THE

ATHENIAN ORACLE

ABRIDGED;

CONTAINING THE MOST VALUABLE

Questions and Answers,

IN

THE ORIGINAL WORK;

ON

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY, DIVINITY,

LOVE AND MARRIAGE.

London:

PRINTED BY AND FOR JOHN NICHOLS AND SON,
25, PARLIAMENT-STREET, WESTMINSTER.

1820.
THE present Abridgment contains the quintessence of "The Athenian Oracle;" and comprises a rich treasure of useful knowledge, for the Theologian, the Historian, the Philosopher, and the Lover. In short, all classes may find in the present Work something conducive to their pleasure and improvement, in their hours of seriousness, as well as those of gaiety.

"The Athenian Oracle" was a Selection of what was valuable in "The Athenian Mercury," one of the many Projects of the celebrated John Dunton; who, in his "Life and Errors," thus informs his Readers of the true Question Project, and of the several Persons that engaged in it:

"I had received a very flaming injury, which was so loaded with aggravations, that I could scarce get over it; my thoughts were constantly working upon it, and made me strangely uneasy: sometimes I thought to make application to some Divine, but how to conceal myself and the ungrateful wretch, was the difficulty. Whilst this
perplexity remained upon me, I was one day walking over St. George's-fields, and Mr. Larkin and Mr. Harris* were along with me; and on a sudden I made a stop, and said, 'Well, Sirs, I have a thought I'll not exchange for fifty guineas.' They smiled, and were very urgent with me to discover it; but they could not get it from me.

'The first rude hint of it was no more than a confused idea of concealing the Querist, and answering his Question. However, so soon as I came home, I managed it to some better purpose, brought it into form, and hammered out a title for it, which happened to be extremely lucky, and those who are well acquainted with the Grecian History may discover some peculiar beauties in it.—However, the honest Reader that knows nothing of criticism may see the reason why this Project was intituled 'The Athenian Gazette,' if he only turns to Acts xvii. 21.—When I had thus formed the design, I found that some assistance was absolutely necessary to carry it on, in regard the Project took in the whole compass of Learning, and the nature of it required dispatch.

'I had then some acquaintance with the ingenuous Mr. Sault; who turned Malebranche into English for me, and was admirably well skilled in the mathematicks; and over a glass of wine I unbosomed myself to him, and he very freely offered

* Two eminent booksellers.
to become concerned. So soon as the design was well advertised, Mr. Sault and myself, without any more assistance, settled to it with great diligence; and Numbers 1, 2. were entirely of Mr. Sault's composure and mine.

"The Project being surprizing and unthought of, we were immediately overloaded with Letters; and sometimes I have found several hundreds for me at Mr. Smith's coffee-house in Stocks-market, where we usually met to consult matters.

"The 'Athenian Gazette' made now such a noise in the world, and was so universally received, that we were obliged to look out after more Members; and Mr. Sault, I remember, one evening came to me in great transport, and told me he had been in company with a gentleman, who was the greatest prodigy of Learning he had ever met with; upon inquiry, we found it was the ingenious Dr. Norris, who very generously offered his assistance gratis, but refused to become a stated Member of Athens. He was wonderfully useful in supplying hints; for, being universally read, and his memory very strong, there was nothing could be asked, but he could very easily say something to the purpose upon it.

"In a little time after, to oblige Authority, we altered the title of 'Athenian Gazette' into 'Athenian Mercury.' The undertaking growing every week upon our hands, the impatience of our Querists, and the curiosity of their Questions,
which required a great deal of accuracy and care, obliged us to adopt a third member of Athens; and the Reverend Samuel Wesley being just come to town, all new from the University, and my acquaintance with him being very intimate, I easily prevailed upon him to embark himself upon the same bottom, and in the same cause. With this new addition we found ourselves to be masters of the whole design, and thereupon we neither lessened nor increased our number.

"The 'Athenian Mercury' began at length to be so well approved, that Mr. Gildon thought it worth his while to write 'A History of the Athenian Society;' to which were prefixed several Poems, written by the chief Wits of the age (viz. Mr. Motteux, Mr. De Foe, Mr. Richardson, &c. and in particular, Mr. Tate, now Poet Laureat), was pleased to honour us with a poem directed to the Athenian Society.

Mr. Swift*, a country gentleman, sent an Ode to the Athenian Society; which, being an ingenious poem, was prefixed to the Fifth Supplement of the 'Athenian Mercury.' †

Our Athenian Project not only obtained among the populace, but was well received among the politer part of mankind.

"That great and learned Nobleman, the late

* Afterwards the celebrated Dean.

† This Ode has since been incorporated in Swift's Works and it accompanies this Advertisement. See p. ix.
Marquis of Halifax, was once pleased to tell me, 'that he constantly perused our Mercuries, and had received very great satisfaction from very many of our Answers.'

"The late Sir William Temple, a man of a clear judgment, and wonderful penetration, was pleased to honour me with frequent Letters and Questions, very curious and uncommon; in particular, that about the Talismans* was his.

"The Honourable Sir Thomas Pope Blount, when he resided in town, has very frequently sent for me to his chamber, and given me particular thanks for my Athenian Project; and, the last visit I made him, he told me "the Athenian Society was certainly the most useful and informing design that had ever been set on foot in England."

"Sir William Hedges was pleased to tell me, "he was so well pleased with the 'Athenian Mercuries,' that he would send several complete sets into the Indies, to his friends; and that he thought the publik, and himself in particular, so much obliged to me, that I should always be welcome to his house; and that he would serve me to the utmost with reference to my trade."

"I could mention many more honours that were done me, by Sir Peter Pett† and many

* Re-printed in the present Volume, p. 39*.
† "A virtuoso and a great scholar, and Fellow of the Royal Society. He was well accomplished for conversation, because of his natural fluency and the fineness of his wit."
others, whose learning and judgment the world has little reason to question.

"Our 'Athenian Mercuries' were continued till they swelled, at least, to twenty volumes folio; and then we took up, to give ourselves a little ease, and refreshment; for the labours and the travels of the mind are as expensive, and wear the spirits off as fast, as those of the body. However, our Society was never formally dissolved.

"The old Athenian volumes, a while ago, growing quite out of print, a choice collection of the most valuable Questions and Answers, in three volumes, have lately been re-printed, and made public [a fourth was subsequently added], under the title of "The Athenian Oracle."

Thus far we have given the history of the Work before the Reader in the words of honest John Dunton, the original Pro- jector; and it only remains to add, that, in the Selection now offered to the Publick, there is nothing that is in the least calculated to give offence to the most chaste and delicate mind.

July 10, 1820.
ODE

TO

THE ATHENIAN SOCIETY.

AS when the deluge first began to fall,
That mighty ebb never to flow again
(When this great body’s moisture was so great,
It quite o’ercame the vital heat),
That mountain which was highest first of all,
Appear’d above the universal main,
To bless the primitive Sailor’s weary sight!
And ’twas perhaps Parnassus, if in height
It be as great as ’tis in fame,
And nigh to Heaven as is its name:
So, after th’ inundation of war,
When learning’s little household did embark
With her world’s fruitful system in her sacred ark,
At the first ebb of noise and fears,
Philosophy’s exalted head appears;
And the Dove-Muse will now no longer stay,
But plumes her silver wings, and flies away;
And now a laurel-wreath she brings from far,
To crown the happy conqueror,
To shew the flood begins to cease,
And brings the dear reward of victory and peace.

II.

The eager Muse took wing upon the waves decline,
When War her cloudy aspect just withdrew,
When the bright sun of peace began to shine,
And for awhile in heav’nly contemplation sat
On the high top of peaceful Ararat;
And pluck’d a laurel-branch (for laurel was the first that grew,
The first of plants after the thunder, storm, and rain),
And thence, with joyful, nimble wing,
Flew dutifully back again,
And made an humble chaplet* for the king.

* The Ode I writ to the King in Ireland.
And the Dove-Muse is fled once more
(Glad of the victory, yet frightened at the war),
And now discovers from afar
A peaceful and a flourishing shore:
No sooner did she land,
On the delightful strand,
Than straight she sees the country all around,
Where fatal Neptune rul'd erewhile,
Scatter'd with flow'ry vales, with fruitful gardens crown'd,
And many a pleasant wood!
As if the universal Nile
Had rather water'd it than drown'd:
It seems some floating piece of paradise,
Preserv'd by wonder from the flood,
Long wand'ring through the deep, as we are told
Fam'd Delos d'd of old,
And the transported Muse imagin'd it
To be a fitter birth-place for the God of wit,
Or the much-talk'd oracular grove;
When with amazing joy she hears
An unknown musick all around
Charming her greedy ears
With many a heavenly song
Of nature and of art, of deep philosophy and love,
Whilst angels tune the voice and God inspires the tongue.
In vain she catches at the empty sound,
In vain pursues the musick with her longing eye,
And courts the wanton echoes as they fly.

III.

Pardon, ye great unknown, and far-exalted men,
The wild excursions of a youthful pen;
Forgive a young and (almost) virgin muse,
Whom blind and eager curiosity
(Yet curiosity, they say,
Is in her sex a crime needs no excuse)
Has forc'd to grope her uncouth way
After a mighty light that leads her wand'ring eye.
No wonder then she quits the narrow path of sense
For a dear ramble through impertinence;
Impertinence, the scurvy of mankind.
And all we fools, who are the greater part of it,
Though we be of two different factions still,
Both the good natur'd and the ill,
Yet wheresoe'er you look, you'll always find
We join like flies, and wasps, in buzzing about wit.
In me, who am of the first sect of these,
All merit, that transcends the humble rules
Of my own dazzled scanty sense,
Begets a kinder folly and impertinence
Of admiration and of praise.
And our good brethren of the surly sect
Must e'en all herd us with their kindred fools:
For though, possess'd of present vogue, they've made
Railing a rule of wit, and obloquy a trade;
Yet the same want of brains produces each effect.
And you whom Pluto's helm does wisely shroud
From us the blind and thoughtless crowd,
Like the fam'd Hero in his mother's cloud,
Who both our follies and impertinencies see,
Do laugh perhaps at theirs, and pity mine and me.

IV.

But censure's to be understood
Th' authentic mark of the elect,
The public stamp Heav'n sets on all that's great and good
Our shallow search and judgment to direct.
The war methinks has made
Our wit and learning narrow as our trade:
Instead of sailing boldly far to buy
A stock of wisdom and philosophy,
We fondly stay at home, in fear
Of ev'ry censoring privateer;
Forcing a wretched trade by beating down the sale,
And selling basely by retail.
The Wits, I mean the atheists of the age,
Who fain would rule the pulpit as they do the stage;
Wond'rous refiners of philosophy,
Of morals and divinity.
By the new modish system of reducing all to sense,
Against all logick and concluding laws,
Do own th'effects of Providence,
And yet deny the cause.

V.

This hopeful sect, now it begins to see
How little, very little do prevail
Their first and chiefest force
To censure, to cry down, and rail,
Not knowing what, or where, or whom you be,
Will quickly take another course:
And, by their never-failing ways
Of solving all appearances they please,
We soon shall see them to their ancient methods fall,
And straight deny you to be men, or any thing at all.
I laugh at the grave answer they will make,
Which they have always ready, general and cheap:
'Tis but to say, that what we daily meet,
And by a fond mistake
Perhaps imagine to be wond'rous wit,
And think, alas! to be by mortals writ,
Is but a crowd of atoms justling in a heap,
Which from eternal seeds begun,
Justling some thousand years till ripen'd by the sun;
They're now, just now, as naturally born,
As from the womb of earth a field of corn.

VI.

But as for poor contented me,
Who must my weakness and my ignorance confess,
That I believe in much I ne'er can hope to see;
Methinks I'm satisfy'd to guess,
That this new, noble, and delightful scene,
Is wonderfully mov'd by some exalted men,
Who have well studied in the world's disease
(That epidemic error and depravity,
Or in our judgment or our eye),
That what surprizes us can only please.
We often search contentedly the whole world round
To make some great discovery,
And scorn it when 'tis found.
Just so the mighty Nile has suffer'd in its fame,
Because 'tis said (and perhaps only said)
We've found a little inconsiderable head,
That feeds the huge unequal stream.
Consider human folly, and you'll quickly own,
That all the praises it can give,
By which some fondly boast they shall for ever live,
Won't pay th'impertinence of being known:
Else why should the fam'd Lydian King,
Whom all the charms of an usurped wife and state,
With all that power unfelt, courts mankind to be great,
Did with new unexperienc'd glories wait,
Still wear, still doat on his invisible ring?
VII.

Were I to form a regular thought of fame,
Which is perhaps as hard t' imagine right
As to paint Echo to the sight;
I would not draw th' idea from an empty name;
Because, alas! when we all die,
Careless and ignorant posterity,
Although they praise the learning and the wit,
And though the title seems to show
The name and man by whom the book was writ,
Yet how shall they be brought to know
Whether that very name was he, or you, or I?
Less should I daub it o'er with transitory praise,
And water-colours of these days:
These days, where e'en th' extravagance of poetry
Is at a loss for figures to express
Men's follies, whimsies, and inconstancy,
And by a faint description makes them less,
Then tell us what is fame, where shall we search for it?
Look where exalted Virtue and Religion sit
Enthron'd with heav'nly wit,
Look where you see
The greatest scorn of learned vanity
(And then how much a nothing is mankind!)
Whose reason is weigh'd down by popular air,
Who by that, vainly talk of baffling death;
And hopes to lengthen life by a transfusion of breath,
Which yet who'er examines right will find
To be an art as vain as bottling up of wind):
And when you find out these, believe true fame is there,
Far above all reward, yet to which all is due;
And this, ye great unknown, is only known in you.

VIII.

The juggling sea-god, when by chance trepann'd
By some instructed querist sleeping on the sand,
Impatient of all answers, strait became
A stealing brook, and strove to creep away
Into his native sea,
Vext at their follies, murmur'd in his stream;
But, disappointed of his fond desire,
Would vanish in a pyramid of fire.
This surly slipp'ry God, when he design'd
To furnish his escapes,
Ne'er borrow'd more variety of shapes
Than you to please and satisfy mankind,
And seem (almost) transform'd to water, flame, and air,
So well you answer all phænomena's there:
Though madmen and the wits, philosophers and fools,
With all that factious or enthusiastic dotards dream,
And all the incoherent jargon of the schools;
Though all the fumes of fear, hope, love, and shame,
Contrive to shock your minds with many a senseless doubt;
Doubts where the Delphic God would grope in ignorance and night,
The God of learning and of light
Would want a God* himself to help him out.

IX.

Philosophy, as it before us lies,
Seems to have borrow'd some ungrateful taste
Of doubts, impertinencies, and niceties,
From every age through which it pass'd,
But always with a stronger relish of the last.
This beauteous queen, by Heav'en designed
To be the great original
For man to dress and polish his uncourtly mind,
In what mock habits have they put her since the Fall!
More oft in fools and madmens' hands than sages,
She seems a medley of all ages,
With a huge fardingale to swell her fustian stuff,
A new commode, a top-knot, and a ruff,
Her face patch'd o'er with modern pedantry,
With a long sweeping train
Of comments and disputes, ridiculous and vain,
All of old cut with a new dye:
How soon have you restored her charms
And rid her of her lumber and her books,
Drest her again genteel and neat,
And rather tight than great!
How fond we are to court her to our arms!
'How much of Heav'n is in her naked looks!'
X.

Thus the deluding Muse oft blinds me to her ways,
    And ev'n my very thoughts transfers
    And changes all to beauty, and the praise
    Of that proud tyrant sex of hers.
    The rebel Muse, alas! takes part
    But with my own rebellious heart,
And you with fatal and immortal wit conspire
    To fan th' unhappy fire.

_Cruel unknown!_ what is it you intend?

Ah! could you, could you hope a poet for your friend?
    Rather forgive what my first transport said:
May all the blood, which shall by woman's scorn be shed,
    Lie upon you and on your children's head!
For you (ah! did I think I e'er should live to see
    The fatal time when that could be!)
    Have e'en increas'd their pride and cruelty.
Woman seems now above all vanity grown,
        Still boasting of a great unknown
Platonic champions, gain'd without one female wile,
    Or the vast charges of a smile;
Which 'tis a shame how much of late
    You've taught the cov'tous wretches to o'er-rate.
And which they've now the consciences to weigh
        In the same balance with our tears,
    And with such scanty wages pay
The bondage and the slavery of years.
Let the vain sex dream on, their empire comes from us,
    And had they common generosity
        They would not use us thus:
Well———though you've rais'd her to this high degree,
    Ourselves are rais'd as well as she;
And spite of all that they or you can do,
    'Tis pride and happiness enough to me
Still to be of the same exalted sex with you.

XI.

Alas! how fleeting and how vain,
If even the nobler man, our learning and our wit!
    I sigh when'er I think of it:
As at the closing of an unhappy scene
XVI
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Of some great king and conqueror's death,
When the sad melancholy Muse
Stays but to catch his utmost breath.
I grieve this nobler work most happily begun,
So quickly and so wonderfully carry'd on,
May fall at last to interest, folly, and abuse.
There is a noon-tide in our lives,
Which still the sooner it arrives,
Although we boast our winter-sun looks bright,
And foolishly are glad to see it at its height,
Yet so much sooner comes the long and gloomy night.
No conquest ever yet begun,
And by one mighty hero carried to its height,
E'er flourish'd under a successor or a son;
It lost some mighty pieces through all hands it past,
And vanish'd to an empty title in the last.
For when the animating mind is fled,
(Which nature never can retain,
Nor e'er call back again)
The body, though gigantic, lies all cold and dead.

XII.

And thus undoubtedly 'twill fare
With what unhappy men shall dare
To be successors to these great unknown,
On Learning's high-established throne.
Censure, and pedantry, and pride,
Numberless nations, stretching far and wide,
Shall (I foresee it) soon with Gothic swarms come forth
From Ignorance's universal North,
And with blind rage break all this peaceful government:
Yet shall these traces of your wit remain,
Like a just map, to tell the vast extent
Of conquest in your short and happy reign;
And to all future mankind shew
How strange a paradox is true,
That men who liv'd and dy'd without a name,
Are the chief heroes in the sacred list of fame.
THE

Athenian Oracle.

PART I.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

IN

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY.

Question. — What are the Clouds? and where are they when the air is clear?

Answer. — The clouds are of two sorts; one an exhalation of water, the other of a more terrestrial matter; but where such are, when the air is clear, seems more difficult, though not an impossibility, to resolve. Suppose, then, a room, through which there are some chinks for the rays of the sun to enter—if you look upon those rays, you may plainly discern the innumerable atoms which dance in
the air; — but if you go out to look for them in the air, where the whole body of the sun has its effect, there is not an atom to be seen, though there are atoms there also. From this instance it appears, that the truest representation of light is when a darker body is near; for no man can judge of light without darkness, nor of motion without something fixed; now the clouds being rarified through an excessive heat, or drawn up a great distance from the earth, are invisible to us, and appear like air, through the abundance of light, without commixture of darkness, which proportionably contracts our optic nerves: this is evident; for, after the clearest and hottest day, when the element begins to be a little darkened through the approaching night, the clouds become visible, and we see that which too much light prevented before.

**Quest.**—What is Melancholy, its symptoms, causes, and cure?

**Ans.**—A raving without fever or fury, with fear and sadness; it is seated in the brain and heart: the disaffection of one makes persons rave, of the other renders them sad or fearful; the fancy is always busy, for the most part intent upon one thing, and the ideas appear improper, distorted, and horrid; the juices of the body contracting an acid and corrosive disposition, and thereby throwing all things out of order. The
vital spirits grow dull and languid, and the blood little less than stagnates about the heart. The effects thereof we may see in Bedlam every day; they are as various as the freaks of the unguided fancy, which are almost infinite, or as the particular causes thereof, jealousy, superstition, love, despair, and sometimes even a violent fit of passion or anger, which is in one degree beyond melancholy, even a short madness. All the cure that belongs to us to prescribe is diversion, which reaches both cases. If the brain be affected with deep thinking on one particular object, turn the stream, if possible, to something else: — flatter, humour, or do what you can for the same end. For sadness, or a deep sullen temper, fear is the best cure, which rouses the mind, and, if not carried too high, sets the lazy spirits to work to throw off the impending evil, and thereby assists Nature in what else she has to do.

Quest. — A lady desires to know whether Fleas have stings, or whether they only suck or bite, when they draw blood from the body?

Ans. — Not to trouble you, Madam, with the Hebrew or Arabic name of a flea, or to transcribe Bochart’s learned dissertations on the little animal, we shall, for your satisfaction, give such a description thereof as we have yet been able to discover.

Its skin is of a lovely deep red colour, most neatly polished, and armed with scales, which can
resist any thing but fate and your ladyship's unmerciful fingers; the neck of it is exactly like the tail of a lobster, and, by the assistance of those strong scales it is covered with, springs backwards and forwards much in the same manner, and with equal violence; it has two eyes on each side of its head, so pretty, that I would prefer them to any, Madam, but yours; and which it makes use of to avoid its fate, and fly its enemies, with as much nimbleness and success as your sex manage those fatal weapons, lovely basilisks as you are, for the ruin of your adorers. Nature has provided it six substantial legs, of great strength, and incomparable agility, jointed like a cane, covered with large hairs, and armed each of them with two claws, which appear of a horny substance, more sharp than lancets, or the finest needle you have in all your needle-book. It was a long while before we could discover its mouth, which, we confess, we have not yet so exactly done as we could wish, the little bashful creature always holding up its two fore feet before it, which it uses instead of a fan, or mask, when it has no mind to be known; and we were forced to be guilty of an act both uncivil and cruel, without which we could never have resolved your question. We were obliged to unmask this modest one, and cut off its two fore legs to get to the face; which being performed, though it makes our tender hearts as well as yours almost bleed to think
of it, we immediately discovered what your Ladyship desired, and found Nature had given it a strong proboscis, or trunk, as a gnat or muschetto, though much thicker and stouter, with which we may very well suppose it penetrates your fair hand, feasts itself on the nectar of your blood, and then, like a little faithless fugitive of a lover, skips away, almost invisibly, nobody knows whether.

**Quest.**—What are the utmost effects of Joy, and how does it operate on the affections?

**Ans.**—Sudden Joy kills, as well as sudden Grief. Diagoras Rhodius, hearing his three sons were victorious at the Olympic games in one day, died immediately in that transport of joy; and so did Dionysius, Sophocles, and Phillipides, upon winning the bays from other stage-players: and, what is more astonishing, Zeuxis, that famous painter, having made the portraiture of an old woman very oddly, died with laughing at it. Grief destroys a man by a violent agitation of the spirits, and sudden condensation again, whereby they are too much pressed, their avenues obstructed, and their intercourse with the air hindered; so that the heart, wanting respiration, is stifled. Joy produces the same effect from contrary causes, namely, by a too great dilatation of the spirits: they who die for joy are of a sanguine, soft, and rare contexture; so that when this dila-
tation of spirits happens, they leave the heart destitute of succour; and the ventricles closing together, they perish under the passion.

**Quest.**—What Nation invented Painting?

**Ans.**—Some have been of opinion that the offspring of Abraham that went into Egypt were the first, and that they taught it to the Egyptians: but it is more universally believed; that the Egyptians were the first painters, statuaries, and philosophers, and that Greece brought painting to perfection; but what part of Greece is yet doubted. Some would assign it to Sicyones, others to Corinth, where, by drawing lines round the extremities of a man, was rudely made the first step to picture. The Greeks began with one colour, and by degrees brought it to the perfection which we find in the days of Apelles. From Greece it went to Rome, where it was almost lost again by the inundations of the Huns, Vandals, Goths, and Lombards; but was restored afterwards by Titian, Raphael, Urbin, Angelo, &c.

Although it be the opinion of a late author that the Egyptians were the first painters; yet we find the most ancient writers deny it; though in assigning the place they disagree amongst themselves. Pliny would persuade us that one Gyges, a Lydian, was the very first author. Theophrastus would have one Polignotus, an Athenian, to be the institutor thereof. But Pliny says,
that Polignotus was a Thalian, and was the first that painted women in single apparel, and trimmed their heads with cauls and sundry colours. And it is very probable that Pliny was right, since painting with divers colours was not practised for a considerable time after the first invention; Cleophantus of Corinth being the first author of divers colours, as Telephanes was the first that drew with one colour only: so that after all a full answer to the question cannot be given, since the ancients themselves disagree about it in their assertions.

Quest.—How is the fire made betwixt the flint and the steel?

Ans.—Mr. Hook, in his microscopic experiments, has put the question out of all doubt. Taking a steel and flint, and examining by a microscope the scintillations that fell upon a piece of white paper, he first thought them to be small globulous pieces of melted steel, or little particles of red hot flint; but, upon further search, he really found that those little red particles that fell were vitrifications of the flint and steel.

Question.—Tell me, ye learned heads, if such there be, Nature's profound and secret mystery:
1. How this vast Orb on unseen axles turns?
2. And unconsumed the Sun for ever burns?
3. What unknown power gives its heat such force,
   Orders its motion, and directs its course?
4. How angry tempests drive the seas to shore,
   Beat the vast swelling waves, and make them roar?
5. When waves, like mighty islands, rise and swell,
   How fish beneath those moving mountains dwell?
6. Why servile springs do constant tribute pay
   Unto their arbitrary monarch, sea?
7. How in the hidden space of Fate's dark womb
   Things are at present laid that are to come?
8. Next the mysterious births of flowers disclose,
   From the field-daisy to the garden-rose?
9. Why such a painted coat the tulip wears?
   And why in red the blushing rose appears?
10. Why clad in white, the innocent lily's seen?
11. And how the scent comes from the jessamine?
12. Why humble strawberries creep along the ground?
13. And why the apple struts, and looks so round?
14. Why ivy clings to the oak's hardened waste?
15. And why the elm by the loving vine's embraced?
16. Why Nature did for fishes scales prepare?
17. And clothes some beasts in wool, and some in hair?
18. Why golden feathers do the fowls adorn?
19. And why they chirp and sing beneath the morn?
20. And why all these are destined to maintain
    The sovereign lord of all the creatures, Man?

Answer.—Dear friend unknown, we thus reply to thee,
    And thy profound mysterious mystery:
1. As moved at first by its great Maker's troll,
   It perseveres 'tis same eternal roll.
2. Vast unexhausted vulcans it compose,
   Or fume turns fire, and as it burns it grows.
3. That Power which decked with light the world's first morn,
   Before the stars, or Sun itself, was born;
4. Or streams that rushed from subterranean caves,
   Or air compressed, thus vex the struggling waves.
5. As worms i' th' earth when by fierce whirlwinds rent, For nothing's press'd in its own element.
6. Less will to more, as small to a greater fire; The lower wave slides on, still pressed by the higher.
7. What's yet to come is not, 'tis nothing then, And nothing can have neither how nor when.
8. Your pardon, Sir: through half should we but run, The nurses midwifery should ne'er be done.
9. From mingled lights, so gay the tulip shows, Or salts commix'd; from uniform, the rose.
10. This drinks not in, but outwards beats the beams;
11. That spends its sweets in odoriferous streams.
12. Their legs are short and weak, their stature low; And those must creep that cannot stand or go.
13. With a long waist, long shanks, and lofty crest; What wonder if it overlooks the rest?
14. Why do the faint and weak supporters chuse?
15. And tell me why do cripples crutches use?
16. Them mother Nature did with scales supply, As coats of mail, to guard the watery fry.
17. Degrees of heat bring curls, or else abate, As in our hair, and Negro's woolly pate.
18. From different texture different colours fall;
19. Birds love the morn, because they're poets all.
20. Who else deserves their homage and esteem?
   If he's their lord, whom should they serve but him?

**Quest.**—Why are Osiers smooth one year, and rough another, successively?

**Ans.**—It is a mistake; they are only smooth the first year, and every succeeding year grow rougher, by reason that the spring affords new juice for a new formation.
**Quest.**—Whence have we our Opium? Whether is it hot or cold? If hot, why narcotic or stupefying; if cold, why sudorific or procuring sweat? Let it be what it will, how comes it to have that deference for those animal spirits which are required for the motion of the heart and for respiration, as very often to spare them, while it seizes the others that communicate with the organs of the external senses?

**Ans.**—Opium is the tear that distils from poppies, which at certain times in the year have incisions made in them for that end. We have it from Greece, Cabaia in the East Indies, and Grand Cairo in Egypt. No one has ever asked, whether opium be hot or cold; for some ages the opinion of the antients about its being cold having been for a long time exploded, since upon experiment it is found to be inflammable, bitter, and sulphureous; and of all narcotics it has the finest sulphur; that of hembane and hemlock being more impure, gross, and injurious. Opium is primarily hypnotic, whereas other anodyne sulphurs are so but by accident, as that of metals, minerals, and that which lodges in native cinnabar. The reason why treacle and mithridate provoke sweat is from the opium that is in them. Narcotics have in them a volatile salt, as opium and saffron, from whence arises the proper reason of their resolution in the stomach when given in emulsions, spirit of wine, or brandy. The salt is left behind,
whilst the sulphureous effluvia are conveyed to, and circulate with the blood. It particularly affects the nervous parts, and acts both by demulcing, digesting, mollifying, &c.; as also by stupefying or fixing the animal spirits, by stopping their small passages to the brain, as also their influx into the nerves, whereby the archeus of Nature becomes lax, inactive, and drowsy. The reason why it affects not those spirits which serve for respiration, pulsation, and the motion of the heart, while the others are stagnated, is because the dose usually prescribed is but barely sufficient to affect the first small passages it meets with, and so stupefies the senses; whereas a large dose would reach to the cerebellum, where the par octavum has it rise, the dependant channel of which being obstructed, there ensues a universal narcosis, or stupefaction, and by consequence death.

**Quest.**—What is the original cause of the Gout?

**Ans.**—The Gout is the product of excess and irregularities, especially in drinking some French wines, and other sorts of liquors that are saline and acid; which appears by their settling, or tartar, in casks. This salsitude and sharpness causes a pungency and pains in making its way to the pores where Nature would eject it, and it has often been known to break out in the finger ends,
in a dry chalky or limy substance. It is sometimes hereditary, and something like it is caused by excessive heats and colds. A lady, who for thirty years scarcely used her hands by reason of the gout, being reduced by misfortune to a mean condition and an abstemious diet, was quite deserted by the companion of her excesses.

**Quest.**—How is the Dew produced?

**Ans.**—It differs from rain and snow in this, namely, the matter of the rain and the snow are the attractions of many days into the middle region of air, which is much more ample and vast than the inferior, in which the dew is ingendered from a few vapours attracted in the space of one night, which, for want of heat, cannot ascend very high, but falls again upon the nap of herbs and leaves of trees like unto little pearls; and this is that which is called dew: this occurs in the most temperate seasons of the year; for when it is very hot there can be no dew, because the matter being heated, it easily ascends on high, or else it is easily dissipated by the heat. And if the weather be cold this dew is congealed, and condensed, and from thence is made that which we call the hoary frost.

**Quest.**—Wherefore is it that, having two eyes, we see nevertheless but one kind, or image, of the objects?
Ans.—Even so for having two ears no more than one and the same sound is heard, the origin of their motion being the same, for these two organs make but one sense; but yet provident Nature has been pleased that one and the same sense should have two instruments, to the end that, if one should be taken from us, the other might supply the defect thereof.

Quest.—What is Death?

Ans.—Not to be, and to cease to be, is much the same; it sometimes happens, that the more common a thing is, the more difficult it is to explain it, as in many sensible objects. Nothing is more easy than to discriminate life and death, and yet to explain the nature of both is a severe task, because the union or disunion of a most perfect form with its matter is inexplicable. However, we shall offer those things that have given us the greatest satisfaction in our inquiries. — Death, or a cessation of doing and suffering, is generally agreed to be the greatest evil in Nature, because it is a destruction of Nature itself; but why it should be represented so terrible, is as great a paradox as a certain knowledge of what death really is. This is the common plea of mortals; here we know, and are known, and all the enterprizes we take in hand,—we have the satisfaction of reflection, and a review when they are past; but dying deprives us of knowing what we are
doing, or what other state we are commencing. It is a leap in the dark, not knowing where we shall light. But this is a weakness, which, as it makes men anticipate their misery, so it enlarges it too. We look upon Nature with our eyes, not with our reason, or we should find a certain sweetness in mortality, for that can be no loss which can never be missed or desired again. As Caligula passed by, an old man requested him that he might be put to death. Why, says the Emperor, are you not already dead? There is something in death, sometimes at least, that is desirable by wise men, who know it is one of the duties of life to die, and that life would be a slavery if the power of death were taken away. We had the curiosity to visit two certain persons; one had been hanged, and the other drowned, and both of them very miraculously brought to life again; — we asked what thoughts they had, and what pains they were sensible of? The person that was hanged said, he expected some sort of a strange change, but knew not what; but the pangs of death were not so intolerable as some sharp diseases; nay, he could not be positive whether he felt any other pain than what his fears created. He added, that he grew senseless by little and little, and at the first his eyes represented a brisk shining red sort of fire, which grew paler and paler, till at length it turned into a black, after which he thought no more, but insensibly acted
the part of one that falls asleep, not knowing how or when. The other gave almost the same account; and both were dead, apparently, for a considerable time. These instances are very satisfactory in cases of violent death, and for a natural death I cannot but think it yet much easier. Diseases make conquest of life by little and little, therefore the strife must be less where the inequality of power is greater.

**Quest.**—What is Individuation; or wherein consists the Individuality of a thing?

**Ans.**—Individuation is the unity of a thing with itself, or that whereby a thing is what it is.

To begin with those species of body which are not properly organized, which have neither life nor sense, as stones, metals, &c. In these, individuation seems to consist in nothing but greater or less; take the less part of a stone away, you may still call it the same stone; take an equal part with the remains, that individuation ceases, and they are two new individuals. Divide a stone, &c. as often as you please, every part of it will be a stone still, another individual stone, as much as any in the mountain or quarry it was first cut out of, even though reduced to the minutest sand, or, if possible, a thousand times less. But when we take one step farther, and proceed a degree higher to the vegetable kingdom, the case is far otherwise, and indeed Nature seems to
be still more distinct, and, as it were, careful in its individuation the higher it rises, till at last it brings us to that great transcendental individual, the only proper uncompounded essence, the One God, blessed for ever.—To return to plants: their individuation consists in that singular form, contexture, and order of their parts, whereby they are disposed for those uses to which Nature has designed them, and by which they receive and maintain their beings. For example: in a tree, from which though you take the branches, it grows, receives nourishment from the earth, maintains itself, and is still a tree, which the parts thereof are not when separated from the rest; for we cannot say every part of a tree is a tree, as we can every part of a stone is still a stone; but if this tree be cloven in two or more pieces, or felled by the roots, this contexture and orderly respect of the parts one to another ceases; its essence as a tree is destroyed, its individuation perishes, and it is no more a tree, but a stump, or timber. Let us proceed a degree higher, to merely sensible creatures, who are not so immediately depending on the earth, the common mother, as the plants, nor rooted to it as they are, but walk about, and have, in respect of that, an independent existence, and are a sort of world by themselves. And here the individuation consists in such a particular contexture of their essential parts, and their relation one towards another, as enables them to
exert the operations of the sensible or animal life. Thus, cut off the legs, or any other parts of an animal, it is the same animal still; but cut off its head, or take away its life, and it is no longer that individual animal, but a mere carcase, and will, by degrees, resolve itself into common matter again, or, rather, be transmigrated into some other form. To ascend now to the highest rank of visible beings—the rational. The Individualisation of man appears to consist in the union of a rational soul with any convenient portion of fitly organized matter. Any portion of matter duly qualified, and united to the soul by such an union as we experience, is immediately individualised by it, and, together with that soul, makes a man; so that, if it were possible for one soul to be clothed over and over at different times with all the matter in the universe, it would in all those distinct shapes be the same individual man. Nor can a man be supposed in this case to differ more from himself, than he does when he is an infant, or just passed an embryo, from himself when of adult or decrepit age; he having, during that time, changed his portion of matter over and over; as, being fat and lean, sick and well, lost by bleeding, excrement, perspiration, &c.; gained again by aliment; and perhaps not one particle, or but very few of the first matter which he took from his parents and brought with him into the world, now remaining. And thus much by way
of essay towards the resolution of this noble question.

Quest.—Whether there is any crisis of time wherein persons have extraordinary accidents as to fortune or misfortune?

Ans.—The Sacred Writ censures the observers of days, times, and seasons, the noted superstition which at that time was very common, and at this day is not quite effaced. That upon certain revolutions of time some things extraordinary have happened, and to such persons as were not at all superstitious in that point, is very certain. We read, Heylin. Geog. p. 734, that on a Wednesday Pope Sextus the First was born, on the same day made a monk, created general of his order, made cardinal, chosen pope, and finally on the same day inaugurated. Also, it is observed, in Stow's Annals, p. 812, Thursday was observed to be a day fatal to King Henry VIII. and to all his posterity, for he himself died on Thursday the 28th of January, King Edward the Sixth on Thursday the 6th of July, Queen Mary on Thursday the 17th of November, and Queen Elizabeth on Thursday the 24th of March. But these observations are warrantable, being made after the time was expired, and reputed rather as accidental than necessary, as by chance a man may throw ambs-ace three or four times together without being compelled by fate or destiny; for, if a man throws, he must throw something, and there is
as much reason that he should throw ambs-ace four times together as any other four numbers that shall be named successively. He that acts without reason, and believes things for which he can give no account at all, deserves to be excluded from the society of rational creatures.

**Quest.** — Whether the common notion of the world be true, that these latter ages, for some centuries past, have a less share of learning, judgment, and invention, than those which have preceded, because we find them deficient in finding out such advantageous arts as their forefathers have done?

**Ans.** — It is disputable whether the invention of useful arts is infinite or not; but, upon a supposition of truth in both cases, we see no reason to conclude this age comes short of the preceding, as to priority in arts and sciences. We will consider the first part of the dilemma, and suppose the invention of useful arts infinite; if so, we must conclude, as we find by daily experience, that at length arising to be too numerous, some would be lost and supplanted by others, which would not be if the first were more useful. Again, if the invention of useful arts be finite, they can be but once invented; so that those who have already effected it cannot pretend a pre-eminence to those that follow, who also would have found the same out if they had lived before,
as is seen by the great improvements daily made in what is invented. Further, it is a vulgar error that any valuable art is of one man's inventing; as, for instance, in sailing, how many ages passed before the invention of sails, or a commodious building of ships, or before the compass was invented, and how long before the invention of the compass was the nature of the loadstone discovered? If we take a view of the liberal sciences, can we believe that Aristotle's philosophy was all his own, or rather a compendium of what other philosophers had written before, and by him methodically compiled, with some additions? As to curious mechanics, as some are improved, and as the subject is copious, so some are invented. Ælian and Pliny mentioned one Myrmecides, who wrought out of ivory a chariot, with four wheels, and as many horses, in so little room that a little fly might cover them all with her wings; as also a ship, with all the tackling to it, no bigger than that a small bee might cover it with her wings. Though these were great curiosities, and probably of one man's invention, we need not seek beyond the limits of our Island for its parallel. In the twentieth year of Queen Elizabeth, one Mark Scaliot made a lock, consisting of eleven pieces of iron, steel, and brass, all which, together with a pipe-key to it, weighed but one grain of gold; he made also a chain, consisting of forty-three links, whereunto having fastened the lock and key before mentioned, he put the chain
about a flea's neck, which drew them all with ease. See the inventions and experiments of the Royal Society, which will abundantly convince any one that our age has as active and busy spirits for invention as any former age in the world.

