

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_154732

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE AGE OF REASON

The Thinker's Library No. 69.

THE AGE OF REASON

BY
THOMAS PAINE

LONDON:
WATTS & CO.,
5 & 6 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C4.

First issued in the Thinker's Library, 1938
Second impression 1945



THIS BOOK IS PRODUCED IN COMPLETE
CONFORMITY WITH THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS

Printed and Published in Great Britain by C. A. Watts & Co. Limited,
5 & 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

The text of the present issue of *The Age of Reason* is a reprint of Mrs. H. Bradlaugh Bonner's edition, and is based directly upon that of Daniel Isaac Eaton's edition of 1795 (for the first Part) and 1796 (for the second).

BIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION

ADAPTED FROM AN ESSAY BY JOHN M. ROBERTSON

THE enduring popularity of the chief works of Thomas Paine is not the least remarkable fact in the history of opinion. It is given to few controversial writers to keep a large audience during a hundred years; and there must be a commanding element in the personality of one who does. In the case of Paine, this was revealed with signal success by his biographer, Dr. Moncure Conway, who is responsible for the definitive edition of his works; and a brief survey of Paine's career and performance, in the light of Dr. Conway's researches, may not unfitly accompany this edition of *The Age of Reason*.

I.

It is noteworthy that the protagonist of modern democratic Freethought was on his father's side born (29th January, 1737) in that sect which has above all others sought to act upon what passes for the doctrine of Christianity. He seems to have been baptized of his mother's church, the Church of England, despite the common statement that he was never christened; and he was certainly "confirmed," as the phrase goes; but though his father, Joseph Paine, is said to have been disowned by the Society of Friends for getting married by a priest, he seems to have remained a Quaker, and was so registered at burial. All along, as was natural, Thomas Paine retained some Quaker sympathies, though he was one day to find Quakerism as far astray in politics as in religion.

Of his home life we have now a few ascertained particulars. His father was a lovable parent; his mother less so, though to her he was a dutiful as to his father

an affectionate son; and though it is not impossible that she may have written on his leaving England the letter of mingled anxiety and vituperation which was published by his venal enemy Oldys (pseudonym of Chalmers), he carefully supported her, and behaved filially by her on his visit home in her extreme old age. The Paines were poor, and their son's early life was hard and unlucky. Bred to his father's trade of stay-making, he ran away at seventeen to join the privateer "Terrible," Captain Death—so the names oddly run. "From this adventure," as he himself tells in the second part of the *Rights of Man*, he "was happily prevented by the affectionate and moral remonstrances of a good father." But where there is not a kind mother, even a good father cannot make a happy home; and Paine again ran away, this time going to sea on the privateer "King of Prussia," Captain Mendez. It was after this cruise that, in 1756, at the age of twenty, he found employment in London as a stay-maker, and remained there for two years, in which time he zealously studied astronomy and attended the lectures of Martin and Ferguson. For a good many years thenceforward, Paine's life was a struggling one. In 1758 we find him working at his trade at Dover. Next year he set up in business for himself at Sandwich, where he soon married; but the business did not prosper, and his wife died in 1760. After this he "crammed" to qualify himself as an exciseman; and in 1762 he became a gauger at Grantham, from which place he was sent in 1764 to watch smugglers in Alford. There he got into trouble by doing what so many excisemen did who wished to be on good terms with their neighbours: he passed stocks without examining them. Frankly confessing his fault on challenge, he was dismissed. Again, at twenty-eight, he took to stay-making; but in 1766 we find him an usher in an "academy" at Goodman's Fields, London, at a salary of £25; and it seems probable that he tried at that time to secure ordination in the English Church, and that he even preached in Moorfields. He was certainly not a Freethinker at this stage. On petition

for reinstatement in the excise, however, he was nominally reinstated, and in 1768 reappointed, getting a post at Lewes; and here he remained till 1774, with a fair amount of happiness.

Again, however, he fell into ill luck, being in truth not the kind of man to make money. He married again in 1771, wedding the daughter of a man with whom he had lodged. The father died, leaving his widow and daughter badly provided for, and in 1769 Paine opened a shop on their behalf, he himself running a "tobacco-mill," on what scale of production does not appear. After the shop came the marriage; and the wife, who was ten years her husband's junior, does not seem to have been a suitable mate. Perhaps Paine on his side spent a little more time in the convivial and controversial club at the local White Hart Tavern than was strictly justifiable. It is remarkable that in this local circle he had already a high reputation as a reasoner; and he even wrote some tolerable verses; but his only prose work thus far was a pamphlet pleading the cause of his fellow-excisemen in the matter of wages. It is suggestive of his taste in literature that he sent this pamphlet to Goldsmith, the master of the purest English style then written; and he seems even to have made the poet's acquaintance when he went to London to push the excisemen's cause. They were organized into a kind of trade union—a fact which in those days sufficed to defeat them. Paine's advocacy was not successful; he was discharged for being absent without leave; and, to crown all, the shop and tobacco-business did not pay, and had to be sold up. At the same time Paine and his wife, who seem never to have cohabited, formally separated by mutual consent, he renouncing all his legal claims. Later he sent money help to her anonymously; but they were never reunited, and their ground of quarrel remains unknown. All that is clear is that there was no question of infidelity on Paine's part, and that he in after years spoke of his wife kindly. And now, at the age of thirty-seven, penniless, and in a manner stamped with failure, Paine decided to begin life afresh

in that new world beyond the seas whose history he was destined so profoundly to affect. Seldom has there been a more inauspicious prelude to a great career.

II.

The change which came over Paine's life when he landed in the New World is a measure of the obstacles which in England barred poor men of ability from the use of their powers. He was a born publicist; a born teacher in matters of public conduct and public morals; a born writer; but he had lived till thirty-seven in England without finding his way to writing anything more important than a plea for better treatment for his fellow-excisemen. In the colonies he at once found openings for his faculty. A letter of introduction from Franklin (then in England) got him employment in Philadelphia as a tutor; and what was better, a printer who had started a magazine got him to edit it. This he did with immediate success; "probably there never was," says Dr. Conway, "an equal amount of good literary work done on a salary of fifty pounds a year." Like a true American, he commenced by predicting a more than European development for American literature. But it is notable that, while Paine had during his stay at Lewes begun not only to put out his powers of controversy but to attempt light literary composition in his social circle, one of the first features of the *Pennsylvania Magazine* under his control was the description of recent English inventions. Thus at the very outset he seemed to strike the keynotes of the civilization of his adopted country. He anticipated American inventiveness no less than American democracy.

What is still more memorable for us to-day, however, is the fact that in the first months of his new work he laid down principles far in advance of the American democracy of his generation. He was from the first an opponent of slavery. But indeed the moral originality and courage of his teaching in every direction is astonish-

ing. "The whole circle of human ideas and principles," says Dr. Conway, "was recognized by this lone way-faring man. The first to urge extension of the principles of independence to the enslaved negro; the first to arraign monarchy, and to point out the danger of its survival in presidency; the first to propose articles of a more thorough nationality to the new-born States; the first to advocate international arbitration; the first to expose the absurdity and criminality of duelling; the first to suggest more rational ideas of marriage and divorce; the first to advocate national and international copyright; the first to plead for the animals; the first to demand justice for woman: what brilliants would our modern reformers have contributed to a coronet for that man's brow, had he not presently worshipped the God of his fathers after the way that theologians called heresy! 'Be not righteous overmuch,' saith cynical Solomon; 'neither make thyself otherwise: why shouldst thou destroy thyself?'"

An anti-slavery essay was Paine's first composition for publication, though not the first published. "It is a most remarkable article," says Dr. Conway. "Every argument and appeal, moral, religious, military, economic, familiar in our subsequent anti-slavery struggle, is here found stated with eloquence and clearness." Others had before deprecated slavery; but "Paine's essay is as thorough as Garrison himself could have made it"; and thirty-five days after the appearance of Paine's paper "the first American Anti-slavery Society was formed in Philadelphia." What was more, Paine pointed his plea by the analogy of the political conflict then actually going on with the mother country, and soon to deepen into a war. "How just, how suitable to our crime is the punishment with which Providence threatens us. We have enslaved multitudes, and shed much innocent blood, and now are threatened with the same." Paine added a practical scheme for solving the slavery problem by liberating all save the infirm, and placing them on frontier lands. Had his advice been taken, the America of to-day might possibly have been

free of its greatest domestic danger. But it was not taken ; and it was left for Paine only to do his best to secure the national freedom of his socially free fellow-citizens.

III.

In Paine's public life there are three great tidal periods—the period when he was helping more than any other to make the Revolution in America ; the period when, having come to Europe after the American Revolution was fairly consolidated, he published the *Rights of Man*, and laid in England the foundations of a new democracy in the very teeth of the great reaction of which Burke was the prophet ; and lastly the period when, after his hopes from the French Revolution had substantially failed, and he expected death as his own meed, he wrote his *Age of Reason*, significantly making his last blow the most deadly of all his strokes at the reign of tradition. But the second was none the less a great exploit. There are few more inspiring strokes in political history than Paine's ringing rejoinder to the pre-eminent Whig who made the crown of his life's work consist in giving Toryism its gospel.

Paine had come to England meaning to attempt reform here as he had wrought reconstruction in the colonies. He was not planning mere revolution ; and it is a complete misconception to regard him as nothing but a revolutionist. What he thought most about was the constitution that was to follow on revolution ; and his conception of Federal government was from the first profound and statesmanlike—only too much so for his generation. After the Republic was safely established, one of his most important pamphlets (1786) was devoted to preventing a despotic interference with the Bank of Philadelphia, which had grown out of his \$500 subscription ; and his enemies have admitted that he it was who prevented the injustice being done. In founding the Philosophical Society of Philadelphia he pointed out to his fellow-citizens that "we have grafted on our infant Commonwealth the manners of

ancient and corrupted monarchies. In having effected a separate government we have as yet effected but a partial independence. The revolution can only be said to be complete when we shall have freed ourselves no less from the influence of foreign prejudices than from the fetters of foreign power." And when he came to England in 1787 it was with no mere notion of encouraging a change in the form of government, but with the hope of altering its methods. Within a few weeks of his landing he had written his *Prospects on the Rubicon ; or, An Investigation into the Causes and Consequences of the Politics to be agitated at the Meeting of Parliament*, a protest against war and a plea for the cause of the poor. "I defend," he declared, "the cause of the poor, of the manufacturer" [in those days this meant "hand-worker" or "factory-worker," not "employer"], "of the tradesman, of the farmer, and of all those on whom the real burthen of taxes falls—but above all, I defend the cause of humanity."

IV.

The thing above all to be remembered is that Paine's *Age of Reason* is the work of a fervent Theist. So far was he from being an Atheist, as he has been called—with embellishment—by Theodore Roosevelt, that he was specially moved to write by way of opposing Atheism. Of his first treatise he wrote :—"The people of France are running headlong into Atheism, and I had the work translated in their own language, to stop them in that career, and fix them to the first article of every man's creed who has any creed at all—I believe in God." He even attributed his imprisonment in part to his attitude against "Atheism." And so inveterate was his Theism that with the prospect of a cruel and unjust death before him, and with a distracted moral world around him, he ended the first part of his *Age of Reason* with an affirmation of the absolute beneficence of God, and of men's duty to be good to each other and to animals because God was so good to them. Beyond

this position he never advanced, unless it be that, as Dr. Conway thinks, he leant in his later years to a form of dualism. His whole free-thinking development, indeed, was tardy. At forty he seems still to have called himself a Christian.

All the more bitter, apparently, was the hatred heaped upon Paine by religious people, including Unitarians, for exposing the mythology of Christianity in the name of theism. He had been careful to speak in the highest terms of Jesus as a man : it is remarkable that, as Dr. Conway notes, the principal tributes of the century to the personality of Jesus were those of Voltaire, Rousseau, and Paine. But Christians and Unitarians alike hated him for his criticism of the Bible; and neither loved him any the better because of his new doctrine of the "Religion of Humanity," to which he was the first to give that name. Of course he lost ground with political admirers. A friend calling on him in Paris in 1802 told him so, and he replied "in a tone of singular energy" that he would not have published *The Age of Reason* if he had not thought it "calculated to inspire mankind with a more exalted idea of the Supreme Architect of the Universe, and to put an end to villainous imposture. He then broke out," the friend continues, "with the most violent invectives against our received opinions, accompanying them at the same time with some of the most grand and sublime conceptions of an Omnipotent Being that I ever heard or read of."

He left Europe, sick of the failure of Republicanism in France, with a delighted hope of freedom in the States. There, however, the warring sects at once united to "stretch the author of *The Age of Reason* on their common rack, as far as was possible under a Constitution acknowledging no deity. This persecution began on the victim's arrival." Nothing could prevent Paine from exercising a great political influence with his pen when he resumed pamphlet-writing; but in the country he had helped to found he was repeatedly treated with all the indignity that piety leagued with human meanness could inspire.

In the ill-usage of Paine there was one element of retribution. He himself, in the warmth of his Theism, always spoke of Atheism as "infidelity." That was the term most commonly applied to his own heresy. But, anti-Atheist as he was, it is from the Atheists ever since that Paine has had most abundant recognition; and the reason is simple. Paine was the first English Deist who had assailed the prevailing creed at once with entire sincerity and with great power; and the absolute honesty of his method led other and younger men inevitably to conclusions ahead of his. The old Unitarians, as Dr. Conway shows, "for twenty-five years continued to draw attention from their own heresies, by hounding on the prosecution of Paine's adherents." But in modern England the mere apparition of a man so morally fearless is in itself a claim on the fealty of thousands.

Had Paine chosen not to publish his opinions for the mass of the people to read, he would have been one of the most distinguished figures in the States. Mere tacit deism was really rather fashionable, as Unitarianism has been since; and even after the first shock of *The Age of Reason*, Paine had a good deal of moral support. But when he joined a deistic propaganda he found that in theology as in politics courage and constancy were scarce virtues. The Deists, perhaps conscious in many cases of the weakness of their own position, gradually succumbed, sliding into decorous Unitarianism, or wholly holding their peace; and before his death Paine was very lonely, so much so that he even planned a return to Europe. So far did hostility to him go that at one election his vote was actually refused, on the old pretence that he was a French subject, by an official who in the time of war had been a royalist, living within the British lines.

In his last years, Dr. Conway thinks, Paine suffered, as it happened Washington did, from the morbid apprehension of coming poverty—a trouble which frequently besets in old age men who have had a hard life, though their circumstances may finally be good.

Paine was latterly, for a man of his simple habits, moderately well off; but he was certainly never more, and in his bachelorhood and his ostracism his life was not very bright. Then arose the calumny, propagated by men who had been his friends and became his virulent enemies—Cheetham being the worst of them—that his life was uncleanly and drunken. On this naturally followed the Christian legend of a raving death-bed. Both slanders have been refuted a hundred times, both being utterly baseless. That Paine in his latter years was not at all intemperate is proved by a dozen testimonies, cited by Dr. Conway. It is a pleasure to read of one old lady who, having known Paine well, turned fiercely to the last upon anyone who repeated the calumnies current about him. And it will always be a memorable thing that Cobbett, who had at first, while writing as “Peter Porcupine” in New York, been Paine’s zealous enemy, was entirely conquered by Paine’s masterly pamphlet on the *Decline and Fall of the English System of Finance*, and became his faithful champion, exposing the falsehood of the death-bed story, and even ultimately bringing Paine’s bones to England, where they later passed from hand to hand, till now they seem to be entirely lost sight of. It matters very little indeed: he died on June 8th, 1809, and they must now be well mouldered.

Now that Paine’s life has been at last fully and competently written, though malice and ignorance will no doubt long continue to libel him, his fame is safe in the hands of instructed people. His figure now stands out as that of one of the best, humanest, wisest, and bravest men of his generation. But nothing is more conspicuous in his character throughout than his goodness of heart. When Christian little boys, hearing him always ill-spoken of by their parents, went to rob his orchard, the old gentleman came out, patted their heads, and showed them the best apples. The one noticeable weak point in his character, a certain tendency to self-praise, is a fault that literally leans to virtue’s side, as it clearly connects with his absolute frankness and straight-

forwardness. Similar self-esteem is common enough, but habits of diplomacy develop the saving grace of mock modesty. Paine saw too much dishonest reticence to be careful about cultivating the habit in matters of public concern; and in point of fact, as his biographer points out, he was driven to self-vindication by endless vilification. The nearest approach he ever made to personal malice was in his few retaliations upon personal enemies or false friends, or, as in the case of Washington, on one who owed him much and had abandoned him to his enemies. As regards enemies, few men have had worse. And it should not be forgotten, as Dr. Conway remarks, that "several liberal Christians, like Hicks, were friendly towards Paine at the close of his life, whereas his most malignant enemies were of his own 'Painite' household, Carver and Cheetham." Analogous phenomena have been observed in later cases.

V.

Naturally Paine's Biblical criticism does not do all that generations of scholarly research have done since. But it is still one of the best possible introductions, for plain people, to Biblical criticism, because it supplies what so many of the "higher" critics do not give—a strong lead to moral as well as to literary veracity. Those to whom Paine is shocking, while Professor Smith is edifying, are they who most need Paine's hardy and cordial inspiration. To read him is to breathe the very breath of intellectual rectitude. And while he was "no scholar," in point of mere knowledge of the questions raised Paine was a better informed Biblical critic than the average bishop of his day, whose pathetic incapacity is well illustrated by the historic picture of the Bishop of London earnestly beseeching Hannah More to write an answer to the new infidel.

There ought not to be omitted from even the most cursory account of this much-calumniated man a final tribute to the alert vigour and terse fitness of his style, which is really not more "Saxon" than good English

had need be, being compounded of all the elements that go to make a sound and copious modern English diction. What else, indeed, than vitally good writing could have kept alive for these hundred years a book warred upon by every weapon of bigotry and every form of false-witness, when later research had much more fully developed its theses, and when even some of its own assumptions are felt to be untenable? When the old traditions of prejudice and venality have passed away Paine's name will have its due place, not only in our political but in our literary history, as that of a man of native genius whose prose bears being read beside that of Burke on a common theme, and who found in sincerity the secret of a nobler eloquence than his antagonists could draw from their stores of literature or the fountains of their ill-will.

PART THE FIRST

It has been my intention, for several years past, to publish my thoughts upon religion. I am well aware of the difficulties that attend the subject; and, from that consideration, had reserved it to a more advanced period of life. I intended it to be the last offering I should make to my fellow-citizens of all nations; and that at a time when the purity of the motive that induced me to it could not admit of a question, even by those who might disapprove the work.

The circumstance that has now taken place in France, of the total abolition of the whole national order of priesthood, and of everything appertaining to compulsive systems of religion, and compulsive articles of faith, has not only precipitated my intention, but rendered a work of this kind exceedingly necessary; lest, in the general wreck of superstition, of false systems of government, and false theology, we lose sight of morality, of humanity, and of the theology that is true.

As several of my colleagues, and others of my fellow-citizens of France, have given me the example of making their voluntary and individual profession of faith, I also will make mine; and I do this with all that sincerity and frankness with which the mind of man communicates with itself.

I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life.

I believe in the equality of man, and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavouring to make our fellow-creatures happy.

But lest it should be supposed that I believe many other things in addition to these, I shall, in the progress of this work, declare the things I do not believe, and my reasons for not believing them,

I do not believe in the creed professed by the Jewish Church, by the Roman Church, by the Greek Church, by the Turkish Church, by the Protestant Church, nor by any Church that I know of. My own mind is my own church.

All national institutions of Churches, whether Jewish, Christian, or Turkish, appear to me no other than human inventions set up to terrify and enslave mankind, and monopolize power and profit.

I do not mean by this declaration to condemn those who believe otherwise. They have the same right to their belief as I have to mine. But it is necessary to the happiness of man that he be mentally faithful to himself. Infidelity does not consist in believing or in disbelieving; it consists in professing to believe what he does not believe.

It is impossible to calculate the moral mischief, if I may so express it, that mental lying has produced in society. When a man has so far corrupted and prostituted the chastity of his mind as to subscribe his professional belief in things he does not believe, he has prepared himself for the commission of every other crime. He takes up the trade of a priest for the sake of gain, and, in order to *qualify* himself for that trade, he begins with a perjury. Can we conceive anything more destructive to morality than this?

Soon after I had published the pamphlet, *Common Sense*, in America, I saw the exceeding probability that a revolution in the system of Government would be followed by a revolution in the system of Religion. The adulterous connection of Church and State, wherever it had taken place, whether Jewish, Christian, or Turkish, had so effectually prohibited, by pains and penalties, every discussion upon established creeds and upon first principles of religion, that until the system of government should be changed, those subjects could not be brought fairly and openly before the world, but that, whenever this should be done, a revolution in the system of religion would follow, human inventions and priest-craft would be detected, and man would return to the

pure, unmixed, and unadulterated belief of one God, and no more.

Every national Church or religion has established itself by pretending some special mission from God, communicated to certain individuals. The Jews have their Moses; the Christians their Jesus Christ, their apostles and saints; and the Turks their Mahomet; as if the way to God was not open to every man alike.

Each of those Churches show certain books which they call *revelation*, or the word of God. The Jews say that their word of God was given by God to Moses face to face; the Christians say that their word of God came by divine inspiration; and the Turks say that their word of God (the Koran) was brought by an angel from heaven. Each of those Churches accuses the other of unbelief; and for my own part, I disbelieve them all.

As it is necessary to affix right ideas to words, I will, before I proceed further into the subject, offer some observations on the word *revelation*. Revelation, when applied to religion, means something communicated *immediately* from God to man.

No one will deny or dispute the power of the Almighty to make such a communication if he pleases. But admitting, for the sake of a case, that something has been revealed to a certain person, and not revealed to any other person, it is revelation to that person only. When he tells it to a second person, a second to a third, a third to a fourth, and so on, it ceases to be a revelation to all those persons. It is revelation to the first person only, and *hearsay* to every other; and consequently they are not obliged to believe it.

It is a contradiction in terms and ideas to call anything a revelation that comes to us at second hand, either verbally or in writing. Revelation is necessarily limited to the first communication. After this it is only an account of something which that person says was a revelation to him; and though he may find himself obliged to believe it, it cannot be incumbent on me to believe it in the same manner, for it was not a revelation made to

me, and I have only his word for it that it was made to him.

When Moses told the children of Israel that he received the two tables of the Commandments from the hand of God, they were not obliged to believe him, because they had no other authority for it than his telling them so; and I have no other authority for it than some historian telling me so. The Commandments carry no internal evidence of divinity with them. They contain some good moral precepts, such as any man qualified to be a law-giver or a legislator could produce himself without having recourse to supernatural intervention.¹

When I am told that the Koran was written in heaven, and brought to Mahomet by an angel, the account comes too near the same kind of hearsay evidence, and second-hand authority as the former. I did not see the angel myself, and therefore I have a right not to believe it.

When also I am told that a woman, called the Virgin Mary, said, or gave out, that she was with child without any cohabitation with a man, and that her betrothed husband, Joseph, said that an angel told him so, I have a right to believe them or not; such a circumstance required a much stronger evidence than their bare word for it; but we have not even this, for neither Joseph nor Mary wrote any such matter themselves. It is only reported by others that *they said so*. It is hearsay upon hearsay, and I do not choose to rest my belief upon such evidence.

It is, however, not difficult to account for the credit that was given to the story of Jesus Christ being the son of God. He was born when the heathen mythology had still some fashion and repute in the world, and that mythology had prepared the people for the belief of such a story. Almost all the extraordinary men that lived under the heathen mythology were reputed to be the sons of some of their gods. It was not a new thing

¹ It is, however, necessary to except the declaration which says that God *visits the sins of the fathers upon the children*. It is contrary to every principle of moral justice.

at that time to believe a man to have been celestially begotten; the intercourse of gods with women was then a matter of familiar opinion. Their Jupiter, according to their accounts, had cohabited with hundreds; the story, therefore, had nothing in it either new, wonderful, or obscene; it was conformable to the opinions that then prevailed among the people called Gentiles, or mythologists, and it was those people only that believed it. The Jews who had kept strictly to the belief of one God and no more, and who had always rejected the heathen mythology, never credited the story.

It is curious to observe how the theory of what is called the Christian Church sprung out of the tail of the heathen mythology. A direct incorporation took place in the first instance, by making the reputed founder to be celestially begotten. The trinity of gods that then followed was no other than a reduction of the former plurality, which was about twenty or thirty thousand. The statue of Mary succeeded the statue of Diana of Ephesus. The deification of heroes changed into the canonization of saints. The mythologists had gods for everything: the Christian mythologists had saints for everything. The Church became as crowded with the one as the Pantheon had been with the other; and Rome was the place of both. The Christian theory is little else than the idolatry of the ancient mythologists, accommodated to the purposes of power and revenue; and it yet remains to reason and philosophy to abolish the amphibious fraud.

Nothing that is here said can apply, even with the most distant disrespect, to the *real* character of Jesus Christ. He was a virtuous and an amiable man. The morality that he preached and practised was of the most benevolent kind, and, though similar systems of morality had been preached by Confucius, and by some of the Greek philosophers, many years before; by the Quakers since, and by many good men in all ages; it has not been exceeded by any.

Jesus Christ wrote no account of himself, of his birth, parentage, or anything else. Not a line of what is called

the New Testament is of his own writing. The history of him is altogether the work of other people; and as to the account given of his resurrection and ascension, it was the necessary counterpart to the story of his birth. His historians, having brought him into the world in a supernatural manner, were obliged to take him out again in the same manner, or the first part of the story must have fallen to the ground.

The wretched contrivance with which this latter part is told exceeds everything that went before it. The first part—that of the miraculous conception—was not a thing that admitted of publicity; and therefore the tellers of this part of the story had this advantage—that, though they might not be credited, they could not be detected. They could not be expected to prove it, because it was not one of those things that admitted of proof, and it was impossible that the person of whom it was told could prove it himself.

But the resurrection of a dead person from the grave, and his ascension through the air, is a thing very different as to the evidence it admits of from the invisible conception of a child in the womb. The resurrection and ascension, supposing them to have taken place, admitted of public and ocular demonstration, like that of the ascension of a balloon or the sun at noonday, to all Jerusalem at least. A thing which everybody is required to believe requires that the proof and evidence of it should be equal to all; and universal; and, as the public visibility of this last related act was the only evidence that could give sanction to the former part, the whole of it falls to the ground, because that evidence never was given. Instead of this, a small number of persons—not more than eight or nine—are introduced as proxies for the whole world, to say they *saw* it, and all the rest of the world are called upon to believe it. But it appears that Thomas did not believe the resurrection; and, as they say, would not believe without having ocular and manual demonstration himself. *So neither will I*; and the reason is equally as good for me and every other person as for Thomas.

It is in vain to attempt to palliate or disguise this matter.

The story, so far as relates to the supernatural part, has every mark of fraud and imposition stamped upon the face of it. Who were the authors of it is as impossible for us to know as it is for us to be assured that the books in which the account is related were written by the persons whose names they bear. The best surviving evidence we now have respecting this affair is the Jews. They are regularly descended from the people who lived in the times this resurrection and ascension are said to have happened, and they say *it is not true*. It has long appeared to me a strange inconsistency to cite the Jews as a proof of the truth of the story. It is just the same as if a man were to say : " I will prove the truth of what I have told you by producing the people who say it is false."

That such a person as Jesus Christ existed, and that he was crucified—which was the mode of execution at that day—are historical relations strictly within the limits of probability. He preached most excellent morality, and the equality of man; but he preached also against the corruptions and avarice of the Jewish priests, and this brought upon him the hatred and vengeance of the whole order of priesthood. The accusation which those priests brought against him was that of sedition and conspiracy against the Roman Government, to which the Jews were then subject and tributary; and it is not improbable that the Roman Government might have some secret apprehension of the effects of his doctrine as well as the Jewish priests; neither is it improbable that Jesus Christ had in contemplation the delivery of the Jewish nation from the bondage of the Romans. Between the two, however, this virtuous reformer and revolutionist lost his life.

It is upon this plain narrative of facts, together with another case I am going to mention, that the Christian mythologists calling themselves the Christian Church have erected their fable, which, for absurdity and extravagance, is not exceeded by anything that is to be found in the mythology of the ancients.

The ancient mythologists tell us that the race of giants

made war against Jupiter, and that one of them threw a hundred rocks against him at one throw; that Jupiter defeated him with thunder; and confined him afterwards under Mount Etna; and that every time the giant turns himself Mount Etna belches fire. It is here easy to see that the circumstance of the mountain—that of its being a volcano—suggested the idea of the fable, and that the fable is made to fit and wind itself up with that circumstance.

The Christian mythologists tell us that their Satan made war against the Almighty, who defeated him, and confined him afterwards—not under a mountain, but in a pit. It is here easy to see that the first fable suggested the idea of the second; for the fable of Jupiter and the giants was told many hundred years before that of Satan.

Thus far the ancient and the Christian mythologists differ very little from each other. But the latter have contrived to carry the matter much farther. They have contrived to connect the fabulous part of the story of Jesus Christ with the fable originating from Mount Etna; and, in order to make all the parts of the story tie together, they have taken to their aid the traditions of the Jews; for the Christian mythology is made up partly from the ancient mythology and partly from the Jewish traditions.

The Christian mythologists, after having confined Satan in a pit, were obliged to let him out again, to bring on the sequel of the fable. He is then introduced into the Garden of Eden, in the shape of a snake or a serpent, and in that shape he enters into familiar conversation with Eve, who is no ways surprised to hear a snake talk; and the issue of this *tête-à-tête* is that he persuades her to eat an apple—and the eating of that apple damns all mankind.

After giving Satan this triumph over the whole creation, one would have supposed that the Church mythologists would have been kind enough to send him back again to the pit; or, if they had not done this, that they would have put a mountain upon him (for they say that their faith can remove a mountain), or

have put him *under* a mountain—as the former mythologists had done—to prevent his getting again among the women and doing more mischief. But, instead of this, they leave him at large, without even obliging him to give his parole. The secret of which is that they could not do without him; and, after being at the trouble of making him, they bribed him to stay. They promised him *ALL* the Jews, *ALL* the Turks by anticipation, nine-tenths of the world beside, and Mahomet into the bargain. After this, who can doubt the bountifulness of the Christian mythology?

Having thus made an insurrection and a battle in heaven, in which none of the combatants could be either killed or wounded; put Satan into the pit; let him out again; given him a triumph over the whole creation; damned all mankind by the eating of an apple, these Christian mythologists bring the two ends of their fable together. They represent this virtuous and amiable man, Jesus Christ, to be at once both God and man, and also the Son of God—celestially begotten on purpose to be sacrificed, because they say that Eve, in her longing, had eaten an apple.

Putting aside everything that might excite laughter by its absurdity, or detestation by its profaneness, and confining ourselves merely to an examination of the parts, it is impossible to conceive a story more derogatory to the Almighty, more inconsistent with his wisdom, more contradictory to his power, than this story is.

In order to make for it a foundation to rise upon, the inventors were under the necessity of giving to the being whom they call Satan a power equally as great, if not greater, than they attribute to the Almighty. They have not only given him the power of liberating himself from the pit after what they call his fall, but they have made that power increase afterwards to infinity. Before this fall they represent him only as an angel of limited existence, as they represent the rest. After his fall he becomes, by their account, omnipresent. He exists everywhere, and at the same time. He occupies the whole immensity of space.

Not content with this deification of Satan, they represent him as defeating by stratagem, in the shape of an animal of the creation, all the power and wisdom of the Almighty. They represent him as having compelled the Almighty to the *direct necessity* either of surrendering the whole of the creation to the government and sovereignty of this Satan, or of capitulating for its redemption by coming down upon earth and exhibiting himself upon the cross in the shape of a man.

Had the inventors of this story told it the contrary way—that is, had they represented the Almighty as compelling Satan to exhibit *himself* on a cross in the shape of a snake, as a punishment for his new transgression—the story would have been less absurd, less contradictory. But, instead of this, they make the transgressor triumph and the Almighty fall.

That many good men have believed this strange fable, and lived very good lives under that belief (for credulity is not a crime), is what I have no doubt of. In the first place, they were educated to believe it, and they would have believed anything else in the same manner. There are also many who have been so enthusiastically enraptured by what they conceived to be the infinite love of God to man, in making a sacrifice of himself, that the vehemence of the idea has forbidden and deterred them from examining into the absurdity and profaneness of the story. The more unnatural anything is, the more is it capable of becoming the object of dismal admiration.

But, if objects for gratitude and admiration are our desire, do they not present themselves every hour to our eyes? Do we not see a fair creation prepared to receive us the instant we are born—a world furnished to our hands that cost us nothing? Is it we that light up the sun, that pour down the rain, and fill the earth with abundance? Whether we sleep or wake, the vast machinery of the universe still goes on. Are these things and the blessings they indicate in future, nothing to us? Can our gross feelings be excited by no other subjects than tragedy and suicide? Or is the gloomy

pride of man become so intolerable that nothing can flatter it but a sacrifice of the Creator?

I know that this bold investigation will alarm many, but it would be paying too great a compliment to their credulity to forbear it upon that account. The times and the subject demand it to be done. The suspicion that the theory of what is called the Christian Church is fabulous is becoming very extensive in all countries; and it will be a consolation to men staggering under that suspicion, and doubting what to believe and what to disbelieve, to see the subject freely investigated. I, therefore, pass on to an examination of the books called the Old and the New Testament.

These books, beginning with Genesis and ending with Revelation (which, by the bye, is a book of riddles that requires a revelation to explain it), are, we are told, the word of God. It is, therefore, proper for us to know who told us so, that we may know what credit to give to the report. The answer to this question is: That nobody can tell, except that we tell one another so. The case, however, historically appears to be as follows:—

When the Church mythologists established their system, they collected all the writings they could find and managed them as they pleased. It is a matter altogether of uncertainty to us whether such of the writings as now appear, under the name of the Old and the New Testament, are in the same state in which those collectors say they found them; or whether they added, altered, abridged, or dressed them up.

Be this as it may, they decided by *vote* which of the books out of the collection they had made should be the WORD OF GOD, and which should not. They rejected several; they voted others to be doubtful, such as the books called the Apocrypha; and those books which had a majority of votes were voted to be the word of God. Had they voted otherwise, all the people, since calling themselves Christians, had believed otherwise; for the belief of the one comes from the vote of the other. Who the people were that did all this we know nothing

of; they call themselves by the general name of the Church; and this is all we know of the matter.

As we have no other external evidence or authority for believing those books to be the word of God than what I have mentioned, which is no evidence or authority at all, I come, in the next place, to examine the internal evidence contained in the books themselves.

In the former part of this essay I have spoken of Revelation. I now proceed further with that subject, for the purpose of applying it to the books in question.

Revelation is a communication of something which the person to whom the thing is revealed did not know before. For if I have done a thing, or seen it done, it needs no revelation to tell me I have done it, or seen it; nor enable me to tell it, or to write it.

Revelation, therefore, cannot be applied to anything done upon earth of which man is himself the actor or the witness; and consequently all the historical and anecdotal part of the Bible, which is almost the whole of it, is not within the meaning and compass of the word revelation, and, therefore, is not the word of God.

When Samson ran off with the gateposts of Gaza, if he ever did so (and whether he did so or not is nothing to us), or when he visited his Delilah, or caught his foxes, or did anything else, what has revelation to do with these things? If they were facts, he could tell them himself; or his secretary, if he kept one, could write them, if they were worth either telling or writing; and if they were fictitious, revelation could not make them true; and whether true or not, we are neither the better nor the wiser for knowing them. When we contemplate the immensity of that Being who directs and governs the incomprehensible WHOLE, of which the utmost ken of human sight can discover but a part, we ought to feel shame at calling such paltry stories the word of God.

As to the account of the creation, with which the book of Genesis opens, it has all the appearance of being a tradition which the Israelites had among them before they came into Egypt; and after their departure from

that country they put it at the head of their history, without telling, as it is most probable, that they did not know how they came by it. The manner in which the account opens shows it to be traditionary. It begins abruptly. It is nobody that speaks. It is nobody that hears. It is addressed to nobody. It has neither first, second, nor third person. It has every criterion of being a tradition. It has no voucher. Moses does not take it upon himself by introducing it with the formality that he uses on other occasions, such as that of saying : "*The Lord spake unto Moses, saying.*"

Why it has been called the Mosaic account of the creation I am at a loss to conceive. Moses, I believe, was too good a judge of such subjects to put his name to that account. He had been educated among the Egyptians, who were a people as well skilled in science, and particularly in astronomy, as any people of their day; and the silence and caution that Moses observes in not authenticating the account is a good negative evidence that he neither told it nor believed it. The case is that every nation of people have been world-makers, and the Israelites had as much right to set up the trade of world-making as any of the rest; and, as Moses was not an Israelite, he might not choose to contradict the tradition. The account, however, is harmless; and this is more than can be said for many other parts of the Bible.

Whenever we read the obscene stories, the voluptuous debaucheries, the cruel and torturous executions, the unrelenting vindictiveness with which more than half the Bible is filled, it would be more consistent that we called it the word of a demon than the word of God. It is a history of wickedness, that has served to corrupt and brutalise mankind; and, for my own part, I sincerely detest it, as I detest everything that is cruel.

We scarcely meet with anything, a few phrases excepted, but what deserves either our abhorrence or our contempt, till we come to the miscellaneous parts of the Bible. In the anonymous publications, the Psalms and the book of Job, more particularly in the latter, we find a great deal of elevated sentiment reverentially

expressed of the power and benignity of the Almighty; but they stand on no higher rank than many other compositions on similar subjects, as well before that time as since.

The Proverbs, which are said to be Solomon's though most probably a collection (because they discover a knowledge of life which his situation excluded him from knowing), are an instructive table of ethics. They are inferior in keenness to the proverbs of the Spaniards, and not more wise and economical than those of the American Franklin.

All the remaining parts of the Bible, generally known by the name of the Prophets, are the works of the Jewish poets and itinerant preachers, who mixed poetry, anecdote, and devotion together; and those works still retain the air and style of poetry, though in translation.¹

¹ As there are many readers who do not see that a composition is poetry unless it be in rhyme, it is for their information that I add this note.

Poetry consists principally in two things—Imagery and Composition. The composition of poetry differs from that of prose in the manner of mixing long and short syllables together. Take a long syllable out of a line of poetry, and put a short one in the room of it, or put a long syllable where a short one should be, and that line will lose its poetical harmony. It will have an effect upon the line like that of misplacing a note in a song.

The imagery in those books called the Prophets appertains altogether to poetry. It is fictitious, and often extravagant, and not admissible in any other kind of writing than poetry.

To show that these writings are composed in poetical numbers, I will take ten syllables as they stand in the book, and make a line of the same number of syllables (heroic measure) that shall rhyme with the last word. It will then be seen that the composition of those books is poetical measure. The instance I shall produce is from Isaiah.

"Hear, O ye heavens, and give ear, O earth,"
 'Tis God himself that calls attention forth.

Another instance I shall quote is from the mournful Jeremiah, to which I shall add two other lines for the purpose of carrying out the figure and showing the intention of the poet.

*O ! that mine head were waters, and mine eyes
 Were fountains, flowing like the liquid skies,
 Then would I give the mighty flood release,
 And weep a deluge for the human race.*

There is not throughout the whole book called the Bible any word that describes to us what we call a poet, nor any word that describes what we call poetry. The case is that the word *prophet*, to which latter times have affixed a new idea, was the Bible word for poet, and the word *prophesying* meant the art of making poetry. It also meant the art of playing poetry to a tune upon any instrument of music.

We read of prophesying with pipes, tabrets, and horns. Of prophesying with harps, with psalteries, with cymbals, and with every other instrument of music then in fashion. Were we now to speak of prophesying with a fiddle, or with a pipe and tabor, the expression would have no meaning, or would appear ridiculous, and to some people contemptuous, because we have changed the meaning of the word.

We are told of Saul being among the *prophets*, and also that he prophesied; but we are not told what *they prophesied*, nor what *he prophesied*. The case is, there was nothing to tell; for these prophets were a company of musicians and poets, and Saul joined in the concerts; and this was called *prophesying*.

The account given of this affair in the book called Samuel is that Saul met a *company* of prophets—a whole company of them!—coming down with a psaltery, a tabret, a pipe, and a harp, and that they prophesied, and that he prophesied with them. But it appears afterwards that Saul prophesied badly—that is, he performed his part badly; for it is said, that an “*evil spirit from God*”¹ came upon Saul, and he prophesied.”

Now, were there no other passage in the book called the Bible than this to demonstrate to us that we have lost the original meaning of the word *prophecy*, and substituted another meaning in its place, this alone would be sufficient; for it is impossible to use and apply the

¹ As those men who call themselves divines and commentators are very fond of puzzling one another, I leave them to contest the meaning of the first part of the phrase, that of an *evil spirit from God*. I keep to my text, I keep to the meaning of the word *prophecy*.

word *prophecy* in the place it is here used and applied if we give to it the sense which latter times have affixed to it. The manner in which it is here used strips it of all religious meaning, and shows that a man might then be a prophet, or might *prophecy*, as he may now be a poet or a musician, without any regard to the morality or the immorality of his character. The word was originally a term of science, promiscuously applied to poetry and to music, and not restricted to any subject upon which poetry and music might be exercised.

Deborah and Barak are called prophets, not because they predicted anything, but because they composed the poem or song that bears their name, in celebration of an act already done; David was ranked among the prophets, for he was a musician, and was also reputed to be (though perhaps very erroneously) the author of the Psalms. But Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not called prophets. It does not appear from any accounts we have that they could either sing, play music, or make poetry.

We are told of the greater and the lesser prophets. They might as well tell us of the greater and the lesser God; for there cannot be degrees in prophesying consistently with its modern sense. But there are degrees in poetry, and therefore the phrase is reconcilable to the case, when we understand by it the greater and the lesser poets.

It is altogether unnecessary after this to offer any observations upon what those men, styled prophets, have written. The axe goes at once to the root by showing that the original meaning of the word has been mistaken, and consequently all the inferences that have been drawn from those books, the devotional respect that has been paid to them, and the laboured commentaries that have been written upon them, under that mistaken meaning, are not worth disputing about. In many things, however, the writings of the Jewish poets deserve a better fate than that of being bound up, as they now are, with the trash that accompanies them under the abused name of the word of God.

If we permit ourselves to conceive right ideas of things, we must necessarily affix the idea, not only of unchangeableness, but of the utter impossibility of any change taking place, by any means or accident whatever, in that which we would honour with the name of the word of God; and therefore the word of God cannot exist in any written or human language.

The continually progressive change to which the meaning of words is subject, the want of an universal language which renders translation necessary, the errors to which translations are again subject, the mistakes of copyists and printers, together with the possibility of wilful alteration, are of themselves evidences that human language, whether in speech or in print, cannot be the vehicle of the word of God. The word of God exists in something else.

Did the book called the Bible excel in purity of ideas and expression all the books that are now extant in the world, I would not take it for my rule of faith as being the word of God, because the possibility would, nevertheless, exist of my being imposed upon. But when I see throughout the greatest part of this book scarcely anything but a history of the grossest vices and a collection of the most paltry and contemptible tales, I cannot dishonour my Creator by calling it by his name.

Thus much for the Bible; I now go on to the book called the New Testament. The *new* Testament!—that is, the *new* will, as if there could be two wills of the Creator.

Had it been the object or the intention of Jesus Christ to establish a new religion, he would undoubtedly have written the system himself, or *procured it to be written* in his lifetime. But there is no publication extant authenticated with his name. All the books called the New Testament were written after his death. He was a Jew by birth and by profession, and he was the son of God in like manner that every other person is; for the Creator is the Father of All.

The first four books, called Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, do not give a history of the life of Jesus Christ,

but only detached anecdotes of him. It appears from these books that the whole time of his being a preacher was not more than eighteen months; and it was only during this short time that those men became acquainted with him. They make mention of him at the age of twelve years, sitting, they say, among the Jewish doctors, asking and answering them questions. As this was several years before their acquaintance with him began, it is most probable they had this anecdote from his parents. From this time there is no account of him for about sixteen years. Where he lived or how he employed himself during this interval is not known. Most probably he was working at his father's trade, which was that of a carpenter. It does not appear that he had any school education, and the probability is that he could not write, for his parents were extremely poor, as appears from their not being able to pay for a bed when he was born.

It is somewhat curious that the three persons whose names are the most universally recorded were of very obscure parentage. Moses was a foundling, Jesus Christ was born in a stable, and Mahomet was a mule-driver. The first and the last of these men were founders of different systems of religion; but Jesus Christ founded no new system. He called men to the practice of moral virtues and the belief of one God. The great trait in his character is philanthropy.

The manner in which he was apprehended shows that he was not much known at that time; and it shows also that the meetings he then held with his followers were in secret, and that he had given over, or suspended, preaching publicly. Judas could not otherways betray him than by giving information where he was, and pointing him out to the officers that went to arrest him; and the reason for employing and paying Judas to do this could arise only from the causes already mentioned, that of his not being much known, and living concealed.

The idea of his concealment not only agrees very ill with his reputed divinity, but associates with it something

of pusillanimity; and his being betrayed, or, in other words, his being apprehended on the information of one of his followers, shows that he did not intend to be apprehended, and consequently that he did not intend to be crucified.

The Christian mythologists tell us that Christ died for the sins of the world, and that he came on *purpose to die*. Would it not then have been the same if he had died of a fever, or of the small-pox, or of old age, or of anything else?

The declaratory sentence which, they say, was passed upon Adam in case he ate of the apple was not that *thou shalt surely be crucified*, but *thou shalt surely die*. The sentence was death, and not the *manner of dying*. Crucifixion, therefore, or any other particular manner of dying, made no part of the sentence that Adam was to suffer, and consequently, even upon their own tactics, it could make no part of the sentence that Christ was to suffer in the room of Adam. A fever would have done as well as a cross, if there was any occasion for either.

