which was printed at Hamburg in the year 1670, and the latter we know not where, in 1677, a few months after his death. In the *Tractatus Theologico-politicus,* already mentioned, he treats of *prophecy* and *prophets ;* and of the *call of the Hebrews,* whom he affirms to have been diſtinguiſhed from other nations only by the ad­mirable form of their government, and the fitneſs of their laws for long preserving their political state. He is likewiſe of opinion, or at leaſt pretends to be ſo, that God may, in what we call a *ſupernatural way,* have gi­ven political inſtitutes to other nations as well as to the Hebrews, who were, he ſays, at no time a peculiar peo­ple to the Supreme Lord of heaven and earth ; for, according to him, all hiſtory, ſacred and profane, teſtifies that every nation was bleſſed with the light of prophecy. That light indeed, if his notions of it be just, was of very little value. He labours to prove, that the prophets were diſtinguiſhed from other men only by their piety and virtue ; that their revelations de­pended wholly on their imaginations and the diſpositions of their minds ; that they were often groſsly ig­norant and highly prejudiced ; that the ſpeculative opi­nions of one prophet are ſeldom in uniſon with thoſe of another ; and that their writings are valuable to us on­ly for the excellent rules which he acknowledges they contain reſpecting the practice of piety and virtue. He then proceeds to treat of the divine law and of mi­racles ; and endeavours to prove that no miracle, in the proper ſenſe of the word, can have been at any time performed ; becauſe every thing happens by a neceſſity of nature, the reſult of the divine decrees, which are from all eternity neceſſary themſelves. He acknow­ledges, that in the Scriptures, which he professes to ad­mit as true hiſtory, miracles are often mentioned ; but he ſays that they were only Angular events which the ſacred hiſtorrans *imagined* to be miraculous: and he then gives ſome very extraordinary rules for interpreting the books of the Old and New Teſtaments where they treat of miracles, or appear to foretel future events. See our articles Miracle and Prophecy.

Having thus diveſted the Scriptures of every thing characteriſtic of a revelation from heaven, he next calls in queſtion their authenticity. He affirms, in contra­diction to the cleareſt internal evidence, that the Penta­teuch and all the other hiſtorical books muſt have been written by one man ; and that man, he thinks, could not have flourished at a period earlier than that of Ezra. The grounds of this opinion are unworthy of the ta­lents of Spinoza; for that he had talents is incontro­vertible. His principal objection to the authenticity of the Pentateuch is, that Moſes is made to ſpeak of himſelf in the third perſon, and to talk of the Canaanites being then in the land ; and becauſe he finds in his writings, as well as in the books of Joſhua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, &c. places deſigned by names which he suppoſes they had not in the early ages of which theſe books contain the hiſtory, he concludes that theſe wri­tings muſt be one compilation from ancient records made at a very late period ; more eſpecially as the au­thor often ſpeaks of things of great antiquity remaining to this day. The books of Eſther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, muſt have been compiled, he thinks, under the Maccabees ; and he ſeems to conſider as of equal value with them the ſtory of Tobit, and the other two apocryphal treatiſes intitled the Wiſdom of Solo­mon and Eccleſiaſticus.

Theſe ſenſeleſs cavils, worthy only of one of thoſe modern freethinkers whoſe learning, in the opinion of Biſhop Warburton, is not ſufficient to carry them even to the confines of rational doubt, we have ſufficiently obviated in another place (ſee Scripture, n⁰ 8—31 ) Spinoza urges them against the other books of the Old Teſtament. The prophecies of Iſaiah, Jeremiah, Eze­kiel, Daniel, Hoſea, and Jonah, are, as we have them, only fragments, he ſays, of the writings of thoſe men compiled by the Phariſees under the second temple from ancient and voluminous records.

In the midſt of this dogmatical ſcepticiſm, if we may uſe ſuch a phraſe, he bears ſuch a teſtimony to the laſt chapters of the book of Daniel, as we ſhould not have looked for in the writings either of a Jew or of a Deiſt, After detailing the various hypotheſes which in his time were held reſpecting the author and the intention of the book of *Job ;* in which, he ſays, Momus is called Sa­tan, he proceeds in theſe words : “ Tranſeo ad Danielis librum ; his fine dubio ex cap. 8. ipſius Danſelis ſcripta continet. Undenam autem priora ſeptem capi­ta deſcripta fuerint, neſcio@@\*;” thus admitting the fa­mous prophecy of the ſeventy weeks. The canon of the Old Teſtament, he ſays, was finally ſettled by rab­bins of the Phariſaical ſect, who wiſhed to exclude from it the books of *Proverbs, Ecelesiastes,* and *Eseekiel,* as they had actually excluded others of equal value ; but the three books in queſtion were inſerted by the influence of two of the rabbis of greater wiſdom and inte­grity than the rest.

That ſo paradoxical a writer, who had been original­ly a Jew, and was now almoſt a Deiſt, ſhould have treated the New Teſtament with as little ceremony as the Old, will not ſurpriſe the intelligent reader. He begins his remarks, however, with affirming, that no man can peruſe the Chriſtian Scriptures, and not acknowlcdge the apoſtles to have been prophets ; but he thinks that their mode of propheſying was altogether different from that which prevailed under the Moſaic dispenſation ; and that the gift, whatever it was, forſook them the inſtant that they left off *preaching,* as their *writings* have to him every appearance of human compoſitions. This diſtinction between Chriſtian and Jewiſh prophecy is the more wonderful, that he founds it principally on the diſſimilarity of sty*le* viſible in the writings of the Old and New Teſtaments ; though, in his second chapter, which treats of the works of the Jewiſh prophets, he ſays expressly, “ Stylus deinde prophetiæ pro eloquentia cujuſque prophetæ variabat, prophetiae enim Ezekielis et Amosis non sunt, ut illæ Esaiæ, Nachumi eleganti, sed rudiore stylo scriptæ.” That the Hebrew ſcholar may be convinced of the truth of this remark, he recommends to him to ſtudy diligently the writings of theſe prophets, and to conſi­der the occaſions on which their prophecies were utter­ed : “ Quæ ſi omnia recte perpendentur (ſays he) fa­cile oſtendant, Deum nullum habere ſtylum peculiarem dicendi, ſed tantum pro eruditione, et capacitate prephetæ eatenus effe elegantem, compendioſum, ſeverum, rudem, prolixum, et obſcurum.” Another objection brought by Spinoza againſt the prophecies of the New Teſtament ariſes from the authors of them having been