---

*Quest.*—Why men dream of things they never thought of?

*Ans.*—We deny they ever do; nay, it is impossible they ever should, unless in divine dreams, and that of such a nature that both the thing and the notion thereof should be revealed together; for the fancy, we own, has power to join things together when they are before in the mind, or to conceive monsters and impossibilities out of real things, sleeping as well as waking. For example, I have the notion of myself, a horse, a road, thieves, water, fire, a house, night, or what else you might name, treasured up in my memory: these my fancy in a dream may chance to shuffle together, and make me think I am on horseback, and upon the road, that I there meet with thieves, that I take the water to avoid them, and lodge in a house which in the night-time happens to be on fire. These things we have all thought of before, taken distinctly or asunder, but never just in that very order. So in fictitious beings, beings of reason as some metaphysicians, or more properly of fancy as others, when we make impossible conjunctions of things. I have seen a man, I have seen a dog; out of these two real things
fancy forms one fictitious being, either sleeping or waking, and makes a monstrous creature, partly canine, and partly human, which a painter can describe on paper, though it first must have a being in his own fancy. All this, we own, the fancy has power to perform, but never to start any notion absolutely new, and independent on the frame of things before treasured in the memory.

**Quest.**—What becomes of Smoke?

**Ans.**—It ascends into the air, and, if in great quantity, forms a sort of a cloud, as we may see if we will but take the pains to go half a mile out of London; if in smaller, it is dissipated by the winds, or lost in the vast tracts of air, as a little water when spilt on great heaps of dust; for that it is annihilated none can be so foolish as to conceive.

**Quest.**—Of what antiquity are Epitaphs and Elegies?

**Ans.**—Many instances of Epitaphs in prose and in verse may be collected from the old Greek poets and Historians, who yet were but children compared to the Chaldeans and Egyptians. But the most ancient precedent of epitaphs must be that recorded in the most antient history, namely, the Old Testament, 1 Sam. vi. 18; where it is recorded, that the great stone erected as a memorial unto Abel, by his father Adam, remained unto that day in being, and its name was called "the stone of Abel;” and its elegy was, “Here was shed
the blood of righteous Abel;” as it is also called 4000 years after, Matt. xxiii. 35. And this is the origin of monumental memorials and elegies.

---

**Quest.**—How does a nettle sting? whether by leaving part in the flesh, as a bee its sting, or by what means?

**Ans.**—That soft down which covers the leaves is in all probability the substance which, being darted in the small pores of the flesh, and by reason of its peculiar configuration sticking fast therein, gives such torment to the part afflicted, much after the same manner as cow-itch, though more pungent and violent. Now this configuration, suppose humated or aculeated, when the nettle is violently and suddenly pressed, seems to be lost and destroyed, the little stings being broke off, or blunted one against another, which is the reason a nettle never stings when we press it hard between our fingers.

---

**Quest.**—Whether Riches and Honour are really of that intrinsic value as the eager and general thirst after them would argue?

**Ans.**—It has been affirmed that opinion is the rate of things; but a truer maxim is, that reason is the true rate of things, and truth is always itself without change. When, if I take my measure in any thing according to my opinion to-day, I may change them again to-morrow, and both times miss the truth, and so make a third choice,
which fully shews the etymology of an opinionist, viz. one that looks only on the surface, or appearance of things, which is a very mean character for a rational being. Riches or poverty are as they are used, and not as they are esteemed, unless by wise men. A man cannot be unhappy under the most depressed circumstances, if he uses his reason, not his opinion: for those ends it was sent him; and the most exalted fortunes are, if reason be not consulted, the subject of a wise man's pity. Bajazet the first, after he had lost the city of Sebastia, and therein Orthobulus his eldest son, as he marched with his great army against Tamerlane, heard a country shepherd merrily diverting himself with his homely pipe, as he sat upon the side of a mountain, feeding his poor flock. The king stood still a great while listening to him, to the great admiration of his nobility about him; at last, fetching a deep sigh, he broke forth into these words, "O happy shepherd, who hadst neither Orthobulus nor Sebastia to lose!"

**Quest.**—Whether Birds have any government?  
**Ans.**—The bee, and they are the Muses' birds, certainly have, and that a very regular one. But, lest any should be so unkind to degrade those pretty creatures into flies or insects, we will instance in some of a little larger wing. All birds, and beasts, and fishes too, have thus much of government, that the weaker obeys,
and the stronger rules; but still, whether there is any other settled subordination of power amongst them, we suppose, is the question. It is observed in all the season-birds, or those which go and come at stated times of the year, that they fly in troops, and use a constant order in their flight, regarding the wind, and throwing themselves into such a body as is most convenient, either to move against or with it as their occasions serve. They have, besides, their scouts and advanced guards before, to scour the country, or discover an enemy. Read Bergarak's Supercoelestial Navigations; and you will have the most exact account of their order, laws, government, and manner of living, that you can anywhere meet with.

**Quest.**—Whether Society or Solitude be most preferable, in order to the noblest ends of man?

**Ans.** Some of the best thoughts on both sides may be met with in Mr. Cowley's Essay for Solitude, and Mr. Evelyn's against it. Honest old Aristotle has summed up almost all that can be said in a few words. "A solitary life," says he, "is either brutal or divine, above or below a man." Whence his other assertion is clear, that man must be a *poetical*, or, if you will, a *social* animal. We must confess, could we believe a man answered the end of his creation by an ascetic hermetical life, we do not doubt but it would give the highest pleasure he is capable of in the world, by contemplation and meditation.
But we are not yet so happy, nor ought we to be so,—that being a cowardly sort of content, which is got by running away from whatever displeases. Should all good men thus take a whim of leaving the world, what would become of it? And would it not be just such a piece of justice and kindness, as for all the physicians in a nation to go and live in a wilderness, lest their patients should infect them? We do not in the least doubt but that it is much more difficult to live honestly in the midst of so many thousand temptations, which are unavoidable in this world, than to do so when retired from all things of that nature. But, though difficult, it is possible, and the more difficulty the more honour. Not but that we think the greatest trial a truly good man will have of his virtue, while he remains on the scene of action, lies on the contrary side to that where it is generally suspected. He has more need of his patience than his temperance; and he must be better humoured than most men, if, when he once knows it well, he does not almost lose all his charity for this world.

**Quest.**—What think you of the Milky Way in the heavens?

**Ans.**—It is amusing to consider the extravagant fancies of the poets and some of the ancient philosophers about it. Some say that when Juno suckled Hercules, and discovered who it was, she spilt her milk there; others that it is the space of heaven which the Sun's chariot burnt by the ill
driving of Phaëton; others the place where Apollo fought the giants, the road of the gods leading to Jupiter's palace, the residence of heroes, the mansion of the virtues, the highway of souls, with innumerable more such whims. The former philosophers, particularly Aristotle, held it to be a meteor, fed by plentiful exhalations from the earth, and fired or irradiated by the stars in this place. This opinion prevailed till the use of long telescopes, which discover an innumerable company of small stars there, which are not visible to the naked eye; and it is generally concluded that it is nothing but stars, which being at too great a distance to transmit their light to us distinctly, the same is associated and united together thereby causing a whiteness, or a weak and imperfect light.

**Quest.**—What is the reason of the Polarity of the Loadstone, and that a needle touched with it turns towards the North? and what is the reason of the Variation of the Compass in some places?

**Ans.**—It appears the earth itself is the great magnet: when a bar of iron has stood long in the window, that end of it which is next the earth will have the same virtue which the loadstone has. Mr. Boyle, in his book of the usefulness of Experimental Natural Philosophy, observed that a loadstone heated red hot lost its attractive virtue, and by cooling it again, he gave its extremes a polarity; and, by refrigerating the same end, some-
times North, and sometimes South, changed the poles at pleasure; and this change was wrought not only by cooling it directly North or South, but perpendicularly, that end of it which was towards the ground turning towards the North, which shews the magnetic nature of the earth, its effluvia being able to impart a magnetic faculty to the loadstone itself. Now, if this terraqueous globe be mostly earth under the North pole, the mystery is plainly resolved; or if it be the most perfect earth there, and not dust or sand, by the burning of the sun, or be not overcome with restringency of ice and cold, the case is yet the same. Hence the solution of the variation of the needle is also plain. I am assured that, between the shore of Ireland, France, Spain, Guinea, and the Azores, the North point varies towards the East; at some part of the Azores it deflects not on the other side of the Azores, and this side of the Equator, the North point of the needle wheels to the West, so that in the latitude 36° near the shore the variation is about 11 degrees: but on the other side of the Equator it is quite otherwise; for in Brasilia the South point varies 12 degrees into the West; but elongating from the coast of Brasilia toward the shore of Africa, it varies eatward, and arriving at the Cape de las Aquilas, it rests in the meridian, and looks neither way; the cause of which variations is the inequality of the earth, variously disposed, and indifferently mixed with the sea, the needle drives that way where the greater and most
powerful part of the earth is placed; for whereas on this side the Azores the needle varies Eastward, it is occasioned by that vast tract of part of Europe and Asia seated eastward. At Rome there is a less variation than at London; for on the West side of Rome are seated the great Continents of France, Spain, and Germany; but unto England there is almost no earth Westward.

**Quest.**—Is it not better to die than to live?

**Ans.**—The question ought to have particularized one of these,—whether is it better for a good man or a bad man, an animal or a vegetable, to die or live?—and then a direct solution might have been given. But suppose the question means in general terms, we answer that life is much more desirable than death. By a common instinct of self-preservation, all creatures shun that great evil, death. It is the greatest of all evils, because a destruction of all good. A creature is much more noble in its due proportions and shapes, than when it lies in its corruption or chaos of earth; in the last there is nothing in it desirable in respect either of itself, or the rest of the creation, but in the first there are particular impresses of and communications from the great divine original good; nay a good man himself would be afraid of the grave were he not in hopes of living again. Life is the all of every being, being a part of Him who is the fountain of life. What perfection, happiness, and enjoyment, can be ex-
pected in nothingness? All that can be pretended in favour of the contrary opinion is the absence of evil. "There," say they, "we shall meet with no crosses, disappointments, pain, misery, and, in short, none of the evils of life." To which I answer, that the presence of good is more desirable than the absence of evil. Again, every individual animal of the creation may be happy. Birds, beasts, and fishes, seek no further than moderate well-tempered elements, to fly, breathe, and swim in, and sufficient food to live upon; when they enjoy this, they can seek no farther; and if so they must be happy, for if not they would seek for happiness in something else. Man only, that irregular restless lump, who knows no medium of things, but is much more happy or miserable than all the rest of the creation, is not left destitute of his rest and end, namely God. If he will be so inconsiderate, notwithstanding his frequent disappointments, to renew his search after happiness, where it is not to be found, he has only himself to blame, but he has no cause to accuse his Creator, who has taken sufficient care for his happiness, unless he expects to be made happy against his will.

Quest.—Looking over Sir William Temple's Memoirs, I met with a story concerning an old parrot, belonging to Prince Maurice, that readily answered to several questions promiscuously put to him. By what means did this creature attain
to the knowledge of doing that which to human reason seems so very improbable?

*Ans.*—Scaliger tells us, that he saw a crow in the French king's court, that was taught to fly at partridges, or any other fowls, from the falconer's hand. Cardinal Assanio had a parrot that was taught to repeat the Apostle's Creed *verbatim* in Latin. And in the Court of Spain there was one that could sing the Gamut perfectly: if at any time he was out, he would say, "Nova Bueno;" that is, "Not well;" but when he was right, he would say, "Bue-nova," "Now it is well." In the time of war betwixt Augustus Cæsar and M. Antonius, there was a poor man at Rome, who, purposing to provide for himself against all events, had this contrivance. He bred up two crows with his utmost diligence, and brought it to pass that in their prating language one would salute Cæsar, and the other Antonius. This man, when Augustus returned conqueror, met him upon the way, with his crow in his hand, which ever and anon came out with his "Salve, Cæsar, Victor, Imperator;" "Hail, Cæsar, the conqueror and emperor." Augustus, delighted therewith, purchased the bird at the price of 20,000 deniers of Rome. It would be too long to mention the tractability of the dragon Seneca speaks of, or what strange things were performed by Emanuel of Portugal's elephant; the quickness of some dogs at Rome and Constantinople. Our thoughts upon the whole are these: That the novelty of things makes them wonderful,
when there is not the least reason for wonder, if we consider the nature of such things. We will grant it possible for a parrot to answer distinctly to such and such questions; but this action needs no reason to the performance of it, since it may be effected without it, *viz.* by an habituated idea of things. Not only man, but the inferior ranks of animals receive their ideas by the senses. Suppose the ear, for that comes nearest the question, such and such sounds oft repeated, and such and such actions immediately preceding or immediately following such sounds, must necessarily form a complex idea both of the sound and action; so that when either such action or such sound is repeated, an idea of the other must necessarily attend it. Thus dogs are taught to fetch and carry; and thus parrots talk when they speak more words than one together; as, for instance, "Poor Poll;" these words being often repeated together, if one of them be mentioned and the other left, there must necessarily be an idea of the other sound, because custom and habit chain them together; and if two words, why not three? and if three, why not many together? There needs but a little more diligence, care, and frequent instruction. Some wonder to see an elephant dance, when all is nothing but the pure effect of custom upon repetition of complex ideas. The manner of teaching an elephant to dance has been thus practised. They bring a young elephant upon a floor, heat it underneath, and play
upon the music while he lifts up his legs and shifts his feet about by reason of the torture of the heat; this often practised, he does so upon the bare sound of music; so that it shews, when he dances after music, that it is not from any principles of reason, but from the concatenation of the two ideas of heat and music, which custom has habituated him to. And thus it is with dogs, birds, dancing horses, parrots, magpies, &c.

Quest.—Whence arose the custom of allowing the Benefit of Clergy to some offenders? If it was to transcribe manuscripts, as some say, before the art of printing was known, why is it still continued, since that reason has long ago ceased?

Ans.—In the extreme times of Popish ignorance, when monks themselves could scarcely understand or read Latin, and the common people were wholly ignorant of it, the monks had that privilege of reading their neck-verse, whatever villainies they committed, whilst the illiterate vulgar died for it; and thence came the Benefit of Clergy. But why it is yet continued we know not, unless those Statutes were never repealed since the monks flourished in this kingdom. Possibly the first custom in this Nation came from the old Romans, who sometimes pardoned criminals upon the repeating of

"Tu potis es nigrum, vitio prefigere Theta."
**Quest.**—What is your opinion of the star that appeared at our Saviour's birth, and went before the wise men? its nature, magnitude, height, and duration?

**Ans.**—It is very probable that it was a sort of Comet, apparently like a common star, because it was so low as to seem to stand over the place where our Saviour was born; for, if it had been but as high as the Moon, it would have appeared yet farther off when the wise men came to Bethlehem. For the rest, we find no credible author amongst the ancients that makes any mention of it.

**Quest.**—When the English and French fleets fought, many persons who saw the battle could discern the flashing of fire, but heard no guns? The spectators stood upon a high hill by the sea; and others, who were forty miles behind them within land, heard the guns very perfectly.—Query, why those within sight, at ten leagues distance, could not hear, while those who were so much farther off could?

**Ans.**—Sound cannot proceed farther than the first body it meets with; all others are mock sounds, or echoes by a reverberation, or repercussion of the air: therefore the sound meeting with that hill whereupon your acquaintance stood, was made the first repercussion, which would answer in the next valley to it within-land; and as
many valleys as it met with, so many echoes it made; so that when the sound came to those persons so far within-land, it might very well be heard several minutes before it reached them. It was impossible to hear it upon the first hill, for want of a proper echo between that and the sea. If your acquaintance had turned their backs, and hearkened from the echoes within-land, they might have heard a faint repetition of it that way.

**Quest.** — What is the reason that, by applying the empty shells of some shell-fishes to your ear, you may therein perceive a noise like the roaring of the sea?

**Ans.**—Those shells have a gyral conformation, not altogether unlike that of the ear itself. Now the air being imprisoned in the turnings and windings within, has that particular rushing sound, either in forcing itself out, or passing from one part thereof to another, being forced in by the motion of the exterior air, and wandering about in those meatus's, or curious labyrinths, wherein it is received.

**Quest.** — By what means a rudder guides a ship?

**Ans.** — By making a small sort of a stream, or current, which takes the ship or boat either on one side or the other, and turns it accordingly which way soever the steersman pleases.
Quest. — Why do such as would shoot right wink with one eye?

Ans.—Because there is but one right line from one point to another; but from two eyes there are two lines to one object, which, though they both terminate there, yet do not begin together; therefore two eyes beginning at several points, cannot both of them act directly, unless he shoot with two guns at once.

Quest.—Who are the most happy in the world, wise men or fools?

Ans. — Much may be said of either, but the manner very different. If the fool be the happier, the world is a very desirable place, there being such a quantity of happy men in it. The Supreme Being is essential happiness; those, therefore, that act the most like him are happiest. There is but one right line, and infinite crooked ones; one wisdom, but follies innumerable; one real goodness, but divers appearances of it; and but one best way to every thing, and to judge of every thing that is reason, or understanding. Here only is the paradox; the fool's happiness consists in a privation of grief, and the happiness of a wise man in possession of good; which, being a little considered, the result of this next question will answer the first; namely, which would be more miserable, a wise man that wanted his good, or a fool that had a sense of his grief?
In this reverse the wise man would be more miserable; because he that wants his happiness wants every thing, but he that has a sense of grief may have a sense of happiness. Now this reverse, or contrary to the reverse, must necessarily make him happy; namely, his possession of good is preferable to the fool's privation of grief.

**Quest.** — What is the reason of, and when began, that custom of changing the Pope's name at his inauguration?

**Ans.**—Pope Gregory the Fourth being dead in the year 842, they chose for the sovereign bishop of Rome a Roman of noble blood, illustrious education, but of a harsh name, viz. Hogsface: therefore, because this name seemed to him disagreeable to such a holy function, and remembering that our Saviour changed the name of St. Peter, he also changed his name, and called himself Sergius after his father. From thence came the custom observed to this day, that he who is chosen Pope may at his pleasure take what name pleases him best; but they keep the custom of taking the names of some of their predecessors.

---

**Quest.**—Whether the sky be of any colour?

**Ans.**—No, if you mean by sky the æther; nor are clouds of any colour naturally, but what they receive by reflection from different lights.
Quest. — Whether snakes are hurtful by nature?

Ans.—Our English snakes are harmless worms, as now almost every ploughman and old woman knows. That which appears so dreadfully out of its mouth, and which it brandishes so like a sting, is only a poor innocent tongue, more soft, if possible, than a silken thread. It has teeth, but never bites any thing, though highly provoked, unless it be a little grass. They hiss and leap at any thing when vexed, but never do any injury. We warn the reader never to take up by mistake vipers in the fields instead of the other; their poison, without speedy remedies, being very deadly, though it is thought not so strong as those in warmer climates.

Quest. — Was there ever any such execution practised in England as hanging in chains alive?

Ans.—Many about three hundred years since, and some few instances within two hundred years, whence it is common that you have relation of persons eating their shoulders, and as far as they could reach, to preserve life a little longer than otherwise it was possible. Under this head comes that famous relation of the woman that kept her father alive for a considerable time with the milk of her own breasts.
Quest.—Whether the force and virtues of the old Egyptian Talismans, and their other magical operations, were true and real, or only imagery, or illusion?

Ans.—In treating upon this subject, we shall consider it in this method. The word itself; the manner how it is made; what effect (according to the ancients) it hath produced; and, lastly, what our judgment is upon the whole.

The word Talisman is Arabic, and comes very near the Hebrew word Iselem, which signifies image, figure, or character. So far as we can learn, Zoroaster was the first inventor of it. Some authors tell us, that the manner of making it is thus:—When such and such constellations, aspects, &c. of stars happen, which according to observation had such and such influences, the artist engraved his Talismani, or figure, in the nature of an hieroglyphick, signifying such and such mystery, upon some metal, precious stones, rings, or medals, which they believed would receive and keep the critical influences of their designed aspects. Some were to work cures, some to incite such and such passions, some to keep away rain, hail, venomous beasts; in short, all sort of evils: and others were to procure such and such good things, according to the nature of the aspect under which they were engraved. But engraving would be too long an action, and would not be finished before its proper aspect was over,
and another begun; therefore, we are rather of the opinion of those authors, who inform us, that the metal was ready melted, and at the critical moment cast into a mould, where it received the impression designed by its author, under its respective constellation.

It would be too long to tell the world that many things have really been effected by (or at least under the shew of) a talismanical virtue, amongst the Egyptians; besides, in other histories there are various instances. Virgil's brazen fly and golden horseleach, with which he hindered flies from entering into Naples, and killed all the horseleeches in a ditch. The figure of a stork, placed by Apollonius at Constantinople, to drive all the storks out of that country; as also that of a gnat, which cleared Antioch of those troublesome insects. Thus we read that the people of Hampts, in Arabia, and those of Tripoli, in Syria, preserved themselves from venomous beasts by the talisman of a scorpion, placed upon one of their towers. Paracelsus mentions one against the pestilence, Julius Ristonius a Prato had one powerful against the gout, with innumerable more such instances; which not only shew that there have been such things as Talismans, but that really such effects have been, and as was supposed by virtue of their characteristic.

We shall also give the reasons why the an-
cientis believed such virtues in them; viz. because they really believed the stars had such and such influences, which might be communicated by sympathy, as our sympathetic powder, wound-salve, &c.

Now, and according to the observations formerly made upon the ophites, which having veins in it, like a serpent, cure the bite of a serpent by application; the squill and poppy, which resemble a head, cure the head-ache; eye-bright cures sore eyes, which it resembles; and innumerable more such unaccountable things in nature.

Our opinion is, that really such cures and other miracles have been wrought, but it was only by the help of the devil, not of Talismans; and in this the devil imitates God, who was pleased to make use of a brazen serpent to cure the Israelites. Thus a silly juggler, "Blow here, Presto be gone," &c. which was only mock and pretence, when something else was the cause of conveyance. Under this may be reckoned charms for tooth-ache, agues, &c. as also unlawful and wicked trials about witches, and a hundred observations, which weak and ignorant people are guilty of.

But to prove Talismans, charms, &c. to be all abuse, cheat, and illusion, we shall offer:

That every thing acts by its first or second qualities, or by its substance, whence proceed all properties and sympathies; not by their quali-
ties, as heat, cold, hardness, softness, &c.; since then it might do in other shapes: not in their substance, for several sorts of matter will serve to make a Talisman. To which we might add, that it is not the figure neither, which is no more proper to receive the influences of such an aspect, than the skin of the animal itself stuffed with straw: those things, which cure by occult and unknown qualities, do it not by virtue of their figure, but by the property of their substance, which remains when they are despoiled of their figure, and turned into powder. In short, the whole is a wicked, superstitious, ridiculous juggle, and the devil has had too many fair opportunities of such things for his interest.

**Quest.**—Whether a man does not sin as much in spending his money foolishly, as in being covetous?

**Ans.**—Upon some accounts, we think more; for a prodigal man, in our judgment, is a worse member of the commonwealth than the covetous; because a man may be covetous, without injuring any body but himself, and some or other will at least get something by his death; but the prodigal man not only ruins his own family, but very frequently all besides that have any thing to do with him; when he dies, cheats all besides the worms. And so fare thee well, Bristol.
Quest.—Who was the first Philosopher?

Ans.—It is affirmed by Laertius that Thales was the first among the Greeks in natural philosophy and mathematics. He is called by Plutarch the inventor of philosophy; by Justin Martyr the most ancient of philosophers; by Tertullian the first that made an inquiry after natural causes.

Quest.—Whether, when a horse neighs, it is a rejoicing or because he is angry?

Ans.—We believe neither; but rather a desire of company, as is frequently observed in all the race both old and young.

Quest.—Why do parrots, magpies, &c. talk, when several other birds cannot, if the same means be used?

Ans.—From a natural instinct of imitating sounds, and not, as some believe, from a proper formation of their tongue; for then those which had tongues the most like men, as a dog, cat, and other quadrupeds, would speak better than parrots.

Quest.—From what principle had idolatry its first rise?

Ans.—The most common opinion upon the origin of idolatry is, that it began by adoration of the sun and stars; men being naturally inclined to respect what they imagine the most noble general causes of their felicity, as the heavens and
the stars; and afterwards they came to pay the same homage to the greater part of those objects which contributed to their preservation, or was able to do them any harm. This opinion would not be improbable, if man had been the work of chance, and formed after the extravagant manner that Epicurus and many poets have imagined:—

"Gensque virum truncis, et rupto robore nata;"

and if they were the authors of their own religion. But what the Scripture tells us of the creation of the world, that it was peopled by one man only, and re-peopled after the deluge by only one family, does not agree very well with this hypothesis. From thence it is plain that the chief care of the Patriarchs to their children was, to teach them that whatever we see was the work of an invisible God, and that no creating power could be attributed to any thing that is the object of our senses. It is not very likely that all the nations of the earth should so soon forget these instructions, and so easily confound the Creator with his creatures, nor that they should change their God and Religion all of a sudden; therefore idolatry must insensibly be introduced, and have taken its origin from some false explanations which have been made of the true doctrine. In the beginning they only adored God; and although in the time of the Patriarchs, to whom Angels often appeared, they had a great veneration for these celestial spirits; yet they carefully distin-
guished this respect from divine adoration. They believed also soon after the beginning of the world that the souls of just men, after their death, were placed in the ranks of Angels, and by degrees they were accustomed to look upon these spirits as beings unto whom God had committed a part of the care of the universe. After which they came to think that, since God had given them so much power, they might require their assistance, and endeavour to make them favourable to them by paying them a religious worship; in pursuance of which, they immediately erected statues to them, and celebrated games and anniversary feasts upon the day of their death; and by degrees they came to set up altars, consecrate temples, and offer victims to them; so that in a little time the world was full of divinities; each nation thinking it an honour to have more of them than their neighbours, and to increase the number of their gods, passed among them as a mark of their intelligence. This was a mystery which the heathens afterwards thought they were obliged to hide from the common people, although the learned among them were not ignorant of it. Hesiod says freely, that the gods were good mortals, who, by the will of the great Jupiter, were become the guardians of men, and distributed riches and the good things of this world to them. St. Austin affirms, upon the testimony of Varro, that, in all the writings of the heathens, it would
be very difficult to find any of their gods who were not men. Pliny, who has made such deep inquiries into antiquity, speaking of Vespasian and other Roman heroes, which had been placed in the number of the gods, says, "It was a very ancient custom of testifying their acknowledgment to persons of merit by placing them in the number of the gods;" and as for the names of all other divinities, they owed their birth to the splendid actions of men, as may be seen in consulting Isidorus of Seville.

Quest.—How came the Continent of America and the Islands adjoining, to be inhabited at first: for surely had the people been derived from any nation of the then known world, they could never have lost knowledge, learning, and discipline, to such a degree; for it is said they had not the use of letters?

Ans.—Noah and his family, having been accustomed to the ark, would doubtless from thence build some sort of vessels, at least for coasting along shores; and when they were increased, and spread over the Northern parts of Europe, might very probably be transported by contrary winds, or tempests, from Denmark or Scotland, to the Northern parts of America, it being no great distance. This will appear still more probable if we consider that earthquakes, tempests, &c. have caused those strange alterations in the face of Na-
ture, that many countries are now covered with water that were formerly land, and many that are now land were covered with water; that some are separated by the sea, as England and France, which formerly lay together—of which we meet with many examples in consulting the most ancient geography. Then the question will not any longer be involved with that difficulty. As for their ignorance, it is no argument for or against their being or not being the sons of Noah. The greatest part of Africa, and especially Southward, are altogether as illiterate as those in America, and generally more savage.

**Quest.**—What is a perfect number?

**Ans.**—A perfect number is that which is equal to all its aliquot parts added together; according to this definition, 6 is a perfect number, because, if you take its aliquot parts, which are 1, 2, 3, their sum will be equal to 6; again 28 is a perfect number, because its aliquot parts, 1, 2, 4, 7, 14, added together, make 28. Now if you will find as many of them as you please, take the following progression, 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, &c. which it is easy to continue in doubling every last term;—choose in this progression any one term, subtract unity from it; if the remainder is a prime number, multiply this remainder by the term immediately preceding, the product will be a perfect number; but if the remainder is no prime num-
ber, you must choose another term. This rule will be made clear by some instances; take the term 4, subtract unity from it, the remainder is 3, which being multiplied by the term immediately proceeding, viz. 2, the product 6 is a perfect number; again, take the term 8, subtract unity from it, the remainder is 7, multiply this remainder by 4, the product is 28, which is a perfect number. But if you would take 16, because, having taken unity from 16, the remainder, 15, is no prime number, the product of 15, by 8, will not be a perfect number; therefore, take the following term, 32, and working as is prescribed, you will find 496 for another perfect number.

**Quest.**—A lady who is extremely troubled with corns desires to know the reason?

**Ans.**—Alas, poor lady! There may be many weighty reasons assigned for this sore calamity. Perhaps her hard heart has infected her toes, and made them as obdurate as herself; or else the little wag Cupid is taking his vengeance upon her for having murdered some of his humble servants, and is turning her into stone for a flinty-hearted creature, as his cousin Apollo served Niobe; and she is now dying upwards as Daphne’s poor toes rooted in the ground, and if she appeases not the little angry god quickly, she must in a few days expect to be perfect plaster of Paris.
**Quest.**—Pray prescribe rules to please a passionate father, and to break myself of being passionate; which is not easy, because I take my blood from him?

**Ans.**—Never cross him when he is angry; never do anything that looks like a slight upon him; be ready to obey his commands, and remember he is your father. For yourself, it is sure enough that the inclinations we receive from our parents are to be conquered by industry and reason, though example teaches more forcibly than either. Do but observe then how your father looks when he is passionate, how he exposes himself, and what weak things he speaks and does; and always reflect upon these, three minutes and three quarters, precisely, by your watch, whenever you feel yourself inclined to passion; and this alone, we should think, as it is a very proper, so would prove an efficacious remedy.

**Quest.—**How long has the invention of guns been in the world?

**Ans.**—According to the Portugal relations, the gun was invented anno Christi 85, in the kingdom of China, where most other inventions began, by one of their kings named Urtey; but it appeared not in Europe till 1350, when it was found out by one Bertoldu, a German, occasioned by an accident which he saw happen in a
mixture of sulphur and nitre inclosed in a vessel over the fire, in making an experiment in chemistry.

---

**Quest.**—Sailing down the River Medway from Chatham to Sheerness, about six o'clock in the morning, there appeared a strange sun, I observed, about 28 degrees from the true sun to the South, and both of an equal distance from the horizon; the sky was a little overcast, yet not so much but that the true sun shined pretty clearly; the false one was much inferior to it for lustre, yet seemed to have the same dimensions and motion; it continued about three quarters of an hour, and vanished gradually. From whence did this proceed?

**Ans.**—The sun fills the air with its images, which pass through the same, unless they be reflected by some body that is smooth and resplendent in its surface, but opaque at the bottom; such are looking-glasses, and also water, whether it be upon the earth or in the clouds. Now when a smooth cloud that is ready to fall down into rain happens to be opposite the sun, it represents the figure or image of the sun; and if there happen to be another opposite to this first, it reflects the figure—in the same manner as a looking-glass, opposite to that wherein we look, receives the image from the former, and represents the same. If no one wonders to see the representa-
tion of the sun here below in clear water, or any other resplendent body, it can be no great wonder that the same sun imprints his image as well on high as below; not in one cloud only or two, but in many, as Pliny observes he himself saw. This multiplicity of suns, which are called Parhelii, generally, though not always, happens either about the rising or setting of the sun; because the refraction which is necessary for seeing them is not so well made to our eyes when the sun is in the meridian. Also when the sun is in the meridian he produces more heat, and does not allow the cloud any time to stay, but dissolves it as soon as it becomes opposite to him; which he does not at his rising or setting, being then more weak. The same cause that shews us two or three suns did also represent three moons, under the Consulship of C. Domitius and C. Flaminius; as also three other, which appeared in the year 1315 for three months together; which impression is called Paroselene, and cannot be made but at full moon.

_Quest._—Of all callings and employments which are the most cleanly, neat, and genteel?

_Answer._—The most cleanly is the dust-cart-man; the neatest the barber; the genteelest the taylor.

_QUEST._—What is thought?

_Answer._—It is the act of the mind, or rather the
effect of that act; an Ens Rationis, produced by reflex, the very working of the soul, as being of the essence of mind, or immaterial substance, and consequently is actually inseparable from it, without annihilation. Though this very effect is not to be discovered without particular reflection, we often enough think at random, without knowing precisely what we think of, unless we actually rouse our minds, and reflect upon it.

Quest.—I am the father of several children, and am very desirous to bring them up as may be most to their advantage; and hitherto I have observed Solomon's maxim, not to spare the rod, for fear of spoiling the child. For which I have been much blamed, though my correction has always been moderate; but my accusers argue thus: the whipping or keeping children in any awe destroys their natural courage, dulls their understanding, and robs them of that presence of mind which is necessary for all to have. I desire your opinion concerning the correction and instruction of children?

Ans.—The proper educating of their children ought to be the care of every parent, because many, if not most, of the irregularities of youth, and errors and mistakes of riper years, proceed from the want of it; but so much wisdom is requisite to be able rightly to correct and instruct young persons, that it is not strange that so many fail in their endeavours to perform it. There are
but few general rules to be given; persons' circumstances, as well as the natural genius, and constitution of children, differ so much. It is undoubtedly the best way to begin to correct them for their little faults, as soon as they are capable of knowing they offend. Moderate and just correction never hurts any, though the tempers of children must be always considered; such as are naturally meek or heavy should be most gently dealt with; but those who are obstinate or high-spirited ought to be severely corrected, and not too often, though when it is done they must always be conquered. A child whipped with these precautions is never injured; but when it is merely done, as too often it is, only to satisfy a foolish passion in a parent, without observing the just limits; as sometimes beating it unmercifully for a small fault, and at another time overlooking several very considerable ones, or else always using it outrageously whether the crime be more or less. This the child coming in course of time to perceive; if it be of a soft easy temper, it often discourages it, and makes it become very dull; and, if sour and haughty, it makes it more stubborn and disobedient. Children are also capable of having their judgments instructed and manners formed much sooner than is generally thought, as we have seen in those of some persons of quality, whose children of ten or twelve years of age have been
as wise as youths commonly are at eighteen or twenty. There must also be encouragements used, as well as punishment, to make them do well; and such rewards should always be given them, when they do their duty, as suits the merit of the action. To this must also be added the good example of those who instruct them; a wise tutor never does any thing before a child which he would correct as a vice in him.

**Quest.**—What reason can you give, why the Eastern wind should be so much colder and sharper than the Western, seeing both are parallel from the Sun and the Equinox?

**Ans.**—A probable reason may be assigned from the places from whence these winds come, or which they visit in their passage. The Eastern is a land-wind, and comes over vast tracts of cold ground before it reaches our climate. The Western comes from the sea, which is considerably warmer than the land, where mixing with the vapours, which are accounted the cause of the warmth of islands, it may come less sensibly cold, than that which arrives from the contrary quarter.

**Quest.**—What is the greatest happiness a man can enjoy in the world?

**Ans.**—A quiet conscience and a contented mind.
HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY.

**Quest.**—Why is Britain represented by a woman sitting with a shield, &c. on the copper coins?

**Ans.**—The fancy was taken from some old Roman coins, which represented Britain in the same manner. There are two very like in Camden, Tab. 3, both of Antoninus Pius. On the reverse of the one, Britain is represented sitting on a globe, though with no spear nor shield. On the other she is in the same posture, though much nearer our present coins, with a shield under her and a spear in her hand, only in the shield we have now added the cross. Nor need the querist go any further than Lilly’s rule, for a reason why Britain is made a woman, since Judea and all other names of countries or regions were reckoned of that sex and gender.

**Quest.**—Whether it be possible for parents to be over-fond of their children? And whether the humour of some parents be not very ridiculous, who are always playing with their children, and talking of their childish employment and actions?

**Ans.**—We suppose the fondness here intended is that of parents towards their children when in their infancy, when the honour of being a father first comes upon them, or when the little fools begin first to talk and play with the great ones. To which we reply, that to be always employed
in this manner, to plague others with the perpetual relation of insipid childish follies, or to betray an extravagant and immoderate affection towards children, all these extremes are equally ridiculous. But then neither do we here condemn a very great tenderness and complaisance towards children, not even though it should sometimes be in private expressed by such actions as would, if more public, appear sufficiently diverting.

Socrates told Alcibiades, who caught him playing with a child, and laughed at him heartily, that he would do well to suspend his censures till he was himself a father. There have been in this age persons of prudence, who recommend the conversation with children, as soon as they begin to shew the first dawning of reason, as extremely diverting, as well as innocent; and it is pity those should ever have any of their own who do not think so. There is nothing in the world, says Petrarch, that is sweeter or more agreeable than the little prattlings and looks of an infant. The little blessings entertain us, in their way, with so much sweetness and innocence, that nothing but a mere barbarian can be proof against it. There being besides this a natural tenderness and affection which is due from any person to that which he has brought into the world, which those that want may learn it even from brute creatures; though the trial of their kindness, and the chief instance of it, is in giving them a pious and in-
genuine education, and doing nothing before them when they grow up, which they would not have them practice. It is only to observe the mean between a worse than brutal neglect of children, or aversion for them, and that nauseous fondness of some persons towards them, which makes them appear contemptible and ridiculous.

**Quest.**—What is the meaning of the word Nature?

**Ans.**—It is the settled course of things, or steady order of causes and effects never altered without a miracle.

**Quest.**—What is the reason that, when we move a fire-stick swiftly round, there appears to be a circle of fire, although the fire is but in one place at a time?

**Ans.**—The image of things is impressed on the brain by the optic power; and so long as that impression remains, we believe we see such an image, although we see it not at all. Thus, if we fix our eyes a considerable time upon a window, and immediately turn them towards some darker place we may plainly distinguish the squares, &c. which is nothing but the image in the brain. Now the brain being purely passive, it is impossible it should not take these impressions, whether from real or apparent objects, as it is impossible for a glass not to take reflections. Thus the fire appears circular, as in the question, because
it moves circularly. Suppose through 300 points the eye strives to catch at every one of these points, and at every one of them the brain receives the aforesaid impression, which impression is circular, according to the motion of the fire; and the fire moving quickly, and repeating these points several times, the impression is more sensible, and not lost till renewed again, which therefore appears to us as one continued circle.