This sentence of death which, they tell us, was thus passed upon Adam, must either have meant dying naturally—that is, ceasing to live—or have meant what these mythologists call damnation; and, consequently, the act of dying on the part of Jesus Christ must, according to their system, apply as a prevention to one or other of these two *things* happening to Adam and to us.

That it does not prevent our dying is evident, because we all die; and if their accounts of longevity be true, men die faster since the crucifixion than before; and with respect to the second explanation (including with it the *natural death* of Jesus Christ as a substitute for the *eternal death or damnation* of all mankind), it is impertinently representing the Creator as coming off or revoking the sentence by a pun or a quibble upon the word *death*. The manufacturer of quibbles, St. Paul, if he wrote the books that bear his name, has helped this quibble on by making another quibble, upon the word *Adam*. He makes there to be two Adams: the one who sins in

fact and suffers by proxy; the other who sins by proxy and suffers in fact. A religion thus interlarded with quibble, subterfuge, and pun, has a tendency to instruct its professors in the practice of these arts. They acquire the habit without being aware of the cause.

If Jesus Christ was the being which those mythologists tell us he was, and that he came into this world to *suffer*, which is a word they sometimes use instead of *to die*, the only real suffering he could have endured would have been *to live*. His existence here was a state of exilement or transportation from heaven, and the way back to his original country was to die. In fine, everything in this strange system is the reverse of what it pretends to be. It is the reverse of truth, and I become so tired with examining into its inconsistencies and absurdities that I hasten to the conclusion of it, in order to proceed to something better.

How much or what parts of the books called the New Testament were written by the persons whose names they bear is what we can know nothing of, neither are we certain in what language they were originally written. The matters they now contain may be classed under two heads: anecdote and epistolary correspondence.

The four books already mentioned—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—are altogether anecdotal. They relate events after they had taken place. They tell what Jesus Christ did and said, and what others did and said to him; and in several instances they relate the same event differently. Revelation is necessarily out of the question with respect to those books; not only because of the disagreement of the writers, but because revelation cannot be applied to the relating of facts by the persons who saw them done, nor to the relating or recording of any discourse or conversation by those who heard it. The book called the Acts of the Apostles—an anonymous work—belongs also to the anecdotal part.

All the other parts of the New Testament, except the book of enigmas called the Revelation, are a collection of letters under the name of epistles, and the forgery of letters under the name of epistles; and the forgery

of letters has been such a common practice in the world that the probability is at least equal whether they are genuine or forged. One thing, however, is much less equivocal, which is that out of the matters contained in those books, together with the assistance of some old stories, the Church has set up a system of religion very contradictory to the character of the person whose name it bears. It has set up a religion of pomp and of revenue in pretended imitation of a person whose life was humility and poverty.

The invention of purgatory, and of the releasing of souls therefrom by prayers bought of the Church with money; the selling of pardons, dispensations, and indulgences are revenue laws, without bearing that name or carrying that appearance.

But the case, nevertheless, is that those things derive their origin from the proxyism of the crucifixion, and the theory deduced therefrom, which was that one person could stand in the place of another, and could perform meritorious services for him. The probability, therefore, is, that the whole theory or doctrine of what is called the redemption (which is said to have been accomplished by the act of one person in the room of another) was originally fabricated on purpose to bring forward and build all those secondary and pecuniary redemptions upon; and that the passages in the books upon which the idea of the theory of redemption is built have been manufactured and fabricated for that purpose. Why are we to give this Church credit, when she tells us that those books are genuine in every part, any more than we give her credit for everything else she has told us, or for the miracles she says she has performed? That she *could* fabricate writings is certain, because she could write; and the composition of the writings in question is of that kind that anybody might do it; and that she *did* fabricate them is not more inconsistent with probability than that she should tell us, as she has done, that she could, and did, work miracles.

Since then no external evidence can, at this long distance of time, be produced to prove whether the

Church fabricated the doctrine called redemption or not (for such evidence, whether for or against, would be subject to the same suspicion of being fabricated); the case can only be referred to the internal evidence which the thing carries of itself, and this affords a very strong presumption of its being a fabrication. For the internal evidence is that the theory or doctrine of redemption has for its basis an idea of pecuniary justice, and not that of moral justice.

If I owe a person money, and cannot pay him, and he threatens to put me in prison, another person can take the debt upon himself and pay it for me. But if I have committed a crime, every circumstance of the case is changed. Moral justice cannot take the innocent for the guilty, even if the innocent would offer itself. To suppose justice to do this is to destroy the principle of its existence, which is the thing itself. It is then no longer justice. It is indiscriminate revenge.

This single reflection will show that the doctrine of redemption is founded on a mere pecuniary idea corresponding to that of a debt which another person might pay; and as this pecuniary idea corresponds again with the system of second redemptions obtained through the means of money given to the Church for pardons, the probability is that the same persons fabricated both the one and the other of those theories, and that, in truth, there is no such thing as redemption; that it is fabulous, and that man stands in the same relative condition with his Maker he ever did stand since man existed; and that it is his greatest consolation to think so.

Let him believe this, and he will live more confidently and morally than by any other system. It is by his being taught to contemplate himself as an outlaw, as an outcast, as a beggar, as a mumper, as one thrown, as it were, on a dunghill, at an immense distance from his Creator, and who must make his approaches by creeping and cringing to intermediate beings, that he conceives either a contemptuous disregard for everything under the name of religion, or becomes indifferent, or turns what he calls devout. In the latter case he consumes

his life in grief, or the affectation of it. His prayers are reproaches. His humility is ingratitude. He calls himself a worm, and the fertile earth a dunghill, and all the blessings of life by the thankless name of vanities. He despises the choicest gift of God to man—the GIFT OF REASON; and, having endeavoured to force upon himself the belief of a system against which reason revolts, he ungratefully calls it *human reason*, as if man could give reason to himself.

Yet, with all this strange appearance of humility and this contempt for human reason, he ventures into the boldest presumptions. He finds fault with everything. His selfishness is never satisfied; his ingratitude is never at an end. He takes on himself to direct the Almighty what to do, even in the government of the universe. He prays dictatorially. When it is sunshine he prays for rain, and when it is rain he prays for sunshine. He follows the same idea in everything that he prays for; for what is the amount of all his prayers but an attempt to make the Almighty change his mind, and act otherwise than he does? It is as if he were to say: Thou knowest not so well as I.

But some perhaps will say: Are we to have no word of God—no revelation? I answer: Yes. There is a word of God; there is a revelation.

THE WORD OF GOD IS THE CREATION WE BEHOLD; and it is in *this word*, which no human invention can counterfeit, or alter, that God speaketh universally to man.

Human language is local and changeable, and is, therefore, incapable of being used as the means of unchangeable and universal information. The idea that God sent Jesus Christ to publish, as they say, the glad tidings to all nations, from one end of the earth unto the other, is consistent only with the ignorance of those who know nothing of the extent of the world, and who believed, as those world-saviours believed, and continued to believe for several centuries (and that in contradiction to the discoveries of philosophers and the experience of navigators), that the earth was flat like a trencher, and that a man might walk to the end of it.

But how was Jesus Christ to make anything known to all nations? He could speak but one language, which was Hebrew; and there are in the world several hundred languages. Scarcely any two nations speak the same language, or understand each other; and as to translations, every man who knows anything of languages knows that it is impossible to translate from one language into another without not only losing a great part of the original, but frequently mistaking the sense; and, besides all this, the art of printing was wholly unknown at the time Christ lived.

It is always necessary that the means that are to accomplish any end be equal to the accomplishment of that end, or the end cannot be accomplished. It is in this that the difference between finite and infinite power and wisdom discovers itself. Man frequently fails in accomplishing his ends from a natural inability of the power to the purpose, and frequently from the want of wisdom to apply power properly. But it is impossible for infinite power and wisdom to fail as man faileth. The means it useth are always equal to the end; but human language, more especially as there is not an universal language, is incapable of being used as an universal means of unchangeable and uniform information; and therefore it is not the means that God useth in manifesting himself universally to man.

It is only in the CREATION that all our ideas and conceptions of a *word of God* can unite. The creation speaketh an universal language, independently of human speech or human language, multiplied and various as they be. It is an ever existing original, which every man can read. It cannot be forged; it cannot be counterfeited; it cannot be lost; it cannot be altered; it cannot be suppressed. It does not depend upon the will of man whether it shall be published or not; it publishes itself from one end of the earth to the other. It preaches to all nations and to all worlds; and this *word of God* reveals to man all that is necessary for man to know of God.

Do we want to contemplate his power? We see it in

the immensity of the creation. Do we want to contemplate his wisdom? We see it in the unchangeable order by which the incomprehensible Whole is governed. Do we want to contemplate his munificence? We see it in the abundance with which he fills the earth. Do we want to contemplate his mercy? We see it in his not withholding that abundance even from the unthankful. In fine, do we want to know what God is; search not the book called the Scripture, which any human hand might make, but the Scripture called the Creation.

The only idea man can affix to the name of God is that of a *first cause*, the cause of all things. And incomprehensible and difficult as it is for a man to conceive what a first cause is, he arrives at the belief of it from the tenfold greater difficulty of disbelieving it. It is difficult beyond description to conceive that space can have no end; but it is more difficult to conceive an end. It is difficult beyond the power of man to conceive an eternal duration of what we call time; but it is more impossible to conceive a time when there shall be no time. In like manner of reasoning, everything we behold carries in itself the internal evidence that it did not make itself. Every man is an evidence to himself that he did not make himself, neither could his father make himself, nor his grandfather, nor any of his race; neither could any tree, plant, or animal, make itself; and it is the conviction arising from this evidence that carries us on, as it were by necessity, to the belief of a first cause eternally existing, of a nature totally different to any material existence we know of, and by the power of which all things exist; and this first cause man calls God.

It is only by the exercise of reason that man can discover God. Take away that reason, and he would be incapable of understanding anything; and, in this case, it would be just as consistent to read even the book called the Bible to a horse as to a man. How then is it that those people pretend to reject reason?

Almost the only parts in the book called the Bible that convey to us any idea of God are some chapters in Job and the 19th Psalm. 'I recollect no other. Those

parts are true *deistical* compositions; for they treat of the *Deity* through his works. They take the book of creation as the word of God; they refer to no other book and all the inferences they make are drawn from that volume.

I insert, in this place, the 19th Psalm, as paraphrased into English verse by Addison. I recollect not the prose, and where I write this I have not the opportunity of seeing it.

The spacious firmament on high,
 With all the blue ethereal sky
 And spangled heavens, a shining frame
 Their great original proclaim.
 The unwearied sun, from day to day,
 Does his Creator's power display,
 And publishes to every land
 The work of an Almighty hand.
 Soon as the evening shades prevail,
 The moon takes up the wondrous tale,
 And nightly to the list'ning earth
 Repeats the story of her birth.
 Whilst all the stars that round her burn,
 And all the planets in their turn
 Confirm the tidings as they roll,
 And spread the truth from pole to pole.
 What tho', in solemn silence, all
 Move round this dark terrestrial ball.
 What tho' no real voice, nor sound,
 Amidst their radiant orbs be found,
 In reason's ear they all rejoice
 And utter forth a glorious voice,
 For ever singing as they shine,
 THE HAND THAT MADE US IS DIVINE.

What more does man want to know than that the hand or power that made these things is divine, is omnipotent? Let him believe this, with the force it is impossible to repel if he permits his reason to act, and his rule of moral life will follow of course.

The allusions in Job have all of them the same tendency with this psalm: that of deducing or proving a truth, that would be otherwise unknown, from truths already known.

I recollect not enough of the passages in Job to insert them correctly; but there is one occurs to me that is

applicable to the subject I am speaking upon. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?"

I know not how the printers have pointed this passage, for I keep no Bible; but it contains two distinct questions that admit of distinct answers.

First, Canst thou by searching find out God? Yes. Because, in the first place, I know I did not make myself, and yet I have existence; and by *searching* into the nature of other things I find that no other thing could make itself; and yet millions of other things exist; therefore it is that I know, by positive conclusion resulting from this search, that there is a power superior to all those things, and that power is God.

Secondly, Canst thou find out the Almighty to *perfection*? No. Not only because the power and wisdom he has manifested in the structure of the creation that I behold is to me incomprehensible; but because even this manifestation, great as it is, is probably but a small display of that immensity of power and wisdom by which millions of other worlds, to me invisible by their distance, were created, and continued to exist.

It is evident that both these questions were put to the reason of the person to whom they are supposed to have been addressed; and it is only by admitting the first question to be answered affirmatively that the second could follow. It would have been unnecessary, and even absurd, to have put a second question more difficult than the first, if the first had been answered negatively. The two questions have different objects: the first refers to the existence of God, the second to his attributes. Reason can discover the one, but it falls infinitely short in discovering the whole of the other.

I recollect not a single passage in all the writings ascribed to the men called apostles, that conveys any idea of what God is. Those writings are chiefly controversial; and the gloominess of the subject they dwell upon, that of man dying in agony on a cross, is better suited to the gloomy genius of a monk in a cell, by whom it is not impossible they were written, than to any man

breathing the open air of the creation. The only passage that occurs to me, that has any reference to the works of God, by which only his power and wisdom can be known, is related to have been spoken by Jesus Christ, as a remedy against distrustful care. "Behold the lilies of the field, they toil not, neither do they spin." This, however, is far inferior to the allusions in Job, and in the 19th Psalm; but it is similar in idea, and the modesty of the imagery is correspondent to the modesty of the man.

As to the Christian system of faith, it appears to me as a species of Atheism; a sort of religious denial of God. It professes to believe in a man rather than in God. It is a compound made up chiefly of manism with but little Deism, and is near to Atheism as twilight is to darkness. It introduces between man and his Maker an opaque body which it calls a redeemer; as the moon introduces her opaque self between the earth and the sun, and it produces by this means a religious or an irreligious eclipse of light. It has put the whole orbit of reason into shade.

The effect of this obscurity has been that of turning everything upside down, and representing it in reverse; and among the revolutions it has thus mag'ically produced, it has made a revolution in Theology.

That which is now called natural philosophy, embracing the whole circle of science, of which astronomy occupies the chief place, is the study of the works of God, and of the power and wisdom of God in his works, and is the true theology.

As to the theology that is now studied in its place, it is the study of human opinions and of human fancies *concerning* God. It is not the study of God himself in the works that he has made, but in the works or writings that man has made; and it is not among the least of the mischiefs that the Christian system has done to the world, that it has abandoned the original and beautiful system of theology, like a beautiful innocent, to distress and reproach, to make room for the hag of superstition.

The Book of Job and 19th Psalm, which even the

Church admits to be more ancient than the chronological order in which they stand in the book called the Bible, are theological orations conformable to the original system of theology. The internal evidence of those orations proves to a demonstration that the study and contemplation of the works of creation, and of the power and wisdom of God revealed and manifested in those works, made a great part of the religious devotion of the times in which they were written; and it was this devotional study and contemplation that led to the discovery of the principles upon which what is now called Science is established; and it is to the discovery of these principles that almost all the arts that contribute to the convenience of human life owe their existence. Every principal art has some science for its parent, though the person who mechanically performs the work does not always, and but very seldom, perceive the connection.

It is a fraud of the Christian system to call the sciences *human invention*; it is only the application of them that is human. Every science has for its basis a system of principles as fixed and unalterable as those by which the universe is regulated and governed. Man cannot make principles—he can only discover them.

For example. Every person who looks at an almanack sees an account when an eclipse will take place; and he sees also that it never fails to take place according to the account there given. This shows that man is acquainted with the laws by which the heavenly bodies move. But it would be something worse than ignorance were any church on earth to say that those laws are a human invention.

It would also be ignorance, or something worse, to say that the scientific principles by the aid of which man is enabled to calculate and foreknow when an eclipse will take place, are a human invention. Man cannot invent anything that is eternal and immutable; and the scientific principles he employs for this purpose must be, and are of necessity, as eternal and immutable as the laws by which the heavenly bodies move; or they could not be

used as they are to ascertain the time when, and the manner how, an eclipse will take place.

The scientific principles that man employs to obtain the foreknowledge of an eclipse, or of anything else relating to the motion of the heavenly bodies, are contained chiefly in that part of science that is called trigonometry, or the properties of a triangle, which, when applied to the study of the heavenly bodies, is called astronomy; when applied to direct the course of a ship on the ocean, it is called navigation; when applied to the construction of figures drawn by rule and compass, it is called geometry; when applied to the construction of plans of edifices, it is called architecture; when applied to the measurement of any portion of the surface of the earth, it is called land surveying. In fine, it is the soul of science. It is an eternal truth; it contains the *mathematical demonstration* of which man speaks, and the extent of its uses is unknown.

It may be said that man can make or draw a triangle, and therefore a triangle is a human invention.

But the triangle, when drawn, is no other than the image of the principle: it is a delineation to the eye, and from thence to the mind, of a principle that would otherwise be imperceptible. The triangle does not make the principle, any more than a candle taken into a room that was dark makes the chairs and tables that before were invisible. All the properties of a triangle exist independently of the figure and existed before any triangle was drawn or thought of by man. Man had no more to do in the formation of those properties or principles than he had to do in making the laws by which the heavenly bodies move; and therefore the one must have the same divine origin as the other.

In the same manner as it may be said that man can make a triangle, so also may it be said that he can make the mechanical instrument called a lever. But the principle by which the lever acts is a thing distinct from the instrument, and would exist if the instrument did not: it attaches itself to the instrument after it is made; the instrument therefore can act no otherwise

than it does act; neither can all the effort of human invention make it act otherwise. That which, in all such cases, man calls the *effect* is no other than the principle itself rendered perceptible to the senses.

Since, then, man cannot make principles, from whence did he gain a knowledge of them so as to be able to apply them, not only to things on earth, but to ascertain the motion of bodies so immensely distant from him as all the heavenly bodies are? From whence, I ask, *could* he gain that knowledge but from the study of the true theology?

It is the structure of the universe that has taught this knowledge to man. That structure is an ever-existing exhibition of every principle upon which every part of mathematical science is founded. The offspring of this science is mechanics; for mechanics is no other than the principles of science applied practically. The man who proportions the several parts of a mill uses the same scientific principles as if he had the power of constructing an universe; but as he cannot give to matter that invisible agency by which all the component parts of the immense machine of the universe have influence upon each other, and act in motional unison together without any apparent contact, and to which man has given the name of attraction, gravitation, and repulsion, he supplies the place of that agency by the humble imitation of teeth and cogs. All the parts of man's microcosm must visibly touch. But could he gain a knowledge of that agency, so as to be able to apply it in practice, we might then say that another *canonical book* of the word of God had been discovered.

If man could alter the properties of the lever, so also could he alter the properties of the triangle; for a lever (taking that sort of lever which is called the steel-yard, for the sake of explanation) forms, when in motion, a triangle. The line it descends from (one point of that line being in the fulcrum), the line it descends to, and the chord of the arc which the end of the lever describes in the air, are the three sides of a triangle. The other arm of the lever describes also a triangle; and the

corresponding sides of those two triangles, calculated scientifically, or measured geometrically; and also the sines, tangents, and secants generated from the angles, and geometrically measured, have the same proportions to each other as the different weights have that will balance each other on the lever, leaving the weight of the lever out of the case.

It may also be said that man can make a wheel and axis, that he can put wheels of different magnitudes together, and produce a mill. Still the case comes back to the same point, which is, that he did not make the principle that gives the wheels those powers. That principle is as unalterable as in the former cases, or rather it is the same principle under a different appearance to the eye.

The power that two wheels of different magnitudes have upon each other is in the same proportion as if the semi-diameter of the two wheels were joined together and made into that kind of lever I have described, suspended at the part where the semi-diameters join; for the two wheels, scientifically considered, are no other than the two circles generated by the motion of the compound lever.

It is from the study of the true theology that all our knowledge of science is derived, and it is from that knowledge that all the arts have originated.

The Almighty lecturer, by displaying the principles of science in the structure of the universe, has invited man to study and to imitation. It is as if he had said to the inhabitants of this globe we call ours: "I have made an earth for man to dwell upon, and I have rendered the starry heavens visible, to teach him science and the arts. He can now provide for his own comfort, AND LEARN FROM MY MUNIFICENCE TO ALL TO BE KIND TO EACH OTHER."

Of what use is it, unless it be to teach man something, that his eye is endowed with the power of beholding, to an incomprehensible distance, an immensity of worlds revolving in the ocean of space? Or of what use is it that this immensity of worlds is visible to man? What

has man to do with the Pleiades, with Orion, with Sirius, with the star he calls the north star, with the moving orbs he has named Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and Mercury, if no uses are to follow from their being visible? A less power of vision would have been sufficient for man if the immensity he now possesses were given only to waste itself, as it were, on an immense desert of space glittering with shows.

It is only by contemplating what he calls the starry heavens as the book and school of science that he discovers any use in their being visible to him, or any advantage resulting from his immensity of vision. But, when he contemplates the subject in this light, he sees an additional motive for saying that *nothing was made in vain*; for in vain would be this power of vision if it taught man nothing.

As the Christian system of faith has made a revolution in theology, so also has it made a revolution in the state of learning. That which is now called learning was not learning originally. Learning does not consist, as the schools now make it consist, in the knowledge of languages, but in the knowledge of things to which language gives names.

The Greeks were a learned people; but learning, with them, did not consist in speaking Greek, any more than in a Roman's speaking Latin, or a Frenchman's speaking French, or an Englishman's speaking English. From what we know of the Greeks, it does not appear that they knew or studied any language but their own; and this was one cause of their becoming so learned; it afforded them more time to apply themselves to better studies. The schools of the Greeks were schools of science and philosophy, and not of languages; and it is in the knowledge of the things that science and philosophy teach that learning consists.

Almost all the scientific learning that now exists came to us from the Greeks, or the people who spoke the Greek language. It therefore became necessary to the people of other nations, who spoke a different language, that some among them should learn the Greek language,

in order that the learning the Greeks had might be made known in those nations, by translating the Greek books of science and philosophy into the mother tongue of each nation.

The study, therefore, of the Greek language (and in the same manner for the Latin) was no other than the drudgery business of a linguist, and the language thus obtained was no other than the means—as it were, the tools—employed to obtain the learning the Greeks had. It made no part of the learning itself, and was so distinct from it as to make it exceedingly probable that the persons who had studied Greek sufficiently to translate those works—such, for instance, as Euclid's *Elements*—did not understand any of the learning the works contained.

As there is now nothing new to be learned from the dead languages, all the useful books being already translated, the languages are become useless, and the time expended in teaching and in learning them is wasted. So far as the study of languages may contribute to the progress and communication of knowledge (for it has nothing to do with the *creation* of knowledge), it is only in the living languages that the new knowledge is to be found; and certain it is that, in general, a youth will learn more of a living language in one year than of a dead language in seven; and it is but seldom that the teacher knows much of it himself. The difficulty of learning the dead languages does not arise from any superior abstruseness in the languages themselves, but in their *being dead*, and the pronunciation entirely lost. It would be the same thing with any other language when it becomes dead. The best Greek linguist that now exists does not understand Greek so well as a Grecian plowman did, or a Grecian milkmaid; and the same for the Latin, compared with a plowman or a milkmaid of the Romans; and, with respect to pronunciation and idiom, not so well as the cows that she milked. It would, therefore, be advantageous to the state of learning to abolish the study of the dead languages, and to make learning consist, as it originally did, in scientific knowledge.

The apology that is sometimes made for continuing to teach the dead languages is, that they are taught at a time when a child is not capable of exerting any other mental faculty than that of memory. But this is altogether erroneous. The human mind has a natural disposition to scientific knowledge, and to the things connected with it. The first and favourite amusement of a child, even before it begins to play, is that of imitating the works of man. It builds houses with cards or sticks; it navigates the little ocean of a bowl of water with a paper boat; or dams the stream of a gutter, and contrives something which it calls a mill; and it interests itself in the fate of its works with a care that resembles affection. It afterwards goes to school, where its genius is killed by the barren study of a dead language, and the philosopher is lost in the linguist.

But the apology that is now made for continuing to teach the dead languages could not be the cause at first of cutting down learning to the narrow and humble sphere of linguistry; the cause, therefore, must be sought for elsewhere. In all researches of this kind, the best evidence that can be produced is the internal evidence the thing carries with itself, and the evidence of circumstances that unites with it, both of which, in this case, are not difficult to be discovered.

Putting them aside as a matter of distinct consideration, the outrage offered to the moral justice of God by supposing him to make the innocent suffer for the guilty, and the loose morality and low contrivance of supposing him to change himself into the shape of a man in order to make an excuse to himself for not executing his supposed sentence upon Adam; putting, I say, those things aside as a matter of distinct consideration, it is certain that what is called the Christian system of faith, including in it the whimsical account of the creation, the strange story of Eve, the snake, and the apple, the amphibious idea of the man-god, the corporeal idea of the death of a god, the mythological idea of a family of gods, and the Christian system of arithmetic that three are one, and one is three, are all irreconcilable, not only

to the divine gift of reason that God hath given to man, but to the knowledge that man gains of the power and wisdom of God, by the aid of the sciences, and by studying the structure of the universe that God has made.

The setters-up, therefore, and the advocates of the Christian system of faith, could not but foresee that the continually progressive knowledge that man would gain by the aid of science, of the power and wisdom of God, manifested in the structure of the universe, and in all the works of creation, would militate against, and call into question, the truth of their system of faith; and therefore it became necessary to their purpose to cut learning down to a size less dangerous to their project, and this they effected by restricting the idea of learning to the dead study of dead languages.

They not only rejected the study of science out of the Christian schools, but they persecuted it; and it is only within about the last two centuries that the study has been revived. So late as 1610 Galileo, a Florentine, discovered and introduced the use of telescopes, and, by applying them to observe the motions and appearances of the heavenly bodies, afforded additional means for ascertaining the true structure of the universe. Instead of being esteemed for those discoveries, he was sentenced to renounce them, or the opinions resulting from them, as a damnable heresy. And prior to that time Vigilus was condemned to be burned for asserting the antipodes, or, in other words, that the earth was a globe, and habitable in every part where there was land; yet the truth of this is now too well known even to be told.

If the belief of errors not morally bad did no mischief, it would make no part of the moral duty of man to oppose and remove them. There was no moral ill in believing the earth was flat like a trencher, any more than there was moral virtue in believing it was round like a globe; neither was there any moral ill in believing that the Creator made no other world than this, any more than there was moral virtue in believing that he made millions, and that the infinity of space is filled with worlds. But when a system of religion is made to grow out of a

supposed system of creation that is not true, and to unite itself therewith in a manner almost inseparable therefrom, the case assumes an entirely different ground. It is then that errors not morally bad become fraught with the same mischiefs as if they were. It is then that the truth, though otherwise indifferent itself, becomes an essential by becoming the criterion that either confirms by corresponding evidence, or denies by contradictory evidence, the reality of the religion itself. In this view of the case it is the moral duty of man to obtain every possible evidence that the structure of the heavens, or any other part of creation, affords with respect to systems of religion. But this the supporters or partisans of the Christian system, as if dreading the result, incessantly opposed, and not only rejected the sciences, but persecuted the professors. Had Newton or Descartes lived three or four hundred years ago, and pursued their studies as they did, it is most probable they would not have lived to finish them; and had Franklin drawn lightning from the clouds at the same time, it would have been at the hazard of expiring for it in flames.

Latter times have laid all the blame upon the Goths and Vandals; but, however unwilling the partisans of the Christian system may be to believe or acknowledge it, it is nevertheless true that the age of ignorance commenced with the Christian system. There was more knowledge in the world before that period than for many centuries afterwards; and, as to religious knowledge, the Christian system, as already said, was only another species of mythology; and the mythology to which it succeeded was a corruption of an ancient system of Theism.¹

¹ It is impossible for us now to know at what time the heathen mythology began; but it is certain, from the internal evidence that it carries, that it did not begin in the same state or condition in which it ended. All the gods of that mythology, except Saturn, were of modern invention. The supposed reign of Saturn was prior to that which is called the heathen mythology, and was so far a species of Theism that it admitted the belief of only one God. Saturn is supposed to have abdicated the government in favour of his three sons and one daughter, Jupiter, Pluto, Neptune

It is owing to this long interregnum of science, *and to no other cause*, that we have now to look through a vast chasm of many hundred years to the respectable characters we call the ancients. Had the progression of knowledge gone on proportionately with the stock that before existed, that chasm would have been filled up with characters rising superior in knowledge to each other; and those ancients we now so much admire would have appeared respectably in the background of the scene. But the Christian system laid all waste; and if we take our stand about the beginning of the sixteenth century, we look back through that long chasm to the times of the ancients as over a vast sandy desert in which not a shrub appears to intercept the vision of the fertile hills beyond.

It is an inconsistency, scarcely possible to be credited, that anything should exist under the name of a *religion* that held it to be *irreligious* to study and contemplate the structure of the universe that God had made. But the fact is too well established to be denied. The event that served more than any other to break the first link in this long chain of despotic ignorance is that known by the name of the Reformation by Luther. From that time, though it does not appear to have made part of the

and Juno; after this thousands of other gods and demi-gods were imaginarily created, and the calendar of gods increased as fast as the calendar of saints and the calendar of courts have increased since.

All the corruptions that have taken place in theology and in religion have been produced by admitting of what man calls *revealed religion*. The mythologists pretended to more revealed religion than the Christians do. They had their oracles and their priests, who were supposed to receive and deliver the word of God verbally on almost all occasions.

Since, then, all corruptions drawn from Moloch to modern predestinarianism, and the human sacrifices of the heathens to the Christian sacrifice of the Creator, have been produced by admitting of what is called *revealed religion*, the most effectual means to prevent all such evils and impositions is not to admit of any other revelation than that which is manifested in the book of Creation, and to contemplate the Creation as the only true and real word of God that ever did or ever will exist; and that everything else called the word of God is fable and imposition.

intention of Luther, or of those who are called Reformers, the sciences began to revive, and liberality, their natural associate, began to appear. This was the only public good the Reformation did; for with respect to religious good it might as well not have taken place. The mythology still continued the same; and a multiplicity of national popes grew out of the downfall of the Pope of Christendom.

Having thus shown, from the eternal evidence of things, the cause that produced a change in the state of learning, and the motive for substituting the study of the dead languages instead of the sciences, I proceed, in addition to the several observations already made in the former part of this work, to compare or rather to confront the evidence that the structure of the work affords, with the Christian system of religion. But as I cannot begin this part better than by referring to the ideas that occurred to me at an earlier part of life, and which I doubt not have occurred in some degree to almost every other person at one time or other, I shall state what those ideas were, and add thereto such other matter as shall arise out of the subject, giving to the whole, by way of preface, a short introduction.

My father being of the Quaker profession, it was my good fortune to have an exceedingly good moral education, and a tolerable stock of useful learning. Though I went to the grammar school,¹ I did not learn Latin, not only because I had no inclination to learn languages, but because of the objection the Quakers have against the books in which the language is taught. But this did not prevent me from being acquainted with the subjects of all the Latin books used in the school.

The natural bent of my mind was to science. I had some turn, and, I believe, some talent, for poetry; but this I rather repressed than encouraged, as leading too much into the field of imagination. As soon as I was able, I purchased a pair of globes, and attended the philosophical lectures of Martin and Ferguson, and

¹ The same school, Thetford in Norfolk, that the present Counsellor Mingay went to, and under the same master.

became afterwards acquainted with Dr. Bevis, of the society called the Royal Society, then living in the Temple, and an excellent astronomer.

I had no disposition for what is called politics. It presented to my mind no other idea than is contained in the word Jockeyship. When, therefore, I turned my thoughts towards matters of government, I had to form a system for myself that accorded with the moral and philosophic principles in which I had been educated. I saw, or at least I thought I saw, a vast scene opening itself to the world in the affairs of America; and it appeared to me that unless the Americans changed the plan they were then pursuing, with respect to the Government of England, and declare themselves independent, they would not only involve themselves in a multiplicity of new difficulties, but shut out the prospect that was then offering itself to mankind through their means. It was from these motives that I published the work known by the name of *Common Sense*, which is the first work I ever did publish; and so far as I can judge of myself, I believe I never should have been known in the world as an author on any subject whatever, had it not been for the affairs of America. I wrote *Common Sense* the latter end of the year 1775, and published it the first of January, 1776. Independence was declared the fourth of July following.

Any person who has made observations on the state and progress of the human mind, by observing his own, cannot but have observed that there are two distinct classes of what are called thoughts: those that we produce in ourselves by reflection and the act of thinking, and those that bolt into the mind of their own accord. I have always made it a rule to treat those voluntary visitors with civility, taking care to examine, as well as I was able, if they were worth entertaining; and it is from them I have acquired almost all the knowledge that I have. As to the learning that any person gains from school education, it serves only, like a small capital, to put him in the way of beginning learning for himself afterwards. Every person of learning is finally his own

teacher; the reason of which is that principles, being of a distinct quality from circumstances, cannot be impressed upon the memory. Their place of mental residence is the understanding, and they are never so lasting as when they begin by conception. Thus much for the introductory part.

From the time I was capable of conceiving an idea, and acting upon it by reflection, I either doubted the truth of the Christian system or thought it to be a strange affair. I scarcely knew which it was; but I well remember, when about seven or eight years of age, hearing a sermon read by a relation of mine, who was a great devotee of the Church, upon the subject of what is called *Redemption by the death of the Son of God*. After the sermon was ended I went into the garden, and as I was going down the garden steps (for I perfectly recollect the spot) I revolted at the recollection of what I had heard, and thought to myself that it was making God Almighty act like a passionate man that killed his son when he could not revenge himself any other way; and as I was sure a man would be hanged that did such a thing, I could not see for what purpose they preached such sermons. This was not one of those kind of thoughts that had anything in it of childish levity; it was to me a serious reflection arising from the idea I had that God was too good to do such an action, and also too almighty to be under any necessity of doing it. I believe in the same manner to this moment; and I moreover believe that any system of religion that has anything in it that shocks the mind of a child cannot be a true system.

It seems as if parents of the Christian profession were ashamed to tell their children anything about the principles of their religion. They sometimes instruct them in morals, and talk to them of the goodness of what they call Providence; for the Christian mythology has five deities; there is God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, the God Providence, and the Goddess Nature. But the Christian story of God the Father putting his son to death, or employing people to do it (for that is the plain language of the story), cannot

be told by a parent to a child; and to tell him that it was done to make mankind happier and better is making the story still worse, as if mankind could be improved by the example of murder; and to tell him that all this is a mystery is only making an excuse for the incredibility of it.

How different is this from the pure and simple profession of Deism! The true Deist has but one Deity; and his religion consists in contemplating the power, wisdom, and benignity of the Deity in his works, and in endeavouring to imitate him in everything moral, scientific, and mechanical.

The religion that approaches the nearest of all others to true Deism, in the moral and benign part thereof, is that professed by the Quakers; but they have contracted themselves too much by leaving the works of God out of their system. Though I reverence their philanthropy, I cannot help smiling at the conceit, that if the taste of the Quaker could have been consulted at the creation, what a silent and drab-coloured creation it would have been! Not a flower would have blossomed its gaities, not a bird been permitted to sing.

Quitting these reflections, I proceed to other matters. After I had made myself master of the use of the globes and of the orrery,¹ and conceived an idea of the infinity of space and the eternal divisibility of matter, and obtained at least a general knowledge of what is called natural philosophy, I began to compare—or, as I have before said, 'to confront—the eternal evidence those things afford with the Christian system of faith.

Though it is not a direct article of the Christian system

¹ As this book may fall into the hands of persons who do not know what an orrery is, it is for their information I add this note, as the name gives no idea of the uses of the thing. The orrery has its name from the person who invented it. It is a machinery of clockwork, representing the universe in miniature, and in which the revolution of the earth round itself and round the sun, the revolution of the moon round the earth, the revolution of the planets round the sun, their relative distances from the sun as the centre of the whole system, their relative distances from each other, and their different magnitudes, are represented as they really exist in what we call the heavens.

that this world that we inhabit is the whole of the habitable creation, yet it is so worked up therewith—from what is called the Mosaic account of the creation, the story of Eve and the apple, and the counterpart of that story, the death of the Son of God—that to believe otherwise (that is, to believe that God created a plurality of worlds at least as numerous as what we call stars) renders the Christian system of faith at once little and ridiculous, and scatters it in the mind like feathers in the air. The two beliefs cannot be held together in the same mind; and he who thinks that he believes both has thought but little of either.

Though the belief of a plurality of worlds was familiar to the ancients, it is only within the last three centuries that the extent and the dimensions of this globe that we inhabit have been ascertained. Several vessels, following the tract of the ocean, have sailed entirely round the world, as a man may march in a circle and come round by the contrary side of the circle to the spot he set out from. The circular dimensions of our world in the widest part, as a man would measure the widest round of an apple or a ball, is only twenty-five thousand and twenty English miles, reckoning sixty-nine miles and a half to an equatorial degree, and may be sailed round in the space of about three years.¹

A world of this extent may, at first thought, appear to us to be great; but if we compare it with the immensity of space in which it is suspended, like a bubble or a balloon in the air, it is infinitely less in proportion than the smallest grain of sand is to the size of the world, or the finest particle of dew to the whole ocean—and is, therefore, but small; and, as will be hereafter shown, is only one of a system of worlds of which the universal creation is composed.

It is not difficult to gain some faint idea of the immensity of space in which this and all the other worlds

¹ Allowing a ship to sail, on an average, three miles an hour, she would sail entirely round the world in less than one year, if she could sail in a direct circle; but she is obliged to follow the course of the ocean.

are suspended if we follow a progression of ideas. When we think of the size or dimensions of a room our ideas limit themselves to the walls, and there they stop. But when our eye, or our imagination, darts into space—that is, when it looks upward into what we call the open air—we cannot conceive any walls or boundaries it can have; and if, for the sake of resting our ideas, we suppose a boundary, the question immediately renews itself, and asks what is beyond that boundary; and, in the same manner, what is beyond the next boundary; and so on, till the fatigued imagination returns, and says: *There is no end*. Certainly, then, the Creator was not pent for room when he made this world no larger than it is; and we have to seek the reason in something else.

If we take a survey of our own world—or, rather, of this of which the Creator has given us the use, as our portion in the immense system of creation—we find every part of it (the earth, the waters, and the air that surrounds it) filled, and, as it were, crowded with life, down from the largest animals that we know of to the smallest insects the naked eye can behold, and from thence to others still smaller, and totally invisible without the assistance of the microscope. Every tree, every plant, every leaf, serves not only as a habitation, but as a world, to some numerous race, till animal existence becomes so exceedingly refined that the effluvia of a blade of grass would be food for thousands.

Since, then, no part of our earth is left unoccupied, why is it to be supposed that the immensity of space is a naked void, lying in eternal waste? There is room for millions of worlds as large, or larger, than ours, and each of them millions of miles apart from each other.

Having now arrived at this point, if we carry our ideas only one thought further we shall see, perhaps, the true reason—at least, a very good reason—for our happiness; why the Creator, instead of making one immense world extending over an immense quantity of space, has preferred dividing that quantity of matter into several distinct and separate worlds, which we call planets, of

which our earth is one. But, before I explain my ideas upon this subject, it is necessary (not for the sake of those that already know, but for those who do not) to show what the system of the universe is.

That part of the universe that is called the solar system (meaning the system of worlds to which our earth belongs, and in which Sol, or, in English language, the Sun, is the centre) consists, besides the sun, of six distinct orbs, or planets, or worlds, besides the secondary bodies, called the satellites, or moons, of which our earth has one that attends her in her annual revolution round the sun, in like manner as the other satellites, or moons, attend the planets, or worlds, to which they severally belong, as may be seen by the assistance of the telescope.

The sun is the centre, round which those six worlds or planets revolve at different distances therefrom, and in circles concentric to each other. Each world keeps constantly in nearly the same tract round the sun, and continues at the same time turning round itself in nearly an upright position, as a top turns round itself when it is spinning on the ground, and leans a little sideways.

It is this leaning of the earth ($23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees) that occasions summer and winter, and the different length of days and nights. If the earth turned round itself in a position perpendicular to the plane or level of the circle it moves in around the sun, as a top turns round when it stands erect on the ground, the days and nights would be always of the same length—twelve hours day, and twelve hours night—and the season would be uniformly the same throughout the year.

Every time that a planet (our earth, for example) turns round itself, it makes what we call day and night; and every time it goes entirely round the sun it makes what we call a year; consequently our world turns three hundred and sixty-five times round itself, in going once round the sun.¹

¹ Those who supposed that the sun went round the earth every twenty-four hours made the same mistake in idea that a cook would do in fact that should make the fire go round the meat, instead of the meat turning round itself towards the fire.

The names that the ancients gave to those six worlds, and which are still called by the same names, are Mercury, Venus, this world that we call ours, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. They appear larger to the eye than the stars, being many million miles nearer to our earth than any of the stars are. The planet Venus is that which is called the evening star, and sometimes the morning star, as she happens to set after, or rise before, the sun, which, in either case, is never more than three hours.

The sun, as before said, being the centre, the planet or world nearest the sun is Mercury; his distance from the sun is thirty-four million miles, and he moves round in a circle always at that distance from the sun, as a top may be supposed to spin round in the tract in which a horse goes in a mill. The second world is Venus; she is fifty-seven million miles distant from the sun, and consequently moves round in a circle much greater than that of Mercury. The third world is this that we inhabit, and which is eighty-eight million miles distant from the sun, and consequently moves round in a circle greater than that of Venus. The fourth world is Mars; he is distant from the sun one hundred and thirty-four million miles, and consequently moves round in a circle greater than that of our earth. The fifth is Jupiter; he is distant from the sun five hundred and fifty-seven million miles, and consequently moves round in a circle greater than that of Mars. The sixth world is Saturn; he is distant from the sun seven hundred and sixty-three million miles, and consequently moves round in a circle that surrounds the circles or orbits of all the other worlds or planets.

The space, therefore, in the air or in the immensity of space, that our solar system takes up for the several worlds to perform their revolutions in round the sun, is of the extent in a straight line of the whole diameter of the orbit or circle in which Saturn moves round the sun, which, being double his distance from the sun, is fifteen hundred and twenty-six million miles: and its circular extent is nearly five thousand million; and its

globical contents is almost three thousand five hundred million times three thousand five hundred million square miles.¹

But this, immense as it is, is only one system of worlds. Beyond this, at a vast distance into space, far beyond all power of calculation, are the stars called the fixed stars. They are called fixed because they have no revolutionary motion as the six worlds or planets have that I have been describing. Those fixed stars continue always at the same distance from each other, and always in the same place, as the sun does in the centre of our system. The probability, therefore, is that each of those fixed stars is also a sun, round which another system of worlds or planets, though too remote for us to discover, performs its revolutions, as our system of worlds does round our central sun.

By this easy progression of ideas, the immensity of space will appear to us to be filled with systems of worlds; and that no part of space lies at waste, any more than any part of the globe of earth and water is left unoccupied.

Having thus endeavoured to convey, in a familiar and easy manner, some idea of the structure of the universe, I return to explain what I before alluded to—namely the great benefits arising to man in consequence of the

¹ If it should be asked, 'How can man know these things? I have one plain answer to give, which is, that man knows how to calculate an eclipse, and also how to calculate to a minute of time when the planet Venus, in making her revolutions round the sun, will come in a straight line between our earth and the sun, and will appear to us about the size of a large pea passing across the face of the sun. This happens about twice in a hundred years, at the distance of about eight years from each other, and has happened twice in our time, both of which were fore-known by calculation. It can also be known when they will happen again for a thousand years to come, or to any other portion of time. As, therefore, man could not be able to do these things if he did not understand a solar system and the manner in which the revolutions of the several planets or worlds are performed, the fact of calculating an eclipse or a transit of Venus is a proof in point that the knowledge exists; and as to a few thousand or even a few million miles more or less it makes scarcely any sensible difference in such immense distances.

Creator having made a *plurality* of worlds, such as our system is, consisting of a central sun and six worlds, besides satellites, in preference to that of creating one world only of a vast extent.

It is an idea I have never lost sight of, that all our knowledge of science is derived from the revolutions (exhibited to our eye, and from thence to our understanding) which those several planets, or worlds, of which our system is composed make in their circuit round the sun.

Had then the quantity of matter which these six worlds contain been blended into one solitary globe, the consequence to us would have been that either no revolutionary motion would have existed, or not a sufficiency of it to give us the idea, and the knowledge of science we now have; and it is from the sciences that all the mechanical arts that contribute so much to our earthly felicity and comfort are derived.

As therefore the Creator made nothing in vain, so also must it be believed that he organized the structure of the universe in the most advantageous manner for the benefit of man; and as we see, and from experience feel, the benefits we derived from the structure of the universe formed as it is, which benefits we should not have had the opportunity of enjoying if the structure so far as it relates to our system had been a solitary globe, we can discover at least one reason why a *plurality* of the worlds had been made—and that reason calls forth the devotional gratitude of man as well as his admiration.

But it is not to us, the inhabitants of this globe only, that the benefits arising from a plurality of worlds are limited. The inhabitants of each of the worlds of which our system is composed enjoy the same opportunities of knowledge as we do. They behold the revolutionary motions of our earth as we behold theirs. All the planets revolve in sight of each other; and therefore the same universal school of science presents itself to all.

Neither does the knowledge stop here. The system of worlds next to us exhibits in its revolutions the same principles and school of science to the inhabitants of

their system as our system does to us, and in like manner throughout the immensity of space.

Our ideas, not only of the Almightyness of the Creator, but of his wisdom and his beneficence, become enlarged in proportion as we contemplate the extent and the structure of the universe. The solitary idea of a solitary world rolling or at rest in the immense ocean of space gives place to the cheerful idea of a society of worlds, so happily contrived as to administer, even by their motion, instruction to man. We see our own earth filled with abundance; but we forget to consider how much of that abundance is owing to the scientific knowledge the vast machinery of the universe has unfolded.

But, in the midst of those reflections, what are we to think of the Christian system of faith that forms itself upon the idea of only one world, and that of no greater extent, as is before shown, than twenty-five thousand miles? An extent which a man walking at the rate of three miles an hour, for twelve hours in the day, could he keep on in a circular direction, would walk entirely round in less than two years. Alas! what is this to the mighty ocean of space and the almighty power of the Creator?

