natural Morality; as also making
all Actions and Events, Materially and Mechanically necessary.

Now there could be no Satisfactory Conutation of this Atheistick
Hypothesis, without a fair Proposals first made of the several Grounds of
of it, to their best advantage, which we have therefore endeavoured in the Former Chapter. The Answers to which Atheistic Arguments, ought, according to the Laws of Method, to be referred for the Last Part of the whole Treatise, where we are positively to determine the Right Intellectual System of the Universe; it being properly our Work here, only to give an Account of the Three False Hypotheses of the Mundane System, together with their several Grounds. Nevertheless, because it might not only seem Indecorous, for the Answers to those Atheistic Arguments, to be so long deferred, and placed so far behind the Arguments themselves, but also prove otherwise really Inconvenient, we shall therefore choose rather to break those Laws of Method, (neglecting the Scrupulosity thereof) and subjoin them immediately in this place, craving the Readers Pardon for this Preposterousness.

It is certain that the Source of all Atheism, is generally a Dull and Earthy Disbelief of the Existence of things beyond the Reach of Sense; and it cannot be denied but that there is something of Immorality in the Temper of all Atheists, as all Atheistic Doctrine tends also to Immorality. Notwithstanding which, it must not be therefore concluded, that all Dogmatick Atheists came to be such, merely by means of Gros Intemperance, Senility, and Debauchery. Plato indeed describes one sort of Atheists in this manner; οἳ δὲν περὶ τὴν ὅρασιν, τὴν ἤδωρον γνώσιν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀπρακτόν τι θυματικόν ὑποστὶ περιστροφήν, μὲνοι τὲ λογικὴ ἡ μαθησις ἐξίσου ποιεῖν. Such who together with this Opinion, that all things are void of Gods, are added also by Intemperance of Pleasures and Pains, and hurried away with Violent Lafts, being Persons otherwise endued with strong Memories, and quick Wits. And these are the Debauched, Ranting, and Heavily Atheists. But besides these, that Philosopher tells us, that there is another Sort of Atheists also, οἳ μὲν ὑπαξια ἔγνωκεν τὸ περίπτερον, δὸς φιλος περιστροφῆς ὑποστὶ, μετατάσσει τὰ γνώμαια τὰς κακὰς, καὶ τὴν ὅδεγησιν τὸν ἀδικίαν, ἢ τὰς παρατέκτων περὶ αὐτῶν περὶβλήσεων, τὰς τὴν μὴ διακοσμοῦσιν ἢ ἀνθρώπων φαύλησιν, τὰς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ὑποστὶς. Such, who though they think there be no Gods at all, yet notwithstanding being naturally disposed to Justice and Moderation, as they will not do Vain and Exorbitant things themselves, so they will shun the Conversation of wicked debauched persons, and delight rather in the Society of those that are Fair and Just. And these are a Sort of Externally honest, or Civilized Atheists. Now what that thing is, which besides Gros Senility and Debauchery, might tempt men to entertain Atheistic Opinions, the same Philosopher also declares; namely that it is, an Affection of Singularity, or of seeming Wiser than the Generality of Mankind. For thus when Clinias had disputed honestly against Atheists, from thofe Vulgar Topicks, of the Regularity and Harmony of the Universe (observable in the Courses of Sun, Moon and Stars, and the Scaions of the Year) and of the common Notions of Mankind, in that both Greeks and Barbarians generally agreed in this, that there were Gods, thinking he had thereby made a Sufficient Confutation of Atheism, the Athenian Hope hereupon discovers a great Fear and Jealousy which he had, lest he should thereby but render himself
of Contempt to Atheists, as being a conceited and scornful Generation of men. Αν φοβομαι γα τις μισής μου ψυχής, μην ἐμπόδισον καθαρρήσεμον, μικρὸς μεν ἐν καθένας, τινα μικρὸς γα τὴν ουσίαν της, τω διαψευυτένεις οὖν, ἀλλ' ξύνης ἀκριβὴς μένον ιδέαν τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ τιθα, τοίχων γινώσκας τοὺς ψυχὴς οὕτως, &c. I am afraid of these wicked men the Atheists, lest they should despise you: For you are ignorant concerning them, when you think the only Cause of Atheism to be Intemperance of Pleasures and Lusks, violently hurrying mens Souls on to a wicked Life. Clin. What other Cause of Atheism can there be besides this? Ath. That which you are not aware of, who live remotely, namely, ἄμαλχα μαλαχαι ζελητῶ δεκατίων ἐκας ἐπιστήμῃς. A certain grievous Ignorance, which yet notwithstanding hath the appearance of the greatest Wisdom. And therefore afterwards, when that Philosopher goes about to propoe the Atheistick Hypothesis, he calls it, καθ' ρήματα δε- ξανθός διπλωμένοι σαρκάσμοι ἀπόλυτον λόγον. That which to many seemeth to be the Wisest and profoundest of all Doctrines.

And we find the same thing at this very day, that Atheists make a great Pretence to Wisdom and Philosophy, and that many are tempted to maintain Atheistick Opinions, that they may gain a Reputation of Wit by it. Which indeed was one Reason that the rather induced us, nakedly to reveal all the Mysteries of Atheism, because we observed, that so long as these things are concealed and kept up in Huggermugger, many will be the rather apt to suspect, that there is some great Depth and Profundity of Wisdom lodged in them, and that it is some Noble and Generous Truth, which the Bigotick Religionists endeavours to smoother and oppress.

Now the Case being thus, it was pertinently suggested also, by the aforementioned Philosopher, κατὸ νησίδαν τὸ διαφυτεύον, εἰ δεινεῖς τοὺς ψυχήν ἀκριβῶς, ἄνοιξιν τὸ ἐξαιρετός, ἅμα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ἂν ἐξαιρετισθήσεσιν ἑξωρίσου. That it must needs be a Matter of no small moment, for any one to make it appear, that they who maintain wicked Atheistick Opinions, do none of them reason rightly, but grossly stumble in all their Ratiocinations. And we hope to effect this in our present Undertaking, to make it evident, that Atheists are no such Conjurers, as (though they hold no Spirits) they would be thought to be; no such Gigantick men of Reason, nor Profound Philosopher, but that notwithstanding all their Pretensions to Wit, their Atheism is really nothing else, but άμαλχα μαλαχαι χαλεπϊ, a most Grievous Ignorance, Sottishness and Stupidity of Mind in them.

Wherefore we shall in the next place, Conjure down all those Devils raised and displayed in their most Formidable Colours, in the Precedent Chapter; or rather we shall discover that they are really nothing else, but what these Atheists pretend God and Incorporeal Spirits to be, More Phantastick Spectres and Impostures, Vain Imaginations of deluded Minds, utterly devoid of all Truth and Reality. Neither shall we only Confute those Atheistick Arguments, and to stand upon our defensive Posture; but we shall also assail Atheism even with its own Weapons, and plainly demonstrate, that all Forms of
of Atheism are unintelligible Nonsense, and Absolute Impossibility to Humane Reason. As we shall likewise over and above, Occasionally insert some (as we think) Undeniable Arguments for a Deity.


1. That neither the Hylozoick nor Cosmo-plastick Atheists are condemned for asserting an Orderly and Artificial Plastick Nature, as a Life distinct from the Animal, however this be a Thing exploded, not only by the Atomick Atheists, but also by some Professed Theists, who notwithstanding might have an undiscovered Tang of the Mechanically-Atheistik Humour hanging about them. 2. If there be no Plastick Artificial Nature admitted, then it must be concluded, that either all things come to pass by Fortuitous Mechanism, and Material Necessity (the Motion of Matter unguided) or else that God doth ωὐταρχεῖν ἑαυτῷ, do all things himself Immediately and Miraculously, framing the Body of every Gnat and Fly, as it were with his own hands; since Divine Laws and Commands cannot Execute themselves, nor be the proper Efficient Causes of things in Nature. 3. To suppose all things to come to pass Fortuitously, or by the Unguided Motion of Matter, a thing altogether as Irrational as it is Atheistical and Impious; there being many Phenomena, not only above the Powers of Mechanism, but also contrary to the Laws of it. The Mechanick Theists make God an Idle Spectator of the Fortuitous Motions of Matter, and render his Wisdom altogether Utile and Insignificant. Aristotle's Judicious Censure of the Fortuitous Mechanicks, with the Ridiculousness of that Pretence, that Material and Mechanical Reasons are the Only Philosophical. 4. That it seems neither decorous in respect of God, nor congruous to Reason, that he should ωὐταρχεῖν ἑαυτῷ, do all things himself Immediately and Miraculously, Nature being quite Superficed and made to signify nothing. The same further confuted by the Slow and Gradual Process of things in Nature, as also by those Errors and Bungles that are committed, when the Matter proves Inert and Contumacious, arguing the Agent not to be Irresistible. 5. Reasonably inferred, that there is a Plastick Nature in the Universe, as a Subordinate Instrument of Divine Providence, in the Orderly Disposal of Matter; but yet so as not without a Higher Providence presiding over it, forasmuch as this Plastick Nature cannot all Elegantly or with Discretion. Those Laws of Nature concerning Motion, which the Mechanick Theists themselves suppose, really nothing else but a Plastick Nature. 6. The Agreeableness of this Doctrine with the Sentiments of the best Philosophers in all Ages, Aristotle, Plato, Empedocles, Heracleitus, Hippocrates,
pocrates, Zeno and the Paracelisians. Anaxagoras, though a pro-
fessed Atheist, severely confounded both by Aristotle and Plato, as an
Encourager of Atheism, merely because he used Material and Mecha-
nical Causes more than Mental and Final. Physiologers and Astra-
mers who largely suspected of Atheism in Plato's time. 7. The Pla-
fick Nature, no Occult Quality, but the only Intelligible Cause of
that which is the Grandest of all Phenomena, the Orderly Regular-
ity and Harmony of Things, which the Mechanick Theories, how-
ever pretending to scale all Phenomena, can give no account at all of.
A God, or Infinite Mind, affected by them, in vain and to no
purpose. 8. Two Things here to be performed by us; First, to give an
Accoimt of the Plastick Nature, and then to shew how the Nation of
it hath been Mistaken, and Abused by Atheists. The First General
Accoimt of this Plastick Nature according to Aristotle, that it is to
be conceived as Art it itself acting, Inwardly and Immediately upon
the Matter: as if Harmony Living in the Musical Instruments, should
move the Strings of them, without any External Impulse. 9. Two
Preeminencies of the Plastick Nature above Humane Art. First, that
whereas Humane Art acts upon the Matter from without Commonly
en and Molimiously, with Tumult and Hurliby, Nature acting on
it from within more Commandingly, doth its Work Easily, Cleverly
and Silently. Humane Art acts on the Matter Mechanically, but Na-
ture Vitaly and Magically. 10. The Second Preeminence of Nature
above Humane Art, that, whereas Humane Artists are often to seek
and at a loss, anxiously Consulting and Deliberating, and upon Second
thoughts Mend their former Work, Nature is never to seek, nor Unresolved
what to do, nor doth she ever Repent afterwards of what she hath
done, changing her former Course. Humane Artists themselves Con-
sult not, as Artists, but only for want of Art; and therefore Nature,
though never Consulting, may all Artificially. Concluded, that what
is called Nature, is really the Divine Art. 11. Nevertheless, that
Nature is not the Divine Art, but a Superfiicial, but Concreted and
Embodied in Matter: Ratio Merita & Consilium: Not the Divine
Art Archetypal, but Ethiopal. Nature differs from the Divine Art, as
the Humane Officer from the Architect. 12. Two Imperfections of
the Plastick Nature, in respect whereof it falls short even of Humane
Art; First, that though it alls for Ends Artificially, yet it self neither
Intends those Ends, nor Understands the Reason of what it doth,
and therefore cannot act Electively. The Difference between the Sper-
matick Reactions and Knowledge. Nature doth but Ape or Mimmick
the Divine Art or Wisdom, being not Master of that Reason, accord-
ing to which it alls, but only a Servant to it, and Drudging Execu-
tioner of it. 13. Proved that there may be such a thing as alls Arti-
ficially, though it self do not comprehend that Art, by which its Mo-
tions are Governed, First from Musical Habits; the Dancer
resembles the Artificial Life of Nature. 14. The same further con-
vinced from the Insemins of Brute-animals, directing them to all Ratio-
nally and Artificially, in order to their own Good and the Good of
the Universe, without any Reason of their own. The Insemins in
Brutes but Passive Imprcsses of the Divine Wisdom, and a kind of Fate
upon them. 15. The Second Imperfection of the Plastick Nature, that it
alls
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all is without Animal Philosophy, condescending, Express Conjunctive, and Consciousness, and is devoid of Self-perception and Self-enjoyment. 16. Whether this Energy of the Plastick Nature, be to be called Cognition or no, but a Logomachy or Contention about Words. Granted that what moves Matter Vital, must needs do it by some Energy of its own, distinct from Local Motion; but that there may be a simple Vital Energy, without that Duplicity which is in Synthetical, or clear and express Consciousness. Nevertheless that the Energy of Nature might be called a certain Drowsie, Unawakened, or Atonis'd Cognition. 17. Instances which render it probable, that there may be a Vital Energy, without Synthetical, clear and express Consciousness, or Consciousness. 18. The Plastick Nature, acting neither Knowledge nor Phantastically, acts Fatally, Magically and Sympathetically. The Divine Laws and Fate, as to Matter, not mere Cognition in the Mind of God, but an Energetic and Effective Principle; and the Plastick Nature, the true and proper Fate of Matter, or the Corporeal World. What Magic is, and that Nature which acts Fatally, acts also Magically and Sympathetically. 19. That the Plastick Nature, though it be the Divine Art and Fate, yet for all that, it is neither God nor Godless, but a Low and Imperfect Creature, it acts Artificially and Rationally no otherwise, than compounded Forms of Letters, when printing Coherent Philosophick Sense, nor for Ends, than a Saw or Hatchet in the hands of a skilful Mechanick. The Plastick and Vegetative Life of Nature the Lowest of all Lives, and Inferior to the Sensitive. A Higher Providence than that of the Plastick Nature governing the Corporeal World it self. 20. Notwithstanding which, forasmuch as the Plastick Nature is a Life, it must needs be Incorporeal. One and the same thing, having in it an entire Model and Platform, and acting upon several distant parts of Matter at once coherently, cannot be Corporeal; and though Aristotle no where declare whether his Nature be Corporeal or Incorporeal (which he neither doth clearly concerning the Rational Soul) and his Followers conclude it to be Corporeal, yet according to the very Principles of that Philosophy it must needs be otherwife. 21. The Plastick Nature being Incorporeal, must either be a Lower Power lodged in Souls that are also Conscious, Sensive or Rational, or else a distinct Substantial Life by it self, and Inferior Kind of Soul. How the Platonists complicate both these together, with Aristotle's agreeable Determination, that Nature is either Part of a Soul, or not without Soul. 22. The Plastick Nature as to Animals, according to Aristotle, a Part or Lower Power of their Respective Souls. That the Phenomena prove a Plastick Nature or Archæus in Animals, to make which a distinct thing from the Soul, is to multiply Entities without necessity. The Soul endowed with a Plastick Power, the chief Formatrix of its own Body, the Contribution of certain other Causes not excluded. 23. That besides that Plastick Principle in Particular Animals, forming them as so many Little Worlds, there is a General Plastick Nature in the whole Corporeal Universe, which likewise according to Aristotle is either a Part and Lower Power of a Conscientious Mundane Soul, or else something depending on it. 24. That no less according to Aristotle than Plato and Socrates, our selves partake of Life from the Life of the Universe, as well as we do of Heat and Cold, from
from the Heat and Cold of the Universe; from whence it appears, that Ariflotle alfo held the worlds Animation, with further Undeniable Proof thereof. An Answer to Two the most considerable places of that Philofopher that fume to imply the contrary. That Ariflotle's First Immovable Mover, was no Soul, but a Perfect Intellectual {landing from Matter, but that he supposed this to move only as a Final Caufe, or as being Loved, and besides it a Mundane Soul and Plastic Nature, to move the Heaven Efficiently. Neither Ariflotle's Nature nor his Mundane Soul, the Supreme Deity. However, though there be no such Mundane Soul as both Plato and Ariflotle conceived, yet notwithstanding there may be a Plastic Nature depending upon a Higher Intellectual Principle. 25. No Impossibility of some Other Particular Plastic Principles, and though it be not reasonable to think, that every Plant, Herb, and Pile of Gras hath a Plastic or Vegetative Soul of its own, nor that the Earth is an Animal; yet that there may possibly be One Plastic Inconflous Nature, in the whole Terraqueous Globe, by which Vegetables may be feverally organized and framed, and all things performed which transcend the Power of Fortuitous Mechanism. 26. Our Second Undertaking, which was to fhew how greatly those Atheifts, (who acknowledge this Plastic Nature) Misunderstand it and Abuse the Notion, to make a Counterfeit God-almighty or Numen of it, to the exclusion of the True Deity, First, in their supposing that to be the First and Highest Principle of the Universe, which is the Laft and lowest of all Lives, a thing as Essentially Derivative from, and Dependent upon a Higher Intellectual Principle, as the Echo on the Original Voice. 27. Secondly, in their making Sense and Reason in Animals to Emerge out of a Senseless Life of Nature, by the mere Modification and Organization of Matter. That no Duplication of Corporal Organs, can ever make One Single Inconflous Life, to advance into Redoubled Consciousness and Self-enjoyment. 28. Thirdly, in attributing Perfect Knowledge and Understanding to this Life of Nature, which yet themselves fuppofe to be devoid of all Animal Sense and Consciousness. 29. Lastly, in making the Plastic Life of Nature to be merely Corporal; the Hylozoists contending that it is but an Inadequate Conception of Body, as the only Substance, and fondly dreaming, that the Vulgar Notion of God, is nothing but such an Inadequate Conception of the Matter of the Whole Universe, fuppofed for a Complete and Entire Substance by it felf, the Cause of all things.
The Idea of God declared, in way of Answer to the First Atheistical Argument. The Grand Prejudice against the Naturality of this Idea, as Essentially including Unity or Onelyness in it, from the Pagan Polytheism, removed. Proved that the Intelligent Pagans generally acknowledged One Supreme Deity. What their Polytheism and Idolatry was: with some Account of Christiannity. 1. The either Stupid Insensibility or Groß Impudence of Atheists, in denying the word GOD, to have any Signification, or that there is any other Idea answering to it, besides the mere Phantasm of the Sound. The Disease called by the Philosopher, ἐπιλεικτικῇ χωρί, the Petrification (or Dead Insensibility) of the Mind. 2. That the Atheists themselves must needs have an Idea of God in their minds, or otherwise when they deny his Existence, they should deny the Existence of Nothing. And that they have also the same Idea of him with Theists, they denying the very same thing which the others affirm. 3. A Lemma or Preparatory Proposition to the Idea of God, That though some things be Made or Generated, yet it is not possible that all things should be Made, but something must of Necessity Exist of itself from Eternity Unmade, and be the Cause of those other things that are Made. 4. The Two most Opposite Opinions, concerning the which was Self-existent from Eternity or Unmade, and the Cause of all other things Made: One, That it was nothing but Senseless Matter, the most Imperfect of all things; The Other, That it was something Most Perfect, and therefore Consciously Intellectual. The Asserters of this latter Opinion, Theists in a first and proper sense of the former, Atheists. So that the Idea of God in general, is a Perfect Consciously Understanding Being (or Mind) Selfexistent from Eternity, and the Cause of all other things. 5. Observed, That the Atheists who deny a God, according to the true Idea of him, do often Abuse the word, calling Senseless Matter by that Name, and meaning nothing else thereby, but a First Principle or Self-existent Unmade thing. That according to this Notion of the word God, there can be no such thing as an Atheist, no man being able to persuade himself, that all things sprung from Nothing. 6. In order to the more punctual Declaration of the Divine Idea, the Opinion of those taken notice of, who suppose Two Self-existent Unmade Principles, God and Matter, and so God not to be the Sole but only the Chief
chief principle. 7. That these are but imperfect and mistaken the-
ists. Their idea of God declared, with its defequences. a lati-
tude in theirism. none to be condemned for absolute atheism, but such
as deny an eternal unmade mind, ruling over the matter. 8. The
most compendious idea of God, an absolutely perfect being: That
this includes not only conscious intellectual and necessary existence,
but also, omni-causality, omnipotence and infinite power: and there-
fore God, the sole principle of all, and cause of matter. the true
notion of infinite power. pagans acknowledged the divine omnip-
potence. and that the atheists supposed infinite power to be in-
cluded in the idea of God, proved from lucretius. 9. That absolute
perfection implies something more than power and knowledge. a
vaticination in mens minds of a higher good than either. that
God is better than knowledge, according to aristotle: and that there
is morality in the nature of God, wherein his chief happiness con-
stitueth. this borrowed from plato, who makes the highest perfection,
and supreme deity, to be goodness it self, above knowledge and intel-
lect. god, and the supreme good, according to the scripture, love. God
no soft or fond love, but an impartial law, and the measure of all things.
that the atheists supposed goodness also to be included in the idea of God. the idea of
God more explicate and unfolded, a being absolutely perfect, in-
finitely good, wise and powerful, necessarily existent, and not only
the frame of the world, but also the cause of all things. 10. That
this idea of god essentially includes unity or onelyness in it; since
there can be but one supreme, one cause of all things, one omnipo-
tent, and one infinitely perfect. this unity or onelyness of the deity,
supposed also by epicurus and lucretius, who professedly denied a
God according to this idea. 11. The grand prejudice against the
naturality of this idea of God, as it essentially includes unity and
solairicty, from the polytheism of all nations formerly, besides the
Jews, and of all the wise men and philosophers; from whence it
is inferred, that this idea of God is but artificial, and owes its original
to laws and institution. an enquiry to be made concerning the true
fulness of the pagan polytheism. that the objectors take it for granted,
that the pagan polytheistis universally ascertained, many self-exi-
sistent intellectual beings, and independent deities, as so many partial
causes of the world. 12. First, the irrationality of this opinion,
and its manifest repugnancy to the phenomena, which renders it least
probable, to have been the belief of all the pagan polytheists. 13. Se-
condly, that no such thing at all appears, as that ever any intelligent
pagans ascertained a multitude of eternal, unmade, independent de-
ties. the hesiodian gods. the valentinian eons. the nearest approach
made thereunto by the manichean good and evil gods. this
doctrine not generally ascertained by the greek philosophers, as plutarch
affirmeth. questioned whether the persian evil demon or ar-
manius, were a self-existent principle, essentially evil. aristotle's confutation and explosion of many principles, or independent
deities. faultus the manichean his conceit, that the Jews and Christians
paganized, in the opinion of monarchy, with st. auflin's judgment,
concerning the pagans, thereupon. 14. Concluded that the
pagan
Pagan Polytheism must be understood according to another Expre\nsation in the word Gods, as used for Created Intellectual Beings, superior to Men, that ought to be Religiousl\nly Worshipped. That the Pagan held both Many Gods and One God, (as Onatus the Pythagorean declares himself) in different Senses: Many Inferior Deities Subordinate to One Supreme. 15. Further Evidence of this, that the Intelligent Pagan Polytheists, held only a Plurality of Inferior Deities, Subordinate to one Supreme: First, because after the Emersion of Christianity, and its contest with Paganism, when occasion was offered, not only no Pagan asserted a Multiplicity of Independent Deities, but also all Universally disclaimed it, and professed to acknowledge One Supreme God. 16. That this was no Refinement or Interpolation of Paganism, as might possibly be suspected, but that the Doctrine of the most Ancient Pagan Theologers, and greatest Promoters of Polytheism was agreeable heretofore, which will be proved, not from suspected Writings (as of Trismegist and the Sibyls) but such as are Indubitable. First, That Zoroafter the chief Promoter of Polytheism in the Eastern Parts, acknowledged one Supreme Deity, the Maker of the World, proved from Euhubus in Porphyry; besides his own words cited by Euebius. 17. That Orpheus, commonly called by the Greeks, The Theologer, and the Father of the Grecianick Polytheism, clearly asserted one Supreme Deity, proved by his own words, out of Pagan Records. 18. That the Egyptians themselves, the most Polytheistic of all Nations, had an acknowledgement amongst them of one Supreme Deity. 19. That the Poets, who were the greatest Depravers of the Pagan Theology, and by their Fables of the Gods, made it look more Aristocratically, did themselves notwithstanding acknowledge a Monarchy, one Prince and Father of Gods. That famous Passage of Sophocles not to be suspected, though not found in any of these Tragedies now extant. 20. That all the Pagan Philosophers, who were Theists, universally asserted a Mundane Monarchy. Pythagoras as much a Polytheist as any, and yet his First Principle of Things, as well as Numbers, a Monad or Unity. Anaxagoras his One Mind ordering all things for Good. Xenophon his One and All, and his One God the Greatest among the Gods. 21. Parmenides his Supreme God, One Immovable. Empedocles both Many Gods Junior to Friendship and Contention, and his One God called τά ἕνεκα τοῖς ἐπηγεγορίωσαν. Zeno Elevates his Demonstration of One God, in Aristotle. 22. Philolaus, his Prince and Government of all, God always One. Euclides Megarenfis his God called τά Ἐγγεγορίωσαν, One the Very Good. Timæus Locrus his Mind and Good, above the Soul of the World. Antilithenes his One Natural God. Onatus his Corypheus. 23. Generally believed and true, that Socrates acknowledged One Supreme God; but that he disclaimed all the Inferior Gods of the Pagan, a Vulgar Error. Plato also a Polytheist; and that Passage which some lay so great fires upon (That he was serious, when he began his Epistles with God, but when with Gods Jocular) Spurious and Counterfeit; and yet he was notwithstanding an Undoubted Monotheist also in another sense; an Asserter, of One God over all, of a Maker of the World, of a First God, of a Greatest of the Gods. The First Hypothesis of the Platonick Trinity, properly
ly the King of all things, for whose sake are all things: The Father of the Cause and Prince of the World, that is, of the Eternal Intellect, or Mind. 24. Aristotle an Acknowledger of Many Gods (he accounting the Stars such) and yet an express Asserter of their being, One Prince, One Immovable Mover. 25. Cleanthes and Chrysippus Stoicks, though they filled the whole Heaven, Earth, Air and Sea with Gods; yet notwithstanding they acknowledged, only One God Immortal, Jupiter; all the rest being conjured into him, in the Successive Conflagrations, and afterwards made anew by him. Cleanthes his excellent and devout Hymn to the Supreme God. 26. Endless to cite all the Passages of the later Pagan Writers and Polytheists, in which one Supreme God is asserted. Excellent Discourses in some of them concerning the Deity, particularly Plotinus. Who though he derived all things, even Matter itself, from one Supreme Deity, yet was a Contender for Many Gods. 27. This not only the Opinion of Philosophers and Learned men, but also the General Belief of the Pagan Vulgar; that there was One Supreme God, proved from Maximus Tyrius. 

The Romans Deus Optimus Maximus. The Pagans when most serious, speak of God singularly. Kyrie Eleison part of the Pagans Litany to the Supreme God. The more civilized Pagans at this very day acknowledge one Supreme Deity, the Maker of the World. 28. Plutarch's Testimony, that notwithstanding the variety of Paganick Religions, and the different Names of Gods used in them; yet One Reason, Mind or Providence ordering all things, and its Inferior Ministers, were alike everywhere Worshipped. 29. Plain that the Pagan Theists must needs acknowledge One Supreme Deity, because they generally believed, the whole World to be One Animal, governed by One Soul. Some Pagans made this Soul of the World their Supreme God, others an Abstrack Mind Superior to it. 30. The Hebrew Doctors generally of this Persuasion, that the Pagans worshipped one Supreme God, and that all their other Gods were but Mediators between him and men. 31. Lastly, this confirmed from Scripture. The Pagans Knew God. Aratus his Jupiter, and the Athenians Unknown God, the True God. 32. In order to a fuller Explication of the Pagan Theology, and shewing the Occasion of its being misunderstood, Three Heads requisite to be insisted on. First, that the Pagans worshipped One Supreme God under Many Names: Secondly, that besides this One God, they worshipped also Many Gods, which were indeed Inferior Deities Subordinate to him; Thirdly, that they worshipped both the Supreme and inferior Gods in Images, Statues and Symbols, sometimes abusively called also Gods. First, that the Supreme God among the Pagans was Polyonymous, and worshipped under several Personal Names, according to his several Attributes and the Manifestations of them, his Gifts and Effects in the World. 33. That upon the same compass, Things not Substantial were Personated and Deified by the Pagans, and worshipped as so many several Names or Notions of One God. 34. That as the whole Corporeal World Animated, was supposed by some of the Pagans to be the Supreme God, so he was worshipped in the several Parts and Members of it (having Personal Names bestowed upon them) as it were by Parcels and Piece-meal, or by so many Inadequate Conceptions. That some...
of the Pagans made the Corporeal World the Temple of God only, but others the Body of God. 35. The Second Head proposed, that besides the One Supreme God, under several Names, the Pagans acknowledged and Worshipped also Many Gods; those gods, Made Gods, Created intellectual Beings Superior to Men. 36. The Pythagorean or Platonick Trinity of Divine Hypotheses. And the Higher of the Inferior Deities, according to this Hypothesis; Nous, Psyche, and the whole Corporeal World; with particular Noes and Henades. 37. The other Inferior Deities acknowledged as well by the Vulgar as Philosophers, of Three Sorts. First the Sun, Moon and Stars, and other greater Parts of the Universe, Animated, called Sensible Gods. 38. Secondly, their Inferior Deities Invisible, Ethereal and Aerial Animals, called Demons. These appointed by the Supreme Deity, to preside over Kingdoms, Cities, Places, Persons and Things. 39. The Last sort of the Pagan Inferior Deities, Heroes and Statues, or Men-gods. Euemeius taxed by Plutarch, for making all the Pagan Gods nothing but Dead Men. 40. The Third general Head proposed, That the Pagans worshipped both the Supreme and Inferior Gods, in Images, Statues and Symbols. That first of all, before Images and Temples, Rude Stones and Pillars without Sculpture, were erected for Religious Monuments, and called pagudi or Bethels. 41. That afterwards Images, Statues and Symbols were used, and housed in Temples. These placed in the West-end of the Temples to face the East; so that the Pagans entering, worshipped towards the West: One probable Occasion of the Ancient Christians Praying towards the East. The Golden Calf made for a Symbolick Presence of the God of Israel. 42. All the parts of the entire Pagan Religion represented together at once in Plato. 43. That some late Writers, not well understanding the Sense of Pagans, have confounded all their Theology, by supposing them to Worship the Inanimate parts of the World as such, for Gods; therefore differing betwixt their Animal and their Natural Gods. That no Corporeal thing was worshipped by the Pagans otherwise, than either as being itself Animated with a Particular Soul of its own, or as being part of the whole Animated World, or as having Demons presiding over it, to whom the Worship was properly directed; or Last, as being Images or Symbols of Divine Things. 44. That though the Egyptians be said to have Worshipped Brute Animals, and were generally therefore condemned by the other Pagans, yet the wisest of them used them only as Hieroglyphicks and Symbols. 45. That the Pagans worshipped not only the Supreme God, but also the Inferior Deities, by Material Sacrifices, Sacrifices or Fire-offerings, in their First and General Notion, nothing else but Gifts and Signs of Gratitude, and Appendices of Prayer. But that Animal Sacrifices had afterwards a Particular Notion also of Expiation fastened on them, whether by Divine Direction, or Humane Agreement, left undetermined. 46. The Pagans Apology for the Three forementioned Things. First, for Worshipping one Supreme God under Many Peculiar Names, and that not only according to his several Attributes, but also his several Manifestations, Gifts and Effects, in the Visible World. With an Excuse for those Corporeal Thefts, who Worshipped the whole Animated World as the Supreme God, and the several
ral Parts of it under Personal Names, as Living Members of Him. 47. Their Apology for Worshipping, besides the One Supreme God, Many Inferior Deities. That they Worshipping them only as Inferior, could not therefore be guilty of giving them that Honour, which was proper to the Supreme. That they Honour the Supreme God incomparably above all. That they put a Difference in their Sacrifices, and that Material Sacrifices were not the proper Worship of the Supreme God, but rather below him. 48. Several Reasons of the Pagans, for giving Religious Worship to Inferior Created Beings. First that this Honour which is bestowed upon them, does ultimately redound to the Supreme God, and aggrandize his State and Majesty, they being all his Ministers and Attendants. 49. That as Demons are Mediators betwixt the Celestial Gods and Men, so those Celestial Gods and all the other Inferior Deities, are themselves also Mediators betwixt Men and the Supreme God, and as it were Convenient steps, by which we ought with Reverence to approach him. 50. That there is an Honour in Justice due, to all those excellent Beings that are above us, and that the Pagans do but honour every thing as they ought, in that due rank and place, in which the Supreme God hath set it. 51. That Demons or Angels being appointed to preside over Kingdoms, Cities and Persons, and the several parts of the Corporeal Universe, and being many ways Benefactors to us, Thanks ought to be returned to them by Sacrifice. 52. That the Inferior Gods, Demons and Heroes, being all of them able to do us either Good or Hurt, and being also Irresistible, and therefore Provokable by our Neglect of them, it is as well our Interest as our Duty, to Pacific and Appease them by Worship. 53. Lastly, that it cannot be thought, that the Supreme God will envy those Inferior Gods, that Worship or Honour which is bestowed upon them; nor suspected, that any of those Inferior Deities will Passionately go about to set up themselves against the Supreme God. 54. That many of the Pagans worshipped none but Good Demons, and that those of them who worshipped Evil ones did it only in order to their Appesement and Mitigation, that so they might do them no hurt. None but Magicians to be accomplished properly Devil-Worshippers, who honour Evil Demons, in order to the gratification of their Revenge, Lust and Ambition. 55. The Pagans plead that those Demons, who delivered Oracles, and did Miracles amongst them, must needs be Good, since there cannot be a greater reproach to the Supreme God, than to suppose him to appoint Evil Demons as Presidents and Governors over the World, or to suffer them to have so great a way and share of Power in it. The Faith of Plato in Divine Providence, that the Good every where prevails over the Bad, and that the Delphick Apollo was therefore a Good Demon. 56. The Pagans Apology for Worshipping the Supreme God in Images, Statues and Symbols. That these are only Schetically Worshipped by them, the Honour passing from them to the Prototype. And that since we living in Bodies, cannot easily have a Conception of any thing without some Corporeal Image or Phantasm, this much must be indulged to the Infirmitie of Humane Nature (at least in the Vulgar) to Worship God Corporeally in Images, to prevent their running to Atheism. 57. That though it should appear by
by this Apology of the Pagans, that their Caeze were not altogether so bad, as is commonly supposed; yet they cannot be justified thereby, in the Three Particulars above mentioned, but the Scripture Condemnation of them is Irrefragable. That knowing God, they did not glorify him as God, or sacrifice his Name; that is, Worship him according to his Uncommon and Incommunicable, his Ineffable and Incommunicable, Transcendent and Singular, Incomparable and Unresemblable Nature; but mingled some way or other Creature-worship with the Worship of the Creator. First, that the Worshipping of one God in his Various Gifts and Effects, under several personal Names, a thing in it self absurd, may also prove a great occasion of Atheism, when the things themselves come to be called by those Names, as Wine Bacchus, Corn Ceres. The Conclusion easily following from thence, that the Good things of Nature are the only Deities. But to Worship the Corporeal World it self Animated, as the Supreme God, and the Parts of it, as the Members of God, plainly to Confound God with the Creature, and not to Glorifie him as Creator, nor according to his Separate and Spiritual Nature. 58. To give Religions Worship to Demons or Angels, Heroes or Saints, or any other Intellectual Creatures, though not honouring them equally with the Supreme God, is to deny God the Honour of his Holines, his Singular, Ineffable and Incommunicable Nature, as he is the only Self-originated Being, and the Creator of all; Of whom, through whom, and to whom are all things. As God is such a Being, that there is nothing like him, so ought the Worship which is given him, to be such as hath nothing like it, A Singular, Separate and Incommunicate Worship. They not to be Religiousy Worshipped that Worship. 59. That the Religious Worship of Created Spirits proceeded chiefly from a Fear that if they were not worshipped, they would be provoked and do hurt, which is both highly injurious to Good Spirits, and a Distrust of the Sufficiency of God's Power to protect his Worshippers. That all Good Spirits Uninvok'd, are of themselves officiously ready to assist those who sincerely Worship and Propitiate the Supreme Deity, and therefore no need of the Religious Worship of them, which would be also Offensive to them. 60. That Men praying to Images and Statues is much more Ridiculous than Children talking to Babies made of Clouts, but not so Innocent: they thereby Debasing both themselves and God, not Glorifying him according to his Spiritual and Unresemblable Nature, but changing the Glory of the Incorruptible God, into the Likeness of Corruptible Man or Beast. 61. The Mistake of those who think none can be guilty of Idolatry, that believe one God the Maker of the World. 62. That from the same ground of Reason, that nothing ought to be Religiousy Worshipped beside the Supreme God, or whom he appoints to represent himself (because he ought to be Sacrificed, and dealt withal according to his Singular Nature as unlike to every thing,) it follows, contrary to the Opinion of some opposers of Idolatry, that there ought also to be a Discrimination made, between things Sacred and Profane, and Reverence used in Divine Worship. Idolatry and Sacrilege allied. 63. Another Scripture-Charge upon the Pagans, that they were Devil-worshippers; not as though they intended all their Worship to Evil Demons or Devils.
Devils as such, but because their Polytheism and Idolatry (unacceptable to God and Good Spirits) was promoted by Evil Spirits del-vering Oracles and doing Miracles for the Confirmation of it, they also infusing their selves into the Temples and Statues, therefore the Wor-ship was look'd upon, as done to them. The same thing 'twixt others besides Pagan, that they Worshipped Devils. 64. Proved that they were Evil Demons who delivered Oracles and did Miracles amongst the Pagan, for the carrying on of that Religion, from the many Obscene Rites and Mysteries, not only not prohibited, but also enjoined by them. 65. The same thing further proved, from other cruel and bloody Rites, but especially that of Man Sacrifices. Plutarch's Clear Acknowledgement, that both the Obscene Rites and Man-Sacrifices, amongst the Pagan, owed their Original to Wicked Demons. 66. That the God of Israel, neither required, nor accepted of Man Sacrifices, against a modern Diatribe. 67. That what Faith greater Plato might have in the Delphick Apollo, he was no other than an Evil Daemon or Devil. An Answer to the Pagan Argument from Divine Providence. 68. That the Pagan Religion, unfound in its Foundation, was Infinitely more Corrupted and Depraved by means of these Four Things: First, the Superstition of the Ignorant Vulgar. 69. Secondly, the Licentious Figures of Poets and Fable-Mongers, frequently condemned by Plato and other Wiser Pagan. 70. Thirdly, the Craft of Priests and Politicians. 71. Lastly, the Imposture of evil Demons or Devils. That by means of these Four Things, the Pagan Religion became a most foul and unclean thing. And as some were captivated by it under a most grievous Yeke of Superstition, so others strongly inclined to Atheism. 72. Plato not insensible that the Pagan Religion stood in need of Reformation; nevertheless, supposing many of those Religious Rites, to have been introduced by Visions, Dreams, and Oracles, he concluded that no wise Legislator would of his own head venture to make an Alteration. Implying, that this was a thing not to be effected otherwise than by Divine Revelation and Miracles. The generally received Opinion of the Pagan, that no man ought to trouble himself about Religion, but content himself to worship God, νόμος πάσχος, according to the Law of that Country which he lived in. 73. Wherefore God Almighty in great compassion to Mankind, designed himself to reform the Religion of the Pagan World, by introducing another Religion of his own framing in stead of it; after he had first made a Pre-ludium thereunto, in one Nation of the Israelites, where he expressly prohibited by a Voice out of the Fire, in his First Commandment, the Pagan Polytheism, or the worshipping of other Inferior Deities besides himself, and in the Second, their Idolatry, or the Worshipping of the Supreme God in Images, Statues or Symbols, besides which he restrained the use of Sacrificers. As also successively gave Predictions of a Messiah to come, such as together with Miracles might reasonably concurlate Faith to him when he came. 74. That afterwards in due time, God sent the promised Messiah, who was the Eternal Word Hypostatically united with a Pure Humane Soul and Body, and so a true Χριστός, or God-man: Designing him for a Living Temple and Visible Statue or Image, in which the Deity should be represented and
and Worshipped, as also after his Death and Resurrection, when he was to be invested with all Power and Authority, for a Prince and King, a Mediator and Intercessor, between God and Men. 75. That this Σταθερος or God-man was so far from intending to require Men-sacrifices of his Worshippers, as the Pagan Demons did, that he devoted himself to be a Catharman & Expiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the whole World, and thereby also abolished all Sacrifices or Oblations by Fire whatsoever, according to the Divine Prediction. 76. That the Christian Trinity, though a Mystery, is more agreeable to Reason than the Platonick, and that there is no absurdity at all, in supposing the True Soul and Body of the Messiah, to be made a Living Temple or Shechinah, Image or Statue of the Deity. That this Religion of One God and One Mediator, or Σταθερος God-man, preached to the Pagan World and confirmed by Miracles, did effectually destroy all the Pagan inferior Deities, Middle Gods and Mediators, Demons and Heroes, together with their Statues and Images. 77. That it is no way incongruous to suppose that the Divine Majesty, in prescribing a Form of Religion to the World, should graciously condescend to comply with Human Infirmity, in order to the removing of Two such Grand Evils, as Polytheism and Idolatry, and the bringing of men to Worship God in Spirit and in Truth. 78. That Demons and Angels, Heroes and Saints are but different Names for the same things, which are made Gods by being worshipped. And that the introducing of Angel and Saint-worship, together with Image-Worship, into Christianity, seems to be a defeating of one grand design of God Almighty in it, and the Paganizing of that, which was intended for the Unpaganizing of the World. 79. Another Key for Christianity in the Scripture, not disagreeing with the former, That since the way of Wisdom and Knowledge, proved Ineffectual as to the Generality of Mankind, men might by the contrivance of the Gospel be brought to God and a holy Life (without profound Knowledge) in the way of Believing. 80. That according to the Scripture, there is a Higher, more Precious and Diviner Light, than that of Theory and Speculation. 81. That in Christianity, all the Great, Goodly and most Glorious things of this World, are surried and disgraced, comparatively with the Life of Christ. 82. And that there are all possible Engines in it to bring men up to God, and engage them in a holy Life. 83. Two Errors here to be taken notice of; The First of those who make Christianity, nothing but an Antinomian Plot against Real Righteousness, and as it were a secret Confederacy with the Devil. The Second, of those who turn that into Matter of mere Notion and Opinion, Dispute and Controversie, which was designed by God only as a Contrivance, Machin, or Engine to bring men Effectually to a Holy and Godly Life. 84. That Christianity may be yet further illustrated, from the consideration of the Adversary or Satanical Power, which is in the World. This no Miniscule Substantial Evil Principle, but a Polity of Lapsed Angels, with which the Souls of Wicked men are also Incorporated, and may therefore be called The Kingdom of Darkness. 85. The History of the Fallen Angels in Scripture briefly explained. 86. The concurrent Agreement of the Pagans concerning Evil Demons or Devils, and their Activity in the World. 87. That there is a perpetual
ual War betwixt Two Polities or Kingdoms in the World, the one of Light, the other of Darkness, and that our Saviour Christ or the Messiah, is appointed the Head or Chieftain over the Heavenly Militia, or the Forces of the Kingdom of Light. 88. That there will be at length a Palpable and Signal Overthrow of the Satanical Power, and whole Kingdom of Darkness, by heaven's Light, God appearing in an extraordinary and miraculous manner, and that this great affair is to be managed by our Saviour Christ, as God's Vicegerent, and a Visible Judge both of Quick and Dead. 89. That our Saviour Christ designed not, to set up himself Factiously against God Almighty, nor to be accounted without superior to God, but that when he hath done his Work, and put down all Adversary Power, himself will then be subject to God, even the Father, that so God may be all in all. 90. Lastly, having spoken of Three Forms of Religions, the Jewish, Christian, and the Pagan, and there remaining only a Fourth the Mahometan, in which the Divine Monarchy is zealously asserted, we may now Conclude, that the Idea of God (as essentially including Unity in it) hath been entertained in all Forms of Religion. An Account of that seemingly-strange Phenomenon of Providence; the Rise, Growth and Continuance of the Mahometan Religion, not to be attempted by us, at least in this place.

1. Having in the Former Chapter prepared the way, we shall now proceed (with the Divine Assistance) to Answer and Confute all those Atheistical Arguments before proposed. The First whereof was this, That there is no Idea of God, and therefore, either no such Thing existing in Nature, or at least no Possible Evidence of it.

To affirm that there is no Idea of God, is all one as to affirm, that there is no Conception of the Mind answering to that Word or Name. And this the Modern Atheists think not to maintain. That the Word God hath no Signification, and that there is no other Idea or Conception in Mens Minds, answering thereunto, besides the mere Phantasm of the Sound. Now for any one to go about soberly to confute this, and to Prove that God is not the Only Word without a Signification, and that men do not every where pay all their Religious Devotions, to the mere Phantasm of a Transient Sound, expecting all Good from it, might very well seem to all Intelligent persons, a most Absurd and Ridiculous Undertaking; both because the Thing is so evident in itself, and because the plainest things of all can least be Proved:  

Evid. in Time.  

§.176.  

He that thinks all things to be Demonstrable, takes away Demonstration it self. Wherefore we shall here only suggest thus much, that since there are different Words for God in several Languages, and men have the fame Notion or Conception in their Minds answering to them all, it must needs be granted, that they have some other Idea or Conception belonging to those Words, besides the Phantasms of their several Sounds. And indeed it can be nothing else, but either
CHAPTER IV.

Impudence of Atheists.

Monstrous Sottishness and Stupidity of Mind, or else Prodigious Impudence, in these Atheists to deny, that there is any Idea of God at all, in the Minds of men, or that the Word hath any Signification.

It was herefore observed by Epictetus, ου τις ενίθλω περι το έγαν Αναλογίας, ὅτε δὲ περὶ τοιαύτα καθισμόν είναι άρκον, οὐ μελέτησε τον ουτώ το δ' ου έτεον τυχών ενδούς ένδεικτών, ουτά άριστον τον την διδάσκαλον ανακοίνων.

That if any man will oppose or contradict the most evident Truths, it will not be easy, to find arguments wherewith to convince him, and yet this notwithstanding, ought neither to be Imputed, to any Inability in the Teacher, nor to any Strength of Wit in the Denier, but only to a certain Dear Infensibility in him. Whereupon he further adds, that there is a double ενίθλως or ενίθλως, Mortification or Petrifaction of the Soul, the one, when it is Sufpified and Bejotted in its Intellectus; the other, when it is Bedeaded in its Morals, as that Tudor that naturally should belong to a Man. And he concludes, that either of these States (though it be not commonly so apprehended) is a Condition little lets deplorable, than that of Bodily Death, as also that such a person is not at all to be Disputed with.

For ποτε πονερὴ προφ. ου έπων πονερόν πρεσβεύειν, κατὰ αυτὴν επί γενεώτεροι, ειπερολεξικό το προσονείθη κατ' εναντιωμενα τον τοιούτων. What Sword can one bring or what Fire, by burning or blashing, to make such a one perceive that he is dead? but if he be convinced, and will not acknowledge it, then he is worse than dead, being curstated as to that Tudor that belongs to a man. Moreover, that Philosopher took notice that in those times, when this Denial of most Evident Truths, proceeded rather from Impudence than Stupidity or Sottishness, the Vulgar would be apt to admire it, for strength of Wit and great Learning, αν αύτ' τα όντα μεν αποκανευέται, τῆς επί άρτι καλεμένης. But if any man's Tudor be dead or mortified in him, we call this Power and Strength.

Now as this was sometimes the Case of the Academicks, so is it also commonly of the Atheists, that their Minds are Partly Petrified and Bsummned into a kind of Sottish and Stupid Infensibility, so that they are not able to discern things that are most Evident; and Partly Depudorated or become so void of Shame, as that though they do perceive, yet they will Obstinate and Impudently deny the plain things that are, as this, that there is any Idea answering to the word God, besides the Phantasm of the Sound. And we do the rather insist upon this Prodigious Monstrosity of Atheists in this place, because we shall have occasion afterwards more than once to take notice of it again, in other Instances, as when they affirm, that Local Motion and Cogitation, are really one and the self same thing, and the like. And we conceive it to be unquestionably True, that it is many times nothing else, but either this Shameless Impudence or Sottish Infensibility in Atheists, that is admired by the Ignorant, for Profoundness of Wit and Learning, αλλά ταύτω δύναμιν έντε, μη γινέταις ει μη, τοι το θεόν καταδεικνύει, καθή μη ποτε το επιθέων ων μείον γαρ επιθέων σημείον τελευτη. But shall I call this Power or Wit, and commend it upon R 2 that
II. But whatever these Atheists deny in words, it is notwithstanding evident, that even themselves have an Idea or Conception in their Minds answering to the Word, God, when they deny his Existence, because other wise they should deny the existence of Nothing. Nor can it be at all doubted, but that they have also the same Idea of God with the Theists, they denying the Existence of no other thing than what these affect. And as in all other Controversies, when men dispute together, the one affirming the other denying, both Parties must needs have the same Idea in their Minds of what they dispute about, or other wise their whole Disputation would be but a kind of Babel-Language and Confusion; so must it be likewise in this present Controversie, betwixt Theists and Atheists. Neither indeed would there be any Controversie at all between them, did they not both by God, mean one and the same thing; nor would the Atheists be any longer Atheists, did they not deny the Existence of that very same Thing, which the Theists affirm, but of something else.

III. Wherefore we shall in the next place declare what this Idea of God is, or what is that thing whose Existence they that affirm are called Theists, and they who deny Atheists. In order whereunto, we must first lay down this Lemma or Preparatory Proposition, That as it is generally acknowledged, that all things did not exist from Eternity, such as they are, Unmade, but that somethings were Made and Generated or produced; so it is not possible that All things should be Made neither, but there must of necessity be something Self-existent from Eternity, and Unmade; because if there had been once Nothing, there could never have been any thing. The Reason of which is so evident and irresistible, that even the Atheists confess themselves conquered by it, and readily acknowledge it for an indubitable Truth. That there must be something ὑπηκόος, something which was never Made or Produced, and which therefore is the Cause of those other things that are Made, something αὐτόποιος and αὐτουποιος, that was Self-originated and Self-existing, and which is as well ἀνέλεσθαι and ἀφέσθαι, as ὑπηκόος, Incorruptible and Undestroyable, as Ingenereable; whose Existence therefore must needs be Necessary, because if it were supposed to have happened by Chance to exist from Eternity, then it might as well happen again to Cæste to be. Wherefore all the Question now is, what is this ὑπηκόος and ἀνέλεσθαι, αὐτόποιος and αὐτουποιος, this Ingenereable and Incorruptible, Self-originated and Self-existing Thing, which is the Cause of all other things that are Made.

IV. Now there are Two Grand Opinions Opposite to one another concerning it: For first, some contend that the only Self-existent, Unmade and Incorruptible Thing, and First Principle of all things, is Sensible Matter, that is, Matter either perfectly Dead and Stupid, or at least devoid of all Animal and Conscious Life. But because this is really the Lowest and most Imperfect of all Beings,
Others on the contrary judge it reasonable, that the First Principle and Original of all things, should be that which is Most Perfect (as Aristotle observes of Pherecydes and his Followers, τὸ γνώσιν πόστον ἐκ τιμῶν, That they made the First Cause and Principle of Generation to be the Best) and then apprehending that to be endowed with Conscious Life and Understanding, is much a Greater Perfection than to be devoid of both, (as Balbus in Cicero declares upon this very occasion, Nec dubium quin quod Animans sit, habetque Mentem & Rationem & Sensum, id sit melius quin id quod his caret.) they therefore conclude, That the only Unmade thing, which was the Principle, Cause and Original of all other things, was not Self-existent, but a Perfect Conscious Understanding Nature, or Mind. And these are they who are strictly and properly called Theists, who affirm that a Perfectly Conscious Understanding Being, or Mind, existing of itself from Eternity, was the Cause of all other things; and they on the contrary who derive all things from Self-existent Matter, as the First Original, and deny that there is any Conscious Understanding Being Self-existent or Unmade, are those that are properly called Atheists. Wherefore the true and genuine Idea of God in general, is this, A Perfect Conscious Understanding Being (or Mind) Existing of itself from Eternity, and the Cause of all other things.

V. But it is here observable, that those Atheists who deny a God, according to this True and Genuine Notion of him, which we have declared, do often Abuse the Word, calling Self-existent Matter by that Name. Partly perhaps as indeavouring thereby, to decline that odious and ignominious name of Atheists, and partly as conceiving, that whatsoever is the First Principle of things, Ingenerable and Incorruptible, and the Cause of all other things besides itself, must therefore needs be the Divinest Thing of all. Wherefore by the word God, these mean nothing else, but that which is Self-existent, Unmade or Self-existent, and the Self-existing or First Principle of things. Thus it was before observed, that Anaximander called Infinite Matter, devoid of all manner of Life, the τὸ Σῶον or God; and Pliny, the Corporeal World, endued with nothing but a Plastic Unknowing Nature, Numin; as also others in Aristotle, upon the same account called the Inanimate Elements Gods, as Supposed First Principles of things, Σέλον τοῦ πατρός, for these are also Gods. And indeed Aristotle himself seems to be guilty of this miscarriage of Abusing the word God after this manner, when speaking of Love and Chaos, as the two first Principles of things, he must, according to the Laws of Grammar, be understood to call them both Gods: τὸν τοῦ γνώσιν πόστον ἐκ τιμῶν, Concerning these two (Gods) how they ought to be ranked, and which of them is to be placed first, whether Love or Chaos, is afterwards to be resolved. Which Passage of Aristotle's seems to agree with that of Epicharmus, Ἀλλὰ λέγεις μὴ καθοριστεὶν φανερῶν θεῖον, But Chaos is said to have been made the first of the Gods; unless we should rather understand him thus, That Chaos was said, to have been made before the Gods. And this Abuse of the Word God, is a thing which the learned Origen took notice of in his Book against Celcius, where he speaks of that Religious Care, which ought to be had a-
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brought the use of Words: οὐ τινὲς μεγαλουχίστερον καὶ διάλεγον τομαί ἦν ἴσως εἰλικρίνες, ἀλλὰ καὶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ, καὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ, καὶ, μεταξὺ ἐμοίοι πλὴν τοῦ τι θεός ὑφομονήσας, οὕτως οὐκ ἔμενοι. He therefore that hath but the least consideration of these things, will take a Religious care, that he give not improper names to things, lest he should fall into a like miscarriage with those, who attribute the name of God to Inanimate and Sensible matter. Now according to this false and spurious Notion of the word God, when it is taken for any Supposed First Principle, or Self-existent Unmade Thing, whatsoever that be, there neither is nor can be any such thing as an Atheist, since whatsoever hath but the least dram of Reason, must needs acknowledge, that Something or other Existed from Eternity Unmade, and was the Cause of those other things that are Made. But that Notion or Idea of God, according to which some are Atheists, and some Theists, is in the strictest sense of it, what we have already declared, A Perfect Mind, or Consciously Understanding Nature, Self-existent from Eternity, and the Cause of all other things. The genuine Theists being those who make the First Original of all things Univerally, to be a Consciously Understanding Nature (or Perfect Mind) but the Atheists properly such, as derive all things from Matter, either perfectly Dead and Stupid, or else devoid of all Conscious and Animal Life.

VI. But that we may more fully and punctually declare the true Idea of God, we must here take notice of a certain Opinion of some Philosophers, who went as it were in a middle betwixt both the Former, and neither made Matter alone, nor God, the Sole Principle of all things; but joyned them both together and held Two First Principles or Self-existent Unmade Beings, independent upon one another, God, and the Matter. Amongst whom the Stoics are to be reckoned, who notwithstanding because they held, that there was no other Substantia besides Body, strangely confounded themselves, being by that means necessitated, to make their Two First Principles, the Active and the Passive, to be both of them really but One and the same Substance: their Doctrine to this purpose being thus declared by Cicero; Naturam dividant in Res Duas, ut Altera effet Efficiens, Altera autem quas huic se praebens, ex qua Efficietur aliquod. In eo quod Efficiet, Vim esse contingat in eo quod Efficeretur, Materialiam quamvis in Tunque tamque Uranique. Neque enim Materiam ipsum observe potuisse est nullæ Vi conteneretur, neque Vim sine aliqua Materiam; Nihil est enim quod non Alicui esse cognatur. The Stoics divided Nature into Two Things, as the First Principles, One whereof is the Efficient, or Artificer, the Other that which offers itself to him for things to be made out of it. In the Efficient Principle they took notice of Active Force, in the Patient of Matter; but so as that in each of these were both together: so much as neither the Matter could cohere together unless it were contained by some Active Force, nor the Active Force subsist of itself without Matter, because that is Nothing which is not somewhere. But besides these Stoics, there were other Philosophers, who admitting of Incorporeal Substantia, did suppose Two First Principles, as Substanccs really distinct from one another that were Coexistent from Eternity, an Incorporeal Deity and Matter;
And we find it commonly taken for granted, that Aristotle also was of this Persuasion, though it cannot be certainly concluded from hence (as some seem to suppose) because he afferted the Eternity of the World: Plutinus, Porphyrius, Iamblichus, Proclus and Simplicius, doing the like, and yet notwithstanding maintaining, that God was the Sole Principle of all things, and that Matter also was derived from him. Neither will that Passage of Aristotle's in his Metaphysics, necessarily evince the Contrary, Seces, &c. *πάντων πατερ ενων <ος ημελν, God seems to be a Cause to all things and a certain Principle, because this might be understood only of the Forms of things.

But it is plain that Plutarch was a Maintainer of this Doctrine, from Discourse upon the Platonick Psychogonia, (besides other Places) *πάντων υφαντον παραπλησιου, & μοιδομον υπο θεου γιρναιν λεγει, to μοιδομον υπο καιναιν Ματεραριων, &c. He is the Author of this Doctrine, as before the Stoicks, in the way of a Subjiciunt, *π idiotενιν, *παραπλησιον, ας Υποκλειουσδε αν την ομοιωσιν, ας διανοουν χωρισταιν, & κατα το μη σ εφεται, ινα λοιπα, και αν αιτεταιν. It is therefore better for us to follow Plato (than Heraclitus) and loudly to declare, that the World was made by God. For as the world is the Best of all Works, so is God the Best of all Caufes. Nevertheless the Substance or Matter out of which the World was made, was not it self made: but always ready at hand, and Subject to the Artificer, to be ordered and disposed by him. For the making the World, was not the Production of it out of Nothing, but out of an antecedent Bad and Disorderly State, like the Making of an House, Garret or Statue.

It is also well known, that Hermogenes and other ancient Pretenders to Christianity, did in like manner affert the Self-existence and Production of the Matter, for which Caufe they were commonly called Materiarii, or the Materiarian Hereticks; they pretending by its means to give an account (as the Stoicks had done before them) of the Original of Evils, and to free God from the Imputation of them, their Ratiocination to which purpose, is thus set down by Tertullian: *κανον μερας εικονικων, *σκοτων εικονικων, *φωνας *σκοτων, &c. He could not make all things out of Himself, because himself being Unmade, he should then really have been the Maker of Nothing. And he did not make all out of Nothing, because being Essentially good, he would have made Nihil non optimum, every thing in the fit manner, and so there could have been no Evil in the World. But there are Evils, and these could not proceed from the Will of God, by which needs arise from the Fault of something, and therefore of the latter, out of which things were made. Lastly, it is sufficiently known文书, that some Modern Sects of the Christian Profession, at this day, do also affert the Uncreatedness of the Matter. But these
these suppose, in like manner as the Stoicks did, Body to be the only Substance.

VII. Now of all these whatsoever they were who thus maintained Two Self-existent Principles, God and the Matter, we may pronounce Univerfally, that they were neither Better nor Worfe, than a kind of Imperfect Theifts.

They had a certain Notion or Idea of God, such as it was, which seems to be the very fame, with that expressed in Aristotle, ἢς εἶναι ἐν αὐτῷ, An Animal the Best Eternal, and represented also by Epicurus in this manner, ἢς πᾶσιν ἐγὼ μικρὰ ἤτοι ἴνα μετ' ἀφικνήσεις, An Animal that hath all Happiness with Incorruptibility.

Wherein it was acknowledged by them, that besides Sensible Matter, there was also an Animalis and Conscientious Perceptive Nature, Self-existent from Eternity; in opposition to Atheifts, who made Matter, either devoid of all manner of Life, or at least of such as is Animalis and Conscientious, to be the Sole Principle of All things. For it hath been often observed, that some Atheists attributed, a kind of Platyphilic Life or Nature, to that Matter, which they made to be the Only Principle of the Universe.

And these Two sorts of Atheisms were long since taken notice of by Seneca in these words; Universum in quo nos quaque sumus, express esse Consilii, & aut ferri Temeritate quadam aut Natura necesse quid faciat. The Atheists make the Universe, whereas our selves are part, to be devoid of Counsel, and therefore either to be carried on Temerarioufly and Fortuitously; or else by such a Nature, as which (though it be Orderly, Regular and Methodical) yet is notwithstanding Necessity of what it doth. But no Atheist ever acknowledged Conscientious Animality, to be a First Principle in the Universe; nor that the Whole was governed by any Animalis, Sentient, and Understanding Nature, preluding over it as the Head of it; but as it was before declared, they Concluded all Animals and Animality, all Conscientious, Sentient and Self-perceptive Life, to be Generated and Corruptible, or Educed out of Nothing, and Reduced to Nothing again. Wherefore they who on the Contrary asserted Animality and Conscientious Life, to be a First Principle or Unmade thing in the Universe are to be accounted Theists. Thus Balbus in Cicero declares, that to be a Theist, is to assert, Ab Animantibus Principiis Mundum, esse Generatum, That the World was Generated or Produced at first from Animant Principles, and that it is also still governed by such a Nature, Resomnes subiectas esse Naturae Sentienti, That all things are subject to a Sentient and Conscientious Nature, steering and guiding of them.

But to distinguish this Divine Animal, from all others, these Definers added, that it was ἢς εἶναι and μικρὰ ἥτοι, the Best and most Happy Animals; and accordingly, this Difference is added to that General Nature of Animality, by Balbus the Stoick, to make up the Idea or Definition of God complete: Talem esse Deum certa Notione animi presentium; First, all Animals; Secondly, in omni Natura.
CHAP. IV.

Imperfect Theists.

nibil Illo sit Praestantius: We presage concerning God, by a certain Notion of our Mind; First, that he is an Animal, or Consciously Living Being; and then Secondly, that he is such an Animal, as that there is nothing in the Whole Universe, or Nature of things, more Excellent than Him.

Wherefore these Materiaristan Theists acknowledged God to be a perfectly-understanding Being, and Such as had also Power over the Whole Matter of the Universe; which was utterly unable to move itself, or to produce any thing without him. And all of them except the Anaxagoreans concluded, that He was the Creator of all the Forms of Inanimate Bodies, and of the Souls of Animals. However, it was Universally agreed upon amongst them, that he was at least The Orderer and Disposer of all, and that therefore he might upon that account well be called, the Δυνατος, The Maker or Framer of the World.

Notwithstanding which, so long as they Maintained Matter to exist Independently upon God, and sometimes also to be Refractory and Contumacious to him, and by that means to be the Cause of Evil, contrary to the Divine Will; it is plain that they could not acknowledge the Divine Omnipotence, according to the Full and Proper fence of it. Which may also further appear from these Queries of Seneca concerning God. Quantum Deus possit? Materiam ipsam Format, et Dat natur? Deus quicquid Vult efficiat? An in multis rebus illum traditanda desituit, & a Magno Artifice Praevia formenter multa, non quia cessat Ars, sed quia id in quo exercetur, sepe Inobsequens Artifi? et? How far Gods Power does extend? Whether he make his own Matter, or only use that which is offered him? Whether he can do whatsoever he will? Or the Materials in many things frustrate and Disappoint him, and by that means things come to be Unformed by this great Artificer, not because his Art fails him, but because that which it is exercised upon, proves Stubborn and Contumacious? Wherefore, I think, we may well conclude, that those Materiaristan Theists, had not a Right and Genuine Idea of God.

Nevertheless, it does not therefore follow, that they must needs be concluded Absolute Atheists; for there may be a Latitude allowed in Theism; and though in a strict and proper fence, they be only Theists, who acknowledge One God perfectly Omnipotent, the Sole Original of all things, and as well the Cause of Matter, as of any thing else; yet it seems reasonable, that such Consideration should be had of the Infirmity of Humane Understandings, as to extend the Word further, that it may comprehend within it, those also who affert One Intellectual Principle Self-existent from Eternity, the Framer and Governor of the whole World, though not the Creator of the Matter; and that none should be condemned for Absolute Atheists, merely because they hold Eternal Uncreated Matter, unless they also deny, an Eternal Unmade Mind, ruling over the Matter, and to make Senecio's Matter the Sole Original of all things. And this is certainly most agreeable to common apprehensions; for Democritus and Epicurus, would
never have been condemned for Atheists, merely for asserting Eternal Self-existent Atoms, no more than Anaxagoras and Archelaus were, (who maintained the same thing) had they not also denied, that other Principle of theirs, a Perfect Mind, and concluded that the World was made, μενειν διαπεφαρον πιαλανειν τω παλαιος ζοινος μαναγεισθαι μετ' ἄρσεσιως, Without the ordering and disposal of any Understanding Being, that had all Happiness with Incorruptibility.

VIII. The True and Proper Idea of God, in its Most Contracted Form is this, A Being Absolutely Perfect. For this is that alone, to which Necessary Existence is Essential, and of which it is Demonstrable. Now as Absolute Perfection includes in it all that belongs to the Deity, so does it not only comprehend (besides Necessary Existence) Perfect Knowledge or Understanding, but also Omnipotence (in the full extent of it) otherwise called Infinite Power. God is not only ξενική καταστάσει, and Animans quo nihil in omni Natura praesentia, as the Matterian Theists describ'd him, The Best Living Being, nor as Zeno Eleates called him, μονο των μαθητών, the Most Powerful of all things; but he is also παρακενθής, and πατικορθησα, and πατεκέφασ, Absolutely Omnipotent, and Infinitely Powerful: and therefore neither Matter, nor any thing else can exist of itself Independently upon God; but he is the Sole Principle and Source, from which all things are derived.

But because this Infinite Power, is a thing, which the Atheists quarrel much withal, as if it were altogether Unintelligible and therefore Impossible, we shall here briefly declare the Sense of it, and render it (as we think) easily Intelligible or Conceivable, in these Two following steps. First, that by Infinite Power is meant nothing else, but Perfect Power, or else as Simplicius calls it, ὁμοθετός, a Whole and Entire Power, such as hath no Allay and Mixture of Impotency, nor any Defect of Power mingled with it. And then again, that this Perfect Power (which is also the same with Infinite) is really nothing else, but a Power of Producing and Doing, all whatsoever is Conceivable, and which does not imply a Contradiction; for Conception is the Only Measure of Power and its Extent, as shall be shewed more fully in due place.

Now here we think fit to observe, that the Pagan Theists did themselves also, vulgarly acknowledge Omnipotence as an Attribute of the Deity, which might be proved from sundry Passages of their Writings.

Homer. Od. ο'.

οὐδέ ἀλλότρ' ἐπ' ἀλλῳ
μὴν ἀραξάθεντα καλύτερα δίδαι, δύνατιν γὰς ἀπόκειν.

Deus alind post alind
Jupiter, Bonumque Malumque dat, Poteiti enim Omnia.

And
And again, Od. i.

——Odis et μεθ' α' d'ασι θ' α' ιας,
"Οτι κεν ο Ιδισ ιεθ' δοιας γη άπτανα.

——Deus autem hoc dabit, illud omittet,
Quedunque ei libitum suerit, Poteit enim Omnia.

To this Purpose also before Homer, Linus,

'Ράδια ποιήσετε γερά τελεση, ή σιναιτε οίνοι.

And after him, Callimachus,

δαλμεν ὠξας παν διακτο?

All things are possible for God to do, and nothing transcends his Power:
Thus also amongst the Latin Poets, Virgil Æn. the First,

Sed Pater Omnipotens, Speluncis abdidit Atris.

Again Æn. the Second,

- At Pater Anchises, oculos ad sidera latus
  Extulit, & Celo palmas cum Vosce tetendit;
  Jupiter Omnipotens, precibus si sileseris ullis;

And Æn. the Fourth,

Talibus orantem dixit, arsque tenentem
  Audiiit Omnipotens.

Ovid in like manner, Metamorph. 1.

Tum Pater Omnipotens, missa persegit Olympia
  Fulmine, & excussit substratum Pelion Offa.

And to cite no more, Agatho an ancient Greek Poet, is commended by Aristole, for affirming, nothing to be exempted from the Power of God, but only this, that he cannot make That not to have been, which hath been; that is, do what implies a Contradiction.

Hoc namque duntaxat, negatum etiam Deo est;
  Que facta sunt, Insecta posse reddere.

Lastly, that the Atheists themselves under Paganism look'd upon Omnipotence,
tence, and Infinite Power, as an Essential Attribute of the Deity, appears plainly from Lucretius, when he tells us, that Epicurus, in order to the Taking away of Religion, set himself to Confute Infinite Power.

As if he should have said, Epicurus by shewing that all Power was Finite, effectually destroyed Religion; he thereby taking away the Object of it, which is an Omnipotent and Infinitely Powerful Deity. And this is a thing which the same Poet often harps upon again, that there is No Infinite Power, and Consequentially no Deity, according to the true Idea of it. But last of all, in his Sixth Book, he condemns Religionists, as guilty of great folly, in asserting Omnipotence of Infinite Power (that is, a Deity) after this manner.

Where though the Poet, speaking carelessly, after the manner of those times, seem to attribute Omnipotence and Infinite Power to God; Plurally, yet as it is evident in the thing it self, that this can only be the Attribute of One Supreme Deity, so it may be observed, that in those Passages of the Poets before cited, it is accordingly always ascribed to God Singularly. Nevertheless all the Inferiour Pagan Deities, were supposed by them to have their certain shares of this Divine Omnipotence, severally dispensed and imparted to them.

IX. But we have not yet dispatched all that belongs to the Entire Idea of God. For Knowledge and Power alone, will not make a God. For God is generally conceived by all to be a Most Venerable and Most Desirable Being: whereas an Omniscient and Omnipotent Arbitrary Deity, that hath nothing either of Benignity or Morality in its Nature to Measure and Regulate its Will, as it could not be truly August and Venerable, according to that Maxime, sine Bonitate nulli Majestas; so neither could it be Desirable, it being that which could only be Feared and Dreaded, but not have any Firm Faith or Confidence placed in it. Plutarch in the Life of Aristides, τὸ θεὸν τείχος ἰσόθυναι δικαίως, εἰρωνεία, καὶ δικαιότως, καὶ ἀρετὴν ἐν σωματῶσιν ἀρετὴν, τὸν ζητῆσαι αἰτίας μὴ ὑπὲρ ὑπερήφανος, τὸν κατὰ νόμον καὶ τὸν παρθένον χρηστάνειν. Ἰδαναι ἦν οὕτως ἰσόθυναι, καὶ ἐσορευτικοῷ, καὶ πανικατωτῷ ὁμιλεῖ, καὶ ἐδικαιοτάτῳ ἐπιρροή μεγαλῶν ἱκέται. God seems to excel in these Three things, Incorruptibility, Power and
and Virtue, of all which the most Divine and Venerable is Virtue, for Vacuum and the Siren's Elements have Incorruptibility, Earthquakes, and Thunders, Buffeting Winds and Oversweming Torrents, Much of Power and Force. Wherefore the Vulgar being affected three manner of ways towards the Deity, so as to admire its Happines, to Fear it, and to Honour it; they esteem the Deity Happy for its Incorruptibility, they Fear it and stand in awe of it for its Power, but they Worship it, that is Love and Honour it, for its Justice. And indeed an Omnipotent Arbitrary Deity, may seem to be in some sense, a Worfe and more Undesirable Thing, than the Manichean Evil God, forasmuch as the Latter could be but Finitely Evil, whereas the Former might be to Infinitely. However (I think) it can be little doubted, but that the whole Manichean Hypothesis, taken all together, is to be preferred, before this of One Omnipotent Arbitrary Deity (devoid of Goodness and Morality) ruling all things, because there the Evil Principle is Yoaked with another Principle Essentially Good, checking and controlling it. And it also seems less Dihonourable to God, to impute Defect of Power than of Goodness and Justice to him.

Neither can Power and Knowledge alone, make a Being in it self completely Happy; for we have all of us by Nature μαθήματα τῇ (as both Plato and Aristotle call it) a certain Divination, Prefage, and Parturient Vaticination in our minds, of some Higher Good and Perfection, than either Power or Knowledge. Knowledge is plainly to be preferred before Power, as being that which guides and directs its blind Force and Imperus; but Aristotle himself declares, that there is λόγος τῇ καταβάσις, which is λόγος ἔργα, Something better than Reason and Knowledge, which is the Principle and Original of it. For (faith he) λόγος ἔργα ἐστὶ λόγος, ἀλλὰ τῇ καταβάσις. The Principle of Reason is not Reason, but Something Better. Where he also intimates this to be the Proper and Essential Character of the Deity; τῇ ἐν καθέναν ἐγνώμονη, πάντα ἐν οἷον. For what is there, that can be better than Knowledge, but God? Likewise the same Philosopher elsewhere plainly determines, that there is Morality in the Nature of God, and that his Happines confindeth principally therein, and not in External things, and the Exercise of his Power. Ὑπὸ μὲν ἐν ἐκδοσίᾳ ἀδικίμισις οὕτω μᾶλλον ταύτα, ἀπὸ μὲν ἀρετὴς ἐξ ὑμνήσκοις, ἐκ τῆς πρεσβείας καὶ τάσσε τεσσαράκτερα, καὶ συναισχυνάσματος ἑαυτοῦ, μαζεύεται τῇ ἐν τοῖς καθορίσμοις, ὑπὸ ἀδικίμιας μὲν ἄλλος ἦτο ἐν μαζεύσις, ὑπὸ μὲν ἀγαθοῦ ἐξ ἐκδοσίας ἀγαθοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἀρετῶν ἐστὶς, τῇ τῶν ἀρετῶν τίς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. That every man hath so much of Happines, as he hath of Virtue and Wisdom, and of Acting according to these, ought to be confessed and acknowledged by us; it being a thing that may be proved from the Nature of God, who is Happy, but not from any external Good, but because he is himself (or that which he is) and in such a manner affected according to his Nature, that is, because he is Essentially Moral and Virtuous.

Which Doctrine of Aristotle's, seems to have been borrowed from Plato, who in his Dialogues De Republica, discoursing about Moral Vertue, occasionally falls upon this Dispute concerning the Sum-

S
A Good Superior to Knowledge. Book I.

Now whatever this Chiefest Good be, which is a Perfection Superior to Knowledge and Understanding; that Philosopher resolves that it must needs be First and Principally in God; who is therefore called by him, \( \text{ο} \text{μ} \text{ν} \text{α} \text{τ} \) α\( \text{ρ} \text{o} \text{ς} \), The very Idea or Essence of Good. Wherein he trode in the Footsteps of the Pythagoreans, and particularly of Timæus Locrus, who making Two Principles of the Univerfe, Mind and Necessity, adds concerning the Former, τον χετόν ἃ παρὰ τῆς τριγυνίας ἐρωταί, Σεμιπα συμβατικοὶ ἀνερχομένας τῆς ἀναγκῆς. The First of these Two, is of the Nature of Good, and it is called God, the Principle of the Best things. Agreeably with which Doctrine of theirs, the Hebrew Cabalists also make a Sephiroth in the Deity, Superior both to Binah and Chochmah (Understanding and Wisdom) which they call Cheth or the Crown. And some would suspect this Cabalistic Learning to have been very ancient among the Jews, and that Parmenides was imbued with it, he calling God in like manner σαφάλοιον or the Crown. For which Velleius in Cicerō, (representing
But all this while we seem to be to seek, What the Chief and Highest Good Superiour to Knowledge is, in which the Efficence of the Deity principally conflits, and it cannot be denied, but that Plato sometimes talks too Metaphysically and Clowdily about it; for which cause, as he lay open to the Lath of Aristole, so was he also Vulgarly perstringed for it, as appears by that of Amphys the Poet in Lattinus.

What Good that is, which you expect from hence, I confess, I less understand, than I do Plato's Good. Nevertheless he plainly intimates these two Things concerning it. First, that this Nature of Good which is also the Nature of God, includes Benignity in it; when he gives this accompt of Gods both Making the World and after such a Manner; because he was Good, and that which is Good hath no Envy in it, and therefore he both made the World, and also made it as well, and as like to himself as was possible. And Secondly, that it comprehends Eminently all Vertue and Justice, the Divine Nature being the First Pattern hereof; for which cause Vertue is defined to be, An Affimilation to the Deity. Justice and Honesty are no Fadditious things, Made by the Will and Command of the more Powerful to the Weaker, but they are Nature and Perfection, and descend downward to us from the Deity.

But the Holy Scripture without any Metaphysical Pomip and Obscurity, tells us plainly, Both what is that Highest Perfection of Intellectual Beings, which is ἐστιν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Better than Reason and Knowledge, and which is also the Source, Life and Soul of all Morality, namely that it is Love or Charity. Though I speak with the Tongue of Men and Angels, and have not Love, I am but as a sound Brass, or a clayish Cymbal, which only makes a Noice without any Inward Life. And though I have Prophecy, and Understand all Mysteries, and all Knowledge, and though I have all Faith, so that I could remove Mountains, and have not Love, I am Nothing; that is, I have no Inward Satisfaction, Peace or True Happines. And though I beflow all my Goods to feed the poor, and give my body to be burned, and have not Love, it profiteth me nothing; I am for all that utterly defitute of all True Morality, Vertue and Grace. And accordingly it tells us also in the next place, what the Nature of God is, that he is properly, neither Power nor Knowledge (though having the Perfection of both in him) but Love. And certainly whatever Dark Thoughts concerning the Deity, some Men in their Cells may fit brooding on, it can never reasonably be conceived, that that which is ἐστιν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, is such a Sto
Most Self-sufficient and Self-happy Being should have any Narrow and 
Selfish Designs abroad, without it self, much less harbour any Malignant 
and Deleterious ones, towards its Creatures. Nevertheless because so 
many are apt to abuse the Notion of the Divine Love and Goodness, 
and to frame such Conceptions of it, as destroy that Awful and 
Renntal Fear that ought to be had of the Deity, and make 
Men Presumptuous and Regardless of their Lives, therefore we think 
fit here to superadd also, that God is no Soft nor Fond and Partial 
Love, but that Justice is an Essential Branch of this Divine Goodness; 
God being, as the Writer De Mundo well Expresses it, μὴ ἔσθω 
τὰ πάντα, οὐχὶ τὰ πάντα, the Measure of all 
things. In Imitation whereof, Aristotle concludes also, that a Good 
Man (in a Lower and more Imperfect Sense) is μὴ τὰ πάντα, an Impartial 
Measure of Things and Actions.

It is evident that the Atheists themselves in those former times 
of Paganism, took it for Granted, that Goodness was an Essential 
Attribute of the Deity whose Existence they opposed (so that it was 
then generally acknowledged for such, by the Pagan Theftis) from 
those Argumentations of theirs before mentioned, the 12th. and 13th. 
taken from the Topick of Evils, the Pretended Ill Frame of things, 
and Want of Providence over Humane Affairs. Which if they were 
true, would not at all disprove such an Arbitrary Deity (as is now 
phanced by some) made up of Nothing but Will and Power, without 
any Essential Goodness and Justice. But those Arguments of the 
Atheists are directly Level'd against the Deity, according to the 
True Notion or Idea of it; and could they be made Good, would 
do execution upon the same. For it cannot be denied, but that the 
Natural Consequence of this Doctrine, That there is a God Essentically 
Good, is this, that therefore the World is Well Made and Governed. 
But we shall afterwards declare, that though there be Evil in the 
Parts of the World, yet there is none in the Whole; and that Moral 
Evils are not Imputable to the Deity.

And now we have proposed the Three Principal Attributes of the 
Deity. The First whereof is Infinite Goodness with Fecundity, the 
Second Infinite Knowledge and Wisdom, and the Last Infinite Active 
and Perceptive Power. From which Three Divine Attributes, the 
Platonic and Pythagoreans, seem to have framed their Trinity of 
Archical Hypostases, such as have the Nature of Principles in the 
Universe, and which though they apprehended as several Distinct Sub- 
stances, gradually subordinate to one another, yet they many times 
extend the πάντα so far, as to comprehend them all within it. Which 
Pythagorick Trinity seems to be imitated by Aristotle in those words, 
καθότι γὰρ οὐκ θεῶν οὐδεμίαν τὸ πάντα τῶν τοῦ πάντα πάντας τὴν διάγει. 
As the Pythagoreans also say, the Universe and all things, are deter-
mind'd and contain'd by three Principles. Of which Pythagorick 
Trinity more afterward. But now we may enlarge and fill up, 
that Compendious Idea of God premised, of A Being Absolutely Per-
fect, by adding thereunto (to make it more Particular) such as is In-
finity Good, Wise, and Powerful, necessarily Existing, and not only 
the
CHAPTER IV. Onlyness contained in this Idea.

The Frame of the World, but also the Cause of all things. Which Idea of the Deity, is sufficient, in order to our present Undertaking.

Nevertheless, if we would not only attend to what is barely necessary for a Dispute with Atheists, but also consider the Satisfaction of other Free and Devout Minds, that are hearty and sincere Lovers of this Most Admirable and Most Glorious Being, we might venture for their Gratification, to propose yet a more Full, Free and Copious Description of the Deity, after this manner. **God is a Being Absolutely Perfect, Unmade or Self-originated, and Necessarily Existing, that hath an Infinite Fecundity in him, and Virtually Contains all things; as also an Infinite Benignity or Overflowing Love, Uninvariably displaying and communicating itself, together with an Infinite Redundancy, or Nature of Justice: Who fully comprehends himself, and the Extent of his own Fecundity; and therefore all the Possibilities of things, their several Natures and Respects, and the Best Frame or System of the Whole: Who hath also Infinite Active and Perceptive Power: The Fountain of all things, who made all that Could be Made, and was Fit to be made, producing them according to his Own Nature (his Essential Goodness and Wisdom) and therefore according to the Best Pattern, and in the Best manner Possible, for the Good of the Whole; and reconciling all the Variety and Contrariety of things in the Universe, into One most Admirable and Lively Harmony. Lastly, who Contains, and Upholds all things, and governs them after the Best Manner also, and that without any Force or Violence; they being all Naturally subject to his Authority, and readily obeying his Laws. And Now we see that God is such a Being, as that if he could be supposed Not to Be, there is Nothing, whose Existence, a Good Man could possibly more Volition or Defire.

X. From the Idea of God thus declared, it evidently appears, that there can be but One such Being, and that Morales, Unity, Oneliness or Singularity is Essential to it: forasmuch as there cannot possibly be more than One Supreme, more than One Omnipotent or Infinitely Powerful Being, and more than One Cause of all things besides itself. And however Epicurus, endeavouring to pervert and Adulterate the Notion of God, pretended to satisfie that Natural Prophesies or Anticipation in the Minds of Men, by a Feigned and Counterfeit ascertaining of a Multiplicity of Coordinate Deities, Independent upon One Supreme, and such as were also altogether unconcerned either in the Frame or Government of the World, yet himself notwithstanding plainly took notice of this Idea of God which we have proposed, including Unity or Oneliness in it (he professedly opposing the Existence of such a Deity) as may sufficiently appear from that Argumentation of his, in the Words before cited.

quipere Immensi summum, quipere habere Præsumi
Indi manu validas potis est moderantur habentis?
quipere carus annus convertere, & annus
Ignibus aetheris terras suffusive feraece?

Quis regere Immensi summum, Quis habere Præsumi
Indi manu validas potis est moderantur habentis?
Quipere carus annus convertere, & annus
Ignibus aetheris terras suffusive feraece?

Lit. i. 9.
Omnibus
Where he would conclude it to be a thing Utterly impossible, for the Deity to Animadvert, Order and Dispose all things, and be Present every where in all the distant places of the World at once; which could not be Pretended of a Multitude of Coordinate Gods, sharing the Government of the World amongst them, and therefore it must needs be level’d against a Divine Monarchy, or One Single, Solitary Supreme Deity, ruling over all. As in like manner, when he pursues the same Argument further in Cicero, to this purpose, that though such a thing were supposed to be Possible, yet it would be notwithstanding absolutely Inconsistent with the Happines of any Being, he still proceeds upon the same Hypothesis of one Sole and Single Deity: *Sive ipse Mundus Deus est, quid potest esse minus quietum, quam nullo puncto temporis intermisso, veriari circum axem Celi admirabili celeritate? Sive in ipso Mundo Deus inest aliquid qui regat, qui gubernet, qui currit afferorum, mutationes temporum, hominum commoda vitidique iucundus; ne ille est implicatus molestiis operiosis.* Whether you will suppose the World itself to be a God, what can be more unjust, than without intermission perpetually to whirling round upon the Axis of the Heaven, with such admirable celerity? Or whether you will imagine a God in the World distant from it, who does govern and dispose all things, keep up the Course of the Stars, the Successive Changes of the Seasons, and Orderly Vicissitudes of things, and contemplating Lands and Seas, conferve the Utilities and Lives of men; certainly He must needs be involved in much solicitous trouble and Employment. For as Epicurus here speaks Singularly, so the Trouble of this Theocracy could not be thought so very great, to a Multitude of Coordinate Deities, when parcel’d out among them, but would rather seem to be but a sportful and delightful Diversifement to each of them. Wherefore it is manifest that such an Idea of God, as we have declared, including Unity, Onelines and Singularity in it, is a thing, which the ancient Atheists, under the times of Paganism, were not unacquainted with, but principally directed their Force against. But this may seem to be Anticipated in this place, because it will fall in afterwards more opportunity to be discussed of again.

XI. For this is that which lies as the Grand Prejudice and Objection against that Idea of God, which we have proposed, Essentially including μονοκρατία, Singularity or Onelines in it, or the Real Existence of such a Deity, as is the Sole Monarch of the Universe; because all the Nations of the World heretofore (except a small and inconsiderable handful of the Jews) together with their Wise-men and greatest Philosophers, were generally look’d upon as Polytheists, that is, such as Acknowledged and Worshipped a Multiplicity of Gods. Now One God and Many Gods, being directly Contradictory to one another, it is therefore concluded from hence, that this Opinion of Monarchy or of One Supreme God, the Maker and Governor of all, hath no Foundation in Nature, nor in the genuine Idea’s and Prophesies of mens minds, but is a mere Artificial thing, owning its Original wholly
wholly to Private Phancies and Conceits, or to Positive Laws and Institutions, amongst Jews, Christians and Mahometans.

For the assoiling of which Difficulty (seeming so formidable at first sight) it is necessary, that we should make a Diligent Enquiry into the True and Genuine sense of this Pagan Polytheism. For since it is impossible that any man in his Wits, should believe a Multiplicity of Gods, according to that Idea of God before declared, that is, a Multiplicity of Supreme, Omnipotent, or Infinitely Powerful Beings; it is certain that the Pagan Polytheism, and Multiplicity of Gods, must be understood according to some other Notion of the Word Gods, or some Equivocation in the use of it. It hath been already observed, that there were somet ime amongst the Pagans, such, who meaning nothing else by Gods, but Understanding Beings Superiour to men, did suppose a Multitude of such Deities, which yet they conceived to be all (as well as Men) Native and Mortal, Generated successively out of Matter and Corrupted again into it, as Democritus his Idols were. But thefe Theogonies, who thus Generated all things whatsoever, and therefore the Gods themselves universally, out of Night and Chaos, the Ocean or Fluid Matter, (notwithstanding their Using the Name Gods) are plainly condemned both by Aristotle and Plato, for down-right Atheifs, they making Senfless Matter, the Only Self-existent thing, and the Original of all things.

Wherefore there may be another Notion of the Word Gods, as taken for Understanding Beings Superiour to Men, that are not only Immortal, but also Self-existent and Unmade; and indeed the Affir ters of a Multiplicity of such Gods as thefe, though they cannot be accounted Theifs in a strict and proper sense (according to that Idea of God before declared) yet they are not vulgarly reputed Atheifs neither, but look'd upon as a kind of Middle thing betwixt Both, and commonly called Polytheifs. The reafon whereof seems to be this, because it is generally apprehended to be Essential to Atheism, to make Senfless Matter the Sole Original of all things, and consequently to suppose all Confeius Intellectual Beings to be Made or Generated; wherefore they who on the contrary affert (not One but Many Understanding Beings Unmade and Self-existent, must needs be look'd upon as thofe, who of the Two, approach nearer to Theifm than to Atheifm, and fo deserve rather to be called Polytheifs, than Atheifs.

And there is no Question to be made, but that the Urgers of the forementioned Objection against that Idea of God, which includes onefides and Singularity in it, from the Pagan Polytheism, or Multiplicity of Gods, take it for granted, that this is to be understood of Many Unmade Self-existent Deities, Independent upon one Supreme, that are so many First Principles in the Universe, and Partial Causes of the World. And certainly, if it could be made to appear, that the Pagan Polytheifs did universally acknowledge such a Multiplicity of Unmade Self-existent Deities, then the Argument fetch'd from thence, against the Naturality of that Idea of God proposed
posed (Essentially including Singularity in it) might seem to have no small Force or Validity in it.

XII. But First this Opinion of Many Self-existent Deities, Independent upon One Supreme, is both Very Irrational in itself, and also plainly Repugnant to the Phenomena. We say First, it is Irrational in itself, because Self-existence, and Necessary Existence being Essential to a Perfect Being and to nothing else, it must needs be very Irrational and Abjurd, to suppose a Multitude of Imperfect Understanding Beings Self-existent, and no Perfect One. Moreover, if Imperfect Understanding Beings were imagined to Exist of themselves from Eternity, there could not possibly be any reason given, why just so many of them should exist, and neither More nor Less, there being indeed no reason why any at all should: But if it be supposed, that these Many Self-existent Deities happened only to Exist thus from Eternity, and their Existence notwithstanding, was not Necessary but Contingent, the Consequence hereof will be, that they might as well happen again to cease to be, and so could not be Incorruptible. Again, if any one Imperfect Being whatsoever, could exist of it self from Eternity, then all might as well do so, not only Matter, but also the Souls of Men and other Animals, and consequently there could be No Creation by any Deity, nor those supposed Deities therefore deserve that Name. Lastly, we might also add, that there could not be a Multitude of Intellectual Beings Self-existent, because it is a thing which may be proved by Reason, that all Imperfect Understanding Beings or Minds, do partake of One Perfect Mind, and suppose also Omnipotence or Infinite Power; were it not, that this is a Consideration too remote from Vulgar Apprehension, and therefore not to fit to be urged in this place.

Again, as this Opinion of Many Self-existent Deities, is Irrational in itself, so is it likewise plainly Repugnant to the Phenomena of the World. In which, as Macrobius writes, Omnia sunt connexa, all things conspire together into One Harmony, and are carried on Peaceably and Quietly, Constantly and Eavenly, without any Tumult or Hurly-burly, Confusion or Disorder, or the least appearance of Schism and Faction, which could not possibly be supposed, were the World Made and Governed, by a Rabble of Self-existent Deities, Coordinate, and Independent upon One Supreme. Wherefore this kind of Polytheism was obiter thus confuted by Origen; πέτοι, ἃν φέλποι ηὲ ἢ ἦν ἑομένων πάθος ἐλειμένων τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἄτομον τῆς κάρας σεμερόν τοῦ ἀναπεσόν τοῦ ἄθροις, καὶ ἐνεργέοντος ὡς ὠν ἐναρξαί, ἢ διὰ τότο μὴ δυσχέρεως ἢ πολλά τινα ἀναπεσόντα ἐπί τοῦ ἐνεργείαν ἀκρόπλοιον ὡς ἔνα ὑπὸ πολλά ἦν ἀλλὰ ἐναρχείας ἀναπεσόντας τοῦ ἀναπεσόν τοῦ ἄθροις. How much better is it, agreeably to what we see in the harmonious System of the World, to worship one only Maker of the World, which is one, and conspiring throughout with its whole self, and therefore could not be made by many Artificers, as neither be contained by Many Souls, Moving the Whole Heaven? Now since this Opinion is both Irrational in itself and Repugnant to the Phenomena, there is the less Probability that it should have been received and entertained by all the more Intelligent Pagans.
XIII. Who, that they did not thus Universally, look upon all their Godras so many Unmade Self-existent Beings, is unquestionably manifest from hence, because ever since Hesiod’s and Homer’s time at least, the Greekish Pagans generally acknowledged a Theogonia, a Generation and Temporary Production of the Gods; which yet is not to be unfeconded Universally neither, forasmuch as he is no Theist, who does not acknowledge some Self-existent Deity. Concerning this Theogonia, Herodotus writeth after this manner: δε γε ἐσθε αὐτοὶ οὐκοῦν καί ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ὀλυμπ. ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπὶ Ὀλυμπ. ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς εἰ δικαίως, ὡς εἰ πρῶτο τοῖς θεοῖς, ὡς εἰ, ὡς ἡ μηδενίς πατήρ. ούκ εἰσὶν οὐκοῦν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καί τοῦ πατρὸς. οὔτοι οἱ πατρὸι τῆς Ἐποχῆς, εἰ τοίς μὲν πατρὶς τοῖς, οὔτοι οἱ πατρὶς τοῖς, οὔτοι οἱ πατρὶς τοῖς. It hence every one of the Gods was Generated, or whether they all of them were, and what are their forms, is a thing that was not known till very lately, for Hesiod and Homer, were (as I suppose) not above four hundred years my seniors. And these were they who introduced the Theogonia among the Greeks, and gave the Gods their several Names; that is, settled the Pagan Theology. Now if before Hesiod’s and Homer’s time, it were a thing not known or determined amongst the Greeks, whether their Gods were Generated or all of them Existed from Eternity; then it was not Universally concluded by them, that they were all Unmade and Self-existent. And though perhaps some might in those ancient times believe one way, and some another, concerning the Generation and Eternity of their Gods, yet it does not follow, that they who thought them to be all Eternal, must therefore needs suppose them to be all Unmade or Self-existent. For Aristotle, who ascertained the Eternity of the World, and consequentally also of those Gods of his, the Heavenly Bodies, did not for all that, suppose them to be Self-existent or First Principles, but all to depend upon One Principle or Original Deity. And indeed the true meaning of that Question in Herodotus, Whether the Gods were Generated or Existed all of them from Eternity, is (as we suppose) really no other than that of Plato’s, ἐκ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐκ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. Whether the World were Made or Unmade, and whether it had a Temporary beginning, or existed such as it is from Eternity; which will be more fully declared afterwards. But ever since Hesiod’s and Homer’s time, that the Theogonia or Generation of the Gods, was settled, and generally believed amongst the Greeks, it is certain that they could not possibly think, all their Gods Eternal, and therefore much less, Unmade and Self-existent.

But though we have thus clearly proved that all the Pagan Gods were not Universally accounted by them, so many Unmade Self-existent Deities; they acknowledging a Theogonia or a Generation of Gods, yet it may be suspected notwithstanding, that they might suppose a Multitude of them also (and not only One) to have been Unmade from Eternity and Self-existent. Wherefore we add in the next place, that no such thing does at all appear neither, as that the Pagans or any others, did ever publickly or professedly affect a Multitude of Unmade Self-existent Deities. For First, it is plain concerning the Hesiodian Gods, which were all the Gods of the Greekish Pagans
Pagans, that either there was but one of them only self-existens, or else none at all. Because Hesiod's Gods were either all of them derived from Chaos (or the Floting Water) Love it self being Generated likewise out of it (according to that Aristophanic tradition before mentioned) or else Love was supposed to be a distinct Principle from Chaos, namely the Active Principle of the Universe, from whence together with Chaos, all the Theogonia and Cosmoogonia was derived. Now if the former of these were true, that Hesiod supposed all his Gods Univerfally, to have been generated and sprung originally from Chaos or the Ocean, then it is plain that notwithstanding all that Rable of Gods must be up by him, he could be no other than one of those Atheistick Theogonists before mentioned, and really acknowledged no God at all, according to the True Idea of him; he being not a Theift, who admits of no self-existens Deity. But if the latter be true, that Hesiod supposed Love to be a Principle distinct from Chaos, namely the Active Principle of the Universe, and derived all his other Gods from thence, he was then a right Paganick Theift, such as acknowledged indeed Many Gods, but only one of them Unmade and self-existens, all the rest being generated or created by that one. Indeed it appears from those passages of Aristotle before cited by us, that that Philosopher had been sometimes divided in his judgment concerning Hesiod, where he should rank him, whether among the Atheists or the Theists. For in his Book de Coelo, he ranks him amongst those, who made all things to be generated and corrupted, besides the Bare Subfance of the Matter, that is amongst the Absolute Atheists, and look'd upon him as a Ringleader of them: but in his Metaphysicks, upon further thoughts, suspects that many of those who made Love the Chiefest of the Gods, were Theists, supposing it to be a First Principle in the Universe, or the Active Cause of things, and that not only Paganists, but also Hesiod was such. Which latter opinion of his is by far the more probable, and therefore embraced by Plutarch, who somewhere determines Hesiod to have affected one Deity, or Unmade, or Unmade Deity, as also by the ancient Scholastick upon him, write thus, that Hesiod's Love was ὁ ἀόρατος ἄριστος, ὁ δὲ εὐδοκός ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ἀρχαίου κόσμου ἐκδότης τῆς ἐξωτικῆς ἀγάπης: The Heavenly Love, which is also God, that other Love that was born of Venus, being Junior. But Joannes Diaconus: ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἄνωθεν εὐδοκός, ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἀρχαίου κόσμου εὐδοκός, τοῦ ἂν ἄριστος τοῦ πάντων. But by Love here (faith he) we must not understand Venus her Son, whose Mother was as yet Unborn, but another more ancient Love, which I take to be the Active Cause or Principle of Motion, Naturally inferred into things. Where though he do not seem to suppose this Love to be God himself, yet he conceives it to be an Active Principle in the Universe derived from God, and not from Matter. But this opinion will be further confirmed afterward.

The next considerable appearance of a Multitude of Self-existens Deities, seems to be in the Valentinian Thirty Gods and Elements, which have been taken by some for such; but it is certain that these were all of them save One, Generated; they being derived by that Phan- tasick
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taftick Devizer of them, from One Self-originated Deity, called
Bythus. For thus Epiphanius informs us, "τρίτος αὐτοῦ ἦν ὁ Θεός ὃν ἐνακοπηκτικὸς ἦν Θεός ἢ ἤτο δὲ σωματικὸς θεὸς.
λόγος ὁ θεοῦ σωματικὸς παρέχεται, ἵνα ἐν πρᾶξις ἐστιν θεός." This (Valentinus) would also introduce Thirty Gods and Angels, and Heavens, the
first of which is Bythus; he meaning thereby an Unfathomable Depth and Profundity; and therefore this Bythus, was also called by him
ὁ διάκονος Σωματικὸς παρθένος, The Highest and Ineffable Father.

We do indeed acknowledge that there have been some, who have really ascribed a Duality of Gods, in the sense declared; that is of
Animals or Perceptive Beings Self-existent; One as the Principle of
Good, and the other of Evil. And this Ditheism of theirs, seems to
be the nearest approach, that was ever really made to Polytheism.
Unless we should here give heed to Plutarch, who seems to make
the ancient Persians, besides their Two Gods, the Good and the Evil,
or Oromisdes and Arimanius; to have ascribed also a Third Middle
Deity called by them Mithras; or to some Ecclesiastick Writers, who
impute a Trinity of Gods to Marcion; (though Tertullian be yet
more Liberal, and encreas the Number to an Ennead.) For those
that were commonly called Tritheists, being but mistaken Christians
and Trinitarians, fall not under this Consideration. Now as for
that forementioned Ditheism, or Opinion of Two Gods, a Good and
an Evil one, it is evident that its Original sprung from nothing else,
but First a Firm Perfection of the Essential Goodness of the Deity,
with a Conception that the Evil that is in the world, was altogether
Inconsistent and Unreconcilable with the same, and that therefore for the falsity of this Phenomenon, it was absolutely necessary,
to suppose another Animals Principle Self-existent, or an Evil
God. Wherefore as these Ditheists, as to all that which is Good in
the World, held a Monarchy, or one Sole Principle and Original,
so it is plain, that had it not been for this business of Evil (which
they conceived could not be falsed any other way,) they would never have ascertained any more Principles or Gods than One.

The chiefest and most eminent Affertors of which Ditheistick Do-
ctrine of Two Self-existent Animals Principles in the Universe, a
Good God and an Evil Demon, were the Marcionites and the Ma-
ricians, both of which, though they made some Light Pretences to
Christianity, yet were not by Christians owned for such. But it is
certain that besides these and before them too, some of the Profes-
fed Pagans also, entertained the same Opinion, that famous Mora-
life Plutarchus Chersonensis, being an Undoubted Patron of it; which
in his Book De Iside & Osiride he represents, with some little dif-
ference, after this manner; μεγάλον γαί τον τόπον τῆς ἀποθεώσεως τοῦ ἄγαντος τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα οὗ ὢν
καὶ χριστιανοί, ὥς οἱ ἱστορικοὶ δυκάμενοι, ἀλλά ἦσαν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ τοῦ μεταφυσικοῦ τοῦ τόπου, ἀπολογοῦν τοῦ τούτων τοῦ
παντότητος, πολλοὶ παρειποθοῦν τοῦ σαβελλίου, πολλοὶ τοῦ τούτου τοῦ παντότητος, διὰ τὴς τοῦ παντότητος δυσμαχίας. The
Generation and Constitution of this World is mixt of contrary Powers
or Principles (the one Good, the other Evil) yet so as that they are not
both of equal force, but the Better of them more prevalent; notwith-
standing
Indeed learned men of later times, have for the most part look'd upon Plutarch here, but either as a bare Relater of the Opinion of other Philosophers; or else as a Follower only, and not a Leader in it. Notwithstanding which, it is evident, that Plutarch was himself heartily Engaged in this Opinion, he discovering no small fondness for it, in sundry of his other Writings: as for Example in his Platonick Questions, where he thus declares himself concerning it, "τὸ πολλὰς ὑπ' ἑαυτῷ ἀγάπησαν ἀληθείας ἢ τὸ μὲν ἔχειν ἡμεῖς, ἡ τοῖχος ἡ ἐκκλησία, η τοὶ ἀλέοντων κόσμῳ, συνυπόθεσιν ἀληθείας ἐϊς ἀλήθειαν ἀοίδω· τὸ γὰρ ζευγήν ἢ τὸ αὐτοκράτορ ἢ τὸ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἄθανατον ἢ τὸ ὄρατον ἢ τὸ θανάτον ἢ τὸ ἐνεργόν ἢ τὸ ἀνενεργόν, Or else that which is often affirmed by us is true, that a Mad Irrational soul, and an unformed disorderly Body did coexist with one another from Eternity, neither of them having any Generation or Beginning. And in his Timean Psychogonia, he does at large industriously maintain the fame, there and elsewhere endeavouring to establish this Doctrine, as much as possibly he could, upon Rational Foundations. As First, that Nothing can be Made or Produced without a Cause, and therefore there must of Necessity, be some Cause of Evil also, and that a Positive one too; he representing the Opinion of those as very ridiculous, who would make the Nature of Evil, to be but an Accidental Appendix to the World, and all that Evil which is in it, to have come in only by the by, and by Consequence, without any Positive Cause. Secondly, that God being Essentially Good could not possibly be the Cause of Evil, where he highly applauds Plato for removing God to the greatest distance imaginable from being the Cause of Evil. Thirdly, that as God could not, so neither could ὡς ἄξιος, Matter in it self devoid of all Form and Quality, be the Cause of Evil, noting this to have been the Subterfuge of the Stoicks. Upon which account, he often condemns them, but uncertainly, sometimes as such, who assign No Cause at all of Evils, and sometimes again as those who made God the Cause of them. For in his Psychogonia he concludes that unless we acknowledge a Substantial Evil Principle, οὐ Στοικαὶ καταλαμβάνειν ζητεῖν ἐπέτιμον, το κακόν ὡς οἱ μὲν ὀλίγοι, ἀκριβῶς ἐκεῖνος ὑπερποίησεν ὑπερφοντες, οὐδ' ἐνὶ ὁλοίς ἐστὶν ἃ ἀγαθόν, οὐδ' ἐν ἀτίμων, οὐδ' ἐνὶ ὁλοίς καὶ ἐνὶ ὑπερθερμανότοις. The Stoical Difficulties will of necessity overtake and involve us, who introduce Evil into the World from Nothing, or Without a Cause, since neither that which is Essentially Good (as God) nor yet that which is devoid of all Quality (as Matter) could possibly give being or Generation to it. But in his Book against the Stoicks, he accuses them as thole, who made God, Essentially Good, the Cause of Evil, οὐτότι τὸν κακόν ἀξιών, ἀξιών ὁποῖον τὸ θεόν ποιεῖ, ἐ ὅ τι ἡν πνεῦμα ἐξ ἐντέκτης περιφονίας, ἀπινος χεὶς ἢ καὶ πέπεσε ὑπερθερμανότοις, ὑπερκαταντός αὐτῶν. Καθάνει γὰρ ὁ κακόν τινι συμβαίνει μὲν ὑπ' ἐνέδρα, ὡς τὸ μὲν ὄντος, ἢ ὡς τὴν κακεντρωτικοῦ ἡμίκεν. ἢς ὑπερκαταντός αὐτῶν ὡς τὸν καινοῦς ἐνεργείαν ὡς τὸν κακοῦς ἐνεργείαν. Themselves make God being Good, the Principle and Cause of Evil, since Matter which is devoid of Quality, and receives all its Differences...
from the Active Principle, that moves and forms it, could not possibly be the Cause thereof. Wherefore Evil must of necessity, either come from Nothing, or else it must come from the Active and Moving Principle, which is God. Now from all these Premises joined together, Plutarch concludes, that the Phenomenon of Evil, could no otherwise possibly be salved, than by supposing a Substantial Principle for it, and a certain Irrational and Maleficent Soul or Demon, Unmade, and Coexisting with God and Matter from Eternity to have been the Cause thereof. And accordingly he resolves, that as whatsoever is Good in the Soul and Body of the Universe, and likewise in the Souls of Men and Demons, is to be ascribed to God as its only Original, so whatsoever is Evil, Irregular and Disorderly in them, ought to be imputed to this other Substantial Principle, a <i>νεκρὸς</i> κατοικία, <i>an Irrational and Maleficent Soul or Demon</i>, which infinuating it self every where throughout the World, is all along intermingled with the Better Principle: ήδη πάντως ἐγέρν τῷ Θεῷ τῷ <i>νεκρῷ</i>, <i>So that neither the Soul of the Universe, nor that of Men and Demons, was wholly the Workmanship of God, but the Lower, Brutish and Disorderly part of them, the Effect of the Evil Principle.</i>

But besides all this, it is evident that Plutarch was also strongly polemized with a Conceit, that nothing Substantial could be Created (no not by Divine Power) out of Nothing Preexisting; and therefore that all the Substance of whatsoever is in the World did Exist from Eternity Unmade: so that God was only the Orderer, or the Methodizer and Harmonizer thereof. Wherefore as he concluded that the Corporeal World was not Created by God out of Nothing, as to the Substance of it, but only the Preexisting Matter, which before moved Disorderly, was brought into this Regular Order and Harmony by him: In like manner he resolved that the <i>Soul of the World</i> (for such a thing is always suppos'd by him) was not made by God out of Nothing neither, but out of any thing Inanimate and Soulless Preexisting, but out of a Preexisting Disorderly Soul, was brought into an Orderly and Regular Frame; αὐτοὶαὶ ἐν τῇ περὶ τῇ κακίᾳ γνώσει, αὐτοὶαὶ ὑπὸ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὸν, ἢ ᾧ ἀμώμου ὑπὸ λοιπόν τοῦ σωματικοῦ, ἢ τοῦ καινοῦ ἔχειν. Τούτῳ οὖν ἐν αἰσχρότητι γνώσει ἐν ἑλπίδοις λέγει: οὗ τις ἐκ τῆς σωματίκος τῆς αμώμου, ἢ τῆς νεκροῦ ἐκ τῆς ψυχοῦ προέρχονται, ἢ ἐν καινοῦ ἐκ μικροῦ ἐργαζόμενον ἐφαγότα, ἢ ἔτη γεννήθηται πρὸς ἑτερον. There was <i>Unformed Matter</i>, before this Orderly World was made, which Matter was not Incorporal, nor Unmoved or Inanimate, but Body composed and aided by a Furious and Irrational Mover, the Deformity whereof was the Disharmony of a Soul in it, devoid of Reason. For God neither made Body out of that which was No-Body, nor Soul out of No-Soul. But as the Musician who neither makes Voice nor Motion, does by ordering of them notwithstanding produce Harmony; so God, though he neither made the Tangible and Reifying Substance of Body, nor the Phantasstick and Self-moving Power of Soul, yet taking both those Principles preexisting (the one of which was Dark and obscure, the other Turbulent and Irrational) and orderly disposing and Harmonizing of them, he did by that means produce this most beautiful and perfect Animal of the World. And further to the same purposes ἂν χαίσι χαίσι διαλέγει ἡ δή υἱος ἡ υἱος, ἢ γεννήθη ἡ γεννήθη ἡ ἐμαθήη, ἢ ὁ Σάτις πάθει ἡ ἡμέραν.
Plutarch's Grounds for an Evil God, Book I.

God was not the Cause or Maker of Body simply, that is, neither of Bulk nor Matter, but only of that Symmetry and Perfection which is in Body, and that likeness which it hath to itself. Which same ought to be concluded also, concerning the Soul of the World, that the Substance of it was not made by God neither; nor yet that it was always the Soul of this World, but at first a certain Self-moving Substance, endowed with a Phantastick Power, Irrational and Disorderly, Existing such of it self from Eternity, which God by Harmonizing, and introducing into it fitting Numbers and Proportions, Made to be the Soul and Prince of this Generated World. According to which Doctrine of Plutarch's, in the supposed Soul of the World, though it had a Temporary beginning, yet was it never Created out of Nothing, but only that which preexisted disorderly, being acted by the Deity, was brought into a Regular Frame. And therefore he concludes, that the first and last of that World, which God was supposed to have created, was such as these words express: Wherefore, if you take this view of Mind, Reason and Harmony, it is not only the Work of God, but also a Part of him, nor is it a thing so much made by him, as from him and existing out of him. And the same must he likewise affirm concerning all other Souls, as those of Men and Demons, that they are either all of them the Substance of God himself, together with that of the Evil Demon, or else certain Deliberations from both, (if any one could understand it) blended and confounded together: He not allowing any new Substance at all to be created by God out of nothing preexistent. It was observed in the beginning of this Chapter, that Plutarch was an Affieror of two αὐτοκεφαλα or Self-existent Principles in the Universe, God and Matter, but now we understand, that he was an Earnest Propugnor of another Third Principle (as himself calls it) besides them both, viz. a θεός ἄριστος κακοτάτος, a Mad Irrational and Maleficient Soul or Demon; So that Plutarch was both a Triarchi, and a Diatheist, an Affieror of Three Principles, but of Two Gods; according to that forementioned Notion of a God, as it is taken, for an Animalist or Perceptive Being Self-existent.

We are not ignorant, that Plutarch endeavours with all his might to perpasse, this to have been the constant Belief of all the Pagan Nations, and of all the Wise men and Philosophers that ever were amongst them. For this (faith he, in his Book De Iside & Osiride) is a most ancient Opinion, that both have delivered down from Theologers and Law-makers, all along to Poets and Philosophers; and though the first Author thereof be Unknown, yet hath it been so firmly believed everywhere, that the Footsteps of it have been imprinted upon the Sacrifices and Mysteries or Religious Rites, both of Barbarians and Greeks, Namely, That the World is neither wholly Ungoverned by any Mind or Reason, as if all things floated in the Dreams of Chance and Fortune, nor yet that there is any one Principle steering and guiding all, without Restraint or Control; because there is a Confused Mixture of Good and Evil in everything, and nothing is Produced by Nature Sincere. Wherefore it
it is not one only Dispenser of things, who as it were out of several Vessels distributeth those several Liquors of Good and Evil, mingling them together and dashing them as he pleaseth. But there are two Distinct and Contrary Powers or Principles in the World, one of them always leading as it were to the Right hand, but the other tugging a Contrary way. In short, that our whole Life and the whole World is a certain Mixture and Confusion of these Two: at least this Terrestrial World below the Moon is such, all being every where full of Irregularity and Disorder. For if nothing can be Made without a Cause, and that which is Good cannot be the Cause of Evil, there must needs be a distinct Principle in Nature for the Production of Evil as well as Good. And this hath been the Opinion of the Most and Wised Men, some of them affirming that, and this, that, and that, so that there are Two Gods as it were of Contrary Crafts and Trades, one whereof is the Maker of all Good, and the other of all Evil; but others calling the Good Principle only a God, and the Evil Principle a Demon, as Zoroaster the Magician. Besides which Zoroaster and the Persian Magi, Plato pretends that the Footsteps of this Opinion were to be found also in the Altrology of the Chaldeans, and in the Mysteries and Religious Rites, not only of the Egyptians, but also of the Grecians themselves: and lastly he particularly imputes the same, to all the most famous of the Greek Philosophers, as Pythagoras, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Plato and Aristotle; though his chiefest endeavour of all to prove, that Plato was an Undoubted Champion for it.

Now because Plutarch's Authority pasteth so uncontrolled, and
his Testimony in this particular seems to be of late generally received as an Oracle, and conseqently the thing taken for an Unquestionable Truth, that the Ditheistic Doctrine of a Good and Evil Principle, was the Catholick or Univerfal Doctrine of the Pagan Theifti, and particularly that Plato, above all the rest, was a Professed Champion for the same; we shall therefore make bold to examine Plutarch's Grounds for this so confident Assertion of his; and principally concerning Plato. And his Grounds for imputing this Opinion to Plato, are only these Three which follow. First, because that Philosopher in his Politicus, speaks of a Necessary and Innate Appetite, that may sometimes turn the Heavens a contrary way, and by that means cause Disorder and Confusion; Secondly because in his Tenth De Legibus, he speaks of Two kinds of Souls, whereof One is Beneficent, but the other Contrary; And Lastly, because in his Timaeus he supposeth, the Matter to have been Moved disorderly before the World was made, which implies that there was a Disorderly and Irrational Soul consisting with it as the Mover of it, Matter being unable to move it itself. But as to the First of these Allegations out of Plato's Politicus, we shall only observe, that that Philosopher, as if it had been purposely to prevent such an Interpretation of his meaning there as this of Plutarch's, inverts these very words μόν τό θεό τής φύσεως ἵνα τά αὐτὰ τό θεό, which, contrarily minded to one another, turning the Heavens sometimes one way and sometimes another. Which plain declaration of Plato's Sense, being directly contrary to Plutarch's Interpretation, and this Ditheistic Opinion, might serve also for a sufficient Confrontation of His Second Ground from the Tenth De Legibus, as if Plato had there affirmed, that there were Two Souls moving the Heavens, the One Beneficent, but the other Contrary; because this would be all one as to assert Two Gods, contrarily minded to one another. Notwithstanding which, for a fuller Answer thereto, we shall further add, that this Philosopher, did there, First, only distribute Souls in General into Good and Evil, the Moral Differences Properly belonging to that rank of Beings called by him Souls, and first emerging in them, according to this Premised Doctrine, τῷ ἀκεφαλίῳ αὐτίκα ἢ κακίᾳ ἢ τῷ παλαιῷ ἢ τῷ εἰκόνι; διότι τί οὖν ἀδικοί. Soul is the Cause of Good and Evil, Honesty and Dishonesty, Justice and Unjustice. But then afterwards, making Enquiry concerning the Soul of the World or Heaven, what kind of Soul that was, he positively concludes, that it was no other than a Soul endowed with all Virtue, as ἀνθρώποιν ψυχής, διότι τοις ἄκεφαλούς μίαν πολίον, πάν τό αἰεί ἀξιοφόρων ζώον ἀναγόμενον φατικόν ἀντιμετρησμόν ἡ μορφή, ὅποις ἀδέλφοις ψυχὴν ἦτο τῇ πνεύματι. Ἐκ τῶν ζωτών, τοις ὁμοίως εἰρήνης ἢ ἄριστον ἀλλήλων ἕγερσιν, ἡ παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐκείνη ἐχάρισεν μίαν πάλιν ἀξιόλογον ψυχήν. Ath. Hos. Since it is Soul that moves all things, we must of necessity affirm, that the Heaven or World is moved by some Soul or other, adorning and disposing of it; whether it be the Best Soul, or the Contrary. Clin. O Holpes, it is certainly not Holy nor Pious to conclude otherwise, than that a Soul endued with all Virtue, One or More, moves the World. And as for the laft thing urged by Plutarch, that before the World was made, the
the Matter is said by Plato, to have been Moved disorderly, we conceive that that Philosopher did therein only adhere to that Vulgarly received Tradition, which was Originally Mosaiical, that the First beginning of the Cosmopoeia, was from a Chaos, or Matter confusedly moved, afterward brought into Order. And now we think it plainly appears, that there is no strength at all in any of Plutarch's forementioned Allegations, nor any such Monster to be found anywhere in Plato, as this Substantial Evil Principle or God, a Wicked Soul or Demon, Unmade and Self-existent from Eternity, Opposite and Inimicous to the Good God, sharing the Empire and Domini-
on of the World with him. Which Opinion is really nothing else but the Deifying of the Devil, or Prince of Evil Spirits, making him a Corrival with God, and entitling him to a Right of receiving Divine Honour and Worship.

And it is observable, that Plutarch himself confesseth this Interpretation which he makes of Plato, to be New and Paradoxical, or an Invention of his own, καθ έν γεων, επικεφαλε δεν ημενικς, Such as because it was contrary to the Generally received Opinion of Platonists, himself thought to stand in need of some Apology and Defence. To which purpose therefore he adds again, προτόου έν την ἀρχή τοτε ετερον, ως ἐνθωμος προκειμενω τη έκπληκτη, παροιμιαν ιερουσπευνοις. P. 1014. And this (as faith he) declare mine own Opinion first concerning these things, confirming it with Probabilities, and as much as possibly I can, aiding and affixing the Truth and Paradoxicalness thereof. Moreover Proclus upon the Timaeus takes notice of no other Philosophers, that ever imputed this Doctrine to Plato, or indeed maintained any such Opinion, of Two Substantial Principles of Good and Evil, but only Plutarch and Atticus; (though I confess Chalcidius cites Numenius also to the same purpose) Proclus his words are these: οι μὲν Ψευδο πλεοτειχων διερεύνηκε δικεφαλινον, περιστερων εις την ανεκτομον νημων περι τις κακοτης, περικεφαλας αυτου την κακοτην ψυχης την ταυτην εραστην, περιυν γε αυτης κακοτης, αυτου και εις την αυτης η κακοτης έντασιν. Plutarchus Cheronensis and Atticus maintain, that before the Generation and Formation of the World, there was Unformed and disorderly Matter existing (from Eternity) together with a Maleficient Soul; for whence, say they, could that Motion of the Matter, in Plato's Timaeus, proceed, but from a Soul? and if it were a Disorderly Motion, it must then needs come from a Disorderly Soul. And as Proclus tells us, that this Opinion of theirs had been before contested by Porphyries and Jamblichus, as that which was both Irrational and Impious, so doth he there likewise himself briefly refel it in these Two Propositions: First, that η εικοσ τα ψυχη θεοματιν γε του Θεος, Every soul is the Offspring of God, and there can be no Soul nor any thing else, besides God Self-existent; and Secondly, το καινη διαδοχαν ποιη, which he has several times η τη Θεοποιη, η διαδοχη του τον την εικοσ του Θεον, η μεναις και η λεικοποιησις, ητε ηις καινης του ποιησιν. It is absurd to make Evil alike Eternal with Good, for that which is Godless cannot be of like honour with God, and equally Unmade, nor indeed can there be anything at all positively op-
site to God.
But because it may probably be here demanded, What Account it was then possible for Plato to give, of the Original of Evils, so as not to impute them to God himself, if he neither derived them from \*\*\*\*\*, Unqualified Matter (which Plutarch has plainly proved to be absurd) nor yet from a \*\*\*\*\*, an Irrational and Maleficient Soul of the World or Demon, Self-existent from Eternity; we shall therefore hereunto briefly reply: That though that Philosopher derived not the Original of Evils, from Unqualified Matter, nor from a Wicked Soul or Demon Unmade, yet did he not therefore impute them to God neither, but as it seemeth, to the Necessity of Imperfect Beings. For as Timæus Locrus had before Plato determined, that the World was made by God and Necessity, so does Plato himself accordingly declare in his Timæus, ὁτι μενεμνημόνια τὸν τῆς κόσμου \*\*\*\*, ή ἀκάλπτος καὶ εὐφύς, καὶ ἀκάλπτος ἂν οὐσίας, καὶ ἃ ἀκάλπτος \*\*\*\*\*. That the Generation of this World is mixt and made up of a certain composition of Mind and Necessity both together, yet so as that Mind, doth also (in some sense) rule over Necessity. Wherefore though according to Plato, God be properly and directly the Cause of nothing else but Good, yet the Necessity of these Lower Imperfect things, does unavoidably give Being and Birth to Evils. For First, as to Moral Evils, (which are the Chief of) there is a Necessity that there should be Higher and Lower Inclinations in all Rational Beings Vitaly United to Bodies, and that as Autexousious or Free-willed, they should have a Power of determining themselves more or less, either way; as there is also a Necessity, that the same Liberty of Will (essential to Rational Creatures) which makes them capable of Praise and Reward, should likewise put them in a Possibility of deserving Blame and Punishment. Again, as to the Evils of Pain and Inconvenience; there seems to be a Necessity, that Imperfect Terrestrial Animals, which are capable of the Sense of Pleasure, should in contrary Circumstances (which will also sometimes happen, by reason of the Inconstency and Incomposibility of things) be obnoxious to Displeasure and Pain. And Lastly, for the Evils of Corruptions and Dissolutions; there is a plain Necessity, that if there be Natural Generations in the World, there should be also Corruptions; according to that of Lucretius before cited,

Quando alid ex alio rescit Natura, nec ullam
Remigini patitur, nisi Morte adjutam aliena.

To all which may be added, according to the Opinion of many, That there is a kind of Necessity of some Evils in the World, for a Condiment (as it were) to give a Rellish and Halt-gouf to Goods; since the Nature of Imperfect Animals is such, that they are apt to have but a Dull and Sluggish Sense, a Flat and Insipid Taste of Good, unless it be quickned and stimulated, heightened and invigorated, by being compared with the Contrary Evil. As also, that there seems to be a Necessary Use in the World of the \*\*\*\*\*, those Involutionary Evils of Pain and Suffering, both for the Exercise of Vertue, and
aud the Quickening and Exciting the Activity of the World, as also for the Reprefling, Chalting and Punifhing of those 
Voluntary Evils of Vice and Aktion. Upon which feveral ac-
compts, probably, Plato concluded, that Evils could not be utterly de-
stroyed, at leaft in this Lower World, which according to him, is the 
Region of Lapfed Souls; and hence, they are with the 
Necofity, their Capability of being Over-rulled, by 
their own Nature, and Purpose, to God; for we may 
affimilate our Selves to God as much as may be. Which 
Assimilation to God confifteth in being 
just and holy with Wisdom. Thus, according to the Sense of 
Plato, though God be the Original of all things, yet he is not to be 
accounted properly the 
Caufe of Evils, as leaft Moral ones, (they 
being only Defects) but they are to be imputed to the 
Necessity of 
Imperfed Beings, which is that 
Danphous, That Necoffity which doth 
often refle God, and as it were 
break off his Bridle. Rational Creatures being by means thereof, in a 
Capacity of acting contrary to God’s Will and Law, as well as 
their own true Nature and Good; and other things hindred of that 
Perfection, which the Divine Goodness would else have imparted to 
them. Notwithstanding which, Mind, that is, God, is said also by 
Plato, to Rule over Necoffity, because those Evils, occasioned by the 
Necofity of Imperfed Beings, are Over-ruled by the Divine Art, 
Wisdom, and Providence, for God; Typhon and Arimanius (if we may 
ufe that Language) being as it were Outwitted, by Ofiris and 
Oromedus, and the worst of all Evils made, in Spight of their own Nature, 
to contribute Subserviently to the Good and Perfection of the Whole; 
and hence it is, that 
this must needs be acknowledged to be the greatest Art of all, to be able to 
Bonifc Evils, or 
affimilate them with Good.

And now we have made it to appear (as we conceive) that Plu-
arch had no fufficient Grounds to impufe this Opinion, of Two 
Afive Perceptive Principles in the World, (one the Caufe of Good 
and the other of Evil) to Plato. And as for the other Greek Philofophers, 
their Pretences to make them Afflators of the fame Doctrine, seem to 
be yet more light and frivolous. For he concludes the 
Pythagoreans to have held Two such Subftantial Principles of Good and Evil, merely be 
caufe they sometimes talk’d of the 
Contradicfies and 
Conjufations of things, fuch as Finite and Infinte, Dextrous 
and Siniftrous, Eaven and Odd, and the like. As alfo that 
Heracli-
us entertain’d the fame Opinion, becaufe he fpoke of a 

advice xedox, A Versatifal Harmony of the World, whereby things reci-
procate forwards and backwards, as when a Bow is fuccifively In-
tended

* Of 

* The Pythagoreans have a fthefed Evil amonf

the Principles. Syrius in Arif-

Metaph. MS. p. 16.
tended and Remitted; as likewise because he affirmed, All things to flow, and War to be the Father and Lord of all. Moreover he resolves that Empedocles his Friendship and Contention could be no other than a Good and Evil God; though we have rendered it probable, that nothing else was understood thereby, but an Active Spermatick Power in this Corporeal World, causing Vicissitudes of Generation and Corruption. Again Anaxagoras is entitled by him to the same Philosophy, for no other reason, but only because he made Mind and Infinite Matter, Two Principles of the Universe. And Laftly, Aristotle himself cannot escape him from being made an Asserter of a Good and Evil God too, merely because he concluded Form and Privation, to be Two Principles of Natural Bodies. Neither does Plutarch acquit himself anything better, as to the Sects of Whole Nations, when this Doctrine is therefore imputed by him to the Chaldeans, because their Astrologers supposed Two of the Planets to be Beneficent, Two Maleficient, and Three of a Middle Nature: and to the ancient Greeks, because they sacrificed, not only to Jupiter Olympian, but also to Hades or Pluto, who was sometimes called by them the Infernal Jupiter. We confess that his Interpretation of the Traditions and Mysteries of the ancient Egyptians is ingenious, but yet there is no necessity for all that, that by their Typhon should be understood a Substantial Evil Principle, or God Self-existent, as he contends. For it being the manner of the ancient Pagans, (as shall be more fully declared afterwards) to Physiologize in their Theology, and to Personate all the several Things in Nature; it seems more likely, that these Egyptians did after that manner, only to accommodate Personate that Evil and Confusion, Tumult and Hurliburlfy, Constancy Alteration and Vicissitude of Generations and Corruptions, which is in this Lower World, (though not without a Divine Providence) by Typhon.

Wherefore the only Probability now left, is that of the Persian Magi, that they might indeed assert Two such Active Principles of Good and Evil, as Plutarch and the Manicheans afterwards did; and we must confess, that there is some Probability of this, because besides Plutarch, Laertius affirms the same of them, δύο κατ’ αὐτάς τιαν ἄγαλμα ἐπιλαμβάνει τὰ πάντα; That there are Two Principles according to the Persian Magi, a Good Demon and an Evil one; he seeming to Vouch it also from the Authorities of Hermippus, Endoxus and Theopompos. Notwithstanding which, it may very well be Questioned, whether the meaning of those Magi were not herein misunderstood, they perhaps intending nothing more by their Evil Demon, than such a Satanical Power as we acknowledge, that is, not a Substantial Evil Principle, unmade and Independent upon God, but only a Polity of Evil Demons in the World, united together under One Head or Prince. And this not only because Theodorus in Photinus, calls the Persian Arimanini, by that very name, Satanas; but also becaues those very Traditions of theirs, recorded by Plutarch, himself, seem very much to favour this Opinion, they running after this manner; ᾧ θεός Διός εἰμι εὐμαρκός, εὗρεν ἄριστον κομβὸν ἑπταδρόμων ἐκ Λιμωτοῦ, ὡς τῶν ἄλλων φασάμενα παραπλήσας ἄρα καρανίδων, ἄρα γε τὸν πάντι.
However, from what hath been declared, we conceive it does sufficiently appear, that this Ditheistic Doctrine of a Good and Evil God, (or a Good God and Evil Demon both Self-existent) asserted by Plutarch and the Manicheans, was never so universally received among the Pagans, as the fame Plutarch pretendeth. Which thing may be yet further evidenced from hence, because the Manicheans professed themselves not to have derived this Opinion from the Pagans, nor to be a Subdivision under them, or Schism from them, but a quite different Sect by themselves. Thus Fanus in St. August. line: Pagani Bona & Mala, Tetra & Splendidia, Perpetua & Caduce, Mutabilita & Certa, Corporalia & Divina, Onum habere Principium dogmatizant. His ego vahe contraria conso, qui Bonis omnibus Principium factore Deum, Contrarix vero Hylen (sic enim Mali Principium & Naturam Theologus noter appellat.) The Pagans dogmatize, that Good and Evil things, Foul and Splendid, Perishing and Perpetual, Corporal and Divine, do all arise proceed from the same Principle. Whereas we think far otherwise, that God is the Principle of all Good, but Hyle (or the Evil Demon) of the contrary, which names our Theologer (Manes) confounds together. And afterwards Fanus there again determines, that there were indeed but Two Sects of Religion in the World, really distinct from one another, viz. Paganism and Manicheism. From whence it may be concluded, that this Doctrine, of Two Active Principles of Good and Evil, was not then look’d upon, as the Generally received Doctrine of the Pagans. Wherefore it seems reasonable to think, that Plutarch’s imputing it so Universally to them, was either out of Design, thereby to gain the better countenance and authority, to a Conceit which himself was fond of; or else because he be-
ing deeply tinctured, as it were, with the Sufhensions of it, every thing which he look'd upon, seem'd to him coloured with it. And indeed for ought we can yet learn, this Plutarchus Chersonensis, Numenius and Atticus were the only Greek Philosophers, who ever in Publick Writings positively asseried any such Opinion.

And probably S. Athanasius, is to be understood of These, when in his Oration Contra Gentes, he writes thus concerning this Opinion, 'ελληνικάν ἐν τῆς πλακτινώσεις λαθῶν, καὶ Χερσονήσιων εἰς ἐγκωμίαν, ἐπὶ ὕποτεθυκαί καὶ ἀδικοῦσιν ὀνομάζοντες κυρίως ὑπὸ τοῦτος, οὕτως ὁμολογοῦσιν ὀπισθώς τοῦ ὁμοίου ἀδικεῖν. ς ὑπὸ τοῦτος, τί τις καὶ τις ἀνθρώπους τὸν ὁμοίου ὁλοκλήρου καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν ἀκυρών ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκείνης ἐκεῖνος, καὶ πᾶν ἁλόν ἀκρίβεια τὸν ὁμοίου ὁλοκλήρου ἐκείνης, καὶ ὅπως ἔστω ἔνας τοῦτος κατ' αὐτῶς ἄνθρωπον λογοκρίνει, 

Some of the Greeks, wandering out of the right way, and ignorant of Christ, have determined Evil to be a Real Entity by itself, erring upon two accounts, because they must of necessity, either suppose God not to be the Maker of all Things, if Evil have a Nature and Essence by itself, and yet be not made by him, or else that he is the Maker and Cause of Evil, whereas it is impossible, that he who is Essentially Good, should produce the Contrary. After which that Father speaks alto of some degenerate Christians, who fell into the same Error, οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκπροσώπους τῆς καθολικῆς διδακτικῆς, οὗ ἔστω τῶν πιστῶν νοεράρχειται, καὶ ἀπεικόνισαν τὴν τοῦ καθαρής καὶ ἀδελφότητα ἀξίας. Some Heretics, forfaking the Ecclesiastical Doctrine, and making shipwreck of the Faith, have in like manner, falsely attributed a Real Nature and Essence to Evil. Of which Heretics there were several Sects before the Manichaean, sometime taken notice of and cenfur'd by Pagan Philosophers themselves as by Celcus, where he charges Christians with holding this Opinion, that there is ἐκ τῆς μετανοίας ὑπὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἀξίας, An Execrable God contrary to the Great God, and by Plotinus, writing a whole Book against such Christians, the 11th of his Second Ennead, which by Porphyrius was inscribed περὶ τῶν παντὸς, Against the Gnostics.

But if notwithstanding all that we have hitherto said to the contrary, that which Plutarch so much contends for, should be granted to be true, that the Pagan Theologers generally asseried Two Self-existent Principles (a Good God, and an Evil Soul or Demon) and no more, it would unavoidably follow from thence, that all those other Gods which they worshipped, were not look'd upon by them, as so Many Unmade Self-existent Beings, because then they should have acknowledged so many First Principles. However it is certain, that if Plutarch believed his own Writings, he must of necessity take it for granted, that none of the Pagan Gods (those Two Principles of Good and Evil only excepted) were by their Theologers accounted Unmade or Self-existent Beings. And as to Plutarch himself, it is unquestionably manifest, that though he were a Pagan, and a Worshippers of all those Many Gods of theirs, but especially amongst the rest, of the Delian Apollo (whose Priest he declares himself to have been) yet he supposed them all (except only one Good God,
and another Evil Soul of the World) to be no Self-existent Deities, but Self-generated, or Created Gods only. And the same is to be affirmed of all his Pagan Followers, as also of the Manicheans, forasmuch as they, besides their Good and Evil God (the only Unmade Self-existent Beings acknowledged by them) worshipped also Innumerable other Deities.

Hitherto we have not been able to find amongst the Pagans, any who ascertained a Multitude of Unmade Self-existent Deities, but on the contrary we shall now find One, who took notice of this Opinion of πολλα δεκσιμ, Many Principles, so far forth as to confute it, and that is Aristotle, who was not occasioned to do that neither, because it was a Doctrine then Generally Received, but only because he had a mind, oddly to impute such a thing to the Pythagoreans and Platonists, they making Idea’s (sometimes called also Numbers) in a certain sense, the Principles of things. Nevertheless the Opinion it self is well confuted by that Philosopher, from the Phenomena after this manner; ει δε τινς δέκσιμ πολλα του του μικρου μαθαιου, εις τον Άιτα Ματ. διαλογισμος της των δεκσιμ αιτιων. They who say that Mathematical Number is the First, and suppose one Principle of one thing, and another of another, would make the whole World to be like an incoherent and disagreeing Poem, where things do not all mutually contribute to one another, nor conspire together to make up one Sense and Harmony; But the contrary (as he) is most evident in the World; and therefore their cannot be Many Principles, but only One. From whence it is manifest that though Aristotle were a Worshirper of Many Gods, as well as the other Pagans, he somewhere representating it as very absurd to Sacrifice to none but Jupiter; yet he was no Polytheist, in the sense before declared, of many Unmade Self-existent Deities, nor indeed any Ditheist neither, a asserior of Two Understanding Principles, a Good and Evil God, as Plutarch pretended him to be; he not only here exploding that Opinion of πολλα δεκσιμ, Many Principles, but also expressly deriving it from One, and in that very Chapter affirming, that Good is a Principle, but not Evil. But as for the Platonists and Pythagoreans there straining him, though it be true that they made Idea’s in some former Principles, as the Paradigms of things, yet according to Aristotle’s own Confession, even in that same Chapter, they declared so, that there was αιτια δεκσιμαι, αιτιος τος αιτιος πολλος, another Principle more excellent or Superior, which is indeed that that was called by them the Τηνων, the Unity itself or a Monad, that is, One most Simple City.

Though we did before demonstrate, that the Pagan Gods were not supposed by them to be Unmade Self-existent Beings, because they acknowledged a Theogonia, a Generation and Temporary Production of Gods; yet forasmuch as it might be suspected, that they held notwithstanding a Multitude of Unmade Deities, we have now made the Enquiry that we could concerning this, and the utmost that we have been able yet to discover is, that some few of the Professed Pagans, as well as of pretended Christians, have indeed asserior a
Duplicity of such Gods (viz. Understanding Beings Unmade) one Good and the other Evil, but no more. Whereas on the contrary we have found, that Aristotle did professedly oppose, this Opinion of Many Principers, or Unmade Gods, which certainly he durst never have done, had it then been the Generally received Opinion of the Pagans. And though it be true, that several of the Ancient Christians, in their Disputes with Pagans, do confute that Opinion of Many Unmade Deities, yet we do not find for all that, that any of them seriously charge the Pagans with it, they only doing it occasionally and ex abundanti. But we should be the better enabled, to make a clear Judgment concerning this Controversie, whether there were not amongst the Pagan Deities, a Multitude of Supposed Unmade Beings; if we did but take a short Survey of their Religion, and consider all the several kinds of Gods worshipped by them; which may, as we conceive, be reduced to these following Heads. In the first place therefore it is certain, that Many of the Pagan Gods, were nothing else but Dead Men (or the Souls of Men Deceased) called by the Greeks Heroes, and the Latines Martyrs, such as Hercules, Liber, Æsculapius, Caius, Pollux, Lucius, and the like. Neither was this only true of the Greeks and Romans, but also of the Egyptians, Syrians and Babylonians. For which cause the Pagan Sacrifices, are by way of contempt in the Scripture called, the Sacrifices of the Dead, that is, not of Dead or Lifeless Statues, as some would put it off, but of Dead Men, which was the reason, why many of the Religious Rites and Solemnities, observed by the Pagan Priests, were Mournful and Funeral; accordingly as it is expressed in Baruch concerning the Babylonians, The Priests sit in their Temples having their clothes rent, and their heads and beards shaven, and nothing upon their heads; They roar and cry before their Gods, as men do at the Feast, when one is dead. (Some of which Rites, are therefore thought to have been Interdicted to the Israelitish Priests.) And the same thing is noted likewise by the Poet concerning the Egyptians,

Et quem tu plangens, Hominem testarit, Osiris:

And intimated by Xenophon the Colophonian, when he reprehensibly admonished the Egyptians after this manner, εις Σεσκωμίζων μια Σπεραθ, εις Σαρκίν μια Σώματι. That if they thought these to be Gods they should not so lament them, but if they would lament them, they should no longer think them Gods. Moreover it is well known, that this Humour of Deifying Men, was afterwards carried on further, and the Living Men (as Emperors) had also Temples and Altars, erected to them; Nay Humane Polities and Cities, were also sometimes Deified by the Pagans, Rome it self being made a Goddes. Now no man can imagine that those Men-gods and City-gods, were look’d upon by them as so many Unmade Self-existent Deities, they being not indeed so much as φυσικοι Θεοι, Gods Made or Generated by Nature, but rather Artificially Made, by Humane Will and Pleasure. Again, Anath fort of the Pagan Deities, were all the Greater Parts of the Vihib Mundane System, or Corporeal World, as supposed to be Animate
The Sun, the Moon and the Stars, and even the Earth itself, under the Names of Vesta, and Cybele, the Mother of the Gods, and the like. Now it is certain also, that none of these could be taken for Unmade Self-existent Deities neither, by those who supposed the whole World it self to have been Generated, or had a Beginning, which as Aristotle tells us, was the Generally received Opinion before his time. There was also a Third Sort of Pagan Deities, Ethereal and Aerial Animals Invisible, called Demons, Genii and Lares, Superior indeed to Men, but Inferiour to the Celestial or Mundane Gods before mentioned. Wherefore these must needs be look'd upon also by them but as Pourvu Seil, Generated or Created Gods, they being but certain Inferiour Parts of the whole Generated World.

Besides all these, the Pagans had yet another Sort of Gods, that were nothing but mere Accidents or Affections of Substances, which therefore could not be supposed by them to be Self-existent Deities, because they could not so much as Subsist by themselves. Such as were, Vertue, Piety, Felicity, Truth, Faith, Hope, Justice, Clemency, Love, Desire, Health, Peace, Honour, Fame, Liberty, Memory, Sleep, Night, and the like; all which had their Temples or Altars erected to them. Now this kind of Pagan Gods, cannot well be conceived to have been anything else, but the Several and Various Manifestations of that One Divine Force, Power and Providence that runs through the Whole World (as respecting the Good and Evil of Men) Spiritually Personated, and so represented as so Many Gods and Goddesses.

Lastly, There is still Another kind of Pagan Gods behind, having Substantial and Personal Names, which yet cannot be conceived neither to be so many Understanding Beings, Unmade, and Independent upon any Supreme, were it for no other reason but only this, because they have all of them their Particular Places and Provinces, Offices and Functions severally (as it were) assign'd to them, and to which they are confined; so as not to interfere and clath with one another, but agreeable to make up one Orderly and Harmonious System of the Whole; One of those Gods ruling only in the Heavens, Another in the Air, Another in the Sea, and Another in the Earth and Hell; One the God of God or Goddess of Learning and Wisdom, Another of Speech and Eloquence, Another of Justice and Political Order; One the God of War, Another the God of Pleasure, One the God of Corn, and Another the God of Wine, and the like. For how can it be conceived, that a Multitude of Under-standing Beings Self-existent and Independent, could thus of themselves have fallen into such a Uniform Order and Harmony, and without any clashing, peaceably and quietly sharing the Government of the whole World amongst them, should carry it on with such a Constant Regularity? For which Causse we conclude also, that neither those Dii Majorum Gentium, whether the Twenty Selechi, or the Twelve Consentes, nor yet that Triumvirate of Gods, amongst whom Honor shares the Government of the whole World, according to that of Maximus Tyrius, τε λέγεται Ομωρλτ τιτανιδοι διός ἔστιν: ως δ' ἡ θεὸς ζεσον ἱππαθον

U
Wherefore the Truth of this whole business seems to be this, that the ancient Pagans did physiologize in their theology, and whether looking upon the Whole World Animated, as the Supreme God, and consequently the Several Parts of it, as his Living Members, or else apprehending it at least to be a Mirror, or Visible Image of the Invisible Deity, and consequently all its Several Parts, and Things of Nature, but so many Several Manifestations of the Divine Power and Providence, they pretended, that all their Devotion towards the Deity, ought not to be Hudled up in one General and Confused Acknowledgment, of a Supreme Invisible Being, the Creator and Governor of all, but that all the Several Manifestations of the Deity in the World, considered fingly and apart by themselves, should be made so many Difint Objectis of their Devout Veneration; and therefore in order hereunto did they **πέποντομοίν, speak of the things in Nature, and the Parts of the World, as Persons, and consequently as so many Gods and Goddesses; yet so, as that the Intelligent might easily understand the Meaning, that these were all really nothing else, but so many Several Names and Notions, of that One Nomen, Divine Force and Power, which runs through the whole World, multiformly displaying itself therein. To this purpose Balbus in Cicer, Videtjne xit à Physicis reduis, trarja Ratio fit ad Commentitiis & Ficlus Doos? See you not how from the Things of Nature, Ficlitious Gods have been made? And Origen seems to insin upon this very thing, (where Celsus upbraids the Jews and Christians for worshipping One only God) throwing that all that seeming Multiplicity of Pagan Gods, could not be understood of so Many Disint Substantial Independent Deities; θ'ναιον των που ευτε διακτη οποιονται το πληθυν, τοιοοι και τα Ρμπία, τας θετικας βαρελες, δεινωνι αποκτων και δομου μελλουσον κοντης απο δος των μοντας, δε ανωτη τας 'ορος, και τας κατα τας γενικες οποιονται δυναστης κατ' ουν υπερηφανος, ή και δυναστη τα ελληνον απελασμα (συμμετεχει δεικτης απο τα πρωτα το ιμπηρια οικια περιπλασμα) δεικνυει οις. To this Sense; Let Celsus therefore himself shew, how he is able to make out a Multiplicity of Gods (Substantial and Self-existent) according to the Greeks and other Barbarian Pagans; let him declare the Essence and Substantial Personality of that Memory which by Jupiter generated the Muse, or of that Themis which brought forth the Hours; or let him shew how the Graces always Naked do subsist by themselves. But he will never be able to do this, nor to make it appear that those Figures of the Greeks (which seem to be really nothing else but the Things of Nature turned into Persons) are so many distinct (Self-existent) Deities. Where the latter Words are thus rendered in a Late Edition; 

*Sed nunquam poterit (* Celsus *) Grecorum Figmenta, que validiora fieri videntur, ex rebus ipsis*
Now this Fictitious Personating, and Deifying of Things, by the Pagan Theologers, was done Two manner of ways; One, when those Things in Nature, were themselves without any more ado or Change of Names, spoken of as Persons, and so made Gods and Goddeses, as in the many instances before proposed. Another, when there were distinct Proper and Personal Names accommodated severally to those Things, as of Minerva to Wisdom, of Neptune to the Sea, of Ceres to Corn and of Bacchus to Wine. In which latter Case, those Personal Names Properly signify, the Invisible Divine Powers, supposed to preide over those several Things in Nature, and these are therefore properly those Gods and Goddeses, which are divines gods, the Givers and Dispensers of the Good Things, and the Removers of the Contrary; but they are used Improperly also, for the Things of Nature themselves, which therefore as Manifestations of the Divine Power, Goodness and Providence, Personated, are sometimes also Abstractly called Gods and Goddeses. This Mystery of the Pagan Polytheism, is thus fully declared by Mosesopulis; i.e. those two names or Titles divine & divine which were given, as a word of God, to such names of the Gods and Goddeses, as were said to have been kinds of the same. In Hebr. p. 1.
the Deity presiding over it, Aphrodite or Venus. And lastly, in the same manner, by the Muses, they signified both the Rational Arts, Rhetorick, Astronomy, Poetry, and the Goddesses which assist therein or promote the same. Now as the several Things in Nature and Parts of the Corporeal World, are thus Metonymically and Catacaustically, called Gods and Goddesses, it is evident, that such Deities as these, could not be supposed to be Unmade or Self-existent, by those who acknowledged the whole World to have been Generated and had a Beginning. But as these Names were used more Properly, to signify Invisible and Understanding Powers, Presiding over the Things in Nature, and Dispening of them, however they have an appearance of so many several distinct Deities, yet they seem to have been all really nothing else, but as Balbus in Cicero expresses it, Deus Pervitinens per Naturam cujufque Rei, God passing through, and acting in the Nature of every thing, and consequentiy, but several Names, or so many Different Notions and Considerations of that One Supreme Numen, that Divine Force, Power, and Providence, which runs through the whole World, as variously Manifesting itself therein.

Wherefore, since there were no other Kinds of Gods amongst the Pagans, besides those already enumerated, unless their Images, Statues and Symbols (should be accounted such (because they were also sometimes Abusively called Gods) which could not be supposed by them to have been Unmade or without a Beginning, they being the Workmanship of men's own hands; We conclude universally, that all that Multiplicity of Pagan Gods, which makes so great a shew and noise, was really neither nothing but several Names and Notions of One Supreme Deity, according to its different Manifestations, Gifts and Effects in the World, Personated; or else Many Inferior Understanding Beings, Generated or Created by One Supreme: so that One Unmade Self-existent Deity, and no more, was acknowledged by the more Intelligent of the ancient Pagans, (for of the Sottish Vulgar no man can pretend to give an account, in any Religion) and consequently, the Pagan Polytheism (or Idolatry) consisted not, in worshipping a Multiplicity of Unmade Minds; Deities and Creators Self-existent from Eternity and Independent upon One Supreme; but in Mingling and Blending, some way or other unduly, Creature-worship, with the Worship of the Creator.

And that the ancient Pagan Theifts thus acknowledged One Supreme God, who was the only θεός ἄρπας, Unmade or Unproduced Deity, (I say, Theifts, because those amongst the Pagans, who admitted of Many Gods, but none at all Unmade, were absolute Atheists) this may be undeniably concluded from what was before proved, that they acknowledged Omnipotence or Infinite Power, to be a Divine Attribute. Because upon the Hypothesis of Many Unmade Self-existent Deities, it is plain that there could be none omnipotent, and consequently no such thing as Omnipotence in rerum natura: and therefore Omnipotence was rightly and properly styled by Macrobius, Summi Dei Omnipotentia, it being an Attribute Essentially Peculiar, to One Supreme, and Sole Self-existent Deity.

And Simplicius
And we think it here observable, that this was a thing so generally contended and acknowledged, that *Fanfus* the Manichean, took up this Conceit, that both the Christians and Jews Paganized in the Opinion of Monarchy, that is, derived this Doctrine of One Deity, the Sole Principle of all things, only by Tradition from the Pagans, and by consequence were no other than *Schisms* or Subdivided *Sects* of Paganism. *Vos deficientes ad Gentibus* (saith he) *Monarchie Opi- nione non primo nobisveni divulgites, id est, ut Omnia credatis ex Deo. Efferant Schismata, necnon & Piores osfrir Judaei. De Opintione Monarchie, in nullo extant ipsi dissentient a Pagnar. Quare confutat Vos atque Judaeos, Schismata eae Gentilitatis. Sectas autem si quaeras, non plus erant quàm Duae, Gentium & Nostra. Tou revolting from the Gentiles, break off their Opinion of Monarchy, and carried it along with you, so as to believe all things to come from God. Wherefore you are really nothing but a Schism of Paganism, or a Subdivided Branch of it, and so are your Predecessors the Jews, who differ nothing from Pagans, neither in this Opinion of Monarchy. Whence it is manifest, that both Christians and Jews are but Schisms of Gentilitia. But as for *Sects* of Religion, really differing from another, there are but these Two, That of the Pagans, and That of ours, who altogether differ from them. Now though this be false and foolish, as to the Christians and Jews, deriving that Opinion of Monarchy, only by way of Tradition, from the Pagans, which is a thing founded in the Principles of Nature; yet it sufficiently shews, this to have been the General Opinion of the Pagans, that all their Gods were derived from One sole Self-existent Deity; so that they neither acknowledged a multitude of Unmade Deities, nor yet that Duplicity of them, which *Arach* contended for, (One Good and the Other Evil) who accordingly denied God to be the Caufe of all Things, writing thus in his Defect of Oracles, *αμνός ἄλλης αἵλης ἄλλης* and *αμνός τί παύλυλον ἄλλουν ἀλλοτριω*, *αἰτητώς τά μεθέλεσα πρέπον*; They are guilty of one Extreme, to make God the Cause of Nothing, and they of another, who make him be Cause of all things. But this Paradox, was both late started among the Greeks, and quickly cried down by the Succession of their Philosophers, and therefore prejudiceth not the Truth of *Fanfus* his
General Assertion, concerning the Pagans. Which is again fully confirmed, by St. Augustine in his Reply: *Signis ita dividit, ut dicit curprivate aliqua Religione detinentur, Aliis placere Unum Deum colendum, Aliis Multos; per hanc differentiam & Pagani à nobis Remoti sunt, & Manichei cum Pagans deputantur, nos autem cum Judaeis. Hic fortis dicatis, quod Multos Deus seftror, ex Una Substantia perhibetis; quafi Pagani Multos fuis, non ex Una afferant, quosvis diversa illis officia, & Opera, & Potestates illis attribuant, sic vent etiam apud vos, Alius Deus ex pagnat Genem Tenebrarum, Alius ex ea capti fabricat Mundum, &c.*

If one should make another Distribution of Religionists, into such as Worship either One God, or Many Gods; according to this Division the Pagans will be removed from us Christians, and joined with those Manicheans. But perhaps you will here say, that all your Many Gods are derived from One Substance, as if the Pagans did not also derive all their Gods from One, though attributing several Offices, Works and Powers to them; in like manner as amongst you, One God expungs the Nation of Darkness. Another God makes a World out of it, &c. And again afterwards he writes further to the same purpose: *Disputargò Falsus Monarchiae Opinionem, non ex Gentibus nos habere, sed Gentes non nique ad ad Falsos Deos esse dilaplas, ut Opinionem anisterent Unius Veri Dei, ex quo esse Omnibus qualiscunque Natura:* Let Faith therefore know, that We Christians have not derived the Opinion of Monarchy from the Pagans, but that the Pagans have not so far degenerated, sinking down into the Worship of false Gods, as to have left the Opinion of One True God, from whom is all whatsoever Nature.

XIV. It follows from what we have declared, that the Pagan Polyctheism or Multiplicity of Gods, is not to be understood in the sense before expressed, of Many Gods &c.; but according to some other Notion or Equivocation of the word Gods. For God is, ὅς τιλλικες λαγεμίδων, one of those words that hath been used in many different senses, the Atheists themselves acknowledging a God and Gods, according to some Private Sences of their own, (which yet they do not all agree in neither) and Theists not always having the same Notion of that Word: For as much as Angels in Scripture are called Gods in one sense, that is, as Understanding Beings, Superior to men, Immortal, Holy and Happy; and the word is again sometimes carried down lower to Princes and Magistrates; and not only so, but also to Good men as such, when they are said to be Made Partakers of the Divine Nature. And thus that learned Philosopher and Christian Boethius, Omnis Beatus Deus; sed Natura quidem Deum, Participationem vero nihil prohibet esse quemplurimos, every Good and Happy man is a God, and though there be only One God, by Nature yet nothing binders but that there may be Many by Participation. But then again all Men and Angels are alike deniéd to be Gods in other Respects, and particularly, as to Religious Worship. Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou Serve. Now this is that, which seems to beEssentially included in the Pagan Theists, may be thus defined, An Understanding,
derstanding Being superior to Men, not originally derived from Sensible Matter, and look'd upon as an Object for mens Religious Worship. But this general Notion of the word God, is again restrained and limited, by Differences, in the Division of it. For such a God as this, may be either áγέννητος, Ingenerate or Unproduced, and consequently Self-existent; or else γενέτορ, Generated or Produced, and Dependent on some Higher Being as its Cause. In the former fence, the Intelligent Pagans, as we have declared, acknowledged only One God, who was therefore called by them ὁ Θεὸς κατὰ εὐεξίαν, according to that of Thales in Laertius, πρωτοκλιτῶν ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ ἀμήσωτος γι' ἐνα. God is the oldest of all things, because he is Unmade or Unproduced, and the only thing that is so: but in the latter, they admitted of Many Gods, Many Understanding Beings, which, though Generated or Produced, yet were Superior to Men, and look'd upon as Objects for their Religious Worship. And thus the Pagan Theists were both Polytheists and Monotheists in different Sences, they acknowledged both Many Gods and One God; that is, Many Inferior Deities, subordinate to One Supreme. Thus Onatus the Pythagorean in Stoicheus declares himself, δεικτός εἶ μοι, ἐπὶ ἐποιήσας: ἔγραφεν ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ μὲν ἡ μέγιστα, ἡ καθ' ὑπερεξέπετο, ἡ καὶ προδέδω τε παντὸς: οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι πολλοί διαφέροντες καὶ διάφοροι, μεταλαβόντες πᾶν πάντων καὶ ὁ ἄλλοι, ὁ μεγαλότερος ὁ ἀμήσωτος, οὗ ἔγραφεν καὶ συμπαντικὸς καὶ πιὸ δὲ ἄλλοι οἱ Τειχέως εἰς καὶ ἐπετελοῦσαν, συν τὰ πάντας ἄνθρωποι. And thus it seems to me that there is not only One God, but that there is One the Greatest and Highest God, that governeth the whole World, and that there are Many other Gods, besides him differing as to power, that One God reigning over them all, who surmounts them all, in Power, Greatness and Virtue. This is that God, who contains and comprehends the whole World; but the other Gods, are those who together with the Revolution of the Universe, orderly follow that First and Intellegible God. Where it is evident, that Onatus his πολλοὶ θεοὶ or Many Gods, were only the Heavenly Bodies, or Animated Stars. And partly, from those words cited, but chiefly others which follow after in the same place, (that will be produced elsewhere) it plainly appears, that in Onatus his time, there were some who acknowledged One Only God, denying all those other Gods, then commonly Worshipped. And indeed Anaxagoras seems to have been such a one; forasmuch as ascertaining One Perfect Mind Ruling over all, (which is the True Deity) he effectually degraded all those other Pagan Gods, the Sun, Moon and Stars from their Godships, by making the Sun nothing but a Globe of Fire, and the Moon, Earth and Stones, and the like of the other Stars and Planets. And some such there were also among the Ancient Egyptians, as shall be declared in due place. Moreover Proclus upon Plato's Timeus tells us, that there hath been always least doubt and controversy in the World concerning the One God, than concerning the Many Gods. Wherefore Onatus here declares his own fence, as to this particular, viz. that besides the One Supreme God, there were also Many other Inferior Deities, that are Understanding Beings, that ought to be Religiously Worshipp'd.

But because it is not impossible, but that there might be imagin'd one Supreme Deity, though there were many other Θεοὶ Ὁμόθεοι Un

made
made and Self-existent Gods besides, as Plutarch suppos'd before, One Supreme God, together with a Soul, an Irrational Soul or Demon made Inferior in power to it, therefore we add in the next place, that the more Intelligent Pagans did not only asser One God that was Supreme and self-existent, the most Powerful of all the Gods, but also who being Omnipotent, was the Principle and Cause of all the rest, and therefore the only & omnipotent & self-existent, the only Unproduced and Self-existent Deity. Maximus Tyris affirms this to have been the general fence of all the Pagans, that there was, Sei & self-existent, & omnipotent, & unproduced, & self-existent, One God the King and Father of all, and many Gods, the Sons of God, reigning together with God. Neither did the Poets imply any thing less, when ἀνήφρος was so often called by the Greeks and Jupiter by the Latins &c. and Homonum Patris Deorum, or Hominum Sarthorique Deorum, and the like. And indeed the Theogonia of the ancient Pagans before mention'd, was commonly thus declared by them universally, Ἀνθρόπος ὁ θεός ὅτι the Gods were Generated, or as Herodotus expresseth it, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔγενον θεοῦ, that every one of the Gods was Generated or Produced; which yet is not so to be understood, as if they had therefore suppos'd, no God at all Unmade or Self-existent, (which is Absolute Atheism) but that the of the Gods, as distinguished from the & the, from God or the Supreme Deity, were all of them universally, Made or Generated.

But to the end that we may now render this business, yet something more eaisie to be believed, that the Intelligent Pagans did thus supposè all their Gods have One, to have been Made or Generated, and consequently acknowledged only One Sei & self-existent & omnipotent, One Unproduced and Self-existent Deity, we shall in this place further observe, that the Theogonia of these Ancient Pagans, their Genesis and Generation of Gods, was really one and the same thing with the Cosmogonia, the Genesis and Generation of the World, and indeed both of them understood of a Temporary Production both of these Gods and the World. And this we shall first prove from Plato in his Timæus, where he being to treat of the Cosmogonia, premiseth this Distinction, concerning Two Heads of Being; That some were Eternal and never Made, and some again Made or Generated, the former whereof he calls θέων or Essence, the latter ἡγεμόν or Generation: adding also this difference between them, that the Eternal and Immortal things, were the proper Objects of Science and Demonstration, but the other Generated things of Faith and Opinion only ἢ αὐτῷ ταῖς ἀληθείαις τῷ γὰρ τοιούτῳ τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι παντὸς πάνω εἰς ἀλήθειαν. For what Essence is to Generation, the same is certainty of Truth or Knowledge to Faith. And thereupon he declares that his Reader was not to expect the same Evidence and Certainty of Truth from him, where he was now to treat of things Generated (namely the Gods and the Visible World) as if he had been to discourse about things Immortal and Eternal, in these words, ἓν ὁ θεός, ὁ κόσμος, πᾶσα ποιήσαντος ἄλλα, ἀλλ' ἡγεμόν ἡ γένεσις, &c. If therefore, O Socrates, many things having been spoken by many men, concerning the Gods, and the Generation of the Universe, we be not able to discourse Demonstratively concerning the same, you ought not at all to wonder at it, or be displeased with us, but
on the contrary, to rest well satisfied with our performance, if upon this Argument we do but deliver Probabilities. Where the Gods are by Plato plainly referred to θεόσ and not to θεία, to Generation and not to Eternal or Immutable Essence, as they are also joined with the Generation of the World, as being but a Part thereof. Neither is this at all to be wondered at in Plato, since first the whole Visible World, was no less to him, than it was to the other Pagans, a God; he calling it θεός θεόσ, a Happy God, and before it was yet Made, θεός επίσημος, a God about to be Made. Not as if Plato accosted the Senelle's Matter of this Corporal World, whether as perfectly Dead and Stupid, or as endowed with a Platfick Nature only, to be a God, (for no Immutable thing was a God to Plato) but because he supposed the World to be an Animal, endowed with an Intellectual Soul, and indeed the best of all Animals compounded of Soul and Body, ὅσοι ἐν δι θεό θεον ἔσοι καὶ ἔσοι ἔσοι ἐπίσημος, ἡ θεον ἀπειρωθήτος ἐπίσημος, τῇ θεον ἀπειρωθήτος τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. Wherefore we are thus according to Probability to conclude, that this World was really made by the Providence of God, an Intellectual Animal; whence from an Animal forthwith it became a God. So that here we are to take notice, of Two Gods in Plato, very different from one another, One a Generated God, this whole World Animated, and another that God, by whose Providence this World was Generated, and thus made an Animal and a God; which latter must needs be an Unmade, Self-existent Deity, and not belong to θεοσ but to θεία, not to Generation but to Immutable Essence. Again those greater Parts of the World, the Sun, the Moon and the Stars, (as supposed also to be Animated with Particular Souls of their own) were as well accosted by Plato, as by the other Pagans, Gods, he plainly calling them there ἀγαθοί καὶ θεοί τοῖς ἄνθρωποις. Visible and Generated Gods. Besides which celestial Gods, the Earth it self also is supposed by him, to be either a God or Goddes, according to those Ancient Copies of the Timaeus, used both by Cicero and Proclus: γίνεται καὶ αὐτόν μον θεοκόρην, εἶχον τὸν ἀνθρώπον παντοτέχνην, φέρεται καὶ δύσσεχον νησίτι της ρωμαίους, ἐρμοπυκτης, πρόετοι καὶ προερχόμενοι διανοούσαις ἡτανα των κόσμους ἐσώτερος ἡθούσας. God Fabricated the Earth also, which is our Nurse, turning round upon the Axis of the World, and thereby causing and maintaining the Succession of Day and Night, the First and Oldest of all the Gods, generated within the Heavens. Where since that Philosopher seems the ather to make the Earth an Animal and a God, because of its Diurnal Revolution upon its own Axis, we may conclude that afterwards when in his old age, (as Plutarch records from Theophrastus) he gave entertainment also to that other part of the Pythagorick Hypotheses, and attributed to the Earth a Planetary Annual Motion likewise about the Sun, (from whence it would follow, that as Plutius expresseth it, the earth was in θεία θεόσ, one of the Stars) he was therefore still so much more inclin'd, to think the Earth to be a God as well as the other Planets, or at least as the Moon, that having been formerly re-cited in the Orphick Tradition, but as another Habitable Earth, or these Verses of Orphæus, are recorded by Proclus, to that purpose.
The sense whereof is this, That God in the Cosmogonia or Cosmopoeia, besides this Earth of ours, fabricated also another vast Earth, which the Immortal Gods call Selene, but mortal men Mene, or the Moon; that hath many Hills and Valleys, many Cities and Houses in it. From whence Proclus, though as it seems a Stranger to the Pythagorick System, yet being much addicted to these Orphick Traditions, concluded the Moon to be, γαῖα ἀβεβευκέναι, an Ethereal Earth.

After all this, Plato, that he might be thought to omit nothing in his Timean Cosmogonia, speaks also of the Genesis, Orthus or Generation of the Poetic Gods, under the name of Demons, such as Tethys and Phoebus, Saturn and Rhea, Jupiter and Juno, and the like; which seem to be really nothing else, but the other Inanimate Parts of the World and Things of Nature Section. And, that is, Fictiously Personated and Deified (as is elsewhere declared.) Which whole businesse was a Thing set off by those Poets with much Fiction and Physiological Allegory. And though Plato, out of a seeming compliance with the Laws of his City, pretends here to give credit to this Poetic Theogonia, as Tradition delivered down from the Sons of the Gods, who must not be supposed to have been ignorant of their Parents; yet as Ensebius well observeth, he doth but all the while filily jear it, plainly infinuating the Fabulosity thereof, when he affirmeth it to have been introduced not only εἰκόνων ἐνεμέρων ἀπονεματικοῖς, but also εἰκόνων ἀνεμεμέρων without necessary Demonstrations, but also εἴδος εἰκών, without so much as Probabilities. Nevertheless Proclus suspecting no such matter, but taking Plato in all this, to have been in very good earnest, interprets these Poetic Gods or Demons mentioned by him, to be the Gods below the Moon, (notwithstanding that the Earth was mentioned before by Plato) calling them ἔρεις ἐκείνας Σεός, the Gods that cause Generation, and seeming to understand thereby the Animated Elements; Jupiter being here not taken, as he is often elsewhere, for the Supreme God, but only for the Animated Ether, as Juno for the Animated Air. And upon this occasion, he runs out into a long Dispute, to prove, that not only the Stars were Animated, but also all the other Sublunar Bodies or Elements: οὐκ ἐκ τούτων ἀλλὰ ἐκείνας ἔρεις ἐκείνας Σεός, that is, the animated Bodies of the Moon, being those Bodies which are implanted in the sublunar world. For the whole Earth is not Animated, and can no more be so, nor the Heaven, unless with bodies which are Animated; and the Moon is the中间 Body between the Earth and Heaven, and is the very and only Body which doth so altogether agree with the Earth, as we read of in the Scriptures. For if the whole World be a Happy God, then none of the Parts of it are Godless, or devoid of Providence; but if all things partake of God and Providence, then are they not unfurnished of the Divine Nature, and if so, there must be some peculiar Orders of Gods preceding over them. For if the Heavens by reason of particular Souls and Minds, partake of that one Soul and one Mind; why should we not conclude the same, concerning the Elements, that they also by
certain intermedious Orders of Gods, partake of that One Divinity of the whole World. Wherefore a little before, the same Proclus highly condemns, certain Ancient Physiologers, whom he supposesfth Aristotle to have followed: πολλοίς δὲ φιλοσοφοις ἔμελες εἰς σφαγίαν, ἐπορίσας τ. 1,268. τιτάς εἶναι τὰ στείχη, ᾠδήματος τά μὲν γὰς θερμότητα τὰ μὲν γὰς σφαγίαν διὰ τὸν ἐὰν αὐτός τούτος, νάν Ἀρίστολον μετέχειν ἀπολογῶν, τινὰς κεφαλῶν, ἀπὸ πολυμάνδρων, ἐδέσπον, ἔτος ἀρχηγόνων ἀνέπλητον, οὐκ ἄρα ἀρχηγοῖς ἔσχατον, τὰς θερμήνιας περιφρονίσεις μένους ἡγεμόνες, τας ἀνακαινίας αὐτικάς, ἄλλα ὡς ὑπό, ἔτει πλεῖος ἄφορος ἄρα τὰ στείχια τοῦτων καταλέπτων. The Elements were thought by most of the Ancient Physiologers to be Inanimate, and to be moved Fortuitously without Providence. For though they acknowledged the Heavenly Bodies, by reason of that Order that appears in them, to partake of Mind and God's, yet they left this Sublunary World (or Genesis) to Float up and down without Providence. And these Aristotle afterwards followed, appointing immoveable Intelligences to preside over the Celestial Spheres only, (whether Eight or more) but leaving all the lower Elements Dead and Inanimate.

Lastly, besides all those other Mundane Gods before mentioned, as Generated together with the World, though Proclus seem to be of another Opinion, yet it is manifest that Plato doth not there in his Timeus, altogether forget those properly called Demons (elsewhere so much insisted upon by him) but in the very next following words, he plainly intimates them, after this manner: ὑστε παθητικῶς καὶ ὑπὸ ὁμ. ἑλεύθερον Ἰστοὶ, τὰ Θεάν διάκομοι στηρεσάριστον ἱερὰ, ὡς μή κακῶς ὑπὸ ἱερὰς γίγνοντο ἵσταν, and to govern this mortal Animal, Man, after his last manner possible, so that he should no otherwise fail of doing well or being happy, than as he became a cause of Evil and Misery to himself, by the abuse of his own Liberty.

And thus much out of Plato's Timeus; but the same thing might be roved also out of his other Writings, as particularly from that Page his Tenth Book of Laws, where he takes notice again of the Theogonia of the Ancients, and that as it had been depraved and corrupted y a great mixture of Impious and Immoral Fables. Εἰπεὶ ἡμῖν δὲ γράϕων δέχραντος πάρηκλησιν. οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ μέτρους, οἱ δὲ ἀνδρὸς μέτρους λεγοντες ἐπὶ τῶν αἰώνων. οἱ μὲν παραπείτωποι, ός γέρανοι ὡς πράσινα φύους ἱεράς ἐπὶ ἄλλαν. ἐκαίνοις τοῖς ἄφιτοι πολλά θεογοῖς διδασκάλων, άλλοι δὲ τοῖς περὶ ἀλλού ἀρχομένοικοι. There are, saith he, extant amongst us Athenians, certain ories and traditions, very ancient, concerning the Gods, written partly Metre and partly in Prose, declaring how the Heaven, and the other lands were at first made, or Generated, and then carrying on their fabulous theogonia further, how the Generated Gods, afterward conversed with one another, and ingredyng after the manner of men, begat other Gods. Where at Philosopher taking off his vizard, plainly discovers his great like of that whole Fabulous Theogonia (however he acknowledges elsewhere
elsewhere that it did contain ὑπολογας, that is, Physiological Allegories under it) as a thing that was destructive of all Piety and Virtue, by reason of its attributing all Humane Passions and Vices to the Gods. However it plainly appears from hence, that the Theogonia and the Cosmogonia were one and the same thing, the Generation of the Gods being here, the Generation of the Heaven, and of the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and the like.

Moreover this same thing is sufficiently manifest also, even from Hesiod's own Theogonia, which doubtless was that which Plato principally aimed at, and if it were not absolutely the First, yet is it the most ancient Writing now extant, in that kind. For there in the beginning of that Poem, Hesiod invokes his Muses after this manner:

Salve! nata Jovis, date vero amabilem cantilenam:
Celebrate quoque immortalium divinum genus semper existentium
Qui Tellure progenit sunt, Callostellato,
Noctibus caliginosis, quoqueitem falsus nutrivit Pontus,
Dicite inferno, ut primum Dii & Terra salvi fuerint,
Et Flumina, & Pontus inuentus aminervens,
Astraque fulgentia, & Celum Latum supernu,
Et quot ex his nati sunt Dii datores bonorum.

Where we see plainly, that the Generation of the Gods, is the Generation of the Earth, Heaven, Stars, Seas, Rivers, and other things begotten from them (as probably amongst the rest Demons are Nymphe which the same Hesiod speaks of elsewhere.) But immediately after this Invocation of the Muses, the Poet begins with Chaos at Tartara and Love, as the First Principles, and then proceeds to the Production of the Earth, and of Night out of Chaos, of the Ether and of D from Night; of the Starry Heavens, Mountains and Seas, &c. All which Generation or Generation of Gods is really nothing but a Poetical Description of the Cosmogonia: as throughout the Sequel of that whole Poem, all seems to be Physiology, veiled under Fiction and Allegories. And thus the Ancient Scholia upon that Book begin, ἐν ὑπολογοις τοῦ δεινοματικοῦ τοῦ μνήμου, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντίκειται, we must know, that the whole Doctrine of the Theogonia, contains under it, in way of Allegory, a Physiological Declaration of things. Hesiod's Gods being not only the Animated Parts of the World, but also all the other Things of Nature, fictitiously Personated and Deified, or Abusively called Gods and Goddeses.
Neither was this only the Doctrine of the Greeks, that the World was thus Made or Generated, and that the Generation of the World, was a Theogonia or a Generation of Gods (the World it self and its several Parts being accounted such by them) but also in like manner of the other Barbarian Pagans. For Diogenes Laertius hath recorded, concerning the Persian Magi, ἀπερμαθητευόμενοι παρά τις κοίνας, τινας εἰς γνώσιν, ἢς ἐπικοινωνία, γιὰ τοῖς ἐπικοινωνίαις, ἵνα τὰς δεραῖς τὰς ζωὰς, ἢς ἐκ τῶν ζωὸν, ἃς ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῶν. That they did both assist the Being and Generation of Gods, and also that these Gods were Fire and Earth and Water, that the Animated Elements were Gods, (as Proclus also before declared) and that these together with the World, were Generated, or had a Beginning. And both Laertius and Diodorus represent it as the Opinion of the ancient Egyptians, that the World was Generated by a Temporary Production, as also that the Sun and Moon and other Parts of the World, were Gods. But whereas the same Diodorus writes of certain Egyptian Gods, οἱ γενεων ἄνων ἐγκυμόνες, which had standing by an Eternal Generation, he seems to mean thereby, only the Celestial Gods the Sun, Moon and Stars, as distinct from those other Hero's and Men-Gods, which are again thus described by him, εἰς παντὸς ἄνθρωπος, διά εὐσεβείας, ποιεῖν καὶ νυνίν ἀνθρώπον ἀναγωγίαν, πατρίδως ταύταις ἡ παλαιώτερος, who though naturally Mortal, yet by reason of their Wisdom, Virtue and Beneficence toward Mankind, had been advanced to Immortality.

And by this time we think it doth sufficiently appear, that the Theogonia of the Ancients, is not to be understood merely of their Heroes and Men-gods, or of all their Gods, as supposed to have been nothing else but Mortal Men, (Dii Mortalius nati Matribus, as Prof. in Cicero speaks) who according to the more Vulgar signification of the Word, had been Generated, (Humano Mere) as some, otherwise Learned Men, have seemed to suppose, but that it extends to the Inferiour Pagan Gods, some whereof were Parts of the Visible World Animated, as the Sun, Moon, Stars, and Earth; so that their theogonia, was the very same thing with the Cosmogonia, or at least Part thereof. Notwithstanding which, we deny not but that there was also in the Paganick Fable of the Gods, a certain Mixture of Fable and Herology interwoven, and complicated all along together with Physic.

We are in the next place to observe, that both this Theogonia and Cosmogonia of the Ancient Pagans, their Generation of the World and Gods, is to be understood of a Temporary Production of them, whereby they were Made & by Generation, or from an Antecedent Non-existence brought into Being. For this was the General Tradition amongst the Pagans, that the World was made out of an antecedent Chaos, as shall afterwards further declared. And Aristotle affirmeth, that before this time, this Genesis and Temporary Production of the World had been universally entertain'd by all, and particularly that Plato was an Author of the fame. Nevertheless, the generality of the latter Platonists, endeavour with all their might, to force a contrary sense upon his Timaeus. Which is a thing that Plutarch, long since observed, after this manner: οἱ πλάσματα ἔχουσιν Πλάτωνος, φοινικοὶ κρινόμενοι, λόγως καὶ ἀνθρώπους.
That Plato really asserted, Book I.

The most of Plato's Followers, being infinitely troubled and perplexed in their minds, turn themselves every way, using all manner of Arts, and offering all kind of violence to his Text, as conceiving, that they ought by all means possible, to hide and conceal that Opinion (as inaud and detestable) of the Generation of the World, and of the Soul of it, so as not to have continued from Eternity, or through a succession of Infinite Time. Notwithstanding which, we conceive it to be undeniably evident, that Plato in his Time, doth affirm the Genesis of the World in this sense, to wit of a Temporary Production of it, and as not having existed from Eternity or without Beginning. First, because in the entrance of that Discourse, he opposeth these Two things to one another, that which always is, and that which are, that which is Generated or Made, and therefore in affirming the World to have been Generated, he must needs deny the Eternity thereof. Again, the Question is so punctually stated by him afterwards, as that there is no possibility of any Subterfuge left; whether the World always was, having no Beginning or Generation, or whether it was Made or Generated, having commenced from a certain Epocha? To which the Answer is, that it was Made or had a Beginning. Moreover this Philosopher, there plainly affirms also, that Time itself was Made, or had a Beginning, which ought to be attributed to God, being plain from the beginning of any other things. God taking all that Matter, which was, (not then resting, but moving confusedly and disorderly) he brought it into Order, out of Confusion. Which is no more than if he should have said, God made this World, out of an antecedent Chaos; which, as we said before, was the constant Tradition of the Ancient Pagans. Now as to Authority, we may well conclude, that Aristotle was better able to undertand both Plato's Philosophy, and Greek, than any of those Junior Platonists, who lived hundreds of years after. And yet we are not quite defitute of other Sufficient besides Aristotle's neither, not only Philo the Jew, but also Plutarch and Atticus, who were both of them Platonick Pagans, voting on this side, besides Alexander Aprodius a judicious Peripatetic. The only Objection considerable, is from what Plato himself writes in his Third and Sixth Book of Laws. In the former whereof Clinias, and the Athenian Hopes, discourse together after this manner, concerning the Original or First Beginning of Common-wealths: παλαιας ας ἑκατον των πνω φθέγματι χρισμένας και λαίας τοῦ πάντοτε ἀοιδῆς, καὶ χρατουμένης τω γαῖας αὐτῆς, καὶ μεσαλλοῦσα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. Καὶ πάς λέγει γάρ ἀνθρώπω πολυτάδερμοι, δείκτης ἐν πάντι χάλα.
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Now it is very true, what we have several times before suggested, that there have been amongst the Pagans, both Theonists and Cosmogoniasts.
That Plato was
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nifs too, that were Atheists. They abusing the word Gods several ways; Some of them, as Anaximander, understanding thereby Intimate Worlds successively Generated out of Sensible Matter, and Corrupted again into it; others, as Anaximenes and Democritus, allowing that there were certain Animals and Understanding Beings Superior to Men, but such only as were Native and Mortal, in like manner as Men, and calling these by the Name of Gods. Of the former of which Two Philosophers, St. Austin gives us this account; Anaximenes omnes rerum causas Infinito Acri dedit, nec Deos negavit aut saecuit, non tamen ab ipsis Aereum fadum, sed ipfos ex Aere ortos credidit; Anaximenes made Infinite Air, to be the first Original and Cause of all things, and yet was he not therefore silent concerning the Gods, much less did he deny them; nevertheless he did not believe the Air to have been Made by the Gods, but the Gods to have been all generated out of the Air. These were therefore such Theogonists, as supposed all the Gods without exception, to be Generable and Corruptible, and acknowledged no Dei ¥γόδου at all, no Understanding Being Unmade and Self-existent, but concluded Sensible Matter to be the only ¥γόδου and Original of all things, which is Absolute Atheism. Notwithstanding which, it is certain that all the Pagan Theogonists were not Atheists, (no more than all their Cosmogonists Theists) but that there was another sort of Theogonists amongst them, who supposed indeed all the Inferior Mundane Gods to have been Made or Generated in one Sense or other, but afferted One Dei ¥γόδου 9 ει ανωντόδο, One Supreme Unmade Self-existent Deity, who was the Cause of them all, Which Theogonists for distinction sake, from those other Atheistical ones may be called Divine.

And that Plato was such a Divine Theogonist, is a thing as we conceive out of question. But if there had been any doubt concerning it, it would have been sufficiently removed from those Passages before-cited out of his Timeus. To which nevertheless, for fuller satisfaction sake, may be added these Two which follow. The first, pag. 34. Βερο ζε σαδο θεος, ου εστι εξ αερος γενομεν, αι θεος τοιαυτα τον Αθειον δαμενοι: For thus it ought to be read θεος, as it is also in Aldus his Edition, and not θεος, as in Stevens, following an error in that of Ficinus. And accordingly the words are thus rendered by Cicero, Hec Deus est qui Semper erat, de Aliquando Futuro Deo cogitans, longum cum effect, & undeque equabiliter, &c. This was the Ratiocination or Resolution of that God, which Always Is, concerning that God which was sometime about to be made; that he should be Smooth and Spherical, &c. Where again, it prefently follows in Cicero's Version, Sic Deus tunc Aeterus, Hunc Perfecte Beatum Deum procevit, Thus that Eternal God, procured this perfectly Happy God, the World. Where there is plainly mention made, of Two Gods, one a Generated God, the Animated World, called elsewhere in Plato bein των θεων, and another Eternal and Unmade God, Intimates & Infectus Deus, who was the Cause of the Worlds Generation or Production. Or to keep close to Plato's own Language, One God who belonged to Genesis, or that head of Being which he calls Generation; and therefore must needs have an Antecedent Cause of his Existence; since nothing can be Made without a Cause; and
and another God, that was truly and properly \( \delta \epsilon \iota \alpha \), Immortal Essence, who was the Cause of that Generated God, the Universe, and therefore of all things. The other Passage of Plato's is pag. 41. of his Timæus, and the Proclus therein quoted but in the wrong place, as follows, with the note in the margin of the former, "et vero, quia caput non est et ultimum ad ultimum." If Plato had so expressed himself in the Timæus, it is unlikely that he would not have mentioned it in the Platonists and Pythagoreans, as we are to speak again afterwards. In the mean time it is evident, that in that Passage of Plato's before-cited, there is plain mention made, both of \( \theta \epsilon \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \) and of \( \Theta \iota \iota \), of Dio Orti, Gods who were made or Generated with the World, and of \( \delta \iota \iota \theta \iota \iota \iota \iota \) of One God who was the Maker of them, and of the Whole Universe, who therefore is himself every way \( \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu \iota \hat{o} \iota \iota \) Unmade or Unproduced.
And accordingly he afterwards subjoyns, κε ό μαύ ό ταῦτα παῦνα δι' 
ταξις, ἐμβιαίω καὶ τα' εναμι τελειον θεον. ἤρμοδος δὲ νομισθη οἱ παλαιά 
τω τω πατερες τοι, ἐπειδοίκ αὑτη, which Cicero thus renders, Atque
is quidem (Deus) qui cum a compositi, constanter in suo maneat statu, 
qui autem erant ab eo creati (Dii) cium Parentis ordinem cognovissent, 
hinc sequbantur, &c. Then that God who framed all things, remained
constantly in his former States, and his Sons, or the Gods that were
Created by him, observing his Order and Appointment.

Neither was Plato singular in this, but the Generality of the other
Pagan Theists who were more Intelligent, all along agreed with him
herein, as to the Generation of the Mundane Gods, and so were both
Theists and Theogonists, they indeed understanding nothing else by
their Theogonists or Generation of Gods, than a Divine Cosmogonia or
Creation of the World by God; forasmuch as they supposed the World
itself as Animated, and its several Parts, to be Gods. So that they af-
ferred these Three Things, First a Cosmogonia the Generation of the
World, that it was not from Eternity, but had a Novity or Beginning.
Secondly, that this Cosmogonia or Generation of the World, was also a
Theogonia or Generation of Gods, the World it selfe and several of its
Parts Animated being esteemed such. And Lastly, that both these
Gods and the World, were Made and Produced by One θεος ἄγνωστος θη
cosmos, One Unproduced and Self-originated Deity. All which Par-
ticulars, we may here briefly exemplifie in P. Ovidius Nisus, whose Pa-
ganity sufficiently appears, from his Fastorium and all his other Writ-
ings, and who also went off the Stage, before Christianitie appeared
on it, and may well be presumed, to represent the then generally re-
ceived Doctrine of the Pagans. First therefore, as for the Genera-
tion and Novity of the World, and its First Production out of a Chaos, we
have it fully acknowledged by him in these following Verses.

Metam. I. 1

Ante Mare & Terras, &c, quod tegit omnia, Calum,
Urus erat tota Naturenum in orbis,
Quem dixere Chaos, rudis indigestaque moles,
Nec quiquam nifs pondus iners, congelaque codem
Non bene juniarum discordia semina rerum.
Nullus adhuc mundo praebebat Lumina Titan,
Nec nova crescendo reparatas cornua Phoebus,
Nec circumfusus penebat in aure Tellus,
Ponderibus librata jupos; nec brachia longo
Marginis terrarum porrecte Amphi'rathe.
Quaere erat & Tellus, &c.

Which in Mr. Sanders his English, with some little alteration, speak-
thus:

Before that Sea and Earth and Heaven was fram'd,
One face had Nature which they Chaos nam'd.
No Titan yet the World with Light adorns,
Nor waxing Phebe fills her wain'd Horns,
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Nor hung the self-poiz’d Earth in thin Air plac’d,
Nor Amphitrite the vast shore embrac’d;
Earth, Air and Sea Confounded, &c.

In the next place, when there was a World made out of this Chaos, that this Cosmogonia or Generation of the World, was also a Theogonia or Generation of Gods, is plainly intimated in these Verses.

Neu Regio foret allaquis Animalibus orba,
Afera tenent celeste solum, Formæque Deorum.

To this fence,

That nought of Animals might unfurnisht’d lie,
The Gods, in Form of Stars, possessthe Sky.

And that all this was effect’d, and this Orderly Mundane System produced out of a disorderly confus’d Chaos, not by a Fortuitous Motion of Matter, or the Jumbling of Atoms, but by the Providence and Command of One Unmade Deity, which was also that that furnish’d all the several Parts of the World with respective Animals; the Sea with Fishes, the Earth with Men, and the Heaven with Gods; is thus declared also by the Poet;

Hanc Deus & Melior litem Natura diremit,
Nam Celo Terras, & Terris abscedit Undas:
Et liquidum spiffo secrevit ab Aere Calum, &c.

Sic ubi dispositis, Quisquis fuit ille Deorum,
Congeriem secuit, secatamque in membra redegit,
Principio terram, ne non aqualis ab omni
Parte foret, magni speciem glomeravit in orbis:
Tum feta diffudit, rapidisque tunc scorere ventis
Jussit, &c.

Sic onus inclusum, numero distinxit eodem
Cur a Dei, &c.

This Strife (with Better Nature) God decides,
He Earth from Heaven, the Seas from Earth divides;
He Ether pure extracts from Groser Air.
All which unfolded by His Prudent Care,
From that blind Mas, the happily disjoin’d
With strifeless peace, He to their seats confin’d, &c.
What God forever this Division wrought,
And every part to due proportion brought,
First left the Earth unequal should appear,
He turn’d it round in figure of a Sphere.
Then Seas diffus’d, Commanding them to roar
With ruffling Winds, and give the Land a shore.
To those he added Springs, Ponds, Lakes immense,
And Rivers whose winding borders fence.

Where
Where though that learned Paraphrast, supposed (and not without some probability neither) that Deus & Melior Natura, God and the Better Nature, were one and the same thing, yet we rather conceiv'd them to be distinct, but one of them subordinate to the other as its Instrument, God and the Platistic Nature, accordingly as Aristotle writes in his Physicks, νέκτο όποιον τόν τοι ποιήσαν, That Mind and Nature, were both together, the Cause of this Universe.

Nevertheless we cannot but observe in this place, that though that Poet speak more than once of God Singuly, as also calls him Mundus Fabricator, and Ille Opifex Rerum, and Mundi melioris Origo, yet notwithstanding, where he writes of the making of Man, Pagan-like, he affirms him, though to have been made by God, yet according to the Image or Likeness of The Gods, which govern all things.

Sanctius his Animal, mentisque capaxis alta
Decræt adhuc, & quod dominari in eateria posset:
Natus homo est: sinu hinc divino femine fécit,
Ille Opifex rerum, mundi melioris Origo:
Sive recens tellus, sedudque vuper ab alto
Æthere, cognati retinebat semina cali.
Quam satus Iapeto, misitam floviaibus undis,
Firxit in effigiem Moderantium cuncta Deorum.

The Nobler Being, with a Mind possess'd,
Was wanting yet, that should command the rest.
That Maker, the best Worlds Original,
Either him fram'd of seed Celestial;
Or Earth which late he did from Heaven divide,
Some sacred seeds retain'd to Heaven allied:
Which with the living stream Prometheus mixt,
And in that Artificial Structure fix'd,
The Form of all the All-ruling Deities.

And because some may probably be puzzled with this seeming Contradiction, that One God should be said to be the Maker of the whole World and of Man, and yet the Government of all should be attributed to Gods, Plurally 3 and Man said to be made in the Image and Likeness of the Gods; we shall therefore add here, that according to the tenor of the Pagan Theology, the Inferior and Minor Gods were supposed also, to have all of them, their several share in the Government of things below them: For which cause they are called not only by Maximus Tyrins οικεροίσ τῆς εἰκόνος, Or co-rulers with God, but also by Plato himself, τὸ μητήρ τόννυκροτούς, the Co-governors and Co-reigners with the Supreme God. So that the Government of this Inferior World, was by the Pagans often attributed to them joyntly, the Supreme and Inferior Gods both together, under that one general name of God. But the chief of those Inferior Deities, in whose Image Man is also said to have been made, as well as in the Likeness of the Supreme, were either those Celestial Gods, and Animated Stars, before mentioned by the Poet or else the Eternal Gods of Plato, which were look'd upon likewise as Co-makers of the World subordinate.
CHAP. IV. and Theists.

Besides Ovid, we might instance here in many more of the Pagan Theogonists, clearly acknowledging in like manner One Unmade Deity, which Generated both the World, and all the other Gods in it; as for example, Strabo, who affirming that the World was φῶς κάμ χριστίαν οὐ τούτος ἡ γέρον. The joint work both of Nature and Providence, as it was before ascribed by Ovid, to Deus & Melior Naturae; adds concerning Providence or the Deity in this manner: τοῦ περιατός, οὐ τῇ κατά τρισδεκάδας τοῖς τισί; καὶ μέρος οὐρανος δύνατος, ὡς τοῖς πρώτοις εἰκάς ἄνευ, ἐκ πλῆθες διαφόρως ἰδίος ἐνθι_ev, τότε ταμαίωσις τοις ἢ τις θεοῦς τις τοῖς περιατοῖς τούτοις. That having a multiform Fabricity in it, and delighting in variety of works, it designed principally to make Animals, as the most excellent things, and amongst them chiefly those Two Noblest kinds of Animals, Gods and Men; for whose sakes the other things were made; and then assigned Heaven to the Gods, and Earth to Men, the two extreme parts of the World, for their respective Habitations. Thus also Seneca in Laodamia, speaking concerning God, ης τὰ πρώτας Φαντάμας μοις περίτοιν μακρόσειν, & hoc ordinare quo neque maius quiaquam noviti Natura nec melius; ut omnis sub Ducibus, quavis ipse pretium se corpus intenderat, tamen Ministris regni sui Deos genuit. God when he laid the Foundations of this most beautiful Fabric, and began to erect that Structure, than which Nature knew nothing greater or more excellent; to the end that all things might be carried on under their respective Governors orderly, though he intended Himself through the whole, as to preside in chief over all, yet did be Generate Gods also, as subordinate Ministers of his Kingdom under him. We shall forbear to mention the Testimonies of others here, because they may be more opportunely inferred elsewhere; only we shall add, as to Hesiod and Homer, that though they seem to have been sometimes suspected, both by Plato and Aristotle, for Atheistic Theogonists, yet as Aristotle did upon maturer thoughts, afterwards change his Opinion concerning both of them, so is it most probable that they were no Atheists but Divine Theogonists, such as supposed indeed Many Generated Gods, but One Supreme Unmade Deity, the Maker both of the World and Them. And this not only for the Grounds before alleged concerning Hesiod, and because both of them do every where affirm, even their Generated Gods to be Immortal, (which no Atheists did) but also for sundry other Reasons, some of which may be more conveniently inferred elsewhere. Moreover it hath been already intimated, that the Generated Gods of Hesiod and Homer, extend farther than those of Plato’s, they being not only the Animated Parts of the World, but also all the other Things of Nature Fictiously Personated, and Improperly or Abusively called Gods and Goddeffes, whereof a farther account will be afterwards given.

Neither ought it at all to be wondred at, if these Divine Theogonists among the Pagans, did many times as well as those other Atheistic ones, make Chaos and the Ocean, Senior to the Gods, and Night the Mother of them. The former of these being not only done by Hesiod and Homer, but also by the Generality of the ancient Pagan Theists in 

Epickar-
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Epicharmus: and the Latter by Orpheus an undoubted Theist, in his Hymn of the Night,

Nidiçα Στραγονος ἀκομναι, ιδέ μεν ἄφριμον.

Nor them concelebro Genetricem Hominumque Deumque.

They not understanding this Absolutely and Universal, of all the Gods without exception, as the other Atheistic Theogonists did, as if there had been no Unmade Deity at all, but Chaos and Night, (that is, Senseless Matter, blindly and fortuitously moved) had been the sole Original of all things, but only of the οὐ κόσμοι, the Gods, so called by way of Distinction from God or the Supreme Deity, that is, the Inferior Mundane Gods Generated together with the World. The Reason whereof was, because it was a most ancient and in a manner Univerally received Tradition amongst the Pagans, as hath been often intimated, that the Cosmogonia or Generation of the World took its first Beginning from a Chaos, (the Divine Cosmogonias agreeing herein with the Atheistic ones;) this Tradition having been delivered down, from Orpheus and Linus (amongst the Greeks) by Hesiod and Homer and others; acknowledged by Epicharmus; and embraced by Thales, Anaxagoras, Plato, and other Philosophers, who were Theists: The Antiquity whereof was thus declared by Euripides:

Οἰν έμες ο μαρός, άλλ έμες μητέρα ταύτος,
'τε斯 άσεβος τς γαίας τιν' ἐν μερίδι μιᾶ,
'επεί ά' εμφασις άθανάτων ἄλλων ἄλης,
Τιμωρόντα πάντα, κανδήκοντα έις φοῖς τινος,
Τά τε άνυψα, άθών, άνιγκες, το ρήμα τραφό,
Γενός τι οὖν τόνων.

Non hic Mens, sed Matris est sermo meus,
Figura ut Una sicut Celi & Soli,
Secretaque maxut receperunt Statum,
Cum ediderunt hec in ora Luminis;
Feras, Volucres, Arbores, Ponti Gregem,
Hominis quoque ipsos.

Neither can it reasonably be doubted, but that it was Originally Mosi- cal, and indeed at first a Divine Revelation, since no man could other- wise pretend to know, what was done before Mankind had any Being. Wherefore those Pagan Cosmogonists who were Theists, being Polytheists and Theogonists also, and affirming besides the One Supreme Unmade Deity, other Inferior Mundane Gods, Generated together with the World (the Chief whereof were the Animated Stars) they must needs according to the Tenor of that Tradition, suppose them as to their Corporeal Parts at least, to have been Juniors to Night and Chaos, and the Off-spring of them, because they were all made out of an Antecedent Dark Chaos. Τῶν μούγαλων άπεθανάκτων άλεγοι (Faith Plutarch) ἦν ταῖς άνυψαι τιναλώ εσταί, ἦν το οὖν τε φανερόν μην ἀποστείλεται τον Μαύρον ἁρανέρον The Mus Araneus being blind, is said to have been deified by the Egyp-
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And, because they thought, that Darkness was older than Light. And the Case was the same concerning their Demons likewise, they being conceived to have their Corporeal Vehicles also; for which Cause as Porphyris from Numenius writeth, the ancient Egyptians pictured them in Ships or Boats floating upon the Water. For they Alloquing did the Devil and his Angels appear in a Cloud, and an Angel of Light. The Egyptians therefore represented all their Demons, as not standing upon firm Land, but in Ships upon the Water. But as for the Corporeal Part or Souls of those Inferior Gods, though these Divine Theogonists could not derive their Original from Chaos or Matter, but rather from that other Principle called Life, as being Divinely Created, and so having God for their Father, yet might they notwithstanding, in another sense, phanec Night to have been their Mother too, in a much as they were all made from an antecedent Non-existence or Nothing, brought forth into Life. For which Cause there seems to have been in Orpheus, a Dialogue betwixt the Maker of the World and Night. For that this ancient Cabala, which derived the Cosmogonia from Chaos and Life, was at first Religious and not Atheistical, and this understood in it not to be the Off-spring of Chaos; but may be concluded from hence, because this Life as well as Chaos, was of a Moisical Extraction also, and plainly derived from that Spirit of God, which is said in the Scripture, To have moved upon the waters, that is, upon the Chaos: whether by this Spirit to be meant God Himself, as acting immediately upon the Matter, or some other Active Principle derived from God and not from Matter (as a Mundane Soul or Plastick Nature.) From whence also it came, that as Porphyris testifieth, the ancient Pagans thought the Water to be Divinely inspired, being the Portion of the gods, because of the first World and the first Life, God having represented them as Spirit, to be inspir'd by God. But they thought that Souls attended upon the Water or resorted thereto, as being Divinely Inspired, as Numenius writeth, adding the Prophet also, therefore to have said, That the Spirit of God moved upon the Water.

And that this Cabala was thus understood by some of the ancient Pagan Cosmogonists themselves, appears plainly, not only from Simmias Rhodius and Parmenides, but also from these following Verse of Orpheus, or whoever was the Writer of those Argonauticks, undoubtedly ancient, where Chaos and Love are thus brought in together;

πωείς μεθ' ἐργαλεῖα xάος μελικρατον ύανων, ος προάγεται φάραξ, ἃς τ' ἐσμένης εἰς πτέρες ἔλαις, Γιης τ' ἀκράτεις στηρια, πολιμκά τ' παλάνας, Πρεσβηταρίτη τ' τ' αὐτώτατο πολύμνην θραύσα, ὅσα τ' ἐρωμεῖ αὐτίκη, διήσερεν ἀ' ἀλλον ἀ' ἀλλας.

To this Sense; We will first sing a pleasant and delightful Song, concerning the ancient Chaos, how Heaven, Earth and Sea, were framed out of it, as also concerning that Much-wise and Sagacious Love, The Oldest of all, and Self-perfect, which actively produced all these things, separating one thing from another. Where this Love is not only called Παλύμνην of Much-counsel or Sagaciousness, which implies it to have been
been a Substantial and Intellectual Thing, but also πρῶτον τὰς ὅλας of all, and therefore Senior to Chaos, as likewise ὁ πάντων, Self-perfect or Self-originated. From whence it is manifest, that according to the Orphick Tradition, this Love which the Cosmogonia was derived from, was no other than the Eternal Unmade Deity (or an Active Principle depending on it) which produced this whole Orderly World, and all the Generated Gods in it, as to their Material part, out of Chaos and Night. Accordingly as Aristotle determines in his Metaphysics, not only in the place before-cited, but also afterward, ἕκαστος ἔί τινα, δεδομένα πιστά καὶ εὐθείᾳ, ἢ τὸν οὐκ εἴσακύνησαι εἰς οὐδὲν ἐπάνω αὐτῷ. Others, besides the Material Cause of the World, assign an Efficient, or Cause of Motion, namely whosoever make, either Mind (and Intellecf) or Love a Principle. Wherefore we conclude that that other Atheistic Cabala, or Ariostoianick Tradition before-mentioned, which accordingly as Aristotle also, elsewhere declareth concerning it, did οὐ κατὰ πάντα γινομαι, Generate all things whatsoever, even the Gods themselves universally out of Night and Chaos, making Love it self likewise, to have been produced from an Egg of the Night. I say, that this was nothing else but a mere Depravation of the ancient Mosaic Cabala, as also an Absolutely Impossible Hypothesis, it deriving all things whatsoever in the Universe, besides the Bare Substance of Sense Matter, in another Sense then, that before-mentioned, out of Non-entity or Nothing, as shall be also farther manifested afterwards.

We have now represented the Sense and generally received Doctrine of the ancient Pagan Theologers, that there was indeed a Multiplicity of Gods, but yet to that One of them only was ἀγαθόν, Generate or Unmade, by whom all the other Gods together with the World were Made, so as to have had a Novity of Being or a Temporary Beginning of their Existence. Plato and the Pythagoreans here only differing from the rest in this, that though they acknowledged the World and all the Mundane Gods, to have been Generated together in Time, yet they supposed certain other Intelligible and Superior Gods also, which however produced from one Original Deity, were nevertheless Eternal or without Beginning. But now we must acknowledge, that there were amongst the Pagan Theists some of a different persuasion from the rest, who therefore did not admit of any Theogonia in the Ence before declared, that is, any Temporary Generation of Gods, because they acknowledged no Cosmogonia, no Temporary Production of the World, but concluded it to have been from Eternity.

That Aristotle was one of these, is sufficiently known, whose Inferior Gods therefore, the Sun, Moon and Stars, must needs be ὑφεσσύνην or Ingenerate, in this sense, so as to have had no Temporary Production, because the Whole World to him was such. And if that Philosopher be to be believed, himself was the very First, at least, of all the Greeks, who aserred this Ingenerate of Eternity of the World, he affirming that all before him, did ἀοιδούντος ὡς ἴματον, and καταεγκυνον, Generate or Make the World, that is attribute a Temporary Production to it, and consequently to all those Gods also, which were a Part thereof. Notwithstanding,
standing which, the Writer de Placitis Philosphorum, and Sto-

ians, impute this Dogma of the Worlds Eternity, to certain others
of the Greek Philosophers before Aristotole, (besides Ocellus Lucanus,
who is also acknowledged by Philo to have been an afftertor thereof.)

And indeed Epicharmus, though a Theist, seems plainly to have been
of this Perswation, that the World was Unmade, as also that there
was no Theogonia nor Temporary Production of the Inferior Gods, from
hefe Verfes of his, according to Grotius his Correction.

\[\text{Excerpt p. 478.}\]

Nempe Di semper fuerunt, atque nunquam intercedent :  
Hac que dico semper nobis rebus in ifdem fce eixibent.  

Exitifse fod Deorum Primum peribetur Chaos:  

Quinam uerd ? nam de nihilo nil poter primum exifere,  

Ergo nec Primum profcdo uicquam, nec finit Alterum :  
Sed que nunc fic appellantur, alia fient postmodum.

Where, though he acknowledges this to have been the General

Of the ancient Theifls, That Chaos was before the Gods, and

That the Inferior Mundane Gods, had a Temporary Generation or Pro-

duction with the World, yet notwithstanding does he conclude a-

inft it, from this Ground of Reafon, because Nothing could proceed

on Nothing, and therefore, both the Gods, and indeed whatsoever

is Substantial in the World, was from Eternity Unmade, only

the Fashion of things having been altered.

Moreover Diodorus Siculus affirms, the Chaldeans likewise to have af-

firmed this Dogma of the Worlds Eternity, that it was 

untill the Gods were made, \&c. Cic. in  

Seculumque, \&c. but the following words of that

Historographer, tell us that it was neuer generated from any Beginning, nor will 

ever admit Corruption. Who, that they were not Atheifts for all that 

(though more than Aristotole) appears from these following words of that

Historographer, tell us that it was neuer generated from any Beginning, nor will 

ever admit Corruption. Who, that they were not Atheifts for all that

Y

Y
mals 5 (They concluding that no Souls were Younger than Body or the World, and because they would not seem to depart from their Master Plato, therefore did they endeavour, violently to force this same fence upon Plato’s words also.

Notwithstanding which, concerning these Latter Platonists, it is here observable, that though they thus asserted, the World, and all Inferior Gods and Souls, to have been ἀπολύτης, according to that fiercer fence of the Word declared, that is, to have had no Temporary Generation or Beginning, but to have Existed from Eternity, yet by no means did they therefore conceive them to be ἀυτόγενες ἀυτοπρο- σκέται, Self-originated, and Self-existing, but concluded them to have been all derived from one sole Self-existent Deity as their Caule, which therefore, though not in order of Time, yet of Nature, was before them. To this purpose Plato, νῦν περὶ οὔτως ἐνιαύτα, ὡς χεῖρος περ- πευτοῦ ὁμίτις ἱστα, ἀλλὰ χρῆ τὸ ὑπερ- φοντός ἐμοῖς, ἐστιν ἑτούσι, αὐθεντοῦ ὅμως ἐμοῖς ἡ ἀσθενεία ἐμοῖς ἐν οἷς ἑκένοι ὑπερυπαντοῦντο τὰ τῶν ἀγάπων. Mind or God, was before the World, not as if it existed before it in Time, but because the World proceeded from it; and that was in order of Nature First, as the cause thereof, and its Archetype or Paradigm; the World also always subsisting, by it and from it. And a gain elsewhere to the same purpose, ὃ ταῖν ἐρχόμενος, ἀλλὰ εὑρέσιν ἐς ἀληθείαν, ἢ ἐς φαντασίαν, ἢ λί αν έποιεῖται, τοιαύτης, ὡς γὰρ πληρωθὲν τέτων, ἢ τὰ φαινομενά, ἢ τὰ παραφαινομενά, τοιαύτης. The things which are said to have been made or Generated, were not so Made, as that they ever had a Beginning of their Existence, but yet they were Made and will be always Made, (in another fence 3) nor will they ever be destroyed, otherwise than as being disolved into those Simple Principles, out of which some of them were compounded. Where though the World be said never to have been Made, as to a Temporary beginning, yet in another fence, it is said to be always Made, as depending upon God perpetually, as the Emanative Cause thereof. Agreeably whereunto, the Manner of the Worlds Production from God, is thus declared by that Philosopher, εἰ δὲ ταῦτα οἱ φεύγουσιν ὑπὸ γενεσίας αὐτῶν, ἐν ταῖς ὑπερ- πευτοῖς τοιούτην, τοιαύτην προτεῖνει, πρὸ τοῖς ἐκείνοις, ὡς τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς. They do not rightly, who Corrupt and Generate the World, for they will not understand what Manner of Making or Production the World had, to wit, by way of Effusiveness or Eradiation from the Deity, From whence it follows, that the World must needs have been so long as there was a God, as the Light was coeure with the Sun. So like wise Proclus concludes, that the World was ἐκ γενεσίας, ἐκ θελητικῆς, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκ γενεσίας, always Generated or Eradiated from God, and therefore must needs be Eternal, God being so. Wherefore these Latter Platonists, supposed the same thing concerning the Corporeal World, and the Lower Mundane Gods, which their Master Plato did, concerning his Higher Eternal Gods; that though they had no Temporary Production, yet they all depended no less upon one Supreme Deity, than if they had been made out of Nothing by Him. From whence it is manifest, that none of these Philosophers apprehended any Repugnancy at all, between these Two Things; Eternity of Being, and Being Caused or produced by Another. Nor can we make any great Doubt, but that if the Latter Platonists, had been fully convinced
convinced of any Contradictions Inconsistency here, they would readily have disclaimed, that their so beloved Hypothesis, of the World's Eternity; it being so far from Truth what some have supposed, that the Atheists, that these latter Platonists, were led into this Opinion no otherwise than from the sole Consideration of the Deity to wit its operations, its existence, its Essentiel Goodness, and Generative Power, or Emanative Fecundity, as Proclus plainly declares upon the Times.

Now though Ariftotle were not Acted with any such Divine Enthusiasm, as thefe Platonists seem to have been, yet did he notwithstanding, after his sober Manner, really maintain the fame thing; That though the World and Inferior Mundane Gods, had no Temporary Generation, yet were they nevertheless, all Produced from One Supreme Deity as their Caufe. Thus Simplicius represents that Philosopher's Sense, 'ApaxovHëu & 59iv3ciov a0j0 4 µν€€µροι, & d£ violate 5&5t;&££.*e 0E. In Arift. Phys. L. 8. Arifrotile would not have the World to have been made (to as to have had a Beginning) but yet nevertheless to have been produced from God after some other manner. And again afterward; 'ApaxovHëu to aStov to 5içv rd, 6t a jÎ5e ipevoL dråv dEov l&jov, oûj€ 6v£tôv autv oövóçv. Arifrotile though making God the Caufe of the Heaven and its Eternal Motion, yet concludes it notwithstanding to have been Ingenerate or Unmade, that is, without Beginning. However, we think fit here to observe, that though Arifrotile do for the moft part express, a great deal of Zeal and Confidence, for that Opinion of the Worlds Eternity, yet doth he sometimes for all that, seem to flag a little, and speak more Languidly and Sceptically about it; as for Example, in his Book De Partibus Animalium, where he treats concerning an Artificial Nature, µµòxov ino, 4 d3ovo roGvÀ0xvov, 5tô tawav.; L. I. C. I. t is more likely that the Heaven was made by such a Caufe as this (if it were made) that it is maintained by such a Caufe, than that Mortal Animals should be fo; which yet is a thing more generally acknowledged. Now it was before declared, that Arifrotile's Artificial Nature, was nothing but the mere Executioner or Opificer of a Perfect Mind, that of the Deity, which Two therefore he sometimes joyns together as the Cosmopelia, affirming that Mind and Nature, that is, God and Nature, were the Caufe of this Universe.

And now we see plainly, that though there was a Real Controversy amongst the Pagan Theologers, (especially from Arifrotile's time onward) concerning the Cosmogonia and Theogonia, according to the Stricter notion of those words, the Temporary Generation or Production of the World and Inferior Gods; or whether they had any Beginning or no; yet was there no Controversie at all, concerning the Self-existence of them, but it was Universal being agreed upon amongst them, That the World and the Inferior Gods, however supposed by one to have exifted from Eternity, yet were nevertheless all derived from one Sole Self-existent Deity, as their Caufe; 5tô Sô d3ovo-grôv ovv 6v£tôv autv, being either Eradiated or Produced from God, therefore it is observable, that these Pagan Theists, who affectted the
the Worlds Eternity, did themselves distinguish concerning the word ἡ ζωή θεωτήν, Nature, Natum, &c. &c., as that which was Equivocal, and though in one sense of it, they denied that the World and Inferior Gods were θεωτήν, yet notwithstanding did they in another sense clearly affirm the fame. For the word θεωτήν (say they) strictly and properly taken, is to ἐν πάντι ζεύγος τιν ἐν τοῖσι παθέσθαι λέγοντι, that which in respect of time, passed out of Non-existence into Being, or ὅ ἐν παθέσθαι μὴ ἐστι, ὡσ τῷ ὅ ἐστιν ὁμοιον, that which being not before, afterwards was. Nevertheless they acknowledge, that in a larger sense, this Word γενετός may be taken also for τὸ ὑπόνοον ἄπτε αἰτίας ὑφεξενεῖσθαι, that which doth any way depend upon a Superior Being as its Cause. And there must needs be the same Equivocation in the word ἡ θεωτήν, so that this in like manner may be taken also, either ἐν πάντι, or that which is ἐν γένεσιν, as having no Temporary Beginning; or else for that which is, ὅ ἐν αἰτίαις ἀποκλίθαι, ἐν γένεσιν or ἀποποίηται, and consequently it was used by those Pagan Theists, who concluded ὅ ἐν αἰτίαις ἐν γένεσις, i.e. That Matter was Unmade, that is, not only existed from Eternity without Beginning, but also was Self-existent, and Independent upon any Superior Cause. Now as to the former of these two senses of those words, γενετός and ἐν γένεσις, the Generality of the ancient Pagan, and together with them Plato, affirmed, the World and all the Inferior Gods to be γενετός, to have been Made in Time, or to have had a Beginning, (for whatever the Latter Platonists pretend, this was undoubtedly Plato’s Notion of that word and no other, when he concluded the World to be γενετός, forasmuch as himself expressly opposes it to ἡ ζωή, that which is Eternal.) But on the contrary, Aristotle and the later Platonists, determined the World and all the Inferior Gods, to be in this sense ἐν γένεσις, such as had no Temporary Beginning, but were from Eternity. However according to the latter Sense of those words, all the Pagan Theologers agreed together, that the World and all the Inferior Gods, whether having a Beginning, or Exitting from Eternity, were notwithstanding γενετός ἄπτε αἰτίαις, produced or derived from a Superior Cause; and that thus, there was only One θεός ἀποκλίθαι, One Unproduced and Self-existent Deity, who is said by them to be αἰτίαις ἐνεκτὸν ἔπειτο περιπτεργωθαι, Superior to a Cause and Older than any Cause, he being the Cause of all things besides himself. Thus Cantor and his Followers in Proclus, zealous Affirmers of the Worlds Eternity, determined, γενετός θεωτήν ζησάουσα ἢ ζησάων ἢς ἀπ’ αἰτίαις ἀριθμεῖσθαι, ἓν ὅτι ὑπὸ αἰτίαις ἀποκλίθαι τὸ κόσμον, that the World (with all the Inferior Mundane Gods in it) notwithstanding their Being from Eternity, might be said to be γενετός that is or was, as being produced from another Cause, and not Self-originated or Self-existing. In like manner Proclus himself, that grand Champion for the Worlds Eternity, plainly acknowledged notwithstanding, the Generation of the Gods and World in this sense, as being produced from a Superior Cause, as having been produced from a Superior Cause, θεωτήν θεωτήν θεωτήν, τῷ ἐν αἰτίαις ἀποκλίθαι τῷ μεγαλίστατῳ; ὡς τῷ τῶ ἐναντίω ὑπερήφανω, πρὸς τὰς αἰτίαις ἀριθμεῖσθαι. We call it the Generations of the Gods, meaning thereby, not any Temporary Production.
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duction of them, but their Ineffible Proceeding, from a Superior First Cause. Thus also Salvius, in his Book De Dis & Mundo, where he contends the World to have been from Eternity or without Beginning, yet concludes both it, and the other Inferior Gods to have been made by One Supreme Deity, who is called by him, Θεός, the First God. For faith, μεγίστος και δυνάμεως θεός, δυνάστε 

the First God, or the First Cause, having the greatest power or being Omnipotent, ought therefore to make, not only Men, and other Animals, but also Gods and Demons. And accordingly this is the Title of his 13. Chapter, πάντων αιδών ομήρων μυθιων, How Eternal things may be said to be Made or Generated. It is true indeed (as we have often declared) that some of the Pagan Theists affirmed, God not to be the only αγεννητος ου αναγεννητος, the only Unmade and Self-existcnt Being, but that Matter also was such; nevertheless, this Opinion was not so generally received amongst them, as is commonly supposed: and though some of the ancient Fathers confidently impute it to Plato, yet there seems to be no sufficient ground for their so doing; and Porphyrius, jambylus, Proclus, and other Platonists, do not only professedly oppose the same, as false, but also as that which was diUant from Plato's Principles. Wherefore according to that larger Notion of the Word αγενετος, as taken synonymously with αυτοεξης and αυτοκρατορ, there were very many of the Pagan Theologers who agreed with Christians in this, αυτος ο θεος αυτος αυτος αυτος τοις ο θεους αυτος, that God is the only Ingenerate or Unmade Being, and that his very essence is Incorruptibility and Inseparability; all other things, even Matter or it self, being made by him. But all the rest of them (only a few Dithetical excepted) though they supposed Matter to be Self-existcnt or did they conclude, that there was only αυτος αυτοεξης, only the Unmade or Unproduced God, and that all their other Gods, were υπαρξαι, in One fence or other, if not as Made in Time, yet at least as reduced from a Superior Cause.

Nothing now remaineth, but only that we shew, how the Pagans did distinguish, and put a difference, betwixt the One Supreme Unmade Deity, and all their other Inferior Generated Gods. Which we the rather concerned to do; because it is notorious that they did many times also confound them together, attributing the Government of the Whole World to the Gods promiscuously, and without putting any due Discrimination, betwixt the Supreme, and Inferior; (the true reason whereof seems to have been this, because they supposed the Supreme God, not to do all immediatly, in the Government of the World, but to permit much to his Inferior Ministers) One In- 

unce of which we had before in Ovid, and innumerable such others might be cited out of their most sober Writers. As for Example, in his First Book of Laws, Deorum Immortalium vi, ratione, po-


loderatores omnium rerum, elque quae geruntur, eorum geri judicio at 

e Numine, coidëmque optimè de genere hominum mereri, & quasie

quisque
How the Pagans distinguished, Book I.

First therefore, as the Pagans had Many Proper Names for One and the same Supreme God, according to several Particular Considerations of him, in respect of his several different Manifestations and Effects in the World, which are oftentimes mistaken for so many Distinct Deities (some supposing them Independent, others Subordinate;) so had they also besides these, other Proper Names of God, according to that more full and comprehensive notion of him, as the Maker of the Whole World, and its Supreme Governor, or the Sole Monarch of the Universe. For thus the Greeks called him Zeus, and Zevus, &c., the Latin Jupiter and Jovis, the Babylonians Belus and Bel, the Persians Mithras and Ormazdes, the Egyptians and Scythians (according to Herodotus) Ammon or Pappus. And Celsus in Origen, concludes it to be a Matter of pure Indifference, to call the Supreme God by any of these Names, either Zeus or Ammon or Pappus, or the like. Celsus thinks it to be a matter of no moment, whether we call the Highest and Supreme God, Adonai and Sabaoth, as the Jews do; or Dia and Zena, as the Greeks; or as the Egyptians Ammoun; or as the Scythians Pappes. Notwithstanding which, that Pious and Jealous Father expresseth a great deal of Zeal, against Christians then using any of those Pagan Names. But we will rather endure any torment (faith he) than confess Zeus (or Jupiter) to be God; being well assured that the Greeks often really worship, under that Name, an Evil Demoon, who is an enemy both to God and Men. And we will rather suffer death, than call the Supreme God Ammoun, whom the Egyptian Enchanters thus invoked; ἅγετοντι τὸν Παπαύον, ἵππον ἑπατον, ἀλλ' ἱματι ὑποστήματα, ἀπὸ κάθε
In the mean time we deny not, but that both the Greeks and their Zeus, however his great Jealousie, made him to call him here a Demon, it being true in a certain fence, which shall be declared afterward, that the Pagans did oftentimes, really worship an Evil Demon, under those very Names, of Zeus, and Jupiter, as they did likewise under those of Hammon and Pappus.

Ap sliced hoc sublime candens, quem invocant omnes Jovem.

Hunc etiam Augures nefiri cium dicunt, Jove Fulgentem Jove Tonante; dicunt enim in Caso Fulgentem, Tonante, &c. The reason of which speeches seems to have been this, because in ancient times, some had supposed the Animated Heaven, Ether and Air, to be the Supreme Deity. We grant moreover, that the same words have been sometimes used for, also, for a Hero or Deified Man, said by some to have been born in Crete, by others in Arcadia. And Callimachus though he were very angry with the Cretians, for affirming Jupiter's Sepulchral Monument, to have been with them in Crete, as thereby making him Mortal,

Cretes semper mendaces, tuum enim, Rex, Sepulchrum
Extruxerunt: Tu vero non es mortuus, semper enim es.

Himself nevertheless (as Athenagoras and Origen observe) attributed the beginning of death to him, when he affirmed him to have been born in Arcadia; &c. but Callimachus is to be pitied, because a Terrene Nativity is the Beginning of Death. Wherefore this may pass for a general Observation here, that the Pagan Theology, was all along Confounded with a certain Mixture, of Physiology and History blended together. Nevertheless it is unquestionable, that the more intelligent,
intelligent of the Greek Pagan, did frequently understand by
Zeus, that *Supreme Unmade Deity, who was the Maker of the World,
and of all the Inferior Gods. Porphyrius thus declares
their fence, Τ Δια, ὃς κυρίως ὑπολομάκασε, οὐκ οίκειι ευστής εὐκατολοι, ἄραν καὶ ἐπόσων. By Zeus, the Greeks understood that Mind of the World
which framed all things in it, and contained the whole World. Agree-
able whereunto is that of Maximus Tyrius, Κάλια γὰρ διὰ, τον περ
οβάτων, η επομένους, ο ἄριστον ἐπίκειται: By Jupiter you are to
understand, that most Ancient and Principly Mind, which all things follow
and obey. And Eusebius himself, though not forward to grant any
more than needs he must to Pagan, concludes with this acknowledgment
hereof, ξένον ὃς μυκτήν παρεδόθη ἃδειας, ἃδεια, ἃ διὰ τις
παλαιὸς ἐνεμέλησε, ἅπας γὰρ πλήσασθαι, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸς ἀνάγκης ἑαυτῷ, ο θεὸν δημιουργεῖς. Let Jupiter therefore be no longer, that Fiery and Ethereal
Substance, which the ancient Pagan according to Plutarch supposed him to be; but that Highest Mind, which was the Maker of all things. But
Thomannius by Jupiter understands the Soul of the World, he writing thus
concerning him: ἃ ἄρα ἐὰν ἰδοὺ πάντων ἐνεμέλησα, ἔτι ο θεὸν
καταφέκτων ἔκει τοις συγκέκεκταν οὐδὲν, ἣν ἄρτων ἐκλείκτων δέσιν, αὐτίκα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ ἔλευθερω, ἣ διὰ τὸ παλαιὸς ἑαυτῷ ὅλας λέγεται ἄλλοι. As we ourselves are
governed by a Soul, so hath the World in like manner a Soul
that containeth it; and this is called Zeus, being the Cause of Life
to all things that live; and therefore Zeus or Jupiter, is said to
reign over all things. However, though these were two different
Conceptions amongst the Pagan concerning God, some appre-
hending him to be an Abstract Mind separate from the World and
Matter, but others to be a Soul of the World only; yet nevertheless
they all agreed in this, that Zeus or Jupiter was the Supreme Moderator or Governor of all. And accordingly Plato in his Cratylus
P. 394. Suph. taking these Two Words, *zíōn and δία, both together etymologyereth
them as one, after this manner: πώς ἢ ἡ μισθών ὡς ἐν ὅλοι τῶν φύσιν διὰ ζή,
ὅτι τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἄρα, ἐκ εὐστής εὐκατολοι, πάντων, ἤ ἄραν καὶ
παλαιὸς ἐνεμέλησεν, τοῖς εὐστής εὐκατολοίς ἄρα, τοῖς ἑαυτῶν ἄραν καὶ
παλαιῶν ἐνεμέλησεν. The Two words compounded together, declare the Nature of God; for there is nothing, which is more the
Cause of Life both to our selves and all other Animals, than he who is the
Prince and King of all things, so that God is rightly thus called; he being that by whom all things Live. And these are really but one Name
of God, though divided into Two Words. But because it was very obvi-
ous, then to object against this Position of Plato's, that Zeus or Jupiter
could not be the Prince of all things, and First Original of Life, from the Theogonia of Hesiod and other ancient Pagan, in which himself was made to have been the Son of *Keôs or *Saturn; therefore
this Objection is thus preoccupied by Plato, τῶν ἀποκριτῶν ἡ ἔναν,
τοις δὲν ἐνεμέλησεν ἄραν *καταφέκτων, ὡσποδεύσης. Whosoever shall bear this,
(faith he) will presently conclude it, to be contumelious to this Zeus or
Jupiter (as he hath been described by us) to be accounted the Son of Cronos or Saturn. And in answer hereunto, that Philosopher stretch-
eath his Wits, to falve that Poetic Theogonia, and reconcile it with his own Theological Hypotheses; and thereupon he interprets that Hes-
iodian
Chap. IV.  

For the Supreme God.

Indian Zeus or Jupiter, into a Compliance with the Third Hypothesis of his Divine Triad, so as properly to signify the Superior Soul of the World; Ὄνομα τοῦ μεγάλου τοῦ θεοῦ ζωον οὗτος γίνεται ἀληθῶς, καὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ τελευταίου τοῦ θεοῦ. Nepos of the things we have already mentioned, it is reasonable to suppose, Zeus or Jupiter to be the Offspring of some Great Mind: and Chronos or Saturn signifies a pure and Perfect Mind Eternal; who again is said to be the Son of Uranus or Ceiius. Where it is manifest, that Plato endeavours to accommodate this Ptoleam Trinity of Gods, Uranus, Chronos and Zeus; or Ceiius, Saturn and Jupiter, to his own Trinity of Divine Hypotheses, as in the Gorgias, weς and ἢμι, the First Good, a Perfect Intellige, and the Highest Soul. Which Accommodations, is accordingly further pursued by Plotinus in several places; as Enn. §. l. c. 4. and Enn. 5.1.8. §. 13. Nevertheless these Three Archial Hypotheses of the Platonick Trinity, though look'd upon as Substances distint from each other, and Subordinate; yet are they frequently taken all together by them for the Whole Supreme Deity. However the Word Zeus is by Plato everalately attributed, to each of them; which Proclus thus observed upon the Timaeus: λέγεται οἵ τινι διότι ήπικ οἶκος ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἀλλων πλατέας τοῖς διότι. ἐν τοιαύτα διότι άναισθήσεως βοτες, οἵ καὶ θεοῦ φυσικάς ἡγεμονίας, ἠμις ἃν θεοῦς ἥκει μεταφύλαξι, καὶ ἀλλος ἃν θεοῦς ἥκει κρινούμενος τεσσαράς, ὡς οἵ φυσικός λέγει, ἀλλος ἃν αἰσθήσεως ὡς τοῦ φυσικού τεσσαράς ἡγεμονίας ἔτη οἵ καὶ ἀλλος θεοῦς ἥκει ἀμφότερος ἡγεμονίας. We say therefore, that there are several Orders, Ranks or Degrees of Zeus or Jupiter in Plato; for sometimes he is taken for the Demiurgus or Opificer of the World, as in Cratylus, sometimes for the First of the Saturnian Triad, as in Gorgias, sometimes for the Superior Soul of the World, as in Phaedrus; and lastly sometimes for the Lower Soul of the Heaven. Though by Proclus his lieve, that Zeus or Jupiter which is mentioned in Plato's Cratylus (being plainly the superior Psyche or Soul of the World) is not properly the Demiurgus, Opificer, according to him, that Title rather belonging to υς or Intellei, which is the Second Hypothesis in his Trinity.

As for the Vulgar of the Greekish Pagans, whether they apprehended God to be νοῦς ἔξω καταρκτικὸς ένοικος, a Mind or Intellige separate from the World, or else to be a Soul of the World only; it cannot be doubted, but that by the word Zeus, they commonly understood the supreme Deity in one or other of those fenses, the Father and King of Gods; he being frequently thus styled in their solemn Nuncupations of Vows, ζεύς πατερ, ζεύς ἄνω, O Jupiter Father, and O Jupiter King. As he was invoked also ζεύς εὐσπλειν, in that excellent Prayer of an ancient Poet, not without cause commended in Plato's Alcibiades.

ζεύς εὐσπλειν, τας μέν εὐσπλειν καὶ ἀνεξάρτητον ἑαυτοῦ

*Aμην ἤδε, τας τε ένευς καὶ ἀνεξάρτητον αἰταρλελεν*

Jupiter King, give us good things whether we pray or pray not for them, with bold evil things from us, though we should pray never so earnestly for them. But the Instances of this kind being innumerable, we all forbear to mention any more of them. Only we shall observe, that Zeus Sabazius was a name for the Supreme God, sometime intro-
duced amongst the Greeks, and derived in all probability, from the Hebrew Sabaoth, or Adonai Tjeboth, the Lord of Hosts, (that is of the Heavenly Hosts) or the Supreme Governor of the World. Which therefore Aristophanes took notice of, as a strange and foreign God, lately crept amongst them, that ought to be banish'd out of Greece; these several Names of God being then vulgarly spoken of, as so many distinct Deities; as shall be more fully declared afterwards. We shall likewise elsewhere show, that besides ἀνθρώπος, πάντως also was used by the Greeks, as a Name for that God, who is the supreme Moderator and Governor of the whole World.

That the Latins did in like manner, by Jupiter and Jovis, frequently denote the Supreme Deity, and Monarch of the Universe, is a thing unquestionable; and which does sufficiently appear from those Epithets that were commonly given to him, of Optimus and Maximus, the Best and the Greatest, as also of Omnipotens, frequently bestowed upon him by Virgil and others. Which word Jupiter or Jovis, though Cicero etymologize it à Jovando, or from Jovans Pater, as not knowing how to do it otherwise, yet we may rather conclude it to have been of an Hebraical Extraction, and derived from that Tetragrammaton or Name of God, consisting of Four Consonants; whose Vowels (which it was to be pronounced with) though they be not now certainly known, yet must it needs have some such found as this, either Jovab, or Jabeboh, or Ἰάβος or Ἰάβα, or the like; and the abbreviation of this Name was Ἰάβ. For as the Pagan Nations, had besides Appellatives, their several Proper Names for God, so also had the Hebrews theirs, and such as being given by God himself, was most expressive of his Nature, it signifying Eternal and Necessary Existence.

But in the next place we shall suggest, that the Pagans did not only signify the Supreme God, by these Proper Names, but also frequently by the Appellatives themselves, when used not for a God in General, but for The God, or God xατ' ἐμφαω, and by way of eminence. And thus ὡς and ἄρτι are often taken by the Greeks, not for ὡς τις, a God, or one of the Gods, but for God, or the Supreme Deity. We have several Examples hereof, in Passages before-cited, occasionally in this very Chapter, as in that of Aristotle's, τί ού οὐ κείσον ἔξω Χριστοῦ πλω ἄρης; What is there therefore, that can be better than Knowledge, but only God: As also that of his, that Happiness consists principally in Vertue, οὗτως πνευματολογησάντες ἑώς μοίητες τᾷ ἑως χρωμάτως, it is a thing that ought to be acknowledged by us from the Nature of God. So likewise in that of Thales, προσεβεβαιωτόν πάντων ἄνθρωπον ἄρης, ἄρης χρωμάτως, God is the oldest of all things, because he is Unmade, and that of Maximus Tyrius, πέρικοι ἴσος πάντες οὕς οὐκ αἴσχους ἴσος. Many Gods the Sons of God and Co-reigners together with God. Besides which, there have been others also mentioned, which we shall not here repeat. And innumerable more Instances of this kind might be added, as that of Antiphanes, ἄρης! ἵσος ὁπως, ἵσος αὐτῶν ἴσος, ἵσος ἱλασθής ἤ ἵσος ἵσος, God is like to nothing, for which cause he cannot be learnt by any, from an Image: This of Socrates, οὗ ταύτη φησίν τοι οὗτος, ταύτη γαλαξία. If God
God will have it so, let it be so. And that of Epictetus, ὃ μὲν οὖν μᾶλλον τῷ καθολικῷ, τί ἐκεῖν, τί οὐκ εἰκὼν; τί δὴ με ποιεῖν ὁ θεὸς νῦν; Do thou only remember, these Catholic and Universal Principles: What is Mine and what is not Mine? What would God have me now to do? and what would he have me not to do? But we shall mention no more of these, because they occur too frequently in all manner of Greek Writers, both Metrical and Prosatical.

Wherefore we shall here only add, that as the Singular θεὸς, was thus often used by the Greeks for God κατὰ ἐξοχήν or in way of Eminency, that is, for the Supreme Deity, so was likewise the Plural θεοί frequently used by them, for the Inferior Gods by way of Distinction from the Supreme. As in that usual Form of Prayer and Exclamation Ἔστι, εἴπετε, ἢ θεός, O Jupiter and the Gods, and that Form of Obtestation, ποὺς δίδαξι θεοί, By Jupiter and the Gods. So in this of Euripides,

'Αλλ' ἔτιν, αὐτῷ καὶ πᾶς ἥγεσις λογική, Ζεὺς ή θεός, μετέχει βασιλείας τοις Ἰππίοις.

Εἴ, (σιν λείτων qui rideant) εἴ Jupiter,
Superque θεός qui videtur Mortalium.

In which Passages, as Jupiter is put for the Supreme God, so is θεός likewise put, for the Inferior Gods, in way of distinction from him. Thus also θεοῖς and θεοῖς are taken both together, in Plato's Phædo, θεοῖς for the Supreme, Unmade and Incorruptible Deity, and θεός for the Inferior Gods only, ὁ δὲ τῷ θεῷ (οἰμοὶ) ξένη σαμβιβάζεται, ή ἀντί τοῦ θεοῦ, θεοὶ θεοῖς ἀνθρώποι ἡμῖν ἀναπληρώθηκε. Οἰομοὶ πολλοὶ τῇ δι' (εἰφή) ἀνθρώποι γας, ἡ ἀντι μαίλλην, ἀεὶ ἐρωμαί, ἀσάλευτοι θεοῖν,

I suppose, said Socrates, that God and the very Species, Essence or Idea of Life, will be granted by all to be Incorruptible. Doubtlesly by all men (said Cebes) but much more as I conceive, by the Gods. But a further Instance will be propounded afterwards, of the word θείος thus used by way of distinction, for the Inferior Gods only; as it was before declared, that the Theogonia or Generation of Gods was accordingly understood by the Greeks universally, of the θεός, that is, the Inferior Gods.

Moreover as the word θεὸς was taken κατὰ ἐξοχήν, or by way of eminency, for the Supreme God, so was δαιμόνιος likewise. As for example, in this Passage of Callimachus before cited imperfectly,

Plato di Rep. ἐκγένεσε δήθεν τῷ πτήσιν οἰμοὶ ἀπατῶν, διὰ ἐναπληρώθηκε βασιλείας τῆς ἄρτιοτος κατέλαβε πολλοὶ θεοὶ, ἐνοπλοίων

He will never be neglected of the Gods, who endeavours, as much as it is possible for a man, to be like to God. p. 613.

Where θεοῖς and δαιμόνιος are used both alike signifier, for the Supreme God. And thus also in that famous Passage of another Poet,
Homer likewise, in one and the same place, seems to use όδες and δαμαν both together, after the same manner, for the Supreme God,

"οπως τ' ἂν θεοπρεπες δαμανα φασί τιμήσωσιν,
"ον τ' ἐκ θεοτικών, τάξιν οί μέγα τίμας υπολαίηθεν.

Quoties homo vult, adverso Namine, cum vire pugnare
Quem Deus honorat, mox in cum magna clades devoluitur.

Again we conceive, that Jupiter or the Supreme God, was sometimes signified amongst the Pagans, by that expression, ἡς οὕτως Δε

us Ipse, as in that of Homer’s Ninth Iliad,

— Ovid, "et nunc uno utrinque odes autēs,
Τύραννος ἀναφόρος ἢ οὐ οὖν ἠλοντα.

— Nesciē mihi promitteret Deus Ipse,
Sane interm adbradens, effébratum me juvenem selectionem.

And thus St. Cyril of Alexandria interprets Homer here, η γάς τις φυ
σι, εί ης θεών τις ὑπεροϊδό μει τις μὴ γράφως ἀπέμειμενο, παλαιάριον τι τιν

νεστικα, πεπηκέν τι τι χρήμα μέγα τις εἶναι πάντας φασί. &c. το γάς τυχε

ντας αὐτής, ητ όρν ξαν ζων ἁν μεθίς τεπλαξαμένοι τιν, αὐτόν δὲ μὲν

καλορρωπανόντι καὶ τ' ἀλλακαὶ ὀλίξα οἴην. Homer doth not say, If any of the
Gods would promise me freedom from old Age and restitution of Youth,
but he reserves the matter only to the Supreme God; neither doth he re

fer it to any of the Fictitious Poetic Gods, but to the true God alone. The
same Language was also spoken, in the Laws of the Twelve Ta

bles; Decurie deudo cafes, Opes amovento: Si secus faxint, Deus ipse

vindex civit: Let the Gods be worshipp’d chastely, Superfluity of Riches

and Pomp being removed: If men do otherwise, God Himself will be

the Avenger. Where though the word Gods be used generally, so as to

comprehend both the Supreme and Inferior Gods under it, yet Deus

Ipse, God himself, denotes the Supreme God only. In like manner

ὁ δαμαν αὐτής also seems to be taken for the Supreme God in that of

Εὐριπέδες,

Αῦξα μὲ ὁ δαμαν αὐτῆς, οὐαν ἔχω εἶλα,

Which was thus rended by Horace,

— Ipse Deus, simulatque volet, me solvet.

Notwithstanding which, δαμαν and δαμανος, are often distinguish

ed from ὰδες and ὰδη, they being put for an Inferiour rank of Beings

below the Gods, vulgarly called Demons, which word in a large fenc
fence comprehends also Heroes under it. For though these Demons be sometimes called Gods too, yet were they rather accounted Wits, Demi-gods, than Gods. And thus was & demones, Gods and Demons, are frequently joined together, as things distinct from one another: which Notion of the word Plato refers to, when he concludes, Love not to be a God, but a Demon only. But of these Demons we are to speak more afterwards.

Furthermore, the Pagan Writers frequently understand the Supreme God by the το Θεόν, when the word is used Substantively. As for example, in this of Epicharmus,

οὕδε διερηγήσαντο το Θεόν. τότε ήπφτε θεοτοκός αἰτήσεις.

Ἀκτὸς θεῷ μην ἔποιήσας. ἀδικοῦτε τὰ ἀδικία τε.

Res nulla est Deum que laetat, seire quod te convenit:
Ipsi est noster Introspector, tum Deus nil non potest.

So likewise in this of Plato's, πάντως ἄνθρωπος ἔστι θεός ἐπιφανεία το Θεόν, God is far removed both from Pleasure and Grief. And Plotinus calls the Supreme God, τό εὖ το παντί ἐπίθεν, The Divinity that is in the Universe. But because the Instances hereof are also innumerable, we shall decline the mentioning of any more, and instead of them, only set down the Judgment of that diligent and impartial Observer of the Force of words, Henricus Stephanus, concerning it; Reddittur etiam το Θεόν sepe Deus, sed its tamen ut intelligendum sit, non de quolibet Deo, ab ipsis etiam prophanis Scriptoribus dici, verum de eo quem intelligenter, cum Deus dicens quasi xari ἐξοικοθείη, ad differentiam corum, qui multo, apellatione Sein includebantur, summum videlicet Supremumque Numen, & quasi dicas Sein Sein υπὲρ δυνατον καὶ ἄξιον, ut loquitur de Jove Homerus.

Lastly, as το Θεόν so likewise was το δαιμονιων used by the Greeks, for the Supreme Numen, or that Divinity which governs the whole World. Thus whereas it was commonly said (according to Herodotus) έν τοθεόν φόβους, That God was envious; the meaning whereof was, that he did not commonly suffer any great Humane Prosperity, to continue long, without some check or counterbaff; the fame Proverbial speech is expressed in Aristotles, φόβοις το δαιμονιων. And in this fence the word seems to be used in Iocrates ad Demonium, τό οιδα το δαιμονιων οὔ μεθε, μελετητε μετα το πλας, Worship God always, but especially with the City, in her Publick Sacrifices. And doubtless it was thus taken by Epicetetus in this Passage of his, μία οὖν το δαιμονίων, το Τίτων ο υ προφθασ, η μεθε μεδεξας εχ νοταρ διο επεσχορον, η σοκίς γις κατ' αποκαλλοντικα, το μεθεν οουν υγιεινον, το αθηναίων πάλια το δαιμονιων, ιτι τη τυχι. There is but one way to Tranquillity of Mind and Happiness, Let this therefore be always ready at hand with thee, both when thou wakest early in the morning, and all the day long, and when thou goest late to sleep; to account no external things thine own, but to commit all these to God and Fortune. And there is a very remarkable Passage in Demarthenes (observed by Budens) that must not be here omitted, in which we have το δαιμονιων for the
the Supreme God, both together; εὐθείας οἱ Θεοὶ ἴδον τῷ δικαίωμαν, ἕν μὶ τῷ δικεῖσθαι Ἰωσήφον. The Gods and the Deity will know or take notice of him that gives not a righteous sentence; that is, both the Inferior Gods, and the Supreme God himself. Wherefore we see, that the word δικαιώμαν, as to its Grammatical Form, is not a Diminutive, as some have conceived, but an Adjective Substantiv’d; as well as to ἵππον, from whence it is derived, is often used for an Inferior Rank of Beings below the Gods, though sometimes called Gods too; and such was Socrates his δικαιώμαν to commonly known. But the Grammar of this Word, and its proper Signification in Pagan Writers, cannot better be manifested, than by citing that Passage of Socrates his own, in his Apology, as written by Plato, who though generally supposed to have had a Demon, was notwithstanding by Melitus accused of Atheism; εὐθείας οἱ Θεοὶ ἴδον τῷ δικαίωμαν, ἐν μὶ τῷ δικεῖσθαι Ἰωσήφον. In his Adversaries, he does not deny that there are any Men or confessing that there are Divine things, as to the gods, can neverthelss deny that there are any Horses? If this cannot be, then no man who acknowledges Demonic things, can deny Demons. Wherefore I being confessed to assert δικαιώμαν, must needs be granted, to hold δικαιώμαν alio. Now do we not all think, that Demons are either Gods, or at least Sons of the Gods. Wherefore for any one to conceive that there are Demons, and yet no Gods, is altogether as absurd, as if one should think that there are Mules, but yet neither Horses nor Asses. However, in the New Testament, according to the Judgment of Origens, Eusebius, and others of the Ancient Fathers, both those words δικαιώμαν and δικαιώμαν, are alike taken, always in a Worser sense, for Evil and Impure Spirits only.

But over and besides all this; the Pagans do often characterize the Supreme God, by such Titles, Epithets, and Descriptions, as are Incomparably proper to him; thereby plainly distinguishing him from all other Inferior Gods. He being sometimes called by them, ὁ θεός, the Opitex Architect or Maker of the World, ὁ θεός, the Prince and chief Ruler of the Universe; ὁ θεός, and ὁ πρυτής τῶν θεῶν (by the Greeks) and (by the Latins) Primus Deus, the First God, ὁ πρυτής τῶν θεῶν, the First Mind; ὁ μέγας Θεός, the Great God; ὁ μέγας Θεός, and ὁ μέγας Θεός, the greatest God and the greatest of the Gods; ὁ θεός, the Highest; and ὁ ἐπίκοινος, the Supreme of the Gods; ὁ ἐπίκοινος, the Uppermost, or most Transcendent God; ὁ πρυτής τῶν θεῶν, and ὁ πρυτής τῶν θεῶν, that Chief or Principal God τὸ θεοῦ, the God of Gods; and Ἀγάθος Αρχόν, the Principle of Principles, τὸ τρέχον ἀντίον, the First Cause; τὸ πρότερον ἀντίον, the First Cause; τὸ πρῶτον ἀντίον. He that Generated or Created this whole Universe; καὶ Θεόν τοῖς παῖσι, He that rules over the whole World; Σωμάτιος Ὀρθὸς ὁ Διὸς, the Supreme Governor and Lord of all, ὁ ἐναῖς, the God over all; ὁ Θεός, and ὁ Θεός, the God over all; καὶ Θεός, ἀγαθός, ἀθυτός, ἀθυτός, 
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XV. What hath been now declared, might, as we conceive, be judged sufficient, in order to our present Undertaking; which is to prove, that the more Intelligent of the Ancient Pagans, notwithstanding that Multiplicity of Gods worshipped by them, did generally acknowledge, One Supreme, Omnipotent, and Only Unmade Deity. Nevertheless, since men are commonly so much preposited with a contrary Periwigion (the reason whereof seems to be no other than this, that because the Nation of the Word God, which is now generally received amongst us Christians, is such as does essentially include self-existence in it, they are therefore apt to conceive, that it must needs do likewise amongst the Pagans;) we shall endeavour to produce yet some further Evidence for the Truth of our assertion. And first we conceive, This to be no small Confirmation hereof, because after the Publication of Christianity, and all along during that Tugging and Contest which was betwixt it and Paganism, none of the Professed Champions for Paganism, and Antagonists of Christianity (when occasion was now offered them) did ever affect any such thing, as a Multiplicity of Understanding Deities Unmade (or Creators) but on the contrary, they all generally disclaimed it, profiting to acknowledge One Supreme Self-existent Deity, the Maker of the whole Universe.

It is a thing highly probable, if not unquestionable, that Apollonius Jason, shortly after the Publication of the Gospel to the World, was a Person made choice of by the Policy, and assisted by the Powers of the Kingdom of Darkness, for the doing of some things Extraordinary; merely out of delign, to derogate from the Miracles of our Saviour Christ, and to enable Paganism the better, to bear up against the Faults of Christianity. For amongst the many Writers of this Philosophers Life; some, and particularly Philostratus, seem to have had no other aim in this their whole undertaking, then only to dress up Apollonius, in such a garb and manner, as might make him best seem...
to be a fit Corrival, with our Saviour Christ, both in respect ofSan-
Sanctity and Miracles. Eunapius therefore tell us, that he mis-titled
his Book, and that in stead of 'Apollonius μου, the Life of Apollonius,
he should have called it οιος εις μισθος ειπωςαι, The Coming down,
and Converse of God with Men; forasmuch as this Apollonius (faith he)
was not a bare Philosopher or Man, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἴππος, αὐτοποιητικός, but
a certain middle thing betwixt the Gods and Men. And that this was
the use commonly made by thePagans, of this History of Apollonius,
namely to set him up in way of opposition and Rivalry to our Saviour
Chrift, appears sundry ways. Marcellinus, in an Epiſcle of his to St.
Anſin, declares this as the Grand Object of the Pagans against
Christianity, (therefore deſiring St. Anſin's answer to the fame;) NIB-
fo alia Dominum, quia alii homines facere potuerunt, feciſe vel egen
tentiumtum; Apollonium sequem tum nobis, & Apuleium, alioque
Magica artis homines, in mecum proferunt, quorum majora contendunt
exitifse miracula: The Pagans pretend, That our Saviour Chrift did no
more, than what other men have been able to do, they producing their
Apollonius and Apuleius, and other Magicians, whom they contend to
have done greater miracles. And it is well known that Hierocles to
whom Eunapius gives the commendation of a very Learned man, wrote
a Book against the Christians (entitled Ἀναλλάχες, or Λαζερίς πιλαλέες)
the chief design whereof was to compare this Apollonius Tyanes with,
and prefer him before our Saviour Chrift: "Αλλὰ η αabetic Κρισίνιζη, απο-
µισθεσιν ἐν Κῡν̄, ἢ τοὺς ἱπποὺς ἀναλάλησαν τις ἐξ ἀγάλλης, καὶ τὰς τοιούτας
θεαις ἕκαστον ἑκαστὰ: they are Hierocles his own words in Eunapius; The
Christians (faith he) keep a great deal of fire, crying up of one JesuS, for
restoring sight to the blind, and doing some such other Wonders. And
then mentioning the Thaumaturgi or Wonder-workers amongst the
Pagans, but especially Apollonius Tyanes, and instilling largely upon
his Miracles, he adds in the close of all, Τὸν τὸν ἡμερὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ
Ιησοῦς τὸν ἃτερος εἶναι τὸν Κρισίνιζη, οὐ τὸν τὸς ἐξ ἀγάλλης ἀναλάλησας
τις ἐν Κῡν̄, οὐ τὸν τὸιούτος θεαν τὸν τὸιούτος θεαν, τὸ ποὺ τὸν
τοιοῦτος ἐκαστὸς. To what purpose now have we mentioned all these
things? but only that the solid judgement of us (Pagans) might be
compared with the Levity of the Christians; forasmuch as we do not accept
him a God, who did all these Miracles, but only a Person beloved of the
Gods, whereas they declare Jesus to be a God, merely for doing a few
Wonders. Where, because Eunapius is silent, we cannot but subjoin an
Anſwer out of Laſcantius (which indeed he seems to have directed
against those very words of Hierocles, though not naming of him) it
being both pertinent and full. Apparel nos sapientiores esse, qui mira-
bilibus facīs, non statim fidem Divinitatis adjunximus, quam vos, quia
ob exigua portenta Deum credidistis—Disce igitur, si quid tibi cedis
est, non folum idcirco a nobis Deum creditum Christum, quia mirabilia
feci, sed quia vidimus in eo facta esse omnia que nobis annunciatum,
Vaticania Prophetarum. Fecit mirabilia, Magum putassemus, ut vos
nuncupatis; & Judei tunc putaverunt, si non illa ipsa fœtura Christum.
Prophetæ omnes non Spiritu prædictas portant. Itaque Deum creditum, non
magis ex factis, operibusque mirandis, quam ac ipsis Cruci, quam vos
sunt Canes lambitis, qui omnium simul & illa prædicta est. Non igitur Sa
Testimo
Testimonies, (cui enim de se dicenti poteft credi?) fed Propbatarum Testimoniorum, qui omnibusque secipit ac parui est, multo amice concinrunt; Sedem Divinatoria accepti; quod neque Apollonio neque Apuleio, neque quinque Magorum poteft aliquando contingere. It is manifest that we Christians are wiser than you Pagans, in that we do not presently attribute Divinity to a person, merely because of his Wonders; whereas a few Portentous things, or Extraordinary actions, will be enough with you, to make you Deifie the Doer of them: (and so indeed did some of them, however Herrocleus denies it, Deific Apollonius.) Let this writer against Christianity therefore learn, (if he have any Understanding or Sense in him) that Christ was not therefore believed to be a God by his Christians, merely because of his Miracles, but because we saw all these things done by, and accomplished in him, which were long before predicted to us by the Prophets. We believe him therefore to be God, no more from his Miracles, than from that very Cross of his, which you do much quarrel with, because that was likewise foretold. So that our Belief of Christ's Divinity, is not founded upon his own Testimony (for who can be believed concerning himself?) but upon the Testimony of the Prophets, who sang long before of all those things, which he both did and suffered. Which is such a peculiar advantage and privilege of his, as that neither Apollonius nor Apuleius, nor any other Magician, could ever frame therein. Now as for the Life and Morals of this Apollonius Tyanaeus, as it was a thing absolutely necessary, for the carrying on of such a Diabolical Design, that the Person made use of for an Instrument, should have some colourable and plausible pretence to Vertue, so did Apollonius accordingly take upon him the profession of a Pythagorean; and indeed act that part externally so well, that even Sidonius Apollinaris, though a Christian, was so dazzled with the glittering show and luster of his counterfeit Vertues, as if he had been enchanted by this Magician, so long after his death. Nevertheless who soever is not very dim-sighted in such matters as these, or partially affected, may easily perceive, that this Apollonius was so far from having any thing of that Divine Spirit which manifested it self in our Saviour Christ (transcending all the Philosophers that ever were) that he fell far short of the better moralized Pagans, as for example Socrates, there being a plain appearance of much Pride and Vain-glory (besides other Foolery) discoverable both in his Words and Actions. And this Ensefus undertakes to evince from Philostratus his own History, (though containing many Fallhoods in it,) that Apollonius, a Magician, had the power of making those who saw him, believe him to be a God, and that Apollonius was so far from deserving to be compared with our Saviour Christ, that he was not fit to be ranked among the moderately and indifferently Honest men. Wherefore as to his reputed Miracles, if credit be to be given to those Relations, and such things were really done by him, it must for this reason also be concluded, that they were done no otherwise than by Magic and Necromancy; and that this Apollonius was but an Archimago or grand Magician. Neither ought this to be suspected for a mere flander call upon him, by partially affected Christians only; since, during his Life...
time, he was generally reputed, even amongst the Pagans themselves, for no other than a ψεύτης, or Infamous Inchanter, and accused of that very Crime before Domitiian the Emperor; as he was also represented such, by one of the Pagan Writers of his Life, Maragenes, senior to Philostratus; as we learn from Origen, as οἱ μαγεῖα προφήτης, οτί δὲ μετάλμυς εἶπεν, πιπέρια ποτε ἦν, φιλοσόφοι αὐτοῖς ἠθέντο, εἰ μὲν, αἰσ-
"τάτο τὰ γυγαμήλης μαγεῖας ἢ Ἦλιον Απολλωνίας τοῖς Τυανᾶσι μάλις ἦν, φιλο-
sόφοις ἀπομυθημένους· εἰ δὲ τὸ μὴ κεραυνοῖ διὰ διὰ μικροσκοπίας, ἡ γένεται ἥ-
λον ὑπὸ τὸν Ἀπολλωνίαν μαγεῖας, εἰ αὐξηθεῖται ταῖς φιλοσοφίαις, ἢ ἔργα γίνο
tαι αὐτῶν εἰσπληκτές· εἰ δὲ, οὐκι, ἦν ἐπὶ Ελευθέρων παῖδις διηγομένως, καὶ τινὲς ἑπικρήσεως. As concerning the Infamous and Diabolical Magick, he
that would know whether or no a Philosopher be temptable by it, or illaque-
able into it, let him read the Writings of Maragenes, concerning the mem-
or-able things of Apollonius Tyanaeus, the Magician and Philosopher; in
which he that was no Christian, but a Pagan Philosopher himself, af-
firmed, some not ignoble Philosophers to have been taken, with Apolloni-
us his Magick, including (as I suppose) in that number Euphrates and a
certain Epicurean. And no doubt but this was the reason why Phi-
lostratus derogates so much from the authority of this Maragenes, af-
firming him to have been ignorant of many things concerning Apol-

lonius (καὶ ἡ μάγεια μαγεῖας περὶ Μεραρίδος, &c.) Because Maragenes had thus
represented Apollonius in his true colours, as a Magician; whereas Phi-
lostratus his whole business and design was, on the contrary, to vindicate him from that Imputation: the Truth whereof notwithstanding, may be sufficiently evinced, even from those very things that are recorded by Philostratus himself. And here by the way we shall observe, that it is reported by good Historians, that Mir-
cacles were also done by Vespasian at Alexandria, Per eos menses
(f hairstyles the words of Tacitus) multi miracula evenere, quis calidissi-
me favor, & quaedam in Vespasianum inclinatio numinis offenderetur.
Ex plebe Alexandrinâ quidam, certorum tabe notus, genua ejus adovolvi-
tur, remedium cecatitis exposcens genuit; monitu Serapidis Dei, quem
dedita superstitionibus gens ante arios soli; precabaturque Principem, ut
genae & certorum orbes dignaretur restringere oris excrematio. Alius
manus aeger, coelest Deo anhore, ut pede ac vestigio Rafaelis cala-
retur orabat. At that time many Miracles happened at Alexandria, by
which was manifested the Heavenly Favor, and Inclination of the Divine
Powers towards Vespasian. Πλεονεκτικον Alexandria, that had been
known to be blind, casts himself at the feet of Vespasian, begging with
tears from him a remedy for his sight (and that according to the suggestion of the God Serapis) that he would deign but to spit upon his Eyes and Face. Another having a Lame band (directed by the same Oracle) beseeches him
but to tread upon it with his foot. And after some debate concerning this
business, both these things being done by Vespasian, statim converta ad
ejus manus, & cecos reflexit dies, the Lame band presently was restored
to its former usefulness, and the Blind man recovered his sight: Both which
things (faith the Historian) some who were Eye-witnesses, do to this
very day testify, when it can be no advantage to any one to lie concerning
it. And that there seems to be some reason to suspect, that our
Archimago Apollonius Tyanaeus, might have some Finger in this business
also, because he was not only familiarly and intimately acquainted with
with Vespasian, but also at that very time (as Philostratus informeth us) prevalent with him at Alexandria, where he also did many Miracles himself. However we may here take note, of another Stratagem and Policy of the Devil in this, both to obscure the Miracles of our Saviour Christ, and to weaken men's Faith in the Messiah, and battle the Notion of it; that whereas a Fame of Prophecies had gone abroad every where, that a King was to come out of Judea, and rule over the whole World (by which was understood no other than the Messiah) by reason of these Miracles done by Vespasian, this Oracle or Prediction might the rather seem to have its accomplishment in him, who was first proclaimed Empour, in Judea, and to whom Josephus himself falsely and flatteringly had applied it. And since this business was started and suggested by the God Srapis, that is, by the Devil; (of whose Counsel probably Apollonius also was:) this makes it still more strongly suspicious, that it was really a Design or Policy of the Devil, by imitating the Miracles of our Saviour Christ, both in Apollonius and Vespasian, to counter-work God Almighty in the Plot of Christianity, and to keep up or conserve his own Utter'd Tyranny in the Pagan World still. Nevertheless we shall here shew Apollonius all the favour we can, and therefore suppose him, not to have been one of those more foul and black Magicians, of the common sort, such as are not only grossly funk and daunted in their lives, but also knowingly do Homage to Evil Spirits as such, for the gratification of their Lusts; but rather one of those more refined ones, who have been called by themselves Theurgists, as he being in some measure freed from the grosser Vices, and thinking to have to do only with good Spirits; nevertheless being Proud and Vainglorious, and affecting Wonders, and to transcend the Generality of Mankind, are by a Divine Necessity, justly exposed to the Illusions of the Devil or Evil Spirits, cunningly insinuating here, and aptly accommodating themselves to them. However concerning this Apollonius, it is undeniable, that he was a zealous Father of the Pagan Polytheism, and a stout Champion for the Gods, professing to have been taught by the Samian Pythagoras his Ghost ow to Worship these Gods Invisible as well as Visible, and to have onerse with them. For which cause he is filled by Vepisicus, Amicus versus Deorum, A true Friend of the Gods, that is, a hearty and sincere Friend, to that old Pagan Religion, now assaulted by Christianity, in which not One only True God, but a Multiplicity of Gods, were Worshipped. But notwithstanding all this, Apollonius himself was a clear and undoubted Afferter of One Supreme Deity, as is evident from his Apologetick Oration in Philostratus, prepared for Diitian, in which he calls him θεός θεόν, and τὸν θεόν δημιουργὸν θεόν at God who is the Maker of the whole Universe, and of all things. And as he elsewhere in Philostratus declares both the Egyptians and Egyptians to have agreed in this Theology; insomuch that though the Egyptians condemn'd the Indians for many other of their Opinions, yet did they highly applaud this Doctrine of theirs, τὸν ὁμοίως τοῦ τοῦ Ζεύς τοῦ δημιουργοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν θεόν οὗ του θεοῦ, τὸν θεὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, That God was the Maker both of the Generation and essence of all things, and that the cause of his making them, was his Essential
Essential Goodness: So doth he himself very much commend this Philo-

logy of Jarchus the Indian Brahman, viz. That the whole World
was but One Great Animal, and might be resembled to a Ship
wherein their are many Inferior subordinate Governours, under
One Supreme, the Oldest and Wisest; as also expert Mariners of se-
veral sorts, come to attend upon the Deck, and others to climb the
Masts and order the Sails, who being seduced by the Frauds of Mœs
this Opinion of One God, ἔτι τῷ ἑρατημένῳ οἴκῳ ἐπαρκείοι μάλις ζῇ
of πεπολοδείς, ἀγγέλων ἀποκάλυπται θεραφομαχούσεις, ἵνα ἐκεῖνοι Κυρὶς θεῦ
Those silly Shepherds and Herdsman, following Moses his Leader, are
being seduced by his Rustick frauds, came to entertain this Belief, the
there was but One only God. Nevertheless this Celsus himself plainly
acknowledged, amongst his Many Gods, One Supreme, whom he
sometimes calls θεὸν τῆς ἐπή, the First God; sometimes θεὸν τῶν Ἀκρό-
the Greatest God; and sometimes θεὸν τῶν Συνορίων δίων, the Supercelestial
God, and the like; and he doth so zealously assert the Divine Omnipotence,
that he calls an imputation upon the Christians of derogating
from the same, in that their Hypotheseis of an Adversary Power
exaliant in διάκολος διακόλος, καὶ ἀποκεφαλώσω τῶν, παιδοῦ τῆς Ἱδεῖν τῶν, διαζώλω τῆς
γλώσσης θεωρίων ὑπομάχοντας ἐκ τοῦ. ἄλλως μὲν ἐν πινακίς πᾶν
τῶν θεῶν, εἴ ἡθος ἑαυτῷ ἔχειν, ὅτι θεὸς κοίνων ἔχεις, τινὸς ἄνθρωπος
ἐξαγώνιστα, ἂν ἰσιδορόμοιον ἐκ τε, ἐκ τοῦ. The Christians are error-
ously led into most wicked Opinions concerning God, by reason of the
great ignorance of the Divine Enigmas; whilst they make a certain Ad-
versary to God, whom they call the Devil, and in the Hebrew Language
Satan: And affirm, contrary to all Piety, that the Greatest God, hath
minded to do good to men, is disabled or withhold by an Adversary, sit-
ting him. Lastly where he pleaseth most for the worship of Demons,
he concludes thus concerning the Supreme God, ὅπως ὑδήμαοι ἑδομ.
The next and greatest Champion for the Pagan Cause in Books and Writings, was that Famous Tyrian Philosopher, *Aldeus*, called by the Greeks *Porphyrius*; who published a Voluminous and elaborate Treatise (containing Fifteen Books) against the Christians; and yet He notwithstanding was plainly as zealous an Aflertor of One Supreme Deity, and One Only *Æterna*, Unmade or Self-existent Principle of all things; as any of the Christians themselves could be; he strenuously opposing that formentioned Doctrine of *Plutarch* and *Atticus*, concerning Three Unmade Principles, a Good God, an Evil Soul or Demon, and the Matter, and endeavouring to demonstrate, that all things whatsoever, even Matter itself, was derived from One Perfect Understanding Being, or Self-originated Deity. The Sum of whole Argumentation to which purpose, we have represented by *Porcuu* upon the *Timeus*, Page 119.

After *Porphyrius*, the next eminent Antagonist of Christianity, and Champion for Paganism, was *Hierocles* the Writer of that Book entituled (in *Eusebius*) *Philoludjas*, or a Lover of the Truth; which is noted to have been a Modestor Inscription, than that of *Celsus* his æm. Ins. *Vdýs*, or True Oration. For if *Eusebius Pamphili*, were the Writer of that Answerto this *Philalethes* now Extant, as we both read in our Copies, and as *photius* also read; then must it needs be granted, that *Hierocles* the Author of it, was either contemporary with *Porphyrius*, or else but little his Junior. Moreover this *Hierocles* seems plainly to be the person intended by *Laetantius* in these following words, *Alit candidum materiam mordaciss scripsit, qui erat tum è numero ju- licum, & qui aulcor in primis facienda persecutionis fuit: quod secere son contentus, etiam scriptis eos quos affixerat, ineptus ess. Compo- uit enim Libellos Duos, non Contr. Christianos, nè inimico infectiari vi- leretur, sed Ad Christianos; ut humanè ac benignè confulere videre- ner. In quibus ita falsitatem Scripture Sacre arguiere conatus ess, tan- nam fii+ effet tota contraaria.*— *Prœcipuâ tamen Paulum Petruâque accipuit, ceteroque Discipulos, tanquam fallacie seminatores: quos e- fendo tamen ruder & in•fidos fuisse testatus ess.* Another hath handled the same matter more smartly; who was First himself one of the Judges and chief Author of the Persecution; but being not contented with that sickness, he added this afterwards, to persecute the Christians also with his Pen: He compounding Two Books, not inscribed Against the Christians (lest he should seem plainly to all the part of an enemy) but To the Christians (that he might be thought to counsel them humanely and benigne:) in which he *so* charges the holy Scripture with Falsbod, as if it were all nothing else but contradictions: but he chiefly labors Paul and Peter, as diviners of lies and deceits, whom notwithstanding he declares to have
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phili who Answered the Philalethes, but that it must needs be some other Falsebus much Junior. But we finding Hierocles his Philalethes in Laçantius, must needs conclude on the contrary, that Hierocles the famous Christiano-maflix, was not the same with that Hierocles who wrote de Fato. Which is further evident, from Aneas Gazeus in his Theophrastus, where first he mentions one Hierocles an Alexandrian, that had been his Master, whom he highly extols, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c.

But tell me, I pray you, are there yet left amongst you in Egypt, any such Expounders of the Arcane Mysteries of Philosophy as Hierocles our Master was? And this we suppose to be that Hierocles, who wrote concerning Fate and Providence, (if not also upon the Golden Verces.) But afterward upon occasion of Apollonius, the Cappadocian, or Tyana-ian, he mentions another Hierocles distinct from the former; namely him, who had so boasted of Apollonius his Miracles, in these words, Απολλόνιος ός η τε ξενον ιερά ιερεύναι. Hierocles γε ο διδάσακας, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c.

Thus Apollonius is convinced of falsity; but Hierocles (not our Master) but he that boasts of the Miracles (of Apollonius) adds another incredible thing. And though it be probable, that one of these was the Author of that Commentary upon the Golden Verces, (for that it should be written by a Christian is but a dream) yet we cannot certainly determine which of them it was. However that this Hierocles, who was the Maflix of Chriftianity and Champion for The Gods, was notwithstanding, professed affirer of one Supreme Deity, is clearly manifest also from Alacinthus, in these following words, Quam tandem nobis atulitfī Veritatem? nis quod Assfortor Deorum, eos ipfos ad ultimum prodiditō: roceutus enim Summi Dei laudes, quem Regem, quem Maximum, quem Opificem rerum, quem Fontem bonorum, quem Parentem omnium, quem Factorem Altoremaque viventium confessus es: ademisti Jovi tuo egnum; ciumque Sumnum potesta depulsum, in Ministrorum numerum dignisti. Epilogus ergo te tuus arguit Stultitiae, Vanitatis, Erroris, firmas Deos esse & illos tamen subjiciis & mancipas ei Deo, cujus eligionem conariss evectere. Though you have entitled your Book Philalætes, yet what Truth have you brought us therein, unless only this, that an Assfıer of the Gods (contradicting your self) you have at last trysted those very Gods. For in the close of your Book, prosecuting the afts of the Supreme God, and confessing him to be the King, the Greatest, the Optica of the World, the Fountain of Good, the Parent of all things, the Maker and Conserver of all Living beings, you have by this means thrown your Jupiter, and degrading him from his Sovereign Power, duc'd him into the rank of Inferiour Ministers. Wherefore your Epître argues you guilty of Folly, Vanity and Error, in that you both assured, and yet subjeyt and mancipate them under that one God, whoseigion you endeavour to overthrow. Where we must confess we understand not well Laçantius his Logick; forasmuch as Hierocles his Zeus Jupiter, was one and the same with his Supreme God (as is also re-intimated) and though he acknowledged all the other Gods to be his Inferiour Ministers yet nevertheles he did contend, that to ought to be Religiouily Worshipped, which was the thing that Laçantius should have confuted. But that which we here take no-tice
tice of; is this, that Hierocles a grand Persecutor of the Christians, and the Author of that bitter Invevtive against them, called Phila'thes, though he were so strenuous an affelter of Polytheism and Champion for The Gods, yet did he nevertheless at the same time, clearly acknowledge one Supreme Deity, calling him the King (that is the Monarch of the Univerfe) the Greatest, the Opifex of the World, the Fountain of Good, the Parent of all things, and the Maker and Conserver of all Life.

But the greatest Opposer of Christianity every way, was Julian the Emperor; who cannot reasonably be suspected to have disfigured or blanched Paganism, because he was an Emperor, and had so great an Animolity against Christianity, and was so superflitiously or bigotically zealous for the Worship of the Gods; and yet this very Julian notwithstanding, was an unquestionable Aflteror of One Supreme Deity. In his Book written against the Christians, he declares the general fence of the Pagans, after this manner; οι γδι μεταφορα φασι, τα δημιουργα αποτηναν μηδεν ουκα μελες ἡ βασιλεα, νεανισκον το πνευμα το θεον ουκ ουτως εν ουτω, ουνεξως η πολιτειας ητοι, ου ηκα\vsup>

οτα ηττεται, τω εντων λοιπων ουατα, επεζε ου μη το πνευμα πλήρως εδοξα, ου εν παλαι, ου δη τους μεταφες, έλλη παρε αλλω κατα στοιχειας.

Our Theologers affirm, the Maker of all to be a common Father, and King, but that the Nations, as to particular things, are distributed by him to other Inferior Gods, that are appointed to be Governors over Countries and Cities, every one of which administers in his own Province agreeably to himself. For whereas in the Common Father, all things are Perfect, and One is All, in the Particular or Partial Deifier, one excels in one Power, and another in another. Afterwards in the same Book he contends, that the Pagans did entertain righter Opinions concerning the Supreme God, than the Jews themselves: ης ε μη δο πεποησα ην τι μαζε δημιουργε αρ καθισιμος ου τοι μοισες μηδεν υπεκατοιται εν αυτω, μεταφορα τερεμυ δεδας, οι καινος μηδε ηκεινον υπαλλελαζονται αποτηναν το θεον ηποτε, ιναρσιν 5 αλλους, οι πολεμοι οι μηδε ουκ ηκεινον, ειρε ου σαηρυ αντιστροφαις, έκατο τω εντω διαφεροντας ίπονοβολεον τερεμυ δεδας, η καιδιαμεχεν ἡν, ου τοι ζυγο της καινοησιας.

If that God who is so much spoken of by Moses, be the Immediate Opifer of the whole World, we Pagans entertain better Opinions of him who suppose him to be the common Lord of all; but that there are other Governors of Nations and Countries under him, as Prefects or Presidents appointed by a King; we not ranking him, amongst those Particular Governors of Particular Countries and Cities, as the Jews do. From both which places, it is evident, that according to Julian's Theology all those other Gods, whose Worship he contended so much for, were but the Subordinate Ministers of that One Supreme God, the Maker of all.

The same thing might be further manifested from Julian's Oratien made in praise of the Sun as a Great God in this visible World he therein plainly acknowledging another far more Glorious Deity which was the Cauë of all things, ές μηδε ο θεος ουκ ημερεγε, παλιν θεοι καις θεοιν, έπω ζυγο δεδας έξω θαυς καινοησιας.

There is One God the Ma
Derived all his Gods from One.

...Gods moving round the Heavens, in the midst of which is the Sun. Where we have a clear acknowledgement of One Supreme God, and of Many Inferior Deities both together. Moreover in the fame Oration, he declareth that the Ancient Poets, making the Sun to have been the Offspring of Hyperion, did by this Hyperion understand nothing else, but the Supreme Deity, who is above all things, and about whom, and for whose sake, are all things. Which Supreme Deity is thus more largely described by him in the fame Oration (where he calls him the King of all things)...

...this mystery of the Intelligible Sun, every way like himself, of which the Sensible Sun is but a Image. For thus Dionysius Petavion rightly declares the fence of alian in this Oration; Vanitatis hiatus & logocissima disputatio...

...and Chief Deity, was produced a certain Intelligible and Archetypal God, which hath the same place or order, in the rank of Intelligible things, that the Sensible Sun hath in the rank of Sensibles. So at here are Three things to be distinguished: from one another, First Supreme Deity which Plato calls, The Good, Secondly the Intelligible or Eternal Intellig, and Lastly the Corporeal or Sensible Sun (Animated). Where notwithstanding, we may take notice, how near this lan Philosopher and Emperor, Julian, approached to Christianity; though so much opposed by him; in that he also supposed an Eternal Mind or Intellig, as the Immediate Offspring of the First untenant of all things, which seems to differ but a little from the triune God of the Christian. However it is plain that this devout Restorer of impiety, and zealous Contender for the Worship of The Gods, asserteth no Multiplicity of Independent, Self-existent Deities, but derived his Gods from One.
as the Original of all things. Maximus Madaurense, a confident and resolv'd Pagan in St. Austin's time, express'd both his own and the general fence of Pagans after this manner; Equidem Unum esse Deum Sumnum, sine initio, Nature cun Patrem Magnum atque Magnificum, quis tam demens tam mento captus neque est certissimum? Hujus nos virtutes per Mundam opus diffusas, multis vocabulis invocamus, quoniam nomen ejus cuncti proprium videbunt ignoramus. Itas, ut dam ejusquae quaedam Membram captim, variis supplicationibus prosequimur, Totum colere profecto videamus. Truly that there is One Supreme God, without beginning, as the Great and Magnificent Father of Nature; who is so mad or devoid of sense as not to acknowledge it to be most certain? His Virtues diffus'd throughout the whole World, (because we know not what his proper name is,) we invoke under many different names. Whence it comes to pass, that whilst we prosecute with our supplications, his as it were divided Members severally, we must needs be judged to worship the whole Deity. And then he concludes his Epistle thus; Dii tefervent, per quos & Eorum, atque cunctorum mortalium, Communem Patrem, universi mortales quos terra suffinet, mille modis, concordi diversitate venerantur; The Gods keep thee, by and through whom, we Pagans, dispersed over the whole World, do worship the common Father, both of those Gods, and all Mortals, after a thousand different manners, nevertheless with an agreeing discord. Longissimus likewise, another more modest Pagan Philosopher, upon the request of the fame St. Austin, declares his fence concerning the way of worshipping God and arriving to happiness to this purpose. Per Minores Deos per venerad Sumnum Deum non sine Sacris Purificatoris, That we are to come to the Supreme God, by the Minor or Inferior Gods, and that not without Purifying Rites and Expiations; he supposing that besides a vertuous and holy Life, certain Religious Rites and Purifications, were necessary to be observed, in order to that end. In which Epistle, the Supreme God is also styled by him, Unus, Universus, Incomprehensibilis, Ineffabilis & Infatigabilis Creator.

Moreover, that the Pagans generally disclaim'd this Opinion of Many Unmade Self-existent Deiters, appeareth plainly from Arnobius, where he brings them in, complaining, that they were fallly and maliciously accused by some Christians, as guilty thereof, after this manner; Fruiira nos falsa & calamitio incenisis & appetitiu mine, tanquam inficius eam cons Deum effe Majorem; cum a nobis & Jupiter nominetur, & Optimus habetur & Maximus; cinesque illius Augustissimas fides, & Capitolia confusurarum inmania; In vain do you Christians calumniate us, Pagans, and accuse us as if we denied, Our Supreme Omnipotent God; though we both call him Jupiter, and account him the Best and the Greatest; having dedicated the most august seats to him, the vast Capitolis. Where Arnobius in way of opposition, shows first how perplexed and intangled a thing the Pagans Theology was, their Poetic Fables of the Gods, nonenoncely con founding Hierology together with Theology; and that it was impossible that that Jupiter of theirs, which had a Father and a Mother, a Grand father and a Grandmother, should be the Omnipotent God. Nam D.
as Omnipo
tens, mente
um omnium, & com
muni mortalitatis affen
tu, nec
que Genitus
situr, nec
que novam in
lacer aliquando esse
prolatum; nec ex
alipus
temore capisse
esse, vel
seculum ac
temporum. Non
exim is
per se
sunt, sed
e ex ojus
perpetua
perfecta, &
infinita semper
continuante procedunt. At vero
Jupi
ter (ut
vor fertis) & Patr
drem habet & Matrem,
Aos & Aias, num
supr in
uteru matris
sae
formatum, & c. Tou
Pagans
confoud your
selves
with Contradictions; for the
Omnipotent God, according to the
natural
sense of all mankind, was neither
begotten or made, nor ever had a
Beginning in time, be being the
Fountain and Original of all things. But
Jupiter (as you say)
had both Father and Mother, Grandfathers
and
Grandmothers, and was but lately formed in the
womb; and therefore
he cannot be the Eternal
Omnipotent God. Neverthe
es Arnobius after
wards considering (as we suppose) that these Poetick
Fables, were,
by the wiser Pagans, either totally rejected,
or else some way or other
Allegorized, he candidly dismi
th th
this advantage which he had
at
them; and grants their Jupiter to be the true
Omnipotent De
ty, and consequently that fame God which the
Christians
worshiped;
but from thence infers, that the Pagans therefore must needs
be highly
guilty, whilst worshipping the same God with the
Christians,
they did hate and persecute them after that manner. Sed sint,
us
non
in aliquo, 
v
n


Natum hominem colimus; quid enim, vos hominem nullum colitis natum? non unum & alium? non innumeros alios? quinimo non omnes quos jam tempus habetis vestris, mortalium justijlis ex num. ro. & colo sideribusque donatis? & Concedamus interdicta nummus vestris opinatioibus dantes, unum Christum finisse de nobis, mentis, animes, corporis, fragilatas & conditions umus; nonne dignus a nobis est tantum ob numerus gyatiam, Deus dicit Deijsque setiri? Si enim vos Liberum quod reperit utum vinsi? si quod panis, Cererem est Aculapium, quod herbarum; f Minervam, quod olea; f Triptolemum, quod arari; f demique Herculcm, quod ferae, quod fure, quod multiplicium caputum superavit composiciit natrices, divorum retulisis in celum: hujusibus quantis afficiendus est nobis, qui ab erroribus nos magnis in- maturi veritate traduxit. &c. Are these the Gods who are so much offended, with Christ's being worshipped, and accepted a God by us? they who being forgetful of their former condition, would not have the same bestowed upon another, which hath been granted to themselves? Is this the Justice of the Heavenly Powers? This the righteous judgment of Gods? or is it not rather base Envy and Covetousness, for them thus to ingross all to themselves? We worship indeed one that was born a man, What then? Do you worship no such? not one, and another, and innumerable? And are not almost all your Gods, such as were taken from out of the rank of men, and placed among the Stars? And will you accompany that damnable in us, which you yourselves practice? Let us for the present yield thus much to your Insidious; and grant, that Christ was but an ordinary man, of the same rank, and condition with other mortals, yet might we not for all that (according to your Principles) think him worthy, by reason of the great benefits we received from him to be accompanied a God? For if you have advanced into the number of your Divi, Bacchus or Liber for inventing the use of Wine, Ceres of Corn, Aculapius of Herbs, Minerva of the Olive, Triptolemus of the Plow, and Hercules for subduing Beasts, Thieves and Monsters; With how great honours ought he to be affected by us, who by the infusion of divine truth hath delivered us from such great Errors of mind. &c. Which Argumentation of Arnobius though it were good enough ad homines, to stop the mouths of the Pagans, there being more reason, that Christ shoul be made a God, for the Benefits that mankind receive from him, than that Bacchus or Ceres or Hercules should be so; yet as the same Arnobius himself seems to intimate, it is not sufficient without something else superadded to it, for the Justification of Christianity. Neither indeed was that the chief quarrel which the Pagans had with the Christians, That they did defied one who was crucified (though the Cross of Christ was also a great offence to them) but that they condemning the Pagans, for worshipping others besides the Supreme Omnipotent God, and de- caging all the Gods of theirs, did themselves notwithstanding worship one Mortal man for a God. This Celsus urges in Origen, εκ ου των μισθων λεγων, επειδρον και των πλους και χαρισματος εκεινων, η ομηρων πλους πληθυνης λειων νομιμως και των, εκ των των αλλων ανθρωπων. If these Christians themselves worshipp'd no other but One God, or the pure Divinity, then might they perhaps seem to have some just pretence of cenuring us; but now they themselves give divine Honour, to one that lately rose up and yet
they persuaded themselves, that they do not at all offend God in worshipping that supposed Minifter of his. Which as Origen makes there a reply to it, so shall it be further considered by us afterwards.

As for the Judgment of the Fathers in this Particular, Clemens Alexandrinus, was not only of this Opinion, that the Pagans (at least the Greeks) did worship the true God, and the same God with the Christians (though not after a right manner) but also endeavours to confirm it from the Authority of St. Peter: That the Greeks knew God Peter intimates in his Predication. There is One God, faith he, who made the Beginning of all things, and hath power over their End, &c. Worship this God, not as the Greeks do. Wherein he seemeth to suppose, the Greeks to worship the same God, with us, though not according to the right Tradition received by his Son. He does not enjoin us not to worship that God, which the Greeks worship; but to worship him otherwise than they do, altering only the manner of the worship, but not the Object, or preaching another God. And what that is, not to worship God as the Greeks do, the same Peter intimates in those words. They worship him in images of wood and stone, brass and iron, gold and silver, and sacrifice to the Dead also, as to Gods. Where he adds further out of St. Peter's Predication, Neither worship God as the Jews do, &c. The one and only God (faith Clemens) is worshipped by the Greeks Paganeously, by the Jews Judicately, but by Us newly and Spiritually. For the same God who gave the two Testaments to the Jews and Christians, gave Philosophy to the Greeks. Nunc opulentus pagae, Erant, &c. by which the Omnipo
tent God, is glorified amongst the Greeks.

La&mantius Firmianus, also, in many places affirms, the Pagans Dr. D. P. to have acknowledged One Supreme Deity; Summum Deum & Philo
dosophi & Poetae, & ipsi denique qui Deos colunt, scpse fatentur, That there is One Supreme Deity, both Philosophers and Poets, and even the vulgar Worshippers of the Gods themselves, frequently acknowledge. From whence he concludes, that all the other Pagan Gods, were nothing but the Ministers of this One Supreme, and Creatures made by him, (he then only blaming them, for, calling them Gods, and giving them religious Worship.) Lib. I. When he had declared that it was altogether as absurd to suppose, the World to be governed by many Independent Gods, as to suppose the Body of a man to be governed by many Minds Lib. i.p. 16. or Souls Independent; he adds, Quod quia intelligunt iiji assentores Deorum, ita cor præesse singulis rebus ac partibus dicunt, ut tantum Unus sit Reator omnium. Nam ergo ceteri non Dii erunt, sed Satellites ac Ministi, Quos ille Unum, Maximum & Potens omnium, officiis his praecit, ut ipsi ejus imperio & nutibus serviant. Si universi pares sunt; non solum Dii omnes sunt. Nec enim posse hoc ideae esse, quod servit & quod dominatur. Nam si Deus est nomen summa potestatis, Incorruptibilis esse debet, Perfectus, Impassibilis, nulli rei subjiciens. Ergo Dii non sunt quos paree Uni Maximo Deo necessitas cogit. Which because the Assentors of God, well understand, they affirm these Gods of theirs so to preside over the several parts of the World, as that there is only one chief Rector or Governor. Whence it follows, that all their other Gods, can be no other thing than Ministers and Officers, which one Great
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Eusfcuus, Cefaristenfis likewise gives us this accomet of the Pagans Creed or the Tenour of their Theology, as it was then held by them, 

whereas they had not so far degenerated as to have lost the knowledge of One Supreme God, from whom is all whatsoever Nature and that they derived all their Gods from One. We shall now in the last place conclude with the Judgment of Paul.

What St. Austin's fence was, concerning the Theology of the Pagans, hath been already declared, namely, that they had not so far degenerated as to have lost the knowledge of One Supreme God, from whom is all whatsoever Nature and that they derived all their Gods from One. We shall now in the last place conclude with the Judgment of Paul.

Bis. 6, 6, 11. Ins Orosius, who was his Contemporat, Philopoi dum intentent mensu studio quaeuntur sanctitique omnia. Unum Deum, Authorum omnium re percurrent, ad quem Unum omnia referrentur, unde etiam nunc Paganim quo jam declarata Veritas de continuaci magis quam de ignorantia convincit, cium a nobis discurruntur, non se Plures sequi, sed sub Uno Deo Magno, Plures Ministros venerari fatentur. Reflatigitur de intelligentiam Dei, per multias intelligentijs suspicione, Confusa diffusio, quia de Uno Deo. omnium penes una eft opinio. The Philosophers of the Gentiles, with intent study of mind, they enquired and searched after things, for
that there was One God, the Author of all things, and to which One, all things should be referred. Whence also the Pagans at this very day, whom the declared truth rather convinces of Continuancy, than of Ignorance; when they are urged by us, confess themselves, not to follow Many Gods, but only under One God to worship Many Ministers. So that there remaineth only a confused discussion concerning the manner of understanding the true God, because about One God, there is almost one and the same opinion of all.

And by this time we think it is sufficiently evident, that the Pagans (at least after Christianity) though they affected Many Gods, they calling all Understanding Beings Superiour to men by that Name (according to that of St. Jerom, Deum quicquid superas effet, Gentiles putant), yet they acknowledged One Supreme Omnipotent and only Unmade Deity.

XVI. But because its very possible, that some may still suspect, all this to have been nothing else but a Refinement and Interpolation of Paganism, after that Christianity had appeared upon the Stage, or in a kind of Mangonization of it, to render it more vendible and plausible; the better able to defend itself, and bear up against the Assults of Christianity; whilest in the mean time the Genuine Doctrine of the ancient Pagans was far otherwise: although the contrary hereunto might sufficiently appear from what hath been already declared, yet however, for the fuller satisfaction of the more strongly prejudiced, we shall by an Historical Deduction made, from the most ancient times all along downwards, demonstrate that the Doctrine of the Greatest Pagan Polytheists, as well before Christianity as after it, was always the same. That besides their Many Gods, there was One Supreme, Omnipotent and Only Unmade Deity.

And this we shall perform not as some have done, by laying the chief Stress upon the Sibylline Oracles, and those reputed Writings of Hermes Trismegistus, the Authority whereof hath been of late so much decayed by Learned Men; nor yet upon such Oracles of the Pagan Deities, as may be suspected to have been counterfeited by Christians: but upon such Monuments of Pagan Antiquity, as are altogether unsuspected and indubitable. As for the Sibylline Oracles, there may (as we conceive) be Two Extremes concerning them: One, in swallowing down all that is now extant under that Title, as Genuine and Sincere, whereas nothing can be more manifest, than that there is much Counterfeit and Sopposititious Stuff, in this Sibylline Farrago which now we have. From whence, besides other Instances of the like kind, it appears too evidently to be denied, that some pretended Christians of former times, have been for Pious and Religious Frauds; and endeavoured to uphold the Truth of Christianity by Figments and Forgeries of their own devising. Which as it was a thing Ignoble and Unworthy in it self, and argued that those very Defenders of Christianity, did themselves disfrust their own Cause; so may it well be thought, that there was a Policy of the Devil in it also, there being no other more Effectual way than this, to render all Christianity (at least
leaff in after-ages) to be suspected. Indomuch that it might perhaps be question'd, Whether the Truth and Divinity of Chr{tianity} appear more, in having prevail'd against the open force and opposition of its professed Enemies, or in not being at last smothered and oppressed, by these Frauds and Forgeries of its seeming Friends and Defenders. The Other Extreme may be, in concluding the whole business of the Sibylline Oracles (as any ways relating to Christianity) to have been a mere cheat and Figment: and that there ne'er was any thing in those Sibylline Books, which were under the Custody of the Quindecimviri, that did in the leaft predict our Saviour Christ or the Times of Christianity. For notwithstanding all that the Learned Blundell hath written, it seems to be undeniably evident, from Virgil's Fourth Idyllium, that the Cumean Sibyl, was then supposed to have predicted a New Flourishing Kingdom or Monarchy, together with a Happy State of Justice or Righteousness, to succeed, in the Latter Age of the World.

Moreover it is certain, that in Cicero's time, the Sibylline Prophecies, were interpreted by some in favour of Cæsar, as predicting a Monarchy; Sibyllæ versus absurda, quos illa fuisse judicis dicitur. Quorum Interpretis nuper falsa quadam hominum fana dicturus in Senatu putabatur, Enum, quem revera Regem habebamus, appellantur qui quse Regem, fi salvi esse vellemus. We take notice of the Verses of the Sibyl, which she is said to have pour'd out in a Fury or Prophecy Frenzy, the Interpreter whereas was lately thought to have been about to declare in the Senate-house, That if we would be safe, we should acknowledge him for a King, who really was so. Which Interpretation of the Sibylline Oracles (after Cæsar's Death) Cicero was so much offended with, (he also looking upon a Roman Monarchy, as a thing no nees impossible than undefeasable) that upon this occasion, he quarrels with those very Sibyline Oracles themselves, as well as the Readers and Expounders of them, after this manner; Hoc si est in Libris, in quem Hominem, & in quod Tempus est & Callide enim, qui illa composuit, perfectis, ut, quod canque accidit, predictum videtur, Hominum & Temporum definitione subiat. Adhibuit etiam latebram obscuritatis, ut idem versus alius in aliam rem posse accommodari videtur. Non esse autem illud Carmen furrens, tum ipsum Poema declarat, (est enim magis Attis & Diligentie quæ Incitatio & motus) tum vero ea quæ &c. dicitur, cum diceps ex primis Verfum litteris aliqua coniunctur. Quamobrem Sibyllam quidem jepo'st at conditam habeamus, ut, id, quod pridini est a Majoribus, injsd us Senatus in legantur quidem Libri. If there be any such thing contained in the Sibylline Books, then we demand, concerning what Man is it spoken, and of what Time? For whoever framed those Sibylline Verses, he craftily contrived, that whatsoever should come to pass, might seem to have been predicted in them, by taking away all Distinction of Persons and Times. He also purposely affected Obscurity, that the
the same verses might be accommodated sometime to one thing, and sometime to another. But that they proceeded not from Fury and Propheticke Rage, but rather from Art and Contrivance, doth no less appear otherwise, than from the Acrostick in them. Wherefore let us shut up the Sibyl and keep her close, that according to the Decree of our Ancestors, her verses may not be read without the express command of the Senate. And lastly he addeth, Cum Autiflitis ega manus ut quidvis potius ex illis libris, quam regem proferant, quern Romæ pofthac nec Dii nec Homines effe patientur? let us also deal with the Quindecimviri, and Interpreters of these Sibylline Books, that they would rather produce any thing out of them, than a King; whom neither Gods nor Men will hereafter suffer at Rome. Where though Cicero were mistaken, as to the Event of the Roman Government, and there were doublets some Predictions in these Sibylline Books, of a New Kingdom or Monarchy, to be set up in the World; yet that the Roman Empire was not the thing intended in them, doth manifestly appear from that Description in Virgil’s forementioned Eclogue; wherein there is accordingly another completion of them expected, though flatteringly applied to Solomon’s. Wherefore we conclude that the Kingdom and Happy State or Golden Age, predicted in the Sibylline Oracles, was no other than that of the Messiah, or our Saviour Christ, and the times of Christianity. Lastly, in that other Passage of Cicero’s, concerning the Sibylline Oracles, Vacant ad deponendas potius quàm ad suscipiendas Religiones; let them be made use of rather for the extinguishing, than the begetting of religions and Superstitions; there seems to be an Intimation, as if of themselves they rather tended, to the lessening than increasing of the Pagan Superstitions; and therefore may probably be thought, to have reduced a Change of that Pagan Religion, by the Worship of one Sole Deity to be introduced. Neither ought it to seem a jot more strange, that our Saviour Christ should be foretold by the Pagan Sibyl, than that he was so clearly predicted, by Balaam the Aramitek Sorcerer. However those things in the Sibylline Verses, might have been derived some way or other, from the Scripture-prophecies; which there is indeed the more probability of, because that Sibylline Prophet made so of those very fame Figures and Allegories, in describing the Future Happy State, that are found in the Scripture; as for Example,

Nec magnos metuent Arventa Leones, etc.