Quest.—Whether cutting off the bottom root in planting of trees, as is usual, does not more hurt than good?

Ans.—No. The nearer any thing is to individualation, the nearer it comes to the nature of immaterial bearings, and by consequence is the more perfect; as, for instance, a long sucker acts not only to maintain itself, but the whole trunk for which it acts; but a short sucker saves so much for the nourishment of the trunk, as it spares compared to a longer.

Quest.—I am about nineteen years old, and have been often desired by my friends, who I believe are pious persons, to learn to dance; which I am sensible is needful to teach men how to behave themselves in company; but I somewhat question the lawfulness of it: for I take it to be an institution of the Pagans, who, upon the days of their sacrifices, did dance before the altars of their gods; as also condemned by
the Fathers, as unlawful, in many of their writings. Besides, it weakens piety, occasions ill thoughts, and consequently seems a breach of the seventh commandment; it having been also the occasion of many bad actions, as well as the loss of time, which we ought rather to employ in prayer, and other exercises of piety and devotion. I desire your opinion?

Ans.—Though we would be very tender of advancing any thing that should have an ill influence on manners, which are already but too much corrupted; yet, we must own, we think none of the reasons brought in the question conclusive against dancing. As for the first, it being a Paganish institution, it would be very hard to prove it, and we think it not true;—for, first, dancing seems, in some sort, natural. It is difficult not to leap for joy; and the whole body seems almost necessarily to follow the motion of the spirits and blood, when more brisk and lively than ordinary; nor can the reducing of steps to order be any more hurtful than leaving them without order. Now this natural way of expressing mirth, which is also a healthful exercise to the body, was in process of time made use of by all nations, both in their sacred festivals and on civil occasions. It was used in the festivals of the Jews very early; for we read in Exod. xv. 20. that Miriam the Prophetess, and all the women, went out with timbrels and with dances,
saying, "Sing ye to the Lord," &c. And it is even said, Psalm cxlix. 3, "Let them praise his name in the dance." And that this was also a civil expression of joy, common among the nations even before Moses, appears from that of Job xxii. 11, where he mentions the dancing of children; and this dancing was also a civil diversion, and expression of joy and triumph, among the Jews. The daughters of Shiloh went, it seems, to dance every year, only for their diversion; and it was promised as a blessing to Israel, Jer. xxxxi. 13, "Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, both young men and old together." And dancing, as well as music, is mentioned as customary on great joy, in the parable of the Prodigal. The Fathers, we own, did sometimes speak angrily against it, and so they did against usury and other things; wherein, though we have a great and just respect both for their piety and judgment, they are yet generally thought to have been in an error, but by none ever thought infallible. For the weakening of piety, it must be by occasioning ill thoughts, or wasting time, neither of which are necessary effects of it, any more than of courtship to one you intend to make your wife; but, if you find they are, you must forbear public dancing, and yet you may still be privately instructed by a master at your own chamber, there being a time for recreation as well as severer study and business; nay, as Solo-
mon says, "a time to dance, as well as to mourn." From what has been said, we think, may be deduced a full answer to all the objections the question mentions; though nothing is said here for immodest dances, or devouring too much time in them, which is equally unlawful, in that or any other recreation.

**Quest.**—Why are mean persons coming to honour generally prouder and less obliging than gentlemen, &c. who have had better birth and education?

**Ans.**—Because a courteous and genteel behaviour takes a long time to be well learned, and is seldom acquired unless men begin from their very infancy, which persons of quality do; and by constant conversation, either with those above them, or else such as are well bred, they more easily and naturally imitate their manners, and can at least command their outward expressions and behaviour. Whereas, on the contrary, those who have had a mean education have their minds generally rough, and still savouring of their birth and breeding; both because a habit imbibed in infancy or youth is with great difficulty to be conquered, and because they have not had so much time or opportunity to polish their words or behaviour, whence they may sometimes appear proud when they really are not; there being some difference between pride and ill-breeding,
though much alike and very near a-kin. But further, when such persons are really proud, they have not perhaps been courtiers long enough to dissemble and hide it. Not but that there are exceptions to be found on both sides—persons well born, who disgrace both their birth and education by ridiculous pride, which they mistake for greatness of mind, though far distant from it; and, on the contrary, there are of meaner birth and parentage, who, by the force of a more than ordinary genius, have soon learnt all the finesses of conversation, and being as obliging and well tempered as any in the world.

**Quest.** What was the chief cause of the destruction of the Empire of Constantinople.

**Ans.**—Most Historians conclude the principal causes to have been the divisions of the Christians, and the perfidy and cruelties that were exercised by many of them, to make themselves masters of the empire. For they were so divided, that, instead of thinking how they might unite against the common enemy, they chiefly employed themselves in endeavouring to become great, though to the injury of each other; and thus, in violating the laws of Christianity, they acted against true policy, which happens much oftener than men are aware of.

**Quest.**—I am willing to have as perfect a
knowledge of things as my capacity will admit; therefore desire to know whether it may be by a general or particular application to the sciences?

Ans.—Since it is impossible our narrow capacities should be able to receive a perfect knowledge of all things, it is much better for us to limit our studies to one, or a few, that our assiduous application thereto may render us as absolute masters thereof as is possible to be attained in this world; for by the pursuit of all we are sure to gain but a superficial knowledge. But were it possible for us by a long tedious enquiry to understand the true causes of every production, and to discover Nature even in her most hidden recesses, yet our happiness would be defective; since possession only would avail but little to our satisfaction, without we were able to possess and enjoy that knowledge. So that it is not enough to have a great stock of notions, without we were able to bring them to practice; and this is better done by him that understands one thing perfectly, than by him that has a confused notion of all things, which is knowing a little of every thing, and of all nothing; we cannot think of two things at the same time. And so our eye and mind can discern but one single tree in a forest, one branch in a tree, nay perfectly but one single leaf in a branch; the reflection of the mind, like that of the eye, being made by a direct line, which has but one point of incidence. And the least thing, even
the least part, is sufficient to employ the mind of man; from which consideration a Philosopher once exercised his wit for forty-three years upon an emmet. And many volumes have been written upon particular animals and plants; as Apuleius busied himself about an ass; Crysippus on a cole-wort; Marcion and Diocles upon the turnip and rape; Phanias of a nettle; Juba on Euphorbium, &c. And although all persons are desirous of knowledge, yet men's inclinations are very different; and some take to one study, and some to another, which Nature has seemed wisely to provide for discovery and preservation of the sciences, which end would be frustrated, should we inquire after new ones before we have attained what we first seek after, considering the shortness of our lives, and the copiousness of the arts; wherefore it is necessary for every one to apply himself to what he is most naturally inclined, for thereby men have only become famous. As Plato, instead of improving philosophy as he might have done, indulged his genius in studying metaphysics, Socrates morality, Democritus natural philosophy, and Archimedes the mathematics, &c.; and on the contrary, some persons striving to be universal have failed in excelling in any thing.

Quest.—What degree does Silver bear amongst other metals? what are the chief properties of it,
and from whence is it that we have the greatest part of it?

*Ans.* — Silver is the finest metal in the world excepting gold; it will beat very thin, and stretch in wire beyond any sort of metal but gold, even as small as a man's hair. It will not rust, but cankers a little into a pale blue, consumes some small matter in melting; it is dissolvable, like other metals, in aquafortis; and a thin plate of it, as a great or lesser piece, rubbed with brimstone and held over a candle, splits and moulders, because it is a calcine, the powder of which paints glass yellow. It chiefly comes from the West Indies and High Germany, being dug out of mines in an ore not much unlike lead or antimony, and the richer veins of lead are said to have much silver in them.

---

*Quest.*—Of Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, which was the best?

*Ans.*—You had done well to have told us whether you mean the best Man, or the best Philosopher. Pythagoras, as far as we know of him at this distance of time, appears to have been the best moralist of the three, especially if we believe the Golden Verses, like the Orphaies of Orpheus, to contain his precepts. But then his philosophy was whimsical and trifling. Plato talks very handsomely and magnificently of divine things, and well deserves that title Antiquity has given
him. But then he is magisterial rather than argumentative, and proceeds more upon tradition than reason. Aristotle appears not to have been over moral, nor to have much troubled himself with divinity; but yet his ethics, as to theory, are for the most part sound and practicable; he had a large soul, and could comprehend anything. He was happier than either of the others, in having for his patron the Conqueror of the world, by whose assistance he made experiments which others were incapable of; and besides, we still read with admiration his rhetorick and his poetry, which show he was a person of extraordinary depth of judgment, and deep insight into mankind and the affairs of life.

---

Quest.—What is Happiness?

Ans.—It is not what the world generally supposes, since there are so many disappointed; and the pretences of mankind in this search would, to an unconcerned looker-on, argue that men are creatures of different species. It was not without good reason that the ingenious Earl of Rochester, in his Satire against man, concludes that some men differ more from others than others do from beasts; meaning, as is evident by what precedes, that the really pious few, that believe and live well, have not only their pretences, but ideas of things, very different from those of other men, whose souls are immersed in sense, and lost in
body. Those that know the world most are the best judges of the dissatisfactions and disappointments that every one complains of. Here is one who promises himself a large share of felicity by purchasing such an estate, another this preferment, a third by the possession of that cruel fair-one, &c.; and if, by an unwearied industry, or, in respect of us, an adventitious occurrence, the business is accomplished, we are yet either where we were, wishing for something else under the same impatience, or labouring under the too late repentance of disappointments. And the reason is evident, for we put false values upon things at a distance, and fix the whole of our inclinations upon unproportional objects. As no man smells with his eyes or ears, or tries sounds with his nose, so no wise man will stamp an unjust estimate upon the pleasures of sense, and the actions wherein his body is mostly concerned. It is the pleasures of a well-informed mind, and the reflections of just and virtuous actions, that gives a title to what our querist call Happiness. Every creature is made for some end; and if this order be inverted, such a creature is abused, or made in vain. The end of man was, to know, love, and enjoy his Maker; and where this conformity holds, there ensues a happiness proportionable to the measure of those; — and this is what we understand by Happiness.
Quest.—Is there any cure for Stammering, and what is it?

Ans.—There is; for we have known it cured in several instances. There are more ways than one to do it; the first is, repeating many hard words deliberately several times a day; and for prevention, never speaking in haste. The other, keeping a pebble or some such thing in your mouth, and speaking or reading with it there.

Quest.—Was there such a man as Hercules?

Ans.—In the time that Deborah and Barac were Judges of Israel, a Phœnician merchant, named Alcides, who was born in Boeotia, and who, it is supposed, was our very Hercules, undertook great voyages, sometimes alone, and sometimes in company; some upon his own account, and others by commission. He established many Colonies; and as Greece was not yet well peopled, so in many places the new inhabitants were obliged to take a great deal of pains to defend themselves, as well from wild beasts as the injuries of the air. In that time, there were many young men that kept and fed the tamer beasts, that had successfully accustomed themselves to the fighting with bears and lions. Alcides had at eighteen years of age killed a lion in a mountain of Boeotia who had made a great ravage in the Theban flocks; on which the king of that place gave in marriage to him, or to his men, his daugh-
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ters; and Alcides used afterwards to wear the skin of the lion he had slain for a cloak. He likewise killed another lion in the forest of Nemea, which, by the order of the king of Mycena, he had chased into some park, where he continued a long time, and there established the powerful colony of the Heraclidas, which signified merchants. This colony delivered the country from many venomous animals, and made themselves famous by hunting the wild boars and savage bulls of the mountains.

After this Alcides left his colony in Peloponnesus, and returned to Thebes; but departing upon some business in his travels, Eurytus, Prince of Ecalia, promised to give his daughter to him that best drew the bow. Alcides presented himself, and made it appear that he was the most expert in that exercise; but the king kept not his word, under pretence that the Phoenicians had been accustomed to sacrifice their own children; yet Iphitus, the king's son, became a friend to Alcides, whom Alcides afterwards killed in a quarrel; for which murder he fled to Laconia, where the prince of the place purified him according to the manner of that time by plunging him in a river; but falling sick, he thought the gods were angry with him for the murder, and therefore resolved to consult a famous priest that lived at Delphos. He told Alcides that, to cure his infirmity, he must quit Greece, and make satisfaction to Eurytus.
This advice he intended to follow; but being arrived on the coasts of Asia, he was made a slave by some subjects of Omphales queen of Lydia, where he continued three years; in which time he made some famous voyages, and in one of them at last discovered some Phoenician vessels, which he joined, and, upon his making himself known to them, they delivered him from his captivity. He went not very far, but stopped in Mysia, where he established a colony; but the riches of Phrygia raised an envy in the Phoenicians that were in Mysia, and put them in mind of besieging some advantageous fort near Troy, and establish themselves there; to which end they equipped a little fleet of eighteen vessels, that they themselves had built, and went under the conduct of Alcides; but the repulse of the enemy, and some divisions amongst themselves, made them soon leave the place. Alcides, returning from thence into Greece, was again engaged in wars to defend his colony at Peloponnnessus. He a little after died upon a mountain of Thessaly, called Oeta, where his body was burnt, as was then the custom of that country; and because of his mighty actions, he was placed amongst the number of the gods. And although all these things were not done by himself only, because he was the chief, he had the honour of all enterprizes. Besides the name of Alcides, or Alceus, that he had from his infancy, he was called Herokel, which the Greeks made
Heracleis, and the Latins Hercules. It is a Phœnician word, which signifies merchant. And indeed Alcides did nothing else but establish Phœnician colonies, or make the negotiations of those more flourishing that drew their origin from Phœnia.

Quest.—Why does the fruit of a tree in grafting always take after the scion, and not after the root?

Ans.—The juice which ascends from the earth for the nourishment of the tree is the same in all trees; but their particular fruits, and their different formation, seem to depend on the internal disposition of those more immediate parts from whence they are produced. Thus we see, not only very good fruits raised from a thorn, and good apples from a crab-stock, but several sorts of fruit on the same tree; which seems evidently to demonstrate that those fine meatuses, or channels, in the graft form those juices which the root receives from the earth according to their own nature, and thence produce their own proper fruits; as seals, or rather moulds, instamp such impressions on a large piece of wax, not as it had before, but as they themselves represent. One and the same trunk will give nutriment to apples, pears, and all sorts of fruits that have pippins in them, but not to stoned fruit, as plumbs, apricots, &c. which are of a different species.
**Quest.** — From what cause proceeds the shell that covers the snail?

**Ans.** — From the same cause that the nails of a man's fingers proceed, namely, from moisture; which is also the cause of hair; and as a man's finger shapes the nail growing out of it, so the body of the snail shapes the shell, or horn, which receives its nourishment from that part or knot whereby it is fastened to the snail.

**Quest.** — How was it that they formerly preserved bodies for so long a time without their corrupting?

**Ans.** — The antients were so careful, not only of preserving the images of their forefathers, but also of keeping their bodies, that they variously embalmed them. The Grecians washed them in wine mingled with warm water, and then put them into oil of olives, honey, or wax. The Ethiopians first salted them, and then put them into vessels of glass. In the Canary Islands they seasoned them in the sea, and afterwards dried them in the sun. The Scythians placed them upon mountains covered with snow, or in the coolest caves. The Indians covered them with ashes. The Egyptians, believing that corrupted bodies rose not again, and that the soul was sensible of the body's corruption, were as curious in their preservation as any nation whatever; they filled them with myrrh, cinnamon, and other spices, or with
oil of cedar; then they salted them with nitre, whose acrimony consumed all the superfluous humidities which caused putrefaction.

---

**Quest.**—What is Anger?

**Ans.**—Anger is a passion caused by the apprehension of a present evil, which may be repelled, but with some difficulty; its principle is the soul, its instrument the spirits, its matter the blood, its seat the heart. It proceeds from a temper of body hot and dry, and easy to be inflamed, or from the diversity of seasons, times, ages, and sex. Hence the choleric and young persons are more inclined to it than the phlegmatic and aged, because they have a temper more proper to this passion. Women and children are easily displeased, through weakness of mind; as it is a sign of a sublime spirit not to be troubled at any thing, but to believe that as every thing is below itself, so nothing is capable of hurting it; which reason Aristotle made use of to appease the rage of Alexander, telling him, "he ought never to be incensed against his inferiors, but only against his equals or superiors; and, there being none that could equal him, much less surpass him, he had no cause of anger." Anger is one of the most deformed and monstrous passions, so violent that it causes the face to look pale, afterwards red; the eye sparkles, the voice trembles, the pulse beats with violence, the hair becomes stiff, the mouth
foams, the teeth gnash, the hand cannot hold; the mind is no longer in its own power, but is beside itself for some time, anger not differing from rage, but in duration; which made a philosopher tell his servant, "he would chastise him if he were not angry;" and the Emperor Theodosius commanded his officers never to execute any person by his orders till about three days; and Xenodorus advised Augustus never to determine any thing when he found himself angry, till he had first softly repeated the twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet. And indeed, if this passion be not repressed, it transports a man so out of himself that he is incensed, not against men only, but even against beasts, plants, and inanimate things; as Ctesiphon, who in great fury fell to kicking with a mule; and Xerxes, who scourged the sea. And it even reduces men to such brutality, that they fear not to lose themselves for ever, if they can but be revenged on those that have offended them.

**Quest.** — Which may be most easily resisted, Pleasure or Pain?

**Ans.** — If Pleasure be considered as a good, and Pain as an evil, it is clear the latter is as insupportable as the former is agreeable. But there are two sorts of good and evil, pain and pleasure, one of the mind, the other of the body; and frequently the pains and sufferings of the body are the joys of the mind; and the pleasures and gra-
tifications of the flesh, the crosses and torments of the spirit. Now there are scarcely any pure and unmixed pleasures or pains in the world; they are usually mingled one with the other; and if they could be separated, pain would turn the scale, as being the more heavy and difficult to be supported. In reference to which mixture, the Greek poet judiciously feigned that there are two vessels at the entrance of heaven, one full of honey and sweetness, the other full of gall and bitterness; of which two liquors mingled together Jupiter makes all to drink, and tempers with them everything he pours down here below; so that the pains and pleasures of the mind or the body being moderate, and indifferently tempered with each of those liquors, may be supported by men. Pleasure and good, as the more natural, much more easily than evil and pain, which are destructive to Nature: but when both of them are extreme, and the sweetness of pleasure is not abated by any little mixture of unhappiness, nor the bitterness of misfortunes lessened by small satisfactions, then men cannot relish this potion, because they are not accustomed to things pure and sincere, but to confusion and mixture, and cannot bear the excess of joy or grief, the extremes of which are found to be fatal.

In the first place, with respect to Grief;—Licinus, finding himself condemned for cheating the public, died with regret; Fabius, because he was
cited before the tribunes of the people for violating the laws of nations; Julia, Cæsar's daughter, at the sight of the bloody garments of her husband Pompey; and one of the sons of Gilbert duke of Monpensier, going into Italy, died upon the sepulchre of his father, which he went thither to see.

And as for Joy, besides our own experience, many remarkable examples shew the excess of it as deadly. Diagorus Rhodius, seeing his three sons victorious in one day at the Olympic games, died with joy. The like fate also befell Chino the Lacedæmonian, upon the same victory of one of his sons. Dionysius the Tyrant of Sicily, and the Poet Sophocles, having heard that they had won the bays for tragedies, died both immediately; and so did the Poet Philippides, upon winning that for comedies. Zeuxis the Painter, as before-mentioned, having drawn the picture of an old woman very oddly, died with laughing at it. Sinus, a Turkish general, upon the recovery of his only son, whom he thought lost; Leo the Tenth, upon taking Milan, which he had passionately desired, died for joy.

Thus both these passions have great resemblance in their excesses; they equally transport a man beyond the bounds of reason; the one by its agreeableness makes him forget himself, and the other by its bitterness leads him to despair. Grief destroys life, either by the violent agitation of the
spirits, or by their condensation, which, stopping the passages, hinders breathing, from whence follow suffocation and death. Pleasure and joy produce the same effect by contrary causes, namely, by too great a dilatation of the spirits, which causes weakness, and that weakness death.

And since they may be both so fatal to you, if you are not past that foolish age—when you choose a mistress, let her be wise and good, that she may know how to prevent your dying with joy, and have too much compassion to suffer you to die of grief, though we believe the last generally the least fatal.

Quest.—What is Time?

Ans. — It is the duration of a creature, measured by the revolution of the heavenly bodies. Duration, and that successive, because it is of a creature, whereby, first, the present moment is excluded, being only the term of time, not time itself; and then it is implied that time is incompatible with an uncreated being, who, as all sound Philosophers and Divines have ever held, has no succession, no parallax, or tropical conversion, which we render, “no variableness, nor shadow of turning.” By creature here, we mean all created beings, the whole system or frame of visibles, and even invisibles, which ever began to be; time in general being the complex measure of their duration, taken from end to end, and the
best particular measure we have of this duration being the repeated revolutions of the heavenly bodies: so that, if there were any created beings before this world was made, as it is probable there were, at least Angels, we can in general apply successive duration to their existence; though it is owned we cannot the measure of any heavenly or earthly bodies actual revolution, because then no such bodies; though, like the Julian period, we can set the watch a little backward, and make time intrude upon eternity in supposition, we mean so, as to say there were so many actual durations, so many instants passed from their creation to the creation of the world, as would have made so many days or years greater or less than any number given.

---

**Quest.**— *Nothing* is in all languages a noun substantive: now a noun is the name of a thing, that may be seen, felt, heard, or understood; and how can any part of that description agree to *Nothing*? I desire your serious answer herein, and the definition of Nothing; and opinion, whether it may properly be called a noun substantive?

**Ans.**—Nothing is 000,000,000,000,000, &c.; wherein, it is a plain case, are included all things that are necessary to a complete definition; for there is first its genius, which is 0; and then its difference, both essential 0, and accidental 0; nay, all the train of little tiny accidents that wait upon
the ancient family of the Nothings, clearly and distinctly marshaled according to their respective ranks and titles, as 0—0—0—0; and, lest others of them should take it amiss for being neglected or excluded, a long &c. is left for a back-door to all the rest.

But, in order to answer this question, we must now, like bad disputants, be forced to distinguish after we have defined.

There are three sorts of nothings; one nothing which is something; another nothing between nothing and something; and a third nothing, which is nothing. This may make people stare that are no metaphysicians; but it is all as plain as a pike-staff to one that has but read Suarez; for, to be yet more methodical, there is, in the first place, your purum nihil, or arrant nothing, a contradiction, and absolute impossibility in nature; a monster, one part of whom unbuilds another, as transubstantiation, a Jacobite's faith, courage, honour, honesty, and twenty other nothings of the same stamp. There is a second nothing, which is between a nothing and a something, what the old jabberers call a nihil existentiae actualis, nothing as to actual real existence, but what may exist; as a million of things, nothings we mean, that are possible, are not future, and which, we hope and have a strong guess, will never be present. But though this nothing has but a very small portion, of something in it, yet some it seems to have, at
least to conception; and there is, by Avicenna's leave, a difference between the nihility of a possibility and an impossibility.

There is further a *nihil positionis*, such a nothing as comes nearer to something than all the rest, and may be reckoned just on the edge of being; a nothing which puts or affirms nothing, but either takes something away, as privation, blindness in a man, &c. or only outwardly affects it, as any extrinsical denomination. Some reckon also a nothing of subsistence, by which they mean accidents, of modes of being; but we think these downright somethings, and that nothing has nothing to do, to pierce so far into the realms of entity. After all, it seems to us, that there is still lurking one old, great, generical nothing, which includes all these, and yet may be considered as abstracted from them—a sort of idea nothing, a being of reason or fancy, which we must have in our minds, somehow or other, when we discourse of nothing; and which yet cannot perhaps strictly and properly be comprehended under any of the former heads. And yet less than all these is the word Nothing, the mere shadow of a shadow, for all its high pretensions to Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; and, for aught we know, fifty languages more than ever in the Polyglott. This sometimes expresses all the fore-mentioned particular notions, possible, impossible, privative, &c.; at others, only the general confused notion
of undeterminate nothing; and sometimes again it is taken for its own little self, the very tiny word, the nilulum, first docked into nihil, and then split into nil, not unlike our nothing into nought, and so made less than nothing.

But how can Nothing be seen, felt, or heard, or understood? Oh, very easily. Did you never yet see a countryman gaping up in the sky? Go to him, and ask him what he sees there; and perhaps his answer will be, "Nothing." Nay, select if you can forty wise people, and desire them to look up as well as he—they will all agree, they see "Nothing." Then for feeling, Nothing may be a noun; aye, and a noun substantive too, for all that; for did you never put your hand in your pocket, and feel Nothing there? Then for hearing, there is no manner of doubt on it; for as long as we are sure that an horrid stillness may invade the ears of us mortals—it is a clear case, that, like a fat old gentleman who steals many a hearty nap at church against the pillars of the middle aile, it is possible for a man to have his mouth open, and yet hear Nothing. Or, if he should chance not to nod fair, but try hard heads with his brother snorer, and wake them both before the shrieking clerk did it; yet, if the parson talk sense, they might understand nothing of it. And so may nothing be seen, felt, heard, and understood. Ergo, it is a noun.

Quest.—What is your opinion of the nature of
plants; as whether they are capable of pain, when cut or broken, &c.!

Ans.—We shall first consider their generation; they have now for some thousand years lain under the same scandal that insects have, viz. that they are produced by equivocal generation. It would be too tedious, only for comparison's sake, to run over the old received opinions, that salt holds the place of the masculine seed, and humidity the feminine; and by this means excrements produce beetles, flies, worms, or other insects; sweat and wine produce lice and fleas; the slime of marshes generate frogs, being very nitrous; boats of salt produce rats, which conceive others by licking the salt; bees come from oxen, hornets from horses, scorpions from crabfish, the marrow of a back-bone turns to a serpent, with a hundred more such fabulous idle stories: for, by the help of microscopes, we have discovered that all animals and insects, however mean and despicable, are produced from parents of their own species, even to a gnat and a mite. Francisco Redi, upon the innumerable trials that he made with putrid flesh of all sorts, corrupted cheese, fruits, herbs, and insects themselves, constantly found that all these kinds of putrefaction only afforded a nest and aliment for the young of those insects that he admitted to come to them, and when he sealed them up in glasses, vessels covered with paper, fine lawn, &c. nothing was ever produced
even in the warm climate of Florence. Malpighius also has observed those tumours and excrescences of plants, leaves, &c. that yield flies and worms, are first made by such insects which wound the tender buds with a hollow trunk, and deposit an egg in the hole with a sharp corrosive liquor, which causes a swelling in the leaf, and so shuts up the orifice. We need not add the experiments of Lewenhoek, and others, since now this doctrine of equivocal generation is universally exploded.

Nothing, even so much as grass, is producible on the earth without seed.

Malpighius shews, that the earth which has no seed in itself can produce nothing at all. He caused to be digged a deep pit, and took of the earth of it, which he put into a glass, that he might the more conveniently see whether it produced grass, or anything else; this glass he covered with fine lawn, several heights above one another, to keep the smallest seed from falling into it, as also that it might have the convenience of the air; and, after having exposed this vessel to the air for a long time, he found nothing at all to grow in it; but, having put some seeds into it, they sprang up, and grew immediately.

If it be objected, that in London, after the plague, grass grew in the streets, being not hindered by treading upon it, and that all highways spring up with grass when unfrequented—it is
easily answered, that seeds of grass are easily carried by the wind from one place to another; but besides, there is no need of such a supply, where the roots of grass are left behind, which will spring up when at liberty; but in places where there is neither root nor seed, as in the above experiment, there will be nothing produced.

Thus the generation of plants, herbs, &c. is as certainly equivocal as that of brutes and men, viz. produced as one fire kindles another; and therefore no prerogative can be claimed by one above another as to their generation. As to the nutrition, increase, &c. of vegetables, I come to consider them; but we shall also examine their organs, and what relation and similitude they bear to those of brutes, and consequently to ours. Dr. Basil is very positive, in his Kingdom of Vegetables, that there is nothing in animals, but there is some resemblance of it in plants, and for the most part, they have the same organs with them. With him also M. Malpighius agrees, who has so far considered, and curiously examined their nature, that he offers to shew in plants all the same parts which serve to the divers functions of life in men and beasts—such as are for reception of the air, for the use of the plant, those which serve to the concoction and digestion of the aliment, the circulation of nutritive succus, the excretion of superfluities, &c. Mr. König gives but a very lame definition of the soul of vegetables; however, he agrees with me, that this
soul is the principle of their vegetation, and of nutrition, increase, propagation, &c. since there are no laws yet known of matter, that can cause such circulations and motions as are in the succous, nutritious, and other plants. He has very well remarked, that they have not only the same organs destined to the same uses, but that they resemble them in many respects. The same accidents and the same revolutions happen to them in common with animals. They increase, feed, are vigorous, sicken and die. Nor can we be assured that they have not thought; and are sensible of pain and pleasure in the proper functions of their nature; but we have rather some very good reasons to believe the affirmative. It is unquestionable, that not only in different species, but often in the very same kind, there is a vast difference as to the complexion and constitution of all creatures; those which most tenderly and delicately bred, give their arteries the liberty of spreading into extremely fine branches, and thereby become extremely sensible of pain or pleasure. It is so in the vegetative world; some trees, plants, herbs, &c. that are carefully manured and managed, are much sooner blasted, than the wild mountainous ones, which are continually exposed to the severity of wind and weather; therefore, if we can possibly produce such instances of the sensibility of plants, we shall bid fair to prove it essential to the whole; only by accidents, severe usage, dif-
ference of contexture, &c. it may not be so apparent in all: and it is no argument that a thing is not, because we cannot see or understand it. There is a sensitive plant growing, as Scaliger and others relate, in Zonolha, a part of Tartary, where the inhabitants sow a sort of grain much like that of our melons, but somewhat longer, from which grows an herb, which they call Borrancetz, or a lamb, for it is like one, having feet, horns, &c. it grows to the earth by a root which enters at its navel, and it eats all the grass about it, as far as it can reach, and dies when it has no food. Anthony Pegafet tells us of a tree, much like a mulberry, which has leaves with little feet, that it uses, when fallen off the tree, to run away from those that come near it. But Pliny is very positive as to his balsam tree, which trembles when the axe is near it. And Scaliger, a more credible author, if the two last be suspected, tells us of the Arbor pudica, which, upon the approach of a man, or other animal, contracts its boughs, and extends them again upon their departure, which is also observable in the sponge. There is such a uniformity in nature between some plants and animals, that there is scarcely any difference but in local motion; which yet is found in some, as the gourd and cucumber, which follow the neighbouring water, and shape their fruit in length to reach it.

The Herba Viva, of Arosta, folds up its leaves
and flowers when touched; tulips do the same in the evening; the carline thistle, called the peas-
ant's-almanack, folds up its flowers when a tem-
pest is at hand; and innumerable more such in-
stances there are, which would persuade us that all vegetatives have sense as well as life, but ruggedness of the contexture and frame of most makes it imperceptible to us. We might carry the matter yet higher, but yet with a question which we leave to the ingenious, whether, since they have sense, some of them at least apparently, may not be said to make rational inferences, and be guided by a soul capable of abstract specu-
lations?

**Quest.**—What are we to understand by the Centaurs and Lapithæ, and were there ever any such monsters as Virgil represents, or that the story proceeded from any sort of men?

**Ans.**—Under the reign of Ixion, king of Thes-
saly, a company of bulls which fed upon Pelion run mad, by which means the mountain was in-
accessible. They also descended into the inha-
bited parts, and ruined the trees and fruits, and killed the larger cattle. Upon which Ixion de-
clared that he would give a great reward to any persons that would destroy these bulls. Riding on horseback was never practised before that time. But some young men that lived in a village at the
foot of Pelion, had attempted successfully to train horses fit to back, and had accustomed themselves to that exercise. These youths undertook to clear the mountain of the bulls, which they effected by pursuing them on horseback, and piercing them with their arrows as they fled; but when the bulls stopped or followed them, they retired without receiving any hurt. And from hence they were called Centaurs, viz. Pierce-Bulls. Having received of Ixion the recompence he promised them, they became fierce and proud, and committed a thousand insolences in Thessaly, not sparing even Ixion himself, who dwelt in the town of Larissa. The inhabitants of the country were at that time called Lapithæ, who one day invited the Centaurs to a feast which they celebrated; but the Centaurs abused their civility; for, having drunk too much, they took the Lapithæs' women from them, set them on their horses and carried them away. This violence kindled a long war between the Centaurs and the Lapithæ; the Centaurs in the night came down into the plain, and laid ambushes for their enemies; and as soon as day appeared retired again into the mountain with whatever they had taken. Thus, as they retired, the Lapithæ saw only the hinder parts of their horses, and the men's heads; so that they seemed but as one animal, from whence they believed the Centaurs had become half men and half horses, and that they were sons
of clouds, because the village where they dwelt was called Nophelus, which signified a cloud.

**Quest.**—How, out of matter which appears plainly homogeneous, should be formed animals which consist of so many and so different parts. Some think this is done by the fermentation of the seed; but it seems not possible that infinite variety of parts, so aptly disposed, should arise from thence. Others assert that the first seed of the several animals created by God did formerly include all seeds in itself: but this also seems very difficult to conceive, because of the infinite number of animals which have been formed from the creation of the world; though to this they say, that the parts of matter are infinite. Others are of opinion that all the seeds of the several animals were in the beginning of the world created by God, and that we take them in daily. Pray, which of these opinions esteem most probable?

**Ans.**—Whatever matter may be in itself and its essence, it is certain that it appears to our senses as various and heterogeneous: however, the modus of the formation of animals is still unknown. The Inspired Writers express themselves here, at least, according to the capacity of the learned as well as the vulgar, when they acknowledge the ignorance of mankind—how the bones do
at first grow in their embryotic state—and that we are awfully and wonderfully made, when we are fashioned secretly in the lower parts of the earth. However, it seems not probable that mere fermentation should produce this, or action or re-action of one part of matter upon another, though we grant it may have a strange and unaccountable power in the alteration of matter purely insensible or inanimate. This fermentation may dilate, and extremely alter the parts of animate matter, when they are already delineated and marked out by the finger of the Almighty; but still, matter being a principle purely passive and irrational, we cannot conceive how it should become an animal, any more than a world, it being much more easy for stones to leap out of a quarry, and make an Escurial, without asking the architect's leave, or calling for the mason, with his mortar and trowel, to assist them. Nor seems it necessary, or rational, that the first seed of every creature should formerly include all those seeds that should be afterwards produced from it; since it is, we think, sufficient that it should potentially include them, as Abraham did Levi, or as one kernel all those indeterminate kernels that may be thence afterwards raised, the first seeds being doubtless of the same nature with those that now exist, after so many thousand years, the order of time making only an accidental
difference; which if we do not grant, we must run into this absurdity, that every thing does not produce its like, a bird a bird, or a horse a horse, which would be to fill all the world with monsters, which Nature does so much abhor. But every seed, or kernel, for example, does now actually and formally contain all the seeds or kernels which may be at any time afterwards produced from them. A kernel has indeed, as we have found by microscopes, a pretty fair and distinct delineation of the tree and branches into which it may be afterwards formed, by the fermentation of its parts and addition of suitable matter; as in the tree are potentially contained all the thousands and millions of kernels, and so of trees, that shall or may be thence raised afterwards: and so we are apt to believe it must be in the first animals—whereas the finest glasses, which are brought to an almost incredible perfection, cannot discover actual seeds in seeds, or kernels in kernels; though, if there were any such thing as an actual least atom, they might, one would think, be discovered by them, since they have shown us not only seeds, but even new animals, in many parts of matter where we never suspected them, and even in some of the smallest animals themselves, whereof our naked sight can take no cognizance. As for the parts of matter, be they how they will, finite or infinite, it makes no great alteration; for, if these parts are
not all seminal, we are no nearer. Nay, at best, an absurdity seems to be the consequence of this hypothesis: because, if those parts are infinite, and include all successive generations of animals, it would follow that the number of animals too should be infinite—nay, the number of any insect, any animal; and instead of one, we should have a thousand infinites; and it would be strange too if they should not, some of them, be greater or less than one another.

For that pleasant fancy, that all the seeds of animals were distinctly created at the beginning of time and things, that they are mingled with all the elements, that we take them in with our food, and the he and she atoms either fly off or stay as they like their lodgings; we hope there is no need of being serious to confute it. And we may ask of this, as well as the former hypothesis, what need of them, when the work may be done without them? The kernel, as before, contains the tree; the tree a thousand other fruits, and ten thousand kernels: the first animal several others; and as many of them as Nature can dispose of, and provide fit nourishment for, are produced into what we may call actual being, in comparison to what they before enjoyed. If it be asked, whether these imperfect creatures have all distinct souls while lurking yet in their parent? we answer, that there is no need of it; they are not yet so much as well defined
bodies, but rather parts of the parent. There is required yet a great deal more of the chemistry and mechanism of Nature, and that in both sexes, to make one or more of these insect beings, the offspring of man, capable of receiving a rational soul; but when that capacity comes, in proper time, to infuse it, though when that is, and wherein it consists, perhaps He only knows, who is the Father of spirits, as well as the Former of the universe.

Quest.—Why is the first of August called Lammas Day, above all days of the year?

Ans.—At that time the popish priests began to make masses, that the lambs and sheep might not die all that season by the cold after shearing: therefore it was called Lammas Day.

Quest.—Does Sound proceed from the striking of two bodies one against another, or from the air which is broken thereon?

Ans.—The striking of two hard bodies, one against another, is indeed the efficient cause of sound, but not the formal; for sound is made, not in the beating of those two bodies alone, but by the collision and breaking of the air between them. As for example, sound is not in the bell that sounds, but in the air beaten and broken between the clapper and the bell.
**Quest.**—Why cannot we endure Thirst so long or so well as Hunger?

**Ans.**—Because Hunger is but a simple appetite of food, but Thirst is a double appetite; namely, of food and refreshment; so that two defects are more difficult to be supported than one. And therefore, also, we receive much more pleasure in drinking when we thirst, than in eating when we hunger; and as the pleasure is greater in the enjoyment, so is the displeasure and inconvenience in the want thereof. Moreover, drink suddenly penetrates the body and all the parts thereof; but food insinuates by little and little, and after many concoctions it changes.

**Quest.**—Wherefore do such as are made afraid look pale and wan?

**Ans.**—Because Nature withdraws the blood from the exterior to the more noble and inward parts of the body; even as such who have lost the power and command of the field, or campaign, retreat to their garrisons and castles, the best fenced and fortified; for it is the blood that causes that blushing colour in the face, which, being withdrawn, paleness ensues.

**Quest.**—Why do flowers flourish and open in the morning, and are contracted and shut at night?

**Ans.**—It is because the nature of heat is to
dilate and open, and of cold to contract and shut; so that the sun, by its heat, makes them open and flourish; and the sun being set, they are contracted and shut by the cold of the following night.

