THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D. D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

CONTAINING THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

PART I.

1204

THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;

JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES;

HISTORY OF HERETICS;

AND HIS SERMONS AND TRACTS;

WITH

GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND COPIOUS INDEXES.

TO THE FIRST VOLUME IS PREFIXED

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

ANDREW KIPPIS, D.D. F.R.S. AND S.A.

VOLUME I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, N° 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

THE

BOOKSELLER's ADVERTISEMENT.

THE general eſtimation in which the writings of Dr. LARDNER are held, by the learned of every denomination of Chriſtians, will preclude the neceſſity of any particular recommendation of them to the public attention.

His great work, on the CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY, in ſeventeen volumes octavo, was become very ſcarce, and ſold for as much as all his Works originally coſt unbound *. His JEWISH and HEATHEN TESTIMONIES, and HISTORY OF HERETICS OF THE TWO FIRST CENTURIES, formed five volumes in quarto; and his SERMONS and TRACTS, which, together, made five volumes in octavo, added very conſiderably to this expenſe. Some of his Tracts were not to be purchaſed.

Theſe conſiderations, together with the very liberal manner in which the Rev. Dr. Kippis conſented to write the Life of his much honoured friend, have given occaſion to the preſent complete edition of the works of this learned man. In reſpect to the manner of executing this deſign; it has been the intention of the editor to conſult no leſs the advantage and convenience of the purchaſer, by furniſhing him with a very cheap edition, than the honour of the writer, by the accurate and correct manner in which he has endeavoured to print it.

The firſt ſix volumes compriſe the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory;—the ſeventh, eighth and ninth, the Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies, and the Hiſtory of Heretics;—the tenth, all his Sermons, excepting four on the Dæmoniacs, which the author intended as a Supplement to the firſt part of the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, and which are here placed at the end of it;—the eleventh contains

* The original price in ſheets was as follows:

	£.	s.	d.
The Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, 17 vols. octavo,	3	8	0
Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies, 4 vols. quarto,	2	2	0
Hiſtory of Heretics, quarto,	0	15	0
Sermons, 2 vols.	0	8	0
Single and Poſthumous Sermons,	0	8	6
Tracts,	0	13	0
	7	14	6

contains all his Tracts, with Indexes to the whole. In arranging the volumes and pamphlets of these divisions of the work, the order of time in which they were written has been generally followed.

Some singularities in the author's spelling, which have been generally rejected by the best writers, have not been observed in this edition; the orthography most in use having been adopted, at the desire of a very large majority of such of the subscribers as could readily be consulted.

Perhaps few writers on theological subjects, in modern times, have been more frequently referred to or quoted than Dr. Lardner. To enable the reader, therefore, the more readily to turn to such quotations, the volume and page of the original edition are inserted at the top of the pages; by which means the present edition may, in all such cases, be consulted with nearly the same ease as any of the former.

When the quantity contained in each of these volumes is considered, it is presumed that the errata will not be thought numerous, and that no apology will be necessary for having omitted to note such as are merely typographical and do not affect the sense. For the accuracy of this edition, as well as for the copious Indexes, which it is hoped will be found highly useful, the public are indebted to the patient industry and unremitting attention of the Rev. Mr. Baxter Cole.

St. Paul's Church-Yard,
London, March 25, 1788.

JOSEPH JOHNSON.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Thoſe marked f. are Subſcribers for the Fine Paper.

THE Rev. W. Agutter, A. M. Magdalen college, Oxford
——— W. Jarvis Abdy, A. B. St. John's, Southwark
——— Mr. Aſtley, Cheſterfield
——— M. Anſtis, Bridport. f.
——— R. Amner, Coſely, Staffordſhire. f.
——— S. Allen
——— R. Alderſon, Norwich
Lady Abdy, Sackville-ſtreet
Mr. Henry Grove Amory, Bucklerſbury, London
—— J. Allen, Glaſgow
—— W. Allen and Co. Bookſellers, Newark
—— Ainge

B

Rev. Dr. Buchan, Boxgrove, near Chicheſter
The Rev. Mr. Rochmont Barbauld, Hampſtead
——— S. Bethell, A. M. Fellow of Brazen-noſe college, Oxford
——— C. Bathurſt, A. M. New college, Oxford. f.
——— Barton, A. B. Corpus Chriſti college, Oxford
——— Mr. Bruce, Emanuel college, Cambridge
——— W. E. Biſhop, Epping
——— Bennet, Baſinghall ſtreet, London
——— T. Belſham, Daventry. f.
——— W. Broadbent, Daventry. f.
——— Joſeph Bretland, Exeter
——— Baynes, Droxford, Hants
——— W. Bulmer, Thorp, near Wanfleet, Lincolnſhire
——— G. Birley, St. Ives, Huntingdonſhire. f.
——— Robert Boog, Paiſley

The Rev. Mr. Beckwick, York
——— Burſlam, Hanbury, Worceſterſhire
——— W. Bentley, Salem, New-England
——— J. Burrough, Rector of Sapcote, Leiceſterſhire
——— Bale, Withyham, Suſſex
——— Adam Blair
——— Edmund Butcher
——— Batt, Student, Chriſt Church, Oxford. f.
——— Barker, ditto, ditto. f.
——— Bailey. f.
——— W. Beloe, Weſtminſter
The Honourable Simon Butler
Sir W. Buſk, Knt. Attorney-general, Iſle of Man. f.
John Foſter Barham, Eſq. Bedford
George Brookſbank, Eſq. London. f.
John Butler, Eſq. Yeovil. Two copies. f.
James Black, Eſq. Mincing-lane, London. f.
Ryles Bentley, Eſq. Jamaica
T. H. Broadhead, Eſq. f.
Ellis Bent, Eſq. Warrington. f.
T. W. T. Bridges, Eſq. Tiverton. f.
L. Bartholomew, Eſq. Addington
William Blunt, Eſq.
Richard Bright, Eſq. Briſtol
Iſaac Hawkins Browne, Eſq.
Thomas Bond, Eſq. Bath. f.
W. Blackburne, M. D. Spring-gardens, London
Mr. J. Burden, Bookſeller, Wincheſter. Two copies
——S. B. Becket, Bookſeller, Briſtol
——D. Brent, Rotherhithe. f.
——C. and J. Berry, Bookſellers, Norwich. Two copies
——John Barton, Hartford. f.
——L. A. Bennet, Bookſeller, Rotterdam. Two copies
——Thomas Booth, Norwich. f.
——Thomas Bright, Fleet-ſtreet
——Thomas Broadhurſt, New college, Hackney
——Thomas Benſley, Bolt-court, Fleet-ſtreet

C

The late Lord Biſhop of Carliſle. f.
The Lord Biſhop of Cheſter. f.

The Rev. Mr. Cockſhutt, Fellow of St. John's college Cambridge, and one of his Majeſty's preachers at Whitehall. f.
———Dr. Cooper, Yarmouth
———Iſaac Crouch, A. M. Vice Principal, Edmund hall, Oxford
———T. Craſter, A. M. Rector of Thorpe, Lincolnſhire. f.
———A. Clarkſon, A. M. Derby
———Mr. Coates, Corpus Chriſti, Oxford. f.
———Coates, Birmingham. f.
———Joſeph Carter
———J. Corniſh, Collyton
———Clarke, Hull. f.
———Cappe, York
———Carlyon, Truro, Cornwall. f.
———Curry, Kennilworth
———Tho. Clarke, John-ſtreet, Tottenham-court-road
———Morgan Cove, Sithney, Cornwall
———B. Carpenter, Stourbridge
———Miles Copple, Welton
———Cave, Finedon. f.
M. Conſtable, Eſq. Waſſend, Holderneſs. Two copies
John Carter, Eſq. Portſmouth. f.
Charles Cooper, Eſq. Norwich. f.
Richard Hall Clarke, Eſq. Exeter
John Carey, Eſq. Guernſey. f.
Charles Nalſon Cole, Eſq. Lincoln's-inn-fields. f.
Richard Cooke, Eſq. Iſle of Wight
Mr. Cooke, Daventry
—— Alexander Chalmers, Throgmorton-ſtreet, London
—— W. Chriſtie, jun. Montroſe
—— T. Chriſtie, jun. London
—— John Colliſon, Newington Butts
—— Tho. Cooper, Grafton-ſtreet, Tottenham-court-road
—— J. B. Cleaver, Munnington, near York
—— W. Coney, Oriel college, Oxford
—— Archdeacon Conſtable, Beverly
—— Carr, Gomerſall
—— Henry Cundell, Minories, London
—— William Charnley, Newcaſtle
Mrs. F. Chambers, Mincing-lane, London

Mr. Crutwell, Bath
—— Clacker, Chelmsford

D

The Rev. Dr. Dampier, Dean of Rochester. f.
———Henry Dabzac, D.D. Senior Fellow of Trinity college, Dublin
———Richard Dreyer, LL.B. Trinity college, Cambridge
———S. Disney, LL.B. Halsted, Essex. f.
———J. Disney, D.D. F.S.A. Knightsbridge. f.
———T. Dalton, B. D. Vicar of Carisbrook, Isle of Wight. f.
———Dr. Davis, Hackney
———Mr. Dewhurst, Cottingham. f.
——— Dodds, West Meon, Hants
——— Diemar, Strasburg. f.
——— D. Durell, Student, Christ Church, Oxford. f.
——— J. D. Dreyer, Garden-court, Temple
——— T. M. Davis. f.
——— Dikes, Magdalen college, Cambridge
——— Henry Dennet, Liverpool
——— John Davis, High-street, Mary-le bone
——— B. Davies, Liverpool
——— R. Deane, Berwick, Yorkshire
John English Dolben, Esq. Finedon, Northamptonshire. Two copies. f.
Thomas Darch, Esq. Gower-street, London
Christopher D'Oyly, Esq. Curzon-street, London
Mr. John Davis, Daventry
—— J. Drewry, Bookseller, Derby
—— Dymond, Apothecary, Holborn
—— States Morris Dykman, London. f.
—— Isaac Dobree, Guernsey
—— Charles Dilly, Poultry, London

E

The Lord Bishop of Exeter. f.
The Rev. Dr. Evans, Prebend of Worcester
——— W. Enfield, LL.D. Thorpe, near Norwich
——— Mr. England, Stafford, near Dorchester
——— J. P. Estlin, Bristol. f.
——— Evans, Stockton
——— Peter Emans, Coventry. f.
——— Eaton, St. Ann's, Soho, London

The Rev. Mr. Evans, Marſhfield
——— Thomas Elrington
William Eſdaile, Eſq. Lombard-ſtreet, London. f.
William Edwards, Eſq. Bruges, Flanders
Mr. Charles Elliot, Bookſeller, Edinburgh. Three copies

F

The Rev. Frend, A. M. Fellow of Jeſus college, Cambridge
——— H. Fly, A. M. F. R. S. London
——— Mr. Fownes, Salop. f.
——— T. Fynes, Gameſton, Nottinghamſhire
——— B. Forſter, Rector of Boconnoe, Cornwall
——— John Follet, Newton-Abbot, Devonſhire
——— Henry Finch, Ravenſtone, Bucks. f.
——— John Fuller, Cheſham, Bucks.
Mr. E. K. Fordham, Royſton, Herts
—— Stephen Freeman, Dyer's-court, London
—— James Fletcher, Bookſeller, Oxford. Eight copies

G

The Lord Biſhop of Glouceſter
His Grace the Duke of Grafton. f.
The Rev. A. Geddes, D. D. Maddox-ſtreet, London. f.
——— Iſaac Goſſet, D. D. F. R. S. Edward-ſtreet, Portman-ſquare
——— Gunning, A. M. Rector of Spexhall, and Vicar of Sutton. f.
——— Mr. Garnham, Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge. f.
——— Gauntlet, Fellow of Wincheſter college
——— R. Gifford, Duffield, near Derby
——— S. Griffith, Woolverhampton
——— R. Gardner, Taunton
Thomas Gibſon, Eſq. Hackney. Three copies
Robert Gambier, Eſq.
Mr. Thomas Giles, Woodbridge. f.
—— W. Gellibrand, Edmonton. f.
—— G. Gordon, Glaſgow
—— W. Guy, Surgeon, Chicheſter

H

The Rev. John Hey, D. D. Norris's Profeſſor of Divinity, Sidney college, Cambridge
——— Mr. H. A. Hole, Fellow of Jeſus college, Cambridge

The Rev. Mr. Hutchinſon, Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge
——— John Hammond, A. M. Cambridge
——— William Hales, D. D. Fellow of Trinity college, Dublin
——— Mr. G. Hall, Fellow of Trinity college, Dublin
——— E. Harwood, D. D. Bloomſbury, London
——— Samuel Henley, F. S. A. Rector of Rendleſham, Suffolk. f.
——— Mr. Hawkes, Birmingham
——— Hodgſon, Croydon
——— Halliday, Norton
——— Harris, Hanwood
——— Hunt, Cound, Shropſhire
——— T. Heineken, Ware. f.
——— L. Holden, Tenterden
——— R. Howell, Beckington, Somerſetſhire
——— John Hogg, Exeter
——— Phil. Holland, Bolton
——— J. Hewlett, Shacklewell
——— Hurſt, Stanford, Nottinghamſhire
——— W. Haſſal, Spotland-bridge, near Rochdale
——— Harris, Maidſtone
——— Joſeph Hardy, Sevenoaks, Kent
——— Abraham Harris
——— Houghton, Salop
——— W. Hay, North-Walſham, Norfolk. f.
——— Howe, Ringwood
——— William Hazlitt
——— Geoffrey Hornby, Chriſt's college, Cambridge
George Harris, LL. D. Doctors Commons. f.
William Heberden, M. D. Pall mall. f.
Thomas Brand Hollis, Eſq. F. R. A. S. S. and Acad. A. S. New-England. f.
S. Heywood, Eſq. Harpur-ſtreet, London
J. P. Heywood, Eſq. Lincoln's-inn
H. Hole, Eſq. Ibberley, Devonſhire
J. Harriſon, Eſq. Newcaſtle. f.
Lewis Hay, Eſq. Edinburgh. f.
John Hewitt, Eſq. Coventry
Mr. Joſeph Hewitt, ditto
W. C. Hart, Eſq. Barriſter at Law, Middle Temple, London
Mr. S. Heywood, Attorney at Law, Nottingham. f.
——— S. Hulme, Lambert-hill, London

Mr.

Mr. W. Hughes, High Holborn, London
—— Samuel Hardman, Manchester
—— A. Hamilton, ſen. Bedford-row, London
—— John Holt, Rochdale, Lancaſhire
—— Henry Hughs, Bedford-row, London
—— Harrop, Chowbent, Lancaſhire
—— James Halls, Hornchurch, Eſſex
—— Houlbrooke, Holly Green, Shropſhire. f.
Miſs Heywood, Mansfield
Mrs. Mary Horſman, Clapham

J

The Rev. Joſeph Jane, B. D. Rector of Acton, Glouceſterſhire
——— Mr. Thomas Jervis. f.
——————— Jenkins, Whitchurch
——————— Robert Jacomb, Laurance-Pountney-hill, London
——————— Inge, Student of Chriſt Church, Oxford. f.
——————— Robert Jackſon
A. Jellicoe, Eſq. Highbury-place, near London. f.
J. Ingram, Eſq. Billiter-ſquare, London. f.
Mr. D. Jones, Hommerton Academy
—— Jeremiah Joyce, New college, Hackney
—— Joſeph Johnſon, Highbury-Place
—— J. Johnſon. f.
—— W. Jacobs
Mrs. Idle, Binfield, Berks

K

The Rev. John Kearney, D. D. Senior Fellow of Trinity college, Dublin
——— S. Kilderbee, A. M. Rector of Aſh and Trimley St. Martyn. f.
——— Mr. Kenrick, Exeter
——————— Sampſon, Kingsford, Sturrey
Samuel Kendrick, Eſq. Bewley
John Kettle, Eſq. Birmingham
Mr. F. Kemble, Swithin's-lane, London
——Edward Kilvington, Jeſus college, Cambridge

L

The Lord Biſhop of London
The Lord Biſhop of Lincoln
The Lord Biſhop of Llandaff. f.

SUBSCRIBERS.

The Rev. William Lowth, Prebend of Winchester. f.
——— Dr. Law, Archdeacon of Rochester
——— Dr. Lambe, Banbury
——— Dr. Lamb, Oxford. f.
——— Theophilus Lindsey, A. M. London. Two copies. f.
——— D. Love, A. M. Vicar of Finringhoe
——— Mr. Lambert, Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge
——— J. Lyons, Minister of St. Mary's, Dover
——— D. Lewis, Bullhouse, Thurlstone. f.
——— Lucas, Salop
——— Lewis, Castle-street, London
——— Lefirgue, Stamford. f.
——— James Lindsey, Newington-green
Edward Beeston Long, Esq. Wimpole-street, London
John Lee, Esq. Lincoln's-inn-fields, London. f.
Richard Warburton Lytton, Esq.
George Lee, Esq. Bruges, Flanders
Thomas Le Mesurier, Esq. Temple, London
A. Longmore, Esq. Baddow, Essex. f.
T. H. Lee, Esq. Lympston. f.
J. Lowes, Esq. Newcastle. f.
John Leaper, Esq. Derby. f.
Thomas Lees, Esq. Stoke Newington. f.
Mr. Leake, Hamersmith
—— Robert Loder, Bookseller, Woodbridge
—— Richard Lobb, Walcot-place, near London
—— Joseph Lloyd, Bookseller, Bristol. Four copies
—— Nath. Le Cocq, jun. Guernsey
—— Lawrance, Cheapside, London
Library, Public, of the University of Cambridge. f.
——— of Trinity college, Cambridge
——— of Sidney Sussex college, Cambridge
——— of St. John's college, Cambridge. f.
——— of the University of Dublin. Two copies
——— of the University of St. Andrew's
——— Private, of the Students of Divinity in the University of Glasgow
——— London, Ludgate-hill
——— Public, at Norwich
——— of the Society of Writers to the Signet, Edinburgh
——— of the Unitarian Chapel at Sheffield

Library

Library of the Chapel in High-ſtreet, Shrewſbury
——— of the Society at Exeter
——— of the Reading Society at Chowbent, Lancaſhire
——— of the Reading Society at Cottingham
——— Subſcription, at Hull
——— of the New Society at Nottingham
——— Subſcription, at Stamford
——— of the Society at the King's-Arms, Newark
——— Circulating, at Leeds
——— of the Sociable Club at Swanſea
——— of the Cockermouth Club

M

The Rev. W. Maſon, A. M. Precentor of York cathedral
—— P. Marth, A. M. Rector of Figeſton, Yorkſhire
—— Mr. Millar, Rector of Wormſhill, Kent
—— Thomas Maurice, A. M. Epping
—— A. Maurice, D. D. Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Geneva. f.
—— J. Morgan, B. D. Rector of Chelmsford, Eſſex
—— Macgill, D. D. Ayr, N. B.
—— Mr. Moody
—— M. Maurice
—— A. Macauly, Strathblane
—— Morgan, Exeter
——— Manning, Exeter
——— Moody, Kingſton
——— Mansfield, Bradley
——— Mills, Barford, Warwickſhire. f.
——— Manifold, Bradley
C. T. Morgan, Eſq. Great Ormond-ſtreet, London. f.
Robert Wilde Moult, Eſq. f.
James Milnes, Eſq. Thornſhouſe. f.
W. Manning, jun. Eſq. St. Mary-axe, London
Mr. W. Morgan, Chatham-place, London
—— H. G. Macnab, Glaſgow
—— S. Macgill, ditto
—— R. Muir, ditto. f.
—— J. and J. Merrill, Bookſellers, Cambridge

Mr.

Mr. Meyer, Shrewſbury
—— Thomas James Matthias, Scotland-yard, London
—— Thomas Malkin, Hackney
—— George Moore, Bache's-row, Hoxton
—— John Marſhall, Hackney
Mrs. R. S. Milnes, Fryſtone, near Ferrybridge

N

The Rev. Thomas Newton, A. M. Fellow of Jeſus college, Cambridge
——— Mr. Henry Norman, Rector of Morſted, Hants
——— Newſam, Sidney college, Cambridge
——— Nares, Abingdon-ſtreet, Weſtminſter
Robert Newton, Eſq. Norton houſe, Derbyſhire. f.
Mr. North, Bridge-ſtreet, Blackfriars, London
—— Thomas Nicholls, Minories, London

O

The Rev. Arthur Owen, A. M. Fellow of Emanuel college, Cambridge
——— C. Onley, A. M. Stiſted hall, Eſſex. f.
——— Richard Ormerod, A. M. Chriſt's college, Cambridge.
——— Mr. Oddie, York

P

The Rev. Dr. Pearce, Maſter of the Temple
——— P. Peckard, D. D. Maſter of Magdalen college, Cambridge
——— T. Poſtlethwaite, B. D. Trinity college, Cambridge
——— T. Parkinſon, A. M. Fellow of Chriſt's college, Cambridge
——— George Porter, A. B. of Chriſt's college, Cambridge
——— J. Porter, A. M. Trinity college, Cambridge
——— Richard Price, D. D. Hackney
——— Joſeph Prieſtley, LL. D. F. R. S. Birmingham
——— T. F. Palmer, A. M. Dundee
——— Mr. J. Pitts, Rector of Great Brickhill, Bucks
——— C. Parry, Vicar of Speen, Berks
——— John Palmer, Birmingham
——— Samuel Palmer, Hackney
——— J. Pope, Stand, near Manchester
——— Peckford, Exeter
——— George Pollen, Guildford
——— Pott, Student of Chriſt's college, Oxford. f.

The

The Rev. Mr. W. Philipps, Palgrave, near Diſs
S. Pett, Eſq. Leſkeard, Cornwall. f.
George Payne, Eſq. Bruges
Meſſrs. Payne and Son, Bookſellers, London. Six copies
——Prince and Cooke, Bookſellers, Oxford. Six copies
Mr. Phillips, Bookſeller, London. Six copies
——Page, Gough-ſquare, London. f.
——J. Powell, Earl-ſtreet, Red-lion-ſquare
——Robert Padley, Burton Joyce. f.
——Thomas Jordan Pine, Maidſtone
——Pugh, Cheapſide, London
——Thomas Padget, Ibſtock, Leiceſterſhire

R

The Rev. Dr. John Randolph, Canon of Chriſt Church, Oxford. f.
——P. A. Reaſton, A. M. St. John's college, Cambridge
——Abraham Rees, D. D. London
——Mr. Robothen, Congleton
——Ralph, Halifax. f.
——Tobias Ruſtal, Skilton, Suffolk
——Richard Raikes, Neaſdon. f.
——Roger Ruding, Merton college, Oxford
——John Rowe, Shrewſbury. f.
——Raine, Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge
Ebenezer Radcliffe, Eſq. Walthamſtow
Thomas Raikes, Eſq. New Broad-ſtreet, London. f.
Richard Reynolds, Eſq. Paxton, near St. Neot's. f.
W. Ruſſell, Eſq. Birmingham
G. Ruſſell, Eſq. ditto
John Ryland, Eſq. ditto
John Rickards, Eſq. ditto
T. Rogers, Eſq. Cornhill, London
Meſſrs. Robſon and Clarke, Bookſellers, London. Six copies
Mr. John Relph, London
——W. Rathbone, jun. Liverpool
Mr. E. Rogers, Liverpool
——W. T. Robards, Norwich
Mrs. Rayner, Sunbury. f.

S

The Lord Biſhop of Saliſbury. f.
The Lord Biſhop of St. Aſaph. f.
The Rev. H. Sumner, D.D. Eton. f.
——— Joſeph Stock, D.D. Trinity college, Dublin
——— Samuel Squire, B.D. Fellow of Univerſity college, Oxford
——— Charles John Smith, A.M. Rector of Euſton, Suffolk
——— W. Saliſbury, Rector of Morton, Eſſex
——— Mr. Stennet, Muſwell-hill
——— Scholfield, Birmingham
——— Simpſon, Leeds
——— James Scott, Carluke
——— Smirnove, Ruſſian chapel, London
——— Shutte, North Witham, Lincolnſhire
——— Sandy. f.
——— Shatlock, Ilfracombe, Devonſhire
——— Andrew Scott, Doncaſter
——— Skinner, Eaſton, near Stamford
S. Shore, Eſq. Norton hall, near Sheffield. Two copies. f.
Miſs Sarah Shore, Meerſbrook, Derbyſhire. f.
W. Seuard, Eſq. f.
John Sargent, jun. Eſq. Lavington, Suſſex
W. Smith, Eſq. Horſham
Thomas Smith, Eſq. Cirenceſter. f.
G. Smith, Eſq. f.
John Stone, Eſq. Hackney
William Stone, Eſq. Rutland-place, London
Thomas Sanden, M.D. Chicheſter. f.
Mr. G. Smith, ſen. Trinity college, Cambridge
—— G. Smith, Deptford
—— Robert Smith, jun. Glaſgow
—— Edward Smith, Birmingham
—— William Smith, Bedford
—— James Stanger. f.
—— S. Stuckey, Langport
—— Thomas Sale, Chowbent, Lancaſhire
Mr. Shaw, Woodford, Eſſex
—— Joſeph Sparks, Dorcheſter
—— W. Sibbald, Johnſon, Glaſgow
—— John Struthers, Glaſgow

Mr.

Mr. John Shave, Ipſwich
—— William Sturch, London
—— Sumarez, Newington Butts
Mrs. Shelley, Bath. f.

T.

The Rev. Joſeph Turner, Vice Chancellor of the Univerſity of Cambridge. f.
——— Tyrwhitt, A. M. of Jeſus college, Cambridge
——— W. Johnſton Temple, LL. B. Gluziers Budock, Cornwall. f.
——— T. Towle, B. D. London
——— Mr. J. Toulmin, Taunton
——— Toulmin, Chowbent, Lancaſhire
——— J. Tremlett, Glouceſter
——— John Taylor, Walmſly chapel
——— Turner, Wakefield
——— W. Turner, jun. Newcaſtle upon Tyne
——— M. Thomas, Frenchay, near Briſtol
——— Meredith Townſend, Stoke-Newington. f.
——— Richard Templeman, Shaftſbury
——— Thomas Toller, Iſlington
——— Thomas Tayler, Ely-place, London
W. Thompſon, M. D.
W. Tayleure, Eſq. Salop. f.
R. G. Temple, Eſq. Mortlake. f.
M. Towgood, Eſq. Hackney. f.
John Taylor, Eſq. Birmingham. f.
Charles Taylor, Eſq. ditto
Mr. E. Thomas, London
—— Iſaac Thompſon, Croſs-lane, London. Two copies
—— Ralph Taylor, Glaſgow
—— J. Todd, Bookſeller, York. Eight copies
—— R. Trewman, Exeter
—— Teſſyman, York
—— Mr. Triphook, St. James's-ſtreet
Mrs. Tillard, York

V.

The Rev. Dr. Vincent, Weſtminſter. f.
——— Mr. W. Cawthorne Unwin, Stock, Eſſex. f.
——— Valpy, Reading
John Vanhende, M. D. Bruges, Flanders
W. Vaughan, Eſq. Mincing-lane, London
Mr. Valentine, Chowbent, Lancaſhire

W.