Now as Cicero seems to complain, that in his time these Sibylline Oracles were too much expounded to view; so is it very probable, that notwithstanding they were to be kept under the Guard of the Quindecimviri, yet many of them might be copied out, and set abroad, and thereby an occasion be offered, to the ignobly zealous Christians, who were for Officious Lyes and Piouts Scrapes, to add a great deal more of their own forging to them. Either indeed is it imaginable, how any such Cheat as this, should at first have been attempted, or afterwards have proved successful, had there not been some Foundation of Truth, to support
and countenance it. Besides which, it is observable, that Celsus, who would have had the Christians rather to have made the Sibyl than our Saviour Christ a God; taking notice of their using of those Sibylline Testimonies against the Pagans, did not tax them, for counterfeiting the whole buniness of these Sibylline Oracles, but only for inserting many things of their own into them; yea, he hath also slighted the line in dole, being did without ancient Prophetes, but now you can boldly insert into her Verses, many, and those Maleficient things of your own. Where Origen, that he might vindicate as well as he could the honour of Christians, pleads in their defence, that Celsus for all that, could not shew what they had foisted into those Sibylline Verses, because if he had been able to have produced more ancient and incorrupt Copies, in which such things were not found, he would certainly have done it. Notwithstanding which it is likely, that there were other ancient Copies then to be found, and that Celsus might have met with them too, and that from thence he took occasion to write as he did. However, this would not justify the present Sibylline Books, in which there are Forgeries, plainly discoverable, without Copies. Nevertheless it seems that all the ancient Christians did not agree in making use of these Sibylline Testimonies, thus much being intimated by Celsus himself, in the forecited words, yecjëv yiy<n, which some of you make use of 5 as they did not all acknowledge the Sibyl to have been a Prophetess neither, since upon Celsus mentioning a Sect of Christians called Sibyllists, Origen tells us, that these were such as using the Sibylline Testimonies, were called so in way of disgrace, by other Christians, who would not allow the Sibyl to have been a Prophetess; they perhaps conceiving it derogatory to the Scriptures. But though their may be some of the ancient Sibylline Verses (still left, in that Farrago which we now have; yet it being impossible for us to prove which are such; we shall not insist upon any Testimonies at all from thence, to evince that the ancient Pagans acknowledged One Supreme Deity. Notwithstanding which we shall not omit one Sibylline Paffage, which we find recorded in Pausanias (from whence by the way it appears also, that the Sibylline Verses were not kept up so close, but that some of them got abroad;) he telling us, that the defeat of the Athenians at Ægos Potamos, was predicted by the Sibyl in these Words (amongst others):

kai tâ' Aithenias kàpìv toû Ægos
Zeûs iûpêmètov, hêpâ rēptô- nêp mômèv, &c.

Ac tum Cecropidis ëthum geminisque eiebit,
Jupiter Alitonus, rerum cui Summa Potechus, &c.

Whereeto might be added also, that of another ancient Pelianae Prophetess, in the same Writer, wherein the Divine Eternity and Immutability, is plainly declared.

Zeûs iûs, Zeûs ës, Zeûs ësêh, Zo ìepôla Zêk.

Jupiter
Jupiter Est, Fuit, atque Erit: O bone Jupiter alme.

Besides these Sibylline Prophecies, there are also other Oracles of the Pagan Deities themselves, in which there was a clear acknowledgment of One Supreme and Greatest God. But as for such of them, as are said to have been delivered since the Times of Christianity, when the Pagan Oracles began to fail, and such as are now extant only in Christian Writings, however divers of them are cited out of Porphyrius his Book of Oracles; because they may be suspected, we shall not here mention any of them. Nevertheless we shall take notice of One Oracle of the Clarian Apollo, that is recorded by Macrobius, in which One Supreme Deity is not only affirmed; but is also called by that Hebrew Name, (or Tetragrammaton) Jao, 

Jupiter est, fuit, atque erit: O bone Jupiter alme.

You are to call the Highest and Supreme of all the Gods, Jao: Though it be very true, that that Clarian Devil there, cunningly endeavoured to divert this to the Sun, as if that were the Only Supreme Deity and True Jao. To which might be added, another ancient Oracle (that now occurs) of the Dodonean Jupiter, together with the Interpretation of Themistocles, to whom it was delivered; wherein he was commanded πρὸς τῷ Ιανωμένῳ τῷ Σωλόπλεκτῳ, to repair to him who was called by the same Name with God, which Themistocles apprehended to be the King of Persia, μεσαίος τῷ Ἱπποτος έίναι τῷ Λέοντευβόλικας, because both he and God, were alike called (though in different respects and degrees) the Great King or Monarch.

But as for those Writings, commonly imputed to Hermes Trismegist, that have been generally condemned by the Learned of this Latter age, as wholly Counterfeit and Supposititious, and yet on the contrary are affirmed by Athanasius Kircherus, for sincere and Genuine; we shall have occasion to declare our sense, concerning them, more opportunely afterward.

The most Ancient Theologers, and most Eminent Assertors of Polytheism amongst the Pagans, were Zoroaster in the Eastern Parts, and Zephyrus amongst the Greeks. The former of which, was of so great Aniquity, that Writers cannot well agree about his Age. But that he was Polytheist is acknowledged by all, some affirming it to be signified in his Very Name, as given him after his death; it being interpreted by some A W orshipper of the Stars. Neither is it to be doubted, but that Ester or Ester in the Persian Language did signify a Star, as it hath been observed also by Learned men, concerning sundry other Words, now familiar in these European Languages, that they derived their Original from the Persian. Notwithstanding which, it may be suspected that this was here but a Greek Termination: the Word being not only in the Oriental Languages, written Zertooft and Zaradust, but also in Syriac, Zarades. However Zoroaster's Polytheism is intimated by Plato;
where his Magic is defined to have been nothing else, but Biblical Deities: The Worship of the Gods. Whence by the way we learn also, that the word μαγεία or Magic, first taken in a good sense, which is confirmed by Porphyry in De Antro Nymparum, was of the Persians, and that the word was skillful in the knowledge of the Deity, and Religious Worshippers of the same, were called Magi. And as Magic is commonly conceived to be founded in a certain Vital Sympathy that is in the Universe, so did these ancient Persian Magi, and Chaldeans (as Pallas tells us) suppose, the only way at first by them approved, of attracting the Influence and Ablution of those Superior Invisible Powers, was by Piety, Devotion, and Religious Rites: Nevertheless their Devotion was not carried out only to One Omnipotent God, but also to Many Gods; neither is it to be questioned but that this Divine Magic of Zoroaster, shortly after degenerated in many of his Followers, into the Theurgical Magic, and at length into jejus, downright Sorcery and Witchcraft; the only thing which is now vulgarly called Magic. But how many Gods forever this Zoroaster worshipped, that he acknowledged notwithstanding one Supreme Deity, appeareth from the Testimony of Eubulus, cited by Porphyry in his De Antro Nymparum, πετατός μηδέν, ώς εφε περικολογία, ἔμοι εὐεργετής τὸν ἀνθρώπον εἰς τὴν παραμικρὴν ἐπὶ τὴν τάξειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τῷ πηρώ τῇ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀνάμικτῃ, εἰς τὴν παραμικρὴν τὴν πατρίδος Μήθρας, ἐνδιάθεσις σωφρόνης. Zoroaster first of all, as Eubulus testifieth, in the Mountains adjoining to Persis, consecrated a Native Orbicular Cave, adorned with flowers and watered with fountains, to the honour of Mithras, the Maker and Father of all things; this Cave being an Image or Symbol to him, of the whole World, which was made by Mithras. Which Testimony of Eubulus, is the more to be valued, because as Porphyry elsewhere informeth us, he wrote the History of Mithras at large, in many Books, from whence it may be presumed, that he had thoroughly furnished himself with the knowledge of what belonged to the Persian Religion. Wherefore from the Authority of Eubulus, we may well conclude also, that notwithstanding the Sun, was generally worshiped by the Persians as a God, yet Zoroaster and the ancient Magi, who were beft initiated in the Mithraick Mysteries, asserted another Deity, Superior to the Sun, for the True Mithras, such as was παρά τὸν τοῦ αὐτης τοῦ Μιθρᾶ, the Maker and Father of all things, or of the whole World, whereof the Sun is a part. However these also look'd upon the Sun as the most lively Image of this Deity, in which it was worshipped by them, as they likewise worship'd the same Deity Symbolically in Fire, as Maximus Tyrius informeth us; agreeable to which, is that in the Magick Oracles,
The Persians, who were not able to conceive of any thing incorporeal, might, as well as Herophilus, Hippocrates, and the Stoicks amongst the Greeks, look upon the Fiery Substance of the whole World (and especially the Sun) as Animated and Intellectual, to be the Supreme Deity, and the only Mithras, according to that Inscription, Deus Solis Invicto Mithrae. However, Mithras, whether supposed to be Corporeal or Incorporeal, was unquestionably taken by the Persians for the Supreme Deity, according to that of Hesychius, Μίθρας, ὁ πατήρ ὧν ἔμφυτος Μεθράς, Mithras, The First God among the Persians, who was therefore called in the Inscription Omnipotent, Omnipotenti Deo Mithrae. Which First, Supreme and Omnipotent God was acknowledged by Artabanus the Persian, in his Conference with Themistocles, in these words, Ἡμι <πολλὲς νόμους ἡ χαλέαν οὐδόν, καθομος ὃς φαίνει, τὸ τιμῶν μοικίων, <τραπεζίων εὐπόρον Φεας τὸ πάτα σαρξον. Amongst those many excellent Laws of ours, the most excellent is this, that the King is to be honoured and worshipped religiously, as the Image of that God, which conferreth all things. Scaliger with some others (though we know not upon what certain grounds) affirm, that Mither in the Persian Language signified Great, and Mithras, Greater or Greatest, according to which, Mithras would be all one, with Deus Major or Maximus, The Greatest God. Wherefore we conclude, that either Herodotus was mistaken, in making the Persian Mithras the same with Mylitta or Venus; (And perhaps such a mistake might be occasioned from hence, because the Word Mader or Mather in the Persian Language signified Mother, as Mylitta in the Syrian did;) or else rather, that this Venus of his, is to be understood of the <Ἀφροδίτης ζεύγιος, the heavenly Venus or Love; and thus indeed is she there called in Herodotus, Urania; by which though some would understand nothing else but the Moon, yet we conceive the Supreme Deity, True Heavenly love (the Mother and Nurse of all things) to have been primarily signified therein.

But Zoroaster and the ancient Magi are said to have called the Supreme God also by another name, viz. Oromasdes or Ormisdes; however Oromades, according to Plato, seems to have been the Father of Zoroaster. Thus, beides Plutarch and others, Porphyrius, in the Life of Pythagoras, πάρθηκε μάλιστα δ' αληθείαν, τύτω γὰρ μικρὸν θεασάσθη τῆς ἀλήθειας ποιῶν Σέλων ἀλήθειας, ἐπεὶ ἢ ἀλήθεια τῆς Ἀλήθειας ἢ ἀλήθεια τῆς Ἀλήθειας ἦν: ὧν ἠγοραζόν χαλέαν ἐλέον, τοιαύτα τὰ μέρη σάμα φοιλ' τοῦ δ' ἄρχοντο ἀληθείαν. Which we would understand thus. Pythagoras exhorteth men chiefly to the Love of Truth, as being that alone which could make them resemble God, he having learn'd from the Magi that God, whom they call Oromades, was as to Corporeals most like to Light, and as to Incorporeals to Truth. Though perhaps some would interpret these words otherwise, so as to signify Oromades to have been really crowned of Soul and Body, and therefore nothing else but the Animated Sun, as Mithras is commonly supposed also to have been. But the contrary hereunto, is plainly implied in those Zoroastrian Traditions or Fables, concerning Oromades, recorded in Plutarch, ὃν ἀγαπεῖον ἡ ἀλήθεια τῆς ἀλήθειας, ὧν ὁ ἅλλος τὸ γίος ἀφήνει, that Oromades was as far removed from the Sun, as the Sun was from the Earth. Wherefore Oromades was according to the Persians, a Deity superior to the Sun;
God properly as the Fountain of Light and Original of all Good, and the same with Plato’s τὰ γαύδων or First Good. From whom the Persians, as Scaliger informs us, called the First Day of every Month Ormafsda, probably because he was the Beginning of all things. And thus Zaroæther and the ancient Magi, acknowledged one and the same Supreme Deity, under the different names of Mithras and Oromafades.

But it is here observable, that the Persian Mithras was commonly called τέτραπλάζως, Three-fold or Treble. Thus Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, ἵς ἑσπὶ μάγοι τὸ μηχανίων τῷ τετραπλάζως μέτα τελῶν. The Persian Magi to this very day, celebrate a Festival Solmennity in honour of the Triplafian (that is, the Three-fold or Triplicated) Mithras. And something very like to this, is recorded in Plutarch, concerning Oromafdes also, ὁ μῆνες θεομαχίας τε χρῶν ἐκείνων, Oromafdes Three augmented or Triplicated himself; from whence it further appears that Mithras and Oromafses were really one and the same Numen. Now the Scholasts upon Dionysius pretend to give a reason of this Denomination of the Persian Mithras, Triplafios, or Threefold, from the Miracle done in Henedjah’s Time, when the Day was encreased, and almost Triplicated; as if the Magi then observing the same, had thereupon given the name of τετραπλάζως, or Threefold, to their God Mithras, that is, the Sun, and appointed an Anniversary Solmennity for a Memorial thereof. But Learned men have already shewed the Foolery of this Conceit; and therefore it cannot well be otherwise concluded, but that here is a manifest Indication of a Higher Mystery, viz., a Trinity in the Persian Theology; which Gerardus Ì. Poffius would willingly understand, according to the Christian Hypothesis, of a Divine Trinity, or Three Hypotheses in one and the same Deity, whose Distinctive Characters, are Goodness, Wisdom, and Power. But the Magical or Zoroastrian Oracles, seem to represent this Persian Trinity, more agreeably to that Pythagoric, or Platonick Hypothesis, of Three Distinct Substances Subordinate one to another, the Two First whereof, are thus expressed in the following Verfes,

πάντα χα εκτίλπτα πλήθος, ἢ τοιο παραδίκα

Deaths, in πρώτων κινήται εἶναι ἄνδρον.

To this Sense: The Father or First Deity, perfected all things, and delivered them to the Second Mind, who is that, whom the Nations of men commonly take for the First. Which Oracle Fellius thus glosseth upon; τω πατίνου μῆνες ἐκκρίβατος ὁ τετράπλαζως παρὰ πατίνυ, παραδίκα τοιούτω τα μήνες χρῶν τῷ ἐκκρίβατος τω πατίνυ, εἰς τὸ πασχάλα καμήλεα, ἐν τῷ πατίνου καλοῖς. The First Father of the Trinity, having produced this whole Creation, delivered it to Mind or Intelleæ. Which Mind, the whole Generation of Mankind being ignorant of the Paternal Tranquility, commonly call the First God. After which, Fellius takes notice of the difference here betwixt this Magical or Chaldeack Theology, and that of Christians: παντὸς τῶν πατίνου μήνες ἐκκρίβατος ἑκατον, ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ πατίνου τῆς, ὁ ἴδιος τῷ μεγαλίᾳ παλαις, τω κατὰ πατίνου εὐφαλία, &c. But our Christian Doctrine is contrary hereunto, namely thus: That the First Mind or Intelleæ, being the Son of the Great Father, made the whole
The Father in the Mosiack Writings, speaks to his Son, the Idea of the Creation; but the Son is the immediate Opifex thereof. His meaning is, that according to this Persian or Chaldaick Theology, the First Hypothesis of the Divine Triad, was the Demiurge or Immediate Architec of the World, whereas according to the Christian as well as Platonick Doctrine, he is the Second. For which cause, Pletbo framed another Interpretation of that Magick Oracle, to render it more conformable both to the Christian and Platonick Doctrine; α ο ποιησ τον ατωμα ζετήςατ, τα γινομενα δυλαι δω(των θεων ζη τη οκταθε τις τη στοιχειω τη στοιχειω) κα τη μεθ' οιανθ Δαρμος Στοι παραδειγμα, ανεχω δυλαι θεοι, ως υπαρχει, &c. The Father perfected all things, that is the Intelligible Ideas (for these are those things which are complete and perfect) and delivered them to the Second God, to rule over them. Wherefore whatsoever is produced by this God, according to its own Exemplar and the Intelligible Essence, must needs owe its Original also to the Highest Father. Which Second God, the Generations of men, commonly take for the First; they looking up no higher, than to the Immediate Architec of the World. According to which Interpretation of Pletbo's (the more probable of the Two) the Second Hypothesis in the Magick (or Persian) Trinity, as well as in the Platonick and Christian, is the Immediate Opifex or Architec of the World; and this seems to be properly that which was called Mithras in Eubulas.

But besides these Two Hypotheses, there is also a Third mentioned in a certain other Magick or Chaldaick Oracle, cited by Proclus, under the Name of Psyche, or the Mundane Soul; μετά δ' πατερκός Διανοιας, ηγείθαι ίποναι μετά.
The Zoroastrian Trinity, Book I.

The being, Light, Bottwash yet how great an Agreement there was, betwixt the Zoroastrian and the Platonick Trinity, they differing in a manner only in Words. And the Middle of these, namely the Eternal Intellect that contains the Ideas of all things, being, according to the Platonick Hypothesis, the Immediate demiurges and Architect of the World, this probably was that Mithras, as we have already intimated, who is called in Eubulus, the Demiurgus of the World, and the Maker and Father of all things. Now if that Third Hypothesis of the Magick or Chaldaick Oracles, be the same with that, which the Persians call Arimania, then must it be upon such an accept as this, because this Lower World (wherein are Souls Vitally united to Bodies, and Laptable) is the Region where all manner of Evils, Wicknedness, Pain, Corruption and Mortality reign. And herewith Hyedussemeth to agree: "Aegimian (Faith he) δ' Αίδης (Aesch us πετασία, Arimania among the Persians, is Hades, that is, either Orcus or Pluto; wherein he did but follow Theopompus, who in Plutarch calls Arimania likewise Hades or Pluto: which it seemed as was well the Third in the Persian, Trinity (or Triplasian Deity) as it was in the Homanian. And this was that Arimania, whom the Persian King in Plutarch, upon Themistocles his flight, addresed his Devotion to, και τας Μυκεν το οία τος πολεμίως, τικύπτων σφρίς δίδεται προ ττς Ἀριμανίς, όποια εἰ- λακατον τος ἐξουσίας ἔδωκεν. He prayed, that Arimania would always give such a mind to his Enemies, as thus to banish and drive away their best men from them. And indeed from that which Plutarch affirms, δυνατόν Μιθρασ και διπτητικ Ερμοιοί, That the Persians from their God Mithras, called any Mediator, or Middle betwixt two, Mithras; it may be more reasonably concluded, that Mithras, according to the Persian Theology, was properly the Middle Hypothesis of that Triplasian or Triplasian Deity of theirs, than that he should be a Middle Self-existent God, or Mediator, betwixt Two Adversary Gods Unmade, one Good, and the other Evil, as Plutarch would suppose.

Notwithstanding which, if that which the fame Plutarch and others do so confidently affirm, should be true, that Zoroaster and the ancient Magi, made Good and Evil, Light and Darkness, the Two Substantial Principles of the Universe, that is, asserted an Evil Demon Coeternal with God, and Independent on him, in the very same manner that Plutarch himself and the Manicheans afterward did; yet however it is plain, that in this way also, Zoroaster and the Magi, acknowledged One only Fountain and Original of all Good, and nothing to be independent upon that One Good Principle or God, but only that which is so contrary to his Nature and Perfection, as that it could not proceed from him, namely Evil. But we have already discovered a suspicion, that the meaning of those ancient Magi, might possibly be otherwise; they philosophizing only concerning a certain Mixture of Evil and Darkness, together with Good and Light, that was in the Composition of this Lower World, and Personating the fame 5 as also perhaps taking notice especially therein of Evil Demons (who are acknowledged likewise in the Magick Oracles, and called Σώρες θάνατος, Beasts of the Earth, and θάνατος θάνατος, Terrestrial Dogs;) the Head of which might be sometimes called also Emphatically δ' Πονηρός διστήμον πωγώω, the Evil Demon of the Persians, as being the very fame with the Devil.
Devil: all which was under the immediate Presidency or Government of that God, called by them Arimanus, Iades or Pluto, the Third Hypostasis in the Triplalian Deity of the Persians. Which suspension, may be yet further confirmed from hence, because the Persian Theologers, as appears by the Inscriptions, expressly acknowledged the Divine Omnipotence, which they could not possibly have done, had they admitted of a Manichean Substantial Evil Principle, Coeternal with God, and Independent on him. Besides which it is observable, that whereas the Gnosticks in Plotinus time, ascribing this World to have been made, not so much from a Principle Essentially Evil and External, as from a Lapsed Soul; to weigh down the Authority of Plato that was against them, did put Zoroafter in the other Scale, producing a Book entitled, ἀποκαλύφθαι τα ζητούμενα, or the Revelations of Zoroafter, Porphyry tells us, that himself wrote purposely, to disprove those Zoroastrian Revelations, as New and Counterfeit, and forged by those Gnosticks themselves; therein implying also the Doctrine of the ancient Zoroafter, no way to have countenanced or favoured that Gnostick Heresy. Moreover the Tenets of these ancient Magi, concerning that Duplicity of Principles, are by Writers represented with great Variety and Uncertainty. That Accompt which Theodorus in Plotinus (treating of the Persian Magick) gives thereof, as also that of Eudoxus in Damascius, are both of them so Nonfensical, that we shall not here trouble the Reader with them; however, neither of them supposes the Persian Arimanus or Satanus, to be an Unmated Self-existing Demon. But the Arabsians, writing of this Alta-niah, or Persian Duplicity of Good and Evil Principles, affirm, according to the most approved Magi, Light, was Kadiman, the Most Ancient and First God, and that Darkness was but a Created God; they expressly denying the Principle of Evil and Darkness, to be Coehe with God, or the Principle of Good and Light. And Abulfeda represents the Zoroastrian Doctrine (as the Doctrine of the Magi Reformed) after this manner, That God was older than Darkness and Light, and the Creator of them, so that he was a Solitary Being, without Companion or Correlative; and that Good and Evil, Virtue and Vice did arise from a certain Commixture of Light and Darkness together, without which this lower World could never have been produced; which Mixture as still to continue in it, till at length Light should overcome Darkness; and then Light and Darkness shall each of them have their separate and distinct Worlds, apart from one another.

If it were now needful, we might still make it further evident that aroafter, notwithstanding the Multiplicity of Gods worship'd by him, as an Asserter of One Supreme, from his own Description of God in Ephesians, Ὁς οὖν ἐστιν ὁ πρωτός ἡ ἀρχή, ἡ κύριος, ὁ διάκος, ὁ μετά, ἐν μορφῇ ἐλεον, ἐν ἀμή, ἐν μορφῇ πνεύμα καθεν, ἐν ἀμφότερος ἐν μορφῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν μορφῇ ἐκ τούτου, ἐν μορφῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν μορφῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν μορφῇ τοῦ θεοῦ; God is the First Incorruptible, Eternal, Unmade, Indivisible, Most unlike to every thing, the Head or Ruler of all Good, Unobtiable, the Best of the Good, the Wise of the Wise; He is also the Father of Law and Justice, Self-taught, Perfect, and the
the only Inventor of the Natural Holy. Which Eusebius tells us, that this Zoroastrian Description of God, was conteined verbatim, in a Book entitled, A Holy Collection of the Persian Monuments; as also that Ophiates (himself, a famous Magician, and admirer of Zoroaster) had recorded the very same of him, in his Ophiateson.

Now we having, in this Discourse concerning Zoroaster and the Magi, cited the Oracles, called by some Magical, and imputed to Zoroaster, but by others Chaldaical; we conceive it not improper to give some account of them here. And indeed if there could be any Assurance of the Antiquity and Sincerity of those Reputed Oracles, there would then need no other Testimony to prove, that either Zoroaster and the Persian Magi, or else at least the Chaldeans, asserted not only a Divine Monarchy, or One Supreme Deity the Original of all things; but also a Trinity, consistently with the same.

And it is certain that those Oracles are not such Novel Things as some would suspect, they being cited by Synesius, as then Venerable and of great Authority, under the name of ἔσχε λάθει, Holy Oracles, and there being of this Number, some produced by him that are not to be found in the Copies of Pселlus and Pletho; from whence it may be concluded, that we have only some Fragments of these Oracles now left. And that they were not forged by Christians, as some of the Sibylline Oracles undoubtedly were, seems probable from hence, because so many Pagan Philosophers make use of their Testimonies, laying no small stress upon them. As for Example Damascius, out of whom Patritius hath made a Considerable Collection of such of these Oracles as are wanting in Pселlus and Pletho's Copies. And we learn from Photius, that whereas Hierocles his Book of Fate and Providence, was divided into Seven Parts, the Drift of the Fourth of them was this, τον λεγόμενον λάθει, ές συμφωνίαν συνέγειν, ές πλήθον ἑδιγμάτω, to reconcile the Reputed Oracles, with Plato's Doctrines. Where it is not to be doubted, but that these Reputed Oracles of Hierocles, were the same with these Magick or Chaldæick Oracles; because they are frequently cited by Philosophers under that name of λάθει or ὁράκληα. Proclus upon the Timeus, έπει τ' ἐπίτατον, είς ὀρφικόν, είς λαγίαν, παντός είς παντός ὑμεῖς τ' ἑκατεύς, παντός άληθέντον τ' έπει τ' ζωντεύον ὡρα τα πλάθη τ' έπον οἴκει τ' πέμπον ές ὑκρόλει αἱδρέων. Τhe Maker of the Universe, is celebrated both by Plato, and Orpheus, and The Oracles, as the Father of Gods and Men; who both produced Multitudes of Gods, and sends down Souls for the Generations of Men. And as there are other Fragments of these, cited by Proclus elsewhere under the name of λάθει or Oracles, so doth he sometimes give them that higher Title of θεουδοδοζος θεολογίας, and μωσαγγελίας. The Theology that was Divine Tradition or Revelation. Which magnificent Encomium, was bestowed in like manner upon Pythagoras his Philosophy, by Jamblichus, that being thought to have been derived in great part from the Chaldeans and the Magi, έπει τ' έπει είς θεολογίας, μωσαγγέλως. This Philosophy of Pythagoras, having been first Divinely delivered, or revealed by the Gods, ought not to be handled by us without a Religious Invocation of them. And that Porphyris was not unacquainted with
these Oracles neither, may be concluded from that Book of his, entitled άλείχουκας, γενιτοποιών, concerning the Philosophy from Oracles, which consisting of more Parts, one of them was called, γελλον ξήδων λόγος, The Oracles of the Chaldeans: which that they were the very same with those we now speak of, shall be further proved afterward. Now though Pindarus affirm, that the Chaldean Dogma, conteined in those Oracles, were some of them admitted both by Aristotle and Plato, yet does he not pretend, thefe very Greek Verfes themselves to have been so ancient. But it feems probable from Suidas, that Julianus a Chaldean and Theurgift, the Son of Julianus a Philofopher, (who wrote concerning Demons and Teleurgics) was the firft that turned those Chalday or Magick Oracles, into Greek Verfes, τιτελούντων λόγων αὐτών οὗ ταξιδες, ἕργας Στρατίων, τελειών, λόγωι δὲ πνευμι. Julianus in the time of Marcus Antoninus the Emperor, wrote the Teleurgic and Telestick Oracles, in Verse. For that there is fomethinking of the Theurgical Magick mixed together with Mystical Theology in these Oracles, is a thing fo manifest, from that Operation about the Hecatine Circle, and other passages in them, that it cannot be denied; which renders it still more unlikely, that they should have been forged by Chriftians. Nevertheless they carry along with them (as hath been already observed) a clear acknowledgment of a Divine Monarchy, or One Supreme Deity, the Original of all things; which is called in them θεὸς πατήρ, and the Paternal Principle, and that Intelligible, ἐνεργοῦσιν τοῦ ὕποκειντος, that cannot be apprehended otherwise than by the Flower of the Mind, as alfo that One Fire from whence all thingspring; Pindarus thus gloffing upon that Oracle, Αἶδον τοῖς ῥήμασιν τεταγμένον, καὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ὑπόκειντος ἐλασθανόν, κυρίου τεταγμένον, οὐκ ἐπέσχεν, καὶ τὸ λόγον, καὶ πλότησε τὸ χριστός δύναμιν. All things whether Intelligible or Sensible receive their Essence from God alone, and return back again only to him; for thus that this Oracle is irreprehensible, and full of our Doctrine, and it is very observable, that these very fame Oracles, expressly determined also, that Matter was not ἀμάκατος, Unmade or Self-existent, but derived in like manner, from the Deity. Which we learn from τοῦ ὑπόκειντος τοῖς ῥήμασιν τοὶ οὓς, where when he had positively asserted, that there is in πάντως ὁ λόγος, One thing the Cause of all things, and ἀκατακτήτας πάντως ὁ λόγος, ὁ οὗ ἐφοίνης ὁ λόγος, That the Supreme Good, being the Cause of all things, is also the Cause of Matter, he confirms his Affertion of his, from the Authority of the Oracles, and τοῖς ῥήμασις τοῦ ὑπόκειντος τοῖς, τοῦ λόγους ἀμακακότων πολυπολιεῖον ὑλήν, ἐνδείκτην οδηγοῦσιν ὁ λόγος, ὁ οὗ πολυπολιεῖον ὁ λόγος. From this Order also, do the Oracles deduce, the generation of the Matter, in these words, From hence (that is, from the Supreme Deity) altogether proceeds the Genes of the Multiform Matter. Which unquestionably was one of those very Magick or Chalday Oracles; and it may be further proved from hence, because it was by Porphyryus fet down amongst them, as appears from οὖς Γαζαῖος in his Theophrastus, καὶ ἐκατοντάραζον, ἐκατονταράζον, καὶ τις κατακτήτης των πολυπολιείων λόγων, ἐνεργείας οὐκ ἔχοντας των πολυπολιείων λόγων, ἐφοίνης τοῦ πολυπολιείου λόγου, ἐγείροντας τοῦ πολυπολιείου λόγου. οὐδεὶς τις κατακτήτης των πολυπολιείων λόγων, οὐδεὶς ἀπογείρωσις τών πολυπολιείων λόγων. Neither was Matter void of Generation or Beginning, which the Chaldeans and Porphyryus teach thee; he making this the Title of a whole
Concerning the Magick, Book I.

The only Inventor of the Natural Holy. Which Eusebius tells us, that this Zoroastrian Description of God, was contained verbatim, in a Book entitled, A Holy Collection of the Persian Monuments; as also that Oftanes (himself a famous Magician, and admirer of Zoroaster) had recorded the very same of him, in hisSTATECHON.

Now we having, in this Discourse concerning Zoroaster and the Magi, cited the Oracles, called by some Magical, and imputed to Zoroaster, but by others Chaldaica; we conceive it not improper to give some account of them here. And indeed if there could be any Assurance of the Antiquity and Sincerity of those Reputed Oracles, there would then need no other Testimony to prove, that either Zoroaster and the Persian Magi, or else at least the Chaldeans, asserted not only a Divine Monarchy, or One Supreme Deity the Original of all things, but also a Trinity, consistently with the same.

And it is certain that those Oracles are not such Novel Things as some would suspect, they being cited by Synesius, as then Venerable and of great Authority, under the name of Ἵστος λέγων, Holy Oracles, and there being of this Number, some produced by him that are not to be found in the Copies of Pselus and Pletho; from whence it may be concluded, that we have only some Fragments of these Oracles now left. And that they were not forged by Christians, as some of the Sibylline Oracles undoubtedly were, seems probable from hence, because so many Pagan Philosophers make use of their Testimonies, laying no small stress upon them. As for Example Damafeus, out of whom Patrtius hath made a Considerable Collection of such of these Oracles as are wanting in Pselus and Pletho's Copies. And we learn from Photius, that whereas Hierocles his Book of Fate and Providence, was divided into Seven Parts, the Drift of the Fourth of them was this, τὸ λέγῳν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς συμφωνεῖν συνέχειν, ὡς πλήθους τετελειγόντος, τοιοῦτος ὑπερτεροῖν, to reconcile the Reputed Oracles, with Plato's Doctrines. Where it is not to be doubted, but that those Reputed Oracles of Hierocles, were the same with these Magick or Chaldaic Oracles; because these are frequently cited by Philosophers under that name of λέγων or Oracles. Proclus upon the Timeus, ὡς το πλήθους, ὡς ὡς ὡς ὡς ὡς ὡς ὡς ὡς. Where the Maker of the Universe, is celebrated both by Plato, and Orpheus, and the Oracles, as the Father of Gods and Men; who both produced Multitudes of Gods, and sends down Souls for the Generations of Men. And as there are other Fragments of these, cited by Proclus elsewhere under the name of λέγων of Oracles, so doth he sometimes give them that higher Title of Θεοπράξεως Σελεύσεως, and ρωσιοβυοιος, The Theology that was of Divine Tradition or Revelation. Which magnificent Encomium, was bestowed in like manner upon Pythagoras his Philosophy, by Jamblichus, that being thought to have been derived in great part from the Chaldeans and the Magi, τὸ νόμῳ τῶν Θεοπράξεως Σελεύσεως τούτου ἡ Θεοτοκία. This Philosophy of Pythagoras, having been first Divinely delivered, or revealed by the Gods, ought not to be handled by us without a Religious Invocation of them. And that Porphyris was not unacquainted with these.
these Oracles neither, may be concluded from that Book of his, entitled ἐν τῇ τοῦ λογίου φιλοσοφίᾳ, concerning the Philosophy from Oracles; which consisting of more Parts, one of them was called, περὶ τῆς καλλικότερας λόγου, The Oracles of the Chaldeans: which that they were the very same with those we now speak of, shall be further proved afterward. Now though Pjellus affirm, that the Chaldean Dogma, contained in those Oracles, were some of them admitted both by Aristotle and Plato, yet does he not pretend, these very Greek Veres themselves to have been so ancient. But it seems probable from Suidas, that Juliane a Chaldean and Theurgist, the Son of Juliane a Philosopher, (who wrote concerning Demons and Teleurgicks) was the first that turned those Chaldian or Magick Oracles, into Greek Verse; οὐ ταυτά, ἅπαντα ἀντώνως τῷ βασιλείῳ, ἐγραμμένος, τέληκες, λόγος ὁ ἑαυτῷ. Juliane in the time of Marcus Antoninus the Emperor, wrote the Theurgick and Teleurgick Oracles, in Verse. For that there is something of the Theurgical Magick mixed together with Mystical Theology in these Oracles, is a thing so manifest, from that Operation about the Hecatine Circle, and other passagges in them, that it cannot be denied; which renders it still more unlikely, that they should have been forged by Christians. Nevertheless they carry along with them (as hath been already observed) a clear acknowledgment of a Divine Monarchy, or One Supreme Deity, the Original of all things; which is called in them The Father, and the Paternal Principle, and that Intelligible, θεὸν τὸν ἀτόμον, that cannot be apprehended otherwise than by the Flower of the Mind; as also that One Fire from whence all thingspring; Pjellus thus glossing upon that Oracle, All things were the offspring of one Fire, πέντε τὰ ὄντα τὰ πάντα νοητά, καὶ αὐθόρματα, ἀπὸ μένος τοῦ ὑπόκουρον έλέον, πέ τοι δύο μένοι Θεῶν ἐπίσκοποι, &c. ἄξιον δ' έτι Λόγον, το τόπος το ομοιόμοιος διαγωγας. All things whether Intelligible or Sensible receive their Essence from God alone, and return back again only to him; so that this Oracle is irreprehensible, and full of our Doctrine, and it is very observable, that these very same Oracles, expressly determined also, that Matter was not ἄξιον οὖς, Unmade or Self-existent, but derived in like manner, from the Deity. Which we learn from ῥοχίον upon Plato's Timæus, where when he had positively asserted, that there is ἐν πάλιν οὐκόν, One thing the Cause of all things; and ἀξιόθεν πάλιν οὐκόν ἐστι, as holy, ἐν εἰς ὅλης ἔκτος, That the Supreme Good, being the Cause of all things, is also the Cause of Matter; he confirms his Assertion of his, from the Authority of the Oracles, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὡθον, τὰ τέκτων τοῦ λόγου ἀξιόθεν τῶν πολυτιτικῶν θεῶν, ἐν ΄εν ἀξιόθεν έπάνω, ἐν ΄εν πολυτιτικὴ πάνω. From this Order also, do the Oracles deduce, the Generation of the Matter, in these words, From hence (that is, from the Supreme Deity) altogether proceeds the Genesis of the Multiform Matter. Which unquestionably was one of those very Magick in Chaldian Oracles; and it may be further proved from hence, because it was by Porphyrius let down among them, as appears from Eneas Gaesius in his Theophrastus, ἐν ΄εν ἀξιόθεν οὖς ἐν ΄εν ἀξιόθεν θεᾶς, ταύτα ὃς ἐν τούτῳ ἐν ΄εν ἀξιόθεν, τοῦ ἀξιόθεν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς καλεῖ διότι, ὃς προφητεύει, ὁ ὑπάρχων τῷ πατρὶ, ὃς μὲν ἐν τῷ θεῷ, τῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ, εἰς τὸν ἐν τῷ θεῷ, ὃς γὰρ εἰς τῷ θεῷ γεννήθη. Neither was Matter void of Generation or Beginning, which the Chaldeans and Porphyrius teach thee; he making this the Title of a whole Book.
Book published by him, The Oracles of the Chaldeans, in which it is
confirmed, that Matter was Made.

Moreover that there was also in these Magick or Chalday Oracles,
a clear Signification of a Divine Triad, hath been already declared,
But we shall here produce Proclus his Testimony for it too, for he
and his Ptolemaeus in his Elogia, was of, and his Testimony, and the
Tychon Lévy who is in his Ptolemaeus, to the three
Oracles of which

The whole World sheweth forth a Triad or Trinity, the Head whereof, is
a Monad or Perfect Unity: Than which nothing can be plainer.

XVII. And now we pass out of Asia into Europe, from Zoroaster
to Orpheus. It is the Opinion of some Eminent Philologers of Latter
times, That there never was any such Man as Orpheus, but only in
Fairy-land, and that the whole History of Orpheus, was nothing but a
mere Romantic Allegory, utterly devoid of all Truth and Reality.
But there is nothing alledged for this Opinion from Antiquity, save
only this one Passage of Cicero’s concerning Aristotile; Orpheum
Post didoc; Aristoteles nunquam fausse. Aristotile teacheth that there
never was any such man as Orpheus the Poet; in which nowithstanding
Aristotile seems to have meant no more than this, that there was no
such Poet as Orpheus Senior to Homer, or that the Verses vulgarly
called Orphical, were not written by Orpheus. However, if it should
be granted, that Aristotile had denied the Existence of such a man; there
seems to be no reason at all, why his Single Testimony should here
preponderate, against the Universal Consent of all Antiquity, which
is for one Orpheus the Son of Oeages, by birth a Thracian, the Father
or Chief Founder, of the Mythical and Allegorical Theology amongst
the Greeks, and of all their most Arcane Religious Rites and Mysteries,
who is commonly supposed to have lived before the Trojan War,
(that is, in the time of the Israelitish Judges) or at least, to have been
Senior both to Hesiod and Homer; and also to have died a Violent
Death, most affirming him to have been torn in pieces by Women.
For which cause in that Vision of Herus Pamphylius in Plato, Orpheus
his Soul being to come down again, into another Body, is said to have
chosen rather, that of a Swan (a reputed Musical Animal) than to be
born again of a Woman, by reason of that great hatred, which he had
conceived of all Woman-kind, for his suffering such a Violent Death
from them. And the Historick Truth of Orpheus, was not only acknow-
ledged by Plato, but also by Icrates, Senior to Aristotile likewife
(Chap. IV. not a meer Romance 295

(in his Oration in the praise of Busiris;) and confirmed by that sober Historiographer Diodorus Siculus, he giving this Account of Orpheus, that he was a man who diligently applied himself to Literature, and having learned the Mystical Part of Theology, travelled into Egypt, where he attained to further knowledge, and became the greatest of all the Greeks, in the Mysteries of Religion, Theological Skill and Poetry. To which Pausanius addeth, that he gained great authority, that Orphic doctrine may be mentioned: as one, who being Orphus, &c. 

As being believed to have found out Expiations for wicked Actions, Remedies for Diseases, and Appointments of the Divine Displeasure. Neither was this History of Orpheus contradicted by Origen, when Celsus gave him so fit an occasion, and so strong a Provocation to do it, by his Preferring Orpheus, before our Saviour Christ. To all which may be added in the last place, that it being commonly concluded from the Greek word ὅρφικαδα, that the Greeks derived their Telette and Mysteries of Religion, from the Thracians, it is not so reasonable to think with the Learned Vossius, that Xanoclis was the Founder of them, (and not Orpheus) this Xanoclis being by most reported to have been Pythagoras his Servant, and consequently too much a Junior; and though Herodotus attribute more Antiquity to him, yet did he conceive him to have been no other than a Demon, who appearing to the Thracians, was worshipped by them; whereas in the mean time, the General Tradition of the Greeks, derived the Thracian Religious Rites and Mysteries, from Orpheus and no other, according to this of Suidas, λέγειν τό ὁρφικασ ὁρθος, πρωτος ἐπικοινωνει τα ἐφιλοφα μυστικα, ετι το πιον ἐνθα θεις ἔνθασιν έκλεισον, ἐς Ἑρωδοτος ὁς το διδασκει. It is commonly said, that Orpheus the Thracian, was the First Inventor of the Religious Mysteries of the Greeks, and that Religion was from hence called Threfcheia, as being Thracian Invention. Wherefore though it may well be granted, that by reason of Orpheus his great Antiquity, there have been many abulious and Romanick things intermingled with his History; yet there appears no reason at all, why we should disbelieve the Existence of such a Man.

But though there were such a man as Orpheus, yet may it very well question'd for all that. Whether any of those Poems, commonly attributed to him, and called Orphical, were so ancient, and indeed written by him. And this the rather, because Herodotus declares it his own Opinion, that Ἡρωδων and Homer, were the earliest of all. 

The Greek Poets, or οι περὶ ονταον καλαν ψαλμιον τότον την ἄνθρωπον γενιτυχον εἶσον ψαλμοι, and that those other Poets, said to have been before them, were indeed Juniors to them, meaning hereby in all probability, Orpheus, Musaeus and Linus. As also because Aristotle seems plainly to have followed Herodotus in this, he mentioning the Orphick Poems (in his book Of the Soul) after this manner, τα ὁρφικα καλαν ψαλμια.] The verses that are called Orphical. Besides which Cicero tells us that some attributed all the Orphick Poems to Cercops a Pythagorean, and it is all known, that many have attributed the same to another of that school, Orphrocritus, who lived in the times of the Ptolemats: Moreover we read more than once in Sextus Empiricus of ὁρφικασ ὁς τοις, τοις ὁρφικασ.)
Whether Orpheus were the Author, Book I.

Orphicus, Onomacritus in the Orphicks, Suidas also reports, that some of the Orphick Poems were anciently ascribed to Theognetus, others to Timoetes, others to Zopyrus, &c. From all which Grotsin seems to have made up this Conclusion: That the Pythagoricks entitled their own Books to Orpheus and Linus, just in the same manner, as Ancient Christians entitled theirs, some to the Sibyls, and others to Hermes Triumegist. Implying therein, that both the Orphick Poems and Doctrine, owed there very Being and First Original, only to the Pythagoreans. But on the other side, Clemens Alexandrinus affirmeth that Heraclitus the Philosopher borrowed many things from the Orphick Poems. And it is certain, that Plato does not only very much commend the Orphick Hymns, for their Suavity and Delicounes, but also produce some Verses out of them, without making any Scruple concerning their Author. Cicero himself, notwithstanding what he cites out of Ariostoile to the contrary, seems to acknowledge Orpheus for the most ancient Poet, he writing thus of Cleanthes, In Secundo Libro De Natura Deorum, vult Orphei, Mufaei, Hefiodi, Homeriique Fabellas accommodare ad ea quae ipsa de Diis Immortalibus scripserat, ut etiam Veterrimi Poetae, qui haec neiuspiciati quidem sint, Stoici suisse videantur; Cleanthes in his Second Book of the Nature of the Gods, endeavours to accommodate the Fables of Orpheus, Mufaeus, Hefiod and Homer, to those very things which himself had written concerning them; so that the most ancient Poets, who never dream'd of any such matter, are made by him to have been Stoicks. Diodorus Siculus affirmeth Orpheus to have been the Author of a most excellent Poem. And Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Athenagoras, and others, take it for granted, that Homer borrowed many Passages of his Poems from the Orphick Verses, and particularly that very Beginning of his Iliads,

Lastly, Jamblicbus testifieth, that by Moft Writers, Orpheus was represented as the ancients of all the Poets, adding moreover, what Diad. he wrote in, ad plerae νυν της ιστοριας αποφασις, περιπληστι της δοξαι κλασικης διαλεκτις νυν ορφικη, περιπληστι υπα της πωτερ. Most of the Historiographers declare, that Orpheus, who was the ancientst of all the Poets, wrote in the Dorick Dialekt. Which if it be true, then those Orphick Fragments, that now we have, (preferred in the Writings of such as did not Dorize) must have been transformed by them out of their Native Idiom. Now as concerning Herodotus, who supposing Homer and Hesiod to have been the ancientest of all the Greek Poets, seemed therefore to conclude the Orphick Poems to have been Pheudegraphous; himself intimates that this was but a Singular Opinion, and as it were, Paradox, of his own, the contrary thereunto being then generally received. However Ariostoile probably, might therefore be more inclinable to follow Herodotus in this, because he had no great kindness for the Pythagoric or Orphick Philosophy. But it is altogether Irrational and Abfurd to think, that the Pythagoricks would entitle their Books to Orpheus, as designing to gain credit and authority to them thereby; had there been no such Doctrine before, either contained in some ancient Monument of Orpheus.
of the Poems called Orphical.

or at least transmitted down by Oral Tradition from him. Wherefore the Pythagorics themselves constantly maintain, that before Pythagoras' time, there was not only an Orphick Cabala Extant, but also Orphick Poems. The Former was declared in that ancient Book called τετελεσθέντα λόγος, or The Holy Oration; if we may believe Proclus upon the Timeus, προτείνεται δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ τιμία τοῦ πρὸ τιμίαν διὰ τοῦκατακοιμηθείσαν οὐκ ἐγένεται. "A ἡ ορθὴ διὰ ἀπολύφθειν λόγῳ μετακατακοιμηθείσα, ταύτα πιστεύει εἰρεμένοι ἐρμηνεύει εἰς λειτουργίας τοῦ ὁράτου, ἀλασομόμοις τελέσθε μετακατακοιμηθείσαι. Ταύτα γὰρ θεόν ἐν πιστεύειν τῶν ἱερότητων. Timeus being a Pythagorean, follows the Pythagorick Principles, and these are the Orphick Traditions: or what things Orpens deliver'd Mystically, (or in arcane Allegories) these Pythagoras learn'd when he was initiated by Aglaosophemus in the Orphick Mysteries, Pythagoras himself affirming as much in his Book called, The Holy Oration. Where Proclus without any doubt or scruple, entitles the Book inscribed τετελεσθέντα λόγος or The Holy Oration, to Pythagoras himself. Indeed several of the ancients have resolved, Pythagoras to have written nothing at all, as Flavius Josephus, Plutarch, Lucian and Porphyrius 3, and Epigenes in Clemens Alex. affirms that the τετελεσθέντα λόγος or Holy Oration, was written by Ceropes a Pythagorean. Nevertheless Diogenes Laertius thinks them not to be in good earnest, who deny Pythagoras to have written any thing, and he tells us that Heracleides acknowledged this τετελεσθέντα λόγος or Holy Oration for a genuine and indubitate Faus of Pythagoras. Jamblichus is also of the same opinion, as the most received; though confessing some to have attributed that Book, to Telauges Pythagoras his Son. But whoever was the Writer of this Hieros Logos, whether Pythagoras himself, or Telauges, or Ceropes, it must needs be granted to be of great antiquity, according to the Testimony whereof, Pythagoras derived much of his Theology, from the Orphick Traditions. Moreover Ion Chins in his Trigrammi testified, as Clemens Alexandrinus informeth us, that Pythagoras himself referred some Poems to Orpheus as their Author; which is also the General fences of Platonists as well as Pythagoreans. Wherefore upon all accounts, it seems most probable, That either, Orphes himself wrote some Philosophick or Theologic Poems, though certain other Poems might be also father'd on him, because written in the same strain, of Mystical and Allegorical Theology, and as it were in the same Spirit, with which this Thracian Prophet was inspired: Or else at least, that the Orphick Doctrine, was first conveyed down by Oral Cabala or Tradition from him, and afterwards forits better Preservation, expressed in Verses, that were imputed to Orpens, after the same manner, as the Golden Verfes written by Lysias, were to Pythagoras. And Philoponus intimates this Latter to have been Aristotle's Opinion concerning the Orphick Verses: He glossing thus upon those words of Aristotle before cited, καθαλαφθὼν ἐπτ' ἐνα καθαλαφθὼν ἐπτ', ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνα καθαλαφθὼν ἐπτ', ἐπὶ το.interfaces λέξις. λέξις ὁν τί τα ἐνα καθαλαφθώ, καθαλαφθώ δὲ λέξις ἐνα καθαλαφθών ἐπτ' ἐνα καθαλαφθών. Aristotle calls them the Reputed Orphick Verses, because they seem not to have been written by Orpheus himself, as the same Aristotle affirmeth in his Book of Philosophy. The Doctrine and Opinions of them indeed were his, but Dionysiacus is said to have put them into Verse. However, there can be
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No doubt at all made, but that the Orphick Poems, by whomsoever Written, were some of them of great antiquity (they being much older than either Aristotle, Plato or Herodotus) as they were also had in great esteem amongst the Pagans; and therefore we may very well make a judgment of the Theology of the ancient Pagans, from them.

Now that Orpheus, the Orphick Doctrines, and Poems, were Polytheistical, is a thing acknowledged by all. Justin Martyr affirms that Orpheus asserted Three Hundred and Sixty Gods; he also belittles upon him, this Honourable Title (if it may be so accounted) of polytheistical...
Nevertheless, fymbo-...

But that Orpheus, notwithstanding all his Polytheism or Multiplicity of Gods, acknowledged one Supreme Unmade Deity, as the Original of all things, may be firft presumed from hence, because those Two Most Religious Philosophick Sects, the Pythagoreans and Platonists, not only had Orpheus in great esteem, he being commonly called by them ὁ Ὀρφής, The Theologer, but were also thought, in great measure to have owed their Theology and Philosophy to him, as deriving the name from his Principles and Traditions. This hath been already intimated and might be further proved. Pythagoras, as we are informed by Porphyrios and Iamblichus, learn'd something from all thefe Four, from the Egyptians, from the Persian Magi, from the Chaldeans, and from Orpheus or his Followers. Accordingly Syrianus makes ὁ Πυθαγόρας, The Orphick and Pythagorick Principles to be one and the fame. And as we understand from Suidas, the fame Syrianus wrote a Book entitled, Ἡ Εὐανθία Ὀρφικος Πυθαγορικος ὕμνος. The Harmony of Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato. Proclus, besides the place before cited, frequently insifts upon this elsewhere, in his Commentary upon the Timæus, as p. 289. Πυθαγόρας οὖν ὁ τῶν Ὀρφικῶν παρακάλων. "Anaximenes of the Orphics ὁ παρακάλων δίκαιος Ὀρφικός ἦν παρισυπτὸν. It is Pythagorical to follow be Orphick Genealogies. For from the Orphick Tradition downward by Pythagoras, was the knowledge of the Gods derived to the Greeks. And that he Orphick Philosophy did really agree and symbolize with that which afterward was called Pythagorick and Platonick, and was of the fame train with it, may be gathered from that of Plato in his Cratylus, where he speaks concerning the Etymology of the Greek Word ὤν. ὡς Ὀρφήές, ὁ μικότα, ἡ μικάται Ὀρφής ὥστε τὸ ὄνωμα, ὡς ὡς ὁ Ὄρφηος ὥστε τὸ ὄνωμα, ὡς ὁ Ὀρφήος ὥστε τὸ ὄνωμα. ὡς ὁ Ὀρφήος ὥστε τὸ ὄνωμα. Orpheus and his followers seem to me to have given the best Etymology of this word ὄνωμα (from σανεικόει ) That the Soul is here in a State of unifomity, its Body being a Prison to it, wherein it is kept in custody, till its Debt or Faults be expiated, and is therefore called σανεικόει. Now these three Philosophies, the Platonick, Pythagorick, and Orphick, symbolizing so much together, it is probable that as the Platonick and Pythagorick, so the Orphick likewise, derived all their Gods from One self-existent Deity.

Which may be further manifested, from that Epitome of the Orphick Shrine, made long since by Timotheus the Chronographer in his Cofmography, still extant in Cedrenus and Eusebius Chronica, and imperfectly set down.
down by *Suidas* (upon the Word *Orpheus*) as his own, or without mentioning the Authors Name:—*εἰς ἄριστον ἀνέφεσθα τῷ κόσμῳ ὁ Οὐρής, ὑπὸ τῷ Θεῷ δυνατόνθην. *First of all the Ether was made by God,* and after the *Ether* a Chaos; a Dark and dreadful Night, then covering all under the whole *Ether.* *Senecios* thus explains, Orpheus hereby signifying (faith *Timotheus*) that Night was Seniour to day, or that the World had a Beginning; eiriakis εἰς τῇ αὐτῇ εὐχεθείς, ἀκτολαμπτόν του ἑα πέταλον ὑπεταίον ἔνα, προκεῖσθαι αὐτῷ τῷ δυναμεὶ των, εἰ αὐτῷ τῷ αἰθέρι, εἰ πάντων τῷ ὑπ’ αὐτῷ ἀιθέρι.* He having declared also in his Exposition, that there was a certain Incomprehensible Being, which was the Highest and Oldest of all things, and the Maker of every thing, even of the *Ether* itself, and all things under the *Ether.* But the Earth being then invisible by reason of the Darkness, a Light breaking out through the *Ether,* illuminated the whole Creation: This Light being said by him, to be that Highest of all Beings (before mentioned) which is called also Counsellor and Life. *Τῶν τὸ τετράδικτα* (to use *Suidas* his words here) μιαν ἄριστον ἀνέφεσθα, εἰ εἰ κρατέρ οἱ δυναμεὶ πάντων τῆς, τό πάντα εἰ τῷ μιᾷ ὑπ’ ἀκτολαμπτάλος εἰ τῇ ἐνα. *These Three Names in Orpheus (Light, Counsell and Life) declaring one and the same Force and Power of that God, who is the Maker of all, and who produceth all out of Nothing into Being, whether Visible or Invisible. To conclude with *Timotheus:* 'ος αὐτῷ ὁ Ὀρφῆς, ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ βίβλῳ πεταίθην, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰς τῶν ὑπετάνθων μᾶς Ἀντίκοις. τα πάντα ἔχεται, εἰ αὐτός εἰς τῆς πάντως. And the same Orpheus in his Book declared, that all things were made by one Godhead in Three Names, and that this God is all things.

But that Orpheus asserted *One Supreme Deity,* as the Original of all things, is unquestionably evident from the *Orphick Verses* themselves; of which notwithstanding, before we mention any, in way of Proof, we shall premise this Observation, or rather Suspicion of our own; That there seem to be some *Orphick Verses* supposititious, as well as there were *Sibylline*; they being counterfeited either by Christians or Jews. For we must freely profess, for our own part, that we cannot believe all that to be genuine, which is produced by ancient Fathers as *Orphical,* that is, either to have been written by Orpheus himself, or else by *Onomacritus,* or any other Pagan of that Antiquity, according to the *Orphick Cabala* or Tradition.

As for example, this concerning Moses,

"Ως λύγος ἀρχισω, ἢς υπερφυΐς διητάζειν, Ἕκ τε ὅπερ ἔν δυσμίμα σκοτεὶ αὐτῷ ἡπέλασα τεσσάρον,"

Ut habeat sermo antiquorum, ut Ex-aqua-ortus descriptus, Acceptâ divinitis Lege que Duplicia Praecepta continet.

And this that is commonly understood of Abraham,

"οὐ γάρ κέν τις ἰδεῖν ψυχήν, μεταγενὲν καλινάν, "

Eì μι κοινογνώσιν τοις ἀπολλοβίων φόλων ἀναθέν χαλδαῖον, ιδέας γάρ εἰν ἰδιοί παράτης.

No.
CHAPTER IV.

Professed Monarchist.

Non enim quisquam mortalium videre posset cum qui hominibus imperat; 
Nisi Unigenitus quidam profectus ab antiqua origine Gentis Chaldeorum; Sciebat enim atri cursus.

The manifest Forgery of which, might make one suspect also some other Passages, such as this concerning the Divine Logoi:

Eis ἣ λόγον θεὸν μακάριος, τότε πρὸς Ελευθερο, "Ιδοὺ οὗτος ὁ λαός αὐτῶν νῦν ἐστὶν."

Wherefore, it being not ingenuous, to lay stress upon that for the Proof of any thing, which our selves believe not to be sincere and genuine; we shall here cite no Orphick Verses, for the acknowledgment of One Supreme Deity, but only such as we find attested in Pagan Writings. As first of all that Copy produced by Proclus upon the Timeaus:

To this Sense: Wherefore, together with the Universe, were made within Jupiter, the Height of the Ethereal Heaven, the Breadth of the Earth and Sea, the great Ocean, the Profound Tartara, the Rivers and Fountains, and all the other things; all the Immortal Gods, and Goddeses. Whatsoever hath been, or shall be, was at once contained in the Tomb of Jupiter.

Proclus understands this of the Idea's of all things, being in God, before the World was produced, that is, in order of Nature only, he appolling them in time Coeve. However it is plain, that all things are to becontained in the Womb and Fecundity of One Self-originated Deity; not only all the other Gods and Goddeses, but every thing else whatsoever.

Again Proclus in the same place, ushers in another Copy of Orphick Verses (which are also found in the Writer de Mundo) after this manner: ἦλθεν Ἰδéa καὶ πάνθερα ἢν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ θέλημας ὡς τοῦ καὶ πάντα τοῦ παντοτέκνου. The Demiurgus or Maker of the World, being full of Ideas, did by these comprehend all things within himself, as that Theologer also declareth in these following Verses:

These are the opening verses of the Orphic Hymn to the Logoi, which Proclus quotes as an example of the Orphic teaching. The Logoi are the primordial ideas or archetypes that underlie all creation. The passage suggests a view of the universe as a collective mind, where all things are contained within the divine mind of the Logoi.
Proved clearly that the Orpheists Book I.

Which likewise in plain Prose is this: The high-thundering Jove is both the First and the Last; Jove is both the Head and Middle of all things; All things were made out of Jupiter; Jove is both a Man and an Immortal Maid; Jove is the Profundity of the Earth and Stary Heaven; Jove is the Breath of all things; Jove is the Force of the un-tameable Fire; Jove the Bottom of the Sea; Jove is Sun, Moon and Stars; Jove is both the Original, and King of all things: There is one Power, and One God, and one great Ruler over all.

Where though there be many strange Expressions, yet this seems to be the strangest of them all, that Jupiter should be said to be, both a Man, and an Immortal Maid. But this is nothing but a Poetic Description of the Divine Person, Male and Female together. And it was a thing very familiar with all the Mystical Theologers amongst the Pagans, to call God ζυγευμον, Male and Female together; they signifying thereby Emphatically, The Divine Fecundity, or the Generative and Creative Power of the Deity; that God was able from himself alone, to produce all things. Thus Damaseus the Philosopher, writing of this very Orphick Theology, expounds it, ἀρνοντες θεον ἐν των ὑπερβολαῖον, παίς ἐν τῷ πάντων ἔνοπτον ἐγκλέα. The Orphick Theology calls the First Principle, Hermaphroditick, or Male and Female together; thereby denoting that Essence, that is Generative or Producing of all things. And that Learned and Pious Christian Bishop, Synesius, it seems thought the Expression so harmless, that he scrupled not himself to make use of it. in those elegant and devout Hymns of his to God Almighty.

Σαν πατης, Σαν δ' ήσαι ματες, Σαν ηφις, Σαν _odd咝.  
Του Πατερ, Του εσ Ματερ;  
Του Μας, Του Φαμινα.

Besides these, there are also certain other Orphick Verses, scatter'd up and down in Proclus, but cited altogether in Eusebius out of Porphyris, in which the whole World is represented, as One Great Animal, God being the Soul thereof.

"Εν χ μνας προσλαΐαν εκ ου τοιδε πάντα καυκλάτων,  
που αγαθε, ες αγαθα, ες αληθε, νους την ουλαε.  
Και μνησας πρωτον υμεντον, ες ερεσ πολυπατης.  
Πάντα γε ας μεγάλως παλαιος τοιδε καυκλατων.  
Το αυτι καρπασθη υδον ιδεις, ες καλα πεποτων.  
Ουματος αιγυλης εν χρυσως άμφυς θεσει  
Ασρω μακαμαραν δεκαλλως πρεσβειαν, κ.λ.ν.  

Omnia
Omnia Regali sunt haec in corpore clausa,
Ignis & Unda, & Terra, &cither cum Nothe Dieque:
(Confirma, Primus Gemitor, cum Numine Amoris:)
Jupiter immenso Sub Corpore umbra coerct:
Et hujus Caput Eximium, Vestisque decoros
Undique splendens Calum, cui pendula circum
Aurea Caesaries Aflorum dumus fundit:
Sunt oculi Phoebus, Phoebique adversa recurrent
Cynthia, &c.

Where probably that one Verse,
Kal Mutis, πρεπε χαλώτας, ε*ιερος πιλατινος·

though truly Orphical, and indeed Divine (it signifying that Mind and Love were the First Begetters and Original of all thing:) was notwithstanding, clap'd in uuduly out of some other place. But from all these Citations, it plainly appears, that according to the Orphick Theology, though there were many Gods and Goddesses too, admitted, yet here was One Original and King of them all, One Supreme Deity acknowledged. We are not ignorant, that some of the ancient and learned fathers, conceiving it contradicitious, for Orpheus at the same time, o affert both Many Gods, and One God, apprehended this to be a convenient Salvo for this Difficulty, to suppose that Orpheus had by Fits and Turns, been of different Humours and Persuasions; First a Rank Polytheist, affirming Three Hundred Gods, and more; and then afterwards a Converted Monotheist; they being the rather led into this Opinion, by reason of certain Counterfeit Orphick Verses in Aristoxenus, made probably by some ignorant Jew; wherein Orpheus is made to sing a Palinodia or Recantation, for his former Error and Polytheism. But we must crave leave with all due respect, to dissent from Reverend Antiquity in this, it plainly appearing from that First Orphick Exception in Proclus, that Orpheus at the same time acknowledged, both One Unmade Deity (the Original of all things) and Many Generated Gods and Goddesses, that were all contained in it.

Having now made it sufficiently evident from such Orphick Fragments, as have been acknowledged by Pagan Writers and by them cited out of Orpheus his Hymns and Rhapsodies; that the Opinion of Monarchy or One Self-existent Deity, the Original of all things, was an Essential Part of the Orphick Theology or Cabala; we shall here further observe, at besides this Opinion of Monarchy (but consistently with the same) Trinity also of Divine Hypotheses Subordinate, was another part of Orphick Cabala. Proclus upon Plato's Timaeus, making an Enquiry to Plato's Demiurgus or Opifex of the World, gives us an account of some other Platonists, of the Doctrine of Amelius (who was contemporary with Plotinus, and who is said to have taken notice of St. John the Evangelist had written concerning the Logos, as agreeing with the Platonick and Pythagoric Hypotheses) after this manner: Ἀμηλίου ἐφῳ τε τεταρτων, τε τεταρτων, τε τεταρτων, τε τεταρτων...
A Trinity, part
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Amelius makes a Threefold Demiurgus or Opifex of the World, Three Minds and Three Kings: Him that Is, Him that Hath, and Him that Beholds. Which Three Minds differ thus, in that the First is Essentially that which he is (or all Perfection: ) The Second is its own Intelligible, but Hath the First (as something distinct from it) and indeed partakes thereof, and therefore is Second. The Third, is also that Intelligible of its own, (for every Mind is the same thing with its correspondent Intelligible) but Hath which is in the Second, and Beholds the First. For how much severer every Being departs from the First, so much the Obscurer is it. After which Proclus immediately subsygnifies, tótes én tois tès énay hìs dýmpasegès úpsilíthmì, hì tès xúròs tòs Pláton; tèss wpalíades, hì tès parí Oeceri tèss, plátow, hì Ouagwòs, hì Kéyson, hì òp\~n òpò tois aútoph dýmpasegès ó fvbòhs dévni: Amelius therefore supposesthese Three Minds and Demiurgick Principles of his, to be both the same with Plato's Three Kings, and with Orpheus his Trinity, of Phanes, Uranus, and Chronus; but Phanes is supposed by him to be principally the Demiurgus. Where though Proclus (who had some Peculiar Phanefys and Whimfys of his own, and was indeed a Confounder of the Platonick Theology, and a Mister of much unintelligible Stuff with it) does himself avow a Monad or Unity, Superior to this Whole Trinity, yet does he seem nevertheless, rightly to contend against Amelius, that it was not the First Hypothesis neither in the Platonick nor Orphick Trinity, that was chiefly and properly the Demiurgus or Opifex of the World, but the Second. And thus Proclus his Master Syriannus had before determined, that in the Orphick Theology, the Title of Opifex, did properly belong to Orpheus his συνεπεκάιν, or First-begotten God, which was the same with Plato's Νέος or Divine Intellect. Agreeably whereunto Proclus his Conclusion is, τις ρε μοι εν τις χρώνεις ειτέ ηύν ης Θεος αυτος πολύς αυτης, ερημει δια των πατών, ει δέτοι υπάν των οκτα τοις τοις Πλάτων, αυτης αυτης υπέρμετον άνακρι σεις, απο των άπο των άνεσε. Thus much may suffice to have declared, who is the Demiurgus of the World, namely, that it is the Divine Intellect, which is the proper and immediate Cause of the whole Creation, and that it is one and the same Demiurgical Jupiter, that is praised both by Orpheus and Plato. Now besides this, it is observable that Damascius in his Book διαίη αιγεων, or Concerning the Principles (not yet published) giving an account of the Orphick Theology, tells us amongst other things, that Orpheus introduced, τε μεροπον σειν, a Triform Deity. To all which may be added what was before cited out of Timotheus the Chronographer, That God had Three Names, Light, Counsel, and Life, and that all things were made by one Deity under these Three several Names. Where Cedrenus, the Preverber of that excellent Fragment of Antiquity, concludes in this manner: τε ωστιο τιμήδος συνεγελολονον δια βασιλευσιον, άπο αυτοις περι της τοσον χρίσον, ερημει, απο υσιν υπέρμετον ανακρι σεις. These things Timotheus the Chronographer wrote, affirming Orpheus;
long ago, to have declared, That All things were made by a Coessential or Consubstantial Trinity. Which though otherwise it might be looked upon supposically, because that Timotheus was a Christian (especially in regard of that word εἰμι) yet by comparing it with what we have before alleged, out of Pagan Writers, it appears, that so far as concerns an Orphick Trinity, it was not altogether vainly Written, or without Ground by him.

But we have not yet done with Orpheus and the Orphick Theology before we have made one further Reflection upon it, so as to take notice of that strong and rank Haut-gout, which was in it, of making God to be All. As for example, if we may repeat the forecited Pallahes, and put in the Name of God, instead of Ζάς or Τυτφι; of Ζάς Ζαίτις, This Universe, and all things belonging to it, were made within God. Ζάς είναι γαρ εύφη μικρα, Paraphr. All things were contained together in the Womb of God: Ζάς κεραλή Ζάς μεκανος, God is the Head and Middle of all things: Ζάς πάυμα χαίνας, &c. God is the Basis of the Earth and Heaven: God is the Depth of the Sea: God is the Breath of all (or the Air that we breathe) God is the Force of the Untameable Fire: God is Sun, Moon and Stars. Τιταν Ζαίτις, There is One singly (or Divine) Body: and

πάντα ΣΩ είναι μεγάλος Ζαίτις πετά σωµατί πάνω,

for All these things lie in the Great Body of God. And thus was the Orphick Theology before represented also by Timotheus the Chronographer, as Σατανατος πατίας παράδειγμα, ζεύς εκτές ζεύς παλά, All things were made by God, and Himself is All Things.

But further to prove that the ancient Greekish Pagans, were indeed of such a Religious Humour as this, to resolve All Things into God, and to make God All, we shall here cite a Remarkable Testimony of Plutarch's, out of his Deceit of Oracles: Μήν πάντας παλαόντας αυτίς έχόντας, P. 43ο. Μήν οφαίνεις πελάλης δείλοις ζεύς πετάτω, τι περίεργον μένον ή τον περιβλέπον ένδοιο, κατά δέ η το κατάπληκτον καταπλήκτον ποιον περιβλέπον,

Ζάς αρχή, Ζεύς μετα, δίς σ' εκ πολυτά πελάτων.

As if it was evident to them, that All things were called Ornaments, one of them containing that of those that contain all things, ζεύς εκ τού περιβλέπον αυτίς, or the same as they called it, ζεύς εκ τού περιβλέπον ποιον περιβλέπον. Whereas there are Two Causes of all Generation (the Divine and the Natural) the most ancient Theologers and Writers, attended only to the more excellent of these Two, (the Divine Cause) solving all things into God, and pronouncing this of them univerally, but God was both the Beginning, and Middle, and that all things were of God. Insomuch that these had no regard at all to the other Natural and Necessary Causes of things. But on the contrary their Juniors, who were called Physici (or Naturalists) straying from this most excellent and Divine Principle, placed all in Bodies, their Passions, Collisions, Mutations and Commixtures together.
Theologers and Poets, Plutarch plainly meant Orpheus and his Followers, it being an Orphick Verse, that is here cited by him, whereby he gives also an acknowledgment of their Antiquity. But by their Juniors, who are called Physici, he could understand no other, than those First Ionic Philosophers, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Hippo, and the rest, whom those Degenerate Italicks afterward followed, Atomizing Atheistically, Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus. So that here we have another Confirmation also, of what was before affected by us, that the Ionick Philosophers after Thales, and before Anaxagoras, were generally Atheistical. And indeed from them the word *common* or Naturalists, came to be often used as Synonymous with *Physico* or Atheistic. Now these Two are here condemned by Plutarch, for Two Contrary Extremes; the One who resolved all into Natural and Necessary Causes, that is, into Matter, Motion, and Qualities of Bodies, leaving out the Divine Cause, as guilty of Atheism; the other, who altogether neglecting the Natural and Necessary Causes of things, resolved all into the Divine Cause, as it were swallowing up all into God, as guilty of a kind of Fanaticism. And thus we see plainly, that this was one Grand Arcanum of the Orphick Cabala, and the ancient Grecian Theology, That God is All things.

Some Fanaticks of Latter Times, have made God to be All, in a Grofs Sense, so as to take away all Real Distinction betwixt God and the Creature, and indeed to allow no other Being besides God; they supposing the Substance of every thing, and even of all Inanimate Bodies, to be the very Substance of God himself, and all the variety of things that is in the World, to be nothing but God under several Forms, Appearances and Disguises. The Stoicks anciently made God to be All, and All to be God, in somewhat a different way; they conceiving God properly to be the Active Principle of the whole Corporeal Universe, which yet (because they admitted of no Incorporeal Substance) they supposed, together with the Passive or the Matter, to make up but one and the same complete Substance. And others who acknowledged God to be an Incorporeal Substance distinct from the Matter, have notwithstanding made All to be God also, in a certain sense; they supposing God to be nothing but a Soul of the World, which together with the Matter, made up all into One entire Divine Animal. Now the Orphick Theologers cannot be charged with making God all, in that Firle and Grossly Fanatick Sense; as if they took away all Real Distinction betwixt God and the Creature, they so affenting God to be all, as that notwithstanding, they allowed other things to have Distinct Beings of their own. Thus much appearing from that Riddle, which in the Orphick Verse was proposed by the Maker of the World, to Night.

How can All things be One, and yet Every thing have a distinct Being in its own? Where "εν τι τα πάντα, All things One, or One all things seems to be the Supreme Deity, or Divine Intellect, as Proclus all interprets it, τα όλα εις μοναδικας ε εις ωρεσ, και η τον πάντα μοναδικάς ες ωρεσ, και
Chap. IV. Theology, That God is All.
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Jupiter who containeth the Universè, and All things within himfelf, Univitely and Intellectually, according to these Orphick Oracles, gives a Particular Subsistence of their own also, to all the Mundane Gods, and other parts of the Universè. And this is χείρος ᾿Ετέρος, in that fore-cited Orphick Verse. Every thing a-part by it felf, the whole Produced or Created Universè, with all its Variety of things in it; which yet are Orphically faid to be God also, in a certain other fence, that shall be declared afterward. Nor can the Orphick Theologers be charged with making God All, in the Second Stoical Sence, as if they denied all Incorporeal Subfance; they plainly aferting as Damæfius and others particularly note, ᾿Ην ἄνδρακτον, an Incorporeal Deity. But as for the Third way it is very true, that the Orphick Theologers, did frequently call the World, The Body of God, and its Several Parts, His Members, making the Whole Universè to be one Divine Animal; Notwithstanding which they fup- poped not, this Animated World to be the First and Higheft God, but either ἄνθρωπος τός, as the Hermaick or Trimegiflick Writers call t, The Second God; or elfe as Numenius and others of the Platonifts peak, τοῦ τοῦ, The Third God: the Soul thereof being as well in the Orphick; as it was in the Pythagorick and Platonick Trinity, but he Third Hypofta~; they fupposing Two other Divine Hypoftases uperior thereunto, which were perfectly Secret from Matter. Wherefore, as to the Supreme Deity, thefe Orphick Theologers, made him to be All things, chiefly upon the Two following Accompts. firf because All things coming from God, they inferred, that therefore they were all contain'd in Him, and confequently were in a cer- tin fence Himself; thus much being declared in thofe Orphick Verfes noted by Proclus and others;

πάντα τά δυνάμεις, ἀλήθειας ἕν τοις πολυμνοίς.

which Apuleius thus renders,

Namque SinOccultant, dulces in luminis oras
Cuntia tult, facro versans sub pede curas.

The Sence whereof is plainly this; That God at firft Hiding or Occult-containing all things within himfelf, did from thence display them; ad bring them forth into light, or diftinft Beings of their own, and so take the World. The Second is, Because the World, produced by God, and really existing without him, is not therefore quite cut off from him, nor subsists alone by it felf as a Dead Thing, but is still lively united to him, effentially Dependent on him, always Supported and Upheld, Quickned and Enlivened, Acted and Pervaded by him; according to that Orphick Passage, 'ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς αὐτοτελεῖ — God paffes through and intimately pervades All things.

Now it is very true, that some Christian Theologers also have made God to be All, according to these Latter fences; as when they affirm the whole
whole World to be nothing else but Deum Explicatum, God Expanded or Unfolded, and when they call the Creatures, as St. Jerom and others often do, Radios Deitatis, the Rays of the Deity. Nay the Scripture itself may seem, to give some countenance also hereunto, when it tells us, That Of Him, and Through Him, and To Him, are All things, which in the Orphick Theology was thus expressed, God is the Beginning, and Middle, and End of All things; That of was called συμ αύτοϋ του τοῦ, All things were made in him, as in the Orphick Verses, —οίλες δι' ουτως εκ του αυτου, All things consist in him: That, In Him we Live and Move, and have our Being; That God doth ζωοποιηθαι πάντα, Quicken all things, and that he ought to be made, παντας αυτον, All in All; which supposeth him in some sense to be so. Norwithstanding which, this is a very Ticklish Point, and easily liable to Mistake and Abuse: and, as we conceive, it was the Mistake and Abuse of this One Thing, which was the Chief Ground and Original of the both Seeming and Real Polytheism, not only of the Greekish and European, but also of the Egyptian and other Pagans; as will be more particularly declared afterwards: They concluding that because God was All things, and consequently All things God; that therefore God ought to be Worshipped in All things, that is, in all the several Parts of the World, and Things of Nature; but especially in those Animated Intellectual Beings, which are Superiour to Men. Consentaneously whereunto, they did both θεολογεϊν και ποιειν, Theologize or Deifie all things, looking upon every thing as having ἀγαθοποιηθαι τι, something Supernatural, or a kind of Divinity in it; and also bestowed Several Names upon God, according to all the several Parts of the World, and Things of Nature, calling him in the Starry Heaven and Ether; in the Air, Juno; in the Winds, Aeolus; in the Sea, Neptune; in the Earth and Subterraneous Parts Pluto; in Learning, Knowledge and Invention, Minerva and the Muse; in War, Mars; in Pleasure, Venus; in Corn, Ceres; in Wine, Bacchus; and the like.

However it is unquestionably Evident from hence, that Orpheus with his Followers, that is, the Generality of the Greekish Pagans, acknowledged one Universal and All-comprehending Deity, One that was All; and consequently could not admit of Many Self-existant and Independent Deities.

XVIII. Having treated largely concerning the Two most Eminent Polytheists amongst the ancient Pagans, Zoroaster and Orpheus and clearly proved that they allferred One Supreme Deity; we shall in the next place observe, that the Egyptians themselves also, notwithstanding their Multiforms Polytheism and Idolatry, had an acknowledgment, amongst them, of One Supreme, and Universal Nomen.

There hath been some Controversie amongst Learned Men, Whether Polytheism and Idolatry had their first rise from the Egyptians or the Chaldeans, because the Pagan Writers for the most part give the Precedency here to the Egyptians: Lucian himself, who was by Birth a Syrian, and a diligent enquirer into the Antiquities of his own Country
Country, affirming that the Syrians and Assyrians received their religion and gods first from the Egyptians: and before Lucian, Herodotus the Father of History, reporting likewise that the Egyptians were the first, that erected Temples and Statues to the Gods. But whether the Egyptians or Chaldeans were the first Polytheists and Idolaters, there is no question to be made, but that the Greeks, and Europeans generally derived their Polytheisms and Idolatry from the Egyptians. Herodotus affirms in one place, that the Greeks received their Twelve Gods from thence, and in another, that ἕβεν ὥλνα τα ἱδονα τινας αὐτον ἅτα ποιησασθαι. Almost all the Names of the Gods, came first out of Egypt into Greece. In what sense this might be true of ἀλος it self, though the word be Originally Greek, shall be declared afterwards: But it is probable that Herodotus had here a further meaning, that the very Names of many of the Greekish Gods, were originally Egyptian. In order to the confirmation of which, we shall here propound a Conjecture concerning One of them, viz. 'Αγαύα, called otherwife by the Greeks Παλλας, and by the Latins Minerva. For first, the Greek Etymologies of this word, seem to be all of them either Trifling and Frivolous, or Violent and Forced. Plato in his Cratylus having observed, that according to the ancient Allegorical Interpreters of Homer, 'Αγαύα, was nothing else but ἔς or ἔξων, Mind or Understanding Perfomned and Deified, conceived that the first imposers of that Name, intending to signify thereby Divine Wisdom called it τῆς Μόρυς, with The Understanding of God, or the Knowledge of Divine things; as if the Word had been at first θεόνυμον, and thence afterward transformed into 'Αγαύα. But being not fully satisfied himself with this Etymology, he afterwards attempts another, deriving the Word from νόημος ὡς τῆς Ἠλίης, Knowledge concerning Manners or Practical Knowledge; as if it had been at first θεόνυμον, and from thence changed into 'Αγαύα. Others of the Greeks have deduced this Word, ἀπὸ τῆς ἔρημης, because it is the Property of Wisdom, to collect all into One, supposing that it was at first 'Αγαύα. Others would fetch it from Σάλως and Alpha Prativise, because Μινερβα or Wisdom, though she be a Goddess, yet hath nothing of Feminine Imperfection in her. Others again would etymologize it, ἀπὸ τῆς μὴ περιπλανήτης Σάλως ή ποταμὸς τω ἐκεῖνῳ, because Virtue or Wisdom, is of such a Noble and Generous temper, as that it scorning to subject itself to any base and unworthy servitude. Lastly, others would derive it, ἀπὸ τῆς τέρησας, affirming it to have been at first Μεγαλουδα. From all which uncertainty of the Greeks concerning the Etymology of this Word, 'Αγαύα, and from the Frivolouness or Forskednes of these Conjectures, we may rather conclude, that it was not originally Greekish but Exotical, and probably, according to Herodotus, Egyptian. Wherefore let us try whether or no, we can ind any Egyptian Word from whence this 'Αγαύα might be derived. Plato in his Timeus, making mention of Sais a City in Egypt, where Solon sometime sojourned, tells us, ὥς ἐν πάλαις ἐκεῖς ἐξηραμένα ἥνη, ἀπὸ τούτων Νείθ, ἐμφασις ἢ, ὡς ἐκεῖνων λογίσας, 'Αγαύα, That the President or Tutelar God of that City was called in the Egyptian Language Neith, but in the Greek, as the same Egyptians affirm, 'Αγαύα. Now why might not this very Egyptian word Neith, by an evil inversion
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have
have been at first turned into Thien or Θεῖον, (men commonly pronouncing Exotic words ill-favouredly) and then by additional Alpha's at the beginning and end, transformed into Ἀθλοῦκ. This seems much more probable, than either Plato's Ὥδεια, or Ἡβοῖον, or any other of those Greek Etymologies before-mentioned. And as the Greeks thus derived the Names of many of their Gods from the Egyptians, so do the Latins seem to have done the like, from this one Instance of the word Neptune, which though Varro would deduce à nabendo, as if it had been Nuptium, because the Sea covers and hides the Land, and Sea-liger with others, &c. to ἰον, from Wafting, this being the chief use of Water, yet as the learned Bochart hath observed, it may with greater probability be derived from the Egyptian word Nephthys. Plutarch telling us, ὧν ὄντων καλεῖται τα ἣτα ἤλθεν καὶ τεκελεῖ ὦν ἴκος ὧν ἵκεσι, that the Egyptians called the Maritime parts of Land, or such as border upon the Sea, Nephthys. Which Conjecture may be further confirmed from what the same Plutarch elsewhere writes, that as Isis was the Wife of Osiris, so the Wife of Typhon was called Nephthys. From whence one might collect, that as Isis was taken sometimes for the Earth, or the Goddess presiding over it, so Nephthys was the Goddess of the Sea. To which may be further added out of the same Writer, that Nephthys was sometimes called by the Egyptians Αφοδίσιος or Venus, probably because Venus is said to have rife out of the Sea. But whatever may be thought of these Etymological conjectures, certain it is, that no Nation in the world was ever accompted by the Pagans, more Devout, Religious and Superstitious, than the Egyptians, and consequently none was more Polytheistical and Idolatrous. Homer in his Praise of Eniris, gives them a high Encomium for their Sanctity, and Herodotus affirmeth of them, that they were διδυσᾶς μόλιςων πόλεων ανθρώπων, Exceedingly more Religious, and more Devout Worshippers of the Deity, than all other Mortals. Wherefore they were highly celebrated by Apollo’s Oracle (recorded by Porphyrius) and preferred before all other Nations for teaching rightly, διὰ τὸν θεὸν κακοῦς, that hard and difficult way that leadeth to God and Happiness; But in the Scripture, Egypt is famous for her Idol and for her Spiritual Whoredoms and Fornications; to denote the uncleanness whereof, she is sometimes joined with Sodom. For the Egyptians, besides all those other Gods that were worshipped by the Greeks and other Barbarians, besides the Stars, Demons and Heroes; and those Artificial Gods, which they boasted so much of their power of making, viz. Animated Statues; had this peculiar Intoxication of their own, which render’d them infamous and ridiculous even amongst all the other Pagans, that they worshipped Brute Animals also, in one sense or other.

Quis necsit, Volsi Bithyniae, qualia demens
Ægyptus portenta, volat & Crocodilus adorat
Pars hæc, illa pavet satrumam serpentibus ibid.

Concerning which Origen against Celsus thus writeth; παρ᾿ οὖς προδότας μὲν ἢ λατρείας εἰπομεν, μὴ ἄλλως εἰς προσταλλων μεγαλο. Ἡ τε ἡ καλλίμενη μὲν Σωματων, ἡ εκτοι τὴν γαρ ἰσορροπίαν, ἡ δὲ οὐκ ἔνθεσεν μᾶλλα ἀποδιδόμενης ἒκ τοῦ
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Concerning which Origen against Celsus thus writeth; παρ᾿ οὖς προδότας μὲν ἢ λατρείας εἰπομεν, μὴ ἄλλως εἰς προσταλλων μεγαλο. Ἡ τε ἡ καλλίμενη μὲν Σωματων, ἡ εκτοι τὴν γαρ ἰσορροπίαν, ἡ δὲ οὐκ ἔνθεσεν μᾶλλα ἀποδιδόμενης ἒκ τοῦ
But notwithstanding this multifarious Polytheism and Idolatry of the
former Egyptians, that they did nevertheless acknowledge, One Supreme
and Universal Numen, may first be probably collected, from
that great Fame which they had anciently over the whole World for
their Wisdom. The Egyptians are called by the Eldi in Herodotus,
σοφοτατε ἔργοινον, The wisest of Men, and it is a commendation that is
given to one in the same Writer, That he excelled the Egyptians in wisdom,
who excelled all other Mortals. Thus is it set down in the Scripture, for
Moses his Encomium, that he was learned in all the Wisdom of the Egyptians;
and the Tranfcendency of Solomon’s Wisdom is likewise thus
expressed, by the Writer of the Book of Kings, that it excelled the
Wisdom of all the Children of the East-country, and all the Wisdom of Egypt.
Where by the Children of the East, are chiefly meant the
Perian Magi, and the Chaldeans; and there seems to be a Climax here,
that Solomon’s Wisdom did not only exceld the Wisdom of the Magi
and of the Chaldeans, but also that of the Egyptians themselves.
From whence it appears, that in Solomon’s time Egypt was the chief
School of Literature in the whole World, and that the Greeks were
then but little or not at all taken notice of, nor had any considerable
fame for Learning. For which cause, we can by no means give credi-
to that of Philo in the Life of Moses, that besides the Egyptian
Priests, Learned men were sent for by Pharaoh’s Daughter, out of
Greece to instruct Moses. Whereas it is manifest from the Greekish
Monuments themselves, that for many Ages after Solomon’s time, the
most famous of the Greeks, travel’d into Egypt to receive Culture
and Literature, as Lycurgus, Solon, Thales and many others, amongst
whom were Pythagoras and Plato. Concerning the former of which
Pythagoras writes, that coming into Egypt, and being there instructed by
the Priests, he was the first that brought Philosophy into Greece:
and the latter of them is perftringed by Xenophon, because Ἀγαθὸς ἡ
φιλοσοφίας μὴ ἔχει ἐν ὑπερτερότεις σεισμιν, not contented with that sim-
ple Philosophy of Socrates (which was little else besides Morality) he
was in love with Egypt, and that monstrous Wisdom of Pythagoras.
Now as it is not probable that the Egyptians, who were so famous for
Wisdom and Learning, should be ignorant of One Supreme Deity, so
is it no small Argument to the contrary, that they were had in so great
esteem by those Two Divine Philosophers, Pythagoras and Plato. We
grant indeed, that after the Greeks began to flourish in all manner
of Literature, the Fame of the Egyptians was not only much eclipsed,
(so that we hear no more of Greeks travelling into Egypt upon the
former account) but also that their ardour towards the liberal Sci-
ences, did by degrees languish and abate; so that Strabo in his time
could
could find little more in Egypt, besides the empty Houses and Pallaces in which Priests formerly famous for Astronomy and Philosophy had dwelt. Nevertheless their Arcane Theology remained more or less among the unextinct to the left, as appears from what Origen, Por-
physius and Jamblichus have written concerning them.

The Learning of the Egyptians was either Historical, or Philosophi-
cal, or Theological. First the Egyptians were famous for their Histori-
Learning and Knowledge of Antiquity, they being confessed in Plato to have had so much ancienter Records of Time than the Greeks, that the Greeks were but Children or Infants compared with them. They pretended to a continued and uninterrupted series of History, from the Beginning of the World downward, and therefore seem to have had the clearest and strongest Perfwations of the Cosmogonia. Indeed it cannot be denied, but that this Tradition of the World's Be-
ginning, was at first in a manner Universal among all Nations. For con-
cerning the Greeks and Persians we have already manifested the fame, and as Sanchiathion testifich the like concerning the Phenicians, do soes Strabo likewise of the Indian Brachmans, affirning that they did agree with the Greeks in many things and Particularly in this, ἃντι γνωρίζομεν δὴ μὲν Μωσῆς ὡς φασίδει, That the World was both Made, and should be Destroyed. And though Diodorus affirm the contrary of the Chalde-
ans, yet we ought in reason to assign rather to Berosus, in respect of his greater Antiquity, who represents the fence of the Ancient Chal-
dean after this manner, γνωρίζομεν ὡς ὅτι τὸ πάνω σύνολον ἤν περὶ — ἢ
μέγα, ὡς διὰ μεθαρμόνης εἰς μὲν θεοτριστὰ, χρηστὶ γυνὴ ὡς σεβασμόν,
ἄν' ἀνάκυκλον, ἐν διόπτρα ἂν καὶ μελι—ἀπιστεύσει ὃ͜ν ἐκ τοῦ ἐκστρατεύου ἠτον ἐκ στή-
lών ἢ τες πέντε πλανώτως. That there was a time when all was Darkness and Water, but Bell (who is interpreted Jupiter) cutting the Darknes in the middle, separated the Earth and Heaven from one another and so framed the World; this Bell also producing the Stars, the Sun and the Moon and the five Planets. From which Testimony of Berosus, according to the Vision of Alexander Polybius, by the way it appears also, that the Ancient Chaldeans acknowledged One Supreme Deity, the Maker of the whole World, as they are also celebrated for this in that Oracle of Apollo, which is cited out of Porphyry by Eusebiius,

Where the Chaldeans are joyned with the Hebrews, as worshipping likewise in a holy manner, One Self-existent Deity. Wherefore if Dio-
dorus were not altogether mistaken, it must be concluded, that in the latter times, the Chaldeans (then perhaps receiving the Doctrine o Ariolict) did defer and abandon the Tradition of their Ancestor concerning the Cosmogonia. But the Egyptians, however they attributed more Antiquity to the World than they ought; yet seem to have had a constant Perfwation of the Beginning of it, and the Firmel of all other Nations; they (as Kircher tells us) therefore picturing Horn or the World, as a Young man Beardles, not only to signify its constant youthful and flourishing Vigour, but also the Youngnes and Newne
of its Duration. Neither ought it to be suspected, that though the Egyptians held the World to have had a Beginning, yet they conceived it to be made by Chance without a God, as Anaximander, Democritus and Epicurus afterwards did; the contrary thereunto being so Confessed a Thing, that Simplicius a zealous Contender for the Worlds Eternity, affirms the Mosaic History of its Creation by God, to have been nothing else but 

The Place is so considerable, that I shall here let it down in the Authors own Language, viz. I have taken you to the author of the Book of 

As for the Philosophy of the Egyptians, That besides their Physi-ology, and the Pure and Mix'd Mathematicks (Arithmetick, Geometry and Altracerony) they had another higher kind of Philosophy also, concerning Incorporeal Substances, appears from hence, because they were the first Affterers of the Immortality of Souls, their Preexistence and Transmigration, from whence their Incorporeity is necessarily inferred. Thus Herodotus says, as they say, that 

Thus the Egyptians were the first Affterers of the Souls Immortality, and of its Transmigration after the Death and Corruption of this Body, into the Bodies of other Animals successively, viz. until it have run round through the whole Circuit of Terrestrial, Marine and Volatile Animals, after which (they say) it is to return again into a Humano Body; they supposing this Revolution or Apocatastasis of Souls, to be made in no less space than that of Three Thousand years. But whether Herodotus were rightly Catechized and instructed in the Egyptian Doctrine as to this particular or no, may very well be questioned; because the Pythagoreans whom he there tacitly reprehends for arrogating the first Invention of this to themselves, when they had borrowed it from the Egyptians, did represent it otherwise; namely, That the Defect of Humane Souls into these Earthy Bodies, was first in way of Punishment, and that their sinking lower afterwards into the Bodies of Brutes, was only to some, a further Punishment for their further Degeneracy; but the Vertuous and Pious Souls should after this Life enjoy a State of Happiness, in Celestial or Spiritual Bodies.
And the Egyptian Doctrine is represented after the same manner by Porphyrius in Stobæus, as also in the Hermetic or Triphagiick Writings. Moreover Chalcidius reports, that Hermes Trismegistus, when he was about to die, made an Oration to this purpose, That he had here lived in this Earthly Body, but an Exile and Stranger, and was now returning home to his own Country, so that his Death ought not to be lamented, this Life being rather to be accomplished Death. Which Periwigian the Indian Brahmans also were imbued withal, whether they received it from the Egyptians (as they did some other things) or no; 

That this Life here is but the Life of Embryo's, and that Death is a Generation or Birth into true Life. And this may the better be believ'd to have been the Egyptian Doctrine, because Diodorus himself Hath some Passages sounding that way; as that the Egyptians lamented not the Death of Good men, but applauded their Happiness, as being to live ever in the other World with the Pious. However it being certain from this Egyptian Doctrine of Preexistence and Transmigration, that the Egyptians did assert the Souls Incorporeity, it cannot reasonably be doubted, but that they acknowledged also, an Incorporeal Deity. The Objection against which, from what Porphyrius writeth concerning Cheiremon, will be answered afterwards.

We come in the last place to the Theology of the Egyptians. Now it is certain, that the Egyptians besides their Vulgar and Fabulous Theology (which is for the most part which Diodorus describes) had another ἀποκρυπτη στολονια, Arcane and Recondite Theology, that was concealed from the Vulgar and communicated only to the Kings, and such Priests and others as were thought capable thereof; These Two Theologies of theirs differing, as Aristotle's Exoteric and Acrumaticks. Thus much is plainly declared by Origen, whose very name was Egyptian, it being interpreted Horo-genitus, (which Hornus was an Egyptian God) upon occasion of Celsus his boastful, that he thoroughly understood all that belonged to Christianity; Celsus (faith he) seemeth here to me, to do just as if a man travelling into Egypt, where the Wife men of the Egyptians, according to their Country-Learning Philophsifie much, about those things that are accounted by them Divine, whilst the Idiots in the mean time, hearing only certain Fables which they know not the meaning of, are very much pleased therewith; Celsus, I say, doth as if such a Sojourner in Egypt, who had conversed only with those Idiots, and not been at all instructed by any of the Priests, in their Arcane and Recondite Mysteries, should boast that he knew all that belonged to the Egyptian Theologie. Where the same Origen also adds, that this was not a thing proper neither to the Egyptians only, to have such an Arcane and True Theology, different from their Vulgar and Fabulous one, but common with them to the Perfians, Syrians and other Barbarian Pagans; and also amongst the Egyptians, the same may be said also of the Perfians, amongs whom the Religious Rites are performed Rationally by those that are in genious
Their Arcane Theology.

The text continues from the previous page, discussing the Arcane Theology of the Egyptians, mentioning the Sphinxes, and the significance of certain symbols and deities in relation to Christian doctrine. The text references various theological and historical figures, including the Egyptians and the Sphinx, in the context of religious symbolism and doctrine.
The Egyptians, besides their Vulgar, Book I.

Also Harpocrates and Sigilions in their Temples, which are thus described by the Poet,

 Quique premunt vocem, digitique silentia suadent.

They being the Statues of Young men pressling their Lips with their Finger. The meaning of which Harpocrates is thus expreßed by Plutarch, "He had in his Hand, and doth have a Finger taking on a Shape of his own, and this is called the Finger of the Egyptian, Harpocrates, which signifies that he was never to be spoken of or profane; and this was the Name of the Book, and the Statistical Design of the God, Harpocrates. The Egyptians of the last Ages is not to be taken for an Imperfect and INFANT God, but for the President of mens Speech concerning the Gods, that is but imperfect, blabulent and inarticulate, and the Regulator or Corrector of the same. His Finger upon his Mouth being a Symbol of Silence and Taciturnity. It is very true that some Christians have made another Interpretation of this Egyptian Harpocrates, as if the meaning of it had been this; That the Gods of the Egyptians had been all of them really nothing else but Mortal Men, but that this was a Secret that was to be concealed from the Vulgar. Which Conceit, however it be witty, yet is it devoid of Truth, and doubtless the meaning of those Egyptian Harpocrates was no other than this. That either the Supreme and Incomprehensible Deity was to be adored with Silence, or not spoken of without much caution and circumvention, or else that the Arcane Mysteries of Theology were not to be promiscuously communicated, but concealed from the profane Vulgar. Which same thing seems to have been allfo signified, by that yearly Feast kept by the Egyptians in honour of Thoth or Hermes, when the Priests eating Honey and Figs pronounced those Words, γιάνας καὶ ἀλόκειας, Truth is sweet. Also by that Amulet which Ἰpsilon was fabled to have worn about her, the interpretation whereof, was φανε ἀλοκεις, True Speech.

This ἀκρογονίας θεολογία, this Arcane and Recondite Theology of the Egyptians, was concealed from the Vulgar Two manner of ways, by Fables or Allegories, and by Symbols or Hieroglyphicks. Enæbius informs us, that Porphyris wrote a Book πελεσοφος ἐν ἱερογλυφικαις θεολογίας, Concerning the Allegorical Theology both of the Greeks and Egyptians. And here by the way we may observe, that his business of Allegorizing in matters of Religion, had not its first and only Rise among the Christians, but was a thing very much in use among the Pagan Theologers also; and therefore Celsus in Origen commends some of the Christians for this, that they could Allegorize ingeniouly and handlyomly. It is well known how both Plinian and Symesius Allegorized those Egyptian Fables of Ἰpsilon and Ὀφις, the one to a Philosophical, the other to a Political fence. And the Egyptian Hieroglyphicks, which were Figures not answering to Sound or Words, but immediately representing the Objects and Conceptions of the Mind, were chiefly made use of by them to this purpose to express the Mysteries of their Religion and Theology, so as that they might be concealed from the profane Vulgar. For which cause the Hieroglyphick Learning of the Egyptians, is commonly taken for one and the same thing with their Arcane Theology or Metaphysicks. And th
Chap. IV. had an Arcane Theology.

This the Author of the Questions and Answers ad Orthodoxos, tells us in,
was annectly had in much greater esteem amongst the Egyptians,
than all their other Learning, and that therefore Moses was as well
instructed in this Hieroglyphick Learning and Metaphysical Theology
of theirs, as in their Mathematicks. And for our parts we doubt not
but that the Monja Thaca lately published, containing so many strange
and uncouth Hieroglyphicks in it, was something of this Hieroglyphic-
ology, this Arcane Theology of the Egyptians, and not meer Histor-
ry, as some imagine: Though the late confident Oedipus, seem to ar-
rogate too much to himself, in pretending to such a certain and exact
Interpretation of it. Now as it is reasonable to think, that in all
those Pagan Nations where there was another Theology besides the
Vulgar, the principal part thereof, was the Doctrine of One Supreme
and Universal Deity the Maker of the whole World, so can it not well
be conceived, what this Hieroglyphic and Mathematical Theology,
this Arcane and Mysteries and Enigmatical Theology of the Egyptians,
so much talked of, should be other than a kind of Metaphysics
concerning God, as One Perfect Incorpooreal Being, the Original of all
things.

We know nothing of any Moment, that can be objected against
this, save only that which Porphyrus in his Epistle to Anato an Egyptian
Priest, writeth concerning Charamon, that "εν τω ζωικω, ουκ εις το αλλοιο, αυτοι εκ
περι τω θεω φρομελεσαν μετα μιν ιησου εκ αει το λογον περι σου εν τω λαονε
θοσ τον ζωικων λεγομενον, εκ τω σημαντεσ συ ποιαν και δοξικοι, και
Charamon and others acknowledge nothing before this Visible and
Corpooreal World, alledging for the countenance of their Opinion, such of
be Egyptians as talk of no other Gods, but the Planets and those Stars
that fill up the Zodiack, or rise together with them, their Decans, and Ho-
scopes, and Royst Princes, as they call them; whose names are also in-
serted into their Almanacks or Ephemerides, together with the times of
their Raising and Settings, and the Prognosticks or significations of fu-
ture Events from them. For he observed that those Egyptians which made
he Sun the Demiurgus or Architeft of the World, interpreted the Stories
of Isis and Osiris, and all those other Religious Fables, into nothing
at Stars and Planets and the River Nile, εις θεον περι τον νεανις του θεον
εις αναμυστας εκ θα σας ζις ζοης, and referred all things universally
into Natural or Inanimate, nothing into Incorpooreal and Living
beances. Which Passage of Porphyrus concerning Charamon, we
confess Eufebius lays great ftrees upon, endeavouring to make ad-
Vantage of it, first against the Egyptians, and then against the Greeks
and other Pagans, as deriving their Religion and Theology from them;
is manifest from hence, faith he, that the very Arcane Theology of the
Egyptians, Deified nothing but Stars and Planets, and acknowledged
Incorpooreal Principle or Demiurgick Reason as the Cause of this Uni-
verse, but only the Visible Sun: And then he concludes in this manner,
now what is become of this Arcane Theology of the Egyptians, that
after nothing but verfible Matter or Dead Inanimate Bodies. But it is
well known that Eufebius took all advantages possible, to represent
the Pagans to the world, and render their Theology ridiculous and
furd; nevertheless what he here urgeth against the Egyptians, is
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the less valuable, because himself plainly contradicts it elsewhere, declaring that the Egyptians acknowledged a Demiurgic Reason and Intellectual Architect of the World, which consequently was the Maker of the Sun; and confessing the same of the other Pagans also. Now to affirm that the Egyptians acknowledged no other Deity than Inanimate Matter and the Sensorial World, is not only to deny that they had any άρχοντος θεολογία, any Arcane Theology at all, (which yet hath been sufficiently proved) but also to render them absolute Atheists. For if this be not Atheism to acknowledge no other Deity besides Dead and Sensorial Matter, then the word hath no signification. Charemon indeed seems to impute this Opinion (not to all the Egyptians) but to some of them; and it is very possible that there might be some Atheists amongst the Egyptians also, as well as amongst the Greeks and their Philosophers. And doubtless this Charemon himself was a kind of Astrological Atheist; for which cause we conclude, that it was not Charemon the Stoick, from whom notwithstanding Porphyrios in his Book of Abstinence cite certain other things concerning the Egyptians, but either that Charemon whom Strabo made use of in Egypt, or else some other of that name. But that there ever was or can be any such Religious Atheist, as Eusébius with some others imagine, who though acknowledging no Deity, besides Dead and Sensorial Matter, notwithstanding devoutly court and worship the same, constantly invoking it and imploring its assistance, as expecting great Benefit to themselves thereby; This we confess is such a thing, as that we have not Faith enough to believe, it being a sottishness and contradistinct Non-sence, that is not incident to humane Nature. Neither can we doubt, but that all the devout Pagans, acknowledged some Living and Understanding Deities or other; nor easily believe that they ever Worshipped any Inanimate or Sensorial Bodies otherwise, than as some way referring to the same, or as Images and Symbols of them. But as for that Passage in Porphyrios his Epistle concerning Charemon, where he only propounds doubts to Anabo the Egyptian Priest, as defining further Information from him concerning them, Janmblchus hath given us a full answer to it, under the person of Abamno another Egyptian Priest, which notwithstanding hath not hitherto been at all taken notice of, because Ficus and Sextellus not understanding the word Charemon to be a Proper name, ridiculously turn'd it in their Translations, Optarem and Ganderem, thereby also perverting the whole Fence. The words in the Greek MS. (now in the hands of my Learned Friend Mr. Gale) run thus, Εκείνης φησὶν οὖν ἄλλοι, τῷ άεί οὖν καὶ θεὸν οὐκ ἔδωκαν πεποίητο ἄλλοι, τὸς πληρωματικός, τοὺς πληρωματικούς εἴρησις, ὧν τὰ τῶν πληρωμάτων, ἣ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὕτως εἴρησις βαπτίσας τῷ πληρωματικός, τῶν πληρωματικῶν, τῆς ἀρχαίας πεποίητος τῷ πληρωματικῷ, τῶν πληρωματικῶν τῶν πληρωματικῶν, τῶν πληρωματικῶν εἰρήσεως. But Charemon and those others who pretend to write of the first Cause of the World, declare only the Last and Lowest Principles, as likewise the
who treat of the Planets, the Zodiac, the Decans, the Horoscopes and
the Religious Princes. And those things that are in the Egyptian Almanacks
(or Ephemerides) contain the least part of the Heretical Institutions,
namely the Phases and Occultations of the Stars, the Increase and Decrease
of the Moon and the like Astrological Matters 5 which things have the
lowest place in the Egyptian Etymology. Nor do the Egyptians resolve all
things into (Senfles) Nature, but they distinguish both the Life of the
Soul, and the Intellectual Life, from that of Nature, and that not only
in our selves, but also in the Universe 5 they determining Mind and Rea-
son, first to have existed of themselves, and so this whole World to have
been made. Wherefore they acknowledge before the Heaven and in the
Heaven a Living Power, and place pure Mind above the World, as the
Demius of the World. But

Wherefore there is no pretext at all to suspect, that the Egyptians
were universally Atheists and Anarchists, such as supposed no Living
Understanding Deity, but resolved all into Senfle Matter as the first
and highest Principle 6 But all the question is whether they were not
Polyarchists, such as ascertained a Multitude of Understanding Deities
Self-existent or Unmade. Now that Monarchy was an essential part
of the Arcane and True Theology of the Egyptians A. Steuws Eu-
gabins, and many other learned men, have thought to be unquestion-
ably evident, from the Hermetick or Trinmegistick Writings, they ta-
king it for granted, that these are all genuine and sincere. Whereas there
is too much cause to suspect that there have been some Pious Frauds
practised upon them by Trinmegistick Writings, as well as there were up-
on the Sibylline 7 and that either whole Books of them have been
counterfeited by pretended Christians, or at least several spurious and
supposititious Passages here and there inferted into some of them.

If we Caufanon who was the first Discoverer, has taken notice of many
such, in that first Hermetick Book entituled Pæmander, some also in
the Fourth Book inscribed Crafer, and some in the Thirteenth call’d
the Sermon in the Mount, concerning Regeneration 8 which may justly
render those three whole Books, or at least the First and Last of them
to be suspected. We shall here repeat none of Cauf?action’s condemned
Passages, but add one more to them out of the Thirteenth Book, or
Sermon in the Mount, which, however omitted by him, seems to be
more rankly Christian than any other, and of which we have a number of
translations: Tell me this also, Who is the Cause or Worker of Regeneration 8 The Son of God,
One Man, by the will of God. Wherefore though Ath. Kircherus contend with much zeal for the sincerity of all these Trismegistick Books, yet we must needs pronounce of the Three forementioned, at least the Remader properly so called, and the Sermon in the Mount, that they were either wholly forged and counterfeit by some pretended Christians, or else had many spurious Passages inferred into them. Wherefore it cannot be solidly proved, from the Trismegistick Books, after this manner, as supposed to be all alike Genuine and sincere, that the Egyptian Pagans acknowledged One Supreme and Universal Numen. Much less can the same be evinced from that pretended Arisotelick Book, De secretiore parte Doine Sapientiae secondum Egyptians, greedily swallowed down also by Kircherus, but unuestionably pseudepigraphous.

Notwithstanding which, we conceive that though all the Trismegistick Books that now are or have been formerly extant, had been forg'd by some pretended Christians, as that Book of the Arcane Egyptian Wisdom, was by some Philosopher and imputed to Aristole; yet would they for all that upon another account, afford no inconsiderable Argument to prove that the Egyptian Pagans aserfected One Supreme Deity; viz. Because every Cheat and Imposture must needs have some Basis or Foundation of Truth to stand upon; there must have been something truly Egyptian, in such counterfeit Egyptian Writings, (and therefore this at leaft of One Supreme Deity) or else they could never have obtained credit at first, or afterwards have maintain'd the same. The rather because these Trismegistick Books were dispersed in those ancient times before the Egyptian Pagantim and their Succession of Priefts were yet extint; and therefore had that which is so much infil'd upon in them, been dilflonant from the Egyptian Theology, they must needs have been presently exploded as meer Lyes and Forgeries. Wherefore we say again, that if all the Hermaick or Trismegistick Books that are now extant, and those to boot, which being mentioned in ancient Fathers have been lost, as the τογοinis, and the τοδιεοδιακε, and the like, had been nothing but the Fious Frauds and Cheats of Christians, yet must there needs have been some Truth at the bottom to give Subfidence to them; This at leaft, that Hermes Trismegist or the Egyptian Priests, in their Arcane and True Theology, really acknowledged One Supreme and Universal Numen.

But it does not at all follow that because some of these Hermaick or Trismegistick Books now extant, were counterfeit or supposititious, that therefore all of them must needs be such, and not only so, but those also that are mentioned in the Writings of ancient Fathers which are now loft. Wherefore the Learned Cajaubon seems not to have reckoned or concluded well, when from the detection of Forgeries in Two or Three of those Trismegistick Books at moft, he pronounces of them all universally, that they were nothing but Christian Cheats and Impostures. And probably he was lead into this mistake, by reason of his too securely following that vulgar Error (which yet had been confuted by Patricius) that all that was published by Ficinus under
the name of \textit{Hermes Trismegist}, was but one and the same Book \textit{Pev-
mander}, consisting of several Chapters, whereas they are all indeed of
many Distinct and Independent Books, whereof \textit{Pevmander} is only
placed First. However there was no shadow of reason, why the \textit{Ac-
elaps} should have fallen under the same condemnation, nor several
other Books superseded by \textit{Patricius}, they being unquestionably di-

tinct from the \textit{Pevmander}, and no signs of Spuriousness or Baldary

discovered in them. Much less ought those \textit{Trismegistick Books}, cited

by the Fathers and now lost, have been condemned also Unseen.

Wherefore notwithstanding all that \textit{Coffa} has written, there may

very well be some \textit{Hermetick or Trismegistick Books} Genuine, though

all of them be not such; that is, according to our after-declaration,

there may be such Books, as were really Egyptian, and not counter-

efieted by any Christian, though perhaps not written by \textit{Hermes Tris-

megist himself}, nor in the Egyptian Language. And as it cannot well

be conceived how there should have been any counterfeit Egyptian

Books, had there been none at all Real, so that there were some

Real, and Genuine, will perhaps be rendered probable by these fol-

lowing Considerations.

That there was anciently amongst the Egyptians, such a man as

\textit{Thoth, Theuth or Tanit}, who together with Letters, was the First In-

ventor of Arts and Sciences, as Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy,

and of the Hieroglyphick Learning, (therefore called by the Greeks

\textit{Hermes}, and by the Latins \textit{Mercurius}) cannot reasonably be denied

but being a thing confirmed by general Fame in all Ages, and by the

testimonies not only of \textit{Sanchuniathon} a Phenician Hiftoriographer,

who lived about the times of the Trojan War, and wrote a Book

concerning the \textit{Theology of the Egyptians}, and \textit{Manethos Sebennytta}
an Egyptian Priest, contemporary with \textit{Ptol. Philadelphia} but also of

the great Philosopher \textit{Plato}, who is said to have sojourned Thirteen
cars in \textit{Egypt}, that in his \textit{Philbus} speaks of him as the First Inventor

of Letters (who did distinguish betwixt Vowels and Consonants de-

termining their several Numbers) there calling him either a \textit{God or

vivine Man} but in his \textit{Phaedrus} attributeth to him also, the Invention

of Arithmetic, Geometry and Astronomy, together with some

admirable recreations, making either a God or Demon,

\[\textit{εκαίνων τῷ Αἰγυπτίῳ, ἡμαντὶ γατε ἐκεὶ παλαιών ποιεῖσθαι, ὥν ὥστε}

\[\textit{τὸ οἴνου τὸ εἰρήνη ἀκόλουθον ἐκεῖνον, αὐτῷ ἔδοξε τὸ δαίμον οὖν ὁ Θεὸς ἔχειν χεῖρ}

have heard (faith he) that about Naucratis in \textit{Egypt}, there was one of

ancient Egyptian Gods, to whom the Bird Ibis was sacred, as his Sym-

bol or Hieroglyphick; the name of which Demon was \textit{Theuth}. In which

latter, the philosopher subjoins also an Ingenious Dispute, betwixt its

\textit{Theuth}, and \textit{Thamus} then King of \textit{Egypt}, concerning the Conveni-

ence and Inconvenience of \textit{Letters} the Former boasting of that In-

vention as \textit{μνημεία} σφαίρας φανακόν, as a \textit{Remedy for Memory and

great Help to Wisdom}, but the Latter contending, that it would ra-

ther beget \textit{Oblivion}, by the neglect of Memory, and therefore was

not to properly \textit{μνημεία} as \textit{φανακόν}, \textit{a Remedy for Memory,

Reminiscence, or the Recovery of things forgotten:} adding, that it

could also weaken and enervate Mens Natural Faculties, by flagging

them, and rather beget \textit{ἀμαξία} σφαίρας, than \textit{αμαξία}, a \textit{Puffy Conceit and

Opinion}
Opinion of Knowledge, by a Multifarious Rabble of Indigested Notions, than the Truth thereof. Moreover since it is certain, that the Egyptians were famous for Literature before the Greeks, they must of necessity have some One or More Founders of Learning amongst them, as the Greeks had; and Thoth is the Only or First Person celebrated amongst them upon this account, in remembrance of whom the First Moneth of the Year was called by that Name. Which Thoth is generally supposed to have lived in the times of the Patriarchs, or considerably before Moses; Moses himself being said to have been instructed in that Learning, which owed its Original to him.

Again, besides this Thoth or Theuth, who was called the First Hermes, the Egyptians had also afterwards, another eminent Advancer or Restorer of Learning, who was called Ἑρμῆς, The Second Hermes; They perhaps supposing the Soul of Thoth or the First Hermes to have come into him by Transmigration; but his proper Egyptian Name was Siphos, as Synesius out of Manetho informs us; Σιφόσ, ὁ Ἑρμῆς, υἱὸς Πύθων. Siphos (who is also Hermes) the Son of Vulcan. This is he, who is said to have been the Father of Tat, and to have been Surnamed Τερκανάος, Ter Maximus, (being so styled by Manetho, Jamblichus and others.) And he is placed by Synesius in the Fifth year after the Israelitish Exodus, though probably somewhat too Early. The Former of these Two Hermes, was the Inventor of Arts and Sciences, the Latter, the Restorer and Advancer of them; the First wrote in Hieroglyphicks upon Pillars, or Τῇ Συρεικυίῳ γράφει (as the learned Valerius conjectures it should be read, instead of Συρεικυίῳ;) Which Syringes what they were, Am. Marcellinus will instruct us; The Second Interpreted and Translated those Hieroglyphicks, composing many Books in several Arts and Sciences; the Number whereof set down by Jamblichus, must needs be Fabulous, unless it be understood of Paragraphs, or Verses. Which Trismegisitick or Hermetick Books, were said to be carefully preferred by the Priests, in the Interior Recceans of their Temples.

But besides the Hieroglyphicks written by the First Hermes, and the Books composed by the Second (who was called also Trismegist) it cannot be doubted, but that there were Many other Books written by the Egyptian Priests successively in several Ages. And Jamblichus informs us, in the beginning of his Mysteries, That Hermes the God of Eloquence, and President or Patron of all true Knowledge concerning the Gods, was formerly accounted Common to all the Priests, informing, that τὸ αὐτὸν τῷ στυλῆσαι κοινώς αὐτῷ ἀνεύτεκτα, 'Ερμῆς πανίκτη τὸν οίκον κυβερνοῦσα κατενόησεν, they dedicated the Inventions of their Wisdom to him, entitling their own Books to Hermes Trismegist. Now though One Reason hereof, might probably have been thought to have been this, because those Books were supposed to have been written, according to the Tenour of the Old Hermetick or Trismegisitick Doctrines; yet Jamblichus here acquaints us with the chief Ground of it, namely this, that though Hermes was once a Mortal Man, yet he was afterward Deified by the Egyptians (which is testified also by

Plato
Now that some of those ancient Hermaick Books, written by Hermes Trismegist himself, or believed to be such by the Egyptians, and epitomized by their Priests, were still in being and extant among them, after the times of Christianity, seems to be unquestionable, from the testimony of that Pious and Learned Father, Clemens Alexandrinus, he giving this particular Account of them, after the time of the Opus, which was continued by the Precentor, carrying Two of Hermes's Books along with him, the One of which contains the Hymns of the Gods, and Other Directions for the Kingly Office. After him followed the Horopus, who is particularly instructed in Hermes his Astrological Books, which are Four. Then succeed the Hierogrammateus or Sacred Scribe, with Feathers upon his head, and a Book and Rule in his hands, to whom belongeth to be thoroughly acquainted with the Hieroglyphicks, as also with Cosmography, Geography, the Order of the Sun and Moon and the Planets, the Chorography of Egypt, and Description of Nile. In the next place cometh the Stolites, who is to be thoroughly instructed in the Ten Books, which treat concerning the honour of the Gods, the Egyptian Worship, Sacrifices, Fruits, Prayers, Pomps, and Festivals: and last of all marcheth the Prophet, who is President of the Temple and Sacred things, and ought to be thoroughly versed in those other Ten Books, called Sacerdotal, concerning Laws, the Gods, and the whole Discipline of the Priests. Wherefore amongst the Books of Hermes there are Forty Two accounted most necessary, of which Thirty Six, containing the Egyptian Philosophy, were to be learned by those Particular Orders before-

### Chap. IV. Hermaick Books extant after Clemens A. 323

(Plate) and made to be the Tutelar God, and Fautor of all Arts and Sciences, but especially Theology; by whose Inspiration therefore, all such Books were conceived to have been written. Nay further, we may observe, that in some of the Hermaick or Trismegistic Books, now extant, Hermes is sometimes put for the Divine Wisdom or Understanding itself. And now we see the true Reason, Why there have been many Books, called Hermetical and Trismegistical; Some of which notwithstanding, cannot possibly be conceived to have been of such great Antiquity, nor written by Hermes Trismegist himself, viz. because it was customary with the Egyptian Priests, to entitle their own Philosophick and Theologick Books, to Hermes. Moreover it is very probable, that several of the Books of the Egyptian Priests of Latter times, were not Originally written in the Egyptian Language, but the Greek; because at least from the Ptolemick Kings downward, Greek was become very familiar to all the learned Egyptians, and in a manner vulgarly spoken; as may appear from those very Words, Hermes, Trismegist, and the like, so commonly used by them, together with the Proper Names of Places, and because the Coptic Language to this very day, hath more of Greek than Egyptian Words in it; nay Plutarch ventures to etymologize those Old Egyptian Names, Isis, Osiris, Hermes and Typhon from the Greek, as if the Egyptians had been antiently well acquainted with that Language.
Hermaick Books acknowledged, Book I.

Furthermore, that there were certain Books really Egyptian, and called Hermaical or Trismegistical (whether written by the ancient Hermes Trismegist himself, or by other Egyptian Priests of latter times according to the Tenour of his Doctrine, and only entitled to him) which after the times of Christiandiy began to be taken notice of by other Nations, the Greeks and Latins; seems probable from hence, because such Books are not only mentioned and acknowledged by Christian Writers and Fathers, but also by Pagans and Philosophers. In Plutarch's Discourse de Thide & Osride, we can read thus of them: 'En µai'εύκας ἀποκαλυμμένος βῆλος, ἰδέαν γυναικείαν, αἰώνιοι ἰδεαὶ διαθέσθαι, ἵνα τῷ μὲν ἔχῃ τῷ δὲ ἔχειν ἡ ἐξωρίζων νόμος, ἡ τῶν ἰδεῶν ὄνομα, τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς καθαρώτητος τῶν ἱερῶν, τῶν ἵνα ἐκ νόμου τῶν ἱερῶν, τῆς ἰδεών τινὰς, τοῦτον καθάρισθαι, αἱ τὰ διὰ τοῦτον, οἱ μὲν ὀνόματες, οἱ δὲ Τριστεγία, οἱ δὲ Σάμια λειψάναι. In the Books called Hermes's or Hermaica, it is reported to have been written concerning Sacred Names, that the Power appointed to preside over the Motion of the Sun, is called by the Egyptians Horus (as by the Greeks, Apollo) and that which presides over the Air and Wind, is called by some Osiris, by others Sarapis, and by others Sothi, in the Egyptian Language. Now these Sacred Names in Plutarch, seem to be, Several Names of God, and therefore whether these Hermaic Books of his, were the same with those in Clemens Alexandrinus, such as were supposed by the Egyptians to have been written by Hermes Trismegist himself, or other Books written by Egyptian Priests according to the Tenour of this Doctrine. We may by the way observe, that according to the Hermaical or Trismegistical Doctrine, One and the same Deity, was worshipped under Several Names and Notions, according to its Several Powers and Virtues, manifested in the World; which is a thing afterwards more to be insinuated on. Moreover it hath been generally believed, that L. Apuleius Madanrensis an eminent Platonick Philosopher, and zealous Asetter of Paganism, was the Translator of the Asclepian Dialogue of Hermes Trismegist, out of Greek into Latin; which therefore hath been accordingly published with Apuleius his Works. And Barthius affirms that St. Austin does somewhere expressly impute this Version to Apuleius, but we confess we have not yet met with the place. However there seems to be no sufficient reason, why Calvin should call this into Question from the Stile and Latin. Again it is certain, that Jamblichus doth not only mention these Hermaick Books, under the name of Θα θεία τίθη, the Books that are carried up and down as Hermes's originally imputed to him; but also vindicate them from the imputation of Imposture. Not as if there were any suspicion at all of that which Casaubon is so confident of, that these Hermaick Books were all forged by Christians, but because some might then possibly imagine them to have been counterfeited by Philosophers. Wherefore it will be convenient here to set down the whole Passage of Jamblichus concerning it, as it is in the Greek MS.
by Pagans and Philosophers.

Now Jamblichus in his answer here affirmeth, that the Doctrine of the ancient Hermes, or the Egyptian Theology, was as to the Substance truly reprented in those Books, (vulgarily imputed to Hermes,) but not so by Charon. L. C., St. Cyril of Alexandria informs us, that there was an Edition of these Hermack or Trismegistic Books (compiled together) formerly made at Athens, under this Title, Ἐπιστέμους Ἐρμαϊκών Ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ, and was published before Jamblichus his time, took them for those Salaminiaca, which he found in the Latin Translations of Jamblichus made by Ficinus and Scultellus. Whereas indeed he was here abused by those Translators, there being no such thing to be found in the Greek Copy. But the word Ἀχανθωνος, (not understood by them) being turned into Salaminiaca; Casaubon...
conjectur'd them to have been those *Hermaick* Books publ.ished at *Athens*, because *Salamis* was not far distant from thence. Now it cannot be doubted, but that this Edition of Hermaick Books at *Athens*, was made by some Philosopher or Pagans and not by Christians, this appearing also from the words of St. Cyril himself, where having spoken of *Moses* and the agreement of *Hermes* with him, he adds, *πεπιστεύετο* ὃν τὸ τέτος μινυλο, ἐκ ἰδίων συγγεγράφων, ὃ συντεθεὶς λειτίσα, τὸ ἦτοι εἴρημα ἐπεξείλαθος μελέτων, *of which Moses he also who compiled and published the Fifteen Hermaick Books at Athens, makes mention in his own discourse* (annexed thereunto.) For thus we conceive that place to be understood, that the Pagan Publisher of the Hermaick Books himself, took notice of some agreement that was between *Moses* and *Hermes*. But here it is to be noted that because *Hermes* and the Hermaick Books were in such great credit not only among the Christians, but also the Greek and Latin Pagans, therefore were there some counterfeit Writings obtruded also under that specious Title; *such as that Ancient Botanic Book mentioned by Galen, and those Christian Forgeries of later times the *Palamus* and *Sermon on the Mount*. Which being not cited by any ancient Father or Writer, were both of them doubtless later than *Jamblichus*, who discovers no suspicion of any Christian Forgeries in this kind.

But *Cesaubon*, who contends that all the Theologick Books imputed to *Hermes* *Trismegistus*, were counterfeited by Christians, affirms, all the Philosophy, Doctrine and Learning of them (excepting what only is Christian in them) to be merely Platonical and Grecanical but not at all Egyptian; thence concluding, that these Books were forged by such Christians, as were skilled in the Platonical or Grecanick Learning. But first, it is here considerable, that since Pythagorism, Platonism and the Greek Learning in general, was in great part derived from the Egyptians, it cannot be concluded, that whatsoever is Platonical or Grecanical, therefore was not Egyptian. The only Instance that *Cesaubon* infilts upon, is this *Dogma* in the Trismegistick Books, *That Nothing in the World perisheth, and that Death is not the Destruction*, but *Change and Translation of Things only*. Which because he finds amongst some of the Greek Philosophers, he resolves to be peculiar to them only, and not common with the Egyptians. But since the chief design and tendency of that *Dogma*, was plainly to maintain the *Immortality*, *preexistence* and *Transmigration of Souls* which Doctrine was unquestionably derived from the Egyptians, there is little reason to doubt but that this *Dogma* was it self Egyptian also. And *Pythagoras*, who was the chief Propagator of this Doctrine amongst the Greeks, *et alibi philosophor apud philoxeni* *quod est* *Soros*, *That no real Entity (in Generations and Corruptions) was Made or destroyed according to those Ovidian Verses before cited*,

*Nec perit in toto quicquam, nibi credite, mundo,*

*Sed variet faciemque novat. Nascite vocatur*

*Incipere esse Alhind, &c.*

did in all probability, derive it together with its superfri...
Old Egyptian Phylology.
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Old Egyptian Phylology. (the Preexistence and Transmigration of Souls, &c) at once from the Egyptians. But it is observable, that the Egyptians had also a peculiar ground of their own, for this Dogma (which we do not find intisfied upon by the Greek Philosophers) and it is thus expressed in the Eighth of Fiernus his Hermetick Books or Chapters; a & φύσις: & οὐκ ἐστὶ; ἦς ἔστι; ἐστιν ἀκὶνη, ἀκὶνητω; τι τοῦ ζωοτάτου τὸς μέγας τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκὶνητ' ἀκὶνητ' παντ' ἕν τώ τι νεκρος, ῥήματα Γ' ἐν τῷ νεκρῷ, μήγε τί τῷ νεκρῷ, μήγε τί ἐν τῷ νεκρῷ ἐν τῷ λειψάνῳ ζων. If the World be a Second God, and an Immortal Animal, then it is impossible that any part of this Immortal Animal should perish or come to nothing; but all things in the World are Parts of this great Mundane Animal, and chiefly Man, who is a Rational Animal.

Which fame Notion we find also intisfied on in the Afclepius Dialogue; Secundum Deum hanc crede, ὁ Ἀσκλπιός, omnia gubernantem, omnium mundana illustrantem animalia. Si enim Animal, Mundus, vivens, sempere et eft, sit in mundo mortale eft; viventis enim unius cuiusque Partis, quae in ipso mundo, sicut in uno codemque Animale semper vivente, nullus eft mortalitas locis. Where though the Latin be a little imperfect, yet the fentence is this; You are to believe the World, ὁ Ἀσκλπιός, to be a Second God, governing all things, and illustrating all Mundane Animals. Now if the World be a Living Animal, and Immortal; then there is nothing Mortal in it, there being no place for mortality as to any Living Part or Member, of that Mundane Animal, that always Liveth. Notwithstanding which we deny not, but that though Pythagoras first derived this Notion from the Egyptians, yet he and his Followers might probably improve the fame farther (as Plato tells us, that the Greeks generally did, what they received from the Barbarians) namely to the taking away the Qualities and Forms of Bodies, and resolving all Corporeal Things, into Magnitude, Figure and Motion. But that there is indeed some of the old Egyptian Learning, contained in these Trismegistick Books now extant, shall be clearly proved afterwards, when we come to speak of the Grand Mystery of the Egyptian Theology (derived by Orpheus from them) That God is All. To conclude, Jamblichus his judgment in this cafe, ought without controversy, to be far preferred before Cfaubon's, both by reason of his great Antiquity, and his being much better skilled, not only in the Greek, but also the Egyptian Learning; That the Books imputed to Hermes Trismegist did οἰκουμενικά λέγουσας ἄθροισις τῆς λόγου, really contain the Hermack Opinions, though they speake sometimes the Language of the Greek Philosophers.

Wherefore upon all these Considerations, we conceive it reasonable to conclude, that though there have been some Hermack Books conjectured by Chriftians, since Jamblichus his time, as namely the Revander and The Sermon in the Mount, concerning Regeneration; neither of which are found cited by any ancient Father; yet there were other Hermack Books which though not written by Hermes Trismegistus himself, nor all of them in the Egyptian Language, but some of them in Greek, were truly Egyptian, and did for the substance of them, contain the Hermack Dogrine. Such probably were those mentioned by the Ancient Fathers, but since lost, as the τό ῥέμα, which seems to have been a discourse concerning the Cosmogonia, and
The Asclepian Dialogue, Book I

The ἀσκληπιον, and the like. And such also may some of these Her
tick Books be, that are still extant, as to instance particularly, the
Asclepian Dialogue, entituled in the Greek Ὄνομα λήγερ, the Per
oration, and in all probability translated into Latin by Apuleius.
For it can hardly be imagined, that he who was so devout a Pagan
so learned a Philosopher, and so Witty a man, should be so far im-
posed upon, by a counterfeit Triumegistick Book, and mere Christian
Cheat, as to bestow Translating upon it, and recommend it to the
World, as that which was genuinely Pagan. But however, whether
Apuleius were the Translator of this Asclepian Dialogue or no, it is
evident that the Spirit of it is not at all Christian, but rankly Pagan.
One Instance whereof we have, in its glorying of a power that me
have of Making Gods, upon which accompl St. Austin thought fit to
concern himself in the confusion of it. Moreover it being extant
and vulgarly known before Iamblicus his time, it must needs be in-
cluded in his τῶν ἐξελεύσεων ἀπὸ ἑαυτοῦ, and consequently receive this at-
testation from him, that it did contain not merely the Greekish, but
the Hermeical and Egyptian Doctrine.

There are indeed some Objections made against this, as first from
what we read in this Dialogue, concerning the Purification of the World,
partly by Water, and partly by Fire; Tunc ille Dominus & Pater Deus
Primipotens, & Unus Gubernator mundi, intuens in mores fadique ha-
uminum, voluntate sua (quae est Dei Benignitate) utiit resistentes, & co-
rupta errorem revocans, malignitatem omne vel Albusione diluem
veligne conjunctus, ad antiquam faciem mundum revocabit: When
World becomes thus Degenerate, then that Lord and Father, the Su-
preme God, and the only Governor of the World, beholding the man-
ne and deeds of men, by his Will (which is his Benignity) always resis-
ting, and restoring things from their Degeneracy, will either wash
was the Malignity of the World by Water, or else confine it by Fire, at
restore it to its ancient form again. But since we find in Julius Firm-
cus, that there was a Tradition amongst the Egyptians, concerning
the Apocatafiasis of the World, partim per καλὰν θεῖον θεὸν, partim p
ἐνσυνάγωγον, partly by Intradition and partly by Conflagration, this O-
jection can signify nothing. Wherefore there is another Objection, th
that some more plausibility, from that Prophecy which we find in th
Asclepius, concerning the overthrow of the Egyptian Paganism (ulu-
ed in with much Lamentation) in these words, Tunc Terra iit, sanct,
Jima feudes Delabrorum, Sepulcrorum erit mortuorumque plenissima; Th
this Land of Egypt, formerly the most holy seat of the Religious Temples
of the Gods, shall be every where full of the Sepulchers of Dead men.
The fence whereof is thus expressed by St. Austin, Hoc uidetur delai-
quad Memorie Martyrum nostrorum, Templis curum Delubrisque securi-
rent; ut vix. qui hoc legunt, animo a nobis ache orae atque pereundo, p
 sant in Paganis Deos cultos satis in Templis, à nobis autem acu Mortis
in Sepulbris: He seems to lament this, that the Memorials of our Ma-
tys should succeed in the place of their Temples, that so they who read
this with a perversive mind, might think that by the Pagan the Gods we
worshipped in Temples, hut by us (Christians) Dead men in Sepulchres.
Notwithstanding which, this very thing seems to have had its:
compliment too soon after, as may be gathered from these Passages of Theodoret, \\
cs, of De Cor. G. A. \\

leiusia (or &c.) the Martyrs.

of St. Paul, Thomas and Sergius, and other holy Martyrs. Wherefore this being so shrewd and plain a Description in the Apclebian Dialogue, of what really happened in the Christian World, it may seem suspicious, that it was rather a History, written after the Event, than a Prophecy before it, as it pretends to be. It very much resembling that complaint of Ennapius Sardianus in the Life of Aedesius, when the Christians had demolished the Temple of Serapis in Egypt, feizing upon its Riches and Treasure. That instead of the Gods, the Monks then gave Divine honour to certain vile and flagitious persons deceased, called by the name of Martyrs. Now if this be granted, this Book must needs be Counterfeit and supposititious. Nevertheless St. Austin entertained no such Suspicion concerning this Apclebian Passage, as if it had been a History written after the Fact, that is, after the Sepulchres and Memorials of the Martyrs came to be so frequented; he supposing this Book to be unquestionably; of greater Antiquity. Wherefore he concludes it to be a Prophecy or Prediction made, infinita sallacitis spiritis, by the Inhabit or Suggestion of some Evil Spirit; they sadly then prefaging the ruine of their own Empire. Neither was this Apclebian Dialogue only ancien ter than St. Austin, but it is cited by Laächtus Firmianus also, under the name of $^{13}$, the Peri- 

cell Oration, as was said before, and that as a thing then reputed of great Antiquity. Wherefore in all probability this Apclebian Passage, was written before that described Event had its accomplishment. And indeed if Antoninus the Philosopher (as the forementioned Ennapius writes) did predict the very same thing, that after his decease, that magnificent Temple of Serapis in Egypt, together with the rest, should be demolished, &c. to inegi taphos χρυσωρίων, and the Temples of the Gods turned into Sepulchres; why might not this Egyptian or Trismegistick Writer, receive the like Inspiration or Tradition? Or at least make he same Conjecture.

But there is yet another Objection made against the Sincerity of his Apclebian Dialogue, from Laächtus his citing a Passage out of it, for the Second Person in the Trinity, the Son of God; Hermes in co Libro (saith Laächtus) quia ος τδλογος λογος inscribatur, his usus est verbi, \\

"5\n
Which
Which we find in Apuleius his Latin Translation thus rendered, Domi-
nus omnium Conformator, quem recte Deum dicimus, & se Sec-
cundum Deum fecit, qui uideri & sentiri posset; quem Secundum [De-
um] sensibilem ita dixerim, non ideo quod ipse sentiat (de hoc enim an-
ipse sentiat annon alio dicerum tempor) sed eo quod uidentem sensus
incurrit: Quoniam ergo hunc fecit ex Primum, & a Secundum, vi-
jusque est ei pulcher, uipto qui est omnium bonitate priuilegiius, ama-
vit eum ut Divinitatis sae Prolern (for so it ought to be read, and not
Patrem, it being τόν θεόν in the Greek:) The Lord and Maker of all, whom
we rightly call God, when he had made a Second God, Visible and Sen-
sible (I say, sensible, not actively, because himself hath Sense, for con-
cerning this, whether he have Sense or no, we shall speak elsewhere, but
passively, because he incurs into our Sense) this being his first and un-
ly Production, seemed both beautiful to him, and most full of all good,
and therefore he loved him dearly as his own Offspring. Which La\zekarianus,
and after him St. Austin, understanding of the Perfect Word of God
or Eternal Λογος, made use of it as a Testimony against the Pagans,
for the Confirmation of Christi\n

Con Fal lib. 1.P.33.
ruling over all things that were made by him; this is the perfect and
genuine Son of the first Omniperfect Being. Nevertheless the Author of
the Πατρικος or Aelepian Dialogue, in that forecited Pas-
fage of his, by his Second God, the Son of the First, meant no such
thing at all, as the Christian Logos, or Second Person of the Trinity,
but only the Visible World. Which is to plain from the words them-
selves, that it is a wonder how Lactantius and St. Austin could inter-
pret them otherwise, he making therein a Question whether this Sec-
ond God were [actively] Sensible or no. But the fame is farther mani-
from other places of that Dialogue, as this for example, Eternitas
Dominus Deus Primus est, Secondus est Mundus; The Lord of Eterni-
ty is the First God, but the Second God is the World. And again,
Summus qui dicitur Deus Rector Gubernatorque Sensibils Dei, ejus qui
in se complectitur omnem locum, omnemque rerum substantialiam; The
Supreme God is the Governor of that Sense God, which contains in
it all place and all the Subsistence of things. And that this was indeed a
part of the Hermaic or Egyptian Theology, that the Visible World
Animated, was a Second God, and the Son of the First God, appears
also from those Hermaic Books published by Ficinus, and vulgarly
called Poemander, though that be only the First of them. There
hath been one Passage already cited out of the Eighth Book,
Πατρικος Σεις ο ναομεγας, The World is a Second God. After which
followeth more to the same purpose, προς ης ηδοναν ουν, οι αληθεις, η
δημοφως, η δημοφως για τιλων Σεις. οι οικος ου και εκείνον αυτην ου, ουτε
γενι-
μενος, ουτε αυτην ουκ ουκ ουκ αυτην ουκ, ουκ ουκ ουκ εν αυτην;
The First God is that Eternal Unmade Maker of all things; the Sec-
ond is he that is made according to the Image of the First, which
is contained, cherished or nourished and immortalized by him, as by
his own Parent, by whom it is made an Immortal Animal. So again
in the Ninth Book, πατεις ο Σεις τη ναομεγας, ου μεγας τη Σεις
God is the Father of the World, and the World is the Son of God.
And in the Twelfth, ου συμπερα συμπερα ης ο μεγας Σεις ου τη μεγας
This whole World is a Great and the Image of a
Greater.

As for the other Hermetick or Trismegiſtick Books, published par-
tly by Ficinus, and partly by Patricius, we cannot confident-
ly condemn any of them for Christian Cheats or Impositions, save only
the Poemander, and the Sermon in the Mount concerning Regeneration,
the First and Thirteenth of Ficinus his Chapters or Books. Neither
of which Books are cited by any of the Ancient Fathers, and there-
fore may be presumed not to have been extant in Jamblichus his time,
but more lately forged; and that probably by one and the self
same hand, since the Writer of the Latter (the Sermon in the Mount)
makes mention of the Former (that is, the Poemander) in the close of
it. For that which Cajanbon objects against the Fourth of Ficinus his
Books or Chapters (entituled the Crater) seems not very consider-
able, it being questionable, whether by the Crater, any such thing
were there mentioned, as the Christian Baptiferion. Wherefore as for
all the rest of those Hermaic Books, especially such of them as being
cited by ancient Fathers, may be presumed to have been extant be-
fore
fore "Jamblichus" his time; we know no reason why we should not
concur with that learned Philosopher in his Judgment concerning
them. That though they often speak the Language of Philosophers, and
were not written by Hermes Trismegist himself, yet they do really con-
tain "Sphinx" equivocal, Hermaical Opinions, or the Egyptian Doctrine.
The Ninth of Ficinus his Books mentions the Asclepian Dialogue, un-
der the Greek Title of δέλεος λόγος, pretending to have been writ-
ten by the same hand; χάθε δ' άσκληπίτη, δ' τέλοιον αναδείκτα λόγον, τὸν
δ' αναγματών ιγώμευ ἀνδρακίων κάλον, καὶ τὸν ἀναδικτά λόγον διεκδέκτω. 
The meaning of which place (not understood by the Translators)
is this, I lately published (Ο Ασκλεπίος) the Book entituled δέλεος λόγος
(or the Perfect Oration) and now I judge it necessary, in pursuit of
the same, to discourse concerning Sense. Which Book, as well as the
Perfect Oration, is called by Laëntius. As is also the Tenth of Fi-
cinus, called the Clavis, which does not only pretend to be of kin to
the Ninth and conseqently to the Asclepian likewise, but also to contain
it in an Epitome of that Hermack Book called τῷ ὄνομα, mentioned
in Eusebius his Chronicon, that χάθε λόγον, δ' άσκληπίτη, τοι ανάδεικτα, δ' τοι
πίματος δ' οὐκομον ζητεὶ τάτα αναδείκτα καλον. Τά τε τινών λόγου ζητεὶ εὐθῶς τω χάθη
λόγων, τὶς λογίστων καὶ λειτουργιών. Τὰ δὲ τοῦτα ἱθα. My former Discourse was dedicated to the (Ο
Ασκλεπίος) but this to Tatius; it being an Epitome of that Genica that
were delivered to him. Which τοιοῦτο are thus again afterwards men-
tioned in the same Book, καὶ τὸν τοῦ γενέσθαι, ὅτι ἄπο ἕκει
τὸ παλᾶ πάσαν αὐτὸν χάθε εὖ δι' ᾧ θεοῦ. Have you not heard in the Genica,
that all Souls are derived from one Soul of the Universe? Neither
of which two places were understood by Ficinus. But doubtles this
latter Hermack Book, had something foiled into it, because there is
a manifest contradiction found therein forasmuch as that Transmigra-
tion of Human Souls into Brutes, which in the former part thereof is affir-
ed after the Egyptian way, as αἰειτικήν ἰακόν κακάς, as the just punish-
ment of the wicked, is afterwards cried down and condemned in it,
as the greatest Error. And the Eleventh and Twelfth following Books,
seem to us to be as Egyptian, as any of the rest; as also does that long
Book entituled καὶ τὸν τοῦ γενέσθαι, the Thirteenth in Patricius. Nay it is
observable, that even tho' very Books themselves, that are so jufly
suspected and condemned for Christian Forgeries, have something
of the Hermaical or Egyptian Philosophy, here and there inters-
pered in them. As for example, when in the Pander God is twice
called ἀνθρωποι ἱλια, Male and Female together, this seems to have been
Egyptian (and derived from thence by Orpheus) according to that
elegant Passage in the Asclepian Dialogue concerning God; Hic ergo qui Solus est Omnia, utrinque Sexus fecunditate plenissimus,
semper Voluntatis sue progamin, semper quicquid volueris procreare,He therefore who alone is All Things, and most full of the Fecundity of
both Sexes, being always pregnant of his own Will, always produceth
whatsoever he pleaseth. Again when Death is thus described in it,
κακίας ἅτα τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, τὸ εὖ τὸ ἀθώος, τὸ δὲ ἁλος, τὸ ἁρπαγμὸς, γνώρων,
to be nothing else but the Change of the Body, and the Form or Lives
passing into the Invisible: This agreeth with that in the Eleventh Book
or Chapter, τῶν μεταφορῶν θεοῦ, ὡς ἡ τοῦ ἀθόου διάκεισθαι, τὸ τοῦ
ζωῆς ὡς τὸ ἀφαίτης ἁρπάων, That Death is nothing but a Change, it
being
being only the dissolution of the Body, and the Life or Soul's passing into the Invisible or Inconspicuous. In which Book it is also affirmed of the World, иустма мови αυτοτ καθ εκας ὁμορριν νε, την αμανην. That every day some part or other of it, goes into the Invisible, or into Hades, that is, does not utterly perish, but only disappears to our sight, it being either translated into some other Place, or changed into another Form. And, accordingly it is said of Animals, in the Twelfth Book, διελθειν, ερ νε, απολυται αλι νε νεα βεθαντιν. That they are dissolved by Death, not that they might be destroyed, but made again anew. As it is also there affirmed of the World, that it doth παντα παρεν εις αετονων, make all things out of itself, and again unmake them into itself, διαλύνει πάσα ανανεσι, and that disolving all things it doth perpetually renew them. For that nothing in the whole World utterly perisheth, as it is often declared elsewhere in the Triphogistiick Writings, so particularly in this Twelfth Book of ὑνεμευς, αρχής, αμφαλσίμης, παν μεν αμία πάσα μεν, εις τόν πάντας  ᾠνειν. The whole World is unchangeable, only be parts of it being alterable; and this so, that none of these neither utterly perisheth, or is absolutely destroyed, πως μεν ες πο λογιν φθειραν τως ανεπτυχθην, εις καλλιτεκνια τως δαίμων. For how can any part of that be Corrupted, which is Inconspicuous, or any thing of God perish or go to nothing? All which, by Casaubon's lieve, we take to have been originally Egyptian Doctrine, and thence in part afterwards transplanted into Greece. Moreover when in the Pamander, God is styled more than one, φας καν, ὑπερ ὕπερ, Light and Life, this seems to have been Egyptian also, because it was Orphical. In like manner the Appendix to the ermon in the Mount, called ὑπερίδεια προφητική, or the Occult Cantion, ath some Strains of the Egyptian Theology in it, which will be afterwards mentioned.

The result of our present Discourse is this, that though some the Triphogistiick Books, were either wholly counterfeited, or else certain supposititious Passages inserted into them by some Christian hand, yet there being others of them originally Egyptian, or hich as to the substance of them, do contain Hermatical or Egyptian Trifmesistes (in all which One Supreme Deity is every where asserted) may well conclude from hence, that the Egyptians had an acknowledgment among them of One Supreme Deity. And herein several of the Ancient Fathers have gone before us; as first of all Justin Martyr, καταγωγα κα τον υποτάσσε, εριμεϊς σαφεις καθ φανερας, θελεν τον Και αληθινον. And also in his Apologia, called God Most Hidden, and Hermes plainly declares, That is so hard to conceive God, but impossible to express him. Neither doth follow that this latter Passage is counterfeit, as Casaubon concludes, because there is something like it in Plato's Timæus, there being doubtless a very great agreement betwixt Platonism and the Ancient Egyptian Doctrine. Thus again St. Cyprian; Hermes quoque Triphonius. De Idol. Ian. Καταγωγα κα τον υποτάσσε, εριμεϊς σαφεις καθ φανερας, θελεν τον Και αληθινον. And also St. Basilick, De covered and invisibill which Passage is also cited by St. Anfažin. Lib. 1, p. 30. Cyprian, Hermes Triphogistiick also acknowledge One God, confessing him to amthius likewase; Thoth antiquissimus & instruc tantissimus omni gen-
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here
But that the Egyptians acknowledged, besides their Many Gods, One Supreme and All-comprehending Deity, needs not be proved from these Trismegistical Writings (concerning which we leave others to judge as they find Cause) it otherwise appearing, not only because Orpheus (who was an undoubted Allerter of Monarchy, or One First Principle of All things) is generally affirmed to have derived his Doctrines from the Egyptians; but also from plain and express Testimonies. For besides Apollonius Tyaneus his Affirmation concerning both Indians and Egyptians, before cited, Plutarch throughout his whole Book De Iside & Osiride, supposes the Egyptians thus to have affirmed One Supreme Deity, they commonly calling him θεὸς πάντας βιον, the First God. Thus in the beginning of that Book he tells us, that the End of all the Religious Rites and Mysteries, of that Egyptian Goddess Isis, was, αὐτή πέταται, εἰς κυκλότος, εἰς αὐτή γνάσις, εἰς ἡς ἔρημος παχύκοκκος γίνεται. εἰς ταύτη τοῦ παρ' αὐτή διὰ τοῦτο διά τοῦτο, the Knowledge of that First God, who is the Lord of all things, and only intelligible by the Mind, whom this Goddess exhorteth men to seek, in her Communion. After which he declareth, that this First God of the Egyptians was accounted by them an Obscure and Hidden Deity, and accordingly he gives the reason why they made the Crocodile to be a Symbol of him πάσης τῆς φαντασίας, τοῦ ζώου ρύμου λειών. That Deity is hid under the name, which living in the water, hath his Eyes covered by a thin transparent membrane, falling down over them, by reason whereof it sees and is no seen, which is a thing that belongs to the First God, To see all things, him self being not seen. Though Plutarch in that place gives also another reason why the Egyptians made the Crocodile a Symbol of the Deity υπὸ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ τινας πάλινς ἐκφοβότον ἐκείνη τιμῶν, ἐκείνης μικρὰς. Σύνεξις γυναικῶν μετὰ μἄριον ἀλώσεως εἰς, φειδότος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἀνθρώπων ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἔστι, εἰς δὲ ἀληθείας ραβδὸν καλλάθει ἐκ αὐτοῦ τοῦ εὐνουχοῦ διδόμενος. Neither were the Egyptians without a plausible reason, for worshipping God Symbolically in the Crocodile, that being said to be an Imitation of God, in that it is the only Animal without a Tongue. For the Deity,

Provd that The Egyptians acknowledged, Book I.
A First, and Supreme God.

Chap. IV.

wine Ne[O or Reason standing not in need of Speech, and going on through a silent path of Justice in the World, does without noise righteously govern and dispose all humane affairs. In like manner Horus-Apollo in his Hieroglyphicks, tells us, that the Egyptians acknowledging a nought[O]c[O]v[O]c, an Omnipotent Being that was the Governor of the whole World, did Symbolically represent him by a Serpent, Κεραυνὸς χρόνος οίκου μετὰ τοῦ κ[O]κε[O]ρμον εἰς τὸν νε[O]κρόμον, they picturing also a great House or Palace within its circumference, because the World is the Royal palace of the Deity. Which Writer also gives us another reason, why the Serpent was made to be the Hieroglyphick of the Deity; viz. the gods of the Egyptians, when they looked upon them, saw a Hawk, and that the First and Divinest Being of all, is Symbolically represented, by a Serpent having the head of an Hawk. And that a Hawk was also sometimes used alone, for a Hieroglyphick of the Deity, appeareth from that of Plutarch, That in the Porch of an Egyptian Temple at Saïs, were ingraven these Three Hieroglyphicks, a Young man, an Old man, and an Hawk; to make up his Sentences, That both the Beginning and End of humane Life dependeth upon God, or Providence. But we have Two more remarkable Passages in the forementioned Horus Apollo, concerning the Egyptian Theology, which must not be pretermitted: the first this, παρει σωμάτων κεραυνὸς κεραυνὸς τοῦ δικού του πτέρυγον, That according to them, there is a spirit passing through the Whole World, to wit, God. And again διατυπώσας τοὺς κεραυνοὺς πτέρυγον, It semeth to the Egyptians, that nothing at all conflicts without God. In the next place, Ἰάμβλικος was a person who had made it his business, to inform himself thoroughly concerning the Theology of the Egyptians, and who undertakes to give an account thereof, in his Answer to Porphyrys his Epistle to Imedo an Egyptian Priest; whose Testimony therefore may well seem to deserve credit. And he first gives us a Summary account of their Theology after this manner, οἱ πρώτοι Ἰάμβλίκος, μετὰ τοῦ κεραυνοῦ κεραυνὸς τοῦ δικοῦ τοῦ πτερύγου, οἱ υπό τινας σειράς δεινόμαζον τον επιστολον, οἱ υπό τινας σειράς δεινόμαζον πατρίν, αὐτὸς κεραυνός τοῦ σαίσι. Αὐτὸς Ηρακλέας, Οὐλαματιδάκενος τοῦ τοῦ σαίσι, Τιτανομαχίας, πολεμοῦ τοῦ κεραυνοῦ πατρου, τοῦ κεραυνοῦ εἰς χάριν τοῦ κεραυνοῦ τοῦ κεραυ

Lib. 1...
self, and in himself, he ruleth over all things and in himself containeth all things. And because he spiritually comprehends all things, therefore does he impart and display the same from himself. According to which excellent Description of the Deity, it is plain that the Egyptians affording One God that Comprehends All things, could not possibly suppose a multitude of Self-existent Deities. In which place also the name Jamblichus tells us, that as the Egyptian Hieroglyphick for Material and Corporeal things, was Mud or Floating Water, so they picture’d God, in Loto arbore sedentem super Lutum, sitting upon the Lote-tree above the Watery Mud, Quod immit Dei eminentiam aliis hominibus, qua sit ut nullo modo attingat Lutum ipsum. Demonstratique Dei imperium intellec-tuale, quia Loto arboris omnium sunt rotunda tam frondes quam fructus, &c. Which signifies the transcendent Eminency of the Deity above the Matter, and its intellectual Empire over the World, because, both the Leaves and Fruit of that tree are Round, representing the Motion of intellect. Again he there adds also, that the Egyptians sometime pictured God sitting at the Helm of a Ship. But afterward in the same Book, he sums up the Querries, which Porphyrius had propounded to the Egyptian Priest, to be resolved concerning them, in this manner; ουδεις ου τυλιγμον, ἵνα τὸ πρῶτον ἀυτοῦ ἵγκεται εἶναι αἰσθητὸς, πέτραν οὖν ἐν ἑνὸς ὄμοιον ἔμελται, ἃ μόνον ἐμετ’ ἀλλὰ τό ἀλλὰς ἡ ἀλλὰς, πότερον ἐκ νυσσόμενος ἀπὸ κυμάτων, ἤ ἔτερον ἀναγερέσθαι τῷ εὐθείᾳ, ἢ πέρι τὸν δυναμόν ἢ ἢ εἰ ἐκ νυσσόμενος τῷ εὐθείᾳ, ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἀναγερόσθαι τῷ εὐθείᾳ, ἢ εἰ ἐκ νυσσόμενος τῷ εὐθείᾳ ἢ γεννηθηναι τῷ εὐθείᾳ συμμετοχή ποίῳ πρῶτων, οὐ δὲ αἰσθητὸν ἡγομαντίαν τὸν δεῖν σαραγονή, Τοιούτῳ, οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸν δεῖν σαραγονής, τοιούτῳ θεοῦ, τοιούτῳ εἰς τὸν δεῖν σαραγονής. And he, that desire to be resolved, What the Egyptians think, to be the first Cause of all. Whether Intellect or something above Intellect? And that Whether alone or with some other? Whether Incorporeal or Corporeal? Whether the first Principle be the same with the Demiurgus and Architeche of the World, or before him? Whether all things proceed from one or many? Whether they suppose Matter, or Qualified Bodies, to be the first? and if they admit a First Matter, Whether they assert it to be Unmade or Made? In answer to which Porphyrian Querries, Jamblichus thus begins; καὶ πρῶτον μόνον, πρῶτον πρὸς τῆς προτοφανείας, οὐδὲν τέτων αἰκης: πόρον δὲν ὄμοιον ὄντως ἢ ἀναγερέσθαι, ἢ περίδες ἢ πρῶτες ὅτι ἡ θέα τῆς θεοῦ διηκελον, άλλοι, οἳ μονοτητής το ἑκτά ἐκτάς ψυχής ἐντόθι μὲν ὡς ὑποτύπους οὐκ ἐπίπληκται, ἢττον ἀλλο τι. I shall first reply to that you first demand, That, according to the Egyptians, before all Entities and Principles there is one God, who is in order of nature before (him that is commonly called) the first God and King: Immutable, and always remaining in the solitariness of his own Unity, there being nothing Intelligible nor any thing else complicated with him &c. In which words of Jamblichus and those others that there follow after, though there be some obscurity (and we may perhaps have occasion further to consider the meaning of them elsewheren) yet he plainly declares, that according to the Egyptians, the first Original of all things, was a perfect Unity above Intellect, but intimating withall, that besides this First Unity, they did admit of certain other Divine Hypostases (as a perfect Intellect, and Mundane Soul) subordinate thereunto, and dependent on it, concerning which he that writeth afterwards τῶν πρῶτῶν ὑπομενόντων περὶ τῆς ἑκτάς, οὐδὲν ἢ τῷ ἔργῳ ἐντόθι ἐπίπληκται, περὶ τῶν ἑκτάς ἐντόθι ἐπίπληκται, μιᾷ Νοον ἐν τῷ ἑνόμον προστίθεσι. The Egyptians do knowledge, before the Heaven, and in the Heaven, a Living Power (or Soul) and again they place a pure Mind or Intellec above the World Bu
But that they did not acknowledge a Plurality of Coordinate & Independent Principles is further declared by him after this manner, viz. Whether Hermes and the Egyptians, Matter was also Made or produced by God; or essentialitate succidit ac subsistit Materialitate, as Scutellius turns it. Which Passage of Jamblichus, Proclus upon the Timaeus (where he affirms that God was αὔτος αὐτίκα τὰ ἔλαια, the unessential cause of Matter) takes notice of in this manner, viz. He is of the opinion concerning Matter, which was not Unmade or Self-existent, but produced by the Deity. For the Divine Jamblichus hath recorded, that Hermes would have Materiality to have been produced from Essentiality (that is, the Passive Principle of Matter from that Active Principle of the Deity;) And it is very probable from hence, that Plato was also of the same opinion concerning Matter, viz. because he is supposed to have lowered Hermes and the Egyptians. Which indeed is the more like if that be true which the same Proclus affirmed concerning Orpheus, who Orphics θὰ τῶν τὰ λόγον πᾶν πρωτις θὰ νωτῷ ποίησαι παραχθάνω τὰ, That Orpheus also did after the same manner, deduce or derive Matter from the First Hypostasis of Intelligibles, that is, from the Supreme Deity. We shall conclude here in the last place with the Theory of Damaeus, in his Book of Principles writing after this manner concerning the Egyptians, Αἴγυπτιος ὁ μόνω εὐδημοτορ ἀπειρός ἄληθες: οὐ Αἴγυπτιοι καὶ οἱ μέλη φιλόσοφοι γαρ εἰσίν, ἣν διέθεσεν ταῖς καραθημέναις, διὰ γένους τοις Αἴγυπτιοι ἦν τα λόγοι: ὡς εἰς κατ. τότε οὐκ ἄλλως ἠθέλησεν εἰς τῶν φιλόσοφων ὡς Ευδημοτορ καραθημένως: Εὐδημος ἔθεε ὃν τοις φιλόσοφοι τοις Αἴγυπτιοι τοις περιτοί οὕτως. Eudemus hath given us no exact account of the Egyptians, but the Egyptian Philosophers that have been in our times, have denied the hidden truth of their Theology, having found in certain Egyptian Writings, that there was according to them, One Principle of things, praised under the name of the Unknown Darkness, and that was repeated: Which Unknown Darkness is a Description of that Supreme Deity, that is Incomprehensible.

That the Egyptians amongst their Many Gods did acknowledge Supreme, May sufficiently appear also, even from their vulgar Religion and Theology. In which they had first a Peculiar and other Name for him as such. For as the Greeks called the Supreme God
God Zeus, the Latins Jupiter or Jove, so did the Egyptians call his Hammon or Ammon according to Herodotus, whose Testimony to the purpose hath been already cited, and confirmed by Origen who was an Egyptian born. Thus also Plutarch in his Book de Theis, την πολλαν ναμεληθεν, ἵνα παρ' Ἀρχενίας νύμφα τῆς Διός ἔσω, ἢ Ἁμων, ὁ Άρης ἀγαθὰς Ἁμωνα λέγετεν. It is supposed by most, that the proper name of Zeus or Jupiter (that is, the Supreme Deity) among the Egyptians, is Amous, which we Greeks pronounce Hammon. To the same purpose Hesychius, Ἀμων ὁ Ζακ, Ἄμωντας, Ammon according to Aristotle is the same with Zeus. Whence it came to pass that by the Latin Writers Hammon was vulgarly called Jupiter Ammon. While Hammon was not only used as a proper name, for the Supreme Deity by the Egyptians, but also by the Arabians and all the Africans according to that of Lucan,

Quadris Ἐθιοπων populis Aramumque beatis
Gentibus, atque Indis, annus fì Jupiter Ammon.

Wherefore not only Marmarica (which is a part of Africa, where was that most famous Temple of this Ammon) was from thence denominated Ammonia, but even all Africa, as Stephanus informs us was sometimes called Ammonis, from this God Ammon, who has been therefore titled Zeus Alexæs, the Libyan Jupiter.

Indeed it is very probable, that this word Hammon or Ammon was at first derived from Ham or Cham the son of Noah, whose Portiosity was chiefly seated in those African parts, and from whom Egypt was called, not only in the Scripture, the Land of Ham, but also by the Egyptians themselves, as Plutarch testifieth, Χαμ or Chemia, as St. Jerome, Ham; and the Coptes also to this very day call it Chem. Nevertheless this will not hinder, but that the Word Hammon for all that, might be used afterwards by the Egyptians, as a name for the Supreme God, because amongst the Greeks, Ζεὺς in like manner was supposed to have been at first the name of a Man or Hero but yet afterwards applied to signify the Supreme God. And that might be such a mixture of Herology or History, together with Theology as well amongst the Egyptians, as there was amongst the Greeks! Nay some learned men conjecture, and not without probability, that the Zeus of the Greeks also was really the very same with that Ham or Cham the son of Noah, whom the Egyptians first worshipped as a Hero or Deified Man; there being several considerable agreements and correspondencies between the Poetic Fables of Saturn and Jupiter, and the true Scripture-Story, of Noah and Cham; as there likewise a great affinity betwixt the words themselves, for as the Greek signifies Heat or Furnace, so is Ζεὺς derived by the Greek Grammarians from ξέα. And thus will that forementioned Testimony of Herodotus, in some sense be verified, that the Greeks received the names of most of their Gods, even of Ζεύς himself, from the Egyptians.

Perhaps it may be granted also, that the Sun was sometime wo
Chap. IV. Hammon a Hidden & Indivisible Deity. 339

shiped by the Egyptians, under the Name of _Hammon_; it having been in like manner sometimes worshipped by the Greeks under the
Name of _Zeus_. And the word very well agreeeth herewith, הַמּ ה in the Hebrew Language signifying not only Heat but the Sun; 5 from whence כַּשָּׁה_Chamanis_ also was derived. Nevertheless it will not follow from hence, that therefore the Visible Sun, was generally accounted by the Egyptians the _Supreme Deity_, no more than he was amongst the Greeks. But as we have often occasion to observe, there was in the Pagan Religion, a confused Jumble, of _Herology, Physiology, and Theology_ all together. And that the Notion of this Egyptian God _Hammon_, was neither confined by them to the Sun, nor yet to the whole _Corporal World_ or _Nature of the Universe_ (as some have conceived) is evident from hence, because the Egyptians themselves, interpreted it, according to their own Language, to signify, That which was _Hidden and Obseure_, as both _Manetho_ an ancient _Egyptian Priest_, and _Hecateus_ (who wrote concerning the Philosophy of the Egyptians;) in _Plutarch_ agree: _Manetho_ μὴ ὁ Ἐλληνικὸς περὶ κεκρυμμένων ὑπήρκει ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ὑπὸ τεσσαρεύ μὲν ἔλεγεν αὐτὸς
Ἄρδης τοῖς _Egyptiis_ ὃς ἔχει οὐκ ἔχει τάς ἀργυρίας, ὅταν τὰ προσκαλεῖται, προσκλιτῶν τὸ ἅγιον ἂν τῶν φανῶν ἄλλο τρίτον τὸν ὅτι κεκρυμμένων ὑπάρχει, προσκλιτῶν τὸν ἄλλας ἀργυρίας, _Manetho_ ἀρχιερεὺς κεκρυμμένων ὑπάρχει, ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν ἀργυρίων ὑπάρχει, ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν ἀργυρίων _Manetho_ Sebennites conceives the Word _Amoun_, to signify that which is Hidden. And _Hecateus_ affirmeth thus the Egyptians _Ufe_ this Word when they _call any one to them that was distant or absent from them_; Wherefore the _First God_, because he is Invisible and Hidden, they, as it were Inviting him to approach near, and to make himself Manifest and conspicuous to them, _call him Amoun_. And agreeably hereunto, _Jamblichus_ gives us this account of the true Notion of this Egyptian God _Ammon_, ἦς ὁ ἄρχιερεύς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀργυρίων ὑπάρχει, ὁ ὁποῖον ἔχει οὐκ ἔχει τὰς ἀργυρίας τῶν ἀργυρίων ὑπάρχει, ὁ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχιερην ὁ κεκρυμμένων ὑπάρχει, ὁ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχιερην εἰς τὸν ἄρχιερην ὑπάρχει, ὁ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχιερην ὑπάρχει. _The Demurgical Intellect, and President of Truth_, as with _Wisdom_ it proceedeth to Generation, and produceth into Light, the _Secret and Invisible Powers of the hidden Reasons_, is, according to the _Egyptian Language_, called _Hammon_. Wherefore we may conclude, that _Hammon_ amongst the Egyptians, was not only the Name of the _Supreme Deity_, but also of such a one as was Hidden, Invisible and Incorporeal.

And here it may be worth our observing, that this Egyptian _Hammon_ was in all Probability taken notice of in Scripture, though vulgar Interpreters have not been aware thereof. For thus we understand that of _Jeremy_ 46. 25. _The Lord of Hosts_, _the God of Israel_ with, behold I will visit _and_ _pun_ (that is, not the _Multitude of Noe_, but) _Ammon_ (the _God_ of _Noe_, and _Pharaoh_ and _Egypt_ with her (other) _Gods_ and _Kings_, and all that tryst in him;) _I_ will deliver them into the hands of these that seek their lives, and into the hands of Nebuchadrezzar _King of Babylon_. For the understanding of which place, we may observe, that according to the Language of those ancient _Pais_, when every _Country_ or _City_, had their Peculiar and Proper names, for the _Gods_ presiding over them or Worshipped by _them_,
them, the several Nations and Places, were themselves commonly denoted and signified, by the names of those their respective Gods. With which kind of Language, the Scripture itself also complieth: as when the Moabites are called in it, the People of Chemosh, Numbers 21. And when the Gods of Damascus are said to have smitten Abaz, because the Syrians smote him, 2 Chron. 28. Accordingly whereunto also, whatsoever was done or attempted against the several Nations or Countries, is said to have been done or attempted against their Gods. Thus Moab's Captivity is described, Jeremy 48. Thou shalt be taken, and Chemosh shall go into captivity. And the overthrow of Babylon is predicted after the same manner, in the Prophecy of Isaiah Cap. 46. Bell boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, themselves are gone into captivity. As also the same is threatened in that of Jeremy, C. 51. I will visit Bell in Babylon, and will bring out of his mouth, that which he hath swallowed up, and the Nations shall not flow unto him any more, for the Wall of Babylon shall be broken down.

Now Bell according to Herodotus, was a name for the Supreme God amongst the Babylonians, as well as Ammon was amongst the Egyptians; who notwithstanding by both of them was worshipped after an Idolatrous manner. And therefore as in these latter places, by the Visiting and Punishing of Bell, is meant the visiting and punishing of the Babylonians; so in that former place of Jeremy, by the visiting of Ammon, and the Gods of Egypt, is understood, the visiting of the Egyptians themselves; accordingly as it is there also expressed. No was, it seems, the Metropolis of all Egypt; and therefore Ammon the Chief God of those Ancient Egyptians, and of that City, was called Ammon of No. As likewise the City No, is denominated from this God Ammon in the Scripture, and called both No-Ammon, and Ammon-No. The former in the Prophecy of Nahum, Cap. 3. Art thou better than No-Ammon? or that No in which the God Ammon is worshipped? Which is not to be understood of the Oracle of Ammon in Marmarica, as some have imagined (they taking No for an Appellative and so to signify Habitation;) it being unquestionably the Proper name of a City in Egypt. The Latter in that of Ezekiel, Cap. 30. I will pour out my fury upon Sin, the strength of Egypt, and will cut off Hammon-No. In which place as Sin is meant Ptolœum, so Hammon No, by the Seventy, is interpreted Diospolis, the City of Jupiter; that is, the Egyptian Jupiter, Hammon. Which Diospolis was otherwise called the Egyptian Thebes, (anciently the Metropolis of all Egypt) but whose Proper name in the Egyptian Language, seems to have been No; which from the chief God there worshipped, was called both No-Ammon and Hammon-No: as that God himself was also denominated from the City, Ammon of No. And this is the rather probable, because Plato tells us expressly, that Ammon was anciently the Proper or Chief God of the Egyptian Thebes or Diospolis, where he speaks of Theuth or Thoth the Egyptian Hermes, in these words: μετα装置 ῥωθέων δι' αυτοπτήν δι' ὅτι Ἀιαπούς ἐκεῖνος ἐκ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐν οὐ' ἔλευσεν Ἀιαπούς ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ δοκέαν θεοῦ καθότι ἂν Ἀμμαν. Thamus was then King over all Egypt, reigning in that great City (the Metropolis thereof) which the Greeks call the Egyptian Thebes, and whose Gods was Ammon. But whereas the Prophet Nahum (who seems to have written after the completion of that judgmen
There is an excellent Monument of Egyptian Antiquity preferred by Plutarch and others, from whence it may be made yet further Evident, that the Egyptians did not suppose a Multitude of Unmade Self-existent Deities, but acknowledged One Supreme, Universal and All-comprehending Numin. And it is that Inscription upon the Temple at Sais, which I am all that hath been, Is, and Shall be, and my Peplum or Veil, no mortal hath ever yet uncovered: which though perhaps some would understand thus, as if that Deity therein described, were nothing but the Sensible Matter of the whole Corporeal Universe, according to that Opinion of Cheremon before mentioned and confuted; yet it is plain, that this could not be the meaning of this Inscription: First, because the God here described, is not a mere Congeries of Infinite Matter, or Aggregation of Divided Atoms, but it is some One thing which was All: According to that other Inscription upon an Altar dedicated to the Goddess Isis, which we shall also afterward make use of, Tibi, Une, que es Omnia; To the who being One, art All things. Again, in the Deity here described, there is both a Veil or Outside, and also something Hidden and Conceal’d; the fence seeming to be this, I am all that was, is, and shall be, and the whole World is nothing but my self Veiled: but my naked and unveiled Brightness, no mortal could ever yet behold or comprehend: Which is just, as the Sun should say, I am all the Colours of the Rainbow (whose mild and gentle light may easily be beheld) and they are nothing but my simple and Uniform Light, variably refracted and abated: but my immediate Splendour and the Brightness of my Face, no mortal can contemplate, without being either blinded or dazed by it. Wherefore this Description of the Deity, may seem not a little to resemble that Description which God makes of himself to Moses, Thou shalt see my Back-parts, but my Face shall not be seen. Where there also something External and Visible in the Deity, and something Hidden and Conceal’d, Invisible and Incomprehensible to Mortals, and Philo thus glosseth upon those words, οὐκ ἐμπροσθότητα ταύτην, το καὶ μετὰ αὐτοῦ ἔνδειξιν, το ἡγεμονίαν ὧν ὅτι τὸν πάντας ὀνείρομεν εἰς τὸν θεόν. & τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐν παρὰ παραλογίσμα. It is sufficient for a wise man to know God at Posteriori, or from his Effects; but whoever will needs behold the naked Essence of the Deity, will be blinded with the transcendent Radiance and Splendour of his Beams. Where, according to Philo, the Works of God, as manifesting the Attributes
of his Power, Goodness, and Wisdom, are called the Back-parts of the Deity; so are they here in this Inscription called the Peplum, the Veil and Exterior Garment of it, or else God himself Veiled. Wherefore it is plain, that the Deity here described, cannot be the mere Visible and Corporeal World as Seniors and Inanimate, that being all Outside and Exposed to the View of Senec, and having nothing Hidden or Veiled in it. But thirdly, this will yet be more evident, if we do but take notice of the Name of this God, which was here described, and to whom that Temple was dedicated; and that was in the Egyptian Language, Neith, the fame with 'Athena among the Greeks, and Minerva among the Latins; by which is meant Wisdom or Understanding: from whence it is plain, that the Inscription is to be understood not of such a God, as was meere Seniors Matter (which is the God of the Atheists) but a Mind. Athenagoras tells us, that the Pagan Theologers interpreted τὸ Ἀθηνᾶς or Minerva to be τὸ φενός Ὀδιοστος, Wisdom or Mind passing and diffusing itself through all Things; than which there cannot be a better Commentary on this Inscription. Wherefore it may be here observed, that those Pagans who acknowledged God to be a Mind, and Incorporeal Beingcrete from Matter, did notwithstanding frequently consider him, not abstractly by himself alone, but concretely together with the Refult of his whole Fecundity, or as displaying the World from himself, and diffusing himself through all things, and being in a manner All Things. Accordingly we learn'd before from Horn Apollo, that the Egyptians by God, meant, a Spirit diffusing itself through the World, and intimately pervading all things: and that they supposed, that nothing at all could consist without God. And after this manner, Jamblichus in his Mysteries, interprets the meaning of this Egyptian Inscription: For when he had declared that the Egyptians, did both in their Doctrine and their Priestly Hierurgies, exhort men to ascend above Matter, to an Incorporeal Deity the Maker of all, he adds, ὑπογίνεται ἐν ὑμῖν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ ἡ ἁγιασμός, ἡ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστίν ἡ ἐν θάνατι, ἡ ἐν θανάτῳ ἡ ἐν ζωῇ, ἡ ἐν ζωῇ ἡ ἐν θανάτῳ, ἡ ἐν θανάτῳ ἡ ἐν ζωῇ. Hermas also propounded this Method, and Bithysthe Prophet interpreted the same to King Ammon, having found it written in Hieroglyphick letters in the Temple of Sais in Egypt; as he also there declared the name of that God, who extends or diffuses himself through the whole World. And this was Neith, or Athena, that God thus described, I am all that was, Is, and Shall be, and my Peplum or Veil no mortal could ever uncover. Where we cannot but take notice also, that whereas the Athena of the Greeks was derived from the Egyptian Neith, that the afo was famous for her Peplum too, as well as the Egyptian Goddes. Peplum (faith Servius) est Proprié Palla pīda Fāmina, Minerva consœrata; Peplum is properly a womanish Pall or Veil, embroidered all over, and consœrated to Minerva. Which Rite was performed at Athens, in the Great Panathenaiicks, with much Solemimity, when the Statue of this Goddes, was also by those Noble Virgins of the City, who embroidered this Veil, cloathed all over therewith. From whence we may probably conclude, that the Statue of the Egyptian Neith also, i th
the Temple of Sais, had likewise agreeably to its Inscription, such a Peplum or Veil call'd over it, as Minerva or Artemis at Athens had; this Hieroglyphically to signifie, that the Deity was invisible and incomprehensible to mortals, but had Veiled it self in this Visible Corporeal World, which is as it were the Peplum, the exterior Variegated or embroidered Vestment of the Deity. To all which Considerations may be added in the last place, what Proclus hath recorded, that there was something more belonging to this Egyptian Inscription, than what is mentioned by Plutarch; namely these words, κατα τον θεόν τόν θεόν τον θεόν, And the Sun was the Fruit or off-Spring which I produced; from whence it is manifest, that according to the Egyptians, the Sun was not the Supreme Deity, and that the God here described, was as Proclus also observeth, ἀνυπόκτων Σωτήρ, A Demiurgical Deity the Creator of the whole World, and of the Sun, Which Supreme Incorporeal Deity, was notwithstanding in their Theology, said to be All Things, because it diffused it self thorough All.

Wherefore, whereas Plutarch cites this Passage out of Hecatoem, concerning the Egyptians, κατα τον θεόν τόν θεόν τον θεόν, that they take the First God, and the Universe, for One and the Same thing; the meaning of it cannot be: as if the First or Supreme God of the Egyptians, were the Sensible Corporeal World; Plutarch himself in the very next words declaring him to be, ἄφραμ ἃς ἐκμεμερομένα, Invisible and Hidden; whom therefore the Egyptians, as inviting him to manifest himself to them, called Hammon; as he elsewhere affirmeth, That the Egyptians First God or Supreme Deity, did see all things, himself being not seen. But the forementioned Passage must needs be understood thus, that according to the Egyptians, the First God, and τὸ θυσία or the Universe, were Synonymous expressions, often used to signifie the very same thing; because the First Supreme Deity, is that which contains All Things; and diffuseth it self through All Things. And this Doctrine was from the Egyptians derived to the Greeks, Orpheus declaring, κατα τὸν θεόν, that all things were One, and after him Parmenides and other Philosophers, κατα τὸν θεόν, that One was the Universe or all, and that τὸ θυσία was ἐκλειψαν, that the Universe was Immoveable, by meaning nothing else hereby, but that the First Supreme Deity, was both One and All things, and Immoveable. And thus much is lainly intimated by Aristotle in these words, κατα τὸν θεόν ἀνυπόκτων, τὸ θυσία ἐς ἐν μιᾷ μόρισιν ὑποτεταγμένον ἑπεράσω. There are some who pronounced concerning the whole Universe, as being but One Nature; that is, who called the Supreme Deity τὸ θυσία or the Universe, because that Vertu-vel Contained All things in it.

Nevertheless τὸ θυσία or the Universe, was frequently taken by the agn Theologers also, as we have already intimated, in a more comprehensive sense, for the Deity, together with all the extent of Fecundity, God as displaying himself in the World; or, for and the World both together; the Latter being look'd upon, nothing but an Emanation or Efflux from the Former. And thus was
was the word taken by Empedocles in Plutarch, when he affirmed, that the World was not the Universe, but only a small part thereof. And according to this sense was the God Pan understood both by the Arcadians and other Greeks, not for the mere Corporeal World as Sensible and Inanimate, nor as endowed with a Plastick Nature only (this was partly included in the Notion of Pan also) but as proceeding from a Rational and Intellecutal Principle, diffusing it self through All; or for the whole System of Things, God and the World together, as one Deity. For that the Arcadick Pan, was not the Corporeal World alone, but chiefly the Intellecutal Ruler and Governor of the same, appears from this Testimony of Macrobius; Hunc Deum Arcades colunt, appellantes Pan, non Sylvorum Dominum, sed universa substantia. The Arcadians worship this God Pan (as their most ancient and honorable God) calling him the Lord of Hyle, that is, not the Lord of the Woods, but the Lord or Dominator over all Material Substance. And thus does Phorminus likewise describe the Pan of the other Greeks; not as the mere Corporeal World, Sensible and Inanimate, but as having a Rational and Intellectual Principle for the Head of it, and presiding over it, that is, for God and the World both together, as one System; the World being but the Illusion and Emanation of the Deity. The lower parts of Pan (faith he) were Rough and Goatish, because of the aspersion of the Earth, but his upper parts of a Humane Form, because the Either being Rational and Intellectual, is the Hegemonick of the World; Adding hereunto, that Pan was signified to be Lustful or Lascivious, because of the Multitude of Spermatick Reasons contained in the World, and the continual Mixtures and Generations of things to be clothed with the Skin of a Libbard, because of the bespangled Heavens, and the beautiful variety of things in the World, to live in a Defart, because of the Singularity of the World; and Lastly, to be a good Demon, by reason of that supreme Mind, Reason and Understanding that governs all in it. Pan therefore was not the mere Corporeal World Sensible and Inanimate, but the Deity as displaying it self therein, and pervading All things. Agreeably to which Diogenes Siculus determines, that παύον were but two several Names for one and the same Deity, (as it is well known that the whole Universe was frequently called by the Pagans Jupiter also, as well as Pan.) And Socrates himself in Plato directs his Prayer in a most devout and serious manner, to this Pan, that is, not the Corporeal World or Sensible Matter, but an Intellectual Principle Ruling over all, or the Supreme Deity diffusing it self through All; he therefore diistinguishing him from the Inferiour Gods, o θεόν χιλία τις, ἀλλ' ἐκείνου τοίς ἀκατάστατοι, δεινόν μεικτά κατωθεν τινίδεν. That is the Excedent, for the Gods are of the same. O Good (or Gracious) Pan, and ye other Gods, who preside over this place; Grant that I may be Beautiful or Fair within, and that those External things, which I have, may be such as may best agree with a right Internal disposition of mind, and that I may account him to be rich that is wise and just: The matter of which prayer, though it be excellent, yet is it Paganically directed to Pan (that is the Supreme God) and the Inferiour Gods both together. Thus we see that as well
And here we cannot but by the way take notice of that famous and remarkable Story of Plutarch's in his defect of Oracles, concerning Demons Lamenting the Death of the Great Pan. In the time of Tiberius (if it he) certain persons embarking from Asia for Italy, towards the Evening sailed by the Echinades, where being becalmed, they heard from thence a loud voice calling one Thamos an Egyptian Magician amongst them, and after the third time commanding him when he came to the Palodes, to declare that the Great Pan was dead. With the advice of his company resolved, that if they had a quick ale when they came to the Palodes, he would pass by silently, but if they should find themselves there becalmed, he would then perform what the voice had commanded: But when the ship arrived therewith, there neither was any Gale of Wind nor agitation of later. Whereupon Thamos looking out of the hinder Deck, towards the Palodes, pronounced these words with a loud voice, μηδεν παν θαλάς. The Great Pan is dead, which he had no sooner said, but he was answered, with a Quire of many voices, making great Howling and Lamentation, not without a certain mixture of Admiration. Plutarch, who gives much credit to this Relation, as how Sollicitous Tiberius the Emperor was, first concerning the 2nd thereof; and afterwards, when he had satisfied himself therein, concerning the Interpretation; he making great Enquiry amongst his learned men, who this Pan should be. But the only use which that Philosopher makes of this Story is this, to prove that Demons having dies as well as men, (though of a different kind from them and much more longeve) yet were notwithstanding Mortal: he endeavouring from thence to salve that Phenomenon of the Defect of Oracles, because the Demons who had formerly haunted those places are now dead. But this being an idle Fancy of Plutarch's, it is much more probably concluded, by Christian Writers; that this coming to pass in the Reign of Tiberius when our Saviour Christ was crucified, was no other than a Lamentation of Evil Demons (without a mixture of Admiration) upon account of our Saviour's Death, happening at that very time: They not mourning out Love for him that was dead, but as sadly prefiguring evil to themselves from thence, as that which would threaten danger to their Kingdom of Darkness, and a Period to that Tyranny and Dominations which they had so long exercised over Mankind; according to 1 Par. 8:26 and having spoiled Principalities and Powers (by his Death on the Cross) He triumphed over them in it. Now our Saviour's Death could not be called Pan, according to that Notion of the 2d, as taken for nothing but the Corporeal World devoid of all manner of Life, or else as endued only with a Mechanical Nature; but Appellation might very well agree to him, as Pan was taken for the δόξα ποιήσες του ναζαίων, that Reason and Understanding by which all things were made, and by which they are all governed, or for 2 Thess. xiv. 6, τήν δυναμιν, that Divine Wisdom which diffuseth itself through all
things. Moreover Pan being used not so much for the naked and abstract Deity, as the Deity as it were embodied in this Visible Corporeal World, might therefore the better signify, God manifested in the Flesh, and clothed with a Particular Humane Body (in which respect alone, he was capable of dying.) Neither indeed was there any other Name, in all the Theology of the Pagans, that could so well befit our Saviour Christ as this.

We have now made it manifest, that according to the ancient Egyptian Theology, (from whence the Greekish and European was derived) there was One Intellectual Deity, One Mind or Wisdom, which as it did produce all things from it self, so doth contain and comprehend the whole, and is it self in a manner All things. We think it in the next place to observe, how this Point of the Old Egyptian Theology, viz. God's being All Things, is every where inflicted upon throughout the Hermaick or Trefmegistick Writings. We shall begin with the Aelesian Dialogue or the τῳδεία, translated into Latin by Apuleius; in the Entrance of which, the Writer having declared, Omnia Unius esse, & Unum esse Omnia, that all things were of One and that One was All things, he afterwards adds this explication there of, Nonne hoc dixi, Omnia Unum esse, & Unum Omnia, upote qult in Creatore fuerint omnia, antequam creasset omnia? Nec immemisit Unus esse dictas Omnia, cuius membra sunt Omnia. Hujus itaque quae Unus Omnia, vel ipse est Creator omnium, in tota loc disputatione cura meminisse: Have we not already declared, that All things are One, and One All things? forasmuch as All things existed in the Creator, before they were made; Neither is he improperly said to be All things whose Members all things are. Be thou therefore mindful in this whole disputation, of him who is One and All things, or was the Creator of All. And thus afterwards does he declare, that all Created things were in the Deity before they were made, Ideoce non erant quandatura erant sed in eo jam una erant unde nasci habuerunt, they did not properly then exist before they were made, and yet at that very time, were they in him from whom they were afterwards produced.

Again, he writes thus concerning God, non spero totius Majestatis Effecdorem, omnium rerum Patrem vel Dominum, uno posse quamvis multis composito nomine nuncupari. Hunc voca potius omni nomine, si quidem sit Unus & Omnia; ut neceffe sit aut Omnia ipsius nomine, aut ipsum omnium nomine nuncupari. Hic igitur Solus Omnia, &c. I cannot hope sufficiently to express, the Author of Majesty, and the Father and Lord of all things, by any One Name, though compounded of never so many names. Call him therefore by every Name, forasmuch as he is One and All things, so that of necessity, either All things must be called by His name, or be by the Names of All things. And when he has spoken of the mutability of Created things he adds, Solus Deus ipse in se, & A se; & Circum se, totus est plenus atque perfectus, ipsius firma stabilitas est; nec alicujus impulsi, nec loco moveri potest cum in eo sunt Omnia, & in omnibus ipse est Solus: God alone in himself, and from himself, and about himself, is altogether perfect; an himself is his own stability. Neither can he be moved or changed, by impulse of any thing, since All things are in him, and he alone is in All things.

*culmus est omnium sensibilium specierum, qualitatum, vel corporum; quae
omnia sine Deo vegetari non possunt: Omnia enim Deus, & ad Deo Omnia,
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Agreement of Trifinogistick Books, Book I.

and Constitution of all things. Book the Ninth, μὲνδε ὅ λέγω ὅτι ἐὰν αὐτὸς ἑσθε, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἄλλης ἀποφασμαινόμε, αὐτὸς ἑκατέτετο ἔρην ἄν ζῆνον αὐτὸ προσακραδονύν, εἴτε ἐξ ἑαυτῆς. I would not say, that God Hath all things, but rather declare the truth, and say that he Is All things; not as receiving them from without, but as sending them forth from himself. Again afterwards in the same Book, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἑαυτόν ἀπαλατορίζω τὸν ὅ τι ὄντων ὅτι ἔγειρον, λέγω τῷ Ἑβ. τῷ ὅ ὄντο ὃν ὧν ἐκεῖ, καὶ ὃτι ἑσθε, καὶ ὃτι ἑσθε, ὃτι ἐστι ἑσθε, ὃτι ἐστι. There shall never be a time, when any thing that is, shall cease to be, for when I say any thing that Is, I say any thing of God; for God hath all things in him and there is neither any thing without God, nor God without any thing. Book the Tenth, καὶ γὰρ ἐξετάζεις ἡ παρὰ τοῦ ὄρους, ὅ τι τὸ πάντων ἐνέστε τῇ αὐτῇ ὀπις ὄντων; τίτί ἢ γας, τίτι ἢ γας, τίτι ἢ γας. What is God, but the very Being of all things that yet are not, and the Subsistence of things that are. And again, ὃς ἐστι, ὃς παρησία ὃς ὅ τοι ἐσθεν, ὃ σὰν τὸ πάντων. God is both the Father and Good, because he is All things. Book the Eleventh, αὐτός ὃν ἔγειρον ὃν ὧν ὧν ἐκεῖ, ἀυτός ὃν ὧν τὸν ὃν. God acting immediately from himself, is always in his own work, Himself being that which he makes: for if that were never so little separated from him, all would of necessity fall to nothing and die. Again, ποιεῖν ἐκ τίνι ἢ τίνι, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτον κείμενον, All things are in God, but not as lying in a place. And further, since our own Soul can by Cognition and Phancy, become what it will, and where it will, any thing, or in any place, ὅτι τοι ἐν τῷ τέρσῳ οὐκ ἔρην ἢ Θεόν, ἄρανοι φιλόσοφοι πάντα ὃν ἔστε, τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἐστιν. This may consider God in the same manner, as containing the whole World within himself, as his own Conceptions and Cognitions. And in the Close of that Chapter, which is also thence cited by St. Cyril, is to the same purpose, νομίζεις ὅ τοι τῆς Θεοῦ παρακαταγής λεγομεν (καθάρεις τοῦ Σιδηροῦ, τοῦ ψαθοῦ, καθάρεις τοῦ παρακάτων θεοῦ, τοῦ πάντων καθαρικον, Θεος λεγομεν θεολογεια) ὅταν γενετό ἐστίν λέγοντος, ὃ ὃ τοῦ τοῦ πάντων. I have heard the good Demon (for he alone, as the first begotten God, beholding all things, speake Divine Words) I have heard him sometimes saying, that One is all things. Again in the same Chapter, ὅ τι οὐκ ἐστιν κατ' ἑαυτόν ἐστιν ἀνατελεῖν κατά, ὃ μικρός τοῦ τέκτων, ὃ μικρός τοῦ περίκες, πλασματικὰ ὃ ὃ νυφῖς, ὃς ἑαυτὸν ἐν τῶν διὰ πατές τοῦ αἰώνος, ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, ἐν τῷ κράτισι, ἐν τῷ ἀναγεννησθῆναι, ἐν τῷ ἐν τῷ κράτισι, ἐν τῷ κατ' ἑαυτόν, ἐν τῷ κατ' ἑαυτόν, κατ' ἑαυτόν. This whole World is intimately united to him, and observing the order and will of its Father, hath the fulness of Life in it, and there is nothing in it through Eternity (neither Whole nor Part) which does not live; for there neither is, nor hath been, nor shall be, any thing Dead in the world. The meaning is, that all things vitally depend upon the Deity, who is said in Scripture, to quicken and enliven all things.
In this Universe there is nothing which he is not: Wherefore there is neither Magnitude nor Place nor Quality nor Figure nor Time about God, for he is All or the whole. But these things belong to Parts. And the Arcane Caution, though that Thirtieth Book to which it is subjoined be superfluous, yet harps much upon this Point of the Egyptian Theology, That God is All: who made All, and is All, and is God, the Univerfe or All. And in this Universe there is nothing which he is not: Wherefore there is neither Magnitude nor Place nor Quality nor Figure nor Time about God, for he is All or the whole. But these things belong to Parts. And the Arcane Caution, though that Thirtieth Book to which it is subjoined be superfluous, yet harps much upon this Point of the Egyptian Theology, That God is All: who made All, and is All, and is God, the Univerfe or All. And in this Universe there is nothing which he is not: Wherefore there is neither Magnitude nor Place nor Quality nor Figure nor Time about God, for he is All or the whole. But these things belong to Parts.

I am about to praise the Lord of the Creation, the All and the One. And again, All the Powers that are in me, praise the One and the All. Book the Fifteenth, i.e., the Thirtieth to the One, for the All ought to be One. Book the Sixteenth, as before, the Thirtieth. To the Lord of Creation, and to the One of the Powers, and to the One of the All, and to the One of the Creation. And he who made All, and is All, and is God, the Univerfe or All, has declared: All things are Parts of God, but if all things are Parts of God, then God is All things; Wherefore He making All things, doth, as it were, make himself.

Now by this we see, how well these Triumegistick Books, agree with that Ancient Egyptian Inscription, in the Temple of Isis, That God is All that Was, Is, and Shall be. Wherefore the Egyptian Theology thus undoubtedly asserting, One God that was All things; it is altogether impossible that it should acknowledge a Multitude of Self-existent, and Independent Deities.

Hitherto we have taken notice of Two several Egyptian Names, for One and the same Supreme Deity, Hammon and Neith; but we shall find that besides these, the Supreme God was sometimes worshipped by the Egyptians under other Names and Notions also; as of Isis, Osiris and Sarapis. For first, though Isis have been taken by some for the Moon, by others for the whole Earth, by others for Ceres or Corn, by others for the Land of Egypt, (which things in what fence they were Deified by the Egyptians, will be elsewhere declared) yet was she undoubtedly taken also sometimes, for an Universal and All-comprehending Numen. For Plutarch affirms, that Isis and Neith, were really one and the same God among the Egyptians, and therefore the Temple of Neith or Minerva at Sais, where the forementioned Inscription was found, is called by him, the Temple of Isis; so that Isis as well as Neith or Minerva among the Egyptians, was there described, as That God, who is All that Was, Is, and Shall be, and whose Veil no Mortal hath ever uncovered; that is, not a particular God, but an Universal and All-comprehending Numen. And this may be yet further confirmed, from that Ancient Inscription and Dedication to the Goddes Isis, still extant at Capua.
Where the Goddess Isis is plainly declared to be \( \text{ISIS} \), One and All things; that is, a Universal and All-comprehending Deity. And with this agreeeth also that Oration of this Goddess Isis in Apuleius: 

\[
\text{En adjun tusis, commota, Luci, precibus, rerum Natura Parentes, elementorum omnium Domina, seculorum Progenies initialis: Summa numinum, Regina marium, Prima Celiunm, Deorum Dea, uneiformes; quae ecell luminosa culmina, maris falubria flamia, inferorum deplorata silentia, nutibus meis dippo. Cujus Numen unicum multiformi specie, ritu vario, nomine multijugo totus veneratur orbis: Eccho here am I, moved by thy Prayers, Lucius, that Nature which was the Parent of things; the Mistress of all the Elements; the \( \text{Begynng} \) and \( \text{Original of Ages} \); the \( \text{Sum} \) of all the Divine Powers; the Queen of the Seas; the First of the Celestial Inhabitants; the \( \text{Uniform Face of Gods} \) and Goddesses; which with my books dispense the Luminous Heigts of the Heavens, the wholesome Blasts of the Sea, and the deplorable silences of Hell; whose only Divine Power, the whole World worships and adores, in a Multiform manner, and under Different Rites and Names.
\]

From which words it is plain, that this Goddess Isis, was not the meer \( \text{Animated Moon} \) (which was rather a Symbol of her) but that she was an Universal Deity, comprehensive of the whole Nature of things; the One Supreme God, worshipped by the Pagans, under severall Names, and with different Rites. And this is the plain meaning of those last words \( \text{Numen Unicum, &c.} \) that the whole World worshippeth one and the same Supreme God, in a multiform manner, with various Rites, and under many different Names. For besides the Several Names of the other Pagans there mentioned, the Egyptians worshipp'd it, under the Names of \( \text{Hammon, Neith} \), and others that shall be afterwards declared. And thus was Isis again worshipp'd and invok'd, as the \( \text{unicum Numen} \), or only Divine power, by Apuleius himself, in these following Words; \( \text{Tu sanet \& humani generis hospitatrix perpetua, dulcem matris affectionem miseris tribus, fatorum inextricabiliter contorta retraest lisa, fortune tempesfates mitigas, \\ & fellarum noxxos meatus cohibes: Tu Speri colunt, observat Inferi. Tu rotas orbem, luminas solum, regis mundum, calca Tararum, Tibi respondent fideles, gaudent numina, serviant elementa: Tu nutu spiritum flamia, &c. Thou holy and perpetual Saviour of Man-kind that art always bountiful in cherishing Mortals, and dost manifest the dear affections of a Mother to them in their Calamities, thou extinguish'st the involved threads of Fate, mitigatest the tempesfates of Fortune, and restrains'st the noxious influences of the Stars: the Celestial Gods worshipp thee, the Infernal \( \text{Powers} \) obey thee; thou rollest round the Heavens, enlightnest the Sun, governest the World, treadest upon Tartarus or Hell; the Stars obey thee, the Elements serve thee, at thy beck the winds blow, &c. Where Isis is plainly supposed to be an Universal Numen and supreme Monarch of the World. Neither may this hinder,
Besides, that she was called a Goddess as Neith also was, these Pagans making their Deities to be indifferently of either Sex, Male or Female. But much more was Osiris taken for the Supreme Deity, whose name was sometimes said, to have signified in the Egyptian Language, οὐκόνδαλκας, that which had many Eyes, sometimes ρητος ἀντιχρις, ἀκακελιον, an active and beneficent Force; (and whose Hieroglyphick was an Eye and a Scepter) the former signifying Providence and Wisdom, and the Latter Power and Majesty (as Plutarch tells us) Who also is thus described in Apuleius, Deos Deorum magnorum potior, & majorem numinem, & summorum Maximus, & Maximorum Regnator, Osiris: That God who is the chiefest of the Greater Gods, and the Greatest of the Chiefest, and which Reigneth over the Greatest. Wherefore the same Apuleius also tells us, that Isis and Osiris were really one and the same Supreme Numen, though considered under different Notions and Worshipped with different Rites, in these words, Ἀνθρώπων connexa in uno unica, ratio Numinis, Religionisque effet, atque Telesc dicitur Deus maximus, though Isis and Osiris be really one and the same Divine Power, yet are their Rites and Ceremonies very different. The proper notion of Osiris, being thus declared by Plutarch, το θεσμον ηπ τον ἄλοκον την, κεγαλείον τον ήδιον, that First and Highest of all Beings, which is the same with Good. Agreeably whereunto, Scambichus affirmeth, οὐκόνδαλκας ἀντιχρις ὑπερ Ονεις, that God as the L. 3. p. 237. Cause of all Good is called Osiris by the Egyptians. Lastly, as for Sarapis, though Origen tells us, that this was a new upstart Deity, set up by Polyne in Alexandria; yet this God in his Oracle to Nicocrion the King of Cyprus, declares himself also to be a Universal Numen, comprehending the whole World, in these words, ἠστάσις καταφαξίας κεκαλεί, &c. to this Sense; The Starry Heaven is my Head, the Sea my Belly, my Ears are in the Ether, and the bright Light of the Sun is my clear looking Eye. And doubtles he was worshipped by many under this notion. For as Philarchus wrote thus concerning him, κάθετος ὅπως το το ποιεομενον, that Sarapis was the Name of that God, which orders and governs the whole World: so doth Plutarch himself conclude, that Osiris and Sarapis, were ηπιστος ὅπως ἡμεις ημεις ἀνακρινομεν, both of them Names of One God, and the same Divine Power. Accordingly whereunto Diodorus Siculus determines, that these Three, Hammon, Isis and Sarapis, were different names for one and the same Deity, or Supreme God. Notwithstanding which, Porphyrius it seems, had a very ill conceit of that Power which manifested itself in the Temple of this God Sarapis, above all the other Pagan Gods, he suspecting it to be no other than the very Prince of evil Demons Euseb. Tr. s. p. 21. the Devils, οἱ το φυγετες εὐεργετες ην το εινη ὑπο το ή σαραπισιν ξυπανωθηκαί, that Sarapis under the Son of God, the Prince and Head: this appearing (faith he) not only from those rites of Apparition used in the Worship of this God, but also from the symbol of him, which was a Three-headed Dog, signifying that Evil Deity, which ruleth in these Three Elements, Water, Earth, and Air. Neither indeed can it be doubted, but that it was an Evil Demon or Devil, that delivered Oracles in this Temple of Sarapis as well as elsewhere among the Pagans, however he affected to be worshipped the Supreme God.
Besides all this, Eusebius himself from Porphyrius informs us, that the Egyptians acknowledged One Intellectual Demiurgus, or Maker of the World, under the name of Cnepb, whom they worshipped in a Statue of Humane Form, and a blackish Sky-coloured Complexion; holding in his hand a Girdle and a Scepter, and wearing upon his Head a Princeely Plume, and thrusting forth an Egg out of his Mouth. The reason of which Hieroglyphick is thus given, έν λευκοί: ὑπερορωφίας, καὶ καταμύθημα, καὶ χίλιοι γαλήναι, καὶ ἡς ἕως ἔκζοσις, καὶ ἡς παραλλαγάς, ἢ ἡς νεφές κυνείται. Did it think proper to say, 'This is the Morning Star,' because that Wisdom and Reason, by which the World was made, is not easy to be found out but hidden and obscure. And because this is the Fountain of Life and King of all things; and because it is Intellectually moved, signified by the Feathers upon his head. Moreover by the Egg thrust out of the Mouth of this God, was meant the World, created by the Eternal Κύης, and from this Cnepb, was said to be Generated or Produced another God, whom the Egyptians call Phtha and the Greeks Vulcan; of which Phtha more afterwards. That the Egyptians were the most eminent Asserters of the Cosmogonia or Temporary Beginning of the World, hath been already declared; for which cause the Scholiast upon Ploemly thus persurgeth them, δέσυζε ἐδίαι λέγει τόν τον Αίγυπτιον κόσμον, The Egyptians were wont to talk perennially of the Genesis or Generation of the World. And Aelopius, an ancient Egyptian Writer in his Myriogenetis, affirms that according to the Egyptian Tradition, the Sun was made in Libra. But that the Egyptian did not suppose the world to have been made by Chance, as Epicurus and other Atheistical Philosophers did, but by an Intellectual Demiurgus called by them Cnepb is evident from this Testimony of Porphyrius. Which Cnepb was look'd upon by them as an Unmade and Eternal Deity, and for this very cause the Inhabitants of Thebais refused to worship any other God besides him, as Plutarch informs us in these words, ὅτι ἐν τῷ γεγενέσθαι τῷ παραλόγῳ έλέαν, τός μηδενί ἄλλες παρουσίαι μίας πληθ, μενος μη δυσμική τέων οὐκοῦν, μετοικία, καὶ Εἰκονική νομοθεσία, ἀλλὰ ἐν καλέσω κατακεφαλαίας, ἀπό τά ναόν κατακεφαλαίας, κατὰ εἰκονικής, κατὰ θερικής. Whilst the other Egyptians paid their proportion of Tax imposed upon them, for the nourishment of those sacred Animals, worshipped by them, the Inhabitants of Thebais only refused, because they would acknowledge no Mortal God, and worshipped him only whom they call Cnepb an Unmade and Eternal Deity.

Having now made it undeniably manifest, that the Egyptians had an acknowledgement amongst them of One Supreme Universal an Unmade Deity, we shall conclude this whole Diffcource with the Two following Observations: First that a great part of the Egyptian Polytheism, was really nothing else but the Worshipping of One and the same Supreme God, under many different Names and Notion as of Hammon, Neith, Isis, Osiris, Sarapis, Kneph, to which may be added Phtha, and those other names in Jambliclius, of Eion and meph. And that the Pagans universally over the whole world did the like, was affirmed also by Apuleius, in that fore-cited Paage his, Nomen Unicum, multiformi specie, ritu vario, nomine multiformi...
Nevertheless here may well be a Question started, whether amongst those several Egyptian Names of God, some might not signify distinct Divine Hypothesis Subordinates; and particularly, whether there were not some Footsteps of a Trinity, to be found in the old Egyptian Theology? For since Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato, who all of them allered a Trinity of Divine Hypothesis, unquestionably derived much of their Doctrine from the Egyptians, it may reasonably be supposed, that these Egyptians did take the like before them. And indeed Athanasius Kircherus makes no doubt at all hereof, but tells us, that in the Pamphylian Obelisk, that First Hieroglyphick of a Winged Globe, with a Serpent coming out of it, was the Egyptian Hieroglyphick of a Triforium Deity, or Trinity of Divine Hypothesis; he confirming the same, from the Testimony of Abenebius an Arabian Writer, and a Chaldaic Fragment imputed to Sanchuniathon; the Globe being laid to signify, the First Incomprehensible Deity without Beginning or End, Self-existente; the Serpent the Divine Wisdom and Creative Vertue; and lastly the Wings, that Active Spirit, that cleaveth, quicketh, and enliveth all things. How far credit is to be given to this, we leave others to judge; but the clearest footsteps that we can find anywhere of an Egyptian Trinity is in Emblicibus, so written concerning their Mysteries; which whole place therefore is worth the setting down, and may. All the power of the present [Sec.](author's note) a Hermes, the Son of the Goddess, by whom he is fathered, and which name, according to some, signifies the God Emeph, as the Prince or Cneph, the Ruler over all the Celestial Gods, whom he affirmeth to be a Mind disregarding himself and converting his Cognitions or Intuitions to himself. Before which Emeph, he placeth One Indivisible, whom he or Cneph, Seth Eicon, in which is the first Intelligible, and which is worshipped by silence. After which Two, Eicon and Emeph, the Demingrick or Cneph, and president of truth as with wisdom it proceedeth to Generations, and bringeth forth the hidden Powers of the occult Reasons into light, called in the Egyptian Language Ammon; as it Artificially effecteth all things with truth, Phtha (which Phtha the Greeks attending only to the Artificer thereof call Hepeheius or Vulcan) as it is productive of god, Oliris, besides other names that it hath according to its other Powers.
Powers and Energies. In which Passage of Jamblichus we have plainly Three Divine Hypothesis, or universal Principles Subordinate, according to the Hermack Theology; First an Indivisible Unity called Eidos, Secondly a Perfect Mind converting its Intelligence into it self, called Emeb or Hembut; and Thirdly the Immediate Principle of Generation, called by several names, according to its several Powers, as Phthas Mormon, Orisis and the like: So that these Three Names with others, according to Jamblichus, did in the Egyptian Theology, signify, one and the same Third Divine Hypothesis. How well these Three Divine Hypothesis of the Egyptians, agree with the Pythagorick or Platonick Trinity, of First, the Unity and Goodness it self, Secondly, Mind, and Thirdly Soul, I need not here declare. Only we shall call to mind what hath been already intimated, that that Reason or Wisdom which was the Demiurgus of the World, and is properly the Second of the forementioned Hypothesis, was called also amongst the Egyptians, by another name, Cnepb; from whom it was said to have been produced or begotten the God Phthias, the Third Hypothesis of the Egyptian Trinity; so that Cnepb and Emeb are all one. Wherefore we have here plainly an Egyptian Trinity of Divine Hypothesis Subordinate, Eidos, Emeb (or Cnepb) and Phthas. We know not what to add more to this of Jamblichus, concerning an Egyptian Trinity, unless we should insist upon those Passages which have been cited by some of the Fathers to this purpose out of Hermack or Trismegistick Books, whereof there was one before it down out of St. Cyril; or unless we should again call to mind, the Citation out of Damaecius, µως της νικης οντες αγιας οονας ινκαλακας επι της τρισεβωνης μηνον έπικος, that according to the Egyptians, there is One Principle of all things praised under the name of the Unknown Darkness, and this Thrice repeated. Agreeably to which Angiustian Stenclius produces another Passage out of the same Philosophical Writer; that the Egyptians made, παρθενος ουκ εντον μνημον ανακαλακας επι της τρισεβωσις, the First Principle of all to be Darkness above all Knowledge and Understanding (or Unknown Darkness) they Thrice repeating the same. Whence the foregoing Stenclius takes to be a clear acknowledgement of a Trinity of Divine Hypothesis in the Egyptian Theology.

Our Second Observation is this, That the Egyptian Theology as we as the Orpichick (which was derived from it) affirming One Incorpore Deity, that is All Things, as it is evident, that it could not admit Multitude of Self-existent and Independent Deities, so did the seeing Polytheism of the Egyptians proceed also in great measure from this Principle of theirs not rightly understood; they being kept thereby, in a certain sense, Sutori to Personate and Deify the Seven Parts of the World, and Things of Nature, bestowing the Names of Gods and Goddeses upon them. Not that they thereforeset worship the Inanimate Parts of the World as such, Much less Things in Substantial but mere Accidents, for so many Real, Distinct, Person Deities; but because conceiving that God who was All things, ought to be Worshipped in All things (such especially as were most Beneficial to Mankind), they did, according to that Aschetian and Trismegistic.
Doctrine before-mentioned, Call God by the Name of every Thing, or every Thing by the Name of God. And that the wiser of them very well understood that it was really One and the same Simple Deity, that was thus worshipped amongst them by piece-meal, in several Parts of the World, and Things of Nature, and under different Names and Notions, with different Ceremonies, is thus declared by Plutarch, Εἰ οἷς ἔχεται, ἵνα τὸ θεϊκόν τοις ἔχοντες τῷ πολλῷ, τῇ πρὸς ἰδίᾳ, τῇ ἰδιότητί, τῇ ἰδιωτικότητι του θεϊκοῦ. The Deity is a Greek Word, which signifies Knowledge, and Typhon is the Enemy to this Gods; who being puffed up by Ignorance and Error, doth Diffuse and Discern the Holy Doctrine (of the Simple Deity) which His Collects together again, and makes up into One, and thus delivers it to those who are initiated into the Sacred Mysteries, in order to Dissection. In which words, Plutarch intimates, that the Egyptian Fable, of Osiris being Mangled and Cut in pieces by Typhon, did Allegorically signify the Description and Dissection of the Simple Deity, by reason of the Weakness and Ignorance of vulgar minds (not able to comprehend it altogether at once) into several Names and Partial Notions, which yet True Knowledge and Understanding, that is, Isis, makes up whole again and unites into One.

XIX. It is well known that the Poets, though they were the Prophets of the Pagans, and pretending to a kind of Divine Inspiration, did otherwise embody the minds of the Vulgar, with a certain Sense of Religion, and the Notions of Morality; yet these notwithstanding were the grand Depravers and Adulterators of the Pagan Theology. For this they were guilty of upon several Accounts. As First, Their attributing to the Gods, in their Fables concerning them, all manner of Humane Imperfections, Passions and Vices. Which abuse of theirs, the wiser of the Pagans were in all ages highly sensible of, and offended with, as partly appears from these Free Passages vented upon the Stage,

---

καὶ τὸ ὀργ. ἐν βρεττῷ
καὶ τῇ περιπετ. ἐν θεῷ ἑν θεῷ,
πᾶς ἑν σιμόνοις, τὰς κεῖσες ὑμῶν βρεττῶν.
ἀλλὰ τῷ Διός κατατηρᾷ τὸν θεὸν.

---

Si quis ess mortalium
Qui seclera patra, exigunt penam Dei:
At nonne iniquum est, vos, suas leges quibus
Gens debet hominum, jure nullo vivere?

To this fence: Since mortal men are punished by the Gods for transgressing their Laws, is it not unjust, that ye Gods who write these Laws, should your selves live without Law? And again,

---

οὐκ ἐν χαίρεται κακὰ ἐν σφυραῖν οἴ τοι θεόν κακὰ
μακρῶς, ἐὰν τὸς Διὸς ἔχουσας τόδε.

---

Nulla
Nulla nos posthoc notet
Condita, signando illa que superos decent
Imitantur homines. Culpa ad authores redit.

Let men no longer be blamed for imitating the Evil Actions of the Gods; for they can only be justly blamed, who teach men to do such things by their Examples.

Secondly, the Poets were further guilty of depraving the Religion and Theology of the Pagans, by their so frequently personating and deifying all the Things of Nature, and Parts of the World, and calling them by the Names of those Gods, that were supposed to preside over them; that is, of the several Divine Powers manifested in them. This Plutarch taxes the Poets with, where giving directions for young men reading of their Writings, he thus reasonably cautions against the danger of it, "τούτο ἀνέχεται ἢ χρείαν, εἰ μέλλοντι εἰς τὸ ποιμάντων ἀφελείσθαι, τῷ μὲν ὢσκεῖν πῶς τοῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐμνήσθαι, τοῖς δὲ ουκ ἐπιλοίπυναι χρείαν. —χρείαν τοῦ τῆς θεοῦ ὑπὸμα, οἷον προϊζαι, ποι- τε μὴ ἄνω ἐκείνων θραξιόλοι τῇ ὑπετί τοῖς δυνάμεις τινάς, ὥς τίς δικαίως εἰσὶν, καθομήλιαν, χαμάλορες προτοχειολογεῖς. It is very profitable and necessary if we would receive good from the Writings of the Poets and not hurt, that we should understand how they use the names of the Gods in different senses. Wherefore the Poets sometimes use the names of the Gods properly, as intending to signify thereby the Gods themselves, and sometimes again they use them improperly and equivocally, for those Powers which the Gods are the Givers and Dispensers of, or the Things which they preside over. As for example, Vulcan is sometimes used by the Poets, for that God or Divine Power which presides over Fire and the Arts that operate by Fire, and sometimes again the word is taken by them for Fire itself. So Mars in like manner, is sometimes used for the God which presides over Military Affairs, and sometimes again it signifies nothing else but War. An instance whereof is there given by Plutarch out of Sophocles.

Τυρής ὦς, ἡ γυναῖκι, ὧν ἢ ἄρεν Ἀρεις,
Σὺς περατοὺς, πάντα τοὺς ἅμα παῖδας.

Mars (O Multicrēs) cecus hīrus suīs
Vēnt ore frēdens, cumūla communis mala.

And we might give this other instance of the fame from Virgil,

— Fūrit totō Mars impius orbe.

For the God of War, that is, the Divine Providence that presides over Military Affairs, could not be called Impious or Wicked, but it is War itself that is there so styled.

Indeed we shall afterwards make it appear, that the first Original of this business, proceeded from a certain Philosphick Opinion among
amongst the Pagans, *That God was diffus’d throughout the whole world,* and was himself in a manner All Things; and therefore ought to be Worshipped in All Things but the Poets were principally the men, who carried it on thus far, by Personating the several Inanimate Parts of the World and Things of Nature, to make such a Multitude of *diffus’d Gods and Goddessest of them.* Which Humour, though it were chiefly indulged by them, *απευθυνότας εξω, only for the delight and pleasure of the Reader,* besides gratifying their own Poetick Passions; yet was it a matter of *Dangerous Consequence,* as the same Plutarch gravely and soberly advizes, in his Book de Side, it begetting in some gross and irrational *superstition* (that is, in our Christian Language, *Idolatry*) and carrying others on to downright *Impiety and Atheism.* But this will be afterwards also again infill’d on.

Wherefore in the next place, we shall observe that the Poets did also otherwise deprave the *Theology of the Pagans,* so as to make it look somewhat more *Aristocratically,* and this principally. Two manner of ways; First by their speaking so much of the Gods in General and without Distinction, and attributing the Government of the Whole World to them in Common, so as if it were managed and carried on, *Communi Confite Deorum,* by a *Common Council and Republick of Gods,* wherein all things were determined by a *Majority of Votes,* and as if their *Jupiter or Supreme God were no more amongst them than a Speaker of a House of Lords or Commons,* or the Chairman of a Committee. In which they did indeed attribute more to their Inferior Deities, than according to their own Principles they ought.

And Secondly (which is the *Last Depravation of the Pagan Theology by these Poets*) by their making those that were really nothing else but several Names and Notions of one and the same Supreme Deity, according to its several Powers manifested in the World, or the different Effects produced by it; to be so many really distinct Persons and Gods; insomuch as sometimes to be at odds and variance with one another and even with Jupiter himself. This St. Basil seems to take notice of, in his Oration, *How Young men may be prof’d by the Writing of the Greeks, πάντων δ’ ἵναις μέλας και σέσω τι δικαίωμα ἡγούμενος (ποιμνιτες) περὶ δύσμας, ἐγείροντες σιλποντες ἰδιοί, καὶ τὸ τούτων ὁποιάν διακοινοῦται. But least of all will we give credit to the poets, where they discourse concerning the gods, and speak of them as many (Distinct and Independent) Persons, and that not agreeing amongst themselves neither, but siding several ways, and perpetually quarrelling one another.

Notwithstanding all which Extravagancies and Mischarriages of the poets, we shall now make it plainly to appear, that they really affirmed, not a Multitude of *Self-existent and Independent Deities,* but we only *Unmade Deity,* and all the other, *Generated or Created Gods.* This hath been already proved concerning Orpheus from such fragments of the Orphick Poems, as have been owned and attested by Pagan Writers: but it would be further evident, might we
give credit to any of those other Orphick Verses, that are found cited by Christians and Jews only (and we cannot reasonably conclude all these to be counterfeit and supposititious) amongst which we have this for one,

There is One only Unmade God, and all other Gods and Things, are the Offspring of this One. Moreover when God in the same Orphick Fragments, is called ηῦλες-πατὴρ, both Father and Mother of all things (accordingly as it was observed before) that both the Orphick and Egyptian Theology, made the Supreme Deity especially, to be Φυλοκόσμησίς, Hermaphroditical, or Male and Female together; This, as Clemens Alexandrinus rightly interprets the meaning of it, was to signify, τῷ ὑζε μῆν ξενων Υφεκριθήν, the Production of things out of nothing or from the Deity alone, without any Preexistent or Self-existent Matter.

But we shall pass from Orpheus to Homer. Now it is certain that Homer’s Gods, were not all Eternal, Unmade and Self-existent, he plainly declaring the contrary concerning the Gods in general; that they had a Genesis, that is, a Temporary Production, as in that forecited Verse of his

The Ocean from whence the Gods were Generated, Where by Gods are meant all the Animated parts of the world Supernatural to men, but principally (as Enallaxius observes) the Stars, Θείω ἄνερ ἄμμαν, Gods (faith he) are here put for Stars. And as the same Philologer further adds, the Gods or Stars, do by a Synechdochic signification All Things, or the Whole World, ἄνερ τῶν πάντων ἡς ἄνο μέρος, a Part being put for the Whole, accordingly as the same Poet elsewhere declares his fence, speaking likewile of the Ocean,

Which was the Original of all things, or from whence (not only the Gods but also) all other things were Generated. Wherefore the full meaning of Homer was this, That the Gods or Stars, together with this whole Visible World, had a Temporary Production, and were at first made out of the Ocean, that is, out of the Watry Chaos. So that Homer’s Theogonia as well as Hesiod’s, was one and the same thing with the Coymonomia, his Generation of Gods, the same with the Generation or Creation of the World, both of them having in all probability derived it from the Mosaic Cabala, or Tradition. And Enallaxius tells us, that, according to the Ancients, Homer’s &τοῦντείκης, described H. c. was εὐνύμης τοῦ Ζώνατας, an obscure signification of the Cosmogonia or Coymonomia.

Nevertheless though εἰ Σῶι or the Gods in general, be by Homer thus
thus generated from the Ocean or Watry Chaos, yet this is to be understood only of the Inferior Gods, and He is supposed to be distinguished from them, who in the same Poet is frequently called, ὁ θεὸς κατ' ἐξουσία, God by way of eminency (to whom he plainly ascribes Omnipotence) and Ἄταξις or Jupiter, whom he titles ἀκμῆς θεῶν, the most powerful of all, and πέραιτα θεῶν, the First and Chiefest of the Gods, and ὡς ἰδιός and προέδρον, the Highest of Gods and Governors, and whom he affirmeth infinitely to transcend the Gods, II. b. τοιοῦτον ἐς τ' ἐμί θεόν, καὶ τ' ἐμί ἄνθρωπον.

And to reign as well over Gods as Men, II. α.

Lastly, whom he maketh to be πατὴρ θεῶν, the Father of the Gods as well as Men, that is, nothing less than the Creator of them and the whole World. He therefore who thus produced the Gods and Stars, out of the Ocean or Watry Chaos, must needs be excluded out of that number of Gods, so as not to have been himself Generated or made out of it. Thus have we before observed, that τοιόν, or the Gods in general, are frequently taken, both by Homer and other Greek Writers, in way of distinction from ἃθεῶν or Jupiter, that is, for the Inferior Gods only.

It is true indeed that others of the Pagan Gods besides Jupiter, were by the Latins in their solemn Rites and Prayers, titled Patres, Fathers; and as Jupiter is nothing else but θεὸς Pater, contracted into one word, so was Mars called by them Mercurius, and Saturnus, Janus, Neptunus and Liber had the like addition also made to their names, Saturnus pater, Janus pater, Neptunus pater, Liber pater; and not only so, but even their very Heroes also (as for example, Quirinus) had his honourable title of Father bestowed upon them, All which appear

from tho Vericles of Lucilius,

Ut nemo sit nostrum quin aut Pater Optimus Dium,
Aut Neptunus Pater, Liber, Saturnus Pater, Mars,
Janus, Quirinus Pater nomen dicatur ad unum.

Notwithstanding which, there is a great difference to be observed, hat though those other Gods were called Fathers, yet none of them was ever called, either by the Greeks, πατὴρ θεῶν, or by the Latins, Pater optimus Dium, have only Ἄταξις or Jupiter, the Supreme Deity.

And that Homer was thus generally understood by the Pagans themselves to have asserted a Divine Monarchy, or One Supreme Deity ruling over All, may further appear from these following Citations. Plutarch in his Platonick Questions, ὑπὸ ἔννοιας τὸν θεὸν κατ' ἐξουσίαν, and πέτων ἡ ἐμοίρα,  ἀκμῆς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἱεράτους αἰχμήνα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς ἰδιός καὶ προέδρον προείστως, Leonocrates called Jupiter, Hypaton, or the Highest, but before him Homer styled that God, who is the Prince of all Princes, ὡς ἰδιός καὶ προέδρον, the Highest.
Highest of Rulers or Governors. Again the same Plutarch de Iride & Osiride, to the 3 one of %o polt of thepici, 7t 7t copy. fcrifsc, ev 7t tudi 7t of the pvorna, imlwio, 7t 7t tudi ^o'nim 7t v.omepe. 7t 7t yepiiw x & beo^o>'o 7t pcriw swv tnuwv x 7t mpos x, kalwv, 7tpai 7t tudi 7t porl 7t mects aw 7t, 7t 7t mpos x, toiy wswio x 7t tudi wperva x. The Egyptians when they described Osiris by those Hieroglyphicks of an Eye and a Scepter, did by the former of them signify Providence, and by the latter Power as Homer when he calls that Jodo or Jupiter, who ruleth and reigneth over all things, rafion and mpos, seem by the word rafion, to denote his Power and Sovereignty, but by mpos his Wisdom and Knowledge. To Plutarch may be added Proclus, who upon Plato's Times, having proved that according to that Philosopher, there was 'to nevpiw 7t vaps x 7t 7t ev 7t 7d 'oovov. One only Maker of the whole World, affirms the same likewise of that Divine Poet Homer (as he there titles him) 7t 7t, 7t rnon 7t pon 7t rafion 7t mpos 7t mpos x, 7t 7t ev 7t nevpiw 7t vaps x, 7t 7t ev 7t 7d, oovov, 7t 7t ev 7t 7d 7t rmon 7t mpos x, 7t 7t ev 7t veov 7t vaps x. That he also throughout all his Poeti, praises Jupiter, as the Highest of all Rulers, and the Father both of Gods and Men, and attributes all Demiurgical Notions to him. Whereupon he concludes in this manner, 7t 7t mpos x, 7t 7t rmon 7t mpos x, 7t 7t ev 7t veov 7t vaps x, 7t 7t ev 7t 7d 7t rmon 7t mpos x. And thus we have made it manifest, that all the Greekish Theology, universally ascribes to Zeus or Jupiter, the Making of all things. Lastly, Aristotle himself confirmeth the same with his Testimony, where he writes of the Paternal Authority after this manner, 7t 7t mpos x, 7t 7t rmon 7t mpos x, 7t 7t ev 7t veov 7t vaps x, 7t 7t ev 7t 7d 7t rmon 7t mpos x. Pathe doov x to Stev 7t, 7t v vaps x, 7t 7t mpos x, 7t 7t rmon 7t mpos x, 7t 7t ev 7t veov 7t vaps x, 7t 7t ev 7t 7d 7t rmon 7t mpos x. The Paternal Power or Authority over Children, is a Kingly Authority: Wherefore Homer when he intended to set forth Jupiter's Kingly Power over all, very well called him the Father of Men and Gods. For be that is a King by Nature, ought both to differ from those that he reigneth over, and also to be of the same kind with them; as the Senior is to the Junior, and he that Begettest to his Off-spring. Where Aristotle's fience seems to be this, That Jupiter had therefore a Natural and not acquired Kingly Power over all the Gods, because they were all his Off-spring and Begotten by him, as well as Men. In which Passage therefore Aristotle plainly accquits and frees Homer from all supicion of Atheism.

As for Hesiod, if we had not already sufficiently prov'd from his Theogonia, that all his Gods (that is his Inferiour Deities) were Generated and Made, as well as Men, it might be made unquestionably evident, from this Verse of his in his Opera,
Chapter IV. Only of Inferior Gods.

mered. Where the word ὄνομα is thus interpreted by the Greek School of the, and ὑπάρχει, ἐναντία. 

μὲν ἄνθρωπον

Διότι τῆς πρώτης ἔτσι, et cæterum, ἢ ἀνθρώπος, ὁ τόλμηται ἀπ' ἱλικίᾳ. 

Where in Homer, whom the First golden Age of Men; as may be proved from other places in the same Poet; and though he speaks of the Gods in general, yet doth he but transfer that, which was the work of One upon all of the like kind. And there are several other Instances, of this Poets using θεός for θεὸς, Gods for God. But it is possible that Hesiod's meaning might be the same with Plato's, that though the Inferior Mundane Gods were all made at first by the Supreme God, as well as Men, yet they being made something sooner than Men, did afterwards contribute also to the Making of men.

But Hesiod's Theogonia or Generation of Gods, is not to be understood universally neither, but only of the Inferior Gods, that Zaks or Jupiter being to be excepted out of the number of them, whom the same Hesiod as well as Homer, makes to be the Father of Gods, also the King of them, in these words,

'Αὐτὸς ἂν πάντων μέγας καὶ Νοέσαι ἦν

'Athenion,'

and attributes the Creation of all things to him, as Proclus writeth, on this place,

'Οὐτε αὐτῷ ζήσεις ὡμοί, δεκατείς ομιλεῖς, ἐκ τούτων, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ διαδιδότας πᾶσα τῆς Δια 

τοιούτων ἐξιστά, ὑπό τινα, ἄνθρωποι, ἢ πάλαι πιθανὴ, νεκρῷ, ἰδίᾳ τοίς, ὄνομα, ἢ ἀνθρώπος, ὃς 

who, though Hesiod's Theogonia is to be understood of the Inferior Gods, and not of Zaks or Jupiter, who was the Father and Maker of those Gods, and himself therefore αὐτότοις, of existent or Unmade.

In like manner, that Pindar's Gods were not Eternal, but Made or Unmade, is plainly declared by him in these words,

'Ἐν ἄνθρωποι, ἐν θεοῖς ἄνθρωποι, ὡς 

μιᾶς ἵππες ἄφθονες'.
Unum Hominum, Unum Deorum genus,
Et ex Unspiranrus
Matre utrique.

There is one kind both of Gods and Men, and we both breath from the
same Mother, or spring from the same Original. Where by the com-
mon Mother both of Gods and Men, the Scholiast understands the
Earth and Chaos, taking the Gods here for the Inferior Deities only,
and principally the Stars.

This of Pindar's therefore is to be understood, of all the other
Gods, That they were made as well as men out of the Earth or
Chaos, but not of that Supreme Deity, whom the same Pindar else-
where calls, Θεὸν μεγίστων, the most powerful of the Gods, and Ἄριστος
Lord of all things, and παντὸς θεὸν, the Cause of every thing,
and ἠλέηται Θεὸν, that God who is the best Artificer, or was the Fru-
mer of the whole World, and as Clemens Alexandrinus tells us, τὸ πάν
or the Universe. Which God also, according to Pindar, Cheiron in-
structed Achilles to worship principally, above all the other Gods.

The fence of which words is thus declared by the Scholiast, ἔχειν
τοὺς τὸ μεγαλόφυτον ἄριστον καὶ παντὸς ὁμοίον ἄριστον καὶ διόν, ἂν τοὺς θεούς
τὸν παντὸς καὶ σέλεσθαι. That be should honour and worship the Lord
founding Jupiter, the Lord of Thunder and Lightning, transcendent!
above all the other Gods. Which by the way confutes the Opinion
of those who contend, that the Supreme God, as such, was not at all
Worshipped by the Pagans.

However this is certain concerning these Three, Homer, Hesiod,
and Pindar; that they must of necelcity either have been all abso-
lute Atheists, in acknowledging no Eternal Deity at all, but mak-
ing nothing Chaos, Night and the Ocean, the Original of all their God-
without exception, and therefore of Jupiter himself too, that Kin
and Father of them, or else assert One only Eternal Unmade Sel
existent Deity; so as that all the other Gods were Generated or
Created by that One. Which latter doubtles was their genuine
fence; and the only reason why Aristotele and Plato might possi-
bly sometime have a suspicion of the contrary, seems to have been thei-
their not understanding that Mofaike Cabbbala, which both Hesiod at
Homer followed, of the World's, that is, both Heaven and Earth
being made at first out of a Watery Chaos; for thus is the Traditie
declared by St. Peter, Ep. 2. Ch. 3.

There might be several remarkable Passages to the same purpo-
produced out of those two Tragic Poets, Aeschylus and Sophocles
which yet because they have been already cited, by Justin Mart.}

{Clem}
There is in truth, One only God, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, Air and Winds, &c. After which followeth also, something against image-worship; That though this be such as might well become a Christian, and be no where now to be found in those extant Tragedies of this Poet (many whereof have been loft) yet the sincerity thereof, cannot reasonably be at all suspected by us, it having been cited by so many of the Ancient Fathers in their Writings against the Pagans, as particularly, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Cyril and Theodoret; of which number, Clemens tells us, that it was attested likewise, by that ancient Pagan Historiographer Hecataeus. But there are so many Places to our purpose, in Euripides, that we cannot omit them all; In his Suppliæ we have this, wherein all mens Absolute Dependence upon Jupiter, or one Supreme Deity, is fully acknowledged;

There is in truth, One only God, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, Air and Winds, &c. After which followeth also, something against image-worship; That though this be such as might well become a Christian, and be no where now to be found in those extant Tragedies of this Poet (many whereof have been lost) yet the sincerity thereof, cannot reasonably be at all suspected by us, it having been cited by so many of the Ancient Fathers in their Writings against the Pagans, as particularly, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Cyril and Theodoret; of which number, Clemens tells us, that it was attested likewise, by that ancient Pagan Historiographer Hecataeus. But there are so many Places to our purpose, in Euripides, that we cannot omit them all; In his Suppliæ we have this, wherein all men's Absolute Dependence upon Jupiter, or one Supreme Deity, is fully acknowledged;

There is in truth, One only God, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, Air and Winds, &c. After which followeth also, something against image-worship; That though this be such as might well become a Christian, and be no where now to be found in those extant Tragedies of this Poet (many whereof have been lost) yet the sincerity thereof, cannot reasonably be at all suspected by us, it having been cited by so many of the Ancient Fathers in their Writings against the Pagans, as particularly, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Cyril and Theodoret; of which number, Clemens tells us, that it was attested likewise, by that ancient Pagan Historiographer Hecataeus. But there are so many Places to our purpose, in Euripides, that we cannot omit them all; In his Suppliæ we have this, wherein all men's Absolute Dependence upon Jupiter, or one Supreme Deity, is fully acknowledged;

There is in truth, One only God, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, Air and Winds, &c. After which followeth also, something against image-worship; That though this be such as might well become a Christian, and be no where now to be found in those extant Tragedies of this Poet (many whereof have been lost) yet the sincerity thereof, cannot reasonably be at all suspected by us, it having been cited by so many of the Ancient Fathers in their Writings against the Pagans, as particularly, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Cyril and Theodoret; of which number, Clemens tells us, that it was attested likewise, by that ancient Pagan Historiographer Hecataeus. But there are so many Places to our purpose, in Euripides, that we cannot omit them all; In his Suppliæ we have this, wherein all men's Absolute Dependence upon Jupiter, or one Supreme Deity, is fully acknowledged;

Tibi (Cunctorum Domino) Vinuti,

There is in truth, One only God, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, Air and Winds, &c. After which followeth also, something against image-worship; That though this be such as might well become a Christian, and be no where now to be found in those extant Tragedies of this Poet (many whereof have been lost) yet the sincerity thereof, cannot reasonably be at all suspected by us, it having been cited by so many of the Ancient Fathers in their Writings against the Pagans, as particularly, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Cyril and Theodoret; of which number, Clemens tells us, that it was attested likewise, by that ancient Pagan Historiographer Hecataeus. But there are so many Places to our purpose, in Euripides, that we cannot omit them all; In his Suppliæ we have this, wherein all men's Absolute Dependence upon Jupiter, or one Supreme Deity, is fully acknowledged;

Tibi (Cunctorum Domino) Vinuti,

There is in truth, One only God, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, Air and Winds, &c. After which followeth also, something against image-worship; That though this be such as might well become a Christian, and be no where now to be found in those extant Tragedies of this Poet (many whereof have been lost) yet the sincerity thereof, cannot reasonably be at all suspected by us, it having been cited by so many of the Ancient Fathers in their Writings against the Pagans, as particularly, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Cyril and Theodoret; of which number, Clemens tells us, that it was attested likewise, by that ancient Pagan Historiographer Hecataeus. But there are so many Places to our purpose, in Euripides, that we cannot omit them all; In his Suppliæ we have this, wherein all men's Absolute Dependence upon Jupiter, or one Supreme Deity, is fully acknowledged;
Salsamque Molam feror, seu Ditis,
Tu, seve Jovis nomine gaudas:
Tu namque Deos Superos inter,
Sceptrum trañ as Sublime Jovis;
Idem Regnum Terejire tenes.
Tu Lucem animis infunde Virum,
Gentifcire volunt, quo fata
Mentis Luat
Cui Clericulum rite litando
Requiem sit habere laborum.

Where we may obferve that Zeus and "Advs", Jupiter and Pluto, are both of them supposed to be Names, equally belonging to One and the same Supreme God. And the Sum of the Prayer is this, That God would infuse Light into the Souls of men, whereby they might be enabled to know, What is the Root, from whence all their Evils spring, and by what means they may avoid them.

Lastly, there is another Devotional Passage, cited out of Euripides, which contains also a clear acknowledgment of One Self-existent Being, that comprehends and governs the whole World,

Σε + ταιταρην, η εν αλτεται
Τημεω, παντων φωνενιμπλεκεναν,
"ον πειρα μπιν φως, πειρα δε' οφανα
Μεν αιμολιχαν ονεκτητω τη εσων
"ουλητ οιλελεται αμφικλεναη!

"Thou Self-sprung Being, that do'st All Enfold,
And in thine Arms, Heav'n's Whirling Fabric hold!
Who art Encircled with resplendent Light,
And yet ly'st Mantled o're in Shady Night!
About whom, the Exultant Starry Fires,
Dance nimbly round, in Everlasting Gyres.

For this fence of the Second and Third Verses, which we think the Words will bear, and which agrees with that Orphick Passage

——— πειρα μπιν φως, πειρα δε'

That God being in himself a most bright and dazeling Light, is resplendently to us, and by reason of the Weakness of our Understanding covered over with a Thick Cloud, as also with that in the Scripture Clouds and Darknes are round about him; I say, this fence, which I chose rather to follow, as more Rich and August, than that other Vulgar one, though Grammatically and Poetically good also; The Successive Day and Night, together with a Numberless Multitude of Stars, perpetually dance round about the Deity.

Aristophanes in the very beginning of his Plutus distinguisheth betwixt Zeus and God, Jupiter and the Gods,
And we have this clear Testimony of Terpander cited by Clemens Alexandrinus,  

Zeux piantos aegy, zeux piantos aegytor, Thos Jupiter who are  

the Original of all things, Thos Jupiter who are the Governor of all.  

And these following Verses are attributed to Menander.

Τὸν ὅπλα πάθων κελευνών  
Καλὸν τωτῆς, τὸν δυνάμει τιμῆς μένον,  
Ἄγχων τοῖς ἄρρητον διήρθην ἡ μία πέπερν.'

Rerum universarum Imperatorem & Patrem,  
Solum perpetuo colere suppliciter decet,  
Artificem tanta & Largitorem copia.

Where men are exhorted to Worship the Supreme God only, as the sole Author of all Good, or at least transcendently above all the other Gods. There are also Two remarkable Testimonies, one of Hermes, an ancient Greek Poet, and another of Aratus, to the same purpose; which shall both be reserved for other places.

Wherefore we pass from the Greek to the Latin Poets, where Ennius first appears, deriving the Gods in General (who were all the inferior Deities) from Erebus and Night, as supposing them all to have been Made or Generated out of Chaos, nevertheless acknowledging One who was

--- Divumque Hominumque Pater, Rex,

Whose Father and King of Gods and Men, that is, the Maker or Creator of the whole World, who therefore made those Gods together with the World out of Chaos, himself being Unmade.

Plautus in like manner sometimes distinguishes betwixt Jupiter and the Gods, and plainly acknowledgeth One Omnipotent Deity,

Est profeendo Deus, qui qua nos gerimus, auditque & videt.

Which Passage very much resembles that of Manlius Torquatus in

Quod pater terrae, Est Celeste Nunnem, Es Magne Jupiter; a strong Asseretion of one Supreme and Universal Deity. And the same Plautus in his

Indens clearly affirms one Supreme Monarch and Emperor over All, from the Inferior Gods are subervient to,

Qui Gentes omnes Mariaque & Terras movet,  
Ejus sum Civis civitate Calitum;  
Qui est Imperator Divorum atque Hominum Jupiter,  
Is nos per gentes alium alia dispartat,  
Hominum quia ta, mores, pietaem & fidem  
Nofcamus.
The Consent of Latin Poets, Book I.

Qui falsas lites falsis testimoniis
Petunt, quique in jure abjurant pecuniam,
Eorum referimus nomina exscripta ad Jovem.
Cotidie Ille scit, quis hic querras malam.
Iterum Ille eam rem judicatam judicat.
Bonos in aliis tabulis exscriptos habet.
Atque hoc selestii illin in animum inducunt suum
Jovem se placare posse domis, hostis;
Sed operam & sumptum perdunt, quia
Nihil Ei acceptum est a perjuris supplicii.

Where Jupiter, the Supreme Monarch of Gods and Men, is said to appoint other Inferior Gods under him, over all the parts of the Earth, to observe the Actions, Manners and Behaviours of men every where; and to return the names both of bad and good to him. Which Jupiter judges over again all unjust judgments, rendering a righteous retribution to all. And though wicked men conceit that he may be bribed with sacrifices, yet no worship is acceptable to him from the Perjurious. Notwithstanding which, this Poet afterwards jumbles the Supreme and Inferior Gods all together, after the usual manner, under that one general name of Gods, because they are all supposed to be Co-governors of the World.

Facilius, signi pius est, à Dis supplicans,
Quam qui celestus est, inveniet veniam sibi.

Again the same Poet elsewhere brings in Hanno the Carthaginian with this form of Prayer addressing himself to Jupiter or the Supreme God,

Jupiter, qui genus colis alisos, Hominum, per quem vivimus
Vitalis eum, quem penes fips, vitaeque sunt Hominum Omnium
Da diem hunc solutum, quaeo, rebus meis agundis.

In the next place, we have these Verses of Valerius Soranus, an ancient and eminent Poet, full to the purpose, recorded by Varro,

Jupiter Omnipotens, Regum Rex ipse Deumque,
Progenitor Genitrixque Deum; Deus UNUS & OMNIS.

To this fence: Omnipotent Jupiter, the King of Kings and Gods, an the Progenitor and Genitrix, the both Father and Mother of those Gods; One God and all Gods. Where the Supreme and Omnipotent Deity is called Progenitor & Genitrix Deorum, after the same manner as he was called in the Orphick Theology ὁ προγενέστατος and ὁ γενετήριος, the expression denoting the Gods and all other Things, to have been produced from him alone, and without any preexistent matter. Moreover according to the tenour of this Ethnick Theology, the One God was All Gods and Every God, the Pagans supposed, that whatever any Inferior Deity was worshipped by them, the Supreme was therein also at once worshipped and honoured.

Though
Though the fence of Ovid hath been sufficiently declared before, yet we cannot well omit some other Passages of his, as that grateful and sensible acknowledgment,

Quod loquor & spiro, Celumque & lumina Solis
Auspicio (possumque ingratus & immemor esse?)
Ipse dedit.

And this in the Third of his Metamorph.

Ille Pater Refforque Deum, cui Dextra trifulcis
Ignibus armata est, qui Nutu concutit Orbem.

Virgil's Theology also may sufficiently appear from his frequent acknowledgment of an Omnipotent Deity, and from those Verses of his before cited out of En. 6. wherein he plainly allerts One God to be the Original of all things, at least as a Soul of the World; Servius Honoratus there paraphrasing thus, Deus est quidam Divinus Spiritus, qui per quatuor suus elementa, gignit universa, God is a certain Spirit, which infused through the Four Elements, begetteth all things. Nevertheless, we shall add from him this also of Venus her Prayer to Jupiter, En. 1.

O qui res Hominumque Deumque,
Æternis regis imperitis, & fulmine terres!

Which Venus again, En. 10. be-speaks the same Jupiter after this manner,

O Pater, O Hominum Divumque Æterna Potestas!

Where we have this Annotation of Servius, Divumque Æterna Potestas, propter aliorum Numinum discretionem, Jupiter is here called the Eternal Power of the Gods, to distinguish him from all the other Gods that were not Eternal, but Made or Generated from him.

Neither ought Horace to be left out, in whom we read to the same purpose, Lib. 1. Od. 12.

Quid prius dicam solitis Parentis
Landibus? Qui res Hominum & Deorum,
Qui Mare & Terras, variisque mundum
Temperat horis.

Unde nil majus generatur ipso,
Nec vigeat quiquam simile aut secundum
Proximos illi tamen occupavit
Pallas honores:

ud again, Lib. 3. Od. 4.

Qui Terram incircum, qui mare Temperat
Where from those words of Horace, Solitis Parentis Laudibus, it appears that the One Supreme Deity, the Parent and Maker of all things, was then wont to be celebrated by the Pagans as such, above all the other Gods. And whereas those Pagans vulgarly ascribed the Government of the Seas particularly to Neptune, of the Earth and Hades or Inferi (which are here called Trifiia Regna) to Pluto, these being here attributed by Horace to One and the same Supreme and Universal Deity, it may well be concluded from thence, that Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto, were but Three several Names or Notions, of One Supreme Numen, whose Sovereignty notwithstanding was chiefly signified by Jupiter. Which same is to be said of Pallas or Minerva too, that signifying the Eternal Wisdom, that it was but another name of God also, though look'd upon as inferior to that of Jupiter and next in dignity to it: unless we should conclude it to be a Second Divine Hypothesis, according to the Doctrine of the Pythagoreans and Platonists (probably not unknown to Horace), as also to that Scripture Cabbala, I was set up from everlasting, or ever the Earth was, when there were no Depths, I was brought forth, &c. But of this more afterward.

Lastly, we shall conclude with Manilius who lived in the same Augustean age, and was a zealous opposer of that Atheistical Hypothesis of Epicurus and Lucretius, as appears from these Verses of his,

Quis credat tantas operum sine Numine Moles,
Ex Minimis cecaque creatum sedere mundum?

Wherefore he also plainly afferts One Supreme Deity the Framer and Governor of the whole World in this manner, Lib. 2.

Namque canam tacita Naturam mente potentem,
Insuamque Deum Caelo, Terrisque, Fretoque,
Ingentem aequali moderantem sedere molem,
Totumque alterno consenitu vivere mundum,
Et rationis agi motus, quum SPIRITUS UNUS
Per cunctas habitas partes, atque iriget Orbeum,
Omnia pervolitans, Corpusq animale figurat, &c.

And again,

Hoc opus immensum constructum corpore mundi,
Vis Anima Divina regit, Sacroque Meatu,
Conspirat Deus, & tacita ratione gubernat.

And, Lib. 4.

Faciem Celi non invidet Orbi
Ipse Deus, sultusque suos, corpusque recludit,
Where notwithstanding, we confess, that the whole Animated World, or rather the Soul thereof, is, according to the Stoical Doctrine; made by Manilium to be the Supreme Numen.

XX. We now pass from the Poets of the Pagans to their Philosophers. A Modern Writer concerning the Religion of the Gentiles, affirmeth this to have been the Opinion of very eminent Philosophers, that all the Minor Gods of the Pagans, did exist of themselves from Eternity Unmade, they giving many reasons for the same. But how far from truth this is, will (as we conceive) appear sufficiently, from the Sequel of this Discourse. And we cannot conclude otherwise but that this Learned Writer, did mistake that Opinion of Aristotle and the latter Platonists, concerning the Eternity of the World and Gods, as if they had therefore asserted the Self-existence of them; the contrary whereunto hath been already manifested. Wherefore we shall now make it unquestionably evident by a Particular Enumeration, That the Generality of the Pagan Philosophers who were Theists, however they acknowledged a Multiplicity of Gods, yet asserted One only Self-existent Deity, or a Universal Numen, by whom the World and all those other Gods were Made. There being only one few Dithieists to be excepted, (such as Plutarch and Atticus) who are of a certain Softness and Tenderness of Nature, that they might free the One Good God, from the Imputation of Evils, would needs set up besides him, an Evil Soul or Demon also in the World self-existent, to bear all the blame of them.

And indeed Epicurus is the only Person that we can find, amongst the reputed Philosophers, who though pretending to acknowledge Gods, yet professedly opposed Monarchy, and verbally asserted a multitude of Eternal Unmade Self-existent Deities: but such, as had nothing at all to do either with the Making or Governing of the World. The reason whereof was, because he would by no means limit the World to have been made by any Mind or Understanding; therefore he concluded,

Naturam Rerum, haud Divinâ Mente Coortam,

Lucret. 1. 3.

that there was no God the Demiurgus or Framer of the World. But nevertheless that he might decline the Oidum of being accompted an Heist, he pretended to assert a Multitude of Gods Unmade and In-erruptible, such as were unconcerned in the Fabrick of the World. Wherein first it is evident, that he was not serious and sincere, because he really admitting no other Principles of things in his Philosophy, besides Atoms and Vacuum, agreeably thereunto, could acknowledge no other Gods, than such as were compounded out of Atoms.
Atoms, and therefore Corruptible. And thus does Origen declare the Doctrine of Epicurus, not indeed as he pretended to hold it, but as according to the tenor of his Principles, he must have held it, had he really asserted any Gods at all, or the Emanation of Gods, as Heiltsay there is. But notwithstanding he asserted on Supreme and only Unmade or Self-existent Deity, is also manifest from that other Apotheosis of his in Laertius, the Self being compounded of Atoms, and therefore by their very constitution Corruptible, are in continual labour and toil, struggling with their Corruptive Principles. Nevertheless if Epicurus had in good earnest asserted such a Commonwealth of Gods, as were neither Made out of Atoms, nor yet Corruptible; so long as he denied the World to have been Made by any Mind or Wisdom (as we have already declared) he ought not to be reckoned amongst the Theists but Atheists.

Thales the Mileian was one of the most Ancient Greek Philosophers, who that he admitted a Plurality of Gods in some sense, is evident from that faying of his cited by Aristotle, 

All things are full of Gods. But that notwithstanding he asserted on Supreme and only Unmade or Self-existent Deity, is also manifest from that other Apotheosm of his in Laertius, the Self being the Oldest of all things, because he is Unmade. From whence it may be concluded, that all Thales his other Gods were Generated, and the Offspring of One sole Unmade Deity.

Thereceses Syrus was Thales his contemporary, of whom Aristotle in his Metaphysics hath recorded, that he affirmed that the First Principle from whence all other things were Generated, was the Self, or an Absolutely Perfect Being; So as that in the Sea of Nature things did not ascend upwards from the most Imperfect, but the more Perfect, and the contrary descend downwards from the most Perfect, to the less Perfect. Moreover Laertius informs us that this was the Beginning of one of Theraceses his Books 2D's of the Self, as in the Books of other suppose Jupiter, and Time, and the Earth always were. Where notwithstanding in the following words, he makes the Earth to be dependent upon Jupiter. Though some reading νερόν here instead of χέννα, seem to understand him thus; the Jupiter and Saturn, really one and the same Nomen, was always from Eternity. However there is in these words an acknowledgment of One Single and Eternal Deity.

Pythagoras was the most eminent of all the ancient Philosophers, who that he was a Polytheist as well as the other Pagans, may be concluded from that Beginning of the Golden Verses (though not written by him)

Wherein men are exhorted in the first place to worship the Immortal Gods, and that accordingly as they were appointed by Law, all men the Heroes, and last of all the Terrestrial Demons. And according
cordingly Laertius gives this account of Pythagoras his Piety, πιτ
cες Ἡλικίας ἐν τοῖς ἐσπείρασι, μὴ τοῖς ἑόρτασι. That be conceived men ought
to worship, both the Gods, and the Heroes, though not with equal honour.
And who these Gods of Pythagoras were, the same Writer also declareth,
ἕνων ταύτα, σημαίνων τοὺς ἄλλας ἀρχής, ὡς εἶπες. That they were
in part at least, the Sun, and Moon, and Stars.

Notwithstanding which, that Pythagoras acknowledged One
Supreme and Universal Νομιν, which therefore was the Original of
all those other Gods, may partly appear from that Prayer in the
Golden Verses, which, whether written by Philolaus or Lyric or some
other Follower of Pythagoras, were undoubtedly ancient and agreeable
to his Doctrine.

τὰ τέκτα, ἦ ποιμέν ταυτα λυπής ἄνθρωπος:
καὶ ποιμέν ἄθεως οὐκ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος.

Jupiter alme, multo jubeas vel solitum omnes:
Omnibus tantum vel quonam demone monstra.

Upon which Hierocles thus writeth, ἐποίησε τῷ πατρὶ
δόξον τοῖς πτερεόσι τῷ όνεαν, ἡν θλίβεις, δημοκριτη συμφώνοις· ἐδὲ τῇ τῆς ἔρξ
τοι, ἀλλὰ τῷ ποιμέν ὑπολείτε, τότε δίκαιον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργων ἀναχώρησα
It was the manner of the Pythagoreans to honour the Maker and Father
of this whole Universe, with the name of Dis and Zen, it being just,
that he who gave Birth and Being to all, should be denominated from
thence: And again afterwards, τῷ τῶν θεῶν ὑπαιππος σύμβολον ἔστι, ἐκ τοῦ τῆς ἔρξ
τοι, τῷ ποιμέν ὑπολείτε, τότε δίκαιον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργων ἀναχώρησα
This very name Zeus, is a convenient symbol or image of the Demiurgical Nature. And they who
first gave names to things, were by reason of a certain wonderful
Wisdom of theirs, a kind of excellent Statuaries; they by those several Names of
Images, lively representing the natures of things. Moreover that this Pythagoric Prayer was directed to the Supreme Namen and
King of Gods, ὁμολογίως thus declares in his Protrepticke, ἐκ δὲ τῆς
τῶν μᾶς ὕπω ἀνακολουθήσας ἐς τῶν θεῶν διδασκαλίαις ἔμειναι διὰ τῆς ἔρξ
τοι, αὐτοίς ἀναχώρησα τῷ βασιλείᾳ αὐτῶν ἄδει. Here is
excellent exhortation of these Golden Verses, to the pursuit of Di
vine Fidelity, mingled together with Prayers and the Invocation of the
Gods, but especially of that Jupiter who is the King of them. Moreover
the same might further appear from those Pythagoric Fragments
that are still extant, as that of Ocellus Lucanus, and others
who where Moralisists, in which as Gods are sometimes spoken of plu-
ally, so also is God often singularly used, for that Supreme Deity
which containeth the whole.

But this will be most of all manifest, from what hath been re-
corded concerning the Pythagoric Philosophy and its making a
Monad the First Principle. It is true indeed that the Writer de Pla-
Ntis Philosophorum, doth affirm, Pythagoras to have ascerted Two Sub-
stantial
Notwithstanding which, it may well be made a Question, Whether Pythagoras by his Dyad, meant Matter or no; because Melaus or Porphyrius, in the Life of Pythagoras, thus interprets those Two Pythagorick Principles, of Unity and Duality, τὸ ὑστὸν ῥήματος αὐτοῦ, τῷ ἐμπιστευμένῃ τῷ ἐπίκτῳ ὁ Σωτόρ, ὁ σπουδασμός ὁ δεύτερος τῆς τῆς τούτων τοῦ Σωτόρος Ἰρρευκόμενος, ἐν προσαγόνισεν, ὁ δὲ τὸ ἐν τούτῳ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πρώτου, ἢ προσαγονίσεις τῆς ὑμετέρας ἡ ἴν ἐξαιτηθησθήτω σοι ἐνὶ τοῖς μεσαῖοι τά ἐν Μονας, τῷ μετὰ τούτῳ τῆς τοῦ πρώτου αὐτοῦ, τῷ τε ἄλλον τῆς ἴν ἐξαιτηθήτω σοι τῇ πρώτῃ ἵν μεταξύ τά ἐν Μονας, τῇ τοῦ πρώτου αὐτοῦ τῇ πρώτῃ ἵν μεταξύ τά ἐν Μονας. The Cause of that Sympathy, Harmony, and Agreement, which is in things, and of the conversation of the Whole, which is always the same and like itself, was by Pythagoras called Unity or a Monad (that Unity which is in the things themselves being but a participation of the First Cause: ) But the reason of Alterity, Inequality and unconstant Irregularity in things was by him called a Dyad. Thus according to Porphyrius, by the Pythagorick Dyad, is not so much meant Matter, as the Infinite and Indeterminate Nature, and the Passive Capability of Things. So that the Monad and Dyad of Pythagoras, seem to have been the same with Plato's πάντας and ἔστιν, his Finite and Infinite in his Philebus; the Former of which Two only is Substantial, that First most Impal, the cause of all Unity and the Measure of all things.

However
However if Pythagoras his <i>Dyad</i> be to be understood of a Substantial Matter, it will not therefore follow, that he supposed Matter to be Self-existent and Independent upon the Deity, since according to the best and most ancient Writers, his <i>Dyad</i> was no Primary but a Secondary Thing only, and derived from his <i>Monad</i>, the sole Original of all things. Thus Diogenes Laertius tells us, that Alexander who wrote the Successions of Philosophers, affirmed he had found in the Pythagorick Commentaries, ἂς ἔρμων ἡς ἐπὶ ἀπόστολον, μενετήν ὥστε ἵνα μοναδεῖς, ἄξος ὑπὸ διάδοσευς, ὡς εὖ ἔργον τὴν µορφὴν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ οὐκοῦν. That a Monade was the Principle of all things, but that from this Monade was derived infinite Duality, or Matter for the Monade to work upon, as the Alive Cause. With which agreeeth Hermias, affirming this to be one of the greatest of all the Pythagorick Mysteries, that a Monade was the sole Principle of all things. Accordingly whereunto Clemens Alexandrinus, cites this Passage out of Theaetetus an ancient Pythagorean in his Book concerning Nature, 'Α ἀλήθεια τοῦ ἔτους, ἀλήθεια εἰς.<br />

μήδεν ὁλοκλήρως, μικροί. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔτους ἐν εὗ ὕπον, The true Principle of all things was only One; for this was in the beginning One and Alone. Which words also seem to imply the World to have had a Novity of Existent or beginning of Duration. And indeed, however Ocellus Lucanus write, yet that Pythagoras himself, did not hold the Eternity of the World, may be concluded from what Porphyry records of him, where he gives an Account of that his superstitious abstinence from Beans, ὁτι περίτης άέρις ἄθλος τειχεροδυόν, καὶ πελάτας ἀτομα συμφερόν, καὶ χωρίς τειχεροδυόν καὶ πελάτας συμφερόν ἐν τῇ γη, τοιούτῳ άθλον καὶ διάκεις συνέκτων, ἔκακον το ἐμα τειχεροδυόν, καὶ φονείας ἀναβαςμένον, τότε ἐκ ἀπό τὴν ὑπέρ συνέκτων, αὐτόπας συμφερόν καὶ κακὰς συγγένεις. That at the beginning, things being confounded and mingled together, the Generation and Secretion of them afterwards proceeded by degrees, Animals and Plants appearing at which time also from the one purified Matter, sprung up both Men and Beams.<br />

Pythagoras is generally reported to have held a Trinity of Divine Hypostases; and therefore when St. Cyril affirmeth Pythagoras to have called God Ἰεραρχίας ἡς ἔρως καθὼς, ἰδόντως κῆνας, the Animations of the whole Heavens, and the Motion of all things; adding that od was not, as some supposed, ἐκτὸς τῶν διακομισθῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ αὐτῆς ὑπὸ ἄλογον. without the Fabric of the World, but whole in the whole, its seems proper to be understood, of that Third Divine Hypostasis of the Pythagorick Trinity, namely the <i>Eternal Psyche</i>. Again when God is called in Philoæa according to Pythagoras, οὐκός ὁ τῆς, ἦ πρὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπὸ ἄλογον, without the Fabric of the World, but whole in the whole, its seems proper to be understood, of that Third Divine Hypostasis; the Supreme Deity according to him being something above mind or Intellect. In like manner when in Cicero, Pythagoras his opinion concerning the Deity is thus represented; <i>Deum esse animam, per natum rerum omnium intentionis & commentium, ex quo nomen nostris carpentur, That God was a Mind passing through the whole Nature of things, from whom our Souls were, as it were, decerned cut out. And again, Ex universa mente Divina, deliberatis esse ainos nostros; this in all probability was to be understood allio ei-
other of the Third or Second Divine Hypostasis, and not of the First, which was properly called by him, Δεις and μόριος, a Unity and Monad, and also as Plutarch tells us, τί ἄγαθον, Goodness it self. Aristotle plainly affirmeth that some of the ancient Theologers amongst the Pagans made ἔσωλα or Love, to be the First Principle of all things, that is, the Supreme Deity; and we have already shewed, that Orpheus was one of these. For when Ἐρασίστερος and παλαίς, Delightful Love, and that which is not blind, but full of Wisdom and Counsel, is made by him to be αὐτοπροσώπος and προσέπων, Self-perfect and the Oldest of all Things, it is plain that he supposed it to be nothing less than the Supreme Deity. Wherefore since Pythagoras is generally affirmed, to have followed the Orphick Principles, we may from hence presume that he did it in this also. Though it be very true, that Plato who called the Supreme Deity τὰ γα, ὦ, as well as Pythagoras, did differ from the Orphick Theology in this, and would not acknowledge Love for a name of the Supreme Deity; as when in his Symposium in the person of Agatho he speaks thus: ὁ βασιλιάς τών θεών ἄνθρωπος ὑπό τῆς τριών ἀνθρώπων, ἐκείνων ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ καὶ ὁ μετά τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ ἀνθρώπων. Though I should readily grant to Phedrus many other things, yet I cannot consent to him in this, that Love was Older than Saturn and Japet, but on the contrary I do affirm him to be the Youngest of the Gods; as he is always youthful. They who made Love Older than Saturn as well as Japet, supposed it to be the Supreme Deity; wherefore Plato here on the contrary affirms Love not to be the Supreme Deity or Creator of all, but a Creature; a Certain Junior God, or indeed as he afterwards adds, not so much a God as a Daemon; it being a thing which plainly implies Imperfection in it. Love (saith he) is a Philosopher, whereas δεῖν ἂς ὑποτάλλευτον, and ὑποτάλλευτον σφαιράς γενναίον, τὸ γα, no God philosopizeth, nor desires to be made wise, because he is so already. Agreeably with which Doctrine of his, Plotinus determines that Love is peculiar to that middle rank of Beings, called Souls, πῶς δέννῃς, ἀφρατὴν, ὁ τῶν ἀκρατῶν, τὸ αὐτοπροσώπος γενεά, ἤ τὸ αὐτόκοιτος, ἢ μετα τοῦ αὐτοπροσώπος, ἢ τὸ αὐτόκοιτος, ἢ τὸ αὐτόκοιτος. Every Soul is a Venus, which is also intimated by Venus her Nativity, and Loves being begotten with her; wherefore the Soul being in its right natural state, Love God desiring to be united with him, which is a pure, heavenly and virgin Love; but when it descends to Generation, being courted with these Amorous allurements here below, and deceived by them, it changeth that its Divine and Heavenly Love, for another Mortal one; but if it again shake off these lascivious and wanton Loves, and keep it self chaste from them, returning back to its own Father, and Original, it will be right affected as it ought. But the reason of this difference betwixt the Orphickis and Plato, that the former made Love to be the Oldest of all the Gods, but the latter to be a Junior God or Demon, proceeded only from an Equivocation in the word Love. For Plato's Love was the Daughter of Penia, that is, Poverty and Indigency, together with a mixture of πλούς or Riches, and being so as it were compounded of Plenty and Poverty, was in plain language, no other than the Love of Deity.
Chapter IV.

Others, the Youngest God.

Defire, which as Aristophanes affirmed is μετά λόγος, accompanied with grief and pain. But that Orphick and Pythagorick Love, was nothing else but πίστις and αἰσχρός, Infinite Riches and Plenty, a Love of Redundancy and Overflowing Fulness, delighting to communicate it self, which was therefore said to be, the Oldest of all things and most Perfect, that is, the Supreme Deity; according to which notion also in the Scripture it self, God seems to be called Love, though the word be not there, εἰρήνα but ἐρήνα. But to say the Truth, Parmenides his Love (however made a Principle somewhere by Aristophanes) seems to be neither exactly the same with the Orphick, nor yet with the Platonick Love, it being not the Supreme Deity, and yet the First of the Created Gods; which appears from Simplicius his connecting these Two Verses of his together in this manner,

Ἐν οἷς μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος παλαιάς ἐστὶν οἰκεῖος,

Πρώτην μὲν ἐνγείρειν ἐνίκηρ μοίρισάλη πάνεσιν.

In the midst of these Elements is that God which governeth all things, and whom Parmenides affirmed to be the cause of Gods, writing thus, God first of all created Love, before the other Gods. Wherefore by his Love of Parmenides, is understood nothing else, but the Lower God of the World, together with a Plastick Nature, which though it be the Original of Motion and Activity in this Corporeal World, yet is but a Secondary or Created God. Before whole Production, Necessity said by those Ethnick Theologers to have reigned, the true meaning whereof seems to be this, that before that Divine Spirit moved the Waters and brought things into an orderly System, there was nothing but the Necessity of Material Motions, unguided by any orderly Wisdom or Method for Good (that is, by Love) in that confused and floating Chaos.

But Pythagoras it seemeth, did not only call the Supreme Deity a loved, but also a Tetrad or Tetraedrus; for it is generally affirmed, that Pythagoras himself was wont to swear hereby; though Porphyrius and amblichus, and others write, that the Disciples of Pythagoras swore by pythagoras, who had delivered to them the Doctrine or Cabala of this tetraedrus. Which Tetraedrus also in the Golden Verses, is called ὁ τεταράκτων φόρμως, the Fountain of the Eternal Nature, an expression that cannot properly belong to any thing but the Supreme Deity. And thus ἄνευ τῶν ὡν, ὁ μὴ τῆς ἄτομας ἐκφευρᾶται, ὃς χρήσεις ἀλλὰς θερμάται ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ, ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ, ὁ τεταράκτων φόρμως, ἐπικράτησεν τῷ ἐξορθίῳ τῷ ἔνθα συγγράφη οὗτος. There is nothing in the whole World, which doth not depend upon the Tetraedrus, as its Root and Principle. For the Tetrad is, as we have already said, the Maker of all things; the Intelligible God, the Cause of the Heavenly and Sensible God, that is of the Animated World or Heaven. Now the Latter Pythagoreans and Platonists, endeavour to give Reasons, why God should be called Tetras or Tetraedrus, from certain Mysteries in that Number Four, as for example, First,
First, because the Tetrad is \( \text{διδεσεις} \), the Power of the Decade, it virtually containing the whole Decade in it, which is all Numbers or Beings; but the bottom of this Mystery is no more than this, that One, Two, Three, and Four, added together, make up Ten. Again because the Tetrad is an Arithmetical Medity, betwixt the Monad and the Hebdomad, which Monad and Hebdomad are said to agree in this, that as the Monad is Ingenit or Unmade, it being the Original and Fountain of all Numbers, so is the Hebdomad said to be, not only \( \piοςαηος \), but \( \alpha \muθος \) a Motherless as well as Virgin Number. Wherefore the Tetrad lying in the middle betwixt the Ingenit Monad, and the Motherless Virgin Hebdomad; and it being both begotten and begetting, say they, must needs be a very Mysterious number and fitly represent the Deity. Whereas indeed it was therefore unfit to represent the Deity, because it is begotten by the Multiplication of another Number; as the Hebdomad therefore doth not very fitly symbolize with it neither; because it is barren or begets nothing at all within the Decade, for which cause it is called a Virgin. Again it is further added, that the Tetrad fitly resembles that which is Solid, because as a Point answereth to a Monad, and a Line to a Dyad, and a Superficies to a Triad (the first and most simple figure being a Triangle) so the Tetrad properly represents the Solid, the first Pyramid being found in it. But upon this consideration, the Tetrad could not be so fit a Symbol of the Incorporeal Deity neither as of the Corporeal World. Wherefore these things being all so trifling, slight and phantastical, and it being really absurd for Pythagoras to call his Monad a Tetrad; the late conjecture of some Learned men amongst us, seems to be much more probable, that Pythagoras his Tetradys was really nothing else but the Tetragrammaton, or that proper name of the Supreme God amongst the Hebrews, consisting of Four Letters or Consonants. Neither ought it to be wondered at, that Pythagoras (who besides his traveling into Egypt, Persea, and Chaldea, and his sojournings at Sidon, is affirmed by Josephus, Porphyrius and others, to have conversed with the Hebrews also) should be so well acquainted with the Hebrew Tetragrammaton, since it was not unknown to the Hetrurians and Latins, their \( \text{jove} \) being certainly nothing else. And indeed it is the opinion of some Philologers, that even in the Golden Verfers themselves, notwithstanding the seeming repugnancy of the Syntax, it is not Pythagoras that is sworn by, but this Tetradys or Tetragrammaton, that is, \( \text{jove} \) or \( \text{Jehovah} \), the Name of God, being put for God himself, according to that received Doctrine of the Hebrews \( \text{ἀποφθέγματα οὐν, ἣς ἤποτις} \), That God and his Name are all one; as if the meaning of those words

\[
\text{Nai μὴ ἀνθείς θ' ἐκδέχάρα τετραγράμματος, Πάγον ἄνωθεν φοινίκας.}
\]

were this; By the Tetragrammaton or Jovah, who hath communicated [himself, or] The Fountain of the Eternal Nature, to our Humane Souls; for these according to the Pythagoricke Doctrine, were said to be ex Mente Divina carpte & debita, i.e. nothing but Derivative Streams from that first Fountain of the Divine Mind.

Wherefore
Wherefore we shall now sum up all concerning Pythagoras in this conclusion of St. Cyril's, &c. &c., that is to say, natural history, nature, the divine law, etc., pious oracles, it may be, of Pythagoras,ocrates, or others, &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c,
Heraclitus was no Clear but a Confounded Philosopher (he being neither a Good Naturalist nor Metaphysician) and therefore it is very hard or rather impossible, to reconcile his Several Opinions with one another. Which is a thing the less to be wondred at, because amongst the rest of his Opinions, this also is said to have been One; That Contradictions may be true; and his writings were accordingly as Plato intimates, full with Unintelligible Mysterious Non-sense. For First he is affirmed to have acknowledged no other Substance besides Body, and to have maintained, That All things did Flow, and nothing Stand, or remain the same; and yet in his Epistles (according to the common opinion of Philosophers at that time) doth he suppose the Præ & Post-existence of Humane Souls in these words, τὰ χρόνον καὶ χρόνιον ἀπόκαθαν οὐκ ἔστιν ὠνήντιον, τῆς προτος εἰς τὸ ἀνεξομενένιον τέτοιο τοῖς παράδειγμα μανθάνοντες, καὶ ἀναμισθείσους τὰ παράδειγμα μανθάνοντες, τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐκάκλησις καὶ κατὰ κελαίων ὀσμῶν τέκνων τέτοιο τῇ ἅγιᾳ ἁγιασμένῃ. My soul seemeth to vaticinate and presage its approaching dismission and freedom from this its prison, and looking out as it were through the cracks and crannies of this body, to remember those its native Region or Countries, from whence descending, it was cloathed with this Flaming Mortal Body; which is made up and confipitated of Electrum, Choler, Serum, Blood, Nerves, Bones and Flesh. And not only so, but he also there acknowledgeth the Souls Immortality, which Stoicks, allowing its Permanency after Death, for some time at least, and to the next Conflagration, did deny, ἡ αἰώνια τῆς σώματος, ἐπὶ τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐν τῷ φυσικῷ ἐνομίζοντος, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐνομίζοντος σαρκὸς χρήματος, οἷς σχετικὸν καὶ ματαιωμένον, μεταφέρεται ὡς με εἰκόνων θεῶν, τὰ πολλάκια ὡς τὰς ἀνθρωπίνως ἀλλὰ ἀνθρώπως. This Body shall be fatally changed to something else, but my Soul shall not die or perish, but being an Immortal thing, shall fly away mounting upwards to Heaven; these Ethereal Houses shall receive me, and I shall no longer
longer converse with men but God. Again though Heraclitus alliterated the Fatal Necessity of all things, yet notwithstanding was he a strict Moralist, and upon this account highly esteemed by the Stoicks, who followed him in this and other things; and he makes no small pretence to it himself, in his Epistle to Hermodorus, εἰ δὲ τοιαύτα πελάτι δούλων καθόθηκας: τινὲς κακοὶ, τινὲς χαμόι ναί, τινὲς φυμαίνει, τινὲς περίκομα, καθὼς πελάται τινὲς καθόθηκας καλαθείς, εἰ δούληγε μετι, εἰ δούληγε μετι μετί φανερώσει με λύτρι, φανερώσει με δεσμιν. ἦτορ τάταν, ἦτορ ἢτορ ἢτορ ἢτορ, ἡμέτα αὐτοὺς ὐπαντό γενεας. I have also had my difficult Labours and Concerns as well as Hercules; I have conquered Pleasures, I have conquered Riches, I have conquered Ambition; I have subdued Cowardice and Flattery; neither Fear nor Intolerance can control me; Grief and Anger are afraid of me, and fly away from me. These are the Victories for which I am crowned, not by any other, but as being Made Master of my Self. Lastly though Heraclitus made Fire to be the First Principle of all things and hath some odd Pageages imparted to him, yet notwithstanding was he as a sort Religious, he supposing that Fiery Matter of the whole Universe, Animantium &c. &c. to be an Animal and God. And as acknowledged Many Gods, according to that which Ariosto recorded of him; That when some paffing by had espied him fitting in a Smoaky Cottage, he bespake them after this manner, Inteque, manu haec Diit jurit. Come in, I pray, for here there are Gods also; he flapping all places to be full of Gods, Demons and Souls: So was he an doubted Altherer of One Supreme Name, that governs all things that such as could neither be represented by Images, nor confined to Temples. For after he had been accussed of Impiety by Enthycles, writes to Hermatodon in this manner, ἀλλ' ἂν αὐτοῖς ἀνήφρωτι διδάσκατε προσωπικά τί ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, τίς ὁ Θεός ὁ Θεός εἰς τοὺς τχίς ἀνήφρωτος; δοκεῖς γαί, οἴ τοι ενδυσάμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνέχειν—ἐπάθει λοιπον, καὶ ἔστιν ἐν θεῳ ἀνήφρωτος, ἢ ἐστίν ἐν εἰς τοὺς ἀνήφρωτος, ἢ ἐστίν ἐν εἰς τοὺς ἀνήφρωτος. But omnific and unlearned! teach us first what God is, that you may believe in accussing me of Impiety; Tell us where God is? Is he up within the Walls of Temples? Is this your Piety to place God in the dark, or to make him a Stony God? O you unskilful! know ye not, that God is not made with hands, and hath no balis or fulcrum to stand on, nor can be included within the Walls of any Temple; the whole world, variegated with Plants, Animals and Stars, being his Temple. Again, ἐστίν εἰς εὐσεβείας, ἐν καθαρότητι, ὡς μένος ὡς ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίας ἔρημοι, ἐν τοις τοι ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίαις ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίαις ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίαις ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίαις ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίαις ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίαις ἔστω, καὶ ἐν ἀγοραίαις ἔστω. ἄμην I mpoious, O Enthycles, who alone know God is? Is there no God without Altars? or are Stones the only offer of him? Nor, his own Works give testimony to him, and prinly the Sun; Night and Day bear witnesses of him; the Earth bringeth forth fruits, declares him; the Circle of the Moon, that was made him, is a Heavenly Testimony of him.
to be considered, whose Predecessors of the Ionick Order (after Thales) as Anaximander, Anaximenes and Hippo, were (as hath been already observed) Materialists and Atheists; they acknowledging no other Substance besides Body, and resolving all things into the Motions, Passions, and Affections of it. Whence was that cautious advice given by Janubichus, ποιήσας τῷ Ιωάννικι φιλοσοφίᾳ τῷ το λόγῳ τα καθ' ουτό Σκοπήσας, ὥσπερ τινῶς ἐπὶ πολλάκις προγεμέχρως ἐξετασθεικής. Prefer the Itonick Philosophy, which contemplates Incorporeal Substanccs by themselves, before the Ionick, which principally considers Bodies. And Anaxagoras was the first of these Ionicks who went out of that Road, for seeing a necessity of some other Cause, besides the Material (Matter being not able, so much as to move it self, and much less if it could, by Fortuitous Motion, to bring it self into an Orderly System and Compages) the therefore introduced Mind into the Cosmopoeia, as the Principal Cause of the Universe, which Mind is the same with God. Thus Themistius, speaking of Anaxagoras, τὸν ἑαυτόν ποιῶν ἐπιστήμην τῆς Μορφοφυσᾶς, ὅτι ποιῆσαι ἐπὶ τὸν παντὸς. He was the first (that is, amongst the Itonick Philosophers, who brought in Mind and God, to the Cosmopoeia, and did not derive all things from Sensible Bodies. And to the same purpose Plutarch in the Life of Pericles, τοῖς ὑπὸς πρῶτος τοῦ χιλίου ἐκ τοῦ ἀναγεννητος Διανοοματης εἰς τὸν ἄλλο τὸν ἐπηεισα Χρυσεύχης ἢ ἐκπρόσομος. The other Itonick Philosophers before Anaxagoras, made Fortune and blind Necessity, that is, the Fortuitous and Necessary Motions of the Matter, to be the only Original of the World, but Anaxagoras was the first who affirmed a pure and sincere Mind to preside over all. Anaxagoras therefore supposed Two Substantial Self-existent Principles of the Universe, one an Infinite Mind or God, the other an Infinite Homeomery of Matter, or Infinite Atoms; not Unqualified, such as those of Empedocles and Democritus, which was the most Ancient and Genuine Atomology; but Similar, such as were severally endowed with all manner of Qualities and Forms, which Physiology of his therefore was a spurious kind of Atomism. Anaxagoras indeed, did not suppose God to have created Matter out of nothing, but that he was κοινός αὐχά, the Principle of its Motion, and also τὰς καὶ τὰς ἐνότατα ὁρία, the Regulator of this motion for Good, and consequently the Cause of all the Order, Pulchriniude, and Harmony of the World: for which reason this Divine Principle, was called also by him, notwithstanding Mind but Good itself being that which at the Sake of Good. Wherefore according to Anaxagoras, First, the World was not Eternal but had a Beginning in time, and before the World was made, there was from Eternity an Infinite Congeries of Similar and Qualified Atoms, Self-existent, without either Order or Motion; Secondly, the World was not afterwards made by Chance but by Mind or God, first moving the Matter, and then directing the Motion of it so, as to bring it into this orderly System and Compages. So that νέκ was ηοζωεν, Mind the first Maker of the World, and νέκ ἐκάλεσε ἐνότατες τὸν νέκ, Mind, that which still governs the same the King and Sovereign Monarch of Heaven and Earth. Thirdly, Anaxagoras his Mind and God, was purely Incorporeal; to which purpose his words recorded by Simplicius are very remarkable, ηοζ μὲν ἔννοιαν ἐνοτάτα μεταφέρεσθαι ἐνδοχρήστως ἀνθρωποί οὕτως ἐποίησε, εἰ μὴ νέκ τρεῖς.
Chap. IV. The Maker of the Whole World

Indeed it may well be made a Question, whether or no besides this Supreme and Universal Deity, Anaxagoras did acknowledge any of those other Inferior Gods, then Worshipped by the Pagans; because it is certain, that though he affiicted Infinite Mind to be the Maker and Governor of the whole World, yet he was accuited by the Athenians for Atheism, and besides a Mulet imposed upon him, Banished for the same: the true ground whereof was no other than this, because he affirmed the Sun to be nothing but a Mass of Fire, and the Moon in Earth, having Mountains and Valleys, Cities and Houses in it; and probably concluded the same of all the other Stars and Planets, that they were either Fires, as the Sun, or Habitable Earths, as the Moon; wherein, supposing them not to be Animated, he did consequently deny them to be Gods. Which his Ungodding of the Sun, Moon and Stars was, then Look'd upon by the Vulgar as nothing less than absolute Atheism, they being very prone to think, that if there were not any Understanding Beings Superior to Men, and if the Sun, Moon, and Stars were not such, and therefore in their Language Gods; there was no God at all. Neither was it the Vulgar only who condemned Anaxagoras for this, but even those Two grave Philosophers Socrates and Plato did the like; the First in his Apology made to the Athenians, where he calls this opinion of Anaxagoras Aburd; the second in his Book of Laws, where he complains of this Doctrine as great Inlet into Atheism, in this manner: ἐνδειξείς τὸν παρθένον γραφον ὡς εἴη Σωλ, τοῦτον ἀληθεύω, πάνταν τὸν ἀληθινῷ, καὶ ἄλλα ἄνθρωπον ὡς Θεόν καὶ Δίκαιον ὡς Θεόν, ὡς ἁλήθεια τότεν ἀλήθειας λόγοις ἐν ἔλεγχοι, ἄνθρωπον ὡς τὴν καὶ λίθος ἐκείνου, καὶ ὁδόν ὡς ἀλήθειας πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀνθρώπους. When you and I, endeavouring by Arguments to prove there are Gods, speak of the Sun and Moon, Stars and Earth, as Gods and Divine Things, our young men presently, being principled by these new Philosophers, will reply that these are nothing but Earth and Stones (Sensible and Inanimate Bodies) which therefore cannot mind nor the notice of any Humane affairs. Where we may observe these Two things, First, that nothing was accounted truly and properly a God among the Pagans, but only what was endowed with Life and Understanding. Secondly, that the taking away of those Inferior Gods of the
the Pagans, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, by denying them to be Animated, or to have Life and Understanding in them, was according to Plato's Judgment, then the most ready and effectual way to introduce Absolute Atheism.

Moreover it is true, that though this Anaxagoras were a professed Theist, he affearing an Infinite Self-existent Mind, to be the Maker of the whole World, yet he was severely taxed also, by Aristotle and Plato, as one not thorough-paced in Theism, and who did not so fully, as he ought, adhere to his own Principles. For whereas, to assert Mind to be the Maker of the World, is really all one, as to assert Final Caufality for things in Nature, as also that they were made after the Best manner; Anaxagoras when he was to give his particular account of the Phænomena, did commonly betake himself to Material Causes only; and hardly ever make use of the Mental or Final Cause, but when he was to seek and at a loss; then only bringing in God upon the Stage. Socrates his discourse concerning this in Plato's Plaido, is very well worth our taking notice of: Having one sometime read (faith he) out of a Book of Anaxagoras, τος τε πάντων άτομ, that Mind was the Orderer and Cause of all things. I was exceedingly pleased therewith, concluding that it must needs follow from thence, that All things were ordered and disposed of as they should and after the best manner possible; and therefore the Causes even of the things in Nature (or at least the grand strokes of them) ought to be fetched from the θεότης, That which is Absolutely the Best. But when afterwards I took Anaxagoras his Book into my hand, greedily reading it over, I was exceedingly disappointed of my expectation, finding therein no other Causes assigned, but only from Airs, and Ethers, and Waters, and such like Physical and Material things. And he seemed to me to deal, just as if one having affirmed that Socrates did all by Mind, Reason and Understanding; afterward undertaking to declare the Causes of all my Actions, as particularly of my Sitting here at this time, should render it after this manner; Because forsooth my Body is compounded of Bones and Nerves, which Bones being solid, have Joints in them at certain distances; and Nerves of such a nature, as that they are capable of being both Intended and Remitted: Wherefore my Bones being lifted up in the Joints and my Nerves some of them intended and some remitted, was the cause of the bending of my Body, and of my sitting down in this place. He in the mean time neglecting the true and proper Cause hereof, which was no other than this; Because it seemed good to the Athenians to condemn me to die, as also to my self most just, rather to submit to their censure and undergo their punishment, than by flight to escape it; for certainly otherwise, these Nerves and Bones of mine, would not have been here now in this posture, but amongst the Megarensians and Beotians; carried thither ὑπὸ σέβης τῷ δείκτη, by the Opinion of the Best, had I not thought it better to submit to the sentence of the City, than to escape the same by flight. Which kind of Philosophers (faith he) do not seem to me, to distinguishing between the True and Proper Cause of things and the Cause Sine qua non, that without which they could not have been effected. And such are they, who devise many odd Physical Reasons, for the firm Settlement of the Earth, without any regard to the
From which pallage of Plato's we may conclude, that though Anaxagoras were so far convinced of Theism, as in Profession to make One Infinite Mind the Cause of all things, Matter only excepted, yet he had notwithstanding too great a Tang of that Old Material and Atheistical Philosophy of his Predecessors, still hanging about him, who resolved all the Phenomena of Nature, into Physical, and nothing into Mental or Final Causes. And we have the rather told this long story of him, because it is so exact a Parallel with the Philosophick Humour of some in this present Age, who pretending to assert a God, do notwithstanding discard all Mental and Final Caufes, from having any thing to do with the Fabrick of the World; and resolve all into Material Necessity, and Mechanism; into Vortices, Globuli and Striate Particles, and the like. Of which Christian Philosophers we must needs pronounce, that they are not near so good Theists as Anaxagoras himself was, though so much condemned by Plato and Aristotle; forasmuch as he, did not only assert God to be the Cause of Motion, but also the Governor, Regulator and Methodizer of the same, for the production of this Harmonious System of the World, and therefore to δι' αυτοίς διαίτη, the Cause of Well and Fit. Whereas these utterly reject the Latter, and, only admitting the Former, will needs suppose Heaven and Earth, Plants and Animals, and all things whatsoever in this orderly Compages of the World, to have resulted merely from a certain Quantity of Motion, or Agitation, at first impressed upon the Matter, and determin'd to Vortex.

X X X I. The Chronology of the old Philosophers having some uncertainty in it, we shall not Scrupulously concern our selves therein, but in the next place consider Parmenides, Xenophanes his Auditor and a Philosophick Poet likewise, but who conversing much with two Pythagoreans, Amennis and Diochotes, was therefore look'd upon as one that was not a little addicted to the Pythagorick Sect. That this Parmenides acknowledged Many Gods, is evident from what hath been already cited out of him; notwithstanding which he plainly affer'ted also, One Supreme, making him, as Simplicius tells us, τὸν ἔντεκον τῶν, the Cause of all those other Gods, of which Love is said to have been first produced. Which Supreme Deity, Parmenides as well as Xenophanes called, ὁ ὅλος ὁ πᾶς, One that was All, or the Universe; but adding hereunto of his own, that it was also ἀνωπόθετον, Immovable.

Now though it be true, that Parmenides his Writings being not without obscurity, some of the Ancients, who were least acquainted with Metaphysical Speculations, understood him Physically; as if he had affer'ted the whole Corporeal Universe, to be all but One Thing, and that Immovable, thereby destroying together with the Diversity of things, all Motion, Mutation, and Aktion; which was plainly to make Parmenides
nides not to have been a Philosopher but a Mad man. Yet Simplicius, a man well acquainted with the Opinions of Ancient Philosophers, and who had by him a Copy of Parmenides his Poems, (then scarce, but since lost) assures us that Parmenides dreamt of no such matter, and that he wrote & οὐδὲν ἦλθον συνέχειαν, ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν τῷ ὅτι ὁδοὶ, or οὐδὲν ὁδοὶ συνέχειαν, not concerning a Physical Element or Principle, but concerning the True Ens, or the Divine Transcendence. Adding, that though some of those Ancient Philosophers did not differing, τὰ φυσικὰ ἡπὶ τῷ ὑπὸ φύσει, Natural things from Supernatural 5 yet the Pythagoreans, and Xenophon, and Parmenides, and Empedocles, and Anaxagoras, did all handle Two distinctly 5 καὶ τὰς ἀστραφές λαυκάδων τὰς πολλὰς, however, by reason of their obscurity it were not perceived by many 5 for which cause they have been most of them misrepresented, not only by Pagans, but also by Christian Writers. For as the same Simplicius informs us, Parmenides propounded Two several Doctrines, one after another; the First concerning Theological and Metaphysical things, called by him ἀλήθεια, Truth, the Second concerning Physical and Corporeal things, which he called δήσιμον, Opinion. The Tradition betwixt which, was contained in thefe Verses of his,

ἐν τῷ ζῷ οὐ πάθει πάθον ὅσον ἐδένυσιν
λαμείδεισιν· ἄρα κυριακὸς ἐκ τῆς πεντάκλητος
μάθεις, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἐπιστή, ἀποτελοῦν ἀνασέλων.

In the Former of which Doctrines, Parmenides affirmed One Immovable Principle 5 but in the Latter, Two movable ones, Fire and Earth. He speaking of Souls also as a certain Middle or Vinculum, betwixt the Incorporeal and the Corporeal World, and affirming that God did, τὰς ἄμαχα πέμπων ποτὶ μέξι ἐκ τῷ ἐμφάνισιν εἰς τὸ ἀείδες, πῦρ ἐκ ἀπατέα, sometimes send and translate Souls, from the Visible to the Invisible Regions, and sometimes again, on the contrary from the Invisible to the Visible. From whence it is plain, that when Parmenides affirmed his One and All Immovable, he spake not as a Physiologer, but as a Metaphysician and Theologer only. Which indeed was a thing so evident, that Aristotle himself, though he had a mind to obscure Parmenides his fence, that he might have a sling at him in his Physicks, yet could not altogether dissemble it. For when he thus begins, There must of necessity be either One Principle or Many 5 and if there be but One, then must it either be Immovable, as Parmenides and Melitus affirm, or else Movable, οὐ τοιοῦτοι φαινόν, as the Naturalists or Physiologers 5 he therein plainly intimates, that when Parmenides and Melitus, made One Immovable the Principle of all things, they did not write this as Physiologers. And afterwards he confesses, that this Controversie, whether there were One Immovable Principle, does not belong to Natural Philosophy, but to some other Science. But this is more plainly declared by him elsewhere, writing concerning Parmenides and Melitus after this manner, ἐὰν τι ἄλλον λέγεις οἷον καλοῖς, ἀλλὰ τὰ φαινόμενα γα ἔνα μεταξὺ λέγει τῇ τῇ ἐκ τῆς ἀείδες τῷ ἐντὸν ἀείδες δοκεῖ ἄξιον, ψεύδων, ἐκεῖνος προτέρος, τὰ τοιοῦτα προτέρους. Though it be granted that Parmenides and Melitus otherwise said well yet we must not imagine them to have spoken Physically. For this, the
there is something Unmade and Immoveable, does not so properly belong to
Physick, as to a certain other Science which is before it.

Wherefore Parmenides as well as Xenophanes his Master, by his
One and All, meant nothing else, but the Supreme Deity, he calling it
also Immoveable. For the Supreme Deity was by these Ancient Philoso-
phers styled. First it is and moveth a Unity and Monad, because they con-
ceived, that the First and most Perfect being and the beginning of all
things, must needs be the most Simple. Thus Eudorus in Simplicius
declares their sense: * οὐδὲν ἠφεται ὡς τέλος τὸ ὑπάρχων, ὡς
τὸ ἐκ τοῦ μόνου, ὡς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, ὡς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ποнηροῦ.
These Ancients affirmed, that the One or Unity, was the first Principle of
All, Matter it self as well as other things being derived from it, they
meaning by this One, that highest or Supreme God, who is over all.
And Simplicius concludes, that Parmenides his ὁ Μένος, his One Ens, was a certain Divine Principle Superior
or Mind or Intellect, and more Simple, because it virtually contained all things,
and as Simplicius writes, πᾶσα ἡ συνείδησις ἔν τοι ὀνόματι F. 31.Cr.
"οὔτος ἔχεται, ὡς ἐν τούτῳ ἐκ τοῦ μόνου, ὡς ἐν τῷ Μένος, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ
συνείδησις, ὡς ἐν τῷ Μένος." It remain-
wherefore, that that Intellectible, which is the Cause of all things,
and therefore of Mind and Understanding too, in which all things are
contained and comprehended compendiously and in a way of Unity, I say
that this was Parmenides his One Ens or Being.