**Quest.** Is it the custom of remote countries to testify their sorrow for the loss of friends by wearing of different apparel? And if it is, do they put on black, or any other colour? And what reason can be given for our preferring black to all other colours?

**Ans.**—Black is the most fit emblem of sorrow and grief. As death is the privation of life, and black a privation of light, it is very probable this colour has been chosen to denote sadness, upon that account. When black appears in the body, it is generally a sign of death, because it is produced by mortification and extinction of the spirits; a living body being full of vivacity and brightness, whereas a dead one is gloomy and dismal; for at the same moment the soul leaves the body, a dark shade seems, as it were, to be drawn over it—so that this colour is not only a proper representation of grief and sadness, but also of death, which is the cause of it, and has been preferred for mourning by most people throughout Europe. Yet the Syrians, Cappadocians, and Armenians, use sky-colour, to denote the place they wish the dead to be in;
namely, in the heavens;—the Egyptians yellow, to shew that, as herbs being faded become yellow, so death is the end of human hope;—and the Ethiopians grey, because it resembles the colour of the earth, which receives the dead.

**Quest.**—Whether the antients were as well skilled in shipping and navigation as the moderns are?

**Ans.**—Athenæus tells us, that Ptolemy Philopater had a galley built for pomp and pleasure, with a double prow and forty ranks or orders of rowers. And Plutarch asserts, that Demetrius equipped several ships of war, which had in each of them four thousand rowers: this for their bulk. Then N. Whitsen, who wrote on naval architecture in High Dutch, whose book was printed at Amsterdam in 1671, says, the ships of the antients were much firmer and more durable than ours. He tells us of a ship found in the time of Pope Pius II. in the Numidian sea, twelve fathoms under water, thirty feet long, and proportionably broad, of Cyprus and Larix wood, so hard that it would scarcely burn or cut, and not in the least any where rotten or perished; and the whole ship so close, that not a drop of water was soaked into the under rooms. But whatever we think of this story, or of the vast bulk assigned to some ships; of this we are certain, that they antiently had some very large
vessels. Authentic histories mention Hiero the Syracusan's ship, which, by the description Mr. Evelyn gives us out of old writers, "that it was among those which had been taken from mountains, or floating islands, and that it was a moving palace, adorned with groves of trees, both for fruit and shade:" by the description given of it, it seems to be the same which the miraculous Archimedes, as his history tells us, by his mathematical engines lifted up in the air, equal and even, as a trial of his art, when Hiero and all his courtiers were at dinner in it. Nor were they formerly wanting in stratagems, or ingenious devices, to murder one another; for Minus is said to be the first inventor of the sea-fights, who lived not long after the Flood; and that not only the use of flags, but even of false colours, fire-ships, stink-pots, and snake-pots, were known to the antients, as we learn in Fronto on Stratagems. Then for the number of their vessels, Homer tells us, there were a thousand ships against Troy; and the Roman histories, and Polybius, inform us, the Roman and Carthaginian Armadas have met at sea, with more than a hundred thousand men of a side; and at other times, forty thousand have been killed of a side in one battle. But, notwithstanding all this, it is certain that we excel the antients, not only in other parts of navigation, but also in that of shipping, our vessels be-
ing, if not so great as some of those are represented, yet much more serviceable.

**Quest.**—To whom do we owe the invention of Glass, what is it composed of, and to what perfection may it be brought?

**Ans.**—Glass is found in all bodies capable of calcination and vitrification; but chiefly in nitre, sand, shells, certain stones, wood, and plants; from which it is drawn differing in beauty according to the matter whence it is extracted by means of a most violent fire, which resolving the compound, consumes all its parts except that vitrious matter, which is proof against its violence. We owe its invention to certain merchants of nitre, who, having landed in Phœnicia, and made a fire on the sand, used some clods of their nitre, as a trevet for their kettle; and the heat of the fire melting the sand and nitre into glass, they took notice of it, and published the invention. Afterwards moulds were found out, wherein to cast it into all sorts of figures; pipes or tubes to ram it in; others to blow it, and give it all sorts of colours, which almost miraculously arise from the very substance of the glass, without other mixture, only by the wind and blast managed according to the rules of art; as also mills to calcine and pulverize gravel, stones, or sand.

Glass wants but one thing; and that is, the removing of its brittleness or fragility; were it not
for that, it would be the most precious thing in the world. The eye, the noblest part of man, symbolizes with glass by that crystalline humour whereon the point of the visual ray terminates. But as all things in the world are no sooner arrived to their point of perfection, but they are most subject to be corrupted, so fragility is inseparable from glass, arrived to that degree. As gold is the masterpiece of Nature, so is glass of Art, which cannot produce any thing more noble. It is the fairest and cleanest of all bodies, as partaking the most of light, the noblest and divinest of all sublunary bodies, to which alone it affords passage through its imperceptible pores, being by that means the most useful and delightful piece of architecture; the beauties and properties whereof cannot be seen but by light, half of which lattices intercept, but glass communicates intire; serving, moreover, to correct the defects of sight in old men, by spectacles; and of the countenance in looking-glasses, by means of which man perfectly knows himself. But to judge how glass may be malleable, we must know that it is composed of two substances,—the one earthy, the other gum-mous, serving for cement to unite those dry parts, whose connexion in any body whatsoever is impossible, but by acrious humidity, without which the earthy parts would fall to dust. Now to remedy the brittleness of glass, it were expedient to find out two matters whose union might be
closer, or to link them together better by some more humid oleaginous matter than the ordinary, which would no more hinder the transparencies of glass than it doth that of talc, which is wholly oleaginous in its substance, and never less diaphonous and flexible. The fire likewise, being very sharp and violent, consumes almost all the moisture of glass, and makes it more brittle, for which reason it ought to be moderated.

---

**Quest.** — Which is the more noble, Man or Woman?

**Ans.** — One of the greatest difficulties arising in the discussion of this controversy is, that there is no judge to be found who is not interested in the cause. It must not, therefore, be thought that the determination of this point is of little importance: for we should have none of those dismal feuds, both in high and mean families, did not women go about to command over men instead of obeying them. Now whether the business be fairly arbitrated, or whether it be yielded out of complacency to that sex which loves to be commended, and out of pity to its weakness; upon examination of the reasons of either side, it is safer to suspend one's judgment, that we may neither betray our own sex, nor incense the other,—which, it is said, is not so easily reconciled as it is offended.

Others are of opinion, that the courtship and
suing which men make to women is a tacit but sufficient argument of the esteem wherein they hold them; for we do not seek after a thing we undervalue. But the excellence of women above men is chiefly argued from the place, the matter, and the order, of their creation; for man had not the advantage to be created in the terrestrial paradise, as woman had, who also was produced out of a more noble matter than he—he being made out of the dead earth, and she out of living organized matter. As for the order of the creation; God, in the production of mixed bodies, began with the meanest things, and ended with the noblest. He first made the earth and the sea, then plants, fishes, and the other brutes; after which, he created man, as the master-piece of all things; and lastly woman, as the master-piece of Nature, and the model of all perfections, mistress of man, stronger than he, as the Scripture saith, and, consequently, mistress of all the creatures. Moreover, there is no sort of good which is not found in a higher degree in woman than in man. As for the goods of the body, the chief of which is beauty, men have therein utterly lost the cause; which they will be as little able to carry in reference to the goods of the mind, the same being found more vigorous, and attaining sooner to maturity in women. They commonly perform more actions of virtue than men; and indeed they have more need of them, to withstand the assaults made
upon their chastity, which is not so often found in the other sex. They are acknowledged by all to be more merciful, faithful, and charitable than men; so devout, that the Church terms them by no other name; and so patient, that God has judged them alone worthy to carry their unborn children nine months; no doubt, because men had not virtue and resolution enough for that office. In short, there is no science or art in which women have not excelled; witness the two virgins De Roches and De Gournai, the Viscountess of Auchi, and Juniana Morel, a sister Jacobin of Avignon, who understood fourteen languages, and at Lyons maintained Theses in philosophy at the age of thirteen. So also of old, Diotima and Aspasia were so excellent in philosophy, that Socrates was not ashamed to go to their public lectures. Hipalia, of Alexandria, the wife of Isidore the philosopher; in oratory, Tullia, the daughter, and doubly heiress of Cicero; and Cornelia, who taught eloquence to the Gracchi, her sons; in poetry, Sappho, the inventress of Sapphic verses; and the three Corynnas, of whom the first overcame Pindar, the prince of Lyric poets, five times; and in painting, Irene and Calypso, in the days of Varro. If there have been prophets, there have also been prophetesses and sibyls; yea, they were virgins of old, that rendered the oracles at Delphos. In brief, if there have been warlike men, there have been Amazons too, who
have shewn that valour is not solely to be found in men. And there have been maidens who have fought very courageously, whose sex was not known till they were slain in battle. But these feminine virtues are not so much celebrated as those of men, by reason of the envy which they bear to the sex, having subjected the same to such a pass that they are enforced to support all our defects. Though, indeed, women may say to men, as a lion did to a man who shewed him the picture of a man killing a lion—"if lions," said he, "were addicted to painting, he would see more men killed by lions than lions by men;"—if women had had the making of laws and histories, you would see more virtues exercised by women than by men. But, though it will be said that only men give their opinion of this matter, yet God himself has passed a decree upon them in these words, "The woman shall be subject to the man." And it is to no purpose to say, that it was otherwise before the first sin, and that subjection was imposed on the woman for a punishment; seeing the punishment of the serpent, that he should creep upon the earth, does not presuppose that he caused man to sin by the means of his wife; but indeed God converted that into a penalty which before was natural to him. The same ought to be said concerning the woman, who was no less subject to the man before than after his sin. Moreover, after God had taken the wo-
man out of Adam's side, whence, they say, it happens that their heads are so hard, he did not say she was good, as he had pronounced all the rest of his creatures. And to get Adam to marry her, there was no other expedient found but to cast him into a sleep; no doubt because, had he been awake, he would have been much puzzled to resolve upon it. So that they who, considering on one side the usefulness of that sex for the preservation of the species of men, and on the other the mischiefs whereof it is the cause, have not ill determined, when they termed woman a necessary evil; to which men are addicted, by natural instinct, for the general good, and to the prejudice of the particular, just as water ascends upwards, contrary to its own nature, for the eschewing of vacuity. Woman is an imperfect animal, whom Plato questioned whether he should not rank among the irrational, and whom Aristotle terms "a monster." They who treat her most gently style her a simple error of Nature. Now, if in some species of animals the females have the advantage above males, as tigresses, lionesses, and she-wolves, it is in fierceness; and therein we also yield to women. But what more competent judge amongst men can they find than Solomon, who tried so many, and enquires, "who can find a wise woman?" and who, after he had compared them to the bottomless pit, concludes, that all wickedness is supportable, provided it be not the
wickedness of a woman; yea, that the wickedness of a man is better than the goodness of a woman.

Lastly, the middle opinion is, that every thing is esteemed according to its author, structure, and composition, the means it makes use of, the manner how it employs the same, and its end. Now, man and woman having the same author, God, and being composed almost of the same parts, it remains to inquire what means both the one and the other make use of for attaining their end, which is happiness. It is certain that the being either man or woman makes neither of them good or bad, handsome or deformed, noble or infamous, happy or unhappy. There are found of both sorts in each sex:—as, to begin in Paradise, the eleven thousand virgins alone shew that the feminine sex has as good a share therein as men. In thrones, Semiramis, Thomiris, many queens and empresses, have manifested that women as well know how to command as men; Judith, cutting off the head of Holofernes; and the maid of Orleans, having shown that men alone were not courageous, and fit for martial achievements. In brief, there is no kind of performances in which examples are not to be found both of men and women who have acquitted themselves well therein. In economy, or the management of a family, if some men are masters, there are found women too, who, having the supremacy, perform so well that the men cannot complain.
fore they who seek the cause of the nobleness or abjectness of man and woman in the sex, seek it where it is not. It is not the being a man, or a woman, that makes noble or ignoble;— it is the being an excellent man, or an excellent woman: for, as they are mistaken who impute some vice or virtue to a whole province, because to be vicious or virtuous are personal things; the same ought to be said concerning man or woman, who are citizens of the whole world;—either of whom taken in general has nothing in them but what is very decorous, good, and perfect, and, consequently, very noble, as proceeding from an Author who communicated to them what perfection and nobleness were respectively requisite. If there be any defect, it proceeds from the individual person, and ought no more to be attributed to the sex than to the species.

Quest. — Whether Truth is always to be spoken?

Ans. — Truth being a moral duty, it much imports the interest of a government that it be observed and kept inviolably, not only in contracts and public actions, but also in private discourses. And it is our judgment that truth always should be spoken, although it be to one's damage.

But some say, truth is not always to be spoken. This Nature teaches us, while she discovers to us only the surface of the earth, but has hid all the
treasures of it, as all the parts of man, especially the more noble, are concealed under the skin. That which vilifies mysteries is the publishing of them, called profanation; that which hinders the effect of state counsels, whereof secrecy is the soul, is the letting of them be discovered, which is treason; that which takes away the credit from all arts and professions is the rendering them common; and physic, amongst others, knows the advantage of concealment, while the welfare of the patient many times depends upon his ignorance. Would you see what difference there is between a wise man and a fool, a civil man and a clown: it does not consist in knowledge, for they often have the same thoughts and inclinations; but the fool speaks all that he thinks, the wise man does not; as the clown will declare by gesture, and, if he can, do every thing that comes into his fancy; but the better-bred man uses restraint upon himself. The comedian, therefore, wanted not reason to say, that truth begets hatred; and the Scripture teaches us that the dissimulation of the wise Egyptian women to Pharaoh, when they were commanded to murder the Hebrew children at the birth, was approved. There is great difference between speaking falsehood, and not speaking always the truth which is expected from us; the former being vicious, the other not. Whence Athanasius being asked by his pursuers whether he had seen Athanasius, told them "he went that
way a little time since;" but did not tell them that himself was the person. And St. Francis being asked if he saw a robber pass by, shewed his sleeve, and said, "that he did not pass that way."

As only weak and distempered eyes are unable to bear the light of the sun, so only weak and sickly minds cannot suffer the lustre of truth. All men are obliged to speak it, but particularly that which is dictated from God's mouth; and we ought rather to choose martyrdom than renounce the belief of it. Less ought they to conceal it who are bound to it by their condition as preachers and witnesses, provided they have regard to place, time, and persons, without which circumstances it is unacceptable and absurd. Yet in two cases particularly the not telling of truth may be dispensed with: When the safety of the Prince, or good of the State, is concerned, for which Plato, in his Commonwealth, says, it is lawful to lie sometimes; and the Angel Raphael told Tobias "that it is good to hide the secrets of Kings." And when our life is concerned, or that of our father, mother, and kindred, against whom, although we know them guilty of a crime, we are not obliged to declare it; provided nevertheless that it be with the respect due to the magistrate, and that we beware of speaking lies whilst we intend only to decline discovery of the truth. It is the opinion of the Civilians that a father cannot be constrained to bear witness against his son, nor a son
against his father, except in the case of high treason.

These three things must not be confounded—to lie, to speak or tell a lie, and to do or act one. To lie, is to go against our own meaning; as when I know a thing, and not only conceal it, but speak the contrary. This action, according to some, is always evil, as it is never lawful to do evil that good may come of it. According to others, it is qualified according to the diversity of its end: for he who tells a lie to save a traveller’s life, who is pursued by thieves, seems to do better than if he exposed himself to their cruelty by his discovery. The physician who dissembles to his patient the danger of his disease, and thinks it enough to acquaint his domestics, does better than if he cast him into despair by a dismal prognostication; and when he cheers him up in suitable time and place by some pleasant made story, what he speaks can scarcely be reckoned amongst idle words. But he who lies for his profit, as many tradesmen do, sins proportionally to the deceit which he thereby causes; but he is most culpable who lies to the magistrates. One may tell or speak a lie without lying; namely, when one speaks a false thing conceiving it to be true. To do or speak a lie, is to lead a life contrary to one’s profession; as he who preaches well and lives ill. Whence we conclude, that many pre-
cautions are requisite to lie without committing an offence; that a lie is to be spoken as little as possible, and never to be done or acted at all.

Quest.—Which is better, to go to bed late, and rise betimes in the morning; or to do the contrary?

Ans.—All the great and most refined spirits, and even most men who have more than an ordinary burthen of affairs, generally go to bed late, and rise late, whereof several reasons may be assigned; as the affairs themselves, which insensibly steal away the time from us; the time sliding away faster from him who takes a pleasure in the doing of a thing, than it does from another who is in some trouble of mind or body; whence a tedious tale and a bad book are always thought too long. They therefore are to be thought the happiest, who, if they had their own wills, would go to bed latest; not only for that reason which made a certain king say, that he would be king as long as he could; inasmuch as, when he slept, there was no difference between him and the meanest of his subjects; but also for this, that night surprizing them before they had done all their business, the supper must be the later, and consequently the going to bed. The second reason is, that there ought to be a correspondence between the tranquillity of the mind and the body;
it being necessary that he who would take a good sleep should not be subject to any disturbance of mind; and that, rest being procured only by that order which every one has taken in his affairs, it is to be imagined that the later a man goes to bed the more business he has dispatched, and consequently there remains less to be done. Upon this ground it is, that the suppers of men of business are accounted the most quiet; for, having spent the whole day in trade, they then enjoy greater serenity. In the third place, a man should not go to bed till digestion be pretty well advanced; from the want or slowness whereof, hideous dreams, crudities, and apoplexies, proceed. Now this digestion is so much the more advanced, the later a man goes to bed. Fourthly, that custom is the best, from which it is in a man's power most easily to wean himself, and in the change whereof he will be subject to the least inconvenience. Now he who has contracted a habit of going to bed late, will find it a less inconvenience to go to bed betimes, that so he may rise betimes, or upon some other motive, than he shall to sit up late who has accustomed himself to go to bed betimes; for he will be sleepy and unfit for doing anything as soon as his bed-time is come. Fifthly, Hippocrates would not have a man enslave himself to an over-strict course of life, as such regular persons find it the greater difficulty
to support the miscarriages which oftentimes cannot be avoided in the ordinary course of life.

Now those who go to bed betimes are commonly more regular in the hours of supper, and all the other actions of the day; upon the exact observance whereof that of their bedtime depends. Now it is obvious to any, who consider the difference of professions, that there are but few that leave a man liberty to observe so exact a rule as this; so that being sometimes necessitated to make a breach of the rule of going to bed betimes, they must receive a far greater inconvenience from the neglect of it, than they ordinarily do who go to bed late. Sixthly, the same reason obliges phlegmatic persons, and such as are subject to catarrhs, to content themselves with little sleep, for their humidity, joined with that of sleep; augments their diseases; besides that sleeping, which moistens and cools, is not so well procured in that part of the day which is most cool and moist, that is, from nine at night till three in the morning, but rather towards the morning, at which time the blood begins to abate its heat, and dilates itself till ten in the morning, as all will acknowledge who are subject to the megrims, who find very great ease by morning-sleep, which accordingly is found to be the most delightful. Moreover those who rise too early in the morning are subject to head-ache in the afternoon, and
more easily moved with anger all the rest of the day; to effect which, the consideration of the temperament does very much conduce. The greater part of men being subject to choler, and the coolness and moisture of the night correcting that hot and dry distemper, it is the more convenient that sleep should be in the day-time.

But it is argued by some, that the restoration of the spirits obliges the animal to sleep, which ought to continue at least for such a space of time as amounts to the third part of that which a man has been awake, and should never exceed the one half of it. But the time when we should begin or end our sleep being left to our own discretion, it is requisite we should accommodate ourselves to the order of nature, which has appointed the day to labour, and the night to rest in. Nay, it is also the advice of Hippocrates, Galen, and other physicians, who think it not enough to direct rest in the night, and waking in the day, but also conceive very great hopes of those who in sickness are regular therein. Add to this, that darkness, silence, and the coolness of the night, are fit to recruit the spirits, and promote their retirement within; whereas light, noise, and heat of the day, are more proper to occasion their egress for the exercise of actions; which granted, he who observes not this rule, charges nature with an erroneous proceeding. And that this is her way is plain, since those animals which are guided only
by her motion thus act. Birds go to their rest, and awake with the sun; if any of our domestic creatures do otherwise, our irregularity is the cause; and that perversion is of no less dangerous consequence than that of the seasons, which is ever attended by diseases. And who makes any doubt but that the greatest perfection of the heavens consists in their regular motion, the principal cause of their duration, which order we should come as near to as we can in our actions; among which sleeping and waking, being the hinges on which all the others of our life depend—if there be any irregularity in these, confusion and disorder must needs be expected in all the rest; as may be seen in the lives of courtiers of both sexes, who turn night into day, and day into night, a course of life much different from that which is observed by the members of regulated companies. Besides, it is the morning that not only holds a stricter correspondence with the Muses, but is also the fittest time for the performance of all the functions of body and mind. Then is it that physicians prescribe exercise, in regard that the body being cleared of the excrements of the first and second concoction, is wholly disposed for the distribution of aliment, and evacuation of the excrements of the third; so that he who passes that part of the day about his affairs, besides the expedition he acquires, does by that means maintain the energy of his body and mind, which is
commonly dulled by sleeping in the day-time; which fills the head with vapours, and when exercise comes to succeed it in the warmest part of the day, the heat, which is then commonly greatest, makes it less supportable. Therefore Nature, which is a sure guide, inclines us to sleep in the evening; there being nothing but the multiplicity and distraction of evil affairs, which depriv ing us of that function, as it does of divers others, makes the life of man so much the less certain, the more he is involved in affairs; whereas the duration of that of animals, and next to them of country people, and such as comply with the conduct of Nature, is commonly of a greater length, and more certain.

**Quest.**—What is Friendship?

**Ans.**—Friendship is a powerful and strict union, which unites the lover and the loved, like that bond which in nature unites the matter and the form, the accidents and the substance. The cause of it is goodness, which, being proportionate to the body, produces a natural amity; to the passions, an animal amity; to the understanding a rational one; to the laws a political or civil; to religion a divine one. This goodness, consisting in a proportion and symmetry, is not different from beauty; and therefore we apprehend beauty in good things, and goodness and convenience in such as are handsome and graceful.
Besides goodness, which is the cause of friendship, and towards which our will is as necessarily carried as the intellect is towards truth, and all the senses towards their proper objects, resemblance and friendship itself are the causes of friendship. The first is founded upon the love we bear to ourselves: for as we love ourselves above anything else in this world, so we love those who resemble us, and symbolize with our humours and inclinations. Hence it is that one of the most common courses to please is, to conform ourselves to those by whom we desire to be affected; then friendship, the second means of acquiring love, is no less effectual, it being almost impossible not to love them who love us.

Friendship must be distinguished from love: for love is a passion arising from the imagination of a sensible good, and is found even in brute beasts; but friendship is one of the most excellent virtues, or rather the fruit of accomplished and perfect virtue. Virtue has place only among excellent persons, uniting them together in the exercises of virtue. Being once established, it is very durable. Therefore Seneca pronounces that the friendship which knows an end was never true. Some friendships there are whose foundation is profit and pleasure, but they are always imperfect. Whence it is that old men and young are ordinarily accounted incapable of true friendship; the former, because they scarcely regard
any thing besides profit; and the latter, because
their minds are more set upon what is pleasant
and agreeable, than upon what is honest and vir-
tuous. Nor is it ever found amongst wicked per-
sons. For a perfect friend must love another as
much as himself. And although the affection we
bear to ourselves be not true friendship, because
it must always have reference to another, yet it is
the most certain, yea the measure of perfect friend-
ship; and God has appointed it as the rule of our
love to our neighbour. Now, how can he be a per-
fected friend who does not love himself? how can he
agree with another who accords not with himself?
for a vicious man is his own chief enemy, while
he pursues the false and imaginary good instead of
the true—vice instead of virtue; and many times
he becomes his own murderer by intemperance
and other vices. He has always a civil war with-
in himself; his reason is never at peace with his
appetite; what one desires, the other rejects.
Consequently, he has never any inward joy; but
he is greatly displeased with being alone, and for
that reason always seeks the company of those
like himself, to divert his sad thoughts.
There is nothing comparable to friendship,
which is the salt and seasoning of human life,
the preserver of societies, and the most agreeable
and sweetest consolation that persons of virtue
and honour can have; by help of which a man
finds another self, to whom he may intrust his
most secret thoughts. It is therefore one of the
greatest blessings to have a friend, whom you may
make partaker of your felicity, which is so much
the greater, when it is communicated to others
without being diminished to yourself; and in case
adversity befall you, the same is sweetened by the
relation you make thereof to him who shares this
burden with you, and so renders it more support-
able. True it is, that although a friend be ne-
cessary in either fortune, yet he is more advan-
tage to us in adversity; in which a friend supplies
his friend with health and counsel, and is thereby
distinguished from a false one, who loves only
for the sake of his own pleasure and profit. Now
whatever is excellent has most of unity. And as a
river divided into several streams is more weak,
so friendship shared among many is always lan-
guid and impotent. Besides, a friend should be
complacent to his friend in everything, and they
ought to be but one soul living in two bodies.
Now it is as hard to please many, as it is impos-
sible to please all the world. And should two
friends at the same time implore the succour of a
third, he could not betake himself to both toge-
ther, nor consequently satisfy the duty of friend-
ship.

Friendship is either natural, spiritual, or moral.
The natural is between father and children, bre-
thren and sisters, husband and wife, and between
kindred or alliance. The spiritual is between
those who profess the same law and religion. The moral is between such as are united together on the account of virtue. It consists only in the union of wills, not of understandings; for I may have an opinion different from that of my friend, without prejudicing our friendship, but not a different will. And as honesty does not take away piety, nor piety honesty; so spiritual and moral friendship do not destroy one another. For I may love one morally whom I do not love spiritually; that is, I may unite with him in the exercises of honesty or virtue, though I differ in those of piety.

Quest.—Why do all men naturally desire knowledge?

Ans.—Several answers may be given though the reason may appear different. Aristotle rightly observes, that the first question ought to be whether the thing be, or exist; because it is in vain to seek the causes of that which has no being. It is therefore first to be inquired, whether it be true that all men have a natural desire of knowledge, and then the causes thereof must be sought. That which is natural must be found in all; so we say it is natural to a stone to tend downwards, because all of them do so. But it is so far from being true that all men are desirous to know and learn, that, for rectifying the defect of such desire, we see teachers sometimes armed with the
rod, sometimes forced to use allurements and rewards, and employ all imaginable artifices, to excite a desire of learning in such as want it, the number of whom is always greater than of others. Hence it is that in a school of five hundred pupils you shall scarcely find fifty that have well profited in learning; and amongst a hundred masters of trade, scarcely ten good workmen. Moreover, there are some men who have not much less of the beast than of the man. And as the greatest clerks are not always the wisest men, so neither are they the most happy. The best and most knowing philosophers are not the men that do their business best. It will be said, that to understand the means of advancing one's self is a sort of knowledge; and they who have not a genius for learning, have one for other things, and profit therein as well as in the sciences. But I answer, that philosophy being the key of all other discipline, it is a sign they will not open the chest, when they refuse the key of it.

All naturally desire to know, but not all things, nor at all times, nor by all the ways prescribed them; every one would learn after his own mode and things proportionable to his reach; and as when these conditions meet together, they excite the desire; so when any one is wanting, they cause disgust. Thus one is passionately affected to Algebra, which deters the wit of another. One matter may please at the beginning, and become
distasteful in the continuance; and the same subject being created in familiar discourse will render you attentive, yet displease you in a more lofty style, which on the other side would content some other. It is not therefore to be wondered, if some minds have reluctance against the constraint offered to be laid upon them. Supposing this desire of knowledge not general, it is demanded how it comes to be so great in many persons, that some have relinquished all their fortune for it, others have spent their whole age in attaining it, others have put out their eyes the better to attend it, and some lost their lives for it. Surely they all do thus for some good. Now good is divided into three kinds; and, correspondently, some do it for profit, fitting themselves to gain themselves a livelihood; others for honour, and to gain the prerogatives which knowledge procures to the most learned; others, only for the pleasure they find in study; and not for the sake of knowledge itself; for when we once have attained the knowledge of a thing, it affords us delight no longer; whence it is that excellent workmen are always poor, because so soon as they have arrived to a perfection of skill, they leave all further search to others; their only pleasure was in the acquisition; this pleasure herein resembling all other sorts, which consist only in action, and not in acquiescence or satisfaction. But may
it not also be thus, because our soul being a number, always desires and aims to perfect itself? And as no number can be assigned so great, but some other may be added to it, even to infinity; so our soul is capable of receiving new light and new notions, to infinity. Or else, as every thing tends to its natural place; so our soul, being of celestial origin, aspires to the infinite knowledge of God by that of finite things.

The reason why both young and old desire to know, is, because of the extreme pleasure which they take in knowing things. But if some be not inclined to it, it is in regard of the difficulties, which abate indeed, but cannot wholly extinguish their natural ardour. This pleasure is apparent, in that we take delight to know not only true things, but such as we are conscious to be notoriously false; yea sometimes we are more delighted with the latter than the former, provided they have some pretty conceits, as with stories, fables and romances. For there is nothing so small and inconsiderable in nature, wherein the mind finds not incomparable delight. "The gods," saith Aristotle, "are as well in the least insects, as in the most bulky animals;" and to despise little things is, in his judgment, to do like children. For, on the contrary, as in art, the less place a picture takes up, the more it is esteemed; and the Iliads of Homer were sometimes the more ad-
mired for being comprised in a nutshell. So in nature, the less volume things are in, the more worthy they are of admiration. Now if there be so much pleasure in seeing the figures and representations of natural things, because we observe the workman's industry in them; there is much more contentment in clearly beholding those things themselves, and remarking in their essence properties and virtues, the power and wisdom of nature far transcending that of art. But if the knowledge of natural things affords us so great delight, that of supernatural things delights us in a higher measure; and it is also much more difficult, because they are remote from our senses, which are the ordinary conveyances of knowledge. Wherefore, there being pleasure in knowing both great things and small, natural and supernatural: it is no wonder if man, who usually follows delectable good, takes delight in knowing.

We love the sense of seeing above all the rest, because it supplies us with more knowledge than the rest; because man, being mindful of the place of his origin, desires to raise himself above plants and other animals: by sense he advances himself above plants; by memory above certain animals who have none; by experience above them all; but by the use of reason, from which proceeds science, men excel one another. And, as Seneca saith, men are all equal in their beginning and their end, that is, as to life and death, not differ-
ing but in their interval, whereof science is the fairest ornament. The cause of this desire of knowing proceeds then from the natural inclination every thing has to follow its own good. Now the good of man, as man, is to know. For as a thing exists not but so far as it acts, therefore the reasonable soul, being the most noble and perfect of all forms, desires to employ itself incessantly in its action, which is the knowledge of things. Indeed every thing strives after its own operation. As soon as the plant is issued out of the earth, it thrusts forward till it comes to its just bigness. The eye cannot without pain be hindered from seeing; silence causes sadness.

The intellect becomes every thing which it understands. Hence man, the most inconsistent of all things, is carried so ardently to the knowledge of all things; which finding not worthy of him, he relinquishes, till he be arrived at the knowledge of his Creator; to whom conforming himself, he desires to know nothing more, but acquiesces, contemplating in him, as in a mirror, all other things of the world.

We have the seeds and treasures of knowledge hidden in ourselves; which, longing to be exerted and reduced from power into act, incessantly solicit us to put them forth. Hence comes the desire of knowing, or rather awakening those species which are perfected in us by use, and in time wholly displayed. Teachers do not infuse know-
ledge into the children whom they instruct, but only assist them to produce it out of folds and recesses of the mind, in which otherwise it would remain unprofitable, and like matter without form. As the steel does not give fire to the flint, but elicits the same of it, so those natural lights and notices being at first enveloped with clouds, when their veil is taken away, and they are loosened from the contagion of the senses, they extremely delight those who bore them inclosed in their breast, and needed help to exclude them.

**Quest.**—Is there such a thing in nature as a Vacuum; and what are the opinions of the learned about it?

**Ans.**—The vulgar call that empty which is not filled with some visible body. But the philosophers give this name to a place destitute of all corporeity whatsoever, yet capable of being filled; at least, if any such can be in nature; for it cannot be understood of those imaginary spaces beyond the heavens, which, Pythagoras said, served for their respiration, whereof he conceived they stood in need, as animals do. Democritus and Leucippus admitted a twofold vacuum: one in the air, serving for local motion; the other in all mixed bodies requisite to the internal growth, and also to the lightness of things; alleging that according as their atoms are closely or loosely connected, and of various figures, so bodies are light
or heavy. But these opinions being antiquated, some adhere to the common one, which admits no vacuum at all.

Others say, that since nature abhors a vacuum, there must be such a thing; for of two contraries, one supposes the other. And indeed it is impossible for any local motion, condensation or rarefaction, and inward augmentation, to be made without admitting vacuity: for, as for local motion, when a body removes out of place, that into which it enters is either full or empty; not full, for then it could not receive a new body without penetration of dimensions, which nature cannot suffer, therefore it must be empty. For this reason, Melissus affirmed that all things are immoveable; for being unable to comprehend how motion could be made without, and unwilling to admit vacuity, therefore he denied both. To say that bodies give way one to another, is to increase the difficulty instead of resolving it; for the body which gives place to another must displace a third, and this a fourth, and so to infinity. Moreover, a vacuum is proved by condensation and rarefaction; for the former being made when a body is reduced into a lesser extent, and its parts approach nearer one another without loss of any, either these parts penetrate one another, or else there was some void space, which is possessed by themselves when they are pressed together, seeing, if they had been so con-
tiguous as that there were not any empty pores between them, they would not have come closer together. Likewise rarefaction, being caused when the parts recede one from another, if no other body interpose, there must needs be a vacuum between the parts, or else they must have been one within another. If it be said, that proportionably as one thing is condensed in one place, another is as much raresied somewhere else, to fill up the vacuum, and so on the contrary; this is harder to be conceived than a vacuum. Lastly, accretion, or growth, which is caused by the reception of aliment in the body, could not be made, if there were not some void passages to receive this aliment. And, to conclude, experience shews us, that a pail of water will receive its own measure of ashes or lime, which it could not do if there were no vacuity.

A third opinion is, that every thing affects unity, not only because God, who is the universal cause of all, is one, and most simple, and every thing ought to be like its cause; but that all things find their good in unity, as they do their ruin in disunion. Wherefore every thing in the world is so united, that there is not any empty space between two; and contiguity is as necessary in the parts of the world, as contiguity in those of a living creature: for if there were a vacuum in the world, the heavens would not transmit their influences into the elements and
their compounds, for the preservation of which the same are absolutely necessary; considering that, whatever acts upon a distant thing, must do it by some medium uniting the agent and the patient.

But it is said, that since nature offers violence to herself, to prevent inanity, and all things quit their particular interest for that of the publick, undoubtedly there is no such thing as a vacuum in nature; for we see that she makes heavy things to ascend, light things to descend, and breaks the solidest and strongest things without any external violence, only to avoid the inconvenience of vacuity. If bellows be compressed, and the holes stopped, no human force can expand them without breaking: a bottle, of what material soever, filled with boiling water and stopped, and put into cold, immediately flies into pieces. You cannot draw wine out of a vessel, unless you give entrance to the air by some hole. A vessel being full of heated air, and its orifice applied to the water, sucks the same upwards; a cupping-glass, when the heated and subtile air in it becomes condensed and takes up less room, attracts the flesh into itself. Syphons and pumps, by which the water is made to ascend higher than its source, are founded wholly upon this avoiding of vacuity. Our own bodies also afford an instance; for the aliment could not be assimilated in each part, without the suction and attraction
which is made of it, to supply the wants of what is consumed by exercise or heat; otherwise the blood and nourishment would tend only downwards by their own weight. And what makes the effect of blood-letting and evacuation so sensible, but this very flight of vacuum?

A notable vacuity, and of great extent, cannot be without a miracle; but some small inter-spersed vacuities may be between the particles of the elements and compounds, like the pores of our bodies: for Nature abhors the former, and can do nothing without the latter; it being impossible for qualities to be transmitted to any subject through a great vacuum, which would hinder the perception of our senses, and the fire itself from heating at the least distance. There could be no breathing in it; birds could not fly in it: in brief, no action could be exercised in it but those whereof the principle is in the thing itself, and which needs no medium, as local motion, which would be more easily made, because there could be no resistance.

Nature does what she can to hinder a vacuum, yet suffers one when she is forced to it; for if you suck all the air out of a bottle, then stop it exactly, and having put it under water, with the mouth downwards, open it again, the water will immediately ascend, to fill the vacuity left by the exsuction of the air. And if with a syringe you force air into a vessel strong enough to endure
such violence, when the pores of the air, which were empty before, come to be filled, it will, of its own accord, drive out the water very impetuously, which was first put into it. Likewise, though the air naturally keeps above the water, yet, by enclosing it in some sort of vessel, you may violently make it continue under the water.

**Quest.**—Pray oblige me with the several opinions you have met with concerning the capricious or extravagant humours of women?

**Ans.**—It should not be thought that all women are capricious; but only the reason inquired of those that are so, and why are they more than man? To allege the difference of souls, and suppose that as there is an order in the celestial hierarchies, whereby the Archangels are placed above Angels, so the spirits of men are more perfect than those of women, were to fetch a reason too far off, and prove one obscure thing by another more so. Nor is the cause to be found in their bodies, taken in particular; for then the handsome would be free from this vice, the actions which borrow grace from their subject appearing to us of the same nature, and consequently their virtues would seem more perfect, and their defects more excusable; whereas, for the most part, the fairest are the most culpable. We must therefore recur to the correspondence and proportion of the body and the soul; for
sometimes a soul lights upon a body so well framed, and organs so commodious for the exercise of its faculties, that there seems more of a superbem than of a man in its actions, whence some persons of either sex attract the admiration of the world. On the contrary, other souls are so ill lodged, that their actions have less of man than of brute; and because there are more women than men found, whose spirits are ill quartered and faculties depraved, hence comes their capricious and peevish humour. The manner of living to which the laws and customs subject women, contribute much to their defects; for, leading a sedentary life, wherein they have also the same objects before their eyes, and their minds not being diverted by civil actions, as those of men are, they make a thousand reflections upon their present condition, comparing it with those whereof they account themselves worthy. This puts their modesty to the rack, and oftentimes carries them beyond the respect and bounds which they proposed to themselves; especially if a woman of good wit sees herself married by a weak husband, and is ambitious of shewing herself. Another, judging herself to merit more than her rival, not knowing to whom to complain of her unhappiness, does every thing in spite.