The Lord Biſhop of Wincheſter. f.
The Rev. the Dean and Chapter of Windſor
The Rev. R. Walond, Cathedral church, Exeter
——— T. Wren, D.D. Portſmouth. f.
——— J. Williams, LL.D. Sydenham. f.
——— T. D. Whittaker, LL.B. Holme, Lancaſhire
——— Winkler, D.D. Hamburgh
——— Thomas Wintle, B.D. Brightwell, Berks
——— John Walter, LL.B. Lanlivery
——— Mr. Waddington, Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge
——— Thomas Watſon, jun. Plymouth
——— W. Wilkins, Bourton on the Water
——— W. Williams, Maſter of Blackheath ſchool
——— S. Walker, Enfield
——— W. Wood, Leeds
——— W. Whitmore, Stockton
——— George Walker, Nottingham
——— Edward Williams, ditto
——— J. Wiche, Maidſtone
——— Watſon, Whitby
John Whitehead, M.D. Devonſhire-ſquare
John Wright, Eſq. Clapham
Samuel Wegg, Eſq. Bloomſbury-ſquare
James Weſt, Eſq. Chatham-place, London. f.
Mr. Wilſon, Holborn-court, London. f.
—— G. Wanſey, Warminſter
—— S. Woolmer, Bookſeller, Exeter
—— T. Witherby, Birchin-lane, London
—— Robert Wetton, Chertſey. f.
—— Thomas Wright, Fleet-ſtreet. f.
Mrs. Wilſon, Rotheram. f.

Y.

The Rev. the Dean and Chapter of York, for the Minſter Library
The Rev. Mr. Yates, Liverpool
——— Duke Young, Otterton, Devonſhire
Mr. John Yerbury, jun. Gracechurch-ſtreet.

GENERAL CONTENTS

OF THE WHOLE WORK.

VOL. I. THE LIFE OF DR. LARDNER.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY; Part I.—To which is ſubjoined, as a Supplement, THE CASE OF THE DÆMONIACS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

VOL. II. THE CREDIBILITY, &c. Part II. Chap. I. to XXXIX.

VOL. III. Chap. XL. to LXIII.

VOL. IV. Chap. LXIV. to CXIII.

VOL. V. Chap. CXIV. to the end.

VOL. VI. HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS, WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

VOL. VII. JEWISH TESTIMONIES TO THE TRUTH OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

TESTIMONIES OF ANCIENT HEATHEN AUTHORS. Chap. I. to XVI.

VOL. VIII. Chap. XVII. to LII.

VOL. IX. Chap. LIII. to the end.

THE STATE OF GENTILISM UNDER THE CHRISTIAN EMPERORS.

THE HISTORY OF THE HERETICS OF THE TWO FIRST CENTURIES AFTER CHRIST.

VOL. X. FIFTY-THREE SERMONS.

VOL. XI. TRACTS.

INDEXES.

CONTENTS.

OF THE

FIRST VOLUME.

THE LIFE OF DR. LARDNER.

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY; PART I.

BOOK I.

		PAGE.
	PREFACE - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	3
Chap.	INTRODUCTION - - - - - - - - - - - - -	8
I.	OF PRINCES AND GOVERNORS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT - - - - -	11
II.	OF THE STATE OF THE JEWS IN JUDEA DURING THE MINISTRY OF OUR SAVIOUR AND HIS APOSTLES	33
III.	OF THE STATE OF THE JEWS OUT OF JUDEA - -	107
IV.	CONCERNING THE JEWISH SECTS AND THE SAMARITANS	118
V.	OF THE JEWS AND SAMARITANS EXPECTATIONS, AND THEIR IDEA OF THE MESSIAH - - - - - -	131
VI.	OF THE GREAT CORRUPTION OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE	139
VII.	THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF OUR SAVIOUR'S LAST SUFFERINGS - - - - -	142
VIII.	OF THE TREATMENT WHICH THE APOSTLES AND OTHER DISCIPLES OF JESUS MET WITH FROM JEWS AND GENTILES - - - - - -	164
IX.	CONCERNING DIVERS OPINIONS AND PRACTICES OF THE JEWS - - - - - -	201
X.	ROMAN CUSTOMS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	221
XI.	THREE REMARKABLE FACTS - - - - -	237

BOOK II.

I.	THREE OBJECTIONS AGAINST LUKE II. 1, 2. CONSIDERED	248
II.	TWO OBJECTIONS TAKEN FROM THE SILENCE OF JOSEPHUS - - - - - -	329
III.	AN OBJECTION AGAINST THE FIFTEENTH YEAR OF TIBERIUS COMPARED WITH THE AGE OF JESUS AT HIS BAPTISM - - - - - - -	339

CHAP.		PAGE.
IV.	OF ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS - - -	383
V.	OF THE DIFFERENT NAMES GIVEN TO HERODIAS'S FIRST HUSBAND BY THE EVANGELISTS AND JOSEPHUS -	389
VI.	OF ZACHARIAS, SON OF BARACHIAS - -	398
VII.	OF THEUDAS - - - - -	405
VIII.	OF THE ÆGYPTIAN IMPOSTOR - - -	414
	THE CONCLUSION - - - - -	419
	AN APPENDIX CONCERNING THE TIME OF HEROD'S DEATH	423

THE CASE OF THE DÆMONIACS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TETAMENT: FOUR DISCOURSES UPON MARK V. 19. "HOWBEIT JESUS SUFFERED HIM NOT, BUT SAITH UNTO HIM, GO HOME TO THY FRIENDS, AND TELL THEM HOW GREAT THINGS THE LORD HATH DONE FOR THEE, AND HATH HAD COMPASSION ON THEE."

PREFACE	- - - - -	429
DISCOURSE I.	THE HISTORY OF THE TWO DÆMONIACS IN THE COUNTRY OF THE GADARENES, WHICH IS RECORDED BY THREE EVANGELISTS, EXPLAINED, AND IMPROVED - - - - - - - - -	430
DISCOURSE II.	TWO OPINIONS CONCERNING THE CASE OF THOSE WHO WERE CALLED DÆMONIACS: ONE SUPPOSING THAT SUCH PERSONS WERE TORMENTED, POSSESSED, INHABITED, AND ACTED, BY ONE OR MORE SPIRITS: THE OTHER THAT THESE AFFLICTIVE CASES WERE BODILY DISTEMPERS ONLY. AND THE FORMER OF THOSE OPINIONS, AS HELD IN THE TIME OF OUR SAVIOUR AND HIS APOSTLES, LARGELY REPRESENTED - -	444
DISCOURSE III.	THE LATTER OF THOSE OPINIONS ASSERTED, AND SUPPORTED BY DIVERS CONSIDERATIONS - -	457
DISCOURSE IV.	OBJECTIONS AGAINST THIS OPINION STATED, AND CONSIDERED, AND THE ARGUMENT CONCLUDED	468
AN APPENDIX FOR FURTHER ILLUSTRATING THE SUBJECT - -		458

ERARTA IN VOL. I.

Page.	*Line.*	
xxx	6,	in the life, *for* England *read* New England
lxviii	3,	from bottom, *for* at the end of, *read* in.
lxxxvi	7,	from bottom, *for* parental *read* paternal
cxxi		laſt line, *for* ends *read* friends
cxli	4,	*for* al *read* all
clv	10,	from bottom, *for* χρε *read* χρη
112	5,	*for* way *read* other way.
207	12,	from bottom, *for* fore *read* before.
310	10,	*for* xvi *read* xiv.
365	8,	*dele* ſeveral.

IN THE NOTES.

13 col. 2	l. 5.	*for* ουσσεβες, *read* δυσσεβες.
17	1	laſt line, *for* αυτεν *read* αυτων
185	1	1, *for* διαπεραγναι *read* διαρπαγηνα.
255	1	6, *for* 542 *read* 241
257	1	3 from bottom, *for* γενεθ-αι *read* γενεσθαι
282		*for* τι *read* ει
357	2	9, *for* poteſtatum *read* poteſtatem
366	2	12, *for* deponans *read* deponas
368	2	2, *for* ideque *read* ideoque
377	2	laſt line, *for* Ἰης *read* Ἰησ
496	1	5, *for* οφωρισμενες *read* αφωρισμενες

THE

LIFE

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D. D.

BY

ANDREW KIPPIS, D. D. F. R. S. AND S. A.

ADVERTISEMENT.

AFTER the greateſt part of the following narrative had been compoſed, I received a letter from Mr. David Jennings, grand-nephew to Dr. Lardner, deſiring me to withdraw my publication. This letter was written not only in his own name, but in the name of the Rev. Dr. Dickens, Prebendary of Durham, who married a niece of Dr. Lardner, a lady ſtill living, and who joined in the requiſition. At the ſame time I was aſſured, that if I perſiſted in my intention, they would ſtrongly and publicly diſavow their having conſented to the performance. Although, for reaſons which to my own mind appeared perfectly ſatisfactory, I refuſed to comply with their requeſt, I acquainted them that I had not the leaſt objection myſelf to record their diſavowal, and to take upon me the diſgrace of having written the life without aſking their permiſſion. Accordingly I here do this in the moſt expreſs manner. I here declare, that if, in the life of Dr. Lardner now preſented to the public, there be any miſtakes in point of fact, or errors of ſentiment; that if it be ill written, or improperly written, its faults belong to myſelf alone, being chargeable upon no other perſon whatſoever.

I take this opportunity of informing the literary world that I am not, as many gentlemen have ſuppoſed, the editor of Dr. Lardner's works. I am only the writer of the life. The ſuperintendence of the edition has been conſigned to a very worthy perſon, of approved learning and diligence, whoſe accuracy and care in the undertaking will, I doubt not, be ſufficiently apparent.

ANDREW KIPPIS.

THE

LIFE

OF

DR. NATHANIEL LARDNER.

DR. NATHANIEL LARDNER was born at Hawkherſt, in the county of Kent, on the ſixth of June, 1684. His father, Mr. Richard Lardner, was a miniſter of reſpectable character among the proteſtant diſſenters, and, for a conſiderable number of years, paſtor of a congregation at Deal; but whether he was in that ſituation at the time of his ſon's birth does not appear: perhaps, as the toleration act had not then taken place, he might not as yet have become a ſettled preacher. The mother of our author was the daughter of a Mr. Collier, formerly of the borough of Southwark, but who afterwards retired to Hawkherſt, which is a large village, ſouth of Cranbrook, and lying in that part of Kent which borders upon Suſſex. It was probably at his grandfather's houſe that young Lardner was born. Where he received his grammatical education, cannot now be aſcer-

tained; though it is ſuppoſed, from his father's reſidence at Deal, that it might be at that place. Wherever it was, there can be no doubt, from the literature which he afterwards diſplayed, of his having made an early progreſs in the knowledge of the learned languages. From the grammar ſchool he was removed to a diſſenting Academy in London, under the care of the Reverend Dr. Joſhua Oldfield. Here, however, he muſt have continued but a very little time; for in the latter end of 1699, being then only in the ſixteenth year of his age, he was ſent to proſecute his ſtudies at Utrecht, under the profeſſors D'Uries, Grævius, and Burman, names of no ſmall celebrity in the literary world. Under ſuch tutors, Mr. Lardner made a ſuitable improvement in various branches of learning; and he brought back with him a teſtimonial from profeſſor Burman, to that purpoſe.

It was not uncommon, at that period, for the young men who were intended for the diſſenting miniſtry in England, to ſtudy abroad, and particularly in the univerſities of Holland. Several perſons, who afterwards became of no ſmall conſideration among the diſſenters, and who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their valuable writings, were educated in this manner. Mr. Martin Tomkins went over with Mr. Lardner to Utrecht, and they found there Mr. Daniel Neal.

After ſpending ſomewhat more than three years at Utrecht, Mr. Lardner removed to Leyden, where

he ſtudied about ſix months. In 1703, he returned to England, in company with Mr. Tomkins and Mr. Neal; and from that time, to the year 1709, we have no memorials concerning him. This ſpace was probably ſpent by him at his father's houſe, who quitted Deal in 1703 or 1704, and came to reſide in or near London; and we may be certain that young Mr. Lardner employed himſelf in a cloſe and diligent preparation for the ſacred profeſſion which he had in view. He was not one of thoſe who are in haſte to diſplay their talents in the pulpit; for it was not till the ſecond of Auguſt, 1709, when he was above twenty-five years of age, that he preached his firſt ſermon. This was at Stoke-Newington, for his friend Mr. Martin Tomkins, who had become the Miniſter of a congregation at that place. The ſubject of Mr. Lardner's diſcourſe was taken from Romans i. 16; "For I am not aſhamed of the goſpel of Chriſt: "for it is the power of God unto ſalvation to every "one that believeth; to the Jew firſt, and alſo to "the Greek." There could not have been a more proper text, for a man who was deſtined, in the order of divine providence, to be one of the ableſt advocates for the authenticity and truth of the Chriſtian Revelation that ever exiſted. During the four years which ſucceeded to this event, we have no information concerning our author, excepting, that he was a member of the congregational church under the paſtoral charge of the Reverend Mr.

Matthew Clark, a gentleman of eminence among the diſſenting clergymen of that period, and father to Dr. Clark, a phyſician of character, reputation, and extenſive practice, who died not long ſince at Tottenham, in Middleſex.

In 1713, Mr. Lardner was invited to reſide in the houſe of Lady Treby, the widow of Sir George Treby, Knt. who had been appointed Lord Chief Juſtice of the Court of Common Pleas in 1692, and had ſuſtained that high office and dignity, with great integrity and ability, till his deceaſe, in 1702[a]. The propoſal made to our author was, that he ſhould be domeſtic chaplain to her ladyſhip, and tutor to her youngeſt ſon, Brindley Treby. To this propoſal he acceded; and it need not be ſaid, how well qualified he was, by his knowledge, judgment, and learning, for ſuperintending a young gentleman's education. After having conducted Mr. Treby's ſtudies three years, he accompanied him in an excurſion into France, the Auſtrian Netherlands, and the United Provinces, which employed four months. From a journal which Mr. Lardner kept of this tour, it was evident, that he did not loſe the opportunity it afforded him of making exact and judicious obſervations on the manners and cuſtoms of the inhabitants whom he ſaw and viſited, and on the edifices and curioſities of the countries through

[a] Beatſon's Political Index, part iii. p. 74.

which

which he paſſed. How long he ſuſtained the ſpecific character of tutor to young Mr. Treby, does not appear; but he continued in Lady Treby's family till her death, which happened in the beginning of the year 1721. By this event, he was removed from a ſituation which ſeems to have been an agreeable one, and was thrown into circumſtances of ſome perplexity and ſuſpence. His own remarks will ſhew the ſtate of his mind at that time. "I am yet at a loſs," ſays he, "how "to diſpoſe of myſelf. I can ſay I am deſirous "of being uſeful in the world. Without this, "no external advantages relating to myſelf will "make me happy: and yet I have no proſpect of "being ſerviceable in the work of the miniſtry; "having preached many years without being fa-"voured with the approbation and choice of any "one congregation [b]."

It reflects no honour upon the diſſenters, that a man of ſuch merit ſhould ſo long have been neglected. But it muſt be obſerved, that in elections which are dependent upon the whole body of a congregation, a regard will uſually be paid, not only to internal abilities, but to external qualifications. It is not probable that Mr. Lardner, even in his beſt days, was poſſeſſed of a good elocution; and his ſimple mode of compoſition was not cal-

[b] Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Rev. Nathaniel Lardner, D. D. p. 4.

culated to ſtrike the multitude. Rational preaching had not then made a very extenſive progreſs among the diſſenters; and it is to be lamented, that, when it became more prevalent, it ſhould too often be diſjoined from energy and pathos.

Two years after the death of Lady Treby, Mr. Lardner met with another calamity, which greatly affected him. This was the deceaſe of his former pupil, Brindley Treby, Eſq; a gentleman for whom our author had the higheſt affection and eſteem. Indeed, he felt ſo deeply the loſs of his friend, that he imputed to it, in part, the increaſe of a deafneſs, which had been coming upon him for ſome time before. In the beginning of the year 1724, he writes as follows: "Mr. Corniſh preached; "but I was not able to hear any thing he ſaid, "nor ſo much as the ſound of his voice. I am, "indeed, at preſent ſo deaf, that when I ſit in the "pulpit, and the congregation is ſinging, I can "hardly tell whether they are ſinging or not[c]."

Previouſly to this account of himſelf, and at leaſt as early as 1723, Mr. Lardner was engaged, in conjunction with a number of miniſters, in carrying on a courſe of lectures, on a Tueſday evening, at the Old Jewry. His firſt aſſociates were Mr. Hughes, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Harriſon, Mr. Kench, and Mr. Godwin; the two latter of

[c] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 11.

whom

whom ſoon reſigned the connection, and their places were ſupplied by Mr. Calamy and Mr. Mole [d].

At

[d] Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Obadiah Hughes was many years miniſter of a congregation in Southwark, from which he removed to Weſtminſter. By marriage he became poſſeſſed of a large fortune. He was an acceptable preacher, and printed ſome occaſional ſermons; but did not otherwiſe diſtinguiſh himſelf in the literary world.

On Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Samuel Chandler's abilities, learning, and writings, it is needleſs to enlarge, as they cannot be unknown to any of my readers. Such perſons as wiſh to ſee a particular account of him, may have recourſe to the third volume of the Biographia Britannica.

Mr. Harriſon was a miniſter of the Antipædobaptiſt perſuaſion, who officiated in Wild-ſtreet. Not long after his having been engaged in the Tueſday lecture, he conformed to the church of England, and preached a ſermon at St. Vedaſt's, Foſter-lane, in vindication of his conformity. The ſermon, which was afterwards printed, did not obtain the approbation of biſhop Hoadly. When Mr. Gough, another young diſſenting miniſter, ſome years after, applied to that prelate for orders, his lordſhip adviſed him not to follow Mr. Harriſon's example with regard to publication. This Mr. Gough was the author of a pamphlet on the Cauſes of the Decay of the Diſſenting Intereſt, an anſwer to which was one of Dr. Doddridge's earlieſt performances. Mr. Gough publiſhed, likewiſe, a volume of ſermons, which are ſenſible and judicious, and not deſtitute of elegance. He was of the ſchool of Clarke and Hoadly, and was very intimate with Dr. James Foſter. Mr. Harriſon became inſane, and died in early life: but there is no reaſon to believe that he was diſſatisfied with his own conduct. For theſe particulars concerning him, the preſent Biographer is indebted to an excellent and learned friend, the Rev. Mr. Edward Williams, of Nottingham. The author of the Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Lardner is miſtaken in aſſerting that Dr. Harris was one of the Tueſday

At this time, and indeed ſome years before, Mr. Lardner was member of a literary ſociety, conſiſting of miniſters and lay gentlemen, who met, on Monday evenings, at Chew's coffee-houſe, in Bow-lane, Cheapſide. The chairman of this ſociety, at every meeting, propoſed two queſtions, to be freely and candidly debated; beſide which, each member, in his turn, produced an

evening lecturers: Dr. William Harris was then an old miniſter; whereas the lecture was carried on by young men.

Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Kench was, as well as Mr. Harriſon, a Baptiſt miniſter, and of conſiderable note in his day. I do not recollect that he publiſhed any other than a few occaſional diſcourſes.

Mr. Godwin was long the reſpectable paſtor of a congregation that met in Little St. Helen's, Biſhopſgate-ſtreet. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Doddridge, and aſſiſted him much in correcting his works from the preſs, and in drawing up the Index to the Family Expoſitor.

Mr. Calamy, the ſon of the famous Dr. Edmund Calamy, was an ingenious and learned man. He was for ſome time aſſiſtant to Dr. Benjamin Groſvenor, but declined preaching ſeveral years before his death.

Mr. Mole was firſt a miniſter at Uxbridge, then at Rotherhithe, and laſt of all at Hackney. At length he retired to Uxbridge, where he died not many years ſince. In point of learning, he might be ranked with Lardner, Benſon, and Chandler. He was the author of ſome valuable publications, and employed the latter part of his days in writing, in Latin, a life of the celebrated Laurentius Valla, including the religious and literary hiſtory of the time. The manuſcript of this work Mr. Mole's executors, with an inattention which can never be juſtified, permitted to be ſold with his books at a common auction.

eſſay

eſſay on ſome learned or entertaining ſubject. Such inſtitutions have been of eminent ſervice to the republic of literature: they have given riſe to many important diſcoveries, and to many valuable works, which otherwiſe would never have exiſted. A hiſtory of ſocieties of this kind, which are now diffuſed through every part of Europe, and are extended to the Weſtern and the Eaſtern world, tracing their ſmall beginnings, their gradual increaſe, their more permanent eſtabliſhment, and their beneficial effects, would be a very inſtructive and entertaining performance.

Another ſociety, which met at Chew's coffee-houſe on a Thurſday, and of which Mr. Lardner was a member, conſiſted entirely of miniſters. The gentlemen belonging to this ſociety had a deſign of compoſing a Concordance of Things to the Bible, and began to methodize the book of Proverbs for that purpoſe. They had firſt drawn up a ſcheme of the whole undertaking, the different parts of which were aſſigned to Mr. Lardner, Mr. Corniſh, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Read, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Wroe, and Mr. Savage [c]. It doth not appear

[c] Mr. Corniſh was aſſiſtant to Mr. Joſhua Bayes, ſen. and continued in that capacity till his death, which happened when he was under forty years of age.—Mr. Hughes I have already mentioned.—Mr. James Read preached to a ſociety in New Broad-ſtreet, behind the Royal Exchange, firſt as aſſiſtant to Dr. John Evans, author of the "Chriſtian Temper," and other uſeful publications, and afterwards as joint paſtor with Dr. Allen.

appear that the design was ever carried fully into execution; and one impediment to it, so far as Mr. Lardner was concerned, probably arose from the more important work in which he now began to be engaged.

In one of the schemes for the Tuesday evening's lecture, which is preserved in the Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Lardner, the subjects are entirely of a practical and moral nature, and admirably calculated for instruction and improvement in that view. But besides treating upon subjects of this kind, the gentlemen who carried on the lecture, preached a course of sermons on the evidences of natural and revealed religion. In this course,

len. He had a brother, Mr. Henry Read, who, to a very advanced age, was minister of a congregation which met in St. Thomas's, Southwark; and of whom the following character was given, between twenty and thirty years ago, in some verses that were written upon the six Tuesday Salters Hall Lecturers of that period.

" Through youth, through age, O Read, thy honest heart
" Hath never quitted the consistent part.
" Thy thoughts are useful, though thy style is plain,
" And genuine goodness breathes through all thy strain."

Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Samuel Clark settled at St. Alban's, where he lived many years, and died, with great reputation. He was the author of a collection of Scripture Promises, with a discourse prefixed concerning the proper use and application of them. This work, which has gone through several editions, and has afforded no small degree of consolation to many pious Christians,

courſe, the proof of the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory was aſſigned to Mr. Lardner; and in the latter end of the year 1723, and the beginning of 1724, he delivered three ſermons on that moſt important object of Chriſtian enquiry. Here it was that the foundation was probably laid of his great work. Certain it is, that from this time he was diligently engaged in writing the firſt part of his Credibility. His modeſty, however, was ſuch, that he was doubtful about the publication of it, and greatly regretted that, by the deceaſe of his dear friend and pupil, Mr. Treby, he was deprived of his advice, on this and other occaſions. It is hence evident how much Mr. Treby had profited by the inſtructions which had been given him,

tians, was recommended by Dr. Watts. Dr. Clark publiſhed, likewiſe, three ſermons on the folly, ſin, and danger of irreſolution in religion. It is to the honour of this gentleman, that he was the early patron of Dr. Doddridge, who ever retained for him a filial regard and affection. He was the father of the late excellent Mr. Samuel Clark, of Birmingham. Both father and ſon will probably be noticed when Dr. Doddridge's life ſhall come to be written in the Biographia Britannica.

Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Jeremiah Hunt, of Pinners Hall, was a very judicious divine, and the author of ſeveral learned and valuable publications. Some account of him will be found in the diſcourſes of Dr. Lardner, who preached his funeral ſermon.—Of Mr. Wroe I am not able to give any intelligence.—Mr. Savage was a worthy and ſenſible miniſter, who ſettled at Edmonton, where he continued to the time of his deceaſe. I do not recollect that he publiſhed any thing, beſides a few occaſional ſermons.

ſince

part of ſervice, in the work of the goſpel, with their honoured paſtor, for whom he had entertained, from his early youth, a high regard and eſteem. On the 14th of September, he entered upon his new charge; and the ſubject of his firſt ſermon was taken from 2 Cor. v. 20. "Now then we are am-
"baſſadors for Chriſt: as though God did beſeech
"you by us, we pray you, in Chriſt's ſtead, be ye
"reconciled to God." In Mr. Lardner's prayer before ſermon, after the interceſſions for the public, and for Dr. Harris in particular, he proceeded to pray for himſelf, in the following ſtrain of integrity and piety: "And we beſeech thee, do thou gra-
"ciouſly aſſiſt thine unworthy ſervant, whom, by
"thy providence, thou haſt alſo called to ſerve thee
"in this place. Grant that he may take great heed
"unto himſelf and his doctrine, that he may ſave
"himſelf and them that hear him. Do thou en-
"lighten him more and more in the knowledge
"of the truth; and grant that he may be faithful
"to thee, and ſpeak the word with all boldneſs, not
"ſhunning to declare the whole counſel of God,
"ſo far as he is acquainted therewith. And may
"the hearts of thy people be opened to receive
"the truth with all readineſs: may they carefully
"and impartially examine the things which they
"hear, and embrace what is agreeable to thy will.
"O Lord, our hope is in thee! do thou ſtrengthen
"us, and make us ſufficient for what thou calleſt
"us to. Let thy ſtrength be made perfect in our
"weakneſs:

" weakneſs: cauſe thy face to ſhine upon us; let
" us ſee thy power and thy glory in the ſanctuary.
" May ſome who are yet in darkneſs and ignorance
" be here enlightened; may ſome be converted;
" and may thy people be comforted, and conti-
" nually edified more and more in their moſt holy
" faith. May we meet with thee in thine houſe, and
" have joy and pleaſure in drawing near unto thee.
" May we, by all thy ordinances, by prayer, by the
" miniſtry of thy word, and by thy ſacraments, be
" made more meet for all the events of provi-
" dence; for all the ſervices and ſufferings of this
" life; and for the ſtate of perfection and glory in
" the world to come." His account of this prayer is ſucceeded by the ſubſequent ejaculation. " May
" God hear my earneſt prayers, in enabling me to
" perform this ſervice he has called me to, ſo as
" may be for his glory, and the edification of his
" people[g]."

The religious world was at this time engaged in an important controverſy, relative to the Chriſtian revelation. That of which I am ſpeaking had been begun by Mr. Woolſton, who, perhaps, was rather an enthuſiaſt and a madman than an infidel. By reading Origen, and other myſtical writers, he had been led to embrace the allegorical mode of explaining the ſcriptures, which, at length, he carried to a moſt extravagant and ridiculous exceſs. After

[g] Ibid. p. 12, 13, 14.

ſeveral

ſeveral abſurd publications, he contended, in a tract, intitled, "The Moderator between an Infidel and "an Apoſtate," to which two ſupplements were added, that the miracles of our Lord were not real, or ever actually wrought. For this work a proſecution was commenced againſt him, in 1726, by the Attorney General; but, in conſequence of Mr. Whiſton's interceſſion, it was laid aſide. Mr. Woolſton was not induced by this indulgence to continue in ſilence. He purſued the ſubject through the years 1727, 1728, 1729, and 1730, in ſix diſcourſes, and two defences of them; in which he not only maintained the ſame principles he had done in his "Moderator," but treated the miracles of our Saviour with a licentiouſneſs, buffoonery, and inſolence, that had all the appearance, if not the reality, of malignant infidelity. The proſecution, therefore, was renewed againſt him; and, being tried before Lord Chief Juſtice Raymond, he was condemned in one year's impriſonment, and a fine of a hundred pounds.