From whence then could arise the solitary and strange conceit that the Almighty, who had millions of worlds equally dependent on his protection, should quit the care of all the rest and come to die in our world, because they say one man and one woman had eaten an apple? And, on the other hand, are we to suppose that every world in the boundless creation had an Eve, an apple, a serpent, and a redeemer? In this case, the person who is irreverently called the Son of God, and sometimes God himself, would have nothing else to do than to travel from world to world, in an endless succession of deaths, with scarcely a momentary interval of life.

It has been by rejecting the evidence that the word, or works of God in the creation, affords to our senses, and the action of our reason upon that evidence, that so many wild and whimsical systems of faith, and of religion, have been fabricated and set up. There may be many

systems of religion that so far from being morally bad are in many respects morally good; but there can be but ONE that is true; and that one necessarily must, as it ever will, be in all things consistent with the ever-existing word of God that we behold in his works. But such is the strange construction of the Christian system of faith, that every evidence the heavens afford to man either directly contradicts it or renders it absurd.

It is possible to believe, and I always feel pleasure in encouraging myself to believe it, that there have been men in the world who persuade themselves that what is called a *pious fraud* might, at least under particular circumstances, be productive of some good. But the fraud, being once established, could not afterwards be explained; for it is with a pious fraud, as with a bad action, it begets a calamitous necessity of going on.

The persons who first preached the Christian system of faith, and in some measure combined it with the morality preached by Jesus Christ, might persuade themselves that it was better than the heathen mythology that then prevailed. From the first preachers, the fraud went on to the second, and to the third, till the idea of its being a pious fraud became lost in the belief of its being true; and that belief became again encouraged by the interest of those who made a livelihood by preaching it.

But though such a belief might by such means be rendered almost general among the laity, it is next to impossible to account for the continual persecution carried on by the Church for several hundred years against the sciences and against the professors of science, if the Church had not some record or some tradition that it was originally no other than a pious fraud, or did not foresee that it could not be maintained against the evidence that the structure of the universe afforded.

Having thus shown the irreconcilable inconsistencies between the real word of God existing in the universe and that which is called the *word of God*, as shown to us in a printed book that any man might make, I proceed to speak of the three principal means that have

been employed in all ages and perhaps in all countries to impose upon mankind.

Those three means are Mystery, Miracle, and Prophecy. The two first are incompatible with true religion, and the third ought always to be suspected. With respect to mystery, everything we behold is, in one sense, a mystery to us. Our own existence is a mystery, the whole vegetable world is a mystery. We cannot account how it is that an acorn, when put into the ground, is made to develop itself and become an oak. We know not how it is that the seed we sow unfolds and multiplies itself, and returns to us such an abundant interest for so small a capital.

The fact, however, as distinct from the operating cause, is not a mystery, because we see it; and we know also the means we are to use, which is no other than putting the seed in the ground. We know therefore as much as is necessary for us to know; and that part of the operation that we do not know, and which if we could not perform, the Creator takes upon himself and performs it for us. We are therefore better off than if we had been let into the secret, and left to do it for ourselves.

But though every created thing is in this sense a mystery, the word mystery cannot be applied to *moral truth*, any more than obscurity can be applied to light. The God in whom we believe is a God of moral truth, and not a God of mystery or obscurity. Mystery is the antagonist of truth. It is a fog of human invention that obscures truth, and represents it in distortion. Truth never envelops *itself* in mystery; and the mystery in which it is at any time enveloped is the work of its antagonist, and never of itself.

Religion, therefore, being the belief of a God, and the practice of moral truth, cannot have connection with mystery. The belief of a God, so far from having anything of mystery in it, is of all beliefs the most easy, because it arises to us, as is before observed, out of necessity. And the practice of moral truth, or in other words a practical imitation of the moral goodness of

God, is no other than our acting towards each other as he acts benignly towards all. We cannot *serve* God in the manner we serve those who cannot do without such service; and therefore the only idea we can have of serving God is that of contributing to the happiness of the living creation that God has made. This cannot be done by retiring ourselves from the society of the world, and spending a recluse life in selfish devotion.

The very nature and design of religion, if I may so express it, prove even to demonstration that it must be free from everything of mystery, and unencumbered with everything that is mysterious. Religion, considered as a duty, is incumbent upon every living soul alike, and therefore must be on a level with the understanding and comprehension of all. Man does not learn religion as he learns the secrets and mysteries of a trade. He learns the theory of religion by reflection. It arises out of the action of his own mind upon the things which he sees, or upon what he may happen to hear or to read, and the practice joins itself thereto.

When men, whether from policy or pious fraud, set up systems of religion incompatible with the word or works of God in the creation, and not only above but repugnant to human comprehension, they were under the necessity of inventing or adopting a word that should serve as a bar to all questions, inquiries, and speculations. The word *mystery* answered this purpose; and thus it has happened that religion, which in itself is without mystery, has been corrupted into a fog of mysteries.

As *mystery* answered all general purposes, *miracle* followed as an occasional auxiliary. The former served to bewilder the mind, the latter to puzzle the senses. The one was the lingo, the other the legerdemain.

But before going further into this subject, it will be proper to inquire what is to be understood by a miracle.

In the same sense that everything may be said to be a mystery, so also may it be said that everything is a miracle, and that no one thing is a greater miracle than another. The elephant, though larger, is not a greater

miracle than a mite; nor a mountain a greater miracle than an atom. To an Almighty power it is no more difficult to make the one than the other; and no more difficult to make a million of worlds than to make one. Everything, therefore, is a miracle in one sense; whilst, in the other sense, there is no such thing as a miracle. It is a miracle when compared with our power, and with our comprehension. It is not a miracle compared with the power that performs it. But as nothing in this description conveys the idea that is affixed to the word miracle, it is necessary to carry the inquiry further.

Mankind have conceived to themselves certain laws by which what they called nature is supposed to act; and that a miracle is something contrary to the operation and effect of those laws. But unless we know the whole extent of those laws, and of what are commonly called the powers of nature, we are not able to judge whether anything that may appear to us wonderful or miraculous be within, or be beyond, or be contrary to, her natural power of acting.

The ascension of a man several miles high into the air would have everything in it that constitutes the idea of a miracle, if it were not known that a species of air can be generated several times lighter than the common atmospheric air, and yet possesses elasticity enough to prevent the balloon, in which that light air is enclosed, from being compressed into as many times less bulk by the common air that surrounds it. In like manner, extracting flashes or sparks of fire from the human body as visible as from a steel struck with a flint, and causing iron or steel to move without any visible agent, would also give the idea of a miracle, if we were not acquainted with electricity and magnetism; so also would many other experiments in natural philosophy, to those who are not acquainted with the subject. The restoring persons to life who are to appearance dead, as is practised upon drowned persons, would also be a miracle if it were not known that animation is capable of being suspended without being extinct.

Besides these, there are performances by sleight of hand, and by persons acting in concert that have a miraculous appearance, which, when known, are thought nothing of. And besides these, there are mechanical and optical deceptions. There is now an exhibition in Paris of ghosts or spectres which, though it is not imposed upon spectators as a fact, has an astonishing appearance. As, therefore, we know not the extent to which either nature or art can go, there is no positive criterion to determine what a miracle is; and mankind, in giving credit to appearances under the idea of their being miracles, are subject to be continually imposed upon.

Since, then, appearances are so capable of deceiving, and things not real have a strong resemblance to things that are, nothing can be more inconsistent than to suppose that the Almighty would make use of means, such as are called miracles, that would subject the person who performed them to the suspicion of being an impostor; and the person who related them to be suspected of lying; and the doctrine intended to be supported thereby to be suspected as a fabulous invention.

Of all the modes of evidence that ever were invented to obtain belief to any system or opinion to which the name of religion has been given, that of *miracle*, however successful the imposition may have been, is the most inconsistent. For, in the first place, whenever recourse is had to show, for the purpose of procuring that belief (for a miracle, under any idea of the word, is a show), it implies a lameness or weakness in the doctrine that is preached. And, in the second place, it is degrading the Almighty into the character of a showman, playing tricks to amuse and make the people stare and wonder. It is also the most equivocal sort of evidence that can be set up; for the belief is not to depend upon the thing called a miracle, but upon the credit of the reporter, who says that he saw it; and therefore the thing, were it true, would have no better chance of being believed than if it were a lie.

Suppose I were to say that when I sat down to write

this book a hand presented itself in the air, took up the pen, and wrote every word that is herein written, would anybody believe me? Certainly they would not. Would they believe me a whit the more if the thing had been a fact? Certainly they would not. Since, then, a real miracle, were it to happen, would be subject to the same fate as the falsehood, the inconsistency becomes the greater of supposing the Almighty would make use of means that would not answer the purpose for which they were intended, even if they were real.

If we are to suppose a miracle to be something so entirely out of the course of what is called nature that she must go out of that course to accomplish it, and we see an account given of such miracle by the person who said he saw it, it raises a question in the mind very easily decided, which is : Is it more probable that nature should go out of her course, or that a man should tell a lie? We have never seen, in our time, nature go out of her course, but we have good reason to believe that millions of lies have been told in the same time; it is, therefore, at least millions to one that the reporter of a miracle tells a lie.

The story of the whale swallowing Jonah—though a whale is large enough to do it—borders greatly on the marvellous; but it would have approached nearer to the idea of a miracle if Jonah had swallowed the whale. In this, which may serve for all cases of miracles, the matter would decide itself as before stated—namely, Is it more probable that a man should have swallowed a whale or told a lie?

But supposing that Jonah had really swallowed the whale, and gone with it in his belly to Nineveh, and, to convince the people that it was true, have cast it up in their sight of the full length and size of a whale, would they not have believed him to have been the devil instead of a prophet? or, if the whale had carried Jonah to Nineveh, and cast him up in the same public manner, would they not have believed the whale to have been the devil, and Jonah one of his imps?

The most extraordinary of all things called miracles, related in the New Testament, is that of the devil flying away with Jesus Christ, and carrying him to the top of a high mountain; and to the top of the highest pinnacle of the temple, and showing him and promising to him *all the kingdoms of the world*. How happened it that he did not discover America; or is it only with *kingdoms* that his sooty highness has any interest?

I have too much respect for the moral character of Christ to believe that he told this whale of a miracle himself; neither is it easy to account for what purpose it could have been fabricated, unless it were to impose upon the connoisseurs of miracles as is sometimes practised upon the connoisseurs of Queen Anne's farthings, and collectors of relics and antiquities, or to render the belief of miracles ridiculous, by outdoing miracle, as Don Quixote outdid chivalry; or to embarrass the belief of miracles by making it doubtful by what power, whether of God or of the devil, anything called a miracle was performed. It requires, however, a great deal of faith in the devil to believe this miracle.

In every point of view in which those things called miracles can be placed and considered, the reality of them is improbable and their existence unnecessary. They would not, as before observed, answer any useful purpose, even if they were true; for it is more difficult to obtain belief to a miracle than to a principle evidently moral without any miracle. Moral principle speaks universally for itself. Miracle could be but a thing of the moment, and seen but by a few; after this it requires a transfer of faith from God to man, to believe a miracle upon man's report. Instead therefore of admitting the recitals of miracles as evidence of any system of religion being true, they ought to be considered as symptoms of its being fabulous. It is necessary to the full and upright character of truth that it rejects the crutch; and it is consistent with the character of fable to seek the aid that truth rejects. Thus much for mystery and miracle.

As mystery and miracle took charge of the past and

the present, prophecy took charge of the future, and rounded the tenses of faith. It was not sufficient to know what had been done but what would be done. The supposed prophet was the supposed historian of times to come, and if he happened, in shooting with a long bow of a thousand years, to strike within a thousand miles of a mark, the ingenuity of posterity could make it point-blank; and if he happened to be directly wrong, it was only to suppose, as in the case of Jonah and Nineveh, that God had repented himself, and changed his mind. What a fool do fabulous systems make a man?

It has been shown in a former part of this work that the original meaning of the words *prophet* and *prophe-sying* has been changed, and that a prophet, in the sense the word is now used, is a creature of modern invention; and it is owing to this change in the meaning of the words that the flights and metaphors of the Jewish poets, and phrases and expressions now rendered obscure by our not being acquainted with the local circumstances to which they applied at the time they were used, have been erected into prophecies, and made to bend to explanations at the will and whimsical conceits of sectaries, expounders, and commentators. Everything unintelligible was prophetic, and everything insignificant was typical. A blunder would have served for a prophecy, and a dish-clout for a type.

If by a prophet we are to suppose a man to whom the Almighty communicated some event that would take place in future, either there were such men or there were not. If there were, it is confident to believe that the event so communicated would be told in terms that could be understood; and not related in such a loose and obscure manner as to be out of the comprehension of those that heard it, and so equivocal as to fit almost any circumstance that might happen afterwards. It is conceiving very irreverently of the Almighty to suppose he would deal in this jesting manner with mankind; yet all the things called prophecies, in the book called the Bible, come under this description.

But it is with prophecy as it is with miracle. It could not answer the purpose even if it were real. Those to whom a prophecy should be told could not tell whether the man prophesied or lied, or whether it had been revealed to him, or whether he conceived it; and if the thing that he prophesied, or pretended to prophesy, should happen, or something like it, among the multitude of things that are daily happening, nobody could again know whether he foreknew it, or guessed at it, or whether it was accidental. A prophet, therefore, is a character useless and unnecessary; and the safe side of the case is to guard against being imposed upon by not giving credit to such relations.

Upon the whole, mystery, miracle, and prophecy are appendages that belong to fabulous and not to true religion. They are the means by which so many *Lo heres!* and *Lo theres!* have been spread about the world, and religion been made into a trade. The success of one impostor gave encouragement to another, and the quieting salvo of doing *some good* by keeping up a *pious fraud* protected them from remorse.

Having now extended the subject to a greater length than I first intended, I shall bring it to a close by abstracting a summary from the whole.

First, That the idea of, or belief in, a word of God existing in print, or in writing, or in speech, is inconsistent in itself for the reasons already assigned. These reasons, among many others, are the want of an universal language, the mutability of language, the errors to which translations are subject, the possibility of totally suppressing such a word, the probability of altering it, or of fabricating the whole, and imposing it upon the world.

Secondly, That the creation we behold is the real and ever-existing word of God, in which we cannot be deceived. It proclaims his power, it demonstrates his wisdom, it manifests his goodness and beneficence.

Thirdly, That the moral duty of man consists in imitating the moral goodness and beneficence of God manifested in the creation towards all his creatures.

That seeing, as we daily do, the goodness of God to all men, it is an example calling upon all men to practise the same towards each other; and consequently that everything of persecution and revenge between man and man, and everything of cruelty to animals, is a violation of moral duty.

I trouble not myself about the manner of future existence. I content myself with believing, even to positive conviction, that the power that gave me existence is able to continue it, in any form and manner he pleases, either with or without this body; and it appears more probable to me that I shall continue to exist hereafter than that I should have had existence, as I now have, before that existence began.

It is certain that, in one point, all nations of the earth and all religions agree. All believe in a God. The things in which they disagree are the redundancies annexed to that belief; and, therefore, if ever an universal religion should prevail, it will not be in believing anything new, but in getting rid of redundancies, and believing as man believed at first. Adam, if ever there was such a man, was created a Deist; but in the meantime let every man follow, as he has a right to do, the religion and the worship he prefers.

PART II

PREFACE

I HAVE mentioned in the former part of *The Age of Reason* that it had long been my intention to publish my thoughts upon Religion; but that I had originally reserved it to a later period in life, intending it to be the last work I should undertake. The circumstances, however, which existed in France in the latter end of the year 1793 determined me to delay it no longer. The just and humane principles of the revolution, which philosophy had first diffused, had been departed from. The idea, always dangerous to society as it is derogatory to the Almighty—that priests could forgive sins—though it seemed to exist no longer, had blunted the feelings of humanity, and callously prepared men for the commission of all manner of crimes. The intolerant spirit of Church persecutions had transferred itself into politics; the tribunals, styled Revolutionary, supplied the place of an Inquisition; and the Guillotine of the State outdid the fire and faggot of the Church. I saw many of my most intimate friends destroyed, others daily carried to prison, and I had reason to believe, and had also intimations given me, that the same danger was approaching myself.

Under these disadvantages I began the former part of *The Age of Reason*; I had besides neither Bible nor Testament to refer to, though I was writing against both, nor could I procure any, notwithstanding which I have produced a work that no Bible believer, though writing at his ease and with a library of Church books about him, can refute. Towards the latter end of December of that year a motion was made and carried to exclude foreigners from the Convention. There were but two in it—Anacharsis Clootz and myself—and I saw

I was particularly pointed at by Bourdon de l'Oise in his speech on that motion.

Conceiving after this that I had but a few days of liberty, I sat down and brought the work to a close as speedily as possible; and I had not finished it more than six hours in the state it has since appeared before a guard came there, about three in the morning, with an order signed by the two Committees of Public Safety and Surety General for putting me in arrestation as a foreigner, and conveyed me to the prison of the Luxembourg. I contrived in my way there to call on Joel Barlow, and I put the manuscript of the work in his hands as more safe than in my possession in prison, and, not knowing what might be the fate in France either of the writer or the work, I addressed it to the protection of the citizens of the United States.

It is with justice that I say that the guard who executed this order, and the interpreter of the Committee of General Surety who accompanied them to examine my papers, treated me not only with civility, but with respect. The keeper of the Luxembourg, Benoit, a man of a good heart, showed to me every friendship in his power, as did also all his family, while he continued in that station. He was removed from it, put into arrestation, and carried before the tribunal upon a malignant accusation, but acquitted.

After I had been in the Luxembourg about three weeks, the Americans then in Paris went in a body to the Convention to reclaim me as their countryman and friend, but were answered by the President, Vadier, who was also President of the Committee of Surety General, and had signed the order for my arrestation, that I was born in England. I heard no more after this from any person out of the walls of the prison till the fall of Robespierre, on the 9th of Thermidor, July 27, 1794.

About two months before this event I was seized with a fever that in its progress had every symptom of becoming mortal, and from the effects of which I am not recovered. It was then that I remembered with

renewed satisfaction and congratulated myself most sincerely on having written the former part of *The Age of Reason*. I had then but little expectation of surviving, and those about me had less. I know, therefore, by experience the conscientious trial of my own principle.

I was then with three chamber comrades—Joseph Vanuele, of Bruges, Charles Bastini, and Michael Robyns, of Louvain. The unceasing and anxious attention of these three friends to me by night and by day I remember with gratitude and mention with pleasure. It happened that a physician (Dr. Graham) and a surgeon (Mr. Bond), part of the suite of General O'Hara, were then in the Luxembourg. I ask not myself whether it be convenient to them, as men under the English Government, that I express to them my thanks, but I should reproach myself if I did not; and also to the physician of the Luxembourg, Dr. Markoski.

I have some reason to believe, because I cannot discover any other cause, that this illness preserved me in existence. Among the papers of Robespierre that were examined and reported upon to the Convention by a Committee of Deputies is a note in the handwriting of Robespierre in the following words:—

Demander que Thomas Paine soit decreté d'accusation, pour l'interêt de l'Amerique autant que de la France.

(Demand that Thomas Paine be decreed of accusation, for the interest of America as well as of France.)

From what cause it was that the intention was not put into execution, I know not, and cannot inform myself; and therefore I ascribe it to impossibility on account of that illness.

The Convention, to repair as much as lay in their power the injustice I had sustained, invited me publicly and unanimously to return into the Convention, and which I accepted to show I could bear an injury without permitting it to injure my principles or my disposition. It is not because right principles have been violated that they are to be abandoned.

I have seen, since I have been at liberty, several

publications written, some in America and some in England, as answers to the former part of *The Age of Reason*. If the authors of these can amuse themselves by so doing, I shall not interrupt them. They may write against the work and against me as much as they please; they do me more service than they intend, and I can have no objection that they write on. They will find, however, by this Second Part, without its being written as an answer to them, that they must return to their work, and spin their cobweb over again. The first is brushed away by accident.

They will now find that I have furnished myself with a Bible and Testament, and I can say also that I have found them to be much worse books than I had conceived. If I have erred in anything in the former part of *The Age of Reason*, it has been by speaking better of some parts of those books than they deserved.

I observe that all my opponents resort, more or less, to what they call Scripture evidence and Bible authority, to help them out. They are so little masters of the subject as to confound a dispute about authenticity with a dispute about doctrines; I will, however, put them right, that if they should be disposed to write any more they may know how to begin.

THOMAS PAINE.

October, 1795.

PART THE SECOND

It has often been said that anything may be proved from the Bible; but before anything can be admitted as proved by the Bible, the Bible itself must be proved to be true; for if the Bible be not true, or the truth of it be doubtful, it ceases to have authority, and cannot be admitted as proof of anything.

It has been the practice of all Christian commentators on the Bible, and of all Christian priests and preachers, to impose the Bible on the world as a mass of truth, and as the word of God; they have disputed and wrangled, and have anathematized each other about the supposable meaning of particular parts and passages therein; one has said and insisted that such a passage meant such a thing; another, that it meant directly the contrary; and a third, that it meant neither one nor the other, but something different from both; and this they have called *understanding* the Bible.

It has happened that all the answers which I have seen to the former part of *The Age of Reason* have been written by priests; and these pious men, like their predecessors, contend and wrangle, and pretend to *understand* the Bible; each understands it differently, but each understands it best; and they have agreed in nothing but in telling their readers that Thomas Paine understands it not.

Now, instead of wasting their time, and heating themselves in fractious disputations about doctrinal points drawn from the Bible, these men ought to know, and if they do not it is civility to inform them, that the first thing to be understood is, whether there is sufficient authority for believing the Bible to be the word of God, or whether there is not?

There are matters in that book, said to be done by

the express command of God, that are as shocking to humanity, and to every idea we have of moral justice, as anything done by Robespierre, by Carrier, by Joseph le Bon, in France; by the English Government in the East Indies; or by any other assassin in modern times. When we read in the books ascribed to Moses, Joshua, etc., that they (the Israelites) came by stealth upon whole nations of people, who, as the history itself shows, had given them no offence; *that they put all those nations to the sword; that they spared neither age nor infancy; that they utterly destroyed men, women, and children; that they left not a soul to breathe*; expressions that are repeated over and over in those books, and that too with exulting ferocity, are we sure these things are facts? Are we sure that the Creator of man commissioned these things to be done? Are we sure that the books that tell us so were written by his authority?

It is not the antiquity of a tale that is any evidence of its truth; on the contrary, it is a symptom of its being fabulous; for the more ancient any history pretends to be, the more it has the resemblance of a fable. The origin of every nation is buried in fabulous tradition, and that of the Jews is as much to be suspected as any other. To charge the commission of acts upon the Almighty, which in their own nature and by every rule of moral justice are crimes—as all assassination is, and more especially the assassination of infants—is matter of serious concern. The Bible tells us that those assassinations were done by the *express command of God*. To believe therefore the Bible to be true, we must *unbelieve* all our belief in the moral justice of God; for wherein could crying or smiling infants offend? And to read the Bible without horror, we must undo everything that is tender, sympathizing, and benevolent in the heart of man. Speaking for myself, if I had no other evidence that the Bible is fabulous than the sacrifice I must make to believe it to be true, that alone would be sufficient to determine my choice.

But, in addition to all the normal evidence against the Bible, I will in the progress of this work produce

such other evidence as even a priest cannot deny, and show from that evidence that the Bible is not entitled to credit as being the word of God.

But before I proceed to this examination, I will show wherein the Bible differs from all other ancient writings with respect to the nature of the evidence necessary to establish its authenticity: and this is the more proper to be done because the advocates of the Bible, in their answers to the former part of *The Age of Reason*, undertake to say, and they put some stress thereon, that the authenticity of the Bible is as well established as that of any other ancient book; as if our belief of the one could become any rule for our belief of the other.

I know, however, but of one ancient book that authoritatively challenges universal consent and belief, and that is *Euclid's Elements of Geometry*; ¹ and the reason is because it is a book of self-evident demonstration entirely independent of its author, and of everything relating to time, place, and circumstance. The matters contained in that book would have the same authority they now have had they been written by any other person, or had the work been anonymous, or had the author never been known; for the identical certainty of who was the author makes no part of our belief of the matters contained in the book. But it is quite otherwise with respect to the books ascribed to Moses, to Joshua, to Samuel, etc. Those are books of *testimony*, and they testify of things naturally incredible; and therefore the whole of our belief as to the authenticity of those books rests, in the first place, upon the *certainty* that they were written by Moses, Joshua, and Samuel; secondly, upon the credit we give to their testimony. We may believe the first, that is, may believe the certainty of the authorship, and yet not the testimony, in the same manner that we may believe that a certain person gave evidence upon a case, and yet not believe the evidence that he gave. But if it should

¹ Euclid, according to chronological history, lived three hundred years before Christ and about one hundred years before Archimedes. He was of the city of Alexandria.

be found that the books ascribed to Moses, Joshua, and Samuel were not written by Moses, Joshua, and Samuel every part of the authority and authenticity of those books is gone at once; for there can be no such thing as forged or invented testimony; neither can there be anonymous testimony, more especially as to things naturally incredible: such as that of talking with God face to face, or that of the sun and moon standing still at the command of a man.

The greatest part of the other ancient books are works of genius, of which kind are those ascribed to Homer, to Plato, to Aristotle, to Demosthenes, to Cicero, etc.; here again the author is not an essential in the credit we give to any of those works, for as works of genius they would have the same merit they have now were they anonymous. Nobody believes the Trojan story as related by Homer to be true; for it is the poet only that is admired, and the merit of the poet will remain though the story be fabulous. But if we disbelieve the matters related by the Bible authors (Moses, for instance) as we disbelieve the things related by Homer there remains nothing of Moses in our estimation but an impostor. As to the ancient historians, from Herodotus to Tacitus, we credit them as far as they relate things probable and credible, and no further; for if we do we must believe the two miracles which Tacitus relates were performed by Vespasian—that of curing a lame man and a blind man in just the same manner as the same things are told of Jesus Christ by his historians. We must also believe the miracle cited by Josephus, that of the sea of Pamphilia opening to let Alexander and his army pass, as is related of the Red Sea in Exodus. These miracles are quite as well authenticated as the Bible miracles, and yet we do not believe them; consequently the degree of evidence necessary to establish our belief of things naturally incredible—whether in the Bible or elsewhere—is far greater than that which obtains our belief to natural and probable things; and therefore the advocates for the Bible have no claim to our belief of the Bible because we believe things stated in

other ancient writings, since we believe the things stated in those writings no further than they are probable and credible, or because they are self-evident, like Euclid; or we admire them because they are self-evident like Homer, or approve them because they are sedate like Plato, or judicious like Aristotle.

Having premised those things, I proceed to examine the authenticity of the Bible; and I begin with what are called the five books of Moses: *Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy*. My intention is to show that those books are spurious, and that Moses is not the author of them; and still further that they were not written in the time of Moses, nor till several hundred years afterwards; that they are no other than an attempted history of the life of Moses, and of the times in which he is said to have lived, and also of the times prior thereto, written by some very ignorant and stupid pretenders to authorship several hundred years ago, after the death of Moses; as men now write histories of things that happened or are supposed to have happened, several hundred or several thousand years ago.

The evidence that I shall produce in this case is from the books themselves; and I will confine myself to this evidence only. Were I to refer for proofs to any of the ancient authors, whom the advocates of the Bible call profane authors, they would controvert that authority, as I controvert theirs; I will therefore meet them on their own ground, and oppose them with their own weapon, the Bible.

In the first place, there is no affirmative evidence that Moses is the author of those books; and that he is the author is altogether an unfounded opinion got abroad, nobody knows how. The style and manner in which those books are written give no room to believe, or even to suppose, they were written by Moses, for it is altogether the style and manner of another person speaking of Moses. In *Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers* (for everything in *Genesis* is prior to the times of Moses, and not the least allusion is made to him therein), the whole, I say, of these books is in the third person. It

is always, *the Lord said unto Moses*, or *Moses said unto the Lord*, or *Moses said unto the People*, or *the People said unto Moses*; and this is the style and manner that historians use in speaking of the persons whose lives and actions they are writing. It may be said that a man may speak of himself in the third person, and therefore it may be supposed that Moses did; but supposition proves nothing, and if the advocates for the belief that Moses wrote those books himself have nothing better to advance than supposition they may as well be silent.

But granting the grammatical right that Moses might speak of himself in the third person because any man might speak of himself in that manner, it cannot be admitted as a fact in those books that it is Moses who speaks, without rendering Moses truly ridiculous and absurd—for example, Numbers, c. xii., v. 3. “Now the man Moses was very meek above all the men which were on the face of the earth.” If Moses said this of himself, instead of being the meekest of men, he was one of the most vain and arrogant of coxcombs; and the advocates for those books may now take which side they please, for both sides are against them. If Moses was not the author, the books are without authority; and if he was the author, the author is without credit, because to boast of *meekness* is the reverse of meekness, and is a *lie in sentiment*.

In Deuteronomy, the style and manner of writing marks more evidently than in the former books that Moses is not the writer. The manner here used is dramatical; the writer opens the subject by a short introductory discourse, and then introduces Moses as in the act of speaking, and when he has made Moses finish his harangue, he (the writer) resumes his own part, and speaks till he brings Moses forward again, and at last closes the scene with an account of the death, funeral, and character of Moses.

This interchange of speakers occurs four times in this book: from the first verse of the first chapter to the end of the fifth verse it is the writer who speaks; he then introduces Moses as in the act of making his

harangue, and this continues to the end of the fortieth verse of the fourth chapter; here the writer drops Moses, and speaks historically of what was done in consequence of what Moses, when living, is supposed to have said, and which the writer has dramatically rehearsed.

The writer opens the subject again in the first verse of the fifth chapter, though it is only by saying that Moses called the people of Israel together. He then introduces as before and continues him, as in the act of speaking, to the end of the 26th chapter. He does the same thing at the beginning of the 27th chapter, and continues Moses as in the act of speaking to the end of the 28th chapter. At the 29th chapter the writer speaks again through the whole of the first verse and the first line of the second verse, where he introduces Moses for the last time, and continues him as in the act of speaking to the end of the 33rd chapter.

The writer, having now finished the rehearsal on the part of Moses, comes forward and speaks through the whole of the last chapter; he begins by telling the reader that Moses went up to the top of Pisgah; that he saw from thence the land which (the writer says) had been promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; that *he*, Moses, died there in the land of Moab, but that no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day—that is, unto the time in which the writer lived who wrote the book of Deuteronomy. The writer then tells us that Moses was an hundred and ten years of age when he died; that his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated; and he concludes by saying that there arose not a prophet *since* in Israel like unto Moses, whom, says this anonymous writer, the Lord knew face to face.

Having thus shown, as far as grammatical evidence applies, that Moses was not the writer of those books, I will, after making a few observations on the inconsistencies of the writer of the book of Deuteronomy, proceed to show, from the historical and chronological evidence contained in those books, that Moses *was not*, because *he could not be* the writer of them; and con-

sequently that there is no authority for believing that the inhuman and horrid butcheries of men, women, and children told of in those books were done, as those books say they were, at the command of God. It is a duty incumbent on every true Deist that he vindicates the moral justice of God against the calumnies of the Bible.

The writer of the book of Deuteronomy—whoever he was—for it is an anonymous work—is obscure, and also in contradiction with himself in the account he has given of Moses.

After telling that Moses went to the top of Pisgah (and it does not appear from any account that he ever came down again), he tells us that Moses died *there* in the land of Moab, and that *he* buried him in a valley in the land of Moab; but as there is no antecedent to the pronoun *he*, there is no knowing who *he* was that did bury him. If the writer meant that *he* (God) buried him, how should *he* (the writer) know it? Or why should we (the readers) believe him, since we know not who the writer was that tells us so, for certainly Moses could not himself tell where he was buried?

The writer also tells us that no man knoweth where the sepulchre of Moses is *unto this day*, meaning the time in which this writer lived; how then should he know that Moses was buried in a valley in the land of Moab? for as the writer lived long after the time of Moses, as is evident from his using the expression *unto this day*, meaning a great length of time after the death of Moses, he certainly was not at his funeral; and, on the other hand, it is impossible that Moses himself could say that *no man knoweth where the sepulchre is unto this day*. To make Moses the speaker would be an improvement on the play of a child that hides himself and cries, *Nobody can find me*; nobody can find Moses.

This writer has nowhere told us how he came by the speeches which he has put into the mouth of Moses to speak, and therefore we have a right to conclude that he either composed them himself, or wrote them from oral tradition. One or other of these is the more prob-

able, since he has given in the fifth chapter a table of commandments, in which that called the fourth commandment is different from the fourth commandment in the twentieth chapter of Exodus. In that of Exodus, the reason given for keeping the seventh day is because (says the commandment) God made the heavens and the earth in six days, and rested on the seventh; but in that of Deuteronomy the reason given is that it was the day on which the children of Israel came out of Egypt, and *therefore*, says this commandment, *the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day*. This makes no mention of the creation, nor *that* of the coming out of Egypt. There are also many things given as laws of Moses in this book that are not to be found in any of the other books, among which is that inhuman and brutal law (chap. xxi., verses 18-21) which authorizes parents, the father and the mother, to bring their own children to have them stoned to death for what it is pleased to call stubbornness. But priests have always been fond of preaching up Deuteronomy, for Deuteronomy preaches up tithes; and it is from this book, c. xxv., v. 4, they have taken the phrase and applied it to tithing, that *thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn*: and that this might not escape observation, they have noted it in the table of contents, at the head of the chapter, though it is only a single verse of less than two lines. O priests! O priests! ye are willing to be compared with an ox, for the sake of tithes. Though it is impossible for us to know *identically* who the writer of Deuteronomy was, it is not difficult to discover him *professionally*, that he was some Jewish priest who lived, as I shall show in the course of this work, at least three hundred and fifty years after the time of Moses.

I come now to speak of the historical and chronological evidence. The chronology that I shall use is the Bible chronology; for I mean not to go out of the Bible for evidence of anything, but to make the Bible itself prove historically and chronologically that Moses is not the author of the books ascribed to him. It is therefore

proper that I inform the reader (such an one, at least, as may not have the opportunity of knowing it) that in the larger Bibles, and also in some smaller ones, there is a series of chronology printed in the margin of every page for the purpose of showing how long the historical matters stated in each page happened, or are supposed to have happened, before Christ, and consequently the distance of time between one historical circumstance and another.

I begin with the Book of Genesis. In the 14th chapter of Genesis the writer gives an account of Lot being taken prisoner in a battle between the four kings against five, and carried off; and that when the account of Lot being taken came to Abraham, he armed all his household, and marched to rescue Lot from the captors; and that he pursued them unto Dan (v. 14).

To show in what manner this expression of *pursuing them unto Dan* applies to the case in question, I will refer to two circumstances—the one in America, the other in France. The city now called New York, in America, was originally New Amsterdam; and the town in France, lately called Havre-Marat, was before called Havre-de-Grace. New Amsterdam was changed to New York in the year 1664, Havre-de-Grace to Havre-Marat in the year 1793. Should, therefore, any writing be found, though without date, in which the name of New York should be mentioned, it would be certain evidence that such a writing could not have been written before, and must have been written after, New Amsterdam was changed to New York, and consequently not till after the year 1664, or at least during the course of that year. And in like manner, any dateless writing, with the name of Havre-Marat, would be certain evidence that such a writing must have been written after Havre-de-Grace became Havre-Marat, and consequently not till after the year 1793, or at least during the course of that year.

I now come to the application of those cases, and to show that there was no such place as *Dan* till many years after the death of Moses; and consequently that Moses

could not be the writer of the book of Genesis, where this account of pursuing them unto *Dan* is given.

The place that is called Dan in the Bible was originally a town of the Gentiles, called Laish; and when the tribe of Dan seized upon this town, they changed its name to Dan, in commemoration of Dan, who was the father of that tribe, and the great grandson of Abraham.

To establish this in proof, it is necessary to refer from Genesis to the 18th chapter of the book called the book of Judges. It is there said (v. 27) that they [the Danites] came unto Laish unto a people that were at quiet and secure, and they smote them with the edge of the sword [the Bible is filled with murder] and burnt the city with fire; and they built a city (v. 28) and dwelt therein, and they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, howbeit the name of the city was Laish at the first.

This account of the Danites taking possession of Laish, and changing it to Dan, is placed in the book of Judges immediately after the death of Samson. The death of Samson is said to have happened 1120 years before Christ, and that of Moses 1451 before Christ; and therefore, according to the historical arrangement, the place was not called Dan till 331 years after the death of Moses.

There is a striking confusion between the historical and the chronological arrangement in the book of Judges. The five last chapters, as they stand in the book, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, are put chronologically before all the preceding chapters; they are made to be 28 years before the 16th chapter, 266 before the 15th, 245 before the 13th, 195 before the 9th, 90 before the 4th, and 15 years before the 1st chapter. This shows the uncertain and fabulous state of the Bible. According to the chronological arrangement, the taking of Laish, and giving it the name of Dan, is made to be twenty years after the death of Joshua, who was the successor of Moses; and by the historical order, as it stands in the book, it is made to be 306 years after the death of Joshua, and 331 after that of Moses; but they both exclude Moses from

being the writer of Genesis, because, according to either of the statements, no such a place as Dan existed in the time of Moses; and therefore the writer of Genesis must have been some person who lived after the town of Laish had the name of Dan; and who that person was nobody knows, and consequently the book of Genesis is anonymous and without authority.

I proceed now to state another point of historical and chronological evidence, and to show therefrom, as in the preceding case, that Moses is not the author of the book of Genesis.

In the 36th chapter of Genesis there is given a genealogy of the sons and descendants of Esau, who are called Edomites, and also a list, by name, of the kings of Edom; in the enumerating of which, it is said (v. 31): "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel."

Now, were any dateless writing to be found in which, speaking of any past events, the writer should say these things happened before there was any congress in America, or before there was any convention in France, it would be evidence that such writing could not have been written before, and could only be written after there was a congress in America or a convention in France, as the case might be; and consequently that it could not be written by any person who died before there was a congress in the one country or a convention in the other.

Nothing is more frequent, as well in history as in conversation, than to refer to a fact in the room of a date; it is most natural so to do, first, because a fact fixes itself in the memory better than a date; secondly, because the fact includes the date and serves to excite two ideas at once; and this manner of speaking by circumstances implies as positively that the fact alluded to is past, as if it was so expressed. When a person in speaking upon any matter says it was before I was married, or before my son was born, or before I went to America, or before I went to France, it is absolutely

understood, and intended to be understood, that he has been married, that he has had a son, that he has been in America or been in France. Language does not admit of using this mode of expression in any other sense; and whenever such an expression is found anywhere it can only be understood in the sense in which only it could have been used.

The passage, therefore, that I have quoted—"that these are the kings that reigned in Edom, before there reigned *any* king over the children of Israel"—could only have been written after the first king began to reign over them; and consequently that the book of Genesis, so far from having been written by Moses, could not have been written till the time of Saul at least. This is a positive sense of the passage, but the expression *any* king implies more kings than one—at least it implies two; and this will carry it to the time of David; and if taken in a general sense it carries itself through all times of the Jewish monarchy.

Had we met with this verse in any part of the Bible that *professed* to have been written after kings began to reign in Israel, it would have been impossible not to have seen the application of it. It happens then that this is the case: the two books of Chronicles, which give a history of all the kings of Israel, are *professedly*, as well as in fact, written after the Jewish monarchy began; and this verse that I have quoted, and all the remaining verses of the 36th chapter of Genesis, are, word for word, in the 1st chapter of Chronicles, beginning at the 43rd verse.

It was with consistency that the writer of the Chronicles could say, as he has said, 1st Chron., c. i., v. 43, *These are the kings that reigned in Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel*, because he was going to give, and has given, a list of the kings that had reigned in Israel; but as it is impossible that the same expression could have been used before that period, it is as certain as anything can be proved from historical language that this part of Genesis is taken from Chronicles, and that Genesis is not so old as

Chronicles, and probably not so old as the book of Homer, or as Æsop's Fables—admitting Homer to have been, as the tables of chronology state, contemporary with David or Solomon, and Æsop to have lived about the end of the Jewish monarchy.

Take away from Genesis the belief that Moses was the author, on which only the strange belief that it is the word of God has stood, and there remains nothing of Genesis but an anonymous book of stories, fables, and traditionary or invented absurdities, or of downright lies. The story of Eve and the serpent, and of Noah and his ark, drops to a level with the Arabian Tales, without the merit of being entertaining, and the account of men living to eight and nine hundred years becomes as fabulous as the immortality of the giants of the mythology.

Besides the character of Moses, as stated in the Bible, is the most horrid that can be imagined. If those accounts be true, he was the wretch that first began and carried on wars on the score or on the pretence of religion, and under that mask, or that infatuation, committed the most unexampled atrocities that are to be found in the history of any nation, of which I will state only one instance.

When the Jewish army returned from one of their plundering and murdering excursions, the account goes on as follows, Numbers, c. xxxi., v. 13 :—

“ And Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and all the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them without the camp; and Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, with the captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, which came from the battle; and Moses said unto them, *Have ye saved all the women alive?* behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the Council of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord. Now, therefore, *kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known a man by lying with him; but all the women-children that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.*”

Among the detestable villains that in any period of the world have disgraced the name of man, it is im-

possible to find a greater than Moses, if this account be true. Here is an order to butcher the boys, to massacre the mothers, and debauch the daughters.

Let any mother put herself in the situation of those mothers : one child murdered, another destined to violation, and herself in the hands of an executioner ; let any daughter put herself in the situation of those daughters, destined as prey to the murderers of a mother and a brother ; and what will be their feelings ? It is in vain that we attempt to impose upon nature, for nature will have her course, and the religion that tortures all her social ties is a false religion.

After this detestable order follows an account of the plunder taken, and the manner of dividing it ; and here it is that the profaneness of priestly hypocrisy increases the catalogue of crimes. Verse 37 :—

“ *And the Lord's tribute of the sheep was six hundred and three score and fifteen ; and the beeves were thirty and six thousand, of which the Lord's tribute was three score and twelve ; and the asses were thirty thousand and five hundred, of which the Lord's tribute was three score and one ; and the persons were sixteen thousand, of which the Lord's tribute was thirty and two.*”

In short, the matters contained in this chapter, as well as in many other parts of the Bible, are too horrid for humanity to read or for decency to hear, for it appears from the 35th verse of this chapter that the number of women-children consigned to debauchery by the order of Moses was thirty-two thousand.

People in general know not what wickedness there is in this pretended work of God. Brought up in habits of superstition, they take it for granted that the Bible is true, and that it is good ; they permit themselves not to doubt of it ; and they carry the ideas they form of the benevolence of the Almighty to the book which they have been taught to believe was written by his authority. Good heavens ! it is quite another thing ; it is book of lies, wickedness, and blasphemy ; for what can be greater blasphemy than to ascribe the wickedness of man to the orders of the Almighty ?

But to return to my subject, that of showing that Moses is not the author of the books ascribed to him, and that the Bible is spurious. The two instances I have already given would be sufficient, without any additional evidence, to invalidate the authenticity of any book that pretended to be four or five hundred years more ancient than the matters it speaks of or refers to as facts; for in the case of *pursuing them unto Dan*, and of the *kings that reigned over the children of Israel*, not even the flimsy pretence of prophecy can be pleaded. The expressions are in the preter tense, and it would be downright idiotism to say that a man could prophesy in the preter tense.

But there are many other passages scattered throughout those books that unite in the same point of evidence. It is said in Exodus (another of the books ascribed to Moses), c. xvi., v. 35: "And the children of Israel did eat manna *until they came to a land inhabited*; they did eat manna *until they came into the borders of the land of Canaan*."

Whether the children of Israel ate manna or not, or what manna was, or whether it was anything more than a kind of fungus, or small mushroom, or other vegetable substance common to that part of the country, makes nothing to my argument; all that I mean to show is that it is not Moses that could write this account, because the account extends itself beyond the life and time of Moses. Moses, according to the Bible (but it is such a book of lies and contradictions, there is no knowing which part to believe, or whether any), died in the wilderness, and never came upon the borders of the land of Canaan, and consequently it could not be he that said what the children of Israel did, or what they ate when they came there. This account of eating manna, which they tell us was written by Moses, extends itself to the time of Joshua, the successor of Moses, as appears by the account given in the book of Joshua, after the children of Israel had passed the river Jordan, and came unto the borders of the land of Canaan. Joshua, c. v., v. 12: "And the manna ceased on the

morrow, after they had eaten of the old corn of the land; neither had the children of Israel manna any more, but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year."

But a more remarkable instance than this occurs in Deuteronomy, which, while it shows that Moses could not be the writer of that book, shows also the fabulous notions that prevailed at that time about giants. In the third chapter of Deuteronomy, among the conquests said to be made by Moses, is an account of the taking of Og, king of Bashan, v. 18:—

"For only Og, King of Bashan, remained of the remnant of giants, behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron, is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man."

A cubit is 1 foot $9\frac{88}{100}$ inches; the length, therefore, of the bed was 16 feet 4 inches, and the breadth 7 feet 4 inches; thus much for this giant's bed. Now for the historical part, which, though the evidence is not so direct and positive as in the former cases, is nevertheless very presumably and corroborating evidence, and is better than the *best* evidence on the contrary side.

The writer, by way of proving the existence of this giant, refers to his bed as to an *ancient relic*, and says is it not in Rabbath (or Rabbah) of the children of Ammon? Meaning that it is; for such is frequently the Bible method of affirming a thing. But it could not be Moses that said this, because Moses could know nothing about Rabbah, nor of what was in it. Rabbah was not a city belonging to this giant king, nor was it one of the cities that Moses took. The knowledge, therefore, that this bed was at Rabbah, and of the particulars of its dimensions, must be referred to the time when Rabbah was taken, and this was not till four hundred years after the death of Moses, for which see 2 Sam., c. xii., v. 26: "And Joab (David's general) fought against *Rabbah of the children of Ammon*, and took the royal city."