In the next place, Parmenides with the others of those Anci-
ents, called also his ὁ Μένος, his One Ens or First most Simple
being, All, or the Universe; because it virtually contained all things,
and as Simplicius writes, πᾶσαι δεινοκαταθέσεις ἐμφανίσεως ἐκείνης,
All things are from this One, distinctly displayed. For which cause, in Plato's
armenides, this One is said to be, ὡς πᾶσαι πολλά οὖν ἐνεργείας, distributed
into All things, that are Many. But that Parmenides by his
ἐν τῷ Μένος, One-All, or the Universe, did not understand the Corporeal
World, is evident from hence, because he called it ὁμοιότης or Indi.
In Phys. F. 17.
sible, and as Simplicius observes, supposed it to have no Magnitude; it
equaetle that which is Perfectly One, can have no Parts.

Wherefore it may be here observed, that this expression of
ἐν τῷ ὁμοιότητι, or being All, hath been used in very different Sences; for as Par-
menides and Xenophanes understood it of the Supreme Deity that One
of the Perfection and most Simple Being, was the Original of all things,
other of them meant it Atheistically, concerning the most Imperfect
of the lowest of all Beings, Matter or Body, they affirming all things to
nothing but One and the same Matter, diversly modified. Thus much
can learn from that place of Aristotle's in his Metaphysics, ὧν μὴ ἐν
L 1. c. τε πᾶν καὶ μενική ἐναλ τὴν φύσην ἐκ υἱοῦ τουκας,
τε τό πᾶν καὶ μενική ἐναλ τὴν φύσην ἐκ υἱοῦ τουκας,
Τε ὃς ἀναβιοντοῖς ἐνυφόους, ὃς ἀναβιοντοῖς ἐνυφοντοῖς, ὃς ἀναβιοντοῖς ἐνυφοντοῖς, ὃς ἀναβιοντοῖς ἐνυφοντοῖς, ὃς ἀναβιοντοῖς ἐνυφοντοῖς, ὃς ἀναβιοντοῖς ἐνυφοντοῖς, ὃς ἀναβιοντοῖς ἐνυφο

It is another one of the rules of the Church, which is, that all things
be All in this sense, as if All things were nothing but one and the
same Matter, and that corporeal and endued with magnitude, it is ma-
nder.
nifeft that they err sundry ways. But here is a great Difference between
these Two to be observed, in that, the Atheistical authors of One and
All (whether they meant Water or Air by it, or something else) did
none of them suppose their One and All to be Immovable but Moveable 5
but they whole Principle was One and all Immovable (as Parmenides,
Melissus and Zeno) could not possibly mean any thing else thereby,
but the Deity 5 that there was one most Simple, Perfect, and Immu-
able Being Incorporeal, which virtually contained All Things, and
from which All things were derived. But Heraclitus, who is one of
those who are said to have affirmed ἐν οὐσίᾳ τῷ πώς, that One was all,
or that the Universe was but One Thing; might possibly have taken
both those senses together (which will also agree in the Stoical Hypo-
thesis) that All things were both from One God, and from One
Fire 5 they being both alike Corporeal Thefts, who supposed an in-
telllectual Fire, to be the First Principle of All Things.

And though Aristotle in his Physics quarrel very much with Par-
menides and Melissus, for making One Immovable Principle, yet in his
Metaphysics, himself doth plainly close with it and own it as very
good Divinity, that there is One Incorporeal and Immovable
Principle of All Things, and that the Supreme Deity is an Immu-
able Nature, ἐπεὶ ὅπερ τε ἐστὶ μεταφυσικῶς, λοιπὸν τὸ μνήμεν εἰ καὶ ἄκτος, ἐν
tοῖς πεποίησιν αἰώνιοιν, ἐρατωθῷ ἐν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀς, καὶ συνήθει ἐν ὑπὸν ἐν
cρυφόναι καὶ κυριακτοῖν ἑκάτοι. If there be any such Substance as this, that
is separate (from Matter, or Incorporeal) and Immovable (as we find
afterwards endeavour to show that there is) then the Divinity ought
to be placed here, and this must be acknowledged to be the First and
most Proper Principle of all. But left any should suspect, that Aristotle,
if not Parmenides also, might for all that, hold Many such Immove-
able Principles, or Many Eternal, Uncreated and Self-existent Beings
as so many Partial Causes of the World, Simplicius assures us, μὴ γὰρ
γενέα ἔσοντα πάλιν καὶ ἀκόπτον τοῖς ἄκτοις λέγεις, i.e. that though di-
verse of the Ancient Philosophers affected a Plurality of Moveable Prin-
ciples (and some indeed an Infinity) yet there never was any Opinion(entertained amongst Philosophers, of Many, or More than One, Im-
moveable Principles). From whence it may be concluded, that no Philo-
opher ever affered, a Multitude of Unmade Selfexistent Minds, or In-
dependent Deities, as Coordinate Principles of the World.

Indeed Platoniz seems to think that Parmenides; in his Writings, by his
τὰ ὅμ., or Ens, did frequently mean a Perfect Mind or Intellec, there be-
ing no True Entity (according to him) below that which Understand
(which Mind, though Incorporeal, was likened by him to a Sphere, be-
cause it comprehends all within it self, and because Intellec is no
from without, but from within.) But that when again, he called his
On or Ens, One, he gave occasion thereby to some, to quarrel with
him, as making the same both One and Many; Intellec being that
which contains the Ideas of all things in it. Wherefore Parmenides
his whole Philosophy (faith he) was better digested and more exa-
lly and distinctly set down in Plato's Parmenides, where he acknowled-
geth, Three Unities Subordinate, or a Trinity of Divine Hypothesi-
Plato, speaking more exactly, distinguishes Three Divine Unities Subordinate; The First of that which is Perfectly and most Properly One; the Second of that which was called by him, One-Many; the Third of that which is thus expressed, One and Many. So that Parmenides did also agree in this acknowledgment of a Trinity of Divine or Archetical Hypotheses. Which Observation of Plutinus is, by the way, the best Key, that we know of, for that Oblique Book of Plato's Parmenides. Wherefore Parmenides thus ascertaining a Trinity of Divine Hypotheses, it was the First of those Hypotheses, that was properly called by him, One; the Universe or all: That is, One most Simple Being, the Fountain and Original of all. And the Second of them (where is a Perfect Intellect) was it seems by him called, in way of distinction, in polia or in mutua, One-Many or One-All Things. By which All Things are meant, the Intelligible Ideas of Things, that are all contained together in One Perfect Mind. And of those was Parmenides to be understood also, when he affirmed, That all things did stand, and nothing flow; not of Singular and Sensible Things, which, as the Heracliticks rightly affirmed, do indeed all flow; but of the Immediate Objects of the Mind, which are Eternal and Immutable; Aristotle himself acknowledging, that no Generation nor Corruption belongeth to them; since there could be no Immutable and Certain Science; unless there were some Immutable, Necessary and Eternal Objects of it. Wherefore, as the same Aristotle also declares, the true Meaning of that Controversie, betwixt the Heracliticks and Parmenideans, Whether All Things did flow or Some things stand? was the same with his. Whether there were any other Objects of the Mind, besides Singular Sensibles, that were Immutable; and consequently, Whether there were any such thing, as Science or Knowledge which had Firmitude and Stability in it? For those Heracliticks who contended, that the only Objects of the Mind, were Singular and Sensible things, did with good reason consequently thereupon deny, that there was any Certain and Constant Knowledge, since there can neither be any Definition of Singular Sensibles, (as Aristotle writes) nor any Demonstration concerning them. But the Parmenideans on the contrary, who maintained the Firmitude and Stability of Science, did as reasonably conclude thereupon, that besides Singular Sensibles, there were other Objects of the Mind, Universal, Eternal and Immutable, which they called the Intelligible Ideas, all originally contained in One Archetypal Mind or Understanding, and from thence participated by Inferior Minds and Souls. But it must be acknowledged, that Parmenides and the Pythagoreans, went a step further, and did not only suppose those Intelligible Ideas, to be the Eternal and Immutable Objects of all Science, but also as they are contained in the Divine Intellect, to be the Principles and Causes of all other things. For thus Aristotle declares their Sence, τινι τα τοιο της ἄλλοις, and again, τό τι την εἶναι ἐκδέχεται ἔτοιμον τοις χρήσιν, τοις τοις ἐδει τι ἐν. The Ideas are the Causes of all other things; and, the Essence of all other things below, is imparted to them from the I-
ideas, as the Ideas themselves, derive their Essence from the First Unity.
Those Ideas in the Divine Understanding, being look'd upon by these Philosophers, as the Paradigms and Patterns of all Created things. Now these Ideas being frequently called by the Pythagoreans, Numbers, we may from hence clearly understand the Meaning of that seemingly monstrous Paradox or puzzling Griphos of theirs, that Numbers were the Causes and Principles of all things, or that All things were made out of Numbers; it signifying indeed no more than this, that All things were made from the Ideas of the Divine Intellect, called Numbers; which themselves also were derived from a Monad or Unity; Aristotle somewhere intimating this very account of that Assertion, τὸς ἀρχαῖος αὐτῶς ἐναὶ τῷ άλλῳ τῇ ζίγια, That Numbers were the Causes of the Essence of other things, namely, because τα ἔδο αὐτοῖς, the Ideas were Numbers. Though we are not ignorant, how the Pythagoreans made also all the Numbers within the Decad, to be Symbols of Things. But besides these Two Divine Hypotheses already mentioned, Parmenides seems to have affected also a Third, which becaused it had yet more Alterity, for distinction faketh was called by him, neither ην τα πάν, One the Universe or All; nor ην ταδε, One-All Things; but ην καὶ πάντα, One and All things; and this is taken by Plotinus to be the Eternal Pseche, that actively produceth All Things, in this Lower World, according to those Divine Ideas.

But that Parmenides by his One-All Immutable, really understood nothing else but the Supreme Deity, is further unquestionably evident from those Verses of his cited by Simplicius, but not taken notice of by Stephanus in his Poëtae Philosophica, of which we shall only set down some few here.

In which together with those that follow, the Supreme Deity is plainly described, as One Single, Solitary, and most Simple Being, Unmade of Self-existent, and Necessarily Existing, Incorporeal and devoid of Magnitude, altogether Immutable or Unchangeable, whose Duration therefore was very different from that of ours, and not in a way of Flux or Temporary Succession, but a Constant Eternity, without either Past or Future. From whence it may be observed, that this Opinion of a Standing Eternity, different from that Flowing Succession of Time, is not so Novel a Thing, as some would perwade, nor was it first excogitated by Christian Writers, Schoolmen or Fathers, it being at least as old as Parmenides; from whom it was also afterwards received and entertained by the best of the other Pagan Philosophers; however it hath been of late so much decried, not only by Atheistical Writers, but other Precocious and Conceited Wits also, as Non-fence and Impossibility.
Chap. IV. Finite; Melissus his Infinite.

It is well known that Melissus held forth the very same Doctrine with Parmenides, of One Immutable, that was All, which he plainly affirmed to be Incorporeal likewise, as Parmenides did; and Melissus also declared, that his One Ens must needs be devoid of Body, because if it had any Rassities in it, it would have Parts. But the only Difference that was between them was this, that Parmenides called this One Immutable that was All, *πεπερατωμένον, Finite or Determined, but Melissus *αποφαίνεται, infinite. Which Difference notwithstanding was in Words only, here being none at all, as to the reality of their Sense; whilst each of them endeavoured in a different way, to set forth the greatest Perfection of the Deity; there being an Equivocation in those words *κλίνεται, and Infinite, and both of them signifying in one fence Perfection, but in another Imperfection. And the Disagreeing Agreement of these two Philosophers with one another, Parmenides and Melissus; is also of Xenophanes with them both concerning the Deity, is well declared by Simplicius after this manner: *καὶ ὃ ἦν χάρις ἄλλην  Αριστοτ., τοῖς μεταφορικοῖς ἔκφρασεν, πάς κακῆς διαφόρεις ἐκλήσεις τὴν ἔννοιαν, ὥστε τὰς ἀρχαῖς διάβας, ἐκφορομενίαν ὁμοιά συμφράσεως. Καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀφελεῖ ὑπὲρ τρίτης ἀρχῆς, διειληφθήσεται, ἀπὸ χειροποιηθῆς ἀπὸ μαρτυροῦντος. οὐ μὴν Παρμενίδους ἐν λέγων οἷς πεπερατωμένον ἀνυπάκουσον ἡ ἐν τῷ πλαίδεσ ψευδάθερον, ἢ τὸ πίστιν ὄνομα ἢ πέρας ἀκόμα, τῷ τοις μιμλών ἀναφέροντα ἀφαίρεσθαι, ἢ τῷ παῖσιν τετελούν τῷ εἰρήνην ἀνεπικοῦν πεπερατωμένον εἰρήνη, μαθών τῇ πέλαξι. ὃ πάντων ἢ αἰει ἢ τῷ ὅτι ἄλλης ὀδοὺς ἢ, ἄλλους ἄπειρους ἢ μελλόντος ἢ τῷ μιμλών ἀκόμας ἢ χάρις ἢ οὕτω ἡ Σκέψεως. οὐ τῇ ἀνεκλείβον τῇ Ἰσα, τῷ ἡ αἰει ἢ δυνάμεις, ἀπερευτὸν ἢ αἰει ἢ μελλόνον. ἢ ἀρχικὴν. πλων οἱ μαθών ἢ αἰει ἢ ἁπάκινον, ἢ χάρις ἢ ἀπερευτόν ἢ ἀρχικὴν. τῷ πάντω. πέρας ἢ χάρις ἢ ἁπάκινον, ἢ καθάποτας ἢ αἰει ἢ δυνάμεις ἢ ἁπάκινον. τῷ ἀπερευτόν τῇ Ἰσα, ἢ ἁπάκινον ἢ δυνάμεις ἢ ἁπάκινον. ἠγοράθηναι. Perhaps it will not be improper for us to digress a little here, to gratify the studious and inquisitive Reader, by showing how those eminent philosophers, though seeming to dissent in their Opinions concerning the Principles, did notwithstanding harmoniously agree together. First of all, they who dis course concerning the Intelligible and First Principle of All; Xenophanes, Parmenides and Melissus, of whom Parmenides called it One Finite and Determined; because as Unity must exist before Multiplicity, so that which is to all things the cause of Afore, Bound and Determination, ought rather to be described by Measure and Finitude, than Infinity; as also that which is every way perfect, and hath attained its own end, or rather is the end of all things (it was the beginning) must needs be of a Determinate Nature; for which is imperfect and therefore indigent, hath not yet attained its Taur or Majesty. But Melissus, though considering the Inmutability of the Deity likewise, yet attending to the Inexhaustible perfection of its Source, the Unlimitless and Unboundedness of its Power, declareth it to be Infinite, as well as Ingenit or Unmade. Moreover Xenophanes laying upon the Deity, as the Cause of All things, and above All things, pleased it above Motion and Rest, and all those Antitheses of Inferior Bings, as Plato likewise doth in the first Hypothesis of his Parmenides;
whereas Parmenides and Melissus, attending to its Stability and constant Immutability, and its being perhaps above Energy and Power, praised it as Immovable. From which of Simplicius it is plain, that Parmenides when he called God, πάντας ζωος, Finite and Determined, was far from meaning any such thing thereby, as if he were a Corporeal Being of Finite Dimensions, as some have ignorantly supposed, or as if he were any way limited as to Power and Perfection; but he understood it in that sense, in which πάντας is taken by Plato, as opposite to ἀπειρον, and for the Greatest Perfection, and as God is said to be πάντας και κατακόρον, The Term and Measure of All Things. But Melissus calling God ἀπειρον, Infinite, in the sense before declared, as thereby to signify his Inexhaustible Power and Perfection, his Eternity and Incorruptibility, doth therein more agree with our present Theology, and the now received manner of speaking. We have the rather produced all this, to shew how Curious the ancient Philosophers were, in their Enquiries after God, and how exact in their Descriptions of him. Wherefore however Anaximandrus Infinite, were nothing but Eternal Senile Matter (though called by him the το Σενον, the Divinest thing of all) yet Melissus his ἀπειρον, or Infinite, was the true Deity.

With Parmenides and Melissus fully agreed Zeno Eleates also, Parmenides his Scholar, that One Immovable, was All, or the Original of All things, he meaning thereby nothing else, but the Supreme Deity. For though it be true, that this Zeno did excogitate certain Arguments against the Local Motion of Bodies, proceeding upon the Hypothesis of the Infinite Divisibility of Body, one of which was famously known by that name of Achilles, because it pretended to prove that it was impossible (upon that Hypothesis) for the Swift-footed Achilles, ever to overtake the creeping Snail, (which Argument of his, whether or no they are well answered by Aristotle, is not here to our purpose to enquire) yet all this was nothing else, but Ingenii, a sportful exercit of Zeno's Wit, he being a Subtil Logician and Difputant, or perhaps an Endeavour also, to shew how puzzling and perplexing to humane Understanding, the conception of the most vulgar and confessed Phenomenon of Nature may be. For that Zeno Eleates by his One Immovable that was All, meant not the Corporeal World, no more than Melissus, Parmenides, and Xenophanes, is evident from Aristotle writing thus concerning him: τι τοιτε έν ην ἢ Σεν ον έχει, οτε κατακόρον, οτε και τοιαύτα, Zeno by his one Ens which neither was moved, nor moveable, meanteth God. Moreover the same Aristotle informs us, that this Zeno endeavoured to demonstrate, that there was but One God, from that Idee which all must have of him, as that which is the Best, the Supreme and most powerful of all, or as an absolutely Perfect Being; ει δ' ει Σεν έι Σεν κατακόρον κατακορον, εις φως τριτοτε αποδεικνυον αιτίαν. If God be the Best of All things, then all must needs be One. Which Argument was thus purfied by him: τι τοι κατακόρον έι, κατακόρον διαφως, κατακόρον διαφως μι θεος, κατακόρον μι θεος, κατακόρον μι θεος. Zeno by his one Ens, which neither was moved, nor moveable, meant that One God, from that Idea which all must have of him, as that which is the Best, the Supreme and most powerful of all, or as an Absolutely Perfect Being; ει δ' ει Σεν έι Σεν κατακόρον κατακορον, εις φως τριτοτε αποδεικνυον αιτίαν. If God be the Best of All things, then all must needs be One. Which Argument was thus purfied by him: τι τοι κατακόρον έι, κατακόρον διαφως, κατακόρον διαφως μι θεος, κατακόρον μι θεος, κατακόρον μι θεος, κατακόρον μι θεος. Zeno by his one Ens, which neither was moved, nor moveable, meanteth God.


Empedocles is said to have been an Emulator of Parmenides also, which must be understood of his Metaphysics, because in his Physiology (which was atomic) he seems to have transcended him. Now that Empedocles acknowledged One Supreme and Universal Name and that Incorporal too, may be concluded from what hath been already cited out of his Philosophick Poems. Besides which the Writer De Mundo (who though not Aristotile yet was a Pagan of good antiquity) clearly affirmeth, that Empedocles derived all things whatsoever, from One Supreme Deity; for all these names, Se, Sei, Sia, Sei, Sei, Se, one Equal being neither better nor worse than another, Wherefore if there be a God, and this be the nature of him, then can there be but One. And indeed other wise he could not be able to do whatever he would.

All the things that are upon the Earth and in the Air and Water, may truly be called the works of God, who ruleth over the World. Out of whom, according to the physical Empedocles, proceed all things that were, are, and shall be, viz. Plants, Men, Beasts and Gods. Which notwithstanding we conceive, to be rather true as to Empedocles his fence, than his words, he affirming, as it seems, in that cited place, that all these things were made, not immediately out of God, but out of Contention and Friendship; because Simplicius who was furnished with a Copy of Empedocles his Poems, twice brings in that cited Passage of his in this connexion.

Things are divided and segregated by Contention, but joyed together by Friendship; from which Two (Contention and Friendship) all that was, is, and shall be, proceed; as trees, men and women, beasts, birds and fishes, and last of all the long lived and honourable Gods. Wherefore the fence of Empedocles his words here was this; that the whole created World, together with all things belonging to it, viz. Plants, Beasts
Empedocles makes Contention to be a certain Principle of Corruption and Generation: Nevertheless he seems to generate this Contention itself also from the Very One (that is, from the Supreme Deity.) For all things according to him are from this Contention, God only excepted; he writing after this manner, From which (that is, Contention and Friendship) all the things that have been, are and shall be (Plants, Beasts, Men and Gods) derived their Original. For Empedocles it seems supposed, that were it not for \( \text{κύλικα} \) Discord or Contention, all things would be One: So that according to him, all things whatsoever proceeded from Contention or Discord, together with a mixture of Friendship, save only the Supreme God, who hath therefore no Contention at all in him, because he is Essentially \( \text{τὸ ὅν} \), Unity it self and Friendship. From whence Aristotle takes occasion to quarrel with Empedocles, as if it would follow from his Principles, that the Supreme and most Happy God, was the Least Wife of all, as being not able to know any thing besides himself, or in the World without him, \( \text{διὰ τοῦ} \) sometimes write, \( \text{αὐτὸς} \) himself. Empedocles here making the Gods themselves to be derived from Contention and Friendship, the Supreme Deity, or most Happy God, only excepted, (who hath no Contention in him, and from whom Contention and Friendship themselves were derived) plainly acknowledged both One Unmade Deity, the Original of all things under the name of \( \text{τὸ ὅν} \), The very One, and many other Inferiour Gods, generated or produced by him; they being Juniors to Contention, or Discord, as this was also Junior to \( \text{UNITY} \), the First and Supreme Deity. Which Gods of Empedocles, that were begotten from Contention (as well as Men and other things) were doubtless the Stars and Demons.

Moreover
Moreover we may here observe, that according to Empedocles his Doctrine, the true Original of all the Evil, both of Human Souls and Demons (which he suppos'd alike Lapable) was derived from that Nature of them, together with the the III Use of their Liberty, both in this Present and their Pre-existent State. So that Empedocles here trode in the footsteps of Pythagoras, whose Praise he thus loudly sang forth in his Poems,

Horum de numero quidam praeducta norat
Flurina, Mentis Operis Amplis sub pejlore servantis,
Omnia Vestigianus Sapientium Doctra Reperta, &c.

XXII. Before we come to Socrates and Plato, we shall here take notice of some other Pythagoreans, and Eminent Philofophers, who clearly attested One Supreme and Universal Number, though doubtless acknowledging withal, Other Inferior Gods: Philo in his Book De Mundi Opificio, writing of the Hebdomad or Septenary Number, and observing that according to the Pythagoreans, it was called both a Motherless and Virgin Number, because it was the only number within the Decad, which was neither Generated, nor did it self Generate, tells us that there fore it was made by them a Symbol of the Supreme Deity, or περιήγησιν την ἐκβολήν τοῦ ἀγάμου τοῦ προστατοῦ. The Pythagoreans likened this Number, to the Prince and Governor of All Things, or the Supreme Monarch of the Universe, as thinking it to bear a resemblance of his Immutability, which Phancy of theirs was before taken notice of by us. However Philo hereupon, occasionally cites this Remarkable Testimony of Philolaus the Pythagorean, φανοῦ, ἵπταν καὶ ἔργον ἀπέστη ο̃ς ὄνοσ, ὑπ' ἐκεῖ ἐν, μεταμόρφος ἀληθινόν, μετὰ ἀρχής ἐφικτὸν, τῆς τοῦ αἰῶνος θεοῦ (faith he) is the Prince and Ruler over all, always One, Stable, Immutable, Like to himself, but unlike to every thing else. To which may be added what in Stoics further recorded, out of the same Philolaus, ο̃ς ἐις ὁ μοιχός τοῦ αἰώνος ἐις ἔνθα τοῦ ἐνθαρρυντόν καὶ ἐνεργάμεθα καὶ ἐναρέματο, this World was from Eternity and will remain to Eternity, One governed by One, which is Cognate and the Best. Where notwithstanding he emeth, with Ocellus, to maintain the Worlds Pre-eternity. And again, ο̃ς ἐκ χάλασ ο̃ς ἐκέεν ἐλέγε, καί αὐτόν ὑμῖν ἐκείνην ἐκέεν αἰών ζωὴν τοῦ αἰώνος, therefore, saith Philolaus, the World might well be called the Eternal Eternity or Effect of God, and of Successive Generation.

Jamblichus in his Protrepticks cites a Passage out of Archytas another Pythagorean, to the fame purpose, ἐστὶς ἀναλυθο̃ς ὅποι τε ζῆν, παῖς ἔσται ἵπταν ὑπὸ μᾶς τε ἐκ ἑυτῆν ἐναρέματο, ἦτο ἐν ἑαυτή μοι καλῶς ἐκοπτόν ἐφικτόν, ὃς το χρυσὸν ἐστηθεὶ τοῦ καλώς ἐκαλόμεθαι, &c. Whosoever is able to reduce all kinds of things under One and the same Principle, this man says to me, to have found out an excellent Specula, or high Station, from
from whence he may be able to take a large view and prospect of God, and of all other things; and he shall clearly perceive that God is the beginning, and End, and Middle of all things, that are performed according to justice and right reason. Upon which words of Archytas, Jamblicus thus glosseth: Archytas here declares the end of all theological speculation, to be this, not to rest in many principles, but to reduce all things under one and the same head. Adding τιμωτέρον μεν τῷ θεῷ, τέλος δὲ ποιος Θεος ἦς. That this knowledge of the first unity, the original of all things, is the end of all contemplation. Moreover Sto-beus cites this out of Archytas his Book of Principles, viz. That besides Matter and Form, ἀναγκαστικῶς πάντα ἔχει ἀλήθεια, τῶν καθάσκοι, ἀναγκαστικῶς περιβλατείον ἀλήθεια τῶν μορφῶν, ταύτα δὲ τῶν περιβλατών διάμετρόν, ὀς καθένα τῶν τριάκτων ἄρχων. There is another more necessary cause, which moving, brings the form to the matter, and that this is the first and most powerful cause, which is justly called God. So that there are three principles, God, Matter, and Form; God the Artificer and Mover, and Matter that which is moved, and form the art introduced into the matter. In which same Sto-Beus exception it also follows afterwards, ἐνίκερο ποιεσθαι γνώμην, μοίρας ποιεσθαι ἐν τοιαύτης ὁμοτροπίας. That there must be something better than mind, and that this thing better than mind, is that which we (properly) call God.

Ocellus also in the same Sto-beus thus writeth, παντὸς μὲν σκέψεως ἕξει, τούταις δ' ἐκτος ἄλλης. And ἔννοιάν εἰσίν, τούταις δ' ἐκτος ἄλλης, ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν πλείων, ἀνθρώπος ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων. Life contains the bodies of animals, the cause of which life is the soul; Concord contains houses and cities, the cause of which Concord is law; and Harmony contains the whole world, the cause of which harmony is God. And to the same purpose Ariflæus, διὸ τὸν ἔχειν τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὁποῖος ἐξερχόμεθα καὶ ἐκκλησίας, As the Artificer is to art, so is God to the Harmony of the world. There is also this passage in the same Sto-beus cited out of an anonymous Pythagorean, ἦς μᾶς οὖν ἄλλης ἐκτος παντοτε, διὸ ἐνενεργείος, God is the principle, and the first thing; and the world (though it be not the Supreme God) yet is it Divine.

Timæus Locus his God, Book I.

Timæus Locus a Pythagorean Senior to Plato, in his book concerning nature, or the soul of the world (upon which Plato's Timæus was but a kind of commentary) plainly acknowledgeth both one Supreme God the Maker and Governor of the whole world, and also many other gods, his creatures and subordinate ministers; in the cloath thereof, writing thus concerning the punishment of wicked men after this life, ἀπολογία τιμωτέρον ἄλλης ἐκτος, καὶ τοῖς καθάσκοις καταγαγόντας τοὺς τῆς καθήσομεν ἀνθρώποις, οἰκονομίαν, παλαιανομος, φιλοσοφίας, ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς ἄλλας, τοῖς καταγαγόντας τοὺς εἰς τὴν ἀνθρώπου καταγαγόντας, τοῖς καταγαγόντας τοὺς ἀλλας, τοῖς καταγαγόντας τοὺς ἀλλας. All these things, hath Nemesis decreed, to be executed in the second circuit by the ministry of vindictive terrestrial demons that are overseers of humane affairs; to which demons, that Supreme God the ruler over all, hath committed the government and administration of the world. Which world is comphlated and made up of Gods, Men, and other animals, all created according to the best pattern.
The Creator of Gods.

of the Eternal and Unmade Idea. In which words of Timaeus, there are these three several Points of the Pagan Theology contained; first, that there is One Supreme God, Eternal and Unmade, the Creator and Governor of the whole World, and who made it according to the Best Pattern or Exemplar of his own Idea's and Eternal Wisdom. Secondly, that this World Created by God, is compounded and made up of other Inferior Gods, Men, and Brute Animals. Thirdly, that the Supreme God hath committed the Administration of our humane Affairs to Demons and Inferior Gods, who are constant inspectors over us, some of which he also makes use of for the punishment of wicked men after this Life. Moreover in this Book of Timaeus the Supreme God is often called, δ' θεός, and sometime Θεός, God in way of eminency; sometime κόσμος, Mind, sometime θεός οὐκομένους, The Principle of the elf things, sometime δείκτης τῆς ἐπιτύπωσις, The Maker of the Better, Evil being supposed not to proceed from him; sometime ἐκ τοῦ, the Best and most Powerful Cause, sometime ἐκ τῆς ἡλεκτρικῆς, The Prince and Parent of all things. Which God, according to him, is not the Soul of the World neither, but the Creator thereof, having made the World an Animal, and a Secondary Generated God. θεός ἄλλος, ἐν καὶ εἰς ἀλλόμεσον ποιήσας, τὸν ἐπίτα Θεόν ἔφερα τοιὰς ἕρωτος, ἐπιτὰς ἐκεῖς ἀλλ' ἐς τὸν ἔρωτα, ἔφερα τὸν κατήκτη τῆς εἰκονομοῦντος, God willing to make the world the Best, that it was capable of making it a Generated God, such as should never be destroyed by any other Cause but only by that God himself who framed it, if he should ever live to dissolve it. But since it is not the part of that which is good to destroy the Best of Works, the World will doublesever remain incorruptible and Happy; the Best of all Generated things, made by the Best Cause, looking not at Patterns Artificially framed without him, but the Idea and Intelligible Essence, as the Paradigms, which whatsoever is made conformable to, must needs be the Best, and such as shall never need to be amended. Moreover he plainly declares, that this Generated God, his, the World, was produced in Time, so as to have a beginning, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡκομένους, λογοι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπίτα τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ σφαίρας τῆς ἐπιτύπωσις, ἐκ τῶν ἑωρακτικῶν, Wherefore whatever Ocellus and Philolus might venture, yet this Timaeus held not the Worlds Eternity; wherein he followed, not only Pythagoras himself (as we have already shewed) but to the generality of the first Pythagoreans, of whom Aristotle pronounces without exception, θοικος ὁ, καὶ ἄνθρωπος, that they Generated the World. Timaeus indeed in this Book, seems to affect the Pre-existent of the Matter, as if it were a Self-existent Principle together with God, and yet Clemens Alexandrinus cites a passage out of him looking in another way, ἀλλ' ἐπίτα τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ποιημάτων ἀνεκτίμητο περί τιμαίων, καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ φύσει συνήθησιν ἐναι ἀνήλθεν εἰς μακροχρόνια, ἐκ τῆς μορφῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγείρθησεν, εἰς την ἐγείρθησαν, ἐκ τοῦ ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν ἑωρακτικὸν, οὗ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: Would you hear of one only Principle of all things among the Greeks? Timaeus Locrus in his Book of Nature, will bear me witness thereof; he there in express words writing thus, There is One Principle of All Things Unmade, 5 for if it were made it would not be a Principle; but that would be the Principles, from whence it was made. Thus
we see that Timaeus Locrus asserted One Eternal and Unmade God, the maker of the whole World, and besides this, another Generated God, the World it self Animated, with its several parts; the difference betwixt both which Gods, is thus declared by him, οτι δι' μηδεις αιτητον ενδυομεν ενων εις ους, τος δε απαντησεις εαυτου εις γνωσαι τον αυτον. Αν ου δε επιστημον αυτου ως ευλογησαι εις εαυτον. That Eternal God, who is the Prince, Original, and Parent of all these things, is seen only by the Mind, but the other Generated God, is visible to our eyes, viz. this world and those parts of it which are Heavenly, that is the Stars, as so many particular Gods contained in it. But here it is to be observed, that that Eternal God, is not only so called by Timaeus, as being without beginning, but also as having a distinct kind of duration from that of Time, which is properly called Εορος or Eternity, he therein following Parmenides, ονομα δε τα ανωτερον χρονον, ον αιανα ποταμονπομορης; τοι δε το αξιων αειωματα του ιδουνα και αυτον εις επειδη εγνωμον. ονομα δε τα αυτον χρονατησαν, οτι δε πας αειωματα αιανα εις χρονατησαν. Time is but an Image of that Unmade Duration which we call Eternity; wherefore as this sensible World was made according to that Eternal Exemplar or Pattern of the Intelligible World, so was Time made together with the World, as an Imitation of Eternity.

It hath been already observed, that Onatus another Pythagorean took notice of an Opinion of some in his time, that there was One only God, who comprehended the whole World, and no other Gods besides, or at least, none such as was to be religiously worshipped by himself in the mean time asserting, That there was both One God and Many Gods; or besides One Supreme and Universal Nomen, Many other Inferior and Particular Deities, to whom also men ought to pay Religious Worship. Now his further account of both these Afferances, is contained in these following words; του δε λεγονει εκ

οτι δεν ερεμω, αλλα μη ποιησον αμαρτητους τοι δε υπερυπαν πληθυς του λοιπον εις δαιμονιαν επειδη εις αυτους επειραις και αποκλησιν; η δε το αεωμα του καινουργευσαι και θεον, ενσωσιν εις αυτων του αναπτυξαν εις αυτων τους αναπτυξαν η σεως του ποιησαι τοι ποιημαι, εις λοιπων, εις αυτων και αυτοι ποιησαι τοι λαμβανειν. η δε του θεον του παννυχου τοι αποκλησαι εις λαμβανειν, εγους εις τον παντακολουθησαι την του καινουργευσαι και ποιησαι μην του εις αυτων του εγους και του αναπτυξαν εις αυτων του αποκλησαι εις αυτων, αποκλησαι εις αυτων. Δε τοι θεον του αυτων εις τον παννυχου τοι, εις τον ποιησαι, εις τον παννυχου, εις τον ποιησαι τοι ποιημαι, εις τον ποιημαι τοι ποιησαι τοι ποιημαι. They who maintain that there is only One God, and not Many Gods, are very much mistaken, as not considering aright, what the Dignity an Majesty of the Divine Transcendency chiefly consisteth in, namely, Ruling and Governing those which are like to it (that is, Gods) and excelling or surmounting Others, and being Superiour to them. But all the other Gods, which we contend for, are to that First and Intelligent God, but as the Dancers to the Corypheus or Choragus, as the Inferior Common Soldiers, to the Captain or General, to whom it properly belongeth, follow and comply with their Leader and Commander. The work indeed common or the same to them both, to the Ruler and them that are Rule, but they that are ruled, could not orderly confine and agree tore.
And as the Supreme God is here called by Onatus, the Coryphæus of the Gods, so is he in like manner by the Writer De Mundo, titled the Coryphæus of the World, or the Præcentor and Presalter of it, in these words, καθὼς πρὸς χρῆμα, καυρώπαλα καλὸδεξιον, συνεπιξύπται πᾶς ὁ γεως ἱνδρῶν, τὸ ὑπὸ καθενῶν, καὶ ἰδιαφόρον φωναῖς ἐξουσίας καὶ αρμόνίας, μᾶλα ἐξεργαζόμενοι καταχωρίζοντες ἄνα τὰ πλῆθος ἡ ἐπίκλησις, τό οὕτως ἄθυμον, ἀθανάτον, αὐθανάτον, πάντα ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ πάντων. And in a Chorus, when the Coryphæus or Precentor hath begun, the whole Quire compounded of men, and sometimes of women too, followeth, singing every one their part, some in higher and some in lower notes, but all mingling together into one complete harmony; so in the world God, as the Coryphæus, the Præcentor and Presalter, beginning the Dance and Musick, the Stars and Heavens move round after him according to those numbers and measures, which he describes them, all together making up one most excellent Harmony.

It was also before observed, that Euphantus the Pythagorean, d Archelaus the Successor of Anaxagoras (who were both of them Atomists in their Phylogeny) did affect the World to have been Made Pag. 24.

First, and still to be governed by One Divine Mind; which is ore than some Atomists of ours in this present age, who notwithstanding pretend to be very good Theists, will acknowledge. We in the next place, mention Euclides Megarensis, the Head of that School, who is said to have been Plato's Master for the time, after Socrates his death; whose Doctrine is thus set down:

Laertius, ἦν τὸ Ἀρχαῖον ἀπεφέρα, πάλαις ἄνυμμα Καλὸδεξιον... τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς τῆς αὐθανάτου τῆς τῆς πνευμάτων τῆς τῆς ἐν τῇ ἐπίκλησις. Ἀρχαῖον, ἀπεφέρα, μὲ οὖν τοῦ Φαλεακὼν... Which we understand thus, That Euclides (who followed Xenophanes and Parmenides) made the First Principle of all things, to be One the very Good, called sometimes Fons, sometimes God, sometimes Mind, and sometimes by other names that he took away all that is Opposite to Good, denying it to have a Real Entity; that is, he maintained, that there was no Positive Name of Evil, or that Evil was no Principle. And thus do we also understand that of Cicero, when he represents the Doctrine of the Megicks after this manner, Id bonum solum esse, quod effe Unum, & in Deo, & Ideo, & Semper 3 to wit, that they make this concerning Id, that Good or Goodness it self is a Name properly belonging to him, who is also One, and Like, and the Same, and Alwayes; and that to true Good of man, consil leth in a Participation of, and Conformity with this First Good. Which Doctrine Plato seems to have derived from him, he in like manner, calling the Supreme Entity, by those Two Names, τὸ άγαθόν, the One, and the Good, and concluding true humane Felicity to consist, in a Participation of the First Good, or of the Divine Nature.
In the next place we shall take notice of Antisthenes, who was the Founder also of another Self, to wit, the Cynick 3 for he in a certain Physiological Treatise, is said to have affirmed, Essê Populares Deos Multos, sed Naturalem Deus, That though there were many Popular Gods, yet there was but One Natural God: Or, as it is expressed in Læcantis, Deos esse Naturalem Deum, quamvis Gentes & Urbes suis habeant Populares; That there was but One Natural God, though Nations and Cities had their several Popular Ones. Wherefore Vellevin the Epicurean in Cicero quarrels with this Antisthenes, as one who destroyed the Nature of Gods, because he denied a Multitude of Independent Deities, such as Epicurus pretended to assert. For this of Antisthenes, is not so to be understood, as if he had therein designed to take away all the Inferior Gods of the Pagans, which had he at all attempted, he would doubtless have been accounted an Atheist, as well as Anaxagoras was; but his meaning was, only to interpret the Theology of the Pagans, concerning those other Gods of theirs, that were or might be looked upon, as Absolute and Independent; that these, though many Popular Gods, yet indeed were but One and the same Natural God, called by several Names. As for example, when the Greeks worshipped Zeus, the Latins Jovis, the Egyptians Hammon, the Babylonians Bel, the Scythians Pappaeus; these were indeed many Popular Gods, and yet nevertheless all but One and the same Natural God. So again when in the self same Pagan Cities and Countries, the respective Laws thereof, made mention of several Gods, as Supreme and Absolute in their several Territories, as Jupiter in the Heavens, Juno in the Air, Neptune in the Sea; or as being Chief in several kinds and Functions, as Minerva for Learning, Bellona for War, &c. (for this Aristotle takes notice of in his Book against Zeno, καὶ τὸν νόμον, πρὸς θεὸς ἐκπλήσσειν ὅποι νομισματικὸς, That according to the Laws of Cities and Countries, one God was Best for one thing, and another for another.) Antisthenes here declared concerning these also, that they were indeed many Popular or Civil Gods, but all really One and the same Natural God.

To Antisthenes might be added Diogenes Sinopensis, of whom it is recorded by Laertius, that observing a Woman too superstitiously worshiping the Statue or Image of a God, endeavouring to abate her Superstition, he thus bespake her, οὕτω καλῇ ἡ ἀμνῇ, καὶ πᾶς οἷς ἐπιθυμεῖς ἡγεῖται ἡ (πάντα γὰρ ἐκείνα εὐδαιμόνης ἀμφοτέρως) ἄρνηταις; Τάκα, ὅπως, δεῖ πως ἡ τοιαῦται πλῆθος θεᾶς προσευχὴς. Take unto your care, 0 Woman, of not behaving your self unseemly, in the sight of that God, who stands behind you? for all things are full of him. Thereby giving her occasion, more to mind and regard, that Supreme and Universal Numen, that filleth the whole World, and every where.

XXIII. It hath been frequently affirmed, that Socrates died Martyr for One only God, in opposition to those Many Gods of the Pagans, and Tertullian for one, writeth thus of him, Propter dede mortuus est Socrates, quia Deos defraudavit; 5 Socrates was therefore condemned to die, because he destroyed the Gods. And indeed that Socrates affirmed one Supreme God, the Maker and Governor of the whole World.
World, is a thing not at all to be doubted. In his discourse with
Aristodemus in Xenophon's first Book of Memoirs, he convinced him,
that the things of this world were not made by Chance, but by
Mind and Counsel. And so he endeavoured to per-
suade him, that that Mind and Understanding which is in us, was
derived from some Mind and Understanding in the Univerfe, as well as
that Earth and Water which is in us, from the Earth and Water of the
Univerfe, or J σαυλ ψειδεν τι δινως εχειν, αναιοηζ ὑ ανεικον ψειδον
εν, ειός υ γε τι μικρε πολευτεν εν ταλ αρνοι πολλαις δακτ ηνες, εν υ-
γες μεροι, ποιλα πολλαι η, ς τα ραλλοι ςεντ ηνου εκατε μικρον μα-
εηντ λεγεται τα σπλενται σιε, εν τα μενοι αεις αναει ηνα σε δηγνες ποι-
διναι συνεργοιοι Ι. Do you think that you only have Wisdom in your self,
and that there is none anywhere else in the whole World without you? I
though you know that you have but a small Part in your Body, of that vast
Quantity of Earth which is without you; and but a little of that Water
and Fire, and so of every other thing that your Body is compounded of,
in respect of that great Miss and Magazine of them which is in the World.
Is Mind and Understanding therefore the only thing, which you fancy
you have some way or other luckily got and snatched unto your self, whilst
there is no such thing any where in the world without you; all those in-
finite things thereof being thus orderly disposed by Chance. And when
Aristodemus afterward objected, that he could not see any Artificer
that made the World, as he could those Artificers which made all
other humane things, Socrates thus replies, ο έ η τιω καινατο συχο
καλο εξειν, η το σαλατω καινατο εν ηνοι. Αν καταχω τα τοι εισει σιε λεγειν, εν τη-
η διναμε αλλαι πολλα πολεμος. Neither do you see your own Soul,
which rules over your Body; so that you might for the same reason con-
clude, your self to do nothing by Mind and Understanding neither, but
all by Chance, as well as that all things in the World are done by Chance.
Again when he further disputed in this manner, against the necessi-
ity of Worshipping the Deity, α η το ψειδον το αλλατινον, η επικεςτεν, με-
σαιαν μελαριπετεσαν ιγνατοι, η ας η ιμας οντος περιφερεσδαι Ι. I despeive not the Deity, O Socrates, but think him to be a more magni-
ficent Being, than that he should stand in need of my worship of him.
Socrates again answers, μελαριπετεσαν ας δηει σε ομαθειαν, το διδα-
καν ποταεν αυτο. How much the more Magnificent and Illustrious that
Being is, which takes care of you, so much the more in all reason ought it to be
honoured by you. Lastly, Aristodemus discovering his disbelief of Provi-
enance,as a thing which seemed to him Incredible if not Impossible,that
me and the same Deity should be able to mind all things at once, So-
crates endeavours to cure this disbelief of his in this manner;
το καινατο, αναιοηζειν, ὑ γε το σαν νας ηνοι το σαν ανακ ηνος ραλλοι μελαρι-
πετεσαν ιγνατοι εκεαν εκην υ η τιω εν παιει περιφερεσειν το πολεμ εν εναι ειδο
η το ταςδαιν α με το σαν αμα ενεκας, η το πολλα πολλαι ενεκειναι, το-
το η ιμας οντος εδεικναι αυτοι α μα πολεμ ιεων. Consider, Friend, I
say you, if that Mind which is in your Body does order and dispose it
very way as it pleases; why should not that Wisdom which is in the Uni-
verfe, be able to order all things therein also, as seemeth best to it? and if
That Socrates a Martyr for

But notwithstanding Socrates his thus clear acknowledging Of Supreme and Universal Numen, it doth not therefore follow, that he rejected all those other Inferior Gods of the Paganas, as is commonly conceived. But the contrary thereunto appeareth, from these very passagges of his now cited, wherein there is mention made of other Gods besides the Supreme. And how conformable Socrates was to the Pagan Religion and Worship, may appear from those last Diir words of his (when he should be most ferious) after he had drunk the poison, wherein he required his friends to offer a Votive Cock to him to Esculapius: For which Origens thus perstrigeth him, *τινα τοιποτα φιλοσφοτατικοτα τον θυσιαν το θρησκευσιν το έκλειπεν, διαελθεντες και ανιχνευτες το μεγεθυν αποικαι σταυρωται, δηλαδη και εκεινον ενι σωτηρας ετελειωσεν. That God is such and so great a Being, as that he can at once see all things, and hear all things, and be present everywhere, and take care of all affairs. Moreover Socrates in his discourse with Euthydemos in Xenophon's Fourth Book, speaks thus concerning that invisible Deity which governs the whole world; 6i δει αυτοι δια αυτου διδασκειν, ειδε τοτεν ας το εμφανις ιστος διδασκειν, 6ι δο έκλειπεν σου τοτεν ας το εμφανις ιστος διδασκειν. The other Gods giving us good things, do it without visibly appearing to us; and that God who Framed and Containeth the whole world (in which are all good and excellent things) and who continually supplieth us with them. He thought he be seem to do the Greatest things of all, yet notwithstanding is himself Invisible and Unseen. Which ought the least to be wondered at by us, because the Sun, who seemeth manifest to all, yet will not suffer himself to be exactly and distinctly viewed, but if any one boldly and impudently gaze upon him, will deprive him of his sight: As also because the Soul of Man, which most of all things in him partaketh of the Deity, though it be that which manifestly rules and reigns in us, yet is it never seen, ετι μην ισετε το δυναμις του φυσιας του θεου του πατρος, και ευτυ το θεου το εμφανις, οπως υποκαθιστησε της του θεου ειλικρινος, ον εκ του εν εις τον καθαρον. The other Gods giving us good things, do it without visibly appearing to us, and that God who Framed and Containeth the whole world (in which are all good and excellent things) and who continually supplieth us with them. He thought he be seem to do the Greatest things of all, yet notwithstanding is himself Invisible and Unseen. Which ought the least to be wondered at by us, because the Sun, who seemeth manifest to all, yet will not suffer himself to be exactly and distinctly viewed, but if any one boldly and impudently gaze upon him, will deprive him of his sight: As also because the Soul of Man, which most of all things in him partaketh of the Deity, though it be that which manifestly rules and reigns in us, yet is it never seen, ετι μην ισετε το δυναμις του φυσιας του θεου του πατρος, και ευτυ το θεου το εμφανις, οπως υποκαθιστησε της του θεου ειλικρινος, ον εκ του εν εις τον καθαρον.
opposed so excellently concerning the Soul, and discoursed concerning the happiness of the future state to those who live well, do afterward sink down from these Great, High and Noble things, to a superstitious regard of Little, Small and Trifling Matters, such as the laying of a Cock to Asculapius. Where notwithstanding, Origen doth not charge Socrates with such gros and downright Idolatry, as he doth elsewhere, for his sacrificing to the Pythian Apollo, who was but an Inferior Demon. And perhaps some may excuse Socrates here, as thinking that he look'd upon Asculapius no otherwise, than as the Supreme Deity, called by that Name, as exercising his Providence over the Sicknes and Health or Recovery of Men, and that therefore he would have an Eucharistic Sacrifice offered to him in his behalf, as having now cured him at once of all diseases by Death. However Plato informs us, that Socrates immediately before he drank his Poison, did, έξωθι τις Τεις, τω μελικαν τω εσβίδε εχως Τώριν είναι. pray (not to God, but to the Gods, that is, to the Supreme and Inferior Gods both together, as in Plato's Phaedrus he did to an and the other Tutelar Gods of that place) that his Translation from hence into the other world might be happy to him. And Xenophon in his Memoirs, informs us, that Socrates did both in his Words and Practice, approve of that Doctrine of the Pythian Apollo, That the Rule of Piety and Religion, ought to be the Law of every Particular City and Country; he affirming it to be a Vanity for any man to be singular here. Lastly, in his own Apology, as written by Plato, he professes to knowledge, the Sun, Moon and Stars, for Gods; condemning the contrary Doctrine of Anaxagoras, as Irrational and Absurd. Wherefore we may well conclude this Opinion, of Socrates his being Condemned for denying the Many Gods of the Pagans, or of his being Martyr for One only God, to be nothing but a Vulgar Error.

But if you therefore demand, what that accusation of Impiety really was, which he was charged with, Socrates himself in Plato's Euthyphro, will inform you, that it was for his free and open condemning those Traditions concerning the Gods, wherein Wicked, Dishonest and Unjust Actions, were imputed to them. For when Euthyphro having accused his own Father, as guilty of Murther (measuring committing a Homicide into prison who hapned to diethere) could justify himself from the examples of the Gods, namely Jupiter and Saturn, because Jupiter the Best and Justest of the Gods, had omitted his Father Saturn to Prifon for devouring his sons; as Saturn himself also had castrated his Father Caelus for some miscarriages of such, Socrates thus bespeaks him. "Apollo, Euxharos, πατέρα μοι αἰεικες της φρονήσεις, άνι φοβερήν και ψυχήν της φρονήσεως, έτερον τον πατερα επειδήν πατέρα τις Άνθέων, δοὺς κατ' αυτήν ορκωναι. &c. Is not this the very thing, O Euthyphro, for which I am accused? namely because when I hear any one affirning such matters as concerning the Gods, I am very loath to believe them, and sick not obliquely to declare my dislike of them? And can you, O Euthyphro, in good earnest think, that there are indeed Wars and Contentions amongst the Gods, and that those other things were also done by them, which Poets and Painters commonly impute to them? such as the Peplum or Veil of Inerva, which in the Panathenaicks is with great pomp and ceremony brought..."
Plato also a Real Polytheist. Book I.

brought into the Acropolis, is embroidered all over with? Thus we see, that Socrates though he affented one Supreme Deity, yet he acknowledged notwithstanding other Inferior created Gods, together with the rest of the Pagans, honouring and worshipping them; only he disliked those Poetic Fables concerning them (believed at that time by the Vulgar) in which all manner of Unjust and Immoral Actions were Fathered on them; which together with the Envy of many, was the only true reason, why he was then accused of Impiety and Atheism.

It hath been also affirmed by many, that Plato really affented One only God and no more, and that therefore whenever he speaks of Gods Plurally, he must be understood to have done this, not according to his own Judgment, but only in a way of Politick Compliance with the Athenians, and for fear of being made to drink a poision in like manner as Socrates was; In confirmation of which opinion there is also a Passage cited out of that Thirteenth Epistle of Plato to Dionysius, wherein he gives this as a Mark, whereby his Serious Epistles, and such as were written according to the true fence of his own mind, might by his friends be distinguished from those which were otherwise; and this, When I begin my Epistles with God, then may you conclude I write seriously, but not so when I begin with Gods. And this place seems to be therefore the more Authentick, because it was long since produced by Eusebius to this very purpose, namely to prove that Plato acknowledged One Only God; for, God hath given you, and giveth to, I think, the Only God, as he saith, and acknowledged the same, that ye be the only possed of God, and by the Spirit of God, and of the Lord, as in the Epistle to the Thirteenth, so hath the Lord God, and of God's power, as also Mark in his Epistles, and, Wherein he gives this Symbol or Mark, whereby he might be known to write seriously, namely, when he began his Epistles with God, and not with Gods.

Notwithstanding which, we have already manifested out of Plato Timæus, that he did in good earnest affent a Plurality of Gods, for which Gods of his are to be understood, Animated or Intelligible Beings Superior to Men, to whom there is an Honour and Worth from men due. He therein declaring, not only the Sun, and Moon and Stars, but also the Earth it self (as Animated) to be a God or Goddess. For though it be now read in our Copies, παρεσταθη α' μονον, that the Earth was the Oldest of all the Bodies within the Heavens, yet it is certain that anciently it was read otherwise, παρεσταθη τω Παθρι, The Oldest of the Gods; not only from Proclus and Cicero, but also from Laertius writing thus: γινε τε παρεσταθη μονη ανω, των τω θεων θεων, γραφή δε δυνατον, δε ναας ε' μικρων ποιει, δε η γοι τω μοις, καλοντι δε οτι τα μοις, Though Plato's Gods were the most part Fiery, yet did he suppose the Earth to be a God or Goddess, ascribing it to be the Oldest of all the Gods within the Heavens, Made or Created to distinguish day and night, by its Diurnal Circumny.
However though Plato acknowledged and worshipped Many Gods, yet it is undeniably evident, that he was no Polyarchist, but a Monarchist, an adherent of One supreme God, the only autopœous, or Self-originated Being; the maker of the Heaven and Earth, and of all thofe other Gods. For it is plain that according to Plato, the Soul of the whole World was not itfelf Eternal, much lefs Self-exiftant, but Made or produced by God in time, though indeed before its Body, the World, from thofe words of his: των ψυχων η ας των εκενον ουτως προφησεν Plato. Timæus, λέγει, οτικ διανενεκοτι και διας περιπεπεμενη και δια των ψυχων αυτω διαλεγαλην και προς... P. 54. 

επιδερχοντα μετατιθενες, δι καθαριτως αφοσιωδος σωσιστω: God did not fabricate, or make the Soul of the world, in the fame order, that we now reaf concerning it, that is After it, as Junior to it; but that which was to rule over the world as its Body, being more excellent, he made it Firft, and senior to the fame. Upon which account Aristotle quarrels with Plato as contradicting himself, in that he affirmed the Soul to be a Principle, and yet supposed it not to be Eternal, but Made together with the Heaven: ἀλλα μην ὁποια πλαταν κα οὐν τα λέγειν, ην οἰκεία ἀρχίων ἐμοι οἷον αυτο τούτο πάντευς, ἐπειδὴ τις τις ἕκανεν της διάφορας μικρώς. Neither is it po
dible for Plato, here to extricate himself, who sometimes declares the Soul to be a Principle, as that which Moves it Self, and yet affirms it again not to be Eternal, but made together with the Heaven. For which cause some Platonists conclude, that Plato afferted a Double Psyche, one the Third Hypostasis of his Trinity, and Eternal, the other Created in Time together with the World, which seems to be a Probable Opinion. Wherefore according to Plato, the Soul of the World, which is the bieft of all his Inferior Gods, was not Self-exiftent but Made or Pro-
duced by God in time, all the other Gods of his, which were but
Parts of the World, as the Sun, Moon, Stars and Demons, must needs
be so too. But left any should suspect, that Plato might for all that,
suppose the World and its Gods not to have been made by One only
Unmade God, but by a Multitude of Co-ordinate Self-existent Prin-
ciples, or Deities conspiring; we shall observe that the contrary
hereunto, is plainly declared by him, in way of answer to that Que-
re, Whether or not there were Many and infinite Worlds (as some Phi-
losophers had maintained) or only One? he Resolving it thus,

firstly, for, &c. en αυτον προφητευον, & πολλακι θω απερεψ λεγαν
ς αυ-
τον ενα, ειτε ς το αυτοστειμα θεωμαιηκονος εσχοι το ς ευ-
μενον
ποιμαν ἑπτα τοιαυτα ξαιναι, μεθ' ημερο δαΐνον ιν τιν πατ' εις, &c. ινα εν τινε
τοι τω μονον, ομοιον το παντελει ξαιναι, δια τυχαι τι κατο, θω απερε
ποιμαν ο ποιμαν καζοις, αλλι δις ουδεμιους οριον ςεγονας, εις τι κατοικην,
Whether have we rightly affirmed, that there is only One Heaven, (or
World) or is it more agreeable to reason to hold Many or Infinite?

We say there is but One, if it be made agreeable to its Intellectual Para-
digm, containing the Ideas of all Animals and other things in it; For
there can be but One Archetypal Animal, which is the Paradigm of all
created Beings: wherefore that the World may agree with its Para-
digm in this respect of Solitude or Oneness, therefore it is not Two nor
Infinite, but One-only-begotten. His meaning is, that there is but

One Archetypal Mind, the Demiurgus or Maker of all things, that
were produced; and therefore but One World.

And this One God which according to Plato, was the Maker of the
whole World, is frequently called by him in his Timæus and else-
where, α το, God or The God, by way of Excellency; sometimes
α ωμακρον, The Architect or Artificer of the World; sometimes θα ποιη
τε, the Maker and Father of this Universe, where it is hard to find out, but impossible to declare to the Vulgar: again,
α το σεθς, the God over all, θα ωμαιος, the Creator of Nature,
τε ποιησεν αυτοι, the sole Principle of the Universe; ποιησεν αυτοι,
καυσις of all things; νεος ποιησεν βαλανς, Mind the King of all things,
και αυτοκρατορ αυτα καυσιον διο ποιησεν ιναι, that Sovereign Mind, which
orders all things and passes through all things; τε ποιησεν καυσιν
The Governor of the Whole; το αν ακον, he that be εις, that which
is and was never made; ποιησεν αυτοι, the First God; θα μοιχ
ναιος, and α μεγας θεος, The Greatest God, and the Greatest of the
 Gods; θα λοιπο νοσις, He that Generated or Produced the Sun; θα
dοτοι ας ας, he that by virtue of soul, τε ποιησεν το αν ακον, he that be εις, he that
οτε, he that makes Earth, and Heaven, and the Gods; and doth all things both in Heaven, and Hell, and under the Earth: Again, he
whose Efficiency the Things of the World, ιναι αυτοι, πεποιησεν
οντα, were afterwards made when they were not Before; or from an
Antecedent Non-existence brought forth into Being. This Philosophy
somewhere intimating, that it was as easy for God to produce the
Real Things, the Sun, Moon, Stars and Earth, &c. from himself, as

Dr. Rep. L. 18. It is for us to produce the Images of our selves and whatsoever else we please;
only by interposing a Looking-glass. Lastly he is called δις ποιησεν τωτε ας
ηναιονυμις, δις λοιπον, He that Caused or produced both All other things, and
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that which he is? And if we should suppose, that it were in his own choice, to be what he would, and that he had liberty to change his Nature into whatsoever else he pleased, it is certain that he would neither will to be any thing else, besides what he is, nor complain of himself as being now that which he is, out of necessity, he being indeed no other but that which himself hath willed and doth always will to be. For his Will is his Essential Goodness, so that his Will doth not follow his Nature but concur with it in the very Essence of this Good there being contained his Choice, and Willing of himself to be such. Lastly, παν ἀληθῶς, καὶ ἀληθὲς τὸ μια βεβαιότατον, ἢλθείν τὸ μια βεβαιότατον. For upon this, he says, Plato says, that God is all Will, nor is there anything in him which he doth not Will, nor is his Being before his Will, but his Will is Himself, or he Himself the first Will. So that he is as he would himself, and such as he would, and yet his will did not Generate or Produce anything, that was not before. And now we may in all Probability conclude, that Latantius derived this Doctrine from Plato and Plotinus, which how far it is to be either allowed of or excused, we leave others to judge; only we shall observe, that as the word αὐτοφων, frequently attributed to God by Christians as well as Pagans, seems to imply as much; so the Scope and Drift of Plotinus in all this, was plainly no other, than partly to set forth the Self-existence of the Supreme Deity after a more lively manner, and partly to confute that odd Conceive, which some might possibly entertain of God, as if he either Happened by Chance, to be what he is; or else were such by a Certain Necessity of Nature, and had his Being imposed upon him: whereas, he is as much every way, what he would Will and Chief to be, as if he had Made himself by his own Will and Choice. Neither have we set down all this, only to give an account of that one Expression of Plato's, That God can make Himself and all things, but also to show how punctually precise, curious and accurate, some of these Pagans were, in there Speculations concerning the Deity.

To return therefore to Plato; Though some have suspected the Trinity which is commonly called Platonick, to have been nothing but a mere Figment and Invention of some later Platonists; yet contrary hereunto seems to be unquestionably evident, that Plato himself really asserted such a Trinity of Universal and Divine Hypothesis, which have the nature of Principles. For first, whereas in his Tenth Book of Laws, he professedly opposing Atheists, undertakes to prove the Existence of a Deity, he does notwithstanding there ascend no higher than to the Psyche, or Universal Mundaal Soul, as a Self-moving Principle, and the immediate or proper Cause of all that Motion which is in the World. And this is all the Good that there he undertakes to prove. But in other places of his Writings he frequently asserts above the Self-moving Psyche an Immovable and Standing Nous or Intellect, which was properly the Deming or Architectonic Frame of the whole World. And lastly, above the Multiform Intellect, he plainly asserts yet a higher Hypostasis, the most Simple and most absolutely Perfect Being, which he calls Ἄλλοι πολλοὶ πλατωνικοὶ.
Chap. IV. Properly The King of All Things.

in opposition to that Multiplicity which speaks something of imperfection in it, and ταφανεία: Goodness itself, as being above Mind and Understanding; the First Intelligible, and an Infinite Fecundity together with overflowing Divinity. And accordingly in his Second Epistle to Dionysius, does he mention a Trinity of Divine Hypostases, all together. Now the words ὃς Θεός and ὃς Θεόν, God and the Divinity in Plato, seem sometimes to comprehend this whole Trinity of Divine Hypostases, as they are again sometimes severally applied to Each of them, accordingly as we have already observed, that Zeus or Jupiter in Plato, is not always taken for the First and Highest Hypostasis in his Trinity, but sometimes the Second Hypostasis of Mind or Intelligibility is meant thereby, and sometimes again his Third Hypostasis of the Universal and Eternal Psyche; nevertheless the First of these Three Hypostases, is that which is properly called by the Platonists, πονηρευτικόν, the Fountain of the Godhead, and by Plato himself, ὁ πάνω θεός; that he, ὁ υπὲρ τοῦ πάντοτε, ὕπερ τοῦ πάντων πάντων τῶν καλῶν. 

The King of All things, about whom are All things, and for whose sake are All things, and the Cause of all Good and Excellent Things.

And this First Divine Hypostasis, which in Plato's Theology, is properly ὁ πάνω θεός, the Original Deity, is largely insinuated upon by that Philosopher in the Sixth of his Politicks, under the Name and Title of ταφανεία: The Good; but principally there illustrated by that Resemblance of the Sun, called by that Philosopher also, a Heavenly God, and said to be the Off-spring of this Higheft Good, and something Analogous to it in the Corporal World, ὁ, το πάνω τούτῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ πάντω, πέρα τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, τοῦ πάντοτε καὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πέρα τοῦ πάντων τῶν καλῶν. This is the same in the Intelligible World, to Intelligible (or Knowledge) and Intelligibles, that the Sun is in the Sensible World, a Sight and Visible. For, as the Sun is not Sight, but only the Cause of it; nor is that Light, by which we see, the same with the Sun itself, but only some Light, a Sun-like Thing; so neither is the Supreme and Higheft Good (properly) Knowledge, but the Cause of Knowledge; nor s Intelligibil (precisely considered as such) the Best and Most Perfect Being, but only ὁ πάνω θεός, a Boniform Thing. Again, As the Sun gives things not only their Visibility, but also their Generation; so does this Higheft Good, not only cause the Cognoscibility of things, but also their very Essences and Beings. οἵ ἐκ ζιζάς οἴχοι τοῦ ἀρχήν, ἀλλ' ἐκ ἑπτάνων τοῦ μεγίστου, προεξέχει καὶ δύναμις ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, This Higheft Good being at it self properly Essence, but above Essence, transcending the same, other in respect of Dignity and Power. Which Language and Conceit of Plato's, some of the Greek Fathers seem to have entertained, et so as to apply it to the whole Trinity, when they call God ὁ πάνω θεός, or Super-essential. But the meaning of that Philosopher, as we conceive, no other than this, that this Higheft Good, is in no Particular Characteristic upon it, limiting and determining of it, it being the Hidden and Incomprehensible Source of all Things. In the Last place, we shall observe, that this First Divine Hypostasis of the Platonick Trinity, is by that Philosopher alluded, τοῦ πάνω θεοῦ καὶ ὁ πάνω τῶν πάνων, Θεὸς τοῦ Πριγκίπου καὶ Καγαί τῶν Αιώνων, The Father of the Prince and Cause of All things. Wherein we cannot but take notice of an Admira-
Admirable Correspondency, betwixt the Platonick Philosophy and Christianity, in that the Second Hypostasis of both their Trinities (called also sometimes Λόγος by the Platonists, as well as τὸ ἐν) is said to be the Immediate Cause of All things; and the Demiurgus, the Architect, Maker or Artificer of the Whole World.

Now to Plato we might here joyn Xenophon, because he was his Equal, and a Socratick too; (though it seems there was not so good Correspondence betwixt them,) which Xenophon, however in sundry places of his Writings, he acknowledge a Plurality of Gods, yet doth he give plain Testimony also of One Supreme and Universal Numen, as this particularly, δὲ πάντα σέναν ἀποτέλεσμα, δὲν μὴ μερίκης τι, κατ' ὑμών φονείζει, ὑποςέπι ἔτι μορφῶν μαθήματος. He that both agitates all things, and establisheth the Frame of the whole world, though he be manifest to be great and powerful, yet is he, as to his Form inconspicuous.

In the next place we come to Aristotle: Who that he acknowledged more Gods than One (as well as the other Pagans) appears from his using the word so often Plurally. As particularly in this Passages of his Nicomachian Ethics, ἐν τῷ θελεῖ δεικνύοντος ὅτι Σωφρονικά τὰς θεσπίσεις, καὶ εἰσίθενται ἐν φαινεῖ, τὰς γὰρ μοιχικὰ υπελεγμένα μοιχαὶ λεγεῖς, ἐν πολλοῖς ἐπηρεάζεται καὶ θεολογίαν μαθῆσαι θὰ διέρθην, καὶ γεγονούσα θαυματικῶς καὶ Σωφρονικὰ, θαυμάσεις ἀπεδόθησα, καὶ ὃ τὸ καλὸν, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν Ὀδηγοῦσαν, ἢ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅτι νόησαν; ἢ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅτι ἵνα νοέσαν; ὃς ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἵνα νοέσαν; οὕτως ὁννέσαν, ὧν ἣν ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, ἢ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅτι νόθοσαν, ὃς ἥν ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, ἢ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. That Persever Happiness is a Speculative or Contemplative Energy, may be made manifest from hence; because we account the Gods most of all Happy. Now what Moral Actions can we attribute to them? Whether those of Justice amongst one another; as if it were not ridiculous to suppose the Gods to make Contracts and Bargains amongst themselves, and the like. Or else those of Fortitude and Magnanimity? As if the Gods had their Fears, Dangers and Difficulties to encounter withal. Or those of Liberality as if the Gods had some such thing as Money too, and there were among them Indigent to receive Alms. Or Lastly, shall we attribute to them the Actions of Temperance? But would not this be a Reproachful Commendation of the Gods, to say, that they conquer and master their vicious Lusts and appetites? Thus running through all the Actions of Moral Virtue, we find them to be small and mean and unworthy of the Gods. And yet we all believe the Gods to live, and consequently to Act; unless we should suppose them perpetually to sleep as Endymion did. Wherefore if all Moral Actions, and therefore much more Mechanical Operations be taken away from that which Lives and Understands, what is there left to it besides Contemplation? To which he there adds a further Argument also of the same thing. Because other Animals, who are deprived of Contemplation, partake not of Happiness. For to the God
all their Life is Happy, to men so far forth, as it approacheth to Contemplation, but brute Animals, that do not at all contemplate, partake not at all of Happiness. Where Aristotle plainly acknowledges a Plurality of Gods, and that there is a certain Higher Rank of Beings above Men. And by the way we may here observe, how from those words of his, ἐγὼ τε πάντως ὑπελαφάζω τοὺς θεούς, All men suppose the Gods to live, and from what follows in him; that Opinion of some late Writers may be confuted, that the Pagans generally worshipped, the Inanimate Parts of the World as true and proper Gods: Aristotle here telling us, that they Univerally agreed in this, that the Gods were Animals, Living and Understanding Beings, and such as are therefore capable of Contemplation. Moreover Aristotle in his Politicks, L 5. c. i., writing of the means to conserve a Tyranny, as he calls it; sets down his plan for one amongst the rest, ἡτὶ δὲ ταύτα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν πανηγυρίζων καὶ συμπανθητικῶς διατῃρώμενον, ὃνλοι τοῦ γὰρ φοβούμενον, τὸ πλῆθος ἀλήθειαν ἐπηνοεῖτο, καὶ ἐν διάβαλλαις τούτῳ χώραν ἐν ἀφορμῇ καὶ προτέρως τῷ θεῷ καὶ προστάτωυς πάντων ὑποτήθηκεν, as if the Gods might stand in need of the Protection of Kings, and are thin dangerous to the Kings. For a Prince or Monarch, to seem to be always, more than ordinarily sedulous about the Veneration of the Gods: because men are less afraid of suffering any Injury from such Kings or Princes, as they think to be Religiously disposed, not deviously affected towards the Gods. Neither will they be so apt to take conspiracies against such, as supposing that the Gods will be their Adbutors and Assistants. Where the word δεινοδοξῶσαι, seems to be taken in a good sense, and in way of Commendation, for a Religious Person; though we must confess, that Aristotle himself does not here write so much like a δεινοδοξός, as a Moor Political. Likewise in his First Book De Celo, he writeth thus, πάντες ἀφέναις δὲ, &c. c. i: οί δὲ θεοί ὑπελαφάζομεν, καὶ πάντες ἀποκείμενοι τῷ Θεῷ τούτῳ ἀπόδειξαμίας, καὶ ἀνακείμενοι καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνεις, ζώοι τὰ ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἀπειθήτων συνεπιθυμήσεως, ἔστε ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, ἐπειπερ καὶ ἐστὶ, &c. All men have an Opinion or Persuasion that there are Gods. And they who think so, as well Barbarians as Greeks, attribute the Highest place to that which is Divine, as supposing the Immortal Heavens, to be most accommodated to Immortal Gods: therefore if there be any Divinity, as unquestionably there is, the Bores of the Heavens must be acknowledged to be of a different kind from the other Elements. And in the following Book he tells us again, that it is most agreeable to the θεῖς; οἱ δὲ θεοί, to that Vaticination, which all men have in their minds concerning the Gods, to suppose the Heavens to be a Quintessence, distinct from the Elements, and therefore incorruptible. Where Aristotle affirmeth, that men have generally, κατὰ τὸν πρώτον, a Vaticination in their Minds, concerning Gods; to wit, that themselves are not the Highest Beings, but that there is a Rank of intellectual Beings, superior to men; the chief of which is the Supreme Deity, concerning whom there is indeed, the Greatest θεῖς Vaticination of all.

We acknowledge it to be very true, that Aristotle does not so much insist upon Demons, as Plato and the generality of Pagans in that Age did, and probably he had not so great a Belief of their existence: though he doth make mention of them also, as when in his Metaphysics, speaking of Bodies compounded of the Elements, he
he instanceth in  ζεα της δυναμεως, Animals and Demons, and else-
where he intimateth to have Airy Bodies, in these words, 

De An. L. 1. παραδειγματιστατι γονια της, ης δια την αληθη, ως του αρχαλος κυριος, το αριστερος βελτιων ζητει, ης διαςκοντος σωματωματως, some perhaps would demand a Reason, 

why the Soul that is in the Air, is better and more immortal than that in Animals. However, whether Aristotle believed these Lower Demo-

n Gods or no, it is certain that he acknowledged a Higher kind of Gods, namely the Intelligences, of all the Several Spheres, if not also the Souls of them and the Stars, which Spheres being according to the 

Astronomy then received, Forty Seven in number, he must needs acknowledge at least so many Gods. Besides which, Aristotle seems 

also to suppose another sort of Incorporeal Gods, without the Heavens, 

where according to him, there is neither Body, nor Place, nor Va-
cuum, nor Time; in these words, του τον τα καια παρων, του χρονος, 

ου αυτος ποτε γενομεν, ου' του ηδονος ηδονα μενοι, το τοια 

τω θεσκοτω τετηγμενων φορουν, αλλα καινωνου ης τηρει, τοι εκ ταις τοι 

δομος ϑα αυτοπραποσεως δικτηλι, τη αρπακτα αδων. They who expect there 

are such as are neither apt to be in a Place, nor to wax old with Time, 

nor is there any change at all in those things above the Highest Sphere 

but they being impassible and unalterable, lead the best and most self 

sufficient Life, throughout all Eternity. But this Passsage is not without 

fulpicion of being Supposittious.

Notwithstanding all which, that Aristotle did assert One Supreme 

and Universal Natura, is a thing also unquestionable. For though it 

be granted that he useth the Singular Θεος, as likewise το Θεον and 

to θεουσιος, many times Indefinitely, for a God in General, or any Di-

vine Being; and that such places as these have been oftentimes 

miftaken by Christian Writers, as if Aristotle had meant the 

Supreme God in them; yet it is nevertheless certain, that he 

often useth those words also Emphatically, for One only Supreme 

God. As in that of his Metaphysics, το το δυσε δονια το αλη 

τινα εναι, αλλα αρχη της God, seemeth to be a Cause and certain Principle 

of all things. And also in his De Anima, where he speaks of the 

Souls of the Heavens, and its Circular Motion: αλλα μω αρχη θεου 

ται γερανη Θεων δε το κυκλο των φωνα των Θεων, ως των 

αιτη το κυκλο των μονος, καινωνια ς ης ου σειρος. Neither is that 

good Cause of the Circular Motion of the Heavens, which the 

Platonic (that is the Platonic) call the το δι, because it is better 

that it should be so than otherwife; as if God therefore ought, to have 

made the Soul of the World such, as to move the Heaven circularly, be 

cause it was better for it to move so than otherwise; but this being a Sp 

culation that properly belongs to some other Science, we shall no further 

pursue it in this place. Thus afterwards in the same Book 

επειδης δε ημετερολογειν α γερανη των Θεων, μενοι του τοι απ 

εν εν γεωργει, το θεου, του δε θεου παντοτη που παντοτην δε 

εκαςεν ας follows from Empedocles his Principles, that God must needs be the Most 

Unwise of all, be alone being ignorant of that (out of which all other 

things are compounded) τοιος φιλος or Contention (because himself is all 

things but φιλος, Unity and Friendship) whereas Mortal Animals know or conceive all things, they being compounded of all. Which
same Passage, we have again also in his Metaphysics, from whence it was before cited to another purpose. To these might be added another place out of his Book, of Generation and Corruption, to 0dov συναρσεως kai τεκνων, ἣδεις, ἐντελεῖς ποιήσει. God hath filled up the Whole or Universe, and constantly supplies the same, having made a Continual Successive Generation. Lastly, τὸ εἰκόνιον is sometimes plainly used by Aristotle also, not for The Divinity in general, or Any thing that is Divine, but for that One Supreme Deity, the Governor of the whole World. Thus in that Passage of his Rhetorick to Alexander, cap. 1. p. 609: πρὸς τὸν διδάσκαλον τέκνον ἔδωκεν, ἡμᾶς οἱ μεγίσται πάντες ἕως τῷ εἰκόνι τῶν τεκνουμένων, This is that wherein we Men differ from other Animals, having received the greatest honour from God, that though they be endued with Appetite and Anger and other Passions, as well as we, yet we alone are furnished with Speech and Reason.

Over and besides which, Aristotle in his Metaphysics (as hath been Lib. 14. c. 15; already observed) professedly opposeth that Imaginary opinion of Par. Many Independent Principles of the Universe, that is, Many Undeveloped self-existent Deities; he confuting the same from the Phenomena, because διὰ τὴν περιάν συγκέντρωσαν, All things are plainly Coerdered to One, the whole world conspiring into One agreeing Harmony; whereas if there were many Principles or Independent Deities, the System of the World must needs have been ἑστασίαν, Incoherent and Incongruous, like an Ill-agreeing Drama, both'd up of Many Imperfect Interferions. Whereupon Aristotle concludes after this manner: ὁ δὲ θεὸς μόνος ἐν καθαρῷ παστικώδει,

Oui év χριστός πολυκομοσιών, ἐς Κοιλέας.

In Things will not be ill administered (which was then it seems a kind of Coerberial Speech) and according to Homer, the Government of Many is at Good, (nor could the affairs of the World be even carried on under it) wherefore there is One Prince or Monarch over all. From which Passage of Aristotle's, it is evident, that though he asserted Ἐκεῖνος, a Multiplicity of Gods in the Vulgar Sense, as hath been already declared, yet he absolutely denied πολυκομοσιών, and πολυκομοσιών, Polyarchy or Mundane Aristocracy, that is, a Multiplicity of First Principles and Independent Deities. Wherefore though Aristotle dotted much upon that Whimsey of his, of as many Intelligibles, or Eternal and Immovable Minds (now commonly called Intelligences,) as there are Movable Spheres of all kinds in the Heavens (which he sticks not also sometimes to call Principles,) yet must he of necffect be interpreted to have derived all these, from One Supreme Universal Deity, which, as simplicius expresseth it, is ἐκ τῶν ἀρχῶν, the Principle of Principles: which comprehends and contains those Inferior Deities under after the same manner, as the Primus Mobile or Highest Sphere, contains all the Lesser Spheres within it. Because otherwise there would not be ἔς Κοιλέας, One Prince or Monarch over the whole; but the Government of the World would be a Polychranry or Aristocracy of Gods, concluded to be an Ill Government. Moreover as μακρός represents Aristotle's sense, it is not conceivable that, so ma...
ny Independent Principles, should thus constantly Conspire, that Agreeable Harmony of the Whole Heaven. As there could not be any reason neither, why there should be just so many of these Intelligences, as there are Spheres and no more; and it is absurd to suppose, that the First Principles of the Universe happened by Chance.

Now this Highest Principle, as it is $\text{\textit{ÎäíÈæ}}, \text{An Immovable Essence}\text{, is by Aristotle} in the First place, supposed to be ævum movit pnevma, the Principle of Motion in the Universe, or at least of that Chief Motion of the Primum Mobile or Highest Sphere (which according to the Astronomy of those times seems to have been the Sphere of Fixed Stars) by whose Rapid Circumgyration, all the other Spheres and Heavens, were imagined to be carried round, from East to West. And accordingly the Supreme Deity, is by Aristotle called, the First Immovable Mover, or the Mover of the Primum Mobile, and whole Heaven. Which First Mover being concluded by him to be but One, he doth from thence infer the Singularity of the Heaven or World, et $\mu\chi\nu\kappa\alpha\eta\nu\nu\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\iota\nu$ et $\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\iota\lambda\eta\iota\alpha\nu\nu\kappa\rho\sigma\iota\iota\alpha\nu\nu$, the highest pnevma ævum movit pnevma. There is One Numerically, First Immovable Mover and no more; and therefore there is but One Movable neither, that is, by One Heaven or World. In which Doctrine of Aristotle, there seem to be a Great Difference, betwixt his Philosophy and that of Plato, in that Plato makes the Principle of Motion in the Heavens and Whole World, to be a Self-moving Soul, but Aristotle supposeth it to be a Immovable Mind or Intellect. Nevertheless, according to Aristotle, to do justice to himself, the Difference betwixt them is not great, any at all; Aristotle’s Immovable Mover being understood by him not to move the Heavens Efficiently, but only Objectively and Finally ævum movit pnevma, as being Loved. Which Conceit of his, Proclus upon it, to’s Timæus, perstringeth after this manner, $\tau\eta\sigma\iota\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\iota\nu\nu\kappa\rho\sigma\iota\iota\alpha\nu\nu$ Some of the ancients converting the World, to Mind (or Intellest) and making it move, only by Love of that first Desirable acknowledged nothing at all to descend down from Mind (or God) on the World; but equalized the same with other Amiable things, among Sensible, that have nothing Generative in their Nature. Where Proclus seems to suppose Aristotle to have attributed to God, no Efficiency at all upon the World; the Contrary whereunto, shall be evidently proved afterwards. In the mean time it is certain, that Aristotle, besides his Immovable Mover of the Heavens, which moveth only actually, or as Being Loved, must needs suppose another Immediate Mover of them, or Efficient Cause of that Motion; which could be nothing but A Soul, that enamoured with this Supreme Mind, did as it were in Imitation of it, continually Turn round the Heavens. Which seems to be nothing but Plato’s Doctrine dignified; that Philosopher affirming likewise, the Circular Motions of the Heavens, caused effi-
CHAP. IV. His Cause of Well and Fit.

Scientifically, by a Soul of the World in his Timeus to be, "τιν οἵον καὶ νόμον μετακόσμε ζηων, a Motion that is most agreeable to that of Mind or Wislome: And again in his Laws, "τιν τιν καὶ νόμον μετακόσμε ζηων, thus, which of all Corporeal Motions only resembles the Circuit of Intellect." Which Platonick Conceit found entertainment with Boetius, who writing of the Soul of the World, represents it thus, "Qui cum Sella Duo motum glomeravit in Orbis, In foment reditura mecum, Mentemque Profundam Circuit, & simili convertit Imagine Caelum."

Wherefore as well according to Plato's Hypothesis as Aristotle's, it may be affirmed of the Supreme Deity, in the same Boetius' His Language, that, ———Stabilisque manentes dat cum a Moveri,

Being it self Immovable, it causeth all other things to Move. The Immediate efficient Cause of which Motion also, no leas according to Aristotle than Plato, seems to have been a Mundane Soul; however Aristotle thought not so fit to make this Soul, a Principle; in all Probability, because he was not so well assured, of the Incorporeity of Souls, as of Minds or Intellects.

Nevertheless this is not the only thing, which Aristotle impued to his First and Higheft Immovable Principle, or the Supreme Deity, is turning Round of the Primum Mobile, and that no otherwise than being Loved, or as the Final Cause thereof, as Proclus supposed; but he as well as Anaxagoras, asserted it to be also, "νομον καὶ καλας αλλων," The Cause of Well and Fit, or τι τιν τιν καὶ νόμον μετακόσμε ζηων, that without which, there could be no such thing as Well; that is, no no Order, Attitude, Proportion and Harmony in the Universe. He declaring excellently, that "ει τιν καὶ καλας αλλων αλλων εις τιναι αλλων, εις τιναι αλλων τιναι," Unless there were something else in the world besides Sensibles, there could be neither Beginning nor Order in it, but one thing would be the Principle of another infinitely, or without end; and again in another place already cited, "τι τιν καὶ καλας αλλων εις τιναι αλλων τιναι καλας αλλων," It is not at all likely, that either Fire or Earth or any such Body, could be the Cause of that Well and Fit that is in the World; nor can Noble an Effect as this, be reasonably imputed to Chance or Fortune. Therefore himself agreeably with Anaxagoras concludes, that it is or Mind, which is properly αλλων τιναι καλας αλλων, The Cause of Well and Fit, and accordingly does he frequently call the Supreme Deity by that Name. He affirming likewise that the Order, Habitude and Harmony of the whole World, dependeth upon the Higheft and Supreme Being in it, after the same manner as the Order of an Army dependeth upon the General or Emperor; who not for the Order, but the Order for him. Which Higheft Being of the Universe, is therefore called by him also, conformably to Pla-
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The Separate Good of the World, in way of distinction from that Intrinlick or Inherent Good of it, which is the Order and Harmony it felt: it was the Order of the Whole Frame of Nature, and System of the World. And thus doth he plainly declare his Scheme where he applauds Anaxagoras for maintaining that the Order of the Universe was the efficient Cause of all that was in it, so as to have had a beginning, then it was certainly Made, not by Chance and Fortune, but by such an Artifical Nature, as is the Instrument of a Perfect Mind. And in his Physical where he contends for the Worlds Ante-Eternity, he concludes: nevertheless, affirmeth, MIND must of necessity be the Cause of this Whole Universe. For though the World were never so much Coeternal with Mind, yet it was in order of Nature after it and Junior to it as the Eff being so, he himself thus generously resolving, that Aristotle's (the Atheists) affirm the Elements to be the First Beings, yet it was the most reasonable thing of all to conclude, that Mind was the Oldest of All things, and Senior to be World and Elements; and that according to Nature, it had a Frinly and Sovereign Dominion over all. Wherefore we think it now sufficiently evident; that Aristotle's Supreme Deity, does not only move the Heavens as being loved, or is the Final Cause of Motion, but so was the Efficient Cause, of this Whole Mundane System, framed according to the Best Wisdom, and after the Best manner Possible.
according to that Vulgar Sense of many in these days of ours; as if he were indeed an Understanding or Perceptive Being, and that perfectly Omniscient, but yet nevertheless such, as acted all things Arbitrarily, being not determined by any Rule or Nature of Goodness, but only by his own Fortitious Will. For according to those ancient Philosophers, that which acts without respect to Good, would not so much be accounted Mens as Dementia, Mind, as Madness or Folly; and to impute the Frame of Nature or System of the World, together with the Government of the same, to such a Principle as this, would have been judged by them all one, as to impute them to Chance or Fortune. But Aristotle and those other Philosophers, who called the Supreme God, Nec or Mind, understood thereby, that which of all things in the whole world, is most opposite to Chance, Fortune, and Temperance; that which is regulated by the τὸ εὖ καλέσ, The Well and Fit of every thing, if it be not rather the very Rule, Measure and Essence of Fitness itself; that which acteth all for Ends and Good, and doth every thing after the Best manner, in order to the Whole. Thus Socrates in that place before cited out of Plato's Theo interprets the Meaning of that Opinion, That Mind made the World, and was the Cause of all things: ὡς τὸν ζήσαι, ἐπὶ τὸν νησιν καλέσαι, ὡς ἑαυτὸν πνεύμα τυπιν ὡς ἥρπνίτικαι ὡς. That therefore every thing might be concluded to have been disposed of after the Best Manner possible. And accordingly Theophrastus, Aristotle's Scholar and Successor, describeth God after this manner, τὸ πνεύμα τὸ θεοτάκτων, πνεύμα τὸ ἀξιότακτον, That First and Divine Being of all, which willeth all the Best things. Whether of these Two Hypotheses concerning God, One of the ancient Pagan Philosophers, that God is as essentially Goodness as Wisdom, or as Plotinus after Plato calls him Decency and Fitness itself; the Other of some late Professors of Christiannity, that he is nothing but Arbitrary Will, Omniscient and Omnifcient, I say whether of these Two is more agreeable to Fictitious and True Christiannity, we shall leave it to be considered:

Lastly, it is not without Probability, that Aristotle did, besides the Frame of Nature, and Fabrick of the World, impute even the very Substance of Things themselves also, to the Divine Efficiency (nor indeed can there well be any doubt of any thing save only the Matter;) partly from his affirming God to be a Cause and Principle to all things; and partly from his Commending this Doctrine of Anaxagoras; 

That Mind was together with Well and Fit, the Cause and Principle of Things themselves. However that Aristotle's Inferiour Gods at least, and therefore his Intelligences of the Upper Spheres, which were Incorporeal Substances, were all of them Produced or Created by One Supreme, may be further confirmed from this Definition of his in his Rhetorick, 

The Divinity is nothing but either God or the Work of God. Where Ἀρης is unquestionably used in way of Eminency, for the Supreme Deity, as in those places of Aristotle's before cited, to which sundry more might be added, as, τὰ τὸν ἄναφατά τὸ Ἀρης, ἐν δὲν ἀναφέρεται, God poiffis. 

eth
etb all Good things, and is Self-sufficient; and again where he speaks of things that are more than praise-worthy, τιτον ἐς ἐνα ἄνθρωπον χαῖρεν τοις, [Eth.Nic. L.1. τὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν περὶ τῆς τῆς τῶν ἀκοφορίας, such are God and Good. But here Aristotle affirming, that there is nothing Divine, but either God himself, or the Work and Effect of God, plainly implies, that there was no Multitude of Self-existent Deities, and that those Intelligences of the lesser Stars or Spheres, however Eternal, were themselves also Produced or Caused by One Supreme Deity.

Furthermore Aristotle declares, that this Speculation concerning the Deity, does constitute a Particular Science by itself, distinct from those other Speculative Sciences of Physiology, and the Pure Mathematicks, so that there are in all, Three Speculative Sciences, distinguished by their several Objects, Physiology, the Pure Mathematicks, and Theology or Metaphysicks: The Former of these, that is, Physiology, being conformant, οὐκ ἐς ἐπεξεργασίαν, about Things both Immovable and Separate from Matter, and Movable; the Second (viz. Geometry or the Pure Mathematicks) οὐκ ἐς ἐπεξεργασίαν, about things Immovable indeed, but not really separable from Matter, so as to exist alone by themselves; but the Third and Last, οὐκ ἐς ἐπεξεργασίαν, Concerning things both Immovable and Separable from Matter, that is, Incorporeal Substances Immovable: This Philosopher there adding, εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ ἔργα τῆς ζήλης σπείρων ἀναφεξίμενον, εἰ τὰ δὲ τῆς ζήλης, ἀναφέντιον, εἰς, φιλοσοφία πρῶτον. That if there were no other Substances beside these Natural things, which are Material and Movable, there would be the First Science; but if there be any Immovable Substance, the Philosophy thereof must needs in order of Nature be before the other. Lastly he concludes, that as the Speculative Sciences in General, are more Noble and Excellent than the other, so is Theology or Metaphysicks the most Honourable of all the Speculatives. Now the chief Points of the Aristotelick Theology, or Metaphysical Doctrine concerning God, seem to be these Four following. First, Tho' though all things be not Ingenit or Unmade, according to the Book of Xenophanes, ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ ἐκδόθηντα, they made, etc., ὡς καθένα γιορτήν ἐπηρεάζει, εἰς ἐπηρεάσει. There is no necessity that all things should be Unmade, for what hindereth but that some things may be Generated from other things? Yet there must needs be something Eternal and Unmade, as likewise Incorruptible, because εἰ πώς ὁ Ζήλης φιλοσοφήν χαίρειν, πῶς ἐπερεύονται; If all Substances were Corruptible, then All might come to nothing. Which Eternal, Unmade (or Self-existent) and Incorruptible Substance, according to Aristotle is not Sensible Matter, but a Perfect Mind. Secondly, that God is also an Incorporeal Substance, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπηρεάζων, Separate from Sensible, and not only by, according to Aristotle's Judgment likewise, ἀπαντέρωθος, and ἀκοφορίας, Indivisible, and Devoid of Parts, and Magnitude. Nor can it be denied, but that besides Aristotle, the Generality of the other Ancients who asserted Incorporeal Substance, did suppose likewise to be Unextended, they dividing Substances (as we learn from Philo) into the intellectual, ἄνθρωπος, Distant and Indistant, or Extended and Unextended Substances. Which Doctrine whether
True or no, is not here to be discussed. Thirdly, That in God Intellect is really the same thing with the Intelligibles. Because the Divine Mind being (at least in order of Nature) Senior to all things, and Architectonical of the World, could not look abroad for its Objects, or find them any where without it self, and therefore must needs contain them all within it self. Which Determination of Aristotle's, is no less agreeable to Theism, than to Platonism; whereas on the contrary, the Atheists, who affect Mind and Understanding as such, to be in order of Nature Junior to Matter and the World, do therefore agreeably to their own Hypotheces, suppose all Intelligences to be by way of Passion from Corporeal things without, and no Mind or Intellect, to contain its Intelligibles, or Immediate Objects within it self. Lastly, That God being an Immovable Substance, his Σωια is Etyeoa, His Essence and Act or Operation the Mt. Lib. 14, same, being agreed by Σωια τωστω δι' αυτος ετευα Etyeoa. There must then be some such Principle as this, whose Essence is All or Energy, from which Theorem Aristotle indeed endeavours to establish the Eternity of the World, that it was not made αυτες, Σωια πεττως, καθ' αυτος, from Night, and a Confused Chaos of things, and from Nothing, that is, from an Antecedent Non-existence, brought forth into being; Because God who is an Immovable Nature, and whose Essence is All or Energy, cannot be supposed to have rested or Slept from Eternity, doing nothing at all, and then after Infinite Ages, have begun to move the Matter, or make the World. Which Argumentation of Aristotle's, perhaps would not be Inconsiderable, were the World, Motion and Time, capable of Existing from Eternity, or without Beginning. Of which more elsewhere. However, from hence it is undeniable evident, that Aristotle, though ascertaining the World's Eternity, nevertheless derived the fame from God, because he would prove this Eternity of the World, from the Essential Eternity and Immutability of the Deity.

We shall now conclude all concerning Aristotle, with this short summary, which himself gives us of his own Creed and Religion, agreeably to the Tradition of his Pagans Ancestors; θεοθεοθεοθεο, ου ημών Σωια, καθ' Αριστοτέλεια, Μιθ. 14, "εκνα παντα έκτο, Θεος η ειπον, ηλια. Αριστοτέλης θανατευμεν, και τον τη μωραν την ευχαριστων ου ζωε, και τον θεον, την τακτω την κοινην την και τον τη δουλειαν την ου τον του την και την ειρηνην, την την την και την και την ειρηνην."

"have been delivered down to us from very ancient Times, that the Stars are Gods also; besides that Supreme Deity which contains the Whole Nature. But all the other things, were Fabulously added hereunto; for the better Persuasion of the Multitude, and for Utility of Humane Life and Political Ends, to keep men in Obedience to Civil Laws. As for example, put these Gods are of Humane Form, or like to other Animals; with such other things as are consequent hereupon. In which words of Aristotle, are Three Things may be taken notice of. First, That this was the General Persuasion of the Civilized Pagans from all known Antiquity downwards, that there is One God, which comprehends the whole Nature. Where το Θεον is by Aristotle plainly taken for the Supreme Deity. And his own fence concerning this Particular, is elsewhere thus
thus declared after the same manner, where he speaks of Order
Harmony and Proportion, Θείας γε δυνάμεως έργον, πρός και τοις
συνέχεις το τοιούτον. This is the Work of the Divine Power, which also contains
this Universe. Which Divinity Containing and Completing the
Whole Nature and Universe, must needs be a Single and Solitary Being 3
according to that Expression of Horace before cited.

Nec viget quicquam Simile aut Secondum,

That which hath nothing Like it, nor Second to it. The
next thing is, That according to the Pagan Tradition, besides
this Universal Name, there were certain other Particular and Infe-
erious Deities also, that is, Understanding Beings Superior to Men;
namely the Animated Stars or Spheres, according to the Vulgar Ap-
prehension, though Aristotle's Philosophy would interpret this chief-
ly of their Immutable Minds or Intelligences. Lastly, that all the
rest of the Pagan Religion and Theology, those Two Things only ex-
cepted, were Fabulous and Fictions, invented for the better
Perfuation of the Pagan to Piety, and the consening of them in
Obedience to Civil Laws; amongst which this may be reckoned for
one, that those Gods are all like Men or other Animals; and there-
fore to be worshipped in Images and Statues of those several Forms
with all that other Fabulous Farrago which dependeth hereupon.
Which being separated from the rest, the πατήρ ή δέξια, or ancient
Tradition of their Pagan Progenitors, would remain comprized within
those Two Particulars above mentioned, namely, that there is One
Supreme Deity that Contains the whole Universe, and that besides it
the Animated Stars or their Minds, are certain Inferior Gods
also.

To Aristotle may be here subjoined Speusippus and Xenocrates his
Equals and Rivals, they being Plato's Successors; and together with
Theophratus his own Scholar and Successor. Concerning the former
of which it is recorded in Cicero, that agreeably with Plato, he affirm-
ed Vn virtum quondam, quae omnia regantur, eamque Animalem, One An-
nimal and Intellectual Force by which all things are governed 5 by reason
whereof, Velhios the Epicurean complains of him, as thereby en-
deavouring, Evellere ex animis cognitionem Deorum, To pluck out
the minds of men the Notion of Gods, as indeed both he and Plato do
destroy those Epicurean Gods, which were all supposed to be In-
dependent and to have no Sway or Influence at all upon the Gov-
ernment of the World, whereas neither of them denied a Plurality
of Subordinate and Dependent Deities, Generated or Created by One
Sovereign, and by him Employed as his Ministers in the Oeconomy
of the Universe: For had they done any such thing as this, they
would certainly have been then condemned for Atheists. And
Xenocrates his Theology, is thus represented in Stobæus, τινι μονάδι γα
τινυ νυκτί Θεός, τινυ μόνι αθέλια ναξιον πατερας περατον τοιοίν, υπός προσαγω-
γει και ζώια, και τέτελεσσα, και κόσμος, ὡς ζώια ουτως πατερας τοιοίν, Θεός: τίνι
καὶ μοναδικήν Θεόν πατερας, ἡ υπόφυ τε κοινωνία λύμαν μεγαλόν ἄγονον, ἐπεί στηρ
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X X V. The Stoicks and their chief Doctors, Zeno, Cleanthes and Chryssippos, were no better Naturalists and Metaphysicians, than Heraclitus, in whose footsteps they trode: they in like manner admitting no other Substance besides Body, according to the true and proper Notion thereof, that as which is, not only Euergetico, Distant and Extended, but also Extensum, Reftless and Impenetrable. So that according to these Stoicks, the Souls not only of other Animals, but of Men also, were properly Corporeal, that is, Substances Impenetrably Extended; and which differ'd from that other part of theirs, commonly called their Body, no otherwife, than that they were, eisux $xui;si$, $xu$ ammeeve, a more Thin and Subtil Body, and $xui;si$, a Hot and Fiery Spirit: it being supposed by these Philosophers, that Cognition, Reason and Understanding, are lodged only in the Fiery Matter of the Universe. And though the Generality of these Stoicks, acknowledged Humane Souls, to have a certain Permanency after Death, and some of them till the next Conflagration unless they should be crushed and broken all to pieces, in their Passage out of the Body, by the down-fall of some Tower, steepie, or the like, upon them) yet did they all conclude against their Immortality, there being nothing at all Immortal with them (as hall be afterwards declared) have only Jupiter, or the One Supreme Deity. And as for the Punishment of Wicked Souls after death, though some of them seem to have utterly exploded the same, as a meer Figment of Poets, (insomuch that Epicurus himself denies, there was any Ache-

1con, Cocyus or Phlegellem) yet others granted, that as the better souls after Death, did mount up to the Stars, their First Original, the Wicked wandred up and down here, in certain Dark and Miry subterranean Places, till at length they were quite extinct. Nevertheless, they seem to have been all of this Perswasion, that the Rightening of men with punishments after Death, was no Proper or Accommodate means to promote Virtue, because that ought to be pursued after for its own sake, or the Good of Honesly, as Vice to be avoided, for that Evil of Turpitude which is in it, and not for any other External Evil consequent thereupon. Wherefore Chryssippos apprehended Plato for subjoining to his Republick such affrightful stories of Punishments after death,  

\[ \text{Chap. IV. and Theophrastus, Monarchists.} \]
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Nevertheless though these Stoicks were such Sotthic Corporealists, yet were they not for all that Atheists: they resolvling that Mind of Understanding, though always lodged in Corporeal Substantia, ye was not first of all begotten out of Sensibls Matter, so or so Modified but was an Eternal Unmade thing, and the Maker of the whole Mundane System. And therefore as to that Controversie so much agitated amongst the Ancients, Whether the World were made by Chance or by the Necessity of Material Motions, or by Mind, Reason and Understanding; they avowedly maintained that it was neither by Chance nor by Material Necessity, but Divina Mente, by a Divine and Eternal Mind every way perfect. From which one Eternal Mind, the also affirmed Humane Souls to have been derived, and not from Sensibls Matter 3 Prudentiam & Mentem a Dies ad Hominem perveniens that Mind and Wisdom descended down to Men from the Deity. And that, Ratio nihil alid est, quam in Corpus humannum Pars Divini Spiritus morfa 3 Reason is nothing else but Part of the Divine Spirit merged into a Humane Body; so that these Humane Souls were to them, other than natura esse unam, certain Parts of God, or Deceptions and Avulsions from him. Neither were the Reasons by which
these Sticks would prove, the World to have had a Divine Original, at all Contemnible, or much inferior to those which have been used in these Latter days; they being such as these: First, That it is no more likely, this Orderly System of the World, should have been made by Chance, than that *Homo* his *Animals*, or *Homer's Iliads* might have resulted from the Fortuitous Projection or Tumbling out of so many Forms of Letters, confounded all together. There being as much continued and coherent Sense and as many several Combinations, in this Real Poem of the World, as there is in any Plants Poem made by men. And since we see no Houses or Cities, no Books or Libraries any where made by the fortuitous Motions of Matter, it is a madness to think that this Admirable Compages of the whole World should first have resulted from thence. Again, there could not possibly be such an Agreeing and Confmiring Cognition of things, and such a Universal Harmony throughout the whole World, as now there is, *wise Divino & Continuato Spiritu continentur*, were they not all contained by One and the same Divine Spirit: Which is the most obvious Argument, for the Unity or Oneness of the Deity. They reason alo from the Scale of Nature, or the Gradual Perfection of things in the Universe, one above another; That therefore there must be something Absolutely Perfect, and that either the World it self, or something prefoing over it, was a Pintùpio Sapiens, *Wise from the Beginning*, or rather without Beginning and from Eternity. For as in the Growth of Plants and Animals, *Natura suo quodam Sinere ad Ultimum pervenit*, Nature by a Continual progress and Journeying forwards, arrives at length to the greatest Perfection, which those things are respectively capable of: And as those Arts of Picture and Architecture, aim at Perfection, *ita in omni Naturæ necessè est Absolvit aliquí & Perfecti, so in the Nature of the whole Universe, there must needs be something Absolutely Perfect*, reach'd never. *Necesse est praestarien aliquam esse Naturam qua nihil est Melius*; since there is such a Gradual Ascent and Scale of Perfections in Nature one above another, there must needs be some most Excellent and perfect Being, than which nothing can be Better, at the Top of all, as he Head thereof. Moreover they disputed Socratically after this manner, *Onde arrupit Homo Fatum, Mentem & Rationem? Whence did man snatch Life, Reason, or Understanding? Or from what was it indled in him? For is it not plain, that we derive the Moisture and Fluidity of our Bodies, from the Water that is in the Universe, their Consistency and Solidity from the Earth, their Heat and Activity from the Fire, and their Spirituality from the Air; Illud autem quod vincit ex omnia, Rationem, Mentem & Consilium, &c. Obi invenimus? unde intrudimus? An ceterni Mundus habebit omnia? Hoc unum quod primi est non babebit? But that which far transcendeth all these things, is Reason, Mind and Understanding, where did we find it? or from thence did we derive it? Habi the Universe all those other things of ours in it, and in a far greater proportion? and hath it nothing at all of that which is the most excellent thing in us? Nihil quod Animi, quodque Rationis est express, id generare ex se potest Anima natura, completeque Rationis, Mundus autem generat Animam unam componere Rationis: nothing that is devoid of Mind and Reason can Generate things Ani-
man and Rational, but the World Generateth such, and therefore it
self (or that which contains it and prefigures over it) must needs be An-
imant, and Rational or IntelleEual. Which Argumentation is further
set home by such Similitudes as these; Si ex Oliva modulatæ cæne-
tes Tibie non excverunt, non dubitares quin effet in Oliva Tibicius que-
dam Scientia. Quid si Platani Fidiculas ferrent numerous sono-
tes, idemfelicet conferes in Platanis inesse Muscum. Cur igitur Mundus
non Animans Sapiensque judicetur, cum ex fo procevent Animantes atque
Sapientes? If from the Olive-Tree should be produced Pipes sounding
Harmoniously, or from the Plain-Tree Fiddles, playing of their own
accord Musically, it would not at all be doubted, but that there was,
some Musical either Skill or Nature, in those Trees themselves; Why
therefore should not the World be concluded, to be both Animant and
Wife (or to have something in which is so) since it produced such Be-
ings from it self? And though perhaps some may think that of Cotta's
here, to have been a smart and witty Repartie, Querit Socrates unde
Animam arripuerimus, se nulla fuet in mondo? Et ego quaerun-
de Oratio non? unde Numeros? unde Cantus? nisi vero liqui Solem
cum Luna putemus, cum propis accesserit: aut ad harmoniam canere
Mundum ut Pythagoras exi sintim. Socrates demandeth, whence we
snatch'd Soul, Life, and Reason, if there were none in the world? and
I demand (faith he) whence did we snatch Speech, Music, and Numbers?
Unles perhaps you will suppose the Sun to confabulate with the
Moon, when he approaches near her in the Syzygies or the World to
sound Harmonically as Pythagoras conceited. Yetthishow smart fcor-
ver it may seem, was really but an Empty Flash of Academick Wit,
without any Solidity at all in it, as shall be manifested afterward.
Lastly the Stoicks endeavoured to prove the Existence of a God af
after this manner, Ut nulla pars Corporis nostri esse non sit minor
quam Nofmetips junus, sic Mundum Universum pluris esse necesse est
quam Partem aliquam Universi; A' there is no Part of our Body which
is not Inferior in perfection to Our selves, so must the Whole Universe
needs be supposef, to be Better and more Perfect than any of the Parts
thereof. Wherefore since it is Better to be ended with Life and
Understanding, than to be devoid thereof, and these are Pure Per-
fections; they being in some measure in the Parts, must needs be
much more in the Whole. Nullius fenfus carentis Pars, potefi esse Sen-
tiens, Non Part of that which is utterly dead and stupid, can have Life
and Understanding in it. And it is a Madness for any man to sup-
pofe, Nihil in omni Mundo Melius esse quam se, that there is nothing
in the whole World Better than himself, or than Mankind; which is but
a Part thereof. Now Cotta here again exercises his jeering Academick Wit after the same manner as before; Hoc placet, jam effet,
quam Mundus optimus Librum legere videatur, &c. Illo modo etiam
Diferius, Mathematicus, Musicus, omni divinae docetria referens, pa-
stremo Philosopher cælit Mundus. By this same Argument you might
well prove, That the World is also Book-learned, an Orator, a Mathe-
natician, a Musician, and last of all a Philosopher. But neither
Objection of his nor that Former, have any Firmitude at all in their
Because though an Effed cannot be Better or more Perfect than
Canfe, nor a Part than the Whole; and therefore whatsoever there
of Pure Perfection in any Sense, it must needs be more in the Cause; yet as to those things there mentioned by Cotta (which have all a plain Mixture of Imperfection in them) as they could not therefore formally exist in that which is Absolutely Perfect, so is it sufficient, that they are all Eminently and Virtually contain’d therein.

By such Argumentations as these (besides that taken from the Topick of Prefence and Divination) did the ancient Stoicks endeavour to Demonstrate the Existence of a God, or a Universal Numinous, the Maker and Governor of the whole World; and that such a one, as was not a meer Flasick or Methodical and Senfes, but a Conscious and Perfectly Intellectual Nature. So that the World to them, was neither a meer Heap and Congeries of Dead and Stupid Matter, fortuituously compacted together; nor yet a Huge Plant or Vegetable; that is, that ended with a Spermatick Principle only; but an Animal enformed and enlivened by an Intellectual Soul. And though, being Corporalists, they sometimes called, the Whole World it self or Mundane Animal, God; and sometimes the Fiery Principle in it, as Intellectual, and the Hegemonick of the Mundane Soul; Yet was the God of the Stoicks properly, not the very Matter it self, but that Great Soul, Mind and Understanding, or in Seneca’s Language, that Ratio Incorporalis, that Rules the Matter of the whole World. Which Stoical God was also called, as well Τ'κυσίων as Νός, Good as Mind; that which is a Most Moral, Benign, and Beneficient Being; according to that excellent CLeanthean Description of him, in Clements Alexandrinus.

Τ'κυσίων ειστὶς μ’ οἶνον θεί αἰκε δί, τετοιονδίον, μίσασον, ὑπον, διστείς, Κοσμίτην εκτιβά, χρησιμοί, καλῶν, ἔνεο, &c.

But this Maker and Governor of the Whole World was most commonly named by the Stoicks Zeus and Zen, or Jupiter; some of them including that therefore there was but one Zeus or Independent deity, because the Whole World was but One Animal, governed by One Soul; and others of them endeavouring on the contrary to prove the Unity and Singularity of the World, from the Oneliness of this Zeus or the Supreme Deity, supposed and taken for granted, and because there is but One Fate and Providence. Which Latter consequence, Plutarch would by no means allow of, he writing thus concerning it, where he pleads for a Plurality of Worlds, Εντυλετί. D. Def. or. 423. Επεί τις Στοιχαί τις ἐν φυσις, πεποναμμένη πεὶς ἐμομμένη μίκης σεβοί, ξυ πολλοὶ διές ξυ Ζήνης ἐστίνως, πλεῖοι ἐντὸς κόσμου; τις ἄναγκῃς πολλαὶ ἐνα ἄνες, ἐν πλεῖοι ἐνα κόσμοι, ξυ μὴ καθ’ ἕκαστον ἔκα πρῶτον, ξυ ἀκοινοὶ τῇ ἐν ἐκ Θεο, οἱδε ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκόμης ἐκπληρωτεν τής ἐποιμαζομένῃ, &c. Neither is it at all considerableness, what the Stoicks here object against a Plurality of Worlds, they demanding how there could be but One Fate, and One Providence, and One Jove (or Independent Deity) were there many Worlds? For what Necessity is there, that there must be more Zens or Joves than One, if there were more Worlds? and why might not this One and the same God of this Universe,
Universe called by us, the Lord and Father of all, be the First Prince, and Highest Governor in all those Worlds? Or what binders but that a Multitude of Worlds, might be all Subject to the Fate and Providence of one Jupiter or Supreme God, himself inspecting and ordering them every one; and imparting Principles and Spermatick Reasons to them, according to which all things in them might be Governed and Disposed. For can many distinct Persons in an Army or Chorus, be reduced into One Body or Polity? and could not Ten, or Fifty, or a Hundred Worlds in the Universe, be all Governed by One Reason, and be ordered together in Reference to One Principle? In which Place these Two things are plainly contained, First, that the Stoicks unquestionably asserted, One Supreme Deity, or Universal Monarch over the whole World; and Secondly, that Plutarch was so far from giving any entertainment to the Contrary Opinion; that he concluded, though there were Ten, or Fifty, or a Hundred Worlds, yet they were all Subject to One Supreme, Solitary, and Independent Deity.

But however though these Stoicks thus unquestionably asserted One Sole Independent and Universal Numen, the Monarch over the whole World; yet did they notwithstanding, together with the other Pagans, acknowledge a Plurality of Gods: they concluding, πάλιν μετὰ τῶν Θεῶν καὶ θανάτου, That all things were full of Gods and Demons. And so far were they from falling short of the other Pagans, as to this Polytheism or Multiplicity of Gods, that they seem rather to have surpassed and outstripped them therein. Plutarch making mention of their τοις θεοῖς πλήθος, their So great Multitude of Gods, and affirming them, εναλλακτικώς τὰς λόγους τοῦ θεοῦ, τοὺς γυναῖκας, τοὺς ἄνδρας, to have filled the whole Heaven, Earth, Air, and Sea with Gods. Nevertheless they plainly declare, that all this their Multiplicity of Gods (One only excepted) was Generated or Created in time by that One, called Zeus or Jupiter, who was not only the Spermatick Reason, but also the Soul and Mind of the whole Universe; and who from Himself produced the World and those Gods, out of Non-existence into Being. And not only so, but that also in the Successive Conflagrations, they are all again Resolved and Swallowed up into that One. Thus Plutarch in his Defeat of Oracles, writing of the Mortality of Demons, Τοὺς θεοῖς γένοσαν νεκροῖς, έσμένιον έκ τοῦ μετατομέων άνάλογων θέσεων, αποκριθέντος, από του τοιούτου τού πλανήτου, ιέρομοι κατ᾽ άκμάσ, κατὰ τοὺς άνθρώπους ημάς, ήμάς κατὰ τοὺς θεοὺς, τοὺς θεούς κατὰ τοὺς θεούς, τοὺς θεούς. We know the Stoicks to maintain this Opinion, not only concerning Demons, but also the Gods themselves, that they are Mortal. For though they own such a Multitude of Gods, yet do they acknowledge only one of them Eternal and Incorruptible; affirming concerning a the rest, that as they were made in time, so they shall be again Corrupted and Destroyed. Plutarch himself, there defends the Mortality of Demons: but this only as to their Corporeal Part, that they die in their present Bodies, and transmigrate into others, their Souls in the meantime remaining Immortal and Incorruptible; but the Stoicks maintain'd the same, as well concerning Gods as Demons; and this in such a manner, as that their very Souls, Lives, and Personalities should be utterly extinguish'd and Destroyed. To the fame purp
pofe Plutarch again writeth, in his Book of Common Notions against the Stoicks, χριστιανις ή Κλασσικάς επιστημονικάς (ός έγετε αυτήν) τώλη λογος θεώ, τ' ερευνα, τόν γύν, τ' άληθε, τόν σινιαλήθε, έναν τιν έν τον άραθην, ούδε εκ των ἀπολαλητών, τόν μεν τον διός, ες κατ' επιστήμην καθαπαλητός, τός άλος, ες, τω άληθε τιν τον ατιόν συλλογίζοντος έχει τας παντός αυτής, άλα αυτί μετεκολάτον αν τοις άλλοις. άτας, ή προνιάς, είκασμένης, τό γ' φύσεως γέρσωσαν, αμορφούν λόγων, τος άλος απολατίας, άνω γεγονότως ή φθαρμομένης ὑπόγνως, τινάς, δεί, αυτής, έος μενείς καθ' επιστήμην άλος. Chrysippus and Leaneathes, having filled the whole Heaven, Earth, Air and Sea with gods, leave not One of these their so Many Gods Incorruptible nor Eternal, save Jupiter only, into whom they frame all the rest; thereby taking him to be a Helios and Devourer of Gods, which is as bad, if they should affirm him to be Corruptible, it arguing as much Impeachment for one to be Nourished and Preserved by the Conjunction of other things into him, as for himself to die. Now this is not only gathered by way of Consequence, from the other Principles of the Stoicks, as it is a thing which they expressly assert, and with a loud voice proclaim, in all their writings concerning the Gods, Providence, Fate and Fates, that all the Gods were Generated (or Made in time) and as they shall be destroyed by Fire; they supposing them to be Melting, as if they were Waxen or Leader things. This indeed is Elenical to the Stoical Deceivince, and from their Principles Inseparable and Unavoidable; forasmuch as they held all to be Body, and that the Successive Conflagrations, all Corporeal Systems and Comages shall be dissolved by Fire; so that no other Deity, can then visibly remain safe and Untouch'd, save Jupiter alone, the Fiery Principle of the Universe, Animated or Intellectual. Here therefore there is a considerable Difference to be observed, betwixt these Stoicks and the other Pagan Theists; that whereas the others for the most part acknowledged their Gods to have been made in Time, by One supreme Universal Nomen, but yet nevertheless to be Immortal and continue to Eternity; The Stoical Pagans maintained, that all their other Gods, save Jupiter alone, were not only χριστιανις but αναληθομενον, such as should be as well Corrupted, as they were Generated, and this so also, as that their very Personalities should be utterly abolished and annihilated: all the Stoical Gods in the Conflagration being as it were Melted and Confounded into One.

Wherefore during the Intervals of the Successive Conflagrations, the Stoicks all agreed, that there is no more than one God (as or Jupiter) left alone (there being then indeed nothing else besides himself) who afterwards produceth the whole Mundane System, together with All the Gods out of himself again. Chrysippus in Plutarch affirmenth, ίσιος τον μηδ εκθεσαν τον δια έκ τας θαλαμικων, τη Τ. 1077. ου την παροικια, όπως τον εκθεσακες θαλακει, μενον αφηθην την άληθην την παροικιαν, εστι τους θεον εκθεσας, εστι μενον το ποιημα άμετρος, τος των απολατίας διάλεξαν άμετρος. That as Jupiter and the World may be resembled to a Man, so may Providence be to the Soul, when therefore there shall be a Conflagration, Jupiter of all the Gods, being alone Incorruptible and then remaining, will retire and withdraw himself into
into Providence; and so both together remain in that same Eterne
Substance. Where notwithstanding Jupiter and Providence are really
but One, and the same thing. And Seneca writeth thus concerning
the Life of a Wife: man in Solitude, *Qualis futura est Vita Sapiens,
fi sine amicis relinquatur, in custodiam confectus, aut in desertum litudin
ejecus? *Qualis est Jovis, omnem Resoluto mundo, & DIIS IN UNUM
CONFUSIS, paullisper cecante Natura, acquisiecit sbi, Cognitionibus
suis traditus; If you ask what would be the Life of a Wife man either
in a Prison, or Desert? I answer, the same with that of Jupiter, when
the World being resolved, and the GODS all CONFOUNDED into
ONE, and the Course of Nature ceasing, he resteth in himself, converst
with his own Cognitions. Arrius his Epicurius likewise, speaking
of the same thing, Ironically introduces Jupiter, bemoaning him-
sclf in the Conflagration, as now left quite alone; after this man-
*ētis tūn "Decusto, *ētis tūn "Hygon, *ētis yugum. Alas, I am now left all alone.

I have neither Juno, nor Minerva, nor Apollo with me; neither Bro-
ther nor Son, nor Nephew nor Kinman (neither God nor Goddes)s I
cannot keep company. He adding also according to the sense of the Stoic
that in all these successive Conflagrations, *ētis *ētis émurus omen; in
tempests eri; *ētis tūn "Sókron, *ētis *ētis *ētis tūn "Sókron, *ētis "Hēron,
and *ētis "Epimoloi omen *ētis *ētis *ētis tūn "Sókron, Jupiter being left alone, converseth only with
himself, and resteth in himself, considering his own Government, and
being entertained with thoughts becoming himself. And thus have we
made it unquestionably evident, that the Stoics acknowledgeth only One Independent and Self-existant Deity, One Universal Name
which was not only the Creator of all the other Gods, but also in
certain Alternate Vicissitudes of time, the Decreator of them; it
then swallowing them up, and devouring them all into himself,
as he had before produced them together with the World, out of
himself.

It is granted, that these Stoics as well as the other Pagans, do
Religiously Worship More Gods than One, that is, More Understand-
ings Superior to Men. For it was Epicurus his own Exhortation
*ētis *ētis Tēs, Pray to the Gods. And the same Philosopher thus defini-
eth the Disposition of a Person Rightly Affected, *ētis *ētis Tēs, I would willingly know what is my Duty, First
the Gods, and then to my Parents, and other Relations. And they say
M. Antoninus his Preceptor, *ētis *ētis Tēs, Revere the Gods, and so to
*ētis *ētis Tēs, in every thing implore the Aid and Assistance of the God.
And accordingly in that Cloke of his First Book, himself does thank-
fully ascribe many Particular Benefits to The Gods in common; *ētis
*ētis Tēs to *ētis *ētis *ētis Tēs, *ētis Tēs, I owe to the Gods, that I had god
Progenitors and Parents, &c. Where amongst the rest, he reckons
this for One, That he never was any great Proficient, either in Poi-
try or Rhetorick; because these would probably (had he succeeded
in his Pursuit of them) have hindered him from the attainment of better things: and after all his Enumeration, he concludes thus;
*ētis *ētis Tēs, For all these things and the Assistance of the Gods and Fortune, viz. because they are not in our
own power.
Neither can it be denied, but that they did often derogate from the Honour of the Supreme God, by attributing such things to the Gods in common, (as the Donors of them) which plainly belong to the Supreme God only. As when Epictetus makes Reason in


Men to be a gift of the Gods, οί γὰρ οὐ τὸ άναθετέον οὐ τὸ κακοδιμιω-


θην τὰ ανθρώπων καὶ έπειναι, Εν δὲ ήτοι έπειναι, Μετά τούτων, έπειναι, Μετά τούτων, ουκ είναι. Is Reason therefore given us by the Gods, nee-


λι to make us Miserable and Unhappy? And when he again imputes


Virtue to them; Halt thou overcome thy Lust, thine Intemperance, thine Anger? το Σήμερον οὖν έξέστη σώματα, ή οπισθεν καὶ ή πρόπερα, τόσοιο έος Σήμερον οὖν έξέστη σώματα, ή οπισθεν καὶ ή πρόπερα, τόσοιο έος έπειναι καὶ έπειναι τούτο, έπειναι, άλλως, how much greater Cause thou hast thou of offering Sacrifice, than if thou hast got a Consulship or Pretorship? for those things come only from thy Self, and from the Gods. Though the Reason of these Speeches of theirs seems to have been no other, than this, because they took it for granted, that those Understanding beings Superiour to men, called by them Gods, were all of them the intruments and Ministers of the Supreme God in the Government of the whole World, and had therefore some kind of Stroke or Influence more or less, upon all the Concernments of Mankind. Whence it came to pass, that they oft en used those Words God and Gods prominently and Indifferently. As one and the same Celebrated Speech of Socrates, is sometimes exprested Singularly, ει τινη ποιησε ους, if God ill have it so, let it be so, (Arr. Epict. L. 1. c. 29. and L. 4. c. 4.) and sometimes again Plurally, ει τινη ποιησε ους, if the Gods will have so.

Wherefore notwithstanding the Many Gods of those Stoicks, they orshiped for all that One Supreme, that is, One Universal Numb., that contains and comprehends the whole World. Who was vau-


lously described by them, sometimes as the Nature and Reason of the whole World; and γάρ ούδε διόνυσος προειρηθήκη διώκειν, The Nature of the


Author, the Oldest of all the Gods; and γάρ ή μνήμη διώκειν φιλον, if God ill have it so; let it be so; (Arr. Epict. L. 1. c. 29. and L. 4. c. 4.) and sometimes again Plurally, ει τινη ποιησε ους, if the Gods will have so.

Voted. Sometimes is he called γάρ ούδε διόνυσος προειρηθήκη διώκειν, the Cause of all things; sometimes το έλασμα τρόπου, the Hegemonic and Ruling Principle of the whole World, and διέσχεσα το έκείνο, the Prince of the World. As in, ει διώκουσι το έλασμα, The Governor of the Whole, as in this of Epict.', ος, ζυγός έτοι κατά το έλασμα γίνεται, τό τοι διόνυσον το έλασμα, ζυγός έτοι κατά το έλασμα γίνεται, τό τοι διόνυσον το έλασμα, L.1. c. 12, καλεί οι αρχαγοί παράξενος τό αύτος τό πλάσμα, A Good man submits his Mind to be the Governor of the whole Universe; as good Citizens do theirs to the Law of the City. Also διέσχεσα, The Orderer of all, in this-othe-


Religious Paffage of the fane Philosophers, το το παντότε αύτος τα σαρκαζόντες, το το παντότε αύτος τα σαρκαζόντες, το το παντότε αύτος τα σαρκαζόντες, έτοι κατά το έλασμα, το το παντότε αύτος τα σαρκαζόντες, έτοι κατά το έλασμα, το το παντότε αύτος τα σαρκαζόντες, έτοι κατά το έλασμα, The Instructed is to Will things to be as they are Made: and how are they Made? As that Great Disposer of all hath appointed. Again the Supreme God is sometimes called by them, το το έλασμα τα σαρκαζόντες, That Individual Principle which contains the whole, as in this Instructuon of U and
And it must in reason be supposed, that this Jupiter or Universal Name of the World, was honoured by these Stoicks far above all their other Particular Gods; he being acknowledged by them to have been the Maker or Creator of them as well as the whole World and the only Eternal and Immortal God; all those other Gods, that had been already declared, being as well Corruptible, Mortal, and Annihilable; as they were Generated or Created. For though Cicero, who pretends to represent the Doctrine of the Stoicks, attribute the Very First Original of the World and Plurality of Gods, in these words, Dico igitur Providenial Deorum Mundum & omnium Mundi partes, & initio constitutas esse, & omne tempore administrari, yet unquestionably Cicero forgot himself here.
and rather spake the Language of some other Pagans, who together with the Generation of the World, held indeed a Plurality of Eternal (though not Independent) Deities, than of the Stoicks who affected One only Eternal God, and suppos'd in the Reiterated Conflagrations, all the Gods to be Melted and Confounded into One, so that Jupiter being then left alone, must needs make up the World again, as also all those other Gods, of out of himself. And thus does Zen in Laertius describe the Cosmoporia, &c. That God at First, being alone by himself, converted the Fiery Substance of the World by degrees into Water, that is, into a Claftic Chaos, out of which Water, himself afterwards as the Spermatic Reason of the World, formed the Elements and whole Mundane System. And Cicero himself elsewhe, in his De Legibus, attributes the first Original of Mankind cautiously, not to the Gods in Common, but to the Supreme God only, Hoc Animal Providum, &c. quem vocamus Homineum, praecultra quadam conditione Generalium esse, & SUMMO DEO: and this, rather according to the Sence of the Stoicks than of the Platonifts, whole Inferiour Generated Gods also (being first made) were suppos'd to have had a stroke in the Fabreflation of Mankind, and other Animals. Thus Epictetus plainly afcribes, the making of the whole World to God, or the One Supreme Deity, where he mentions the Galileans, that is, the Christians, their Contempt of Death, though imputing it only to Custom in them, and not to right Knowledge, (as M. Antoninus likewise afcribes the fame to Solon, &c.) meet L. 11. S. 3.


Fed out of Madness, and the Galileans out of Custom? and can none attain thereunto by Reason and true Knowledge, namely because God made all things in the World, and the whole World it self Perfick and Uncondenrable; but the parts thereof, for the use of the Whole, so that be Parts ought therefore to yield and give place to the whole. Thus does ie again elsewhe demand, &b. Deo the Deitit of Jupiter, as &c.:

Who made the Sun? Who the Fruits of the Earth? Who the Sea? Who the agreeable Fitness of things? Wherefore thou having received all from another, even by very self, dost thou murmur and complain against the Donor of them, if he take away any one thing from thee? Did he not bring thee into the World? shew thee the Light? how Sense and Reason upon the? Now the Sun was the chief of the superior Stoical Gods, and therefore he being made by another, all the Rest of their Gods must needs be so too. And thus is it plainly expressed in this following Citation, &c. 3. 1. 3. 1. 4. 3. 1. 5. 3.

If any one could be thoroughly sensible of this we are all made by God, and that as Principal Parts of the World, Nid that God is the Father both of Men and Gods, he would never think meanly of himself, knowing that he is the Son of Jupiter also. Where the is plainly put for the Supreme God, and Deo for the Inferiour Gods only. Again he thus attributes the Making of Man and Government of the whole World to God or Jupiter only. o Deo the. U 2
And that these Stoicks did indeed Religiously Worship and Honour, the Supreme God above all their other Gods, may appear from sundry Instances. As first, from their acknowledging He be the Soveraign Legillator, and professing Subjection and Obedience to his Laws, accounting this to be their Greatest Liberty. Thus Epictetus, "As I am able, I obey, and I fulfill, with my eyes open to the sights, and not any avow the actions, because I do not choose. Things would not be well governed, if Jupiter took no care of his own Citizens, that they also might be happy like himself."

Again from their acknowledging Him to be the Supreme Governor of the whole World, and the Orderer of all things in it by his Fate and Providence, and their professing to submit their Wills to his Will in every thing; Epictetus somewhere thus bespeaks the Supreme God, "Thus I worship God, which is myself, and I worship Him, and I worship Him, and I worship Him."

L. 3 c. 5. And again, "Thus I worship God, who can bring me under bondage to himself, and again, I worship God, who can bring me under bondage to himself."

L. 4 c. 7. These things, would I be found employing myself about, that I may be able to say to God, "Have I transgressed any of thy Commandments, or have I used my Faculty and Anticipations (or Common Notions) otherwise than thou requiredst?"

L. 2 c. 16. Did I ever complain of thy Government? I was sick when thou wouldst have me to be, and so are others, but I was so willingly. I was poor also at thy appointment, but Rejoycing I never bore any Magistracy or had any Dignity, because thou would not have me, and I never desir'd. Didst thou ever see me the man Dejected or Melancholy for this? Have I appeared before thee at all time with a Discontented Countenance? Was I not always prepared for whatsoever thou requiredst? Wilt thou now have me to depart out of this Festival Solemnity? I am ready to go; and I render thee all thanks, for that thou hast honoured me so far, as to let me keep a Fast with thee, and behold thy works, and observe thy Economy of the world. Let Death seize upon me no otherwise employed, than thus thinking and writing of such things. He likewise exhorts others after the manner, "Take advantage that the eyes of the world may be opened, that my life may be a light and a guide, that I may amaze the world with my life, and shine upon them as a light and a guide, and be a light and a guide, and be a light and a guide."
The same is likewise manifest from their Pretensions to look on God, and refer all to him; expecting aid and assistance from him, and placing their Confidence in him. Thus also Epictetus, L. 2. c. 19.

*My design is this, to render you free and undisputed, always looking at God, as well in every walk, as greater Matter. Again the same Stoick concludes, L. 2. c. 16.

but as he called Jupiter, or the Supreme God, his Father, so did he whatsoever he did, looking at him. Thus M. Antoninus speaketh of Double Relation that we all have; One L. 8. c. 3.

Thos. 3. if us, and another to God, to that Divine Cause, from which all things happen to all. As L. 3. c. 11.

we affirmeth the Platonian's to know * in the Deity supreme in us, but the Platonian's of the Deity supreme in us, but the Platonian's.

That no Humane thing is well done without a Reference to God. L. 6. c. 5.

and he excellently exhorted men, that they should seek their Confidences with this thing; in doing one action after another, tending to a Common Good, or the good of Humane Society, together with the Remembrance of God. L. 6. c. 8.

is own Confidence in the Supreme Deity is in these words, * I trust and rely upon the Governor of the whole World.

This may be concluded also from their Thanking the One Supreme God for all, as the Author of all good, and delightfully Celebrating his Praises. L. 4. c. 7.

Epictetus declares it to be the Duty of a Good man, L. 1. c. 16.

*To thank God for all things. And elsewhere he speaketh thus, * I, * I had not in order to give you a true Idea, I am not in order to give you a true Idea.

This we see; and* I had not in order to give you a true Idea, I am not in order to give you a true Idea.

To answer your question, what should we do else, but both Publicly...
publicly and privately praise God, bless him, and return thanks to him; ought not they who dig, plow, and eat, continually sing such a Hymn to God as this? Great is that God, who gave us these Organs to cultivate the earth withal; great is that God who gave us hands, scc. who enabled us to grow undiscernibly, to breath in our sleep. But the Greatest and Divinest Hymn of all is this, to praise God for the Faculty of Understanding all these things. What then if for the most part men be blinded, ought there not to be some One, who should perform this office, and sing a Hymn to God for all? If I were a Nightingale I would perform the office of a Nightingale, or a Swan, that of a Swan; but now being a Reasonable Creature, I ought to celebrate and sing aloud the praises of God, that is, of the Supreme Deity.

Lastly the fame is evident from their Invoking the Supreme God as such, addressing their Devotions to him alone without the Conjunction of any other Gods; and particularly imploring his Assistance against the Affairs of Temptations, called by them Phanics. To this purpose is that of Epideius, μέγας ὁ ἄγαν ὢν ὢν, Ἡμών τὸ καθ' ὑπὸς ὑπὸς βασιλεὺς, ὑπὸ κλαύσεως, ὑπὸ θέως μίμησις, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐνθαρρυνόμενοι καὶ ἱκτίζομεν, ἐκ τῆς δύο μέθερας ἐκ χειρῶν αἱ πλευράς. This is a great Conflict or Contention, a Divine Enterprize, it is for Liberty and for Kingdom. Now remember the Supreme God call upon him as thy Helper and Assistant, as the Mariners do upon Caltor and Pollux in Tempest. He commends also this Form of Devotional Address, of Divine Ejaculation, which was part of Cleanthes his Litany, to be used frequently upon occasion, "Αυξά δ' με τῷ Ζηύ, εὖ εἴπο τοπορφοδοτησ, πώς (οἷοι) εἰμὶ δακτυλικοί ταῖς; ἐκ τοῦ οὐκοί θεῖον οὐκ θεῖον; in 5 ἐν μία Σίθος ὡς ἐν ἑντών ἑντών. Lead me, 0 Jupiter, and Thou Fate, whithersoever I am by you destin'd: and I will readily and cheerfully follow; who though were never so reluctant yet must needs follow. Where Jupiter and Fate are really but one and the same Supreme Deity, under two sever Names. And therefore the Sence of this Devotional Ejaculation was no less truly and faithfully, than Elegant thus rendered by Seneca;

Duc me Parentis, Celsique Dominator Poli, Quocunque placuit, nulla parendi est mora, Assum impiger, sac nolle, comitator Genem, Malisque pattar, quod pati licit bono.

But because many are so extremely unwilling to believe, that the Pagans ever made any Religious Address to the Supreme God as such, we shall here set down an Excellent and Devout Hymn of the same Cleanthes to him: the rather because it hath been but little taken notice of. And the more to gratifie the Reader, we shall subjoin an Elegant Translation thereof into Latin Verse, which he must give to the Muse of my Learned Friend Dr. Duport.

Hymn, to the Supreme God.

Magne Pater Divinit, cui Nomina Multa, sed Unam Omnipotens semper Virtus, Tu Jupiter Autor Nature, certa qui singula lege gubernas!

Rex salsus. Te nempe licet Mortalibus agris Cum his compelleare, omnes tua namque propago Nos sumus, aterna quasi Imago vocis & Echo Tantum, quotquot humi spirantes repirimus; Ergo Te cantabo, tura & robur sine fine celebrans.

Quippe tuo hic totus, terram qui circuit, orbis Parens (quoque agit) imperio, ac obtemperat ulter Irridilis Telum manibus tibi tale ministrum, Anceps, ignitum, baud moriturum denique fulmen. In illo etenim illius tota & natura tremiceit; Illo & Communem Rationem dirigis, & qua Mundis agitat Molem, magno se corpore miscentis:

Tantus Tu rerum Dominus, Refforque Supremus. Nec sine Te saltem in terris, Deus, aut opus ullem.

Æthera
Ætheræ nec dioñit, nec per carula ponti,
Errore Æ tua quo, nisi que gens impia patrat.
Confusa in se, Tu dirigis ordine certo;
Assiæ Te ingratis & inost tua gratia rebus;
Faece harmonia, Tu feicixt, omnia in Omn;
Sic Bona mixta Malis compingis, ut una refurget
Cum Horum Ratio communis & insque perennans:
Quam refugit, sbernique hominum mens: Leva malorum.
Heu Miseri! bona qui querunt sibi semper & optant,
Divinam tamen hanc Communem & denique Legem,
Nec fœcœlare occultis, nec fando attendere curant:
Cui si parentem poterant traducere vitam
Cum ratione: mente bonam; nunc fponite feruntur
In mala precipites, trahit & sua quemque voluptas.
Hunc agit ambitio, landifque impenfa cupido,
Illum & avarities, & amor vesans babendi
Blanda libidos alium, Venerisque licentia dulcis
Sic aliò tendunt aliæ in diversa ruentes.
At Tu, Jupiter alme, tonans in nubibus atris,
Da sapere, & mentem misericordias mortalibus aufer
Infanam, hanc, Tu pelle Pater 5 da apprehendere posse.
Conflitum, fretus quo Tu omnia viti gubernas:
Nos ut bonorati pariter, tibi demus honorem,
Perpetus tuæ fæda hymnis preñara canentes,
Ut fas est homini 5 nec enim mortalibus illum,
Nec Superis, majus poterit contingere donum,
Quam canere eterno Communem carmine Legem.

XXVI. It would be endless now to cite all the Testimonies of
other Philosophers and Pagan Writers of Latter Times, concerning
One Supreme and Universal Numen. Wherefore we shall content ou-
selfes only to instance in some of the most remarkable, beginning with
M. Tull. Cicero. Whom though some would suspect to have been a Sto-
ick as to the Theism, because in his De Natura Deorum, he brings in Cott
the Academick, as well opposing Q. Lucil. Ballus the Stoick, as C. Ver-
laus the Epicurian; yet from sundry other places of his writings, it
sufficiently appears, that he was a Dogmatick and Hearty Theist, as
for example, this in his second Book De Divin. Effe præfentanm ab.ai-
quam, Æternanque natum, & eam fuperciam admirandamque in
numin generi, Pulchritudo Mundi, ordoque rerum CæleStium cogit con-
sideri; that there is some Most Excellent and Eternal Nature, which
to be admired and honoured by mankind, the Pulchritudo of the World
and the order of the Heavenly Bodies compell us to confess. And this in
his Oration De Haruspicum responsis 5 Quo eff tam voces, qui cum
supexerit in Column, Deus effe non sentiat, & ea que tanta Mente fum-
uit vix quisquam Arte ulla, Ordinem rerum ac Vicissitudinem persq.
posset, eam sicri putet 5 Who is so mad or stupid, as when he looks up
Heaven; is not presently convinced that there are Gods? or can perswade
himself, that those things which are made with so much Mind and Wis-
don, as that no humane skill is able to reach and comprehend the artif
and contrivance of them, did all happen by chance? To which pu
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pose more places will be afterwards cited. However in his Philo-

sophick Writings, it is certain that he affected to follow the way of

the New Academy, let on foot by Carneades, that is, to write Scep-
tically, partly upon Prudential accounts, and partly for other Rea-

sons intimated by himself in these words, *Quis requirant quid quaque

De N. D. L. 1; de reipf sentiamus, curiositatem faciat quam neceffis. Non enim

Authoritates in disputando quam Rationis momenta quaecumque sunt.

Quin etiam obiecit plerumque is qui discere voluit, Authoritas corum qui

se docere profidentur. Dein tum enim suas judicium addibere, ideoque

bene ratione, quod ab eo quem probat, judicatum videt: They who

would needs know, what we our selves think concerning every thing, are

more curious than they ought, because Philosophy is not so much a matter

of Authority as of Reason; and the Authority of those who profess to

teach, is oftentimes an hindrance to the Learners, they neglecting by

that means to use their own Judgment, securely taking that for granted,

which is judged by another whom they value. Nevertheless Cicero in

the Cloce of this discourse *De Natura Deorum (as St. Austin also ob-

erved) plainly declares himself to be more profenfe and inclinable to

the Doctrine of Ballus than either that of Velleius or Cotta, that

s, though he did not allent to the Stoical Doctrine or Theolo-

y in every Point (himself being rather a Platonif than a Stoick) yet

he did much prefer it before not only the Epicureifus of Velleius, but

lo the Sceptieifus of Cotta. Wherefore Auguftinus Steuchus and oth-

er Learned men, quarrel with fundry passages of Cicero's upon an-

other account, not as Atheifical, but as seeming to favour a Multi-

pude of Independent Gods; he sometimes attributing not only the

government of the World, and the making of Mankind, but also

the first Constitution and Fabric of the whole World, to Gods Plural-

As when he writeth thus, Ut perpetuum Mundi effet ornatus, ma-

na adhibita cura est a Providentia Deorum: For the perpetual ador-

ing of the World, great care hath been taken, by the Providence of

the gods: And A Dis Immortalibus Hominibus providum effe, &c. That

he Immortal Gods have provided for the Convenience of Mankind, ap-

pars from the very Fabric, and Figure of them: And that place be-

more cited, Dico igneur Providentia Deorum, Mundum & omnes Muni-

partes initio constitutis esse, I say that the World and all its parts

were at first constituted by the Providence of the Gods. And Laftly,

here heates the Controversie of that Book De N. D. thus 5 Utrum P. 125. Lard.

ii nihil agent, nihil moliantur? An contra ab His, & a Principio

omnia saepe, & consequentia sint, & ad infinitum temporum regantur atque

veiantur? Whether the Gods do nothing at all, but are void of care

and trouble? or whether all things were at first Made and Constituted,

and ever since are Moved and Governed by them? Notwithstanding

much it is Evident that this Learned Orator and Philosopher, plain-

ly acknowledged the Monarchy of the Whole, or One Supreme and Un-

verfal Nomen over all. And that first from his so often using the

Lord God in the Singular, Emphatically and by way of Eminency

Ipfi Deo nihil minus gratum, quam non omnibus patere adfide Placentu-

mum & Calendarum viam; Nothing can be lefs grateful to God himself,

so that there ought not to be a liberty open to all (by reason of the Col-

tues of Sacrifices) to worship and appeafe him; And Nifi juvante Deo, ta-

les
les non fuerunt Curius, Fabricius, &c. Curius and Fabricius had never been such men as they were, had it not been for the Divine assistance.

Again, Commoda quisquis sitimur, Lucemque quia fruimur, Spiritumque quem dicimus, á Deo nobis dari atque imperiri videmus, We must needs acknowledge that the benefits of this life, the light which we enjoy, and the spirit which we breathe, are imparted to us from God. And to mention no more, in his Version of Plato's Timæus, Deos alios in Terra, alios in Luna, alios in relictus mundi partes spargens Deus quasi ferebat, God distributing Gods to all the parts of the World, did as it were sow some Gods in the Earth, some in the Moon, &c. Moreover by his making such descriptions of God as plainly imply his Owness

P. 556, Lact., and Singularity, as in his Orat. pro Milone, Est est profecto Ila Vis; neque in his Corporibus atque in hac Imbicateitate nostra, ineś quiddam quod vigeat & sentiat, & non ineś in hoc tanto Nature tamque praclaro motu. Nisī forte idcirco esse non putant, quia non appareat nec certinur: princi quas nostram ipsam mentem qua fapimus, qua providemus, qua hæc ipsa agimus & dicimus, videre, aut plane quales & ubi sit, sentire possumus: There is, there is certainly, such a divine Force in the world; neither is it reasonable to think, that in these gross and frail Bodies of ours, there should be something which hath Life, Senes, and Understanding, and yet no such thing in the whole Universe; unless men will therefore conclude, that there is none, because they see it not; as if we could see our own mind (whereby we order and dispose all things and whereby we reason and speak there) and perceive what kind of thing it is and where it is lodged. Where, as there is a strong aversion of the Existence of a God, so is his Singularity plainly implied, in that he supposes him to be One Mind or Soul acting and governing the whole World, as our Mind doth our Body. Again in his Tusculan Questions, Nec vero Deus ipsè alio modo intelligi potest, nisi Mens Soluta quaedam, & Libera segregata ab omni Concretionem mortali, omnium sententia & movent. Neither can God himself be understood by us otherwise, than as a certain Loose and Free Mind, segregated from all mortal Concretion, which both perceives and moves all things. So again in the same Book, Hoc ignor & alia innumerabilia cum cernimus, possumusque dubitare, quin hic pro fest aliginis vel Effector, st hæc nata sunt ut Platoni videtur; vel sperem fuerint ut Ariftotelis placeat, Moderator tanti operis & munus. When we behold these and other wonderful works of Nature, can we in all doubt, but that there presideth over them, either one Maker of all, if they had a beginning as Plato conceived; or else if they always were. Ariftotle supposeth, One Moderator and Governour? And in the Thit, De Legibus, Sine Imperio nec Donum illa, nec Civitatis, nec Gentes, nec Hominum universum Genus stare, nec rerum Natura omnis, nec si Mundus potest. Nam & hic Deo part, & hinc obedient Maria Terreque, & hominum vita injustissimae legis obtentem: Without Government, neither any House, nor City, nor Nation, nor Mankind in general, nor the whole Nature of things, nor the World itself could subsist. For this also obeyeth God, and the Sea and Earth are subject to him, as the Life of man is disposed of, by the Commands of the Supreme

L. 1p. 116. Law. Elsewhere he speaks of Dominans ille nobis Deus, qui non vel hinc injustissimum debemus, That God who rules over all Mankind and forbids them to depart hence without his leave. Of Deus, cujus nume
parent omnia, That God, whose Divine Power all things obey. We read also in Cicero, of Summum or Supremus Deus, the Supreme God, to whom the First making of Man is properly imputed by him; of Summi Reformat & Donum Numinum, The Divine Power of the Supreme Lord and Governor; of Deus praepotens, and Rerum omnium praepotens; Jupiter, The most Powerful God, and Jupiter who hath power over all things; of Principes ille Deus, qui omnem hunc mundum regit, sicet Animus humanus id corpus cui praepotens est, That Chief or Principal God, who governs the whole world in the same manner as a Human Soul governeth that Body which it is set over. Wherefore as for those Passages before objected, where the Government of the World, as to the concernments of Mankind at least, is ascribed by Cicero to Gods Plurally, this was done by him and other Pagans, upon no other account but only this, because the Supreme God was not supposed by them to do all things himself immediately in the Government of the World, but to assign certain Provinces to other Inferior Gods, as Ministers under him, which therefore sharing in the Economy of the World, were look'd upon as Co-governours thereof with him. Thus when Balbus in Cicero to excuse some seeming defects of Providence, in the Prosperities of wicked and the Adversities of good men, pretended, Non animadvertere omnia Deos, nè Reges quidem, That the Gods did not attend to all things, as neither do Kings, Cotta amongst other things replied thus: Fac Divinam Mentem esse dixissent, Culum verfam, terram inventam, varia moderantam, cur tam multos Deos nibil agere & ciffare patitur? Cur non rebus humanis aequos titulos Deos praefect, qui à te Balbe Innumerales explicati sunt? Should it be granted, that the Divine Mind (or Supreme Deity) were distress'd with turning round the Heavens, observing the Earth, and Governing the Seas, yet why does he let so many other Gods to do nothing at all? Or why does he not appoint some of those idle Gods over Human affairs, which according to Balbus and the Stoicks are innumerable? Again when the Immortal Gods are said by Cicero to have provided for the convenience of Mankind in their First Constitution, his doubts is to be understood according to the Platonick Hypotheses, that the Gods and Demons being first made, by the Supreme God, were set a work and employed by him afterward in the making of man and other mortal Animals. And lastly, as to that which hath the greatest difficulty of all in it, when the whole World is said by Cicero to have been made by the Providence of the Gods, his mult needs be understood also of those Eternal Gods of Plato's, according to whose Likeness or Image the World and Man are said to have been made, that is, of the Trinity of Divine Hypostases, called by Amicus, Plato's Three Minds and Three Kings, and by others the Platonists, the First and Second and Third God, and the άνθρώπων αύτόν, and τό θεόν αύτον, &c. The First and Second Cause, &c. and it may be here observed, what we learn from S. Cyril, that some Pagans endeavoured to justify this Language and Doctrine of theirs, even from the Mosaic Writings themselves, Ἰερικ τε ἐγεν, CONTRA JU. τοπολογησον δια τούτου, ἵνα ἐπιστημήν ναυτίαν καὶ εἰκόνα ἡμετέρων ἐνικήσῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἄμωτον, τότε τοῦτον καὶ τὸν μεταφηματικον, that the God of the Universe being about to make man, did there bespeak the other Gods, (ποίει μὲν ἐωτος θεότητος, ἂν δοκεῖ, τούτως ἐτέρας προειρήσεις Xx 2
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Which S. Cyril and other Christian Writers understand of the Trinity. Now those Eternal Gods of Plato, according to whole Image, the World and Man is said by him to have been made, and which (though one of them were properly called the Demiurgus) yet had all an Influence and Causality upon the making of it, were (as hath been already observed) not so many Independent and Self-originated Deities, but all derived from One First Principle. And therefore Cicero following Plato in this, is not to be suspected upon that account, to have been an Asserter of Many Independent Gods, or Partial Creators of the World; especially since in many other places of his Writings, he plainly owns a Divine Monarchy.

We pass from M. Tullius Cicero to M. Terentius Varro his Equal, a man famous for Polymathy or Multifarious Knowledge, and reputed unquestionably (though not the most Eloquent, yet) the most Learned of all the Romans, at least as to Antiquity. He wrote One and Forty Books concerning the Antiquities of Humane and Divine things, wherein he transcended the Roman Pontifices themselves, and discovered their Ignorance as to many points of their Religion. In which Books he distinguished Three Kinds of Theology, the First Mythical or Fabulous, the Second Physical or Natural, and the Last Civil or Popular. The First being most accommodated to the Theatre or Stage; the Second to the World or the Wiser men in it; the Third to Cities or the Generality of the Civilized Vulgar. Which was agreeable also to the Doctrine of Scacola that Learned Pontifex, concerning Three Sorts of Gods, Poetical, Philosophical and Political. As for the Mythical and Poetical Theology it was cenfured after this manner by Varro

In co sunt multa contra Dignitatem & Naturam immortalium fiha. I hoc enim est ut Deus alius ex capite, alius ex femore sit, alius ex guttna fanguinis natus. In hoc ut Diificrat, ut adulteraverint, ut serv fren homini. Denique in hoc omnia Diis attribuuntur, quon non modo in hominem, sed etiam in contemplationem hominem cadere potuisse. That, according to the Literal Sense, it contained many things contrary to the Dignity and Nature of Immortal Beings. The Genealogy of the God being derived from the Head, of another from the Thigh, of another from the drops of Blood: Some being represented as Thieves, others Adulterers, &c. and all things attributed to the Gods therein that were not only incident to men, but even to the most contemptible and flagitious of them. And as for the Second, the Natural Theology which is that True, this Varro conceived to be above the capacity of Vulgar Citizens and that therefore it was expedient, there should be another Theology calculated, more accommodate for them, and of a middle kind betwixt the Natural and the Fabulous, which is that which is called Civil. For he affirmed, Multa esse vera que vulgo seire non sit ut, & quaedam que tamets falsa sint, alter exstare populum expedient, that there were many things true in Religion, which it was not convenient for the Vulgar to know; and again some things which though false, yet it was expedient they should be believed by them. As Scacola the Roman Pontifex in like manner, would not have the Vulgar to know
that the True God had neither Sex, nor Age, nor Bodily Members.


Civitates, quod dicere etiam in Libris Kerum Divinorum, ipsis Varro non dubitavit, Scevolis therefore judgeth it expedient that Cities should be deceived in their Religion, which also Varro himself doubts not to affirm in his Books of Divine Things. Wherefore this Varro though disapproving the Fabulous Theology, yet out of a pious design as he conceived, did he endeavour to allure as much as he could, the Civil Theology, then received amongst the Romans, and to vindicate the fame from Contempt: yet nevertheless, so, as that, Si caus Civit. (Civ. D. L. 4.

Iatim novam constitueret, ex Natura potius Formulâ, Deos & Deorum. 

nominâ: suisse dedicature, non dubitât constiteri; If he were to constitute a New Rome himself, he doubts not to confess, but that he would dedicate Gods and the Names of Gods after another manner, more agreeably to the Form of Nature or Natural Theology. Now what Varro's own fence was concerning God, he freely declared in those Books of Divine Things; namely, That he was the Great Soul and Mind of the whole World: Thus St. Austin, Hi soli Varroni vidention animadvertit. (Civ. D. L. 5.)

Ipsi quid effect Deus, qui crediderunt cum esse Animam, Motu ac Rati- 

one mundum gubernantium: These alone seem to Varro to have under- 

stood what God is, who believed him to be a Soul, governing the whole World by Motion and Reason. So that Varro plainly asserted One Supreme and Universal Nomen, he erring only in this (as St. Austin conceives) that he called him A Soul, and not the Creator of Soul, or a Pure and Abstract Mind. But as Varro acknowledged One Universal Nomen, the Whole Animated World, or rather the Soul thereof, which he affirmed to be called by several Names, as in the Earth Tellus; in the Sea Neptune, and the like; so did he also admit (together with the rest of the Pagans) other Particular Gods, which were to him nothing but Parts of the World Animated with Souls Superiour to men; A summo Circuito cali, sique ad Circulum Lunae, etheriae Ani- 

mas esse Astra ac Stella; esque celestes Deos, non modo intelligi esse etiam videri: Inter Lunae vel gyro, & nimborum Caenumina Ac- 

ses esse Animas: sed eos animo non oculis videri & vocari Heros & 

ares & Genios: That from the highest Circuit of the heavens to the 

phere of the Moon, there are Ethereal Souls or Animals, the Stars, 

which are not only understood but also seen to be Celestial Gods: And 

between the Sphere of the Moon and the Middle Region of the Air, there 

are Ethereal Souls or Animals, which though not seen by our Eyes, yet are dis- 

covered by our Mind and called Heroes, Lares, and Genii. So that 

according to Varro the only True Natural Gods, were as himself also 

determined, Animae Mundis, ac Partes ejus, Firft the great Soul and 

find of the whole world which comprehended all; and secondly the 

Parts of the World Animated superiour to men. Which Gods so he affirmed to be worshipped Cælius more purely, and chiefly without Images, as they were by the first Romans for one hundred and seventy years: he concluding, qui primi simulacra Deorum po- 

tali posuerunt, eos civitatisbus suis & metum dempffisse & errorem ad- 

sidisse: prudenter exsiliam (faith St. Austin) Deos facile posse in Si- 

mulacrorum soliditate contemni: That those Nations who first set up 

images of the Gods, did both take away Fear from their Cities and add

Errore
Errour to them: be wisely judging, that the Popery of Images, would easily render their Gods contemptible.

L. Annum Seneca the Philosopher, was contemporary with our Saviour Christ and his Apostles, who, though frequently acknowledging a Plurality of Gods, did nevertheless plainly assert One Supreme, he not only speaking of him Singularly, and by way of Emi-
nency, but also plainly describing him as such as when he calls him,

Formatorum Universis, Redorem & Arbitrum & Cujusdem Mundi: Ex
quo suspensa sunt omnia: Animum ac Spiritum Universi; Mundani hu-
jus operis Dominum & Artificem; Cui nomen omne convenit: Ex quo
nata sunt omnia; Cujus Spiritu vivimus; Totum sui partibus inditum,
& se sustinentem suae: Cujus Consilio huique mundo providetur, ut in
concursus cat, & ait: Suis explicat: Cujus Decretum omnium sunt; Di-
vinum Spiritum per omnem maxima & minima equally intentione di-
sponsam; Deum potentem omnium; Deum illum maximum potentissimumque,
qui ipse creat omnium; Qui ubique & omnibus presidet; Celci & Deorum
omnium Deum, a quo ipsa Numinas singula adoramus & collimus, suspensa
sunt: and the like: The Framer and Former of the Universe; the Go-
vernour, Defender and keeper thereof; Him upon whom all things depend;
The Mind and Spirit of the World; The Artificer and Lord of this whole
Mundane Fabric; To whom every name belongeth; From whom all things
spring; By whose Spirit we live; Who is in all his parts and sustains
himself by his own force; By whose Counsel the World is provided for, and
carried on in its Course constantly and uninterruptedly; By whose Decree
all things are done; The Divine Spirit that is diffused through all things,
both great and small with equal Intention; The God whose power ex-
tends to all things; The Greatest and most Powerful God who doth his
self support and uphold all things; Who is present everywhere to all
things; The God of Heaven and of all the Gods, upon whom are suspend-
ed all those other Divine Powers, which we singly worship and adore.

Moreover we may here observe from St. Austin, that this Seneca in
a Book of his, against Superstitions (that is now lost) did not only
Highly extol the Natural Theology, but also plainly censure and con-
demn the Civil Theology then received amongst the Romans, and that
with more Freedom and Vehemency, than Varro had done the Fab-
ulous or Theatrical and Poetical Theology. Concerning a great part
whereof he pronounced, that a wise man would observe such thing:
tanquam Legibus jussa, non tanquam Dies gratia, only as commanded
the Laws (he therein exercising Civil Obedience) but not at all,
Grateful to the Gods.

M. Fabius Quintilianus, though no admirer of Seneca, yet fully
agreed with him in the same Natural Theology, and sets down the
as the generally received Notion or Definition of God, Deum
& Spiritum omnibus partibus innitium, That God is a Spirit mingled
and diffused through all the parts of the World; he from thence infer-
ing Epicurus to be an Atheist, notwithstanding that he verbally affli-
ed Gods, because he denied a God according to this Generally receiv-
ed Notion, he bestowing upon his Gods a circumcised humane
form, and placing them between the Worlds. And the Junior Pity
though he was a Persecutor of the Christians, he concluding, quae
cunque esset quod satenvent, pericmaciam certa & inflexiblem obis-
itationem debere puniri, that whatsoever their Religion were, yet notwith-
standing their Stubbornness and Inflexible Obstancy ought to be pun-
ished, and who compelled many of them to worship the Images of the
Emperor, and to sacrifice and pray to the Statues of the Pagan
Gods, and lastly to blaspheme Christ; yet himself plainly plained
allowed also One Supreme Universal Nomen, as may sufficiently
appear from his Panegyric Oration to Trajan, where he is called
Deus ille, qui manifestus ac praestans Caelum ac Sydera insecut; that
God who is present with, and inhabits the whole Heaven and Stars;
himself making a Solemn Prayer and Supplication to him, both in the
beginning and close thereof, and sometimes speaking of him therein
singularly and in way of Eminency; as in these words, Occultat u-
rorumque Semina Deus, & plerumque Bonorum Malorum; Cause, sub
inversa specie latent: God biddeth the Seeds of good and evil, so that
he causes of each often appear disguised to men. L.Apolleins also, who
herted Miracles the Pagans endeavoured to confirm their Reli-
by, as well as they did by those of Apolloniæ, both in fundry
places of his writings, plainly affart One Supreme and Universal Nu-
en, we shall only here set down One, Cum Summus Deorum, cum
a hoc for solum cognitionum ratione considerat, sed Prima, Media, & Ulti-
uas obat, comportaque intima Providentia ordinatwns universitate
& Constantia regis. Since the Highest of the Gods, does not only con-
der all these things in his mind and Cognition, but also pass through
and comprehend within himself the Beginning Middle and End of all
things, and constantly Govern all by his occult Providence. Laftly Sym-
machus, who was a zealous Stickler for the Restitution of Paganism,
clared the Pagans to worship One and the same God with the
Christians, but in several ways, he conceiving, that there was no
ecclility God should be worshipped by all after the same manner.
Eqvum est, quicquid omnes colunt, UNUM putari: Eadem specillum P. 306.
sira: Commune Caelum est: Idem nos Mundus involvit: Quicqui
qua quisque prudentia Verum requirat? Uno Hincus non poetei per-
emiri ad tam Grande Secretum: We ought in reason to think, that it
One and the same Thing, which all men worship: As we all behold the
me Stars, have the same Common Heaven, and are involved within
the same World. Why may not men pursue One and the same Thing in
ferent ways? One Path is not enough to lead men to so Grande a Secret;
he Sence whereof is thus elegantly expressed by Prudentius.

Uno omnes sub sole siti, vegetamur oculis
Aere, Communis cumbis viventibus Avra.
Sed quid sit qualis Deus, diversa secuti
Quaminit, atque Vitis longe distantibus Unum
Invitis ad Occultum; juxta est nos cuique genti,
Per quod iter progressus, est ad tam Grande Profundum.

and again afterward,

Secretum sed grande nequit Rationis opertis

Quae

P. 285.

P. 502.
And the beginning of Prudentius his Confutation is this,

Longè alius verum est. Nam multa ambago viarum
Anfractus dubios habet, & perplexus erat.
Sola errore caret simplex viar, necia flecti
In diverticulum, bivis nec pluribus anceps, &c.

We shall now instance also in some of the Latter Greek Writers, Though the Author of the Book De Mundo, were not Arisotle, yet that he was a Pagan, plainly appears from some passages thereof, as where he approves of Sacrificing to the Gods, and of Worshipping Heroes and Dead men; as also because Apuleius would not otherwise have translated so much of that book, and incorporated it into his De Mundo. He therefore does not only commend this of Heraclitus εκ παντος ειν, ηκ ενς παλΑ, That there is one Harmonious System made out of all things, and that All things are derived from One; But doth himself also write excellently, concerning the Supreme God, whom he calleth τω γιδ θεων σωφρινω αιθεω, the Soul which Containeth all things, and το των κοσμου κυριωτων, The Best and Most excellent part of the World; he beginning after this manner ἔγκαθο μοι ἐν τοις νομοις τοῦ ὄρασέ της παλαιας, εκ ενια τοι παλα, ει δη ει τοι σωματα. ㆍγοημις γε φως, αυτη καθ εκατοιω αυτωρες, θεομοιοτος το εκ τοις 8ωμες. It is an ancient Opinion or Tradition, that hath been conveyed down to all men from their Progenitors, that all things are from God, and consists by him, and that no Nature is sufficient to preserve it self, left alone, and devoid of the Divine assistance and influence. Where we may observe, that the Apuleian Latin Version, altering the fence, renders the words thus, Veitvs opinio est, atq; in cogitatione omnium hominum penitus incidit, Deum esse: Originis non habere aut Huorem: Deumque esse salutem & perseverantiam Eum, quas essentiae rerum: So that whereas, in the Original Greek, This is said to be the general Opinion of all mankind, That all things are from God, and subsist by him, and that nothing at all can preserve itself without him, Apuleius correcting the words, makes the general fence of mankind to run no higher than this; That there is a God who hath no author of his original, and who is the safety and preservation of all those things that were made by himself. From whence it may be probably concluded, that Apuleius, who is said to have been of Plutarch's Progeny, was infected also with those Paradoxical Opinions of Plutarch's, and consequently did suppose, All things not to have been made by God, nor to have depended on him (as the Writer in Mundo affirmeth) but that there was something besides God, namely the Matter and an Evil Principle, Uncreated and Self-existent. Afterwards the same Writer De Mundo, elegantly illustrates Similitudes, how God by One Simple Motion and Energy of his own, without any labour or toil, doth produce and govern all the Variety of Motions in the Universe; and how he doth
Plutarch, Chersonensis (as hath been already declared) was Unluckily engaged in Two False Opinions, The First of Matters being Ingenit or Uncreated, upon this Pretence, Because Nothing could be made out of Nothing; the Second of a Positive Substantial Evil Principle, or an Irrational Soul and Demon Self-existent, upon this Ground because the World was made of Evil, and the Sees of the Lord, were of Evil. That what a Pilot is to a Ship, a Charioteer to a Chariot, the Coryphes to a Guide, Law to a City, and a General to an Army; the same is God to the World. There being only this difference, that whereas the Government of some of them is toilsom and licentious, the Divine Government and Sterrage of the World, is most easy and facile: for as this Writer adds, God being himself Immutable, Movest all things in the same manner as Law, in it self Immutable, by Moving the minds of the Citizens, orders and disposeth all things.

Philostratus Chersonensis, as hath been already declared, was Unluckily engaged in Two False Opinions, The First of Matters being Ingenit or Uncreated, upon this Pretence, Because Nothing could be made out of Nothing; the Second of a Positive Substantial Evil Principle, or an Irrational Soul and Demon Self-existent, upon this Ground because the World was made of Evil, and the Sees of the Lord, were of Evil. That what a Pilot is to a Ship, a Charioteer to a Chariot, the Coryphes to a Guide, Law to a City, and a General to an Army; the same is God to the World. There being only this difference, that whereas the Government of some of them is toilsom and licentious, the Divine Government and Sterrage of the World, is most easy and facile: for as this Writer adds, God being himself Immutable, Movest all things in the same manner as Law, in it self Immutable, by Moving the minds of the Citizens, orders and disposeth all things.
That Galen was no Atheist, and what his Religion was; may plainly appear from this one passage out of his third Book De Viva Partium, to omit many others, al\l\l as is, and he is a presiding spirit of men concerning him, and the nature of the Gods in general, but especially of that Supreme Ruler over all; there is an opinion in all humane kind, as well Barbarians as Greeks, that is naturally implanted in them as rational Beings, and not derived from any mortal Teacher. The meaning whereof is this, that men are naturally puffed up with a Perversion, that there is One God, the Supreme Governor of the whole World, and that there are also below him, but above men, Many other Intellectual Beings, which these Pagans called Gods.

Maximus Tyrius in the close of his first Dissertation, gives us this the Representation of his own Theology, 

Dio Chrysostomus, Galen, Book I.
Maximus Tyrius, Aristides, 445

I will now more plainly declare my fence by this solemn

engine in your mind, a great and powerful Kingdom or Principality,

which all the rest freely and with one consent conpire to direct their

actions, agreeably to the will and command of one Supreme King, the

left and the best. And then suppose the bounds and limits of this Em-

pire, not to be the River Halys, nor the Hellepont, nor the Meotian

Lake, nor the Shores of the Ocean; but Heaven above, and the Earth be-

neath. Here then let that great King sit Immutable, prescribing Laws

in all his subjects, in which consists their safety and security: the Conforts

his Empire, being many both Visible and Invisible Gods; some of

which that are nearest to him and immediately attending on him, are

the highest Royal dignity, fatishing as it were at the same table with him:

others again are their Ministers & Attendants: and a Third Sort,

inoprio to them both. And thus you see, how the order and chain of this
government depends down by steps and degrees, from the Supreme God

the Earth and Men. In which Refemblance, we have a plain ac-
knowledgegment of One Supreme God, the Monarch of the whole

World, and Three subordinate ranks of Inferior Gods, as his Mini-

sters, in the Government of the World; whom that Writer there
so calls, Σίδος Σίδος πάλαις, ἢ φίλος, Gods the Sons and Friends of

God.

Aristides the famous Adrianene Sophist and Orator, in his first O-

rion or Hymn vowed to Jupiter, after he had escaped a great

trept, is so full to the purpose, that nothing can be more: he after

H proeme beginning thus, Zes τα πολλά εκπομνά, ου δέν εἴτε ἡτον

διὰ ποικίλων, ου γάρ, ου καλόντα, ου δικαίως, ου διότι τόσο μετά

τα χάρια, ου δέν ἢ πρίγκιπα, ου διότι εἰσήκουσα, ου διά τὴν

καθαρότητα, ου δέν ἢ εὐθυμίαν, ἢ εἴπερ μένειν λαοῖν. Επειτα γαρ

προτίθηκε οὐκ ἐκ τῆς λογοτεχνίας τοῦ μαθητής, οὐ οὐκ ἔστη

ἐκ τῆς λογοτεχνίας τοῦ μαθητής, οὐδὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς λογοτεχνίας

τοῦ μαθητής, οὐδὲ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς λογοτεχνίας τοῦ μαθητής, οὐδὲ

ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς λογοτεχνίας τοῦ μαθητής...
are between these, and Gods and Men and all Animals, whatsoever
is perceivable either by sense or by the mind. But Jupiter first of all
made himself; for he was not Educated in the flowery and odorous
flowers of Crete, neither was Saturn ever about to devour him, nor in-
stead of him did he swallow down a stone. For Jupiter was never in
danger, nor will he be ever in danger of any thing. Neither is there an-
other thing older than Jupiter, no more than there are sons older than
their parents, or works than their Officiers. But he is the First and
the Oldest, and the Prince of all things, he being made from himself;
or can it be declared when he was made, for he was from the beginning,
and ever will be, his own Father, and greater than to have been begotten
from another. As he produced Minerva from his brain and needed no
wedlock in order thereunto, so before this did he produce himself from
himself, needing not the help of any other thing for his being. But on
the contrary, all things began to be from him, and no man can tell the
time, since there was not then any time when there was nothing else besides,
and no work can be older than the maker of it. Thus was Jupiter the
beginning of all things and all things were from Jupiter, who is better
than Time, which had its beginning together with the World. And a-
again, ας δὲ Θεον ἐκαὶ φύλε αὐτοφυέων ἀ διὸ τὴν πατρίνα τειχίς δυναμένος
ἐκακός ἔχει, θεὸν ἀνέκτος καὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ σφαγῆ, ἑκάστη εἰς αὑτού ἁλίπτοντα, καὶ
πάντα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκάκοσθα. ἔργα τα τῇ θεῷ ἀνέκτων ὁτα νόστοι συμβαλλόντο, ᾐρε,
κτότο εἰς τὴν πατρίνα ἱλασάτων, ἑπάνω αὐτῶν τὰ πάλιν συνεχέοι, καὶ
ἐπεί τῷ ἑως ἀνεκτανός ὁμολογείτο, ἀνέκτος ἂν θεῶ Συμβαλλότας τῇ θεῷ ὑπή-
tος, καὶ πάντα τῷ πάλιν οὗτος τειχίς δικαίως, αὐτὰς ἕνων ἐκεῖνος
καὶ ἐπεί τε ἑως. All the several kinds of Gods, are but a Definition and Deriva-
tion from Jupiter, and according to Homer's Chain all things are con-
verted with him and depend upon him. He amongst the first produces
Love and Necessity, Two the most powerful Holders of things together
that they might make all things firmly to cohere. He made Gods to be the
Curators of men, and he made men to be the Worshippers and Servitors
of those Gods. All things are every where full of Jupiter, and the Benefits
of all the other Gods, are his work, and to be attributed to him, the
being done in compliance with that order which he had prescribe-
them.

It is certain that all the Latter Philosophers after Christianity, wher-
ther Platonists or Peripateticks, though for the most part they ascer-
ted the Eternity of the World, yet Universally agreed in the acknow-
lledgment of One Supreme Deity, the Cause of the whole World, and
all the other Gods. And as Numenius, Plotinus, Amelius, Porphyrius,
Proclus, Damascius and others, held also a Trinity of Divine Hypo-
s, so had some of those Philosophers excellent Speculations concern-
the Deity, as particularly Plotinus; who notwithstanding that he
derived Matter and All things, from One Divine Principle, yet was a
Contender for Many Gods. Thus in his Book incribed, against the
Gnosticks: ἵνα δὲ ἀκεχεῖν μὴδὲ σωφρόντι οὕτωσιν, μὴ μάλιστα ἢ αἰῶ-
μικοίν ἐκεῖνον ἔκτοκον θανάσαντα, ὡς καὶ ὁ ἐκτόκος ἐκτόκος ἐκτόκος, ὡς
καὶ ὁ ἄδηλος ἄδηλος ἄδηλος, οὕτω τε καὶ μάλιστα μέγας τῆς ἀφάς
αὐτὲς κατείη πληκτὸς· πάντως γὰρ ἡ μέγιστα ἡ ἡγέια τῆς πάντως, ἦν
μακαρευοικότως· αὐτοίνευν δὲ ἢ ὡς ἂν τός νότος ὑμῖν θέας, ὥς ὡς τότε ὅ,
Not to be Contrasted into One.

Chap. IV. Not to be Contrasted into One.

We shall conclude therefore with this full Testimony of St. Cyril, in P. 23. First Book against Julian, ο epubl. ἐμαρχάς, ἣς τὸ τῆς Ἐπιστήμης μετα- ρομάερα εἰς Ἑβιν, αὐτή μετά παρεῖμαι εἰς θεολογίαν. Συνέκρινε δὴ τὸν Σάεραν ἐν τῷ ἐπιστημονικῷ, τί πόλεμος έστιν, ποιήσαι εἰς τὸν καὶ πολλάς τεύχους | καὶ τοιαύτης καὶ τος εἰς τούτος καὶ τοίς οἷς εἰς ταύτας καὶ τοίς | καὶ τοῖς πάντες τεῦχος. Every man ought to endeavour with all his might, to become as Good as may be, but yet to think himself to be the only thing that is good, but that there are no other Good men in the World, and Good Demons, but much more gods: who though inhabiting this inferior world, yet look up to that superior: and most of all, the Prince of this Universe, that most Happy Soul. From whence be ought to ascend yet higher, and to praise those Intelligible Gods, but above all that great King and Monarch; declaring his Greatness and Majesty by the Multitude of Gods which are under him. For this is not the part of them who know the power of God, to contrast all into one, but to shew forth all that Divinity which himself hath displayed, who remaining One makes Many depending on him, which are by him and from him. For this whole World is by him, and oaks up perpetually to him, as also both every one of the Gods in it, and Themis: the Peripatetic, (who was so far from being a Christian, that as Ptolemy probably conjectures, he perfringes our Saviour Christ under the Name of Empedocles, for making himself a God) both not only affirm, that one and the same Supreme God, was worshipped by Pagans, and the Christians, and all Nations, though in different manners; but also, that God was delighted with this variety of Religions: τόκοτη φανατεία τῆς φυσικαί ἕν τι παντοτές ὁσι. 12. μαγιστράτοις εἰς τις Σύριως παλαιαίς εἰς Ελληνικά, ἔλλοις Λαομενίδις, καὶ ἐν οἷς οὖν αὐτοῖς Σύριως ἐμειωτέ, ἀλλ' άνθη καταστηκμέναις ἐες μικρότερο. The Author and Prince of the Universe, seems to be delighted with this Variety of Worship: He would have the Syrians worship him One way, the Greeks another, and the Egyptians another; neither do the Syrians (or Christians) themselves all agree, they being subdivided into many Sects.

XXVII. Neither was this the Opinion of Philosophers and Learned Men only, amongst the Pagans, but even of the Vulgar also. Not that we pretend, to give an account of all the most idolatrous amongst them, who as they little considered their Religion, probably did they not understand that Mystery of the Pagan Theology (hereafter to be declared) that Many of their Gods, were nothing but several Names and Notions of one Supreme Deity, according to its various Manifestations and Effets: but because, as we conceive,
Vulgar Pagans acknowledg'd.

Book I.

ceive this Tradition of One Supreme God, did run current a-

mongst the Generality of the Greek and Latin Pagans at least,

whether Learned or Unlearned. For we cannot make a bet-

er judgment concerning the Vulgar and Generality of the an-

cient Pagans, than from the Poets and Mythologists, who were the

chief Instrucers of them. Thus *Arisatole* in his Politicks, writing

of Musick, judgeth of mens Opinions concerning the Gods, from

the Poets, so that it is very probable in this Deity, &c. &c. We

may learn what opinion men have concerning the Gods, from hence, because the Poets never bring in

Jupiter, Singing or Playing upon an Instrument. Now we have al-

ready proved from fundry Testimonies of the Poets, that (however-

they were Depravers of the Pagan Religion, yet) they kept up this Tradi-

tion of one Supreme Deity, one King and Father of Gods: To

which Testimonies many more might have been added, as of Se-

eca the Tragedian, Statius, Lucan, Silius Italicus, Persius, and Martial, but

that we then declined them to avoid tediousnes. Wherefore we ball

here content our selves only to set down this Affirmation of Dio

Chrysoforus,

concerning the Theology of the Poets, έτιν 5' εις ποι

tis οι ποιηται, τον τευτόν, τερετομένων, καθώς συμβεβηκαν ἀπαιτητικῶς τοις λόγοις ὀνήμενον, καὶ δὲ τοις μεταλήγοντας σκότους ἦσαν ἄφετος, καὶ δὲ τοις κεραυνοῖς, καὶ δὲ τοῖς πνεύμασι, καὶ δὲ τοῖς σωματίσισι. Οὗτοι οὖν οἱ ποιηταὶ, οἵ τευτόν, τερετομένων, καθώς συμβεβηκαν ἀπαιτητικῶς τοις λόγοις ὀνήμενον, καὶ δὲ τοις μεταλήγοντας σκότους σκότους ἦσαν ἄφετος, καὶ δὲ τοῖς κεραυνοῖς, καὶ δὲ τοῖς πνεύμασι, καὶ δὲ τοῖς σωματίσισι. Οὗτοι οὖν οἱ ποιηταὶ, οἵ τευτόν, τερετομένων, καθώς συμβεβηκαν ἀπαιτητικῶς τοις λόγοις ὀνήμενον, καὶ δὲ τοις μεταλήγοντας σκότους σκότους ἦσαν ἄφετος, καὶ δὲ τοῖς κεραυνοῖς, καὶ δὲ τοῖς πνεύμασι, καὶ δὲ τοῖς σωματίσισι.

Moreover Arisatole himself hath recorded this in his Politicks,

ποιήσε αὐτῶν τεσσαρακοσίων, That all men affirmed the Gods to be under

a Kingly power, or that there is one Supreme King and Monarch over

the Gods. And Maximus Tyrinus declareth, that as well the Unlearn-

ed as the Learned, throughout the whole Pagan world, universally

agreed in this, that there was one Supreme God, the Father of all the

other Gods: Εἰς τοὺς παραγόντας ὀψιλοτροπίᾳ τοῦ τευτόν, ναυλαίας ἀπείρων ἀ-

θρευσίας διὰ γενεαλόγησις ἐκείνος ἄπαντα λεγομένους οἶκος. Οὗτοι οὖν οἱ ποιηταὶ, οἵ τευτόν, τερετομένων, καθώς συμβεβηκαν ἀπαιτητικῶς τοις λόγοις ὀνήμενον, καὶ δὲ τοις μεταλήγοντας σκότους σκότους ἦσαν ἄφετος, καὶ δὲ τοῖς κεραυνοῖς, καὶ δὲ τοῖς πνεύμασι, καὶ δὲ τοῖς σωματίσισι. Οὗτοι οὖν οἱ ποιηταὶ, οἵ τευτόν, τερετομένων, καθώς συμβεβηκαν ἀπαιτητικῶς τοις λόγοις ὀνήμενον, καὶ δὲ τοις μεταλήγοντας σκότους σκότους ἦσαν ἄφετος, καὶ δὲ τοῖς κεραυνοῖς, καὶ δὲ τοῖς πνεύμασι, καὶ δὲ τοῖς σωματίσισι.

Diff. P. 45.

If there were a meeting called of all these several Trades and Profession: a Painter, a Statuary, a Poet, and a Philosopher, and all of them were required to declare their sense concerning God, do you think the

Painter would say one thing, the Statuary another, the Poet another, and the Philosopher another? Not nor the Scythian neither, nor the Greek
Both One God, and Many.

It hath been already observed, that the several Pagan Nations did vulgarly their peculiar Proper Names for the One Supreme God. For as the Greeks called him Zeus or Zen, the Latins Jupiter or Jove, so did the Egyptians, Africans and Arabians, Hammon. Which Hammon therefore was called by the Greeks the Zeus of the Africans, and by the Latins their Jupiter. Whence is that in Cicero’s De Natu- Deorum, Jovis Capitolini Nobis alia species, alia Afris Ammonis Jove, the form of the Capitoline Jupiter with his Romans, is different from that, of Jupiter Ammon with the Africans. The Name of the Scythian Jupiter also, as Herodotus tells us, was Pappus or Father. The Egyptians likewise had their Δαί θεοί, as Xenophon styles him, their Country-Zeus or Jupiter (namely Mithras or Ormases) who in the one Xenophon, is distinguished from the Sun, and called in Cyrus’s Proclamation in the Scripture, The Lord God of Heaven, who had given him all the Kingdoms of the Earth. Thus the Babylonian Bel is declared by Berosus (a Priest of his) to have been that God, who as the Maker of Heaven and Earth. And Learned men conceive, at Bel (which is the same with Bel, and signifies Lord) was first amongst the Phenicians also a Name for the Supreme God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, sometimes called Beel Samen, The Lord of Heaven. As likewise that Molech which signifies King, was amongst the Ammonites, the King of their Gods; and that Marias (the chief god of the Gazites, who were Philistines) and signifies the Lord of Heaven, was that from whence the Cretians derived their Jupiter, called the Father of Gods and Men.

Origen
Origen indeed contended, that it was not lawful for Christians to call the Supreme God by any of those Pagan Names, and probably for these Reasons, because those names were then frequently bestowed upon Idols; and because they were contaminated and defiled by Aburd and Impure Fables. Nevertheless that learned Father does acknowledge the Pagans really to have meant Ἰδον καταγ ροτόν, The God over all, by those several Names. Which yet Laëvantius Firmiani would by no means allow of as to the Roman Jupiter, worshipped in the Capitol, he endeavouring to confute it after this manner; "Van est Persuasio corum qui nomen Jovis Summo Deo tribuant. Solent enim quidam errores suos hab exusfatione defendere; qui convindi at Uno Deo, cum id negare non possit, ipsum colere affirmant. Vt hoc fbi placere ut Jupiter nomine, quo quid absurdus? Jupiter enim sine Contubernio Conguis Filiaeque collat non solet. Unde quid si apparent, nec fas est id nomen eo transferri, ubi nec Minerva est ubi nec Juno: It is a vain perswasion of those, who would give the name of Jupiter to the Supreme God. For some are wont thus to excuse their errors, when they have been convinced of one God, so as that they could not contradict it, by saying that themselves worshipped Him, be being called by them Jupiter: Than which, what can be more absurd? since Jupiter is not worshipped without the Partnership of his Wife and Daughter. From whence it plainly appears, that this Jupiter is, and that the name ought not to be transferred thither, where there is neither any Minerva nor Juno.

The ground of which argumentation of Laëvantius was this, because the great Capitoline Temple of Jupiter, had three Sacella or Little Chappells in it, all contained under one roof, Jupiter's in the middle, Minerva's on the right hand, and Juno's on the left; according to that of the Poet.

Trina in Tarpeio fulgent confortia Templo.

Which Juno, according to the Poetick Theology, is said to be the Wife of Jupiter, and Minerva his Daughter, begotten not upon Juno but from his own Brain. Where it is plain that there is a certain mixture of the Mythical or Poetical Theology, together with the Natural, as almost every where else there was, to make up that Civil Theology of the Pagans. But here (according to the more Recondit and Arcan Doctrine of the Pagans) these three Capitoline Gods, Jupiter, Minerva, and Juno, as well as some others, may be understood, to have been nothing else but several Names and Notions, of One Supreme Deity, according to its several Attributes and Manifestations, Jupiter incanating the Divine Power and Sovereignty, as it were seated an enthroned in the Heavens; Minerva the Divine Wisdom and Under-Standing, and Juno the same Deity acting in these Lower parts of the world. Unless we would rather with Macrobius, Physiologize the all Three, and make Minerva to be the Higher Heaven, Jupiter the Middle Ether, and Juno the Lower Air and Earth, all Animated that is, One God, as acting differently in these Three Regions of the world. Which yet seems not so congruous, because it would place Minerva above Jupiter.
Chap. IV. Trinity; or Cabiri.

Nevertheless it may justly be suspected, as G. I. Vossius hath already observed, that there was yet some higher and more sacred Mystery, in this Capitoline Trinity, aimed at; namely, a Trinity of Divine Hypothesis. For these three Roman or Capitoline Gods, were said to have been First brought into Italy out of Phrygia by the Trojans, but before that into Phrygia by Dardanus, out of the Samothrachian Island; and that within eight hundred years after the Noachian Flood, if we may believe Euentius. And as these were called by the Latins, divi patrones, which Macrobius thus interprets, Dii per quos Venus vieritius, per quos hancius Corpus, per quos rationem animi posseuis, that is, The Gods by whom we live, and move, and have our being; but Varro in Arnobius, Dii qui sunt Intrinsecus, atque invires sacramentum Carli, the Gods, who are in the most inward recesses of Heaven; so were they called by the Samothrachians, aces or Cabiri, that is, as Varro rightly interprets the word, sol soror, or Divi Patres, The Powerful and Mighty Gods. Which aces or Cabiri being plainly the Hebrew מִרְאָדְּּי, gives just occasion to suspect, as this Ancient Tradition of three Divine Hypothesis (unquestionably entertained by Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato amongst the Greeks, and probably by the Egyptians and Persians) sprung originally from the Hebrews. The First of these Divine Hypothesis, called Jove, being the Fountain of the Godhead; and the Second of them called by the Latins Minervas, (which, as Varro interprets it, as that wherein Idea & Exempla rerum, the Ideas and first Exemplars of things were contained) fitly expressing the Divine Logos; and the Third Juno, called Amor ac Deliciae Jovis, well enough answering (as Vossius thinks) to the Divine Spirit.

But Laudanius hath yet another objection against the Roman Jupiter's being the Supreme God, quid est quid hujus nominis proprietas, in Divinam simi sed Humanam exprimit? Jovem enim Junonemque Junando esse dixit Ciceron interpretatur. Et Jupiter quasi Juvans dicitur. Quod nonem in Deum minime convenit, quia Jovis minis est, &c. Nemo sic Deum precatur, ut sic Adjovet, sed ut Servet, &c. Ergo non Impius modo, sed etiam Impius est, qui nomine Jovis instat Summa Patefratis animini. What if we add that the propriety of this word Jupiter, does not express a Divine, but only a Human force? Cicer deriving both Jove and Juno alike to Juvando, that is, from help; for Juvans Pater or a Helping Father, is not a Good Description of God; for almost as it properly belongeth to men to Help. Neither doth any one pray to God, to Help him only, but to Save him. Nor is Father, said to help his Son, whom he was the Begter of, &c. Therefore he is not only Unskillful but Impious also, who by the Name of Jovior Jupiter, diminishes the power of the Supreme God. But as this of Laudanius seems otherwise weak enough; so is the Foundation of it absolutely rumous, the true Etymon of Jupiter (though Cicer knew to much) being without peradventure, not Juvans Pater, but Jovis Pater, Jove the Father of Gods and Men; which Jovis is the Hebrew Tetragrammaton (however these Romans came by it) not altered by a Latin Termination. Wherefore as there could be
no impiety at all in calling the Supreme God *Jove* or *Jovis*, it being that very name which God himself chose to be called by: so neither is their any reason why the Latins should not as well mean the Supreme God thereby, as the Greeks did unquestionably by *Zeus*, which will be proved afterwards from irrefragable Authority.

Especially if we consider, that the Roman Vulgar, commonly bestowed these Two Epithets upon that Capitoline *Jupiter* (that is, not the SENLES Statue, but that God who was there worshipped in a Material Statue) of *Optimus* and *Maximus*, the *Best* and the *Greatest*, they thereby signifying him to be a Being *Infinitely Good* and *Powerful*. Thus Cicero in his *De Nat. Deorum*, Jupiter a *Poets dicturn Divum atque Hominum Pater*, a majoribus autem nostris *Optimus Maximus*. That *same Jupiter* who is by the Poets styled, *The Father of Gods and Men*, is by our ancestors called, *The Best The Greatest*. And in his *Orat. pro S. Ro- *scio*, Jupiter *Optimus Maximus*, cuius mun & arbitrio, *Caelum*, *Terra*, *Mariaque reguntur*, Jupiter the *Best* the *Greatest*, by whose beck and command, *the Heaven*, *the Earth* and *the Seas* are governed. As also the Junior *Flinx*, in his *Panegyric Oration*, *Parus Hominum Deorumque*, *Optimi prins*, deinde *Maximi nomine colitur*, *The Father of Men and Gods*, is worshipped under the Name, *first of the Best*, and *then of the Greatest*. Moreover *Servius Honoratus* informs us, that the *Pontifices* in their publick Sacrifices, were wont to address themselves to *Jupiter* in this Form of words, *Omnipotens* Jupiter, *seu quod alio nomine appellari volueris*, *Omnipotent* Jupiter, or by what other name soever thou pleasedst to be called. From whence it is plain, that the Romans under the name of *Jupiter* worshipped the Omnipotent God. And according to *Seneca* the ancient *Hetrurians*, who are by him distinguished from Philosophers, as a kind of illiterate Superstitious persons (in these words, *Hec adline Etruris & Philosophos communia sunt, in illo disserentium*) had this very same Notion answering to the word *Jupiter*, namely, of the Supreme Monarch of the Universe. For First he sets down their Tradition concerning Thunderbolts in this manner, *Fulmina dicunt a Jove mitti, & tres illi manubias dant. Prima (ut aint) monet & placata est, & ipsius consilio Jovis mittitur. Secundam quidem mittit Jupiter, sed ex Conflii sententiâ 3 Duodecin enim Deos advocat, &c. Tertiam idem Jupiter mittit, sed adhibitis in Consilium Dix quos Superioris & Involutos vocant, quae valet*, &c. The *Hetrurians say, that the Thunder-bolts are sent from Jupiter*, and that there are three kinds of them, the *First* Gentle and Monitory and sent by Jupiter alone; the *Second* sent by Jupiter, but not without the counsel and consent of the Twelve Gods, which Thunderbolt doth some good but not without Harm also; the *Third* sent by Jupiter likewise, but not before he hath called a Council of all the Superiors Gods: and this utterly valets and destroys both private and publick States. And then does he make a Commentary, upon this old *Hetrurian Doctrine*, that it was not to be taken literally, but only so as to impress an awe upon men and to signify that *Jupiter* himself intended nothing but Good he inflicting evil not alone, but in partnership with others, and when the necessity of the cafe required. Adding in the last place, *Ne be quidem crediderunt (Etrurf.) Jovem qualem in Capitolio, & in cetera edidit*.
As nothing is more frequent with Pagan Writers, than to speak of **God** Singularity, they signifyng thereby the One Supreme **Deity**, so that the same was very familiar with the Vulgar **Pagans** also, in their ordinary discourse and common speech, hath been recorded by divers of the Fathers. Tertullian in his Book De Testimonio Animae, and his poleger, intimeth in several of these Forms of Speech then vulgarly used by the Pagans, as **God** videt, Deo commend, **Deus** rediit, Deus inter nos indicabit, Quod **Deus** vult, *Si **Deus** voluerit*, *God** dederit, and the like. Thus also Minutius Felix, Cum ad Celum manus tendunt, nihil aliud quam **Deum** Dicunt. Magnus est, & **Deus** Verus est, &c. vulgus *de Naturalis forma*, *an Christiani confidunt oratio?* When they stretch out their hands to **Heaven**, they mention only **God**; and these forms of speech, He is Great, and **God** is True, and if **God** grant (which are the natural language of the **Vulgus**) are they not a plain confession of **Christianity**. And lastly Laussianus, Cum jurant, & cum Optant, & cum Gratias agunt, *non Deos silent, sed Deum nominant*; *add ipse veritas, cognosc natura, etiain invitus pectoribus crumnit*: When they swear, and when they wish, when they give thanks, they name not Many **Gods** but God only; *Truth*, by a most force of nature, thus barking forth from them whether they will or no. And again, *Ad Deum confugint, a Deo petant auxilium*, **Deus** ne fulcevarit oratur. Et si quis ad extremam mensuram necessitatem redactus, *vidit precibus expersit, Deum Solum defatur*, & *per ejus divinum atque unicum Nomen hominum fili mi- nicordiam querit*: They fly to **God**, *Aid is desired of God*, they pray that **God** would help them; and when any one is reduced to extremest necessity, he begs for Gods sake, and by his Divine power alone implores the mercy of men. Which same thing is fully confirmed also, by Pro-
clues upon Plato's Timaeus, where he observes, that the One Supreme God, was more Universally believed throughout the World in all ages, than the Many Inferior Gods: for, as he saith, 'tis not this, but the other way. Moreover, if we look into the ancient proverbs of the Hebrews, they declare, that the Deity is the Helper of all who beseech her. Hence it is, that the Pagan and Christian Churches, praying to their respective Deities, say, 'Grant, O Lord, such and such a thing.'

Moreover we learn from Ariannus his Epitethus, that that very Form of Prayer which hath been now so long in use in the Christian Church, Kyrie Eleison, Lord have mercy upon us, was ancietly part of the Pagan Litany to the Supreme God, either amongst the Greeks, or the Latins, or both. Moreover, we may observe that the Deity is the Helper of all who beseech her. Hence it is, that the Pagan and Christian Churches, praying to their respective Deities, say, 'Grant, O Lord, such and such a thing.'
Ch. IV. Litany, To the Supreme God.

The knowledge of the first Intelligible, and the Lord, that is, of the Supreme God. And Ormazd is called Koe, The Lord, in Plutarch’s Life of Alexander; as Nis also, Koe, by Aristotle, that is De An. Le. the Supreme Ruler over all. Thus likewise Plato in his Sixth Epistle c. 7. ad Hermias, &c. styles his First Divine Hypothesis, or the Absolutely Supreme Deity, Θεοσαραγος και αιδιοσ μητρος. Κυριου, The Father of the Prince and Conqueror of the World, (that is, of the Eternal Intelligible) The Lord. Again Jamblichus writeth thus of the Supreme God, Deo εις Της Μηλιτήν νευς τι αυχων γινεν. It is confessed that every Good ought to be asked of the Lord, that is, the Supreme God, which words are afterwards repeated in him also, p. 129, but depraved in the printed Copy thus, Θεο νομολογην απελτιν τι νευς τι αυχων γινεν. Lastly, Clemens Alexandrinus tells us, that the Supreme God was called not by one only name, but by diversely, namely, Υτατον, υ τ’ Κατευ, υ Νικη, υ το το τ’ Όρ, υ πατρι, υ ανδρακ, υ Κυριου, Either the One, or the Good, or Mind, or the very End, or the Father, or the Demiurgus, or the Lord. Wherefore we conclude, that this Kyrie Eleison, or Domine Missere, in Arrianus, was a Pagan Litany or Supplication to the Supreme God. Though from Mauritius the Emperors Strategenata it appears that in his time a Kyrie Eleison was Right Chief wont to be sung also by the Christian Armies before Battel.

And that the most Sottishly Superstitious and Idolatrous of all the Pagans, and the Worshippers of never so many Gods amongst them; did notwithstanding generally acknowledge, One Supreme Deity over them all. One Universal Namen, is positively affirmed, and fully attested by Aurelius Prudentius, in his Apotheosis, in these words;

Ecquis in idolio recubans inter sacra mille, 
Ridiculose Deos venerans, salve, cæspite, thure, 
Non putat esse Deum Sumnum, & super omnia Solum? 
Quaevis Saturnis, Junonis, & Cythereis, 
Vortentisque alia, sumantes consenset aras, 
Attamen in Solum quoties suspetit, in Ono 
Constituit jus omnem Deos, cui servavit ingens 
Virtutum ratio, Varii infracta Ministris.

We are not ignorant that Plato in his Cratylus, where he undertakes to give the Etymologies of words, and amongst the rest of the word Θεος, writeth in this manner, concerning the First and most Ancient inhabitants of Greece; That they seemed to him, like as other Barbarians at that time, to have acknowledged no other Gods, than such as were visible and Sensible, as the Sun and the Moon, and the Earth, and the Stars, and the Heaven. Which they perceiving to run round perpetually, therefore called them Θεος, from Θεος, that signifies to run. But that after, they took notice of other Invisible Gods also, they bestowed the same name of Θεος upon them likewise. Which Paflage of Plato’s usufuly somewhere would make use of, to prove that the Pagans diversely acknowledged no other Gods, but Corporeal and Inanimate; plainly contrary to that Philosophers meaning, who as he no where affirmin, that any Nation ever was so barbarous, as to worship Senseful and Inanimate Bodies, as such, for Gods, but the contrary; so doth
doth he there distinguish, from those First Inhabitants of Greece and other Barbarians, the afterward civilized Greeks, who took notice of Invisible Gods also. However, if this of Plato should be true, that some of the ancient Pagans, worshipped none but Visible and Sensible Gods (they taking no notice of any Incorporeal Beings) yet does it not therefore follow, that those Pagans had no Notion at all amongst them, of One Supreme and Universal Numen. The contrary thereunto being manifest, that some of those Corporealists looked upon the whole Heaven and Ether Animated, as the Highest God, according to that of Euripides cited by Cicero,

De N. D. p. 223.

Vides Sublimesfum, immoderatum athera,
Qui teneo terram circumueitu ampleciitvur,
Hunc Sumnum habeto Divum, hunc perhibeo Jovem.

As also that others of them conceived that Subtil Fiery Substance, which permeates and pervades the whole World, (supposed to be Intellectual) to be the Supreme Deity which governs all; this Opinion having been entertained by Philosophers also, as namely the Heraclists and Stoicks. And lastly, since Macrobius in the Person of Ventius Prætextatus, refers so many of the Pagan Gods, to the Sun, this renders it not improbable, but that some of these Pagans might adore the Animated Sun, as the Sovereign Numen, and thus perhaps invoke him in that Form of Prayer there mentioned: "Hunc, Sublimem Numen, etiam deorum, O Omnipotent Sun, the Mind and Spirit of the whole World, &c. And even Cleanthes himself, that Learned Stoick, and Devout Religionist, is suspected by some to have been of this Perswation.

Nevertheless we think it opportune here to observe, that it was not Macrobius his Deign in those his Saturnalia, to defend this, either as his own opinion, or as the opinion of the Generality of Pagans, That the Animated Sun, was Absolutely the Highest Deity; (as some have conceived) nor yet to reduce that Multiplicity of Pagan Gods, by this device of his, into a seeming Monarchy and near compliance with Christianitv; he there plainly confining his Design, to the Dii duntaxat qui sub Celo sunt, that is, the Lower gods of Mundane Gods, and undertaking to shew, not that all of these, neither, but only that many of them, were reducible to the Sun, as Anonymous, and called by several Names, according to his Several Virtues and Essences. For, what Macrobius his own opinion was, concerning the Supreme Deity, appears plainly from his other Writing, particularly this Passage of his Commentary upon Scipio's Dream where the Highest Sphere and Starry Heaven was called Sumnum Dei, the Supreme God; Quod hunc Extimum Globum, Sumnum Deum vocavit, non ita accipiam eum, ut ife Prima Causa, & Deus ille Omn. potentissimus existimatur, cum Globus ipsi, quod Calum est, Animal Fabrica, Anima ex Mente processerit, Mens ex Deo, qui vere Sumnum est, procerata sit. Sed Sumnum quidem dixit ad Ceterorum Ordinis qui subjicet sunt: Deum vero quod non modo Immortale Animal ac In- vivum sit, plenum inclyta ex illa purissima Mente rationis, sed quod viribus
virtutes omnes, quae illum Primum Omnipotentiam Summum æquarum, ant ipsa ficut, ant continent; ipsa denuque Jovem metes vocantur, & apud Theologos Jupiter est mundi Animus: That the Outmost Sphere is here called the Supreme God, is not so to be understood, as if this were thought to be The First Cause, and The Most Omnipotent God of all. For this Starry Sphere being but a part of the Heaven, was made or produced by Soul. Which Soul also proceeded from a Perfect Mind or Intellect; and again Mind was begotten from that God, who is Truly Supreme. But the Highest Sphere is here called the Supreme God, only in respect to those Lesser Spheres or Gods, that are contained under it; and it is styled a God, because it is not only an Immortal and Divine Animal, fail of Reason derived from that Perfect Mind, but also because it maketh or containing within itself, all those Virtues which follow that Omnipotence of the First Summity. Lastly, this was called by the ancient Jupiter, and Jupiter to Theologers is the Soul of the World. Wherefore though Macrobius, as generally the other Pagans, did undoubtedly worship the Sun as a Great God, and probably would not flick to call him Jupiter nor potenterfetop neither (in a certain sense) Omnipotent or the Governour of all, nor perhaps Denum Summum, as well as the Starry Heaven was so styled in Scipio's Dream, he being the Chief Moderator in this Lower World; yet nevertheless it is lain that he was far from thinking the Sun to be Primus Causa, or omnipotentissimum Deum. The First Cause, or the most Omnipotent God of all. He acknowledging above the Sun and Heaven, First, an Eternal Psyche, which was the Maker or Creator of them both; and then Robed this Psyche, a Perfect Mind or Intellect, and Lastly above that find a God who was Verus Summus, Truly and Properly Supreme, The First Cause, and the most Omnipotent of all Gods. Wherein Macrobius plainly Platonized, altering a Trinity of Archial or Divine Hypostases. Which same Doctrine is elsewhere also further desired by him after this manner: Deus qui Prima Causa est & vocatur, Deus omnium,queque suntque videuntur efe, Principium & Origo; His superabundanti Majestatis secunditate de se Mentem creavit, &c. Meno que non vocatur, quia Patrem inspicit, plenam similitudinem est autoris. Animam ordo de se creat posteriora repiciens. Renfus nuna partem quam intuentur indiuunt, ac paulatim regrediente rejo in fabricam corporum, in corpore ipsa degenerat: God who is and called, the First Cause, is alone the Fountain and Original of all things as he or seem to be; He by his superabundant Fecundity, produced on himself Mind, which Mind, as it looks upward towards its Father, bears the perfect resemblance of its Author, but as it looked downwards, produced Soul. And this Soul again as to its superior part resembles that Mind from whence it was begotten; but working downwards, produced the Corporeal Fabric, and all else upon Body. Befides which e same Macrobius tells us, that Summi & Principis omnium Dei, summ simulachrum fixit Antiquitas, quia supra Animam & Naturam quo nihil fatis eft de falsis pervenire, de Dei autem ceteris, & de anima, non fuisse ad falsa convertunt: The Pagan Antiquity made Image at all of the Highest God, or Prince of all things, because he above Soul and Nature, where it is not lawful for any Fabulosity to be tempated. But as to the other Gods, the Soul of the World, and those below
The Sun, not the Persian Jupiter. Book I.

...below it, they thought it not inconvenient here, to make use of Images, and Fiction or Fabulosity. From all which it plainly appears, that neither Macrobius himself, nor the Generality of the ancient Pagans according to his apprehension did look upon the Animated Sun, as the Absolutely Supreme and Highest Being.

And perhaps it may not be amiss to suggest here, what hath been already observed; that the Persians themselves also, who of all Pagan Nations, have been most charged with this, the Worshipping of the Sun as the Supreme Deity, under the name of Mithras, did not-withstanding if we may believe Eubulus (who wrote the History of Mithras at large) acknowledge another Invisible Deity Superior to it, (and which was the Maker thereof and of the whole World) as the True and Proper Mithras. Which opinion, is also plainly confirmed, not only by Herodotus, distinguishing their Jupiter from the Sun, but also by Xenophon in sundry places; as particularly where he speaks of Cyrus his being admonished in a Dream of his approaching death, and thereupon addressing his Devotion by Sacrifices and Prayers first to the Ζεύς πολεμών, the Persian Jupiter, and then to the Sun, and the other Gods. "Ευβούλιος ἔλθε καὶ προσκύνησεν τῷ Ζεύς πολεμών, πάντες όντες αὐτόν ἀλλοτριον καταλήγον, τοις Βαλκανικοῖς δὲ καὶ αὐτόν χοίρας ταύρον καὶ αἴλουρον κυνηγεῖτο, ὕπατος ταίνων ἄλλης καὶ τοῖς Σόλονις, Διότι ὄντες ζεῦς, αἰείων, καὶ προσευχόμενος, δόθη ἡ ἱεροτελεία Χαρίαν, ἀνδρομενός τοι, καὶ αὕτη τοῖς Σόλονις χαίρων, &c. He sacrificed to their Country (or the Persian) Jupiter, and to the Sun, and to the other Gods, upon the Tops of the Mountains, as the custom of the Persians is, praying after this manner; Then our Country Jupiter (that is, thou Mithras or Orofanes) and thou Sun, and all ye other Gods, I pray you, these my Eucharistic Sacrifices, &c. And we find also the like Prayer used by Darus in Plutarch Liv. lα. 4ερας, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρόνου Παγάνων, Τόμη χρό
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The Ethiopians in Strabo's time, may well be look'd upon as Barbarians, and yet did they not only acknowledge one Supreme Deity, but all the same as was distinct from the world, and therefore Invisible, he writing thus concerning them, οὗτοι νομίζοντες θέλουσιν διακλητισθείν, ὑμέναι γὰρ τοὺς πρῶτον τον Θεὸν ἡμῶν, τοὺς Πλοῦτον, τὸν Δήμον, ἀνδρομενον τόιν, ὡς ἐκ τῷ θρόνῳ τος ἐξαγγέλλοντες καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ταύρον κυνηγεῖτο, &c. They believe, that there is one Immortal God, and this the Causel of all things; and another Mortal one, a nonymous; but for the most part they account their Benefactors as Kings, Gods also. And though Cæsar affirm of the ancient Germans, Deorum numero eos folos ducunt, quos cernunt, & quorum opus, aperite juvantur, Solis, & Vulcanum, & Luuan, yet is he contradicted by Tacitus, who coming after him had better information and others have recorded, that they acknowledged one Supreme God, under the name of Than, and then of Thanus, and Theutat. Latly, the Generality of the Pagans at this very day, as the Indians, Chine.
XCVIII. It hath been already declared, that according to Theophrastus and Symmachus, two zealous Pagans, One and the same Supreme God, was worshipped in all the several Pagan Religions throughout the world, though after different manners. Which Diversity of religions, as in their opinion, it was no way inconvenient in itself, so either it was Ungrateful nor Unacceptable to Almighty God, it being more for his Honour, State and Grandeur, to be worshipped with his Variety, than after one only Manner. Now that this was also the opinion of other ancients Pagans before them, may appear from this remarkable Testimony of Plutarch's in his Book De Iside, where defending the Egyptian Worship (which was indeed the main design that whole Book 5) but withal declaring, that no Inanimate thing ought to be look'd upon or worshipped as a God, he writeth thus: ρ. 337. Εάν αὐτὸς ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος ὁ Θεός, ὃς ὁ παρεσπομένος οὐκ ἦν ὁ παρεσπομένος ὁ ἅγιος, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀγία θεία ἡ ἁγία· οὐκ ἦν οὕτως ἡ ἀληθινὴ θεία· ἡ ἀληθινὴ θεία ὑπὸ τοῦ παρεσπομένου κατά διάσπασιν. Εάν αὐτὸς ὁ παρεσπομένος ἦν ἱερός, ὅταν οὖν τοιαύτα λέγει τοιαύτα, ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὰ τιμηθήτω τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἵς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἵς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἵς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τὸ ψωλόν Τίττων· οἷς ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς οἷς ἐπικεφαλής ἑαυτῷ ἐπενεχθείς, τοῖς ο الخيار.
the Laws of several Countries, have been everywhere worshipped throughout the whole world. And there have been also different Symbols consecrated to them, the better to conclude and lead on men's understandings to Divine things; though this hath not been without some hazard or danger of casting men upon one or other of these Two Inconveniences, either Superstition or Atheism. Where Plutarch plainly affirms, that the Several Religions of the Pagan Nations, whether Greeks or Barbarians, and among these the Egyptians also, as well as others, consisted in nothing else, but the worshipping of One and the Same Supreme Mind, Reason and Providence, that orders all things in the world, and of its Utility Divinum, ita vocant, its Subservient Powers or Ministers, appointed by it over all the several parts of the World; though under different Names, Rites and Ceremonies, and with different Symbols.

Moreover that Titus Livius was of the very same opinion, that the Pagan Gods of several Countries, though called by several Names, and worshipped with so great Diversity of Rites and Ceremonies, yet were not for all that, Different, but the same common to all, may be concluded from this passage of his, where he writeth of Hannibal: Nescio an Mirabilior fuerit in adversis, quam secundis rebus Quippe qui milites ex colluvione omnium gentium, quibus alius Ritus, aliis sacra, ali PRO PE Dii effent, ita uno vinculo copulaverit, ut nulla seditione extiterit. I know not whether Hannibal were more amendable in his adversity or Prosperity; who having a mixt colluviae of all Nations under him, which had different Rites, different Ceremonies and Almost different Gods, from one another, did notwithstanding unite them all together in one common bond, that there hapned no sedition at all amongst them. Where Livy plainly intimates, that though there was as great diversity of Religious Rites and Ceremonies among the Pagans, as if they had worshipped several Gods, yet the Gods of them all, were really the same, Namely, One Supreme God, and his Ministers under him. And the same Livy elsewhere declares, this to have been the General opinion of the Romans and Italians likewise at that time; where he tells us how they quarrelled with Fulvius Flaccus, for that when being Censor, and building a new Temple in Spain, he uncovered another Temple dedicated to Juno Lacinia amongst the Bruttii, and taking off the Marble-Tyde thereof, sent them into Spain to adorn his new erected Temple withal; and how they accused him thereofpublicly in the Senate-house in this manner, Quod ruinis Templorum Templa edificare tanquam non Idem ubique Dii immortales essent, sed soletis altorum, to colendi exornandique; That with the ruins of Temples he built New Temples; as if there were not every where the Same Immortal Gods, but that some of them might be worshipped and adorned with the spoils of others.

The Egyptians were doubtless the most singular of all the Pagan, and the most oddly different from the rest in their manner of worship, yet nevertheless, that these also agreed with the rest in the Fundamentals, of worshipping one Supreme and Universal Name,
gether with his Inferior Ministers, as Plutarch lets himself industriously to maintain it, in that forementioned Book De Iside, so was it further cleared and made out (as Damascius informs us) by Two Famous Egyptian Philosophers Aeleclipides and Heraclides in certain writings of theirs, that have been since left: \( \text{...} \)

- **Damascius, de Princ.MS.**

- **Heraclides, Philosopher.**

- **Aeleclipides, Philosopher.**

Concerning things &c.

- **Heraclides, Philosopher.**

- **Aeleclipides, Philosopher.**

- **Heraclides, Philosopher.**

- **Aeleclipides, Philosopher.**

The modern names are Hesiodus and Aziotis, and notably that of Aziotis was known to the modern writers, and is the one that was written by them. But Aeleclipides having been more open and full with ancient Egyptian writings, was more thoroughly inform'd, and exactly skilled in his Country Theology, he being the Egyptian of the two last named. And so, when Heraclides, his friend, was writing, he composed in praise of the Egyptian Gods, and from that Traditae begun to be written by him (but left unfinished) which containeth, The Symphony of all Theologies, now we say that Aeleclipides his Symphony of all the Pagan Theologies, and therefore of the Egyptian with the rest, was their agreement in the same, Two Fundamentals expressed by Plutarch; namely the worshipping of One Supreme and Universal Numen, Reason and Providence, overruling all things; and then of his Subservient Ministers (the Instruments of Providence) appointed by him, over all the parts of the world: Which being honoured under several Names, and with different Rites and Ceremonies, according to the Laws of the respective Countreys caused all that Diversity of Religious, that was amongst them. Both which Fundamental Points, of the Pagan Theology, were in like manner acknowledg'd by Symmachus, The First of them being thus expressed, **Æquum est quicquid omnes colunt, Omnis A a a 2 putari.**
putari. That all Religions agreed in this, the Worshipping of One and the same Supreme Numinous; and the Second thus, Varios Gentes, Orbibus Mens Divina distribuit, That the Divine Mind appointed divers Guardian and Tutelar Spirits under him, unto Cities and Countries. He there adding also, that Sulus cuique Mos est, sumum cuique Jus. That every Nation had their peculiar Modes and Manners in worshipping of those: and that these external differences in Religion, ought not to be flood upon, but every one to observe the Religion of his own Country. Or else these Two Fundamental Points of the Pagan Theology, may be thus expressed, First, that there is One Self-Originated Deity, who was the Demiurgus or Maker of the whole World. Secondly, That there are besides him, Other Gods also, to be Religiously worshipped (that is, Intellectual Beings superior to men) which were notwithstanding all Made or Created by that One Stobaus thus declaring their sence, τε πληθυνθείς ουκ έξ ἑαυτου αλλ' αν τοις λεγομενοις, ἣμα τας κόσμου γυναικας, That the multitude of Gods, is the work of the Demiurgus, made by him together with the world.

XXIX. And that the Pagan Theologers, did thus generally acknowledge, One Supreme and Universal Numinous, appears plainly from hence, because they supposed the whole World to be an Animal. Thus the Writer de Placitis Philos, and out of him Stobaus, ου μηδεναι ποιητες εμους έν ημων ει περιτοι διοικημοντες αλλ' αν τοι τε δυναμεις το τοι ήπειρος, ου το τοι ακτως εισωνται το τοι κενον, ειτε εμους ειτε περιτε ιεπιελκόντες, φοβει δε τυι ελάυγος. All others affirm the World to be an Animal, and governed by Providence; only Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus, and those who make Atoms and Vacuum the Principles of all things, dissenting, who neither acknowledge the World to be Animated, nor yet to be governed by Providence but by an Irrational Nature. Where by the way, we may observe the Fraud and Juggling of Gaffndus, who takes occasion from hence highly to extol and applaud Epicurus, as one who approached nearer to Christianity than all the other Philosophers, in that he denied the World to be an Animal; whereas according to the Language and Notions of those times, to deny the Worlds Animation, and to be an Atheist or to deny a God, was one and the same thing; because all the Pagans who then asserted Providence, held the World also to be Animated; neither did Epicurus deny the Worlds Animation, upon any other account than this, because he denied Providence. And the Ground upon which this opinion of the Worlds Animation was built, was such as might be obvious even to vulgar understandings; and it is thus expressed by Plotinus according to the sence of the Ancients, άντων το ευζωνικον εις τον λεγει, ιμα το μενες οικοδομης ετοιμας το παιδος ζωεις έργαζοντο · ποις γα τι το μεσος εταιρει τ' ζωγος την παιδος οικον. It is absurd to affirm, that the Heaven or World is Inanimate, or devoid of Life and Soul, when we our selves who have but a part of the Mundane Body in us, are endued with Soul. For he could a Part have Life and Soul in it, the Whole being Dead and Inanimate? Now if the world whole be One Animal, then must it need be Governed by One Soul, and not by Many. Which One Soul of the World, and the whole Mundane Animal was by some of the Pag. Theol.
Theologers (as namely the Stoicks) taken to be the πρῶτος Ἰδε, The first and Highest God of all.

Nevertheless others of the Pagan Theologers, though assering the world's Animation likewise, yet would by no means allow the Mundane Soul to be the Supreme Deity; they conceiving the First and Highest God to be an Absiract and Immutable Mind, and not a Soul. Thus the Panegyrift, (cited also by Gyllades,) invokes the Supreme Deity doubtfully and cautiously, as not knowing well what to call him, whether Soul or Mind; as thus summi rerum Salor, cujus tot nominis sunt, qua? gentium linguis esse voluitis? quem enim te ipse dici velis, ire non possimus: sive in te quaedam vis Mentique Divina est, quae tota tua mundi, omnibus miscantibus elementis, & sine ullo extrinsecus accidente vigaris impulsa, per te ipse movetis? sive aliqua suprahumana potestas ex, quae hoc opus totum ex altiore Natura arcipdispiciis: iniquum oramus, &c. Thou Supreme Original of all things, who hast many Names as thou holiest pleased there should be languages; whether thou best a certain Divine Force and Soul, that infused into the whole world art mingled with all the Elements, and without any External impulse moved from thy self; or whether thou beest a Power Elevated above Heaven, which lookst down upon the whole work of Nature, as from a higher Tower; Thee we invoke, &c. And as the Supreme Deity was as considered only as a Perfect Mind, Superior to Soul, so was the Mundane Soul and whole Animated World, called by these Pagans frequently, Δ'Αριτέτες Θεός, The Second God. Thus in the Asclepian Dialogue or Perfect Oration, is the Lord and Maker of all, said to have made a Second God Visible and Sensible, which is the World.

But for the most part, they who assered a God, Superior to the Soul of the World, did maintain a Trinity of Universal Principles, or Divinities Hypothesiz'd subordinate, they conceiving, that as there was above the Mundane Soul a Perfect Mind or Intelligence; so that Mind and Intelligence as such, was not the First Principle neither, because there must be a third in order of nature before these, an Intelligence before Intelligence. Which first Intelligence, was called by them, τὸ τῆς τὸ θεός, and The Good, or Unity and Goodness; it self Substantial, the Cause of Mind and All things. Now as the Tagathian or Higthe of these Tree Hypothesizes, was sometimes called by them ὁ πατὴρ Θεός, The First God, and τῆς or Intelligence ὁ Πάτερ οὐκετά, The Second God, so was the Mundane Soul and Animated world, called τῆς Ἰδεῖς, The Third God

Nunius in Proclus upon Plato's Timæus, ἡμερῶν ὑδρ Τῆς τετέ ρος 32, 32.

But Ἰδες, ποτέν τε μὴ καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς, ποτέν τοῖς ἄλλοισ, ποτέν τὸ πατήρ τῃ Θεοῦ κατ' ὑπότασιν τοῦ πατήρ τοῖς ἂν Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ πατὴρ τοῖς ἂν δικαίως ἄλλοισ, τοῖς πολλοῖς, ὁ δὲ θεός Θεός, τοῖς δὲ θεομεγαλούχου τῇ Θεοῦ. Nunius prasing Three Gods, calls the Father the First God, the Maker the Second, and the Work the Third. For the World according to him, is the Third God; as he supposes also Two Opifcers, the First and the Second God. Plotinus in like manner speaks of this also, as very \textit{En.3.L.5 s.6.}

Familiar language amongst those Pagans, ὁ δὲ θεός Θεός, &c. as 
an, τῆς Ἰδεῖς, And the World, as is commonly said, is the Third God.
But neither they, who held the Supreme Deity to be an Immovable Mind or Intellect, superior to the Mundane Soul (as Aristotle and Xenocrates) did suppose that Mundane Soul and the whole World, to have depended upon Many such Immovable Intellects Self-existent, as their First Cause, but only upon One: nor they, who admitting a Trinity of Divine Hypotheses, made the Supreme Deity properly, to be a Monad above Mind or Intellect, did conceive that Intellect to have depended upon Many such Monads, as First Principles Co-ordinate, but upon One only. From whence it plainly appears, that the Pagan Theologers, did always reduce things under a Monad, and acknowledge not Many Independent Deities, but One Universal Numen (whether called Soul, or Mind, or Monad) as the Head of all. Though it hath been already declared, that those Pagans, who were Trinitarians, especially the Platonists, do often take those Three Hypotheses subordinate (a Monad, Mind and Soul) all together for the τὸ Σῶον, or One Supreme Numen; as supposing an extraordinary kind of Unity, in that Trinity of Hypotheses, and so as it were, a certain Latitude and Gradation, in the Deity.

Whereby by the way Two things may be observed, concerning the Pagan Theologers: First, that according to them generally the whole Corporeal System, was not a Dead Thing, like a Machine Artificially made by men, but that Life and Soul were mingled with and diffused thorough it All: inasmuch that Aristotle himself, taxes those, who made the World to consist of nothing but Monads or Atoms altogether Dead and Inanimate, as being therefore a kind of Atheism. Secondly, That how much more some of the supposed the Supreme Deity and First Cause, to be Elevated above Heaven and Corporeal World, yet did they not therefore conceived either the World to be quite Cut off from that, or that from the Word, so as to have no commerce with it nor influence upon it; but as it proceeded from this First Cause, so did they suppose that to be closely and intimately united with all those Emanations from it, (though without Mixture and Confusion) and all to subsist in it, and pervaded by it. Plutarch in his Platonick Questions, propounds this amongst the rest, τι δὲ πετοὶ τὰ ανυμενμένα θεῦ, παρεκτερά ποιητὰς τὰ ποίημα ποιώντες; Why Plato called the Highest God, the Father and Maker of All? To which he answers in the First place thus, τὸ γὰρ ὃ θεός γενεται, τὸ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ποιητὴν ἔτι, ποιητὰς γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἐργαζομαι ἂν ἀνάλογον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. That perhaps he was called the Father of all the Generated Gods, and men, but the Maker of the Irrational and Inanimate things of the World. But afterward he adds, That this Highest God, might therefore have styled the Father of the whole Corporeal World also, as well as the Maker, because it is no Dead and Inanimate thing, but ended with Life; τὸ ὅπως καὶ τὸς ὁμοίως ὁ ἀνθρώπως, καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ovis oikeiomevov ἀγάπητι, ἡ λογικὴ αἰνομορφή ἡ αἴνεται, ἡ λογικὴ ἀναμορφή ἢ ἀνάλογος, ἀναλόγως ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐργαζομαι ἂν ἀνάλογως ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. ποιητὰς καὶ εἰς ἀναλόγως ἀνελθομεν τοῖς ποιηταῖς, ἀν ἀναλόγως ποιητὰς. καὶ ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.
The Artificer, or Maker, is therefore rightly styled by Plato, not only the Maker, but also the Father of the whole World, as being an Animal. To the same purpose also Plotinus, *Thetai* *deos* δ' οιων οιως της καθες εις τοιαυτα, ἐκ αὐτων μεθ' την την πολλοτητα, εις ου και συνανοιαν καθη, ἵπποι και ψυχοι προβηκομερας και κρατων, εις φθορον αλλ' ηι εις θεόν, περικε τοιδι ου την ψυχην εαυτης εις αυτην και εν αληθειαν αυτην, εις εν εις οδων αποικυαν τοιαυταν ζωην. *The World being made a large and stately Edifice, was neither cut off and separated from its Maker, nor yet mingled and confounded with him. Forasmuch as he will remaineth above Presiding over it: The World being so animated, as other to be possessed by Soul, than to possess it, it being in that great Wife which susteneth it, as a net in the waters, all mottled with Life.* Thus Plotinus supporting the whole Corporeal World to be Animated, firmeth it neither to be cut off from its Maker (by which Maker he here understandeth the Mundane Soul) nor yet that Mundane Soul it self, be Immerged into its Body the World, after the same manner as our humane Souls are into these Bodies; but so to preside over it, and act it, as a thing Elevated above it. And though according to im, that *Second Divine Hypothesis of Nous or Intellect* be in like manner Elevated above this Mundane Soul; and again that *First Hypothesis or Supreme Deity, (called by him Divity and Goodness)* above intellect; yet the Corporeal World could not be said, to be cut off from these neither; they being all three (Monad, Mind, and Soul) solely and intimately united together.

XXX. The Hebrews were the only Nation, who before Christiata for several ages, professedly opposed the Polytheism and Idolatry the Pagan World. Wherefore it may be probably concluded, at they had the right Notion of this Pagan Polytheism and understood what it conflicted in, viz. Whether in worshipping Many Unde, Self-originated Deities, as Partial Creators of the World; or else worshipping besides the Supreme God, other Created Beings Superior Men? Now *this* plainly understood the Pagan Polytheism after is latter way; as may appear from this passage of his in his Book ancient the Confusion of Languages, where speaking of the Supreme God (the Maker and Lord of the whole World) and of his *powers of so many, his Innumerable Assistent Powers*, both visible and invisible, he adds, καταλαγαζοντες εις της τω έναστης της υπερθαναι φωνα, εις δια δος εξεδοξησεν, αληθεια της καθιστη τοι εις αυτων μεσον, ηλιον, εις της υπερθαναις φωνας, και τω συνεπειας αρχον. *And other ancients add, these as also were, in the word made flesh and that in which no man receiveth that World, in the world made flesh, no man receiveth that Word, wherefore some men being struck with admiration*.
wiration of both these Worlds, the Visible and the Invisible, have not only Devised the whole of them, but also their several Parts, as the Sun, and the Moon, and the whole Heaven, they not scrupling to call these Gods. Which Nation and Language of theirs, Moses repeated in those words of his, Thou Lord the King of Gods; he thereby declaring the transcendency of the Supreme God above all those his subjects called Gods. To the same purpose Philo writeth also in his Commentary upon the Decalogue, πασὶ τῶν τιμωτῶν ποσελθόν, τὸς ἀδιάφρατος φῶς μὴ περικοπηθέν, εἴ τις καθομοιότατος καὶ αὐτοκρατορός οὐκ ἐλεηθεὶς ἤ ἐπάλλαξεν τῶν μορφώσεων, καθ’ εὐθείας, εἰτε ἤ παρθεὶς ἐπεπερατὼν ὑπὸ τις καὶ ἄλλων, εἴ πλεον τότε ἤ περάσαν. Τόπος τοῦ διστηρίου εἰσαγώγηται ἐκ ἄλλων ἢ τῶν ἑπίσκοπων, εἰς τῆς ἑπίσκοπων ἡμετέρας ἡμετέρας ἡμετέρας ἡμετέρας: Wherefore removing all such impiety, Let us worship no Beings, that are by Nature Brothers and Germane to us, though endued with far more pure and immortal Essences than we are. For all Created things as such, have a kind of Germane and Eternally Equality with one another, the maker of all things being their common Father. But let us deeply infixed ths first and most holy commandment in our breasts, to acknowledge and worship One only Highest God. And again afterwards, ουτὶ μὴ ἔληγεν ὡς σι λύνεν, ἔφη τό σημεῖον τοῦ οἴκου οἱ πόλεις, ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἐστὶν ὕλη πολιτείας μετὰ ὧν ἐπεξερεύσατο, διαφανέστατον, τοὺς ὑπόκλιντας τοῖς ἐορθοῖς σωματιοῖς. They who worship the Sun, and the Moon, and the whole Heaven and World, and the Principal parts of them as Gods, err, in that they worship the Subjects of the Prince; whereas the Prince alone ought to be worshipped. Thus according to Philo, the Pagan Polytheism confisled, in giving Religious Worship, besides the Supreme God, to other Created understanding Beings, and Parts of the World, more pure and immortal than men.

Flavins Josephus in his Judaick Antiquities, extolling Abraham Wisdom and Piety, writeth thus concerning him, περὶ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἀμελητέου ἐν συμφορᾷ, ὃν θεόν ἔχον, which some would understand in this manner, that Abraham was the first who publicly declared, that there was one God the Demiurgus or maker of the whole world; as if a mankind besides at that time, had supposed, the world to have been made not by One but by Many Gods. But the true meaning of the words is this, That Abraham was the first, who in that degenerate age, publicly declared that the Maker of the whole world, was the One only God, and alone to be Religiously Worshipped; accordingly as it follows afterwards in the same writer, αἱ καθέστη τῷ παλατίνῳ τῶν ὕποκλινσίων ἄνθρωποι, to whom alone men ought to give honour and thanks. And the reason hereof is there also set down, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν, εἰ καὶ τὸ πεῖρας ἀκεχυμενίως συναίνηται, τὰ πείρας τοῦ τοῦ τοπέχεν ἵναπεταὶ καὶ κατ᾽ οἰκείαν ἤρων. Because all those other being that were then worshipped as Gods, whatsoever any of them contributed to the happiness of mankind, they did it not by their own power, but by his appointment and command; he instancing in the Sun and Moon, and Earth and Sea, which are all made and ordered by a higher power and providence, by the force whereof they contribute to our utility. As if he should have said, That no Created Being ought to be Religiously worshipped, but the Creator only. And therefore
agree with what we read in Scripture concerning Abraham, that he called upon the Name of the Lord, יְהֹוָה 'THE GOD OF THE WHOLE WORLD; that he worshipped no particular Created Being, as the other Pagans at that time did, but only that Supreme Universal Numen, which made and continued the whole World. And thus Maimonides interprets that place, דְָיוָה לַעֲבֹד וְלַעֲבֹד מִזְַכְּרָא הָאָדָם אָדָם. Abraham began to teach, that none ought to be Religiously Worshipped, save only the God of the whole World. Moreover the same Josephus afterwards in his Twelfth Book, brings in Aristides (who seems to have been a secret Profelyted Greek) pleading with Ptolemaus Philadelphus, in behalf of the Jews and their Liberty, after this manner; τίνι παρατάρτυς οὐ δίκτητος, θέσθησαν τάς νόμας αὐτοῖς τῷ ἐπικύρωσε συναγωγήν θεοῦ, ἣν ἔστιν ημῖν συναγωγή, ζῆνα καλωσὺς αὐτήν, οὕτως ἀπί τό συνάξης ζημίας τῷ ζῆνα, τὴν ἐκκυκλίαν αὐτῆς τοιασίας. It would well agree with your Goodness and Magnanimity, to free the Jews from that miserable Captivity which they are under: since the same God who governeth your Kingdom, gave Laws to them, as I have by different search found out. For both They and we, do alike worship the God who made all things, we calling him Zene, because he gives life to all: Wherefore for the honour of that God, whom they worship after a singular manner, please you to indulge them the liberty of returning to their native country. Where Aristides also according to the sense of Pagans thus concludes; Know, O King, that I intercede not for these Jews as having any cognation with them, πολύντων οὐ καμίαν βουλήν ἐπιτελεῖται τῆς ἔργης αὐτοῖς, γιὰ γένους αὐτῶν ἐκκυκλίας τοῖς ἀντιποιοῖς, διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τὰ δικαιώματα, but all men being the Workmanship of God, and knowing that o is delighted with beneficence, 1 therefore thus exhort you.

As for the latter Jewish Writers and Rabbins, it is certain that the enerality of them supposed the Pagans to have acknowledged One Supreme and Universal Numen, and to have worshipped all their other Gods, only as his Ministers, or as Mediators between him and them: Maimonides in Halacoth חַלַּכְת describes the Rite of the Pagan Polytheism in the days of Enosḥ, after this manner: בִּגְוָי אֵיל בְּגָדָה בָּבֶל לִשְׁמָה נָהוּ לְזָרָה בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶל בָּבֶl. In the days of Enosḥ, the Sons of men grievously erred, and the wickedness of that age became brutish (even Enosḥ himself being in the majority of them) and their error was this, that since God had created the stars and Spheres, to govern the world; and placing them on high, had flowed this honour upon them, that they should be his Ministers and Servient Instruments; men ought therefore to praise them, honour them; and worship them: this being the pleasure of theoffed God, that men should magnifie and honour those whom myself hath magnified and honoured, as a King will have his Ministers to be reverenced, this honour redounding to himself. Again the me Maimonides in the beginning of the Second Chapter of that book writeth thus;
The Pagans Many Gods,  Book I

The Foundation of that Commandment against Strange Worship (now commonly called Idolatry) is this, that no man should worship any of the Creatures whatsoever, neither Angel, nor Sphere, nor Star, nor any of the four Elements, nor any thing made out of them. For though be that worships these things, knows that the Lord is God, and Superior to them all, and worships those Creatures no otherwise, than Enosh and the rest of that age did, yet is he nevertheless guilty of Strange Worship, or Idolatry. And that, after the times of Enosh also, in succeeding ages, the Polytheism of the Pagan Nations, was no other than this, the worshipping (besides One Supreme God) of other created Beings, as the Ministers of his Providence, and as Middles or Mediators betwixt Him and Men, is declared likewise by Maimonides (in his More Nochboim) to have been the Universal Belief of all the Hebrews or Jews; and he hath it in, to make that (though to be an error, yet is it a most manifest, and unanswerable) that the children of Israel, in the Mosaic Laws, command their children and their children’s children, never to give an ear to that which is called God, or to worship the powers thereof, but to call God by his proper Name, which is Jehovah. And this is no less true and sound, than if they were to say, to worship none other than the Name of God, be it so called."

You know that whatsoever committed Idolatry, he doth it not as supposing, that there is no other God besides that which he worshippeth, for it never came into the minds of any Idolaters, nor never will, that that Statute which is made by them of metal, or stone, or wood, is that very God who created Heaven and Earth; but they worship those Statues and Images only as the representation of something which is a Mediator between God and them. Moses Albeldha the Author of the Book entituled, Gbalath Tamid, resolves all the Pagan Polytheism and Idolatry, into these Two Principles, one of which repected God, and the other men themselves.

The Idolaters first argued thus, in respect of God, that since he was of such transcendent perfection above men, it was not possible for men to be united to or have communion with him, otherwise than in means of certain Middle Beings or Mediators; as it is the manner of Earthly Kings, to have petitions conveyed to them by the hands of Mediators and Intercessors. Secondly they thus argued also in respect of themselves. That being corporeal so that they could not apprehend God Abstractly, they must needs have something Sensible, to excite and raise up their devotion to fix their Imagination upon. Joseph Albo in the Book called Ikkarim, concludes that Abab and the other Idolatrous Kings of Israel and Jude worshipped other Gods upon those two accounts mentioned by Maimonides & no otherwise, namely that the Supreme God was honoured worshipping of his Ministers, and that there ought to be certain Middles and Mediators between him and Men, &c.
Ahab and other Kings of Israel and Judah, and even Solomon himself, erred in worshipping the Stars upon those two accounts already mentioned of Maimonides, notwithstanding that they believed the Existence of God and his Unity; they partly conceiving that they should honour God by worshipping his Ministers, and partly worshipping them as Mediators between God and themselves. And the same Writer determines the meaning of that First Commandment (which is to him the Second) Thou shalt have no other Gods before my face, to be this, not to set up any Inferior Gods as Mediators between me and myself, or worship them so, as thinking to honour me thereby. R. David Kimchi (upon 2 Kings 17.) writeth thus, concerning that Israelitish priest, who by the King of Assyria's command, was sent to Samaria to teach the new inhabitants thereof to worship the God of that land (of whom it is afterwards said, that they both feared the Lord and served their Idols;) to have altogether prohibited them their Idolatry, they would not have hearkened to him, that being a thing which all those Eastern people were educated in from their very Infancy, insomuch that it was a kind of First Principle to them. Wherefore he permitted them to worship all their several Gods, as before they had done, only he required them to direct the intention of their minds to the God of Israel (as the supreme) for those Gods could do them neither Good nor Hurt, otherwise than according to his Will and pleasure: but they worshipped them this purpose, that they might be MEDIATORS between them and the Creator. In the Book Nitzachon, all the Polytheism and Idolatry of the Pagans, is reduced to these Three Heads; First, when they worshipped the Ministers of God, as thinking to honour him thereby; and Secondly, when they worshipped three Heads or Statues of wood and stone, for memorials of him. And though it be true that Izaak Abrahanel (upon 2 Kings 17.) does enumerate more Species of Pagan Idolatry, even ten, yet are they all of them but so many several Idols of Creature-worship; and there is no such thing amongst them to be found, as the worshipping of many Unmade Independent Beities, as Partial Creators of the World.

Moreover those Rabbinick Writers commonly interpret certain passages of the Scripture to this sense, That the Pagan Idolaters, notwithstanding, acknowledge, One Supreme Deity, as that Jericho 10.7. Who is there that will not fear thee, thou King of Nations? For all their Idols, both the wife men and in all their Kingdoms, there is none like thee; though they are become all together brutish, and their worshipping of stocks is a doctrine of vanity: For Maimonides thus glosseth on those Words, "As if he should say, all the Gentiles..."
tiles know, that thou art the only Supreme God, but their error and folly consisteth in this, that they think this vanity of worshipping Inferior Gods, to be a thing agreeable to thy will. And thus also Kimchi in his Commentaries.

Upon dm incettfe those who worship Idols, should fear thee, for thou art their King; and indeed amongst all the wisemen of the Nations and in all their Kingdoms it is generally acknowledged, that there is none like unto thee. Neither do they worship the Stars otherwise, than as Mediators between thee and them. Their wise men know, that an Idol is nothing; and though they worship Stars, yet do they worship them, as thy Ministers, and that they may be Intercessors for them. Another place is that, Malachi 1. 11. which though we read in the Future Tenfe, as a Prophecy of the Gentiles, yet the Jews understand it of that present time, when those words were written. From the rising of the Sun to the going down thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure oblation, for my name is great amongst the Gentiles, faith the Lord of Hosts. But ye prophane it, &c. Upon which words R. Solomon glosseth thus, מי שומע ידין שואת, ואמרו כל שמה על כל בלבך,emento mecum, nisi ait ait hebreo The Pagan Polye thesfs and Idolaters Know, that there is One God Superior to all those other Gods and Idols worshipped by them; and in every place are there Free-will-offerings, brought to my name, even amongst the Gentiles. And Kimchi agreeeth with him herein, אף על פי שסרוגו על 名ך זה לא יзнא והשחתות אף על פי האמור, Although the Pagans worshipped the Host of Heaven, yet do they confess me to be the first Cause, they worshipp ing them only as in their opinion certain Mediators between me and them. Whether either of these two places of Scripture, does sufficiently prove, what these Jews would have, or no; yet however it is evident from their interpretations of them; that themselves suppos ed, the Pagans to have acknowledged, One Supreme Deity, and that their Other Gods, were all but his Creatures and Ministers. Never the less there is another place of Scripture which seems to found more to this purpose, and accordingly hath been thus interpreted by Rabbi Solomon and others, Psal. 65. 6, where God is called מעשה כפ ה' באים דברי him. The Confidence of all the Ends of the Earth, and of them that are afar off in the Sea, that is, even of all the Pagan World.

Thus we see plainly, that the Hebrew Doctors and Rabbins, have been generally of this persuasion, that the Pagan Nations anciently at least the Intelligent amongst them, acknowledged One Supreme God of the Whole World; and that all their Other Gods were but Creatures and Inferior Ministers; which were worshipped by them upon these Two Accounts, either as thinking, that the Honour done to them redounded to the Supreme; or else that the might be vanitas mundi, and, their Ministers, and Intercessors, Orators, and Negotiators with him. Which Inferior God
of the Pagans, were supposed by these Hebrews, to be chiefly of Two Kinds, Angels, and Stars or Spheres. The Latter of which the Jews as well as Pagans, concluded to be Animated and Intellectual:

For thus Maimonides expressly, מְבַטְעַתּוּ מַעְרֵא לָכֵל בֵּעֵרוּ מְשָׁר וַתַּעֲדֵהוּ וַתַּעֲדֵהוּ וַתַּעֲדֵהוּ אַשָּׁר הָיָה הָזָּה לָכֵל וַתַּעֲדֵהוּ, The Stars and Spheres are every one of them Animated, and endowed with Life, Knowledge and Understanding. And they acknowledge him, who commanded and the World was made, everyone of them, according to their degree and excellency praising and honouring him, as the Angels do. And this they would confirm from that place of Scripture, Neh. 9. 6. Thou, even thou art Lord alone, Thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Host, the Earth with all things that are therein, the Seas and all that is therein, and Thou preferrest them all; and the Host of Heaven Worshippest Thee: The Host of Heaven being commonly put for the Stars.

XXXI. But Lastly, this same thing is plainly confirmed from the Scriptures of the New Testament also; That the Gentiles and Pagans, however Polytheists and Idolaters, were not unacquainted with the knowledge of the True God, that is, of the One only Self-existent and Omnipotent Being, which Comprehendeth all things under him. From whence it must needs follow, that their other Many Gods, were all of them supposed to have been derived from this One, and to be Dependent on him.

For First, St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans tells us, that those Gentiles or Pagans didastonishingly hold the Truth in Unrighteousness, or Unjustly Detain and Imprison the same. Which is chiefly to be understood, of the Truth concerning God, as appears from that which follows, and therefore the Pagans not to have been unfurnished of such a knowledge of God, as might and ought to have kept them from all kinds of Idolatry; however by their Default, it proved ineffectual to that end, as is afterwards declared, 6. οι δεκαλοσια οδοι και οδοι ουκ εξελευον, They liked not to retain God visible to the Agnostics, or Practical Knowledge of him. Where there is a distinction to be observed, betwixt γνῶσις and θεωρίας, the Knowledge and the Agnition of God; the former whereof in this chapter, is plainly granted to the Pagans, though the Latter be here omitted; because they lapsed into Polytheism and Idolatry, which is the meaning of these words, ματαιωθας τινι αληθειας τις θειες, They changed the Truth of God into a Lie. Again the Apostle there affirmeth, That the θειες φανεροι εκ των των τοσα, That which may be Known of God, was manifest within them, and himself having showed it unto them. There is something of God Unsearchable and Incomprehensible by all Mortals, butth at of God which is NOWABLE, his Eternal Power and Godhead, with the Attributes belonging thereunto, is made manifest to all mankind, from his works. The invisible things of him, from the Creation of the World, being clearly seen and understood by the things that are made. Moreover this Apostle expresseth, the Pagans to have known God, in that Censure which he
hagieveth of them, ἣν γαρ τὸν Ἐβραϊκόν, ὥς ἄλλον ἐξόντως, that when they knew God they glorified him not as God; because they fell into Polytheism and Idolatry. Though the Apostle here inculceth only in the Latter of those two, their changing the glory of the Incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man and to birds and beasts and creeping things. The reason whereof is, because this idolatry of the Pagans, properly so called, is that, is their worshipping of stocks and stones, formed into the likeness of man or beast, was generally taken amongst the Jews, for the grosser of all their

De Decal. p. 753. Religious Miscearrages. Thus Philo plainly declareth; οὕτω μὴ ήλθεν καὶ οἵεις, καὶ ἦν ὑπερήφανος, καὶ οἷον πρόπολον τῇ καὶ ἔλεος, ἔκκαιρος χάραξεν μέν (ποὺ ἔστω, τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἱεράς σημαίνων); θέλειτο ὃ τὸν ἄνθρωπον παρακάτου, καὶ ἔδειξεν καὶ λίθος, ἐξαγαγόν τῇ καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρωποὺς Θεός, μεροφείσθης. &c. Wherefore worship the Sun, and Moon, and the whole Heaven, and World, and the chief Parts thereof, as Gods, do unquestionably Err (they honouring the subjects of the Prince) but they are guilty of left iniquity and injustice, than those who form wood and stone, gold and silver, and the like matters, into statues to worship them, &c. of which affersion he afterwards gives this account, τῇ ναῷ καλλίτις οὓς ὑποίπτευσαν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς παρεκκλήσεως, because these have cut out the most excellent Fulcrum of the Soul, the persuasion of the Everliving God, by means whereof, like unballasted ships, they are tossed up and down perpetually, nor can be ever able to rest in any safe harbour. And from hence it came to pass, that the Polytheism of the Pagans, their worshipping of inferior Gods (as Stars and Demons) was vulgarly called also by the Jews and Christians, Idolatry, it being so denominated by them a sambosor specie. Lastly, the Apostle plainly declares, that the error of the Pagan Superstitition universally consisted (not in worshipping Many Independent Gods and Creators, but) in joyning creature-worship, as such, some way or other, with the worship of the Creator; τοῦ ἐκείνου καὶ ἄλλων πάντων τοῦ ἄνθρωπος θαύματον, which words are either to be thus rendred; They [religiously] worshipped the creature besides the Creator, that Preposition being often used in this sense, as for example, in this of Aristophanes, where he affirmer concerning Plato, that he did τὸν ἐποίειν τὰς ἀριστοτείλικας τῆς προφυσικῆς παράτιν, (not make Numbers to be the Things themselves, as the Pythagoreans had done,) but Unity and Numbers to be besides the things, or τὸς ἀριστοτείλικας τῶν προφυσικῶν παράτιν, Numbers to exist by themselves, besides the sensible. He by Numbers meaning, as Aristophanes himself the expounds it, τὸ ἐποίηκα τινὰς ἑξήμορφας τῆς ἐποίηκα τῶν προφυσικῶν παράτιν, those Ideas, contained in the First Intelligence (which was Plato's Second Divine Hypothesis, as also by τὸν ἐποίηκα τῶν προφυσικῶν παράτιν, Numbers to exist by themselves, besides the sensible, that Ipsum Unum, or Unity which gives being to these Ideas, is understood Plato's First Divine Hypothesis. Or else the Words ought to be translated thus; And worshipped the Creator above or more than the Creator, that Preposition being sometimes used comparatively, so as to signify Excess, as for example in Luke 13. 2. Think you that these Galileans were sühmumophai παρά ὑποίπτευσα τοῖς ἑαυτοῖς, Sinners beyond all the Galileans? And ver. 4. Think you, that those eighteen upon whom the Tower of Siloam fell, were sühmumophai παρά ὑποίπτευσα debts above all the men that dwelt in Jerusalem. Accord
Neither of which interpretations, it is supposed, that the Pagans did worship the True God, the Creator of the whole World; though they worshipped the Creature also, besides him, or (perhaps in some sense) above him and more than him also. But as for that other interpretation, of which Beza chose rather to follow, that they worshipped the Creature, the Creator being wholly PASSED BY, this no true Literal Version, but only a Gloss or Commentary upon the words, made according to a certain preconceived and extravagant opinion, that the Pagans did not at all worship the Supreme God or Creator, but universally transfer all their worship upon the creature only. But in what fence the Pagans might be said to worship the Creatures, above or beyond or more than the Creator (because it is not possible that the Creature, as a Creature, should be worshipped with more Internal and Mental Honour, than the Creator herself, look'd upon as such) we leave others to enquire. Whether no, because when Religious Worship, which properly and only belongeth to the Creator, and not at all to the Creature, is transferred from the Creator upon the Creature, according to a Scripture-interpretation and Account, such may be said to worship the Creature more than the Creator? Or whether because some of these Pagans, more frequently address their Devotions to their Inferior Gods (as Stars, Demons and Hero's) as thinking the Supreme God, other above their Worship, or Incomprehensible, or Inaccessible by them? Or lastly, Whether because the Image and Statue-worshippers among the Pagans (whom the Apostle there principally regards) did direct all their External Devotion to sensible objects, and creaturely forms? However it cannot be thought, that the Apostle here taxes the Pagans, meekly for worshipping Creatures above the Creator, as if they had not at all offended, had they worshipped them only in an Equality with him; but doubtless their sins, that they gave any Religious Worship at all to the Creature, though in way of aggravation of their crime, it be said, that they also worshipped the Creature more than the Creator. Thus we see plainly that the Pagan Superstition and Idolatry (according to the True Scripture notion of it) consisteth not in Worshipping of Many Creatures, but in Worshipping the Creatures together with the Creator.

Besides this we have in the Acts of the Apostles an Oration, which Paul made at Athens in the Areopagitick Court, beginning after this manner; To men of Athens, I perceive that ye are every way more ordinarily Religious; for the word SUPERSCRIPTURAS seems to be there in a good sense, it being not only more likely that St. Paul would in the beginning of his Oration thus capture benevolently, conciliate their benevolence, with some commendation of them, it also very unlikely that he would call their worshipping of the God by way of Superstition, for so it followeth: For as I pleaded, and beheld your sacred things (or monuments) I found an Altar with this inscription, ΑΓΑΘΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. It is true that both Philostratus and Panasius write, that there were at Athens, ΑΓΑΘΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ, Altars of Unknown Gods: but their meaning in this might well be, not that there were Altars Dedicated
Dedicated to Unknown Gods Plurally, but that there were several Altars, which had this Singular Inscription, **TO THE UNKNOWN GOD.** And that there was at least one such, besides this, Scripture-record, is evident from that Dialogue in Lucian’s Works, entitled *Philopatris,* where Critias uteth this form of Oath,  

\[ \text{Νῦ Ἀγάπη τω Θεстве, Νῦ by the Unknown God at Athens: and Triplion in the close of that Dialogue speaketh thus,} \]

\[ \text{ሥ 않은} \text{Unknown God.} \]

But we have found out that Unknown God at Athens, and worshipped him, with hands stretched up to Heaven, will give thanks to him, as having been thought worthy to be made subject to this power. Which passages, as they do unquestionably refer to that Athenian Inscription either upon one or more Altars, so does the latter of them plainly imply, that this Unknown God of the Athenians, was the Supreme Governor of the World. And so it follows in St. Paul’s Oration,  

\[ \text{ὅν ἐν ἀγαπεῖτε δεσπότης, τὸν ἰδίᾳ καταφέρναι ὑπὸ, whom therefore you ignorantly worship (under this name of the Unknown God) Him declare unto you, the God that made the World, and all things in it, the Lord of Heaven and Earth.} \]

From which place we may upon firm Scripture-Authority conclude these Two Things; First, that by the Unknown God of the Athenians, was meant the Only True God, He who made the World and all things in it, and who in all probability was therefore styled by them, Ἄγαπετος Θεός, the Unknown God, because he is not only Invisible but also Incomprehensible by mortals; of whom Josephus against Appion writeth thus, That he is θεὸς ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς, ὁποῖος ἦν ἦλθεν ἄγαπετος, knownable to us only by the Effects of his Power, but as to his own Essence, Unknowable or Incomprehensible. But when in Dion Cassius the God of the Jews is said to be ἅγιος καὶ σωτήρ, not only Invisible but also Ineffable, and when he is called in Lucan *Incurrit Deus, an Uncertain God,* the reason hereof seems to have been, not only because there was no Image of him, but also because he was not vulgarly the known by any Proper Name, the Tetragrammaton—being religiously born amongst the Jews in common use, that it might not be profaned. And what some learned men have here mentioned upon this occasion, of the Pagans sometimes sacrificing ἱερεῖα ἡμῖν to the Proper and Convenient God, without signifying any name seems to be nothing to this purpose; that proceeding only from Superfluous Fear of these Pagans (supposing several Gods to please over several things) lest they should be mistaken, in not applying to the Right and Proper God, in such certain cases, and so their Devotion prove unsuccessful and ineffectual. But that this Unknown God is here said to be ignorantly worshipped by the Athenians, is to be understood chiefly in regard of their Polytheism and idolatry. The second thing that may be concluded from hence is this, That the Athenian Pagans, did δεσποτίζον, Religiously Worship the True God, the Lord of Heaven and Earth; and so we have a Scripture-conformation all of that opinion, That the Pagans did not at all worship the Supreme God.

Laftly, St. Paul citing this passage out of *Aratus* a Heathen Poet, concerning Zeus or Jupiter,
For we are his Offspring, and interpreting the fame of the True God, in whom we live and move and have our being; we have also here a plain Scripture-acknowledgment that by the Zeus of the Greekish Pagans, was sometimes at least meant the True God. And indeed that Aratus his Zeus was neither a man born in Crete nor in Arcadia, but the Maker and Supreme Governor of the whole World, is evident both from the antecedent and the subsequent Veris. For Aratus his Phenomena begin thus.

'Er Δίος άριστομάκοι ———

(which in Tully's Version is Ab Jove Musarum Primordia) and then follows a Description of this Zeus or Jupiter:

'Ο τοι φίλον έμφασις εγνήσι
'Αφέντων' μεγαλί' τιος πάσης μεγάλη αρχή,
πάσης τις άνθρώπων άρχης μεγάλη τώ' Σαλικαντα,
και της άριστος πάση ί Δίος πατρίμιμος πάσης'.
Τώ τέχνα ο' άριστος ισόπλη.

'o this sense; Him of whom we men are never silent; and of whom all things are full, being permeating and pervading all and being where, and hence benefit, we all constantly make use of and enjoy. For we also are his Offspring. Where Theon the Scholiast writeth thus, πά́ντα περιοδος φησίν άρχης τιος άρχης μεγάλη Σαλικαντα, τις παλέργων τούτων και δυνατής, Δίαν, οί πρώτους περιορισμών: Δίά την άριστος πατρίμιμος άριστος'. Aratus being about to declare the Position of the Stars, doth in the first place, very decorously and becomingly invoke Zeus, the Father and Maker of all. For by Zeus is here to be understood the Demiurgus of the World, as he afterwards expresseth it, οί των πατρίς δυνατιστας Θεός, the God who made all things. Notwithstanding which, we must confesse, that is Scholiast there adds, that some of these Passages of the poet, and even that cited by the Apostle, τώ τέχνα ο' άριστος, may be understood also in another sense, of the ζης φωσκόης, the Physical Jupiter, that is, the Air: but without the least shadow of Probability, for no other reason, as we conceive, but only to shew his Physiological Skill. However this is set down by him, in the First place the genuine and proper sense of these words, περιοδος φησίν άρχης μεγάλη, is άριστων των περιορισμών: περιοδος τού των ανθρώπων μεγάλης, τις αν και κυριακωμισθείς, ούτε παλέργων των δυνατών πατριμιμοί. This agreeeth with that Title of Jupiter, when he is called the Father of Gods and Men: For if he be made Us, and all these other things for our use, we may well be called His, and also style him our Father and Maker, and that this was the only Notion, which the Poet here had of Zeus or Jupiter, appears undeniably also from the following words, as
Who as a kind and benign Father, beareth lucky Signs to men; which to understand of the Air were very absurd. And

"Auteo, οδύς σίμμονς εν ὤφελος ἐσφαλέων,
"Ἀφεξιπαθων ἑνεκειλο γας ἐς ὅλωστιν Ἄρπες".

For he also hath adorned the Signs in Heaven, distinguishing Constellations, and having appointed Stars to rise and set at several times of the year.

And from this,

Τῷ μὲν ἀεὶ πραγμόν τι ἐνίοτεν ἦλπισκοίην,

Therefore is He always Propitiated and Placated both First and Last. Upon which the Scholiast thus, ἵνας ἄντι τοῦ σταυροῦ τῆς τῶν μὲν πράξεως σταυρίων ἐναι Σταυρόν ἐργάντων, ἐπὶ ἡμῶν, ἐπὶ τῷ ποιμνί δι' ὑποδύσεως. This perhaps refers to the Libations, in that the First of them was for the Heavenly Gods, the Second for Heroes, and the Last for Jupiter the Saviour. From whence it plainly appears also, that the Pagans in their Sacrifices (or Religious Rites) did not forget Jupiter the Saviour, that is, the Supreme God.

Lastly, from his concluding thus;

καὶ τῶν μᾶς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς, μὴ ἀνέφηπτον ἐνεκρῷ.

Where the Supreme God is saluted, as the Great Wonder of the World, and Interest of Mankind.

Wherefore it is evident from Aratus his Context, that by his Zeus or Jupiter was really meant the Supreme God, the Maker of the whole World; which being plainly confirmed also by St. Paul an the Scripture, ought to be a matter out of Controversie amongst us. Neither is it reasonable to think that Aratus was Singular in this but that he spake according to the Received Theology of the Greek and that not only amongst Philosophers & Learned Men, but even the Vulgar also. Nor do we think that that Prayer of the ancient Athenian, commended by M. Antoninus, for its Simplicity, is to be understood otherwise, "εὐτυχος ὄς ὄψιν ζει, ζητήσετε την ἀφίξην, καὶ ἀπόλλυσιν ἐναθέτωσιν, θανίτις θεραπεύσιν, τὴν ἀλλήλους ἀλληλούς, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν θείον πείθην." Rain Rain 0 Good (or Graciously) Jupiter, upon the fields and pastures of the Athenians: upon which the Emperor thus, ὑποτελείς ὂς ὄψιν ἀπόλλυς, ἀπέλαθον ἐναθέτωσιν, We should either not pray at all (to God) or else thus plainly and freely. And since the Latins had the very fame Notion of Jupiter, that the Greeks had of Zeus, it cannot be denied but that they commonly by their Jupiter also, understood the One Supreme God, the Lord of Heaven and Earth. We know nothing that can be objected against this, from the Scripture, unless should be that Passage of St. Paul. In the Wisdom of God the Worly Wisdom knew not God. But the meaning thereof is no other th
this, that the Generality of the World before Christianity, by their Natural Light, and Contemplation of the works of God, did not attain to such a Practical Knowledge of God, as might both free them from Idolatry, and Effectually bring them to a Holy Life.

XXXII. But in order to a fuller explication of this pagan theology, and giving yet a more Satisfactory Account concerning it, there are Three Heads requisite to be infifted on; First, That the Intelligent Pagans worshipped the One Supreme God under Many Several Names; Secondly, That besides this One God, they worshipped also Many Gods, that were indeed Inferior Deities Subordinate to Him; Thirdly, That they worshipped both the Supreme and Inferior Gods, in Images, Statues and Symbols, sometimes Abusively called also Gods. We begin with the First, That the Supreme God among the Pagans, was Polyonymous, and worshipped under several Personal Names, according to several Notions and Considerations of him, from his Several Attributes and Powers, Manifefitations, and Effects in the World.

It hath been already observed out of Origen, that not only the Egyptians, but alo the Syrians, Persians, Indians, and other Barbarian Pagans, had beside their Vulgar Theology, another more Arcane and Recondite one, amongst their Priests and Learned Men: and that the same was true concerning the Greeks and Latins also, is unquestionably evident from that account, that hath been given by us of their Philosophick Theology. Where by the Vulgar Theology of the Pagans, we understand, not only their Mystical or Fabulous, but also their political or Civil Theology, it being truly affirmed by St. Austin concerning both these, Et Civilis & Fabulosa, ambæ Fabulosa sunt, ambæque cæ. Novile, That both the Fabulous Theology of the Pagans was in part their Civil, and their Civil was Fabulous. And by their more Arcane or Recondite Theology, is doubtfles meant, that which they conceived to be the Natural and True Theology. Which Distinction of the Natural and True Theology, from the Civil and Political, as it was acknowledged by all the Ancient Greek Philosophers, but most expressly by Aristotle, Plato, and the Stoicks; so was it owned and much infifted upon, both by Scaevola that famous Roman Pontiffex, and by Tertullian that most Learned Antiquary; they both agreeing, that the ievil Theology then establisht by the Roman Laws, was only the Theology of the Vulgar, but not the True; and that there was another theology besides it, called by them Natural, which was the Theology of the Men and of Truth: nevertheless granting a necessity that in Cities and Commonwealths, besides this Natural and True Theology (which the generality of the Vulgar were uncapable of) there should be another Civil or Political Theology, accommodate to their apprehensions; which Civil Theology differ'd from the Natural, only by a certain mixture of Fabulosity in it, and was therefore look'd upon by them, as a Middle, betwixt the Natural, and the Fabulous or Poetical Theology.

Wherefore it was acknowledged, that the Vulgar Theology of the Pagans, that is, not only their Fabulous, but even their Civil also, was
was oftentimes very discrepant from the Natural and True Theology; though the wise men amongst them in all ages, endeavoured as much as they could, to difsemble and disguise this Difference, and by Allegorizing the Poetick Fables of the Gods, to bring that Theology, into some seeming conformity with the Natural, and Philo
tick; but what they could not in this way reconcile, was by them excused upon the necessity of the Vulgar.

The Fabulous Theology both of the Greeks and Romans, did not only Generate all the other Gods, but even Jupiter himself also, their Supreme Numen, it assigning him both a Father and a Mother, a Grandfather and a Grandmother. And though the Romans did not plainly adopt this into their Civil Theology, yet are they taxed by St. Austin for suffering the Statue of Jupiter's Nurse to be kept in the Capitol for a Religious Monument. And however this differ'd nothing at all from that Atheistick Doctrine of Evemerus, That all the Gods were really no other than Mortal Men, yet was it tolerated and connived at by the Politicians, in way of necessary compliance with the Vulgar, it being so extremely difficult for them to conceive any such Living Being or Animal, as was never Made and without Beginning. Insomuch that Callimachus, who would by no means admit of Jupiter's Sepulchre, either in Crete or Arcadia (but look'd upon it as a foul reproach to him) for this reason,

Because he was Immortal and could never die; did notwithstanding himself, attribute a Temporary Generation and Nativity to him, as Origen and others obferve. Nevertheless, the generality of the more Civilized and Intelligent Pagans, and even of the Poets themselves, did this while constantly retain thus much of the Natural and True Theology amongst them. That Jupiter was the Father both of Gods and Men, that is, the Maker of the whole World, and consequently himself Without Father, Eternal and Unmade, according to that Pela
dean Oracle before cited out of Pausianus,

Again the Civil Theology of the Pagans as well as the Poetick, had not only many Phantastick Gods in it, but also an appearance of a Plurality of Independent Deities; it making Several Supreme in their several Territories and Functions; as One to be the Chief Ruler over the Heavens, Another over the Air and Winds, Another over the Sea and Another over the Earth and Hell: One to be the Giver of Corn. Another of Wines One the God of Learning. Another the God of Plea
sure, and Another the God of War; and so for all other things. But the Natural Theology of the Pagans (so called) though it did admit a Plurality of Gods too, in a certain sense, that is, of Inferior Deities Subordinate to One Supreme, yet did it neither allow of more Inde
pendent Deities than One, nor own any Gods at all but such as were Natural, that is, such as had a Real Existence in Nature and the World

without
Chap. IV. Their Real and Natural Gods.

without, and not in men's opinion only. And these Varro concluded, to be noother than First, the Soul of the World, and then the Animated Parts thereof Superior to men; that is, One Supreme Universal Numen Unmade, and other Particular Generated Gods, such as Stars, Demons, and Heroes. Wherefore all the other Gods besides these, are frequently exploded by Pagan Writers (as Cicero and others) under the Name of Div Poetici, that is, not Philosophical, but Poetical Gods, and Div Commentitii and Fictitious, that is, not Natural and Real, but Fcnged and Fictitious Gods. They in the meantime giving his Account of them, that they were indeed nothing else, but so many Several Names and Notions of One Supreme Numen, according to his Several Powers and various Manifestations, and Effects in the World; it being thought fit by the wisdom of the ancient Pagan Theologers, that all those manifold Glories and Perfections of the Deity, should not be huddled up, and as it were crowded and rumpled together, in one General Acknowledgment of an Invisible being the Maker of the world, but that they should be distinct and severally displayed, and each of them adored singly and apart; and this too (for the greater Pomp and Solemnity) under so many personal Names. Which perhaps the Unskilful and fortiith Vulgar, might sometimes mistake, not only for so many Real and Substantial, but also Independent and Self-existent Deities.

We have before proved that one and the same Supreme God, in the Egyptian Theology, had several Proper and Personal Names given, according to several Notions of him, and his several Powers and Peculies; Jamblichus himself in that passage already cited, plainly af-

firms thus much, 'ὅ ἡμεροειδῆς οὐ, ὡς, ἡς. τῷ ἥραρίλῃ τὰ κανόνημαν λέων δύναιν θέως ἀξιων, ἄλατον ἂν τῷ ἴπτι ἐνεργειών γιάλοισαν λεγόμενα, συντικλάσαν ἐν αἰώνι εἴσαιν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς παντοθένους ἐν ὁμολογίας καὶ φανάρις, γιὰκαὶ ἐν τῇ περιποίησι ἢν ἐν τῇ παλαιαῖς τῇ τοῦ παλαιαῖς καὶ ἑαυτος ἑαυτίας ἐκεῖνη The Desigual Mind and President of Truth, as with wisdom it procecdeth to generation, and bringeth forth the hidden Power of the occult Reasons, contained within itself, into light, is called in the Egyptian Language Numon, as it Artificially effects all things with Truth, Phtha; as it is productive of Good things Ofirs, besides which it hath also several other names, according to its other Powers and Energies; as namely Neith (according to Proclus his Copy Neithes, Neithas) the Tutelar God of the City Sais, from whence probably the Greek Athis was derived, (the Egyptians being said to have been at first a Colony of these Sais,) this is The Divine Wisdom diffusing itself self thorough all. So likewise rapisp, which though some would have to be the Sun, is by others only described as an Universal Numen. As Arisides, in his Eighth O-
are divided, and some of them are invoked for one thing, and
some for another; this is look'd upon by them as the Coryphaeus
of all the Gods, who contains the beginning and end of all
things, and who is able to supply all wants. Cneoph is also described
by Eusebius as that Divine Intellect, which was the Demiurgus of
the world and which giveth life to all things, as he is by Plutarch laid to be Ægaios or Unmade, so that this was also another
Egyptian Name of God; as likewise was Emped and Eidon in Janus
blitches; though these may be severally distinguished into: Trinity of Divine Hypostases. Lastly, when Isis, which was some
times called Multimammae, and made all over full of Breathe, to
ifie her Feeding all things, thus describes her self in Apuleius, Sum
ma Numinum, Prima Calitum, Deorum Severumque Facies Uniformis
et vnus nomen Unicum multiforme species; ritu variis, nomine multijungo totum veneratur Orbis; as she plainly makes her self to be the Supreme Deity
so doth the Intimate, that all the Gods & Goddefses were comprehended'
contented in Her Alone, and that she (i.e. the Supreme God) was worshiped
under several personal Names & with different rites, over the who
Pagan World. Moreover this is particularly noted concerning the Egyptians by Damaclius the Philosopher, that, to worth Olympian and be called
Divine God, he usually called Apollo, and, therefore this Epithet of Πολυνυμeus commonly given to him, i.e. God with many Names. Which many Proper Names of his, Macrobius
insinueth upon in his Saturnalia, though probably making more of
them than indeed they were. And the Moon was not only so called,
but also Diana, and Lucina, and Hecate, and otherwise, in so much that
this Goddef also, hath been stiled Polyonymous as well as her brother
the Sun. AndLastly, the Earth besides those Honorary Titles of
Boa Dea, and Magna Dea, and Mater Deorum, The Good Goddef, and
the Great Goddef, and the Mother of the Gods, was multiplied by
them into those Many Goddefses, of Vesta, and Rhea, and Cybele, id.
Ceres, and Proserpina, and Ops, &c. And for this cause was the text
described by Αεθυλος,

Και ταυτα πολλαι ουμακοι χρυσομεμφθητα

Et Tellus Multorum Nominum Facies Una.

Now if these Inferiour Gods of the Pagans, had each of them so
many Personal Names bestowed upon them, much more might the Supreme
God be Polyonymous amongst them; and so indeed he was commonly
stiled, as that learned Grammarian Hesychius intimates, upon that
Amongst the Pagans.

word polœanswv, πῶς μονάδα ἵναις εἰκαλεῖ, καὶ Ἡλιοῦ 'Ἀπολλων', they called the Monad thus, and it was also the Epithet of Apollo; whereas by the Monad according to the Pythagorick Language, is meant the supreme Deity, which was thus styled by the Pagans πολνάων, the being that hath many Names. And accordingly Cleanthes thus beginning that forseid Hymn of his to him,

κοῦσ' ἀλακτόν, πολνάων,

thus most Glorious of all the Immortal Gods, who are called by many Names. And Zeno his Master, in Laertius expressly declareth, ο θεὸς πολλῶν περιγραφής ἰδιαίτερον καὶ τὸς δυνάμεις. God is called by many several Names, according to his several Powers and Vertues, whose Instan
ces shall be afterwards taken notice of. Thus also the Writer De Mundo,

δύναμες τὸς πολυανοὺς ἂν, καθώς μὴ χρῆνας τὸν τείνεi παθίν αὐτῶν νομισμ

god though he be but one, is polyonymous, and variously denominated from several attributes, and the effects produced by him. Quae

νοεῖται, Καθέναν rerum continentium. Tot Appellationes ejus possum esse

votis (f parts Seneca) illi Propria Nomina aptatis, vim aliquam Es

De Beo. L. i.

domi; Caesariam rerum continentiam. Tot Appellationes ejus possunt esse

votis Munera: You may give God whatsoever Proper Names you please, so

by signifies some force and effect of Heavenly things: He may have as many

omas, as he hath Manifestations, Offices and Gifts. Macrobius also, from

the Authority of Virgil, thus determines, Unius Dei Effetti Varios pro

viriis confendos esse (or as Vossius corrects it, Censeri) Numinibus, That

in Various Effects of one God, were taken for several Gods; that is,

expressed by several Personel Names; as he there affirmeth, the Di

vers Vertues of the Sun, to have been Names to Divers Gods; because

they gave occasion for the Sun, to be called by several Proper and

Personal Names. We shall conclude with that of Maximus Ca

urens, before cited out of St. Austin, Hujus Virtutes per Muni

sum Opus diffusus, Nos multis vocabulis invocamus, quoniam No

cen ejus Proprium ignoramus. Ita fit ut dum ejus quasi quaedam

embra carptim variis supplicationibus prosequimur, Totam colere pro

To videamur. The Vertues of this One Supreme God, diffused throughout

the whole World, we (Pagans) invoke under many several Names, be

cause we are ignorant what his Proper Name is. Wherefore we thus wor

shipping his several Divided Members; must needs be judged to wor

ship him Whole, we leaving out nothing of him. With which Latter

ords feemeth to agree, that of the Poet, wherein Jupiter thus be

ceaks the other Gods,

Cælicole, Mea Membra, Dei; quos Nostra Poteftas;
Officiis divina faciit.

there it is plainly intimated, that the Many Pagan Gods were but

e several Divided Members of the One Supreme Deity, whether be

ne according to the Stoical Sense, the Real and Natural Gods, were

but Ports of the Mundane Soul; or else because all those other

antastic Gods, were nothing but several Personal Names, given to

the several Powers, Vertues, and Offices of the One Supreme:

Now
Now the Several Names of God, which the Writer De Mundo in
anceth in, to prove him Polyonymus, are first of all such as these
begindat & 'agendeps The Thunderer and Lightner, "Hs. The
Giver of Rain, 'emakdps The Bestower of Fruits, ounos The Keeper
of Cities, 'majir The Mild and Placable, under which Notion
they sacrificed no Animals to him, but only the Fruits of the Earth
which he blessed with many other such epithets, as thiiies, ziiies,
'te epaipieska, 'ka,kephas, 'pelamwades, &c. and Lastly he is called
'swet and 'eldakies, 'savior and Asfertour. Answerably to which
Jupiter had many such Names given him also by the Latins, as Vistam
Invictus, Opitulus, Stator; the True meaning of which last, (accord-
ing to Seneca) was not that which the Hylarians pretend, quod pot
Votum suscepsit, acies Romanorum suffentium stetit, because once after
Vows and Prayers offered to him, the Flying Army of the Romans
made to stand; sed quod fiant beneficio ejus Omnia, but because all
things by means of him Stand Firm and are Established. For which
same reason he was called also by them (as St. Austin informs us)
Centupedae, as it were, standing Firm upon an Hundred Feet, and
Gdiss the Beam, Prop, and Supporter of the World. He was styled also by the
Latins (amongst other Titles) Almus and Rumineus, i.e. He that nouris-
eth all things, as it were, with his Breasts. Again that Writer De Mundo
addeth another sort of Names, which God was called by; as 'Aris
Acad. Qua. Necessity, because he is an Immutable Essence, though Cicero gives an
other reason for that appellation, Interdum Deus Necessitatem appo-
lant, quia nihil aliter esse positit, atque ab eo consistantem sit; they som-
times call God Necessity, because nothing can be otherwise than as it is
Him appointed. Likewise 'i,mac@pou, because all things are by him con-
nected together, and proceed from him unbiinderably. "Nepo@p, he
cause all things in the world are determined, and nothing left Infin-
ity of Undetermined) being, because, he makes an apt Division and Dis-
tribution of all things. 00@0, because his Power is such, that no one can possibly avoid or escape him. Lastly, that Ingenious Fable
(as he calls it) of the Three Fatal Sirens, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atrop,
according to him, meant nothing but God neither, asvhe 3 avned
the end of Time,oplous the Dest, kaiqodes o d yepesia xatov eia, All this is no
thing else but God, as the noble and generous Plato also intimates, will
be affirmed, God to contain the Beginning, and Middle, and End of all
things. And both Cicero and Seneca tell us, that amongst the Latins,
God was not only called Fatum, but also Nature, and Fortune. Qua
multa est Natura (faith Seneca) quam Deus, Divina Ratio, i.e.
Mundo & Partibus ejus infesta? What is Nature else, but God at
the Divine Reason, inserted into the Whole World and all its Sever-
Parts? He adding, that God and Nature, were no more Two Differ-
ent Things, than Annanus and Seneca. And Nonnumquam Deus (faith
Cicero) Fortunae appellant, quod efficiat multa improvida, & nec opinio
nobis, propter obsecratae ignorancea etaque Causam; They sometimes
call God also by the name of Fortune, because he surpriseth us in many
Events, and bringeth to pass things unexpected to us, by reason of the
Obscenity of Causes and our Ignorance. Seneca thus concludes conclu-
scing thefe, and the like Names of God, Omnia ejusdem Dei Nonna

The names, variantum in sua Potestate; these are all names of one and the same God, Various Manifestly his power.

But concerning most of these aforementioned names of God, and such as are like to them, it was rightly observed by St. Austin, that they had no such appearance or show of many distinct gods; for omnia cognomina impressione Deus, proper Canas Potestatesque diversas, non tamen proper tot res, etiam tot Deorum esse coegerunt, &c. Though the Pagans imposed all these several names upon one God, in respect of his several powers, yet did they not therefore, seem to make so many gods of them: as if Victor were one God, and Invictus another God, and Centupeda another God, and Tigillus another, and Ruminus another, &c. Wherefore there are other names of God used amongst the Pagans, which have a greater show and appearance of so many distinct deities, not only because they are proper names, but also because each of them had their peculiar temples appropriated to them, and their different rites of worship. Now these are of two sorts; first, such as signify the deity according to its universal, and all-comprehending nature; and secondly, such as denote the name only according to certain particular powers, manifestations, and effects of it in the world. Of the first kind there are not a few. For first of all, P A N, as the the very word plainly implies him to be a universal numen, and as he was supposed to be the harmonies of the whole world, or to play upon the world as a musical instrument, according to that of Orpheus (or onomacritus).

"A Vmosio v lsoioio vkeon filopolicymon molotu,

which we before showed, that by him the Arcadians and Greeks meant, not the corporeal world inanimate, nor yet as endowed with a sensible nature only, but as proceeding from an intellectual principle or divine spirit, which framed it harmoniously; and as being still in tune, acted and governed by the same. Which therefore is said to be the universal pastor and shepherd of all mankind, and of the whole world, according to that other Orphic passage,

A E c t s e u H u m a n u m G e n u s, a e sine limite Terram.

And this Pan, Socrates in Plato's Phædrus, plainly invokes as the supreme numen. Pan therefore, is the one only God (for there cannot possibly be more than one Pan, more than one All or universe) who contained all within himself, displayed all from himself, framing the world harmoniously, and who is in a manner all things.

Again J A NUS, whom the Romans first invoked in all their sacrifices and prayers, and who was never omitted, whatsoever God they sacrificed unto; was unquestionably many times taken for a universal numen, as in this of Martial,

Nitidique Sator pulcherrime mundi:
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And
And again in this of Ovid.

Quicquid ubique vides, Celum, Mare, Nubila, Terras,
Omnia sunt nostra claria patenteque Manu:
Me penes est Unum vesti Cycloodia Mundi.

From which passages it also appears, that Janus was not the
mer Senfles and Inanimate Matter of the World, but a Prin-
ciple Prefiding over it. And without doubt all the Beginnings o
things, were therefore referred to this Janus, because he was ac-
counted the moft Ancient God, and the Beginning of all things. St. An-
fin concluding him to be the fame with Jupiter, therefore quarrel
with the Pagans (that is, with their Civil Theology) for thus makin

forsum habent Tempula, forsuum Aras, diversa Sacra, dissimilia Simu-
lacula ? Si propere, quia alia vis ejf Primordiorum, alia Canfars,
ex illa Jani ex ifa Jovis nomen accepit : nonquid fimus homo in a
versis rebus duas habeam poteflates, aut duas artes, (quia singularum
verfae vis eft) idem Duo dicuntur Artifices &c. Since therefore Janu
is the World, and Jupiter is the World, and there is but one World, be
can Janus and Jupiter be Two Gods? Why have they their Temples
part, their Altars apart, diftind Sacred things, and Statues of differen
forms? If because the force of Beginnings is One, and the force of Ca
Another, he is therefore called Janus from the former, and Jupiter from
the latter ; I ask whether or no, if one Man have two Several arts and
different things, be therefore be to be called Two Artificers? Or is this
any more reafon, why one and the fame God, having Two Powers, is
over the Beginnings of things, and another over the Caufes, fhould
therefore be accounted Two Gods? Where when Jupiter and Je
nus are both faid to be the World, this is to be underftood
properly not of the Matter but the Soul or Mind of the World.

St. Autfin himself elsewhere declares, Sit Jupiter Corporei hujus Me
di Animus, qui univerfam ifiam Molem, ex quitum Elementa ef
fruiCam atque comparatam, implet & movet ; Let Jupiter be the Kid
of this corporal World, which both filleth and moveth that whole be
compounded and made up of the four Elements. Nevertheless as the
Soul and Body both together are called the Man, fo was the whole
Animated World, by the Pagans called God. Now the forement
ned Argumentation of St. Autfin, though it be good againft the pa
gans Civil Theology, yet their other Arcane and Natural Theology as
unconcerned in it, that plainly acknowledging all to be but One,
which for certain Reafons was worshipped under Several Names, ad
with Diferent Rites. Wherefore Janus and Jupiter, being really or
Diferent Names for One and the fame Supreme God, that confequent
of Salmafius feems very probable, that the Romans derived their
Janus from zanf, the Efolian Jupiter.

GENIUS was also another of the Twenty Select Roman Gods 8 that
this was likewise a Universal Nomen, containing the whole Name of
things, appears from this of Festus. Genium appellabant Deum, qui vix
obiter rerum omnium genendarum, etc. called that God, who hath the
power of begetting or producing all things. Genius. And St. Austin also
plainly declareth Genius to be the same with Jupiter, that is, to be but
another Name for the One Supreme God. Cum aut loco [Varro] dicit,
Genium esse Uno faciusque animum rationalis, salem antem Mund,
Annum Deum esse, ad hoc ideam utique revocat, ut tamquam Universa-
lis Deum, ipsis Mundi Animus esse creditur. Sis effigitur quern appellat
Jovem. And afterwards, Restat ut emm Singulariter & Excellenter di-
cantar Deum Genium, quam dicunt Mundi Animum; ac per hoc Jovem.
When Varro elsewhere calleth the Rational Mind of every one, a Genius,
and affirmeth such a Mind of the whole World, to be God; he plainly
implies, that God is the Universal Genius of the world, and that Gen-
ius and Jupiter are the same. And though Genius be sometime used for
the Mind of every man, yet the God Genius, spoken of by way of Ex-
cellency, can be no other than the Mind of the whole world, or Jupiter.

Again that CHRONOS or SATURN was no Particular Dei-
y, but the Universal Numen of the whole World, is plainly affirmed
by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, where commending the Fertility of
Italy, he writeth thus, "οὑς τινα παλαιοτάτην τος πολλας ιερευνοντων την Κρονον
Rom. An. L. τω την ανεκδοτικην την , τ ραυς κειεικας την, ειναι θεον διδοκομας
την, τη πανποριων ανδρονος:" or as he writeth of Genia,
την Κρονον ος Ρωμαιον, πασον τοιοων τις οικιοφατα τω τη κοιμων φιων, εν γενη
της ομοδοσας. Wherefore it is no wonder, if the Ancients thought
the Country to be sacred to Saturn, they supposing this God to be the
River and Perfection of all happiness to men; whether we ought to call
in Chronos as the Greeks will have it, or Cronos as the Romans; be-
ing either way such a God, as comprehends the Whole Nature of the
World. But the word Saturn was Hetrurian (which Language was
originally Oriental) and being derived from του ης signifies Hidden,
that by Saturn was meant, that Hidden Principle of the Universe
which containeth all things, and he was therefore called by the Ro-
mans Deus Latins, The Hidden God; as the wife of Saturn in the
ontific Books is Latis Saturni, and the Land it self (which in the
etrurian Language was Saturnia) is in the Roman Latium; from
hence the Inhabitants were called Latins, which is as much to say,
the Worshipers of the Hidden God. Moreover that Saturn
could not be inferior to Jupiter, according to the Fabulous Theology,
plainly from hence, because he is therein fai d to have been his Fa-
ther. But then the Question will be, how Saturn and Jupiter could
both of them One and the same Universal Numen? To which
there are severall Answers. For first Plato who propounds this Diffi-
culty in his Cratylus, solves it thus; That by Jupiter here is to be
understood the Soul of the World, which according to his Theology,
derived from a Perfect and Eternal Mind or Intellect (which
chronos is interpreted to be) as Chronos also depended upon Urans
Deus, the Supreme Heavenly God, or First Original Deity. So
that Plato here finds his Trinity of Divine Hypothesis, Archical and
Universal, τετελεσθη, Νεος, and τοιος, in Urans, Chronos, and Zeus; or
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plainer
plainer and more simple sense of Hesiod's Theogonia, that Jupiter who together with Neptune and Pluto, is said to have been the Son of Saturn, was not the Supreme Deity, nor the Soul of the World neither, but only the Ether, as Neptune was the Sea and Pluto the Earth. All which are said to have been begotten by Chronos or Saturn the Son of Uranus, that is as much as to say, by the Hidden Verte of the Supreme Heavenly God. But the Writer De Mundo, though making Jupiter to be the First and Supreme God, yet (taking Chronos to signify Immensity of Duration or Eternity) will have Jupiter to be the Son of Chronos in this sense, because he doth thus διακεῖται διάκεισθαι διάκεισθαι διάκεισθαι, continue from one Eternity to another; so that Chronos and Zeus are to him in a manner one and the same thing. But we are apt to think that no Ingenious and learned Pagan who well understood the Natural Theology, would deny, but that the best Answeer of all to this difficulty is this, That there is no Cohent Sence, to be made, of all things, in the Fabulous Theology, St. Austin, from Varro, gives us this account of Saturn, that it is he who produceth from himself continually the Hidden Seeds and Forms of things, and receiveth or receiveth them again into himself; which some think to have been the true meaning of that Fable concerning Saturn his devouring his Male-children; because the Forms of these Corporeal things, are perpetually destroyed, whilft the Material Parts (signified by the Females) still remain. However it is plain, that this was but another Pagan Adumbration of the Deity, that being all sometimes thus defined by them, as St. Austin likewise en-
forms us, Sinus quidam Nature in seipsó continens omnia, A certain Be-
form, or Deep Hollow, and Inward Recefs of Nature, which contain-
within it self all things. And St. Austin himself concludes, that ac-
cording to this Varronian Notion of Saturn likewise, the Pagans Ju-
piter and Saturn, were really but one and the same Numen, De Civ.
D. L. 7. c. 13. Wherefore we may with good reason affirm, that Sa-
turn was another Name for the Supreme God amongst the Pagans, i
signifying that Secret and Hidden Power, which comprehends, per-
vades and supports the whole World; and which produces the Seed
or Seminal Principles and Forms of all things from itself. As also
Uranus or Cælus, was plainly yet another Name for the same Super-
Deity; or the First Divine Hypostasis comprehending the whole.

In the next place, though it be true that Minerva be sometimes
taken for a Particular God; or for God according to a Particular Man-
ifestation of him in the Ether (as shall be shewed afterwards) y
was it often taken aloof, for the Supreme God according to his mo-
General Notion, or as a Universal Numen diffusing himself through
things. Thus hath it been already proved, that Neith or Neitha, w
the same amongst the Egyptians, that Athena amongst the Greeks,
and Minerva amongst the Latins; which that it was a Universal Num-
men, appears from that Egyptian Inscription in the Temple of the
God, I am all that Was, Is, and Shall be. And accordingly Athens
goras tells us, that Athena of the Greeks was, ἦ φησίν διὸ τὸν ἄνα-

Thus that

old Inscrip-

tion, OΣ-

MUS MAX-

MUS ΑΕ-
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TERNUS

JUPITER.
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things. Wherefore this Athena or Minerva of the Pagans was either the First Supreme Deity a Perfect and Infinite Mind the Original of all things or else a second Divine Hypothesis, the immediate Offspring and First Begotten of that First Original Deity. Thus Arbises in his Oration upon Minerva, 

"pindar be that "

... therefore retiring into himself, he begot and brought her forth from himself: So that this is the only Genuine Offspring of the first Father of all. And again, According to the Lord, and the whole command from him to be delivered to the Gods. For she is greater than the Angels, and commandeth them some one thing and some another, accordingly as she had received of her Father: she performing the office of an Interpreter and Introducer to the Gods when it is needful. Where we may observe by the way, that this word Angel, came to be in use amongst the Pagans from Jews and Christians, about this very age that Arbises lived in; after which we meet with it frequently in the writings of their Philosophers. Lastly Arbises thus concludes his Oration upon Minerva, "

"jupiter was..."

he that from what we have said will determine, that Minerva is as it were the Power and Virtue of Jupiter himself not r. Wherefore (not to enumerate all the minute things belonging to Minerva) we conclude thus concerning her, that all the works of Jupiter, are common with Jupiter and Minerva. Wherefore that conceit hich the Learned and Industrious Plossius, somewhere seems to favour, that the Pagans Univerfal Nenum was no other than a Sensitive Nume, or Spermatick Reason of the whole World, undirected by a Higher Intellectual Principle, (which is indeed no better than omnipotent Atheism) is plainly confuted from hence, they making 

"sun and understanding, under these Names of Neith, Athena, and Minerva, to be either, the Absolutely Supreme Deity, or the First-gotten Offspring of it."

To Minerva may be added Apollo, who though often taken for the Sensible Sun Animated, and so an Inferior Deity, yet was not always understood in this sense, nor indeed then when he was reckoned among the Twelve Consentes, because the Sun was afterwards added to them, in the number of the Eight Select Gods. And that he was sometimes taken for the Supreme Universal Nume, the Maker
Maker of the Sun and of the whole World, is plainly testified by Plutarch (who is a competent Witness in this Cafe, he being a Priest of this Apollo) writing thus concerning him in his Defeat of Oracles, *καὶ τοιοῦτον θεόν χαίρεις καὶ σε λέγεις, καὶ τότε, καὶ ἐπέσης τῷ ὑπερτέρας τῷ ἐρωτήσεσαν, εἰς αὐτὸν δόθησαν φανής τῆς τοῦ καθεστάτου, διὸ αὐτὸς δόθησαν τῷ ἀιφείον, καὶ τῷ ἐναντίον, ἀνισόν. Whether Apollo be the Sun, or whether he be the Lord and Father of the Sun, placed far above all sensible and Corporeal Nature, it is not likely, that he should now deny his Oracles to them to whom himself is the cause of Generation and Nourishment, of Life and Understanding.

Moreover Urania Aphrodite, the Heavenly Venus or Love, was Universal Numen also, or another name of God, according to his more General Notion, as Comprehending the whole World, it being the same with th at "Eros, or Love, which Orphens, and others in Aristotle, made to be the First Original of all things. For it is certain that the Ancients distinguished concerning a double Venus and Love. Thus Panthias in Plato's Symposium, ἐν μέσῳ γὰρ ἐς πρότερον ἀμήκτων ὑφωμένων ἐξερχόμενόν, ἐν δὲ καὶ σήμερον ὑποκατάμασς. ἐν δὲ νεωτέρω ἀμήκτων ὑπὲρκυνήον ἐν δὲ πολυάμω τὸν καλέσαν, διαγενείον ἐν καὶ ἐξετάζω, κρίνω δὲ τὴν σύνθεν, παρώδον ὑπὲρκυνήον καλέσαν, καὶ γὰρ τίς. There are Two Venus, and therefore two Loves, one the Older and without a Mother, the Daughter of Uranus or Heaven, which we call the Heavenly Venus another younger, begotten from Jupiter and Dione, which we call the Vulgar Venus; and accordingly are there of necessity two Loves, answering to these two Venuses, the one Vulgar, and the other Heavenly. The Elder of these two Venuses, is in Plato said to be Seniorio to Japh and Saturn, and by Orphens the Oldest of all things, and πρῶτον ὁ ἄνθρωπος. The First Begetter of all. Upon which account perhaps, it was called by the Oriental Nations, Mylitta or Genitrix, as being the Fruit of Mother of all. This was also the same with Plato's τῷ πρῶτῳ καλῶ, The First Fair; the Caufe of all Pulchritude, Order and Harmony in the World. And Panthias the Writer tells us, that there were Temples several erected to each of these Venuses or Loves, the Heavenly and the Vulgar, and that Urania or the Heavenly Venus was so called, ὡς τίς ἐστις καὶ πόνας συνεκτᾶς, because the Love belonging to it, was pure and free from all corporeal affections, which as it is in men, is but a participation of that first Urania, or Heavenly Venus and Love, God himself. And thus is Venus described by Euripides in Stobæus, as the Supreme Numen.

Thus also by Ἑρμείον, Ἐστί τις ἄνθρωπος, πόνας συνεκτᾶς, Ἐστί τις ἄνθρωπος, πόνας συνεκτᾶς, πολίθης ἐστις, Ἐστί τις ἄνθρωπος, πόνας συνεκτᾶς, Ἐστί τις ἄνθρωπος, πόνας συνεκτᾶς, πολίθης ἐστις.

To this hence, Do you not see how great a God this Venus is? but you are never able to declare her Greatness, nor to measure the vast extent thereof. For this is the which nourisheth both Thee and Me and all Mortals, and which makes Heaven and Earth friendly to conspire together, etc. But by Ovid this is more fully expressed, in his Fastorum,
Where all the Gods are said to have been Created or Made by Venus, that is, by the One Supreme Deity, But lastly this is best of all performed by Severinus Boetius, a Christian Philosopher and Poet, in this manner

And to this Urania or Heavenly Venus was near of kin also, that Third Venus in Pausanias called Ἀτσαγόλα, and by the Latins Venus Verticordia, pure and chaste Love, expulsive of all unclean Lusts, to which the Romans consecrated a Statue, as Valerius M. tells us (L. 8. c. 15.) quo facilis Virginitas, Multieraque mentes à libidine ad pudicitiam converteretur. To this end, that the minds of the Female Sex might then the better be converted from Lust and Wantonness to Chastity. We conclude therefore that Urania or the Heavenly Venus, was sometimes amongst the Pagans a Name for the Supreme Deity, as that which is the most Amiable Being, and First Pulchritude, the most Bewig and Fecund Begither of all things, and the constant Harmonizer of the whole World.

Again though Vulcan, according to the most common and Vulgar Notion of him, be to be reckoned amongst the Particular Gods, yet had he also another more Universal Consideration. For Zeno in Laertius tells us, that the Supreme God was called Ἰεβασσός or Vulcan, Ἀρχόν τοῦ Χρυσίου Σταυροῦ τῆς Ἰεβασσᾶς, as his Hegemonick
Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto, Book I.

Furthermore Seneca gives us yet other Names of the Supreme Deity, according to the Sence of the Stoicks, Hunc & Liberum Patrem, &c. Herculem, ac Mercurium nostrri putant, Liberum Patrem, quia Omnium Patres, &c. Herculem, quod vis ejus invocat est, Mercurium, quia Ratio penes illum est, Numerique, &c. Ordo, &c. Scientia: Furthermore our Philosophers take this Author of all things to be Liber Pater, Hercules, and Mercury; The First because he is the Parent of all things, &c. the Second, because his Force and Power is unconquerable, &c. And the Third, because there is and from him Reason, Number, Order and Knowledge. And now we see already, that the Supreme God was sufficiently Polyonymous amongst the Pagans; and that all these, Jupiter, Pan, Janus, Genius, Saturn, Cæus, Minerva, Apollo, Aphrodite, Urania, Hephaestus, Liber Pater, Hercules and Mercury, were not so many Really Distinct and Substantial Gods, much less Self-existent and Independent Ones; but only several Names, of that One Supreme Universal and All-comprehending Namen, according to several Notions and Considerations of him.