A far better method of confuting Mr. Woolſton was adopted by many learned divines at that period. The pamphlets written againſt him were, indeed, very numerous; and among the reſt of the defenders of revelation, Mr. Lardner appeared to no ſmall advantage. His work upon this occaſion, which was publiſhed in the latter end of the year 1729, was intitled, "A Vindication of Three of "our bleſſed Saviour's Miracles, *viz.* The Raiſing "of

" of Jairus's Daughter, the Widow of Naim's Son, " and Lazarus." It was in anſwer to the objections of Mr. Woolſton's fifth diſcourſe, that this piece was compoſed. Mr. Lardner had drawn it up for his own private ſatisfaction, without any immediate view to publication; and his modeſty was ſuch, that for a time he did not think of printing it, becauſe his colleague, Dr. Harris, had ſubjoined to two diſcourſes on the reaſonableneſs of belief in Chriſt, and the unreaſonableneſs of infidelity, ſome brief remarks on the caſe of Lazarus. It was to the advantage of the public that our author changed his opinion. His vindication was undoubtedly one of the beſt treatiſes which appeared in the controverſy with Mr. Woolſton; and it is no exaggeration to ſay, that it abounds with admirable and judicious obſervations, and contains a complete defence of three of the moſt important of our Lord's miracles. Accordingly, it was very favourably received by the learned world, and ſoon came to a ſecond edition.

Mr. Lardner was not one of thoſe who approved of the proſecution which was carried on againſt Mr. Woolſton by the civil magiſtrate. In his preface, therefore, he has made ſome excellent remarks on the ſubject of free enquiry and diſcuſſion. If men be permitted to deliver their ſentiments freely in matters of religion, and to propoſe their objections againſt Chriſtianity itſelf, he declares it to be his opinion, that there would be no reaſon to be in

pain for the event. "On the ſide of Chriſtianity," ſays he, "I expect to ſee, as hitherto, the greateſt "ſhare of learning, good ſenſe, true wit, and fair-"neſs of diſputation; which things, I hope, will "be ſuperior to low ridicule, falſe argument, and "miſrepreſentation." He farther obſerves, that all force on the minds of men, in the matters of belief, is contrary to religion in general, and the Chriſtian religion in particular; and that ſeverity, inſtead of doing good, has always done harm. Dr. Waddington, at that time biſhop of Chicheſter, who was highly pleaſed with the whole of Mr. Lardner's vindication of the three miracles, was not equally ſatisfied with his preface, and, therefore, wrote to him upon the ſubject. To the biſhop our author ſent an anſwer, which produced a ſecond letter from his lordſhip, and a reply in return. Theſe four letters, which were written with great mutual civility and reſpect, are given in the Appendix[h]; and it will now be little doubted, on what ſide lay the advantage of the argument.

Another correſpondent, occaſioned by the Vindication of the Three Miracles, was the Lord Viſcount Barrington; who had made ſome remarks, and ſuggeſted ſome difficulties concerning the death of Jairus's daughter. Theſe remarks are unhappily loſt; but Mr. Lardner's letter, in anſwer to them, is preſerved, and will be found in the Appendix[i]. His lordſhip, who poſſeſſed a very enlightened

[h] Appendix, N° I. [i] Appendix, N° II.

mind

mind on the ſubject of religious liberty, highly approved of Mr. Lardner's preface; and the approbation of ſo good a judge was received by our author with peculiar ſatisfaction. "I have a great "deal of reaſon," ſays he, "to rejoice, that the "manner, in which the argument for free writing "is managed in the preface, is not unacceptable to "your lordſhip; for, as to the principles them-"ſelves, I had no doubt but they would be agree-"able to your judgment, however they may be "ſuſpected or diſliked by others, who have leſs "ſtudied the Chriſtian doctrine. A true Chriſtian "may ſuffer on the account of his religion, but he "can never make others ſuffer on account of "theirs: whatever may be the conſequence of it, "we are not to ſupport Chriſtianity by force. "Our bleſſed Saviour, rather than make uſe of "compulſion, would chuſe to be without a fol-"lower. John, vi. 67[k]."

Though Mr. Lardner's time was chiefly employed in his preparations for the pulpit, and in carrying on his great work, he, nevertheleſs, found leiſure to write other occaſional pieces, beſides his vindication of the three miracles. In 1730, he ſent a letter to Mr. Laroche, to be inſerted in his Literary Journal, a periodical work, which, beſides giving an account of books, admitted ſhort original communications, conſiſting of critical diſquiſitions and

[k] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 32.

dissertations. The subject of the letter was a difficulty concerning the omission of the history of our Saviour's ascension, in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, though it is related by St. Mark and St. Luke. This difficulty our author has removed with his usual good sense and discernment, as the reader may see by having recourse to the appendix[l]. In the same year, he wrote his Letter on the Logos. It was not composed with a view to publication; and, indeed, was not published till nearly thirty years after, when I shall have occasion to mention it again. From a passage in the vindication of the three miracles, I collect that Mr. Lardner had very recently embraced the doctrine advanced in the Letter, or, at least, had not long come to a final determination on the subject. For in that passage he asserts, that our Saviour "descended from the height of glory he had with "the Father[m]." Or is it to be considered as an incidental expression, which dropped from our author, though he might for some time have had his doubts and difficulties with regard to the præexistence of Christ?

In 1733, appeared the first volume of the second part of "The Credibility of the Gospel History; "or the PRINCIPAL Facts of the New Testament "confirmed by passages from ancient authors who "were contemporary with our Saviour, or his

[l] Appendix, N° III.

[m] See the volume of Tracts, p. 41.

"apostles,

" apoſtles, or lived near their time." It was Mr. Lardner's original intention not to publiſh a part of the evidence for the principal facts of the New Teſtament, until the whole work was completed. But he was diverted from this purpoſe by the importunities of his friends. He could have wiſhed, however, to have exhibited at once the whole evidence of the two firſt centuries of Chriſtianity; but he thought it expedient to break off ſooner, that he might not render the volume of an inconvenient ſize. Our author took this opportunity of expreſſing his gratitude for the favourable reception which had been given to the former part of his work. Beſides its being univerſally well received at home, it was ſo much approved abroad, that it was tranſlated by two learned foreigners; by Mr. Cornelius Weſterbaen of Utrecht into Low Dutch, and by Mr. J. Chriſtopher Wolff of Hamburgh into Latin. " I cannot but eſteem it," ſays Mr. Lardner, " as an uncommon happineſs, that " my thoughts have been ſo juſtly repreſented " by perſons well known in the republic of letters " for compoſitions of their own."

The teſtimonies produced and conſidered, in the firſt volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility, were thoſe of St. Barnabas, St. Clement, Hermas, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, Papias, Juſtin Martyr, Dionyſius of Corinth, Tatian, Hegeſippus, Melito, St. Irenæus, and Athenagoras. Our author has alſo treated on a fragment called St. Clement's ſecond

epiſtle, the relation of St. Polycarp's martyrdom, the evangeliſts in the reign of Trajan, the epiſtle to Diognetus, and the epiſtle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons. In the introduction, he hath given an admirable ſummary of the hiſtory of the New Teſtament. Among other proofs of approbation and regard which Mr. Lardner received in conſequence of this publication, he could not avoid being pleaſed with the following affectionate remarks, by his learned and valuable friend, the Rev. Mr. Joſeph Hallet, jun. of Exeter. "Your new "volume, with which you have now obliged the "world, will, I am perſuaded, do good ſervice to "the cauſe of Chriſtianity. You cannot be igno-"rant of my opinion of it, from the converſation "I had the honour to have with you about it in "your ſtudy.—Your method, upon the whole, "pleaſes me much better than Mr. Jones's, be-"cauſe he hardly ever does more than refer to "chapter, verſe, and page; whereas you write "the words of the text and of the quoſation at "length; and when he has a huddle of references, "you, in the caſe of Irenæus, prudently chuſe *one* "*plain quotation* of each book of the New Teſta-"ment cited by him. When the work ſhall be all "finiſhed in that manner, it will be worth its "weight in gold, and all the Chriſtian world will "be obliged to thank you for it[n]."

[n] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 49.

In

In 1735, was publiſhed the ſecond volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory. The ſubjects of this volume were, Miltiades, Theophilus of Antioch, Pantænus, St. Clement of Alexandria, Polycrates, Heraclitus and ſeveral other writers near the end of the ſecond century, Hermias, Serapion, Tertullian, a number of authors who required only to be ſhortly mentioned, and certain ſuppoſititious writings of the ſecond century; ſuch as, the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Sibylline Oracles, the Teſtaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Recognitions, the Clementine Homilies, and the Clementine Epitome. Among theſe different articles, thoſe which relate to St. Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian are peculiarly important, and the remarks on the apocryphal works are very curious and uſeful. The farther Mr. Lardner proceeded in his deſign, the more did he advance in eſteem and reputation among learned men of all denominations. Even the adverſaries to religion could not withhold their teſtimony to his merit. The noted Dr. Morgan, (afterwards the writer of the "Moral Philoſopher," in which revelation was attacked with the greateſt virulence, and which hath received many noble and ſatisfactory anſwers) in a letter to our author, containing ſome objections to the firſt chapter of St. Luke's goſpel, compliments him highly on his integrity, impartiality, and candour. This letter, together with Mr. Lardner's ſenſible and

judicious reply, will be found in the Appendix °.

In November 1736, our author was attacked by another ſevere and dangerous fever. The effects of it were ſuch, that he did not recover his health, ſo far as to be able to preach, till late in the ſpring of 1737. In that year, he publiſhed his "Counſels of Prudence for the uſe of young people; a diſcourſe on the wiſdom of the Serpent and the innocence of the Dove: in which are recommended general rules of prudence; with particular directions relating to buſineſs, converſation, friendſhip, and uſefulneſs." This diſcourſe was generally and juſtly admired. Indeed, it contains moſt excellent advice to young perſons; advice reſulting from the union of wiſdom, integrity, and knowledge of the world; and which, if followed, would be the beſt foundation of happineſs, both here and hereafter. If, from the mention of this diſcourſe, any ſingle youth ſhould be engaged ſo to attend to the directions it contains, as to reduce them to practice, the preſent Life of Dr. Lardner will have been written to a moſt valuable purpoſe.

Dr. Secker, biſhop of Oxford, was highly pleaſed with the Counſels of Prudence. In a letter to our author, he expreſſed himſelf in the following terms: "I am alſo in your debt for thoſe excellent "Counſels of Prudence, which you publiſhed ſome

° Appendix, N° IV.

"time

" time ago, and would recommend it to you, to
" relieve yourſelf now and then from your great
" work, and oblige the world with ſome of theſe
" little pieces. One would hope they might do
" a great deal of good in it, and I am ſure, there is
" great need of doing every thing that can be done
" to promote ſerioufneſs and mildneſs among men."
After giving this teſtimony to Mr. Lardner's diſcourſe, the biſhop adds, that the number of religious perſons was dreadfully leſſened, and that thoſe who remained were very far from preſerving a due moderation and charity one towards another. " I am
" very ſorry," ſays he, " for faults of this kind,
" which we of the eſtabliſhment fall into; and
" too many of you, I fear, are not leſs faulty;
" though I do not take the ſpirit of ſome papers
" to be the ſpirit of the Diſſenters. May God
" make us all wiſer and better; and may he long
" preſerve your health, dear Sir, to be uſeful to
" his church." Here Dr. Secker had a reference to the controverſy which was then carrying on with regard to the juſtice, propriety, and expediency of retaining or repealing the corporation and teſt acts; in which controverſy, as is uſual in ſuch caſes, ſome warm things (and perhaps warmer than was reaſonable and prudent) might be advanced by ſeveral of the advocates for the diſſenters, as well as by their opponents. In anſwer to the latter part of the biſhop's letter, Mr. Lardner wrote as follows: " I have not received any information

" concerning

" concerning the writer or writers of the papers
" to which your lordſhip refers. But I believe
" your lordſhip to be in the right, in ſuppoſing
" that there are many diſſenters, by whom they
" are not approved. So far as I know, the diſſen-
" ters are generally in a good temper. Some, in-
" deed, were ſoured by a late diſappointment.
" And they were chiefly of thoſe who uſed to be
" reputed men of moderation and charity, and who
" were far from being diſaffected to the church of
" England. For theſe, as it ſeems, were the men
" who were moſt earneſt in the affair: though all
" ſuch did not engage in it with equal earneſtneſs.
" Perhaps this may deſerve to be conſidered[p]."
It is hence ſufficiently apparent, that our author did not approve of the refuſal that had been given to the repeal of the corporation and teſt acts, though he has expreſſed himſelf with his uſual mildneſs of ſentiment, and gentleneſs of language.

In 1738, Mr. Lardner was enabled to give to the world the third volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility. This volume carried the evidence down to the year 233, and included Minucius Felix, Apollonius, Caius and others, Aſterius Urbanus, St. Alexander biſhop of Jeruſalem, St. Hippolytus, Ammonius, Julius Africanus, Origen, and St. Fermilian. Some of theſe articles are of great conſequence, and I need not inform my readers that

[p] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 66—68.

this

this muſt be peculiarly the caſe with reſpect to the account of Origen.

Our author, in this ſame year, drew up a paper, containing "Remarks upon ſome Difficulties concerning the Chriſtian Doctrine." Theſe remarks were in anſwer to a friend, who had made certain objections to the excellence and uſefulneſs of ſeveral of the precepts of our holy religion. Mr. Lardner's paper, which is inſerted in the Appendix, diſplays his cuſtomary good ſenſe, and ſagacity of obſervation [q].

In 1739, there was only one publication by our author, which was intitled, "A Caution againſt Conformity to this World." It conſiſted of two diſcourſes, which had been preached from Romans xii. 2, and which may juſtly be conſidered as a ſequel to the Counſels of Prudence. The directions and cautions given in theſe ſermons will be found uſeful at all times; and an attention to them would be highly ſeaſonable at preſent; when, without indulging to ſatirical reflections upon the age, it may too truly be aſſerted, that the influence of general cuſtom and faſhion is not always favourable to thoſe diſpoſitions and habits which are recommended by wiſdom, piety, and virtue.

Early in January, 1740, appeared the fourth volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility. Our author began this volume with an account of va-

[q] Appendix, N° V.

rious

rious writers of leſs note in the former part of the third century, and then proceeded to the conſideration of Noetus, and others who were called heretics at that period; ſuch as the Valeſians, the Angelics, the Apoſtolics, and the Origeniſts. But the volume was chiefly devoted to St. Gregory, biſhop of Neocæſarea; Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria; and St. Cyprian, biſhop of Carthage. The two laſt articles are very copious and curious.

On the 17th of January, Mr. Lardner loſt his father, who departed this life in the 87th year of his age. With his worthy parent our author had reſided ever ſince he had quitted Lady Treby's family; and how much he was affected by his deceaſe, will ſtrongly be manifeſted from what he wrote upon the occaſion. "I am," ſays he, "full "of grief, and find it very difficult to bear up un-"der the affliction. I entreat the Lord Almighty "to be my father and protector, to ſupport me, "and to guide me in the remaining part of my life, "ſo as that I may live to his praiſe and glory. I "entreat and pray that he will enable me to be-"have as a Chriſtian, and one perſuaded of his "fatherly care and protection; and that this af-"fliction may be improved by me for my farther "humiliation and repentance; for engaging in a "cloſer dependance on God; for quickening my "preparations for another and better world." He farther writes: "I find this affliction lit very heavy "upon me. My deareſt brother, *Richard Lardner*,

"died

"died in April, 1733, ſome little time before I "publiſhed the firſt volume of the ſecond part of "the Credibility. The fourth volume of this "work was publiſhed but a few days before my "father died [r]."

Conſidering the great age of old Mr. Lardner; that he had been weakened for ſome years before by a paralytic diſorder; and that the deafneſs of his ſon muſt have been ſome obſtruction to their mutual converſation, it may perhaps be thought that the grief which our author has expreſſed above was rather too exceſſive. But whoever reflects upon the matter will be ſenſible, that there muſt have been ſomething very excellent both in the father and the ſon, and very engaging in their manner of living together, when a ſeparation, which ſo long muſt have been expected, could have been thus painful to the ſurvivor. Such parental and filial regard cannot but appear beautiful and delightful to every well-regulated mind. Dr. Lardner was finely attempered to the ſocial affections; and he has recorded, in his Vindication of the Three Miracles, that, for his own part, he never loved ſtoical principles or diſpoſitions [s].

A character of old Mr. Lardner was drawn up by Mr. Neal, and will be found in the Appendix [t]. It may be obſerved by the way, that Mr.

[r] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 87—89. [s] Volume of Tracts, p. 48. [t] Appendix, N° VI.

Richard

Richard Lardner, our author's only brother, was a counſellor at law. They had but one ſiſter, Elizabeth, who was married to the Rev. Mr. Daniel Neal, now mentioned; a gentleman who, not to ſpeak of his other writings, is well known to the learned world by his Hiſtory of England, and ſtill more by his Hiſtory of the Puritans.

Mr. Lardner's excellent friend, Mr. Hallet, entered deeply into his feelings on the death of his father, and wrote him a letter, upon that event, which was full of ſympathy and piety [u]. On the 25th of May, in this ſame year, our author met with another affliction, in the deceaſe of his highly valued colleague, Dr. William Harris. On this occaſion, it naturally fell upon him to preach the funeral ſermon, which he did from 2 Theſſ. i. 10. In the diſcourſe, which was printed, and will be found in his works, he gave a high and, I doubt not, a juſt character of Dr. Harris. The doctor was, indeed, for a great number of years, a very eminent miniſter among the proteſtant diſſenters. He had been choſen paſtor of the congregation at Crouched Fryers, in 1698, when he was only in the 23d year of his age, and continued in that relation to his death in 1740. It appears that he was a gentleman of various accompliſhments, being a man of the world, as well as a ſcholar. In his writings, he paid a greater attention to neatneſs and elegance of compoſition than was done by

[u] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 89—91.

ſome

ſome of his brethren; and his diſcourſes on the Meſſiah have been held in much reputation. A funeral ſermon for him was likewiſe preached and publiſhed by Dr. Groſvenor.

Soon after Dr. Harris's deceaſe, Mr. Lardner had an unanimous invitation to undertake the paſtoral charge of the ſociety at Crouched Fryers, in conjunction with ſome other miniſter of whom they ſhould make a choice. Upon receiving this invitation, he conſulted with his friend Mr. Hallet, who ſtrongly urged him to accept of it; and endeavoured to remove the difficulties he might feel on that head, and eſpecially thoſe ariſing from his deafneſs. Mr. Hallet wiſhed him to acquire a larger concern in directing the affairs of a congregation than he had hitherto done, and to appear at the Fund, and other places, as one of the chief among the diſſenting miniſters, according to his real deſerts [x]. Whatever were Mr. Lardner's reaſons, he declined taking a ſhare in the paſtoral office. It is probable that his deafneſs contributed, among other cauſes, to this determination. In November, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) George Benſon was choſen ſole paſtor of the ſociety, and our author continued aſſiſtant preacher.

It was not till the year 1743, that Mr. Lardner was enabled to give to the public the fifth volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility. This vo-

[x] Ibid. p. 91—95.

lume

lume comprehended St. Cornelius and St. Lucius, biſhops of Rome, Novatus, Dionyſius biſhop of Rome, Commodian, Malchion, Anatolius and three others, biſhops of Laodicea, Theognoſtus, Theonas biſhop of Alexandria, Pierius preſbyter of the church of the ſame city, two Doritheuſes, Victorinus biſhop of Pettaw, Methodius biſhop of Olympus in Lycia, Lucian preſbyter of Antioch, Heſychius biſhop in Egypt, Pamphilus preſbyter of Cæſarea, Phileas biſhop of Thmuis in Egypt, Philoromus receiver-general at Alexandria, Peter biſhop of Alexandria, and the Miletians. In an advertiſement, prefixed to the volume, our author expreſſes his apprehenſions that ſome perſons might be ready to charge him with prolixity in the conduct of his undertaking. But he hath offered ſuch reaſons for the method he has purſued, as will ſatisfy every reflecting mind. Among other things, he obſerves, that the particular deſign of his work was to enable perſons of ordinary capacities, who had not an opportunity of reading many authors, to judge for themſelves concerning the external evidence of the facts related in the New Teſtament. "I write," ſays he, "chiefly for gentle-
"men, and ſuch others as are not poſſeſſed of large
"libraries; and therefore I produce paſſages of
"ancient authors at length, and oftentimes tranſ-
"cribe alſo the original words at the bottom of
"the page, that this evidence may at once appear
"in a clear and ſatisfactory light."

In

In the ſame year, the world was indebted to Mr. Lardner for another valuable performance, the title of which was, "The Circumſtances of the "Jewiſh People an Argument for the Truth of "the Chriſtian Religion." It conſiſts of three "diſcourſes on Romans xi. 11; in which the grand points inſiſted upon by our author, and maintained with great perſpicuity and ſucceſs, are, that the preſent ſtate of the Jews was foretold by our Lord; that it is agreeable to many prophecies in the Old Teſtament; that it affords reaſon to believe that the Meſſiah is already come; that it furniſhes an argument for the divine authority of the goſpel; and that it exhibits an atteſtation to divers things, upon which ſome evidences of Chriſtianity depend.

Mr. Lardner ſuſtained this year a domeſtic affliction, in the deceaſe of his brother-in-law, the Reverend Daniel Neal, M. A.; and in the next year (1744) he had the calamity of loſing a moſt intimate and beloved friend, and a diſtant relation by marriage, Dr. Jeremiah Hunt. This gentleman died on the 5th of September, and was juſtly lamented by many of the moſt reſpectable diſſenters in the city of London. Mr. Lardner preached his funeral ſermon, from John xiv. 2; and hath drawn his character at length, and with great affection. Indeed, he appears to have deſerved every encomium. Among his other qualities, he had an uncommon talent at communicating inſtruction by

converſation, which he carried on in ſo perſpicuous and pleaſing a manner, that it mightily engaged the attention and won the hearts of young people. I have ſeldom known more enlightened and judicious Chriſtians than thoſe who enjoyed, in early life, the friendſhip of Dr. Hunt. The doctor, whoſe learning was very extenſive, and whoſe knowledge of the ſcriptures was profound, entertained a great contempt for Infidels, who pretend to condemn revelation, without ever having applied to it a careful ſtudy and conſideration. Though they are apt to give themſelves airs of ſuperior knowledge, he looked upon the whole body of them, as a ſort of men, who had only a very ſuperficial acquaintance both with ſcripture and antiquity. To this ignorance of theirs he in part aſcribed their infidelity; for he uſed to aſſert, that all antiquity confirms and corroborates revelation [y]. Theſe ſentiments of Dr. Hunt have their foundation in reaſon. It cannot, indeed, be denied, that a number of ingenious men, of extenſive knowledge in certain reſpects, are ſceptical with regard to religion. But then they have not examined this particular ſubject with a becoming ſerioufneſs and impartiality. They have not thoroughly ſtudied the various external and internal evidences which have been urged in proof of Chriſtanity; and eſpe-

[y] See the volume of Sermons, p. 118.

cially,

cially, they have not ſearched into the ſcriptures themſelves, thence to deduce the real doctrines of the goſpel; but have aſſumed their ideas of them, and conceived a diſlike to them, from the abſtruſe ſyſtems and formularies which all eſtabliſhments have adopted. Dr. Hunt had a ſtrong perſuaſion that the age ſucceeding that in which he lived would be as remarkable for enthuſiaſm, as his own was for infidelity. His prediction hath already, in ſome degree, been accompliſhed. Enthuſiaſm hath ſtrongly ſeized a part of the people, while infidelity has prevailed among others; ſo that, betwixt them both, rational religion has ſuffered not a little. But let not her friends be diſcouraged; for, in the due order of Providence, ſhe will, I doubt not, revive with freſh luſtre and beauty, and, at length, draw all men after her.

In 1745, Mr. Lardner favoured the public with another volume of his great work, being the ſixth of the ſecond part. Excepting one chapter, relative to Archelaus biſhop in Meſopotamia, the whole volume was devoted to the Manichees; and the account of them is eminently curious and inſtructive. When our author began his work, he declined writing the hiſtory of the heretics of the two firſt centuries, becauſe of the difficulty of the ſubject, and for ſome other reaſons; not intending to omit it entirely, but deferring it till another opportunity. But when he came lower, theſe reaſons no longer operated; and, therefore, from the be-

ginning of the fourth volume, he introduced, as occaſion offered, a number of writers who were deemed heretical, and whoſe teſtimonies contributed to his main deſign [z].

In the ſame year, Mr. Lardner reviſed and publiſhed a volume of poſthumous ſermons of the Rev. Mr. Kirby Reyner, of Briſtol. This was done at the requeſt of the family; and in ſerving the family, he did ſervice to the cauſe of religion; for, if I am not miſtaken in my recollection, Mr. Reyner's diſcourſes are of that plain and practical nature, which renders them excellently adapted for the uſe of common Chriſtians.

It was in the beginning of this year, that Mr. Lardner received a diploma from the Mariſchal college of Aberdeen, conferring upon him the degree of Doctor in Divinity. The diploma was voted in the moſt obliging manner, and was rendered agreeable by its having the cordial and unanimous ſignature of the profeſſors of the college. This was an honour which our author did not ſolicit, but which, when it was beſtowed upon him, he did not think it unbecoming in him to accept; preſerving herein the due medium, between ſeeking for ſuch a diſtinction, and deſpiſing it when offered. His own remark, in the caſe of Dr. Hunt, deſerves notice. "In the year 1729," ſays he, "the uni-
"verſity of Edinburgh, out of a regard to his diſ-

[z] Advertiſement prefixed to the fifth volume.

"tinguiſhed

" tinguiſhed merit, complimented him with the " higheſt honorary title in their gift; *a piece of* " *reſpect, not to be ſlighted by any man of letters* [a]." When we conſider Dr. Lardner's extraordinary attainments and learning, the reflection which he made, on receiving his degree, diſplayed an extraordinary humbleneſs of mind. " I pray God," ſaid he, " I may not be elevated by any acceptance my la- " bours meet with; but that I may proceed with " humility, diligence, and integrity in the whole of " my life [b]."

With relation, in general, to this academical diſtinction, it may be obſerved, that when it is conferred without merit, it cannot give honour; that when it is beſtowed upon merit, it becomes a proper mark of reſpect; and that merit, untitled, can ſhine by its own luſtre. Though the friends of the late Reverend Hugh Farmer did not procure for him a diploma, his abilities and learning will carry down his name with reputation to poſterity. The title of Doctor could not have added to the celebrity of ſuch men as Richard Hooker, John Hales, Joſeph Mede, and William Chillingworth, in the church of England; or of Matthew Poole, John Howe, and Richard Baxter, among the diſſenters.

Dr. Lardner, in 1746, was appointed one of the correſpondent members at London, of the ſociety

[a] Volume of Sermons, p. 112. [b] Memoirs of Lardner, ubi ſupra, p. 96.

in Scotland, for propagating Chriſtian knowledge, and proteſtant principles, in the northern parts of that country, and the numerous iſlands which are ſituated near its coaſts. This tribute of reſpect was probably the reſult of ſome ſervice or benefaction to that excellent and uſeful ſociety.