The word capricious is used to signify the extravagant humour of most women, because there is no animal they resemble more than a goat,
whose motions are so irregular: for such as have searched into the nature of this animal find that its blood is so sharp, and spirits so ardent, that it is always in a fever; and hence it is, that being agitated with this heat, which is natural to it, it leaps as soon as it comes into the world. Now the cause of this temper is the conformation of the brain, which they say is like that of a woman; the ventricles of which being very small, are easily filled with sharp and biting vapours, which cannot evaporate, as Aristotle affirms, because their sutures are closer than those of men. Those vapours prick the nerves and membranes, and so cause those extraordinary and capricious motions. Hence it is that women are more subject to the megrims, and other diseases in the head, than men. And as those that sell a goat never warrant it sound, as they do other animals, there is no less excuse in reference to women: which caused the Emperor Aurelius to say, "that his father-in-law Antoninus, who had done so much to others, had done him mischief enough in giving him his daughter, because he found so much bone to pick in a little flesh." Moreover, the Naturalists say that the goat is an enemy to the olive-tree, which is a symbol of peace, whereunto women are not over well-affected: for, not to mention the first divorce which woman caused between God and man, by her liquorishness, her talking, her ambition, her luxury, he
obstinacy, and other vices, are the most common causes of all the quarrels which arise in families and in civil life. If you would have a troop of goats pass over any difficult place, you need force but one to do it, and all the rest will follow: so women are naturally envious, and no sooner see a new fashion but they must follow it. And gardeners compare women and girls to a flock of goats, who roam and browse incessantly, holding nothing inaccessible to their curiosity. There is but one considerable difference between them: the goat wears horns, and the women makes others wear them.

A third opinion is, that there is more resemblance between a woman and a mule, than between a woman and a goat. For the mule is the most testy and capricious of all beasts, fearing a shadow more than a spur; so a woman fears every thing but what she ought to fear. The obstinacy of the mule, which is so great that it has grown into a proverb, is inseparable from the whole sex, most of them being gifted with a spirit of contradiction. Mules delight to go in companies; so do women. The bells and muzzles of the one have some correspondence with the ear-rings and veils of the others; and both love priority. The more quiet you allow a mule, it becomes the more restive; so women become more vicious in idleness. Neither of them willingly admits the bridle between their teeth.
Lastly, the mule that has seemed most tractable all its time, one day or other pays his master with a kick; and the woman that has seemed most discreet, at one time or other commits some notorious folly.

Those who invented the little medals representing the upper part of a woman and the lower of a mule, commend this sex while they think to blame it; for there is nothing more healthy, strong, patient of hunger and the injuries of seasons, or that bears more, or is more serviceable, than a mule. Now, if certain actions of women seem full of perverseness and caprice to some, possibly others will account them to proceed from vivacity of spirit and greatness of courage; and as the Poet, in great commendation of his black mistress, chanted her cheeks of jet and bosom of ebony, so, whatever some people's mistake may say to the contrary, the most capricious woman is the most becoming. Nor is this humour unprofitable to them; for as people are not forward to provoke a mule, for fear of kicks, so we are more shy of women than otherwise we should be, for fear of caprices; yet some hold that this capriciousness of women follows the moon; others, that the flower of beans contributes very much to it.

If credit is to be given to experience, Solomon, who had a thousand women, compares an ill capricious woman to a tigress and a lioness.
Such were Medea, Xantippe, and many others. Moreover, the Poets say that the Gods, intending to punish Prometheus for having stolen the celestial fire, gave him a wife. And when Satan afflicted Job, he deprived him of his flocks, of his houses, and of his children; but had a care not to take his wife from him, knowing that this was the only way to make him desperate, as it would have done without God's special grace. The Rabbins say, three sorts of persons were exempted from public charges, and could not be called into judgment; namely, the poor, the nephritic, and he that had a bad wife; because they had business enough at home, without needing any abroad. The laws, likewise, exempted new-married men from going to the wars the first year of their marriage; allowing them this time, which is the roughest and most important, to reduce their fierce spouses to duty; which if the husband could not effect, a little bill of divorce did the business. Though the Chaldeans used not so much formality, but only extinguished the domestic fire which the priest kindled at the marriage; yet the privilege was not reciprocal, neither divine nor human laws having ever allowed women to relinquish their husbands; for then, being as capricious and inconstant as they are, they would have changed every day. For the same reason, the laws have always prohibited to women the administration of public.
affairs. And the religion of the Mahometan Arabians assigns them a paradise apart; because, say they, if the woman should come into the paradise of the man, they would disturb all the feast.

__Quest._—How did beasts come into islands? and how did some remote islands come first to be inhabited?

__Ans._—The latter question appears the less difficult; and, as the former may, perhaps, have some dependence on it, shall be first answered. As History leaves us in the dark, all we can do is to advance some probable hypothesis, which must stand till it appears chargeable with any absurdity. We say then that the world was first peopled from the East, as Holy Writ assures, and history and reason persuade; arts and arms first flourished there, and almost innumerable armies appeared in early times, whence repeated numbers still issuing, in the same course with the sun, proceeded from place to place, and island to island, we mean those less remote from the continent, and which in clear weather might be seen from it, and ships easily got thither, for there was shipping as early as Noah. But what is it to those more remote, as America, when the compass was not invented; first, let that be proved an island, and then we will dispute further on it: in the mean time we shall take the liberty to suppose
on, that it was peopled from the North-west part of Tartary, which, if not a continent, must yet be much nearer to those parts than our side of the world.—For the second question: Beasts might pass the same way, and perhaps easier than men. If it is all land, through inaccessible snows and woods; if only some strait and narrow sea separates, nothing more common than for sailors in that part of the world to find great numbers of living beasts floating on the ice; and this way, as well as others, wild beasts might be driven over, or be there without so much trouble, if we admit this following hypothesis, wherein I can see no absurdity. That there were islands before the flood cannot be proved by history or reason. Let us suppose there were none, but some actually made by its fury and violence; other parts of the continent, only disposed or prepared for islands, continuing joined by a very small isthmus; while that remained, there was a bridge large enough for beasts to go over, which being, in process of time, worn away, whereof tradition, observation, and history, give us instances, those peninsulas were thereby transformed into complete islands.

**Quest.**—What is the cause of titillation?

**Ans.**—Lord Bacon has observed, that a man is the most ticklish where the shin is thinnest, which, as he adds, causes a quicker emission of the spirits; but this cannot be the efficient reason,
because another can tickle me where I cannot tickle myself, and my skin is no thicker when another touches it than when I touch it myself. The certain reason is, the abundance of nerves, which are the ministers of sensation, as, for example, the palms of the hands, and the soles of the feet, are very nervous; another reason is, the unaccustomedness of touching those places, as appears in this—That the hand is not so ticklish as the foot, because it is more used to it.

**Quest.**—Whether it is possible for any person to die of conceit?

**Ans.**—Fancy is very strong in some persons, especially in those of a melancholy disposition: the reason of the Doctor, in the reign of King James the First, who undertook either to kill or cure by fancy, is no foreign answer to the question. The Doctor begged some condemned persons to make the trial; and choosing one amongst the rest whose constitution he thought might be most proper to work upon, he preserved him till the last, settling the rest, one after another, up to the chin in warm water afterwards; opened a vein, and let them bleed to death, using to them that stood by such remarks as—"Now such and such veins are exhausted; now so and so;" till they expired; and coming to the last person, he was accordingly stripped, and placed like the rest, when the Doctor made a false orifice that would not
bleed, using the same remarks of him to the bystanders as he did of the rest; and when he was going to make the last remark he made for the rest, the person swooned away, and died without loss of blood, purely by fancy.

---

*Quest.*—What place does the Sun set in, and where does it rise?

*Ans.*—All the world over.

---

*Quest.*—What is worse than Ingratitude?

*Ans.*—

---

*Quest.*—What is the reason that simple water distilled from green herbs is white and clear, without the least tincture of green in it?

*Ans.*—Colour in general consists in these two things, a certain disposition of the parts of the matter to be seen, and the medium through which it is seen. For instance, a coal has millions of little pores when viewed by a microscope, which imbibe the light, and being not able to make that reflection that a closer body can, gives that idea which we call blackness. White is always found in a body which has an infinite number of asperous little pointed particles of matter, which, by their aptitude to give a great confused reflected light, afford us the colour which is called by that name; and thus the *Via Lactea* in the heavens, which appears white,
is only a multitude of little stars, which are only discernible by the help of a good telescope; these, by their variety of reflections, which by reason of their closeness cause a confusion of light, give an idea of whiteness. Again, the change of the light medium alters the colour of things, as by day-light silk and gold have other colours than they have in the night. This premised, the question is very readily resolved, and all questions of the same nature; as, why red port should turn to white wine in its passage? The reason is this: the disposition of parts that was in the liquid are by motion and fermentation altered, and, by consequence, the same light falling upon different positions of the particles of which any liquid is compounded, must necessarily give a different reflection, or produce in us a different idea of colour.

**Quest.**—Why the Moon's beams do not convey a warmth as the Sun's beams do?

**Ans.**—The first reason is, the great distance the Moon is from us, and, consequently, the rays of the Sun are reflected very weakly. Were we upon the Moon, we should find the rays reflect from all around its atmosphere as the rays of the Sun falling on the Earth reflect a great heat, especially from walls and sides of houses; and even as our culinary fires, having a metal reflector set behind the meat while roasting, reflect a great heat back again. The second reason may be, the
roughness and porosity of the Moon's body, which is not so apt for reflection as if it were smooth and close. And lastly, because of the globosity of the Moon; for, being round, it reflects the Sun's rays every way, and does not collect them so strongly for any one place as if it were a plain or other figure.

Quest.—If the Moon has no innate light of its own, what is that faint light that may be seen when the Moon is in the new, as we call it, for all the rest of the circumference besides the little enlightened parts has a weak light?

Ans.—As that planet is a Moon to our Earth, so our Earth is as it were a Moon to that planet, and it is the reflection of the Sun's light from our Earth upon the planet which gives it that weak light.

Quest.—Whence proceeds weeping and laughing for the same cause?

Ans.—It is from an equal compressure of the muscles, by the passions; as, for instance, touch a place of your body, and it itches; rub the same place hard, and it smarts. In like manner, when the passions act easily upon the muscles, a smile ensues; if a little harder, it causes laughter; if harder, it causes laughter and crying at the same time; but if it be very violent, it causes only crying.
Quest.—Why an owl can see better by faint and imperfect light, than at such time as when the sun shines in its vigour?

Ans.—Some creatures have the pupil of their eye very large, and are not subject to so little a contraction as is requisite for a great light; as cats, rats, mice, owls, and some few more: whereas, the generality of creatures are naturally furnished with pupils, or eyesights, that will grow greater or less according to the degree of light. As, for instance, when a man has been in the dark for some considerable time, and comes suddenly into a light place; or when a candle is brought into a dark room, and a man wakes out of his sleep—the sudden light dazzles the eye, by reason the pupil of the eye was extended before to co-operate with the act of visibility; nor can the eye be easy till it has again received a proper degree of contraction for the quality of light, and a due representation of objects. This may also be farther confirmed by this instance: cover one of your eyes, and the pupil of the other will dilate to supply the office of that which is covered; uncover that eye again, and the other pupil will contract, for the reason above. From the one it appears that the creatures above-named, being furnished with a great eye, sights which admit not of a contraction proper for great lights can see best in lesser lights; yet they cannot see at all where there is no light.
**Quest.**—Whether the least particle of matter is infinitely divisible?

**Ans.**—Yes, if you can find eyes always strong enough to discern the last subdivision, and instruments fine enough for such subdivisions; also, if both this strong eye and fine instrument will last for ever; for infinite divisions, and infinite time or eternity, if you please to call it so, are inseparable. 16 Prop. 3 Euclid. will tell you something more of this nature, if you are mathematically inclined.

---

**Quest.**—What is the reason that Millers are more usually deaf than other persons?

**Ans.**—We read that those people that live near the fall of the River Nile cannot hear one another unless they speak loud, and with an extreme vehemency; and that they soon become deaf; which proceeds from a continued and too much extension of the membrane of the ear called the drum. We have an instance in the Philosophical Transactions, of a person that could hear when he rode in a coach; but when he was in a room, or silent place, where there was no vehement agitation of air to extend the sunken membrane, he heard not without difficulty; and thus it is with a miller, whose employ is amongst a continued noise of waters, &c.; for the drum of the ear, being continually stretched by the agitation of the air, when he comes out of the noise grows remiss, therefore not so capable of hearing as be-
fore; just as an alteration is effected in the sound of another drum, according to the straitness or looseness of its bearing.

**Quest.**—What is the most delightful thing to a man in this world?

**Ans.**—Much as he is. If intemperate and luxurious, he delights most in what he ought most to be ashamed of; virtuous men will take the greatest delight in fair and virtuous actions, the noblest whereof we esteem to be obliging a friend, or forgiving an enemy. But were we asked what it is we esteem most delightful to the most of men, we should make no scruple to affirm, it is getting money; since for this only they will lose their pleasure, part with their virtue, and sell their honour.

**Quest.**—Whether it is better to lose the sight, or hearing?

**Ans.**—Seeing is the more pleasant, hearing the more useful sense. Without hearing, if born deaf, or so from infancy, it is not easy to conceive how any can be taught so much as the principles of Religion, or any useful knowledge; both which are frequently found to great perfection in the blind, they being generally masters of vast memories, as having none of those objects which so frequently distract our thoughts by employing our eyes. Not but that there have been some,
who, having been deaf from their nativity, or infancy, have almost unaccountably attained to the knowledge of many useful truths, and understanding what is said, by observing the motion of the speaker's lips, nay, sometimes only by feeling them speak, or laying their hand on their mouth while they do it; whereof see a remarkable story in the Reverend Bishop of Sarum's Letters, Letter IV. p. 248.

**Quest.**—Why is it that the Sun can easily enlighten with its rays the deepest waters, and yet cannot penetrate the clouds, which dissolve into nothing but water?

**Ans.**—It is because there are many earthy exhalations, and smoky vapours taken up into the clouds, which make it so obscure and dark, that the Sun cannot entirely penetrate to give light. And that the waters, on the contrary, that are of themselves clear and neat, are more susceptible of the light and brightness of the Sun.

**Quest.**—How comes it that the heat of the Sun makes our flesh tawny and black, and, on the contrary, whitens linen?

**Ans.**—Because its heat boiling the humours of our bodies, they become blackish, and by that means stain our skin. But linen drying itself more easily in the Sun becomes whiter, the humidity thereof being evaporated; for it is humi-
dity that takes away from it its whiteness, even as it may be perceived that water thrown upon on a whited wall will blacken it; but, when dried up, it returns to its whiteness.

---

**Quest.**—Why is snow so profitable to the fruits of the earth?

**Ans.**—By covering the earth, it protects the fruits from the cold of the winter; it hinders the growing of useless herbs; it partakes somewhat of fatness, because of the air inclosed in it; which, melted into water, is fattening to the earth. If fruits bud too soon, it drives away the vigour to the root, by which means they are better nourished.

---

**Quest.**—Which is hardest, to get, or to keep, an estate, knowledge, or the like?

**Ans.**—As the harder a weight is to be lifted up, it is the harder to be held up; so the more labour there is in acquiring, the more there is also in preserving the thing acquired. Hence those who have undergone hard toils to get an estate, are more busied in keeping it than they who receive one from another without pains. On which account it was, that Aristotle says, "Benefactors love those they do good to, better than they are beloved by them, because it is more trouble to oblige than to be obliged; and women love and preserve their children so tenderly and dearly, be-
cause of the pain they undergo in bringing them forth. Yet, because this sex is designed to look after the goods of the family, and men to procure them, it may seem thereby that it is harder to get than to keep; otherwise the strongest would not have the more difficult task, which equity and justice require them to have.

**Quest.**—Why have some naturally their hair curled?

**Ans.**—Galen gives many reasons; saying, the hair curls from the hot and dry temperament of the persons; as one may perceive that all small bodies, long and strait, dried by the fire, do bow and fold. Or else this may proceed, says he, from the feebleness of the matter of the hair; which, being not able to remain straight in its length, doth bow and bend itself back again; or else, according to Aristotle, this may proceed from the double motion of the matter of hairs which is fuliginous exhalations: thus, being something hot and dry, and by that means partaking both of an earthy and fiery quality, the earthy tending downwards, and the fiery upwards, it must necessarily follow, that by this double and contrary motion the hair be curled. All which reasons are very probable.
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**Quest.**—What is the reason that the Evangelists say nothing of what happened to our Saviour before his thirteenth year, excepting only the disputation with the Doctors when he was about twelve, which St. Luke relates?

**Ans.**—The end an Author proposes to himself in writing should be his rule to direct him what to say, and what to omit; and it was not the design of the Evangelists, simply to write the life of our Saviour, but to transmit the Gospel to posterity, that is, a doctrine, which, under the condition of repentance and future obedience, promises to man the forgiveness of sins, and eternal life; which Gospel is composed of two parts, one of which is doctrinal, the other historical, of which
last they have made no more use than was necessary to confirm this doctrine, as the history of the miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ, which could properly begin only at his baptism, because it was from that time he began publicly to preach and to do miracles. So the Evangelists have omitted all that passed before; and if they had said any thing, it ought rather to have been looked upon as a kind of preamble, to make the person of our Saviour known, than the beginning of an exact history of his life.

**Quest.** — It being certain from history that those who have been founders of Laws have generally pretended divine inspiration for them, as Lycurgus, Numa, Mahomet, and others; by what criterion may we discover when such pretensions as these are false and fabulous; and, if there be any such, when they are true and real?

**Ans.** — It cannot be denied that we ought to be very cautious that we have as good testimony and argument as the nature of the thing will bear, before we believe any such revelations; the consequences of it being so very great, as we are more careful in receiving gold than baser metals, because the loss is greater if false coin be put upon us. Nor yet, on the other side, is there any necessity, or reason, for fear of being over-credulous, to run into the contrary extreme; such a complete scepticism being a greater enemy to science than
credulity itself, because the credulous man may believe something that is false, but the sceptic nothing that is true, though he has never so certain and necessary cause persuading its belief.

It is extremely suspicious that a pretence to inspiration is false and ill-grounded, when those are wicked men who pretend to have it.

Nor is it any more reasonable to believe a man in such cases on his own single word, without any better or stronger attestation. Indeed, this seems so far from reasonable, that it is highly ridiculous; for it makes the testimony degenerate from divine to purely human, as far as concerns us, even supposing it could be true. This must be granted, that, if the mission of any person from Heaven has been first attested in an extraordinary manner, it is but reasonable to believe him for the future, for the work's sake, unless he plainly destroys what he before built; for we are not to suppose God would attest an impostor, and what God does attest must of necessity be true. But he who pretends to come in the name of God, in an extraordinary manner, as inspired by Him, and yet has no credentials, no undoubted sign or miracle to attest his mission; he really comes in his own name, and deserves to be treated as an impostor.

Nor can any laws have a divine origin when they are contradictory to the laws of Nature, common morality, or right reason. Now that
there is such a thing as law natural, or some common inclinations to, and sentiments of, what is just and right, has been granted even by the worst of men, a Dionysius himself owning some respect for it, and refusing to violate that law, at the same time he owned he had broken those of his country. Indeed, the best and clearest test of a law must be common unprejudiced reason, if it is against that, so as to be absurd and ridiculous plainly prejudicial to the interests of mankind, destructive of Religion and morality, it cannot with any propriety be said to be a law, nor can it proceed from God. And further, if we had not a natural power, when unprejudiced, of making a judgment in such cases, why would God appeal to us concerning the equality of his ways?

Now the opposites to all these must be the surest notices of true revelation: as, 1. When we observe a man of an exemplary holy life, no way enthusiastical, full of unaffected religion and devotion, not given to superstition, not credulous or ambitious, or covetous, or unjust; of good sense, of a candid and brave temper: it is not at all reasonable to believe he will impose any falsehood upon mankind; and if God reveal himself at all, it is much more probable he will do it to such an one, than to one of a quite contrary character: and what is so probable it cannot be unreasonable to believe, though it is so not to believe it when we have positive arguments for
the reality of it, and that the most demonstrative that the nature of the thing is capable of.

For, in the second place, the same reason that makes it highly weak to believe any matter of fact, especially of so great consequence, where it is not thoroughly attested, makes it as ridiculous and extravagant to refuse or disown our belief to such fact as has sufficient and indubitable testimonies to confirm it, as strong and convincing, and perhaps more so, than any we have for our own estates or parents, or that there were such persons as Julius Cæsar or Alexander. And in this number may we reckon numerous witnesses to the truth of some things evidently surpassing the power of art and nature, in confirmation of any law, as of divine origin; especially when, in the last place, the matter of this law is highly agreeable to the laws of nature and unprejudiced reason; when it plainly tends to the making of mankind wiser, and better, and happier. And, as a corollary to the whole, we may fairly add, that such laws as are contrary to those which we have all the reasons alleged to believe divinely inspired cannot themselves be so, because God can no more reveal contradictions than he can act them.

It will be proper now to bring all this to bear, and make it plain and useful, by descending to instances in the most famed Legislators of former
ages, who pretended divine authority, and an immediate mission from Heaven.

We shall confine ourselves to those mentioned in the objection, Lycurgus, Numa, Mahomet, adding Solon. And here, not to detract from the wisdom and genius which most or all of these men were really possessed of, nor from some good principles they seem to be endowed with, this, in the beginning, lies against them all—that they were not so much as honest men, much less religious, who would endeavour to persuade their people that they came immediately from God, when it was all an imposture. It is not sufficient to urge, in their excuse, that it was for the benefit of their people, and only a pious fraud; for the falsehood and arrogancy is the same, and cannot change its nature from any prudential reasons; nay, worse, all of them are guilty of blasphemy, as well as forgery, for entitling the Divine Being to laws so contradictory to His nature, and that reason He has printed on the breasts of all mankind. Nor can there be a greater argument of the falseness of their rules than the methods they used to support them, for truth can never need falsehood to strengthen or recommend it. Of Lycurgus, it gives deep suspicion of his cruelty and loose inclinations, that he made such laws for his citizens, not for an exigency only, and, as Solon said of his, "because they would receive no better;" but such
as he used all means to render eternal, and wisely starved himself to make them so; and that, when he had the citizens under his power, he might have imposed what he pleased upon them; and in effect did what must needs have been much more difficult and grievous, as the equality of lands, estates, and several others, nay, the secret laws, and that of the children, which were plainly his own imposition and invention, and seem to proceed from his nature, not any political necessity that may be urged in their defence. It is true, he forgave Alexander, when he struck out his eye, and it was the most politic thing he could do; for thereby he made many of the citizens his friends, which otherwise might have proved his desperate and implacable enemies.

Solon, whatever his wisdom might be, certainly was not so extraordinary for his honesty. There could not be a more soft, effeminate, licentious man, than he was.

Numa, according to the account historians give us, was the best man of all the heathen lawgivers; but yet is not without such faults as were wholly inexcusable. He was intolerably superstitious and enthusiastic; he would not so much as accept the crown of Rome till he had asked leave of every crow or owl that flew by him. He propagated these foolish superstitions among the people, and rooted them so deep in their religion and common conversation, that it made them
weak and fearful on the most frivolous and ridic-
culous occasions, which sometimes was the loss of generals, armies, and kingdoms, taking them off from a wiser dependance on Heaven, and, with submission to that, making use of their own valour and reason; and if there was sometimes a brave man who shook off these shackles, he was looked upon little better than an atheist.

Mahomet is hardly fit to be mentioned; everyone knows, he was the lewdest impostor that ever abused mankind.

Nor does most of the evidence they bring for the divinity of their laws amount to any more than their own good word; at least, none of them came attested in such a manner as necessary to persuade a wise man they were sent from Heaven.

Lycurgus, for his famous Rheira, which he pretends he received at Delphos, had no wit-
ness but himself and a priestess. Indeed he travelled both into Crete and Egypt, making an acquaintance with the principal men in both places, to get what he could from them, where he collected some of his laws, making additions of his own; and his pretending he received them from Heaven seems to be an imitation of the Jewish Legislator, who certainly had his laws from thence, and whose story he must have heard. Besides, his way of promulgating his laws is a clear evidence that he had not sufficient attestation of the divine authority, to which all men,
as soon as convinced, immediately submit: for he did it by force and armed men, whom he drew up into the market-place when his project was ripe, and frightened poor Charilaus so much, that he ran to sanctuary on apprehension of treason.

Solon, too, pretends an oracle; but he makes little of it, and so it is not worthy of notice.

But for Numa, he quite gluttéd his barbarous Romans with cheat and prodigy. He made them believe strange visions were seen and prophetic voices heard, and almost frightened them out of their senses to get them to embrace his religion; and this he so long used them to, till, as Plutarch tells us, there was nothing so ridiculous but he could make them believe it.

Mahomet, to say truth, is the pleasantest fellow of them all: if he had no miracles, he made it up to the full with lying wonders. Indeed, most of his miracles were near a-kin to transubstantiation; removing mountains, while they stood still where they were. It is true, if you will believe him, Alborach and he travelled many thousand leagues together, the self-same road that Gonzales since took with his Gazas, and Bergerac with his bottles of may-dew and marrow-bones; and well worth their pains was it, for they brought back the Alcoran with them; but not so much as one angel's hand or mark to confirm it, of all those that he met and talked with
in his journey. He had indeed, once on a time, a voice out of the earth, not from Heaven, which proclaimed him the great Prophet of God. But the subtle knave was resolved the poor fellow, whom he had placed in a hollow cavern for the purpose, should never tell tales out of school, or recant what he had said; and for that reason made his followers immediately fill up the cave's mouth with heaps of stones, and bury the wretch alive, while he was in so good a mind.

Add to this, if there needed any more, that the most ingenious writers among the heathens do now and then, in spite of their religion, drop such things as show plainly they thought it all an imposture. And this not poets or epicureans only, but the gravest and most learned among them, their very priests, and those that were initiated in their highest mysteries. Tully's opinion is very well known in these matters, and has been often published to the world. But Plutarch is yet more fair and ingenuous; for, after he has said all he could of his Numa, in defence of Lycurgus and other heathen lawgivers' inspiration, of which, to say true, he gives a pleasant account, "That he sees no reason but that the gods, when in a grave and sober humour, would inspire and assist the makers of laws, as well as when they are in a merry pin they do musicians and poets, which we suppose nobody will deny him after this;" and his frankly owning
that thoughts are free, and every one may think what pleases him best in these matters: as if he had not yet said enough, he comes to the point, and fairly defends lawgivers for cheating the people. "It cannot be denied," says he, "but that such men as Lycurgus, Numa, and others, who were to deal with the seditious humours of fanatic citizens, and the inconstant disposition of the multitude, might lawfully establish their precepts with the pretence of divine authority, and cheat them into such politics as tended to their own happiness. For those law-givers that were truly inspired, see the next question.

**Quest.**—Whether there is any such thing as Revealed Religion?

**Ans.**—This will appear from the fact, that there actually has been such revelation; first, of moral truths; then of the very person of a Legislator and Mediator, who confirmed those truths, and clearly and unanswerably asserted future punishments and rewards. We can do no more than prove such things must have been, and have been; nor can we prove past fact by any other argument than universal tradition, enquiry into the probability of the fact, and veracity of the evidence, and the further witness, either of enemies or disinterested people, wise and capable of judging; all which criterions of truth we find in the two grand revelations made to mankind; that of the Law from Sinai, and of the person of a
Teacher and Mediator in Jesus, of whom every good and wise man, who has fairly examined his doctrine and works, must say, as Plato did of such a future instructor, "I will gladly own and acknowledge him the Saviour of the world." For the former of these revelations, the law given from Sinai, for the sake of the rest of mankind, and not the Jews only, if the fact were not true, what makes the Jewish Nation so invincibly persist in the profession of that law to this very day, though scattered through the whole earth? when other Religions, that have pretended revelation, not having so firm a basis at first, though spread a thousand times farther, are now sunk and lost, as the Grecian and Roman, there being scarcely a man now left in the world who adores their Mars, or Saturn, or Jupiter, or Juno. Nor was this Law only pretended by Moses to be revealed to him alone by God, as Numa deduced his from his Egeria; for God himself hath written it, and spake in a voice from Heaven, which was heard by six hundred thousand men, mixed with thunder and lightning, the whole mountain quaking beneath it. Now, that the Jews had the knowledge of God among them has been witnessed by heathen authors, and is further plain from hence, that great men have travelled to their own country, on purpose to learn it. They have no other learning, say some: it must be, then, this learning which they went thither for, morality and know-
ledge of the truth of God, certainly the best and noblest accomplishments in the world. "God himself bears witness," says Porphyry, "that the Hebrews have found it." And Pythagoras went among the Egyptians and Hebrews to get learning; and Hermippus tells us he was circumcised, that he might be admitted into the learning of the Jews. And Josephus gives us several instances, in his Discourse against Appion, of the respect and reverence which the ancient Philosophers had for the learning and religion of the Jews, as believing it divine. The truth of our Saviour's mission, doctrine, and miracles, is attested by so many thousands, that we cannot suppose him an impostor, without thinking disrespectfully of God himself, who has left us no way of arguing stronger than from sense, and no way of judging objects of sense but by sense conjoined with reason. The wondrous works of our Saviour are not denied by Julian, Porphyry, the Jews, Mahomet, nor his greatest enemies. They are particularly recorded by eye-witnesses, and attested by a person of great sense and learning, St. Paul, who had been his bitter enemy; and by St. James, and other Writers of the Apostolical ages. The Author of this Religion proposed no worldly honour to himself, but knew he was to attest it by his blood, and foretold as much to his followers. There appears nothing, throughout his life and doctrine, but what speaks him a
wise and honest man, far from pride or vain-glory. What, then, could he propose, had he been an impostor? How came he, a poor carpenter, by such an excellent system of speculative and moral truths, which certainly are not the worse for being attested by miracle, unless he had them from Heaven? How came his Followers so stedfast in them, who knew they were to have the same fate with their Master, for propagating them? and these not a few heated enthusiasts, but wise, and great, and good men; nay, in after-ages, Philosophers, and Senators, and Princes; though at first, it is true, not many wise or noble, for an obvious reason; these conquered the world, not by fighting, but dying; and exalted the trophies of the Mediator over all the learning of Greece and power of Rome. And the same divine virtue which has overthrown the Neros, the Macatiuses, the Dioclesians, the Julians, the same that unraveled all the sophisms of Celsus or Porphyry, of Tryphon and others—there is not the least reason to fear its falling before a few miserable modern pretenders, to quibble rather than argument. Nor shall all the secret mines of the treacherous Deist, or open attacks of the would-be Atheist, ever prevail against it.

**Quest.**—What is the meaning of St. Paul being "a night and a day in the deep;" where
shall we find that he was "thrice shipwrecked," as he says of himself. 2 Cor. ii. 25?

Ans.—The meaning of his being a night and a day in the deep is plain enough that on a shipwreck he so long remained in the sea, on a board, raft, or some such thing, before he was taken up or got to land. For his being thrice shipwrecked, it seems not a very sensible question; where should we find it? when we find it in the next text mentioned, and why need it be twice recorded; St. Luke not taking particular notice of all the apostle's actions, any more than he, or St. John, or the other two Evangelists, of those of our Saviour?

Quest.—I have had a few difficulties concerning some opinions of the Jews that I have met with, which seem to disagree with the Bible; and find there were these several sects amongst them in the time of our Saviour—the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Herodians, Samaritans, Hareans and Zealots?

Ans.—The three most considerable of all the sects that were amongst the Jews when Christ was born were, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. Perhaps the Pharisees might have their name as explainers and interpreters of the Law, which was a chief part of their work, and for which they were in great estimation amongst the Jews; or rather from separation, the most natural import of the word, as Epiphanius says, so called
because exempted from others in their extraordinary pretences to piety; the Jews describe a Pharisee, as one that separates himself from all uncleanness, unclean meats, and from the people of the earth, who accurately observe not the difference of meats. Pharisee, in the Talmud, denotes a pious and holy man. This sect was supposed to arise not long after the Maccabees. Under the pretence of Religion, however, they were malicious, covetous, great oppressors, merciless dealers, proud, scornful, and indeed guilty of most immoralities; they held the oral law of infinitely greater moment than the written word; that the traditions of their forefathers were above all things to be embraced; the strict observance of which would entitle a man to eternal life; that the souls of men were immortal, and had their dooms awarded in subterraneous regions; that there is a metempsychosis of pious souls out of one body into another; that things come to pass by fate, and an inevitable necessity; and yet that man's will is free, that by this means men might be rewarded, or punished according to their works.

The Sadducees were as opposite to the Pharisees in their temper, as they were in their principles. Epiphanius thinks the Sadducees were so called from justice, as pretending to be just and righteous; but this character agrees not with their lives. They are generally thought to have had the name from Sadock, the scholar of Antigonus
Sochans, about the year 3720, 384 years before Christ. They pass, by the writers of their own nation, for impious men, of very loose manners; the natural consequence of their principles, for they denied a future state, the reason of which desperate opinion is supposed to arise from mistaking Antigonus, who pressed his scholars not to be mercenary, but to serve God for himself, without the expectation of reward. This Sadock and Baithos, two of his disciples, misunderstood, and thought he denied any further reward. They held no providence, but that God Almighty is so absolutely placed above the world, that he neither regarded the vice nor virtue acted in it. These opinions made them hated by the people: they were styled by them heretics, infidels, epicureans; no name being thought bad enough for them. They absolutely rejected the traditions of the Pharisees, and affirmed men were to keep the letter of the Law. Josephus says, "they were the fewest of all sects, but generally of the best rank and quality; therefore, unwilling to be disturbed in their ease and luxury, they were the most severe against tumults and seditions, for which they could not be blamed, having all their expectation and happiness in this life.

The Esseans began about the time of the Maccabees, when the persecution of Antiochus forced the Jews to the woods and mountains; and though this storm blew over in a little time, yet those
men were so pleased with their retreat, that they continued and combined into religious societies, living a solitary and contemplative life. Their numbers were usually about four hundred, according to both Philo and Josephus. Pliny calls them a solitary generation. They paid a reverence to the temple by sending gifts and presents thither; but worshiped God at home, using their own rites and ceremonies. Every seventh day they met in their synagogue; where, the younger sitting at the feet of the elder, one read some portions out of a book, which another, well skilled in the principles of their sect, expounded to the rest, instructing them in piety and virtue. They industriously cultivated their ground, and lived on the fruits of it; had all in common, there being neither rich nor poor among them. Their manners were innocent, being exact observers of justice, beyond the practice of other men. It is very probable the reason why we have no mention made of them in the Gospels is, because, living remote from others, they never concerned themselves with the actions of Christ or his Apostles; but, out of a pretended veneration for wisdom and virtue, they neglected all care of the body, and renounced matrimony, thinking it unbecoming men of such a philosophical genius to spend any time upon the necessities of the body. Their way they called "worship," and their rules, "doctrines of wisdom." Their contemplations were sublime and
speculative, dealing much in the names and mysteries of Angels; their carriage bore a great shew of modesty and humility. Therefore it is not unlikely they were the persons chiefly designed by St. Paul, when he charges the Collossians, to let no man beguile them of their reward in a voluntary humility and worshiping of Angels, intruding into those things which he has not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshy mind, that being dead to the rudiments of the world, they should no longer be subject to these Dogmata, or ordinances, such as touch not, taste not, handle not; the main principles of the Essean institution being the commandments and doctrines of men; which things have indeed a shew of wisdom, in will-worship, and humility and neglecting of the body, not in any honour to the satisfying the flesh.

The Herodians were supposed either a part of Herod's guard, or a party that espoused his interest; they were particularly active in pressing men to take tribute. In matters of opinion they seemed to side with the Sadducees, for what St. Matthew calls the Leaven of the Sadducees, St. Mark calls the Leaven of Herod.

The Samaritans were the posterity of those that succeeded the ten tribes, a mixture of Jews and Gentiles; they held nothing but the Pentateuch to be the word of God; that Mount Gerizim was the true place of worship; that they were the de-
scendants of Joseph, and heirs of the Aaronical Priesthood; that no correspondence was to be had with strangers, or any unclean thing touched.

The Karreans were a branch of the Sadducees, but afterwards rejected their opinions. They are the true Textualists, adhering only to the writings of Moses and the Prophets, expounding the Scripture by itself, disowning the absurd glosses of the Talmud. There are to this day great numbers of them at Constantinople and other places.

The Zealots, so often mentioned by Josephus, were an insolent and ungovernable sort of men; who, under a pretence of zeal for God, committed the greatest outrages.

Quest.—By what means did the Pharisees become so powerful amongst the Jews? and why was our Saviour so displeased with them? From whence had the Jews their pretence for writing the Talmud? what was it chiefly composed on? who were the principal authors of it? and of what repute was it amongst them?

Ans.—Our Saviour was displeased with them because of their hypocrisy, which evidently appeared by what they taught, they being in the chair of exposition about the time of our Saviour. The priesthood were much degenerated; and the Pharisees, being more learned, took an opportunity to advance themselves, and expound the Law,
but made the observance of it to consist merely in outward performances: besides which, they corrupted and dishonoured the Law, by preferring their oral and unwritten traditions to it, which was their Law delivered by word of mouth, the pedigree of which they thus deduce: They say that, when Moses was in the mount forty days, God gave him a double Law, one in writing, and the other traditionary, containing the sense and explication of the former; which, when come down, he repeated first to Aaron, then to Ithamar and Eleazer his sons, then to the seventy elders, and lastly to the people; the same persons all this time being present. Then, Moses going out, Aaron who had heard it four times, repeated it to them again; and at Aaron's departure, his sons did the like, and so the elders; and at last the people departed, and taught every man his neighbour. Moses at his death delivered it again to Joshua, he to the elders, they to the prophets, the prophets to the men of the great synagogue, the last of whom was Simeon the just, who delivered it to Antigonus Locheus, he to the wise men his successors, whose business it was to recite it; and it was handed through several generations. At last it came to R. Jebuda, whom the Jews stiled Holy Master, who committed it to writing, calling his book Misnaith, or the Repetition; this was afterwards explained by the Rabbins that dwelt at Babylon, with several cases and
and controversies concerning their Law, which resolutions some time after were collected into another volume, and called Gemara, or Doctrine; and both together make the entire body of the Talmud, the one being the text, the other the comment. The Jews in all latter ages preferred this before the Law, holding that of no use without this, it being the explanation of it; it being a little commendation for a man to read the Bible; but if he studied the Mishna, he should receive eternal life by it; that the Bible is like water, the Mishna like wine, and the Talmud like spiced wine.

---

**Quest.**—What is the meaning of this passage in the Proverbs, "God hath made all things for himself, yea, even the wicked for the day of evil?"

**Ans.**—The design of it is to shew that God has disposed all things in such a manner, as that they shall answer one to another; and that he has so ordered his creation, that the wicked shall be punished even by the course of nature.

---

**Quest.**—I would intreat you to resolve me this question. Whether God brings judgments upon the children for their parents' sins; for we read in the second commandment, "that the Lord is a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation;" and in Ezekiel, "that the
fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."

