

Though her pain was violent for many hours, and very much hindered the desired composure of her thoughts; yet in this she was submissive to the divine will, and patient under his hand. But it pleased God to give her ease the remaining part of her time, when she took occasion to express the inward joy that she experienced. When cordials were applied for the refreshment of weak and fainting nature, she said, "I have better cordials to refresh me than these."

The last two days of her life she seemed wholly disengaged from every thing in this world, as one that had taken her leave of all things here below, and was at leisure for nothing but heavenly contemplations. Her discourse was very affecting. Whenever she spoke of herself it was with the most soul-humbling expressions; but how often did she extol and admire the love of God in Christ! The same truths that she was refreshed with in life were her comfort and delight in death. She had the self-same abasing; yea, self-abhorring and grace-advancing thoughts. She had a full assurance of salvation, and of an abundant entrance with a holy triumph administered into it; often speaking in the words of the Apostle, 2 Tim. i. 12, "I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." And with joy unspeakable, making use of those words with application to herself, Jude, ver. 24. "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy."

Her inward peace was too great to be expressed: She said, "Time will fail me to express what comfort I have." When nature was very weak, and her strength and spirits exhausted, she blessed God that her faith did not fail. No; that was strongest when outward comforts were at a very low ebb; and she had thereby those clear manifestations of Christ, and soul-refreshing foretastes of glory, which were a kind of heaven in her way to it. Her last words were with rapture of admiration, "*O those rays of glory!*" Thus her soul took its flight into the bosom of Jesus, to enjoy what it had long waited for, namely, further discoveries of his love, and to be clothed with immortality, and enjoy eternal life.

~~~~~

LETTER III. from the Bishop of Landaff to Thomas Paine.

**H**AVING done with what you call the grammatical evidence that Moses was not the author of the books attributed to him, you come to your historical and chronological evidence; and you begin with Genesis. Your argument is taken from the single word — Dan — being found in Genesis, when it appears from the book of Judges, that the town of Laish was not called Dan, till above three hundred and thirty years after the death of Moses;

VOL. XIX. Dec. 1796.

therefore

therefore the writer of Genesis, you conclude, must have lived after the town of Laish had the name of Dan given to it. Left this objection should not be obvious enough to a common capacity, you illustrate it in the following manner: "Havre-de Grace was called Havre-Marat in 1793; should then any dateless writing be found, in after times, with the name of Havre-Marat, it would be certain evidence that such a writing could not have been written till after the year 1793." This is a wrong conclusion. Suppose some hot republican should at this day publish a new edition of any old history of France, and instead of Havre-de Grace should write Havre-Marat; and that, two or three thousand years hence, a man, like yourself, should, on that account, reject the whole history as spurious, would he be justified in so doing? Would it not be reasonable to tell him — that the name Havre-Marat had been inserted, not by the original author of the history, but by a subsequent editor of it: and to refer him, for a proof of the genuineness of the book, to the testimony of the whole French nation? This supposition so obviously applies to your difficulty, that I cannot but recommend it to your impartial attention. But if this solution does not please you, I desire it may be proved, that the *Dan*, mentioned in Genesis, was the same town as the *Dan*, mentioned in Judges. I desire, further, to have it proved, that the *Dan*, mentioned in Genesis, was the name of a town, and not of a river. It is merely said — Abram pursued them, the enemies of Lot, to Dan. Now a river was full as likely as a town to stop a pursuit. *Lot*, we know, was settled in the plain of *Jordan*; and *Jordan*, we know, was composed of the united streams of two rivers, called *Jor* and *Dan*.

Your next difficulty respects it's being said in Genesis — "These are the kings that reigned in *Edom* before there reigned any king over the children of Israel: — this passage could only have been written, you say (and I think you say rightly), after the first king began to reign over Israel; so far from being written by Moses, it could not have been written till the time of Saul at the least." I admit this inference, but I deny it's application. A small addition to a book does not destroy either the genuineness or the authenticity of the whole book. I am not ignorant of the manner in which commentators have answered this objection of Spinoza, without making the concession which I have made; but I have no scruple in admitting, that the passage in question, consisting of nine verses containing the genealogy of some kings of Edom, might have been inserted in the book of Genesis, after the book of Chronicles (which was called in Greek by a name importing that it contained things left out in other books) was written. The learned have shewn, that interpolations have happened to other books; but these insertions by other hands have never been considered as invalidating the authority of those books.