In 1748, our author was engaged in ſuperintending a new edition of the two firſt volumes of the ſecond part of the Credibility; and in the ſame year he publiſhed the ſeventh volume of that part. The perſons of whom an account was given, and whoſe teſtimonies were recited in this volume, were, Arnobius, Lactantius, Alexander biſhop of Alexandria, Arius and his followers, and Conſtantine the Great, the firſt Chriſtian emperor. There were, likewiſe, two chapters on the Donatiſts, and on the burning of the ſcriptures, in the time of Diocleſian's perſecution. It will appear, from the names I have mentioned, that moſt of theſe articles are of peculiar importance. The character of Conſtantine is ſtated and eſtimated with equal candour and judgment; and the obſervations on the ſtory of that emperor's having ſeen in the heavens, nearly at mid-day, the trophy of the croſs, placed above the ſun, conſiſting of light, with an inſcription annexed, BY THIS CONQUER, are very ſagacious and convincing. Credulity not having been Dr. Lardner's foible, he was on that account the more eminently qualified for the execution of the great work he had undertaken. There

was

was an Appendix to this volume, in anſwer to ſome remarks which Mr. Jackſon had made upon our author's fifth volume, relative to the riſe of Sabellianiſm, and the name of Novatus. Whoever is diſpoſed to look into the Appendix, which in the preſent edition is ſubjoined to that part of the Credibility to which it more immediately belongs, will have little heſitation in determining on what ſide lay the advantage of the argument.

This year Dr. Lardner loſt his ſiſter, Mrs. Elizabeth Neal; whoſe deceaſe drew from him the following pious and affectionate reflections. "I am "the oldeſt of the three children which God gave "to my honoured parents. I am ſtill preſerved: "but now all worldly friendſhips fade, and are "worth little. I have lately publiſhed the ſeventh "volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility: but "a temper and conduct worthy the doctrine of the "goſpel, are more valuable than any written de-"fences and apologies for it, or explications of it. "I beg that I may be more and more poſſeſſed of "that temper of humility and meekneſs which ſhall "bear good fruits: and I have great reaſon to think "of another world, and the change which I muſt "paſs under. I cannot expect, any more, ſuch "tenderneſs and affection as have been ſhewn me "by my father, mother, brother, and ſiſter, now "no more in this world[c]."

[c] Ibid. p. 97.

A new edition of the third volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility was called for in 1750; and in the courſe of the ſame year appeared the eighth volume. This volume began with the council of Nice, and then proceeded to Euſebius biſhop of Cæſarea. The other perſons and objects treated of were, Marcellus biſhop of Ancyra in Galatia, Euſtathius biſhop of Antioch, Athanaſius biſhop of Alexandria, a dialogue againſt the Marcionites, Juvencus, Julius Firmicus Maternus, Cyril of Jeruſalem, the Audians, Hilary of Poictiers, Aerius, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius biſhop in Cyprus, and the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions and Canons. In this volume, the two firſt articles are of peculiar importance. At the concluſion of the account of the council of Nice, are ſome admirable reflections on the conduct of that council, and on the pernicious effects of introducing ſubſcriptions, authority, and force into the Chriſtian church. In the hiſtory of Euſebius, which is very copious, we meet with a number of excellent obſervations concerning the diviſions of the ſacred books, the character of the writers of them, and the employment of the apoſtles, and apoſtolical men. With theſe biſhop Secker was highly pleaſed; but he was not equally ſatisfied with what our author had advanced in relation to the council of Nice. The letter which his lordſhip wrote to Dr. Lardner upon the occaſion, together with the doctor's anſwer,

anſwer, may be ſeen in the Appendix[d]. Dr. Secker's letter marks the turn of his mind, and will furniſh matter of reflection to the curious reader, who has a talent at diſcerning the nice diſcriminations of character.

In this ſame year, our author publiſhed a volume of ſermons, the ſubjects of which are intirely of a practical nature. Theſe ſermons, as might be expected from Dr. Lardner, are very judicious and inſtructive, and the peruſal of them cannot fail of being acceptable and uſeful to candid and ſerious Chriſtians. Our author having preſented theſe diſcourſes, together with the eighth volume of the Credibility, to Dr. Doddridge, that gentleman wrote a letter of acknowledgment in return, which is inſerted in the Appendix[e]. Dr. Doddridge's letter is rather curious; partly as it diſplays ſomething of the ſentiments and diſpoſition of that excellent man; and partly as it exhibits a ſmall foible in his character, which was that of repreſenting with too much parade the various employments and buſineſs wherein he was engaged.

Dr. Lardner, in 1751, reſigned the office of morning preacher at Crouched Fryers. His reaſons for this determination were, the continuance and even increaſe of his deafneſs, the ſmallneſs of the morning auditory, and the importance of redeeming time for carrying on his long work. Dr. Benſon,

[d] Appendix, N° VII. [e] Appendix, N° VIII.

whom

whom he had acquainted, by letter, with his purpose of resignation, wrote thus to him in return. "I was so much affected, on Monday evening, "upon reading your letter, that I had very little "sleep that night; and my mind still remains "greatly affected with the thoughts of parting "with you. For though I cannot but own I feel "the weight of your reasons, yet I must frankly "tell you, I do not expect ever to have an assistant, "in whom I can place so thorough a confidence, "and for whom I can entertain so warm an affec-"tion, and so high an esteem. I thank you hearti-"ly for all your friendly, kind, and obliging treat-"ment of me, especially since I came to Crouched "Fryers; and I earnestly desire that our friendship "may never be interrupted [f].

Our author, adhering to his resolution, preached his last sermon on the 23d of June; having been assistant at Crouched Fryers nearly twenty-two years. His farewell discourse was taken from 2 Cor. iv. 18. "While we look not at the things which "are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for "the things which are seen are temporal, but the "things which are not seen are eternal." These words afforded a fine subject for the conclusion of Dr. Lardner's pious and faithful labours in the pulpit. In a letter written to him by a friend, in 1748, are some observations, concerning

[f] Memoirs, ubi supra, p. 107.

his

his character as a preacher, and the cauſe of his not being generally acceptable, which it may not be amiſs to tranſcribe. "It has often grieved me to "ſee ſo few perſons attend your public adminiſtra- "tions, and puzzled me to aſſign a reaſon for it. "When I conſider the ſimplicity, propriety, and "purity of your language; the juſtneſs of your "ſentiments; the importance of the ſubjects you "handle; the ſerioufneſs and ſolemnity that ani- "mates every part of your performances; that "you never meddle with any of the diſputable "points that divide and alienate Proteſtants; nay, "have treated even Popery itſelf in ſuch a manner "as ſhews you to be indeed an imitator of the "meekneſs and gentleneſs of Chriſt; what can "be the reaſon? I can think of none but this, "that there is ſome little imperfection in your "ſpeech. Your voice is naturally ſtrong, clear, "and agreeable; but it is not difficult to perceive, "in forming ſome ſounds, that the organs of "ſpeech are weak. But I take this to be the leaſt "part of the defect; which, from long and careful "obſervation, I think conſiſts in two things, *viz.* "Indiſtinctneſs, or ſlipping over now and then a "word or ſyllable; or running them too cloſe to- "gether, eſpecially at the end of a ſentence; and "uſually at the ſame time lowering your voice. "This is moſt remarkable in your prayer, leſs ſo "in

"in your ſermon, and ſtill leſs in your read-
"ing[g]."

It is certain that Dr. Lardner's mode of elocution muſt have been very unpleaſant. That, from his early and extreme deafneſs, he could have no ſuch command of his voice, as to give it a due modulation, thoſe who were perſonally acquainted with him well knew. When to this it is added, that he dropped his words greatly in the pulpit, it cannot be a matter of ſurpriſe that he was not popular. Some few judicious perſons, who could raiſe their minds above all external advantages, admired him extremely: but ſuch hearers can never be numerous.

The ninth volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility appeared in 1752. In the preface to it our author aſſigns the reaſon why, with regard to a few names, he had been obliged to tranſgreſs the order of time. He was deſirous that Ephrem the Syrian ſhould be in the former volume; and the chapter was completed as far as it could be done from the Greek edition of his works at Oxford, and the firſt two volumes of the edition then begun at Rome. But Dr. Lardner having been informed that the remaining volumes of the Roman edition might be expected in a ſhort time, he determined to wait for them; and they did not come to his hands till ſeveral months after the

[g] Ibid. p. 107—109.

publication

publication of the eighth volume. Ephrem being laid aſide, he took Epiphanius; and the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions naturally followed, which requiring a long chapter, ſome other articles, of ſmaller conſequence, were for the preſent excluded. The perſons treated of in the ninth volume were, Rheticius biſhop of Autun, Triphyllius, Fortunatianus, Photinus, Euſebius biſhop of Vercelli, Lucifer biſhop of Cagliari in Sardinia, Gregory biſhop of Elvira, Phæbadius biſhop of Agen, Caius Marius Victorinus Afer, Apollinarius biſhop of Laodicea, Damaſus biſhop of Rome, Baſil biſhop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius biſhop of Iconium, Gregory biſhop of Nyſſa in Cappadocia, Didymus of Alexandria, Ephrem the Syrian, Ebedjeſu, Pacian biſhop of Barcelona, Optatus of Milevi, Ambroſe biſhop of Milan, Diodorus biſhop of Tarſus, Philaſter biſhop of Breſcia, Gaudentius biſhop of the ſame city, Sophronius, and Theodore biſhop of Mopſueſtia in Cilicia. There is, alſo, a long and curious chapter concerning the Priſcillianiſts, and a ſhorter one, relative to a Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epiſtles, inſcribed by many to Hilary deacon of Rome. To this volume were ſubjoined, "Remarks upon Mr. Bower's Account "of the Manichees, in the ſecond volume of his "Hiſtory of the Popes." Mr. Bower had retailed the common calumnies with regard to theſe heretics, which are refuted by our author with his uſual candour, good ſenſe, and knowledge of antiquity.

quity. The remarks, in the preſent edition, are annexed to the hiſtory of the Manichees. In this year (1752) a ſecond impreſſion was called for of the Diſcourſes on the Circumſtances of the Jewiſh People.

The next year produced the tenth volume of the ſecond part of the Credibility; in which the perſons treated of are few in number, but very important with reſpect to their character, works, and teſtimony. They are Jerome, Rufinus, Auguſtin biſhop of Hippo Regius in Africa, and John Chryſoſtom biſhop of Conſtantinople. A ſhort chapter is introduced, on the Third Council of Carthage. Two other publications came from Dr. Lardner in the ſame year. The firſt was, "A Diſſertation upon the two Epiſtles aſcribed "to Clement of Rome, lately publiſhed by "Mr. Wetſtein; with large extracts out of them, "and an argument ſhowing them not to be "genuine." At the cloſe of this judicious and elaborate diſſertation, our author has made ſome obſervations concerning the deſign of his great undertaking, which the reader will probably not be diſpleaſed with peruſing. "When," ſays he, "tidings were firſt brought hither, that Mr. Wet-"ſtein had received two new epiſtles of Clement "out of the Eaſt, ſeveral of my friends and readers "ſignified their deſire, that when they ſhould be "publiſhed, I would obſerve the teſtimony therein

" afforded to the books of the New Teſtament;
" which ſervice I have now performed, according
" to my ability. They ſuppoſed it to be a ne-
" ceſſary part of the work, in which I have been
" long employed: which is not barely a biblio-
" theque of eccleſiaſtical authors, or memoirs of
" eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, but was begun, and has
" been carried on with a view of ſhowing the
" truth of the Chriſtian religion; particularly,
" the truth and credibility of the evangelical
" hiſtory, and the antiquity, genuineneſs, and
" authority of the books of the New Teſtament,
" the original records of the doctrine and mira-
" cles of our Saviour and his apoſtles. And all
" along great care has been taken, to diſtinguiſh
" genuine from ſuppoſititious writings; which I
" now reflect upon with much ſatisfaction. In
" this method, witneſſes, when produced, appear
" in their true time and character; and every one
" is able to judge of the value of their teſti-
" mony."

The other production of Dr. Lardner, which came out in 1753, appeared without his name, and was intitled, " An Eſſay on the Moſaic Account of " the Creation and Fall of Man." By the misfortunes of the bookſeller, almoſt the whole impreſſion was loſt; ſo that, in the preſent edition, it has the recommendation of novelty. Our author adopts the literal ſenſe of the hiſtory of our firſt parents, and, after having critically explained the narration,

ration, deduces from it a variety of important obſervations.

Dr. Lardner was now drawing to the concluſion of the ſecond part of the Credibility. In 1754, the eleventh volume of it was publiſhed, containing a ſuccinct hiſtory of the principal Chriſtian writers of the fifth, ſixth, and following centuries, to the beginning of the twelfth century; with their teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament. The perſons introduced in this volume were more than forty in number, it not being neceſſary to make the articles ſo large and particular, as had been requiſite at a more early period. An Appendix was added, giving an account of the eccleſiaſtical hiſtories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret.

It had begun to be ſuggeſted, by ſome perſons, that our author had carried down his teſtimonies lower than was needful to the purpoſe of his main argument. But ſuch a ſuggeſtion was not the reſult of a due conſideration of the matter. The Rev. Dr. Henry Miles of Tooting, an eminent diſſenting miniſter, and a reſpectable member of the Royal Society, expreſſed his ſentiments to Dr. Lardner upon the ſubject in ſo judicious a manner, after reading the eleventh volume, that they well deſerve to be inſerted. "I thank God," ſays he, "who has enabled you to finiſh your "deſign in a collection of ancient teſtimonies, &c. "for the ſervice of the Chriſtian cauſe; the benefit

"of

" of which the preſent generation and future ages
" will reap. The more I conſider the characters
" of the writers, cited by you, in the former, and
" this volume, the more am I ſatisfied you did
" right to bring your work down ſo far as you have
" done. Thoſe who have been, or are otherwiſe
" minded, do not ſeem to me to have well con-
" ſidered the diſtance of time at which we are re-
" moved from the period to which your laſt
" volume reacheth; nor how far it was neceſſary
" to preclude the cavils and exceptions, which our
" enemies, and their ſucceſſors, may be ready to
" make to the truths of the goſpel hiſtory: nor is
" it conſidered, *that the diſtance will be continually*
" *growing*. For my part (ſetting aſide the conſi-
" deration of your principal view) I cannot help
" looking upon it as a very uſeful and deſirable un-
" dertaking, if we regard it as a branch of eccleſi-
" aſtical hiſtory; of which we have nothing in our
" language that can render it unneceſſary; and
" moreover, if we conſider it as containing a va-
" riety of important inſtructions, which no careful
" reader can overlook, in the characters and con-
" duct of the writers, mentioned by you. Sure I
" am, this leſſon all may naturally be taught; how
" abſolutely neceſſary it is for us to regard the
" inſpired writings as the rule of our faith and
" practice, and not the dictates or conduct of falli-
" ble men in former or later ages[h]."

[h] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 110, 111.

As ſuch a quantity and variety of matter were comprehended in our author's great work, an epitome of it became very deſirable, to aſſiſt the recollection of the memory, and to diſplay in one view the force of the argument. Accordingly, this was undertaken by Dr. Lardner himſelf, who, in the twelfth and laſt volume of the ſecond part, which was publiſhed in 1755, gave a general review of his deſign, and an admirable recapitulation of the eleven preceding volumes, with ſome new additional obſervations. Liſts were added, of various readings, and of texts explained; together with an alphabetical catalogue of Chriſtian authors, ſects, and writings, and an alphabetical table of principal matters.

About this time, Dr. Lardner, in conjunction with Dr. Chandler, Dr. John Ward, and the Rev. Mr. Edward Sandercock, was engaged in peruſing, and preparing for the preſs, ſome poſthumous diſſertations of the Rev. Mr. Moſes Lowman, a learned diſſenting miniſter at Clapham. Various works were written by this gentleman, among which three have been held in conſiderable eſteem by the public. Theſe are, a Treatiſe on the Civil Government of the Hebrews, another on the Ritual of that people, and a Commentary on the Revelations. He wrote alſo a ſhort piece, drawn up in the mathematical form, to prove the being and perfections of God by the argument a priori. Dr. Chandler, in his funeral ſermon for Mr. Lowman, aſſerted that it was an abſolute demonſtration. Perhaps it came as

near

near to it as any thing that has been written upon the ſubject: but I dare not pronounce that there is no flaw in the reaſoning, or that it will produce undeniable conviction. It was as an author that Mr. Lowman excelled, and not as a preacher. His diſcourſes in the pulpit were ſo obſcure, that a gentleman of great intelligence, one of his congregation, ſaid he could never underſtand him.

Early in the ſpring of the year 1756, I had the happineſs of commencing an acquaintance with Dr. Lardner, and the honour of its being ſought for on his ſide, in conſequence of the favourable opinion which his candour had led him to form of me, from the firſt ſermon I ever printed, on the advantages of religious knowledge. In the ſame year, the doctor publiſhed the firſt and ſecond volumes of the Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory. It fell to my lot to be the Monthly reviewer of theſe volumes; and the accounts which I gave of them were ſo fortunate as to obtain our author's approbation. He did not know, at the time, from whom they came. To what circumſtance it was owing that the review of the work was conſigned to me, I cannot now recollect, it not being till long after, that I could with any juſtice have been deemed a periodical critic. When the third volume of the Supplement appeared, which was in 1757, Dr. Lardner himſelf drew up a ſhort and ſimple ſtate of the contents of it, which was inſerted in the Review, with a ſlight addition

by way of encomium; for nothing that had the leaſt tendency to praiſe came from his own pen.

The firſt volume of the Supplement contained general obſervations upon the canon of the New Teſtament, and a Hiſtory of the Four Evangeliſts, with the Evidences of the Genuineneſs of the Four Goſpels, and the Acts of the Apoſtles, and an Examination of the Times in which theſe books were written. There is, likewiſe, a chapter concerning the time when the Apoſtles left Judea, to go and preach the Chriſtian religion to other countries; which event, our author thinks, could not have taken place until after the council at Jeruſalem. He concluded the volume with a diſcuſſion of the queſtion, Whether any one of the firſt three Evangeliſts had ſeen the goſpel of the others before he wrote his own? and here Dr. Lardner hath determined, with great appearance of reaſon and argument, that St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, did not abridge or tranſcribe from each other, but are diſtinct, independent, and harmonious witneſſes. The ſecond volume comprehended the hiſtory of St. Paul, diſplayed the evidences of the genuineneſs of his fourteen Epiſtles, particularly that to the Hebrews, and aſcertained the times in which they were written. Through the whole were interſperſed many curious remarks; and the two concluding chapters were employed in ſhewing, that the epiſtle inſcribed to the Epheſians was actually addreſſed to them, and that the churches

churches of Coloſſe and Laodicea were planted by St. Paul. In the third volume the ſeven Catholic Epiſtles, and the Revelation of St, John, were conſidered, and hiſtories given of St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude. The order of the books of the New Teſtament is examined, and proofs afforded that they were early known, read, and made uſe of by Chriſtians. In concluſion, it is ſhewn, that there is no reaſon to believe that any of the ſacred books of the New Teſtament have been loſt.

It would not be eaſy to ſay too much in praiſe of the Supplement to the Credibility. The ſeveral queſtions diſcuſſed in this work are determined in conſequence of a depth of inveſtigation, and an accuracy of judgment, which are highly worthy of admiration. It is remarkable, that in various points the opinions of our author are very different from thoſe which his former colleague, Dr. Benſon, maintained, in his Hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles, the prefaces to his Paraphraſes, and the diſſertations annexed to them. True criticiſm, we believe, will uſually decide in favour of Dr. Lardner.

I cannot avoid ſtrongly recommending the Supplement to the Credibility to the attention of all young divines. Indeed, I think that it ought to be read by every theological ſtudent before he quits the univerſity or academy in which he is educated. There are three other works which will be found of eminent advantage to thoſe who are intended for, or beginning to engage in the Chriſtian miniſtry.

Theſe are, Butler's Analogy, Biſhop Law's Conſiderations on the Theory of Religion, and Dr. Taylor's Key to the Apoſtolical Writings, prefixed to his paraphraſe on the epiſtle to the Romans. Without agreeing with every circumſtance advanced in theſe works, it may be ſaid of them, with the greateſt truth, that they tend to open and enlarge the mind; that they give important views of the evidence, nature, and deſign of revelation; and that they diſplay a vein of reaſoning and enquiry which may be extended to other objects beſides thoſe immediately conſidered in the books themſelves.

It muſt not be forgotten, that the Supplement to the Credibility has a place in the excellent collection of treatiſes in divinity which has lately been publiſhed by Dr. Watſon biſhop of Landaff. For a collection which cannot fail of being eminently conducive to the inſtruction and improvement of younger clergymen, and for the noble, manly, and truly evangelical preface by which it is preceded, this great prelate is entitled to the gratitude of the Chriſtian world.

May I not be permitted to add, that there is another collection which is ſtill wanted; and that is, of curious and valuable ſmall tracts, relative to the evidences of our holy religion, or to ſcriptural difficulties, which, by length of time, and in conſequence of having been ſeparately printed, are almoſt ſunk into oblivion, or, if remembered, can

ſcarcely

ſcarcely at any rate be procured? The recovery of ſuch pieces, and the communication of them to the public, in a few volumes, and at a reaſonable price, would be an acceptable, as well as an uſeful ſervice to men of enquiry and literature.

The Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory completed one grand part of Dr. Lardner's deſign, which was, to produce, at large, the teſtimonies of Chriſtian writers to the books of the New Teſtament. What he had already executed had employed him thirty-three years; and it was contrary to his expectation that his life was ſpared to the accompliſhment of ſo much of the eminently important ſcheme which he had in view. Providence, however, preſerved him for ſtill farther uſefulneſs. There was one part of his plan which he never carried into effect. It was his intention to allege the teſtimonies of Chriſtian writers, not only to the books, but alſo to the principal facts of the New Teſtament, ſuch as the birth, miracles, death, and reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, the miſſion of the Apoſtles, and the miracles wrought by them: to which were to be added ſuch conſiderations as might give weight to theſe teſtimonies, and confirm their truth. This our author deſigned to be the ſecond book of the ſecond part of the Credibility, and he ſuppoſed that it might be comprized in a ſingle octavo volume; on which account it is rather the more ſurprizing that it was not completed. Perhaps, upon reflec-

tion, he might judge, that almoſt every thing which he wiſhed to ſay in this reſpect, would be found in the volumes already publiſhed.

This year (1757) Dr. Lardner, in conjunction with the Rev. Mr. Caleb Fleming, reviſed for publication, and introduced with a preface, a poſthumous tract of Mr. Thomas Moore, intitled, "An Enquiry into the Nature of our Saviour's "Agony in the Garden." Mr. Moore was a woollen-draper, in Holywell Street, near the Strand, a thinking man, and ſtudious in the ſcriptures. The deſign of his pamphlet was to account for our Lord's agony, from the ſeries of events which befell him during the latter part of his miniſtry, without ſuppoſing it to have been the reſult of any præternatural inflictions.

In the year 1758, appeared two productions from the pen of our author. The firſt was, "The "Caſe of the Demoniacs, mentioned in the New "Teſtament; being four diſcourſes upon Mark v. "19, with an Appendix for the farther illuſtration "of the ſubject." Dr. Lardner, in this work, maintains the hypotheſis which was ſupported by Mr. Joſeph Mede in the laſt century, by Dr. Sykes and others in the preſent, and ſtill more recently, in a very elaborate manner, by the late Rev. Hugh Farmer. This ſcheme, which ſuppoſes the demoniacs to have been only diſeaſed or lunatic perſons, and not actually poſſeſſed by evil ſpirits, ſeems to gain ground; and will probably be found

to

to be moſt agreeable, not only to the principles of ſound philoſophy, but to the genüine language of antiquity and ſcripture, when rightly underſtood. The Treatiſe on the Demoniacs having been conſidered by our author as an appendix to the firſt part of his Credibility, relative to the facts occaſionally mentioned in the New Teſtament, it is ſubjoined to that work in the preſent edition.

The other publication of Dr. Lardner's this year, was a ſhort one, without his name, the title of which was, "A Letter to Jonas Hanway, "Eſq; in which ſome reaſons are aſſigned, why "houſes for the reception of penitent women, "who have been diſorderly in their lives, ought "not to be called Magdalen Houſes." Mary Magdalen, as our author ſhews, was not the ſinner who is recorded in the ſeventh chapter of St. Luke, but a woman of diſtinction and excellent character, who for a while laboured under ſome bodily indiſpoſition, which our Lord miraculouſly healed. To call, therefore, a hoſpital for repenting proſtitutes a Magdalen-houſe was, he thought, a great abuſe of the name of a truly honourable and valuable woman. If Mary's ſhame had been manifeſt, and upon record, ſhe could not have been worſe ſtigmatized. Such was the delicacy of Dr. Lardner's mind, that, independently of the caſe of Mary Magdalen, he diſliked the uſe of the word "proſtitutes" in the title of a place of reception for females who had been of bad characters. Speaking

ing of a proper inſcription, he ſays, "I ſhall pro-
"poſe one, which is very plain: *A Charity Houſe*
"*for Penitent Women*: which, I think, ſufficiently
"indicates their fault; and yet is, at the ſame
"time, expreſſive of tenderneſs, by avoiding a word
"of offenſive ſound and meaning, denoting the
"loweſt diſgrace that human nature can fall into,
"and which few modeſt men and women can
"think of without pain and uneaſineſs. Or, if
"that title is not reckoned diſtinct and particular
"enough, with a ſmall alteration it may be made,
"for penitent Harlots[i]." The letter to Mr. Han-way produced no effect; and perhaps it came too late. Beſides, though the higheſt regard ought ever to be paid to the memory of that gentleman, as a moſt excellent and philanthropic citizen, he was not, I believe, eaſily diſengaged from what he had once adopted.

In 1759, Dr. Lardner publiſhed, but without his name, "A Letter written in the year 1730,
"concerning the queſtion, Whether the Logos ſup-
"plied the place of a human ſoul in the perſon of
"Jeſus Chriſt." To this letter, which I have mentioned before, and which is ſuppoſed to have been originally addreſſed to Lord Barrington, were now added "two Poſtſcripts: the firſt, con-
"taining an Explication of theſe words, the Spirit,
"the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, as uſed in

[i] Volume of Tracts, p. 264.

"the

" the ſcriptures: the ſecond, containing Remarks " upon the third part of the late Biſhop of " Clogher's Vindication of the Hiſtories of the Old " and New Teſtament." In this treatiſe, our author oppoſes the Arian hypotheſis, to which he acknowledges that he had once, for a while, been much inclined, but which he now entirely diſliked, thinking it to be all amazing throughout, and irreconcilable to reaſon. The point which he labours to prove is, that Jeſus is a man appointed, anointed, beloved, honoured and exalted by God above all other beings. It is obſervable, that Dr. Lardner did not derive his opinions upon this ſubject from the ſtudy of the Socinian authors. " I have not," ſays he, " been greatly converſant " with the writers of that denomination. I have " never read Crellius de uno Deo Patre; though " I believe it to be a very good book. There is " alſo, in our own language, a collection of Unita- " rian tracts, in two or three quartos. But I am " not acquainted with it, nor can I remember that " I ever looked into it. I have formed my ſenti- " ments upon the ſcriptures, and by reading ſuch " commentators, chiefly, as are in the beſt repute. " I may add, that the reading of the ancient " writers of the church has been of uſe to confirm " me, and to aſſiſt in clearing up difficulties[k]." In the preface, our author declares, that though he is

[k] Ibid. p. 83, 84, 112.

not

not without a juſt concern for ſuch things as appear to him to be of importance, he hopes, the whole is written in the way of reaſon and argument, with meekneſs and candour, without acrimony and abuſe. The truth of this declaration will not be denied by thoſe who diſagree the moſt with Dr. Lardner; and ſurely it is not ſaying too much to add, that he has diſplayed great knowledge of ſcripture, and of ſcriptural phraſeology. His intimate friend Mr. Hallet did not adopt his opinion; and ſeveral letters were exchanged between them on the ſubject. Their different views with regard to what they apprehended to be divine truth, did not, however, produce the leaſt diminution in their mutual affection. One of Mr. Hallet's letters was concluded in terms which reflect honour on his character. "The conſideration of theſe "matters," ſays he, "is ſo far from leſſening my "friendſhip and regard for you, that I reverence and "eſteem you more than ever; and you ſhall never "find me ſay one word inconſiſtent with the "higheſt reſpect and friendſhip.—May God long "preſerve your uſefulneſs[1]!"