*Ans.*—We have innumerable instances of the temporal afflictions that children have met with for their parents' crimes, which, without a reformation in them, are often entailed on many generations. And sometimes the examples of parents so far influence their children, that they become partakers of the same guilt; but, except they themselves do evil, they may be assured they shall not suffer after this life, since we are expressly told, "every man shall answer for his own sins."

**Quest.**—It has been my misfortune to fall into the company of some young sparks, who puzzle me about the eternity of the world. They are men whom, though I am of a contrary opinion, yet, I cannot well confute. I therefore desire your assistance, how I may answer them?

*Ans.*—As for the eternity of the world, you perhaps may have met with this argument, that there is no annihilation of things, but a continual revolution and change of one thing into another. There is no dealing with these sparks by Scripture, which tells us that "God made the world." You must therefore confute them, from their own principles, thus: The world was not from eternity in that state we now find it; which I prove thus: Either the day was from eternity, or the night was from eternity, or both together were from
eternity; if only the day, then the night was not; if only the night, then the day was not; but they could not be both together, since they are successive of one another by twelve hours; and if we should admit the contradiction that they were both together, it would yet prove our position, which says, the world was not from eternity in the state we now find it; for now there is both day and night. And after the same manner we may prove that winter and summer have not been from eternity; and, consequently, not that revolution and change of things as was at first alleged. Again, as to the eternity of men upon the face of the earth, we deny it, and say, if there have been successive generations of men from eternity, it follows that there has been an innumerable company of men who have lived already; for, if their number was certain and determinate, we should come to the first man, and so to the second, third, fourth, and so to the last; and if we have a first and a last, then eternity loses its definition, as a duration without beginning or ending. But the number of men which have hitherto lived is not infinite, therefore men are not from eternity. There wants only the minor to be proved thus: A number greater than an infinite number cannot be given, but we can give a number greater than the men which have yet lived, namely, the hairs of these men's heads; therefore the number of men which have lived is
not infinite. Here the number of hairs contains the number of men, and another greater number over and above. Now, whatever is contained or determined is finite, and what is finite is not infinite; and, consequently, men have not been from eternity. Besides, we having proved in the preceding argument that day and night have not been from eternity; it would be a hard task for these gentlemen to prove in what other dimensions of time those men lived in that were before day and night. But, though there is little need of it, we will give them another argument. Those men that have yet lived have succeeded one another either by a finite or infinite distance of time; not by an infinite distance, as the succession of families, to our knowledge, shews; therefore by a finite distance; and infinity of duration cannot be made of finite revolutions.

**Quest.**—Has Gunpowder or Printing done the greatest mischief to the world?

**Ans.**—Printing has done both more service and disservice to the world; not only because Printing was prior in acting, but also because its consequences reach beyond the effects of gunpowder. As the cause is nobler than its effects, Printing is more prejudicial than Gunpowder: since Gunpowder would seldom be employed in any great execution, if Printing did not first raise such disputes and distractions as are the causes of wars and tumults.
**Quest.**—How may we convince the Heathen that our God is the true God, and their gods false ones?

**Ans.**—There are so many learned pens that have undertaken this subject, especially that of Hugo Grotius, that, if it was another subject, it would savour of presumption to add more; but, because no pen can be barren in this great truth, I will add something, perhaps, not generally observed. To obey, to die, or to be changed, is inconsistent with the essence of a Deity; yet the sun, sea, stars, and all the thirty thousand gods that Hesiod mentions, have received their appointed orders in nature, which have been altered, inverted, and sometimes destroyed, by their Author—which we may call God, Nature, or what we please—and this is the God we acknowledge. Again, that an ox, a cat, an onion, &c. which have been worshiped for gods, could not appoint their own being is certain from this reason, that they could not act before they had a being; and it would be against their nature to invert, alter, or destroy their own nature—which confirms the preceding hypothesis.

**Quest.**—How a man shall know himself?

**Ans.**—Know your Creator, and this is one of the best ways to know yourself. Almost all knowledge is acquired by comparison. After his image you are made; see then, if you would know your-
self, whether you are degenerated or really like your great original.

Know other men, see their faults and virtues; apply them, and you may thence easily judge of your own.

Know your enemies, and if possible what they think and say of you. This is a much surer way than to consult your friends; you will hear much more from the first than the last. These are the best directions we can give.

**Quest.**—Whether Satires or Sermons have been more successful towards reforming men's manners?

**Ans.**—Some Sermons are Satires, and some Satires are Sermons. We will not be so uncharitable as to say both are much alike, because the world is incorrigible, and mind neither; but, taking them as they are commonly distinguished, I desire one instance of a man lampooned out of vice, though we have some few of those who have been preached out of it. At least, I dare be bold to say, our English way of Satire will hardly ever do it, since it is for the most part like our fighting, downright and bloody; and that generally pleases most which calls most hard names, which may enrage a man and make him look about for suitable returns. It will make him angry, but never make him better.
**Quest.**—How may we know the Scriptures to be the word of God?

**Ans.**—We have moral demonstration that they are so, and that from these topicks. First, from divine testimony, in those legible signatures and impresses of Divinity instamped upon them. Some directions for mankind are necessary, and those such as shall remain standing rules. None can compare with this, for antiquity, utility, gravity, majesty. Nor is that strange effect these writings have in the minds of men in the perusing of them, both Heathens and Christians, an argument to be slighted. As for human testimony, we have that which is to us satisfactory; namely, the concurrent tradition of all places and ages, which have delivered down these books to us as the work of inspired men; and we may challenge all the enemies of those Sacred books to produce, in one instance, a matter of fact attested on this manner that is not true. If there have been some men who have either denied or lessened the authority of these books, or added others to them which they would pretend of equal authority, even this is a strong argument of the truth of those Sacred Writings, since such accidents as these are clearly prophesied of, and provided against, therein. But we have, besides all this, the progress of the Gospel, and the sufferings of the Martyrs, to witness the same undeniable truth. For how should the doctrines contained in these books make such a pro-
gress though the world without force, nay, in spite of it, and in contradiction to all the proud affected learning of Greece and Rome? and why should the wisest, and best, and bravest of men, many thousands of millions of them, endure the severest torments for what was contained therein, had there not been something extraordinary, and confessing a divine power, which first dictated it, which has still preserved it, and which will do so to the end of the world.

**Quest.**—If the Scriptures be the word of God, how is it that they are not more plain, so as to prevent that variety of interpretation, which, instead of promoting peace and love, involves us in contention, enmity, and division?

**Ans.**—The variety of interpretations are no prejudice against it; for, as the most exact rule in the world will appear crooked if beheld through a wrong medium, so it is here; the fault is not in the Scriptures, but in the vitiated judgments or passions of men: for the diversity of opinions is only accidental, as sin had never been in the world had not God made men. Do we question Acts of Parliament to be really the King's and Kingdom's word, because their meaning is sometimes disputed? It will be urged, God could have made them otherwise; it may be true, but then he must have made man otherwise, and so made him not a man, which he had not been if not free and
rational, and while so he can neither be compelled in his faith nor actions. And, being thus free, it is impossible any proposition can be formed which is not in his power, verbally at least, to deny, and do this so long till at last he may really doubt of it, though never so self-evident, much more in what is only revealed. He may, he does, abuse God's name every day, and it is no wonder if he does as much by his word. We find those who, at least in words, deny his very essence; and we may as well argue there is no God, no Religion, natural or revealed, because all these are abused, and made the occasions, or at least pretences, of confusion and discord, as that the Holy Scriptures are not God's word. For the same reason we must look into the natural and direct tendency of these Sacred Writings, and what they would certainly produce if their directions were practised, which it is our faults if they are not, if we would form a right judgment of them, and discern whether they are of God. Now nothing can be plainer, than that they every where inculcate peace, and love, and unity; and particularly in the New Testament. And what can bear more legible marks of Divinity, than such writings as, if they were followed, would make man so like God, and earth like heaven? And if they have not these effects, we may blame ourselves. Whatever is fundamental or necessary to salvation is plainly taught in the Scriptures; and if, instead of believing and
practising them, we will eternally quarrel about some little shibboleths, which sometimes we find, but oftener make in them, let us not find fault with them, but amend ourselves according to those excellent rules which are there given us.

Quest.—Our Saviour says, for every "idle word we shall give an account of in the day of judgment." Pray, the meaning of it?

Ans.—The meaning of the term "idle word," cannot be, as some weak persons have mistaken it, every word which tends not to some spiritual edification; but every wicked blasphemous word, as the context shews; our Saviour having been discoursing of the Pharisees blaspheming him and saying, "he cast out demons by Belzebub."

Quest.—What is the true meaning of the word Superstition?

Ans.—Supra, or super statutum in Civil Law; it comes from beyond or above the Statute. In Divinity it means a necessary observance of those indifferent things which God had neither commanded nor forbidden; as, for instance, it is superstition to believe the wearing of a surplice in religious worship a sin, because God has not forbidden it; and it is superstition to believe the not wearing it a sin, because God has not commanded it. And so in meats, times, &c.
Quest.—I request that you would reconcile the seeming contradictions in the Four Evangelists about the Suffering of our Saviour?

Ans.—They all four agree in the principal circumstances of this history, except one, wherein St. Mark and St. John seem differently to relate the time of his Crucifixion. They unanimously say, that darkness covered the whole earth from the sixth hour until the ninth hour, during which time the Saviour of the world was nailed to the cross. But St. John says, it was about the sixth hour that Pilate was still sitting upon his tribunal, and said, after having scourged Jesus with rods, "Behold your King," John xix. 14; and St. Mark xv. 25, "Now it was the third hour, and they crucified him." We might here make some remarks upon the original and invention of hours, of their division into four quarters of three hours each, into double hours, six of which made a day; upon the four watches of the night, and the common division of the day into morning, noon, and evening; and of the manner of beginning the day, and correcting the hour among the Jews—but that the digression would be too tedious for this place, and therefore we should omit it, and endeavour to reconcile them in as brief terms as we can. The Jews assembled early in the morning to consult how they might destroy Jesus, and resolved in this assembly to accuse him before the Governor. And this accusation was
made at the third hour, or at the ninth in the morning, which is a circumstance that none of the Evangelists but St. Mark has precisely observed. So that these words, "now it was the third hour," ought to be considered as a parenthesis, which relates to what preceded; as if the Sacred Historian, after having related their accusations against our Saviour, and the sentence that Pilate pronounced upon him before he passed to the Crucifixion, which was the consequence of it, designed to speak of the time in which Jesus was brought before the Governor. It is by a like method that the same Evangelist concludes the Crucifixion, ver. 33: "Now, the sixth hour being come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour." As this expression did not signify that the Crucifixion, and all the circumstances of it which St. Mark had related, were passed before the sixth hour; but, on the contrary, that they began at that time: so these words, "now it was the third hour," that our Evangelist speaks, after having given the history of the Jewish process against Jesus, signifies that he entered at the ninth hour in the morning—and it was about the ninth hour that the Romans used to give audience. And in respect to St. John's manner of speaking, that it was about the sixth hour when Pilate said to the Jews, "Behold your King," we think no one can make any difficulty of it, since every one knows that, in our vulgar
language we say it is about noon, although it be but a little past eleven, or near one, and in the space of near two hours many things might pass.

\[\text{Quest. — Whether it be a sin to deceive the deceiver?}
\]

\[\text{Ans.—Yes; for although circumstances may make an action more or less sinful, yet they change not the nature of sin, for deceit is deceit, though used to a deceiver. The command is positive: "Let no man defraud or circumvent his brother," &c. There is no limitation or exception made, unless he be a deceiver.}
\]

\[\text{Quest. — What was the mark God set upon Cain?}
\]

\[\text{Ans.—The Rabbins say, that his flesh was crusted, and made invulnerable; and that Lamech, when he killed him, wounded him in the eye. I know a gentleman whose misfortune it was to kill his friend in a duel—and honourably, according to that notion the world now has of honour; and though upon his trial he came off with his life, yet the action made such impression upon his spirits that he carries a visible mark of horror and disturbance in his countenance to this day; and such an one that causes many thinking persons that are strangers to him to take a particular notice of him when they meet him. One, among the rest, meeting him in my company, pulled me}
\]
by the arm to take notice of him; and when he was passed by, told me, "that gentleman has the character of Cain legibly written in his face." I told my friend, "he had unfortunately killed a man." My friend replied, "he did not know it before I told him." I am persuaded that this was Cain's mark.

**Quest.**—Why one hour's sermon seems longer than two hour's conversation?

**Ans.**—For several unlucky reasons. Sometimes because the sermon may be duller than the conversation; at others, because the hearer is dull himself, and has not the wit to like it. Sometimes because those in the pulpit talk all, and talk sense; when in conversation, those who love it may hear their own dear selves talk as much and as impertinently as they please; and, besides, have the liberty of contradiction, the very life and soul of some people. But the most general reason for this sad truth is, the almost universal decay of piety, added to the adverseness which the best men find in their minds towards acts of devotion, till conquered by industry and pains. Where men are truly pious and religious, they think no entertainment in the world comparable to that wherein they may be taught the way of happiness; nor will they easily be tired with what affords them at the same time so much of profit and pleasure.
Quest.—Why does our Saviour use that odd similitude of a camel's going through the eye of a needle? and what is the genuine meaning of that text?

Ans.—The proverbs of all nations are said to contain the greatest part of their experience and wisdom; and this similitude, most Commentators agree, is founded on a proverb of the Jews. Some say, it alludes to a very strait low gate in Jerusalem, called The Needle-gate, through which the camels could never pass without first unloading their burdens; which, if true, were a beautiful and apposite simile. But we doubt this is rather a witty than a true interpretation. The learned and indefatigable Bochart has another interpretation. He tells us, in his dissertation concerning the Camel, that the word "gamal," which signifies a camel, is also interpreted a cable; and says it is a common proverb among the Eastern nations when they speak of an impossibility—that it is easier for a cable to be threaded through the eye of a needle, which is a very proper and apt simile; and this of the two I esteem the more natural interpretation, leaving the Reader to embrace which he pleases.

Quest.—Whether Virtue and Goodness, or Prudence, be any defence against misfortune? or whether virtuous and good men are not equally liable to misery and distress as the worst of men?
What is the meaning of that common proverb, "God never sends mouths, but he sends meat?" and how does he provide for men in misery and distress? how does he feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and take care of virtuous and good men?

Ans. — That Virtue and Goodness, generally speaking, are a defence, though Prudence must be used: — That God does take care of the good, and defend and provide for them, otherwise there could be no providence, and then no God: — That virtuous men are for these reasons less liable to misfortunes than the wicked; — nay, that God by his common providence makes provision for all his creatures. — If fact be brought against this, we have this to say upon it — that oftentimes those are not good men, but hypocrites, who are miserable; that, if generally good, they may yet in some things be faulty, and for that be for a time punished to make them better; that, if they neglect prudent means to obtain or preserve a share in the necessaries of life, or imprudently and unnecessarily draw a greater charge on themselves than they can maintain, they must blame themselves, not Providence; that, in some instances of common calamities, the good can no more expect to be always preserved, than from sickness, pain, or the other natural inconveniences of life; that, notwithstanding all this, a fervent devotion, and generous trust on God's mercies, promises, and providences, are not in vain, but they often deliver
out of misery and distress; and none know that they shall not while there is life, for so long there is hope; and when once the happy turn comes, the former uneasy circumstances render the present much more pleasure and welcome; that, if all fails, there is another world, which, if those who are afflicted in this do not believe, nay, are not willing to wait for, they are not patient, they are not good, they have no share in this particular providence of God, they themselves vindicate his justice, and destroy their own argument.

**Quest.**—Whether Peter, or Paul, or any of the Apostles, used notes in their preaching?

**Ans.**—No; nor Bibles neither to put their notes in. They had not so much as texts, as we see by most if not all their Sermons recorded in the Scripture. They had no pulpits, nor several other things that are in use among us. But what consequence can be drawn from all this—these being only such circumstances as enter not at all into the nature of the thing? Such notes as we have, they could not probably have; our way of writing not being then, at least not so commonly, in fashion; for Zachary, when he would express his mind, asked not for pen, ink, and paper, but for a writing-table, though, it is true, the other way too was sometimes used. But, as the Apostles used no notes, so neither did they study their Sermons beforehand, nor need they to do it, the
gift of preaching being one of those miraculous gifts at that time bestowed upon the Church of God. As for notes or no notes, it may not be unenter-taining to discourse a little farther, though beyond the question, in reference to the present custom of the nation. It is known that our Mi-

nisters began to write their Sermons first about the time of the Reformation, when their enemies ac-
cused them for preaching seditiously; for which reason they penned down all that they spoke, to produce their notes if there should be occasion. And finding this to be an advantage, as to the closeness of their discourses, and more correct expression, they have ever since continued it, and that to so good purpose, that the English Sermons are now the best in the world. But there are dif-

ferent ways of using notes in preaching. To have them in the pulpit for an assistance to the me-

mory, which he that comes without must be a bold man; or to use them entirely, without at all trusting to the memory, and here we ac-

knowledge a Sermon generally appears with much more life when the preacher's eye is not chained to the book; and the custom of thus preaching making the thing in time much more easy than at first it appears. But then, on the contrary, to get all by heart is a great slavery, and takes up so much time from other studies, that we question whether it will be always worth the while to do it. Upon the whole, though the common people
would never think St. Paul preached a good Ser-
mon, unless, as some of them call it, \textit{he read it every word without a book}; yet all those who are
worth pleasing had rather hear a piece of good
sense and close discourse read to them out of the
pulpit than a mass of rambling nonsense with-
out book ever so volubly tumbled over.

\textit{Quest.} — How far is a Sabbath-day's Journey,
which we often find mentioned in the Scriptures?
\textit{Ans.} — About seven of the Hebrew furlongs,
much the same with the old Roman mile, con-
taining a thousand of the Hebrew greater feet,
two thousand of their lesser.

\textit{Quest.} — When were public places of worship
first built, and who was the founder of them?
\textit{Ans.} — Lactantius and many others believe it
was a little after the building of Babel, and that
Ninus was the first who about that time set up
statues in memory of Jupiter and Juno, and Be-
lus his father, which statues were set up over their
sepulchres, and divine honours offered them, and,
in process of time, inclosed within stately build-
ings, which were called their temples, and built
within consecrated groves. Such were the tem-
}
because they had continual lights burning in them, they were called *luci à lucendo*, after which they became places of refuge, which use some believe was first invented by the children of Hercules, to secure themselves from those their father had oppressed.

Quest.—What condition is the most eligible for assisting us to be wise and virtuous?

Ans.—A poor man, being loaded with misery, thinks of nothing but how to live; and so far is poverty from being a help to virtue, that it frequently makes men despise laws, and, through their misery, abandon themselves to rage and despair; and, in hopes of some redress, they become mutinous, seditious, and guilty of thefts, murders, and all manner of outrages, having nothing to lose but their unhappy lives, by venturing of which they expect to gain some little change in their fortunes and quiet. And as for the rich man, our Saviour tells us, "it is easier for a camel, or cable-ropo, to go through the eye of a needle than for such an one to enter into the kingdom of Heaven;" the fullness of his condition affording him so many diversions from his duty, that it is almost impossible for him to find the path of virtue; and, therefore, we often see riches attended with vanity, luxury, and effeminacy, all which are enemies to science. So that the middle condition, where there is a sufficient fortune to allow the ne-
cessary means for knowledge, and to encourage a virtuous life, being free from those inconveniences and temptations which riches and poverty abound with, is the most to be desired, and likeliest, as we generally see, to produce these happy effects.

**Quest.** — Whether a Dissenter is a Schismatic, notwithstanding his liberty by law?

**Ans.**—A Christian becomes not more or less Christian by being a National one, as to the essence of Religion; but if a National Church agrees in doctrine with the doctrine of Christ, and Dissenters agree in doctrine with the National Church, neither of them are Schismatics from the doctrine or Church of Christ; and it was the doctrinal part of Religion which Christ promised to be withal, so that the gates of Hell should not prevail against it. But, if a National Church makes the terms of her communion political, another Church, dependent on her, may dissent from such political terms, if the Magistrate gives the liberty, without Schism.

**Quest.**—In Ephes. iv. 26, we are exhorted “to be angry, and sin not;” now when can a man be said to be angry, without sin?

**Ans.**—When the cause of his anger is lawful and reasonable, and when it does not transport him so far as to make him forget his being a rational creature and a Christian. The truth is,
there are but very few cases wherein a person can well be angry at all; but he may be allowed most warmth, when either he does himself, or sees others do, any thing that tends to the dishonour of God and Religion.

Quest.—Why our blessed Saviour loved St. John best, when St. Peter loved the Saviour most?

Ans.—St. John appears to have had more rational love of our Saviour than St. Peter, whose zeal for him seems to have been chiefly grounded on the mistaken notion of his countrymen, that he was to be a Temporal Messiah, to conquer kingdoms, and make his Apostles Viceroids all over the world. Besides, St. John was related to our Saviour, and of more agreeable temper than St. Peter, who was warm and hasty, though well-meaning and honest.

Quest.—It is known that all Nations have believed something of God: but how far may a general agreement be said to be a proof of that important doctrine?

Ans.—This testimony is of very great force, whether it be considered in itself, or in respect of its origin. Lactantius thought it so good a proof, that, having cited a great many both Heathen and Christian Authors against the Atheists, he urges the consent of all people and nations, many
of which, although they differed almost in every thing else, yet generally agreed in the belief of a Divinity. By an ancient Philosopher, probable things have been ranked in this order:—That whatever seems true to some learned persons is in some sort probable; what appears so to the generality of some learned men is more probable; but that in which all men agree is in the highest degree of probability, and approaches very near to those truths which may be demonstrated; so that he might very justly pass for an extravagant person, who should have the boldness to deny it. There is no man in the world, who, by his single judgment can balance the constant authority of all mankind. If any person should, through a contradictitious spirit, or by any other motive, affirm that snow is black, that motion is impossible, or that two contradictory propositions may be true in the same time; there would be no other way to refute him, but to oppose to him the universal consent of all men; and if he refused to agree to it, he ought to be looked upon either with pity or contempt. He had need have very powerful and clear reasons, who should resist the common opinion of all men, and equally accuse them of error. Several Heathen Philosophers have looked upon this common agreement as a considerable argument. "The consent of all men," says Seneca, "is of very great weight to us: a mark that a thing is true, is when it appears so
to all the world; thus, we conclude there is a Divinity, because all men believe it; there being no nation, how corrupt soever they be, which deny it." Cicero has said the same thing in several places, and has observed, that, although many Nations have had extravagant opinions of the Divinity, yet they all agreed in the belief that there is an eternal power, on whom we depend."—"In the hottest disputes," says Maximus of Tyre, "in the deepest contest, and in the diversity of opinions which are amongst men, we see a doctrine established throughout the earth, which is, that there is a God, who is king and father of all men. It is what is confessed by all the world, both learned and ignorant." There are many such instances, where the general consent has been thought a good argument for the being of a God. It is true, there has been a few men who have contradicted the universal consent; but these may be considered as monsters. If we consider the origin of this universal opinion, we shall still better perceive its force; for it can only have taken its rise from one of these four things. First, either it must be united to the understanding, like to the most evident principles of the sciences, and the inclination we have to be happy; or else that we have a natural disposition to embrace this opinion as soon as it is proposed to us, as our eyes are naturally disposed to perceive the light when it appears; or some
powerful reason, which presents itself to the mind of all men, even of the most ignorant. Or, lastly, from ancient tradition, which came from one and the same source, which has dispersed this opinion through all the earth. We cannot imagine any other way whereby this opinion should be introduced amongst all men, who are so much inclined to think diversely of one and the same thing; and whichever of them we choose, the argument is equally strong and conclusive. If it is from the light of nature, it is as extravagant to deny it, as it would be to say that the most evident principles of the sciences are false. If it is said, that it is by a natural disposition that men believe there is a God, why should we resist an inclination of nature, since its motions never deceive us? Or, if it is agreed that there is a powerful reason which persuades all men of it, we must renounce common sense if we refuse to assent to it. But if it is said that man received this knowledge from an ancient tradition, which indeed appears most probable, it must be enquired from whence this tradition came, and who was the common master of all mankind. We very well know the names of those who have introduced any sect, or engaged people in certain opinions; but we find neither the name of him who is pretended to have invented this doctrine, nor the place nor time in which he has lived, nor the manner whereby it
was introduced and dispersed amongst men. It is this which makes us believe that the authors of this tradition are our first parents; who, as they could not be ignorant of their origin, so undoubtedly they taught this truth to their children. It is natural to conceive that it was by this means all men had learned it. This thought leads us to another, which is of very great importance in this matter: it is, that all men have descended from one man only, or at least from a small number of persons who were all together; from whence it will appear, that man had a beginning, and that we cannot reject the doctrine of the existence of a God as a political fiction; for, supposing man to have a beginning upon earth, from whence could he originate but from such a Divinity as we conceive of? What other being could have formed such admirable bodies as ours, and united such intelligences to them as our souls? Let those who deny this tell us also who taught the first men there was a God; and how it came into their mind, that they drew their existence from Him, if He who made them had not discovered to them, after a sensible manner, that it was to Him they owed their being? And since it is what they taught to their posterity, we have no reason to refuse our belief, nor can we imagine any witnesses worthy of faith, nor men who can give us a better account of their origin than themselves: therefore we cannot
reasonably reject a tradition which came from them.

**Quest.**—Considering we live in an age when men's opinions as to matters of faith are various, how shall we behave in respect to those who differ from us, as not only to avoid error, but also to prevent ourselves from rashly censuring and condemning those who embrace not the same opinion as we do?

**Ans.**—We ought to keep to the plain text of Scripture, and affirm nothing as necessary to salvation which is not clearly revealed in it, without permitting ourselves to draw far-fetched or too subtle consequences from thence, or engage ourselves in metaphysical arguments about things which are above our reach. And this method might make us more charitable too, and less censorious of others; because the many controversies which divide us are commonly upon such things as the Scripture has not clearly decided in favour of either party; the errors we ascribe to one another often respecting the manner of things, which in many cases Holy Writ has not determined.

**Quest.**—Though I am satisfied the Christian Religion does directly tend to the happiness of mankind both here and hereafter, yet I desire your answer to this question—Whether, since it
has gained the civil power, it has been the occasion of more good or harm?

*Ans.*—The Christian Religion can never be said to have been the necessary and proper cause of any evil, or to have given any just occasion for it—not but that occasion may have been taken, where none has been really given. At least this is certain, that what is good can have no real or necessary effect on the productions of evil; though evil may accidentally cleave to its productions, as sin came first into the world; and, as our Saviour says, he came not to send peace, but a sword. It is we, then, who are called Christians, that have been the real causes of those evils which have disturbed the world since Christianity came into it; for to think that itself has been the just occasion of them, is as false in morals, as the old Heathen calumny was against them in natural evils, when they used to charge the Christians as the causes of droughts and earthquakes, and all public calamities. What mischief has been, is owing to the want of Christianity, not to the profession of it. And those who make this objection ought to consider the consequence of it; for, if the Christian Religion has been an evil to the world since it has been supported by the civil authority, it is plain that it must be owing to the authority, not to the Religion, unless we suppose a good thing can change its nature, and
grow mischievous, merely because lawful authority does establish and defend it.

But we are inclined to believe there has been fewer mischiefs in the world since Christianity came to be established than there were before, as bad as we are, and so much degenerated from the primitive Christians, though Christianity is still the same. Many bad customs and usages have been broken by Christian Emperors—as the bloody sports of the theatres and gladiators; the public allowance of the stews, and shameful tribute for them; but, besides the abrogation of these and other bad customs, many excellent and wholesome laws have been made by Christian Emperors, and even a body of such laws collected by one of them, as were useful to the commonwealth, which are, as it were, the standard of equity through a great part of the world. If it be objected that Christianity has been the occasion of much war and bloodshed, it is easily and justly answered, in the words of St. James, that "these things had quite another origin. Is it not from those lusts which war in your members?" the lust of empire, of glory, interest, or the like, generally being the cause, whatever is pretended.

Still there is nothing in the Christian Religion that in the least warrants or encourages any ill practices, but quite the contrary; being undoubtedly the best institution in the world; and by
how much any communion deviates from charity and mercy, by so much the farther are they removed from true Christianity, and nearer the Religion of the Heathens, which was really bloody and barbarous, whose very sacrifices and highest mysteries were lewdness and murder.

*Quest.*—I have long indulged myself in a restless habit, which I now find contradictory to my reason, and would leave it. I will not be particular, because the answer may be of use to others, who are not without the allurement of some darling sin. Query, what is a habit, whether to be overcome, and by what methods?

*Ans.*—Habit, or an inclination to a given action, generated by frequent repetition of either vice or virtue, is caused by a repetition of vicious or virtuous acts. There was a time before the first of these acts which constitute the habit began. Now, when the first temptation was offered, it was either in our power to withstand it, or not. If out of our power, then we are forced, by a necessity of sinning, from God, or else by our own irresistible weakness. Not the first, because God cannot be the author of sin; nor the last, because as yet we were not weakened by the habit of it; so that it follows, the first act was in our power. This proved, I shall further premise, that the general is of the same nature with all the particulars of which it is constituted, or it could be no general made up of those particulars.
As, for instance, a habit of supposing twenty repetitions, the last is constituted of the nature and guilt of the preceding nineteen; and itself, and so downward, till you come to the first, which, as is proved, was once in your power to have withstood it; and if the first, the second must also be in your power, because it is part of the first, only something less, and weakened by guilt, yet not destroyed, nor can ever be absolutely destroyed. Any person, let his habit in vice be ever so strong, if he is not given over to a judicially reprobate mind, may, by the assistance of Heaven, reclaim and undo all his wicked customs in vice. It holds also in virtue, wherein a habit is stronger in the last act than the preceding one, but yet of the same nature, and so downward to the first, where we shall find our own power, for so we may call what is given us, effectually co-operating with the grace of God; which we may resist, for we are not forced into good actions any more than vicious ones, for that would destroy rewards and punishments: from whence it also follows, that a habit of virtue may be lost, and the grace of God extinguished in us, which is plainly supposed in Ezekiel, xviii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 20, 21, 22, and several other texts. There are only two texts from the Scriptures that are brought to prove the impossibility of leaving off habits of vice and virtue. The first is, "Can the leopard change its spots, and the Ethiopian his
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The Athenian Oracle. skin? then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil;" and the other is, "He that is born of God sinneth not, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Both which places only shew that it is a very unusual, difficult matter, to do it. The first of these texts ought not to render us desperate, nor the last secure; for they express no more than that generally it is so, but not always, as other testimonies of Sacred Writ, and the frequent instances we meet do evince the contrary.

Having shown what habit is, and that it may be broken, it only remains to lay down the method how. A habit always has its contrary, and may be broken by the use of those methods which contribute its contrary, or by removing the occasions by which it is increased and continued. As, for instance, a fire is extinguished by water, or by not applying fuel to feed it. Ambition, revenge, passion, and all other effects of pride, are the best overcome by practising acts of self-resignation, and subjection to Divine Providence. One of the ancient Philosophers used himself to beg alms of statues; and being asked the reason, said he, "I am learning patience by denial." A seeking of all opportunities of being denied, disappointed, abused, and affronted, and at the same time resolving to hear it, quickly alters the man, and roots out the above-mentioned effects of pride. It is a method God approves, and.
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often makes use of, when he reclaims such people by sickness, afflictions, &c. Again, is the habit drunkenness, gluttony, idleness, or uncleanness? the cure is, by practising temperance and chastity. But in these and such-like cases, where the flesh is concerned, our Divines have well inculcated, that it is safer to flee than fight; not once to hear reasons of either side upon any suggestion, but to drive it out of your mind by going about some business, or entering into some good company; and, when the temptation is off, to fortify yourself by reason, prayer, and resolution not to comply. Examples are of great use; read Augustine's Confessions. And so it is possible, in all habits, to get the mastery. What is more tyrannical than the passion of love? and yet how easily overcome, by avoiding the occasions that excite it, as converse with the object, or by representing the ingratitude, weakness, &c. of the party beloved! In short, get but a true informed judgment, the art of knowing things as they really are in their own nature, and the business is almost done. To be master of one's self and habits, it is indispensably necessary that our thoughts be good and regular, which is effected by good converse either with books or persons. Hence we may know ourselves, and adapt particular remedies to our weaknesses, for there is nothing impossible that is necessary to the accomplishment of our happiness.
**Quest.**—Whether the soul is eternal, or pre-existent from the Creation, or contemporary with its embryo?

**Ans.**—Souls are not eternal, for then they would be gods, and not created beings, creation supposing a commencement of time. Nor is the creation of souls contemporary with any of the six days labours; because it is as impossible they should be idle, being pure acts, as it is impossible for the fire not to burn. But no person could ever yet produce one instance of their pre-existent acting; nor will the maintainers of pre-existence find any service in that text: “And in the sixth day God ended his work, which he had made;” for though it be literally true *quoad Deum*, to whom time past, present, and to come, is the same, yet it is not so *quod hominem*, for we see daily many immediate instances of the Almighty’s works, which have not been left to the established order of nature and second causes. Besides, it is observable, that though Adam was the last of the creation, yet his soul was made after his body, as may be gathered from the order of the words; namely, “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul.” Hence we conclude, that the soul is only contemporary with its embryo, since there can be no demonstration made of its actings prior to what are apparent in that organ.
**Quest.**—What is the soul of man, and whether eternal?

**Ans.**—It is a known story of the Philosopher, who, being asked what God was, took at first a day to answer it; and when that was elapsed, demanded still more time for the resolution; till at length he was compelled to acknowledge it was an unfathomable depth, wherein he might soon lose himself, but never find a bottom. The excellent Epictetus thus accosted his friend: "Thy reason makes thee a-kin to God; see that thou do nothing unworthy so great a Relation." If, then, the soul be like God, it must be difficult to find that out to perfection, though something may be known of it, as well as its Maker. An exact definition cannot be given. Some tolerable description, then, will be as far as we shall pretend to advance; but therein hope to give more distinct notion of the thing than is usually given, asserting nothing but what is or shall be made intelligible, and that from such principles as are either agreed upon by all sects in Philosophy, or have the undoubted suffrage of experience or common reason, and which we hope will be able to solve most of the objections—requiring thus much justice of the Reader, not to condemn any thing before he has thoroughly considered it; and then, readily granting him the philosophical liberty of making what objections he pleases.
Our notion, then, of the soul of man is, that it is an immaterial substance, made after the image of God, which, together with a rightly organized body, constitutes a man; the explanation whereof will, we hope, give a tolerable resolution of this grand question.

The soul is a substance, which we prove by the definition of a substance; a thing subsisting by itself, and subject to accidents. That the soul subsists by itself will be granted, if we can prove that it is not in any thing as an accident; that is, so as to be absent without the injury or destruction of the subject. That it is subject to accidents is plain, and that too as a last subject. Learning and many other things are accidents; yet we see some learned, others unlearned.

It must be a substance, because it is not accident; and one of the two it must be, if it be any thing: and that there is some principle of action within us, none deny. This is proved both from the general notion of an accident, hinted at before, which denies it to be a last subject, as the soul is; and more clearly, by removing all those accidents which are pretended to constitute what we call the soul of man: among which, it will be sufficient if we prove it is no quality or temperament of the body, arising from different qualities and humours. A made quality cannot act; though when in a requisite subject it may in some sense enable it to act. But this principle within us
does itself act both upon the body and ideas which it has formed, either with or without its aid; and if one quality cannot act, no more can several, or I know not what results from all together. Further, were this principle of action within us, which we call the soul, nothing but such a sort of crasis of the body, consisting of or resulting from its different humours, this soul must necessarily decay, as this temperament is injured or weakened by diseases, or approaching death. But nothing is more common than to see persons just going out of the world, when the body is in sufficient disorder, yet enjoying their reason in as high a degree as ever, and frequently more intensely than when in perfect health, which not only proves this principle of action within, whatever it is, something far nobler than a fleeting kind of I know not what quality or qualities, but leads us fairly to the first and remote difference of the soul, its immateriality.

We come then to the second branch of our definition, to prove the soul an immaterial substance. And this we shall do;

By removing any supposed absurdity or contradiction in those terms. The common idiom of our language, and the vulgar discourse, generally use the word Substance in the grosser sense, for something they can feel, and which for that reason, they generally call Substantial; making the very dullest of their senses, the sole judge of what
is so very nice, that even it often eludes our senses, and perhaps in some cases our very reason. Nor do the people, for this very cause, ever dream that the air is a substance, making that and ghost, terms convertible, though we are as sure it is so as that the earth itself is.

That the soul is such a substance we have already proved; that it may, without any absurdity, be an immaterial substance, we have endeavoured to shew. That it is such a substance, we shall thus proceed to evince.

The essences of things are known by their properties and operations. Whatever then acts above the power of matter cannot be matter; is something above matter; is immaterial. This the soul of man does; therefore it deserves that title.

The grand question, it must be confessed, is still: How far the power of matter reaches? or, if that be not a proper term, How far matter may be modified by a superior agent, and to what fineness it may be reduced, and how curious machines, may be formed out of it? That we do not pretend to resolve; but this we may venture to say, That if we can find something which has no relation to congruity with matter, or at least is not such; upon such an object, we may conclude, matter cannot naturally act. But such notions and things we are sure are within us. As for example, conjunction and division, or affirmation and negation, still continued reflexion, with a
possibility of still drawing it finer and finer, almost infinitely. These things mere matter seems not capable of, how subtle and fine soever it may be, because it acts only by images; but we have no image of affirmation and negation, or reflexion. Actions, we are sure, pass within us, and which we learned not from abroad, but could exercise as long since as we are able to remember. The words indeed, by which we express those actions, we receive from abroad, but not the things. I have a notion of a tree, a house, a man, in my fancy; and can shut my eye, and reflect vividly enough on the shapes of them depicted in my brain; but defy all the world to shew me a picture of that reflexion, and so onward; or to tell me in what colours. The act of affirmation and negation, "I will," and "I will not," are inscribed in the fancy.

Nay, further, the very notion or idea of an immaterial or spiritual substance, which we find, much after the same manner with those before mentioned, instamped on our minds, would be a very considerable argument of the truth and reality of the thing itself, could we once prove it innate, and not received from outward images, by discourse or reading, but this it is possible in a great measure to perform; for we find no beginning in history of this notion. No age, nor perhaps place, where it is not believed; confusedly or not, is not the question; since it is enough we are thus
far certain, that a state after death has been universally credited, and that we have something in us which survives our bodies. But the politic institutions and laws of, perhaps, all Nations in the world, we can trace and discover; of this we can never find the root, nor ever shall any where but in ourselves, how long soever we continue the fruitless inquiry.