"Take away from Genesis," you say, "the belief that Moses was the author, on which only the strange belief that it is the  
Word

Word of God has stood, and there remains nothing of Genesis but an anonymous book of stories, fables, traditionary or invented absurdities, or of downright lies." — What! is it a story then that the world had a beginning, and that the author of it was God? If you deem this a story, I am not disputing with a deistical-philosopher, but with an atheistic madman: Is it a story, that our first parents fell from a paradisiacal state, — that this earth was destroyed by a deluge — that Noah and his family were preserved in the ark — and that the world has been repopled by his descendants? — Look into a book so common that almost every body has it, and so excellent that no person ought to be without it — Grotius on the truth of the christian religion — and you will there meet with abundant testimony to the truth of all the principal facts recorded in Genesis. The testimony is not that of Jews, christians, and priests: it is the testimony of the philosophers, historians, and poets of antiquity. The oldest book in the world is Genesis; and it is remarkable that those books which come nearest to it in age, are those which make, either the most distinct mention of, or the most evident allusion to, the facts related in Genesis concerning the formation of the world from a chaotic mass, the primeval innocence and subsequent fall of man, the longevity of mankind in the first ages of the world, the depravity of the antediluvians, and the destruction of the world. — Read the tenth chapter of Genesis. — It may appear to you to contain nothing but an uninteresting narration of the descendants of *Shem, Ham, and Japheth*; a mere fable, an invented absurdity, a downright lie. No, sir, it is one of the most valuable, and the most venerable records of antiquity. It explains what all profane historians were ignorant of — the origin of nations. Had it told us, as other books do, that one nation had sprung out of the earth they inhabited; another from a cricket or a grasshopper; another from an oak; another from a mushroom; another from a dragon's tooth; then indeed it would have merited the appellation you, with so much temerity, bestow upon it. Instead of these absurdities, it gives such an account of the peopling the earth after the deluge, as no other book in the world ever did give; and the truth of which all other books in the world, which contain any thing on the subject, confirm. The last verse of the chapter says — "These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations; and by these were the nations divided in the earth, after the flood." It would require great learning to trace out, precisely, either the actual situation of all the countries in which these founders of empires settled, or to ascertain the extent of their dominions. This, however, has been done by various authors, to the satisfaction of all competent judges; so much at least to my satisfaction, that had I no other proof of the authenticity of Genesis, I should consider this as sufficient. But, without the aid of learning, any man who can barely read his Bible, and has but heard of such people as the *Affyrians, the Elamites, the Lydians, the*

*Medes, the Ionians, the Thracians,* will readily acknowledge that they had *Affur, and Elam, and Lud, and Madai, and Javan, and Tiras,* grandsons of *Noah,* for their respective founders; and knowing this, he will not, I hope, part with his Bible, as a system of fables. I am no enemy to philosophy; but when philosophy would rob me of my Bible, I must say of it, as Cicero said of the twelve tables,—This little book alone exceeds the libraries of all the philosophers in the weight of it's authority, and in the extent of it's utility.

From the abuse of the Bible, you proceed to that of Moses, and again bring forward the subject of his wars in the land of Canaan. There are many men who look upon all war (would to God that all men saw it in the same light!) with extreme abhorrence, as afflicting mankind with calamities not necessary, shocking to humanity, and repugnant to reason. But is it repugnant to reason that God should, by an express act of his providence, destroy a wicked nation? I am fond of considering the goodness of God as the leading principle of his conduct towards mankind, of considering his justice as subservient to his mercy. He punishes individuals and nations with the rod of his wrath; but I am persuaded that all his punishments originate in his abhorrence of sin; are calculated to lessen it's influence; and are proofs of his goodness; inasmuch as it may not be possible for Omnipotence itself to communicate supreme happiness to the human race, whilst they continue servants of sin. The destruction of the Canaanites exhibits to all nations, in all ages, a signal proof of God's displeasure against sin; it has been to others, and it is to ourselves, a benevolent warning. Moses would have been the wretch you represent him, had he acted by his own authority alone: but you may as reasonably attribute cruelty and murder to the judge of the land in condemning criminals to death, as butchery and massacre to Moses in executing the command of God.

The Midianites, through the counsel of Balaam, and by the vicious instrumentality of their women, had seduced a part of the Israelites to idolatry; to the impure worship of their infamous god Baal-peor:—for this offence, twenty-four thousand Israelites had perished in a plague from heaven, and Moses received a command from God “to smite the Midianites who had beguiled the people. An army was equipped, and sent against Midian. When the army returned victorious, Moses and the princes of the congregation went to meet it; “and Moses was wroth with the officers.” He observed the women captives, and he asked with astonishment, “Have ye saved all the women alive? Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation.” He then gave an order that the boys and the women should be put to death, but that the young maidens should be kept alive for themselves. I see nothing in this proceeding, but good policy, combined with mercy.