I do not recollect that the letter on the Logos made any great impreſſion, at the time of its firſt publication. The ſentiments advanced in it were then confined to a few perſons; and others were not readily diſpoſed to embrace them. It is not

[1] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 113.

neceſſary

neceſſary to inform my readers, that a period of leſs than thirty years has produced a ſurpriſing alteration in this reſpect. The fact is equally allowed by thoſe who rejoice in, and by thoſe who deplore the progreſs of Socinianiſm. What are the doctrines of the New Teſtament, with regard to the perſon and præ-exiſtence of Chriſt, is the grand controverſy of the day; a controverſy that is warmly agitated, and which is not likely to be ſoon brought to a concluſion. Were I to indulge to the obſervations which ariſe in my mind on this occaſion, I ſhould be led into a digreſſion incompatible with my preſent undertaking. If Providence ſhould ſpare my life, it is my wiſh, when certain preſſing engagements are diſcharged, to impart to the public a few candid reflections on ſome late, and indeed ſtill ſubſiſting theological diſputes. I cannot, however, diſmiſs the ſubject, without remarking the coincidence of opinion which ſometimes takes place between perſons extremely different in their religious profeſſions and connections. The celebrated Father le Courayer, author of the Diſſertation on the Validity of Engliſh Ordinations, continued to the end of his life in the communion of the Roman Catholic church. Nevertheleſs, in the declaration of his laſt ſentiments on the doctrines of religion, recently publiſhed, he has delivered ſuch views of things reſpecting the Trinity, as Dr. Lardner himſelf muſt have highly approved.

proved. The paſſage is ſo ſtriking, and breathes ſo liberal a ſpirit, that I ſhall inſert it below [m].

A ſecond

[m] The doctrine of the Unity of God, ſo true, and ſo evident, has ſerved for a pretext to many, to try to inſpire averſion at Chriſtianity, as if it affected this truth by its doctrines of the Trinity, and the Incarnation. The writings of ſome of the fathers, and the wretched philoſophy of the ſchools, may, in fact, have given ground to ſome people to draw ſuch a conſequence: but there is nothing in the goſpel which does not tend, on the contrary, to confirm us more and more in the knowledge and worſhip of one God; and nothing is leſs oppoſite to this truth than the doctrines which are thought to deſtroy it effectually.

Of all the modes of explaining the doctrine of the Trinity, I know of none more contrary to the true doctrine of Chriſtianity, than that which ſuppoſes in the Deity an exiſtence of three ſubſtances diſtinct, however collateral, however ſubordinate. It is, in my apprehenſion, to re-eſtabliſh Polytheiſm, under the pretext of explaining a myſtery. The unity of God, is the foundation of the goſpel; and every thing that may in any way affect this truth is dangerous. As Jeſus Chriſt and his apoſtles have laboured, on the one hand, to reclaim the Gentiles from the belief and from the worſhip of many gods, and have ſuppoſed, on the other hand, that the Jews thought ſoundly in the article of Deity, in which they never diſtinguiſhed different ſubſtances; it ſeems to me a departure from the ſimplicity of the goſpel, and a voluntary inclination to corrupt the idea of a clear truth, by ſingular explications, which it becomes neceſſary to abuſe at leaſt, in order to combat.

I believe, therefore, that there is but only one God; that his Spirit is not a ſubſtance diſtinct from him; and that Jeſus Chriſt, to whom divinity was very intimately united, is his Son in virtue of that union. This is all the Trinity that I find in the goſpel; and I cannot conceive that any other Trinity can accord with the Unity of God. I know that many ancient writers have had recourſe to the multiplication of ſubſtances, to give us an

idea

A ſecond volume of Sermons, on various ſubjects, was publiſhed by our author in 1760. The diſcourſes in this volume, though always applied to

idea of this myſtery; and others have imagined other ſyſtems, more philoſophical than evangelical, that have leſs ſerved to clear up this matter than to obſcure it. But I diſtinguiſh theſe ſyſtems from that of the goſpel: and, inaſmuch as I find this laſt worthy of reſpect, it therefore appears to me little eſſential to adopt notions which often have much obſcurity, and ſometimes are even involved in contradiction.

The Incarnation has nothing any more contrary to the doctrine of the Unity of God, than the Trinity. Accordingly, it is extremely remarkable, that neither Jeſus Chriſt nor his apoſtles have ever repreſented to us theſe myſteries as including incomprehenſible things, and which it was impoſſible to reconcile to reaſon. God, willing to draw men from their errors and to purify them from their ſins, filled Jeſus Chriſt with his wiſdom, inveſted him with his power, communicated to him his authority, and gave him his Spirit [a], not by meaſure, as to the prophets, but united himſelf ſo intimately with him, that Jeſus Chriſt appeared in the form of God [b]; that he was made Lord and Chriſt [c]; Prince and Saviour [d]; that he was filled with wiſdom and with grace [e]; that all the fullneſs of the godhead reſided corporally in him [f]; and that he received the glory, the honour, the virtue, the ſtrength, and the bleſſing, of his Father [g]; who, by the participation which he gave him of his power and authority, made him enter, at the ſame time, into a participation of his glory, in ſuch a manner, that he who honours the Son honours the Father who ſent him [h]. Thus God, referring always every thing to himſelf, and not terminating in Jeſus Chriſt, who is no otherwiſe regarded than as the organ and the inſtrument of

[a] John iii. 34. [b] Phil. ii. 6. [c] Acts ii. 36. [d] Acts v. 31.
[e] Luke ii. 40. [f] Coloſſ. ii. 9. [g] Apoc. v. 12. [h] John v. 23.

the

to practical purpoſes, are more curious and critical than thoſe which he gave to the world ten years before. Several important circumſtances, relative to

the mercy of his Father, is always God alone, who is the object of our adorations; and there is nothing that ſhocks us in conceiving, that He can communicate himſelf to a man as fully, and as intimately, as he judges it neceſſary for his own glory, and for the ſalvation of mankind.

This is the explication of that intimate union of divinity with humanity in Jeſus Chriſt, which, perfectly ſimple as it is, has ſo much divided all Chriſtendom. From a willingneſs to find, in this intimate union of divinity with humanity in Jeſus Chriſt, all that we experience in the union of the body and the ſoul, we have been thrown into embarraſſments and contradictions, which it is impoſſible either to explain or to conciliate. We talk of hypoſtaſes, of perſonalities, of idioms, and of every thing that a dark philoſophy could imagine, to render things credible, of which it was unable to give us any notion. Some have made a ridiculous mixture of the divinity with the humanity. Others, in diſcriminating too nicely the difference, have ſeemed to place Jeſus Chriſt only in the rank of ordinary prophets. Hence the Neſtorianiſm, the Eutycheiſm, the Apollinariſm, and the Monotheliſme, which have excited ſuch fatal ſchiſms in the church, and which have, perhaps, as much favoured the progreſs of Mahometaniſm in the Eaſt, as the ignorance of theſe nations, and the victorious arms of the Saracens.

To avoid theſe exceſſes, we muſt abide in the ſimplicity of the goſpel, and content ourſelves with acknowledging, that God, to bring the world back to his knowledge, and to his worſhip, gave birth to Jeſus Chriſt in a miraculous manner, and united Himſelf to him in a way the moſt cloſe and intimate, ſo that it might be ſaid, that Jeſus Chriſt was in God [i], and God in him; that all that appertained to the Father [k] was in the diſpoſition of the

[i] John x. 38. [k] John xvii. 7. 10.

Son,

to the hiſtory of our Saviour, and the doctrines of the goſpel, are conſidered and explained; and it would not be eaſy to find, in the ſame compaſs, a greater treaſure of Chriſtian knowledge. This year

Son, by the communication which the Father had given him of His power; that he had reſigned all judgment to him[l]; that, as the Father could raiſe the dead to life, the Son could do ſo alſo[m]; that the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt was not his own, but that of his Father who ſent him[n]; that he was only the ſame thing with him[o]; that it was the Father who abode in him, and who did all his works[p]; in one word, that he was the Son of God[q], becauſe that God, on ſending him into the world, had ſanctified him to ſuch a degree, that he who ſaw him[r], ſaw his Father, and that he who believed in him, believed alſo in God.

When one has once acknowledged the truth and the holineſs of the goſpel, all this doctrine concerning the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt appears to me ſo ſimple, that I cannot conceive how it was poſſible to corrupt it by ſo many explications, which are good for nothing, but to make Chriſtianity appear leſs reaſonable, and full of contradictions. In conſequence of a continual deſire to find new myſteries, an infinitude of imaginations have been conſecrated; and it is ſtill more lamentable, that theſe imaginations are become a part of religion, by the authority of ſome, and by the acquieſcence of others; ſo that a man paſſes for an unbeliever, or an irreligious perſon, if he does not ſubſcribe to the predominant ſyſtem, and if he happens to have too much underſtanding to ſubmit to received prejudices, or too much fortitude to be overawed by violence.

It is not ſo much the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, as his doctrine, that is the object of the Chriſtian religion; and though we ought to honour the Son as we honour the Father, becauſe he had his miſſion, and was cloathed with his authority, it is, however,

[l] John v. 22. [m] John v. 21. [n] John vii. 16. [o] John x. 30.
[p] John xiv. 10. [q] John x. 36. [r] John xi. 44, 45.

year a ſecond edition was demanded of the eleventh volume of the Credibility, and of the two firſt volumes of the Supplement. The fifth volume had been reprinted in 1756, and the fourth and ſixth in 1758.

Deeply engaged as Dr. Lardner was, in preparing his own works for the preſs, he could not reſiſt the ſolicitations which were made to him to reviſe occaſionally the productions of other perſons. About this time, at the requeſt of his friend, Mr. Caleb Fleming, he corrected the manuſcript of "A Criticiſm upon modern notions of "Sacrifices; being an Examination of Dr. Tay-"lor's Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement exa-"mined." The author of the tract here mentioned, was a Dr. Richie, a phyſician, and a diſſenting miniſter, ſomewhere in the north of England. By the ſame gentleman was afterwards publiſhed, in two volumes, quarto, an elaborate work, concerning the peculiar doctrines of revelation, relating to piacular ſacrifices, redemption by Chriſt, and the treatment of moral characters by the Deity. It was the production of a man who had applied himſelf diligently to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures,

ever, to God only that Jeſus Chriſt reclaims our attention; and he aſſumes no other conſequence to recommend himſelf to the Jews, than as having been ſanctified by his Father, to come and announce his doctrine, and to inſtruct us in truths unknown to the Gentiles, and very much altered by the Jews.—Le Courayer's "Declaration of his laſt Sentiments on the different Doctrines of Religion." The Engliſh tranſlation, p. 14—26.

and

and who has taken immenſe pains to aſcertain his own views of things; notwithſtanding which, it is now little known, and ſtill leſs read. The different fate of books would furniſh matter for a curious and a copious diſquiſition.

Another work, the manuſcript of which Dr. Lardner reviſed, at the deſire of the writer, for whom he had a particular eſteem, was a Treatiſe on the true Doctrine of the New Teſtament concerning Jeſus Chriſt. This treatiſe, which has come to a ſecond impreſſion, was the compoſition of the Rev. Mr. Paul Cardale, a diſſenting miniſter at Eveſham, in Worceſterſhire. It is introduced by a long diſcourſe on free enquiry in matters of religion, and contains a full defence of what is called the Socinian ſcheme. I believe that it has been of ſome conſiderable influence in drawing over perſons to the author's opinion. Mr. Cardale, I remember, is very large in endeavouring to ſhew, that the great bleſſings of the goſpel do not depend upon the queſtion concerning our Lord's præ-exiſtence; and that no ſtreſs is laid upon it, in the account which is given in the New Teſtament of the benefits we derive from our divine maſter. A ſentiment which I ſhould earneſtly wiſh to be generally impreſſed, is, that the glory of our holy religion ſtands firm on every ſcheme. Writers are apt to expreſs themſelves, as if the Chriſtian revelation would be of little value, unleſs their particular ſyſtems are adopted: but this is a kind of language

which is extremely injudicious, and which ought to be avoided and diſcouraged. The apoſtle St. Paul, ſpeaking of Jeſus Chriſt, ſaith: "Who of "God is made unto us wiſdom, and righteouſneſs, "and ſanctification, and redemption[n]. To this account of things every Chriſtian, of every denomination, gives a moſt ready and cordial aſſent. But can any man be ſaid to think meanly of the evangelical diſpenſation, or to detract from its excellence and dignity, who believes that God is the author of it, that it was communicated by Jeſus Chriſt, and that he conveys to us knowledge, pardon, holineſs, and eternal life? Theſe are bleſſings of unſpeakable importance; bleſſings which render the goſpel a pearl of invaluable price: and as ſuch it will be eſteemed by all who aſſent to its truth and divine authority, whatever ſentiments they may embrace concerning matters of more doubtful diſputation.

In 1761, and 1762, Dr. Lardner condeſcended to make ſome communications to a periodical work, then carrying on, intitled, "The Library," which conſiſted entirely of original pieces, and was conducted by ſome of the younger diſſenting miniſters of the city of London. His papers, which were four in number, are inſerted at the end of the volume of tracts, in the preſent collection. A new edition of the tenth volume of the ſecond part of

[n] 1 Corinth. i. 30.

the

the Credibility came out in 1761, and of the twelfth volume in 1762. Not again to reſume the ſubject, it may here be mentioned, that the eighth volume was reprinted in 1766.

It was in 1762 that our author publiſhed his "Remarks on the late Dr. Ward's Diſſertations "on ſeveral Paſſages of the ſacred Sciptures; where-"in are ſhewn, beſide other Things, that St. John "computed the Hours of the Day after the Jewiſh "Manner; who are the Greeks, John xii; who "the Grecians, Acts vi; the Deſign of the apoſ-"tolic Decree, Acts xv; that there was but one "Sort of Jewiſh Proſelytes; wherein lay the Fault "of St. Peter; and how St. Paul may be vindi-"cated." Of theſe Remarks it is ſufficient to ſay, that they diſplay Dr. Lardner's uſual ſkill in what-ever relates to the critical Knowledge of the New Teſtament. He has particularly confuted the no-tion of two kinds of proſelytes, which had not only been adopted by Dr. Ward, but which, for ſome time before, had been a favourite opinion with Lord Barrington, Dr. Benſon, and other writers, ſo as to lead them into various miſtakes. A long intimacy had ſubſiſted between Dr. Ward and our author; and accordingly, throughout the whole of his Remarks, he has treated the me-mory of his friend with the greateſt regard and reſpect.

Dr. Lardner, in 1764, communicated to the world, without his name, ſome ſtrictures on an-

other eminent New Teſtament critic, Dr. James Macknight, who had recently publiſhed his Harmony of the Four Goſpels. The arrangement of the circumſtances relative to our Lord's reſurrection, had for ſeveral years engaged the attention of Chriſtian writers. Mr. Gilbert Weſt had treated the ſubject very much at large, and was ſuppoſed to have thrown great light upon it, by having recourſe to a different interpretation of ſome of our Saviour's appearances, recorded by the Evangeliſts, from what had hitherto been given. A new vein of criticiſm was opened by him, which was purſued by other perſons. Dr. Macknight, in particular, beſtowed extraordinary labour upon the matter, in the concluſion of his Harmony. The efforts of his ingenuity and diligence had not the good fortune to ſatisfy Dr. Lardner. It appeared to him, that certain ſuppoſitions, which had been made by Dr. Macknight, were altogether without foundation. He thought proper, therefore, to publiſh, in a letter to the author, Obſervations upon his Harmony, ſo far as related to the Hiſtory of our Saviour's Reſurrection. It cannot be denied that this tract is a piece of maſterly criticiſm. The account which is given in it, of the various appearances of our Lord, after his reſurrection, comes recommended by ſuch a ſimplicity of truth, as calls for the warmeſt approbation. I have reaſon to believe, that there were other points in which Dr. Lardner did not agree with Dr. Macknight. In

matters

matters liable to difficulty, and involved in ſome degree of obſcurity, a diverſity of ſentiments will take place between the moſt upright, able, and ſerious enquirers after truth.

Amidſt theſe various productions of a ſmaller nature, Dr. Lardner continued the proſecution of his grand object. Accordingly, ſoon after the publication of his Obſervations on Dr. Macknight's Harmony, and in the ſame year, he gave to the world, in quarto, the firſt volume of "A large Collection of "ancient Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies to the "Truth of the Chriſtian Religion." This volume contained the Jewiſh teſtimonies, and the teſtimonies of heathen authors of the firſt century. In the preface, Dr. Lardner has given an account of thoſe who had gone before him in the ſame deſign; from which account it will appear, that the ſubject, comparatively ſpeaking, had hitherto been but imperfectly conſidered. As he was apprehenſive that his work might be charged with prolixity, he has made an apology for it, which muſt effectually ſilence every objector. "I aim," ſays he, "to be diſtinct and particular. Theſe things have "already been ſlightly touched upon by many. I "propoſe to enlarge, and ſet them in a fuller light. "I allege paſſages of ancient authors at length: I "ſettle their time: I diſtinguiſh their works, and "endeavour to ſhew the value of their teſtimonies. "I intend likewiſe to allege the judgments of di-"vers learned moderns, who have gone before me

" in this ſervice. All the perſecutions of this " time are a part of my ſubject, as they were ap- " pointed by edicts of heathen emperors, and were " carried on by heathen governors of provinces, " and officers under them. I ſhall have an op- " portunity to ſhew the patience and fortitude " of the primitive Chriſtians, and the ſtate of " Judaiſm, Gentiliſm, and Chriſtianity, in the " firſt four centuries. As moſt of the authors to " be quoted by me are men of great diſtinction in " the republic of letters, ſome occaſions will of- " fer for critical obſervations, which cannot be all " declined: but nice and intricate queſtions will " be carefully avoided, that the whole may be " upon the level with the capacities of all who " are inquiſitive, and diſpoſed to read with atten- " tion." Such is our author's repreſentation of his purpoſes; and it will be almoſt deemed ſuperfluous to add, that they are executed with the greateſt accuracy, learning, candour, and judgment.

The heathen teſtimonies, conſidered in the firſt volume, were, the pretended Epiſtle of Abgarus king of Edeſſa to Jeſus, and the Reſcript of Jeſus to Abgarus; the knowledge which the Emperor Tiberius had of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; a monumental inſcription concerning the Chriſtians in the time of Nero; Pliny the elder; Tacitus; Martial; Juvenal; and Suetonius. But this volume began with, and was chiefly employed upon, the Jewiſh teſtimonies; among which the famous hiſtorian Joſephus is the principal object. The third

chapter,

chapter, relative to the fulfilment of our Saviour's predictions concerning the deſtruction of the temple and the city of Jeruſalem, and the miſeries of the Jewiſh people, is of peculiar importance; and accordingly, it has juſtly obtained a place in Biſhop Watſon's collection. It was a neceſſary part of Dr. Lardner's plan, to examine the celebrated paſſage with regard to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is now found in all the copies of Joſephus. This paſſage, therefore, our author has diſcuſſed with his uſual ſagacity and diligence; and he has pronounced it to be an interpolation. Dr. Samuel Chandler, who was not convinced by what he had advanced upon the ſubject, wrote to him a letter on the occaſion, to which he returned a ſhort anſwer. The letter and the reply may be ſeen in the Appendix[o]. Several learned writers among us were diſpoſed, about this time, to maintain the authenticity of the paſſage in queſtion. Dr. Chapman had done it in his Euſebius. The ſame cauſe had been defended by Dr. Nathaniel Foſter, in a diſſertation publiſhed at Oxford, in 1749. Nor is it without very eminent ſupport in the preſent day. Mr. Bryant has exerted all the efforts, in vindication of the paſſage, which ingenuity and literature could ſupply: he has done every thing but producing conviction. I have been favoured with a letter from the Rev. Mr. Henley, of Rendleſham in

[o] Appendix, N° IX.

Suffolk,

Suffolk, containing a communication from the Abbé de Voiſin, and ſome obſervations by the late Abbé Bullet, relative to the teſtimony of Joſephus, which I inſert with great pleaſure in the Appendix [P].

Without taking it upon me to decide concerning the authenticity of this famous paſſage, I muſt be permitted to remark, that it can never be of any real advantage in a controverſy with the enemies of our holy religion. Of what avail can it be, to produce a teſtimony ſo doubtful in itſelf, and which ſome of the ableſt advocates for the truth of the goſpel reject as an interpolation? An Infidel muſt revolt at ſuch an argument. It ought, therefore, to be for ever diſcarded from any place among the evidences of Chriſtianity, though it may continue to exerciſe the ingenuity and critical ſkill of ſcholars and divines.

The ſecond volume of the Collection of Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies appeared in 1765; containing the heathen teſtimonies of the ſecond century. In the preface to this volume, ſome farther obſervations were made upon the paragraph in the works of Joſephus, concerning our bleſſed Saviour. Dr. Foſter's diſſertation, and Dr. Chandler's private letter, furniſhed the occaſion for theſe additional obſervations; in which our author ſtrenuouſly defends his former opinion. The perſons treated of in

[P] Appendix, N° X.

this

this volume are, Pliny the younger, and Trajan; Epictetus the ſtoic philoſopher, and Arrian; the Emperor Adrian; Bruttius Præſens; Phlegon, Thallus, and Dionyſius the Areopagite; the Emperor Titus Antoninus the pious; the Emperor Marcus Antoninus the philoſopher; Apuleius; the early adverſaries of Chriſtianity, and particularly Celſus; Lucian of Samoſata; Ariſtides the ſophiſt; Dion Chryſoſtom; and Galen. Of the chapters relative to theſe perſons, the longeſt, and the moſt important, are thoſe concerning Pliny, Marcus Antoninus, and Celſus. Whoever peruſes them, will find in them a noble treaſure of curious and valuable information. I cannot forbear tranſcribing a ſhort paſſage, from the article on Pliny and Trajan, which beautifully diſplays the candid mind of Dr. Lardner. The evidence before him had obliged him to ſay ſome things that are unfavourable to Trajan's character; after which he adds: "It ought "not to be thought by any that I take pleaſure in "detracting from the merit of thoſe who have "been diſtinguiſhed by their high ſtations, or their "eminent abilities, or their uſeful ſervices to man-"kind of any ſort. For indeed, the diſadvan-"tageous part of this detail has been made, and "carried on, not without great reluctance, much "diffidence, and tenderneſs; whilſt commendable "things have been cheerfully acknowledged. And "if we now think, and judge, and act, better than "many in former times, it is owing to our ſuperior

"advantages;

"advantages; ſuch eſpecially as we have received "from the Chriſtian Revelation, by which our "minds have been enlightened and enlarged: for "which we ought to be ever thankful, ſtill "thinking modeſtly of ourſelves, and giving God "the glory of all[q]."

The third volume of the Collection of Teſtimonies was publiſhed in 1766, containing an account of the Heathen writers and writings of the third century, whence arguments may be deduced in ſupport of the truth of the Chriſtian religion. This volume, which extended to the converſion of Conſtantine the great, abounded, like the two former ones, with much valuable information. The perſecutions to which the profeſſors of the goſpel were expoſed, and particularly that under the emperor Diocleſian, are here amply conſidered. A peculiar attention is, likewiſe, paid to Porphyry, and to his objections againſt the authenticity of the book of Daniel. In the chapter that relates to Diogenes Laertius, our author has introduced a very curious Criticiſm on the Altar to the Unknown God, at Athens, which is mentioned in the Acts of the Apoſtles.

The fourth volume of the Teſtimonies appeared in 1767. In this volume were contained the teſtimonies of Heathen writers of the fourth, fifth, and ſixth centuries; to which was added, the ſtate of Gentiliſm under Chriſtian emperors.

[q] See the preſent edition of Dr. Lardner's works, vol. vii. p. 337, 338.

Among

Among the perſons who here paſſed in review before Dr. Lardner, Julian, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Libanius are particularly diſtinguiſhed. The accounts of theſe, and of contemporary authors, are very entertaining; though, as witneſſes in favour of our holy religion, they are not ſo important as Celſus, and other writers of an earlier period. Nevertheleſs, they deſerved to be collected, and to be put together in their proper order. Hence our author had an opportunity of diſplaying the laſt ſtruggles of expiring Gentiliſm, and of relating ſome attempts to reſtore it, after it had been for a while exploded with ſcorn and diſdain. He has, likewiſe, introduced to the acquaintance of his readers, not a few men of great learning, and fine abilities, who were ſtill tenacious of the ancient rites, and fond of all the fables upon which they were founded, and by which they had long been upheld and encouraged.

In the copious article concerning Julian, a very important point came under Dr. Lardner's conſideration, which was, the account of that emperor's attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jeruſalem, and of the defeat of the attempt, by a divine and miraculous interpoſition. This account has been given not only by three contemporary Chriſtian writers, Gregory Nazianzen, Chryſoſtom, and Ambroſe, but alſo by the Heathen hiſtorian Ammianus Marcellinus. It is mentioned, likewiſe, by Rufinus, Socrates,

crates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and other ancient authors. Accordingly, the ſtory has obtained an almoſt univerſal credit; and ſcarcely any learned man had dared to ſuggeſt a doubt concerning it, excepting Baſnage, in his Hiſtory of the Jews. It is well known that Biſhop Warburton wrote a very elaborate treatiſe in defence of the miracle; and that this treatiſe has been eſteemed one of his capital productions, in point of judgment, as well as of literature. Dr. Lardner, however, after the fulleſt examination, was obliged to heſitate upon the ſubject. His difficulties he has ſtated with his uſual ſimplicity and candour; and it muſt be acknowledged that the conſiderations propoſed by him have great weight. Perhaps many who read them will be induced, for the future, to lay but little ſtreſs upon a narration, which has heretofore been ſo generally admitted. I need not ſay that our author had no intention to weaken the evidences of Revelation. He was influenced by nothing but that ſacred and impartial regard to truth which he maintained in all his enquiries. Some of the reflections which occur in his criticiſm will probably here be read with pleaſure, as they finely diſplay the temper of his mind. "Let not "any be offended," ſays he, "that I heſitate "about this point. I think we ought not too "eaſily to receive accounts of miraculous interpo-"ſitions, which are not becoming the Divine "Being. There are many things ſaid of Julian,

"which

" which all wiſe and good men do not believe.—
" The truth of hiſtory is not at all affected by re-
" jecting improbable relations. Nor is the cauſe
" of Chriſtianity at all hurt by our refuſing to
" aſſent to ſome things, which Chriſtian writers
" have ſaid of Julian. That he pretended favour
" for the Jews, and ſometimes talked of rebuilding
" their city and their temple, is allowed. But
" that he actually attempted it, and ordered money
" for the work out of the public treaſury, when he
" was ſetting out upon the Perſian expedition, and
" that his attempt was fruſtrated by many miracu-
" lous interpoſitions, is not ſo certain. Though
" theſe things ſhould be conteſted or denied, it
" can be of no bad conſequence. Other hiſtories,
" which are void of the like improbabilities, are
" not affected by it. And the Evangelical hiſtory
" remains firm and inviolate, having in it all poſſible
" marks of truth and credibility.