But besides these, there were many other Pagan Gods called by Servius, Dii Speciales, Special or Particular Gods, which cannot be thought neither, to have been so many Really Distinct and Substantial Beings (that is Natural Gods) much less Self-existent and Independent, but only so many several Names or Notions of One and the same Supreme Deity, according to certain Particular Powers and Manifestations of it. It is true, that some late Christian Writers against the Polytheism and Idolatry of the Pagans, have charged them with having a Trinity of Independent Gods, viz. Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto; sharing the Government of the whole world amongst these Three, and consequently acknowledging no One Universal Namen. No withstanding which it is certain, that according to the more Ancient Doctrine and Cabala of the Pagans, concerning the Natural True Theology, these Three considered as Distinct and Independent Gods, were accounted but Dii Poetici & Commentitii, Poetical and Fictitious Gods, and they were really esteemed no other, than so many Several Names and Notions of One and the same Supreme Namen, acting variously in those several parts of the world, the Heaven, the Sea, the Earth and Hell. For First as to Pluto and Hades, called
also by the Latins Orcus, and Dis (which latter word seems to have been a contraction of Diurnos to answer the Greek Pluto) as Balbus in Siciro attributes to him, Omnem Viam terrenam, all Terrene Power, so others commonly assign him the Regnum of Separate Souls after Death. Now it is certain, that according to this latter Notion, it was by Pluto understood no otherwise than as a Name for that Part of the Divine Providence which exercises itself upon the Souls of men after Death. This Ficinus observed upon Plato's Cratylus, Animaduerta pro ceteris, autonem hic significare praecipue, Providentiam Divinam ad Separatas minus pertinentem: You are to take notice, that by Pluto is here meant, that part of Divine Providence, which belongeth to Separate souls. For this is that which according to Plato, binds and detains the Souls, in that separate State, with the best Vinculum of all, which is not Necessity, but Love and Desire, they being ravished and armed as it were with those pure delights which they there enjoy, and thus is he also to be understood, in his Book of Laws, writing Lib. 8. this manner concerning Pluto, Cat. ο διαφοράν ρυπεμασίς αυτόπως τα ταυτα δεις, αλλά τιμιος, ος ονδικε αι τα ενοδίκε παλιαν Αει αζεταν κοινωνία ζε το φυζε χει σεμλι, διαλλοπος δι την η χειροος, οι ενδαισαν οι χει λογις. Neither ought Military men to be troubled or offended at this God Pluto, but highly to honour him, as who always is the best beneficent to mankind. For I affirm with the greatest seriousness, that the Union of the Soul with this Terrestrial body, is never better than the Dissolution or Separation of them. Pluto therefore according to Plato, is nothing else but a Name for that Part of the Divine Providence, that is exercised upon the Souls of men, in their Separation from their Earthly Bodies. And upon this account was Pluto styled by Virgil, The Stygian Jupiter. But by others Pluto together with Orcus, is taken in a larger sense, for the Manifestation of the Deity in this whole Terrestrial Globe, and thus is the Writer De Mundo be understood, when he tells us, that God or Jupiter is θεος το ζε το χονις, πεπλησματε δε ωστες το το βασις, ατι ποιησαι αιτιος αιτιος εν βοθα Celestial and Terrestrial, he being denominated from every Nature, forasmuch as he is the cause of all things. Pluto therefore is θεος το χονις or χονις θεος, The Terrestrial (also, as well as the Stygian and Subterranean) Jupiter; and that other Jupiter which is distinguished both from Pluto and Neptune, is properly θεος ρας, The Sevenly Jupiter, God as manifesting himself in the Heaven. Hence it is that Zeus and Hades, Jupiter and Pluto, are made to be one and the same thing, in that Passage which Julian cites as an Oracle of Apollo, but others impute to Orpheus.

Zeus, Zeus, is 'Aitios,

Jupiter and Pluto are one and the same God. As also that Euripides in place before produced, is so doubtful whether he should call the Serene God (ιν ροί νυν μενοσ, that takes care of all things here below) Zeus or Hades.
Whether thou hadst rather, be called Jupiter or Pluto.

Lastly Hermespanax the Colophonian Poet, in those Verses of his (afterward to be set down) makes Pluto in the first place, (with many other Pagan Gods) to be really one and the same with Jupiter.

That Neptune was also another Name of the Supreme God, from another Particular Consideration of him, namely as acting in the Seas; (at least according to the Arcane and Natural Theology of the Pagans) is plainly declared by divers of the Ancients. Xenocrates in Stobaeus, and Zeno in Laertius, affirm, that God as acting in the water is called Posidonie or Neptune. To the same purpose Balbus in

De N.D.L. 2. Cicero. Sed tamen his Fabulis spectat ac repudiatis, Deus Partinem per Naturam cujusque rei, per Terras Ceres, per Maria Neptunus, alia
per alia, poterunt intelligi, qui qualesque sint, &c. But these Poetic Fables concerning the Gods, being defixed and rejected; it is easy for us to understand, how God passing through the Nature of everything, may be called by several Names, as through the Earth Ceres (and Pluto through the Seas Neptune; and through other parts of the world by other Names: so that all these Titular Gods were but so many several

De N.D.L. 3. Denominations of one Supreme Deity. And Cotta afterward thus represents the sense of this Theology, Neptunum esse dicit Animam cum Intelligentiâ per mare pergentem; idem de Cerere: Tour meaning is, Neptune is a Mind which with understanding passeth through the Sea, as the like of Ceres through the Earth. Lastly, to name no more, Maximus Tyrtius agreeth also herewith, καλεῖ τὸ μᾶλλον ἰδία τῆς προεύθυνσις, καὶ ποιεῖ τὸ ποιεῖ μιᾶς τῆς Σταθήσεως ιδν, διοικοῦσιν οὐκ ἔστιν τῷ γενέσθε φύσει ἡ ἀρμονία. You are to call Jupiter that Princely Mind, which things follow and obey, &c. and Neptune that Spirit, which passeth through the Earth and Sea, causes their State and Harmony.

Lastly, that these Three Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto, were not Three really Distinct Substantial Beings, but only so many Several Names for One Supreme God (according to the True and Natural Theology of the Pagans) is thus plainly declared by Pausanias in his Corinthiacks; there expounding the meaning of a certain Statue of Jupiter, with Three Eyes (called the Country-Jupiter of the Trojans) in this manner: τετελείδες ἄραικες ἐχειν θεία τα ἔθα ὡς περὶ τοις ἄκμασθαι αὐτόν, διὰ τῶν μὴ λόγοις καὶ τοῦτον ἡμῖν ἀπεξάνασε. ὦν ἐκ ἄρχες φαίνεται τὸν γέγονεν ἔκειν ἔτος τὸν Ὑποκρίτην δίκαιον διόμαχον αὐτῷ τότεν;

ἀκεῖνος το ταχαλογίου ἡ ἐπανειρήμεσθαι.
have Three Eyes, one may guess this to have been the reason: Because first

the common speech of all men makes Jupiter to reign in the Heaven. A-

gain he that is said to rule under the Earth, is in a certain Verse of Homer

called Zeus or Jupiter too, namely the Infernal or Subterraneous Jupiter together with Proserpina. And lastly Alchylus the son of Eu-

perorion, calls that God who is the King of the Sea also Jupiter. Where-

fore this Statuary made Jupiter with Three Eyes, to signify, that it is

one and the same God, which ruleth in those Three several Parts of the

World, the Heaven, the Sea, and the Earth. Whether Pausanias were

in the right or no, as to his Conjecture concerning this Three-

y'd Statue of Jupiter, it is evident that himself and other ancient

Pagans acknowledged Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto, to be but Three se-

veral Names and Partial Considerations of one and the same God, who

ruled over the Whole World. And since both Proserpina and Ceres

were really the same with Pluto, and Salacia with Neptune: we may

cell conclude, that all these, Jupiter, Neptune, Salacia, Pluto, Proserpina

and Ceres, though several Poetical and Political Gods, yet were really

taken but for One and the same Natural and Philosophical God.

Moreover as Neptune was a Name for God, as manifesting himself

the Sea and ruling over it, so was Juno another Name of God as act-

ing in the Air. This is expressly affirmed both by Xenocrates in Stobaeus,

and Zeno in Lærinius. And St. Austin propounding this Quære, why

Juno was joined to Jupiter as his wife and Sifter, makes the Pagans

swear thus to it, Quia Jovem (inquit unum) in Aether accipimus: in Aere

nonem: because we call God in the Aether Jupiter, in the Air Juno.

But the reason why Juno was Feminine and a Goddess, is thus given by

Heraclitus effeminans autem cum, Junonique tribuerunt, quod nihil ali

ere mollis, they effeminated the Air and attributed it to Juno a God-

ess, because nothing is softer than it. Minerva was also sometimes ta-

ken for a Special or Particular God, and then was it nothing else (as

Plato informs us) but a Name for the Supreme God as Passing through

Higher) Aether: Which gave occasion to St. Austin thus to ob-

心境 against the Pagan Theology, Ætheris partem Superiorum Minera-

tere dictur, & hae occasione fingere Poetas, quoad de Jovis Capite

sit, cur non ergo ipsa potius Deerum Regina deputatur, quoad sit Jo-

vior Superior? If Minerva be said, to possess the Highest part of

Æther, and the Poets therefore to have feigned her so have

been begotten from Jupiter's head, why is not she rather called the

Queen of the Gods, since she is superior to Jupiter? Furthermore as

the Supreme God was called Neptune in the Sea, and Juno in the Air,

by the same reason may we conclude, that he was called Vulcan in

Fire. Lastly, as the Sun and Moon, were themselves sometimes

writhed by the Pagans for Inferiour Deities, they being suppos'd

the Animated with Particular Souls of their own; so was the Sup-

reme God also, worshipped in them both (as well as in the other

parts of the world) and that under those names of Apollo, and Diana.

Thus the Pagans appointing a God to preside over every Part of the

World, did thereby but make the Supreme God Polyonymous, all those

names of theirs, being indeed nothing but several Names of him.

With Theology of the Ancient Pagans, Maximus Tyrius, treating

E c e 2 concerning
Many other Pagan Gods, in St. Austin; Book I.

Concerning Homer's Philosophy (after he had mentioned his Tripartite Empire of the world, (shared between Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto) thus declareth, αἰσχρὸν τὸν ἄλλον παρά τοὺς Θεοὺς, καὶ ἀλήθεια πολλοὶ ἔργαι τῶν Θεῶν πιστεύον κατ' οὕτως ἐπιμένων. & τὸ μὴν ἀνάθεμα ἔστι μεταποιήσεις, ὅτι δένων πρὸς τίνα, καὶ ἄλλου πρὸς τίνα. & c. &. Thou mayst find also in Homer, other Principles, and the Originals of several Names; which, the ignorant bear as Fables, but a Philosopher will understand as Things and Realities. For he assigns a Principle of Virtue and Wisdom, which he calls Minerva, another of Love and Desire, which he calls Venus, another of Artificialness and that is Vulcan, who rules over the Fire. And Apollo also with him presides over Dancings, the Muses over Songs, Mars over War, Æolus over Winds, and Ceres over Fruits. And then does he conclude thus, καὶ οὕτως μάλλον ὁμοίως ἡγούμεν, ὡς δὲ διέσωσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὕτως ἐργάσατο έργαμεν. ἀλλὰ ποιῆσαι μεταλέγησαν, ἡκὼν λύγγαρον, ἡκὼν τίχυς. So that no part neither of Nature, nor of the World, is to Homer Godless (or void of a God) none definite of a Ruler, or without a Superior Government; but all things full of Divine Names, and of Divine Reason, and of Divine Art. Where his Æolus, his Divine Names, are nothing but several Names of God, as manifesting himself variously in the several Things of Nature, and the Parts of the world, and as presiding over them.

Wherefore besides those Special Gods of the Pagans, already mentioned, that were appointed to preside over several Parts of the world, there are Others, which are but several Names of the Supreme God neither, as exercising several Offices and Functions in the world, and bestowing several Gifts upon mankind: as when in giving Corn and Fruits he is called Ceres, in bestowing Wine Bacchus, in men recovery of their Health, Æsculapius, in presiding over Traffic and Merchandizing, Mercury, in governing Military Affairs, Mars, in ordering the Winds Æolus, and the like.

That the more Philosphick Pagans, did thus really interpret the Fables of the Gods, and make their Many Poetical and Political Gods, to be all of them but One and the same Supreme Nature, God, is evident from the testimonies of Antisthenes, Plato, Xenocrates, Zeno, Clearchus, and Chrysippus (who allegorized all the Fables of the Gods accordingly) and of Scævola the Roman Pontiffex, of Cicero, Varro, Seneca, and many others. But that even their Poets all did sometimes venture to broach this Arcane Theology, is manifest from those Fragments preserved, of Hermiasax the Colophonian amongst the Greeks, and of Valerius Soranus amongst the Latins; who former thus enumerating the chief Pagan Gods, and declaring them to be all but one and the same Numen;

Πλούτων, Περσεφόνη, Διμήδης, Κόσμες, Ερώτες, Τετειχεῖς, Νυμφίδες, Τυχίδες, Κυκάκτης, ἐφάμες, Ἐγέρσες της ἱλαρίας, πάθω, Δίκη το Σύμμορφον, 
Ἀρτέμις, Ἡ, ἐκεῖς ὄντος ἀπόλλων, ἕτος ἔστιν δική.

Pluto, Persephone, Ceres, & Venus alma & Amores.
The Latter pronouncing Univerally, that Jupiter Omnipotens, is

One God, and All Gods. Whether by his Jupiter he here meant the Soul of the World only, as Varro would interpret him agreeably to his own Hypothesis, or whether an Abstract Mind Superiour to it; but probably he made this Jupiter to be All Gods, upon these two Accounts; First as he was the Begetter and Creator of all the other Natural Gods, which were the Pagans Inferior Deities (as the Stars and Demons) Secondly, as that all the other Poetical and Political Gods, were Nothing else but Several Names and Notions of him.

The Philosophiph Theology, Book I.

"...and the quomodo let the in Ji where in necnon the let let..."

"...and' l and..."
According but Firfr, (which not it their and Moon, J equircs hilofophick^ bofe nature ovethc heology mtemplalion nothing lies, lat Dokof drro, byfiological (lerting *" 11ralzxnA tcifcr eir ready zerfal re the is dpofed, ilofophy m this defje "tofity. "'oets, z£t, (e *"(ianding m this, efje words, or Apuleius and his Deo Socratir, who was a Platonick Philofopher; we shall here make it evident, that he was not rightly understood by Vofius
Apuleius his Reduction of the Book I.

Vossius neither; which yet ought not to be thought any Derogation from this Eminent Philologer (whole Polymathy and Multifarious Learning, is readily acknowledged by us) that he was not to well versed in all the Niceties and Puntillo's of the Platonick School. For though Apuleius do in that Book, besides those Visible Gods, the Stars, take notice of another kind of Invisible ones; such as the Twelve Confectes, and others, which (he faith) we may animis confedere, per variis Utilitates in vita agenda, animaduerfas in visibus, quibus corum singulis curant, make a confederacy of by our minds, from the various Utilitates in humane life, perceived from those things which each of these take care of; yet that he was no Bigot in this civil Theology, is manifest from hence, because in that very place, he declares as well against Superstition, as Irreligious Prophanenesis. And his design there was plainly no other, than to reduce the Civil and Poetic Theologies of the Pagans into some handsome conformity and agreement with that Philosophical, Natural, and Real Theology of theirs, which derived all the Gods from One Supreme and Universal Numinis: but this he endeavours to do, in the Platonick way, himself being much addicted to that Philosophy. Hos Deos in sublimi aetheris vertice locatis, Plato existimat versos, incorpores, animales, sine noli neque sine neque exordio, sed profusos ac retro eiernos, corporis contagione, sed quidem natura remotos, ingenio ad summam beatitudinem porrebo, &c. Quorum Parentem, qui omnium rerum Dominator atque Author est, solum ab omnibus nexibus patiendi aliquid gerendique, nulla vice ad aliquas rei mutas objiciendum cur ego nunc dicere exordiarcum Plato celestis facundia præditus, frequentissime predicit, hunc solum majestatis incredibili quodam nimietate & ineffabili, non posse penuria sermonis humani, quavis oratione vel modicè comprehendi. All these Gods placed in the high's Aither, Plato thinks to be true, incorporeal, Animal, without beginning or end, Eternal, happy in themselves without any external good. The Parent of which Gods, who is the Lord and Author of all things, and who is alone free from all bonds of doing and suffering, why should I go about in words to describe him? since Plato who was endued with most Heavenly eloquence, equal to the Immortal Gods, does often declare, that this Highest God by reason of his excess of Majesty, is both ineffable and incomprehensible. From which words of Apuleius it is plain, that according to him, the Twelve Confectes, and all the other Invisible Gods were derived from One Original Deity, as their Parent and Author. But then if you demand, what Gods of Plato these should be, to which Apuleius would here accommodate the Civil and Poetic Gods, contained in those Two Verstes of Ennies,

Juno, Vesta, Minerva, Ceres, Diana, Venus, Mars.
Mercurius, Jovis, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Apollo.

and the rest of this kind, that is, all their other Gods (properly called) Invisible? We reply, that these are no other than Plato's Ideas or First Paradigms and Patterns of things, in the Arcahtypal World which is the Divine Intellect (and his Second Hypostasis) derived for his first Original Deity, and most Simple Monad. For as Plato writ eth in his Timæus, ἄνωθεν τὰ ἰδέα τε καί σχέδια, ἑκατέρος πᾶς ἄλλος, τοις Σένφιλῳ

Worl
World, must needs be the Image of another Intelligible one. And again afterwards, περὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὀνόματος ὁ Ἰουβατικός τοῦ ποταὶ ἔκεινον. Καὶ ἐν τῷ Πλάτων ἐν τῖς ἐξομολογίαις, ἡ αὐτῆς ὁ λύκος ὑπάρξεισιν, τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἡ ἀναφορά ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἐμφανίᾳ, τοῦ ὁποίου λεπτὸν ὡς ἡμέρα ἡ ἀποκαλυπτική ἐκείνη. Τὰ ἡμέρα τῆς ψυχῆς, τῆς καθότου ἐμφανίας τῆς, ἠπάτων ὑπάρξεισιν, τοῦ ἐν τῷ καθότῳ ἐμφανίᾳ ἐκείνῳ τῆς λύκος ἀναφορά ἐμφανίζεται, ἡ ἀναφορά ἐμφανίας τῆς καθότου ἐμφανίας τῆς.

Pagan.

What Animal was the Pattern, according to whose likeness he that made this great Animal of the World, framed it? certainly we must not think it to be any Particular Animal, since nothing can be perfect which is made according to an imperfect copy. Let us therefore conclude it, to be that Animal, which containeth all other animals in it, as its Parts. For that World containeth all Intelligible Animals in it, in the same manner as this Sensible World, both as and other sensible animals. Wherefore Plato himself here and elsewhere speaking obscurely of this Intelligible World, and the Ideas of it, no wonder if many of his Pagan followers, have absurdly made so many Distinct Animals and Gods of them. Amongst whom Apuleius accordingly would refer all the soul and Poetic Gods, of the Pagans (I mean their Gods, properly called, Invisible) to this Intelligible world of Plato's, and thole federal Ideas of it. Neither was Apuleius singular in this, but others of the Pagan Theologers did the like, as for example Julian in his Book Against the Christians; οὐχὶ οὐκ ἔχει τὸν πάθιον τῶν ζῷων ἐμφανίας; ἡ ἀναφορά τοῖς ἄνωθεν ἔμφασις. οἱ φυσικοὶ τοῖς ἀνωτέρω καθολικοῖς ἔμφασις, τὸν λαόν τοῖς ἡμερῶν ἐμφανίας, τὸν λαόν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω καθολικοῖς ἔμφασις, τὸν λαόν τοῖς ἡμερῶν ἐμφανίας.

The Intelligible Gods, of Julian

book I.

376.0x624.0

The development accommodates Julian for the fame of the Vivific Influence of the Sun, was Incarnated, and appeared in a humane form at Epidaurus. This is the Doctrine of that Julian, who was so great an Opposer of the Incarnation of the Eternal Logos, n
our Saviour Jesus Christ. Neither was this Doctrine, of Many Intelligible Gods, and Powers Eternal, (of which the Archetypal World consisted,) first invented, by Platonick Pagans, after the times of Christianity, as some might suspect; but that there was such a thing existing before among them also, may be concluded from this pallage of Philo's, *De Confis.*

---

Our Saviour Jesus Christ. Neither was this Doctrine, of Many Intelligible Gods, and Powers Eternal, (of which the Archetypal World consisted,) first invented, by Platonick Pagans, after the times of Christianity, as some might suspect; but that there was such a thing existing before among them also, may be concluded from this pallage of Philo's, *De Confis.*

---

We have now given a full account of Apuleius his fence in that book De Deo Socratis, concerning the Civil and Poetical Pagan Gods; which was not to affect a Multitude of Substantial and Eternal Deities, or Minds Independent in them; but only to reduce the Vulgar Theology of the Pagans, both their Civil and Poetical, into some conformity with the Natural, Real, and Philosophick Theology; and is according to Platonick Principles. Wherein many other of the Pagan Platonists, both before and after Christianity concurred with him; they making the Many Pagan Invisible Gods, to be really the Eternal Ideas of the Divine Intellect, called by them: Parts of the Intelligible and Archetypal World, which they supposed to have been the Paradigms and Patterns according to which the Sensible World, and all Particular things therein were made and on which they depended, they being only Participations of them: Therefore though this may well be look'd upon as a Monstrous Exaggeration, in these Platonick Philosophers, thus to talk of the Divine Ideas, or the Intelligible and Archetypal Paradigms of things, not only Substantial, but also as so many several Animals, Persons, and Gods; in being their humour thus upon all slight occasions to multiply Gods; yet nevertheless must it be acknowledged, that they did at the very first time declare, all these to have been derived from One Supreme Unity, and not only so, but also to exist in it; as they did likewise at other times, when unconcerned in this business of their Pagan Polytheism.

---

Our Saviour Jesus Christ. Neither was this Doctrine, of Many Intelligible Gods, and Powers Eternal, (of which the Archetypal World consisted,) first invented, by Platonick Pagans, after the times of Christianity, as some might suspect; but that there was such a thing existing before among them also, may be concluded from this pallage of Philo's, *De Confis.*

---

We have now given a full account of Apuleius his fence in that book De Deo Socratis, concerning the Civil and Poetical Pagan Gods; which was not to affect a Multitude of Substantial and Eternal Deities, or Minds Independent in them; but only to reduce the Vulgar Theology of the Pagans, both their Civil and Poetical, into some conformity with the Natural, Real, and Philosophick Theology; and is according to Platonick Principles. Wherein many other of the Pagan Platonists, both before and after Christianity concurred with him; they making the Many Pagan Invisible Gods, to be really the Eternal Ideas of the Divine Intellect, called by them: Parts of the Intelligible and Archetypal World, which they supposed to have been the Paradigms and Patterns according to which the Sensible World, and all Particular things therein were made and on which they depended, they being only Participations of them: Therefore though this may well be look'd upon as a Monstrous Exaggeration, in these Platonick Philosophers, thus to talk of the Divine Ideas, or the Intelligible and Archetypal Paradigms of things, not only Substantial, but also as so many several Animals, Persons, and Gods; in being their humour thus upon all slight occasions to multiply Gods; yet nevertheless must it be acknowledged, that they did at the very first time declare, all these to have been derived from One Supreme Unity, and not only so, but also to exist in it; as they did likewise at other times, when unconcerned in this business of their Pagan Polytheism.

---

Our Saviour Jesus Christ. Neither was this Doctrine, of Many Intelligible Gods, and Powers Eternal, (of which the Archetypal World consisted,) first invented, by Platonick Pagans, after the times of Christianity, as some might suspect; but that there was such a thing existing before among them also, may be concluded from this pallage of Philo's, *De Confis.*

---

We have now given a full account of Apuleius his fence in that book De Deo Socratis, concerning the Civil and Poetical Pagan Gods; which was not to affect a Multitude of Substantial and Eternal Deities, or Minds Independent in them; but only to reduce the Vulgar Theology of the Pagans, both their Civil and Poetical, into some conformity with the Natural, Real, and Philosophick Theology; and is according to Platonick Principles. Wherein many other of the Pagan Platonists, both before and after Christianity concurred with him; they making the Many Pagan Invisible Gods, to be really the Eternal Ideas of the Divine Intellect, called by them: Parts of the Intelligible and Archetypal World, which they supposed to have been the Paradigms and Patterns according to which the Sensible World, and all Particular things therein were made and on which they depended, they being only Participations of them: Therefore though this may well be look'd upon as a Monstrous Exaggeration, in these Platonick Philosophers, thus to talk of the Divine Ideas, or the Intelligible and Archetypal Paradigms of things, not only Substantial, but also as so many several Animals, Persons, and Gods; in being their humour thus upon all slight occasions to multiply Gods; yet nevertheless must it be acknowledged, that they did at the very first time declare, all these to have been derived from One Supreme Unity, and not only so, but also to exist in it; as they did likewise at other times, when unconcerned in this business of their Pagan Polytheism.
What a Rabble of Invisible Gods and Goddeses, the Pagans had, besides those their Dii Nobles, and Dii Majorum Gentium, their Noble and Greater Gods (which were the Confentes and Selecti) hath been already shewed out of St. Austin, from Varro and others; as namely, Dea Mena, Deus Vagitanus, Dea Leuana, Dea Cunina, Diva Rumina, Diva Potina, Diva Educia, Diva Pavenitia, Dea Venilia, Dea Agenoria, Dea Stimula, Dea Streuna, Dea Numeria, Deus Confus, Deus Sentia, Deus Jugatinus, Dea Virginensis, Deus Mutinus. To which might be added more out of other places of the fame St. Austin, as Deus Deverra, Deus Domidicus, Deus Domitus, Deus Manturia, Deus Pater Subigus, Deus Mater Prena, Deus Pertunda, Deus Rufina, Deus Collatina, Dea Valloncia, Dea Seia, Dea Segetia, Dea Tutilina, Deus Nodotus, Deus Voluitina, Dea Patevina, Dea Hostilina, Dea Flora, Dea Laeturita, Dea Matura, Dea Runcina. Besides which there are yet so many more of these Pagan Gods and Goddeses extant in other Writers, as that they cannot be all mentioned or enumerated by us, divers whereof have Very Small, Mean, and Contemplative Offices assigned to them, as their names for the most part do imply; some of which are such, as that they were not fit to be here interpreted. From whence it plainly appears, that there was no Deity, nothing at all without a God to the Pagans, they having so strong a Perſwation, that Divine Providence extended itself to all things, and expressing it after this manner, by assigning to Every thing in Nature, and Every part of the World, an whatsoever was done by men, some particular God or Goddes by name, preſide over it. Now that the Intelligent Pagans, should believe a good earneft, that all these Invisible Gods and Goddeses of theirs, were so many Several Substantial Minds, or Understanding Beings Eternal and Unmade, really existing in the World, is a thing in itself Terribly Incredible. For how could any possibly perceive themselves, that there was One Eternal Unmade Mind or Spirit, which for example, Essentially preſided over The Rockings of Infants Cradle, and nothing else? another over the Sweeping of Houses? another over Ears of Corn? another over the Husks of Grain? and another over the Knots of Straw and Gras, and the like? And the Caeſar is but very tame, for those other Noble Gods of theirs (as they call them) the Confentes, and Selecti; since there can be no reason given, why they should all of them, be so many Substantial and Eternal Spirits Self-existent or Unmade, if none of the other were such. Wherefore if these be not all, so many Several Substantial and Eternal Minds, so many Self-existing and Independent Deities, then must they of necessity, be either Several Partial Considerations of the Deity; viz. Several Manifestations of the Divine Power and Providence Personal; or else Inferiour Ministers of the fame. And thus have we already the ed
Chap. IV. Divine Vertues and Powers Deified, 503

shewed, that the more High-flown and Platonick Pagans, (as Julian, Apuleius and others) understood these Consentes and Select Gods, and all the other Invisible ones, to be really nothing else, but the Ideas of the Intelligible and Archetypal World, (which is the Divine Intellelt) that is indeed, but Partial Considerations of the Deity, as Virtuallly and Exemplarily containing all things: whilst others of them, going in a more plain and cæleft way, concluded these Gods of theirs, to be all of them, but several Names and Notions of the One Supreme Deity, according to the Various Manifestations of its Power in the world; is Seneca expressly affirmeth, not only concerning Fate, Nature and Fortune, &c. but also Liber Pater, Hercules, and Mercury, (before mentioned by him) that they were Omnia ejusdem Dei Nomina, varië stentis sub potestate, all Names of One and the same God, as diversitating its powers: and as Zenon in Laeritus concludes of all the rest: or else, which amounts to the same thing) that they were the Several Powers and Vertues of One God Diditionally Personated and Deified, as the Pagans in Esibebins apologize for themselves, that they did Strapulian τος Pr. Ev. L. 3. c. νοομον ουνθαeration νοομον τοις ὑμης Σκηνον, Deifie nothing but the Invisible Powers of that God which is over all. Nevertheless because those Several Powers of the Supreme God were not supposed to be all executed immediately by himself, but by certain other υπορεγείν ουνθαeration, Subservient Ministers under him, appointed to preside over the Several Things of Nature, Parts of the World, and Affairs of Mankind commonly called Demons;) therefore were those Gods sometimes taken also for such Subservient Spirits, or Demons collectively: as perhaps in this of Epictetus, ποτε δε ζευετεον τινας; ἵνα καὶ ζευετεον τινας; δείκνυμι ως τως Σμύρνης, ος τως Διός, ος ημις Διοίς, ος τως Τροίας; έποιησται, ος της Διοίς, ος της Μιλησιάς, ος της Τικυλίας, ος της Υψωμας, ος της Λίρας, ιπποκ. When will Zephyrus or the West-wind blow? When it seemeth good to himself or to Aelous; for God hath not made thee Steward of the winds, but Aelous.

But for the fuller clearing of the whole Pagan Theology, and especially this one. Point thereof, that their Πολυθεία, was in great part nothing else but Polytheismus, their Polytheism or Multiplicity of Gods, nothing but the Polonymy of One God, or his being called by Many Personal proper Names. Two Things are here requisite to be further taken notice of: first, that according to the Pagan Theology, God was conceived to be diffused throughout the whole World, to permeate and permeate all things, to exist in all things, and intimately to All all things: thus we observed before out of Horus Apollo, that the Egyptian Theologers conceived of God, as τος παντος κυριος τοις παντοις πνευμα, a Spirit pervading the whole World, as likewise they concluded, δεις δεις κατοικησίν άνθρωπος, that Nothing at all Confined without God. Which me Theology was Univerally entertained also amongst the Greeks. or Thus Diogenes the Cynick in Laeritus, ως εις πάντα πανίς, All things are of him. And Aristotle or the Writer De Plantis makes God not only Λιθ. 1. cap. 1. to comprehend the whole world, but also to be an Inward Principle of Life in Animals; τος εις ζως και άνθρωπος τοις της ζωής της ελκ(a) τοις, και τοις Διανομοις ζωος, δε έκσυμφωνοετος ως εις πάντας, τοις ζωος, και τοις πλανητικοις, that is the Principle in the Life or Soul of Animals: certainly no other than that Noble Animal (or Living Being) that compasses and
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And many other

Sextus Empiricus thus represents the sence of Pythagoras, Empedocles, and all the Italic Philosophers; 

and surrounds the whole Heaven, the Sun, the Stars, and the Planets.

That we men have not only a conjunction amongst our selves with one another, but also with the Gods above us, and with brute Animals below us: for because there is One Spirit which like a Soul pervades the whole World, and unites all the parts thereof together. Clements Alexandrinus writeth thus of the Stoicks, 

Deum etiam in terris, et in aqua, et in aeribus, timentem fidei suae, 

did not like. As also did Tertullian, when he represented their Doctrine thus; 

Stoici volunt Deum sic per Materiam decucurripe, quod modo Mel per Favos, 

the Stoicks will have God, so to run through the

Lib. 15. p. 357. Matter, as the Honey doth the Combs. Strabo testifieth of the ancient

Indian Brachmans, 

That in many things they Philoosophized after the Greek manner, as when they affirm that the World had a beginning, and that it would be Corrupted, and that the Maker and Governor thereof, Pervades the whole of it. The Latins also fully agreed with the Greeks in this: For though Seneca somewhere propounds this

Quetion, Utrum Examinfus operi swn Circumfusus sit Deus, an totius

world, or inwardly immingating do Pervade it all? Yet himself elsewhery affurwes it, when he calls God, 

Divinum Spiritum per omnia, maxima, ac minima, equali intentione diffusum.

A Divine Spirit, Diffused through all things, whether Smallest or Greatest, with equal intension. God in Quintilians Theology, is Spiritus omnibus

partibus Immaculatus; and Illycufus, per omnes rerum Nature partes Spiritus, a Spirit which infuscates it self into, and is Mingled with all the parts of the world; And that Spirit which is diffused through all the parts of Nature. Apuleius likewise affirmeth Deum omnia permeare, That God doth permeate all things, and that Nulla res est tam prestantius viribus, quam Cogitation, it self, de auxilio. It is nothing so excellent or powerful, as that it could be content with its own Nature alone, void of the Divine Aid or Influence: and again, Dei Praesentiam, non ram coidation sol, sed Oculi, & Auree, & Sensibilis Substantia comprehendit, That God is not only present to our Cognition, but also to our very eyes and ears, in all these Sensible things. Servius agreeably with this doctrine of the Ancient Pagans, determineth, that Nulla Parte Elementi sine Deo est, That there is no part of the Elements devoid of God. And that the Poets fully closed with the fame Theology, is evident from those known passages of theirs, Jovis omnia plena, and 

The Poets fully closed with the fame Theology, is evident from those known passages of theirs, Jovis omnia plena, and 

Terraque, Traiuque Mariis, Celanque profundum. 

—Deum namque ire per omnes

Last

L. 4.
Lastly we shall observe that both Plato and Anaxagoras, who neither of them Confounded God with the World, but kept them both distinct and affirmed God to be ὁμογενὴς, Unmingled with anything, and the Order and Government of all things, in which is the very same with that Doctrine of Christian Theologers, # θεῷ δὲ πάντων οὐ σοφὺς διά, That God pervades and passes through all things, Unmixedly. Which Plato also here in his Cratylus, plainly making διάκως to be a Name for God,LYM O M I K Μ I S O Z T E, from διά, i.e. passing through all things, and hereupon gives us the best account of Heraclitus his Theosophy, that any where extant (if not rather a Fragment of Heraclitus himself) in these words, ἡπὶ τῶν θεῶν τὸν θεὸν οὐν τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ μὲν υπὸ φύσιν φυσικὸν τὸ δὴ τοῦ ἐκ οὐρανοῦ μοιχεῖ διὰ τότε παρ- ποιεῖ θεὸν διὸν, οἱ δὲ ποιῶν τοῖς γυναικεῖοι γένεσιν: έναν ζεύγος τετηκαὶ καὶ εὐσταθεῖς, τό γὲ αὖ δίκαιος άλλος διὰ τὰ δύο τούτοις οὖν παρέχε, οἱ δὲ ποιῶν τοῖς γυναικεῖοι γένεσιν: έναν ζεύγος τετηκαὶ καὶ εὐσταθεῖς, διὰ τὸ δύο τούτων άλλος, διὰ τὰ δύο τούτων οὖν παρέχε, οἱ δὲ ποιῶν τοῖς γυναικεῖοι γένεσιν: έναν ζεύγος τετηκαὶ καὶ εὐσταθεῖς, διὰ τὸ δύο τούτων άλλος. From this, and the other words of this, we may observe, that they who affirm the Universe to be in constant motion, suppose a great part thereof, to do nothing else but move and change; but that there is something which offends through and pervades this whole Universe, by which all these things are made, are made; and that this is both the Most Swift, and Most Subtil Substantials: for it could not otherwise pass through all things, were it not so Subtil, that nothing could keep it out or hinder it; and it must be most swift, that it may use all things, as if they stood still, that nothing might escape it. Since therefore this doth preside over, and Order all things, Permeating and Passing through them; it is called διὰκως by Plutarch: the Letter Cappa, being only taken in for the more handson pronunciation. Here we have therefore Heraclitus his Description of God, namely this, τῆς θεοῦ πατρός καὶ τοῦ πατέρα, διὰ τούτων. έναν ζεύγος τετηκαὶ καὶ εὐσταθεῖς, διὰ τὸ δύο τούτων οὖν παρέξε, οἱ δὲ ποιῶν τοῖς γυναικεῖοι γένεσιν, That Most Subtil and Most Swift Substance, which permeates and passes through the whole Universe, by which all things that are made, are made. Now faith Plato, some of these Heraclitics, say that this is Fire, others that it is Heat; but he deriding both these Conceits; concludes with Anaxagoras, that it is a Perfect and unmixed with any thing; which yet Permeating and Passing through all things, Frames, Orders, and Disposeth all.

Wherefore this being the Universally received Doctrine of the Pagan, that God was a Spirit or Substance Diffused through the whole world, which Permeating and Inwardly Acteth all things, did Order all; wonder, if they called him, in several Parts of the World, In the Tings of Nature, by several Names; or to use Ciceron's Language, no wonder if Deus Pertinens per Naturam conjuge rei, per Terras Ceres, per Martia Neptronum, &c. if God pervading the nature of every thing, were the Earth called Ceres, in the Sea Neptune, in the Air Juno, &c. and this very account does Paulus Orosius (in his Historick work against the Pagans, Dedicated to St. Anulin) give of the original of the Roman Polytheism, Quamdam in Multis Deum credunt, Multos Deos, &c. &c. Ratio Timore, sinistrum, That Some whilst they believe God to be

In
In many things, have therefore, out of an indifferet fear, signed many gods; in which words he intimates, that the pagans many gods, were really but several names of one god, as existing in many things, or in the several parts of the world; as the same ocean is called by several names, as beating upon several shores.

Secondly, the Pagan Theology went sometimes yet a strain higher, they not only thus supposing God to pervade the whole world, and to be Diffus'd throughout all things, which as yet keeps up some difference and distinction betwixt God and the world, but also himself to be in a manner all things. That the ancient Egyptian Theology, from whence the Theologies of other nations were derived, ran so high as this, is evident from that excellent monument of Egyptian antiquity, the Sat'ick Inscription often mentioned, I am all that was, is, and shall be. And the Trismegistick Books infilling so much every where upon this notion, that God is all things, (as hath been observed,) renders it the more probable, that they were not all Counterfeit and Suppositious; but that according to the testimony of Jamblichus, they did at least contain De'as, 'Ema'xos, some of the old Thebatical or Hera'medal Philosophy, in them. And from Egypt in all probability, was this doctrine by Orpheus derived into Greece, the Orphick Verstes themselves running much upon this strain, and the Orphick Theology being thus epitomized by Timothenes the Chronographer; that all things were made by God, and that Himself is All Things. To this purpose is that of æschylus,


Et Terra, & Æther, & Poli Arx est Jupiter, Et Cunila Solus, & aliquid Sublimis.

And again,

Ibn. p. 53.

--- Nunc ut implacabilis

Apparet Ignis: nunc Tenebris, nunc Agne
Par ile cerni: simulat interdum Feram,
Tonitura, Ventos, Fulmina, & Nebila.

As also this of Lucan among the Latins,

Lib. 9. v. 580.

--- Superos quid quærimus ulter?

Jupiter est quodcumque Vides, quocumque moveris.

Whereunto agree also, these passages of Seneca the Philosopher, Qui est Deus? Quod vides Totum, & quod non vides, Totum. And S
CHAP. IV. Theology. That God is All Things.

Solus est Omnia; opus sum & Extrà & Intrà tenet: What is God? he is all that you see, and all that you do not see. And he alone is All Things, containing his own work not only without but also within. Neither was his the Doctrine only of those Pagans who held God to be the soul of the World, and consequently the whole Animated World to be the Supreme Deity, but of those others also, who conceived of God as an Abstract Mind Superior to the Mundane Soul, or rather a Simple Monad Superior to Mind also; as those Philosophers, Ionopanes, Parmenides, and Melissus, who described God to be one and All Things, they supposing that because all things were from him, they must needs have been first in a manner In him and Himself All Things. With which agree the Author of the Afclepian Dialogue, then he maketh, Unus Omnis, and Creator Omnim; One All Things, ad the Creator of All Things, to be but equivalent Expressions: and then he affirmeth, that before things were made, In co auras event, unde Nasci habuerunt; They then Existed in him, from whom afterwards they proceeded. So likewise the other Triumegistick Books, then they give this account of Gods being both All Things that Are, and All things that Are Not, τὰ μὲν οὐδὲν ἔχωντο, τὰ δὲ μὴ οὐδὲν ἔχοντο, because those things that Are, be bath manifested from himself, and those things that Are not, he still containeth within himself; or it is elsewhere expressed, he doth κρυπτεῖν, Hide them and Conceal them in himself. And the Orphick verses gave this same Account of Gods being All Things, πάντα τὰ δὲ κρυπτά, &c. because he Conceal'd and Hid them all within himself, before they were made then and afterward from himself displayed them, and brought them forth into Light: Or because

— —— ὑμεῖς οὖν γεγραμμένοι ἐνέχειτε,
Fure they were produc'd, they were all contain'd together in the Womb of God;

Now this was not only a further Ground, of that seeming lyceism amongst the Pagans, which was really nothing but the Pompyn of One God, and their Personating his Several Powers; but also another more strange and puzzling Phenomenon in their Theology, namely, their Personating also, the Parts of the World Inanimate, All Things of Nature, and bestowing the Names of Gods and Goddesses on them. It was before observed out of Moschopulus, that the Pagans did in óóνενα τίνι τιλ ὢναμα τον, η το ἐκκατοντα το τος δοῦναι ὅνομα, Call the things in Nature, and the Gods which presided over them, by one and the same Name. As for Example, they did not only call God which preside over those arts that operate by Fire, Hephaistus or Vulcan, but also Fire itself. And Demeter or Ceres, was not only taken by them for that God, who was supposed to Give Corn and Fruits, but also for Corn itself. So Dionysus or Bacchus did not only signify, that God that Giveth Wine, but also Wine it self. And he instancing rather, in Venus, and Minerva, and the Muses, concludes the same universally of all the rest. Thus Arnobius in his Book against the Pagans, In usu sermonis vestri, Martem pro Pugna appellatis, pro Aqua Nupnum, Liberum Patrem pro Vino, Cercerem pro Sane, Minervam pro Stamine, pro Obsequis libidinis Venerem. Now we will not deny, Ggg
but that this was sometimes done Metonymically, the Efficient Cause, and the Ruling or Governing Principle, being put for the Effed, or that which was Ruled and Governed by it. And thus was War frequently styled Mars, and that of Terence may be taken also in this sense, Sine Cerere & Libero friget Venus. And Plutarch (who declares his great dislike of this kind of Language) conceives that there was no more at first in it than thus, εστὶν ἡμῖν ὁ ἄνδρεύς μελέτης Μαθητῶν, ἐνότατος πάλαις, εἰς ἡμέραν ἡμῶν τοῦ μενών ἔχον, τους ἁπάντας τοῦ τό, αὐτὸς ἡμῖν καλέων εἰς ἐφεδράς, πιστεύσεις ἐπὶ χρῆς ἐκεῖνοις. As we, when one buyeth the Books of Plato, commonly he buyeth Plato; and when one alters the Plays of Menander, that he alters Menander, so did the ancients not spare to call the Gifts and Effects of the Gods, by the names of those Gods specifically, thereby honouring them also for their Utility. But he grants that afterward this Language was by ignorant Persons abused and carried on further, and that not without great Impiety; οὐ τῷ Μαντείῳ ἐπέμενεν τὸν ἄνδρεύς μελέτης, ἐνότατος πάλαις, ἐπὶ δύος τοὺς τοῦ περιεχεῖσθαι ἐγνώσεως, καὶ γνώσεως καὶ ἐποίησις, ἐκ τῆς παραγόνθης με- τάνοιας. And indeed, Cicero, plainely declares, Tun ille quid erat à Deo na- tum, Nomine ipsius Dei nunepabanunt, ut cum Fruges Cererem appellau- mun, Vixim autem Librum; Tun autem Res ipsa in qua Vis inquit Ma- jor, sic appellatur ut ea ipsa Res nominetur Deus. Both that which proceeds from God, is called by the name of a God, as Corp is sometimes thus called Ceres, and Wine Libra, and also whatsoever hath any great Force in it, That thing it self is often called a God too. Philo also thus represents the Religion of the Pagans, as first Defying Corporal In ani mate Things, and then bestowing those Proper Personal Names upon them: εκπέμπεται γὰρ οἱ μὲν τὰς παραγόνθις ἀρκεῖς, γιὰτί ἡ ἐφορία ἡ ἀλή- σες τῶν, εἰς ἄνδρεὺς μελέτης, ἐνότατος πάλαις, καὶ ἐποίησις ἀνε- γείρεται, οἱ δὲ καταθέτοντες καταθέτεισιν. ὅτι δὲ ἀνωτέρω καὶ πρωτό- τον, ἐκπεμπότες, καὶ προάγοντες, τὸ μεταρρύθμισι πάλαις, καὶ προάγοντες καὶ εἰς ἀποτέλεσμα, καὶ ἐποίησις τῶν, τῶν τούτων ἐστὶ, καὶ μεταρρυθμιστῶν τῶν ἐστὶ, καὶ ἀποτέλεσμα τῶν ἐστὶ, τῆς παραγόνθης. And whensoever this is the ease, or of the same nature, they will say, τὸ παράλληλον, τὸ παράλληλον τὸ παράλληλον. And whensoever this is the ease, or of the same nature, they will say. And whensoever this is the ease, or of the same nature, they will say. Some have Devised the Four Ele- ments, the Earth, the Water, the Air and the Fire. Some the Sun, the Moon, and the Planets and Fixed Stars: Others the Heaven, others the whole World. But that Highest and most Ancient Being, the Part
of all things, the Chief Prince of this great City, and the Emperor of this invincible Army, who governeth all things sylphisterously, Him have they covered, concealed and obscured, by bestowing counterfeit Personal Names of Gods upon each of these things. For the Earth they called Proserpina, Pluto and Ceres; the Sea Neptune, under whom they place many Demons and Nymphs also as his Inferior Ministers; the Air Juno; the Fire Vulcan; the Sun Apollo; the Moon Diana, &c. and dividing the Heaven into Two Hemispheres, one above the Earth the other under it, they call these the Dioscuri, feigning them to live alternately one one day, and the other another. We deny not here but that the Four Elements, as well as the Sun, Moon, and Stars, were supposed by some of the Pagans, to be Animated with Particular Souls of their own, (which Ammianus Marcellinus seems principally to call Spiritus Elementorum, the Spirits of the Elements, worshipped by Julian,) and upon that account to be so many Inferior Gods themselves. Notwithstanding which, that the Inanimate Parts of these, were also Deified by the Pagans, may be concluded from hence; because Plato, who in his Cratylus etymologizeth Dionysus from Giving of Wine, and elsewhere calls the fruits of the earth (De Leg. p. 28) Ceres, doth himself neverthelesse in compliance with this Vulgar Speech, call Wine and Water as mingled together in a Glass (or Cup) 'o be drunk, Gods: where he affirneth that a City ought to be, De Leg. L. c. ηποτην κακοσιν ηκαστοις, και μεν οι αυτης κεχριμετχι οικη, καλακετην·· ζυ γη περιοις ετεσ Σε α, καλως καυσκει λαλων, ανοχη πιειει κιλετεν επετηθησιν· so tempered, as in a Cup, where the furious Wine poured out bubbles and sparkles, but being corrected by another sober God (that is, by Water) both together make a good and moderate Potion. Cicero also tells us, that before the Roman Admirals went to Sea, they were wont to offer up a Sacrifice to the Waters. But of this more afterward. However it is certain, that dear Accidents, and Affections of Things in Nature, were by these Pagans commonly Personated and Deified, as time in Sophocles his Elecra is a God, xειος γε διακας εις, For time is an eafie God; and Love in Plato's Symposium, where it is wonred at, that no Poet had ever made a Hymn to "ευαλι πωλουσος εις και σωσηλ ται, To Love being such and so great a God. Though the same late in his Philbus, when Protarachus had called Pleasure a Goddess P. 12, ρο, was not willing to comply so far there with Vulgar Speech; Δ' εκει ναες, ζ προπαγες, αει πες το γε, συν διακας εις εις και λατον, ολλα πειρας ποιεις φλεις, καν εις τω με δης λαδης, ων εκεινος του, τριτων προσφατης, του διενοι ες ας εις τωντων. My fear, Θ ro tarachus, concerning the Names of the Gods, is extraordinary great. Therefore as to Venus, I am willing to call her, what she pleaches to be called; but Pleasure I know is a Various and Multiform thing. Therefore it cannot be denied but that the Pagans did in some one or other Deifie or Theologize all the Parts of the World, and Things in Nature. Which we conceive to have been done at first upon no other Ground than this, because God was supposed by them, not only to Permeate and Pervade all things, to be Diffused thorough All, and to Act in and upon All; but also to be Himself in a manner All things, which they expressed after this way; by Personating the things of Nature Severally, and bestowing the Names of Gods and
Gods upon them. Only we shall here observe, that this was done especially (besides the Greater Parts of the World) to Two Sorts of things. First, such in which Humane Utility was most concerned:

Thus Cicero, Mulcæ. alii Naturæ Deorum ex Magnis Beneficis corum, non sine cœa & à Graecis Superiesibus & à Majoribus notibus, constitutum nominatioque sunt: Many other Natures of Gods have been constituted and nominated, both by the wise men of Greece, and by our Ancients, merely for the great Benefic received from them. The Reason whereof is thus given by him, Quia quicquid magnum Utilitatem generi afferte humano, id non sine Divina Bonitate erga homines fieri arbitrabantur; Because they thought, that whatsoever brought any great Utility to mankind, this was not without the Divine Goodness.

Secondly, such as were most wonderful and Extraordinary, or Surprising; to which that of Semce seems pertinent, Magnorum Fluminum Capita Venerata, Subita & ex abditis vasti annis crypto Aras habet. Coluntr Aquarium Caellantium Fontes & Stagna quadam vel Opacitas vel immerga Altitudine sacravit. We adore the rising Heads and Springs of great Rivers. Every sudden and plentiful Eruption of Waters out of the hiddn Caverns of the Earth, hath its Altars erected to it; and some Fools have been made Sacred for their immense Profoundity and Opacity.

Now this is that which is properly called, the Physiological Theology of the Pagans, their Perforating and Deifying (in a certain Sense) the Things of Nature, whether Inanimate Substances, or the Affections of Substances. A great part of which Physiological Theology was Allegorically contained in the Poetic Fables of the Gods. Eusebius indeed was of opinion, that those Poetic Fables were at first only Historical, and Historical, but that afterwards some went about to Allegorize them into Physiological Sences, thereby to make them feem the lesimigious and ridiculous: τιμωτὶ ὤν τὰ παλαιὰς Θεολογίας, ἦν μεταλλήλως νοτοί τις, χρίς καὶ πρῶτον διατυπώμενης, λογικά τε κεφάλαια κοινωνίας εἰς τοὺς τιμωτὶ ὤν τὰ παλαιὰς Θεολογίας, ἦν μεταλλήλως νοτοί τις, τούτῳ φανερώμενος τὸ δὲ μὲν εἰς ἑπεχύτητα, συμβολὴς καὶ προβολὴς τῆς μεταλλήλως νοτοί τις, ὡς παστικὴ, πρωτοφανὴς, ἔτοι παλαιὰς διατυπώμεναι, ὡς παλαιὰς διατυπώμεναι καὶ μεταλλήλως νοτοί τις, μεταλλήλως νοτοί τις. Such was the ancient Theology of the Pagans, namely, Historical, of men deceased, that were worshipped for Gods which some late Upstarts have altered, devising other Philosophical and Physiological Sences of those Histories of their Gods, that they might thereby render them the more specious, and hide the Impiety of them. For they being neither willing to abandon those Fopgeries of their forefathers, nor yet themselves able to bear the Impiety of these Fables (concerning the Gods) according to the Literal Sense of them, have gone about to cure them thus by Physiological Interpretations. Neither can it be doubted, but that there was some Mixture of Herology and History in the Poetic Mythology; for denied, that the Pagans of latter times, such as Porphyry and others, did excogitate and devise certain new Allegorical Sences of their own, such as never were intended. Origen before both him and Porphyry, noting this of the Pagans, that when the aurdity of their Fables concerning the Gods was objected and urged against them, some of them did, ἔτι τὸν ἀπολογητικὸν ἐθνον παράπληξιν, apologizing for these things, betake themselves to Allegori...
But long before the times of Christianity, those First Stoics Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, were famous for the great pains which they took in Allegorizing these Poetic Fables of the Gods. Of which Curtius Cicero thus, Magnam molestiam inscript & minimè necessarium, primus Zeno, post Cleanthes, dein deinde Chrysippus, Commentiarium Fabellarum reddere rationem, & vocabulorum cur quidque uta appellatun sit, cajus explicare. Quondam facile, illud profecto conferremini, longe alterum rem habere atque hominum opinio sit, eos qui Diis appellantur, [Sunt] Naturæ esse, non Figure Deorum, Zeno first and after him Clea

Thee stoics took it for granted, that the Natures of Things were allegorized, and therefore, and that those Gods were not Animal, nor indeed philosophical, but Fictitious, and nothing but the Things of Nature Allegorized. Origin also gives us a Tast of Chrysippus his thus Allegorizing, in his interpreting an obscene Picture or Table of Jupiter ad Juno, in Samos; & Agis & τος, κατά τοῦ συγμάχουν, ὅ τις φιλοσόφων, ὅ τις τις περισσοτέρος λέγει τῷ ἡθῶν ἅπαν συνδέσμον, ἕξεν ἐκ 

This Grave Philosopher in his writings saith that after having received the Spermatick Reasons of God, contained in his within itself, for the adorning of the whole world, and this Juno this Picture in Samos, signifies Matter, and Jupiter God. Upon which occasion that pious Father adds, ἄριστα τοὐά τοὺς ὄρατος, ἀριστα τοὺς ἔσορας μιθῆς ἄριστα μεῖζον ὅν ἐμπροσθοτέρον ἄλλος των ἐπουρανίων ἀρχών, ἐκ μοι οὐδεὶς ἐκ τοῦ ἄριστος τέχνης. For the sake of which, and innumerable other such like Fables, we will never endure to call The God over all, by the name of Jupiter, but exercising pure Piety towards the Maker of the world, will take care not to defile Divine things with impure Names. And we see again, according to Chrysippus his Interpretation, that Juno was no Animal nor Real God, but only the Nature of Matter Personated and Deified, that is, a mere Fictitious and Poetic God. And we think it is unquestionably evident, from Hesiod's Theogonia, that many of these Poetic Fables, according to their First Intention, were really nothing else but Physiology Allegorized, and consequently those Gods, nothing but the Natures of things Personated and Deified. Plato himself, though no friend to these Poetic Fables, p. 378.
them were Physically, and some Tropologically Allegorical: modes various, according to the \"elucidation\" of each, either in a demonstrative, or \(\textit{supernatural}^+\) fashion. \&c. Let no man think me to be ignorant that some of the Greek Fables are profitable to men, partly as declaring the Works of Nature by Allegories, partly as being helpful for humane life, \&c. Thus also Cicero, \textit{Dea quaeque}, and \textit{quidem Physica, magna fluxit Multitude Deorum, qui induit specie humana,Fabulas Poeticas suppendis-taverni, hominum autem vitam Superstitione omni referentur.}

Eusebius indeed, seems sometimes to call it as an Imputation upon the whole Pagan Theology, that it did \textit{Seiácen tiv \(\&\textit{Surov \&Cov, Deifie the Inanimate Nature; but this is properly to be understood of this Part of their Theology only, which was Physiological, and of their Mythology or Poetic Fables of the Gods Allegorized: it being otherwise both apparently false, and all one as to make them downright Atheists. For he that acknowledges no \textit{Animal God}, as hath been declared, acknowledges no God at all, according to the True Notion of him; whether he derive all things from a \textit{Fortuitous Motion of Matter, as Epicurus and Democritus did, or from a \textit{Plasticck} and Orderly but Senile Nature, as some Degenerate Stoicks, and \textit{Strato} the Peripateticck; whose Atheism seems to be thus described by Manilius,

\begin{verbatim}
Aut neque Terra Patrem nostris, nec Flamma, nec Aer,
Aut Humor, faciniique Deum per quatuor artus,
Et Mundi fruxere Globum, probibentique requiri
Ultra se quidquam.
\end{verbatim}

Neither ought this \textit{Physiological Theology} of the Pagans, which consisted only in Personating and Deifying Inanimate Substances, and the Natures of Things to be confounded (as it hath been by some late Writers) with that \textit{Philosophical Theology} of Scaevola, Varro and others, (which was called \textit{Natural also, but in another fence, as True and Real} it being indeed but a Part of the Poetical first, and afterward of the Political Theology, and owing its Original much to the Phancies of Poets, whose Humour it was perpetually to Personat Things and Natures. But the \textit{Philosophick Theology} properly so called which according to Varro was that, \textit{de qua multis libros Philosophorum} queruntas it admitted none but \textit{Animal Gods}, and such as really exist in Nature, \(\textit{which therefore were called Natural}\) namely one Supreme Universal Numen, a Perfect \textit{Soul} or \textit{Mind comprehending all and his \(\textit{υπηρετοι δυνάμεις, other Inferiour Understanding Beings h}

Minifters Created by him, such as Stars and Demons, so were all the \textit{Personated Gods}, or \textit{Natures of Things Deified}, in the Arcane Theology interpreted agreeably thereunto.

St. \textit{Austin} often takes notice of the Pagans thus Mingling and as were Incorporating \textit{Physiology} with their \textit{Theology}, he judifly condemn the same. As in his 49. Epitile; \textit{Neque illius existentiae imp.\ jua Sacrilega Sacra \& Simulachra, quid eleganter interpretatur quaeque significat: Omnis quippe illa Interpretatio ad Creaturam resur, non ad Creatorem, cui uni debetur Servitus Religionis, illa que-
Wherefore these personated Gods of the Pagans, or those Things called Gods and Goddefse, were for all that, by no means accounted by the Intelligent amongst them, True and Proper Gods. Thus Cotta in Cicero; Cum Fruges Ceresem, Vinum liberrum dicimus, genero nos quidem sermonis nimirum affeat: sed erat amicum eft effe putus, qui illud, que vocatur Deum eft credat; though it be very common and familiar language amongst us, to call Corneres, and Wine Bacchus; yet who can think any one to be so mad, as to take us to be really a God, which be feeds upon? The Pagans really accounted at only for a God, by the worshipping and invoking whereof, they might reasonably expect benefit to themselves, and therefore nothing as Truely and Properly a God to them, but what was both Substantial, and also Animant and Intellectual. For Plato writes that the Atheiftick L.10.de Leg. of his time, therefore concluded the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, to be Gods, because they were nothing but Earth and Stones (or certain Fiery Matter) devoid of all Understanding and Sense, and that from whence, οὐδὲν τοι ἀνθρώπων περὶ γαϊτὸν φυσικῶν διάδρομον, unable to be notice of any Humane Affairs. And Ariftole affirmeth concerning the Gods in general, ξυν τοι ποις υπελαξαν αὐτές, οἱ ἀνθρώποι ἐν ὅσι, c. That all men conceived them to Live, and consequently to All, since they cannot be supposed to sleep perpetually as Endymion did, The Pagans, universally conceived the Gods to be Happy Animals; and Ariftole ere concludes the happiness of them all to confit in Contemplation. Lucretius himself would not debar men of that Language (then algarly received amongst the Pagans) of calling the Sea Neptune, corn Ceres, Wine Bacchus, and the Earth the Mother of the Gods, so, provided that they did not think any of thefe for all that, to be truly and Really Gods.
And the reason why the Earth was not really a Goddes, is thus given by him,

_Terra quidem vero caret omni tempore Senfu._

_Because it is constantly devoid of all manner of sense. Thus Balbus in Cicero tells us, that the first thing included in the notion or Idea of a God, is this, _Ut sit Animans, That it be Animatus, or endowed with Life, Sense, and Understanding_. And he conceiving the Stars to be undoubtedly such, therefore concludes them to be Gods. _Quoniam tenuissimus effe Aether, & semper agitatur & viget, necesse est, quod animal in eo signatur, idem quoque Senfu accrimit esse_. Quare cum in Athere Astra gignatur, conficiatam esse in suis Senjnum inesse & Intelligentiam. Ex quo effectur in Deorum numero Astra esse decedera. Because the Aether is most subtil, and in continual agitation, that Animal which is begotten in it, must needs be endowed with the quickest and sharpest sense. Wherefore since the Stars are begotten in the Aether, it is reasonable to think them to have Sense and Understanding; from whence it follows, that they ought to be reckoned in the number of Gods. And Cotta in the Third Book, affirms that all men were so far from thinking the Stars to be Gods, that _Multi ne Animantes quidem effe concedant, many would not so much as admit them to be Animals_: plainly intimating that unless they were Animated, they could not possibly be Gods.

_Laftly Plutarch for this very reason absolutely condemns, that whole practice of giving the names of Gods and Goddesles, to Inanimate things, as Abfurdi, Impious, and Atheistical, OZSCOS & 3beis 3movi, 3eSes eis. Ei3bas, enwtof 3Bos eis 3a 3usos, Tefius 3movi, 3eSes eis. Ei3bas, enwtof 3Bos eis. 3eSes eis. They who give the names of Gods to Sensless and Inanimate Nature and Things, and such as are destroyed by men in the use of them, beget wicked and Atheistical opinions in the minds of men: since it cannot be conceived how these things should be Gods; for nothing that is Inanimate is a God. And now we have very good reason to conclude, that the Distinction or Division of Pagan Gods (used by some) into Animal and Natural (by Natural being meant Inanimate) is utterly to be rejected, if we speak of their True and Proper Gods; since nothing was such to the Pagans but what had Life, Sense, and Understanding. Wherefore those Personated Gods, that were nothing but the Natures of Things Deified, as fuch, were but Dii Commentarii & Filiijii, Counterfeit and Fictional Gods: or as Origen calls them in that place before cited, τοις ολοις ἀναπλάσμοις, συμβασιλεύοντες κόσμος ἁπα θρυγματων, Figments of the Greeks (and other Pagan), that were but Things turned into Persons and Deified. Neither _
can there be any other sense made, of these Personated and Deified Things of Nature, than this, that they were all of them really so many several Names of one Supreme God, or partial Confederations of him, according to the several Manifestations of himself in his Works, thus according to the old Egyptian Theology before declared, God is to have both, no Name, and every Name; or as it is expressed in the Alcæopian Dialogue, Cum non posset uno quovis & multis compotis nomine nuncupari, potius omni nomine vocandus est, quicdem a Nomis & omnibus ut necessis sit, ant omnium ipsius nomine, ant ipsum nominum nomine nuncupari: since he cannot be fully declared by any one Name, though compounded of never so many, therefore is he rather to be called by every Name, he being both one and all Things: so that either every Thing must be called by his Name, or he by the Name of every Thing. With which Egyptian Dialogue, Seneca seemeth also fully to agree, when he gives this Description of God, cui nomine omnis reverent, He to whom every Name belongeth; and when he further declares thus concerning him, quaeque voles illi nomina aptatis; ad, tot appellations ejus posunt esse, quot Munera, you may give him however Names you please, &c. and, there may be as many Names of one and the same nature, as there are gifts and effects of him; and lastly, when he makes God and nature, to be really one and the same thing; and, every thing we see, to be God. And the writer de Mundo, is likewise con- nant hereunto, when he affirmeth that God is, nuncipis iterumque, &c. &c., or, may be denominated from every nature, cause he is the cause of all things. We say therefore, that the Paganists in this their theologizing of physiology, and deifying the things of the world, did accordingly call every thing the name God; or God by the name of every thing.

Wherefore these personated and deified things of nature were not themselves properly and directly worshipped by the intelligent pagans, who acknowledged no inanimate thing for a God; so as to terminate their worship ultimately in them; but either relatively only the supreme God, or else at most in way of complication with in, whose effects and images they are, so that they were not only worshipping themselves as God was worshipped in them. For these pagans professed, that they did, τοιὁνως ως πορείαν, μονοὶ δέορφος της σωματικής σκέπης, look upon the Heaven (and World) not slightly and officiously; nor as mere brute animals, who take notice of nothing, but the sensible phantasms, which from the object doth obtrude themselves upon the senses, or else as the same Julian, in that oration, again more fully professeth it, τοιὁνως δεορφος ἑποτε τον ἄλογα καθαρτιόν, v. supra, p. 186. καθαρτιόν ἄλογα ἐστιν το ορασός τῆς ἀφοινής τῆς πλείως γένους φύσις, a view and contemplate the Heaven and World, with the same eyes, that oxen and horses do, but so as from that which is visible to their outward senses, to discern and discover another invisible nature, or it. That is, they professed to behold all things with religious eyes, and to see God in every thing, not only as pervading all things, as diffused through all things, but also as being in a manner all things therefrom, they looked upon the whole world as a sacred thing, and having a kind of divinity in it; it being, according to their theolog-
nothing but God himself Visibly Displayed. And thus was God worshipped by the Pagans, in the whole Corporeal World taken all at once together, or in the Universe, under the Name of Pan. As they also commonly conceived of Zeus and Jupiter, after the same manner, that is, not Abstractly only (as we now use to conceive of God) but Concretely, together with all that which Proceedeth and Emanateth from him, that is, the Whole World. And as God was thus described in that old Egyptian Monument, to be All that Was, Is, and Shall be; so was it before observed out of Plutarch, that the Egyptians took the First God, and the Universe, for One and the same Thing; not only because they supposed the Supreme God, Virtually to contain all things within himself, but also because they were wont to conceive of him, together with his Outflowing, and all the extent of Eunculity, the whole World displayed from him, all at once, as one entire thing. Thus likewise, do the Pagans in Plato confound & μητρον θεον, and ἐκείνος ὁ μέγατες, The Greatest God, and The Whole World together, as being but one and the same thing. And this Notion was so Familiar with these Pagans, that Strabo himself, writing of Moses, could not conceive of his God, and of the God of the Jews, any otherwise than thus, τὸ κόσμον ἑλέας ἡ πτωτική, κ. γ. θάλασσαν, ἔχοντας ἐν γένεις, κ. τ.λ. τὸν ὄλον γόνην, namely, That which containeth us all, and the Earth, and the Sea, which we call the Heaven and World, and the Nature of the Whole. By which notwithstanding, Strabo did not mean, the Heaven or World Inanimate, and a Sensible Nature, but an Understanding Being, framing the whole World and containing the fame, which was conceived together with it: of which therefore he tells us, that according to Moses, no wise man would go about, to make any Image or Picture, resembling any thing here amongst us. From whence we conclude, that when the fame Strabo, writing of the Persians, affirmeth of them, that they did, ζεγα-
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νεικίσσειν ἄδικα, take the Heaven for Jupiter, and also Herodotus before him, that they did, ἐπιτυχώς παῖνα. Τόν κόσμον ὁμοίως, Call the Whole Circle of the Heaven, Jupiter; that is, the Supreme God; the meaning of neither of them was, that the Body of the Heaven Inanimate, was the Highest God, but that though he were an Understanding Nature, yet framing the whole Heaven or World and containing the fame, he was at once conceived together with it. Moreover, God was worshipped also by the Pagans, in the Several Parts of the World, under Several Names; as for example in the Higher and Lower Air, under those Names of Minerva and Jupiter; in the Air, under the name of Juno; in the Fire, under the name of Vulcan; in the Sea, under the name of Neptune, &c. Neither can it be reasonably doubted, but that when the Roman Sea-Captains, Sacrificed to the Wav, they intended therein to worship that God, who ofteth in the Wave, and whose Wonders are in the Deep.

But besides this, the Pagans seemed to apprehend a kind of necessity, of worshipping God thus, in his works, and in the Visible things of this World, because the generality of the Vulgar were then unable to frame any notion or conception at all of an Invisible Deity, and therefore unless they were detained in a way of Religion, by such a worshipping
worship of God as was accommodate and suitable to the lowness of their apprehensions, would unavoidably run into Atheism. Nay the most Philosophical Wits amongst them, confecting God to be Incomprehensible to them, therefore seemed themselves also, to stand in need of some Sensible Props, to lean upon. This very account is given by the Pagans, of their practice, in Eusebius, ἀστυπλότας καὶ ἀφρός Τύχης. E.V.L. 3. καὶ τὸ πάντων οὐδὲν οὐδὲν, καὶ διὰ πάντων διάκονος, καὶ τὸν εἰκόνα διὰ τὰς. K.S. e. 13. διευκολύνων ὑπὸ φῶς, That God being Incorpoerally and Insensibly present in all things, and pervading or passing through all things, it was reasonable, that men should worship him, and by and through those things that are Visible and Manifest. Plato likewise represents this as the opinion of the generality of Pagans in his time, μέγας γὰρ θεὸν ἢ ἠλών ἢ ἐκμακρύνθην τόν τὸν ἐτελευτητικόν πολυγονόν τὸν οὗτοι τοσούτον οὐδέν οὐκ, that as for the Greatest God, and the Whole World, men should not hastily & curiously search after the knowledge thereof, nor pragmatically inquire into the causes of things, it being not pious for them so to do. The meaning whereof seems to be no other than this, that men ought to content themselves to worship God in his Works, and in this Visible World, and not trouble themselves with any further curious Speculations concerning the Nature of that, which is Incomprehensible to them. Which though Plato professeth his dislike of, yet does that Philosopher himself elsewhere, plainly allow of worshipping the First Invisible God, a those Visible Images which he hath made of himself, the Sun and Moon and Stars. Maximinus Tyrius doth indeed exhort men to ascend p. in the Contemplation of God, above all Corporeal Things, λόγος ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἑκάστος, ὁδείς τὸ ἕν τῇ σκέψει σαμάχα (καλὰ μὴ τὸ τῶν κ. ὑγιατος ἤνακά, ἢ γενικά, ἢ πρέπει τὸ καθέναν ἐκείνας ἀλλὰ ἡ τότειν πιστὴν ηλικίαν ὁδείς, ἢ ἡμερών ταῖς ἔργοις, ηὐτὴν τῇ τούτω, &c. The End of your Journey, (laith he) is not the Heaven, or those glimmering Bodies in the Heaven; for though those be beautiful and sublime, and the genuine Offspring of this Supreme Deity, framed after the best manner, yet ought these all to be transcended by you, and your mind lifted up far above the Starry Heavens, &c. Nevertheless he cloes his discourse thus, οὐ γὰρ ἔναντι προς τις τοις τοις περιφορίας ὅμοιος Σαῖν, καὶ τοις τοις ἐχθροῖς τοις. οὐ μετερθεὶς, καὶ πρωτοκλήντων τοις ἐφύσεις πολλαὶ καὶ πρῶτοι οὖν, οὐδὲ οὐ καὶ νησίτης πινακίδας λεγέντος, οὑ καὶ τεσσαρεῖς μελῶν δεῖς Σειρίοις κ. φελοῖς, ἦν ἠλπίζοις ἐξ ἔφοβος. τοῦτο μὲν κατ᾽ ἐπιδρον ἀπὸ τῆς φοίνικος, c. But if you be too weak and unable to contemplate that Father and Author of all things, it will be sufficient for you for the present to behold Works, and to Worship his Progeny or Offspring, which is various and manifold. For there are not only according to the Egyptian Poet, Thir- t'hon and Gods all the Sons and Friends of the Supreme God; but D unimaginable. And such in the Heaven are the Stars, in the Ether Deities, &c. Lastly Socrates himself also, did not only allow of this way of worshipping God, (because himself is Invisible) in his works at are Visible, but also commend the same to Ethybaldemus, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντας, ἐκ νόμου ἅδες ἀν αὐτοῖς ἐκ νόμου ἃν τοῖς μεταφάσας τῷ θεῷ ἄρχον. Υπὸ ξέφωσι τοις τοις ἔνας ἐφύσεις οὐδὲνος τοὺς τοὺς Σειρίοις. That I ask the truth, your self shall know, if you will not stay expecting, till I see the Forms of the Gods themselves, but count it sufficient for you holding their works to worship and adore them. Which he afterward particular.
particularly applies to the Supreme God, who made and containeth
the whole World, that being Invisible, he hath made himself
Visible in his Works, and consequently was to be worshipped and
adored in them. Whether Socrates and Plato, and their genuine Fol-
lowers, would extend this any farther than to the Animated Parts of
the World, such as the Sun, Moon, and Stars were to them, we can-
not certainly determine. But we think it very probable, that many
of those Pagans who are charged with worshipping Inanimate Things,
and particularly the Elements, did not withstanding direct their Wor-
ship, to the Spirits of those Elements, as Ammianus Marcellinus tells
us Julian did, that is, Chiefly the Souls of them, all the Elements be-
ing suppos'd by many of these Pagans to be Animated, (as was before
observed concerning Proclus,) and Partly also, those Demons which
they conceived to inhabit in them and to preside over the parts of
them; upon which account it was said by Plato and others of the An-
cients, that παντα παίρνει, All things are full of Gods, and
Demons.

XXXIII. But that these Physiological Gods, that is, the Things of
Nature Perfomated and Deified were not accoyinted by the Pagans Tin
and Proper Gods, much less Independent and Self-existent ones, may
further appear from hence, because they did not only thus Perfomate
and Deify Things Substantial and Inanimate Bodies, but also meet Ac-
cidents, and Affections of Substances. As for example First, the Passi-
on of the Mind, τον πνεύματος το ζωον του λογου, the Soul, faith S. Greg.
Nazianzen, They accounted the Passions of the Mind to be Gods, or at least
worshipped them as Gods; that is, built Temples or Altars to their
Names. Thus was Hope, not only a Goddess to the Poet Theog.,
things, of which Vellius has collected the largest Catalogue, in his eighth Book De Theologia Gentili. And this Porsonating and Deifying of Accidental Things, was so familiar with these Pagans, that as St. Chrysostome hath observed, St. Paul was therefore called by some of the vulgar Athenians, to have been a Setter forth of strange Gods, when he preached to them Jesus and the Resurrection, because they supposed him not only to have made Jesus a God but also Angelical or Resurrection, a Goddes too. Nay this Humour of Theologizing the Things of Nature transported these Pagans so far, as to Deifie Evil Things, also, that is, things both Noxious and Vicious. Of the former Pliny thus, H.N.L. 2. c. 7. inferi quoque in generas describimus, Morbiqne, & muta etiam Vetus, dum esse placatus trepido metu cupimus. Ideoque etiam publice Febri Funum in Palatio dedicatum est, Orbone ad aedem Larinarum Ara, & Male Fortuna Exequilis: So great is the number of these Gods, that even Hell or the state of death itself, Diseases and Many Plagues are numbered amongst them, whilst with a trembling fear we desire to have these pacified. And therefore was there a Temple publickly Dedicated in the Palace to be Fever, as likewise Altars elsewhere reeled to Orbona, and to Evil Fortune. Of the latter Balbus in Cicero, Quo ex genere Cupidinis & N.D.L. 2. Volumptatis, & Lubentina Veneris, Vocabula Consecrata sunt, Vitiofarum erum & non Naturalium: Of which kind also, are those Names of Luiff, & Pleasure, and Wanton Venery, things Vicious and not natural, Consecrated and Deified. Cicero in his Book of Laws informs us, that at Athens there were Temples Dedicated also to Contumely and Impudence, but withal giving us this censure of such practices, Quae omnia insmodi detestanda & repudianda sunt. All which kind of things are to be detested and rejected, and nothing to be Deified but what is Vertuous or Good. Notwithstanding which, it is certain, that such Evil Things thence, were Consecrated to no other end, than that they might be reproached. Moreover as these Things of Nature, or Nature of Things, were sometimes Deified by the Pagans plainly and nakedly in their own appellative Names, so was this again sometimes done disguisedly, under the other Counterfeit Proper Names: as Pleasure was Deified, under the names of Voluptia, and of Lubentina Venus 3 Time, (according to the Opinion of some) under the Name of Cronos or Saturn, which it Produceth all things, so devours all things into it self again; Rudeor or Wisdom likewise, under the Names of Athena or Minerva, or it is plain that Origen understood it thus, when Celfus not only c. Gis. L. 2. approved of Worshipping God Almighty, in the Son and in Minerva, p. 221. that which was Lawful, but also commended it as a thing Highly Ious; he making this Reply; Αριστευσα δι λογος των ηκνων ας διωκαται καθως παρετηκε, c. 'Athow η κοντεν μετα ηλε πατομαιλιομενην και ει εκδικουση ηγος, ετε δονοι, και τε η τοπος βουλιοεις, φιλακιοεις ογη τη δε ηεγενεδεικε εφακες, Μεν Τη Καταβασιμ, &c. We speak well of the Son, as a good work of God's, c. but as for that Athena or Minerva, which Celfus here joyeneth with the Son, this is a thing Fabulously devised by the Greeks (whether according to some Mythical, Arcane and Allegorical Sense, or without it) when they say that she was begotten out of Jupiter's Brain All Armed. And again afterwards, Εν Τω επιζολομητυ και λεγεθαι η ανάμειμα περαν αν Αθηνης, it be granted that by Athena or Minerva, be Tropologically meant Prudence, &c. Wherefore not only according to the Poetical, but also to
to the Political and Civil Theology of the Pagans, these Accidental Things of Nature, and Affections of Substances, Perfonated, were made to many Gods and Goddesfs, Cicero himself in his Book of Laws approving of such Political Gods as these; Bene vero quod Mens, Pietas, Virtus, Fides, confecratur manu: quorum omnium Rome dedicata publice Templum funt, ut illa qui habeat (habent autem omnnes boni) Deus ipsos in animis suis collocatos putent: It is well, that Mind, Piety, Virtue and Faith, are consecrated, (all which have their Temples publicly dedicated at Rome) that so they who possess these things (as all Good men do) may think that they have the Gods themselves placed in their minds. And himself makes a Law for them, in his own Common-wealth, but with a Cautionary Provision, that no Evil and Vicious Things be Consecrated amongst them; As lulla, proper que datur homini adipens in Celum, Mentem, Virtutem, Pietatem, Fidem, earumque laudem dedicata. Nec ulli vi torum Solemnia obtinunt: Let them also worship those things by means whereof, men ascend up to Heaven, and let there be shrines or Temples Dedicated to them. But let no Religious Ceremonies be performed to Vicious things.
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CHAP. IV.  But Several Names of God.

Define, spudor est, Gentilis ineptia, tandem Res Incorporea, Simulatis Fingere membri.

Let the Gentiles be at last ashamed, if they have any blame in them, of this their folly, in describing and setting forth Incorporeal things with Counterfeit Human Members. Where Accidents and Affections of Things, such as Victory was, (whose Altar Symmachus there contended for the Restauration of) are by Prudentius called Res Incorporea, Incorporeal Things, accordingly as the Greek Philosophers concluded, that Virtus were Ἀνθρωπολογίας, Qualities Incorporeal. Neither is it possible, that the Pagans themselves should be insensible hereof; and accordingly we find, that Cotta in Cicero doth for this reason utterly banish, and explode these Gods out of the Philosophick and True Theology, Nam certesigitur subtilliore ratione opus esse ad haec resellenda? Nam Montem, Fidem, Spem, Virtutem, Honorem, Victriam, Saltem, Concordiam, ceteraque eujusmodi, Rerum Vm habere videmus, non Deorum. Aut enim in nobis nec infans ipsis, ut Mens, ut Spes, ut Fides, ut Virtus, ut Concordia aut optanda nobis sunt, ut Honos, ut Salus, ut Victoria. Quare autem in his Vic Deorum ist, tum intelligam cum cognovero? Is there any need, think you, of any great Subtilty to confine these things? For Mind, Faith, Hope, Virtue, Honour, Victory, Health, Concord, and the like, we see them to have the Force of Things, but not of Gods. Because they either exist in us, as Mind, Hope, Virtue, Concord; or else they are desired to happen to us, as Honour, Health, Victory (that is, they are nothing but meer Accidents or Affections of Things) and therefore how they can have the Force of Gods in them cannot possibly be understood. And again afterwards he affirmeth, Eos qui Dii appellantur, Rerum Naturae esse, non Figuras Deorum, That those who in the allegorical Mythology of the Pagans, are called Gods, are really, but be Nature of Things, and not the True Figures or Forms of Gods.

Wherefore since the Pagans themselves acknowledged, that those personated and Deified Things of Nature, were not True and Proper Gods; the meaning of them could certainly be no other than this, that they were so many Several Names, and Partial Confederations of One Supreme God, as manifesting himself in all the Things of Nature. For that Vis or Force, which Cicero tells us, was that in all such things, which was called God or Deified, is really no other, than something of God in Every Thing, that is Good. Neither do we otherwise understand, those following words of Balbus in Cicero, Quam Re- com, quia Vis erat tanta, ut sine Deo regi non posset, ipsa Res Deorum aemum obtinuit; Of which things because the Force is such, as that it could not be Governed without God, therefore have the Things themselves obtained the Names of Gods, that is, God was acknowledged and worshipped in all, which was Paganeously thus signified, by calling of them Gods. And Pliny, though no very Divine Person, cet being ingenious, easily understood this to be the meaning of Fragilis & laboriosa Mortalitas, in Partes ifs a digest, Infirmitatis s aemor, ut Portionibus quiique coleret, quo maxime indigere; Frail
ad toilow, Mortality, hast thus broken and crumbled the Deity into Parts.
Partes, mindful of its own Infirmity; that so every one by Parcels and Pieces, might worship that in God, which himself most stands in need of. Which Religion of the Pagans, thus worshipping God, not entirely all together at once, as he is One most Simple Being, Unmixed with any thing, but as it were brokenly, and by piece-meals, as he is severally Manifested, in all the Things of Nature, and the Parts of the World, Praetentius thus pursued in his Second Book against Symmachus;

That Osiris was the Supreme Deity, see the Egyptian Inscription, in Theop. Symm. Alcem. p. 297, TyparvGermain, in ib. Ci. Osiris the most ancient King of all things.

\[\text{Tu, me praterito, meditari Numina mille,}
\text{Qui simules parere meis Virtutibus, ut me}
\text{Pars varius partes minus, cui nulla recidi}
\text{Pars aut Forma potest, quia sum Substantia Simplex;}
\text{Nec Pars esse quaet.}
\]

From which words of his we may also conclude, that Symmachus the Pagan, who determined, That it was One Thing that all worshipped, and yet would have Victory, and such like other things, worshipped as Gods and Goddeses, did by these and all those other Pagan Gods before mentioned, understand nothing but so many Several Names, and Partial Considerations of One Supreme Deity, according to its several Virtues or Powers: so that when he sacrificed to Victory, he sacrificed to God Almighty, under that Partial Notion, as the Giver of Victory to Kingdoms and Commonwealths. It was before observed out of Plutarch, that the Egyptian Fable of Osiris, being mangled and cut in pieces by Typhon, did Allegorically signify the same thing, viz. the One Simple Deity's, being as it were divided (in the Fabulous and Civil Theologies of the Pagans) into many Partial Considerations of him, as so many Nominal and Titular Gods, which Isis notwithstanding, that is True Knowledge and Wisdom, according to the Natural or Philosopher's Theology, unites all together into One. And that not only such Gods as thefe, Victory, Virtue, and the like, but also those other Gods, Neptune, Mars, Bellona, &c. were all really, but one and the same Jupiter, acting severally in the world, Plautus himself seems sufficiently to intimate, in the Prologue of his Amphitryon in these words,

Nam quid ego memorem, ut alios in Tragedis
Vidi, Neptunum, Virtutem, Victorian,
Martem, Bellonam, commemorare quae bona
Vobis fecissent \& Quis Benefactis meus Pater,
Deum Regnator, Architec, omnibus.

Whereas there was before cited a Passage out of G. I. Vossius his Book, De Theolog. Gent. which we could not understand otherwise than thus, that the generality of the Pagans by their Political (or Civil) Gods, meant so many Eternal Minds Independent and Self-Existent we now think our selves concerned, to do Vossius so much right, a to acknowledge, that we have since met with another place of his in that same Book, wherein he either corrects the former Opinion or else declares himself better concerning it, after this manner: the Pagans generally conceived, their Political Gods, to be so man...
Substantial Minds (or Spirits) not Independent and Self-existent, nor indeed Eternal neither; but Created by One Supreme Mind or God and appointed by him to preside over the Several Parts of the World and Things of Nature, as his Ministers. Which same thing he affirmeth of those Deified Accidents and Affections, that by them were to be understood, so many Substantial Minds or Spirits Created, prefiguring over those several Things, or dispensing of them. His words the beginning of his Eighth Book (where he speaks concerning hefe Affections and Accidents Deified by the Pagans) are as followeth.

His explanations Deorum propè immensa est copia. Ac in Civili quem Theologia, considerari solent, tanquam Mentes quasdam, hoc bono a Summo Deo sortite, ut Affectionibus his presint. Neque credeant Deum, quem Optimum Max. vocabant, non per se omnina curere, quo pati, ut dicebant, plurimum beatitudini eju decedet, d. inifar Regas, plurimos habere Ministros & Ministras, quorum fines huic illivere cura presecifit. Sic Justitia, que & Altrae ac Theis, prefedt ecr altibus curis, in quibus Justitia attendeter: Co-ius curare creditus est Compositions. Et sic in ceteris id genus Diis, item ab ea Affectione sortitii, eju cura cuique commissa crediendar, quia pati, ut consideretur, non aliter different à Spiritibus suo Angelidis malisque, quam quod bi recurat à Deo conditi sint: ille vero Men-tes, de quibus nunc logiunur, sunt Figmentum Mentis humane, pro nu-vo Affectionum, in quibus Vis esse major videtur, comminificent eintes Affectionibus Singulis prefedt. Facile, autem Sacerdotes suas commensa persuadere sulpicioribus potuerunt, quia fatis videtur veri- tate, summa illi Menti, Deorum omnium Regi, innumeris servire menti, ut e prefedtor sit Summi Dei beatitudine, minusque curis implicitur: que tot Fantalantium numero, Summi Numinis Majestas magis eluce-rit. Ac talis quidem Opinio ecr Theologia Civili. Of such Gods as 

there was an innumerable company amongst the Pagans. And in Civil Theology they were wont to be considered, as certain Minds (or Spirits) appointed by the Supreme God, to preside over the Affections of Things. They supposing, that God, whom they called the Best and the Creator, did not immediately himself take care of every thing, since that it needs be a divination to him, and a hindrance of his happiness; that he had as a King, many He and She-Ministers under him, which had their several offices assigned to them. Thus Justice which was 

cled also Altrae and Themis, was by them thought to preside over all the actions, in which Justice was concerned. And Comus over all Re- 

nings, and the like. Which Gods, if considered after this manner, no otherwise differ from Angels good and bad, than only in this, that the Latter are Beings really created by God; but the former the Figments of men only; they, according to the number of Affections, that are any greater force in them, devising and imagining certain Minds to preside over each of them. And the vulgar might therefore be the 


easily led into this persuasion by their Priests, because it seemed reasonable to them, that that Supreme Mind, who is the King of all the Gods, should have many other Minds as his Subservient Ministers under him, both to free him from Solicitous Care, and also to add to his Gran-


der and Majesty. And such was the Doctrine of the Civil Theology. Were though Vossius speak Particularly, of that kind of Pagan Gods, which were nothing but Affections and Accidents Deified, (which n
man in his wits could possibly suppose to be themselves True and Proper Gods, they having no Subsistence of their own) That these by the

generality of the Vulgar Pagans, were conceived to be so many Created Minds or Spirits, appointed by the Supreme God, to preside as his Ministers over those several Affections of Substances; yet does he plainly imply the same of all those other Political Gods of these Pagans likewise, that they were not look'd upon by them, as so many Unmade, Self-existent, and Independent Beings, but only as Inferior Minds or Spirits, created by the Supreme God, and by him appointed to preside over the Several Parts of the World, and Things of Nature, and having their Several Offices assigned to them. Wherefore as to the main, We and Vossius are now well agreed, viz. That the ancient Pagans afferti no such thing as a Multitude of Independent Deities; so that there only remain, some Particular Differences of smaller moment, betwixt us.

Our selves have before observed, that Αἰολὸς was probably taken by Epictetus in Arrianus, (not indeed for One, but) for Many Created Ministers of the Supreme God, or Demons Collectively; appointed by him to preside over the Winds in all the several Parts of the World. And the Pagans in St. Austin, seem to interpret those Deified Accidents and Things of Nature after the same manner, as the Names of certain Unknown Gods or Demons (one or more) that were appointed to preside over them respectively, or to dispense the same. Quoniam sic habant Majores nostri nemini talia, nis aliquo Deo largiante concedi, quorum Deorum nomina non inveniabant, carum rerum nominibus appellabant Deos, quas ab ipsis sentiebant dari; alicus vocabula inde fletentes: scit ut Bello Bellonam nuncpavanquam non Bellum; scit a cunia Cinam non Cunam; scit a setebus Segetianon Segetem; scit a Pomis Pomonam non Pomum; scit a boibus Bobonam non Bovem. Aut certe nulla vocabuli declinatione scit res ipse nominatur: ut Pecunia dicta est Deaque dat pecuniam, non omnino pecunia Dea ipfa putata: Ita Virtus quae dat virtutem, Honor qui honorem, Concordia que concordiam, Victoria que victoriam dat. Ita, iniquum, cum Felicitas Dedicitur, non ipfa que datur sed, Nomen illud attenditur, a quo Felicis datur. Because our Forefathers knew well that these things, do not happen to any, without the special Gift and Favour of some God; therefore were those Gods, whose names they knew not, called from the names of those very things themselves, which they perceived to be bestowed by them, there being only a little Alteration made in them, as when the God that causeth War, was called not Bellum but Bellona; the God which presideth over Infants Cradles not Cuna but Cunina, that which giveseth Corn Segitia; and that which affordeth apples Pomona, &c. But at other times, this was done without any Declension of the Word at all, they calling both the Thing and the God, which is the Bestower of it, by one and the self same name. As Pecunia doth not only signify Money, but also the Gods which giveseth Money; Virtus the Goddes which giveseth Virtue; Honor the God that bestoweth honour; Concordia the Goddes that causeth Concord; Victory the Goddes which affords Victory. So also when Felicity is called a Goddes, by it is not meant, that thing which is given, but that Divine Power, from whence it is given. Here, I say, the I-
And Laelantius Firmianus, taking notice of that Profession of the Pagan Gods, to worship nothing but One Supreme God and his Subservient Ministers Generated or created by him, (according to that of Seneca in his Exhortations, Genuisse Regni suij Miniftros Deum; that the Supreme God had generated other Inferiour Ministers of his Kingdom unto him, which were called by them also Gods) plainly denies the Pagan Gods save One, to be the Created Ministers of that One Supreme, he making this Reply; Verum hi neque Dei sunt, neque Deos deocari, aut coli volunt, &c. Nec tamen illi sunt qui vulgo coluntur, quum & exigus & certus est numeros: But these Ministers of the Divine Kingdom, or Subservient Created Spirits, are neither Gods, nor did they be called Gods, or honoured as such, &c. Nor indeed are they the Gods, that are now vulgarly worshipped by the Pagan, of which there is not a Small and Certain number. That is, the Pagan Gods, are ranked into certain Ranks, and the Number of them is determin'd by the Utilities of Humane Life; of which, their Noble and Seleci Gods, being but a few. Whereas, faith he, the Ministers of the Supreme God, according to their own Opinion, not Twelve nor Twenty, not Three Hundred and Sixty, but Innumerable; Stars, and Demons.

Moreover Aristotle in his Book against Zeno (supposing the I. An. in Xen. de deo, to be this, the Most powerful of all things, or the Most Perfect Body) objecteth thus, that according to the Laws of Cities and Count-
men have an Idea in their minds of God, as One the most Excellent and most Powerful Being of all; this doth not seem to be according to Law, that is, the Civil Theology: for there the Gods are mutually better one than another, respectively as to several things; and therefore Zeno took not this Confent of mankind concerning God, from that which vulgarly seems. From which passage of Aristotle we may well conclude, that the Many Political Gods of the Pagans, were not all of them vulgarly look’d upon, as the Subservient Ministers of One Supreme God, and yet they generally acknowledging, (as Aristotle himself confesseth) a Monarchy, and consequent not many Independent Deities; it must needs follow, as Zeno doubtlesly would reply, that these their Political Gods, were but One and the same Supreme Natural God, as it were Parcel’d out, and Multiplied; that is, receiving Several Denominations, according to Several Notions of him; and as he exerciseth Different Powers, and produceth Various Effects. And this we have sufficiently prov’d already to have been the general sense of the Chief Pagan Doctors; that these Many Political and Popular Gods, were but the Polynomy of One Natural God, that is, either Partial Considerations of him, or his Various Powers and Virtues, Effects and Manifestations in the World, severally Personated and Descried.

And thus does Vossius himself afterwards confess also; That according to the Natural Theology, the Many Pagan Gods, were but so many Several Denominations of One God; though this Learned Philologer doth plainly straiten and confine the Notion of this Natural Theology too much, and improperly call the God thereof, the Nature of Things; however acknowledging it such a Nature, as was ended with Sense and Understanding. His Words are these, Diuersa vero sententia Theologorum Naturalium, qui non alium Numinem agnoscant quam Naturam Kermm, eique omnibus Gentium Numinibus referantur, &c. Nempe mens eorum fuit ficut Natura effe occupata, circa hanc vel illam Affectionem, ita Numinia Nominatae Deorum variarum. Cum igitur ubicunque Vim aliquam majorem videns, ita Deorum aliquid credens: et etiam devener, ut immanem Deorum Deorumque singularem Caturum. Sagaciore interim hac cuncta, Unum esse Numinem jaciant: putat Kermm Naturam, quae licet una foris, pro variis tantum Efficitur varia fortresur nonnma, vario etiam afficeretur cultu. But the Church is very different as to the Natural Theologers, who acknowledged no other God but the Nature of Things, and referred all the Pagan Gods to that. For they conceived that as Nature was occupied about several things, so were the Divine Powers and the Names of Gods, multiplied and diversified. And where-ever they saw any Greater Force, there did they presently conceive something Divine, and by that means came they at length to feign an innumerable company of Gods and Goddesses. But the more sagacious in the mean time affirmed, all these to be but One and the same God; so the Nature of Things, which though Really but One, yet according to its various Effects both received divers Names, and was Worshipp’d after different manners. Where Vossius calls the Supreme God of these Natural Theologers, the Nature of Things; as if the Natural Theology had been denominat’d from Physicks, or Natural Philosophy only, whereas we have already shew’d, that the Natural Theologers were all of them, partly influenced by the Learning of the Ancients, partly by the Manners of the Times, and partly by the Political Laws of their respective Countries; and that their different Names of Gods were not their particular Inventions, but the common Practice of the Barbarous and Ignorant Nations, the Barbarians themselves considering the Names of Gods as nothing but their own Factions, Tribes, and Cities, and not as the Names of Gods proper, which they conceived belonged to the Supreme God, as the Roman Nation was wont to say. And this, according to Vossius, is the natural Reason why the Pagan Gods were so diversely denominated; and this, according to him, is the true Origin of all the Pagan Theology; and this, according to him, is the true Cause of the divers Names of Gods. Where Vossius calls the Supreme God of these Natural Theologers, the Nature of Things; as if the Natural Theology had been denominat’d from Physicks, or Natural Philosophy only, whereas we have already shew’d, that the Natural Theology was a獨立的自然神學.
Chap. IV. The Polyonomy of One God.

logy of Varro and Sextus, was of equal extent with the Philosophers, whose only Name, that it was not a Blind and Unintelligible Nature of Things, doth sufficiently appear, from that History thereof given by us: as also that it was called Natural in another sense, as Real; and as opposite to Opinion, Phancy and Fable, or what hath no Reality of Existence any where in the World. Thus does St. Tullian distinguish between Natura Deorum, the True Nature of the Gods, and Hominum Instituta, the Institutes of Men concerning them. As also he sets down the Difference, between the Civil and Natural Theology, according to the Mind of Varro in this manner, Fieri potest ut vid.

1. Urbe, secundum Falsas opiniones ea colatur & credatur, quorum Mundum vel extra Mundum Natura sit usquam: It may come to pass, that those Things may be worshipped and believed in Cities, according to popular opinions; which have no Nature or Real Existence anywhere, either in the World or without it. Wherefore if instead of this Nature Things, which was properly the God of none but only of such Atheistic Philosophers as Epicurus and Strato, we substitute that Great Mind or Soul of the whole World, which Perceiveth All Things, and is diffused through All; (which was the True God of the Pagan Theists) this of Vossius will be unquestionably true, concerning their Natural Theologers, that according to them, those Many Poetical and Mythical Gods before mentioned, were but One and the same Natural Real God; who in respect of his Different Vertues, Powers, and Effects, was called by several Names, and worshipped after different manners. Yet nevertheless so, as that according to those Theologers, there were Really also Many other Inferior Ministers of this One Supreme God, (whether called Minds or Demons) that were supposed to be the Subservient Executioners of all those several Powers of his. And accordingly we had before, this full and true account of the Pagans Natural Theology set down out of Prudentius.

In Uno

Constituit jus omne Deo, cui serviat ingenis
Virtutum ratio, Variis instituta Ministris.

That it acknowledged One Supreme Omnipotent God, ruling over all, displaying and exercising his manifold Vertues and Powers in the World, (all severally Personated and Deified in the Poetical and Civil Theologies) together with the Subservient Ministry of other Inferior Creations, Understanding Being, or Demons, called also by them Gods:

is very true, as we have already declared, that the more High-flown Platonick Pagans, did reduce those Many Poetical and Politico-Gods, and therefore doubtless all the Personated and Deified Things of Nature too, to the Platonick Ideas, or First Paradigms and Patterns of Things in the Archetypal World, which they affirmed to have been begotten from the Supreme Deity, that is, from the First Hypothesis of the Platonick Trinity; and which were commonly called by the utmost Sto, Intelligible Gods, as if they had been indeed, so many distinct Substances and Personas. And as we have also proved of Philo, that this High-flown Paganick Theology, was ancienst
The Egyptians also reduced, Book I.

than either Julian or Apuleius; so do we think it not unworthy our Observation here, that the very same Doctrine, is by Celsus imputed also to the Egyptian Theologers, as pretending to worship Brute Animals no otherwise, than as Symbols of those Eternal Ideas; and that we Christians derive the Egyptians, without cause, they having many Mysteries in their Religion, so as much as they profess, that perishing Brute Animals are not worshipped by them, but the Eternal Ideas. According to which of Celsus it should seem, that this Doctrine of Eternal Ideas, as the Paradigms and Patterns of all things below in this Sensible World, was not proper to Plato nor the Greeks; but common with them to the Egyptians also. Which Eternal Ideas, however supposed to have been generated from, that First Divine Hypothesis of the Platonic and Egyptian Trinity, and called Intelligible Gods; were nevertheless acknowledged by them, all to exist in One Divine Intellectual, according to that of Plotinus, \\

*That the Intelligibles exist nowhere of themselves, without Mind or Intelligence, which Mind or Intelligence, being the Second Divine Hypothesis, these Intelligible and Invisible Gods, (however Generated from God) yet are therefore said by Julian in his Book against the Christians, both to consist with God, and to insufficient in him. To which purpose also, is this other Praise of Julian's in his Sixth Oration, where he sets down, that as he is to the Intellectuals, so is he to the Intelligibles. And this to the Egyptians is a very necessary point, therefore they have both of them, and are distinguished.

For God is All things, so as much as he containeth within himself, the Causes of all things, that any way are; whether of Immortal things, or of Corruptible and Perishing things, not Corruptible but Eternal also, and always remaining; which therefore are the Causes of their perpetual Generation, and New Production. Now these Causes of All things contained in God, are no other than The Divine Ideas. Wherefore from hence it plainly appears, that these Platonic and Egyptian Pagans, who thus reduced their Multiplicity of Gods to the Divine Ideas, did not therefore make them to be so many Minds or Spirits, really distinct from the Supreme God, (though dependent on him too) but indeed only so many Partial Considerations of One God, as being All things, that is, containing within himself the Causes of all things. And accordingly we find in Origen, that as the Egyptian Theologers called their Religious Animals, Symbols of the Eternal Ideas, so did they also call them Symbols of God. And seeing them in their Trinity, and with that idea of these Visible, and those Invisible, or beings, and establishing both the idea of this soul and that soul, Celsus applauds the Egyptian Theologers, talking so magnificently and mysteriously of those Brute Animals worshipped by them, and affirming them to be, certain Symbols of God.

And now we have given some account of the Polyny of the One Supreme God, in the Theologies of the Pagans; or of his being called by Many Proper Personal Names, carrying with them an Appearance of So many Several Gods. First, that God had many several Names.
O cæta revera Sator! O PRINCIPUM DEORUM!
Stridula cui Limina, cui Cardinei Tunnitum,
Cui referata magni sunt aurea Claudia Mundi.

Venier, as the Great Mind and Soul of the whole World. Saturn, as 
hat Hidden Source and Principle, from which all Forms and Lives 
flourished, and into which they again retire; being there laid up 
their Secret Storehouse: Or else as one of the Egyptian or Her 
aic Writers expresseth it, that which doth, παντα πειθεί πές εις διεφ 
ointments, make all things out of itself, and unmake them into itself 
again. This Hermetic Saturn, answering to the Egyptian Hammon, that 
likewise signifies Hidden, and is accordingly thus interpreted by ῶμη 
clicius, ο το αρχαί ζήτ καθαρότατον άρμον δύναμεν εις ψάκ αύγον, he that 
ringer forth the secret Power of the Hidden Reasons of things (confe 
within himself) into Light. God was also called Athena or Mina, as 
Wisdom diffusing itself through all things: and Aphrodite Urania, the 
Severity Venus or Love. Thus Phanes, Orphæus his Supreme God, (so 
called according to Lycantus, Quia cum adhuc nihil esset, Primus ex 
initio ipse apparuerit, because when there was yet nothing, he First 
appeared out of that Infinite Abyss, but according to Proclus, because he did 
several ποιοντα εις γενεσις, discover and make manifest the Intelligible Ut 
(Or Ideas) from himself; though we think the Conjunction of 
theanthes Kircherus to be more probable than either of these, that 
phanes was an Egyptian Name;) this Phanes, I say, was in the Orphic and 
Hermeneutics Theory, as Proclus upon Plato's Timæus informs us, styled 
δεα τε προσγεζ, Tender and Soft Love. And Thercydes Syrus likewise affirmed 
δει χρηστα θεοποιηκτον ή δει μεθοδω δυνατονι, That Jupiter was turn 
all into Love, when he went about to make the world. Besides which, 
there were other such Names of the Supreme God and more than have 
een mentioned by us; as for example, Summanus amongst the 
ancient Romans, that afterward grew obsolele; of which St. Austin 
C.D.II.4.13 
nus; Romani vetere nescio quem Summanum, cui Nothurna Fulmina 
ribanebat, colorant magis quam Jovem, ad quem Divina Fulmina 
etimbat. Sed postquam Jovi Templum insigne as sublime constru 
sc proper adis dignitaten, sic ad eum multitudo confluxit, ut vix inn 
iciatur qui Summanum nomen, quod audiri iam non potest, se faltem 
iste minuerit: The ancient Romans, worshipped I know not what God 
alled Summanus, more than they did Jupiter. But after that a fra 
and magnificent Temple was erected to Jupiter, they all betook them 
desider that Jupiter; in so much that the Name of Summanus now not at all 
heard, is scarcely to be found in any ancient writings.

Again as the Pagans had certain other Gods, which they called 
special; so were these but Several Names of that Supreme God Allo, 
corresponding to Particular Considerations of him, either as 
Prediing
But lastly, as God was supposed by these Pagans, not only to pervade all things, and to fill all things, but also, he being the cause of all things, to be himself in a manner all things; so was he called also by the name of every thing, or every thing called by his name: that is, the several things of nature and parts of the world were themselves verbally deified by these Pagans, and called gods and goddeses. Not that they really accounted them such in themselves, but that they thought fit in this manner to acknowledge God in them, as the author of them all. For thus the Pagans in St. Austin, Ufque adeoque, inequitat. Majores nostros insipientes suiffa credendum est, ut haec necirent innumera divina eje, non Deos? Can you think that our Pagan ancestors were so sottish, as not to know, that these things are but divine gifts, and not gods themselves? And Cicero also tells us, that the meaning of their thus deifying these things of nature, was only to signify, that they acknowledged the force of all things to be divine, and to be governed by God; and that whatsoever brought any great utility to mankind, was not such without the divine goodness. They conceiving also, that the invisible and incomprehensible deity, which was the cause of all things, ought to be worshipped in all its works and effects, in which it had made it self visible, accordingly as they declare in that place of Ephesians before cited in part, μη τα οφθαλμα σωματα ζη&ν και σωλην, και ομορα, μηδεν τα αισθατα μερι τη νοεμα φασιν θεον, Αλλα τας αυτο τοτης αφορμις δυναμεις, εκ της ου τη φαινει. Ενα ου θεος, πανως δυναμεις τη νοεμα πληρως, και δια πανως δικαιος, και της πανως κατατητος αριστερας και αριστερας αυ των ουα, και δια πανως δυναμιν, και της εν κατε δια των δυναμεων ολον. That they did not deifie those visible bodies of the sun, and moon and stars, nor the other sensible parts of the world themselves, but those invisible powers of the god over all, that were displayed in them. For they affirm, that that god who is but one, but yet filleth all things with his various powers, and passes through all things, forasmuch as he is invisibly and incorporeally present in all, is reasonably to be worshipped in and by those visible things.

Athanasius bp. of Alexandria, in his book against the Greeks, reduce all the false gods of the pagans, under two general heads; the first, poetical, fictitious or phantastical gods; the second, creature or real things of nature deified by them. His words are these: ει δι της μηδε ποιησε λεγομενος θεος, η ηκει στη το αληθειας και της των άγνω θεοποιησες ηλιας πλαισιωατος, &c. Since this reason or discourse of ours, hath sufficiently convinced, both the poetical god of the pagans to be no gods at all; and also that they who deifie the creatures, are in a great error; and so hath confuted the whole paganism idollaty, proving it to be meer ungodliness and impiety, there is nothing
Poetical and Phantastical.

CHAP. IV. Poetical and Phantastical.

Now but the True Poet left; he who is worshipped by us Christians, being the only True God, the Lord of Nature, and the Maker of all Substances, from whence we may observe, that according to Athanasius, the Poetic Gods, were no Real Things in Nature, and therefore they could be no other, than the Several Notions and Powers of the One supreme God Deified, or several Names of him. So that Athanasius his poetic Gods, or ο ἢ& τοι παντοίς, &amp; ο, God fabulously deified by the Poets, were chiefly those Two Kinds of Pagan Gods, first mentioned by us; that is, the Various Considerations of the One Supreme Name, according to its general Notion, expressed by so many proper Names; and Secondly his Particular Powers diffused thorough the World, severally Personated and Deified. Which considered, so many distinct Deities, are nothing but mere Fiction and Phantasy, without any Reality. And this do the Pagans themselves in Athanasius acknowledge. 

XXXIV. Hitherto have we declared the Sense of the Pagans in General, those also being included, who supposed God to be a Being Exalted above the World, that they agreed in these Two Things. First of Breaking and Crumbling as it were, of the Simple Deity, and Turning out of the fame into Many Particular Notions and Partial Considerations, according to the Various Manifestations, of its Power and Providence in the world; by the Personating and Deifying of which Severally, they made as it were, so many Gods of One. The chief Ground whereof was this, because they considered not the Duty according to its Simple Nature, and Abstractly only; but Considerately also with the World, as he Displayeth himself therein, Preserved all, and Diffuseth his Vertues thorough all. For as the Sun reflected by Groser Vapours, is sometimes Multiplied, and the same Object beheld through a Polyedrous Glass, by reason of those many Surfaces, being representer in several places at once, is thereby rendered Manifold to the Spectator; So One and the Same Supreme God, considered Concretely with the World as Manifesting his Several Parts and Vertues in it, was multiplied into Several Names, not with-
out the Appearance of so Many Several Gods. Whereas παλαιών with those ancient Pagans, was the same thing with πολυθυελθον, That which hath Many Names, all one with that which hath Many Powers: According to this of Callimachus concerning Diana,

Δις μεν παρθενών ἢδον, ἡπεκο, φυλάσσειν, Καὶ Παλαιώτης.

And this of Virgil concerning Alecto,

Tibi Nomina Mille,

Mille nocendi Artes.

And accordingly the Many Pagan Gods are in Plato's Cratylus, interpreted as the Many Powers of One God Diffused through the World.

And the Pagan Theologers seemed to conceive, this to be more suitable to the Pomp, State and Grandeur, of the Supreme God, for he to be considered Diffusely, and called by Many Names, signifying his Many Several Vertues and Powers (Polyonymy being by them accounted an Honour) rather than to be contracted and thrunk all up, into One General Notion, of a Perfect Mind, the Maker or Creator of the whole World. The Second Thing in which the Pagans agreed is, their Personating and Deifying all the Parts of the World, and Things of Nature themselves and so making them so many Gods and Goddeses too. Their meaning therein being declared to be really no other than this: That God who doth not only Pervade all things, but also was the Cause of All things, and therefore himself is in a manner All things, ought to be worshipped in all the Things of Nature and Parts of the World: as also that the Force of every thing was Divine, and that in all things that were Beneficial to mankind, The Divine Goodness ought to be acknowledged.

We shall now observe how both those forementioned Principles, of Gods Pervading all things, and his Being All things, which were the Chief Grounds of the Seeming Polytheism of the Pagans, were inproved and carried on further, by those amongst them, who had a Higher Notion of the Supreme Deity, than as the Soul of the World. Which Opinion that it found entertainment amongst so many of them probably might be from hence, because it was so obvious for those of them that were Religious to conceive, that as themselves confounded of Body and Soul, so the Body of the Whole World, was not without its Soul neither: and that their Humane Souls were as were derived from the Life and Soul of the World, as the Earth and Water in their Bodies was, from the Earth and Water of the World. Nor whereas the more refined Pagans, as was before observed, supposing God to Pervade and Pass thorough All things ὅπως ἦν ὢν; Unmixedly; the concluded God to be, (according to that Definition of him in Quotian, taken in a rigid Sense) Spiritum omnibus Partibus Immixtum: Spirit Immingled with all the Parts of the World: or else in Man's his Language,

Infusumque Deum Calo, Terrisque Fretoque,
Infused into the Heaven, Earth, and Seas: Sacroque measu Conspirare Deam, and intimately to conspire with his own Work the World, as being almost one with it. Upon which account he was commonly called Nature also, that being thus defined by some of the Stoicks, Deus Mundo permisit, God Mingled throughout with the World, and Divina Ratio toti Mundo infita, The Divine Reason inserted into the whole World. Which Nature notwithstanding, in way of distinction from the Particular Nature of things, was called now φύσεως, and communis Natura, the Common Nature. And it was plainly declared by them, not to be a Sensible Nature; according to that of Balbus in ireo, Natura est qua continent Mundum omnem, eumque tectum, atque aquidem non fine Senju, atque Ratione: It is Nature by which the whole World is contained and upheld, but this such a Nature as is not without sense and Reason. As it is elsewhere said to be, Perfect and Eternal Reason, the Divine Mind and Wisdom containing also under it, all the ἐν περιπάτει δι', the Spermatick Principles by which the things of nature (commonly so called) are affected. Wherefore we see at such Naturalists as these, may well be allowed to be Theists (More himself in Strabo being accounted one of them) whereas those that acknowledge no Higher Principle of the World, than a Sensible Nature (whether Fortuitous, or Orderly and Methodical) cannot be accounted any other than Absolute Atheists. Moreover this Soul of the World, was by such of these Pagans as admitted no Incorporeal Essence, itself concluded to be a Body too, but ηευτοτοτον ξ έ τάκσιν, Most Subtil and Most Swift Body, as was before observed out of Plato though endowed with Perfect Mind and Understanding, as well as the Spermatick Reasons] which intimating it self into all other Bodies, did Persuade and Persuade the whole Universe, and frame all Things, inwardly Mingling it self with all. Heraclitus and Hippafus thinking this to be Fire, and Diogenes Apolloniates Air; whom Simplicius, who had read some of his then extant Works, vindicates from the Imputation of Atheism, which Hippo and Anaximander lyer.

Again, whereas the more Sublimated Pagans affirmed the Supreme God to be All, so as that he was nevertheless something Above All too, as being Above the Soul of the World; (and probably Eschylus in that celebrated passage of his, is to be understood after this manner; ἔστι γὰρ τὸ κατὰ τοὺς πατέρας, ὡς τὸ πατέρας κατὰ τὸν κόσμον, Jupiter is the Ether, Jupiter is the Earth, Jupiter is the Heaven; Jupiter is All things, and yet something Higher than all 5 or Above all:) those Pagans who acknowledged a Higher Numin, than the Soul of the World; made God to be All Things in a greater sense, they supposing the whole Corporeal World limited to be also the Supreme Deity. For though God to them, were Principally and Originally, that Eternal Unmade Soul and Mind, which diffuseth itself thorough all things, yet did they conceive that the Humane Soul and Body, both together, made up one whole Rational Animal, or Man; so this Mundane Soul, and its Body the World, did in like manner both together, make up One Entire Divine Animal, or God.
It is true indeed, that as the **Humane Soul** doth **Principally act** in some one Part of the Body, which therefore hath been called the **Hegemonicon** and **Principale**, some taking this to be the **Brain**, others the **Heart**, but **Strato in Tertullian** ridiculously, the **Place between the Eyes-browes**; so the Stoicks did suppose the **Great Soul or Mind** of the World, to act Principally in some one Part thereof, (which what it was notwithstanding they did not all agree upon) as the **Hegemonicon** or **Principale**; and this was sometimes called by them, **Empathically, God**. But nevertheless they all acknowledged this **Mundane Soul**, as the **Souls** of other Animals, to **Pervade, Animate, or Enliven and Acquaint**, more or less its whole Body, *The World*. This is plainly declared by **Laertius in the Life of Zeno.** This **οὐδε** κόσμον ἔδωκατο ἐν εὐνοίᾳ τινι, ἀλλ' ἀυτῷ μέσῳ διωκόμενοι τοι ἡ καινοτομία ἃν κινεῖν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἀυτῷ μέσῳ μάλλων, ἀλλ' ἀυτῷ μέσῳ, τοι ἢς ἔχει καταλαμβάνειν, ἀλλ' ἀυτῷ μέσῳ, τοι ἢς καταλαμβάνειν. 

The Stoicks affirm, that the World is governed by Mind and Providence, this Mind passing through all the Parts of it, as the Soul doth in us: Which yet doth not act in all parts alike, but in some more, in some less: it passing through some parts only as a Habit, (as through the bomer and Nerwes) but through others as Mind or Understanding, (as through that which is called the Hegemonicon or Principale,) so the whole World being a Living and Rational Animal, hath its Hegemonicon or Principal Part too, which according to Antipater is the **Aether**, to Possidonius the **Air**, to Celecthes the **Sun**, &c. And they say also, that this First God is, as it were, sensibly Diffused through all Animals and Plants, but through the Earth itself, only as a Habit. Wherefore the whole World, being thus Animated and Animated by one **Divine Soul**, is it self according to these Stoicks alloweth The **Supreme God.** Thus **Didymus in Enseismi.** Ὑπὸν ἅ ποιόν συστήσας ἠδον, ἡ σοφία, καὶ τον ἄνθρωπον ἀναγενναίον **The Stoicks call the whole World God.** Origen again affirmt: *Scipio* ἀποκάλεσε δὴ ἂν ὡς κράτους ἄπανν' ἀποκάλεσε, ἐπικούρεις μὲν ἂν πρώτον ' *The Greeks universally affirm the World to be a God, but the Stoicks, the First and Chief God.' And accordingly **Manilus,**

Quæ pateat Mundum Divinum Numine verti
Atque Ipsum esse Deum:

*Whereby it may appear the World to be Governed by a Divine Mind, and also it self to be God. As likewise **Seneca the Philosopher, Tota hoc qua continentur, & Deum ess, & Deus ess**; *This whole World, within which we are contained, is both One thing, and God. Which is not to be understood, of the Meer Matter of the World, as it is nothing but a Heap of Atoms, or as ended with a Plastick and Sensibl Natur only; but of it as Animated by such a Soul, as besides Senec was originally ended with perfect Understanding; and as deriving all its Godship from thence. For thus **Varro in St. Augustin declare both his own, and the Stoical Sence concerning this Point, Dict dem Varro, adhuc de Naturali Theologia praolquent, Deum se arbitra*
Now if the Whole Animated World be the Supreme God, it plainly follows from thence, that the several Parts and Members thereof, must be the Parts and Members of God; and this was readily acknowledged by Seneca, Membrum sumus Corporis magni; We are all members of One great Body: and Totum hoc Deus est, Socii ejus. & Membrum sumus; This whole World is God, and we are not only His Members, but also His Fellows or Companions: as if our Humane Souls, had certain kind of Fellowship also, with that Great Soul of the Universe. And accordingly, the Soul of the World, and the whole Animal, was frequently worshipped by the Pagans, in these its several Members; the chief Parts of the World, and the most important Things of Nature as it were by Piece-meal. Neverthelss it doth not at all follow from thence, that these were therefore to them really many Several Gods; for then not only every Man, and every Con Quintible Animal, every Plant and Herb and Pile of Gras, every River and Hill, and all things else whatsoever, must be so many several Gods. And that the Pagans themselves did not take them for such,igen obverses against that Affertion of Celsus; That if the Whole be God, then the several Parts thereof must needs be Gods, or Di- seto: e'o enim Thea & meon adiphabetae, aliae nae piina tae akora Thea, ou diw o kq'kia, pl'k 7 totois kai tae phutae: ei 7 meoio Tn kq'kia kai oic omai, ej tis oris, kai ai kddasaxai - ak etpi adc, o kq'kia, odoc kai koi oic xamoi kai ai kddasaxai Stoio eisai all e'te ttpo fiksoLe 'Elmose - tae e', e trethutes (ei apy. aviaxai, x Xeis, e'c eceioi onomadai) petepoi kai Xeisaxai, tetois ejn logeis Thees. Kai tis kultikon kllas ykntai kai koi 'Elmose ieiou, ou ektai dox kai odois, podocis to meo toto ejn Thea &? tae, ti- xeis isei Zea, kai miaa, kai skupes, kai skulikes, kai pan to tis o- wos ideis, aliai kai to tis o' orfis, kai to tis i'vismone, ejtis o' eis logeis odois e'k kq'kia, fiksoLe. From hence it would follow, that not only Men be Divine and Gods, but also all Brute Animals too (they being Parts of the World); and Plants to boot. Nay Rivers, and Mountains, and Seas, be Parts of the World likewise, (if the Whole World be God) must accord- to Celsus needs be Gods also. Whereas the Greeks themselves will not apprehend this; but they would only call those Spirits or Demons, which ride over these Rivers and Seas, Gods. Wherefore this Universal Afirmation of Celsus, is false even according to the Greeks themselves; That the whole be God, then all the Parts thereof must needs be Divine or As. It following from thence that Flyer, and Gnats, and Worms, and kind of Serpents, and Birds, and Fishes, are all Divine Animals or As: Which they themselves, who assert the World to be God, will not deny. Wherefore
Wherefore though it be true, that the Pagans did many times Perfonate and Defire, the Chief Parts of the World, and Things of Nature, as well as they did the Several Powers and Virtues of the Mundane Soul, diffused through the whole World, yet did not the intelligent amongt them, therefore look upon thefe, as so many True and Proper Gods, but only worship them as Parts and Members of One Great Mundane Animal; or rather, Worship the Soul of the whole World, their Supreme Deity, in them all, as its various Manifestations. This St. Afxtin intimates, when writing against Faufius the Manichean, he prefers even the Pagan Gods before the Manichean; Jam vero Calem, Terra, &c. Aer, &c. Luna, &c. et alia sylvera omnia, hac manifesta omnis apparent, atque ipsa sensibus presto sunt. Quae cum Paganis tantum Deos colunt, vel tantum PARTES UNIUS MAGNI DEI (nam universum Mundum quidam corum putant MAXIMUM DEUM) excidunt qui sunt. Vos autem cum ea colatis, quae omnino non sunt, propriiores effe lilia Pietati, qui Corpora colunt, ef non colenda, tamen vera. Now the Heaven, Earth, Sea, and Air, Sun, Moon, and Stars, are Things all manifest and really present to our senses, which when the Pagans Worship as Gods, or as Parts of One Great God, (for some of them think the Whole World to be the GREATEST GOD,) they Worship things that are so that you worshipping things that are not, would be nearer to true Piety than you are, were you Pagan and worshipped Bodies too, which though they ought not to be worshipped, yet are they True and Real Things. But this is further infused upon the same St. Afxtin in his Book De C. D. where after that large Enumeration of the Pagan Gods before set down; he thus convinces their Folly in worshipping the Several Divided Members, parts and Powers, of the One Great God, after that manner Perfonated, hac omnia que dixit, & quæcumque non dixi (non enim omnia dicenda arbitratum sunt), Hi omnes Dii Dei quæque sunt Unus Jupiter; etsi sunt quidam volunt omnia etsi Parts ejus, sine Virtutes ejus, etsi eis videtur quisque cuncta, efe Mundi Animus, quæ sententia velut magnorum, multorum, Deorum est. Hec, inquam, etsi sit, quod quale est, nondum interim quæ, quid perderent, si Unum Deum coelent prudentiori Compendio? Quid enim ejus compermentur, cum ipse colaretur? Si autem metendum sint æt Prætermissae sine Neglectæ Parts ejus irascercetur: non ergo ut volvent vel Unus Animantis hac tota vita est, quæ Omnes simul continget Deos quasi Suas Virtutes, vel MEMBRA, vel PARTES: sed liam quæque, Pars habet vitam quæcunque separatam, etsi præter alteram irreparata po test, etsi alia placata alia concitari. Si autem dicitur Omnia simul, etsi est, Totum ipsum Jovem potiusque officiis, si PARTES ejus non eis singillatis, minuatinique coelestibus, fuli dictur. Nullas quippe cunctas protermitteretur, cum ipse Unus qui habet Omnia, colleretur. All the things, which we have now said, and many more which we have not said (for we did not think fit to mention all) All these Gods and God defies, let them be One and the same Jupiter: whether they will have them to be his Parts, or his Powers and Virtues, according to the sense of those who think God to be the Soul or Mind of the Who World, which is the opinion of many and great Doctors. This say, if it be so, which what-it is, we will not now examine; What would
Thus do the Pagans in Athanasius also declare, that they did not worship the several Parts of the World, as Really so many True and Proper Gods, but only as the Parts or Members, of their one Supreme God, that Great Mundane Animal (or Whole Animad World) taken all together as one thing; and this being a thing not in itself, but an idea or imagination conceived in the mind of the worshipper, a thing which, though it has been called immortal, hath nothing of the nature of God, as distinguished by any of the attributes of God, who is infinite, eternal, and sovereign. The Supremacy of God, however, is not called the Supremacy of the several Parts, that are pretended to be Gods, as if each had an independent existence, even as a God, and as such to be adored and worshiped. But thus, as the several Parts of the World, taken severally, are but indifferent and imperfect things; nevertheless do they contend, that as they are by themselves join'd all together, into the Great Body (enlivened by one Soul) so is the whole of them truly well and properly God. And now we think, it is sufficiently evident, that though these Pagans Vertically Personated and Deified, not only the several Powers and Vertues, of the One Supreme God, or Mundane Soul, diffused throughout the whole World, but also the several Parts of the World itself, and the Natures of Things, yet their meaning herein, was not to make these in themselves really, so many several True and Proper Gods, (much less Independent Ones) but to worship One supreme God (which to them was the whole Animated World) in those several Parts and Members; as it were by Piece-meal, or under so many Inadequate Conceptions.

The Pagans therefore were plainly Divided in their Natural Theology, as to their opinions concerning the Supreme God; some of them conceiving him to be nothing Higher, than a Mundane Soul: Whereas others of them, as Origen's Language, did call God, in the shining and luminary powers of God, made and constituted of the several parts of the World, transmuted and changed into the several parts of the World, and transmuted into the several parts of the World, and transmuted into the several parts of the World, and so was made, not cut off from him, but suffused all over him, as a Dead Thing, but was closely united to him, and Lively dependent on him; these, I say, though they did not take the World for God, or the Body of God, yet did they also look upon it
as such, as that which was Divine and Sacred; and supposing that God was to be worshipped in All, or that the whole World was to be worshipped, as his Image or Temple. Thus Plutarch, though much disliking the Deifying of Inanimate Things, doth himself nevertheless approve, of worshipping God in the whole Corporeal World, he affirming it to be fitly a Godhead of, a most Holy, and most God-becoming Temple. And the ancient Persians or Magi, who by no means would allow of worshipping God in any Artificial Temples made with mens hands, did notwithstanding thus worship God, Sub Dio, and upon the Tops of Mountains, in the whole Corporeal World, as his Natural Temple, as Cicero testifieth; Ncc sequor Magos Persarum, quibus audiotoribus Xerxes inflammasset Templo Graecorum dicitor; quod Parsibus includerent Deos, quibus omnium deferrent effer potestia ac libera, quorum hic Mundus Omnis Templum et Domitianus; Neither do I believe to the Persian Magi, by whose suggestion and persuasion, Xerxes is said to have burnt all the Temples of the Greeks, because they enclosed and shut up their Gods within walls, to whom all things ought to be open and free, and whose Temple and Habitation this whole World is. And therefore when Diogenes Laertius writeth thus of thee Magi, that they did, 3xex exxerxalaxen tov, y1Tovi lOv, 3xex xaxevxalaxen, make Fire and Earth and Water to be Gods, but condemn all Statues and Images; we conceive the meaning hereof to be no other than this, that as they worshipped God in no Temple, so neither did they allow any other Statues or Images of him, than the Things of Nature, and Parts of the World; such as Fire, and Earth, and Water, called therefore by them, in this sense, and no other, Gods. For thus are they clearly represented by Clemens Alexandrinus, and that according to the express Testimony of Dino, οίδεν δὲ υπόκλητος τῶν μάγων ὁ Διός λέγειν, Σέαν αρχάγγελόν μερατ. τῷ και ὑποκλητοθέν. Οὐκ ἐπηρεασθεῖν οὐδὲ τῇ τῶν ἀγίων κέντρῳ, ἔτη τῆς τοιῶν ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μεγάλων ἐπηρεάτων οἰονίας τοὺς πλαίσι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἑστεροῖς καταληκτικοῖς ἐστιν ἀγάλματα μη, Σέαν καὶ δύναμι καὶ λιτότης υποκλητοθέν, ἀστήρ ἑλληκοντικὸς: Εἰ μὲν Κόρβας καὶ ἑλληκοντικῆς κάθες Αἰτίος; ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν τινὰ ἐκκλησίας φιλόσοφον, Dino affirmed, that the Persian Magi sacrified under the open Heavens, they accounting Fire and Water to be the only Statues and Image of the Gods. For I would not here conceal their ignorance neither, nor thinking to avoid One Error fall into another; whilest they allow not Wood and Stones to be the Images of the Gods, as the Greeks do nor Ichneumones and Ibides, as the Egyptians, but only Fire and Water as Philosophers. Which difference betwixt the Pagan Theologers that some of them look'd upon the whole World as God, or as the Body of God, others only as the Image, or the Temple of God; is thus taken notice of by Macrobius upon Scipio's Dream, where the World was called a Temple. Bene antem Universus Mundus Dei Templum vocatur, proper illos qui estimant, nihil esse alium Deum, nisi Credum ipsum & Celestia ipsa que cenimus. Iciocrates omnium interintellige, nuncquam poiesi viderei, quiescumque humano judicium aspeci, Templum ejus vocavit; ut qui hoc veneratur ut Tempium, cultum amicum maximum debeat Conditore; sicutque quisquis in unum Templum ex ilum inducitur, rur facit vivendum Sacramotis; The whole World is well called here the Temple of God, in way of opposition to those, w thi,
hink God to be nothing else, but the Heaven itself, and these heavens things which we see, (or the whole Sensible World Animated:) therefore Cicero, that he might shew the Omnipotence of the First and Supreme God, to be such as could scarcely be understood, but not at all received by Sens, he calleth whatsoever falleth under humane Sight, his Temple; that so he that worshippeth these things as the Temple of God, might in the mean time remember, that the chief Worship is due to the Maker and Creator of them; as also that himself ought to live in the world like a Priest or Myfta, holy and religiously. And thus we see that the Pagans were universally Cosmolatres, or World-worshippers, in defence or other: not that they worshipped the World as a Dead and Inanimate thing, but either as the Body of God, or at least as the temple or Image of him. Neither of which terminated their worship, that which was Sensible and Visible only, but in that great Mind Soul, which Framed and Governeth the whole World Understandingly: though this was called also by them (not the Nature of Things, but) things of God, The Common Nature, and things which were or shall be shown, the nature of the Universe, because it contained under it, the Spermatick Principles, or Plastick Principles of the whole World.

Furthermore these Pagan Theifts Universally acknowledging the whole World to be an Animal, and that Mundane Animal also to be God; those of them who supposed it not to be the First and Highest God, did consequently all conceive it, as hath been already observed, to be either a Second or at least a Third God. And thus Origen, whose divine interpretation (if I understand it aright, to wit, that he understood the whole World to be a God; some of them, as the Stoicks, the First God; others, as the Platonists, (to whom may be added the Egyptians also) the Second God: though some of these Platonists call it a Third God. Those of the Platonists who called the Mundane Animal, or Animated World, the Second God, look'd upon that whole Plonick Trinity of Divine Hypothesis (τριάδος, νόμος and φύσις) all but the First God: but those others of them who called it a Third God, proposed a greater distinction between those Three Hypotheses, and made many several Gods of them; the First, a Monad, or Simple Goodness; the Second, Mind or Intellee; the Third, Psyche or the Universal Soul, which also without any more ado they concluded to be the Immediate Soul of this Corporal World, Existing likewise from Eternity with it. Now this Second God, which was the whole Animated World as will to the Egyptians as the Platonists, was by them both said to be, not only the Temple and Image, but also the Son of the First God. That Egyptians called the Animated World, the Son of God, hath been proved, and that the other Pagans did the like also, is evident.

In this of Celsus, where he pretends, that the Christians called their Jesus, the Son of God, in imitation of those Ancient Pagans, who alluded the World to; Celsus, Exper. 2, 239, 330, already proved, and that the other Pagans did the like also, is evident.
made by God, the Son of God, and God. Now is there not a goodly similitude (think you) between these two Sons of God, theirs and ours?

Upon which words of his, Origen wrote thus, "οὐδὲ ἐὰν ὁ θεὸς ἕλθῃ, ηττο, τοῦτο ὅτι μὲν οὐκ ἴση τοῦτον τὸν θεὸν, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν τῆς μαρτυρίας, ὡς ἐκ τῆς Ιερής προσκυνήσεως."

Celsus supposed, us Christians to have borrowed, this appellation of the Son of God, from the Pagans, they calling the World, as made by God, the Son of God, and God. Wherefore these Pagans, who look'd upon the whole Animated World, only as the Second God, and Son of God, did unquestionably also worship the First God, in the World, and that probably by Personating and Deifying his several Parts and Members too. Thus do we understand, what that was which gave occasion to this mistake of late Writers, that the Pagans worshipped the Inanimate Parts of the World, as such, for True and Proper Gods; viz. their not perceiving, that they worshipped these only, as the Parts or Living Members of One Great Mundane Animal, which was to them, if not the First God, yet at least the Second God; the Temple, Image, and Son, of the First God.

And now have we (as we conceive) given a full account of the seeming Polytheism of the Pagans, not only in their Poetical and Fabulous, but also in their Political or Civil Theology; the former of which was nothing but Phancy and Fiction, and the Conforming of Divine to Humane Things; the latter nothing but Vulgar Opinion and Error together with the Laws and Institutes of Statesmen and Politicians designed Principally to amuse the Vulgar, and keep them the better in obedience and subjection to Civil Laws. Besides which the Intelligent Pagans, generally acknowledged another Theology, which was neither Fiction, nor meer Opinion and Law, but Nature and Philosophy, or Absolute Truth and Reality: according to which Natural and Philosophick Theology of theirs, there was only One Unmade Self-originated Deity, and many other Created Gods, as his Inferior Ministers. So that those many Poetical and Political Gods, could not possibly be look'd upon otherwise, than either as the Created Ministers of One Supreme God, whether taken Singly or Collectively, or else as the Polyonymy and Various Denomination of him, according to several Notions and Partial Conceptions of him; and his several Powers and Manifestations in the World, Personated and Deified, Which latter we have already proved to have been the most generally receive Opinion of the Pagan Theologers; according to that of Euclidus the Philosopher, οὐκ ἔχοντοι, ταύτα σώματα, τοῖς ἄλλοις κατ᾽ ἑαυτόν, There is One Supreme Good (or Highest Deity) called by Many Names: and according to that of Antisthenes before cited, That the Many Popular Gods, were but One and the same Natural God, viz. as Lactantius adds, Summa Artifex, The Maker of the whole World.

We shall conclude with repeating what hath been already suggested, that though the Intelligent Pagans, did Generally disclaim their Fabulous Theology; St. Austin telling us, that when the absurdities thereof were urged against them, they would commonly make such replies as these, Abst, inquiunt, Fabularum est in Gargulitas; and again, Rufus, inquiunt, ad Fabulas redit; for he...

 orig. C. C. St. p. 208.
CHAP. IV. To be Deceived in their Religion.

From us (say they) to think so or so, this is nothing but the garlally of Fables, and, You would bring us again to Fables; and though they owned another Theology besides their Civil also, which was the Natural and Philosophical, as the only True, yet did they notwithstanding acknowledge a kind of necelity, that in those times at least, there should be besides the Natural and Philosophical Theology, which the vulgar were not so capable of; another Theology framed and held forth, that might be more accommodate to their apprehensions. Thus that Roman Pontifex Secvola in St. Austin declareth, Expedire assimilat falli in Religione Civitates, That it was expedient (as he thought) that Cities and Commonwealths, should be deceived in their Religion, or have something False or Fabulous intermingled with it. Having this reason for the same, Because the Natural and Philosophical Theology, contained many things in it, which though True, yet would be hurtful for the vulgar to know; as for example, Quod Verum Deo nec Scenum habeat, nec Etalem, nec definita Corporis Membræ, That True God hath neither Sex, nor Age, nor bodily Members; and that Hercules and Æsculapius, &c. were not Gods but Men, obnoxious to some infirmities with others, and the like. And the Learned Varro in his Book of Religions, publicly maintained the same Doctrine, Varro de Religionibus loquens, evidenter dicit, Multa esse Verique unico seire non sit Utile; Multaque que tamuis Falsa sint, aliter custodem Populum expeditis; & idem Gracca Teletas & Mysteria tarn sitissimo partisibusque clasissæ, &c. That there were many things True in Religion, which it was not convenient for the vulgar to know; as likewise many things False, of which it was expedient they should think otherwise; and that for this cause, the Greeks enclosed their Teletas or Mysteries within walls, and kept them under a Seal of Secrecy. Upon which of Varro St. Austin thus noteth, Hic certe totum Confutum prædictum Sapientium, per quos Civitates & Populi regerentur; Varro here plainly discovers and betrays the whole counsel and secrecy of State-men and Politicians, by whom the Cities and Nations were governed, and their Arcanum of Government, namely this, That People were to be deceived in their Religion, for their own good and the good of their Government. The same Father there adding, That Evil Demons were much grist with this Deceit, and liked this Fraud and Imposure very well, which gave them an advantage to Rule and Tyrannize, as well over the Deceivers as the Deceived. Lastly Strabo also, though otherwise a man and sober, speaks freely and broadly to the fame purpose, οὕτως δὲ θεόλογος τὰς μεταφοράς, τὰς πολλὰς τὶς πλαύδες ἐπικρατήναι λόγοι δυνατοί, οὕτως θεολόγος, οὕτως προσπαθήσαι, πρὸς δύσεις διὰ τὰς θεολόγους τοῦ ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰς φαντασίας, τοῦ ὥσις οὖσας, καλὰς πεπερατές. It is not possible, that women and others of the vulgar sort, should be confused and carried on towards Pity, Holiness, and Faith, merely by Philosophical Reason and Truth, but this must be done by Superstition, and that not without the help of Fables and Prodigies or Wonderful Narrations. From whence it is plain, that Strabo did not only allow a necelity of a Civil Theology besides the Natural and Philosophical, but also of a Fabulous and Prodigal one too. And this is a thing the less to be wondered at in the Pagans, because some Christians also seem to acknowledge a kind of truth herein; Synesius himself writing after this manner;
The Pagans Real Polytheism;  Book I.

C. AP. L.

XXXV. We have now dispatched the First of those Three Heads proposed to be insulft on, viz. That the Pagans worshipped One and the fame Supreme God, under Many Personal Names, so that much of their Polytheism, was but Seeming and Phantastical, and indeed nothing but the Polynomy of One Supreme God, they make Many Poetical and Political Gods of that One Natural God: and thus worshipping God by Parts and Piece-meal; according to that deep acknowledgement of Maximus Madaurensis before cited; Unius Summi Dei Virtutes, per Mundam Opus Diffusas, nos multis Voculis invocamus; & dum Eius quaeque Membrum carptim variis Supplicationibus prosequimur, Totum colere videamus; The virtues of the One Supreme God diffused throughout the whole World, we (Pagans) invoke under many several Names, and so prostituting with our supplication his as it were Divided Members, must needs be thought to worship him whole, we leaving out nothing of him. We shall proceed to the Second Head proposed, That besides this Polynomy of One Supreme God in the Poetical and Civil Theology of the Pagans, which was the Seeming and Phantastick Polytheism, they had another Real Polytheism also, they acknowledging in their Natural and Philosophick Theology likewise, a Multiplicity of Gods, that is, of Substantial Understanding Beings, Superior to men, really Existing in the world. While though they were called by them Gods, yet were they not therefore supposed to be Adytontes and Autarches, Unmade and Self-existent, Independent Beings, but all of them (One only excepted) Neimi the Generated Gods, according to the larger Notion of that word before declared, that is, though not xτερων, yet at least, ἀπ' αὐτῶν γενέων, though not as Made in time, yet as Produced from a Superior Cause. Plutarch propounding this for one amongst his Platonick Presleys, Why οὗτος οὖς, the Highest or Supreme God, was called by him both The Father and Maker of all things, gives this Reply to it in the Wels
Words before cited; \( \text{παίδιον παρακατα} \) ἔχουσαν τὴν ἑπονομαζόν. That perhaps he was said to be the Father of all the Generated Gods, and of Men, (as he is also stated in Homer) but the Maker of all other Irrational and Inanimate Beings. From which Pallage of Plutarch's it plainly appears, that the \( \text{οὐκοτόκος οὐδὲς, The One Highest God,} \) being every way \( \text{αὐθεντικότερός, Unmade and unproduced,} \) was thought to be the Maker or Father of all the other Gods, therefore called \( \text{νεικοτός. Which is further plainly declared elsewhere by the same Plutarch in thes words; Plατακτόνος πατέως. And Plut}^\text{.L.8.} \) κατὰς καὶ \( \text{ἄλλον γεννήτω,} \) \( \text{καθὼς ἓτειν ἐνεργήσαντος,} \) \( \text{c. i.} \) Plato calleth the One Unmade and Eternal God, the Father and Maker of the World, and of all other Things Generated. And though some of those Many Gods of Plato's were by him also called \( \text{Αἰνικός or Eternal,} \) yet were they likewise, \( \text{εὐτωπτικός, in another sense,} \) that is \( \text{Produced and Derived by way of Emanation, from that One, who is every way \( \text{αὐθεντικότερός, Un-} \) derived and Independent upon any other Cause. And thus Proclus \( \text{U. Theol. P. L.3,} \) universally pronounces; \( \text{Tὸ ἑνὸς θεοῦ, πάντως ὁ θεός, διὸ οὐ προκύπτει ἢ ἐξελεύθερος \( \text{c. 7.} \) All the Gods one, their Being Gods, to the First God. He adding, that he is therefore called \( \text{πανίς ἢ ἅγιον, The Fountain of the Godhead.} \)

Wherefore the Many Gods of the Intelligent Pagans, were derived from One God, and but \( \text{υἱογραφίαν, (as Plutarch somewhere calls them) The Subservient Powers, or Ministers of the One Supreme Unmade Deity. Which (as hath been before observed) was frequently called by these Pagans οὐδὲς, God, κατ' \text{εὐτωπτικός, or in way of Emini-} \) ency, as likewise were those other Inferior or Generated Gods, in way of distinction from him called \( \text{ὁ θεὸς, The Gods.} \) And accordingly he sence of \( \text{Celsus is thus represented in Origen, οὐδὲς δυσκολορος ἐνοικίαν, L.4p.300: πάντως ἐνοικιάτω, μᾶς ὄνομα ἐγὼν ὅσιος ἐνθεός. That the Gods were the Makers of the Bodies of all Animals, the Souls of them only, being the Work of God. Moreover these Inferior Gods, are styled by \( \text{Amni-} \) anus Marcellinus, \( \text{Substantial Potestates, Substantial Powers,} \) probably L. 32: one way of distinction from those other Pagan Gods, that were not \( \text{ναυταλλοι, but only so many Names and Notions of the One Supreme} \) god, or his Powers severally Personated and Deified. Which Substantial Powers of \( \text{Am. Marcellinus, (as Divination and Prophecy was by their means imparted to men) were all faid to be subject to that One} \) supreme Deity called \( \text{Themis: whom (faith he) the ancient Theo-} \) nurgers stated \( \text{In Cubilis & Soho Jovis, in the Bed-chamber and Throne} \) of Jupiter; and as indeed some of the Poets have made her to be the Wife of Jupiter, and others his Sister. And \( \text{Anaxarchus in Plutarch yles her πάγιον ὑπὸ τῆς \text{Δίας, Jupiter's Assessor, though that Philosopher πες, Αἰεί, cured the Fable, and grossly deprived the meaning of it, as if it fig-} \) ced πάντα τὸ πρὸς τὸν τοῖχον ὑπὸ τὴν προσοφυσαργοσ. \( \text{Sélod εἷς καὶ} \) \( \text{Séllon, That whatever} \) is done by the Sovereign Power, is therefore Just and Right: whereas the True Moral thereof was this, That \( \text{Justice or Righteous-} \) ness fits in Counsell with God, and in his Mind and Will, prescribes laws to Nature and the whole World. \( \text{Themis therefore was an} \) other \( \text{Name of God, amongst the Pagans, according to his Universal Con-} \) sideration, besides those before mentioned: and when \( \text{Plato in his Book} \)
Book of Laws, would have men to swear by the Names of those Three Gods, Jupiter, Apollo, and Themis; these were but so many several Partial Notions of the One Supreme Deity; the meaning thereof being no other than this, as Pignius observeth, Timore Divino, Veritas ipse, ac Aequitate sanctiri debere juramenta. In Jove enim Summi Nominis Votofatum, Falsi ac Perjurii Vindicem in Apolline Veritatis Lumen in Themide, Jus, Fas atque Lex, Iusticia esse intelligitur. Est enim Themis, ipse Lex eterna, altera Univerfalis, Mundo ac Naturae praecepta; or according to Cicero, Ratio rei Summi Jovis. And Ficinus in his Commentary as to the main agreeith herewith. So that, when the Pagan Theologers affirmed, the Nomen of Themis to preside over the Spirits of the Elements, and all those other Substantial Powers, from whom Divination was participated to men; their meaning therein was clearly no other than this; That there was One Supreme Deity ruling over all the other Gods, and that the Divine Mind, which prescribeth Laws to Nature and the whole World, and contains all the Fatal Decrees in it, according to the Evolution of which, things come to pass in the World, was the Fountain from whence all Divination proceeded; as these Secrets were more or less imparted from thence to those Inferiour Created Spirits. The Philosophy of the Pagan Theology amongst the Greeks was plainly no other than this; That there is One Unmade Self-existent Deity the Original of all, and that there are many other Substantial Powers or Spirits, created by it, as the Ministers of its Providence in the World; but there was much of Poetry or Poetick Phancy, intermingled with this Philosophy, as the Flourish to it, to make up their Pagan Theology.

Thus, as hath been before declared, the Pagans held both One God, and Many Gods, in different senses: One Unmade Self-existent Deity, and Many Generated or Created Gods. Onatus the Pythagorean declaring that they who asserter one only God and not Many, understood not what the Dignity and Majesty of the Divine Transcendency consisted in, namely in ruling over Gods; and Plotinus conceiving that the Supreme God was moft of all Glorified, not by being Conferred into One, but by having Multitudes of Gods, Derived from him, and Dependent on him; and that the Honour done to them, redounded unto him. Where there are Two Things to be distinguished; First, that according to the Pagan Theists, God was no Solitary Being, but that there were Multitudes of Gods, or Substantial Powers, and Living Understanding Natures, Superior to men, which were neither Self-existent, nor yet Generated out of Matter, but all Generated or Created from One Supreme. Secondly, that forasmuch as these were all supposed to have some Influence more or less, upon the Government of the World, and the Affairs of Mankind, they were therefore all of them conceived to be the due Objects of mens Religious Worship, Adoration and Invocation; and accordingly was the Pagan Devotion scattered amongst them all. Nor were the Gods of the Oriental Pagans neither, meer Dead Statues and Images, as some would conclude from the Scripture, but Living Understanding Beings, Superior to men, (though worshipped in Images) according to that Reply of the Chaldeans in Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar, when he required them to tell him Dream
Chap. IV. How God, no Solitary Being. 345

Dream. There is none other that can shew this thing before the king. Except these gods whose dwelling is not with flesh; that is, the Immortal Gods, or who are exalted above the Condition of Human Frailty. Though some conceive, that these words are to be understood of a Peculiar sort of Gods; namely, that this was such a thing, as could not be done by those Demons and Lower Aerial Gods, which frequently converse with men; but was reserved to a Higher rank of Gods, who are above humane converse. Now as to the former of these Two Things, that God is no Solitary Being, but that here are Multitudes of Understanding Beings Superior to Men, the creatures and Ministers of One Supreme God; the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament fully agree with the Pagans herein.

"Horn thinl^them theam, dicimus, quippe, the that there is, The Immortal Gods, or who are exalted above the Condition of Human Frailty. Though some conceive, that these words are to be understood of a Peculiar sort of Gods; namely, that this was such a thing, as could not be done by those Demons and Lower Aerial Gods, which frequently converse with men; but was reserved to a Higher rank of Gods, who are above humane converse. Now as to the former of these Two Things, that God is no Solitary Being, but that here are Multitudes of Understanding Beings Superior to Men, the creatures and Ministers of One Supreme God; the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament fully agree with the Pagans herein.

"houfand Thoufands miniftrd unto him, and ten thoufand times" Daniel 7:10; 
houfand stood before him, and ye are come to an innumerable Company of Heb. 12:22: 
Angels. But the Latter of them, That Religious Worship and Invocation doth of right belong to thee Created Spirits, is constantly denied and condemned in these Writings, that Being a thing peculiarly reserved, to that one God, who was the Creator of Heaven and Earth. And thus is that Prophecy of Jeremy to be understood, expressed in the Chalday Tongue, that so the Jews might have it in readiness for those Chaldean Idolaters, when they came into Babylon, Thus Jeremy 10:11; all ye fay unto them, the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens. That there shall come a time, when none shall be Religious Worshiped where upon the face of the whole Earth, save only that God who made the Heavens and the Earth, and he without Images too. Which Prophecy, but in part yet fulfilled, shall then have its complete accomplishment, when the Kingdoms of this world, shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. And thus is the Contro- 

rectly hated betwixt the Pagans and the Christian by Laidan-L.1.

"Sed fortasse querat aliquis a nobis, quod apud Ciceronem querit" Ciceronem quærit fortunatus; Si Deus Deus est, quæ esse beata Solitudo quæst? Tanquam qui nona èse diciumus, Deserunt ac Solitarium esse diciamus. Habet enim Miniftrum, non vocamus Nuntius. Et est füfum verum quod dives necam supra retulit; Genufse Regis sui Miniftros Deum. Verum hi quod Diu sunt, necque Deos se vocari aut coli volunt: quippe, qui nihil poteft Jusum ac Voluntatem Dei faciunt. As if we who fay, there is but one God, therefore made a Solitary and Deferted Deity. Whereas we know that God hath his Ministers, whom we call Angels: And a grant that to be true, which was before cited out of Seneca, That God hath Generated or Created Ministers of his Kingdom. But these neither Gods; nor would they be called Gods, nor worshipped; for such as they only Execute the will and command of God. And againa forwards to the same purpofé, Si eos multitudine dilectat, non Duode- 

dicimus, nec Trecentos sexaginta quinque (ut Orpheus) sed innume-
sores, & argumus corum errores in diversum, qui tam pauce putant. 

dant tamen quo nomine appellari debant, ne Deum Verum violent, cuj 

Nomem expominus, dabs Pluribus tribunum, &c. Si Multitudo deligi 

tem, we say not, that there are Twelve, nor yet three hundred sixty-five, 

Orpheus, but innumerable. And we tax their error on the contrary to think them to be so few. Nevertheless let them know, by what name they
they ought to be called, lest they violate the true God, whose Name is profaned, when it is given to many. From which passages of Lucan, it plainly appeareth, that the main Controversie between the Christians and the Pagans, was then only this, Whether or no, the Created Ministers of the Supreme God, might be called Gods, and Religious Worship. But this Pagan Objection against the Solitary Deity of the Christians, is by some ancient Christian Writers also otherwise answered; namely from those Three Hypotheses or Persons of the Trinity; they affirming upon that account, that though Christians did not acknowledge such a Multitude of Gods, as the Pagans, yet did they not therefore make God a Solitary and Sterile Being, before the Creation neither, as the Jews did; but went in a middle way between Jews and Pagans: they interpreting Moses also his Faciamus Hominem, to this sense.

X XXXVI. We shall now shew Particularly what these Many Gods of the Pagans were. It hath been often observed, That the Pagans were divided in their Philosophick or Natural Theology, as to their Opinions concerning the Supreme God; some of them thinking, that c. amen ερημικόν βων εύς φέρων, That the Supreme Deity was an Abstract Being, Elevated above Nature and the Whole World: but others that he was nothing higher, than an Anima Mundi, or Soul of the World. Now the former of these Two were chiefly amongst the Greeks, the Pythagoreans and the Platonists, who had accordingly several Distinctions amongst them concerning their Gods, as between the κοπιδωμοι Σεόι and the πρωτόν, The Supermundane and the Mundane Gods; Tho Σεόι είδων and the γεννηδόν, the Eternal and the Generated Gods; that Word Latter being now taken in a narrower and more confined sense, for such as were made in Time, or had a Beginning of their Existence: and Lastly, the νοοτρίς Σεόι and the άληθινον, the Intelligible and the Sensible Gods. And the αντικρησίων, αδήμων and νοοτρίς Σεόι, Supermundane, Eternal, and Intelligible Gods, of these Pythagoreans and Platonists, were first of all and Principally, the three &c. άληθινον ντόπιοι, (as Plotinus calls them) those Three Divine Hypotheses, that have the Nature of Principles in the Universe, viz. Tagathon or Hen, Now and Psyche, or Monad, Mind, and Soul. That this Trinity was not first of all a meer Invention of Plato's, but much earlier than him, is plainly affirmed by Plotinus in these words, that ήδεω τος λόγος τεος μία καινος, μία καινος, άλλα ταλάκε μηρ εκδηλοε άλλα δεδοκά| they ought to be called, lest they violate the true God, whose Name is profaned, when it is given to many. From which passages of Lucan, it plainly appeareth, that the main Controversie between the Christians and the Pagans, was then only this, Whether or no, the Created Ministers of the Supreme God, might be called Gods, and Religious Worship. But this Pagan Objection against the Solitary Deity of the Christians, is by some ancient Christian Writers also otherwise answered; namely from those Three Hypotheses or Persons of the Trinity; they affirming upon that account, that though Christians did not acknowledge such a Multitude of Gods, as the Pagans, yet did they not therefore make God a Solitary and Sterile Being, before the Creation neither, as the Jews did; but went in a middle way between Jews and Pagans: they interpreting Moses also his Faciamus Hominem, to this sense.

X XXXVI. We shall now shew Particularly what these Many Gods of the Pagans were. It hath been often observed, That the Pagans were divided in their Philosophick or Natural Theology, as to their Opinions concerning the Supreme God; some of them thinking, that c. amen ερημικόν βων εύς φέρων, That the Supreme Deity was an Abstract Being, Elevated above Nature and the Whole World: but others that he was nothing higher, than an Anima Mundi, or Soul of the World. Now the former of these Two were chiefly amongst the Greeks, the Pythagoreans and the Platonists, who had accordingly several Distinctions amongst them concerning their Gods, as between the κοπιδωμοι Σεόι and the πρωτόν, The Supermundane and the Mundane Gods; Tho Σεόι είδων and the γεννηδόν, the Eternal and the Generated Gods; that Word Latter being now taken in a narrower and more confined sense, for such as were made in Time, or had a Beginning of their Existence: and Lastly, the νοοτρίς Σεόι and the άληθινον, the Intelligible and the Sensible Gods. And the αντικρησίων, αδήμων and νοοτρίς Σεόι, Supermundane, Eternal, and Intelligible Gods, of these Pythagoreans and Platonists, were first of all and Principally, the three &c. άληθινον ντόπιοι, (as Plotinus calls them) those Three Divine Hypotheses, that have the Nature of Principles in the Universe, viz. Tagathon or Hen, Now and Psyche, or Monad, Mind, and Soul. That this Trinity was not first of all a meer Invention of Plato's, but much earlier than him, is plainly affirmed by Plotinus in these words, that ήδεω τος λόγος τεος μία καινος, μία καινος, άλλα ταλάκε μηρ εκδηλοε άλλα δεδοκά|
Ch. IV.

and Eternal Gods.

entained it, as such. And Moderatus (as Simplicius informeth in ArchPhy.

ickCabala) affirmeth, this Trinity of Principles, to have been a Pyth.

as that according to the Pythagoreans, the

or Unity, is above all Essence; that the Second One, which

that which truly is, and Intelligible, according to them, is the Ideas

did that the Third, which is Physical or Soul, partaketh both of the

Ilf Unity, and of the Ideas. Lastly we have Jamblichus his Telltimo-

also in Proclus to the same purpose; namely that the whole

Divine things, both out of the

Pythagoric and the Orphick writings. And that a Trinity was part of

the Orphick Cabala, we have already proved, out of Amelius, he affir-

mation (in Proclus) that Plato's Three Gods were the same with

Orphus his Trinity, of Phanes, Uranus, and Cronus. Moreover, since all

the Three, Orphus, Pythagoras, and Plato, travelling into Egypt,

they there initiated in that Arcane Theology of the Egyptians (called

Himatical) it seemeth probable (as was before observed) that this

Divine Triad, was also part of the Arcane Theology of the

Egyptians. It hath been also noted, that there were some footstepp

of such a Trinity in the Aithirick Mysteries amongst the Persians,

drew from Zoroaster; as likewise that it was expressly contained in

the Magic or Chaldaic Oracles, of whatsoever authority they may be.

Moreover it hath been signified, that the Samothracians had very an-

tly a certain Trinity of Gods, that were the Highest of all their

Gods, and that called by an Hebrew name too, Cabbirim, or the Migh-

rous; and that from thence the Roman Capitoline Trinity of Gods,

it was derived. The second whereof was Minerva, which amongst

the Latins, as Athena amongst the Greeks, was understood to signify

the Divine Wisdom. Lastly, the Ternary or Triad, was not only ac-

counted a Sacred Number amongst the Pythagoreans, but also as con-

taining some Mystery in Nature, was therefore made use of by other

Greeks and Pagans, in their Religious Rites; as Aristotle informeth

De Cael. Lib. 3, as

a
c

\text{...}

in which place

... Wherefore from Nature, and as it so observeth her Laws, have we taken this Number of Three, making use of the same in the Sacrifices of the Gods, and other Purifications.
son, though there be nothing in it (if rightly understood) that is repugnant to Reason: and since there are in the ancient Writings of the Old Testament, certain significations of a Plurality in the Deity, or of more than one Hypostases, we may reasonably conclude, that which Proclus ascertained of this Trinity, as it was contained in the Chaldaick Oracles, to be true, that it was at first first, of a Theology of Divine Tradition or Revelation, or a Divine Cabala, viz. amongst the Hebrews first, and from them afterwards communicated to the Egyptians and other Nations. Neither ought it to be thought any considerable Objection to the contrary, because the Platonists, Pythagoreans, and other Pagan Theologers, did not express this their Trinity in the very words of the Aghanian Creed, nor according to the Form of the Nicean Council. Forasmuch as this Mystery was gradually imparted to the World, and that first but sparingly to the Hebrews themselves either in their Written or Oral Cabala; but afterwards more fully under Christianity, the whole Frame whereof was built thereupon. Nevertheless was it not so distinctly and precisely determined, nor punctually and scrupulously framed amongst the Christians neither, till after the rising up of Herefies concerning it. Nor when all was done did the Orthodox themselves at first Universally agree, in the fig nification of the word Ομοοιόγενης Co-essential or Consubstantial. Nor lastly is it a thing at all to be wondred at, that in such a Difficult and Mysterious Point, as this, there should be some diversity of apprehensions amongst the reputed Orthodox Christians themselves; and much less therefore amongst Pagans and Philosophers. However we freely acknowledge, that as this Divine Cabala, was but little understood, by Many of those who entertained it among the Pagans, so was it by divers of them, much Depraved and Adulterated also.

For first, the Pagans universally called, this their Trinity, a Trinity of Gods, πατεραί, δόμινοι, and τελεσάν Θεον, the First, the Second, and the Third God; as the more Philosophical amongst them called it also a Trinity of Names, and a Trinity of Principles, and sometimes a Trinity of Opificers; thus is this Cabala of the Trinity thy led in Proclus, ή τελεσάν Θεον ὑποτατος, the Tradition of the Third Gods. And accordingly is it said of Numenius by him, that τὰ μικρὰ μνημεία, he did τοῦ Θεον καλον, πάνων, ἐπικρίνεις, having praised the Three Gods, Tragically or Affectionately called them, τὸ Γενεατον, the Son, and the Nephew. Numenius thereby intimating, that as the Second of these Gods, was the Offspring of the First God, so the Third called the Nephew of the First, was derived both from him and from the Second, from the First as the Grandfather, and from the Second, as the Father of him. Harporcation likewise, Atticus and Aemelius, are said by Proclus, to have entertained this same Cabala or Tradition of the Three Gods, the Latter of these styling them, κακάλες τρεις, and τοιούτοι Νευματοι, Three Kings, and Three Opificers: Makers of the whole World. In like manner Platonius speaking of the Second of these Three Hypostases, (that is, the First Mind, or Essence) calls him ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Θεον the Second God, καὶ τὸς αὐτοῦ φως ὁ τοῦ δαίμονος, προφητείαν καθὼς, ἐν ὑπονοίαν εἰς τὸν ἐρετικὸν εἶναι χαλκός ὡς ὄνων μνημείως, ὕπο τοῦ ἐγγίζωντος, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπαφέν 

\[\text{Eem.5. L. 5. c. 5.} \]
From a Divine Cabala.

But since according to the Principles of Christiannity, which was
only designed to oppose and bear down the Pagan Polytheism,
there is One only God to be acknowledged; the meaning whereof not-
withstanding seems to be chiefly directed, against the Deifying of Crea-
d Being, or giving Religious Worship to any, besides the Uncrea-
d.
The Trinity after enim they though yet as possibly
for Rule, they any religious this though fuch thofe fons, Duo Aufin did gan, Jewifh declared Decalogue, Principles on, becauſe to A&m?jv according we God the Father) and alfo it felf to Be God (that is, not a creature) yet is it no where called An Other, or Second God. Therefore cannot we Christians entertain this Pagan Language of a Trinity of Gods, but must call it either a Trinity of Divine Hypoflafes, or Subfiances, or Per- font, or the like. Nevertheless it is observable, that Philo, though according to his Jewish Principles, he was a zealous Oppofier of the Pagan Polytheifm and Idolatry, yet did he not for all that, scruple to call the θεον ο&-yos the Divine Word, after the Platonick way, Δαυις εως a Second God; as not fubjeeting this to claffi with the Principles of his Religion, or that Second Commandment of the Decalogue, Thou fhalt have no other Gods before my Face; possibly because he conceived, that this was to be understood of Creatures-Gods only; whereas his Second God, the Divine θεον or Word, is declared by him to be θεος, Eternal, and therefore according to the Jewifh Theology Uncreated. However this Language of a Second and Third God, is not fo excusable in a Jew, as it might be in a Pagan; because the Pagans according to the Principles of their Religi- on, were fo far from having any Scrupulousness, againſt a Plurality of Gods, (fo long as there was only One Fountain of the Godhead ac- knowledged) that they rather accounted it an honour to the Supreme God, as hath been already fhewed, that he fhould have Many other, not only Titular Gods under him, but also fuch as were Religioufly Worfiippced: Wherefore befides this Second and Third God, they also did luxuriate in their other Many Creature-gods. And indeed St. Auffin doth upon this accompli, feem somewhat to excuse the Pagans for this their Trinity of Gods, and Principles, in these words, Liferis enim verbis loquuntur philofophi, nec in rebus ad intelligendum difficielli- vis, offensionem religiosis animum pertimescunt. Nobis autem ad cer- tamen Regulam loqui fas effe, ne Verborum licentia, etiam in rebus, qua in his significanter, impiam gignat opinionem. Nos autem non dicius Duo vel Tria Principia, cum de Deo loginum: ficunt nec Duo Deus vel Trei, nobis licetiam eis dicere, quamvis de Unicoque loquentes, vel de Filio, vel de Spiritu Sanio, etiam singulum quemque Deum effe fatuum. The Philosophers uſe Free Language, nor in these things which are extremely difficult to be understood, did they at all fear the offending of any Reli- gious and Scrupulous ears. But the Caff is otherwife with us Christians, for we are tied up to Phrases, and ought to speaek according to a certain Rule, left the licentious uſe of words, should beget a wicked Opinion in any concerning those things that are signified by them. That is, though this might be in a manner excusable in the Pagans, becaufe each of those Three Hypoflafes is God, therefore to call them severally Gods and all of them a Trinity of Gods, and Principles; they having no ſuch Rule then given them to govern their Language by as this, That though the Father be God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghoft God, yet are they not Three Gods, but One God; yet is not this allowabe for Christians, to speaek of a Second or Third God or Principle, or to call the Holy Trinity a Trinity of Gods, notwithstanding that when we speake of the Father or of the Son, or of the Holy Ghoft severally, we confefs each of them to be God.
And indeed when the Pagans thus spake of a First, Second and Third God, and no more, though having Innumerable other Gods besides, they did by this Language plainly imply, that these Three Gods of theirs, were of a very different kind, from all the rest of their Gods; that is, not ἑκάστοι, but ἀλλὰ, not Created, but Eternal and Uncreated Ones. And that many of them did really take this Whole Trinity of Gods, for the Θεὸν in general, the Divine Numen, and sometimes call it the First God too, in way of distinction from their Generated Gods; will be shewed afterward. So that the Θεός, the First God, was used in different senses by these Pagans, sometimes a larger sense, and in way of opposition to all the ἑκάστοι ἑαυτῷ the generated or Created Gods, or the Gods that were made in Time together with the World; and sometime again, more Particularly, in way of distinction from those Two other Divine Hypotheses Eternal, called by them the Second and Third God. Which First of the Three Gods, is also frequently by them called Θεός, God, Emphatically and by way of Excellency, they supposing a Gradual Subordination in these Principles.

Neither was this Trinity of Divine Subsistence only thus ill-imagin'd by the Pagans generally, when they called it a Trinity of Gods; at also the Cabala thereof, was otherwise much Depraved and Adulterated, by several of the Platonists and Pythagoreans. For first, the third of these Three Hypotheses commonly called Ψυχή, is by some them made to be ἡγούμενος the Immediate Soul of the Corporeal World, informing, acting, and enlivening it, after the same manner the Souls of other Animals do their respective Bodies; inasmuch at this Corporeal World it self, as together with its Soul it makes one Complete Animal, was frequently called the Third God, his Proclus affirmeth of Numenus the Pythagorean, ὢ νοῦς νοσίτης τῷ τετράτῳ ἑαυτῷ, That the World according to him, was the Third. And Platonius, being a great Reader of this Numenus, seems to have been somewhat infected by him with this Conceit also, though contrary to his own Principles; from those words before cited out him, ὢ νοῦς οὐκέτι, ἐκ ἐκείνης λέγουσι τῷ τετράτῳ, the World, as is commonly said, is the Third God.

Now if the World be not a Creature, then is there no Created Being at all, but all is God. But not only Timæus Locrus, but also Plato himself, calls it, Θεὸν γεννήτω, that is, a Created God, the word γεννήτω being here put for that, which after it once was not, is brought into being, which is the proper Notion of a Creature. So that the Animal World, is by Plato made to be only the chief of all the γεννήτω Θεῶν, that is, the Creature-Gods. Wherefore it is plain that in this Trinity of some Platonists and Pythagoreans, wherein the World is made to be the Third God, there is a confused Jumble of Creatures, and Uncreated Beings together. For the First of those Gods is the Father and Fountain of all, or the Original of the Godhead. The Second, so far as he is called by them, both πατὴρ and ἐκζών, the Maker, and the Officer of the whole World, he therefore
fore can be no Creature neither: whereas the Third, which is said to be the World, was by Numenius himself also expressly called, both πάντως and το ἐνακεφαλικόν, the Work or Thing Made, that is, plainly, the creature of both the Former. Proclus thus fully represents his sense, πάντως μὲν καλεὶ το πέτον, τοποθήθη το ἄρτιον, ποίομα το τε Τέστον. Εἰς το κοιτίζεται ἐπίπεδον το τέτοιον, ἐκ το πρῶτος ἐκ το ἀρτίον οὐκ, το το ἐνακεφαλικόν το τε Τέστον. Numenius called the First of the Three Gods, the Father; the Second of them the Maker; and the Third the Work or Thing Made; so that according to Numenius there were two Opificers or Creators of the World, the First and the Second God; and the World itself (that is, the Thing Made and Created by them both) is said to be the Third God.

And that this Notion of the Trinity, is an Adulterated One, may be also further concluded from hence, because according to this Hypothesis, they might have said that there were Three Hundred and more Gods, as well, as that there are Three; since all the other Generating, Generated Gods, might have come into the Number too, as well as the World, they being Parts thereof, and Gods that differ not in kind from it but only in degree. Wherefore these Philo-Sophers ought not to have made a Trinity of Gods, distinguishing from all the rest, but rather First to have distributed their Gods into Se ιδέαν and γενετος, that is Eternal or Uncreated, and Created Gods, and then to have subdivided those Created Gods, into the Whole World and the Parts thereof Animated.

But because it may be here alleged in favour of this Spurious Hypothesis of the Trinity, That the World was accounted the Third God, only by Accident, in respect of its Soul, which is properly that Third God; though Numenius with others plainly affirm the World it self as πάντως and ἐνακεφαλικόν, as the Work and Thing Made, to be the Third; we shall therefore reply to this, that even the Soul of the Mundane Animal it self, according to Timæus, and Plato, and other is affirmed to be γενετος, a Generated God, that is, such as was produced from Non-existence into Being, and therefore truly an properly a Creature. Which Aristotle observing, therefore took occasion to taxe Plato as contradicting himself, in making the Soul of the World a Principle, that is, the Third God; and yet supposing it to be ἐν κοιτίζεται το τε Τέστον, not Eternal but Made or Created together with the Heaven, of which something before. Wherefore we conclude that this ancient Cabala of the Trinity, was Depraved and Adulterated, by those Platonists and Pythagoreans, who made either the World a God, or else το ἄρτιον, an Informed Soul of the World, to be the Third Hypothesis thereof, they Mingling Created and Uncreated Beings together, in that which themselves notwithstanding call a Trinity of Causes and of Principles.

And we think it highly probable that this was the true Reason, why Philo, though he admitted the Second Hypothesis of the Platonists and Pythagoreans (if not Egyptian) Trinity, called by him Ψεῦτος Εῦθες, the Divine Word, and styled Ἀρχέως ἔθες, the Second God, and as
To this First Depravation of that Ευαλογισμὸς Θεολογία, that Theology of Divine Tradition, and ancient Cabbala of the Trinity, by many of the Platonists and Pythagoreans, may be added another, That some of them declaring the Second Hypothesis of their Trinity to be the Archetypal World, or το Ἱνός ἱδέας παγελών, as Philo calls it, the World that is compounded and made up of Ideas, and contained in it all those kinds of things Intelligibly that are in this Lower World Sensibly and further concluding, that all these several Ideas of this Archetypal and Intelligible World, are really so many distinct Substances, Animals, and Godshave thereby made that Second Hypothesis, not to be One God, but a Congeries and Heap of Gods. These are those Gods commonly called by them, τοντοι Σεληνιστικοί Θεοί Intelligible Gods, not as before in way of distinction from the αἰσθητοι the Sensible Gods (which is a more general notion of the word) but from from those other Gods of theirs (afterwards to be insulited on also) called τοιοί Θεοί Intellectual Gods. Proclus upon Plato's Politia concludes, that there is no Idea of Evil, for this reason, because if there were, η ημιν ης καθών ιδεα Σεληνιστικοι, άιναίσθαι πάντα ιδέας έσείς έπειραίς οίκον ίνιος τοιος ἵππος, that very Idea of Evil also would it self be a God, because Every Idea is a God, as Parmenides hath affirmed. Neither was Plotinus himself, though otherwise more sober, altogether uninfectcd with this Phantastick Conceit, of the Idea being all of them Gods; he writing thus concerning the Second God, The First Mind or Intellectual ζ γενόρθυν ή ἡν τά ὄντα συν οὕτως, τηνίκα, παν ημών το τη ιδέας καθώς, πάντας το έπειραίς βανκοντες, That he being begotten by the First God, (that is, by way of Emanation, and from Eternity) generated all Entities together with himself, the Pulse of the Ideas, which are all Intelligible Gods. Apuleius also (as hath been already noted) grossly and fullsomely imputes the fame to Plato, in these words, οις δεσ φαλος παντοτε παντοτε παντοτε, sed prorsus ac retro aeternos, ingenio ad summan beatitudinem porreto, &c. And he with Julian and others, reduce the Greater part of the Pagan Gods, to these Ideas of the Intelligible or Archetypal World, as making Apollo for Example, to be the Intelligible Sun, the Idea of the Sensible 3 and Diana, the Intelligible Moon, and the like for the rest. Lastly, it hath been observed also that the Egyptian Theologers, pretended in like manner, to worship
Worship these Intelligible Gods, or Eternal Ideas, in their Religious Animals, as Symbols of them.

Philo indeed Platonized so far, as to suppose God to have made an Archetypal and In intelligible World, before he made this Corporeal and Sensible: because (σο Θεός) in Such a sense, and because φύσις, the Shape or Form of Things, is the cause of all things. But the Shape or Form of Things is only the visible Idea, which is the Image of the Unseen and Invisible, the Mind of God, and the Image of Himself. God intending to make a Visible World, first formed an Intelligible One; so that having an Incorporeal, and most God-like Pattern before him, He might make the Corporeal World agreeably to the same, this Younger an Image of that Older, that should contain as many Sensible kinds in it, as the other did Intelligible. But it is not possible (faith he) to conceive this World of Ideas to exist in any place. Nay according to him, Moses himself philosophized also after the same manner, in his Cosmoporia, describing in the First Five Verses of Genesis, the making of an Intelligible Heaven and Earth, before the Sensible; the truest and purest νοήμαν of such an Entity derived fromн the Mind of God, which is the Shape or Form of Things, not the Matter of Things; produced νοήμαν, that being νοητον νοηματος το πνευματος των θεων. And mars, and the Visible Part of the World, or World, the Ideas of Air and Vacuum; Corporeal Water and Air and last of all Light, which was also the Corporeal and Intelligible Paradigms of the Sun and Stars, and that from whence their Sensible Light is derived. But Philo does not plainly make these Ideas of the Intelligible and Archetypal World, to be so many distinct Substances, and Animals; much less Gods: though he somewhere takes notice of those, who admiring the Pulchritude of both these Worlds, did not only Deify the whole of them, but also their several Parts; that is, the Several Ideas of the Intelligible World also, as well as the Greater Parts of the Sensible; an Intelligible Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon; they pretending to worship those Divine Ideas, in all these Sensible things. Which high-flown Platonick Notion, as it gave Sanctuary and Protection, to the grossest and foulest of all the Pagan Superstitions and Idolatries, when the Egyptians would worship Brute Animals, and other Pagans, all the Things of Nature, (Intimate Substances, and more Accidents) under a pretence of worshipping the Divine Ideas in them; so did it directly tend to absolute Impiety, Irreligion, and Atheism; there being few that could entertain any thoughts at all of those Eternal Ideas, and scarcely any who could thoroughly per苇ad themselves, that these had so much Reality in them, as the Sensible things of Nature; as the Idea of a House, in the mind of an Architect, hath not so much Reality in it, as a Material House, made up of Stones, Mortar and Timber; so that their Devotion must needs sink down wholly into those Sensible Things, and themselves naturally at length fall, into this Atheistick Perversion; that the Good Things of Nature, are the only Deities.

Here therefore have we a Multitude of Pagan Gods Supermundane and Eternal, though all depending upon One Supreme) the Gods by themselves.
them properly called, **_Intelligible_, or the Divine Ideas._ And we cannot but account this for another _Depravation_ of the ancient _Mosaick Cabbala_ of the _Trinity_, that the _Second Hypostasis_ thereof, is made to be the _Archetypal World_, and all the _Divine Ideas_, as to many distinct _Substances_, _Animals_, and _Gods_; that is, not One God, but a whole _World of Gods._

But over and besides all this, some of these _Platonists_ and _Pythagoreans_, did further _Deprave_ and _Adulterate_, the ancient _Hebrew or Mosaick Cabbala_ of the _Trinity_, (the certain _Rule_ whereof is now only the _Scriptures of the New Testament_) when they concluded, that as from the _Third Hypostasis_ of their _Trinity_, called η πρώτη Ὑψωτική_ _The First Soul_, there were _Innumerable other Particular Souls_ derived, namely the _Souls of all Inferiour Animals_, that are _Parts of the World_; so in like manner, that from their _Second Hypostasis_, called ὁ πρῶτος Ὑψωτικός, _The First Mind or Intellect_, there were _Innumerable other _Minds_ or _Intelligences Substantial Derived_, _Superiour to the First Soul_; and not only so, but _also_, That from that _First and Highest Hypostasis_ of all, called τὸ ἀέρ, and τὰ ἄνθρωποι, _The One_, and _The Good_, there were derived likewise _many Particular Ideas_, and _Axiomæticas, Unities and Goodnesses Substantial_, _Superiour to the First Intellect_. Thus _Proclus_ in his _Theologick Institutions_, ἀπὸ τὸ τὸ ἀέρ τὸ πρῶτον ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, ἀντίκροτον ἑπτά, μετὰ τὸ πρῶτον ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, μετὰ τὸ πρῶτον ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, μετὰ τὸ πρῶτον ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, μετὰ τὸ πρῶτον ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, μετὰ τὸ πρῶτον ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, after the _First One_, (and from it) there are _many Particular Henades_, _Unities_; after the _First Intellect_ and from it, _many Particular Moods_ or _Intelligences_; after the _First Soul_, _many Particular Derivative Souls_; and lastly, after the _Universal Nature_, _many Substantial Natures_, and _Spermatick Reasons_. Where it may be _obiter_ observed, that these _Platonists_ supposed, below the _Universal Psyche_, _Mundane Soul_, a _Universal φύσις_, or _Substantial Nature_ also, but as that besides it, there were _other Particular Λέγει συμπαύσιοι_, _Sensual Reasons_, or _Platonic Principles_ also.

As for these _Noes_, and that besides the _First Universal Mind or Intellect_, there are other _Particular Minds_ or _Intelligences Substantial_, a _Rank of Beings not only immutably Good and Wise_, but also _every Immovable_, and therefore above the _Rank of all Souls_, that are _Immovable Beings_; _Proclus_ was not singular in this, but had the occurrence of many other _Platonists_ with him; amongst whom _Plotinus_ may seem to be one, from this Passage of his besides others, _ὅτε ἐνακόλουθον ἡ Ὑπάκολογία τῶν ἑπτά, ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά, ὑπακολογίας τῶν ἑπτά_, That _Suls are Immortal_, and _every Mind or Intellect_, we have elsewhere _largely proved_. Upon which words _Ficinus_ thus, _He, & supra & in- _Passage_, _plotinii notabiles_, _Plures esse Mentium Animarumque Substantias inter se distinctas, quamvis inter eas Unio sit Mirabilis:_ We and from many other _Passages_, before and after, you may observe, that according to _Plotinus_ there are _many Substantial Minds_, distinct from _Souls_, though there be a wonderful _Union_ betwixt them. Moreover, that there was also above these _Noes_ or _Immovable_ but _Multiform Minds_, not only one _Perfect Monad_, and _First Good_, but also a _Rank of Many Particular Henades or Monades_, and _Agathotetes_ was,
The Spurious Platonick Trinity: Book I.

In Epit. END. besides Proclus and others, asserted by Simplicius also. He 

f. 9. 

produceth all things from himself, in several Ranks and Degrees; The First, the Middle, and the Last or Lowest of all. But the First and the next to himself, doth he produce like himself, One Goodness Many Goodnesses, and one Unity or Henade, Many Henades. And that by these Henades and Autoagathotes, he means Substantial Beings, that are Conscious of themselves, appears also from these following words, to the fashion of those Ancient Philosophers, that the powers of the Good, falls from Goodness, and that God is not Immortal. He also adds something concerning the First, that though there were a Rank of Lower Beings, and not supernatural, not Essentially Goodness, but only by Participation being by their own Nature also Immovable, they can never degenerate, nor fall from that Participation of Good. Notwithstanding which, we must confess that some of these Platonists, seem to take the word Henades sometimes in another sense and to understand nothing else thereby, but the Intelligible Ideas before mentioned; though the ancient Platonists and Pythagoreans were not wont to call these Unityes, but Numbers.

And now have we discovered, more of the Pagans Inferior Gods, Supernatural and Eternal; viz. besides those our Sti, those Intelligible Gods; Tremors of Henades and Autoagathotes; Unityes and Goodnesses; and also of Noes, Immovable Minds or Intelligens; or as they frequently call them, Sti vivant, and Sti niez, Henadic (or Monadical) Gods, and Intelligual Gods.

But since these Noes, or niez, Sti, are said to be all of them in their own nature a Rank of Beings above Souls, and therefore Superior to that First Soul, which is the Third Hypothesis of this Trinity, as all those Henades or vivant Sti, those Simple Monadical Gods, a likewiser yet a higher Rank of Beings above the Noes, and therefore Superior to the Second Hypothesis also, the First Mind; and yet these Henades and Noes, however supposed by those Philosophers to be Eternal, forasmuch as they are Particular Beings only, and not mineral, cannot be placed higher than in the Rank of Creatures; it follows from hence unavoidably, that both the Second and Third Hypothesis of this Trinity, as well the First Mind as the First Soul, must be accounted Creatures also; because no Created Being, can be Superior to any thing Uncreated. Wherefore Proclus and some others of those Platonists, plainly understood this Trinity no otherwise than as a certain Scale or Ladder of Beings in the Universe; on Gradual Decrease of things from the First or Highest, by steps downward, lower and lower, so far as to the Souls of all Animals, in when
which cause, Proclus to make up this Scale complete, adds to these three Ranks and Degrees, below that Third of Souls, a Fourth of Natures also; under which there lies nothing but the Passive Part of the Universe, Body and Matter. So that, their Whole Scale, of all that is above Body, was indeed not a Trinity, but a Quadrinity, or Four Ranks; and Degrees of Beings, one below another, the First of Natures or Unities, the Second of Noes, Minds or Intellects, the Third of Souls, and the Left of Natures; these being as it were so many Orbs and Spheres, one within and below another. In all which several Ranks of Being, they supposed One First Universal, and Unparticipated, as the Head of each respective Rank, and Many Particular, or Participated Ones: as One First Universal Henade, and Many Secondary Particular Henades; One First Universal Nous, Mind or intellect, and Many Secondary and Particular Noes or Minds; One First Universal Soul, and Many Particular Souls; and Lastly One Universal Nature, and Many Particular Natures. In which Scale of Beings, they Deified, besides the First Το ιεν and Ταος, One, and Good, not only the First Mind, and the First Soul, but also those other Particular Henades, and Noes universally; and all Particular Souls above humane: leaving out besides them and Inferior Souls, that Fourth Rank of Natures, because they conceived, that nothing was to be accounted a God, but what was Intellectual and Superior to Men. Wherein though they made Several Degrees of Gods, one below another, and called some απόθες and some γιόντες, some Eternal, and some Generated, or Made in time; yet did they no where clearly distinguish, betwixt the Deity properly so called, and the Creature, or shew how far in this Scale, the True Deity went, and where the Creature began. But as it were melting the Deity by degrees, and bringing it down lower and lower, they made the Juncture and Commixture betwixt God and the Creature, so smooth and close, that there they indeed parted, was altogether undiscernible. They rather implying them, to differ only in Degrees, or that they were not absolute but Comparative Terms, and consifted but in More and Less. All which was doubtless a gross Mistake of the ancient Cabala of the Trinity.

This is therefore that Platonick Trinity, which we oppose to the Christian, not as if Plato's own Trinity in the very Essentia Conftitution thereof, were quite a Different Thing from the Chriftian; it felf in all Probability having been at fift derived from a Divine or Mofaick Cabala; but becaufe this Cabala, (as might well come to pass in a thing fo Mysterious and Difficult to be conceived) hath been by divers of the Platonifts and Pythagoreans, Misunderftood, Depraved and Altered, into such a Trinity, as Confounds the Differences between God and the Creature; and removes all the Bounds and Land-marks betwixt them: finks the Deity lower and lower by Degrees; (all multiplying of it, as it goes) till it have at length brought it down to the Whole Corporeal World, and when it hath done this, is not to stop there neither, but extends it further still, to the Animated Things thereof, Stars and Demons. The Design or Direft Tendency thereof, being nothing else but to lay a Foundation, for Infinite Poly-

Nun 3
Concerning the Christian Trinity, we shall here observe only Three Things; First, that it is not a Trinity of mere Names or Words, nor a Trinity of Partial Notions and Inadequate Conceptions, of One and the Same Thing. For such a kind of Trinity as this, might be conceived in that First Platonick Hypostasis it self, called τὸ ὕποστα, and τὰ ὑπόστασις, The One and The Good, and perhaps also in that First Person of the Christian Trinity; namely of Goodness, and Understanding or Wisdom, and Will or Active Power, Three Inadequate Conceptions thereof. Tis true, that Plotinus was so high flown, as to maintain, that the First and Highest Principle of all, by reason of its Perfect Unity and Simplicity, is above the Multiplicity of Knowledge and Understanding, and therefore does not so much as νοεῖν κατά, in a proper sense, Under-stand it self: Notwithstanding which, this Philosopher himself adds that it cannot therefore be said to be Ignorant nor Unwise neither; these Expressions belonging only to such a Being, as wasby Nature Intellectual, νοεῖν μὲν ὑπὸ μὲν νοεῖν, ἀποκρύπτειν, Intellectualis nisi intelligens, demens meriti judicatur. And he seems to grant, that it hath a certain Simple Clarity and Brightness in it, Superior to that of Knowledge. As the Body of the Sun has a certain Brightness Superior to that Secondary Light which streams from it; and that it may be said, to be νοεῖν αὐτὴν Knowledge it self, that does not Under-stand, as Movement it self does not Move. But this can hardly be conceived by ordinary Mortals, that the Highest and most Perfect of all Beings, should not fully comprehend it self, the Extent of its own Fecundity and Power and be conscious of all that proceedeth from it, though after the most Simple manner. And therefore this high-flown conceit of Plotinus (and perhaps of Plato himself too) has been rejected by latter Platonists, as Phantasistical, and Unsafe; for thus Simplicius, αὐτὰ ἡ γίγαν \\

θανάτου τινα ναταρετόν,  ζην εἰν τις ζὴν ἐν αὐτὸς ὁ ἄλλος γνῶσεως ἰδωται.

But it must needs have also the most perfect Knowledge, since it cannot be ignorant of any thing that is produced from it self. And St. Austin, in like manner, confutes that Affertion of some Christians, that the θεός, or Eternal Word, was that very Wisdom and Understanding, in which the Father himself was wise; as making it nothing, but an Inadequate Conception of God. But this opinion, that the Christian Triine is but a Trinity of Words, or meer Logical Notions, and Inadequate Conceptions of God, hath been plainly condemned by the Chriftie Churc

The Christian Trinity, as opposed, Book I.
The Second Thing that we observe concerning the Christian Trinity is this, that though the Second Hypothesis or Person thereof, were begotten from the First, and the Third Proceedeth both from the First and Second; yet are neither this Second nor Third, Creatures; and that for these following Reasons. First, because they were not Made, but, as Arians maintained, that is, from an Antecedent Non-existence brought forth into being, nor can it be said of either of them, Erat Quando Non erat, that once they were not, but their Going forth Was from Eternity, and they were both Co-eve and Coeternal with the Father. Secondly, because they were not only Eternal Emanations (if we may so call them) but also Necessary, and therefore are they both also, Absolutely Undestroyable and Unannihilable. Now according to true Philosophy and Theology, no Creature could have existed from Eternity, nor be Absolutely Undestroyable, and therefore that which is both Eternal, and Undestroyable, is ipso facto Uncreated. Nevertheless, because some Philosophers have asserted (though erroneously) both the whole World’s Eternity, and its being Necessary Emanation also from the Deity, and consequently, that it is Undestroyable; we shall therefore further add, that these Second and Third Hypotheses or Persons of the Holy Trinity, are not only therefor Uncreated, because they were both Eternal, and Necessary Emanations, and likewise are Unannihilable; but also because they are Universal, each of them comprehending the Whole World, and all Created things under it; which Universality of theirs, is the same thing with Infinity: Whereas all other Beings besides this Holy Trinity, are Particular and Finite. Now we say, that no Intellectual Being, which is not only Eternal, and Necessarily Existent, or Undestroyable, but also Universal or Infinite, can be a Creature.

Again in the last place we add, that these Three Hypotheses or Persons, are truly and really One God. Not only because they have all Finitely One and the same Will, according to that of Origen, Con. elp. 326, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὸν πάντα καὶ καθότι τοῦ οὐδὲν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ως τὸν παλαιόν τὸν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οὕτω δὲν ὑποσταύ συμβαίνει, ἵνα τὰ όροι τὴν τοιαῦτα γένους οὐκ εἰς τούτους αὔξησην. We worship, the Father of Truth, and the Son the Truth itself, being Two Things as to Hypotheses; but one in Agreement, Continent, and Same in Will; but also because they are Physically (if we may speak) One also; and have a Mutual Particulatness, and Insubstantiality, and Permeation of one another; according to that of our beloved Christ, I am In the Father, and the Father In Me. And the other that Dwelleth In Me, he doth the Works. We grant indeed, that there can be no Infinitude of the like Unity or Oneness found in any Created Beings; nevertheless we certainly know from our very lives, that it is not impossible, for two distinct Substances, that are a very different Kind from one another, the One Incorporeal, the other Corporeal, to be so closely united together, as to become the Animal and Person; much less therefore should it be thought impossible, for these Three Divine Hypotheses, to be One God.
We shall conclude here with Confidence, that the Christian Trinity, though there be very much of Mystery in it, yet is there nothing at all of plain Contradiction to the Undoubted Principles of Humane Reason, that is, of Impossibility to be found therein, as the Atheists would pretend, who cry down all for Non- sense and Absolute Impossibility, which their Dull Stupidity cannot reach to, or their Infatuated Minds easily comprehend, and therefore even the Deity itself. And it were to be wished, that some Religionists and Trinitarians did not here symbolize too much with them, in affecting to represent the Mystery of the Christian Trinity, as a thing directly contradictory to all Humane Reason and Understanding; and that perhaps out of design to make men surrender up themselves and Consciences, in a Blind and Implicit Faith, wholly to their Guidance: as also to debauch their Understandings by this means, to the swallowing down of other Opinions of theirs, plainly repugnant to Humane Faculties. As who should say, he that believes the Trinity, (as we all must do, if we will be Christians) should boggle at nothing in Religion never after; nor scrupulously chew or examine any thing: as if there could be nothing more Contradictory or Impossible to Humane Understanding propounded, than this Article of the Christian Faith.

But for the present we shall endeavour only to shew, that the Christian Trinity (though a Mystery, yet) is much more agreeable to Reason, than that Platonick or Pseude-Platonick Trinity before described; and that in those Three Particulars then mentioned. For First, when those Platonisfs and Pythagoreans, interpret their Third God, or Last Hypothesis of their Trinity to be neither the World, or else a Vni- form Soul thereof, as together with the World its Body, makes up One Animal and God; as there is plainly too great a Leap here betwixt their Second and Third Hypothesis, so do they Debase the Deity therein too much, confound God and the Creature together, laying a Foundation not only for Cosmos-Latry or World-IDolatry in general, but also for the grooffest and most sottish of all Idolatries, the worshipping of the Inanimate Parts of the World themselves, in pretence as Parts and Members of this great Mundane Animal, and Sensible God.

It is true indeed that Origen and some others of the ancient Christian Writers, have supposed, that God may be said in some fence to be the Soul of the World. Thus in that Book Peri Archon, Societ. Corpus nostrum unum ex multis Membris aptatum est, & ab una Animal continetur, id a Universum Mundum, velut Animal quoddam Immane opinandum puto; quod quasi ab una Animal Virtute Dei ac Ratione teneatur. Quod etiam a Sanchor Scripturâ indicari arbitrator, per illud quod diximus est per Prophetam; Nonne Caelum & Terram ego repono, dicit Dominus & Caelum mibi Sedes, Terra autem Scabellum pedum meorum; Et quod Salvator cum ait, non esse jurandum neque per Caelum, quia Sedes Dei est, neque per Terram quia Scabellum pedum ejus Sed & illud quod ait Paulus, Quoniam in ipso Vivimus & Movemur & Sumus. Quamodo enim in Deo Vivimus, & Movemur, & Sumus, nisi quod in Virtute sua Universum confingit & continet Mundum? As our own Body is made up of many Members, and contained b

On
One Soul, so do I conceive that the whole World is to be looked upon, as One huge great Animal, which is contained as it were by One Soul, the Verum and Reason of God. And so much seems to be intimated by the Scripture in sundry places; as in that of the Prophet, Do not I fill Heaven and Earth? And again, Heaven is my Throne and the Earth my Foot-stool. And in that of our Saviour, Swear not at all, neither by Heaven, because it is the Throne of God, nor by the Earth because it is his Footstool. And lastly in that of Paul to the Athenians, For in him we Live and Move, and have our Being. For how can we be said to Live and Love, and have our Being in God, unless because he by his Verum and Power, does Constrain and Contain the whole World? And how can Heaven be the Throne of God, and the Earth his Footstool, unless his Verum and Power fill all things both in Heaven and Earth? Neverthe-

less, God is here said by Origen, to be but Quasi-Animas, As it were the Soul of the World: As if he should have said, That all the Perfection of a Soul, is to be attributed to God, in respect of the World; Quickening and Enlivening all things, as much as if he were the very Soul of it, and all the Parts thereof were his Living Members. And perhaps the whole Deity ought not to be look'd upon, according to Aristotle's Notion thereof, meerly as &e; & Cia, an Immoveable Essence, for then it is not conceivable, how it could either Act on the World, or be Sensible of any thing therein: or to what purpose any Devotional Address should be made by us to such an Inflexible, Inflexible, Rock-like and Adamantine Being. Wherefore all the Indices of a Mundane Soul, may perhaps be attributed to God in the same sense, and he called, Quasi Animas Mundi, As it were the Soul of the World: Though St. Cyprian would have this, properly to belong to the Third Hypothesis or Person of the Christian Trinity, viz. The Holy Ghost. But there is something of Imperfection also, plainly shewing and adhering to this Notion of a Mundane Soul, besides something of Paganity likewise necessarily consequent thereupon, which cannot be admitted by us. Wherefore God, or the Third Divine Hypothesis cannot be called the Soul of the World in this sense, as if it were Interior thereto, and so Passive from it, as our Soul is Immersed in, and Passive from its Body. Nor as if the World and this Soul together, made up one Entire Animal, each Part whereof, were incomplete alone by itself. And that God or the Third Hypothesis of the Christian Trinity, is not to be accounted in this Sense properly, the Soul of the World, according to Origen himself, we may learn thus from his words; Solus Dei, id eft, Patris, & Fili:, & Spirit. Luc. I. 26.

Sancti, Nature, id propria est, ut sine Materiali Substantia, & sine ullo Corpore adjectis societate intelligentiae subsilvar: It is proper to the Nature of God alone, that is, of the Father, and of the Son, of the Holy Ghost, to subsist without any Material Substance, or Body vitally United to it. Where Origen affirming, that all Created Souls are Spirits whatsoever, have always some Body or other Vitaly United to them, and that it is the Property only of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, not to be Vitaly United to any Body, as the Soul thereof whether this Assertion of his be true or no (which is a thing not to be discussed) he does plainly hereby declare, that God or the Third Hypothesis of the Trinity, is not to be accounted in a true proper Sense, the Soul of the World.

And
And it is certain that the more Refined Platonists, were themselves also, of this Perfuation; and that their Third God, or Divine Hypostasis, was neither the Whole World (as supposed to be Animated) nor yet the Immediate Soul of this Mundane Animal, but only the Immediate Soul of this Mundane Animal, but only the Immediate Soul, a Supermundane Soul; that is, such a thing as though it Preceded over the Whole World, and take Cognizance of all things in it, yet is not properly an Essential Part of that Mundane Animal, but a Being Elevated above the same. For thus Proclus plainly affirmeth, not only of Amelius but also of Porphyrius himself, who likewise pretended to follow Plotinus therein; "...Porphyrius, no" Porphyrius, ethic Porphyrius, and Porphyrius, the Third Hypostasis of the Platonick Trinity, is neither the World, nor the Immediate Soul of the Mundane Animal; but a certain Supermundane Soul, which also was the Opificer and Creator of the World, and therefore no Creature. Now the Corporeal World, being supposed by these Platonists also, to be an Animal, they must therefore acknowledge a Double Soul, one Ψυχή Έκ Σώματος, the Immediate Soul of this Mundane Animal, and another Ψυχή Ψυκτικός Σώματος, a Supermundane Soul, which was the Third in the Trinity of Gods, or Divine Hypostases, the Proper and Immediate Opificer of the World. And the same in all probability, was Plato's opinion also, and therefore that Soul, which is only the Deity, that in his Book of Laws he undertakes to prove, was Ψυχή Ψυκτικός Σώματος, a Supermundane Soul, and not the same with that Ψυχή Έκ Σώματος the Mundane Soul, whose Genesis or Generation is described in his Timeus; the Former of them being a Principle and Eternal, the Latter made in Time, together with the World; though said to be Older than it, because in order of Nature before it. And thus we see plainly, that though some of these Platonists and Pythagoreans, either Misunderstood or Depraved, the Cabala of the Trinity, so as to make the Third Hypostasis thereof, to be the Animated World, which themselves acknowledged to be, πνευμα and ἐνθεόν, a Creature or Thing made; yet others of the more Refined of them, supposed the Third Hypostasis of their Trinity, to be, not a Mundane but a Supermundane Soul, and ἐνθεόν, not a Creature, but the Creator or Opificer of the Whole World.

And as for the Second Particular proposed, it was a gross Absurdity in these Platonists also, to make the Second, in their Trinity of Gods and Hypostases, not to be one God or Hypostasis, but a Multitude of Gods and Hypostases; as also was that a Monstrous Extravagancy of theirs, to suppose the Ideas, all of them, to be so many distinct S-
Chap. IV. Ideas, no Animals, nor Gods.

Animas thus imputes to Plato; Vult Plato esse quasdam Substantias Invisibles, Incorporea, Supermundiales, Divinas, &c. Eternas, quas appellat Idea, id est, Formas &c. Exempla, &c. Caussa Naturalium solum manifesforum, &c. subjacentium Corporalibns: & illas quidem esse Veritates, nec autem Imagines carum: Plato concievit, that there are certain Substances, Invisible, Incorporeal, Supermundial, Divine and Eternal, which he calls Ideas, that is, Forms, Exemplars and Causes of all these Natural and Sensible Things, they being the Truths, but the other the Images. Neither can it be denied, but that there are some odd Expressions in Plato, founding that way, who therefore may not be justified in this, nor I think in some other Conceits of his, concerning these Ideas; as when he contends that they are not only he Objects of Science, but also the Proper and Physical Causes of all things here below; as for example, that the Ideas of Similitude and Unsimilitude, are the Causes of the Likeness and Unlikeness of all beings to one another by their Participation of them. Nevertheless cannot be at all doubted, but that Plato himself and most of his followers very well understood, that these Ideas, were all of them, truly nothing else but the Noewata or Conceptions, of that one Peri Intellefi, which was their Second Hypothesis; and therefore they build not upon them in good earnest, as to many Distinct Substances Existent severally and apart by themselves out of any Mind; however they were guilty of some Extravagant Expressions concerning them. Wherefore when they called them, &c. Ideas, Essences or Substances (as they are called in Philo ὑποκαταστάλεις, the most necessary Nences) their true meaning herein was only this, to signify that they were not such Accidental and Existent Things, as our Conceptions are, they being the Standing Objects of all Science, at least, if not the Causes also of Existent Things. Again when they were by them sometimes called Animals also, they intended only to signify thereby that they were not mere Dead Forms, like Pictures drawn upon Paper, or Carved Images and Statues. And thus Amelius the Philosopher, plainly understood that Pasage of St. John the Evangelist, concerning Eternal Λύω, he pointing the Words other than our Copies.

Now, si ὧν δεῖ τὸν ιδέαν ὕποκαταστάλει, ὅτι ὃς μετὰ τό παλαιόν παλαιόν παλαιόν, ὅτι ὃς ἔστιν ὃς ὑποκαταστάλεις, In whom whatsoever was made, was Living, and Life, and True Being. Lastly no wonder if from Animals these Ideas forthwith became Gods too, to such men, as took all occasions possible to multiply Gods; in which there was also something othat Scholastic Notion, quicquid est in Deo, est Deus, Whatsoever is in God is God. But the main thing therein, was a piece of Pagan Poetry; these Pagan Theologers being Generally possesseth with that Poetical humour of Personating Things and Deifying them. Wherefore though the Ideas were so many Titular Gods to many of the Paganick Pagans, yet did Julian himself (for Example) who made the most of them, suppose them all συνωμοστή, συνοικοστή, to Cosmica God and Euxis in him, that is, in the First Mind, or Second Hypothesis of their Trinity.
Lastly whereas Proclus and others of the Platonists intermingle
Many Particular Gods with those Three Universal Principles or Hypothesis,
of their Trinity, as Noet, MIND, or INTELLiGEB Superior to the First
Soul; and Henades and Agathotetes, Unities and Goodnesses Superior
without the First INTELLiGEB too; thereby making those Particular Beings,
which must needs be Creatures, Superior to those Hypotheses that are
Universal and infinite; and by consequence, Creaturizing of them; this
Hypothesis of theirs (I say) is altogether Aburd and Irrational al-
so: there being no Created Beings Essentially Good and Wise, but all
by Participation, nor any Immovable Nature amongst them whose
@Cia is their Essence, their Essence their Operation; but all Muta-
ble and Changeable, and probably, as Origen and others of the Fathers
add, Lapsable and Peccable. Nulla Natura est, quæ non recipiat Bonum
& Malum, Excepta Deus naturæ, quæ Bonorum omnium Fons est et
Christi Sapientia, Sapientia enim Fons est, & Sapientia utique Sub-
titiam recipere non potest; & Justitia est, quà munquam profecto In-
justitiæ capiet; & Verbum est vel Ratio, quà utique Irrationalis est
non potest sed & Lux est, & Lucem certum est quod Tenebra non com-
prehendatur. Similiter & Natura Spiritus Sancti, quà Sanatæ, non
recipit Pollutionem; Naturaliter enim vel Substantialiter Sanctæ est.
Siqua antem alia Natura Sancta est, ex Assumptione hon vel Inspiratione
Spiritum sancti habet, ut sanctificetur, non ex tide Naturæ horae pòsident;
sed ut Accidens; propter quod & decindere potest, quod accidit. There
is no Nature, which is not capable both of Good and Evil, excepting only
the Nature of God, who is the Fountain of all Good; and the Wisdom
of Christ, for he is the Fountain of Wisdom, and Wisdom it self never
can receive Folly; he is also Justice it self which can never admit of In-
Justice and the Reason and Word it self, which can never become Irra-
tional; he is also the Light it self, and it is certain that Darkness cannot
comprehend this Light, nor inflame it self with it. In like manner the
Nature of the Holy Ghost, is such as can never receive Pollution, it
being Substantially and Essentially Holy. But whatsoever other Nature
is Holy, it is only such in way of Participation and by the Inspiration of
this Holy Spirit; so that Holiness is not its very Nature and Essence, but
only an Accident to it, and whatsoever is but Accidental may fail. All
Created Beings therefore having but Accidental Goodness and Wisdom, may
Degenerate and fall into Evil and Folly. Which of Origen's is all one
as if he should have said, there is no such Rank of Beings as Au-
togatathotetes, Essential Goodnesses, there being only one Being
Essentially Good, or Goodness it self. Nor no such Particular
Created Beings existing in Nature, as the Platonists call Noet;
neither, that is, Minds or INTELLiGEB Immovable, Perfectly and Es-
sentially Wise, or Wisdom it self, whose @Cia is their Essence, whose
Essence is their Operation, and who conseqwently have no Flux at
all in them, nor Successive Action; (only the Eternal Word and Wis-
dom of God being such) who also are absolutely Unutable to
any Bodies. It is true that Origen did sometimes make mention of
Nee Minds or INTELLiGEB, but it was in another fence, he calling all Soul,
as first Created by God, and before their Lapse, by that name: whic
was as much as if he should have said, though some of the Platonists talk much of their Noes, yet is there nothing answerable to that name, according to their Notion of them, but the only Noe really existing in Nature, are, Unfallen but Peccable Souls; he often concluding, that the Highest Rank of Created Beings, are indeed no better than those which the Platonists commonly call θεῖαι, or Souls. By which Souls he understood first of all, Beings in their own nature Self-movable, and Active; whereas the Noes of the Platonists are altogether Immovable and aboveAction. And then again, such Beings or Spirits Incorporeal, as exit not Absolutely and Separately from all Matter, as the Noes of the Platonists were supposed to do, but are Vitaly Unitable to Bodies, so as together with those Bodies, to compound and make up One Animal. Thus, I say, Origen conceived even of the Highest Angelical, and Arch-Angelical Orders, that they were called all of them θεῖαι, Souls United to Bodies, but such as were Pure, Subtil and Ethereal; however he supposed it not Impossible for them to sink down into Bodies, more Gross and Feculent. And it is certain that many of the Ancient Christian Writers concurred with Origen herein, that the Highest Created Spirits were no Naked and Abstract Minds, but Souls cloathed with some Corporeal Indument. Lastly, Origen's Souls were also supposed to be all of them, endowed with Librum Arbitrium or Free-Will, and consequently to be Self-improvable and Self-impairable; and no Particular Created Spirits to be absolutely in their own Nature Impeccable, but Lapsible into Vicious Habits: Whereas the Platonick Noes, are supposed to be such Beings, as could never Fall nor Degenerate. And the Generality of the Christian Writers seem'd to have confented or confess'd with Origen in this also, they supposing him who is now the Prince of Devils, to have been once in Angel of the Highest Order. Thus does St. Jerome determine; Sceus Deus est, in quem Peccatum non cadit; Cetera cum sunt Liberi Arbitrii, possunt in utramque partem suam feclere voluntatem: God is the only Being, that is absolutely incapable of Sin, but all other Beings, having their Free Will in them, may possibly turn their Will to either way, that s to Evil as well as to Good. It is certain, that God in a fence of Perfection, is the most Free Agent of all, neither is Contingent Liberty Inversely denied to him; but here it is made the only Privilege of God, that is, of the Holy Trinity, to be devoid of Librum Arbitrii, namely as it implies the Perfection, that is, Peccability and Impatibility, in it.

It is true that some of the Platonick Philosophers, suppose that even in that Rank of Beings called by them Souls, though they be not Essentially Immutable but all Self-movable, and Active, yet there are some of them of so high a Pitch and Elevation, as that they can never Degenerate, nor sink down into Vitiou Habit. Thus Simplicius for one; ἄλλα οί μὲν προάν της ψυχῆς, ἀπό προορίζοντας υπὸ τοῦ κτήσθησαι, καὶ εἶναι τὸ πρὸς σκέψιν ωφοιδον, δια τὸ μὴ ένα το αὐτή ἐγείρει, ἀλλα οδηγοῦ τῇ αρχῇ, πάντως ἀσυγκες πρὸς αὐτῷ, συμφωνεῖ τῇ η ἀποτάκτικας οὕτως έγείροντο, η τὰν αἴρεσιν καταστάσεις πρὸς σκέψιν τητουργούν, έστιν παραλληλιστὴ πρὸς τὴ χάνειν. η έστ' ι τέρεις εν πράξεις αὐτή ἀλλα ἐστ' καὶ τῶν αἴρεσις, θέλε τά εν εἰς πράξεις σκεπήσοις τι μάθη αὐτοὶ πρόαν

ΟΟΟο

In Epist. p.1,13.
Different Degrees of Souls. Book I.

But the First and Highest of Souls which were immediately produced from what are Essentially Good, although they have some abatement in them, being not Goodnesses Essentially, but desserts of Good; nevertheless are they so near a kin to that Highest Good of all, as that they do Naturally and Indivisibly cleave to the same, and have their Volitions always uniformly directed towards it, they never declining to the worser. Infomuch that if Prorexis, be taken for the choosing of one thing before another, perhaps there is no such thing as Prorexis to be imputed to them, unless one should call the choosing of the First Goods, Prorexis. By these higher Souls, Simplicius must needs understand, either the Souls of the Sun, Moon and Stars, or else those of the Superior Orders of Demoniac or Angelick Beings. Where though he make a Question, Whether Prorexis or Deliberation belong to them, yet does he plainly imply that they have none at all of that Liberous Liberum Arbitrium or Free-will belonging to them, which would make them capable of Vice and Immorality as well as Virtue.

But whatever is to be said of this, there seems to be no necessity at all, for admitting that Affertion of Origen’s, that all Rational Souls whatsoever, even those of Men and those of the highest Angelical Orders are Universally of one and the same Nature, and have no Fundamental or Essential Difference in their Constitution; and consequently that all the difference that is now betwixt them, did arise only from the Difference of their Demeanour, or Utile of that Power and Liberty, which they all alike once had. So that Thrones, and Dominions, and Principalities, and Powers, were all made such by their Merits; and Humane Souls though now sunk so low, yet are not absolutely Uncapable of Commencing Angels, or ascending to those highest Altitudes: as it is not impossible, according to him neither, that the Highest Angels also, the Seraphim and Cherubim, might in length of time, not only Degenerate into Devils, but also sink down into Humane Bodies. His reason for which Monstrous Paradox is only this, that the Divine Julifice cannot otherwise be salved, but God must needs be a Purographer, an Acepter of Persons, should he have Arbitarily made such vast Differences among Intellectual Beings, Which Ground he also extendeth so far, as to the Humane Soul of our Saviour Chrifl himself, as being not Partially appointed to that transcendent Dignity, of its Hypostatick Union, but by reason of its most faithful adherence to the Divine Word and Wisdom, in a Pre-existent State, beyond all other Souls, which he endeavours thus to prove from the Scripture, That dilectionis Perfectio, & affectibus sinceritatem, ei insiparabilem cum Deo secemt Unitatem, ita ut non fortuita fuerit, aut cum Personae acceptione, Anima ejus adefuncto, sed Virtutum suarum sih merito delata & ad Deum Prophetam divinum. Dilectissi Jutisigas & odijis iniquitatem, propter eam unxit te Deus, Deus tuus, oleo latitie prae participibus suis: Dilectissis ergo merito ungitur Oleo Letitiae Anima Christi, id est, cum Verbo Dei Unum efficitur. Urgi namque oleo latitie, non aliud intelligitur quam Spiritu Sancto repelleri. Prae Participibus autem dicit 5 quia non Graia Spiritus fuerit Propheti ei data est, sed ipsius Verbi Dei et sae Substantiels inerat Plenitudine. Tha
be Perfection of Love and Sincerity of Divine Affection, procured to his Soul its inseparable Union with the Godhead, so that the Assumption of it was neither Fortitious nor Partial, or with Prosfopolepsis (the Reception of Persons) but bestowed upon it justly for the Merit of its Creator, hear (faith he) the Prophet thus declaring to him ; Thou hast Righ
teousness and hated Iniquity, therefore with God, even by God, anointed thee with the oil of Gladness above thy Fellows, be Soul of Christ therefore was anointed with the oil of Gladness or de
cide one with the Word of God, for the Merits of Love and faithful
lorens to God, and no otherwise. For to be anointed with the oil
Gladness, here properly signifies nothing else, but to be replenished
with the Holy Ghost. But when it is said, that he was thus anointed abou
Fellows, this intimates, that he had not the Holy Ghost bestowed up
him, only as the Prophets and other Holy men had, but that the Sub-
stantial Fulness of the Word of God dwelt in him. But this Reason of
Origen's seems to be very weak, because if there be a Rank of Souls
how Humane, specifically differing from the same, as Origen him-
if must needs confess (he not allowing the Souls of Brutes to have
ten Humane Souls Lapsed, as some Pythagoreans and Platonists con-
tended, but renouncing and disclaiming that Opinion as monftrously
Absurd and Irrational) there can be no reason given, why there might
be as well other Ranks and Orders of Souls Superior to those of
Men, without the Injustice of Prosfopolepsis, as besides Simplicius, Plea-
and the Generality of other Platonists conceived.

But least of all can we assent to Origen, when from this Principle, that
Soul is such, are Essentially endowed with Liberum Arbitrium or
Free Will and therefore never in their own Nature Impeccable, he in-
forms these 'Endless Circuits' of Souls Upwards and Downwards, and so
makes them to be never at rest, denying them any Fixed State of
Happiness and Happiness by Divine Grace; such as wherein they might
have the Fear and Danger of ever losing the fame. Of whom
St. Justin therefore thus, illum & propter alia nonnulla, & maxime pro-
pter alternantes fine esstationes beatitudines & miseries, & statuis seco-
lium intermissis ab ipsis ad illas, atque ab illis ad illas Ius ac Rediit
terminabiles; non immutabili reprobavit Ecclesia: quia & hoc quod
minorors videatur, anisti, faciendo sanckis Veras Miseries, quibus pa-
manuent, & Falsas Beatitudines, in quibus verum ac securum, hoc
fine Timore certum, sempiterni boni gaudium, non haberent. The
Church hath deservedly rejected Origen, both for certain other opinions
of his, and especially for those his Alternate Beatitudes and Miseries
without end, and for his infinite Circuits, Ascents and Descents of Souls
from one to the other, in restless Vicissitudes and after Periods of Time.For
asch as hereby he hath quite lost, that very Title of Pithful or Merciful,
which otherwise he seemed to have deserved, by making so many True
Mistakes for the best of Saints, in which they should successively undergo
Suffering and Smart; and none but False Happiness for them, such
as therein they could never have any True or Secure Joy, free from the
Fear of losing that Good which they possess. For this Origenetical Hypothesis,
leads directly contrary to the whole Tenour of the Gospels, promising
Eternal and Everlasting Life, to those, who believe in Christ, and
Perseveringly obey him;  

1. Job. 2. This is the Promise that he bath Promised us, even Eternal Life: and Titus 1. 2. In hope of Eternal Life, which God that cannot Lie hath promised. And, God so loved the World, that he gave his only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have Everlasting Life: and left all this should be taken for a Periodical Eternity only, John 3. 26. He that believeth in me shall never die. And possibly this might be the Meaning of St. Paul, 2 Tim. 1. 10. when he affirmeth of our Saviour Christ, That he hath abolished Death, and brought Life and Immortality to Light throughout the Gospel; not because he was the First who had discovered and published to the World, the Souls Immortality, which was believed before, not only by all the Pharisaick Jews, but also by the Generality of Pagans too, but because these for the most part held their Endless Circuits and Transmigrations of Souls; therefore was he the First who brought Everlasting Life to Light, and gave the World assurance, in the Faith of the Gospel, of a Fixed and Permanent State of Happiness, and a never fading Crown of Glory to be obtained, Him that overcometh, will I make a Pillar in the Temple of my God, and he shall go no more out, Apoc. 3. 12.

Now the Reason why we mention'd Origen here, was because he was a Perfon, not only thoroughly skilled in all the Platonick Learning, but also one who was sufficiently addicted to those Dogmata, he being commonly conceived to have had too great a kindness for them; and therefore had there been any Solidity of Reason, for either those Particular Henades, or Noes of theirs, Created Beings above the Rank of Souls, and consequently according to the Platonick Hypothesis, Superior to the Universal Psyche also, (which was the Third Hypothesis in their Trinity, and seems to answer to the Holy Ghost in the Christian;) Origen was as likely to have been favourable thereunto as any other. But it is indeed manifestly repugnant to Reason, that there should be any such Particular, that is, Created Henades, and ωτωσκεθεται Eessential Goodnesses, Superior to the Platonick First Mind; or any such Noes, and ωττυποφια Eessential Wisdoms, Superior to their Universal Psyche, it being all one, as if in the Christian Trinity besides the First Perfon or the Father, one should suppose a Multitude of Particular Paternities Superior to the Second, and also besides that Second Person, the Son or Word, a Multitude of Particular Sons or Words, all Superior to the Third Person the Holy Ghost. For this is plainly to make a Breach upon the Deity; to confound the Creator and Creature together; and to suppose a company of such Creatures-Gods, as imply a manifest contradiction in the very Notion of them.

Wherefore we shall here observe, that this was not the Catholic Doctrine of the Platonick School, that there were such Henades and Noes, but only a private Opinion of some Doctors among them, and that of the latter fort too. For First, as for those Henades, as there are not the least Footsteps of them to be found at where in Plato's Writings, so may it be plainly gather'd from the, that he supposed no such thing. Forasmuch as in his Second Epiff, whe
where he describes his Trinity, he doth not say of the First, ως ετοις περι του πρωτου about the First, as he doth of the Second ἀνατον ως το ανατον, and of the Third τελων ως το τελων, about the Second are the Second, and about the Third the Third; but of the First he faith, ως ετοις του πρωτου μεντη ητι, και εκεινη ηνα αληθη, και εδεικναι ανατον αποτελου της καλας, About the King of all things, are all things; and for his sake are all Things; and he is the cause of all Things that are good: Wherefore here are no Particular Henades and Agathotetes, Quities and Goodness, about the First τηνων και ταξινον, One and Good; but all Good things are about him, he being both the Efficient and Final Cause of all. Moreover Plotinus throughout all his Works dicasovers not the Least supicion neither, of these Henades and Agathotetes, this Language being scarcely to be found any where in the Writings of any Platonists, Seniour to Proclus: who also as if we were conscious that this assumention to the Platonick Theology, were not so defensible a thing, doth himself sometime as it were tergiverfate and decline it by equivocating in the Word Henades, taking them for the Ideas, or the Intelligible Gods before mentioned. As perhaps Symposius also ues the Word, in his first Hymn, when God is called by him

'Ενοτητων ειδες αυτη,
Μωναδων μενας τα πρωτην.

The First Henad of Henades; and the First Monad of Monades: That is, The First Idea of Good, and Cause of all the Ideas. And as for the particular Nos, Minds or Intellechts, these indeed seem to have crept somewhat before Plotinus his time, he besides the Passage before ited, elwewhere giving some Intimations of them, as Enn. 6. L.4. c.4. P. 647, 848. λα μεν γεναι πολλαι και νοι πολλαι; But how can there be many Souls, and many Minds, and not only one, but many Enites? From which and their places of his, Ficimus concluded Plotinus himself really to have firted, abovethe Rank of Souls, a Multitude of other Substantial Wings, called νοεσ or νοι, Minds or Intellechts. Nevertheless Plotinusreaking of them so uncertainly, and making fuch an Union betwixt all these Nos, and their Particular Respective Souls; it may well be question’d, whether he really took them, for any thing else, but the leads and Summities of thofe Souls; he supposing that all Souls, have Mind in them, the participation of the First Mind; as also a Unity in the participation of the First Unity; whereby they are capable of being conjoin’d with both: δε νοι εν αμαλανωθαμεν, και εν αρχαιων, και αιρθαι. 

Στον ημαρνη το οντον ημαρνη ημαρνη εν αμαλανωθαμεν, και αιρθαι ανα οντον του κοινου οντον αιρθαι. Στον ημαρνη το οντον ημαρνη ημαρνη εν αμαλανωθαμεν, και αιρθαι ανα οντον του κοινου οντον αιρθαι. Enn.L.5.6.c.11.

There must needs be Mind in us, as also be Principle and Cause of Mind, God. Not as if he were divided, but because though remaining in himself, yet he is also considered in many, as capable to receive him. As the Centre, though it remain in it self, yet it is also in every Line, drawn from the Circumference, each of them, by a certain Point of its own, touching it. And by some such Thing, we, is it, that we are capable of touching God, and of being United.
to him, when we directed our Intention towards him. And in the next
Chapter he adds, τά τοιούτα ήν ἀποκαλυμμένα, καὶ ἀκριβῶς τάς τοιούτας ἐνεργείας τα πολλά, οἱ έν θεόν δήλον ἐνεργείαν, εἴπερ μέν ἐν τοις εὐφύεις ἐνεργείαις αὐτήν, τοῖς δὲ το θεάν εἰν ἐν οὐσία, &c. That though
we have these things, in us, yet do we not perceive them, being for the
most part idle and asleep as to these higher Energies; as some never at all
exercise them. However those do always all three, Mind, and that which is
before Mind, Unity; but every thing which is in our Souls, is not per-
cieved by us unless come to the Whole, when we dispose our selves towards it,
&c. Where Plotinus seems to make, the Noes or Minds, to be nothing
else, but something in Souls, whereby they partake of the First
Mind. And it is said of Porphyrius, who was well acquainted with
Plotinus his Philosophy that he quite discarded and rejected these
Noes or Intellects, as Substances really distinct from the First Mind,
and separate from Souls. And it is certain that such Minds as
these, are no where plainly mentioned by Plato, he speaking only
of Minds in Souls, but not of any Abstract and Separate Minds save
only one. And though some might think him to have given an Im-
mation of them in his Ρρόπερες άν άν άν τη άντε, (before mentioned)
his Second about the Second Things, or Second Things about the Second;
yet by these may very well be understood, the Ideas as by the
Third Things about the Third, all Created Beings. Wherefore we may
conclude, that this Platonick, or rather Pseudo-Platonic Trinity,
which confounds the Differences betwixt God and the Creature, and
that probably in favour of the Pagan Polytheism and Idolatry, is no-
ting so agreable to Reason it self, as that Christian Trinity before
described, which distinctly declares how far the Deity goes, and where
the Creature begins: namely, that the Deity extends so far as to this
Whole Trinity of Hypothesis; and that all other things whatsoever,
this Trinity of Person only excepted, are truly and properly their
Creatures, produced by the jount concurrence and Influence of them
all, they being really but One God.

But it is already manifest, that all the formentioned Depravations
and Adulterations of that Divine Cabbala of the Trinity, and that Spu-
rious Trinity described, (which becaue affered by some Platonists,
was called Platonical, in way of distinction from the Christian,) cannot
be justly charged neither upon Plato himself, nor yet upon all his Fol-
lowers Universally. But on the contrary we shall now make it appear,
that Plato and some of the Platonists, retained much of the Ancient
Genuine Cabbala, and made a very near approach to the True Christian
Trinity; forasmuch as their Three Hypotheses, differing from all
their other Gods, seem to have been none of them accounted Crea-
tures, but all other things whatsoever the Creatures of them.

First therefore we affirm, that Plato himself, does in the beginning
of his Timæus, very carefully differcng betwixt God and the Creature,
he determining the Bounds between them, after this manner
We being here to treat, concerning the Universe, judge it necessary to begin with a distinction, between that which always is, and hath no sort of Generation; and that which is Made, but never truly is. The Former of which, being always like its self and the same, is comprehensible by Intelligence with Reason, or is the Object of Knowledge; the latter of them, that which is Made and Perisheth, but never truly is, is not properly Knowable, but Observable only, or the Object of Opinion together with Irrational Sense. Now everything that is made must of necessity be made by some Cause. The reason why Plato being to treat of the Universe, begins here with this distinction, was, as Proclus well observes, because, or τις κοινός ἐν οὐκ ἀνάλογος ἄτομος, τί ἔστιν τι ἀέαν ἢ. It is either one of our Common Notions, or a thing Mathematically demonstrable, that there must be something Eternal, or which was never Made, but always was, and had no Beginning. And it is evident by Sense and experience that all things are not such, but that some things are Made and Perish again, or Generated and Corrupted. Now the Latter Platonists, being strongly perswaded with a Prejudice, of the World's Eternity, or that it had no Beginning, have offered strange violence to Plato's Text in this place, and wrested his words to quite a different sense from what he intended; as if by his τὸ γεγένημαι That which is Made, he did not at all mean, That which had a Beginning, but only, that whose Duration is, Flowing and Successive or Temporal, which might notwithstanding be without Beginning; and as if he supposed the whole corporeal World to be such, which though it hath a Successive and Temporal Duration, yet was without any Beginning. And the Curtrran so strong this way, that even Boetius, that Learned Christian Philosopher, was himself also carried away with the force thereof, he taking it for granted likewise, that Plato held the Eternity of the World in this sense, that is, its Being without Beginning, Non reél quiu. (Faith he) qui cum audiant viisima Platonii, Mundum bene nec habuisset Intimum Numinis, nec habituerum esse Deorum; hoc modo Conditori audient Mundum sive Coeternum putant. Aliquid efi enim, per Inminimium duci viam, quod Mundo Plato tribuit; aliquid Interminabile Vite sui tam pariter complexum esse presentium; quod Divine Mente prorpublicum esse manifestum est. Neque Deae, Conditiis rebus Antiquiori dorsi debet, Temporis Quamnisi, sed Simplicis потius proprietate Naturn. Some when they hear, Plato to have held, that the World had no beginning, nor shall never have an end, do not rightly from thence infer, That Plato therefore made the World Co-Eternal with God, because One Thing always to Be, and another thing, to possess an Endless is all at once, 3 which is proper to the Divine Mind. Neither ought We to be thought Older than the World, in respect of Time, but only the Respect of the Simplicity of his Nature. To which purpose he adds afterwards, Itaque dignarsebus Nomina velimus imponere, Platonem societas Dea quidem æternum, Mundum vero dicimus esse Perpetuum; before, if we would give proper Names to things agreeable to their Natures, following Plato, we should say, That God was Eternal; but the Word only Perpetual. But as this Doctrine of the latter Platonists, one frustrates Plato's Design in this place, which was to prove or
affert a God, because if the World had no beginning, though its Duration be never so much Successive, yet would it not follow from thence, that therefore it must needs have been made by some other Cause; so is it directly contrary to that Philosopher's own Words; himself there declaring, that by his τὸ γεννημένον, Ortona, or That which is Made he did not understand only, That whole Duration is Successive, but also τὸ γεννημένον ἀπὸ ὁλου ἔργου, That which had a beginning of its Generation, and τὸ ἄλλο γεννημένον ἄλλου ἔργου, That which begun from a certain Epocha of Time; or that which Once was not, and therefore must needs be brought into being by some other Cause. So that Plato there plainly supposes, all Temporary Beings, once to have had a Beginning of their Duration, as he declareth in that very Timeos of his, that Time it self was not Eternal, or without Beginning, but Made together with the Heaven or World, and from thence does he infer, that there must of necessity be, another Eternal being, viz. such as hath both a Permanent Duration, and was without Beginning, and was the Cause both of Time and the World: for as much as nothing can possibly be made without a Cause; that is, nothing which once was not, could of it self come into Being, but must be produced by some other thing; and so at last we must needs come, to something which had no Beginning. Wherefore Plato, thus taking it for granted, that whatsoever hath a Temporary and Flowing Duration, was not without Beginning; as also that whatsoever was without Beginning, hath a Permanent Duration or Standing Eternity; does thus state the Difference between Uncreated and Created Beings, or between God andCreature: namely, that Creature is That whose, Duration being Temporary or Successive, once had a Beginning; and this is his, τὸ γεννημένον μόνον, ὁ ἄλλο ἔργον, That which is Made, but never truly Is, and that which ὑπὸ ἄλλου προελεημένον λειτουργεῖ, Must of necessity be Produced by some Cause; but that whatsoever is without Beginning, and hath a Permanent Duration, is Uncreated or Divine; which is his τὸ μόνον ἄλλο, ὁ ἄλλον ἄλλον, That which always Is, and hath no Generation; nor was ever Made. Accordingly as God is styled in the Septuagin Translation, of the Mosaisck Writings, ὁ ὢν, He that Truly is.

Now as for this αἰώνιος ἀῤῥατος, this Eternal Nature, which wayes It, and was never Made, Plato speaks of it, not Singularly only as we Christians now do, but often in the Paganick way Plurally a πότε; as when in this very Timeos, he calls the World, ὁ ἀϊώνιος ἀνθρωπος ἀναλυθείς, a Made or Created Image, of the Eternal Gods. By which Eternal Gods he there meant doubtless that τὸ πρῶτον, an τὸ ἄλλο πρῶτον, and τὸ τελευταῖον, that First, and Second, and Third; which in his Second Epistle to Dionysius, he makes to be the Principles of All things; that is, his Trinity of Divine Hypostases, by whose Concurrence and according to whom Image and Likeness, the whole World was made; as Plotinus also plainly declareth in these words of his before cited, τὸ μὲν τὸ πρῶτον ἀναιρεῖται καὶ ἑνετελευτημένοις, ἀλλὰ τὸ τελευταῖον, τὸ γένος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ ἐν τῆς κόσμου. This World is an Image which was Iconized, or perpetually Renewed (as the Image in a Glass is) of the First, Second, and Third Principle, which are always Standing; that is, fixed in Eternity, and were never Made. For thus Enochius records,
that the Ancient Interpreters of Plato expounded this First, Second and Third of his in the forementioned Epistle, of a Trinity of Gods; which the Platonists disapproved of, as being opposed to the doctrine of Plato himself. In this way, the Interpreters of Plato referred, to the First God, to the Second Cause, and to the Third the Soul of the World, they calling this also the Third God. Wherefore we think there is good reason to conclude, that those Eternal or Uncreated Gods of Plato in his Time, whose Image or Statue this whole Generated or Created World is said by him to be, were no other than his Trinity of Divine Hypostases, the Makers or Creators thereof. And it was before (as we conceive) rightly gueffled, that Cicero also was to be understood of the same Eternal Gods, as Platonizing, when he affirmed: A Deus omnia à Principio saepe, That all things were at first made by the Gods, and a Providentia Deorum, Mundum & omnes Mundit pater constitutas esse, That the World and all its Parts were constituted by the Providence of the Gods.

But that the Second Hypostasis in Plato's Trinity, viz. Mind or Intellect, though said to have been Generated, or to have Proceeded by way of Emanation from the First called Tagathus, The Good, was notwithstanding unquestionably acknowledged, to have been Eternal or without Beginning, might be proved by many express Testimonies of the most Genuine Platonists; but we shall here content our selves only with Two, one of Plotinus writing thus concerning it, Enn. 5, L. 1. c. 5. έπνοιαν ᾧ ἡν ἐστὶν καὶ ἐν χρυσῷ, ή τήν ιδέαν ἐκ θεῶν ἀναλαμβάνει, ὡς ἐτέρων τιμωρίων, &c. Let all Temporal Generation here, be quite banished from our thoughts, whilst we treat of things Eternal, or such as always are, in attributing Generation to them only in respect of Causality and Order, not of Time. And though Plotinus there speak particularly of the Second Hypostasis or Nous, yet does he afterwards extend the same idea to the Third Hypostasis of that Trinity, called Psyche, or the Luminous Soul; which is there said by him likewise to be the Word the Second, as that Second was the Word of the First, ἡ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἀπὸ περιτιτκον νεόν, ἡν δεινα, ἡ θεοτριτις αποκαταν νεός, ὅτι ἀλλά μὴ ἀυτῷ, ὡς ἐν χρυσῷ λόγῳ τῷ σκόρπῳ ἀνέστησεν ὃς ἐν πάση χρυσῇ, That which is Generated from what is better than Mind, is by no other than Mind, because Mind is the Best of all things, and ever thing else is after it, and Junior to it, as Psyche or Nous, which is in the manner the Word of Mind, and a certain Energy thereof, as Mind is the Word and Energy of the First Good. The other testimony is of Porphyrius, cited by S. Cyril out of the Fourth Book of his Philosophost History, where he fets down the Doctrine of Plato after this manner, οἱ νῦν τοῦ αὐθεντοῦ εἰσενεκτὸν τὴν χρυσᾶ τοῦ θεοῦ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ κατέγραφον. Jul. L. 1. p. 5, as it were, that ἡ τοῦ δικαίου ἡν, ἡ τοῦ πίστεως ἐνδαί τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ ἐν πάση καὶ παλαιστήριος ἀκτικάλοι, περὶ ἑστίν καὶ καλώς ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· παραθέναι δὲ περισσημερεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ· παρελθεῖν δὲ ὁ ἐν αὐτῆς περὶ ἑστίν, ἔσται δὲ καὶ ἕσται γεγονέναι περὶ πάντων ἐν τῷ θεῷ, περί ὁμοιοῦ καὶ ἕσται καὶ περὶ ἕσται, ἕσται δὲ ἐν αὐτής.
Now because this is so great a Riddle or Mystery, it is worth the while to consider its true meaning and the ground thereof; which is thus declared by Porphyrius. Mind though it sprang from the First Good or Supreme Deity from Eternity, yet is it said to be Self-Begotten, because it did not spring from that, as any ways moved towards its Generation, but as always standing still or quiescent. Which Doctrine was before delivered by Plato thus declared concerning the First Good, That from it was Generated a certain Mind Incomprehensible to Mortals; in which subsisting by itself, are contained the things that truly are, and the Essences of all Beings. This is the First Fair, and Felicity it itself, which proceeded or sprang out of God from all Eternity as its Cause, but notwithstanding after a peculiar manner, as Self-begotten, and as its Own-Parent. For it was not begotten from that as any way moved towards its Generation, but it proceeded from God as it were Self-begottenly. And that not from any Temporal beginning, there being as yet no such thing as Time. Nor when Time was afterwards made, did it any way affect him; for Mind is always Timeless, and alone Eternal. Here besides the Eternity of Mind or Intellect, the Second Divine Hypothesis in the Platonick Trinity, there are other strange and unusual expressions concerning it; for though it be acknowledged to have been Generated from the First Original Deity, yet is it called μονογενος and μονογενες, Its Own-Parent, and its Own-Ospring, and said to have sprung out, μονογενος Self-begottenly.

Now because this is so great a Riddle or Mystery, it is worth the while to consider its true meaning and the ground thereof; which is thus declared by Porphyrius. Mind though it sprang from the First Good or Supreme Deity from Eternity, yet is it said to be Self-Begotten, because it did not spring from that, as any ways moved towards its Generation, but as always standing still or quiescent. Which Doctrine was before delivered by Plato thus declared concerning the First Good, That from it was Generated a certain Mind Incomprehensible to Mortals; in which subsisting by itself, are contained the things that truly are, and the Essences of all Beings. This is the First Fair, and Felicity it itself, which proceeded or sprang out of God from all Eternity as its Cause, but notwithstanding after a peculiar manner, as Self-begotten, and as its Own-Parent. For it was not begotten from that as any way moved towards its Generation, but it proceeded from God as it were Self-begottenly. And that not from any Temporal beginning, there being as yet no such thing as Time. Nor when Time was afterwards made, did it any way affect him; for Mind is always Timeless, and alone Eternal. Here besides the Eternity of Mind or Intellect, the Second Divine Hypothesis in the Platonick Trinity, there are other strange and unusual expressions concerning it; for though it be acknowledged to have been Generated from the First Original Deity, yet is it called μονογενος and μονογενες, Its Own-Parent, and its Own-Ospring, and said to have sprung out, μονογενος Self-begottenly.
we have no warrant for it from the Scriptures; though we are not ignorant that some late Divines have ventured to call the Christian Logos, after the same manner, and to say, God from himself.

Dionysius Petavius, having rightly declared the Doctrine of Arius after this manner, that the Father was the only Eternal God, and that the Son or Word, was a Creature made by him in Time, and out of nothing; that is, after he had not been, produced into Being; subjoin these Words, In a verò professione, quod supra memoravist, pla. De Trin. L. missive confit, Germanum Platonicam Athanafris, from the prof. c. 8. §. 4. 5. a fession of this Doctrine, it is most undeniably manifest (what was before affirmed) that Arius was a German or Genuine Disciple of Plato’s. But from what we have now cited out of Plato himself, and others of his most Genuine Followers, it is certain, that Petavius (though otherwise Learned and Indulgent) was herein grossly mistaken, and that Arius was no Platonist at all. And indeed for either Plato or Platonism, to have denied the Eternity of that Second Hypothesis of his, called Nous or Logos, and the Son of the First; would have been all one as if they should have denied the Eternity of Wisdom and Understanding it self; because according to them, this Second Hypothesis is Essentially nothing but Wifdom, Original Wisdom it self, and consequently that very Wisdom, by which God himself is Wifdome. Which how far, or in what sense it is true, we do not here dispute. Nevertheless Athanasius seems to have been fully of the same Opinion, with them herein, from this passage of his, Kαι σπυρια η υκουειν, Petav. tom. 16 ἄνδρος ὑπὲρ θεοῦ Κυρίου, ἐν ὑπὸ ἄνδρος σπυρίας ὑποτεκλέξ, ἅνω μέντοι ὑπὸ τῆς πάντων πατέρων ὑπό τεκλή, &c. Our Lord is both Wisdom and Truth, Neither is he Second from any other Wisdom; but it is he alone, whom the Father made all things. And again, ὑπὸ λόγου ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου πάντων. For the Father of the Word, is not properly himself the Word. And ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου πάντων, ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου πάντων. Wifdom seems to have nothing to do with Wisdom. For the Lord is Wisdom, therefore that as not Wisdom, which produced Wisdom, that speaks thus of her self, is delight was with me. But those latter Words, he cite them with approbation out of Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria. And the same Athanasius affirmeth, Arius on the contrary, to have maintained, That there was another Word and Wisdom, Senior to that Word and Wisdom our Saviour Christ. To conclude, no Platonist in the World, ever denied the Eternity of that Nous or Universal Mind, which is the Second Hypothesis of their Trinity; but on the contrary, as hath been ready observed, some of them seem to rather to attribute too much it, in calling it wthpнλμης and wthμβνως, its Own-Parent and its off-Spring, as that which was Self-Begotten, though this but in a certain Mythical sense, they otherwise not denying it to have proceeded also, from the First Good, and to be the Off-Spring thereof. Therefore Plato, who supposed the World not to have been Eternal, confiting the Eternity of that Second Hypothesis of his Trinity, thereby again made it to be no Creature, according to Athanasius his own Doctrine, εἰ δοτὸς ἢτιν ὑπὸ τοῦ, εἰ τοῦ ὀνήματος, εἰ τοῦ ὀνήματος τοῦ ὃς, εἰ τῷ ὁμας τῷ ὁμας, εἰ τῷ ὁμας τῷ ὁμας.
Neither is there any force at all in that Testimony of Macrobius, which Petavius urgeth to the Contrary; wherein the First Cause is said, De fide Mentem Cresffe, to have Created Mind from itself; and again this Mind, Animam de Je Cresffe, to have Created from it itself Soul; because it is certain, that these Ancient Pagans, did not then so strictly confine that Word Create, (as we Christians now do) to that narrow Sence and Notion, of the Production of Things in Time; but used it generally, for all manner of Production or Efficiency. But the chief Ground of Petavius his misfame herein, besides his Prejudice against Platonism in general, was his not distinguishing betwixt that Spurious Trinity of some Platonists, wherein the Third Hypothesis, was the Whole Animated World, (which gave him occasion to write thus, Tertius verus Deus manifeste Creatus ab iljdem Platonicos putatur, quem & tumus nominant;) and that other Doctrine of theirs, who made it not to be the World it self, that is a Creature, but the Artificer or Creator thereof.

But we grant, that there may be some more reason to make a Question, whether Plato himself held the Eternity of the Mundane Soul (commonly said to be the Third Hypothesis of his Trinity) or no; because in his Timaeus, though he acknowledged it to be Senior to the World; yet does he seem to attribute a Temporary Generation or Nativity to it. Nevertheless it is no way probable, that Plato’s Third Principle of all things, in his Epistle to Dionysius, and that Psyche or Soul of his, which is the only God, that in his Tenth De Legibus he goes about to prove against the Atheists; should ever not have been; and therefore it is most reasonable to compound this business, thus, by supposing with Plutinus and others, that Plato held a Double Psyche or Soul, one ψυχή ζωον or Mundane, which is as it were the Concrete Form of this corporeal World; whereby this World is properly made an Animal; and a Second or Created God; another ψυχή ζωον, Supra-mundane, or Separate; and which is not so much the Form, as the Artificer of the World. The First of which Two, Plutinus calling it the Heavenly Venus, thus describeth; τυλίξαι γιγαντων λειμαρίων, ης Κεφαλής της ὀντος Εορησίας, αὐθαίρθος ζωμα Ζωοτάτων εἶναι, καθώς ἐκ αὐτῆς ἀπεκτησεν ἄκριτα, μελανασκόν ἐνος ὡς μὴ 5 εἰς τὸ πλεῖον ὄλοιν, μὴ τὴν Ἀθλοσταθα, μὴν δυνάμειν, ἐντὸς δὲ φύσεως μὴ χρῆ τον κάθε φύσιν ποιεῖν. Καθώς εἰς οὗτος προς τὰ ὑπόπτα, ἐκ αὕτης τινα θυμίαν ἔχει, ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ὁ πολεμίζεται, τῇ ἀμφισβητή, ἐν τῇ ζωή. Σὺν αὐτῆς Δίκαιου, καὶ Βελανος, σὺν αὐτῆς, καὶ καθιστά ἐν οὐσίας, καὶ τῶν ἱεροτημάτων, τῶν μεταμφίαν, ἱππότος ὡς ἔχει ἐκ αὐτῆς, οὕτων αὐτῶν ἀπεκτησεν ὡς, ἐκ αὐτῇ συμμετέχειν, ἀρετοί, μὴν τῇ Κεφαλῇ, ή μὲν θυμία τῇ Χερσίς τῇ Κεφαλῇ, ἐκατέρθεις τα περὶ αὐτής, καὶ ἐκείνης ἐκατέρθεις ἐκατέρθεις. Τοῦτο θερινόν την νεως, which they affirm to have been begotten from Saturn, that is from a Perfect Mind or Intellect, must needs be that most Divine Soul (the Third Archetical Hypothesis) which being immediately begotten, pure from that which is pure, always remains above, so that it neither can nor will ever descend down to these lower things, so as to be immersed in them: it being of
such a nature, as is not inclinable to sink or lapse downward. A certain separate substance, which doth not at all partake of Matter, as the fable intimates, when it called it Motherless; and therefore may it well be said by us, not a Demon but a God. Whence it comes to pass, that this Soul can never fall, it being much more closely united and connected with that invariable Mind or Intellef, than that Light which is circumfused about the Sun, is connected with the Sun. This Venus therefore following Chronus, or rather the Father of Chronus Uranus, acting towards it, and being enamoured with it, begat Love. 

Moreover we call this Soul itself Separated, so is this Love of it, or begotten by it, a separate Love. After which he speaks of another soul of the World, which is not separate from it, but closely conjoined herewith, he calling it, a Lower Venus and Love; namely, that other Soul which in the Fable, is said to have been begotten from Jupiter himself (the Superior Soul of the World) and Dione, a Watery Nymph. We conclude therefore, that though this Lower Mundane Soul, might according to Plato, have a Temporary production together with the World, or before it; yet that other Superior and most Divine Soul, which Plotinus calls the Heavenly Venus and Love, the Son of Chronus without a Mother, and which was truly the Third Hypothesis of Plato's Trinity, was Eternal, and without Beginning. And thus according to the forementioned Principle of Athonasius, none of these Three Hypotheses of Plato's Trinity, were Creatures, but all of them Divine and Incorrupted.

Which to make yet more evident, we shall further observe, First at Plato himself, in that Second Epistle of his to Dionysius, after he had mentioned his First, Second, and Third; that is, his Trinity of Divine Hypotheses, immediately Subjoyneth these Words. He in the beginning quo:

Secondly the Three Hypotheses of Plato's Trinity, are not only all Eternal, but also Necessarily Excistent and Absolutely Undestroyable. For the First of them, can no more Exit without the Second, nor the First, and Second, without the Third, than Original Light can Exit without Splendor, Corufcation, or Effulgency. And Plotinus writing against the Gnosticks in his time, who would make more of these Divine Hypotheses or Principles, than Three, concludes that there can be neither more of them, nor fewer, in this manner, Eu. L. 9. 11. c. 1. 

For the

Ev. 1. L. 1.
Thirdly, as all these three Platonick Hypothesis are Eternal and
Necessarily Existent, so are they plainly suppos'd by them, not to be
Particular, but Universal Beings; that is, such as do contain and comprehend the whole World under them, and pre-
side over all things, which is all one as to say, that they are each of them Infinite and Omnipotent. For which rea
son they are also called by Platonick Writers, Ἐξωτερικά and ἔσχατα, and Ἑνωμένα, Principles and
Causes, and Opifices of the whole World. First, as for Ἐσείς Mind or Understanding: Whereas the Old Philo-
osophers before Plato, as Anaxagoras, Archelaus, &c. and Aristotle after him, suppos'd Mind and Understand-
ing, to be the very First and Highest Principle of all: which also the Magick or Caldean Oracles take notice of as the most
Common opinion of mankind,

That Mind is generally by all men look'd upon, as the First and Highest
God; Plato considering, that Unity was in order of Nature before
Number and Multiplicity; and that there must be a mind before us, an
Intelligible before Intelligibility, so that Knowledge could not be the First;
and Lastly, that there is a Good transcending that of Knowledge; made One most Simple Good, the Fountain and Original of all things, and the First Divine Hypothesis; and Mind or Intelligibility only
the Second next to it, but Indescribable from it, and most nearly Cognate
with it. For which cause in his Philebus, though he agree thus far
with those other Ancient Philosophers, Ἐσείς ἐστὶν ἴδιον ὑπάρξεως, that Mind always rules over the whole Universe; yet does he add after-
wards, ὅτι Ἐσείς ἐστιν ὑπάρξεως τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκείνου, that Mind is (not
absolutely the First Principle, but) Cognate with the Cause of all
things; and that therefore it rules over all things, with, and in a
kind of subordination to that First Principle, which is Tagathon or the
Highest Good. Where when Plato affirms that Mind or his Second
Divine Hypothesis is ἐυθύτης with the First, it is all one as if he should
have said, that it is ἑξωτερικός, and ἐξωτεριά, and ἐξωτερικός, with it; all
which words are used by Athanasius, as Synonymous, with ἐσχατικὸς
Co-Essential or Co-Substantial. So that Plato here plainly and ex-
pressly agrees or Symbolizes, not with the Doctrine of Arius; but
with that of the Nicene Council and Athanasius; that the Second Hy-
pothesis of the Trinity, whether called Mind, or World, or Son, is not
ὁμοουσιος.
And then, as for the Third Hypothesis, called Psyche or the Superior Mundane Soul, Plato in his Cratylus, bestowing the name of Zeus, that is, of the Supreme God upon it, and etymologizing the same from Zeus, adds these words concerning it, αὐτῶν τῶν ᾿Αθηναίων, τοῖς ἐπομον πέαν, ἓν γὰρ αὐτὸς μαθεῖται τῇ Ζητῇ, ὁ δὲ Ζήτης τοι διὰ ἀλλὰς τῇ πελάντω.] There is nothing which is more the Cause of Life to us and all other Animals, than this Prince and King of all things; And that therefore God was called by the Greeks Zeus; because it is by him that all Animals live. And yet that all this was properly meant by him, of the Third Hypothesis of his Trinity, called Psyche, is manifest from those words of his that follow, where he expounds the Poetic Mythology before mentioned, making Zeus to be the Son of Chronus; Ἄθηνας τοῖς μεγαλοῖς τοις διακόλοις ἐπομον τῇ Ζητῇ, δὲ, It is agreeable to reason, that Zeus should be the Progeny or Offspring of a certain great Mind. Now ἄθηνας and γένεσις are equivalent Terms also; and therefore Plato here makes the Third Hypothesis of his Trinity likewise to be ἀθηναίων, Co-Essential with the second; as he elsewhere made the Second, Co-Essential with the first.

It is true that by the δυνάμεις, or Opificer in Plato, is commonly meant Nous or Intellect, his Second Hypothesis; (Platonists affirming much, δυνάμεις οὐκ εἰσὶν πλατών, The Demiurgus to Plato is Intellect.) Nonetheless, both Amelius, and Platonus, and other Platonists, call this Third Hypothesis also δυνάμεις, the Artificer or Opificer of the whole World; Some of them making him to be the Second from Mind or Intellect; others the Third from the First Good the Supreme Cause of all things; who was by Atticus and Amelius styled Demiurgus also. Wherefore as was before suggested, according to the quaint and most ancient Platonic Doctrine, all these Three Hypotheses, were the Joint-Creators of the whole World, and of all things besides themselves; as Ficinus more than once declares the Tenour thereof, Hi Tres uno quidam confensu omnia producent, These Three L. 1. No one common consent produce all things; and before him Proclus, ἐν ἐκπτωτικων τοι ενια εις τοι μοι και ψυχης, All things depend upon the One, by Mind and Soul; and accordingly we shall conclude in the words of Porphyrius, That the True and Real Deity according to Plato, extends to Three Divine Hypotheses, the last whereof is Psyche or Soul.

From all which it appears, that Arius did not so much Platonize, as the Nicene Fathers and Athanasius; who notwithstanding made not Plato, but the Scripture, together with Reason deducing natural Consequences therefrom, their Foundation. And that the Platonick Trinity, was a certain Middle thing also, betwixt the Doctrine of Sa-
beus and that of Arius; it being neither a Trinity of Words only, or logical Notions, or meer Modes; but a Trinity of Hypotheses; nor yet a Jumbled Confusion of God and Creature (Things Heterousions) together; neither the Second nor Third of them being Creatures.
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or Made in Time, but all Eternal, Infinite, and Creators.

But that it may yet more fully appear, how far the most refined Platonick and Parmenidian or Pythagorick Trinity, doth either Agree, or Disagree with the Scripture-Doctrines, and that of the Christian Church in several Ages; we shall here further observe Two Things concerning it. The First whereof is this, That though the Genuine Platonists and Pythagoreans, suppos'd none of their Three Archetical Hypotheses to be indeed Creatures, but all of them Eternal, Necessarily Exist'ent, and Universal or Infinite, and consequently Creator of the whole World; yet did they nevertheless, affirm an Essential Dependence of the Second Hypothesis upon the First, as also of the Third both upon the First and Second; together with a Gradual Subordination in them. Thus Plotinus, writing of the Generation of the Eternal Intellect, which is the Second in the Platonick Trinity, and answers to the Son or Word in the Christian; To ἤ δὲ τὸ Πατρί, θεοὶ δὲ, οὐδὲν γινόμεν, ζωὴν ἐργάζεται. Τί ἐστιν χρήση τὰ πάντα λέγειν; μουνὴν ἂν αὐτῷ ἥκη, ἵνα μὴ μὲν μετ' αὐτῷ, μετέχους δὲ μετ' αὐτῶν. Εἰς τὸν δὲ τὸν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ οὐκ ἔστιν. Καὶ τὸ πνεύμα ἡ αὐτὸν κρείττον ἰσός, οὐκ ἐκαίνω. Καὶ κρείττε ἐπικληθήσεται εἰς ὁμοιότητα. That which is always perfect, Generates what is Eternal, and that which it Generates, is always Less than itself. What shall we therefore say of the most Absolutely Perfect Being of all? Does that produce nothing from itself? or rather does it not produce the Greatest of all things after it? Now the Greatest of all things after the most Absolutely Perfect Being, is Mind or Intellect; and this is Second to it. For Mind beholdeth this as its Father, and Standeth in need of nothing else besides it; whereas that First Principle standeth in need of no Mind or Intellect. What is Generated from that which is Better than Mind; must needs be Mind or Intellect; because Mind is better than all other things, they being all in order of Nature, After it and Junions to it; as Psyche it self, or the First Soul; for this is also the Word or Energy of Mind, as that is the Word and Energy of the First Good. Again the same is more particularly declared by him, concerning that Third Hypothesis called Psyche, that as it Essentially Dependent upon the Second, so is it Gradually Subordinate or some way Inferior to it, ψυχὴ όμοια θεοῦ εἰσὶν, καὶ ὁ τέλειον άνίκη, ψυχὴν ἐκδότη, εἰς δὲ τίνα τοιαύτα ἄγων ἐπίλογον· κρείττου δὲ χαίρων ἵναι εἰσὶν, εἰς θεόν. Ἀπὸ τοῦ ψυχόμενον, ὃν ἐκαίνω καὶ εὐδαιμόνεσθαι: Perfect Intellect Generates Soul; and it being Perfect, must needs Generate, so great a Power could not remain Steril. But that which is here Begotten also, cannot be greater than its Begetter; but must needs be Inferior to it, as being the Image thereof. Elsewhere the same Philosopher, calling the First Hypothesis of this Trinity, Uranus, the Second, Chrono and the Third, Zene (as Plato had done before) and handomly Allegorizing that Fable, concludes in this manner concerning Chrono, the Second of these, μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ πρὸς τοῦ κακονοῦ, ὡς μονογενής ἔτι. That he is in a Middle state or degree, between his Father, who is Greater, and his Son, who is Less and Inferior. Again, the same thing is, by that Philosopher thus asserted in general, ὡς τῶν χυμομέλων.
In the things Generated from Eternity, or Produced by way of natural Emanation, there is no Progress upwards, but all Downwards, and still a Gradual Descent into Greater Multiplicity. We shall cite but only one passage more out of this Philosopher, which containeth something of Argumentation in it also; εγὼ γὰρ ἐκ ἐκείνου ζωὴν ἔχω, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκείνου, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκείνου. Therefore, and which farther from Eternity, but that Repeated again and Ingeminated; and as it is not the same, so neither can it be better than it. From whence it follows, that it must needs be Gradually Subordinate and Inferior to it.

Which Gradual Subordination and Essential Dependence, of the Second and Third Hypothesis upon the First, is by these Platonicks illustrated several ways. Ficinus refembles it to the Circulations of Water, when some Heavy Body falling into it, its Superficies is depressed, and from thence every way Circularly Wrinkled. Alius (faith he) is ferme profituit ex altero, sic ur in aqua Circulus dependet a Circulo; One of these Divine Hypothesises, doth in a manner so depend upon another; some Circulation of water depends upon another. Where it is observable also, that the Wider the Circulating Wave grows, still hath it the more Subsidence and Demeurence, together with an Abatement of Celerity; till at last all becomes plain and smooth again. But by the Pagan Platonists themselves, each Following Hypothesis, is many times said to be, ἵνα εἰς τὸν Circulo, a Print, Stamp or Impression, made by the Former; like the Signature of a Seal upon Wax. Again it is often said by them, εἰς ὅλην, and ἐν ὅλην, and μιᾷ μοι, an Image, and Representation, and Imitation; which if considered in Audibles, then will the Second Hypothesis be look'd upon, as the Echo of an Original Voice; and the Third as the Repeated Echo, or Echo of that Echo; so if both the Second and Third Hypothesises were but certain Replications of the First Original Deity with Abatement; which though not Accidental or Evident ones, but Substantial, yet have a like Dependence one upon another, and a Gradual Subordination. Or if it be considered in Figures, then will the Second Hypothesis be resemled to the Image of a Tree in a Glass, and the Third to the Image of that Image Reflected in another Glass, which depend upon the Original Face, and have a gradual Abatement of the vigour thereof. Or else the Second and Third, may be conceived as Two Parelles, or as a Second and Third. For thus does Plotinus call the Universal Psyche or Third Hypothesis, εἰς ὅλην εἰς ὅλην ἔχω, The Image of Mind (which is the Second) retaining much of the Splendour thereof. Which Similitudes of theirs notwithstanding, they would not have to be Squeezed or Pressed hard; because they acknowledge that there is something of Diffimilitude in them also, which then would be forced out of them. Their meaning amounts to no more than this, that as in a Glass, is said ἐν τῷ, Essentially to belong to something εἰς, and to depend upon it; so each following Hypothesis, doth Essentially Depend upon the Former or First, and hath a Subordination εἰς. But we meet with no expreffion in any of these Pagan Platonists, so Unhandfom and Offensive, as that of Thilo's, in his Q. Q. 2 Second.
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ομίας περιγραφής ενέπαφος εἰς τοίχα. The World is the Shadow of God,
which he made use of, as an Instrument, in the making of the World.
Notwithstanding which, the fame Writer doth call him elsewhere,
more honourably, a Second God and The Son of the First God. As
in the same place he doth alfo declare, that this Shadow and Image
of God, is it felf the Archetype of other things, αύτον 6 1ν αυτόν, 6 αυτου−
νει άποθέσεως, 6τόν 6ν φερόντων, αυτόφορο αύτος άποθέσεως οκαίονος,
να αρχάς ινα θελήμα τε ιατά ανίκητο αύτον μονοπροσοδίμα. This Shadow
and as it were Image (of the First God) is it felf the Archetype and
Pattern of other things below it. As God is the Pattern of this Image
(which we call his Shadow 3;) So is this Image it felf another Pattern
or Paradigm also. But this Dependence and Subordination of the
Divine Hypotheses, is moft frequently interludted in Platonick Writings,
by the τύραμυς or τυραμυς, the Effulgency or Out-shining of
Light and Splendour from the Sun, and other Luminous Bodies; the
Nous or Second Hypothesis, being refembléd to that Radious Effulgency,
which immediately encompassing them, is beheld together with them,
and as the Astronomers tell us, augments their apparent Diameter,
and makes it bigger than the True, when they are beheld through
Telescopes, cutting off those luxuriant and Circumambient Rays.
And the Third Hypothesis is resembled to the Remoter and more Di-
Stant Splendour, which circling still Gradually decreafed. Thus
Platineus, τάς τε τούτοις ψυχεῖ τοιαύτης λύων, τοιαύτης θείας
ει αυτοσ αυτος μείζων, τοιαύτης ουκ αυτος ει αυτοσ
er 6 αυτω 6 μείζων, αυτος αυτω ἐκ τοίαυτω αυτω λαμας, τοιαυτης
ει αυτω ει τοιαυτης μειζων μείζων. How should we consider this Second
Hypothesis otherwise than as the Circumjunct Splendour, which encompass-
eth the Body of the Sun 3 and from that always remaining, is perpetually
Generated a new.

But this Essential Dependence, and Gradual Subordination of Hy-
potheses, in the Platonick Trinity, will yet more fully appear, from
those Particular Distinctive Characters, which are given to each of
them. For the First of these, is often said to be "Ev πολον, One
before all things; a Simple Unity, which Virtually containeth all things
And as Platineus writes, έοις εικε πολον ας μι διεκκεκριμάνα, τα ώς δια
προς διάκεκρις τολόγον. This jo containeth all things, as not being ye
Secrete and Divin'd; whereas in the Second they are discerned and disfin-
guished by Reason; that is, they are Actuallly distinguish'd in their I-
deas; whereas the First is the Simple and Secund Power of all things.
Wherefore the Second was called by Parmenides, "Ev πολον, one Actu-
ally all things; that is, in their Distinct Ideas. And the Third ac-
cording to the fame Philosopher, as Platoninus tells us, was "Ev πολον
One and all things; as having still more Multiplicity and Alterity in it
One Effectually all things. That which doth Actively Display, and
Produce into Being, what was Virtually or Potentially contained in
the First; and Ideallly or Exemplarily in the Second. Accordingly
the First of these is sometimes said to be το αυτος, All things Un-
tively, The Second πολον νυκτος, All things Intellecutally, and the Thi
πολον ψυχως, All things Animally; that is, Self-infably, Actively or Pro-
ductively. Again the First of these is commonly styl'd το αυτος, T
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The Good, or Goodness, is self, above Mind and Understanding, and also invisible, above Essence, Ineffable and Incomprehensible. And sometimes also is a Simple Light; The Second, Necessity, Unity and Goodness only by Participation, or the Form, but Essentially and Formally, Mind or Understanding, Reason and Wisdom, All-Comprehending or Infinite Knowledge. The Third, self-movable Soul; Goodness and Wisdom by Participation, but Essentially and Formally, Infinite Self-Activity, or Effulgent, Infinite, Active, Perceptive and Animadverse Power. Sometimes it is styled also Absolute and Eternal, Venus and Love; but differently from that of the First Good, which is Love too; but a Love of Redundancy, or Overflowing Fulness and Fecundity; in the same sense, a World, a World, a World, a World, a World. That which being Absolutely Perfect, and seeking or wanting nothing, as it were Oversloved, and by its Exuberant Redundancy, Produced All things. Whereas this Latter is a Love of Infinite Activity. Of the First, it is said by Plotinus, that it is ineffable, above all manner of Action, for which Cause the Making of the World, is not properly ascribed to him; though he be the Original Fountain of all. According to that of Numenius, so is the true God. Or, in the same sense, God, who being the King of all things. Of the Second, to whom the Energy of Intelligency is attributed, it is said notwithstanding that his is his Active, his Essence his Operation; and that he is a Multiform, yet an Immovable Nature; therefore is properly called the Demiurgus, as the Contriving Artist or Artificer, in whom the Archetypal World is contained, and the First Paradigm or Pattern of the whole Universe. But the third is a kind of Movable Deity, to the three (as Plotinus takes) is his Active, is the judged. That which moveth about and Intelligeth, the Light or Efficiency thereof, and its Print or Signature, which always dependeth upon it, and iseth according to it. This is that which reduces both the Fecundity of the First Simple God, and also the Immovable Wisdom and Archeteconic Contrivance, the second into Act and Energy. This is the Immediate, and as were Manly Opifer of the whole World, and which actually Governs, Rules and Presideth over all. Amein that Passage of his before cited out of Proclus, calling thee Three Hypostases Three Minds, and Three Kings; styles the First of them, the Good, Him that is: The Second, Him that Hath, and the Third, Him that Beholds. In which Expressions, though Peculiar to himself, he denotes an Essential Dependence, and Gradual Subordination, in them.

Now that which is most liable to exception, in this Platonick Scale of Gradation of the Deity, seems to be the Difference betwixt the First
First and the Second. For whereas the Essential Character of the Second, is made to be, Understanding, Reason and Wisdom; it seems to follow from hence, that either the First and the Second, are really nothing else but two different Names or Inadequate Conceptions of One and the same thing, or else if they be different Hypotheses or Persons, that the First of them, must needs be Διατομή ἐκ διαφοράς, devoid of Mind, Reason and Wisdom; which would be very absurd. To which all the reply we can make is as follows. First, that this is indeed, one Peculiar Arcanum of the Platonick and Pythagorick Theology (which yet seems to have been first derived from Orpheus and the Egyptians, or rather from the Hebrews themselves) that whereas the Pagan Theologers generally concluded, οὐκ ἕναν παραγεγένητο, That Mind and Understanding properly so called, was the Oldest of all things; the Highest Principle and First Original of the World; those others placed something above it, and consequently made it to be not the First but the Second. Which they did chiefly upon these Three following Grounds. First, Because Understanding, Reason, Knowledge and Wisdom, cannot be conceived by us mortals otherwise, than so as to contain something of Multiplicity in them; whereas it seems most reasonable to make the First Principle of all, not to be Number or Multitude, but a perfect Monad or Unity. Thus Platonius, ὅπε τε μοινόν ἕναν, ἐκ διαφοράς ἐκ διαφοράς ἐκ τῆς νοησίας, ὑπερήφανον τοῦ εἶναι ἐν διαφοράς, διὰ τὴν ἄνωθεν δύναμιν· τὸ γὰρ ὁ πάντως ἔσται αὐτῷ, ἄλλα πολλά. &c. Intelligency as well as Vision, is in its own nature an Indefinite thing, and is determined by the Intelligible: therefore it is said, that Ideas as Numbers, are begotten from Infinite Duality, and Unity; And such is Intelligibly; which consequently is not Simple, but Many, it contemplating Many Ideas, and being compounded of Two, That which is Understood, and that which Understands. And again elsewhere, τὸ πρῶτον τὸ μὲν ἑικόνα νοητὰ, ὣτε εὑρίσκει τὸ μὲν ἑικόνα νοητὰ, ἀπάντηταν δὲ τὸ ὁ πάντως πολλὰ πολλὰ, ἄλλα τὸ πολλῷ τῷ ὑπέρ τούτω εἰς τὸν πολλὸν. &c. The Principle of everything, is more Simple than the thing it self. Wherefore the Sensible World was made from Intelligibly or the Intelligible; and before this, must there needs be something more Simple still. For Many did not proceed from Many, but this Multiform thing Intelligibly, proceeded from the which is not Multiform, but Simple, as Number from Unity. To this purpose does he argue also in these words, ἐὰν τὸ νοεῖν τοῦ πλωτοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ μὲν πλωτοῦ τὸ νοεῖν μη εἰσούσι· ἵνα τὸ πλωτὸν ὁ τός ὁ πλωτὸς ὁ πλωτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ πλωτὰ τοῦ τὸ νοεῖν μη εἰσοῦσιν· ἐὰν τὸ πλωτὸν τὸ πλωτὸν ὁ τός ὁ πλωτὸς ὁ πλωτὸς. &c. If that which understands be Many, or contain Multitude in it, then that which contains no Multitude, does not properly under- stand; and this is the First thing: but Intelligibility and Knowledge, properly so called are to be placed among things which follow after it are Second. And he often concludes, ὅπε τοῦ οὗτος φεύγει ὅπε τοῦ γεγονός· ὅπε τοῦ γεγονός. That Knowledge (properly so called by reason of its Multiplicity) belongs to the Second Rank of Being, and not the First. Another Ground, or Reason is, Because in order of Nature, there must be Number before, something Intelligible, before Intelligibly: and from hence does P. tinus conclude, τὸ νοεῖν ἐκ πλωτοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ εἰκόνα, ἐκ τοῦ πλωτοῦ εἰκόνα· ἦ σύνετον, ἦ γενεψυχόν, ἦ σύνετον ὑπάρχουν τὸ εἰκόναν· ἦ γενεψυχόν εἰσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ· &c. That to Understand is not the First, neither in Essence nor in Unity; but the Second, a thing in order of Nature, after the First.
Not the First, but Second.

...and springing up from thence, as that which is moved with desire towards it. Their Third and last Ground or Reason is, because Invocation and Knowledge, are not the highest Good; that therefore here is some Substantial thing in order of Nature Superior to Intellect. Which Consideration Plato much insinueth upon, in his sixth book De Republic. Now upon these several Accounts do the Platonists confidently conclude, "Ut dicti nequeant Logos, ut in, "

That the Supreme Deity is more excellent and better than the Logos (Reason or the Word) Intelligibil and Sense, be affording these things; but not being these himself. And ὅς ὕπομένει ἐκ αὐτών ὁ λόγος, πάλιν ὁ πάπας τὸ ἐκ τῆς Ὀλυμπίας ὁ λόγος, πάπας τὸ ἐκ ἐκείνου ὁ λόγος. That which was Generated from the First Principle, was Logos (Word or Reason) Manifold; But the First Principle itself was not Word: If you demand therefore, How Word or Reason, should proceed from that which is not Word or Reason? we answer, as that which is Bonsform, from Goodness it self.

With which Platonick & Pythagorick Doctrine exactly agreeeth Phileo the Jew also, ὅ ἐπὶ τὸ διά λόγος, κριθαυνός θεῦν πάροι λογικά φήμα, τέρμα τοῦ πάντων ἐν τῇ βελτίωτερε καθιστάνει λόγος, εὐθὺς ἕτερος γεωντος ἔξωκοινων. That God which is before the Word or Reason, better and more excellent than all the Rational Nature; neither is so that any thing which is Generated should be perfectly like, to that which is Originally from it self, and above all. And indeed, we should not have so much insinueth upon this, had it not been by reason of a devout Veneration that we have for all the Scripture-mysteries which Scripture seems to give no small Countenance to this Doctrine, then it makes in like manner, an Eternal Word and Wisdom, to be the Second Hypostasis of the Divine Triad; and the First-begotten Son of God the Father. And Athanasius, as was before obvied, very much completh here also the Platonick Notion; when he denies that there was any λόγος or σῶς, any Reason or Wisdom, before that Word and Son of God, which is the Second Hypostasis of the Holy Trinity. What then? Shall we say that the First Hypostasis or Person, in the Platonick Trinity, (if not the Christian also) is κόσμος and άλογος, Sensible and Irrational, and altogether devoid of Mind and Understanding? Or would not this beto introduce a certain kind of Mysterium Atheism, and under pretence of Magnifying and Advancing the Supreme Deity, Monstrously to Degrade the one? For why might not Sensible Matter, as well be supposed, to be the First Original of all things, as a Sensible Incorporeal Being? Plato therefore, who rigidly and superstitionly adheres to Plato's Text here, which makes the First and Highest Principle of all, to be a Being as by reason of its Absolute and Transcendent Perfection, not only above Understanding, Knowledge, and Reason, but also above Essence it self, (which therefore he can find no other names for, but only Unity and Goodness Substantial) and consequently, knowledge and Wisdom, to be but a Second or Post-Nate Things, though Eternal; but notwithstanding does seem to labour under a Metaphysical Profundity; he sometimes endeavours, to solve the difficulty thereof after this manner, by distinguishing of a Double Light; the One Simple and Uniform, the other Multiform or Manifold.
fold; and attributing the Former of these, to the Supreme Deity only, (whole Simple Original Light he refembles to the Luminous Body of the Sun it felt;) The latter of them to the Second Hypothesis, as being the ἐκλαμάμεις or ἀπεκνύσθαι, the Circumambient Fulgor, or Outshining Splendour of that Sun. Thus Enum. 5. L. 6. c. 4. τὸ πορεύεσθαι τῷ τὸ καθεστάθαι οὕτως, That from which this Multiform Light of ἂλλα or Intellect (the Second Hypothesis) is derived, is ἂλλα ἀκροτήριον, Another most Simple Light. As he elsewhere accordingly writeth of the First Principle, or Supreme Deity, that it is, «εἰ δὲ ἢ ἐντεινεῖ τῇ τῷ τῇ νοσίν, in Knowledge or Understanding, but of different kind from that Understanding of the Second Hypothesis, called Intellect. Sometimes again, this Philosopher subtilly distinguiseth, betwixt νοσίν ἀκροτήριον, Intelligence it self, and τὸ νοσιν or τὸ ἀκροτήριον νοσίν, That which doth Understand, or which hath Intelligence in it; making the First Principle to be the Former of these Two, and the Second Hypothesis of their Trinity to be the Latter: ὡς δὲ νοσίν τῇ ακροτήριον, ἀλλά τῇ τῷ τῷ νοσίν: ὅδε τῷ πορευεσθαι, τῷ τῷ τῷ ἀκροτήριον, τῷ νοσίν γινωσκεῖ, τῷ τῷ τῷ νοσίν νοσίν, That which Understands is Intelligence it self doth not understand, but that which hath Intelligence. For in that which doth understand, there is a kind of Duplicity. But the First Principle of all, hath no Duplicity in it. Now that Duplicity, which he phantasies to be, in that which Hath Intelligence, is either the Duplicity of Him that hath this Intelligence and of the Intelligence it self, as being not the same; or else of Him and the τῷ νοσίν, the Intellectual, or Object of his Intellection: Intellec supposing an Intelligible in order of nature before it. And from this Subtility would he infer, that there is a certain kind of Imperfection and Indignity, in which Doth Understanding, or Hath Intelligence, ἐνθέτει τῷ νοσίν, ἐνθέτει τῷ νοσίν: That which Understandeth is Indign as that which Seeth. But perhaps this Difficulty might be more easily solved, and that according to the Tenour of the Platonick Hypothesis too; by supposing the Abatement of their Second Hypothesis, to consist only in this, that it is not Essentially τῷ νοσίν Goodness it self; but only ὑποθέτει Boniform, or Good by Participation; it being Essentially no higher, than ἂλλα, ἄλλα and άλλα. Mind, Reason, and Wisdom; for which cause it is called by those Names, as the proper Characteristick thereof. Not as if the Fish were devoid of Wisdom, under Pretence of being Above it; but because this Second is not Essentially any Thing Higher. As in like manner, the Third Hypothesis, is not Essentially Wisdom it self, standing or quietest, and without Motion or Action; but Wisdom as it Motion, or Wisdom Moving and Acting.

The Chief Ground of this Platonick Doctrine, of an Essential Dependence, and therefore Gradual Subordination, in their Trinity of Divine Hypotheses: is from that Fundamental Principle of their Theology: That there is but One Original of all things; and μία, πάντα ἐξ ἓντεινεῖ only One Fountain of the Godhead; from whence all other thing whatsoever, whether Temporal or Eternal, Created or Uncreated, was altogether derived. And therefore this Second Hypothesis of the Trinity, since it must accordingly Derive its whole Being from the First, as the ἀπεκνύσθαι from the νοσίν, The Splendour from the Original Light, must of necessity have also an Essential Dependence.
upon the fame; and consequently, a Gradual Subordination to it.

For though they commonly affirm their Second Hypothesis to have been Begotten from their First, and their Third from their Second; yet do they by no means understand thereby, any such Generation, as that of men; where the Father, Son and Nephew, when Absolute at least, have no Essential Dependence one upon another, nor Gradual Subordination in their Nature, but are all perfectly Co-equal, and alike Absolute. Because this is but an Imperfect Generation, where that which is Begotten, doth not receive its whole Being Originally from that which did Beget, but from God and Nature; the Begetter being but either a Channel or an Instrument, and having been himself before Begotten or Produced by some other. Whereas the First Divine Hypothesis is altogether Unbegotten from any other, he being the Sole Principle and Original of all things, and therefore must the Second needs derive its whole Essence from him, and be Generated after another manner, namely in a way of Natural Emanation, as Light is from the Sun; and consequently though Co-eternal, have an Essential Dependence on him, and Gradual Subordination to him.

Moreover, the Platonists would recommend this their Gradation in the Deity, or Trinity of Hypotheses Subordinate, from hence; because by this means, there will not be so vast a Chaos and Hiatus, between God and the Highest Creatures; or so Great a Leap and Jump in the Creation, as otherwise there must needs be. Nor will the whole Deity be skrewed up to such a Disproportionate Height and Elevation; as would render it altogether Uncapable, of having any Entercourse or Commerce with the lower world; it being according to this Hypothesis of theirs, brought down by certain Steps and Degrees, nearer and nearer to us. For if the Whole Deity, were nothing but One Simple Monad, devoid of all manner of Multiplicity, as God is frequently represented to be, then could it not well be conceived by us Mortals, how it should contain the Distinct Ideas of all things within itself, and that Multiform Platform and Paradigm of the Created Universe, commonly called the Archetypal World. Again, were the Deity only an Immovable Mind, as Aristotle's God, is under sicca, an Absolutely Immovable Substance, whose Essence and Operation are one and the fame; and as other Theologers affirm, that whatsoever is in God, is God; it would be likewise utterly uncontrivable, not only, How there should be any Liberty of Will at all in God (whereas the fame Theologers, contradicting themselves, zealously pretend notwithstanding, that all the Actions of the Deity are not Necessary, and but few of them such) but also, How the Deity should have any Commerce or Entercourse with the Lower world, or it should Quicken and Actuate the whole, be sensible of all the Motions in it, and act pro re natâ accordingly; all which the Infinities, and Common Notions of Mankind urge upon them. Neither can they be denied, without raising the very Foundations of all Religion since it would be to no more purpose, for men to make their Devotional Ad-
Senfles Adamantine Rock, but these Difficulties (as the Platonists pretend) are all removed by that Third Hypothesis in their Trinity; which is a kind of Movable Deity. And thus are all the Phenomena of the Deity, or the different Common Notions, in the Minds of men concerning it, though seemingly repugnant and clashing with one another, yet (in their opinion) fairly Reconciled and Salved, by this Trinity of Divine Hypotheses Subordinate.

Lastly, they pretend also, that according to this Hypotheses of theirs, there may be some Reasonable Satisfaction given to the Mind of Man, both why there are so many Divine Hypotheses, and why there could be no more: whereas according to other ways, it would seem to have been a meer Arbitrary Businefs; and that there might have been either but One Solitary Divine Hypothesis; or but a Duality of them; or else they might have been beyond a Trinity, Numberles.

The Second Thing which we shall observe concerning the most Genuine Platonic and Parmenian Trinity, is this; That though these Philosophers sometimes called their Three Divine Hypotheses, not only τρεῖς φύσεις, Three Natures, and Three Principles, and Three Causes, and Three Officers; but also Three Gods; and a First, and Second, and Third God; yet did they often for all that, suppoee all these Three, to be Really One σῶς, One Divinity, or Numen. It hath been already proved from Origen and others, that the Platonists most commonly called the Animated World, the Second God, though some of them, as for example Numenius, styled it the Third God. Now those of them, who called the World the Second God, attributed indeed (not more, but) less Divinity to it, than those who would have it to be the Third God. Because these Latter suppoee, that Soul of the World to be, the Third Hypothesis of their Trinity; but the other taking all these Three Divine Hypotheses together, for One Supreme and First God, called the World the Second God; they suppoing the Soul thereof, to be another Soul Inferiour to that First Psyche, which was properly their Third Hypothesis. Wherefore this was really all one, as if they should have called the Animated World the Fourth God: only by that other way of reckoning, when they called it a Second God, they intimated, that though those Three Divine Hypotheses, were frequently called Three Gods, yet were they notwithstanding Really, all but One Sowl, Divinity or Numen; or as Plotinus speaks, το αὐτὸν τοῦν διὸν, the Divinity which is in the whole World. Thus when God is so often spoken of in Plato Singularly, the word is not always to be understood of the First Hypothesis only, or the Tagathon, but many times plainly of the πρῶτον, and ἅλπι, and τελεον, the First, and Second and Third all together; or that whole Divinity which consisteth or is made up, of these Three Hypotheses. And this will further appear from hence, because when the whole World is said in Plato to be the Image of the Eternal Gods, as also by Plotinus, of the First, Second and Third, by what it is always produced anew, as the Image in a Glass is; this is not to be understood as if the World being Tripartite, each Third part thereof, was severally produced or Created by one of those Three.
nor yet can it be conceived, how there could be Three Really distinct Creations of One and the same thing. Wherefore the World having but one Creation, and being Created by those Three Divine Hypostases; it follows, that they are all Three Really but One Creator and One God. Thus when both in Plato and Plutarch, the Lives and Souls of all Animals, (as Stars, Demons and Men) are attributed to the Third Hypostasis, the First and great βιοιο, as their Fountain and Cause after a Special Manner; accordingly as in our Creed, the Holy Ghost is styled, the Lord and Giver of Life; this is not so to be understood, as if therefore the First and Second Hypostases were to be excluded from having any Causality therein. For the First is styled by Plato also, ἀκτίων ἀνωτέρων ἡ θεότης, The Cause of all Good things, and therefore doubtless chiefly of Souls; and the Second is called by him and others too, ἀκτίων καὶ ὄνωπος, The Cause and Artificer of the whole World. We conclude therefore, that Souls being Created by the Joint Concurrence and Influence of these Three Hypostases Subordinate, they are all Really but One and the same God. And thus it is expressly affirmed by Porphyrius in St. Cyril, ἠχεῖ τε λόγω υπόστασιν τοῖς ἄριστοι περιηκτικοῖς ἔως· εἰς χάριν τύ προσχατότα ἤν πιστεύειν, μετ' αὐτῷ λέγεται ὧν τῆς ἐκ προφήτων ἀριστάρχου· ἠχεῖ δὲ ὁ θεός τῶν ἐνταξεὶ περιηκτίων: That the Essence of the Divinity proceeds or propagates itself (by way of descent downwards) unto Three Hypostases or Subsistences. The Highest God, is the Tagathon or Supreme Good; the Second next after him is the Demiurgus so called, the Architect or Artificer of the World; and the Soul of the World that is the Third; for the Divinity extendeth so far as to this Soul. Here we plainly see, that though Porphyrius calls the Three Divine Hypostases, Three Gods; yet does he at the very same time declare, that in ἂριστοι καὶ ἄξιοι and συμμορφοὶ, the Essence of the Godhead and the Divinity, extends it self to all these Three Hypostases, including the Third and last also, (which they call the Mundane Soul) within the compass of it. And therefore that even according to the Porphyrian Theology it self, (which could not be suspected to affect any compliance with Christianity) the Three Hypostases in the Platonick Trinity, are ὄμοσμοι, Co-Essential, both as being each of them God, and as being all One God. St Cyril himself also acknowledging as much; where he writeth thus of the Platonists, ὥστε ἄριστοι υποστάσεις υπὸ τοῖς ἀριστάρχοι ἐκ αὐτῷ, ἠχεῖ δὲ τῆς λόγου ὑποστάσεως τοῦ ἄριστου περιηκτικοῦ· That supposing Three Hypostases which have the Nature of Principles (in the Universe) they extend the Essence of God, to all these three Hypostases.

Indeed many conceive, that the Platonists making the Three Hypostases of Their Trinity to be thus Gradually Subordinate one to another, could not for that very Reason, acknowledge them to be One Divinity: but the Platonists themselves do upon this very account and other, declare, all these Three to be One Divinity, because they have an Essential Dependence and Gradual Subordination in them; the Second being but the Image of the First, and the Third the Image both of the First and Second. Whereas were these Three supposed to be Perfectly Co-Equal, and to have no Essential Dependence one upon another, they could not by these Platonists be concluded to be
any other than *Three Co ordinate Gods*, having only a General or Specifical Identity; and so no more One, than Three men are One man: a thing which the Platonick Theology is utterly abhorrent from, as that which is inconsistent with the Perfect Monarchy of the Universe, and highly derogatory from the honour of the Supreme God, & First Cause. For example, should *Three Suns* appear in the Heaven all at once, with Co-equal Splendor, and not only so, but also be concluded, that though at First derived (or Lighted and Kindled) from one, yet they were now all alike Absolute and Independent; these *Three* could not so well be thought to be one Sun; as *Three* that should appear Gradually differing in their Splendour, Two of them being but the Parheli of the other, and Essentially dependent on it: forasmuch as the Second would be but the Reflected Image of the First, and the Third but the Second Refracted. At least those *Three Coequal Suns* could not so well be thought to be One Thing; as the Sun, and its First and Secondary Splendour (which can neither be beheld without the Sun, nor the Sun without them;) might be accounted One and the Same Thing.

The Platonists therefore, First of all suppose such a close and near Conjunction betwixt the *Three Hypostases* of their Trinity, as is no where else to be found in the whole World. To this purpose *Plato* says, οὐκ ἐστίν ὁ τριώπτης, ἀλλ' ἐτής μετ' αὐτῷ ἢ μετ' ἄλλων· ἀλλ' ἐτής· πολὺ ἐξ ἀνώτατου τοῦ γενέσθαι τῆς ἄρχουσαν ἢ μείζων ὑπό τοῦ γενέσθαι τετῆραν. This that Intelliged is said to behold the First Good; not as if it were Separated from it, but only because it is After it, but so as that there is nothing between them: as neither is there betwixt Intelliged and Soul. Every thing which is Begotten, Desires and Loves that which Begat it; especially when these Two (that which Begat and that which is Begotten) are alone, and nothing besides them. Moreover when that which Begat, is absolutely the First thing, that which is Immediately Begotten from it, must needs Cohere intimately with it, and so as to be separated from it only by Alterity. Which is all one as if he should have said, that these *Three Divine Hypostases* are so Intimately conjoinied together, and united with one another, as that they are *Tantum non, Only Not*, the Very self same. Again the Platonists further declare that these *Three Hypostases* of their Trinity, are ἀδιάδοχοι, absolutely Indivisible and Inseparable, as the ἀδιάδοξον from the φε, the Splendour Indivisibly conjoinied with the Light or Sun. Which Similitude also Athanasius often makes use of to the same purpose. Thirdly, these Platonists seem likewise to attribute to their *Three Divine Hypostases*, just such an *Epi*αφες, Circum inscription, or Mutual In-Being, as Christians do. For as their Second and Third Hypostases, must needs be in the First, they being therein virtually contained; so must the First likewise, be in the Second and Third; they being as it were but Two other Editions thereof; or it self Gradually Displayed and Expanded. But to speak Particularly, the First must needs be in the Second, the Toga than in the Nows; and so both of them Really One and the same God because the common Notions of all Mankind attribute Understand
ing and Wisdom to the Deity; but according to the Principles of Plato, Platonists, and others, the Deity does not properly understand any where but in the Second Hypothesis, which is the Mind and Wisdom of it. And the Emperor Origen, of the Second or Third Hypothesis, was thus intimatted by Plato also, Σαρξια μιας, Νοσία μίας, καὶ τὸ τῆς Πρωτοστοῖαν ὁμολογίαν. Οὕτως εἰς τὴν τῷ τῆς Πρωτοστοῖαν ὁμολογίαν, βασιλεύων μυκτραλοχάλω. Where having spoken of that Divine Wisdom and Mind which orders all things in the World, he adds; Ent Wisdom and Mind can never be without Soul, (that is, cannot act without it.) Wherefore in the Nature of Jupiter, is at once contained, both a Kingly Mind and a Kingly Soul. Here he makes Jupiter to be both the Second and Third Hypotheses of his Trinity, Nous and Psyche; and consequently those Two, to be but One God. Which Nous is also said to be 

eoven, i.e. of the same kind, and Co-Essential with the First Cause of all things. To conclude, as that First Platonick Hypothesis, which is itself said to be above Mind and Wisdom, is properly Wise and Understanding in the Second; so do both the First and the Second, Move and All in the Third. Lastly, all these Three Hypotheses, Tagathon, Nous and Psyche, are said by the Platonists, to be One ăvov or Divinity; Juft in the same manner, as the Centre, Immutable Distance, and Movably Circumference, of a Sphere or Globe; are all essentially One Sphere. Thus Platonius expressly, writing of the Third Hypothesis or Psyche, ςυμτό πολεὶ τῷ Νοσία ἡ Πρωτοστοῖαν καθισταὶ προσεκτ. Τ. 409. ἐκείνων καθαρός, διὸς μετὰ καθαρὸς αὐθαναίος, διόρθωμα ἀδιάκοπον. οὗτος τῇ ἔρημῳ καθαρός, ἐὰν τὸν τέκτον τοῦ τότε, τῷ νῦν ἄλλην ἀνθρώπων ἑαυτῷ μετὰ παραγόντων ἐκ τότε. For this Psyche or Third Hypothesis, is Venerable and Adorable thing also; it being the Circle fitted to the centre, an Indis tant Distance, (forasmuch as it is no Corporeal thing,) or these Things are just so as if one should make the Tagathon or First Good, to be the Centre of the Universe; in the next place Mind or Intellect to be the Immovable Circle or Distance; and Lastly Soul to be at which turns round, or the whole Movably Circumference; Added by us or Desire. These Three Platonick Hypotheses therefore, seem to be really nothing else, but Infinite Goodness, Infinite Wisdom, and Infinite Live Love and Power; not as mere Qualities or Accidents, but as Substantial things; that have some kind of Subordination one to another; all concurring together to make up One ăvov, or Divinity, just the Centre, Immutable Distance, and Movably Circumference, concretely make up One Sphere.

We have now given a full account of the True and Genuine Plati

nick and Parmenidian or Pythagorick Trinity; from which it may clearly appear, how far it either Agree or Disagree with the Goffian. First therefore, though some of the Latter Platonists have partly Misunderstood, and partly Adulterated that ancient Cabal of the Trinity, as was before declared, confounding therein the Differences between God and the Creature, and thereby laying a Foundation for Infinite Polytheism; yet did Plato himself and some of the Genuine followers (though living before Christianity) approach near to the Doctrine thereof, as in some manner to correspond therewith, in those Three Fundamentals before mentioned; First,
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in not making a mere Trinity of Names and Words, or of Logical Notions and Inadequate Conceptions, of One and the Same thing; but a Trinity of Hypotheses or Substances, or Persons. Secondly, in making none of their Three Hypotheses, to be Creatures, but all Eternal, Necessarily Existant, and Universal; Infinite, Omnipotent; and Creators of the whole World; which is all one in the sense of the ancients, as if they should have affirmed them to be Homooousian. Lastly, in supposing the three Three Divine Hypotheses, however sometimes Paganically called Three Gods, to be Essentially, One Divinity. From whence it may be concluded, that as Arianism is commonly supposed to approach nearer to the Truth of Christianity than Photinianism, so is Platonism undoubtedly more agreeable thereto than Arianism; it being a certain Middle thing betwixt That and Sabellianism, which in general was that Mark that the Nicene Council also aimed at.

Notwithstanding which, there is a manifest Disagreement also, betwixt the Platonick Trinity as declared, and the Now-received Doctrine in the Christian Church; confuting in a different Explication of the Two latter Points mentioned. First, because the Platonists dream'd of no such thing at all, as one and the same Numerical Essence or Substance, of the Three Divine Hypotheses. And Secondly, because though they acknowledged none of those Hypotheses to be Creatures, but all Gods; yet did they affect an Essential Dependence of the Second and Third upon the First, together with a certain Gradual Subordination; and therefore no Absolute Co-equality. And this is the true reason, why so many late Writers, have affirmed Platonism to Symbolize with Arianism, and the Latter to have been indeed nothing else but the Spawn of the Former; merely because the Platonists did not acknowledge One and the same Numerical Essence or Substance of all their Three Hypotheses; and affected a Gradual Subordination of them; but chiefly for this Latter Ground. Upon which account some of the ancients also, have done the like, as Particularly St. Cyril (Contra Jul. Lib. 1.) he writing thus concerning Plato, Τοῦ Ῥάινικον μὴ ὁ οὐκ ὑπάρχει εἰς τὸν ἄλλον περιουσίαν, ἀλλὰ τῆς τὸν ἁγίον κεφαλήν, ὡς τῆς διόνυσος ὑποτελεῖται, ὡς τοὺς δικαίους ὑπὸ τόν Ἀνδρέαν τῶν ὑπόστασις ὑποτελεῖ. Plato did not thoroughly perceive the whole Truth of the Trinity, but in like manner with those who follow Arius, divided the Deity, or made a Gradation in it, and Introduced Subordinate Hypotheses. As elsewhere the same Pious Father, also taxes the Platonists for not declaring the Three Hypotheses of their Trinity, to be, in his sense, Homooousian; that is, Absolutely Co-equal. But though we have already proved, that Platonism can by no means be confounded with Arianism; because it directly confronted the same in its main Essentials, which were Erat quando non Erat, or the Second Hypothesis being made οὐ ὁ διὸν τοῖς, together with its being Mutable and Lapsible; since according to Platonism, the Nouns is Essentially but Eternal and Immutable; yet that the most Refined Platonism, differed from the Now-received Doctrine of the Christian Church; in respect of its Gradual Subordination, is a thing so Unquestionably evident, as that it can by no means be Dissimulated, Palliated, or Examined.
Of Plato's and the Christ. Trinity.