As I am not undertaking to point out all the con-

traditions in time, place, and circumstance that abound in the books ascribed to Moses, and which prove to a demonstration that those books could not be written by Moses, nor in the time of Moses, I proceed to the book of Joshua, and to show that Joshua is not the author of that book, and that it is anonymous and without authority. The evidence I shall produce is contained in the book itself; I will not go out of the Bible for proof against the supposed authenticity of the Bible. False testimony is always good against itself.

Joshua, according to the first chapter of Joshua, was the immediate successor of Moses; he was, moreover, a military man, which Moses was not; and he continued as chief of the people of Israel twenty-five years; that is, from the time that Moses died, which, according to the Bible chronology, was 1,451 years before Christ, until 1,426 years before Christ, when, according to the same chronology, Joshua died. If, therefore, we find in this book, said to have been written by Joshua, references to *facts done* after the death of Joshua, it is evidence that Joshua could not be the author, and also that the book could not have been written till after the time of the latest fact which it records. As to the character of the book, it is horrid; it is a military history of rapine and murder as savage and brutal as those recorded of his predecessor in villainy and hypocrisy, Moses; and the blasphemy consists, as in the former books, in ascribing those deeds to the orders of the Almighty.

In the first place, the book of Joshua, as is the case in the preceding books, is written in the third person; it is the historian of Joshua that speaks, for it would have been absurd and vain-glorious that Joshua should say of himself, as is said of him in the last verse of the sixth chapter, that "*his fame was noised throughout all the country.*" I come now more immediately to the proof.

In the 24th chapter, v. 31, it is said: "And Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and *all the days of the elders that over-lived Joshua.*"

Now, in the name of common sense, can it be Joshua that relates what people had done after he was dead? This account must not only have been written by some historian that lived after Joshua, but that lived also after the elders that had outlived Joshua.

There are several passages of a general meaning with respect to time, scattered throughout the book of Joshua, that carry the time in which the book was written to a distance from the time of Joshua, but without marking by exclusion any particular time, as in the passage above quoted. In that passage the time that intervened between the death of Joshua and the death of the elders is excluded descriptively and absolutely, and the evidence substantiates that the book could not have been written till after the death of the last.

But though the passages to which I allude, and which I am going to quote, do not designate any particular time by exclusion, they imply a time far more distant from the days of Joshua than is contained between the death of Joshua and the death of the elders. Such is the passage, c. x., v. 14, where, after giving an account that the sun stood still upon Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon, at the command of Joshua (a tale fit only to amuse children), the passage says: "And there was no day like that, before it, nor *after it*, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man."

This tale of the sun standing still upon Mount Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon, is one of those fables that detects itself. Such a circumstance could not have happened without being known all over the world. One-half would have wondered why the sun did not rise, and the other why it did not set, and the tradition of it would be universal; whereas there is not a nation in the world that knows anything about it. But why must the moon stand still? What occasion could there be for moonlight in the daytime, and that too whilst the sun shined? As a poetical figure, the whole is well enough: it is akin to that in the song of Deborah and Baruk, *The stars in their courses fought against Sisera*; but it is inferior to the figurative

declaration of Mahomet to the person who came to expostulate with him on his goings on : *Wert thou*, said he, *to come to me with the sun in thy right hand, and the moon in thy left, it should not alter my career.* For Joshua to have exceeded Mahomet, he should have put the sun and moon one in each pocket, and carried them as Guy Faux carried his dark lantern, and taken them out to shine as he might happen to want them. The sublime and the ridiculous are often so nearly related that it is difficult to class them separately. One step above the sublime makes the ridiculous, and one step above the ridiculous makes the sublime again; the account, however, abstracted from the poetical fancy, shows the ignorance of Joshua, for he should have commanded the earth to have stood still.

The time implied by the expression *after it*—that is, after that day—being put in comparison with all the time that passed *before it*, must, in order to give any expressive signification to the passage, mean a *great length of time*; for example, it would have been ridiculous to have said so the next day, or the next week, or the next month, or the next year. To give, therefore, meaning to the passage, comparative with the wonder it relates, and the prior time it alludes to, it must mean centuries of years; less, however, than one would be trifling, and less than two would be barely admissible.

A distant but general time is also expressed in the 8th chapter, where, after giving an account of the taking of the city of Ai, it is said, v. 28 : “ And Joshua burned Ai, and made it an heap for ever, even a desolation *unto this day.*” And again, v. 29, where speaking of the king of Ai, whom Joshua had hanged and buried at the entering of the gate, it is said : “ And he raised thereon a great heap of stones, that remained *unto this day.*” That is, unto the day or time in which the writer of the book of Joshua lived. And again, in the 10th chapter [v. 27], where, after speaking of the five kings whom Joshua had hanged on five trees and then thrown in a cave, it is said : “ And he laid great stones on the cave’s mouth, which remain *until this very day.*”

In enumerating the several exploits of Joshua, and of the tribes, and of the places which they conquered or attempted, it is said, c. xv., v. 63 :—

“ As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah, could not drive them out; but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah *at Jerusalem unto this day.*”

The question upon this passage is, At what time did the Jebusites and the children of Judah dwell together at Jerusalem? As this matter occurs again in the first chapter of Judges, I shall reserve my observations till I come to that part.

Having thus shown from the book of Joshua itself, without any auxiliary evidence whatever, that Joshua is not the author of that book, and that it is anonymous and consequently without authority, I proceed, as before mentioned, to the book of Judges.

The book of Judges is anonymous on the face of it; and, therefore, even the pretence is wanting to call it the word of God. It has not so much as a nominal voucher; it is altogether fatherless.

This book begins with the same expression as the book of Joshua. That of Joshua begins, c. i., v. 1: *Now after the death of Moses*, etc., and this of Judges begins, *Now after the death of Joshua*, etc. This, and the similarity of style between the two books, indicate that they are the work of the same author, but who he was is altogether unknown; the only point that the book proves is that the author lived long after the time of Joshua; for, though it begins as if it followed immediately after his death, the second chapter is an epitome or abstract of the whole book, which, according to the Bible chronology, extends its history through a space of 306 years; that is, from the death of Joshua, 1,426 years before Christ, to the death of Samson, 1,120 years before Christ, and only 25 years before Saul went *to seek his father's asses, and was made king*. But there is good reason to believe that it was not written till the time of David at least, and that the book of Joshua was not written before the same time.

In the first chapter of Judges the writer, after announcing the death of Joshua, proceeds to tell what happened between the children of Judah and the native inhabitants of the land of Canaan. In this statement the writer, having abruptly mentioned Jerusalem in the 7th verse, says, immediately after, in the 8th verse, by way of explanation, "Now the children of Judah *had* fought against Jerusalem, and *taken* it"; consequently, this book could not have been written before Jerusalem had been taken. The reader will recollect the quotation I have just before made from the 15th chapter of Joshua, v. 63, where it is said that *the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem at this day*; meaning the time when the book of Joshua was written.

The evidence I have already produced to prove that the books I have hitherto treated of were not written by the persons to whom they are ascribed, nor till many years after their death, if such persons ever lived, is already so abundant that I can afford to admit this passage with less weight than I am entitled to draw from it. For the case is that, so far as the Bible can be credited as a history, the city of Jerusalem was not taken till the time of David, and consequently that the books of Joshua and Judges were not written till after the commencement of the reign of David, which was 370 years after the death of Joshua.

The name of the city that was afterwards called Jerusalem was originally Jebus, or Jebusi, and was the capital of the Jebusites. The account of David's taking this city is given in 2 Samuel, c. v., v. 4, etc.; also in 1 Chron., c. xiv., v. 4, etc. There is no mention in any part of the Bible that it was ever taken before, nor any account that favours such an opinion. It is not said, either in Samuel or in Chronicles, that they *utterly destroyed men, women, and children; that they left not a soul to breathe*, as is said of their other conquests; and the silence here observed implies that it was taken by capitulation, and that the Jebusites, the native inhabitants, continued to live in the place after it was taken. The account, therefore, given in Joshua, that

the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem at this day, corresponds to no other time than after the taking the city by David.

Having now shown that every book in the Bible from Genesis to Judges is without authenticity, I come to the book of Ruth—an idle, bungling story foolishly told, nobody knows by whom, about a strolling country girl creeping slyly to bed to her cousin Boaz. Pretty stuff, indeed, to be called the word of God! It is, however, one of the best books in the Bible, for it is free from murder and rapine.

I come next to the two books of Samuel, and to show that those books were not written by Samuel, nor till a great length of time after the death of Samuel, and that they are, like all the former books, anonymous and without authority.

To be convinced that these books have been written much later than the time of Samuel, and consequently not by him, it is only necessary to read the account which the writer gives of Saul going to seek his father's asses, and of his interview with Samuel, of whom Saul went to inquire about those lost asses, as foolish people nowadays go to a conjurer to inquire after lost things.

The writer, in relating this story of Saul, Samuel, and the asses, does not tell it as a thing that had just then happened, but as a *story ancient in the time this writer lived*; for he tells it in the language or terms used at the time that *Samuel* lived, which obliges the writer to explain the story in the terms or language used in the time the *writer* lived.

Samuel, in the account given of him in the first of those books, c. ix., is called *the seer*; and it is by this term that Saul inquires after him, v. 11:—

“And as they (Saul and his servant) went up the hill to the city, they found young maidens going out to draw water; and they said unto them, *Is the seer here?*”

Saul then went according to the direction of these maidens, and met Samuel without knowing him, and said to him, v. 18: “Tell me, I pray thee, where the

seer's house is? and Samuel answered Saul, and said, *I am the seer.*"

As the writer of the book of Samuel relates these questions and answers in the language or manner of speaking used in the time they are said to have been spoken, and as that manner of speaking was out of use when this author wrote, he found it necessary, in order to make the story understood, to explain the terms in which these questions and answers are spoken; and he does this in the other verse, where he says: "*Before-time* in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, Come let us go to the seer; for he that is now called a prophet was *before-time* called a seer."

This proves, as I have before said, that this story of Saul, Samuel, and the asses was an ancient story at the time the book of Samuel was written, and consequently that Samuel did not write it, and that that book is without authenticity.

But if we go further into those books, the evidence is still more positive that Samuel is not the writer of them; for they relate things that did not happen till several years after the death of Samuel. Samuel died before Saul, for the 1st Samuel, c. xxviii., tells that Saul and the witch of Endor conjured Samuel up after he was dead; yet the history of matters contained in those books extended through the remaining part of Saul's life, and to the latter end of the life of David, who succeeded Saul. The account of the death and burial of Samuel (a thing which he could not write himself) is related in the 25th chapter of the first book of Samuel; and the chronology affixed to this chapter makes this to be 1,060 years before Christ; yet the history of this *first* book is brought down to 1,056 years before Christ—that is, to the death of Saul, which was not till four years after the death of Samuel.

The second book of Samuel begins with an account of things that did not happen till four years after Samuel was dead; for it begins with the reign of David, who succeeded Saul, and it goes on to the end of David's reign, which was forty-three years after the death of Samuel, and therefore the books are in themselves

positive evidence that they were not written by Samuel.

I have now gone through all the books in the first part of the Bible to which the names of persons are affixed as being the authors of those books, and which the Church, styling itself the Christian Church, has imposed upon the world as the writings of Moses, Joshua, and Samuel; and I have detected and proved the falsehood of this imposition. And now, ye priests of every description, who have preached and written against the former part of *The Age of Reason*, what have ye to say? Will ye, with all this mass of evidence against you and staring you in the face, still have the assurance to march into your pulpits and continue to impose these books on your congregations as the works of *inspired penmen* and the word of God: when it is as evident as demonstration can make truth appear that the persons who ye say are the authors are *not* the authors, and that ye know not who the authors are? What shadow of pretence have ye now to produce for continuing the blasphemous fraud? What have ye still to offer against the pure and moral religion of Deism, in support of your system of falsehood, idolatry, and pretended revelation? Had the cruel and murdering orders with which the Bible is filled and the numberless torturing executions of men, women, and children, in consequence of those orders, been ascribed to some friend whose memory you revered, you would have glowed with satisfaction at detecting the falsehood of the charge, and gloried in defending his injured fame. It is because ye are sunk in the cruelty of superstition, and feel no interest in the honour of your creator, that ye listen to the horrid tales of the Bible, or hear them with callous indifference. The evidence I have produced, and shall still produce in the course of this work, to prove that the Bible is without authority, will, whilst it wounds the stubbornness of a priest, relieve and tranquillize the minds of millions: it will free them from all those hard thoughts of the Almighty which priest-craft and the Bible had infused into their minds, and which stood in everlasting opposition to all their ideas of his moral justice and benevolence.

I come now to the two books of Kings and the two books of Chronicles. Those books are altogether historical, and are chiefly confined to lives and actions of the Jewish kings, who in general were a parcel of rascals; but these are matters with which we have no more concern than we have with the Roman emperors, or Homer's account of the Trojan war. Besides which, as those books are anonymous, and as we know nothing of the writer or of his character, it is impossible for us to know what degree of credit to give to the matters related therein. Like all other ancient histories, they appear to be a jumble of fable and of fact, and of probable and of improbable things, but which distance of time and place and chance of circumstance in the world have rendered obsolete and uninteresting.

The chief use I shall make of those books will be that of comparing them with each other and with other parts of the Bible, to show the confusion, contradiction, and cruelty in this pretended word of God.

The first book of Kings begins with the reign of Solomon, which, according to the Bible chronology, was 1015 years before Christ; and the second book ends 588 years before Christ, being a little after the reign of Zedekiah, whom Nebuchadnezzar, after taking Jerusalem and reconquering the Jews, carried captive to Babylon. The two books include a space of four hundred and twenty-seven years.

The two books of Chronicles are a history of the same times, and in general of the same persons, by another author; for it would be absurd to suppose that the same author wrote the history twice over. The first book of Chronicles (after giving the genealogy from Adam to Saul which takes up the first nine chapters) begins with the reign of David; and the last book ends, as in the last book of Kings, soon after the reign of Zedekiah, about 588 years before Christ. The two last verses of the last chapter bring the history fifty-two years more forward, that is to 536. But these verses do not belong to the book, as I shall show when I come to speak of the book of Ezra.

The two books of Kings, besides the history of Saul, David, and Solomon, who reign over *all* Israel, contain an abstract of the lives of seventeen kings and one queen who are styled kings of Judah, and of nineteen who are styled kings of Israel; for the Jewish nation, immediately on the death of Solomon, split into two parties who chose separate kings, and who carried on most rancorous wars against each other.

Those two books are a little more than a history of assassinations, treachery, and wars. The cruelty that the Jews had accustomed themselves to practise on the Canaanites, whose country they had savagely invaded under a pretended gift from God, they afterwards practised as furiously on each other. Scarcely half their kings died a natural death, and in some instances whole families were destroyed to secure possession to the successor, who, after a few years, and sometimes only a few months or less, shared the same fate. In the tenth chapter of the second book of Kings an account is given of two baskets full of children's heads, 70 in number, being exposed at the entrance of the city; they were the children of Ahab, and were murdered by the orders of Jehu, whom Elisha, the pretended man of God, had anointed to be king over Israel on purpose to commit this bloody deed and assassinate his predecessor. And in the account of the reign of Manaham, one of the kings of Israel, who had murdered Shallum, who had reigned but one month, it is said (2 Kings, c. xv., v. 16) that Manaham smote the city of Tiphseh, because they opened not the city to him, "*and all the women therein that were with child he ripped up.*"

Could we permit ourselves to suppose that the Almighty would distinguish any nation of people by the name of *his chosen people*, we must suppose that people to have been an example to all the rest of the world of the purest piety and humanity, and not such a nation of ruffians and cut-throats as the ancient Jews were: a people who, corrupted by and copying after such monsters and impostors as Moses and Aaron, Joshua, Samuel, and David, had distinguished themselves above all others on the face

of the known earth for barbarity and wickedness. If we will not stubbornly shut our eyes and steel our hearts, it is impossible not to see, in spite of all that long-established superstition imposes upon the mind, that the flattering appellation of *his chosen people* is no other than a *lie* which the priests and leaders of the Jews had invented to cover the baseness of their own characters, and which Christian priests, sometimes as corrupt and often as cruel, have professed to believe.

The two books of Chronicles are a repetition of the same crimes; but the history is broken in several places by the author leaving out the reign of some of their kings; and in this, as well as in that of Kings, there is such a frequent transition of kings of Judah to kings of Israel, and from kings of Israel to kings of Judah, that the narrative is obscure in the reading. In the same book the history sometimes contradicts itself: for example, in the second book of Kings, c. i., v. 17, we are told, but in rather ambiguous terms, that after the death of Ahaziah, king of Israel, Jehoram, or Joram (who was of the house of Ahab), reigned in his stead in the *second year* of Jehoram, or Joram, son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah; and in c. viii., v. 16, of the same book it is said, and in the *fifth year* of Joram, the son of Ahab, king of Israel, Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah, Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, began to reign—that is, one chapter says Joram of Judah began to reign in the *second year* of Joram of Israel; and the other chapter says that Joram of Israel began to reign in the *fifth year* of Joram of Judah.

Several of the most extraordinary matters related in one history as having happened during the reign of such and such of their kings are not to be found in the other in relating the reign of the same king: for example, the first two rival kings, after the death of Solomon, were Rehoboam and Jeroboam; and in 1 Kings, c. xii. and xiii., an account is given of Jeroboam making an offering of burnt incense, and that a man, who is there called a man of God, cried out against the altar, c. xiii., v. 2:—

“O altar, altar! thus saith the Lord: Behold, a child shall

be born to the house of David, Josiah by name, and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places, and burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burnt upon thee."

Verse 4 :—

" And it came to pass, when king Jeroboam heard the saying of the man of God, which had cried against the altar in Bethel, that he put forth his hand from the altar saying, *Lay hold of him* ; and his hand which he put out against him *dried up, so that he could not pull it again to him.*"

One would think that such an extraordinary case as this (which is spoken of as a judgment), happening to the chief of one of the parties, and at the first moment of the separation of the Israelites into two nations, would, if it had been true, have been recorded, in both histories. But though men in late times have believed *all that the prophets have said unto them*, it does not appear that those prophets or historians believed each other—they knew each other too well.

A long account also is given in Kings about Elijah. It runs through several chapters and concludes with telling, 2 Kings, c. ii., v. 11 :—

" And it came to pass, as they (Elijah and Elisha) still went on, and talked, that behold there appeared *a chariot of fire, and horses of fire*, and parted both asunder, and Elijah *went up by a whirlwind to heaven.*"

Hum ! this the author of Chronicles, miraculous as the story is, makes no mention of, though he mentions Elijah by name ; neither does he say anything of the story related in the second chapter of the same book of Kings, of a parcel of children calling Elisha *bald head, bald head* ; that this *man of God*, v. 24, " turned back and looked upon them and *cursed them in the name of the Lord* ; and there came forth two she-bears out of the wood, and tore forty and two children of them." He also passes over in silence the story told, 2 Kings, c. xiii., that when they were burying a man in the sepulchre where Elisha had been buried, it happened that the dead man, as they were letting him down (v. 21), " touched the bones of Elisha, and he (the dead man) *revived and*

stood up on his feet." The story does not tell us whether they buried the man, notwithstanding he revived and stood up on his feet, or drew him up again. Upon all these stories the writer of Chronicles is as silent as any writer of the present day who did not choose to be accused of *lying*, or at least of romancing, would be about stories of the same kind.

But however these two historians may differ from each other with respect to the tales related by either, they are silent alike with respect to those men styled prophets, whose writings fill up the latter part of the Bible. . Isaiah, who lived in the time of Hezekiah, is mentioned in Kings, and again in Chronicles, when these historians are speaking of that reign; but, except in one or two instances at most, and those very slightly, none of the rest are so much as spoken of, or even their existence hinted at; though, according to the Bible chronology, they lived within the time those histories were written—some of them long before. If those prophets, as they are called, were men of importance in their day, as the compilers of the Bible and priests and commentators have since represented them to be, how can it be accounted for that only one of these histories should say anything about them?

The history in the books of Kings and of Chronicles is brought forward, as I have already said, to the year 588 before Christ; it will therefore be proper to examine which of these prophets lived before that period.

Here follows a table of all the prophets, with the times in which they lived before Christ, according to the chronology affixed to the first chapter of each of the books of the prophets; and also of the number of years they lived before the books of Kings and Chronicles were written.

This table is either not very honourable for the Bible historians, or not very honourable for the Bible prophets; and I leave to priests and commentators, who are very learned in little things, to settle the point of *etiquette* between the two, and to assign a reason why the authors of Kings and Chronicles have treated these prophets,

whom in the former part of *The Age of Reason* I have considered as poets, with as much degrading silence as any historian of the present day would treat Peter Pindar.

TABLE.

Names.	Years before Christ.	Years before Kings and Chronicles.	Observations.
Isaiah	760	172	mentioned.
Jeremiah	629	41	{ mentioned only in the last chapter of Chronicles.
Ezekiel	595	7	not mentioned.
Daniel	607	19	not mentioned.
Hosea	785	97	not mentioned.
Joel	800	212	not mentioned.
Amos	787	199	not mentioned.
Obadiah	787	199	not mentioned.
Jonah	862	274	see the note. ¹
Micah	750	162	not mentioned.
Nahum	713	125	not mentioned.
Habakkuk	626	38	not mentioned.
Zephaniah	630	42	not mentioned.
Haggai			
Zechariah			
Malachi			

} after the year 588.

I have one observation more to make on the book of Chronicles, after which I shall pass on to review the remaining books of the Bible.

In my observations on the book of Genesis I have quoted a passage from the 36th chapter, v. 31, which evidently refers to a time *after* kings began to reign over the children of Israel; and I have shown that as this verse is verbatim the same as in Chronicles, c. i., v. 43, where it stands consistently with the order of history, which in Genesis it does not, the verse in Genesis, and a great part of the 36th chapter, have been taken from Chronicles; and that the book of Genesis, though it is placed first in the Bible, and ascribed to Moses, has been

¹ In 2 Kings, c. xiv., v. 25, the name of Jonah is mentioned, on account of the restoration of a tract of land by Jeroboam; but nothing further of him is said, nor is any allusion made to the book of Jonah, nor to his expedition to Nineveh, nor to his encounter with the whale.

manufactured by some unknown person after the book of Chronicles was written, which was not until at least eight hundred and sixty years after the time of Moses.

The evidence I proceed by to substantiate this is regular, and has in it but two stages. First, I have already stated that the passage in Genesis refers itself for *time* to Chronicles; secondly, that the book of Chronicles, to which this passage refers itself, was not *begun* to be written until at least eight hundred and sixty years after the time of Moses. To prove this, we have only to look into the thirteenth verse of the third chapter of the first book of Chronicles, where the writer, in giving the genealogy of the descendants of David, mentions *Zedekiah*; and it was in the time of *Zedekiah* that Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem, 588 years before Christ, and consequently more than 860 years after Moses. Those who have superstitiously boasted of the antiquity of the Bible, and particularly of the books ascribed to Moses, have done it without examination, and without any other authority than that of one credulous man telling it to another; for, so far as historical and chronological evidence applies, the very first book in the Bible is not so ancient as the book of Homer by more than three hundred years, and is about the same age as Æsop's Fables.

I am not contending for the morality of Homer; on the contrary, I think it a book of false glory, tending to inspire immoral and mischievous notions of honour; and with respect to Æsop, though the moral is in general just, the fable is often cruel; and the cruelty of the fable does more injury to the heart, especially in a child, than the moral does good to the judgment.

Having now dismissed Kings and Chronicles, I come to the next in course, the book of Ezra.

As one proof among others I shall produce to show the disorder in which this pretended word of God, the Bible, has been put together, and the uncertainty of who the authors were, we have only to look at the first three verses in Ezra and the two last in Chronicles; for by what kind of cutting and shuffling has it been that the first three verses in Ezra should be the last two verses in

Chronicles, or that the last two in Chronicles should be the first three in Ezra? Either the authors did not know their own works, or the compilers did not know the authors.

Last two verses of Chronicles.

Ver. 22. Now in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, that the word of the Lord, spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah, might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying,

Ver. 23. Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord God of heaven given me; and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of his people? the Lord his God be with him, and let him go up.

First three verses of Ezra.

Ver. 1. Now in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, that the word of the Lord, by the mouth of Jeremiah, might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he made proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying,

Ver. 2. Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, the Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah.

Ver. 3. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem.

The last verse in Chronicles is broken abruptly and ends in the middle of a phrase with the word *up*, without signifying to what place. This abrupt break, and the appearance of the same verses in different books, show, as I have already said, the disorder and ignorance in which the Bible has been put together, and that the compilers of it had no authority for what they were doing, nor we any authority for believing what they have done.¹

¹ I observed as I passed along several broken and senseless passages in the Bible, without thinking them of consequence enough to be introduced in the body of the work, such as that (1 Sam., c. xiii., v. 1) where it is said, "Saul reigned *one year*; and when he had reigned *two years* over Israel, Saul chose him three thousand men," etc. The first part of the verse, that Saul reigned *one year*, has no sense, since it does not tell us what

The only thing that has any appearance of certainty in the book of Ezra is the time in which it was written, which was immediately after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, about 536 years before Christ. Ezra (who, according to the Jewish commentators, is the same person who is called Esdras in the Apocrypha) was one of the persons who returned, and who, it is probable, wrote the account of that affair. Nehemiah, whose book follows next to Ezra, was another of the returned persons; and who, it is also probable, wrote the account of the same affair in the books that bears his

Saul did, nor say anything of what happened at the end of that *one year*; and it is, besides, mere absurdity to say he reigned *one year* when the very next phrase says he had reigned two, for if he had reigned two it was impossible not to have reigned one.

Another instance occurs in Joshua (c. v.), where the writer tells us a story of an angel (for such the table of contents at the head of the chapter calls him) appearing unto Joshua, and the story ends abruptly and without any conclusion. The story is as follows: V. 13, "And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over-against him with his sword drawn in his hand; and Joshua went up to him, and said unto him, Art thou for us or for our adversaries?" V. 14, "And he said, Nay; but as captain of the hosts of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, *What saith my Lord unto his servant?*" V. 15, "And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did so." And what then? Nothing. But here the story ends, and the chapter too.

Either this story is broken off in the middle, or it is a story told by some Jewish humorist in ridicule of Joshua's pretended mission from God; and the compilers of the Bible, not perceiving the design of the story, have told it as a serious matter. As a story of humour and ridicule it has a great deal of point, for it pompously introduces an angel in the figure of a man with a drawn sword in his hand, before whom Joshua *falls on his face to the earth and worships* (which is contrary to their second commandment); and then the most important embassy from heaven ends in telling Joshua to *pull off his shoe*. It might as well have told him to pull off his breeches.

It is certain, however, that the Jews did not credit everything their leaders told them, as appears from the cavalier manner in which they speak of Moses when he was gone into the mount. "As for *this* Moses," say they, "*we wot not what is become of him*" (Exod., c. xxxii., v. 1).

name. But those accounts are nothing to us, nor to any other persons, unless it be to the Jews as a part of the history of their nation : and there is just as much of the work of God in those books as there is in any of the histories of France, or Rapin's *History of England*, or the history of any other country.

But even in matters of historical record neither of these writers is to be depended upon. In the second chapter of Ezra, the writer gives a list of the tribes and families and of the precise number of souls of each that returned from Babylon to Jerusalem ; and this enrolment of the persons so returned appears to have been one of the principal objects for writing the book ; but in this there is an error that destroys the intention of the undertaking.

The writer begins his enrolment in the following manner, c. ii., v. 3 :—"The children of Parosh, two thousand an hundred seventy and two." Verse 4 :—"The children of Shephatiah, three hundred seventy and two." And in this manner he proceeds through all the families ; and in the 64th verse he makes a total and says the whole congregation together was *forty and two thousand three hundred and threescore*.

But whoever will take the trouble of casting up the several particulars will find that the total is but 29,818 ; so that the error is 12,542.¹ What certainty then can there be in the Bible for anything ?

¹ Particulars of the families from the second chapter of Ezra :—

Chap. ii.			Bt. over ... 14,851			Bt. over ... 17,870		
Verse	3	... 2,172	Verse	17	... 323	Verse	31	... 1,254
"	4	... 372	"	18	... 112	"	32	... 320
"	5	... 775	"	19	... 223	"	33	... 725
"	6	... 2,812	"	20	... 95	"	34	... 345
"	7	... 1,254	"	21	... 123	"	35	... 3,630
"	8	... 945	"	22	... 56	"	36	... 973
"	9	... 760	"	23	... 128	"	37	... 1,052
"	10	... 642	"	24	... 42	"	38	... 1,247
"	11	... 623	"	25	... 743	"	39	... 1,017
"	12	... 1,222	"	26	... 621	"	40	... 74
"	13	... 666	"	27	... 122	"	41	... 128
"	14	... 2,056	"	28	... 223	"	42	... 139
"	15	... 454	"	29	... 52	"	58	... 392
"	16	... 98	"	30	... 156	"	60	... 652

Nehemiah, in like manner, gives a list of the returned families, and of the number of each family. He begins as in Ezra by saying, c. vii., v. 8 :—"The children of Parosh, two thousand an hundred seventy and two." And so on through all the families. This list differs in several of the particulars from that of Ezra. In the 66th verse Nehemiah makes a total and says, as Ezra had said :—"The whole congregation together was forty and two thousand three hundred and threescore." But the particulars of this list make a total but of 31,089, so that the error here is 11,271. These writers may do well enough for Bible makers, but not for anything where truth and exactness are necessary.

The next book in course is the book of Esther. If Madam Esther thought it any honour to offer herself as a kept mistress to Ahasuerus, or as a rival to Queen Vashti, who had refused to come to a drunken king, in the midst of a drunken company, to be made a show of (for the account says they had been drinking seven days and were merry), let Esther and Mordecai look to that, it is no business of ours—at least it is none of mine; besides which the story has a great deal the appearance of being fabulous and is also anonymous. I pass on to the book of Job.

The book of Job differs in character from all the books we have hitherto passed over. Treachery and murder make no part of this book; it is full of the meditations of a mind strongly impressed with the vicissitudes of human life, and by turns sinking under and struggling against the pressure. It is a highly wrought composition, between willing submission and involuntary discontent; and shows man, as he sometimes is, more disposed to be resigned than he is capable of being. Patience has but a small share in the character of the person of whom the book treats; on the contrary, his grief is often impetuous; but he still endeavours to keep a guard upon it, and seems determined, in the midst of accumulating ills, to impose upon himself the hard duty of contentment.

I have spoken in a respectful manner of the book of

Job in the former part of *The Age of Reason*, but without knowing at that time what I have learned since : which is, that from all the evidence that can be collected the book of Job does not belong to the Bible.

I have seen the opinion of two Hebrew commentators, Abenezra and Spinoza, upon the subject : they both say that the book of Job carries no internal evidence of being a Hebrew book ; that the genius of the composition and the drama of the piece are not Hebrew ; that it has been translated from another language into Hebrew, and that the author of the book was a Gentile ; that the character represented under the name of Satan (which is the first and only time this name is mentioned in the Bible) does not correspond to any Hebrew idea ; and that the two convocations which the Deity is supposed to have made of those whom the poem calls sons of God, and the familiarity which this supposed Satan is stated to have with the Deity, are in the same case.

It may also be observed that the book shows itself to be the production of a mind cultivated in science, which the Jews, so far from being famous for, were very ignorant of. The allusions to objects of natural philosophy are frequent and strong, and are of a different cast to anything in the books known to be Hebrew. The astronomical names Pleiades, Orion, and Arcturus are Greek, and not Hebrew names ; and as it does not appear from anything that is to be found in the Bible that the Jews knew anything of Astronomy, or that they studied it, they had no translation of those names into their own language, but adopted the names as they found them in the poem.

That the Jews did translate the literary productions of the Gentile nations into the Hebrew language, and mix them with their own, is not a matter of doubt ; the thirty-first chapter of Proverbs is an evidence of this : it is there said, v. 1 : " The words of king Lemuel, the prophecy that his mother taught him." This verse stands as a preface to the proverbs that follow, and which are not the proverbs of Solomon, but of Lemuel ; and this Lemuel was not one of the kings of Israel, nor of

Judah, but of some other country, and consequently a Gentile. The Jews, however, have adopted his proverbs, and as they cannot give any account who the author of the book of Job was, nor how they came by the book, and as it differs in character from the Hebrew writings and stands totally unconnected with every other book and chapter in the Bible before it and after it, it has all the circumstantial evidence of being originally a book of the Gentiles.¹

The Bible-makers, and those regulators of time, the Bible chronologists, appear to have been at a loss where to place and how to dispose of the book of Job; for it contains no one historical circumstance, nor allusion to any, that might serve to determine its place in the Bible. But it would not have answered the purpose of these men to have informed the world of their ignorance; and, therefore, they have affixed it to the æra of 1520 years before Christ, which is during the time the Israelites were in Egypt, and for which they have just as much authority as I should have for saying it was a thousand years before that period. The probability, however, is that it is older than any book in the Bible; and it is the only one that can be read without indignation or disgust.

¹ The prayer known by the name of *Agur's Prayer*, in the 30th chapter of Proverbs, immediately preceding the Proverbs of Lemuel, and which is the only sensible, well-conceived, and well-expressed prayer in the Bible, has much the appearance of being a prayer taken from the Gentiles. The name of Agur occurs on no other occasion than this, and he is introduced, together with the prayer ascribed to him, in the same manner, and nearly in the same words, that Lemuel and his proverbs are introduced in the chapter that follows. The first verse of the 30th chapter says, "The words of Agur, the son of Jakeh, even the prophecy"; here the word prophecy is used with the same application it has in the following chapter of Lemuel, unconnected with anything of prediction. The prayer of Agur is in the 8th and 9th verses, "Remove far from me vanity and lies; give me neither riches nor poverty, but feed me with food convenient for me; lest I be full and deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain." This has not any of the marks of being a Jewish prayer, for the Jews never prayed but when they were in trouble, and never for anything but victory, vengeance, and riches.

We know nothing of what the ancient Gentile world (as it is called) was before the time of the Jews, whose practice has been to calumniate and blacken the character of all other nations; and it is from the Jewish accounts that we have learned to call them heathens. But as far as we know to the contrary, they were a just and moral people, and not addicted, like the Jews, to cruelty and revenge, but of whose profession of faith we are unacquainted. It appears to have been their custom to personify both virtue and vice by statues and images, as is done nowadays both by statuary and by painting; but it does not follow from this that they worshipped them any more than we do. I pass on to the book of

Psalms, of which it is not necessary to make much observation. Some of them are moral, and others are very revengeful, and the greater part relates to certain local circumstances of the Jewish nation at the time they were written, with which we have nothing to do. It is, however, an error, or an imposition, to call them the *Psalms of David*; they are a collection, as song-books are nowadays, from different song-writers, who lived at different times. The 137th Psalm could not have been written till more than four hundred years after the time of David, because it is written in commemoration of an event—the captivity of the Jews in Babylon—which did not happen till that distance of time.

“By the rivers of Babylon there we sat down; yea, we wept when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof; for there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; . . . saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion.”

As a man would say to an American, or to a Frenchman, or to an Englishman, Sing us one of your American songs, or your French songs, or your English songs. This remark, with respect to the time this psalm was written, is of no other use than to show (among others already mentioned) the general imposition the world has been under with respect to the authors of the Bible. No regard has been paid to time, place, and circumstance; and the names of persons have been affixed to the several

books which it was as impossible they should write as that a man should walk in procession at his own funeral.

The book of Proverbs. These, like the Psalms, are a collection, and that from authors belonging to other nations than those of the Jewish nation, as I have shown in the observations upon the book of Job; besides which some of the proverbs ascribed to Solomon did not appear till two hundred and fifty years after the death of Solomon; for it is said in the first verse of the 25th chapter: "These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out." It was two hundred and fifty years from the time of Solomon to the time of Hezekiah. When a man is famous, and his name is abroad, he is made the putative father of things he never said or did; and this most probably has been the fashion of that day, to make proverbs, as it is now to make jest-books, and father them upon those who never saw them.

The book of Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher, is also ascribed to Solomon, and that with much reason, if not with truth. It is written as the solitary reflection of a worn-out debauchee, such as Solomon was, who, looking back on scenes he can no longer enjoy, cries out, *All is vanity!* A great deal of the metaphor and of the sentiment is obscure, most probably by translation; but enough is left to show they were strongly pointed in the original.¹ From what is transmitted to us of the character of Solomon, he was witty, ostentatious, dissolute, and at last melancholy; he lived fast, and died, tired of the world, at the age of fifty-eight years.

Seven hundred wives, and three hundred concubines, are worse than none; and however it may carry with it the appearance of heightened enjoyment, it defeats all the felicity of affection by leaving it no point to fix upon; divided love is never happy. This was the case with Solomon; and if he could not, with all his pretensions to wisdom, discover it beforehand, he merited, unpitied, the mortification he afterwards endured. In this point

¹ *Those that look out of the window shall be darkened* is an obscure figure translation for loss of sight.

of view his preaching is unnecessary, because, to know the consequences, it is only necessary to know the case. Seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines would have stood in place of the whole book. It was needless after this to say that all was vanity and vexation of spirit, for it is impossible to derive happiness from the company of those whom we deprive of happiness.

To be happy in old age it is necessary that we accustom ourselves to objects that can accompany the mind all the way through life, and that we take the rest as good in their day. The mere man of pleasure is miserable in old age, and the mere drudge in business is but little better; whereas natural philosophy, mathematical and mechanical sciences, are a continual source of tranquil pleasure, and, in spite of the gloomy dogma of priests and of superstition, the study of those things is the study of the true theology; it teaches man to know and to admire the Creator, for the principles of science are in the creation, are unchangeable, and of divine origin.

Those who knew Benjamin Franklin will recollect that his mind was ever young, his temper ever serene; science, that never grows grey, was always his mistress. Without an object, we become like an invalid in an hospital waiting for death.

Solomon's songs are amorous and foolish enough, but which wrinkled fanaticism has called divine. The compilers of the Bible have placed these songs after the book of Ecclesiastes; and the chronologists have affixed to them the æra of 1014 years before Christ, at which time Solomon, according to the same chronology, was nineteen years of age, and was then forming his seraglio of wives and concubines. The Bible-makers and the chronologists should have managed this matter a little better, and either have said nothing about the time, or chosen a time less inconsistent with the supposed divinity of these songs, for Solomon was then in the honeymoon of one thousand debaucheries.

It should also have occurred to them that as he wrote, if he did write the book of Ecclesiastes, long after these songs, and in which he exclaims that all is vanity and

vexation of spirit, that he included those songs in that description. This is the more probable, because he says, or somebody for him—Ecclesiastes, c. ii., v. 8—I gat me men singers, and women singers (most probably to sing those songs), and musical instruments of all sorts; *and behold* (v. 11) *all was vanity and vexation of spirit*. The compilers, however, have done their work but by halves, for as they have given us the song, they should have given us the tunes, that we might sing them.

Those books called the books of the Prophets fill up all the remaining part of the Bible; they are sixteen in number, beginning with Isaiah and ending with Malachi, of which I have given a list in the observations upon Chronicles. Of these sixteen prophets, all of whom except the last three lived within the time the books of Kings and Chronicles were written, two only, Isaiah and Jeremiah, are mentioned in the history of those books. I shall leave the character of the men called prophets to another part of the work.

Whoever will take the trouble of reading the book ascribed to Isaiah will find it one of the most wild and disorderly compositions ever put together; it has neither beginning, middle, nor end; and except a short historical part, and a few sketches of history in two or three of the first chapters, is one continued incoherent, bombastical rant, full of extravagant metaphor, without application, and destitute of meaning; a schoolboy would scarcely have been excusable for writing such stuff; it is (at least in translation) that kind of composition and false taste that is properly called prose run mad.

The historical part begins at the 36th chapter, and is continued to the end of the 39th chapter. It relates some matters that are said to have passed during the reign of Hezekiah, king of Judah, at which time Isaiah lived. This fragment of history begins and ends abruptly; it has not the least connection with the chapter that precedes it, nor with that which follows it, nor with any other in the book. It is probable that Isaiah wrote this fragment himself, because he was an actor in the circumstances it treats of; but except this

part, there are scarcely two chapters that have any connection with each other; one is entitled at the beginning of the first verse, the burden of Babylon; another, the burden of Moab; another, the burden of Damascus; another, the burden of Egypt; another, the burden of the Desert of the Sea; another, the burden of the Valley of Vision: as you would say, the story of the Knight of the Burning Mountain, the story of Cinderella, of the Children in the Wood, etc., etc.

I have already shown, in the instance of the last two verses of Chronicles and the first three in Ezra, that the compilers of the Bible mixed and confounded the writings of different authors with each other, which alone, were there no other cause, is sufficient to destroy the authenticity of any compilation, because it is more than presumptive evidence that the compilers are ignorant who the authors were. A very glaring instance of this occurs in the book ascribed to Isaiah; the latter part of the 44th chapter and the beginning of the 45th, so far from having been written by Isaiah, could only have been written by some person who lived at least a hundred and fifty years after Isaiah was dead.

These chapters are a compliment to *Cyrus*, who permitted the Jews to return to Jerusalem from the Babylonian captivity to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple, as is stated in Ezra. The last verse of the 44th chapter and the beginning of the 45th are in the following words:—

“That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid. Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings to open before him the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee,” etc.

What audacity of church and priestly ignorance it is to impose this book upon the world as the writing of Isaiah! when Isaiah, according to their own chronology, died soon after the death of Hezekiah, which was six hundred and ninety-eight years before Christ; and the

decree of Cyrus in favour of the Jews returning to Jerusalem was, according to the same chronology, 536 years before Christ, which is a distance of time between the two, of one hundred and sixty-two years ! I do not suppose that the compilers of the Bible made these books, but rather that they picked up some loose, anonymous essays, and put them together under the names of such authors as best suited their purpose. They have encouraged the imposition, which is next to inventing it; for it was impossible but they must have observed it.

When we see the studied craft of the scripture-makers, in making every part of this romantic book of school-boy's eloquence bend to the monstrous idea of a Son of God, begotten by a ghost on the body of a virgin, there is no imposition we are not justified in suspecting them of. Every phrase and circumstance are marked with the barbarous hand of superstitious torture, and forced into meanings it was impossible they could have. The head of every chapter, and the top of every page, are blazoned with the names of Christ and the Church, that the unwary reader might suck in the error before he began to read.

"Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son," Isaiah, c. vii., v. 14, has been interpreted to mean the person called Jesus Christ and his mother Mary, and has been echoed through Christendom for more than a thousand years; and such has been the rage of this opinion that scarcely a spot of it but has been stained with blood and marked with desolation in consequence of it. Though it is not my intention to enter into controversy on subjects of this kind, but to confine myself to show that the Bible is spurious, and thus, by taking away the foundation, to overthrow at once the whole structure of superstition raised thereon, I will, however, stop a moment to expose the fallacious application of this passage.

Whether Isaiah was playing a trick with Ahaz, king of Judah, to whom this passage is spoken, is no business of mine; I mean only to show the misapplication of the

passage; that it has no more reference to Christ and his mother than it has to me and my mother. The story is simply this :—

The king of Syria and the king of Israel (I have already mentioned that the Jews were split into two nations, one of which was called Judah, the capital of which was Jerusalem, and the other Israel) made war jointly against Ahaz, king of Judah, and marched their armies towards Jerusalem. Ahaz and his people became alarmed, and the account says, v. 2 :—“ His heart was moved, and the hearts of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind.”

In this situation of things Isaiah addresses himself to Ahaz, and assures him in the *name of the Lord* (the cant phrase of all the prophets) that these two kings should not succeed against him; and to satisfy Ahaz that this should be the case, tells him to ask a sign. This, the account says, Ahaz declined doing, giving as a reason that he would not tempt the Lord; upon which Isaiah, who is the speaker, says, v. 14 :—“ Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign, *behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son.*” And the 16th verse says :—“ *For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good,* the land which thou abhorrest (or darest, meaning Syria and the kingdom of Israel) shall be forsaken of both her kings.” Here then was the sign, and the time limited for the completion of the assurance or promise, namely before this child should know to refuse the evil and choose the good.

Isaiah having committed himself thus far, it became necessary to him, in order to avoid the imputation of being a false prophet and the consequence thereof, to take measures to make this sign appear. It certainly was not a difficult thing, in any time of the world, to find a girl with child, or to make her so; and perhaps Isaiah knew of one beforehand; for I do not suppose that the prophets of that day were any more to be trusted than the priests of this; be that, however, as it may, he says in the next chapter, v. 2 :—“ And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest

and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, *and I went unto the prophetess, and she conceived and bare a son.*"

Here then is the whole story, foolish as it is, of this child and this virgin; and it is upon the barefaced perversion of this story that the book of Matthew, and the impudence and sordid interest of priests in later times, have founded a theory which they called the gospel; and have applied this story to signify the person they call Jesus Christ, begotten, they say, by a ghost, whom they call holy, on the body of a woman engaged in marriage and afterwards married, and whom they call a virgin seven hundred years after this foolish story was told—a theory which, speaking for myself, I hesitate not to disbelieve and to say is as fabulous and as false as God is true.¹

But to show the imposition and falsehood of Isaiah, we have only to attend to the sequel of this story, which, though it is passed over in silence in the book of Isaiah, is related in the 28th chapter of 2 Chronicles, and which is that, instead of these two kings failing in their attempt against Ahaz, king of Judah, as Isaiah had pretended to foretell in the name of the Lord, they *succeeded*; Ahaz was defeated and destroyed, an hundred and twenty thousand of his people were slaughtered, Jerusalem was plundered, and two hundred thousand women, and sons and daughters, carried into captivity. Thus much for this lying prophet and impostor Isaiah, and the book of falsehoods that bears his name. I pass on to the book of

Jeremiah. This prophet, as he is called, lived in the time that Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, in the reign of Zedekiah, the last king of Judah; and the suspicion was strong against him that he was a traitor in the interest of Nebuchadnezzar. Everything relating to Jeremiah shows him to have been a man of an equivocal character; in his metaphor of the potter and the

¹ In the 14th verse of the chapter it is said that the child should be called Immanuel, but this name was not given to either of the children, otherwise than as a character, which the word signifies. That of the prophet was called Maher-shalhash-baz, and that of Mary was called Jesus.

clay, c. xviii., he guards his prognostications in such a crafty manner as always to leave himself a door to escape by, in case the event should be contrary to what he had predicted.