The young men might have become dangerous avengers of, what they would esteem, their country's wrongs; the mothers might have again allured the Israelites to the love of licentious pleasures and the practice of idolatry, and brought another plague upon the congregation; but the young maidens, not being polluted by the flagitious habits of their mothers, nor likely to create disturbance by rebellion, were kept alive. You give a different turn to the matter; you say—"that thirty-two thousand women-children were consigned to debauchery by the order of Moses."—Prove this, and I will allow that Moses was the horrid monster you make him—prove this, and I will allow that the Bible is what you call it—a book of lies, wickedness, and blasphemy"—prove this, or excuse my warmth if I say to you, as Paul said to Elymas the forcerer, who sought to turn away Sergius Paulus from the faith, "O full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?"—I did not, when I began these letters, think that I should have been moved to this severity of rebuke, by any thing you could have written; but when so gross a misrepresentation is made of God's proceedings, coolness would be a crime. The women-children were not reserved for the purposes of debauchery, but of slavery;—a custom abhorrent from our manners, but every where practised in former times, and still practised in countries where the benignity of the christian religion has not softened the ferocity of human nature. You here admit a part of the account given in the Bible respecting the expedition against Midian to be a true account: it is not unreasonable to desire that you will admit the whole, or shew sufficient reason why you admit one part, and reject the other. I will mention the part to which you have paid no attention. The Israelitish army consisted but of twelve thousand men, a mere handful when opposed to the people of Midian; yet, when the officers made a muster of their troops after their return from the war, they found that they had not lost a single man! This circumstance struck them as so decisive an evidence of God's interposition, that out of the spoils they had taken they offered "an oblation to the Lord, an atonement for their souls." Do but believe what the captains of thousands, and the captains of hundreds, believed at the time when these things happened, and we shall never more hear of your objections to the Bible, from it's account of the wars of Moses.

You produce two or three other objections respecting the genuineness of the first five books of the Bible. — I cannot stop to notice them: every commentator answers them in a manner suited to the apprehension of even a mere English reader. You calculate, to the thousandth part of an inch, the length of the iron bed of *Og* the king of Basan; but you do not prove that the bed was too big for the body, or that a Patagonian would have been lost in it. You make no allowance for the size of a royal bed; nor ever suspect

suspect that king *Og* might have been possessed with the same kind of vanity, which occupied the mind of king Alexander, when he ordered his soldiers to enlarge the size of their beds, that they might give to the Indians, in succeeding ages, a great idea of the prodigious stature of a Macedonian. In many parts of your work you speak much in commendation of science. I join with you in every commendation you can give it: but you speak of it in such a manner as gives room to believe, that you are a great proficient in it; if this be the case, I would recommend a problem to your attention, the solution of which you will readily allow to be far above the powers of a man conversant only, as you represent priests and bishops to be, in *hic, hæc, hoc*. The problem is this — To determine the height to which a human body, preserving it's similarity of figure, may be augmented, before it will perish by it's own weight. — When you have solved this problem, we shall know whether the bed of the king of Basan was too big for any giant; whether the existence of a man twelve or fifteen feet high is in the nature of things impossible. My philosophy teaches me to doubt of many things; but it does not teach me to reject every testimony which is opposite to my experience: had I been born in Shetland, I could, on proper testimony, have believed in the existence of the Lincolnshire ox, or of the largest dray-horse in London; though the oxen and horses in Shetland had not been bigger than mastiffs.

### A MIRACULOUS CURE.

To the EDITOR.

**T**HE following instance of the Goodness and Mercy of the ALMIGHTY, to a distressed object, I was a witness of in the year 1785, when stationed in the city of Glasgow. I hope the publishing of it at this time, will induce many persons to apply with confidence to the great Physician, in their distresses; and probably may convince others, who are inclined to scepticism, that there is a GOD, who ruleth in the Heaven of Heavens, and yet graciously condescends to look down upon his creatures in this lower world, regards with compassion their afflictions, and when necessary, miraculously interposes, and delivers them from all their fears.

A young woman, a member of our Society, of the name of Mc Lean, was afflicted with a very bad complaint in her eyes. The pain was so extreme that she could not bear a ray of light to shine upon her, but was obliged to be confined to a dark room, day and night. She could not use her eye-lids at all, so that they were constantly closed, except when she ventured to open them with her hand. She applied to several medical gentlemen, who

assisted