Over and besides which, it cannot be denied but the best of Plato's Followers, were sometimes also further extravagant in their Doctrine of the Trinity, and spake at random concerning it, and inconsistently with their own Principles; especially where they make such a Vaft and Disproportionate Distance betwixt the Second and Third Hypothesis thereof; they not Defending Gradually and Orderly, but as it were Tumbling down, from the Former of them to the Latter. Thus Plotinus himself, when having spoken magnificently of that Soul of the World, which is his Third Hypothesis, he subjoyns, immediately, εὐμεταξύς ὡς ἡμετέρα, ἐγὼ ἐσμὲν ἡδίω προσελθόντων συνθέρησα, λέγων καθευδορῶν, αὐτῶν τί σφυνόν εἰν ἡμῖν. That this Soul of ours, is also Uniform (or of the same Species) with that Mundane Soul; For if any one (faith he) will consider it as in it self, Pure and Naked, or stripped from all things adventitious to it, it shall find it to be in like manner venerable. Agreeably whereunto both this same Philosopher else-where call that Mundane Soul, πρεσβύτερον βέλτις, that is, but the Elder Sister of our Humane Souls. Which as it rankly favour of Philosophick Pride and Arrogancy, thus to think so magnificently of themselves, and to equalize in a manner their own Souls, with that Mundane Soul; so was it a Monstrous Degradation, of that Third Hypothesis of their Trinity, and little other than an Absolute Creating of the same. For if our Humane Soul be εὐμεταξύς, of the same Kind or Species, with the Third Hypothesis of the Trinity, then it is not only, εὐμεταξύς, of like Honour and Dignity, but also in the Language of the Christian Church, εὐμεταξύς, Co-Essential with our Humane Souls, (as our Saviour Christ according to the Arians in Athanasius, is said to be, εὐμεταξύς, Co-Essential with us.) From whence it will follow, That either, That must be a Creature, or else our Humane Souls Divine. Wherefore unless these Platonists would confine the Deity, wholly to their First Hypothesis, which could be monstrously absurd for them, to suppose that First Eternal and Wisdom, by which the World was Made, to be a Creature; they must of necessity make a Vaft Leap or Jump, betwixt the Second and Third of their Hypotheses; the Former of them, being that Peru, Wisdom which was the Architect or Demiurgus of the World, whilst the Latter is only, the Elder Sister of all Humane Souls. Moreover these Platonists by their thus bringing down the Third Hypothesis of their Trinity so low, and Immerging it so deeply into the Corporeal World, as if it were the Informing Soul thereof, and making to be but the Elder Sister of our Created Souls, did doubtless there- designedly lay a foundation for their Polytheism and Creature-ship (now Vulgarly called Idolatry) that is, for their Cosmo-Latry, Astro-Latry, and Demono-Latry. For thus much is plainly intimated in this following Passage of Plotinus, διὰ τούτῳ διότι τοῦΣε; τῇ Σε; τῇ Περί, P. 483... Σε; τῇ Περί, Σε; τῇ Περί, Σε; τῇ Περί, This whole Corporeal World made a God by the Soul thereof. And the Sun is also a God, because animated; as likewise are all the Stars therefore Gods. Where he afterwards adds, τῷ Σε; τῇ Περί, τῷ Σε; τῇ Περί, τῷ Σε; τῇ Περί, That which is to these Gods or Goddesses, the Cause of their being Gods, must needs it self, be the Elder God or Goddess. So that this
this Third Hypothesis of the Platonick Trinity, called the Mundane Soul, is but a kind of Sisfer-Goddes, with the Souls of the Sun, Moon and Stars, though elder indeed than they; they being all made Goddeffes by her. Where there is a confused Jumble of things Contradictitious together; That Soul of the World being at once supposed to be a Sisfer to other Souls, and yet notwithstanding to Devife them; whereas this Sisferly Relation and Consanguinity betwixt them, would of the Two, rather Degrade and Creaturize that Mundane Soul, which is their Third God or Divine Hypothesis, than Advance and Deifie those Particular Created Souls. Here therefore we fee the Inconvenience of these Platonick παραφοι, Stories, Stairs, and Gradations in the Deity, that it is a thing liable to be much abused to Creature-worship and Idolatry, when the Difiances are made fo Wide, and the Lowefs of the Deity is supposed to differ but Gradually only, from the Highefs of Created Beings. And becaufe Porphyrin trode in Plotinus his Footsteps here as elsewhere, this was in all probability the true reason why the Arians (as Socrates recordeth) were by Confantine called Porphyrians, not becaufe their Trinities were exactly the same, but becaufe Aris and Porphyrin did both of them alike (though upon different Grounds) make their Trinity a Foundation for Creature-worship and Idolatry. But notwithstanding, all this (as many other things) was but heedflely and inadvertently written by Plotinus; he as it were droufly nodding all the while, as it was also but fuipinely taken up by Porphyrin after him; it being Plainly Inconsistent with the Genuine Tenour of both their Hypothesis, thus to Level the Third Hypothesis of the Trinity, with Particular Created Souls, and thereby to make fo Disproportionate a Distance, and fo Vast a Chasm betwixt It and the Second. For Plotinus himself, when in a more sober mood, declares, that Third Hypothesis, not to be the Immediate Informing Soul of the Corporeal World; but a Higher Separate Soul, or Superior Venus, which also was the Demiurgus, the Maker both of other Souls and of the whole World. As Plato had before expressly affirmed him to be the Inspirer of all Life, and Creator of Souls, or the Lord and Giver of Life. And likewise declared, that amongst all those things, which are ἀνακείσαται πνεύματι, Congenorous and Cognate with our Humane Souls, there is 'οπιώ πνεύμα, nothing any where to be found at all like unto it. So that Plato, though he were also a Star-worshiper and Idolater, upon other grounds; yet in all probability would he not at all have approved of Plotinus his ἐνεργεία, because our Souls being of the same Species with that Third Hypothesis of the Divine Triad; but rather have said, in the Language of the Psalmist, It is he that bath made us, and not we our selves, we are his People and the Sheep of his Pasture.

Notwithstanding all which, a Christian Platonist or Platonick Christian, would in all probability, Apologize for Plato himself, and the ancient and most Genuine Platonists and Pythagoreans after this manner. First, That since they had no Scriptures, Councils, nor Creeds, to direct their Steps in the Darkness of this Mystery, and to confine their Language to a Regular Uniformity; but Theologize all Freely and Boldly, and without any Scrupulosity, every one according
cording to his own private apprehensions, it is no wonder at all if they did not only speak many times unadvisedly, and inconsistently with their own Principles, but also plainly wander out of the Right Path. And that it ought much rather to be wondered at, that living so long before Christianity, as some of them did, they should in fo Absurd a Point, and Dark a Mystery, make so near an approach to the Christian Truth afterwards revealed, than that they should any where stumble or fall short of the Accuracy thereof. They not only extending the True and Real Deity to Three Hypotheses, but also calling the Second of them, Λόγος, Reason or Word too, (as well as νοῦς, Mind or Intellec) and likewise the Son of the First Hypothesis, the Father; and affirming him to be the θεότερος and δώρων, the Artificer and Cause of the whole World; and Lastly describing him as the Scripture doth, to be the Image, the Figure or Character, and the Splendour or Brightness of the First. This, I say, our Christian Platonists, fuppose to be more wonderful, that this to Great and Absurd a Mystery, of Three Eternal Hypotheses in the Deity, should thus by Pagan Philosophers, so long before Christianity, have been affered, as the Principle and Original of the whole World; it being more indeed than was acknowledged by the Nicene Fathers themselves; they then not so much as determining, that the Holy Ghost was an Hypothesis, much less that he was God.

But Particularly as to their Gradual Subordination of the Second Hypothesis to the First, and of the Third to the First and Second: our Platonick Christians, doubtles would therefore plead them the more excusable, because the Generality of Christian Doctors, for the First Three hundred years after the Apostles times, plainly affered the same; as in Martyr, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Irenaeus, the Author of the Recognitions, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Gregorius Thaumaturgus, Irenius of Alexandria, Latifundius, and many others. All whose Testimonies, because it would be too tedious to set down here, we shall instent our selves only with one of the last mentioned; Et Pater & Filius Desi; Sed Ile quas exsuerant Fons, Hic tanquam desfleurs.

Ino Rives: The tanquam Sol, Hic tanquam Radius à Sole porreliquus: At the Father and the Son is God: But he as it were an Exsurbanter

mountain, this as a Stream derived from him: He like to the Sun, This to a Ray extended from the Sun. And though it be true, that Abuasis writing against the Arians, does appeal to the Tradition of the Ancient Church, and amongst others cites Origen's Testimony of; yet was this only for the Eternity and Divinity of the Son of God, but not at all for such an Absolute Co-equality of him with the Father, as would exclude all Dependence, Subordination and Inferiority; the Ancients so Unanimously agreeing therein, that they are by Petavius therefore taxed for Platonism; and having by that means corrupted the Purity of the Christian Faith, in this Article of the Trinity. Which how it can be reconciled with those other Opinions, of Eclatrick Tradition being a Rule of Faith, and the Impossibility of the Visible Churches error in any Fundamental Point, cannot easily be understood. However this General Tradition or Consent of the Christian Church, for Three hundred years together after the Apos-
In what Sense, Plato's Trinity. Book I.

It is true, though it cannot Justifie the Platonists, in any thing discrepant from the Scripture, yet may it in some measure doubtless plead their excuse, who had no Scripture Revelation at all, to guide them herein; and so at least make their Error more Tolerable or Pardonable.

Moreover the Platonick Christian would further Apologize for these Pagan Platonists after this manner. That their Intention in thus Subordinating the Hypostases of their Trinity, was plainly no other, than to exclude thereby a Plurality of Co-ordinate and Independent Gods, which they supposed an absolute Co-equality of them would infer. And that they made only so much Subordination of them, as was both necessary to this purpose, and unavoidable; the Juncture of them being in their Opinion so close, that there was, μὴ δὲ μέση, Nothing Intermedians, or that could possibly be Thrust in between them. But now again on the otherhand, whereas the only ground of the Co-Equality of the Personas in the Holy Trinity, is because it cannot well be conceived, how they should otherwise all be God; since the Essence of the Godhead, being Absolute Perfection, can admit of no degrees; these Platonists do on the contrary contend, that notwithstanding that Dependence and Subordination which they commonly suppose in these Hypostases, there is none of them for all that, to be accounted Creatures, but that the General Essence of the Godhead, or the Uncreated Nature, truly and properly belongeth to them all; according to that of Porphyry before cited, ἡ τε ἅγιον υποστασά τω θεῷ προελάβατον, The Essence of the Godhead, proceedeth to Three Hypostases. Now these Platonists conceive, that the Essence of the Godhead, as common to all the Three Hypostases of their Trinity, confisiteth (besides Perfect Intellectuality) in these Following things. First, In Being Eternal, which as we have already showed, was Plato's Distinctive Character, betwixt God and the Creature. That whatsoever was Eternal, is therefore Uncreated; and whatsoever was not Eternal, is a Creature. He by Eternity meaning, the having not only no Beginning, but also a Permanent Duration. Again, In having not a Contingent but Necessary Existence, and therefore being Absolutely Undestroyable; which perhaps is included also in the Former. Lastly, In being not Particular but Universal, ὅ & πᾶς, One and all things, or that which Comprehends the whole; which is all one as to say, in being Infinite and Omnipotent, and the Creator of the whole World. Now say these Platonists, if any thing more were to be added to the General Essence of the Godhead besides this, then must it be Self-existence, or to be Understood from any other, and the First Original, Principle, and Cause of all; but if this be made so Essential to the Godhead, or Uncreated Nature, as that whatsoever is not thus Originally of it Self, is therefore impossible to be detрудed and thrust down into the rank of Creatures; the must both the Second and Third Hypostases, as well in the Christian as the Platonick Trinity, upon this Supposition, needs be Creatures and not God; the Second deriving its whole Being and Godship from the First, and the Third, both from the First and Second, and so neither First nor Second being the Cause of all things. But it is unquestionable to these Platonists, that whatsoever is Eternal; Necessary Existence,
Existent: Infinite, and Omnipotent, and the Creator of All things, ought therefore to be Religiously Worshipped and Adored as God, by all Created Beings. Wherefore this Essence of the Godhead, that belongeth alike to all the Three Hypostases, being, as all other Essences, Perfectly Indivisible, it might well be affirmed, according to Platonick Grounds, that all the Three Divine Hypostases (though having some Subordination in them) yet in this sense are Co-Equal, they being all truly and alike God or Uncreated. And the Platonists thus distinguishing, betwixt \( \xi \) \( \xi \), and \( \pi \), the Essence of the Godhead, and the Distinct Hypostases or Personalties thereof, and making the First of them to be Common, General and Universal, are not without the consent and approbation of the Orthodox Fathers hereinafter determining likewise, that in the Deity, Essence or Substance differs from Hypostase, as to \( \xi \xi \) from \( \xi \xi \), that which is Common and General, differs from that which is Singular and Individual. Thus, besides many others, St. Cyril, in \( \text{πέρα της ζωής ηδόν και ηδονότι \ πέρα της ζωής ηδόν} \), The Essence or Substance of the Deity, differs from the Hypostasis, after the same manner as a Genus or Species differs from an Individuum. So that as well according to these Fathers as the Platonists, that Essence or Substance of the Godhead, which all the Three Persons agree in, is not Singular, but General or Universal; they both supposing, each of the Persons also, to have their own Numerical Essence. Wherefore according to this Distinction, betwixt the Essence or Substance of the Godhead, and the Particular Hypostases, (approved by the Orthodox others) neither Plato, nor any Intelligent Platonist, would scruple to describe, that Form of the Nicene Council, that the Son or Word, is \( \xi \xi \), Co-Essential or Con-Substantial, and Co-Equal with the Father. And we think it will be proved afterwards, that this was the only Meaning of the Nicene Council it self, that the Son was therefore Essential or Con-Substantial with the Father; meerly because he is God and not a Creature.

Besides which the Genuine Platonists would doubtless acknowledge also, all the Three Hypostases of their Trinity to be Homousian, Essential or Con-Substantial yet in a further sense than this, namely being all of them One \( \xi \xi \xi \) or Divinity. For thus, besides that Tige of Porphyrius before cited, may these words also of St. Cyril understood concerning them, \( \text{νέα της ζωής υποστάσεως τω \ ίδιω τω μή \ περιγράφως ιγκεύονται} \). That according to them, the Essence of God, tendeth to Three Hypostases, or comprehendeth Three Hypostases in it; this is not only so that each of these Three is God; but also that they are not so many Separate and Divided Gods, but all of them together One God or Divinity. For though the Platonists as Pagans, being not scrupulous in their Language as we Christians are; do often call them Three Gods, and a First, Second, and Third God; yet notwithstanding as Philosophers, did they declare them to be One \( \xi \xi \xi \) or Divinity; all that as it seems upon these several accounts following. First, Because they are Indivisibly conjoined together, as the Splendour is Indivisible from the Sun. And then, Because they are Mutually Inexistent in each other, the First being in the Second, and both First and Second...
in the Third. And Lastly, Because the Entireness of the whole Divinity, is made up of all these three together, which have all three Eternity as well as the same Energy or Action ad extra. And therefore as the Centre, Radiant Distance, and Movable Circumference, may be said to be Co-Essential to a Sphere, and the Root, Stock, and Bows or Branches, Co-Essential to an entire Tree; so, but in much a more perfect sense, are the Platonick Logos, Nous and Psyche, Co-Essential to that, as the Hydrocarbons are the Elements from which the Gas is derived. That the Branches are Co-Essential with, and Indivisible from the Tree; and illustrating the Trinity by that Similitude. Neither must it be thought, that the Whole Trinity is One, after the same manner, that each Single Person thereof is in itself One, for then should there be a Trinity also in each Person. Nor that it is so called Undivided, as if three were not Three in it (which were to make the Mystery Contemptible) but because all the Three Hypotheses or Persons, are Indivisibly and Indissolubly united to each other, as the Sun and the Splendour; and really but One God. Wherefore though there be some Subordination of Hypotheses or Persons in Plato's Trinity, (as it is commonly represented) yet is this only ad intra, within the Deity it self, in their Relation to one another, and as compared amongst themselves; but ad extra, Outwards, and to Us, are they all One and the same God, concurring in all the same Actions; and in that respect without any Inequality, because in Identity there can be no Inequality.

Furthermore the Platonick Christian, would in favour of these Platonicke, urge also, that according to the Principles of Christianity it self, there must of necessity, be some Dependence and Subordination of the Persons of the Trinity, in their Relation to one another; a Priority and Posterity, not only τοκ οιος, but also καρδικλος, of Divinity as well as Order amongst them. First, because that which is Originally of itself, and Underived from any other, must needs have some Superiority and Preeminence, over that which derives its whole Being and Godship from it, as the Second doth from the First alone, and the Third from the First with the Second. Again though all those Three Hypotheses or Persons be alike Omnippet ad Extra, or Outwards; yet ad intra, Inwards, or within the Deity itself, are they not so: for the Son being not able to beget the Father, nor the Holy Ghost to produce either Father or Son; and therefore neither of these two latter, is absolutely the Cause of all things; but only the First. And upon this account was that First of the three Hypotheses (who is the Original Fountain of all) by Macrobius styled, Omnippetissimus Deus. The Most Omnippetive God; he therein implying the Second and Third Hypotheses, Nous and Psyche, to be Omnippetive too; but not in a perfect Equality with him, as within the Deity they are compared to each other; however ad Extra, or Outwards, and to Us, they being all One are Equally Omnippetive. And Plotinus writeth also to the fame purpose: εεί τολον εκει το πρωτον, εκ δυνασ επαρατον εκ παλαιον τον ανασ σον ουρανον τω θεω, &c. If the First be absolutely Perfect, and the First Power, th mast it needs be the Most Pow'ful of all Beings; 5 other Power.
only imitating and partaking thereof. And accordingly hereunto would the Platonick Christian further pretend, that there are fundry places in the Scripture which do not a little favour, some Subordination and Priority both of Order and Dignity, in the Person of the Holy Trinity; of which none is more obvious, than that of our Saviour Christ, My Father is greater than I; which to understand of his Humanity, feemeth to be less reasonable, because this was no news at all, that the Eternal God, the Creator of the whole World, should be Greater than a Mortal Man, born of a woman. And thus do divers of the Orthodox Fathers, as Athanasius himself, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Chrysostome, with several others of the Latins, interpret the same to have been spoken, not of the Humanity, but the Divinity of our Saviour Christ. Infomuch that Petavius himself, expounding the Athanasian Creed, writeth in this manner, Pater Major Filio, rite & catholicè pronuntiatus est à plerisque Veterum, & Origine Prior sine reprehensione dixi solut; The Father is in a right Catholic manner, affirmed by most of the ancients, to be Greater than the Son; and he is commonly said also, without reprehension, to be Before him in respect of Original. Whereupon he concludeth the true meaning of that Creed to be this, that no Person of the Trinity, is Greater or Less than other in respect of the Essence of the Godhead common to them all, Quia Vera Deitas in nullo esse aut Minor aut Major potest, because the true Godhead can be nowhere Greater or Less; but that notwithstanding, there may be some Inequality in them, as they are Hic Deus, and Hac Persona, This God and That Person. It is true indeed that many of those ancient Fathers do restrain and limit this Inequality, only to the Relation of the Persons one to another, as the Father's getting, and the Son's being Begotten by the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeding from both; they seeming to affirm, that there is otherwise perfect Equality amongst them. Nevertheless several of them do extend this Difference further also, as for example, St. Hilary a zealous opposer of the Arians; he in his Book of Synods writing thus, Sius Unum dicens Deum, Chriftum autem Deum, antefecula Filium Dei, Secundum Patri in Creatione omnium, non confitetur, Anathema sit. And again, Non exaquinam vel conformamus Filium Patri, sed Subiectum intelligimus. And Athanasius himself, who is commonly accounted the very Rule of Orthodoxality in this Point, when he so often refembles the Father to the ἡ ἁμαρτία, or to the φως, the αὐτός, or the Original Light; and the Son to the ἀπαύγασμα, the Splendour or Brightnes of it; (as likewise doth the Nicene Council and the Scripture itself;) he seems hereby to imply some Dependence of the Second upon the First, and Subordination to it. Especially when he declareth, that the Three Persons of the Trinity, are not to be look'd upon as Three Principles, nor to be resembled to Three Suns, but to the Sun, and its Splendour, and its Derivative Light, ὡς ἐκ τῆς ὑψώσεως ἐκ τοῦ τριῶν θεὸν ὑπὲρκυμνεία τῷ εἰκόνι, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀποφάνσεως χρίσμα, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ τοῦ ἀπαύγασμα ὕμνου, ὡς μετὰ ἀκριβῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ τοῦ εἰκόνι. For it appears from the similitude used by us, that we do not introduce Three Principles (as the Marcionists and Manicheans did) in comparing the Trinity to Three Suns, but only to the Sun and its Splendour; So that we acknowledge only one Principle. As also where
he approves, of this of Dionysius of Alexandria, δέ γαρ οἷς οἷον ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἅπασεν, ἵνα λυθείν πάν,· οὐδὲν αἰνεῖν περικείμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν αἰνεῖν τὸ ἁπάσας θεοῦ,· τας ἄκαθαρμονίας,· τας ἄγυνας τις φεύχομεν αὐτίκα,· God is an Eternal Light, which never began, and shall never cease to be 3 wherefore there is an Eternal Splendour also coexistent with him, which had no beginning neither, but was Always Generated by him, fining out before him.

For if the Son of God, be as the Splendour of the Sun ἄγιον, Always Generated, then must he needs have an Essential Dependence upon the Father and Subordination to him. And this same thing further appears from those other resemblances, which the same Dionysius maketh, of the Father and the Son, approved in like manner also by Athanasius, viz. to the Fountain and the River 3 to the Root and the Branch: to the Water and the Vapour; for so it ought to be read τὸν κόσμον, and not τὸν κόσμον, as appeareth from his Book of the Nicene Synod, where he affirmeth the Son to have been begotten of the Essence or Substance of the Father, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ ἁπάσας θεοῦ, ὡς ἄγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, as the Splendour of the Light, and as the Vapour of the Water: adding, ὡς τὸ ἀπαντήμονα θεοῦ, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ κόσμου, οὕτως ἄγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς τοῦ κόσμου ἄναπτομαι ὡς τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ θεοῦ. For neither the Splendour nor the Vapour, is the very Sun, and the very Water; nor yet is it All-siven from it, or stranger to its nature, but they are both Eflusses from the Essence or Substance of them 3 as the Son is an Efflux from the Substance of the Father, yet so as that he is no way diminished or lessened thereby. Now all these similitudes of the Fountain and the River, the Root and the Branch, the Water and the Vapour, (as well as that of the Sun and the Splendour) seem plainly to imply some Dependence and Subordination. And Dionysius doubtless intended them to that purpose, he alluring as Photius informent us, an Inferiority of Power and Glory in the Second, as likewise did Origen before him: both whose Testimonies notwithstanding, Athanasius maketh use of, without any cenfure or reprehension of them. Wherefore when Athanasius and the other Orthodox Fathers, writing against Arius, do so frequently assert the Equality of all the Three Persons, this is to be understood in way of opposition to Arius only, who made the Son to be Unequal to the Father as ἐποδον, of a different Essence from him, One being God and the other a Creature: they affirming on the contrary, that he was Equal to the Father, as ἐποδον, of the same Essence with him: that is, as God and not a Creature. Notwithstanding which Equality, there might be some Subordination in them, as Hic Deus and Hæ Persone (to use Euthus his Language) This God and that Person.

And thus does there seem not to be so great a Difference, between the more Genuine Platonists, and the ancient Orthodox Fathers, in their Doctrine concerning the Trinity, as is by many conceived. However our Platonick Christian would further add; that there is necessity at all from the Principles of Platonism it self, why the Platonists should make any other or more Subordination in their Trinity, than the most severely Orthodox Fathers themselves. For according to the Common Hypothesis of the Platonists, when the Character of the First Hypothesis is supposed by them, to be Infinite Goodness, of the Second, Infinite Wisdom, and of the Third, Infinite Active Love and Power (the
(these not as Accidents and Qualities, but as all Substantial) it is more to be feared, that all these are really but One and the same God, than how there should be any considerable Inferiority in them. But besides this, there is another Platonick Hypothesis (which is Austin hinteth from Porphyrius, though he professeth he did not well understand it) wherein the Third Hypothesis is made to be, a certain Middle between the First and Second. And this does Proclus also sometimes follow, calling the Third in like manner, the Middle Power, and the Relation of both the First and Second to one another. Which agreeth exactly with that apprehension of some Christians, that the Third Hypothesis is as it were the Lexus between the First and the Second, and that Love whereby the Father and Son Love each other. Now according to this Latter Platonick Hypothesis, there would seem to be not so much a Gradation or ascension, as a kind of Circulation in the Trinity. Upon which all considerations, the Platonick Christian will conclude, That though some junior Platonists have adulterated the Notion of the Trinity, yet either there is no such great difference between the Genuine Platonick Trinity, rightly understood, and the Christian; or else that as the same might be modelled and rectified, there need not to be.

But though the Genuine Platonists, do thus suppose the Three Hypotheses of their Trinity, to be all of them, not only God, but also One God, or the Single One Entire Divinity; upon which Latter account the Whole may be said also by them, to have One Singular or Numerical Essence: yet notwithstanding must it be acknowledged, that none where suppose, each of these Three Hypotheses, to be Numerically the very same, or to have no Distinct Singular Essences of their own: this being in their apprehensions, directly contradictory to their very Hypothesis itself, and all one as if they should affirm them, need not to be Three Hypotheses, but only One. Nevertheles, the Christian Platonist would here also apologize for them after this manner: That the ancient Orthodox Fathers of the Christian Church, were generally of no other persuasion than this, that that Essence or Substance of the Godhead, which all the Three Persons or Hypotheses agree in as each of them is God, was not One Singular and Individual, but only One Common and Universal Essence or Substance: that word Essence, being used by them as Synonymous with Essence, and applied to Universals likewise, as it is by the Peripateticks, when they call Anim, or Animal in General, Substantiam Secundam, A Second Substance. Now this is Evident from hence, because these Orthodox Fathers, did commonly distinguish in this Controversie of the Trinity, the Hypothesis of the Essence or Substance of the Godhead, from the Hypothesis of the Persons themselves, after this manner; namely, that the Hypothesis of the Person was Singular and Individual; but the Essence or Substance Common and Universal. Thus does Theodoret pronounce of these Fathers in general, καταγε των κατω δικαιωσιν. According to the Doctrine of the Fathers, as that which is Common differs from that which is Proper, and the Genus from the Species or Invidual, so does...
doth Essence or Substance, differ from Hypostases, that is to say, that Essence or Substance of the Godhead, which is Common to all the Three Hypostases, or whereby each of them is God, was concluded by the Fathers, not to be One Singular or Individual, but One General or Universal Essence and Substance. Theodoret notwithstanding there acknowledging, that no such Distinction was observed by other Greek Writers, betwixt those two words δόσις and υπόστασις, Essence or Substance and Hypostases; as that the Former of them should be restrained to Universals only, Generical or Specific Essences or Substances; but that this was peculiar to the Christian Fathers, in their doctrine concerning the Trinity. They in the mean time not denying, but that each Hypostasis, Person, or Person in the Trinity, might be said in another sense, and in way of Opposition to Subellius, to have its own Singular, Individual or Existant Essence also; and that there are thus, τας ἄνω τρία Singular Individual and Existant Hypostases in the Deity, as well as τέσσερα interchangeably, Three Hypostases; an Hypostasis being nothing else to them, but an Existant Essence: however for distinctions fake, they here thought fit thus to limit and appropriate the Signification of these Two words; that a Singular and Existent Essence, should not be called Essence, but Hypostasis; and by ζήτου ἐνίαν hypostasis or Substance, should be meant, that General or Universal Nature of the Godhead only, which is Common to all those Three Singular Hypostases or Persons, or in which they all agree. We might here heap up many more Testimonies for a further Confirmation of this; as that of St. Basil; où ἐν ἀλλά άνθρωπον πεστο τῷ θεῷ, τότε δέν χειρὶ ζήτου τῷ ἐνίαν, What Common is to Proper, the same is Essence or Substance (in the Trinity) to the Hypostases. But we shall content our selves only, with this full acknowledgment of D. Petavius. In hoc Uno Graecorum præsertim omnium judicia concordant; ζήτου, id est, Efficientia seu Substantiam, ant Naturalam (quum ζήτου vocant) Generale esse aliquid & Commune, ac minime definitum, υπόστασις vero Proprium, Singularis, & Circumscriptum, quod ex illo Communi, & Peculiaribus quibusdam Notis ac Proprietatibus venit compositus. In this One Thing, do the Judgments and Opinions of all the Greeks especially agree, that Utia Essence or Substance, and Nature, which they call Phylos (in the Trinity) is something General, Common and Undetermined; but Hypostasis is that which is Proper, Singular and Circumscribed; and which is as it were compounded and made up of that Common Essence or Substance, and certain Peculiar Notes and Properties, or Individualizing Circumstances.

But besides this, it is further certain, that not a few of those Ancient Fathers, who were therefore reputed Orthodox, because they zealously opposed Arianism, did entertain this opinion also; that the Three Hypostases or Persons of the Trinity, had not only one General and Universal Essence of the Godhead, belonging to them all, the being all God; but were also Three Individuals, under One and the same Ultimate Species, or Specific Essence and Substance of the Godhead; just as Three Individual men, (Thomas, Peter and John) under that Ultimate Species of Man; or that Specific Essence of Humanity, which have only a Numerical Difference from one another.
Wherefore an Hypothesis or Person (in the Trinity) was accordingly thus defined, by some of the Fathers, (viz. Anastasius and Cyril) to be,  

*Eutheca cum suis quibusdam proprietatibus, ab his quae sunt ejusdem Species, Numero differente; an Essence or Substance, with its Certain Properties (or Individuating Circumstances) differing only Numerically from those of the same Species with it.*

This Doctrine was plainly affected and Indultriously purfued (besides several others both of the Greeks and Latins) especially by Gregory Nyffen, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus the Martyr, and Damasen; whose words because Petavius hath set them down at large, we shall not here inrent. Now these were they who principally instiffed, upon the Absolute Co-Equality and Independent Co-Ordination, of the Three Hypotheses or Persons in the Trinity, as compared with one another. Because, as Three Men, though one of them were a Father, Another a Son, and the Third a Nephew, yet have no Essential Dependence one upon another, but

* naturally Co-Equal and Unsubordinate, there being only a Numerical Difference betwixt them: so did they in like manner conclude, that the Three Hypotheses or Persons of the Deity (the Father, Son and Holy Ghost) being likewise but Three Individuals, under the same Ultimate Species or Specifick Essence of the Godhead, and differing only Numerically from one another, were Absolutely Co-Equal, Unsubordinate and Independent; and this was that which was Commonly called by them, their οὐκοστίον, their Co-Essentiality or Con-Substantiality. Wherefore it is observable, that St. Cyril one of these Theologers, finds no other fault at all with the Platonick Trinity, but only this, that such an Homoonysotia, such a Co-Essentiality or Con-Substantiality, as this, was not acknowledged therein, ἀλλ' ἂν πρὸς Cons. Gal. l. 18. τῶν αὐτών οὖν, εἰ δ' ἢ ης ἐξοστίων ἔχουσιν. Lόγον οὐκομονησμένον ἐθέλον ὑποτελέσθαι εἰς τοις ἔννοιαις ταῦτα πεπραγμένα, ἠ τὸ γὰρ δὲ φημί οὐκοστιών εἰς μείον ὀφθαλμόν ὑποτασοίνεσθαι, there would have been nothing at all wanting to the Platonick Trinity, for an Absolute agreement of it with the Christian, had they but accommodated the right Notion of Co-Essentiality or Con-Substantiality to their Three Hypotheses so that their might have been but one Specific Nature or Essence of the Godhead, not further distinguishable by a Natural Diversity, but Numerically only, and so no one Hypothesis may Inferior or Subordinate to another. That is, had these Platonists complied with that Hypothesis of St. Cyril and others, that the three Persons of the Trinity, were but Three Independent and Co-ordinate Individuals, under the same Ultimate Species or Specifick Essence of the Godhead, as Peter, Paul and John, under that Species Common Nature of Humanity, and so taken in this Co-Essentiality or Con-Substantiality of theirs, then had they been completely orthodox. Though we have already shewed, that this Platonick Trinity, was in another sense Homoonysion, and perhaps it will appear afterwards, that it was so also in the very sense of the Nicene Fathers and of Athanasins. Again these Theologers supposed, the three Persons of their Trinity, to have really no other than a Specific Unity or Identity; and because it seems plainly to follow from hence, that therefore they must needs be as much Three Gods as Three Men are Three Men; these learned Fathers endeavoured with their
Logick to prove, That Three Men, are but Abusively and Improperly so called Three, they being really & truly but One, because there is but One & the same Specific Essence or Substance of Humane Nature in them all; and seriously persuaded men to lay aside that kind of Language, by which name Logick of theirs, they might as well prove also, that all the men in the world are but One Man, and that all Epicurus his Gods were but one God neither. But not to urge here, that according to this Hypothesis, there cannot possibly be any reason given, why there should be so many as Three such Individuals in the Species of God, which differ only Numerically from one another, they being but the very same thing thrice repeated; and yet that there should be no more than Three such neither, and not Three Hundred, or Three Thousand, or as many as there are individuals in the Species of Man; we say, not to urge this, it seems plain that this Trinity, is no other than a kind of Tritheism, and that of Gods Independent and Co-ordinate too. And therefore some would think, that the Ancient and Genuine Platonick Trinity, taken with all its faults, is to be preferred before this Trinity of St. Cyril and St. Gregory Nyssen, and several other reputed Orthodox Fathers; and more agreeable to the Principles both of Christianity and of Reason. However it is evident from hence, that these Reputed Orthodox Fathers, who were not a few, were far from thinking the Three Hypotheses of the Trinity, to have the same Singular Existent Essence; they supposing them to have no otherwise, one and the same Essence of the Godhead in them, nor to be One God, than Three Individual Men, have one Common Specific Essence of Manhood in them, and are all One Man. But as this Trinity came afterwards to be decried, for Tritheistik; so in the room thereof, started there up, that other Trinity of Persons Numerically the Same, or having all One and the same Singular Existent Essence; a Doctrine which seemeth not to have been owned by any publick Authority in the Chriftian Church, save that of the Lateran Council only.

And that no such thing was ever entertained by the Nicene Fathers and those First opposers of Arianism, might be rendered probable in the First place from the free Confession and Acknowledgment of D. Petavius, (a Perfon, well acquainted with Eccleſialick Antiquity;) and for this reason especially, because many are much led by such new Names and Authorities; In eo præcipium pœruim collocavit Patres, ut æqualem Patri Naturam, Excellentiamque Filium esse defendent, utra exprimam SINGULARITATIS mentionem, licet eam conficere. Etenim Nicenii fìbi Praefules, qui hanc nem non melius Arifana Sacra arcana cognovit, nemo quæ opprimenda maximè forte, æquipotens potius, nihil in Professionis fæc. formulæ perpetravit alius, ut æquilatam illam Effentiam, Dignitatem, Æternitatem afirmet. Te statur hoc òuos etiæ quo ipsa, quæ arx quædam fuit Catholici Dogmati. Hec enim æqui latam potius Effentiam, quam SINGULARITATEM significat, ut Capite Quinto docuit. Deinde certa ejusdem modi jufti: illo Decreto, ut, &c. The chief force which the Ancient Fathers oppose against the Arian Hæretics, was in asserting only the Equality of the Son with the Father as to Nature or Essence, without any expression...
Chap. IV. Homousians, Anti-Sabellianists

of the singularities of the same. For those Nicene Bishops themselves, who did understand best of any, the secrets of the Arian Faction, and which way it should especially be propounded, aimed at nothing else in their Confession of Faith, but only to establish that Equality of Essence, Divinity, and Eternity between them. This does the word Homousios itself declare, it signifying rather Equality, than singularities of the Essence, as we have before showed. And the like do those other Passages in the same Decrees, as That there was no time when the Son was not, and That he was not made of nothing, Nor of a different Hypostasis or Essence. Thus does Petavius clearly confess, that this Same Singularity of Numerical Essence was not affected by the Nicene Council nor the most Ancient Fathers, but only an Equality or Sameness of Generical Essence; or else that the Father and Son agreed only in One Common Essence or Substance of the Godhead, that is, the Eternal and Uncreated Nature.

But the truth of this will more fully appear, from these following Particulars. First because these Orthodox Anti-Arian Fathers, did all of zealously condemn Sabellianism; the Doctrine whereof is no other than this, that there was but one Hypostasis or Singular Individual Essence, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and consequently that they were indeed but Three several Names, or Notions, or Modes, of one and the self same thing. From whence such Aburdities as these would follow: That the Father's Begetting the Son, was nothing but one Name, Notion, or Mode of the Deities Begetting another; or else the same Deity under one Notion, Begetting it self under another Notion. And when again the Son or Word, and not the The Fathet, is said to have been Incarnated, and to have suffered death for us upon the Cross; that it was nothing but a meer Logical Notion or Mode of the Deity, that was Incarnate and Suffered, or else the whole Deity under one particular Notion or Mode only. But should it be asserted notwithstanding, that this Trinity which we now speak of, was a Trinity of meer Names and Notions, as that of the Sabellians, but of Ininfant Hypostases or Personas; then must it needs follow (since every singular Essence is an Hypostasis, according to the sense of the Ancit Fathers) that there was not a Trinity only, but a Quadrinity of Hypostases, in the Deity. Which is a thing that none of those Fathers ever dream'd of.

Again the word Homousios, as was before intimated by Petavius, is never used by Greek writers otherwise, than to signify the Agreement of things, Numerically differing from one another, in some common Nature, or Universal Essence; or their having a Generical Unity or Identity, of which sundry Infinities might be given. Nor need it be likely, that the Greek Tongue should have any name that, which neither is a thing in Nature, nor falls under Human Conception, viz. Several Things having one and the same singular Essence, And accordingly St. Basil interprets the force of this word thus, ἄνωθεν τινα των τούτων τ' ὑπόθεσιν ἢ τ' οὕτως τ' ἐκοίμησαν ἵνα ἄκοιμησαν. That it plainly takes away the Sameness of Hypostasis, that is, of Singular Numerical Essence (this being that which
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which the ancient Fathers meant by the word Hypostasis: ) For the [same thing, is not Homoousios, Co-Essential or Con-Substantial with it self, but always One thing with Another. Wherefore as τὸ ὄνομαν and συγγείας, are used by Plotinus as Synonymous, in these words concerning the Soul, ἐάν μὲν διὰ συγγείας ἢ τὸ ὄνομα, That it is full of Divine things, by reason of its being Cognate or Congenereous, and Homoousious with them: so both Athanasius in like manner use them, when he affirmeth, τὸ κύριον ἐίναι ὄνομαν ἢ συγγείας ἢ ἁμαρτίας. That the Branches are Homoousious [Co-essential or Con-Substantial] and Congenereous with the Vine, or with the Root thereof. Besides which, the same Father utes, ὄνομας and ὀρθονίας, and ὀρθοφοίαι, for ὄνομας, in sundry places. None of which words can be thought to signify an Identity of Singular Essence, but only of General or Specific. And thus was the word Homoousios, plainly used by the Council of Chalcedon, they affirming that our Saviour Christ was, ὄνομας τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Σωτῆρ̄ τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ, ἢ ὄνομας ὥστε τῷ ἀπαντητεῖν, Co-Essential or Con-Substantial with the Father, as to his Divinity; but Co-Essential or Con-Substantial with us Men, as to his Humanity. Where it cannot reasonably be suspected, that one and the same word should be taken in two different senses in the same Sentence, so as in the first place to signify a Numerical Identity, but in the second, a General or Specific only. But Lastly, which is yet more, Athanasius himself speaketh in like manner of our Saviour Christ's being Homoousios with us Men; εἰ μὲν ἐν ὀρθονίας ἢ τῷ ὄνομα, τῷ αὐτῷ μὲν ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἢ περὶ τῷ ὄνομαν ὡς ἁμαρτίας ἢ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τῷ πατρὶ, ἢ ἁμαρτίας τῷ γαρόν. If the Son be Coessential or Consubstantial (or of the same Essence or Substance) with us Men, he having the very same Nature with us, then let him be in this respect a Stranger to the Essence or Substance of the Father, even as the Vine is to the Essence of the Husbandman. And again a little after, in the same Epistle, ἡ λέγων μὴ ἴσα πάντως ἡ λέγων ἴσαν, τῷ τῆς πιστεὸς ἑστα, ἐφεξῆς τῷ ὀρθονίᾳ ἢ μὲν ἐναὶ τῷ ἁμαρτάνων. Or did Dionysius, think you, when he affirmed the Word not to be Proper to the Essence of the Father, suppose him therefore to be Coessential or Consubstantial with us Men? From all which it is unquestionably evident, that Athanasius did not by the word Homoousios understand, That which hath the Same Singular and Numerical Essence with another, but the same Common General or Specific only; and consequently, that he conceived the Son to be Coessential or Consubstantial with the Father after that manner.

Furthermore the true meaning of the Nicene Fathers, may more fully and thoroughly be perceived, by considering what that Doctrine of Arians was, which they Opposed and Condemned. Now Arians maintained, the Son or Word, to be υἱός λέγων a Creature, Made in Time, and Mutabile or Defeasible, and for that reason as Athanasius tells us, ὁ ἐρεισκόμενος καὶ ἀναηρεχόμενος, of a different Essence or Substance from the Father (That which is Created, being supposed to differ Essentially or Substantially, from that which is Uncreated.) Wherefore the Nicene Fathers, in way of Opposition to this Doctrine of Arians determined, that the Son or Word, was not thus ἤμαρτον.
CHAP. IV.  Word Homoousios.

nor ἄνωτερον, but οὐκ ὄντος τοῦ πατρόν, Coessential or Consubstantial with the Father; that is, not a Creature, but God; or agreeing with the Father in that Common Nature or Essence of the Godhead. So that this is that δόξα, Essence or Substance of the ancient Fathers, which is said to be the Same in all the Three Hypostases of the Trinity as they are called God; not a Singular Existence Substance, but the Common, General, or Universal Essence of the Godhead, or of the Uncreated Nature, called by S. Hilary, Natura Una, non Unitate Per. De Sydici; one, sed Generis; one Nature, not by Unity of Person, but of Kind. Which Unity of the Common or General Essence of the Godhead, is the same thing also with that Equality, which some of the Ancient Fathers so much insist upon against Arius, namely An Equality of Nature, as the Son and Father are both of them alike God; that Essence of the Godhead (which is Common to all the Three Persons) being as all other Essences, supposed to be Indivisible. From which Equality it flesh also does it appear, that they acknowledged no Identity of Singular Essence, it being absurd to say, that One and the flesh same thing, is Equal to itself. And with this Equality of Essence, did some of these Orthodox Fathers themselves imply, that a certain Inequality of the Hypostases or Persons also, in their mutual Relation to one another, might be consistent. As for example, St. Athan. Fili, &c. contra Ar. Fili, &c. Spiritus Sancti, etiam in St. Athan. c. 18.

dispersum cognitum Potestatem, Naturam falsam confiteantur Equalem; though they conceive the Power of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be Unequal, yet let them for all that, confess their Nature at least to be Equal. And St. Basil likewise, though the Son be in Order Second to be Father, because produced by him, and in Dignity also, (forasmuch as the Father is the Cause and Principle of his being) yet it is not for all that, Second in Nature, because there is One Divinity in them both, and that this was indeed the meaning, both of the Nicene Fathers, and of Athanasius, in their Homoousiotes, their Coessentiality or Consubstantiality, and Equality of the Son with the Father; namely, their having both the same Common Essence of the Godhead, or that the Son was No Creature, as Arius contended, but truly God or Uncreated likewise, will appear undeniably, from many passages in Athanasius, of which we shall here mention only some few. In his P. 251.

little concerning the Nicene Council, he tells us, how the Eusebian Faction subscribed the Form of that Council, though afterward it was recanted, τοῦτον τὰ ὑπερεχειλον ὑπερεχειλον εἴ τι ἐν ἐν εὐερεχειλον τῶν ἐν όμοιον εἰς αὐτόπιστον τὸν τότοις ἐπικεφαλαιον τινι· λόγον τα ἐκ ὑπερεχειλον τοῦ ὑπερεχειλον, ἐτι εἰς τινα πάμην, μεττὶ τα ὑπερεχειλον ὁ τὸ ὑπερεχειλον ἐκ τοῦ πάμην ἐκ τοῦ πάμην ὁ λόγος τοῦ τοῦ πάμην ὁ λόγος. All the rest subscribing, the Eusebianists themselves subscribed also to these very words, which they now find fault with; mean of the Essence or Substance, and Coessential or Consubstantial, that the Son is no Creature or Failure or any of the Things Made, by the Genuine Offspring of the Essence or Substance of the Father. Afterwards he declareth, how the Nicene Council at first, intended to be made use only of Scripture Words and Phrases, against the Arian, τιθηθὰ τελετων τος μοι τῶν Ἀρσιανῶν ἐν αὐτοίς λέγει αὐτοίς· τος 3. 167.

γεγραμμένοι διδομείσαι φονέας γοητείας, ὅτι το εἶπεν ὁ θεός καί ὃς εἶναι τὸν ὁ πατήρ, ἔκ τοῦ ὄντος, τοῦ δέ λόγου ὡς ἐκ στοίχεια, ἅλλ' ἐν κατάμαχο διά τοῦ πάμην. Ἡδον δὲ
The Nicene Fathers, Book I.

As that Christ was the Son of God, and not from nothing, but from God, the Word and Wisdom of God, and consequently no Creature or thing Made. But when they perceived that the Eusebian Fashion would evade all these Expressions by Equivocation, they conceived themselves necessitated, more plainly to declare what they meant by being From God, or Out of him; and therefore added, that the Son was Out of the Substance of God, thereby to distinguish him from all Created Beings. Again a little after in the same Epistle he adds, "they conceived themselves necessitated, more plainly to declare what they meant by being From God, or Out of him; and therefore added, that the Son was Out of the Substance of God, thereby to distinguish him from all Created Beings."

Wherefore it feemeth to be unquestionably evident, that when the Ancient Orthodox Fathers of the Christian Church, maintained against Arius, the Son to be Homoousion, Confessional or Consubstantial with the Father, though that word be thus interpreted, of the same Essence or Subsistence, yet they Universally understood thereby, not the Sameness of Singular and Numerical, but of Common or Universal Essence only; that is, the Generical or Specific Essent of the Godhead; that the Son was no Creature, but truly and properly God. But if it were needful, there might be yet more Testimonies cited out of Ath.
Athanasmus to this purpose. As from his Epistle De Synodis Arimini &c. 979. Seleneus, where he writeth thus, concerning the Difference between those two words οὐσίας. of Like Substance, and οὐσίας. Of the Same Substance. οὐσίας. But they oufjav bjri cjQoj!)-t&$ it, and is owtj, as tyo?.

Again, it is not to be like to a man, in respect of the Essence or Substance of Humanity, but only as to Figure or Form: they being said as to their Essence to be Congenereous, of the Same Nature or Kind with one another. Nor is a man properly said, to be unlike to a Dog, but of a Different Nature or Kind from him. Wherefore that which is Congenereous, of the Same Nature, Kind, or Species, is also Homounion, Coessential or Confubstantial (of the Same Essence or Substance) and that which is of a different Nature, Kind, or Species, is Heterounion, (of a different Essence or Substance.)

Again Athanasius in that Fragment of his Against the Hypocrifie of Melitus, &c. concerning Confubstantiality writeth in this manner; ο τινως ανωτος το ουσιον τη πατες, λεγεν ο ουσιον, ανωτος το ευαν ουσιον ας ανωτος το ουσιον, ας ουσιον τη μονη. Wherefore that which is Congenereous, of the same Nature, Kind, or Species, is also Homounion, Coessential or Confubstantial (of the Same Essence or Substance) and that which is of a different Nature, Kind, or Species, is Heterounion, (of a different Essence or Substance.)

It is that denies the Son to be Homounion, Confubstantial with the Father, affirming him only to be like to him, denies him to be God. In the manner, he who retaining the word Homounion or Confubstantial, interprets it notwithstanding only of Similitude or Likeness in Substance, affirmeth the Son to be of another Different Substance from the Father, and therefore not God; but like to God only. Neither doth such a one rightly understand those words. Of the Substance of the Father, he doth thinking the Son to be so Confubstantial, or of the Essence and Substance of the Father, as one man is Confubstantial, or of the Essence or Substance of another who begat him. For he who affirmeth that the Son is not of God, as a man is of a man, according to Essence or Substance; but that he is like him only, as a Statue is like a Man or as a Dog may be like to God, it is manifest that such a one, though he use the word Homounion, yet he doth not really mean it. For he will not understand it according to the customary signification thereof, for that which hath One and the Same Essence or Substance; this word being used by Greeks and Pagans in no other sense, than to signifie that which hath the Same Nature; as we ought to believe concerning the other Son and Holy Ghost. Where we see plainly, that though the word Homounion is interpreted, That which hath One and the Same Essence.
Essence or Substance, yet is this understood of the Same Common Nature, and as one man is of the same Essence or Substance with another. We might here also add to this, the concurrent testimonies of the other Orthodox Fathers, but to avoid tediousness we shall omit them, and only insert some passages out of St. Athanys to the same purpose. For he in his First Book Contra Maximus. Chap. the 15. writeth thus, 

Dno veri Hominem, est nulla eorum Filius fit Alterius, Unius tamen & Ejusdem sunt Substantiae. Homo autem alterius Hominis Verus Filius nullo modo potest nisi Ejusdem cum Patre esse Substantiae, etiam non sit per omnia Similis Patri, Quocirca Verus Dei Filius, & Unius cum Patre Substantiae est, quia Verus Filius est; & per omnia est Patri similis, quia est Dei Filius. Two True men, though neither of them be Son to the other, yet are they both of One and the Same Substance. But a man who is the true Son of another man, can by no means be of a Different Substance from his Father, although he be not in all respects like unto him. Wherefore the true Son of God, is both of one Substance with the Father, because he is a true Son, and he is also in all respects like to him, because he is the Son of God. Where Christ or the Son of God, is said to be no otherwise, of one Substance with God the Father, than here amongst men, the Son is of the same Substance with his Father, or any one man with another. Again the same S. Athanys in his Respons. ad Sermonem Arianorum, expresseth himself thus: Arianis nos vocant Homousianos, quia contra eorum errores, Graeco vocabulo non sensum defendimus, Patrem, Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum; id est, Unius Ejusdemque Substantiae, vel ut expressissimis dicamus Essentiae (quae & ex Graecæ appellatur) quod planius dicatur Unius Ejusdemque Nature. Et tamen sequi istorum quin nos Homousianos vocant, Filium suum non cujus ipse esset, sed Diversæ discret esse Naturæ, Exheredari ab ipso mallet Filius, quam hoc putari. Quanta igitur impietate iiji cacantur, qui cum confessantur Unicon Dei Filium, volunt Ejusdem Nature cujus Pater est confessi; sed diversæ atque impariss, & multis modis rebusque dissimilis, tangam non de Deo Natus, sed ab illo de Nibilis fit Creatus, Gratia Filius, non Naturæ. The Arians call us Homousians, because in opposition to their Error we defend the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be in the Language of the Greeks Homousious, that is of One and the Same Substance, or to speak more clearly Essence, this being in Greek called Uios, which is yet more plainly thus expressed, of One and the Same Nature. And yet there is none of their own Sons, who thus call us Homousians, who would not as willingly be disinherited, as be accounted of a Different Nature from his Father. How great impiety therefore are they blinded with, who though they acknowledge that there is One only Son of God yet will not confess him, to be of the same Nature with his Father but different and unequal and many ways unlike him, as if he were no Born of God, but Created out of Nothing by him, himself being a Creature; and so a Son, not by Nature but Grace only. Lastly (to name a more places) in his First Book De Trinitate, he hath these words; Si Filius Creatura non est, ejusdem cum Patre Substantiae est, Omnium Substantia que Deus non est Creatura est, & que Creatura non est Deus est. Et si non est Filius ejusdem Substantiae cujus est Pater, erit Ficta Substantia est. If the Son be not a Creature, then is he of
fame Substance with the Father; for whatever Substance is not God, 
be Creature, and whatever is not Creature is God. And therefore if 
the Son be not of the Same Substance with the Father, he must needs be 
a Made and Created Substance, and not truly God.

Lastly, that the ancient Orthodox Fathers, who used the word 
Homoousios against Arius, intended not therein to affect the Son to 
have One and the same Singular or Individual Essence with the Father, 
appareth plainly from their disclaiming and difowning those 
two words Tautoousion and Monousion. Concerning the Former of which, 
Epiphanius thus; καὶ εὐρωπό τουτούς ἐπεμάχετο τον λεγόμενον μεν Ἀρ. Ηαρ. 76, Ν.7. 
καὶ Σαβελλίου επιτίμησαν. Ταύτα θεόμενα τῷ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ τῷ Αἰεί, καὶ 
tῷ διακόνῳ. We affirm not the Son to be Tautoousion (One and the same 
Substance with the Father) left this should be taken in way of compliance 
with Sabellius; nevertheless do we affect him to be, the Same, in Godhead, 
and in Essence, and in Power. Where it is plain, that when 
Epiphanius affirmed the Son to be the same with the Father in Godhead 
and Essence, he understood this only; of a Generical or Specific, 
and not of a Singular or Individual Sameness; namely, that the 
Son is no Creature, but God also as the Father is; and this he inti-
mates to be the true and genuine sense of the word Homoousios: he 
therefore rejecting that other word Tautoousion, because it would be 
able to misinterpretation, and to be taken in the Sabellian sense, 
or that which hath One and the Same Singular and Individual Essence, 
which the word Homoousios could not be obnoxious to. And 
concerning that other word Monoousios, Athanasius himself, in his 
Exposition of Faith, thus expressly condemns it, ἤττο Θεοποιήσας ὑποτεθήκα 
καὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ μονογενοῦς καὶ τοῦ ὑποτεθήκας. We do not think the Son 
be really One and the Same with the Father, as the Sabellians do, and 
be Monoousios and not Homoousios: they thereby destroying the ve-
being of the Son. Where Usia, Essence or Substance, in that Fictional 
word Monoousios, is taken for Singular or Existential Essence, the 
hole Deity being thus fided by Sabellius, to have only One Singular 
Essence or Hippoiasis in it; whereas in the word Homoousios, is under-
stood a Common or Universal, Generical or Specifical Essence; the Son 
being thus fided to agree with the Father, in the Common Essence of 
Godhead, as not being a Creature. Wherefore Athanasius here 
claimeth a Monoousian Trinity, as Epiphanius did before; a Tauto-
tousion; both of them a Trinity of mere Names, and Notions, or Inade-
quate Conceptions of One and the Same Singular Essence or Hy-
poiasis; they alike distinguishing them, from the Homoousian Trinity, 
a Trinity of Real Hypoiasis or Persons, that have severally their 
润滑油 Essence, but agree in one Common and Universal Essence 
of the Godhead, they being none of them Creatures but all Un-
created or Creator. From whence it is plain, that the ancient Or-
thodox Fathers, affected no such thing, as One and the Same Singular 
for Numerical Essence, of the several Persons of the Trinity; this 
according to them, being not a Real Trinity, but a Trinity of mere 
Names, Notions, and Inadequate Conceptions only; which is thus 
declared and declared against by Athanasius, τί έστι πάθεν εις πάθος, 
καὶ ψευδαίσθη λέγοντο, ἀλλά ἀληθείας καὶ ψευδείας τί έστι, τί έστι τῆς 
Τριτης. 

In the 

Trinity,
Trinity, is not a Trinity of mere Names and Words only, but of Hypotheses, truly and really Existing. But the Homoousian Trinity, of the Orthodox, went exactly in the Middle, betwixt that Monoousian Trinity of Sabellius, which was a Trinity of different Notions or Conceptions only of One and the Self-Same Thing, and that other Heterousian Trinity of Arian, which was a Trinity of Separate and Heterogeneous Substances (one of which only was God, and the other Creatures) this being a Trinity, of Hypotheses or Persons, Numerically differing from one another, but all of them agreeing, in one Common or General Essence of the Godhead or the Uncreated Nature, which is Eternal, and Infinite. Which was also thus particularly declared by Athanasius, the female of one person and substance, from which is descended, to name but a few, the Catonic, Homousian, or Homoousian, 

And now upon all these Considerations, our Platonick Christian Church, did herein agree with the Platonick Trinity, that it was not Monoousian, One Sole Singular Essence, under Three Notions, Conceptions, or Modes only; but Three Hypotheses or Persons. As likewise the right Platonick Trinity, does agree with the Trinity of the ancient Orthodox Christians in this, that it is not Heterousian but Homoousian, Coessential or Consubstantial; none of their Three Hypotheses being Creatures or Particular Beings, made in Time; but all of them Uncreated, Eternal, and Infinite.

Notwithstanding all which, it must be granted, that though the Homoousiates, or Coessentiality of the Three Persons in the Trinity does imply them to be all God, yet does it not follow from thence of necessity, that they are therefore One God. What then shall we conclude that Athanasius himself also entertained that opinion before mentioned and exploded? Of the Three Persons in the Trinity, being but Three Individuals under the same Species, (as Peter, Paul and Timothy,) and having no other Natural Unity or Identity than Specificall only? Indeed some have confidently fastned this upon Athanasius, because in those Dialogues Of the Trinity, published among his works, and there entitled to him, the same is grossly owned, and in defence thereof, this Absurd Paradox maintained; that Peter Paul and Timothy, though they be Three Hypotheses, yet are not to be accounted Three men, but only then, when they differ from one another, or disagree in Will or Opinion. But it is certain, from several Passages in those Dialogues themselves, that they could not be written by Athanasius; and there hath been another Father found for them, to wit, Maximus the Martyr. Notwithstanding which, thus much must not be denied by us, that Athanasius in those others his reputedly Genuine Writings, does so...
time approach so near hereunto, that he lays no small stress upon this Homenotes, this Coessentiality, and Common Nature of the Godhead, to all the Three Persons, in order to their being One God. For thus, in that Book entitled, Concerning the Common Essence of the Three Persons, and the Chapter inscribed, "ovi sC eit trC tC sC Sei, That there are not Three Gods;" doth Athanasius lay his Foundation here. When to that question proposed, How it can be said, that the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet that there are not Three Gods; the First Reply which he makes is this, ὦς τὰ παρὰ τὰ ἁπλά φῶς ἅμα, κανδὴ, ἢ δώσαις αἰώνας. ὥστε ὅ ὢς ταῦτα, τὸ πλῆθος ἰδρυμένα ἀπὸ μιᾶς φωτός, ἐν ἐναντίου καλεῖ· καὶ ὡς ὁ θεός τοὺς αὐθαπάτους, τὸ παύλιν αὐθαπάτου τῷ ὑπό τοῦ κράτους, ἦν διαλαύσεος τῷ καθένας, ὡς ὁ ἔνας τῶν διαματικῶν. Where there is a Communion of Nature, there is also one Common Name of Dignity bestowed. And thus doth God himself, call things divided into Multitudes from one Common Nature, by One Singular Name. For both when he is angry with men, doth call all those who are the objects of his anger, by the name of One Man: and when he is reconciled to the world, is he reconciled thereto as to One Man. The first Infinances which he gives hereof, are in Gen. the 6. the 3. and 7. Veres: My Spirit shall not always strive with Man, and I will destroy Man whom I have Created: Upon which Athanasius makes this Reflexion; καὶ τοια ψυχαὶ ὃς ἐδείκνυσί· αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῶν φωτῶν, τὸ παύλιν αὐθαπάτου ἐπὶ πάσης πρόσωπος οὐκ ὁ πλῆθος ἐν τῇ πλῆθος. Though there was not then only one man, but Infinite Myriads of men, nevertheless by the name of One Nature, doth the Scripture call all those men, One Man, by reason of their Community of Essence of substance. Again he commenteth in like manner upon that other scripture-passage, Exodus the 15. 1. The Horse and his Rider hath he browned into the Sea, "οτι ἐξῆλθεν φαρμὸν ἡ ἀρχὴ, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδαν, πιείς τοὺς μετὰ ἔρημον ἀμαρτάντας ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ὡς ἤτοι πολλοί· ἵππον ἀρκετον εἰς μιᾶς καλεῖς, ἤτοι πολλοί· ὡς πολλοί εἰς ὁλαθείναν μιᾶς ἐκκυρίας, ἤτοι πολλοί· ὡς πολλοί ἐκκυρίας, ἤτοι πολλοί· ὡς πολλοί ἐκκυρίας, ὡς πολλοί· ὡς πολλοί ἐκκυρίας. When haraoh went out to the Red Sea, and fell with Infinite Chariots in the same; and there were many men that were drowned together with him, and many Horses; yet Moses knowing that there was but one Common Nature of all those that were drowned, speakest thus both of the ten and Horases: The Lord hath thrown both the Horse and the Rider into the Sea; he calling such a Multitude of Men, but One Singular Man, and such a Multitude of Horases but One Horse. Whereupon Athanasius thus concludeth, εἰ ἐν ὅν τις αὐθαπάτου, ὡς ἐνεδράσατο τοῖς ἰδιῶταις, ἵπποις ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου, ἵπποις ἐκ τῶν καλαθέοις ἵπποις ἐκ τῶν πληθυντικῶν. Where are differences of Form, Power and Will (all men not having the one disposition of Mind, nor Form, nor Strength) as also different images, (from whence men are called by the Poets Meropés) nevertheless by reason of the Community of Nature, the whole world is called One.
One Man; might not that Trinity of Persons, where there is an Undivided Dignity, One Kingdom, One Power, One Will, and One Energy be much rather called One God? Yet though it be true, that Athanasius in this place (if at least this were a Genuine Fetus of Athanasius) may justly be thought to attribute too much to this Common Nature, Essence, or Substance, of all the Three Persons, as to the making of them to be truly and properly One God; and that these Scripture-pasages are but weakly urged to this purpose; yet is it plain, that he did not acquiesce in this only, but addeth other things to it also, as their having not only One Will, but also One Energy or Action, of which more afterwards. Moreover Athanasius, elsewhere plainly implieth, that this Common Essence or Nature of the Godhead, is not sufficient alone, to make all the Three Hypostases, One God. As in his Fourth Oration against the Arians, where he tells us, that his Trinity of Divine Hypostases cannot therefore be accounted Three Gods nor Three Principles, because they are not reformed by him, to Three Original Suns, but only to the Sun, and its Splendour, and the Light from both. Now Three Suns, according to the Language of Athanasius, have several ἐν φύσεις καὶ ἔσος, a Common Nature, Essence, and Substance, and therefore are Coessential or Consubstantial; and since they cannot be accounted one Sun, it is manifest, that according to Athanasius, this Specifick Identity or Unity, is not sufficient to make the Three Divine Hypostases One God. Again the same Athanasius, in his Exposition of Faith, writeth thus, ἡ τρία ὑποκάτωσιν, μεμεικτὰς καὶ οὐ κατακτών, ὡς ἀνωτάτης ἐπὶ ἀνωτάτου ἑνὶ νομίζω, ἵνα ψυχομονήν ἐκ τῆς εἰλικρίνειας τοῦ Φοτισμοῦ, ὁδοὶ δὲν πολλυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς εἰλικρίνειοις. Neither do we acknowledge Three Hypostases, Divided or Separate, themselves (as is to be seen corporeally in men) that we may not comply with the Pagan Polytheism. From whence it is Evident, that neither Three Separate Men, though Coessential to Athanasius, were accounted by him to be One Man, nor yet the Community of the Species of the Godhead, can alone by it self, exclude Polytheism from the Trinity. Wherefore the true reason, why Athanasius laid so great a stress upon this Homoaousios, or Coessentiality of the Trinity, in order to the Unity of the Godhead in them, was no because this alone was sufficient to make them One God, but because they could not be so without it. This Athanasius often urgues against the Arians, as in his Fourth Oration, where he tells them, πολλὶς τοῖς ἑνώτητι τῶν ἑνώτητων, ἵνα τοῖς ἑνώτητος ἑνώτητι. That they must needs introduce a Plurality of Gods, because of the Heterogeneity of their Trinity. And again afterwards determining, that there is ὃ ἐν ἀσόφῳ, ἡ ἑνώτητα τῶν ἑνώτητων, one Species of the Godhead, in Father, Son and Spirit, he adds ἔτοι μὲν ἐκ τῶν τε καὶ τυχειότερων ἀμοιβαῖον ἐστὶν, ὡς τοῖς ὑπερτυχειότεροις τουτοις, ὅτι ὑπερτυχειότεροι τοις ἑνώτητοι, πολλαὶ ἡνωμοιότατα ἑνώτητας, ἵνα τοῖς μὲν ἑνώτητοι ἑνώτητας, Ἐν θεῷ ὑπερτυχειότεροι, ἤ τοις ἐν ὑπερτυχειότεροι τοῖς ἑνώτητας, ἵνα τοῖς οὗτοι ἑνώτητας, ἔτοι μὲν ἐκ τῶν τε καὶ τυχειότερων ἀμοιβαῖον. And thus do we acknowledge one only God in the Trinity; and maintain it more Religiously than those Hereticks do, who introduce Multiiform Deity, consisting of divers Species; we supposing only One Universal Godhead in the whole. For if it be not thus, but the Son be Creature, made out of nothing, however called God by those Arians,
then must He and his Father, of necessity be Two Gods; one of them a Creator, the other a Creature. In like manner in his Book, Of the P. 177.

Nicene Council, he affirmeth, concerning the Arians, that they make in a manner Three Gods, dividing the Holy Monad into Three Heterogeneous Substances, Separate from one another. Whereas the right Orthodox Trinity, on the contrary, is elsewhere thus described by him, 

P. 190.

In the Father, Son, and Spirit, hath nothing Aliene, Foreign or Extraordinary intermingled with it; nor is it compounded of Heterogeneous things, the Creator and Creature jointed together. And whereas the Arians interpreted that of our Saviour Christ, I and my Father are One, only in respect of Consent or Agreement of Will, Athanasius shewing the insufficiency hereof, concluded thus, Whereas besides this Consent of Will, there must of necessity be another Unity of Essence or Substance also, acknowledged in the Father and the Son. Whereby Unity of Essence or Substance, that Athanasius did not mean, a Unity of Singular and Individual, but of General or Universal Essence only, appears plainly from these following words, 

P. 223.

The Holy and perfect Trinity Theologized, in the Father, Son, and Spirit, hath nothing Aliene, Foreign or Extraordinary intermingled with it; nor is it compounded of Heterogeneous things, the Creator and Creature jointed together. And whereas the Arians interpreted that of our Saviour Christ, I and my Father are One, only in respect of Consent or Agreement of Will, Athanasius shewing the insufficiency hereof, concluded thus, Whereas besides this Consent of Will, there must of necessity be another Unity of Essence or Substance also, acknowledged in the Father and the Son. Whereby Unity of Essence or Substance, that Athanasius did not mean, a Unity of Singular and Individual, but of General or Universal Essence only, appears plainly from these following words, 

P. 461.

by One Godhead in the Trinity; where the following words plainly apply this to be understood in part at least, of One Common or General Essence of the Godhead, the Son of the Father, can be neither God nor Man, but both; or else one Godhead, the Son and the Father are One thing in the Propriety of Nature, and in the Sameness of one Godhead; it is evident from the Context, but this is not to be understood of a Sameness of Singular Essence, that partly of a Common and General One, and partly of such another.
ther Sameness or Unity, as will be hereafter expressed. Lastly, when
the Three Hypotheses, are somewhere said by him, to be of the One 
Essence or Substance, this is not to be understood neither in that 
place, as if they had all Three the same Singular Essence, but in some 
of those other Sences before mentioned.

But though Athanasius no where declare, the Three Hypotheses of
the Trinity, to have only One and the same Singular Essence, but on the 
contrary, denies them to be Monousian; and though he lay a great 
stress upon their ἕνων ἕνων, their Specifick or Generick Unity, and Co-
essentiality, in order to their being One God; for as much as without 
this, they could not be God at all; yet doth he not rely wholly upo
n this, as alone sufficient to that purpose, but addeth certain other 
considerations thereunto, to make it out; in manner as followeth.

First, that this Trinity, is not a Trinity of Principles, but that there
is only One Principle or Fountain of the Godhead in it, from which
the other are derived. Thus does he write in his Fifth Oration,

De Syn. A-

P. 656.

µύε ἀρχή, ἢ ἢ τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἑκάστης, θα ἐκ τοῦ δια τοῦ Πνεύματος. There is but One Principle, and according-

De Syn Nuc. 

De Syn. & Sch. p. 920.

ly but One God. Again in his Book against the Sabellianists, ὁ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὁ μὴ δύο πατέρες, μεν ἐκ τοῦ ἑυθείας ὁ κύριος, ὁ μὴ δύο πατέρες ὁ Πατής, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ δύο, αὐτὸν μακραιότερον ἀνεπάντησε. There are not Two Gods, both because there are not Two Fa-
thers, and because that which is Begotten is not of a different Essence
from that which Begat. For he that introduced Two Principles, Preach-
eth Two Gods; which was the Impiety of Marcion. Accordingly the
same Athanasius declareth, τοῦ διὰ τοῦ πατέρας ἀρχή ἢ ἢ θέος ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἑκάστης, οτι τὸ ἔνων ὑπὸ ἑκάστης, ἢ τοῦ Πνεύματος. That God (the Father
is the First Fountain of all Good things, but the Son a River pour-
f quest from him. To the same purpose is it also, when he compar-

De Syn Nuc. 

p. 375.

eth the Unity of the Godhead from hence, in this manner
ποι $('[τὸ 

τὸ διὰ τὸν Θεοῦ ἢ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἢ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἑκάστης, ποιεῖν ἢ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἢ τοῦ 

τὸ διὰ τὸν Θεοῦ ἢ τοῦ Πνεύματος. The Divine Tri-

nity most needs be collected and gathered up together, under that omi-

nous God of the whole World, as under One Head. But the chief forc
of this Consideration, is only to exclude the Doctrine of the Mar-
cionists, who made More Independent and Self-exciting Principles an
Gods. Notwithstanding which, it might still be objected, that the
Christian Trinity, is a Trinity of Distinct Subordinate Gods, in oppo-
sition whereunto, this argument seems only to prepare the way to whi
follows; namely of the close Conjunction of these Three Hypotheses
into One God; for as much, as were they Three Independent Prin-
ciples, there could not be any Coalescence of them into One.

In the next place therefore, Athanasius further addeth, that the
Three Divine Hypotheses, are not μετακόσμως and κατεκόσμως, 
Separate and Disjoined Beings, but ἄνωθεν, Indivisibly United

0
one another. Thus in his Fifth Oration, η αὐτῆς, ἦν ἐν ὑπακοα τῇ Ἰερών, τῷ ταῖς ἐξ ἀληθίνου, ἀμέτρητος, ἐν διάφορην καὶ ἀληθεύον πόνον ἀπὸ τῆς πνεύματος. The Father and the Son are both one thing in the Godhead, and in that the Word, being begotten from Him, is Indivisible and Inseparably conjoined with Him. Where when he affirmeth, the Father and the Son, to be One in the Godhead, it is plain that he doth not mean them to have One and the same Singular Essence, but only General and Universal; because in the following words, he supposeth them to be Two, but Indivisibly and Inseparably United together. Again in his Book De Sent. Dionis. ἐστιν ἀδιαφόρητος τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, ὡς ἐστὶ τὸ ἀπώλειαν σαμαῖα περὶ τὸ φαί, The Son is Indivisible from the Father, as the Splendour is from the Light. And afterwards in the same Book he refleth further upon this Point, according to the sense of Dionysius, in this manner, ὅ ὑποκαταστέσας ἐν τῷ πνεύματι υἱός εἶναι ἐξανθρωπίσας, ὡς εἶναι ὁ λόγος πρός τὸν κύριον κύριον τὸν αὐτοῦ πάντων. ἐν ποιμαντικῷ προς τῷ πασί πασιν, and further, ἐν καιρῷ καὶ ἐν πάντες τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ, διὸ τίνι πάντες διέκειται, ἢ τί ποιμαντικῷ παντὸς πάντων ἐν καιρῷ καὶ τί πάντων διέκειται τίς πάντων. Dionyssius teacheth, that the Son is Cognate with the Father, and indivisible from him, as Reason is from the Mind, and the River from the Fountain. Who is there therefore, that would go about to alienate Reason from the Mind and to separate the River from the Fountain, making up a halt between them? or to cut off the Splendour from the Light? Thus also in his Epistle to Serapion, that the Holy Ghost is not a Creature, &c. διέλεσαν προς τοῦτο ἐν ὑπακοα σαμαίαν τὸ φαί, ὡς ἐν σαμαία τῷ σαμαία, μὴ ἐπικρατησάντων, πῶς ἐν τάξιν. Let these men first divide the Splendour from the Light, or Wisdom from him that is Wise, or else let them under no more hope these things can be. Elsewhere Athanasius calls the whole Trinity, τῷ ἀδιάφορον καὶ ἐνομαστὰ πρὸς ὢν αὐτόν, A Trinity Undivided and United to it self. Which Athanasian Indivisibility of the Trinity, is not so to be understood as if Three were not Three, but first of all that neither of these could be without the other, as the Original Light or Sun could not be without the Splendour, nor the Splendour without the Original Light, and neither of them without a Diffused Derivative Light. Wherefore God the Father being an Eternal Sun, must needs have also an Eternal Splendour, and an Eternal Light. And Secondly, that these are so Nearly and Intimately Conjoyned together, that there is a kind of ζωτικὸν Continuity betwixt them, which yet is not to be understood in the way of Corporal Things, but so as is agreeable to the nature of things Incorporeal.

Thirdly, Athanasius ascendeth yet higher, affirming the Hypothesis of the Trinity, not only to be Indivisibly Conjoyned with one another, but also to have a Mutual Inexistence in each other, which latter Greek Fathers have called ἡ διαμαρτύρων, their Circumcision. To this purpose does he cite the Words of Dionysius, ἀποθεόον. P. 665. ἐν λόγῳ, καὶ ἐν καρδίᾳ καὶ σῶμα ἐκεινὸς, ἐν καρδίᾳ καὶ σώμα ἐκεῖνος, &c. Χριστός, ἐν καρδίᾳ καὶ σώμα ἐκεῖνος, καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἐν πάσῃ ἐκεῖνος, τῷ ἑαυτῷ, τῷ ἑαυτῷ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ. For Reason is the Efflux of the Mind, which in men is derived from the Heart into the Tongue; where it becomes another Reason.
son or Word, differing from that in the Heart: and yet do these both, Mutually Exist in each other, they belonging to one another; and so though being Two, are One Thing. Thus are the Father and the Son, One thing, being Said to Exist in each other. And Athanasius further illustrates this also by certain Similitudes; as that again of the Original Light and the Splendour, he affirming that God was to the Apocalypse, and is to the Light, That the Original Light is in the Splendor, and again the Splendor in the Sun; and also that of the Prototype and the Image, or the King, and his Picture, which he thus insinuates upon, viz. that God is the Beginning of the Doings, and is the Wisdom, and is the Father; and that God is the Spirit, and is the doctrine, and is the Light, and is the Word, and is the Wisdom, and is the Father. The Picture is contained in the Form and Figure of the King, and in the King the Form and Figure of the Picture. And therefore if anyone, when he had seen the Picture, should afterward desire to see the King, the Picture would be a Prophopoeia before him after this manner: thus I, and he, and she, and another, and this, and that, and the other, and the whole, and all things, and what things are, and things that are not, and things that are, and things that are not, and things that are, and all things, and all things, and all things.


For the Father and Son are not, as they suppose, Transfigurated and Poured out, one into another, as into an Empty Vessel: as if the Son filled up the Concavity of the Father, and again the Father that of the Son; and neither of them were full or perfect in themselves. For all this is proper to Bodies; wherefore though the Father be in some sense, Greater than the Son, yet notwithstanding may he be in him after an Internal manner. And he replieoth to their Last Cavil thus, That the Son is not so in the Father, as we ourselves are said to Live and Move and Be in God; but as the stream is not the sea, so that we may say, In God, in that sense wherein it is said in the prophets, the fountain of the Father, is that Life in whom all things are quickened and consist: neither does he who is the Life live in another Life, which were to suppose him not to be the Life it self. Nor (faith he) must it be conceived, that the Father is no otherwise in the Son, than he is in holy men Corroborating of them; for the Son himself is the Power and Wisdom of God, and all Created Beings are sanctified by a Participation of him in the Spirit. Wherefore this Perichoresis or Mutual In-being of the Father and the Son, is to be understood after a Peculiar manner, so as that they are Really thereby One; and what the Son and Holy Ghost doth, the Father doth in them, according to that of Athanasius, "It is by the Father, the sea, the fountain of the Father, that the Son is in him; so the Spirit in the whole Body of the Church, is the Life of the Godhead of the Father, and so the Father exerciseth a Providence over all things in the Son."

Lastly, the same Athanasius in sundry places still further supposes, that the Three Divine Hypotheses, to make up one Entire Divinity after the same manner, as the Fountain and the Stream make up one Entire River; or the Root and the Stock and the Branches, one Entire Tree. And in this sense also, is the whole Trinity said by him, to be μία ἡμέρα, and μία φωνή, and μία καρδιά, and μία Ἰερά, One Divinity and One Nature, and One Essence, and One God. And accordingly the ord Homoousios seems here to be taken by Athanasius, in a further sense, besides that before mentioned; not only for things Agreeing one Common and General Essence, as Three Individual men are essential with one another; but also for such as are concurrently together, make up One Entire Thing; and are therefore Joynly Essentially thereunto. For when he affirmeth, τὸ φυτὸν ἐκεῖνον ἐφέτευσεν ἡμᾶς, τὸ θάλασσαν ἐκεῖνον ἐφέτευσεν, That the Tree is Congenial or Homogenial with the Root, and the Branches; his meaning is, that the Root, Stock, and Branches, are not only of One Kind, but also all together make up, the Entire Essence of One Plant or Tree. In like manner, those Three Hypotheses, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are not only Congenial and Coessential, as having all the Essence of the Godhead alike in them, but also as Concurrently making up one Entire Divinity: Accordingly, whereunto Athanasius further concludes, that these Three Divine Hypotheses have not a Common Sense of Will only, but Essentially one and the Self Same Will, and that they do also jointly produce ad extra, μίαν ἐνέγειαν, One and the
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Epist. 4 Scap. Self-same Energy, Operation or Action; nothing being Peculiar to the Son as such, but only the Oeconomy of the Incarnation: "ορθοος ευ-
αντι αναληγετε διδ τη φυση και τας εντολες και και υπεριχε 
ο γε πατερ οι τη θεος 
εν την πνευματι την αγια 
tην πνευματι την πνευματι και εν την εν-
τολην την αγιαν 
εκκλησιαν και θεον 
cαι οι το ανθρωπον εν τη 
εντολην και εν τη πνευματι 
cαι εν την αγιαν εκκλησιαν και εν την 
πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν και εν την 
πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησιαν 
cαι εν τη πνευματι την αγιαν εκκλησια

Hitherto hath the Platonick Christian endeavoured partly to Rectify and Reform the True and Genuine Platonick Trinity, and partly to Reconcile it, with the Doctrine of the Ancient Church. Nevertheless, to prevent all mistakes, we shall here declare, that wherefover this most Genuine Platonick Trinity, may be found to differ, not only from the Scripture it self (which yet notwithstanding is the sole Rule of Faith) but also from the Form of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Councils; and further from the Doctrine of Athanasius too, in his Genuine writings, (whether it be in their Inequality, or in any thing else) is there utterly disclaimed and rejected by us. For as for that Creed commonly called Athanasian, which was written a long time after, by some other hand; since at first it derived all its authority, either from the Name of Athanasius to whom it was Entituled, or else because it was supposed to be an Epitome and Abridgement of his Doctrine; this (as we conceive) is therefore to be interpreted according to the Tenour of that Doctrine, contained in the Genuine Writings of Athanasius. Of whom we can think no otherwise, than as a person highly Instrumental and Serviceable to Divine Providence for the preserving of the Christian Church, from lapsing by Arianism, into a kind of Paganick and Idolatrous Christianity; in Religiously Worshipping of those, which themselves concluded to be Creatures; and by means of whom especially, the Doctrine of the Trinity, (which before fluctuated in some loose Uncertainty) came to be more punctually Stated and Settled.

Now the Reason why we introduced the Platonick Christian here thus Apologizing, was First, because we conceived it not to be the Interest of Christianity, that the ancient Platonick Trinity, should be made more discrepant from the Christian, than indeed it is. And Seco
Besides which, Another Reason for this Apology of the Chriftian Platonift was, because as the Platonifc Pagans after Chriftianity, did approve of the Chriftian Doctrine concerning the Logos, as that which was exactly agreeable with their own; so did the Generality of the Chriftian Fathers, before and after the Nicene Council, represent the Chriftian, Platonifc Trinity, as really the fame thing with the Chriftian; or as approaching so near to it, that they differed chiefly in Circumstances, or the manner of Expression. The Former of these is evident from that famous Paffage of Amelius Contemporary with Jonas, recorded by Enchius, St. Cyril and Theodoret, that he what the Logos or Word, by whom Existing from Eternity according to Heraclitus, all things were made: and whom that Chriftian also placeth in the rank and dignity of a Principle, affirming unto have been with God, and to be God, and that all things were made by him, and that whatsoever was made, was Life and Being in him. Also that he descended into a Body, and being clothed in Flesh, appeared as a Man, though not without demonstration of the Divinity of Nature. But that afterwards being Loosed or Separated from the five, he was Deified, and became God again, such as he was before he came down into a Mortal Body. In which words Amelius speaks favourably of the Incarnation of that Eternal Logos. And the fame is further manifelt from what St. AUin writeth concerning a Platonift in his C.D.L. &c.

Initiati Saneti Evangelii, cui nomen est secundum Johannem, 15.

XX 2 quidam
The Fathers Senate of the Book 1
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quidam Platonicius, sicut a Seno Simpliciano, qui posse Mediolanens, Ecclcsiis prefedit Episcopus, soluhamus audire, aures Litteris conferendo, & per omnes Ecclesiis in locis eminentissimis proponendam esse elicebat: We have often heard, from that holy man Simplicianus, afterward Bishop of Millan, that a certain Platonist affirmed, the beginning of St. John's Gospel, deferred to be written in Letters of Gold, and to be set up in all the most eminent places throughout the Christian Church.

And the latter will sufficiently appear from these following Testimonies: Justus Martyr, in his Apology affirmeth of Plato, ο' ἀθέτηται μέγεθος τος οὗ καὶ δύναμις τῆς λεγομεν καθ' εἰς τοῖς ἀληθείας τις πεποιημεν, &c. That he gave the Second place to the Word of God, and the Third to that Spirit, which is said to have moved upon the waters. Clemens Alexandrinus speaking of that passage in Plato's Second Epistle to Dionysius, concerning the First, Second and Third, writeth thus: η Ἀλήθεια ἔσχων ἡ Ἰερα, ἥ τινες ἀγαθος θέλοντες, ζητοῦσιν μεν αὕτη το ήγομεν πνεύμα, ἐνδοιασάτε ἕνας & ἄλλο το ἀληθείαν; & το οἷόν, ἐνδοιασάτε τὸ ἀληθείαν το πεποιημεν: I understand this no otherwise, than that the Holy Trinity is signified thereby, the Third being the Holy Ghost, and the Second the Son by whom all things were made, according to the Will of the Father. Origens also affirmeth the Son of God to have been plainly spoken of by Plato in his Epistle to Hermias and Coriscus, ο' πατὴ ἐνποιηλαμβανεν εἰς τοιαύτης κατάς, η πολλαν ἐν πλάσματι ἐνδοιεος ίνα, ἐνδοιασάτε το τος ἀλήθειαν, ἐνδοιασάτε τον ἐπι σου ἀληθεῖαν, τον πατην λεγομεν η το πεποιημεν η κοσμου κατάς ινας. Cellus who pretended to know all things, and who cited so many other passages out of Plato, doth purposely (as I suppose) dissemble and conceal, that which he wrote concerning the Son of God, in his Epistle to Hermias and Coriscus; where he calleth him, the God of the whole Universe, and the Prince of all things both present and future; afterwards speaking of the Father of this Prince and Cause. And again elsewhere in that Book, he writeth to the same purpose, ἡ λὰ εἰς οἰκονομίας το το ἐπί σου πλάσμα αι τοι ο瞀θελές λει- γαθές, τον τον αναφέρειν εἰς τοιαύτης, τον το οἷόν μενῳ ἐπι σου γραφειν, ἐνδοιασάτε το τον ἀληθείαν, το τον πατην λεγομεν, τον πατην εἰς τοιαύτης, τον πατην εἰς τοιαύτης. Neither would Cellus (here speaking of Chriftians making Christ the Son of God) take any notice of that passage in Plato's Epistle before mentioned, ed. concerning the Creator and Governor of the whole world, at being the Son of God; lest he should be compelled by the Authority of Plato whom he so often magnifieth, to agree with this Doctrin of ours, that the Demiurgus of the whole World is the Son of God; but the First and Supreme Deity, his Father. Moreover St. Cyprian, or who ever wer the Author of the Book inscribed De Spiritu Sancto, affirmeth, the Platonists First and Universal Hynde, to be the same with the Holy Ghost in the Christian Theology; in thefe words, Hujus Sempttern Virtus & Divinitas, cum in propria natura, ab lnqpositoribus Municantium Philosophiis proprii investigari non posset; Substilissimi taminiituii coniecturis Compositionem Mundi, & distinguishit Elementorumque fedimenta, presenti omnis Animam adjuvies dixierunt; quibus, sedumdum genus & ordinem singularum, vitam preberet & notum, & i transgressibiles fideret Metas, & Stabilitatem assignares; & Univers
Genuine Platonick Trinity.

In the next place Eusebius Caesarifer gives a full and clear Testimony, of the Concordance and Agreement of the Pluto-

asick, at least as to the main, with the Christian Trinity, which he will have to have been the Cabala of the ancient Hebrews, thus: 

For Eusebius, this is the use of the ancient Cabala, which is in accordance with the Cabala of the early Christians, who were influenced by it.

Jain bunc Vitam, bunc matum, bunc resum Essentialis, Animam Mundii vocaverunt. In the next place Eusebius Caesarifer gives a full and clear Testimony, of the Concordance and Agreement of the Platonick, at least as to the main, with the Christian Trinity, which he will have to have been the Cabala of the ancient Hebrews, thus: 

The Oracles of the Hebrews, placing the Holy Ghost, after the Father and the Son, in the Third Rank; and acknowledging a Holy and Blessed Trinity after this manner: so as that this Third Power does also transcend all Created Nature; and is the First of those Intellectual Substances, which proceed from the Son, and the Third from the First Cause: see how Plato Enigmatically declarte the same things in his Epistle to Dionysius, in these words, &c. These things the Interpreters of Plato refer to a First God, and to a Second Cause, and to a Third the Soul of the World, which they call also the Third God. And the Divine Scriptures in like manner rank the Holy Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the place or degree of a Principle. But it is most observable what Athanasius himself affirmeth of the Platonists; that though they derived the Second Hypostasis of their Trinity from the First, and the Third from the Second, yet they supposed both their Second and Third Hypostases, to be Uncreated; and therefore does he fend the Arians to School thither, who because there is but one Athanasius, One Self-Originated Being, would unskillfully conclude, that the Word or Son of God, must therefore needs be a Creature. Thus in his Book concerning the Decrees of the Nicene Council; he hath so far as he is able, to pluck up the Platonists, in their Speculations, as to the Trinity, what He, by the Son, and by the Holy Ghost, is made, that is, Unbegotten and Uncreated; and the Second Person of the Trinity,
The Cabala of the Tr. Book I.

nity, the Son or Word of God, though acknowledged by him, not to be *Agennetes* Unbegotten (he being Begotten of the Father, who is the only Agenneter) yet is he here said to be *Agennetes* Uncreated; he declaring the Platonists, thus to have affirmed the Second and Third Hypotheses of their Trinity, not to be Creatures, but Uncreated. Which Signal Testimony of Athanasius, concerning the Platonick Trinity is a great Vindication of the same. We might here further add, St. Austin's Confession also, that God the Father, and God the Son, were by the Platonists acknowledged in like manner, as by the Christians; though concerning the Holy Ghost, he observes some difference, between Plotinus and Porphyrius, in that the Former did Postpone Animae Naturam Paterno Intellectui, the Latter, Interponere; Plotinus did Postpone his Pylech or Soul after the Paternal Intellect, but Porphyrius Interposed it, between the Father and the Son, as a Middle between both. It was before observed, that St. Cyril of Alexandria, affirmeth nothing to be wanting to the Platonick Trinity, but only that Homousiotes of his and some other Fathers in that Age, that they should not only all be God or Uncreated, but also Three Coequal Individuals, under the same Ultimate Species, as Three Individual Men; he conceiving that Gradual Subordination that is in the Platonick Trinity, to be a certain tang of Ariusism. Nevertheless he thus concludes, τολο τη ημιδαν αλεστας τι αληθες, That Plato notwithstanding was not altogether ignorant of the Truth, but that he had the knowledge of the Only Begotten Son of God, as likewise of the Holy Ghost, called by him Pylech; and that he would have every way expressed himself rightly, had he not been afraid of Anius and Melitus, and that Poison which Socrates drank. Now whether this were a Fault or no, in the Platonists, that they did not suppose their Hypotheses to be Three Individuals under the same Ultimate Species, we leave to others to judge. We might here add the Testimony of Chalcedon, because he is unquestionably concluded to have been a Christian; though his Language indeed be too much Paganical, when he calls the Three Divine Hypotheses, a Chief, a Second, and a Third God; if in rei dispositionis talis mente concipienda est 5 Originem quidem rerum esse Summum & Ineffabilem Deus; post Providentiam ejus Secundum Deum, Latorem Legis utrisque Vita tam Eternae quam Temporaria; Tertium esse porro Substantiam que Secunda Mens, Intelleculique dicatur, quaeque edam Cystos Legis Eternae. His Subjicit afferre Rationabiles Animas, Legi Obsequentes, Miniftrarum ve-ro Potestates; &c. Ergo Summus Deus judex, Secundus ordinat, Tertius intimat. Anima vero Legem agent. This thing is to be considered after this manner; That the First Original of Things is the Supreme and Ineffable God; after his Providence a Second God, the Eftablisher of the Law of Life both Eternal and Temporal; and the Third (which is also a Substance, and called a Second Mind or Intellecul) is a certain Keeper of this Eternal Law. Under these Three, are Rational Souls, Subject to that Law, together with the Ministerial Powers, &c.; So that the Sovereign or Supreme God Commands, the Second Orders, and the Third executes. But Souls are Subject to the Law, Where Chalcedon though seemeth indeed rather more a Platonist, than a Christian; yet acknowledged no such Beings as Henades and Noes; but only Three Divine Hypotheses, and under them Rational Souls. But we shall conclude with the Testimonies...
Wherefore we cannot but take notice here of a Wonderful Providence of Almighty God, that this Doctrine of a Trinity of Divine Hypothesis, should find such Admittance and Entertainment in the Pagan World, and be received by the wisest of all their Philosophers, before the times of Christianity; thereby to prepare a more easy way for the Reception of Christianity amongst the Learned Pagans. Which that it proved successful accordingly, is undeniable evident from the Monuments of Antiquity. And the Junior Platonists, who were most opposite and adverse to Christianity, became at length so sensible hereof, that besides their other Adulterations of the Trinity before mentioned, for the countenancing of their Polytheism and Idolatry, they did in all probability for this very reason, quite innovate, change and pervert the whole Cabala, and no longer acknowledge a Trinity, but either a Quadernity or a Quinary, or more of Divine Hypotheses. They first of all contending, that before the Trinity, there was another Supreme and Highest Hypothesis, not to be reckoned with the others, but standing alone by itself. And we conceive, the first Innovator in this kind, to have been Januarius, who in his Egyptian Mysteries, where he seems to take the Egyptian Theology to agree with his own Hypotheses, wrote in this manner:

...
Principle, and the God of Gods, a Monad from the first One, before all Essence. Where so far as we can understand, Jamblichus his meaning is, that there is a Simple Unity in order of Nature before that Tagathon, or Monad, which is the First of the Three Divine Hypostases. And this Doctrine was afterward taken up by Proclus, he declaring it in this manner, "πως τὰ ἐπίσημα ἂν ὑπεραχθῆναι τοῖς ἀνάρχουσιν ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τὰ πληθυνότα ἀπὸ τοῦ πληθυσμοῦ τοῦ ἷοῦ ἐπεξεργασμένοι τῶν πληθυσμῶν." Proclus declaring it in this manner, in this manner. Plato every where aforesaid from multitude to Unity, from whence also the order of the Many proceeds, but before Plato and according to the Natural order of things, One is before Multitude and every Divine order begins from a Monad. Wherefore though the Divine Number proceed in a Trinity, yet before this Trinity must there be a Monad. Let there be Three Demiurgical Hypostases; nevertheless before these must there be One, because none of the Divine orders, begins from Multitude. We conclude, that the Demiurgical Number, does not begin from a Trinity, but from a Monad, standing alone by it self before that Trinity. Here Proclus, though endeavouring to gain some countenance for this doctrine out of Plato, yet as fearing lest that should fail him, does he fly to the order of Nature, and from thence would infer, that before the Trinity of Demiurgical Hypostases, there must be a Single Monad or Henad standing alone by it self, as the Head thereof. And St. Cyril of Alexandria, who was Junior to Jamblichus but Senior to Proclus, seems to take notice of this Innovation in the Platonick Theology, as a thing then newly crept up, and after the time of Porphyry: ἡ τοιαύτης ἢ ἡ προερχόμενη καὶ πρὸς τὸ τοῦτο ἄντιλογον, ἢ ὁ πρῶτος ἡ τοιαύτης ἡ τοῖς ὁμολογούσις τοῖς ἢ πρὸς τὸ τοιαύτης ἢ χρηστίνης τοῖς υἱοθέτησις 'απὸ τῆς ὁμολογίας τῆς τριάδος μιᾶς. But those before mentioned, contradicted this Doctrine of Porphyry & the ancient Platonists, affirming that the Tagathon ought not to be con numerated or reckoned together, with those which proceed from it, but b exempted from all Communion, because it is altogether Simple and unca pable of any Commixture or Consociation with any other. Wherefor these begin their Trinity with Nous or Intellect, making that the First. The only difference here is, that Jamblichus seems to make the first Hypostasis of the Trinity after a Monad, to be Tagathon, but St. Cyril of Nous. However they both meant the same thing, as also did Proclus after them. Wherefore it is evident, that when from the time of the Nicene Council and Athanasius, the Christian Doctrine of the Trin ity came to be punctually stated and settled, and much to be infuse upon by Christians, Jamblichus and other Platonists, who were great Antagonists of the same, perceiving what advantage the Chi stians had from the Platonick Trinity, then first of all Innovated this Doctrine, introducing a Quaternity of Divine Hypostases, instead a Trinity, the First of them being not Coordinate with the other Three nor Consecrated or Reckoned with them: But All of them, though Subordinate, yet Universal, and such as Comprehend the whol
that is, Infinite and Omnipotent; and therefore none of them Creatures. For it is certain, that before this time, or the Age that Zamblicius lived in, there was no such thing at all dream'd of by any Platonists as an Unity before and above the Trinity, and so a Quaternity of Divine Hypostases: Platonius positively determining, that there could neither be More nor Fewer than Three; and Proclus himself acknowledging the Ancient Tradition or Cabala, to have run only of Three Gods; and Numenius, who was Junior to them both, writing thus of Socrates, Euph. E.F. I'm. 

Moreover the same Proclus, besides his Henades and Noes before mentioned, added certain other Phantaftick Trinities of his own also, as this for example, of the First Essence, the First Life, and the First Intellect; (to omit others) whereby that Ancient Cabala and Tradition, Theology of Divine Tradition, of Three Archial Hypostases, and no more, was disfigured, perverted, and adulterated.

But besides this Advantage from the ancient Pagan Platonists and Pythagoreans, admitting a Trinity into their Theology, in like manner as Christianity doth (whereby Christianity was the more recommended to the Philofohick Pagans) there is another Advantage of the same extending even to this present time, probably not Unintended into by Divine Providence; That whereas Bold and Conceited Wits precipitantly condemning the Doctrine of the Trinity for Nonence, absolute Repugnancy to Humane Faculties and Impossibility, have therupon some of them quite shaken off Christianity and all Revealed Religion; professing only Theism; others have frustrated the Design thereof by aganizing it into Creature-Worship or Idolatry; this Ignorant and Conceited Confidence of both, may be retarded and confused from hence, because the most ingenious and acute of all the Pagan Philosophers, the Platonists and Pythagoreans, who had no by-als at all upon them, nor any Scripture Revelation, might seem to impose upon their Faculties, and followed the free Sentiments and Dictates of their own Minds, did notwithstanding not only entertain this Trinity of Divine Hypostases Eternal and Uncreated, but were also fond of the Aposlhes; and made it a main Fundamental of their Theology.

It now appears from what we have declared, that as to the Ancient and Genuine Platonists and Pythagoreans, none of their Trinity of Gods, Divine Hypostases were Independent, so neither were they any Creature-Gods, but Uncreated; they being all of them not only Eternal, and Necessarily Existent, and Immutable, but also Universal, that Infinite and Omnipotent; Causes, Principles, and Creators of the Whole World. From whence it follows that these Platonists could not justly be taxed for Idolatry, in giving Religious Worship to each Hypostasis of this their Trinity. And we have the rather insisted so long upon this Platonick Trinity, because we shall make use of this Doctrine afterwards, in our Defence of Christianity, where we are to shew; That one Grand Design of Christianity, being to abolish the...
Pagan Idolatry, or Creature-Worship, it self cannot justly be charged with the same, from that Religious Worship given to our Saviour Christ, and the Trinity, (the Son and Holy Ghost) they being none of them, according to the true and Orthodox Christianity, Creatures; however the Arian Hypothesis made them such. And this was indeed, the Grand ReaL'on, why the Ancient Fathers, so zealously opposed Arianism, because That Christianity, which was intended by God Almighty, for a means to extirpate Pagan Idolatry, was thereby it self Paganized and Idolatrized, and made highly guilty of that very thing, which it so much condemned in the Pagan, that is Creature-Worship. This might be proved by fundry testimonies, of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Hilary, Ambrose, Ausine, Faustinus, and Cyril of Alexandria; all of them charging the Arians, as guilty of the very same Idolatry with the Gentiles or Pagans, in giving Religious Worship even to the Word and Son of God himself (and consequen'tly to our Saviour Christ) as he was supposer them to be but a Creature. But we shall content our selves here, only to cite one remarkable passage out of Athanasius in his Fourth Oratio against the Arians, ad loc 

P. 468, 469.

...
Hypotheses, affirmed by him to be all Uncreated, were by them look’d upon, only as One entire Divinity.

But the Principal Things, which we shall observe from this Passage of Athanasius, and those many other places of the Fathers, where they parallel the Arians with the Pagans, making the former guilty of the very same Idolatry with the Latter, even then when they worshipped our Saviour Christ himself, or the Word and Son of God, as he was by them supposed to be nothing but a Creature, are these following; First, That it is here plainly declared by them, that the generality of the Pagans, did not worship a Multitude of Independent Gods, but that only One of their Gods was Uncreated or Self-Existent, and all the other Many Gods, look’d upon by them as his Creatures. This as it is expressly affirmed by Athanasius here, that the Greeks or Pagans, did ένετρος και παλινος γινομε ν ανειλιν, Worship only One Uncreated, and Many Created Gods, so is it plainly implied by all those other forementioned Fathers, who charge the Arians with the Guilt of Pagan Idolatry; because had the Pagans worshipped Many Uncreated and Independent Gods, it would not therefore follow, that the Arians were Idolaters, if the Pagans were. But that this was indeed the case of the Fathers, both before and after the Nicene Council, concerning the Pagan Polytheism and Idolatry, that it confin’d or in worshiping Many Uncreated and Independent Gods, but only One Uncreated and Many Created; hath been already otherwise manifested; and it might be further confirmed by many Tertimonies of them; as this of Saint Gregory Nazianzen in 37. Oration; Τι δαι εις και περι ελλιπη φαεν αν μια οικος, διε φολοπατειν τις εχινας φιλοπατεις; What then would one say, is there but One Divinity also amidst the Pagans, as they who Philosophize more fully and perfectly amongst them do declare? And that full and remarkable One of Trenexus, where he plainly affirmeth of the Gentiles; A Creature potius quam Creatori servivabit, Qv his qui non sunt Di; L. 2. c. 7.

Primum Deitatis Locum attribuenter, Uni alicui & Summo Fabrica, hujus Universitatis Deo 5; That they so served the Creature, and those who are not Gods, rather than the Creator; that notwithstanding they attributed the First place of the Deity, to One certain Supreme God, the Maker of this Universe. The second thing is, that Athanasius and all the other Orthodox Fathers, who charged the Arians with Pagan Idolatry, did thereby plainly imply, Those not to be Uncapable of IDOLO, who worship One Sovereign Numen, or acknowledge One Supreme Deity, the Maker of the whole World; since not only the Arians unquestionably did so, but also according to these Fathers, the very Pagans themselves. The Third Thing is, that in the Judgement of Athanasius, and all the Orthodox Anti-Arian Fathers, to give Religious Worship to any Created Being whatsoever, though Inferior to the worship, which is given to the Supreme God, and therefore according to the Modern Distinction, not λατοσεα, but d’ αλεξ, is absolutely, Idolatry. Because it is certain, that the Arians gave much an Invidious worship, to Christ the Son or Word of God, whom they pretended to be a mere Creature, Made in Time, Mutable and Defective, than they did to that Eternal God, who was the Creator of
him. As those Fathers imply, the Pagans themselves to have given much an Inferior Worship, to their many Gods, whom themselves looked upon, as Creatures, than they did in &Nabt, To that One Uncreated God.

Now if the Arians, who zealously contended for the Unity of the Godhead, were nevertheless, by the Fathers condemned, as guilty of Idolatry, for bestowing but an Inferior kind of Religious Worship, upon Christ the Son of God himself, as he was supposed by them to be a Creature; then certainly they cannot be excused from that Guilt, who bestowed Religious Worship, upon these other Creatures, Angels and Souls of men, though Inferior to what they give to the Supreme Omnipotent God, the Creator of all. Because the Son of God, however conceived by these Arians to be a Creature, yet was looked upon by them as the First, the most Glorious, and most Excellent of all Creatures, and that by which as an Instrument, all other Creatures, as Angels and Souls, were made: and therefore if it were Idolatry in them, to give an Inferior kind of Religious Worship, to this Son and Word of God himself, according to their Hypothesis, then can it not possibly be accounted less, to bestow the fame upon those other Creatures, Made by him, as Angels and Men deceased. Besides which, the Word and Son of God, howsoever supposed by these Arians to be a Creature, yet was not Really such; and is in Scripture unquestionably declared to be a True Object of Religious Worship (Worship him all ye Gods) so that the Arians though Formally Idolaters, according to their own falfe Hypothesis; yet were not Materially and Really so: whereas these Religious Angel-and Saint-Worshippers, must be as well Materially as Formally such. And here it is observable, that these Ancient Fathers made no such Distinction of Religious Worship, into Latria, as peculiar to the Supreme God, it being that whereby he is adored as Self-Existent and Omnipotent, or the Creator of all; and Dulia, such an Inferior Religious Worship, as is communicable to Creatures; but concluded of Religious Worship Universally, and without Distinction, that the due Object of it all was the Creator only and not any Creature. Thus Athanasius plainly in his Third Oration, ει γας τη της Ευρεξείας περσεκεινε, κανενακα την ηλελοχη- ταν, ει πορεία περσεκεινε, αλλα ει την ητος, κτισματι γα κτωμα ακα περσεκεινε, αλλα κτωμα Ρως. If the Son or Word of God were to be Worshipped, (though a Creature) because transcending us in glory and dignity, then ought every Inferior Being to Worship what is Superior to it: Where as the case is otherwise: For a Creature doth not Religious Worship, but only God the Creator. Now they who distinguished Religious Worship, into Latria and Dulia, must needs suppose the Object of it in general, to be that which is Superior to us, and not the Creature only; which is here contradicted by Athanasius. But because it was objected against these Orthodox Fathers by the Arians, that the Humanity of our Saviour Christ, which is unquestionably a Creature, doth share in their Religious Worship also; it is worth the while to see what account Athanasius gives of this: ει κτωμα περσεκεινε, ει γα κτωμα κατα τοις ητοις η και η, τοις άλλα και κτωμα ακα. If a Creature is looked upon in that Sense, which the Arians suppose, then this Answer will not be of any Service.
CHAP. IV. The Divinity in Christ.
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...and acknowledge Polytheifm, and even confidered to alone, divided from the Word, nor yet intending to worship the Word, do we remove it, at a great distance from this flesh, but knowing that of the Scripture, The Word was made Flefh, we look upon this Word even in the Flefh as God. And again to the fame purpose, P. 160,

...know, at length, that we who Worship the Lord in Flefh, Worship no Creature, but only the Creator clothed with a Creaturely Body. And for the fame caufe was it that Necejfis afterwards, dividing the Word from the Flefh, the Divinity of Christ from the Humanity, and not acknowledging such an Hypoftick Union between them as he ought, but nevertheless Religiously Worshipping our Saviour Christ, was therefore branded by the Christian Church, with the Name of Arian, or Arian-Worshipper, or Idolater. To conclude, they who excufe themselves from being Idolaters no otherwise, than because they do not give that very fame Religious Worship, to Saints and Angels, which is peculiar to God Almighty, and conflites in honouring him as Self-Existent, and the Creator of all things, but acknowledge those others to be Creatures; Suppose that to be Necessary to Idolatry, which is Absolutely impossible, viz. to acknowledge more Omnipotents as Creators of all than One, or to account Creatures as such Creators; as they imply all thofe to be Uncapable of Idolatry, who acknowledge One Supreme God the Creator of the whole World; which is directly contradictory to the Doctrine of the Ancient Church.

Hitherto in way of Answer to an Atheiftick Objection, against the Naturallity of the Idea of God, as including Onelines in it, from the aghan Polytheifm, have we largely proved, that at leaft the Civilized and Intelligent Pagans, generally acknowledged One Sovereign Namer, and that their Polytheifm was partly but Phantastical, nothing but the Polygony of one Supreme God, or the Worshipping him under different Names and Notions according to his several Vertues and Manifestations. And that though besides this they had another Natural and Real Polytheifm also; yet this was only of Many Inferior or Created Gods, Subordinate to One Supreme 'Aye·w·o-gr, or Uncreated.

A Which notwithstanding, is not fo to be understood, as if we did contently affirm, that Opinion of Many Independent Deities, never to have so much as entred into the Mind of any Mortal. For since Human Nature is fo Mutable and Depravable, as that notwithstanding the Connot Idea and Proceps of God in the Minds of Men, some unreasonably do degenerate and lapfe into Atheifm; there can be no
reason why it should be thought absolutely impossible, for any ever
to entertain that false Conceit of More Independent Deities. But as
for Independent Gods Invisible, we cannot trace the footsteps of such a
Polytheism as this, anywhere, nor find any more than a Ditheism, of
a Good and Evil Principle: Only Thilo and others seem to have con-
ceived, That amongst the ancient Pagans, some were so grossly fottish,
as to suppose a Plurality of Independent Gods Visible, and to take the
Sun, and Moon, and all the Stars for Such. However, if there were
any such, and these Writers were not mistaken, as it frequently hap-
pened, it is certain that they were but very few, because amongst the
most Barbarian Pagans at this day, there is hardly any Nation to be
found, without an acknowledgment of a Sovereign Deity, as appears
from all those Discoveries which have been made of them, since the
improvement of Navigation.

Wherefore what hath been hitherto declared by us, might well be
thought a sufficient Answer to the forementioned Atheistical Objection,
against the Idea of God. Notwithstanding which, when we wrote
the Contents of this Chapter, we intended a further Account, of the
Natural and Real Polytheism of the Pagans, and their Multifarious Idolatry,
chiefly in order to the Vindication of the Truth of Christianity
against Atheists: forasmuch as one grand Design hereof, was unques-
tionably, to destroy the Pagan Polytheism and Idolatry, which consisted
in Worshipping the Creature besides the Creator.

But we are very Sensible, that we have been surprized in the Length
of this Chapter, which is already swelled into a Disproportionate Big-
ness; by means whereof we cannot comprehend within the compass
of this Volume, all that belongs to the Remaining Contents, together
with such a Full and Copious Confutation of the Atheistical Grounds, as
was intended. Wherefore we shall here Divide the Chapter, and re-
serve those Remaining Contents together, with a further Confutation of
Atheism, for another Volume, which God affording Life, Health, and
Leisure, we intend shall follow. Only subjoyning in the mean time, a
Short and Compendious Confutation, of all the Atheistical Arguments pro-
posed:
A

CONFUTATION

OF

ATHEISM.

CHAP. V.

Having in the Second Chapter revealed all the Dark Mysteries of Atheism, and produced the utmost strength of that Cause; and in the Third, made an Introduction to the Confutation of those Atheistical Grounds, by representing all the several Forms and Schemes of Atheism, and shewing both their Disagreements amongst themselves, and wherein they all agree together against Theists; We have been hitherto prevented, of that full and Copious Confutation of them, intended by us, by reason of that large Account given, of the Pagan Polytheism; which yet was no Imptinent Digression neither, it removing the Grand Objection against the Naturality of the Idea of God, as including One of it, in so also preparing a way for that Defence of Christianity, designed by us against Atheists. Wherefore that we may not here be quite excluded, of what was principally intended, we shall subjoin a Contracted and Cpandious Confutation, of all the Premised Atheistical Principles. The First whereof was this: That either men have no Idea of God at all, or else none but such as is Compounded and Made up of Impossible and Contradictious Notions; from whence these Atheists would in Him, to be an Unconceivable Nothing. In Answer whereunto, there hath been something done already, it being declared in the Beginning of the Fourth Chapter, what the Idea of God is, viz. A Perfect Understanding Nature, Necessarily Self-Existant, and the Cause of another things. And as there is Nothing either Unconceivable, or Contradictious in this Idea, so have we shewed, that these Confounded Atheists, do not only at the same time, when they verbally deny an Idea of God, implicitly acknowledge and confess it, for as much as otherwise, denying his Existence, they should deny the Existence of Nothing; but also that they agree with Theists in this very Idea, it being the only thing which Atheists Contend for, That the First Original
and Head of all things, is no Perfect Understanding Nature, but that all sprung from Tohu and Bohu, or Dark and Sensible Matter Forcibly moved. Moreover we have not only thus declared the Idea of God, but also largely proved, and made it clearly evident, that the Generality of Mankind in all Ages, have had a Prophesy or Anticipation in their Minds, concerning the Real and Actual Existence of such a Being: the Pagans themselves, besides their other Many Gods (which were Understanding Beings Superior to men,) acknowledging One Chief and Sovereign Numen, the Maker of them all, and of the Whole World. From whence it plainly appears, that those few Atheists, that formerly have been, and still are, here and there up and down in the World, are no other than the Monsters and Anomalies of Humane Kind. And this alone might be sufficient, to repel the First Atheistical Assault, made against the Idea of God.

Nevertheless, that we may not seem to dissemble any of the Atheistical Strength, we shall here Particularly declare, all their most Colourable Pretences, against the Idea of God, and then shew the Folly and Invalidity of them. Which Pretences are as follow: First, That we have no Idea nor Thought of any thing not Subject to Corporeal Sense; nor the least Evidence of the Existence of any thing, but from the same. Secondly, That Theists themselves acknowledging God to be incomprehensible, may be from thence inferred to be a Non-Entity. Thirdly, That the Theists Idea of God including Infinity in it, is therefore absolutely Unconceivable and Impossible. Fourthly, That Theology is an Arbitraneous Complement of Inconsistent and Contradictory Notions; and Lastly, That the Idea and Existence of God owes all its being, either to the Confounded Non-Sense of Astonished Minds; or else to the Fiction and Impudence of Politicians.

We begin with the First. That we can have no Idea, Conception, or Thought of any thing, not Subject to Sense; nor the least Evidence of the Existence of any thing, but from the same. Thus a Modern Atheistical Writer says, Whatsoever we can conceive, hath been perceived first by Sense, either at once or in parts; and a man can have no Thought representing any thing not Subject to Sense. From whence it follows, that whatsoever is not Sensible and Imaginable, is utterly unconceivable and to us Nothing. Moreover the same Writer adds, That the only Evidence which we have of the Existence of any thing, is from Sense; the Consequence whereof is this, That there being no Corporeal Sense of a Deity, there can be no Evidence at all of his Existence. Wherefore according to the Tenour of the Atheistical Philosophy, all is Resolved into Sense; as the only Criterion of Truth, accordingly as Protagoras in Plato's Theaetetus concludes, Knowledge to be Sense; and a late Writer of our own determines, Sense to be Original Knowledge. Here have we a wide Ocean before us, but we must Contraét our Sayls, Were Sense, Knowledge and Understanding; then he that sees Light and Colours, and feels Heat and Cold, would understand Light and Colours, Heat and Cold, and the like of all other Sensible Things: neither would there be any Philosophy at all concerning them. Whereas the Mind of man remaineth altogether unsatisfied, concerning the Natur
of these Corporeal Things, even after the Strongest Sensations of them, and is but thereby awakened, to a further Philosophick Enquiry and Search about them, what this Light and Colours, this Heat and Cold, &c. Really should be; and whether they be indeed Qualities in the Objects without us, or only Phantasms and Sensations in our selves. Now it is certain, that there could be no Sufficion of any such thing as this, were Sense the Highest Faculty in us; neither can Sense it self ever decide this Controversie; since one Sense cannot judge of another, or correct the Error of its all Sense as such, (that is, as Imancy and Apparition) being alike True. And had not these Atheists been Notorious Dunces, in that Atomick Philosophy which they so much pretend to, they would clearly have learnt from thence, That Sense is not Knowledge and Understanding, nor the Criterion of Truth as to Sensible things themselves; it reaching not to the Essence or Absolute Nature of them, but only taking notice of their Outside, and perceiving its own Passions from them, rather than the Things themselves: And that there is a Higher Faculty in the Soul, of Reason and Understanding, which judges of Sense, detects the Phantast and Imposition of it; discovers to us that there is nothing in the Objects themselves like to those forementioned Sensible Ideas; and resolves all Sensible Things into Intelligible Principles; and the Ideas whereof are not Foreign and Adventitious, and mere Passive Impressions upon the Soul from without; but Native and Devised to it, or Actively Exerted from the Soul it self: no Passion being able to make a Judgment either of it self or other things. This being so Evident, that Democritus him self could not but take Notice of it, and acknowledge it, though he made not a right use of it; he in all Probability, continuing notwithstanding a Confused and Etablished Atheist: Sextus Empiricus having recorded this of him, in this manner: Εις τοις καθεν δει φανερω τινες γνωσις; τω μη δει τι τηλεσθον, τω δει διανοιας. Συν τω μερι δει η διανοιας γνωσιν κατελθειν, προσμαχηστας αυτην την εις αληθειας καταγειν, τω δει την αληθειας σωσις ὑπομενει, ἀληθειας αυτης το προς διεγενος, τος αληθινας αληθειας λεγει την αληθεια, γιαραι το εις ιδιας η μερι δει και την αληθειας σωσις της, το δει ἀληθειας. Το δει της ἀληθειας σωσις της ἀληθειας. Ρετω. Οις τα δει της ἀληθειας σωσις της ἀληθειας. 

Democritus in his own affermation, that there are Two kinds of Knowledges, One by the Sense, and another by the Mind. Of which that by the Mind is only Acquired Knowledge, he bearing witness to the Faithfulness and Firmness thereof, for the Judgment of Truth. The other by the Sense, he calleth the Dark, denying it to be a Rule and Measure of Truth. His own words are these. There are Two Species of Knowledge, the One Genuine the other Dark and Obsolete. The Dark and Obsolete Knowledge is Seeing, Hearing, Speaking, Tasting, Touching. But the Genuine Knowledge, is neither Hidden and Recondite. To which purpose there is another Fragment also of this Democritus preferred by the Sage Sextus: Έν γυναικα, τον καλον παιδοι, τον καλον δεκων τον καλον οικον. Αμωμοι δεκων και οικον ο πατριας το πατριας το εις γαρ την θεαματων πατριας. Εις φανερω τον δεκων, Ηττω και θεαματων, are only in Opinion or Phancy. Colour is only in opinion. Atoms and Vacuum are in Truth and Reality. That which is thought to be, are Sensible; these are not according to Truth, but Atoms and Vacuum only. Now
the chief Ground of this Rational Discovery of the ancient Atoms, that Sensible things, as Heat and Cold, Bitter and Sweet, Red and Green, are no Real Qualities in the Objects without, but only our own Phancies, was because in Body, there are no such things Intelligible, but only Magnitude, Figure, Site, Motion and Rest. Of which we have not only Sensible Ideas, Paffively impressed upon us from without, but also, Intelligible Notions, Actively Exerted from the Mind itself. Which Latter notwithstanding, because they are not unaccompanied with Sensible Phantasms, are by many unskilfully confounded with them. But besides thefe, we have other Intelligible Notions or Ideas also, which have no Genuine Phantasms at all belonging to them. Of which whofeover doubts, may easily be satisfièd and convinced, by reading but a Sentence or two, that he understands, in any Book almost that shall come next to his hand; and reflexively examining himself, whether he have a Phantasm or Sensible Idea, belonging to every Word, or no. For whoever is modest and ingenuous, will quickly be forced to confefs, that he meets with many Words, which though they have a Sense or Intelligible Notion, yet have no Genuine Phantasm belonging to them. And we have known some, who were confidently engaged in the other Opinion; being put to read the beginning of Tully's Offices, presently non plust and confounded, in that firt word Quanquam; they being neither able to deny but that there was a Sense belonging to it, nor yet to affirm, that they had any Phantasm thereof, save only of the Sound or Letters. But to prove that there are Cogitations not Subject to Corporeal Sense, we need go no further than this very Idea or Description of God; A Substance, Absolutely Perfect, Infinitely Good, Wise and Powerful, Necessarily Self-existent, and the Cause of all other Things. Where there is not one Word unintelligible, to him that hath any Understanding in him, and yet no Confiderative and Ingenious Person can pretend, that he hath a Genuine Phantasm or Sensible Idea, anfwering to any one of thofe Words; either to Sub- fance, or to Absolutely Perfecr, or to Ininitely, or to Good, or to Wise, or to Powerful, or to Neceffity, or to Self-exiftence, or to Cause or indeed to All, or Other, or Things. Wherefore if it is nothing but want of Meditation, together with a Fond and Sottifh Dottion upon Corporeal Sense, which hath fo far imprefed upon fome, as to make them believe, that they have not the leaft Cognition of any thing, not Subject to Corporeal Sense, or that there is nothing in Humane Understanding or Conception, which was not firft in Bodily Sense; a Doctrine highly favourable to Atheifm. But fince it is certain on the contrary, that we have many Thoughts not Subject to Sense, it is manifest that whofever falls not under External Sense, is not therefore Unconceivable, and Nothing. Which whofever afferts, muft needs affirm, Life and Cognition it felf, Knowledge or Understanding, Reason and Memory, Volition and Appetite, things of the greatest Moment and Reality, to be Nothing but mere Words without any Signification. Nay Phancy and Sense it felf, upon this Hypothefis, could hardly fcape from becoming Non-Entities too, forasmuch as neither Phan- cy nor Sense falls under Sense, but only the Objects of them; we neither seeing Vision, nor feeling Tafition, nor hearing Audition, mu-
We grant indeed that the Evidence of Particular Bodies, existing His & Nunc, without us, doth necessarilily depend upon the Information of Sense: but yet nevertheless the Certainty of this very Evidence, is not from Sense alone, but from a Complication of Reason and Understanding together with it. Were Sense the only Evidence of things, there could be no Absolute Truth and Falsity, nor Certainty at all of any thing: Sense as such being only Relative to Particular Persons, Seeing and Phantastical, and obnoxious to much Delusion. For if our Nerves and Brain be inwardly so moved, and affected, as they would be by such an Object present, when indeed it is absent, and no other Motion or Sensation, in the mean time prevail against it and obliterate it; then must that Object of necessity seem to us present. Moreover those Imaginations, that spring and bubble from the Soul it self, are commonly taken for Sensations by those when asleep, and sometimes in Melancholy and Phrenetical Persons also, when awake. That Atheistical Principle, that there is no evidence at all of any thing as Existing, but only from Corporeal Sense, is plainly contradicted by the Atomick Atheists themselves, when they assert Atom and Vacuum to be the Principles of all things, and the Evidious Images of Bodies to be the Causes both of Sight and Cognition: for Single Atoms, and those Evidious Images, were never seen nor felt; and Vacuum or Empty Space, is so far from being sensible, that these Atheists themselves allow it to be the One Only Corporeal. Wherefore they must here go beyond the Ken of Sense, and appeal to Reason only for the Existence of these Principles: as Theeis, p. 155.

Plato professedly doth,

If we think nothing to exist, but what they can feel with their Fingers, we exclude all that is invisible, out of the Rank of Being. Were Evidence to be allowed to nothing, that doth not fall under Corporeal Sense, then must we deny the Existence of Soul and Mind, in our selves, and others, because we can neither Feel nor See any such thing. Whereas we are certain of the Existence of our own Souls, partly from an inward Consciousness of our own Cognitions, and partly from that Principle of Reason, That, Nothing can not All. And the Existence of other Individual Souls, is manifest to us, from their Effects upon their Respective Bodies, their Motions, Actions, and Discourse. Wherefore since the Atheists cannot deny the Existence of
of Soul or Mind in men, though no such thing fall under External Sense, they have as little Reason to deny, the Existence of a Perfect Mind, prefiding over the Univerfe, without which it cannot be conceived whence our Imperfect ones should be derived. The Existence of that God, whom no Eye hath seen nor can see, is plainly proved by Reason from his Effects, in the Visible Phenomena of the Universe, and from what we are Conscious of within our Selves.

The Second Pretence of Atheifts against the Idea of God, and consequently his Existence, is because Theifts themselves acknowledging God to be Incomprehensible, it may be from thence Inferred, that he is a Non-Entity. Which Argumentation of the Atheifts, supposeth these Two Things, Firft, That what is Incomprehensible, is altogether Unconceivable; and then, that what is Unconceivable, is Nothing. The Latter of which Two, perhaps may be granted to them; That what is So Utterly Unconceivable, as that no Man can frame any manner of Idea or Conception of it, is therefore either in it self, or at least to us, Nothing. Because though that of Protagogus be not true, in his fence, πάλιν χρησακτιν ομότον ἀνθρώπων ἐπι, τα ἰδόν οὐκ ἔστιν, τά δὲ ἤτοι διότι, κατὰ τὴν ἔνν. That Man is the measure of all things, either as Existing or not Existing. He meaning indeed nothing else thereby, but that there was no Absolute Truth or Falshood of any thing, but all was Relative to particular persons, and Phantastical or Seeming only. And though it must not be granted, that whatsoever any man's falilow Understanding, cannot easily and fully comprehend, is therefore presently to be expunged out of the Catalogue of Beings; which is the Reason, or rather Infidelity of the Anti-Trinitaries; yet is there notwithstanding some Truth in that of Aristotle, that λογισμὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος, the Rational Soul or Mind, is in a manner All things; it being able to frame some Idea and Conception or other, of whatsoever is in the Nature of things, and hath either an Actual or Possible Existence, from the very Highteft to the Loweft. Mind and Understanding is as it were a Diaphanous and Crystalline Globe, or a kind of National World, which hath some Reflex Image, and correspondent Ray, or Representation in it, to whatsoever is in the True and Real World of Being. And upon this account may it be said, that whatsoever is in its own Nature Absolutely Unconceivable, is indeed a Non-Entity.

But the Former is absolutely denied by us, That Whatsoever is Incomprehensible is Unconceivable: and therefore when we affirm that God is Incomprehensible, our meaning is only this, that our Imperfect Minds cannot have such a Conception of his Nature, as doth perfectly Master, Conquer, and Subdue that Vast Object under it; or at least is so fully Adequate and Commensurate to the same, as that it doth every way Match and Equalize it. Now it doth not at all follow from hence, because God is thus Incomprehensible to our Finite and Narrow Understandings, that he is utterly Unconceivable by them, for that they cannot frame any Idea at all of him, and he may therefore be concluded to be a Non-Entity. For it is certain, that we cannot fully Comprehend our Selves, and that we have not such an Adequate and Comprehensive Knowledge of the Essence of any Substantial thing, a
that we can perfectly Master and Conquer it. It was a Truth, though abused by the Scepticks, that there is something incomprehensible in the Essence of the Lowest Substances. For even Body it self, which the Atheists think themselves so well acquainted with, because they can feel it with their fingers, and which is the only Substance that they acknowledge either in themselves or the Universe, hath such puzzling Difficulties and Entanglements in the Speculation of it, that they can never be able to extricate themselves from. We might instance also in some Accidental things, as Time and Motion. Truth is Bigger than our Minds, and we are not the Same with it, but have a lower Participation only of the Intellectual Nature, and are rather Apprehenders than Comprehenders thereof. This is indeed One Badge of our Creaturely State, that we have not a perfectly Comprehensible Knowledge, or such as is Adept and Common sense to the Essences of things; from whence we ought to be led to this acknowledgment, that there is another Perfect Mind or Understanding being above us in the Universe, from which our Imperfect Minds were derived, and upon which they do depend. Wherefore if we can have no Idea or Conception of any thing whereof we have not a Full and Perfect Comprehension, then can we not have an Idea or Conception of the Nature of any Substance. But though we do not Comprehend all Truth, as if our Mind were Above it, or Master of it; and cannot Penetrate into, and look quite thorough the Nature of every thing; yet may Rational Souls frame certain Ideas and Conceptions, of whatsoever is in the Orbe of Being, proportionate to their own Nature, and sufficient for their purpoe. And though we cannot fully Comprehend the Deity, nor Exhaust the Infiniteness of its Perfection, yet may we have an Idea or Conception of a Being Absolutely perfect, such as one as is, Nostro modulo conformis, agreeable and proportionate to our Measure and Scantling, as we may approach near to a Mountain, and touch it with our hands, though we cannot encompass it all round, and enclaspe it within our arms. Whatsoeuer in its own Nature Absolutely Unconceivable, is Nothing; but not whatsoever is not fully Comprehensible by our Imperfect Understandings.

It is true indeed, that the Deity is more incomprehensible to us than any thing else whatsoever, which proceeds from the Fulness of its being and Perfection, and from the transcendency of its Brightness, for the very same reason, may it be said also, in some sense, that is more Knowable and Conceivable than any thing. As the Sun, though by reason of its Excessive Splendour, it dazle our weak sight, it is notwithstanding far more Visible also, than any of the Noodles Stella, the small Misty Stars. Where there is more of Light, there is more of Visibility, so where there is more of Entity, Reality, and Perfection, there is there more of Conceptibility and Cogniscibility; such an Object Filling up the Mind more, and Acting more strongly on it. Nevertheless because our Weak and Imperfect Minds are in the Vait Immenity and Redundancy of the Deity, and overcome with its transcendent Light, and dazzling Brightness, therefore both it to us an Appearance of Darkness and Incomprehensibility. Thus
As the unbounded Expansion of Light, in the clear transparent Ether, hath to us the Apparition of an Azure Obscurity; which yet is not any Absolute thing in itself, but only Relative to our Sense, and a meer Phantasm in us.

The Incomprehensibility of the Deity, is so far from being an Argument against the Reality of its Existence, as that it is most certain on the contrary, that were there nothing Incomprehensible to us, who are but contemptible Pieces, and small Atoms of the Universe; there were no other Being in the world, but what our Finite and Imperfect Understandings could span or fathom, and encompass round about, look thorough and thorough, have a commanding view of, and perfectly Conquer and Subdue under them; then could there be nothing Absolutely and Infinitely Perfect, that is, no God. For though that of Empedocles be not true in a Literal Sense, as it seems to have been taken by Aristotle, ροτάκω τοιοντα &c., That by Earth we see Earth, by Water Water, and by Fire Fire, and understand every thing by something of the same within our selves; yet is it certain, that every thing is apprehended by some Internal Congruity in that which apprehends, which perhaps was the sense intended by that Noble Philosopherick Poet. Wherefore it cannot possibly otherwise be, but that the Finiteness, Scantiness, and Imperfection of our narrow Understandings, must make them Symmetrical or Incommensurate, to that which is Absolutely and Infinitely Perfect.

And Nature it self plainly intimates to us, that there is some such Absolutely Perfect Being, which though not Inconceivable, yet is Incomprehensible to our Finite Understandings; by certain Passions which it hath implanted in us, that otherwise would want an Object to display themselves upon; namely those, of Devout Veneration, Adoration, and Admiration, together with a kind of Euphane, and Pleading Horror; which in the silent Language of Nature, seem to speak thus much to us, that there is some Object in the World, so much Bigger and Fuller than our Mind and Thoughts, that it is the very same to them, that the Ocean is to narrow Vessels, so that when they have taken into themselves as much as they can thereof by Contemplation, and filled up all their Capacity, there is still an Immensity of it left without, which cannot enter in for want of room to receive it, and therefore must be apprehended after some other strange and more mysterious manner, viz. by their being as it were Plunged into it, and Swallowed up or Lost in it. To conclude, the Deity is indeed Incomprehensible to our Finite and Imperfect Understandings, but not Inconceivable, and therefore there is no Ground at all for this Atheistical Pretence, to make it a Non-Entity.

We come to the Third Atheistical Argumentation; That because Infinity (which according to Theology is included in the Idea of God and pervadeth all his Attributes) is utterly Unconceivable, the Deity it self is therefore an Impossibility, and Non-Entity. To this Sense found sundry Passages of a Modern Writer so as, Whatsoever we know we learn from our Phantasms, but there is no Phantasm of Infinite an-
and therefore no Knowledge or Concepcion of it. Again, Whatcheour we
Imagine is Finite, and therefore there is no Concepcion or Idea, of that
which we call Infinite. No man can have in his Mind an Image of
Infinite Time, or of Infinite Power. Wherefore the Name of God is used,
not to make us conceive him, but only that we may Honour him. The
t authentication whereof (as may be plainly gathered from other Pas-
fages of the same Writer) is thus to be Interpreted; That there is
nothing of Philosophick Truth and Reality, in the Idea or Attributes
of God; nor any other Sense in Those Words, but only to signify,
the Veneration and Astonishment of mens own Confounded Minds. And
accordingly the Word Infinite, is declared, to signify nothing at
all in that which is so called, (there being no such thing really ex-
isting) but only the Inability of mens own Minds, together with their
Reckless Astonishment and Admiration. Wherefore when the same
Writer determines, that God must not be said to be Finite; this being
no good Courtship nor Complement; and yet the Word Infinite, signi-
ficeth nothing in the thing itself, nor hath any Concepcion at all
anwering to it; he either does plainly abuse his Reader, or else he
leaves him to make up this Conclusion; That since God is neither
Finite nor Infinite, he is an Unconceivable Nothing. In like manner,
another Learned Well-willer to Atheism, declareth, That he who
calleth any thing Infinite, doth but Rei quam non capit, attribute
somen quod non intelligit, Attribute an Unintelligible Name, to a thing
Unconceivable; because all Concepcion is Finite, and it is impossible
to conceive any thing that hath no Bounds or Limits. But that which is
mistaken for Infinite, is nothing but a Confused Chaos of the Mind, or
a unshapen Embryo of Thought, when men going on further and further,
and making a Continual Progress, without seeing any End before them,
ending at length quite weary and tyred out with this their endless Journey,
lay it down, and call the thing by this Hard and Unintelligible Name,
Infinite. And from hence does he also infer; That because we can
have no Idea of Infinite, as to signify any thing in that which is so
called; we therefore cannot possibly have, Germanam Ideam Dei,
my True and Genuine Idea or Notion of God. Of which, they who
understand the Language of Atheists, know very well the meaning
of this; That there is indeed No such thing; or, That he is a
non-Entity.

Now since this Exception against the Idea of God, and confe-
quently his Existence, is made by our Modern and Neoterick Atheists;
we shall in the first place shew, how Contradictitious they are herein
their Predecessors, the Old Philosophick Atheists; and consequently
now inconsistent and disagreeing, Atheists in several Ages have been
in one another. For whereas these Modern Atheists, would have
thought a sufficient Confutation of a Deity, That there can be No-
ing Infinite; it is certain that the Ancient Philosophick Atheists were
far from being of this Persuasion, that some of them, as Anax-
axander expressly, made Ατρής, or Infinite, the Principle of all things;
at is, Infinitely Extended and Eternal Matter, devoid of all Life
and Underlanding. For though Melissa his Ατρής or Infinite,
which he made The First Principle, was a Most Perfect Being, Emi-
ently
ently containing all things (as hath been already shewed) and therefore the True Deity: Anaximander's *αἰσχρός or Infinite, yet however called *αἰσχρός or Divine by him, (it being the only Divinity which he acknowledged) was nothing but Sensible Matter; an Atheistick Infinite. Wherefore both Theists and Atheists in those former times, did very well agree together in this One Point, that there was Something or other Infinite, as the First Principle of all things; either Infinite Mind, or Infinite Matter; though this latter Atheistick Infinity of Extended Matter, be indeed repugnant to Conception, (as shall be proved afterwards) there being no True Infinite, but a Perfect Being, or the Holy Trinity. Furthermore, not only Anaximander, but also after him, Democritus, and Epicurus, and many others of that Atheistick Gang, heretofore asserted likewise, a Numerical Infinity of Worlds, and therefore much more than an Infinity of Atoms, or Particles of Matter. And though this Numerical Infinity of theirs were also Unconceivable and Impossible; yet does it sufficiently appear from hence, that those Ancient Philosophick Atheists were so far from being abhorrent from Infinity, as a Thing Impossible, and a Non-Entity, that they were on the contrary very fond thereof; and therefore never went about to disprove a Deity, after this manner, Because there can be Nothing Infinite.

But in the next place, we shall make it manifest, that these Modern Atheists, do no less contradict plain Reason and their very Selves also, than they do their Predecessors in that Impiety, when they thus go about to disprove the Existence of a God; Because there can be Nothing Infinite, neither in Duration, nor in Power, nor in any other regard. For First, though it should be doubted, whether there be a God or no, yet must it needs be acknowledged to be as Indubitable, as any thing in all Geometry, that there was something or other Infinite in Duration, or Eternal, without Beginning; because, if there had been once Nothing at all, there could never have been Any thing; that Common Notion or Principle of Reason, having here an Irresistible Force, That Nothing could ever come from Nothing. Now if there were never Nothing, but always Something, then must there of necessity be something Infinite in Duration, and Eternal without Beginning. Wherefore it cannot be accounted les than Extreme Sottishness and Stupidity of Mind, in these Modern Atheists, thus to impugn a Deity, from the Impossibility of Infinite Duration without beginning. But in the next place, we must confess it seems to us hardly conceivable, that any Atheist whatsoever, could possibly be so prodigiously Sottish, or so monstrously infatuated, as really to think; that once there was Nothing at all, but that afterwards Sensible Matter happened, (no body knows how) to come into Being, from whence all other things were derived. According to which Hypothesis, it would follow also, that Matter might as well some time or other happen again, to cease to be, and to all things vanish into Nothing. To conclude therefore, these Atheists must of necessity be Guilty, of One or Other of these Two Things; either of Extreme Sottishness and Stupidity, in acknowledging neither God, nor Matter, nor Any Thing, to have Existed Infinitely from Eternal.
Eternity without Beginning; or else if they do acknowledge the Pre-
Eternity of Matter, or its Infinite Past-duration without Beginning; 
then, of the most Notorious Impudence, in making that an Argu-
ment against the Existence of a God, which themselves acknowledge 
to Matter.

Nevertheless we shall here readily comply, with these Modern A-
theists thus far, as to grant them these Two following Things; First,
that we can have no Proper and Genuine Phantasm of any Infinite 
whatevcr, because we never had Corporeal Sense of any, neither of 
Infinite Number, nor of Infinite Magnitude, and therefore much les 
of Infinite Time or Duration, and of Infinite Power; these two Latter 
things, Time and Power, themselves not falling under Corporeal 
Sense. Secondly, That as we have no Phantasm of any Infinite, so 
either is Infinity Fully Comprehensible by our humane Understand-
ts, that are but Finite. But since it is certain even to Mathematical 
Evidence, That there was Something Infinite in Duration, or with-
out Beginning, Insomuch that no Intelligent Atheist, upon Mature 
Consideration will ever venture to contradict it, we shall from hence 
xtort from these Atheists an acknowledgment, of the Falsness of 
these Two Theorums of theirs, That whatsoever we have no Phantasm 
or Sensible Idea of, as also whatsoever is not Fully Comprehensible by 
us, is therefore a pure Non-Entity or Nothing: and enforce them to 
onfess, That there is something Really Existing in Nature, which 
we have neither any Phantasm of, nor yet can Fully Comprehend with 
our Imperfect Understandings.

Nay, we will yet go further in compliance with them and acknow-
ledge likewise, That as for these Infinities, of Number, of Corporeal 
Magnitude, and of Time or Successive Duration, we have not only 
Phantasm, nor Full Intellectual Comprehension of them, but alfo 
manner of Intelligible Idea, Notion or Conception. For though it 
true, that Number be somewhere said by Aristotle to be Infinite, 
it was his meaning there only in such a negative Sense as this, that 
e can never possibly come to an End thereof by Addition, but may 
our minds still add Number to Number Infinently; which is all one 
if he should indeed have affirmed, that there can be no Number A-
ually and Positively Infinite, according to Aristotle's own Definiti-
of Infinite elsewhere given, namely, That to which nothing can be 
cluded: no Number being ever so Great, but that One or More may 
be added to it. And as there can be no Infinite Number, so nei-
ther can there be any Infinity of Corporeal Magnitude; not only be-
cause if there were, the parts thereof must needs be Infinite in Num-
er; but also because, as no Number can be so great, but that More 
may be added to it; so neither can any Body or Magnitude be ever 
Vast; but that more Body or Magnitude may be supposed still fur-
er and further; this Addition of Finites, never making up Infinite, 
indeed Infinite Space, beyond the Finite World, is a thing which 
been much talked of; and it is by some supposed to be Infinite 
Body, but by others to be an Incorporeal Infinite; through whose 
true Distance notwithstanding (Menurable by Poles and Miles)
A a a a

this
this Finite World might roll and tumble Infinitely. But as we conceive, all that can be demonstrated here, is no more than this, That how vast soever the Finite World should be, yet is there a Possibility of more and more Magnitude and Body, still to be added to it, further and further, by Divine Power, Infinitely; or that the World could never be made fo Great, no not by God himself, as that his own Omnipotence could not make it yet Greater. Which Potential Infinity or Indefinite Encresableness of Corporeal Magnitude, seems to have been mistaken for an Actual Infinity of Space. Whereas for this very Reason, because more could be added to the Magnitude of the Corporeal World Infinitely, or without End; therefore it is Impossible that it should ever be Positively and Actually Infinite; That is, such as to which nothing more can Possibly be added. Wherefore we conclude concerning Corporeal Magnitude, as we did before of Number, that there can be no Actual and Actual Infinity thereof; and that how much Vaster soever, the World may be, than according to the Supposition of Vulgar Astronomers, who make the Starry Sphere the Utmost Wall thereof, yet is it not Absolutely Infinite, such as Really hath No Bounds or Limits at all; nor to which Nothing more could by Divine Power be added. Lastly, we affirm likewise concerning Time or Successive Duration, that there can be no Infinity of that neither, no Temporal Eternity without Beginning: and that not only because there would then be an Actual Infinity and more than an Infinity of Number; but also because upon this Supposition, there would always have been an Infinity of Time Past, and consequently an Infinity of Time Past, which was never Present. Whereas all the Moments of Past-Time, must needs have been once Present: and if so, then all of them, at least have One, Future too; from whence it will follow, that there was a First Moment or Beginning of Time. And thus does Reason conclude, neither the World nor Time itself, to have been Infinite in their Past Duration, or Eternal without Beginning.

Here will the Atheist think presently, he hath got a great advantage to disprove the Existence of a God, Nonne qui Eternitatem Mundi sic tollunt, eadem operis etiam Mundi Conditores Eternitatem tollunt? Do not they, who thus destroy the Eternity of the World, at the same time destroy also the Eternity of the Creator? For if Time it self were not Eternal, then how could the Deity or any thing be so? The Atheist securely taking it for granted, that God himself could not be otherwise Eternal, than by a Successive Flux of Infinite Time. But we say, that this will on the contrary afford us a plain Demonstration of the Existence of a Deity. For since the World and Time it self, were not Infinite in their Past-Duration, but had a Beginning, therefore were they both certainly made together by some other Being, who is in order of Nature Senior to Time, and so without Time, before Time; he being above that Successive Flux, and comprehending in the Stability and Immutable Perfection of his own Being, his Yesterday and To day and For ever. Or thus; Something was of necessity Infinite in Duration, and without Beginning; But neither the World, nor Motion, nor Time, that is, no Successive Being, was such; therefore is there something else whose Being and Duration is not...
Chapter IV. Attribute, of the Deity.

ceffive and Flowing, but Permanent; to whom this Infinity belongeth. The Atheists here, can only smile, or make faces; and how their little wit, in quibbling upon Nunnels, or a Standing Now of Eternity; as if that Standing Eternity of the Deity (which with so much Reason hath been contended for, by the Ancient Genuine Theists) were nothing but a Pitiful Small Moment of Time Standing still; and as if the Duration of all Beings whatsoever must needs be like our own. Whereas the Duration of every thing, must of necessity be agreeable to its Nature; and therefore, As that whose Imperfect Nature is ever Flowing like a River, and conflits in Contantual Motion and Changes one after another, must needs have accordingly a Successive and Flowing Duration, sliding perpetually from Present into Past, and always postling on towards the Future, expecting something of itself, which is not yet in being, but to come: So must that, whose Perfect Nature, is Essentially Immutable, and always the Same, and Necessarily Evident, have a Permanent Duration; never loosing any thing of itself once Present, as sliding away from it; nor yet running forwards to something of itself before, which is not yet in being; and it is as Contradictory for it, ever to have begun, as ever to cease to be.

Now whereas the Modern Atheists pretend to have proved, that there is Nothing Infinite, neither in Duration nor other wise, and consequently No Deity; meerly because we have no Sense nor Phantom of Infinite, nor can Fully Comprehend the same; and therefore will needs conclude that the Words, Infinite and Eternal, signify nothing in the thing itself, but either mens own Ignorance and Inability to conceive When, or Whether, that which is called Eternal, began; together with the Confounded Non-sense of their Altonish'd Minds, and their Stupid Veneration, of that which their own Fear and Phance, has raised up as a Bugbear to themselves; or else the progress of their Thoughts further and further backward Indefinitely; though they plainly confute themselves in all this, by sometimes acknowledging Matter and Motion Infinite and Eternal, which argues either their Extreme Sottishness or Impudence.) We have flewed with Mathematical Evidence and Certainty, that there is really some thing Infinite in Duration or Eternal, by which therefore cannot be Scant, Mens own Ignorance, or the Confounded Non-sense of their invention, nor yet the Idle Progress of their Minds further and further Indefinitely, which never reaches Infinite; but a Reality in the thing itself, namely this, that it Never was Not; nor had any Beginning. Moreover having Demonstrated concerning this Infinity and Eternity, without Beginning, that it cannot possibly belong to any Successive Being, we confidently conclude against these Atheists also, that it was not Matter and Motion, or this Mundane System, but an Inexhaustible Nature of a Permanent Duration, (that is, a God) whom it belonged. To sum up all therefore, we say that Infinite and Eternal, are not Words that signify nothing in the thing itself, nor mean Attributes of Honour, Complement and Flattery, that is, Devout and Religious Non-sense, Error and Falshood, but Attributes belonging to the Deity, and to that alone, of the most Philosophick and Universal Truth.
Omnipotence, not to be Extended

Truth and Reality. And though we being Finite, have no Full Comprehension and Adequate Understanding of this Infinity and Eternity (as not of the Deity) yet can we not be without some Notion, Conception and Apprehension thereof, so long as we can thus demonstrate concerning it, that it belongs to something, and yet to nothing neither but a Perfect Immutable Nature. But the Notion of this Infinite Eternity will be yet further cleared in the following Explanation and Vindication of Infinite Power.

For the Atheists principally quarrel with Infinite Power, or Omnipotence, and pretend in like manner this to be Utterly Unconceivable, and Impossible, and Subjected in Nothing. Thus a Modern Atheistical Writer concludes, that since No man can conceive Infinite Power, this is also but an Attribute of Honour which the Confounded Non-fence of Astonish'd Minds, bestows upon the Object of their Devotion, without any Philosophick Truth and Reality. And here have our Modern Atheists indeed the Suffrage and Agreement of the ancient Philosophick Atheists also with them, who as appears from the Verses before cited out of Lucretius, concern'd themselves in nothing more, than affecting All Power to be Finite, and Omnipotence or Infinite Power to belong to Nothing.

First therefore it is here observable, that this Omnipotence or Infinite Power asserted by Theists, has been commonly either ignorantly mistaken, or wilfully misrepresented by these Atheists, out of design to make it seem Impossible and Ridiculous; as if by it were meant, a Power of Producing and Doing any thing whatsoever without Exception, though never so Contradictions. As a late Atheistical Person, seeming to affect this Divine Omnipotence and Infinite Power, really and designedly notwithstanding abused the fame, with this Sceptick Irony, That God by his Omnipotence, or Infinite Power, could turn this Tree into a Syllogism. Children indeed have sometimes such Childish apprehensions of the Divine Omnipotence; and Ren. Cartesius, (though otherwise an Acute Philosopher) was here no less Childish, in affirming, that all things whatsoever, even the Natures of Good and Evil, and all Truth and Falshood, do so depend upon the Arbitrary Will and Power of God, as that if he had pleased, Twice Two should not have been Four, nor the Three Angles of a Plain Triangle, Equal to Two Right ones, and the like; he only adding, that all these things notwithstanding, when they were once settled by the Divine Decree, became Immutable; that is, I suppose, not in themselves or to God, but unto us. Than which, no Paradox of any old Philosopher, was ever more Absurd and Irrational: and certainly if any one did desire, to perfwade the World, that Cartesius, notwithstanding all his pretences to Demonstrate a Deity, was indeed but an Hypocritical Theist, or Personated and Disguised Atheist, he could not have a fairer pretence for it out of all his Writings, than from hence. This being plainly to destroy the Deity, by making one Attribute thereof, to Devour and Swallow up another; Infinite Will and Power, Infinite Understanding and Wisdom. For to suppose God to Understand and to be Wise only by his Will, is all one as to suppose him.
him, to have Really no Understanding at all. Wherefore we do not affirm, God to be so Omnipotent or Infinitely Powerful, as that he is able to Destroy or Change the Intelligible Nature of things at Pleasure; this being all one, as to say, that God is so Omnipotent and Infinitely Powerful that he is able to Destroy, or to Baffle and Befool his own Wisdom and Understanding, which is the very Rule and Measure of his Power. We say not therefore, that God by his Omnipotence or Infinite Power, could make Twice Two not to be Four, or turn a Tree into a Syllologion; but we say, that Omnipotence or Infinite Power, is that which can Produce and Do, all whatsoever is Possible, that is, whatsoever is Conceivable, and Implies no manner of Contradiction: the very Essence of Possibility being no other than Concepiility. And thus has the Point been stated all along, not only by Christian Theists, but even the Ancient Pagan Theologers themselves; that Omnipotence or Infinite Power, is that which can do all things, that do not imply a Contradiction, or which are not Unconceivable. This appearing from that of Agatho, cited before out of Aristotle, That nothing is exempted from the Divine Power, but only to make τὰ παρασκεύασθαι, what hath been done, to be Undone; or the like hereunto. Now Infinite Power, being nothing else, but a Power of Doing whatsoever is Conceivable, it is plainly Aburd to say; That a Power of doing nothing but what is Conceivable, is Unconceivable.

But because the Atheists look upon Infinity, as such a Desperate and Affrightful thing, we shall here render it something more easie, and take off that Frightful Vizard from it, which makes it seem such a Monno or Bugbear to them; by declaring in the next place, that Infinity, is Really nothing else but Perfection. For Infinite Understanding and Knowledge, is nothing else but Perfect Knowledge, that which hath no Defect or Mixture of Ignorance with it; or the Knowledge of whatsoever is Knowable. So in like manner, Infinite Power, is nothing else but Perfect Power, that which hath no Defect or Mixture of Impotency in it; a Power of Producing and Doing all whatsoever is Possible; that is, whatsoever is Conceivable. Infinite Power an Do, whatsoever Infinite Understanding can Conceive, and nothing else: Conception being the Measure of Power and its Extent, and whatsoever is in it self Unconceivable, being therefore Impossible. Lastly Infinity of Duration or Eternity, is Really nothing else, but Perfection, as including Necessary Existence and Immutability in it. So that it is not only Contradictitious to such a Being, to Cease to Be, or Exit; but also to have had a Newness or Beginning of Being; or to have any Flux or Change therein, by Dying to the reftent, and acquiring something New to it self which was not before, notwithstanding which, this Being comprehends the differences of all, Present, and Future, or the Successive Priority and Posteriority of Temporary Things. And because Infinity is Perfection, therefore in nothing which includeth any thing of Imperfection, in the very Idea and Substance of it, be ever Truly and Properly Infinite, as Number, Corporeal Magnitude, and Successive Duration. All which in only, Mentiri Infinitatem, Counterfeit and Imitate Infinity, in their having more and more added to them Infinitely, whereby not-
notwithstanding they never reach it or overtake it. There is nothing truly infinite, neither in knowledge, nor in power, nor in duration, but only one absolutely perfect being or the holy trinity.

Now, that we have an idea or conception of perfection, or a perfect being; is evident, from the notion that we have, of imperfection so familiar to us: perfection being the rule and measure of imperfection, and not perfection of perfection as a straight line, is the rule and measure of a crooked, and not a crooked line of a straight. So that perfection is first conceivable, in order of nature, before imperfection, as light before darkness, a positive before the privative or defective. For perfection is not properly the want of imperfection, but imperfection of perfection. Moreover, we perceive divers degrees of perfection, in the essences of things, and consequently a scale or ladder of perfections, in nature, one above another, as of living and animate things, above sense and inanimate; or of rational things above sensitive. And this by reason of that notion or idea, which we first have, of that which is absolutely perfect; as the standard; by comparing of things with which, and measuring of them, we take notice of their approaching more or less near thereunto. Nor indeed could thefe gradual ascents, be infinite, or without end; but they must come at last, to that which is absolutely perfect, as the top of them all. Lastly, we could not perceive perfection in the most perfect of all those things which we ever had sense or experience of in our lives, had we not a notion or idea of that which is absolutely perfect, which secretly comparing the same with, we perceive it to come short thereof. And we might add here, that it is not conceivable neither, how there should be any lesser perfection, existent in any kind, were there not first something perfect in that kind, from whence it was derived. This of Boetius, being the very sense and language of nature in rational beings; omne quod imperficiatum esse dicitur, id deinitione perfecti imperficiatum esse perhibetur. quod si, ut in qualibet generi imperficiatum quid esse videatur, in eo perficiatum quoque aliquid esse, necessi sit. item sublata perfectione, unde illud, quod imperficiatum perhibetur, exstitet, ne sibi quidem potest. Neque enim a diminutis incontinuamatisque, natura rerum cepit egressum; sed ab integris absolutique procedens, in hac extremo, utque efficient dilabitur. whatsoever is said to be imperfect, is accounted such, by the diminution of that which is perfect. From whence it comes to pass, that if in any kind, any thing appear imperfect, there must of necessity be something also, in that kind, perfect. For perfection being once taken away, it could not be imagined, from whence that which is accounted imperfect, should have proceeded. Nor did the nature of things, take beginning, from incommensurate and imperfect things, but proceeding from things absolute and complete, thence descend down to these lower, effete, and languid things. But of this more elsewhere.

Wherefore since infinite is the same with absolutely perfect, we having a notion or idea of the latter, must needs have of the former.
mer. From whence we learn also, that though the word Infinite, be in
the form thereof, Negative, yet is the sense of it, in those things
which are really capable of the same, Positive, it being all one with
Absolutely Perfect: as likewise the sense of the word Finite, is Ne-
gative; it being the same with Imperfect. So that, Finite is proper-
ly the Negation of Infinite, as that which in order of Nature is be-
fore it; and not Infinite the Negation of Finite. However in those
things which are capable of no true Infinite, because they are Essent-
ially Finite, as Number, Corporeal Magnitude, and Time, Infinity be-
ing there a mere Imaginary thing, and a Non-Entity, it can only be
conceived, by the Negation of Finite; as we also conceive Nothing,
by the Negation of Something; that is, we can have no Positive Con-
ception at all thereof.

We conclude, To assert an Infinite Being, is nothing else but to
assert a Being Absolutely Perfect, such as Never was Not, or had no
beginning, which could produce all things Possible and Conceivable,
and upon which all other things must depend. And this is to assert
God; One Absolutely Perfect Being, the Original of all things. God,
and Infinite, and Absolutely Perfect, being but different Names for
one and the same thing.

We come now to the Fourth Atheistic Objection, That Theology is
nothing but an Arbitraries Compendium of Inconsistent and Contradic-
tious Notions. Where First, we deny not, but that as some Theolo-
gers (or Bigoted Religionists) of later times, extend the Divine Om-
potence, to things Contradictious and Impossible, as to the Making of
the and the same Body, to be all of it, in several distant places at once:
may others sometimes unskilfully attribute to the Deity, things
confident or Contradictious to one another, because seeming to
them to be all Perfections. As for example, though it be conclud-
generally by Theologers, that there is a Natural Justice and San-
cty in the Deity, yet do some notwithstanding contend, That the
God is not determined by any Antecedent Rule or Nature of
Deity, but that whatsoever he could be supposed to Will Arbitra-
y, would therefore be Ipso facto Just; which is called by them
Divine Sovereignty, and look'd upon as a Great Perfection;
though it be certain that these Two Things are directly Contradicti-
s to one another; viz. That there is something in its own Nature
and Unjust, or a Natural Sanctity in God; and That the Arbitrary,
and Command of the Deity, is the only Rule of Justice and Unjusti-
ity; and some Theologers determining, That whatsoever is in God,

Essential to the Deity; they conceiving such an Immutability to be
necessary Perfection thereof, seem thereby not only to Contradict
the Liberty of Will in the Deity, which themselves notwithstanding con-
d for in a high degree; that all things are Arbitrarily determined
by Divine Decrees; but also to take away from it, all Power of Acting ad
Extra, and of Perceiving or Animadverting things done successively here
in the World. But it will not follow from these and the like Contra-
dictions, of mistaken Theologers, that therefore Theology it self is Con-
tradicions, and hath nothing of Philosophick Truth at all in it; no
more
more than because Philosophers also hold Contradictory Opinions, that therefore Philosophy it self is Contradictions, and that there is Nothing Absolutely True or False, but (according to the Protagorean Doctrine) all Seeming and Phantastical.

But in the next place we add, that though it be true, that the Nature of things, admits of nothing Contradictions, and that whatsoever plainly Implies a Contradiction, must therefore of necessity be a Non-Entity, yet is this Rule notwithstanding, obnoxious to be much abused, when whatsoever mens Shallow and Grofs Understandings cannot Reach to, they will therefore presently conclude to be Contradictions, and Impossible. As for example, the Atheists and Materialists cannot Conceive of any other Substance besides Body, and therefore do they determine presently, that Incorporeal Substance is a Contradiction in the very Terms; it being as much as to say Incorporeal Body; wherefore when God is said by Theologers, to be an Incorporeal Substance, this is to them an Absolute Imposibility. Thus a Modern Writer: The Universe, that is, the whole Mas of all things, is Corporeal; that is to say, Body. Now every Part of Body is Body, and Consequently every Part of the Universe is Body; and that which is not Body is no part thereof. And because the Universe is All, that which is no part of it, is nothing. Therefore when Spirits are called Incorporeal, this is only a name of Honour, and it may with more Piety be attributed to God himself, in whom we consider, not what Attribute best expresseth his Nature which is Incomprehensible; but what best expresseth our Desire to Honour him. Where, Incorporeal, is said to be, an Attribute of Honour, that is, such an Attribute, as expresseth only the Veneration of mens Minds, but signifieth nothing in Nature, nor hath any Philosophick Truth and Reality under it: a Substance Incorporeal being as Contradictions, as Something and Nothing. Notwithstanding which, this Contradiction is only in the Weakness and Childishnes of those mens Understandings, and not the thing it self; it being Demonsrable, that there is some other Substance besides Body, according to the True and Genuine Notion of it. But because, this mistake is not proper to Atheists only, there being some Theists also, who labour under this fame Infirmity of Mind, not to be able to Conceive any other Substance besides Body, and who therefore affirm a Corporeal Deity: we shall in the next place shew, from a passage of a Modern Writer, what kind of Contradictions they are, which these Atheists impute to all Theology; namely such as these, that it supposes God, to Perceive things Sensible, without any Organs of Sense; and to Understand and be Wise without any Brains. For men (faith he) attribute to God Almighty for Honours sake, whatsoever they see Honourable in the world, as Seeing, Hearing, Knowing, Justice, Wisdom, &c. But they deny him such poor things, as Eyes, Ears and Brains, and other Organs, without which we Worms, neither have, nor can conceive...
Chap. IV. Brains, no Contradiction.

True Religion consists in Obedience to Christ's Lieutenants, and in giving God such Honour, both in Attributes and Actions, as they in their several Lieutenancies shall ordain. Where the plain and undisguised meaning of the Author seems to be this; That God is no Subject of Philosophy, as all Real things are: (accordingly as he declareth elsewhere, that Religion non est Philosophia sed Lex, Religion is not a Matter of Philosophy, but only of Law and Arbitrary Constitution) He having no Real Nature of his own, nor being any True Inhabitant of the World or Heaven, but (as all other Ghosts and Spirits) an Inhabitant of mens Brains only, that is, a Figment of their Fear and Phancy, or a meer Political Scare-Crow. And therefore such Attributes are to be be given to him, without any Scrupulosity, as the Civil Law of every Country shall appoint, and no other. The Wife and Natufe, very well understanding, that all this Business of Religion, is nothing but meer Pageantry, and that the Attributes of the Deity, indeed dignifie neither True nor False nor any thing in Nature, but only mens Reverence and Devotion towards the Object of their fear: the manner of expressing which, is determined by Civil Law. Wherefore to say, that God seeth all Things, and yet hath no Eyes; and that he hears all things, and yet hath no Ears; and that he understands and is Wife, and yet hath no Brains; and whatsoever else you will please to say of him, as Attributes of Honour and only as signifying Devotion, is thus far well enough. But when men, not understanding the true Cabal, will needs go further, they mistaking Attributes of Honour for Attributes of Nature and of Philosophick Truth, and making them Premises to infer Absolute Truth, and convince Falshood from, or Matters to Dispute and Reason upon, that is, when they'll needs suppose such a thing as a God, Really to Exist in the World, then do they involve themselves in all manner of Contradiction, nonsense, and Absurdity; as for example, to affirm seriously, that this God really seeth all things in the world, and yet hath no Eyes; and that he indeed hears all things, and yet hath no Ears; and Laftly that he understands and is Wife, and yet hath no Brains, which things e all Absolutely Contradictious, Unconceivable and Impossible.

The summ of all of this, that when Religion and Theology, which is indeed nothing but Law and Phantastick, is made Philosophy, then is it all meer Jargon and Insignifian Non-sense. And now we see, what one Contradiction are, which the Atheists charge upon Theology; as as owe all their Being, only to the Grossness, Sottishness, and Brushe, of these mens own apprehensions. From whence proceedeth the wife, this following Definition of Knowledge and Understanding:

That it is nothing but a Tumult of the Mind, raised by External things, Pressing the Organical Parts of mans Body. O Tell me among People, when will ye Understand? and ye Fools, when will ye be wise? He that Planted the Ear (and gave mans Soul a power of hearing) shall not He (though himself have no Ears) hear? He formed the Eye, (and gave the Humane Soul a power of Seeing, but as an Instrument) shall not be (though himself have no Eyes) see? Lastly, He that teacheth man Knowledge, (or gave him an Understanding Mind, besides Brains) shall not be (though himself be without Brains) Know and Understand?
It is certain, that no simple Idea, as that of a Triangle or a Square, of a Cube or Sphere, can possibly be contradicted to itself; and therefore much less can the Idea of a perfect Being (which is the compendious Idea of God) be more simple, than any of the other. Indeed this simple Idea of a perfect Being, is pregnant of many attributes, and therefore the Idea of God, more fully declared by them all, may seem to be in this respect a compendious Idea, or one Idea and Conception, consisting or made up of many; which if they were really contradicted, would render the whole, a non-entity. As for example, This, a plain Triangle, whose three angles are greater than two right ones; it being contradicted and un conceivable, is therefore no true Idea, but a non-entity. But all the genuine attributes of the Deity, of which its entire Idea is made up, are things as demonstrable of a perfect Being, as the properties of a triangle or a square are of those Ideas respectively; and therefore cannot they possibly be contradicted, neither to it, nor to one another; because those things which agree in one third, must needs agree together amongst themselves.

Nay the genuine attributes of the Deity, namely, such as are demonstrable of an absolutely perfect Being, are not only not contradictory; but also necessarily connected together, and inseparable from one another. For there could not possibly be, one thing infinite in wisdom only, another thing infinite only in power, and another thing only infinite in duration or eternal. But the very same thing, which is infinite in wisdom, must needs be also infinite in power, and infinite in duration, and so vice versa. That which is infinite in any one perfection, must of necessity, have all perfections in it. Thus are all the genuine attributes of the Deity, not only not contradictory, but also inseparably connected; and the idea of God no congeries either of disagreeing things; or else of such as are unnecessarily connected with one another.

In very truth, all the several attributes of the Deity, are nothing else but so many partial and inadequate conceptions, of one and the same, simple perfect Being, taken in as it were by piece-meal; by reason of the imperfection of our humane understandings, which could not fully conceive it all together at once; and therefore are they really all but one thing, though they have the appearance of multiplicity to us. As the one simple light of the sun, diversely refracted and reflected from a ruddy cloud, hath to us the appearance, of the variegated colours of the rainbow.

Wherefore the attributes of God, are no bundle of un conceivable, and impossible, huddled up together; nor attributes of honour and complement only, and nothing but the religious nonence of Atonish'd minds, expressing their devotion towards what they fear; but all of them attributes of nature, and of most severe philosopick truth. Neither is the idea of God, an arbitrary complement, of things unnecessarily connected, and separable from one another.
another: it is no Fictitious nor Fictional thing, made up by any Feigning Power of the Soul, but it is a Natural and most Simple Uncompounded Idea; such as to which nothing can be Arbitrarily added, nor nothing detracted from. Notwithstanding which, by reason of the Imperfection of humane Minds there may be, and are, different Apprehensions concerning it For as every one that hath a Conception of a Plain Triangle in general, doth not therefore know, that it includes this Property in it, to have Three Angles Equal to Two Right ones; nor doth every one, who hath an Idea of a Rectangular Triangle, presently understand, that the Square of the Subtense, is Equal to the Squares of both the Sides; so neither doth every one, who hath a Conception of a Perfect Being, therefore presently know that all that is included in that Idea. Moreover men may easily mistake things, for Absolute Perfections, which are not such, as hath been partly already shewed.

And now whereas the Atheists, pretend in the next place, to give an Account of that Supposed Contradiction, in the Idea and Attributes of God; namely, that it proceeded principally, from Fear, or the Confounded nonsense of men Astonished Minds, huddling up together all Imaginable Attributes of Honour, Courtship, and Complement without any Philosophick Truth, Sense, or Signification: as also in art from the Fiction and Imposition of Politicians: all this hath been already prevented, and the Foundation thereof quite taken away, by our shewing, that there is nothing in the Genuine Idea of God and his Attributes, but what is Demonstrable of a Perfect Being, and that there cannot be the least either Added to that Idea, or Detracted from it, any more than there can be anything Added to, or Detracted from the Idea of a Triangle or of a Square. From whence it follows unavoidably, that there cannot possibly be any thing, either Intraductions or Arbitrations in the Divine Idea, and that the Genuine Attributes thereof, are Attributes of Necessity Philosophick with: namely, such as do not only speak the Piety, Devotion, and Presence of mens own Minds: but declare the Real Nature of the thing itself. Wherefore when a Modern Atheistical Writer, affirmeth all those who Reason and conclude concerning God's Nature, from Attributes: That Losing their Understanding in the very first attempt, they fall from one Inconvenience (or Absurdity) to another without end, after the same manner as when one ignorant of Court-Ceremonies, coming into the presence of a greater person than he was wont to look to, and stumbling at his entrance, to save himself from falling, he slips his Cloak, to recover his Cloak, lets fall his Hat, and so with disorder after another, discovers his Rusticity and Astonishment: we say, that though there be something of Wit and Phancy in this, as it is applied to Theology and the Genuine Attributes of the Deity, there is not the least of Philosophick Truth. However we deny, but that some, either out of Superstition, or else out of Flatterers of God Almighty) have sometimes attributed such things to him, as are Incongruous to his Nature, and under a pretence of Honouring him, by Magnifying his Power and Sovereignty, do indeed...
most highly Dihonour him; they representing him to be such a Being, as is no way Amiable or Desirable.

But the Atheists are most of all concerned, to give an Account of that Unquestionable Phenomenon, the General Persuasion of the Existence of a God, in the Minds of men, and their Propensity to Religion, in all ages and places of the world; whence this should come, if there be really no such thing in Nature. And this they think to do, in the Last place also, Partly, from mens Own Fear, together with their Ignorance of Causes, and Partly, from the Fiction of Lawmakers and Politicians, they endeavouring thereby to keep men in Civil Subjection under them. Where we shall First plainly and Nakedly declare the Atheists meaning, and then manifest the Invalidity and Folly of these their Pretences, to save the forementioned Phenomenon.

First therefore, these Atheists affirm, That mankind by reason of their Natural Imbecillity, are in perpetual Sorrows, Anxiety, and Fear, concerning Future Events, or their Good and Evil Fortune to come; and this Passion of Fear inclining men to Imagine things Formidable and Fearful, and to Suspect or Believe the Existence of what really is not; I say, that this Distressing Fear and Jealousie in the Minds of men, concerning their Future Condition, raises up to them the Phantasm of a most Affrightful Spectre, an Invisible Understanding Being, Arbitrarily Governing and Swaying the affairs of the whole World, and at pleasure Tyrannizing over Mankind. And when men Exorbitant Fear and Fancy, has thus raised up to it self, such a Mormo or Bugbear, such an Affrightful Spectre as this, a thing that is really no Inhabitant of the World or of Heaven, but only of mens Brains; they afterward stand in awe of this their Own Imagination, and Tremblingly worship this Creature and Figment of their own Fear and Phancy, as a thing Really Existing without them, or a God; devising all manner of Expressions of Honour and Reverence towards it, and anxiously endeavouring, by all ways conceivable, to Propitiate and Atone the same. And thus have they brought upon themselves, a most heaviest Tack of Bondage, and filled their Lives with all manner of Bitterness and Misery.

Again to this Fear of Future Events, the Atheists add also Ignorance of Causes, as a further Account of the Phenomenon of Religion, so generally entertained in the world. For Mankind (say they) are Naturally Inquisitive into the Causes of things, and that not only of the Events of their Own Good and Evil Fortune, but also of the Phenomena of the World, and the Effects of Nature. And such is their Curiosity, that whereforever they can discover no Visible and Natural Causes, there are they prone to Feign and Imagine, other Causes Invisible and Supernatural. As it was observed of the Tragic Dramatists, that whenever they could not well extricate themselves, they were wont to bring in a God upon the Stage: and as Aristotle recordeth of Anaxagoras, that he never betook himself to Mind or Understanding, that is, to God, for a Cause; but only then when he was at a loss for other Natural and Necessary Causes. From whence these Atheists would infer, that nothing but Ignorance of Causes, made Anaxagoras.
The Atheists Seeds of Relig.

CHAP. IV.

xagoras to allert a Deity. Wherefore it is no wonder (say they) if the Generality of Mankind, being Ignorant of the Causes, almost of all Events, and Effects of Nature, have by reason of their Natural Curiosity and Fear Feigned or Introduced, one Invisible Power or Agent Omnipotent, as the Supreme Cause of all things: they believing themselves thereto, as to a kind of Refuge, Asylum, or Sanctuary for their Ignorance.

These two Accounts of the Phenomenon of Religion, from mens Fear and Solicitude about Future Events, and from their Ignorance of Causes, together with their Curiosity, are thus joyned together by a Modern Writer; Perpetual fear of Future Evils, always accompanying mankind, in the Ignorance of Causes, as it were in the Dark, unless needs have for Object Something. And therefore when there is nothing to be feen, there is nothing to accuse for their Evil Fortune, but some Power or Agent Invisible. Moreover it is concluded, that from the same Originals, sprang, not only that vulgar opinion of Inferiour Ghosts and Spirits also, subfervient to the Supreme Deity (as the Great Ghost of the whole World) (Apparitions being nothing but mens own Dreams and Phancies taken by them for Sensations) but also mens taking things Casual for Prognosticks, and their being so Superstitiiously addicted to Omens and Portents, Oracles, and Divinations and Prophecies; this proceeding likewise, from the same Phantafick Supposition, that the things of the World, are disposed of, not by Nature, but by some Understanding and Intending Agent or Person.

But left these Two forementioned Accounts, of that Phenomenon of Religion, and the Belief of a Deity, to Epidemiical to Mankind, could yet seem insufficient; the Atheists will superadd a Third to them, from the Fiction and Imposture of Civil Soveraigns, Crafty Law-makers and Designing Politicians. Who perceiving a great advantage to be made, from the Belief of a God and Religion, for the better keeping of men in Obedience and Subjection to themselves, and in Peace and Civil Society with one another (when they are perswaded, that besides the Punishments appointed by Laws, which can only be placed upon open and convicted Transgressors, and are often avoided and avoided; there are other Punishments that will be inflicted even upon the secret violators of them, both in this Life and after death, by a Divine, Invisible and Irresistible Hand) have therefore, Dextrously laid hold of mens Fear and Ignorance, and cherished of Seals of Religion in them (being the Infirmitie of their Nature) and further confirmed their Belief of Ghosts and Spirits, Miracles and Oddities, Oracles and Divinations, by Tales or Fables, publickly allowed and recommended. According to that Definition of Religion, given by a Modern Writer, Fear of Power Invisible, Feigned by the Mind, or Imagined from Tales publickly allowed, Religion; not allowed, Superstition. And that Religion thus Nursed up by Politicians, might be every way Compliant with, and Obsequious to their Desires, and no way Refractory to the same; it hath been their great Ease to perswade the People, that their Laws were not meerly their OWN
own Inventions, but that themselves were only the Interpreters of the Gods therein, and that the same things were really displeasing to the Gods, which were forbidden by them: God ruling over the world no otherwise than in them, as his Vicegerents; according to that Assertion of a Late Writer, Deum nullum Regnum in homines habere, nisi per eos qui Imperium tenent, that God Reigneth over men, only in the Civil Sovereigns. This is therefore another Atheistical Account of Religions so generally prevailing in the world, from its being a fit Engine of State, and Politicians generally looking upon it, as an Acrenum Imperii, a Mystery of Government, to posses the Minds of the People with the Belief of a God, and to keep them busily employed in the exercises of Religion, thereby to render them the more Tame and Gentle, apt to Obedience, Submission, Peace and Civil Society.

Neither is all this, the meer Invention of Modern Atheists, but indeed the old Atheistical Cabal; as may appear partly, from that known Paffage of the Poet, That the Gods were first made by Fear; and from Lucretius his fo frequently inquiring upon the same, according to the mind of Epicurus. For in his First Book, he makes Terrorem animi & Tenebras, Terrore of Mind, and Darkness, the Chief Causes of Theism: and in his Sixth, he further pursues the same Grounds, especially the Latter of them, after this manner;

*Cetera que fieri in Terris Caelique tuncur, Mortales, pavidis quorum pendent mentibus sepe, Efficiunt animos humiles formidine Divium: Depressaque premunt ad terram, propterca quad
IGNORANTIA CAUSARUM, conferre Deorum Cogit ad Imperium res; & concedere Regnum, &
Quorum operum causas nulla ratione movere Possunt, hae fieri Divino Numine rentur.*

To this Sense. Mortals, when with Trembling Minds they behold the Object's both of Heaven and Earth, they become depressed and sunk down under the Fear of the Gods. Ignorance of Causes setting up the Reign and Empire of the Gods. For when men can find no Natural Causes of those things, they suppose them presently, to have been done by a Divine Power.

And this Ignorance of Causes, is also elsewhere intufed upon by the same Poet, as the chief Source of Religion, or the Belief of a God.

Moreover when a Modern Writer, declares the Opinion of Ghosts, to be one of those things, in which confifthe the Natural Seeds of Religion:
Religion: As also that this opinion proceedeth from the Ignorance how to distinguish Dreams and other strong Phancies, from Vision and Sense; he leemeth herein to have trod likewise in the Footsteps of Lucretius, giving not obscurely, the same Account of Religion in his Fifth Book.

\[\text{Nunc quo causa Deum per magnas Numina gentes, Pervergari, \& ararum compleverit Urbes, \&c. Non ita difficile est rationem reddere Verbis. Quippe etenim jam tum Divinius mortalium Seelae, Egregias animo facies vigilantae videbant, Et magis in Somnis, mirando corporis audi. His igitur Senfum tribuebant, \&c.}\]

That is, How the Noise of the Gods, came thus to ring over the whole world, and to fill all places with Temples and Altars, is not a thing very difficult to give an account of, it proceeding first, from mens Fearful Dreams, and their Phantasmns when awake; taken by them for Visions and Sensations. Whereupon they attributed not only Sense to these things as really Existing, but also Immortality and great Power. For though his were properly an Account only, of those Inferior and Plebeian Gods, called Demons and Genii, yet was it supposed, that the belief of these things, did easily dispose the minds of men also, to the Persuasion of One Supreme Omnipotent Deity over all.

Latterly, That the Ancient Atheists, as well as the Modern, pretended, the Opinion of a God, and Religion, to have been a Political invention, is frequently declared in the writings of the Pagans; as this of Cicero, \text{It qui dixerunt totam de Dies Immortalibus Opinionem, si\text{f}}\text{fam esse ab hominibus Sapientibus, Reipublicae causa, \text{ut quot Rati nonsposet, eos ad officium Religionis ducaret \text{5 nonne omnem Religionem} jurtius sustulerunt? They who affirmed the whole opinion of the gods, to have been feigned by wise men for the sake of the Commonwealth, that so Religion might engage those to their Duty whom Reason could not; did they not utterly destroy all religion? And the fence of the Ancient Atheists is thus represented by Plato; \text{et in} \text{De Leg.}\text{, \text{qui} \text{ex} \text{the} \text{in} \text{De Leg.}\text{, \text{ex} \text{De Leg.}\text{, \text{ex} \text{De Leg.}\text{, \text{ex} \text{De Leg.}}}}\]

They First of all affirm, that the gods are not by Nature, but by Art and Laws only, and that from thence comes to pass, that they are different to different Nations and Countreys, accordingly as the several humours of their Law-makers did chance determine. And before Plato, Critius one of the Thirty Tyrants at Athens, plainly declared Religion at first to have been a Political Intrigue in those Verfes of his recorded by Sextus the Philosopher, beginning to this purpose: \text{That there was a time at first, when mens was Disorderly and Brutish, and the Will of the Stronger was the only Law. After which they consented and agreed together to make Civil War, that so the disorderly might be punished. Notwithstanding which, it was still found that men were only hindred from open, but not from secret Injustices. Whereupon some Sagacious and Wittie Person was the Author of a further Invention, to deter men as well in secret, as from open Injuries;
Namely, by introducing or signifying a God Immortal and Incorruptible, who hears and sees and takes notice of all things. Critias then concluding his Poem in these words,

And in this manner do I conceive, some One at first, to have persuaded mortals to believe, that there is a kind of Gods.

Thus have we fully declared, the sense of the Atheists, in their Account of the Phenomenon of Religion and the Belief of a God; namely, that they derive it principally from these Three Springs or Originals; First from mens own Fear and Solicitude concerning Future Events, or their Good and Evil Fortune. Secondly, from their Ignorance of the Causes both of those Events, and the Phenomena of Nature; together with their Curiosity. And Lastly, from the Fidelity of Civil Sovereigns, Law-makers, and Politicians. The Weakness and Foolery of all which, we shall now briefly manifest. First therefore, it is certain, that such an Excess of Fear, as makes any one constantly and obstinately to believe, the Existence of That, which there is no manner of ground neither from Sense nor Reason for; tending also to the great Disquiet of mens own Lives, and the Terror of their Minds; cannot be accounted other than a kind of Crassedness or Disinstitution. Wherefore the Atheists themselves acknowledging, the Generality of mankind, to be possessed with such a Belief of a Deity, when they resolve this into such an Excess of Fear; it is all one, as if they should affirm, the Generality of mankind, to be Frighted out of their Wits, or Crazed and Distemper'd in their Brains: none but a few Atheists, who being undaunted and undismissed have escaped this Panic Terror, remaining Sober and in their Right Senses. But whereas the Atheists, thus impute to the Generality of mankind not only Light-Minded Credulity, and Phantasy, but also such an Excess of Fear, as differs nothing at all from Crazedness and Distraction or Madness; We affirm on the contrary, that their supposed Courage, Stayedness and Sobriety, is really nothing else but the Dull and Sattish Stupidity of their minds; Dead and Heavy Incredulity, and Earthly Diffidence or Distrust; by reason whereof, they will believe nothing but what they can Feel or See.

Theists indeed have a Religious Fear of God, which is Consequent from him, or their Belief of him (of which more afterwards;) but the Deity it self or the Belief thereof, was not Created by any Antecedent Fear, that is, by Fear concerning Mens Good and Evil Fortune;
being certain, that none are less solicitous concerning such events, than they who are most truly religious. The reason whereof is, because these place their chief good, in nothing that is distinct, alien or in another's power, and exposed to the strokes of fortune; but in that which is most truly their own, namely the right use of their own will. As the atheists on the contrary, must needs for this very reason be liable to great fears and solicitudes, concerning outward events, because they place their good and evil, in the passion of pleasure and pain; or at least denying natural honesty, they acknowledge no other good, but what belongs to the animal life only, and so is under the empire of fortune. And that the atheists are indeed generally, timorous and fearful, suspicious and distressful things; seems to appear plainly, from their building all their politics, civil societies, and justice, (improperly so called) upon that only foundation of fear and distress.

But the grand error of the atheists here is this, that they suppose the deity, according to the fence of the generality of mankind, to be nothing but a mormo, bug-bear, or terriculum; an affrightful, hurtful, and most undesirable thing: whereas men every where invoke the deity in their straits and difficulties for aid and assistance; looking upon it as exercitable and pleasurable; and by their trust and confidence in it, acknowledge its goodness and benignity. Synesius de regno p. 9, affirms, that though men were otherwise much divided in their opinions, yet that they held the deity exercitable and pleasurable; They all every where, both wise and unwise, agree in this, that God is to be praised, as one who is good and benign.

If among the pagans, there were any, who understood that proverbial speech, &c. in the worst fence, as if God Almighty, were of an envious and spiteful nature, these were certainly, but a few ill-natured men, who therefore drew a picture of the deity, according to their own likeness. For the proverb in that fence, was disclaimed and cried down, by all the wiser pagans; as aristotle, who affirmed the poets to have lied in this, as well as they did in many other things; and plutarch, who taxeth herodotus for insinuating, &e. the deity to be of an envious and vexatious or spiteful disposition, whereas himself appropriated this only to that evil demon or principality, as appeared by him; as appeared from the life of P. emilius written by him, where he affirmeth, not that, but that the deity was of an envious nature, where, that there is a certain deity demon, whose proper task it is, to bring down all great and overbearing humane prosperity, and so to temper every man's life, that none may be happy in this world sincerely and unmixedly, without a check of adversity; which is as if a christian, should ascribe it to the devil.

And Plato plainly declares the reason of God's making the world at first, to have been no other than this, that he was good, and there is no manner of envy in that which is good. From whence he also concluded, &c. That God there.
The Sence of, το ολον φυσερνά, Book I.

Therefore willed, all things should be made the most like himself, that is, after the best manner. But the true meaning of that Id-located Proverb, seems at first, to have been no other, than what besides Hezek, the Scripture it self also attributes to God almighty, that he affecteth to Humble and Abase the Pride of men, and to pull down all High, Towering, and Lofty things, whether as Noxious and Hurtful to the men themselves, or as in some fence Invidious to him, and Dero-
gatory from his Honour, who alone ought to be exalted, and no flesh to glory before him. And there hath been so much experience of such a thing as this in the world, that the Epicurean Poet him-
self, could not but confess, that there was some Hidden Force or Power which seemed to have a spite to all Over-swelling Greatnesses, and affec
t to cast contempt and scorn upon the Pride of men,

Lamb. 593.

Utque aderet humanas vis Abdita quaedam
Obserit, & pulchros fæces, sævasque secure,
Procure, ac indibirio sibi habere videtur.

Where he plainly Reel'd and Stagger'd in his Atheifm; or else was in
deed a Theift, but knew it not; it being certain that there can be no such Force as this, in Regno Atomorum, in the Reign or Empire of Sensel's Atoms. And as for those among Christians, who make such a horrid Representation of God Almighty, as one who Created the greatest part of mankind, for no other end or design, but only this, that he might Recreate and Delight himself in their Eternal Tor-
ments; these also do but transcribe or copy out their own Ill Nature, and then read it in the Deity; the Scripture declaring on the contrary, That God is Love. Nevertheless these very persons in the mean time, dearly hug and embrace God Almighty in their own Conceit, as one that Fondly Good, Kind, and Gracious to themselves; he having fastned his affections upon their very Persons, without any considera-
tion of their Dispositions or Qualifications.

It is true indeed, that Religion is often expressed in the Scripture, by the Fear of God, and Fear hath been paid to be Prima Menfura Deitatis, the First Measure of the Divinity in us, or the First Impres-
sion that Religion makes upon men in this Obnoxious and Guilty state, before they have arrived to the true Love of God and Righte-
uousness. But this Religious Fear, is not a Fear of God, as a meer Ar-
britary Omnipotent Being, much less as Hurtful and Mischievous (which could not be disjoyned from Hatred;) but an aweful regard of him, as of one who is Effentially Just, and as well a Punisher of Vice and Wickedness, as a Rewarder of Virtue. Lucretius himself, when he de-
scribes this Religious Fear of men, confessing it to be conjoynd
with a Conscience of their Duty, or to include the same within it self.

Tunc Populi Gentesque tremunt, &c.
Ne quod ob admissum fièdè diùumque superbi,
Penarum grave fit solvendi tempus adaeum.

And
And this is the Sense of the Generality of mankind, that there being a Natural Difference of Good and Evil Moral, there is an Impartial Justice in the Deity which presideth over the same, and inclines it as well to Punish the wicked, as to Reward the Virtuous: Epictetus him. 

felf acknowledging thus much, "Si Deus non fcepurus mundus, tunc quod in deo aequum habet, in Deum feipsum, in aequum Deo, quod in Deum habet." He fuppofes, that there are both great Evils inflicted upon the wicked from the Gods; and also great Rewards by them bestowed upon the Good. And this Fear of God, is not only Beneficial to mankind in general, by repressing the growth of wickedness, but also wholesome and Salutary to thole very perfons themselves, that are thus Religionly affected, it being Preparative of them both from Moral Evils, and likewife from the Evils of Punishment consequent thereupon. This is the True and Genuine Fear of Religion; which when it degenerates into a Dark kind, of Jealous and Suspicious Fear of God Almighty, either as a Hurtful, or as a mere Arbitrary and Tyrannical Being, then is it look'd upon, is the Vice or Extreme of Religion, and distinguished from it by that name of Φασιστικός, Superflitious. Thus is the Character of a Superflitious Man given by Plutarch, "οτικα θεός άνας, λυπηρός οί καθάρος τοις θεούς." that he thinks there are Gods, but that they are Noxious and Hurtful; and οτικα θεός, a Superflitious man must needs hate God, as well as Fear him. The true Fear of God (as the Son of Sirach speaks) is the Beginning of his Love, and Faith, the Beginning of cleaving to him. As if he should have said, be first Entrance into Religion is an Awful regard to God as the Father of Vice; the Second Step forwards therein, is Faith or Confidence in God, whereby men Reely upon him for Good, and Cleave to him: and the Top and Perfection of all Religion, is the Love of God above all, as the most Amiable Being. Christianity, the best of religions, recommendeth Faith to us, as the Inlet or Introduction into all True and Ingenuous Piety; for He that cometh to God, must not only believe that he Is, but also that he is a Rewarder of thole that feek him. Which Faith is better defined in the Scripture, than by any Scholastick: to be the Substance of things (that are to be) hoped for, and the Evidence of things not seen. That is, a Confident Persuasion of things that fall not under Sight, (because they are either visible or Future) and which also are to be Hoped for. So that Religious Fear confideth well with Faith, and Faith is near of kin to Love, and the result of both Faith and Hope, is Love: which Faith, and Love, do all suppose an Essential Goodness in the Deity, God is in a Being, who if He were not, were of all things whatsoever most to be Wished for. It being indeed no way desirable (as that noble Emperor concluded) for a man to live in a world, void of a God and Providence. He that believes a God, believes all that Good and Perfection in the Universe, which his Heart can possibly wish or desire. But the Interest of none, that there should be no God, but only of his wretched Persons, as have abandoned their First and only true Interest, of being Good, and Friends to God, and are desperately relived upon ways of Wickedness.

The Reason why the Atheists do thus groffly mistake the Notion of God,
Atheists; No Nat. Justice, nor Charity. Book I.

God, and conceive of him differently from the Generality of mankind, as a thing which is only to be Feared, and must consequently be Hated, is from nothing but their own Vice and Ill Nature. For first, their Vice so far blinding them, as to make them think, that the Moral Differences of Good and Evil, have no foundation in Nature, but only in Law or Arbitrary Constitution (which Law is contrary to Nature, Nature being Liberty, but Law Restraint;) as they cannot but really Hate that, which Hinders them of their True Liberty and Chief Good, so must they needs interpret the Severity of the Deity so much spoken of against Wickedness, to be nothing else, but Cruelty and Arbitrary Tyranny. Again it is a wretched Ill-natured Maxim, which these Atheists have, That there is Nulla Naturalis Charitas, No Natural Charity, but that Omnisc Benevolentia oritur ex Imbecillitate & Mcd., All Benevolence ariseth only, from Imbecility and Fear; that is, from being either obnoxious to another's Power, or standing in need of his Help. So that all that is now called Love and Friendship amongst Men, is according to these really nothing, but either a crouching under Another's Power, whom they cannot Resist; or else Mercatura quaedam Utilitatum, a certain kind of Merchandizing for Utilities. And thus does Cotta in Cicero declare their fence, Ne Hominem quidem constit, nisi Imbecilli effent, futuros Beneficos aut Beneficos, You conceive that no man would be any way Beneficient or Benefvolent to another, were it not for his Imbecility or Indigence. But as for God Almighty, these Atheists conclude, That upon the Supposition of his Existence, there could not be so much as this Spurious Love or Benevolence in him neither, towards any thing; because by reason of his Absolute and Irresistible Power, He would neither stand in Need of Any thing, and be devoid of all Fear. Thus the formentioned Cotta, Quid est Præsstantius Bonitate & Beneficentia? Qua cum carere Deum vultis, neminem Deum nec Deum nec Hominem Carum, neminem ab eo amari vultis. Ita sit ut non modo Hominem à Ditis, sed ipsi Dii inter se ab aliis aliis negligentur. What is there more excellent than Goodness and Benevolence; which when you will needs have God to be utterly devoid of, you suppose that neither any God nor Man, is Dear to the Supreme God, or beloved of him. From whence it will follow, that not only men are neglected by the Gods, but also the Gods amongst themselves are neglected by one another. Accordingly a late Pretender to Politicks, who in this manner, discards all Natural Justice and Charity, determine concerning God, Regnandi & Punendi eos qui Leges suas violant, jux Deo esse à Soli Potentia Irresistibili, That he has no other Right of Reigning over men, and of Punishing those who transgress his Laws, but only from his Irresistible Power. Which indeed is all one as to say, That God has no Right at all of Ruling over mankind, and imposing Command upon them, but what he doth in this kind, he doth it only by Fear and Power; Right, and Might, (or Power) being very different things from one another, and there being no Jus or Right without Natural Justice; so that the word Right is here only Abused. And Contention fully hereunto the same Writer further adds, Si jus Regnandi habet Deus ab Omnipotentiua, manifestum est obligationem ad praebendum ipsi obedientiam incumbere Hominius propter Imbecillitatem, That if God's Right of Commanding, be derived only from his Omnipotence,
But all this is nothing, but the Atheists False Imagination; True Religion representing a most comfortable Prospect of things from the Deity; whereas on the contrary, the Atheistick Scene of things, is Dismal, Hopeless and Forlorn, That there should be no other Good, than what depends upon things wholly out of our own power, the momentary gratification of our Infatiate Appetites, and the perpetual pouring in to a Dolium Perturbum, a Perforated and Leaking Vessel. That our selves should be but a Congeries of Atoms, upon the disolution of whose Compages, our Life should vanish into nothing, and all our Hope perish. That there should be no Providence over us, nor any Kind and Good-natured Being above, to take care of us, there being nothing without us, but Dead and Senseless Matter. True indeed there could be no spiteful Designs in Senseless Atoms, or a Dark Inconsciou Nature. Upon which account, Plutarch would grant, that even this Atheistick Hypothesis it self, as bad as it is, were notwithstanding to be preferred, before that of an Omnipotent, Spiteful and Malicious Being, (if there can be any such Hypothesis as this) a Monarchy of the Manichean Evil Principle, reigning all alone over the whole world, without any Corrival, and having an undisturbed Empire. Nevertheless it is certain also, that there could be no Faith nor Hope neither, in these Senseless Atoms, both Necessarily and Fortuitously moved, no more than there could be Faith and Hope in a Whirlwind, or in a Tempestuous Sea, whose merciless waves are Inexorable, and deaf to all Cries and Supplications. For which reason Epicurus himself confessed, that it was better to give credit to the Fable of the Gods, (as he E. 49. Ch. 2 calls it) than to serve the Atheistick Fate, or that Material Necessity of all things, introduced by those Atheistick Phyliologers Lucrecius and Democritus: καθιστήν ό τις αὕτη σος μέλη διοικονομεῖν, τι τοῦ φυ- νύχων εμφανίζεται, ὥμφα μὴ ἐν τῆς ἀποκριθείς, ὑπεργοφεῖν ἥν ἂν δὲ πάντα ὡς ἂν ἀληθεῖν ἔχει τῶν ἁρμόδων. Because there is Hopes that the Gods may be prevailed with, by worship and prayer; but the other (Necessity) is altogether deaf and Inexorable. And though Epicurus thought to mend the matter, and make the Atheistick Hypothesis more tolerable, by introducing it (contrary to the Tenour of those Principles) Liberty of
Atheism founded in Distrust. Book I.

of Will in Men; yet this being not a Power over things Without us, but our selves only, could alter the case very little. Epicurus himself was in a Panick Fear, left the frame of Heaven should sometime upon a sudden crack, and tumble about his Ears, and this Fortuitous Com-

pilment of Atoms be dissolv'd into a Chaos.

—-- ——— Tria tali Texta

Una Dies dabit exitio; multosque per annos
Sustentata rei noles, & Machina mundi.

And what Comfort could his Liberty of Will then afford Him, who
placed all his happiness in Security from External Evils? θ'δε τα
μι μοιχίων τας, μη φοβιζόν τιν. (faith Plutarch) The Atheistick Design in
shaking off the Belief of a God, was to be without Fear; but by means
hereof, they fram'd such a System of things to themselves, as under
which, they could not have the least Hope, Faith or Confidence. Thus
running from Fear, did they plunge themselves into Fear; for they
who are without Hope, can never be free from Fear. Endless of ne-
cessity must the Fears and Anxieties of those men be, who shake off
that One Fear of God, that would only preserve them from Evil,
and have no Faith nor Hope in him. Wherefore we might conclude
upon better grounds than the Atheists do of Theism; that Atheism
(which hath no foundation at all in Nature nor in Reason) springs
first from the Impos'ure of Fear. For the Faith of Religion, being
the Substance or Confidence of such things not seen, as are to be Hoped
for; Atheistick Insidelity must needs on the contrary be, a certain heav-
y Difficulty, Despondence and Misgiving of Mind, or a Timorous
Distrust and Disbelieve of Good, to be Hoped for, beyond the reach
of Sense; namely of an Invisible Being Omnipotent, that exerciseth a
Just, Kind, and Gracious Providence, over all those who commit their
ways to him, with an endeavour to please him, both here in this
Life and after Death. But Vice, or the Love of Lawless Liberty, pre-
vailing over such Disbelieving persons, makes them by degrees, more
and more delirous, that there should be no God; that is, no such
Hinderer of their Liberty, and to count it a happiness to be freed
from the Fear of him, whose Justice (if he were) they must needs
be obnoxious to.

And now have we made it Evident, that these Atheists who make
Religion and the Belief of a God, to proceed from the Impos'ure of
Fear, do first of all disguise the Deity, and put a Monstrous, Horrid
and Affrightful Vizard upon it, transforming it into such a thing, as
can only be Feared and Hated; and then do they conclude concerning it (as well indeed they may) that there is no such thing
as this, really Existing in Nature, but that it is only a Morn or Bug-
bear, rai'd up by mens Fear and Phan'sie. Of the Two, it
might better be said, that the Opinion of a God, sprung from mens
Hope of Good, than from their Fear of Evil; but really, it springs
neither from Hope nor Fear, (however in different Circumstances it
raies both those Passions in our Minds) nor is it the Impos'ure of a
Passion, but that whose Belief is supported and Sustained, by th
stronge.
Chap. IV. Theism, not from Ignor. of Causes.

Strongest and clearest Reason, as shall be declared in due place. But the Sense of a Deity, often Preventing Ratiocination in us, and urging it more immediately upon us, it is certain that there is also, besides a Rational Belief thereof, a Natural Prepossession or Anticipation in the Minds of men concerning it, which by Aristotle is called matēdà, A Vaticination.

Thus have we sufficiently confuted, the First Atheistical Pretence, to save the Phenomenon of Religion and the Belief of a God, so generally entertained, from the Impurities of Fear: we come now to the Second, that it proceeded from the Ignorance of Causes also, or Mens want of Philosophy: they being prone, by reason of their Innate Curiosity, where they find no Causes to make or feign them; and from their Fear, in the Absence of Natural and Necessary Causes, to imagine Super-Natural and Divine; this also affording them a handsom Cover and Pretext for their Ignorance. For which cause these Atheists stick not to affirm of God Almighty, what some Philosophers do of Occult Qualities, that he is but Phænomenon, & Fafium Ignorantiae, a Refuge Lucap.500. and Shelter for mens Ignorance; that is, in plain and downright Language, The meer Sanctuary of Fools.

And these two things are here commonly joyned together by these Atheists, both Fear, and Ignorance of Causes, as which jointly concurreth in the Production of Theism. Because as the Fear of Children raises up Bugbears especially in the Dark, so do they suppose in like manner, the Fear of men, in the Darkness of their Ignorance especially, to raise up the Mormo, Spectre or Phantasm of a God; which is thus intimated by the Epicurean Poet,

Omnia Caecis
In tenebris Metuunt.

And accordingly Democritus gave this account of the Original of The-Steph. Poc. m or Religion, οὕτως τε τούτος μεταπέρα της Συμμετοχής οί ποιούμεν Ἵη Περί της Συμμετοχής, καθότι προετός οι συμμετοχής, λει ζήσεν, εἰ ἦ τῷ στειλθες αὐτικοῖς, ιδου τοῦ Σοφοῦ οὗ οὕτως τὸν αἰτομ. That when in old times, men feared strange and affrightful things in the Meteors and the Heaven, as Thunder, Lightning, Thunderbolts & Eclipses; they not knowing the Causes thereof, & being terrified thereby, presently imputed them to the Gods. And Epicurus declares this to have been the reason, why he took such great pains in the Study of Physiology, that by finding out the Natural and Necessary Causes of things, he might be able to free both himself and others from the Terror of a God, which would otherwise invade and Assault them: the Importunity of mens minds, when-ever they are at a loss for Natural Causes, urging them so much, with the Fear, Suspicion, and Jealousie of a Deity.

Wherefore the Atheists thus dabbling in Physiology, and finding out what they conceive, Material and Mechanical Causes, for some of the Phenomena of Nature, and especially for such of them, as the unskilful Vulgar some times impute to God himself; when they can prove Eclipses
Atheists, Ignorant of Causes.  

Eclipses (for example) to be no Miracles, and render it probable, that Thunder is not the Voice of God Almighty himself, as it were roaring above in the Heavens, merrily to affright and amaze poor Mortals, and make them quake and tremble; and that Thunderbolts are not there flung by his own hands, as the direful messengers of his wrath and displeasure; they presently conclude triumphantly thereupon, concerning Nature or Matter, that it doth

\[ \text{Ipse sua per se, sponte, omnia, Diœ agere expers,} \]

Do all things alone of itself without a God. But we shall here make it appear in a few Instances as briefly as we may, that Philosophy and the True Knowledge of Causes, leads to God; and that Atheism is nothing but Ignorance of Causes and of Philosophy.

For first, no Atheist, who derives all from Sensless Atoms or Matter, is able to assign any Cause at all of Himself, or give any true account of the Original of his own Soul or Mind, it being utterly Unconceivable and Impossible, that Soul and Mind, Sense, Reason and Understanding, should ever arise from Irrational and Sensless Matter; however modified; or result from Atoms, devoid of all manner of Qualities; that is, from mere Magnitude, Figure, Site and Motion of Parts. For though it be indeed absurd to say (as these Atheists allege) that Laughing and Crying Things, are made out of Laughing and Crying Principles,

\[ \text{Et Ridere potest non ex Ridentibus factus?} \]

Yet does it not therefore follow, that Sensible and Rational Beings, might result from a Composition of Irrational and Sensless Atoms; which according to the Democritic Hypothesis, have nothing in them, but Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion, or Rest. Because Laughing and Crying, are Motions, which result from the Mechanism of Humane Bodies, in such a manner Organized, but Sense and Understanding are neither Local Motion, nor Mechanism. And the Caele will be the very same, both in the Anaximandrian or Hylopathian, and in the Stratonick or Hylozoick Atheism, because Sense and Conscious Understanding, could no more result, either from those Qualities of Heat and Cold, Moiât and Dry, contempered together, or from the meer Organization of Inanimate and Sensless Matter, than it could from the

\[ \text{Concursus, Motus, Ordo, Positura, Figure,} \]

of Atoms devoid of all manner of Qualities. Had there been once nothing but Sensless Matter, Fortuitously Moved, there could never have emerged into Being, any Soul or Mind, Sense and Understanding; because no Effêct can possibly transcend the Perfection of its Cause. Wherefore Atheists supposing Themselves, and all Souls and Mind, to have sprung from Stupid and Sensless Matter; and all that Wisdome which is any where in the World, both Political and Philosophical
to be the Result of meet Fortune and Chance; must needs be concluded, to be Grolly Ignorant of Causes; which had they not been, they could never have been Atheists. So that Ignorance of Causes, is the Seed, not of Theism, but of Atheism: true Philosophy, and the Knowledge of the Cause of our Selves, leading necessarily to a Deity.

Again, Atheists are Ignorant of the Cause of Motion in Bodies also; by which notwithstanding they suppose all things to be done; that is, they are never able to Salve this Phenomenon, so long as they are Atheists, and acknowledge no other Substance besides Matter or Body. For First it is undeniably certain, that Motion is not Essential to all Body as such, because then no Particles of Matter could ever Rest; and consequently there could have been no Generation, nor no such Mundane System produced as this is, which requires a certain Proportionate Commixture of Motion and Rest; no Sun, nor Moon, nor Earth, nor Bodies of Animals; since there could be no Coherent Consistency of any thing, when all things flutter'd and were in continual Separation and Division from one another. Again it is certain likewise, that Matter or Body as such, hath no Power of Moving it self Freely or Spontaneously neither, by Will or Appetite; both because the same Inconvenience would from hence ensue likewise, and because the Phenomena or Appearances do plainly evince the contrary. And as for that Prodigiously Absurd Paradox, of some few Hylotozick Atheists, that all Matter as such, and therefore every Smallest Particle thereof, hath not only Life Essentially belonging to it, but also Perfect Wisdom and Knowledge, together with Appetite, and Self-moving Power, through without Animal Sense or Consciousness; this, I say, will be elsewhere in due place further confuted. But the Generality of the ancient Atheists, that is, the Anaximandrovs and Democritics, attributed no manner of Life to Matter as such; and therefore could ascribe no Voluntary, or Spontaneous Motion to the same, but Fortuitous only; according to that of the Epicurean Poet already cited,

Nam certe neque Consilio, Primordia rerum,
Ordinesque, atque jagaci mente locaunt;
Nec quos quaque darent Motus pepigere profectos.

Therefore these Democritics, as Aristotle somewhere intimates, were able to assign no other Cause of Motion, than only this, That One Body moved another from Eternity Infinitely, so that there was no Motus noster, no First Unmoved Mover, ever to be found; because there is no Beginning nor First in Eternity. From whence probably that Doctrine of some Atheistic Stoicks in Alex. Aphrodijus was derived, That there is no First in the rank and order of Causes. In the Lib de Fato, notsteps of which Philosophers, a Modern Writer seemeth to have P. lodden, when declaring himself after this manner; Si quis ab Es-

Vnusque, ad Canum equijs Immediatam, atque inde et Remoti-

vns, ac sic perpetuo rationatione ascenderit, non tamen in aeternum

ocedere poterit, sed defatigatus aliquando deficiet. If any one will

from whatsoever Effet, ascend upward to its Immediate Cause, and,
from hence to a Remoter, and so onwards perpetually, in his Katiccination, yet shall he never be able to hold on thorough all Eternity, but at length being quite tyr'd out with his journey, be forced to desist or give over. Which seems to be all one, as if he should have said; One thing Moved or Caused another Infinitely from Eternity, in which there being no Beginning, there is consequently no First Mover or Cause to be reach'd unto. But this Infinite Progress of these Democriticks, in the Order of Causes, and their shifting off the Cause of Motion, from one thing to another without end or beginning, was rightly understood by Aristotle, to be indeed the Affigning of No Cause of Motion at all, εις ἀνεργον έναν, ει μηδε τρεις φύσεων πτωτον. They acknowledging (faith he) no First Mover according to Nature, must needs make an idle Progress Infinitely that is, in the Language of this Philosopher, affign no Cause at all of Motion. Epicurus therefore to mend the matter, though according to the Principles of the Atomick Physiology, he discarded all other Qualities, yet did he notwithstanding admit this One Quality of Gravity or Ponderosity in Atoms, pressing them continually downwards in Infinite Space. In which, as nothing could be more Absurd nor Unphilosophical, than to make Upwards and Downwards in Infinite Space, or a Gravity tending to no Centre, nor Place of Rest; so did he not affign any Cause of Motion neither; but only in effect affirm, the Atoms therefore to tend Downwards, because they did so: a Quality of Gravity signifying only an Endeavour to tend Downwards, but Why or Wherefore, no body knows. And it is all one as if Epicurus should have said; that Atoms moved Downwards by an Occult Quality, he either betaking himself to this as an Alysium, a Sanctuary or Refuge for his Ignorance; or else indeed more absurdly making his very Ignorance it self (diguized under that name of a Quality) to be the Cause of Motion. Thus the Atheists univerally, either affign'd no Cause at all for Motion, as the Anaximandrians and Democriticks; or else no True one, as the Hylcristicks; when to avoid Incorporeal Substance, they would venture to attribute, Perfect Understanding, Appetite or Will, and Self-moving Power, to all Sensible Matter whatsoever. But since it appears plainly, that Matter or Body cannot Move it self; either the Motion of all Bodies, must have no manner of Cause, or else must there of necessity, be some other Substance besides Body, such as is Self-active and Hylarchical, or hath a Natural Power, of Ruling over Matter. Upon which latter account, Plato rightly determin'd, that Cognitiation, which is Self-activity or Autochinesis, was in order of Nature, before the Local Motion of Body, which is Heterochinesis. Though Motion considered Passively in Bodies, or taken for their Translation, or Change of Distance and Place, be indeed a Corporeal thing, or a Mode of those Bodies themselves moving; yet as it is considered Actively, for the Vis Movens, that Active Force which causes this Translation or Change of Place, is it an Incorporeal thing? the Energy of a Self Active Substance, upon that fluggish Matter or Body, which canno at all move it self. Wherefore in the Bodies of Animals, the True and Proper Cause of Motion, or the Determination thereof at least, is not the Matter it self Organized; but the Soul either as Cogitative, or Passively Self Active, Vitaly united thereunto, and Naturally Ruling over it. But in the whole World it is either God himself, Originally imperi
ing a certain Quantity of Motion upon the Matter of the Universe, and constantly concurring the same, according to that of the Scripture, *In* 

**Chap. IV. Nor of the Mundane Regularity.**

им we Live & Move; (which seems to have been the Sense also of that Noble Agrigentine Poet and Philosopher, when he described God, to be only, A Pure or Holy Mind, that with swift thoughts agitates the whole World,) or else it is Instrumentally, an Inferior Created Spirit, Soul, or Life of Nature, that is, a Subordinate Hierarchical Principle, which hath a Power of Moving Matter Regularly, according to the Direction of a Superior Perfect Mind. And thus do we see again, that Ignorance of Causes, is the Seed of Atheism, and not of Theism; no Atheists being able to assign a true Cause of Motion; the Knowledge whereof plainly leadeth to a God.

Furthermore those Atheists who acknowledge no other Principle of things, but Senseless Matter Fortuitously moved, must needs be Ignorant also of the Cause of that Grand Phenomenon, called by Aristotle, the τό ἃ ἢ, χαλκός, the Well and Fit in Nature, that is, of the most Artificial Frame of the whole Mundane System in General, and of the Bodies of Animals in Particular, together with the Conspiring Harmony of all. For they who boasted themselves able to give Natural Causes of all things whatsoever without a God, can give no other Cause at all of this Phenomenon, but only that the World Happened by Chance to be thus made as it is. Now they who make Fortune and Chance, to be the only Cause of this so Admirable Phenomenon, the most Regular and Artificial Frame, and Harmony of the Universe; they either make the mere Absence and Want of a Cause, to be a Cause, Fortune and Chance being nothing else but the Absence or want of an Intending Cause. Or else do they make, their own Ignorance of a Cause, and They know not How, to be a Cause; as the Author of the Leviathan interprets the meaning hereof, Many times (faith he) men put for Cause of Natural Events, their own Ignorance, not disguised in other words, as when they say, that Fortune is the Cause of things Contingent, that is, of things whereof they know no Cause. Or they affirm against all Reason, one Contrary to be the Cause of another, as Confusion to be the Cause of Order, Pulchritude and Harmony; Chance and Fortune, to be the Cause of Art and Skill; Folly and Nonsense, the Cause of the most Wise and Regular Contrivance. Or Lastly, they deny it to have any Cause at all, since they deny an Intending Cause, and there cannot possibly be any other Cause of artificial Acts and Conspiring Harmony, than Mind and Wisdom, Counsel and Contrivance.

But because the Atheists here make some Pretences for this their ignorance, we shall not conceal any of them, but bring them all to light; to the end that we may discover their Weakness and Foolery. And therefore they pretend, that the World is not so Artificially and will made, but that it might have been made much better, and that there are many Faults and Flaws to be found therein; from whence they would infer, that it was not made by a God, he being supposed by atheists, to be no Bungler, but a Perfect Mind, or a Being Infinitely good and Wise, who therefore should have made all things for the
But this being already set down by it self, as a Twelfth Atheistick Objection against a Deity, we must reserve the Confutation thereof for its proper place. Only we shall observe thus much here by the way; That those Theists of Later times, who either because they fancy a meer Arbitrary Deity; or because their Faith in the Divine Goodness is but weak; or because they Judge of things according to their own Private Appetites, and Selfish Passions, and not with a Free Uncaptivated Universality of Mind, and an Impartial Regard to the Good of the Whole; or because they look only upon the Present Scene of things, and take not in the Future into consideration, nor have a Comprehensive View of the whole Plot of Divine Providence together; or lastly, because we Mortals do all stand upon too Low a Ground, to take a commanding view and Prospect upon the whole Frame of things; and our shallow Understandings are not able to fathom the Depths of the Divine Wisdom, nor trace all the Methods and Designs of Providence; grant, That the World might have been made much Better than now it is; which indeed is all one as to say, that it is Not Well made; these Neo*terick Christians (I say) seem hereby, to give a much greater advantage to the Atheists, than the Pagan Theists themselves heretofore did, who stood their Ground, and generously maintained against them; that Mind being the Maker of all things, and not Fortune or Chance, nor Arbitrary Self-will, and Irrational Humour Omnipotent, the τὸ ἐξαίτης, that which is Absolutely the Best in every Case, so far as the Necessity of things would admit, and in compliance with the Good of the Whole, was the Measure and Rule both of Nature and Providence.

Again the Atomick Atheists further alledged, that though there be many things in the world, which serve well for Ûser, yet it does not at all follow, that therefore they were made Intentionally and Designedly for those Ûses; because though things Happen by Chance to be so or so Made, yet may they serve for something or other afterward, and have their several Ûses Consequent. Wherefore all the things of Nature, Happened (say they) by Chance; to be so made as they are; and their several Ûses notwithstanding were Consequent, or Following thereupon. Thus the Epicurean Poet,

Lucret. L. 4.
Ps. 367. Lamb.

Nothing in many parts Body was made out of design for any Ûse, but all the several parts thereof, happening to be so made as they are their Ûses were Consequent therupon. In like manner the Old Atheistick Philosophers in Aristotle, concluded, τὸς θεῖος ὄνομα ἔκκενσι, ἐνακαίται, τὸς μέν ἐπιτροπῆς δεῖκε,  ἐπιπεδεῖς τοὺς ὄρους, τὸς μερίδια πλατεῖς, ἔκει χρυσάνθημα πρὸς τὸ λευκὸν τῷ πρωσῷ, ἐπεὶ οὕτως ἐνακαίται, ἐκλή ὑπερτερίαν ὄμοιος ὃς ἐν τῷ ἀλλον μερισίν, ὡς οἴκει διά βαλαντὶ τῷ ωκεάνι τῷ. That the Former Teeth, were made by Material Mechanical Necessity, Thin and Sharp, by means whereof they became fit for Cutting, but the Jaw-Teeth Thick and Broad, whereby they be
And, as &c. no any but besides 077 and and aM' and of fens, td, ly. tended fence fuch, this fuch, Chap. 1 Vfeful for the Grinding of Food. But neither of them were intended to be such, for the fake of these Ufes, but Happened by Chance only. And the like concerning all the other Parts of the Body, which seem to be made for Ends. Accordingly the fame Arifotle, represents the fence of thofe ancient Atheiils, concerning the other Parts of the Universe, or Things of Nature, that they were all likewise made such, by the Nefcity of Material (or Mechanical) Motions Undirected, and yet had nevertheless their several Ufes Consequent, upon this their Accidental Structure. Ti καλεί τω ψόν µή ἴκεδ το πόνον, µνη' ἐπὶ βελτιν, ἀν' ῥηχὼ ὡς θάνατος, ἧς ὅπον ἢ ὅτον αὕτη, ἀν' ἡ αὐτέχνη, &c. What binders but that Nature might act without any respect to Ends or Good and Better, as Jupiter or the Heaven, raineth not Intentionally to make the Corn grow, but from Nefcity? Because the vapours being raised up into the Middle Region, and there Refrigerated and Condensed, must needs descend down again in the form of Water. But this happens by meer Chance and without any Intention, that the Grain is made to grow thereby, as the Contrary sometimes Happens, by the excess of it.

But to this we Reply, That though a thing that Happens Accidentally to be fo or so Made, may afterwards notwithstanding prove often ferviceable for some Ufe or other: yet when any thing confifteth of many Parts, that are all Artificially proportionated together, and with much Curiosity accommodated one to another, any one of which Parts having been wanting, or otherwise in the leaft placed and disposed of, would have rendred the whole altogether Ineff for such a Ufe: then may we well conclude it not to have been made by Chance, but by Counfel and Design Intentionally, for such Ufes. As for example, The Eye, whole Structure and Fabrick confifting of many Parts (Humours and Membranes) is fo Artificially compos'd; no reaſonable person who confiders the whole Anatomy thereof, and the Curiosity of its Structure, can think otherwise of it, but that it was made out of Design for the Ufe of Seeing; and did not Happen Accidentally to be fo made, and then the Ufe of Seeing follow; as the Epicurean Poet would fain perswade us,

Lumina ne facias Occulorum clara Create;
Propicere ut possimus.

You are by all means to take heed, of entertaining that fo dangerous Opinion (to Atheism) that Eyes were made for the fake of Seeing; and Ears for the fake of Hearing. But for a man to think, that not only Eyes happened to be fo made, and the Ufe of Seeing Unintendt Followed; but also that in all the fame Animals, Ears Happened to be fo made too, and the Ufe of Hearing Followed them; and a Mouth and Tongue Happened to be fo made likewise, and the Ufe of Eating, and (in men) of Speaking, was also Accidentally Consequent thereupon; and Feet were in the fame Animals made by Chance too, and the Ufe of Walking Followed; and Hands made in them by Chance also, upon which fo many neceffary Ufes depend; besides Illumine other Parts of the Body, both Similar and Organical, none of which could
could have been wanting, without rendering the whole leuct or Difeôf; I say, to think, that all these things should Happen by Chance to be Thus made in every one and the fame Animal, and not Designed by Mind or Counsel, that they might joyntly Concur and Contribute to the Good of the whole; This argues the greatest In-sensibility of Mind Imaginable. But this Absurd and Ridiculous Conceit hath been long since so industriously Confuted, and the folly thereof to fully manifest, by that learned Pagan Philosopher and Physi-cian, Galen, in his Book of the Use of Parts, that it would be altogether Superfluous to insinuate any more upon it.

Wherefore that the Former Teeth are made Thin and Sharp, and the Jaw Teeth Thick and Broad, by Chance only, and not for Use, was one of the Democratick Dotages; as also That nothing in the Clouds and Meteors, was intended for the Good of this Habitable Earth, within whose Atmosphere they are contained, but all proceeded from Material and Mechanical Necessity. Which Conceit, though Cartesius seem to have written his whole Book of Meteors in favour of, he beginning it with the Derision of thofe, who Seat God in the Clouds, and imagine his hands to be Employed, in opening and shutting the Cloafers of the Winds, in sprinkling the Flowers with dews, and thunder-striking the Tops of Mountains; and closing his Discourse with this Boaf; that he had now made it manifest, there was no need to fly to Miracles, (that is, to Bring in a God upon the Stage) to fave thofe Phenomena; yet were it eafie enough to demonstrate, the Deficiency of thofe his Mechanical Undertakings, in many particulars, and to evince that all thofe things could not be carried on, with such constant Regularity, by mere Fortuitous Mechanism, without any Superior Principle to guide and steer them. Nevertheless we acknowledge, that God and Nature do things everywhere, in the moft Frugal and Compendious way, and with the leaft Operofeness; and therefore that the Mechanick Powers are not rejected, but taken in, so far as they could comply serviceably with the Intellectual Model and Platform. But still fo, as that all is Supervised by One Understanding and Intending Cause, and nothing paffes, without His Approbation; who when either thofe Mechanick Powers fall fhort, or the Stubborn Necessity of Matter proves uncompliant, does over-rule the fame, and supply the Defects thereof, by that which is Vital; and that without fetting his own Hands immediately to every work too; there being a Subserving Minifter under him, an Artificial Nature, which as an Archeus of the whole world, governs the Fluctuating Mechanism thereof, and does all things faithfully for Ends and Purpofes, Intended by its Director.

But our Atomick Atheifts still further allledge, That though it might well seem strange, that Matter Fortuitoufely moved, should at the very fift jump, fall into fuch a Regular Frame as this is, having fo many Aptitudes for Ufes, fo many Correspondencies between several things, and fuch an agreeing Harmony in the whole; yet ought it not to feen a jot strange, if Atoms by Motion, making all possible Combination, and Contextures, and trying all manner of Conclusions and Experim
CHAP. IV. The Atheists, Once-Inept World.

...should after Innumerable other Freaks, and Discongruous Forms produced, in length of time, fall into such a System as this is. Wherefore they affirm, that this Earth of ours at first, brought forth divers Monstrous and Irregular Shapes of Animals,

Orba pedum partim, manuum viduata vicissim; Multa sine ore etiam, sine Volut caca reperta.

Some without Feet, some without Hands, some without a Mouth and Face, some wanting fit Muscles and Nerves for the Motion of their members. And the old Philosophsick Atheists, were so frank and laud herein, that they fluck not to affirm, amongst those monstrous shapes of Animals there were once produced, Centaurs, and Scyllas, and Chimeras, mixtly Boiform and Hominiform; but Epicurus a little ashamed of this, as that which mact needs look Oddly and Ridiculously, and seeming more Cautious and Caftigate, pretends to correct the Extravagancy of this Phancys.

Sed neque Centauri succurrit, neque tempore in utro; Effe quadupl Duplici Natura, O Corpora Bino, Ex alienigenis Membris compa&apet las.

Nevertheless, there were not then any Centaurs, nor Bi-form and Tri-form Animals; he adding, that they who feigned such things as thefe, might as well phancy, Rivers flowing with Golden Streams, and Trees Germinating sparkling Diamonds, and such vasty Gigantean men, as could ride over Seas, and take up Mountains in their Clutches, and turn the Heavens about, with the strength of their arms. Against all which notwithstanding, he gravely gives such a Reason, as plainly overthrows his own Principles,

Res sic quaque suo ritu procedit, & omnes, Federe Nature certo discrimina servant.

Because things by a certain Covenant of Nature, always keep up their Specific Differences, without being confounded together. For what Covenant of Nature can there be in Infinite Chance? or what Law can there be set to the Absolutely Fortuitous Motions of Atoms, to circumscribe them by? Wherefore it must be acknowledged, that according to the genuine Hypothesis of the Atomick Atheism, all Imaginable Forms of Inanimate Bodies, Plants and Animals, as Centaurs, Scyllas and Chimeras, are producible by the Fortuitous Motions of Matter, there being nothing to hinder it, whilst it doth,

Omninodis coire, atque omnis perrantare Quaecunque interfice possint congressa creaere,

But it self into all kind of Combinations, play all manner of Freaks, and say all possible Consequences and Experiments.
But they Pretend, that these Monstrous, Irregular Shapes of Animals, were not therefore now to be found, because by reason of their Inept Fabrick, they could not propagate their kind by Generation, as neither indeed Preferve their own Individuals. Thus does Lucretius declare the fence of Epicurus.

And that this Atheijisick Doctrine was older than Epicurus, appeareth from these words of Aristotle, ὃς χρυσὶν ξύνεται σφαίρα, τάξιν μονίτω τι ἐκείνη ἀπὸ τὰ αὐτομάτα συνάσσεται, ἐν τῇ μὴ ἄκενε, αὐτόμαθε, καὶ βοήθει ἑπτελείας. When Animals Happened at first to be made, in all manner of Forms, those of them only, were preferred and continued to the present time, which chance to be fitly made (for Generation) but all the others prolifered, as Empedocles affirmed of the Partly-Ox and Partly-Man Animals. Moreover the ancient both Anaximandrian and Democratick Atheists, concluded that besides this One World of ours, there were other Infinite Worlds, (they conceiving it as absurd to think, there should be but one only World in Infinite Space, as that in a vast plowed and sowed Field, there should grow up only one Ear of Corn, and no more) and they would have us believe, that amongst these Infinite Worlds (all of them Fortuitously made) there is not-one of a Thousand or perhaps of Ten thousand, that hath such Regularity, Concinnity, and Harmony in it, as this World that we chanced to emerge in. Now it cannot be thought strange (as they suppose) if amongst Infinite Worlds, One or Two, should chance to fall into some Regularity. They would also confidently assure us, that the present System of things, in this World of ours, shall not long continue such as it is, but after a while fall into Confusion and Disorder again;

The same wheel of Fortune, which moving upward, hath brought into view this Scene of things that now is, turning round, will sometime or other, carry it all away again, introducing a new one in its stead: and then shall we have Centaurs, and Scylla's and Chimera's again; all manner of Inept Forms of Animals, as before.

But because men may yet be puzzled with the Universality and Constancy of this Regularity, and its long Continuance through so many Ages, that there are no Records at all of the contrary any where to be found; the Atomick Atheists further adds, that the Sensible Atoms, playing and toying up and down, without any care or thought, and from Eternity Trying all manner of Tricks, Conclusion.
ions and Experiments, were at length (they know not how) Taught, and by the Necessity of things themselves, as it were, Driven, to a certain kind of Trade of Artificersness and Methodicalness, so that though their Motions were at First all Casual and Fortuitous, yet in length of Time, they became Orderly and Artificial, and Governed by a certain Law; they contracting as it were upon themselves by long Practice and Experience, a kind of Habit of moving Regularly; or else being by the mere Necessity of things, at length forced so to move, as they should have done, had Art and Wisdom directed them. Thus Epicurus in his Epistle to Herodatus, ολυ νυσυ παπαλκατεν ην τιν φρον ποια θ. 18. v. γ. η παντων άν τηλων την πολεμακον διδύς ηλευ ην τη γενεατησι την, it must be held, that Nature is both Taught and Necessitated by the things themselves: Or else as Gassendus interprets the words, quadam veluti Naturali Necessariaque Doctrina sensim imbuta; by little and little imbued, with a certain kind of Natural and Necessary Doctrine.

To which Atheistick Pretences, we shall briefly reply; First, that it is but an Idle Dream, or rather Impudent Forgery of thefie Atheists, that heretofore there were in this World of ours, all manner of Monstrons and Irregular Shapes of Animals produced; Centaurs, Scylla's, and Chimera's, &c. and indeed at first none but such: There being not the least footstep of any fuch thing appearing in all the Monuments of Antiquity, and Traditions of Former times; and these Atheists being not able to give any manner of reason, why there should not be such produced as well at this Present time, however the Individuals themselves could not continue long, nor propagate by Generation; or at least why it should not Happen, that in some Ages or Countries, there were either all Androgyne, of both Sexes, or else no Animal but of One Sex, Male, or Female only; or lastly none of any Sex at all. Neither is there any more reason to give credit to these Atheists, when (though enemies to Divination) they would Prophecy concerning Future times, that in this World of ours, all shall sometime fall into Confusion and Nonfeence again. And as their Infinity of Worlds, is an Absolute Impossibility, so to their Bold and Confident Assertion, concerning those Supposed other Worlds, as if they had travelled over them all; that amongst Ten Thoufand of them, there is hardly One, that hath so much Regularity in it, as this World of ours; it might be replied, with equal Confidence, and much more Probability of Reason; That were every Planet about his Sun of ours an Habitable Earth; and every Fixed Star a Sun, having likewise its several other Planets or Habitable Earths moving round about it; and not any one of these Desert or Uninhabited, but all Peopled with Animals; we fay, were this fo extravagant Supposition true; That there would not be found any one Ridiculous or Inept System amongst them all; but that the Divine Art and Wisdom (which being Infinite, can never be Defective, nor any where idle) would exercise its Dominion upon all, and every where Im-press the Sculptures and Signatures of it self.

In the next place we affirm, That the Fortuitous Motions of Senseless Things, trying never so many Experiments and Conclusions, and ma-
king never so many Combinations and Aggregate Forms of things, could never be able to produce so much as the Forms or System of one complete Animal, with all the Organick parts thereof to Artificially disposed (each of these being as it were a Little World) much less the System of this Great World, with that variety of Animals in it; but least of all could it Constantly Continue such Regularity and Artificialness every where. For that the Fortuitous Motions of Irrational, Senseless and Stupid Matter, should in length of time grow Artificial, and contract a Habit, of acting as Regularly and Methodically, as if perfect Art or Wisdom had directed them; this it the most Prodigious Nonse, Imagination, and can be accounted no other, than Atheistic Fanaticism.

It is no more possible, that the Fortuitous Motion of Dead and Senseless Matter, should ever from itself be Taught and Necessitated to produce such an Orderly and Regular System as the Frame of this whole World is, together with the Bodies of Animals, and constantly to continue the same than that a man perfectly Illiterate, and neither able to write nor read, taking up a Pen into his hand, and making all manner of Scrawl, with Ink upon Paper, should at length be Taught and Necessitated by the Thing it self, to write a whole Quire of Paper together, with such Characters, as being Deciphered by a certain Key, would all prove coherent Philosopherick Sense. Or that than we ourselves, writing down the mere Letters of the Alphabet, transposedly, any how, as it happens, without the least Thought, either of Words or Sense, after our Scribbling a long time together, what was altogether Insignificant, should at length have been Taught and Necessitated by the Thing it self, without the least Study and Consideration of our own, to write this whole Volume. Or to use another Instance; This is no more possible, than that Ten or a Dozen Persons, altogether unskilled in Musick, having several Instruments given them, and striking the Strings or Keys thereof, any how, as it happened, should after some time of Discord and Jarring, at length be Taught and Necessitated, to fall into most Exquisite Harmony, and continue the same uninterruptedly for several Hours together.

Wherefore if it be Ridiculous for one that hath read over the works of Plato or Aristotle, or those six Books of T. Lucretius Carus, De Natura Rerum; to contend, that possibly, the Letters of those Books might be all put together by Chance, or Scribbled at random, without the least Thought or Study of the Writer, he having also no manner of Philosopherick Skill in him; Or for one that hears ten or a dozen Persons playing in Conform upon Instruments of Musick, and making Ravishing Harmony, to persuade himself that none of those Players, had for all that, the least of Musical Art or Skill in them but struck the Strings as it happened: It must needs be much more Ridiculous and Absurd, to suppose this Artificial System of the whole World, to have Resulted from the Fortuitous Motion of Senseless Atoms, without the Direction of any Art or Wisdom; there being much more of Sense, Art, and Philosophy therein, than in any Philosopherick Volume or Poem ever written by men; and more of Harmony an
and Proportion, than in any Composition of Vocal Music. We conclude therefore with Aristotle, as Dionysus \( \delta \) t \( \theta \) tov \( \tau \) tov \( \epsilon \) \( \kappa \) \( \varepsilon \) \( \iota \) \( \varsigma \) \( \upsilon \), that it is Absolutely Impossible things should have come to pass, after L.2.c.8. this manner; that is, by meet Fortune and Chance, and without the Direction of any Mind or God. The Divine Mind and Wisdom, hath Printed its Seal or Signature upon the Matter of the whole Corporeal World, as that Fortune and Chance, could never possibly have counterfeited the same.

Notwithstanding all which, the Ancient Atheists would undertake by their wonderful skill in Logic, to demonstrate, that The Frame of Nature could not possibly be made by any Intending Cause, and for the sake of Ends and Uses; as for example, that Eyes could not be first of all made Intentionally for the Use of Seeing, nor Ears Intentionally for the Use of Hearing, and so for the rest: Because forsooth, these things were all of them, in order of Time and Nature, before their several Uses. The argument is seriously propounded by Lycetius after this manner,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nec fuit ante, Videre, Oculorum lumina nata,} \\
\text{Nec Diitis orare, prius quam Lingua creatae est.} \\
\text{Sed potius longe Lingua praecepsit Origio} \\
\text{Sermonem, multaque Create sunt prius Aures.} \\
\text{Quam Sonus est Auditus, & omnia denique membra,} \\
\text{Ante suere, ut opinor, corum quam fuit usus.} \\
\text{Hanc igitur potuisse Utendi crescere causa.}
\end{align*}
\]

Lamb.p. 367.

To this sense; there was no such thing as Seeing before Eyes were made, nor Hearing before Ears, nor Speaking before the Tongue. But the original of the Tongue much preceded Speech: So likewise Eyes and Ears were made before there was any Seeing of colours or Hearing of Sounds. In like manner all the other members of the Body, were produced before their respective Uses. And therefore they could not be made Intentionally, for the sake of those Uses. The Force of which Argument confitteth in this Proposition; That whatsoever is made for the sake of another thing, must exist in time after that other thing for whose sake it was made; Or, That for which anything is made, must not only be, in order of Nature, but also of Time, before that which is made for it. And this that Epicurean Poet endeavours to prove by sundry instances;

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{At Contra conferre Manu certaminam pugna,} \\
\text{Ante fuit multi quam lucidatela volarent, &c.}
\end{align*}
\]

Ibid.

Arts were made for the sake of Fighting, but Fighting was before Darts, as if they had never been invented. Bucklers were excogitated and invented; for the keeping off of blows and strokes, but the declining of staves was before Bucklers. So were Beds contrived for the sake of Reeling and Sleeping, but Reeling and Sleeping were older than Beds; and the occasion for the invention of them. Cups were intended and designed for the sake of Drinking, which they would not have been, had

\[ \text{E e e 2} \]

there
there not been drinking before. According to the force of which Instances, the Poet would infer, that whosoever affirms Eyes to have been made for the sake of Seeing, must suppose in like manner, there was some kind of Seeing or other, before Eyes. But since there was no Seeing at all before Eyes, therefore could not Eyes be made for the sake of Seeing. And this is the Atheistick Demonstration, That the Parts of Mens Bodies, and other things of Nature, could not be made by any Intending Cause, for the sake of Ends and Uses.

But it is evident, that this Logick of Atheists, differs from that of all other Mortals; according to which The End or That for which any thing is made, is only in Intention before the Means, or That which is Made for it; but in Time and Execution after it. And thus, was the More Efectual way of Fighting and doing Execution, for whose fake Darts were invented, in True after Darts, and only in Intention before them. It is true indeed, that Fighting in General, was before Darts, Sleeping before Beds, and Drinking before Cups, and thereby did they give occasion for men to think of Means, for the more Efectual Fighting, and more Commodious Sleeping and Drinking. Men being commonly excited from the Experience of Things, and the Sense of their Needs and Wants, to excogitate and provide fit Means and Remedies. But it doth not therefore follow, that the Maker of the World, could not have at once beforehand, a Preventive Knowledge, of whatsoever would be Useful and for the Good of Animals, and so make them Intentionally for those Uses. Wherefore the Argument should have been framed thus; Whatsoever any thing is made for, as the end, that must needs be in the Knowledge and Intention of the Maker, before the Existence of that which is made for it. And therefore if Eyes were made for the Sake or End of Seeing, Seeing must of necessity be in the Knowledge and Intention of the Maker of Eyes, before there were any Eyes actually existing. But there could be no Knowledge of Seeing, before there were any Eyes. Wherefore Eyes could not be made for the sake of Seeing.

And this indeed is the Genuine Scope and Drift of the Premised Atheistick Argument, however it were disguised by them in their manner of propounding it. The Reason whereof was, because they took it for granted, that all Knowledge as such, is Derived by Sense, from the Things themselves Known Pre-existing. From whence it follows, that there could be no Knowledge of Vision or Seeing, before there was Actual Seeing and Eyes; and so they think it to be Demonstrated, that Eyes could not be made by any Deity for the Sake of Seeing, before there was Seeing; no more than Spectacles by men for the sake of Eyes, before there were Eyes. Thus does the Epicurean Poet conclude Triumphantly,
That is, The Members of Ments Bodies, and Organs of Sense, were first Made by themselves, and then did they afterwards give the Notice or Knowledge of their several Utiles: none of which could have been had before. Wherefore we affirm again and again, that it is Impossible, these things should have been made Designly for their Uses.

So that the Controversie is at last resolved wholly into this. Whether or no, all Knowledge and Understanding as such, Universally, does arise from Things Antecedently Existing without the Knower. Which being affermed by Atheists, they conclude from thence, that the Things of the World could not be made by the Previous Counsel, Contrivance, and Intention of any Understanding Deity, but that they all Blunder'd out themselves, one after another, according to the Train or Sequel of the Fortuitous Motions of Matter. And that from thence, Knowledge and Understanding, Counsel and Intention, sprung up afterward, as Junior to Things, and the World. But this being already made the Eleventh Atheistic Argument against a Deity, viz. that all Knowledge and Mental Conception, is the Information of the Things themselves Known, existing before and without the Knower, and a Passion from them; and therefore that the World must needs be, before any Knowledge or Conception of it, and no Knowledge or Conception, before the World, as its Cause: We shall refer the Answer to it, and Confutation of it, to its proper place; where we shall plainly Demonstrate, that Knowledge or Understanding, is not in its own Nature, Edypal, but Archeypal; and that it is Older than the World, and the Maker of all things.

But the Atheists yet further urge, against the Proving of a God from the τὸ ἐν μέσῳ κολόνας, the Regular Frame of the whole World in general, and the Artificial Structure of the Bodies of Animals, after this manner; That it is altogether Unreasonable to suppose, there should be no Cause in Nature, for the Phenomena thereof, especially for those things which are daily Generated, as the Bodies of Animals: but (as by the Tragick Poets) a God should be introduced, as it were from a Machin forcibly to save them. And indeed though there were a God, yet they think He ought not to be detruded to such mean Offices as this, viz. to make the Body of every the most Contemplable Animal, as it were with his own Hands Miraculous; nor ought Nature or the World to be suppos'd so Imperfect, as if it must be Bungled and Botched up every where after this manner. It is Nature herefore which is the Cause of thefe Natural Productions and Generations. Which Nature, that it doth not Intend nor act Designly for Ends and Uses, appears not only from hence, because it never Consults or Deliberates, (which Aristotle intimates to have been the Reason why some of old denied, the things of Nature, to have been made for Ends) but also because it hath no Animal-Sense or Conscience, no Understanding or Appetite. Wherefore this Opinion of, Intending, and Final Causality in Nature, can be accounted no other than an Idolatous specus (as some affect to phrase it) or a Prejudice of mens Minds,
Minds, when they apply their own Properties to things without them, and think because themselves Intend, and act for Ends, that therefore Nature doth like the do. And they might as well say, that Nature Laughs and Cries, Speaks and Walks, Syllogizes and Philosophizes, because themselves do so. But as a Modern Philosopher concludeth, The Universe, as one Aggregate of things Natural, hath no Intention belonging to it. And accordingly were all Final Causes rightly banished by Democritus out of Phylology, as Aristotie recorded of him, τι ἐν ἄκρος ἄριστον, πῶς ἄριστῳ ὁ κρυπτὸς ἔφης: That he reduced all things to Natural and Necessary Causes, altogether rejecting Final.

To all which we briefly reply; That there are indeed two Extremes here to be avoided, the One of those, who derive all things from the Fortuitous Motions of Sensible Matter, which is the Extreme of the Atomick Atheists, the Other of Bigotical Religionists, who will needs have God aτεργατος και νιωθα, to do all things himself immediately; as if all in Nature were Miracle. But there is a Middle betwixt both these Extremes; namely, to suppose, that besides God and in Subordination to him, there is a Nature (not Fortuitous, but) Artificial and Methodical, which governing the Motion of Matter and bringing it into Regularity, is a Secondary or Inferiour Cause of Generations. Now this Natura Artificialia, this Artificial Nature, though it self indeed do not understand the Reason of what it doth, nor properly Intend the Ends thereof, yet may it well be conceived to act Regularly for the sake of Ends Understood and Intended, by that Perfect Mind, upon which it depends. As the Manuare Officers, understand not the Designs of the Architect, but only drudgingly perform their several tasks imposed by him: and as Types or Forms of Letters, compos'd together, Print Coherent Philosophick Sense, which themselves understand nothing of (upon which Artificial or Spermatick Nature, we have largely infinited before, in the Appendix to the Third Chapter.) And thus, neither are all things performed immediately and Miraculously by God himself, neither are they all done Fortuitously and Temerariously, but Regularly and Methodically for the sake of Ends, though not understood by Nature it self, but by that Higher Mind which is the Cause of it, and doth as it were continually Inspire it. Some indeed have unskilfully attributed their Own Properties, or Animal Idiopathies to Inanimate Bodies, as when they say, that Matter desir'd Forms as the Female doth the Male, and that Heavy Bodies descend down by Appetite toward the Centre, that so they may rest therein: and that they sometimes again, Ascend in Discretion, to avoid a Vacuum. Of which Fanciful Extravagances, if the Advancer of Learning be understood, there is nothing to be reprehended in this following paflage of his, Incredibile est quantum a-gmen Idolorum Philosophiae immiserit, Naturalium Operationum ad Similitudinem Actionum Humanarum Redució: It is incredible, how many Errors have been transfus'd into Philosophy, from this One Delusion of Reducing Natural Allions, to the Mode of Human: or of thinking that Nature ademeth as a Man doth. But if that of his be extended further, to take away all Final Causes from the things of Nature, as nothir.
nothing were done therein for Ends Intended by a Higher Mind, then
is it the very Spirit of Atheism and Infidelity. It is no Idol of the
Cave or Den (to use that Assisted Language) that is, no Prejudice, or
Fallacy imposed upon our selves, from the attributing our own Ani-
mal's Properties, to things without us; to think that the Frame and
System of this whole World, was contrived by a Perfed Under-
standing Being or Mind (now also presiding over the same) which hath
every where Printed the Signatures of its own Wisdom upon the
Matter. As also, that though Nature it self do not properly Intend,
yet it acteth according to an Intellectual Platforms Prescribed to it, as
being the Masonry Opifcer of the Divine Architektonick Art, or this
Art it self as it were Transfited into the Matter and Embodied in it.
Thus Cicero's Rallus long since declared concerning it; that it was
not, Vis quendam sine Raione, cient Motus in Corporibus Necessarios 3;
sed Vis particeps Ordinis, tanquam via progressivis; cuius Solerians
nulla Aris, nemo Artiftex consequi potest imitando 3 Not a force Ungui-
ded by Reason, Exciting Necessary Motions in Bodies Temerarious ly; but
such a Force as partakes of Order, and proceeds as it were Methodically;
whose Cunning or Ingeniosity, no Art or Humane Opifcer can possibly
reach to by imitation. For, it is altogether Unconceivable, how we
Our Selves should have Mind and Intention in us, were there none
in the Universe, or in that Highest Principle from which all proceeds.
Moreover it was truly affirmed by Ariftotle, that there is much more of
Art in some of the things of Nature, than there is in any thing
Artificially made by men; and therefore Intention, or Final and
Mental Caufality, can no more be seccuded from the consideration of
Natural, than it can from that of Artificial things. Now it is plain
that Things Artificial, as a Houfe or Clock, can neither be Under-
stood, nor any true Cause of them assigned, without Design, or In-
tention for Ends and Good. For to say, that a Houfe, is Stones, Tim-
ber, Mortar, Iron, Glafs, Lead, &c. all put together, is not to give
Definition thereof, or to tell what indeed it is; it being such an
Apt Disposition of all these Materials, as may make up the whole fit for
Habitation, and the Use of men. Wherefore this is not sufficiently to al-
ign the Cause of a Houfe neither; to declare out of what the
stones were dug, nor in what Woods or Forests the Timber was fel-
d, and the like: Nor as Ariflotle addeth, εἰπε γὰρ τοῦχον εἴη.
ἐκ ουρίου νομίζει, οτι το μαθωρα κατο πέρτης χέραξι, τοι το ἅρια χαρτο-
το χρῆς: διε ο εἰδω μαθωρ κατο εκ εὐαρέα, η δ εἰρ εἰδε την αριστοτεκνον
χεριονε ἵ μαλϊκε το εξικον καρφώτων γογξ: If any one should go about thus
to give an account, a Houfe from Material Necessity (as the Atheiftick
philosophers then did of the World and the Bodies of Animals) That
the Heavier things being carried downward of their own accord, and
the Lighter upward; therefore the Stones and Foundation lay at the
bottom, and the Earth for the Walls being Lighter was Higher; and the
Timber being yet Lighter, Higher than that; but above all the Straw or
which, it being the Lightest of all; Nor lastly, if as the fame Ariftotle
elsewhere also suggeteth, one should further pretend, that a Houfe was
therefore made such, εἰπε τοῦχον το εἴρε, ὁράαν, &c. meery because the
Hands of the Labourers, and the Axes, and Hammers and Trowells,
and other Instruments, Chanced all to be moved so and so: We say,
that none of all thefe, would be to affign the true cause of a House; without declaring, that the Architect firft framed in his Mind a Model or Platform of fuch a thing, to be made out of thofe Materials, fo aptly disposed, into a Foundation, Walls, Roofs, Doors, Rooms, Stairs, Chimneys, Windows, &c. as might render the whole fit for Habitation, and other Humane ues. And no more certainly can the Things of Nature, (in whose very Essence Final Caufality is as much included) be either rightly Underftood, or the Caufes of them affigned, meerly from Matter and Mechanism, or the Neceffary and Unguided Motion thereof; without Design or Intention for Ends and Good. Wherefore to fay, that the Bodies of Animals became fuch, meerly because the Fluid Seed, by Motion Happened to make fuch Traces, and beget fuch Stamina and Lineaments, as out of which that Compages of the whole refulted; is not to affign a Caufe of them, but to Difemble, Smoother, and Conceal their True Efficient Caufe, which is the Wisdom and Contrivance of that Divine Architect and Geometer, making them every way fit, for the Inhabitation and ues of their repective Souls. Neither indeed can we banifh, all Final, that is all Mental Caufality, from Philosophy, or the Confederation of Nature, without banifhing at the self fame time, Reason and Understanding from our felves; and looking upon the Things of Nature, with no other Eyes, than Brutes do. However none of the Ancient Atheifts, would ever undertake to affign Necessary Caufes, for all the Parts of the Bodies of Animals, and their Efiermation, from meer Matter, Motion, and Mechanism: Thofe small and pitiful attempts in order thereunto that have been made by fome of them in a few Instances, (as that the Spina Dorfe, came from the Fluxure of the Bodies of Animals, when they firft fpung out of the Earth; the InteSiines from the Flux of Humours excavating a crooked and winding Channel for it felf, and that the Noftrils were broke open, by the Eruption of breath;) thefe, I fay, only shewing the Unfeifablenefs and Impofibility thereof. And therefore Democritus was fo wise, as never to pretend to give an Account in this way, of the Formation of the Fetus, he looking upon it, as a thing absolutely Deterpate; nor would he venture to fay any more concerning it (as Arifotle informeth us) than that it was a certain thing, that it always came to a paft of neceffi-
y, but stopp'd all further Enquiry concerning it after this manner, to επονον το δια τη, τον το των τυς, τη επειτω έσον το εκφερε αρχην, That to demand, about any of these things, for what Cause it was thus, was to demand a Beginning of Infinite. As if, all the Motions from Eternity, had an Influence upon, and Contribution to, whatsoever Corporeal thing was now produced. And Lucretius notwithstanding all his Swaggering, and boating, that He and Epicurus were able to affign Natural and Necessary Caufes for every thing, without a God; hath no where fo much as one word concerning it. We conclude therefore, that Arifotle's Judgment concerning Final Caufe in Philosophy, is much to be preferred before that of Democritus καλ ημερо μη τη φυσικο λογικο ει αιτηε, μελεται τη ποτε έκφερα αιτη, του του τη υλης, αλλ ζε αιτη τη αια, That Both kind of Caufe (Material, and Final) ought to be declared by a Physiologer, but efp- ecially the Final; the End being the Caufe of the Matter, but the Mat-
ter not the Cause of the End. And thus do we see plainly, that the
Atomick Atheists are utterly Ignorant of the Cause, ἡ δὲ ἡ ἔκλεις,
of the Regular and Artificial Frame of the things in Nature, and con-
fsequently of the whole Mundane System; the True Knowledge
whereof, necessarily leadeth to a God.

But it is prodigiously strange, that these Atheists, should in this,
their Ignorance and Sottishness, be Justified by any Professed Theist
and Christian of Later times; who Atomizing in their Physiogy also,
would fain persuade us in like manner, that this whole Mund-
ane System, together with Plants, and Animals, was derived,
merely from the Necessary and Unguided Motion, of the Small Par-
ticles of Matter, at first turned round in a Vortex, or else jumbled
all together in a Chaos, without any Intention for Ends and Good,
that is, without the Direction of any Mind. God in the mean time
standing by, only as an Idle Spectator, of this lusus Atomorum, this
Sportful Dance of Atoms, and of the various Results thereof. Nay these
Mechanick Theists, have here quite outtripped and out-done, the Ato-
mick Atheists themselves, they being much more Immodest and Ex-
vagant, than ever those were. For the Professed Atheists,
durst never venture to affirm, that this Regular System of things, Re-
sulted from the Fortuitous Motions of Atoms, at the very first: be-
fore they had for a long time together, produced many other Inept
Combinations, or Aggregate Forms of particular things, and Nonen-
tical Systems of the whole. And they supposed also, that the Regulari-
ty of things here in this world, would not always continue such
neither, but that some time or other, Confusion and Disorder would
break in again. Moreover, that besides this World of ours, there
are at this very instant, Innumerable other worlds Irregular, and
that there is but One of a Thoufand or ten Thousand, amongst the
Infinite Worlds, that have such Regularity in them. The reason of
all which is, because it was generally taken for granted and look'd
uppon as a Common Notion, that τὰ τά τοικὰ τῶν ἀτόμων, ἡ
et ἡ τῶν ζωτίων, as Aristotle expreffith it, that None of those things
which are from Fortune or Chance, come to pass constantly and always alike.
But our Mechanick, or Atomick Theists, will have their Atoms, never
so much as once to have Fumbled, in these their Fortuitous Motions;
nor to have produced any Inept System, or Incongruous Forms at all;
but from the very first all along, to have taken up their Places, and
have Ranged themselves, in Orderly, Methodically and Difereently, as that
they could not possibly have done it better, had they been Direct-
ed by the moft Perfeé Wifdom. Wherefore thefe Atomick Theists,
utterly Evacuate that grand Argument for a God, taken from the
Phenomenon of the Artificial Frame of things, which hath been so
much inlufhed on in all Ages, and which commonly makes the
strongest impression of any other, upon the Minds of men; they
leaving only certain Metaphysical Arguments for a Deity, which though
never fo good, yet by reason of their Subtilty, can do but little Execu-
tion upon the Minds of the Generality, and even amongst the
learned, do oftentimes beger, more of Doubtful Disputation and
Skepticism, than of Clear Conviction and Satisfaction. The Atheists
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in the mean time laughing in their sleeves, and not a little triumphing, to see the Caele of Theism, thus betrayed by its professed Friends and Aflertors, and the Grand Argument for the fame, totally shored by them; and so their work done, as it were to their hands, for them.

Now as this argues the greatest Infensibility of Mind, or Sottifm, and Stupidity, in Pretended Theists, not to take the least notice of the Regular and Artificial Frame of things, or of the Signatures of the Divine Art and Wisdom in them, nor to look upon the World and things of Nature, with any Other Eyes, than Oxen and Horses do; so are there many Phenomena in Nature, which being partly Above the Force of these Mechaniick Powers, and partly Contrary to the fame, can therefore never be Salved by them, nor without Final Causes, and some Vital Principle. As for example, that of Gravity, or the Tendency of Bodies Downward, the Motion of the Diaphragma in Respiration, the Syphole and Diafylle of the Heart, which was before declared to be a Muscular Confinution and Relaxation, and therefore Mechanical but Vital. We might also add amongst many others, the Interception of the Plains of the Equator and Ecliptick, or the Earth's Diurnal Motion, upon an Axis not Parallel with that of the Ecliptick, nor Pependicular to the Plain thereof. For though Cartesius would needs imagine this Earth of ours once to have been a Sun, and so it fell the Centre of a leffer Vortex, whose Axis was then Directed after this manner, and which therefore still kept the fame Site or Posture, by reason of the Striate Particles, finding no fit Pores or Traces for their passage thorough it, but only in this Direction; yet does he himself confess, that because these Two Motions of the Earth, the Annual and Diurnal, would be much more conveniently made upon Parallel Axes, therefore according to the Laws of Mechanism, they should perpetually be brought nearer and nearer together, till at length the Equator and the Ecliptick come to have their Axes Parallel to one another. Which as it hath not yet come to pass, so neither hath there been, for these last two Thousand years, (according to the best Observations and Judgments of Astronomers) any nearer approach, made of them to one another. Wherefore the Continuation of these Two Motions of the Earth, the Annual and Diurnal, upon Axes different or not Parallel, is resolvable into nothing, but a Final and Mental Cause, or the τὸ ἀληθεῖα, becauе it was Best it should be so, the Variety of the Seasons of the year depending hereupon. But the greatest of all the particular Phenomena, is the Organization and Formation of the Bodies of Animals, consisting of such Variety and Curiosity; which these Mechanick Philosophers being no way able to give an account of, from the Necessary Motion of Matter, Unguided by Mind for Ends, prudently therefore break off their System there, when they should come to Animals, and so leave it altogether untouched. We acknowledge indeed, that there is a Posthumous Piece extant, imputed to Cartesius, and entitled, De la Formation du Fœtus, wherein there is some Pretence made to salve all this by Fortuitous Mechanism. But as the Theory thereof is wholly built upon a False Supposition, sufficiently
sufficiently confuted by the Learned Harvey, in his Book of Generation, That the Seed of tho Matterially enter, into the Composition of the Egg; 10 so is it all along. Precarious and Exceptionable; nor does it extend at all to the Differences that are in several Animals, or offer the leaft Reason, why an Animal of one Species or Kind, might not be Formed out of the Seed of another.

It is here indeed Pretended by these Mechanick Theifts, that Final Causes, therefore ought not to be of any Regard to a Philosopher, because we should not arrogate to Our selves to be as Wife as God Almighty is, or to be Privy to his Secrets. Thus in the Metaphysical Meditations, Aristotle ob hono Unicum Rationem totum illud Causarum genus, quod à Fine peti solet, in Rebus Physicis nullum Usum habere existimo; non enim abique Teneritate me putus, investigare posse Finer Dei. And again likewise in the Principles of Philosophy, Nullas unquam Rationes circa Res Naturales, à Fine quem Deus aut Natura in its faciendi sibi prophetis, admittimus, quia non tantum nobis debemus arrogare, ut ejus Consiliorum participes esse possimus. But the Question is not, Whether we can always reach to the Ends of God Almighty, and know what is Absolutely Best in every case, and accordingly make Conclusions, that therefor the thing is, or ought to be so; but, Whether any thing at all, were made by God, for Ends and Good, otherwise than would of it self have resulted from the Fortuitous Motion of Matter. Nevertheless we see no Reafon at all, why it should be thought Preeminence of Intrusion into the Secrets of God Almighty, to affirm, that Eyes were made by him for the End of seeing (and accordingly so contrived as might best conduce thereunto) and Ears for the End of Hearing, and the like. This being so plain, that nothing but Sottish Stupidity, or Atheisick Incredulity (masked perhaps under an Hypocritical Veil of Humility) can make any doubt thereof. And therefore Aristotle justly reprehended Anaxagoras, for that Absurd Aphorism of his, Διό τὸ χέρι, χέραν, φανομαλλον ἐνιά τού ζώου, καὶ κυνοπτω, That Man was therefore the Wifest (or most Solert) of all Animals, because he Chanced to have hands. He not doubting to affirm on the Contrary, Ξιρον διό τὸ φανομαλλον ἐνιά τού ζώου χέρος, ἐγνω θυτις ἐκεῖνα διὰ διακεῖσαι καὶ κυνοπτω κατοχρησμον φανομαλλον, τοι διοπόλεμον οἰκοτικον προσάκι τί ποὶ ἀνυνθρίτι διότι τού μαλλών ανυνθρε, ἢ τοι ἀνυνθ οἰκον προσάκι πατομαται. That it was far more reasonable to think, that because Man was the Wifest (or most Solert and Active) of all Animals, therefore he had Hands given him. For Nature (titho he) distributeth as a Wife man doth, what is suitable to every one; and it is more Proper to give Pipes to one that hath Musical Skill, than upon him that hath Pipes, to bellow Musical Skill.

Wherefore these Mechanick Theifts would further, alledge, and that with some more Colour of Reason: That it is below the Dignity of God Almighty, to condescend to all those mean and trivial Offices, and to do the Things of Nature himself immediately; as also that it would be but a Botch in Nature, if the Defects thereof were every where to be supplied by Miracle. But to this also the Reply is easy; that though the Divine Wisdom it self contrived the System of the whole World, for Ends and Good, yet Nature, as an Inferior Atmi-
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Nature, is the Laff of all those Causes that Fabricate this Corporeal and Sensible world, and the utmost Bound of Incorporeal Substances. Which being full of Reasons and Powers, Orders, and Trefides over all Mundane affairs. It proceeding (according to the Magick Oracles) from that Supreme Goddess, the Divine Wisdom, which is the Fountain of all Life, as well Intellectual, as that which is Concrete with Matter. Which Wisdom, this Nature always effentially depending upon, passes through all things unhinderably; by means whereof, even Inanimate things, partake of a kind of Life; and things Corporeal remain Eternal in their Species, they being contained by its Standing Forms or Ideas, as their Causers. And thus does the Oracle describe Nature, as presiding over the whole Corporeal Word, and perpetually turning round the Heavens. Here have we a Description of One Universal Substantial Life, Soul, or Spirit of Nature, Subordinate to the Deity; besides which the fame Proclus, elsewhere supposeth other Particular Natures, or Supernatural Reasons, in those Words of his, "the Spirit of his, God the Fountain of all Particular," After the first Soul, are other particular Souls, and after the Universal Nature, Particular Natures. Where it may be observed by the way, that this Proclus, though he were a Superstititious Pagan, much addicted to the Multiplying of Gods (Subordinate to one Supreme) or a Bigotick Polytheist, who had a humour of Deifying almost every thing, and therefore would have this Nature forsooth to be called a Goddef, toooyect does he declare it not to be properly such, but Abusively only (viz. because it was no Intellectual Thing) as he saith the Bodies of the Sun, Moon and Stars, supposed to be Animated, were called Gods too, they being the Statues of the Gods. This is the meaning of those Words, "The that make the Earth, and they the Earth, and the Earth to make the; and that they the make wholly, and the make wholly the Earth." Nature is a God or Goddef, not as having Godship properly belonging to it, but as the Divine Bodies are called Gods, because they are Statues of the Gods.

Wherefor
Wherefore we cannot otherwise conclude concerning these our Mechanick Atheists, who will thus needs derive all Corporeal things from a Dead and Stupid Nature, or from the Neceflary Motions of Sensible Matter, without the Direction of any Mind, or Intention for Ends and Goods; but that they are indeed Conun Germans to Atheists; or poftifted in a Degree, with a kind of Atheiftick Enthusiasm, or Fanaticism; they being so far forth, Inspired, with a Spirit of Insidility, which is the Spirit of Atheism.

But thefe Mechanick Atheists are again counterballanced by another sort of Atheists, not Mechanical nor Fortuitous; namely the Hylozoics, who are unquestionably convinced, that Opera Naturæ sunt Opera Intelligentiae, that the Works of Nature are Works of Understanding; and that the Original of these Corporeal things was not Dead and Stupid Matter Fortuitously moved; upon which account Strato derided, Democritus his Rough and Smooth, Crooked and Hooky Atoms, as mere Dreams and Dottages. But thefe notwithstanding, because they would not admit of any other Substance besides Matter, suppose Life and Perception, Essentially to belong to all Matter as such; whereby it hath a Perfect Knowledge of whatsoever itself could Do or Suffer (though without Animal-consciousness) and can Form it self to the Best advantage; sometimes improving it self by Organization, to Sense in Brutes, and to Reason and Reflexive Understanding in Men. Wherefore according to the Principles of these Hylozoics, there is not any need of a God, at all; that is, of one Perfect Mind or Understanding being presiding over the whole world; they concluding accordingly, the Opinion of a God, to be only a Mistaking, of the Inadequate Conception of Matter in General, its Life and Energetick Nature taken alone Abstractly, for a Complete Substance by it self. Nevertheless these Hylozoick Atheists, are no way able by this Hypothesis of theirs neither, to valve that Phenomenon of the Regularity and Harmony of the whole Universe; because every Part of Matter, being according to them, a Distinct Perceptible by it self, whose knowledge extendeth only to its own Concernment; and there being no one thing presiding over all the things of the whole World (ὡς δὲ πᾶξ συνταξιός, in which all things are Co-ordered together) could never have fallen, into One such Agreeing and Conspiring Harmony.

And as for those other Cosmo-Plastick Atheists, who suppose the whole World to be as it were but One Huge Plant, Tree, or Vegetable, or to have One Spermatical, Plastick, and Artificial Nature only, Order'd and Methodically disposing the whole, but without Sense and Understanding, these can no way do the business neither, that is, false the aforementioned Phenomenon, it being utterly Impossible, that there should be any such Artificial and Regular Nature, otherwise than as derived from, and depending upon, a Perfect Mind or Wisdom.

And thus do we see plainly, that no Atheists whatsoever, can value the Phenomena of Nature, and this Particularly, of the Regular
The Phenomenon of the Universe, and that true Philosophy, or the Knowledge of Causes, Necessarily leadeth to a God.

But besides these Phenomena, of Cognition or Soul and Mind in Animals, Local Motion in Bodies, and the Artificial Frame of things for Ends and Vies, together with the Conspiring Harmony of the Whole; which can no way be Saved without a Deity; We might here further add, that the Fortuitous, that is, the Anaximandrian and Democritick Atheists, who Univerally ascribed the Novity of this Mundane System, were not able to give any tolerable account neither, of the First Beginning of Men, and those Greater Animals, that are no otherwise begotten, than in the way of Generation, by the Commixture of Male and Female.

Aristotle in his Book of the Generation of Animals, writeth thus; Lib. 3. c. ult. Περί ητ̓ι έλεγών και στυλλέον οςίστων, υπόλεκτοι τις αυτ', αυτ' έλε- γνοι τιν' χυμαίνεις, διαπερ φατι πιές, δυο τεκτων χυμαίνεις ή έπερον έγ. As exchange, which tending to putrefaction, it is evident. If Men and Fourfooted Animals, were ever Generated out of the Earth, as some affirm, it may be probably conceived to have been, one of these Two ways; either that they were Produced as Worms out of Putrefaction, or else Formed in certain Eggs; growing out of the Earth. And then after a while he concludes again, επερ τος της αρχής οςίστων πάντα τοις ζωής, της λογικής δύναμις της, επερ εις έπερον. That if there were any Beginning of the Generation of all Animals, it is reasonable to think it, to have been one of these Two formentioned ways. It is well known that Aristotle, though a Theist, else where affirrth the World's Eternity, according to which Hypothesis of his, there was never any First Male nor Female, in any kind of Animals, but one begat another Infinitely without any Beginning; a thing utterly repugnant to our Humane Faculties, that are never able to frame any Conception of such an Infinity of Number and Time, and of a Successive Generation from Eternity. But here Aristotle himself seems staggering or Sceptical about it; If Men were ever Generated out of the Earth; and, If there were any Beginning of the Generation of Animals: As he doth also, in his Topics, propound it for an Instance of a thing Disputable, πόσον ο κόσμου άλλο; ή ετος, Whether the World were Eternal or no; he ranking it amongst those δε ητοι τω λόγον μη εχεικο εντος μεγαλου, Those Great things for which we can give no certain Reason, one way or nor other. Now (faith he) If the World had a Beginning, and If Men were once γυναικείς or ουτρόχοες, Earth-Born, then must they have been in all probability, either Generated as Worms, out of Putrefaction, or else out of Eggs; he supposing (it seems) those Eggs to have grown out of the Earth. But the Generality of Atheists in Aristotle's time, as well as Theists, denying this Eternity of the Mundane System, as not so agreeable with their Hypothesis, because it Constant and Invariable an Order in the World, from Eternity, hath not such an appearance or semblance of Chance, nor can be easily supposed to have been, without the Providence of a Perfect Mind, prevailing over it, and Senior to it (as Aristotle conceived) in Nature, though not in Time; They therefore in all Probability concluded likewise, Men at First
CHAP. IV. Beginning of Animals.

First to have been *Generated* One of these Two ways, either out of *Purerefusion*, or from *Eggs*; and this by the *Fortuitous Motion* of Matter; without the Providence or Direction of any Deity. But after *Aristotle*, *Epicurus* Phancied those First Men and other Animals, to have been Formed in certain *Wombs* or *Bags* growing out of the Earth,

*Crescibant Uteri terræ radicibus aptis*;

And this no otherwise than by the *Fortuitous Motion of Atoms* also.

But if Men had been at First Formed after this manner, either in *Wombs* or *Eggs* (growing out of the Earth) or *Generated out of Purerefusion*, by *Chance*; then could there be no reason imaginable, why it should not sometimes so Happen now, the *Motions of Atoms* being as Brisk and Vigorous, as ever they were, and so to continue to all Eternity: so that there is not the least Ground at all, for that *Precarious Phancy* and * Pretence of Epicurus*, that the Earth as a *Child-bearer Woman*, growing old, became at length *Infecte* and *Barren*: Moreover the Men thus at first excluded out of *Bags*, *Wombs* or *Egg-bells*, or *Generated out of Purerefusion*, were supposed by these *Atheists* themselves, to have been produced, not in a *Mature* and *Adult*, but an *Infant-like*, Week and Tender State, just such as they are now born into the World; by means whereof they could neither be able to Feed and Nourish themselves, nor defend themselves from harms and Injuries. But when the same *Epicurus* would here pretend also, that the *Earth* which had been so *Fruitful a Mother*, became afterward by *Chance* too, as tender and indulgent a *Nurse*, of this her own Progeny, and sent forth Streams or Rivers of milk after them, out of those Gaps of her Wounded Surface, which they had before burst out of, as *Critoilus* long since observed, he might as well have signified, the *Earth* to have had *Breasts* and *Nipples* oo, as *Wombs* and *Milk*; and then what should hinder, but that the might have *Arms* and *Hands* also, and *Swaddling bands* to boot? Neither is that less *Precarious*, when the same *Atheistical Philosopher* adds, that in this Imaginary State of the *New-born world*, there was or a long time neither any *Immoderate Heat* nor *Cold*, nor any *Rude* and *Churlish blasts of Wind*, the least to annoy or injure those *New-born Infants* and *Nurslings*. All which things being considered, *Anaximander* seems of the Two, to have concluded more wisely, that Men, because they require a longer time than other Animals to be hatched up in, were at first *Generated in the Bellies of Fishes*, and there nourished up for a good while, till they were at length able to defend, and shift for themselves, and then were *Disgorged*, and cast up upon dry land. Thus do we see, that there is nothing in the World so *Monstrous*, nor *Prodigiously Absurd*, which men *Atheistically* inclined, will not rather *Imagine*, and *Swallow down*; than entertain the *Notion of a God.*

Wherefore here is *Dignus Vindice Nodus*, and this *Phenomenon of the First Beginning of Mankind*, and other Greater Animals, cannot
be saved otherwise, than according to the Mosaic History, by admitting of Exod. and Deut. a God out of a Machine, that is, an Extraordinary Manifestation of the Deity, in forming Man, and other Animals, Male and Female, once out of the Earth; and that not in a Rude, Tender and Infant-like State, but Mature and Adult, that so they might be able immediately, to shift for themselves, Multiply and Propagate their kind by Generation; and this being once done, and now no longer any necessity, of such an extraordinary way of proceeding; then putting a stop immediately thereunto, that so no more Terrigene nor Authochthon, Earth-born Men, should be any longer produced. For all these circumstances being put together, it plainly appears, that this whole Phenomenon, surpasses, not only the Mechanical, but also the Platishck Powers; their being much of Discretion in it, which the latter of these, cannot arrive to neither; they always acting, Fatally and Necessarily. Nevertheless we shall not here determine, Whether God Almighty might not, make use of the Subservient Ministry of Angels or Superior Spirits, Created before Man, in this first extraordinary Efformation of the Bodies of Animals out of the Earth, in a Mature and Adult State; as Plato in his Timetus, introduceth the Supreme God (whom he supposeth to be the immediate Creator of all Immortal Souls): thus bespeaking the Junior Gods, and setting them a work in the Fabrification of Mortal Bodies, τῇ λόγον ἔμειν ἁπάντως, ἀκρότατω ἐνυφί προσφατων, ἀπογείθνει ἔκα τα ἐκ τοω. It is your work now to Adaptate the Mortal to the Immortal, and to Generate or make Terrestrial Animals; He afterwards adding, μετὰ τοσπάσας, ταῖς τοϊς παρεδέχας Σωματα, ὑπομείναι πλέον διάθηκα, That after the Sowing of Immortal Souls, (the Supreme God:) committed to these Junior Gods, the task of forming Mortal Bodies. Which of Plato's, some conceive to have been derived from that of Moses, Let us make Man after our own Image.

Moreover, these Atheists are no more able to Save that other Common and Ordinary Phenomenon neither, of the Conservation of the Species of all Animals, by keeping up constantly in the world, a due Numerical Proportion between the Sexes of Male and Female. For did this depend only upon Fortuitous Mechanism, it cannot well be conceived, but that in some ages or other, there should happen to be, either all Males, or all Females; and so the Species fail. Nay it cannot well be thought otherwise, but that there is in this a Providence also, Superior to that of the Platishck or Spermatick Nature, which hath not so much of Knowledge and Discretion allowed to it, as whereby to be able alone, to govern this Affair.

Lastly, there are yet other Phenomena; no less Real, though not Physiological, which Atheists can no way Save, as that of Natural Justice, and Honesty, Duty, and Obligation; the true Foundation both of Ethics and Politics; and the τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Liberty of Will, properly so called, not that of Fortuitous Determination, when there is a Perfect Equality or Indifference of Eligibility in Objects; but that where by men definite Commendation and Blame, Rewards and Punishments; and so become fit Objects for Remunerative Justice to display itself upon.
and which the
pretended to Salve this, by his Exignum Clineam Principiorum, this attempt of his, was no other, than a plain Delirancy, or Atheistick Phrenzy in him.

And now have we already, Preventively Confuted, the Third Atheistick Pretence also, to Salve the Phenomenon of Religion and the Belief of a God, so generally entertained; namely from the Fiction and Imposture of Politicians; we having not only manifested, that there is a Natural Prolepsis and Anticipation of a God, in the Minds of men, as the Object of their Fear, Preventing Reason; but also that the Belief thereof, is sustained and upheld, by the Strongest Reason; the Phenomenon of Nature being no way Salvable, nor the Causes of things Assignable, without a Deity; so that Religion being Founded, both upon the Infinites of Nature, and upon Solid Reason, cannot possibly be any Fiction or Imposture of Politicians. Nevertheless we shall speak something particularly to this also. The Atheists therefore conceive, that though those Infirmities of Humane Nature, mens Fear and Ignorant Credulity, do much dispose and incline them, to the Belief of a God, or else of a Rank of Beings, Superiour to men (whether Visible or Invisible) commonly called by the Pagans, Gods; yet would not this be so generally entertained, as it is; especially that of One Supreme Deity, the First Original of all things, and Monarch of the Universe, had it not been for the Fraud and Fiction of Lawmurers and Civil Sovereigns, who the better to keep men in Peace and Subjection under them, and in a kind of Religious and Superstitious Observation of their Laws, and Devotion to the same, devised this Notion of a God, and then possesled the Minds of men with a Belief of his Existence, and an Awe of him.

Now we deny not, but that Politicians may sometimes abuse Religion, and make it serve for the promoting of their own private Interests and Defigns; which yet they could not so well do neither, were the thing it self, a meer Cheat and Figment of their own, and had no Reality at all in Nature, nor any thing Solid at the bottom of it. But since Religion obtains so universally everywhere; it is not conceivable, how Civil Sovereigns throughout the whole World, some of which are so distant, and have so little Correspondence with one another, should notwithstanding, all so well agree in this One Cheating Mystery of Government, or Piece of State-Goozenage; nor if they could, how they should be able so effectually to posses the Generality of mankind, (as well wife as unwife) with such a Constant Fear, Awe, and Dread, of a meer Counterfeit thing, and an Invisible Nothing; and which hath not only no manner of Foundation neither in Sense nor Reaason, but also (as the Atheists suppose) tends to their own great Terroour and Disquietment; and so brings them at once under a miserable Vassallage both of Mind and Body. Especially since men are not generally, so apt to think, that how much the more any have of Power & Dignity, they have therefore so much the more of Knowledge.
knowledge and skill, in philosophy and the things of nature, above others. And is it not strange, that the world should not all this while, have suspected or discovered this cheat and juggle of politicians, and have smell out, a plot upon themselves, in the fiction of religion, to take away their liberty and enthrall them under bondage: and that so many of these politicians and civil sovereigns themselves also, should have been unacquainted herewith, and as simply awed, with the fear of this invisible nothing, as any others? All other cheats and juggles when they are once never so little detected, are presently thereupon dashed quite out of countenance, and have never any more the confidence to obtrude themselves upon the world. But though the Atheists have for these two thousand years past, been continually buzzing into mens ears, that religion is nothing but a mere state-juggle and political imposition, yet hath not the credit thereof been the least impaired thereby, nor its power and dominion over the minds of men abated; from whence it may be concluded, that it is not counterfeit and fictitious thing, but what is deeply rooted in the intellectual nature of man, a thing solid at the bottom, and supported by its own strength. Which yet may more fully appear from christianity, a religion founded in no humane policy, nor tending to promote any worldly interest or design, which yet by its own, or the divine force, hath prevailed over the power and policy, the rage and madness of all civil states, Jewish and pagan, and hath conquered so great a part of the perfecting world under it; and that not by resisting, or opposing force, but by suffering deaths and martyrdoms, in way of adherence to that principle, that it is better to obey god than men. Which thing was thus prefigured in the prophetick scripture; why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the lord, and against his christ, &c. he that believeth in the heavens shall laugh, the lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, &c. yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of sion. I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Be wise now therefore, o ye kings, &c.

But that theism, or religion, is no gallity or imposition, will be yet further made unquestionably evident. That the generality of mankind have agreed in the acknowledgment of one supreme deity, as a being eternal and necessarily existent, absolutely perfect, and omnipotent, and the maker of the whole world, hath been already largely proved in the foregoing discourse. To which purpose is this of sextus the philosopher, καὶ τοῖς παλαμοις ἔχειν πάντας ἀνθρώπους προσωπικοῖς καὶ, καθ ἐν μιακεῖς τι περὶ ζωής καὶ ἀποκτενοῦντος πρὸς ἀν- ἱκανότητος, καὶ προσωπικοὶ συναγαλοῦν. All men have this common pro- lepsis, concerning god, that he is a living being incorruptible, perfectly happy, and incapable of all manner of evil. And the notion of that god, which epicurus opposed, was no other than this, an understanding being, having all happiness, with incorruptibility, that framed the whole world. Now, i say, that if there be no such thing,
as this Exilting, and this Idea of God, be a mere Fiditious Thing, then was it altogether Arbitraries. But it is unconceivable, how the Generality of Mankind, (a few Atheists only excepted,) should universally agree, in one and the same Arbitraries Figment. This Argumentation hath been formerly used, by some Theists, as appeareth from the forementioned Sextus, πολεος Ν οτίν ἔλογον, τον Adv. Math., τον αὐτοις ἐπιθέλειν ἐνίθεμα, ολία μη φαντάζεσθε ἄνωτες εἰκωνείς. It is altogether Irrational to think, that all men should by Chance, light upon the same Properties (in the Idea of God) without being Naturally mov'd thereunto. Neither is that any sufficient account which the Atheists would here give, that Statesmen and Politicians, every where thus poscilled the Minds of men with One and the same Idea; the Difficulty still remaining, how Civil Sovereigns and Law-makers, in all the distant parts of the world, and such as had no Communication nor Entercourse with one another; should universally Jump, in one and the same Fiditious and Arbitraries Idea.

Moreover, were there no God, it is Not Conceivable, how that forementioned Idea should ever have Entred into the Minds of men, or how it could have been Formed in them. And here the Atheists again, think it enough, to say that this Notion or Idea was put into the Minds of the Generality of mankind, by Law-makers and Politicians, Telling them, of such a Being, and persuading them to believe his Existence; or that it was from the first Feignor or Inventor of it, propagated all along and conveyed down, by Oral Tradition. But this argues their great Ignorance in Philosophy, to think that any Notion or Idea, is put into mens Minds from without, meereby by Telling or by Words; we being Pasive to nothing else from words, but their Sounds and the Phantasms thereof; they only occasioning the Soul to excite such Notions, as it had before within it self (whether Instant or Adventitious) which those words by the Compact and Agreement of men were made to be Signs of; or else to reflect also further, upon those Ideas of their own, Consider them more Difficullly, and Compare them with one another, and though all Learning be not the Remembrance of what the Soul once before actually understood, in a Pre-existant State, as Plato somewhere would have it, according to that of Boetius,

Quod fi Platonis Musa personat Verum,
Quod quisque Disceit, Immemor Recordatur;

e is all Humane Teaching, but Merielical, or Obftricious; and not
filling of the Soul as a Vell, meerly by Pouring into it from With-
, but the Kindling of it from Within; or helping it to excite
d awaken, compare, and compound its own Notions, as whereby
arrive at the Knowledge, of that which it was before Ignorant of;
the thing was better expressed by the forementioned Philosophick
et, in these words,

Haret profello Semen introfsum Veri,
Quod excitatur Ventilante Doctrina.
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Where-
Wherefore the more telling of men, There is a God, could not infuse any Idea of him into their Minds; nor yet the further giving this Definition of him, that he is a Being Absolutely Perfect, Eternal and Self-Existent, make them understand any thing of his Nature, were they not able to Excite Notions or Ideas from within themselves, correspondent to those several words. However the Difficulty still remains, How those Civil Sovereigns and Law-makers, or how Critias, his very first Inventor of that Cheat of a God, could Form that Idea, within themselves, since upon supposition of his Non-Existence, it is the Idea of Nothing, or of a Non-Entity. And this was Judiciously Hinted also by the fame Sextus; or by many others, that in the minds of men, do not consider, that they still remain intangled in the Difficulty, if any one further demand of them, how those Law-makers themselves could first form that Idea? From whence it is afterward concluded, and they affirm, that there is no Mind, no head, no face, no body of a Man, that therefore the Notion of a God, sprung not from the Arbitrary Fictions of Law-makers and Politicians.

But some Atheists will yet further Reply, That there is a Feigning Power in the Humane Soul, whereby it can Frame Ideas or Conceptions of such things, as actually never were nor will be; as of a Centaur, or of a Golden Mountain; and that by such a Feigning Power as this, the Idea of God, though there be no such thing Existing, might be Framed. And here we deny not, but that the Humane Soul hath a Power of Compounding Ideas and Things, together, which Exist Severally, and Apart, in Nature, but never were, nor will be, in that Conjunction: and this indeed is all the Feigning Power that it hath. For the Mind cannot make any New Cognition, which was not before, but only Compound that which is. As the Painter cannot Feign Colours, but must use such as exist in Nature, only he can Variously Compound them together, and by his Pencil, draw the Figures and Lineaments of such things as no where are; as he can add to the Head and Face of a Man, the Neck, Shoulders, and Body of a Horse. In like manner that more Subtle Painter or Limner, the Mind and Imagination of man, can frame Compounded Ideas of things, which no where Exist, but yet His Simple Colours notwithstanding, must be Real; He cannot Feign any Cognition, which was not in Nature, nor make a Positive Conception of that which is Absolutely Nothing; which were no less than to make, Nothing to be Something, or Create Something out of Nothing. And though the whole of these Fictions Ideas (as of a Golden Mountain) does not any where actually Exist yet for as much as it doth not Absolutely Imply a Contradiction, for it is to do, therefore hath it also a Possible Entity too, and otherwise it could not be Conceivable. As a Triangular Square, for example, being a Contradiction, Thing, hath not so much as a Possible Entity, and therefore is not Conceivable as such; (though both a Triangle and a Square severally be Conceivable) it being meer Non-Sence, Nothing, and not
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Idea at all. Nay we Conceive, that a Theist may premise with Reverence to say, that God Almighty himself, though he can Create More or Fewer Really Existent things, as he pleaseth, and could make a whole world out of Nothing, yet can he not make more Cogitation or Conception, then 1 is or was before contained in his own Infinite Mind and Eternal Wisdom; nor have a Positive Idea of any thing, which hath neither Actual nor Possible Entity.

But the Idea of God, is not a Complement or Aggregation of things, which Exist Scatteredly and Apart in the World; for then would it be a mere Arbitrarius thing; and it might be what every one pleased; one Adding more things together, and another Fewer; but each of them writing, the Name or Title of God, as bungling Painters did, under these there several Figments. Whereas we have already proved, that the Idea of God, is One most Simple Idea, of an Absolutely Perfect Being, though having several Partial and Inadequate Conceptions; so that nothing can be Added to it, nor Detracted from it, there being nothing included therein, but what is Demonstrable of a Perfect Being, and therefore nothing at all Arbitrarians.

Moreover, many of those Partial Conceptions contained in the entire Idea of God, are no where else to be found in the whole world, Existing Singly and Apart; and therefore, if there be no God, they must needs be Absolute Non-Entities, as Immutability, Necessary Existance, Infinity, and Perfection, &c. so that the Painter that makes this Idea, must here Feign Colours themselves, or Create New Cogitation and Conception out of Nothing, upon the Atheistical Supposition.

Lastly, if there be no God now Existing, it is Impossible that ever there should be any, and so the Whole Idea of God, would be the Idea of that, which hath no Possible Entity neither; whereas those other Fictitious Ideas, made by the Mind of man, though they be of such things, as have no Actual Existance, yet have they all a Possible Entity as was said before.

But that we may Conceal nothing of the Atheist's Strength, we must here acknowledge, that some of them have yet pretended further, that besides this Power of Compounding things together, the human Soul hath also another Ampliating, or Increasing and Improving Power, by both which together, though there be no God Existing, nor yet Possible; the Idea of him, may be Fictitious made: those Partial Ideas which are no where else to be found, arising, as they say, from a meditations ατό τη άναθάπαν, a Transition and Gradual Process from men, in way of Amplification, Augmentation and Improvement. Thus do we read in Sextus, Το άπόθανε το άπηθε, έν άθροί: Αντι. Mab. P. 317...

"ο, πτελον έν άνθρωποι, παρήλπε έν το ατό τη άναθάπαν κατά τη λήκνυ άνθρωπον ανδράπαν τη φαντασία, τότε έρελεν κύκλοιν, έστε ανθρώπον έν ανθρώποι νοιτείτις έν μακάριον έν έστιν ανθρώποι ή περιπετείαις τοιου τώ χρόνους, έτι αυτώ καθίστασι, έρελεν ανθρώποι έν άνθρωποι έν ανθρώποι τη φαντασίαν έντραπτου οί πολλοί..."
But to this we Reply; First, that according to the Principles of the Atheists themselves, there could not possibly be any such Amplification and Feigning Power of the Soul, as whereby it could Make More than Is; because they suppose it to have no Active Power at all; but all our Conceptions to be nothing but mere Passions, from the Objects without; according to that of Protagoras in Plato's Theetetus, οὐδὲν ἐν ἡμῖν δυνάμενον ἰδεῖν ἔργα, οὐδὲν ἂν ἡμεῖς παράνομοι ἄν. It is neither possible; for a man to conceive that which is not; nor any more of otherwise, than he suffers. Again as Sextus the Philosopher also intimates, the Atheists are here plainly guilty, of that Fallacy or Error in Ratiocination, which is commonly called a Circle, or Πληκτόν. For whereas they could not otherwise Judge, the greatest Perfection and Happiness which ever they had experience of in men, to be Imperfect, then by an Anticipated Idea of Perfection, and Happiness, with which it was in their minds compared; (by virtue of which Idea also, it comes to pass, that they are able to Amplifie those lesser Perfections of men further and further, and can take occasion from Imperfect Things, to think of that which is Absolutely Perfect;) that is, whereas those Atheists themselves first make the Idea of Imperfection, from Perfection; they not attending to this, do again go about, to make up the Notion or Idea, of that which is Absolutely Perfect (by way of Amplification) from that which is Imperfect. But that men have a Notion of Absolute Perfection in them, by which as the Rule or Measure, they (comparing other things therewith) Judge them to be Imperfect; and which is therefore in Order of Nature First; may appear from hence, because all Theologers as well Pagan as Christian, give this Direction, for the Conceiving of God, that it should principally be done, Per Viam Remotionis, by way of Remotion of all Imperfection from him. Thus Alcinous, πρὸς τὸν μυθὸν εἰς τὴν Αὕρων, Τῆς ἀρχῆς οὐκ ἔχουσα, The first way of Conceiving of God, is by Remotion or Abstraction. We add in the last place, That Finite things put together can never make up Infinite, as may appear from that Instance of Humane Longevity proposed, for if one should Amplifie that never so much, by adding of more and more Past Time or years to it; yet would he never thereby be able, to arrive at Eternity without beginning. God differs not from those Imperfect Created things, in Degrees only, but in the Whole Kind. And though Infinite Space may perhaps be here Objected, as a thing taken for granted, which being nothing but Extension or Magnitude, must therefore consist or be made up of Finite Parts, yet as was it before declared, we have
have no certainty of any more than this; that the Finite World might have been made Bigger and Bigger Infinitely or Without End, which Infinity of Magnitude, is but like that of Number, Potential; from whence it may be inferred as well of the one, as the other, that it can never be Actually Infinite. Wherefore were there no Infinitely Perfect Being in Nature, the Idea thereof could never be made up by any Amplifying Power of the Soul, or by the Addition of Finite. Neither is that of any moment, which Caffenius so much objected here to the contrary, that though there were no God or Infinite Being, yet might the Idea of him as well be Feigned, by the Mind, as that of Infinite Worlds, or of Infinite Matter, was by some Philosophers: For Infinite Worlds and Infinite Matter, are but words ill put together; Infinity being a Real thing in Nature, (and no Fiction of the Mind) as well as the World or Matter; but yet proper to the Deity only. But it is no wonder, if they who denied a God, yet retaining this Notion of Infinity, should misapply he same, as they did also other Properties of the Deity, to Matter.

To conclude this; Our humane Soul cannot Feign or Create any new Cogitation or Conception, that was not before, but only variously compound that which Is; nor can it ever make a Positive idea of an Absolute Non-Entity, that is, such as hath neither Actual or Possible Existence. Much less could our Imperfect Beings, Create the Entity of to Vest a Thought, as that of an Infinitely Perfect Being, out of Nothing; this being indeed more than for God Almighty, or a Perfect Being, to Create a Real World out of Nothing; because there is no Repugnancy at all in the Latter, as there is in the former. We affirm therefore, that Were there no God, the Idea of an Absolutely or Infinitely Perfect Being, could never have been Made Feigned, neither by Politicians, nor by Poets, nor Philosophers, nor by other. Which may be accounted another Argument for a Deity.

But that Religion is no Figment of Politicians, will further unquestionably appear, from that which now shall follow. As the Religion of an tb, is a Necessary Vincent of Civil Society; so Obligation in Conscience, respecting the Deity as its Original, and as the Punisher of Violation thereof, is the very Foundation of all Civil Sovereignty. For Oaths and Covenants (into which some would resolve Civil Power) without this Obligation in Conscience, are nothing but Words and Breath: and the Laws and Commands of Civil Sovereignty, do not make Obligation, but presuppose it, as a thing in Order of Nature Before them, and without which they would be Invalid. Which is a Truth fo Evident, that the Writer De Cive, could not, at that time, as he did not rightly understand this Natural Obligation, but acknowledge it in these words, Obligatio ad Obedientiam Civitatem, enuntiat leges Civiles Validas sunt, Omnis Lega Civilia prior — Quod si quis Princept Summus, Legem Civilem in hanc Formulam conciperet, Non Rebellabatur, nihil efferet. Nam nisi prins Obligationes Civiles ad Obediendum, hoc esse ad Non Rebellandum, Omnis Lex Indida esse fuit, & si prins Obligentur esse Superflua. The Obligation to
Relig. the Foundat. of Civ. Power. Book I.

Civil Obedience, by the force of which all the Civil Laws become Valid, is before those Civil Laws. And if any Prince should make a Law to this purpose, That no man should Rebel against him, this would signify nothing, because unless they to whom it is made, were before Obliged to Obey, or not to Rebel, the Law is Invalid; and if they were, then it Superfluous. Now this Previous Obligation to Civil Obedience, cannot be derived (as the forementioned Writer De Goe, and of the Leviathan, supposed) from mens Private Utility only, because every man being Judge of this for himself, it would then be Lawful for any Subject, to Rebel against his Sovereign Prince, and to Poyfon or Stab him, whenever he could reasonably persuade himself, that it would tend to his own Advantage, or that he should thereby procure the Sovereignty. Were the Obligation to Civil Obedience, Made only by mens Private Utility, it would as easily be Dissolved by the fame. It remaineth therefore, that Conscience and Religious Obligation to Duty, is the only Basis, and Essential Foundation of a Polity or Common-Wealth; without which there could be no Right or Authority of Commanding in any Sovereign, nor Validity in any Laws. Wherefore Religious Obligation cannot be thought to be the Fiction or Imposture of Civil Sovereigns, unless Civil Sovereignty itself, be accounted a Fiction and Imposture; or a thing which hath no Foundation in Nature, but is either wholly Artificial, or Violent.

Moreover had a Religious Regard to the Deity, been a meer Figment or Invention of Politicians, to promote their own Ends, and keep men in Obedience and Subjection under them, then would they doubtles, have so framed and contrived it, as that it should have been every way Flexible and Compliant; namely by persuading the world, that whatsoever was Commanded by themselves, was agreeable to the Divine Will, and whatever was Forbidden by their Laws, was displeasing to God Almighty, and would be Punished by him: God ruling over the World, no otherwise, than by and in, these Civil Sovereigns, as his Vicegerents; and as the only Prophets and Interpreters of his will to men. So that the Civil Law of every Country, and the Arbitrary will of Sovereigns, should be acknowledg-
ed to be the only Measure of Just and Unjust (there being nothing Naturally such) the only Rule of Conscience and Religion. For from Religion thus Modelled, Civil Sovereigns might think to have an Absolute Power, or an Infinite Right, of Doing or Commanding whatsoever they pleased, without exception, nothing being Unlawful to them, and their Subjects being always Obliged, in Conscience, without the least Scruple, to Obey.

But this is but a meer Larva of Religion, and would be but a Mockery of God Almighty; and indeed this is the only Religion that can be called a Political Figment. Neither could the generality of mankind be ever yet thus persuad'd, that the Arbitrary Will of Civil Sovereigns was the only Rule of Justice & Conscience; and that God Almighty could Command nothing, nor Reveal his will concerning Religion, to any kind otherwife than by these, as his Prophets and Interpreters. True Religion & Conscience, are no such Waxed things, Servilely Addicted, to
But disowned by Politicians.

the Arbitrary Wills of men; but immoriferous, stiff, and inflexible: they respecting the Deity only, his Eternal or Everlasting Laws, and his Revealed Will; with which whenever Human Laws clafs (a thing not impossible) they conclude, that then God ought to be obeyed, and not Men. For which Cauè the Proflane Politicians, declare open war against this Religion, as a thing utterly inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty; becaus it introduces a Fear greater than the Fear of the Leviathan; namely that of Him, who can inflict Eternal Punishments after Death; as also because it clashes with that monstrous, Infinite and Unlimited Power of theirs, which is such a Thing, as is not attributed by Genuine Theists, to God Almighty himself; a Power of making their mere Arbitrary Will the Rule of Justice, and not Justice the Rule of their Will. Thus does a Modern Writer of Politicks, condemn it, for Seditious Doctrine, tending to the Dissolution of a Common Wealth, that Subjects may make a Judgment of Good and Evil, Just and Unjust; or have any other Confidence besides the Law of the Land. As also this, That Subjects may Sin in obeying the Commands of their Sovereign. He likewise adds, That it is Impossible, a Common Wealth should stand, where any other than the Sovereign, hath a Power of giving greater rewards than Life, and of inflicting greater Punishments than Death. Now Eternal Life is a greater reward than the Life present, and Eternal torment than the Death of Nature. Wherefore God Almighty being the Dispenser of Eternal Rewards and Punishments; this is all one as if he should have said, It is impossible a Common Wealth should stand, where the Belief of a God, who can Punish with Eternal Torments after this Life, is entertained. Thus does the same Writer declare, That if the Superstitions Fear of Spiri- Levol. p. 4. 

rits (whereof God is the Chief) and things depending thereupon, were taken away, men would be much more fitted than they are, for Civil Obedience: And that they who affirm the Immortality of Souls, or their capability of receiving punishments after Death; fright men from obeying the Laws of their Country, with Empty names, as men right Birds from the Corn, with an Empty Dublet, a Hat, and a Crooked Stick. And accordingly He concludes, that Civil Sovereigns do not only make Justice, but Religion also; and that no Scripture or Divine Revelation can Oblige, unless it be first made Law, or stamped with their Authority. Now since that which can make Religion and Gods, null it self needs be greater than all Gods; it follows according to the Tenour of this Doctrine, that the Civil Sovereign is in Reality, the supreme Numen: Or else at least, that the Leviathan (the King over all the Children of Pride) is the Highest Deity, next to Sense's Omnipo- sense's Most Matter; the One of these being the Atheists Natural, the Other their Artificial God. Nevertheless we shall here observe by the way, that whist these Atheistical Politicians, thus endeavour, to Swell up the Civil Sovereign, and to bestow upon him, an Infinite Right, by removing to that end out of his way; Natural Justice, Conscience, Religion, and God himself; they do indeed thereby absolutely despise all Right and Authority; since the Subject is now no longer Obliged in Conscience to Obey him, and so in stead of True Right and Authority, they leave him nothing but mere Frutitious Force. Wherefore since Theifan and True Religion are thus plainly disowned and H H H H 
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disclaimed by these Politicians, as altogether Inconsistent with their Designs, they cannot be supposed to have been the Figments of Civil Sovereigns, or the meer Creatures of Political Art. And thus have we abundantly confuted, those three Atheistical Pretences, to falve the Phenomenon of Religion; from Fear, and the Ignorance of Causes, and the Fidion of Politicians.

