gion ; to efface in our mind all traces and ideas of the an­cient one ; and to fortify ourſelves againſt our prejudices, our fears, and our worldly intereſts : for we muſt get quit of all theſe, ſince we are going moſt generouſly to renounce all the goods of this life, and all the hopes of the next.— What makes me chooſe the feaſt of Pentecoſt for our firſt public appearance in our new capacity, is the great concourſe of people from all nations which will be then at Jerusalem ; for it will be a favourable opportunity to preach to them the reſurrection of him whom our rulers have cru­cified, and by their means to ſpread the news quickly over the whole world. We are ignorant indeed of foreign tongues, and we are without interpreters ; but our pretence will ſuffice. Some will comprehend by ſigns what we would ſay to them, and others, who hear and underſtand our lan­guage, will aſſiſt them. We cannot, it is true, work a mi­racle ; but was there ever ſuch a miracle thought of as our daring to reſiſt all that is mighty and reſpectable in our na­tion ? There would perhaps be more prudence in not ap­pearing altogether ; and as we have nothing extraordinary or divine to command reſpect, nor any protection to hope from God or man, in not expoſing ourſelves in a *body* on the firſt day of our enterprize ; but in a deſign like ours, ſingular in its whole nature, and contrary to common rules, of what uſe would prudence be ? I am ſure that with our Galilean pronunciation, and with the goodly appearance that we ſhall make in our fiſhermens garments, we ſhall perſuade a multitude of people. Nay, ſo confident am I of our ſucceſs, that I include in my deſign not only Judea but all the nations upon earth. Nor ſhall I be diſcouraged by the diverſity of religions, manners, and tongues, which pre­vail in the world ; be affrighted by the hoſtile power of all mankind ; or have my zeal in the leaſt abated for him who hath deceived us, by the improbability of being able to make the Gentiles, who know nothing of the Scriptures or the Meſſiah, adore as the Son of God the man whom the Jews have crucified as an impoſtor.

“ In the mean time, it will be proper to accuſtom ourselves to the moſt inhuman ſpectacles, in order to arrive by degrees at ſuch a hardneſs of heart as nothing can be ſuppoſed to move. You may depend upon it, that we ſhall see multitudes of people, ſeduced by our diſcourſes, proſcribed, : baniſhed, thrown into dark prisons, torn in pieces by en­gines of torture, condemned to wild beaſts, to the fire, and to the moſt ſhameful and inſupportable puniſhments, for preaching with us the reſurrection of Jelus. Now, as we are all by nature inclined to compaſſion, we might be tempted to relieve them from ſuch exquiſite miſery, ſince we could effectually do it by a single word ; but this word, which would diſcover the whole myſtery, muſt never slip from our mouths. There muſt not be ſo much as one ſigh or one groan to betray us. Inſtead of unſeaſonably reproaching ourſelves with our impoſture by which we deceived them, we muſt applaud ourſelves for their ſeduction ; we muſt place our own joy in their wretchedneſs ; and we muſt not be afraid to honour, and cauſe them to be honoured, as illuſtrious witnesses of the truth, though we know them to be on­ly martyrs to our hypocriſy, and to their own facility in be­lieving falſehood@@\*.”

This is a faithful view of the outlines of that plan which *muſt have been formed* by the apoſtles, if they intended to de­ceive the world with reſpect to the reſurrection of their Maſter. It is of no conſequence to the argument whether it grow gradually out of the joint deliberations of the whole body, or was completely digeſted, as we have ſuppoſed, by one of the number, and implicitly adopted by the reſt : it is enough that every circumſtance which we have mention­ed muſt have occurred to them, and that every reſolution muſt have been unanimouſly adopted which we have made to flow from the mouth of this daring orator. But ſurely the bare recital of ſuch an oration is ſufficient to ſhow the impoſſibility of carrying into effect ſo abſurd, ſo horrible, and ſo impious a meaſure— a meaſure diametrically oppo­ſite to all the principles and motives of human actions.

Archbiſhop King has ſuppoſed @@\*, that the human will is a faculty diſtinct from the underſtanding and the appetites; that activity is essential to it ; and that previous to an elec­tion formed, it is equally indifferent to all objects. He thence infers, that a man may chooſe, and even take delight in, what is not naturally agreeable to any of his appetites ; be­

@@@[m]\* See the Principles of the Christian Religion translated by Mr Lally.

@@@[m]\* Origin of Evil, 4th edit. ch. 5. sect. I. subsect. 3. and 4.

dants ? Thirdly, In opposition to your inſinuation, that Mary Magdalene was a common woman, I wiſh it to be conſidered whether there is any ſcriptural authority for that imputation ; and whether there be or not, I muſt contend, that a repentant and reformed woman ought not to be eſteemed an improper witneſs of a fact. The conjecture which you adopt concerning her is nothing less than an illiberal, indecent, unfounded calumny, not excuſable in the mouth of a li­bertine, and intolerable in your’s.

“ The book of Matthew (continues Paine) goes on to ſay: " And behold there was an 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 book? ſay nothing about any earthquake.’—What then ? does their ſilence prove that there was none ‘ Nor about the angel rolling back the ſtone and sitting upon it.’—What then ? does their ſilence prove that the ſtone was not rolled back by an angel, and that he did not sit upon it ‘ And according to their accounts there was no angel ſitting there.’—This concluſion (ſays his Lordſhip) I muſt deny ; their accounts do not ſay there was no angel sitting there at the time that Matthew ſays he ſat upon the ſtone. They do not deny the fact, they simply omit the mention of it ; and they all take notice that the women, when they arrived at the ſepulchre, found the ſtone rolled away : hence it is evident that the ſtone was rolled away be*ſore* the women arrived at the ſepulchre ; and the other evangelists, giving an account of what happened to the women *when* they reached the ſepulchre, have merely omitted giving an account of a tranſaction previous to their arrival. Where is the contradiction ? What ſpace of time intervened between the rolling away the ſtone and the arrival of the women at the ſepulchre, is nowhere mentioned ; but it certainly was long enough for the angel to have changed his poſition ; from fitting on the outſide he might have entered into the ſepulchre ; and another angel might have made his appearance, or, from the firſt, there might have been two, one on the outſide rolling away the ſtone, and the other within. Luke, you tell us, ‘ says there were two, and they were both ſtanding ;. and John ſays there were two, and both sitting.’ —It is impossible, I grant, even for an angel to be sitting and ſtanding at the ſame instant of time ; but Luke and John do not speak of the ſame inſtant, nor of the ſame appearance.—Luke ſpeaks of the appearance to all the women ; and John of the appearance to Mary Magdalene alone, who tarried weeping at the ſepulchre after Peter and John had left it. But I forbear making any more mimιte remarks on still minuter objections, all of which arc grounded on this miſtake—that the angels were ſeen at one particular time, in one particular place, and by the same individuals.”