The next branch of our description of the soul is, that it is made after the image of God. Nor will that be found so loose or indistinct a notion as some will at first glance perhaps imagine it. I believe Moses wrote as a Philosopher as well as a Divine, at least in what concerns the happiness of man, under which some competent knowledge of his own soul seems to be included, gives us just notions of things. He tells us, that “man was created after God’s image;” this I do not expect should pass with those who pretend themselves so averse to authority, without reason. It is from experience then, both of others and themselves, we are to argue with them. Accordingly, we say that man was made with a dependance on, subservient to, and image of God—as beasts bear the same relation to man; and add, that this image will very much explain the human soul, add gives us some of those incommunicable properties thereof, which no beast possesses, though they have some sort of image or resemblance of them.

We all then acknowledge; that that adorable
Perfection who made the world is unbounded or infinite in all his attributes. We shall instance in some of them, and shew the resemblance our souls bear towards them, both as to their extent and perfection. And these are, the knowledge of of God, his power and sovereignty, and his justice, and love of order. Now, the soul has a lively image or resemblance of the first of these, in its infinite capacity, and unbounded desire of knowledge, which, whatever these may have, has hardly any share to which it may go, and no further, nor can ever be satisfied with less than an infinite object. It has, secondly, an image of the sovereignty and power of God, in that empire it has over itself and the visible world, and that noble liberty it has towards representing objects. This desire too is inexplicable by all the world, and carries a sort of an infiniteness in it. Lastly, it carries with it an image of the justice of God, in its natural love of order, and that conscience which it can never totally efface, but which sits enthroned in the mind, is absolute and sovereign there, can never be forced or controlled, but passes judgment within itself, both of a man's own actions and those of the universe.

Nor is any of this supposed only; it is plain undeniable matter of fact, and what all the world must acknowledge, if they be either just or ingenious.

But none of all these divine signatures are, that we know of, in brute creatures, which are but
mere modified matter; nor ought we to grant any powers in them, which cannot be proved and cleared by such acts as are not equivocal and uncertain. Their knowledge, if they have any thing that can be called so, has nothing like infinite in it, nor so much as a capacity thereunto. It is but the faint image of ours, as ours is of a higher; and must needs be as dilute and weak as the rays of the sun when reflected and refracted several times from one object to another. It is only or principally for the service of man, to whom it is of much more use than to themselves. It is limited one way, for one direct use and end. There appears no consciousness of it, nor reflection upon it, abstractedly considered, as we are sure we have in our own, and can never prove in theirs; and so in the other instances mentioned. The last clause of the description is this, which, united with a fitly organized body, constitutes a man. As what went before distinguished it from mere matter, so this does from mere spirit, or Angel.

As for the latter branch of the question, whether this soul be eternal? If what is already proved stands firm, that will hardly be denied: for if by eternal is intended only immortal, as I presume the Querist only means, or eternal a parte-post, as the Schools call it; it must unavoidably be so because it is immaterial; for I can conceive no means of its ceasing to be, because I can have no notion of a dissolution where there are no parts in one without each other.
**Quest.**—Whether all souls are alike?

**Ans.**—All souls are of equal excellence and perfection, as well the soul of an embryo, as of Aristotle, if you speak of the essential or specific excellence, which is equally communicated to all the singualrs or individuals of the same species: for there is but one specific difference by which man, and every particular man, is distinguished from the beasts; so that one man is not more reasonable than another. It is true that the *genius* may be more perfect in one species than in another; so man is a more excellent creature than a beast, because the difference of *rationality* which is in man is more excellent than the irrationality of beasts. But Peter is not a more excellent man than Paul, because the specific difference is not more in Peter than in Paul. In respect of some accidental differences, there may be some inequality; but these concern not the nature or essence of man. Even so one soul may have more knowledge or other accidental perfection than another, in respect of fitter organs, otherwise the same essential excellence is equal in all, and the soul of a fool is not less excellent than that of Solomon; nor of an embryo than of him who has lived an hundred years, except in accidental perfections; for, had the embryo's soul the same perfection of organs, &c. that the soul of Aristotle had, she would exercise the same organical acts that he did; that is, the same that immediately flow from, and depend upon the soul.
Quest.—In what part of the body is the soul?

Ans.—It is generally held in every part; at least we are sure it is not in a place in the same manner that body is but a spirit, if we knew how that was. But its noblest operations, imagining and thinking, are undoubtedly transacted in the brain. This we are sure of, that in deep thinking we feel our heads otherwise affected than at other times; and afterwards we as certainly know they have been at hard labour, by that pain and lassitude we find in them, as that our feet or hands have been so, when, after a long walk or manual operation, they are affected in the same manner. The clearest notion of the soul's essence is, that it is the image of God. As God is everywhere in the greatest world, so it is according to its proportion and similitude in the lesser, or the body of man. It sits, perhaps, in its throne in the head; but its action not confined there, but diffused through all parts, and actuating them according to their natures.

Quest.—Whether separate souls know one another, seeing they have not the organs of seeing, speech, &c.?

Ans.—There is certainly a communication of Angels and souls in Heaven, as appears from several texts, Rev. vii. 9, 10, 11, 12. 1 Cor. xiii. 1. Dan. viii. 13. But we can conceive this communication to be chiefly an ability of insinuating their thoughts to each other by a mere act of their
DIVINITY.

wills, just as we now speak to God, or ourselves when our lips do not move, or the least outward sign appears. Whether there is any other converse we know not; but that there is what is sufficient to know and to be known we are satisfied.

---

_QUEST._—What have the Philosophers, guided only by natural reason, conceived as to the future state of the soul?

_ANS._—When Socrates had the fatal draught, looking upon the officers of death, he said, "that it did not seem to him that they led him to death, but that he was going to mount up to heaven." Cato embraced his son after he had awhile contemplated the immortality of the soul. Plutarch saith, "the wise man goes with pleasure out of the darkness of the earth, to enjoy in heaven an immortal light with the gods."—"Have courage," says another; "let not death affright us, since after death we shall either be gods, or like gods. Let us not fear that our bodies will bury our souls under their ruins. When this corporeal nature shall entirely perish and disappear, there is a necessity that the spirit which animates us, and is the foundation of our being, must remain without being hurt or damaged by them.

---

_QUEST._—Whether the souls of studious or learned men are not more perfect in the world to come,
than the souls of the ignorant and illiterate, if you suppose them equally pious here?

*Ans.*—Piety takes its estimate both from knowledge and practice, so that there cannot be an equality between souls equally careful and industrious here; for the motive and manner of this care are different in themselves, and act by sentiments not in the nature, but in the manner. As, for instance, two persons go along the streets; one sees clearly, and the other is almost blind: they both go the same journey, take the same care of impediments; but he that sees best has a better prospect of the journey's end, and can go with greater pleasure, being better able to avoid the inconveniences of the way than the other. I shall not enter into the dispute whether doing or suffering shall have the greater reward hereafter; for they both proceed from one principle; but certainly, the more we are like God both in knowledge and holiness, the higher our preferment will be hereafter with him; and no doubt this difference will much depend upon the improvements we ourselves make of our time in this world.

---

*Quest.*—Where is the soul of man when he is in a swoon?

*Ans.*—Wherever it is, or whatever it is doing, the body knows nothing of it. The sensitive faculties being useless by the unfitness of the organs, and the common sense, imagination, me-
mory, and all stand still, as the different wheels and motions of a watch or clock, when either the weight is down, or any great spring or wheel is disordered. The soul undoubtedly acts at present by the corporeal organs; and accordingly we are not likely to remember what passes when we are in the condition before mentioned. The soul is still in the body, as much as spirit can be in place, as much as it was before the person first swooned, and remains there as long as the body is any way tenantable, which it may be for some time, though perhaps a little out of repair; or else, for aught we know, till God himself commands it away, to return to him that gave it; and that as really and distinctly as he sends it first into the body of the child in the womb of the mother.

**Quest.**—Whether there is such a particular period set to the life of every particular man, as that he cannot in the course of nature go beyond it, and that he shall fulfil such a period, notwithstanding any dangers of casualties he may engage withal?

**Ans.**—There have been many authors that have controverted this case. The two principal texts, brought by such as hold the affirmative, are that of Job, *Thou hast appointed his bounds, beyond which he cannot pass*; and the other is that of our Saviour, *My hour is not yet come*. The meaning of the first appears to us, that God has
sentenced mankind to mortality, and has so laid the chain of causes, that man shall not outlive the bounds ordinarily of seventy years, or a few more, because of the conveniency of the world, and the succession of generations. As for the second, our Saviour very well knew the conspiracy, time, and manner of his death, with every preceding circumstance that would concur therewith; and therefore he might properly say, "his hour was not yet come," before that time. Common experience shews that the temperate live long and healthful, when the intemperate die quickly. Now for a man to say that God ordains the means and the end, is to say that God is the author of sin:—if so, murders, rapine, violence, and all wickedness whatever, have a safe retreat, namely, a necessity—that it could not be avoided; and if so, farewell rewards and punishments, heaven and hell, nay, even the existence of a Divine Being.

**Quest.**—Does the Scripture any where affirm an election of a determinate number of men to eternal life and happiness?

**Ans.**—We cannot be satisfied, by any of those Scriptures which are brought for that purpose, that there is any such election of a determinate number as either puts a force on their creatures, and irresistibly saves them, or absolutely excludes all the rest of mankind from salvation.
chief texts commonly brought in favour of that opinion are the following: Acts xiii. 48. *As many as were ordained to eternal life believed.* But Grotius and Hammond, Mr. Mede, and others, seem to make it pretty clear that the original word, translated *ordained,* signifies no more than disciplined, listed in the number of those who seek eternal life; being a military word, and so used by good authors; and accordingly, St. Chrysostom, as he is quoted by Dr. Hammond, so interprets the place. "Separated to God, devoted, addicted, prepared, or disposed to eternal life." Another place most frequently urged, and which seems most favourable to this opinion, is that, Eph. i. 4. *As he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.* By the word "election," says Grotius, "is here meant vocation by the Gospel; as, on the contrary, Vocation is sometimes taken for Election: 1 Cor. i. 24. *To them that are called, both Jew and Gentile, Christ, the power of God,* &c. Nor does the word Election improperly signify the great benefits reserved for those who were to live in the time of the Messiah, as the word is taken, 1 Thess. iv. 1; not that hereby is understood the actual calling of the Jews and Gentiles, but the decree for their calling. We add, that there is no doubt but whosoever are saved receive so great a benefit, not through their own merits, but God's mercy in Jesus, to whom all his works were
known from the foundation of the world; that is, from all eternity; but yet we think there is no one place in the Holy Scripture, which proves that so many men, and no more, were irresistibly determined to everlasting salvation.

---

**Quest.**—Why is the sense of approaching death so alarming to some, and yet not at all formidable to others? and which is the noblest, which the easiest death?

**Ans.**—It is alarming, not only to some, but to all—naturally, from that reluctance and horror, arising from the apprehension of approaching dissolution, which we see even in creatures that want reason, from an instinct fixed in their natures for the preservation of their beings; but this is heightened in rational creatures, by a further consideration of hereafter, and the fear of something still behind that is worse than death: both which fears are conquered, at least relieved, in others, either by a custom of facing death, or by a very pious or desperately profligate life.—The noblest death, undoubtedly, is dying for Religion; next to that, for our Country, let the manner be what it will in either. The easiest death is at the mouth of a cannon, where, in the hundredth part of a minute, a man is mounted up to immortality.

---

**Quest.**—Whether the Pentateuch was written by Moses?
Ans.—We prove that these five books were really written by Moses; 1st. from the universal traditional testimony, both of Jews, Christians, and Heathens, much more than we have for Homer's, Pindar's, Virgil's, or Confucius's works, which from a single, narrow, national tradition, we so firmly believe to be theirs whose names they bear, that a man would deserve no other answer but laughter, who affirmed the contrary. The Jews and Christians will not dispute it. The ancient, very ancient Heathens, affirm as much. Orpheus himself, or if not he, one allowedly very ancient author, mentions him, his works, his very name, as clearly as it could be expressed in Greek, and that as a Lawgiver; and quotes out of him the same things we now find in the writings which bear his name.

But we have "infinitely a more sure word of Prophecy;" and are able to demonstrate in this case, as well as several others, that those who deny Moses must deny Our Saviour, for it is he who expressly and frequently appeals to the books of Moses, the Canon being long before that time fixed as it is now. They have Moses and the Prophets, say Our Saviour. Again, in another place, What did Moses command? Why was this asked, if not unanswerable. So St. Luke, xxiv. 27, Beginning at Moses and all the Prophets; and St. Mark, xii. 26. Have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake
unto him. Further, we are able to prove three of those books at least quoted. As his Exodus is called the Book of Moses in the place just mentioned; and again in Heb. ix. 19, Leviticus is said to be the writing of Moses; Romans, v. Deuteronomy in the viith of the Acts, and the 27th; or, what is equivalent, texts are taken from thence, whereof Moses is affirmed to be the author.

The objections against this hypothesis are, the several passages in these writings, which, it is said, agree not to the time of Moses; in the chief are these following:—Gen. xiii. 7; "And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land;" whence it is argued, they dwelt not there now, when this was written; and therefore the book of Genesis was composed after the Canaanites were expelled. Of the same nature is that expression unto this day; for, say the objectors, were not the time wherein those things were transacted long passed, it were not proper for the historian to say things continued in such or such a state to this day. Another argument is, Moses, speaking of himself as a third person, commending, discommending, &c. which they think he would not have done, had he wrote himself; another, the naming of places, particularly Dan, which was not so called till many ages after; another, the death of Moses being described in the last chapter; and lastly, the coherence and connec-
tion between these and the succeeding books, as far as Ezra. And thus we have endeavoured fairly to represent the strength of their objections; whereunto we give the following, and, we hope, satisfactory answers.

And first, should we grant that the high priests or scribes in every age, having the keeping of the Sacred Canon, made what literal or verbal additions or alterations they thought fit, to render them more plain and intelligible to the Church, for whose use they were written: this would clear all the controversy. But we think there is no need of making use of this general shield, while we are able to put by every particular stroke which has been made at the antiquity of these books. The first is, "the Canaanite and the Perizzite were then in the land;" whence they would argue, they were not so at the writing the history: but we deny that to be a fair way of reasoning; the particle then relating not always to time present, but sometimes to the time past, and that as properly as the other. Thus we may say, supposing, in the time of William Rufus, the Normans were then in the land, referring to their not having been so before, or of such or such a year before passed. Supposing one had lived in 1665, the plague was then in the city, not at all affirming it not there when we spoke it. Now, we found good reason for this expression, the Canaanite was then in the land, Gen. xii. 8.
because of what follows, the Lord said, unto thy seed will I give this land; it being a commendation of the faith of Abraham, that he believed what was promised, when there appeared so little likelihood thereof. Again, chap. xiii. ver. 7. There was a strife between Abraham's and Lot's herdsmen, and the Canaanite dwelled then in the land. The inconvenience and scandal of their strife being insinuated, when they were among such ill neighbours; for which reason too, Abraham might urge concord between them, and says: Let there be no strife, for we are brethren.

The second expression, unto this day, signifies an undetermined space of time, more or less, and may as fairly be applied to a short time as a long one. Thus it is said of Rahab the harlot, She herself, not her family, she dwelleth in Israel unto this day, Josh. vi. 25, which therefore could not be long after the time wherein the thing happened.

As for Moses speaking of himself in the third person, so does St. John and many other writers, nothing being more common. As for his commending, disparaging himself, &c. it argues the authority, simplicity, and impartiality of his writings. As for his naming places as they were long after called, we may without violence affirm it prophetical prolepsis; for why may not names of places, as well as things, be spoken of by prophecy, to make the thing prophesied more un-
questionable, when it begins to be fulfilled? as Cyrus and others. For the addition of a few lines at the latter end of Deuteronomy, giving an account of his death, that indeed might be added by succeeding governors, Joshua or Eleazar, as a postscript, though the rest all his own writing.

But then they argue, from the connexion and coherence between the different books, both these five and the succeeding, that they were all the work of one hand; which leads to the examination of the hypothesis which they advance instead of the old one, namely, at the destruction of the Temple, all the copies of the Holy Books were burnt; when (says the Apocrypha) Esdras, or Ezra, by the strength of memory, recovered them again, word for word; say the objectors, he, out of all the sacred books, composed what we have now, giving the first five the name of Moses, to gain them the higher authority, and adding the rest as he thought fit. But neither can this hold; because this story of Ezra is all apocryphal; and much more what they build upon it, because there were several copies of those books written out for the King, and probably too for the Levites and expounders of the Law, in their cities and synagogues; because the book of Moses is mentioned expressly, both in the Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah; because we find in the Writers after their captivity several
Chaldee words, and almost whole chapters, but not so in the Pentateuch, &c.; because the Samaritans had, and still have, the Pentateuch, though they had nothing to do with the Jews after their captivity. Lastly, because the ark of God is described in some of those books, namely, 2 Chron. v. 9. as then, when the book was written, continuing in the same posture as it was when removed by Solomon. "They drew out the staves of the ark, and there they are unto this day: but neither staves nor ark, as it is notoriously known, continued under the second temple; and, as for the corrections, they might be made as the postscript of Deuteronomy, before mentioned.
PART III.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ON

LOVE AND MARRIAGE.

Quest.—What is Love?

Ans.—It is very much like light—a thing that everybody knows, and which none can well explain. It is not money, fortune, jointure, raving, stabbing, hanging, romancing, flouncing, swearing, romping, desiring, fighting, dying, though all those have been, are, and will continue to be, mistaken and miscalled for it. It is a pretty little soft thing, that plays about the heart? and those who have it will know it well enough by this description. It is extremely like a sigh; and could we find a painter that could draw one, you would easily mistake it for the other. It is all over eyes; so far is it from being blind, as some old dotards have described it, who
certainly were blind themselves. It has a mouth too, and a pair of pretty hands; but yet the hands speak, and you may feel at a distance every word that comes from the mouth gently stealing through your very soul. But we dare not make any further inquiries, lest we should raise a spirit too powerful for all our art to lay again.

Quest.—Why Love generally turns to coldness and neglect after marriage?

Ans.—Had the question been proposed universally, as if it always had done so, we must have denied it, since we have in our knowledge instances of some persons who have their flames and raptures, and all that, as Hudibras calls it, as much after the noosing as before; and, to say truth, those who are so are in so fine a dream, that it were both a pity and a cruelty to wake them. But the question is very cautiously and prudently put—Why Love generally turns to coldness? In which sense it is undeniably true, and the reason thereof we shall attempt to give.—Variety has a strange charm in it, and satiety commonly causes loathing; and even manna, every day, would make us weary of it. But this variety may be obtained, this satiety may be cured, where there is at first a virtuous love, grounded on sympathy and similitude; where there are besides wit and discretion; all which have charms that never can be exhausted. Dis-
cretion hides those faults which are generally discovered after marriage, or by degrees removes them; if not, virtuous Love excuses, or at least balances them, and wit has always something entertaining and new; that is the salt and spirit which keeps the sweets of matrimony from growing vapid, dull, and disagreeable. If it is very seldom all these qualifications meet, it is no wonder that the first order as seldom continues; but, where these are, it cannot fail. Thus we have not only shown the reason of this coldness and neglect, so very common after marriage, but also the manner how to avoid it.

**Quest.**—What are the best remedies for Love, and what cure is there for a desperate love?

**Ans.**—There is a story of a monk, that was so desperately in love with a barber's daughter, who lived near his monastery, as to make him absolutely unfit for any business. His abbot had a great kindness for him; and, finding arguments useless, very carefully and fatherly ordered the two Lovers to be shut up together in a close room, and no one to come near them, and their provisions to be put in at a small wicket every day. The monk, for the first week, thought himself in paradise; the second it was pretty well; but the third in purgatory; the fourth, in hell itself; begging at the wicket, of all loves, that the abbot would let him out again, though, he were to live
on nothing but bread and water;—a pleasant remedy enough, but such an one as our desperate lover will hardly find practicable. We therefore advise him to a long absence, hard labour, work it out; for some say it is a lazy disease. Or, if this suit not with their circumstances, let them affront the person loved, and thereby get themselves more absolutely scorned and hated; and if that do not answer, they almost deserve no other but a hempen remedy.

---

**Quest.**—Where is the likeliest place to get a husband in?

**Ans.**—Poor distressed lady! had we but her name; we should be induced to insert an advertisement for her in this book. But, since she has left us in the dark, she must be contented with the best directions we can give her in this weighty matter. We answer, then, that it is the likeliest place to get a Lover where there are fewest Women; and accordingly, if she will venture to ship herself for some of the Plantations by the next fleet, if she is at all marketable, ten to one but one or other will save her longing.

---

**Quest.**—Is absence best for Love?

**Ans.**—Not in the beginning of an amour, but when it is confirmed and settled. It is dangerous at first, because it gives a Rival opportunity to make addresses; and it is in loving as it is in racing—where, if once a horse get the start, it is
not so easily recovered. But when the main dispute is once over, and the heart fairly won, the case is much altered; then, perhaps, being always present is one of the most dangerous, though desired, things that can befall a lover. As acquaintance grows more intimate, our lovers are still less upon their guard; they do not show their best side to one another as at first. Faults will daily be found, unlucky accidents will fall out, such things will be discovered as would never have been suspected nor believed; a thousand little quarrels and piques will arise, which at least produce vexation, oftentimes a final parting. But in absence it is quite the reverse; we willingly forget the faults of those we love, and magnify their excellencies; we embrace and cherish their dear ideas and memories; we are daily expecting and wishing to hear from them; and if we hear, especially by letters, our love is extremely increased by those little subtle messengers: there is all the soul, and more, to be seen in them. We say therein whatever we please, without being put to the trouble of a suitable repartee, or seeking for a kind, and yet discreet answer. All our thoughts are there exhibited at the best advantage, and we may give them just what turn we please. The man may write with as much passion as he pleases; he may set his adorable before him, dressed in as many beauties as his fancy can form, without having the original present to con-
fute him; and write according to the new-found excellence of his ideal mistress, and bring in all the fine things he thinks of. The lady may, with all the caution she pleases, answer him again, and let as much love as she will look out through her prudence; make what promises she pleases, yet with such restrictions and modifications as shall bind her no more than ropes of sand. And when they come once to meet again, there is such ado, with transports, raptures, and the rest, that, in a word, we dare think no longer of it.

**Quest.**—Whether it be lawful for a young lady to pray for a husband; and, if lawful, in what form?

**Ans.**—He must renounce humanity that would not make it as immortal as possible, which is only effected by Marriage, whereby we survive in our children. Misery, without a friend to bear a part, is very afflicting; and happiness, without communication, is tedious. We should be a vagrant sort of animal without Marriage, as if Nature were ashamed of our converse. We should contribute to the destruction of states, condemn the wisdom of the first institutor, and censure the edicts of such commonwealths, who, upon very good grounds, have discountenanced and punished celibacy. Nay, supposing all the miseries that marriage-haters suggest should fall
upon us, it is our own fault, if, with Socrates, we do not learn more by a scolding wife than by all the precepts of philosophers.—Now, if it be lawful to marry, it is lawful for ladies to pray for good husbands, if they find their inclinations, concerns in the world, or other motives, which they are to be judges of, consistent with the ends of such society. As to the form of prayer required, they may, if they please, use the following, if they are not better furnished already:

"From a profane libertine, from one affectedly pious, from one of a starched gravity, or of ridiculous levity, from an ecstasied poet, from a modern wit, from a base coward, and a rash fool; from a Venus darling, from a Bacchus proselyte, from a domestic animal, save me.

"Give me one whose love has more of judgment than passion, who is master of himself, who has an equal flame, a parallel inclination, a temper and soul so like mine, that, as two tallies, we may appear more perfect by union!

"Give me one of a genteel education, with an indifferent fortune, rather independant of the servile fate of palaces, and yet one whose retirement is not so much from the publick as into himself; one above flattery and affront, and yet as careful in preventing the injury as able to repair it; one, the beauty of whose mind should exceed that of his face, yet not deformed so as to be distinguishable from others even into ridicule!
"Give me one that has learned to live much in a little time; one that is no great familiar in converse with the world, nor no little one with himself; who, with these uncommon endowments of mind, may have a sweet, mild, easy disposition; but, as the master-perfection, let him be truly virtuous and good!"

Quest.—Whether it is better to live single, or to marry?

Ans.—Marriage is all in the extremes, nothing moderate in it; it is either accompanied with hatred and bitterness, or full of sweetness and affection; it is either a paradise, or a hell. It is never the latter from its own nature; but from the fault of the persons, who know not how to use it as they ought. Persons are generally so happy in it, that they would not leave it if they might have their choice. When the Emperor Conrade the Third besieged Guedelphus Duke of Bavaria in the city of Wensburg in Germany, the women, perceiving that the town could not possibly hold out long, petitioned the Emperor that they might depart only with so much as each of them could carry on their backs; which the Emperor consented to, expecting they would have loaded themselves with silver and gold, &c.; but they all came forth, every one with her husband upon her back; at which the Emperor was so moved, that he wept, received the Duke into his favour, gave
all the men their lives, and extolled the women with deserved praises.—There needs not a greater instance of there being something in marriage beyond any other enjoyment in the world: but let the ladies judge, since their own sex were parties concerned in this affair.

*Quest.*—Whether fruition diminishes love?

*Ans.*—If the love terminates upon the senses, and fixes not upon the soul, human weakness is soon weary, and inclined to change; and familiarity breeds contempt. But such a love as centers upon virtue, modesty, and mental endowments, cannot be cloyed, because it is always increasing, and the mind always as active. To question whether we love such a subject when we possess it, is to ask whether love be love;—passion before enjoyment is desire, but possession alone is capable of producing true love. Now, the perfection of any thing must be its completion, and not destruction; friendship is by acts increased; and no doubt but, if there was occasion, there might be found many married persons that would not hesitate to imitate the noble contention of Gracchus and Cornelia, by choosing to die for one another.

*Question.*—Why men obliged do still fresh loves pursue, While those denied are generally true?

*Answer.*—By wind and water sparks and flames arise, While soon the quiet flame in ashes dies.
Question (From the Ladies).—
How Love to all our hearts the way can find,
When he himself, vain deity, is blind?
Answer.—Unless ourselves we yield, he can't command;
He finds the way because we guide his hand.

1.
Question.—Say, if your studies can devise,
Or what new methods can you find,
That men, made up of oaths and lies,
May yet be charm'd by womankind?
2.
Or, since the task so hard does prove,
What is 't that our poor sex must do,
While, though we would declare our love,
'Tis yet too dangerous to woo?
3.
If we surrender soon our hearts,
Those easy conquests soon disdain,
Yet rail at all our female arts,
And swear that maids should never feign.
4.
How wretched then is virgin youth,
Which neither path can safely try,
Since Scorn attends on speaking truth,
And Virtue yet forbids to lie!

Answer.—A brave resistance gives renown,
While easy conquests all disdain;
The longer you defend the town,
The greater honour still you gain.
2.
Nor ever was 't esteem'd disgrace,
When there's no succour in the field,
Although you'll not betray the place,
On honourable terms to yield.
3.
That weak within, you need not own
To those who eagerly pursue;
Nor are without, our forces known,
But you cheat us, and we cheat you.

4.
From questions by ensnaring youth
Proposed, your wit must set you free;
You need not tell us all the truth,—
You're on your oaths no more than we.

**Quest.**—I have promised Marriage against the consent of my friends; which they suspecting have resolved to marry me to another, for whom I have a great aversion:—how am I to behave myself in this difficult affair?

**Ans.**—The resolving of two questions will clear all the difficulty in this affair. Whether a promise of marriage is binding when made against the consent of friends? and, Whether friends have any power to force consent to marriage? For the first, if the person be of years of discretion, the promise is really binding, so as never to marry any other, but to marry that person as soon as all obstructions are removed; but the want of parents' consent is a very just obstruction as long as they live, though not any longer, for they have no power to disannul any such contract or promise, when once actually and solemnly made.
With respect to the second question, so far as children are under government, and not at their own disposal, they undoubtedly sin in making such promises, and cannot perform them till their parents' consent, or death, gives them liberty. But so far as they are free and rational creatures, they have a power of disposing of themselves; for so much power no parent himself, unless a tyrant, can deny them. Children are neither cattle nor slaves; they have therefore at least a negative voice, even where there was no prior obligation, much more where there is; though, supposing there were none, they ought to submit to their parents' choice, unless where it is a plain case that it would make them miserable. The positive promise in this case was unlawful, nor is it to be actually performed without the parents' consent or death; yet the parent has no power to annul this promise, much less to force their child to marry any other.

Quest.—A lady with a good fortune has a mind to marry; but is unwilling to have either a fool, a fop, or a beau, a cotquean, a book-learned sot, or one they call a sober honest man—such an one, I mean, as goes plodding about all day, minding only the main chance—in the evening, for his diversion, drinks his pint, or smokes some hours in a tavern with company that pleases him, comes home and grumbles at his wife if the day's
expences have been a halfpenny extraordinary—that will buy his wife some good clothes to go abroad with him on holidays, or to a neighbour's christening; hardly else allowing her to stir; and sometimes gives her half-a-crown in her pocket, of which she must render an exact account. I now say, a woman being to make her choice, which of these, think you, is the least evil? and, if she likes none of them, what sort of a husband must she choose?

 Ans.—The lady is a little difficult; and seems not in haste to be married, if she stays till a husband offers that is not touched with any of the characters she has given.

Let us compare these fine rivals, and see which of them best deserves the honour of a lady's love. For the first, a Fool, whom for the present we will suppose distinguished from his near kindred that follow, fop, beau, &c. Some of the fair sex would make choice of a fool that they might govern, as the fool husband would have no brains for the task. But one should think a preposterous desire of domination would hardly outweigh the inconvenience of his nauseous folly; besides that, sometimes the lady may be mistaken; for some fools are certainly the most unmanageable beasts in nature, and a wise woman will not desire to have more of her own will than a wise man would permit her.—Exit Fool.

Now for Fop, who only thinks a little better of
himself than his elder brother, though of the self-same family; he has as little wit, though more noise; he is not so heavy as his brother, and is hardly so much fool as madman — a dancing, singing, empty creature, and may make an indifferent plaything, but a bad husband, unless you intend to share him with all the kind souls in the nation.—The Beau is only a Fop of the last edition, a very fortune-hunter, and therefore the ladies must look to themselves, for he aims as sharply at all the young, as the crazy King of Portugal used to do at the old women, and hopes as surely to fetch them down with his heart-breakers as the other with his blunderbuss. He is in love with his clothes as much as the Fop with himself; he is all garniture. Could a lady change him as oft as he does his fashions, it would be a little safer venturing upon him; but she may have him a better bargain if she can find any way to purchase his clothes, for she then has all of him, or at least a more essential part than either his soul or body.—For a Cotquean, it is an awkward sort of a creature too to make a husband of; but the best is, he will be more troublesome to the maids in the kitchen than to you; and besides, you will be sure to have him much at home; for this two-legged turnspit, exactly contrary to his brother brute, cannot endure to be out of the way when the cook has any business.—For a Book-learned Sot, the truth is, it is very hard to have him always making love
to his books, and forget his own flesh and blood; and it may tempt a lady sometimes to wish herself a book, that she may now and then be folded down, or turned over; but, for the most, those wives have no reason to complain, for they have their husbands always at home, safe locked up as their plate or jewels, and can resort to them for advice as often as there is occasion. Lastly, for the sober honest man, who minds the main chance, &c. one would think he should please; but then he goes plodding about all day, and drinks his pint of wine at the tavern in the evening; perhaps too stays out late at night;—why, all this is pretty tolerable; nor is what follows very ill—buys his wife good clothes, lets her go abroad to see her neighbours, gives her a little money to spend; though, if she has but wit enough to prevent being a beggar, if she has a good fortune she will reserve to herself so much when she gives the rest as never to be reduced to such meanness; and, if the man can afford it, he will give her a weekly allowance for family expences, without either requiring or undertaking the drudgery of trifling accounts. However, this character is easily distinguishable from the rest; and we suppose the lady means by it, a hum-drum, brainless, wooden fellow—a mere husband, with no life, nor spirit, nor conversation—in a word, a trading blockhead, which no ingenuous woman would be bound apprentice to for life if she could avoid it.
If she be at her own disposal, it is almost impossible in this case to be deceived; for the man described is such a kind of thing as no disguise will conceal; he must shew himself when he puts on his holyday suit, and steps a-courting, though leaving word whither he is gone, for fear of a customer; nor can he so much as ask the grand question out of his shopboard phrase, "Madam, what do you please to buy?" However, this we think more tolerable than most of his rivals. The Fool is too bad. The Fop, the Beau, and brisk careless fellow, will, if possible, beggar himself, and you, and all his family. The Cotquean is more proper for a scullion than a husband. This plodding main-chance fellow you speak of will secure you good clothes, and one of the highest pews in the church, while he lives; and, if he happens to drop off, leaves you another chance, and your fortune better than ever. Nor have we forgot him that we left plodding in his study, whom perhaps sympathy makes us inclined to vote for before all the rest. He is no fool, though he may look like one; he is generally sound and honest—not so the Fop and Beau; he plagues you not in the kitchen like Sir Cot, nor calls you coram nobis for the odd farthings in buying a piece of beef, like your lump of a spark behind the counter; but lets you alone, to rule and order his family, buy as many fine clothes as you please, and do what you like best; and, unless you
want an angel, where could you find a better than a virtuous lover of learning?

_QUEST._—Being lately in the country, I fell in the company of two sisters of equal fortunes, the elder handsome, and of a sweet temper, the younger a perfect beauty, her temper but so so; however, at first sight she quite enflamed me, but her conversation somewhat cooled the fire her eyes had kindled. In the mean time, the conversation of the other absolutely charmed me. I love to look on the one I love, to discourse with the other. In this state of divided love I met with a third, neither fair nor good-natured, but possessing a large fortune. Which ought I to choose, beauty, or good-humour, or tenfold riches?

_ANS._—To begin with the beauty, which generally attracts soonest, though it seldom holds longest, we can by no means vote for her; for, if she be without good-humour, she is nothing but a gilded bawble. Beauty soon dies; a fit of sickness, or bearing a few children, soon spoils it, and, though it does well before marriage, there are but few who admire it afterwards. Besides, even a froward temper, if there is nothing else, soon decays it; for a face that is often used to wear voluntary wrinkles will at length contract natural ones; and a sour air spoils the finest face in the world. A man courts for a short time, but when he marries he is fixed for life. There is no
remedy for a man that has a scolding wife, except a little cotton for his own ears, or a drum for hers. Nor is the rich fool much more eligible. It is true, were the fortune to be had without the lawful incumbrance, or were it lawful, after the honey-moon was over, to carry her down for a few months to the Fens of Lincolnshire, or the Hundreds in Essex, there might be something to be said in favour of it; though we should think it as hard fortune, were it our own case, to be turned out of the world because old and rich, as we do that the poor giants in romances should be all knocked on the head, merely because they were larger and stronger than other men. No, better leave her and all her luggage at a safer distance; never be a slave, only to see the golden fetters glitter. If she is deformed, or a fool, all the beautiful faces she has in her bags will not keep her own from frightening you; she will soon grow disagreeable; for a fool in the house is like one on the stage—it never shews well twice. She with a moderate face and fortune, and very good humour, is the girl; there being many inconveniences in uniting with the other, but none at all, or at least but what are common, in venturing on the third, the elder of the two country sisters.

Quest.—Is it possible to love so well after marriage as before? and if it be, what are the best means of preserving so great a happiness?
Ans.—If by loving as well be meant loving with the same ardour and sensitive pleasure as before, it is impossible. But though in this sense there are not many love so well, unless after long absence, yet undoubtedly there are many who love far better in another sense, in that love which has less of the sense—and more of the soul in it. This love, like wine, grows finer and more spirituous by age; it more resembles friendship. Wherever such persons meet as are possessed of many noble qualities, the more they are acquainted the more they love.

The directions how to preserve so great a happiness are—first, to love those who have something to recommend them besides beauty, wit, or fortune; any of which alone are but mean companions when we are to have no other society all our lives. To all these let good-humour be added; and discretion, virtue, and piety, if you know where to find them. When thus met, let nothing but death part you, and never be both angry at once. But, if you must sometimes fall out, be so wise as to take your turns, and, when it is over, learn the excellent art of forgetfulness; or, if you remember any thing, let it be each for yourselves, not, as is common, for one another. And, as the crown of all, let your love be in one sense truly spiritual; not only love the body, but the soul, that you may never part, here or hereafter!
Quest. — I am a married man; but, having a very bad wife, have been parted from her some years, and design never to live with her more. Now I desire your advice, whether I may pray to God to take her to himself, that I may endeavour to make myself happy in another mate?

Ans. — Surely, if she is fit for Heaven she is fit for you; as, if she were as good while you lived with her as she is now, how came you to part. But, supposing the cause were sufficient, and she is yet no better; it would yet be handsomer to submit to God's will, and wait with patience; or rather pray for her improvement, and that she may not be taken hence till she is prepared for Heaven.

Quest. — A gentleman having been formerly in love, and disappointed, offered his hand to another lady, who refuses to receive him, because she thinks it not possible for a gentleman who has been in love before to love again with the same ardour and affection as at first.

Ans. — The lady has nothing to fear; the majority give their suffrage in the affirmative. This is clear, if we consider how often some are married, how many have been disappointed in their affections, either by parents' compulsions, their own quarrels, or upon second or more advised thoughts, and yet, after all, have proved happy instances of an extraordinary affection. Nor can
we see any reason to the contrary, since the affection terminates not so much in the person as in the qualifications of those who are loved; it is there only that a wise man’s interest is secured. I am ready to confess, sensual love hates a rival, and perhaps cannot be twice passionately fixed. But the soul is unconfined and free, is ignorant of the name of rival, as also of the distinction of sexes; it fixes and removes, as unbiassed and sober reason dictates. Where that fixes, and is secured, the lesser, I mean that of the person, always submits; at least so far as is necessary for an easy and comfortable life. An agreeable converse, and union of soul, never cloy; but are equally vigorous in youth and age, and in all states and conditions where the fear of God resides.

**Quest.** — A gentleman being in love with a young lady, and having disclosed himself to her with all kindness, she slighted him, and never would own she had any respect for him; on which the courtship dropped: now, having gained the affection of another, the former charges him with inconstancy. It is required to know, to which of them he should cleave?

**Ans.**—You are obliged to keep to the last, having already made your addresses to her, and handsomely retreated from the first; though we should not have commended your haste, but that we suppose gratitude might have a little influence
on you; and indeed it is too commonly practised to refuse or despise a fair lady, only because she loves first.

**Quest.**—A young man having married a young woman who was well descended, but her fortune being far inferior to her inward endowments, the marriage was disapproved of by her husband's relations; insomuch that they leave no means unattempted to set the young couple at variance; the consequence whereof, it is feared, will prove destructive to each other's happiness. She, being virtuously inclined, desires advice in her behaviour towards her husband's relations in such a case?