In the 7th and 8th verses of that chapter he makes the Almighty to say :—

“ At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it, if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them.”

Here was a proviso against one side of the case; now for the other side. Verses 9 and 10 :—

“ At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice; then *I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them.*”

Here is a proviso against the other side; and according to this plan of prophesying a prophet could never be wrong, however mistaken the Almighty might be. This sort of absurd subterfuge, and this manner of speaking of the Almighty as one would speak of a man, is consistent with nothing but the stupidity of the Bible.

As to the authenticity of the book, it is only necessary to read it in order to decide positively that, though some passages recorded therein may have been spoken by Jeremiah, he is not the author of the book. The historical parts, if they can be called by that name, are in the most confused condition; the same events are several times repeated, and that in a manner different, and sometimes in contradiction to each other; and this disorder runs even to the last chapter, where the history, upon which the greater part of the book has been employed, begins anew and ends abruptly. The book has all the appearance of being a medley of unconnected anecdotes, respecting persons and things of that time, collected together in the same rude manner as if the various and contradictory accounts that are to be found in a bundle of newspapers respecting persons and things of the present

day were put together without date, order, or explanation. I will give two or three examples of this kind.

It appears from the account of the 37th chapter that the army of Nebuchadnezzar, which is called the army of the Chaldeans, had besieged Jerusalem some time; and on their hearing that the army of Pharaoh, of Egypt, was marching against them they raised the siege, and retreated for a time. It may here be proper to mention, in order to understand this confused history, that Nebuchadnezzar had besieged and taken Jerusalem during the reign of Jehoiakim, the predecessor of Zedekiah; and that it was Nebuchadnezzar who had made Zedekiah king, or rather viceroy; and that this second siege, of which the book of Jeremiah treats, was in consequence of the revolt of Zedekiah against Nebuchadnezzar. This will in some measure account for the suspicion that affixes itself to Jeremiah of being a traitor and in the interest of Nebuchadnezzar; whom Jeremiah calls in the 43rd chapter, v. 10, the servant of God.

The 11th verse of this chapter (the 37th) says :—

“ And it came to pass that, when the army of the Chaldeans was broken up from Jerusalem, for fear of Pharaoh’s army, then Jeremiah went forth out of Jerusalem, to go (as this account states) into the land of Benjamin, to separate himself hence in the midst of the people; and when he was in the gate of Benjamin, a captain of the ward was there, whose name was Irijah . . . and he took Jeremiah the prophet, saying, *Thou fallest away to the Chaldeans* : then said Jeremiah, *It is false ! I fall not away to the Chaldeans.*”

Jeremiah being thus stopped and accused was, after being examined, committed to prison, on suspicion of being a traitor, where he remained, as is stated in the last verse of this chapter.

But the next chapter gives an account of the imprisonment of Jeremiah, which has no connection with this account, but ascribes his imprisonment to another circumstance, and for which we must go back to the 21st chapter. It is there stated, v. i., that Zedekiah sent Pashur, the son of Malchiah, and Zephaniah, the son of Maaseiah the priest, to Jeremiah to inquire of him con-

cerning Nebuchadnezzar, whose army was then before Jerusalem : and Jeremiah said to them, v. 8 :—

“ Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I set before you the way of life, and the way of death; he that abideth in this city shall die by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence; *but he that goeth out and falleth to the Chaldeans that besiege you, he shall live, and his life shall be unto him for a prey.*”

This interview and conference breaks off abruptly at the end of the 10th verse of the 21st chapter; and such is the disorder of this book that we have to pass over sixteen chapters upon various subjects in order to come at the continuation and event of this conference, and this brings us to the 1st verse of the 38th chapter, as I have just mentioned.

The 38th chapter opens with saying, “ Then Shephatiah, the son of Mattan; and Gedaliah, the son of Pashur; and Jucal, the son of Shelemiah; and Pashur the son of Malchiah (here are more persons mentioned than in the 21st chapter), heard the words that Jeremiah spoke unto all the people, saying, Thus saith the Lord, He that remaineth in this city shall die by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence; but he that goeth forth to the Chaldeans shall live; for he shall have his life for a prey, and shall live ” (which are the words of the conference); therefore, say they to Zedekiah—

“ We beseech thee, let this man be put to death; *for thus he weakeneth the hands of the men of war that remain in this city, and the hands of all the people in speaking such words unto them, for this man seeketh not the welfare of this people, but the hurt.*”

And at the 6th verse it is said :—“ Then they took Jeremiah, and cast him into the dungeon of Malchiah.”

These two accounts are different and contradictory. The one ascribes his imprisonment to his attempt to *escape out of the city*; the other, to his *preaching and prophesying in the city*; the one to his being seized by the guard at the gate; the other to his being accused before Zedekiah, by the conferees.¹

¹ I observe two chapters, 16th and 17th, in the first book of Samuel that contradict each other with respect to David and the manner he became acquainted with Saul, as the 37th and

In the next chapter (the 39th) we have another instance of the disordered state of this book; for notwithstanding the siege of the city by Nebuchadnezzar has been the subject of several of the preceding chapters, particularly the 37th and 38th, the 39th chapter begins as if not a word had been said upon the subject, and as if the reader was still to be informed of every particular respecting it; for it begins with saying, v. 1 :—" In the ninth year of Zedekiah, king of Judah, in the tenth month came Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and all his army, against Jerusalem, and they besieged it," etc., etc.

But the instance in the last chapter (the 52nd) is still more glaring; for though the story has been told over

38th chapters of the book of Jeremiah contradict each other with respect to the cause of Jeremiah's imprisonment.

In the 16th chapter of Samuel it is said that an evil spirit of God troubled Saul, and that his servants advised him (as a remedy) "to seek out a man who was a cunning player upon the harp"; and Saul said (v. 17), "Provide me now a man that can play well, and bring him to me. Then answered one of the servants, and said, Behold I have seen a son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, that is cunning in playing, and a mighty man, and a man of war, and prudent in matters, and a comely person, and the Lord is with him: wherefore Saul sent messengers unto Jesse, and said, Send me David thy son." "And (v. 21) David came to Saul, and stood before him, and he loved him greatly; and he became his armour-bearer; and . . . when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul (v. 23), David took up his harp, and played with his hand, so Saul was refreshed, and was well."

But the next chapter (17th) gives an account all different to this of the manner that Saul and David became acquainted. Here it is ascribed to David's encounter with Goliath when David was sent by his father to carry provision to his brethren in the camp. In the 55th verse of this chapter it is said, "And when Saul saw David go forth against the Philistine (Goliath), he said unto Abner, the captain of the host, Abner, whose son is this youth? And Abner said, As thy soul liveth, O king, I cannot tell. And the king said, Inquire thou whose son the stripling is. And as David returned from the slaughter of the Philistine, Abner took him and brought him before Saul, with the head of the Philistine in his hand; and Saul said unto him, Whose son art thou, thou young man? And David answered, I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite." These two accounts belie each other, because each of them supposes Saul and David not to have known each other before. This book, the Bible, is too ridiculous even for criticism.

and over again, this chapter still supposes the reader not to know anything of it; for it begins by saying, v. 1 :—
 “Zedekiah was one and twenty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned eleven years in Jerusalem; and his mother’s name was Hamutal, the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah.” Verse 4 :—“And it came to pass, in the ninth year of his reign, in the tenth month . . . that Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came, he and all his army, against Jerusalem, and pitched against it,” etc., etc.

It is not possible that any one man, and more particularly Jeremiah, could have been the writer of this book. The errors are such as could not have been committed by any person sitting down to compose a work. Were I, or any other man, to write in such a disordered manner, nobody would read what was written, and everybody would suppose that the writer was in a state of insanity. The only way, therefore, to account for the disorder is that the book is a medley of detached unauthenticated anecdotes, put together by some stupid book-maker, under the name of Jeremiah; because many of them refer to him, and to the circumstances of the times he lived in.

Of the duplicity and of the false predictions of Jeremiah I shall mention two instances, and then proceed to review the remainder of the Bible.

It appears from the 38th chapter that when Jeremiah was in prison Zedekiah sent for him; and at this interview, which was private, Jeremiah pressed it strongly on Zedekiah to surrender himself to the enemy. “If,” says he, v. 17, “thou wilt assuredly go forth unto the king of Babylon’s princes, then thy soul shall live,” etc. Zedekiah was apprehensive that what passed at this conference should be known, and he said to Jeremiah, v. 25 :—

“If the princes (meaning those of Judah) hear that I have talked with thee; and they come unto thee and say unto thee, Declare unto us now what thou hast said unto the king; hide it not from us, and we will not put thee to death; and also what the king said unto thee: then thou shalt say unto them, I

presented my supplication before the king, that he would not cause me to return to Jonathan's house to die there. Then came all the princes unto Jeremiah, and asked him; and *he told them according to all these words that the king had commanded.*"

Thus this man of God, as he is called, could tell a lie, or very strongly prevaricate, when he supposed it would answer his purpose; for certainly he did not go to Zedekiah to make his supplication; neither did he make it: he went because he was sent for, and he employed that opportunity to advise Zedekiah to surrender himself to Nebuchadnezzar.

In the 34th chapter is a prophecy of Jeremiah to Zedekiah, in these words, v. 2 :—

"Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will give this city into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall burn it with fire; and thou shalt not escape out of his hand, but shalt surely be taken, and delivered into his hand; and thine eyes shall behold the eyes of the king of Babylon, and he shall speak with thee mouth to mouth, and thou shalt go to Babylon. Yet hear the word of the Lord; O Zedekiah, king of Judah, thus saith the Lord, Thou shalt not die by the sword, but thou shalt die in peace; and with the burnings of thy fathers, the former kings which were before thee, so shall they burn odours for thee, and they will lament thee, saying, Ah, lord! for I have pronounced the word, saith the Lord."

Now, instead of Zedekiah beholding the eyes of the king of Babylon and speaking with him mouth to mouth, and dying in peace and with the burning of odours, as at the funeral of his fathers (as Jeremiah had declared the Lord himself had pronounced), the reverse, according to the 52nd chapter, was the case: it is there said, v. 10 :—

"And the king of Babylon slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes; . . . then he put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and . . . bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon, and put him in prison till the day of his death."

What then can we say of these prophets but that they are impostors and liars?

As for Jeremiah, he pronounced none of those evils. He was taken into favour by Nebuchadnezzar, who gave him in charge to the captain of the guard, c. xxxix., v. 12: "Take him (said he), and look well to him, and

do him no harm; but do unto him even as he shall say unto thee." Jeremiah joined himself afterwards to Nebuchadnezzar, and went about prophesying for him against the Egyptians, who had marched to the relief of Jerusalem while it was besieged. Thus much for another of the lying prophets, and the book that bears his name.

I have been the more particular in treating of the books ascribed to Isaiah and Jeremiah, because those two are spoken of in the books of Kings and Chronicles, whilst the others are not. The remainder of the books ascribed to the men called prophets I shall not trouble myself much about, but take them collectively into the observations I shall offer on the character of the men called prophets.

In the former part of *The Age of Reason* I have said that the word prophet was the Bible word for poet, and that the flights and metaphors of the Jewish poets have been foolishly erected into what are now called prophecies. I am sufficiently justified in this opinion, not only because the books called the prophecies are written in poetical language, but because there is no word in the Bible, except it be the word prophet, that describes what we mean by poet. I have also said that the word signifies a performer upon musical instruments, of which I have given some instances: such as that of a company of prophets, prophesying with psalteries, with tabrets, with pipes, with harps, etc., and Saul prophesied with them, 1 Sam., c. x., v. 5. It appears from this passage, and from other parts in the book of Samuel, that the word prophet was confined to signify poetry and music; for the person who was supposed to have a visionary insight into things concealed was not a prophet, but a *seer*,¹ 1 Sam., c. ix., v. 9; and it was not till after the word *seer* went out of use (which was, most probably, when Saul banished those he called wizards) that the

¹ I know not what is the Hebrew word that corresponds to the word "seer" in English, but I observe it is translated into French by *Le Voyant*, from the verb *voir* to *see*, and which means the person who *sees*, or the seer.

profession of the seer, or the art of seeing, became incorporated into the word prophet.

According to the *modern* meaning of the word prophet and prophesying, it signifies foretelling events to a great distance of time; and it became necessary to the inventors of the gospel to give it this latitude of meaning, in order to apply or to stretch what they called the prophecies of the Old Testament to the times of the New. But according to the Old Testament, the prophesying of the seer, and afterwards of the prophet, so far as the meaning of the word seer was incorporated into that of prophet, had reference only to things of the time then passing, or were closely connected with it; such as the event of a battle they were going to engage in, or of a journey, or of an enterprise they were going to undertake, or of any circumstances then pending, or of any difficulty they were then in; all of which had immediate reference to themselves (as in the case already mentioned of Ahaz and Isaiah with respect to the expression, "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son"), and not to any distant future time. It was that kind of prophesying that corresponds to what we call fortune-telling, such as casting nativities, predicting riches, fortunate or unfortunate marriages, conjuring for lost goods, etc.; and it is the fraud of the Christian Church, not that of the Jews, and the ignorance and the superstition of modern, not that of ancient times, that elevated these poetical—musical—conjuring—dreaming—strolling gentry, into the rank they have since had.

But besides this general character of all the prophets, they had a particular character. They were in parties, and they prophesied for, or against, according to the party they were with, as the poetical and political writers of the present day write in defence of the party they associate with against the other.

After the Jews were divided into two nations, that of Judah and that of Israel, each party had its prophets, who abused and accused each other of being false prophets, lying prophets, impostors, etc.

The prophets of the party of Judah prophesied against

the prophets of the party of Israel; and those of the party of Israel against those of Judah. This party prophesying showed itself immediately on the separation of the first two rival kings, Rehoboam and Jeroboam. The prophet that cursed or prophesied against the altar that Jeroboam had built in Bethel was of the party of Judah, where Rehoboam was king; and he was way-laid on his return home by a prophet of the party of Israel, who said unto him (1 Kings, c. xiii.) :—"Art thou the man of God that camest from Judah? and he said, I am." Then the prophet of the party of Israel said to him :—

"I am a prophet also as thou art (signifying of Judah), and an angel spake unto me by the word of the Lord, saying, Bring him back with thee unto thine house, that he may eat bread and drink water; but (says the 18th verse) he lied unto him."

The event, however, according to the story, is :—The prophet of Judah never got back to Judah; for he was found dead on the road by the contrivance of the prophet of Israel, who no doubt was called a true prophet by his own party, and the prophet of Judah a lying prophet.

In the third chapter of the second of Kings a story is related of prophesying, or conjuring, that shows in several particulars the character of a prophet. Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and Joram, king of Israel, had for a while ceased their party animosity and entered into an alliance; and those two, together with the king of Edom, engaged in a war against the king of Moab. After uniting and marching their armies, the story says they were in great distress for water, upon which Jehoshaphat said :—

"Is there not here a prophet of the Lord, that we may inquire of the Lord by him? and one of the servants of the king of Israel said, here is Elisha." (Elisha was of the party of Judah.) "And Jehoshaphat said, The word of the Lord is with him."

The story then says that these three kings went down to Elisha; and when Elisha (who, as I have said, was a Judamite prophet) saw the king of Israel, he said unto him :—

“What have I to do with thee? get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother. And the king of Israel said unto him, Nay: for the Lord hath called these three kings together, to deliver them into the hand of Moab” (meaning, because of the distress they were in for water).

Upon which Elisha said:—“As the Lord of hosts liveth, before whom I stand, surely, were it not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, I would not look towards thee, nor see thee.” Here is all the venom and vulgarity of a party prophet. We have now to see the performance or manner of prophesying.

Verse 15:—“Bring me,” said Elisha, “a minstrel; and it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him.” Here is the farce of the conjurer. Now for the prophecy:—“And he said (singing, most probably, to the tune he was playing), Thus said the Lord, Make this valley full of ditches.” Which was just telling them what every countryman might have told them, without either fiddle or farce, that the way to get water was to dig for it.

But as every conjurer is not famous alike for the same things, so neither were those prophets; for though all of them, at least those I have spoken of, were famous for lying, some of them excelled in cursing. Elisha, whom I have just mentioned, was a chief in this branch of prophesying; it was he that cursed the forty-two children in the name of the Lord, whom the two she-bears came and devoured. We are to suppose that those children were of the party of Israel; but as those who will curse will lie, there is just as much credit to be given to this story of Elisha’s two she-bears as there is to that of the dragon of Wantley, of whom it is said:—

Poor children three devoured he,
That could not with him grapple;
And at one sup he eat them up,
As man would eat an apple.

There was another description of men called prophets that amused themselves with dreams and visions, but whether by night or by day we know not. These, if they were not quite harmless, were but little mischievous.

Of this class are Ezekiel and Daniel; and the first question upon those books, as upon all the others, is, Are they genuine—that is, were they written by Ezekiel and Daniel?

Of this there is no proof; but so far as my own opinion goes, I am more inclined to believe they were than that they were not. My reasons for this opinion are as follow: First, because those books do not contain internal evidence to prove they were not written by Ezekiel and Daniel, as the books ascribed to Moses, Joshua, Samuel, etc., etc.

Secondly, because they were not written till after the Babylonish captivity began; and there is good reason to believe that not any book in the Bible was written before that period: at least it is probable from the books themselves, as I have already shown, that they were not written till after the commencement of the Jewish monarchy.

Thirdly, because the manner in which the books ascribed to Ezekiel and Daniel are written agrees with the condition these men were in at the time of writing them.

Had the numerous commentators and priests, who had foolishly employed or wasted their time in pretending to expound and unriddle these books, been carried into captivity as Ezekiel and Daniel were, it would greatly have improved their intellects in comprehending the reason for this mode of writing, and have saved them the trouble of racking their invention as they have done to no purpose; for they would have found that they themselves would be obliged to write whatever they have to write respecting their own affairs, or those of their friends, or of their country, in a concealed manner, as those men have done.

These two books differ from all the rest, for it is only these that are filled with accounts of dreams and visions; and this difference arose from the situation the writers were in as prisoners of war, or prisoners of state, in a foreign country, which obliged them to convey even the most trifling information to each other, and all their political projects or opinions, in obscure and meta-

phorical terms. They pretended to have dreamed dreams and seen visions, because it was unsafe for them to speak facts or plain language. We ought, however, to suppose that the persons to whom they wrote understood what they meant, and that it was not intended anybody else should. But these busy commentators and priests have been puzzling their wits to find out what it was not intended they should know, and with which they have nothing to do.

Ezekiel and Daniel were carried prisoners to Babylon, under the first captivity, in the time of Jehoiakim, nine years before the second captivity in the time of Zedekiah. The Jews were then still numerous, and had considerable force at Jerusalem; and it is natural to suppose that men in the situation of Ezekiel and Daniel would be meditating the recovery of their country and their own deliverance. It is reasonable to suppose that the accounts of dreams and visions, with which these books are filled, are no other than a disguised mode of correspondence to facilitate those objects; it served them as a cypher, or a secret alphabet. If they are not this, they are tales, reveries, and nonsense: or at least a fanciful way of wearing off the wearisomeness of captivity: but the presumption is they are the former.

Ezekiel begins his book by speaking of a vision of *cherubims* and of a vision of a *wheel within a wheel*, which he says he saw by the river Chebar, in the land of his captivity. Is it not reasonable to suppose that by the cherubims he meant the temple at Jerusalem, where they had figures of cherubims, and by a wheel within a wheel (which, as a figure, has always been understood to signify political contrivance) the project or means of recovering Jerusalem? In the latter part of this book he supposes himself transported to Jerusalem and into the temple; and he refers back to the vision on the river Chebar, and says, c. xliii., v. 3, that this last vision was like the vision on the river Chebar; which indicates that those pretended dreams and visions had for their object the recovery of Jerusalem and nothing further.

As to the romantic interpretations and applications, wild as the dreams and visions they undertake to explain, which commentators and priests have made of these books, that of converting them into things which they call prophecies, and making them bend to times and circumstances as far remote even as the present day, it shows the fraud, or the extreme folly, to which cruelty or priestcraft can go.

Scarcely anything can be more absurd than to suppose that men situated as Ezekiel and Daniel were, whose country was overrun and in the possession of the enemy, all their friends and relations in captivity abroad or slavery at home, or massacred, or in continual danger of it : scarcely anything, I say, can be more absurd than to suppose that such men should find nothing to do but that of employing their time and their thoughts about what was to happen to other nations a thousand or two thousand years after they should be dead ; at the same time nothing more natural than that they should meditate the recovery of Jerusalem and their own deliverance ; and that this was the sole object of all the obscure and apparently frantic writing contained in those books.

In this sense, the mode of writing used in those two books, being forced by necessity and not adopted by choice, is not irrational ; but if we are to view the books as prophecies, they are false. In the 29th chapter of Ezekiel, speaking of Egypt, it is said, v. 11 : “ No foot of man shall pass through it, or foot of beast shall pass through it : neither shall it be inhabited forty years.” This is what never came to pass, and consequently it is false, as all the books I have already reviewed are. I here close this part of the subject.

In the former part of *The Age of Reason* I have spoken of Jonah, and of the story of him and the whale. A fit story for ridicule, if it was written to be believed ; or for laughter, if it was intended to try what credulity could swallow ; for if it could swallow Jonah and the whale, it can swallow anything.

But as is already shown in the observations on the book of Job, and of Proverbs, it is not always certain

which of the books in the Bible are originally Hebrew, or only translations from books of the Gentiles into Hebrew ; and as the book of Jonah, so far from treating of the affairs of the Jews, says nothing upon that subject, but treats altogether of the Gentiles, it is more probable that it is a book of the Gentiles than of the Jews, and that it has been written as a fable to expose the nonsense and satirize the vicious and malignant character of a Bible prophet or a predicting priest.

Jonah is represented first as a disobedient prophet, running away from his mission, and taking shelter aboard a vessel of the Gentiles bound from Joppa to Tarshish : as if he ignorantly supposed by such a paltry contrivance he could hide himself where God could not find him. The vessel is overtaken by a storm at sea ; and the mariners, all of whom are Gentiles, believing it to be a judgment on account of some one on board who had committed a crime, agreed to cast lots to discover the offender ; and the lot fell upon Jonah. But, before this, they had cast all their wares and merchandize overboard, to lighten the vessel, while Jonah, like a stupid fellow, was fast asleep in the hold.

After the lot had designated Jonah to be the offender they questioned him to know who and what he was ; and he told them *he was an Hebrew* ; and the story implies that he confessed himself to be guilty. But these Gentiles, instead of sacrificing him at once, without pity or mercy, as a company of Bible-prophets or priests would have done by a Gentile in the same case—and as it is related Samuel had done by Agag, and Moses by the women and children—they endeavoured to save him, though at a risk of their own lives : for the account says :—

“ Nevertheless (that is, though Jonah was a Jew and a foreigner, and the cause of all their misfortunes, and the loss of their cargo) *the men rowed hard to bring it (the boat) to land, but they could not, for the sea wrought, and was tempestuous against them.*”

Still, however, they were unwilling to put the fate of the lot into execution, and they cried, says the account,

unto the Lord saying: "*We beseech thee, O Lord, we beseech thee, let us not perish for this man's life, and lay not upon us innocent blood; for thou, O Lord, hast done as it pleased thee.*" Meaning thereby that they did not presume to judge Jonah guilty, since he might be innocent, but that they considered the lot that had fallen upon him as a decree of God, or as it *pleased God*. The address of this prayer shows that the Gentiles worshipped *one Supreme Being*, and that they were not idolaters, as the Jews represented them to be. But the storm still continuing, and the danger increasing, they put the fate of the lot into execution, and cast Jonah into the sea; where, according to the story, a great fish swallowed him up whole and alive.

We have now to consider Jonah securely housed from the storm in the fish's belly. Here we are told that he prayed; but the prayer is a made-up prayer, taken from various parts of the Psalms, without connection or consistency, and adapted to the distress, but not at all to the condition, that Jonah was in. It is such a prayer as a Gentile, who might know something of the Psalms, could copy out for him. This circumstance alone, were there no other, is sufficient to indicate that the whole is a made-up story. The prayer, however, is supposed to have answered the purpose, and the story goes on (taking up at the same time the cant language of a Bible-prophet), saying: "*The Lord spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land.*"

Jonah then received a second mission to Nineveh, with which he sets out; and we have now to consider him as a preacher. The distress he is represented to have suffered, the remembrance of his own disobedience as the cause of it, and miraculous escape he is supposed to have had, were sufficient, one would conceive, to have impressed him with sympathy and benevolence in the execution of his mission; but, instead of this, he enters the city with denunciation and malediction in his mouth, crying, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown."

We have now to consider this supposed missionary in

the last act of his mission; and here it is that the malevolent spirit of a Bible-prophet, or of a predicting priest, appears in all that blackness of character that men ascribe to the being they call the devil.

Having published his prediction, he withdrew, says the story, to the east side of the city. But for what? Not to contemplate in retirement the mercy of his Creator to himself or to others, but to wait, with malignant impatience, the destruction of Nineveh. It came to pass, however, as the story relates, that the Ninevites reformed, and that God, according to the Bible phrase, repented him of the evil he had said he would do unto them, and did it not. This, saith the first verse of the last chapter, *displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was very angry*. His obdurate heart would rather that all Nineveh should be destroyed, and every soul, young and old, perish in its ruins, than that his prediction should not be fulfilled. To expose the character of a prophet still more, a gourd is made to grow up in the night, that promiseth him an agreeable shelter from the heat of the sun in the place to which he is retired; and the next morning it dies.

Here the rage of the prophet becomes excessive, and he is ready to destroy himself. "*It is better,*" said he, "*for me to die than to live.*" This brings on a supposed expostulation between the Almighty and the prophet, in which the former says:—

"Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd? And Jonah said, I do well to be angry, even unto death. Then said the Lord, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for which thou hast not laboured, neither madest it grow, which came up in a night and perished in a night; and should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, in which are more than threescore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand?"

Here is both the winding up of the satire and the moral of the fable. As a satire it strikes against the character of all the Bible-prophets, and against all the indiscriminate judgments upon men, women, and children,

with which this lying book, the Bible, is crowded; such as Noah's flood, the destruction of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, the extirpation of the Canaanites, even to sucking infants and women with child, because the same reflection, *that there are more than threescore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left*, meaning young children, applies to all their cases. It satirizes also the supposed partiality of the Creator for one nation more than for another.

As a moral, it preaches against the malevolent spirit of prediction; for as certainly as a man predicts ill he becomes inclined to wish it. The pride of having his judgment right hardens his heart, till at last he beholds with satisfaction, or sees with disappointment, the accomplishment or the failure of his predictions. This book ends with the same kind of strong and well-directed point against prophets, prophecies, and indiscriminate judgments, as the chapter that Benjamin Franklin made for the Bible, about Abraham and the stranger, ends against the intolerant spirit of religious persecutions. Thus much for the book of Jonah.

Of the poetical parts of the Bible, that are called prophecies, I have spoken in the former part of *The Age of Reason*, and already in this; where I have said that the word *prophet* is the Bible-word for *poet*; and that the flights and metaphors of those poets, many of which are become obscure by the lapse of time and the change of circumstance, have been ridiculously erected into things called prophecies, and applied to purposes the writers never thought of. 'When a priest quotes any of those passages, he unriddles it agreeably to his own views, and imposes that explanation upon his congregation as the meaning of the writer. The *whore of Babylon* has been the common whore of all the priests, and each has accused the other of keeping the strumpet; so well do they agree in their explanations.

Here now remain only a few books, which they call the books of the lesser prophets; and as I have already shown that the greater are impostors, it would be cowardice to disturb the repose of the little ones. Let

them sleep, then, in the arms of their nurses, the priests, and both be forgotten together.

I have now gone through the Bible, as a man would go through a wood with an axe on his shoulder, and fell trees. Here they lie; and the priests, if they can, may replant them. They may, perhaps, stick them in the ground, but they will never make them grow.

I pass on to the books of the New Testament.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

The New Testament, they tell us, is founded upon the prophecies of the Old ; if so, it must follow the fate of its foundation.

As it is nothing extraordinary that a woman should be with child before she was married, and that the son she might bring forth should be executed, even unjustly, I see no reason for not believing that such a woman as Mary, and such a man as Joseph, and Jesus, existed ; their mere existence is a matter of indifference, about which there is no ground either to believe or disbelieve, and which comes under the common head of "*It may be so ; and what then ?*" The probability, however, is that there were such persons, or at least such as resembled them in part of the circumstances, because almost all romantic stories have been suggested by some actual circumstance ; as the adventures of Robinson Crusoe, not a word of which is true, were suggested by the case of Alexander Selkirk.

It is not, then, the existence or non-existence of the persons that I trouble myself about ; it is the fable of Jesus Christ, as is told in the New Testament, and the wild and visionary doctrine raised thereon, against which I contend. The story, taking it as it is told, is blasphemously obscene. It gives an account of a young woman engaged to be married, and while under this engagement she is, to speak plain language, debauched by a ghost, under the impious pretence (Luke, c. i., v. 35) that "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." Notwithstanding, Joseph afterwards married her as his wife, and in his turn rivals the ghost. This is 'putting the story into intelligible language, and when told in this

manner there is not a priest but must be ashamed to own it,¹

Obscenity in matters of faith, however wrapped up, is always a token of fable and imposture; for it is necessary to our serious belief in God that we do not connect it with stories that run, as this does, into ludicrous interpretations. This story is, upon the face of it, the same kind of story as that of Jupiter and Leda, or Jupiter and Europa, or any of the amorous adventures of Jupiter; and shows, as is already stated in the former part of *The Age of Reason*, that the Christian faith is built upon the heathen mythology.

As the historical parts of the New Testament, so far as concerns Jesus Christ, are confined to a very short space of time—less than two years—and all within the same country and nearly to the same spot, the discordance of time, place, and circumstance which detects the fallacy of the books of the Old Testament, and proved them to be impositions, cannot be expected to be found here in the same abundance. The New Testament, compared with the Old, is like a farce of one act, in which there is not room for very numerous violations of the unities. There are, however, some glaring contradictions, which, exclusive of the fallacy of the pretended prophecies, are sufficient to show the story of Jesus Christ to be false.

I lay it down as a position which cannot be controverted, first, that the *agreement* of all the parts of a story does not prove the story to be true, because the parts may agree and the whole may be false; secondly, that the *disagreement* of the parts of a story proves *the whole cannot be true*. The agreement does not prove truth, but the disagreement proves falsehood positively.

The history of Jesus Christ is contained in the four books ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The first chapter of Matthew begins with giving a genealogy of Jesus Christ; and in the third chapter of Luke there is

¹ Mary, the supposed virgin mother of Jesus, had several other children, sons and daughters. See Matt., c. xiii., vv 55, 56.

also given a genealogy of Jesus Christ. Did these two agree, it would not prove the genealogy to be true, because it might nevertheless be a fabrication; but if they contradict each other in every particular it proves falsehood absolutely. If Matthew speak truth, Luke speaks falsehood; and if Luke speak truth, Matthew speaks falsehood; and as there is no authority for believing one more than the other, there is no authority for believing either; and if they cannot be believed, even in the very first thing they say and set out to prove, they are not entitled to be believed in anything they say afterwards. Truth is a uniform thing; and as to inspiration and revelation, were we to admit it, it is impossible to suppose it can be contradictory. Either then the men called apostles were impostors, or the books ascribed to them have been written by other persons and fathered upon them, as is the case in the Old Testament.

The book of Matthew gives, c. i., v. 6, a genealogy by name from David, up through Joseph, the husband of Mary, to Christ, and makes there to be *twenty-eight* generations. The book of Luke gives also a genealogy by name from Christ, through Joseph, the husband of Mary, down to David, and makes there to be *forty-three* generations; besides which, there are only the two names of David and Joseph that are alike in the two lists. I here insert both genealogical lists, and for the sake of perspicuity and comparison have placed them both in the same direction—that is, from Joseph down to David :—

GENEALOGY, ACCORDING
TO MATTHEW.

- Christ.
- 2 Joseph.
- 3 Jacob.
- 4 Matthan.
- 5 Eleazar.
- 6 Eliud.
- 7 Achim.
- 8 Sadoc.
- 9 Azor.

GENEALOGY, ACCORDING
TO LUKE.

- Christ.
- 2 Joseph.
- 3 Heli.
- 4 Matthat.
- 5 Levi.
- 6 Melchi.
- 7 Janna.
- 8 Joseph.
- 9 Mattathias.

GENEALOGY, ACCORDING
TO MATTHEW.

- 10 Eliakim.
- 11 Abiud.
- 12 Zorobabel.
- 13 Salathiel.
- 14 Jechonas.
- 15 Josias.
- 16 Amon.
- 17 Manasses.
- 18 Ezekias.
- 19 Achaz.
- 20 Joatham.
- 21 Ozias.
- 22 Joram.
- 23 Josaphat.
- 24 Asa.
- 25 Abia.
- 26 Roboam.
- 27 Solomon.
- 28 David.

GENEALOGY, ACCORDING
TO LUKE.

- 10 Amos.
- 11 Naum.
- 12 Esh.
- 13 Nagge.
- 14 Maath.
- 15 Mattathias.
- 16 Semei.
- 17 Joseph.
- 18 Juda.
- 19 Joanna.
- 20 Rhesa.
- 21 Zorobabel.
- 22 Salathiel.
- 23 Neri.
- 24 Melchi.
- 25 Addi.
- 26 Cosam.
- 27 Elmodam.
- 28 Er.
- 29 Jose.
- 30 Eliezer.
- 31 Jorim.
- 32 Matthat.
- 33 Levi.
- 34 Simeon.
- 35 Juda.
- 36 Joseph.
- 37 Jonan.
- 38 Eliakim.
- 39 Melea.
- 40 Menan.
- 41 Mattatha.
- 42 Nathan.
- 43 David.

From the birth of David to the birth of Christ is upwards of 1,080 years; and as the lifetime of Christ is not included, there are but 27 full generations. To find, therefore, the average age of each person, mentioned in the first list, at the time his first son was born, it is only necessary to divide 1,080 by 27, which gives 40 years for each person. As the lifetime of man was then but of the same extent it is now, it is an absurdity to suppose that twenty following generations should all be old bachelors before they married; and the more so when we are told

that Solomon, the next in succession to David, had a house full of wives and mistresses before he was twenty-one years of age. So far from this genealogy being a solemn truth, it is not even a reasonable lie. The list of Luke gives about twenty-six years for the average age, and this is too much.

Now, if these men, Matthew and Luke, set out with a falsehood between them (as these two accounts show they do) in the very commencement of their history of Jesus Christ, and of who and of what he was, what authority (as I have before asked) is there left for believing the strange things they tell us afterwards? If they cannot be believed in their account of his natural genealogy, how are we to believe them when they tell us he was the Son of God, begotten by a ghost, and that an angel announced this in secret to his mother? If they lied in one genealogy, why are we to believe them in the other? If his natural genealogy be manufactured, which it certainly is, why are we not to suppose that his celestial genealogy is manufactured also, and that the whole is fabulous? Can any man of serious reflection hazard his future happiness upon the belief of a story naturally impossible, repugnant to every idea of decency, and related by persons already detected of falsehood? Is it not more safe that we stop ourselves at the plain, pure, and unmixed belief of one God, which is deism, than that we commit ourselves on an ocean of improbable, irrational, indecent, and contradictory tales?

The first question, however, upon the books of the New Testament, as upon those of the Old, is, Are they genuine? Were they written by the persons to whom they are ascribed? for it is upon this ground only that the strange things related therein have been credited. Upon this point there is no *direct proof for or against*; and all that this state of a case proves is *doubtfulness*; and doubtfulness is the opposite of belief. The state, therefore, that the books are in proves against themselves as far as this kind of proof can go.

But, exclusive of this, the presumption is that the books called the Evangelists, and ascribed to Matthew,

Mark, Luke, and John, were not written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and that they are impositions. The disordered state of the history in these four books, the silence of one book upon matters related in the other, and the disagreement that is to be found among them, implies that they are the productions of some unconnected individuals, many years after the things they pretend to relate, each of whom made his own legend; and not the writings of men living intimately together, as the men called apostles are supposed to have done: in fine, that they have been manufactured, as the books of the Old Testament have been, by other persons than those whose name they bear.

The story of the angel, announcing what the Church calls the *immaculate conception*, is not so much as mentioned in the books ascribed to Mark and John, and is differently related in Matthew and Luke. The former says the angel appeared to Joseph; the latter says it was to Mary; but either Joseph or Mary was the worst evidence that could be thought of, for it was others that should have testified *for them*, and not they for themselves. Were any girl that is now with child to say, and even to swear it, that she was gotten with child by a ghost, and that an angel told her so, would she be believed? Certainly she would not. Why then are we to believe the same thing of another whom we never saw, told by nobody knows whom, nor when, nor where? How strange and inconsistent is it that the same circumstances that would weaken the belief even of a probable story should be given as a motive for believing this one, that has upon the face of it every token of absolute impossibility and imposture.

The story of Herod destroying all the children under two years old belongs altogether to the writer of the book of Matthew; and not one of the rest mentions anything about it. Had such a circumstance been true, the universality of it must have made it known to all the writers; and the thing would have been too striking to have been omitted by any. The writer tells us that Jesus escaped this slaughter because Joseph and Mary were

warned by an angel to flee with him into Egypt; but he forgot to make provision for John, who was then under two years of age. John, however, who stayed behind, fared as well as Jesus, who fled; and therefore the story circumstantially belies itself.

Not any two of these writers agree in reciting, *exactly in the same words*, the written inscription, short as it is, which they tell us was put over Christ when he was crucified: and besides this, Mark says He was crucified at the third hour (nine in the morning); and John says it was the sixth hour (twelve at noon).¹

The inscription is thus stated in those books:—

Matthew—This is Jesus the king of the Jews.

Mark—The king of the Jews.

Luke—This is the king of the Jews.

John—Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews.

We may infer from these circumstances, trivial as they are, that those writers, whoever they were and in whatever time they lived, were not present at the scene. The only one of the men called apostles who appears to have been near the spot was Peter; and when he was accused of being one of Jesus' followers, it is said (Matthew, c. xxvi., v. 74): "Then began he to curse and swear, saying, I know not the man." Yet we are now called upon to believe this same Peter, convicted, by their own account, of perjury. For what reason, or on what authority, should we do this?

The accounts that are given of the circumstances that they tell us attended the crucifixion are differently related in those four books.

The book ascribed to Matthew says that there was darkness over all the land, from the sixth hour unto the ninth hour—that the veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom—that there was an earthquake—that the rocks rent—that the graves opened, that the

¹ According to John, the sentence was not passed till about the sixth hour (noon), and consequently the execution could not be till the afternoon; but Mark says expressly that he was crucified at the third hour (nine in the morning), c. xv., v. 25; John, c. xix., v. 14.

bodies of many of the saints that slept arose and came out of their graves after the resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many. Such is the account which this dashing writer of the book of Matthew gives, but in which he is not supported by the writers of the other books.

The writer of the book ascribed to Mark, in detailing the circumstances of the crucifixion, makes no mention of any earthquake, nor of the rocks rending, nor of the graves opening, nor of the dead men walking out. The writer of the book of Luke is silent also upon the same points. And as to the writer of the book of John, though he details all the circumstances of the crucifixion down to the burial of Christ, he says nothing about either the darkness, the veil of the temple, the earthquake, the rocks, the graves, nor the dead men.

Now if it had been true that those things had happened, and if the writers of those books had lived at the time they did happen, and had been the persons they are said to be—namely, the four men called apostles, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—it was not possible for them, as true historians, even without the aid of inspiration, not to have recorded them. The things, supposing them to have been facts, were of too much notoriety not to have been known, and of too much importance not to have been told. All these supposed apostles must have been witnesses of the earthquake, if there had been any, for it was not possible for them to have been absent from it; the opening of the graves and the resurrection of the dead men, and their walking about the city, is of still greater importance than the earthquake. An earthquake is always possible and natural, and proves nothing; but this opening of the graves is supernatural, and in point to their doctrine, their cause, and their apostleship. Had it been true, it would have filled up whole chapters of those books, and been the chosen theme and general chorus of all the writers; but, instead of this, little and trivial things, and mere prattling conversations of *he said this* and *she said that*, are often tediously detailed, while this most important of all, had it been true, is

passed off in a slovenly manner, by a single dash of the pen, and that by one writer only, and not so much as hinted at by the rest.

It is an easy thing to tell a lie, but it is difficult to support the lie after it is told. The writer of the book of Matthew should have told us who the saints were that came to life again and went into the city, and what became of them afterwards, and who it was that saw them—for he is not hardy enough to say that he saw them himself—whether they came out naked, and all in natural buff, he-saints and she-saints; or whether they came full dressed, and where they got their dresses; whether they went to their former habitations and reclaimed their wives, their husbands, and their property, and how they were received; whether they entered ejectments for the recovery of their possessions, or brought actions of *crim. con.* against the rival interlopers; or whether they died again, or went back to their graves alive and buried themselves.

Strange indeed that an army of saints should return to life and nobody know who they were, or who it was that saw them, and that not a word more should be said upon the subject, nor these saints have anything to tell us! Had it been the prophets who (as we are told) had formerly prophesied of these things, *they* must have had a great deal to say. They could have told us everything, and we should have had posthumous prophecies, with notes and commentaries upon the first, a little better at least than we have now. Had it been Moses, and Aaron, and Joshua, and Samuel, and David, not an unconverted Jew had remained in Jerusalem. Had it been John the Baptist, and the saints of the times then present, everybody would have known them, and they would have out-preached and out-famed all the other apostles. But instead of this these saints are made to pop up, like Jonah's gourd in the night, for no purpose at all but to wither in the morning. Thus much for this part of the story.

The tale of the resurrection follows that of the crucifixion; and in this, as well as in that, the writers, who-

ever they were, disagree so much as to make it evident that none of them were there.

The book of Matthew states that when Christ was put in the sepulchre the Jews applied to Pilate for a watch or a guard to be placed over the sepulchre, to prevent the body being stolen by the disciples; and that in consequence of this request the sepulchre *was made sure, sealing the stone* that covered the mouth and setting a watch. But the other books say nothing about this application, nor about the sealing, nor the guard, nor the watch; and according to their accounts there were none. Matthew, however, follows up this part of the story of the guard or the watch with a second part, that I shall notice in the conclusion, as it serves to detect the fallacy of those books.

The book of Matthew continues its account, and says (c. xxviii., v. 1) that at "The end of the sabbath, as it began to *dawn*, towards the first day of the week, came *Mary Magdalene* and the *other Mary*, to see the sepulchre." Mark says it was sun-rising, and John says it was dark. Luke says it was *Mary Magdalene*, and *Johanna*, and *Mary the mother* of James, and *other women*, that came to the sepulchre; and John states that *Mary Magdalene* came alone. So well do they agree about their first evidence! They all, however, appear to have known most about *Mary Magdalene*; she was a woman of a large acquaintance, and it was not an ill conjecture that she might be upon the stroll.

The book of Matthew goes on to say (v. 2):—"And behold there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and *sat upon it*." But the other books say nothing about any earthquake, nor about the angel rolling back the stone and *sitting upon it*; and according to their accounts there was no angel *sitting there*. Mark says the angel *was within the sepulchre, sitting* on the right side. Luke says there were two, and they were both standing up; and John says they were both sitting down, one at the head and the other at the feet.

Matthew says that the angel that was sitting upon the stone upon the outside of the sepulchre told the two Marys that Christ was risen, and that the women went *away* quickly. Mark says that the women, upon seeing the stone rolled away, and wondering at it, went *into* the sepulchre, and that it was the angel that was *sitting* within on the right side that told them so. Luke says it was the two angels that were standing up; and John says it was Jesus Christ himself that told it to Mary Magdalene, and that she did not go into the sepulchre, but only stooped down and looked in.

Now if the writers of these four books had gone into any court of justice to prove an *alibi* (for it is of the nature of an alibi that is here attempted to be proved, namely, the absence of a dead body, by supernatural means), and had given their evidence in the same contradictory manner as it is here given, they would have been in danger of having their ears cropped for perjury, and would have justly deserved it. Yet this is the evidence, and these are the books that have been imposed upon the world as being given by divine inspiration, and as the unchangeable word of God.

The writer of the book of Matthew, after giving this account, relates a story that is not to be found in any of the other books, and which is the same I have just before alluded to.

Now, says he (that is, after the conversation the women had had with the angel sitting upon the stone) :—

“ Behold some of the watch (meaning the watch that he had said had been placed over the sepulchre) came into the city, and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done; and when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, that his disciples came by night, and stole him away while we *slept*, and if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you. So they took the money, and did as they were taught; and this saying (that his disciples stole him away) is commonly reported among the Jews *until this day*.”

The expression, *until this day*, is an evidence that the

book ascribed to Matthew, was not written by Matthew, and that it has been manufactured long after the times and things of which it pretends to treat; for the expression implies a great length of intervening time. It would be inconsistent in us to speak in this manner of anything happening in our own time. To give, therefore, intelligible meaning to the expression, we must suppose a lapse of some generations at least, for this manner of speaking carries the mind back to ancient time.

The absurdity also of the story is worth noticing, for it shows the writer of the book of Matthew to have been an exceedingly weak and foolish man. He tells a story that contradicts itself in point of possibility; for though the guard, if there were any, might be made to say that the body was taken away while they were *asleep*, that same sleep must also have prevented their knowing how and by whom it was done; and yet they are made to say that it was the disciples who did it. Were a man to tender his evidence of something that he should say was done, and of the manner of doing it, and of the persons who did it, while he was asleep and could know nothing of the matter, such evidence could not be received; it will do well enough for Testament evidence, but not for anything where truth is concerned.