" Finally, to put an end to theſe critical obſerva-
" tions. Julian's favourable regards for the Jewiſh
" people, and his intention (or deſire at leaſt) to re-
" build the city of Jeruſalem, and the temple there,
" are manifeſt, and fully atteſted by contemporary
" witneſſes, and by his own writings. It is as
" manifeſt, that his deſign to rebuild Jeruſalem and
" the Jewiſh temple, was never accompliſhed,
" but was fruſtrated and defeated. Whether it
" was owing to miraculous interpoſitions, or to his
" expenſive preparations for the Perſian war, and

" other

"other circumſtances of his affairs, and to his "death and defeat in that war; the over-ruling "providence of God ought to be acknowledged in "the event. And the argument for the truth of "the Chriſtian religion, taken from the fulfilment "of our Saviour's predictions in the deſtruction of "Jeruſalem, and the overthrow of the Jewiſh "people by Veſpaſian and Titus, and their con-"tinued diſperſion, remains in all its force. It is "an argument which I never intended to weaken: "it is, I think, a demonſtrative argument for the "truth of the Chriſtian religion; and, as I have "often hinted in this work, deſerving the atten-"tive regard and ſerious conſideration of all man-"kind[1]."

The fourth volume of the collection of Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies completed another capital part of our author's original deſign. It was publiſhed ten years after he had finiſhed his Credibility; ſo that this grand object, with the interruption ariſing from ſome ſmaller productions, occupied him during the ſpace of forty-three years. A reflection preſents itſelf on this occaſion; which is, that works of great conſequence are not of ſpeedy execution. Although Dr. Lardner led a very retired life; though he entered but little into public buſineſs; though he was a ſtated preacher only twenty-one years, and that but once a day; yet

[1] Teſtimonies, vol. iv. p. 67, 68, 70, 71.

we

we ſee how long a time he was employed, and diligently employed, in accompliſhing the end he had in view. Thoſe who are not themſelves engaged in important and extenſive literary undertakings, can have but an imperfect conception of the difficulties to be ſurmounted, the diſappointments to be incurred, the books to be procured and waited for, the dates to be ſettled, the facts to be aſcertained, and the various other cauſes which often occaſion delays, that muſt be far more unpleaſant to the writer than they can poſſibly be to any reader whatever.

Though our author's life and pen were ſo ardently devoted to the public good, he never received any thing that could deſerve to be regarded as a recompence for his labours. The ſalary he had, whilſt he continued to be a preacher, was very inconſiderable; and his works were often publiſhed by him to his loſs, inſtead of his gain. This was particularly the caſe with reſpect to the latter volumes of the Credibility. At length he parted with the copy-right of that performance, together with all the remaining printed copies of it, for the trifling ſum of a hundred and fifty pounds. Such a ſum was by no means an equivalent for the expences he had incurred: but he conſented to the agreement, in the hope that the work would be rendered more extenſively uſeful, when it became the immediate intereſt of the bookſellers to promote

its ſale[s]. From the ſcarcity of the ſeparate volumes, and the immenſe price to which complete ſets of the Credibility have ſince ariſen, it is to be preſumed that theſe gentlemen have had no reaſon to repent of their bargain. As to Dr. Lardner, his work is with the Lord, and his reward with his God.

Whilſt our author ſubmitted patiently to various diſadvantages, in order to ſerve the intereſts of truth and virtue, and to maintain the honour of the Chriſtian religion, he was not inſenſible that he had not met with the ſupport and encouragement to which he was entitled. He particularly complained of the neglect of the rich diſſenting laity, in purchaſing his volumes[t]. This I remember his having once mentioned to me in a letter; in which he took notice, that he had never received any mark of favour from the diſſenters; "not," ſaid he, "ſo much as a truſt." He here referred

[s] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 129.

[t] That excellent and munificent citizen, Thomas Hollis, Eſq; muſt be exempted from this charge. In 1764, Dr. Lardner requeſted him, by letter, to ſubſcribe to his Collection of Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies. Upon this application, Mr. Hollis ſent the good man a bank-note of twenty pounds, which the Doctor told to a friend, was the greateſt ſum he had ever received from any of his benefactors[a]. There can be no doubt but that ſeveral of the wealthy diſſenters purchaſed our author's writings, though this was not done by them ſo generally as might have been expected, and as the merit of the works deſerved.

[a] Memoirs of Thomas Hollis, Eſq; vol. i. p. 253.

to

to Dr. Daniel Williams's charities and library, the truſtees of which conſiſt of thirteen miniſters and ten lay gentlemen. It was not to the honour of that body, that Dr. Lardner was never choſen to be one of their number. His deafneſs, I believe, was conſidered as an objection, but ſurely without ſufficient reaſon; for no perſon could have been better qualified to give advice on moſt occaſions, and eſpecially with reference to books. If I had not believed that his nephew, Mr. Nathaniel Neal, was influenced by a principle of extreme delicacy, I ſhould have thought him ſomewhat to blame in the affair. That gentleman was not only a truſtee, but agent for the truſt, and had a great ſway in all its concerns. If, therefore, he had intimated, that the election of his uncle would be a deſirable meaſure, it could ſcarcely have met with an objection. I ſhould be unwilling to ſuppoſe that any little bigotries, with regard to Dr. Lardner's theological ſentiments, contributed to his being neglected. It is certain that no ſuch narrowneſs of ſpirit is found in the preſent truſtees.

The laſt work of our author, that was publiſhed during his life-time, was the fourth volume of his Teſtimonies. As, however, ſome poſthumous pieces of his have ſince made their appearance, I ſhall mention them in this place. There came out, in 1769, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Lardner, to which were annexed, eight ſermons upon various ſubjects. The four firſt of them had by himſelf been tranſcribed for the preſs.

On the fifth and ſixth, though not fairly tranſcribed, he had written as follows: "Peruſed, and, ſo "far as I am able to perceive, all is right; and I "humbly conceive ought to be publiſhed." Theſe two Diſcourſes are on the internal marks of Credibility in the New Teſtament, and are admirably worthy of peruſal. They are the ſermons which he had preached in 1723 and 1724, at the Tueſday evening lecture. and contain, in ſome degree, the outlines of his great work, and eſpecially of that part of it which relates to the facts occaſionally mentioned in the Evangelical and Apoſtolical writings.

In 1776 was publiſhed, a ſhort Letter, which our author had ſent, in 1762, to Mr. Caleb Fleming, upon the Perſonality of the Spirit. It was printed at the end of Mr. Cardale's Enquiry whether we have any Scripture warrant for a direct Addreſs either to the Son or to the Holy Ghoſt.

It was a part of Dr. Lardner's original deſign, with regard to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, to give an account of the heretics of the two firſt centuries. To the arrangement, therefore, of his collections upon this ſubject he applied himſelf, after he had finiſhed his Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies; but he did not live to complete his intentions. Some parts, indeed, of the work were fitted for the preſs, having received his laſt corrections; whilſt in other parts only a few hints were written. It was doubted, for a time, whether the progreſs he had made in his undertaking was ſufficient for

it to be laid before the public. However, upon mature deliberation, his papers were put into the hands of the Rev. Mr. Hogg, a worthy, learned, and judicious diſſenting miniſter at Exeter, who, in the additions which he made to Dr. Lardner's materials, did not introduce a relation of any perſon, excepting where the Doctor himſelf had drawn up a part of it, or had left ſome hints or references. In conſequence of Mr. Hogg's reviſal and aſſiſtance, there appeared, in 1780, in one volume, quarto, "The Hiſtory of the Heretics of the two firſt "centuries after Chriſt: containing an account of "their time, opinions, and teſtimonies to the "books of the New Teſtament. To which are "prefixed, general obſervations concerning Here-"tics." Though this volume is not, upon the whole, ſo valuable and important as ſome of the former ones, it is poſſeſſed, nevertheleſs, of very conſiderable merit. It recites the teſtimonies of heretics, rectifies a variety of miſtakes concerning them, and refutes many groundleſs charges to which they were expoſed from the ignorance, falſe zeal, and bigotry of their adverſaries.

The laſt poſthumous publication written by Dr. Lardner, appeared in 1784. It is intitled, "Two Schemes of a Trinity conſidered, and the "Divine Unity aſſerted." This work conſiſts of four diſcourſes upon Philippians, ii. 5—11. The firſt repreſents the commonly received opinion of the Trinity; the ſecond deſcribes the Arian ſcheme;

the third treats on the Nazarean doctrine; and the fourth explains the text according to that doctrine. Our author had himself transcribed these sermons for the press, with particular directions designed for the printer. The manuscript having come into the possession of Mr. Wiche, a very respectable dissenting minister, of the Baptist persuasion, at Maidstone, in Kent, he gave it to the public. Even those who are far from agreeing in sentiment with Dr. Lardner, have applauded the candour, the simplicity, and the love of truth, which these discourses evidently discover. Indeed, they are chiefly estimable for the temper and spirit with which they are composed. It was not to be expected that they could contain much new matter, on points which, of late years, have been so frequently and copiously discussed.

Providence spared the life of Dr. Lardner to a long term; and, his hearing excepted, he retained, to the last, the use of his faculties, in a remarkably perfect degree. At length, in the summer of 1768, he was seized with a decline, which carried him off in a few weeks, at Hawkhurst, the place of his nativity, and where he had a small parental estate. He had been removed thither, in the hope that he might recruit his strength by a change of air, and relaxation from study. The day of his decease was the twenty-fourth of July, in the eighty-fifth year of his age. His remains were conveyed to town, and deposited in Tindal's burying-ground, commonly

monly called Bunhill Fields. At his particular requeſt, no ſermon was preached on occaſion of his death[u]. Thus did his modeſty and humility accompany him to the laſt moment of his earthly exiſtence. Some time after his deceaſe, a ſtone was erected to his memory, with an Engliſh inſcription.

In looking back upon the life and character of Dr. Lardner, and comparing them with thoſe of other men, we ſhall find few names that are more truly entitled to be remembered with veneration and applauſe. The ſincerity of his piety has been ſeen in a variety of circumſtances which I have had occaſion to mention. Indeed, a regard to God appears to have been ever the governing principle of his actions. His piety, too, was of the moſt rational kind, being founded on juſt and enlarged views concerning the nature of religion. What his ideas were in this reſpect will be found in many parts of his writings, and may be diſcerned in two extracts from letters of his to Lord Barrington, which are inſerted below[x].

Correſpondent

[u] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 136.

[x] The Extracts are as follows:

"I have ever had a good deal of curioſity, which, I apprehend, uſually accompanies a love of truth. But I have learnt a neceſſity of reſtraining, or at leaſt of regulating and governing that curioſity. The capacities of men are limited, and even ſmall in compariſon of the whole compaſs of things. The moſt important matters ought to be firſt preferred. A few certain principles

Correſpondent to our author's piety was his love of truth, as is manifeſt from the whole of his works.

are better than a great many, if only obſcure and uncertain. When evidence is not full and clear, it is beſt to ſuſpend and doubt. Religion is the concern of all men; it ought therefore be clear and plain. And obſcure religion is of little or no value: indeed, it ſeems to be one of the greateſt abſurdities that can be conceived. If God make a revelation, intended for the general benefit of mankind, one would expect it ſhould be clear. We find in the Old Teſtament predictions of a diſpenſation, under which men ſhould not need to teach one another, ſaying, *Know the Lord: for all ſhould know him, from the leaſt to the greateſt.* I have a ſtrong perſuaſion that the Goſpel was plain at firſt. It is contained in the four Goſpels and Acts, which are plain books. If Chriſtianity is not plain now, I apprehend it muſt be our own fault, ſome way or other. A doctrine that contains plain directions of duty, and plain promiſes of a reward, ſufficient to encourage to duty in all circumſtances, to ſtrengthen againſt temptations, to give comfort under afflictions, to calm the affections, and can be eaſily proved to be certain, is indeed an excellent doctrine. This is true religion. This is a pearl of great price, a treaſure indeed, for which a man may reaſonably part with all that he has to buy it. I ſay, eaſily proved to be certain. But it requires a ſincere and honeſt diſpoſition. Such a mind, with good inſtruction, will learn more in a few hours, than the prejudiced and ſelfiſh, in an age. Indeed, ſuch as theſe can never receive the truth, unleſs mixed with other matters that ſubvert it.

I am the more diſcouraged in the purſuit of ſpeculations in matters of religion, becauſe I obſerve our bleſſed Saviour (who knew all things) and his Apoſtles enter not into many particulars of the future life, and deliver no abſtract notions about any thing, nor ſay any thing whatever to gratify mere curioſity, but only matters of the utmoſt conſequence to the happineſs of men. I have alſo obſerved, that the obſcure and difficult principles of the philoſophers,

works. No one ſeems ever to have preſerved a greater impartiality in his enquiries, or to have been

philoſophers, the great variety of opinions they had, and the uncertainty of them, were great defects in their philoſophy, and objections againſt it. And I have been not a little concerned to ſee the ſtate of Chriſtianity among us reſemble ſo much the ſtate philoſophy was in at the time the Chriſtian religion firſt appeared in the world. There is ſtill the more reaſon for thoſe who ſincerely deſire the intereſt of religion, to keep to plain, certain truths, if poſſible; becauſe of the prodigious, the almoſt univerſal indolence of mankind, who continually catch at every thing, that may countenance their neglect of enquiry and examination; who ſeek nothing but this world, how they and their families may enjoy eaſe, riches, and grandeur. For all which reaſons, it may be beſt not to advance any obſcure and uncertain matters in religion; or, if for ſome ſpecial reaſons they are advanced, that they be propoſed as uncertain and doubtful, and that little ſtreſs be laid upon them."

In a ſubſequent letter, he thus writes:

"A principal occaſion of my writing as I did about curioſity, was (as far as I remember) the ſubject matter of debate or enquiry, the future reward of good men. I apprehend ſome ill conſequences from too nice and curious enquiries about that, ſince God has not plainly revealed to us, as I ſuppoſed, the place of that happineſs. But whatever I ſaid about curioſity, I never intended to diſcourage a diligent and careful ſearch after truth. There is ſcarce any thing more diſagreeable and offenſive to me, than the common indolence of mankind about religion, and truth in general. And therefore another reaſon, why I ſpake againſt needleſs enquiries, was, becauſe I feared that the rendering religion abſtruſe and difficult, and multiplying queſtions in divinity (eſpecially in thoſe things which are of importance), might be improved by mankind, as a pretence to countenance their lazy and indolent diſpoſition[a]."

[a] Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Lardner, p. 130—134.

more

more free from any undue bias. He followed truth wherever it led him; and for the attainment of truth he was admirably qualified, both by the turn of his diſpoſition and his underſtanding. With a mind ſo calm and unprejudiced, with a judgment ſo clear and diſtinct, he could ſcarcely fail of forming right apprehenſions concerning moſt of the ſubjects which the courſe of his ſtudies enabled him to inveſtigate.

The candour and moderation with which Dr. Lardner maintained his own ſentiments, conſtituted a prominent feature in his character. Thoſe he differed from in opinion, he always treated with gentleneſs and reſpect; and in the controverſies he carries on with them, there is no ſeverity of cenſure, no harſhneſs of language. This circumſtance is the more worthy to be mentioned and applauded, as it is ſo different from what we often meet with in the preſent day. Many of our writers ſeem to be reverting to that abuſe of each other, which was common among ſcholars ſome time after the revival of literature. They are not ſatisfied without caſting illiberal reflections on the perſons of the men whoſe tenets they oppoſe, and arraigning the motives of their conduct. What renders this diſpoſition the more ridiculous is, that it is frequently exerted on the moſt trivial occaſions. Apprehended miſtakes in philology, or diverſities of judgment in matters of mere taſte, are

treated

treated with as great a bitterneſs as if they were crimes of the deepeſt dye. How much more beautiful, and more worthy of imitation, was the manner of conducting diſputable queſtions which was purſued by Dr. Lardner! Such a method will be found, in the end, more favourable to the diffuſion of truth, and more conducive to a laſting reputation. Circumſtances, indeed, may ariſe, in which a ſharpneſs of chaſtiſement may appear to be juſtifiable. Uncommon inſolence and uncommon bigotry may deſerve to be ſtrongly expoſed: and yet, even here, a manly neglect and contempt of unmerited cenſure may be the moſt honourable and the moſt uſeful mode of behaviour.

Benevolence, as well as piety, entered deeply into Dr. Lardner's character. Though his retired life prevented him from taking a very active part in public deſigns, he was ready to promote every good work. To perſons in diſtreſs he was ever willing to contribute, to the higheſt degree which his fortune would admit. On ſome occaſions, he exerted himſelf with great vigour and ſucceſs. When a gentleman came to London, in 1756, to ſolicit contributions towards building a church for the Proteſtants of Thorn, in Poland, our author was particularly ſerviceable to him, both by his advice and recommendation. He, in a great meaſure, took upon himſelf the management of the affair; on which account he afterwards received the thanks of the preſident and fellows of the college of Thorn,

Thorn, in an elegant Latin letter. Near the time of his deceaſe, he was engaged in aſſiſting and recommending the Rev. Mr. Finman, miniſter of the reformed congregation at Rutzow, in the dutchy of Mecklenburg Schwerin, who had come over to England for a like purpoſe. Upon this occaſion, a letter was written to Dr. Lardner, by Dr. Secker, archbiſhop of Canterbury, which was the concluſion of a very long correſpondence between two eminent perſons, who were now each of them on the verge of diſſolution[y]. As this letter diſplays the archbiſhop's ſtate of mind at that time, and the continuance of his regard for our author, it will be inſerted below[z].

In his private deportment, Dr. Lardner was very amiable. His manners were polite, gentle, and obliging; and he was attentive, in every reſpect, to

[y] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 127, 128.

[z] "Good Dr. Lardner,

"I would have ſeen Mr. Finman, and anſwered your firſt letter, if I had been able. But it hath pleaſed God to afflict me, for many months paſt, with ſo conſtant, and ſo ſevere a pain in one of my hips, that I am almoſt incapable of any attention to any thing elſe. Become quite uſeleſs, and nearly worn out, I beg you will pray God to give me patience, and ſuch degree of eaſe as he ſhall think fit: and can only add, that as I hope my ſpirit is truly Chriſtian towards all who love the Lord Jeſus in ſincerity, ſo I am, with particular eſteem and thankfulneſs for the whole of your obliging behaviour to me through life,

"Your faithful friend and ſervant,

"Lambeth, July 13, 1768. "THOMAS CANT."

[a] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 128, 129.

the

the laws of decorum. It has been juſtly remarked, that he "ſeemed carefully to obſerve the rules laid "down in his Counſels of Prudence[a]." Perhaps it may not be diſagreeable to my readers, to be informed of the mode in which he carried on converſation. Paper, pens, and ink, being immediately brought in when viſiters came to his houſe, they wrote down ſuch intelligence as they had to communicate, or the obſervations and queſtions which they wiſhed to propoſe. To theſe, as they were ſeverally written, he replied with great freedom and chearfulneſs, and in a way that was both inſtructive and entertaining. As the paper contained the unconnected anſwers and remarks of the different guèſts, upon different ſubjects, it formed what would have appeared to a ſtranger to be a very heterogeneous mixture. It was, however, carefully preſerved by the Doctor, to be peruſed by him when his viſitors were gone; and the peruſal of it often led him to objects of farther conſideration and enquiry.

Our author was not one of thoſe ſcholars who are unacquainted with mankind. He had ſeen much of life during his reſidence with Lady Treby; he was continually viſited by perſons of various profeſſions and countries; and he poſſeſſed that ſagacity of obſervation, which is the principal requiſite towards obtaining a knowledge of the world.

[a] Memoirs, p. 130.

Nor

Nor is it uncommon for eminent men, who live in retirement, to have ſome people near them, who are fond of conveying to them every kind of information which it is in their power to collect. Whether ſuch information may not occaſionally derive a tincture from the miſtakes and prejudices of the communicators, I ſtay not to examine.

On the learning of Dr. Lardner it is not neceſſary to enlarge, ſince his character in this reſpect is known to all the world. With regard to that ſpecies of literature which was cultivated by him, he was accurate and profound in the greateſt degree. Some branches of knowledge there were to which he did not apply his attention; for who is adequate to every object? But as a divine, and eſpecially with relation to his acquaintance with the New Teſtament, and with Chriſtian antiquity, perhaps he never had his equal. The works of our author being thus valuable, and relating to objects of the higheſt importance, it is not ſurpriſing that they ſhould be held in great eſteem, not only at home, but abroad. I have already mentioned, that the firſt part of the Credibility was tranſlated into Low Dutch by the Rev. Mr. Cornelius Weſterbaen of Utrecht, and into Latin by the Rev. Mr. John Chriſtopher Wolff of Hamburgh. A German tranſlation of it appeared at Berlin and at Leipſic, in 1750, by the Rev. Mr. David Bruhn of Memel in Pruſſia, and Mr. John David Heilman; and it was accompanied with a large Preface,

face, by the Rev. Profeſſor Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten. The ſecond part of the Credibility was likewiſe tranſlated both in Holland and in Germany. In 1751, the German tranſlation of the fourth volume was printed, and the whole deſign may probably have ſince been compleated. The Vindication of the three Miracles was alſo tranſlated into German, by the Rev. Mr. Meyenberg, and publiſhed at Zell, in 1750, together with a Preface, written by the Rev. Dr. Pleſken. A tranſlation of the Diſcourſes on the Circumſtances of the Jewiſh People appeared at Halle, in 1754; and of the Treatiſe of the Demoniacs, at Bremen, in 1760[b].

The literary connections of Dr. Lardner were extenſive; and he was particularly on a very friendly footing with his learned contemporaries among the diſſenters. This has already been ſufficiently apparent, in the notice which, in the courſe of the preſent Narrative, there has been occaſion to take of Lord Barrington, Dr. Hunt, Mr. Tomkins, Mr. Hallet, Dr. Ward, Dr. Benſon, Dr. Chandler, and Dr. Doddridge. Our author had a high regard and eſteem for Mr. Mole, and they freely communicated to each other their opinions and remarks on ſubjects of religion and literature. He correſponded with Mr. Brekell of Liverpool, the writer of ſome valuable tracts on points of Biblical criticiſm. In the latter part of his life,

[b] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 125, 126.

Dr. Lardner's

Dr. Lardner's greateſt perſonal intimacy was with Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Caleb Fleming. This gentleman lived within a few doors of him, and there was a perfect conformity betwixt them with reſpect to their theological ſentiments. Reſiding ſo near to each other, for between twenty and thirty years, their intimacy grew up to the moſt unreſerved confidence. My friend Dr. Towers has favoured me with the peruſal of a ſeries of letters, written to Dr. Fleming by Dr. Lardner, in which he freely diſcloſed his thoughts concerning men and things. Dr. Fleming was a man of great integrity, and of an acute and vigorous underſtanding, but in regard to learning, not by any means to be named with his friend. He was for a time miniſter to a ſmall congregation at Bartholomew Cloſe, after which he ſucceeded the celebrated Dr. James Foſter at Pinners Hall. Few people have written a greater number of pamphlets, ſome of which, being publiſhed without his name, were but little noticed by the world. Others of his tracts were better received, and ſeveral of them are curious and valuable. There are inſtances in which he was ſingular, not to ſay whimſical, in his poſitions. His writings might have been more generally acceptable and uſeful, if they had been free from a certain quaintneſs and obſcurity of ſtyle. Aiming at originality and ſtrength of expreſſion, he often loſt perſpicuity, and never attained to elegance. He was a determined enemy to civil and

eccleſiaſtical

eccleſiaſtical tyranny, and a very zealous Socinian.

Dr. Lardner's connections and friendſhips were not confined to perſons of his own religious communion. He was converſant with ſeveral reſpectable clergymen of the church of England, and received from them teſtimonies of their eſteem for his character, and approbation of his works. The letters which paſſed between him and biſhop Waddington, and his long and uninterrupted acquaintance with archbiſhop Secker, have already been mentioned. He maintained a large correſpondence both at home and abroad; and particularly in America and Germany. In conſequence of the reputation he had acquired by his publications, he was viſited by moſt of the learned foreigners who came over to England; and, after their return to their own countries, many grateful acknowledgments were tranſmitted to him of the friendly reception he had given them, and the aſſiſtance they had derived from him in their literary deſigns and purſuits [c].

Such being the excellencies which Dr. Lardner poſſeſſed, both as a writer and a man, it was natural that he ſhould often be ſpoken of in terms of reſpect and applauſe. Lord Barrington concluded his correſpondence with him, concerning Jairus's daughter, in the following language: "Thus I

[c] Ibid.

" think our controverſy ends. But our friendſhip " and correſpondence I hope never will, but with " our lives: and our friendſhip, I hope, then, but " for a ſeaſon. I have had ſo much ſatisfaction " and inſtruction from your great learning and " judgment, and from your patience, candour, " openneſs, and obliging manners, that, whenever I " have difficulties to put, in the future courſe of " my enquiries, or want to ſee what difficulties my " ſentiments are liable to, I ſhall take the liberty " to trouble you, unleſs you forbid me; or (if " your great civility will not allow you to do that) " I forbear, from the ſenſe I have, of how much I " rob the world, in the reſult of the learned pur- " ſuits they juſtly expect from you, by ſuch kind " of interruptions as thoſe I have given you [d]."

This was a tribute paid to Dr. Lardner's merit in early life; ſince which he has been juſtly applauded by a variety of reſpectable writers. Dr. Benſon ſpeaks of our author as " his highly eſteem- " ed friend;" and refers his readers to the Credibility, as a fair, full, and impartial account of the teſtimonies of the ancient Fathers [e].

" With reſpect to the external evidence of Chriſ- " tianity," ſays Dr. Jebb, " it may be obſerved, " that the works of the very learned and ingenious " Dr. Lardner, are calculated to produce a firm

[d] Memoirs, ubi ſupra, p. 41, 42.

[e] Benſon's Paraphraſes, vol. i. p. 326. and vol. ii. p. 376, ſecond edition.

" perſuaſion

" perſuaſion of the truth of thoſe hiſtorical facts " which form the foundation of the Chriſtian in- " ſtitution [f]."

The biſhop of Carliſle (Dr. Law) has prefaced a quotation from our author, in the following terms: " I ſhall only beg leave to introduce the " teſtimony of a candid and judicious writer, who " appears to entertain right notions both of the " nature of the Chriſtian inſtitution, and of the beſt " means for the propagation and ſupport of it; " and who has ſupplied us with the moſt valuable " collection of ancient evidences of its truth [g]."

In an anonymous tract, known to be written by Mr. Lindſey, that gentleman obſerves, " that the " publication of the letter on the Logos, in 1759, " ſoon made a great revolution in the opinions of " learned men [h]. For the piece was ſoon known " to be his, though without his name; and his " numerous writings were already in the higheſt " requeſt; his character alſo for probity, impar- " tiality, for critical ſkill, and the knowledge of

[f] Short Account of Theological Lectures, quarto, 1772, p. 17. note.

[g] Conſiderations on the Theory of Religion, p. 30. note, ſeventh edition.

[h] I do not agree with the worthy and learned writer in this aſſertion. It doth not appear to me that the influence of the Letter on the Logos was ſpeedy, but ſlow and gradual, and in conjunction with other publications; among which may be mentioned Mr. Cardale's Treatiſe on the true Doctrine of the New Teſtament concerning Jeſus Chriſt.