But since besides those Ordinary Phenomena before mentioned, which are no way Salvable by Atheists, there are certain other Phenomena Extraordinary, that either immediately prove a God and Provis
dence, or else that there is a Rank of Understanding Beings Invisible, Superior to men, from whence a Deity may be afterwards inferred; namely these Three Especially, Apparitions, Miracles, and Prophecies: (Where the Atheists Obstinate denying Matter of Fact and History, will needs impute these things, either to jugling Fraud and Knavery; or else to mens own Fear and Phancy, and their Ignorance how to distinguish Dreams, and other strong Imaginations from Vison and Senfe; or Lastly to certain Religious Tales or Legends, allowed by the Publick Authority of Civil Sovereigns, for Political Ends;) we shall here Suggest something briefly, to vindicate the Historick Truth of those Phenomena, against Atheists.

First therefore, as for Apparitions, Though there be much of Fabulosity in these Relations, yet can it not reasonably be concluded, that there is nothing at all of Truth in them: since something of this kind, hath been averred in all Ages, and many times attested by persons of Unquestionable Prudence, and Unsuspected Veracity. And whereas the Atheists impute the Original of these things, to mens Mistaking both their Dreams, and their Waking Phancies, for Real Visions and Sensations; they do hereby plainly contradict one Main Fundamental Principle of their own Philosophy, that Senfe is the only Ground of Certainty, and the Criterion of all Truth: for if Prudent and Intelligent persons may be so frequently mistaken in confounding their own Dreams and Phancies with Sensations, how can there be any Certainty of knowledge at all from Senfe? However, they here derogate so much both from Senfe, and from Humane Testimonies, as that if the like were done in other Cales, it would plainly overthrow all Humane Life.

Wherefore other Atheists, being apprehensive of this Inconveni
ence, of denying so many Sensible Appearances, and Testimonies, or Relations of Fact; have chose rather to acknowledge the Reality of Apparitions; yet notwithstanding concluding them to be things Caused and Created, by the Power of Imagination only; as if the strength of Imagination were such, that it could not only Create Phancies, but also Real Sensible Objects; and that at a distance too from the Imagi
ers, such as whereby the Senfe of others shall be for the time affected, though they quickly vanish away again. From which Prodigious Paradox, we may take notice of the Fanaticism of some Atheists, and that there is nothing so monstrously Absurd, which men infected with Atheistical Incredulity, will not rather entertain into their Belief.
Belief, than admit of any thing that shall the least hazard or endanger, the Existence of a God. For if there be once any Invisible Ghosts or Spirits acknowledged, as Things Permanent, it will not be easy for any to give a reason, why there might not be one Supreme Ghost also, prefiding over them all, and the whole world.

In the last place therefore, we shall observe, that Democritus was yet further convinced, by these Relations of Apparitions; so as to grant that there was a certain kind of Permanent Beings and Independent upon Imagination, Superior to men, which could appear in different Forms, and again disappear at pleasure, called by him Idols or Images: he supposing them to be of the same nature, with those Exuvious Effluces, that stream continually from the surface of Bodies: only he would not allow them to have any thing Immortal at all in them, but their Concrections to be at length all Dissolvable, and their Personalities then to vanish into nothing. Thus Sextus the Philo-opher, says, that there was a kind of Idols or Spe-rires, that do often approach to men, some of which are Beneficent and some Maleficient. Upon which account, he wiseth, that it might be his good hap, to meet with fortunate Idols. And be addeth, that these are of a vast bigness, and very Longeuve, but not Incorruptible, and that they sometimes do fore-signifie unto men future events, both visibly appearing to them and sending forth audible voices. Now though Democritus were much blamed for this Conceiion of his by Fellow-Atheifts, as giving thereby too great an advantage to Theifts; yet in his own opinion, did he sufficiently secure himself against the Danger of a God from hence, by supposing all these Idols of his, to be Corruptible, they being indeed nothing but certain Finer Concrections of Atoms, a kind of Aeriel and Ethereal Animals; that were all Body, and without any Immortal Soul, as he supposed men also to be; so that a God could be no more proved from them, than from the Existence of men. For thus he adds in Sextus, οἱ τῶν μετὰ φαντασκόπους λαθεῖται μιαλοι, υπηύπαν τῶν θεων οιδή, μην αυτοὶ άλλοι διοική τῶν ὁπίσω κατὰ τάς ἐν ἕδει, τὰς αἰονίας φύσες τοιχοῖς. Men in ancient times, having a sense of these apparitions or Idols, fell from thence into the opinion of a God; although they be besides these Idols, no other God, that hath an Incorruptible Nature. However, though Democritus continued thus gross-Atheistical, yet was he further convinced; than our Modern Atheists will be, that the Stories of Apparitions were not all Fabulous, and that there are not only Terrestrial, but also Aeriel and Ethereal animals; nor this Earth of ours alone Peopled and Inhabited, whilst all those other vast Regions above, lie Defert, Solitary, and Waft, where it may be observed again, that divers of the Ancient Fathers, though they agreed not so far with Democritus, as to make the Angelical Beings, to be altogether Corporal, yet did they likewife suppose them to have their certain Subtil Ethereal or Aeriel Bodies. In which respect St. Austin in his 115. Epistle, calleth Angels אדיתים, and De-
vils, Aereos Animantes. Thus Psellus in his Dialogue, ὅδε ἔστιν ἔκπληκτος ἀμύνοντος, ὡς ἐν σωματω καὶ γυναικῶ, τὸ σωματικῶν ἀπὸ ποιῶν, μετασχηματίζων ἄλλοις ὑμῖν ὑμείς σωματικῶς νικῶν. Καὶ τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ μηδὲν ἁμαρτάνω, τὸν σωματικὸν ποιῶν· καὶ εἰσι τοῦτον ὥστε, ὡς ἔστιν ἀμύνοντος καὶ προσφέροντος ὑμῖν σωματικῶς δικαίωσασθεν νομισματικῶς λεγόντας εἰς ἁμαρτίαν καὶ ἐξαιρέσθαι, ἵνα ἐγγίζῃ. But you are to know, that Demons or Devils, are not altogether Incorporeal, but that they are joined to Bodies, and so Converse with Bodies, which may be learned also from the Fathers, the Divine Basil contending, that there are Bodies, not only in Devils, but also in the pure Angels themselves, as certain Subtile, Airy, Deficate Spirits. Where afterwards he shows, how the ἑκατεχισμοί ἐκχύλωσε σώμα, that Body which is Concerted with Angels, differs from that which Devils are united to, in respect of the Radiant Splendour of the one, and the Dark Fuliginous Obscurity of the other. Moreover that Devils are not without Bodies, he endeavours further to confirm, from the words of our Saviour, that they shall be Unamished with Fire, which (faith he) were a thing impossible, were they All of them Incorporeal. And some perhaps will attempt to prove the same concerning Angels too; from those other words of our Saviour, where speaking of the Resurrection State, he affirmeth, that they who shall be accounted worthy thereof, shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but be Iωνίαν, Equal to the Angels: which Comparative Expression of men, as to their Bodies, with Angels; would be thought not so proper, were the Angels absolutely devoid of all Body. But of this we determine not.

To this Phenomenon of Apparitions, might be added those two others of Magicians or Wizards, Demoniacs, or Enraptured, both of these proving also, the Real Existence of Spirits, and that they are not mere Phancies, and Imaginary Inhabitants of mens Brains only, but Real Inhabitants of the World. As also, that among these Spirits there are some Foul, Unclean, and Wicked Ones; (though not made such by God, but by their own Apostacy) which is some confirmation of the Truth of Christianity, the Scripture infiting so much upon these Evil Demons or Devils, and declaring it to be one design of our Saviour Christ's coming into the World, to oppose these Confederate Powers of the Kingdom of Darkness, and to rescue mankind from the Thraldom and Bondage thereof. As for Wizards and Magicians, Persons who associate and confederate themselves in a peculiar manner with these Evil Spirits, for the gratification of their own Revenge, Luft, Ambition, and other Passions; besides the Scriptures, there hath been so full an attestation given to them, by persons unconcerned in all Ages, that those our so confident Exploders of them, in this present Age, can hardly escape the suspicion, of having some Hankering towards Atheism. But as for the Demoniacs and Enraptured; It hath been much wondered, that there should be so many of them in our Saviour's time, and hardly any or none, in this present Age of ours. Certain it is from the Writings of Josephus, in sundry places, that the Pharisieh Jews, were then generally possessed with an Opinion of these ἀνωμολόγους, Demoniacs; men Possessed with Devils, or Infected by them. And that this was not a mere Phrase or Form of Speech, only amongst them, for persons very ill-affected
affected in their Bodies, may appear from hence, that Josephus declares it as his opinion, concerning the Demons or Devils, that they were possessed and overpowered with the Spirits or Souls of wicked men deceased, getting into the Bodies of the Living. From hence it was that the Jews in our Saviour's time were not at all surprised with his casting out of Devils, it being usual for them also then to Exorcise the same, an Art which they pretended to have learned from Solomon. Of whom thus Josephus, says he, in his Antiq. vol. ii. p. 343, that he wrote on the Deity, &c. 111. 9, 10, 11, that their signatures to signs, and characters were in use, &c. But Josephus says, ibid. that they were cured and expelled by certain forms, whereby Devils are expelled and driven away. Which Method of curing, prevails much among us, at this very day. Notwithstanding which, we think it not at all probable, what a late Atheistical Writer hath asserted, that the heads of the Jews were then all of them so full of Demons and Devils, that they generally took all manner of Bodily Diseafes, such as Fever, Ague, and Dumbness, and Deafness, for Devils. Though we grant that this very thing, was imbted by Plotinus afterward to the Gnosticks, that they suppos'd all Diseafes to be Devils, and therefore not to be cured by Phyllicks, but expelled by Words or Charms. Thus he, in Prop. vi. c. 14. 15. says he, that at this time, the Jews of Palestina, &c. took and deemed such signs as the possession of Devils. Then they said, that they were cured by signs, &c. and all Demons, &c. Dumbness, &c. were cured by signs, &c. and such words, &c. as they were of God, &c. to make them understand the Power of the Saviour. And thus he represents to what height the Jews had come, and that the Saviour was sent to cure them of their diseases, &c. Now when they affirm Diseafes to be Demons or Devils, and pretend that they can expell them by words, undertaking to do the same, they hereby indeed render themselves considerable to the vulgar, who were not a little to admire the powers of Magicians. But they will not be able to persuade wise men, that Diseafes have no natural Causes, from Repletion, or Inanition, or Putrefaction, or the like: Which is a thing manifest from their cure, they being oftentimes removed by purgation, and bleeding, and abstinence. Unless perhaps those men will say, that the Devil is by this means Starved, and made to Flee away. Nor can we think that the Jews in our Saviour's time, either suppos'd all Mad-men to be Demoniacs, or all Demoniacs Mad-men (though this latter feems to be affirmed by an Eminent Writer of our own) we reading of Devils cast out from others besides mad men, and of a woman which had a Spirit of Infirmity only, and was bowed together, and could not lift up her self, which is said by our Saviour Christ to have been, Bound by Satan. Wherefore the sense of the Jews formerly seems to have been this, that when there was any mutual and extraordinary Symptoms, in any bodily Distemper, but especially that of Madnefs, this being look'd upon as something more than Natural; was imputed by them to the Possession or Infection of
of some Devil. Neither was this proper to the Jews only at that time, to suppose Evil Demons to be the Causes of such bodily diseases, as had extraordinary Symptoms, and especially Madness; but the Greeks and other Gentiles also were embued with the same Pervasion; as appeareth from Apollonius Tyaneus his curing a Laughing Demoniac at Athens, he ejecting that Evil Spirit, by threats and menaces, who is said at his departure, to have tumbled down a Royal Porch in the City with great noise. As also, from his freeing the City of Ephesus from the Plague, by stoning an old Ragged Beggar, said by Apollonius to have been the Plague, which appeared to be a Demon, by his changing himself, into the form of a Shagged Dog.

But that there is some Truth in this Opinion, and that at this very day, Evil Spirits or Demons, do sometimes really Act upon the Bodies of men, and either Inflit or Augment bodily Diftempers and Diseases, hath been the Judgment of two very experienced Physicians, Senecius and Fernelius. The Former in his Book, De Manif. Lib. 1. cap. 15. writing thus, Est sine ullo Corporis Morbos De dispositione, Deo permittente, hominim Obiider & Occupare Demon possit, tamen quandoque Morbis, & praecipue Melancholici, fese immiscet Demon; & forfan frequentius hoc accidit, quam feppe creditur. Although the Devil may, by Divine permission, Posses men without any Morbid Disposition, yet doth he usually intermingle himself with Bodily Diseases, and especially those of Melancholy; and perhaps this cometh to pass often, than is commonly believed or suspected. The other in his, De Abditis rerum Caufis, where having attributed real Effects upon the bodies of men, to Witchcraft and Enchantment, he addeth; Nque folum morbos, vernus etiam Demonas, scelerati homines in corpora immittunt. Hi quidem visuntur Furores quaedam specie disferti, hoc non tam a Simplici Error distant, quod summe ardua obloquantur, praterita & occultum reminent, affidentiisque arcana referent. Neither do these wicked Magicians, only inflit Diseases upon mens Bodies, but also send Devils into them, by means whereof they appear dissorted with a kind of fury and madness, which yet differs from a Simple Madness (or the Disease so called) in this, that they speak of very high and difficult matters, declare things past unknown, and discover the Secrets of those that sit by. Of which he subjoyns two Notable Instances, of Persons well known to himself, that were plainly Demoniacal, Possessed, or Affed by an Evil Demon; one whereof shall be afterwards mentioned. But when Maniacal Persons, do not only discover Secrets, and declare things Past, but Future also, and besides this, speak in Languages, which they had never learnt, this puts it out of all doubt and question, that they are not Maniacal Persons, but Maniacs, or Demoniacs or Energumens. And that since the time of our Saviour Christ, there have been often such, may be made evident from the Records of credible Writers. Pfellus in his Book de Statu Animae, De Operat. Dæm. averrit on, of a certain Maniacal Woman, That though she knew nothing but her own Mother tongue, yet when a Stranger who was an Armenian was brought into the Room to her, the spake to him presently in the Armenian Language, namis & turhates namen, uti se Armeniœ in quæ: Armælo, quem medicas Range & lamen morbus, morbos, in quos prius eder, /e we all stood a
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mazed, when we heard, a woman that had never seen an Armenian before in all her life, nor had learnt any thing, but the use of her Difaff, to speak the Armenian Language readily. Where the Relater also affirmeth the fame Maniacal Person, to have foretold certain Future Events, which happened shortly after to himself, τινι δ' ἰδεών ὑπὲρ ἑαυτού, &c. Pag. 63. Although the same Person should have ascribed the thing described to himself, and yet withal have been exempt from it. For the Armenian Language is extremely applied to the utterance of things, which happen to the Jew in the future time, &c. Chap. xiv. 21. Therefore, if we reject, and doubt the truth of these things, by which a pretended Demon had beguiled the said Person, and yet have no mean to escape, unless a Power greater than that of Demons, exempts him from them. All which things (faith he) happened shortly after to me, and I was brought very low even near to Death by them, but was by my Saviour wonderfully delivered. Whereupon Pселlus concludes, Τις τινι εἰδώλων ἔτεκεν, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοιαύτα εἰπείς, ἢ τὰς μακράς πολέμους, ἢ παλαιάς καταστροφές, ἢ μικρὰς διότιμα φερεῖν, οὕτως δὲν ἀὐράν ἔλθης. Then looking upon me, &c. (or rather the Demon) said, thou shalt suffer wonderful pains and torments in thy Body. For the Demons are extremely angry with thee, for opposing their Services and Worship; and they will inflict great evils upon thee, out of which thou shalt not be able to escape, unless a Power greater than that of Demons, exempts thee from them. All which things (faith he) happened shortly after to me, and I was brought very low even near to Death by them, but was by my Saviour wonderfully delivered. Whereupon Pселlus concludes, Τις τινι εἰδώλων ἔτεκεν, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοιαύτα εἰπείς, ἢ τὰς μακράς πολέμους, ἢ παλαιάς καταστροφές, ἢ μικρὰς διότιμα φερεῖν, οὕτως δὲν ἀὐράν ἔλθης. Then looking upon me, &c. (or rather the Demon) said, thou shalt suffer wonderful pains and torments in thy Body. For the Demons are extremely angry with thee, for opposing their Services and Worship; and they will inflict great evils upon thee, out of which thou shalt not be able to escape, unless a Power greater than that of Demons, exempts thee from them. All which things (faith he) happened shortly after to me, and I was brought very low even near to Death by them, but was by my Saviour wonderfully delivered. Whereupon Pселlus concludes, Τις τινι εἰδώλων ἔτεκεν, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοιαύτα εἰπείς, ἢ τὰς μακράς πολέμους, ἢ παλαιὰς καταστροφές, ἢ μικρὰς διότιμα φερεῖν, οὕτως δὲν ἀὑράν ἔλθης. Then looking upon me, &c. (or rather the Demon) said, thou shalt suffer wonderful pains and torments in thy Body. For the Demons are extremely angry with thee, for opposing their Services and Worship; and they will inflict great evils upon thee, out of which thou shalt not be able to escape, unless a Power greater than that of Demons, exempts thee from them. All which things (faith he) happened shortly after to me, and I was brought very low even near to Death by them, but was by my Saviour wonderfully delivered. Whereupon Pселlus concludes, Τις τινι εἰδώλων ἔτεκεν, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοιαύτα εἰπείς, ἢ τὰς μακράς πολέμους, ἢ παλαιὰς καταστροφές, ἢ μικρὰς διότιμα φερεῖν, οὕτως δὲν ἀὑράν ἔλθης.
Of that, to If and done by and to and they to yet » fuch by of Angels we and speaking Languages, which they had never learnt) or else otherwise so Affected and Infected by them, as to have certain Unusual and Supernatural Symptoms; which for brevities fake, we shall here omit. However we thought it necessary, thus much to insist upon this Argument of Demoniackes, as well for the Vindication of Christianity, as for the Conviction of Atheife; we finding some so staggering in their Religion, that from this one thing alone of Demoniackes (they being so strongly possessed, that there neither is, nor ever was any such) they are ready enough to suspect, the whole Gospel or New Testament itself, of Fabulosity and Imposture.

We come now to the Second Head proposed, of Miracles and Effe& Supernatural. That there hath been some thing Miraculous or Above Nature, sometimes done even among the Pagans, (whether by Good or Evil Spirits;) appears not only from their own Records, but also from the Scripture itself. And it is well known, that they pretended (besides Oracles) to Miracles also, even after the times of Christianity; and that not only in Apollonius Tyaneus, and Apuleius, but also in the Roman Emperours themselves, as Vespasian and Adrian; but especially in the Temple of Aesulpiaus; thus much appearing from that Greek Table therein hung up at Rome, in which amongst other things this is Recorded, That a blind man being commanded by the Oracle, to kneel before the Altar, and then passing from the Right side thereof, to the Left, to lay five fingers upon the Altar, and afterwards lifting up his hand, to touch his eyes therewith; all this being done accordingly, he recovered his sight, the people all applauding, that great Miracles were done, under the Emperor Antoninus, &c. But we have in the Scripture an account of Miracles both greater in Number, and of a higher Nature; done especially by Moses, and our Saviour Christ and his Apostles.

Wherefore it seems, that there are Two Sorts of Miracles or Effe& Supernatural. First, such as though they could not be done by any Ordinary and Natural Causes here amongst us, and in that respect may be called Supernatural, yet might notwithstanding be done, God Permitting only, by the Ordinary and Natural Power of other Invisible Created Spirits, Angels or Demons. As for example, If a Stone or other Heavy body, should first ascend upwards, and then hang in the Air, without any Visible either Mover or Supporter, this would be to us a Miracle or Effect Supernatural; and yet according to Vulgar Opinion, might this be done, by the Natural Power of
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Created Invisible Beings, Angels or Demons; God only permitting, without whose special Providence it is conceived, they cannot, thus intermeddle, without humane affairs. Again, if a perfectly illiterate Person, should readily speak Greek, or Latin, this also would be to us a Miracle or Effect Supernatural, for so is the Apostles speaking with Tongues accounted; and yet in Demons, is this sometimes done, by Evil Demons, God only Permitting. Such also amongst the Pagans, was that Miraculum Cenis, (as Apuleius calls it) that Miracle of the Wheatsone, done by Accius Navus, when at his command, it was divided into Two, with a Razor. But Secondly there is another sort of Miracles, or Effects Supernatural, such as are above the Power of all Second Causes, or any Natural Created Being whatsoever, and so can be attributed to none, but God Almighty himself, the Author of Nature, who therefore can Controll it at pleasure.

As for that late Theological Politician, who writing against Miracles, denies as well those of the Former, as of this Latter Kind, contending that a Miracle is nothing but a Name, which the Ignorant Vulgar gives, to Opus Nature Infinitum, any Unwonted work of Nature, or to what themselves can asign no Cause off; as also that if there were any such thing done, Contrary to Nature or Above it, it would rather Weaken than Confirm, Our Belief of the Divine Existence; We find his Discourse every way to Weak, Groundless, and Inconsiderable; that we could not think it here to deserve a Contutation.

But of the Former Sort of those Miracles, is that to be understood, Deut. the 13. If there arise among you a Prophet or dreamer of Dreams, and growth thee a Sign or a Wonder, and the Sign or Wonder come to pass, whereof he speak unto thee saying, Let us go after other Gods, and serve them; thou shalt not hearken to the words of that Prophet or Dreamer of Dreams; for the Lord your God Provesth you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your Soul. For it cannot be Supposed, that God Almighty would himself, purposely Inpire any man to exhort others to Idolatry, and immediately assist such a one, with his own Supernatural Power, of doing Miracles, in Confirmation of such Doctrine. But the meaning is, that by the suggestion of Evil Spirits, some False Prophets might be raised up, to tempt the Jews to Idolatry; or at least, that by Assistance of them, such Miracles might be wrought, in Confirmation thereof, as those sometimes done by the Egyptian Sorcerers or Magicians, God himself not interposing in this case, to hinder them, for this reason, that he might hereby, Prove and Try their Faithfulness towards him. For as much as both by the Pure Light of Nature, and God's revealed Will, before confirmed by Miracles, Idolatry, or the Religious Worship of any but God Almighty, had been sufficiently condemned. From whence it is evident, that Miracles alone, (at least such Miracles as these,) are no sufficient Confirmation of a True Prophet, without consideration had of the Doctrine taught by him. For though a man should have done never so many true and real Miracles, amongst the Jews, and yet should persuade to Idolatry, he was not them confidently to be condemned to death, for a False Prophet. Accordingly
Accordingly in the New Testament, do we read, that our Saviour Christ forewarned his Disciples, That False Prophets and False Christs should arise, and show great Signs or Wonders, in so much that if it were possible, they should seduce the very Elect. And St. Paul foretelleth, concerning the Man of Sin, or Anti-Christ, That his coming should be after the working of Satan, with all Power, and Signs, and Wonders (or Miracles) of a Lye. For we conceive that by Τίτ. iii. in this place, are not properly meant, Feigned and Counterfeit Miracles, that is, meer Chearing and Jugling tricks; but True Wonders and Real Miracles (viz. of the Former Sort mentioned) done for the Confirmation of a Lye, as the Doctrine of this Man of Sin, is there afterwards called 5. For otherwise how could his coming be said to be, According to the Working of Satan, with all Power? In like manner also in St. John's Apocalypse, where the coming of the same Man of Sin and the Mystery of Iniquity, is again described, we read Chapter 13. of a Two Horned Beast like a Lamb, That he shall do great wonders and deceive those that dwell on the Earth, by means of those Miracles, which he hath power to do, in the sight of the Beast. And again Chapter 16. Of certain unclean Spirits like Frogs, coming out of the mouth of the Dragon, and of the Beast, and of the False Prophet; which are the Spirits of Devils working Miracles, that go forth to the Kings of the Earth. And Lastly Chapter 19. Of the False Prophet, that wrought Miracles before the Beast. All which seem to be understood, not of Feigned and Counterfeit Miracles only, but of True and Real also, Effected by the Working of Satan, in Confirmation of a Lye, that is, of Idolatry, False Religion and Imposture; God Almighty permitting it, partly in way of Probation or Tryal of the faithfulness of his own servants, and partly in way of Just Judgment and Punishment upon those, who receive not the Love of the Truth, that they might be saved, as the Apostle declareth. Wherefore those Miracles pretended for divers Ages past, to have been done, before the Relicks of Saints, and Images, &c. were they all True, could by no means justify or warrant, that Religious Worship, by many given to them; because True and Real Miracles, done in order to the promoting of Idolatry, are so far from Justifying that Idolatry, that they are themselves Condemned by it, to be Τίτ. iii. the Miracles of a Lye, done by the Working of Satan.

But as for the Miracles of our Saviour Christ, had they been all of them only of the Former Kind, such as might have been done, God permitting, by the Natural Power of Created Spirits, and their Assistance, yet for as much as he came in the Name of the Lord, teaching neither Idolatry, nor any thing contrary to the clear Light and Law of Nature, therefore ought he by reason of those Miracles, to have been received by the Jews themselves, and owned for a True Prophet, according to the Doctrine of Moses himself. Who both in the 13. and 18. Chapter of Deuter. plainly supposeth, that God would in no other Cafe, permit any False Prophet, to do Miracles, by the assistance of Evil Spirits, save only in that of Idolatry, and (which is always understood, of what is plainly Discoverable by the Light of Nature to
to be False, or Evil.) The reason whereof is manifest, because if he should, this would be an Invincible Temptation; which it is inconsistent with the Divine Goodness, to expulse men unto. And our Saviour Christ, was unquestionably, that One Eximious Prophet, which God Almighty by Moses promised to send unto the Israelites, upon occasion of their own desire made to him at Horeb, Let me not hear again, the voice of the Lord my God, nor let me see this great Fire any more, that I die not. Whereupon the Lord said, They have well spoken that which they have spoken, I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him; and whosoever will not hearken to this words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. Which is all one as if he should have said; I will no more speak to them with Thunder and Lightning, nor reveal my will with Terrible Voice out of Flaming Fire, but the next Great Manifestation of my self, or further Revelation of my Will, shall be, by Prophet, from amongst their own Brethren, I putting my words into his mouth, and speaking to them by him. Whose words they shall be so much obliged to hearken to, as if I had spoken them (as before) from the top of the Fiery Mount. And that they may have no Colour or their Disbelieving this great Prophet especially, or their disobeying of him, I plainly declare, that whosoever cometh in my Name, and does True and Real Miracles, shall be acknowledged undoubtedly by a True Prophet sent by me, and accordingly Believed and Obeyed; and none rejected under the Notion of False Prophets, but only such, as either, do not Real Miracles, or else if they do, come in the name of other Gods, or Exhort to Idolatry. Nevertheless, our Saviour Christ, wrought other Miracles also, of a higher Nature, by the Immediate Power of God Almighty himself; as for example, when before himself, he raised Lazarus, who had been dead four Days, to life; since it cannot be conceived, to be in the Power of Created Spirits (whether Bad or Good) when ever they please, to bring back the Souls of men deceased to their Bodies again, and change the Laws of Nature and Fate. However it must not be supposed, that God will ever set this Seal of his to a Lye, or that which is plainly contrary to the Light and Law of Nature.

The conclusion is, that though all Miracles promiscuously, do not immediately prove the Existence of a God, nor Confirm a Prophet, or whatsoever Doctrine; yet do they all of them evince, that there is a Bank of Invisible Understanding Beings, Superior to men, which the Heathens commonly deny. And we read of some such Miracles also, could not be wrought, but by a Power Perse verently Super-Natural, or God Almighty himself. But to deny and disbelieve all Miracles, is either to deny all Certainty of Sense, which would be indeed to make Sensation it self Miraculous; or else monstrously and unreasonably to derogate from Human Testimonies and History. The Jews would never have so stifly and pertinaciously adhered to the Ceremonial Law of Moses, had they not all along believed it, to have been unquestionably confirmed by Miracles; and that the Gentiles should at first have entertained the Faith of Christ without Miracles, would it self have been The Greatest of Miracles.
The last Extraordinary Phenomenon proposed, was that of Divination, Oracles, Prophecies, or Predictions of Future Events, otherwise Unforeknowable to men: which either Evince a God, or at least that there are Understanding Beings Superior to men. For if there be Prediction or Foreknowledge of such Future Events, as are to Humane Understanding alone, altogether Unforeknowable, then is it certain, that there is some more perfect Understanding, or Knowledge, in the World, than that of men. And thus is that Maxim of the Ancient Pagan Theists, in the Genuine and proper Sense thereof, unquestionably true, Si Divination est Dii sunt. If there be Divination, or Prediction of Future Events, (Undiscoverable by men) then are there Gods: which in their Language, was no more than to say, Understanding Beings Superior to men.

Wherefore we must here distinguish of Oracles and Predictions, after the same manner as we did before of Miracles, that they may be of Two Kinds. First, such as might proceed, only from the Natural Prefaging Power of Created Spirits Superior to men, whether called Angels or Demons. For these being supposed to have not only clearer understandings than men, and a greater insight into Nature, but also by reason of their Agility and Invisibility, opportunity of knowing things remotely distant, and of being privy to mens Secret Machinations and Consultations; it is easily conceivable, that many Future Events might at hand, which cannot be foreknown by men, may be (probably at least) foreseen by them; and that without any Miraculous Divine Revelation, their Caufes being already in Being. As men learned in Astronomy, can foretell Eclipses of the Sun and Moon, which to the Vulgar are altogether Unforeknowable. And as Princes or States-men, that are furnished with great Intelligence, Foreign and Domestic, can preface more of War and Peace, either at home or abroad, and of the Events of Kingdoms, than Ignorant Plebeians. And such were those Predictions, which Democritus, though otherwise much addicted to Atheism, allowed of; Cicero Writing thus of him, Plurima Locis, gravis aut for Democritus, Praefensionem rerum futurarm comprobat; Democritus a grave Writer, doth in many places approve of the Prediction of Future Events. The reason whereof was, because he supposed certain Understanding Beings Superior to men, called by him Idols, which having a larger Comprehension of things, and other advantages of Knowledge, could therefore foretell many Future Events that men were ignorant of. And though perhaps it may be thought, that Democritus would not have entertained this Opinion, of the Foreknowledge of Human Events, had he not asserted the Necessity of all humane Actions and Volitions, but held Liberty of Will, as Epicurus afterwards did; (as if this were Inconsistent with all manner of Prefage and Probable or Conjectural Foreknowledge;) yet is it certain, that there is not so much Contingency in all Humane Actions, by reason of this Liberty of Will, as heretofore was by Epicurus, and still is by many supposed; it being plain, that men act according to an Appearance of Good, and that in many cases and circumstances, it may be Foreknown, without
any Divine Revelation, what such or such persons would do. As for example, that a voluptuous Person, having a strong Temptation to satisfy his Sensual Appetite, and that without incurring any inconvenience of blame or punishment, would readily close with the fame. Besides which, such Invisible Spirits, as Angels or Demons, may sometimes Predict also, what themselves Cause and Effect.

Secondly, there is another Sort of Predictions of Future Events, which cannot be imputed to the Natural Prefaging Faculty of any such Created Spirits, but only to the Supernatural Preexistence of God Almighty, or a Being Infinitely Perfect. As when Events remotely distant in time, and of which there are yet no immediate Causes actually in Being, which also depend upon many circumstances and a long Series of things, any one of which being otherwise, would alter the case; as likewise upon much Uncertainty of Humane Volitions, which are not always necessarily linked and concatenated with what goes before, but often loose and free; and upon that Contingency, that arises from the Indifference or Equality of Eligibility in Objects; Lastly, such things as do not at all depend upon External Circumstances neither, nor are caused by things Natural Antecedent, but by some Supernatural Power; I say, when such Future Events as these, are foretold, and accordingly come to pass, this can be ascribed to no other but such a Being, as Comprehends, Sways, and Governs all; and is by a peculiar Privileedge or Prerogative of its own Nature, Omnificent. Epicurus, though really, he therefore rejected Divinities, and Prediction of Future Events; because he denied Providence yet did he pretend this further reason also against it, because it was a thing Absolutely Inconsistent with Liberty of Will, and Destructive of the fame; and yet in this Case, the same might be granted, Divination is a thing which hath no Existence, nor possibility in nature; and if there were such a thing, it would take away all Liberty of Will, and leave nothing in mans own Power. Thus also Carneades in Cicero maintained, Ne Apollinem quidem futura posse diceere, nisi ea quorum Caussas Natura ita contineret, ut ea fieri necess fisset. That Apollo himself, was not able to foretel, any future Events, other than such as had Necessary Causes in Nature antecedent. And some Christian Theists of latter times, have in like manner, denied to God Almighty, all Foreknowledge of Humane Actions, upon the same pretence, as being both Inconsistent with mens Liberty of Will, and Destructive thereof. For say they, If mens Actions be Free then are they Unforeknowable, they having no Necessary Causes; and again, if there be any Foreknowledge of them, then can they not be Free, they being ipso facto Necessitated thereby. But as it is certain, that Preference does not destroy the Liberty of mans Will, or impose any Necessity upon it; mens Actions being not therefore Future, because they are Foreknown; but therefore Foreknown because Future; and were a thing never to Contingent, yet upon supposition that it will be Done, it must needs have been Future from all Eternity: So is it extreme Arrogance for men, because themselves can Naturally Foreknow nothing, but by some Causes Antecedent, as an Eclipse of the Sun or Moon; therefore to presume to measure the knowledge of God Almighty, according to
the same Scantling, and to deny him the Prescience of Humane Actions; not considering that as his Nature is incomprehensible, so his Knowledge may well be looked upon, by us, as such too; that which is past our finding out, and Too Wonderful for us. However it must be acknowledged for an Undoubted Truth, that no Created Being, can Naturally and Of it self, Foreknow any Future Events, other wise, than in and by their Causes Anteceding. If therefore we shall find, that there have been Predictions of such Future Events, as had no Necessary Antecedent Causes; as we cannot but grant, such Things therefore to be Foreknowable; So muft we needs from thence infer, the Existence of a God, that is, a Being Supernatural, Ininitely Perfect, and Omnicient; since such Predictions as these have proceeded from no other Cause.

That there is Foreknowledge of Future Events, to men Naturally Unforeknowable, hath been all along the Perfusion of the Generality of Mankind. Thus Cicero, Vetus opinio est, iam uque ab Heroico
diutia temporibus, caque & Populi Romani, & omnium Gentium firmata
confeju, Persars quandam inter homines Divinationem, quam Graeci
maximis appellat, id est Presenfionem & Scientiam rerum Futurarm.
This is an Old opinion derived down all along from the Heroick times (or the Mythical Age) and not only entertained amongst the Romans, but also confirmed by the consent of all Nations, that there is such a thing as Divination; and Presenfion or Foreknowledge of Future Events. And the fame Writer elsewhere in the Perion of Balbus; Quaevis nihil
tam irridet Epicurus, quam Predicionem rerum Futuraram, mihi vide-
tur tamen vel maxime confirmare, Deorum Providentia consuli rebus
humanis. Est cuin profetio Divination, quae multis locis, rebus, temper-
ribus apparat, ciun in privatis tum maxime in publicis. Multa cernunt
Auripices, multa Augures provident, multa Oraculis providentur, multa
Vaticinationibus, multa Sommi, multa portentis. Although Epicurus
deride nothing more, then the Prediction of Future things; yet does
this seem to me to be a great confirmation of the Providence of the Gods
over humane affairs. Because there is certainly Divination, it appearing
in many Places, Things, and Times; and that not only Private but espe-
cially Publick. Soothsayers foresee many things, the Augurs many; many
things are declared by Oracles, many by Prophecies, many by Dreams, and
many by Portents. And indeed that there were even amongst the Pa-
gans, Predictions of Future Events, not discoverable by any Humane
Sagacity, which accordingly came to pass, and therefore argue a
Knowledge superior to that of men, or that there are certain Invis-
ible understanding Beings or Spirits; seems to be undeniable from
History. And that the Augurs themselves were sometimes not Un-
afflicted by these Officions Genii, is plain from that of Attius Navins
before mentioned, as the circumstances thereof are related by Histo-
rians; that Tarquininus Priscus having a mind to try what there was
in this skill of Augury, Dixit ei se cogitare quiddam; id poftcum fieri
consubit. Ille augurio ait, poftse respondet. Tarquinius autem dixit
se cogitasse cotem novaculam poiffe praedici; tum Attium justisse experiri:
ita Cotem in Comitum illatam, impervianse & Rege & Populo, novaculam
esse dixeram; Told Navius, that he Thought of something, and he would
know
would know of him, Whether it could be done or no. Navius having
performed his Augurating Ceremonies, replied, that the thing might be
done. Whereupon Prifcus declared, what his Thought was, namely, that
a Whetsone might be cut in two with a Razor. Navius willed them to
make trial: wherefore a Whetsone being brought immediately into the
Court; it was in the sight of the King and all the People, divided with a
Razor. But the Predictions amongst those Pagans, were for the most
part only of the Former Kind, such as proceeded merely from the
Natural Prefaging Faculty of these Demons; this appearing from hence,
because their Oracles were often expressed Ambiguously, so as that they
might be taken either way; those Demons themselves, it seems, being
then not confident of the Event: as also because they were
sometimes plainly mistaken in the Events. And from hence it was,
that they seldom Ventured to foretell, any Events remotely distant,
but only what were nigh at hand, and shortly to come to pass; and
therefore might be Probably Conjectured of, from things then in be-
ing. Notwithstanding which, we acknowledge, that there are some
few Instances of Predictions amongst the Pagans, of the other Kind.
Such as that intimated by Cicero in his Book of Divination, where
he declareth the Doctrine of Diodorus concerning Necessity and Con-
tingency; non necesse fuisse Cypfelum regnare Corinthi, quamquam
id Millesimo ante anno, Apollinis Oraculo editum esset, that it was not
Necessary, Cypfelus the Tyrant, should reign at Corinth, though that
were a thing Predicted by Apollo’s Oracle, a thousand years before. As
also this recorded by Varro, of Vestius Valens, an Augur in the Time
of Romulus, who when Rome was a building, from the flying of
eleven Vultures, prefaged that the continuance of that City would
be for Twelve Hundred years: which seems to have been according-
y fulfilled, in the year of our Lord Four hundred fifty and five, im-
mediately after the death of the Third Valentinian (whom some make
to be the last Real Emperour of the West or Rome) when Genericus
the Vandal, took the City the second time, and fired it. But above
all, that of the Sibyls; of whose Prophecies such things are recorded
by Pagan Writers, as makes it very fulminious, that they did foretell
the coming of our Saviour Christ, and the times of Christianty; but
were these and the like Pagan Prophecies, Real, then must they
needs have had some higher Original, than the Natural Prefaging Fa-
culty of their Demons, especially those of the Sibyls; who for ought
we know, might be as well asfufed Super-Naturally, to predict our
Saviour Christ, amongst the Pagans in the West; as Balaam was in
the East.

But here the Scripture triumpheth over Paganism, and all its Or-
ales and Divinations; there being contained in it so many unquestion-
able Predictions of Events to follow a long time after, and such as
are to be imputed to nothing but the Supernatural Foreknowledge and
insinence of God Almighty. As for example, those concerning the
Mejish, or our Saviour Christ, delivered by Jacob, Mozes, David,
Sias, Jeremy, Daniel, and most of the Prophets; foretelling fundry
particular circumstances of his coming, and that grand Event which
followed after, of the Gentiles or Pagans so general Reception and
Entertainment
Entertainment of Christianity; that is, the Belief of the Messias, promised to the Jews; together with the thinkeing off their Gods and Idols. Amongst which Scripture Prophecies, concerning our Saviour Christ, we must needs reckon for one, and none of the least considerable neither, that of Daniel's Weeks; or of Four hundred and ninety years, to commence from the Going forth of the Word, or the Decree made by Artaxerxes the Son of Xerxes, in the seventh year of his Reign, for the return of the People of Israel, Priests and Levites to Jerusalem; and to terminate in the Death of the Messias, and the Preaching of the Gospel to the Jews only: though we are not ignorant, how some learned men, both of former and latter times, have stretched their wits, they sometimes using no small violence, to divert this Prophecy another way. For that these Prophecies concerning our Saviour Christ, could have no other Original, than the immediate Supernatural Revelation of God Almighty, is evident from the thing it self; it being such as depended on no Natural Causes, much less upon those Constellations, of the Astrological Atheists, but only upon his own Secret Will, and Counsel.

But besides these Prophecies concerning our Saviour Christ, there are others contained in the Scripture, concerning the Fates and Successions of the chief Kingdoms, Empires, and Polities of the World; as of the Rise of the Periian Monarchy; of its Fall and Conquest by the Macedonian Alexander; of the Quadruplicate Division of this Greekish Empire after Alexander's death; of the Succession of the Seleucidae and Lagidae, a Prophetick History, so agreeable with the Events, that it was by Porphyrius pretended to have been written after them; and lastly of the Rise and Continuance of the Roman Empire. For notwithstanding the endeavours of some, to pervert all those Scripture Prophecies, that extend to the present times, it is clearly demonstrable, that this was Daniel's Fourth, Ten horned Beast; or the Legs and Toes of Nebuchadnezzar's Statue, that Fourth Empire strong as Iron, which came at length to be broken or divided, into Ten or many Principalities, called in the Prophetick Language and according to the Eichon, Hornez, amongst whom was to start up, another Horn with Eyes, speaking great words against the most High, and making War with the Saints and prevailing against them, for a Time, Times, and Half a Time. Which Prophecy of Daniels, is the Ground-work of St. John's Apocalypse, it being there further insinuted upon, filled up, and enlarged, with the addition of several particulars; so that both Daniel and John, have each of them from their respective ages, set down a Prophetick Calendar of Times, in a continued Series, (the former more Compendiously and Generally, the latter more Copiously and Particularly) to the very end of the World.

And thus do we see plainly, that the Scripture-Prophecies Evince a Deity; neither can these possibly be imputed by Atheists, as other things, to mens Fear and Fancy, nor yet to the Fiction of Politicians. Nor do they only Evince a Deity, but confirm Christianity also; partly as predicted by them in its several circumstances, a grand one whereof was the Gentiles Reception of it; and partly as it self predicting
Whether God Demonstrable.

To conclude, all these Extraordinary Phenomena, of Apparitions, Witchcraft, Possessions, Miracles, and Prophecies, do Evince that Spirits, Angels or Demons, though Invisible to us, are no Phantoms, but Real and Substantial Inhabitants of the World; which favors not the Atheistic Hypothesis; but some of them, as the Higher kind of Miracles, and Predictions, do also immediately enforce the acknowledgment of a Deity: a Being superior to Nature, which therefore can check and control it; and which comprehending the whole, foreknows the most Remotely distant, and Contingent Events.

And now have we not only fully Answered and Confuted, all the Atheistic Pretences against the Idea of God, tending to disprove his Existence; but also occasionally proposed, several Solid and Substantial Arguments for a Deity: as, That all Successive things, the World, Motion, and Time, are in their own Nature absolutely incapable of an Ante-Eternity, and therefore there must of necessity, be something else of a Permanent Duration, that was Eternal without Beginning; That no Atheist according to his Principles, can possibly give any account of the Original of his own Soul or Mind; That the Phenomenon of Motion cannot be Salved without an Incorporeal Principle, presiding over the whole; That the θο 'ο ξαλέκαι, The Artificial, Regular, and Orderly Frame of things, together with the Harmony of the whole, Demonstrate an Understanding and Intending Cause of the World, that Ordered things for Ends and Good. Besides, that here are several other Phenomena, both Ordinary and Extraordinary, which Atheists being no way able to Salve, are forced to deny.

True indeed, some of the ancient Theists, have themselves affirmed, that there could be no Demonstration of a God, which Assertion of theirs, hath been by others misunderstood into this sense, as if there were therefore no Certainty at all to be had of God's Existence, but only a conjectural Probability; no Knowledge or Science, but only Faith and Opinion. Whereas the true meaning of those ancient Theists, who denied that there could be any Demonstration of a God, was only this, that the Existence of a God could not be Demonstrated A Priori, himself being the First Cause of all things. Thus doth Alexander Aphrodisius, his Physical Doubts and Solutions, after he had propounded an Argument for a God, according to Aristotelick Principles, from Motion declare himself; ὥστε τίνι ἀναλύναι, ἢ τί δοκεῖ τι πραξισκομένην ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ ἐννοεῖν ἑξελείναι, ἢ τίνι πρες ἢ ἑκάστην ἐκαλεῖν χρήματος σωφρόντα τίνι ὕποκείσθω φύσιν. That this Argument or Proof of his was in way of Analysis only: it being not Pos.

Ch. IV. Whither God Demonstrable.
The Cartesian Scepticism; That Book I.

Sible that there should be a Demonstration of the First Principle of all. Wherefore (faith he) we must here fetch our Beginning from things that are After it, and manifest; and thence by way of Analysis, Ascend to the Proof of that First Nature which was before them. And to the same purpose Clemens Alexandrinus, having first affirmed, "et dico, et dixit lex, ut duobus," that is, having thus, in a prophetic sense, proved that the beginning of things was from God, like St. John: "Benedicta, quae gestavit Deum," he concludes therefrom, "et Ecce, levatans Deum, caput suum." Thus, and that the first thing which we should consider is, Whether God is the most difficult thing of all to be discovered of, Because since the Principle of every thing is hard to find out, the First and most antient Principle of all, which was the Cause to all other things, of their being made, must needs be the hardest of all to be declared or manifested; he afterwards subjoins, "et scio est."

But neither can God be apprehended by any Demonstrative Science. For such Science is from things Before in order of Nature, and more Knowable; whereas nothing can exist Before that which is altogether Unmade. And certain it is, that it implies a Contradiction, that God or a Perfect Being should be thus Demonstrated, by any thing before him as his Cause. Nevertheless it doth not therefore follow, that there can be no Certainty at all had of the Existence of a God, but only a Conjectural Probability; no Knowledge, but Faith and Opinion only. For we may have a Certain Knowledge of things, the ait whereof cannot be Demonstrated A Priori, or from Antecedent Necessary Causes; As for example, There was something Eternal of it Self, without Beginning; is not at all Demonstrable by any Antecedent Cause, it being Contradictitious to such a thing to have a Cause. Nevertheless upon supposition only, that something doth Exist, which no man can possibly make any doubt of, we may not only have an Opinion, but also certain Knowledge, from the Necessity of Irrefragable Reason; That there was never Nothing, but something or other did Always Exist from Eternity, and without Beginning. In like manner, though the Existence of a God or Perfect Being, cannot be Demonstrated A Priori, yet may we notwithstanding, from Our very Selves (whose Existence we cannot doubt of) and from what is contained in our own Minds, or otherwise consequent from him; by undeniable Principles of Reason, Neccessarily infer his Existence. And whensoever any thing is thus necessarily inferred, from what is undeniable and indubitable, this is a Demonstration, though not of the ait, yet of the et of it; That the thing is, though not Why it is. And many of the Geometrical Demonstrations are no other.

It hath been affected by a late Eminent Philosopher, that there is no possible Certainty to be had of any thing, before we be Certain of the Existence of a God Essentially Good: because we can never otherwise free our minds from the Importunity of that Supposition, which with irresistible force may assault them; That our selves might possibly be so made, either by Chance, or Fate, or by the pleasure of some Evil Demon, or at least of an Arbitrary Omnipotent Deity, as that we should be Deceived in all our most Clear and Evident Perceptions; and therefore in Geometrical Theorems themselves, and even in our Common
Our Faculties might be False.

Common Notions. But when we are once assured of the Existence of such a God as is Essentially Good, who therefore neither will nor can deceive; then and not before, will this Suspicion utterly vanish, and our selves become Certain, that our Faculties of Reason and Understanding are not False and Impossurs, but Rightly Made. From which Hypothesis it plainly follows, that all those Theists who suppose God to be a mere Arbitrary Being, whose Will is not determined by any Nature of Goodness or Rule of Justice, but it self is the first Rule of both, (they thinking this to be the Highest Perfection, Liberty, and Power) can never be reasonably Certain, of the Truth of any thing, not so much as that Two and Two are Four; because so long as they adhere to that persuasion; they can never be assured, but that such an Arbitrary Omnipotent Deity, might designedly make them such, as should be deceived in all their Clearest Perceptions.

Now though there be a Plausibility of Piety, in this Doctrine, as making the knowledge of a God Essentially Good, so necessary a Pre-cognition to all other Science, that there can be no Certainty of Truth at all without it, yet does that very Supposition, that our Understanding Faculties might possibly be so made, as to deceive us in all our Clearest Perceptions, (where ever it is admitted) render it utterly Impossible, ever to arrive to any Certainty concerning the Existence of a God Essentially Good; for as much as this cannot be any otherwise proved, then by the use of our Faculties of Understanding, Reason, and Discourse. For to say, that the Truth of our Understanding Faculties, is put out of all Doubt and Question, as soon as ever we are assured of the Existence of a God Essentially Good; who therefore cannot deceive; whilstt this Existence of a God, is in the mean time self no otherwise proved, than by our Understanding Faculties; that is, at once to prove the Truth of God's Existence from our Faculties of Reason and Understanding, and again to prove the Truth of those Faculties, from the Existence of a God Essentially Good; this I say is plainly to move round in a Circle; and to prove nothing at all; a gross oversight, which the forementioned Philosopher seems plainly guilty of.

Wherefore according to this Hypothesis, we are of necessity condemned to Eternal Scepticism, both concerning the Existence of a God, when after all our Arguments and Demonstrations for the same, we must length gratife the Atheists with this Confession, in the Conclusion; that it is Possible notwithstanding, there may be None; but also concerning all other things, the Certainty whereof is supposed to depend, upon the Certainty of the Existence of such a God as cannot Deceive.

So that if we will pretend to any Certainty at all, concerning the Existence of a God, we must of necessity explode this New Sceptical Hypothesis, of the Possibility of our Understandings being so made, as to Deceive us in all our Clearest Perceptions, by means whereof, we can be Certain of the Truth of nothing, and to use our utmost endeavour to remove the same. In the First place therefore we affirm, that no Power how great soever, and therefore not Omnipotence it
self, can make any thing to be indifferently either True or False, this being plainly to take away the Nature both of Truth and Falseness, or to make them nothing but Words without any Signification. Truth is not Facts, it is a thing which cannot be Arbitrarily Made, but Is. The Divine Will and Omnipotence it self (now supposed by us) hath no Imperium upon the Divine Understanding; for if God understood only by Will, he would not understand at all. In the next place we add, that though the Truth of Singular Contingent Propositions, depends upon the Things themselves Existing without, as the Measure and Archetype thereof; yet as to the Universal and Abstract Theorems of Science, the Terms whereof are those Reasons of Things, which Exist no where but only in the Mind it self (whole Noemata and Ideas they are,) the Measure and Rule of Truth concerning them, can be no Foreign or Extraneous thing, Without the mind, but must be Native and Domestic to it, or contained Within the mind it self; and therefore can be nothing but its Clear and Distinct Perception. In these Intelligible Ideas of the Mind, whatsoever is Clearly Perceived to Be, Is; or which is all one, is True. Every Clear and Distinct Perception is an Entity, or Truth; as that which is Repugnant to Conception is a Non-Entity or Falseness. Nay, The very Essence of Truth here, is this Clear Perceptibility or Intelligibility; and therefore can there not be any Clear or Distinct Perception of Falseness. Which must be acknowledged by all those who though granting False Opinions, yet agree in this, that there can be no False Knowledge. For the Knowledge of these Universal Abstract Truths, is nothing but the Clear and Distinct Perception of the several Ideas of the mind, and their Necessary Relations to one another; Wherefore to say that there can be no False Knowledge, is all one as to say that there can be no Clear and Distinct Perceptions of the Ideas of the mind, Falsely. In False Opinions, the Perception of the Understanding Power it self, is not False, but only Obcure. It is not the Understanding Power or Nature in us that Err, but it is We Our Selves who Err, when we rashly and unwarily assent to things, not Clearly Perceived by it. The upshot of all this, that since no Power how great soever, can make any thing indifferently to be True; and since the Essence of Truth in Universal Abstract things, is nothing but Clear Perceptibility; it follows, that Omnipotence cannot make any thing that is Falsely to be clearly Perceived to Be; or Create such Minds and Understanding Faculties, as shall have as Clear Conceptions of Falseness, as is of Non-Entities, as they have of Truths or Entities. For example, no Rational Understanding Being that knows what a Part is, and what a Whole, What a Cause and what an Effect, could possibly be so made, as clearly to Conceive the Part to be greater than the Whole, or the Effect to be before the Cause, or the like. Wherefore we may presume with Reverenceto Say, that there could not possibly be a world of Rational Creatures made by God, either in the Moon, or in some other Planet, or else where, that should clearly and Distinctly Conceive, all things contrary to what are clearly Perceived by us; nor could our Humane Faculties have been so made, as that we should have as clear Conceptions of Falseness as of Truths. Mind or Understanding Faculties, in Creatures may be made more or less.
It is true indeed, that Sense considered alone by itself, doth not reach to the Ab soluteness either of the Natures, or of the Existence of things without us, it being as such, nothing but Seeing, Appearance, and Phancy. And thus is that Saying of some antient Philosophers to be understood, that πάντα φανταστικά ἂν ὧν ἐστιν ὁ πάντα, Every Phantast is True; namely because Sense and Phancy reach not to the Absolute Truth and Falsehood of things, but Contain themselves only within Seeing and Appearance; and every Appearance must needs be a true Appearance. Notwithstanding which, it is certain, that Sense often represents to us Corporeal things, otherwise than indeed they are, which though it be not a Formal, yet is it a Material Falsity. Wherefore Sense in the Nature of it, is not Absolute, but παντά τί, or τί, Relative to the Sentients. And by Sense alone, without any mixture of Reason or Understanding, we can be certain of no more, concerning the things without us, but only this, that they So Seem to us. Hence was that of the ancient Atomick Philosophers, in Plato, it τά, as Plutarch says, τά τιμία τότε, φανταστικά, and ἀληθινά, πάντα τί, καὶ καθότι τί, καὶ Εικόνα τούτης. Neither nor any man else can be certain, that every other man and Brute Animal hath all the very same Phantasms of Colours, that himself hath. Now were there no other Perception in us, but that of Sense, (as the old Atheistical Philosophers concluded Knowledge to be Sense,) then would all our Humane Perceptions be meerly Seeing, Fantastical and Relative; and none of them reach to the Absolute truth of things. Every one in Protagoras his Language would then be, αὕτη μέτωπον δεξαία, Think, or Opine only his Own things; all his Truths being Private and Relative to himself. And that Protagorean Phorion was to be admitted also, in the Sense of that Philosopher, that πάντα τοιὸν καταλείπον μέτωπον ἀνθρώποις, Every man is the Measure of all things to himself; and, That no one man’s Opinion was righter than another’s, but τά φανταστικά ἐκάσῃ, That Which Seemed to Every one, was to him True, to whom it Seemed; all Truth and Perception, being but Seeing, and Relative. But here lies one main difference betwixt Understanding or Knowledge, and Sense; that whereas the Latter is,  

Phantastical
Phantastical and Relative only; the Former reacheth beyond Phancy and Appearance to the Absolute of Truth. For as it hath been already declared, whatsoever is clearly and distinctly perceived in things Absolute and Universal, by any one Rational Being in the whole world, is not a Private thing, and True to Himself only that perceived it, but it is, as some Stoicks have called it, ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀφελεία, a public, Catholick, and Universal Truth: it obtains every where, and as Empedocles fang of Natural Justice 3

It is extended throughout the Vast Æther, and through Infinite Light or Space; and were there indeed Infinite Worlds, all thickly peopled with Rational Animals; it would be alike True, to every one of them. Nor is it Conceivable, that Omnipotence itself, could create any such Understanding Beings, as could have Clear and Distinct Perceptions of the contrary, to all that is Perceived by us, no more than it could Do things Contradictions. But in all Probability, because Sense is indeed, but Seeing, Phantastical, and Relative, this is the Reason that some have been so prone and inclinable, to suspect the like, of Understanding, and all Mental Perception, too, that this also is but Seeing and Relative; and that therefore mens Minds or Understandings might have been so made, by an Arbitrary Omnipotent Deity, as clearly and distinctly to Perceive, every thing that is False. But if notwithstanding all that hath been said, any will still sing over, the Old Song again; That all this, which hath been hitherto declared by us, is indeed True, If our Humane Faculties be True, or Rightly Made; but we can go no further than our Faculties; and whether these be True or no no man can ever be certain; We have no other Reply to make, but that this is an over Stiff and Heavy Adherence to a Prejudice of their own Minds; that not only Sense, but also Reason and Understanding, and all Humane Perception, is meerly Seeing, or Phantastical, and Relative to Faculties only; but not reaching to the Absolute of any Truth; and that the Humane Mind, hath no Criterion of Truth at all within it self.

Nevertheless it will probably be here further Objected; That this is too great an Arrogance, for Created Beings, to pretend to an Absolute Certainty of any thing, it being the Sole Priviledge and Presumptive of God Almighty, to be Infallible, who is therefore Styled in Scripture, ὁ μόνος σοφὸς, The Only Wise; To which we briefly answer; that the Deity is the first Original Fountain, of Truth and Wisdom, which is said to be, The Brightness of the Everlasting Light, the Unspotted Mirror of the Power of God, and the Image of his Goodness. The Divine Word, is the Archetypal Pattern of all Truth; it is ignorant of Nothing, and knoweth all things Infallibly. But Created Beings, have but a Derivative Participation hereof, their Understandings being Obscure, and they Erring in many things, and being Ignorant of more. And it seems to be no Derogation from Almighty God to suppose, that Created Minds by a Participation of the Divine Mind,
Mind, should be able to know certainly; that Two and Two make Four; that Equals added to Equals will make Equals; that a Whole is greater than the Part; and the Cause before the Effect; and that nothing can be made without a Cause; and such like other Common Notions, which are the Principles from whence all their knowledge is derived. And indeed were Rational Creatures, never able to be certain of any such thing as this at all; what would their Life be but a mere Dream or Shadow? and themselves but a Ridiculous and Pompous Piece of Phantastick Vanity? Besides it is no way Congruous to think, that God Almighty should make Rational Creatures so as to be in an utter Impossibility, of ever attaining to any Certainty of his own Existence; or of having more than an Hypothetical Assurance thereof, if our Faculties be True (which possibly may be otherwise,) then is there a God. We shall conclude this Discourse against the Cartesian Scepticism, with that of Origens, &c. by the way, if our Knowledge is the only thing in the World, which Creatures have, that is in its own Nature firm; they having here something of Certainty, but none where else.

Wherefore we having now, that which Archimedes required, Some Firm Ground and Footing to stand upon, such a Certainty of Truth in our Common Notions, as that they cannot possibly be False, without which nothing at all could be proved by Reason; we shall in the next place endeavour, not to shake or disallow any thing thereby; which was the Undertaking of that Geometrical but to Confirm and Establish the Truth of God’s Existence, and that from the very Idea of him; hitherto made good and defended, against all the Assails of Atheists.

It is well known, that Cartesius hath lately made a Pretence to do this, with Mathematical Evidence and Certainty, and he dispatches his business briefly after this manner; God or a Perfect Being, includeth Necessary Existence in his very Idea; and therefore he is. But though the Inventor of this Argument, or rather the Reviver of that which had been before used by some Scholastics, affirmeth it to be Good a Demonstration, for the Existence of a God, from His Idea, as that in Geometry, for a Triangles having Three Angles equal to Two right, is from the Idea of a Triangle; yet nevertheless it is certain, that by one means or other, this Argument hath not hitherto proved so fortunate and Successful, there being many who cannot be made sensible of any Efficacy therein, and not a few who Condemn it for a mere Sophism. As for our selves, we neither have any mind, to quarrel with other mens Arguments Pro Deo, nor yet would we be sought, to lay Itres in this Cause, upon any thing which is not every day Solid and Substantial. Wherefore we shall here endeavour, to lay down the Utmost that Possibly we can, both Against this Argument, and For it, Impartially and Candidly; and then when we have done, leave the Intelligent Readers, to make their own Judgements concerning the Same.

Against it in this manner: First, Because we can Frame an Idea in:
in our own minds, of an Absolutely Perfect Being, including Necessary Existence in it, it will not at all follow from thence, that therefore there is such a Perfect Being Really Existing without our minds; we being able to frame in our minds the Ideas of many other things, that never were, nor will be. All that can be certainly inferred from the Idea of a Perfect Being seems to be this, that if it contain nothing which is Contradictions to it, then it is Not Impossible but that there might be such a Being actually Existing. But the strength of this Argument, not lying merely in this, that because we have an Idea of a Perfect Being, therefore it is; but because we have such an Idea of it, as includeth Necessary Existence in it, which the Idea of Nothing else besides doth; therefore may it be here further Objected in this manner. That though it be very true, that a Perfect Being doth include Necessary Existence in it, because that cannot be every way Perfect, whole Existence is not Necessary but Contingent; yet will it not follow from hence, that therefore there is such a Perfect Being Actually Existing; but all that can be deduced from it, will be no more than this. That whatsoever hath no Necessary and Eternal Existence, is no Absolutely Perfect Being; and again, If there be any Absolutely Perfect Being, then was its Existence always Necessary and will be always such; that is, it did both Exist of itself, from all Eternity without Beginning, and must needs Exist to Eternity Incorruptibly; it being never able to cease to be. It seems indeed no more to follow, that because a Perfect Being includes necessary Existence in its Idea, therefore there is such a Perfect Being Actually Existing; than because a Perfect Being includes Necessary Omniscience and omnipotence in it, that therefore there is such a Perfect Omniscient and Omnipotent Being; all that follows in both cases, being only this; that If there be any Being Absolutely Perfect, then it is both Omniscient and Omnipotent, and it did Exist of itself necessarily, and can never Cease to be. Wherefore here lies a Fallacy in this Argumentation, when from the Necessity of Existence affirmed only Hypothetically or upon a Supposition of a Perfect Being, the Conclusion is made concerning it Absolutely. As some would prove the Necessity of all humane Events, as for example of Adam's Sinning, in this manner, that it always was True before, that either Adam would eat the forbidden fruit, or not eat it, and If he would eat it, he would Certainly eat it, and not Contingently; and again, If he would not eat it, then would he Certainly and Necessarily not Eat it; wherefore whether he will eat it or not eat it, he will do either, Necessarily and not Contingently. Where it is plain, that an Absolutely Necessary, is wrongly inferred in the Conclusion, from an Hypothetical one in the Premisses. In like manner, when upon supposition of an Absolutely Perfect Being, it is affirmed of it, that its Existence must not be Contingent but Necessary, and from thence the Conclusion is made Absolutely, that there Is such a Perfect Being, this seems to be the very same Fallacy. From the Idea of a Perfect Being, including Necessary Existence in it, it follows undeniably, that If there be any Thing Absolutely Perfect, it Must Exist Necessarily, and not Contingently, but it doth not follow, that there Must of Necessity be such a Perfect Being Existing; these two Propositions carrying a very different Sense from one
one another. And the Latter of them, that there must of Necessity be a God or Perfect Being Existing seems to be a thing altogether Indemonstrable; it implying that the Existence of God or a Perfect Being may be proved A Priori, or from some Antecedent Necessary Cause; which was before declared to be a thing Contradictions and Impossible.

And now in Justice are we obliged to plead the best we can also on the Defensive side. Thus therefore; the Idea of God or an Absolutely Perfect Being including in it, not an Impossible, nor a Contingent, but a Necessary Scheffis or Relation to Existence, it follows from thence, Absolutely and without any Ifs and Ands, that he doth Exist. For as of things Contradictions, having therefore in the Idea of them, an Impossible Scheffis to Existence, we can confidently conclude that they never were nor will be; and as of other things not Contradictions or Impossible, but Imperfect only, which therefore have a Contingent Scheffis to Existence, we can Pronounce also that Possibly they might be or might not be; in like manner, a Perfect Being including in the Idea of it a Necessary Scheffis to Existence or an Impossible one to Non-Existence, or containing Existence in its very Essence; we may by Parity of reason conclude concerning it, that it is neither Impossible to Be; nor yet Contingent to Be or not to Be; but that it Certainly Is, and Cannot but Be; or that it is Impossible it should Not Be. And indeed when we say of Imperfect Beings, implying no Contradiction in them, that they may Possibly either Be or not Be, we herein tacitly suppose the Existence of a Perfect Being, because nothing which is Not, could be Possible to be, were there not something actually in Being, that hath sufficient Power to Cause or Produce it. True indeed, we have the Ideas of many things in our minds, that never were, nor will be; but these are only such as include no Necessary but Contingent Existence in their Nature; and it does not therefore follow, that a Perfect Being, which includes Necessity of Existence in its Idea, may notwithstanding Not Be. Wherefore this Necessity of Existence or Impossibility of Non-Existence contained in the Idea of a Perfect Being, must not be taken Hypothetically only or Consequentially, after this manner, that If there be any Thing Absolutely Perfect, then its Existence both was and will be Necessary; but absolutely; that though Contradictionistings cannot Possibly be, and things Imperfect may Possibly either Be or Not Be, yet a Perfect Being cannot But Be; or it is Impossible that it should Not Be. For otherwise were the force of the Argumentation nearly Hypothetical, in this manner, If there be a Perfect Being, then its Existence both was and will be Necessary; this would plainly imply that a Perfect Being, notwithstanding that Necessity of Existence included in its Nature, might either Be or Not Be; or were Contingent to Existence, which is a manifest Contradiction, that the same thing should Exist both Contingently and Necessarily. And this Hypothetical Absurdity, will more plainly appear, if the Argument be expressed in other words, as that Necessity of Existence, and Impossibility of Non-Existence, and Actual Existence, belong to the very Essence of Perfect Being, since it would be then ridiculous to go about, to evade this manner; That If there be a Perfect Being, then it Is, and cannot But Be. Which Identical Proposition, is true of every thing, etc.
but Absurd. Wherefore there is something more to be inferred from the Necessity of Existence included in the Idea of a Perfect Being than so, which can be nothing else but this, that it Absolutely and Actually Is. Moreover no Theists can be able to prove that God or a Perfect Being (supposed by them to Exist) might not Happen by Chance only to Be; if from the Necessity of Existence included in the Idea of God, it cannot be inferred that he could not But Be. Notwithstanding which, here is no endeavour, (as is pretended) to prove the Existence of a God or Perfect Being, A Priori neither, or from any Necessary Cause Antecedent; but only from that Necessity which is included within itself, or is Concomitant and Concurrent with it; the Necessity of its own Perfect Nature. And now we shall leave the Intelligent and Impartial Reader, to make his own Judgment concerning the forementioned Cartesian Argument for a Deity, drawn from its Idea, as including Necessity of Existence in it, that therefore It Is; Whether it be meerly Sophistical, or hath something of Solidity and Reality in it. However it is not very Probable, that many Atheists, will be convinced thereby, but that they will rather be ready to say, that this is no Probation at all of a Deity, but only an Affirmation of the thing in Dispute, and a mere Begging of the Question; that therefore God Is, because he Is, or Cannot But be.

Wherefore we shall endeavour, to make out an Argument, or Demonstration, for the Existence of a God, from his Idea, as including Necessary Existence in it, some other ways. And First, we shall make an Offer towards it in this manner. Though it will not follow from hence, because we can Frame an Idea of any thing in our minds, that therefore such a thing Really Existeth; yet nevertheless, whatsoever we can Frame an Idea of, implying no manner of Contradiction in its Conception, we may certainly conclude thus much of it, that such a thing was not Impossible to be; there being nothing to us Impossible, but what is Contradictions and Repugnant to Conception. Now the Idea of God or a Perfect Being, can imply no manner of Contradiction in it, because it is only the Idea of such a thing as hath all Possible and Conceivable Perfections in it; that is, all Perfections which are neither Contradictions in themselves, nor to one another. And they who will not allow of this Consequence, from the Idea of a Perfect Being, including Necessity of Existence in it, that it doth therefore Actually Exist, yet cannot deny, but that this at least will follow, from its implying no manner of Contradiction in it, that it is therefore a thing Possible, or not Impossible to be. For thus much being true of all other Contingent things, whose Idea implyeth no Contradiction, that they are therefore Possible; it must needs be granted of that, whose very Idea and Essence containeth a Necessity of Existence in it, as the Essence of nothing else but a Perfect Being doth. And this is the First Step, that we now make in way of Argumentation, from the Idea of God or a Perfect Being, having nothing Contradictions in it, That therefore God is at least Possible, or no way Impossible to have been. In the next place as this particular Idea of that which is Possible, includeth Necessity of Existence in it; from these Two things put together at least, the Possibility of such a Being, and its Necessary Existence.
CHAP. IV. Of a God from his Idea.

Of hence (if not from the Latter alone) will it according to Reason follow, that He Actually Is. If God or a Perfect Being, in whose Essence is contained Necessary Existence, be Possible, or no way Impossible to have been, then He Is; because upon Supposition of his Non-Existence, it would be Absolutely Impossible, that he should ever have been. It does not thus follow, concerning Imperfect Beings, that are Contingently Possible, that if they be Not, it was therefore Impossible for them ever to have been; for that which is Contingent, though it be Not, yet might it for all that, Possibly Have been. But a Perfect Necessarily Existing Being, upon the bare Supposition of its Non-Existence, could not more Possibly Have been, than it could Possibly Hereafter be: because if it might Have been, though it be Not, then would it not be a Necessary Existent Being. The Sum of all is this, A Necessary Existent Being, if it be Possible, it Is; because upon Supposition of its Non-Existence, it would be Impossible for it ever to have been. Wherefore God is either Impossible to have been, or else He Is. For if God were Possible, and yet be Not, then is he not a Necessary, but Contingent Being, which is contrary to the Hypothesis.

But because this Argumentation may perhaps run the same Fate also with the former, and by reason of its Subtlety, do but little Execution neither, if not be accounted Sophistical too; men being generally prone to Distrust, the Firmness and Solidity, of such Thin and Subtle Cobwebs, (as these and the like may seem to be) or their Ability to Support the Weight of so Great a Truth; and tosuspect themselves to be Illaguated and Circumvented in them; therefore shall we lay no Stress upon this neither, but proceed to something which is yet more Plain and Downright, after this manner. Whatsoever we can frame an Idea of in our minds, implying no manner of Contradiction, his either Actually Is, or else If it be Not, it is Possible for it to Be, but If God be Not, He Is not Possible hereafter to Be, therefore He Is. The Reason and Necessity of the Minor is evident, because if God be not, and yet Possible hereafter to be, then would he not be an Eternal and Necessarily Existent Being, which is Contradictious to his Idea: and the Ground of the Major, upon which all the weight lies, hath been already declared, where we proved before, That if there were no God or Perfect Being, we could never have had any Conception or Idea of him in our Minds, because there can be no Positive Conception of an Absolute Nothing, that which hath neither Actual nor Possible Existence. Here the Posture of the Argument is only inverted; because we have an Idea of God, or a Perfect Being, implying no manner of Contradiction in it, therefore must it needs have some kind of Entity or other, either an Actual or Possible One; but God if he be not, is not Possible to Be, therefore He doth Actually Exist.

But perhaps this Argumentation also how firm and solid soever, may prove less Convincive of the Existence of a God to the Generality; because whatever is Received, is Received according to the Capacity of a Recipient: and though a Demonstration be never so good in itself, it is but more or less fuch to Particular Persons, according to their abi- ly to comprehend it; Therefore shall we in the next place Form...
yet a Plainer Demonstration, for a God from the Idea of him, including Necessary Existence in it. It being First Premised, That unquestionably—Something or other, did Exist from all Eternity without beginning. For it is certain that Every thing could not be Made, because Nothing could come from Nothing; or be Made by It self, and therefore if once there had been Nothing, there could never have been Any thing. Whence it is undeniable, that there was always Something, and consequently that there was Something Unmade, which Existed of It self from all Eternity. Now all the Question is, and indeed this is the only Question betwixt Theists and Atheists; since Something did certainly Exist of It self from all Eternity, What that thing is, whether it be a Perfect or an Imperfect Being? We say therefore, that whatsoever Existed of It self, from Eternity, and without Beginning, did so Exist Naturally and Necessarily, or by the Necessity of its own Nature. Now nothing could Exist of It self from Eternity, Naturally and Necessarily, but that which containeth Necessary and Eternal Self Existence, in its own Nature. But there is nothing which containeth Necessary Eternal Existence, in its own Nature or Essence, but only an Absolutely Perfect Being; all other Imperfect things, being in their Nature, Contingently Possible, either to be or not be. Wherefore since something or other, must and doth Exist of it self Naturally and Necessarily from Eternity Unmade, and nothing could do this but what included Necessary Self Existence in its Nature or Essence, it is certain that it was a Perfect Being, or God, who did Exist of Himself from Eternity, and nothing else, all other Imperfect things which have no Necessary Self Existence in their Nature, deriving their Being from Him. Here therefore are the Atheists Infinitely Absurd and Unreasonable, when they will not acknowledge, that which containeth Independent Self Existence, or Necessity of Existence (which indeed is the same with an Impossibility of Non-Existence) in its Nature and Essence, that is, a Perfect Being, so much as to Exist at all; and yet in the mean time assert, that which hath no Necessity of Existence in its Nature, the most Imperfect of all Beings, Inanimate Body and Matter, to have Existed of It self Necessarily from all Eternity.

We might here add, as a farther Confirmation of this Argument, what hath been already proved, that no Temporary Successive Being (whose Duration is in a Continual Flux, as if it were every moment Generated a new) and therefore neither our Own Souls, nor the World, nor Matter Moving, could possibly have Existed from Eternity, and Independently upon any other thing, but must have had a Beginning, and been Caused by something else, namely by an Absolutely Perfect Being, whose Duration therefore is Permanent, and without any Successive Generation, or Flux.

But besides all these Arguments, we may otherwise from the Idea of God (already declared) be able both exactly to state the Controversie betwixt Theists and Atheists, and satisfactorily to decide the same. In order whereunto, there is yet something again to be Premised; namely this, that as it is certain Every thing was not Made, but Something Existed of it, Self from Eternity Unmade; so is it
it likewise certain, That Every thing was not Unmade neither, nor Existed of It self from Eternity, but something was Made, and had a Beginning. Where there is a full Agreement between Theists and Atheists, as to this one Point, no Atheist alleging every thing to have been Unmade, but they all acknowledging themselves to have been Generated, and to have had a Beginning; that is, their own Souls and Personalities, as likewise the Lives and Souls of all other Men and Animals. Wherefore since Something certainly Existed of It self from Eternity, but other things were Made, and had a Beginning, (which therefore must needs derive their being from that which Existed of It self Unmade,) here is the State of the Controversie betwixt Theists and Atheists, Whether that which Existed of It self from all Eternity, and was the Cause of all other things, were a Perfect Being and God, or the most Imperfect of all things whatsoever, Immutable and Sensible Matter. The Former is the Doctrine of Theists, as Aristotle affirmeth of those Ancients, who did not write Fabulously Concerning the First Principles, ουν τοσανδρας, ης τετρα ὁνες, το γαναιξαν περικον τθ. Αιστης, τι, οι μμεραι, ης τη υπέρων, της σαραν, ουν εμπερθαλης τε Αναξαγορες, As namely, Pherecydes, and the Magi, and Empedocles and Anaxagoras, and many others; that they agreed in this, That the first Original of all things was the Best, and Most Perfect. Whereby the way we may observe also; that according to Aristole, the Ancient Magi did not acknowledge a Substantive Evil Principle, they making that which is the Best and Most Perfect Being, alone by itself, to be the First Beggar of all. This is the Hypothesis of Theists, that there is One Absolutely Perfect Being, Existing of It self from all Eternity, from whence all other lefser Perfections, or Imperfect Beings, did gradually Descend, till at last they end in Sensible Matter or Inanimate Body. But the Atheistick Hypothesis on the contrary makes Sensible Matter the most Imperfect thing, to be the First Principle or the only Self-Existent Being, and the Cause of all other things, and Consequently all Higher Degrees of Perfections, that are in the world, to have Clownd up, or Emerged by way of Ascent from thence; as Life, Sense, Understanding, and Reason, from that which is altogether Dead and Sensible. Nay, as it was before observed, there hath been amongst the ancient Pagans, a certain kind of Religious Atheists, such as acknowledging Verbally a God, or Soul of the world, presiding over the whole, supposed this notwithstanding to have first Emerged also, out of Sensible Matter, Night and Chaos; and therefore doubtles to be likewise Destroyable again into the same. And of these is that place in Aristole to be understood, μενωντι ης ἀγελθής ραχιν ε τις πρέπουσι ουν ολοι, ης ουργενοι, ης χαιρει, ης αεικενοι, Αλλα γειλικων. They suppose, not the First things, as Night, and the Heaven, and Chaos, and the Ocean, but Jupiter (or God) to Rule and Govern all. Where it is intimated, that the Heaven, Night, Chaos, and the Ocean, according to these, were Seniors to Jupiter, or in Order of Nature before him; they apprehending, that things did Ascent upward, from that which was most Imperfect, as Night and Chaos, to the more Perfect, and at length to Jupiter himself; the Mundane Soul, who governeth the whole world; as our Soul doth our Body. Which same Opinion is afterwards again taken notice of and reprehended by Aristole in these words, εν οδοις ου υπολογιζον εις του παρεως της των.
The Controversie being thus clearly Stated between Theists and Atheists, it may now with great ease, and to the full Conviction of all Minds Unprejudiced, and Unprepossessed with false Principles, be determined. It being on the one hand, undeniably evident, that Lesser Perfections may Naturally Descend from Greater, or at least from that which is Absolutely Perfect, and which Virtually containeth all; but on the other hand utterly Impossible, that Greater Perfections and Higher Degrees of Being, should Rise and Ascend out of Lesser and Lower, so as that which is the most Absolutely Imperfect of all things, should be the First Fountain and Original of All. Since no Effect can possibly transcend the Power of its Cause. Wherefore it is certain that in the Universe, things did not thus Ascend and Mount, or Climb up from Lower Perfection to Higher, but on the contrary, Descend and Slide down from Higher to Lower, so that the first Original of all things, was not the most Imperfect, but the most Perfect Being. But to speak more particularly, it is certain, notwithstanding all the vain pretences of Lucretius and other Atheists, or Semi-Atheists, to the contrary; that Life and Sense could never possibly spring out of Dead and Senseless Matter, as its only Original, either in the way of Atoms, (no Composition of Magnitudes, Figures, Sizes and Motions, being ever able to produce Cognition) or in the way of Qualities, since Life and Perception can no more result from any Mixture of Elements, or Combinations of Qualities of Heat and Cold, Moist and Dry, &c. than from Unqualified Atoms. This being undeniably Demonstrable, from that very Principle of Reason, which the Atheists are so fond of; but, misunderstanding abufe, (as shall be manifested afterward) that Nothing can come from Nothing. Much less could Understanding and Reason in men, ever have Emerged out of Stupid Matter, devoid of all manner of Life. Wherefore we must needs here freely declare, against the Darkness of that Philosophy, which hath been Sometimes unwarily entertained by such as were no Atheists, That Sense may Rise from a certain Modification, Mixture, or Organization, of Dead and Senseless Matter; as also that Understanding and Reason, may result from Sense: the plain Consequence of both which is, that Senseless Matter may prove the Original of all things, and the only Nomen. Which Doctrine therefore is doubtful, a main piece of the Philosophy of the Kingdom of Darkness. But this Darkness hath been of late in great measure dispelled, by the Light of the Atomick Philosophy restored, as it was in its first Genuine and Virgin State, Undecrowned as yet by Atheists, this clearly Showing how far Body and Mechanism can go, and that Life and Cognition can never Emerge out from thence; it being built upon that Fundamental Principle, as we have made it evident in the first Chapter, that Nothing can come from Nothing. And Strato,
and the Hylozoick Atheists, were so well aware and to sensible of this, that all Life and Understanding could not possibly be Generated or Made, but that there must be some Fundamental and Substantial or Eternal Unmade Life and Knowledge; that they therefore have thought necessary to attribute Life, and Perception, (or Understanding,) with Appetite, and Self-moving Power, to all Matter as such, that so it might be thereby fitly Qualified to be the Original of all things. Then which Opinion as nothing can be more Monstrous; so shall we else where Evince the Impossibility thereof. In the mean time, we doubt not to averr, that the Argument proposed, is a Sufficient Demonstration of the Impossibility of Atheism; which will be further manifested in our Answer to the Second Atheistick Objection against a Divine Creation, because Nothing can come from Nothing.

But this Controversy betwixt Theists and Atheists, may be yet more Particularly Stated, from the Idea of God, as including Mind or Understanding in it Essentially, viz. Whether Mind be Eternal and Unmade, as being the Maker of all; or else Whether all Mind were it self Made or Generated; and that out of Sensless Matter? For according to the Doctrine of the Pagan Theists, Mind was Φυσικήν Ειδωλον, Φαιάνων, The Oldest of all things, Senior to the World and Elements; and by Nature hath a Princeely and Lordly Dominion over all. But according to those Atheists, who make Matter or Body devoid of all Life and Understanding, to be the First Principle, Mind must be Εινεγκρύς, A Post-Nate thing, Younger than the world; a Weak, Umbratil, and Ex- vanid Image, and next to Nothing.

And the Controversy as thus Stated, may be also Clearly and Satisfactorily decided. For First, we say, That as it is certainly True, That if there had been once Nothing at all, there could never have been Any thing; So is it true likewise, that If once there had been no Life, in the whole Universe, but all had been Dead, then could there never have been any Life or Motion in it: and If once there had been no Mind, Understanding or Knowledge, then could there never have been any Mind or Understanding produced. Because, to suppose Life and Understanding to rise and spring up, out of that which is altogether Dead & Sensless, as its only Original, is plainly to Suppose Something to come out of Nothing. It cannot be Said so of other things, as of the Corporeal World and Matter, that If once they had not been, they could never Possibly have been; because though there had been no World nor Matter, yet might there have been produced, from a Perfect Omnipotent Incorporeal Being, which in itself Eminently containeth all things. Dead and Sensless Matter could never have Created or Generated Mind and Understanding, but a Perfect Omnipotent Mind, could Create Matter. Wherefore because there is Mind, we are certain, that there was some Mind or other from Eternity without Beginning; though not because there is Body, that therefore there was Body or Matter from Eternity Unmade. Now these Imperfect Minds of ours, were by no means Themselves Eternal or without Beginning; but from an Antecedent Now-Existence brought forth into Being; but since no Mind could spring out of Dead and Sensless Matter, and all Minds could
Knowledge, no Phantastick
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could not possibly be made, nor one produced from another infinitely; there must of necessity be an Eternal Unmade Mind, from whence those Imperfect Minds of ours were derived. Which Perfect Omnipotent Mind, was as well the Cause of all other things, as of humane souls.

But before we proceed to any further Argumentation, we must needs take notice here, that the Atheists suppose no small part of their strength, to lie in this very thing, namely their disproving a God, from the Nature of Understanding and Knowledge; nor do they indeed swagger in any thing more than this. We have already set it for the Eleventh Atheistick Argument, That Knowledge being the Information of the Things themselves Known, and all Conception the Action of that which is Conceived, and the Passion of the Conceivers, the World and all Sensible things, must needs be before there could be any Knowledge or Conception of them, and no Knowledge or Conception before the World as its Cause. Or more briefly thus, The world could not be made by Knowledge and Understanding, because there could be no Knowledge or Understanding of the world, or of any thing in it, before it was made. For according to these Atheists, Things made Knowledge, and not Knowledge Things; they meaning by Things here, such only as are Sensible and Corporeal. So that Mind and Understanding, could not be the Creator of the world and these Sensible things, it self being the mere Creature of them; a Secondary, Derivative, Result from them, or a Phantastick Image of them: the Youngest and most Creaturely thing in the whole world. Whence it follows, that to Suppose Mind and Understanding, to be the Maker of all things, would be no better Sense, than if one should suppose, the Images in Ponds and Rivers, to be the Makers of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and other things represented in them. And upon such a Ground as this, does a Modern Writer presume to determine, that Knowledge and Understanding, are not to be attributed to God Almighty, because they Imply Imperfection, and Dependence upon Corporeal things without;

Quantam Scientia & Intellectus in nobis nihil aliud sunt, quam sustitutus a Rebus Externis Organis prementibus Animis Tumultus, non est quondam aliquod tale accidere Deo. Signum enim est Potentie ab ali dependentis. Which is again Englished thus; Knowledge and Understanding, being in us nothing else but a Tumult in the Mind, raised by External things, that press the Organical parts of mans Body; there is no such thing in God, nor can they be attributed to him, they being things which depend upon Natural Causes. Where this Writer thus denying Knowledge and Understanding to God, upon pretence that it speaks Imperfection and Dependence upon External Corporeal things, (it being nothing but a Tumult raised by the Motions and Pressures of them) he must needs Absolutely deny the First Principle of all things, to be any Knowing Understanding Nature; unless he had asserted some other kind of Knowledge, distinct from that of men, and clearly attributed the Same to God Almighty. Hitherto the Sense of Atheists.

Now we shall for the present, only so far forth concern ourselves in Confuting this Atheistick Doctrine, as to lay a Foundation thereby, for
for the Demonstration of the Contrary, Namely the Existence of a God, or a Mind before the World, from the Nature of Knowledge and Understanding. First, therefore it is a Sottish Conceit of these Atheists, proceeding from their not attending to their own Cogitations; that not only Sense but also Knowledge and Understanding in Men, is but a Tumult, raised from Corporeal things without, preluding upon the Organs of their Body; or else as they declare themselves more distinctly, nothing but the Affinity of Sensible Objects upon them, and their Passion from them. For if this were true, then would every thing that Suffered and Realized Motion, especially Polite Bodies, as Looking-Glasses, have something both of Sense and of Understanding in them. It is plain that there comes nothing to us, from Bodies without us, but only Local Motion and Pressure. Neither is Sense it self, the mere Passion of those Motions, but the Perception of their Passions, in a way of Phancy. But Sensible things themselves (as for example, Lights and Colours) are not Known or Understood either by the Passion, or the Phancy of Sense, not by any thing meekly Foreign and Adventitious, but by Intelligible Ideas Exerted from the Mind it self, that is, by something Native and Domestic to it: nothing being more true, than this of Boetius, that, Omne queo Scitur, non ex Sus, sed ex Comprehensionis Naturâ, Vi, & Facultate Cognoscitur, Whateuer is Known, is Known not by its own Force and Power, but by the Force and Power, the Vigour and Activity of that thing it self which Knows or Comprehends it. Wherefore besides the Phantasms of Singular Bodies, or of Sensible things Existing without us, (which are not mere Passions neither) it is plain that our Humane Mind hath other Cogitations or Conceptions in it, namely the Ideas of the Intelligible Natures and Essences of things, which are Universal, and by and under which it understandts Singulars. It is a Ridiculous Conceit of a Modern Atheistical Writer, that Universals are nothing else but Names, attributed to many Singular Bodies, because whatsoever Is is Singular. For though whatsoever Exist without the Mind, be Singular, yet is it plain, that there are Conceptions in our Minds, Objectively Universal. Which Universal Objects of our Mind, though they Exist not as such anywhere without us, yet are they not therefore Nothing, but have an Intelligible Entity for this very reason, because they are Conceivable, for since Non-Entity is not Conceivable, whatsoever is Conceivable, and an Object of the Mind is therefore Something. And as for Axiomatical Truths, in which something is affirmed or denied, as these are not all Passions from Bodies without us, (for what Local Motions could Impress this Common Notion, upon our Minds, That Things which agree in one Third, agree amongst themselves, or any other?) So neither are these things only gathered by Induction from repeated and reiterated Sensations, we clearly apprehending at once, that it is impossible they should be otherwise. Thus Arisotle Ingeniously; Sed Etaentidem ex ideis, ut eis in aliis, aliisque eis, uti in aliorum, in aliis. Et his quibusque non omnes sed unam idem habeant, ex eis quae, eisque aliis, aliisque eis quae, eisque aliis, et aliisque eis quae, eisque aliis. It is evident that there is no knowledge (of the Universal Theorems of Geometry) by Sense. For if we could perceive by Sense, that the Three Angles of a Triangle, were equal to Two Right; yet
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should we not rest satisfied in this, as having therefore a sufficient knowledge hereof, but would seek further after a demonstration of it: Sense reaching only to Singulars, but Knowledge to Universals. When from the Universal Idea of a Triangle, which is neither here, nor there, nor any where, without our Mind, but yet hath an Intelligible Entity; we see a plain necessity that its Three Angles must be Equal to two Right, then do we know the Truth of this Universal Theorem, and not before: as also we Understand, that every Singular Triangle, (sofar as it is true) hath this Property in it. Wherefore the Knowledge of this and the like Truths, is not derived from Singulars, nor do we arrive to them in way of Acquit, from Singulars to Universals, but on the contrary having first found them in the Universals, we afterwards descending apply them to Singulars: so that our Knowledge here is not After Singular Bodies, and Secundarily or Derivatively From them; but in order of Nature, Before them, and Proleptical to them.

Now these Universal Conceptions, some of which are also Abstract (as Life, Sense, Reason, Knowledge, and the like) many of them are of such things, whose Singulars do not at all fall under Sense, which therefore could never possibly be impressed upon us, from Singular Bodies by Local Motion: and again some such, as though they belong to Corporeal and Sensible things, yet, as their Accuracy cannot be reached to by Sense, so neither did they ever exist in that Matter of this lower world which here encompasseth us, and therefore could not be stamped upon us from without: as for example the Ideas of a Perfect Straight Line, and a Plain Superficies, or of an exact Triangle, Circle, Sphere, or Cube; no Material thing here amongst us being terminated in so straight Lines, but that even by Microscopes there may be discovered much Irregularity and Deformity in them; and very probable it is, that there are no perfectly straight Lines, no such Triangles, Circles, Spheres, or Cubes, as answer to the exactness of our Conceptions, in any part of the whole Material Universe, nor never will be. Notwithstanding which, they are not absolute non-entities, since we can demonstrate things concerning them, and though they never were nor will be, yet are they possible to exist, since nothing can be conceived, but it either is, or else is possible to be. The Humane Mind therefor hath a power of framing Ideas and Conceptions, not only of what actually is, but also of things which never were, nor perhaps will be, they being only possible to be. But when from our Conceptions, we conclude of some things, that though they are not, yet they are possible to be; since nothing that is not, can be possible to be, unless there be something actually in being, which hath sufficient power to produce it; we do implicitly suppose, the existence of a God or omnipotent being thereby, which can make whatsoever is conceivable, though it yet be not, to exist; and therefore Material Triangles, Circles, Spheres, Cubes, Mathematically exist.

The Result of what we have hitherto said is this, that since Singular Bodies, are not the only objects of our Mind and cogitation, it having also Universal and Abstract Ideas, of the Intelligible Natures or Essences of things; (some of which are such, whose Singulars do not
Suppose Infinite Power.

at all fall under Sense; others though they belong to Bodies, yet Sense can never reach to them, nor were they ever in Matter) moreover since our Mind can conceive, of things which nowhere Actually Exist, but are only Possible; and can have such a Demonstrative Science of Universal Truths, as Sense can never ascend to: That therefore Humane Knowledge and Understanding it self, is not the meer Image and Creature of Singular Bodies only; and so Derivative, or Eclipsal from them, and in order of Nature junior to them; but that as it were hovering aloft over all the Corporeal Universal, it is a thing Independent upon Singular Bodies, or Proleptical to them, and in Order of Nature, Before them.

But what Account can we then Possibly give, of Knowledge and Understanding, their Nature and Original? Since there must be Noway, That which is Intelligible, in order of Nature, before Nos; or Intelleetion? Certainy no other than this, that the First Original Knowledge, is that of a Perfect Being, Infinitely Good and Powerful, Comprehending it self; and the utmost Extent of its owne Fecundity and Power, that is, the Possibilities of all things; their Ideas, with their several Relations to one another; all Necessary and Immutable Truths. Here therefore is there a Knowledge before the world, and all Sensible things, that was Archetypal and Paradigmatical to the same.

Of which one Perfect Mind and Knowledge, all other Imperfect Minds (being Derived from it) have a certain Participation; whereby they are enabled to Frame Intelligible Ideas, not only of whatever doth actually Exist, but also of such things, as never Were, nor Will be, but are Only Possible; or Objects of Divine Power.

Wherefore since it is certain, that even Humane Knowledge and Understanding it self, is not a meer Passion from Sensible Things and Singular Bodies Existing without (which is the only Foundation of that before-mentioned Atheistick Argument, that Things Made Knowledge, and not Knowledge Things) and consequently it must needs have some other Original: moreover since Knowledge and Understanding, apprehend things Proleptically to their Existence, (Mind being able to frame Conceptions of all Possible Entities, and Modifications) and therefore in their Nature, do plainly Suppoze the Actual Existence of a Perfect Being, which is Infinitely Fecund and Powerful, and could produce all things Possible or Conceivable; the First Original Knowledge or Mind, from whence all other Knowledge and Minds are derived, being that of an Absolutely Perfect and Omnipotent Being, Comprehending It self, and the Extent of its owne Power, or of its Communicability, that is, the Ideas of all Possibilities of things, that may be Produced by it, together with their Relations to one another, and their Necessary Immutable Truths; accordingly as Wisdom and Understanding are described to be, &c. etc. etc. etc.

And the Breath (or Vapour) of the Power of God, and an Effux (or Emanation) from the Glory of the Almighty, a clear Mirror (or looking Glafs) of his Actual Energy or Virtue, and the Image of his Goodness: I say, the Result of all is this, that the Nature of Knowledge
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And this may be Further confirmed, from what is generally acknowledged, and indeed cannot reasonably be denied by any, viz: That there are Eternal Verities, such as were never Made, and had no Beginning, nor can ever be Destroyed or Ceaft to be: as for Example, such Common Notions as these, That Equals added to Equals, make Equal; That the Caeft is in order of Nature before the Effect. &c. together with all Geometrical Theorems; as Aristotle himself declareth, he writing in his Ethicks after this manner, [Greek text], Concerning Eternal (and Immutable) Things, no man does consult; as for Example, concerning the Diameter or Diagonal of a Square, whether it should be Incommensurable to the Sides or no. Where he plainly affirmeth, this Geometrical Theorems, that the Diameter or Diagonal of a Square, is Incommensurable to the Sides, to be an Eternal Truth. Neither are there such Eternal Truths as thefe only in Mathematicks, and concerning Quantity, but also in Ethicks concerning Morality; there being here αἰθαίρεια δίκαιον, as Justin Martyr calls them, Things Eternally just, which were not Made such at some certain times, by Law and Arbitrary Command, but being such in their own Nature Immutably, were from Everlafting to Everlafting, and (as it is said of that Eternal Word which comprehends all Truth) the Same Yesterday, to Day, and for ever. For of these is that famous Paffage of Sophocles in his Antigone,

ου γὰρ τι νῦν καὶ νῦν, ἀλλ’ ἀεὶ πάντα
ζη τάχως, καὶ οἷς οἴδεις ὡς ὁ τριάντα.

These are not things of to Day, or Yesterday, but they ever Live, and no man knows their Date, or from whence they came. No man can declare the time when all Common Notions, and Geometrical Truths were first Made and Generated out of Nothing, or brought out of antecedent Non-Exisience into Being. Certain it is, that such Truths as these, that the Diameter and Sides of a Square are Incommensurable, or that the Power of the Hypotenuse in a Rectangular Triangle is Equal to the Powers of both the Sides, were not made by any Man’s Thinking, or by those first Geometricians who Discovered or Demonstrated the same, they Discovering and Demonstrating only, that which was. Wherefore these Truths were before there was any man to Think of them, and they would continue still to be, though all the men in the World should be Annihilated: Nay, though there were no Material Squares and Triangles any where in the whole world neither, no not any Matter at all: for they were ever without beginning before the world, and would of necessity be ever after it, should it cease to be.
Now if there be Eternal Truths, which were never Made, and could not be, then must the Rationes Rerum, the Simple Reasons of things also, or their Intelligible Natures and Essences, out of which those Truths are compounded, be of Necessity Eternal likewise. For how can this be an Eternal Truth, that the Diameter of a Square is Incommensurable with the Sides, if the Rationes, the Reasons of a Square, Diameter, and Sides, or their Intelligible Essences, were not themselves Eternal? These are therefore called by Plato (a man of much Meditation, and no Contemptible Philosopher) not only, καὶ τῶν οὐκ ξύνατον, Things which are always the same, and Unchangeable, but also, τὰ μὴ γενέμεα, ἥν ἄρτι οὖνται, Things which were never Made, but always Are, and sometimes μὴ πάντα γενέμεα, μὴ πάντα αἰνολόγεμεν, Things that were neither Made nor can be Destroyed, sometimes τὰ ἀδύνατα καὶ ἀναλόγεα, Things Ingenerable and Incorruptible. Of which Cicero thus, Hæc Plato negat Gigni, sed Semper Effici, & Rationes & Intellectuales Continentes. These things Plato affirmed to have been never Made, but always to Be, and to be contained in Reason and Understanding. And though perhaps it may seem strange, even Aristotle himself also, notwithstanding his so often clashing with Plato's Ideas, here really agreeeth in the main, that the Forms and Species, or the Universal Intelligible Essences of Things, which are the proper and immediate Objects of Science, were Eternal and never Made. Thus in his Metaphysics, τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄλλου τοῦ δοξάτος, No man makes the Form, or Species of a thing, nor was it ever Generated; and again, τὸ ξύνατον ἐν τῷ δόξαν, There is no Generation of the Essence of a Sphere; and, ἐν τῶν ἀναλογομένων, φύσεως τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, The Forms or Species of things are without any Generation or Corruption. And he sometimes calleth these Objects of Science, ἀναλογομένων ἄλλως or φύσιν, An Immutable Essence or Nature. Lastly, where he writeth against the Heraclitians, and those other Sceptics, who denied all Certainty of Science; he first discovers the Ground of their Error herein to have been this, that they supposed Singular Bodies, or Sensibles existing Without, to be the Only Things or Objects of the Mind, or Knowledge, καὶ τῶν ἄνω ἄλλων τῶν ἁπάντων, ὅτι τὰ νόμισμα τῶν ἀναλογομένων (Cicero), τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἐν τῷ ἄνων ὑπάλληλον ὅτι τὰς ἀναλογομένας, καὶ γὰρ τὰ τὸ ἀναλογομένον τοῦ τοῦν καταλαμβάνει, καὶ τὸ ψυχεία τῷ μετακάλλοις ἐκ τῶν ἀναλογομένων, καὶ τῶν τὸ πλέον πάντων μετακάλλον, on which (according to Aristotle, The Original of these men mistake was this, because Truth is to be looked for in Things, and they conceived the only things to be Sensibles, in which it is certain there is much of the Indeterminate Nature. Wherefore they perceiving all the Nature of Sensibles, to be Moveable, or in perpetual Flux and Mutation, since nothing can possibly be verified or constantly affirmed concerning that which is not the same but Changeable, concluded that there could be no Truth at all nor Certainty of Science; those Things which are the only Objects of it, never continuing the same. And then the subjoyns in way of Opposition to this Sceptical Doctrine of theirs, and the aforementioned Ground thereof, ἀναλογομένων ἄλλως ὑπάλληλον ὅτι τὰ μετακάλλοις ἐκ τῶν ἀναλογομένων, καὶ τῶν τὸ πλέον πάντων μετακάλλον, &c. We would have these men therefore to know, that there is another kind of Essence of Things, besides that of Sensibles, to which belongeth neither
neither Motion, nor Corruption, nor any Generation at all. By which 
Essences of things, that have no Generation nor Corruption, he could 
understand nothing else, but those Intelligible Natures, Species, and 
Ideas which are the Standing and Immutable Objects of Science. And 
certain it is, that there could be no constant and Immutable Science 
at all, were there no other Objects of the Mind, but Singulars and 
Senibles, because these are all Mutable. Wherefore the Proper and 
Immediate Objects of the Geometrical Science, are no Singular 
and Material Triangles, Squares, Spheres and Cubes, &c. not only be- 
cause none of these are found Mathematically Exact, and because Ge- 
ometricals in all the Several distant ages and places of the world, 
could not have the same Singular Bodies before them, but also be- 
cause they do none of them continue Immutably the Same: all Cor- 
poral things, being more or less in perpetual Motion and Mutation. 
Whereas that of which any Geometrical Theorem is Verified and De- 
monstrated, must be Immutably and Unalterably the Same. The Tri- 
angles and Circles, spheres and Cubes of Euclid, Archimedes, Pappus, 
Appollonius, and all other Ancient and Modern Geometricals, in all 
the distant places and Times of the World, were both Indivisibly One 
and the Same, and also perfectly Immutable and Incorruptible, the 
Science of Geometry being such. From which Cause it is affirmed al- 
so, of these Mathematical Things, by the forementioned Aristotle, that 
they are No Where as in a Place; as all Singular Bodies are, άνώπό τα 
τώ αέριν τα ἄσωμα τῶν περίπτων τῶν μαθηματικῶν τινακά, δέ μὴ τῶν 
φυσικῶν· καθ' έκαστόν ἁπάντως· δίδ ταύτα τά θαματίκα, καθ' έκαστόν. It is 
abrupt to make Mathematical Things to be in a Place, as Solid Bodies 
are, for Place belongeth only to Singulars, which are therefore separable 
from one another by Place: but Mathematical things are not Anywhere. 
Because they being Universall and Abstrait, are only in Minds: ne- 
evertheless for the same Reason are they also Every Where, they being 
in every Mind that apprehends them. Lastly, these Intelligible Ess- 
ences and Ideas of Things, are called also by Philo, άνωπό τῶν μαθηματικῶν 
The Most Necessary Essences, as being not only Eternal, but having 
likewise Necessary Existence belonging to them: for though there be 
no Abolute Necessity that there should be Matter or Body, yet is 
there an Abolute Necessity that there should be Truth.

If therefore there be Eternal Intelligibles or Ideas, and Eternal 
Truths; and Necessary Existence do belong to them; then must there 
be an Eternal Mind Necessarily Existing, since these Truths and Intelli- 
gible Essences of Things cannot possibly be any where but in a Mind. 
For by the Essences of things, when they are said to be Eternal, must 
not be meant their very Substances, as if every thing were in itself E- 
ternal and Uncreated; or that God in Creation, did only as a Modern 
Writer abolishly Expresseth it, Sartor is insul, osfere Effentias rerum no- 
vali Existentiâ, Cloth the antecedent Essences of things, with a new Garment 
of Existence; but only their Esse Cognitionis, their Possible and Intelligible 
Natures, as they were Objects of Infinite Power, and Understanding, 
before they were Made. There must be a Mind Senior to the world, 
and all Sensible Things, and such as at once Comprehends in it, the I- 
dex of all Intelligibles: their Necessary Schoses and Relations to one ano-
there, and all their Immutable Truths: a Mind, which doth not so, but whilst it is open, and sometimes shut, as Aristotle writeth of it) sometimes understand and sometimes not understand, as if it were sometimes awake and sometimes asleep, or like an Eye sometimes open and sometimes shut, but where it is, such a Mind as is Essentially Act and Energy, and hath no Defect in it. And this as we have already declared, can be no other than the Mind of an Omnipotent, and Infinitely Pervious Being, comprehending itself and the Extent of its own Power, or how far it self is communicable, that is, all the Possibilities of things, that may be made by it, and its respective Truths, Mind and Knowledge, in the very Nature of it, supposing the Actual Existence of an Omnipotent or Infinitely Powerful Being, as its Nother or Intelligible; it being nothing but the Comprehension of the Extent of Infinite or Divine Power, and the Measure of the same.

And from hence it is Evident also, that there can be but one only Original Mind, or no more than one Understanding Being Self Existent; all other Minds whatsoever Partaking of one Original Mind; and being as it were Stamped with the Impression or Signature of one and the same Seal. From whence it cometh to pass, that all Minds in the several Places and Ages of the World, have Ideas or Notions of things Exactly Alike, and Truths Indivisibly the same. Truths are not multiplied, by the Diversity of Minds that apprehend them; eacae they are all but Ephemeral Participations of one and the same original or Archetypal Mind, and Truth. As the same Face may be reflected in several Glasses; and the Image of the same Sun may be seen in a thousand Eyes at once beholding it; and One and the same voice may be in a thousand Ears listening to it; so when Innumerable Created Minds, have the same Ideas of Things, and Understand the Same Truths; it is but one and the same Eternal Light, that is reflected in them all; (that Light which enlightenth every Man, that looketh into the World;) or the same Voice of that One Everlasting Word; that is never Silent, Reechoed by them. Thus was it conclud- ed by Thrasillus, that one man by Teaching, could not possibly beget in the Mind of another, the very same Notions, Conceptions and Knowledge, which himself had in his own Mind, ει μη πιστευη τω να ποιης: διε προφανος ἡ τοιοτη, We were not the Minds both of the Teacher and of the Learner as it were Printed and Stamped alike. As also men could not possibly so confer together as they do, presently apprehending one another's meaning, and raising up the very same Ideas in their Minds, and that meekly by Occasion of Words and sounds, ει πιστευη τοις εις νοσς πεπλετες ενωνωμεν, Were there not some Mind which all men did Partake of. As for that Anti-Monarchical opinion, of Many Understanding Beings, or Minds, Self Originated, independence; (none of which therefore could be Omnipotent) it is neither Conceivable, how such should all agree in the same Truths; there being no common Measure of Truth between them, no more than a Common Rule of their Wills; nor indeed how they should have any Knowledge or Understanding at all, properly so called; that being the Comprehension of the Possibilities of things, or of the Extent of Infinite Power, whereas according to this Hypothesis, there is no Infinite Power at all, the Power of each of those Many supposed Principles,
cases or Deities, being Limited and Finite, and therefore indeed not
Creative of any thing neither, since that which could Create one
ting, could Create all, and consequently would have all depending
upon it. We conclude therefore, That from the Nature of Mind and
Knowledge, it is Demonstrable, That there can be but One Original and
Self-Existent Mind, or Understanding Being, from which all other
Minds were derived. And now have we, more Copiously than we
designed, Confuted the First Atheiftick Argument, we having not only
aflerted the Idea of God, and fully Anfwered and refelled all the
Atheiftick Pretences against the same; but also from this very Idea of
God, or a Perfeft Being, Demonstrated his Existence. We shall dis-
patch the following Atheiftick Obje&ions with more brevity.

We come in the next place, to the Achilles of the Atheifts; their
Invincible Argument, against a Divine Creation and Omnipotence;
because Nothing could come from Nothing. It being concluded from
hence, that whatsoever Subfiiftentially or Really Is, was from All Eter-
inity Of It Self, Unmade or Uncreated by any Deity. Or else thus:
By God is always Underftood, a Creator of some Real Entity or oth-
er out of Nothing; but it is an Undoubtedly Principle of Reafon and
Philofophy, an Undeniable Common Notion, That Nothing can be made
out of Nothing, and therefore there can be no fuch Creative Power as
this. And here we hall perform thefe Three Things; Firft, we hall
sho That in some Senfes, this is indeed an Undenéeble Truth, and
Common Notion, That Nothing can come from Nothing, and what those
Senfes are. Secondly, We shall make it evident, that in the Senfe of
this Atheiftick Obje&ion, it is Absolutely False, That Nothing can come
from Nothing, or be made out of Nothing; and that a Divine Creation
and Omnipotence, can be no way Impugned from the forementioned
Principle rightly Underftood. Thirdly and Laftly, We shall prove,
That as from this Principle or Common Notion, Nothing out of Nothing,
there can be no Execution at all done againft Thefe, or a Divine Cre-
aton; fo from the very Samé rightly Underftood, the Impossibility of
all Atheift may be Demonstratively Proved, it bringingSomething
out of Nothing in an Impossible Senfe; as also the Existence of a God
Evinced.

We grant therefore in the Firft place, that this is in some Senfe an
Undoubtedly Principle of Reafon, or an Undeniable Common Notion, that
Nothing can come from Nothing. For Firft, it is Undenéeble True, THAT
Nothing which once was not, could ever of It Self come into Being; or THAT
Nothing could bring it Self out of Non-Existence into Being; THAT
Nothing can take Beginning of Exiflence from it Self; or THAT
Nothing can be Made or Produced without an Efficient Cause. And from
hence, as hath been already Intimated, is it Demonstratively Certain,
that every thing was not Made, but that there is something Necefsa-
ily Self Existent, and which could not But Be. For had every thing
Again, As Nothing which was Not, could ever Of It Self come into Being, or be Made, without an Efficient Cause, so is it certain likewise, that Nothing can be Efficiently Caused or Produced, by that which hath not in it at least Equal, (if not Greater) Perfection, as also Sufficient Power to Produce the same. We say Nothing which was not, could ever be brought into Being, by that which hath not Formally, Equal Perfection in it; because Nothing can Give what it hath not, and therefore so much of the Perfection or Entity of the Effect, as is greater than that of the supposed Cause; so much thereof of must needs come from Nothing, or be made without a Cause. Moreover whatsoever hath Equal Perfection to another thing, could not therefore Cause or Produce that other thing, because it might either have no Active Power at all, as Matter hath not, it being meerly Passive, or else no Sufficient Active and Productive Power. As for example, though it be not Impossible, That Motion which once was not, should be Produced; yet it is Impossible, that it should be ever Produced, without a Sufficient Cause. Wherefore if there were once no Motion at all in the whole world, nor no Life or Self Active Power in any thing, but all were Dead; then is it certain, that there could never possibly arise, any Motion or Mutation in it to all Eternity. There being no Sufficient Cause, to Produce the Same; since nothing can produce Motion, but that which hath Life or Self Activity in it; and if Motion or any thing else should begin to be, without a Sufficient Cause, then must it needs be Caused by It Self, or of It Self come into Being; which is a thing Impossible. Now no Imperfect Being whatsoever, hath a Sufficient Emanative Power to Create any other Substance, or Produce it out of Nothing; the utmost that can be done by Imperfect Beings, is only to Produce new Accidents and Modifications: as Humane Souls can Produce new Cogitations in themselves, and new Local Motion in Bodies. No Imperfect Being is Substantially Emanative, or can Produce another Sub stance out of Non-Existence. Therefore for any Substance, to be brought into Being, by an Imperfect Substance, which hath not Sufficient Emanative or Creative Power, is a thing plainly Impossible; it being all one as to say, That a Substance might Of It Self, come out of Nothing into Being. And thus is it granted, that no Substance could be Created, or brought out of Non Existance, into Being, but by the sole Efficiency of an Absolutely Perfect Being, which hath both Greater Perfection (it Eminently Containing all things in it) and also a Sufficient Emanative or Creative Power.

And now have we given an Account, of Two Senses, where by it is Impossible, For Any thing to come from Nothing; One, for a thing which was not, to bring it Self into Being, or to be Made without an Efficient Cause. Another, For a thing to be efficiently Caused, by that which hath not at least Equal Perfection in it, or a Sufficient Emanative or Productive Power. Both which Sens of this Axiom respect the Efficient Cause, and thus was it frequent-
ly understood by divers of the Ancients, and particularly by Cicero. We shall now propound a Third Sense, wherein this Axiom is also verified, That Nothing can be Made out of Nothing, respecting chiefly the Material Cause. For since no Imperfect, Natural Being, hath any Creative Power, or can efficiently produce any New Substance or Real Entity, which was not before, into Being, but only act upon Pre-existing Matter, by Motion, and Modify the same; and since Matter, as such, being merely Passive, cannot Cause any thing, that was not before, or will not result from the Composition or Modification of it; it follows undeniably, that in all Natural Generations and Productions out of Preexisting Matter, (without a Divine Creation) there can never be any New Substance or Real Entity brought out of Non-Existance into Being. And this was that very thing, and no other, which the Ancient Physiologists meant, when (as Aristotle tells us) they so much inlinit upon this Principle, Τὸ γὰρ ἀκατάστατον ὑπὸ μὴ ἔτοιμον ἂν ἐστιν, o. That it was Impossible that any Real Entity, should be (Naturally) Made or Generated out of Nothing; Or, as it is also otherwise expressed, ὁσδ' ὦν γὰρ ἁλονδία ὑπὸ οἴσιά ἀπελθειν ἐκ τούτου, That no Real Entity was either Generated or Corrupted. That is, That in Natural Generations, Corruptions, and Alterations, (where God is supposed not Miraculously to interpose) there is no Creation of any New Substance or Real Entity out of Nothing, nor Annihilation, or Destruction of any into Nothing.

We are not ignorant, that the Generality of Modern Writers, have interpreted this Doctrine, of the Old Physiologists in Aristotle, into quite different Senses; as designing therein to take away all Divine Creation out of Nothing (or Non-Existance:) they making all things to have sprung out of Matter (existing Of it itself from Eternity) either Without a God; or else rather (because Parmenides and Empedocles, and other Asserters of this Doctrine, were undoubted Theists) With Him. So that God could not Create any New Entity out of Nothing, but only make things out of Preexisting Unmade Matter, as a Carpenter doth a House, or a Weaver a Piece of Cloth. And thus is it Commonly taken for granted, that no Pagan Philosopher ever went so far, as to acknowledge a Divine Creation of any thing out of Nothing, in the Sense of Christian Theologers. And here we grant indeed that besides the Stoicks, there have been some other Philosophick Theists amongst the Pagans, of this Persuasion; That Nothing was not could be made by God, otherwise than out of Something Pre-existing: as Plutarchus Chersonensis for one, who in a place already Cited positively affirmeth, ἢ μὲν ὡς Κενὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ γὰρ θανάτου, τὸ μὲν δὲ ἅπαν, ἥν ἡ τύλιον, ὡς γασμεῖν, ἀλλὰ υποτεθήκει τοῦ τῆς Δημιουργίας. That though the world were indeed made by God, yet the Substance or Matter, out of which it was Made, was not Made. And then he subjoiins this very Reason for it, ὡς τὸ γὰρ ὑπὸ μὴ ἔτοιμον γένεσα, ἡ ἡ ἕκαστος, μετὰ ἰδιότητος ἐκδοθῆ, ὡς οἰκίας ἡ ἰμαντὸς καὶ ἀναγέννησα. Because there can be no Making of any thing out of Nothing, but only out of Something Pre-existing, nor rightly Ordered or Sufficiently disposed; as in a House, Garment, or Statue. From which conceit of Plutarch's, though he were otherwise Ingenious, it may well be supposed, that the
the Dull Stoicke Air had too much Effect upon him. However neither Plutarch nor the Stoicks, as we conceive, are for this to be accounted Absolute and Downright Atheists, but only Imperfect, Mungrel, and Spurious Theists. And therefore were Atheists never so much able to prove, that there could be no Creation out of Nothing Pre-Existing, which they cannot at all do, yet would not this overthrow Theism in general, there being a Latitude therein. Nevertheless it will undeniably appear, from what shall follow, that those Ancient Italicke and Pythagoricke, were so far from intending here any such thing, to deduce all things out of Matter, either Without, or With a God; as that they plainly designed the very Contrary; namely to prove that no New Real Entity could be Made out of Matter, and particularly that Souls could not be Generated out of the same, which therefore of necessity, must, according to them, have another Divine Original, and be Made by God, not out of Matter, but out of Nothing Pre-Existing; since it could not be supposed by any, that all Souls Existed Of Themselves from Eternity Unmade. And indeed those Pagan Philosophers who affected the Incorpority of Souls, must of necessity in like manner, suppose them not to have been Made, out of Pre-Existing Matter, but by God out of Nothing. Plutarch being only here to be excepted, by reason of a certain odd Hypothesis which he had, that was peculiarly his own; of a Third Principle, besides God and Matter, a Disorderly Soul, or Evil Demon Self Existent, who therefore seems to have supposed all Particular Humane Souls, to have been made, neither out of Nothing, nor yet out of Matter or Body Pre-Existing, but out of a certain Strange Commixture, of the Substance of that Evil Soul, and God, blended together: upon which account, doth he affirm Souls to be, not so much ἐπθασμένας μετ' ἃς, not so much, the work of God, as a Part of him. And now let any one judge, whether upon Plutarch's account, there be not yet further reason, to complain of this Exoticke Air. Wherefore we conclude, that those old Physiologers in Aristotle, who insisted so much upon that Principle, That no Real Entity could be Made or Generated out of Nothing, acted only as Physiologers therein, and not as Theologers or Metaphysicians, they not opposing a Divine Creation out of Nothing Pre-Existing, but only contending that no New Entity could be made out of Matter, and that in Natural Generations, and Corruptions there was no Creation or Annihilation of any thing.

But what the true Scope and meaning of these Physiologers indeed was, will more plainly appear, from that Use or Improvement, which themselves made of this Philosphick Principle, and this was Twinfold. For first, It is certain that upon this Foundation, they all of them endeavoured to Establish, a Peculiar kind of Physiology, and some Anatomology or other, either an Homowenery, or an Anomowenery, a Similar or Dissimilar Anatomy. For Anaxagoras looking upon this Maxim of the Italicke Philosophers, That Nothing could be Physically made out of Nothing, or no Real Entity Generated or Corrupted, as an Unshaken Principle of Reason, and being also not able to Conceive otherwise, of the Forms and Qualities of Bodies than that they were Real Entities, distinct from the Substance of Matter, or its Modifications.
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Tions; concluded that therefore in Generations, Corruptions and Alterations, these were not created out of Nothing, and Annihilated into Nothing, but that every thing was Naturally made, out of Powers, or Causes, out of Pre-Existant and In Existent Things, and consequently that there were in all things, Difsimilar Atoms and Particles of every Kind, though by reason of their Parvitude Insensible to us, and every thing seemed to be, only that, which was most Predominant and Conspicuous in it. To wit, That Bone was made out of Bony Atoms, and Flesh out of Flethy, Hot things out of Hot Atoms, and Cold things out of Cold, Black out of Black, and White out of White, &c. and Nothing out of Nothing, but every thing out of Pre-Existant Similar Atoms. Thus was the fene of Anaxagoras plainly declared by Aristotle, That because Contraries were made out of one another, they were therefore before In-Existant. For since every thing must of necessity be made, either out of Something, or out of Nothing, and all Physiologers agree, That it is Impossible, for any thing to be made out of Nothing; it follows unavoidably, that whatsoever is Generated must be Generated out of things Pre-Existant and In-Existant, though by reason of their Parvitude Insensible to us; That is, out of Similar or Homogenial Atoms, of which there are some of all kinds in every thing, and every thing being mingled in every thing. Here therefore have we, the Anaxagorean Homomewry, or Similar Atomology, built upon this Principle of Reason, as its Foundation, That Nothing can Naturally be Made or Generated out of Nothing.

But the Italicks or Pythagoricks, as well before Anaxagoras as after him, (with whom also hitherto concurred, Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus, those Atheizers of the Italick Physiology) did with much better Reason, from the same Fundamental Principle conclude, that since these Forms and Qualities of Bodies, were unquestionably Generated and Corrupted, they were therefore no Entities Really Distinct from the Substance of Matter, or its Modifications, but only different Dispositions or Modifications of the Insensible Parts thereof, Causing in us Different Phantasm; and this was the First Original of the Difsimilar Atomology. In Matter or Body, therefore as much, there was nothing else to these Philosophers conceivable, but only Magnitude of Parts, Figure, Site, and Motion, or Rest; and these were those few Elements, out of which In-Existant, and variously Combined together, they supposed all those Forms and Qualities of Bodies, (commonly so called) in Generations to result, without the Production of any New Real Entity out of Nothing. For as out of a few Letters in the Alphabet of every Language, Differently placed and Combined, do Result innumerable Syllables, Words, and Sounds, signifying all the several things in Heaven and Earth; and sometimes from all the very same Letters, neither more nor fewer, but only Transposed, are begoten very Different Phantasm of Sounds in us; but without the Production of any New Real Entity out of Nothing: in the very same manner, from those Fewer Letters in the Alphabet of the Corporal Nature, Variously combined, or from the different Modifications of Matter, in respect of Magnitude of Parts, Figure, Site, &c. Motion, are Made up and Spelled out, all those Syllables of Things that are in the whole World,
World, without the Production of any New Real Entity. Many times the very same Numerical Matter, neither more nor less, only differently Modified, Causing very different Phantasm in us, which are therefore vulgarly supposed to be Forms and Qualities in the Things; as when the same water, is successively changed and transformed into Vapour, Snow, Hail, and Ice. And to this very purpose is the forementioned Similitude elegantly pursed by the Epicurean Poet, in these following Verses,

Quin etiam refer nosiris in Versibus ipsis,
Cum quibus & qualis sum Ordine queaque locata.
Namque cadem Celum, Mare, Terras, Fluores, Solem,
Significant, cadem Fruges, Arbusa, Animantes.
Sic ipsis in rebus item jam Materiali
Concursus, Motus, Ordo, Positura, Figura,
Cum permutatur, mutari Res quoque debent.

For were those supposed Forms and Qualities, produced in Generations and Alterations, Entities Really distinct from the Substance of Matter, or its different Modifications, in respect of the Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion of Parts; (there being no such things before In-Exifling as Anaxagoras supposed,) then would they materially proceed from Nothing, which is a thing Impossible. And this Different. Atomology of the ancient Italicks, so far as to these Material Forms and Qualities, Seems to be Undoubtedly the only true Philosophy, it being built upon this sure Principle of Reason, That because Nothing can give what it hath not, therefore no New Substance or Real Entity, can be Materially produced, in the Generations and Alterations of Nature, as such; but only Modifications. As when an Architect builds a House, or a Weaver makes a piece of Cloth, there is only a different Modification of the Pre-Existent Matter.

This is the First Improvement, which the Ancient Italick Philosophers made, of this Principle, That Nothing can be (Physically and Materially) Generated out of Nothing; or that no Real Entity is Naturally Generated or Corrupted; That therefore the Forms and Qualities of Bodies, were no Real Entities, but only Different Modifications. But besides this, there was also another thing, which these Philosophers principally Aimed at herein, as a Corollarly deducible from the same Principle, concerning Souls; that since the Souls of Animals, Especially Humane, are unquestionably Entities Really distinct from Matter, and all its Modifications; (no Magnitudes, Figures, Sites and Motions, being ever able to beget Cognition or Consciousness, much less a Power of Understanding Eternal Verities) that therefore these could not be Generated out of Matter, nor Corrupted into the same. Because Forms and Qualities are Continually Generated and Corrupted, made out of Nothing, and Reduced to Nothing again; therefore are they no Entities Really distinct from Matter, and its different Modifications: but because Souls, at least Humane, are unquestionably Entities Really distinct from Matter, and all its Modifications; therefore can they not possibly be Generated out of Matter.
ter, nor Corrupted into the same. For if Humane Souls were Generated out of Matter, then must some Real Entity be Materially produced out of Nothing, there being Nothing of Life and Cognition in Matter; which is a Thing Absolutely Impossible. Wherefore these Philosophers concluded concerning Souls, that being not Generated out of Matter, they were Insninated or Introduced into Bodies, in Generations. And this was always a Great Controversie, betwixt Theists and Atheists, concerning the Humane Soul, as Lucretius expressed it:

\[ \text{Nata sit, an contra Nascentibus Insinuetur,} \]

Whether it were Made or Generated out of Matter, (that is indeed out of Nothing) or else were ἄφωστοι, From Without, Insinuated into Bodies in Generations? Which latter Opinion of theirs, supposed Souls as well to have Existed Before the Generations of all Animals, as to Exist After their Deaths and Corruptions; there being properly Nothing of them Generated but only their Union with those particular Bodies. So that the Generations, and Corruptions or Deaths of Animals, according to this Hypothesis, are nothing but an Anagrammatical Transposition of Things in the Universe, Pre- and Post-Existent Souls, being sometimes united to one Body, and sometimes to another. But it doth not therefore follow, because these Ancient Philosophers held Souls to be thus Ingenerable, and to have Pre-Existed before the Generation of Animals; that therefore they supposed all Souls to have Existed of Themselves from Eternity Unmade: this being a Thing which was never affected, any more by Theist than Atheist; since even those Philosopherick Theists, who maintained Ἔτερνητατον Ανιμορυμ, The Eternity of Humane Minds and Souls, together with the Worlds, did notwithstanding, assert their Essential Dependence upon the Deity, like that of the Lights upon the Sun; as if they were a kind of Eternal Efficacy, Emanation or Eradiation from an Eternal Sun. Even Plutarch himself, that Great Champion for the Eternity of the World and Souls, in this very Case, when he writes against Plutarch's Self-Existent Evil Soul, expressly declaring, that πάντα ὕλα γνώμη ἐς τὸ ἅλιον, There is no Self Existent Soul; but every Soul whatsoever is the Work Effect and Production of God. Wherefore when they affirmed Souls to be Ingenerable, their meaning was no more than this, that they were not meer Accidental Things as Forms and Qualities are, nor any more Generated out of Matter, than Matter it itself is Generated out of Something else; upon which account, as Aristotle informs us, Souls were called also by them, ἀκεχώροντα, Principles, as well as Matter, they being both of them Substances in the Universe alike original; that is neither of them Made out of the other. But they did not suppose them to be ἄφωστοι, Ingenerate or Unmade in the other Sense, as if they had been Self-Originated, and Independent, as Plutarch's Second and Third Principles; his Evil Soul, and Matter were by him Imagined to be; but so doublets as that if the World had had any beginning, they should then have been all Created together with it, out of Nothing Pre-Exisling. But as for the perpetual Creation of new Souls, in the Successive Generations of Animals, this indeed is a thing
thing which those Philosophers were extremely abhorrent from, as thinking it incongruous, that Souls which are in Order of Nature, Senior to Bodies, should be in Order of Time, Juniors to them; as also not Reasonable, that Divine Creation, (as it were prostituted) should without end, perpetually attend and wait upon Natural Generations, and be intermingled with them.

But as for this pro-existence of Souls, we have already declared our own sense concerning it, in the first Chapter. Though we cannot deny, but that besides Origin, several others of the Ancient Fathers, before the Fifth Council, seem either to have espoused it, or at least to have had a favour and kindness for it; insomuch that St. Augustine himself, is sometimes staggering in this point, and thinks it to be a great secret, whether merch Souls existed before their generations or no; and some where concludes it to be a matter of indifference, wherein every one may have, his liberty of opinion, either way, without offence. Wherefore all that can be certainly affirmed in this cause, is, that humane souls could not possibly be generated out of matter, but were some time or other created by God Almighty, out of nothing pro-existing, either in generations or before them. Lastly, as for brute animals, we must confess, that if they be not mere machines or automata, as some seem inclinable to believe, but conscious and thinking beings, then from the same principle of reason, it will likewise follow, that they cannot be generated out of matter neither, and therefore must be derived from the fountain of all life, and created out of nothing by him: who since he can, as easily annihilate, as create; and does all for the best; no man need all at to trouble himself about their permanency, or immortality.

And now have we given, a full and particular account, of all the several senses, wherein this axiom must be acknowledged to be undeniably true, that nothing can possibly be made out of nothing, or come from nothing; namely these three. First, that nothing which was not, could ever bring it self into being, or efficiently produce it self. Or, that nothing can possibly be made, without an efficient cause. Secondly, that nothing which was not, could be produced or brought into being, by any other efficient cause, then such, as hath at least, equal perfection in it, and a sufficient active or productive power. For if any thing were made by that, which hath not equal perfection, then must so much of the effect as transcended the cause, be indeed made without a cause, (since, nothing can give what it hath not) or be confed by it self, or by nothing. Again, to suppose a thing to be produced by that which hath no sufficient productive power, is really to suppose it also, to be produced from it self without a cause, or from nothing. Where it is acknowledged by us, that no natural, imperfect, created being, can create, or emanatively produce, a new substance, which was not before, and give it, its whole being. Hitherto, is the axiom verified in respect of the efficient cause. But in the third place, it is also true, in respect of the material likewise. Not, that nothing could possibly be ever made, by any power whatsoever, but only out of pre-existent matter; and consequently, that matter...
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After itself could be never Made, but was Self-Existent. For the falsity of this, is sufficiently evident, from what hath been already declared, concerning Humane Souls, their being undoubtedly Substances Incorporated, which therefore could never be Generated out of Matter, and it will be further manifested afterwards. But the Third and Last Sense is this; That Nothing which is Materially Made out of things Pre-Existing, (as some are) can have any other Real Entity, than what was either before contained in, or resulteth from the Things themselves Modified. Or, That there can be no New Entities or Substances, Naturally Generated out of Matter; and therefore that all Natural Generations, are really Nothing else, but Mixtures or New Modifications of Things Pre-Existing.

These, I say, are all the Senses, wherein it is Impossible, That any thing should be Made out of Nothing, or Come from Nothing; and they may be all reduced to this One General Sense, That Nothing can be Made out of Nothing, Causally; Or, That, Nothing cannot Cause Any thing, either Efficiently or Materially. Which as it is undeniable True; So is it so far from making any thing, against a Divine Creation, or the Existence of a God, that the same may be Demonstratively Proved, and Evinced from it, as shall be shewed afterward.

But there is another Sense, wherein things may be said to be Made $\forall$ the \textit{design}, Or, Out of Nothing, when those words are not taken Causally, but only so as to signify the Terminus \textit{a quo}, or Term from which, they are Made, to wit, an Antecedent Non-Existence. And then the Meaning of this Proposition, That Nothing can possibly be Made out of Nothing, will be this, That Nothing which once was Not, could by any Power whatsoever, be afterwards brought into Being. And this is the Sense intimated on, in this Second Atheistical Argumentation, framed according to the Principles, of the Democritic or Epicurean Atheism. That no Real Entity which once was not, could by any Power whatsoever, be Made, or brought out of Non-Existence into Being; and consequently, that no Creative Power out of Nothing, can possibly belong to any thing, though supposed never so Perfect.

In Answer whereunto; we shall perform these Two Things. First, we shall make it appear, that Nothing out of Nothing, taken in this Sense declared, is so far from being a Common Notion, that it is not at all True. And Secondly, we shall prove, that if it were True, yet would it of the Two, make more against Atheism, than it doth against Theism, and therefore ought by no means to be used by Atheists, as an Argument against a Deity. First therefore, it is unquestionably certain, That this cannot be Univerally True; That Nothing which once was not, could possibly be Made, or brought out of Non-Existence into Being, because if it were, then could there be no such thing as Making or Causing at all; no Action nor Motion, and consequently no Generation nor Mutation in the Corporeal Universal; but the whole world would be like a Stiff Immoveable Adamantine Rock; and this would doubtless be a better Argument against Motion, then any of Zeno’s was. But we have all experience within our selves of a Power of Producing New Cogitations,
Chapter IV. How Nothing out of Nothing False.

Cogitations, in our own Minds, new Intellectual and Moral Habits, as also New Local Motion in our Bodies, or at least New Determinations thereof, and of Changing thereby New Modifications in Bodies without us. And therefore are the Atheists forced to restrain the Sense of this Proposition to Substantial Things only, that though there may be New Accidents, and Modifications, Produced out of Nothing, yet there can be no New Substances Made; however they be not able in the mean time to give any Reason why One of those should be in it self more Impossible than the other, or why no Substance should be Makeable. But that some are too stagger'd with the Seeming Plausibility of this Argument, is chiefly upon these following Accounts. First, by reason of the Confusion of their own Conceptions; for because it is certain, That Nothing can possibly be made out of Nothing, in one Sense, to wit Caufally; they not distinguishing Senses, nor being aware of the Equivocation that is in this 't & o' below, Out of Nothing, inadvertently give their Affent, to those Words in a Wrong Sense; that no Substance (as Matter) could possibly be brought out of Non-Existence into Being. Secondly, by reason of their Unskilful Arguing from Artificial Things; When because Nothing can be Artificially Made but out of Pre-Exisitng Matter, as a House or Garment, and the like, (there being nothing done in the Production of these Things, but only a New Modification, of what before Substantially was) they over hastily conclude, that no Power whatsoever could produce any thing otherwise, then out of Pre-Exisitng Matter, and that Matter it self therefore could not possibly be Made. In which Conceit they are again further confirmed from hence, because the Old Physiologers maintained the same thing concerning Natural Generations likewise, That nothing was in them produced 't & o' below, Out of Nothing, neither; or that there was no New Substance or Entity Made in them, really distinct from the Pre-Exisitng Matter and its Modifications; they Unwarily Extending this, beyond the Bounds of Physicks into Metaphysicks; and unduly measuring or limiting Infinite Power accordingly. Lastly, because it is undeniably certain, concerning Our Selves and all Imperfect Created Beings, that none of these can Create any New Substance, which was not before; men are therefore apt to measure all things by their own scantling, and to suppose it Universally impossible, according to Humane Reason, for any Power whatsoever, thus to Create; whence it follows that Theology must in this be acknowledged to be Contradictious to the Principles of Natural Light and Understanding. But since it is certain, that Imperfect Created Beings can themselves Produce Some Things out of Nothing Pre-Exisitng, as New Cogitations, and New Local Motion, New Modifications and Transformations of things Corporeal, it is very reasonable to think, that an Absolutely Perfect Being could do something more; that is, Create New Substances out of Nothing, or give them their Whole Being. And it may well be thought to be as Easy, for God, or an Omnipotent Being, to Make a Whole World, Matter and all, 't & o' below, Out of Nothing, as it is for us to Create a Thought, or to Move a Finger, or for the Sun to send out Rays, or a Candle Light, or lastly, for any Opake Body, to produce the Image of it self in Glassies or Water, or to project a Shadow; all these Imperfect Things being but the
Energies, Rays, Images, or Shadows, of the Deity. For a Substance which once was not, to be Made by God, or a Being Infinitely Perfect; this is not for it to be Made Out of Nothing, in the Impossible Sense, it coming from him who is All. Nor can it be said to be Impossible, for any thing whatsoever, to be Made by that, which hath not only Infinitely Greater Perfection, but also a sufficient Active Power to produce the fame, it being Substantially Emanative. It is true indeed, that Infinite Power in itself, cannot do things in their own Nature Impossible; and this is therefore the only thing, which the Atheists have to prove, That it is in itself Absolutely Impossible, for a Substance, (though not for an Accident or Modification) to be produced out of Non-Existence into Being. Whereas nothing is in itself Absolutely Impossible, but what implies a Contradiction: and though it be Contradictions, for a Thing to Be and Not Be, at the same time; yet is there no manner of Contradiction at all in this, for any Imperfect Contingent Being which before was not, afterwards to be. Wherefore this being in itself no way Impossible, it must be acknowledged to be a Due Object of Infinite Power, or that which may be done by a Perfect Omnipotent Being existing.

If Nothing could be Made &c. &c., Out of Nothing, in this Latter Sense, that is, Nothing which Before was Not, Afterwards brought into Being; then must the Reason hereof be, because no Substance or Real Entity, can be Caused by any other Substance, so as to Receive and Derive its Whole Being from it; and Consequently whatsoever Substance or Real Entity, is in the Whole World, was not only from Eternity without Beginning, but also Existed of Itself Necessarily, and Independently upon any thing else. But First, it hath been already declared, that it is repugnant to the Humane Faculties, that any Temporary Successive Being whatsoever, or that Time it itself should be Eternal without beginning, because upon that Hypothesis, there would always have been an Infinity of Time Past; and if so, then would there of necessity have been, Time Past, which was never present. But to make every Substantial Thing, not only to have Existed from Eternity without Beginning (which yet hath been done by some Mistaken Theists) but also to have Existed Independently upon any thing else, as its Cause, or Original, and therefore of it self Necessarily, this, I say, is it self, to Make Something to come from Nothing in the Impossible Sense, to wit, Causally. For as when some Atheists affirm, That Nothing could Ever Move It self, and yet suppose notwithstanding, that there hath been Motion from all Eternity, they plainly make this Motion, (however supposed to be Eternal) to Come from Nothing in the Impossible Sense: so in like manner, they who suppose Things to have Existed Of themselves Necessarily, which have no Self-Existence, and Necessary Existence contained in their Nature, (as Nothing but a Perfect Being hath) do make this Necessary Existence of such things, to have Come from Nothing. Wherefore though it be certain, that something did Exist Of It self Necessarily from all Eternity, namely a Perfect Being (whose Necessary Existence is therefore not from Nothing, because Essentially included in its own Nature) yet is it certain likewise, that there can be but One Such Thing; Necessity of Existence being Natural and
and Essential to no more. But as for all other things, which are in their own Nature, Contingently Possible to Be or Not to be, Reason pronounces of them, that they could not Exist of themselves Necessarily, but were Caused by Something else; and derived their Original, from that One Absolutely Perfect, and Necessarily Existent Being. So that Plato's Distinction must needs be here allowed of, betwixt Two Kinds of Beings, τὸ μὴ ἀεὶ ὑπ' ὑμῖν, καὶ τὸ ἀεὶ ὑπ' ὑμῖν, That which always Is, and was never Made, nor had Beginning; and τὸ γενόμενον μὴ ἀεὶ ὑπ' ὑμῖν, That which was Made, or had Beginning, but never Truly Is. It having not a Permanent but Successive or Flowing Duration. Accordingly whereunto, Aristotle also affirmeth; That there is no necessity, all things should be Unmade or Self-Originated; but Sometimes might be Made from others Unmade.

Lastly, we shall disprove the Truth of this Assertion, That whatsoever Substantially and Really is, did Exist of itself from all Eternity Unmade, after this manner. Because it would follow from thence that not only Matter, and Unqualified Atoms, (as the Democritic Atheists suppose) but also Souls, especially Humane, must needs have Existed of themselves too, from Eternity Unmade. For as no man can be so Fortified as to conceive Himself, or That which Thinketh in him, his Own Soul or Mind, and Personality, to be no Real Entity; Whilst every Clod of Earth is such; so is it certain that Mind can never be Generated out of Dead and Sensible Matter or Body, nor Refult as a Modification thereof, out of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions, and therefore must needs be a Thing Really Distinct from it, or Substance Incorporeal: the Democritic Atheists being here grossly deceived, in thinking, that because Forms and Qualities of Bodies, may be resolved into those aforementioned Elements of Matter, and consequently concluded to be no Entities Really Distinct from the Substance thereof, but only different Modifications of the same, that therefore the like may be said of Souls too, the Rational not excepted. Wherefore if no Substance or Real Entity could ever be brought out of Non-existence into Being, or be Caused by any thing else, then must all Humane Souls and Personalities, as well as Matter and Atoms, have existed not only from Eternity, without beginning, but also Of themselves Independently upon any other thing. But the Atheists are so abhorrent from this Eternity of Humane Souls, that they will by no means admit of their Post-existence or Immortality; they apprehending, that if any Living Understanding Being, should prove Immortal, they could not sufficiently secure themselves against the Possibility and Danger of a God. Some Theists indeed have afferted Αἰερνητικὰν Άνιμωρούμ, not only the Pre-existence, but also the Eternity of all Humane Minds, together with the World, as Cicero more than once doth; who also in his Book of Divination thus further declares himself concerning it; Άνιμος ὅποια ἐν αὐτίκα Αἰερνητικά, εὐσφατός ἐστιν ἄνεμος Άνιμωρόν, omnia quae in natura rerum sunt vivae; Our Mind, because it hath existed from all Eternity, and conversed with innumerable Minds, see all things that are in Nature: and again, Τω ἁλατείας, χάρις οὐκ εἰσίν, χάρις πᾶσιν. Since the Minds of Men ever were, and ever will be. Nevertheless none of 
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these ever maintained, that Humane Minds and their distinct Personali-
ties, were thus all, Of Themselves, Independently upon any thing as their Cause or Original. And, as it was before Demonstrated, from the Nature of Knowledge and Understanding (it comprehend-
ing the Possibilities of all Things, and therefore supposing Infinite Power) that there can be but One Mind, or Understanding Being, Self-Existent, all Minds partaking of that One Mind; so is it hardly Possi-
ble, for any one in good earnest, to Entertain such a Conceit as this, that his Own Particular Soul, Mind, and Personality, and consequent-
ly all Humane Souls, though subject to such Laws of Fate as now they are; did not only Pre-Exist before their Respective Bodies, and were from Eternity without Beginning, but also Existed Of Themselves Ne-
cessarily and Independently upon any thing else. Wherefore if Humane Souls, Minds, and Personallties, being unquestionably Substantial Things and Really Distinguìshed from Matter, (which therefore could not possibly be Generated out of it) did not all Exist from Eternity, Of Themselves, Necessarily, and Independently, it is certain that they must Derive their whole Being, from the Deity, or be Created Out of Nothing, or Non-Existence by it. And if Humane Souls were unquestionably thus Created, it cannot reasonably be doubted, but that Matter or Body it self, was Created likewise out of Nothing, or Caused by the Deity: for as much as that which Created One thing out of Nothing, could Create every thing; and there is Really more of Sub stance, that is, a Higher Degree of Entity, in Minds and Souls, Conscious Self-moving, and Understanding Beings, then in Sensible Mat-
ter, or Unactive Bulk.

But for as much as this Doctrine of a Divine Creation out of No-
thing Pre-Existing, lies under no small Prejudice upon this Account, because it is so generally taken for granted, that none of the Pa-
gan Theists, who are supposed to have kept close to the simple Light of Nature, did ever acknowledge in the Deity, any such Creative Power out of Nothing, or that God was the Cause of any Sub-
stance, we must of Necessity here declare this, how common forever it be, to be a great Mistake. For besides that, Plato in his Sophist
having defined the Efficient or Effective Power in general, after this manner, πως τον της ἠκείμεν ἐνώπιον τῆς μικράτα περιστρέφοντας, To be A Power or Causality, whereby that which was Not before, was afterwards Made to Be; and then dividing this Efficiency, into Divine and Humane, he Immediately Subjoyns concerning the Former, έκ της νομίμης ἑαυτοῦ προηγημένης τῶν ἐν χρόνου περιστρεφόντων ἑαυτὸν ἑκείνων περιστρέφοντας, To be Made out of Nothing or in Time, or Instantaneously, by the Divine Efficiency alone. After they had Not been, Made to be? Where thus much at least is certain, that Plato did not at all Question the Possibility of a Thing's being Made out of Nothing in this Sense; that is, brought into Being, Af-
ter it had Not been, by a Divine Power. But becaufc it may be thought, that he meant this no further, than of the first compages of Animals, in which Notwithstanding every thing, Souls and all, might be Made out of Pre-Existing Matter; we shall here further add, what in his Timæus he declareth concerning the Soul, τος προηγημέν ἐκ ἄριστος ἑκατέρων εἰσάχθης.
Chap. IV. acknowledged by Philosophers.

That God did not Make it, after Body, and Junior to it; since it was not fit, that the Elder should be Ruled or Governed by the Younger, but he made Soul before Body, Older than it, and Superior to it, as well in respect of Time as Dignity. Which Notion is further pursued by him in his Tenth De Legibus, where he makes the Body to be Made first, then made the Soul: From whence it is plain, that Plato's first χήνες, or Production of Souls by God, could not be out of any Pre-Existing Body or Matter, they being affirmed by him to be, not only this and that particular Body, but all Body whatever, before Longitude, Latitude and Profundity. Which may be further confirmed from hence, because in his Sophist, he plainly condemns that Opinion of some, who make the whole Substances from the Deity, and always to Depend upon it; as Eternal Light, would depend upon an Eternal Sun. Plutarch and his followers being only here to be excepted, who would neither have Souls made out of Nothing by God, nor yet out of Corporeal Matter Pre-Existing, (they being themselves Incorporeal;) but out of a strange Commixture of the Substance of God himself, with the Substance of a certain Diorderly Soul, Self-Existent and Uncreated, of which we have spoken already. But that the Genuine Platonists, did universally suppose, that One Substance might be Caused by another, and derive its whole Being from it, is undeniably Evident from hence, because their Second Divine Hypothesis or Substance, (though Eternal) was according to them, Derived from; or Begotten by their First, and their Third Hypothesis or Substance Produced both from the First and Second; and other inferior Orbs of Being, as the Particular Souls of Demons and Men, from that whole Trinity of Divine Hypotheses.
Matter, not to all Pag. Unmade Book I.
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We have now sufficiently disproved The Truth of that Affertion, That Nothing could be Made out of Nothing, in the Atheistick Senfe thereof; viz. That Nothing which before was Not, could afterwardspossibly be Made to Be: Though this should not be Extended so far, as to Accidental Things, and Modifications, but restrained and confined, only to Substancials: That no Substanct whatsoever, could have a Newness of Being, or be Caused by any other Substanc; but whatsoever Sub-
stantial Thing any where Is in the World, the same did Exit Of It self from Eternity, and Independently upon any thing else; nothing but different Modifications being Made or Produced. Which same Affertion, has been also sometimes, otherwise thus expressed; Nothing can be Made but out of Pre-Exisitng Substanc; or the meaning hereof being this, That Nothing can be Made, but New Accidental Modifications, of what before Substantially was; no Substanc itself being Make-
able or Producible by any other Substanc, neither in Time (so as to have a Newness or Beginning of Being) nor yet from Eternity. Where the Atheists and some others taking it for granted, that there is no other Substanc besides Body, or Matter, do further limit and restrain the Senfe of that Proposition in this manner: Nothing can be Made but out of Pre-Exisitng Matter; that is, Nothing can be Made, but out of
of Corporeal Substance Pre-Existing. An Idolum Specus, (if I may use that Language) which in all Probability had its first Original, chiefly from mens Measuring the Extent of all Power, by their own Production of Artificial things. Because forsooth, a Carpenter or Architect cannot make a House, but out of Pre-Existing Timber, Bricks, and Stones, nor a Taylor a Garment, but out of Pre-Existing Cloth; nor a Cook, Puddings or Pies, but out of Pre-Existing Materials or Ingredients; That therefore no Power whatsoever, no no that of God Almighty, can extend any further, than to the New Modification of Pre-Existing Matter, but not to the Production or Causing of any Substance. We shall in the next place make it appear, that were this Assertion True, That No Substance or Real Entity which once was Not, could be Caused or Produced, yet would it notwithstanding the Two, more impugn Atheism, than Theism (it being possible for Fallhoods, though not for Truths, to disagree) for as much as the Atheists do really bring More Out of Nothing, or Non-Existence, than the Theists do, and therefore ought not to make this an Objection against Theism. For though according to the True and Genuine Theology, God or a Perfect Being be suppos'd, to be the Only Necessary Self-Existent Thing, and the Cause of all other Substance, and consequently to have Produced all Imperfect Things, not only Souls, but also Matter it self, it may be, Out of Nothing, or an Antecedent Non-Existence, yet is there, by reason of the Weakness of Humane Understandings, a Latitude in Theism. Wherefore some there are, who though imposed upon by that Idolum Specus, or imprisoned in it, That Nothing can possibly be Made but out of Pre-Existing Matter, by the New Modification thereof; do notwithstanding devoutly worship a Deity, according to their Notion of it, A Perfectly Understanding Being Unmade; though not the Creator of Matter, yet the Maker of the Whole World out of it, and the Supreme Governour of the same; they thus supposing Two Principles in the Universe, an Active and a Passive one, God and Matter. Besides which, it is not impossible for others to think, that though Matter or Body be not the only Substance, but Humane Souls are Incorporeal, yet the Substance of these Souls was not Created out of Nothing no more than that of Body, but they were Made either out of some Pre-Existing Common Soul, (as their Intelligible Matter) or out of the Substance of the Deity it self; or else Existed of themselves, from Eternity Unmade: and yet nevertheless may these acknowledge, One Supreme Understanding Being Self-Existent also, though neither the Creator of Matter, nor of Souls, yet the Supreme Governour and Orderer of all. And it is certain, that Plutarch's God, was no better than this, and yet was that Pagan notwithstanding, a Devout Religionist in his Kind, as well as a Hearty Moralist. And such a Theism or Theology, as either of those forementioned, (though not Genuine and Sincere, but Imperfect and Mongrel things) would perhaps be to the Atheists, little less Troublesome and Uneafie, than the True. Thus have we shewed, that this Principle, That Nothing can come out of Nothing, or be Made, otherwise than out of Pre-Existing Substance or Matter, though it be indeed Contradictory to the True and Genuine Theology, yet is it not absolutely Inconsistent with all manner of Religion; there being certain Spurious or Imperfect Forms of Theism, built upon this Foundation. But now on the
the contrary, we shall make it manifest, That this very Principle, made use of by the Atheists, is in Truth and Reality Contradictory to all manner of Atheism, and destructive of the same; the Atheists Univerally Generating and Corrupting Real Entities, and Substantial things, that is, Producing them out of Nothing or Non-Existence, and reducing them to Nothing again: for as much as they make all things whatsoever, the bare Substance of Matter only excepted, (which to them is either no Determinate Thing, or else nothing but mere Bulk, or Resisting and Divisible Magnitude) to come out of Nothing, and to go to Nothing. Thus does Aristotle in a place before cited, declare the Atheisticke Sense, εἰ ἰος τις ἥν, δια μικρόν μικρήν ήταν τῇ περιμέτρῳ, ἀλλὰ πάντα γίνεται; There are Certain men, who affirm, that Nothing is Unmade, but All things Generated or Made. Whose Sense is afterwards more distinctly thus proposed by him, τὸ μὲν ἄλλα γίνεται τὸ τῇ φύσιν, ἐν τῇ παράλληλῃ ἡκεῖν. Ἐν τῇ περιμέτρῳ, ἐν τῇ ταύτῃ πάντα μεταχειρίζεσθαι πέραν. That all other things are Generated and Flow, and none of them firmly Is, (they being perpetually Educed out of Nothing, and Reduced to Nothing) but that there is only One thing which remaineth; namely that, out of which all the other are Made, by the Transformation thereof. Which One thing, (to wit Matter) as the fame Aristotle further adds, they affirmed to be the Only Substance, and from Eternity Unmade, but all other things whatsoever, being but πάντα τῇ φύσιν ἡκεῖν, ἐν τῇ ταύτῃ τῇ φύσιν, Passion, Affections, and Dispositions thereof, γίνεται. By, έν τῇ ταύτῃ τῇ φύσιν, To be Generated and Corrupted Infinitely; that is, to be Produced out of Nothing or Non-Existence, and Reduced again to Nothing, without end. And doubtles this is the True meaning of that Paffage in Plato's Tenth De Legibus, not understood by the Late Interpreters; where being to represent the Atheisticke Hypothesis of the System of the Universe; he discovereth their Grand Arcanum, and that which they accounted, σοφὸν αὐτὸν λόγον, The wisest and most mysterious of all Doctrines; after this manner; λέγειν τον παντί διὰ ταύτα έστι τὸ τάξιμα γίνεται, και γίνεται, και γίνεται ταύτα μὲν πρὶς, τό τ᾽ εύρησαν, τό τ᾽ έπισταν. Certain men affirm, that All things are Made, and Have been Made, and will be Made; some by Nature, and some by Art, and some by Fortune or Chance. For unquestionably here, Plato's λόγος τον παντί διὰ ταύτα έστι τὸ τάξιμα γίνεται, Certain men affirm that All things are Generated or Made, &c, is the very same with Aristotle's, εἰ ἰος τις ἥν, δια μικρόν μικρήν ήταν τῇ περιμέτρῳ, ἀλλὰ πάντα γίνεται, Certain men affirm, that there is Nothing Unmade, but that All things are Made or Generated. And perhaps this of Aristotles, was taken out of that of Plato's: Which yet nevertheless is so to be understood, as it is afterwards explained by Aristotle; All things whatsoever, the bare Substance of Matter only excepted. Wherefore it is certain that either there is no Real Entity in the Whole World, besides the Bare Substance of Matter; that is, besides Divisible and Separable Extension, or Resisting Magnitude, and Consequentially that Life and Cognition, Sense and Conception, Reason and Understanding, all our own Minds, and Personalities, are no Real Entities; or else, that there are, according to the Atheisticke Hypothesis, Real Entities Produced out of Nothing, and Reduced to Nothing again. Whereas Theists
Their supposit, all the Greatest Perfections in the Universè, as Life and Understanding, to have been Eternal and Unmade, in a Perfect Being, the Deity, and neither brought out of Nothing or Non-Existence, nor Reducible to Nothing; only Imperfect Beings to have been Made out of Nothing, or Produced out of Non-Existence, by this one Perfect Being or Deity: the Atheists on the contrary, supposing the lowest and most imperfect of all Beings, Matter, Bulk, or Draffible and Resilient Extension, to be the Only Self-Existant and Unmade Thing; conclude all the Greatest Perfections in the Universè, Life, Cognition, and Understanding, to be Made out of Nothing, or Non-Existence, as also to be reduced to Nothing again. Indeed the Hylozoick Atheists, being sensible somewhat of this Inconvenience, of making all Life and Understanding Out of Nothing, and that there must of Necessity be some Fundamental Life and Perception, which is not Accidental but Substantial, and which was never generated and cannot be Corrupted; have therefore attributed a kind of Life and Perception to all Matter as such. Notwithstanding which, even these also, for as much as they deny to Matter, Animal Sense, and Consciousness, suppose all Animal Life or Sense, and Conscious Understanding, to be generated and corrupted, produced out of Nothing and Reduced to Nothing again. Neither can Life, Cognition, and Understanding, be reckoned amongst the Modes of Matter, that is of Magnitude or Draffible and Antitypous Extension, since they may be Conceived without the same: whereas Modes cannot be conceived without their Substance. Standing, Sitting, and Walking, cannot be Conceived without a Body; and that ify Organized too, and therefore are they Nothing but different Modes of such a Body. When that Humane Body, which before did Stand, doth afterwards, Sit, or Walk, no man can think that here is the Miraculous Production of any New Real Entity out of Nothing; nor when the same Matter which was Square or Cubical, is made Spherical or Cylindrical. But when there is Life and Understanding which was not before, then is there unquestionably a new Real Entity Produced. But the Democritick and Epicurean Atheists themselves, according to the Tenor of the Atomick Physiology, acknowledge no other Modes of Matter or Body, but only more or less Magnitude of Parts, Figure, Site, Motion or Rest. And upon this very account do they explode Qualities, considered as Entities really distinct from these Modes; because in the Generation and alteration of them, there would be Real Entities made out of Nothing, or without a Cause; whereupon they Resolve these Qualities into Mechanism and Fancy. But Life, Cognition, and Understanding, are things which have more Real Entity in them, and can no way be Saved by Mechanism and Phancy; wherefore undoubtedly they are no Modes of Matter or Body, but Attributes of another kind of Substance, Incorporeal. All Cogitative Beings, especially Humane Souls, and Personalties, are unquestionably Substantial Things; and yet do the Atheists bring these, and consequently themselves, out of Nothing or Non-Existence, and Reduce them to Nothing again. The Conclusion is; that these very Atheists, who contend against Theists, that Nothing can be Made out of Nothing, do themselves bring All things out of Nothing or Non-Existence, and perpetually Reduce them to Nothing again; according to those Principles, as once there was
no Life, nor Understanding at all in the Universe, so may there be none again. They who deny a God, because there can be no Creative Power belonging to Any Thing, do themselves notwithstanding attribute to Matter (though a mere Possess, Suggests, and Uncreative thing) a Creative Power of Things Substantial, (as Humane Souls and Perjona-ities) out of Nothing. And thus is that Formidable Argument of the Atheists, that there can be no God, because Nothing can be made out of Nothing; not only proved to be False, but also Retorted upon these Atheists themselves, they bringing all things besides Senseless and Unqualified Matter, out of Nothing.

We have now declared, First, in what sense this Proposition is unquestionably True, that Nothing can be Made out of Nothing, or Come from Nothing, viz., Casually, That Nothing which before was Not, could afterward be Made, without a Cause, and a Sufficient Cause. Or more particularly, these Three ways; First, that Nothing which before was Not, could afterward be brought into Being by Itself, or without an Efficient Cause. Secondly, that Nothing which once was Not, could be Made or Produced Efficiently by any thing, which had not at least Equal Perfection in it, and a Sufficient Active or Productive Power; and Consequentially that no New Substance can be Made, but by a Perfect Being, which only is Substantially Emanative. Thirdly and Lastly, that when things are Made out of Pre-Existent Matter, as in Artificial Productions, and Natural Generations, there can be no new Real Entity Produced, but only different Modifications, of what before Substantially was; the Material Cause as such, Efficiently Producing Nothing. And thus was this Axiom Understood by Cicero, That Nothing could be Made out of Nothing, viz. Casually; in his Book De Fato, where he reprehendeth Epicurus for endeavouring to avoid Fate and to Establish Liberty of Will, by that Absurd Figment, of Atoms Declining Uncertainty from the Perpendicular. Nec unde hac suae sent, est causa, cur Epicurus Fatum extimescit, &e. Ab Atomis petat presidium, caque De Via deducat & uno tempore suscipitres duas inomedabiles, Unum ut sine Causa fiat aliquid, ex quo existet, ut De Nihilo quippiam fiat; quod nec ipsa, nec suumquem Physicum placet. Nor is there for all that, any Reason, why Epicurus should be so much afraid of Fate, and seek Refuge in Atoms; he supposing them in their Infinite Defects, to Decline Uncertainty from the Perpendicular, and laying this as a Foundation for Liberty of Will; whereby he plunged himself at once, into Two inextricable difficulties, the First whereof was, the supposing of Something to be made without a Cause, or which is all one, out of Nothing; a thing that will neither be allowed by any Philosopher, nor could Epicurus himself be Pleased or Satisfied therewith. The reason whereof is, because it was a Fundamental Principle of the Atomick Philosophy, That Nothing, (in this sense) could be Made out of Nothing. Moreover we have in the next place declared, in what other Sense, this Proposition, that Nothing can be Made out of Nothing, is False, namely when this out of Nothing, is not taken Casually, but so as to signify the Terminus from which; that Nothing can be Made, out of an Antecedent Non-Existence; that no Real Entity or Substance which before was not, could by any Power whatsoever be afterwards brought into being: Or That Nothing
thing can possibly be Made, but out of Something Pre-ExiSing, by the new Modification thereof. And it appears from that of Cicero, that the True and Genuine Sense of this Proposition, De Nihilo nibil fit; (according to the Mind of those Ancient Physiologers, who laid so great Stress thereupon) was not, that Nothing could by any Power whatsoever, be brought out of Non-Existence into Being; but only that Nothing could be made without a Cause. Nor did they here by Cause mean, the Material only; in this sense, as if Nothing could possibly be Made, but out of Pre-Existing Matter; Epicurus being taxed by Cicero, for introducing that his Third Motion of Atoms, or Clnamen Principiorum, out of Nothing, or Without an Efficient Cause; as indeed all Motion also was, to those Atomick Atheists, in this Sense, from Nothing. Nevertheless, we have also shewed, That if this Proposition, Nothing out of Nothing, in that Atheistical Sense; (as level'd against a Deity) were, True; yet would it of the Two more impugn Atheism it self, than it does Theism, the Atheist-Generating and Corrupting All Things, the Substance of Matter only excepted, all Life, Sense, and Understanding, Human Souls, Minds and Personalties, they Producing thefe, and consequently Themselves, out of Nothing; and resolving them all to Nothing again. We shall now in the Third and Last place, make it manifest, that the Atheists do not only bring Real Entities and Substantial Things out of Nothing in the Second sense, that is out of an Antecedent Non-Existence, (which yet is a thing Possible only to God, or a Perfect Being) but also that they bring them out of Nothing, in the Absolutely Impossible Sense; that is, suppose them to be Made without a Cause, or Nothing to be the Cause of Something.

But we must prepare the way hereunto, by setting down, Firft, a Brief and Compendious Sum of the whole Atheistical Hypothefs. The Atheists therefore who contend, that Nothing can be Made but only New Accidents or Modifications of Pre-ExiSing Sub-fance; Taking it for granted, that there is no other Substance besides Body or Matter, do conclude accordingly, that Nothing can be Made, but out of Pre-Existing Matter or Body. And then they add hereunto, That Matter being the only Subsance, the only Un-made Self-Existing thing, whatsoever else is in the world, besides, the bare Subsance of this Matter, was Made out of it or Produced by it. So that there are these Three Things contained, in the Atheistical Hypothesis; Firft, that No Subsance can be Made or Caused by any thing else, but only new Modifications. Secondly, that Matter or Body is the Only Subsance, and therefore whatsoever is made is Made out of pre ExiSing Matter; Thirdly and Lastly, That whatsoever there is else in the whole world, besides the Subsance of Matter, it is Made or Generated out of Matter. And now we shall demonstrate the Absolute Impollibility of this Atheistical Hypothesis, from that very Principle of the Ancient Physiologers, that Nothing can be Made out of Nothing, in the True Sense thereof; it not only bringing Real Entities and Substantial Things, out of an Antecedent Non-Existence, (though nothing but an Infinitely Perfect Being neither can thus Create) but also Producing them without A Cause.
First therefore, when they affirm; Matter to be the Only Substance, and all things else whatsoever to be Made out of that alone; they hereby plainly Suppose, all things to be Made, without an Efficient Cause, which is to bring them out of Nothing, in an Impossible Sense. For though it be not True, that Nothing can be Made but out of Pre-Existing Matter (and consequently that God himself supposed to Exist, could in this respect do no more, than a Carpenter or Taylor do); I say, though it be not Universally True, That every thing that is Made, must have a Material Cause (so that the Quaternio of Causes in Logick, is not to be Extended, to all things Caused whatsoever;) yet is it certain, that Nothing, which once was not, could Possibly be Made without an Efficient Cause. Wherefore if there be any thing Made, which was not before, there must of Necessity besides Matter, be some other Substance Existing, as the Efficient Cause thereof; for as much as Matter alone, Could not Make any thing; as Marble cannot make a Statue, nor Timber and Stone a House, nor Cloth a Garment. This is our First Demonstration of the Impossibility of the Atheistick Hypothesis: it supposing all things besides the bare Substance of Matter, to be Made out of Matter alone, without any other Active Principle or Deity, or to be Made without an Efficient Cause, which is to bring them from Nothing, in an Impossible Sense. To which may be added by way of Appendix, that whereas the Democritick and Epicurean Atheists, admit of no other Efficient Casuality in Nature, then only Local Motion, and allow to Matter or Body, their only Substance, no Self-Moving Power, they hereby make all the Motion, that is in the whole world, to be without a Cause, and from Nothing; Action without any Subject, or Agent, and the Efficiency of all things, without an Efficient.

In the next place, should we be so liberal, as to grant to the Atomick Atheists, Motion without a Cause, or permit Strato and the Hylozoick Atheists, to attribute to Matter a Self-Moving Power, yet do we affirm, that this Matter and Motion both together, could not Possibly Produce any new Real Entity, which was not before; Matter as such Efficiently Causing Nothing, and Motion only changing the Modifications of Matter, as Figure, Place, Site, and Disposition of Parts. Wherefore if Matter as such, have no Animal Sense and Conscious Understanding, Essentially belonging to it, (which no Atheists as yet have had the Impudence to affirm) then can no Motion or Modification of Matter, no Contenture of Atoms, Possibly beget Sense and Understanding, Soul and Mind; because this would be to bring Something out of Nothing in the Impossible Sense, or to suppose Something to be Made by It itself without a Cause. Which may Serve also for a Confutation of those Imperfect and Spurious Theists, who will not allow to God Almighty, (whether supposed by them to be Corporeal or Incorporeal) a Power of Making any thing, but only out of Pre-Existing Matter, by the new Modifying thereof; as a Carpenter makes a House out of Pre-Existing Timber and Stone, and a Taylor a Garment out of Pre-Existing Cloth. For since Animal Life, and Understanding, are not by them supposed to belong at all to Matter as such, and since they
they cannot result from any Modifications or Contextures thereof, it would plainly follow from hence, that God could not Possibly make Animals, or Produce Sense and Understanding, Souls and Minds, which nevertheless these Theists suppose him to have done; and therefore ought in reason to acknowledge him, not only to be the Maker of New Modifications of Matter, (and one who Built the world only as a Carpenter doth a House) but also of Real Entities distinct from the same.

And this was the very Doctrine (as we have already declared) of the most Ancient Atomick Physiologers; not That every thing whatsoever might be Made out of Pre-Existing Matter; but on the contrary, that in all Natural Generations, there is no Real Entity Produced out of the Matter, which was not before in it, but only New Modifications; and Consequently that Souls and Minds, being not mere Modifications of Matter, in respect of Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion, could never be Produced out of it, because they must then of necessity, Come from Nothing; that is, be Made either by Themselves, without a Cause, or without a Sufficient Cause. It hath also been before noted out of Aristotle, how the Old Atheistical Materialists, being assaulted by those Italick Philosophers after that manner, that Nothing which was not before, in Matter, besides its Modifications, could Possibly be Produced out of it, because Nothing can Come out of Nothing, and consequent that in all Natural Generations and Corruptions, there is no Real Entity Made or Destroyed; endeavoured without denying the words of that Proposition, to Evade after this manner, 

\[ \text{That there is indeed Nothing Generated or Corrupt } \]

\[ \text{ed in some Sense } \]

\[ \text{for as much as the same Substance of Matter, always } \]

\[ \text{remains, it being never Made nor Destroyed. For as men } \]

\[ \text{do not say, that Socrates is Made, when he is Made Musical or Handsome, nor Destroyed, when he loseth these Dispositions, because the subject Socrates, was before and still remaineth; so neither is any Substantial } \]

\[ \text{thing or Real Entity in the world Made or Destroyed in this sense; because Matter which is the Substance of all, perpetually remains, and all other } \]

\[ \text{things whatsoever, are built in } \]

\[ \text{and they } \]

\[ \text{are Generated out of it and Corruptible into it, without the Production of any Real Entity out of Nothing, or the Reduction of any into Nothing, so long as the Substance of Matter which is the only Real Entity, remains always the same. Wherefore though Life, Sense, and Understanding, all Souls and Minds, be Generated out of Matter, yet does it not follow from thence, that therefore there is any Real Entity Made or Produced, because these are Nothing but Accidents and Modifications of Matter. This was the Subterfuge of the Old Hylopolitan Atheists.} \]

Now it is true indeed, that whatsoever is in the Universe, is either Substance or Accidents, and that the Accidents of any Substance, may be Generated.
Generated and Corrupted, without the Producing of any Real Entity out of Nothing; and Reducing of any into Nothing; for as much as the Substance still remains entirely the same. But the Atheists, taking it for granted, that there is no other Substance besides Body or Matter, do therefore fallly suppose, that which is really Incorroporeal Substance, or else the Attributes, Properties, and Modes thereof, to be the merer Accidents of Matter; and consequently conclude these to be Generable out of it; without the Production of any Real Entity out of Nothing. We say therefore, that it does not at all follow, because the fame Numerical Matter, (as for example a Piece of Wax) may be Successively made Spherical, Cubical, Cylindrical, Pyramidal, or of any other Figure; and the same man may Successively, Stand, Sit, Kneel and Walk, both, without the Production of Anything out of Nothing; or because, a heap of Stones, Bricks, Morter, and Timber, lying altogether disorderly and confusedly, may be made into a Steady Palace; and that without the Miraculous Creation of any Real Entity out of Nothing; that therefore the same may be affirmed likewise, of every thing else, besides the bare Substance of Matter, as namely Life and Understanding, Soul and Mind, that though there be No such thing in Matter itself, yet the Production of them out of Matter, would be no Production of something out of Nothing. One Ground of which mistake hath been, from mens not rightly considering what the Accidents of a Substance are, and that they are indeed Nothing but the Modes thereof. Now a Mode is such a thing, as cannot possibly be conceived, without that whereof it is a Mode; as Standing, Sitting, Kneeling and Walking, cannot be conceived without a Body Organized, and therefore are but Modes thereof; but Life and Cognition, may be clearly apprehended without Body, or any thing of Extension; nor indeed can a Thought be conceived, to be of such a Length, Breadth and Thickness, or to be Hewed and Sliced out, into many Pieces, all which laid together, as so many Small Chips thereof, would make up again, the entireness of that whole Thought. From whence it ought to be concluded, that Cognition is no Accident, or Mode of Matter, or Bulky Extension, but a Mode or Attribute of another Substance, Really distinct from Matter, or Incorroporeal. There is indeed Nothing else clearly conceivable by us in Body or Bulky Extension, but only more or less Magnitude of Parts, Figures, Site, Motion, or Rest; and all the Different Bodies that are in the whole World, are but several Combinations or Syllables, made up out of these few Letters: but no Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions, can possibly Spell or Compound, Life and Sense, Cognition and Understanding, as the Syllables thereof; and therefore to suppose these to be Generated out of Matter, is plainly to suppose some Real Entity to be brought out of Nothing, or something to be made without a Cause, which is Impossible.

But that which hath principally confirmed men in this Error is the business of Sensible Qualities and Forms, as they are vulgarly conceived, to be distinct Entities; from those forementioned Modifications of Matter, in respect of Magnitude of Parts, Figure, Site, Motion, or Rest. For since these Qualities and Forms, are unquestionably Generated
and these errors are a misapplying of the names, ideas, and passions, for things really existing.
thing else in the world to be any thing, as Cognition and Local Motion to be the very self same thing. Nevertheless, so strong was the Athenian Intoxication, in those Old Democritics and Epicureans, that though denying Real Qualities of Bodies, for this very reason, because Nothing could be Produced out of Nothing, they Notwithstanding contradicting themselves, would make Sense, Life, and Understanding, to be Qualities of Matter, and therefore Generable out of it, and so Unquestionably, Produced Real Entities out of Nothing, or Without a Cause.

Moreover it is observable, that Epicurus having a mind to assert Contingent Liberty in men, in way of opposition to that Necessity of all Humane Actions, which had been before maintained by Democritus and his Followers, plainly acknowledges, that he could not possibly do this, according to the Grounds of his own Philosophy, without supposing something of Contingency, in the First Principles, that is in the Motion of those Atoms, out of which men and other Animals are Made.

---

_Si semper motus connequitur omnis._
_Et uterque existit semper Natura Ordine Certo._
_Nec Declinando faciunt Primordia Motus._
_Prinципium quoddam quod Fati jufdam rumpat._
_Ex Infinito ne Caufa Caufa sequatur._
_Libera per Terras unde hic Animalibus extat._
_Unde est hic, inquam, Fatis Avo[sa] Voluntas?_

The reason for which, is afterwards thus expressed by him, _Quoniam De Nihilo Nil fit_, because Nothing can be Made out of Nothing. Upon which account he therefore ridiculously Feigned, besides his Two other Motions of Atoms, from Pondus and Plaga, Weight and Strokes, a Third Motion of them, which he calls, _Clamina Principiorum_, a Contingent and Uncertain Declination, every way from the Perpendicular out of Design, to salve this Phenomenon of Free Will in men; Without bringing Something out of Nothing, according as he thus Subjoyneth,

_Square in Seminibus quoque idem fateare necesse est._
_Efse aliam praeter Plagas O Pondera causam._
_Motibus, unde hic est nobis Innata Potesfas._
_De Nihilo quoniam FIERI NIL posse videmus._
_Pondus enim prohibet ne Plaga omnium fiant._
_Exerna quibus Vi. Sed ne Mens ipsa Necessium._
_Intellectum habebat cum his in rebus agentis._
_Et deci lia quas cogatur Ferre Patique._
_Id fuit Exiguum CLINAMEN PRINCIPIORUM._
_Ne raiione loci certa, nec tempore certo._

Now if Epicurus himself, conceived, that Liberty of Will, could not possibly be Generated, in Men out of Matter or Atoms, they having no such thing at all in them (that is no Contingent Uncertainty in their Motion).
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Motion) without bringing of Something out of Nothing; which was contrary to the Fundamental Principles of the Atomick Philosophy, (though this were intolerably absurd in him, thus to suppose Contingency, and a Kind of Free Will, in the Motions of Sensible Atoms, so that indeed he brought his Liberty of Will, out of Nothing,) certainly Sense, and Understanding, Soul and Mind in Animals and Men, could not possibly be Generated out of Atoms or Matter, devoid of all Sense and Understanding: For the very same Reason, Quoniam De Nihilo Nil fit, Because Nothing can be Made out of Nothing. For unquestionably, were all Life and Understanding, all Souls and Minds, Generated out of Dead and Sensible Matter, and were there no Substantial or Essential Life and Understanding in the whole Universe; then must it of Necessity, be all Made out of Nothing, or without a Cause; and consequently Real Entities and Substantial things be Made out of Nothing, which is absolutely Impossible. For though we do not say, that Life and Cognition, Sense and Understanding, abstractly considered, are Substances; yet do we affirm them to be Entities Really distinct from Matter, and no Modifications or Accidents thereof, but either Accidents and Modifications, or rather Essential Attributes of Substance Incorporeal: as also that Souls and Minds, which are the Subjects of them, are indeed Substantial Things. Wherefore We cannot but here again condemn, the Darkness of that Philosophy, which Educest not only species Visible and Audible (Entities Perfectly Unintelligible) and Real Qualities, distinct from all the Modes of Body, and even Substantial Forms too, (as they call them) but also Sensible Souls themselves, both in men and brutes; Ex Potentia Materiæ, Out of the Power of the Matter; that is, indeed Out of Nothing. For as much as this prepares a direct way to Atheism; because if Life and Sense, Cognition and Consciousness, may be Generated out of Dead and Sensible Matter, then might this well be supposed the first Original of All things; nor could there Reasonably be any Stop made, at Rational Souls; especially by these men, who also conclude them, to be Rasa Tabula, mere White Sheets of Paper, that have nothing at all in them, but what is Scribbled upon them, by Corporeal Objects from without: there being nothing in the Understanding or Mind of Man, which was not before in Senfe: so that Sense is the First Original Knowledge; and Understanding, but a Secondary and Derivative thing from it, more Umbraitile and Omniscient.

Hitherto have we Demonstrated that all things whatsoever, could not possibly be Made out of Matter, and particularly that Life and Sense, Mind and Understanding, being no Accident or Mode of Matter, could not by Motion be Generated out of it, without the Production of Real Entities out of Nothing. But because some may Possibly Imagine, that Matter might otherwise than thus by Motion, by a Miraculous Efficiency, Produce Souls and Minds, we shall add in the last place, that Nothing can Efficiently Produce any Real Entity or Substantial thing, that was not before; unless it have at least equal Perfection to it, and a Substantially Emanative, or Creative Power. But fearlessly any man can be so forteifh, as to Imagine, that every Atom of Duff, hath Equal Perfection in it to that of the Rational Soul.
Soul in man, or to Attribute a Creative Power to all Matter, (which is but a Paflive thing) whilst this is in the mean time denied by him, to a Perfect Being; both these Affertions also, in like manner as the Former, Producing Real Entities out of Nothing Causally. And thus have we Demonstrated the Impossibility and Non-sence of all Atheism, from this very Principle, by which the Atheists would assail Theism, in the true Sense thereof, that No thing can be Made without a Cause, or that Nothing cannot be the Cause of Any thing.

Now if there be no Middle betwixt Atheism and Theism, and all things must of Necessity either spring from Senflefs Matter, or else from a Perfect Understanding Being, then is this Demonstration of the Impossibility of Atheism, a Sufficient Establishment of the Truth of Theism; it being such a Demonstration of a God, as the Geometrians call, a Deduction Ad Impossibile, which they allow of for good and frequently make use of. Thus; Either there is a God, or else Matter, must needs be acknowledged, to be the only Self-Existent thing, and all things else whatsoever, to be Made out of it; But it is Impossibile that all things should be made out of Senflefs Matter: Therefore there is a God. Nevertheless we shall here for further satisfaction, show how the Existence of a God, may be Directly Demonstrated also, from this very Principle, which the Atheists endeavour to take Sanctuary in, and from thence to impugne Theism, De Nihilo Nihil, that Nothing can be Made out of Nothing Causally, or That Nothing cannot be the Cause of Any thing.

In the first place therefore, we shall fetch our Beginning, from what hath been already often declared, That it is Mathematically Certain, that Something or other, did Exist Of It Self from all Eternity, or without beginning, and Unmade by any thing else. The Certainty of which Proposition dependeth upon this very Principle, as its Foundation, That Nothing can come from Nothing, or be Made out of Nothing, or That Nothing which once was not, can of it self come into Being without a Cause; it following unavoidably from thence, That if there had been once Nothing, there could never have been Any thing. And having thus laid the Foundation, we shall in the next place make this further Superstructure, that because Something did certainly Exist of it Self from Eternity Unmade, therefore is there also Absolutely, a Necessarily Existent Being. For to suppose, that any thing did Exist Of It Self from Eternity, by its own Free Will and Choice, and therefore not Necessarily but Contingently, since it might have Willed otherwise, this is to suppose it to have Existed before it was, and so Positively to have been the Cause of it self, which is Impossibile, as hath been already declared. When a thing therefore is said to be Of It Self, or the Cause of It self, this is to be understood notherwise, than either in a Negative Sense, as having Nothing else for its Cause; or becaufe, its Necessary Eternal Existence, is Essential to the Perfection of its own Nature. That therefore which Existed Of It self from Eternity, Independently upon any thing else, did not for any Eternity,ly but Necessarily; so that there is undoubtedly, something Absolutely in Being, whose Existence is and always was Necessary. In the next place
it is certain also, that Nothing could exist necessarily of it Self, but what included necessity of existence in its own Nature. For to suppose any thing to exist of itself necessarily, which hath no necessity of existence in its own Nature, is plainly to suppose that necessary existence of it, to come from nothing, since it could neither proceed from that thing itself, nor yet from any thing else. Lastly, there is Nothing which includes necessity of existence in its very Nature and essence, but only an absolutely perfect being. The result of all which is, that God or a perfect being, doth certainly exist, and that there is nothing else which existed of itself from eternity, necessarily and independently; but all other things whatsoever derived their being from him, or were caused by him, matter or body it self not excepted.

That which hath staggered some theists here, and made them so inclined and prone to believe, that matter also existed from eternity unmade, is partly (as hath been already intimated) an identical conceit, that because Nothing can be artificially made by men, otherwise than out of pre-existed matter, as houses and garments, puddings, and pyes, therefore there could be no other making of any thing by any power whatsoever: though even men themselves, can produce something out of no pre-existent matter, as cogitations and local motion. And the same partly proceeded also, from certain false opinions entertained, concerning matter. For first some theists have supposed that an incorporeal first matter, out of which incorporeal matter. Together with an incorporeal form, joined to it, they conceived the essence of body to have been compounded, and made up. And no wonder if these same fanciful philosophers, have further added also hereunto, that from this incorporeal matter, by an incorporeal form, were begotten likewise incorporeal qualities of body. Now it is not conceivable, what else should be meant, by this incorporeal hyle or matter, but only a metaphysical notion, of the potentiality or possibility of things, respectively to the deity; which because it is indeed eternal, and as much unmade as God himself is, it being nothing but the divine power considered passively, or the reverse of it; therefore in all probability, were these philosophers so prone to think, the physical matter, of this corporeal universe, to have been eternal and unmade. Neither was this incorporeal hyle, or matter, a novel opinion, entertained only by some junior platonists, but older than arisotle himself; as appeareth plainly from the first L. 1. c. 6. following words of his in his metaphysics, of μὴν ἀλήθεια τὰ τοῦ ἄλλου τις φοράλα λάγον, ἐκ τοῦ ὑλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ ἀνεπίλατου πρωτοῦ, οὐκ ἀφίκει τοις ἐν όλοπνῳ. Some speak of the principle as matter; whether they suppose this matter to be body, or to be ζωὴν τὸν ἄλλον incorporeal. But this incorporeal matter in phytology can be accounted no better than a kind of metaphysical non-sense. Again others seem to have been the more prone to think, matter or body, to be materiæ have been self existent and unmade, because they both conceived proprietates it to be really the same thing with space, and also took it for grant-secondam that space was infinite, and eternal, and consequently necessarily, be existent. In answer whereunto we reply first, that though space and distance, should be granted to be positively infinite, or to have no bounds nor limits at all, as also to have been eternal, yet according
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to the Opinion of some, would it not follow from thence, that Matter was Infinite, Eternal and Necessarily Existant; not as if Space or Distance, could Exist alone by it Self, an Accident without a Substance, it being plainly Impossible, that Nothing should have any Accidents, Modifications, and Attributes; or be Mensurable by Tarks and Poles; but because this Space is by them supposed, not to be the Extension of Body, but the Infinite and Unbounded Extension of the Deity. But in the next place: If Space be concluded to be certainly Nothing else, but the Extension and Distance of Body or Matter, considered in General, (without respect to this or that particular Body) and Abstractly; in order to the Conception of Motion, and the Mensuration of things; (For Space thus consider'd, is Necessarily Immoveable, as to the Parts thereof respectively; as the Two Extremes of a Tark Distance, can never possibly come nearer to One another) then do we say, that there appeareth no sufficient Ground for this Positive Infinity of Space, we being certain of no more than this, that be the World, or any Figurate Body, never fo Great, it is not Impossible, but that it might be still Greater and Greater, without End. Which Indefinite Encreasableless of Body and Space, seems to be mistaken for a Positive Infinity thereof. Whereas for this very Reason, because it can never beo Great, but that more Magnitude may still be added to it, therefore can it never be Positively Infinite. Nor is there perhaps fo great an Aburdity in this, That Another World could not Possibly be made, a Mile Distant from this; for as much as there being Nothing between them, they must needs Touch; or That this Finite World could have no Mountains and Valleys, in the Exteriour Surface of it, since it might be either Spherical, Cubical or Cylindrical, or of any other Regular Figure, whatsoever the Maker pleased to form it in. To conclude therefore, by Space without the Finite World, is to be Understood, Nothing but the Possibility of Body. Further and Further without End, yet so as never to reach to Infinity; and such a Space as this was there also, before this World was Created, a Possibility of so much Body to be Produced. But Space and Actual Distance, as really Mensurable by Tarks and Poles, though it may be Greater and Greater without end,yet can it not be Positively Infinite, so as that there could be no more added to it; and therefore there can be no Argument from hence, to prove the Necessary Existence of Matter.

Moreover the Existence of a Deity might be further Demonstrated, from this Common Notion, That Nothing can come from Nothing Casual, because if there were no God; as we could not have had any Idea of him, or a Perfect Being, since it must have Come from Nothing, and have been the Idea or Conception of Nothing; So neither could there have been indeed any Knowledge or Understanding at all. For Singular Bodies Existing without us, cannot enter into us, and put Understanding in us, nor is there any thing but Local Motions propagated from them to our Organs of Sense. The Mind must have its Immediate Intelligibles, within it self, for otherwise it could not possibly Understand any thing; which Intelligibles and their Relations to one another, or Verities, are (as was said before) Eternal. Moreover, the Mind can frame Ideas or Conceptions, not only of things Actually Ex-
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议事, but also of all Possibilities, which plainly Implies and supposes the Actual Existence of a Being Infinitely Powerful, that could produce them. So that the proper Object, of Mind and Understanding, is a Perfect Being, and all the Extent of its Power; which Perfect Being, Comprehending it self and the Extent of its own Power, or the Possibilities of all things, is the First Original Mind, of which all other Minds partake. Wherefore were there no Perfect Omnipotent Being, Comprehending it self, and its own Power or all the Possibilities of things, the Intelligible Objects of the Mind and Ideas, must have come from Nothing.

However it hath been already proved from this Principle, Nothing from Nothing, that the Powers of Sense and Understanding, or the Entities of Soul and Mind, could never have resulted, from any Modifications of Sensible Matter whatsoever. Wherefore since it is mathematically certain, that our Humane Souls and Persons, could not possibly have been generated out of Matters, one of these Two things will undeniably follow; That Either they must all have Existed Of Themselves from Eternity Unmade, or Else have been Created in the World, out of an Antecedent Non-Existence, by a Perfect Understanding Being Unmade, or at least have Derived their whole Substance from it. So that it is altogether as certain, that there is a God, as that our Humane Souls and Persons, did not all Exist from Eternity Of Themselves. And that there must be some Eternal Unmade Mind, hath been already Demonstrated also, from the same Principle, Nothing out of Nothing. Thus have We abundantly Confuted, the Second Atheistic Argumentation, that there can be no Omnipotence nor Divine Creation, because Nothing can be Made out of Nothing; we having plainly shewed that this very Principle, in the True Sense thereof, affordeth a Demonstration for the Contrary.

The Six following Atheistic Argumentations, driving at these Two things, First, the Disproving of an Incorporeal, and then of a Corporeal Deity, (From both which, the Atheists conceive it must follow of necessity, that there can be none at all) we shall take them all together, and in order to the Confutation of them, perform these Three Things. First, we shall Answer the Atheistic Argumentations, against an Incorporeal Deity, (contained in the Third and Fourth Heads.) Secondly, we shall shew, that from the very Principles of the Atheistic Corporealism, (as represented in the Fifth and Sixth Heads) Incorporeal Substance is Demonstrable. And Lastly, That there being undeniably Incorporeal Substance, the Two following Atheistic Argumentations also, against a Corporeal Deity, (in the Seventh and Eighth Sections) prove altogether Insignificant.

We begin with the First of these; To shew the Invalidity of the Atheistic Argumentations, against an Incorporeal Deity. It hath been already
already observed, That though all Corporealists, be not therefore of necessity Atheists; yet Atheists universally have been Corporealists, this being always their First and Grand Postulatum, That there is no other Substance besides Body. Thus Plato long ago, declared Concerning them; διάλεξοντα τίνα ενδικά διά πολλά περιπολούμεν, καὶ ημεραίως παθώ, τοινύν πάντα ημερεμονοι τοῦ ὁλοκαύτων οὗλος μιᾷ πάντως τούτοις μιᾷ, καταρρέεις το πολιοτέρον, καὶ ἐάν εἴς θυσίας ἐλλαδόν κατεί. They contend strongly, that that only really Is, which is Tangible or Can Restit their Touch; concluding Body and Substance, to be one and the self-same thing. And if any one should affirm, that there is anything Incorporeal, they will presently cry him down, and not hear a word more from him. For there can be no doubt, but that the Persons here intended by Plato, were those very Atheists, which himself Spoke of afterward, in the same Dialogue 5 μὴ τοῦ τῆς πωλοίς ἀλληλον τοῦ ἔχομεν κακονοιν φήμες της φίλων αὐτοῦ παίνοντον, ἂν ποιήσω καταρρέων αὐτόματα, ή καὶ άνευσελίδων φήμες, ή μετὰ λόγων ής εύθυνους θαλα, ἀπὸ θαυμα μαλακώμενοι. Whether shall we asseem, to that Opinion now aday entertain'd by so many, That Nature Generatest all things from a certain Fortitudinous Cause, without the direction of any Mind or Understanding? or rather, that it produceth them, according to Reason, and Knowledge, proceeding from God? Indeed the Philosopher there tells us, that some of these Atheistic Persons, began then to be somewhat ashamed of making Prudence, and Justice, and other Moral Vertues, Corporeal Things, or Bodies, απὸ τοιοοδον τις μὴν ἔχον αὐτὸς δικαιὸς σφιᾷ σωματική αὐτοῦ κατισχοντα, φησίν ταύτα ποιήσω καταρρέων έτερον, ἀλλαὶ μαλακώμενοι το κολόμμα, ή μακρά τούτων αὐτών, ὑποτεινόμενοι, κατέρρεων ημῶν ὑποτεινοῦσαν. Though they affirm concerning the Soul it self, that this seems to them to be Corporeal; yet concerning Prudence, and those other Vertues mentioned, some have now scarcely the Confidence to maintain, these to be either Bodies or Nothing. But this (faith he) was indeed no less than the quite Giving up of the Cause of Atheists; εἰ γάρ ης του θεου μεταφημάζοντοι το τοιοοδός άστοδός τούτων συνεφέρουν αναλόγους, καθαρίας, because if it be but once granted, that there is never so little Incorporeal, this will be sufficient, to overthrow the Atheistic Foundation. Wherefore he concludes, that such as these, were but Mongrel and Imperfect Atheists, έντευ αὐτῶν φαίνετε έν είνας καταρρεύσατε, λογικα διαφθαρίζατε αυτά, ὑπερ μεν ενακονίας τοίς χρείας συμπεριελθέντως, τε Κύρια. Τότε οὖν το περιπόλον ἔτη, For they who are thorough-paced, and Genuine Atheists indeed, will bo- gle at neither of those forementioned things, but contend that whatsoever, they cannot grasp with their hands, is altogether Nothing. That is, that there is no other Substance nor Entity in the World, but only Body, that which is Tangible, or Restit the Touch. Aristotle also, re- presenteth the Atheistic Hypothesis after the same manner, τότε αυτὸ ζωτίως τον ενδικόν τίνα, τον αὐτον ενδικόν τίνα, τα άλλα πολλά πολλὰ τότε. They affirm that Matter or Body, is all the Substance that is, and that all other things, are but the Passions and Affections thereof. And again in his Metaphysics, ὅτε τον, τα μέζαν ὑπὼν τον φέους, δοὺς ἅμα τοῦθεν, τα τούτων παρατιληφτικά καὶ μεγαλύτερον ἐκέστε, These men maintain All to be One, and that there is but one Only Nature, as the Matter of all things, and this Corporeal, or ended with Magnitude. And now we see plainly, that the ancient Atheists, were of the very same mind, with thes;
In our Days, that Body, or that which is Tangible and Divisible, is the Only Substantial Thing, from whence it follows, that an Incorporeal Substance would be the same with an Incorporeal Body, i.e. an Impossibility, and that there can be no Incorporeal Deity.

But in the Management of this Cause, there hath been some Disagreement amongst the Atheists themselves. For First, the Democratiek and Epicureans, though contending with all the other Atheists in this, That whatsoever was Unextended, and devoid of Magnitude, was therefore Nothing; (so that there could neither be, any Substance, nor Accident or Mode of any Substance, Unextended) did notwithstanding distinguish concerning a Double Nature. First, That which is so Extended, as to be Impenetrable, and Tangible, or Resist the Touch, which is Body. And Secondly, That which is Extended also, but Penetrably and Intangibly, which is Space or Vacuum: a Nature, according to them, really distinct from Body, and the only Incorporeal Thing that is. Now since this Space which is the only Incorporeal, can neither Do nor Suffer any thing, but only give Place or Room to Bodies to Subsift in, or Pass thorough, therefore can there not be any Active, Understanding, Incorporeal Deity. This is the Argumentation of the Democratiek Atheists.

To which we Reply; That if Space be indeed a Nature distinct from Body, and a Thing Really Incorporeal, as they pretend, then will it undeniable follow from this very Principle of theirs, that there must be Incorporeal Substance; and (this Space being supposed by them also to be Infinite) an Infinite Incorporeal Deity. Because if Space be not the Extension of Body, nor an Affection thereof; then must it of Necessity be, either an Accident Existing alone by itself, without a Substance, which is Impossible; or else the Extension or Affection, of some other Incorporeal Substance, that is Infinite. But here will Gaffendus step in, to help out his good Friends, the Democratiek and Epicureans, at a dead Lift; and undertake to maintain, that though Space be indeed an Incorporeal Thing, yet it would neither follow of Necessity from thence, that it is an Incorporeal Substance or Affection thereof, nor yet that it is an Accident, Existing alone by itself without a Substance; because this Space is really neither Accident, nor Substance, but a certain Middle Nature or Essence betwixt both. To which Subterfuge of his, that we may not quarrel about Words, we shall make this Reply; That unquestionably, Whatever Is, or hath any kind of Entity, doth either Subsist by itself, or else is an Attribute, Affection, or Mode, of something that doth Subsist by itself. For It is Certain, That there can be no Mode, Accident, or Affection, of Nothing; and consequently, that Nothing cannot be Extended, nor Measurable. But if Space be neither the Extension of Body, nor yet of Substance Incorporeal, then must it of Necessity be, the Extension of Nothing, and the Affection of Nothing; and Nothing must be Measurable by Poles and Poles.

We conclude therefore, That from this very Hypothesis of the Democratiek and Epicurean Atheists, that Space is a Nature distinct from Body, and Positively Infinite, it follows undeniable, that there must be some
some Incorporeal Substance, whose Affection its Extension is; and because there can be nothing Infinite, but only the Deity, that it is the Infinite Extension of an Incorporeal Deity 5 just as some Learned Theists and Incorporealists have asserted. And thus is the Argument of thefe Democratick and Epicurean Atheists, against an Incorporeal Deity, abundantly confuted 5 we having made it manifest, that from that very Principle of their own, by which they would disprove the fame, it is against themselves Demonstrable.

To which it might be here further added, that Epicurus who professedly opposed Plato's Incorporeal God, as an Impossibility, did notwithstanding, manifestly Contradict himself, when he asserted such a Democracy of Monogrammous Gods, as were not Compounded of Atoms and Vacuum, (though according to him, the only Principles of Body) that so they might be Incorruptible; nor yet could Touch or be Touched, but were Penetrable, as is declared in those Verses of Lucretius,

Tenevis enim Natura Deum, longeque remotas,
Sensibus à nostris, Animi oix mente videtur.
Quae quorum manum Taedum, suffigit & Idum,
Taéide nil nobis quod sit, contingere debet.
Tangere enim non quit, quod Tangi non licet ipsum.

(Though Tangibility and Impenetrability, were elsewhere made by him, the very Essence of Body) and Lastly, such as had not Corpus but Quasi-Corpus, and therefore must needs be Really Incorporeal. Though there is no doubt to be made, but that Epicurus Colluded in all this; himself not Believing a jot of it, nor any such Gods at all.

But other Atheists there were, who concluding likewise, That whatsoever was Unextended was Nothing, were sensible of the Convenience of making Space thus to be a thing really distinct from Body, (from whence it would follow unavoidably, that it was an Affection, of Incorporeal Substance 3) and therefore acknowledged not Two Natures of Extended Things, but as we had it before in Aristotle, ὅπως τιν πλους ἔχων τοὺς των οὐκ αὐτίκοις, One only Nature, and that Bodily Space being therefore to them, either a mere Imaginary Thing, that hath no Reality without our Minds, but only a Phantom of our own, and in their Modern Language, a kind of Ghost, Apparition, or Spectre of a Body; or else indeed, the very Extension of Body it self, considered in General, and Abstractly from this or that Singular Body, Moveable. And these men therefore framed their Argumentation against an Incorporeal Deity after this manner. Nothing truly is, but what is Extended; or hath a Certain Magnitude, (because that which is Unextended and hath no Magnitude, is Nowhere, and consequently Nothing.) But whatsoever is Extended, and in a Place, is Body. Therefore is there no other Substance besides Body; and consequently there can be no Incorporeal Deity. Or else to put the Argument into a more Approvable Syllogistic Form, Whatsoever is Extended, is Body, or Corporeal; But Whatsoever Is, is Extended. Therefore
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fore Whatsoever is, is Body, or Corporeal. And by Consequence there can be no Incorporeal Deity.

To which Argumentation, the Assertors of Incorporeal Substance, have Replied Two manner of ways. For First, the Generality of the ancient Incorporealists, taking it for granted, that whatsoever was Extended in Magnitude, and had Parts one without another, was Disjoinable, as also probably, Impenetrable by any thing else Extended, because there can be no Penetration of Dimensions; and therefore no One Magnitude, can be Imbied or Swallowed up into another, but must of necessity stand without it, adding so much to the Quantity thereof: They readily gave their Assent to that Proposition, That Whatsoever is Extended, into Longitude, Latitude, and Profundity, is Body. But being strongly perfwaded of the Existence of some other Substance besides Body; they denied that Other Proposition of theirs, That Whatsoever is, is Extended; or What is Unextended is Nothing: maintaining that besides Body, or Extended Substance, there was another Substance Incorporeal, which therefore was aspenb, and ärmv, äär, and äpreä, and äxäteä, Unextended, and devoid of Quantity and Magnitude, without Parts, and Indivisible. That Plato himself Philosopherized after this manner, might be proved from sundry Passages of his Writings, as that in his Tenth De Legibus, where he affirmeth, that the Soul is Self, and those things which belong to it, as Cogitative, are πεζτηγε, μους συμμοταν ιι πασχε ιι πλατει, in Order of Nature, before the Longitude, and Latitude, and Profundity of Bodies. Where doubtings his meaning was not; as if there were a Longitude, Latitude, and Profundity in Souls, but of a different kind from that Longitude, Latitude, and Profundity of Bodies, and before it: but that Longitude, Latitude, and Profundity, being the Essential Properties of Body only; Soul and Cognition, as devoid of thefe, was in order of Nature before them. Again from that in his Times, where speaking of Space, Place, and Matter, he condemneth this for a Vulgar Error, That Whatsoever is, must of necessity be in some Place or other, and what is in No Place, is Nothing. τέρνον ζ ο ν γήνος τ’ αυτ’ σαρια, ζ ο ν παρεμον ονα τι ζ θει γινεσ πανι—πεζς ο η παρεμον μελπότατε, ηο ξαμο ν αναδεικου εναλ πα, το αν άπον ει τιν τόποι, ιι κατ’ ευν ηοι οικεμ παχι, το ια μυτε ει γη, μματειν κατ’ αεγμον, ειν εινας. The Third Kind, is that of Space, which gives room to all things that are Generated. And when we look upon this, we dreamlessly affirm, That every thing that is, must of necessity be in some Place, and possed a certain Room and Space, and that whatsover is not Somewhere, either in Earth or in Heaven, is Nothing. Which Dreamwe or Dreaming Imagination, (faith he, like a Gholt) continually haunteth and possedeth men, and that even then, when they think of that True and Awakened Nature of the Deity. Whereas this Philosopher himself, discoursing elsewhere of God, under the Title of τον πεξωκυς ης καληι, The Vast Sea of Pleritude, describeth him after this manner, καιν τ εν, ε ε γην, και σουφλη, καλα αυτη, μεθ’ αυτη, κατατηφιδι αιδ ην, το ι αλλα παντα καλη εκανε μπετηφηνα, As that which is not Any where, either in Earth, or in Heaven, but it self alone by It self, and With It self, all other Beautiful things Partaking of it. And as for Arisbt. Rrrr
P. 14, c. 7.

De An. L. 1. ε καλέω το λέγαν τη φυσικήν μέγαθον εκατ. ου τοις εις ες συνεσεις, δοσις εις νοσίς εις νοσίς τοις νοσίς εις την κεφαλήν τοις λόγοις, εις τοις καθένας, εις τοις μεγάλοις, διατηρησον της νοσίς της νοσίς εις τα τέλη, εις τα καθαιρήσεις, εις τοις μεγάλοις, έλλα τοις εις τα μεγάλοις, διατηρησον τοις νοσίς τοις νοσίς, τοις γραμματικοίς, τοις γραμματικοίς, τοις γραμματικοίς, τοις γραμματικοίς, τοις γραμματικοίς.

It is not rightly affirmed either of the Mundane, or Rational Soul, that they are Magnitudes. For the Intellec is One and Continuous, as Intellectual is, which is the same with the Intelligible. But these are one, not as Magnitudes, but as Numbers. Wherefore the Intellec is not so Continuous, but either devoid of Parts, or not Continuous as Magnitude. For bow, being Magnitude, could it
it understand with any of its parts, whether Conceived as Points, or as lesser Magnitudes; since either way, there would be an innumerable company of Intelligences. Moreover how can it conceive any thing that is indivisible, by what is Divisible? Furthermore in this same Book De Animal, Aristotle stily denies, Souls in general, either to be in a Place, or to be Locally Moved, otherwise than by Accident, as they are fad to be Moved, together with the Motion of the Body. Thus Simplicius, οὐ δὲ πάντως τὰς σωματικὰς ἀπο- 
τελεῖσθαι ἡ Ψυχὴ καὶ ἄλλας; Καὶ οὐκ ἂν αὐτόν ἣν ἢν. See how Aristotle doth every where remove, or exclude from the Soul, Corporeal (or Local) Motions. And Fol. 6, 

again ἀπεναντὶς μὴ μετασχηματίζοντας καὶ ποιμένα τὰ ἄνιομα καὶ πώλη 

Aristotle will by no means allow any Incorporeal things whatsoever, whether of the First, Second or Lowest rank, (they being all the Causes of motion) themselves to be moved. Philoponus likewise, ὀμοίως ἂς πρὸς τὰς σωματικὰς καὶ τὰς ἄνιομα, ἂν ἂν τῶν ἃνιομάς ἀντέλθην, οὐκ ἂν ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνον ἐκεῖνον πάν τι ἢ τὸ ἢ τὸ ἢ τὸ τὸ τὸ τὴν ὅτι. You see how Aristotle, respecting Corporeal Motions, pronounces of the Soul, that it is Immovable. For whatsoever is in a Place (and moveable) is Body. Lastly, in that Passage before cited, Aristotle plainly makes, the Essence of Corporeal Sub stance, as opposed to Incorporeal, to consist in Magnitude.

Besides Plato and Aristotle, we might here instance in sundry other, of the ancient Incorporealists, who clearly maintained the same Doctrine. Philo doth not only assert in general, a Double Essence or Substance, ἀπόστισμα, and παύσηματος, a Distant, and 

In-distant one: but somewhere writeth thus concerning the Deity, ὅτι De Causis, 

τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπελεύσθη τῆς πνευμάτως, τις ἐπελεύσθη τῆς πνευμάτως, τις ἐπελεύσθη τῆς Λίγης. p. 339. 

δεικνύει συμμόρφωσις ἑνώς μετά, δεικνύει μὲν ὅτι η΅ ήν ἀκέραίον καὶ τόπον ἀοίδης τοῖς 

σώματας συμμόρφωσις τῆς η΅ πνευμάτως ἢ καθὼς τῷ γνώμοναν οὕτως ἕπειτα περι-

ἑρείδομεν· παράλληλον, οὕτως ἐκεῖνον τοῦ πνεύματος ὅτι η΅ τις τὸν ἄνιομα ὑπάρχει, διὰ γὰρ η΅ ἀκέραίον ἀκέραίοις τῷ ἐν 

ἀνθρώποις τούτοις, &c. All things are filled with God, as Containing them, but not as being Contained by them, or in them; to whom alone it belongeth to be, both Every where and No where. No where beaues himself Created Space and Place, together with Bod 

ies, and it is not Lawful to include the Creator, within any of his Creatures. And Every where, because he extendeth his Virtues and Powers, throughout Earth and Water, Air and Heaven, and 

leaveth no Part of the World destitute thereof, but collecting all things together under himself, hath bound them fast with Invisible Bonds. But none hath more indifferently pursu'd this busines; then Plotinus who every where affers, Body and Magnitude, to be one and the same thing, and that besides this, there is another Substance Incorporeal, which confequently is ἀπόστισμα, ἀμαχή, and ἀμαχή, de 

void of Quantity, and of Magnitude, and of Parts, locally distant from one another; ὅ τι τῇ ἀοίδῃ ἄκερατον τῇ πνευμάτως ἐχεῖν, ἦθελον, That one and the self 

same Numerical thing, may be all of it, entirely Every where. Wherein his Principal design was to Prove, that the Deity, is not Part of it.
here, and part of it there; and so much thereof in one place, and so much in another (as if the very Substance of it were Mensurable by Yards and Poles) but the whole Undivided Deity, every where, 

And Divines may, &c.

it is not at all to be wondered at, that God being not in a Place, should be present to every thing that is in a Place, wholly and entirely: Reason pronouncing, that having no place, must therefore of necessity be Elys, all of him Indivisibly Present, to whatsoever he is Present. Neither is this, faith he, a thing only deduced by Reason, but that which is before Reason, suggested, by the Infinities of Mankind; to which (with) the Infinites of Nature, speak of that God, who is in every one of us, as supposing him to be one and the same in all. Where the Philosopher subjoins, ζς ζς πρὸς τοιαύτης ἐξήγη, ἵνα ἐκεῖ ἁπαντές φησιν, &c. And this is the Firmest of all Principles, that which our Souls do, as it were, Naturally and of themselves speak, and which is not Collected by Reason, but comes forth from them, before Ratiocination. Moreover he often affirmeth of the humane Soul, or rather takes it as a thing for granted, that this is, the Whole or All of it, in every part of the Body, that is Undividedly; εἰς τὸ ἀρχεῖον, τῷ αὐτῷ ἐξηγήσας, τῷ ἐν τῷ ποιεῖ, τῇ χειλὶ ὑπερέχει. As for the humane Soul, it is one and the same Numerically, in the Hand and in the Foot. And again, ζνὲ ποτέ ἐν τῷ ποιεῖ τῇ χειλὶ τῷ αὐτῷ, τῷ ἐν τῷ μεχρὶ τοῦ ποιεῖ, οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ τῷ ἐν τῷ, Since we commonly suppose, our own Soul to be the same, both in our foot and in our hand; why should we not in like manner, acknowledge, that of the Mundane Soul or Deity, which is in one part of the Universe, to be the same with that in another? In like manner Simplicius, proving that Body is not the first Principle, because there must of necessity be something Self-moving, and what is so, must needs be Incorporeal, writeth thus, τὸ τοῦτον ἐν μιᾷ ἑνίκη ἐνίκη ἐνὶ ἅν ἀνίκητον, μετενὸς χρῆ ἄκινητον ὑποτρίχως, ὥστε δικαίως ἦν οὔθεν ἐκαύτης ὑπομονήθην, ὅπως σῶσω ἑνὸς ἐναρτήσατο ἑιρημίῳ ὑπῆρχεν, τὸ τὸν ἐναρτὸν, αὐτὸν τὸν αὐτὸν κινήματος. Because what is such, must of necessity be Indivisible, and Indisistant, for were it Divisible, and Distant, it could not all of it be conjoined with its whole self; so that the whole should both actively move, and be moved. Which same thing seemeth further Evident, in the Souls being All Conscious of Itself, and Reflexive upon its whole Self, which could not be, were one part of it Distant from another. Again the same Philosopher, expressly denieth, the Soul though a Self-moving Substance, to be at all Locally Moved, other wise then by accident in respect of the Body, which is moved by it, τῷ τοῦ σωματικοῦ κινήματος καταφέρεται (τὸ τοῦ εἰκόνος καταφέρεται) ἀλλὰ τοῦ σωματικοῦ, ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν σωματικῶν κινήσεων, The Soul being not Moved by Corporeal or Local Motions (for in respect of these it is Immovable) but by Cogitative ones only, (the
We should omit the Testimonies of any more Philosophers, were it not, that we find Porphyry so full and express herein; who makes this the very beginning of his ἄριστος πρὸς τὰ νοῦς, his Μανυδείσιον to Intelligibles; πᾶν σώμα έν τῷ τόπῳ, καθ' ἑαυτῷ ἀρκάματον εν τῷ τόπῳ. That though Every Body be in a Place, yet Nothing that is properly Incorporeal, is in a Place: and who afterwards further pursues it in this manner, ἦν τετίθις διαφέρει τὸ ἀκαθάρτον ἐκείνας ἐκεῖνος. ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. οὕτω μετατρέπεται τόπος. The God, is therefore Every where, because he is Nowhere; and the same is true also of the Second and Third Divine Hypothesis, Nous and Psyche. The Supreme God is Every where and No where, in respect of those things which are after him, and only his own and in himself. Nous or Intellect is in the Supreme God; Every where and No where as to those things that are after him. Psyche or the Mundane Soul is both in Intellect and the Supreme God, and Every where and No where as to Bodies. Lastly, Body, is both in the Soul of the World, and in God. Where he denies, God to be Locally in the Corporeal World, and thinks it more proper to say that the Corporeal World is in God, then God in it, because the World is held and contained in the Divine Power, but the Deity is not in the Locality of the World. Moreover he further declares his Senex after this manner; ὅτι εἶ καὶ χάθει ὁ πρῶτα μανθανόν, ἐν καθ' ὑπουργόν τὴν ἐναλλακτικάν σαφῶς καὶ αὐτῶν ἀλλοιώσαν, ὄντων ἀνεφεξεν εἰρηνευτικάν, Nor if there were conceived to be, such an Incorporeal Space or Vacuum (as Democritus and Epicurus supposed) could Mind or God, possibly Exist in this Empty Space, (as Co-extended with the fame) for this would be only Receptive of Bodies, but it could not receive the Energie of Mind or Intellect, nor give any Place or Room to that, being no Bulkie thing. And again, ὣς μὲν καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ἐν τῇ ἐναλλακτικῇ πλεῖστῃ, τό δὲ ἀκαθάρτων τοῦ μόνου μακρότερος καὶ ἀναπληρώthora τοῦ δὲ κόσμου εἰς δικτύων ὁλων γίνεται, καὶ ποιεῖν μᾶς τούτων ἐν αὐτῷ.
And as for Christian Writers, besides Origen, who was so famous an Afferter of Incorporeal Substance, that (as Socrates recordeth) the Egyptian Monks and Anthropomorphitiques, threatened death to Theophilus the Alexandrian Bishop, unless he would at once excreate and renounce the Writings of Origen, and professe the Belief of a Corporeal God, of Humane Form; and who also maintained Incorporeal Substance to be Unextended, as might be proved from Sundry Passages, both of his Book against Celsus, and that Peri Archon; we say (besides Origen and others of the Grecians) St. Augustine amongst the Latins, clearly affereth the same, he maintaining in his Book, De Quantaitate Anima, and else where, concerning the Humane Soul, that being Incorporeal, it hath no Dimensions of Length, Breadth and Profundity, and is Illocably, No where as in a Place. We thall conclude, with the Testimony of Boetius, who was both a Philosopher and a Christian, Quedam sunt (Faith he) Commones Animi Conceptiones, per se notae, apud Sapientes tantum; Ut Incorporta non esse In Loco; There are certain Common Conceptions, or Notions of the Mind, which are known by themselves amongst wise men only, as this for example, That Incorporeals are in No Place. From whence it is manifest, that the generality of reputed Wise men, were not formerly of this opinion, Quod Nulquam est nihil est, That what is No where, or in no certain Place, is Nothing; and that this was not look'd upon by them as a Common Notion, but only as a Vulgar Error.

By this time we have made it unquestionably Evident, that this Opinion of Incorporeal Substance being Unextended, Indistant, and Void of Magnitude, is no Novel or Recent thing, nor first started in the Scholastick Age, but that it was the general Perswasion, of the most ancient and learned Afferters of Incorporeal Substance; especialy, that the Deity was not Part of it Here, and Part of it There, nor the Substance thereof Mensurable by Yards and Poles, as if there were so much of it contained in one Room, and so much and no more in another, according to their several Dimensions; but that the whole Undivided Deity, was at once in Every Part of the world, and consequently No where Locally after the manner of Bodies. But because this opinion, seems so Strange and Paradoxical, and lies under so great Prejudice
Prejudices, we shall in the next place show, how those ancient Incorporealists, endeavoured to acquit themselves in repelling the several efforts and chances made against it. The first whereof is this, That to suppose Corporeal Substances, Unextended and Indivisible, is to make them Absolute Paradoxes, and by means of that, to render them all, (even the Deity it self) contemptible; since they must of necessity be either Physical Minimums, that cannot Actually be divided further by reason of their Littleness, (if there be any such thing) or else meer Mathematical Points, which are not so much as Mentally Divisible: so that Thouands of These Corporeal Substances, or Spirits, might Dance together at once upon a Needle's Point.

To which it was long since thus Replied by Plotinus, έχει οὕτως τις εἰσαγωγής μεγάλης ὅτι ὅτι τὸν ἄθικον τοῦ καὶ μεγάλον ἐναλλάξαι ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄθικον ὡς αἰτίαν, καὶ τὸν ἄθικον αὐτῶς ἐφαρματικὸν; οὐκ αὖ ἐν αὐτῶν ἀφερείας ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄθικον ἐν αἰτίᾳ, τὸν ἄθικον ἐφαρματικὸν τὸν ἄθικον τὸν ἄθικον. God and all other Corporeal Substances, are not so Indivisible, as if they were Parasitical, or Little things, as Physical Points; for so would they still be Mathematically Divisible, nor yet, as if they were Mathematical Points neither, which indeed are no Bodies nor Substances, but only The Terminus of a Line. And neither of these wavers could the Deity Conguere, with the world, or Souls with their respective Bodies, so as to be all present with the whole of them. Again he writeth particularly concerning the Deity thus, οὕτως ἐναλλάξαι, ἐὰν τὸ σύμφωνον, καὶ ἄλλας ἔναλλάς 
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Incorp. no Points, nor Parvitudes. Book I.


Incorp., &c. By a Body, \\
there is
equally,
equal to

in bulk,
because
there is
Great,
and the
Littleest
of whatever is Little (it being more indivi-
dable and more One with itself, than any thing that is Little, and more powerful than any thing that is Great) So that it is above both the Greatest, and the Least; it being found, all one and the same, by every Greatest and every Smallest thing, participating thereof. Wherefore you must neither look upon God, as the Greatest thing, (that is in a way of quantity) for then you may well doubt, how being the Greatest, He can be all of him present with every Least thing, neither diminished nor contract-ed nor yet must you look upon him, as the Least thing neither for if you do so, then will you be at a loss again, how being the Least thing, he can be present, with all the Greatest Bulks, neither multiplied nor augmented.

In a word, the Sum of their Anfwers amounts to this, that an Incorporeal Unextended Deity is neither a Physical Point, because this hath Distance in it, and is Mentally Divisible; nor yet a Mathematical One; because This though having neither Magnitude nor Substance in it, hath notwithstanding Site and Position, a Point being according to Aristotle, a Monad having Site and Position. It is not to be conceived as a Parvitude or very Little thing, because then it could not Converge, with all the Greatest things; nor yet as a Great thing, in a way of Quantity and Extension, because then it could not be All of it Present, to every Least thing. Nor does True Greatest confift, in a way of Bulk or Magnitude, all Magnitude being but Little, since there can be no Infinite Magnitude, and no Finite Magnitude can have Infinite Power, as Aristotle before urged. And to conclude, though some who are far from Atheists, may make themselves merry, with that Conciet, of Thousands of Spirits, dancing at once upon a Needle's Point, and though the Atheists, may endeavour, to Rogue and Ridicule, all Incorporeal Substance in that manner; yet does this run upon a clear Mistake of the Hypotheses, and make nothing at all against it; for as much as an Unextended Substance, is neither any Parvitude, as is here supposed (because it hath no Magnitude at all) nor hath it any Place, or Site, or Local Motion, properly belonging to it; and therefore can neither Dance upon a Needles Point, nor any where else.

But in the next place, it is further Objected; That What is neither Great nor Little, what possesseth no Space, and hath no Place nor Site amongst Bodies, must therefore needs be an Absolute Non-Entity, for as much as Magnitude or Extension, are the very Essence of Being or Entity, as such; so that there can be neither Substance nor Accident Unextended. Now since whatsoever is Extended, is Bodily, there can therefore be no other Substance besides Body, nor any thing Incorporeal, otherwise then as that word may be taken, for a Thin and Subtile Body, in which Sense Fire was by some in Aristotle, said to be Indistinct, and insensible of its own motion, and that motion's motion; The most Incorporeal of all the Elements; and Aristotle himself used the word in the same manner when
when he affirmeth, that all Philosophers did define the Soul, by Three things, Motion, Sense, and Incorporeity; several of those there mentioned by him, understanding the Soul to be no otherwise Incorporeal, than as omnia levitatem, A Thin and Subtle Body. In answer to which Objection; we may remember that Plato in the passage before cited, declareth this to be but a Vulgar Error, that whatsoever doth not take up Space, and is in no Place, is Nothing. He Intimates the Original hereof, to have sprung, from men's adhering too much to those Lower Faculties, of Sense and Imagination, which are able to conceive Nothing, but what is Corporeal. And accordingly Plotinus, v. meum aedem, et prospiciemus auspices, hoc agitur, &. p. 656. οτι τα το το το τον οτιον νομισματος, ίνα τοιαυτά περί τινων ουκ ξένων, καί τοιαύτα πατώματα, των ουκομήν, ἀλλά τα οὐκομήν μαθώματα, οἴνων ἀγαπήσαντος. Sense indeed, which we attending to, disbelieve these things, tells us of Here and There; but Reason dictates, that Here and There, is so to be understood of the Deity, not as if it were Extendedly Here and There, but because every Extended thing, and the several parts of the World, partake everywhere of that, being Indigant and Unextended. To the fame purpoze Porphyrius, δεί τοιν ποιον αν τοις ουκέταις καλαμακρατίας, περί έκατέρω ιδεών. Αφ. Ρ. 242. του μικρούλλαξα τάς φύσεις, μικρούλλαξα το περιστάτος τοις σώμασις, οί τοιαύται, μικρόμακαρίτις καὶ δοξάζων το τοποθέτησαν των μεν των φύσεων, εν συνεχεια πιε τοιαύτας μελαις εν γενετος γινομαι, ἀκούσαν εις αυτόν, κας κας υπό φαντασμάς μεταητας. We ought therefore, in our Disquisitions concerning Corporeal and Incorporeal Beings, to conserve the Property of each, and not to confound their Natures. But especially to take heed, that our Phanony and Imagination, do not so far impose upon our judgments, as to make us attribute to Incorporeals, what properly belongeth to Bodies only. For we are all accustomed to Bodies, but as for Incorporeals scarcely any one reaches to the knowledge of them; men alwayes fluttering about them and disdaining them, so long as they are held under the Power of their Imagination. Where afterwards he propoundeth a Form for this, How we should think of Incorporeals, so as not to Confound their Natures with Corporeals; 30 in ανάφθεις μετα το διάκομι παρεσέων, διά τον αδιάκομι, κατά μεταγόν περικειν, της μεγαρίδος μέρους, ἀπὸ του πλαῦσης παρεχεῖν ἑαυτόν κόσμον πλακασάνθιν, αλλὰ ὁλον πατώματι τοις μερεσι τῆς δικαιομαι. εντι οικαντο το πλαύσης, ακούσαν κατὰ οικανήσας. κατὰ αν οικακας τῆς μεγαρίδος ἀπολογία ων αυτή. That the Indigant and Unextended Deity, is the Whole of it present in Infinite Parts of the Distant World, neither Divided, as applying part to part; nor yet Multiplied into many Wholes, according to the multiplicity of those things that partake thereof. But the whole of it (One and the same in Number) is present to all the Parts of the Bulk: World, and to every one of those many things in it; Undoubtedly and Unmultipliedly that in the mean time partaking thereof Dividedly. It was granted therefore by those Ancients, that this Unextended and Indigant Nature, of Incorporeals, is ἀφαντιστον, a thing altogether Unimaginables, and this was concluded by them, to be the only Reason, why so many have pronounced it to be Impossible, because they attended only to Sense and Imagination, and made them the only Measure of Things and Truths; it having been accordingly maintained by divers of them, (as Porphyrius tells us) that Imagination and Intellection, are
but Two different Names, for one and the same thing; and no more, between Mind and Imagination. Phancy and Imagination in Rational Animals, seeming to be the same thing with Intellectual or Reason, but there are many things, which no man can have any Phantom or Imagination of, and yet are they notwithstanding by all Unquestionably acknowledged for Entitie or Realities, from whence it is plain, that we must have some other Faculties in us, which Extend beyond Phantasm and Imagination. Reason indeed dictates, that whatsoever can either Do or Suffer any thing, must therefore be undoubtedly Something: but whatsoever is Unextended, and hath no Diffant Parts, one without another, must therefore needs be Nothing, is no Common Notion, but the Spurious Suggestion of Imagination only, and a Vulgar Error. There need to be no fear at all, Left a Being Infinitely Wise and Powerful, which Acts upon the whole world; and all the Parts thereof, in Framing and Governing the same, should prove a Non-Entity, merely for want of Bulk and Extension, or because it Swells not out into Space and Distance as Bodies do, therefore Vanish into Nothing. Nor does Active Force and Power, as such, depend upon Bulk and Extension, because then, whatsoever had the greater Bulk, would have the greater Activity. There are therefore, Two kinds of Substances in the Universe, the First Corporeal, which are Nothing but Ones, Bulk, or Tumours, devoid of all Self-Creative Power; the Second, which are Solid, Substantial Powers, Vigorous, and Activities; which though they act upon Bulk and Extension, yet are themselves Unhulkie and devoid of Quantity and Dimensions; however they have a certain body in them in another Sense, an Essential Profundity, according to this of Simplicius, μὲν γὰρ μὲν ἄπλακα ἄκομα ἄνεμον ἐκ τοῦ ποταίμου, ἀμαν ἀλλὰς τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἄνεμον: ἀκόμας ἄκομα οὐκ ἔχοντες ὑπὸ καὶ ἐδιακομοῖς ἀπό τὸν ἐφεξῆς. All Corporeal Substance, is simply Divisible, some Parts of it being here and there, but Intellectual Substance, is Indivisible, and without Dimensions, though it hath much of Depth and Profundity in it in another Sense. But that there is some thing ἀφαντός Unimaginable even in Body it self, is evident, whether you will suppose it to be Infinitely Divisible or Not, as you must of Necessity suppose, one or other of these. And that we ought not always to pronounce of Corporeal Things themselves, according to Imagination, is manifest from hence; because though Astronomical Reasons, allure us, that the Sun is really more than a Hundred Times bigger than the whole Earth, yet can we not possibly for all that, Imagine the Sun of such a Bigness, nor indeed the Earth it self; half so big as we know it to be. The reason whereof is, partly because we never had a Sense or Sight of any such Vast Bigness at once, as that of either of them, and partly because our Senses always representing the Sun to us, but as πέντεος, as of a Foot Diameter, and we being accustomed always to Imagine the same according to the Appearance of Sense, are not able to frame any Imagination of it, as very much Bigger. Wherefore if Imagination be not to be Trusted, nor made the Criterion or Measure of Truth, as to Sensible things themselves, much less ought it to be, as to Things Insemple. Besides all which, the Ancient
Ancient Incorporealists, argued after this manner, that it is, as Difficult for us to conceive, a Substance whose Duration is Unextended or Unstretched out in Time, into Past, Present and Future, and therefore without Beginning; as that which is Unextended as to Parts, Place or Space, in Length, Breadth and Thickness; yet does reason pronounce, that there must needs be, not only a Duration without Beginning, but also a Species of Time, a Timeless Eternity, or a Permanent Duration, differing from that Successive Flux of Time; (which is one of Plato's Arguments, Things Generated, or that had a Beginning.) This Parity of Reason is by Plotinus thus inlilted on, ἄριστον ἐν χρόνῳ, R. 669, να τὸ μὲν ὕγιαν ἄκρωτον ἔνακτι πρὸς διάστασιν, τὸ δὲ ἀκρότον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μέγεθῳ καὶ κρίσισι, καὶ πλέον ἄντις δυνάμει ἀκρότον, τὸ ἐν τοῖς πάντα δεσμοῖς καὶ ὕγιαν χρόνῳ. For the same reason, that we deny Local Extension, to the Deity, must we also deny Temporal Distance to the same: and affirm that God is not in Time, but above Time, in Eternity. For as much as Time, is always Scattered and Stretched out in Length, and Distance, one moment following after another, but Eternity remaineth in the same, without any Flux, and yet nevertheless outgoeth Time, and transcendent the Flux thereof, though seeming to be stretched and spun out more into Length. Now the reason why we cannot frame a Conception of such a Timeless Eternity, is only because our selves are Essentially Involved in Time, and accordingly are our Conceptions Chained, Fettered, and Confined, to that narrow and dark Dungeon, that our selves are Imprisoned in; Notwithstanding which, our Freer Faculties, alluring us of the Existence of a Being, which far transcendent our selves, to wit, one that is Infinitely Perfect; we have by means hereof, a certain Vision, of such a Standing Timeless Eternity, as its Duration.

But as for that Conceit, of Immaterial or Incorporeal Bodies; or, that God, and Humane Souls, are no otherwise Incorporeal, than as οὐκ ἄκρωτος, a Thin and Subtle Body; such as Wind or Vapour, Air, or Ether; it is certain, that according to the Principles of the most ancient Atomick Philosophy, (before it was Atheized) there being no such Real Quantity of Subtlety or Tenacity, (because this is altogether Unintelligible) but this Difference arising wholly, from Motion, Dividing the Infusible Parts, and every way Agitating the same, together with a certain Contexture of those Parts; it is not Impossible but that the Finest and most Subtle Body that is, might become as Great, Hard, Heavy, and Opake, as Flesh, Earth, Stones, Lead, or Iron; and again that the Grofiest of these Bodies, by Motion and a Different Contexture of Parts, might not only be Crystallized, but also become as Thin, Soft, and Fluid as the Finest Ether. So that, there is no Specific Difference, betwixt a Thick and Thin, a Great and Fine, an Opake and Pellucid, an Hard and Soft Body; but Accidental only; and therefore is there no reason, why Life and Understanding, should be thought to belong to the one, rather than to the other of them. Besides which, the Reaons of the ancient Incorporealists, (afterwards to be produced) will Evince that the Humane Soul and Mind, cannot possibly be any Body whatsoever, though never so Fine, Thin, and Subtle; whole Parts are by Motion Dividable and Separable from one another.
But it is further Objected against this Unextended Nature, of Incorporated Substances, as they are said to be All in the Whole, and all in every Part of that Body, which they are united to, or Act upon; that this is an Absolute Contradiction and Impossibility; because if the Whole of the Deity, be in this One Point of Matter, then can there be Nothing at all of it, in the Next adjoining: but that must needs be another Whole, and Nothing the same with the former. In like manner, if the whole Humane Soul, be in this one Part of the Organized Body, then can there be none at all of it, in any other Part thereof; and so not the Whole in the Whole. To which Objection, the ancient Incorporatedists, made this Twofold Reply. First, in way of Concession, That this is indeed an Absolute Contradiction, for an Extended Substance, or Body, to be All of it in every one Part or Point of that Space, which the whole occupieth. Thus Plotinus, συνίσται αὐθαίρως ἐν πλεον τῷ αὐτῷ ὅλῳ ἑαυτῷ, καὶ τῷ μέρει ὅπου τῇ ὅλῳ ἐκτείνεται. It is Impossible for a Body, or Extended Substance, to be one and the same, All of it in every Part of that Space, which it possesseth; and for every Part thereof, to be the same with the Whole. But Secondly, as for an Unextended and Indisjunt Substance, which hath no Parts one without another, it is so far from Being a Contradiction, that it should be All of it in every Part of that Body, which it Acts upon; that it is Impossible it should be otherwise, only a Part in a Part thereof; so that an Equal Quantity of both, should Co-Exist together, because this is to suppost an Unextended Substance to be Extended. We say it is Contradictious to the Nature of that Substance, which is supposed to be, ἀμεγένος ἀμίσος, ἀδίαιρος, ἀμείγος, ἀδιάβολος, Devoid of Magnitude, and of Quantity, and of Parts, Indisjunt, and Indivisible; that it should be otherwise United to, or Conjoined with, an Extended Body, then after this way, which is look’d upon as such Con-juring; namely, that the Whole of it should be present with, and Act upon every Part thereof. Thus Plotinus, ὅτε δὲ λόγος ἐκ αὐτῷ ἐκ τούτος, καὶ δὲ ἐκς αὐτοῦ ἐκτείνεται ὅλῳ ὅπου καὶ ἐκς αὐτοῦ ἐκτείνεται ὅλῳ. This Form of Doctrine, concerning Incorporated, is necessarily taken from the thing itself, (Viz. the nature of them as Unextended) and hath Nothing in it Alien from that Essence, as confounding the Corporal Nature therewith. Whatsoever is Unextended and Indisjunt, cannot possibly Co-Exist, with an Extended Substance, Point by Point, and Part by Part, but it must of necessity be, ὅλων ἐν τοῖς ὕπον ὄχλοις, All of it, one and the same Numerically; that is, (like it self) Undividedly, in every Part of that, which it Acts upon. Wherefore the word ὅλων, in this Form, when it is said, that the Whole Deity, is in every Part of the World, and the Whole Soul in every Part of the Body, is not to be taken in a Positive sense, for a Whole consisting of Parts, one without another, but in a Negative only, for μὴ μεμορφυζόν, An Whole Undivided; so that the meaning thereof is no more than this, that the Deity is not Dividedly, in the World, nor the Soul Dividedly in the Body, a Part here, and a Part There; but The τὸ ὅλων, is τοῦ νόμῳ ἐν τοῖς ὕπον μὲν μεμορφυζόν, ὅπου εὖ ἀνθρώπινον, Everywhere, All of it, Undividedly. Thus again Plotinus, ὅτε δὲ μεμορφυζόν ἐστὶ τῷ ὅλων καὶ μεμορφυζόν, τοῦ ὅλων ἐν τοῖς ὕπον μὲν μεμορφυζόν, καὶ ὅπου εὖ ἀνθρώπινον, τοῦ ὅλων καὶ μεμορφυζόν, τοῦ ὅλων καὶ μεμορφυζόν.
All in Every Part.

The Fourth and Last Objection, against Incorporeal and Unextended Subistence, is from that Illocality, and Immobility, (which will follow thereupon) of Humane Souls, and other Finite Particular Spirits, such as Demons or Angels; That this is not only in it self very Ab- surd, to suppose these Finite and Particular Beings, to be thus Illocal and Immoveable; No where, and Every where: (from whence it would seem to follow that they might Act the whole Corporeal Universe, or take cognizance of all things therein Every where) but also, that this Consec is Contradictious to the Very Principles of Religio- nists themselves, and plainly Confuted by the same: they acknow- ledging Universally, that Humane Souls (at Death) departing out of this Body, do Locally move from thence, into a certain other Place, Called Hades, Hell, or Inferi. Now the Latter Part of this Objection is First to be Anwered. And this is indeed a thing, which the ancient Afferters of Incorporeal Substance, as Unextended, were not unaware of; That the Vulgarly Received Tradition, of Humane Souls, (after Death) going into Hades, might be Objected against them. For the Satisfying whereof, Plutinus suggeteth these Two Things: First, To μὲν εἰς Ἀδην ἔβαλεν, εἰ μὲν ἐν τῷ Ἀιθέρι τῶν Ἀνάγκαι, Ep. 6. L. 4. That if by Hades be meant, nothing but to άδην; The Invisible, (as many times it is) then is there no more signified by the Souls going into Hades, than its no longer being Vitaly united to this Earthly Body, and but Alling apart by it self, and so hath it nothing of Place necessarily included in it. Secondly, Εἰ ταύτα χάριν τόπων, ἡ άνάγκαι: Εἰ ταύτα τούτων ήμαν ἐν τῷ τόπων καθενός λέγων εἰκά ἀλλών οὐκ ἐπάλαισθαι, οὐ τὸ εὐδοκινε εἰ μὲ αὖτίς πολυδέο, πάσης εἰς τούτων οὐ τὸ εὐδοκινε: But if by Hades be understood a Certain Worser Place, (as sometimes it also is.)
Soul always United to some Body. Book I.

What wonder is this? since now where our Body is, there in the same place is our Soul said to be also? But you will reply, how can this be, when there is now no longer any Body left? We answer, that if the Idol of the Soul be not quite Separated from it, Why should not the Soul itself be said to be there also, where its Idol is? Where by the Idol of the Soul Plotinus seems to mean, an Airy or Spirituous Body, Quickned and Vitalized by the Soul, adhering to it after death. But when the same Philosopher supposes, this very Idol of the Soul to be also Separable from it, and that so as to subsist apart by it felt too, this going alone into Hades, or the World Place, whilst that liveth only in the Intelligible World (where there is no Place nor Distance) lodged in the Naked Deity, having nothing at all of Body hanging about it, and being now not a Part but the Whole, and so Situate neither here nor there; in this High Flight of his, he is at once, both Absurdly Paradoxical, in dividing the Life of the Soul as it were into Two, and forgot the Doctrine of his own School, which as himself elsewhere intimateth, was this, "in him, the mind, soul, to be of one spirit, and adhering which are, why should it not be so of the Soul, as it is?" Our Soul, though it shall quit this Body, yet shall it never be disunited from all Body. Wherefore Porphyry answering the same Objection, though he was otherwife much addicted to Plotinus, and here utes his Language too, yet does he in this depart from him, adhering to the ancient Pythagoric Tradition, which as will appear afterwards, was this, "That Humane Souls are always United to some Body or other."

As the Souls being here upon Earth, (faith he) is not its moving up and down upon it, after the manner of Bodies, but its Presiding over a Body which moveth upon the Earth; so is its being in Hades, nothing but its presiding over that Idol, or Enlivened Vaporous Body, whose Nature it is to be in a Place, and which is of a Dark Subsistence. Wherefore if Hades be taken for a Subterraneous and Dark Place, yet may the Soul notwithstanding, be said to go into Hades, because when it quits this Gross Earthly Body, a more Spirituous and Subile Body, collected from the Spheres (or Elements) doth still accompany it. Which Spirit being Moihe and Heavy, and naturally descending to the Subterraneous places, the Soul itself may be said in this sense to go Under the Earth also, with it, not as if the Substance thereof, passed from One Place to Another, but because of its Relation and Vital Union to a Body which does so. When Porphyry addeth, contrary to the Sense of Plotinus; That the Soul is never quite Naked of all Body; but hath always some Body or other joined with it suitable and agreeable to its own present Disposition (either a Purer or Impurer one.) But that at its first quitting the Gross Earthly Body, the Spirituous Body, which accompanyeth it, (its Vehicle) must needs go away Fouled and Incrassated with the gross Vo.
But because this Doctrine of the Ancient Incorporalists, concerning the Humane Soul being always (after Death) United to some Body or other, is more fully declared by Philoponus, then by any other, that we have yet met withal, we shall here excerp some Passages out of him about it. First therefore, he declareth this for his own opinion, agreeable to the Sense of the best Philosophers: this 

\[\text{The Irrational Life of the Soul, hath not all its Being, in this Gros Earthy Body, but remaineth after the Souls Departure out of it; having for its Vehicle and Subject, the Spiritual Body. Which it self is also compounded out of the Four Elements, but receiveth its Denomination from the Predominant Part, to wit Air: as this Gros Body of ours is called Earthy, from what is most Predominant therein. Thus do we see, that according to Philoponus, the Humane Soul after Death, does not meetly exercise its Rational Powers, and think only of Metaphysical and Mathematical Notions, Abstractive things, which are neither in Time nor Place, but exerciseth also its Lower Sensitive and Irrational Faculties, which it could not possibly do, were it not then Vitaly United to some Body; and this Body then accompanying the Soul, he calls Pneumatical, that is (not Spiritual in the Scripture-Sense, but) Spiritual, Vaporous, or Airy. Let us therefore in the next place see, what Rational Account, Philoponus can give of this Doctrine of the Antients, and of his Own Opinion agreeably thereunto, &c.]

\[\text{Chap. V. Body: the Old Philos. Cabala.}
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\[\text{Purged}\]
The Souls Spirituous or Airy

Book I.

Purged and Cleansed in this Life) after its departure out of this Body, is acknowledged, or rather Demonstrated, to go into Hades, there to receive Punishment, for its evil Actions past. For Providence does not only take Care of our Being, but also of our Well-Being. Therefore is the Soul though lamped into a Preter-Natural State, yet not neglected by Providence, but hath a Convenient Care taken of it; in order to its Recovery. And since Sinning had its Original from the Defile of Pleasure, it must of necessity be Cured by Pain. For here also Contraries are the Cures of Contraries. Therefore the Soul being to be Purged, is Punished and Pained in those Subterraneous Judicatories and Prisons, in order to its Amendment. But if the Soul be Incorporeal, it is impossible for it to Suffer. How then can it be Punished? There must of Necessity be some Body joined with it: Which being immediately Conjoined or Agitated, Concreted, or Secreted, and Discordantly Moved, by Heat and Cold, or the like, may make the Soul sensible of Pain by reason of Sympathy as it is here in this Life. What Body therefore, is that which is then Conjoined with the Soul, after the dissolution of that Earthly Body, into its Elements? Certainly it can be no other, than this Pneumatical, or Spirituous Body, which we now speak of. In this are Seated, as their Subject, the Invisible and Conceivable Passions, and they are inseparable from the same, nor could they be in the Soul, disunited from all Body. And that Soul which is freed from these, would be forthwith freed from Generation; nor would it be concerned in those Subterraneous Judicatories and Prisons, but be carried up aloft, to the higher Celestial Regions, &c. After which he endeavours further to confirm this Opinion, from the Vulgar Phenomena, δὴ ἵνα εἰς μαλλον ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκόσμον ὑπάρχωσι, καὶ τὸ βέβαιον σώμα, τὸ ἐκ τῆς Κάλλεως ὑπάρχωσι, εἰς ὑπάρχον πριν τῆς μετατροπῆς των ἀνθρώπων. Εἰ γὰρ οὖ χρώμα τῶν πολιτικῶν τὰ χαμαρίαν παντακυρίας, τὸ δὲ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἁγίων ψυχῶν, οὕτως τῆς σύμμετρας, πληθυνθέντος τῆς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον, τῆς τοῦ σώματος, τῆς τῶν πολιτικῶν. Εἰ δὲ τῶν μυστικῶν τῆς σύμμετρας, τῆς τῶν πολιτικῶν. Εἰ γὰρ τῶν μυστικῶν τῶν θανάτων, τῶν μεταβολῶν καὶ μετασχηματισμῶν, τῶν τοιαύτων, τὰ παρατίθημα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τῶν κατὰ τῶν ψυχῶν. Τοῦτο, κατὰ τὴν κατά τὰ πάντα τῆς κατακαίματος. Παρατίθεται, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ζωτικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοτυπικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοκοιμικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοσυμφωνικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωουργικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοποιικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοφέρων, ἐν τῷ ζωοσυνεσχηματικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοποιητικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωομυθητικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωομεταμορφωτικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοκατακαίματικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοκατακαίματικῷ. Εἰ δὲ τῶν μυστικῶν τῶν θανάτων, τῶν μεταβολῶν καὶ μετασχηματισμῶν, τῶν τοιαύτων, τὰ παρατίθημα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τῶν κατὰ τῶν ψυχῶν. Τοῦτο, κατὰ τὴν κατά τὰ πάντα τῆς κατακαίματος. Παρατίθεται, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ζωτικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοτυπικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοκοιμικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοσυμφωνικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοποιικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοφέρων, ἐν τῷ ζωοσυνεσχηματικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοποιητικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωομυθητικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωομεταμορφωτικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοκατακαίματικῷ, ἐν τῷ ζωοκατακαίματικῷ.
CHAP. V.  Body (Supposed) after Death.  787

They further add, that there is Something of the Plantal and Flaschick Life also, Exercised by the Soul, in those Spiritual or Airy Bodies, after Death; they being Nourished too; though not after the same manner, as those Gross Earthy Bodies of ours are here, but by Vapours; and that not by Parts or Organs, but throughout the Whole of them. (as Sponges) they imbibe, or take care of using a Thinner and Dryer Diet, that is so that Spiritual Body (which we have also at this present time within our Groffer Body) may not be Clogged and Incrass'd, but Attenuated. Over and above which, those Ancients made use of Cathartick, or Purgations to the same end and purpose also. For as this Earthy Body is washed by Water, so is that Spiritual Body cleansed by Cathartick Vapours; some of these Vapours being Nutritive, others Purgative. Moreover those Ancients further declared, concerning this Spiritual Body, that it was not Organized, but did the Whole of it, in every Part throughout, execute all Functions of Sense; the Soul Hearing, and Seeing, and Perceiving all Sensibless, by it every where. For which Cause Aristotle himself, affirmeth in his Metaphysicks, that there is properly but one Sense, and but one Sensory. He by this one Sensory meaning, the Spirit, or Subtle Airy Body, in which the Sensitive Power, doth all of it, through the Whole, immediately apprehend all Variety of Sensibless. And if it be demanded, How it comes then to pass, that this Spirit, appears Organized in Sepulchres, and most commonly of Humane Form, but sometimes in the Form of some other Animals; to this those Ancients Replied, That their appearing so frequently in Humane Form, proceedeth from their being, Incrass'd with Evil Diet, and then as it were damped upon, with the Form of this Exterior Ambient Body, in which they are; as Crystal is Formed and Coloured, like to those things which it is fastbound in, or Reflects the Image of them. And that their having sometimes other different Forms, proceedeth from the Plantalshick Power of the Soul, itself, which can at pleasure transform this Spiritual Body into any shape. For being Airy, when it is Condens'd, and Fixed, it becometh Visible; and again Invisible, and Vanishing out of Sight, when it is Expanded and Raresied.

Now from these Passages cited out of Philoponus, it further appear-eth, that the Ancient Asserters of the Souls Immortality, did not sup-pose Humane Souls after Death, to be quite strip'd, Stark Naked from all Body; but that the Generality of Souls, had then a certain Spiritual, Vaporous, or Airy Body, accompanying them; though in different Degrees of Purity or Impurity, Respectively to themselves. As also, that they conceived, this Spiritual Body, (or at least something of it) to hang about the Soul also here in this Life, before Death, as its Interior Indument or Vesture; which also then ticks to it,
when that other Gross Earthly Part of the Body, is by Death put off, as an Outer Garment. And some have been inclinable to think (by reason of certain Hilarick Phenomena) these Two, to be things fo distinct, that it is not Impossible, for this Spirituous Body, together with the Soul to be Locally separated from the other Groser Body, for some time, before Death, and without it. And indeed thus much cannot be denied, that our Soul Acteth, not Immediately only upon Bones, Flees, and Brains, and other such like Gros Parts of this Body, but first and chiefly upon the Animal Spirits; as the Immediate Instruments of Sense and Phaency; and that by whose Vigour and Activity, the other Heavy and Unwieldy Bulk of the Body, is so nimblly Moved. And therefore we know no reazon but we may affent here to that of Porphyrius, to @μα νομη γι τετελεσ το πνευμα το δν πνευ̂μα ἐχεις, That the Blood is the Food and Nourishment of the Spirit, (that is, that Subtle Body called the Animal Spirits) and that this Spirit is the Vehicile of the Soul, or the more Immediate Seat of Life.

Nevertheless the same Philoponus there addeth, that according to these Ancients; besides the Terrestrial Body, and this Spirituous and Airy Body too, there is yet a Third kind of Body, of a Higher Rank then either of the Former, (peculiarly belonging to such Souls after Death, as are Purged and Cleansed from Corporeal Affections, Luft, and Passions,) called by them, σωμα ἄκριβος, and ἐθεογονος, and Συνάμονος, Σε. A Luciform, and Celestial, and Ethereal Body. The Soul (faith he) continueth either in the Terrestrial, or the Aereal Body, so long, το τι τονω κα το μιδα, κα συνειλας, κα την ἐναθειαν ἐπηνηιαν, Μεξ οης ομοιον χαμες, ἐναι το ου και μειω το τατε ἄλλης αὐτώς ἀνειμον, σωμα ὠνειων και δε το τε αἰδον, ὁ ωαν ἀναπληρως ἐν Ἀναπάντες, την ου εγκαυμον εστιν ἐναθει ανας ἀνας τα ὑπατε ἐχειν τα κλεισθαι αν ρυους, μεν μεν το το μιδας και α συνειλας ἐτε, ό ου και μειω το τατε αὐτώς, ᾧ ου εγκαυμον το σωμα, α α νειλας αυτώς τα τατε αν ου ἀναπάντες, φαν σωμα αυτώς αν ου ἐχειν. Until that having Purged it self, it be carried aloft, and freed from Generation. And then doth it put off, both the Trescible and Concupiscible Passions at once, together with this Second Vehicile, or Body, which we call Spirituous. Wherefore these Ancients say, that there is another Heavenly Body, always conjoined with the Soul, and Eternal, which they call Luciform, and Star-like. For it being a Mundane thing, must of necessity have, some Part of the World, as a Province allotted to it, which it may administer. And since it is always Moveable, and ought always to Att, it must have a Body Eternally conjoined with it, which it may always Enliven. And for these Causes do they affirm, the Soul always to have a Luciform Body. Which Lucid and Ethereal Body of the Soul, is a thing often mentioned by other Writers also; as Proclus in his Commentary upon the Timaeus, καὶ καὶ ἀναπληρως ἀναπάντες το τατε αναπάντες τονομα αὐτως, ας αυτώς ουκ ἐμελειται γιναι εις ἀναπαντες το τοπον τονομα αὐτώς, καὶ αυτώς ουκ ἐμελειται γιναι εις τονομα αὐτώς, καὶ καὶ παρασκευαι τονομα τονομα τονομα. ᾧ καὶ καὶ αὐτώς αὐτώς αὐτώς αὐτώς, ᾧ καὶ καὶ αὐτώς αὐτώς αὐτώς. The Humane Soul hath also, (faith he) such an Ethereal Vehicile belonging to it, as Plato himself intimated.
Chap. V. Luciform and Heavenly Body.

...when he affirmeth the Demiurgus at first to have placed it in a Chariot. For of necessity every Soul before this Terrestrial Body, must have an Eternal and wholly Moveable Body, it being essential to it to move. And elsewhere the same Proclus, ΄ἔναι μὲνοτε έροιθι τέκτων τῆς μορφής. E. 164, έιλάν είρεσιν. & ήμεν επιστρεπτέα καταλήψειν εις γνώσιν, έιλάν ορκαίτι οργάμον τελείως, πολλάκις έγνώμενα τάς ανθρώπους. Whist we remain above, we have need of these Divided Organs, which now we have descending into Generation; but the Uniform Lucid or Splendid Vehicle, is sufficient, this having all Souls United together in it. Which Doctrine, of the Unorganized Luciform, and Spirituous Vehicles, seems to have been derived from Plato, he in his Epinomis, writing thus concerning a Good and Wise man after Death; έν καὶ δ' ἐνοικείοις τοῖς καθ' ου καταλήψειν είς έκποίησιν τῆς αὐτοῦ μορφῆς ανακαλόμενον, μετά μεθένθιν ενί υπάρξει τῇ, μεθένθαι τῷ ανθρώπῳ, μετα μεθένθας μεθανήσεως μόνον, καὶ εάν παλαιά εύροντος ευκαλύπτως ἐσέδωκεν. Of whom, whether I be in Jest or Earnest, I constantly affirm, that when dying he shall yield to Fate, he shall no longer have this Variety of Senes, which now we have, but one Uniform Body, and live a happy Life. Moreover Hierocles much insineth upon this Αὐθυδίας Σεῖα, this Luciform and Ethereal Body, ζε ἄκτως τί χρώμα τί ξύπον καὶ ταλανία. Which also (faith he) the Oracles call the Thin and Subtle Vehicle, or Chariot of the Soul; he meaning doubtles by these Oracles, the Magical or Chaldaick Oracles before mentioned. And amongst those now Extant, under that Title, there seems to be a clear acknowledgment of those Two Vehicles of the Soul, or Interior Indwonts thereof; the Spirituous, and the Luciform Body, the latter of which, is there Enigmatically called ἑπιπέπευξεν, or a Plain Superficies, in these words; ἑις τιπήλαις μελανής, μεθένθαι εν οὐκείν τι ἐπιπέπευξεν, Τάκτε κατα Διάσταλα τοῦ ἑπιπέπευξεν, Τάκτε. κατα Τοῦ ἑπιπέπευξεν, Τάκτε. κατα Τοῦ ἑπιπέπευξεν, Τάκτε. κατα Τοῦ ἑπιπέπευξεν, Τάκτε. For thus Iphitus glosseth upon that Oracle, διό γε τιπήλαις ἐπιπέπευξεν τινα νοσίν οι καλλίσται έκ της μεθαμολογίας έκφασεν, από της ανθρώπους έργασίας έκφασεν αὐτήν. έν τις Άνθρώπων, ληθην, καί άναξίων, ἐντεύξεν ἑπιπέπευξεν. The Chaldaick Philosophers, bestow upon the Soul, Two Interior Tunics or Vestments, the one of which they called, Pneumatical, or the Spirituous Body; which is weathed out as it were to it, and compounded of the Gros Senible Body (it being the more Thin and Subtle part thereof) the other the Luciform Vestment of the Soul, Pure and Pelleuceide, and this is that which is here called the Plain Superficies. Which, faith Plato, is not so to be understood, as if it had not Three Dimensions (for as much as it is a Body also) but only to denote the Sublity and Tenity thereof. Wherefore when the aforesaid Hierocles also calls this Luciform and Ethereal Body, τοῦ πνευματικοῦ Οὐρανοῦ καὶ λογικοῦ ψυχῆς, The Spiritual Vehicle of the Rational Soul, he takes not the Word πνευματικῶς, in that Sense, wherein it is used by Philo and Others; as if he intended to confound this Ethereal Body, with that other Spirituous or Airy Body, and to make but one of them; but rather styles it Spiritual, in a higher Sense, (and which cometh near to that of the Scripture) as being a Body more Suitable and Cognate, with that Highest and Divine Part of the Soul, Mind or Reason, then the other Terrestrial Body is (which upon that account is called also, by the same Hierocles, (as well as it is by St. Paul) σωμα άνέμων, the Animal or Natural Body.
Spirits, or Airy Body, in which Unpurged Souls, receive Punishment after Death, thus:

Quin & Supremo cum Lumine Vita reliquit,
Non tamen omne Malum miseric, nec funditus omnes
Corporae eceedunt peites : perisnque necesse est
Multa diu concreta modis inolegere miris.
Ergo exercerunt pennis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt : alie panduntur inanes
Suspende ad Vento : aliis sub gurgite Vaso
Infecum eliuitur Scelus, aut excitarit Ignis.

And then again of the other Pure Ethereal and Fiery Body, in this manner,

Donee Longa dies perfecto temporis Orbe,
Concretae eceedit labem, Pirumique reliquit
Æthereum Sensum, atque Aurai Simplicis Ignem.

Now as it was before observed, that the Ancient Asserters of the Souls Immortality, supposing it to have besides this Terrestrial Body, another Spiritual or Airy Body, conceived this not only to accompany the Soul after Death, but also to hang about it here in this Life, as its Interior Vest or Tunicle; (they probably meaning hereby, the same with that which is commonly called, the Animal Spirit, diffused from the Brain, by the Nerves, throughout this whole Body) in like manner is it certain, that Many of them supposing, the Soul besides those Two forementioned, to have yet a Third Luciform or Ethereal Body, conceived this in like manner, to adhere to it even in this Mortal Life too, as its Immost Clothing or Tunicle; yet so as that they acknowledged the Force thereof, to be very much weakened and abated, and its Splendour altogether obscured, by the Heavy Weight, and Great Steams or Vapours, of the Terrestrial Body. Thus Suidas upon the Word ἀνυφόδες, tells us out of Ilium, as κη ἱ θυδα ἀνυφόδες ὁσμαὶ, ληφθησαίν ἀνυφόδες τῷ ἀθάνατοι, ἥτο τόμ, καὶ τὸ ἀνυφόδες φως μὲν ἐπικαλλίζει ναίνοι καὶ έπικαλλίζει. That according to some Philosophers, the Soul hath a certain Luciform Vehicle, called also Star- or Sun-like, and Eternal: which Luciform Body, is now put up within this Terrestrial Body (as a Light in a dark Lantern) it being supposed by some of them, to be included within the Head, &c. With which agreeeth Hierocles, ἀνυφόδες καὶ θαυμών Σάβαθος, τὸ ἀνυφόδες ἀνυφόδες, τὸ ἁμαρταίον τὸ αμαρταίον τὸ τινα, το μὲν ἀμαρταίον, τὸ δὲ τινα ἀμαρταίον, τῷ ἀμαρταίον, τῷ δὲ τινα. The Splendid or Luciform Body, both in this Mortal Body of ours, continu
nullly Inspiring it with Life, and containing the Harmony thereof. The ground of which opinion was, because these Philosophers generally conceived, the Humane Soul to have Pre-Existed, before it came into this Earthly Body, and that either from Eternity, or else from the First beginning of the World's Creation; and being never without a Body, and then in a Perfect State, to have had a Lucid and Ethereal Body, either Co-Eternal, or Co-Existent with it, (though in order of Nature Junior to it) as its Chryst or Vehicle; which being Incorruptible, did always inseparably adhere to the Soul, in its After-Last and Deficients, into an Aerial first, and then a Terrestrial Body; this being as it were the Incarnation of Union, betwixt the Soul and them. Thus Plotho declares their Sense, did 3 povxv aoeufa,xv tv a povxv av 3 tov, thvLoovv tv\w o\^v\w v\g\v\v\x\g\v\w\w\v\v\u\v\w\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v\v"
cle, by which as a Middle, it communicates with the other Bodies. Wherefore we must say, that this Etherial Lucid Body, is Extended throughout the whole Brain; whence is that Luciform Spirit derived, that is the Immediate Instrument of Sight. Now from hence it was, that these Philosophers, besides the Moral Purgation of the Soul, and the Intellectual or Philosophical, recommended very much a Mystical or Telestich way of Purifying, this Etherial Body in us, by Dye and Catharsis. Thus the forementioned Hierocles, ἥπερ εἰ τῷ Αὐγοφθείᾳ ἡμῶν σώματι περιτρίφων σώματι Σωμίτην ὑπό, καὶ ἔπεβε οὐκ ηὐτό τετο, &c. Since to our Lucid or Splendid Body, this Gross Mortal Body, is come, by way of Accession, we ought to Purifie the Former also, and see it from Sympathy with the Latter. And again afterwards, οἱ δ' ὁμοίως ἡσαν καθότος ἡ τῶν Ἀνθρώπων ὑπομενόμενον, ὡς ἀν αὐτὸς ὑποτεθεὶς ἡ τέσσερεις ἡ τῶν γενέσθαι μὴ ἐμπνεύσῃ περείς πεῖ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. Together with the Purifications of the Rational Soul, the Purification of the Luciform or Ethereal Vehicle, is also to be regarded, that this being made Light, and Alate or Wingy, might no way hinder the Souls Ascend upward: But he that endeavours, to Purifie the Mind only, neglecting the Body, applies not himself to the whole Man. Whereupon he concludes, τῶν Τελεσκιλών ἔνεργαν λέγω, τῶν τὰ Ἀνθρώπων ἑκατοστὶν Συλάνων, I therefore call this the Telestich or Mystick Operation, which is Conformant about the Purification of the Lucid or Ethereal Vehicle. And whereas Philosophy was by Plato and Socrates Defined, to be a Continuous Exercise of Dying (which yet Pliny thought to be nothing but an Hypochondriaical or Atrabiliarian Diftempir in them, in those words of his, which Salmasius and other Critics can by no means understand, Εστὶν quidam Morbus, Fer Sapientiam Mori, That the Dying by Wisdom or Philosophy, is also but a certain kind of Bodily Disease, or Over-grown Melancholy) Though they supposeth this principally to consist, in a Moral Dying to Corporeal Lusts and Passions, yet was the design thereof, partly Mystical and Telestich also, it driving at this further thing, that when they should put off this Terrestrial Body, they might at once Dye also, to the Spiritual or Aerial; and then their Soul have nothing left, hanging about it, but only the pure Etherial Body, its Light-winged Chariot: which in Virgil’s Language, is

Purumque relinququi
Ætherum Senium, atque Avarii Simplicis Ignem.

Notwithstanding which, the Pythagoreans and Platonists, seem not to have been all of them of this Perwision, that the same Numerical Ethereal Body, which the Soul was at first Created with, continueth still about it, and adhereth to it Inseparably to all Eternity, during its Descents, into other Grosser Bodies; but rather to have supposed, that according to the Moral Disposition of the Soul, it always finds or makes a Cognate and Suitable Body, Correspondently Pure or Impure; and consequently, that by Moral Verine and Philosophy, it might again recover that Celestial Body, which was lost by its Fall and Descent hither. This feemeth to have been porphyrinus his senfe in these words of his, ἐὰς ἐὰν θετέατη κακὸν, ἀνερ αὐταὶ πάντες ταῖς ἰον ὄνειδος διωξαμένοι, ἔν τοι καθαφάτες μὲν διακατείχεν ὁμορφίαν τῷ ἠγέρθω

1 Book I. P. 294.
Now from what hath been declared, it appeareth already, that the
most Ancient Affirers of the Incorpoity and Immortality of the
Humane Soul, supposed it notwithstanding, to be always Con-
joyed with a Body. Thus Hierocles plainly, \( \text{\`7r^\eta\hbar\gamma\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\eta\} \)  
proceeded from the Demiurgus, as that neither
it self is Body, nor yet can it be without Body, but though it self be Incor-
porable, yet its whole Form notwithstanding, is Terminated in a Body.
Accordingly whereunto, the Definition which he gives of a Man, is
this, \( \text{\`7r^\eta\hbar\gamma\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\eta\} \)  
Later Mind, when he affirmed, the Soul to be
always in a Body, but sometimes of one kind, and sometimes of an-
other.

And now have we given a full Account, in what manner the An-
cient Affirers of Incorporeal Substance as Unextended, Answered that

\( \text{\`7r^\eta\hbar\gamma\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\eta\} \)
Of the Locality and Immobility of Particular, Finite Spirits; Demons or Angels, and Humane Souls; that these being all naturally incorporate, however in themselves and directly immovable, yet were capable of being in some sense moved, by accident, together with those Bodies respectively, which they are vitally united to. But as for that Pretence; That these Finite Spirits, or Substances incorporeal, being unextended, and so having in themselves, no relation to any place, might therefore attend and inform the whole corporeal world at once, and take cognizance of all things therein; their reply hereunto was; That these being essentially but parts of the universe, and therefore not comprehensive of the whole; finite or particular, and not universal beings; (as the three hypostases of the platonick trinity are) the sphere of their activity, could not possibly extend any further than to the quickening and enlightening of some certain parts of matter and the world, allotted to them; and thereby of becoming particular animals; it being peculiar to the deity, or that incorporeal substance, which is infinite, to quicken and animate all things.

But it would be no impertinent digression here, (as to the main scope of our present undertaking) should we briefly compare the forementioned doctrine and cabala, of the ancient incorporealists, (the Pythagoreans and platonists) with that of christianity; and consider the agreement or disagreement, that is betwixt them. First therefore, here is a plain agreement of these best, and most religious philosophers, with christianity, in this; That the most consummate happiness, and highest perfection, that humane nature is capable of, consists not in a separate state of souls, strip'd naked from all body, and having no manner of commerce with matter; as some high-brow persons in all ages have been apt to conceive. For such amongst the philosophers (and platonists too) was platoins; unequeness and immanence of whole temper, may sufficiently appear from hence; That as he conceived humane souls, might possibly ascend to so high a pitch, as quite to shake off commerce with all body; so did he in the other hand again imagine, that they might also descend and sink down so low, as to animate not only the bodies of brutes, but even of trees and plants too; Two inconsistent paradoxes; the latter whereof is a most prodigious extravagancy, which yet empedocles (though otherwise a great wit) seems to have been guilty of also, from those verbes of his in atheneus 3

And amongst the Jews, the famous Maymonides was also of this persuasion, it being a known aphorism of his, in his great work, that in the world to come, (or state of consummate happiness) there shall be nothing at all of body, but pure incorporeity. Upon which account, being accused as a denyer of the resurrection, (an article as well of the Jews, as of the christian faith) he wrote that book intituled iggereth teman, purposely to purge
purge himself, and to reconcile those two assertions together, which he doth after such a manner; as that there should be indeed a resurrection, at the first coming of the Jewish Messiah, of some certain persons, to live here a while upon the earth, eat and drink, marry and be given in marriage, and then die again; after which in the world to come, they should for ever continue pure souls, unconnected to any body. In which, it may be well suspected, that the design of the Philostratus drove at, was against Christianity; which notwithstanding, as to this particular, hath the concurrent suffrages of the best philosophers. That the most genuine and perfect state, of the human soul, which in its own nature is immortal, is to continue for ever, not without, but with a body. And yet our high-flown enthusiasts generally, (however calling themselves christians) are such great spiritualists, and so much for the inward resurrection, (which we deny not to be a scripture-notation also;) as in that, of St. Paul, if ye be risen with Christ, &c. and again, if by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead, as that they quite allegorize away, together with other parts of Christianity, the outward resurrection of the body; and indeed will scarcely acknowledge any future immortality, or life to come after death; their spirituality thus ending in sadduceism, and infidelity, if not at length in down-right atheism, and sensuality.

But besides this there is yet a further correspondence of Christianity, with the forementioned philostratus cabbala; in that the former also supposes, the highest perfection of our human souls, not to consist in being eternally conjoined, with such gross bodies, as these we now have, unchangeable and unaltered. For as the pythagoreans and platonists, have always complained, of these terrestrial bodies, as prisons, or living sepulchres of the soul; so does christianity seem to run much upon the same strain, in these scripture-expressions; in this we groan earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon, with our house which is from heaven: and again, we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened, not for that we would be uncloathed, (that is, strip'd quite naked of all body,) but so clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life: and lastly, our selves also which have the first fruits of the spirit, groan within our selves, waiting for the adoption, (sons'hip or inheritance) namely, the redemption of our bodies. That is, the freedom of them from all those evils and maladies of theirs, which we here ly oppressed under. Wherefore we cannot think, that the same heavy load and luggage, which the souls of good men being here burdened with, do so much groan to be delivered from, shall at the general resurrection, be laid upon them again, and bound fast to them, to all eternity. For of such a resurrection as this, platonists, (though perhaps mistaking it for the true christian resurrection,) might have some cause to affirm, that it would be but 

\[\text{ανάκαινης εἰς ἀλλον ὑπον, A resurrection to another sleep;}\] the soul seeming not to be thoroughly awake here, but as it were so parted, with the dull streams and opiate vapours of this gross body. For thus the author of the book of wisdom, the corruptible body presceth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind, that majesth upon

\[\text{U u u u}\]
upon many things. But the same will further appear, from that Account, which the Scripture it self giveth us, of the Resurrection; and First in General, when S. Paul Answering that Query, of the Philosophick Insidie, How are the dead raised, or what Body do they come? Replieth in this manner; Thou Fool (that is, thou who thinkest to puzzle or baffle, the Christian Article of the Resurrection, which thou understa ndest not) That which thou sowe st is not Quickened (to the Production of any thing) except it first die to what it was. And thou sowest not that Body that shall be, but bare Grain as of Wheat, or of Barley, or the like; but God (in the ordinary course of Nature) giveth it a Body, as it hath pleased him, (that is, a Stalk, and an Ear, having many Grains with Husks in it; and therefore neither in Quantity, nor Quality, the same with that which was Sowed under Ground) Nor does he give to all Seeds, one and the same kind of Body neither, but to every Seed its own correspondent Body; as to Wheat one kind of Ear, and to Barley another. As if he should have said; Know that this Present Body of ours, is to be look’d upon, but as a kind of Seed of the Resurrection Body, which therefore is accordingly, in some sense the Same, and in some sense not the Same with it. Besides which General Account, the Particular Oppositions, which the Scripture makes, betwixt the Present and Future Body, seem very agreeable to those of the Philosophick Cabala. For First, the Present Body, is said to be Sowed in Corruption, but the Future Raised in Incorruption. For the Children of the Resurrection, cannot die any more. And then Mortality shall be swallowed up of Life. Wherefore the Christian Resurrection Body, as well as that of the Philosophick Cabala, is σώμα αἰθετον, and άθετον too (2 Cor. 5. 1.) an Immortal and Eternal Body. Again the Body Sowed, is said to be a Dishonourable, Ignominious, and Inglorious Body, and therefore called also by S. Paul, τα εώμα με τη ἀθετικς υμῶν, The Body of our Humility, or Humiliation; A Body agreeable to this Lapsed State of the Soul; But the Body which shall be Raised, shall be a Glorious Body; and σύμφωνον τοι σώματι τω βασιλεις, Conformable to that Glorious Body of Christ. Who when he was but Externally Transfigured, his Face did shin e as the Sun, and his Raiment was white as the Light. The Glory of a Body, confi steth only in the Comeliness of its Proportion, and the Splendor thereof; Thus is there one Glory of the Sun, and another Glory of the Moon, and another Glory of the Stars, that is a different Splendor of them. Wherefore the Future Body of the Righteous, according to the Scripture also, as well as the Philosophick Cabala, will be ζώμα καθεκ, and ζώμα αἰθετον, and ζώμα ἀσκετον, that is, a Glorious, Splendid, Luciferian and Starlike Body, Wisd. 3. 7. αν καιρος εὐρυτης ενωθε εκλάμβειν, The Righteous in the time of their Visitation, shall shine forth. Daniel 12. the 2. and 3. They that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the Firmament; and they that turn many to Righteousness, as the Stars for ever and ever. And Matthew the 13. 43. Then shall the Righteous shin e forth as the Sun, in the Kingdom of their Father. And therefore probably this Future Glorious Resurrection Body, is that Inheritance of the Saints in Light, which the Scripture speaks of, Col. 1. the 12. Moreover, there is another difference betwixt this Present and that Future Body of the Righteous.
Righteous, wherein S. Paul and Hierocles do well agree, the First being called by both of them, *Cæcum Ψυχαν*, *An Animal Body*, The Second, *Cæma πνευματικον*, *A Spiritual Body*. Which latter expression in Scripture, does not only denote, the Subtlety and Tenuity thereof: but also as this Present Body is called an *Animal Body*, because it is suitable and agreeable to that Animal Life, which men have Common with Brutes; so is that Future called *Spiritual*, as bearing a fit proportion and correspondence to *Souls* renewed in the Spirit of their *Mind*, or in whom the Divine Spirit Dwelleth and Aethet; exercising its Dominion. There is an *Animal Body*, and there is a *Spiritual Body*. And, the *First Adam* was made a *Living Soul*, the *Last Adam* a *Quickning Spirit*. And thus are *Ψυχαν* in the Scripture, *taken for* the πνευμα μη ξεντες, *They who have not the Spirit*. And *Ψυχας ἀνερθον* & *Ψυχας τα τω πνευματικα τω Τσα*, *The Animal Man receiveth not*, the things of the *Spirit of God*. Which Spirit is also said in Scripture, *to be the Earnest* of that our *Future Inheritance*, Ephesians the 1. the 14. and the Earnest of this *Spiritual and Heavenly Body*, *Corinth. the 5. the 5.*

It is also said to be that, by which (Efficiently) these *Mortal Bodies*, shall be *Quickened*, Romans the 8. the 11. *If the Spirit of him, that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you*, he that raiseth up *Christ from the dead*, shall also *Quicken your Mortal Bodies*, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. Neither doth Hierocles fall much short of this Scripture Notion, of a *Spiritual Body*, when he describes it to be that, φοι τη νοησε τηλεονιαν Πνευματικαν, *Which is Agreeable to P. 297.*

the Intellectual Perfection of the Soul. This *Spiritual Body* is that, which the Ancient Hebrews called, אבש ושם אגלאס גabyrin, *this* is *Aglass*; 1. If *you Ask what shall become of the Righteous, when God shall renew the world*; the *Answer* is, *God shall make them wings like Eagles*, whereby they shall fly upon the Face of the Waters. Again, as this Present Body, is called in Scripture, an *Earthly Body*, so is the *Future Body* of the *Righteous*, styl'd by S. Paul, as well as the *Pythagoreans*, a *Heavenly Body*; and they who shall then be *possession thereof*, επισταναι ζωης, *Heavenly men*, *Cor. 15*. As is the Heavenly, such are they that are Heavenly. Besides which, as Philosopher supposed, both *Demons* (or *Angels*) and *Men*, to have one and the same, *Cæma ψυχεις*, σαρκον, and σοληνον, or a like *Livid*, *Heavenly and Ethereal Body*, so from that of our Saviour, when he affirmeth, that they who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the Resurrection from the dead, will neither *Marry nor be given in Marriage*; nor can die any more; for they are *ιον Θεου ευλογοι* equal to the *Angels*; from hence I say, we may venture to call this *Resurrection Body*, of the *Just, also, an Angelical, or *I Angelical Body*; and the rather because, the Ancient Hebrews (as we learn from *Nachmonides in Shaar Haggemul*) styl'd it *Ψυχαν θειου υπαινεσμα* The Angelical Clothing of the Soul, and *Tertullian him elf*, *Angelsfactum Thus S. Au- Carnem, Angelified Flesh*. But Lately, S. Paul is not only *Positive in his Bin, Corpora Doctrine here*, but also *Negative*: Now this I say, brethren, that *Flesh and Qualis Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*, neither doth *Corruption inherit from Angelic Intercorpore*. Which Place being undoubtedly not to be Allegorized;
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it may be from thence inferred, that the Happy Resurrection-Body, shall not be this Foul and Grotesque Body of ours, only Varnished and Guided over on the outside of it, it remaining till Nasty Stains and Ruinous within, and having all the same Seeds of Corruption and Mortality in its Nature, which it had before, though by perpetual Miracle kept off, it being as it were by Violence defended, from being Seized upon and devoured, by the Jaws of Death: but that it shall be so Inwardly changed, in its Nature, as that the Possessors thereof, Cannot die any more. But all this which has been said of the Resurrection-Body, is not so to be understood, as if it belonged Universally, to all that shall be Risen up at the last day, or made to appear upon the Earth, as in their own Persons, at that Great and General Assizes; That they shall have all alike, (wicked as well as Good) such Glorious, Spiritual, and Celestial Bodies; but it is only a Description of the (wicked of Sons, The Resurrection of Life, which is Emphatically called also by our Saviour Christ (wicked of Sons, &c. now Tennyson), The Resurrection from the dead, or to a Happy Immortality as they who shall be thought worthy thereof are likewise Styled by him, (wicked of Sons, The Children of the Resurrection. Of which Resurrection only it is, that S. Paul treateth in that Fifteenth Chapter of his to the Corinthians. And we say, that this Christian Resurrection of Life; is the Vesting and Setting of the Souls of Good men, in their Glorious, Spiritual, Heavenly, and Immortal Bodies. The Complete Happiness of a Man, and all the Good that can be desired by him, Was by the Heathen Poet thus Summed up, Ut sit Mens Sana in Corpore Sano. That there be a Sound Mind in a Sound Body: and the Christian Happiness, seems to be all comprised in these Two Things. First, in being Inwardly Regenerated and Renewed in the Spirit of their Mind, Cleaned from all Pollution of Flesh and Spirit, and made partakers of the Divine Life and Nature; and then Secondly, in being Outwardly Clothed, with Glorious, Spiritual, Celestial, and Incorruptible Bodies. The Scripture plainly declareth, that our Souls are not at Home here, in this Terrestrial Body, and These Earthly Mansions, but that they are Strangers and Pilgrims there in it, which the Patriarchs also confessing, plainly declared that they Sought a Country, not that which they came out from, but a Heavenly one. From which Passages of Scripture, some indeed would infer, that Souls being at first Created by God Pure, Pre-Existed before this their Terrane Nativity, in Celestial Bodies; but afterwards frigared and wandered down hither, as Philo for one, aπαλπιτωμα μεν το πολυ το σπιριτων των εις φαλαος καιλος εις, το σωμα, Our Soul (faith he) having left its Heavenly Mansions, came down into this Earthly Body, as a strange place. But thus much is certain, that Our Humane Souls were at first intended and designed by God Almighty, the Maker of them, for other Bodies and other Regions; as their proper Home and Country, and their Eternal Resting Place: however, to us, that be not First, which is Spiritual, but that which is Natural, and afterwards that which is Spiritual. Now though some from that of St. Paul, where he calls this Happy Resurrection-Body, (wicked of Sons, μη τοι ηε καιτъ, That house of ours that is from Heaven, or which cometh out of Heaven, would infer, that therefore, it will not be taken, out of Graves and Charnel Houses; they conceiving also, that the Individuality and Sameness
Sanesness of mens Perfons, does not necessarily depend, upon the Numerical Identity of all the Parts of Matter, because we never continue thus the Same, our Bodies always flowing like a River, and paffing away by Infensible Transpiration, and it is certain, that we have not all the same Numerical Matter, and neither more nor less, both in Infancy and in Old Age, though we be for all that the Self Same Perfons: yet nevertheless according to the best Philosoph, which acknowledges no Essential or Specific Difference of Matter, the Fouleft and Groffleft Body that is, meerly by Motion, may not only be Christianized, but also brought into the Purity and Tenmpacy of the Finest Ether. And undoubtedly, that Same Numerical Body of our Saviour Chrift, which lay in the Sepulchre, was after his Refurrection thus Transformed, into a Spiritual, and Heavenly Body; the Substance and Tenmpacy whereof appeared, from his entering in when the doors were shut, and his vanishing out of Sight; however its Glory were for the time suspended, partly for the better convincing his Disciples of the Truth of his Refurrection, and partly because they were not then able to bear the Splendor of it. We conclude therefore, that the Christian Mystery, of the Refurrection of Life, consifteth not in the Souls being reunited to thefe Vile Rags of Mortality, these Gros Bodies of ours (fuch as now they are) but in having them Changed into the Likeness of Chrifts Glorious Body, and in this Mortal's Putting on Immortality.

Hitherto have we seen, the Agreement that is betwixt Christianity, and the Old Philosophick Cabbala, concerning the Soul, in thefe Two Things. First, That the highest Happines and Perfection of the Humane Soul, consifteth not, in a State of Pure Separation from all Body; and Secondly, that it does not confift neither, in an Eternal Union with such Gros Terrestrial Bodies, as thefe Unchanged; the Soul being not at Home, but a Stranger and Pilgrim in them, and Opprefled with the Load of them: but that at laft the Souls of Good men, shall arrive at Glorious, Spiritual, Heavenly and Immortal Bodies. But now as to that Point, Whether Humane Souls be always United to some Body or other, and confequently when by Death they put off this Gros Terrestrial Body, they are not thereby quite Devofed, and Strip'd Naked of all Body, but have a Certain, Subtle and Spiritual Body, still adhering to them, and accompanying them? Or else, Whether all Souls that have departed out of this Life, from the very beginning of the World, have ever since continued, in a State of Separation from all Body, and shall so continue forwards till the Day of Judgment or General Resurrection? We must confefs, that this is a thing not fo explicitely Determined, or expressly Decided in Christianity, either way. Nevertheless it is First of all, certain from Scripture; That Souls Departed out of these Terrestrial Bodies, are therefore neither Dead nor Asleep, till the Laft Trump and General Resurrection; but still Alive and Awake; our Saviour Chrift affirming, That they all Live unto God; the meaning whereof seems to be this, that they who are said to be Dead, are Dead only unto Men here upon Earth: but neither Dead unto themselves, nor yet unto God, their Life being not Extinct, but only Disappearing to us, and withdrawn from

Death called Sleep in Scripture, only xct διαφωμίζειν.
from our sight; for as much as they are gone off this Stage which we still continue to act upon. And thus is it said also, of our Saviour Christ himself, and that after his Resurrection 100, That he Liveth unto God (Romans the 6. the 10.) From whence it is evident, that they who are said to Live to God, are not therefore supposed to be les Alive, than they were, when they Lived unto men. Now it seemeth to be a Privilege or Prerogative Proper to the Deity only, to Live and Die alone, without Vital Union or Conjunction with any Body. Querendum, faith Origen, Si Possibile est, penitus Incorporas resimvere Rationables Creaturas, cum ad summum Sanitatis ac Beatitudinis venerint? An necefi est eas semper Conjunctione esse Corporibus? It is worth our Enquiry; Whether it be possible, for Rational Creatures, to remain Perfectly Incorporeal, and Separate from all Body, when they are arrived to the Highest Degree of Holiness and Happiness? Or Whether they be always of necessity conjoined with some Bodies? And afterwards he plainly affirmeth it to be Impossible, Vivere præter Corpus, Ulum aliam Naturam, præter Patrem, & Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum. For any other Nature, besides the Father, and the Son, and Holy Ghost, to live quite without a Body. Indeed if this were most Natural to the Humane Soul and most Perfective of it, to continue Separate from all Body, then doubtles (as Origen Implied) should the Souls of Good men, rather After the day of Judgment, continue in such a State of Separation, to all Eternity. But on the contrary, If it be Natural to Souls, to Enlive and Enform some Body or other, (though not always a Terrestrial one) as our Inward Sense inclines us to think, then can it not seem so probable, that they should by a kind of Violence, be kept so long in an Un-Natural or Preter-Natural State of Nakedness and Separation from all Body; some of them even from Adam till the day of Judgment.

Again the Scripture also Intimates, that Souls Departed out of this Life, have a Knowledge of one another, and are also capable of the Punishment of Sense or Pain; Fear him (faith our Saviour) who after he hath killed, hath Power to cast into Hell, Luke the 12. And the Soul of the Rich Man, is said to be immediately after Death in Torments, before the Day of Judgment, as likewise to have Known Abraham and Lazarus. And it seems neither agreeable to our Common Notions, nor yet to Piety, to conclude, That the Souls of wicked men, departing out of this Life, from the beginning of the world in their several Ages, till the Day of Judgment, have all of them no manner of Punishment inflicted on them, save only that, of Remorse of Conscience, and Future Expectation. Now it is not conceivable, how Souls after Death should Know and be Knowable, and Converse with one another, and have any Punishment of Sense or Pain inflicted on them, were they not Vitaly United to some Bodies. And thus did Tertullian reason long ago; Doles apud Inferos Anima curjuabant, & Punitur in Flamma, & Cruciatur in Lingua, & de digito animae faclicior implanat Solutiam Roris. Imaginem exsiliavit, exitum illum Pauperis Latantis, & Divitiis mercantis. Et quid illic Lazari nomen, si non in veritate res est? Sed est Imago credenda est, testimonium est veritatis. Si enim non habes Anima Corpus, non caperet Imaginem Corporis. Nec
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...mentiretur de Corporalibvs Membris Scriptura, si non erant. Quid est autem illud, quod ad Inferna transferetur, post Divortium Corporis? quod detinetur, in Dicti Judicii reservatur? Ad quad & Christus moriendo defendit? putum ad Animas Patriarcharum? Incorporalitas Animi ab omni genere C Vladimir liber est immunis a pena & a Fovelia. Per quod enim Punitur aut Fovetur, hoc est Corpus. Igitur liquid Tormenti tuque Anima preceps in Carcerem, vel Diversorum Infernum, in Igni vel in Sine Abraham, probata est Corporalitas Animi. Incorporalitas enim nihil Patitur, non habens per quad Pati posset: aut se habet, hoc est Corpus. In quantum enim Omne Corporale Possibile est, in tanta quum Possibile est Corporale est. We read in Scripture, of a Soul Tormented in Hell, Punished with Flames, and desitones of a drop of water to cool his Tongue. You will say perhaps, that this is Parabolical and Fictitious. What then does the name of Lazarus signify there, if it were no Real thing? But if it be a Parable never so much, yet must it notwithstanding, as to the main, speak agreeably to Truth. For if the Soul (after Death) have no Body at all, then can it not have any Corporeal Image, Shape, or Figure. Nor can it be thought, that the Scripture, would Lie concerning Corporal Members, if there were none. But what is that, which after its Separation from this Body, is carried down into Hell, and there detained Prisoner, and reserved till the day of Judgment? And what is that which Christ dying descended down unto, I suppose to theSouls of the Patriarchs. But Incorporality is free from all Custody or Imprisonment, as also devoid of Pain and Pleasure. Wherefore if Souls be feasible of Pain after Death, and Tormented with Fire, then must they needs have some Corporeity, for Incorporality suffereth Nothing. And as every Corporeal thing, is Passive or Patible, so again whatsoever is Passive is Corporeal. Tertullian would also further confirm this, from a Vision or Revelation of a certain Sifter-Prophet, (Miracles and Prophecy, being said by him, not to be then altogether Extinct.) Inter cetera offendit mihi Anima Corporaliter, & Spiritus vividatur, Tenebrae & Lucidae, & Acti Coloris. Et Formae per omnia Humane. There was (said he) amongst other things, a Soul Corporeally Exhibited to my View, and it was Tender and Lucid, and of an Aereal Colour, and every way of Humane Form. Agreeably to which, Tertullian himself addeth, Efficient non alien Anima Humane deputandum praeer Humanam, & quidem ejus Corporis quod unaqueque circunsuit. There is no other Shape to be assigned to a Humane Soul, but Humane, and indeed that of the Body, which it before carried about. It is true indeed, that Tertullian here drives the businesse so far, as to make the Soul it self to be Corporeal, Figure and Colorate, and after Death, to have the very fame Shape, which its respective Body had before in this Life: he being one of thofe, who were not able to conceive of any thing Incorporeal, and therefore being a Religioniste, concluded God himself to be a certain Body also. But the Reasons which he here instilth on, will indeed extend no further, than to prove, that the Soul hath after Death, some Body Vitally United to it, by means whereof, it is both capable of Conversion, and Sensible of Pain, for as much as Body alone, can have no Sense of any thing.

And this is that which Irenaeus, from the same Scripture gathereth; not
not that the Soul Is a Body, but that it Hath a Body, after Death con-
joyed with it, and that of the same Form and Figure, with that Bo-
dy which it had before here in This Life; The infime autem Dominus

docuit, non solum persequar, non de corpore in corpus transmigrandientes
animas, sed etiam corporis, in quo etiam adaptantur, custodire

eundem. Et meminisse eas Operum que egerunt hic, & a quibus cessav-
runt, in Enarratione que scribitur de Divite & de Lazaro, qui refuge-

rabatur in Sinu Abraham; in qua ait Divitem cognoscere Lazaram post

mortem; et manere in suo ordine unumquamque ipsum, & Our Lord

bath moft plainly taught us, that Souls do not only continue after Death,

without passing out of one Body into another, but also that they keep

the Character of Body, wherein they are then also adapted, the same which

they had before; as likewise, that they remember the Actions and Omis-
sions of their Life past, in that Enarration, which is written, concern-
ing the Rich Man and Lazarus, who was refreshed in Abraham’s bosom,

wherein be affirmed the Rich Man to have known both Lazara and A-

braham after Death, as also each of them to remain in their own Order.

And thus again in the following Chapter; Fer haec manifestissime de-
claratum est, & Perseverare Animas, & non de corpore in corpus Exire,

& habere Hominis Figuram, ut etiam cognoscatur, & meminisse eo-

rurs quo hic sint, & Dignam Habitationem Unamquamque Gentem per-
cipere, etiam ante Judicium. By these things it is most manifestly de-
clared, that Souls do both Persevere after Death, and that they do not

Transmigrate out of one Body into another; and that they have a Hu-

mane Figure or Shape, (whereby they may be known) as also that they re-

member the things here upon the Earth, and their own Actions; and

Lastly, that each kind of Good and Bad, have their distinct and fituate

Habitations assigned them, even before the Judgment. Now that Ire-

neus did not here mean, that Souls are themselves Bodily Substances,

and consequently, have a certain Character, Form, and Figure of their

own, but only that they have certain Bodies conjoyned with them,

which are Figurate; is First of all evident, from the words them-

selves, Charamterem corporis, in quo etiam adaptantur, custodire Eundem.

The Natural Senfe whereof is this, That they keep the Character of

Body (wherein they are then also adapted, after Death) the same with

that which these Bodies before had here in this Life. And it is further

manifest from hence, because he else where plainly declareth, Souls

themselves to be Incorporeal; as in his Fifth Book and Seventh

Chapter, Flatus autem Vitae Incoroparalis est, But the breath of Life is

Incorporeal.

Furthermore, Origen was not only of the same Perusasion, that

Souls after Death, had certain Subtle Bodies united to them, and that

those Bodies of theirs, had the same & Characterizing Form, which thefe their Terrestrial Bodies before had; but also

thinks, that this, together with the Souls Immortality, may be suf-

ciently proved, from the frequent Apparitions of Ghosts or Departed

Souls in way of opposition to Celsus, endeavouring to invalidate the

Scripture Testimonies, concerning the Apparitions of our Saviour

Christ, and Imputing them either to Magical Imposure, or Fanatick

Phrenzy, or the Disciples mistaking their own Dreams and Phantacies for
for Visions and Sensations, after the Epicurean way; and Plato, &c., as Origen and Thomas, &c., might proceed, though this might seem to have been smartly opposed by Cellius, yet are those very Apparitions of Ghosts notwithstanding, a sufficient Argument or Proof of a certain Necessary Opinion, that Souls do subsist after Death. Neither did Plato mainly conclude, the Immortality and Permanency of the Soul, besides other things, from those Shadow-like Phantoms of the Dead, that have appeared to many about Graves and Monuments. Whereupon he gives this further account of these Apparitions, 
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that many of the Jews, &c., as Origen and Thomas, &c., have frequently imagined, and substantiated in that which is called, a Luciform Body. Where notwithstanding Origen, takes this 'Αγχόδις Σάμια, Or Luciform Body, in a Larger Sense, than the Greek Philosophers were wont to do; namely so as to comprehend under it, that Aery or Vaporous Body also, which belongeth to Unpurged Souls; who do therein most frequently appear after Death; whereas it is thought proper to the Purged Souls, to be cloathed with the Luciform Body only. Besides which, the same Origen tells us, that the Thing which St. Thomas the Apostle disbelieved, was not our Saviour’s appearing after Death, as if he had thought it Impossible, for Ghosts or Souls departed, Visibly to appear, but only his Rising and Appearing in that same Solid Body, which had been before Crucified, and was laid in the Sepulchre; and thereupon, when the Disciples met, to see him, he showed them his hands, and feet, and said to them, ‘Thus is my Body, and it is visible to you.’

This is a repugnant to the Sadducees, who were of a different Opinion, that the Body of a Soul departed (to wit, Condenfed) might be seen with the Eyes of Sense, every way resembling that Form which it had before in this Life, both in respect of Bigness, Figure, Colour, and Voice; and oftentimes also in the same Customary garments. Wherefore according to Origen, the Jews were at that time Generally possessed with this Opinion, that Souls after Death, had certain Bodies united to them, X x x x wherein
Moreover, it might be here observed also, that when upon our Saviour's first Apparition to his Disciples, it is said, that they were affrighted, as supposing, they had seen a Spirit; our Saviour does not tell them, that a Spirit or Ghost, had no Body at all, wherein it could Visibly appear; but (as rather taking that for granted) that a Spirit had no Flesh and Bones, (no σῶμα ἀποφαγός) no such Solid Body, as they might find him to have; bidding them therefore, handle him; to remove that Scruple of theirs. As if he should have said, Though Spirits, or Ghosts, and Souls Departed, have Bodies (or Vehicles) which may by them be so far Condensed, as sometimes to make a Visible appearance to the Eyes of men; yet have they not any such Solid Bodies, as those of Flesh and Bone; and therefore by Feeling and Handling, may you satisfy your selves, that I am not a mere Spirit, Ghost, or Soul, Appearing; as others have frequently done, without a Miracle; but that I appear in that very same Solid Body, wherein I was Crucified by the Jews, by miraculous Divine Power, raised out of the Sepulchre, and now to be found no more there. Agreeable to which of our Saviour Christ is that of Apollonius in Philostratus, λαές μοι, ἐφι, καν μεν διαφησας σε, ἐδουλου ἐμί· ε ἢ ὑπομεναμι ἁπάζω- μυσιν, πασιν κα τε μπα, κα μι ἀπεκδιδομαι το σωμα, Touch me and Handle me, and if you find me to avoid the Touch, then may you conclude me to be a Spirit or Ghost, (that is, a Soul departed) but if I firmly resist the same, then believe me Really to live, and not yet to have cast off the Body. And indeed though Spirits or Ghosts, had certain Subtle Bodies, which they could so far Condense, as to make them sometimes Visible to men; yet is it reasonable enough to think, that they could not Conspire or Fix them, into such a Firmness, Greatness, and Solidity, as that of Flesh and Bone is, to continue therein; or at least, not without such Difficulty and Pain, as would hinder them from attempting the fame. Notwithstanding which, it is not denied, but that they may possibly sometimes make use of other Solid Bodies, Moving and Acting them, as in that famous Story of Phlegons, where the Body Vanished not, as other Ghosts use to do, but was left a Dead Carcase behind. Now as for our Saviour Christ's Body, after his Resurrection, and before his Ascension; which notwithstanding its Solidity in Handling, yet sometimes Vanished also, out of his Disciples sight; this probably, as Origen conceived, was purposely conferred for a time, in a certain Middle State, betwixt the Crotchets of a Mortal Body, and the Spirituality of a Perfectly Glorified, Heavenly & Ethereal Body.