I come now to that part of the evidence in those books that respects the pretended appearance of Christ after this pretended resurrection.

The writer of the book of Matthew relates that the angel that was sitting on the stone at the mouth of the sepulchre said to the two Marys, c. xxviii., v. 7:—"Behold he (Christ) goeth before you into Galilee, there shall ye see him; lo, I have told you." And the same writer, at the next two verses (9, 10), makes Christ himself to speak to these women, immediately after the angel had told it to them, and that they ran quickly to tell to the disciples; and at the 16th verse it is said:—"Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them; and when they saw him, they worshipped him."

But the writer of the book of John tells us a story very different to this; for he says, c. xx., v. 19 :—

“ Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week (that is, the same day that Christ is said to have risen), when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst.”

According to Matthew, the eleven were marching to Galilee, to meet Jesus in a mountain, by his own appointment at the very time when, according to John, they were assembled in another place, and that not by appointment but in secret for fear of the Jews.

The writer of the book of Luke contradicts that of Matthew more pointedly than John does, for he says expressly that the meeting was in *Jerusalem* the evening of the same day that he (Christ) rose, and that the *eleven* were *there*. See Luke c. xxiv., v. 13, 36.

Now, it is not possible, unless we admit these supposed disciples the right of wilful lying, that the writer of those books could be any of the eleven persons called disciples; for if, according to Matthew, the eleven went into Galilee to meet Jesus in a mountain by his own appointment, on the same day that he is said to have risen, Luke and John must have been two of that eleven; yet the writer of Luke says expressly, and John implies as much, that the meeting was that same day in a house in Jerusalem; and on the other hand, if, according to Luke and John, the *eleven* were assembled in a house in Jerusalem, Matthew must have been one of that eleven; yet Matthew says the meeting was in a mountain in Galilee, and consequently the evidence given in those books destroys each other.

The writer of the book of Mark says nothing about any meeting in Galilee; but he says, c. xvi., v. 12, that Christ, after his resurrection, appeared in *another form* to two of them, as they walked into the country, and that these two told it to the residue, who would not believe them. Luke also tells a story, in which he keeps Christ employed the whole of the day of this pretended resurrection until the evening, and which totally invalidates the account of going to the mountain in Galilee. He says

that two of them, without saying which two, went that *same day* to a village called Emmaus, threescore furlongs (seven miles and a half) from Jerusalem, and that Christ in disguise went with them, and stayed with them unto the evening, and supped with them, and then vanished out of their sight, and re-appeared the same evening at the meeting of the eleven in Jerusalem.

This is the contradictory manner in which the evidence of this pretended reappearance of Christ is stated; the only point in which the writers agree is the skulking privacy of that re-appearance: for whether it was in the recess of a mountain in Galilee, or in a shut-up house in Jerusalem, it was still skulking. To what cause then are we to assign this skulking? On the one hand, it is directly repugnant to the supposed or pretended end, that of convincing the world that Christ was risen; and on the other hand, we have asserted that the publicity of it would have exposed the writers of those books to public detection; and therefore they have been under the necessity of making it a private affair.

As to the account of Christ being seen by more than five hundred at once, it is Paul only who says it, and not the five hundred who say it for themselves. It is therefore the testimony but of one man, and that too of a man who did not, according to the same account, believe a word of the matter himself at the time it is said to have happened. His evidence, supposing him to have been the writer of the 15th chapter of Corinthians, where this account is given, is like that of a man who comes into a court of justice to swear that what he had sworn before is false. A man may often see reason, and he has too always the right of changing his opinion; but this liberty does not extend to matters of fact.

I now come to the last scene, that of the ascension into heaven. Here all fear of the Jews, and of everything else, must necessarily have been out of the question; it was that which, if true, was to seal the whole, and upon which the reality of the future mission of the disciples was to rest for proof. Words, whether declarations or promises that passed in private—either in the

recess of a mountain in Galilee, or a shut-up house in Jerusalem—even supposing them to have been spoken, could not be evidence in public; it was, therefore, necessary that this last scene should preclude the possibility of denial and dispute, and that it should be, as I have stated in the former part of *The Age of Reason*, as public and as visible as the sun at noon-day; at least it ought to have been as public as the crucifixion is reported to have been. But to come to the point.

In the first place, the writer of the book of Matthew does not say a syllable about it; neither does the writer of the book of John. This being the case, is it possible to suppose that those writers who affect to be even minute in other matters, would have been silent upon this, had it been true? The writer of the book of Mark passed it off in a careless, slovenly manner, with a single dash of the pen, as if he was tired of romancing or ashamed of the story. So also does the writer of Luke. And even between these two there is not an apparent agreement as to the place where this final parting is said to have been.

The book of Mark says that Christ appeared to the eleven as they sat at meat—alluding to the meeting of the eleven at Jerusalem. He then states the conversation that he says passed at that meeting; and immediately after says (as a school-boy would finish a dull story): "*So then*, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." But the writer of Luke says that the ascension was from Bethany; that *he* (Christ) *led them out as far as Bethany and was parted from them there, and was carried up into heaven*. So also was Mahomet; and as to Moses, the apostle Jude says, v. 9, *that Michael and the devil disputed about his body*. While we believe such fables as these, or either of them, we believe unworthily of the Almighty.

I have now gone through the examination of the four books ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and when it is considered that the whole space of time, from the crucifixion to what is called the ascension, is but

a few days, apparently not more than three or four, and that all the circumstances are reported to have happened nearly about the same spot—Jerusalem—it is, I believe, impossible to find in any story upon record so many and such glaring absurdities, contradictions, and falsehoods as are in those books. They are more numerous and striking than I had any expectation of finding when I began this examination, and far more so than I had any idea of when I wrote the former part of *The Age of Reason*. I had then neither Bible nor Testament to refer to, nor could I procure any. My own situation, even as to existence, was becoming more precarious; and as I was willing to leave something behind me upon the subject, I was obliged to be quick and concise. The quotations I then made were from memory only, but they are correct; and the opinions I have advanced in that work are the effect of the most clear and long-established conviction—that the Bible and Testament are impositions upon the world; that the fall of man, the account of Jesus Christ being the Son of God, and of his dying to appease the wrath of God, and of salvation by that strange means, are all fabulous inventions, dishonourable to the wisdom and power of the Almighty; that the only true religion is Deism, by which I then meant, and now mean, the belief of one God, and an imitation of his moral character, or the practice of what are called moral virtues; and that it was upon this only (so far as religion is concerned) that I rested all my hopes of happiness hereafter. So I say now—and so help me God.

But to return to the subject. Though it is impossible at this distance of time to ascertain as a fact who were the writers of those four books (and this alone is sufficient to hold them in doubt, and where we doubt we do not believe), it is not difficult to ascertain negatively that they were not written by the persons to whom they are ascribed. The contradictions in those books demonstrate two things:—

First, that the writers cannot have been eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the matters they relate, or they would have related them without those contradictions;

and consequently that the books have not been written by the persons called apostles, who are supposed to have been witnesses of this kind.

Secondly, that the writers, whoever they were, have not acted in concerted imposition; but each writer, separately and individually for himself, and without the knowledge of the other.

The same evidence that applies to prove the one applies equally to prove both these cases: that is, that the books were not written by the men called apostles, and also that they are not a concerted imposition. As to inspiration, it is altogether out of the question; we may as well attempt to unite truth and falsehood as inspiration and contradiction.

If four men are eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses to a scene, they will, without any concert among them, agree as to the time and place, when and where that scene happened. Their individual knowledge of the *thing*, each one knowing it for himself, renders concert totally unnecessary; the one will not say it was in a mountain in the country, and the other at a house in town; the one will not say it was at sunrise, and the other that it was dark. For in whatever place it was, and at whatever time it was, they know it equally alike.

And on the other hand, if four men concert a story, they will make their separate relations of that story agree and corroborate each other to support the whole. *That* concert supplies the want of fact in the one case, as the knowledge of the fact supersedes in the other case the necessity of concert. The same contradictions, therefore, that prove there has been no concert, prove also that the reporters had no knowledge of the fact (or rather of that which they relate as a fact), and detect also the falsehood of their reports. Those books therefore have neither been written by the men called apostles, nor by impostors in concert. How then have they been written?

I am not one of those who are fond of believing there is much of that which is called wilful lying or lying originally, except in the case of men setting up to be

prophets as in the Old Testament; for prophesying is lying professionally. In almost all other cases, it is not difficult to discover the progress by which even simple supposition, with the aid of credulity, will in time grow into a lie, and at last be told as a fact; and whenever we can find a charitable reason for a thing of this kind we ought not to indulge a severe one.

The story of Jesus Christ appearing after he was dead is the story of an apparition, such as timid imaginations can always create in vision, and credulity believe. Stories of this kind had been told of the assassination of Julius Cæsar, not many years before, and they generally have their origin in violent deaths, or in executions of innocent persons. In cases of this kind compassion lends its aid, and benevolently stretches the story. It goes on a little and a little farther, till it becomes a *most certain truth*. Once start a ghost, and credulity fills up the history of its life and assigns the cause of its appearance; one tells it one way, another another way, till there are as many stories about the ghost, and about the proprietor of the ghost, as there are about Jesus Christ in these four books.

The story of the appearance of Jesus Christ is told with that strange mixture of the natural and impossible that distinguishes a legendary tale from fact. He is represented as suddenly coming in and going out, when the doors are shut, and of vanishing out of sight and appearing again as one would conceive of an unsubstantial vision; then again he is hungry, sits down to meat, and eats his supper. But as those who tell stories of this kind never provide for all the cases, so it is here. They have told us that when he arose he left his grave clothes behind him, but they have forgotten to provide other clothes for him to appear in afterwards, or to tell us what he did with them when he ascended; whether he stripped all off, or went up, clothes and all. In the case of Elijah, they have been careful enough to make him throw down his mantle; how it happened not to be burnt in the chariot of fire *they* also have not told us. But as imagination supplies all deficiencies of this

kind, we may suppose, if we please, that it was made of salamander's wool.

Those who are not much acquainted with ecclesiastical history may suppose that the book called the New Testament has existed ever since the time of Jesus Christ, as they suppose that the books ascribed to Moses have existed ever since the time of Moses. But the fact is historically otherwise : there was no such book as the New Testament till more than three hundred years after the time that Christ is said to have lived.

At what time the books ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John began to appear is altogether a matter of uncertainty. There is not the least shadow of evidence of who the persons were that wrote them, and they might as well have been called by the names of any of the other supposed apostles as by the names they are now called. The originals are not in the possession of any Christian Church existing, any more than the two tables of stone written on, as they pretend, by the finger of God, upon Mount Sinai, and given to Moses, are in the possession of the Jews. And even if they were, there is no possibility of proving the handwriting in either case. At the time those four books were written there was no printing, and consequently there could be no publication otherwise than by written copies, which any man might make or alter at pleasure and call them originals. Can we suppose it is consistent with the wisdom of the Almighty to commit himself and his will to man upon such precarious means as these ; or that it is consistent we should pin our faith upon such uncertainty ? We cannot make nor alter, nor even imitate, so much as a blade of grass that he has made, and yet we can make or alter *words of God*, as easily as words of man.¹

¹ The former part of *The Age of Reason* has not been published two years, and there is already an expression in it that is not mine. The expression is, *The book of Luke was carried by a majority of one vote only*. It may be true, but it is not I that have said it. Some person, who might know of the circumstance, has added it in a note at the bottom of the page of some of the editions, printed in either England or America ; and the printers, after that, have erected it into the body of the

About three hundred and fifty years after the time that Christ is said to have lived, several writings of the kind I am speaking of were scattered in the hands of divers individuals; and as the Church had begun to form itself into an hierarchy, or church government with temporal powers, it set itself about collecting them into a code, as we now see them, called the *New Testament*. They decided by vote, as I have before said in the former part of *The Age of Reason*, which of those writings out of the collection they had made, should be the *word of God*, and which should not. The Rabbins of the Jews had decided, by vote, upon the books of the Bible before.

As the object of the Church was, as is the case in all national establishments of churches, power and revenue, and terror the means it used, it is consistent to suppose that the most miraculous and wonderful of the writings they had collected stood the best chance of being voted. And as to the authenticity of the books, the *vote stands in the place of it*; for it can be traced no higher.

Disputes, however, ran high among the people then calling themselves Christians, not only as to points of doctrine, but as to the authenticity of the books. In the contest between the persons called Saint Augustine and Fauste, about the year 400, the latter says :—

“ The books called the Evangelists have been composed long after the times of the Apostles by some obscure men who, fearing that the world would not give credit to their relation of matters of which they could not be informed, have published them under the names of the apostles; and which are so full of sottishness and discordant relations that there is neither agreement nor connection between them.”

And in another place, addressing himself to the advocates of those books as being the word of God, he says :—

work, and made me the author of it. If this has happened within such a short space of time, notwithstanding the aid of printing, which prevents the alteration of copies individually, what may not have happened in a much greater length of time when there was no printing, and when any man who could write could make a written copy and call it an original by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John?

"It is thus that your predecessors have inserted in the Scriptures of our Lord many things which, though they carry his name, agree not with his doctrine. This is not surprising, *since that we have often proved* that these things have not been written by himself nor by his apostles, but that for the greatest part they are founded upon *tales*, upon *vague reports*, and put together by I know not what, half Jews, with but little agreement between them; and which they have nevertheless published under the names of the apostles of our Lord, and have thus attributed to them their own *errors and their lies*." ¹

The reader will see by these extracts that the authenticity of the books of the New Testament was denied, and the books treated as tales, forgeries, and lies, at the time they were voted to be the word of God. But the interest of the Church, with the assistance of the faggot, bore down the opposition, and at last oppressed all investigation. Miracles followed upon miracles, if we will believe them, and men were taught to say they believed whether they believed or not. But (by way of throwing in a thought) the French Revolution has excommunicated the Church from the power of working miracles; she has not been able, with the assistance of all her saints, to work *one* miracle since the revolution began; and as she never stood in greater need than now, we may without the aid of divination, conclude that all her former miracles are tricks and lies.²

¹ I have taken these two extracts from Boulanger's *Life of St. Paul*, written in French; Boulanger has quoted them from the writings of Augustine against Fauste, to which he refers.

² Boulanger, in his *Life of St. Paul*, has collected from the ecclesiastical histories and the writers of the fathers, as they are called, several matters which show the opinions that prevailed among the different sects of Christians at the time the Testament as we now see it was voted to be the word of God. The following extracts are from the second chapter of that work:—

"The Marcionists (a Christian sect) were assured that the evangelists were filled with falsities. The Manichæans, who formed a very numerous sect at the commencement of Christianity, *rejected as false all the New Testament*, and showed other writings quite different that they gave for authentic. The Corinthians, like the Marcionists, admitted not the Acts of the Apostles. The Eucratians and the Sevenians adopted neither the Acts nor the Epistles of Paul. Chrysostome, in a homily

When we consider the lapse of more than three hundred years intervening between the time that Christ is said to have lived and the time the New Testament was formed into a book, we must see, even without the assistance of historical evidence, the exceeding uncertainty there is of its authenticity. The authenticity of the book of Homer, so far as regards the authorship, is much better established than that of the New Testament, though Homer is a thousand years the more ancient. It was only an exceedingly good poet that could have written the book of Homer, and therefore few men only could have attempted it; and a man capable of doing it would not have thrown away his own fame by giving it to another. In like manner there were but few that could have composed *Euclid's Elements*, because none but an exceedingly good geometrician could have been the author of that work.

But with respect to the books of the New Testament, particularly such parts as tell us of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, any person who could tell a story of an apparition, or of a *man's walking*, could have made such books, for the story is most wretchedly told. The chance, therefore, of forgery in the Testament is millions to one greater than in the case of Homer or Euclid. Of the numerous priests or parsons of the present day, bishops and all, every one of them can make a sermon or translate a scrap of Latin, especially if it has been translated a thousand times before; but is there any amongst

which he made upon the Acts of the Apostles, says that in his time, about the year 400, many people knew nothing either of the author or of the book. St. Irene, who lived before that time, reports that the Valentinians, like several other sects of the Christians, accused the Scriptures of being filled with errors, imperfections, and contradictions. The Ebionists, or Nazarenes, who were the first Christians, rejected all the Epistles of Paul, and regarded him as an impostor. They report, among other things, that he was originally a Pagan, and he came to Jerusalem, where he lived some time; and that, having a mind to marry the daughter of a high priest, he caused himself to be circumcised; but that, not being able to obtain her, he quarrelled with the Jews and wrote against circumcision and against the observation of the sabbath and against all the legal ordinances."

them that can write poetry like Homer, or science like Euclid? The sum total of a parson's learning, with very few exceptions, is, a b, ab, and hic, hæc, hoc; and their knowledge of science is, three times one is three; and this is more than sufficient to have enabled them, had they lived at the time, to have written all the books of the New Testament.

As the opportunities of forgery were greater, so also was the inducement. A man could gain no advantage by writing under the name of Homer or Euclid; if he could write equal to them, it would be better that he wrote under his own name; if inferior, he could not succeed. Pride would prevent the former, and impossibility the latter. But with respect to such books as compose the New Testament, all the inducements were on the side of forgery. The best imagined history that could have been made at the distance of two or three hundred years after the time, could not have passed for an original under the name of the real writer; the whole chance of success lay in forgery; for the Church wanted pretence for its new doctrine, and truth and talents were out of the question.

But as it is not uncommon (as before observed) to relate stories of persons *walking* after they are dead, and of ghosts and apparitions of such as have fallen by some violent or extraordinary means; and as the people of that day were in the habit of believing such things, and of the appearance of angels, and also of devils, and of their getting into people's insides, and shaking them like a fit of ague, and of their being cast out again as if by an emetic (Mary Magdalene, the book of Mark tells us, had brought up, or been brought to bed of seven devils); it was nothing extraordinary that some story of this kind should get abroad of the person called Jesus Christ, and afterwards become the foundation of the four books ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Each writer told the tale as he heard it, or thereabouts, and gave to his book the name of the saint or the apostle whom tradition had given as the eye-witness. It is only upon this ground that the contradictions in these books

can be accounted for, and if this be not the case they are downright impositions, lies, and forgeries, without even the apology of credulity.

That they have been written by a sort of half Jews, as the foregoing quotations mention, is discernible enough. The frequent reference made to that chief assassin and impostor Moses, and to the men called prophets, establishes this point; and on the other hand the Church has complemented the fraud by admitting the Bible and the Testament to reply to each other. Between the Christian-Jew and the Christian-Gentile, the thing called a prophecy and the thing prophesied of, the type and the thing typified, the sign and the thing signified, have been industriously rummaged up and fitted together like old locks and picklock-keys. The story foolishly enough told of Eve and the serpent, and naturally enough as to the enmity between men and serpents (for the serpent always bites about the *heel*, because it cannot reach higher: and the man always knocks the serpent about the *head*, as the most effectual way to prevent its biting ¹): this foolish story, I say, has been made into a prophecy, a type, and a promise to begin with; and the lying imposition of Isaiah to Ahaz, *That a virgin shall conceive and bear a son*, as a sign that Ahaz should conquer, when the event was that he was defeated (as already noticed in the observations on the book of Isaiah), has been perverted and made to serve as a winder-up.

Jonah and the whale are also made into signs and types. Jonah is Jesus, and the whale is the grave; for it is said (and they have made Christ to say it of himself), Matt., c. xii., v. 40:—"For as Jonah was *three days and three nights* in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be *three days and three nights* in the heart of the earth." But it happens awkwardly enough that Christ, according to their own account, was but two nights and one day in the grave; about 36 hours, instead of 72—that is, the Friday night, the Saturday, and the

¹ "It shall bruise thy *head*, and thou shalt bruise his *heel*" (Genesis, c. iii., v. 15).

Saturday night; for he was up on the Sunday morning by sunrise or before. But as this fits quite as well as the *bite* and the *kick* in Genesis and the *virgin* and her *son* in Isaiah, it will pass in the lump of *orthodox* things. Thus much for the historical part of the Testament and its evidences.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL

The epistles ascribed to Paul, being fourteen in number, almost fill up the remaining part of the Testament. Whether those epistles were written by the person to whom they are ascribed is a matter of no great importance, since the writer, whoever he was, attempts to prove his doctrine by argument. He does not pretend to have been witness to any of the scenes told of the resurrection and the ascension, and he declares that he had not believed them.

The story of his being struck to the ground as he was journeying to Damascus has nothing in it miraculous or extraordinary; he escaped with life, and that is more than many others have done who have been struck with lightning; and that he should lose his sight for three days, and be unable to eat or drink during that time, is nothing more than is common in such conditions. His companions that were with him appear not to have suffered in the same manner, for they were well enough to lead him the remainder of the journey; neither did they pretend to have seen any vision.

The character of the person called Paul, according to the accounts given of him, has in it a great deal of violence and fanaticism; he had persecuted with as much heat as he preached afterwards; the stroke he had received had changed his thinking, without altering his constitution; and either as a Jew or a Christian he was the same zealot. Such men are never good moral evidences of any doctrine they preach. They are always in extremes, as well of action as of belief.

The doctrine he sets out to prove by argument is the resurrection of the same body, and he advances this as an evidence of immortality. But so much will men differ in their manner of thinking, and in the conclusions they

draw from the same premises, that this doctrine of the resurrection of the same body, so far from being an evidence of immortality, appears to me to furnish an evidence against it; for if I have already died in this body, and am raised again in the same body in which I have died, it is presumptive evidence that I shall die again. That resurrection no more secures me against the repetition of dying than an ague fit, when passed, secures against another. To believe therefore in immortality, I must have a more elevated idea than is contained in the gloomy doctrine of the resurrection.

Besides, as a matter of choice, as well as of hope, I had rather a better body and a more convenient form than the present. Every animal in the creation excels us in something. The winged insects, without mentioning doves or eagles, can pass over more space, and with greater ease, in a few minutes than man can in an hour. The glide of the smallest fish, in proportion to its bulk, exceeds us in motion, almost beyond comparison and without weariness. Even the sluggish snail can ascend from the bottom of a dungeon, where man, by the want of that ability, would perish; and a spider can launch itself from the top as playful amusement. The personal powers of man are so limited, and his heavy frame so little constructed to extensive enjoyment, that there is nothing to induce us to wish the opinion of Paul to be true. It is too little for the magnitude of the scene: too mean for the sublimity of the subject.

But all other arguments apart, the *consciousness of existence* is the only conceivable idea we can have of another life, and the continuance of that consciousness is immortality. The consciousness of existence, or the knowing that we exist, is not necessarily confined to the same form, nor to the same matter, even in this life.

We have not in all cases the same form, nor in any case the same matter, that composed our bodies twenty or thirty years ago; and yet we are conscious of being the same persons. Even legs and arms, which make up almost half the human frame, are not necessary to the consciousness of existence. They may be lost or taken

away, and the full consciousness of existence remain; and were their place supplied by wings or other appendages, we cannot conceive that it could alter our consciousness of existence. In short, we know not how much, or rather how little, of our composition it is, and how exquisitely fine that little is, that creates in us this consciousness of existence; and all beyond that is like the pulp of a peach—distinct and separate from the vegetative speck in the kernel.

Who can say what exceeding fine action of fine matter it is that produces a thought in what we call the mind? And yet that thought, when produced, as I now produce the thought I am writing, is capable of becoming immortal, and is the only production of man that has that capacity.

Statues of brass or marble will perish; and statues made in imitation of them are not the same statues, nor the same workmanship, any more than a copy of a picture is the same picture. But print and reprint a thought a thousand times over, and with material of any kind, carve it in wood or engrave it on stone, the thought is eternally and identically the same thought in every case. It has a capacity of unimpaired existence, unaffected by change of matter, and is essentially distinct and of a nature different from everything else that we know of or can conceive. If then the thing produced has in itself a capacity of being immortal, it is more than a token that the power that produced it, which is the self-same thing as consciousness of existence, can be immortal also; and that independently of the matter it was first connected with, as the thought is of the printing or writing it first appeared in. The one idea is not more difficult to believe than the other, and we can see that one is true.

That the consciousness of existence is not dependent on the same form or the same matter is demonstrated to our senses in the works of the creation, so far as our senses are capable of receiving that demonstration. A very numerous part of the animal creation preaches to us, far better than Paul, the belief of a life hereafter. Their

little life resembles an earth and a heaven, a present and a future state, and comprises, if it may be so expressed, immortality in miniature.

The most beautiful parts of the creation, to our eyes, are the winged insects; and they are not so originally. They acquire that form and that inimitable brilliancy by progressive changes. The slow and creeping caterpillar-worm of to-day passes in a few days to a torpid figure and a state resembling death; and in the next change comes forth in all the miniature magnificence of life, a splendid butterfly. No resemblance of the former creature remains; everything is changed; all his powers are new, and life is to him another thing. We cannot conceive that the consciousness of existence is not the same in this state of the animal as before. Why, then, must I believe that the resurrection of the same body is necessary to continue to me the consciousness of existence hereafter?

In the former part of *The Age of Reason* I have called the creation the true and only real word of God; and this instance, or this text, in the book of creation, **not** only shows to us that this thing may be so, but that it is so; and that the belief of a future state is a *rational belief*, founded upon facts visible in the creation: for it is not more difficult to believe that we shall exist hereafter in a better state and form than at present, than that a worm should become a butterfly, and quit the dunghill for the atmosphere, if we did not know it is a fact.

As to the doubtful jargon ascribed to Paul in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, which makes part of the burial service of some Christians, it is as destitute of meaning as the tolling of the bell at the funeral. It explains nothing to the understanding; it illustrates nothing to the imagination; but leaves the reader to find any meaning if he can. "All flesh," says he, "is not the same flesh. There is one kind of flesh of men, another of fishes, and another of birds." And what then? Nothing. A cook could have said as much. "There are also," says he, "bodies celestial, and bodies terrestrial; the glory of the celestial is *one*, and the glory of the

terrestrial is *another*." And what then? Nothing. And what is the difference? Nothing that he has told. "There is," says he, "one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars." And what then? Nothing; except that he says that *one star differeth from another star in glory*, instead of distance; and he might as well have told us that the moon did not shine as bright as the sun. All this is nothing better than the jargon of a conjurer who picks up phrases he does not understand to confound the credulous people who come to have their fortune told. Priests and conjurers are of the same trade.

Sometimes Paul affects to be a naturalist, and to prove his system of resurrection from the principles of vegetation. "*Thou fool*," says he, "*that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die*." To which one might reply in his own language, and say, Thou fool, Paul: that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die *not*; for the grain that dies in the ground never does nor can vegetate. The living grains only produce the next crop. But the metaphor in point of view is no simile. It is succession and resurrection.

The progress of an animal from one state of being to another, as from a worm to a butterfly, applies to the case, but this of the grain does not, and shows Paul to have been, what he says of others, *a fool*.

Whether the fourteen epistles ascribed to Paul were written by him or not is a matter of indifference. They are either argumentative or dogmatical: and as the argument is defective, and the dogmatical part is merely presumptive, it signifies not who wrote them. And the same may be said for the remaining parts of the Testament. It is not upon the Epistles, but upon what is called the Gospel contained in the four books ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and upon the pretended prophecies, that the theory of the Church, calling itself the Christian Church, is founded. The epistles are dependent upon those, and must follow their fate; for if the story of Jesus Christ be fabulous, all reasoning founded upon it as a supposed truth must fall with it.

We know from history that one of the principal leaders of this Church, Athanasius, lived at the time the New Testament ¹ was formed; and we know also, from the absurd jargon he has left us under the name of a creed, the character of the men who formed the New Testament; and we know also, from the same history, that the authenticity of the books of which it is composed was denied at the time. It is upon the vote of such as Athanasius that the Testament was decreed to be the word of God: and nothing can present to us a more strange idea than that of decreeing the word of God by vote. Those who rest their faith upon such authority put man in the place of God, and have no true foundation for future happiness. Credulity, however, is not a crime; but it becomes criminal by resisting conviction. It is strangling in the womb of the conscience the efforts it makes to ascertain truth. We should never force belief upon ourselves in anything.

I here close the subject on the Old Testament and the New. The evidence I have produced to prove them forgeries is extracted from the books themselves, and acts, like a two-edged sword, either way. If the evidence be denied, the authenticity of the scriptures is denied with it, for it is scripture evidence; and if the evidence be admitted, the authenticity of the books is disproved. The contradictory impossibilities contained in the Old Testament and the New put them in the case of a man who swears *for* and *against*. Either evidence convicts him of perjury, and equally destroys reputation.

Should the Bible and Testament hereafter fall, it is not I that have been the occasion. I have done no more than extract the evidence from the confused mass of matters with which it is mixed, and arrange that evidence in a point of light to be clearly seen and easily comprehended; and having done this, I leave the reader to judge for himself, as I have judged for myself.

¹ Athanasius died, according to the Church chronology, in the year 371.

CONCLUSION

In the former part of *The Age of Reason* I have spoken of the three frauds, *mystery*, *miracle*, and *prophecy*; and as I have seen nothing in any of the answers to that work that in the least affects what I have there said upon those subjects, I shall not encumber this second part with additions that are not necessary.

I have spoken also in the same work upon what is called *revelation*, and have shown the absurd misapplication of that term to the books of the Old Testament and the New; for certainly revelation is out of the question in reciting anything of which man has been the actor or the witness. That which a man has done or seen needs no revelation to tell him he has done it or seen it, for he knows it already; nor to enable him to tell it or to write it. It is ignorance, or imposition, to apply the term revelations in such cases; yet the Bible and Testament are classed under this fraudulent description of being all *revelation*.

Revelation then, so far as the term has relation between God and man, can only be applied to something which God reveals of his *will* to man; but though the power of the Almighty to make such a communication is necessarily admitted, because to that power all things are possible, yet the thing so revealed (if anything ever was revealed, and which, by the bye, it is impossible to prove) is revelation to the person *only to whom it is made*. His account of it to another is not revelation; and whoever puts faith in that account puts it in the man from whom the account comes; and that man may have been deceived, or may have dreamed it; or he may be an impostor, and may lie. There is no possible criterion whereby to judge of the truth of what he tells, for even the morality of it would be no proof of revelation. In-

all such cases the proper answer would be, "When it is revealed to me, I will believe it to be revelation; but it is not, and cannot be incumbent upon me to believe it to be revelation before; neither is it proper that I should take the word of man as the word of God, and put man in the place of God." This is the manner in which I have spoke of revelation in the former part of *The Age of Reason*, and which, whilst it reverentially admits revelation as a possible thing—because, as before said, to the Almighty all things are possible—it prevents the imposition of one man upon another, and precludes the wicked use of pretended revelation.

But though, speaking for myself, I thus admit the possibility of revelation, I totally disbelieve that the Almighty ever did communicate anything to man, by any mode of speech, in any language, or by any kind of vision, or appearance, or by any means which our senses are capable of receiving, otherwise than by the universal display of himself in the works of the creation, and by that repugnance we feel in ourselves to bad actions, and disposition to good ones.

The most detestable wickedness, the most horrid cruelties, and the greatest miseries that have afflicted the human race, have had their origin in this thing called revelation, or revealed religion. It has been the most dishonourable belief against the character of the divinity, the most destructive to morality and the peace and happiness of man, that ever was propagated since man began to exist. It is better, far better, that we admitted, if it were possible, a thousand devils to roam at large and to preach publicly the doctrine of devils, if there were any such, than that we permitted one such impostor or monster as Moses, Joshua, Samuel, and the Bible prophets to come with the pretended word of God in his mouth, and have credit among us.

Whence arose all the horrid assassinations of whole nations of men, women, and infants, with which the Bible is filled; and the bloody persecutions and tortures unto death, and religious wars, that since that time have laid Europe in blood and ashes; whence arose they, but

from this impious thing called revealed religion, and this monstrous belief that God has spoken to man? The lies of the Bible have been the cause of the one, and the lies of the Testament the other.

Some Christians pretend that Christianity was not established by the sword, but of what period of time do they speak? It was impossible that twelve men could begin with the sword: they had not the power; but no sooner were the professors of Christianity sufficiently powerful to employ the sword than they did so, and the stake and the faggot too; and Mahomet could not do it sooner. By the same spirit that Peter cut off the ear of the high priest's servant (if the story be true), he would cut off his head and the head of his master, had he been able. Besides this, Christianity grounds itself originally upon the Bible, and the Bible was established altogether by the sword, and that in the worst use of it, not to terrify, but to extirpate. The Jews made no converts: butchered all. The Bible is the fire of the Testament, and both are called the *word of God*. The Christians read both books; the ministers preach from both books; and this thing called Christianity is made up of both. It is then false to say that Christianity was not established by the sword. The only sect that have not persecuted are the Quakers, and the only reason that can be given for it is that they are rather Deists than Christians. They do not believe much about Jesus Christ, and they call the scriptures a dead letter. Had they called them by a worse name they had been nearer the truth.

It is incumbent on every man who reverences the character of the Creator, and who wishes to lessen the catalogue of artificial miseries and remove the cause that has sown persecutions thick among mankind, to expel all ideas of revealed religion as a dangerous heresy and an impious fraud. What is it that we have learned from this pretended thing called revealed religion? Nothing that is useful to man, and everything that is dishonourable to his maker. What is it the Bible teaches us? Rapine, cruelty, and murder. What is it the Testament teaches us? To believe that the Almighty committed

debauchery with a woman engaged to be married, and the belief of this debauchery is called faith.

As to the fragments of morality that are irregularly and thinly scattered in those books, they make no part of this pretended thing—revealed religion. They are the natural dictates of conscience, and the bonds by which society is held together, and without which it cannot exist; and are nearly the same in all religions and in all societies. The Testament teaches nothing new upon this subject; and where it attempts to exceed it becomes mean and ridiculous. The doctrine of not retaliating injuries is much better expressed in Proverbs, which is a collection as well from the Gentiles as the Jews, than it is in the Testament. It is there said, Proverbs c. xxv., v. 21: "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink."¹ But when it is said, as in the Testament, "If a man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," it is assassinating the dignity of forbearance, and sinking man into a spaniel.

Loving enemies is another dogma of feigned morality, and has besides no meaning. It is incumbent on man, as a moralist, that he does not revenge an injury; and it is equally as good in a political sense, for there is no end to retaliation; each retaliates on the other, and calls it justice; but to love in proportion to the injury,

¹ According to what is called Christ's sermon on the mount in the book of Matthew, where among some good things a great deal of this feigned morality is introduced, it is there expressly said that the doctrine of forbearance, or of not retaliating injuries, *was not any part of the doctrine of the Jews*; and as this doctrine is found in Proverbs it must, according to that statement, have been copied from the Gentiles, from whom Christ learned it. Those men whom Jewish and Christian idolaters have abusively called heathens had much better and clearer ideas of justice and morality than are to be found in the Old Testament, so far as it is Jewish, or in the New. The answer of Solon on the question, "Which is the most perfect popular government?" has never been exceeded by any man since his time, as containing a maxim of political morality. That, says he, "*where the least injury done to the meanest individual is considered as an insult on the whole constitution.*" Solon lived above 500 years before Christ.

if it could be done, would be to offer a premium for a crime. Besides, the word *enemies* is too vague and general to be used in a moral maxim, which ought always to be clear and defined, like a proverb. If a man be the enemy of another from mistake and prejudice, as in the case of religious opinions, and sometimes in politics, that man is different to an enemy at heart with a criminal intention; and it is incumbent upon us, and it contributes also to our own tranquillity, that we put the best construction upon a thing that it will bear. But even this erroneous motive in him makes no motive for love on the other part; and to say that we can love voluntarily, and without a motive, is morally and physically impossible.

Morality is injured by prescribing to it duties that, in the first place, are impossible to be performed; and if they could be would be productive of evil; or, as before said, be premiums for crime. The maxim of *doing as we would be done unto* does not include this strange doctrine of loving enemies, for no man expects to be loved himself for his crime or for his enmity.

Those who preach this doctrine of loving their enemies are in general the greatest persecutors, and they act consistently by so doing; for the doctrine is hypocritical, and it is natural that hypocrisy should act the reverse of what it preaches. For my own part, I disown the doctrine, and consider it as a feigned or fabulous morality; yet the man does not exist that can say I have persecuted him, or any man, or any set of men, either in the American revolution, or in the French revolution; or that I have in any case returned evil for evil. But it is not incumbent on man to reward a bad action with a good one, or to return good for evil; and wherever it is done, it is a voluntary act, and not a duty. It is also absurd to suppose that such doctrine can make any part of a revealed religion. We imitate the moral character of the Creator by forbearing with each other, for he forbears with all; but this doctrine would imply that he loved man, not in proportion as he was good, but as he was bad.

If we consider the nature of our condition here, we must see there is no occasion for such a thing as *revealed religion*. What is it we want to know? Does not the creation, the universe we behold, preach to us the existence of an Almighty power that governs and regulates the whole? And is not the evidence that this creation holds out to our senses infinitely stronger than anything we can read in a book, that any impostor might make and call the word of God? As for morality, the knowledge of it exists in every man's conscience.

Here we are. The existence of an Almighty power is sufficiently demonstrated to us, though we cannot conceive, as it is impossible we should, the nature and manner of its existence. We cannot conceive how we came here ourselves, and yet we know for a fact that we are here. We must know, also, that the power that called us into being can, if he please, and when he pleases, call us to account for the manner in which we have lived here; and therefore, without seeking any other motive for the belief, it is rational to believe that he will, for we know beforehand that he can. The probability, or even possibility, of the thing is all that we ought to know; for if we knew it as a fact, we should be the mere slaves of terror, our belief would have no merit, and our best actions no virtue.

Deism then teaches us, without the possibility of being deceived, all that is necessary or proper to be known. The creation is the Bible of the deist. He there reads, in the handwriting of the Creator himself, the certainty of his existence; and all other Bibles and Testaments are to him forgeries. The probability that we may be called to account hereafter will, to a reflecting mind, have the influence of belief; for it is not our belief or disbelief that can make or unmake the fact. As this is the state we are in, and which it is proper we should be in as free agents, it is the fool only, and not the philosopher, or even the prudent man, that will live as if there were no God.

But the belief of a God is so weakened by being mixed with the strange fable of the Christian creed, and

with the wild adventures related in the Bible, and of the obscurity and obscene nonsense of the Testament, that the mind of man is bewildered as in a fog. Viewing all these things in a confused mass, he confounds fact with fable, and as he cannot believe all, he feels a disposition to reject all. But the belief of a God is a belief distinct from all other things, and ought not to be confounded with any. The notion of a Trinity of Gods has enfeebled the belief of *one* God. A multiplication of beliefs acts as a division of belief; and in proportion as anything is divided it is weakened.

Religion, by such means, becomes a thing of form, instead of fact; of notion, instead of principle; morality is banished to make room for an imaginary thing called faith, and this faith has its origin in a supposed debauchery; a man is preached instead of God; an execution is an object for gratitude; the preachers daub themselves with the blood, like a troop of assassins, and pretend to admire the brilliancy it gives them; they preach a humdrum sermon on the merits of the execution; then praise Jesus Christ for being executed, and condemn the Jews for doing of it.

A man, by hearing all their nonsense lumped and preached together, confounds the God of the creation with the imagined God of the Christians, and lives as if there were none.

Of all the systems of religion that ever were invented there is none more derogatory to the Almighty, more unedifying to man, more repugnant to reason, and more contradictory in itself, than this thing called Christianity. Too absurd for belief, too impossible to convince and too inconsistent for practice, it renders the heart torpid, or produces only atheists and fanatics. As an engine of power, it serves the purpose of despotism; and as a means of wealth, the avarice of priests; but so far as respects the good of man in general, it leads to nothing here or hereafter.

The only religion that has not been invented, and that has in it every evidence of divine originality, is pure and simple Deism. It must have been the first, and

will probably be the last that man believes. But pure and simple Deism does not answer the purpose of despotic governments. They cannot lay hold of religion as an engine but by mixing it with human inventions and making their own authority a part; neither does it answer the avarice of priests, but by incorporating themselves and their functions with it and becoming like the government, a party in the system. It is this that forms the otherwise mysterious connection of Church and state; the Church humane and the state tyrannic.

Were a man impressed as fully and as strongly as he ought to be with the belief of a God, his moral life would be regulated by the force of this belief, he would stand in awe of God and of himself, and would not do the thing that could not be concealed from either. To give this belief the full opportunity of force it is necessary that it acts alone. This is Deism.

But when, according to the Christian Trinitarian scheme, one part of God is represented by a dying man and another part, called the Holy Ghost, by a flying pigeon, it is impossible that belief can attach itself to such wild conceits.¹

It has been the scheme of the Christian Church and of all the other invented systems of religion to hold man in ignorance of the Creator, as it is of government to hold him in ignorance of his rights. The systems of the one are as false as those of the other, and are calculated for mutual support. The study of theology as it stands in Christian churches is the study of nothing, it is founded on nothing, it rests on no principles, it proceeds by no authorities, it has no data, it can demonstrate nothing, and admits of no conclusion. Not anything

¹ The book called the book of Matthew says (c. iii., v. 16) that *the Holy Ghost descended in the shape of a dove*. It might as well have said a Goose—the creatures are equally harmless, and the one is as much a nonsensical lie as the other. The second of Acts (v. 2, 3) says that it descended in a mighty *rushing wind* in the shape of *cloven tongues*; perhaps it was cloven feet. Such absurd stuff is fit only for tales of witches and wizards.

can be studied as a science without our being in possession of the principles upon which it is founded, and as this is not the case with Christian theology, it is therefore the study of nothing.

Instead then of studying theology as is now done out of the Bible and Testament, the meanings of which books are always controverted and the authenticity of which is disproved, it is necessary that we refer to the Bible of the Creation. The principles we discover there are eternal and of divine origin; they are the foundation of all the science that exists in the world, and must be the foundation of theology.

We can know God only through his works. We cannot have a conception of any one attribute but by following some principle that leads to it. We have only a confused idea of his power if we have not the means of comprehending something of its immensity. We can have no idea of his wisdom but by knowing the order and manner in which it acts. The principles of science lead to this knowledge, for the Creator of man is the Creator of science, and it is through that medium that man can see God, as it were, face to face.

Could a man be placed in a situation and endowed with power of vision to behold at one view, and to contemplate deliberately, the structure of the universe, to mark the movements of the several planets, the cause of their varying appearances, the unerring order in which they revolve even to the remotest comet, their connections and dependence on each other, and to know the system of laws established by the Creator that governs and regulates the whole; he would then conceive, far beyond what any church-theology can teach him, the power, the wisdom, the vastness, the munificence of the Creator; he would then see that all the knowledge man has of science, and that all the mechanical arts by which he renders his situation comfortable here, are derived from that source; his mind, exalted by the scene and convinced by the fact, would increase in gratitude as it increased in knowledge; his religion or his worship would become united with his improvement

as a man; any employment he followed that had connection with the principles of the creation—as everything of agriculture, of science, and of the mechanical arts has—would teach him more of God and of the gratitude he owes to him than any theological Christian sermon he now hears. Great objects inspire great thoughts, great munificence excites great gratitude, but the grovelling tales and doctrines of the Bible and the Testament are fit only to excite contempt.

Though man cannot arrive, at least in this life, at the actual scene I have described, he can demonstrate it, because he has knowledge of the principles upon which the creation is constructed. We know that the greatest works can be represented in model, and that the universe can be represented by the same means. The same principles by which we measure an inch or an acre of ground will measure to millions in extent. A circle of an inch diameter has the same 'geometrical properties as a circle that would circumscribe the universe. The same properties of a triangle that will demonstrate upon paper the course of a ship will do it on the ocean, and when applied to what are called the heavenly bodies, will ascertain to a minute the time of an eclipse, though those bodies are millions of miles distant from us. This knowledge is of divine origin, and it is from the Bible of the Creation that man has learned it, and not from the stupid Bible of the Church, that teaches man nothing.¹

¹ The Bible-makers have undertaken to give us in the first chapter of Genesis an account of the creation, and in doing this they have demonstrated nothing but their ignorance. They make there to have been three days and three nights, evenings and mornings, before there was any sun; when it is the presence or absence of the sun that is the cause of day and night, and his rising and setting that of morning and evening. Besides, it is a puerile and pitiful idea to suppose the Almighty to say, Let there be light! It is the imperative manner of speaking that a conjurer uses when he says to his cups and balls, Presto! be gone. Longinus calls this expression the sublime, and by the same rule the conjurer is sublime, too, for the manner of speaking is expressively and grammatically the same. When authors and critics talk of the sublime they see not how nearly

All the knowledge man has of science and of machinery, by the aid of which his existence is rendered comfortable upon earth, and without which we would be scarcely distinguishable in appearance and condition from a common animal, comes from the great machine and structure of the universe. The constant and unwearied observations of our ancestors upon the movements and revolutions of the heavenly bodies, in what are supposed to have been the early ages of the world, have brought this knowledge upon earth. It is not Moses and the prophets, nor Jesus Christ, nor his apostles, that have done it. The Almighty is the great mechanic of the creation, the first philosopher and original teacher of all science. Let us then learn to reverence our master, and let us not forget the labours of our ancestors.

Had we at this day no knowledge of machinery, and were it possible that man could have a view, as I have before described, of the structure and machinery of the universe, he would soon conceive the idea of constructing some at least of the mechanical works we now have; and the idea so conceived would progressively advance in practice. Or could a model of the universe, such as is called an orrery, be presented before him, and put in motion, his mind would arrive at the same idea. Such an object and such a subject would, whilst it improved him in knowledge useful to himself as a man and a member of society, as well as entertaining, afford far better matter for impressing him with a knowledge of and a belief in the Creator, and of the reverence and gratitude that man owes to him, than the stupid texts of the Bible and the Testament, from which, be the talents of the preacher what they may, only stupid sermons can be preached. If man must preach, let him preach something that is edifying, and from texts that are known to be true.

it borders on the ridiculous. The sublime of the critics, like some part of Edmund Burke's "sublime and beautiful," is like a windmill just visible in a fog, which imagination might distort into a flying mountain, or an archangel, or a flock of wild geese.