" the ſcriptures, and of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, infe-
" rior to none; and in ſome of theſe reſpects, ſu-
" perior to any of the age."

The ſame gentleman, in the ſame publication, has drawn Dr. Lardner's portrait ſomewhat at large; and it is with particular pleaſure that I preſent it to my readers. " To praiſe the living " would be invidious and awkward: but of thoſe " who have finiſhed their courſe well, we may " ſpeak freely, and be heard. Is there a literary " character, that ſtands higher upon the liſts of " fame, as a man, a Chriſtian, and a divine, than " the late Dr. Lardner? After an education in " an univerſity abroad, at that time not inferior in " learned tutors to either of our own, on his re-" turn to his own country, he became early ac-" quainted with the worthy and learned in the " church eſtabliſhed, and out of it. Archbiſhop " Secker, bred a diſſenter, like himſelf, cultivated " and courted his friendſhip through life. His " Vindication of ſome of our Lord's miracles againſt " Mr. Woolſton's attacks, is among the firſt upon " that occaſion, and the moſt candid. But his " Credibility of the Goſpel, in ſeventeen volumes, " octavo, and Jewiſh and Heathen Teſtimonies to " its Truth, in four volumes, quarto, have exhi-" bited ſuch a maſs of evidence for it, and eſta-" bliſhed it on ſo broad a foundation, as nothing " can ſhake. In this he gives, continually, curious " and uſeful inſtances of critical ſkill and judg-" ment:

" ment: but his love of truth and impartiality " are without example, in fairly repreſenting every " argument and objection, without the leaſt diſ- " cernible bias to any opinion or party. His piety " and humility are conſpicuous in all his writings, " and particularly in his ſermons, ſome of which " are among the beſt models for pulpit-diſcourſes " in our language, in explaining important paſ- " ſages of the goſpel, and pointing out the eaſy and " natural inſtruction to be deduced from it[i]."

Biſhop Watſon, in his Catalogue of Books of Divinity, having mentioned Dr. Lardner's Letter on the Logos, immediately ſubjoins ſome reflec- flections, which are ſo admirable, that they cannot be omitted. " Newton and Locke," ſays his Lord- ſhip, " were eſteemed Socinians, Lardner was an " avowed one; Clarke and Whiſton were declared " Arians; Bull and Waterland were profeſſed " Athanaſians. Who will take upon him to ſay " that theſe men were not equal to each other in " probity and ſcriptural knowledge? And if that " be admitted, ſurely we ought to learn no other " leſſon, from the diverſity of their opinions, ex- " cept that of perfect moderation and good-will " towards all thoſe who happen to differ from " ourſelves. We ought to entertain no other wiſh, " but that every man may be allowed, without loſs

[i] Examination of Mr. Robinſon's Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Preface, p. xviii. xxvi. xxvii.

" of fame or fortune, *et ſentire quæ velit, et quæ*
" *ſentiat dicere.* This abſolute freedom of en-
" quiry, it is apprehended, is the beſt way of in-
" veſtigating the ſenſe of ſcripture, the moſt pro-
" bable mean of producing an uniformity of opi-
" nion, and of rendering the goſpel diſpenſation as
" intelligible to us in the eighteenth century, as,
" we preſume, it was to Chriſtians in the firſt."

The ingenious writer of the Memoirs of Thomas Hollis, Eſq; has mentioned a ſhort, but beautiful encomium, which was paſſed on Dr. Lardner and one of his eminent contemporaries, by a very learned perſon, who has often ſaid, that if he were ſentenced to impriſonment for ſeven years, he would not deſire to take any books with him into his confinement beſides the works of Jortin and Lardner [k].

As ſeveral of our author's publications were of courſe ſubjected to the examination of the different literary journals which this country produces, the conducters of them were neceſſarily led to give, on various occaſions, their ſentiments concerning him; which, I believe, has uniformly been done in terms of approbation and reſpect. In one place, the Monthly Review thus ſpeaks: " Before we preſent
" our readers with a view of what is contained in
" this volume (the firſt volume of the ancient Jewiſh

[k] Memoirs of T. Hollis, Eſq; vol. i. p. 254.—I am indebted to my excellent friend, Dr. Diſney, for collecting and preſenting me with the preceding teſtimonies.

" and

" and Heathen Teſtimonies), we cannot, as friends
" to the religion of our country, forbear expreſſing
" the grateful ſenſe we have of the eminent ſervice
" our learned and worthy author has done to the
" cauſe of Chriſtianity, by his excellent writings in
" defence of it. Of the many able writers that have
" appeared in the preſent age, as advocates for the
" truth of the Chriſtian religion, there are none, in
" our opinion, that deſerve to be preferred to Dr.
" Lardner; few, indeed, that can be compared
" with him. In point of learning, his merit is very
" conſiderable: but what is much more valuable
" than mere learning, there is a pleaſing ſimplicity
" in his manner of writing, and a very uncommon
" degree of candour and impartiality. He ſeems
" to have nothing in view but the diſcovery of
" truth; ſcorns the mean and contemptible arts of
" miſrepreſentation, or concealing objections and
" difficulties, and gives his readers a clear and full
" view of the ſubject. How amiable is ſuch a
" character! how worthy of imitation[1]!

In another place, the Monthly Reviewers have expreſſed themſelves in the following language: " From the great ſervice rendered to Chriſtianity " by the laborious purſuits and learned compila- " tions of Dr. Lardner, his name will ever be diſ- " tinguiſhedly honoured in the hiſtory of the " Chriſtian church. Dr. Prieſtley, when he ſpeaks

[1] Monthly Review, vol. xxxii. p. 1.

" of this moſt learned and excellent man, gene-
" rally calls him, ' the prince of modern divines;'
" and we think this tribute to his illuſtrious merit
" not improperly paid. To the moſt elaborate and
" extenſive inveſtigations of eccleſiaſtical antiquity,
" he added all that knowledge of Greek and Ro-
" man literature, which enabled him ſo thoroughly
" to diſcriminate the comparative worth and ex-
" cellence of the ſacred and profane writers. To
" the learning of the ſcholar he added alſo the
" veracity of the hiſtorian; while the amiable can-
" dour and humility of the Chriſtian gave a pleaſ-
" ing luſtre and embelliſhment to his more emi-
" nent accompliſhments [m]."

Language to a like purpoſe occurs in different parts of the Critical Review; but I ſhall content myſelf with referring to one place, in which Dr. Lardner is deſcribed as maſter of a great extent of reading; as poſſeſſing a clear head to collect and ſtate facts and evidences, and a ſound judgment to determine concerning the weight of them; and as having ſpared no time or pains in his laborious taſk [n].

In conſequence of the recent original of the Engliſh Review, it hath had but one opportunity of characterizing our author; but that opportunity it hath embraced with diſtinguiſhed zeal and

[m] Monthly Review, vol. lxiv. p. 33.
[n] Critical Review, vol. iv. p. 517.

energy,

energy. "The name of Lardner," ſays the reviewer, "is well known in the literary world. No "writer, from the very exiſtence of Chriſtianity, "ever conferred ſo eſſential ſervice upon true re- "ligion, or contributed more to clear up its evi- "dence and elucidate its antiquities. Accordingly, there is no country, where the Chriſtian re- "ligion is profeſſed, in which his name is not held "in the greateſt eſteem. Every church would "have been proud to boaſt of him as their mem- "ber, and his voluminous productions have been "tranſlated into almoſt all the languages of "Europe.

"Dr. Lardner certainly poſſeſſed a very clear "and ſound underſtanding, and great ſhrewdneſs "of judgment. His induſtry in the purſuit, and "perſeverance in the inveſtigation, of truth, are "without example. But the quality by which he "was chiefly diſtinguiſhed, and which was per- "haps of more ſervice to him than all the reſt, "was the candour and ingenuity of his mind. He "examined every thing without prejudice. Seated, "as it were, in a more elevated ſphere than other "men, he was not ſubject to have his underſtand- "ing darkened by the clouds, and jaundiced by the "noxious mediums, of partiality, bigotry, and en- "thuſiaſm. He has, therefore, been as ſucceſsful "in refuting the falſe and ſuborned evidences of "Chriſtianity, as in aſſerting and illuſtrating the "true. Thus he has contributed, more than all

"the

"the miſtaken zeal and the pious frauds of a "thouſand ſaints and pontiffs could have done, to "the rendering it that ſimple, venerable, attractive, "and engaging ſtructure which God and Jeſus in-"tended it. It is no longer obſcured by im-"poſtures, and disfigured by the falſe props and "buttreſſes that were brought to ſupport it[o]."

A manuſcript elogium on Dr. Lardner has been put into my hands by a friend, Ebenezer Radcliff, Eſq; the principal part of which is inſerted at the end of this narrative.

I have only recited the teſtimonies given to our author by writers of our own country; but foreigners have not been deficient in ſpreading forth his praiſe. Thoſe who have tranſlated his works have introduced them with proper encomiums on their merit; and different learned men have taken occaſion to expreſs their ſenſe of the excellence and value of his productions. Walchius, in his Bibliotheca Theologica ſelecta, calls the "Credibility" *inſigne opus*; and it is highly ſpoken of in the Bibliotheca Germanica, and the Bibliotheque, ancient and modern, of Le Clerc[p]."

Every well-diſpoſed reader muſt contemplate with pleaſure, on a life which was ſo admirably and uſefully ſpent as was that of Dr. Lardner. Such a life preſents us with a beautiful proof of the dignity to which the human mind is capable

[o] Engliſh Review, for December, 1785. p. 423.

[p] From the obliging information of the Rev. Dr. Goſſet.

of

of aſcending, when it is formed on right views of the Supreme Being, and on the true principles and ſpirit of the Goſpel. Nor may a character like this be reflected upon with pleaſure only, but with the greateſt advantage. The private virtues of Dr. Lardner may juſtly be recommended to univerſal imitation. His love to God and benevolence to man, his regard to truth, his integrity, his purity, his moderation, his candour, his meekneſs, and his humility, it would be the honour and happineſs of Chriſtians in general to ſelect as the models of their temper and conduct.

Dr. Lardner may be held out, in particular, as a fine example to thoſe of his own profeſſion. It is not, indeed, in the power of every one to attain to the ſame extent of learning, or to perform the ſame ſervices to Chriſtianity; but it ſhould be the ambition of ſuch as are engaged in the work of the miniſtry, to follow after him with diligence and zeal, though they may not be able to do it with equal ſteps. As the diſſenters had the honour of producing Dr. Lardner, he will naturally be the object of emulation to the diſſenting clergy. They will ſo far look up to him as their pattern, as to endeavour to qualify themſelves for appearing, when occaſions call for it, in the great departments of literature, and eſpecially in the cauſe of religious truth and liberty, and in the defence and explication of the ſacred writings. Some among them, at leaſt, will, it is hoped, always be inſpired with

with this diſpoſition; in conſequence of which they will not only gain reputation to themſelves, and reflect credit on the body to which they belong; but, what is of infinitely greater importance, will unite with the wiſe, the learned, and the good of every denomination, and of every country, in promoting ſuch a knowledge of religion in general, and of the Chriſtian religion in particular, as will be found eminently conducive to the trueſt improvement and comfort of the preſent life, and to the everlaſting felicity of human beings.

EXTRACT

EXTRACT

FROM A

MANUSCRIPT ELOGIUM

ON

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

BY EBENEZER RADCLIFF, ESQ.

THE Chriſtian religion being founded on facts, to eſtabliſh them, and the credit of their relaters, is of the utmoſt conſequence. Our author, therefore, thought the higheſt reſpect he could pay to it was, to bring it to the teſt of hiſtory; and the reſult of his enquiries was, that, ſo far from depending upon the forged miracles, pious frauds, and ſpurious teſtimonies of the ancient fathers, or the metaphyſical caſuiſtry of modern defenders, he found it to be the weaker for their alliance; and, like a ſkilful engineer, he demoliſhed the buttreſſes, which an officious or timorous zeal erected, that the Goſpel, having nothing to defend but its own fortreſs, might be the more firm and impregnable.

So

So delicate were his ſentiments reſpecting religion, and ſo jealous was he of its honour and purity, that, ſo far from conniving at any flaws in its character, he could not bear it ſhould be ſuſpected; and, I am perſuaded, he would not, even for the immortality it propoſes, have conſented to admit one unfair or unſound argument in its defence.

While his extenſive learning qualified him to try the merits of every evidence, his unbiaſſed integrity, and ſacred veneration for truth, enabled him to paſs an impartial ſentence.

As his teſtimony was honeſt, ſo it was diſintereſted. He had none of that literary pride and ambition which are a diſgrace to the purſuit of truth, and leſſen the credit of its champions. His profeſſion debarred him from worldly emoluments and honours, and he aſpired to no recompence, but that which flows from the nature of true religion, and the approbation of its divine author. So that, if I were diſpoſed to reſt my faith on any human authority, it ſhould be *his*.

I ſhould regard the ſanction of his deciſion as the next in credibility to inſpiration itſelf, and almoſt entitled to implicit veneration. But this was what he never wanted; and he has ſo clearly and candidly repreſented the grounds of his own belief, that every perſon has an opportunity of judging for himſelf: and if there are any who, after ſuch a diſcuſſion, can remain enemies or neuters, we

muſt

muſt leave them to God and their own conſciences, without entering into their hearts or determining the motives by which they have been governed.

It muſt be acknowledged, that revelation has met with many able and learned advocates, who have ſet the various evidence of it in the moſt ſtriking points of view. Its internal excellence, and conſiſtency with the divine perfections, have been clearly illuſtrated. The expediency of divine interpoſition has been fairly deduced from the errors and imperfections of philoſophy. The propriety of the time of Chriſt's appearance has been proved from a concurrence of a multitude of circumſtances; and the agreement betwixt reaſon and ſcripture has been fully aſcertained: and many other arguments ſtrongly preſumptuous, though not deciſive, in its favour, have furniſhed occaſion for the diſplay of much ingenious but unneceſſary reaſoning.

Let but the faithfulneſs of the ſacred records be eſtabliſhed, and the truth of thoſe extraordinary facts which atteſted the divine miſſion of Chriſt be confirmed, and we may challenge the world to diſpute the concluſions which are deducible from them.

The goſpel he taught muſt be the oracle of truth, the rule of our faith and conduct, and the ground of our immortal hopes and expectations.

This important taſk was reſerved for this learned

author, and Providence ſeems to have bleſſed him not only with talents and fidelity, but with an extent of life equal to the execution of it.

To vindicate the evangelical hiſtorians from ignorance, incapacity, and colluſion; to fix the credit of the ſacred records by the concurrent teſtimony of Jews and Gentiles, ſcoffers and apoſtates; to trace the progreſs of the church through ſeveral ſucceſſive ages; and to ſhew the regular and faithful tranſmiſſion of the ſcriptures without innovation or corruption, were the great objects of his ſtudies for many years: and ſuch is the perſpicuity with which he deſcribes and illuſtrates the tranſactions of Chriſt's miniſtry, that he appears more like a contemporary with the apoſtles than an inhabitant of later ages.

If to this we add, that cloud of witneſſes which he collected from all quarters, to give their ſanction to the miracles, doctrine, moral ſublimity, and wonderful effects of the Chriſtian religion, it muſt be allowed, that he has erected a monument to his great Maſter and himſelf, which ſhall laſt as long as the world endures.

As his writings juſtified and explained the leading facts of the New Teſtament, his character was a living pattern of its rules and precepts. His heart was full of the generous warmth of its benevolent ſpirit; but his ſentiments were cool and diſpaſſionate, the reſult of calm enquiry and ſteady conviction.

When

When he thought it his duty, and for the honour of revelation, to call in queſtion common opinions, he did it with unaffected candour and modeſty, and, at the ſame time, with that integrity and ſimplicity, which, if it did not bring over his adverſary, never offended him. He was reſpectful without ceremony, friendly without officiouſneſs, and obliging without mean compliances. He preſerved a dignity of character without reſerve, and united the acuteneſs of the critic with the manners of a gentleman and the ſpirit of a Chriſtian.

The goodneſs of his temper excited a prejudice in favour of his principles; and as his writings were free from acrimony, his life was clear of reproach.

On the whole, when I conſider his ardour for truth, yet tenderneſs for error, his learning mixed with ſo much diffidence and humility, his zeal tempered with ſo much prudence, and his faith accompanied with ſo much benevolence; when I obſerve the ſimplicity of his deportment, his uniform and unaffected piety, his attachment to his divine Maſter, and good-will to mankind, I cannot help ſaying, "This was the diſciple whom Jeſus loved."

APPENDIX.

N° I.

LETTERS between Dr. WADDINGTON, Biſhop of Chicheſter, and Mr. LARDNER.

Eaton, near Windſor, Nov. 14, 1729.

Reverend Sir,

I HAVE received at this place your moſt agreeable preſent of a Vindication, &c. againſt Mr. Woolſton, and do beg leave to return you my moſt ſincere and hearty thanks for it; you have certainly took a very proper and Chriſtian way with him, and I wiſh it may have the deſigned effect upon him: I have no manner of objection to make againſt any one line in the book: you have purſued both him and his Jew very cloſely; and if they are capable of conviction, you ſeem to be the man whom God has raiſed up for that great ſervice: I cannot ſay leſs of your excellent performance; and what I have ſaid comes, I aſſure you, from the ſincerity of my heart.

Will you then, dear Sir, give me leave as ſincerely to take notice of a paſſage or two in your preface which as yet I cannot ſo well digeſt, if I take you right in them, and I am ſure I have no intention to miſtake you wilfully.

Page 4, you have theſe words, "If by way of ſuch a reply he "means a reply without abuſive railing terms, or invoking the "aid of the civil magiſtrate;" and a line or two after you oppoſe "ſolid reaſons and arguments" to "pains and penalties:" Now theſe are paſſages that I own I cannot perfectly approve of: you ſeem in the firſt to put abuſive railing terms, upon the ſame foot with invoking the aid of the civil magiſtrate; and in the latter, to intimate as if pains and penalties had been demanded by ſomebody or other to be inflicted upon Mr. Woolſton, to ſupply the place of ſolid reaſons and arguments. If I am right in putting this interpretation upon your words, I muſt beg leave to ſay, that, in my poor opinion, there is no occaſion

for them; I don't know any one perſon of character who, in writing againſt Mr. Woolſton, has invoked the aids of the civil magiſtrate to inflict pains and penalties upon Mr. Woolſton, for being an Infidel, or writing againſt the Chriſtian religion; but only for writing againſt it in ſuch a blaſphemous, abuſive, ſcandalous manner, as I think may very juſtly raiſe the indignation and reſentment of every honeſt man, whether Chriſtian or not. The two biſhops of London and St. David have expreſsly declared this in print; and I believe it is the ſentiment of many more of that order in the church, if not of all, that (as you very well expreſs it in the 11th page of your preface) "it is the plea-"ſure of Chriſt that men ſhould not be compelled to receive "his law by the puniſhments of this life, or the fear of them; "but that they ſhould be left to propoſe their doubts and ob-"jections—provided it be done in a grave, ſerious manner." But give me leave, dear Sir, to aſk you, with ſome concern, whether Mr. Woolſton has propoſed his doubts and difficulties in a grave, ſerious manner? and if you ſay he has not done it, as I believe you will, do not you ſeem to intimate yourſelf, by putting in that reſerve, as if you thought the civil magiſtrate might puniſh him for not obſerving it; or at leaſt, that there is nothing, in puniſhing him for the breach of all the laws of Chriſtian charity and common decency, contrary to the will and pleaſure of Jeſus Chriſt? This then is the difficulty that ſticks with me in reſpect to theſe paſſages in your preface: and as I have very freely, and yet, I hope, in a very friendly manner, mentioned them to you, ſo I doubt not but you will, in the ſame free and kind way, endeavour to remove them; which will make me perfectly eaſy; for I am ſorry to meet with any thing in your writings (ſo truly ſerviceable to the Chriſtian religion) that may give the leaſt occaſion of offence to the ſincere lovers of Jeſus Chriſt and his goſpel. I am, with the utmoſt reſpect, eſteem, and gratitude,

Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate
faithful friend,
EDWARD CHICHESTER.

To

To this Mr. Lardner anſwered as follows:

My Lord,

I HAVE received the favour of your very kind and friendly letter, for which I am greatly indebted to your Lordſhip. As your approbation of what I have written in the defence of Chriſtianity affords me the higheſt ſatisfaction, ſo it is no ſmall concern to me that there has been any thing ſaid in the preface which is offenſive to a perſon of your Lordſhip's known judgment and integrity; who have alſo expreſſed ſo much kindneſs to me, beyond my deſert or expectation.

I believe (and think I may be poſitive), that when I wrote thoſe expreſſions (preface, page 4), I had no regard to a demand made by any one, of a puniſhment on Mr. Woolſton for his writings. I only intended to diſown, in plain terms, which might not be miſtaken, the principles of perſecution, which he had charged upon ſo many of his adverſaries. As when I mentioned a reply without abuſive terms, I had no reference to any reply written in that way (for I have ſeen no ſuch, nor has he complained of any thing of that nature that I know of, beſides his being called an Infidel, whereas, he ſays, he is a Chriſtian), ſo when I wiſhed his conviction without pains and penalties, I had no reference to any demand made of them. But I do own, that, in the firſt paragraph of page 11, I had a reference to a demand, which I thought had been made for puniſhing him for his writings. And, I ſuppoſe, if he ſhould be puniſhed, it will be for writing againſt Chriſtianity, and not for his manner of doing it.

I am far from thinking that Mr. Woolſton has written in a grave and ſerious manner: and I have ſtrongly expreſſed my diſlike of his manner in the latter end of page 11, and page 12.

Your Lordſhip freely declares, he ought not to be puniſhed for being an Infidel, nor for writing at all againſt the Chriſtian religion; which appears to me a noble declaration. If the governors of the church and civil magiſtrates had all along acted up to this principle, I think, the Chriſtian religion had been

before now well-nigh univerſal. But I have ſuppoſed it to be a conſequence from this ſentiment, that if men have an allowance to write againſt the Chriſtian religion, there muſt be alſo conſiderable indulgence as to the manner likewiſe. This has appeared to me a part of that meekneſs and forbearance, which the Chriſtian religion obliges us to; who are to reprove, rebuke, and exhort with all long-ſuffering. The proper puniſhment of a low, mean, indecent, ſcurrilous way of writing, ſeems to be neglect, contempt, ſcorn, and general indignation. Your Lordſhip has obſerved (in my opinion) extremely well, that this way of writing is ſuch as may juſtly raiſe the indignation and reſentment of every honeſt man, whether Chriſtian or not. This puniſhment he has already had in part, and will probably have more and more, if he ſhould go on in his rude and brutal way of writing. And if we leave all further puniſhment to him, to whom vengeance belongs, I have thought it might be much for the honour of ourſelves, and of our religion. But if he ſhould be puniſhed farther, the ſtream of reſentment and indignation will turn; eſpecially if the puniſhment ſhould be ſevere; and it is likely, that a ſmall puniſhment will not ſuffice to engage to ſilence, nor to an alteration of the manner of writing.

I truly think, that the Chriſtians of this nation are at preſent under a great trial; and I heartily wiſh we may behave ſo under it, as may be moſt for the laſting honour of our religion. It ſeems to me much better for us as Chriſtians, to err ſomewhat (if it be an error) on the ſide of tenderneſs and meekneſs, rather than on the ſide of ſeverity; nothing having done the Chriſtian cauſe greater prejudice, than the ſeverities practiſed by ſome who have bore the name of Chriſtian. It has ſeemed to me (as I have ſaid) to be a conſequence of permitting men to write againſt Chriſtianity, that we muſt alſo ſhew indulgence toward the manner, in ſome meaſure. But no one is to be allowed to ſay any thing injurious to men's characters: this is properly a breach of the peace. I am perſuaded, that no man has been more ſenſibly grieved and offended than myſelf, at the abuſive treatment that has been given to men of the higheſt order and greateſt

greateſt merit in the church. And if any thing of this kind has been ſaid, cognizable by the laws, no man can complain of a juſt puniſhment.

I have, my Lord, freely repreſented my ſentiments, which are ſubmitted to your Lordſhip's conſideration with the greateſt humility and deference. I hope, I have nothing more at heart, than the general intereſt of the Chriſtian religion. And if I have declared in favour of too great lenity, it has been purely becauſe I have ſuppoſed it would be, in the end, moſt for the advantage of that good cauſe.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord,
Your Lordſhip's
Moſt obliged, moſt humble,
and obedient Servant,
Nov. 22. 1729. N. LARDNER.

To which his Lordſhip anſwered.

Eaton College, Nov. 25, 1729.

Reverend Sir,

I HAVE received your's of the 22d, and am very well ſatisfied with the explication you have been pleaſed to give me of your meaning in thoſe paſſages in the 4th page of your preface, which, upon the firſt reading, ſeemed to me to have a more particular view than you now declare they had, and I can very readily believe what you now aſſert to be true, and ſhould indeed beg your pardon for my miſtake (though it was by no means a wilful one) if the candour that appears in every part of your letter did not tempt me to think you have granted it without my aſking.

I don't ſee that you and I are likely to differ much, as to any other points touched upon in your letter; our general principles, with reſpect to the true method of propagating and defending our holy religion, are, I believe, the ſame; and I wiſh as heartily as you can do, that no other had ever been followed by eccleſiaſtical or civil governors; but ſtill I am at a loſs how to underſtand what you are pleaſed to ſay, "That there muſt be likewiſe

" conſiderable indulgence allowed as to the manner of writing " againſt the Chriſtian religion." I am not ſure whether, if Mr. Woolſton heard this, he would not ſay it is all the indulgence he deſires; for he has declared, " that he cannot " write otherwiſe than he has done already;" and if for that reaſon, becauſe he cannot write otherwiſe, he muſt be indulged in writing in his own way, there is no doubt but that he will go on in writing after ſuch a manner, as you ſeem to think may juſtly raiſe the indignation and reſentment of every honeſt man, whether Chriſtian or not; and for which I cannot, I own, think that bare contempt is a ſufficient puniſhment; conſidering the great miſchief ſuch a way of writing muſt do, and daily does in the world: I am willing to indulge ſuch writers as far as ever Chriſtian meekneſs and charity require me to go; but I would juſt beg leave to aſk, what opinion you think St. Paul, or any other truly primitive Chriſtian, would have had, of any perſon writing in *thoſe* days (and that while he ſtill profeſſed himſelf a Chriſtian) in ſuch a manner as Mr. Woolſton does in *theſe?* what you imagine their conduct would have been? whether they would have carried the Chriſtian principles of meekneſs and tenderneſs ſo far as to have indulged him in ſuch a manner of writing, in hopes of working his conviction in that way? It does not appear, by thoſe inſtances we have in the epiſtles of the exerciſe of Chriſtian diſcipline in thoſe days, that they were then indolent in matters of ſuch conſequence to the Chriſtian religion! nor do I think we are under any obligation to do ſo now, and therefore I ſhould be unwilling to give any indulgence at all to " ſuch a manner" of writing, much leſs a " conſiderable one," as your words (conſidering the occaſion on which they are uſed, and to which they muſt refer) ſeem to imply that we ſhould. You, indeed, add afterwards, " That " no man is to be allowed to ſay any thing injurious to men's " characters, and that if any thing of this kind has been ſaid, no " man can complain of a juſt puniſhment, for this is properly a " breach of the peace." Now no one who has read Mr. Woolſton's books or prefaces, can ſurely have the leaſt doubt upon his mind, but that he is in this reſpect guilty to the higheſt degree;

gree; and therefore, in your opinion, deſerves a juſt puniſhment; but beſides this, I think a ſincere Chriſtian may, and ought to go farther; he may very juſtly be concerned for the honour of his bleſſed Saviour, and have ſome real ſtirrings in his breaſt for preventing ſuch abuſes of that holy name as have no ſort of argument in them to perſuade and convince; cannot be the reſult of any fair reaſoning againſt the Chriſtian religion, but muſt neceſſarily proceed from a ſpirit fit to be abhorred by all mankind, and can never be a humane way of "propagating "truth," whether for or againſt Chriſtianity. Theſe, dear Sir, are my free and impartial thoughts upon that particular paſſage in your letter which mentions the "conſiderable indulgence" that ought to be made as to the "manner" of writing againſt Chriſtianity. And I hope, upon the whole, that you and I don't differ ſo much, even on this point, as we may ſeem to do. What puniſhments are proper for ſuch a manner of writing, or whether it may be looked upon as a breach of the peace in a "Chriſtian "ſociety," and ſo by your own allowance puniſhable by the civil magiſtrate, are points I ſhall not enter into now, any farther than to declare freely my opinion, that ſuch a writer ought to be puniſhed by the eccleſiaſtical cenſure of the church, and declared excommunicate by a proper authority; and if he could be farther reſtrained from writing on in the ſame "outrageous "manner" by the civil magiſtrate (with a liberty ſtill to uſe reaſon inſtead of railing), I don't ſee how this could be any prejudice to the Chriſtian religion, any contradiction to the true forbearing ſpirit of it, any injury to the juſt liberties of mankind, or any injuſtice to the writer himſelf, but in my poor opinion the greateſt kindneſs that could poſſibly be done him. I heartily thank you, good Sir, for the preſent you have made me of your additions to your former excellent book, which, I am ſure, I ſhall read with a great deal of profit, as well as pleaſure, as ſoon as they come to hand. You will be ſo good as to excuſe me in not tranſcribing this long letter, which indeed (conſidering the many corrections in it), I ſhould do, but ſuch compliments between ends will, I hope, not be expected, nor am I ſure if I ſhould

I ſhould attempt it, not to commit again as many faults as I mend. I am, therefore, without any more ceremony, and with the greateſt ſincerity and reſpect,

Reverend Sir,

Your very faithful Friend,
and humble Servant,
EDWARD CHICHESTER.