**Ans.**—This is so common an error in parents, that the lady cannot much wonder at it; and though the commonness of it will not excuse the wickedness in respect to *them*, it may in some degree make *her* more easy under it; and it is not improbable but, in time, by bearing all their unhandsome reflections without seeming to resent them, and respecting them as the relations of her husband, she may convince them that such a good and prudent wife is a much more suitable match to one that can maintain her, than a golden one without these qualities. Yet, should this produce not the wished-for effect, it will not miss of its reward; since it is natural to suppose that her husband, who already loves her for her merit,
will esteem her still more; though, should this also fail, she cannot want that satisfaction of mind which always results from having acted wisely, and done our duty.

**Quest.**—I am a young woman, and have been very dutiful to my parents; but now they have proposed a husband for me whom I cannot love: therefore how shall I discharge my duty? whether to oblige my parents, and live an uncomfortable life (for I cannot expect any other, where minds are not equally agreed); or to disoblige them, by refusing what they so earnestly importune?

**Ans.**—As a child cannot lawfully dispose of itself without the consent of its parents, so on the other hand the parents cannot marry their children without their consent. Indeed, a duty to our parents, and the respect we should have for their judgments, should be of more weight in this affair than a childish unreasonable fancy, and which, in all probability, will be the ruin of the person that entertains it; though, on the contrary, where it is covetousness, or some accountable whim, that is the motive in the parents, the many unhappy examples that have been in such matches should prevail with them against such injunctions; and we think it not undutifulness in children to deny their compliances, after all just methods, by the intercession
of friends and entreaties to the contrary. There is no greater barbarity in nature than unequal matches; the mines and galleys are trifles to it in this life, and it is too often the earnest of worse hereafter.

**Quest.**—Whether it is honourable for a lady to answer a gentleman's letters, when she intends not to entertain him?

**Ans.**—It is true that writing is a nice thing, but it is not every letter that will bear being seen. Men, when repulsed, often grow malicious and desperate, and will make what interpretation they please of what is written; or, if it is too prudently expressed to admit any cavils, which is almost impossible, they will as severely censure the very action of writing, or else interpret it too favourably for themselves, and put the lady to further trouble in undeceiving them; for which reason, it had been much more proper if the query had been, whether such writing had been prudent, rather than honourable, which, in most instances, must have been resolved in the negative. However, there may be some singular cases, wherein it may be both honourable and prudent for the lady to write; as when she is satisfied the person she writes to is a man of honour, and cannot otherwise so well disengage him from a fruitless amour.

**Quest.**—Having an intimate acquaintance with
a lady of quality and fortune, and being by frequent and familiar expressions of uncommon favours induced into a belief of more than ordinary kindness, I at last declared my ambitious affection;—at which she rejected my proposals with the greatest regret and disdain, yet notwithstanding continues a more strict and kind correspondence than ever, so long as I mention not any thing, or send any letter tending to my former address; but, as often as I court her complacency, she not only gives me sharp denials, but for some time absents herself from me. Yet I am informed of her uneasiness and melancholy temper when I am gone, and of the pleasure and satisfaction she takes when I am talked of, or in company. Likewise our daily private conversation, both the freedom and liberty of honourable actions, discourse, and silent natural love, not only confirm me in the belief of it, but I am convinced on all hands, and apparently perceive she loves me extremely well.

Now, being fully assured I shall never gain her consent or prevail upon her by express courtship, and knowing that she is a lady of honour and entire chastity, I desire to know what method I shall use to marry her, without either speaking or writing to her of love and affection?

Ans.—It would be well if you could conjure here one of the mutes of the seraglio to be your tutor for one quarter of a year, and teach you to
make dumb love, in which they so much excel. But, since the black art is not lawful, and it would take a long time to fetch the mute either by land or sea, you must be content with the Council of Christendom in this weighty affair. But, first, we congratulate your happiness in having a mistress that will not put you to the expense of oaths or falsehoods, or so much as pen, ink, and paper; indeed, you seem not properly to estimate your good fortune. Why, how many silly things are we poor militant lovers obliged to talk to our mistresses before we can thoroughly deceive them! what a parcel of plays and romances must we plunder for whole nosegays of flowers to present to the ladies of our best affection! Now, all this is clear gains to you; for a penny saved, you know, is a penny gained; and you may even besiege the town without all these lines of circum and contravallation. Well, all this is by way of reprehension. Now for a little direction and exhortation, of which one should think, too, you had no great need. She loves you; she loves to look upon you, to talk with you, and of you, and gives you all the honourable marks of silent natural love; and cannot you love her in her own way, let her love which way she pleases? What if she should require such tokens of love as the African ladies do, and expect you should stand still and admire her, while she pinched and bit you till she made
her obdurate teeth and nails meet in your patient lips and knuckles? But only to sit still and be loved, one would think, should be no very difficult matter. If you must say nothing, cannot you look as well as think the more? Nay, cannot you speak side-ways, though you may not directly; and good speed is often made by sailing upon a side-wind. Thus you may insensibly gain upon her; till at last, if she is a woman, she will speak to you to speak, or give some shrewd signs she would have you no longer silent. But, if she would have you dumb everywhere else, when you think it proper time, try if she will let you speak at church, and herself answer you, since perhaps she has a mind to be surprized in her happiness. In the mean time be patient, observant, and submissive, and no doubt you will gain your point.

---

**Quest.**—Is Love good or evil to us? And which is most laudable, to place it upon mankind, or some other object, as fame, &c.?

**Ans.**—Next to existence itself, the capacity of loving is the greatest gift that God has bestowed upon man; since, by that faculty only, he is fitted for the enjoyment of all outward goods, and the more noble and excellent the object is, so much is it the more capable of giving us an extensive and durable happiness; therefore, the
love of each other is preferable to that of honours, fame, and riches; and our inconstancy and bad choice is the reason why it is so indifferently relished among us.

---

**Quest.**—Whether the woman's condition in marriage be not worse than the man's?

**Ans.**—It much depends on her own conduct. Nature has generally given the woman art enough; by which, if either she herself, or custom, or law, has given our sex any advantage over theirs, they may, if they please, recover more than their own again. In child-birth they have doubtless much more reason to wish the human race might propagate like trees, than man has to desire any such thing, though one of our own sex (Brown), author of "Vulgar Errors," first started that odd whimsey.

---

**Quest.**—What way shall a shame-faced virgin take, to let a person know she loves him?

**Ans.**—If the lady who proposes this question has either hands or eyes, she need not be taught how to use them, unless her spark is a fool, or blind, or never leads her.

---

**Quest.**—Whether it is right for a woman to marry one she does not love, in hopes that love will come after?

**Ans.**—There is a great deal of difference in not
Loving a person, and not being able to love him, as having an unconquerable aversion to him, either from secret unaccountable causes—as who can give a satisfactory reason why so many people have an antipathy to cheese, unless that they were surfeited of milk before they were weaned; or else such an aversion be grounded on some disagreeableness in a man's person or disposition, which may be very difficult to conquer. In both those cases it is not prudent, nor, we think, lawful to marry, because one end of matrimony, mutual comfort and support, can never be answered; besides, you will find so much to bear with and forgive in your husband, as well as he in you, that, unless you are both angels, without this love on both sides to sweeten and unite, you are like to lead but a miserable life. But, in truth, men are not so complaisant after marriage as before; and perhaps you must do all yourself towards loving them, since they generally think they have said all their part before matrimony.

**Quest.**—I wish to be informed what bounds Religion and Reason prescribe to Love; and whether it be not possible, let women be ever so excellent, to sin in over-loving them: I mean, in such love as is itself lawful, towards one particular person?

**Ans.**—Love and Poetry, as they are related in other respects, so are they in this, that they have
bonds and shackles. Cupid, as well as Apollo, is a sort of Pindarical gentleman. He is, you must know, a god too, such a one as it is, and looks as big, with his bows and arrows, as his uncle Jupiter himself, with all his thunder, though Vulcan had just hammered them a new set of bolts out of a forge, and filed them as bright as his mother Juno's forehead. But to say no more of these heathen gods and loves; there is no doubt but the love of a wise and good man ought to be, however difficult the work, confined within the bounds of Religion and Reason, unless he will love irreligiously, or like a distracted person. As for those bounds, they are to be fixed by the bounds of a superior love; and such undoubtedly is, or ought to be, our love to Heaven, to our country, ourselves, and perhaps our parents, at least before marriage; for, though we are "to leave father and mother, and cleave to a wife," yet it is no-where said so of a mistress. As for the second question, the resolution of it depends upon the first, for it is possible to love a woman more than any of these objects which ought to be preferred before her. That Love is disorderly, and a transgression both of the laws of Religion and Reason; though it is difficult to find one who loves in earnest, that has yet nothing to answer for on that account.

Quest.—Whether a young lady ought, in rea-
son or prudence, to keep by her, after she is married, any letters or pictures from any of her former admirers?

Ans.—It may seem in itself an indifferent thing, unless in some few circumstances, which totally alter the case. One is, if the husband be inclined to jealousy; another, if the lady, when married, loved any other person more than her husband, whose letters and pictures might, on that account, be as dangerous for her to keep about her, as on the other imprudent. There may yet be one case more, wherein it may not be convenient for her to keep any thing received of a former lover; and that is, when there is a probability such persons may speak unhandsomely of her if she keep such things, and, being enraged at losing her, may easily take occasion so to speak.

Quest.—A lady desires to know when she shall have a husband?

Ans.—We read of a waggish boy, who went to the Delphic Oracle with a live sparrow in his hand, and proposed this question, "Whether the sparrow was dead or alive?" designing that, if the Oracle had answered dead, to have shewn it alive; but, if the Oracle had answered alive, to have crushed it in his hand, and produced it dead. But the Oracle answered: In te situm, &c. "It is in thy power to produce it either alive or
dead. I am sensible the lady needs not to be instructed in the application, which, if she designs in the affirmative, I would not have her to neglect her form of prayer.

---

**Quest.**—After what manner should a gentleman, at the first visit, accost his mistress?

**Ans.**—Mistresses are to be attacked, like towns, according to their fortifications, situation, or garrison; no general rule, in such cases, can be given. Some are weak of one side, some of another, which a cunning engineer will soon find out. Some are to be mined, some to be bombed, some won by storm, others by composition, others to be starved into a surrender. The pleasantest way of courtship we ever heard of was that of a very old, very rich, very covetous, very foolish, very ugly humble servant, to a fine young lady; whom, having taken abroad in his coach, after some prefatory hums and haws, and genteel leers, he pulls out from under his coat his great bossed Bible, with silver clasps, and, turning to the beginning of Genesis, shews her not that text, *Increase and multiply*, which it is very likely he held his thumb upon, but another, a little after it, *It is not good for a man to be alone*; and thereupon made her a very seasonable holding-forth on the uses and excellencies of matrimony.

Some termagant wits, like Sylvia in "The Sol-
dier's Fortune," are only to be won by downright caterwauling; that is, rambling, and fighting, and scratching, breaking legs and arms and necks, and then to purring again. But a woman of sense, as she hates on one side a freakish lover, or a supple fop that is alternately kneeling, and cringing, and whining; so she will never endure stiffness, pride, and haughtiness, which as ill becomes love as it does devotion; and the greater her birth and fortune are, something of a proportionably greater respect ought to be paid her: in a word, a modest assurance, a manly behaviour, a tenderness for all her inclinations, a diligent observation of her temper and humour, faithfulness, assiduity, liberality, and good sense, will at last carry her, if she is not pre-engaged, or wholly impregnable.

---

**Quest.**—Whether fondness after marriage is more pardonable in man or woman?

**Ans.**—It is silly enough to both, as well as indecent, to be always slabbering, like a couple of horses rubbing one another. It often shows all things are not well behind the curtain, when there is so much love before folks; and there is danger lest their love should not last long, if they squander it away too fast at their first setting up. But to compare this fondness of both sexes, we think it seems worst in a man; because there it is most unnatural, and looks, like a woman with a
beard, so very monstrous, that all the street points at her wherever she appears.

**Quest.**—Whether it is better to marry a woman with a singular good temper, and not truly religious; or a shrewd, of a crabbed temper, that is religious?

**Ans.**—For the first, there are hopes of her, if she is of a good temper, and that well managed, that she may improve, and, by God's mercy, become truly pious and religious; though, if not, we believe even a good man might live more comfortably with her than the other, who, after all, may not prove very religious; for it is certainly true of woman, as well as man, if they bridle not their tongue, all their Religion is vain.

**Quest.**—Can a tender friendship between two persons of different sexes be innocent?

**Ans.**—Such a friendship is not only innocent, but commendable, and as advantageous as it is delightful. A strict union of souls is the essence of friendship. There is no sex in souls; nor, while those only are concerned, can any thing that is criminal intrude. It is a conversation truly angelic; and has so many charms in it, that the friendships between man and man bear no comparison to it. The very souls of the fair sex, as well as their bodies, are more delicate than those of men, while men reckon themselves possessed of a more solid judgment and stronger
reason. Nor can any thing on earth give a greater or purer pleasure than communicating such knowledge to a worthy person, who, if of the fair sex, by the charms of her conversation inexpressibly sweetens the present labours; and, by the advantage of a fine mind and good genius, often advances such notions as the instructor himself would not otherwise have thought of.

Quest.—Is it lawful to make addresses to young ladies without previously consulting their parents and relatives?

Ans. Gallantry and duty, in this case, generally advise to very different measures; and, as the world goes, a lady would give her admirer but small thanks for first making love to her father and mother. But to come to the point.

We may divide addresses to a lady, like attacks on a town, into two ranks; they are either loose blockades, or formed sieges. The first are not of so great consequence; whereas, the latter ought not to be laid or raised without deeper consideration. It is easy to apply this. A general conversation with a lady is requisite, to know, if possible, whether she deserves to be loved; and this before any application be made to the parents for a formal courtship. I would advise to make applications both to the daughter and parents as near as possible at the same time, that neither might conceive any umbrage of each other. The
latter part of the question, indeed, admits of many distinctions. There is, first, a great difference between immediate parents and more remote relations; and perhaps, too, between some parents and others.

*Quest.*—Whether it is lawful to marry a person one cannot love, only in compliance to relations, and to get an estate?

*Ans.*—Had the question only been proposed of such as we do not actually love, it might perhaps have admitted of some limitation, since we sometimes see persons love tenderly after marriage, who could hardly endure each other's sight before; though even such an experiment must be very hazardous; and he must be a bold man who dares venture upon it: but as it is proposed, whether we may marry such as we cannot love, it is beyond all doubt, and must be answered in the negative, since such a practice would be most cruel and imprudent. Society is the main end of marriage. Love is the bond of society, without which there can neither be found in that state pleasure, or profit, or honour; he, then, or she, that marries for so base an end as profit, without any possibility or prospect of Love, is guilty of the highest brutality imaginable, and is united to a carcass without a soul; this being also but too general a truth, as one wittily observes, "That he who marries a woman he could never love, will, it is
to be feared, soon love a woman he never married?

**Quest.**—What course must a person take to remove a lady's aversion to him, supposing her under some previous engagement?

**Ans.**—A pre-engagement of that nature is so sacred a thing, that no man in his sober reason ought to contribute any thing towards the breaking of it, on which account it would scarcely be honest to give directions for the attempting of it. But if the question be simply how to conquer a lady's aversion—that admits of a fair answer. The best way is, after having found her humour, to ply her close; do not let her, if possible, so much as sleep, which they say is the way to tame the wildest creature in the world: or if she does sleep, be so often with her that she can dream of nothing but you. This only receipt has the greatest effect on most of the fair sex, who, if you persevere long enough, will be forced at last to love you in their own defence. As they give alms to beggars to be rid of them and their importunities, so they will give themselves to their lovers to be rid of their wooings.

**Quest.**—Whether, if females went a-courting, there would not be more marriages than there now are?

**Ans.**—I think not so many, at least if they
only were to court, and we to be silent; for as courage is the most proper virtue of man, so modesty is of a woman (though we meet with them sometimes in the contrary sexes); for which reason many ladies would die sooner than stoop to what they think so mean a practice; as we have had instances of some who have actually done so; it is their interest as well as their inclination to be on the defensive, for it is certain that most men slight those females who fall in love with them; most of all if they proffer, or almost force themselves upon them.

Quest.—How shall a man know when a lady loves him?

Ans.—First find out, if you can, whether she has loved any other before, for that renders the case much more difficult; for one that has been deceived herself knows how to deceive you. Jealousy is counted one pretty sure sign of love, but I think it much such another as convulsions are of life. If a woman tells you she loves, there is no way but believing her; indeed, there are hardly any of the tokens of that passion but are fallible, though the shrewdest sign that a woman loves you is her marrying you.

Quest.—Whether beauty be real or imaginary?

Ans.—Custom and opinion go a great way towards making a deformity or a beauty; and how
shall we know who is right, he that abuses the Negro for his flat nose and thick lips, or the Negro, who abuses the other for his thin lips and high nose? Nor has complexion any better fate than proportion; one who is born white among the blacks being as great a monster as a black among those that are white. However, as exceptions do not set aside general rules, there must be a best somewhere; white is lovely, and black horrid — one resembling the light, and the other darkness. In these things, therefore, we place beauty; namely, features, proportion, complexion, mien, and air. There is such a thing as a good feature taken by itself — some things being shaped more neatly than others, as we may see in a horse compared with an elephant — a greyhound with a swine. And this is something in Nature, independent from the fancy or judgment of any man. Now this feature, as it is a real beauty, so it is distinct even from proportion. We see persons who have some good features, nose, mouth, chin, &c.; whereas the rest may either be deformed or unproportionable, not bearing that due regard of situation or magnitude one to another which at first sight appears pleasing or natural. A good mien relates to all the body, a fine air to the face only; a good mien is but of one sort, and more easily described than an air; it signifies the handsome appearance some people make when you take them all together. And this, though there may be something of it in
Nature, yet it is chiefly owing to education; whereas a good air is perfectly natural, and impossible to be given by all the art in the world; for sometimes we see a face with lines of majesty in it, that, like Caesar's, or Gustavus Adolphus', dazzles all that beholds it, and is so sharp and piercing, that it is almost insupportable; at other times we meet with such an incomparable sweetness, that it charms all that see it, and those who have it we rather call pretty than beautiful, since it is often found where there is scarcely one good feature. Now it is a rare happiness indeed to see a face at once both sweet and majestic, though, when discovered, they conquer the world. What then must they do, when the owners of them have the advantages of a good mien, good features, just proportion, and a fine complexion? Complexion is of the least value, for it soonest fades; fools often have it, and we are not agreed which is the best. We rank good features in the next place, with which may be reckoned proportion, since, in general, one cannot be without the other. Better than both appears a good mien, for it lasts longer, and recommends more, especially in a man, where the face is not of much importance. Best of all a good air, because, when good mien and complexion fail—when there is sometimes little that we like either in feature or proportion—a good mien always lasts; and nothing but death, and hardly that, can alter or destroy it.
Quest.—I have a dreadful scold of a wife, and would willingly give you half my estate to tell me how to tame her?

Ans.—That we will do for nothing, on condition you will not turn the old proverb upon us. The method we would prescribe for taming your shrew is, laugh at her, and let her scold on till she is weary; seem to take no notice of her; do as a mastiff would to a little whiffling cur that barks at him; say nothing to her, unless a little by the bye; and perhaps, when she sees herself slighted, she will burst for mere vexation.

Quest.—Whether is the man or the woman more subject to love?

Ans.—The question is very evident. A man is sooner taken and wrapped in love than a woman; for we see that the man, who is born to a thousand good and great enterprizes, does, for the sake of love, abandon all the glory and honour of the world.

Quest.—There is a gentleman whose friends are very desirous to see him settled before their death. He has now the offer of four wives. The one a very considerable fortune, but nothing else to recommend her, and this lady he despises; but this his friends most approve of. Another a very beautiful lady, young, gay, and brisk; and though she is not over wise, yet her person is very hand-
some, and he could love her extremely. The third is a lady of great goodness, high generosity, and abounding in wit. This he esteems above them all, but knows not where to fix; for there is a fourth, that courts him with all the insinuation and passion imaginable, but she is a coquette; excepting that, she is every way a desirable match?

Ans.—Poor Gentleman! he is like to be stifled with kisses, and in great danger of being pressed to death with roses. How many an honest man now would be glad of the worst bit of his leavings! But to business; if the propagation of guineas were the only end of marriage, the first would do best; if neither men nor women have souls, as some Turks and Jews think of the latter, and a few fools of the former, the second would be most desirable. If a man were obliged to cut his own throat, or, what is worse, turn a galley slave, and tug at the matrimonial oar till death do them part, purely and only to save a woman's longing, then let him take the last that is in love with him. But, if he is for a match of body and soul together, let him even "to have and to hold" it with the third, who, if they have but enough to live above contempt or care, can want no fortune while she has so large a share of wit, goodness and generosity.

Quest.—How far may Singing and Music be proper in making love?
Am.—There is nothing that charms the soul more than fine Music. It is almost impossible for any thing to resist it; though in vocal still more than instrumental. It smooths all the rugged passions of the soul, and, like beauty, bewitches into love almost before persons know where they are. But even here, as well as in all other cases, extremes are to be avoided, nothing being more ridiculous than an eternal farewell to love; and a lady of sense would as soon make choice of a singing-master, as one who is always tiring her with hard names and doleful ditties. He must then sing very rarely; not be of the humour of most songsters, who neither know when to begin nor make an end. His performances must be natural and easy, and carry something of a free and genteel air; and he must never himself appear too well pleased with them, but order it so, that he may seem to oblige the lady, not himself, by his melody.

Quest.—How may a man reclaim an unruly woman?

Ans.—Give her rope enough; let her alone, for she is not to be made civil by any thing but the worms. But if you have a mind to try to work miracles, you may use some of the following directions. Watch her tame; that is the last remedy first. This is a way to tame even lions and tigers. Some beat a drum till their poor women
have been perfectly dumb and deaf with the noise. Some are for letting blood under the tongue, or in both arms, to prevent her scolding or fighting. Others are for drawing teeth, which would do well enough if they could cut the nails too at the same time. But the surest way of all is being a good husband yourself; for being bad husbands are very often the cause that the wives are no better than they should be.

Quest.—Why women are for the most part fonder and falser than men?

Ans.—We shall deny they are so for the most part, until the Querist has told all the noses in the world. For their fondness, none ever went further in the trial of it, than Spenser's Squire of Dames. And he made the experiment but on three hundred. But that is all a spiteful fable, invented by the angry Poet for the loss of his mistress. And would some fair lady make the same trial, undoubtedly she would find fewer denials than he did, supposing the story true. Then for their being falser too, the objector unluckily destroys one part of the calumny by the other; for if fonder indeed, we men are generally the painters, and order all things as we please. We write the histories of women, and represent ourselves and them as we think fit; but they seldom write our lives, or defend themselves. But grant the observation true in some cases, yet
the poor ladies are easily excused. If they are fond, it is disingenuous to blame them; and we seldom think them so, till we are willing to leave them. If they are false, we teach them to be so, and they are often driven into it either out of despair or revenge.

---

**Quest.** — A young man is in love with a famed beauty, but slighted by her. The same person is loved by another young lady of less beauty, but superior fortune. How shall he behave himself between them?

**Ans.** — We would advise him to drop his addresses to the beauty for two good reasons—because she is a beauty, and because she will not entertain him. On the contrary, to improve his interest in the fortune, if she has no remarkable ill qualities, because she has a fortune, which he will find the most comfortable importance in all matrimony, and much more savour in it than the old knight-errant way, that thin-gutted, rambling, grinning, starving love; and because she drops into his mouth, and there are all the charges of lies, presents, whining, dying, love-letters, maids, porters, clearly saved into his own pocket.

---

**Quest.** — Whether the passage of St. Paul, in 1 Tim. iii. 2, "A Bishop must be the husband of one wife," does not seem to allow that the Apostle permitted other men to have more than one?
I should think polygamy the happiest life in the world, if it were not forbidden.

**Ans.**—The reason we have so many unhappy marriages is, because the generality of the world are incapable of knowing what true love is; but have an unreasonable and unruly passion to be satisfied, that spoils their true taste of pleasure, and inclines them rather to please the brute than the man; to seek more after a fair face, or diversity of such, than a wise woman and a friend; but the event generally shews the misfortune of the choice. The conversation of one ingenuous woman, that is wise enough to love, and prudent and agreeable in temper, will give more felicity to such as are capable of being happy, than the choice of a thousand; nay, were it possible they should all have similar qualifications: because true love is only between two; and without that all the pleasures of life are insipid. This was well known to our wise Creator, who at first made but two, as a complement of each other's happiness. But, to convince you that you as little understand St. Paul as you do the notions of a happy life, we will explain the passage. That the Bishop must be the husband of but one wife, must be understood the commanding him to marry but one wife, which not only excludes the plurality of women at the same time, but even forbids second marriages to Bishops. After this manner, Lycophron calls Helen "the wife of three husbands," although she never had
three at a time, Theseus being dead before Paris stole her from Menelaus. Africanus calls a woman that was married a second time Duviram, and Tertullian one that was married but once Univiram. The primitive Christians founded it upon this passage; and it is not unlikely but it might be in imitation of the Romans, who did not permit their High Priest to marry a second time, that they also forbid their Bishops. So the same Apostle likewise, in chap. v. ver. 9. requires them to choose such widows for the service of the Church, as should be the wife of but one husband, that is, that they should be such as had not married again; for women were not intended to have many at the same time, and St. Paul would not have forbidden a thing that had never happened. But the Roman Laws permitting women to put away their husbands, it was common for women that were not very chaste to change them often, as several passages of Seneca and Juvenal prove.

**Quest.** — Whether or not a woman being in love may make it known without any breach of modesty? If she were not rather to be commended for speaking her mind, than die like a fool?

**Ans.** — It would be an heroical and happy adventure to break the ice, and give an instance of one that has successfully overcome a tyrannical
custom. But the mischief on it is, the fear of a repulse has hindered many a fine attempt that way. Yet we see no reason why a woman that has sense enough to make a good choice, and knows how as handsomely to discover it, should be obliged to conceal her love: on the contrary, it would be the best method to discover it; since by that means she would find a good reception or a cure; for it is very unlikely a person should long love any one that slighted them.

---

**Quest.**—Who are wisest, those who marry for love, or for convenience?

**Ans.**—There is no degree of wisdom in either; but they are both fools if they marry for one without the other. Love, without the necessary conveniences of life, will soon wear threadbare; and conveniences, without love, are no better than being chained to a post, for the sake of a little meat, drink, and clothing. But, if we compare the small degrees of each together, much love, and moderate convenience, is far better than the most plentiful estate, with little or no love.

---

**Quest.**—Whether all Marriages are made in Heaven?

**Ans.**—The question is, whether every man and woman who marry were predestined to the same. If by this predestination is meant such a necessary determination of our actions as make them
cease to be free and rational, we must absolutely deny any such thing, as being only an excuse for imprudence and folly, and may as well be made use of by bad persons as weak ones. In the mean time we do not doubt but the providence of God does really interpose, and preside over all human actions, in such a way as is agreeable to its own justice and wisdom, and the nature of man; and if in other actions, certainly in this, which is of the highest concern to the happiness of life. But this infers no sort of necessity upon us, nor in the least takes away the freedom of our actions, which we feel we have in whatever we do; though Reason tells us there is one above us, and though it may perhaps fall short in its enquiry how these things can be well reconciled with one another.

Question.—Say, learn'd Athenians, how I may improve,  
Or else secure the extasies of love?  
One of the softer sex is mine, and I  
Am hers; just now 's the nuptial joy.  
Guess at the rest, your condescension can  
Congratulate my bliss, and paint the happy man?  

Answer.—All that is sweet and soft attend,  
All that is calm, serene, and bright,  
That can please, or pleasure mend,  
Or secure, or cause delight.  
Little Cupids, come and move  
Round the Bridegroom's longing eyes,  
Whilst the stately Queen of Love  
Round the Bride her cestos ties.
Golden Hymen, bring thy robe,
     Bring thy torch, that still inspires
Round the stately amorous globe
     Vigorous flames and gay desires.
Sister Graces, all appear;
     Sister Graces, come away;
Let the Heavens be bright and clear,
     Let the Earth keep holyday.
Jocund Nature does prepare
     To salute the charming Bride,
And with odours fills the air,
     Snatch’d from all the world beside.
Virtue, Wit, and Beauty may
     For a time refuse to yield;
But at length they must obey,
     And with honour quit the field.
Their efforts in vain will prove
     To defend their free-born state;
When attack’d by mighty Love,
     They must all capitulate.
Marble-hearted Virgins, who
     Rail at love to shew your wits,
So did once Eliza too,
     Yet with pleasure now submits.
Ye too, envious Swains, who would
     Follow Cupid if you might;
Like that fox that gaping stood,
     Discommend the grapes for spite.
Since experience teaches best,
     Ask if mutual love has charms,
When the Bride and Bridegroom rest
     Lock’d in one another’s arms?

**Quest.**—I am a young woman, and would, like others, fain get as good a husband as possible, and
in order to do it, would know how to choose him. I have heard the wise affirm, there are eight properties required to make so great a rarity—
1. grace; 2. race; 3. face; 4. parts; 5. art; 6. portion; 7. proportion; 8. a good disposition; But, since I am not likely to get a spouse with all these qualifications, I desire no more of them than such as would conduce to a young woman's happiness. To be free, I would have my five senses particularly gratified; and therefore desire to know which three of those qualifications I may best spare in my Lover?

Ans. -- Grace you have nothing to do with here, since it seems you are only for pleasing your senses. Nor will a good race edify your touch or taste. Arts will please your ear, if he plays and sings well; face, your eyes; portion, your taste and smell; and that which rhymes to it, the fifth sense. And then what need of the two remaining qualifications? since all your five senses are gratified without them? But we will be serious, and give you better advice than perhaps you will take. In the first place, do not be too nice in your choice, lest you should get no husband at all, or the worst that offers—the common fate of you critical ladies. Then, if you have a choice to make, choose first one that has piety, or at least moral honesty, if you know where to find him. Do not give yourself to one of mean parentage, let him be ever so rich, who will probably taste of his education, and use you ill when he has you,
unless his temper and conversation in the world has corrected that vice. Nor, on the other side, doat on that airy name, a gentleman, where there is no estate; much less on a good face, unless you have a mind to have your neighbours share with you; nor on a wit, unless you long to be basely used as a proof of his being so; or, at best, he will be likely to have too much love for himself long to admire you; much less choose one who has nothing but wealth, or all things without it, we mean a competency of it, unless you have enough for both; for you will soon find the bed itself uneasy, if the cradle be full, and the cupboard empty. All we say of the next shall be, that it does very well; a handsome leg and foot are not amiss; but yet there is no one, except perhaps now and then some lewd piece of quality, that doats upon monsters either in excess or defect. For the last, a good disposition, it is well in a man, though more necessary in a woman; a tolerable portion of good-humour, we mean not so much as degenerates into fondness and softness, which is apt to surfeit instead of please, and, besides, lays men open to ill company, and the practices of every cunning knave he meets. On the whole, take this advice as to the precedency of these qualifications, on the order wherein they ought to be desired: 1. first; 6. second; 7. third; 4. fourth; 8. fifth; 2. sixth; 3. seventh; 5. eighth.
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Anger, what is it? 69.
Angry and sin not, when can a man be? 185.
Animals, on the formation of, 85.
Apostles used no notes in their preaching, 181.

Beauty, whether it be real or imaginary? 258.
Benefit of Clergy, whence its origin? 33.
Birds, have they any government? 24.
Bishop to be the husband of one wife, explained, 265.
Bodies, on preserving, 68.
Britain, why represented by a woman sitting with a shield? 51.

Cain, what mark did God set upon him? 177.
Camel's going through the eye of a needle, explained, 179.
Centaurs and Lapithae explained, 83.
Children, whether punishable for their parents' sins? 165.
Christ, why not baptized till thirty years old? 144.
Christ, the many contradictions about his sufferings reconciled, 175.
Christianity, whether the occasion of more good or harm? 192.
Clouds, what are they? 1.
Colour, on alteration of, in different bodies, 135.
Conceit, is it possible to die of? 134.
Constantinople, chief cause of its destruction, 58.
Corns, whence they proceed? 44.
INDEX.

Courtship, whether allowable without consulting parents, &c. 255.

Crisis, is there any of time? 18.

Dancing, lawfulness of? 54.

Days, whether persons have extraordinary accidents on peculiar? 18.

Death, what is it? 13.

Death, the greatest of all evils, 29.

Death, why so alarming to some, and not to others? 214.

Deceiver, if a sin to deceive him? 177.

Dew, how produced? 12.

Dissenter, whether a schismatic? 185.


Early or late hours, which best? 106.


Election of a determinate member to eternal life, 212.

Epitaphs and Elegies, their antiquity? 22.

Esseans, account of, 160.

Estate, which is hardest, to get or to keep an estate? 142.

Eternity of the world, 166.

Eyes, why both eyes see but one image? 12.

Eyes, why see more correctly with one than with both? 36.

Fear, why it causes paleness? 90.

Fire, how made betwixt Flint and Steel? 7.

Fire, circle of, from a fire-stick, 53.

Fleas, have they stings? 3.

Flowers, why open in morning, and shut at night? 90.

Friendship, what is it? 111.

Fruit-trees, grafting explained, 67.

Glass, origin of? 94.

God hath made all things for himself, &c. the meaning of? 165.
God, how to know the true from false gods? 169.
God, all nations have believed in a God, 186.
Goodness, whether any defence against misfortune? 179.
Gout, original cause of? 11.
Gunpowder or Printing, which the cause of the greatest mischief? 168.
Guns, when first invented? 45.

Habits, how to be overcome, 194.
Hair, why some curls naturally, 143.
Hanging in chains alive? 38.
Happiness, which enjoy most, wise men or fools? 36.
Happiness, what is the greatest? 50.
Happiness, what is it? 62.
Hearing or Sight, the loss of which least felt? 140.
Hercules, or Alcides, account of, 64.
Herodians, account of, 162.
Horses, the cause of their neighing? 39.
Husband, where is the likeliest place to get one? 224.
Husband, whether lawful to pray for one? 226.
Husband, a lady's difficulty in the choice of, 232.
Husband, whether a woman should take one she cannot love? 243, 248.
Husband, how best to choose one, 271.

Idle words, to be accounted for in day of judgment, explained, 174.
Idolatry, whence its first rise? 39.
Individuation, wherein does consist? 15.
Ingratitude, nothing worse than, 135.
Inspiration, by what can we discover divine from false? 145.
Islands, how did beasts come into? 132.
Islands, how came they inhabited? 132.

Joy, its utmost effects? 5.
INDEX.

Karreans, account of, 163.
Know one's self, how to do it? 169.
Late or early hours, which best? 106.
Lammas Day, why so called? 89.
Latter ages, whether they have less of learning, judgment, and invention, than the antients? 19.
Laughing and weeping for the same cause, whence it proceeds? 137.
Letters, &c. of former admirers, whether to be preserved after marriage? 251.
Life more desirable than death, 29.
Loadstone, whence its polarity? 27.
Love, what is it? 221.
Love, why it generally turns to coldness and neglect after marriage? 222.
Love, is absence best for it? 224.
Love, whether diminished by fruition? 229.
Love, whether possible to love twice with the same ardour? 240.
Love, cases of difficulty in, 240, 241, 244, 245, 248, 265.
Love, is it good or evil? 247.
Love, whether bounds prescribed to by Religion and Reason? 240.
Love, how first to address a lady? 252.
Love, the most likely way to succeed in? 257.
Love, how to ascertain whether a lady loves you? 258.
Love, whether man or woman most subject to? 261.
Man or woman, which the most noble? 96.
Marriage, if promise of, allowable against consent of friends? 231.
Marriage, is it possible to love as well after marriage as before? 238.
INDEX.

Marriage, whether the woman's condition is not worse than the man's? 248.

Marriage, over-fondness after, whether more pardonable in man or woman? 253.

Marriage, whether to be entered into with those we cannot love? 256.

Marriages for love or convenience, which are best? 266.

Marriages, if all made in Heaven? 266.

Marriages, whether more, if ladies went a-courting? 257.
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Printing or Gunpowder, which occasions the most mischief? 168.
Prudence, whether any defence against misfortune? 179.
Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, which the best? 61.
Revealed Religion, concerning, 154.
Riches and Honour, their real intrinsic value? 25.
Rudder, how does govern a ship? 35.
Sabbath day's journey, how far? 183.
Sadducees, account of, 159.
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Scripture, how to know it to be the word of God? 171.
INDEX.

Scripture, ought to keep to the strict text of, 191.
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Sermons or Satires, which most successful in reforming manners? 170.
Sermon, why one hour's, seems longer than two hour's conversation? 178.
Shells, whence a noise in, like the roaring of the sea? 35.
Sight or Hearing, the loss of which is least felt? 140.
Silver, its degree amongst metals? 60.
Singing, how far proper in making love? 262.
Single life, or married, which is best? 228.
Sky, whether of any colour? 37.
Smoke, what becomes of it? 22.
Snail, shell of, whence it proceeds? 68.
Snakes, if hurtful? 38.
Snow, why profitable to the fruits of the earth? 142.
Society, or Solitude, which preferable? 25.
Soul, what is it? 199.
Soul, whether eternal? 198.
Soul, whether all alike? 207.
Soul, in what part of the body is it? 208.
Soul, what the ancient philosophers conceived of it? 209.
Soul, where is it when a man is in a swoon? 210.
Souls of studious or learned men, whether more perfect than those of ignorant men? 209.
Sound, progress of, 34.
Sound, whence it proceeds? 89.
Stammering, cure for it? 64.
Star which appeared at our Saviour's birth, its nature, &c. 34.
Sun, false, whence does it proceed? 46.
Sun, where does it set and rise? 135.
Sun, why cannot it penetrate the clouds? 141.
Sun, why does it make our flesh tawney, yet whiten linen? 141.
Superstition, true meaning of, 174.

Talismans, Egyptian, force and virtues of? 39*. 
Talmud, account of, 165.
Temples of worship, when first built? 183.
Thirst, why less bearable than hunger? 90.
Thought, what is it? 47.
Time, what is it? 71.
Titillation, the cause of? 133.
Trades, the most cleanly, neat, and genteel? 47.
Trees, if cutting-off the bottom-root hurtful or beneficial? 54.
Truth, whether always to be spoken? 102.

Vacuum, is there such a thing? 121.
Virtue, whether any defence against misfortune? 179.

Weeping and laughing for same cause, whence it proceeds? 137.
Wife, whether beauty, good temper, or riches, to be preferred in the choice of? 237.
Wife, whether allowable to pray for the death of a bad one? 240.
Wife, a good and prudent better than a rich one, 242.
Wife, which is best, a good tempered and not religious, or crabbed and religious? 254.
Wife, scolding, how to tame her? 261.
Wife, whether riches, beauty, goodness, or extreme love in return, should have the preference in the choice of? 262.
Wind, why the East colder than the West? 50.
Woman, whether it be allowable to make known her love? 267.
Women, capriciousness of, 126.
Women, why fonder and falser than men? 264.
Wives, unruly, how to reclaim? 263.

Zealots, account of, 163.

THE END.
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