The Bible of the creation is inexhaustible in texts. Every part of science, whether connected with the geometry of the universe, with the systems of animal and vegetable life, or with the properties of inanimate matter, is a text as well for devotion as for philosophy; for gratitude, as for human improvement. It will, perhaps, be said that if such a revolution in the system of religion take place, every preacher ought to be a philosopher. *Most certainly*, and every house of devotion a school of science.

It has been by wandering from the immutable laws of science, and the right use of reason, and setting up an invented thing called revealed religion, that so many wild and blasphemous conceits have been formed of the Almighty. The Jews have made him the assassin of the human species, to make room for the religion of the Jews. The Christians have made him the murderer of himself, and the founder of a new religion to supersede and expel the Jewish religion. And to find pretence and admission for these things they must have supposed his power or his wisdom imperfect, or his will changeable; and the changeableness of the will is the imperfection of the judgment. The philosopher knows that the laws of the Creator have never changed, with respect either to the principles of science or the properties of matter. Why then is it to be supposed they have changed with respect to men?

I here close the subject. I have shown in all the foregoing parts of this work that the Bible and Testament are impositions and forgeries; and I leave the evidence I have produced in proof of it to be refuted, if any one can do it; and I leave the ideas that are suggested in the conclusion of the work to rest on the mind of the reader; certain as I am that when opinions are free, either in matters of government or religion, truth will finally and powerfully prevail.

PART THE THIRD

PREFACE

To the Ministers and Preachers of all Denominations of Religion.

It is the duty of every man, as far as his ability extends, to detect and expose delusion and error. But nature has not given to everyone a talent for that purpose, and among those to whom such a talent is given there is often a want of disposition or of courage to do it.

The world, or more properly speaking that small part of it called Christendom, or the Christian world, has been amused for more than a thousand years with accounts of prophecies in the Old Testament about the coming of the person called Jesus Christ, and thousands of sermons have been preached, and volumes written, to make man believe it.

In the following treatise I have examined all the passages in the New Testament, quoted from the Old, and called prophecies concerning Jesus Christ, and I find no such thing as a prophecy of any such person, and I deny there are any. The passages all relate to circumstances the Jewish nation was in at the time they were written or spoken, and not to anything that was or was not to happen in the world several hundred years afterwards; and I have shown what the circumstances were to which the passages apply or refer. I have given chapter and verse for everything I have said, and have not gone out of the books of the Old and New Testament for evidence, that the passages are not prophecies of the person called Jesus Christ.

The prejudice of unfounded belief often degenerates into the prejudice of custom, and becomes at last rank

hypocrisy. When men from custom or fashion, or any worldly motive, profess or pretend to believe what they do not believe, nor can give any reason for believing, they unship the helm of their morality, and, being no longer honest to their own minds, they feel no moral difficulty in being unjust to others. It is from the influence of this vice, hypocrisy, that we see so many church and meeting-going professors and pretenders to religion so full of trick and deceit in their dealings, and so loose in the performance of their engagements, that they are not to be trusted further than the laws of the country will bind them. Morality has no hold on their minds, no restraint on their actions.

One set of preachers make salvation to consist in believing. They tell their congregations that if they believe in Christ their sins shall be forgiven. This, in the first place, is an encouragement to sin, in a similar manner as, when a prodigal young fellow is told his father will pay all his debts, he runs into debt the faster and becomes the more extravagant. Daddy, says he, pays all, and on he goes. Just so in the other case, *Christ pays all*, and on goes the sinner.

In the next place, the doctrine these men preach is not true. The New Testament rests itself for credibility and testimony on what are called prophecies in the Old Testament of the person called Jesus Christ; and if there are no such things as prophecies of any such person in the Old Testament, the New Testament is a forgery of the councils of Nice and Laodicea, and the faith founded thereon delusion and falsehood.¹

Another set of preachers tell their congregations that God predestined and selected from all eternity a certain number to be saved, and a certain number to be damned eternally. If this were true, *the day of judgment* IS PAST :

¹ The Councils of Nice and Laodicea were held about 350 years after the time Christ is said to have lived; and the books that now compose the New Testament were then voted for by YEAS and NAYS, as we now vote a law. A great many that were offered had a majority of NAYS, and were rejected. This is the way the New Testament came into being.

their preaching is in vain, and they had better work at some useful calling for their livelihood.

This doctrine also, like the former, hath a direct tendency to demoralize mankind. Can a bad man be reformed by telling him that, if he is one of those who were decreed to be damned before he was born, his reformation will do him no good; and if he was decreed to be saved, he will be saved, whether he believes it or not?—for this is the result of the doctrine. Such preaching and such preachers do injury to the moral world. They had better be at the plough.

As in my political works my motive and object have been to give man an elevated sense of his own character, and to free him from the slavish and superstitious absurdity of monarchy and hereditary government; so in my publications on religious subjects, my endeavours have been directed to bring man to a right use of the reason that God has given him; to impress on him the great principles of divine morality, justice, mercy, and a benevolent disposition to all men and to all creatures, and to inspire in him a spirit of trust, confidence, and consolation in his Creator, unshackled by the fables of books pretending to be *the word of God*.

THOMAS PAINE.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

As a great deal is said in the New Testament about Dreams, it is first necessary to explain the nature of dream, and to show by what operation of the mind a dream is produced during sleep. When this is understood, we shall be the better enabled to judge whether any reliance can be placed upon them; and, consequently, whether the several matters in the New Testament related of dreams deserve the credit which the writers of that book, and priests and commentators, ascribe to them.

AN ESSAY ON DREAM

In order to understand the nature of dreams, or that which passes in ideal vision during a state of sleep, it is first necessary to understand the composition and decomposition of the human mind.

The three great faculties of the mind are IMAGINATION, JUDGMENT, and MEMORY. Every action of the mind comes under one or other of these faculties. In a state of wakefulness, as in the daytime, these three faculties are all active; but that is seldom the case in sleep, and never perfectly; and this is the cause that our dreams are not so regular and rational as our waking thoughts.

The seat of that collection of powers of faculties that constitute what is called the mind, is in the brain. There is not, and cannot be, any visible demonstration of this anatomically, but accidents happening to living persons show it to be so. An injury done to the brain by a fracture of the skull will sometimes change a wise man into a childish idiot: a being without mind. But so careful has nature been of that *sanctum sanctorum* of man, the brain, that of all the external accidents to which humanity is subject, this happens the most seldom. But we often see it happening by long and habitual intemperance.

Whether those three faculties occupy distinct apartments of the brain, is known only to the Almighty power that formed and organized it. We can see the external effects of muscular motion in all the members of the body, though its *primum mobile*, or first moving cause, is unknown to man. Our external motions are sometimes the effect of intentions, and sometimes not. If we are sitting and intend to rise, or standing and intend to sit or walk, the limbs obey that intention as if they heard the order given. But we make a thousand

motions every day, and that as well waking as sleeping, that have no prior intention to direct them. Each member acts as if it had a will or mind of its own. Man governs the whole when he pleases to govern, but in the interims the several parts, like little suburbs, govern themselves without consulting the sovereign.

But all these motions, whatever be the generating cause, are external and visible. But with respect to the brain, no ocular observation can be made upon it. All is mystery, all is darkness in that womb of thought.

Whether the brain is a mass of matter in continual rest—whether it has a vibrating pulsative motion, or a heaving and falling motion, like matter in fermentation—whether different parts of the brain have different motions according to the faculty employed, be it the imagination, the judgment, or the memory, man knows nothing of it. He knows not the cause of his own wit; his own brain conceals it from him.

Comparing invisible with visible things, as metaphysical can sometimes be compared with physical things, the operations of these distinct and several faculties have some resemblance to the mechanism of a watch. The mainspring, which puts all in motion, corresponds to the imagination; the pendulum, or balance, which corrects and regulates that motion, corresponds to the judgment; and the hand and dial, like the memory, record the operations.

Now in proportion as these several faculties sleep, slumber, or keep awake, during the continuance of a dream, in that proportion will the dream be reasonable or frantic, remembered or forgotten.

If there is any faculty in mental man that never sleeps, it is that volatile thing, the imagination; the case is different with the judgment and memory. The sedate and sober constitution of the judgment easily disposes it to rest, and as to the memory, it records in silence, and is active only when it is called upon.

That the judgment soon goes to sleep may be perceived by our sometimes beginning to dream before we

are fully asleep ourselves. Some random thought runs in the mind, and we start, as it were, into recollection that we are dreaming between sleeping and waking.

If the judgment sleeps while the imagination keeps awake, the dream will be a riotous assemblage of misshapen images and ranting ideas; and the more active the imagination is, the wilder the dream will be. The most inconsistent and the most impossible things will appear right, because that faculty, whose province it is to keep order, is in a state of absence. The master of the school is gone out, and the boys are in an uproar.

If the memory sleeps, we shall have no other knowledge of the dream than that we have dreamt, without knowing what it was about. In this case it is sensation, rather than recollection, that acts. The dream has given us some sense of pain or trouble, and we feel it as a hurt rather than remember it as a vision.

If memory only slumbers, we shall have a faint remembrance of the dream, and after a few minutes it will sometimes happen that the principal passages of the dream will occur to us more fully. The cause of this is that the memory will sometimes continue slumbering, or sleeping, after we are awake ourselves, and that so fully that it may, and sometimes does, happen, that we do not immediately recollect where we are, nor what we have been about, or what we have to do. But when the memory starts into wakefulness, it brings the knowledge of these things back upon us like a flood of light, and sometimes the dream with it.

But the most curious circumstance of the mind in a state of dream, is the power it has to become the agent of every person, character, and thing of which it dreams. It carries on conversation with several, asks questions, hears answers, gives and receives information, and it acts all these parts itself.

But however various and eccentric the imagination may be in the creation of images and ideas, it cannot supply the place of memory with respect to things that are forgotten when we are awake. For example, if we have forgotten the name of a person, and dream of

seeing him, and asking him his name, he cannot tell it; for it is ourselves asking ourselves the question.

But though the imagination cannot supply the place of real memory, it has the wild faculty of counterfeiting memory. It dreams of persons it never knew, and talks with them as if it remembered them as old acquaintances. It relates circumstances that never happened, and tells them as if they had happened. It goes to places that never existed, and knows where all the streets and houses are, as if it had been there before. The scenes it creates often appear as scenes remembered. It will sometimes act a dream within a dream, and in the delusion of dreaming tell a dream it never dreamed, and tell it as if it was from memory. It may also be remarked that the imagination in a dream has no idea of time *as time*. It counts only by circumstances; and if a succession of circumstances pass in a dream that would require a great length of time to accomplish them, it will appear to the dreamer that a length of time equal thereto has passed also.

As this is the state of the mind in dream, it may rationally be said that every person is mad once in every twenty-four hours; for were he to act in the day as he dreams in the night, he would be confined for a lunatic. In a state of wakefulness, those three faculties being all active, and acting in unison, constitute the rational man. In dream it is otherwise, and therefore that state which is called insanity appears to be no other than a disunion of those faculties, and a cessation of the judgment, during wakefulness, that we so often experience during sleep; and *idiotcy*, into which some persons have fallen, is that cessation of all the faculties of which we can be sensible when we happen to wake before our memory.

In this view of the mind, how absurd it is to place reliance upon dreams, and how much more to make them a foundation for religion! Yet the belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, begotten by the Holy Ghost, a being never heard of before, stands on the story of an old man's dream. Matthew i. 20: "And behold the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph, in a

dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

After this we have the childish stories of three or four other dreams; about Joseph going into Egypt; about his coming back again; about this, and about that; and this story of dreams has thrown Europe into a dream for more than a thousand years. All the efforts that nature, reason, and conscience have made to awaken man from it have been ascribed by priestcraft and superstition to the workings of the Devil; and had it not been for the American Revolution, which by establishing the *universal right of conscience* first opened the way to free discussion, and for the French Revolution which followed, this religion of dreams had continued to be preached, and that after it had ceased to be believed. Those who preached it and did not believe it still believed the delusion necessary. They were not bold enough to be honest, nor honest enough to be bold.

Every new religion, like a new play, requires a new apparatus of dress and machinery to fit the new characters it creates. The story of Christ in the New Testament brings a new being upon the stage, which it calls the Holy Ghost; and the story of Abraham the father of the Jews, in the Old Testament, gives existence to a new order of beings it calls angels. There was no Holy Ghost before the time of Christ, nor angels before the time of Abraham. We hear nothing of these winged gentlemen till more than 2,000 years, according to the Bible chronology, from the time they say the heavens, the earth, and all therein, were made. After this they hop about as thick as birds in a grove. The first we hear of pays his addresses to Hagar in the wilderness; then three of them visit Sarah; another wrestles a fall with Jacob; and these birds, of passage, having found their way to earth and back, are continually coming and going. They eat and drink, and up again to heaven. What they do with the food they carry away in their bellies the Bible does not tell us.

One would think that a system loaded with such gross

and vulgar absurdities as Scripture religion is, could never have obtained credit; yet we have seen what priestcraft and fanaticism could do, and credulity believe.

From angels in the Old Testament we get to prophets, to witches, to seers of visions, and dreamers of dreams, and sometimes we are told, as in 1 Samuel ix. 15, that God whispers in the ear. At other times we are not told how the impulse was given, or whether sleeping or waking. In 2 Samuel xxiv. 1 it is said: "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them, to say, Go number Israel and Judah." And in 1 Chronicles xxi. 1, when the same story is again related, it is said: "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel."

Whether this was done sleeping or waking, we are not told, but it seems that David, whom they call "a man after God's own heart," did not know by what spirit he was moved; and as to the men called inspired penmen, they agreed so well about the matter that in one book they say it was God, and in the other that it was the Devil.

Yet this is the trash the Church imposes upon the world as the word of God! This is the collection of lies and contradictions called the Holy Bible! This is the rubbish called revealed religion!

The idea that the writers of the Old Testament had of a God was boisterous, contemptible, and vulgar. They make him the Mars of the Jews, the fighting God of Israel, the conjuring God of their priests and prophets. They tell as many fables of him as the Greeks told of Hercules.

They pit him against Pharaoh, as it were to box with him; and as Moses carries the challenge, they make their God to say, insultingly, "I will get me honour upon Pharaoh, and upon his host, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen." And that he may keep his word, they make him set a trap in the Red Sea, in the dead of the night, for Pharaoh, his host, and his horses, and drown them as a rat-catcher would do so many rats.

Great honour, indeed ! The story of Jack the Giant-killer is better told.

They match him against the Egyptian magician to conjure with him, and after bad conjuring on both sides (for where there is no great contest, there is no great honour) they bring him off victorious. The three first essays are a dead match : each party turns his rod into a serpent, the rivers into blood, and creates frogs : but upon the fourth, the God of the Israelites obtains the laurel—he covers them all over with lice ! The Egyptian magicians cannot do the same, and this lousy triumph proclaims the victory.

They make their God to rain fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah, and belch fire and smoke upon Mount Sinai, as if he were the Pluto of the lower regions. They make him salt up Lot's wife like pickled pork ; they make him pass, like Shakespeare's Queen Mab, into the brains of their priests, prophets, and prophetesses, and tickle them into dreams ; and, after making him play all kinds of tricks, they confound him with Satan, and leave us at a loss to know what God they meant.

This is the descriptive God of the Old Testament ; and as to the New, though the authors of it have varied the scene, they have continued the vulgarity.

Is man ever to be the dupe of priestcraft, the slave of superstition ? Is he never to have just ideas of his Creator ? It is better not to believe that there is a God, than to believe of him falsely. When we behold the mighty universe that surrounds us, and dart our contemplation into the eternity of space, filled with innumerable orbs, revolving in eternal harmony, how paltry must the tales of the Old and New Testaments, profanely called the Word of God, appear to thoughtful man ! The stupendous wisdom and unerring order that reign and govern throughout this wondrous whole, and call us to reflection, *put to shame the Bible !* The God of eternity and of all that is real is not the God of passing dreams and shadows of man's imagination ! The God of truth is not the God of fable ; the belief of a

God begotten and a God crucified is a God blasphemed. It is making a profane use of reason.

I shall conclude this Essay on Dream with the first two verses of the 34th chapter of Ecclesiasticus, one of the books of the Apocrypha. "The hopes of man void of understanding are vain and false! and dreams lift up fools. Whoso regardeth dreams is like him that catches at a shadow, and followeth after the wind."

I now proceed to the examination of the passages in the Bible called prophecies of the coming of Christ, and to show there are no prophecies of any such person; that the passages clandestinely styled prophecies are not prophecies, and that they refer to circumstances the Jewish nation was in at the time they were written or spoken, and not to any distant or future time or person.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

*Quoted from the Old, and called Prophecies Concerning
Jesus Christ.*

The passages called prophecies of or concerning Jesus Christ, in the Old Testament, may be classed under the two following heads :—

First,—those referred to in the four books of the New Testament called the four Evangelists—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

Secondly,—Those which translators and commentators have, of their own imagination, erected into prophecies, and dubbed with that title at the head of the several chapters of the Old Testament. Of these it is scarcely worth while to waste time, ink, and paper upon; I shall therefore confine myself chiefly to those referred to in the aforesaid books of the New Testament. If I show that these are not prophecies of the person called Jesus Christ, nor have reference to any such person, it will be perfectly needless to combat those which translators or the Church have invented, and for which they had no other authority than their own imagination.

I begin with the book called the gospel according to St. Matthew.

In the first chapter, v. 18, it is said : “ Now the birth of Jesus was in this wise : When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.” This is going a little too fast; because to make this verse agree with the next, it should have said no more than that she was found with child; for the next verse says : “ Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man and not willing

to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily." Consequently Joseph had found out no more than that she was with child, and he knew it was not by himself.

Verse 20 :—

" But while he thought on these things (that is, whether he should put her away privily or make a public example of her), behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him *in a dream* (that is, Joseph dreamed that an angel appeared unto him), saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins."

Now, without entering into any discussion upon the merits or demerits of the account here given, it is proper to observe that it has no higher authority than that of a dream; for it is impossible for a man to behold anything in a dream but that which he dreams of. I ask not, therefore, whether Joseph (if there was such a man) had such a dream or not; because, admitting he had, it proves nothing. So wonderful and irrational is the faculty of the mind in dreams, that it acts the part of all the characters its imagination creates, and what it thinks it hears from any of them is no other than what the roving rapidity of its own imagination invents. It is, therefore, nothing to me what Joseph dreamed of—whether of the fidelity or infidelity of his wife; I pay no regard to my own dreams, and I should be weak indeed to put faith in the dreams of another.

The verses that follow those I have quoted are the words of the writer of the book of Matthew :—

" Now (says he) all this (that is, all this dreaming and pregnancy) was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us."

This passage is in Isaiah vii. 14, and the writer of the book of Matthew endeavours to make his readers believe that this passage is a prophecy of the person called Jesus Christ. It is no such thing; and I go to

show it is not. But it is first necessary that I explain the occasion of these words being spoken by Isaiah. The reader will then easily perceive that, so far from their being a prophecy of Jesus Christ, they have not the least reference to such a person, or to anything that could happen in the time that Christ is said to have lived—which was about seven hundred years after the time of Isaiah. The case is this:—

On the death of Solomon, the Jewish nation split into two monarchies—one called the kingdom of Judah, the capital of which was Jerusalem; the other, the kingdom of Israel, the capital of which was Samaria. The kingdom of Judah followed the line of David, and the kingdom of Israel that of Saul; and these two rival monarchies frequently carried on fierce wars with each other.

At the time Ahaz was king of Judah, which was in the time of Isaiah, Pekah was king of Israel; and Pekah joined himself to Rezin, king of Syria, to make war against Ahaz, king of Judah, and these two kings marched a confederated and powerful army against Jerusalem. Ahaz and his people became alarmed at the danger, and their hearts were moved, “as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind” (Isaiah vii. 2).

In this perilous situation of things—Isaiah addresses himself to Ahaz, and assures him in the name of the Lord (the cant phrase of all the prophets) that these two kings shall not succeed against him; and to assure him that this shall be the case (the case, however, was directly contrary ¹), tells Ahaz to ask a sign of the

¹ 2 Chronicles xxviii. 1: Ahaz was twenty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem, but he did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord. Verse 5: Wherefore the Lord his God delivered him into the hand of the king of Syria, and they smote him, and carried away a great multitude of them captives, and brought them to Damascus: and he was also delivered into the hand of the king of Israel, who smote him with a great slaughter. Verse 6: And Pekah, king of Israel, slew in Judah an hundred and twenty thousand in one day. Verse 8. And the children of Israel carried away captive of their brethren two hundred thousand, women, sons, and daughters.

Lord. This Ahaz declined doing, giving as a reason that he would not tempt the Lord; upon which Isaiah, who pretends to be sent from God, says (v. 14) :—

“ Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign : Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse evil, and choose the good, for before the child shall know to refuse evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.”

Meaning the king of Israel and the king of Syria, who were marching against him.

Here then is the sign, which was to be the birth of a child, and that child a son; and here also is the time limited for the accomplishment of the sign—namely, before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good.

The thing, therefore, to be a sign of success to Ahaz, must be something that would take place before the event of the battle then pending between him and the two kings could be known. A thing to be a sign must precede the thing signified. The sign of rain must be before the rain.

It would have been mockery and insulting nonsense for Isaiah to have assured Ahaz, as a sign that those two kings should not prevail against him, that a child should be born seven hundred years after he was dead; and that before the child so born should know to refuse the evil and choose the good, he (Ahaz) should be delivered from the danger he was then immediately threatened with.

But the case is, that the child of which Isaiah speaks was *his own child*, with which his wife or his mistress was then pregnant; for he says in the next chapter, verses 2, 3 : “ And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah. And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived and bear a son.” And he says at v. 18 of the same chapter : “ Behold, I, and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and for wonders in Israel.”

It may not be improper here to observe that the word translated *a virgin* in Isaiah does not signify a virgin in Hebrew, but merely *a young woman*. The tense is also falsified in the translation. Levi gives the Hebrew text of the 14th verse of the 7th chapter of Isaiah, and the translation in English with it : "Behold a young woman is with child and beareth a son." The expression, says he, is in the present tense. The translation agrees with the other circumstances related of the birth of this child, which was to be a sign to Ahaz. But as the true translation could not have been imposed upon the world as the prophecy of a child to be born seven hundred years afterwards, the Christian translators have falsified the original : and instead of making Isaiah to say, "Behold, a *young woman* is with child and *beareth* a son"—they have made him to say, "Behold, a *virgin shall* conceive and *bear* a son." It is, however, only necessary for a person to read Isaiah vii. and viii., and he will be convinced that the passage in question is no prophecy of the person called Jesus Christ. I pass on to the second passage quoted from the Old Testament by the New as a prophecy of Jesus Christ. Matthew ii. 1 :—

"Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the East to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea : for thus it is written by the prophet. And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, are not the least among the princes of Juda : for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel."

This passage is in Micah v. 2.

I pass over the absurdity of seeing and following a star in the daytime, as a man would with a *Will-with-the-whisp*, or a candle or lantern, at night ; and also that of seeing it in the east when they themselves came from the east ; for could such a thing be seen at all to

serve them for a guide, it must be in the west to them. I confine myself solely to the passage called a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

The book of Micah, in the passage above quoted (v. 2), is speaking of some person, without mentioning his name, from whom some great achievements were expected; but the description he gives of this person at the 5th verse proves evidently that it is not Jesus Christ, for he says at the 5th verse:—

“And *this man* shall be the peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our land; and when he shall tread in our palaces, then shall we raise against him (that is against the Assyrian) seven shepherds and eight principal men.”

Verse 6:—

“And they shall waste the land of Assyria with the sword, and the land of Nimrod in the entrances thereof; thus shall *he* (the person spoken of at the head of the second verse) deliver us from the Assyrian when he cometh into our land, and when he treadeth within our borders.”

This is so evidently descriptive of a military chief that it cannot be applied to Christ without outraging the character they pretend to give us of him. Besides which, the circumstances of the times here spoken of, and those of the times in which Christ is said to have lived, are in contradiction to each other. It was the Romans, and not the Assyrians that had conquered, and *were in the land* of Judea, and *trod in their palaces* when Christ was born, and when he died; and so far from his driving them out, it was they who signed the warrant for his execution, and he suffered under it.

Having thus shown that this is no prophecy of Jesus Christ, I pass on to the third passage quoted from the Old Testament by the New as a prophecy of him.

This, like the first I have spoken of, is introduced by a dream. Joseph dreameth another dream, and dreameth that he sees another angel. The account begins at Matthew ii. 13:—

“The angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and

flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word : for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt : and was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son."

This passage is in the book of Hosea (xi. 1). The words are : "When Israel was a child then I loved him, and *called my son out of Egypt*. As they called them, so they went from them : they sacrificed unto Baalim, and burnt incense to graven images."

This passage, falsely called a prophecy of Christ, refers to the children of Israel coming out of Egypt in the time of Pharaoh, and to the idolatry they committed afterwards. To make it apply to Jesus Christ he, then, must be the person who sacrificed unto Baalim and burnt incense to graven images ; for the persons called out of Egypt by the collective name Israel, and the persons committing this idolatry, are **the** same persons, or the descendants of them. This, then, can be no prophecy of Jesus Christ unless they are willing to make an idolater of him. I pass on to the fourth passage called a prophecy by the writer of the book of Matthew.

This is introduced by a story told by no one but himself, and scarcely believed by anybody, of the slaughter of all the children under two years old, by the command of Herod ; a thing which it is not probable could be done by Herod, as he only held an office under the Roman government, to which appeals could always be had, as we see in the case of Paul.

Matthew, however, having made or told this story, says, c. ii., v. 17 : "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, *In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and would not be comforted because they are not.*"

This passage is in Jeremiah xxxi. 15 ; and this verse, when separated from the verses before and after it, and which explains its application, might with equal propriety be applied to every case of wars, sieges, and

other violences, such as the Christians themselves have often done to the Jews, where mothers have lamented the loss of their children. There is nothing in the verse taken singly that designates or points out any particular application of it, otherwise than it points to some circumstance which, at the time of writing it, had already happened, and not to a thing yet to happen, for the verse is in the preter or past tense. I go to explain the case, and show the application of the verse.

Jeremiah lived in the time that Nebuchadnezzar besieged, took, plundered and destroyed Jerusalem, and led the Jews captive to Babylon. He carried his violence against the Jews to every extreme. He slew the sons of King Zedekiah before his face; he then put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and kept him in prison till the day of his death.

It is of this time of sorrow and suffering to the Jews that Jeremiah is speaking. Their temple was destroyed, their land desolated, their nation and government entirely broken up, and themselves, men, women, and children, carried into captivity. They had too many sorrows of their own immediately before their eyes to permit them, or any of their chiefs, to be employing themselves on things that might, or might not, happen in the world several hundred years afterwards.

It is, as already observed, of this time of sorrow and suffering to the Jews that Jeremiah is speaking in the verse in question. In the next two verses, the 16th and 17th, he endeavours to console the sufferers by giving them hopes, and, according to the fashion of speaking in those days, assurances from the Lord that their sufferings shall have an end, and that their children shall return again to their own land. But I leave the verses to speak for themselves, and the Old Testament to testify against the New.

Jeremiah xxxi. 15 :—"Thus saith the Lord, a voice was heard in Ramah [it is in the preter tense], lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not."

Verse 16 :—" Thus saith the Lord, Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears; for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy."

Verse 17 :—" And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border."

By what strange ignorance or imposition is it that the children of which Jeremiah speaks (meaning the people of the Jewish nation, scripturally called children of Israel, and not mere infants under two years old), and who were to return again from the land of the enemy, and come again into their own borders, can mean the children that Matthew makes Herod to slaughter? Could those return again from the land of the enemy, or how can the land of the enemy be applied to them? Could they come again to their own borders? Good heavens! how has the world been imposed upon by the Testament-makers, priestcraft, and pretended prophecies! I pass on to the fifth passage, called a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

This, like two of the former, is introduced by a dream. Joseph dreameth another dream, and dreameth of another angel. And Matthew is again the historian of the dream and the dreamer. If it were asked how Matthew could know what Joseph dreamed, neither the Bishop nor all the Church could answer the question. Perhaps it was Matthew that dreamed, and not Joseph; that is, Joseph dreamed by proxy, in Matthew's brain, as they tell us Daniel dreamed for Nebuchadnezzar. But be this as it may, I go on with my subject.

The account of this dream is in Matthew ii. 19 to 23 :—

" But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream, to Joseph in Egypt, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: for they are dead which sought the young child's life. And he arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judea in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither: notwithstanding, being warned of God in

a dream [here is another dream], he turned aside into the parts of Galilee : and he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth : that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene."

Here is good circumstantial evidence that Matthew dreamed, for there is no such passage in the Old Testament; and I invite the Bishops and all the priests in Christendom, including those of America, to produce it. I pass on to the sixth passage, called a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

This, as Swift says on another occasion, is *lugged in head and shoulders*; it needs only to be seen in order to be hooted as a forced and far-fetched piece of imposition.

Matthew iv. 12 :—

"Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee : And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea-coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim : that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias [Isaiah] the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, *by the way* of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up."

I wonder Matthew has not made the cris-cross-row, or the christ-cross-now (I know not how the priests spell it), into a prophecy. He might as well have done this as cut out these unconnected and undescriptive sentences from the place they stand in, and dubbed them with that title.

The words, however, are in Isaiah ix. 1 and 2, as follows :—

"Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali, and afterwards did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations."

All this relates to two circumstances that had already happened at the time these words in Isaiah were written. The one, where the land of Zebulon and Naphtali had

been lightly afflicted, and afterwards more grievously, by the way of the sea.

But observe, reader, how Matthew has falsified the text. He begins his quotation at a part of the verse where there is not so much as a comma, and thereby cuts off everything that relates to the first affliction. He then leaves out all that relates to the second affliction, and by this means leaves out everything that makes the verse intelligible, and reduces it to a senseless skeleton of names and towns.

To bring this imposition of Matthew clearly and immediately before the eye of the reader, I will repeat the verse, and put between brackets [] the words he has left out, and put in *italics* those he has preserved.

[Nevertheless, the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation when at first he lightly afflicted] *the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali* [and afterwards did more grievously afflict her] *by the way of the sea beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations.*

What gross imposition is it to gut, as the phrase is, a verse in this manner, render it perfectly senseless, and then puff it off on a credulous world as a prophecy ! I proceed to the next verse.

Verse 2 : " The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light ; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

All this is historical, and not in the least prophetical. The whole is in the preter tense ; it speaks of things that *had been accomplished* at the time the words were written, and not of things to be accomplished afterwards.

As, then, the passage is in no possible sense prophetical, or intended to be so—and to attempt to make it so is not only to falsify the original, but to commit a criminal imposition—it is a matter of no concern to us, otherwise than as curiosity, to know who the people were of which the passage speaks, that sat in darkness, and what the light was that had shined in upon them.

If we look into the preceding chapter, the 8th, of which the 9th is only a continuation, we shall find the writer speaking, at the 19th verse, of *witches and wizards*

who peep about and mutter, and of people who make application to them: and he preaches and exhorts them against this darksome practice. It is of this people, and of this darksome practice, or *walking in darkness*, that he is speaking at the second verse of the 9th chapter; and with respect to *the light that had shined in upon them*, it refers entirely to his own ministry, and to the boldness of it, which opposed itself to that of the witches and wizards who peeped about and muttered.

Isaiah is, upon the whole, a wild, disorderly writer, preserving in general no clear chain of perception in the arrangement of his ideas, and consequently producing no defined conclusion from them. It is the wildness of his style, the confusion of his ideas, and the ranting metaphors he employs, that have afforded so many opportunities to priestcraft in some cases, and to superstition in others, to impose these defects upon the world as prophecies of Jesus Christ. Finding no direct meaning in them, and not knowing what to make of them, and supposing at the same time they were intended to have a meaning, they supplied the defect by inventing a meaning of their own, and called it his. I have, however, in this place done Isaiah the justice to rescue him from the claws of Matthew, who has torn him unmercifully to pieces, and from the imposition or ignorance of priests and commentators, by letting Isaiah speak for himself.

If the words *walking in darkness* and *light breaking in* could in any case be applied prophetically, which they cannot be, they would better apply to the times we now live in than to any other. The world has *walked in darkness* for eighteen hundred years, both as to religion and government, and it is only since the American revolution began that light has broken in. The belief of *one* God, whose attributes are revealed to us in the book or scripture of the creation, which no human hand can counterfeit or falsify, and not in the written or printed book which, as Matthew has shown, can be altered or falsified by ignorance or design, is now making its way among us: and as to government, *the light is*

already gone forth ; and whilst men ought to be careful not to be blinded by the excess of it, as at a certain time in France, when everything was Robespierrean violence, they ought to reverence, and even to adore it, with all the firmness and perseverance that true wisdom can inspire.

I pass on to the seventh passage, called a prophecy of Jesus Christ. Matthew viii. 16 :—

“ When the even was come, they brought unto him (Jesus) many that were possessed of devils; and he cast out the spirits with *his* word and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias (Isaiah) the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bear our sicknesses.”

This affair of people being possessed with devils, and of casting them out, was the fable of the day when the books of the New Testament were written. It had no existence at any other time. The books of the Old Testament mention no such thing; the people of the present day know of no such thing; nor does the history of any people or country speak of such a thing. It starts upon us all at once in the book of Matthew, and is altogether an invention of the New Testament makers and the Christian Church. The book of Matthew is the first book where the word *devil* is mentioned as being in the singular number.¹ We read in some of the books of the Old Testament of things called familiar spirits, the supposed companions of people called witches and wizards. It was no other than the trick of pretended conjurers to obtain money from credulous and ignorant people, or the fabricated charge of superstitious malignancy against unfortunate and decrepid old age.

But the idea of a familiar spirit, if we can affix any idea to the term, is exceedingly different to that of being possessed by a devil. In the one case the supposed familiar spirit is a dexterous agent, that comes and goes, and does as he is bidden; in the other, he is a turbulent roaring monster, that tears and tortures the body into convulsions. Reader, whoever thou art, put thy trust

¹ The word “ Devil ” is a personification of the word “ evil.”

in thy Creator, make use of the reason he endowed thee with, and cast from thee all such fables.

The passage alluded to by Matthew, for as a quotation it is false, is Isaiah liii. 4, which is as follows: "Surely he (the person of whom Isaiah is speaking) hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." It is in the preter tense.

Here is nothing about casting out devils, nor curing of sicknesses. The passage, therefore, so far from being a prophecy of Christ, is not even applicable as a circumstance.

Isaiah, or at least the writer of the book that bears his name, employs the whole of this chapter, the 53rd, in lamenting the sufferings of some deceased person, of whom he speaks very pathetically. It is a monody on the death of a friend; but he mentions not the name of the person, nor gives any circumstance of him by which he can be personally known; and it is this silence, which is evidence of nothing, that Matthew has laid hold of to put the name of Christ to it; as if the chiefs of the Jews, whose sorrows were then great, and the times they lived in big with danger, were never thinking about their own affairs, nor the fate of their own friends, but were continually running a wild-goose chase into futurity.

To make a monody into a prophecy is an absurdity. The characters and circumstances of men, even in different ages of the world, are so much alike, that what is said of one may with propriety be said of many; but this fitness does not make the passage into a prophecy, and none but an impostor or a bigot would call it so.

Isaiah, in deploring the hard fate and loss of his friend, mentions nothing of him but what the human lot of man is subjected to. All the cases he states of him—his persecutions, his imprisonment, his patience in suffering, and his perseverance in principle, are all within the line of nature; they belong exclusively to none, and may with justness be said of many. But if Jesus Christ was the person the Church represents him to be, that which would exclusively apply to him must be something that could not apply to any other person—

something beyond the lot of mortal man; and there are no such expressions in this chapter, nor any other chapter in the Old Testament.

It is no exclusive description to say of a person, as is said of the person Isaiah is lamenting in this chapter: "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth."

This may be said of thousands of persons who have suffered oppressions and unjust death with patience, silence, and perfect resignation.

Grotius, whom the bishop esteems a most learned man, and who certainly was so, supposes that the person of whom Isaiah is speaking is Jeremiah. Grotius is led into this opinion from the agreement there is between the description given by Isaiah and the case of Jeremiah as stated in the book that bears his name. If Jeremiah was an innocent man, and not a traitor in the interest of Nebuchadnezzar, when Jerusalem was besieged, his case was hard; he was accused by his countrymen, was persecuted, oppressed, and imprisoned, and he says of himself (see Jeremiah xi. 19): "But as for me, I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to the slaughter."

I should be inclined to the same opinion with Grotius, had Isaiah lived at the time when Jeremiah underwent the cruelties of which he speaks; but Isaiah died about fifty years before; and it is of a person of his own time whose case Isaiah is lamenting in the chapter in question, and which imposition and bigotry, more than seven hundred years afterwards, perverted into a prophecy of a person they call Jesus Christ.

I pass on to the eighth passage called a prophecy of Jesus Christ. Matthew xii. 14:—

"Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him. But when Jesus knew it, he withdrew himself from thence; and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; and charged them that they should not make him known. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias (Isaiah), the prophet, saying,

"Behold my servant whom I have chosen; my beloved, in

whom my soul is well pleased; I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust."

In the first place, this passage hath not the least relation to the purpose for which it is quoted.

Matthew says that the Pharisees held a council against Jesus to destroy him—that Jesus withdrew himself—that great numbers followed him—that he healed them—and that he charged them they should not make him known.

But the passage Matthew has quoted as being fulfilled by these circumstances, does not so much as apply to any one of them. It has nothing to do with the Pharisees holding a council to destroy Jesus—with his withdrawing himself—with great numbers following him—with his healing them—nor with his charging them not to make him known.

The purpose for which the passage is quoted, and the passage itself, are as remote from each other as nothing from something. But the case is, that people have been so long in the habit of reading the books called the Bible and Testament with their eyes shut and their sense locked up, that the most stupid inconsistencies have passed on them for truth, and imposition for prophecy. The all-wise Creator hath been dishonoured by being made the author of fable, and the human mind degraded by believing it.

In this passage, as in that last mentioned, the name of the person of whom the passage speaks is not given, and we are left in the dark respecting him. It is this defect in the history that bigotry and imposition have laid hold of to call it prophecy.

Had Isaiah lived in the time of Cyrus, the passage would descriptively apply to him. As king of Persia, his authority was great among the Gentiles, and it is of such a character the passage speaks; and his friendship to the Jews, whom he liberated from captivity, and who might then be compared to a *bruised reed*, was extensive. But

this description does not apply to Jesus Christ, who had no authority among the Gentiles; and as to his own countrymen, figuratively described by the bruised reed, it was they who crucified him. Neither can it be said of him that he did not cry, and that his voice was not heard in the street. As a preacher it was his business to be heard, and we are told that he travelled about the country for that purpose. Matthew has given a long sermon, which (if his authority is good, but which is much to be doubted, since he imposes so much) Jesus preached to a multitude upon a mountain; and it would be a quibble to say that a mountain is not a street, since it is a place equally as public.

The last verse in the passage (the 4th) as it stands in Isaiah, and which Matthew has not quoted, says: "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law." This also applies to Cyrus. He was not discouraged, he did not fail, he conquered all Babylon, liberated the Jews, and established laws. But this cannot be said of Jesus Christ, who, in the passage before us, according to Matthew, withdrew himself for fear of the Pharisees, and charged the people that followed him not to make it known where he was, and who, according to other parts of the Testament, was continually moving about from place to place to avoid being apprehended.¹

¹ In the second part of *The Age of Reason* I have shown that the book ascribed to Isaiah is not only miscellaneous as to matter, but as to authorship; that there are parts in it which could not have been written by Isaiah, because they speak of things one hundred and fifty years after he was dead. The instance I have given of this in that work corresponds with the subject I am upon, at least a little better than Matthew's introduction and his quotation.

Isaiah lived the latter part of his life in the time of Hezekiah, and it was about one hundred and fifty years from the death of Hezekiah to the first year of the reign of Cyrus, when Cyrus published a proclamation, which is given in the first chapter of the book of Ezra, for the return of the Jews to Jerusalem. It cannot be doubted, at least it ought not to be doubted, that the Jews would feel an affectionate gratitude for this act of benevolent justice; and it is natural that they would express that gratitude in the customary style, bombastical and hyper-

But it is immaterial to us, at this distance of time, to know who the person was; it is sufficient to the purpose I am upon—that of detecting fraud and falsehood—to know who it was not, and to show it was not the person called Jesus Christ.

I pass on to the ninth passage called a prophecy of Jesus Christ. Matthew xxi. 1 :—

“ And when they drew nigh into Jerusalem, and were come to Bethphage, unto the Mount of Olives, then sent Jesus two disciples, saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her; loose them and bring them unto me. And if any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, the Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them.

“ All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.”

bolical as it was, which they used on extraordinary occasions, and which was and still is in practice with all the Eastern nations.

The instance to which I refer, and which is given in the second part of *The Age of Reason*, is the last verse of the 44th chapter, and the beginning of the 45th, in these words : “ That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure : even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the Temple, Thy foundation shall be laid. Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him ; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut.”

This complimentary address is in the present tense, which shows that the things of which Isaiah speaks were in existence at the time of writing it ; and, consequently, that the author must have been at least one hundred and fifty years later than Isaiah, and that the book which bears his name is a compilation. The Proverbs called Solomon’s and the Psalms called David’s are of the same kind. The last two verses of the second book of Chronicles and the first three verses of the chapter of Ezra are word for word the same ; which show that the compilers of the Bible mixed the writings of different authors together, and put them under some common head.

As we have here an instance in the 44th and 45th chapters of the introduction of the name of Cyrus into a book to which it cannot belong, it affords good ground to conclude that the passage in the 42nd chapter, in which the character of Cyrus is given without his name, has been introduced in like manner, and that the person there spoken of is Cyrus.

Poor ass ! let it be some consolation, amidst all thy sufferings, that if the heathen world erected a bear into a constellation, the Christian world has elevated thee into a prophecy.

This passage is in Zechariah ix. 9, and is one of the whims of friend Zechariah to congratulate his countrymen, who were returning from captivity in Babylon, and himself with them, to Jerusalem. It has no concern with any other subject. It is strange that apostles, priests, and commentators never permit, or never suppose the Jews to be speaking of their own affairs. Everything in the Jewish book is perverted and distorted into meanings never intended by the writers. Even the poor ass must not be a Jew-ass, but a Christian-ass. I wonder they did not make an apostle of him, or a bishop, or at least make him speak and prophesy. He could have lifted up his voice as loud as any of them.

Zechariah, in the first chapter of his book, indulges himself in several whims on the joy of getting back to Jerusalem. He says, at the 8th verse :—

"I saw by night [Zechariah was a sharp-sighted seer], and behold a man riding on a *red horse* [yes, reader, a *red horse*], and he stood among the myrtle trees that were in the bottom; and behind him *were red horses, speckled, and white.*"

He says nothing about green horses, nor blue horses, perhaps because it is difficult to distinguish green from blue by night, but a Christian can have no doubt they were there, because "*faith is the evidence of things not seen.*"

Zechariah then introduces an angel among his horses, but he does not tell us what colour the angel was of, whether black or white; whether he came to buy horses, or only to look at them as curiosities, for certainly they were of that kind. Be this, however, as it may, he enters into conversation with an angel, on the joyful affair of getting back to Jerusalem, and he saith at the 16th verse :—

"Therefore, thus saith the Lord: I AM RETURNED to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of Hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem."

An expression signifying the rebuilding of the city.

All this, whimsical and imaginary as it is, sufficiently proves that it was the entry of the Jews into Jerusalem from captivity, and not the entry of Jesus Christ seven hundred years afterwards, that is the subject upon which Zechariah is always speaking.

As to the expression of riding upon an ass, which commentators represent as a sign of humility in Jesus Christ, the case is he never was so well mounted before. The asses of those countries are large and well-proportioned, and were anciently the chief of riding animals. Their beasts of burden, and which served also for the conveyance of the poor, were camels and dromedaries. We read in Judges x. 4 that Jair (one of the Judges of Israel) "had thirty sons that rode on *thirty ass-colts*, and they had thirty cities." But commentators distort everything.

There is besides very reasonable grounds to conclude that this story of Jesus riding publicly into Jerusalem, accompanied, as it is said in Matthew xxi. 8, 9, by a great multitude, shouting and rejoicing, and spreading their garments by the way, is a story altogether destitute of truth.

In the last passage called a prophecy that I examined Jesus is represented as withdrawing—that is, running away and concealing himself for fear of being apprehended, and charging the people that were with him not to make him known. No new circumstances had arisen in the interim to change his condition for the better; yet here he is represented as making his public entry into the same city from which he fled for safety. The two cases contradict each other so much that, if both are not false, one of them at least can scarcely be true. For my own part, I do not believe there is one word of historical truth in the whole book. I look upon it at best to be a romance, the principal personage of which is an imaginary or allegorical character, founded upon some tale, and in which the moral is in many parts good, and the narrative part very badly and blunderingly written.

I pass on to the tenth passage called a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

Matthew xxvi. 51 :—

“ And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus [meaning Peter] stretched out his hand and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place : for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be? In that same hour said Jesus to the multitudes, Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me. But all this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.”

This loose and general manner of speaking admits neither of detection nor of proof. Here is no quotation given, nor the name of any Bible author mentioned, to which reference can be had.

There are, however, some high improbabilities against the truth of the account.

First—It is not probable that the Jews, who were then a conquered people and under subjection to the Romans, should be permitted to wear swords.

Secondly—If Peter had attacked the servant of the high priest and cut off his ear, he would have been immediately taken up by the guard that took up his master, and sent to prison with him.

Thirdly—What sort of disciples and preaching apostles must those of Christ have been that wore swords?