But there is a place of Scripture, which as it hath been interpreted
interpreted by the Generality of the Ancient Fathers, would Naturally Imply, even the Soul of our Saviour Christ himself, after his Death, and before his Resurrection, not to have been quite Naked from all Body, but to have had a certain Subtle or Spirituous Clothing, and it is this of St. Peter, ἔκκεντρος μὲν σαρκί, ἑαυτόνδε δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, which being understood by those Ancients, of our Saviour Christ's descending into Hades or Hell, is accordingly thus rendered in the Vulgar Latin, Put to Death In the Flesh, but Quickened in the Spirit. In which (Spirit) also, as in his 12. Book, De Gen. ad that the Word πνευματικος, or Spirit here, according to this interpretation, is to be taken, for a Spirituous Body; the Scene being this: That when our Saviour Christ was put to death in the Flesh, or the Fleshly Body; he was Quickened in the Spirit, or a Spirituous Body. In which (Spirituous Body) also, he went and preached to those Spirits, that were in Prison, &c. So that the Word Spirit, could not here be taken for the Soul of our Saviour Christ; because this being Naturally Immortal, could not properly be said to be Quickened, and Made Alive. Nor could He, that is, our Saviour Christ's Soul, be so well said, to go, In this Spirit neither, that is, in itself, the Soul in the Soul, to preach to the Spirits in Prison. They would add also, that Spirit here, could not be taken for the Divine Spirit neither; which was the Efficient Cause of the Prouision of our Saviour's Body at his Resurrection; because then there would be no direct Opposition, betwixt, Being put to Death in the Flesh, and, Quickened in the Spirit; unless they be taken both alike Materially. As also the following Verse is thus to be understood: That our Saviour Christ, went in that Spirit, wherein he was Quickened, when he was put to Death In the Flesh, and therein preached to the Spirits in Prison. By which Spirits in Prison also, would be meant, not Pure Incorporeal Substances, or Naked Souls, but Souls Clothed with Subtle Spirituous Bodies; as that word may be often understood elsewhere in Scripture. But thus much we are unquestionably certain of; from the Scripture; That not only Elias, whose Terrestrial Body, seems to have been, in part at least, Spiritualized, in his Ascent in that Fiery Chariot, but also Moses, appeared Visibly to our Saviour Christ and his Disciples, upon the Mount, and therefore (since Piety will not permit us to think this a meet Prolific thing) in Real Bodies; which Bodies also, seem to have been Angelum, Lucifor or Lucid, like to our Saviour's then Transfigured Body.

Again, there are sundry places of Scripture which affirm that the Regenerate and Renewed have here in this Life, a certain Earnest of their Future Inheritance; which is, their Spiritual or Heavenly Body; as also the Quickening of their Mortal Bodies is therein attributed, to the Efficiency of the Spirit Dwelling in them. Which is a Thing that hath been taken notice of by Some of the Ancients, as Irenæus; Nunc. L. s. c. 8. autem partem aliquam Spiritus ejus sibi immittens, ad perfectionem & preparationem Incorruptel. paulatin assimilantes Capere & Portare Deum. Quod & Hunc dixit Apostolus; hoc est, Partem ejus Honoris, qui a Deo nobis promissus est; —— Si ergo hunc hoc habitant in nobis, jam XXXX 2 Spirituales
Whether any Created Spirit, Book I.

Spiritus effectus, & abhorretur Mortale ab Immortalitate. Now have we a Part of that Spirit, for the Preparation and Perfection of Incorruption; we being accustomed by little and little to Receive and Fear God. Which also the Apostle hath called an Earnest, that is, a Part of that Honour which is promised to us from God. If therefore, this Earnest (or Pledge) dwelling in us, hath made us already Spiritual; the Mortal is also swallowed up by Immortality. And Novatian, Spiritus Sanctorum id agit in nobis, ut ad Eternitatem & ad Resurrectionem Immortalitatis corpora nostra perducas, dum illa in se assefacit cum Celestial Virtute misteri. This is that which the Holy Spirit doth in us, namely to bring and lead on our Bodies to Eternity and the Resurrection of Immortality; whilst in itself it accustometh us, to be mingled with the Heavenly Virtue. Moreover there are some places also, which seem to imply, that Good Men, (half after Death) have a Further Inchoation of their Heavenly Body, the full Completion whereof, is not to be expected before the Resurrection or Day of Judgment. We know, that If our Earthly House of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a Building of God, a House not made with hands, Eternal in the Heavens. For in this we groan Earnestly. And Verfe the 5, He that hath wrought us for the self same thing is God, who also hath given us the Earnest of the Spirit. Now how these Preludiums and Preligations of an Immortal Body, can conflict with the Souls continuance after Death, in a Perfect Separation from all manner of Body, till the Day of Judgment, is not so easily Conceivable.

Lastly, it is not at all to be Doubted, but that Irenæus, Origen, and those other Ancients, who entertained that Opinion, of Souls being Cloathed after Death, with a certain Thin and Subtle Body, suspected it not in the least, to be Inconsistent, with that of the Future Resurrection: as it is no way Inconsistent, for one who hath only a Shirt or Wafcoaft on, to put on a Suite of Cloths, or Exteriour Upper garment. Which will also seem the least strange, if it be considered, that even here in this Life, our Body is as it were Two Fold, Exteriour and Interiour; we having besides the Groly-Tangible Bulk of our Outward Body; another Interiour Spiritual Body, the Souls Immediate Instrument, both of Sense and Motion; which Latter is not put into the Grave with the Other, nor Imprisoned under the Cold Sods. Notwithstanding all which, that hath been here suggetted by us; we shall not our selves venture, to determine any thing, in so great a Point; but Sceptically leave it Undecided.

The Third and Last thing, in the Forementioned Philosphick or Pythagorick Cabbala, is concerning those Being Superior to men, commonly called by the Greeks, Demons, (which Philo tells us are the fame with Angels amongst the Jews, and accordingly are those words Demons and Angels, by Hierocles and Simplicius, and other of the latter Pagan Writers, sometimes used indifferently as Synonymous) viz. That these Demons or Angels, are not Pure, Abstræct, Incorpooreal Substances, devoid of Vital Union with any Matter; but that they consist of somthing Incorporeal, and somthing Corpooreal, joyned together; so that as Hierocles writeth of them, τὸ μὲν ἐκείνῳ ἀκάθιστον...
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They have a Superior and an Inferior Part in them; and their Superior Part is an Incorpoerale Substance, their Inferior Corporal. In a word, that they, all as well as men, consist of Soul and Body, united together, there being only this Difference betwixt them, that the Souls of these Demons or Angels, never descend down to such Gross and Terrestrial Bodies, as Immune Souls do; but are always Clothed, either with Aerial or Ethereal ones. And indeed this Pythagorick Cabbala, was Universal, concerning all Understanding Beings, besides the Supreme Deity, or Trinity of Divine Hypostases; that is, concerning all the Pagan Inferior Gods; that they are no other than Souls vitally united to some Bodies, and so made up of Incorpooral, and Corporal Substance, Joined together. For thus Hierocrates plainly expresseth himself, in the forecited place; υ λογιζειν έσοδον της άνυμωσιας εις τι ετκαι ετοτο παρελθει, ας μετα τη σωματικαν ως τω μετα ανωτερομου ιεολην, &c. The Rational Nature (in General) was so produced by God, as that it neither is Body, nor yet without Body; but an Incorpoeral Substance, having a Cognizance or Congenite Body. Which same thing was else where also thus declared by him, ιε γαρ πεσε τω πνευματι P. 17, ο λογισεις αικωνεις μετα τω συμπεριφιξει αυτων αναφεξες συμπολιτι, διων εσοδο της ανυμωσιας, the whole Rational Order, or Rank of Being, with its Congenite Immortal Body, is the Image of the whole Deity, the Maker thereof. Where by Hierocrates his Rational Nature or Essence, and by the Whole Rational Order, is plainly meant, all Understanding Beings Created, of which he acknowledgeth only these Three Kinds and Degrees, First, the Immortal Gods, which are to him the Animate Stars; Secondly, Demons, Angels, or Heroes; and Thirdly, Men, called also by him, κοσμικα δυναμεσ, Terrestrial Demons: he pronouncing of them all, that they are alike, Incorpooreal Substances, together with a Congenite Immortal Body and that there is no other Understanding Nature than such, besides the Supreme Deity, which is Complete in itself, without the Conjunction of any Body. So that according to Hierocrates, the Ancient Pythagorick Cabbala, acknowledged no such Entities at all, as those Intelligences of Aristotle, and the Noes of some High-flown Platonists; (that is, perfectly Unbodied Minds;) and much less any Rank of Honades or Unities, Superior to these Noes. And indeed such Particular Created Beings as these, could neither have Sense or Cognizance of any Corporal thing Existing without them; (Sense as Aristotle hath observed, Resulting from a Complication of Soul and Body, as Weaving, Results from a Complication of the Weaver and Weaving Instruments:) nor yet could they All upon any Part of the Corporal Universe. So that these Immovable Beings, would be but like Adamantine Statues; and things Unconnected with the rest of the World, having no Commerce with any thing at all but the Deity; a kind of Insignificant Metaphysical Gazers, or Contemplators. Whereas the Deity though it be not properly ή νημα παγωνεα, a Mundane Soul, such as together with the Corporal World, as its Body, makes up one Complete and Entire Animal; yet because the whole world proceeded from it, and perpetually dependeth on it, therefore must it needs take Cognizance of all, and All upon all in it; upon which account it hath been styled by these Pythagoreans, ή νημα περιγεωνεα, (not a Mundane,
Wherefore we are here also to shew, what Agreement or Disagreement there is, betwixt this Part of the Pythagoric Cabbala, and the Christian Philosophy. And First, it hath been already intimated, that the very same Doctrine, with this of the Ancient Pythagoreans, was plainly alferred by Origen. Thus in his First Book Peri Archon. c. 6. Solius Dei, (faith he) id est Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, Nature id proprium est, ut sine Materiali Substantia, & abique Vtlo Corpore, Adjestionis Sociitate, intelligatur subsister. It is proper to the Nature of God only, that is of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to subsist without Material Substance, or the Society of any Corporeal Adjiction. Again, L. 2. c. 2. Materialum Substantiam Opinione quidem & Intellectu solum Separari, a Naturis Rationalibus, & Pro ipsis, vel Post ipsas Efficitur videri; sed necquam sine ipsa eas vel Vixisse, vel Vivere: solius namque Trinitatis Incorporessa Vita existitire reedt putabitur. Material Substance in Rational Nature, is indeed Separable from them, in Conception and Understanding, it seeming to be made for them, and in Order of Nature after them; but it is not Really and Actually Separable from the same; nor did they ever, or can they, live without it. For a Life perfectly Incorporeal, is rightly deemed, to belong to the Trinity only. So also in his Fourth Book, and his Anacephalaëtis, Semper erunt Rationabiles Nature, que indurent Indumentum Corporeo. Semper ergo erit Natura Corporea, cuius Indumentis Ut neceße est Rationabiles Creatures. Nisi quis putet se poeße ostendere, quod Natura Rationalibus абuisse Vtlo Corpore, vitam degere posset. Sed quam difficile id est, & quam prope impossibile Intellectu nostro, in Superioribus ostendimus. There always will be Rational Nature, which stand in need of a Corporeal Indument. Wherefore there will be always Corporeal Nature, as a necessary Indument or Clothing for these Rational Creatures. Unless anyone could shew, that it is possible for the Rational Nature to live without a Body. Which how difficult and almost Impossible it is, to our Understanding, hath been already declared. Aquinas Affirmeth, Origen in this Doctrine of his, to have followed the Opinion of certain Ancient Philosophers; and undoubtedly it was the Old Pythagoric Cabbala, which the Learned Origen here adhered to; that η λογικα σολο, as it is in Hierocles,
Hierarch, and πᾶς ὁ λογος Ἀρχαῖος, The Rational Nature made by God, that is, all Created Understanding Beings, are neither Body, nor yet without Body; but have always a Cognate or Congenite Body, as their Vehicle or Indument. So that Angels or Demons as well according to Origen, as Hierarch, are all of them Incorporeal Substances, not Naked and Abstract, but Clothed with certain Subtle Bodies; or Animals compounded and made up of Soul and Body together.

Therefore Hucceius and other learned men, seem not well to have understood Origen here, but to have confounded Two different Opinions together, when they suppose him, to have ascertained, Angels and all Understanding Creatures, not, to Have Bodies, but, to Be Bodies, and nothing else; and consequently, that there is no Incorporeal Substance at all, besides the Deity, Whereas Origen only affirmeth, that nothing besides the Trinity, could subsist and live alone, absque ulla corporea adjunctionis Societate, without the Society of any Corporeal Adjunction, and that the Material Nature, is only a Necessary Indument, or Clothing, of all Rational or Understanding Creatures. And in this Senté is it, that an Incorporeal Life is laid by him, to be proper only to the Trinity; because all other Understanding Beings, are Animals, compounded of Soul and Body together. But that Origen acknowledged, even our Humane Soul it self, to be Incorporeal, as also that there is Something in Angels Incorporeal, might be made evident from Sundry Passages in his Writings; as this Particularly in his Sixth Book against Celsus, ἡδ' εὔσεβεια καταθυμία δόξα καὶ Ἰςμεν ἀποροηγέονται, οὕτως οὓς ἐπικελευγμένου τῷ ἀκεφαλίῳ ζωτικῷ, ἢ τῷ άρυδέων ή Μεγάλων, etc. Υπάρχον, We do not think, an Incorporeal Substance to be Combushtible, nor that the Soul of Man can be resolved into Fire, or the Substance of Angels, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, or Powers. Where by the Substance of Angels, he doubtless meant the Souls of them; Origen's Senté being thus declared by St. Jerom; in Libris Συγγεγραμμένοι, Angels, & Thrones, & Dominations, & Powers, & the Governours of the Darkness of this world, and every Name that is named (in St.Paul) to be all of them, the Souls of certain Bodies, such as either by their own Desire and Inclination, or the Divine Allotment, they have receivèd. Now there can be no Question made, but that he who supposed the Souls of men to be Incorporeal, in a strict Philosophick Senté, and such as could not suffer any thing from Fire, did also acknowledge Something Incorpooreal in Angels. And thus doth he somewhere declare himself in that Book Peri ærechon, Per Christum creatà dixit (Paulus) omnia Visibilia & Invisiblea, per quod declaratur, esse etiam in Creaturis quasdam Invisiblea, secundum proprietatem ejun, Substantia; sed he quamvis ipsæ non sunt Corporea, utuntur tamen Corporious, licet ipsæ sunt Corporea Substantia meliores. Illæ vero Substantia Trinitatis neque Corpus, neque in Corpore, esse credenda est; sed in toto Incorpooreal. When Paul affirmeth all things, Visible and Invisible, to have been Created by Christ, or the Νῦμος, he intimateth that even amongst the Creatures, there are some properly Invisible.
Invisible Substances. Which Invisible Substances Created, though they be not Bodies, yet do they use Bodies, themselves being better than Corporeal Substance. But the Substance of the Trinity, is neither Body, nor yet in Body, but altogether Incorporeal. Wherefore Angelical and Humane Souls, are not as Huetius supposeth, called Incorporeal by Origen, only as Subtle Bodies sometimes are, by the more Simple and Unskilful; but in a strict Philosophick sense; only he supposeth them to differ from the Deity in this, that though they be not Bodies, yet they are always In Bodies, or Clothed with Bodies: whereas the Deity is in both senses Incorporeal, it having not so much as any Corporeal Indument. So that there is here no contradiction at all to be found in Origen; he constantly afferting Angels, to have something Incorporeal in them, as their Superior Part, and not in that vulgar sense of a Subtle Body, but in the Philosophick; nevertheless to Have also a Corporeal Indument or Clothing, as their Out side, or Lower Part; and in that regard only, he calling them Corporeal.

It is true indeed, that there were amongst the Ancient Fathers, some, who were so far from supposing Angels to be altogether Incorporeal, that they ran into the other Extremes, and concluded them to have Nothing at all Incorporeal in them, but to be mere Bodies. But these either afferted, that there was no such thing at all as any Incorporeal Substance, and that not only Angels, and Humane Souls, but also God himself, was a Body: or at least they concluded, that nothing Created was Incorporeal; and that God, though Himself Incorporeal, yet could Create nothing but Bodies. These are here the Two Extremes, One, that Angels have nothing Corporeal at all belonging to them: The Other, that they are altogether Corporeal, or have Nothing Incorporeal in them: A Middle between both which, is the Origenick Hypothesis, the same with the Pythagorick; That in Angels, there is a Complication of Incorporeal and Corporeal Substance both together, or that they are Animals consisting of Soul and Body. We shall now make it appear, that the Greater part of the Ancient Fathers, were for neither of the Two fore-mentioned Extremes; Either that Angels were wholly Incorporeal, or that they were wholly Corporeal; but rather for the Middle Hypothesis, that they had Bodies, and yet Were not Bodies; But as other Terrestrial Animals, Spirits or Souls, Clothed with Ethereal or Aerial Bodies. And that the Generality of the Ancient and most Learned Fathers, did not conceive Angels to be mere Unbodied Spirits; is unquestionably Evident from hence, because they agreed with the Greek Philosophers in that Conception, that Evil Demons or Devils, were therefore delighted with the Blood and Nidours of Sacrifices, as having their more Gross, Aerial, and Vaporous Bodies nourished and refreshed with those Vapours; which they did as it were Luxuriant and Gluttonize in. For thus does Porphyrius write concerning them, in his Book De Ablinentia, εν οι Χαλεμαυς λοισι τε, κυπευτο τε, ἐν ου ευτυλο, τε στυγητον κη πνευ-ματικω παλαιας: Εν γα τοιο ουρανις κη ἀεευμελων: These are they, who take pleasure in the Incense, Fumes, and Nidours of Sacrifices, wherewith their Corporeal and Spirituous Part, as it were was distinguished: for this Lives and is Nourished by Vapours and Fumigations. And that before
before Porphyrion, many other Pagan Philosophers, had been of the
same Opinion, appeareth from this of Celsus, *τους εις ισους ες αποτιθηνισιν."
L. 8. ανθρωποι, εις την φαναν, εις της μεν εχθρων διαφωναν τω πλεον
καιναυς συνεθεκης, εις περιοδοις αμοιδαι ναηιερας, etc. We ought to
give Credit to wise men, who affirm, that most of these Lower and Cir-
cumsternaneous Demons, are delighted with Geniture, Blood, and Nidour,
and such like things, and much gratified therewith: though they be not
able to do any thing more in way of recom pense, then sometimes perhaps
to cure the Body or to forestall good and evil Fortunes to Men and Cities.
Upon which account himself though a zealous Pagan, perfwadeth men,
to moderation in the Use of these Sacrifices, as Principally
gratifying the Inferiour and Worser Demons only.
In like manner O-
rius frequently inlitheth upon the same thing, he affirming that De-
vils were not only delighted, with the Idolatry of the Pagan in their
Sacrifices, but also, απο της θεονος ανθρωπιας η τως εις της αμοιδαι Celsis.
Εις δελοιοις ανεξαρτητως τρεισσεται τω σοφιαν φιλοσοφοντων των τοιουθε.
τοις, That their very Bodies were Nourished by the Vapours and Fumes,
arising from them; and that these Evil Demons therefore did as it were
Delicate and Epicurize in them. And before Origin, most of the
Ancient Fathers, as Juffius Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Tertulian,
&e, and also many others after him, endeavour to dispa rage those
Material and Bloody Sacrifices, upon the same Account, as things
whereby Evil Demons were principally Gratified. We shall here
only cite one paflage to this purpose out of St. Basil, or who ever
were the Author of that Commentary upon Iaiaib, because there is
something Philofophick in it: αναγηκαν δια της φιλοσοφους η εις τον θεον, οι
νους νεφελος των θεον η χρησιν εξοικειομενες, διω αναγηκαι τοις θεο-
μοιον τω ανθρωποι, και εστω δια αναγηκαι της θεονοις εις τω
ουρανω αυτως ουκ ιερολογομενοις, ολοι γαρ οι ουλοι τρεισσεται των
αιμων, δια ουκ εις τω ανθρωπων ως οικειομενοι, ολλως αι τελες ποιειντων ζωων η ουκεια, η ουκει
τοις ανθρωποσ εις ουλω της αυτης των θεον, τω τρεισσε τοις ανθρωπους, Sacrifices are
things of no small pleasure and advantage to Demons, because the Blood be-
ing evaporated by Fire and so attenuated, is taken into the Compages and
Substances of their Bodies: The whole of which is throughout, nourished
with Vapours, not by Eating, and Stomachs, or such like Organs, but as the
Hairs and Nails of all Animals and whatsoever other things Receive
nourishment into their whole Substance. And thus do we see it undeni-
able manifest, that many of the Ancient Fathers, suppos'd Devils to
have Bodies; neither can it at all be doubted, but that they con-
cluded the fame of Angels too; these being both of the fame kind,
and differing but as Good and Evil men. And though they do not
affirm this of Good Angels, but of Devils only; that they were thus
Delighted and Nourished with the Fumes and Vapours of Sacrifices,
and that they Epicurized in them; yet was not the reason hereof,
because they conceived them, to be altogether Incorporeal; but to have
Pure Ethereal or Heavenly Bodies: it being proper to those GROSS and
Vaporous Bodies of Demons only to be Nourished and Restieli after
that manner. And Now that all these Ancient Fathers, did not sup-
pose either Angels or Devils, to be altogether Corporeal, or to have
nothing but Body in them, may be concluded from hence, because
many of them plainly declared the Souls of Men to be Incorporeal,
and therefore it cannot be imagined, that they should so far degrade Angels below Men, as not to acknowledge them, to have any thing at all Incorporeal.

But we shall now Instance in some few amongst many of these Ancients, who plainly affirfed both Devils and Angels to be Spirits Incorporate; and not to be meer Bodies, but only to Have Bodies; that is, to consist of Soul and Body, or Incorporeal and Corporeal Substancc joined together. That Angels themselves Have Bodies is everywhere declared by St. Augustine, in his Writings; he affirming, that the Bodies of Good men after the Resurrection, shall be Qualia sunt Angelorum Corpora, Such as are the Bodies of Angels, and that they shall be Corpora Angelicae in Societate Angelorum; Angelical Bodies, fit for Society and Converse with Angels; and declaring the difference, between the Bodies of Angels and of Devils, in this manner, Demones antequam transgrederentur, Caelstia Corpora gereeant, qua conversa sunt ex pena in Aeream Qualitatem, ut jam possum ab Igni Pati; That though Devils before the Transgression had Celestial Bodies as Angels now have, yet might these afterwards in way of Punishment, be changed into Aerial ones, and such as now may suffer by Fire. Moreover the same St. Augustin, some where calleth Good Angels, by the name of Animae Beatæ atque Sanctæ, Happy and Holy Souls: And though it be true, that in his Retractions he calleth and correcteth this; yet was this only a Scrupulosity in that Pious Father, concerning the meer word, because he no where found in Scripture, Angels called by the name of Souls: it being far from his meaning even there to deny them, to be Incorporeal Spirits, joined with Bodies. And certainly he who every where concludes, Humane Souls to be Incorporeal, cannot be thought to have supposed, Angels to have nothing at all but Body in them. Again Claudianus Mamertus, writing against Faustus, who made Angels to be meer Bodies, without Souls, or any thing Incorporeal, maintaineth in way of Opposition; not that they are meer Incorporeal Spirits, without Bodies (which is the other Extream) but that they consist of Corporeal and Incorporeal, Soul and Body, joyned together; he writing thus of the Devils, Diabolus ex Duplici diversaque Substantia consistit: & Corporeus est & Incorporeus, The Devil consisteth of a double and different Substance; he is Corporeal, and he is also Incorporeal. And again of Angels, Patet Beatos Angelos, utriusque Substantiae, & Incorpo ros esse in eae vis, qua ipsi Visibilis Deus: & in ea itidem Parte Corporos, qua hominibus sunt ipsi Visibiles. It is manifest, that the blessed Angels, are of a Two-fold Substance; that they are Incorpo real, in that part of theirs wherein God is Visible to them, and again Corporeal, in that other Part, wherein themselves are Visible to men. Moreover Fulgentius writeth concerning Angels in this manner; Planae ex Duplicitis eorum Substantiae affertur Angelorum & Divi Viri. Id est, ex Spiritu Incorpo reo, quo Dei contemplatione nunquam recedunt: & ex Corpore per quod ex tempore hominibus apparent. Corpora vero Ætherialia, id est, Ignes, eos dicens habere, Demones vero Corpus Aereum. Great and learned men affirm, Angels to consist of a Double Substance, that is, of a Spirit Incorporeal, whereby they contemplate God, and of a Body whereby they are sometimes Visible to men, as also that they have Etherial
Ethereal or Fiery Bodies, but Devils Aerial. And perhaps this might be the meaning of 'Joannes Theofalonicensis', in that Dialogue of his, read and approved of in the Seventh Council, and therefore the meaning of that Council it self too, when it is thus declared, viz. that angels, or rather angels, are incorporeal, and are capable of being burnt with fire. To which purpose, the Thracian there addeth more afterwards from the
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Information of Marcus the Monk, a person formerly Initiated in the Diabolick Mysteries; and of great Ciriosity, to the meaning of Angels, as being divided into rays; and able to divide the body and soul, to which they are united, or which they are united with, by the will of the greater. They are divided into three kinds, as Body, Soul, and Spirit, and are altogether Incorporeal.

The Demonick Spirit or Subtle Body, being in every part of it capable of Sense, does immediately See and Hear, and is also Obnoxious to the affections of Touch; inasmuch that being suddainly divided or cut in two, it hath a Sense of Pain, as the Solid Bodies of other Animals have; it differing from them only in this, that those other Bodies, being once discontinu ed, are not easily consolidated together again, whereas the Demonick Body, being divided, is quickly redintegrated by Coalescence, as Air or Water. Nevertheless it is not without a Sense of Pain, at that time, when it is thus divided, &c. Moreover the same Marcus affirmeth the Bodies of these Demons to be Nourished also, though in a different manner, from ours, forsooth; they being divided into rays, is the same as the rays of light or waves of water. They are some of them Nourished by Inspiration, as the Spirit contained in the Nerves and Arteries; others by sucking in the adjacent Moisture; not as we do by mouth, but as Sponges and Tefaceous Fishes. And now we may venture to conclude, that this Opinion of Angels being not meer Abstract Incorporeal Substances, and Unbodied Minds, but consisting of Something Incorporeal, and Something Corporeal, that is, of Soul or Spirit, and Body Joined together, is not only more agreeable to Reason, but hath also had more suffrages amongst the Ancient Fathers, and those of greater weight too, than either of those Two other Extremes, viz. That Angels are meer Bodies, and have nothing at all Incorporeal in them; or else, that they are altogether Incorporeal, without any Bodily Indument or Clothing.

Notwithstanding which this latter Opinion hath indeed prevailed most in these Latter Ages; Time being rightly compared to a River, which quickly sinks the more Weighty and Solid things, and bears up only the Lighter and more Superficial. Though there may be other Reafons given for this also, as partly because the Aristotelick Philosophy when generally introduced into Christianity, brought in its Abstract Intelligences along with it; and partly because, some Spurious Platonists talking so much of their Hellenes and Noes, their Simple Monads and Immoveable Unbodied Minds, as the Chief of their Generated and Created Gods; probably some Christians might have a mind, to vie their Angels with them. And lastly, because Angels are not only called in Scripture Spirits, but also by Several of the Ancient Fathers to be Incorporeal; whilst this in the mean time, was meant only either in respect of that Incorporeal Part, Soul or Mind, which they suppos'd to be in them, or else of the Tenacity and Subtlety of their Bodies or Vehicles. For this account does Psclaus give hereof, δυο τοις υμετεροις δυο τοις Μοναδοις, ειςΗθεν δπ', τα προτεινον τοις σομακτον
Chap. IV. as having Subtle Bodies.

...as wherein the Grosser Bodies Corporeal, and those which by reason of their Subtlety avoid both our Sight and Touch, Incorporeal. And before Icells, Johannes Theofalonicensis, in his Dialogue, approved in the Seventh Council; yet he did devise, as he used, to call the Grosser Bodies Corporeal, and those which by reason of their Subtlety avoid both our Sight and Touch, Incorporeal. But though this Doctrine of Angels, or all Created Understanding Beings Superior to men, having a Corporeal Indument or Clothing, does so exactly agree with the Old Pythagoric Cabbala, yet have we reason to think, that it was not therefore merely borrowed or derived, from...
from thence, by the Ancient Fathers; but that they were led into it, by the Scripture it self. For first, the Historick Phenomena of Angels in the Scripture, are such, as cannot well be otherwise Saleed, than by supposing them to have Bodies; and then not to lay any stress upon those words of the Psalmit, Who maketh his Angels Spirits, and Ministers, at the same time (though with good reason by the Ancient Fathers interpreted to this sense) because they may possibly be understood otherwise, as sometime They are by Rabbinical Commentators: nor to infilt upon those passages of S. Paul, where he speaks of the Tongues of Angels, and of the Voice of an Arch-Angel, and such like, there are several other Places in Scripture, which seem plainly to confirm this Opinion. As first, that of our Saviour before mentioned to this purpose, Luke the 20. the 35. They who shall be accounted worthy, to obtain that world, and the Resurrection from the dead, neither Marry nor are given in Marriage, neither can they die any more; for they are Equal unto the Angels. For were Angels utterly devoid of all Bodies, then would the Souls of Good men, in a State of Separation, and without any Resurrection, be rather Equal to Angels, than after a Resurrection of their Bodies. Wherefore the Natural meaning of these words seems to be this, (as St. Austin hath interpreted them) that the Souls of Good men, after the Resurrection, shall have Corpora Angelica, Angelical Bodies, and Qualia sunt Angelorum Corpora, such Bodies as those of Angels are. Wherein it is supposed, that Angels also have Bodies, but of a very different kind from those of ours here. Again, that of St. Jude, where he writeth thus of the Devils: The Angels which kept not their First Estate (or rather according to the Vulgar Latin, Sum Princeptatun, Their own Principality) but left their Proper Habitation (or Dwelling House) hath he reserved in everlasting Chains, under darkness, unto the Judgement of the Great Day. In which words, it is first implied, that the Devils were Created by God Pure, as well as the other Angels, but that they kept not τῶν ἀρχῶν οὐρανῶν, Their own Principality, That is, their Lordly Power and Dominion over their Worser and Inferior part, they having also a certain Duplicity in their Nature, of a Better and Worser Principle, of a Superior Part, which ought to Rule and Govern, and of an Inferior, which out to be Governed: nor is it indeed otherwise, easily conceivable, how they should be Capable of Sinning. And this Inferior Part in Angels, seems to have a respect to something that is Corporeal or Bodily in them also, as well as it hath in men. But then in the next place, St. Jude addeth, as the Immediate Result and Natural Consequent of these Angels Sinning, that they thereby Left or Lost, to ήσιν δικαιούμενοι, Sum Princeptatun, Domicilium, That is, not only, their Dwelling Place at Large, tho' Ethereal Countries, and Heavenly Regions above, but also their Proper Dwelling House, or Immediate Mansions, to wit their Heavenly Body. For as much as that Heavenly Body, which Good men expect after the Resurrection, is thus called by St. Paul, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξω, τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, Our Habitation, or Dwelling House that is from Heaven. The Heavenly Body is the Proper House or Dwelling, Clothing or Indument, both of Angelical and Humane Souls; and this is that which makes them fit Inhabitants for the Heavenly Regions. This I say was the Natural effect and Consequent of these Angels Sinning, their Leaving or Loosing, their Pure Heavenly...
Heavenly Body, which became thereupon forthwith Obscured and inter-erated; the Bodies of Spirits Incorpsrate, always bearing a corresponding Purity or Impurity to the different disposition of their Mind or Soul. But then again, in the last place, that which was thus in Part, the Natural Reft of their Sin, was also by the Just Judgment of God, converted into their Punifhment; For their Ethereal Bodies, being thus changed into gros, Aerial, Feculent, and Vaporous ones, themselves were immediately hereupon, as St. Peter in the Parallel Place expresseth it, τοπιτομενοι Παταγωνιος, Cast down into Tartarus, and there Imprisoned, or Referred in Chains Under Darkness, until the Judgment of the Great Day. Where it is observable that the word ταρταροω, used by St. Peter, is the very same, that ApolloDorus, and other Greek Writers frequently make use of, in a like cafe, when they speak of the Titan’s being Caft down from Heaven: which seems to have been Really nothing else, but this Fall of Angels Poetically Mythologi- zed. And by Tartars here in all probability, is meant this Lower Caliginous Air, or Atmosphere of the Earth, according to that of St. Añfifim, concerning thefhe Angels, οποίοι προέκομαν δουλευσις Cai- ligimen, ubi tamen & Aer, That after their Sin, they were thrust down into the Mifty darkness of this Lower Air. And here are they, as it were, Chained and Fettered also, by that fame Weight of their Gros and heavy Bodies, which first sunk them down hither, this not suffering them to reafend up, or return back to the Bright Ethereal Regions above. And being thus for the present Imprisoned in this Lower Tartarus, or Caliginous Air or Atmosphere, they are indeed here Kept and Referred in Custody, unto the Judgment of the Great Day, and General Affairs: however they may notwithstanding in the mean time, seem to Domineer and Lord it for a while here. And Lastly our Saviours, Go ye Cursed into everlafling fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels, seems to be a clear Confirmation of Devils being Bodied; because First to Allegorize this Fire into nothing but Re- morfe of Confequence, would indanger the rendering of other Points of our Religion uncertain also, but to say that Incorporeal SubStan- ces Unminded to Bodies, can be tormented with Fire, is as much as in us lieth, to exoile Christianiuty and the Scripture, to the Scorn and Contempt of all Philosophers, and Philosophick Wits. Wherefore yeufes P. 37: laies no small Stress upon this Place, οκι μην ακακοφ τη της ξυντητι Λο- γου πηθραμητηθη ταυτι ιει παλαιοθεσικοι φοι Χριστιανοι της θαλασσας, δ ενθω ημεθι συμμετοχης διαιμας; το ηδ ημεθεω ημεθεω παθων ηπο συμ- μεθεω ειναι γεν συμμεθεω ειναι της καλας ιαπεθεως περιους παλαις. I am also convinced of this, That Demons have Bodies, from the words of our Saviour affirming, That they shall be Punished with Fire: which how could it be, were they altogether Incorporeal? it being Impossible for that which is both it self Incorporeal, and Vitally Unminded to any Body, to Suffer from a Body. Wherefore of necessity it must be granted, by no Christians, that Devils shall receive Punishment of Sense and Pain hereafter, in Bodies capable of Suffering.

Now if Angels in general, that is, all Created Beings Superior to men, be Substances Incorporeal, or Souls Vitally United to Bodies; though not always the fame, but sometimes of one kind and some-
times of another; and never quite Separate from all Body; it may seem probable from hence, that though there be other Incorporeal Substances besides the Deity, yet Vita Incorporea, a Life perfectly Incorporeal in the forementioned Orogenick Sense, or Sins Corporea Adjunctionis Sociatione Vivere, to Live altogether without the Society of any Corporeal Adjunction, is a Privilege properly belonging to the Holy Trinity only; and consequently therefore, that Humane Souls when by Death, they are Develed of these Gross Earthly Bodies, they do not then Live and Act Compleatly, without the Conjunction of any Body, and so continue till the Resurrection or Day of Judgment: this Being a priviledge which not so much as the Angels themselves, and therefore no Created Finite Being, is capable of; the Imperfection of whole Nature necessarily requires the Conjunction of some Body with them, to make them up Complete; without which it is unconceivable, how they should either have Sense or Imagination. And Thus doth Orogen Consentaneously to his own Principles. Conclude, ά τις εκτις φύσις δυνάμεως και δοξάσεως, αν πνευματικός τότε τυμβρώσσεται, δειλή συνείδησις ισχύει της φύσις τός τότε έχειν· δια τούτο μέν φρονήματα, αντίπαρωμα, μένειν πεπήραν αναθεματικά μέν, πέρασιν δέ ας περηγετών τούτων. ισχύει τον εύπνους καταστημένον εύπνους τός τούτων είς τά καταρακτήρες και ανάθεμα ταύτας τούτας. Our Soul, which in its own Nature is Incorporeal and Invisible, in whatsoever Corporeal place it Exsifteth; doth always stand in need of a Body, suitable to the Nature of that place respectively. Which Body it sometimes beareth, having Put Off that which before was necessary, but is now Superfluous, for the Following State; and sometimes again Putting On something, to what before it had, now standing in need of some better Clothing, to fit it for those more Pure Ethereal and Heavenly places. But in what there follows, we conceive that Orogen's senfe having not been rightly understood, his words have been altered and perverted, and that the whole place ought to be read thus, καὶ εὐδοκέω μεν ὑπὲρ της τύχης ἱεραμανων τοίς χρόνοις προς την ἐκ της ἑρας τούς καταισθάνοντας, ἐν συναίσθησιν ὑπ' ἐφ' ἑαυτήν, ὑπ' ἐκείνου δ' ἐν ἀναθεματικὸν τοῖς αὐτοῖς μείζονα διακρίνοντα, ὑπ' εἰσαίρετον τούς φύσεις, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῖς αὐτοποίησις της τῆς ζωῆς, καταλήπτει μὲν φανον οἱ λόγοι τῆς θεοθείας ὑπ' ζωῆς της ζωῆς, τοῦ ζωῆς ὑπ' αὐχέναι, οἵ οἶκοι φυλάττονταί, αἰώνιον ὡς τοὺς θερμοὺς λέειν ἢ οἱ τῆς ἀνεφελθοντο τοῦ φουλτίου συνεκρατάντας οὕτως εὑρεθαν. The Senfe whereof is this, The Soul descending either into Generation, Put on first, that Body which was useful for it whilst to continue in the Womb; and then again afterward, such a Body as was necessary for it, to Live here upon the Earth in. Again it having here a Two fold kind of Body, the one of which is called ζωή by St. Paul; (being a more Subtle Body, which it had before) the other the Superinduced Earthly House, necessarily subservient to this Schenos here; the Scripture Oracles affirm, that the Earthly House of this Schenos, shall be corrupted or dissolved, but the Schenos itself, Superinduce or Put On a House not made with hands, Eternal in the Heavens: The fame declaring that the Corruptible shall put on Incorruption, and the Mortal Immortality. Where it is plain, that Orogen takes that ζωή in St. Paul (1 Cor. 5. 1.) for a Subtle Body, which the Soul had before its Terrene Nativity,
Vehicles of Souls, from Origen.

Nativity, and which Continues with it after Death; but in good men will at last Superindue, or Put on (without Death) the Clothing of Immortality. Neither can there be a better Commentary upon this place of Origen, than those Excerpts out of Methodius the Martyr in Photius, though seeming to be Vitiated also; where, as we conceive, the sense of Origen and his Followers, is first contained in those words, έπερε τω άρωμα, και της άγιας νηματευσετε αναιτωρητον την εισαγωγη τω άρωμα. That in St. Paul the το άρωμα is One thing; and the Earthly House of this άρωμα Another thing: and We, that is our Souls a Third thing, did shine from both. And then it is further declared in this that follows, (p. 244.) το άρωμα καθαρισμος, το άρωμα πεπολεμημενος, το άρωμα έπερευσεν το άρωμα την προσφεραν εις θανατον. That there is καλος ο άρωμα τα άρωμα την προσφεραν εις θανατον, και εναι διαλογισθαι μεν, και έπερευσεν εις θανατον, της μεταφεραι, της άρωμας την προσφεραν εις θανατον, διαλογισθαι μεν, και έπερευσεν εις θανατον. That Origen plainly in his Fifth Book, hath declared from both. And in this he groan, desirous not to put off, all Body, but to put on Life or Immortality upon the Body which we shall then have. For that House which is from Heaven, That we desirous to put on, is Immortality. Moreover that the Soul is not altogether Naked after Death, the same Origen endeavours to confirm further from that of our Saviour concerning the Rich Man and Lazarus, αλλα ο άρωμα καθαρισμενον το πεπολεμημενον τετελειμενον πεπολεμημενον. A difference, between the Earthly House, in which The Soul is punished, and the Poor man refreshed in Abraham's Bosom, before, the Coming of our Saviour, and before the end of the world, and therefore before the Resurrection, plainly teaches, that even now also after Death, the Soul hath a Body. He thinketh the same also to be further proved from the that will be Visible Apparition of Samuel's Ghost, αλλα το άρωμα φανερωμενον, ας καθαρισθη, and heavenly Esteem, εν, περαμαται της φωσιν τελευτη του, Samuel also visibly the Spirit appearing after Death, makes it manifest, that his Soul was then clothed with a Body. To which he adds in Photius, το αρωμα έγινεν τη αποκαλυπτων κοιμιοντας εκεινον. The Exterieur Form and Figure of the Souls Body after Death, both resemble that of the Gross Terrestrial Body here in this Life. All the Histories of Apparitions, making Ghosts or the Souls of the Body after Death, do appear in the same Form, which put it off but their Bodies had before. This therefore, as was observed, is that which Origen understands, by το αρωμα in St. Paul; not this Gross Terrestrial Body, but a certain Middle Body betwixt it, and the Heavenly, which the Soul after Death, carries away with it. Now this Opinion of the Learned Origenes, was never reckoned up by the Ancient Fathers, or his greatest Adveraries, in the Catalogue of his Errors: nor does Methodius the Martyr, who was so great an Anti-Origenist, where he mentions this Origenick Opinion in Photius, seem to tax it otherwise, then as Platonically Implying, the Soul to be incorporeal. Methodius himself on the contrary contending, not that the Soul Hath a Body conjointed with it after Death, as a distinct thing from it, but that it self Is a Body; ως ο άρωμα, καθαρισμος, αναιτωρητον προσφεραν εις θανατον. ας λογος Σεριμπτε αληθευμενος, εν άρωμα σημασιαν ευπορικως, εν μοι περι των άρωμα της ανεξαρτητε αυτου αναιτωρητε αναιτωρητον των άρωμα των νηματων, και καταρειστι άρωμα αποκαλυπτον.
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of the Souls Having a Body after Death, but much less of its Being a Body: nevertheless does he seem to leave every man to his own Liberty therein, in these words: *Si autem Quaevis, dum Anima de Corpore exerit, Utum ad aliqua loca Corporalia feratur, an ad Incorpo-
ralia Corporalibusc similis; an vero nec ad ipsa, sed ad illud quodd & Corp-
poribus & Similitudinibus Corporum est Excellentius; Cito quidem re-
ponderimus ad Corporalia loca can vel non ferri nisi cum aliquo Cor-
porre, vel non localiter ferri. Jam utrum habeat aliquod Corpus, Oppo-
dat qui potest; Ego autem non puto. Spiritalem enim arbitrari esse non
Corporalem, ad spirituata vero pro meritis fertur, aut ad Loca Vernalia
similia Corporibus.* But if it be demanded, when the Soul goes out of
this Body, whether it be carried into any Corporal Places, or to incor-
poral places like to Corporals, or else to neither, but to that which is more ex-
cellent than both Bodies, and the likeness of Bodies; the Answer is ready;
that it cannot be carried to Corporal Places, or to locally carried any
whither, without a Body. Now whether the Soul have some Body, where
it goes out of this Body, let them that can show: but for my part, I think
otherwise. For I suppose the Soul to be Spiritual and not Corporal, and
that after Death it is either carried to Spiritual things, or else to Penal
Places like to Bodies, such as have been represented to some in Extasies,
&c. Where St. Austin himself, seems to think, the Punishment of
Souls after Death, and before the Resurrection, to be Phantasical, or
only in Imagination. Whereas there could not not be then so much as
Phantasical Punishments neither, nor any Imagination at all in Souls,
without a Body; if that Doctrine of Aristotle’s be true, that Phantazy
order Imagination, is nothing else but a Weaker Sense; that is, a thing
which results from a Complication of Soul and Body both together.
But it is observable that in the forecited place, that which St. Austin
citely opposed, was the Souls Being a Body, as Tertullian, Methodius,
and others had alleged; but as for its Having a Body, he faith only
this, *Opendat qui potest, Let him that can show it: He granting in the
mean time, that the Soul cannot be Locally carried any whither at all
after Death, nor indeed be in any place, without a Body. However
the same St. Austin, as he elsewhere condemneth, the Opinion of
those, who would take the Fire of Hell Metaphorically, acknowledging
it to be Real and Corporal; so does he somewhere think it not
improbable, but after Death, and before the Resurrection, the Souls
of men may suffer, from a certain Fire, for the consumming and burn-
ing up of their drosses, *Post Illius, &e. Corporis Mortem, done ad illum
Veniatur, qui post Resurrectionem Corporum futurum est Damnationis &
Remunerationis Ultinum Dies;* Si hoc temporis Intervallo, Eujusmodi
Ignem dicuntur perpetui quem non sentiant illi, qui non habuerint tales
nores & amores in bujus Corporis Vita, ut Eorum Ligna, & Fanum, &
Stipula Conflagratur: aliis vero sentiant qui ejusmodi suum edificia
portaverunt, &c. non redargu, quia forstam Eorum est. If in this In-
terval of Time, between the Exit of the Body, and the Resurrection or
Day of Judgment, the Souls of the Dead be said to suffer such a Fire as
can do no Execution, upon those who have no Wood, Hay, nor Stuble to
burn up; but shall be felt by such as have made such Buildings or Super-
structures, &c. I reprehend it not, because perhaps it is True. The
Opinion here mentioned, is thus Expressed by Origen, in his Fifth
Book
Book against Celsus, which very place St. Austin seems to have had
respect to, is sundry by Celsus. We have not yet done, to the first and second
reasons of the corporealists, &c. But, what is more, our adversaries are
against the corporealists, &c. Yet are we to say, that St. Austin is
against Celsus, &c. Celsus did not understand, that this Fire as
well according to the Hebrews and Christians, as some of the Greeks,
will be Purgatory to the World; as also to every one of those persons, who
stand in need of such Punishment and Remedy by Fire, which Fire can
do no Execution upon those, who have no combustible Matter in them,
but will be felt by such as in the Moral sense, of their Thoughts, Words,
and Actions, have built up Wood, Hay, and Stable. Now since Souls
cannot suffer from Fire, nor any thing else in way of Sense or Pain,
without being Vitally United to some Body, we may conclude, that
St. Austin when he wrote this, was not altogether abhorrent, from
Souls having Bodies after Death.

Hitherto we have declared, How the Ancient Asserters of Incorporeal
Substance, as Unextented, did repel the Affaulls of Atheists and
Corporealists made against it; but especially, How they quitted them-
selves of that Absurdity, of the Illocality and Immobility of Finite
Created Spirits, by Supposing them always to be Vitally United to
some Bodies, and consequently, by the Locality of these their respec-
tive Bodies, determined to Here and There: according to that of
Origin, and on the other hand, the life, did the heavens move, Our
Soul stands in need of a Body, in order to Local Motions. We shall in
the next place declare, what Grounds of Reason there were, which
induced those Ancient, to assert and maintain a thing so repugnant to
Sense and Imagination, and consequently to all Vulgar Apprehension, as
a Subsance in it self Unextented, Indisjunct, and Indivisible, or De-
void of Magnitude and Parts. Wherein we shall only represent the
Sense of these Ancient Corporealists, so far as we can, to the best
advantage, in order to their Vindication, against Atheists and Mat-
erialists; our selves in the mean time, not ascertaining any thing, but
leaving every one that can, to make his own Judgment; and so either
to close with this, or that other following Hypothesis, of Ex-
tended Corporealists.

Now it is here observable, That it was a thing formerly taken for
granted on both fides, as well by the Asserters, as the Deniers of In-
corporeal Subsance, That there is but One kind of Extension only; and
Consequently that whatsoever hath Magnitude and Parts, or One
Thing Without Another, is not only Intellectually and Logically, but
also Really and Physically Divisible or Discoverable, as likewise Antitypous
and Impenetrable; so that it cannot Coexist with a Body, in the same
Place, from whence it follows, that whatsoever Arguments do evince;
That there is some other Subsance besides Body, the same do there-
fore Demonstrate; according to the Sense of these Ancients, (as
well Corporealists as Incorporealists) that there is Somehing Unex-
stended; it being supposbed by them both alike, that whatsoever is
Extended.
Extended, is Body. Nevertheless we shall here principally propound such Considerations of theirs, as tend directly to Prove, That there is something Unextendedly Incorpsoreal: And that an Unextended Deity is no Impossible Idea; to wit from hence, because there is something Unextended even in our very Selves. Where not to repeat the forementioned Ratiocination of Simplicius, That whatsoever can All and Reflect upon its Whole Self, cannot possibly be Extended, nor have Parts Distant from one another; Plotinus first argues after this manner, Α τινων φιλοσοφων, οi τών θεων ζώα τών λέγοντες, πεπανημένοι, ἔστιν ή θεων εἰς ταύτα σώματα, παράγοντες θεον θεων, οἵ τινες οἱ ἢ υἱοί, καὶ πάντες ταῦτα μέρη ταῦτα, ιδίων ἄριστα τοις μέροις: Καὶ τεῦχος συνεκάλλιο τῇ ὑπ' αὐτὸς αὐτίς· καὶ τοις θεοῖς πεπονθέντοις ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοὶ πολλακοὶ, ὑπ' σῶματι περιέχοντες ἁρμησάντως, ἔν τελέα τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ εἰς εἰς, καὶ ταῦτα μέρη ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑποτάξαν· εἴ δ' ἐκεῖνοι τούτοις μέρεσιν, καὶ θεοῖς φιλοσοφοῖς, ἀν αἱ φιλοσοφοὶ αὐτοῖς ὑποτασσέντες. What then will they say, who contend, that the Soul is a Body (or Extended?) whether or no will they grant concerning every Part of the Soul in the same Body (as that of it which is in the Foot, and that in the Hand, and that in the Brain, &c.) and again every Part of those Parts, that each of them is Soul, such as the Whole? If this be contended to, then is it plain, that Magnitude or such a Quantity, would confer nothing at all, to the Essential of the Soul, as it would do, were it an Extended Thing: but the Whole, would be in many Parts or Places which is a thing that cannot possibly belong to Body; That the same Whole, should be in more; and That a Part, should be what the whole is. But if they will not grant, every Part of their Extended Soul, to be Soul, then according to them must the Soul be Made up, and Compound of Soul-lefs Things. Which Argument is else where again thus propounded by him, εἰ ἔνθαν τέσσαρα, καὶ οἱ μεταξύς αὐτῶν ἵνα ἐπεξετάζων, ἀπὸ τούτων μεῖον ἤ συνετάκτων συμφόρουν, ἴδον ἑργαζόμενον, καὶ νῦν γενέσθαι τοῖς ἁπλῶσι· If every one of the Parts of this Extended Soul, or Mind, have Life in it, then would any one of them alone be sufficient. But to say, that though none of the Parts alone have Life in them, yet the Conjunction of them altogether, makes Life, is absurd; it being impossible, that Life and Soul should result from a Congeries of Lifeless and Souls' things, or that Mindless things put together, should beget Mind. The sum of this Argumentation is this, That either every part of an Extended Soul is Soul, and of an Extended Mind, Mind; or not. Now if no Part of a Soul, as supposed to be Extended, alone be Soul or have Life and Mind in it, then is it certain that the Whole resulting from all the Parts, could have no Life nor Mind; because Nothing can (Caucally) come from Nothing. It is true indeed, that Corporeal Qualities and Forms, according to the Atomick Physiolog, result from a Composition and Contexture of Atoms or Parts, each of which taken alone by themselves, have nothing of that Quality or Form in them,
here is plain, because these Qualities and Forms are not Entities Really distinct from the Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion of Parts, but only such a Composition of them, as cause different Phancies in us; but Life and Understanding, Soul and Mind, are Entities Really distinct from Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion of Parts, they are neither meer Phancies, nor Syllables of things, but Simple and Uncompounded Realities. But if every supposed Part of a Soul be Soul, and of a Mind, Mind; then would all the rest of it besides any One Part, be Superfluous: or indeed every supposed Part thereof, would be the Same with the Whole; from whence it follows, that it could not be Extended, or have any Real Parts at all, since no Part of an Extended thing, can possibly be the Same with the Whole.

Again the same Philosopher endeavours further to prove, that the Humane Soul it self, is Unextended and Indivisible, from its Energies and Operations, and that as well those of Sensation as of Intelligence, First therefore from External Sensations, he Reasons in this manner, eti μελλω πιστεύω ότι εν αυτῷ δε έναι, και της αυτης πνεύς αφιλο-κάνουσιν και ει δε παλλεν εις έννυχτες πλεώ τας εις αυτος, την παλλα σης εν πίνακες, και ει εν τη πνεύμου, αον τερματων εν τω άλλω μεν ενον άλλο εφιλοκάνου, αλλα παλλεν όμω παλλον και ει τω μεν ήν ομοιόν της δε εκειν, ει τι δε έναι εις έν αμφω τη πος εν επιφανει άττα, μου ες τω αυτω μεν της αφιλοκάνου ενθον; That which perceived in us, must of necessity be One thing, and by One and the same Indivisible, perceive all; and that whether they be more things, entering through several Organs of Sense, as the many Qualities of one Substance, or One Various and Multiform thing, entering through the same Organ, as the Countenance or Figure of a man. For if it is not One thing in us, that perceives the Nose, another thing the Eyes, and another thing the Mouth; but it is one and the self same thing, that perceiveth all. And when one thing enters through the Eye, another through the Ear, these also must of necessity come all at last to one Indivisible, or else they could not be compared together, nor one of them affirmed to be different from another? The several Sentiments of them meeting no where together in One. He concludes therefore, that this One thing in us, that sensibly perceives all things, may be resembled to the Centre of a Circle, and the several Senses, to Lines drawn from the Circumference, which all meet in that one Centre. Wherefore that which perceives and apprehends all things in us, must needs be Really One, and the very same; that is, Unextended and Indivisible. Which Argument, is yet further purfued by him, more particularly thus. If that which sensibly perceiveth in us, be Extended, so as to have Difjunct Parts, one without another, then one of these Three things must needs be affirmed; That either Every Part of this Extended Substance of the Soul perceives a Part of the Object only 5 or every Part of it the Whole Object, or else all comes to some One Point, which alone perceives, both the several Parts of the Object, and the Whole; all the other, being but as Circular or Circumferential Lines leading to this Center. Now of the Former of those Three Platonrs thus; μεγάλα άντι τότε, έμμεγάλα αύτη, ἀπὸ μέρος μέρος μετα-, και μεταγίγνωσιν εις της άκτις ειςδιαίον εν δυο, ευεραλτα εν εις μεν άκτις συ τω άκτις ακτιων. If the Soul be a Magnitude, then must it be divided together with the Sensible Object, so that one Part of the Soul
must perceive one Part of the Object, and another, another; and nothing in it, the Whole Sensible: just as if I should have the sense of one thing, and you of another. Whereas it is plain by our Internal Sense, that it is One and the Self same thing in us, which perceives, both the Parts and the Whole. And of the Second, he writeth in this manner,  
εἰ ἔστιν πάντα αὐτοπαθέν, εἰ ἄλλος διαφωνεῖν τῷ μεγάλῳ περαιτέρῳ,  
ἀδερφός ἐστιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκείνῳ αὐτοῦ διαφωνεῖν ἀδίκως διότι τῷ  
ἁπλῷ ἀπεριεῖ τῷ ἧ ἐξελέγχεται ἡμῖν εἴδει. But if every Part of the Ex-  
tended Soul, perceive the Whole Sensible Object, since Magnitude is Infinitely Divisible, there must be in every man Infinite Sensations, and Images of one and the same Object. Whereas we are Intimately Conscious to  
ourselves, that we have but only One Sensation of One Object at the  
fame time. And as for the Third and Last Part of the Disjunctio-  
on, That what Sensibly Perceives in every one, is but One Single  
Point, either Mathematical or Physical. It is certain that a Math-  
ematical Point, having neither Longitude, Latitude, nor Profun-  
dity, is no Body nor Substantia, but only a Notion of our own Mind,  
or a Mode of Conceiving in us. And then as for a Physical Point or  
Minimum, a Body so Little that there cannot possibly be any Lea,  
Plotinus affirming the Infinite Divisibility of Body, here Explodes  
the thing itself. However he further intimates, that If there were any  
such Physical Minimum, or Absolutely Least Body or Extentum, this  
could not possibly receive upon it a Distinct Representation and Deli-  
neation, of all the several Parts of a Whole Visible Object at once, as  
of the Eyes, Nose, Mouth, &c. in a man's Face or Pictur's or of the  
Particulars of an Edifice: nor could such a Parvitude or Atom as this,  
be the CAUSE of all Animal Motions. And this was one of Arisbiot's  
Arguments, whereby he would prove Unextended Incorporeals, ἐπι  
τον ἄνεμος τὸ μεγελεν. If the Soul were Indivisible as a Point, how  
could it Perceive, that which is Divisible? That is, take notice of all  
the Distinct Parts of any Extended Object, and have a Description  
of the whole of them at once upon it itself? The Sum of the whole  
Argumentation is this, That If the Soul be an Extended Substantia,  
then must it of necessity be either a Physical Point or Minimum, the  
Least Extentum that can possibly be, (If there be any such Least, and  
Body or Extension be not Infinitely Divisible) or else it must consist  
of more such Physical Points, joined together. As for the former of  
these, it hath been already declared to be Impossible, that Single  
Atom, or Smallest Point of Extension, should be able distinctly to per-  
ceive all the variety of things: to which might be added, That to  
suppose every Soul to be but one Physical Minimum, or Smallest Ex-  
tenium, is to imply such an Effential Difference in Matter or Extensi-  
on, as that some of the Points thereof, should be Naturally devoid of  
all Life, Sense, and Understanding, and others again Naturally Sen-  
sitive and Rational. Which Absurdity though it should be admit-  
ted, yet would it be utterly Unconceivable, how there should come  
to be, One such Sensitive and Rational Atom in every man and no  
more, and how this should constantly remain the same, from Infancy  
to Old-Age, whilst other Parts of Matter Transpire perpetually.  
But as for the Latter; If Souls be Extended Substances, consisting  
of More Points, one without another; all Concurring in every Sen-  
sation,
tion, then must every one of those Points, either Perceive a Point and Part of the Object only, or else the Whole. Now if every Point of the Extended Soul, Perceive only a Point of the Object, then is there no One Thing in us, that Perceives the Whole; or which can compare one Part with another. But if every Point of the Extended Soul, Perceive the Whole Object at once, confining of many Parts, then would there be Innumerable Perceptions of the same Object in every Sensation; as many, as there are Points in the Extended Soul. And from both those Suppositions, it would alike follow, that no man is One Single Perceipient or Person, but that there are Innumerable distinct Percipients and Persons in every man. Neither can there be any other Supposition made, besides those Three forementioned; as That the whole Extended Soul, should Perceive both the Whole Sensible Object, and All its several Parts, no Part of this Soul in the mean time having any Perception at all by itself: because the Whole of this Extended Being, is nothing but All the Parts taken together; and if none of those Parts have any Life, Senses, or Perception in them, it is Impossible, that there should be any in the Whole. But in very truth, to say that the Whole Soul Perceiveth all, and no Part of it any thing; is to acknowledge it, not to be Extended, but to be Indivisible; which is the Thing that Plotinus contends for.

And that Philosopher here further infers upon Internal Sensations also, and that Νυμπάθεια, or 'ομοπάθεια, That Sympathy, or Homopathy, which is in all Animals, to the same purpose: It being One and the Same thing in them, which Perceives Pain, in the most distant Extremities of the Body; as in the Sole of the Foot, and in the Crown of the Head, and which moves one Part to succour and relieve another labouring under it, which could not possibly be by Traduction of all, to one Physical Point, as the Centre, for divers Reasons. 'Ει τίνα εκείνη παιδίν ήξείνα τά δάφνεν πάντα τό χαίτιον, μή τό μείζον εικόνα, αλλά το τοιούτον, πάντα το ίδιον, αλλά γίνειν εξήν (παντί τέ μέγας το μεν ἄλλα, τό ἄλλα όπλος) οὗ τοιούτον πάλινειν το ειδοχώμενον, διὸ πανταχώσ ενοτικό εκεῖνο το αὐτόν ενίας τίτλον τό τέ μακρὸν, ἔξοδον δὲ πατήρ περιολὴν. Since therefore these Sympathetic Senses, cannot possibly be made by Traduction, at last to One thing; and Body being Bulkie or Out-swelling Extension, One Part thereof Suffering, another cannot Perceive it, (for in all Magnitude, This is One thing, and That Another) it followeth, that what Perceives in us, must be every where, and in all the parts of the Body, One and the Same thing with itself. Which therefore cannot be it self Body, but must of necessity be some other Entity or Substance Incorporeal. The Conclusion is, that in Men and Animals, there is One thing Indivisibly the Same, that Comprehendeth the Whole Outside of them, Perceiveth both the Parts, and the Whole of Sensible Objects, and all transmitted through several Senses; Sympathizeth with all the Distant Parts of the Body; and Acteth entirely upon all. And this is properly called, I My Self, not the Extended Bulk of the Body, which is not One but Many Substances, but an Unextended and Indivisible Unity, wherein all Lines Meet, and Concentre, not as a Mathematical Point, or Least Extension; But as one Self-Active, Living, Tower, Substantial, or Inside-Being, that Containeth, Holdeth, and Connecteth all together.

Lastly,
Lastly, the forementioned Philosopher endeavours yet further to prove, the Human Soul to be Unextended and Devoid of Magnitude, and Indivisible from its Rational Energies or Operations, its motions visible, and apprehensions of intelligibles; and apprehensions of things Devoid of Magnitude, 

πάς τοῦ μέγατον ὄν τὸ μω μέγατον. For how could the Soul (faith he) if it were a Magnitude, Understand and that which hath no Magnitude, and with that which is Divisible, Conceive what is Indivisible? Now it is certain, that we have Notions of many things which are ἀφαίρεται, altogether Unimaginable, and therefore have nothing of Length, Breadth, and Thickness in them, as Virtue, Vice, &c. τοῦ μεγάλου. We have a Conception of the Intension of Powers and Virtues, wherein there is nothing of Extension or Magnitude. And indeed all the Abstract Essences of things, (or the αὐτήκαρα,) which are the First Objects of Intelligences, are Indivisible: τὰ ἐν ύπο εἴδου τὰς αὐτές φύσιν εἰσί, αὐτὰ τερατογενής γα οὐδεν πάς τὸς χρόνον, οὐ μέτα σαρκάν, &c. And though we apprehend Forms that are in Matter too, yet do we apprehend them as Separated and Abstracted from the same; there being nothing of Flesh in our Conception of a Man, &c. Nay, the Soul Conceives Extended things themselves, Unextendedly and Indivisibly; for as the Distance of a whole Hemisphere is contracted into a narrow Compass in the Pupil of the Eye, so are all Distances yet more contracted in the Soul itself, and there Understood Indivisibly; For the Thought of a Mile Distance, or of Ten thousand Miles, or Semidiameters of the Earth, takes up no more Room in the Soul, nor Stretches it any more, than does the Thought of a Foot or Inch, or indeed of a Mathematical Point. Were that which perceiveth in us a Magnitude, then could it not be, ἵνα πάντα ἀναδύθη, Equal to every sensible, and alike perceive, both Lesser and Greater Magnitudes, than it itself: but least of all could it perceive, such things as have no Magnitude at all. And this was the other Part of Aristotle's Argumentation, to Prove the Soul and Mind to be Unextended and Indivisible, 

πάς τοῦ μεγάτον ὄν τὸ μω μέγατον. For how could it perceive, that which is Indivisible, by what is Divisible? He having before Demanded, How, is could apprehend things Divisible, and of a Great Extension, by a meer Point or Absolute Parvitude. Where the Soul, or that which Perceives and Understands, is according to Aristotle, neither Divisible, as a Continued Quantity, nor yet Indivisible, either as a Mathematical, or as a Physical Point, and Absolute Parvitude; but as that which hath in it itself, no Out-Swelling Distance, nor Relation to any Place, otherwise than

A a a a a
as it is Vitally United to a Body; which, (where ever it be,) it always Sympathizes with, and Acts upon.

Besides which, these Ancient Afforers of Unextended Incorporeals, would in all probability confirm that Opinion from hence; Because we can not only Conceive Extension without Cognition, and again Cognition without Extension; from whence it may be inferred, that they are Entities Really Distinct, and Separable from one another, (we having no other Rule, to Judge of the Real Distinction and Separability of things then from our Conceptions,) but also are not able to Conceive Cognition with Extension. We cannot conceive a Thought, to be of such a certain Length, Breadth, and Thickness, Mensurable by Inches and Feet, and by Solid Measures. We cannot Conceive Half, or a Third Part, or a Twentieth Part of a Thought, much less of the Thought of an Indivisible Thing; neither can we conceive every Thought to be of some certain Determinate Figure, either Round or Angular; Spherical, Cubical, or Cylindrical, or the like. Whereas if whatsoever is Unextended, be Nothing, Thoughts must either be meer Non-Entities, or else Extended too, into Length, Breadth and Thickness; Divisible into Parts; and Mensurable, and also (where Finite,) of a certain Figure. And consequently all Verities in us (they being but Complex Axiomatical Thoughts) muft neceffity be Long, Broad, and Thick, and either Spherically or Angularly Figure. And the fame muft be affirmed, of Violations likewise, and Appetites or Passions, as Fear and Hope, Love and Hatred, Grief and Joy; and of all other things belonging to Cognitive Beings, (Souls and Minds,) as Knowledge and Ignorance, Wisdom and Folly, Virtue and Vice, Justice and Injustice, &c. that these are either all of them Absolute Non-Entities; or Else Extended into Three Dimensions of Length, Breadth, and Profundity; and Mensurable not only by Inches and Feet, but also by Solid Measures, as Pints and Quarts; and laft of all (where they are Finite as in men) Figure. But if this be Absurd, and these things belonging to Soul and Mind, (though doubtles as great Realities at laft,) as the things which belong to Bodies) be Unextended, then must the Substances of Souls and Minds themselves be Unextended also. Thus Plotinus of Mind, Μνήσθη σε ἄδα, ἡμιμοίρια, Mind is not Distant from it self: and indeed were it so, it could not be One thing, (as it is) but Many; every Conceivable Part of Diffiant and Extended Substance, being a Substance by it self. And the fame is to be paid of the humane Soul, though it Acts upon Distant Parts of that Body, which it is united to, that it self notwithstanding, is not Scattered out into Distance, nor Dispersed into Multiplicity, nor Infinitely Divisible; because then it would not be One Single Substance, or Monad, but a Heap of Substances. Soul is no more Divisible, than Life of which the forementioned Philosopher thus, ἐκινοί ζω ἀποικίας κρατεῖν; ἀλλ᾿ ζωὴν ἐν ζωή, τό μέρος ζωῆς οἷν εἶναι, Will you divide a Life into two? then the whole of it being but a Life, the half thereof, cannot be a Life. Lastly, if Soul and Mind, and the things belonging to them, as Life and Cognition, Understanding and Wisdom, &c. be Out-spread into Distance, having one Part without another, then can there be no Good Reason given, why they should not be, as well

Really
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Really and Physically, as Intelligently Divisible; and One Part of them Separable from another: since as Plotinus, πάντας μετὰ τὸ μὲν ἄλλο, τὸν ἄλλον. In all Magnitude or Extension, This is One thing, and That Another. At least no Theist ought to deny, but that the Divine Power, could Cleave, or Divide a Thought, together with the Soul wherein it is into Many Pieces, and remove them to the Greatest Distancess from one another, (for as much as this implies no manner of Contradiction, and whatsoever is Conceivable by us, may be done by Infinite Power) in which case, neither of them alone, would be Soul or Mind, Life or Thought, but all put together, make up one entire Mind, Soul, Life, and Thought.

Wherefore, the Sense of the Ancient Incorporealists, seems to have been as follows. That there are in Nature, Two Kinds of Substances specifically Differing from one another. The First οἷσι, Νυκτὶς or Tumours, a meer Passive Thing. The Second άνυσι, Self-Active Powers or Vertues, or ψυχας δειναζον, the Energetic Nature. The Former of these, is nothing else but Magnitude or Extension, not as an Absolute Notion of the Mind, but as a Thing Really Existing without it. For when it is called, Res Extensa, the meaning is not, as if the Res were One thing, and the Extension thereof Another, but that it is Extension, or Distance, Really Existing, or the Thing thereof (without the Mind) and not the Notion. Now this in the Nature of it, is Nothing but Aind Extra Alind, One thing without Another, and therefore perfect Alterity, Disunity, and Divisibility. So that no Extensum whatsoever, of any Sensible Bigness, is Truly and Really, One Substance, but a Multitude or Heap of Substances, as Many as there are Parts into which it is Divisible. Moreover one Part of this Magnitude,always Standing Without another, it is an Essentitial Property thereof to be Antiscopous or Impenetrable, that is, to Jutle or Shoulder out, all other Extended Substance from Penetrating into it, and Co-Existing with it, so as to Possess and take up the same Room or Space. One yard of Distance, or of Length, Breath, and Thickness, cannot possibly be added to another, without making the Whole Extension Double to what it was before, since one of them must of necessity stand without the other. One Magnitude cannot Imbibe or Swallow up another, nor can there be any Penetration of Dimensions. Moreover Magnitude or Extension as such, is meer Outside or Outwardness, it hath nothing Within, no Self-Active Power or Vertue, all its Activity, being either Keeping out or Hindering, any other Extended Thing, from Penetrating into it: (which yet it doth merely by its being Extended, and therefore not so much by any Physical Efficiency, as a Logical Necessity,) or else Local Motion, to which it is also but Passive, no Body or Extension as such, being able to Move it self, or Aff upon it self.

Wherefore were there no other Substance in the World besides this Magnitude or Extension, there could be no Motion or Action at all in it; no Life, Cognition, Conscioueness, No Intelligence, Appetite or Volition (which things do yet make up the Greatest part of the Universe) but all would be a dead Heap or Lump: nor could any one Sub-
The subject of material parts involves being a real substance by itself.
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Chap. V. An Internal Energy.

on Cogitation is. The Action of an Extended Thing as such, is nothing but Local Motion, Change of Distance, or Translation from Place to Place, a mere Outside and Superficial thing; but it is certain, that Cogitation, (Phancy, Intellïction, and Volition) are no Local Motions; nor the mere Riding up and down, of the Parts of an Extended Substance, changing their Place and Distance; but it is Unquestionably, an Internal Energie; that is, such an Energie as is Within the very Essence or Essence, of that which Thinketh, or in the Inside of it. From which Two kinds of Energies, we may now conclude, that there are also Two kinds of Entity or Substance in Nature; the One mere Outside, and which hath Nothing Within it; the Other such a kind of Entity, as hath an Internal Energie; Afteth From itself, and Within it self, and Upon it self; an Inside Thing, whose Action is Within the very Essence or Substance thereof. It being plain, that the Cogitative or Thinking Nature, is such a thing, as hath an Essential Inside or Profundity. Now this Inside of Cogitative Beings, wherein they thus Act or Think, Internally within themselves, cannot have any Length, Breadth, or Thickness in it, because if it had, it would be again a mere Outside thing. Wherefore had all Cogitative Beings, (Sous and Minds) Extension and Magnitude never so much belonging to them, as some suppose them to have, yet could this for all that, be Nothing but the mere Outside of their Being, besides which, they must of necessity have also, an Unextended Inside, that hath no Outswelling Tumour, and is not Scattered into Distance, nor Difpersed into Multiplicity, which therefore could not possibly Exist a Part in a Part, of the supposed Extension, as if one Half of a Mind or Thought, were in One Half of that Extension, and another in another; but must of necessity be All Undividedly, both in the Whole of it, and in every Part. For had every Twentieth or Hundredth Part of this Extension, not the Whole of a Life or Mind in it, but only the Twentieth or Hundredth Part thereof, then could none of them have any true Life or Mind at all, nor consequently the Whole have any. Nor indeed is it otherwise conceivable, how a whole Quantity of Extended Substance should be One thing, and have One Personality, one My Self in it all, were there not One Indivisible thing, Prefiding over it, which Held it all together, and Difpersed it self thorough all. And thus do we see, how this Whole in the Whole and in every Part (do men what they can) will like a Ghost still haunt them, and follow them every where. But now it is Impossible, that One and the self same Substance, should be both Extended and Unextended. Wherefore in this Hypothec of Extended Understanding Spirits, having One Part without Another, there is an Undiscerned Composition of Two Difïnt Substances, Extended and Unextended, or Corporeal and Incorporeal, both together; and a Confusion of them into One. Where notwithstanding, we must acknowledge, that there is so much of Truth aimed at; as that all Finite Incorporeal Substances, are always Naturally united to Some Bodies, so that the Whole of these Created Animals, is Complexed and Made up of Both these together, an Extended Inside, and an Unextended Outside; both of them Substances indeed Really distinct, but yet Vitally United, each to other.

The
Another Hypothesis, Book I.

The Sum of all is, That there are Two kinds of Substances in Nature, the First Extension or Magnitude, Really Existing without the Mind, which is a thing that hath no Self-Unity at all in it, but is Infinite Alterity and Divisibility, as it is also meer Outside and Outwardness, it having nothing Within nor any other Action belonging to it, but only Locally to Move, when it is Moved. The Second, Life and Mind; or the Self Active Cognitive Nature, an Inside Being, whole Action is not Local Motion, but an Internal Energy, Within the Substance or Essence of the Thinker himself; or in the Inside of him; which therefore (though Unextended, yet) hath a certain Inward Recess, besides, or Essential Profundity. And this is a thing which can Act all of it Entirely, upon either a Greater or Lesser Quantity of Extended Substance or Body, and its Several Parts, Penetrating into it, and Co-existing in the same Place with it. Wherefore it is not to be looked upon, either as a Mathematical, or as a Physical Point, as an Absolute Parvitude or the Least Extentum possible; it having not only such an Essential Inside, Bathos, or Profundity in it, wherein it Acteth and Thinketh within itself, but also a certain Amplitude of Active Power ad Extra, or a Sphere of Activity upon Body. Upon which account, it was before affirmed by Plotinus, that an Unextended Incorporeal, is a thing Bigger than Body; because Body cannot Exist otherwise, than a Point of it in a Point of Space, whereas this One and the same Indivisible, can at once both comprehend a Whole Extentum within it, and be All of it in every Part thereof. And Lastly, all Finite Incorporeals, are always Naturally United to some Body or other; from both which together, is Complemented and Made up, in every Created Understanding Being, one entire Animal, consisting of Soul and Body, and having Something Incorporeal, and something Corporeal in it; an Unextended Inside, and an Extended Outside; by means whereof, it is determined to Here and There, and Capable of moving Locally, or Changing Place.

Thus have we represented the Sense of the Ancient Unextended Incorporeals to the best advantage that we could; in way of Answer to the premised Atheistical Argument, against Incorporeal Substance; and in order to the Vindication of them from the Contempt of Atheists; And we do affirm, that the aforementioned Argumentations of theirs, do evince, That there is some other Substance besides Body, which therefore according to the Principles of these Atheists themselves, must be acknowledged to be Unextended, it being concluded by them that whatsoever is Extended is Body. But whether they do also, absolutely prove, that there is, toin & yel, & ein, & ein, & ein, & ein, A Substance Devoid of Magnitude, Indistinct, Without Parts, and Indivisible; this we shall leave others to make a Judgment of. However it is certain that Atheists who maintain the contrary, must needs affirm, that every Thought, and whatsoever belongeth to Soul, Mind, (as Knowledge, Virtue, &c.) is not only Mentally and Mathematically Divisible, so that there may be Half, a Third Part, or a Quarter of a Thought, and the Rest, supposed; but also Physically Separable, or Discrepable, to-
gather with the Soul wherein it is. They must also deny, that there is any Internal Energy at all, or any other Action besides that Outside Superficial Action, of Local Motion, and Consequentially make all Cogitation nothing but Local Motion, or Translation. And lastly, they must maintain, that no Substance can Co-exist with any other Substance (as Soul with Body) otherwise than by Juxta-Position only, and by Poffefsing the Pores, or filling up the Intervals thereof; as a Net with the water.

And this is the First Answer to the forementioned Atheiftick Argument, against Incorporeal Substance. That though whatsoever is Extended be Body, yet Every thing is not Extended, but that Life and Mind or Cogitation, are an Unextended, Indiftant and Indivisible Nature. But as we have already intimated, There are other Learned Afferters of Incorporeal Substance, who left, God and Spirits, being thus made Unextended, should quite Vanifh into Nothing; Anfwer that Atheiftick Argumentation after a different manner; by granting to thefe Atheifts, that Proposition, that whatsoever is, is Extended; and what is Unextended is Nothing; but then denying that other of theirs, That whatsoever is Extended is Body: They afferting, Another Extension, Specifically Differing from that of Bodies. For whereas Corporeal Extension, is not only Impenetrable, foas that no one Part thereof, can Enter into another, but also both Mentally and Really Divisible; one Part being in its Nature Separable from another; they affirm, that there is another Incorporeal Extension, which is both Penetrable, and also Indifcerpible; fo that no One Part thereof, can possibly be Separated from another, or the whole; and that to fuch an Incorporeal Extension, as this, belongeth Life, Cogitation, and Understanding, the Deity having such an Infinite Extension, but all Created Spirits, a Finite and Limited one: which also is in them suppos'd to be Contradiflible and Dilatable. Now it is not our part here, to oppose Theifts, but Atheifts: wherefore we shall leave thefe Two Sorts of Incorporealifts to dispute it out friendly amongst themselves; and indeed therefore with the more Moderation, Equanimity, and Toleracion of DifTent Mutually; becaufe it feemeth, that Some are in a manner Fatally Inclined, to think one way in this Controverfie, and Some another. And what ever the Truth of the Cafe be, it must be acknowledged, that this Latter Hypotheñes, may be very ufeful and Serviceable to retain fome in Theiftm, who can by no means admit, of a Deity, or Any thing else, Unextended. Though perhaps, there will not be wanting others also; who would go in a middle way between these Two, or Compound them together; by supposing the Deity to be indeed altogether Unextended, and all of it Every where; but Finite Incorporeals or Created Spirits, to have an Unextended Inside, a Life or Mind, Diffusing it felf into a certain Amplitude of Outward Extension, whereby they are Determined to a Place; yet fo as to be all in every Part thereof; which Outward Extension, is therefore not to be Accounted Body, becaufe Penetrable, Contradiflible, and Dilatable; and becaufe no one Part thereof, is Separable from the reft, by the Rubbing or Incursion of any Corporeal thing upon them: And thus is the

Atheifts
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Atheiff Argument, against Incorporeal Substance, Anwered Two manner of ways; First, That there Is Something Unextended; and Secondly, That if there were none, yet must there of necessity be, a Substance otherwise Extended than Body is, so as to be neither Antitypous nor Diſceivable. And Our selves would not be Understood here, Dogmatically to Assert any thing in this Point, save only what all Incorpo раlstis do agree in; To wit, That besides Body, which is Impenetrably and Divisible Extended, there is in Nature another Substance, that is both Penetrable of Body and Indiscernible; or which doth not Confift of Parts Separable from one another. And that there is at leaft, such a Substance as this, is unquestionably manifest, from what hath been already declared.

But the Atheist will in the next place, give an Account of the Original of this Error (as He calls it) of Incorporeal Substance, and Undertake to shew from what Mistake it proceeded; which is yet another Pretended Confutation thereof. Namely, that it sprung Partly from the Abuse of Abstract Names and Notions, Men making Substances of them, and Partly from the Scholastick Essences, Diſtinct from the Things themselves, and said to be Eternal. From both which Delusions and Dotages together, the Atheist conceives, that Men have been first of all much Confirmed in the Belief of Ghosts and Spirits, Demons and Devils, Invisible Beings called by several Names. Which Belief had also another Original, mens Mistaking their own Phancies for Realities. The Chief of all which aſſrightful Ghosts and Spectres, according to these Atheists is the Deity, the Oberon, or Prince of Fairies and Phancies. But then whereas men by their Natural Reafon, could not conceive otherwise, of these Ghosts and Spirits, then that they were a kind of Thin, Aerial Bodies; their Understandings have been fo Enchanted by thefe Abstract Names (which are indeed the Names of Nothing) and those Separate Essences and Quiddities of Scholastick, as that they have made Incorporeal Substances of them. The Atheithick Conclusiſon is; That they who areſtit an Incorporeal Deity, do Really but make a Scholastick Separate Essence, or the meer Abstract Notion of an Accident, a Substantial Thing, and a Ghost or Spirit, preſiding over the whole world.

To which our Reply in General ſtirt of all is, That all this, is Nothing but Idle Romantic Fiction, The Belief of a Deity and Substance Incorporeal, standing upon none of those Imaginary Foundations. And then as for that Impudent Atheithick Pretence, That the Deity is Nothing but a Fignet or Creature of Men's Fear and Imagination, and therefore the Prince of Fairies and Phancies. This hath been already Sufficiently Confuted, in our Answer to the ſirt Atheithick Argumentation. Where we have also over and above ſhew'd, that there is not only a Natural Preſepſis or Anticipation of a God in the Minds of Men, but alſo that the Belief thereof, is Supported by the strongest and moſt Substantial Reason; His Exifience Being indeed Demonſtrable, with Mathematical Evidence, to such as are capable; and not blinded with Prejudice, nor Enchanted by the Witchcraft of Vice, and Wickedneſs, to the Debauching of their Understandings. It hath been
Abtiradt, but it all and or that nor their which.

But True or and be yet faid be

We now further add, that the Belief of Ghosts and Spirits Incorporal, and consequentley of an Incorporal Deity, sprung neither from any Ridiculous Mistake of the Abtirald Names and Notions of meer Accident, for Substances, nor from the Scholastick Essences, said to be Eternal. For as for the Latter, none of those Scholasticks ever Dream’d, that there was any Universal Man, or Universal Horse, Existing alone by it self, and Separate from all Singualrs; nor that the Abtirald Metaphysicall Essences of men, after they were Dead, Subsisting by themselves, did Walk up and down amongt Graves, in Airy Bodies. It being absolutely impossible, that the Real Essence of any thing should be Separable from the thing it self, or Eternal, when that is not so. And were the Essences of all things, look’d upon by these Scholasticks, as Substances Incorporal, then muft they have made all things, (even Body it self,) to be Ghosts, and Spirits, and Incorporal; and Accident also, (they having their Essences too,) to be Substantial. But in very Truth, these Scholastick Essences, said to be Eternal, are nothing but the Intelligible Essences of things, or their Natures as Conceivable, and Objects of the Mind. And in this Sense, is it an acknowledged Truth, that the Essences of things, (as for example of a Sphere, or Triangle) are Eternal, and such as were never Made, because there could not otherwise be, Eternal Verities concerning them. So that the true meaning of these Eternal Essences, is indeed no other than this, That Knowledge is Eternal; or that there is an Eternal Mind, that comprehendeth the Intelligible Natures and Ideas of all things, whether Actuallly existing, or Possible only; their Necessary relations to one another, and all the Immutable Verities belonging to them. Wherefore though these Eternal Essences themselves, be no Ghosts nor Spirits, nor Substances Incorporal, they being nothing but Objective Entities of the Mind, or Nomenclatures, and Ideas; yet does it plainly follow, from the Necessary Supposition of them (as was before declared) That there is One Eternal Unmade Mind, and Perfect Incorporal Deity, a Real and Substantial Ghost or Spirit, which comprehending itself, and all the Extent of its own Power, the Possibilities of things, and their Intelligible Natures, together with an Exem-
Incorpor. Substance Proved, Book I.

But our Atheistic Argumentator, yet further urges, That those Scholastics and Metaphysicians, who because Life or Cognition, can be considered alone Abstractly, without the Consideration of Body, therefore conclude it not to be the Accident or Action of a Body, but a Substance by itself, (and which also after men are Dead, can Walk amongst the Graves) that these, (I say) do far Abuse, those Abstract Names and Notions of meer Accidents, as plainly to make Substances Incorporeal of them. To which therefore we Reply also, That were the Abstract Notions of Accidents in General, made Incorporeal Substances, by those Philosophers aimed at; then must they have supposed all the Qualities or Affecttions of Bodies, such as Whiteness and Blackness, Heat and Cold, and the like, to have been Substances Incorporeal also; a thing yet never heard, or thought of. But the Case is far otherwise, as to Conscious Life, or Cognition, though it be an Abstract also; because this, is no Accident of Body, as the Atheist (Serving his own Hypothecis,) securely takes it for granted, nor indeed, of any thing else; but an Essential Attribute, of another Substance, distinct from Body, (or Incorporeal;) after the same manner, as Extension or Magnitude, is the Essential Attribute of Body, and not a meer Accident.

And now having so copiously Confuted, all the most Considerable Atheistic Grounds, we are necessitated to dispatch those that follow, being of lesser Moment, with all possible Brevity and Compendioufness. The Four next, which are the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth, Atheistic Arguments, pretend to no more than only this, to disprove a Corporeal Deity; or from the Supposition, That there is no other Substance in the World besides Body, to infer the Impossibility of a God, that is, of an Eternal Unmade Mind, the Maker and Governor of the Whole World: all Which therefore signify nothing at all, to the Afferters of a Deity Incorporeal, who are the only Genuine Theists. Nevertheless, though none but Stoicks, and such other Corporealists, as are notwithstanding Theists, be directly concerned in an Answer to them; yet shall we first, so far consider the Principles of the Atheistic Corporealism, contained in those Two Heads, the Fifth and Sixth, as from the Absolute Impossibility of these Hypotheses to Demonstrate, a Necessity of Incorporeal Substance; from whence a Deity will also follow.

Here therefore, are there Two Atheistic Hypotheses, founded upon the Supposition; That All is Body; The First, in the way of Qualities, Generable and Corruptible, which we call the Hylopathian; The Second in the way of Unqualified Atoms; which is the Atomick Corporealism and Atheism. The Former of these, was the most Ancient, and the First Sciography, or Rude Delineation of Atheism. For Aristote tells us, That the most Ancient Atheists, were those who supposed, Matter or Body, that is Bulkie Extension, to be the only Substance, and Unmade thing, that out of which all things
things were Made, and into which all things are again Resolved; Whatever is else in the world, being nothing, but the Passions, Qualities, and Accidents thereof, Generable and Corruptible, or Produceable out of Nothing, and Reduceable to Nothing again. From whence the Necessary Consequence is, That there is no Eternal Unmade Life or Understanding; or that Mind, is no God, or Principle in the Universe, but Eternally a Creature.

And this Hylopathian Atheism, which supposeth whatsoever is in the Universe, to be either the Substance of Matter and Bulk, or else the Qualities and Accidents thereof, Generable and Corruptible, hath been called also by us Anaximandrian. Though we deny not, but that there might be formerly, some Difference amongst the Atheists of this Kind; nor are we ignorant, that Simplicius and others, conceive Anaximander, to have asserted besides Matter, Qualities also Eternal and Unmade, or an Homogeneity, and Similar Atomology, just in the same manner as Anaxagoras afterwards did, save only, that He would not acknowledge any Unmade Mind or Life; Anaximander supposing all Life and Understanding whatsoever, all Soul and Mind, to have Risen up, and been Generated from a Fortuitous Commixture of those Similar Atoms, or the Qualities of Heat and Cold, Moist and Dry, and the like, Contemplated together. And we confess, that there is some probability for this Opinion. Notwithstanding which, because there is no Absolute certainty thereof, and because all these Ancient Atheists agreed in this, that Life and Understanding, are either First and Primary, or else Secondary Qualities of Body, Generable and Corruptible; Therefore did we not think fit, to Multiply Forms of Atheism, but rather to make but one kind of Atheism, of all this, calling it indifferently, Hylopathian, or Anaximandrian.

The Second Atheistic Hypothesis, is that Form of Atheism described Under the Sixth Head, which likewise supposing Body to be the only Substance; and the Principles thereof, devoid of Life and Understanding; does reject all Real Qualities, according to the Vulgar Notion of them, and Generate all things whatsoever, besides Matter thereby from the Combinations, of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions, or the Contextures of Unqualified Atoms, Life and Understanding not excepted: Which therefore according to them being no Simple Primitive and Primordial thing, but Secondary, Compound-ed and Derivative, the mere Creature of Matter and Motion, could not possibly be a God or First Principle in the Universe. This is that Atomick Atheism, called Democritical; Lecippeus and Democritus being the First Founders thereof. For though there was before them, another Atomology, which made Unqualified Atoms, the Principles of all Bodies, it supposing besides Body, Substance Incorporeal, yet were these, as Laertius declareth, the First that ever made, Indeed it cannot be denied, but that from these Two Things granted, That all is Body, and That the Principles of Body, are devoid of all
all Life and Understanding, it will follow unavoidably, that there can be, no Corporeal Deity. Wherefore the Stoicks who professed to acknowledge no other Substance besides Body, and yet nevertheless, had a strong Persuasion of the Existence of a God, or an Eternal Unmade Mind, the Maker of the whole World, denied that other Proposition of the Atheistic Corporalists, that the Principles of all Bodies were devoid of Life and Understanding, they afferting an Intellectual Fire, Eternal and Unmade, the Maker of the whole Mundane System, Which Postulate, of a Living Intellectual Body Eternal, were it granted to these Stoicks, yet could not this their Corporeal God notwithstanding, be Absolutely Incorruptible, as Origen often inculcated, that to the Stoicks, is a Body, and therefore Movable, Alterable, and Changeable, and be would indeed be perfectly Corruptible, were there any other Body to act upon him. Wherefore he is only Happy in this, that he wants a Corrupter or Destroyer. And thus much was therefore rightly urged, by the Atheistic Argumentator, that no Corporeal Deity, could be Absolutely in its own Nature Incorruptible, nor otherwise than by Accident only Immortal, because of its Divisibility. For were there any other Matter without this World, to make Inroads or Incursions upon it, or to Disunite the Parts thereof, the Life and Unity of the Stoical Corporeal God, must needs be Scattered and Destroyed. And therefore of this Stoical God, does the same Origen thus further write, that the Stoicks, are bodies, which are sometimes in a state of change, sometimes in a state of rest, but which are never destroyed, but only destroyed, when they are acknowledged to be destroyed; and that the Stoics do not believe in the Divisibility of the Deity, but only in the Divisibility of its Body, which is sometimes destroyed, and sometimes not. Therefore these Men were not able to reach, to a clear Notion of the Deity, as a Being every way Incorruptible, Simple, Uncompounded, and Indivisible. Notwithstanding which, these Stoicks, were not therefore to be ranked amongst the Atheists, but far to be preferred before them, and accounted only a kind of Imperfect Theists.

But we shall now make it evident, that in both these Atheistic Corporalism, (agreeing in those Two things, That Body is the only Substance, and That the Principles of Body are not Vital) there is an Absolute Impollibility, not only because, as Aristotelc objecteth, they supposed no Active Principle; but also because their bringing of Life and Understanding (being Real Entities) out of Dead and Sensible Matter is also the Bringing of Something out of Nothing. And indeed the Atomick Atheists, is here of the two rather the more Absurd and Unreasonable, for as much as he discarding all Real Qualities, and that for this very Reason, because Nothing can come out of Nothing, both himself notwithstanding, produce Life, Sense, and Understanding (Unquestionable Realities) out of mere Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions; that is, indeed, Out of Nothing. Wherefore there being an Absolute Impollibility, of both these Atheistic Hypotheses, (neither of
of which is able to solve the Phenomenon of Life and Understanding) from that confessed Principle of theirs, that Matter as such, hath no Life nor Understanding belonging to it, it follows unavoidably, that there must be some other Substance besides Body or Matter, which is Essentially Vital and Intellectual: "ον γορ πλην χρύσα ἵνα τοι, Because all things cannot possibly have a Peregrine, Adventitious and Borrowed Life, but something in the Universe, must needs have Life Naturally and Originally. All Life cannot be merely Accidental, Generable and Corruptible, producible out of nothing and Reducible to Nothing again, but there must of Necessity be, some Substantial Life, Which Point (That all Life, is not a mere Accident, but that there is Life Substantial) hath been of late with much Reason and Judgment, insinuated upon, and Urged by the Writer Of the Life of Nature. Neither must there be only, such a Substantial Life, as is Naturally Immutable for the future, but also such as is Eternal, and was never Made; all other Lives and Minds whatsoever, (none of which could possibly be Generated out of Matter) being derived from this Eternal Unmade Fountain, of Life and Understanding.

Which thing, the Hylozoick Atheists being well aware of; namely, that there must of Necessity be, both Substantial and Eternal Unmade Life; but supposing also Matter to be the only Substance thought themselves necessitated, to attribute to all Matter as such, Life and Understanding, though not Animalis and Conscious, but Natural only: they conceiving, that from the Modification thereof alone by Organization, all other Animalis Life, not only the Sensitive in Brutes, but also the Rational in Men, was derived. But this Hylozoick Atheism, thus bringing all Conscious and Reflexive Life or Animality, out of a Supposed Senseless Stupid and Inconceivable Life of Nature, in Matter, and that merely from a different Accidental Modification thereof, or Contexture of Parts, does again plainly bring Something out of Nothing, which is an Absolute Impossibility. Moreover this Hylozoick Atheism, was long since and in the first Emerision thereof Solidly Confuted by the Atomick Atheists, after this manner: If Matter as such, had Life, Perception, and Understanding belonging to it, then of Necessity must every Atom or Smallest Particle thereof, be a Difinited Perceiver by it self; from whence it will follow, that there could not possibly be, any such Men and Animals as now are, Comounded out of them, but every Man and Animal, would be a Heap of Innumerable Percipients, and have Innumerable Perceptions and Intellectuals; whereas it is plain, that there is but one Life and Understanding, one Soul or Mind, one Perceiver or Thinker in every one. And to say, that these innumerable Particles of Matter, Do all Confederated together; that is, to make every Man and Animation to be a Multitude or Common-wealth of Percipients and Perseus as it were clubbing together; is a thing so Absurd and Ridiculous, that one would wonder, the Hylozoick should not rather chafe, to recant that their Fundamental Error, of the Life of Matter, than endeavour to seek Shelter and Sanctuary for the same, under such a Pretence. For though Voluntary Agents and Persons, may Many of them, resign up their wills to One, and by that means, have all but as it were One Artificial
Artificial Will: yet can they not possibly resign up their Sense and Understanding too, so as to have all but one Artificial Life, Sense, and Understanding: much less could this be done, by Senseless Atoms, or Particles of Matter supposed, to be devoid of all Conscience or Animality. Befides which, there have been other Arguments already suggested, which do sufficiently Evince, that Sense and Understanding cannot possibly belong to Matter any way, either Originally or Secondly, to which more may be added else where.

And now from these Two things, That Life and Understanding do not Essentially belong to Matter as such, and that they cannot be Generated out of Dead and Senseless Matter, it is Demonstratively Certain, that there must be some other Substance besides Body or Matter. However, the Anaximandrian and Democritic Theists taking it for granted, that the Firft Principles of Body, are devoid of all Life and Understanding, must either acknowledge a Necessity, of some other Substance besides Body, or else deny the Truth of that Axiom, so much made use of by themselves. That Nothing can come out of Nothing. And this was our Second Undertaking, to shew that from the very Principles of the Atheistic Corporealism, represented in the Fifth and Sixth Heads, Incorporeal Substance is, against those Atheists themselves Demonstrable.

Our Third and Last was this: That there being undeniably Substance Incorporeal, the Two next following Atheistic Argumentations, built upon the contrary Supposition, are therefore altogether Insignificant also, and do no Execution at all. The firft of which (being the Seventh) Impugning only, such a Soul of the World, as is Generated out of Matter, is not properly Directed against Theism neither, but only such a Form of Atheism (sometime before mentioned) as indeed cometh nearest to Theism. Which though concluding all things to have sprung Originally, from Senseless Matter, Night and Chaos; yet supposes things from thence to have ascended Gradually, to higher and higher perfection; First, Inanimate Bodies, as the Elements, then Birds and other Brute Animals (according to the fore-mentioned Aristophanick Tradition, with which agreeeth this of Lucretius,

Principio Genus Alitum, variæque Volucres.)

Afterward Men; and in the last place Gods; and that not only the Animated Stars, but Jupiter or a Soul of the world, Generated also out of Night and Chaos, as well as all other things. We grant indeed, that the True and Real Theists amongst the Ancient Pagans also, held the World's Animation, and whosoever denied the same, were therefore accounted Absolute Atheists. But the World's Animation, in a larger Sense, signifies no more than this, That all things are not Dead about us, but that there is a Living Sentient and Understanding Nature Eternal, that first Framed the World, and still Prefideth over it: and it is certain, that in this Sense, all Theists whatsoever, must hold the World's Animation. But the Generality of Pagan Theists held the

World's
World's Animation also in a stricter Sense, as if the World were Truly and Properly an Animal, and therefore a God, Complete and made up, of Soul and Body together, as other Animals are. Which Soul of this great World-Animal, was to some of them the Highest or Supreme Deity, but to others only a Secondary God, they supposing an Abstract Mind Superior to it. But God's being the Soul of the World in this Latter Paganick Sense, and the World's being an Animal or a God, are things Abolutely disclaimed and renounced by us. However this Seventh Atheisticck Argument, is not directed against the Soul of the world in the Sense of the Paganick Theists neither, this being, as they think, already Confuted, but in the Sense of the Atheisticck Theognists, not an Eternal Unmade Soul or Mind, but a Native and Generated One only, such as resulted from the Disposition of Matter, and Contexture of Atoms, the Offspring of Night and Chaos: the Atheists here pretending, after their Confutation of the True and Genuine Theism, to take away all Shadows thereof also, and so to free Men from all manner of Fear, of being obnoxious to any Understanding Being, Superior to themselves. Wherefore we might here omit the Confutation of this Argument, without any detriment at all, to the Cause of Theism. Nevertheless because this in General, is an Atheisticck Assertion, That there is no Life and Understanding, prefiguring over the Whole World, we shall briefly examine the Supposed Grounds thereof, which alone will be a sufficient Confutation of it. The First of them therefore is this, that there is no other Substance in the world besides Body; The Second, That the Principles of Bodies, are devoid of all Life and Understanding; and the Last, That Life and Understanding are but Accidents of Bodies resulting from such a Composition or Contexture of Atoms, as producest soft Fleth, Blood, and Brains, in Bodies Organized, and of Humane Form. From all which, the Conclusion is, that there can be no Life and Understanding in the Whole, because it is not of Humane Form, and Organized, and hath no Blood, and Brains. But neither is Body, the only Substance, Nor are Life and Understanding Accidents resulting from any Modification of Dead and Lifeless Matter; Nor is Blood or Brains, that which Understandeth in us; but an Incorporeal Soul or Mind, Vitally united to a Terrestrial Organized Body; which will then understand with far greater advantage, when it comes to be Cloathed with a Pure, Spiritual and Heavenly One. But there is in the Universe also, a higher kind of Intellectual Animals, which though consisting of Soul and Bodylikewise, yet have neither Fleth, nor Blood, nor Brains, nor Parts so Organized as ours are. And the most Perfect Mind and Intellect of all, is not the Soul of any Body, but Complete in itself, without such Vital Union and Sympathy with Matter. We conclude therefore, that this Passage of a Modern Writer; We Worms, cannot conceive how, God can Understand without Brains; is Vox Pecudis, the Language and Philosophy, rather of Worms or Brute Animals, then of Men.

The next, which is the Eighth Atheisticck Argumentation, is briefly this, that whereas the Deity by Theists is generally supposed, to be a Living Being Perfectly Happy, and Immortal or Incorruptible; there can
can be no such Living Being Immortal, and Consequently, none perfectly Happy. Because all Living Beings whatsoever, are Concretions of Atoms, which as they were at first Generated, so are they again liable to Death and Corruption; Life being no Simple Primitive Nature, nor Substantial thing, but a meer Accidentall Modification of Compounded Bodies only, which upon the Diffusion of their Parts, or the Disorderung of their Contexture, vanisheth again into Nothing. And there being no Life Immortal, Happiness must needs be a meer Insignificant Word, and but a Romantick Fiction. Where first, This is well, that the Atheists will confess, that according to their Principles, there can be no such thing at all, as Happiness; because no Security of Future Permanency; all Life perpetually coming Out of Nothing, and whirling back into Nothing again. But this Atheiffick Argument, is likewise Founded, upon the Former Error; That Body is the Only Substance, the First Principles wherein are devoid of all Life and Understanding; whereas it is certain, that Life cannot possibly result, from any Composition of Dead and Lifeless things; and therefore must needs be a Simple and Primitive Nature. It is true indeed, that the Participated Life, in the Bodies of Animals (which yet is but improperly called Life, it being Nothing but their being Actuated, by a Living Soul) is a meer Accidentall thing, Gennerable and Corruptible; since that Body which is now, Vitally united to a Living Soul, may be Disunited again from it, and thereby become a Dead and Lifeless Carcasse: but the Primary or Original Life it self is Substantial, nor can there be any Dead Carcasse of a Humane Soul. That which hath Life Essentially belonging to the Substance of it, must needs be Naturally Immortal, because no Substance can of it self Perish, or Vanish into Nothing. Besides which, there must be also, some, not only Substantial, but also Eternal Unmade Life, whose Existence is Necessary, and which is Absolutely Unannihilable by any thing else; which therefore must needs have, Perfect Security of its own future Happinesst And this is an Incorporeal Deity. And this is a Brief Consutation, of the Eighth Atheiffick Argument.

But the Democritick Atheist proceeds, endeavouring further to Disprove a God, from the Phenomena of Motion and Cognition; in the Three following Arguments. First therefore, whereas Theists commonly bring an Argument from Motion, to Prove a God, or First Unmoved Mover, the Atheists contend on the contrary; that from the very Nature of Motion, the Impossibility of any such First Unmoved Mover, is clearly demonstrable. For, it being an Axiom of undoubted Truth, concerning Motion, That, Whatever is Moved, is Moved by some other thing; Or, That Nothing can Move it self; it follows from thence Unavoidably, That there is No Eternum Immobile, No Eternal Unmoved Mover; but on the contrary, that there was Eternum Motum, an Eternal Moved; Or, That One thing was Moved by Another, from Eternity Infinitely; Without any First Mover or Cause,
To which we Reply; That this Axiom, Whatsoever is Moved, is Moved by Another, and not by itself, was by Aristotle, and those other Philosophers, who made so much use thereof, restrained to the Local Motion of Bodies only; That no Body Locally Moved, was ever Moved Originally from it itself, but from something else. Now it will not at all follow from hence, That therefore Nilis Movetur nisi a Motu, That No Body was ever Moved but by some other Body; that was also before Moved, by something else; or, That of necessity, One Body was moved by another Body, and that by another, and so backwards, Infinitely, without any First Unmoved or Self-Moving and Self-Active Mover as the Democritick Atheists fondly Conceive. For the Motion of Bodies might proceed (as Unquestionably it did) from something else, which is not Body, and was not before Moved. Moreover the Democritick Atheists, here also without any Ground imagines, That were there but One Puls once given to the world, and no more; this Motion would from thence forward, always continue in it; one Body still moving another, to all Eternity. For though this be indeed a Part of the Cartesians Hypotheses, that according to the Laws of Nature, A Body Moving, will as well continue in Motion, as a Body Retting in Rest, until that Motion be Communicated and Transferred to some other Body; yet is the Cafe different here, Where it is supposed, not only one Puls to have been given to the world at first, but also the fame Quantity of Motion or Agitation, to be constantly Conerved and Maintained. But to let this pass, because it is something a Subtle Point; and not so rightly Understood by many of the Cartesians themselves. We say, that it is a thing Utterly Impossible, That One Body should be Moved by Another Infinitely, without any first Cause or Mover, which was Self Active; and that not from the Authority of Aristotle only, Pronouncing esktopo duvno  tiv oqgo tiv noastes ihev  ev  kardg, &c. That in the Causes of Motion, there could not possibly be an Infinite Progress; but from the Reason there subjourned by Aristotle, Because, ειπε ματην  ετι πατην, δηλα αυτων ἃν ε, If there were no First Unmoved Mover, there could be no Cause of Motion at all. For were all the Motion, that is in the World, a Passion, from something else, and yet no First Unmoved Active Mover; then must it be a Passion from no Agent, or without an Action; and Consequentially proceed from Nothing, and either Cause it self, or be Made without a Cause. Now the Ground of the Atheists' Error here, is only from hence, because He taketh it for granted, That there is no other Substance besides Body, nor any other Action but Local Motion; from whence it comes to pass, that to Him, this Proposition, No Body can Move it self, is one and the same with this; Nothing can Act from It self, or be Self Active.

And thus is the Atheistick Pretended Demonstration against a God, or First Cause, from Motion, abundantly Confuted; we having made it Manifest, that there is no Consequence at all in this Argument, That
That because no Body can move it Self, therefore there can be no First Unmoved Mover; as also having discovered, the ground of the Atheists Error here, their taking it for granted, that there is nothing but Body; and lastly having plainly showed, that it implies a Contradiction, there should be Action and Motion in the World, and yet nothing Self-moving or Self-active. So that it is Demonstrative-ly certain from Motion, that there is a First Cause or Unmoved Mover. We shall now further add, That from the Principle acknowledged by the Democritick Atheists themselves, That no Body can move it Self; it follows also undeniably, that there is some other Substance besides Body, something incorporeal, which is Self-moving and Self-active, and was the First Unmoved Mover of the Heavens or World. For if no Body from Eternity, was ever able to move it Self, and yet there must of necessity be some Active Cause of that Motion which is in the World (since it could not cause it Self) then is there unquestionably, some other Substance besides Body, which having a Power of Moving Matter, was the First Cause of Motion, it Self being Unmoved.

Moreover it is certain from hence also, that there is another Species of Action, distinct from Local Motion, and such as is not Heterochinse, but Autochinese or Self-Activity. For since the Local Motion of Body is essentially Heterochinse, not caused by the Substance it Self Moving, but by something else acting upon it, that Action by which Local Motion is First Caused, cannot be it Self Local Motion, but must be Autochinese or Self-Activity, that which is not a Passion from any other Agent, but springs from the immediate Agent it Self; which Species of Action is called Cognition. All the Local Motion that is in the World, was First Caused by some Cogitative or Thinking Being, which not Acted upon by any thing without it, nor at all Local Motion, but only Mentally; is the Immovable Mover of the Heavens, or Vortices. So that Cognition is in Order of Nature, before Local Motion, and Incorporeal before Corporeal Substance, the Former having a Natural Imperium upon the Latter. And now have we not only Confuted the Ninth Atheistic Argument, from Motion, but also Demonstrated against the Democritick Atheists from their own Principle, that there is an Incorporeal and Cogitative Substance, the First Immovable Mover of the Heavens, and Vortices; that is, an Incorporeal Deity.

But the Democritick Atheist, will yet make a further Attempt, to prove that there can be nothing Self-moving or Self-active, and that no thinking Being could be a First Cause; he laying his Foundation in this Principle, That nothing takes its Beginning from it Self, but from the Action of some other Agent without it. From whence he would infer, that Cognition it Self is Heterochinse, the Passion of the Thinker, and the Action of something without it; no Cognition ever rising up of it Self without a Cause; and that Cognition is indeed, Nothing but Local Motion, or Mechanism; and all Living Understanding Being, Machines, Moved from without; and then make this Conclusion. That therefore no Understanding Being could possibly be a First Cause. He further adding also, that no Understanding,
derStanding Being as such, can be perfectly Happy neither, as the Deity is supposed to be, because Dependent upon Something without it; and this is the Tenth Atheistical Argumentation.

Where we shall First consider, that which the Democritick Atheist makes his Fundamental Principle, or Common Notion to disprove all Autochinesse or Self-Activity by. That Nothing taketh Beginning from it self, but from the Action of some other thing without it. Which Axiom, if it be Understood of Substantial Things, then is it indeed acknowledged by us to be unquestionably true, it being the fame with this, That No Substance which once was not, could ever possibly cause it self or bring it self into Being; but must take its Beginning from the Action of something else; but then it will make Nothing at all against Theism. As it is likewise True, That No Action whatsoever, (and therefore no Cogitation,) taketh Beginning from it self, or causeth it self to be, but is always produced by some Substantial Agent, but this will no way advantage the Atheist neither. Wherefore if he would direct his Force against Theism, he ought to understand this Proposition thus: That No Action whatsoever, taketh Beginning from the Immediate Agent, (which is the Subject of it) but from the Action of some other thing without it; or, That Nothing can Move or Act otherwise, then as it is Move and Affed upon, by something else. But this is only to beg the Question, or to Prove the thing in Dispute, Identically, That Nothing is Self-Active, because Nothing can Act from it self. Whereas it is in the mean time, undeniably certain, That there could not possibly be any Motion or Action at all in the Universe, were there not something Self-Moving or Self-Active, for as much as otherwise all that Motion or Action would be a Passion from Nothing, and be Made without a Cause.

And whereas the Atheists would further prove, that no Cogitation, taketh its Beginning from the Thinker, but always from the Action of some other thing without it, after this manner; Because it is not Conceiveable, why This Cogitation, rather then that, should start up at any time, were there not some Cause for it, without the Thinker. Here in the first place we freely grant, that our Humane Cogitations, are indeed commonly Occasioned, by the Incursions of Sensible Objects upon us; as also, that the Concatenations of those Thoughts and Phantasmes in us, which are distinguished from Sensations, (whether we be asleep or awake) do many times depend upon Corporal and Mechanical Causes in the Brain. Notwithstanding which, that all our Cogitations, are Obtruded, and Imposed upon us from without; and that there is no Transition in our Thoughts at any time, but such as had been before in Sense; (which the Democritick Atheist averss) this is a Thing, which we absolutely deny. For, had we no Mastery at all over our Thoughts, but they were all like Tennis-Balls, Bandied, and Struck upon us, as it were by Rackets from without; then could we not steadily and constantly carry on any Designs and Purposes of Life. But on the contrary that of Aristotle's, is most true, (as will be elsewhere further Proved) that Man and all Rational Beings, are in some Sense, ak fexion, a Principle of Actions, subordinate to the Deity; C c c c 2 which
which they could not possibly be, were they not also, a Principle of Cogitations, and had some Command over them; but these were all as much determined, by Causes without, as the Motions of the Weathercock are. The Rational Soul is it self an Active and Bubling Fountain of Thoughts; that perpetual and Restless Desire, which is as Natural and Essential to us, as our very Life. Continually Raising up and Protruding, New and New Ones, in us; which are as it were Offered to us. Besides which, we have also, a further Self Recollected Power, and a Power of Determining and Fixing our Mind and Intention, upon some certain Objects, and of Ranging our Thoughts accordingly. But the Athieft is here also to be taught, yet a Further Lesson; that an Absolutely Perfect Mind, (such as the Deity is supposed to be,) doth not (as Aristotle writeth of it) διδ μην νοειν. Sometimes Understand, and sometime not Understand; it being Ignorant of Nothing, nor Syllogizing about any thing; but comprehending all Intelligibles, with their Relations and Verities at once, within itself; and its Essence and Energie, being the same. Which Notion, if it be above the Dull Capacity of Athiefts, who measure all Perfection by their own Scantling, this is a thing, that We cannot help.

But as for that Prodigious Paradox of Athiefts, that Cogitation it self, is nothing but Local Motion or Mechanism, we could not have thought it possible that ever any man should have given entertainment to such a Conceit; but that this was rather, a mere Slander raised upon Athiefts; were it not certain from the Records of Antiquity, That whereas the old Religious Athiefts, did upon Good Reason, reduce all Corporeal Action (as Generation, Augmentation, and alteration) to Local Motion, or Translation from place to place; (there being no other Motion besides this Conceivable in Bodies) the ancient Athiezers of that Philosophy (Leucippus and Democritus) not contented herewith, did Really carry the bulines still on further, so as to make Cogitation it self also; Nothing but Local Motion. As it is also certain, that a Modern Athieftick Pretender to Wit, hath publickly owned this same Conception, That Mind is Nothing else but Local Motion in the Organick parts of Man's Body. These men have been sometimes indeed a little Troubled, with the Phancy,Apparition, or Seening of Cogitation, that is The Conscience of it, as knowing not well what to make thereof; but then they put it off again, and satisfy themselves worshipfully with this, that Phancy is but Phancy, but the Reality of Cogitation, nothing but Local Motion; as if there were not as much Reality in Phancy and Conscience, as there is in Local Motion. That which inclined these men so much, to this Opinion, was only because, they were Sensible and Aware of this, that if there were any other Action, besides Local Motion admitted, there must needs be some other Substance acknowledged, besides Body. Cartesius indeed undertook to defend Brute Animals, to be Nothing else but Machines, but then he supposed that there was Nothing at all of Cogitation in them, and Consequently nothing of true Animality or Life, no more than is in Artificial Automaton, as a Wooden Eagle, or the like; Nevertheless, this was justly thought to be Paradox enough.
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But that Cognition it self, should be Local Motion, and Men nothing but Machines; this is such a Paradox, as none but either a Stupid and Befotted, or else an Enthusiastick, Bigotical, or Fanatick Atheist, could possibly give entertainment to. Nor are such men as these, fit to be Disputed with, any more than a Machine is.

But whereas the Atheiftick Objecier, adds also over and above, in the last place, that no Understanding Being can be Perfectly Happy neither, and therefore not a God, because Essentially Dependent upon something else without it; This is all one as if he should say, That there is no such thing as Happines at all in Nature; Because it is certain, that without Consciousness or Understanding nothing can be Happy (since it could not have any Fruition of it self) and if no Understanding Being can be Happy neither, then must the Conclusion needs be, that of the Cyrenaites, that Bαρυμονία μνήμηκτον, Happiness is a mere Chimera, a Phantastick Notion or Fiction of Men's Minds; a thing which hath no Existence in Nature. These are the men, who afterwards Argue from Interest also against a God and Religion. Notwithstanding that they confes their own Principles to be so far, from promising Happines to any, as that they absolutely Cut off, all Hopes thereof. It may be further obferved also in the last place, that there is another of the Atheists Dark Mysteries here likewife couched, That there is no Scale or Ladder of Entity and Perfection in Nature, one above another; the whole Universe from top to bottom, being Nothing but One and the fame Sensible Matter, diversely Modified. As also, that Understanding as such, rather speaks Imperfection; it being but a mere Whifling, Epanid, and Phantastick thing; so that the most absolutely Perfect, of all things in the Universe, is Grave, Solid, and Substantial Sensible Matter: of which more afterwards. And thus is the Tenth Atheiftick Argumentation also Confuted.

But the Democritick and Epicurean Atheists, will make yet a further Affaint, from the Nature of Knowledge, Understanding, after this manner; If the World were Made by a God, or an Antecedent Mind and Understanding, having in it self an Exemplar or Platform thereof, before it was made, then must there be Actual Knowledge, both in order of Nature, and Time, before Things; whereas Things which are the Objects of Knowledge and Understanding, are unquestionably in order of Nature before Knowledge; this being but the Signature of them, and a Passion from them. Now the only Things, are Singular Sensibles or Bodies. From whence it follows, that Mind is the Youngest and most Creaturely Thing in the world; or that the World was before Knowledge and the Conception of any Mind; and no Knowledge or Mind, before the world as its Cause. Which is the Eleventh Atheiftick Argumentation.

But we have Prevented our selves here in the Answer to this Argument, (which would make all Knowledge, Mind, and Understanding Junior to the World, and the very Creature of Sensibles,) having already Fully Confuted it; and clearly Proved, That Singular Bodies, are not the only Things, and Objects of the Mind, but that it containeth
taineth its Immediate Intelligibles within itself; which Intelligibles also are Eternal, and That Mind is no Phantomick Image of Sensibles, nor the Stamp and Signature of them, but Archetypal to them; the First Mind being That of a Perfect Being, comprehending it self, and the Extent of its own Omnipotence, or the Possibilities of all things. So that Knowledge is Older than all Sensible things; Mind Senior to the World, and the Architect thereof. Wherefore we shall refer the Reader for an Answer to this Argument, to Page 729. and so onwards, where the Existence of a God, (that is, a Mind before the World) is Demonstrated also, from this very Topic, viz. the Nature of Knowledge and Understanding.

We shall in this place only add; that as the Atheists can no way Salve the Phenomenon of Motion, so can they much less that of Cognition, or Life and Understanding. To make which yet the more Evident, we shall briefly represent, a Sylabus or Catalogue of the many Atheistical Hallucinations or Delusions, concerning it. As First, That Sensible Matter being the only Substance, and all things else but Accidental Modifications thereof: Life and Mind is all a meer Accidental Thing, Generable and Corruptible, Producible out of Nothing, and Reducible to Nothing again; and that there is no Substantial Life or Mind any where. In Opposition to which, we have before proved, That there must of necessity be some Substantial Life, and that Human Souls being Lives Substantial, and not meer Accidental Modifications of Matter, they are consequently in their own Nature Immortal, since No Substance of it self ever vaniseth into Nothing.

Again the Democriticks, and other Atheists conclude, that Life and Mind, are no Simple and Primitive Natures, but Secondary and Compounded things; they resulting from certain Concretions and Contextures of Matter, and either the Commixtures and Contemporations of Qualities, or else the Combinations of those Simple Elements of Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion; and so being Made up, of that which hath Nothing of Life or Mind in it. For as Flesh is not Made, out of Flethy Particles, nor Bone out of Bone, (as Anaxagoras of old dreamed) so may Life as they conceive, be as well Made out of Lifeless Principles, and Mind out of that which hath no Mind or Understanding at all in it: just as Syllables Pronounceable, do result from Combinations of Letters; some of which are Mutet, and cannot by themselves be Pronounced at all, others but Semi-Vocal. And from hence do thefe Atheists Infer, that there could be no Eternal Unmade Life or Mind, nor any that is Immortal or Incorruptible; since upon the Dissolution of that Compages or Contexture of Matter, from whence they Result, they must needs Vanish into Nothing. Wherefore according to them, there hath probably, sometime heretofore been, no Life nor Understanding at all in the Universe, and there may Possibly be None again. From whence the Conclusion is, That Mind and Understanding, is no God, or Principle in the Universe; it being Emissially Faditius, Native and Corruptible; or as they express it in Plato, Σωφίς εἰς Σωφίδος, Mortal from Mortal things: as also, That the Souls of men, cannot subsist Separately, after Death,
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Death, and walk up and down in airy Bodies; no more than the Form of a House or Tree, after the Dissolution thereof, can subsist by it self Separately, or appear in some other Body. But all this Foolery of Atheists, hath been already Confuted, we having before shewd, that Life and Understanding are Active Powers, Figures, and Performances, that could never possibly result from meer Passive Bulk, or Dead and Senseless Matter, however Modified and Compounded; because Nothing can come Effectively from Nothing. Neither is there any Consequence at all in this, that because Flesh is not made out of Flethy Principles, nor Bone out of Bony, Red out of Red things, nor Green out of Green; therefore Life and Understanding, may as well be Compounded, out of things Dead and Senseless: because these are no Syllables or Complexions, as the others are, nor can either the Qualities of Heat and Cold, Moiety and Dry, or else Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions, however Combined together, as Letters Spell them out, and make them up; but they are Simple and Primitive things. And accordingly it hath been proved, that there must of necessity be, some Eternal Unmade Life and Mind: For though there be no necessity that there should be any Eternal Unmade Red, or Green, because Red and Green may be Made out of things not Red nor Green, they and all other Corporeal Qualities (so called) being but several Contextures of Matter, or Combinations of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions, however Combined; and the several Phancies in us: and though there be no necessity, that there should be Eternal Motion, because if there were once no Motion at all in Matter, but all Bodies Kept, yet might Motion have been Produced by a Self-Moving or Self Active Principle; And Lastly, though there be no necessity that there should be Eternal Unmade Matter or Body neither, because had there been once no Body at all, yet might it be Made or Produced by a Perfect Omnipotent Incorporeal Being: nevertheless is there an Absolute Necessity, that there should be Eternal Unmade Life, and Mind, because were there once no Life nor Mind at all, these could never have been produced out of Matter altogether Lifeless and Mindless. And though the Form of a House cannot possibly Exit Separately from the Matter and Substance thereof, it being a meer Accidental Thing, resulting from such a Compaige of Stone, Timber, and Morter, yet are Humane Souls and Minds, no such Accidental Forms of Compounded Matter, but Active Substantial things, that may therefore subsist Separately from these Bodies, and Enliven other Bodies of a different Contexture. And however some that are no Atheists, be over prone to conceive, Life, Sense, Cognition, and Conception in Brutes, to be Generated out of Dead, Senseless, and Unthinking Matter, (they being disposed thesame by certain Mistaken Principles, and ill Methods of Philosophy) nevertheless is this unquestionably in it self, a Seed of Atheism; because if any Life, Cognition, and Conception, may be Produced out of Dead and Senseless Matter, then can no Philosophy hinder, but all might have been so.

But the Demonstrick Atheists, will yet venture further to deny, that there is any thing in Nature Self-Moving or Self-Active, but that whatsoever
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whosoever Moved and Acted, was before Moved by something else, and Made to Act thereby; and again, that from some other thing and So backward Infinitely; from whence it would follow, that there is no First in the Order of Causes, but an Endless Retro-Infinity. But as this is all one, as to Affirm, that there is no such thing at all as Life in the World, but that the Universe is a Compages of Dead and Stupid Matter, so has this Infinity in the Order of Causes been already exploded for an Absolute Impossibility.

Nevertheless the Atheists will here advance yet an Higher Paradox; That all Action whatsoever, and therefore Cognition, Phancy, and Consciousness itself, is Really Nothing else but Local Motion; and Consequently not only Erute-Animals, but also Men themselves mere Machines, Which is an equal, either Sotithness or Impudence, as to assert, a Triangle to be a Square, or a Sphere, a Cube, Number to be Figure, or any thing else to be any thing: and it is Really all one as to affirm, that there Is indeed no such thing in our selves, as Cognition: there being no other Action in Nature, but Local Motion and Mechanism.

Furthermore the Democritick and Epicurean Atheists, Universally agree in this, that not only Sensations, but also all the Cognitions of the Mind, are the meer Passions of the Thinker, and the Actions of Bodies Existing without, upon him: though they do not all declare themselves, after the same manner herein. For First, the Democriticks conclude, that Sense is Caused by certain Groffer Corporeal Effluvia, streaming from the Surfaces of Bodies Continually, and entering through the Nerves; But that all other Cognitions of the Mind, and mens either sleeping or waking Imagination, proceed from another sort of Simulachra, Idols and Images, of a more Fine and Subtle Contexture, coming into the Brain, not through those open Tubes, or Channels of the Nerves, but immediately through all the smaller Pores of the Body: so that, as we never have sense of Any thing, but by means of those Groffer Corporeal Images, obtruding themselves upon the Nerves; so have we not the least Cognition at any Time in our Mind neither, which was not Caused by those Finer Corporeal Images, and Exuvious Membranes, or Effluvia, rushing upon the Brain, or Contexture of the Soul. And the sense of the lower Animals, which is nothing else but an innate Memory, when the Eye, Nose, Tongue, Ears, Touch, and other Senses, are excited, to cause the Mind to think; Leucippus and Democritus determined, that as well Novels as Atheists, Mental Cognition as External Sensation, was Caused by certain Corporeal Idols, coming from Bodies without; since neither Sensation nor Cognition, could otherwise possibly be produced. And thus does Laeritius also represent the feme of these Atheistic philosophers, that the Effluvia from Bodies called Idols, were the only Causes, to the sense of the other Idols, being excited, of all the Motions, Passions, and Affections, and even the very Volitions of the Soul. So that as we could not have the least Sensation, Imagination, nor Conception, of any thing otherwise than from those Corporeal Effluvia, rushing upon us from Bodies without, and begetting the same in us, at such a time; so neither could we, have
have any Passion, Appetite, or Volition, which we were not in like manner, Corporeally Passive to. And this was the Ground of the Democrick Fate, or Necessity of all Humane Actions, maintained by them, in opposition to the  ἔ γετον ἔρως, or Liberty of Will, which cannot be conceived without Self-Activity, and something of Contingency. They supposing Humane Volitions also, as well as all the other Cogitations, to be Mechanically Caused and Necesstitated, from those Effluvius Images of Bodies, coming in upon the Willers. And however Epicurus sometime pretended to Affert Liberty of Will, against Democritus, yet forgetting himself, did he also here securely Philophostize, after the very same manner,

Nunc age que moveant Animum res, accipe pauchis; 
Quae veniant veniant in Mente, percipe pauchis. 
Principio hoc dieo Remum Simulachra vagari,

But others there were amongst the Ancient Atomists, who could not conceive Sensations themselves, to be thus Caused by Corporeal Effluvia, or Exuvius Membranes, streaming from Bodies Continually, and that for Divers Reasons alleged by them; but only by a Pressure from them upon the Optick Nerve by Reason of a Tension of the Intermediate Air or Ether (being that which is called Light) whereby the distant Object is Touch'd and Felt, utv did ήσσυντε λαξ, as it were by a Staff. Which Hypothesis concerning the Corporeal Part of Sense, is indeed more ingenious, and agreeable to Reason than the Former. But the Atheizers of this Atomology, as they supposed Sense to be Nothing else but such a Pressure from Bodies without, so did they conclude Imagination and Mental Cogitation, to be but the Requiues and Reminders of those Motions of Sense formerly Made; and Conferred afterwards in the Brain (like the Tremulous Vibrations of a Clock or Bell, after the Striking of the Hammer, or the Rouling of the Waves, after that the Wind is ceas'd) Melting, Fading, and Decaying insensibly by degrees. So that according to these, Knowledge and Understanding, is Nothing but Fading and Decaying Sense, and all our Volitions but Mechanick Motions caused from the Actions or Trufions of Bodies upon us. Now though it be true, that in Sense, there is always a Passion Antecedent, made upon the Body of the Sentient from without; yet is not Sense it self this very Passion; but a Perception of that Passion; much less can Mental Conceptions be said to be the Action of Bodies without, and the meer Passion of the Thinker; and least of all Volitions such, there being plainly here, something ἔ γετον ἔρως, In our own Power, (by means whereof, we become a Principle of Actions, accordingly deserving Commendation or Blame,) that is, something of Self-Activity.

Again according to the Democrick and Epicurean Atheists, all Knowledge and Understanding is Really the same thing with Sense: the Difference between these Two, to some of them being only this, That what is commonly called Sense, is Primary and Original Knowledge, and Knowledge but Secondary, or Fading and Decaying Sense: but to others, that Sense is Caused by those more Vigorous Idols, or Effluves, vid.
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via from Bodies, intromitted through the Nerves; but Understanding and Knowledge, by those more Weak and Thin, Umbratile and Evamid ones, that penetrate the other smaller Pores of the Body: so that both ways, Understanding and Knowledge, will be but a Weaker Sense. Now from this Doctrine of the Atheistical Atomists, that all Conception and Cognition of the Mind whatsoever, is Nothing else but Sense and Passion from Bodies without, this Absurdity first of all follows unavoidably, that there can possibly be, any Error, or False Judgment, because it is certain, that all Passion is True Passion, and all Sense or Seeing, and Appearance, True Seeing and Appearance. Wherefore though some Sense and Passion may be more Obscure than other, yet can there be none False, it self being the very Essence of Truth. And thus Protagoras, one of these Atheistical Atomists, having first asserted, That Knowledge is Nothing else but Sense, did thereupon admit this as a Necessary Consequence, That μηκαὶ δεῖξαι αλλ', Every Opinion is True; because it is Nothing but Seeing and Appearance, and every Seeing and Appearance is truly such: and because it is not possible, for any one to Opine that which is Not, or to Think otherwise than be Suffers. Wherefore Epicurus being Sensible of this Inconvenience, endeavoured to Salve this Phenomenon of Error and False Opinion or Judgement, consistently with his own Principles, after this manner; That though all Knowledge be Sense and all Sense True, yet may Error arise notwithstanding, Ex Animi Opinatu, From the Opination of the Mind, adding something of its own, over and above, to the Passion and Phantasia of Sense. But herein he flamfully contradicts himself; For if the Mind in Judging, and Opining, can Superadd any thing of its own, over and above, to what it Suffers, then is it not a meer Passive Thing, but must needs have a Self Active Power of its own, and consequently will prove also Incorporeal, because no Body can Affect otherwise, than it Suffers, or is Made to Affect by something else without it. We conclude therefore, That since there is such a thing as Error, or False Judgement, all Cogitations of the Mind cannot be meer Passions; but there must be something of Self-Activity in the Soul it Self, by means whereof, it can give its Assent, to things not clearly Perceived, and so Err.

Again from this Atheistical Opinion, That all Knowledge is Nothing else but Sense, either Primary or Secondary, it follows also; That there is no Absolute Truth nor Fallibility, and that Knowledge is of a Private Nature, Relative, and Phantasialonly, or meer Seeing; that is, Nothing but Opinion: because Sense is plainly, Seeing, Phantasy, and Appearance, a Private thing and Relative to the Sentient only. And here also did Protagoras, according to his wonted Freedom, admit this Consequence, That Knowledge being Sense, there was no Absoluteness at all therein, and That nothing was True otherwise, than τὸ τοῦ πάντων, To this and to that man to Thinking; That every man did, but τὸ εἰρήνη μενον δεξιά, Opine only his Own things; That τὸ τοῦ πρωάκτων μετεερρονετον, Every man was the Measure of Things, and Truth to himself; and Lastly, τὸ φανάσηται εἰς τότε τοῦ, That whatsoever Seemed to every one, was True to him to whom it Seemed. Neither could Democritus himself, though a man of more discretion than Protagoras, dissemble this Consequence from
from the same Principle asserted by him, that Understanding isphantas
tical, and Knowledge but Opinion: he owning it sometimes before
he was aware, as in these words of his, "γνῶσις χρή καὶ ἔνθεσις τοῦ ἀρνί
tῶ ναυτῆς, ὧν αὐτὸς ἀπελεύθη." We ought to Know Man, according to
this Rule, That he is such a thing, as hath Nothing to do with Absolute
Truth; and again, "οὕτως οὐ πιστεύεις ὅσοι, ὃι ἐπιστήμης ἐν ἀλήθειᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐπιπερ
θυμός ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἐνεξίστατο." We know nothing Absolutely, concerning anything;
and all our Knowledge is Opinion. Agreeably to which, he determin
ed, that mens Knowledge was diversified by the Temper of their
Bodies, and the Things without them. And Aristotle Judgment
observingly both these Doctrines, That there is no Error or Fals Judgement,
but every Opinion True; and again, That Nothing is Absolutely True but Relatively only; to be Really and Fundamentally
One and the same; imputeth them both together, to Democritus; in
these words of his, ἀλήθεια ἔτι οὐκ ἐπιστήμη; ὧν ἀλήθεια ἐπιπερθύ
θυμός ἀνθρώπων μὲν τῷ ἀληθείᾳ, τῷ φαντασμῷ θὲ τῷ ἀληθείᾳ ἐνάντια ἐπιπερ
θυμός ἀνθρώπων, Democritus held, that there was Nothing Absolutely True: but because
he thought Knowledge or Understanding, to be Sensé; therefore did he
conclude that whatsoever Seemed according to Sensé, must of necessity be
True (not Absolutely, but Relatively) to whom it so Seemed. These
Groß Abjardities did the Atheistical Atomists plunge themselves into,
whilst they endeavoured to Salve the Phenomenon of Cognition,
Mind, or Understanding, agreeably to their own Hypothesis. And
it is certain, that all of them, Democritus himself not excepted, were
but meer Blunderers in that Atomick Physiolog, which they so much pretended to, and never rightly Understood the Same. For as much
as that with Equal Clearness teaches these Two things at once, That
Sensé indeed is Phantasical and Relative to the Sentient; But that
there is a Higher Faculty, of Understanding and Reason in us, which
thus discovers the Phantasies of Sensé, and reaches to the Absoluteness
of Truth; or is the Criterion thereof.

But the Democritick and Epicurean Atheists will further Conclude,
that the only Things or Objects of the Mind, are Singular Sensibles, or
Bodies Existing without it; which therefore must needs be in Order
of Nature, before all Knowledge, Mind, and Understanding whatsoever;
this being but a Phantasical Image or Representacion of them.
From whence they Infer, that the Corporeal World, and these Sensible
things, could not possibly be Made, by any Mind or Understanding;
because Eswentially Junior to them, and the very Image and Creatur of
them. Thus does Aristotle Observe, concerning both Democritus and
Protagoras, that they did ὑπολογίζων τα ὧν μὲν ἔτοι τα ἀνθρώπων
Suppose the only Things or Objects of the Mind to be Sensibles: and that
this was the Reason, why they made Knowledge to be Sensé; and therefore
Relative and Phantasical: But we have already Proved, that Mind
and Understanding is not the Phantasical Image of Sensibles or Bodies;
and that it is in its own Nature not Edypal, but Archetypal, and Archite-
conical of all. That it is Senior to the World, and all Sensible
Things, not looking abroad, for its Objects any where without, but
containing them within it itself; The first Original Mind, being an
Absolutely perfect Being, Comprehending it self, and the Extent of its

own
own Omnipotence, or all Possibilities of things, together with the Best Platform of the whole, and producing the fame accordingly.

But it being plain, that there are besides Singulars, other Objects of the Mind Universal, from whence it seems to follow, that Sensibles, are not the only Things; some Modern Atheistical Wits, have therefore invented, this further device to maintain the Cause, and carry the Business on; That Universals are nothing else but Names or Words, by which Singular Bodies are called, and Consequently, that in all Axioms and Propositions, Sententious Affirmations and Negations (in which the Predicate at least is Universal) we do but Add or Subtract, Affirm or Deny, Names of Singular Bodies; and that Reason or Syllogism, is Nothing but the Reckoning or Computing, the Consequences of those Names or Words. Neither do they want the Impudence, to Affirm, that besides those Passions or Phantasies, which we have from things by Sense; we know Nothing at all of any thing, but only the Names, by which it is called. Then which there cannot be a greater Sottifiness or Madness: For if Geometry, were nothing but the Knowledge of Names by which Singular Bodies are called, as it self could not deserve that Name of a Science; so neither could its Truths be the fame in Greek and in Latin: and Geometricals, in all the several distant Ages and Places of the World, must be supposed to have had, the fame Singular Bodies before them, of which they Affirmed and Denied, tho' Universal Names.

In the Last place, the Epicurean and Anaximandrian Atheists, agreeably to the Premised Principles, and the Tenor of their Hypothesis, do both of them endeavour to Depreciate and Undervalue, Knowledge or Understanding, as a thing which hath not any Higher Degree of Perfection or Entity in it, than is in Dead and Sensible Matter. It being according to them, but a Passion from Singular Bodies Existing without, and therefore both Junior, and Inferior to them; a Whirlwind raised in the Brain, by Motions made upon it, from the Objects of Sense; That which Essentially includeth in it, Dependence upon Something else; at best, but a Thin and Evanescent Image of Sensibles, or rather an Image of those Images of Sense; a meer Whirling and Phantasick thing; upon which account they conclude it, not fit to be attributed, to that which is the First Root and Source of all things, which therefore is to them no other, than Grave and Solid, Sensible Matter; the only Substantial, Self-Existent, Independent thing, and Consequently the most Perfect and Divine. Life and Understanding, Soul and Mind are to them, no Simple and Primitive Nature, but Secondary and Derivative, or Syllables and Complexions of things, which Sprung up afterwards, from certain Combinations of Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions, or Contemperations of Qualities; Contextures either of Similar or Dissimilar Atoms. And as themselves are Juniors to Sensible Matter and Motion, and to those Inanimate Elements, Fire, Water, Air and Earth, the First, and most Real Productions of Nature and Chance; so are their Effcts, and the Things that belong to them, comparatively with those other Real Things of Nature, but Slight, Ludicrous, and Omnibrisk; as Land-

skip
skip in Fijture, compared with the Real Protecl, of High Mountains, and Low Valleys, Winding or Meandrous Rivers, Towering Steeples, and the Shady Tops of Trees and Groves: as they are accordingly, commonly dispragared, under those Names of Notional and Artificial.

And thus was the Sense of the Ancient Atheists represented by Plato, 

that the whole World, were those Elements, Fire, Water, Air and Earth, made by Sensible Nature and Chance, without any Art, Mind or Understanding: and next to these the Bodies of the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and this Terrestrial Globe, produced out of the fore-mentioned Inanimate Elements, by Unknowing Nature or Chance likewise, without any Art, Mind or God.

The Fortuitous Concourse of Similar or Dissimilar Atoms, begetting this whole System and Compass of Heaven and Earth; these being altogether the Fruits of Sense and Understanding, but not any Art, Mind, or Understanding: being Generated also in the last place, out of those same Sensible and Inanimate Bodies or Elements, (it riling up in certain Smaller Pieces of the Universe, and Particular Computations of Matter, called Animals) Mortal from Mortal things, did produce certain other Lureous things, which partake little of Truth and Reality, but are mere Images, Umbrages and Imitations, as Piiture and Landscape, &c. but above all, those Moral Differences of Just and Unjust, Honest and Dishonest, the near Figments of Political Art, and slight Ombrati Things, compared with Good and Evil Naturals, that consist in nothing, but Agreement and Disagreement with Sense, and Appetite: that is called "good" or "bad", that is called "just" or "unjust", or as Nature no such thing at all. The Upshot and Conclusion of all is, That there is no such Scale or Ladder in Nature, as Theists and Metaphysicians suppose, no Degrees of Real Perfection and Entity one above another, as of Life and Sense, above Inanimate Matter, of Reason and Understanding above Sense: from whence it would be inferred, that the Order of things in Nature, was in Way of Decent, from Higher and Greater Perfection, Downward to Lesser and Lower, which is indeed to Introduce a God. And that there is no such Scale or Ladder of Perfection and Entity, they endeavour further to prove from hence, because according to that Hypothesis, it would follow, that every the Smallest and most Contemplable Animal, that couldsee the Sun, had a higher degree of Entity and Perfection in
in it, than the Sun itself; a thing ridiculously absurd: or else according to Cotta's Instinct; Ideirio Formicam antependam esse huic Pulcherimam Urbis, quod in Urbis Sensus sit nullus, in Formica non modo Sensus, sed stiam Mens, Ratio, Memoria. That therefore every Ant or Pijuriure, were far to be preferred, before this most beautiful City of Rome; because in the City, there is no Sense, whereas an Ant hath not only Sense, but also Mind, Reason and Memory; that is, a certain Sagacity superior to Sense. Wherefore they conclude that there is no such Scale or Ladder in Nature, no such Climbing Stairs of Entity and Perfection, one above another, but that the whole Universe is One Flat and Level, it being indeed all, Nothing but the same Uniform Matter, Under several Forms, Dreses, and Disguises: or Variegated by Diversity of Accidental Modifications; one of which, is that of such Beings as have Phancy in them, commonly called Animals; which are but some of Sportful or Wanton Natures, more trimly Artificial and Finer Gamiacims, or Pretty Toys; but by reason of this Phancy, they have no Higher Degree of Entity and Perfection in them, than is in Senseless Matter: as they will also be all of them quickly transformed again, into other seemingly dull, Unlinking and Inanimate Shapes. Hitherto the Sense of Atheists.

But the Pretended Grounds of this Atheistical Doctrine, (or rather Madness) have been already also confuted, over and over again. Knowledge and Understanding, is not a meer Passion from the thing Known, Exiling without the Knower, because to Know and Understand; as Anaxagoras of old determined, is in Jestion, to Muster and Conquer the thing Known, and consequently not meerly to Suffer from it, or Passively to Lie Under it, this being in Medio, to be Mustered and Conquered by it. The Knowledge of Universal Theorems in Sciences, is not from the Force of the thing Known exiling without the Knower, but from the Active Power, and Exerted Vigour or Strength, of that which Knows. Thus Severinus Boothus; Videbo ut in cognoscendo, cumha Sud potius Facultate, quam Eorum qui Cognoscantur Utantur? Neque id infuria, nam cum omnem Judicium Judicantis Alum exsita, necesse est ut Jam quisque Operam, non ex Alienâ, sed ex propriâ Poteitate perfecta. See you not, how all things in Knowing, use their own Power and Faculty, rather, than that of the thing Known? For since Judgment is the Action of that which judges, every thing most of necessity performs its own Action, by its own Power, Strength, and Faculty, and not by that of another. Sense itself is not a meer Passion; or Reception of the Motion from Bodies without the Sentient; for if it were so, then would a Looking-Glass, and Other Dead things see: but it is a Perception of a Passion, made upon the Body of the Sentient, and therefore hath something of the Souls own Self-Activity in it. But Understanding and the Knowledge of Abstract Sciences, is neither Primary Sense, nor yet the Fading and Decaying Remnants, of the Motions thereof, but a Perception of another kind, and more inward than that of Sense; not Sympathetical but Unpassionate, the Noemata of the Mind, being things distinct from the Phantasmata of Sense and Imagination, which are but a Kind of Confused Cogitations. And though the Objects of Sense be only Singular Bodies, Exiling without the Sentient, yet are not
not these Sense-ables therefore, the only Things and Cognitables, but there are other Objects of Science, or Intelligibles, which the Mind Containeth within it Self. That Dark Philosophy of some, tending directly to Atheism, That there is Nothing in the Mind or Understanding which was, not First in Corporal Sense, and derived in way of Passion from Matter, was both Elegantly and Solidly Confuted by Boetius his Philosopher Muse, after this manner,

*Obscuro* nimium Senec*.

\[ Ut quondam Celeri stylo \]

*E Corporibus extinctis, \* 

\[ Sed Mens si propriis vigens \]

\[ Sed tantum patiens jacet \]

\[ Quae nullas habet notas, \* 

\[ Sed Mens si propriis vigens \]

\[ Sed tantum patientia jacet \]

\[ Caelique in speculi vicem \]

\[ Unde lec sc animis viget \]

\[ Quae vis singularis prosperit? \]

\[ Quae diviha recolligit? \* 

\[ Nunc Summas Capit inferit, \]

\[ Tum sejus referens sti \]

\[ Hec est Efficius magis \]

\[ Quam quae Materie modo \]

\[ Precedittamen Excitans \]

\[ Vivo in corpore Paffio. \]

\[ Vel Vox auribus subrerpit: \]

\[ Quas intus species tenet, \]

\[ Notis applicat exteris. \]

It is true indeed, that the Notitw, or Thing Understood, is in order of Nature before the Intellection and Conception of it, and from hence was it, that the Pythagoreans and Platonists concluded, that Nex, Mind or Intelle\(_3\), was not the very First and Highest Thing in the Scale of the Universe, but that there was another Divine Hypothesis, in order of Nature before it, called by them "Ev and T" \&c. \&c, One and The Good, as the Notitw or Intelligible thereof. But as those Three Archical Hypotheses of the Platonists and Pythagoreans, are all of them Really but One \&c. or Divinity: And the First of those Three, (Superior to that which is properly called by them, Mind or Intelle\(_3\)) is not supposed therefore to be Ignorant of it Self. So is the First Mind or Understanding, no other, than that of a Perfect Being, Infinitely Good, Fecund, and Powerful, and Virtually Containing all things; comprehending it Self and the Extent of its own Goodness, Fecundity, Virtue, and Power; that is, all Possibilities of things; their Relations to one another, and Verities; a Mind before Sense, and Sensitive Things. An Omnipotent Understanding Being, which is it Self, its own Intelligible, is the First Original of all things. Again, that there must of Necessity be some other Substance besides Body or Matter, and which in the Scale of Nature is Superior to it, is evident from hence, because otherwise, there could be no Motion at all therein, no Body being ever able to move it Self. There must be something Self-Active and Hylarchical, something that can Act both from
from itself, and upon Matter, as having a Natural Imperium, or Command over it. Cogitation is in order of Nature, before Local Motion. Life and Understanding, Soul and Mind, are no Sybiles or Complexions of things, Secundary and Derivative, which might therefore be made out of things devoid of Life and Understanding; but Simple, Primitive, and Un compounded Natures: they are no Qualities or Accidental Modifications of Matter, but Substantial Things. For which Cause Souls or Minds can no more be Generated out of Matter, than Matter it Self, can be Generated out of Something else: and therefore are they both alike (in some sense) Principles, Naturally Ingenerable and Incorruptible; though both Matter, and all Imperishable Souls and Minds, were at first Created by one Perfect Omnipotent Understanding Being. Moreover Nothing can be more Evident than this, that Mind and Understanding hath a Higher Degree of Entity or Perfection in it, and is a Greater Reality in Nature, than meer Sensible Matter or Bulkie Extension. And Consequent upon the things which belong to Souls and Minds, to Rational and Intellectual Beings; as such, must not have Left, but More Reality in them, than the things which belong to Inanimate Bodies. Wherefore the Differences of Just and Unjust, Honesty and Dishonesty, are greater Realities in Nature, than the Differences of Hard and Soft, Hot and Cold, Moist and Dry. He that does not perceive any Higher Degree of Perfection, in a Man, than in an Oyster, or in a Clod of Earth or Lump of Ice, in a Piece of Flint, or Pyre-Cruise, hath not the Reason or Understanding of a Man in him. There is unquestionably, a Scale or Ladder of Nature, and Degrees of Perfection and Entity, one above another, as of Life, Sense, and Cognition, above Reason and Understanding, above Sense, &c. And if the Sun be Nothing but a Mass of Fire, or Inanimate Subtle Matter Agitated, then hath the most Contemplative Animal, that can see the Sun, and hath Consciences and Self-enjoyment, a Higher Degree of Entity and Perfection in it, than that whole Fiery Globe, as also than the Materials, (Stone, Timber, Brick and Morter) of the most Stately Structure, or City. Notwithstanding which, the Sun in other regards, and as its vastly Extended Light and Heat, hath so great an Influence, upon the Good of the whole World, Plants and Animals, may be said to be a far more Noble and Useful thing in the Universe, than any one Particular Animal whatsoever. Wherefore there being plainly a Scale or Ladder of Entity, the Order of Things was unquestionably, in way of Descent, from Higher Perfection, Downward to Lower, it being as Impossible, for a Greater Perfection to be produced from a Lesser, as for Something to be Caused by Nothing. Neither are the Steps or Degrees of this Ladder, (either upward or downward) Infinite; but as the Foot, Bottom, or Lowest Round thereof, is Stupid and Sensible Matter, devoid of all Life and Understanding; so is the Head, Top, and Summity of it, a Perfect Omnipotent Being, Comprehending it Self, and all Possibilities of things. A Perfect Understanding Being, is the Beginning and Head of the Scale of Entity; from whence things Gradually Descend downward; lower and lower, till they end in Sensible Matter. οὐκ οἷς πολλῶν περιωνταὶ, Mind is the Oldest of all things, Senior to the Elements,
We have now made it evident, that the Epicurean and Anaximandrian Atheists, who derive the Original of all things from Sensible Matter, devoid of all Manner of Life, can no way Salve the Phenomenon of Cognition (Life and Understanding, Soul and Mind) no more than they can that of Local Motion. And the Reason why we have insisted so much upon this Point, is because these Atheists, do not only pretend to Salve this Phenomenon of Cognition without a God, and so to take away the Argument for a Deity from thence; but also to Demonstrate the Impossibility of its Existence, from the very Nature of Knowledge, Mind, and Understanding. For if Knowledge, be in its own Nature, Nothing but a Passion from Singular Bodies Existing without the Knower; and if Life and Understanding, Soul and Mind, be Junior to Body, and Generated out of Sensible Matter, then could no Mind or Understanding Being, Possibly be a God, that is a First Principle, and the Maker of all things. And though Modern Writers, take little or no Notice of this, yet did Plato anciently, make the very State of the Controversie, betwixt Theists and Atheists principally to confit in this very thing, viz.: Whether Life and Understanding, Soul and Mind, were Juniors to Body, and Sprung out of Sensible Matter, as Accidental Modifications thereof, or else were Substantial things, and in order of Nature Before it. For after the Passages before Cited, he thus concludes, "I am persuaded that what Plato said, that the Phenomena of Cognition are not to be accounted for by an ultimate Sensorial Principle, but by a First Principle and a Maker; for if Knowledge, Life, Understanding, Soul, and Mind, were not generated by a First Principle and Maker, it is evident that a God cannot be supposed. For these men seem to suppose, Fire, Water, Air and Earth, to be the very First things in the Universe, and the Principles of all things, calling them only Nature; but Soul and Mind, to have sprung up afterwards out of them. Nay, they do not only seem to suppose this, but also in Express Words declare the same. And thus (by Jupiter) we have discovered, the very Fountain of that Atheistical Madness, of the Ancient Physiologers; for them making Inanimate Bodies, Senor to Soul and Mind. And accordingly, that Philosopher addresses himself to the Confutation of Atheism, no otherwize than thus, by proving Soul not to be Junior to Sensible Body, or Inanimate Matter, and Generated out of it; but the Quake, the Fire, the Water, the Air, and Earth, to be the true Principles; and that the reason why they are called Inanimate, is because they are not sensible: For a Body is Inanimate, when it is not sensible. But their Inanimate Bodies, are made of sensible Principles, and therefore must be Supposed to be generated by an ultimate Maker and Superintendent of All. For that which is the First Cause of the Generation and Corruption of all Things, the Atheistical Doctrine supposes, not to have been Frise.
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First Made; but what is indeed the last thing, to be the first, and hence is it, that they err concerning the essence of the Gods. For they are ignorant what kind of thing Soul is, and what power it hath; or else especially concerning its generation and production, that it was first of all made before Body, it being that which governs the motions, changes, and transformations thereof. But if Soul be first in order of nature before Body, then must those things which are cognate to Soul, be also before the things which pertain to Body; and so Mind and Understanding, Art and Law be before Hard and Soft, Heavy and Light; and that which these Atheists call Nature. (The motion of inanimate bodies Junior to art and Mind; it being governed by the same. Now that Soul is in order of nature before Body, this philosopher demonstrates only from the Topick or Head of motion, because it is impossible, that one Body should move another infinitely, without any first cause or mover; but there must of necessity be something self-moving, and self-active, or which had a power of changing it Self, that was the first cause of all local motion in Bodies. And this being the very notion of soul, that it is such a thing, as can move or change it self, (in which also the essence of life consists.) he thus infers, because of the soul, in so many propositions, does it appear to be self-moving; it is therefore sufficiently demonstrated from hence, that Soul is the oldest of all things in the corporeal world; it being the principle of all the motion, and generation in it. And his conclusion is, that it is self-moving; and that Body was made before it, and Body younger and junior to Soul; Soul being that which ruleth, and Body that which is ruled. From whence it follows that the things of soul also, are older than the things of Body; and therefore cognition, intellect, volition, and appetite, in order of nature before length, breadth and profundity. Now it is evident, that Plato in all this understood, not only the mundane soul, or his third divine hypothesis, the original of that motion that is in the heavens and the whole corporeal universe, but also all other particular lives and souls whatsoever, or that whole rank of beings called soul; he supposing it all to have been at first made, before the corporeal system, or at least to have been in order of nature senior to it, as superior and more excellent, (that which ruleth being superior to that which is ruled) and no soul or life whatsoever, to be generated out of sensibles matter.

Wherefore we must needs here condemn that doctrine of some professed theists and christians of latter times, who generate all souls, not only the sensible in brutes, but also the rational in men, out of matter. For as much as hereby, not only that argument for the existence of a God, from souls, is quite taken away; and nothing could hinder but that sensibles matter might be the original of all things; if life and understanding, soul and mind sprung out of it; but also the atheists will have an advantage, to prove the imposibility of a God from hence. Because if life and understanding, in their own nature be factitious, and generable out of matter, then
are they no *Substantial Things,* but *Accidental* only, from whence it
plainly follow, that no Mind could possibly be a *God,* or *Fruit
Caufe* of all things, it being not so much as able to Subfift by it Self.
Moreover if Mind as such, be *Generable,* and *Educible* out of *Nothing,*
then mult it needs be in its own Nature *Corruptible* also, and *Reducible*
to *Nothing* again; whereas the Deity is both an *Unmade* and *In-
corruptible* Being. So that there could not possibly be according to
this Hypothesis, any other *God,* than such a *Jupiter,* or *Soul* of the
World, as the *Athelsticke* Theogenites acknowledged, that Sprung out
of *Night,* *Chaos,* and *Non-Entity,* and may be again Swallowed up
into that *Dark Abyss.* *Sensible* Matter therefore, being the only *Un-
made* and *Incorruptible* things; and the *Fountain* of all things, *Ev-
en of Life* and *Understanding,* it must needs be acknowledged to
be the Only *Real Numen.*

Neither will the *Cafe* be much different, as to some others; who
though indeed they do not professedly *Generate,* the *Rational,* but
only the *Sensitive Soul,* both in Men and Brutes; yet do nevertheless
maintain, the *Human Soul* it self, to be but a mere *Blank,* or *White
Sheet* of Paper, that hath nothing at all in it; but what was *Scribuled*
on it, by the *Objects* of Sense; and Knowledge or Understanding to
be nothing but the *Result* of Sense, and so a *Passion* from Sensible
Bodies existing without the Knower. For hereby, as they plainly make *Knowledge* and *Understanding,* to be in its own Nature, *Junior
to Sense,* and the very *Creature* of *Sensibles*; so do they also imply, the *Rational Soul* and *Mind* it self, to be as well *Generated* as the *Sensi-
tive,* wherein it is Virtually *Contained*; or to be nothing but a
*Higher Modification* of *Matter;* agreeably to that *Leviathan-Dor-
rine,* *That men differ no otherwise from Brute Animals,* then only
in their *Organization,* and the *Life of Speech or Words.*

In very truth, Whoever mainaineth, that any *Life* or *Soul,* any
*Cognition* or *Consciousnes,* *Self-Perception* and *Self-Activity,* can *spring
out of Dead, Sensible and Unactive Matter, the same can never pos-
ibly have any Rational *Affurance,* but that his own *Soul,* had also a
like *Original,* and Consequently is *Mortal* and *Corruptible.* For if
any *Life* and *Cognition* can be thus *Generated,* then is there no Rea-
son, but that all Lives may be so; they being but *Higher Degrees*
in the same *Kind:* and neither *Life,* nor any thing else, can be in its
own Nature *Indifferent,* to be either *Substance* or *Accident,* and
sometimes one, sometimes the other: but either all *Life,* *Cognition,* and
*Consciousnes,* is *Accidental,* *Generable* and *Corruptible,* or else
none at all.

That which hath inclined so many, to think the *Sensitive* *Life at
least,* to be nothing but a *Quality* or *Accident* of *Matter,* *Generable
out of it,* and *Corruptible* into it, is that strange *Protean Transfor-
mation of Matter, into so many seemingly *Unaccountable Forms and
Shapes,* together with the *Scholastick Opinion* threupon, of *Real
Qualities;* that is, *Entities* distinct from the *Substance of Body,* and
its *Modifications,* but yet *Generable* out of it, and *Corruptible,* into
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it. They concluding that as Light, and Colours, Heat and Cold, &c., according to those Phancies which we have of them, are Real Qualities of Matter, distinct from its Substance and Modifications, so may Life, Sense, and Cogitation, be in like manner Qualities of Matter also Generable and Corruptible. But these Real Qualities of Body in the Sense declared, are things that were long since justly exploded, by the Ancient Atomists, and expunged out of the Catalogue of Entities, of whom Lucretius hath Recorded, that they did quite calibier and handle Qualities out of their Philosophy: they resolving all Corporeal Phenomena, and therefore those of Heat and Cold, Light and Colours, Fire and Flame, &c. intelligibly, into nothing but the Different Modifications of Extended Substance, viz. More or Less Magnitude of Parts, Figure, Site, Motion or Rest, (or the Combinations of them) and those different Phancies Caused in us by them. Indeed there is no other Entity, but Substance and its Modifications. Wherefore the Democriticks and Epicureans, did most shamefully contradict themselves, when pretending to reject and explode, all those Entities of Real Qualities, themselves nevertheless, made Life and Understanding: such Real Qualities of Matter, Generable out of it, and Corruptible again into it.

There is nothing in Body or Matter, but Magnitude, Figure, Site, and Motion or Rest; now it is Mathematically Certain, that these however Combin'd together, can never possibly Compound or Make up Life or Cognition: which therefore cannot be an Accident of Matter, but must of Necessity be a Substantial thing. We speak not here of that Life (improperly so called) which is in Vulgar Speech attributed to the Bodies of Men and Animals: for it is plainly Accidental to a Body, to be Vitally United to a Soul, or not. Therefore this is the Life of the Compound, Corruptible and Destroyable, without the Destruction of any Real Entity; there being nothing Destroyed, nor Lost to the Universe, in the Deaths of Men and Animals, as such; but only a Disunion or Separation made, of those Two Substances, Soul and Body, one from another. But we speak here of the Original Life of the Soul itself, that this is Substantial, neither Generable nor Corruptible, but only Creatable and Annihilable by the Deity. And it is strange, that any Men should persuade themselves, that that which Rules and Commands, in the Bodies of Animals, moving them up and down, and hath Sense or Perception in it, should not be as Substantial, as that Stupid and Senseless Matter, that is Ruled by it. Neither can Matter, (which is also but a more Passive thing) Efficiently produce Soul, any more than Soul Matter: no Finite Imperfect Substance, being able to produce another Substance out of Nothing. Much less can such a Substance as hath a Lower Degree of Entity and Perfection in it, Create that, which hath a Higher. There is a Scale or Ladder of Entities and Perfections in the Universe, one above another, and the Production of things cannot possibly be in Way of Ascent from Lower to Higher, but must of Necessity be in way of Descent from Higher to Lower. Now to produce any One Higher Rank of Being, from the Lower, as Cognition from Magnitude and Body, is plainly to invert this Order, in the Scale of the Universe, from Downward.
The Grand Objection against this **Substantiality of Souls Sensitivae**, as well as *Rational*, is from that Consequence, which will be from thence inferred, of their **Permanent Subsistence** after Death, their Perpetuity, or Immortality. This seeming very absurd, that the Souls of Brutes also should be **Immortal**, or subsist after the **Deaths** of the **Respective Animals**: But especially to Two Sorts of Men; First, such as carelessly in good earnest believe, their own Soul’s Immortality; and Secondly, such *Religionists*, as conclude, that if Irrational or Sensitivae Souls, subsist after Death, then must they needs go present, either into Heaven or Hell. And *R. Cartesius* was so senisible of the **Offensiveness of this Opinion**, that though he were fully convinced of the necessity of this **Disjunction**, that either Brutes have nothing of Sense or Cogitation at all, or else they must have some other **Substance** in them besides Matter, he chose rather to make them **Sensiblæ Machinæ**, then to allow them **Substantial Souls**. Wherein avoiding a **Lesser Absurdity or Paradox**, he plainly plunged himself into a Greater; scarcely any thing being more generally received, than the Sense of Brutes. Though in truth all those, who deny the **Substantiality of Sensitivæ Souls**, and will have Brutes to have nothing but Matter in them, ought consequently according to Reason, to do as Cartesius did, deprive them of all Sense. But on the contrary, if it be evident from the **Phaenomena**, that Brutes are not more **Sensiblæ Machinæ or Automata**, and only like **Clocks** or **Watches**, then ought not Popular Opinion and Vulgar Prejudice so far to prevail with us, as to hinder our Assent, to that which found Reason and Philosophy clearly dictates, that therefore they must have something more than Matter in them. Neither ought we, when we clearly conceive any thing to be true, as this, That Life and Cogitation cannot possibly rife, out of Dead and Sensiblæ Matter, to abandon it, or deny our Assent thereunto because we find it attended with some Difficulty, not easily Extrinsicable by us, or cannot free all the Consequences thereof from some Inconvenience or Absurdity, such as seems to be in the **Permanent Subsistence of Brutes Souls**.

For the giving an Account of which notwithstanding, *Plato* and the Ancient *Pythagoreans*, proposed this following **Hypothesis**. That **Soulæ** as well *Sensitivæ*, as *Rational*, being all *Substantial*, but not *Self-Existent*; (becauze there is but one Fountain, and Principle of all things) were therefore Produced or Caused by the Deity. But this; not in the **Generations** of the respective Animals; it being indecorous that this **Divine Miraculous Creative Power**, should constantly unauey
lacquey by and attend upon Natural Generations; as also incongruous, that Souls should be so much Juniors to Every Atom of Dust, that is in the whole World; but either all of them from Eternity; according to those who Denied the Novity of the World; or rather according to others, who asserted the Cohesionon, in the first beginning of the World’s Creation. Wherefore, it being also Natural to Souls as such, to Actuate and Enliven some Body, or to be as it were Clothed therewith, these as soon as Created, were immediately invested with certain Thin and Subtle Bodies; or put into Light Ethereal or Aerial Charits and Vehicles; wherein they subsist both before their Entrance into other Gross Terrestrial Bodies and after their Egress out of them. So that the Souls not only of men, but also of other Animals, have sometimes a Thicker, and sometimes a Thinner Indument or Clothing. And thus do we understand the Deities, not only of the Rational; but also of the other Inferior Sensitive Souls, in these Verses of his,

Tu Canis Animas paribus Vitalique Minoras,
Provehis, & Levibus sublimes Curribus aptantis,
In Cultus Terramque seris.

Where his Light Charits, which all Lives or Souls at their very first Creation, by God are placed in; and in which being wafted, they are both together as it were Sowed into the Gross Terrestrial Matter; are Thin, Aerial and Ethereal Bodies. But this is plainly declared by Proclus upon the Times, after he had spoken of the Souls of Demons and Men, in this manner; ἡ ζωὴ πιστοῦ ὡς ψυχὴ σωματικοῦ, ἐξοικονομημένη, ὡς κατ’ εἰκόνα ἐφ’ ἑνός, And every Soul, must of necessity have, before these Mortal Bodies, certain Eternal and easily moveable Bodies, it being essential to them to move. There is indeed mention made by the same Proclus, and others, of an Opinion of ἐγκαταλειμμένα, Irrational or Brute Demons, or Demonic Aerial Brutes; of which he sometime speaks doubtfully, as ηπειρ οὐ εἰσὶν ἐγκαταλειμμένα, ὡς οὐ οὐκ ἐγκαταλειμμένα. If there be any Irrational Demons, as the Theurgists affirm. But the Dispute, Doubt or Controversie here only was, Whether there were any such Irrational Demons Immortal or no. For thus we learn from the Words of Ammonius upon the Porphyrian Hagage, οἱ μὲν τοῖς ζωαῖς ζωαὶ παρ’ ἐμοῖς ἄλογαν γενόμενα ὡς οὐκ ἔχοντες ζωαὶ, οἱ δὲ τοῖς τειχεῖ τοιαῦτα γενόμενα ζωαὶ, Some affirm, that there is a certain kind of Irrational Demons Immortal; but others, that all these Irrational or Brute Demons, are Mortal: Where by Irrational Demons Immortal, seem to be understood, such as never descend into Terrestrial Bodies; (and these are there disclaimed by Ammonius) but the Mortal Ones, such as act also upon Gross Terrestrial Bodies, obnoxious to Death and Corruption. As if Ammonius should have said, There are no other Brute or Irrational Demons, than only the Souls of such Brute Animals, as are here amongst us; sometimes acting only Aerial Bodies. Thus according to the ancient Pythagoric Hypothesis; There is neither any New Substantial thing now Made, which was not before, nor yet any Real Entity Destroyed into Nothing; not only no Matter, but also no Soul nor Life; God
God after the first creation, neither making any new substance, nor yet annihilating any thing made. He then creating nothing that was not fit to be conferred in being, and which could not be well used and placed in the universal; and afterward never repenting him of what he had before done. And natural generations and corruptions, being nothing but accidental mutations, concretions and seclusions, or anagrammatical transpositions of past and past-existing things, the same souls and lives being sometimes united to one body, and sometimes to another, sometimes in thicker and sometimes in thinner clothing; and sometimes in the visible, sometimes in the invisible: (they having aerial as well as terrestrial vehicles) and never any soul quite naked of all body. And thus does PROCLUS complain of some as spurious PLATONISTS, of which view we shall discourse. In Timæus: όταν παντες ψυχας τεταγμένας, who destroying the thinner vehicles of souls, were therefore necessitated sometimes, to leave them in a state of separation from all body; or without any corporeal indument. Which cabbala probably derived from the Egyptians, by Pythagoras was before fully represented by us out of Ovid, though that transmigration of humane souls there into ferine bodies, hath not been by all acknowledged, as a genuine part thereof. And the same was likewise inscribed upon by Virgil. Geor. I. 4. as also owned and confirmed by Macrobius, for a great truth, Constat fe: summ. scip. L. eiusdem verum rationis affirmationem, quam nec Cicero, nec Virgilius s. c. 13. ususignorat, dicendo,

Nec morti esse locum:

Constat inquam, Nibil intra vivum Mundum perire sed eorum que interire videntur, solus mutari spectem. It is manifest according to reason and true philosophy, which neither Cicero, nor Virgil, were unacquainted with. (the latter of these affirming, That there is no place at all for death.) I say, it is manifest, that none of those things, that to us seem to die, do absolutely perish within the living world; but only their forms changed.

Now how extravagant soever this hypothesis seem to be, yet is there no question, but that a Pythagorean would endeavour to find some countenance and shelter for it, in the scripture especially that place which hath so puzzled and non-plus'd interpreters, Rom. 8.19. For the earnest expectation of the creature, waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject unto vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know, that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together; until now. And not only they, but our selves also which have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within our selves, waiting for the adoption, even the redemption of our bodies. Where it is first of all evident, that the king, creature or creation spoken of, is not the very same with the πνεῦμα or ψυχή, the children or sons of God, but something distinct from them. Wherefore in the next place the Pythagorean will add, that it must of necessity be understood, either of the immaterial creature only, or of the lower animal creation, or else of both these together.
gther. Now though it be readily acknowledged, that there is a
Prosopopoeia here; yet cannot all those Expressions for all that, with-
out difficulty and violence be understood, of the Inanimate Creation
only, or Sensible Matter. Viz. That this hath ἐπικτευωμένη, an
Earnest Expectation of some future Good to itself; That it is now
made Subjéct πάθωμεν, to Vanity, Frustration and Disappointment
of Defere; and φησὶν, to Corruption and Death: And that σὺν ἐκστασιν,
not Willingly, but Reluctantly; And yet ην ἱερέις too, In Hope nor-
withstanding of some further Good to follow afterward; and that it
doth in the mean time σινειδον and συνειδον Groan and Travel in
Pain together, till it be at length delivered, from the Bondage of Cor-
rupion, into the glorious Liberty of the Children of God. Moreover,
in the Generations and Corruptions of Sensible Bodies, as of Minerals
and Vegetables, or when for example, Oyl is turned into Flame,
Flame into Smoke; Water into Vapour, Vapour into Snow or Hail;
Grafs into Milk, Milk into Blood and Bones; and the like, there is
I say in all this, no Hurt done to any thing, nor any Real Entity de-
stroyed, all the Substance of Matter still remaining intirely the same,
without the least diminution, and only Accidental Transformations
thereof made. All this, is Really Nothing, but Local Motion;
and there is no more Toy nor Labour to an Inanimate Body in Motion,
than in Rest; it being altogether as Natural for a Body to be Moved
by something else, as of it self to Rest. It is all nothing, but Change
of Figure, Distance, Site, and Magnitude of Parts, causing severall
Sensations, Phantacies, and Apparitions in us. And they who would
have the meaning of this place to be, That all such like Mutations,
and Alternate Vicissitudes in Inanimate Bodies, shall at Length quite
cease, these Groaning in the mean time, and travelling in Pain, to be
delivered from the Toysome Labour of such Restless Motion, and to be
at Ease and Quies; by taking away all Motion thus, out of a fond
regard, to the Ease and Quiet of Sensible Matter, they would there-
by πόθον ἐπεμφάσις, the whole Corporeal Universe, and Conse-
quently the Bodies of Good Men also after the Resurrection, and
Congeal all into Rockie Marble or Adamant. And as vain is that other
Conceit of some, that the whole Terrestrial Globe, shall at last be
Vitrified, or turned into Transparent Crystal, as if it also Groaned in
the mean time for this. For whatsoever Change shall be made of
the World, In the New Heaven, and the New Earth to come, it is
Reasonable to think, that it will not be made, for the sake of the
Sensible Matter, or the Inanimate Bodies themselves, to which all is a-
lke, but only for the Sake of in Animals, the Living Specta-
tors, and Inhabitants thereof, that it may be fitter, both for their
Use and Delight. Neither indeed can those words; For the Cre-
ature it self shall be delivered from the Bondage of Corruption, into the
Glorious Liberty of the Children of God, be understood of any other,
than Animals; for as much as this Liberty of the Children of God, here
meant, is their being Cloathed, instead of Mortal, with Immortal
Bodies; of which no other Creatures are Capable, but only such as con-
sist of Soul and Body. And that παντείον, that Whole Creation,
which is laid afterwards to Groan and Travel in Pain, together, may
be well understood, of all That of the Creation, which Can Groan, or
be
be Sensible of Evil or Misery. Wherefore the Pythagorean would interpret this place, of the Lower Animal Creation only, which is Sensible of Good and Evil; That as this, was Unwillingly, or against its own Inclination (after the Fall of man, or Lapse of Souls) made subject to Vanity, and the Bondage of Corruption, Pain, Misery and Death, in those Great Terrestrial Bodies: In the manifestation of the Sons of God, when they in stead of these Mortal Bodies, shall be clothed with Celestial and Immortal ones, then shall this Creature also have its certain share in the Felicity of that Glorious Time, and partake in some Measure of such a Liberty, by being Freed in like manner from these their Great Terrestrial Bodies, and now living only in Thin Aerial and Immortal ones: and so a Period put to all their Miseries and Calamities, by him who made not Death, neither hath pleasure in the Destruction of the Living, but Created whatsoever liveth, to this end, that it might have its Being, and enjoy it self. But however much is certain, that Brute Animals, in this place cannot be quite excluded; because the πάντα υπό τὸ Ἑλλεοτικον the Whole Creation, will not suffer that: and therefore a Pythagorean would conclude it a warrantable Inference, from this Text of Scripture, That that whole Rank in the Creation of Irrational & Brute Animals, below Men, shall not be utterly Annihilated, in the Conjunction of things, or Future Renovation of the World, quite strip'd of all this Furniture; Men being then left alone in it: but that there shall be a Continuation of this Species or Rank of Being. And not only so neither; as if there should still be a constant Succession of such Alternate Generations and Corruptions, Productions or Births and Deaths of Brute Animals, to all Eternity; but also that the Individuals themselves shall continue the same, for as much as otherwise there would be none at all delivered from the Bondage of Corruption. And Lastly, that these very Souls of Brutes, which at this time Groan and Travel in Pain, shall themselves be made partakers of that Liberty of the Children of God; since otherwise, they should be With Child, or Parturient of Nothing; Groaning not for themselves, but others. But enough of this Pythagorean Hypothesis, which supposing all manner of Souls, Sensible as well as Rational, to be Substantial things, and therefore to have a Permanency after Death, in their distinct Natures, allows them certain Thin Aerial Ochena, or Vehiciles, to Subsist in, when these Great Terrestrial ones shall fail them.

But let these Aerial Vehiciles of the Souls of Brutes go for a Whimsy or meer Figment; nor let them be allowed, to Act or Enlivem any other, than Terrestrial Bodies only, by means whereof they must needs be, immediately after Death, quite Deftitute of all Body; they Subsisting nevertheless, and not vanishing into Nothing, because they are not meer Accidentes, but Substantial things: We say that in this case, though the Substances of them remain, yet must they needs continue in a State of Insensibility and Inactivity, unless perhaps they be again afterwards united to some other Terrestrial Bodies. Because though Intellectual be the Energie of the Rational Soul alone, without the Concurrence of Body, yet is the Energie of the Sensible, always Conjoyned with it: Sense being, as Aristotle hath rightly de-
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termined, a Complication of Soul and Body together, as Weaving is of the Weaver and Weaving Instruments. Wherefore we say, that if the Irrational and Sensitive Souls in Brutes, being Substantial, things also, be after Death quite destitute of all Body, then can they neither have Sense of any thing, nor Act upon any thing, but must continue for so long a time, in a State of Insensibility and Inactivity. Which is a thing therefore to be thought the less Impossible, because no man can be certain, that his own Soul in Sleep, Lethargies, and Apoplexies, &c. hath always an uninterrupted Consciousness of itself; and that it was never without Thoughts, even in the Mother's Womb. However there is little Reason to doubt, but that the Sensitive Souls of such Animals, as lie Dead or Alseep all the Winter, and Revive or Awake again, at the Approaching warmth of Summer, do for that time continue, in a State of Inactivity and Insensibility. Upon which account, though these Souls of Brutes may be said in one Sense to be Immortal, because the Substance of them, and the Root of life in them, still remains, yet may they in another Sense, be said also to be Mortal, as having the Exercise of that Life for a time at least, quite suspended. From whence it appears, that there is no Reason at all, for that Fear and Suspicion of some; That if the Souls of Brutes be Substantial, and continue in Being after Death, they must therefore needs go either to Heaven or Hell. But as for that Supposed Possibility, of their awakening again afterwards, in some other Terrestrial Bodies, this seemeth to be no more, than what is found by daily Experience, in the Course of Nature, when the Silk-worm and other Worms, dying, are transformed into Butterflies. For there is little Reason to doubt, but that the same Soul which before Acted the Body of the Silk worm, doth afterward Act that of the Butterfly: upon which account it is, that this hath been made by Christian Theologers, an Emblem of the Resurrection.

Hitherto we have declared Two several Opinions, concerning the Substantial Souls of Brutes, suppos'd therefore to have a Permanent Subsistence after Death, one of Plato's and the Pythagoreans', that when they are devest of the gross Terrestrial Bodies, they Live and have a Sense of themselves, in Thin Aerial ones. The other, of such as Exploding these Aerial Vehicles of Brutes, and allowing them none but Terrestrial Bodies, affirm the Substances of them Surviving Death, to continue in a State of Inactivity and Insensibility, Sleep, Silence, or Stupor. But now to say the Truth, there is no Absolute Necessity, that these Souls of Brutes, because Substantial, should therefore have a Permanent Subsistence after Death to all Eternity; Because though it be True, that no Substance once Created by God, will of it self ever vanish into nothing, yet is it true also, that whatsoever was Created by God out of Nothing, may possibly by him be Annihilated and Reduced to nothing again. Wherefore when it is said, that the Immortality of the Humane Soul is Demonstrable by Natural Reason, the meaning hereof is no more than this, that its Substantiality is so Demonstrable; from whence it follows, that it will Naturally no more perish or vanish into Nothing, than the Substance of Matter itself: and not that it is Impossible, either for it, or Matter
Chap. V. Absolutely Unannihilable.

Wherefore the assurance that we have of our own Souls Immortality, must depend upon something else, besides their Substantiailty, namely a Faith also in the Divine Goodness, that he will preserve in being or not annihilate, all such Substances Created by him; whose Permanent Subsistence, is neither Inconsistent with his own Attributes, nor the Good of the Universe: as this of Rational Souls unquestionably is not; they having both Morality and Liberty of Will, and thereby being capable of Rewards and Punishments, and Consequendy fit Objects for the Divine Justice to display it itself upon. But for ought we can be certain, the case may be otherwise, as to the Souls of brute Animals, devoid both of Morality and Liberty of Will, and therefore Unca pinee of Reward and Punishment, That though they will not Naturally of themselves, vanish into Nothing, yet having been Created by God, in the Generations of the Respective Animals, and had some enjoyment of themselves for a time, they may be him again be as well annihilated in their Deaths and Corruptions: and if this be Absolutely the Best, then doubtless is it so. And to this seems agreeable the Opinion of Porphyrius amongst the Philosophers, when he affirmed every Irrational Power or Soul, to be resolved into the Life of the Whole; that is, Retracted and Refumed into the Deity, and so Annihilated as to its Creaturally Nature. Though possibly there may be another Interpretation of that Philosophers meaning here. Viz. That all the Sensitive Souls of Brutes, are Really but one and the same Mundane Soul, as it were Out-flowing, and Variety Displaying it self, and Acting upon all the several parts of Matter, that are capable to receive it, but at their Deaths retiring again back into it self. But we have Sufficiently retunded the Force of that Objection against the Ingenerability of all Souls, and the Substantiailty of those of Brutes also, from their consequent Permanence after Death; we having shewed, That notwithstanding this their Substantiailty, there is no Absolute Necessity, of their Perpetuity after Death, and Permanency to all Eternity, or else that if they do continue to Subsist, (God Annihilating no Substance) unless they have Aerial Vehicles to Act, they must remain in a State of Inactivity, and Insenfibility, Silence, or Sleep.

Now therefore if no Souls; no Life nor Cognition, could possibly be ever Generated out of Dead and Senseless Matter, they being not meer Accidents, but Substantial things, which must in this case, have come from Nothing; then either all Souls Existed of themselves from Eternity, or else there must of Necessity be some Eternal Unmade Life and Mind, from whence all the other Lives and Minds were derived. And that this was the Doctrine of the Ancient Theists, That no Soul or Mind, no Life or Understanding, was ever Generated out of Matter, but all Produced by the Deity, the Sole Fountain of Life and Understanding; might be here proved, were it needful, at large by sundry Testimonies, but it may sufficiently appear from those Verses of Virgil, First in his Sixth Ænead, where after he had spoken of God, as a Spirit and Mind diffused thorough out the whole world, he addeth,
Inde hominum pseudumque genus, Vitate Volantium, 
Et que marmoreo fert monstra sub aquae Fontus,

That from thence, are the Lives of all Men and Beasts, Birds flying in 
the Air, and Monsters swimming in the Sea. And again in his Geo-
grick's, where after these words,

Deum namque ire per omnes 
Terraque Tractusque Maris, Columque profundum,

That God passeth, through all Tracks, of Earths, Seas, and Heavens,
He subjoyneth,

Hinc Pecudes, Armenta, Viros, genus omne Ferarum 
Quemque sibi tenues nascentem arecessere Vitas. 
Scilicet hoc Reddi deinde & Resoluta Referri, 
Omnia, nec Morti esse locum.

And from Hence, not only Men, but also all manner of Brute Animals 
and Beasts, when produced into this world, do every one derive their 
Lives or Souls, as also at their Deaths they render the same back again, 
to him, in whose hand or custody they remain undeestroyed; so that there 
is no place anywhere in the world, left for Death. This was therefore 
undoubtedly, the Genuine Doctrine of the Ancient Theists, however 
some of late, have Deviated and Swerved from it; That no Life was 
Generated out of Matter, but all Created by the Deity, or Derived 
from it, the Sole Fountain of Lives and Souls.

And it is a Truth so evident, That Life being Substantial, and 
not a meer Accidental thing Generated and Corrupted, there must 
therefore of Necessity, be Some Eternal Unmade Life and Mind, 
from whence all other Lives and Minds are derived, That the Hylo-
zoick Atheists themselves (in this far wiser than the Atomicks,) were 
fully convinced thereof: Nevertheless being strongly polleisfed with 
that Atheistick Prejudice, that there is no other Substance besides 
Body, they Attribute this first Original Unmade Life and Understand-
ing, to all Matter as such, (but without Animal Consciousnes,) as an 
Essential part thereof, or Inadequate Conception of it. From which 
Fundamental Life of Nature in Matter, Modified by Organization, they 
phancy the Lives of all Animals and Men, to have proceeded. So 
that though the Modified Lives of Animals and Men, as such, ac-
cording to them be Accidental things, Generated and Corrupted, pro-
duced out of Nothing and reduced to Nothing again, yet this Funda-
mental Life of Matter, which is the Basis upon which they stand, be-
ing Substantial, is also Eternal and Incorruptible. These Hylozoists 
therefore, to avoid a Deity, Suppose every Atom of Sensible Matter, 
to have been from all Eternity, Infallibly omniscient, that is, to know 
all things without either Error or Ignorance, and to have a Knowledge 
before Sense, and Undeived from Sensibles (quite contrary to the 
Doctrine of the Atomick Atheists,) who make all Knowledge Sense,
or the Product thereof) though without any Animal Consciousness and Self-Percognition.

But as nothing can be more Prodigiously Aburd, than thus to attribute Infallible Omniscience, to every Atom of Matter; so is it also directly Contradictious, to suppose Perfect Knowledge, Wisdom, or Understanding, without any Consciousness or Self Perception; Consciousness being Essential to Cognition: as also, that the Substantial and Fundamental Life in men and other Animals, should never Perish, and yet Notwithstanding their Souls and Personalities, in Death, utterly vanish into Nothing. Moreover this Hypothesis, can never possibly Save the Phenomenon of Man and Animals neither; not only because no Organization or Modification of Matter whatsoever, could ever produce Consciousness and Self-Percognition, in what was before Inconscient; but also because every Smallest Atom thereof being suppos'd to be a Percept in it self, and to have a Perfect Life and Understanding of its own, there must be in every one Man and Animal, not one, but a Heap or Commonwealth of innumerable Percipients. Lastly, whereas these Hylozoick Atheists, make every Atom of Matter Omniscient, but nothing at all Omnipotent, or affert Perfect Knowledge, without any Perfect Power, a Knowledge without Sense and Undervived from Sensibles; we demand of them, where the Intelligibles, or Objects of this Knowledge are? and whence the Ideas thereof are derived? for since they proceed not in a way of Passion from Sensibles Existing without, nor could result from those Atoms neither as Comprehending themselves; they must needs Come from Nothing, and many of them at least, be the Conceptions of Nothing. There cannot possibly be any other Original by the wit of man devised, or Knowledge and Understanding, than from an Absolutely Perfect and Omnipotent Being, Comprehending it self, and the Extent of its own Infinite Power, or all Possibilities of things, that is, all Intelligibles. But there can be but One such Omnipotent Being, and therefore no more, than One Original, and Eternal Unmade Mind, from whence all the other Minds are Derived. Wherefore this Hylozoick Atheism, is nothing but the Breaking and Crumbling of the Simple Deity, One Perfect Understanding Being, into Matter, and all the several Atoms of it.

And now have we made it manifest, that these Atheists, are so far from being able to disprove a God, from this Topick of Cognition, Knowledge or Understanding, that they cannot possibly Save the Phenomenon thereof, without a God; it indeed affording Invincible Arguments of his Existence. For First; If no Life or Cognition, Soul or Mind, can possibly Spring out of Matter or Body, devoid of Life and Understanding; and which is nothing but a Thing Extended, into Length, Breadth and Thickness; then is it so far from being True, that all Life and Understanding is Junior to Senseless Matter, and the Off-spring thereof; that of Necessity, either all Lives and Souls, were Self-Existent from Eternity, or else there must be One Perfect Unmade Life and Mind, from whence all other Imperfect ones were derived: there must be an Eternal Knowledge, before Sense and Sensibles;
Sensibles; which is that that hath printed the Stamps and Signatures of it self, upon the Matter of the whole world. Indeed nothing can be more certain than this, that all Knowledge and Understanding in Our selves, is not a meer Passion from Singular Sensibles, or Bodies Existing without us, as the forementioned Atheifls also conclude; (from whence they would again Infer, that Knowledge as such, is in its own Nature Junior to Sensibles, and the meer Creature of them, and Consequently no Creator.) There being nothing which comes to us, from the Objects of Sense without, but Only Local Motion and Pressure, and there being other Objects of the Mind, besides Singular Sensibles; not only all Univerfals, but also such Intelligibles, as never were nor can be in Sense. Now if our Humane Knowledge and Understanding be not a Passion from things Existing without us; then can it have no other Original, than in way of Participation, from a Perfect Mind, the Mind of an Infinitely Fecund and Powerful Being, comprehending It self, and in It self all things; all the Possibilities of things before they were Made, their Respectts and the Verities belonging to them. So that a Perfect Omnippet Being together with the Possibilities of things contained in it; is the First Necess, Intelligible, or Object of Mind and Understanding, by which all other Singulars are Understood. And were there no such Perfect, Infinitely Fecund, and Powerful Being, there could have been, no Mind or Understanding at all. As also, were there no Perfect Mind, viz. That of an Omnippet Being Comprehending It self, and all Possibilities of things virtuallly contained in it; all the Knowledge, and Intelligible Ideas, of our Imperfect Minds, must needs have Sprung from Nothing. And thus is the Existence of a God, again Demonstrated; from that Phenomenon of Knowledge or Understanding.

Having quite Routed and Vanquished the Atheifls Main Body, we shall now blow away the Remainder of their weaker and scattered Forces (viz. Their Objections against Providence, their Queries, and their Arguments from Interest) with a Breath or two. Their First Objection is against Providence, as to the Fabrick of the World, from the Faultiness of the Mundane System, Intelleetually considered, and in Order to Ends; Quia tantâ sat praddita Culpa; That Because it is so Ill-Made, therefore it could not be made by a God. Where the Atheifl takes it for granted, that whosoever afferts a God, or a Perfect Mind to be the Original of all things, does therefore ipso facto suppose All things to be Well Made, and as they Should be. And this doubtless was the Sense of all the Ancient Theologers; however some Modern Theifls deviate there from; these Concluding the Perfection of the Deity, not at all to confilt in Goodness; but in Power and Arbitrary Will only. As if to have a Will determined by a Rule or Reason of Good, were the Virtue of Weak, Impotent, and Obligations Beings only, or of such as have a Superior over them to give Law to them, that is of Creatures; but the Prerogative of a Being
Being Irresistibly Powerfull, to have a Will absolutely Indifferent to all things, and Undetermined by any thing but itself; or to Will nothing because it is Good, but to make its own Arbitrary or Contingent and Fortuitous Determination, the Sole Reason of all its Actions, nay the very Rule or Measure, of Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom itself. And this is supposed by them, to be the Liberty, Sovereignty, and Dominion of the Deity. Wherefore such Theifts as these, would think themselves altogether Unconcerned, in these Attehfick objections against Providence, or in Defending, the Fabric of the World, as Faultless; they being as ready as the Atheifts themselves, to acknowledge, that the World might really have been much better made, than now it is; (Only that it must be said to be Well, because made) but pretending nevertheless, that this is no Impeachment at all of the Existence of a God, Quia Deus non tenetur ad Optimum, Because God is No way Bound or Obliged to the Bifl, he being indeed according to them, nothing but Arbitrary Will Omnipotent. But what doth thefe Theifts here else, then whifl they deny, the Fortuitous Motion of Senlifs Matter, to be the First Original of all things, themselves in the mean time, Enthronc Fortuitousness and Contingency, in the Will of an Omnipotent Being, and there give it an Absolute Sovereignty and Dominion over all? So that the Controversists twixt the Atheifts, and these Theifts, seems to be no other than this; Whether Senlifs Matter Fortuitously Moved, or a Fortuitous Will Omnipotent, such as is altogether undetermined, by Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom, be the Sovereign Numin, and Original of all things. Certainly, we Mortals could have little Ground, for our Faith and Hope, in such an Omnipotent Arbitrary Will as this, then we could have in the Motions of Senlifs Atoms, furiously agitated; or of a Rapid Whirlwind. Nay one would think, that of the Two, it should be more desirable, to be under the Empire of Senlifs Atoms, Fortuitously moved, then of a Will altogether Undetermined by Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom, armed with Omnipotence; because the Former could harbour no Hurtful or Mifchievous Designs, against any, as the Latter might. But this Irrational Will, altogether Undetermined by Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom, is so far from being the Hightest, Liberty, Sovereignty and Dominion; the Greatest Perfection, and the Divine thing of all; that it is indeed nothing else but Weakness and Impotency it self, or Brutish Folly and Madness. And therefore those Ancients who affirmed, that Mind was Lord over all, and the Supreme King of Heaven and Earth, held at the Same time, that Good was the Sovereign Monarch of the Universe, Good Reigning in Mind and together with it; because Mind is that which orders all things for the Sake of Good, and whatsoever doth otherwise, was according to them, not Nis, but * Anim, not Mens, but Dementia, and Consequentially no God. And thus does Celsus in Origen declare the Nature of God, & γε ο ἡ ηλιοσκελες φρετας, θη τοι τελευατος άνωσ-π. 240. plas, ἀλατα οφις, της δικαιας φωςας οης ης τεχνης, God is not the President or Head of Irregular and Irrational Luft or Appetite, and of loose Erratick Disorderliness, but of the Just and Righteous Nature. And though this were there misapply'd by him, against the Christian Doctrine of the Resurrection (not understood) yet is the Passage highly
highly approved by Origen; he adding further in Confirmation thereof, and that as the general Sense of Christians too, 

so likewise, p. 247, and a colleague. 

... and \( \text{where,} \) ... or that 

... therefor, God can do nothing that is Ratiocination, or of the Res" ... 743.

... nothing Unbecoming himself, or what is truly Indecorous; for as much as this is inconsistent with his Godship. And to the same purpose Plotinus, vol. i. ... to him. The Deity addicted according to its own Nature and Essence, and its Nature and Essence displeaseth Goodness and Justice: For if these Things be not there, which should they else be found? And again elsewhere, 

... sense, and that is true sense, and as to the \( \text{to \theta V E G Y E O U ?} \) God is Essentially That which Ought to be; and therefore he did not Happen to be such as he is: and this First Ought to be, is the Principle of all things whatsoever, that Ought to be. Wherefore the Deity is not to be conceived, as meer Arbitrariness, Humour, or Irrational Will and Appetite Omnipotent, (which would indeed be but Omnipotent Chance) but as an Overflowing Fountain of Love and Goodness, justly and wisely dispensing it self, and Omnipotently reaching all things. The Will of God, is Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom; or Decorousness, Fitness, and Ought it self, Willing; so that the \( \text{to \theta E K P E T I K A} \); that which is Absolutely The Best, is \( \text{to \theta E K P E T I K A} \), an Indispensable Law to it, because its Very Essence. God is \( \text{\mu \theta \varepsilon \kappa \iota \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu} \), an Impartial Ballance, lying Even Equal and Indifferent to all things, and Weighing out Heaven and Earth, and all the Things therein, in the most just and exact Proportion, and not a Grain too much or too little of any thing. Nor is the Deity therefore Bound or Obliged to do the Best, in any way of Severity (as men fondly imagine this to be contrary to his Liberty) much less by the Law and Command of any Superior (which is a Contradiction) but only by the Perfection of its own Nature, which it cannot possibly deviate from, no more than \( \text{D\omega g} \) it self. In Conclusion therefore, we acknowledge the Atbeists Argument to be thus far Good; that If there be a God, then of Necessity must all things be Well made, and as they Should be; and vice versa. But no Atheist will ever be able to prove, that either the Whole System of the World, could have been Better Made, or that so much as any one thing therein is Made Ineptly.

There are indeed many things in the Frame of Nature, which we cannot reach to the Reasons of, they being made by a Knowledge far Superior and Transcendent, to that of Ours, and our Experience and Ratiocination, but Slowly discovering the Intrigues and contrivances of Providence therein; Witness the Circulation of the Blood, the Milkie and Lymphatic Vessels, and other things, (without which the Mechanick Structure of the Bodies of Animals cannot be understood) all but so lately brought to light: wherefore we must not conclude, that what-
Chap. V. Inclinator of the Earth's Axis.

foever we cannot find out the Reason of, or the Use that it serveth to, is therefore Impeccable. We shall give one Instance of this; The Intermittent Cacumen, in the Bodies of Men and other Animals seems at first sight, to be but a meer Bitch or Bungle of Nature, and an Odd impertinent Appendix; neither do we know that any Anatomist or Physiologist, hath given a Rational Account thereof, or discovered its Use, and yet there being a False at the Entrance of it, these Two both together, are a most Artificial Contrivance of Nature, and of great advantage for Animals, to hinder the Regurgitation of the Feces upward, towards the Ventricle.

The First Atheistical Instance of the Faultiness of things, in the Frame of Nature, is from the Constitution of the Heavens, and the Disposition of the Equator and Ecliptick, intersecting each other in an Angle, of Three and Twenty Degrees and upwards; whereby as they pretend, the Terrestrial Globe, is rendered much more Uninhabitable, than otherwise it might be. But this is built upon a False Supposition of the Ancients, that the Torrid Zone, or all between the Tropicks, was utterly Uninhabitable by reason of the Extremity of Heat. And it is certain, that there is nothing which doth more demonstrate a Providence than this very thing, it being the most Convenient Site or Disposition, that could be devised, as will appear if the Inconveniences of other Dispositions be considered, especially these Three; First, If the Axes of those Circles should be Parallel, and their Plains Coincident; Secondly, If they should Intersect each other in Right Angles; and Thirdly, (which is a Middle betwixt both) If they should cut one another in an Angle of Forty Five Degrees. For it is evident, that each of these Dispositions would be attended with far greater Inconveniences to the Terrestrial Inhabitants, in respect of the Length of Days and Nights, Heat and Cold. And that these two Circles should continue thus, to keep the same Angular Intersedion, when Physical and Mechanick Causes, would bring them still nearer together; this is a farther Eviction of a Providence also.

In the next place, the Atheist supposes, that according to the general Persuasion of the Sith, the world and all things therein, were Created only for the Sake of Man, he thinking to make some advantage for his Cause from hence. But this seemeth, at first, to have been an Opinion only, of some trait-laced Stoicks, though afterward indeed recommended to others also, by their own Self-love, their Over-Weaning, and Puffy Conceit of themselves. And so Fleas and Lice, had they Understanding, might conclude the Bodies of other greater Animals and Men also, to have been made only for them. But the Whole was not properly made for any Part, but the Parts for the Whole, and the Whole for the Maker thereof. And yet may the things of this Lower World, be well said, to have been Made, Principally, (though not Only) for Man. For we ought not to Monopolize the Divine Goodness to our selves, there being other Animals Superiour to us, that are not altogether Unconcerned neither in this Visible Creation: and it being reasonable to think, that Even the Low-
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or Animals likewise, and whatsoever hath Conscience Life; was made partly also, to Enjoy it self. But Atheists, can be no Fit Judges, of Worlds being made Well or Ill, either in general, or respectively to Mankind, they having no Standing Measure for Well and Ill, without a God and Morality, nor any True Knowledge of themselves, and what their own Good or Evil Consifteth in. That was at first but a Froward Speech, of some fullen discontented Persons, when things falling not out agreeably, to their own Private, Selfish, and Partial Appetites, they would Revenge themselves, by Railing upon Nature, (that is, Providence) and calling her a Stepmother only to Mankind, whilst he was a Fond, Partial, and Indulgent Mother to other Animals, and though this be Elegantly set off by Lucretius, yet is there nothing but Poetick Flourish, in it all, without any Philosophick Truth. The Advantages of Mankind being so notoriously conspicuous above those of Brutes.

But as for Evils in general, from whence the Atheift would conclude, the God of the Theift, to be either Impotent or Envious; it hath been already declared, that the True Original of them, is from the Necessity of Imperfect Beings, and the Incompoffibility of things; but that the Divine Art and Skill, most of all appeareth, in Bonsifying these Evils, and making them like Difcourses in Mufick, to contribute to the Harmony of the Whole, and the Good of Particular Persons.

Moreover a great part of those Evils, which men are afflicted with, is not from the Reality of Things, but only from their own Phanzy and Opinions, according to that of the Moralift, Taqfod, τὸς ἀνθρώπος ἐστὶν τὸν ποιητὴν, ἀλλὰ τὸν ὁμο λογικόν ἐστὶν. It is not Things themselves that disturb men, but only their Own Opinions concerning things; and therefore it being much in our own Power to be freed from thse, Providence is not to be Blamed upon the account of them. Pain, is many times nearly linked with Pleasure, according to that Socratisch Fable, That when God could not reconcile their Contrary Natures (as he would be Tyed them Head and Tail together. And good men know that Pain is not the Evil of the Man, but only of the Part so affected, (as Socrates also) τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἐν τῷ ζεύξει πολλὰ, It goes no further than the Leg where it is. But this is many times very Serviceable, to free us from the Greater Evils of the Mind; upon which all our Happiness dependeth. To the Atheifts who acknowledge no Malaum Culpa, No Evil of Fault, (Turpitude, or Dishonesty) Death is the Greatest and most Tragical of all Evils. But though this according to their forlorn Hypothefis, he nothing less than an Absolute Extinction of Life; yet according to the Doctrine of the Genuine Theifts, which makes all Souls Substantial, no Life of it self (without Divine Annihilation) will ever quite Vanifh into Nothing, any more than the Subftance of Matter doth. And the Ancient Pythagorians and Platonifts, have been here fo Kind, even to the Souls of Brutes also, as that they might not be left in a State of Inactivity and Insensibility after Death, as to beftow upon them certain Subtle Bodies, which they may then continue to Act in. Nor can we think otherwise, but that Arifftote from this Fountain, derived that Doctrine of his in his Second
Of Imperfect Beings.

Second Book, De Gen. An. c. 3. where after he had declared the Sensitive Soul, to be Indivisibl.e from Body, he addeth, ... Sonfly the nay, which but Though the TDI- or he offt! As analoguous to the Element of the Stars. Only as Galen, and S. Austin, and others have conceived, Aristotel deviated here from the Pythagoreans in this, that he suppos'd the Sensitive Soul it self, to be really nothing else, but this Very Subtle and Star-like Body, and not a distinct Substance from it, using it only as a Vehicle. Nevertheless he there plainly affirmeth the Mind or Rational Soul, to be really distinct from the Body, and to come into it From Without Pre-Existing, and consequently, I should acknowledge also its After Immortality. But whatsoever Aristotle's Judgment were (which is not very Material) it is Certain that Dying, to the Rational or Humane Soul, is nothing but a withdrawing into the Tyring-houfe, and putting off the Clothing of this Terrestrial Body. So that it will still continue after death to live to God, whether in a Body, or without it. Though according to Plato's Express Doctrine, the Soul is never quite Naked of all Body, he writing thus, αις ψυχι η σωματικα παρασται, των μεν & ην των γνωσιν, the Soul is always conjointed with a Body, but sometimes of one kind, and sometimes of another; which many Christian Doctors also, as is before declared, have thought highly probable. However our Christian Faith, assures us, that the Souls of Good men, shall at length be clothed, with Spiritual and Heavenly Bodies, such as are, in Aristotle's Language, αις ψυχιν των των δωσιν σωματον, Analogous to the Element of the Stars. Which Christian Revelationtherefore, to Life and Immortality, is far from being, as Celsus reproch'd it, 'Σωματικόν ἐνίατον'The Meel Hope of Worms. And thus much shall suffice, in way of Confutation, of the First Atheistick Objection against Providence, which is the Twelfth Argumentation profounded, in the Second Chapter.

The Thirteenth Atheistick Argument, or Second Objection against Providence; is from the Seeming Confusion of Humane Affairs; That all things fall alike to all; the Innocent and the Nocent, the Pious and the Impious, the Religious and the Prophane: Nay, that many times the Worser Causés and Men, prevail against the Better, as is intimated in that Passage of the Poet, though in the Person of a Thief,

Vilbrix Caufa Deo placitus, sed Vilia Catoni 5

And that the Unjust and Ungodly, often flow in all kind of Prosperity, whilst the Innocent and Devout Worshippers of the Deity, all their Lives long, conflict with Adversity. Whereas were there a God and Providence, as they conceive, Prophane and Irreligious Persons would be presently Thunder-struck from Heaven, or otherwise made remarkable Objects of Divine Vengeance, as also the Pions Miracu-
Now we grant indeed, that this Consideration hath too much puzzled and staggered Weak Minds in all Ages. Because Sentence against an Evil Work is not executed speedily, therefore is the heart of the Sons of men fully set in them to do Evil. And the Psalmist himself, was sometime much perplexed with this Phenomenon, the Prosperity of the Ungodly, who set their Mounths against Heaven, and whose Tongue walketh through the Earth; so that he was Tempted to think, He had cleanseed his Heart in Vain, and Washed his hands in Innocency, till at length entering into the Sanctuary of God, his Mind became Illuminated, and his Soul fixed in a firm Trust and Confidence upon Divine Providence: Whom have I in Heaven but thee, &c. My Flesh and my Heart faileth, but God is the Strength of my Heart, and my Portion for ever.) For as some will from hence be apt to infer, That there is no God at all, but that blind Chance and Fortune steer all (the Fool hath said in his heart, there is no God;) So will others conclude, That though there be a God, yet he either does not know things done here below, (How does God Know? and is there Knowledge in the most High?) or else will not so far humble himself, or Disurb his own Eafe and Quiet, as to concern himself in our Low Humane Affairs.

Thus did some in Plato from hence conclude. Euxi μην ορος, '2λογις αυτων αμελεων περι- μετον. De Leg. 10.

First of all therefore we here say, That it is altogether unreasonable, to require that Divine Providence should miraculously interpose upon every turn, in Punishing the Ungodly and Preserving the Pious, and thus perpetually interrupt the Course of Nature, (which would look but like a Botch or Bungle, and a violent businefs) but rather carry things on a Υποκαλλος δυναμιν, in a Still and Silent Path, and shew his Art and Skill, in making things of themselves fairly unwind, and clear up at last into a Satisfactory Close. Paffion and Self-Interest is blind, or short sighted, but that which steer the whole world is no Fond, Pettifh, Impatient and Passionate thing, but an Impartial, Disinterested, and Unembittered Nature. Nevertheless it is certain, that sometimes we have not wanted Instances, in Cafes extraordinary, of a ονεος και μυροις, God appearing, as it were miraculously upon the Stage, and manifesting himself in taking immediate Vengeance upon Notorious Male-factors, or delivering his Faithful Servants from imminent Dangers or Evils Threatned; as the fame is often done also, by a secret and Undiscerned overruling, of the things of Nature. But it must be granted, that it is not always thus, but the Periods of Divine Providence, here in this World, are commonly Longer, and the Evolutions thereof Slower: According to that of Euripides, which yet has a Tange of Prophanenefs in the Expression,

μέλλει τι ελεον δ' εται τοιοτων φοιξ η,

The Deity is Slow or Dilatory, and this is the Nature of it. For it is not from Slackness and Reminifcs in the Deity, but either from his Patience and Long-Suffering; he willing that men should Repent, or else to teach us Patience by his Example (as Plutarch fuggeth) or
that all things may be carried on with the more Pomp and Solemnity; or lastly, for other particular Reasons, as Plutarch ventures to assert one, why it might not be expedient, for Dionysius the Tyrant, though so Prophané and Irreligious a Person, to have been cut off suddenly. But Wicked and Ungodly Persons often times fail not, to be met withal at last, and at the long run, here in this Life, and either in Themselves or Pottery to be notoriously Branded with the Marks of Divine Displeasure; according to that of the Poet, Ῥαυον antecedentem Scelesflum, &c. It is seldom that Wickedness altogether escapes Punishments; though it come slowly after, limping with a Lame Foot; and those Proverbiaal Speeches amongst the Pagani,

\[\text{Mills of the Gods, do slowly wind,} \\
\text{But they at length to powder grind.}\]

And, Divine Justice steals on Softly with Woollen Feet, but Strikes at last with Iron Hands.

Nevertheless we cannot say, that it is always thus neither, but that Wicked Persons, may possibly sometimes, have an Uninterrupted Prosperity here in this Life, and no visible Marks of Divine Displeasure upon them: but as the generously virtuous, will not Envy them upon this account, nor repine at their own condition they knowing, that οὐκ οὐκόν ταῦτα ἀλλὰν ἀλλὰν ἀ ντι τοῦ φοβοῦ τοῦ ἄγαν, There is neither any thing truly Evil to the Good, nor Good to the Evil; so are they so far from being staggered herewith, in their Belief of a God and Providence, that they are rather the more confirmed, in their Perceptions of a Future Immortality and Judgment after Death, when all things shall be set straight and right, and Rewards and Punishments Impartially Dispensed. That of Plutarch therefore, is most true here, εἷς οὖν ὁ λόγος ἰ ὡς τὸ ὑπὸ τὸν περίπου ἐκείνου εἷς τῷ ἴπτημιν ἰ ἰ ὅ ὃς ἔφαθος τινὶς μὲν ἰ ἰ ὅ ὃς συμβάλλειν καίCONS τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἷς ἔσθεν ὁ ὃς δὲν ἥλπην ἕνωσε ἐν αὐτῷ Ἡμεῖς ἐκεῖνος, That there is a Necessary Connexion betwixt those Two things, Divine Providence, and the Permanence or Immortality of Human Souls, one and the same Reason confirming them both; neither can one of these be taken alone without the other. But they who because Judgment is not presently Executed upon the Ungodly, blame the Management of things as Faulty, and Providence as Defective, are like such Spectators of a Dramatick Poem, as when wicked and injurious Persons are brought upon the Stage, for a while Swaggering and Triumphant, impatiently cry out against the Dramatisf, and presently condemn the Plot: whereas if they would but expect the winding up of things, and stay till the last Close, they should then see them come off with shame and sufficient punishment. The Evolution of the World, as Plutarch calls it, is ἄλογος πάνω, a Truer Poem, and we men Hiltriomical Actors upon the Stage, who notwithstanding infer something of our Own into the Poem too; but God Almighty, is that Skilful Dramatist, who always connecteth that of ours which went before, with what of his follows after, into good Coherent Sense; and will
at last make it appear, that a Thread of exact Justice did run through all, and that Rewards and Punishments are measured out in Geometrical Proportion.

Lastly, it is in it itself Fit, that there should be some where, a Doubtful and Cloudy State of things, for the better Exercise of Vertue and Faith. For as there could have been no Hercules, had there not been Monsters to subdue, so were there no such Difficulties to encounter with, no Puzzles and Entanglements of things, no Temptations and Tryals to assault us; Vertue would grow Languid; and that Excellent Grace of Faith, want due Occasions and Objects to exercise it self upon. Here have we therefore, such a State of things, and this World is as it were a Stage erected, for the more Difficult part of Vertue to Act upon; and where we are to Live by Faith and not by Sight: That Faith, which is the Substance of Things to be Hoped for, and the Evidence of things not Seen; a Belief in the Goodness, Power, and Wisdom of God, when all things are Dark and Cloudy round about us. The Just shall live by his Faith.

We have now sufficiently Confuted, the Second Atheistical Objection also, against Providence, as to the Conduct and Oeconomy of Human Affairs. Nevertheless this is a large Field, and much more might be said in Defence of Providence, both as to these and other Instances, had we room here to Explicate in. Wherefore, for a Supplement of what remains, we shall refer the Reader, to the Writings of others, who have professedly undertaken, Apology's for Providence, both as to the Fabrick, and Oeconomy of the World; but especially the Learned and Ingenious Author of the Divine Dialogues. Only we shall here add Some few Considerations not so much for the Constution of Atheists, as for the better Satisfaction of such Religionists, who too easily Concluding, That all Things might have been much Better than they are; are thereupon apt to call in Question the Divine Attribute of Goodness in its full Extent; which yet is the only Foundation of our Christian Faith.

First, therefore we say, that in Judging of the Works of God, we ought not to consider, the Parts of the World alone by themselves; and then because we could Phancy much Finer things, thereupon blame the Maker of the Whole. As if one should attend only to this Earth, which is but the Lowest and moft Dreggy Part of the Universe; or blame Plants, because they have not Sense, Brutes because they have not Reason, Men because they are not Demons or Angels; and Angels because they are not Gods, or want Divine Perfection. Upon which Account, God should either have made nothing at all, since there can be nothing besides himself Absolutely Perfect, or else nothing but the Higher Rank of Angelical Beings, free from Mortality and all those other Evils, that attend mankind; or such Fine things, as Epicurus his Gods were feigned to be, living in certain delicious Regions, where there was neither Blustering Winds, nor any Lowning Clouds; nor Nipping Frosts, nor Scorching Heat, nor Night nor Shadow; but the Calm and Unclouded Aether always, Smiling with gentle Serenity. Whereas
Whereas were there but one kind of thing, (the Bell) thus made; there could have been no Music or Harmony at all, in the World for want of Variety. But we ought in the first place, to consider the Whole, Whether that be not the Bell, that Could be Made, having all that belongeth to it; and then the Parts in reference to the Whole, whether they be not in their several Degrees and Ranks, Congruous and Agreeable thereunto. But this is a thing which hath been so well inflected upon by Plotinus, that we cannot speak better to it, than in his Words, "ολον γ' τι ἐπίσημο πολλακον, η ἄνωτέραις, η κάτωτέραις ἀνωτέραις περιουσίαι, ὅ τινι ἢ τί μερεῖς τοις κατοικήν, τις τε κατοικτέραις η τοῖς ἱλασθέν οὐκ αυτο- τοις περιουσίαις, ὅτι τόινυν η τίνι μερεῖς τοῦ ἱλασθέν, ἀποτελεῖ ἂν ἂν ἂν αἰσθής, τότε τί μερεῖς ὑπό τοῦ ἱλασθέν ἐν συμφωνίᾳ η ἁμαρτήματε αἰσθάνεται εἰς ἑαυτόν, ἡ τοῦ ἱλασθέν συμφωνίας, μὴ περὶ μερεῖς ἁμαρτίας μετά- περί· τότε η τὸν κόσμον αἰτιομετα, ἀλλὰ τινι η τίνι ἑαυτί ἑαυτί λειτυνότα, διὸν εἰ, διὸν ἑαυτί. God made the Whole most Beautiful, Entire, Complete, and Sufficient; all agreeing friendly with it self and its parts; both the Nobler and the meaner of them being alike Congruous thereunto. Whosoever therefore, from the Parts thereof will blame the whole, is an Absurd and Unjust Conjuror. For we ought to Consider the Parts, not alone by themselves, but in reference to the whole, whether they be Harmonious and Agreeable to the same. Otherwise we shall not blame the Universe, but some of its Parts only, taken by themselves; as if one should blame the Hair or Toes of a man, taking no notice at all of his Divine Vizage and Countenance; or omitting all other Animals, one should attend only to the most contemptible of them: or lightly overlooking all other men, consider only the most Deformed Thesites. But that which God made was the Whole as one thing; which he that attends to, may hear it speaking to him after this manner. God Almighty hath made me, and from thence came I, Perfect and Compleat, and standing in need of nothing, because in me are contained all things; Plants and Animals, and Good Souls, and Men happy with Virtues; and innumerable Demons, and many Gods. Nor is the Earth alone in me adorned, with all manner of Plants, and Variety of Animals; or does the Power of Soul, extend at most no further than to the Seas; as if the whole Air and Ether and Heaven, in the mean time, were quite devoid of Soul, and altogether unadorned with Living Inhabitants. Moreover all things in me deserve Good, and every thing reaches to it, according to its Power and Nature. For the whole World depends upon that First and Highest Good, the Gods themselves who reign in my several parts, and all Animals and Plants, and whatsoever seems to be Immaculate in me. For Some things in me, partake only of Being, some of Life also, some of Sense, some of Reason, and some of Intelligibleness above Reason. But no man ought to require Equal things from Unequal; nor that the Finger should see, but the Eye; it being enough for the Finger to be a Finger, and to perform its Office. And again afterwards, ἢ ζητείς τινί; η ποιεῖς αὐτῇ ἐς τις τοῦ ἔως ἀρχωμέναι ποιή, ἢ ἔτοι ἢ ἐλαθή- ποντας Σικερ ἐνβρέχει. ἀλλὰ τοῦ μεν Ἐνεκ, τοῦ δ' ἑβαλεθασθαν ἀνθρώπου πόνον, ἄτοι ἀνθρώπους, μη δὲν ἐπέρε, καὶ ὀφθαλμον, ἀλλὰ λόγον πυθόμενον τοσοῦ ἐνέργε- ται ἢ ἀνατιηθα οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀνθρώπων πληθυν αἱτίαν, ἀς ἦ σαλώ το ἀλλοτρο θεατής, το δ' ἐγώ τα περισσότατα ἀπροβαίνου τιτόρι η ἐπικε- χείρων μάρφος, ὡς μὴ ποιεῖς ἡ ποιεῖς ἢ ἐμένα, μη τοι ἐπεί, ἠς ἦς ἐπεί. As an Arti- ficer
sicer would not make all things in an Animal to be Eyes; so neither has the Divine Light, or Spermatick Reason of the World made all things God; but some Gods, and some Demons, and some Men, and some Lower Animals. Not out of Envy, but to display its own Variety and Fecundity. But we are like Unskilful Spectators of a Picture, who condemn the Limner, because he hath not put bright Colours every where: whereas he had suited his Colours to every part respectively, giving to each such as belonged to it. Or else are we like those who would blame a Comedy or Tragedy, because they were not all Kings or Heroes that adhered in it, but some Servants and Rude Clowns, introduced also, talking after their Rude fashion. Whereas the Dramatick Poem would neither be Compleat, nor Elegant and Delightful, were all those Rude Parts taken out of it.

Again; We cannot certainly conclude that the Works of God and his Creation do not transcend those narrow Limits, which Vulgar Opinion and Imagination sets them; that commonly terminates the Universe, but a little above the Clouds, or at most supposes the Fixed Stars, being all fastned in One Solid Sphere, to be the Utmost Wall, or Arched Roof, and Rowling Circumference thereof. Much less ought we, upon such Groundless Suppositions, to infer, That the World might therefore have been made much Better than it is, because it might have been much more Roomy and Capacious. We explode the Atheistick Infinity of Distant Worlds; nor can we admit that Cartesian, seemingly more Modest, Indefinite Extension of one Corporeal Universe, which yet really according to that Philosophers meaning, hath Nullos Fines, no Bounds nor Limits at all. For We perceive our selves that the Corporeal World, is as Un capable of a Positive Infinity of Magnitude, as it is of Time; there being no Magnitude so Great, but that more still might be Added to it. Nevertheless, as we cannot possibly Imagine the Sun, to be a Quarter, or an Hundredth Part so big as we know it to be; so much more may the whole Corporeal Universe, far transcend those narrow Bounds, which our Imagination would circumscribe it in. The New Celestial Phenomena, and the late Improvements of Astronomy and Philosophy made thereupon, render it so probable, that even this Dull Earth of ours is a Planet, and the Sun a Fixed Star, in the Centre of that Vortex, wherein it moves, that many have shrewdly suspected, that there are other Habitable Globes, besides this Earth of ours, (which may be Sayled round about in a year or two) as also more Suns, with their respective Planets, than One. However the Distance of all the Fixed Stars from us, being so Vast, that the Diameter of the Great Orb, makes no discernible Parallax in the Site of them; from whence it is also probable, that the other Fixed Stars are likewise vastly distant from one another; This, I say, widens the Corporeal Universe to us, and makes those Flammantia Memoria Mundi, as Lucrative calls them, Those Flaming Walls of the World, to fly away before us. Now it is not reasonable to think, that all this Vastness, should lie Vast, Desert, and Uninhabited, and have nothing in it, that could Praise the Creator thereof, save only this One Small Spot of Earth. In my Father's House, (faith our Saviour) are Many Mansions. And Bar-
We shall add but one thing more; That to make a right Judgment of the Ways of Providence, and the Justice thereof, as to the Economy of mankind, we must look both Forwards and Backwards: or besides the Present, not only upon the Future, but also the Past Time. Which Rule is likewise set down by Platonius, \textit{"sed aequo, non aequu\textsuperscript{3}}. ov \textit{πρεσβυτέρον τῷ λέγων, ἐς ὅ περὲς τὸ παρὸν ἐκάστι πριν βλέπῃ, ἂλλα πρὸς τὸ πρὸς ἐκάστος ἐς ὅ ἂν τὸ μέλλον.}

Neither is that Doctrine of the Ancients to be neglected, that to give an Account of Providence, we ought to look back upon former Periods, as well as forward, to What is Future. Indeed he and those other Philosophers, who were Religious, understood this so, as to conclude a Pre-Existent State of all Particular Souls, wherein they were at first Created by God Pure; but by the Abuse of their own Liberty Degenerated, to be a Necessary Hypothesis, for the Salving that Phenomenon, of the Degenerated State of Mankind in general here in this Life. And not only so, but they endeavoured in like manner to give an account also, of those Different Conditions of Particular Persons as to Morality, from their Infancy, and their other different Fates here, deriving them all, \textit{καὶ προσωπῶν, νῦν παλαιόν,} from their several Demeanors heretofore in a Pre-Existent State. And there have not wanted Christian Doctors, who have complied with these Philosophers in both. But our \textit{Common Christianity} only agrees thus far; as to suppose a Kind of Imputative Pre-Existance in Adam, in whom all were created Pure, and so consequently involved in his after Misfortune, to salve the Prevalence of Human Nature; upon which account we are all said to be \textit{πάντας θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ,} by Nature Children of Wrath. But as for the different Conditions of Persons, and their several Fates, more disadvantageous to some than others this indeed the Generality of Christian Doctors have been content to resolve, only into an Occult, but as PROVINCE. And thus does Origen himself sometimes modestly pass it over. As in his Third Book against Cel dus, * Paulus, \textit{πολλαὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀντικρήσεως τῶν ἐρεθιστῶν γεγονότα, ὡς μιᾷ φαντασίαν ἐπηρετικὴν τῇ ἡσυχίας λατρείας ἡ ταξιδιωτικά, ὡς ὡς τοις ἐπὶ πρότερον ἡ λακάτα ἢ ἄκολος ἢ ἄνω, \text{157,} ἢ ἄνω, \text{154,} Διεπιτίθεν ἢ \text{154,} ἢ ἄλλη τῆς καθός \text{154,} τοῦ μεγάλου εὐεξιότητος κανονοθεσίας. \text{134,} τὰς \text{134,} τὰς τῆς αὐτάς τινὰς μὴν εἰκός ἢ στεροῦσιν ἢ, ἢ τοῖς \text{134,} περιέχοντις λέγειν παράδεισιν ἢ ἄλλας εἰς ἀνεφάσεις ἢ ἀνεφάσεις. It happened to many; so to have been brought up from their very Childhood, as that, by one means or other, they could have no opportunity at all of thinking of the Better things, \&c. And it is very probable, that there are Causes of these things in the Reasons of Providence, though they do not easily fall under Humane Notice.

But there is yet a Third Atheistical Objection against Providence behind; That it is impossible, any One Being should Animadvert and Order all things in the Distant places of the world at once; and were H h h h
this possible, yet would such Infinite Negligency be very Unease and Distraction to it, and altogether inconsistent with Happiness. Nor would a Being Irresistibly Powerful, concern itself in the Good or Welfare of any thing else; it standing in Need of nothing; and all Benevolence and Good will arising from Indigency and Imbecility. Wherefore such a Being, would wholly be taken up in the Enjoyment of itself; and its own Happiness; utterly Regardless of all other things.

To which the Reply is, First; That though our selves and all Created Beings, have but a Finite Animadversion, and Narrow Sphere of Activity, yet does it not therefore follow, that the Cæle must be the same with the Deity, supposed to be a Being Infinitely Perfect, ἀπελευθερωμένος, that hath no manner of Defect, either of Knowledge or Power in it. But this is a mere Idolum Specus, an Idol of the Cave or Den. Men Measuring the Deity, by their own Scantling, and Narrowness. And indeed were there Nothing at all, but what we ourselves could fully Comprehend, there could be no God. Were the Sun an Animal, and had Life Co-Extended with its Rays and Light, it would see and perceive every Atom of Matter, that its out stretched Beams reached to, and touched. Now all Created Beings, are themselves in some sense, but the Rays of the Deity; which therefore cannot but Feel and Sensibly Perceive, all these its own Effluents and Emanations. Men themselves can order and manage Affairs, in several distant Places at once, without any Disturbance, and we have innumerable Notions of things in our Mind, that lie there easily together, without Crowding one another, or Causing any Distraction to us.

Nevertheless, the Minds of weak Mortals may here be somewhat eas'd and helped by considering, what hath been before suggested. That there is no necessity, God Almighty should ἀπελευθερωμένος, do all things himself Immediately and Drudgingly; but he may have his Inferiour Ministers and Executioners under him, to discharge him of that Supposed Encumbrance. As First of all, an Artificial Plastick Nature, which without Knowledge and Animal Conscientiousness, disposes the Matter of the Universe, according to the Platform or Idea of a Perfect Mind, and forms the Bodies of all Animals. And this was the Reason why we did before insist so much upon this Artificial Regular and Methodical Nature; namely that Divine Providence, might neither be excluded, from having an Influence upon all things in this Lower World, as resulting only from the Fortuitous Motions of Sensible Matter, unguided by any Mind; nor yet the Deity be supposed to do every thing itself Immediately and Miraculously, without the Subiervient Ministry of any Natural Cæuses; which would seem to us Mortals, to be not only a Violent, but also an Operose, Confum'd, and Moliminous Business. And thus did Plato acknowledge, that there were ἔργατος, φυσικὰ ὁτίμια ὄνειρα ἡμῶν ἐντόνως κεῖται ὁ θεός. Certain Causes of a Prudent, that is, Artificial and Orderly Nature, which God makes use of, as Subiervient to himself, in the Mundane Economy. Besides which these Insiiiufs also impressed upon Animals, and which they are Passive to, directing them to Act for Ends either not understood, or not attended to by them, in order to their own Good and
and the Good of the Universe, are another part of that Divine Providence, which inferred into things themselves, is the Servant and Executioner of Providence. Above all which there are yet other Knowing and Understanding Ministers, of the Deity, as its Eyes and Hands; Demonsick or Angelick Beings, appointed to preside over Mankind, all Mundane Affairs, and the Things of Nature, they having their several distilling Offices and Provinces assigned them. Of which also Plato thus, τότεος ειν αρχαίς περιπατομενει κατά, ἔως τὸ Καπνιάδον αιδ. p. 903, παίσιν εἰς παντέων: There are certain Rulers or Presidents appointed by that Supreme God, who Governs the whole world, over all the several things and Parts therein, even to the smallest Distribution of them. All which Inferior Caesars, are constantly over looked and supervised by the Watchful Eye of God Almighty, himself, who may also sometimes Extraordinarily Interpose.

We need not therefore, restrain and confine Divine Providence, to a Few Greater things only, as some do, that we may thereby confound the ease of the Deity, and its Freedom from Distraction, but may and ought to Extend it, to all things whatsoever, Small as well as Great. And indeed the Great things of the World cannot well be ordered neither, without some regard to the Small and Little: εἰς τε αὐτῷ ζωτίκη τῶς μεγάλων φανεροὶ οἱ λιθόρροι λίθες οἱ κάθειν. As Archelaus affirms, that great stones cannot be well placed together in a Building, without little. Neither can Generals of Armies, nor Governors of Families, nor Masters of Ships, nor Mechanick Artificers, discharge their several Functions, and do their Works respectively as they ought, did they not mind the Small things also as well as the Great, μή τίνος (faith the forementioned Philosopher) τότε οὖν ἐξάγωσεν περὶ ἀλμυρὸν διωρίζον, ψυχόπτερον, οἱ τὰ περιπατοντα αὐτοῖς ἐξα, ὡς εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐξαιρεῖται, τῷ ἐπεμέληται μαθήματι ζωτίκη συνετῶν, μεγάλα ἀπεκτέλεται. Let us not therefore make God Almighty Inferior to Mortal Officers who by one and the same Art, can order Small things as well as Great: and so suppose him to be Surpive and negligent. Nevertheless the Chief Concernment and Employment of Divine Providence in the World; is the Occurrence of Souls, or Government of Rational Beings; which is by Plato contracted into this Compendium, ἀλλὰ ἄλλο ἔργον τοῦ πείρατος λείπον έις μετατρ. ημείς το μὲν ἀμφότερον γινομένον ὁδόν ἐκείνου τοῦ ποιήσαι ἀνέχεται. ἢ γε γενομένου τοῦ ποιήσαι. μεγάλοις εἰς χελωτόν χάριν ζευκτόν ἐκ τῆς κακίας, & c. There is no other work left, for the Supreme Governor of all, than only to Translate Better Souls into Better Places and Conditions, and Worse into Worse: or, as he after addeth, to dispose of every one in the world in such a manner as might best render, νικασαν ἐγγείον, ναυαγεμένον ἐκ μακρον, Ver- tex viciorius, and triumphat over Vice. And thus may the slow and Imperfect wits of Mortals, be satisfied; that Providence to the Deity, is no Moliminous, Laborious, and Distraffious thing.

But that there is no higher Spring of Life in Rational Animals, than Contrasted Self Love, and that all Good Will and Benevolence, arises only from Indigency and Imbecility, and That no Being whatsoever is concerned in the welfare of any other thing, but only what it self stands in Need of; and Lastly therefore, That what is irresistibly Po-
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werful!
Atheist Queries Answered.

The Atheist Queries come next to be Answered; which being but Three, are Naturally to be disposed in this order: First, If there were a God or Perfect Being, who therefore was sufficiently happy in the enjoyment of himself, Why would he go about to make a World? Secondly, If he must needs make a World, why did he not make it sooner? this Late production thereof, looking, as if he had but newly awaked out of a long sleep, throughout Infinite Past Ages, or else had in length of time contrived a Satiety of his Solitude. Thirdly and Lastly, What Tools or Instruments? what Machines or Engines had he? or How could he move the Matter of the whole world; especially if Incorporeal; because then he would run through all things, and could not lay hold nor fasten upon any thing.

To the First therefore, we say, That the reason why God made the World, was from his own overflowing and Communicative Goodness, that there might be other Beings also happy besides him, and enjoy themselves. Nor does this at all clash, with God's making of the world, for his own Glory and Honour, though Plotinus were so shy of that, γελόειν ἵνα τιμᾶται, ἐπ᾿ ἑαυτῷ ἀναφερόμενον ἕκαστῳ τῷ ῥυτικῷ. It is ridiculous to say, that God made the world, that he might be Honoured; this being to transfer the affections of humane Artificers and Statuaries upon him. But the chief Reafon of his saying so, was, because that Philosopher conceived, the World to have proceeded, not so much from the Will of the Deity, as the Necessity of its Nature. Though this be true also, that God did not make the World, meerly to Oftentate his Skill and Power; but to communicate his Goodness, which is chiefly and properly his Glory, as the Light and Splendor of the Sun, is the Glory of it. But the Atheist demands, What hurt had it been for us, never to have been made? and the Answer is eafie, we should then never have enjoyed any Good; or been capable of Happiness; and had there been no Rational Creatures at all made, it must have been either from Impotent Sterility in the Deity, or else from an Invidious, Narrow and Contracted Selfishness; or want of Benignity, and Communicative Goodness; both which are Inconfident with a Perfect Being. But the Argument may be thus Retorted upon these Atheists; What Hurt would it be for us, to Ceafe to Be, or Become Nothing? And why then are these Atheists as well as others, so Unwilling to Die?

But then in the next place they Urge: Why was not the World made
made Sooner, since this Goodness of God was without Date; and from Everlasting? But this Question may be taken in two different Senses, Either, Why was not the world from Eternity, as God and his Goodness are Eternal? or else Secondly, If the World could not be from Eternity, yet notwithstanding it by was it, not sooner, but so lately made? In both which Queries the Atomick Atheists take it for granted, that the System of the World was not from Eternity, but had a beginning. Now we say, That the Reason why the world was not Made from Eternity, was not from any Defect of Goodness in the Divine Will, but because there is an Absolute Impossibility in the thing it self; or because the Necessity and Incapacity of such an Imperfect Being hindered. For we must confess, that for our parts, we are prone to believe, That could the world have been from Eternity, it should certainly have been so. And just thus does Philoponus, in his Conflutation of Proclus, his Arguments for the World's Eternity, declare himself, and no otherwise. Ἱκτὴν ἄρη μὴ εἰκος ἡ μετάζω ἡ μετάζων ὑπόστασιν. P. 4. μένου, ὑπὸ τὸ εἰκος ἡ μετάζω μετὰμετὰ, ὡς ἡ μετάζω τινὶ ἐκτελεσθῇς ὑποταθέας. ἀλλὰ μὴ εἰκος μὴ εἰκος; ἡ μετάζων ἡ ἀνθρώποι εἰς τὸν ημερών φώναν ὑπετίθεσθε. Our selves also supposing, the world not to have been Eternal, do neither ascribe this to any Defect either of God's or of Power in the Deity, but only to the Impossibility of the Thing it self. Where in the following words, he gives a Two fold Account of this Impossibility, of the worlds Eternity, ὃτι τὸ ἀνθρώποι κατὰ οὐράς ἐκτελεσθῇς, ἡ δεικτικὴν εἰκος, ἡ διϊσχυς ἐν ἕκα, ὑπὸ τοῦ ὁσαντικοῦ της ἐποίησεν τον ἓλθεις ἐν ὧν. First because, There can be nothing Actually Infinite, and yet Run through, as all the Past Duration of the World hath been; and Secondly, because that which is Made or brought into Being by another, as a distinct thing from it, cannot be Co-Eternal with its Maker. Where it is probable, that Philoponus being a Christian, designed not to oppose the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, but only to assert, that Nothing which was properly Made or Created by God, and nothing which was not it self God, could be from Eternity, or without Beginning. And now we see, How those Atheistic Exceptions against the Novity of the Divine Creation, as if God must therefore either have Slept from Eternity, or else have at length contrated a Solitude of his former Solitude, and the like; do of themselves quite vanish into Nothing. But then as to the Second Sense of the Question, Why the World, though it could not possibly be from Eternity, yet was no sooner, but so lately made? we say, that this is an Absurd Question; both because Time was made together with the World, and there was no Sooner or Later, before Time; and also because, Whatever had a beginning, must of necessity be once but a Day Old. Wherefore the World could not possibly have been so Made by God in time, as not to be once, but Five or Six Thousand years old, and no more; as now it is.

And as for the Third and Last Query, How God could move and command the Matter of the whole World? especially If Incorporeal? We Reply; First, That all other things being derived from God as their only Fountain and Original, and Essentially depending on him, who by his Absolute Power alio, could Annihilate whatsoever he Created.
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ted 3 he must needs have a Despotick Power over all; and every thing whatsoever be Naturally Subjëct and Obsequious to him. And since no Body can possibly Move it itself, that which first moved Matter, must of necessity be Incorporeal; nor could it move it by Local Motion, as one Body moves another, or as Engines and Machines move, by Trufion or Pulfion, they being before moved, but must do it by another kind of Action, such as is not Local Motion, nor Heterocinetic, but Autocinetic; that is, by Cognition. Wherefore that Conceit of the Atheifts, that an Incorporeal Deity could not possibly move the Matter of the World, because it would run through it, and could not fasten or lay hold thereupon; is Absurd, because this moves Matter not Mechanically, but Vitally, and by Cognition only. And that a Cogitative Being as such, hath a Natural Imperium over Matter and Power of Moving it, without any Engines or Machines, is unquestionably certain, even from our own Souls; which move our Bodies and Command them every way, meerly by Will and Thought. And a Perfect Mind, prefruding over the Matter of the whole world, could much more irrefibly, and with Infinitely more ease, move the whole Corporeal Universe, meerly by Will and Cognition; then we can our Bodies.

The Last Head of Atheiftick Argumentation, is from Interest: And Firth, the Atheifts would perfwade, that it is the Interest of mankind in General, and of every particular person, that there should be no God, that is, no Being infinitely powerful, that hath no Law, but its own Will; and therefore may punifh whom he pleases Eternally after Death.

To which our Firth Reply is; That if there bea God, and Souls be Immortal, then it is not any man's Thinking otherwise, that will alter the Cafe, nor afford the Atheifts any Relief against those two Imagined Evils of theirs. For Things are Sullen, and will be as they are, what ever we Think them, or Will them to be: and men will at last discover their Error, when perhaps it may be too late. Wifhing is no Proving; and therefore this Atheiftick Argument, from Interest, is no Argument at all against the Existence of a God, it being nothing but the ignorant wish, and vain desire of Besotted Atheifts.

In the next place this Wifh of Atheifts, is altogether founded, upon a Miifaken Notion of God Almighty too. That he is nothing but Arbitrary Will Omnipotent; which indeed is not the most Delursive thing. But as it hath been often declared, the Will of God is the Will of Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom it self Omnipotent. His Will is not mere Will, such as hath no other Reason besides itself; but it is Law, Equity and Chancery; it is the Law, or Ought it self, Decreeing, Willing, and Acting. Neither does God Punifh any, out of a delight in Punifhment, or in the Evil and Suffering of the Persons Punifhed; but to thofe who are not onfet, altogether Incurable, their Punifhment is Physick, in order to their recovery and amendment; fo that the Source and Fountain thereof is Goodness to the
the Persons themselves Punished. But to such as are Incurable, 
the Punishment inflicted on them, is Intended for the Good of the Whole. So that this Attribute of Justice in God, doth not at all 
 Clash with the Attribute of Goodness, it being but a Branch there- 
of or particular Modification of the same. Goodness and Justice in God, are always Complicated together; neither his Goodness be- 
ing Fondness, nor his Justice Cruelty; but he being both Good in 
Punishing, and Just in Rewarding and Dispensing Benefits. Wherefore, 
it can be the Interest of none, that there should be no God nor Im- 
mortality, unless perhaps of such Desperately and Incurably Wick- 
ed Persons, who abandoning their true Interest of being Good, have 
thereupon no other Interest now left them, than Not to be, or become 
Nothing.

To be without a God, is to be without Hope in the World, for A-
theists can have neither Faith nor Hope, in Senseless Matter, and the 
Fortuitous Motions thereof. And though an understanding Being, 
have never so much Enjoyment of it felt for the present, yet could 
it not possibly be Happy, without Immortality, and Security of the Fu-
ture Continuance thereof. But the Atheists conclude, that there is 
Nothing Immortal, and that all Life Perilless and Vanishes into Nothing; 
and consequently also, that insensitia demorit, Happines is a thing, 
that hath no Existence in Nature; a meet Figment and Chi-
ara, or Idle Wish and vain Dream of Mortals. Wherefore it can-
not be the Interest of Mankind, that this Hypothesis should be True, 
which thus plainly cuts off all Hope from men; and leaves them in 
an utter Imp possibility of being ever Happy.

God is such a Being, as if he could be supposed not to be, there is 
nothing which any who are not desperately engaged in Wickedness, 
no not Atheists themselves, could possibly more Wish for, or Desire. 
To believe a God, is to believe the Existence of all Possible Good and 
Perfection in the Universe; it is to believe, that things are as they 
Should be, and that the World is so well Framed and Governed, as 
that the Whole System thereof, could not possibly have been better. 
For Feculability, arises from the Necessity of Imperfect Fecundated Beings, 
left to themselves, and therefore could not by Omnipotence it self 
have been excluded; and though Sin Actual might perhaps have 
been kept out by Force and Violence; yet all things Computed, it 
was doubtless most for the Good of the Whole, that it should not be 
thus Forsibly Hindered. There is Nothing, which cannot be hoped 
for, by a Good man, from the Deity; Whatev' er Happiness his Be-
ing is capable of, and such things as Eye hath not seen, nor Ear heard, nor 
can now enter into the Heart of man to Conceive. Infinite Hopes lie 
before us, from the Existence of a Being Infinitely Good and Powerful, 
and our Own Souls Immortality; and nothing can hinder or Ob-
struct these Hopes, but our own Wickedness of Life. To believe a 
God, and Do well, are Two, the most Hopeful, cheerful, and Comforta-
ble things, that possibly can be. And to this purpose is that of 
Linus,
Wherefore as for Democritus and Epicurus, whose Encomiums the Atheists here so loudly sing forth; we say, That however they have made so great a noise in the World, and have been so much cried up of late, yet were they really no better, than a Couple of Infatuated Sophists, or Witty Fools; and Debauchers of Mankind.

And now come we to the Last Atheistick Argumentation; wherein they endeavour to recommend their Doctrine to Civil Sovereigns; and to perfwade them, that Theism or Religion, is absolutely inconsistent with their Interest: Their Reasons for which are these Three following. First, Because the Civil Sovereign Reigns only in Fear, and therefore if there be any Power and Fear, greater than the Power and Fear of the Leviathan, Civil Authority can dignifie little. Secondly, Because Sovereignty, is in its own nature absolutely Indivisibile, and must be either Infinitite, or None at all: so that Divine Laws (Natural and Revealed) Superiour to it, circumscribing it, would consequently Destrue it. Wherefore Religion and Theism, must of necessity be Displaced, and Removed out of the way, to make room for the Leviathan, to Roll and Tumble in. Thirdly and Laftly, Private Judgment of Good and Evil, Just and Unjust, is also Contradifitious to the very Being of a Body Politick; which is One Artificial Man, made up of many Natural Men United under One Head; having one Common Reason, Judgment and Will, ruling over the whole. But Consequence, which Religion introduceth, is Private Judgment of Good and Evil, Just and Unjust, and therefore altogether Inconsistent with true Politicks; that can admit of no Private Consequences, but only One Publick Conscience of the Law.

In way of Answer to the First of which, we must here briefly Unravel the Atheistick Ethick and Politicks. The Foundation whereof is first laid, in the Villanizing of Humane Nature; as that which has not so much as any the least Seeds, either of Politicalness, or Ethicalness at all in it; nothing of Equity and Philanthropy; (there being no other Charity or Benevolence any where according to them, save what resulth from Fear, Imbecility, and Indigency) nothing of Publick and Common Concern, but all Private and Selfish Appetite, and Utility, or the Desires of Sensual Pleasure, and Honour, Dominion, and Preceellency before others, being the only Measures of Good in Nature. So that there can be nothing Naturally Just or Unjust, nothing in it self Sinful or Unlawful, but every man by Nature hath Just ad omnium, a Right to Every thing, whatsoever his Appetite inclineth him unto, or himself judgeth Profitable; even to other mens Bodies and Lives. Si occidere Cupis, just habes; si thou desirest to Kill, thou hast then Naturally, a Right thereto unto; that is, a Liberty to Kill without any Sin or Injustice. For Just and Lex, or Jusstitia, Right and Law or Justice in the Language of these Atheistick Politicians, are directly contrary to one another; their Right being a Belhine
Bellamine Liberty, not Made, or Left by Justice, but such as is Founded in a Supposition, of its absolute Non-Existence, Should therefore a Son not only murder his own Parents, who had tenderly brought him up, but also Exquisitely torture them, taking pleasure in beholding their rufial Looks, and hearing their lamentable Shrieks and Outcries; there would be Nothing of Sin or Injustice at all in this, nor in any thing else because Justice is no Nature, but a mere Pallidious and Artificial thing, Made only by Men and Civil Laws. And according to these Men Apprehensions, Nature has been very kind and indulgent to mankind herein, that it hath thus brought us into the World, without any Fetters or Shackles upon us, Free from all Duty and Obligation, Justice and Morality, these being to them nothing but Restraints and Hindrances of True Liberty. From all which it follows, that Nature absolutely Dissociates and Segregates men from one another, by reason of the Inconsistency of those Appetites of theirs, that are all Carried out only to Private Good, and Consequently that every man is by Nature, in a State of War and Hostility, against every man.

In the next place therefore, these Atheistical Politicians further add; that though this their State of Nature which is a Liberty from all Justice and Obligation, and a Lawless, Loose, or Bellune Right to every thing, be in it self Absolutely the Best, yet nevertheless by reason of men Imbecility, and the Equality of their Strengths, and Inconsistency of their Appetites, it proves by Accident the Worst: this War with every one, making men Right or Liberty to every thing, indeed a Right or Liberty to Nothing: they having no security of their Lives, much less of the Comfortable enjoyment of them. For as it is not possible, that all men should have Dominion (which were indeed the most desirable thing according to these Principles) so the Generality must needs be sensible of more Evil in such a State of Liberty with an Universal War against all, than of Good. Wherefore when men had been a good while Hewing, and Slashing, and Jfling against one another, they became at length all weary hereof, and conceived it necessary by Art to help the Doceff of their own Power here, and to choose a Lesser Evil, for the avoiding of a Greater, that is, to make a Voluntary Abatement, of this their Infinite Right, and to Submit to Terms of Equality with one another, in order to a Socieable and Peaceable Cohabitation: and not only So, but also for the Security of all, that others should observe such Rulcs as well as themselves, to put their Necks under the Toke of a Common Coercive Power, whose Will being the Will of them all, should be the very Rule, and Law, and Measure of Justice to them.

Here therefore these Atheistical Politicians, as they first of all Slander Humane Nature, and make a Villain of it; so do they in the next place, reproach Justice and Civil Sovereignty also, making it to be nothing but an Ignoble and Baslantly Brut of Fear; or else a Lesser Evil, submitted to, merely out of Necessity; for the avoiding of a Greater Evil, that of War with every one, by reason of men Natural Imbecility. So that according to this Hypothesis, Justice and Civil Government...
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Government are plainly things not Good in themselves, nor Describable, (they being a Hinderance of Liberty, and Nothing but Shackles and Fetters,) but by Accident only, as Necessary Evils: And thus do these Politicians themselves sometimes distinguish between Good and Just, that Bonnen Amator Per Se, Justum Per Accidentum; Good is that which is Loved for itself, but Just by Accident. From whence it follows unavoidably, that all men mutt of necessity be 

Unwillingly Just, or not with a full and perfect, but Sincerely Will only: Just being a thing that is not Sincerely Good, but such as hath a great Duty or Deed of Evil blended with it. And this was the Old Atheistic Generation of Justice, and of a Body Politic, Civil Society, and Sovereignty. For though a Modern Writer affirm this Hyposthesia (which he looks upon as the only true Scheme of Politicks) to be a New Invention, as the Circulation of the Blood, and no older than the Book De Cruce, yet it is Certain, that it was the common received Doctrine of the Atheistic Politicians and Philosophers before Plato's time; who represents their Sense concerning the Original of Justice, and Civil Society in this manner, ο πετον καθ' αυτον τον αυτον, τα τον μου τετελην δεικεσσαι, τον τε 

Δαπανης και τον πλον ι και τον τινα τα καινε 

και το δικαιοτερον αυτον και τον τινα τα 

καινετερον αυτον. I am to declare first what Justice is, according to the Sense of these Philosophers, and from whence it was Generated. They say therefore, that by Nature, Lanfeb Liberty, and to do that which is now called Injustice, and Injury, to other men is Good; but to Suffer it from others is Evil. But of the two, there is more of Evil in suffering it, than of Good in doing it: Whereupon when men had Clasped a good while, Doing and Suffering Injury, the Greater part, who by reason of their Imbecility were not able to take the former without the Latter, at length Comprised the busines among themselves, and agreed together, by Pacts and Covenants neither to Do nor Suffer Injury, but to Submit to Rules of Equality and make Laws by Compact, in order to their Peaceable Cohabitation, they calling that which was required in those Laws by the Name of Just. And then it is added, η αυτον τον τετελην δεικεσσαι τα τον αυτον 

και τον πλον, και το δικαιοτερον αυτον, και τον τα 

καινετερον αυτον. And this is according to these Philosophers, the Generation and Essence of Justice, as a certain Middle thing between the Best and the Worst. The Best, to exercise a Lawless Liberty of doing whatsoever one please to other men without Suffering any inconvenience from it; And the Worst to Suffer Evil from others without being able to revenge it. Justice therefore, being a Middle thing between both these, is Loved, not as that which is Good in itself, but only by reason of men Imbecility, and their Inability to do Injustice. For as much as he that had Sufficient Power would never enter into such Compacts and Submit to Equality, and Subjection. As for Example, if a man had Gyges his Magical Ring, that he could do whatsoever he list, and not be seen or taken Notice of.
of by any, such a one would certainly never Enter into Covenants, nor Submit to Laws of Equality and Subjection. Agreeably whereunto, it hath been concluded also by some of these Old Atheistic Philosophers, that Justice was &amp; piece, Not properly and directly, one's own Good, the Good of him that is just, but another man's Good, partly of the Fellow-Citizens, but chiefly of the Ruler, whose Vassal he is. And it is well Known, that after Plato's Time, this Hypothesis concerning Justice, that it was a mere Relitious thing, and pruned only from mens Fear and Imbecility, as a Lesser Evil, was much inlifted on by Epicurus also.

But let us in the next place see, how our Modern Atheistic Philosophers and Politicians, will manage and carry on this Hypothesis, so as to Conclude men by Art, into a Body Politick, that are Naturally Dissociated from one another, as also Make Justice, and Obligation Artificial, when there is none in Nature. First of all therefore, these Artificial Justice-Makers, City-Makers, and Authority-Makers, tell us, that though men have an Infinite Right by Nature, yet may they Alienate this Right or part thereof, from themselves, and either Simply Renounce it, or Transfer the same upon some other Person; by means whereof it will become Unlawful for themselves, afterwards, to make use thereof. Thus a late Writer, Men may by Signs Declare, Velle se non Licitum sibi amplius fore, certum aliquid sacere quod Jure antefe cifico poterat. That it is their Will, it shall no longer be Lawful for them, to do something which before they had a Right to do; and this is called by him, a Simple Renunciation of Right; and further, he declares, they may declare again, Velle se non Licitum sibi amplius fore alicui Ressitere, &c. That it is their Will, it shall be no longer Lawful for them, to Transfer this or that particular Person, whom before they might Lawfully have Relisted, and this is called a Translation of Right. But if there be Nothing in its own Nature Unlawful, then cannot this be Unlawful for a man afterwards, to make use of such Liberty as he had before in Words Renounced or Abandoned. Nor can any man by his mere Will, make any thing Unlawful to him, which was not so in it self; but only悬end the Exercise of so much of his Liberty, as he thought good. But however, could a man by his Will, Oblige himself, or make any thing Unlawful to him, there would be Nothing got by this, because then might he by his Will, Disoblige himself again, and make the same Lawful as before. For what is Made meerly by Will, may be Destroyed by Will. Wherefore the Politicians will yet urge the busines further, and tell us, That no man can be Obligated but by his own Act, and that the Essence of Injustice, is Nothing else, but Datis Repetitio, The taking away of that, which one had before given. To which we again Reply, that were a man Naturally Unobligated to any thing, then could he no way be Obligated, to stand to his own Act, so that it should be Really Injust and Unlawful for him, at any time upon Second thoughts, Voluntarily to undo, what he had before voluntarily done. But the Atheists here plainly Render Injustice, a meer Ludicrous thing; when they tell us, that it is Nothing but such an Absurdity in Life, as it is in Disputation, when a man Denies a Proposition that he had before Granted. Which is no Real Evil
in him as a Man, but only a thing called an Abjurdity, as a Disputant. That is, Injustice is no Absolute Evil of the Man, but only a Relative Incongruity in him, as a Citizen. As when a man speaking Latin, observes not the Laws of Grammar, this is a kind of Injustice in him, as a Latinist or Grammarians; so when one who lives in Civil Society, observes not the Laws and Conditions thereof, this is, as it were, The False Latin of a Citizen, and nothing else. According to which Notion of Injustice, there is no such Real Evil or Hurt in it, as can any way withstand, the Force of Appetite and Private Utility, and Oblige men to Civil Obedience, when it is Contrary to the Same. But these Political Juglers and Enchanter, will here cast yet a further Mislead before mens Eyes with their Pacts and Covenants. For men by their Covenants, say they may Unquestionably Oblige themselves, and make things Unjust and Unlawful to them, that were not so before. Wherefore Injustice is again Defined by them, and that with more Speciousness, to be the Breach of Covenants. But though it be true, that if there be Natural Justice, Covenants will Oblige yet upon the Contrary Supposition, that there is Nothing Naturally Unjust, this cannot be Unjust, neither to Breach Covenants. Covenants without Natural Justice, are nothing but mere Words and Breath; (as indeed these Atheistic Politicians themselves, agreeably to their own Hypothesis, call them) and therefore can they have no Force to Oblige. Wherefore these Justice-Makers, are themselves at last necessitated, to fly to Laws of Nature, and to Pretend, this to be a Law of Nature, That men should Stand to their Pacts and Covenants. Which is plainly to Contradict their main Fundamental Principle, that by Nature nothing is Unjust or Unlawful; for if it be so, then can there be no Laws of Nature; and if there be Laws of Nature, then must there be something Naturally Unjust and Unlawful. So that this is not to Make Justice, but clearly to Unmake their own Hypothesis, and to suppose Justice to have been already Made by Nature, or to be in Nature; which is a Grofs Abjurdity in Disputation; to Affirm what one had before Denied. But these their Laws of Nature are indeed nothing but Jugling Equivocation; and a mere Mockery; themselves again acknowledging them to be no Laws, because Law is nothing but the Word of him, who hath Command over others; but only Conclusions or Theorems concerning what conduces to the Conservation and Defence of themselves; upon the Principle of Fear; that is, indeed the Laws of their own Temporaries, and Cowardly Complexion: for they who have Courage and Generosity in them, according to this Hypothesis, would never Submit to such Sneaking Terms of Equality, and Subjection, but venture for Dominion; and resolve either to Win the Saddle, or Loose the Horse. Here therefore do our Atheistic Politicians plainly dancée round in a Circle; they first deriving the Obligation of Civil Laws, from that of Covenants, and then that of Covenants from the Laws of Nature; and Lastly, the Obligation both of these Laws of Nature, and of Covenants themselves, again, from the Law, Command, and Sanction of the Civil Sovereign; without which neither of them would at all Oblige. And thus is it manifest, how vain the Attempts of these Politicians are, to Make Justice Artificially, when there is no such thing Naturally; (which is indeed no less than, to make Something out of Nothing) and by
by Art to Conso State into Bodies Politick, those whom Nature had Dissociated from one another: a thing as impossible as to Ty Knott in the Wind or Water; or to build up a Stately Palace or Castle out of Sand. Indeed the Ligaments, by which these Politicians would tie the Members of their huge Leviathan, or Artificial Man together, are not so good as Cobwebs; they being really nothing, but mere Will and Words. For it Authority and Sovereignty be made only by Will and Words, then is it plain, that by Will and Words, they may be Unmade again at pleasure.

Neither indeed are these Atheist Politicians themselves, altogether unaware hercelf; that this their Artificial Justice and Obligation, can be no firm Vindication of a Body Politick, to Conso State those together, and Unite them into One, who are Naturally Dissociated and Divided from one another: they acknowledging, that Covenants without the Sword, being but Words and Breath, are of no strength, to hold the Members of their Leviathan, or Body Politick together. Wherefore they plainly betake themselves at length, from Art to Force and Power, and make their Civil Sovereign, really to Reign only in Fear. And this must needs be their meaning, when they so constantly declare, All Obligation, just and Ouiet, to be derived only from Law; they by Law thereunderstanding, a Command directed, to such as by reason of their Imbecility are not able to Resist: so that the Will and Command of the more Powerful, Oblige by the Fear of Punishment Threatened. Now if the only Real Obligation to obey Civil Laws, be from the Fear of Punishment, then could no man be Obliged to hazard his Life for the Safety of his Prince and Country, and they, who could reasonably promise themselves Impunity, would be altogether Dissolved, and Consequently, might justly break any Laws, for their Own Advantage. An Affection so extravagant, that these Conso State Politicians themselves, are ashamed plainly to own it, and therefore Disingue it, what they can by Equivocation; themselves sometimes also confessing, so much of Truth; that Pons non Obligat, sed Obligation tent, Punishment does not Oblige, but only holds those to their Duty, who were before Obliged. Furthermore, what is Made by Power and Force only, may be Unmade by Power and Force again. If Civil Sovereigns Reign only in the Fear of their own Sword, then is that Right of theirs so much talked of, indeed nothing else but Might, and their Authority, Force; and consequently Successful and Prosperous Rebellion, and whatsoever can be done by Power, will be ipso factio thereby justised. Lastly, were Civil Sovereigns and Bodies Politick, meet Violent and Contra-Natural things, then would they all quickly Vanish into nothing; because Nature will prevail against Force and Violence: Whereas men constantjly every where fall into Political Order, and the Corruption of one Form of Government, is but the Generation of another.

Wherefore since it is plain, that Sovereignty and Bodies Politick can neither be merely Artificial, nor yet Violent things, there must of necessity be some Natural bond or Vindication to hold them together, such as may both really oblige Subjects to Obey the Lawful Commands of Sovereigns, and Sovereigns in Commanding, to seek the Good and Welfare.
Sovereignty, no Creation of the People. Book I.

Welfare of their Subjects; whom these Atheistical Politicians, (by their Infinite and Bellumine Right) quite discharge from any such thing, Which Bond or Vinculum can be no other, than Natural Justice; and something of a Common and Publick, of a Cenarting and Conglutinating Nature, in all Rational Beings: the Original of both which, is from the Deity. The Right and Authority of God himself is Founded in Justice; and of this is the Civil Sovereignty also a certain Participation. It is not the mere Creature of the People, and of mens Wills, and therefore Annihilable again by their Wills at pleasure; but hath a Stamp of Divinity upon it, as may partly appear from hence, because that *Just Vitæ & Necès, that Power of Life and Death*, which Civil Sovereigns have, was never lodged in *Singulars*, before Civil Society; and therefore could not be Conferred by them. Had not God and Nature made a City; were there not a Natural Conciliation of all Rational Creatures, and Subjection of them to the Deity, as their Head (which is Cicero's, *Una Civitas Deorum atque Humanum, One City of Gods and Men*) had not God made *aceous & æcæstat*, Ruling and being Ruled, Superiority and Subjection, with their respective Duty and Obligation, men could neither by Art, or Political Enchantment, nor yet by Force, have made any firm Cities or Politics. The Civil Sovereign is no Leviathan, no Beast, but a God (I have said ye are Gods:) he reigns not in meer Brusish Force and Fear, but in Natural Justice and Conscience, and in the Right and Authority of God himself. Nevertheless we deny not, but that there is need of Force and Fear too, to Contrain those to Obedience, to whom the Conscience of Duty proveth ineffectual. Nor is the Fear of the Civil Sovereigns own Sword, alone sufficient for this neither, Unafflicted by Religion, and the Fear of an Invisible Being Omnipotent, who feeth all things, and can Punish Secret, as well as Open Transgressors, both in this Life, and after Death. Which is a thing so confidedly true, that Atheists have therefore Pretended, Religion to have been at first a meer Political Pigment. We conclude therefore, that the Civil Sovereign reigneth not, meerly in the Fear of his own Power and Swords, but first in the Justice, and Authority, and then in the Power and Fear also, of God Almighty. And thus much for the First Atheistical Preten
tence, from the Interests of Civil Sovereigns.

To their Second, that Sovereignty is Essentially Infinite, and therefore altogether Inconsistent, with Religion, that would Limit and Confine it, We Reply; That the Right and Authority of Civil Sovereigns, is not as thefe our Atheistical Politicians ignorantly supposè, a meer Bellumine Liberty, but it is a Right essentially Founded in the Being of Natural Justice, as hath been declared. For Authority of Commanding is such a Right as supposes Obligation in others to Obe, without which it could be nothing but meer Will and Force. But none can be Obliged in Duty to Obe, but by Natural Justice; Commands as such, not Creating Obligation, but Prefuppofing it. For if Perfons were not before Obligèd to Obe, no Commands would signifie any thing to them. Wherefore the First Original Obligation is not from Will but Nature. Did Obligation to the things of Natural Justice, as many supposè, arise from the Will and Positive Command of God, only
only by reason of Punishments Threatned, and Rewards Promised; the Consequence of this would be, that no man was Good and Just, but only By Accident, and for the sake of Something else; Whereas the Goodness of Justice or Righteousness is intrinsical to the thing itself, and this is that which Obligeth, (and not any thing Foreign to it) it being a different Species of Good from that of Appetite and Private Utility, which every man may Dispense with. Now there can be no more Infinite Justice, than there can be an Infinite Rule, or an Infinite Measure. Justice is essentially a Determinate thing; and therefore can there not be any Infinite Jus, Right or Authority. If there be any thing in its own Nature Just, and Obliging, or such as ought to be done; then must there of necessity be somthing Unjust or Unlawful, which therefore cannot be Obligingly Commanded by any Authority whatsoever. Neither ought this to be thought any Impeachment of Civil Authority, it extending Universally to all, even to that of the Deity it self. The Right and Authority of God himself, who is the Suprme Sovereign of the Universe, is, also in like manner Bounded and Circumscribed by Justice. God's Will is Ruled by his Justice, and not his Justice Ruled by his Will; and therefore God himself cannot Command, what is in its own nature Unjust. And thus have we made it Evident, that Infinite Right and Authority, of Doing and Commanding any thing without Exception, so that the Arbitrary will of the Commander, should be the very Rule of Justice it self to others, and consequently might Oblige to any thing, is an Absolute Contradiction, and a Non Entity; it supposing nothing to be in its own Nature, Just or Unjust, which if there were not, there could be no Obligation nor Authority at all. Wherefore the Atheists who would flatter Civil Sovereigns, with this Infinite Right, as if their Will ought to be the very Rule of Justice and Conscience, and upon that Pretence Prejudice them against Religion, do as ill deserve of them as of Religion hereby, they indeed Absolutely Devesting them of all Right and Authority, and leaving them nothing but meer Brutish Force, and Bellanuine Liberty. And could Civil Sovereigns utterly Demolish and Destroy, Conscience and Religion in the Minds of Men, (which yet is an Absolute Impossibility) they thinking thereby to make Elbow-room for themselves, they would certainly Bury themselves also, in the Ruins of them. Nevertheless thus much is true; That they in whom the Sovereign Legislative Power of every Polity is lodged, (whether Single Persons or Assemblies) they who Make Civil Laws and can Reverfe them at pleasure, though they may Unquestionably Sin against God, in making Unjust Laws, yet can they not Sin Politically or Civilly, as Violators or Transgressors of those Laws Cancelled and Reverfed by them, they being Superior to them. Nor is this all, But these Sovereign Legislative Powers, may be laid to be Absolute also, in another Sense, as being Executions, Or Judicable or On Confizable by any Human Court, because if they were so obnoxious, then would that Court or Power which had a Right to Judge and Confine them, be Superior to them; which is contrary to the Hypothesis. And then if this Power were again Judicable by some other, there must either be, an Infinite Progress or Endless Circulation (a thing not only Absurd, but also
Their Third and Last follows, That Private Judgment of Good and Evil, is Contradictions to Civil Sovereignty, and a Body Politick, this being One Artificial Man, that must be all Governed, by One Reason and Will. But Conscience is Private Judgment of Good and Evil, Lawful and Unlawful, &c. To which we Reply, That it is not Religion, but on the contrary, the Principles of these Atheiſtick Politicians, that Unavoidably introduce Private Judgment of Good and Evil, such as is Absolutely inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty; there being according to them, nothing in Nature, of a Publick or Common Good, Nothing of Duty or Obligation, but all Private Appetite, and Utility, of which also every man is Judge for himself. For if this were so, then when ever any man judged it mort for his Private Utility, to Disobey Laws, Rebel against Sovereigns, nay to Poyson or Stab them, he would be Unquestionably bound by Nature, and the Reason of his own Good, as the Highest Law, to do the fame. Neither can these Atheiſtick Politicians, be ever able to bring men out of this State of Private Good, Judgment, and Will, which is Natural to them, by any Artificial Tricks and Devices, or mere Enchantments of Words, as Artificial Justice, and an Artificial Man, and a Common Person and Will, and a Publick Confequence, and the like. Nay it is observable, that themselves are nectillated by the Tenour of thee their Principles, Cauſically to allow such Private Judgment and Will, as is altogether inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty; as, That any man may Lawfully Refiſt in Defence of his own Life, and That they who have once Rebell'd, may afterwards Juſtly defend themselves by Force. Nor indeed can this Private Judgment of men, according to their Appetite and Utility, be possibly otherwise taken away, then by Natural Justice, which is a thing not of a Private, but of a Publick and Common Nature; And by Confequence, that Obligeth to Obey all the Lawful Commands of Civil Sovereigns, though contrary to mens Appetites, and Private Interests. Wherefore Confequence also, is in it self not of a Private and Partial, but of a Publick and Common Nature; it respecting Divine Laws, Impartial Justice, and Equity, and the Good of the Whole, when clashing with our own Selfish Good; and Private Utility. This is the only thing, that can Naturally Conſociate Mankind together, lay a Foundation for Bodies Politick, and take away that Private Will and Judgment according to mens Appetite and Utility, which is Inconsistent with the fame: agreeably to that of Plato's, τὸ ἀσέλειον ψυχήν, τὸ ἐν ἀσέλειον ζῷον, Tha which is of a Common and Publick Nature Unites, but that which is of a Private Segregate and Difſociate. It is true indeed, that particular Persons must make a Judgment in Confequence for themselves (a Publick Conſequence, being Nonsence and Ridiculous) and that they may also Erre therein; yet is not the Rule neither, by which
which Conscience Judgeth, Private; nor it tell Unaccountable, unless
in such mistaken Fanaticks, as profeffedly follow Private Impul
er, but either the Natural and Eternal Laws of God, or else his revealed
Will, things more Public; than the Civil Laws of any Country, and
of which others also may Judge. Nevertheless we deny not, but
that Evil Persons may and do sometimes make a Pretence of Consci-
ence and Religion in Order to Sedition and Rebellion; as the best
things may be Abused; but this is not the Fault of Religion, but only
of the Men: Conscience obligeing, though First to obey God, yet
in Subordination to him, the Laws of Civil Sovereigns also. To
conclude, Conscience and Religion, Oblige Subjects Actively to Obey
all the Lawful Commands of Civil Sovereigns or Legislative Powers,
though contrary to their own Private Appetite, Interest, and Utility;
but when these same Sovereign Legislative Powers, Command Unlaw-
ful things, Conscience though it here Obliges to obey God rather than
Whosever Refieth the Power, Refieth the Ordinance of God, and they
that Refieth shall Receive to themselves Damnation. And Matthew the
26. All they that take the Sword, shall perish with the Sword. Here is
the Patience and the Faith of the Saints. And thus does Religion, give
unto Caesar the things that are Cæsars, as well as unto God, the things that
are Gods.

And now having fully Confiuted, all the Atheiftick Grounds, we con-
fidently Conclude, That the First Original of all things was neither Stu-
pid and Senseless Matter Fortuitously moved, Nor a blind and Sense-
en, but Orderly and Methodical Plastick Nature; Nor a Living Mat-
ter having Perception or Understanding Natural, without Animal
Sense or Consciousness; Nor yet did every thing Exist of it self Necessa-
riily from Eternity, without a Cause. But there is One only Necessa-
ry Existent, the Cause of all other things; and this an Absolutely Per-
fect Being, Infinitely Good, Wise, and Powerful; Who hath made all
that was First to be made, and according to the Best Wisdom, and ex-
ercised an exact Providence over all. Who Iame ought to be Hal-
lowed and Separated from all other things. To whom be all Honour,
and Glory, and Worship, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE END.
THE
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X. Their further Attempt to doe the same Atomically, That the First Principle of all things whatsoever in the Universe being Atoms, or Corpuscula, devoid of all manner of Qualities, and consequent-ly of Sense and Understanding (which sprung up afterwards from a certain Composition or Contexture of them) Mind or Deity, could not therefore be the First Original of all. 70

XI. A further Atheistick Attempt to impugn a Deity, by disproving the World's Animation, or its being governed by a Living Understanding Animal NATURE, presiding over the whole; because forsooth, Sense and Understanding are peculiar Appendices to Fleth, Blood, and Brains; and Reason is no where to be found but in Human Form. 73

XII. An Eighth Atheistick Inference, That God being taken by all, for a Most Happy, Eternal and Immortal Animal (or Living Being) there can be no such thing; because all living Beings are Conceptions of Atoms that were at first generated, and are liable to Death and Corruption by the Dissolution of their Compa-ges. Life being no Simple Primitive Nature, but an Accidental Modification of compounded Bodies only, which upon the Dissolution of their Parts, or Disturbance of their Contexture, vanishteth into Nothing. 75

XIII. A Ninth Pretended Atheistick Demonstration, That by God is meant a First Cause or Mover, and such as was not before moved by any thing else without it; but Nothing can move it self, and therefore there can be no unmoved Mover, nor any First in the Order of Causes, that is, a God. 76

XIV. Their further Improvement of the same Principle, That there can be no Action whatsoever, without some external Cause; or that, Nothing taketh Beginning from it self, but from the Action of some other Agent without it; so that no Cognition can arise of it self without a Cause; all Action and Cognition being really nothing but Local Motion: from whence it follows, that no Thinking Being could be a First Cause any more than a Machine or Automaton. Page 76.

XV. Another Grand Mystery of Atheism, That all Knowledge and Mental Conception is the Information of the things themselves known existing without the Knower, and a mere Passion from them; and therefore the world must needs have been before any Knowledge or Conception of it, but no Knowledge or Conception before the world, as its Cause. 77

XVI. A Twelfth Atheistick Argumentation, That things could not be made by a God; because they are so Faulty and Ill made. That they were not contrived for the Good of Man, and that the Deluge of Evils which overflows all, shews them not to have proceeded from any Deity. ibid. 79

XVII. A Thirteenth Inference of Atheists, from the Defect of Providence, That in Human Affairs all is Tohu and Bohu, Chaos and Confusion. 79

XVIII. A Fourteenth Atheistick Objection, That it is impossible for any one Being to Animadvert and Order all things in the distant places of the whole world at once; But if it were possible, That such Infinite Negligiosity would be absolutely inconsistent with Happiness. 80

XIX. Queries of Atheists, Why the world was not made sooner? and, What God did before? Why it was made at all, since it was so long unmade? and, How the Architect of the world could rear up so huge a Fabrick? 81

XX. The Atheists Pretence, That it is the great Interest of Mankind, There should be no God: And that it was a Noble and Heroical Exploit of the Democriticks, to Chase away that Aggrieftfull Spectre out of the world, and to free men from the Continual Fear of a Deity, and Punishment after Death, Embittering all the Pleasures of Life. 83

XXI. The Left Atheistick Prence, That Theism is also inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty, it introducing a Fear greater than the Fear of the Leviathan: and that any other Conscience, besides the Civil Law (being Private Judgment)
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I. That the Grounds of the Hylozoick Atheifm could not be insisted on by us in the former Chapter, together with those of the Atomick, they being directly opposite to each other; with a farther Account of this Hylozoick Atheifm. P. 104.

II. A Suggestion in way of Caution, for the Preventing of all mistakes, That every Hylozoift must not therefore be presently condemned as an Atheift, or but a meer Counterfeit Histrionical Theift. 105

III. That nevertheless such Hylozoifts, as are also Corporalifts, or acknowledge no other Substance besides Body, can by no means be excused from the Imputation of Atheifm, for Two Reasons. 106

IV. That Strato Lampacenus (commonly called Phycius) was probably the First Afferter of the Hylozoick Atheifm, he acknowledging no other God, but the Life of Nature in Matter. 107

V. Further Proved, that this Strato was an Atheift, and of a different Form from Democritus, he attributing an Ener-

getick Nature, but without Sense and Animality, to all Matter. Page 108

VI. That Strato, not deriving all things from a meer Fortuitous Principle, as the Demoeritick Atheifts did, nor yet acknowledging any one Plastick Nature to predomine over the whole, but deducing the Original of things from a Mixture of Chance and Plastick Nature both together, in the several parts of Matter must therefore needs be an Hylozooick Atheift. ibid.

VII. That the Famous Hippocrates, was neither an Hylozoick nor Democratick Atheift, but rather an Heraclitick Corporeal Theift. 109

VIII. That Plato took no notice of the Hylozoick Atheifm, nor of any other, save what derives the Original of all things from a meer Fortuitous Nature; and therefore either the Democrical, or the Anaximandrian Atheifm, which Latter will be next declared. 110

IX. That it is hardly Imaginable, There should have been no Philosophick Atheifts in the world before Democritus and Luippus: Plato observing also, that there have been some or other in all ages sick of the Atheistick Disease: And Ariftotle affirming, many of the first Philosophers have assigned only a Material Caufe of the mundane System, without either Intending, or Efficient Caufe. They supposing Matter to be the only Substance, and all other things, nothing but the Passions and Accidents thereof, Generable and Corruptible. 111

X. The Doctrine of which Materialifts may be more fully understood from those Exceptions which Ariftotle makes against them. His First Exception 3 That they assigned no Caufe of Motion, but introduced it into the world Unaccountably. 112

XI. Ariftotle's Second Exception, That these Materialifts assigned no Caufe, T8 E5 xal KaA&3, of Well and Fit; that is, gave no Account of the Orderly Regularity of things. Anaxagoras said to be the First Ionick Philofopher who made Mind and Good a Principle of the Universe.

(a 3) XII. Con-
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XII. Concluded from hence, That these Materialists in Aristotle were downright Atheists, not merely because they held all Substance to be Body, for as much as Heraclitus and Zeno did the like, and yet are not therefore numbered amongst the Atheists (these supposing the whole World to be an Animal, and their Fiery Matter Originally Intellegetul) but because they made Stupid Matter, devoid of all Understanding and Life, to be the only Principle. Page 113

XIII. And supposing every thing, besides the bare Substance of Matter, to be Generable and Corruptible, and consequently, That there could be no other God, than such as was Native and Mortal. That those Ancient Theologers and Theogonists, who generated all the Gods out of Night and Chaos without exception, were only Verbal Atheists, but Real Atheists; Senecles Matter being to them the Highest Numen. ibid.

XIV. The Difference observed between Aristotle's Atheistical Materialists and the Italick Philosophers: the former determining all things, besides that bare Substance of Matter, to be Made or Generated; but the latter, that no Real Entity was either Generated or Corrupted; they therefore both denying the Qualities and Forms of Bodies, and affording the Ingenerability and Incorporeity of Souls. 114

XV. How Aristotle's Atheistical Materialists endeavoured to baffle and elude that Axiome of the Italick Philosophers, That Nothing can come from Nothing nor goe to Nothing. And that Anaxagoras was the First amongst the Ionicks, who yielded so far to that Principle, as from thence to afford Incorporeal Substance, and the Pre-existence of Qualities and Forms; be concerning them to be things Really distinct from the Substance of Matter. 116

XVI. The Error of some Writers, who from Aristotle's affurming, That the Ancient Philosophers did generally conclude the World to have been Made, from hence infer them, to have been all Theists, and that Aristotle contradicted himself in rec- presenting many of them as Atheists. That the Ancient Atheists did generally suppose the World to have been Made, or have had a Beginning; as on the other hand, some Theists did maintain its Ante-Eternity, but in a way of Dependency upon the Deity. That we ought therefore here to distinguish between the System of the World, and the bare Substance of the Matter; All Atheists contending the Matter to have been not only Eternal, but also such Independently upon another Being. Page 117

XVII. Some of the Ancients concluded this Materialism, or Hylopathian Atheism, to have been at least as old as Homer: who made the Ocean (or Fluid Matter) the Father of all the gods; and that this was indeed the Ancientest of all Atheisms, which verbally acknowledging gods, yet derives the Original of them all from Night and Chaos. A Description of Aristotle's Materialism: That Night and Chaos first laid an Egg, out of which sprung forth Love, which afterwards mingling again with Chaos, begat Heaven and Earth, Animals and all the Gods. 120

XVIII. That notwithstanding this, in Aristotle's Judgment, not only Parmenides, but also Hefiod, and other Ancients, who made Love, Senior to the Gods; were to be exempted out of the number of Atheists; they understanding by this Love an Active Principle or Cause of Motion in the Universe: which therefore could not result from an Egg of the Night, nor be the Offspring of Chaos; but must be something in order of Nature Before Matter. Simmias Rhodius his Wings, a Poem in Honour of this Divine or Heavenly Love. This not that Love which was the Offspring of Penia and Porus in Plato. In what Retified and Refined Sense it may pass for True Theology; That Love is the Supreme Deity, and Original of all things. 121

XIX. That however Democritus and Leucippus be elsewhere taxed by Aristotle for this very thing, the assigning only a Material Cause of the Universe; yet were they not the Persons intended by him
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him, in the forementioned Accusation, but certain Ancients & Philofophers, who also were not Atomifts, but Afferers of Qualities, or Hylopathians. Page 123

XX. That Aristotle's Atheistic Materialifts, were indeed all the First Ionick Philofophers before Anaxagoras, Thales being the Head of them. But that Thales being acquitted from this Imputation of Atheifm, by several Good Authors, his next Successor, Anaximander, is rather to be accouunted the ἀδεικνυτὸς, or Prince of this Atheifick Philofophy. ibid.

XXI. A Passage out of Aristotle Objefted, which at first Sight, seems to make Anaximander a Divine Philofopher, and therefore hath led both Modern and Ancient Writers into that Miftake. But that this well confidered, proves the Contrary, That Anaximander was the Chief of the Old Atheifick Philofophers. 124

XXII. That it is no wonder, if Anaximander called Senecæs Matter τὸ ὕδωρ, or The Divinity, fince to all Atheifts, that μὴν ἔχει τὸ ἀνθείατον. And bow this may be faid to be Immortal, and to Govern all: with the concurrent Judgment of the Greek Scholiasts upon this Place. 126

XXIII. A further account of the Anaximandrian Philofophy, from whence it appearèth to have been Purely Atheifical. 127

XXIV. That as the vulgar have always been ill Judges of Theifts and Atheifts, fo have learned men commonly fuppoft fewer Atheifts than indeed there were. Anaximander and Democritus Atheifts both alike, though Philosophizing different ways; and that some Passages in Plato, rejent the Anaximandrian Form of Atheifm, rather than the Democritical. 129

XXV. The reason why Democritus and Leucippus, New-modell'd Atheifm into this Atomick Form. 131

XXVI. That besides the Three Forms of Atheifm already mentioned, we sometimes meet with a Fourth, which fuppoft the Universe to be, though not an Animal, yet a kind of Plant or Vegetable, having one Regular Plaftick Nature in it, but devoid of Understanding and Senfe, which dispoftes and orders the whole. Page 131

XXVII. That this Form of Atheifm, which makes One feneles Plaftick and Plantal Nature to prefide over the whole, is different from the Hylozoick, in that it takes away all Fortuitouſnes; Subjecting all things Universally to the Fate of this One Methodical Unknowing Nature. 132

XXVIII. Possible, that fome in all ages might have entertained this Atheiftical Conceit, That all things are difpofed by One Regular and Methodical Senseles Nature; yetfeft it seemeth to have beenchiefly affected by certain Spurious Heraclicks and Stoicks. Upon which account this Cofmo-plaftick Atheifm may be called Pseudo-zenonian. 133

XXIX. That, besides the Philosophick Atheifts, there have been always in the World Enthufiaftick and Fanaticke Atheifts; though indeed all Atheifts may in some fene be faid to be both Enthufiaftick and Fanaticck, as being neerily led by an Ξανγξ "Ἀλογος, or Irrational Impetus. 134

XXX. That there cannot easily be any other Form of Atheifm besides these Four already mentioned; becaufe all Atheifts are Corporæalifts, and yet not all Corporæalifts Atheifts; but onely fuch of them as make the Fift Principle not to be Intellectual. ibid.

XXXI. A Distribution of Atheifts Producing the forementioned Quaternio, and showing the Difference that is between them. 136

XXXII. That they are but mere Bunblers at Atheifm, who talk of Sensitive and Rational Matter, Specifically differing. And that the Canting Astrolo¬gical Atheifts, are not at all confiderable, becaufe not Understanding themfelves. 137

XXXIII. Another Distribution of Atheifts, That they either derive the Original of all things, from a meerly Fortuitous Principle, and the Unguided Motion of Matter, or else from a Plaftick, Regular and Methodical, but Senseles Nature.
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ture. What Atheists denied the Eternity of the World, and what asserted it. Page 138

XXXIV. That of these Four Forms of Atheism, the Atomick or Democritical, and the Hylozoick or Strarional, are the Principal: which Two being once confuted, all Atheifm will be confuted. 142

XXXV. These Two Forms of Atheism, being contrary to each other, that we ought in all Reason to infift rather, upon the Atomick: nevertheless we shall elsewhere confute the Hylozoick also; and further prove against all Corporalifts, that no Cognition nor Life can belong to Matter. 145

XXXVI. That in the mean time, we shall not neglect the other Forms of Atheifm, but confute them all together, as they agree in one Principle. As also by way of Digreflion here infift largely upon the Plaffick Life of Nature, in order to a fuller Confutation, as well of the Hylozoick, as the Cosmo-plaffick Atheifm. 146

1. That these Two Forms of Atheifm, are not therefore Condemned by us, merely because they suppose a Life of Nature, different from the Animal Life: however this be a thing altogether Exploded by some profefled Theifts, therein symbolizing too much with the Democritical Atheifts. ibid.

2. That if no Plaffick Artificial Nature be admitted, then one of these two things must be concluded; That either all things come to pass by Fortuitous Mechanifm or Material Neceffity (the Motion of Matter Unguided) or else that God doth Aντεγεγυνέναι ζωὰν do all things Himself Immediately and Miraculously; framing the Body of every Gnat and Fly, as it were, with his own hands: for as much as Divine Laws and Commands cannot execute themselves, nor be alone the proper Efficient Caufes of things in Nature. 147

3. To suppose the Former of these, that all things come to pass Fortuitously, by the Unguided Motion of Matter, and without the Direction of any Mind, a thing altogether Irrational and Impious: there being many Phenomena both Above the Mechanick Powers, and Contrary to the Laws thereof. That the Mechanick Theifts make God out of an Idle Spectator of the Fortuitous Motions of Matter, and render his Wifdom altogether useless and insignificant. Aristotle's Judicious Censure of this Fortuitous Mechanism, and his Derifion of that Conceit, that Material and Mechanical Reasons, are the only Philosophical. Page 148

4. That it seems neither Decorous in refpect of God, nor Congruous to Reason, that he should Αντεγεγυνέναι ζωὰν, doe all things Himself Immediately and Miraculously, without the Subserviency of any Natural Caufes. This further Confuted from the Slow and Gradual Progress of things in Nature, as also from those Errors and Bungles, that are Committed, when the Matter proves Incept and Confusional, which argue the Agent not to be Incontinent. 149

5. Reasonably inferred from hence, That there is an Artificial or Plaffick Nature in the Universe, as a Subordinate Instrument of Divine Providence, in the Orderly Disposal of Matter; but not without a Higher Providence also presiding over it; for as much as this Plaffick Nature cannot Act Electively or with Difcretion. Those Laws of Nature concerning Motion, which the Mechanick Theifts themselves suppose, Really Nothing else, but a Plaffick Nature, or Spermatick Reasons. 150

6. The Argeableness of this Doctrine with the Sentiments of the best Philosophers of all Ages. Anaxagoras though a profefled Theift, severely Confured both by Plato and Aristotle as an encourager of Atheifm, merely because he used Material and Mechanical Caufes, more than Mental and Final. Phyfiologers and Astronomers, for the fame Reason also, vulgarly suspected of Atheifm in Plato's time. 151

7. The Plaffick Artificial Nature, no Occult Quality, but the only Intelligible Cause of that which is the Grandefl of all Phenomena, the Orderly Regularity and
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and Harmony of Things; which the Mechanick Thiefs, however pretending to Salve all Phenomena, give no accont of. A God or Infinite Mind affected by these, in vain and to no purpose. Pag. 154

8. Two things here to be Perform'd, To give an accont of the Plastick Artificial Nature; and then, To show how the Nature thereof is Mistaken and Abused by Atheists. The First General Accont of this Nature according to Aristotle, That it is to be conceived as Art it self actiing Insensibly and Immediately upon the Matter; as if Harmony Living in the Musical Instruments should move the Strings thereof without any External Impulse. 155

9. Two Preeminences of Nature above Humane Art; First, That whereas Humane Art acts upon the Matter without, Cumberously or Molinously, and in a way of Twentil or Harlybrly; Nature, acting upon the same from Within more Commandingly, doth its work Easil, Cleverly and Silently. Humane Art ateth on Matter Mechanically, but Nature Vitaly and Magically. 155

10. The Second Preeminence of Nature, That whereas Human Artifts are often to seek, and at a los, Anxiously Consult and Deliberate, and upon Second thoughts Mend their former work; Nature is never to seek or Unresolved what to doe, nor doth she ever Repent of what she hath done, and thereupon correc$ her Former Courf. Human Artifts themselves Consult not as Artifts, but always for want of Art; and therefore Nature, though never Consulting nor Deliberating, may notwithstanding act Artificially and for Ends. Concluded, that what is by us called Nature, is Really the Divine Art. 156


12. Two Imperfections of Nature, in respect whereof it falls short of Humane Art. First, That though it at for Ends Artificially, yet it self neither Intends those Ends, nor Understands the Reason of what it doeth, for which cause it cannot act Eligently. The Difference betwixt Spermatick Realons and Knowledge. That Nature doth but Ape or Mimmick the Divine Art or Wifedom; being it self not Master of that Reason, according to which it acts, but only a Servant to it, and Drudging Executioner thereof. Page 156

13. Proved that there may be such a thing as ateth Artificially, though it self do not comprehend that Art and Reason by which its Motions are Governed. First from Mufical Habits; the Dancer resembles the Artificial Life of Nature. 157

14. The same further Evienced from the Inftincts of Brute Animals, Directing them to act Rationally and Artificially, in order to their own Good and the Good of the Universe, without any Reason of their own. These Inftincts in Brutes, but Passive Impresses of the Divine Wifedom, and a kind of Fate upon them. 158

15. The Second Imperfection of Nature, that it ateth without Animal Phancy, Sw我们无穷, Con-fene, or Con-fcioufnes, and hath no express Self-Perception and Self-Enjoyment. ibid.

16. Whether this Energy of the Plastick Nature, be to be called Cognition or no, Nothing but a Logomachy, or Contention about Words. Granted that what moves Matter Vitaly, must needs do it by some Energy of its own, distinct from Local Motion; but that there may be a Simple Vital Energy, without that Duplicity which is in Synaethesis, or clear and express Concioufnes. Nevertheless, that the Energy of Nature, may be called, a certain Droufie, Unawakened, or Astonifhed Cognition. 159

17. Several Instances which render it probable, that there may be a Vital Energy without Synaethesis, clear and express Con-fene or Concioufnes. 160

18. Wherefore the Plastick Nature, acting neither Knowingly nor Phantastickly, must needs act Fatally, Magnificly and Sympathetically. The Divine (b) Laws
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Laws and Fate, as to Matter, not meer Cognition in the Mind of God, but an Energetick and Effectual Principle in it. And this Plaftick Nature, the True and Proper Fate of Matter, or of the Corporeal World. What Magick is, and that Nature which aſſeth Fatally, aſſeth also Magically and Sympathetically. P. 161

19. That Nature, though it be the Divine Art, or Fate, yet for all that, is neither a God, nor Goddes, but a Low and Imperfect Creature, it aſſing Artificially and Rationally, no otherſide than Com-

ounded Forms of Letters, when Printing Coherent Philofophick Sense; nor for Ends, than a Saw or Hatchet in the hands of a skillfull Mechanick, The Plaftick and Vegetative Life of Nature, the Low-
est of all Lives, and Inferior to the Sensi-
tive. A Higher Providence, than that of the Plaftick Nature, governing the Corpuscular World it ſelf. ibid.

20. Notwithstanding which, for aſſuch as the Plaftick Nature is a Life, it muſt needs be Incorporeal. One and the ſelf ſame thing, having in it an entire Model and Platform of the Whole, and aſſing upon ſeveral Diftant parts of Matter, cannot be a Body. And though Aritotle himſelf do no where declare this Nature to be either Corporeal or Incorporeal, (which he neither clearly doth concerning the Rational Soul,) and his Followers commonly take it to be Corporeal, yet, according to the Genuine Principlers of that Philosophy, muſt it needs be otherwife. 165

21. The Plaftick Nature being Incor-
oporeal muſt either be a Lower Power lodged in Souls, which are also Conſcious, ſensitive or Rational; or else a diſtinſt ſubſtantial Life by it ſelf, and Inferi-
our Soul. That the Platonists aſſert both with Aritotle’s agreeable Determina-
tion; That Nature is either Part of a Soul, or not without ſoul. ibid.

22. The Plaftick Nature as to the Bo-
dies of Animals, a Part, or Lower Pow-
er, of their reſpective Souls. That the Phenomena prove a Plaftick Nature or Archeus in Animals; to make which a diſtinſt thing from the Šoul, would be to Multiply Entities without Necessity. The Šoul endued with a Plaftick Nature, the Chief Formatrix of its own Body, the con-
tribution of other Caufes not excluded. 166

23. That, besides the Plaftick in Par-
ticular Animals, Forming them as fo ma-
ny Little Worlds, there is a General Plaftick or Artificial Nature in the Whole Corporeal Universe, which likewise, according to Aritotle, is either a Part and Lower Power of a Conſcious Mundane Soul, or else something depending thereon. 167

24. That no leſs according to Aritotle, than Plato and Socrates, Our felver pa-
take of Life from the Life of the Universe, as well as we do of Heat and Cold from the Heat and Cold of the Universe. From whence it appears, that Aritotle also held the World’s Animation, which is further Undeniably proved. An Answer to Two the moſt confiderable Places in that Philo-
fopher objected to the contrary. That A-
ritotle’s First Immoveable Mover was no Soul, but a Perfect Intellect abstract from Matter, which he ſuppoſed to move onely as a Final Caufe, or as Being Love-
ed; and besides this, a Mundane Soul and Plaftick Nature to move the Heavens Efficiently. Neither Aritotle’s Nature nor Mundane Soul the Supreme Deity. However, though there be no ſuch Mundane Soul, as both Plato and Aritotle conceived, yet may there be notwithstanding, a Plaftick or Artificial Nature de-
pending upon a Higher Intellectual Prin-
ciple. 168

25. No Impossibility of other Particu-
lar Plafticks; and though it be not rea-
ſonable to think every Plant, Herb and 
Pile of Grass, to have a Plaftick or Vege-
tative Soul of its own, nor the Earth to be an Animal, yet may there poſsibly be one Plaftick Artificial Nature preſsidig over the Whole Terraqueous Globe, by which Vegetables may be severally organ-
ized and framed, and all things per-
formed, which transcend the Power of Fortuitous Mechanifm. 171

26. Our Second Undertaking, which was to Šow, How groſſly those Atheſts (who acknowledge this Artificial Plaftick Nature,
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Nature, without Animality,) Misunderstand it, and Abuse the Notion, to make a Counterfeit God Almighty, or Nume  
of it; to the exclusion of the True Deity. First, In their Supposing,  
That to be the First and Higheft Principle of the Universe, which is the Laft  
and Lowest of all Lives, a thing as Ef-  

tentially Derivative from, and Depen-  
dent upon, a Higher Intellectual Prin-  
ciple, as the Echo on the Original Voice.  
Secondly, In their making Senfe and  
Reason in Animals to emerge out of a  
Senfeless Life of Nature, by the meer  
Modification and Organization of Matter.  
That no Duplication of Corporeal Or-  
gans can ever make One Single Inconfe-  
uous Life to advance into Redoubled  
Confciousness and Self-Enjoyment.  
Thirdly, In attributing (some of them)  
Perfect Knowledge and Understanding  
to this Life of Nature, which yet them-  
selves suppose to be devoid of all Ani-  
mal Senfe and Confciousness. Lastly,  
In making this Plaftick Life of Nature  
to be meerly Corporeal: The Hylolyo-  
iots contending, That it is but an Inadequate  
Conception of Body as the onely Sub-  
fstance, and fondly dreaming that the Vul-  
gar Notion of a God, is Nothing but  
such an Inadequate Conception of the  
Matter of the whole Universe, Miftaken  
for an Entire Substance by it felf the  
Caufe of all things. And thus for the  
Digrefion.

XXXVIII. That though the Confufa-  
tion of the Atheiftick Grounds, according  
to the Laws of Method, ought to have  
been referved for the left part of this Dis-  
coutry; yet we, having reason to violate  
thofe Laws, crave the Reader's Pardon  
for this Preposteroufnefs. A confiderable  
Observation of Plato's, That it is not one-  
yly Grofs Sensuality which inclines men to  
Atheize, but alfo an Affiliation of feem-  
ing Wifer than the Generality of mankind,  
As likewise, that the Atheiffs making fuch  
Pretece to Wit, it is a fefonable and  
proper Undertaking, to Evince, that they  
Fumble in all their Raticinations. And  
we hope to make it appear, that the Atheiffs  
are no Conjurers: and that all Forms of  

Atheifm are Nonsence and Impoffibility.  

Page 174

CHAP. IV.

The Idea of God declared, in way of  
Answer to the First Atheiftick Argu-  
ment; and the Grand Objeftion againft  
the Naturallity of this Idea (as Ef-  

tentially including Unity or One-  
liness in it;) from the Pagans Polye-  
thism, removed. Proved, That the In-  
telligent Pagans Generally acknowl-  
edged One Supreme Deity. A fuller  
Explication of whose Polytheism and  
Iolatry intended; in order to the  
better giving an Account of Christi-  
anity.

