relating to the death and reſurrection of man, the doctrine of a reſurrection muſt then have been well known, and generally received, or ſuch language would have been altogether un intelligible. No (says the bishop) ; that the language might be intelligible, it was only neceſſary that the Iſraelites ſhould have diſtinct *ideas* of a reſurrection from the dead, with­out knowing that the natural body is indeed to riſe again ; and as he thinks that ſuch metaphorical expreſſions as this would have the greateſt force where the doctrine of the re­ſurrection was unknown, he concludes that it muſt have been unknown among the Iſraelites in the days of Iſaiah@@\*,

Had there been no ſacred books among the Iſraelites before this prophecy was uttered, his lordſhip’s reaſoning would have been at least plausible, if not concluſive ; but that a people who knew how death had entered into the world who believed that they were by ſome means or other to be freed from its sting, who, it is natural to ſuppoſe, often meditated upon the bruising of the ſerpent’s head, and the nature of the bleſſing which all nations were to derive from the seed of Abraham, ſhould form diſtinct *ideas* of a reſurrection, and read this prophecy without believing that the natural body is *indeed to riſe again,* we cannot poſſibly conceive. The very ſuppoſition is one of his lord- ſhip’s mot irreconcileable paradoxes ; and it is a paradox which his ſyſtem did not require him to support.

The prophet Ezekiel, when the ſtate of things was most deſperate, is canted by the Spirit into a valley full of dry bones, and aſked this queſtion ; “ Son of man, can theſe bones live ?” To which he anſwers ; “ O Lord God, thou knowest@@\*;” an anſwer which the ſame learned prelate thinks the prophet could not have made, had he been brought up in the knowledge and belief of a reſurrection from the dead. Our opinion is directly the reverſe of that of his lordſhip, who teems to have miſtaken the nature of this ſcenical repreſentation. The prophet was not aſked if *all* the dead would rise at the laſt day ; but only if the particular bones *then* preſented to him could live at *that time,* and while other bones were mouldering in corruption : and to ſuch a queſtion we cannot conceive any anſwer that a man brought up in the belief of a general reſurrection could have given, but—“ O Lord God, thou knoweſt.” Had Ezekiel been a ſtranger to the doctrine of a general reſur­rection, or had he not believed that doctrine, he would doubtleſs have answered the queſtion that was put to him in the negative ; but convinced that *all* men are at *ſome* pe­riod to riſe from the dead, “ that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad,” he very naturally ſaid, that God alone knew whether the bones then exhibited to him in the valley would rise before the general reſur­rection.

But though the more intelligent and righteous Israelites certainly “ all died in faith, and not having received the promises, but having ſeen them afar off, were persuaded of them and embraced them, confeſſing that they were ſtrangers and pilgrims on earth, who desired a better country, that is, a heavenly one@@\*,” we are not to ſuppoſe that this hea­venly deſire aroſe from any thing taught in the law of Moses. That law, when taken by itself, as unconnected with prior and ſubſequent revelations, makes no mention whatever of a heavenly inheritance, which St Paul assures us@@\* was given 430 years before to Abraham by a promise which may be traced back to the firſt ray of comfort vouchſafed to fallen man in the ſentence passed on the original deceiver. “ Wherefore then ſerved the law ? It was added (says the apoſtle), becauſe of tranſgreſſions, till the ſeed ſhould come to whom the promiſe was made.” The tranſ­greſſions here alluded to were polytheiſm and idolatry, which, with their never-failing train of cruel and detestable vices, had overſpread the whole world ; and the primary­ intention of the law was to item the torrent of theſe cor­ruptions, for which we have ſeen it was admirably calcu­lated; and, like a ſchoolmaſter, to inſtruct the Iſraelites in the unity and worſhip of Jehovah, and thus by degrees bring them to Chriſt.

But though it is apparent that a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments made no part of the Moſaic dispensation,yet the law had certainly a ſpiritual meaning to be underſtood when the fulneſs of time ſhould come. Every Chriſtian ſees a ſtriking reſemblance between the ſacrifice of the paachal lamb, which delivered the Iſraelites from the destroying angel in Egypt, and the ſacrifice of the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. Indeed the whole ritual of sacrifice muſt have led the more intelligent of them to faith in a future ſacrifice ; by which, while the heel of the ſeed of the woman ſhould be bruiſed, the head of the ſerpent ſhould be completely cruſhed (ſee Sacri­fice) ; and as prophets were raised up from time to time, to prepare them for the coming of the Meſſiah, and to foretel the nature of his kingdom, there can be no doubt but that thoſe inspired teachers would lay open to them, as far as was expedient, the temporary duration of the Moſaic law, and convince them that it was only the ſhadow of better things to come. From the nature of their ritual, and the different prophecies vouchſafed them, which be­came more and more explicit as the time approached for their accompliſhment, they muſt ſurely have been led to expect redemption from the curſe of the fall by the ſufferings of their Meſſiah ; but that any one of them knew preciſely the *manner* in which they were to be redeemed, and the nature of that religion which was to ſuperſede their own, is wholly incredible @@(b). Such knowledge would

@@@[m]\* Div. Leg book vi. sect. 2.

@@@[m]\* Chap, xxxvii. 3.

@@@[m]\* Heb. xi. 3, &c.

@@@[m]\* Gal. iii. 16-19.

@@@(B) This doctrine is ſtated in ſo clear a light by biſhop Bull, whom, as a divine, we think the glory of the church of England, and who has had few ſuperiors in any church, that the learned reader will be pleaſed to have his opinions in his own words. “ An igitur, inquies, fuerunt fub lege, qui vitam æternam sperarent ? Resp. Qui meliores erant et perſpicaciores in populo Judaico, veroſimile est eos ſeu generalium promiſſionum vi, seu temporalium bonorum levi æstimatione, seu divinæ bonitatis intuitu, seu animæ suæ, melioris quam caduci boni appetentis, consideratione, seu Enochi exemplo (cui sequiori ævo acceſſit Elias raptus) ſeu Patriarcharum traditione, (quibus Deus multis indiciis spem futuro­rum bonorum fecerat, in quorum indiciorum genere non minimum erat et illud, quod multi eximie boni terrestris fe­licitatis expertes vixerint, quod argumentum late exequitur Scriptor ad Hebraeos cap. 11.) seu aliis rationibus adductos credidisse, Deum, praeter ſpecialia ista bona ad hanc vitam pertinentia, et legibus Mosaicis comprehensa, etiam alia poſt mortem cultoribus suis fidis largiri velle. Imo statuendum illud omnino est, ne viros sanctos eximiosque in populo Dei ſuum inſtar tum vixisse, tum devixisse credatur. Nec refert, quod hujus fidei vix ac ne vix quidem ulla in Cano­nicis V. T. Scripturis mentio fiat. Nam certum est, Abrahamum filium promissionis, mactare jussum non recusasse, hac ratiocinatione sustentatum, Deum potentia tanta præditum esse, ut filium jam mortuum in vitam revocare, eumque ei redivivum reſtituere poffet. Certum, inquam, illud est, quia divinus Autor Epistolæ ad Hebraeos id diſerte teſtatur,