Fourthly—The scene is represented to have taken place the same evening of what is called the Lord's Supper, which makes, according to the ceremony of it, the inconsistency of wearing swords the greater.

I pass on to the eleventh passage called a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

Matthew xxvii. 3 :—

“ Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have

sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? See thou to that. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple and departed, and went and hanged himself. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them in the treasury, because it is the price of blood. And they took counsel and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me."

This is a most barefaced piece of imposition. The passage in Jeremiah which speaks of the purchase of a field has no more to do with the case to which Matthew applies it than it has to do with the purchase of lands in America. I will recite the whole passage.

Jeremiah xxxii. 6 :—

" And Jeremiah said, The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Behold, Hanameel, the son of Shallum thine uncle, shall come unto thee, saying, Buy thee my field that is in Anathoth; for the right of redemption is thine to buy it. So Hanameel, mine uncle's son, came to me in the court of the prison, according to the word of the Lord, and said unto me, Buy my field I pray thee, that is in Anathoth which is in the country of Benjamin: for the right of inheritance is thine, and the redemption is thine: buy it for thyself. Then I knew that this was the word of the Lord. And I bought the field of Hanameel, mine uncle's son, that was in Anathoth, and weighed him the money, even seventeen shekels of silver. And I subscribed the evidence and sealed it, and took witnesses and weighed him the money in the balances. So I took the evidence of the purchase, both that which was sealed according to the law and custom, and that which was open. And I gave the evidence of the purchase unto Baruch the son of Neriah, the son of Maaseiah, in the sight of Hanameel mine uncle's son, and in the presence of the witnesses that subscribed the book of the purchase, before all the Jews that sat in the court of the prison. And I charged Baruch before them saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Take these evidences, this evidence of the purchase, both which is sealed, and this evidence which is open, and put them in an earthen vessel, that they may continue many days: for thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, houses and fields and vineyards shall be possessed again in this land."

I forbear making any remark on this abominable imposition of Matthew. The thing glaringly speaks for itself. It is priests and commentators that I rather ought to censure, for having preached falsehood so long, and kept people in darkness with respect to those impositions. I am not contending with these men upon points of doctrine, for I know that sophistry has always a city of refuge. I am speaking of facts; for wherever a thing called a fact is a falsehood, the faith founded upon it is delusion, and the doctrine raised upon it not true. Ah, reader, put thy trust in thy Creator, and thou wilt be safe; but if thou trustest to the book called the Scriptures, thou trustest to the rotten staff of fable and falsehood. But I return to my subject.

There is, among the whims and reveries of Zechariah, mention made of thirty pieces of silver given to a potter. They could hardly have been so stupid as to mistake a potter for a field; and if they had, the passage in Zechariah has no more to do with Jesus, Judas, and the field to bury strangers in, than that already quoted. I will recite the passage.

Zechariah xi. 7 :—

“And I will feed the flock of slaughter, even you, O poor of the flock. And I took unto me two staves; the one I called Beauty, and the other I called Bands; and I fed the flock. Three shepherds also I cut off in one month; and my soul loathed them, and their soul also abhorred me. Then said I, I will not feed you: that that dieth let it die; and that that is to be cut off, let it be cut off; and let the rest eat everyone the flesh of another. And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people. And it was broken in that day; and so the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of the Lord.

“And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it into the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.

“Then I cut asunder mine other staff, even Bands, that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel.”¹

¹ Whiston, in his Essay on the Old Testament, says that the passage of Zechariah, of which I have spoken, was, in the

There is no making either head or tail of this incoherent gibberish. His two staves, one called *Beauty* and the other *Bands*, is so much like a fairy tale that I doubt if it had any other origin. There is, however, no part that has the least relation to the case stated in Matthew; on the contrary, it is the reverse of it. Here the *thirty pieces* of silver, whatever it was for, is called a *goodly price*; it was as much as the thing was worth, and, according to the language of the day, was approved of by the Lord, and the money given to the potter in the house of the Lord. In the case of Jesus and Judas, as stated in Matthew, the thirty pieces of silver were the price of

copies of the Bible of the first century, in the book of Jeremiah, from whence, says he, it was taken and inserted, without coherence, in that of Zechariah. Well, let it be so; it does not make the case a whit the better for the New Testament; but it makes the case a great deal the worse for the Old. Because it shows, as I have mentioned respecting some passages in a book ascribed to Isaiah, that the works of different authors have been so mixed and confounded together, they cannot now be discriminated, except where they are historical, chronological, or biographical, as is the interpolation in Isaiah. It is the name of Cyrus, inserted where it could not be inserted, as he was not in existence till 150 years after the time of Isaiah, that detects the interpolation and the blunder with it.

Whiston was a man of great literary learning, and, what is of much higher degree, of deep scientific learning. He was one of the best and most celebrated mathematicians of his time, for which he was made professor of mathematics of the University of Cambridge. He wrote so much in defence of the Old Testament, and of what he calls prophecies of Jesus Christ, that at last he began to suspect the truth of the Scriptures and wrote against them; for it is only those who examine them that see the imposition. Those who believe them most are those who know least about them.

Whiston, after writing so much in defence of the Scriptures, was at last prosecuted for writing against them. It was this that gave occasion to Swift, in his ludicrous epigram on Ditton and Whiston, each of which set up to find out the longitude, to call one *good master Ditton*, and the other *wicked Will Whiston*. But as Swift was a great associate with the Freethinkers of those days, such as Bolingbroke, Pope, and others, who did not believe the books called the Scriptures, there is no certainty whether he wittily called him wicked for defending the Scriptures, or for writing against them. The known character of Swift decides for the former.

blood; the transaction was condemned by the Lord, and the money, when refunded, was refused admittance into the treasury. Everything in the two cases is the reverse of each other.

Besides this, a very different and direct contrary account to that of Matthew is given of the affair of Judas, in the book called the *Acts of the Apostles*. According to that book the case is, that so far from Judas repenting and returning the money, and the high priest buying a field with it to bury strangers in, Judas kept the money and bought a field with it for himself; and instead of hanging himself, as Matthew says, that he fell headlong and burst asunder.

Some commentators endeavour to get over one part of the contradiction by ridiculously supposing that Judas hanged himself first and the rope broke.

Acts i. 16: "Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was a guide to them that took Jesus" (David says not a word about Judas).

Verse 17:—"For he (Judas) was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry."

Verse 18:—"Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity, and falling headlong he burst asunder in the midst, and his bowels gushed out."

Is it not a species of blasphemy to call the New Testament *revealed religion*, when we see in it such contradictions and absurdities?

I pass on to the twelfth passage called a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

Matthew xxvii. 35:—"And they crucified him and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet. They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." This expression is in the 22nd Psalm, v. 18. The writer of that Psalm (whoever he was, for the Psalms are a collection, and not the work of one man) is speaking of himself and of his own case, and not that of another. He begins this Psalm with the words which

the New Testament writers ascribed to Jesus Christ—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—words which might be uttered by a complaining man without any great impropriety, but which come very improperly from the mouth of a reputed God.

The picture which the writer draws of his own situation in this Psalm is gloomy enough. He is not prophesying, but complaining of his own hard case. He represents himself as surrounded by enemies and beset by persecutions of every kind; and by way of showing the inveteracy of his persecutors, he says, at the 18th verse: "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture."

The expression is in the present tense; and is the same as to say, They pursue me to the clothes upon my back, and dispute how they shall divide them. Besides, the word *vesture* does not always mean clothing of any kind, but *property*, or rather the admitting of a man to or *investing* him with property; and as it is used in this Psalm distinct from the word garment, it appears to be used in this sense. But Jesus had no property; for they make him say of himself:—"The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head."

But be this as it may, if we permit ourselves to suppose the Almighty would condescend to tell by what is called the spirit of prophecy, what would come to pass in some future age of the world, it is an injury to our own faculties and to our ideas of his greatness to imagine it would be about an old coat, or an old pair of breeches, or about anything which the common accidents of life, or the quarrels that attend it, exhibit every day.

That which is within the power of man to do, or in his will not to do, is not a subject of prophecy, even if there were such a thing, because it cannot carry with it any evidence of divine power or divine interposition. The ways of God are not the ways of men. That which an Almighty power performs or wills is not within the circle of human power to do or to control. But any executioner and his assistants might quarrel about

dividing the garments of a sufferer, or divide them without quarrelling, and by that means fulfil the thing called a prophecy, or set it aside.

In the passages before examined I have exposed the falsehood of them. In this I exhibit its degrading meanness as an insult to the Creator and an injury to human reason.

Here end the passages called prophecies by Matthew.

Matthew concludes his book by saying that when Christ expired on the cross, the rocks rent, the graves opened, and the bodies of many of the saints arose; and Mark says, there was darkness over the land from the sixth hour until the ninth. They produce no prophecy for this; but had these things been facts, they would have been a proper subject for prophecy, because none but an Almighty power could have inspired a foreknowledge of them, and afterwards fulfilled them. Since then there is no such prophecy, but a pretended prophecy of an old coat, the proper deduction is there were no such things, and that the book of Matthew is fable and falsehood.

I pass on to the book called the Gospel according to St. Mark.

THE BOOK OF MARK

There are but few passages in Mark called prophecies, and but few in Luke and John. Such as there are I shall examine, and also such other passages as interfere with those cited by Matthew.

Mark begins his book by a passage which he puts into the shape of a prophecy, Mark i. 1 :—

“The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as it is written in the prophets, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee” (Malachi iii. 1).

The passage in the original is in the first person. Mark makes this passage to be a prophecy of John the Baptist, said by the Church to be a forerunner of Jesus Christ. But if we attend to the verses that follow this expression, as it stands in Malachi, and to the first and fifth verses of the next chapter, we shall see that this application of it is erroneous and false.

Malachi having said at the first verse, “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me,” says at the second verse, “But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth; for he is like a refiner’s fire and like fullers’ soap.”

This description can have no reference to the birth of Jesus Christ and consequently none to John the Baptist. It is a scene of fear and terror that is here described, and the birth of Christ is always spoken of as a time of joy and glad tidings.

Malachi, continuing to speak on the same subject, explains in the next chapter what the scene is of which he speaks in the verses above quoted, and who the person is whom he calls the messenger.

“Behold,” says he, c. iv., v. 1 :—

"The day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

Verse 5 :—"Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord."

By what right, or by what imposition or ignorance, Mark has made Elijah into John the Baptist and Malachi's description of the day of judgment into the birthday of Christ, I leave the bishop to settle.

Mark, in the second and third verses of his first chapter, confounds two passages together, taken from different books of the Old Testament. The second verse, "Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee," is taken, as I have said before, from Malachi. The third verse, which says, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his path straight," is not in Malachi, but in Isaiah xl. 3. Whiston says that both these verses were originally in Isaiah. If so, it is another instance of the disordered state of the Bible, and corroborates what I have said with respect to the name and description of Cyrus being in the book of Isaiah, to which it cannot chronologically belong.

The words in Isaiah xl. 3, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his path straight," are in the present tense, and consequently not predictive. It is one of those rhetorical figures which the Old Testament authors frequently used. That it is merely rhetorical and metaphorical may be seen at the 6th verse: "And the voice said, Cry; and he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass." This is evidently nothing but a figure; for flesh is not grass, otherwise than as a figure; or metaphor where one thing is put for another. Besides which, the whole passage is too general and declamatory to be applied exclusively to any particular person or purpose.

I pass on to the eleventh chapter.

In this chapter Mark speaks of Christ riding into Jerusalem upon a colt, but he does not make it the accomplishment of a prophecy, as Matthew has done; for he says nothing about a prophecy. Instead of which, he goes on the other tack, and, in order to add new honours to the ass, he makes it to be a miracle; for he says, v. 2, it was *a colt whereon never man sat*; signifying thereby, that as the ass had not been broken, he consequently was inspired *into good manners*, for we do not hear that he kicked Jesus Christ off. There is not a word about his kicking in all the four Evangelists.

I pass on from these feats of *horsemanship*, performed upon a jackass, to the 15th chapter.

At the 24th verse of this chapter, Mark speaks of *parting Christ's garments and casting lots upon them*, but he applies no prophecy to it as Matthew does. He rather speaks of it as a thing then in practice with executioners, as it is at this day.

At the 28th verse of the same chapter, Mark speaks of Christ being crucified between two thieves; that, says he, *The Scriptures might be fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors*. The same thing might be said of the thieves. The expression is in Isaiah liii. 12. Grotius applies it to Jeremiah. But the case has happened so often in the world, where innocent men have been numbered with transgressors, and is still continually happening, that it is absurdity to call it a prophecy of any particular person. All those whom the Church calls martyrs were numbered with transgressors. All the honest patriots who fell upon the scaffold in France, in the time of Robespierre, were numbered with transgressors; and if he himself had not fallen, the same case, according to a note in his own handwriting, had befallen me; yet I suppose the bishop will not allow that Isaiah was prophesying of Thomas Paine.

These are all the passages in Mark which have any reference to prophecies.

Mark concludes his book by making Jesus to say to his disciples (c. xvi., vv. 15-18):—

"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned [fine Popish stuff this]. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

Now the bishop, in order to know if he has all this saving and wonder-working faith, should try those things upon himself. He should take a good dose of arsenic, and, if he please, I will send him a rattle-snake from America! As for myself, as I believe in God, and not at all in Jesus Christ, nor in the books called the Scriptures, the experiment does not concern me.

I pass on to the book of Luke.

THE BOOK OF LUKE

There are no passages in Luke called prophecies, excepting those which relate to the passages I have already examined.

Luke speaks of Mary being espoused to Joseph, but he makes no reference to the passages in Isaiah, as Matthew does. He also speaks of Jesus riding into Jerusalem upon a colt, but he says nothing about a prophecy. He speaks of John the Baptist, and refers to the passage in Isaiah of which I have already spoken.

At the 13th chapter, v. 31, he says:—

"The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him (Jesus), Get thee out, and depart hence, for Herod will kill thee. And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, behold I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected."

Matthew makes Herod to die whilst Christ was a child in Egypt, and makes Joseph to return with the child on the news of Herod's death, who had sought to kill him. Luke makes Herod to be living, and to seek the life of Jesus after Jesus was thirty years of age; for he says, c. iii., v. 23: "And Jesus himself began to be

about thirty years of age, being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph." The obscurity in which the historical part of the New Testament is involved with respect to Herod may afford to priests and commentators a plea, which to some may appear plausible, but to none satisfactory, that the Herod of which Matthew speaks, and the Herod of which Luke speaks, were different persons. Matthew calls Herod a king; and Luke iii. 1 calls Herod tetrarch (this is, Governor) of Galilee. But there could be no such person as a *king Herod*, because the Jews and their country were then under the dominion of the Roman emperors, who governed them by tetrarchs or governors.

Luke ii. makes Jesus to be born when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, to which government Judea was annexed; and, according to this, Jesus was not born in the time of Herod. Luke says nothing about Herod seeking the life of Jesus when he was born, nor of his destroying the children under two years old, nor of Joseph fleeing with Jesus into Egypt, nor of his returning from thence. On the contrary, the book of Luke speaks as if the person it calls Christ had never been out of Judea, and that Herod sought his life after he commenced preaching, as is before stated. I have already shown that Luke, in the book called the Acts of the Apostles (which commentators ascribe to Luke), contradicts the account in Matthew with respect to Judas and the thirty pieces of silver. Matthew says that Judas returned the money, and that the high priests bought with it a field to bury strangers in. Luke says that Judas kept the money, and bought a field with it for himself.

As it is impossible the wisdom of God should err, so it is impossible those books could have been written by divine inspiration. Our belief in God and his unerring wisdom forbids us to believe it. As for myself, I feel religiously happy in the total disbelief of it.

There are no other passages called prophecies in Luke than those I have spoken of. I pass on to the book of John.

THE BOOK OF JOHN

John, like Mark and Luke, is not much of a prophecy-monger. He speaks of the ass, and the casting lots for Jesus' clothes, and some other trifles of which I have already spoken.

John makes Jesus to say, chapter v., v. 46: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me." The book of the Acts, in speaking of Jesus, says, chapter iii., v. 22: "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you."

This passage is in Deuteronomy xviii. 15. They apply it as a prophecy of Jesus. What impositions! The person spoken of in Deuteronomy and also in Numbers, where the same person is spoken of, is *Joshua*, the minister of Moses and his immediate successor and just such another Robespierrean character as Moses is represented to have been. The case as related in those books is as follows:—

Moses was grown old and near to his end; and in order to prevent confusion after his death (for the Israelites had no settled system of government), it was thought best to nominate a successor to Moses while he was yet living. This was done, as we are told, in the following manner:—

Numbers xxvii. 12:—

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Get thee up into this mount Abarim, and see the land which I have given unto the children of Israel. And when thou hast seen it, thou also shall be gathered unto thy people, as Aaron thy brother was gathered."

Verse 15:—

"And Moses spake unto the Lord, saying, Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, and which may go in before them, and which may lead them out, and which may bring

them in : that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd. And the Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him ; and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation ; and give him a charge in their sight. And thou shalt put *some* of thine honour upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient."

Verse 22 :—

"And Moses did as the Lord commanded him ; and he took Joshua, and he set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation, and he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge, as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses."

I have nothing to do in this place with the truth or the conjuration here practised, of raising up a successor to Moses like unto himself. The passage sufficiently proves it is Joshua, and that it is an imposition in John to make the case into a prophecy of Jesus. But the prophecy-mongers were so inspired with falsehood that they never speak truth.¹

¹ Newton, Bishop of Bristol in England, published a work in three volumes entitled *Dissertations on the Prophecies*. The work is tediously written and tiresome to read. He strains hard to make every passage into a prophecy that suits his purpose. Among others he makes this expression of Moses, "The Lord shall raise thee up a prophet like unto me," into a prophecy of Christ, who was not born, according to the Bible chronologies, till fifteen hundred and fifty-two years after the time of Moses, whereas it was an immediate successor to Moses, who was then near his end, that is spoken of in the passage above quoted.

This bishop, the better to impose this passage on the world as a prophecy of Christ, has entirely omitted the account in the book of Numbers which I have given at length, word for word, and which shows, without the possibility of a doubt, that the person spoken of by Moses is Joshua and no other person.

Newton is but a superficial writer. He takes up things upon hearsay, and inserts them without examination or reflection, and the more extraordinary and incredible they are the better he likes them.

In speaking of the walls of Babylon (vol. the first, page 263), he makes a quotation from a traveller of the name of Tavernier, whom he calls (by way of giving credit to what he says) a celebrated traveller, that those walls were made of burnt brick, ten feet square and three feet thick. If Newton had only thought of calculating the weight of such a brick, he would

I pass on to the last passage in these fables of the Evangelists, called a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

have seen the impossibility of their being used or even made. A brick ten feet square and three feet thick contains 300 cubic feet; and allowing a cubic foot of brick to be only one hundred pounds, each of the bishop's bricks would weigh thirty thousand pounds; and it would take about thirty cart-loads of clay (one-horse carts) to make one brick.

But this account of the stones used in the building of Solomon's temple (vol. ii., p. 211) far exceeds his bricks of ten feet square in the walls of Babylon; these are but brick-bats compared with them.

The stones (says he) employed in the foundation were in magnitude forty cubits, that is above sixty feet, a cubit (says he) being somewhat more than one foot and a-half (a cubit is one foot nine inches), and the superstructure (says the bishop) was worthy of such foundations. There are some stones, says he, of the whitest marble, forty-five cubits long, five cubits high, and six cubits broad. These are the dimensions this bishop has given, which, in measure of twelve inches to a foot, is 78 feet 9 inches long, 10 feet 6 inches broad, and 8 feet 3 inches thick, and contains 7,234 cubic feet. I now go to demonstrate the imposition of this bishop.

A cubic foot of water weights sixty-two pounds and a half—the specific gravity of marble to water is as two and a-half to one. The weight, therefore, of a cubic foot of marble is 156 pounds, which, multiplied by 7,234, the number of cubic feet in one of those stones, makes the weight of it to be 1,128,504 pounds, which is 503 tons. Allowing them a horse to draw about half a ton, it will require a thousand horses to draw one such stone on the ground; how then were they to be lifted into the building by human hands?

The bishop may talk of faith removing mountains, but all the faith of all the bishops that ever lived could not remove one of those stones, and their bodily strength given in.

The bishop also tells of great guns used by the Turks at the taking of Constantinople, one of which he says was drawn by seventy yoke of oxen, and by two thousand men. Vol. iii., page 117.

The weight of a cannon that carries a ball of 48 pounds, which is the largest cannon that is cast, weighs 8,000 pounds, about three tons and a-half, and may be drawn by three yoke of oxen. Anybody may now calculate what the weight of the bishop's great gun must be, that required seventy yoke of oxen to draw it. The bishop beats Gulliver.

When men give up the use of the divine gift of reason in writing on any subject, be it religious or anything else, there are no bounds to their extravagance, no limit to their absurdities.

John having spoken of Jesus expiring on the cross between two thieves, says, c. xix., v. 32 :—

“Then came the soldiers and break the legs of the first (meaning one of the thieves) and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus and saw that he was dead already, they break not his legs, (verse 36) for these things were done that the scriptures should be fulfilled, *A bone of him shall not be broken.*”

The passage here referred to is in Exodus, and has no more to do with Jesus than the ass he rode upon to Jerusalem; nor yet so much, if a roasted jackass, like a roasted he-goat, might be eaten at a Jewish passover. It might be some consolation to an ass to know that, though his bones might be picked, they would not be broken. I go to state the case.

The book of Exodus, in instituting the Jewish passover, in which they were to eat a he-lamb or a he-goat, says (c. xii., v. 5) : “Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year; ye shall take it out from the sheep or from the goats.”

The book, after stating some ceremonies to be used in killing and dressing it (for it was to be roasted, not boiled), says v. 43 :—

“And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover: there shall no stranger eat thereof; but every man’s servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof; a foreigner and an hired servant shall not eat thereof. In one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt not carry forth aught of the flesh abroad out of the house, *neither shall ye break a bone thereof.*”

We here see that the case as it stands in Exodus is a ceremony and not a prophecy, and totally unconnected with Jesus’s bones, or any part of him.

John, having thus filled up the measure of the apostolic fable, concludes his book with something that beats all fable; for he says in the last verse: “And there are

The three volumes which this bishop has written on what he calls the prophecies, contain about 1,200 pages, and he says in vol. iii., page 117, “I have studied brevity.” This is as marvellous as the bishop’s great gun.

also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written, every one, *I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.*"

This is what in vulgar life is called a *thumper*—that is, not only a lie, but a lie beyond the line of possibility; besides which, it is an absurdity, for if they should be written in the world, the world would contain them. Here ends the examination of passages called prophecies.

I have now, reader, gone through and examined all the passages which the four books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John quote from the Old Testament, and call them prophecies of Jesus Christ. When I first sat down to this examination, I expected to find cause for some censure, but little did I expect to find them so utterly destitute of truth, and all pretensions to it, as I have shown them to be.

The practice which the writers of those books employ is not more false than it is absurd. They state some trifling case of the person they call Jesus Christ, and then cut out a sentence from some passage of the Old Testament, and call it a prophecy of that case. But when the words thus cut out are restored to the place they are taken from, and read with the words before and after them, they give the lie to the New Testament. A short instance or two of this will suffice to the whole.

They make Joseph to dream of an angel, who informs him that Herod is dead, and tells him to come with the child out of Egypt. They then cut out a sentence from the book of Hosea, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," and apply it as a prophecy in that case.

The words, "And called my Son out of Egypt," are in the Bible; but what of that? They are only part of a passage, and not a whole passage, and stand immediately connected with other words which show that they refer to the children of Israel coming out of Egypt in the time of Pharaoh, and to the idolatry they committed afterwards.

Again, they tell us that when the soldiers came to

break the legs of the crucified persons, they found that Jesus was already dead, and therefore did not break his. They then, with some alteration of the original, cut a sentence from Exodus, "A bone of him shall not be broken," and apply it as a prophecy of that case.

The words, "Neither shall ye break a bone thereof" (for they have altered the text), are in the Bible; but what of that? They are, as in the former case, only a part of a passage, and not a whole passage; and when read with the words they are immediately joined to, show it is the bones of a he-lamb or a he-goat of which the passage speaks.

These repeated forgeries and falsifications create a well-founded suspicion that all the cases spoken of concerning the person called Jesus Christ are *made cases*, on purpose to lug in, and that very clumsily, some broken sentences from the Old Testament, and apply them as prophecies of those cases; and that, so far from his being the Son of God, he did not exist even as a man—that he is merely an imaginary or allegorical character, as Apollo, Hercules, Jupiter, and all the deities of antiquity were. There is no history written at the time of Jesus Christ is said to have lived that speaks of the existence of such a person, even as a man.

Did we find in any other book pretending to give a system of religion, the falsehoods, falsifications, contradictions, and absurdities which are to be met with in almost every page of the Old and New Testament, all the priests of the present day who supposed themselves capable would triumphantly show their skill in criticisms and cry it down as a most glaring imposition. But since the books in question belong to their own trade and profession, they, or at least many of them, seek to stifle every inquiry into them, and abuse those who have the honesty and courage to do it.

When a book, as is the case with the Old and New Testament, is ushered into the world under the title of being the *Word of God*, it ought to be examined with the utmost strictness, in order to know if it has a well-founded claim to that title or not, and whether we are

or are not imposed upon ; for as no poison is so dangerous as that which poisons the physic, so no falsehood is so fatal as that which is made an article of faith.

This examination becomes more necessary, because when the New Testament was written—I might say invented—the art of printing was not known, and there were no other copies of the Old Testament than written copies. A written copy of that book would cost about as much as six hundred common printed Bibles now cost. Consequently the books were in the hands of but very few persons, and these chiefly of the Church. This gave an opportunity to the writers of the New Testament to make quotations from the Old Testament as they pleased, and call them prophecies, with very little danger of being detected. Besides which the terrors and inquisitorial fury of the Church, like what they tell us of the flaming sword that turned every way, stood sentry over the New Testament ; and time, which brings everything else to light, has served to thicken the darkness that guards it from detection.

Were the New Testament now to appear for the first time, every priest of the present day would examine it line for line, and compare the detached sentences it calls prophecies with the whole passages in the Old Testament, from whence they are taken. Why then do they not make the same examination at this time, as they would make had the New Testament never appeared before ? If it be proper and right to make it in one case, it is equally proper and right to do it in the other case. Length of time can make no difference in the right to do it at any time. But instead of doing this, they go on as their predecessors went on before them, to tell the people there are prophecies of Jesus Christ, when the truth is there are none.

They tell us that Jesus rose from the dead and ascended into heaven. It is very easy to say so ; a great lie is as easily told as a little one. But if he had done so, those would have been the only circumstances respecting him that would have differed from the common lot of man ; and, consequently, the only case that

would apply exclusively to him, as prophecy, would be some passage in the Old Testament that foretold such things of him. But there is not a passage in the Old Testament that speaks of a person who, after being crucified, dead, and buried, should rise from the dead and ascend into heaven. Our prophecy-mongers supply the silence the Old Testament guards upon such things, by telling us of passages they call prophecies, and that falsely so, about Joseph's dream, old clothes, broken bones, and such-like trifling stuff.

In writing upon this, as upon every other subject, I speak a language full and intelligible. I deal not in hints and intimations. I have several reasons for this. First, that I may be clearly understood. Secondly, that it may be seen I am in earnest; and, thirdly, because it is an affront to truth to treat falsehood with complaisance.

I will close this treatise with a subject I have already touched upon in the first part of *The Age of Reason*.

The world has been amused with the term *revealed religion*, and the generality of priests apply this term to the books called the Old and New Testament. The Mahometans apply the same term to the Koran. There is no man that believes in revealed religion stronger than I do; but it is not the reveries of the Old and New Testament, nor of the Koran, that I dignify with that sacred title. That which is revelation to me exists in something which no human mind can invent, no human hand can counterfeit or alter.

The *word of God* is the *Creation* we behold; and this word of God revealeth to man all that is necessary for him to know of his Creator.

Do we want to contemplate his power? we see it in the immensity of his creation.

Do we want to contemplate his wisdom? we see it in the unchangeable order by which the incomprehensible whole is governed.

Do we want to contemplate his munificence? we see it in the abundance with which he fills the earth.

Do we want to contemplate his mercy? we see it in his not withholding that abundance even from the unthankful.

Do we want to contemplate his will, so far as it respects man? the goodness he shows to all is a lesson for our conduct to each other.

In fine, Do we want to know what God is? Search not the book called the Scripture, which any human hand might make, or any impostor invent, but the SCRIPTURE CALLED THE CREATION.

When, in the first part of *The Age of Reason*, I called the Creation the true revelation of God to man, I did not know that any other person had expressed the same idea. But I lately met with the writings of Dr. Conyers Middleton, published the beginning of last century, in which he expresses himself in the same manner with respect to the Creation as I have done in *The Age of Reason*.

He was principal librarian of the University of Cambridge, in England, which furnished him with extensive opportunities of reading, and necessarily required he should be well acquainted with the dead as well as the living languages. He was a man of strong original mind, had the courage to think for himself, and the honesty to speak his thoughts.

He made a journey to Rome, from whence he wrote letters to show that the forms and ceremonies of the Romish Christian Church were taken from the degenerate state of the heathen mythology, as it stood in the latter times of the Greeks and Romans. He attacked without ceremony the miracles which the Church pretended to perform, and in one of his treatises he calls the *creation a revelation*. The priests of England of that day, in order to defend their citadel by first defending its outworks, attacked him for attacking the Romish ceremonies; and one of them censures him for calling *creation a revelation*. He thus replies to him :—

“One of them,” says he, “appears to be scandalized by the title of *revelation*, which I have given to that discovery which God made of himself in the visible works of his creation. Yet it is no other than what the wise in all ages have given to it, who consider it as the most authentic and disputable revelation which God has ever given of himself, from the beginning of the world to this day. It was this by which the first notice of him was revealed to the inhabitants of the earth, and by which alone

it has been kept up ever since among the several nations of it. From this the reason of man was enabled to trace out his nature and attributes, and, by a gradual deduction of consequences, to learn his own nature also, with all the duties belonging to it which relate either to God or to his fellow-creatures. This constitution of things was ordained by God as a universal law or rule of conduct to man, the source of all his knowledge, the test of all truth, by which all subsequent revelations which are *supposed* to have been given by God in any other manner must be tried, and cannot be received as divine any further than as they are found to tally and coincide with this original standard.

"It was this divine law which I referred to in the passage above recited [meaning the passage on which they had attacked him], being desirous to excite the reader's attention to it, as it would enable him to judge more freely of the argument I was handling. For by contemplating this law he would discover the genuine way which God himself has marked out to us for the acquisition of true knowledge—not from the authority or reports of our fellow-creatures, but from the information of the facts and material objects which, in his providential distribution of worldly things, he hath presented to the perpetual observation of our senses. For as it was from these that his existence and nature, the most important articles of all knowledge, were first discovered to man, so that grand discovery furnished new light towards tracing out the rest, and made all the inferior subjects of human knowledge more easily discoverable to us by the same method.

"I had another view likewise in the same passages, and applicable to the same end, of giving the reader a more enlarged notion on the question in dispute, who, by turning his thoughts to reflect on the works of the Creator as they are manifested to us in this fabric of the world, could not fail to observe that they are all of them great, noble, and suitable to the majesty of his nature, carrying with them the proofs of their origin, and showing themselves to be the production of an all-wise and almighty Being; and by accustoming his mind to these sublime reflections, he will be prepared to determine whether those miraculous interpositions so confidently affirmed to us by the primitive fathers can reasonably be thought to make a part in the grand scheme of the divine administration, or whether it be agreeable that God, who created all things by his will, and can give what turn to them he pleases by the same will, should, for the particular purposes of his government and the services of the Church, *descend to the low expedient of visions and revelations*, granted sometimes to boys for the instruction of the elders, and sometimes to women to settle the fashion and length of their veils, and sometimes to pastors of the Church to enjoin them to ordain one man a lecturer, another a priest; or that he should scatter a profusion of miracles around the stake of a martyr, yet all of them vain and insignificant, and without any sensible

effect, either of preserving the life or easing the sufferings of the saint; or even of mortifying his persecutors, who were always left to enjoy the full triumph of their cruelty; and the poor martyr to expire in a miserable death. When these things, I say, are brought to the original test, and compared with the genuine and indisputable works of the Creator, how minute, how trifling, how contemptible must they be! and how incredible must it be thought that, for the instruction of his Church, God should employ ministers so precarious and unsatisfactory and inadequate, as the ecstasies of women and boys, and the visions of interested priests, which were derided at the very time by men of sense to whom they were proposed!

"That this universal law (continues Middleton, meaning the law revealed in the works of the creation) was actually revealed to the heathen world long before the gospel was known, we learn from all the principal sages of antiquity, who made it the capital subject of their studies and writings.

"Cicero (says Middleton) has given us a short abstract of it in a fragment still remaining from one of his books on government, which (says Middleton) I shall here transcribe in his own words, as they will illustrate my sense also in the passages that appear so dark and dangerous to my antagonist.

"The true law (it is Cicero who speaks) is right reason conformable to the nature of things, constant, eternal, diffused through all, which calls us to duty by commanding, deters us from sin by forbidding; which never loses its influence with the good, nor ever preserves it with the wicked. This law cannot be over-ruled by any other, nor abrogated in whole or in part, nor can we be absolved from it either by the senate or by the people, nor are we to seek any other comment or interpreter of it but itself; nor can there be one law at Rome, and another at Athens, one now and another hereafter; but the same eternal immutable law comprehends all nations, at all times, under one common master and governor of all, *God*. He is the inventor, propounder, enactor of this law; and whoever will not obey it must first renounce himself and throw off the nature of man; by doing which he will suffer the greatest punishments, though he should escape all the other torments which are commonly believed to be prepared for the wicked.' Here ends the quotation from Cicero.

"Our doctors (continues Middleton) perhaps will look on this as *rank deism*; but, let them call it what they will, I shall ever avow and defend it as the fundamental, essential, and vital part of all true religion."

Here ends the quotation from Middleton.

I have here given the reader two sublime extracts from men who lived in ages of time far remote from each other, but who thought alike. Cicero lived before the

time in which they tell us Christ was born. Middleton may be called a man of our own time, as he lived within the same century with ourselves.

In Cicero we see that vast superiority of mind, that sublimity of right reasoning and justness of ideas which man acquires, not by studying bibles and testaments, and the theology of schools built thereon, but by studying the Creator in the immensity and unchangeable order of his creation, and the immutability of his law. "There cannot," says Cicero, "be one law now, and another hereafter, but the same eternal, immutable law comprehends all nations at all times, under one common master and governor of all—GOD." But, according to the doctrine of schools which priests have set up, we see one law, called the Old Testament, given in one age of the world, and another law, called the New Testament, given in another age of the world. As all this is contradictory to the eternal, immutable nature, and the unerring and unchangeable wisdom of God, we must be compelled to hold this doctrine to be false, and the old and the new law, called the Old and the New Testament, to be impositions, fables, and forgeries.

In Middleton we see the manly eloquence of an enlarged mind, and the genuine sentiments of a true believer in his Creator. Instead of reposing his faith on books by whatever name they may be called, whether Old Testament or New, he fixes the Creation as the great original standard by which every other thing called the word or work of God is to be tried. In this we have an indisputable scale whereby to measure every word or work imputed to him. If the thing so imputed carries not in itself the evidence of the same almightiness of power, of the same unerring truth and wisdom, and the same unchangeable order in all its parts, as are visibly demonstrated to our senses, and comprehensible by our reason, in the magnificent fabric of the universe, that word or that work is not of God. Let, then, the books called the Old and New Testament be tried by this rule, and the result will be that the authors of them, whoever they were, will be convicted of forgery.

The invariable principles and unchangeable order which regulate the movement of all the parts that compose the universe demonstrate, both to our senses and our reason, that its Creator is a God of unerring truth. But the Old Testament, besides the numberless absurd and bagatelle stories it tells of God, represents him as a God of deceit, a God not to be confided in. Ezekiel xiv. 9 makes God to say : " And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I, the Lord, have deceived that prophet." And he makes God (c. xx., v. 25), in speaking of the children of Israel, to say : " Wherefore I gave them statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." This, so far from being the word of God, is horrid blasphemy against Him. Reader, put thy confidence in thy God, and put no trust in the Bible.

The same Old Testament, after telling us that God created the heavens and the earth in six days, makes the same almighty power and eternal wisdom employ itself in giving directions how a priest's garments should be cut, and what sort of stuff they should be made of, and what their offerings should be—gold, and silver, and brass, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, and rams' skins dyed red, and badgers' skins, etc. (c. xxv., v. 3); and, in one of the pretended prophecies I have just examined, God is made to give directions how they should kill, cook, and eat a he-lamb or a he-goat. And Ezekiel iv., to fill up the measure of abominable absurdity, makes God to order him to take " wheat, barley, and beans, and lentils, and millet, and fitches, and put them in one vessel and make the bread thereof," and bake it with human dung and eat it; but as Ezekiel complained that this mess was too strong for his stomach, the matter was compromised from men's dung to cow dung (Ezekiel iv.). Compare all this ribaldry, blasphemy called the Word of God, with the Almighty power that created the universe, and whose eternal wisdom directs and governs all its mighty movements, and we shall be at a loss to find a name sufficiently contemptible for it.

In the promises which the Old Testament pretends that God made to his people, the same derogatory ideas of him prevail. It makes God promise to Abraham that his seed should be like the stars in heaven and the sand on the sea-shore for the multitude, and that he would give them the land of Canaan as their inheritance for ever. But observe, reader, how the performance of this promise was to begin, and then ask thine own reason if the wisdom of God—whose power is equal to his will—could consistently with that power and that wisdom make such a promise.

The performance of the promise was to begin, according to that book, by 400 years of bondage and affliction. Genesis xv. 13: "And God said unto Abraham, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in the land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall inflict them four hundred years."

This promise, then, to Abraham and his seed for ever to inherit the land of Canaan, had it been a fact instead of a fable, was to operate in the commencement of it as a curse upon all the people and their children, and their children's children for 400 years.

But the case is, the Book of Genesis was written after the bondage in Egypt had taken place; and, in order to get rid of the disgrace of the Lord's chosen people, as they call themselves, being in bondage to the Gentiles, they make God to be the author of it, and annex it as a condition to a pretended promise; as if God, in making that promise, had exceeded his power in performing it, and, consequently, his wisdom in making it, and was obliged to compromise, with them for one-half, and with the Egyptians, to whom they were to be in bondage, for the other half.

Without degrading my own reason by bringing those wretched and contemptible tales into a comparative view with the Almighty power and eternal wisdom which the Creator hath demonstrated to our senses in the creation of the universe, I will confine myself to say that, if we compare them with the divine and forcible sentiments of Cicero, the result will be that the human

mind had degenerated by believing them. Man, in a state of grovelling superstition, from which he has not the courage to rise, loses the energy of his mental power.

I will not tire the reader with more observations on the Old Testament.

As to the New Testament, if it be brought and tried by that standard which, as Middleton wisely says, God has revealed to our senses of his almighty power and wisdom in the creation and government of the visible universe, it will be found equally as false, paltry, and absurd as the Old.

Without entering, in this place, into any other argument, that the story of Christ is of human invention, and not of divine origin, I will confine myself to show that it is derogatory to God, by the contrivance of it; because the means it supposes God to use are not adequate to the almightiness of his power and the eternity of his wisdom.

The New Testament supposes that God sent his Son upon earth to make a new covenant with man, which the Church calls *the covenant of grace*, and to instruct mankind in a new doctrine, which it calls *faith*, meaning thereby, not faith in God, for Cicero and all true Deists always had and always will have this—but faith in the person called Jesus Christ, and that whoever had not this faith should, to use the words of the New Testament, be DAMNED.

Now, if this were a fact, it is consistent with that attribute of God called his *goodness* that no time should be lost in letting poor unfortunate man know it; and as that goodness was united to almighty power, and that power to almighty wisdom, all the means existed in the hand of the Creator to make it known immediately over the whole earth, in a manner suitable to the almightiness of his divine nature, and with evidence that would not leave man in doubt; for it is always incumbent upon us, in all cases, to believe that the Almighty always acts, not by imperfect means, as imperfect man acts, but consistently with his almightiness. It is this only that can become the infallible criterion by which we can

possibly distinguish the works of God from the works of man.

Observe now, reader, how the comparison between this supposed mission of Christ, on the belief or disbelief of which they say man was to be saved or damned—observe, I say, how the comparison between this and the Almighty power and the wisdom of God demonstrated to our senses in the visible creation goes on.

The Old Testament tells us that God created the heavens and the earth, and everything therein, in six days. The term *six days* is ridiculous enough when applied to God; but, leaving out that absurdity, it contains the idea of Almighty power acting unitedly with Almighty wisdom to produce an immense work, that of the creation of the universe, and everything therein, in a short time.

Now, as the eternal salvation of man is of much greater importance than his creation, and as that salvation depends, as the New Testament tells us, on man's knowledge of and belief in the person called Jesus Christ, it necessarily follows from our belief in the goodness and justice of God, and our knowledge of his Almighty power and wisdom, as demonstrated in the creation, that *all this*, if true, would be made known to all parts of the world in as little time, at least, as was employed in making the world. To suppose the Almighty would pay greater regard and attention to the creation and organisation of inanimate matter than he would to the salvation of innumerable millions of souls, which himself had created "*as the image of himself*," is to offer an insult to his goodness and his justice.

Now observe, reader, how the promulgation of this pretended salvation by a knowledge of and a belief in Jesus Christ went on, compared with the work of creation.

In the first place, it took longer time to make a child than to make the world, for nine months were passed away and totally lost in a state of pregnancy: which is more than forty times longer than God employed in making the world, according to the Bible account. Secondly, several years of Christ's life were lost in a state

of human infancy; but ~~the~~ universe was in maturity the moment it existed. Thirdly, Christ, as Luke asserts, was thirty years old before he began to preach what they call his mission : millions of souls died in the meantime without knowing it. Fourthly, it was above 300 years from that time before the book called the New Testament was compiled into a written copy, before which time there was no such book. Fifthly, it was above a thousand years after that before it could be circulated, because neither Jesus nor his apostle had knowledge of, or were inspired with, the art of printing; and consequently, as the means for making it universally known did not exist, the means were not equal to the end, and therefore it is not the work of God.

I will here subjoin the 19th Psalm, which is truly deistical, to show how universally and instantaneously the works of God make themselves known, compared with this pretended salvation by Jesus Christ. Psalm 19th :—

“ The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handy-work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.”

Now, had the news of salvation by Jesus Christ been inscribed in the face of the sun and the moon, in characters that all nations would have understood, the whole earth had known it in twenty-four hours, and all nations would have believed it; whereas, though it is now almost 2,000 years since, as they tell us, Christ came upon earth, not a twentieth part of the people of the earth know anything of it, and among those who do, the wiser part do not believe it.

I have now, reader, gone through all the passages called the prophecies of Jesus Christ, and shown there is no such thing.

I have examined the story told of Jesus Christ, and compared the several circumstances of it with that revelation which, as Middleton wisely says, God has made to us of his power and wisdom in the structure of the universe, and by which everything ascribed to him is to be tried. The result is that the story of Christ has not one trait, either in its character or in the means employed, that bears the least resemblance to the power and wisdom of God, as demonstrated in the creation of the universe. All the means are human means, slow, uncertain, and inadequate to the accomplishment of the end proposed; and therefore the whole is a fabulous invention, and undeserving of credit.

The priests of the present day profess to believe it. They gain their living by it, and they exclaim against something they call infidelity. I will define what it is—**HE THAT BELIEVES IN THE STORY OF CHRIST IS AN INFIDEL TO GOD.**

T. P.

APPENDIX I

MY PRIVATE THOUGHTS ON A FUTURE STATE

I HAVE said, in the first part of *The Age of Reason*, that "I hope for happiness after this life." This hope is comfortable to me, and I presume not to go beyond the comfortable idea of hope with respect to a future state.

I consider myself in the hands of my Creator, that he will dispose of me after this life consistently with his justice and goodness. I leave all these matters to him as my Creator and friend, and I hold it to be presumption in man to make an article of faith as to what the Creator will do with us hereafter.

I do not believe, because a man and a woman make a child, that it imposes on the Creator the unavoidable obligation of keeping the being so made in eternal existence hereafter. It is in his power to do so, or not to do so, and it is not in our power to decide which he will do.

The book called the New Testament, which I hold to be fabulous, and have shown to be false, gives an account, in the 25th chapter of Matthew, of what is there called the last day, or the day of judgment. The whole world, according to the account, is divided into two parts, the righteous and the unrighteous, figuratively called the sheep and the goats. They are there to receive their sentence. To the one, figuratively called the sheep, it says: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." To the other, figuratively called the goats, it says: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

Now the case is, the world cannot be thus divided—the moral world, like the physical world, is composed of numerous degrees of character, running imperceptibly

one into another, in such a manner that no fixed point of division can be found in either; that point is nowhere or is everywhere. The whole world might be divided into two parts numerically, but not as to moral character; and therefore the metaphor of dividing them as sheep and goats can be divided, whose difference is marked by their external figure, is absurd. All sheep are still sheep; all goats are still goats; it is their physical nature to be so. But one part of the world are not all good alike, nor the other part all wicked alike. There are some exceedingly good, others exceedingly wicked. There is another description of men who cannot be ranked with either the one or the other. They belong neither to the sheep nor the goats; and there is still another description of them, who are so very insignificant both in character and conduct as not to be worth the trouble of damning or saving, or of raising from the dead.

My own opinion is that those whose lives have been spent in doing good and endeavouring to make their fellow-mortals happy—for this is the only way in which we can serve God—*will be happy hereafter*; and that the very wicked will meet with some punishment. But those who are neither good nor bad, or are not too insignificant for notice, will be dropped entirely. This is my opinion. It is consistent with my idea of God's justice, and with the reason that God has given me; and I gratefully know he has given me a large share of that divine gift.