I. T HE either Stupid Impenfinbility,  
or Grofs Impudence of Athei-  
ists, in denying the Word God to have  
any Signification; or that there is any  
other Idea answerine to it, besides the  
mear Phantaff of the Sound. The Dis-  
feafe called by the Philofopher, "Απολογι-  
ς ή των φαντασμάτων, The Petrifcation, or Dead  
Impenfinbility, of the Mind.

192

II. That the Atheiffs themfelves must  
needs have an Idea of God in their  
Minds, or otherwife, when they deny his  
Exifence, they fould deny the Exifence  
of Nothing. That they have alfo the fame  
Idea of him in Generall with the The-  
iffs; the One Denying the very fame  
thing which the Others Affirm.

194

III. A Lemma or Preparatory Propo-  
sition to the Idea of God, That though  
some things be Made or Generated, yet  
it is not poible that all things should be  
Made, but somefhing must of neceffity Ex-  
ift of it Self from Eternity Unmade, and  
be the Caufe of thofe other things that  
are Made.

Ibid.

IV. The Two moft Obftrute Opinions  
concerning what was Self-Exiftent from  
Eternity, or Unmade, and the Caufe of  
all other things Made: One, That it was  
Nothing but Sentife Matter, the Moft  
Impenfinbility of all things. The Other, That  
it was Something Most Perfect, and  

( b 2 ) therefore
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therefore Consciously Intellectual. The
Asters of this latter opinion, Theists,
in a Strict and Proper Sense: of the For-
er, Atheists. So that the Idea of God
in General is a Perfect Consciously
Understanding Being, (or Mind,) Self-
Existent from Eternity, and the Cause
of all other things. Page 194, 195.

V. Observeable, That the Atheists, who
deny a God according to the True Idea of
him, do Notwithstanding often Abuse the
Word, calling Sentient Matter by that
name; they meaning Nothing else thereby
but only a First Principle, or Self-Exi-
fent Unmade thing: according to which
Notion of the Word God, there can be no
such thing at all as an Atheist, no man
being able to persuade himself, That all
things sprung from Nothing. 195

VI. In order to a more Punctual De-
claration of this Divine Idea, the Opinion
of those taken notice of who suppose Two
Self-Existent Unmade Principles; God
and Matter: according to which, God
not the Principle of all things, nor the
Sole Principle, but only the Chief. 196,
197.

VII. These Materialians, Imperfect
and Mistaken Theists. Not Atheists, be-
cause they suppose the World Made and
Governed by an Animalish, Sentient and
Understanding Nature; whereas no A-
theists acknowledge Consciously Animality
to be a First Principle, but conclude it to
be all Generate and Corruptible: Nor
yet Genuine Theists, because they ac-
knowledge not Omnipotence in the full
Extent thereof. A Latitude therefore in
Theism; and none to be condemned for
Abolute Atheists, but such as deny an
Eternal Unmade Mind the Frame and
Governor of the whole World. 198, 199.

VIII. An Absolutely Perfect Being,
the most Compendious Idea of God:
Which Includeth in it, not only, Necessa-
ry Existence, and Conscious Intellectual-
ity, but also Omni-Cautality, Omnipo-
tence, or Infinite Power. Wherefore God
the Sole Principle of all things, and Cause
of Matter. The True Notion of Infinite
Power, to be included in the Idea of
God. 200, 201.

IX. That Absolute Perfection implies
yet something more than Knowledge and
Power. A Vaticination in men's Minds,
of a Higher Good than either. That, ac-
cording to Aristotle, God is better than
Knowledge: and both Morality in his
Nature, wherein also his Chief Happine-
s confiseth. This borrow'd from Plato, to
whom the Highest Perfection, and Su-
preme Deity, is Goodness it self Sub-
stantial, above Knowledge and Intellect.
Agreeably with which, the Scripture makes
God, and the Supreme Good, Love.
This not to be understood of a Soft, Fond,
and Partial Love; God being rightly
called also, an Impartial Law, and the
Measure of all things. Atheists also sup-
pose Goodness to be included in the Idea
of that God whose Existence they deny.
This Idea here more largely declared.
202, 203, &c.

X. That this aforementioned Idea of
God, Essentially Includeth Unity, One-
linefs, or Solitariness in it; since there
cannot possibly be more than One Abso-
lutely Supreme, One Cause of All things,
One Omnipotent, and One Infinitely
Perfect. Epicurus and his Followers
professedly denied a God according to
this Notion of him. 207

XI. The Grand Objection against the
Idea of God, as thus Essentially Includ-
ing Onelines and Singularity in it, from
the Polytheism of all Nations for-
merly, (the Jews excepted) and of all
the Wiseft men, and Philosophers. From
whence it is Inferred, that this Idea of
God, is not Natural, but Artificial, and
exes its Original, to Laws and Arbitrary
Institutions only. An Enquiry therefore
here to be made concerning the True
Sense of the Pagan Polytheism: the Ob-
jeéors, strictly taking it for granted, that
the Pagan Polytheists universally afferted
Many, Unmade, Self-Existent, Intelle-
cual Beings, and Independent Deities,
as so many Partial Causes of the World.
208, 209.

XII. The Irrationality of which Opini-
on, and its manifest Repugnancy to the
Pheno-
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Phenomena, render it less probable to have been the Belief of all the Pagan Polytheists. 

XIII. That the Pagan Deities were not all of them Univerfally look'd upon as so many Unmade, Self-Exiftent Beings, Unquestionably Evident from hence; Because they Generally held a Theogonia, or Generation of Gods. This Point of the Pagan Theology insifted upon by Herodotus, the most ancient Profeffed Greek Writer. In whom the meaning of that Question, Whether the Gods were Generated, or Exifted all from Eternity, seems to have been the same with this of Plato's, Whether the World were Made or Unmade. 

Certain also, that amongst the Hefiodian Gods, there was either but One Self-Exiftent, or else None at all. Hefiod's Love supposed to be the Eternal God, or the Active Principle of the Universe. 

That the Valentinian Thirty Gods or Eons (having the greatest appearance of Independent Deities) were all derived from One Self-Originated Being, called Bythus, or an Unfathomable Depth. 

That, besides the Manicheans, some Pagans did indeed acknowledge a Ditheism, or Duplicity of Unmade Gods, One the Principle of Good, the Other of Evil. (Which the nearest Approach, that can be found, to the suppos'd Polytheism.) Plutarchus Charonensis, One or the Chief of these, though not so commonly taken notice of by Learned men. His Reasons for this Opinion Proposed. 

Plutarch's Pretence, That this was the General Perfection of all the Ancient Philosophers and Pagan Nations. His Grounds, for Imputing it to Plato, Examined and Confuted. 

The True Account of the Platonick Origin of Evils, from the NECesfity of Imperfect things.

Pythagoras, and other Philosophers, Purged likewise from this Imputation. That the Egyptians probably did but Perfonate Evil, (the Confusion, and Al ternate Viciffitude of things in this Lower World,) by Typhon. The only Question concerning the Armilianus of the Peri an Magi. This, Whether a Self-Exiftent Principle, or no, Disputed. 

Plutarch and Atticus, the only Profeffed Aftemers of this Doctrine among the Greek Philosophers; (besides Numenius in Chalcidicus,) Who therefore probably, the Persons Confused for it by Athanatus. 

Arifotle's Explosion and Confutation of tovdai, z€, Many Principles. That a better Judgment may be made of the Pagan Deities, a General Survey of them. They all Reduced to Five Heads; The Souls of men Deceased or Hero's, The Animated Stars and Elements, Demons, Accidents and Things of Nature Perfonated, And lastly, several Personial Names, given to One Supreme God, according to the ferveral Manifestations of his Power and Providence in the World; mistaken, for so many Substantial Deities, or Self-exiftent Minds. 

Pagans acknowleding Omnipotence, must needs suppose One Sovereign Numen. Faustus the Manichean his Conceit, that the Jews and Christians Paganized, in the Opinion of Monarchy. With S. Austin's Judgment of the Pagans thereupon. 

XIV. Concluded, That the Pagan Polytheism, must be understood of Created Intellectual Beings, Superiour to men, Religioufly Worshipp'd. So that the Pagans held, both Many Gods, and One God, in different Senfes; Many Inferior Deities, subordinate to One Supreme, Thus Onatus the Pythagorean and Stobæus. The Pagans Creed, in Maximus Tyrius; One God the King and Father of all, and Many Gods the Sons of God. The Pagan Theogonia, thus to be understood, of Many Gods Produced by One God. 

This Pagan Theogonia, Really one and the same thing with the Cosmogonia. Plato's Cosmogonia a Theogonia. 

Hesiod's Theogonia, the Cosmogonia. 

The Persians and Egyptians in like manner,
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manner, holding a Cosmogonia, called it a Theogonia. Page 239
This Pagan Theogonia, how by some mistaken, ibid.
Both this Theogonia, and Cosmogonia of the Ancient Pagans, to be understood of a Temporary Production. ibid.
That Plato really affected the Newness or Beginning of the World. 240, 241
Amongst the Pagans, Two sorts of Theogonists, Atheiftick and Divine. Plato a Divine Theogonist. 242, 243
Other Pagan Theogonists, Theifts, or afferters of One Unmade Deity. 244, 245, &c.
These Divine Theogonists also, made Chaos and Night senior to the Gods; that is, to the Generated ones. 248
The Orphick Cabala of the Worlds Production, from Chaos (or Night) and Love, Originally Moifical. 249
These notwithstanding acknowledged all their Eternal Gods save One, to be εἷς, that is, to have been Derived from that One; and that there was in this sense, but εἷς ὕπολογον, One only Unmade, or Self-existent God. 253, 254
Necessary here to shew, how the Pagans did put a difference, betwixt the One Supreme Unmade Deity, and their other Many Infeifer Generated Gods. 255
This done, both by Proper Names, and Appellatives emphatically used, 256, &c.
Οἶς or Gods, often put for Infeifer Gods only, in way of distinction from the Supreme. 261
Τό Θεόν, and Τό Δυσμοον also, the Supreme Deity. 263
Other Full and Emphatical Descriptions of the Supreme God, amongst the Pagans. 264, 265
XV. Further Evidence of this, that the Intelligent Pagan Polytheists, held only a Plurality of Infeifer Deities subordinate to One Supreme. First, because after the Emanation of Chrifftianity and its contref with Paganism, no Pagan ever afferted Many Independent Deities, but all profefled to acknowledge One Sovereign or Supreme. Page 265
Apollonius Tyanaeus, set up amongst the Pagans for a Rival with our Saviour Christ. 266, &c.
He, though style’d by Vopifcus a true Friend of the Gods, and though a stout Champion for the Pagan Polytheism, yet a profefled affertor of One Supreme Deity. 269, 270
Celsus the First publick Writer against Chrifftianity, and a zealous Polytheift; notwithstanding freely declareth for One First and Greatest Omnipotent God. ib.
The next and moft Eminent Champion for the Pagan Caufe, Porphyrius, an unquestionable affertor of One Supreme Deity. Who in Proclus not only oppofeth that Evil Principle of Plutarch and Atticus, but also contendeth, that even Matter itfelf was derived from One Perfect Being. 271
Hierocles the next Eminent Antagonift of Chrifftianity, and Champion for the Pagan Gods, did in the clofe of his Philofoths, (as we learn from Laftantius) highly Celebrate the Priiìes of the One Supreme God, the Parent of all things. 271, &c.
Julian the Emperor, a zealous contender for the Restitution of Paganism, plainly derived all his Gods from One. 274, 275
This true of all the other Oppofers of Chrifftianity, as Iamblichus, Syrius, Proclus, Simplicius, &c. Maximus Madaurenfs a Pagan Philosopher in S. Auftine, his profeflion of One Sovereign Numen above all the Gods. The fame also the fens of Longinianus. 275, 276
The Pagans in Arnobius universally disfain the Opinion of Many Unmade Deities, and profef the Belief of an Omnipotent God. 276, 277
These Pagans acknowledged by others of the Fathers also, to have held One Sovereign Numen. 279, &c.
But of this more afterwards, when we speak of the Arians.

XVI. That
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XVI. That this was no Refinement or Interpolation of Paganism, made after Christianity (as might be suspected) but that the Doctrine of the most Ancient Pagan Theologers, and greatest Promoters of Polytheism, was confonant hereunto: which will be proved from unfaithful Writings. Page 281

Concerning the Sibylline Oracles, Two Extremes. 282, 8c.

That Zaraoalter the Chief Promoter of Polytheism in the East, professed the acknowledgment of One Sovereign Deity, (and that not the Sun neither, but the maker thereof) proved from Eubulus in Porphyry. 285, 286

Zoroalters Supreme God Ormofades. 287

Of the Triplasian Mithras. 288

The Magick, or Chaldaick Trinity. 289

The Zaraostrion Trinity, Ormofades, Mithras and Arimanes. Thus the Persian Arimanes, no Substantial Evil Principle, or Independent God. 290

Concerning the Repeated Magick or Chaldaick Oracles. 292, 293

XVII. That Orpheus, Commonly called by the Greeks, The Theologer, and the Father of the Greanick Polytheism, clearly asserted One Supreme Numin. The History of Orpheus, not a meer Romance. 294, 295

Whether Orpheus were the Father of the Poems called Orphical. 296, 297

Orpheus his Polytheism. 298

That Orpheus notwithstanding, asserted a Divine Monarchy; Proved from Orphick Verses, Recorded by Pagans. There being other Orphick Verses, Counterfeit. 300, 301

In what Sense Orpheus and other Mystical Theologers amongst the Pagans, called God *Apollo, Hermaphrodite, or of both Sexes, Male and Female together. 304

Orpheus his Recantation of his Polytheism a Fable; He at the same time acknowledging, both One Unmade God, and Many Generated Gods and Goddefses. 305

That besides the Opinion of Monarchy, a Trinity of Divine Hypostases subordinate, was also another Part of the Orphick Caballa. Orpheus his Trinity, Phanes, Uranus, and Chronus. Page 306

The Grand Arcanum of the Orphick Theology, that God is All things, but in a different sense from the Stoicks. 306, 307

God's being All, made a Foundation of Pagan Polytheism and Idolatry. 308

XVIII. That the Egyptians themselves, the most Polytheistical of all Nations, had an Acknowledgement amongst them of One Supreme Deity. The Egyptians the First Polytheists. That the Greeks and Europeans derived their Gods from them, and as Herodotus affirmeth, their very Names too. A Conjecture that 'Astra of the Greeks was Na, or Naia, the Tutchar God of the City Sais a Colony whereof the Athenians are said to have been. And that Neptune the Roman Sea-god, was derived from the Egyptian Nephthys, signifying the Mortal parts. Of the Egyptians worshipping Brute Animals. 309, 310

Notwithstanding this multiform Polylethism and Idolatry of the Egyptians, that they had an Acknowledgement of One Supreme God, probable First, from that great Name which they had for their Wife-dom. Egypt a School of Literature before Greece. 311

The Egyptians, though Attributing more Antiquity to the World than they ought, yet of all Nations the most constant Affeters of the Cosmogonia or Novity and Beginning of the World: Nor did they think the World to have been made by Chance, as the Epicureans; Simpliusics calling the Molaikey History of the Creation, an Egyptian Fable. 312, 313

That besides the Pure and Mixt Mathematicks, the Egyptians had another Higher Philosophy, appears from hence; because they were the first Affeters of the Immortality and Transmigration of Souls, which Pythagoras from them derived into Greece. Certain therefore, that the Egyptians held Incorporeal Substance. 313, 314

That the Egyptians besides their Vulgar
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gar and Fabulous, had another Arcane and Recondite Theology. Their Sphinxes, and Harpocrates, or Sigalions, in their Temples. Page 314, 315

This Arcane Theology of the Egyptians, concealed from the Vulgar two manner of ways, by Allegories and Hieroglyphicks. This doubtless is a kind of Metaphyficks concerning God, as One Perfect Being the Original of all things. 316

An Objection from Chereomon, (cited by Porphyrius, in an Epifile to Anebo an Egyptian Priest,) fully answered by Iamblichus in the Person of Abammo, in his Egyptian Mysteries. 317, 318

That Monarchy was an Essential Part of the Arcane and True Theology of the Egyptians, may be proved from the Trimegistick Writings; though not all Genuine; (as the Pandemon, and Sermon in the Mount concerning Regeneration) Because though they had been all Forged by Christians never so much, yet being divulged in those Ancient times, they must needs have something of Truth in them; this at least, That the Egyptians acknowledged One Supreme Deity, or otherwise they would have been presently Exploded. 319, 320

That Cafaubon, from the Detection of Forgery in two or three at most of those Trimegistick Books, does not Reasonably infer them to have been all Christian Cheats: those also not Excepted, that have been cited by Ancient Fathers, but since left. 320, 321

That there was one Theuth or Thoth, (called by the Greeks Hermes) an Inven- tor of Letters and Sciences among the Ancient Egyptians, not reasonably to be doubted. Besides whom, there is said to have been a Second Hermes, famed Trimegist, who left many Volumes of Philosophy and Theology behind him, that were committed to the Custody of the Priests. 321, &c.

Other Books also written by Egyptian Priests, in several Ages successively, called Hermaical, (as Iamblichus informs us) because Entitled (Pro more) to Hermes, as the President of Learning. 322

That some of those old Hermaick Books remained in the Custody of the Egyptian Priests, till the times of Clemens Alexandrinus. Page 323

Hermaick Books taken notice of formerly, not only by Christians, but also by Pagans and Philosophers. Iamblichus the Testimony of them, that they did Really contain Hermaical Opinions, or Egyptian Learning. Fifteen of these Hermaick Books published together at Athens before S. Cyril’s time. 324, 325

All the Philosophy of the Present Hermaick Books not nearly Greecanick, as Cafaubon affirmeth. That Nothing perieth; old Egyptian Philosophy, derived by Pythagoras, together with the Transmigration of Souls, into Greece. 326, 327

The Afclepian Dialogue, of or Perfect Oration, (said to have been translated into Latin by Apuleius) vindicated from being a Christian Forgery. 328

An answer to two Objections made against it; the latter whereof from a Prophecy taken notice of by S. Aulfyn; That the Temples of the Egyptian Gods, should shortly be full of the Sepulchres of dead men. ibid.

Petravius his further Suspcion of Forgery, because as Laftantius and S. Aulfyn have affirmed, the Christian Logos is herein called a Second God, and the First begotten Son of God. The Answer, that Laftantius and S. Aulfyn were clearly Miftaken, this being there affirmed only of the Visible and Sensible World. 329, 330

That besides the Afclepian Dialogue, others of the present Trimegistick Books, contain Egyptian Doctrine. Nor can they be all proved to be Spurious and Counterfeit. This the rather insifted on, for the Vindication of the Ancient Fathers. 331, 332

Proved that the Egyptians, besides their Many Gods acknowledged One First Supreme, and Universal Deity, from the Testimonies of Plutarch, Horus Apollo, Iamblichus, (affirming that Hermes derived all things, even Matter itself, from One Divine Principle) lastly of Damaclus.
Damascius declaring that the Egyptian Philosophers at that time, had found in the Writings of the Ancients, That they held One Principle of all things, Praised under the name of the Unknown Darkness.

Page 334, &c. The same thing Proved from their Vulgar Religion and Theology; Hammon being a proper Name for the Supreme God amongst them; and therefore Styled the Egyptian Jupiter. 337

Though this word Hammon were probably at first the same with Ham or Cham the Son of Noah, yet will not this binder, but that it might be used afterwards by the Egyptians for the Supreme God. 338

The Egyptian God Hammon, neither confined by them to the Sun, nor to the Corporeal World, but according to the Notation of the word in the Egyptian Language, a Hidden and Invisible Deity. This further confirmed from the Testimony of Tammelchus. 339

This Egyptian Hammon more than once taken notice of in Scripture. 339, 340

That the Egyptians acknowledged one Universal Numen, further proved from that Famous Inscription upon the Saitick Temple, I Am all that Was, Is, and Shall be, and my Veil no Mortal hath ever yet Uncovered. That this cannot be Understood of Senefles Matter, nor of the Corporeal Univerfe, but of a Divine Mind or Wisdom dissifing it self through all. The Peplum or Veil cast over the Statue, as well of the Saitick as Athenian Minerva; Hieroglyphically signifying the Invisibility and Incomprehensibility of the Deity which is Veiled in its works. From what Proclus addeth to this Inscription beyond Plutarch, And the Sun was the Fruit which I produced; Evident, that this was a Demiurgic Deity, the Creaor of the Sun and of the World. 341, 342

How that passage of Hecataeus in Plutarch is to be Understood, That the Egyptians supposed the First God, and the Universe, to be the same, viz. Because the Supreme Deity dissifeth it self thorough all things. To give a Name of God also amongst the Greek Philosophers. 343

That Pan to the Arcadians and other Vulgar Greeks, was not the Corporeal World, as Senefles and Inanimate, but as proceeding from an Intellectual Principle dissifing it self through all; from Macrobius and Phornutus. Socrates his Prayer to Pan, as the Supreme God, in Plato’s Phædus. Page 343, 344

Our Saviofr Christ called the Great Pan by Demons. 345

How the old Egyptian Theology, That God is All things, is every where insifted upon in the Tilmegistick Writings. 346, 347

That the Supreme God was sometimes worshipped by the Egyptians under other Proper Personal Names, as Isis, Osiris, and Serapis, &c. 349, &c.

Recorded in Eusebius, from Porphyrius, that the Egyptians acknowledged one Intellectual Demiurgus, or Maker of the World, under the name of Cneph, whom they pictured, putting forth an Egg out of his Mouth. This Cneph said to have produced another God, whom the Egyptians called Phtha, the Greeks, Vulcan; the Soul of the World, and Artificial Platfick Nature. The Testimony of Plutarch, That the Thebaites worshippd only One Eternal and Immortal God under this name of Cneph. 412

Thus, according to Apuleius, the Egyptians worshipped One and the same Supreme God under many different Names and Notions.

Ibid. Probable, that the Egyptians distinguished Hypoatases in the Deity also. Kircherus his Egyptian Hieroglyphick of the Trinity. An Intimation in Talmichus of an Egyptian Trinity, Eitton, Emeph, or Hempha, (which is the same with Cneph,) and Phtha. 413

The Doctrines of God’s being All, made by the Egyptians a Foundation of Polytheism and Idolatry, they being led hereby to Personate and Deify the several Parts of the World, and Things of Nature; which in the Language of the Aeschelin Dialogue, is, To call God by the name of every thing, or every thing by the name of God, the wife amongst them nevertheless understanding, that all (c)
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The Consent of Latine Poets also, in the Monarchy of the whole. Page 365
XX. After the Poets of the Pagans, their Philosophers considered. That Epicuris was the onely reputed Philosopher, who pretending to acknowledge Gods, yet professedly opposed Monarchy, and verbally asserted a Multitude of External Unmade Deities, but such as had Nothing to do, either with the Making or Governing of the World. He therefore clearly to be reckoned amongst the Atheists. All the Pagan Philosophers who were Thiefs, (a few Ditheists excepted) Universally asserted a Mundane Monarchy.

369, 370.

Pythagoras, a Polytheist as much as the other Pagans, nevertheless a plain Acknowledger of one One Supreme God, the Maker of the Universe.

371

Pythagoras his Dyad, no Evil God or Demon Self-existent, as Plutarch supposed.

372

But this Dyad of his, whether Matter or no, derived from a Monad, One Simple Unity, the Cause of all things.

372

That Pythagoras, acknowledging a Trinity of Divine Hypotheses, did therefore sometimes describe God as a Monad, sometimes as a Mind, and sometimes as the Soul of the World.

373

The Pythagorical Monad and First God, the same with the Orphick Love, Senior of Japhet and Saturn, and the Oldest of all the Gods, a Substantial thing. But that Love which Plato would have to be the Youngest of the Gods, (the Daughter of Peria, or Indigency, and a Parturient thing,) Nothing but a Creaturely affection in Souls, Perfonated and Deified. Parmenides his Love, the First Created God, or Lower Soul of the World, before whose Production, Neceffity is said to have reigned; that is, the Necessity of Material Motions undirected for Ends, and Good.

374, 375.

That Pythagoras called the Supreme Deity, not only a Monad, but a Tetrad or Tetractys also. The Reasons for this given, from the Mysteries in the Number Four,

was but one Simple Deity, worshipped by Piece-Meale. This Allegorically magnified by Ofiris his being dismembered and cut in pieces by Typhon, and then made up One again by Isis. Page 354, 355

XIX. That the Poets many ways deprauid the Pagan Theology, and made it to have a more Aristocratical Appearance.

355, &c.

Notwithstanding which, they did not really affect Many Self-Existent and Independent Gods, but One onely Unmade; and all the rest Generated or Created. Homer's Gods not all Eternal and Unmade, but Generated out of the Ocean; that is, a Watry Chaos. Homer's Theogonia, as well as Hefiod's, the Cofinogonia; and his Generation of Gods, the same thing with the Production or Creation of the World. 357, 358

Nevertheless, Homer distinguished, from all those Generated Gods, One Unmade God, the Father, or Creator, of them, and of the World.

359

Homer thus understood by the Pagans themselves; as Plutarch, Proclus, and Arifotole.

359, 360

Though Hefiod's Gods, properly so called, were all of them Generated, yet did He suppose also One Unmade God, the Maker of them, and of the World.

360, 361

Pindar likewise, a Divine Theogonist; an Afferter of One Unmade Deity (and no more) the Cause of all things; yet nevertheless of Many Generated Gods besides His One God to be worshipped far above all the other Gods.

361, 362

The Supposition which Arifotole sometime had of Hefiod, and Plato of Homer, seems to have proceeded from their not Understanding that Mofaick Cabbala, followed by them both, of the World's being Made out of a Watery Chaos.

362

That famous Passage of Sophocles, concerning One God the Maker of Heaven, Earth, and Seas, (cited by so many Ancient Fathers) defended as genuine.

363

Clear places in the extant Tragedies of Euripides to the same purpose; with other remarkable ones cited out of his now inextant Tragedies: Besides the Testimonies of other Greek Poets.

363, &c.
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Four, tripling. More probability of a late 
Conjecture, that the Pythagorian Tetra-
myths, was the Hebrew Tetragrammaton,
not altogether unknown to the Hetrurian
ans and Latins. Page 375, 376

Xenophanes a plain Afterer both of 
Many Gods, and of One God, called by
him, One and All. Simplicius his clear 
Testimony for this Theosophy of Xenon-
phanes, out of Theophratus. Xenophan-
es misrepresented by Aristotle, as an Af-
ferer of a Spherical Corporeal God. 
377, 378

Heraclitus, though a Cloudy and Con-
founded Philosopher, and one who could 
not conceive of any thing Incorporeal, yet 
both a hearty Moralist, and a zealous Af-
ferer of One Supreme Deity. 378, 379

The Ioniack Philosophers before Ana-
zagoras, being all of them Corporealists, 
and some of them Atheists; that Ana-
zagoras was the First who asserted an Incor-
poral Mind to be a Principle, and though 
not the Cause of Matter, yet of Motion, 
and of the Regularity of things. The 
World, according to him, not Eternal, but 
Made, and out of Pre-Existent Similar 
Atoms, and that not by Chance, but by 
Mind or God. This Mind of his, purely 
Incorporeal, as appareth from his own 
words, cited by Simplicius. 380

Probable, that Anzagoras admitted 
none of the Inferior Pagan Gods. He 
Condemned by the Vulgar for an Atheist, 
came be Ungodded the Stars, denying 
their Animation, and affirming the Sun 
to be but a Maf of Fire, and the Moon 
an Earth. This disliked also by Plato, as 
that which in those times would dispo-
se men to Atheism. 381

Anzagoras further Confuirèd, both by 
Plato and Aristotle, because though af-
serting Mind to be a Principle, he made 
much more use of Material than of Men-
tal and Final Causes, which was looked 
upon by them as an Atheistick Tang in 
him. Nevertheless Anzagoras a better 
Theist than those Christian Philosophers 
of later times, who quite banish all Mental 
Cauality from the World. 382, 383

XXI. Parmenides his acknowledgment 
of One God the Cause of Gods. Which 
Supreme Deity, by Parmenides styled, 
One-All-Immoveable. That this is not to 
be taken Physically, but Metaphysically 
and Theologically; proved at large. 
The First Principle of all, to these Anci-
ents, One, a Simple Unity or Monad. 
This said to be All, because virtually Con-
taining All, and Distributed into All; 
or because All things are distinctly dis-
played from it. Lastly, the same said to 
be Immutable, and Indivisible, and with-
out Magnitude, to distinguish it from the 
Corporeal Universe. Page 383, &c.

"Ev το μέαρχον Μίαν ἄλλον, τό μείζον, 
One All, taken in different 
Senses; by Parmenides and Xenon-
phanes, &c. Divinely, for the Supreme De-
ity, (One most Simple Being the Origin-
al of all things;) but by others in Ar-
istotle, Atheistically, as if all things were 
but One and the same Matter diversly 
Modified. But the One-All of these Lat-
ter, not Immovable, but Moveable; it 
being nothing else but Body; whereas the 
One-All-Immoveable, is an Incorporeal 
Deity. This does Aristotle, in his Meta-
physicks, close with, as good Divinity, 
That there is one Incorporeal Immov-
able Principle of all things. Simplicius 
his Observation, That though divers Phi-
losophers maintained a Plurality or In-
finity of Moveable Principles, yet none 
ever afforted more than One Immov-
able. 385, 386

Parmenides in Plato distinguishes 
three Divine Hypotheses, The First 
whereof called by him, "Ev το μέαρχον, One-
All; the Second, "Ev το μέαρχον, One All 
things; and the Third, "Ev το μέαρχον το 
μείζον, One and All things. 386, &c.

But that Parmenides by his One-All-
Immoveable really understood the Su-
preme Deity, yet further unquestionably 
evident from the Verses cited out of him 
by Simplicius; Wherein there is also at-
tributed thereunto a Standing Eternity, 
or Duration, different from that of 
Time. 388

The only Difference between Parme-
 nidies and Meliuss, that the Former cal-
led his, One-All-Immoveable. Finite; 
the Latter, Infinite; this in Words ra-
ther than Reality: The Disagreeing A-
reement
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greement of these two Philosophers fully declared by Simplicius. Melissus his Language more agreeable with our present Theology. Though Anaximander's Infinite were nothing but Senelis Matter, yet Melissus his Infinite was the True Deity. Page 389

That Zeno Eleates, by his One-All-Immoveable, meant not the Corporal World neither, no more than Melissus, Parmenides, and Xenophanes; but the Deity; evident from Aristotle. Zeno's Demonstration of One God, from the Idea of a most Powerfull and Perfect Being, in the same Aristotle. 390

Empedocles his First Principle of All things, Το Είς, or a Unity likewise, besides which he supposed Contention and Friendship to be the Principles of all Created Beings; not only Plants, Brutes, and Men, but Gods also. 391, &c.

Empedocles his Original of all the Evil both of Humane Soul and Demons, from this Ναύζες, Discord and Contention, together with the Ill use of their Liberty. 393

XXII. The Doctrine of divers other Pythagoreans also the same; as Philolaus, Archytas, Ocellus, Arifteus, &c. Timaeus Locus his God the Creator of Gods. Onatus his Many Gods, and his One God, the Corypheus of the Gods. Euclides Megarensis his One the Very Good. Antifithenes his Many Popular Gods, but One Natural God. Diogenes Sinopenus his God that Fillet all things. 393, &c.

XXIII. That Socrates asserted One Supreme God undeniable from Xenophon. 398, 399

But that he disclaimed all the other Inferior Gods of the Pagans, and died, as a Martyr, for One only God, in this Sense, a Vulgar Error. 400

What the Impiety imputed to him by his Adversaries, appeareth from Plato's Euthyphro, viz. That he freely and openly Condemned those Fables of the Gods wherein Wicked and Unjust Actions were imputed to them. 401

That Plato really asserted One only God and no more, a Vulgar Error like-

wife 5 and that Thirteenth Epistle to Dionysius, wherein he declared himself, to be Seriously only when he began his Epistles with God, and not with Gods, (though exsiant in Eusebius his time,) Spurious and Supposititious. He worshipping the Sun and other Stars also (supposed to be animated) as Inferior Gods. Page 402

Nevertheless, Undeniably evident, that Plato was no Polyarchist, but a Monarchist, no Afferter of Many Independent Gods, or Principles, but of One Original of all things; One First God, One Greatest God, One Maker of the World and of the Gods. 403, 404

In what Sense the Supreme God, to Plato, the Caufc and Producer of Himself; (out of Plotinus) and this notion not onely entertained by Seneca and Plotinus, but also by Laëntianus, That Plato really asserted a Trinity of Universal Divine Hypothesfs, that have the Nature of Principles. The First Hypothesis in Plato's Trinity properly Ἀριστεύς, The Original Deity, the Caufe and King of all things: which also said by him to be Ἐπίκενα ἡ Ἑκάς, or Ἑγεμόνις, Above Effence. 407

Xenophon, though with other Pagans, he acknowledged a Plurality of Gods, yet a plain Afferter also of One Supreme and Universal Numin. 408

XXIV. Aifolute a frequent Acknowledger of Many Gods. And whether he believed any Demons or no, which he sometimes mentions (though sparingly) and insinuates them to be a kind of Aerial Animals, more Immortal than Men; yet did he unquestionably look upon the Stars, or their Intelligences, as Gods. 408, &c.

Notwithstanding which, Aristotle doth not onely often speak of God Singularly, and of the Divinity Emphatically, but also professedly opposes that Imaginary Opinion of Many Independent Principles, or Unmade Deities. He confuting the fame from the Phenomena or the Compaiges of the World, which is not knowned, but all Uniform, and agreeably Conspiring in to one Harmony. 410, 411

Aristotle's Supreme Deity, the First Immo-
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Immoveable Mover. The difference here between Plato, and Aristotle; Plato's Original of Motion, a Self-moving Soul, Aristotle's an Immoveable Mind. But this Difference not so great as at first sight it seems; because Aristotle's Immoveable Mind, doth not Move the Heavens Efficiently, but only Finally, or As being Loved. Besides which, he must needs suppose, another immediate Mover, which could be nothing, but a Soul of them. Page 412

Aristotle's Immoveable Mind, not only the Cause of Motion, but also of Well and Fit; all the Order, Pulchritude and Harmony, that is in the world Called therefore by Aristotle, the Separate Good thereof. This together with Nature, (its Subordinate Instrument) the Efficient Cause of the whole Mundane System: which however Co-eternal with it, yet is, in Order of Nature, Junior to it. 413, 414

Aristotle and other Ancients, when they affirm Mind to have been the Cause of all things, Understood it thus, That all things were made by an Absolute Wifedom, and after the Best Manner. The Divine Will according to them, not a mere Arbitrary, Humorifome, and Fortuitous thing, but Decency and Finess it self.

From this passage of Aristotle's, That the Divinity is either God, or the Work of God; Evident, that he supposed All the Gods, to have been derived from One, and therefore his Intelligences of the Spheres.

That according to Aristotle, this Speculation of the Deity, constitutes a Particular Science by it self, differing from Phylogeny and Geography: the Former whereof (Phylogeny) is Concernant about what was Incorporeal and Movable, the Second (Geometry) about things Immovable, but not Really Separable, but the Third and Last (which is Theology) about that which is both Immovable and Separable, an Incorporeal Deity.

Four Chief Points of Aristotle's Theology or Metaphysics, concerning God; First, that though all things are not External and Unmade, yet something must needs be such, as likewise Incorruptible, or otherwise all might come to Nothing. Secondly, that God is an Incorporeal Substancce, separate from Sensibles, Indivisible and devoid of Parts and Magnitude. Thirdly, that the Divine Intellectual, is the same with its Intelligibles, or containeth them all within it self; because the Divine Mind, being Senior to all things, and Architectonical of the World, could not then look abroad for its Subjects without it self. The contrary to which supposed by Atheists. Lastly, that God being an Immoveable Substancce; his Act and Energy is his Essenss; from whence Aristotle would infer the Eternity of the World. Page 416, 417

Aristotle's Creed and Religion contained in these Two Articles, first That there is a Divinity which comprehends the whole Nature, or Universe. And Secondly, that besides this, There are other Particular Inferiour Gods; But that all other things, in the Religion of the Pagans, were Fabulously superadded heretofore for Political Ends. 417

Speulippus, Xenocrates and Theophrastus, Monarchists. 418

XXV. The Stoicks no better Metaphysicians than Heraclitus, in whose footsteps they trode, admitting of no Incorporeal Substancce. The Qualities of the Mind also, to these Stoicks, Bodies. 419, 420

But the Stoicks, not therefore Atheists; they supposing an Eternal Unmade Mind, (though lodged in Matter) the Maker of the whole Mundane System. 420

The Stoical Argumentations for a God not Inconsiderable, and what they were. 421, 422

The Stoical God, not a mere Plastick and Methodical, but an Intellectual Fire. The World according to them, not a Plant, but Animal; and Jupiter the Soul thereof. From the supposed Oneines of which Jupiter, they would sometimes inferre, the Singularity of the World: (Plutarch on the Contrary affirminng, that though there were Fifty, or (e 3)
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an Hundred Worlds, yet would there be for all that, but one Zeus or Jupiter.) 423

Nevertheless the Stoicks as Polytheistical as any sect. But so, as that they sup-

posed all their Gods save One, to be not Onely Native, but also Mortal; made out of that One, and resolved into that One again: these Gods, being all Melted into Jupiter, in the Conflagration. 424, 425

Wherefore during the Intervals of Successive Worlds, the Stoicks acknowledged but one Solitary Deity, and no more; Jupiter being then left all alone, and the other Gods Swallowed up into him. Who therefore not only, the Creator of all the other Gods, but also the Decreator of them. 425, 426

The Stoicks notwithstanding this, Religious Worshippers of their Many Gods; and thereby sometime derogated from the Honour of the Supreme, by shewing his Sovereignty amongst them. 426, 427

Nevertheless, the Supreme God, praised and extolled by them far above all the other Gods; and acknowledged to be the Sole Maker of the World. 427, &c.

Their Professing Subjection to his Laws as their greatest Liberty. 430

And to submit their Will to his Will in every thing, so as to know no other Will, but the Will of Jupiter. ibid. Their Pretending to Look to God, and to do nothing without a Reference to him; as also to Trust in him and Re-

ly upon him. 431 Their Praising him as the Author of all Good.

ibid. Their Addressing their Devotions to him Alone, without the conjunction of any other God; and particularly imploiring his Assistance against Temptations. 432

Cleanthes his Excellent and Devout Hymn, to the Supreme God. 433

XXVI. Cicero, though afflicting to write in the way of the New Academy, yet no Sceptick as to Theism. Nor was he an Afferter of many Independent Deities. Cicero's Gods (the Makers of the World) the same with Plato's Eternal Gods, or Trinity of Divine Hypotheses Subordinate. This Language, the Pagans in S. Cyril, would justify, from that of the Scripture, Let us make Man. Page 434, 435, &c.

Varro's Threefold Theology, The Fabulous, the Natural, and the Civil or Popular; agreeably to Scævola the Pontifex, his Three Sorts of Gods, Poetical, Philosophical, and Political. The Former condemned by him as False, the Second, though True, said to be above the Capacity of the Vulgar: and therefore a Necessity, of a Third or Middle betwixt both; because many things True in Religion, not fit for the Vulgar to know.

Varro's Supreme Numen, the great Soul or Mind of the whole World: his Infallible Gods, Parts of the World Animated. Image-Worship Condemned by him, as disagreeable to the Natural Theology. 438, 439

Seneca a Pagan Polytheist, but plain afferter of One Supreme Numen, excellently described by him. That in his Book of Superstition (now lost) he did as freely Confuse the Civil Theology of the Romans, as Varro had done the Fabulous or Theatrical. 440

Quintilian, Pliny, Apuleius, their clear acknowledgments of One Sovereign Universal Deity. Symmachus, (a great stickler for Paganism) his Aversion. That it was One and the Same thing, which was Worshipped in all Religions, though in different ways. 440, 441

The Writer De Mundo, though not A-
fotle, yet a Pagan. His Cause that contained All things, and God from whom all things are. Which Passage being left out in Apuleius his Latin Version, gives occasion of suspicion, that he was infected with Plutarch's Ditheism, or at least held Matter to be Unmade. 442

Plutarch a Priest of Apollo, however unluckily engaged in those Two False Opinions, of an Evil Principle, and Matter Unmade, yet a Maintainer of One Sole Principle of all Good. 443

Dio Chrysostomus a Sophist, his clear Testimony, ἐναπλάθεια τὸ θεόν, That the whole World was under a Kingly Government or Monarchy. ibid.

Calen's
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Galen's True Hymn to the praise of him that made us, in his Book De ufu Partium.

Page 444

Maximus Tyrius his short Account of his own Religion; One Supreme God, the Monarch of the whole World, and Three Subordinate Ranks of Inferior Gods, the Sons and Friends of God, and his Ministers in the Government of the World.

Page 444, 445

A most full and Excellent Description of the Supreme God in Aristides his First Oration or Hymn to Jupiter, wherein he affirmeth, all the several kinds of Gods, to be but a Distillation and Derivation from Jupiter.

445, 446

All the Latter Philosophers after Christianity, (though maintainers of the Worlds Eternity, yet) agreed in One Supreme Deity, the Confé of this World, and of the other Gods. Excellent Speculations in them concerning the Deity, especially Plotinus; who though deriving Matter and all from One Divine Principle, yet was a Contender for Many Gods; be supposing, the Grandeur and Majesty of the Supreme God, to be declared by the Multitude of Gods under him. Themistius; That the Same Supreme God, was worshipped by Pagans, Christians, and all Nations, though in different Forms; and that God was delighted with this Variety of Religions.

446, 447

The full Testimony of S. Cyril, That the Greek Philosophers universally acknowledged One God, the Maker of the Universe, from whom were produced into Being, certain other Gods, both Intelligible and Sensible. ibid.

XXVII. This not only the Opinion of Philosophers and Learned men, but also the General Belief of the Vulgar amongst the Pagans. A Judgment of the Vulgar and Generality, to be made from the Poets. Dio Chrysost. his Affirmation, That all the Poets acknowledged One First and Greatest God the Father of all the Rational Kind, and the King thereof.

447

The Testimony of Aristotle, That all men acknowledged Kingship or Monarchy amongst the Gods: of Maximus Tyrius, That notwithstanding so great a Discreancy of Opinion in other things, yet throughout all the Gentile World, as well the Unlearned as Learned did universally agree in this, That there was One God the King and Father of all, and Many Gods the Sons of that One God: Of Dio Chrysostomus also to the same purpose; be intimating likewise that of the two, the acknowledgment of the One Supreme God, was more General than that of the Many Inferior Gods. 448

Page 449

That the sense of the Vulgar Pagans herein is further evident from hence, because all Nations had their several Proper Names for the One Supreme God; as the Romans Jupiter, the Greeks Zeus, the Africans and Arabians Hammon, the Scythians Pappaeus, the Babylonians Bel, &c.

449

True, that Origen, though allowing Christians to use the Appellative Names for God in the Languages of the several Nations, yet accounted it unlawful for them to call him by those Proper Names; because not only given to Idols, but also contaminated with wicked Rites and Fables; according to which, they should be judged rather the Names of a Daemon than of a God. Notwithstanding which, he does not deny, those Pagans ever to have meant the Supreme God by them, but often acknowledge the same. But Laæntinus indeed denies the Capitoline Jupiter to be the Supreme God, and that for two Reasons. First, because he was not worshipped without the Partnership of Minerva and Juno, his Daughter and Wife. Granted here, that there was a Mixture of the Fabulous or Poetical Theology with the Natural to make up the Civil. But that Wife men understood these to be but Three several Names or Notions of One Supreme God. This confirmed from Macrobius. Page 450

Volfius his Conjecture, that in this Capitoline Trinity there was a further Mystery aimed at, of Three Divine Hypotheses. This Roman Trinity derived from the Samothracian Cabiri. Which word
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word being Hebraical, gives Cause to suspect this Tradition of a Trinity amongst the Pagans, to have sprung from the Hebrews.

Laënatius his Second Reason, Because Jupiter being Juvars Pater, was a name below the Dignity of the Supreme God. The Answer, that the true Etymon thereof was Jovis Pater, the Hebrew Tetragrammaton ibid.

That the Capitoline Jupiter was the Supreme God, evident from those Titles of Optimus, Maximus, and of Omnipotens by the Pontifices in their Publick Sacrifices. Seneca's Testimony that the ancient Hellenians, by Jupiter meant the Mind and Spirit, Maker and Governor of the whole World. The Roman Souldiers Acclamation in Marcus Aurelius his German Expedition, (To Jove the God of Gods, who alone is Powerfull) according to Tertullian, a Testimony to the Christians God. 452, 453.

That as the Learned Pagans in their Writings, so likewise the Vulgar in their common Speech, when most serious, often used the word God, Singularity and Emphatically, for the Supreme, proved from Tertullian, Minutius Felix, and Laënatius: together with the Testimony of Proclus, that the One Supreme God, was more universally believed throughout the World than the Many Gods. 453, 454.

That Kyrie Eleison, was anciently a Pagan Litany to the Supreme God, proved from Arius. The Supreme God often called by the Pagans also KsçG, or the Lord. 454, 455.

That even the most sottishly Superstitious, Idolators, and Polytheistical amongst the Pagans, did notwithstanding generally acknowledge One Supreme Deity; fully attested and elegantly declared by Aurelius Prudentius in his Apotheosis. Page 455.

However some of the Ancient Pagans were faid to have acknowledged none but Visible and Corporeal Gods, yet as they conceived these to be endued with Life and Understanding, so did they suppose One Supreme amongst them, as either the whole Heaven or Æther Animated, or the subtle Fiery Substance that pervaded all things, the God of the Heraclithicks and Stoicks; or the Sun the Cleansean God. Page 455, 456.

Though Macrobius refer so many of the Pagan Gods to the Sun, and doubtles his himself looks upon it as a Great God, yet does he deny it to be Omnipotentillum Deum, the Most Omnipotent God of all; he affirming a Trinity of Divine Hypo- ""
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gyptians, but also the other Pagan Nations: the Latter of them, (Afelepiades) having written a Book Entitled, The Symphony or Harmony of all Theologies or Religions, To wit, in these Two Fundamentals, That there is One Supreme God, and besides him, Other Inferior Gods, his Subservient Ministers to be worshipped. From whence Symmachus, and other Pagans concluded, That the Differences of Religion were not to be scrupulously stood upon, but every man ought to worship God according to the Law and Religion of his own Country. The Pagans Seneca thus declared by Stobæus, That the Multitude of Gods, is the work of the Demiurgus, made by Him together with the World. Page 461

XXIX. That the Pagan Theists, must needs acknowledge One Supreme Deity, further Evident from hence; Because they generally believed the whole World to be One Animal, Afacetuated and Governed by One Soul. To deny the Worlds Animation, and to be an Atheist; all one, in the sense of the Ancient Pagans. Against Gallienus, that Epicurus denied the Worlds Animation, upon no other account, but only because he denied a Providential Deity. This whole Animated World, or the Soul thereof, to the Stoicks, and others, The Πνεύμα Θεός, The First and Higheft God. 462

Other Pagan Theologers, who thought afferting likewise, the Worlds Animation, and a Mundane Soul, yet would not allow this to be the Supreme Deity, they conceiving the First and Higheft God, to be no Soul, but an Abstract and Immoveable Mind Superior to it. And to these, the Animated World and Mundane Soul, but Δειντόγε τρεῖς Θεός, A Second God. 463

But the Generality of those who went Higher than the Soul of the World, acknowledged also a Principle Superior to Mind or Intellect, called, Το Ἑν and Τ Ἑν, The One, and The Good: and so afferted, a Trinity of Divine Hypostases Subordinate, Monad, Mind, and Soul. So that the Animated World or Soul thereof, was to some of these, but Το Ἑν τε θεός, The Third God. ibid. The Pagans, whether holding Soul, or Mind, or Monad, to be the Higheft, acknowledged only One in each of these several Kinds, as the Head of all; and so always reduced the Multiplicity of things to a Unity, or under a Monarchy. 464

Oberved, That to the Pagan Theologers Universally, the World was no Dead Thing, or meer Machin and Automaton, but had Life or Soul diffused thorough it all: Those being taxed by Aristotel, as Atheists, who made the world to consist of nothing, but Monads or Atoms, Dead and Inanimate. Nor was it quite Cut off from the Supreme Deity, how much soever Elevated above the fame: the Forementioned Trinity, of Monad, Mind, and Soul, being supposed to be most intimately united together, and indeed all but One Entire Divinity; Displayed in the World, and Supporting the same. 465, 466

XXX. The Sense of the Hebrews in this Controversy. That according to Philo, the Pagan Polytheism consisted not in worshipping Many Independent Gods, and Partial Creators of the World, but besides the One Supreme, other Created Beings Superior to men. 465, 466

That the same also, was the Sense of Flavius Josephus, according to whom, This the Doctrine of Abraham; That the Supreme God was alone to be Religiousy Worshipped, and no Created thing with him. Aristaus his Affertion in Josephus, That the Jews and Greeks worshipped one and the same Supreme God, called by the Greeks Zene, as giving Life to all. 466, 467

. The Latter Rabbinical Writers, generally of this Persuasion, That the Pagans acknowledging One Supreme and Universal Numen, worshipped all their Other Gods, as his Ministers, or as Mediators and Interceiffors between him and them. And this Condemned by them for Βυζων ὁ τοῦ ὑραμὴ θεός Strange Worship or Idolatry. The first Commandment thus interpreted by Maimonides, and Baal Ikkaim; Thou shalt not set up besides me, any Inferior Gods as (d) Media-
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Mediators, nor Religiously Worship my Ministers or Attendants. The Mifcarriages of Solomon and other Kings of Ifrael and Judah, This, That believing the Existence of the One Supreme God, they thought it was for his Honour that his Ministers also should be worshipped. A-bravavel his Ten Species of Idolatry, all of them but so Many several Modes of Creature-Worship; and no mention amongst them made, of many Independent Gods. Page 467, &c.

Certain Places of Scripture also, interpreted by Rabbinical Writers to this purpose; That the Pagan Nations generally acknowledged, One Sovereign Nomen. 469, 470

The Jews, though agreeing with the Greeks, and other Pagans in this, That the Stars were all Animated, nevertheless denied them any Religious Worship. 470, 471

XXXI. This same thing, plainly confirmed, from the New Testament; That the Gentiles or Pagans, however Polytheists and Idolaters, were not Unacquainted with the True God. First from the Epistle to the Romans, where that which is Knowable of God, is said to have been manifest among the Pagans; and they to have known God, though they did not Glorify him as God, but hold the Truth in Unrighteousness; by reason of their Polytheism and Idolatry (or Image Worship) The Latter of which, accounted by the Jews the greatest Enormity of the Pagans, as is proved from Philo: and this the Reason, why their Polytheism, called also Idolatry. Plainly declared by S. Paul, that the Pagan Superstition consisted not in worshiping Many Independent Gods and Creators, but in joining Creature-worship some way or other, with the worship of the Creator. Pzss. 119. 20. Kiriwne, How to be Understood; and in what Sense, the Pagans, though acknowledging the Creator, might be said to have Worshipped the Creature, beyond him. 471, 472

Again, from S. Pauls Oration to the Athenians, where their Unknown God, is said to be that same God, whom S. Paul Preached, Who made the World and all things in it. And these Athenian Pagans are affirmed, Religiously and Devoutly to Worship this True God. Page 473, 474

Lastly, that Aratus his Zeus was the True God, whose Offspring our Souls are; Proved not only from the Context of that Poet himself, undoubtedly, and from the Scholasts upon him, but also from S. Pauls Positive Affirmation. Nor was Aratus Singular in this; That Ancient Prayer of the Athenians, Commanded by M. Antoninus for its Simplicity, (Yeow 3or 2 3. 25, Rain Rain, O Gracious Jupiter &c.) no otherwise to be understood. And how that other Passage of S. Paul, That in the Widsom of God, the World by Widsom knew not God, does not at all Clash herewith. 475, 476

XXXII. In order to a Fuller Explication of the Pagan Theology, and making it the better appear, that the Polytheism thereof, was not Contradictions to the acknowledgment of One Supreme Omnipotent Nomen; Three Things to be Considered. First, That much of their Polytheism was but Seeming and Phantasticall only, and really nothing but the Polyonymy of One God. Secondly, That their Reall and Natural Polytheism, confessed only in Religionly Worshipping, besides this One Supreme Univerfall Nomen, Many other Particular and Inferiour Created Beings; as Animated Stars, Demons, and Hero's. Thirdly, That they Worshipping both the Supreme and Inferiour Gods, in Statues, Images, and Symbols; these were also sometimes Abusively called Gods. To one or other of which Three Heads, all the Pagan Polytheism, Referrible. 477

For the better perceiving, That much of the Pagan Polytheism, was Really nothing, but the Polyonymy of One Supreme God, or the Worshipping him under severall Peronall Names; to be Remembered again, what was before Suggested. That the Pagan Nations Generally, besides their Vulgar, had another more Arcane Theology, which was the Theology of Wife men and of Truth. That is 5
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Besides both their Fabulous and Poeticall, their Politicall and Civil Theology, they had another Natural and Philosopherick one. This Diftrinction of the Vulgar and Civil Theology, from the Natural and Real, owned by the Greeks Generally, and amongst the Latins, by Scaevola the Pontifex, Varro, Cicero, Seneca, and others. ibid.

That the Civil Theology of the Pagans, differed from the Natural and Real, by a certain Mixture of Fabulosity in it. Of the Romans suffering the Statue of Jupiter Numin, to be kept in the very Capitol, as a Religious Monument. Jupiters Nativity, or his having a Father and a Mother, Atheticaly Fabulous; Poets themselves acknowledging so much of the Natural and True Theology, That Jupiter being the Father of Gods and Men, the Maker of the whole World, was himself Eternall and Unmade. 478

That the Civil as well as Poeticall Theology, had some appearance of Many Independent Deities also; they making Severall Supreme, in their several Territories and Functions; One Chief for one thing, and another for another. But according to the Natural and Philosophick Theology, the Theology of Wise men and of Truth, all these but Poeticall, Commentitious, Fictitious, and Phantastic Gods; such as had no definite Substantiall Essences of their own; and therefore Really to be accounted nothing else, but severall Names or Notions of One Supreme God.

Certain, that the Egyptians had severall Proper and Personal Names, for that One Supreme Univerfal Numen, that Comprehends the whole World, according to severall Notions of it or its severall Powers: as Ammon, Pthra, Osiris, Neith, Cneph; to which may be added, Serapis and Isis too. Besides Iamblichus, Damacius bis Testimony also to this purpose; concerning the Egyptian Theology. This the Pattern of the other, especially European Theologies, the Greek and Roman.

That the Greeks and Romans also, often Made More Gods of One, or af-

Evident from those many Proper and Personal Names bestowe, First upon the Sun, (of which Macrobius) who therefore had this Epithet of παλήδεμος given to him; and then upon the Moon, styled also Polynymous, as well as her Brother the Sun; and Lastly upon the Earth, famous likewise, for her Many Names; as Veita, Cybele, Ceres, Proserpina, Ops, &c. Wherefore not at all to be doubted, but that the Supreme God, or Sovereign Namen of the whole World, was much more Polynymous. This Title given to him also, as well as to Apollo in Helychus. He thus Invoked by Cleenthes. Zeno, the Writer De Mundo, Seneca, Macrobius, clearly confirm the same. Maximus Madaurensis in S.Austin, his full acknowledgment thereof; Page 480, 481

The First Inftances of the Polynymy of the Supreme God, amongst the Pagans, in such Names as these; Beatae, Θεός, Φαναρος, Μεταφαναρος, Μεταφαναρος, &c. And amongst the Latins, Victor, Invidius, Opitulus, Stator, Tignillus, Centupeda, Almus, Ruminus, &c. Again, τεμπερζ, Εικεραςμεν, Πετερας, Εικεραςμεν, Μελες, Αυθερας, all severall Names of the One Supreme God, as likewise were Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos, in the Writer De Mundo. And amongst the Latins, not onely Fate, but also Nature, and Fortune too, as Cicero and Seneca affirm.

But besides these, there were other Proper Names of the Supreme God, which had a greater show and appearance of many Several Gods, they having their Peculiar Temples, and severall Appropriated Rites of Worship. And First, such as signifies the Deity, according to its more Universal Nature. As for example, Pan; which not the Corporeal World Inanimate or endued with a Sentles Nature only, but a Rational or Intellectual Principle displaying it itself in Matter, framing the World Harmoniously, and being in a manner All things. This also the Univerfal Pastor and Shepherd; of all Mankind.

Again Janus; First Invoked by the Romans (d 2)
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Romans in their Sacrifices, and never omitted. The most Ancient God, and First Beginning of all things. Described by Ovid, Martial, and others, as a Universal Numen. Concluded by S. Auffin, to be the Same with Jupiter, the Soul or Mind of the whole World. The word Janus probably derived from Zevs, the Ætolian Jupiter. Page 483, 484

Genius also, one of the Twenty Select Roman Gods, according to Feltius, a Universal Numen: that God who is the Begetter of all things. And according to Varro in S. Auffine, the same with Jupiter.

That Chronos or Saturn, no particular Deity; but a Universal Numen also, which Comprehends the whole nature of the World, affirmed by Dionyfius Hali-carnaff. The word Saturn Heturian (and Originally from the Hebrew ונה) signifies Hidden; called by the Latins Deus Latius, the Hidden God; whence Italy Latium, and the Italians Latins; as Worshippers of this Hidden God, or the Occult Principle of all things. This according to Varro, He that Produceth out of himself, the Hidden Seeds and Forms of all things, and Swalloweth them up into himself again; which, the Devouring of his Male Children. This Sinus quidam Naturae, &c. a Certain Inward and deep Receptacle of Nature, containing all things within it self; as God was sometimes Defined by the Pagans. This to S. Auffin, the same with Jupiter; as likewise was Æolus or Uranus, in the old Incription, and therefore another Name of God too. The Poetick Theology, of Jupiter being the Son of Saturn, and Saturn the Son of Æolus; an Intimation (according to Plato) of a Trinity of Divine Hypostases Universal.

Though Minerva or Athena, were sometimes confined to a narrower Sense, yet was it often taken, for a Name of God also, according to his Universal Notion; it being to Athenagoras the Divine Wisdom, displaying it felt through all things. This excellently described by Ariftides, as the First Begotten Offspring of the Original Deity, or the Second Divine Hymnastis, by which all things were made; agreeably with the Christian Theology.

Page 486, 487

Aphrodite Urania, or the Heavenly Venus; another name of God also according to his Universal Notion; it being the same with that Love which Orpheus, and other Philosophers in Aristotle, made the First Original of all things. Plato's Definition of an Elder, and a Younger Venus: The Former, the Daughter of Uranus, without a Mother, or the Heavenly Venus; said to be Senior to Japhet; and Saturn. The Latter, afterwards begotten from Jupiter and the Nymph Dione, the Vulgar Venus: Urania, or the Heavenly Venus, called by the Oriental Nations, Mylitta; that is, the Mother of all things. Temples in Pausanias Dedicated to this Heavenly Venus. This described by Æchylus, Euripides, and Ovid, as the Supreme Deity, and the Creator of all the Gods. God Almighty also, thus described, as a Heavenly Venus or Love, by Sev. Boetius. To this Urania or Heavenly Venus, another Venus in Pausanias, as near a kin; called Ανεξιζεια or Verticordia; As Converse of mens Minds upwards, from Uncharst Love, or Unclean Lust.

Page 488, 489

Though Vulcan, according to the Common Notion of him, a Special God, yet had he sometimes a more Universal Consideration. Zeno in Laertius, that the Supreme God is called Vulcan as Acting in the Artificial Fire of Nature. Thus the Soul of the World, styled by the Egyptians Phtha, which as Iamblichus tells us, was the same with the Greeky Hephæstus, or Vulcan.

Page 489

Besides all which Names of the Supreme God, Seneca informs us, that he was sometimes called Yeru, Liber Pater, because the Parent of all things; sometimes Hercules, because his Force is Unconquerable; and sometimes Mercury, as being Reason, Number, Order and Knowledge.

Page 490

But besides this Polyonymy of God, according to his Universal Notion; there were other Dii Speciales, or Speciall Gods also, amongst the Pagans; which likewise were
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were really but Several Names of One and the same Supreme Deity, variè utentis fist Postulate, (as Seneca Writeth) diversly using his Power, in Particular Cases, and in the Several Parts of the World. Thus Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto, (mistaken by some Christians, for a Trinity of Independent Gods) though Three Civil Gods, yet were they Really, but One and the Same Natural and Philosophick God; as Acting in those Three Parts of the World; the Heaven the Sea, the Earth and Hell. Pluto in Plato's Cratylus a Name for That Part of Divine Providence, which is exercised in the Government of Separate Souls after Death. This Styl'd by Virgil, the Stygian Jupiter. But to others, Pluto together with Ceres, the Manifestation of the Deity, in this whole Terrestrial Globe. The Celestial and Terrestrial Jupiter, but One God. Zeus and Hades one and the same to Orpheus. Euripides doubtfull, whether God should be Invoked, by the Name of Zeus or Hades. Hermelianax the Colophonian Poet, makes Pluto the First of those Many Names of God, Synonymous with Zeus. Page 490, 491

Neptune also, another Special God, a name of the Supreme Deity, as Acting in the Sea only. This affirmed by Xenocrates in Stobaeus, Zeno in Laertius, Balbus and Cotta in Cicero, and also by Maximus Tyrius. 492

The Statue of Jupiter with Three Eyes, in Paufanias; signifying that according to the Natural Theology, it was One and the Same God, Ruling in those Three Several Parts of the World, the Heaven, the Sea, and the Earth; that was called by Three Names, Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto. Wherefore since Proferpina and Ceres are the same with Pluto; and Salacia with Neptune; Concluded, that all these, though Several Poetical and Political Gods; yet were but One and the Same Natural and Philosophick God. 492, 493

Juno also, another Special God, a name of the Supreme Deity as Acting in the Aire. This Xenocrates and Zeno. The Pagans in S. Austin; that God in the Aether is called Jupiter, in the Aire Juno. So Minerva hkevif, when taken for a Special God, a name of the Supreme God, according to that Particular Consideration of him, as Acting in the Higher Aether. From whence, S. Austin dispute against the Pagans. Maximus Tyrius, of these and many other Gods of the Pagans; that they were but Sæa duæaeæ, Divine Names. Page 493, 494

Yet Many other Special Gods, amongst the Pagans, which also were really nothing but Divine Names; or Names of God as variously exercising his Power, or bestowing Several Gifts; as in Corn and Fruit; Ceres, in Wine Bacchus, in Medicine Æculearius, in Traffick Mercury, in War Mars, in Governing the Winds Æolus, &c. 494

That not only Philosophers, did thus interpret, the Many Poetical and Political Gods, into One and the Same Natural God; but the Poets themselves also, sometimes openly broached this more Arcane Free and True Theology; as Hermelianax amongst the Greeks, and Valerius Soranus amongst the Latins. 494, 495

That S. Austin making a large Enumeration of the other Special Gods, amongst the Pagans, affirmed of them Universally, That according to the Sense of the Pagan Doctors, they were but one Natural God, and all Really the same with Jupiter. 495, 496

Apuleius in his Book De Deo Socratris, either not rightly understood by that Learned and Indusarius Philologer, G. I. Vossius, or else not sufficiently attended to. His design there, plainly to reduce the Pagans Civil Theology, into a Conformity with the Natural and Philosophick; which he doth as a Platonist, by making the Dii Conftences of the Romans, and their other Invisible Gods, to be all of them, Nothing, but the Divine Ideas; and so the Offspring of one Highest God. An occasion for this Phancy, given by Plato, where he calls his Ideas Animals. Nor was Apuleius Singular herein; Julian in his Book against the Christians, going the very same way; and no otherwise und.
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derstood by S. Cyril, than as to make the Invisible Gods, worshipp'd by the Pagans, to be the Divine Ideas. A Phancy of the same Julian, who opposed the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, that Æsculapius was first of all the Idea of the Medicinal Art, Generated by the Supreme God, in the Intelligible World; which afterwards, by the Providence Influence of the Sun, was Incarnated, and appeared in Human Form about Epidaurus. And that this Pagan Doctrine, Older than Christianity, proved out of Philo; writing of a Sun, and Moon, Intelligible; as well as Sensible, Religiously worshipp'd by the Pagans: That is, the Ideas of the Archetypal World. And thus were these Ideas of the Divine Intellect, variol. Sed, Intelligible Gods, to Plotinus also. Page 496, &c. 501

Wherefore Julian, Apuleius, and those others, who thus made all the Pagan Invisible Gods, to be nothing else but the Divine Ideas, the Patterns of Things in the Archetypal World; supposed them not to be so many Independent Deities, nor Really Distinct Substances, Separate from one another, but only so many Particular Confederations of One God. Julian before affirming them, viz. Και γενετο εις τας μορφας του Ατδος του Βελους... As to have been Generated out of him; so also to Coexist with him, and Inexist in him. 501, 502

That the Pagans appointed some Particular God or Goddes by Name, to preside over every Thing; (there being undeceived Nothing at all without a God to them;) appear from that Catalogue, of their Ignoble or Petty Gods, Collected by S. Aultine out of Varro. Now it is Incredible; that they should think all these to be so many single Substantial Spirits, of each Sex, Really Existing apart in the World; they must therefore needs take them, to be so many Particular Confederations of the Deity, either in the way of the more High-flown Platonists, as his Ideas Exemplarily and Virtually containing all things; or else in that more Common and easy way of the Generality; as so many Several Denominations of him, according to the Several Manifestations of his Power and Providence; or as the Pagans in Eufebyus declare themselves, those Several Virtues and Powers, of the Supreme God, themselves Personated and Deified. Which yet because, they were not executed, without the Subservient Ministrum of Created Spirits, Angels or Demons, appointed to preside over such things; therefore might these also Collatively taken be included under them. Page 502, 503

But for the fuller clearing of this Point, that the Pagan Polytheism, was in great part Nothing but the Polyonymy of one God; Two Things here to be taken notice of: First, that the Pagan Theology Universally, Supposed God to be Diffused thorough all, to Permeate and Pervade all, and Intimately to Act all. Thus Horus Apollo of the Egyptians. Thus among the Greeks, Diogenes the Cynick, Aristotle, the Italick, and Stoicall Philosophers. Thus the Indian Brachmans before Strabo. Thus also the Latin Poets 5 and Seneca, Quintilian, Apuleius, and Servius, besides others. 503, 504

That Anaxagoras and Plato also, though neither of them Confounded God with the World, but affirmed him to be Unmingled with any thing; yet concluded him in like manner, to Permeate and Pervade all things. Plato's Etymology of Θεος, as taken for a Name of God, to this purpose in his Cratylus. Where a Fragment of Heraclitus, and his Description of God agreeably hereunto; a most Subtle and Swift Substant, that Permeates and Pervades through every thing, by which all things are made. But Plato disclaiming this Corporality of the Deity, will neither have it Fire nor Heat; but a Perfect Mind that Pervades through all things Unmixedly. 505

Wherefore no wonder, if the Pagans supposing God to be Diffused thorough all things, called him in the Several Parts of the World, and Things of Nature, by several Names, as in the Earth Ceres, in the Sea Neptune, &c. This account of the Pagan Polytheism given by Paulus Orofius, That whilst they believed, God to be in Many things, they indirectly made Many Gods of Him. 505, 506
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Further to be observed, That many of the Pagan Theologers 5 seemed to go yet a Strain higher, they supposing God not only to Pervade all things, but also to Be himself all things. That the Ancient Egyptian Theology ran so high, Evident from the Saitick Infcription. A strong Tang hereof in Aeschylus 5 as also in Lucan. Neither was this proper to those, who held God to be the Soul of the World, but the Language also of those other more Refined Philosophers, Xenophanes, Parmenides, &c. they affirming God, to be One and All. With which agreement, the Author of the Aegyptian Dialogue, that God is, Owns own, One all things; and that before things were made, he did then themselves Hide them, or Occultly contain them all, within himself. In like manner Orphicus. Page 506, 507

This not only a further Ground of the Polyonymy of One God, according to the Various Manifestations of himself in the World, but also of another Strange Phenomenon in the Pagan Theology, their Personating the Inanimate Parts of the World, and Natures of things, and bestowing the Names of Gods and Goddeses upon them. Thus Moschophilus before cited, and Arnobius. This Plutarch thinks to have been done at first, Metonymically only, the Effects of the Gods, being called Gods; as the Books of Plato, Plato. And thus far not disputed by him. But himself complaineth, that afterwards, it was carried on further by Superstitious Religionists, and not without great Impiety. Nevertheless that Inanimate Substances and the Natures of things, were formerly Deified, by the Ancient Pagans, otherwise than Metonymically, proved from Cicero, Philo and Plato. For they supposing God, to Pervade all things, and to be All things, did therefore look upon every thing as Sacred or Divine 5 and Theologize the Parts of the World and Natures of Things; Tantally making them, Gods and Goddeses. But especially such things, as wherein Humane Utility was most concerned 5 and which had most of Wonder in them. 507, 510

This properly, the Physiological Theology of the Pagans, their Personating and Deifying the Natures of things, and Inanimate Substances. That the Ancient Pocitick Fables of the Gods were many of them in their first and true meaning, thus Physiologically Allegorical, and not mere Herology, affirmed against Eusebios. Zeno, Cleanthes and Chryllipus, Famous for such Allegorizing the Fables of the Gods. Chryllipus his Allegorizing an Obscene Picture of Jupiter and Juno in Samos. Plato though no Friend to these Pocitick Fables, yet confesseth some of them to have contained Allegories in them: the same doth also Dionylus Halicarnaffius: and Cicero likewise, who affirmeth, this Personating and Deifying the Natures of things, to have filled the World with Superstitition. Page 510, 512

Against Eusebios again, That the whole Theology of the Pagans, consisted not in thus Deifying the Natures of things, and Inanimate Bodies; because he that acknowledgeth no Animant God, acknowledges no God at all, but is a downright Atheist.

Neither ought this Physiological Theology of the Pagans, that consisted in Personating and Deifying the Natures of things and Inanimate Bodies, to be Con founded, with that Natural and Philosophical Theology of Varro, Scavola and others, which admitted of no other, but Animant Gods, and such as Really Existed in Nature: for which Cause it was called Natural, in opposition to the Fictitious and Phantastick, Pocitick Gods. 512

S. Austin's just Censure and Condemnation of the Pagans, for their thus Theologizing of Physiology, or Fictitiously Personating and Deifying the Natures of things. 512, 513

But though the Pagans did thus verballly Personate and Deify the things of Nature, yet did not the Intelligent among them, therefore account these True and Proper Gods. Cotta in Cicero, Though we call Corn Ceres, and Wine Bacchus, yet was there never any one so mad, as to take that for a God, which himself feeds upon and devours. The Pagans really accounted
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counted that only for a God, by the Invoking whereof, they might expect benefit to themselves; and therefore Nothing Inanimate. This proved from Plato, Aristotle, Lucretius, Cicero, and Plutarch. Wherefore these Natures of things Deified, but Fictionitious and Phantastick Gods. Nor can any other sinfe be made of them than this, that they were really but so many several Names of one Supreme God, as severally manifested in his works: according to that Egyptian Theology, That God may be called by the Name of every thing, or every thing by the Name of God. With which agreeeth Seneca, That there may be as many Names of God, as there are Gifts and Effects of his: and the Writer De Mundo, That God may be Denominated from every Nature, he being the Cause of all things.  

Page 513, 515

Wherefore these Deified Natures of things, were not directly worshipped by the Intelligient Pagans, but only Relatively to the Supreme God, or in way of Complication with him only: and so not so much Themselves, as God worshipped in them. The Pagans Pretend, that they did not look upon the world with such Eyes as Oxen and Horses do, but with Religious Eyes, so as to see God in every thing. They therefore worshipped the Invisible Deity, in the Visible manifestations of himself; God and the World together. This sometimes called Pan and Jupiter. Thus was the whole World said to be the Greatest God, and the Circle of the Heavens worshipped by the Persians; not as Inanimate Matter, but as the Visible manifestation of the Deity, displayed from it, and pervaded by it. When the Roman Sea-Captains Sacrificed to the Waves, their worship intended to that God, who Stillceth the Waves, and Quieteth the Billows.  

515, 516

These Pagans also apprehended a Necessity of permitting men to worship the Invisible God in his Visible Works. This account given by them in Eusèbius, Plato himself approved of worshipping the Invisible God in the Sun, Moon, and Stars, as his Visible Images: And though Maximus Tyrius would have men endeavour, to rise above the Starry Heavens, and all Visible things, yet does he allow the weaker, to worship God in his Progeny. And Socrates persuades Euthydemus to be contented herewith. Besides which, some Pagans worshipping the Elements, directed their Intention to the Spirits of those Elements, as Julian in Ammianus (these being supposed also to be Animated) or else to those Demons, whom they conceived to inhabit them, or preside over them. Page 516, 518

XXXIII. Further to be observed, That amongst those Natures of things, some were meerly Accidental, as Hope, Love, Desire, Memory, Truth, Vertue, Piety, Faith, Justice, Concord, Clemency, Victory, Echo, Night. According to which, the vulgar Athenians supposed S. Paul to have Deified Analtas, or made a God of the Resurrection, as well as a God of Jesus. Vices also sometimes thus Deified by them, as Contumely, and Impudence, to whom were Temples dedicated at Athens: though to the end that these things might be Depreciated. These Accidents sometimes Deified under Counterfeit Proper Names, as Plesure under the name of Volupia, and Lubentina Venus; Time under the name of Chronos or Saturn; Prudence or Wisdom, under the names of Athena or Minerva: against which Origen in his answer to Celillus, Cicero himself allowed of Dedicating Temples to Mind, Vertue, Piety, Faith, &c. 518, 520

But such Accidents and Affections of Things Deified, could not possibly be Accidented True and Proper Gods, they having not ısıţ-çen và eşţ, any Real Subsistence, or Substantial Evidence of their own. And thus does Origen again dispute against Minerva’s Godship, as Tropologized into Prudence. As he doth also elsewhere, upon the same Ground, against that of Memory the Mother of the Muses, and that of the Graces: be concluding, these and such like therefore, to be nothing but Figments of the Greeks, they being Things Perfonated, and Feigned with Humane
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Humane Members. Thus the Pagans condemned by Prudentius also, for Feigning Things Incorporeal, with Counterfeit Members. These Gods plainly Exploded by Cotta, or Cicero in Digests; as having only Vim Rerum, but not Deorum, the Force of Things, but not of Gods in them; or being but Natural Rerum, and not Figurate Deorum. Page 520, 521

Wherefore the True meaning of these Deified Natures of Things could be no other than this, that God was to be acknowledged and worshipped in All things; or, as the Pagans themselves declare it, that the Force of every thing was, both governed by God, and it self Divine. Pliny of this Breaking and Crumbling of the Deity into Parts, Every one Worshipping that in God, and for a God, which himself most stood in need of. This dividing of the Simple Deity, and Worshipping it Brokenly by parcels and pieces, as manifested in all the Several Things of Nature, and Parts of the world, Jutly Censured, and Elegantly Persurried, by Prudentius against Symmachus. Where Prudentius grants, that Symmachus, who declared, that it was One thing which all worshipped when he sacrificed to Victory, did sacrifice to God Almighty, under that Partiall Notion, as the Giver of Victory. This in the Egyptian Allegory, Orisir Mangled, and Cut in pieces by Typhon. Victory and Vertue, as well as Neptune, Mars, and Bellona, but several names or Nations of Jupiter, in the Prologue of Plautus his Amphitryo. 521, 522

Volusijs his opinion, that these Deified Accidents, and Natures of Things, as well as the other Pagan Visible Gods, were commonly lookt upon by the Vulgar, as so many Single Substantial Minds, or Spirits Created by the Supreme God, and appointed to preside over these several things respectively. Where it is acknowledged that neither the Political, nor the Political Gods of the Pagans, were taken so much as by the Vulgar, for so many Independent Deities. 523, 524

Probable, that by these Gods, the Wis-
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of his Providence, and Religiously wor-
shiped also. A brief, but full account, of
the Pagans Natural Theology, set down
by Prudentius.

Page 526, 527

And when the more high-born Pagans
referred these Poetical and Political
Gods to the Divine Idea's, or Patterns of
things in the Archetypal World; which
besides the Platonists, the Egyptians in
Cellis are said to have done, making the
Brute Animals worshipped by them, but
Symbols of the Eternal Idea's; They here-
by made these Gods to be but so many
Partial Considerations of One God neith-
er, as being All things, or Containing in
himself the Causes of all things; as Julli-
an himself declareth in his Sixth Oration.

527, 528

An Anacophalosis, That much of the
Pagan Polytheism, was but the Polyonym
by of One God; he being worshipped un-
der several Names. First, according to
several General Notions of him; as of
Janus, Genius, Saturn, Minerva, Urania,
or the Heavenly Venus, or Love, and
others before declared. So also of Sum-
manus, according to S. Austin, and
Themis, afterwards to be mentioned.

528, 529

And Secondly, according to other more
Particular Notions of him, (in their
Special Gods) as Acting in some Parts
of the world only, or exerting some
Particular Powers.

529, 530

And Lastly, as Pervading All things,
and Being All things, or the Cause of
All things, he was thereupon called by
the Name of Every thing, or Every thing by
his Name. The Pagans in S. Austin; That
their Ancestors were not so jettish, as not
to understand, that those Things of Na-
ture were but Divine Gifts, and not Them-
selves Gods. And the Pagans in Eufebi-
us; That the Invisible God, the Cause of
All things, ought to be worshipped in his
Visible Effects, wherein he hath displayed
himself.

530

Though the Two former Kinds of these
Gods only, called by Athanasius Poetical
and Fictitious, be opposing them to those
of the Third sort, that were Natural and
Real things; yet may these also be well cal-
led Poetical, Fictitious, and Phantasti-
cal Gods too; because though themselves
were Real things, Existing in Nature, yet
was their Periaphasis, and Deification,
meer Fictitious, Fancy and Poetry. And
accordingly, were they before called by
Origen "Ενιαος και πλήρως, meer Fig-
ments of the Greeks. Page 530, 531

XXXIV. Of those Pagans who suppo-
sed the Supreme God to be the Whole
Animated World. Hitherto shewed, that
even the most Refined of the Pagans
agreed in these Two things. First, in
Breaking and Grumbling the One Sim-
ple Deity, and multiplying it into Many
Gods; or Parcelling it out into several
Particular Notions, according to its se-
veral Powers and Virtues. (Πολυθυμο-
being, to those Pagans, the same thing with
Πολυθυμία.) And then, in Theologiz-
ing the whole World, Periaphasing and
Defying the Natures of Things, Acci-
dents, and Inanimate Bodies. They sup-
posing God to Pervade all things, and
Himself to be in a manner All things:
Therefore every thing to the Religious, Sa-
cred and Divine; and God to be Wor-
shiped in All.

531, 532

We shall now add, that both those fore-
mentioned Principles, of God's Pervading
all things, and his Being all things, were
carried on farther, by those Pagan The-
ologers, who had no higher Notion of the
Supreme Deity then as the Soul of the
World. For First, Whereas the more
Revised Pagans supposed God to Pervade
all things Unmixedly; These Mingled
and Confounded him with the whole
World. Some of them supposing him also
to be a Subtle Body.

532, 533

Again, Whereas the other more Sublima-
ted Pagans affirmed God so to be All, as
nevertheless to be something also Above
all; These concluded him, to be nothing
Higher then the Animated World. 533

And though they supposed, that as well
in this Mundane Animal, as in other Ani-
mals, there was something Principal and
Hegemonical, (whether the Sun, or Aether,
or Fire,) which therefore was Emphati-
cally called God; yet did they conceive
the whole Matter thereof to be Animated,
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and so to be All God. Not barely as Matter, but by reason of the Soul thereof. Page 534, 535.

Now if the Whole World Animated be the Supreme God, then must all the Parts and Members of the World be the Parts and Members of One God; but not themselves therefore properly so Many Gods. This affirmed by Orygen, as the True Sense of these Pagans, against that unwary Assertion of Celsus, That If the Whole were God, then must the several Parts thereof needs be Gods. 535

Wherefore though these Pagans Deified the Parts of the World and Natures of Things, as well as the Powers of the Mundane Soul; yet did not the Intelligent amongst them Worship them severally, as so many True and Proper Gods, but one as the Parts and Members of one Great Animal or God; or rather Worship the great Mundane Soul (the Life of the whole World) in them all. This proved from S. Aultin. 536, 537

The same plainly declared also by the Pagans in Athanasius, That not the Divided Parts of the World were by them accounted so many several Gods, but the Whole, made up of them All, One God; which yet might be worshipped in its several Parts. 537

The Pagans being thus divided, as to their Opinions, concerning the Natural and True Theology; some of them Worshipped the World as the Body of God, but others only as his Image or Temple. Thus Plutarch, though disputing the Deifying of Inanimate Things, did notwithstanding approve of Worshipping God in the Whole World, as his most Sacred Temple. And the Persian Magi, allowing of no Artificial Temples, made with mens hands, Worshipped God sub Dio, and upon the Tops of Mountains, as conceiving the Whole World to be his Natural Temple. For the same Reason did they condemn also Artificial Statues and Images, concluding Fire, Earth, and Water, and the like Parts of the World, to be the Natural Images of the Deity. Thus Dino in Clemens Alexandrinus. This Difference amongst the Pagan Theologers noted by Macrobius. Thus were all the Pagans World-Worshippers, in different Sense: but not as a Dead and Inanimate Thing, but either as the Body of God, or else as his Temple or Image. Page 537-539.

Furthermore, the Pagans Universally acknowledging the World to be an Animal, those of them who supposed it not to be the First and Hightest God, conceived it to be either a Second, or else a Third God; and so Worshipped it, not only as a Temple or Image, but also as the Son of the First God. Celsus pretended the Christians to have called their Jesus, the Son of God, in imitation of these Pagans, who styled the World so. 539, 540

Thus have we made it fully to appear, That, according to the Saying of Antihe- nics, the Many Popular Gods of the Pagans were but One and the Same Natural God; or, according to that of Euclides, their Many Gods were but Many Names. So that neither their Poetical, nor yet their Political Theology, was lookt upon by them as True and Natural. 540

Nevertheless, the Wiser Pagans generally concluded, that there ought to be another Theology, besides the Natural, fully Calculated for the Vulgar, and having a Mixture of Falsehood and Fabulosity in it. Varo and Scævola agreed, that the Vulgar being Uncapable of the True and Natural Theology, it was expedient for them to be Deceived in their Religion. Strabo also, that the Vulgar cannot by Philosophick Reason, and Truth, be carried on to Piety; but this must be done by Superstition, and by the help of Fables, and Prodigious Relations. The same partly acknowledged by Synesius for true. Plato also; That it is Hard to find out God, but Improbable to declare him to the Vulgar; and therefore a necessity of a Civil Theology, different from the Natural and Philosophical. 540, 542

XXXV. We come now to the next thing Proposed, That, besides this Seeming and Phantastick Polytheism of the Pagans, which was nothing but the Polynomy of One God, they had another Real Poly- theism, even in their Natural and Philo-

(e 2) sophick
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fophick Theology it self. But this not of Self-existent Gods, but Generated or Created ones only. Thus, according to Plutarch, One Higheft Unmade God, is the Maker and Father of all the other Gods, Generated or Derived from him. And Proclus concludes, All the Gods to derive their Godship from the First God, who therefore is the Fountain of the Godhead. Page 542, 543

These Inferiour Pagan Gods, styled by Ammianus Marcellinus, Subtantiall Powers, in way of opposition to those other Poetical and Political Gods, that were not Subtantiall or Reall, but onely fettl Names or Notions of One Supreme God. Those Subtantiall Powers (as Divination and Prophecy was by them imparted to men) said to be all Subject to that One Sovereign Deity, called Themis, placed by Pagan Theologers in the Throne of Jupiter. This Themis also another Name or Notion of the Supreme God, besides those before mentioned. Poetry and Phantafry intermingled by the Pagans with their Natural or Philosophick Theology. 543, 544

Thus the Pagans held both One God, and Many Gods, in different Sensees. Onatus and Plotinus, That the Majesty of the Supreme God consists, in haveing Multitudes of Gods Dependent on him, and Ruled by him; and that the Honour done to them, redounds to him. The Gods of the Oriental Pagans, not mere Dead Statues and Images, but Living Understanding Beings, Represented by them. That Christians afferted no Solitary Deity, as Pagans pretended, but agreed with that of Seneca, That God hath Generated, or Created, innumerable Understanding Beings Superior to Men, Ministers of his Kingdom; The onely difference being this, that they gave them no Religious Worship: Out of Laftantius. 544, 546

XXXVI. That besides the Inferiour Gods, generally received by all the Pagans; (namely, Animated Stars, Demons, and Heroes) the more refined of them, who accounted not the Animated World the Supreme Deity, acknowledg-
ed a Trinity of Divine Hypoftales, Su-
perior to them all. Which Doctrine af-
irmed by Plotinus to have been very
Ancient, and no Invention of Plato's. Page 546

Parmenides an Afferter of a Trinity, long before Plato. This imputed to the Pythagoreans, by Moderatus in Simpli-
cius, and Tamblichus in Proclus. Before Pythagoras, Orpheus had his Trinity, Phanes, Uranus, and Chronus; the fame with Plato's Three Kings or Principles. Probable, that Pythagoras and Orpheus derived the fame from the Theology of the Egyptian Hermes. Some Footsteps of such a Trinity, in the Mithraick Myste-
ries, amongst the Perfians, and the Zoro-
astrian Cabala. The fame expressly decla-
red in the Magick or Chaldace Oracles.
A Trinity of Gods worshipped Ancient-
ly by the Samothracians, and called by
an Hebrew name Cabiri, the Mighty
Gods. From thence the Roman Capit-
olinc Trinity derived; The Second
whereof, Minerva, or the Divine Wife-
dom. The Ternary, a Number used by
the Pagans, in their Religious Rites, as
Mysteries. 546, 547

It being no way Probable, that such a
Trinity of Divine Hypoftales should have
sprung from Humane Wit, we may rea-
sonably affert to what Proclus affirmeth, that it was at first Сквроппге Стедог, a
Theology of Divine Tradition or Re-
velation: As having been first Imparted
to the Hebrews, and from them commu-
nicated to other Nations. Nevertheless,
as this Divine Cabbala was but little un-
derstood by these Pagans; so was it by
many of them Depraved and Adulterated.
547, 548

This called Universally by them, a Tri-
inity of Gods; or a Firft, Second, and
Third God: by some a Trinity of Cau-
ses, and of Principles, and of Opificers.
The Tradition of the Three Gods, in Pro-
clus, Ancient and Famous. Numen-
us his Three Gods, called by him, the
Father, the Son, and the Nephew, (or
Grandson.) Nous or Intellect, to Ploti-

nus, a Second God: as also the World
an Image of all the Three Gods. Ploti-

nus
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Theologian and Porphyrius, their supposed Ec-

That Philo, a Religious Jew, and Zea-

called, notwithstanding, the Divine Word

This not agreeable
to the Principles of Christianity.

Nevertheless S. Auffin partly excuses this

And they perhaps the more excusable,
because they sometimes called also those

Nor was this Trinity of Divine Hypo-

And that this an Adulterated Notion

Neither will this excuse them, that they

This probably the Reason, why Philo,

Yet no where speaketh of a Third God;

So that Philo

Another Depravation of this Species-

Another Depravation of this Species-

A Swarm of Innumerable Pagan Gods

Now since thefe Particular Henades

A Third Depravation or Adulteration

As First, such as made the World to be the

A Third Depravation or Adulteration

A Third Depravation or Adulteration

Such a Trinity, a Con-

ibid.

ibid.

ibid.

ibid.

ibid.

ibid.

ibid.
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ration of the Ancient Cabbala of the Tri-

This that Platonick, or rather Pseudo-
Platonick Trinity, by us opposed to the
Christian; viz. such a Trinity, as con-
founds the Differences betwixt God and
the Creature; bringing the Deity, by de-
gress, down lower and lower, and at
length scattering it into all the Anima-
ted Parts of the World; A Foundation
for Infinite Polytheism, Cofmolatry or
World-Idolatry, and Creature-Worship.
Hence the Platonists and Pythagoreans,
the Fittest men to be Champions for Pa-
ganism against Christianity. 557, 558

Concerning the Christian Trinity, Three
things to be Observed. First, that it is
not a Trinity of meer Names and Words,
nor Logical Notions, or Inadequate
Conceptions of God; this Doctrine
having been condemned by the Christian
Church, in Sabellius and others; but a
Trinity of Hypostases, Subsistence, or
Persons. 558, 559

The Second thing Observable in the
Christian Trinity, That though the Se-
cond Hypostasis thereof were Begotten
from the First, and the Third Proceed-
eth both from the FIrst and Second; yet
neither of them Creatures. First, because
not made &c. &c., or from an Ante-
dent Non-existence brought forth into
Being, but both of them Coeternall with
the Father. Secondly, because all Ne-
cessarily existent, and Un-Annihilable.
Thirdly, because all of them Univerfall,
or Infinite, and Creatours of all other
Particular Beings. 559

The Third Observable as to the Chri-
tian Trinity, That the Three Hypostases
thereof are all Truly and Really One God;
not only by Reason of Agreement of
Will, but also of a Mutuall入户'k, and
and入户k, Permeation of each other,
and Inexistence. Though no Instance of
the like Unity to be found elsewhere in
Nature; yet since two distinct Substances,
Corporal, and Incorporal, make one Man
and Person in our Selves; much more may
Three Divine Hypostases be One God.

Though much of Mystery in the Chri-
tian Trinity, yet nothing of plain Con-
tradiction to Reason therein; that is, no
Nonfense, and Impossibility. The Ill
Design of those, who represent the Chris-
tian Trinity as absolutely Contradictions to
Reason, that they may thereby debauch
mens Understandings, and make them
swallow down other things which unque-
 tionably are such. Page 560

The Christian Trinity much more a-
greeable to Reason, then the Pseudo-Pla-
tonick, in the Three Particulars before
mentioned. First, its making their Third
Hypostasis the Animated World, or Mund-
ane Soul. Which, not only too great a
Leap betwixt the Second and Third,
but also a gross Debasing of the Deity,
and Confounding it with the Creature;

A Foundation for World-Idolatry, and
worshipping Inanimate Things, as Parts
and Members of God. ibid.

God to Origen, but Quasi Animal
Mundi, As it were the Soul of the
World, and not Truly and Properly such.
All the Perfection of this Notion to be at-
tributed to God, but not the Imperfection
thereof. 560, 561

Certain, that according to the more re-
fined Platonists, their Third Divine Hy-
postasis, not a Mundane, but Supra-mund-
ane Soul, and the μαύρον Orifice
of the whole World. So to Amelius,
Porphyrius, and Plotinus. A Double
Soul of the World to Plato likewise. The
Third Hypostasis, to thefe, no Creature,
but a Creatour. 562

So in their Second Particular, (whereby
the aforementioned Pseudo-Platonick
Trinity, no Trinity) its making all the
Idea's and Archetypal Paradigms of
things, so many Hypostases, Animals,
and Gods. This a Monstrous Extrava-
gancy. Not to be doubted, but that Plato
well understood these Idea's to be Nothing
but Noemata, or Conceptions of the Di-
vine Mind, existing no-where apart by
themselves; however called ενοικυ, Ef-
fences or Substances, because not such Ac-
cidental and Evanid things as our Hu-
mane Thoughts are, they being the Stand-
ing and Eternall Objects of all Science:
As also ζώα, or Animals, to signify that
they
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they were not meer Dead Forms, as Pictures upon Paper, or Carved Statues. And thus did not only Amelius understand S. John, concerning the Logos, Whatever was made was Life in him, but also divers of the Ancient Fathers, Greek and Latin. This Deifying of Ideas, but a Piece of Pagan Poetry.

Page 562, 563

Lastly, whereas Proclus and others intermingle many Particular Gods, with those Three Universal Hypotheses, as Henades and Agathotetes, Unities and Goodness, Substantial above the First Intellect; and Noes, Particular Minds or Intellectuals, above the First Soul; this Hypotheses of theirs, altogether Irrational and Absurd; there being Nothing Essentally Goodness, Wisdow, and Sanity, but the Three Divine Hypotheses, all other Beings having only a Participation thereof. Thus Origen expressly, who therefore acknowledgeth no higher Rank of Created Beings, than such as the Platonists call Souls, that are Self-moveable, Vitally Unitable to Bodies, and Pecceable. With whom agreeeth S. Jerome, and others of the Fathers, That God is the only Impceable Being; but all Understanding Creatures, Free-willed, and Laspable.

564, 565

An Opinion of Simplicius, that even in that Rank of Beings called Souls (though not Essentally Immutable, but Self-moveable) some are of so high a Pitch, as that they can never Degenerate, nor Sink or Fall into Vicious Habits. Inform that he makes a Question whether Prorexis belong to them or no. 565, 566

But whatever is to be thought of this, Origen too far in the other Extrem, in denying any other Ranks of Souls above Humane; and supposing all the Difference, that is now betwixt the highest Angels, and Men, to have proceeded only from their Merits, and different Uses of their Free Will; his Reason being this, because God would be otherwise a Perfect Specimepas or Acceptor of Persons. This also Extended by him to the Soul of our Saviour Christ; as not Partially chosen to that Dignity, but for its Faithful Adherence to the Divine Word in a Pre-existant State; which he would prove from Scripture. But if a Rank of Souls below Humane, and Specifically differing from them, or Origen himself confess those of Brutes to be no reason why there might not also be other Ranks or Species Superior to them. Page 566, 567

But leaf of all can we assent to Origen, when from this Principle, That all Souls are Essentially endued with Free Will, and therefore in their Nature Pecceable, he infers these Endless Circuits of Souls, Upwards and Downwards, and consequently denies them any Fixed State of Holiness and Happines by Divine Grace: an Assertion contrary to the Tenour and Promises of the Gospell. Thus perhaps that to be understood, That Christ brought Life and Immortality to Light throughout the Gospell: not as if he were the First who taught the Soul's Immortality, a thing believed before by the Pharisaick Jews, and Generality of Pagans; but because these held their Endless Transmigrations and Circuits, therefore was he the first who brought everlasting Life and Happines to Light. 567, 568

That Origen, a Man very well Skilled in the Platonick Learning, and so much addited to the Dogmata thereof, would never have gor so far into that other Extream had there been any Solidity of Reason, for either those Henades, or Noes, of the Latter Platonists. This Opinion all one, as if a Christian should suppose, besides the First Person, or Father, a Multitude of Particular Paternities, Superior to the Second Person; and also besides the One Son, or Word, a Multitude of Particular Sons or Words, Superior to the Third, the Holy Ghost. This plainly to make a Breach upon the Deity, and to introduce a Company of such Creaturely Gods, as imply a Contradiction in their very Notion. 568

Lastly, this not the Catholick Doctrine of the Platonick School neither; but a Private Opinion only of some late Dogmats, No Footsteps of those Henades and Agathotetes to be found any where in Plato; nor yet in Plotinus. The Language
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Cicero's Gods, by whose Providence the World and all its Parts were framed. Page 572, 573

The Second Hypostasis in Plato's Trinity, to wit, Mind or Intellect, unquestionably Eternal, and without Beginning. The same affirmed by Plotinus also, of the Third Hypostasis, or Psyche, called the Word of the Second, as the Second, the Word of the First. Porphyryus his Testimony to this purpose in S. Cyril's, where also Mind, or the Second Divine Hypostasis, (though said to have been Begotten from the First, yet) called ὁ πατὴρ ὁ Θεός, and ὁ ἑαυτῷ παρεκτέρας, Its Own-Parent, and its Own-Offspring, and said to have sprung out ὁ ἑαυτῷ παρεκτέρας, Self-begottenly. I age 573, 574.

This Mysterious Riddle expanded out of Plotinus. The plain meaning thereof no more then this, That though this Second Hypostasis proceeded from the First, yet was it not produced by it after a Cer-Early but One God. Page 568, 570.

Nevertheless, these formentioned Depravations and Adulterations of that Divine Cabbala of the Trinity, not to be charged upon Plato himself, nor all the other Ancient Platonists and Pythagoreans; some of which approached so near to the Christian Trinity, as to make their Three Hypostases all truly Divine, and Creatures, other things being the Creatures of them. ibid.

First therefore, Plato himself, in his Timaeus, carefully distinguishing between God and the Creature, and determineth the bounds of each, after this manner. That the First, is that which Always Is, and was never Made; the Second, that which is Made and had a Beginning, but truly Is not. His meaning here perverted by Junior Platonists, whom Boetius also followed. Where Plato takes it for granted, That whatsoever hath a Temporary and Successive Duration, had a Beginning; and whatsoever had no Beginning, hath no Successive, but Permanent Duration; and so concludes, That whatsoever is Eternal, is God; but whatsoever exists in Time, and hath a Beginning, Creature.

Now to Plato, more Eternall Gods then One. Which not Idea's or Noemata, but true Substantial Things; his First, Second, and Third, in his Epistle to Dionysius, or Trinity of Divine Hypostases, the Makers or Creatours of the whole World.
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Arius, who maintained Another Word and Wisdom, Senior to that Word and Wisdom in Christ. These Platonicists, so far from denying the Eternity of the Word, that they rather attributed too much to it, in making it Self-begotten. Wherefore Plato, affenting the Eternity of his Second Hypostasis, Nous or Logos, and not of the World, did thereby, according to Athanarius his own Doctrine, make it to be no Creature. Page 575.

Nor is there any force at all in that Testimony of Macrobius, cited by Pecavius, to the contrary, wherein the First Hypostasis is said to have Created Mind from itself, and the Second to have Created Soul; because those Ancient Pagans did not confine the word Creatore, to such a narrow sense as Christians commonly do; but used it generally for all manner of Production. Pecavius his mistake, chiefly from that Spurious Trinity of the latter Platonicists, whose Third God is by themselves called mikas, a Creature. But this is not the Doctrine of the Ancients. 576.

Nevertheless, some more Reason to doubt, whether Plato's Third Hypostasis were Eternal, because in his Timæus, he Generates the Mundane Soul. This Controversy decided, by supposing a Double Psyche, ὑπό τοῦ, and ὑπό τοῦ ἡμῶν, a Mundane, and Supra-Mundane Soul; the first of these called by Plotinus, a Heavenly Venus, and a Separate Soul. Wherefore though the Lower Venus, or Mundane Soul, according to Plato, made in Time together with the World, yet the Higher Divine Soul, or Heavenly Venus, the Son of Chronos without a Mother, his Third Hypostasis, Eternal, and without Beginning. 576, 577.

This further Evident from hence, Because Plato in his Epistle to Dionysius, affirmeth as well of the Second, and Third, as of the First, that in all those things that are Cognate to our Humane Soul, (or Creaturely) there is φανερὰ, Nothing like thereunto. 577.

Secondly, The Three Hypostases of Plato's Trinity, not only all Eternall, but also Necessarily Existent, and Absolutely Unannihilable. Nor could the First any more Exit without the Second and Third, then the Sun without its Primary Light, and Secondary Splendor. These according to Plotinus, the Three Principles of the Universe; so that there could be neither More, nor Fewer. They also who called the Second, Autopator, signified thereby, the Necessity of its Existence. 577, 578.

Thirdly, These Three Platonic Hypostases, as Eternall, and Necessarily so likewise Universal, or Comprehensive of the Whole World, that it is, Infinite and Omnipotent. Therefore called Principles, and Caucis, and Opifiers. Though Nous or Mind vulgarly lockt upon as the Highest Principle of all things, yet Plato set before it, One Most Simple Good. When Nous said by Plato, to be wisest, of the Same Kind, with the First Cause of all things; this all one as if he had affirmed it to be wisest, Co-Essential or Consubstantial with it. Pag. 579.

Plato's Third Hypostasis, Pyche, or the Superior Mundane Soul, called by him Zeus, from ζυς, as also the Caufe and Fountain of Life, and the Prince and King of all things. And when said to be ὑποταις, the Offspring of the Highest Mind, thereby made Consubstantial with it also. So that Plato's whole Trinity Homousian.

Though by the Demiurges or Opificers, Plato commonly meant the Second Hypostasis, Mind or Intellect; yet Atticus, Ancius, Plotinus and others, called the Third or the Higher Pyche also, by that Name. Wherefore according to the Genuine Platonic, and Parmenidian Trinity, all the Three Hypostases Joyn-Creatours of the whole World, This Ficus often, and Proclus. Porphyrius his Affirmaion, that the Deity according to Plato, Extends to Three Hypostases. Ibid.

Certain therefore, that Arius did not Platonicize, but rather Athanarius and the Nicene Fathers, who notwithstanding made not Plato, but the Scriptures, their Foundation. The Genuine Trinity of Plato and Parmenides, a Middle betwixt that of Sabeltius, and that of Arius: it being neither a Trinity of Words and Names, as the Former; nor an Heterousous Trinity, a Confus'd Jumble of God and Creature together; but Homousious and Homogenall: all Eternall, Necessarily Existent, Infinite or Omnipotent, and Creatour. 579, 580.

But that it may yet more fully appear, how far the most refined Platonic and Parmenedian Trinity, does either Agree or Disagree, with the Scripture and Chriftian Doctrine, Two things further to be Observed concerning it. First, that the Platonicists Universally affiered an Essential Dependence of their Second and Third Hypostases upon the First, or also a Gradual Subordination in them. This Plotinus's Chronos, or the Second Hypostasis, is in a Middle State betwixt his Father who is Greater, and his Son who is Inferior, And that in that Eternal Generation or Emanation, no Progress Upward, but all Downward, and a Gradual Defcent. 580, 581.

More of the Dependence and Gradual Subordination of the Second and Third Hypostases of the Platonic Trinity, to the First. Each following Hypostasis called ὑποταις, and τοῦτο, and
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and inno, and abmon, and wimma of that before it. Philo's Offensive Expression, 'That the Logos, or Word, is the Shadow of God. This Gradation commonly Illustrated by the ἐνέργειαν or ἐνέργειαν, the Effulgence or Out-shining Splendor of the Sun. Page 581, 582

The same further manifested, from the several Distinctive Characters, given to each Hypostasis, in the True Platonick or Parmenidian Trinity. The First, ὅλος ἐναλήγμα, One before all things; The Second, οἷος ἐναλήγμα, One All things, as to their Distinct Idea's; The Third, ὅλος ἐναλήγμα, One Really producing All things. The First, Unity and Goodness Essentially; the Second, Understanding and Wisdom; the Third, Self-Active Love and Power. The First or Father ὅλος ἐναλήγμα, Above Action: The Second or Son the Demiurgus, The Maker or contriving Architect of the World, but an Immovable Nature: The Third a Movable Deity, and the Immediate Governor of the whole World. Amicus his Distinction of them into ἰδεα, ἰδεα, ἰδεα. 582, 583

The greatest Difficulty in the distinctive Characters of these Three Platonick Hypostases; That Understanding, Reason, and Wisdom, should be made Peculiar to the Second, as if the First were therefore devoid of Mind, Reason and Wisdom. This an Arcanum of the Platonick and Pythagoric Theology: That whereas Anaxagoras, Arifotle, and the Vulgar, make Mind and Understanding, the Oldest of all things, and the Highest Principle in the universe; this supposes Mind, Knowledge, and Wisdom, to be, not the First, but Second. Partly because there is Multiplicity in Knowledge, but there must be Unity before Multiplicity. And partly because there must be No one Object or Intelligible before Intellect. As also, because Intellect, or Knowledge, is not the Highest Good, or Happiness, and therefore to be some Substantial thing, in order of Nature Superiour to Mind. Hence concluded, that the Supreme Deity is Better then Logos, Reason, Word, or Intellect. That not logos, from whence Logos is derived. Thus Philo; 'The God before Reason or Word, better then all the Rational Nature. But this Difficulty common to Platonism, with Christianity, which Likewise makes Word or Reason and Wisdom, not the First, but Second Hypostasis. Thus does Athanasius deny that there is any Word, Reason, or Wisdom, before the Son of God. What then? Is the First Hypostasis therefore ὅλος and ἐναλήγμα, Devoid of Reason and Mind? Plotinus his Attempts to answer this; That the First hath ὅλος ἐναλήγμα, A Simple Light, different from that Multiform Light of Knowledge. Again, That the First is Nouns aor, Intelligence it self, and therefore Superior to Intellect, or that which hath Intellecction. (For ὅλος τις ἐναλήγμα, Intelligence it self doth not understand.) Besides which, another Attempt also to solve this Difficulty. Page 583, 584

The Ground of this Platonick Dependence and Subordination in the Divine Hypostases; Because there is but One Fountain of the Godhead; so that the Second must needs differ from the First, as the ἰδεας from the ὅλος, The Splendor from the Sun. 585, 586

Though the Second Hypostasis said to have been Begotten, from the First; yet this not to be taken for such a Generation, as that of Men, where Three Men, (Father, Son, and Grandson) all Adult, have no Effential Dependence upon one another, nor Gradual Subordination. This but an Imperfect Generation. 587

Furthermore, the Platonists would recommend this Their Gradation in the Deity, or Subordination of Hypostases, from hence, because by this means, not to great a Leap or Jump in the Creation, as otherwise there must be; nor the Whole Deity screwed up to such a Difproportionate Height, as would render it Uncapable of having any Intercourse with the Lower World. Were the whole Deity, either One Simple Monade, or else an Immovable Mind, it could have no such Liberty of Will as is commonly attributed to it, nor be Affible with anything here below; nor indeed any fitter Object for mens Devotion, than an Adamantine Rock. Whereas all the Phaenomena of the Deity followable by this Platonick Gradation. 587, 588

As also according to this Hypothecis, some reasonable satisfaction to be given, why just so many Divine Hypostases, and neither Fewer, nor More. 588

The Second thing to be Observed, concerning the Genuine Platonick, or Parmenidian Triniti; That though the Hypostases thereof be called Three Natures, and Three Principles, and Three Opifcers, and Three Gods; yet they all Really make up but One Divinity. For the World, being Created by all Three, and yet having but One Creation, they must needs be all One Creator. Porphyrius in S. Cyril explicitly, That, according to Plato, the Essence of the Deity extendeth to Three Hypostases. 588, 589

Platonists further add, That were it not for this Essencial Dependence, and Subordination, the Three Divine Hypostases must needs be Three Co-ordinate Gods, and no more One God, then Three Men are One Man, or Three Suns One Sun. Whereas the Sun, its Splendor, and Derivative Light, may all well be accounted One and the same Thing. 589, 590

These Platonists therefore suppose, so close a Union,
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Union, and so near a Conjunction, between their Three Hypotheses; as no where else to be found in Nature. Plotinus, That there is Nothing between them, and That they are Only Not the very same. They acknowledge slip, their Perichoresis or Mutual Existence. The Three Hypotheses One Divinity to the Platonists, in the same manner, as the Centre, Radius Distance Immovable, and Movable Circumference of a Sphere, all One Sphere. The First Infinite Goodness, the Second Infinite Wisdom, the Third Infinite Active Love, and Power Substantial. Page 590, 591.

From this full Account of the True and Genuine Platonick Trinitiy, its both Agreement and Disagreement with the Christian, Plainly apparent. First, Its Agreement in the Three Fundamentall things before mentioned; and consequently its Discrepancy from Arianism.

Secondly, Its Disagreement notwithstanding, from the Now-received Doctrine, in that it supplies the Three Hypotheses not to have One and the same Singular Divinity, nor yet an Absolute Co-Equality, but a Gradual Subordination, and Essential Dependence. Upon which account, said by some, to Symbolize with Arianism, however different from it in the Main Point.

Besides which, the best of the Platonists, sometimes Guilty of Extravagant Expressions. Plotinus himself so was manifest, That our Humane Soul is of the same Species with the Mundane Soul, or Third Hypostasis; That being but the Elder Sister. Which indeed it to make it Co-Essential or Consubstantial with us Men, as S. Aultine understood it. This a Foundation for Creature-Worship or Idolatry, Why the Arians by Centianialc called Porphyrians. But this Doctrine, as Repugnant to Plato, so elsewhere Contradicted by Plotinus himself.

Notwithstanding, a Platonick Christian would Apologize for Plato and the Genuine Pythagoreans, after this manner. First, That having no Scriptures, Councils, nor Creeds, to direct them in the Darkness of this Mystery, and to guide their Language, they the more excusable, if not always Uniform, and sometimes Extravagant. More to be wondered at, that they should approach so near the Christian Truth.

And for their Gradual Subordination of Hypotheses, and Dependence of the Second and Third upon the First; That thefe Platonists herein the more excusable, because the Majority of Christian Doctors for the first Three Centuries, seem to have affeeted the same. 595, 596.

The Platonick Christians further Apologize;

That the Platonick Intention in Subordinating their Three Hypotheses, only to exclude a Primality of Co-ordinate Independent Gods. That none of Plato's Three Hypotheses, Creator, but that the Essence of the Godhead belonging to them All, they being all Eternal, Necessarily Existent, Infinite, or Omnipotent, and Creatures. Therefore in the sense of the Nicene Council, Consubstantial and Co-equal, The Essence of the Godhead, wherein all the Three Hypotheses agree, as well to the Fathers, as Platonists, General and Universall. Page 594, 597.

Besides which, the Genuine Platonists would acknowledge also, all their Three Hypotheses to be Homoeoulal, Co-essential or Consubstantial, yet in a further Sense, as making up One Entire Divinity: As the Root, Stock, and Branch, Co-essential to a Vine. The Trinity not so Uniedivided, as if Three were not Three in One. The Inequality and Subordination in the Platonick trinity, within the Deity it self only, and in the Relation of the Hypotheses to one another; they being ad extra all One and the same God, Joyfully Consenting in the same Actions, and in this respect, devoid of Inequality.

Furthermore, the Platonick Christian would urge, That according to the Principles of Christianity it self, there must needs be some Dependence and Subordination in these Hypotheses, in their Relation to one another; a Priority and Posteriory of Order and Eminent; That which is Originally of it self, being some kind of Priority and Superiority, over that which is wholly Derived from it. The Second and Third Hypotheses, not so Omnipotent as the First, because not able to beget or Produce that. Hence the First styled by Macrobius, the Most Omnipotent of all. Sunday's Raleigh in Scripture, favouring this Hypothesis, is also Orthodox Fathers. Athanasius by Refusalliance to the Original Light and the Secondary Splendour: to the Fountain and the Stream, the Root and the Branch, the Water and the Vapour. The Equality atterred by the Orthodox, in way of Equality to the Arian Inequality, of God and Creation; That they equally God, or Uncreated. Notwithstanding which, some Inequality amongst them allowed by Petavius and others, as This God, and That Periven. 599, 600.

However, no necessity of any more Inequality and Subordination in the Platonick, than in the Christian Trinity; they being but Infinite Goodness, and Infinite Wisdom, and Infinite Active Love, and Power Substantial. Another Hypothecis of some Platonists, hinted by S. Aultine out of Porphyry, which makes the Third Hypothesis a Mydelle between the First
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and Second; and implies, not so much a Gradation, as a Circulation in the Trinity. Page 600. 601

As for the Platonists supposing their Three Hypotheses (though One Entire Divinity) to have their Distinct Singular Effences, without which they conceive they could be nothing but Three Names; the Platonick Christian would make this Apology; That the Orthodox Fathers themselves were generally of this persuasion, That the Essence of the Godhead wherein all the Three Persons agree, not One Singular, but only One Common or Universal Essence. Their Distillation to this purpose, betwixt this and that, that the former was Common or General, the Latter Singular or Individual. Theodore, Basil, and many others. Peter in his acknowledgement, that the Greeks Universally agreed herein. 601, 602

The Opinion of Gregory Nyffen, Cyril, Damasen, and others; That the Persons of the Trinity no otherwise One, then as Three Individuals under the same Species, or as Three Men agree in the same common Humanity. These are the Christian Affirments of an Abolute, Independent, and Un-subordinate Co-equality. This the only faults that S. Cyril finds in the Platonists; that they did not assert such a Confubstantiality. Whereas this Trinity, Trinithism; the Three Persons thereof being no more One God, then Three Men are One Man. However this certain, that these Fathers did not suppose the Three Hypotheses of the Trinity to have all the same Singular Essence. Another Extremity, that sprung up afterwards in the room of the former Trinithism, and owned by no other Authority, then of a Lateran Council. 603, 604

And that this Sameness of Singular Essence was not affected by the Nicene Fathers, and first Opposers of Arius; Firmly, clearly acknowledged by Petavius. 604, 605

But this further Evident from hence; Because the same Orthodox Fathers, who opposed Arius, in his condemnation of Sabellianism, which affected, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be but One Hypothesis, that is, to have but One and the same Singular Essence; and consequently acknowledged no other Trinity then of Names or Words. 605

It appears also from hence, Because the Word Homousios is never any other Sense, then to signify the Agreement of things Numerically differing, in some Common and General Nature or Essence. S. Basili, That the same thing is not Homousious, Co-effential, or Confubstantial with itself; but always One thing with another. To signify the same with appoidea in Plotinus. So also in Athanarius, be affirming the Branches to be Homousious and Congene-
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Uncreated Nature only. This Grofsly affected in the Dialogues of the Trinity, Vtilgari Impu-

ized to Athanaflus: and to that purpose also, That Three Men are not Three Men, but only then,

when they Differ from one another in Will and Opinion. But these Dialogues Pseudograp-

phous. Nevertheless the Granted, that Atha-

nalius himfelf, in that Book of the Common Ef-

fence of the Perfons, feems to lay something too

much Stress upon this Common Nature, Ef-

fence, or Subftance, of the Three Perfons, as to

the making of them all but One God. Howe-

ver, it is certain he does not there rely upon that

alone; and elsewhere acknowledgeth it to be in-

fufficient. The true Reafon, why Athanaflus

is fo great a Stress upon the Homoioufes, not

because this alone would make them One God,

but because they could not possibly be One God

without it. For if the Father be Uncreated, and

the Son a Creature, then can they not both

be One God. Several Passages of Athanaflus

Cited to this purpose. Thofe Expreffions in him

of One Godhead, and the Samnefs of the Godhead,

and One Efience or Subftance in the Trinity,

not fo to be underftood, as if the Three

Perfons were but feveral Names, Notions, or

Modes of One Thing. Page 612, 616

Wherefore though Athanaflus lay his Foundation

in this obfolute, Common Specific U-

nity of the Perfons, (which is their Confubfian-

ciality,) in order to their being One God, yet

does he superadd other Confequences also

thereunto. As at all this, That they are not

Three Principles, but only One; the Efience

of the Father being the Root and Fountain of

the Son and Spirit: and the Three Hypoftales,

gathered together under One Head. Where

Athanalius implies, That were they prefectly Co-

ordinate and Independent, they would not be

One, but Three Gods.

In the next place, he further addeth; That

these Three Hypoftales are not Three Separated

Disjoind Things, but Individually United;

as the Glendor Indivifible from the Sun, and

Wisdom from him that is Wife. That nei-

ther of these Perfons could be without the other

nor any thing come between them: they fo imme-

diately Conjoyned together, as that there is a kind

of everfe or Continuity between them.616, 617

Thirdly, Athanaflus goes yet higher, affirming

these Three Hypoftales, not only to be Individu-

ally Conjoyned, but alfo to have a Mutual In-

exiftenz in each other. This afterwards called

an Empiricalchis. That of our Saviour, I am

in the Father, and the Father in me, therefore

Quarrelled at by the Arians, because they con-

ceived of Things Incorporeal, after a Corpor-

real manner. That the Godhead of the Son,

is the Godhead of the Father; and the Fa-

ther exercises a Providence over all, in the

Son. Page 617, 619

Lastly, Athanaflus alfo in Sunday Places,
supposes the Three Divine Hypoftales to make

up one Entire Divinity; as the Fountain and

the Stream make up one entire River; the

Root, Stock, and Branches, one entire Tree.

Accordingly the word Homoioufes used by Atha-

nalius, in a further Sense, not only to signi-

fy things Agreeing in one Common and General

Efience, but also fuch as Effentially Concur

to the making up of One Entire thing. That the

Three Hypoftales do OXfardly, or Ad extrâ,

produce all, or every, One and the only or

fame Action; the Father, By the Word, in the Holy

Spirit, doing all things. That this Doctrine of Athanaflus would have been readily af-

fected to by Plato and his Genuine Followers.

The Platonick Chriftian therefore Concludeth,

That there is no fuch Real Di@rence between the

Genuine Platonick Trinity, and that of the

First Orthodox Anti-Arian Fathers, as some

conceive. From which notwithstanding that Tri-

archick Trinity, of S. Greg. Nyfiun, Cyril,

and others, of Three Co-ordinate Individuals

under the fame Species, (as Three Men) feems

to have been a Deviation. 619, 620

Histbte the Platonick Chriftians Apology,

for the Genuine Platonick Trinity; or Endeav-

our to reconcile it with the Doctrine of the Anci-

ent Church: Where nothing is afferted by our

felves, but all Submitted to the Judgement of the

Learned in these Matters. And whatsoever in

Plato’s Trinity fhall be found Difcrepanz

from the fons of the First Orthodox Anti-Ari-

an Fathers, utterly demolished by us. Athana-

lius a great Infrument of Divine Providence,

for preferring the Chriftian Church from Lyp-

fung into a kind of Paganic and Idolatrous

Christianity.

The Reafon of this Apology, for the Genuine

Platonick Trinity: Because it is againz the In-

terest of Chriftianity, that this fhould be made

more Difcrepanz from the Chriftian, then indeed

it is. Moreover certain, that this Genuine Pla-

tonick Trinity was Anti-Arian; or rather the

Arian, Anti-Platonick. Wherefore Socrates wun-

dered, that Georgius and Timotheus Presby-

ters, fhould adhere to the Arian Faction; when

one of them was accounted much a Platonift, the

other an Origenist. 620, 621

Furthermore, Platonick Pagans after Chri-

fanity, highly approved of the Beginning of

S. John’s Goffell, concerning the Logos, as exa-

cely agreeing with their Platonick Doctrine.

This Amelius in Eufebius, and others. A Pla-

tonift in S. Auline, That it deferred to be wirz

in Golden Letters, and set up in fome Eminent

places, in every Chriftian Church. But that

(f 3 )
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which is most of all Considerable, to justify the Apology, The generality of Christian Fathers, before and after the Nicene Council, look'd upon this Platonick Trinity. not as really the same thing with the Christian, yet as approaching so near thereto, that it is differed chiefly in Circumstances, or Manner of Expression. This Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandriaus, Origen, S. Cyprian, or the Author of the Book De Spiritu Sancto, Eusebius Cesarientus, and which is most of all to the purpose, Athanarius himself, be giving a Signal Testimony thereunto. To which may be added, S. Autin, and Thedoret. S. Cyril, though blaming the Platonick Subordination, (Himself supposing the Trinity to be Three Co-ordinate Individuals, under the same Specific Nature of the Godhead) yet acknowledges that Plato was not altogether ignorant of the Truth, &c. But that Plato's Subordination, of his second Hypostasis to the First, was not (as (the Arian) of a Creature to the Creator) already made unquestionably Evident.

Page 621, 623

Wherefore a Wonderful Providence of Almighty God here be to be taken notice of; That this Doctrine, of a Trinity of Divine Hypostases, should be entertained in the Pagan World before Christiantity, as it were to prepare a way for the Reception of it amongst the Learned. Which the Junior Platonists were so sensible of, that besides their other Adulterations of the Platonick Trinity before mentioned, (for the Countenance of their Polytheism and Idolatry) they at length Innovated and Altered the whole Cabala; now no longer acknowledging a Trinity, but at least a Quadrinity of Divine Hypostases, namely, before and besides the Trinity, another Hypostasis superior thereto, and standing alone by itself. This first started by Iamblichus, carried on by Proclus, taken notice of by S. Cyril: besides which, Proclus also added other Platonic Trinities of his own. 625, 627

Another Advantage of this Platonick Trinity, extending to the present time; perhaps not Unintended also by Divine Providence, to abate the Confidence of those Conceited Wits, who so boldly derry the Trinity for Non-sensical Contradiction to Reason, and Impossibility; when they shall find, that the Belie and Freeth Wits among the Pagans, though having no Scripture-Revolution to impose upon them, were yet fond of this Hypothesis. 637

And now it is sufficiently appears, That the Ancient Platonists and Pythagoreans, were not to be taxed for Polytheists and Idolaters, in giving Religious Worship to their Three Divine Hypostases. One grand Deign of Christianty, to free the World from Idolatry and Creature-Worship: And this the reason, why the Ancient Fathers so zealously opposed Arianism, because it threatened that Defign, it Paganizing and Idolatizing that, which was intended for the Unpaganizing of the World. One Remarkable Passage of Athanarius to this purpose.

Page 617, 629

Where First Observeable, That Athanarius expressly affirmeth the Pagans to have Worshipped only One Uncreated, and Many Created Gods. This Greg. Naz. That there was but One Divinity amongst the Pagans also. And Irenaeus, That they attributed the first place of the Deity to One Supreme God, the Maker of this Universe. And Secondly, That to Athanarius, and all those other Fathers, who charged the Arians with idolatry, this was supposed not to consist in Worshipping Many Independent, and Self-Existent Gods, but in giving Religious Worship to Creatures: As the Arians gave a Religious Worship to the Son or Word, supposed by themselves to be but a Creature. 629, 630

But if Arians guilty of Polytheism or Idolatry, for believing Religious Worship upon the Son, or Word, as a Creature, (though the Chief of Creatures, and that by which all others were Made) much more they guilty hereof, who Religiously worshipped other Inferior Beings. Athanarius; That no Creature the Object of Religious Worship, and that the Orthodox worshipped the Divinity, in the Humanity of our Saviour Christ. Nefiorius bordered with the name of a Man-worshipper. Some suppose That necessary to Idolatry, which is Impossible; to Worship more than One, as Omnipotent, or with Mental Latria. 630, 632

And now have we sufficiently Answered the Objection against the Naturality of the Idea of God, as including One in it from the Pagan Polytheism. What further here intended concerning the same, (as a Foundation for our Defence of Christianty) differed, to make Room for a Confutation of all the Atheistical Arguments.

CHAP. V.

A Particular Confutation of all the Atheistical Grounds.

The First Atheistical Argument; That there is no Idea of God. That in Answer to this, The Idea of God hath been already declared: viz. A Perpetual Understanding Being, Unmade, or Self-Existent from Eternity, and the Cause of all other Things. In which, Nothing Unconceivable, nor Contradictious. That these Confounded Atheists themselves, who deny that
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that there is any Idea of God at all, much
withstanding of necessity suppose the contrary
because otherwise, denying his Existence, they
should deny the Existence of Nothing. And
that they agree also with Theists in the same
Idea; The one denying the Existence of that,
which the other affirms; That an Understanding
Nature is the Original of all things. This Idea
of God, as containing Onelines and Singularity
in it, not only largely Defended and made
good against that Objection from the Pagan Polytheism;
but also proved that the Generality of Mankind have a Natural Propensity or Antici-
pation in their Minds, concerning the Real and
Actual Existence of such a Being, Atheists
but Monsters, and Anomalies of mankind. This
a sufficient Confutation of the First Atheistical
Argument. Page 633, 634.

Nevertheless, That Atheists may not pretend,
any of their Strength to be Concealed, all their
Particular Exceptions against the Idea of God
here Declared, being Five. Their First Exception,
That we can have no Idea nor Thought of any
thing not Subject to Sense; much less any Evidence
of the Existence thereof. The Answer.
First, That whereas the Atheists suppose Sense
to be the Only Knowledge, or at least Original
Knowledge; Sense, as such is not Knowledge,
or Understanding; because if it were, then
every one that sees Light and Colours, or
feels Heat and Cold, would understand Light
and Colours, Heat and Cold. Plainly proved
also, from that Atomick Philosophy, (which
the Epicurean Atheists so much pretend to,) That
there is a Higher Faculty of the Soul,
which Judges of Sense, detects the Phantasm
thereof, resolves sensible Things into Intelligibil Principles, 
No Person able to make a judgement, either of it self, or of other things.
The Confounded Democritus himself, sometime acknowledged Sense to be but Seeming
and Phantastic, and not to reach to the Absolute
Truth and Reality of Things. He therefore
Exploded Qualities out of the Rank, of Entities,
because Unintelligible; concluding them to be
but our own Phantasms. Undeniably Evident,
that we have Idea's, Notions, and Thoughts,
of many things that never were in Sense, and
whereof we have no Genuine Phantasms. Athe-
ists attend not to their own Cogitations.
That Opinion, That there is Nothing in the
Understanding which was not before in Sense, Falsé
and Atheistical. Men having a Notion of a
Perfect Understanding Being, the Cause of all
things, as the Object of their Devotion; the
Atheists notwithstanding, would here Prescend them
that they have none, and that the thing is a
Non-Entity, merely because they have no Sensible
Idea, or Phantasm thereof. And so may
they as well prove, not only the Reality and Un-
derstanding, Appetite and Volition, to be Non-Enti-
ties; but also Phancy and Sense itself, neither
of these falling under Sense, but only the Ob-
jects of them. Were God indeed Corporal, as
some mistake the Theists suppose, yet his Essence
chiefly consisting in Mind and Understanding,
this of him could not possibly be Subject to Sense.
But that there is also Substance Incorporeal,
which therefore in its own Nature is Infinibile,
and that the Deity is such, will be elsewhere De-
monstrated. Page 634, 637

Though the Evidence of Singular Bodies
Existing, depend upon the Information of Sense;
yet the Certainty of this very Evidence, not
from Sense alone, but a Complication of Reason
and Understanding with it. Sense Phantastic,
not reaching to the Absolute Truth of things;
and obnoxious to Delusion. Our own Imagi-
 nations, taken for Sensations and Realities,
in Sleep, and by Melancholized Persons when
awake. Atomick Atheists themselves, after the
Existence of such things as they have no Sense of;
Atoms, Membranes, or Exuvious Images of
Bodies, may Incorporeal Space. If the Exis-
tence of Nothing, to be acknowledged, which
falls not under Sense, then not the Existence of
Soul and Mind. — God the Great Mind,
that Rules the whole Universe; whence our Imper-
icnt Minds derived. The Existence of that
God, whom no Eye can see, Demonstrated by
Reason from his Effects. 637, 638

The Second Atheistical Pretense against the
Idea of God, and his Existence from the Theists
own acknowledging Him to be Incopræhensible;
from whence they infer him to be a Non-
Entity. Here perhaps it may be Granted, in a
right Sense, that whatsoever is altogether
unconceivable, is either in itself, or at least to Us,
Nothing. How that of Protagoras, That every
Man is the measure of all things to himself, in
his Sense falsé. Whateover any man's shallow
understanding cannot clearly comprehend, not
therefore to be presently expunged out of the Cat-
ologue of Beings. Nevertheless according to
Aristotle, the Soul and Mind in a manner
Allthings. This a Cyttalline Globe, or No-
tional World, that hath some Image in it of
whatever is contained in the Real Globe of
Being. 638

But this Absolutely False; That whatsoever
cannot be fully Comprehended by Us, is therefore
utterly Unconceivable, and consequently No-
thing. For we cannot fully Comprehend Our
selves, nor have such an Adequate Conception
of any Substancce, as perfectly to Master and Con-
quer the same. That of the Scepticks so far
True, That there is Something Incomprehensible
in the Essence of Everything; even of Body it
self.
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self: Truth Bigger then our Minds. Proper to God Almighty, (who alone is wise) perfectly to Comprehend the Essences of all things. But it follows not from hence, that therefore we have no Idea nor Conception at all of any thing. We may have a Notion or Idea of a Perfect Being, though we cannot fully Comprehend the same by Our Imperfect Minds; as we may see and Touch a Mountain; though we cannot Encompass it all round within our Arms. This therefore a False Theorem of the Atheists, That whatever cannot be fully Comprehended by Mens Imperfect Understandings, is an Absolute Non-Entity.

Page 638, 639

Though God more Incomprehensible then other Things, because of his Transcendent Perfection, yet hath he also more of Conceivability; as the Sun, though dazzling our Sight, yet hath more of Visibility, also, then any other Object. The Dark Incomprehensibility of the Deity, like the Absolute Obscurity of the Transparent Ether, not any thing Absolutely in itself, but only relative to us. 639, 640

This Incomprehensibility of the Deity so far from being an Argument against its Existence, that certain, on the Contrary, were there Nothing Incomprehensible to our Imperfect Minds, there could be no God. Everything Apprehended by some Internal Congruity. The Sensible and Imperception of our Narrow Understandings, must needs make them Asymmetrical or Incommensurate, to what Absolutely Perfect. 640

Nature is itself Intimates, That there is Something Vastly Bigger then our Mind and Thoughts, by those Passions Implanted in us, of Devout Veneration, Adoration, and Admiration, with Ecstatic and Pleading Horror. That of the Deity which cannot enter into the Narrow Vessels of our Minds, must be otherwise apprehended, by their being Plunged into, or Swallowed up and Lost in it. We have a Notion or Conception of a Perfect Being, though we cannot fully Comprehend the same; because our selves being Imperfect, must Needs be Incommensurates thereof. Thus no Reason at all, in the Second Atheistic Pretense, against the Idea of God, and his Existence; from his Confessed Incomprehensibility. ibid.

The Third follows, That Infinity, supposed to be Essential to the Deity, is a thing Per-Rectly Unconceivable, and therefore an Impossibility, and Non-Entity. Some Passages of a Modern Writer to this purpose. The meaning of them, That there is Nothing of Philosophick Truth in the Idea or Attributes of God, nor any other Sense in the words, then only to signify the Veneration and Adoration of mens own Minds. That the word Infinity signifies Nothing in the Thing it self so called, but only the Inability of our Understandings, and Admiration. And since God by his act is denied to be Finite, but cannot be Infinite, therefore an Unconceivable Nothing. Thus another Learned Well-wisher to Atheism, That we have no Idea of Infinite, and therefore not of God. Which in the Language of Atheists, all one as to say, that He is a Non-Entity. Page 640, 641

Answer. This Argument, That there can be nothing Infinite, and therefore no God, proper to the Modern and Neoteric Atheists only; but Repugnant to the Sense of the Ancients. Anaximander's *Apeiron* Infinite Matter, though Melius his *Apeiron* the True Deity. Formerly both Theists and Atheists agreed in this; That there must be Something or other Infinite, either an Infinite Mind, or Infinite Matter. The ancient Atheists also asser'ted, a Numerical Infinity of Worlds. Thus do Atheists Confute or Contradict Atheists. 641, 642

That the Modern Atheists do not least Contradict Plain Reason also, and their very Selves, then they do their Predecessors, when they would degrade a God from hence, Because there can be Nothing Infinite. For First, Certain, that there was something or other Infinite in Duration, or Eternal without Beginning: Because, If there had been once Nothing, there could never have been Any thing. But hardly any Atheists can be so Settled, as in good earnest to think, there was once Nothing at all, but afterwardSeniles Matter Happened to be. Notorious Impudence in them, who aff't the Eternity of Matter, to make this an Argument against the Existence of a God: Because Infinite Duration without Beginning, an Impossibility. 642, 643

A Concession to the Atheists of these Two Things: That we neither have a Phantasm of any Infinite, because there was never any in Sense; and that Infinity is not fully Comprehensible by Finite Understandings neither. But since, Mathematically Certain, That there was something Infinite in Duration, Demonstrated from hence, against Atheists, That there is Something Really Exiting, which we have neither any Phantasmof; nor yet can fully Comprehend in our Minds.

ibid.

Further Granted, That as for Infinity of Number, Magnitude, and Time without beginning, as we have no Phantasm, nor full Comprehension of them, so have we neither any Intelligible Idea, Notion or Conception: From whence it may be Concluded, That they are Non-Entities. Number Infinite in Aristotle, only in a Negative Sense, because we can never come to an End thereof by Addition. For which very Reason also, there cannot possibly be any Number Positively Infinite; since One or More may always
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Three Angles of a Triangle, not to be equal to two Right. That to make one Attribute of the Deity Devour and Destroy another; Infinite Will and Power, Infinite Understanding and Wisdom. To suppose God to understand and be Wife, only by Will, Really to give him no understanding at all. God is so Omnipotent, as that he can destroy the Intelligible Nature of things, which were to Baffle and Befoul his own Wisdom. Infinite Power, that which can do all that it Possible; that it, Conceivable, or Implies no Contradiction. The very Essence of Possibility, Conceivability. And thus all the Ancient Theists. Abjured for Atheists to say, that a Power of doing Nothing, but what is Conceivable, is Unconceivable.

But because Atheists look upon Infinity as such a Mornio, we shall take off the Wizard from it; by declaring, That it is Really nothing else but Perfection. Infinite Understanding and Knowledge, Perfect Understanding, without any Defect, and the Knowledge of all things Knowable. Infinite Power, Perfect Power; or a Power of doing all things Possible. Infinite Duration, Perfection of Essence. Because Infinity, Perfection; therefore Nothing which includes anything thing of Imperfection in the Essence of it, can be truly and properly Infinite; as Number, Magnitude, and Time; all which can but Counterfeit Infinity. Nothing One way Infinite, which is not so Every way, or a Perfect Being.

But the Thing which the Atheists principally Quarrel with, is Infinite Power, or Omnipotence; which they pretend also to be utterly Unconceivable, and Impossible, and a Name of Nothing. Where indeed our Modern Atheists have the joint Seiffage of the Ancients also, who concerned themselves in Nothing more, than Distraining Omnipotence, or Infinite Power. ib. This Omnipotence, either Wifely or Ignorantly Misrepresented by Atheists, as if it were a Power of doing things Contradictory. An Irony of a Modern Atheist, That God could turn a Tree into a Sylllogism. The Atheist Doctrine of Carnefas; That God could have made Twice two, not to have been Four; or the

always be Added. No Magnitude so Great neither, but that a Greater may be Supposed. By Infinite Space, to be Understood, Nothing but a Possibility of more and more Body, further and further Infinitely, by Divine Power; or that the World could never be made so Great, as that God was not able to make it still Greater. This Potential Infinity, or Indefiniteness of Body, seems to be mistaken, for an Actual Infinity of Space. Lastly, no Infinity of Time Past, because then there must needs be Time Past, which never was Present. An Argument of a Modern Writer. Reason therefore Concludes, neither the World nor Time, to have been Infinite in Past Duration. Page 643, 644.

Here will the Atheists think he has got a Great Advantage, for disproving the Existence of a God; They who thus take away the Eternity of the World, taking away also the Eternity of a God. As if God could not be Eternal otherwise; then by a Successive Flux of Infinite Time. But we say, that thus afforded a Demonstration of a God; Because since both the World and Time had a Beginning, there must of necessity be Something, whose Duration is not Successive, but Permanent, which was the Creator of them both. Wherefore the Atheists can here only make Grimaces, and Quibble upon Nunc-Stans, as if that Standing Eternity of the Deity, were nothing but a Pittfall Moment of Time Standing still; and if all Duration must needs be the same with ours, &c. 644, 645.

Concluded, That Infinite and Eternal, are not Words which signify Nothing in the thing itself, but only the Idea Probeces of our Minds, or our own Ignorance, Superfluous Amusement, and Veneration: not mere Attributes of Honour and Complement, but Attributes belonging to the Deity, (and that alone) of the most Philosophick Truth. And though we have no Adequate Comprehension thereof, yet must we have some Notion of that, which we can Demonstrate to belong to Something. 645, 646.

But the Thing which the Atheists Principally Quarrel with, is Infinite Power, or Omnipotence; which they pretend also to be utterly Unconceivable, and Impossible, and a Name of Nothing. Where indeed our Modern Atheists have the joint Seiffage of the Ancients also, who concerned themselves in Nothing more, than Distraining Omnipotence, or Infinite Power. ib. This Omnipotence, either Wifely or Ignorantly Misrepresented by Atheists, as if it were a Power of doing things Contradictory. An Irony of a Modern Atheist, That God could turn a Tree into a Syllogism. The Atheist Doctrine of Carnefas; That God could have made Twice two, not to have been Four; or the
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Imaginary thing and Non-Entity, can be only conceived by the Negation of Finite, as Nothing is, by the Negation of Something, An Infinite Being, Nothing but a Perfect Being, such as never was Not, and could produce all things possible, or Conceivable. Page 648, 649

The Fourth Atheistic Pretext against the Idea of God; That it is an Arbitrarious Complement of Contradictious Notions. Where First we deny not, but that as some Religionists Extend the Divine Power to things Contradictious, so may others compound Contradictions together in the Nature of the Deity. But it does not follow from thence, that Theology isself is therefore Contradictious, no more then that Philosophy is so, because some Philosophers also hold Contradictious things: Or that Nothing is Absolutely True, neither in Divinity, nor Philosophy, but all Seeming, and Phantastical; according to the Protagorean Doctrine. 649, 650

But though it be true, That whatsoever really implies a Contradiction, is a Non-Entity; yet is this Rule Obnoxious to much Abuse, when whatsoever mens shallow Understandings cannot reach to, it is therefore professedly cried down by them, as an Impossibility or Nothing. As when the Atheists, and Materialists, explode Incorporal Substanse upon this Pretense; or make it only an Attribute of Honour, expressing the Veneration of Mens Minds, but signifying Nothing in Nature, nor having any Philosophical Truth. But the Atheists true meaning in this Objection, and what kind of Contradictions they are, which they impugn to all Theology, may appear from a Passage of a Modern Writer: Namely, such as these; when God is said to Perceive Sensible Things, and yet to have no Organs of Sense; as also to Understand, and yet to have no Brains. The Undifguised meaning of the Writer, That Religion is not Philosophy, but Law, and all mere Arbitrary Conflatution; nor God a Subject of Philosophy, as all Real Things are; he being no True Inhabitant of the World or Heaven, but only of mens Brains and Passions; and his Attributes signifying neither True nor False, nor any thing in Nature, but only mens Reverence and Devotion, towards what they Fear. And so may any thing be said of God, we matter what, so it be agreeable to Civil Law. But when mens mistake Attributes of Honour, for Attributes of Philosophical Truth; that is, when they will suppose such a thing as a God Really to Exist; then is all Absurd Nonence and Contradiction. God's Understanding without Brains, no Contradiction. 650, 651

Certain, That no Simple Idea, as of a Triangle, or a Square, can be Contradictious to it self; much less can the Idea of a Perfect Being, the most Simple of all. This indeed Pregnant of many Attributes, which if Contradictious, would render the whole a Non-Entity; but all the Genuine Attributes of the Deity, as Demonstrable of a Perfect Being, as the Properties of a Triangle, or a Square; and therefore can neither be Contradictious to it, nor one another. Page 652

Nay, the Genuine Attributes of the Deity, not only not Contradictious, but also all Necessarily Connected together. ibid.

In Truth, All the Attributes of the Deity, but so many Partial and Inadequate Conceptions of One and the Same Perfect Being, taken into our Minds, as it were, by Piece-meal. ibid.

The Idea of God, neither Fictitious, nor Facitious. Nothing Arbitrarious in it; but a most Natural and Simple Idea, to which not the Least can be Added, nor any thing Detracted from it. Nevertheless, may there be different Approbations concerning God; every one that hath a Notion of a Perfect Being, not Understanding all that Belongeth to it; no more then of a Triangle, or of a Sphere. ibid. 653

Concluded therefore, That the Attributes of God, No Confounded Non-ence of Religiously Aftonifhed Minds, bussling up together all Imaginable Attributes of Honour, Courtship, and Complement; but the Attributes of Necessary Philosophick Truth: and such as do not only speake the Devotion of mens Hearts, but also declare the Real Nature of the thing. Here the Wit of a Modern Atheistic Writer, ill placed. (Though no doubt, but same, either out of Superfition, or Ignorance, may Attribut such things to the Deity, as are Incongruous to its Nature.) Thus the Fourth Atheistic Pretext, against the Idea of God, Confuted. 653, 654

In the next place, The Atheists think themselves concerned, to give an Account of this Unquestionable Phenomenon, the General Perfuelion of the Existence of a God, in the Minds of men, and their Propensity to Religion, whenever this should come; if there were no Real Object for it in Nature. And this they would doe by Imputing it, partly to the Confounded Nonence of Aftonifhed Minds, and partly to the Imputation of Politicians. Or else to these Three Things; To Mens Fear; and to their Ignorance of Causes; and to the Fition of Law-Makers and Civil Sovereigns. 654

The First of these Atheistic Origins of Religion; That Mankind by reafon of their Natural Imbecillity, are in continual Solicitude and Fear concerning Future Events, and their Good and Evil Fortune. And this Paffion of Fear rises...
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rais es up in them for an Object to it self, a most Alfrightfull Phantasm; of an Invisible understanding Being, Omnipotent, &c. They afterwards Standing in awe of this their own Imagination, and Tremblingly Worshipping the Creature of their own Fear and Phancy.

Page 654

The Second Atheiltsick Origin of Theism and Religion; That Men having a Natural Curiosity, to Enquire into the Causes of things, wherefore they can discover no Visible and Natural Causes, are prone to fancy Causes Invisible and Supernatural. As Anaxagoras said, never to have betaken himself to a God, but only when he was at a loss for Neccesary Materiall Caues. Wherefore no wonder if the Generality of Mankind, being Ignorant of the Causes of all or most Things, have betaken themselves to a God, as to a Refuge and Sanctuary for their Ignorance. 654, 655

These two Accounts of the Phenomenon of Religion; from near Fear and Solicitude and from their Ignorance of Causes and Curiosity, joyned together by a Modern Writer. As if the Deity were but a Morno or Bugbear, raised up by men Fear, in the Darknes of their Ignorance of Causes. The Opinion of other Goths and Spirits also, deduced from the same Original. Men's taking things Casuall from Progonastics, and being so addited to Omens, Portents, Prophecies, &c. From a Phantastick and Timorous Supposition, That the things of the World are not disposed of by Nature, but by some Understanding Person. 655

But left those Two Accounts of the Phenomenon of Religion, should prove Inefficient; the Atheists supped a third, Imputing it also to the Fiction and Impudence of Civil Sovereigns; who perceiving an Advantage to be made from hence, for the better keeping men in Submission, have therupon Dextroly laid hold of mens Fear and Ignorance; and Cerebrated those Seeds of Religion in them, from the Infirmities of their Nature: Confirming their belief of Goths and Spirits, Miracles, Prodigies, and Oracles, by Tales, publicly allowed and Recommended. And that Religion might be every way Obsequious to their Designes; have persuaded the People, that Themselves were but the Interpreters of the Gods, from whom they Received their Laws. Religion an Engin of State; to keep men busily Emoyed; Entertain their Minds; render them Tame and Gentle, apt for Submission and Society. 655, 656

All this not the Invention of modern Atheists. But an Old Atheiltsick Cabal; That the Gods made by Fear. Lucretius That the Causes of Religion, Terror of Mind and Darknes: and that the Empire of the Gods over all its Being to mens Ignorance of Causes, as also, that the Opinion of Goths proceeded from mens not knowing how to distinguish their Dreams, &c. other Frightfull Phanacies, from Sensations. 656, 657

An Old Atheiltsick Sarumize also; That Religion a Political Invention. Thus Cicero: The Atheists in Plato, That the Gods are not by Nature, but by Art and Laws onely. Critias, one of the Thirty Tyrants of Athens, his Poem to this purpose. 657, 658

That the Folly and Falsneys of those Three Atheiltsick Pretenctes, for the Origin of Religion, will be fully Manifested. First, At to that of Fear and Phancy. Such an Excess of Fear, as makes anyone countenant believe the Existence of that, for which no manner of Ground, neither in Sense nor Reason, highly tending also to his own Disquiet; Nothing left but Distraction. Wherefore the generality of mankind here affirmed by Atheists, to be Frighted out of their Wits, and Diftempered in their brains; only a few of themselves, who have escaped this Panick Terrour, remaining Sober or in their Right Sense. The Sobriety of Atheists, nothing but Dull Stupidity, and Dead Incredulity; they believing onely what they can see or Feel. 658

True, That there is a Religious Fear, Consequent upon the Belief of a God; as also that the Sense of a Deity, it often awakened in mens Minds, by their Fears and Dangers. But Religion no Creature of Fear. None left Solicitous about their Good and Evil Fortune, then the Pious and Vertuous, who place not their Chief Happiness in things Alien, but only in the Right Use of their own Will. Whereas the Good of Atheists, whole in things Obnoxious to Fortune. The Timorous Complexion of Atheists, from building all their Politicks and Justice upon the Foundation of Fear. 659, 659

The Atheists Grand Errour here; That the Deity, according to the general Sense of Mankind, Nothing but a Terriculum, a Formidable, Hurtful and Undeatablying. Where no men every where agree, in that Divine Attribute of Goodness and Benignity. ibid.
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amongst Christians, who make the worst Representation of God, yet Pious in Kind and Gracious to Themselves. Page 659, 660

True, that Religion often expressed by the Fear of God. Fear, Prima Menfura Deitatis, the First Impreffion that Religion makes upon men in this Lapsed State. But this not a Fear of God, as Michievous and Hurtful, nor yet as a meer Arbitrary Being, but as Juff, and an Impartial Punisher of Wickednefs. Lucretius his acknowledging, mens Fear of God to be conjoined with a Conience of Duty. A Natural Discrimination of Good and Evil, with a Sence of an Impartial Justice, presiding over the World, and both Rewarding and Punishing. The Fear of God, as either a Hurtful, or Arbitrary and Tyrannical Being, (which must needs be joined with something of Hatred) not Religion, but Superfition. Fear, Faith, and Love; Three Steps and Degrees of Religion, to the Son of Sirach. Faith better Defined in Scripture, then by any Scholatics. God such a Being, as if he were not, Nothing more to be Wished for. 660, 661

The Reason why Atheifts thus misake the Notion of God, as a Thing only to be Feared, and confequently Hated; from their own Ill Nature and Vice. The latter disposing them fo much to think, that there is no Difference of Good and Evil by Nature, but only by Law; which Law Contrary to Nature, as Reftraint to Liberty. Hence their denying all Natural Charity, and Acknowledging no Benevolence, or Good Will, but what arises from Imbecillity, Indigency, and Fear. Their Friendship at best no other, then Mercatcur Utilitatum. Wherefore if there were an Omnipotent Deity, this (according to the Atheiftick Hypothefis) could not have fo much, as that Spurious Love or Benevolence to any thing, becaufe standing in Need of Nothing, and Devoid of Fear. Thus Cotta in Cicero, All this offered also, by a late Pretender to Politicks; He adding thereunto, that God hath no other Right of Commanding, then his Ineffitable Power; nor men any Obligation to obey him, but only from their Imbecillity and Fear, or because they cannot Refl him. Thus do Atheifts Transform the Deity into a Monifous Shape; an Omnipotent Being that hath neither Benevolence nor Justice in him. This indeed a Morrow or Bugbear. 661, 662

But as this a false Representation of Theifm; fo the Atheiftick Scene of things, moft Uncomfortable, Hopeless, and Difmal; upon several Accounts. True, that no Spightfull Deligns in Scnlefs Atoms; in which Regard, Plutarch Prefeved, even this Atheiftick Hypothefis, before that of an Omnipotent Michievous Being. However, no Faith, nor Hope neither, in Scnlefs Atoms. Epicurus his Confeffion, that it was better to believe the Fable of the Gods, then that Materiall Neeceffity of all things, offered by the other Atheiftick PhyfioLOGERS, before himself, But be not at all mending the Matter, by his supposed Free Will. The Panic Fear of the Epicureans, of the Frame of Heaven's Cracking, and this Complement of Atoms being dissolv'd into a Chaos. Atheifts running from Fear, plunge themselves into Fear. Atheifm, rather then Theifm, from the Impoffure of Fear, Diftrift, and Disbelief of Good. But vice afterwards prevailing in them, makes them Defire, there should be No God. Page 663, 664

Thus the Atheifts, who derive the Origin of Religion from Fear, Fithe put an Affrightfull Vizard upon the Deity, and then conclude it to be but a Morrow or Bugbear, the Creature of Fear and Phancy. More likely of the Two, that the Opinion of a God, spring from Hope of Good, then Fear of Evil; but neither of these True, it owing its Being to the Impoffure of no Passion, but supported by the Strengeth and cleareft Reason. Nevertheless a Natural Prolific, or Anticipation of a God, in mens Minds, Preventing Reason. This called by Plato and Ariftotle, a Vaticination. 664, 665

The Second Atheiftick Pretence, to difle the Phenomenon of Religion, from the Ignorance of Caufes, and mens innate Curiosity, (Upon which Account the Deity faid by them, to be nothing but an Affylum of Ignorance, or the Sanctuary of Fools,) next to be Contufed. 665

That the Atheifts, both Modern and Ancient, here commonly confpire thefe Two together, Fear, and Ignorance of Caufes; making Theifm the Spawn of both: as the Fear of Children in the Dark, raise Bugbears and Spectres. Epicurus his Reafon, why he took such great pains in the Study of PhyfioLOGY, that by finding out the Natural Caufes of things, he might free men from the Torrour of a God, that would otherwise Affright their Minds. ibid.

The Atheifts thus Dabbling in PhyfioLOGY, and finding out Materiall Caufes for some of those Phenomena, which the workfull Vulgar take only from a Deity; therefore Confident, that Religion had no other Original, then this Ignorance of Caufes: as also, that Nature, or Matter,
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Matter, does all things alone without a God. But we shall make it manifest, That Philosophy and the True Knowledge of Causes Lead to a Deity; and that Atheism, from Ignorance of Causes, and want of Philosophy. Page 665, 666

For First, No Atheist, who derives all from Senile Matter, can possibly assign any Cause of Himself, his own Soul or Mind: it being impossible, that Life and Sense should be naturally produced, from what Dead and Senile, or from Magnitudes, Figures, Sites, and Motions. An Atheistical Objection, nothing to the purpose: That Laughing and Crying things are made out of Not-Laughing and Crying Principles: because those result from the Mechanism of the Body. The Hylozoists never able neither, to produce Animal Sense, and Consciousness, out of what Senile and inconfusious. The Atheists, supposing their own Life and Understanding, and all the Wifdom that it is in the World, to have sprung merely from Senile Matter, and Fortuitous Motion; Graffly Ignorant of Causes. The Philosophy of Our Selves, and True Knowledge of the Cause of our own Soul and Mind, brings to God. Page 666, 667

Again, Atheists ignorant of the Cause of Motion, by which they suppose all things done: this Phenomenon being no way Salvable, according to their Principles. First, undeniably certain, That Motion is not Essential to all Body or Matter as such, because then there could have been no Mundane System, no Sun, Moon, Earth, &c. All things being continually torn in Pieces, and Nothing Cohering. Certain also, That Dead and Senile Matter, such as that of Ananimander, Democritus, and Epicurus, cannot Move it Self spontaneously, by Will or Appetite. The Hylozoists further confedered elsewhere. Democritus could assign no other Cause of Motion, then this, That one Body moved another from Eternity Infinetly: without any First Cause or Mover. Thus also a Modern Writer. To Affert an Infinite Progres in the Caufes of Motion, according to Arrilutole, to assign no Cause thereof at all. Epicurus, though an Exploder of Qualities, forced hereto by the Occult Quality of Gravity. Which, as Abfurd in Infinite Space, and without any Centre of Reft; so indeed nothing but to make him over Ignorance, and He Knows not Why, to be a Caufe. The Motion of Body, from the Activity of something Incorporeal. Though Motion taken for Translation, be a Mode of Matter; yet as it is taken for the Vis Movens, a Mode, or Energy, of Something that is Incorporeal, and Self-Active. The Motion of the whole Corporeal Universe, Originally from the Deity. Thus the Ignorance of the Cause of Motion, another Ground of Atheism. Page 667, 669

Thirdly, The Atheists also ignorant of the Cause of that Grand Phenomenon, the 

Thirdly, The Atheists also ignorant of the Cause of that Grand Phenomenon, the 

...
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and all the other parts Organical and Similar, (without any of which, the Whole would be Inept or Ufuchet;) all their several Uties, Un-Intended, following; Gros Infensibility, and Stupidity. Galen of the Use of Parts. Page 671, 672

Democritus his Dotages; Countenanced alfo by Carcilius His Book of Meteors, (first written with design to Salve all those Phenomena without a God,) but Unsuccessful. Nevertheless we acknowledge, That God and Nature do all things in the most Frugal and Compendious way; and that the Mechanick Powers are taken in, so far as they will serviceably comply with the Intellectual Platform. But Nature not Mechanical and Fortuitous only, but also Vital and Artificial; the Archeus of the whole World. ibid.

Again, Atheists further Pretend, That though it may well seem strange, that Matter Fortuitously Moved, should, at the very Firft, fall into such a Regularity and Harmony, as it now is in the World; yet not at all strange, that Atoms, moving from all Eternity, and making all manner of Combinations and Contexutes, and trying all Experiments, should after innumerable other Inept, and Difcongruous Forms, as length fall into such a System as This. They say therefore, That the Earth, at firft, brought forth divers Monstrous and Irregular Shapes of Animals; some wanting Feet, fome Hands, some without a Mouth, &c. to which the Ancients added Centaurs, Scylla’s, and Chimera’s; mixtly Bovid-form, and Hominiform Animals. Though Epicurus, ashamed to own theft, would seem to exclude them, but without Reason. But because we have now no such Irregular Shapes Produced out of the Earth, they say that the Reason is, because none could Continue and Propagate their kind by Generation, but only such as Happened to be fitly made. Thus Epicurus, and the Atheists before Ariftotle. They also addde horcums, their Infinite Worlds, amongst which they Pretend, not one of a Thousand, or of Ten thousand, hath fo much Regularity in it as this of ours. Lastly, they Prefage likewise, that this World of ours shall not always continue such, but after a while fall into Confution and Disorder again; and then may we have Centaurs, Scylla’s, and Chimera’s as before. 673, 674

Nevertheless, because this Universal and Conflant Regularity of things, for so many Ages together, is fo Puzzling; they would persuade us, that the Senfles Atoms, Playing and Taying up and down, from Eternity, without any Care or Thought; were at length Taught, by the Necessity of things, and driven to a kind of Trade or Habit of Artificialnes and Methodicalnes.

To all which Atheiftick Pretences Replied. 674, 675

First, That this an Idle Dream, or Impudent Forgery, That there was once an Inept Mundan System; and in this World of ours all manner of Irregular Shapes of Animals: not only because no 1 tradition of any such thing; but also because no Reason possibly to be given, why such should not be Produced out of the Earth tall, though they could not Continue long. That also Another Atheiftick Dream, That in this World of ours, all will quickly fall into Confution and Nonence again. And as their Infinite Worlds, an Impossibility, fo their Afdertion of the Irregularity of the supposed other Worlds, well enough Answered, by a Contrary Afdertion; That were every Planet a Habitable Earth, and every Fixed Star, a Sun, having all more or fewer such Habitable Planets moving round about them, and none of them Defert or Un-Inhabited, there would not be found so much as one Ridiculous or Inept System amongst them all; the Divine Act being Infinite. Page 675

Again, That the Fortuitous Motions of Senfles Atoms, should in length of Time grow Artificial, and contrai a Habit or Trade of Acting as Regularly, as if directed by perfe Art and Wifedom; This Atheiftick Fanati-citm. 675, 676

No more Poffible, That Dead and Senfles Matter, Fortuitously Moved, should at length be Taught and Nefceftitated by itfelf, to produce this Artificial System of the World; then that a dozen or more Persons, unfkill’d in Music, and striking the Strings as it Happened, should at length be Taught, and Nefceftitated to fall into Exquisite Harmony; Or that the Letters in the Writings of Plato and Ariftotle, though having fo much Philofophick Sense, should have been all Scribbled at hradome. More Philosophy in the Great Volume of the World, then in all Ariftotle’s and Plato’s Works, and more of Harmony, then in any Artificial Composition of Vocall Mufick. That the Divine Art and Wifedom, hath printed fuch a Signature of its felf upon the Matter of the Whole World, as Fortune and Chance could never Counterfeit. 676, 677

But in the next place, the Atheifts will for all this undertake to Demonstrate, That things could not Poffibly be made by any Intending Cause, for Ends and Uties; as Eyes for Seeing, Ears for Hearing, from hence, because things were all in Order of Time, as well as Nature, before their Uties. This Argument feeriously pronounced by Lucretius in this manner; If Eyes were made for the Ufe of Seeing, then, of necessity, must Seeing have been before Eyes; But there was no Seeing before Eyes; Therefore could not Eyes be made for the sake of Seeing, 677, 678

Evi-
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Evident, that the Logic of these Atheists, differs from that of all other Mortals; according to which, the End for which any thing is designedly made, is only in Intention First, but in Execution Last. True, that Men are Commonly excited, from Experience of things, and Sense of their Wants, to Excogitate Means and Remedies: but it doth not therefore follow, that the Maker of the World could not have a Preventive Knowledge of whatsoever would be Usefull for Animals, and to make them Bodies Intentionally for those Uses. That Argument ought to be thus framed; Whatever is made Intentionally for any End, as the Eye for that of Seeing; that End must needs be in the Knowledge and Intention of the Maker, before the Actual Exisitence of that which is made for it; But there could be no Knowledge of Seeing before there were Eyes; Therefore Eyes could not be made Intentionally for the sake of Seeing. Page 678.

That the True Scope of the Premised Atheistic Argument, however disguis'd by them in the first Propounding. The Ground thereof, because they take it for granted, That all Knowledge is derived from Sense, or from the Things Known, Pre-Exiling without the Knower. And here doth Lucretius Triumph. The Controversy therefore at last resolves into this; Whether all Knowledge be in its own Nature, Junior to Things; for if so, it must be Granted, that the World could not be Made by any Antecedent Knowledge. But this afterwards confuted; and Proved, That Knowledge is not, in its own Nature, Ectypall, but Archetypall; and that Knowledge was Older then the World, and the Maker thereof. 679.

But Atheists will Except against the Proving of a God, from the Regular and Artificial Frame of things; That it is unreasonable to think, there should be no Cause in Nature, for the Common Phenomena thereof; but a God thus Introduced to Salve them. Which also, to Suppofe the world Bungled and Botched up. That Nature is the Caufe of Natural things, Which Nature doth not Intend, nor Act for Ends. Wherefore the Opinion of Final Caufality for things in Nature, but an Idolom Specus. Therefore rightly banifhed, by Democritus, out of Phisology. 679, 680.

The Answer: Two Extremes here to be avoided. One of the Atomick Atheists, who derive all things from the Fortuitous Motion of Senfles Matter; Another of Bigotical Religionists, who will have God to do all things Himself Immediately, without any Nature. The Middle between both, That there is not only a Mechanick and Fortuitous, but also an Artificial Nature, Subservient to the Deity, as the Manuall Opticin, and Drudging Executioner thereof. True, that some Philofophers have absurdly attributed their own Properties or Animal Idiopaties to Inanimate Bodies. Nevertheless, this is no Idol of the Cave or Den, to Suppose the System of the World to have been framed by an Understanding Being, according to whose Direction, Nature, though not of Self Intending, Acts. Balbus his Description of this Artificial Nature in Cicero. That there could be no Mind in us, were there none in the Universe. That of Ariflotle True, That there is more of Art in some things of Nature, then in any thing Made by Men. Now the Caufes of Artificial things, as a House or Clock, cannot be declared, without Intention for Ends. This Excellently pursu'd by Ariflotie. No more can the Things of Nature be rightly Understood, or the Caufes of them fully Affigned, meerly from Matter and Motion, without Intention or Mind. They who banifh Final or Mental Caufality from Philofophy, look upon the Things of Nature, with no other Eyes then Oxen and Horses. Some piftfull Attempts of the Ancient Atheists, to false the Phenomena of Animals, without Mental Caufality. Democritus and Epicurus so cautious, as never to pretend, to give an Account of the Formation of the Fuctus. Ariflotie's Judgment here to be Preferred before that of Democritus. Page 680, 683.

But nothing more Strange, then that these Atheists should be justified in this their Ignorance, by Professed Theifts and Christians who Atomizing likewise, in their Physiolog, contend that this whole Mundane System, refulted only from the Neceffary and Unguided Motion of Matter, either Turn'd Round in a Vortex, or Jumbled in a Chaos, without the Direction of any Mind. These Mechanick Theifts more Immoden then the Atomick Atheists themselves; they Supposing their their Atoms, though Fortuiitously moved, yet nerver to have produced any Incept System, or Incongruous Forms; but from the very first, all along, to have Ranged themselves so Orderly, as that they could not have done it better, had they been directed by a Perfect Mind. They quite take away that Argument for a God, from the Phenomena, and that Artificial Frame of things, leaving only some Metaphysical Arguments; which though never so good, yet by reason of their Subtlety, cannot do so much Execution. The Atheists Granted to see the Caufe of the Fuctus thus betrayed, by its professed Friends, and the Grand Argument for the same, totally Stunned by them. 683, 684.

At this, Great Insensibility of Mind, to look upon the Things of Nature with no other Eyes then
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then Brute Animals do; so are there Sunday Phenomena, partly Above the Mechanick Powers, and partly Contrary to the same, which therefore can never be Salvaged, without Mental and Finall Causality. As in Animals, the Motion of the Diaphragm in Respiration; the Sytolic and Diastolic of the Heart (Being a Muscular Contraction and Relaxation) to which might be added others in the Macrocoen; as in the Interseccion of the Planes of the Equator and Ecliptick, or the Earth’s Diurnall Motion upon an Axis not Parrellel with that of its Annual. Cartellis bis Consequent, that according to Mechanick Principles, these should continually come nearer and nearer together; which since they have not done, Finall or Mentall Causality here to be acknowledged; and because it was Bell it should be so. But the Greatest Phænomenon of this kind, the Formation and Organization of Animals, which these Mechanists never able to give any Account of. Of this Pothumous Piece of Cartellius, De la Formation Du Foetus. Page 684,685

Pretended, That to assign Finall Causes, is to preface our selves to be as Wise as God Almighty, or to be Privy to his Counells. But the Question, not Wether we can always reach to the Ends of God Almighty, or know what is Absolutely Beft in every Cafe, and accordingly Conclude things therefore to be so; but Whether anything in the World be made for Ends, otherwise then would have refulted from the Fortuitous Motion of Matter. No Premution, nor Intrusion into the Secrets of God Almighty, to say, that Eyes were made by him Intentionally for the fake of Seeing. Anaxagoras his Abydus Aphorism, That Man was therefore the moft Soler of all Animals, because he Chanced to have Hands. Far more Reasonable to think, (as Aristotle concluded) That because Man was the wifeft of all Animals, therefore he had Hands given him. More proper to give Pipes, to one that hath Muticall skill, then to halt Pipes, to belowe Muticall skill. 685

In the Left place, The Mechanick Theifts Pretend, and that with some more Planall Causality, That it is below the Dignity of God Almighty, to perform all these Mean and Triviall Offices of Nature, Himself Immediately. This Anfwered again, That though the Divine Wife- dom, it self Contrived the System of the whole, for Ends; yet is there an Artificial Nature under him, as his Interior Minister and Execu- tioner. Proclous his Description hereof, This Nature to Procurs, a God or Goddes; but only as the Bodies of the Animated Stars were called Gods, because the Statues of the Gods.685

That we cannot otherwise Conclude, concerning these Mechanick Theifts, who derive all things in the Mundane Sytem, from the Neccesary Motions of Senfes Matter, without the Direction of any Mind or God; but that they are Imperfect Theifts, or have a certain Tang of the Atheiftick Enthusiafim, (the Spirit of Infidelity) hanging about them. Page 687

But these Mechanick Theifts Counterba- lance’d by another for thee Atheifts, not Fortuis- tors nor Mechanicall; namely the Hylozoists, who acknowledge the works of Nature to be the works of Understanding, and deride Democritus his Rough and Hokey Atoms, devoid of Life; they attributing Life to all Matter as such, and concluding the Vulgar Notion of a God, to be but an Inadequate Conception of Matter, its Energetick Nature being taken alone by it self as a Compleat Substance. These Hylozoists, never able to satisfy that Phenomenon, of the One Agreeing and Conspiring Harmony throughout the whole Universe: every Atom of Matter, according to them, being a Diptica Per- cipient, and these Unable to confer Notions with One another. 687

Nor can the other Cofmo-Platick Atheifts (to whom the whole World, but one Huge Plant or Vegetable, Endued with a Spermatick, Artificiall Nature, Orderly disposing the whole, without Sense or Understanding,) doe any thing towards the Salving of This, or any other Phæ- nomenon; it being Impossible, That there should be any such Regular Nature, otherwise then as Derived from, and Depending on, a Perfect Mind.

ibid.

Besides these Three Phenomena, of Cogitation, Motion, and the Artificial Frame of things, with the Conspiring Harmony of the Whole, (no way Salvable by Atheifts) Here further Added, That those who afferted the No- vity of the World, could not possibly give an Ac- count neither, of the First Beginning of Men, and other Animals, not now Generated out of Potreftation. Aristotle sometimes doubtsfull and staggering concerning the World’s Eternity. Men and all other Animals not produced at first by Chance, either as Worms out of Putrefaction, or out of Eggs, or Wombs, growing out of the Earth; Because no Reason to be given, why Chance should not as well produce the same out of the Earth still. Epicurus his vain Pretence, that the Earth, as a Child-bearing Woman, was now grown Effete and Barren. Moreover, Men and all other Animals not produced at first by Chance, whether as Worms out of Putrefaction, or out of Eggs or Egg-shells, suppos’d by these Atheifts themselves, to have been produced in a Tender, Infant-like State, so that they could neither sup- ply themselves with nourishment, nor defend themselves from harms. A Dream of Epicurus,
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That the Earth sent forth dreams of Milk after those her New-born Infants and Nurtlings; Confuted by Critolasus in Phile. Another Precarious Supplotation or Pigment of Epicurus; That then no inmediate Heats nor Cold, nor any blustering Winds, Anaximander's way of Saving this Difficulty; That Men were first generated and nourished in the Belies of Filths, till able to shift for themselves; and then disgorged upon dry Land. Atheists swallow any thing, rather than a God. Page 658, 689.

Wherefore here being Dignus Vindicater Nodus, a Civicus Synopsius, Reasonably introduced, in the Medick Cabbala, to solve the same. It appearing, from all Circumstances put together, that this whole Phenomenon surpaftet, not only the Mechanick, but also the Plattick Powers; there being much of Differtion therein. However, not denied, but that the Ministry of Spirits (Created before Man, and other Terrestrial Animals) might be here made use of. As in Plato, after the Creation of Immortal Souls, by the Supreme God, the Framing of Mortal Bodies is committed to Junior Gods. 689, 690.

Furthermore, Atheists no more able to Salve that ordinary Phenomenon, of the Confervation of Species, by the Difference of Sexes, and a due Proportion of Number, kept up between Males and Females, Here a Providence also, Superior, as well to the Plattick, as Mechanick Nature.

Lastly, Other Phenomena, as Real, though not Physical; which Atheists cannot possibly Salve, and therefore do commonly Deny; as of Natural Justice or Honesty, and Obligation; the Foundation of Politicks, and the Mathematics of Religion. And of Liberty of Will, not only THAT of Fortuitous Self-determination, when an equal Eligibility of Objects; but also THAT which makes men preserve Commendation and Blame. These not commonly distinguished, as they ought. Epicurus his endeavor to Salve Liberty of Will, from Atoms Declining Uncertainty from the Perpendicular, meer Madness and Frenzy. 690, 691.

And now have we already Preventively Confuted the Third Atheistick Pretence, to Salve the Phenomenon of Theifin, from the Fiction and Imposture of Politicians; we having proved, THAT Philosophy, and the true Knowledge of Causes, inferre the Existence of a God. Nevertheless this to be here further Anwered. 691.

That States-men and Politicians could not have made such use of Religion, as sometimes they have done, had it been a meer Cheat and Pigment of their own. Civil Sovereigns in all the ditfants places of the World, could not have so universalily confird, in this one Piece of State-craft or Conscience; nor yet have been able, to pouffe the Minds of men every-where with such a constant Awe and Dread of an Invisible Nothing. The World would long since have discoverd this Cheat, and suspected a Plot upon their Liberty, in the Fiction of a God; at least Governours themselves would have understood it; many of which not subfiding as much awed with the Fear of this Invisible Nothing, as any Others. Other Cheats and Juggles, when once Detected no longer Praifed. But Religion now as much in Credit as ever, though so long since Derived by Atheists, for a Political Cheat. That Christianly, a Religion founded in no Humane Policy, prevailing over the Craft and Power of all Civil Sovereigns, and Conquered the Perfecting World, by suffering Deaths and Martyrdoms. The Prefigur'd by the Prophecitick Spirit. Page 691.

Had the Idea of God, been an Arbitrarious Pigment, not conceiversible, how men should have universally agreed in the same, and the attributes belonging thereunto? (This Argument used by Sexius:) Nor that Civil Sovereigns themselves should so universally have jump'd in it. 692.

Furthermore, Not Conceiversible, how the Thought or Idea of a God shou'd have been formed by any bad it been the Idea of Nothing. The Superficialists of Atheists, in Pretending, that Politicians, by telling men of Such a thing, put the Idea into their Minds. No Nations, or Idea's, put into mens minds by Words, but only the Phantasm's of the Sounds. Though all Learning be not Remembrance; yet all Humane Teaching, but Mætical or Oblictritious; not the Filling of the Soul as a Vell, by Pouring into it from without; but the Kindling of it from within. Words signify nothing to him that cannot raise up within himself the Notions, or Idea's, correspondent to them. However, the Difficulty still remains; How States-men themselves, or the first Inventer of this Cheat, could have framed any Notion at all of a Non-Entity. 693, 694.

Here the Atheists Pretend, That there is a Feigning Power in the Soul, whereby it can make Idea's and Conceptions of Non-Entities, as of a Golden Mountain, or a Centaur; and that by this, an Idea of God might be framed, though there be no Such Thing. Answer, That all the Feigning Power of the Soul, consisteth only in Compounding Idea's of things, that Really I soft Apart, but not in that Conjunction. The Mind cannot make any New Conception Cognition, which was not before; as the Painter or Limmer cannot Feign Colours.Moreover the whole of these Fictitious Idea's, though it have no Actual, yet (b) 
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 hath it a Possible Entity. The Deity is Self, though it could create a World out of Nothing, yet can it not create more Cogitation or Conception, than is, or was always contained in its own Mind from Eternity; nor frame a Positive Idea of that, which hath no Possible Entity.

The Idea of God, no Complement or Aggregation of things, that exist severally, apart in the World; because then it would be a mere Arbitrational thing, and what Everyone pleased; the contrary whereunto hath been before manifested. 695

Again; some Attributes of the Deity, nowhere else to be found in the whole World; and therefore must be Absolute Non-Entities, were there no God. Here the Painter must Feign Colours, and create new Cogitation, out of nothing.

Lastly, Upon Supposition, that there is no God, it is Impossible not only, that there should be any for the Future, but also, that there should ever have been any; whereas all fictitious Idea's must have a Possible Entity, since otherwise they would be Unconceivable, and no Idea's. ibid.

Wherefore some Atheists will further pretend; that besides this Power of Compounding things together, the Soul hath another Ampliating, or Amplifying Power; by which things together, though there be no God Existing, nor yet Possible; the Idea of him might be Fictitiously Made: those Attributes which are nowhere else to be found, arising by way of Amplification or Augmentation of Something found in Men.

Answer: First, that according to the Principles of those Atheists, that all our Conceptions are nothing but Fancies from Objects without; there cannot possibly be such Amplifying Power in the Soul, whereby it could make more than is. Thus Protagoras in Plato: No man can conceive any thing, but what he suffers. Here also, (as Sextus intimateth,) the Atheists guilty of that Fallacy, called a Circle or Diallelus. For having First undeniably made the Idea of Imperfection, from Perfection; they then go about again, to make the Idea of Perfection, out of Imperfection. That men have a Notion of Perfection, by which, as a Rule, they judge things to be Imperfect; evident from that Direction given by all the Philosophers, to Conceive of God, in way of Remotion or Abstraction of all Imperfection. Lastly, Finite Things added together, can never make up Infinite; as more and more Time backword, can never reach to Eternity without Beginning. God differs from Imperfect things, not in Degree, but Kind. As for Infinite Space, said to consist of Parts Finite; we certain of no more

then this, that the Finite World might have been made Bigger and Bigger Infinitely; for which very Caule, it could never be Actually Infinite. Gaffendus his Objection, That the Idea of an Infinite God, might as well be Feigned, as that of Infinite Worlds. But Infinite Worlds, are but Words or Notions ill Put together, or Combined; Infinity being a Real Thing in Nature, but Mifapplied, it being Proper only to the Deity. Page 696, 697

The Conclusion; That since the Soul can neither make the Idea of Infinite, by Amplification of Finities; nor Feign create any new Cogitation, which was not before; nor make a Positive Idea, of a Non-Entity; certain, that the Idea of God, no Fictitious Thing. 697

Further made Objection, That Religion not the Figure of Civil Sovereigns. Obligation in Consequence, the Foundation of all Civil Right and Authority. Covenants without this, Nothing but Words and Breath. Obligation, not from Laws neither; but before them; or otherwise they could not Oblige. Lastly, This derived, not from Utility neither. Were Obligation to Civil Obedience Made by mens Private Utility, then could it be Dissolved by the Same. Wherefore if Religion, a Fiction or Imposture; Civil Sovereignty must needs be so too.

Had Religion been a Fiction of Politicians, they would then have made it every way Pliable, and Flexible; since otherwise it would not Serve their Turn, nor consist with their Infinite Right.

But Religion in its own Nature, a Stiff, inflexible thing, as also Justice, it being not Factitious, or Made by Will. There may therefore be a Contradiction, between the Laws of God, and of Men; and in this case does Religion conclude, That God ought to be Obeyed, rather than Men. For this Caufe, Atheistic Politicians of Latter times, declare against Religion as Inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty; it destroying Infinite Right, introducing private Judgment, or Conscience, and a fear greater than that of the Leviathan; to wit, of him who can Inflit Eternal Punishments. Snareth Matter the Atheists Natural God; the Levithian or Civil Sovereign, his Artificial One. Religion thus dismembered and disclaimed by Politicians, as inconsistent with Civil Power, could not be the Creature of Political Art. Thus all the Three Atheistical Pretences, to Salvage the Phenomenon of Religion; from Fear, Ignorance of Caufes, and Fiction of Politicians; fully Confuted.

But because, besides those Ordinary Phenomena, before mentioned, there are certain other Extraordinary ones, that cannot be Salved by Atheists,
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Atheists, which therefore they will impute, Partly to Mens Fear and Ignorance, and Partly to the Fiction and Imputation of Civil Governors, (viz. Apparitions, Miracles, and Prophacies;) the Reality of these, here aslso to be briefly Vindicated. Page 700.

First, as for Apparitions; though much of Fabulosity in these Relations, yet unquestionably something of Truth. Atheists imputing these things to men mistaking their Dreams and Phantasies for Sensations, Contradict their own Fundamental Principle, that Sense is the only Criterion of Truth; as also Derogate more from Human Testimony, then they ought. ibid.

That some Atheists Sensible hereof, have acknowledged the Reality of Apparitions, concluding them notethless to be the More Creatures of Imagination; as if a Strong Phancy could produce Real Substances, or Objects of Sense. The Fanaticism of Atheists, who will rather Believe the greatest Impossibilities, than endanger the Being of a God. Invisible Ghosts Permanent, easily introduce One Supreme Ghoul of the whole World. 700, 701.

Democritus yet further Convinced; that there were Invisible Beings Superiour to Men, Independent upon Imagination, and Permanent; (called by him Idols;) but having nothing Immortal in them; and therefore that a God could be no more proved from the Existence of them, than of Men. Granted by him, that there were, not onely Terrestrial, but also Aerial and Ethereal Animals; and that all those Vital Regions of the Universe above, were not Defert and Uninhabited. Here something of the Fathers, ascribing Angels to have Bodies: but more afterwards. 701, 702.

To this Phenomenon of Apparitions, may be added those Tri" others, of Witches and Demoniacs; both of these proving, That Spirits are not Phancies, nor Inhabitants of mens Brains onely, but of the World: as also, That there are some Impure Spirits, a Confirmation of the Truth of Christiannity. The Confident Exploders of Witchcraft, suspetible for Atheism. As for Demoniacs or Encrangement, certain from Josephus, That the Jews did not take these Demons or Devils, for Bodily Disfekes; but Real Substanaces, posposing the Bodies of Men. Nor probable, that they supposed, as the Gnosticks afterward, all Disfekes to be the Inflammation of Evil Spirits: nor yet, (as some think,) all Demoniacs to be Mad-men. But when there were any Unusual and Extraordinary Symptoms, in any Bodily Distemper, but especially that of Madmen, they supposing this to be Supernatural, imputed it to the Inflammation of some Devil. Thus also the Greeks. 702, 704.

That Demoniacs and Encrangement, are a Real Phenomenon; and that there are such aslso in these Times of ours. Asserted by Fernelius and Sennerus. Such Maniacal Personns, as not only discover Secrets, but also Speak Languages, which they had never learnt; Ungenuinly Demoniacs or Encrangement. That there have been such in the Times since our Saviour, proved out of Pilatus; as also from Fernelius. That for the Vindication of Chriltiannity, against those who suppos'd the Scripture-Demoniacs for Fignments. Page 764, 766.

The Second Extraordinary Phenomenon Proposed; That of Miracles, and Effects Supernatural. That there have been such things among the Pagans, and since the Times of Christianity too; Evident from their Records. But more Instances of these in Scripture. 766.

Two Sorts of Miracles. First, Such as, though they cannot be done by Ordinary Causes, yet may be effected by the Natural Power of Invincible Spirits, Angels, or Demons. As Illiterate Demoniacs, speaking Greek. Such among the Pagans that Miracle of the Whetstone, cut in two with a Razor. Secondly, Such as transcended the Natural Power of all Second Causes, and Created Beings. 766, 707.

That late Poltico-Theological Treatise, denying both these Sorts of Miracles; Inconsiderable, and not deserving here a Contrasolution. 707.

Supposed in Deut. That Miracles of the Former Kind, might be done by Falle Prophets, in Confirmation of Idolatry. Wherefore Miracles alone, not sufficient to confirm every Doctrine. ibid.

Accordingly in the New Testament we read, of True Prophets Lying Miracles; that is, Miracles done in Confirmation of a Lie, and by the Power of Satan, &c. God permitting it, in a way of Probation of some one, and Punishment of others. Miracles done for the proving of Creature-Worship or Idolatry, in Head of Justifying the same, themselves Condemned by it. 708.

Had the Miracles of our Saviour been all of the Former Kind onely, yet ought the Jews, according to Moses Law, to have acknowledged him for a True Prophet, he coming in the Name of the Lord, and not Exhorting to Idolatry. Supposed in Deut. That God would not Permit Falle Prophets to do Miracles, fave onely in the Case of Idolatry; or when the Doctrine is discoverable to be Falle by the Light of Nature; because that would be an Invincible Temptation. Our Saviour, That Eximious Prophet foretold, by whom God would again reveal his Will to the World; and no more out of flaming Fire. Nevertheless some Miracles of our Saviour (b 2) Christ's.
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Christ's such also, as could be done only by the Power of God Almighty. Page 708, 709

All Miracles evince Spirits; that is, to disbelieve which is, to disbelieve Sense, or Unreasonably to Derogate from Human Testimony. Had the Gentiles entertained the Faith of Christ, without Miracles, this self would have been a Great Miracle. 709

The Last Extraordinary Phenomenon, Divination or Prophecy. This also evinces Spirits, (called Gods by the Pagans;) and thus that of theirs True; if Divination, then Gods. 710

Two Sorts of Predictions likewise, as of Miracles. First, such as might proceed from the Natural Prefaging Power of Created Spirits. Such Predictions acknowledged by Democritus, upon account of his Idols. Not so much Contingency in Human Actions, by reason of Mens Liberty of Will, as some suppose. 710, 711

Another Sort of Predictions of Future Events, Imputable only to the Supernatural Previsence of God Almighty. Epicurus his Pretence, That Divination took away Liberty of Will; either as Suppelling, or Making a Necessity. Some Thieves also denying the Previsence of God Almighty, upon the same Account. Certain, That no Created Being can foreknow Future Events, otherwise then in their Causes. Wherefore Predictions of such Events, as had no Necessary Antecedent Causes, Evince a God. 711, 712

That there is Forknowledge of Future Events, Unforeknowable to Men; formerly the general Periwulation of Mankind. Oracles and Predictions among the Pagans, which Evince Spirits, as that of Actius Navius. Most of the Pagan Oracles, from the Natural Prefaging Power of Demons. Nevertheless some Instances of Predictions of a higher kind among them, as that of Vectius Valens, and the Sibyls. Thus Balaam, Divinely affisted to Predict our Saviour. 712, 713

Scriptures Triumphing over Pagan Oracles, Predictions concerning our Saviour Christ, and the Conversion of the Gentiles. Amongst which that remarkable one, of the Seventy Weeks. 713, 714

Other Predictions concerning the Fates of Kingdoms, and of the Church. Daniel's Fourth Ten-Horned Bealt, the Roman Empire. This Prophecy of Daniel's, carried on further in the Apocalypse. Both of them Prophetic Calendars of Times, to the End of the World. ibid.

That this Phenomenon of Scripture-Prophecies, cannot possibly be Imputed by Atheists, as some others, to Fear, or Ignorance of Causes, or to the Fiction of Politicians. They not only Evince a Deity, but also the Truth of Christianitty. To this Purpose, of more Use to us, who now live, then the Miracles themselves Recorded in Scripture. Page 714, 715

These Five Extraordinary Phenomena, all of them evince, Spirits to be no Fancies, but Substantiall Inhabitants of the World: from whence a God may be Inferred. Some of them, Immediately prove a Deity. ibid.

Here have we not only fully Confuted all the Athelsticke Pretences from the Idea of God, but also by the way, already Proposed several Substantiall Arguments for a Deity. The Existence whereof will now be further proved from its very Idea. ibid.

True, That some of the Ancient Thieves themselves, Declare God Not to be Demonstrable: Thus Alexander Aphroditi. Clemens Alexand. But their meaning therein no more than this, That God cannot be Demonstrated a Priori, from any Antecedent Necessary Caufe. Not follow from hence, That therefore no Certainty, or Knowledge of the Existence of a God; but only Conjectural Probability, Faith, and Opinion. We may have a Certain Knowledge of things, the done whereof cannot be Demonstrated a Priori; as, That there was Something or other Eternal, without Beginning. Whenever a thing is Necessarily Inferred, from what is altogether Undeniable, this may be called a Demonstration. Many Geometrical Demonstrations such; or of the onely. 715, 716

A Sceptical Position of Cartesius; That there can be no Certainty of any thing, no not of Geometrical Theorems, nor Common Notions; before we be Certain of the Existence of a God, Essentially Good, who therefore cannot Decide. From whence it would follow, That neither Atheists, nor such Thieves, as assert an Arbitrary Deity, can ever be certain of any thing; as Thot, Two and Two are Four. 716, 717

However some appearance of Ficty in this Assertion; yet is it a Foundation of Eternal Scepticism, both as to all other things, and the Existence of a God. That Cartesius here went Round in a Circle, proving the Existence of a God, from our Faculties; and then the Truth of our Faculties, from the Existence of a God; and consequently proved nothing. If it be possible, that our Faculties might be Fals, then must we confess it possible, that there may be no God; and Consequentially remain for ever Sceptical about it. ibid.

Wherefore a Necessity of Exploding and Confuting this New Sceptical Hypothesis, of the Possibility of our Faculties being so made, as to Deceive us, in all our Clearest Perceptions. Omniscience itself cannot make any thing to be Indifferently True or Fals. Truth not Facitious. As
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As to the Universal Theorems of Abstract Science, the Measure of Truth, no Forcin or Extrainous thing, but only our own Clear and Distinct Perception. Here whatsoever is Clearly Perceived, Is. The very Essence of Truth, Perceptibility. Granted by all. That there can be no False Knowledge or Understanding, _the Perception of the Understanding, never Falfe, but only Obscure_. Not Nature that Erreth in us, but We Our selves, in Affenting to things not Clearly Perceived. _Conclusion: That_ Omnipotence cannot Create any Understanding Faculties, _so as to have as Clear and Distinct Conceptions of all Fallhoods and Non-Entities, as of Truths_; because whatsoever is Clearly and Distinctly Perceived, hath therefore an Entity; and Omnipotence it self (to speak with Reverence) cannot make Nothing, to be Something, or Something Nothing. _This no more, then That it cannot doe Things Contradictious_. _Conclusion the Measure of Power_. Page 717, 719

True, That Sense as such, is but Phantastical and Relative: and were there no other Perception, All Truth would be Private, Relative, and Seemings none Absolute. This probably the Reason, why some have suspected the same of Knowledge also. But Mind and Understanding reaches beyond Phancy and Appearance, to the Absoluteness of Things. It hath the Criterion of Truth within it self. 719, 720

Objected: That this an Arrogance, for Creatures to Pretend to an Absolute Certainty of anything. Answes: That God alone is Ignorant of Nothing, and Infallible in All things; but no Derogation from the Deity, to suppose, that he should make Created Minds such, as to have a Certainty of Something; as the Whole to be Greater than the Part, and the like: since otherwise they would be but a mere Mockery, Consequent to think, that God hath made Men, as at they may Possibly attain to some Certainty of his own Existence. Origen, That Knowledge is the only thing that hath Certainty in it. 720, 721

Having now some Firm Ground or Footing to stand upon; a Certainty of Common Notions, without which nothing could be proved by Reason; we shall endeavour by means hereof, to Demonstrate the Existence of a God from his Idea. ibid.

Cartesian his Undertaking to doe this with Mathematical Evidence; as this Idea includeth in it Necessary Existence. _This Argument_ bitherto not so Successfull, it being by many concluded to be a Sophism. That we shall impartially set down all that we can, both For it, and Against it; leaving others to make a Judgment, 721

First, Against the Cartesian Demonstration of a God. _That because we can frame an Idea of a Necessarily Existent Being, it does not at all follow, that It Is; since we can frame Idea's of things, that Never Were, nor will be. Nothing to be gathered from hence, but only that it is Not Impossible. Again, from this Idea, including Necessary Existence, nothing else Infallible, but That, what hath no Necessary Existence, is not Perfect; and, That if there be a Perfect Being, its Existence always was, and will be Necessary: but not Absolutely, That it doth Exist. A Fallacy, when from the Necessity of Existence affirmed only Hypothetically, the Conclusion is made Absolutely. Though a Perfect Being, Must Exist Necessarily, yet not therefore follow, that it Must and Doth Exist. The Latter a thing Indemonstrable._ Page 721, 723

For the Cartesian Demonstration of a God. As from the Notion of a thing Impossible, we conclude, That it never Was nor Will be; and of that which hath a Contingent Scholis to Existence, That it Might be, or Might not be: so from that which hath Necessary Existence in its Nature, That it Actually Is. The force of the Argumentation, not meerly Hypothetically, If there be a Perfect Being, then is its Existence Necessary; because this supposes, that a Necessary Existent Being, is Contingent to be, or not to be: which a Contradiction. The Absurdity of this will better appear, if instead of Necessary Existence, we put in Actual. No Theists can otherwise prove, that a God, though supposed to Exist, might not Happen by Chance to be. Nevertheless God, or a Perfect Being, not here Demonstrated a Priori, when from its own Idea. The Reader left to make a Judgment. 723, 724

A Progymnasma, or Preliminary Attempt, towards the proving of a God from his Idea, but including Necessary Existence. First, From our having an Idea of a Perfect Being. Implying no manner of Contradiction in it, it follows, that such a thing is Possible. And from that Necessary Existence Included in this Idea, added to the Possibility thereof, it further follows, that it Actually Is. A Necessary Existent Being, if Possible, Is; because upon the supposition of its Non-Existence, it would be Impossible for it, ever to have been. Not So, in Contingent things. A Perfect Being, is either Impossible to have been, or else it Is. Were God Possible, and yet Not, He would not be a Necessary, but Contingent Being. However no Stress laid upon this. 724, 725

Another Plainer Argument, for the Existence of a God, from his Idea. Wheresoever we can frame an Idea of in our Minds, implying no Contradiction, this either Actually Is, or else

(3)
The Contents.

if it Be Not, is Possible to Be. But if God Be Not, he is not Possible to Be. Therefore He is. The Major before Proved, That we cannot have an Idea of any thing, which hath neither Actual nor Possible Existence. Page 725

A Further Ratiocination from the Idea of God, as including Necessary Existence, by certain Steps. First, Certain, that something or other did Exist of It self from Eternity, without Beginning. Again, Whatever did Exist of Its self from Eternity, did if Exist Necessarily and Necessarily, and therefore there is a Necessary Existent Being. Thirdly, Nothing could Exist of It self from Eternity Naturally and Necessarily, but what contained Necessary Self-Existence in its Nature. Lastly, A Perfect Being, and nothing else, containeth Necessary Existence in its Nature. Therefore It Is. An Appendix to this Argument; That no Temporary Successive Being, could be from Eternity without Beginning. This Proved before.

725,726

Again, The Controversie between Atheists and Theists, First Clearly Stated from the Idea of God, and then Satisfactorily Decided. Premised; That as every thing was not Made, so neither was every thing Unmade. Atheists agree in both. The State of the Controversie between Theists and Atheists; Whether that which being it self Unmade, was the Cause of all other things Made, were the Most Perfect, or the Most Unperfect Being. A certain kind of Atheistical Theism, or Theogonism, which acknowledgeth a God, or Soul of the World, presiding over the Whole, supposed him notwithstanding to have Emerged out of Night and Chaos, that is, to have been Generated out of Senfles Matter.

726,728

The Controversie thus Stated, easily Decided. Certain, That Lesser Perfection may be derived from Greater, or from that which is Absolutely Perfect; but Impossible, that Greater Perfection, and Higher Degrees of Entity, should rise out of Lesser and Lower. Things did not Ascend, but Descend. That Life and Senfe may Naturally rise from the mere Modification of Dead and Senfles Matter; as also Reason and Understanding from Senfe; the Philosophy of the Kingdom of Darkness. The Hylozoists so Senfible of this, that there must be some Substantial Unmade Life and Understanding; that Atheizins, they thought it Necessary to Attribute Life and Understanding to all Matter, as such. This Argument, a Demonstration of the Impossibility of Atheism.

728,729

The Controversie again more Particularly Stated, from the Idea of God, as including Mind and Understanding in it. Viz. Whether all Mind were Made or Generated out of Senfles Matter; or Whether there were an Eternal Unmade Mind, the Maker of all. This the Doctrine of Theists, That Mind the Oldest of all things; of Atheists, That it is a Polinate thing, Younger than the World, and an Umbralitic Image of Real Beings. Page 729

The Controversie thus Stated, again Decided. Though it does not follow, That if once there had been no Corporeal World or Matter, there could never have been any; yet it is certain, That if once there had been no Life nor Mind, there could never have been any Life or Mind. Our Imperfect Minds, not Of Themselves from Eternity, and therefore Derived from a Perfect Unmade Mind.

729,730

That Atheists think, their chief strength to lie here, in their Disproving a God, from the Nature of Understanding and Knowledge. According to them, Things made Knowledge, and not Knowledge Things. All Mind and Understanding, the Creature of Senfibles, and a Phantastick Image of them; and therefore no Mind their Creator. Thus does a Modern Writer conclude, That Knowledge and Understanding is not to be Attributed to God, because it implieth Dependence upon Things without; which is all one as if he should have said, That Senfles Matter is the most Perfect of all things, and the Highest Numen.

730

A Compendious Confutation of the Premised Atheistical Principles. Knowledge not the Activity of Senfibles upon the Knower, and his Passions, Senfible things themselves, not Known by the Passion, or Phancy of Senfe. Knowledge not from the Force of the Thing Known, but of the Knower. Besides Phantasm of Singulur Bodies, Intelligible Idea's Universal. A Late Atheistical Paradox, That Universals, nothing but Names. Axiomatical Truths in Athirsalian Sciences to Passion from Bodies by Senfe, nor yet gathered by Induction from Many Singulares; we at once Perceiving it Impossible, that they should be otherwise. An Ingenerous Observation of Aristotle; That could it be Perceived by Senfe, the Three Angles of a Triangle to be Equal to Two Right; yet would not this be Science, or Knowledge, Properly so called; which is of Universals First, and from thence descends to Singulares.

730,732

Again, We have Conceptions of things Incorporal, as also of such Corporeals as never did Exit, and whose Accuracy Senfe could not reach to; as a Perfect straight Line, and Plain Superficies, an Exact Triangle, Circle, or Sphere. That we have a Power of framing Idea's of things that never were nor will be, but only Possible.

732

Inferred from hence, That Humane Science is
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it self, not the mere Image and Creature of Singular Sensibles, but Proleptical to them, and in order of Nature Before them. But since there must be Neœis, before Nœis, Intelligibles, before Intellecct; the only true Account of Knowledge and its Original, is from a Per- fect Omnimonient Being, Comprehending itself, and the Extent of its own Power, or the Possibilities of all things, their Relations and Immutable Truths. And of this one Perfect Mind, all Imperfect Minds Partake. Page 732.

Knowledge therefore in the Nature of it, supposes the Existence of a Perfect Omnipo- tent Being, as its Nœis, or Intelligible. This Comprehending it self, the First Original Knowledge, a Mind before the World, and all Sensibles, not Elysipal, but Archetypal, and the Framer of all. Wherefore not Atheism, but Theism, Demonstrable from Knowledge and Understanding. 733, 734

This further Confirmed from hence; because there are Eternal Vortices, such as were never Made, nor had any Beginning. That the Diagonal of a Square, Incommenfurable to the Sides, is an Eternal Truth to Aristotle. Justin Martyr's eidothes, Pneuma, or Eternal Mo- raals, Geometrical Truths, not Made by any man's Thinking, but before all Men; as also before the World and Matter it self. 734

Now if there be Eternal Verities, the Simple Reaons and Intelligible Effences of Things, might needs be Eternal likewise. These called by Plato, Things that Always Are, but were never Made, Ingenerable and Incorruptible. However Aristotile quarrels with Plato's Idea's, yet does be also agree with him in this, that the Forms or Species of things, were Eternal, and Never Made; and that there is No Gene- ration of them, and that there are other things besides Sensibles, the Immutable Objects of Science. Certain, That there could be no Im- mutable Science, were there no other Objects of the Mind, but Sensibles. The Objectis of Geometrical Science, no Material Triangles, Squares, &e. These, by Aristotile, said to be No where. The Intelligible Natures of things to Plato, the most Necessary Effences.735, 736

Now if there be Eternal Truths, and Intelligibles, whose Existence also is Necessary; since there can be nowhere but in a Mind; there must be an Eternal, Necessarily Existing Mind, Comprehending all these Idea's and Truths at once, orBeing them. Which no other, then the Mind of a Perfect Omnimonient Being, Compre- hending it self, and all Possibilities of things, the Extent of its own Power. 736, 737

Wherefore there can be but One only Ori- ginal Mind, which all other Minds Partake of. Hence Idea's, or Notions, exactly alike in several men; and Truths Indivisibly the Same; because their Minds all Stamped with the same Original Seal. Thence, that One man could not Teach Another, were there not the same Notion both in the Learner and Teacher. Nor could men confer together as they doe, were there not One Mind, that all Partake of. That Anti-Monarchical Op- inion, of Many Understanding Being Eternal, and Independent; Confuted. And now have we not only allowed the Idea of God, and Confuted all the Atheistick Pretences against it, but also from this Idea, Demonstrated his Existence. Page 737, 738

S E C T. II.

A Confutation of the Second Atheistick Argument, Against Omnimonence and Divine Creation; That Nothing can by any Power whatsoever, be Made out of Nothing. In Answer to which, Three things to be Ins- tilled on. First, That De Nihilio Nihil, No- thing out of Nothing is in some Sense an Axi- one of Unquestionable Truth, but then makes Nothing against Theism, or Divine Creation. Secondly, That Nothing out of Nothing, in the Sense of the Atheistick Objectors, viz. That Nothing which once was Not, could by any Power whatsoever, be brought into Being, is Absolutely Fals; and that if it were True, it would make no more against Theism; then it doth against Atheism. Lastly, That from this very Axiome, Nothing from Nothing, in the True Sense thereof, the Absolute Im- possibility of Atheism is Demonstrable. 738

De Nihilio Nihil, Nothing from Nothing, in some Sense, is a Common Notion of Un- questionable Truth. For First, Certain, That Nothing which once was Not, could ever Of It Self come into Being; or, That Nothing can take beginning of Existence from It self or, That Nothing can be Made or Produced, without an Efficient Cause. From whence Demonstrated, That there was never Nothing; or, That every thing was not Made, but Something did Exit of It Self from Eternity, Unmade, or Underven from any thing else. 738, 739

Again, Certain also, That Nothing could be Efficiently Produced by what hath not at least Equal Perfection, and a Sufficient Active or Productive Power. That of an Effet, which Transends the Perfection of its suppos'd Cause, must Come from Nothing, or be Made without a Cause. Nor can any thing be Produced by another, though having Equal Perfection, unless it have also a Sufficient Active or Pro- ductive
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ductive Power. Hence Certain, That were there once no Motion at all in the world, and no other Substance besides Body, which had no Self-Moving Power, there could never possibly be any Motion or Mutation to all Eternity, for want of a Sufficient Cause, or Productive Power. No Imperfect Being, hath a Productive Power of any New Sub stance, which was not before, but only of New Accidents and Modifications: that is, No Creature can Create. Which Two foregoing Senses respect the Efficient Cause.

Thirdly, Nothing can be Materially Produced out of Nothing Pre-Existing or Inexisting. And therefore in all Natural Generations (where the Supernatural Power of the Deity interposes not) No New Real Entity or Substance Produced, which was not Before, but only New Modifications of what Substantially Pre-Existed.

Nothing out of Nothing, so much Insisted on by the old Physiologers before Arisftotle, in that Sense; commonly misunderstood by Modern Writers, as if they designed thereby, to take away all Divine Creation out of Nothing Pre-Existing. Granted, This to have been the Sense of the Stoics and of Plutarch: He affirming, the World to have been no otherwise Made by God, than a House is by a Carpenter, or a Garment by a Tailour. Plutarch and the Stoicks therefore, Imperfect Theists, but nevertheless Zealous Religiositie. But the Ancient Italick Philo-

Anly, built upon this Principle, Nothing out of Nothing.

But the Ancient Italicks, both before and after Anaxagoras, (who Leucippos, Democritus, and Epicurus here followed) with greater Sagacity concluded, from the same Principle, Nothing out of Nothing; That those Qualities and Forms of Bodies, Naturally Generated and Corrupted, were therefore no Real Entities, distinct from the Substance of Matter, but only Different Modifications thereof, Causing Different Phan-
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cies in us; and this an Anomoeomery, or Dif-
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Created, sometime or other, by the Deity as well as the Matter of their Bodies was. Page 745

That all these Three Forementioned Particulars, wherein it is True, that Nothing can Pos
dibly come from Nothing, are reducible to this One General Proposition, That Nothing, can be Caused by Nothing; which will no
may elab with the Divine Omnipotence or Creative
Power, as shall be showed afterwards; but
Confirm the same. But those same words, Nothing
out of Nothing, may carry another Sense; when that is in a sense, Out of Nothing, is not
taken Causally but only to signify the Terminus
A quo, the Term From which, or an Antecedent Non-Existence: and then the meaning
thereof will be, That Nothing which before was Not, could afterwards, by any Power whatsoever, be brought into Being. And this the Sense of the Democritick and Epicurean Objectors, viz.
That no Real Entity can be Made, or Brought out of Non Existence into Being, and therefore the Creative Power of Theists, an Imposti-
ibility.

Our Second Undertaking, in way of Answer hereunto; To shew That Nothing out of No-	hing, in this Sense, is False; as also That, were it True, yet it would make no more against The-
ism, than it does against Atheism, and there-
fore ought not to be used by Atheists, as an Ar-
gument against a God. If this Universally True, Th it Nothing at all which once was Not, could ever be brought into Being, then could there be no Making, nor Causing at all, no Motion nor
Action, Mutation or Generation. But our selves have a Power of Producing new Cogitation in our Minds, and New Motion in our Bodies.
Wherefore Atheists forced to restrain this Propo-
sition, to Substantialls only. And here some De-
ceived with the Equivocation, in this is in a sense, Out of Nothing; which may be taken either Ca-
fully, or else to signify the Term From which, that it is, From an Antecedent Non-Existance; they confounding both these together, whereas the First only True, the Latter False. Again, Oth-
ers Staggered with the Plausability of this Propo-
sition; Partly, because no Artificial thing (as a Horse or Garment) can be made by Men, but out of Pre-Existing Matter; and Partly, because Ancient Physiologists maintained the same also, concerning Natural Generations, That no New Real Entity or Substance, could be therein Produced; and Lately, because it is certain, that no Imperfect Created Being, can Create any New Substance; They being therefore apt to mea-
sure all Power whatsoever, by these Scantlings. But as easy, for a Perfect Being to Create a World, Matter and all, Out of Nothing, (in
this Sense, that is, out of an Antecedent Non-
Existance;) as for us to Create a Thought, or to
Move a Finger, or for the Sun to lend out Rays.
For an Imperfect Substantice which once was Not, to be brought into Being by God, this not Imposi-
tible, in any of the Forementioned Senes. He
having not only Infinitely Greater Perfection,
but also Sufficient Productive or Emantative
Power. True, That Infinite Power cannot do things in their own Nature Impossible; but Nothing this Impossible, but what Contradic-
tions; and though a Contradiction for any thing,
at the same time, to be and Not be; yet none at all, for an Imperfect Being, (which is in its
Nature Contingent to Existance) after it had
Not been, to be. Wherefore since the making of a Substantice to be, which was not before, is no
way Contradictious, nor consequitiously, in its own
Nature Impossible; it must needs be an Object of Perfect Power.
Page 743, 748

Furthermore, If no Real Entity or Substantice, could possibly be brought out of Non-Existance into Being; then must the Reason hereof be, be-
cause no Substantice can Derive its Whole Being from another Substantice. But from hence, it would follow, That whatsoever it Substantially, did not only Exit from Eternity, but also Of It Self, Independently upon any thing else. Whereas, First, The Pre-Existence of Temporary Beings, not agreeable to Reason; and then, To suppose In-
perfect Substanices, to have Existed Of Themselves and Necesarily, is to suppose Something to come from Nothing, in the Impossible Sense; they having no Necessarily Self-Existance in their
Nature. As they who affirm, all Substantice to be
Body, and no Body to be able to Move It Self, though supposing Motion to have been from Eternity, yet make this Motion to Come from No-
thing, or be Caused by Nothing. What in its
Nature Contingently Possible, to Be, or Not Be, could not Exit Of It Self; but must Derive its
Being from Something else, which NecesSarily
Existed. Plato's Distinction therefore, between Two kinds of Substanices, must needs be admis-
ted, That which always Is, and was never
Made; and, That which is Made, or had a Be-

748, 749

Lastly, If this True, that No Substantice Make-
able or Produicible; it would not only follow
from thence, (as the Epicurean Atheist supposes)
that Matter, but also that all Souls, (at least
Humane) did Exist Of Themselves, from Eter-
nity, Independently upon any thing else; it be-
ing Impossible, that Mind or Soul, should be a Mo-
dification of Seniles Matter, or Refult from
Figures, Sites, Motions, and Magnitudes. Hu-
mane Souls Substantial, and therefore, accordin
g to this Doctrine, must have been Never
Made; whereas Atheists stilly deny both their
Pre, and Post-Existance. Those Pagan Theists, (i)
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who held the Eternity of Humane Minds, sup-
posed them notwithstanding, to have Depended
upon the Deity, as their Cause. Before Proceed;
That there can be but One Understanding Be-
ing Self-Existent. If Humane Souls Depend
upon the Deity as their Cause, then Dullbliffs
Matter also.

Page 749, 750

A Common, but Great Mistake; That no Pagan Theist ever acknowledged any Creative
Power out of Nothing; or else, That God was
the Cause of any Subsistance. Plato's Definition
of Effective Power, in General, and his Affirma-
tion, That the Divine Efficiency is that,
whereby things are Made, after they had Not been.
Certain, That he did not under-
stand this, of the Production of Souls out of
Matter, by Supposing them to be Before Matter,
and therefore Made by God out of Nothing Pre-
Exisiting. All Philosophers, who held the Im-
morality and Incorppority of the Soul, affected
it to have been Caused by God, either in Time,
or from Eternity. Plutarch's Singularity here,
Unquestionable, That the Platonists suppos'd,
One Subsistance to receive its whole Being from
Another; in that they derive their Second Hy-
pothasis or Subsistance, though Eternals, from the
First; and their Third from Both; and all Inferior Ranks of Being, from all Three.
Plotinus, Porphyrus, Iamblichus, Hierocles,
Proclus, and Others, derived Matter from the
Deity. Thus the Chaldee Oracles; and the
old Egyptian, or Heraick Theology also,
according to Iamblichus. Those Platonists who
suppos'd the World and Souls Eternal, conceiv-
ed them to have received their Being, as Much
from the Deity, as it Made in Time. 750, 752

Having now Disproved this Proposition, No-
thing out of Nothing, in the Atheistic Sense, viz.
That no Subsistance was Caused, or Derived
its Being from Another; but whatsoever is Sub-
stantial, did Exist Of Itself from Eternity, In-
dependently; we are in the next place, to make it
appear also, That were it True, it would no
more oppose Theism, than it doth Atheism.
Fallhoods (though not Truths) may Disagree.
Plutarch, the Stoicks, and Others, who made
God the Creator of no Subsistance, though not
Genuine, yet Zealous Theists. But the An-
cient Atheists, both in Plato and Aristotle,
Generated and Corrupted All things; that is,
Produced Allthings out of Nothing, or Non-
Existent, and Reduced them into Nothing
again; the bare Subsistance of Matter only
Excepted. The same done by the Democratick
and Epicurean Theists themselves, the Mas-
ters of this Objection; though, according to the
Principles of their own Atomick Phyisology,
it is Impossible, that Life and Understanding,
Soul and Mind, should be mere Modifications of
Matter. At Theists give a Creative Power of
All, out of Nothing, to the Deity; so do Athe-
ists, to Passive and Dead Matter. Wherefore
this can be no Argument against Theism; it
Equally opposes Atheism. Page 752, 756

An Anachychalos; wherein Observable,
That Cicero makes De Nihilo fieri, and Sine
Caufa, To be made out of Nothing, and to be
made without a Caufa, One and the Self-same
thing; as also, that he doth not Confine this to
the Material Cause only. One Third and
Laft Undertaking; To Prove that Atheist
Produce Real Entities out of Nothing, in the
First Impossible Sense; that is, Without a Caufa.

Page 755, 757

A Brief Synopsis of Atheism; That Matter
being the only Subsistance, is therefore the only
Un-made Thing; and That whatsoever else is
in the World, besides the Bare Subsistance there-
of, was Made out of Matter, or Produced from
that alone. 757

The First Argument; When Atheists af-
firm, Matter to be the only Subsistance, and
all things to be Made out of that, they Suppoze all
to be Made without an Efficient Cause; which
is to bring them from Nothing, in an Impossi-
ble Sense. Though Somthing may be Made,
without a Material Cause Pre-Exisiting; yet
cannot any thing Feasibly be Made, without an
Efficient Cause. Wherefore if there be any
thing Made, which was Not before, there must
of Necessity be besides Matter, some other Sub-
stance, as the Active, Efficient Cause thereof.
The Atheistic Hypothesis suppos'd, Things to
be Made, without any Active or Efficient Prin-
ciple. Whereas the Epicurean Atheists, Attri-
bute the Efficiency of all to Local Motion;
and yet deny Matter or Body (their only Sub-
stance) a Self-moving Power. They hereby
make all the Motion that is in the World to have
been Without a Caufa, or to Come from No-
thing, all Action, without an Agent; all Ef-
iciency, without an Efficient. 758

Again; Should we grant these Atheists, Mo-
tion without a Caufa; yet could not Dead and
Senifts Matter, together with Motion, ever be-
get Life, Sense, and Understanding; because
this would be Something out of Nothing, in
way of Causality; Local Motion, only Chang-
ing the Modifications of Matter, as Figure,
Place,Size, and Disposition of Parts. Hence also,
these Spurious Theists Confuted, who Conclude
God to have done no more in the Making of
the World, then a Carpenter daub in the Building
of a Houfe, (upon this Prettence, That Nothing
can be made out of Nothing,) and yet Suppoze
him, to Make Souls out of Dead and Senifts
Matter, which is to bring them from Nothing,
in way of Causality. 758, 759

Decla-
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Declared before, That the Ancient Italicks and Pythagoriicks, Proved in this manner, That Souls could not possibly be Generated out of Matter; because Nothing can come from Nothing, in way of Causality. The Substance of the Atheistic Tonicks, out of Aritotle; That Matter being the only Substance; and Life, Sense, and Understanding, Nothing but the Pallions, Affections, and Dispositions thereof, the Productions of them out of Matter, no Production of any new Real Entity. Page 758.

Answer, Atheists taking it for granted, That there is noother Substantic besides Body or Matter, therefore fully conclude, Life, Sense, and Understanding, to be Accidents or Modes of Matter; they being indeed, the Modes or Attributes of Substance Incorpooreal and Self-Active. A Mode, Thatwhich cannot be Conceived, without the Thing whereof it is a Mode, but Life and Cognition may be Conceived without Corporeal Extension; and indeed cannot be Conceived with it. The chief Oclusion of this Error, from Qualities and Forms; as, Because the Quality of Heat, and Form of Fire, may be Generated out of Matter; therefore Life, Cognition, and Understanding also. But the Atomick Atheists themselves, Explane Qualities, as things Really distinct from the Figure, Site, and Motion of Parts; for this very reason, Because Nothing can be made out of Nothing Cauffally. The Vulgar Opinion of such Real Qualities in Bodies, only from mens mistaking their own Phancies, Apparitions, Pallions, Affections, and Seemings, for Things Really Existing without them. That in these Qualities, which is distinct from the Figure, Site, and Motion of Parts, not the Accidents and Modifications of Matter; but of our own Souls. The Atomick Atheists infinitely Abjurd; when explaining Qualities, because Nothing can come out of Nothing, themselves bring Life, Sense, and Understanding, out of way of Causality. This Opinion, That Cognition is Nothing but Local Motion, and Men themselves mere Machines, Prodigious Sotilhnes, or Intolerable Impudence. Page 760.

Very Observeable here, That Epicurus himself, having a Mind to affect Contingent Liberty, confessed, that he could not do this, unleffe there were some such thing in the Principles; because Nothing can be made out of Nothing, or Caused by Nothing; and therefore doe be Evidently feign a Third Motion of Atoms, to solve that Phenomenon of Free-Will. Wherefore he must needs be guilty of an Impossible Production, of Something out of Nothing, when he brings Soul and Mind, out of Dead and Sensible Atoms. Were there no Substantial and Eternal Life and Understanding in the Universe, there could none have been ever Produced, because it must have come from Nothing, or been Made without a Cause. That D'arte Philosophy which teaches, not only Real Qualities and Substantial Forms, but also Souls themselves, at least Sensitive, out of the Power of the Matter, Educet them Out of Nothing, or Makes them without a Cause, and so prepares a direct way to Atheism. Page 763.

They who suppose Matter, otherwise than by Motion, and by a kind of Miraculous Efficiency, to Produce Souls, and Minds, attribute that Creative Power to the Sensible and Inactive Matter, which themselves deny, to a Perfect Being, as an Absolute Impossibility. That bare we demonstrated, the Impollibility and Nonence of all Atheism, from this very Principle; That Nothing can be made from Nothing, or without a Sufficient Cause. Page 765.

Wherefore, If no Middle betwixt these Two; but all things must either Spring from a God, or Matter; Then is this also a Demonstration of the Truth of Theism, by Deduction to Impossible: Either there is a God, or else all things are derived from Dead and Sensible Matter; But this Latter is Impossible: Therefore a God. Nevertheless, that the Existence of a God, may be further Directly Proved also from the same Principle, rightly understood, Nothing out of Nothing Caufally, or Nothing Caused by Nothing, neither Efficiently, nor Materially. Page 764.

By these Steps, First, That there was never Nothing, but Something or other did Exit of It Self from Eternity, Un-made, and Independently upon any thing else, Mathematically Certain; from this Principle, Nothing from Nothing. Had there been once Nothing, there could never have been Anything. Again, Whatever did exist of It Self from Eternity, must have excess Necessarily, and not by any Free Will and Choice. Certain therefore, That there is Something Absolutely in Being, whose Existence Is, and always Was Necessary. Now that which exists Necessarily, Of It Self, must have Necessity of Existence in its Nature, which Nothing but a Perfect Being behoves. Therefore there is a Perfect Being, and Nothing Else besides this, did Exit of It Self from Eternity, but All other things whatsoever (whether Souls or Matter) were made by it. To suppose any thing to Exit of It Self Necessarily, that hath no Necessary Existence in its Nature, is to suppose that Necessary Existence to have Come from Nothing. Page 765.
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Three Reasons, why some Theists have been so Staggering and Sceptical about the Necessary Self-Existance of Matter. First, From an Idioticall Conceit, That because Artificiall Things cannot be made by men, but Out of Pre-Existent Matter, therefore Nothing by God, or a Perfect Being, can be otherwise Made. Secondly, Because some of them have supposed, an Incorporeal Hyle, or First Matter Un-made; an Opinion Older then Aristotle. Whereas this Really Nothing, but a Metaphysical Notion of the Potentiality or Possibility of Things, respectively to the Deity. Lastly, Because some of them have conceived, Body and Space to be Really the same thing; and Space to be Positively Infinite, Eternal, and Necessarily Existent. But if Space be not the Extension of the Deity it Self, as some suppose; but of Body, only considered Abradially, from This or That, and therefore Immoveably; then no sufficient Ground, for the Positive Infinity, or the Indefinity thereof, as Cartesius Imagned: we being certain of no more then this, That be the World and its Space, or Extension, never so Great, yet it might be still Greater and Greater Infinitely; for which very Cause, it could never be Positively Infinite. This Possibility of more Body and Space, further and further Indefinitely, or Without End, as also its Eternity, mistaken, for Actual Space and Dintance Positively Infinite and Eternal, Nor is there perhaps any such great Absurdity, in the Finitenels of Actual Space and Dintance, (according to this Hypothesis,) as some conceive.

Page 765, 766.

Moreover, the Existance of a God may be further proved, from this Common Notion, Nothing from Nothing Caufally; not onely because were there no God, that Idea which we have of a Perfect Being, must have Come from Nothing, and be the Conception of Nothing; but also all the other Intelligible Idea's of our Minds, must have Come from Nothing likewife, they being not Derived from Sense. All Minds, and their Intelligible Idea's, by way of Participation, from One Perfect Omnopotent Being, Comprehending it Self.

Page 766, 767.

However, Certain from this Principle, Nothing from Nothing, or Nothing Caufed by Nothing; That Souls and Minds could never have Emerged out of Dead and Sensefull Matter; or from Figures, Sites, and Motions: and therefore must either have all Existed Of Themselves, Necessarily from Eternity; or else be Created by the Deity, out of Nothing Pre-Exitting. Concluded, That the Existance of a God is altogether as Certain, as That our Humane Souls did not all Exit from Eternity, Of themselves, Necessarily. That is the Second Atheisticall Argumentation against Omnipoctence or Divine Creation, from that False Principle, Nothing out of Nothing, in the Atheisticall Sense, (which is, That Nothing could be brought out of Non-Existance into Being, or No Substance derive its Whole Being from another Substance; but all was Self-Existent from Eternity,) abundantly Confuted. It having been Demonstrated, That unless there be a God, or a Perfect Omnopotent Being, and Creator, Something must have Come from Nothing in the Impossible Sense, that is, have been Caufed by Nothing, or Made without a Cause. Page 767

SECTION III.

THE Six following Atheisticall Argumentations, driving at these Two things, (The Diffusing, First of an Incorporeal, and then of a Corporeal Deity) next taken all together, In way of Answer to which, Three Things, First, To Confute the Atheisticall Argumentations against an Incorporeal Deity, being the Third and Fourth. Secondly, To Show, That from the very Principles of the Atheisticall Corporealism, in their Fifth and Sixth Arguments, Incorporeal Substance is demonstrable. And Lastly, That therefore the Two following Atheisticall Arguments, (built upon the Contrary Supposition,) are also insufficient.

Before we come to the Atheisticall Argumentations, against an Incorporeal Deity, Premised; That though all Corporeallts be not Atheists, yet Atheists universally, meer Corporeallts. Thus Plato in his Sophist; writing of those who maintained, That Nature Generated all things without the Direction of any Mind; affirmed, That they held, Body and Subistence to be One and the Self-same thing. From whence it follows, That Incorporeal Substance, is Incorporeal Body, or Contradictious Nonsense; and That whatsoever is not Body, is Nothing. He likewise addeth, That they who afferte the Soul to be a Body, but had not the Confidence, to make Prudence, and other Vertues Bodies, (or Bodily,) quite overthrew the Cause of Atheism. Aristotle also representeth the Atheisticall Hypothetic; thus, That there is but One Nature, Matter; and this Corporeal, (or endued with Magnitude) the only Substance; and all other things, the Passions and Affections thereof.

Page 767, 769.

In Disproving Incorporeal Substance, some Difference amongst the Atheists themselves, First,
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First, Those who hold a Vacuum: (as Epicurus and Democritus, &c.) though taking it for
grant d, that what is Un-extended or Void of Magnitude, is Nothing; yet acknowledged a Double Extended Nature; the First Impenetrable and Tangible, Body; the Second Penetrable and Intangible, Space or Vacuum; To them the Only Incorporeal. Their Argument thus; Since Nothing, Incorporeal besides Space, (which can neither be nor Suffer any thing) therefore no Incorporeal Deity. The Answer. If Space be a Real Nature, and yet not Bodily; then must it needs be either an Affection of Incorporeal Substantia; or else an Accident without a Substantia. Gallenius his Opinion is here, to help the Atheists; That Space is neither Accident, nor Substantia, but a Middle Nature, or Essence between Both. But, whatsoever Is, must either Subsist by itself, or else be an Attribute, Affection, or Mode of Something that Substitueth by itself. Space, either the Extension of Body, or of Incorporeal Substantia, or of Nothing: but Nothing cannot be Extended; wherefore Space, supposed, not to be the Extension of Body, must be the Extension of an Incorporeal Substantia Infinite, or the Deity; as some Theists Assert. Page 769, 770

Epicurus his Pretended Gods, Such as could neither Touch, nor be Touched, and had not Corpus, but Quali Corpusseously; and therefore Incorporeals distant from Space. But Granted, that He Colluded or Juggled in this. 770

Other Atheists who denied a Vacuum, and allowed not Space to be a Nature, but a mere Imaginary thing, the Phantasm of a Body; or else Extension considered Absolutely, Argued thus. Whatever is Extended, is Body, or Bodily; But whatever Is, is Extended: Therefore whatever Is, is Body. 770, 771

This Argument against Incorporeal Substance, Answered Two manner of ways: Some Asserters of Incorporeal Substance denying the Minor, Whatever Is, is Extended; others the Major of it, Whatever is Extended, is Body. First, The Generality of Ancient Incorporeals really maintained, That there was Something Un-Extended, Indifferent, Devoid of Quantity, and of Magnitude, Without Parts, and Indivisible. Plato, That the Soul is before Longitude, Latitude, and Profundity. He also Denies, That whatever is in no Place, is Nothing. Aristotle's First Immutable Measure, also, Devoid of Magnitude. So likewise is Mind, or That which Understands, to him. He also denies Place, and Local Motion to the Soul, otherwise then by Accident with the Body. 771, 773

Philo's Double Substance, Dillant and Indillant. God also to him, both Every-where, (because his Powers extend to all things) and yet No-where, as in a Place; Place being Created by him, together with Bodies. Plotinus much concerned in this Division. Two Books of his upon this Subject, That One and the same Numerical thing, (viz. the Deity) may be All, or the Whole Every-where. God to him, Before all things that are in a Place; therefore Wholly Present to whatsoever Present. This would be prove also from Natural Infinities. He Asserts likewise, That the Humane Soul is Numerically the Same, both in the Hand, and in the Foot. Simplicius his Argument for Un-Extended Substantia; That Whatsoever is Self-Moving, must be Indivisible and Indistinct. His Affirmation, That Souls, Locally Immoveable, Move the Body by Cognition. 773, 775

None more full and express in this, then Porphyrius. His Assertion, That there were such an Incorporeal Space, (as Democritus and Epicurus supposed) Mind, or God, could not be Co-Extended with it; but only Body. The whole Deity, Individually and Indistinctly Present, to every Part of Divisible and Dillant things. 775, 776

Thus Origen in his Against Celius. Saint Auline, That the Humane Soul hath no Dimensions, of Length, Breadth, and Thickness, and is in it Self Indelibility. Exceius recognizeth this amongst the Common Notions, known only to wise men, That Incorporeals are in No Place. 776

This therefore no Novel or Recent Opinion, That the Deity is not Part of it Here, and Part of it There, nor Manageable by Tardis and Poles, but the Whole Undivided, Present to every Part of the World. But because many Objections against this we shall further Show, how these Ancient Incorporeals endeavoured to Quitthemselves of them. The First Objection; That to suppose the Deity, and other Incorporeal Substances, Un-Extended, is to make them Absolute Parvitudes, and so Contemplable things. Plotinus his Answer; That what is Incorporeal, is so Indivisible as a Little thing; either a Physical Minimum, or Mathematical Point; for thus God could not Conquire with the whole World, nor the Soul with the whole Body. Again, God not so Indivisible, as the Least; he being the Greatest of all, not in Magnitude, but Power. He so Indivisible, as also Infinite. This an Error proceeding from Sense and Imagination; That what Un-Extended, therefore Little. Incorporeal Substantia, the Whole of which is Present to every Part of Body, therefore Greater then Body. Porphyrius to the same purpose, That God is neither to

(1 3)
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be look'd upon as the Leaff, nor as the Greateff, in a way of Magnitude. Page 776, 778

The Second Objeftion; That what neither Great nor Little, and pofterre no Place, a Non-Entity. This according to Plato, Plotinus, and Porphyry, a Miftake, proceeding from men adhering to Sense and Imagination. They Grant, That an Un-Extended Being, is Un-imaginable. Porphyry, That Mind and Phancy are not the same, as some maintain, Which can either Doe, or Suffer, not Nothing, though it seem not out into Diftance. Two Kinds of Substances to Plotinus; Bulky Tumours, and Un-bulky Active Powers. Which latter, laid by Simplicius, to have neverthelefs a certain Depth or Profoundity in them. Something un-imagineable, even in body it felf. We cannot Poifibly Imagine the Sun of fuch a Bignefs, as Reafon Evinces it to be. fpoken also by Plotinus, That an Un-fixt-Our Duration, or Timelesf Eternity, as difficult to be conceived, as an Un-Ex tended Substance; and yet may this needs be Attributed to the Deity. 778, 781

That God and Humane Souls, no otherwise Incorporeal, than as Spirituall Souls, a Thin or Subtile Body, Fall. Because the Difference of Groffenefs and Subtility in Bodies, according to True Philosophy, only from Motion. That the most Subtile Body, may poifibly be made as Groffe as Lead or Iron; and the Groffefs, as Subtile as Ether. No Specitick Difference of Matter. 781

The Third Argument, againft Un-Extended Substance; That to be All in the Whole, and All in every Part, a Contradiction, and Impoffibility. This Granted by Plotinus to be True of Bodies, or that which is Extended, That it cannot be 3 or but Impoffible, that what hath no Parts, should be a Part here, and a Part there. Wherefore the word 3 or (in that, Whole in the Whole, and Conceiv'd, in every Part in every Part, to be taken only in a Negative Sense, for un power'd, undivid'd. The Whole undivided Deity Every-where, and not a Part of it Here only, and a Part There. 782, 783

The Laft Objeftion is against the Illocacy and Immobility of Finite Created Spirits, and Humane Souls cannot. This not only Ab fard, but also Contrary to that Generally Received Tradition among Thelites, of Souls Moving Locally after Death, into another Place, called Hades. Two Anfwers of Plotinus to this. First, That by Hades, may be meant only the Invisible; or the Soul's Ating without the Body. Secondly, That if by Hades, be Meant a Worcer place, the Soul may be faid to be there, where its Idol is. But when this fame Philofopher, fuppofeth the Soul (in Good men) to be separable also from this Idol, he departs from the Genuine Cabala of his own School. That Souls always united to some Body or other. This affefted here by Porphyry; That the Soul is never quite naked of all Body; and therefore may be said to be there, wherefore its Body is. Page 784, 785

Some Exceptions out of Philofoonr, where in the Doctrine of the Ancients, concerning the Soul's Spirituous or Airy Body, (after Death) is Largly declared. 785, 787

Intimated here by Philofoonr, That, according to some of these Ancients, the Soul hath fuch a Spirituous Body here in this Life, as its Interior Indument, which then adheres to it, when its Outer Garment is strips off by Death. An Opinion fome, That the Soul may in this Spirituous Body, leave its Groffer Body for some time, without Death. True, That our Soul doth not immediately Act upon Bones and Fleth; but certain Thin and Subtile Spirits, the Infruments of Sense and Motion. Of which Porphyry thus; The Blood is the Food of the Spirit, and the Spirit the Vehicle of the Soul. 787, 788

The fame Philofoonr further Addeth, That according to the Ancients, besides both the Terreftrial, and this Spirituous or Airy Body, there is yet a Third kind of Body, peculiar to such as are Souls, as are more thoroughly purged after Death; called by them a Luciform, and Heavenly, and Ethereal, and Starre-like Body; Of this Proclus affeft, upon the Timesus, (who affefteth it to be Un-organized,) as likewise Hieoles. This called the Thin Vehicle of the Soul, in the Chaldean Oracles, according to Filenus and Plotho. By Hieoles, a Spiritual Body, in a Sense agreeable to that of the Scriptures; by Synesius, the Divine Body. This Differentiation of Two Interior Vehicles, or Tunicles of the Soul, besides the Terreftrial Body, (called by Plato the Outrecaeous) no Invention of Later Platonites since Chriftianity; it being plainly infifted upon by Virgil, though commonly not Understood. 788, 790

That many of these Platonites and Pythagoreans, fuppofed the Soul, in its First Creation, when Made pure by God, to be Cloathed with this Luciform and Heavenly Body; which also did alwais Indescribably adhere to it, in its After-Defcents, into the Aeriel and Terreftrial; though Fouled and Obscured. Thus Plotho, and the fame Intimated by Galen; when he calls this, the First Vehicle of the Soul. Hence it was, that besides the Moral and Intellestial Purgation of the Soul, they recommended alfo, a Mystical or Teleffick way of Purifying the Ethereal Vehicle, by Diet and Catharms. Thus much Insifted on by Hieoles. What Pliny, Dying
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Dying By Wifedom, or the Philofophick Death. Page 790, 792

But this is not the Opinion of all, That the Same Numerical Ethereal Body, always adhereth to the Soul; but only, that it is wherever either the Body, or Makes a Body, fauitable to it felf. Thus Porphyrius. Plato also fums to have been of this Perfufion. 792, 793

This Affirmed by Hierocrates, to have been the Genuine Cabbala of the Ancient Pythagoreans, which Plato afterwards followed. Hierocrates his Definition of a Man, A Rational Soul together with a Cognate Immortal Body; be declaring, This enfranchised Terreftrial Body, to be but the Idol or Image of the True man, or an Accefion to him. This therefore the Answer of the Ancient Incorpoaraohs, to that Objection againzt the Ilocation and Immobility of Created Incorpoaraohs; That thefe being all Natturally United to Some Body or other, may befhew falt to be in a Place, and Locally Moved. And, That it does not follow, that becaufe Created Incorpoaraohs are Un-extended, they might therefore inform the whole Corpoarth Universal. 793, 794

That it would be no Impertinent Difcertainment here, To Compare the forementioned Pythagoric Cabbala, with the Doctrine of Chriftianity: and to consider their Agreement or Difagreement. First therefore, A Clear Agreement of these most Religious Philosophers with Chriftianity in this, That the Higheft Happinefs, and Perfection of Humane Nature, confifteth not, in a Separate State of Souls, Un-united to any Body; as some High flown Perfons have Conceived. This Plotinus, who fometimes runs as much into the other Extremes, in fuppofing Humane Souls to Animate, not only the Bodies of Brutes, but also of Plants. Thus also Maimonides among the Jews; and therefore fuppofed for denying the Refurrection. His Igereth Tenan, written purpofely to purge himfelf of this Sufpicion. The Allegorizers of the Refurrection, and of the Life to come. 794, 795

Again, Chriftianity Correspondeth with the Philofophick Cabbala, concerning Humane Souls in this, That their Happinefs confifteth not, in Conjunction with fuch Terreftrial Bodies, as thefe we now have: Scripture, as well as Philofophy, complaining of them, as a Heavy Load, and Burthen to the Soul; which therefore not to be taken up again, at the Refurrection. Such a Refurrection as this, called by Plotinus, a Refurrection to Another Sleep. The Difference between the Refurrection-Body, and this Present Body, in Scripture. The Refurrection-Body of the Jaff, (as that of the Philofophick Cabbala) Immortal and Eternal; Glorious and Lucid; Star-like and Spiritual; Heavenly and Angelical. Not this Grofs Flefhly Body, Girdled and Varfifhed over in the outside only, but Changed throughout, This the Refurrection of Life, in Scripture, Emphatically called The Refurrection. Our Souls, Strangers and Pilgrims in these Terreftrial Bodies: Their proper Home and Country, the Heavenly Body. That the Grofs Body that is, according to Philosophy, may meerly by Motion be brought into the Purity and Tenuity of the Finift Ether. Page 795.

But whether Humane Souls after Death, alwayes United to some Body, or else quite Naked from all Body, till the Refurrection; noto Explicitly determined in Chriftianity, Souls after Death, Live unto God. According to Origen, This a Privileidge Proper to the Deity, to Live and Difalone, without Vital Union with any Body. If Natural to the Soul, to Enliven a Body; then not probable, that it should be kept fo long in an Unnatural State of Separation. 799, 800

Again; Probable from Scripture, That wicklid Souls after Death, have Punishment of Sence or Pain, besides Remorse of Confience; which not eafeft Conceivable How they fhould have, without Bodies. Thus Tertullian. He adding, That Men have the fame Shape, or Effigies, after this Life, which they had here. Though indeed he drive the benefit too far, to us to make the Soul itfelf to be a Body, Figure and Colloaurate. 800, 801

But Irenanus plainly suppos'd, the Soul after Death (being Incorporah) to be Adapted to a Body, fuch as his the fame Character and Figure, with its Body here in this Life. 801, 802

Origen alfo of this Perfevation, That Souls after Death, have certain Subtle Bodies, retaining the fame Characterizing Form, which their Terreftrial Bodies had. His Opinion, That Apparitions of the Dead are from the Souls themselves, surviving, in that which is called a Lucifform Body. As alfo that Saint Thomas did not doubt, but that the Body of a Soul departed, might appear, every way like the Former: one only be disbelieved our Saviour's appearing, in the Same Solid Body, which he had before Death. 802, 803

Our Saviour telling his Disciples, That a Spirit had no Flefh and Bones, that is, an Solid Body, as himself then had; seems to imply, them to have Thinner Bodies, which they may Filibly Appear in. Thus in Apollonius, is Touch made the Sign, to distinguish a Ghift Appearing, from a Living Man. Our Saviour's Body after his Refurrection, according to Origen.
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Origin, in a Middle State, between This Gross or Solid Body of ours, and That of a Ghost. Page 804.

A place of Scripture, which is interpreted by the Fathers, would naturally imply, the Soul of our Saviour after Death, not to have been quite Naked of all Body, but to have had a Corporeal Spirit. Mofes and Elias, visibly appearing to our Saviour, had therefore True Bodies.

That the Regenerate here in this Life, have a certain Earnest of their Future Inheritance, (which is, their Spiritual or Heavenly Body), Gathered from Scripture by Irenæus, and Novatian. Which Preblishments of the Spiritual Body, cannot so well coftit with a Perfect Separation from all Body, after Death, till the Day of Judgement.

This Opinion of Irenæus, Origin, and others, supposed by them, not at all to clash with the Christian Article of the Resurrection. Nothing in this Point determined by them.

The Left thing in the Pythagoric Cabbala, That Demons or Angels, and indeed all Created Understandings Beings, consist, as well as Men, of Soul and Body, Incorporeal and Corporal, United together. This Hierocles, Universally of all the Rational Nature, and that no Incorporeal Substance, besides the Supreme Deity, is Compleat, without the Conjunction of a Body. God the Only Incorporeal in this Sense; and not a Mundane, but Supra-Mundane Soul.

Origin's full Agreement with this Old Pythagoric Cabbala, That Rational Creatures are neither Body, nor yet without Body; but Incorporeal Substances, having a Corporeal Indument.

Origin misrepresented by Huetius, as affenting Angels not to Have Bodies, but to Be Bodies: whereas he plainly acknowledged the Humane Soul to be Incorporeal, and Angels also to have Souls. He proved Corporeal Creatures, from the Scriptures; which though themselves not Bodies, yet always Use Bodies. Whereas the Deity is neither Body, nor yet elated with a Body, as the Proper Soul thereof.

Some of the Fathers, so far from fupposing Angels altogether Incorporeal, that they ran into the other Extrem, and concluded them altogether Corporeal; that is, to be All Body, and Nothing else. The Middle between both these, the Originick and Pythagoric Hypothesis, That they consist of Incorporeal and Corporeal Substance, Soul and Body Joined together. The Generality of the Ancient Fathers, for neither of these Extremes. That they did not suppose Angels to be Perfectly Unbodied Spirits; Evident from their affirning, Devils, as the Greek Philosophers did Demons, to be Delighted with the Nidours of Sacrifices; as having their Vaporous Bodies, or Airy Vehicles, refreshed thereby. Thos Porphyrius, and before him Callus. Amongst the Christians, (besides Origen) Justin, Athenagoras, Tatianus, &c. S. Basil, concerning the Bodies of Demons or Devils, being Nourished with Vapours; not by Organs, but throughout their whole Substance.

Several of the Fathers plainly affirning, that Devils and Angels to consist of Soul and Body, Incorporeal and Corporeal Substance, Joyned together. Saint Aurelius, Claudianus, Mammertus, Fulgentius, Joannes Theflalonicensis; and Pfallus, who Philofophizeth much concerning this.

That some of the Ancients, when they called Angels Incorporeal, understood Nothing else thereby, but only that they had not Groffe, but Subtle Bodies.

The Fathers, though herein Happening to Agree with the Philofophick Cabbala, yet seem'd to have been led thereto by Scripture. As from that of our Saviour, They who shall obtain the Resurrection of the Dead, shall be Imbions, Equal to the Angels; that is, according to Saint Aurelius, shall have Angelical Bodies. From that of Saint Jude, That Angels Singing, loft their Own Proper Dwelling-Houfe; that is, their Heavenly Body, (called Sauros by Saint Paul) which made them Fit Inhabitants of the Heavenly Regions; and thereupon Caft down into the Lower Tartarum, interpreted by Saint Aurelius, to be this Caliginous Air or Atmospheric of the Earth. Again, From that Fire said to have been Prepared for the Devils: which being not to be taken Metaphorically, therefore (as Pfallus concludes) Implies them to be Bodied, because an Incorporeal Substance alone, and not Vitaly United to any Body, cannot be Tormented with Fire.

Now if all Created Incorporeal, Superior to Men, be Souls vitally United to Bodies, and never quite Separate from all Body; then Probable, that Humane Souls, after Death, not quite Naked from all Body, as if they could Live and All compleatly without it; a Priviledge Superior to that of Angels, and proper to the Deity. Nor is it at all Conceivable, How Improfe Beings could have Sense and Imagination without Bodies. Origin Contra Cellum, Our Soul in its own Nature Incorporeal, always Standeth in need of a Body, suitable to the place wherein it is. And accordingly, Sometimes Putteth Off what it had before; and Sometimes again Putheth On something New. Where the following words being situated, Origin's Genuine Sense...
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Seft restored. Evident that Origen distinguishes, the Εἰκόνις in S. Paul, (Translated, Tabernacle,) from the Earthly House; be understanding by the former, a Thin Spirituous Body, which is a Middle betwixt the Earthly and the Heavenly, and which the Soul remains in, still clothed with, after Death. This Opinion of Origen's, That the Soul after Death, not quite Separate from all Body, never reckoned up in the Catalogue of his Errors. Origen not Taxed by Methodius, for affording Souls to Have Bodies, but for not affording them to Be Bodies; there being no truly Incorporeal Substan- tance, according to Methodius, but the Deity, This One of the Extremes mentioned, And the Origenick Hypothesis, to be preferred before that of Methodius. Page 817, 830

Already Observed, That Origen not Singular, in this Opinion concerning Human Souls; Ireneaus, Philoponus, Jonannes Theflaloni- centis, Pfeillus, and others, affording the same, S. Auffine in bis De Gen. ad Lit. Granteth, That Souls after Death cannot be carried to any Corporall Places, nor Locally Moved, without a Body. Himself seems to think, the Punish- ment of Souls, before the Resurrection, to be Phantastical. But gives Liberty of thinking otherwise. In bis Book De Civ. D. He Con- ceives, that Origenick Opinion not Improb- able, That some Souls after Death, and before the Resurrection, may Suffer from a certain Fire, for the consuming and burning up of their Dross: which could not be without Bodies. 820, 822

Hitherto shewed, How the Ancient Affecters of Unextended Incorporeals, Answered all the Objections made against them; but especially that of the Illocality and Immobility of Created Incorporeals; namely, That by those Bodies, which they are always Vitally united to, they are Localized, and made Capable of Motion; according to that of Origen, The Soul stands in need of a Body for Local Motions. Next to be considered, their Reasons for this Affer- tion, of Unextended and Indifferent Substance, so re- pugnant to Imagination. 822

That whatsoever Arguments do Evince other Substan- tance besides Body, the Same against the Atheists Demonstrate, that there is Something Unextended; themselves taking it for granted, that whatsoever is Extended, is Body. Neverthe- less, other Arguments propounded by these Ancients, to prove directly, Unextended Substance, Plotinus his Firit; To prove the Humane Soul and Mind sieb. Either every Part of an Extended Soul, is Soul; and of Mind, Mind; or Not. If the Latter, That no Part of a Soul, or Mind, is by it Self Soul, or Mind; then cannot the Whole, made up of all those Parts, be

such, but if every supposed Part of a Soul, or Mind, or of a Mind, or of a Mind; then would all but One be Superfluous; or Every One be the Whole: which cannot be in Extended things. Page 822, 824

Again, Plotinus endeavours to Prove, from the Energies of the Soul, that it is Unextended, because it is One and the Same Indivisible thing, that Percieveth the whole Sensible Object. This further pursued, If the Soul be Extended, then must it either be One Physical Point, or More. Impossible That it should be but One Physical Point. If therefore More, then must every one of those Points, either Percieve a Point of the Object, and no more, or else the Whole. If the Former, then can nothing Percieve the Whole, nor compare one Part of it with another: If the Latter, then would every man have innumerable Perceptions of the whole Object at once. A Fourth Supposition, That the whole Extended Soul, Percieves the Whole Object, and all the Parts thereof, (no Part of the Soul having any Perception by it Self) Not to be Made, Because, the Whole of an Extended Substance, nothing but All the Parts: and so if no Part have any Perception, the Whole can have none. Moreover, To say, the Whole Soul Percieve the all, and no Part of it any thing, it indeed to acknowledg it Unextended, and to have no Distant Parts. 824, 826

Again, This Philosopher would prove the same thing, from the Sympathy or Homopathy, which is in Animals; it being One and the Same thing, that perceives Pain in the Head, and in the Foot; and comprehends the whole Bulk of the Body. 826

Lastly, He disputes farther, from the Rational Energies. A Magnitude could not Un- derstand, what hath no Magnitude, and what is Indivisible: whereas we have a Notion, not only of Latitude Indivisible as to Thickness, and of Longitude as to Breadth, but also of a Mathematical Point, every way Indivisible. We have Notions of things also, that have nei- ther Magnitude nor Site, &c. Again, all the Abstract Effences of things Indivisible. We conceive Extended things themselves, Unex- tendedly the Thought of a Mile, or a Thousand Miles Distance, taking up no more room in the Soul, than the Thought of an Inch, or of a Mathematical Point. Moreover, were that which perceiveth in us, a Magnitude, it could not be Equall to every Sensible, and ake Percieve things Greater and Lesser, then it self. 827, 828

Besides which, they might Argue thus: That we, as we can Conceive Extension without Cogitation, and again Cogitation without Extention, (from whence their Distinction and Separabili-
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ty is Invisible: ) so can we not Conceive Cognition, with Extension; nor the Length, Breadth, & Thickness of a Thought; nor the Half, or a Third, or Twentieth Part thereof, nor that it is Figurate, Round, or Angular. Thoughts therefore must be Non-Entities, if whatever is Unextended be Nothing; as also Metaphysical Truths, they having neither Dimensions, nor Figure. So Volitions and Passions, Knowledge and Wisdome itself, Justice and Temperance. If the things belonging to Soul and Mind, be Unextended, then must themselves be so. Again, If Mind and Soul have Distinct Parts, then could none of them be One, but Many Substances. If Life Divided, then a Half of it would not be Life. Lastly, no reason could be given why they might not be as well Really, as Intellelctually Divisible. Nor could a Theft deny, but that Divine Power might Close a Thought, together with the Soul wherein it is, into many Pieces. Page 828, 829

The Sense of the Ancient Incoporealists therefore this: That in Nature, Two kinds of Substances. The First of them Paffive Bulk, or Distinct and Extended Substance; Which is all, One thing without Another; and therefore as Many Substances, as Parts, into which it can be divided. Effentially Antithetical: one Magnitude Joined to another, always Standing without it, and making the Whole so much Bigger. Body all Outside, having nothing Within, no Internal Energy, nor any Action besides Local Motion; which it is also Passive to.

Were there no other Substance besides this, there could be no Motion. Action, Life, Cognition, Intellpection, Volition; but All would be a Dead Lumps; nor could any one thing Penetrate another. Wherefor another Substance, whose Character were Espars, the Active Nature; Life, Self-Activity, Cognition; which no Mode or Accident of Extension; it having more of Entity in it. Nor are these Two, Extension and Life, Inadequate Conceptions, of One and the Same Substance. A Thinker a Monad; or One Single Substance. Not Conceivable, how the Several Parts of an Extended Substance, should Joynly Concur to Produce One and the Same Thought. 829, 830

The Energies of these Two Substances, very different. The one Nothing but Local Motion, or Translation from Place to Place; a mere Outside Thing: The other Cognition, an Internal Energy; or in the Inside of that which Thinks. Which Inside of the Thinking Nature, hath no Length, Breadth, or Profoundity, no Out-swelling Tumour; because then it would be Outside again. Were a Cogitative Being Extended, yet must it have besides this Extended Outside, an Unextended Infide. But One and the Same Substance cannot be Extended, and Unextended. Wherefore in this Opinion of Extended Incoporeal, a Complication of Two Substances, and a Confusion of them together into One. True nevertheless, That all Finite Incoporeal Substance, is always Naturally united with some Extended Body, or its Outside. Page 831

All Summed up Together. 832

Hitherto the Sense of the Ancient Affecters of Unextended Incoporeal, represented to the best Advantage. Nothing Affected by us; but that these, and other Arguments, do Demonstrate against the Atheists, some Other Substance besides Body; but whether or no, they Prove this to be Indifferent and Unextended; left to others to make a Judgment. The Atheists who deny this, must acknowledge every Thought, to be not only Mentally, but also Physically Divisible and Separable; together with the Soul: as also deny Internal Energy; and consequently make Cognition, Nothing but Local Motion; and Lastly, Hold that no Substance can Co-Exist with Another Substance, more Inwardly, then by Juxta-Position. 832, 833

This the First Answer to the Formentioned Atheistic Argument against Incoporeal Substance; made by the Ancients, By denying the Minor; That though whatever is Extended be Body, yet Every thing is not Extended. But the Argument otherwise Answered, by some Learned Affecters of Incoporeal Substance, By denying the Major; That though every thing be Extended, or what Unextended Nothing; yet whatever is Extended, is not Body; they offering another Extinction Incoporeal, which is both Penetrable, and not made up of Parts Physically Separable from one another; to which belongs Life, Self-Activity, and Cognition. Probable, That some would Compound both the Formentioned Hypothesizes together; by supposing the Deity to be altogether Unextended, and Indivisibly all every-where; but Souls, or Created Incoporeals, to have an Unextended Infide, Diffused, as it were, into an Extended Outside. Our selves here only to Oppose Atheists; and Dogmatize no further, than to Assert, what all Incoporealists agree in, That besides Body, there is Another Substance, which consisteth not of Parts Really Separable from one another; which is Penetrable of Body, and Self-Active, and hath an Internal Energy, distinquent from Local Motion. All which is Demonstratively Certain. This the Full Answer to the First Atheistic Argument, Against Incoporeal Substance; That either there is Something Unextended, or at least Extended other.
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wife then Body, so as to be Penetrable thereof, and Indiscernibly One with it itself, and Self-Active. 833, 834

The Second Atheisticck Affault against Corporal Substancie; By Pretending the Original of this Mistake, to have sprung from the Scholasticr Effences, Distinct from the things themselves; and the Abuse of Abstract Names and Notions, they being made to be Substances Existing by themselves. For, though the Opinion of Ghosts and Spirits, (whereof God is the Chief) sprung first from Fear; yet that these should be Corporal, could never have entered into the Minds of men, had they not been Enchanted with these Abstract Names and Separate Effences. 834

The First Generall Reply to this, That it is all but Romantic Fiction. That the Opinion of the Deity, sprung not from Fear, and That all Invisible Ghosts are not Phanes, already sufficiently Proved; as also The Existence of a God Demonstrated by Reason. That Apparitions are Real Phenomena; and Reasonable to think, That there may as well be Invisible Aerial, and Animal, as there are Visible Terrestrial Animals. Setting like to conclude, That there is no Understanding Nature, Superior to Man. 834, 835

The Second Particular Reply, That the Opinion of Spirits Incorporall, sprung not from the Scholasticr Effences, whether considered Concretely or Universally, or Abstractly, No man supposing, these to be Things Really and Substantially Existing without the Mind; either an Universal Man and Universal Horc, or else Humanity and Equality: and these walk up and down in Any Bodies; they being only Noma, or the Intelligible Effences of Things, as Objects of the Mind. These Effences of Things, said to be Eternall, as their Verities. The meaning of these Eternall Effences not, That they are so many Eternall Substances Incorporal; but, That Knowledge is Eternall, and, That there is an Eternall Unmade Mind, that comprehends them; which all other Minds Partake of. 835, 836

Again, That another Atheisticck Dream, That the Abstract Names and Notions of the Mort Accidents of Bodies, were Made Substances Incorporal; Souls, Minds, and Ghosts. Conceivable Life, no Accident of Bodies, as Atheists Supposed; but the Essential Attribute of Another Substance, which Incorporal; as Magnificudo, or Extension, is the Essential Attribute of Body. 836

The following Atheisticck Arguments to be dispatched with more Brevity. That the Four Next, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth, proceed only upon this Supposition, That there is no Other Substancie in the World, besides Body or Matter; and therefore signify Nothing, to the Affectors of an Incorporall Deity, Stoicks, and the like, only concerned to Asinus them. Nevertheless, From the Impossibility of these Atheisticck Corporalisms, contained in the Fifth, and Sixth, a Neccessity of Incorporall Substancie will be Evinc'd. 836

Here two Atheisticck Corporalisms, Founded upon these Suppositions, That all is Body or Matter; and, That Matter as such, is devoid of Life and Understanding. The First in the way of Qualities and Forms, Generable and Corruptible, called the Hylopolitan. This the most ancient Atheisticck Form, as we learn from Aristotle; viz. That Bulky Extension, the only Substantiall and Unmade thing, and all other things, but the Passions, Qualities, and Accidents thereof; Makeable out of it, and Destroyable into it. The Consequence from whence, That there is no Substantiall Unmade Life and Understanding: And, That no Mind could be a God, or Creator; it being all Accidentall, Fictitious, and Creature. 836, 837

This Hylopolitan Atheism, called also by us, Anaximandrian. Though we are not Ignorant, That Simplicius conceives, Anaximander to have held an Homoeomy, or Similar Atonomy, of Eternall Unmade Qualities, as Anaxagoras afterwards: only, that be acknowledged no Unmade Life or Mind, but Generated it all, from the Forroutious Commixture of those Qualifyed Atoms. (Which no Improbable Opinion, though not Certain.) Because however, Anaximander supposed Life and Understanding, to be at least Secondary Qualities, and Accidents of Body, Generable and Corruptible. And not Fit, to multiply Forms of Atheism. 837

The Second Atheisticck Corporalism, in the way of Unqualifyed Atoms, producing all things, even Life, and Understanding; from Figures, Sites, Motions, and Magnitudes of Parts. From whence it will also follow, That Mind is no Primordial Thing, but Secondary, Compounded, and Derivative; Creature, and no Creator. This called Democritic: not because Democritus was the First Inventor of the Diflimilar Atonomy; but because he was the First Atheizer of it, or the First, who made Diflimilar Atoms, the Principles of All things whatsoever, even of Life and Understanding. ibid.

Not to be Denied, But that from these Two things Granted, That all is Body, and, That the First Principles of Body are devoid of Life and Understanding; it would follow unavoidably, That there is no God. Therefore the Stoicks, who were Corporal Theists, denied the Latter.
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they supposing an Understanding Fire, Eternal and Unmade; the Maker of the whole Mundane System. Truly Obferved by Origen, That the Corporeal God of the Stoics, was but by Accident Incorruptible, and Happy; and only because Wanting a Destroyer. This no Genuine Theifm. Page 323, 328

But an Absolute Impossibility, in both these Atheifick Corporealifms; not only, because they suppose no Active Principle; but also, becaufe they bring Life and Underfanding, that it, Something, out of Nothing; or Make them without a Caufe. Where the Atomick Atheifts, of the Two, moft to be Condemned; becaufe so grossly Contradifting themselves. From that True Principle, That Matter as such, is devoid of Life and Underfanding; an Absolute Néceffity of another Subfance Incorporeal, which is Eternally Vital and Intellecfual. That All Life, cannot possibly be Facifious and Accidental, Generable and Corruptible; but there muft be Subfiantial Life; and alfo some Eternai. 338, 339

The Truth of this Underf stood and Acknowledged by the Hylozoilms; That there muft of Néceffity be, both Subfiantial and Unmade Life and Underfanding; who therefore Attribute the fame to all Matter as such; but without Animality which, according to them, is all Facifious and Accidental. Wherefore, this Hylozoi ch Atheifm alfo, brings Conscious Life and Animality out of Nothing; or Makes them without a Caufe. The Argument of the Epicurean Atheifits, againft Stratoni for or Hylozollm, Unanswerable: That upon this Supposition, there muft be, in every Man and Animal, a Heap of Innumerable Percipients, as many as there are Atoms of Matter; and fo no One Thinker. The Pretence of the Hylozolls, That all the Particles of Matter, in every Animal, do Confederate; Ridiculous, and Impossiblc. 339, 340

Thus the Fifth and Sixth Atheifick Argumentations, fully Confuted; and from that True Supposition in them, That Matter, as fuch, is Devoid of Life and Underfanding, Incorporeal Subfiance plainly Demonstrated; Which was our Second Undertaking. 340

The Third and Laft; That there being Undeniably, Subfiantial Incorporeal, the Two Following Atheifick Argumentations, (built upon the Suppoftion of the Contrary) altogether Infignificant. The Seventh not properly directed against Theifm, but againft a Religious kind of Atheifm or Theogonifm; which suppoited a God or Soul of the World, Generated out of Senflles Souls; and the Offpring of Night and Chaos. A Sober and True Senfe, of the World’s Animation; That there is a Li-

ving, Sentient and Underfanding Nature, Prefiding over the whole World. But the Sence of Pagan Theifits, That the Whole Corporeal World Animated, is a God, Exploded by us. This Argument therefore being not againft Theifm, but Theogonifm; the Confufion thereof might be here well Omitted, without any Detritment to our Caufe. But becaufe the denying of a Living Underfanding Nature, prefiding over the World, is Atheifickl the Ground of this Affertion briefly Declared; That Life and Underfanding are Accidents of Bodies, resulting only from Such a Contexture of Atoms, as produce Fleth, Blood, and Brains, in Bodies Orga

ized; and, That there is no Reafon to be found any-where, but only in Humane Forms: which also Confuted. A Brutifh Paffage, of a Modern Writer, That it is Unconceivable by Men, How God can Underfand without Brains. Page 840, 841

The Next, (which is the Eighth Atheifick Argumentation) That there can be no Living Being Immortal, nor Perfectly Happy; built upon that False Suppoftion alfo, That all Life and Underfanding results from a Contexture of Dead and Senflles Atoms, and therefore is Diffoluble and Annihilable. But that there is Life Effeftual, and Subfiantial, which Naturally Immortal; as also a Néceffity, of an Eternal Life, and Mind Unmade, and Unannihilable; which Perfectly Happy. 841, 842

S E C T. IV.

T H E Epicurean Atheifits further Endeavours, to Diplane a God, from the Pha

nomena of Motion, and Cognition; in the Three Following Argumentations, the Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh. From Motion, thus; That from this Principles, Nothing can move It Self; but whatever is Moved, is moved by Another; it will follow, That there can be no First Caufe, and Unmoved Movers but One thing Moved Another, from Eternity Infinitely; Becauce Nothing could Move Another, which was not It Self First Moved by Something efe. 842, 843

Answer: The meaning of this Axiom is, Not, That Nothing can Act from It Self, as the Atheif Supposes, be taking it for granted, that every Thing is Body, and that all Action is Local Motion; but, That no Body Reiling, could ever Locally Move It Self. A False Suppoftion of the Atheifits, and some Carteffians; That there were but once Motion in the Matter, this would of it Self continue to all Eternity. True, that of Arifotle; That to make an Infinite Pro-
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Progress in the Causes of Motion, and no First Mover; is all one as to say, That there is no Cause at all thereof; or, That all the Motion in the World, is a Passion without an Agent, or Comes from Nothing. Clearly Impossible, That there should be any Motion at all, were there Nothing Self-Moving or Self-Active. Page 843.

Wherefore from this Principle, That no Body can Move It Self, it follows Undeniably; That there is some other Substance in the World besides Body, that hath an Active Power of Moving Body. 843, 844.

Another Corollary from the same Principle; That there is another Species of Action, distinct from Local Motion, and which is not Hetero-kinely, but Autokinely. That the Action by which Local Motion is first Caufed, could not be it Self Local Motion. All Local Motion Caufed Originally by Cognition. That the Ninth Atheilick Argument from Motion Confuted; and from hence, That no Body can Move it Self, Demonstrated, That there is Something Incorporeal. the First Cause of Local Motion, by Cognition. ibid. But the Atheists further Pretend to Prove, That Cognition it self is Hetero-kinely, the Passion of the Thinker, and the Action of some other External Agent upon him; Because, Nothing taketh Beginning from It Self; and, No Cognition can rife of It Self, without a Caufe. That therefore, Thinking Beings themselves are Machines, and Cognition Local Motion. And, No Understanding Being, a First Caufe, nor Perfectly Happy; because Dependent upon something else. 844, 845.

Anfwer. True, That no Substance taketh Beginning from it Self; as also, That no Action Caufeth it Self. But False, That no Action taketh Beginning from the Immediate Agent: Or, That Nothing can Act otherwife, than as Acted upon by Something else. Atheists here Affirm only, what they should Prove, and so Beg the Question. If nothing Self-Active, then all the Motion and Action in the Universe, must Come from Nothing, or be Made without a Caufe. 845.

True also, That our Humane Cognitions are frequently occasioned from External Objects, and that the Concatenations of Thoughts and Phantasies, often depend upon Mechanick Caufes. But False, That all Cognitions are Obtruded upon us from without, and, That no Transition in our Thoughts, which was not before in Sense. The Humane Soul a Principle of Actions, and therefore also of Cognitions. This a Bubbling Fountain of Thoughts. But that there is such a Perfect Mind, as at once Comprehends all Truth, and was before Sensibles. 845, 846.

This a Prodigious Paradox, and Fallacy of Atheists; That Cognition, Local Motion, and Thinking Beings, Machines. Here a Correction of what we wrote before, P. 761, and a Change of our Opinion, upon further Consideration; That not only a Modern Writer, but also the Ancient Atheilick Atomists, did conclude, Cognition to be Really nothing else but Local Motion. Nevertheless, these men troubled with the Phancy of Cognition, which because they cannot make Local Motion, they would persuade us to be no Reality, or Nothing. Atheists are, That if there be any Action besides Local Motion, there must then be some other Substance acknowledged besides Body. They who make Cognition Local Motion, and Men, Machines, no more to be disputed with, than Sensibles Machines. Page 846, 847.

To Affirm, That no Underlying Being can be Happy, nor a God, because Dependent upon Something without it; all one as to Affirm, That Sensibles Matter is the Most Perfect of all things, and, That Knowledge, as such, speaking Imperfection, is but a Whiffing and Phantastical thing. But of this more afterwards. Thus the Tenth Atheilick Argument Confuted. 847.

Another Atheilick Argument, From the Nature of Knowledge and Understanding. That the World could not be made by an Underlying Being, Because there was no Knowledge before Things, which are the Objects of it; and, the only Things are Sensibles, which Knowledge a Passion from, Therefore all Mind, as such, a Creature, and none a Creature. ibid.

This already fully Answered, Page 729, and so forwards. Where Proved, That Singular Bodies are not the Only Things, and Objects of the Mind, but that it contains its Intelligibles within it Self. And, That Knowledge, is Archetypall to the World, and the Maker of All, So the Exiſtence of a God, Demonstrable, from the Nature of Knowledge and Understanding. 847, 848.

That the Atheists can no more Salve the Phænomenon of Cognition, than that of Local Motion; Evident from their Many Hallucinations concerning it; whereof a Catalogue subjoined. First, That all Life and Understanding, a mere Accidentall thing, Generable and Corruptible, and no Life nor Mind Substantiall or Essentiall. This before Confuted. 848.

Again, That Life and Mind, no Simple and Primitive Natures, but Compounded Syllables of things; and therefore none Immortal, nor Incorruptible. Anfwer, That Life and
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Understanding are Active Powers, and could never result from mere Passive Bulk; nor can any Composition of Dead and Sensible Matter, possibly beget Life and Understanding. Though no Necessity, that there should be any Eternal Unmade Red or Green, because these might be Made out of things not Red nor Green; nor that there should be an Eternal Motion, because Motion might be produced from a Self-Active Principle; nor that there should be any Eternal Unmade Matter, because were there none, it might notwithstanding be Created, by a Perfect Incorporeal Being; yet an Absolute Necessity of Eternal Unmade Life and Mind; because had there been once none, there could never have been any. Page 848, 849.

Another Atheistic Hallucination, that there is Nothing of Self-Activity in Cognition; nor any thing could Act otherwise, than as it is Made to Act by Something else. This to bring all Action from Nothing, or to suppose it without a Cause.

Another Madness of theirs already mentioned, that Cognition, Local Motions, and Thinking Beings, Machines. This Equal Sorrifhness or Impudence, as to affirm, Number to be Figure, &c.

Another Paradox of the Epicurean and Democritick Atheists, that Mentall Cognition, as well as Senfation, the more Passions of the Thinker, and the Actions of Bodies Existing without him: Some of them supposing Thoughts, to be Caused by certain Finer Images, their Senfations; Others, that they are the Reminders of the Motions of Sense, formerly made. Answr.: That Senfation it self, is not a mere Corporeal Passion, but the Perception of a Passion, in a way of Phancy; much left Mental Cogitations such; and leaff of all Votions.

But Conscientiously hereto, these Atheists Determine, all Knowledge and Understanding, to be Really the same thing with Sense. From whence follow Two Absurdities. First, That there can be no such thing as Error, because all Passion is True Passion, and all Sense, True Sense: that is, True Seeming and Appearance. This Absurdity owned by Protagoras. Epicurus Endeavoured to avoid this, but in vain, and contrariwise to his own Principles.

A Second Absurdity consequent thereupon: That there is no Absolute Truth nor Falsehood, but all Knowledge Private and Relative, and nothing but Opinion. This freely owned likewise by Protagoras. Sometimes also by Democritus. Who therefore but a Blunderer neither, in the Atomick Philosophy; which plainly Supposes a Higher Faculty of Reason and Understanding, that judges of Sense, and discovers the Phantasthy thereof; it reaching to Absolute Truth.

Another Atheistic Error; That Singular Bodies are the only Objects of Mental Conception, as well as of Senfation. This imputed by Aritotle, to Democritus and Protagoras. But sufficiently before Confuted. 853, 854.

The better to maintain this Paradox, Added by a Modern Atheistic Writer, as his own Invention; That Universals are Nothing else but Names, by which Many Singular Bodies are called: Axioms or Propositions, the Addition and Subtraction of Names; and Sylogistic Reasoning, the recompeng the Consequences of them: and that therefore besides the Passions of Sense, we know Nothing at all of any thing, but only the Names by which it is Called. Whence it would follow, That Geometrical Truths, not the same in Greek and Latin, &c.

That the Atheists, according to these premised Principles, endeavour to Depreciate Knowledge and Understanding, as that which speaks no Higher Perfection, then is in Sensible Matter. Thus the Atheists in Plato, make it but a Ludicrous, Unbratific and Evanid thing, the mere Image of Bodies, the only Realities. Their Design in this, to take away the Scale, or Ladder of Entities.

All the Grounds of this again briefly Confuted; and Particularly, that Opinion so much favoured Athein, That there is Nothing in the Understanding, which was not before in Sense; out of Boecius. Jull and Unjust, Greater Realities in Nature, then Hard and Soft, &c. Unquestionably, a Scale or Ladder of Entities; and therefore Certain, that the Order of Things must be in way of Deficient, from Higher Perfection to Lower, and not of Ascend, from Lower to Higher. The Steps of this Ladder not Infinite: the Foot thereof, Inanimate Matter; the Head, a Perfect Omnipotent Being, Compriending in It self: all Possibilities of Things. Mind by Nature Lord over all; and Sovereign King of Heaven and Earth.

The Reason why we so much Inlet upon this; Because Atheists Pretend, not only to Save the Phenomenon of Cognition without a God; but also from thence to Demonstrate the Impoffibility of his Exhilence. Though Modern Writers not so much aware hereof; yet is the Controversy between Thelists and Atheists, thus Stated by Plato; Whether Soul and Mind Juniors to Sensible Matter, and the Offspring thereof or else Substantial Things, and in Order of Nature before it. Accordingly Plato confutes the Atheuell no otherwise, then by proving Soul not to be Junior to Inanimate Matter and
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and Generated out of the same. Evident, That Plato by Soul here understood, not only the Mundane Soul, but also that Whole Rank of Beings, called Soul; and, That no Life was Generated out of Matter. Page 869, 860.


Nor is the Caufe much different, as to others; who, though they professedly Generate only Sensitive Souls, yet making the Rational, but mere Blanks, which have Nothing in them, but what was Scribbled upon them by Sense; and so Knowledge, in its own Nature, Junior to Sense and Sensibles; Highly Gratify the Atheifts hereby. 861.

If any Life and Cognition may be Generated out of Dead and Sensible Matter, then can no good Reafon be given, why All should not be. Life not partly Accidental, partly Subftantial: but either All Confcioufs Life, Accidental, Generable and Corruptible; or else None at all. ibid.

The Doctrine of Real Qualities Generable and Corruptible, favourable to Atheifm also. And though the Atheiftick Atomifts Explode all the other Qualities, because, Nothing can come from Nothing; yet, contradicting themselves again, do they make Life and Understanding, Real Qualities, Generated out of Matter, or Caufed by Nothing. 861, 862.

There being a Scale or Ladder of Entitities in Nature, to Produce a Higher Rank of Beings, out of a Lower; as Life and Cognition, out of Matter; and Magnitude; is to Invert the Order of this Scale, from Downwards, to Upwards; and so fay a Foundation for Atheiftm. Wherefore great Reafon, to maintain this Pofl, against the Atheifts; That no Souls can be Generated out of Matter. 862, 863.

The Grand Objection against the Subftantia-

lity of Sensible Souls, from that Confequen-
tcy of their Permanent Subftance after Death. Carteius fo Sensible therefo, that he would rather make Brutes to be Sensible Machines, than them Subftantial Souls; which he granted they must have, if Thinking Beings. What clearly Demonstrable by Reafon, not to be abandoned, because attended with some Diffi-
culties, or seemingly Offensive Confequences. 863.

The Pythagorick Hypotheses: That Souls all Created by God, not in the Generation of Ani-

mals, but in the Cohinogonia. These there-

fore, first Cloathed in Thin and Subtle Bo-
dies, Aerial or Aetherial Ochemata, wherein they Subfift, bat before their Ingress into Ter-

reftrial Bodies, and after their Egrefs out of

them. Thuc Boerius and Proclus. Ammonius

bis Irrational Demons Mortal; Brutfh Souls, in Aerial Bodies. Since the First Creation, no New Subftantial thing Made, or Destroy-
ed, and therefore no Life. This looked upon by Macrobius as a Great Truth. Page 863, 864.

That the Pythagoreans would Endeavour to gain some Countenance for this Hypothecis, from the Scripture. 865, 867.

But if these Aerial Vehicles of Brutfh Souls be Exploded for a Whimfey, and none but Ter-

reftrial Bodies allowed to them; though after Death they will not Vanife into Nothing, yet

must they needs remain in a State of Infeftibili-

ty, and Inacility, till re-united to other Ter-

reftrial Bodies. Wherefore thofe in one Senfe Mortall, though in another Immortal, S ilk-

worms dying, and reviving in the Form of But-

terflies, made an Emblem of the Resurrection, by Chriftian Theologers. 867, 868.

But no Absolute Necessity, That the Souls of Brutes, though Subftancial, should have a Permanent Subftance after Death, either in a State of Activitv, or Inacility; Because, whatsoever Created by God, may Possibly by him be Annihilated. The Subftantia1ity only of the Rational Soul, Demonstrable by Reafon; or that it will not of it Self vanish into Nothing; but not that it is Absolutely Impossible, for it to be Annihilated: The affurance of this Depending upon a Faith in the Divine Goodness. Porphyris his Affertion, That Chriftian Souls are Resolved into the Life of the Univerfe. The whole Answer to this Objection, against the Subftantia-

lity of Brutfh Souls; That they may Iutor-

ifying, Possibly be Annihilated in the Deaths of Animals, as well as they were Created in their Generations; but if they do Subfit (without Aerial Vehicles,) they must remain in a State of Inacility and Infeftibillty. 868, 869.

That this the Doctrine of the Ancient Pagan Theologers, That no Life, or Soul, Generated out of Dead and Sensible Matter; but all Produced by the Deity, as well as Matter; Proved out of Virgil: though funder other Testimonies also, might be added thereunto. 869, 870.

The Hylozoick Atheifts themselves, fo Sen-

fible herefo, That there must be some Sub-

tIftial and Unmade Life, (from whence the Lives and Minds of all Animals are Derived,) That they attribute the Same to Matter; and conclude, That though the Modified Lives of Animals, and Men, be Accidental, Generated and Cor-

rupted, yet the Fundamental Life of them, is Subftantial, and Incorruptible. These also afferted, a Knowledge before Senfe, and Un-
derived from Sensibles. 870, 871.

This Hylozoick Atheift again Confuted. Abfurd
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Aburd to suppose, Knowledge and Under-standing, without Consciousness; or also, That the Substantial and Fundamentall Life, of Men and other Animals, should never perish, and yet their Souls, and Personallies, Vanish into Nothing. That no Organization can produce Consciousness. These Atheists not able possibly to give an Account, when the Intelligible Objects and Idea's, of this their Knowledge of Matter, should spring. This Hylological Atheism, Nothing but the Crumbling of the Deity into Matter. Page 871.

Concluded, That the Phenomenon of Mind and Understanding, can no way possibly be Saved by Atheists, without a God; but afford a Solid Demonstration of his Existence. 871, 872.

SECT. V.

THERE now remaining only, the Atheistic Objections against Providence, their Queries, and Arguments from Intericls; Their Firft Objection, From the Frame of the World, as Faulty. Or, Because Things are Ill Made, that therefore not made by a God. This directed against the Sense of the Ancient Theologers; That God being a Perfect Mind, therefore made the World after the Belt manner. Some Modern Theologers Deviating from this, as if the Perfection of the Deity consisted not at all in Goodness, but in Power and Arbitrary Will only. The Controversy betwixt thefe and Atheists; but Whether Matter Fortuitously Moved, or a Fortuitous Will omnipotent, be the Original of all things. No Ground of Faith in a mere Arbitrary Deity. To have a Will Undetermined to Good, no Liberty, nor Sovereignty, but Impotency. God to Celsius, the Head or President of the Righteous Nature. This not only the Sense of Origen, but of the Ancient Christians in General. Plotinus; The Will of God Essentially, That which Ought to be. God an Impartial Balance, Weighing out Heaven and Earth. The Deity, not Servilely Bound to doe the Belt; but this the Perfection of its Nature. No Atheist able to prove, The World to be Ill Made. 872, 874.

Not to be Concluded, That whatsoever we cannot find out the Reason or Ufe of, is therefore Ineptly Made. For example, The Intestinum Caecum, though seemingly an Odd Appendix, and which the Generality of Anatomists give little Account of; yet that, with the Valve at its Entrance, both together, an Artificial Con-trivance of Nature, to hinder the Regurgitation of the Feces. 874, 875.

The FIrst Atheistic Infiance of the Faultinefs
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Unreasonable to require, That God should Miraculously Interpose at every turn; or to think, That every Wicked person should presently be Thunder-struck. That which Strikes the whole World, no Fond and Pallidone, but an Impartial Nature. Yet, That there want not Instances of an Extraordinary Providence. Good Reasons for the Slowness of Divine Vengeance. The Notoriously Wicked, commonly meet with at the long Run. Page 878, 879

The Sometimes Impyance of Wicked Persons, so far from Staggering Good men, as to Providence; that it confirms them in their Belief, of Future Immortality, and Judgement after Death. The Evolution of Humane affairs, a Kind of Dramatick Poem, and God Almighty the Skilful Dramatist, who always Connected that of Ours, which went before, with what of His follows after, into Coherent Scene. A Geometrical Distribution of Rewards and Punishments. 879, 880

That there ought to be a Doubtful and Cloudy State of things, for the Exercise of Faith, and the more difficult Part of Vertue. Had there been no Monsters to Subdue, there could have been no Heroes. Here, we to Live by Faith, and not by Sight. 880

But that to make a full Defence of Providence, would require a large Volume. The Reader therefore referred to others for a Supplement. Ouly some Few Considerations to be here propounded, not so much for the Conformation of Atheists, as Satisfaction of Theists, sometimes apt to call in Question the Divine Goodness, though the very Foundation of our Christian Faith. ibid.

First; That in Judging of the Works of God, we ought not to consider the Parts of the World alone by themselves, but in order to the Whole. Were Nothing made but the Bell, there could have been no Harmony, for want of Variety. Plotinus, That a Linner does not make all Eye, nor place Bright Colours every-where; nor a Dramatist introduce only Kings and Heros, upon the Stage. 88c, 882

Secondly; That we ought not to Confine God's Creation to the Narrowness of Vulgar Opinion, which Extends the Universe, but little beyond the Cloud; and Walls it in, with a Spear of Fixed Stars. The World Unca- pable of Infinity of Magnitude, as well as of Time. Nevertheless, as the Sun is much bigger then we can imagine it, so much more may the World be. The New Celestiall Phenomena, widen the Corporal Universe, and make those Phan- sied, Flaming Walls thereof, to fly away before us. Not reasonable to think, That all this Immense Valuems should be Defect and Uninhibited. 882, 883

Thirdly; That we cannot make a Right Judgement, of the Ways of Providence, without looking both Forwards, upon what is Future; and Backwards, upon what is Past; as well as upon the Present. That the Platoniists and Pythagoreans, solved many Phenomena, from the 12 signs of the Zodiac, Things done in a Pre-Existent State. Our Common Christianity supposeth but a kind of Imputative Pre-Existence; to Salve the Pravity of Mankind, and the Evils of this State. The different Fates and Conditions of Men here in this Life, to be resolved into a Jull, though Occult Providence. Page 883

The Third Objection against Providence, or Fourteenth Athielick Argument; That it is Impossible, for any One being, to Animadvert and Order all things; and if it were Possible, that it would be Distractious, and Inconsistent with Happinesse. Moreover, That an Incredibly Powerfull and Happy Being, would not concern itself in the welfare of others: Benevolence arising only from Imbecillity. 883 884

The Reply; That because our Selves have but a Finite Animadversion, and the Narrow Sphere of Activity, to measure the Deity accordingly, it but an Idol of the Cave or Den. Certain, that were there Nothing, but what we could fully Comprehend, there could be no God. Had the Sun Life, Equally Coextended with its Rays, it would perceive every thing touched by them. Creatures but the Rays of the Deity. Men able to manage affairs, in many distant places, without Distraction. And innumerable Notions, tie together in our Minds, without Crowding one another, or any Disor- derance to us. 884

But for the eaving the Minds of weak Mortals, already Sugggested; That there is no Ne- cessity, God shoule Himself immediately do all things; be having Ministers Under him, Executores of his Providence; as, an Artificial, Platick Nature, (for this reason partly be- fore inferred,) Infinities also in Animals, a Part of that Divine Fate, which is the Servant of Providence. Above which, other Knowing and Understanding Ministers of the Deity, appointed to Preside over Humane Affairs. But all over-look'd by the watchfull Eye of God Almighty, who may Himself Extraordinarily In- terpose. 884, 885

Wherefore we need to Confine Providence, to a Few Greater things only, to free the Deity from Distraction. Small things (upon which Greater often depend) not Neglected by it. Nevertheless, the Chief Employment of Divine Providence, in the Occomony of Souls, by Plato Reduced to this Compendium: The Translating of them into Better or Worser States, according to their Demeanours. Thus may the few wiset of Mortals, (1) were
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more easily conceive, Providence not to be Laborious and Distractions to the Deity. Page 885

But that all Eternity arises from Imbecility, and that what is Perfectly Happy, would be troubled with no Buliness, but enjoy its own Ease; Idols of the Atheists Den. These other, The Narrow Contradictions of their Minds, by Vice and Immorality. 885, 886

The Atheistical Queries, next to be Answered. The First Query. If there were a God, who was Perfectly Happy in himself, Why would he be go about to make a World? Answ. The Reason of God's making the World, was from his Over-flowing and Communicative Goodness, That there might be other Beings Happy, besides Himself. This consistent with God's making the World, for his own Glory. The reason why Plotinus would explain that. True, that God did not make the World, merely to Orientate his Skill and Power; but to Display his Goodness, which is Chiefly his Glory. The Atheists further Demand; What hurt would it have been for us, never to have been Made? Answ. No other then this, That we could never have Enjoyed Good, nor been Capable of Happines. If no hurt not to have been Made, then none to be Amabilis, the Distance being as great, from Nothing to Something, as from Something to Nothing. 886

The Second Atheistical Query. If God's Goodness were the Cause of his making the World, Why then was it not made Sooner? This Question capable of a Double Sense. First, Why was not the World from Eternity? The Reply; This not from any Defect in the Divine Goodness, but because there is an Impossibility of the Thing it self; the Necessity and Incapacity of such an Imperfect Being Hindering it. Our selves Proue to Think, That could the World have been from Eternity, it should have been so. This Philoponus, in his Conception of Proclus his Arguments, for the World's Eternity. And now no place left, for these Athelasitical Cavils, against the Novety of the Creation; as if God must therefore have Stept from Eternity; or had Contradicted a Satiety of his former Selfsends. Another Sense of the Question; Why, though the World could not be from Eternity, yet was it not made Sooner? Answ. The World could not possibly have so been made in Time, as that it should not have been once, but a Day Old; and also once, no more then five or six thousand years Old. 886, 887

The Third Atheistical Querie. How could God move the Matter of the whole World; especi-ally if Incorporated? Answ. That all things being derived from the Deity, and Essentially depending on him, they must needs be Commandable by him, and Obsequious to him, and since no Body can Move it self, that which first Moved the Matter, must be Incorporated, and not move it by Machines and Engines, but by Cognition or Will onely. That Con- ceit, That an Incorporal Deity, could not Move Matter, because it would Run through it; Absurd; This moving not Mechanically, but Vitaly, That Cogitative Beings have a Natu-ral Power of Moving Matter, Evident from our own Souls, Moving our Bodies, not by Machines or Engines, but merely by Thought. More easy for the Deity, to move the Whole World, by Will and Cognition; then for us our Bodies. Page 887, 888

The Last Head of Atheistical Argumentation, From Interets. First, That it is the Inter- est of Particular Persons, there should be no being Infinitely Powerfull, who hath no Law but his own Will. The First Reply; Withing is no Proving. Nor will any man's thinking, make Things otherwise than they are. 888

But Secondly, This With of Atheists, Founded upon a Mistaken Notion of God Almighty, That he is nothing but Arbitrary Will Omnipotent. God's Will, not meer Will; but Law and Equity; Ought it felt Willing. Nor does Justice in God, either with Goodnest, but is a Branch, or Particular Modification thereof. The Interest of none, There should be no God, unleas perhaps of such, as are Irre-claimably Wicked, and wilfully abandon their own True Good. 888, 889

To be Without God; to be Without Hope. No Faith nor Hope in Senseless Matter. Ac- cording to the Atheistical Hypothesies, no Possi- bility of Happines, nor Security of Good. 889

God such a Being, as If he were not, Noth- ing more to be Wished for. To Believe a God, to Believe the Existence of all Good and Perfection; and that all things are Made and Governed as they Should be. Pecability, from the Necessity of Imperfect Free-Willed Beings. Infinite Hopes from a Being Infinitely Good, and Powerfull. Democritus and Epicurus, however cried up so much of late; but Infatuated Sophists, or Witty Fools, and Debauchers of Mankind. 889, 890

The Last Atheistical Argumentation. That Theinf or Religion is Inconsistent with the Interest of Civil Sovereigns. Their First Pre- tence for it, That the Civil Sovereign Reigns only in Fears; and therefore there must be no Power, nor Fear, Greater, than that of the Le- viathan. 890

In Answer to this, The Atheistical Ethics and Politicks to be Unravelled. Their Foundation laid, in the Villanizing of Humane Nature. That there is no Natural Justice, Equity, nor Charity. No Publick nor Common Nature in
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Page 800, 801

But in the next place, They add, That though this State of Nature, which is Bellum Libery, and Laweless Freedom to every thing, be in itself the Belt; yet by Accident, and by reason of Men Imbecillity, does it prove the Worf. Wherefore, when Men had been weary of Hewing and Slashing, they then betipoffed themselves at length of Helping Nature by Art; By Submitting to a Leffer Evil, for the Avoinding of a Greater; Alloting their Infinite Right, and Yielding to Terms of Equality with others, and Subjection to a Common Power.

Page 891

Where these Atheists firft Slander Humane Nature; and then Debate Jufhice and Civil Authority, making it the Igitimpble and Baitardly Brat of Fear; or a Leffer Evil Submitted to, out of Necessity, for the avoiding of a Greater. According to which Atheiftick Hypothofis, No man is Willingly Jult. This no New Invention of the Writer De Civic, but the old Atheiftick Generation of Jufhice, and of a Body Politick, Civil Society, and Sovereignty's (before Plato's time;) it being fully defcribed, in his Second Book of a Common-wealth. Where the Philofopher concludes, Jufhice, according to thefe, take but a Middle thing, between the Belt, and the Worf; Laced, not as Good in it Self, but onely by Reason of Men Imbecillity; Or, That Jufhice is indeed, Another man's Good, and the Evil of him that is Jult. The fame Hypothofis also, concerning Jufhice, as a Facitious thing, that springs onely from Fear and Imbecillity, and was chosen but as a Leffer Evil; Inflated on by Epicurus.

Page 891, 893

The vain Attempts of our Modern Atheiftick Politicians, to Make Jufhice by Art, when there is None by Nature. First, by Renouncing and Tranferring new Right, by Will and Words. For If Nothing Naturally Unlawfull, then can no man, by Will and Words, make any thing Unlawfull to himself. What Made by Will, may be Defroyed by Will. The Ridiculous Concep of these Atheiftick Politicians, That Injuftice is nothing but Dali Repeating, and such an Absurdity in Life, as is in Diffupation, when a man Denies a Propofition, he had before Granted; No Real Evil in the Man, but only a Relative Incongruity in him as a Citizen. Again, These Jufhice-Makers and Authority-Makers, pretend to derive their Facitious Jufhice, from Paets and Covenants. But Paets and Covenants, without Natural Jufhice, (as themselves confess;) Nothing but Words and Breath; and therefore can have no Force to Oblige. Wherefore they make another Pretence also, from certain Counterfeit Laws of Nature, of their own Drifling, that are Nothing but meer Juggling: Equivocation they being but the Laws of Fear, or their own Tinfoles and Cowardly Complexion. They Ridiculously Dance Round in a Circle, when they Derive the Obligation of Civil Laws from Covenants; of Covenants from Laws of Nature; and of Laws of Nature again, from Civil Laws. Their vain Attempts, by Art to Conjoincate, what Nature hath Difociated, like tying Knots in the Wind or Water. Their Artificial Obligation, or Ligaments, by which the Members of their Leviathan are held together, more slender than Cobwebs.

Page 893, 895

These Artificial Jufhice-Makers and Obligation-Makers, Seemible of the Weaknes of these Attempts, Artificially to Conjoincate, what Nature hath Difociated; therefore fly at last from Art, to Force and Power; making their Sovereign, to Reign onely in Fear. This the True meaning of that Opinion, That all Obligation is derived from Law; that is, the Command of him who hath Power to Command. If Obligation, to Obey Civil Laws, onely from Fear of Punishment, then is no man Obligated to hazard his Life for the Safety of his Prince; and whoever can promise themselves Immunity, may Jutily Defoy. If Civil Sovereigns Reign onely in Fear, then is their Authority Nothing but Force; and Power would Jutifie Rebellion. Lozly, If Civil Right or Authority, Nothing but Force and Violence, then could it not last long; What Natural, prevailing against what is Violent.

Page 895

Wherefore since Civil Authority and Bodies Politick, can neither be meerly Artificial, nor yet Violent things, there must be some Natural Vinculum, to hold them together; such as will both Oblige Subjects to Obey the Commands of Sovereigns, and Sovereigns in Commanding, to seek the Good of their Subjects; Something of a Common, Publick and Concludinating Nature: Which, no other than Natural Jufhice. The Authority of God himself, Founded in Jufhices of which Civil Authority, a Participation. Sovereignty, no Creature of the People, and of Mens Wills; but hath

(12) • Stamp
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A Stamp of Divinity upon it. Had not God made a City; Men, neither by Art, or Political Enchantment, nor by meer Force, could have made any. The whole World, One City, of God and Rational Beings. The Civil Sovereignty no Leviathan; that is, No Beak, but a God. He Reigns not in meer Brutish Force and Fear, but in Natural Justice and Conscience, and the Authority of God himself. Nevertheless, need of Force and Fear too, to compel Some to their Duty; nor is the Sovereign’s Sword here alone Sufficient, but he must Reign also in the Fear of God Almighty. Page 895.896

The Second Atheistick Pretext, to Make Religion Inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty; because it Limits and Confines that, which in its own Nature is, and Ought to be Infinite. The Reply; That the Atheist’s Infinite Right and Authority of Civil Sovereigns, is nothing but Bellum Liberty; But true Right and Authority is Essentially Founded in Natural Justice; there being no Authority to Command, where there is no an Obligation to Obey; and Commands not Creating Obligation, but Prefupposing it, without which they would signify Nothing. The First Original Obligation not from Will, but Nature. The Error of those Theists who derive all Obligation to Morall Things, from the Will and Positive Command of God, as Threatening Punishments, and Promising Rewards, From whence it would follow, that no man is Good and Just, but By Accident only, and for the Sake of Something else. Justice a different Species of Good, from that of Private Utility. Infinite Justice, as Absurd, as an Infinite Rule or Measure. If no Infinite Justice, then no Infinite Right and Authority. God’s own Authority bounded by Justice: His Will ruled by Justice; and not Justice by his Will. Atheists, under a Pretext of giving Civil Sovereignty Infinite Right, Really Devise them of all Right and Authority, leaving them nothing but Brutish Force. Proved here, That the Summe Potestates, must of necessity be Divinities.

Page 896.898

The Last Atheistick Pretext, for the Inconsistency of Religion with Civil Power; because Conscience is Private Judgement of Good and Evil. Answer, That not Religion, but Atheism, introduced such Private Judgement, as is Absolutely Inconsistent with Civil Sovereignty, it acknowledging nothing in Nature, that tends to Publick and Common Good; but making Private Appetite the only Rule or Measure of Good; and Utility, of Justice. The Depraver Consequence from hence; That Private Utility may justify Rebellion and Tyrantie. The Atheist’s Professed Affection, That they who have once Rebelled, may Justly Defend themselves afterward by Force. Though Private Persons must make a Judgement in Conscience for themselves, (the Atheists Publick Conscience, being Nonentities and Contradictions,) yet is the Rule of Conscience, not Private, but Publick, except only to Malign and Fanaticks; who therefore Sometimes make a Pretense of Conscience and Religion, in order to Sedition and Rebellion. Religion and Conscience Oblige Subjects, in all Lawful things, Actively to Obey the Sovereign Powers; in Unlawful, Not to Refuse.

898.899

The Conclusion of the Whole Book; That all the Atheisticke Grounds being fully Confuted, and the Impossibility of Atheism Demonstrated; it is certain, That the Original and Head of all things, is no Blind and Inconscionable Nature, but a Perfect Understanding Being, Self-Existent; Who hath Made all that was fit to be Made, and after the Best manner, and Exercised a Jult Providence over all. To whom be All, Honour and Glory, &c.

The End of the Contents.
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Page 16. Line 2. read, XIV. Besides. p. 49. l. 9 to 16. read, (And thus—Body) p. 61. l. 2. read, by 63. g. 89 66. 10. Unextended. 75. 25. dele. but. Lin. ult. read, To this purpose. 102. l. ult. dele. with 13. l. 3. 4. read, could not rise from an Egg of the Night, nor be the Off-spring of Chaos, but must be something— 105. Title, r. Hylæaett 168. r. Irregularity 173. r. 9. Reason and Understanding—Line 37. a Free 201. 9. 212. 3. 4. read, Schoolmasters upon him, writing thus, 231. 27. places errare 251. 12. a 266. 22. Longinianus 269. 28. 268. 304. 5. Sermone 304. 3. Exception 331. 5. Manifested 335. Title, r. Invisible 344. 17. Phæbus 345. (in. Pr.. 414.) 1. 27. non—355. r. 1. 27. Quinti 37. 37. 77. andquot; \\nonandquot; 378. 21. 379. l. debit. 385. 17. 386. 31. read, Third and Fourth Vicegli 379. 31. Delect. 288. 31. andquot;Parsandquot; of—397. Title, read, Very Good. 404. Marg. l. ult. I. L. 10. 433. 30. andquot;Parsandquot; 457. 18. andquot;Parsandquot; 457. 10. Extremum. Lin. 30. a Extremum 482. 29. by him determined 368. 13. respectively, 368. 14. his Pecuniury, 316. 4. altered. 319. 30. Nature, or Nature—548. 28. Son. 468. 19. f. 475. 16. In an Image of a Glass—555. 27. præfæculum 566. 3. 4. 358. 9. 4. The Word 568. 18. Dei. 479. 8. Son. 568. 6. 7. and Grandson, 520. 31. it is there—634. Title, add, Trinity 632. 31. if need be, for another 684. 17. therefore nor—696. l. ult. as it was 717. 39. and also 742. 5. Similar atoms 745. 23. that their Soul’s cannot 752. 3. 4. read, Priests, and other Platonick, expressly denied it to have being—Omnipotence, Omnidan, or Self-Existent, and—752. 8. no not that 765. 4. Matter, together 777. 37. 2. of and andandquot;andquot; as 787. 16. Infracted, 794. 31. the Univerfals 798. 11. Earth, in—Line 23. dele. it 805. Marg. 1. 14. fetters 815. 8. ought to be 851. 1. notice. Extended Oufide, and an Unextended Inside, 853. 32. deletere 883. Marg. 1. 9. andquot;Parsandquot; 884. 35. was One Reason.
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