Mr. Lardner anſwered:

December 2, 1729.

My Lord,

I HAVE the favour of your letter of the 25th of November, which, I hope, your Lordſhip will permit me to ſay, is a pattern of condeſcenſion and goodneſs; nor can I help eſteeming it an honour to me, that my ſentiments are ſo agreeable to that truly Chriſtian ſpirit expreſſed in your letter.

The reaſons of my ſaying that it was a conſequence of permitting men to write againſt the Chriſtian religion, "that "there muſt be likewiſe conſiderable indulgence as to the "manner of writing," were chiefly theſe: that the permiſſion of writing againſt the Chriſtian religion contained in it ſo much, that the "manner" of it alſo ſhould be bore with, in a conſiderable degree; and ſecondly, the cauſe of thoſe who oppoſe Chriſtianity is ſo bad and deſperate, that they who argue againſt it are naturally, and almoſt neceſſarily, led into an unfair way of arguing. If men are ſo weak, or ſo wicked, as to write againſt Chriſtianity, I expect to ſee them make uſe of ſome bad arts to ſupport their cauſe. The fact has been agreeable to this ſuppoſition. The writers in the defence of Chriſtianity have actually exceeded their adverſaries, not only in their arguments and reaſons, but alſo in the manner of arguing and reaſoning.

If what Mr. Woolſton ſays, that he "cannot write other- "wiſe," be true, it farther confirms this ſuppoſition, and is a ſhameful truth for him and his cauſe, publicly acknowledged by himſelf.

To

To your Lordſhip's queſtion, What I think would have been the conduct of St. Paul, and other primitive Chriſtians, in a like caſe? I readily anſwer, my Lord, that, I believe, they would have pronounced a ſentence of excommunication, and it would, in my opinion, be juſtly pronounced upon Mr. Woolſton. The ſentiments advanced by him, and his manner of defending them, do both together, and each of them ſingly, deſerve that ſentence.

Mr. Woolſton has writ in a moſt abuſive and injurious manner to men's characters, but I did not know that he had been proſecuted for it, though I thought he well deſerved it.

I have alſo the honour to agree with your Lordſhip, that we ought to have a very great zeal and concern for the honour of our bleſſed Saviour, and an abhorrence of all ways, "not "humane, of propagating truth, whether for or againſt" Chriſtianity; or that have a plain tendency to deſtroy a ſenſe of religion and virtue in men's minds.

I conclude with humbly acknowledging your Lordſhip's goodneſs in communicating to me your ſentiments upon theſe matters in ſo kind and friendly a manner.

I am, My Lord,
Your Lordſhip's
Moſt obliged, moſt humble,
and obedient Servant,
N. LARDNER.

APPENDIX, No II.

LETTER of Mr. LARDNER to LORD BARRINGTON,

March 7, 1729-30.

My Lord,

I AM very ſenſible of the honour done me by your Lordſhip's approbation of the "Vindication of three Mira-"cles, &c." and have a great deal of reaſon to rejoice, that the manner

manner in which the argument for free writing is managed in the preface is not unacceptable to your Lordſhip; for, as to the principles themſelves, I had no doubt but they would be agreeable to your judgment, however they may be ſuſpected or diſliked by others, who have leſs ſtudied the Chriſtian doctrine; a true Chriſtian may ſuffer on account of his religion, but he can never make others ſuffer on account of theirs. Whatever may be the conſequence of it, we are not to ſupport Chriſtianity by force. Our bleſſed Saviour, rather than make uſe of compulſion, would chuſe to be without a follower. John vi. 67.

I will briefly go over all your Lordſhip's difficulties relating to the death of Jairus's daughter, and then offer ſome conſiderations in favour of the common opinion.

I. "There is not the concluſive evidence that Jairus's daugh-"ter was dead, &c." The evidence is concluſive and ſatisfactory here. If they might be miſtaken in her caſe, ſo they might in Lazarus, when buried: and if buried, while in a deliquium or ſleep, he might have continued in it ſeveral days.

II. Σώθήσεται in the text is a general word. It does not directly expreſs healing barely, but that ſhe ſhould do well, let the caſe be never ſo deſperate; and this was as much as it became our Saviour to ſay at that time.

III. Our Saviour, your Lordſhip knows very well, did not ſpeak in Greek, but in Syriac. Probably he uſed one and the ſame word, when he ſaid "Lazarus ſleeps," and the "Maid "ſleeps." That the Evangeliſts have uſed καθεύδω in one place, and κοιμέομαι in another, is of no manner of importance; ſince the diſciples underſtood him to ſpeak of natural ſleep, when he ſaid, "Lazarus ſleepeth."

IV. The ſaying, ſhe was "not dead," as well as ſhe "ſleeps," does not appear to ſtrengthen the aſſertion. It is all one and the ſame thing. I think we ought to make no ſcruples here, now we have the ſtory of Lazarus, in which it is related, firſt, that Chriſt ſaid, this ſickneſs is not "unto death," and yet he did die: and then, "our friend Lazarus ſleeps:" meaning at the ſame time, that Lazarus was dead, and he would

raiſe

raiſe him up. As when he ſaid Lazarus's ſickneſs "was "not unto death," he muſt be underſtood of a final death; ſo when he ſaid, the maid "is not dead," he muſt be underſtood alſo of a final death, ſince all her friends knew ſhe was dead.

V. The matter of the fifth objection ſerves, in my opinion, to ſhew the propriety of the common interpretation. "Be "gone," for there is no occaſion for you; the maid is not to be buried, ſhe is not finally dead, but will be raiſed up, as out of a ſleep; therefore your lamentations are not ſeaſonable.

VI. The laſt objection is taken from the circumſtances. I perceive no impropriety at all in the action of taking her by the hand, ſuppoſing her to be dead; nor in the ordering "meat "to be ſet before her." This laſt indeed would have been very improper in the caſe of the two other perſons raiſed to life, who were abroad, but ſhe was at home. Their life, health, and ſtrength, would alſo appear ſufficiently in walking home before the company preſent, with all the vigour and agility becoming men. But as this other caſe was in a woman, who cannot with decency ſhow ſtrength and vigour by leaping, or agility in walking, and as ſhe was at home, eating was a very proper ſign to be given of her health and ſtrength. Moreover, as her reſurrection was performed before ſo few witneſſes, it was very proper to have ſome more near, cloſe witneſſes of her life and health; and ſuch the ſervants and friends of the family would be, when they immediately ſaw her eat.

The conſiderations whereby I would ſupport the common opinion, are theſe:

I. If Jairus's daughter was not dead, Matthew and Mark have given no inſtance of a reſurrection to life by our Saviour; which would be very ſtrange, ſince there were ſeveral, and they appear to know there were. Another conſequence is this: If it be ſuppoſed, that Jairus's daughter was not dead, 'tis impoſſible to prove to an infidel, that the other two perſons were dead. Her friends ſuppoſed her dead; Mat. ix. 24. When Jeſus ſaid, *the maid* was *not dead, they laughed him to ſcorn:* Mark

Mark v. 40; *and they laughed him to ſcorn:* Luke viii. 53; *they laughed him to ſcorn, knowing ſhe was dead.* We muſt take the caſes of thoſe Chriſt healed or raiſed as they are brought to him, or repreſented to him by thoſe who may be reaſonably ſuppoſed to know what their caſes are; or we overthrow all evidence, and weaken the credit, not of this only, but of all the other miracles of our Saviour.

II. Matthew and Mark thought ſhe was dead, and that this miracle was a reſurrection to life, or elſe they would have related ſome other miracle of this ſort.

III. All the three Evangeliſts repreſent her dead. Matt. ix. 18. 24. Mark v. 35. 40. Luke viii. 49. 53.

IV. The common paraphraſe of, *the maid is not dead*, &c." that is, ſhe is not finally dead, ſo dead as to be buried, but ſhall be raiſed, as out of a ſleep, is very agreeable to our Saviour's way of ſpeaking upon ſome other occaſions; and is extremely ſuitable to ſilence thoſe weepers and lamenters to whom he ſpoke.

I intended to have concluded here; but, upon a review, I fear your Lordſhip may think I have not paid a ſufficient regard to the firſt circumſtance of the ſixth objection, viz. "that "our Saviour takes her by the hand, before he ſays, *Ariſe!* "which is not an action ſuited to raiſe one abſolutely un- "capable to help herſelf." There is no more aſſiſtance given to a lame man than to a dead man by taking him by the hand to enable him to walk alone. No action or word is uſed in working a miracle, becauſe there is any virtue in the word ſpoken, or the action uſed, of taking hold by the hand, or in any other action aſſignable. All the virtue is owing to the infinite, almighty power of God alone, who graciouſly performs the work, when thoſe words are ſpoken, or thoſe actions are done by his ſervants, by his orders.

Again, "That our Saviour takes her by the hand, before he ſays, *Ariſe!*" Perhaps, the taking by the hand, and the word *ariſe*, were ſimultaneous, or the word *ariſe* was ſpoken immediately after Chriſt took her by the hand, as ſoon after as could be. But I ſhall ſhew preſently (as I apprehend) the propriety

of the different method taken by Chriſt and Peter; though it is by no means neceſſary, that we ſhould be able to aſſign the preciſe propriety of every word or action recorded in the hiſtory of theſe matters. It ſeems to me, not becoming Peter to make uſe of any action, that looked like helping a man perfectly impotent (ſuch as taking him by the hand) before he firſt pronounced theſe, or the like words: *In the name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth, ariſe and walk:* but after that it was proper enough for him to uſe an action, which is a ſort of token of kindneſs, and take him by the hand.

When Peter raiſed Dorcas, he firſt went to prayer, and did not take her by the hand till after ſhe had opened her eyes, and ſat up; that is, was perfectly reſtored to health and life by the Divine Being. It is too arrogant for an apoſtle, in the caſe eſpecially of a dead perſon, to uſe an action that has an appearance of giving help, before he has been at prayer, or made ſome other addreſs to God. But in our bleſſed Saviour it was highly proper and becoming, to take by the hand, in a kind and friendly manner, even a dead perſon, as if ſhe were alive. Though no one would reaſonably ſay there was any impropriety in Chriſt's ſaying *Ariſe!* to Jairus's daughter, before he took her by the hand, yet there does appear to me a peculiar propriety in our bleſſed Saviour's taking by the hand this dead young woman, before, or at the very inſtant, that he ſaid, *Ariſe!*

I hope there is no reaſon for me to add a caution, that it ought not to be objected to me, that there was no ſuch action uſed in the caſe of Lazarus, or the young man at Naim; becauſe the circumſtances of theſe caſes are perfectly different. It would have been the higheſt impropriety for Chriſt to take Lazarus by the hand, whether he had himſelf gone into Lazarus's ſepulchre, or Lazarus had been firſt brought up to him: it would alſo have been highly improper for our Saviour to have gone ſo near the young man at Naim, as to be able to touch him. He did as much as was proper before he raiſed him, in ordering the bier to ſtop. But as the young woman was laid in her chamber, and Jeſus was brought thither, near to her, his taking her

her by the hand is highly proper; it is one of the beauties and proprieties of our Lord's actions in this ſtory, which ought not to have been omitted, and with which I am now much delighted, and heartily thank your Lordſhip for helping me to it. It demonſtrates the plenitude of divine power, and divine goodneſs, that were and are in him. It is an affecting, endearing ſpecimen of the love and friendſhip of the Son of God, and in him of God himſelf, to poor mortal men.

But whether I am in the right or not in thoſe thoughts juſt mentioned, with which I now pleaſe myſelf (but, however, do not think them of any great importance), I apprehend I may except againſt an interpretation of a ſingle phraſe or expreſſion, which is inconſiſtent with the reſt of the narration. And I own, that I think this way of interpreting ſcriptures, would lead us into innumerable miſtakes. I am, my Lord,

Your Lordſhip's

Moſt humble and obedient ſervant,

N. LARDNER.

APPENDIX, N° III.

LETTER ſent by Mr. LARDNER to Mr. LA ROCHE.

SIR,

THE exact care with which you read the books of the New Teſtament, appears not only in the judicious remarks and obſervations, which I have received from you, but alſo in the difficulties which you ſometimes propoſe to me. As for the difficulty mentioned in your laſt, concerning the omiſſion of the hiſtory of our Saviour's aſcenſion, in the goſpels of St. Matthew and St. John, though related by St. Mark, xvi. 19, and St. Luke, xxiii. 51, I might ſay, in behalf of St. John, that he had read St. Mark's and St. Luke's goſpels: and that one main view he had in writing was, to put down thoſe things which the other Evangeliſts had not mentioned: but I do not inſiſt

inſiſt upon this. This omiſſion may be accounted for by other conſiderations, which will juſtify St. Matthew as well as him.

« I. The deſign of all the Evangeliſts in their goſpels, was « to write ſuch a hiſtory of Jeſus, as would prove him to be « the Chriſt." That this was their deſign appears from the goſpels themſelves. And St. Luke has expreſsly ſaid, that it was his, chap. xx. 31, *Theſe things are written, that ye might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God.*

« II. That Jeſus is the Chriſt, is ſufficiently ſhewn by his « miracles, the extraordinary appearances from heaven in his « favour during the courſe of his miniſtry, and by his reſurrec- « tion from the dead, recorded by all the Evangeliſts." Our Saviour had himſelf put the truth of his miſſion upon his reſurrection, as a deciſive proof of his claim; Matt. xvi. 4, compared with Luke xi. 29, 30; John ii. 18—22. And St. Paul ſays, Rom. i. 4, that *Jeſus* was *declared to be the Son of God by the reſurrection from the dead.* See alſo Acts xvii. 3.

« III. By our Saviour's reſurrection is always intended a « reſurrection to an endleſs life, without dying any more; and « his aſcenſion to the Father follows thereupon:" unleſs this had been the caſe, his reſurrection, without any mention of his aſcenſion, could not have been made (as it often is) the principal article of the Chriſtian doctrine. *To be a witneſs with us of his reſurrection.* Acts i. 21.—*With great power gave the apoſtles witneſs of the reſurrection of the Lord Jeſus.* Chap. iv. 33.—*If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth, and believe in thine heart, that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Rom. x. 9. See alſo Acts xxvi. 23. 2 Tim. ii. 8.

But I will detain you a little longer upon this head, to ſhew both theſe things particularly.

« I. By our Saviour's reſurrection is always intended a « reſurrection to an endleſs life, without dying any more." This is ſometimes expreſſed; when not expreſſed, it is implied. *Whom God has raiſed up* (ſaith St. Peter), *having looſed the pains of death, becauſe it was not poſſible that he ſhould be holden of it.* Acts ii. 24.—St. Paul at Antioch, in Piſidia: *And as concerning that he raiſed him from the dead, now no more to return to*

corruption. Acts xiii. 34.—*Knowing that Chriſt, being raiſed from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.* Rom. vi. 9.

When not expreſſed, it is implied. St. Peter, in his diſcourſes to Cornelius, makes no expreſs mention of Chriſt's aſcenſion, but preaches only his reſurrection, as a proof that he was made Lord of all. Acts x. 40, 42. And the ſame apoſtle ſaith, that *God has begotten us again to a lively hope, by the reſurrection of Chriſt from the dead, &c.* 1 Pet. i. 3, 4. St. Paul often argues in the ſame manner. At Athens he proves a future judgment by Chriſt, from his reſurrection. Acts xvii. 31. And, Rom. xiv. 9. *To this end Chriſt both died, and roſe, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the quick and dead.* And 1 Cor. xv. 12. and 20. Once more, 2 Cor. iv. 14.

I might likewiſe ſhew this to be agreeable to the ſtyle of the Evangeliſts, in their goſpels. When our Lord, in St. Matt. xii. 40, publicly foretells his reſurrection, ſaying, *As Jonas, &c.* it is implied that he ſhould be no longer in the ſtate of the dead. This is implied alſo in what he ſaid to the diſciples, Matt. xxvi. 32. It would be tedious to refer you to all the paſſages to this purpoſe in our Saviour's laſt diſcourſes with his diſciples, recorded by St. John: *I go to prepare a place for you,* John xiv. 2. *Becauſe I live, ye ſhall live alſo.* ver. 19.

" II. Our Lord's aſcenſion to heaven was alſo ſuppoſed to " follow upon his reſurrection." This is evident from John xx. 17, when he ſays to Mary Magdalen, *Touch me not! for I am not yet aſcended to my Father,* or, I do not immediately aſcend to my Father. It ſeems, ſhe ſuppoſed that being riſen, he would preſently aſcend to heaven: he therefore aſſures her, that there would be other opportunities for her to converſe with him, and to examine whether it was really he himſelf, or not; and for him to communicate to her, or others, what was needful they ſhould be further informed of by him: *But go to my brethren, and ſay unto them, that I aſcend to my Father, &c.;* which words ſhew, that, *I am about to aſcend* to God, or, *I am riſen,* are in a manner equivalent terms. This is alſo evident from Acts ii. 23—35, particularly ver. 32, 33. God's *raiſing him*

him up, was an aſſurance that he was alſo *exalted*, or very ſoon to be exalted.

« III. There was no abſolute neceſſity, that the diſciples, or « any other perſons, ſhould ſee Chriſt aſcend, or leave this « earth." For his exaltation to power was fully aſcertained to the diſciples by his reſurrection (of which they had diſtinct proof), and by the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon them: to others, by the teſtimony of the diſciples, concerning his reſurrection, by the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt beſtowed upon them, and by the miracles they performed.

« IV. But though there was no neceſſity of it, yet there « was great wiſdom and goodneſs in our Saviour's granting « the diſciples a ſight of his aſcenſion from this earth;" as hinted by St. Mark and St. Luke in their goſpels, and ſomewhat more particularly related, Acts i. 9—11;—becauſe it was of uſe to confirm them, and to encourage them in the difficult work they were ſoon to enter upon. It is alſo of uſe the more to ſatisfy us, and all in after times, of the truth of his reſurrection, and exaltation, though there are other things ſufficient without it.

Upon the whole, it ſeems to me, that the Evangeliſts have acted wiſely, and as the caſe required, in inſiſting chiefly on more important matters, than the ſight the diſciples had of Chriſt's aſcenſion from this earth. And the concluſion of St. Matthew's goſpel (to ſay nothing more of St. John's) after the evidences of our Saviour's reſurrection, is a very proper concluſion of a hiſtory of Jeſus, written to prove that he was the Chriſt. *And Jeſus came, and ſpake unto them, ſaying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt: teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.*

I am,

Your's, &c.

N. LARDNER.

APPENDIX, N° IV.

LETTER from Dr. MORGAN to Mr. LARDNER, with his ANSWER.

Reverend Sir,

I HAVE lately read your Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory with a great deal of pleaſure, and profit: I obſerve in it a ſpirit of candour and impartiality, not very common in works of this kind; and I think you have deſerved very well of the learned world, by removing ſeveral conſiderable difficulties, which might ſeem to affect the evangelical hiſtory. It is a great unhappineſs to your friends in general, and to me as much as any man, that by the nature of your diſorder, we are deprived of the advantages we might otherwiſe reap from your converſation.

From what I had heard of your work, and of your known character, I had a curioſity to ſee what you had offered towards removing the difficulties concerning the hiſtorical and chronological account of Chriſt's birth and baptiſm, as related by the two Evangeliſts Matthew and Luke, or rather of St. Luke himſelf; for, as the matter now ſtands, the whole difficulty reſts upon him, who places the birth of our Saviour in the days of Herod the Great, and at the time of the firſt taxation of the whole country of Judea by Cyrenius, and this by a decree iſſued out under the ſole authority of Auguſtus, without the leaſt mention of Herod's name; and with this farther chronological character, that Jeſus was full thirty in the fifteenth of Tiberius. I muſt own that this has always appeared an unſurmountable difficulty to me, and that I am not yet able to get rid of it, after a careful conſideration of all that you have obſerved and offered concerning it.

That any taxation, enrolment, or cenſus ſhould be laid upon the whole country by the ſole authority of Auguſtus, while Herod was ſtill king of Judea, and in high favour with the emperor, ſeems to me incredible; and I think no ſuch inſtance

can be given, or any thing parallel to it, with reſpect to any country where the Romans owned a king.

The thing here ſpeaks itſelf, and no man could doubt of it if he had not ſome prejudice or prepoſſeſſion to the contrary. But our chronologers, in this point, have been forced to offer violence to Joſephus, and to give up all his hiſtorical and chronological characters relating to the death of Herod the Great, and the nativity of Chriſt, though they are infinitely fond, at the ſame time, of maintaining the authority of Joſephus in moſt other caſes.

But what I lay the main ſtreſs on here is, the authority of Euſebius, towards the middle of the fourth century; who maintains that the taxation recorded by Luke, was the very ſame which was laid by Auguſtus upon the whole country of Judea after the baniſhment of Archelaus. And this is a deciſive point, and even a demonſtration with me, ſo far as hiſtory can be reduced to any thing of certainty, that Luke, Joſephus, and Euſebius were in the right; and that there was no goſpel extant in the time of Euſebius, and owned as authentic by the Catholics, which placed the birth of our Saviour in the days of Herod. For it is not to be imagined that Euſebius ſhould contradict the genuine, authentic, and recognized goſpels of his own times, or that he ſhould make the Roman cenſus laid upon Judea, as mentioned by Joſephus and Luke, to have been the ſame, if this had been repugnant to the ſcriptures of that age.

The firſt chapter of Luke, from verſe 4 to the end, is plainly a parentheſis, as it interrupts the courſe of the ſtory in order of time, and beſides, contains, as I think, ſeveral plain marks of ignorance, ſuperſtition, and forgery: for this parentheſis ſeems to have been taken from the pſeudo Matthew, with ſome farther additions and improvements, which made the matter look ſtill worſe.

In Luke i. ver. 28—33, the angel Gabriel is introduced as appearing to the Virgin Mary, to aſſure her, by a revelation from God, that ſhe ſhould conceive, without the knowledge of man, in a miraculous way; and that the child born of her,

ſhould be that great Prince or temporal Deliverer who had been foretold by the prophets. *He ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the Moſt High: and the Lord God ſhall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he ſhall reign over the houſe of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there ſhall be no end.* ver. 32, 33.

This, one would think, ſhould have been a ſufficient declaration from God, to put Joſeph and Mary out of doubt, that the child was to reſtore the kingdom to Iſrael, and ſettle an everlaſting dominion in the houſe of David, as God had declared by the mouths of all the prophets; and as the whole nation had ever underſtood them, and founded their expectations upon them. And yet, afterwards, when Zacharias the father of John, Simeon, and Anna the propheteſs, came to propheſy the ſame thing, Mary was very much aſtoniſhed, ſhe *kept all theſe ſayings, and pondered them in her heart*, but knew not what it would come to, or what ſuch predictions ſhould mean, though ſhe had been let into the ſecret by a revelation from God before her conception. Matthew mentions nothing of this revelation from God to Mary by the angel, but places the whole credit of the ſtory upon Joſeph's dream, that which his ſpouſe had declared to him, or ſhould have declared, was true.

There is another remarkable difference between the pſeudo Matthew, and Luke's annotator, which ſeems to diſcredit the whole ſtory of Chriſt's being born under Herod. Matthew tells us, that ſoon after the nativity of our Saviour, Joſeph, being warned of God in a dream, took the young child and his mother, and fled into Egypt till the death of Herod. But his emendator in Luke aſſures us, that after the parents had been at Jeruſalem, and performed the ceremony of purification in the temple, *they returned again to Galilee to their own city Nazareth*, Luke, chap. ii. 39, without the leaſt mention of Herod, or any apprehenſions they were under from him.

The genealogy of Chriſt in Matthew and Luke, ſuppoſes plainly that he had ſome natural deſcent, and that he was, as St. Paul affirms, according to the fleſh, of the ſeed of Abraham, and

and deſcended from the fathers of the Jewiſh nation. But the ſtory of our pſeudo Matthew cannot poſſibly be reconciled with this.

Our modern chronologers, in attempting to juſtify this piece of falſe hiſtory, have been obliged to offer violence to Joſephus, and give up all his hiſtorical and chronological characters with reſpect to the reign and death of Herod. And had it not been for ſuch a prejudice, they could have found no difficulty at all in Joſephus, as to this matter. That he was made or declared king of Judea in the 5th Julian year, or in the year of the Julian period 4673, and that he died in the 42d Julian year, or the year of the Julian period 4710, would have been thought very plain from Joſephus, had there been nothing elſe in the caſe. In the Julian year 42, March 13, about three in the morning, there happened a great and remarkable eclipſe of the moon, which is mentioned by Joſephus as falling out a little before the paſcha, when Herod's life was deſpaired of; and he died that year before the feaſt. This eclipſe happened on the full moon before the paſcha; and beſides this, there is no other eclipſe of the moon which can ſtand in competition with it, within the time that Herod's death may be diſputed; I mean no eclipſe viſible in Judea, or within the obſervation of that country.

You may here obſerve, that this ſuppoſed revelation from God to Mary by the angel Gabriel, was the declaration of a thing falſe in fact, though ſuch hope or expectation had been deeply rooted and confirmed in the whole Jewiſh nation for near one thouſand years, or from the time of the revolt of the ten tribes. For after this, all their prophets had promiſed and foretold the reſtoration of the kingdom to the houſe of David, and the perpetual duration of it in that family after ſuch a reſtoration.

But Chriſt himſelf always diſclaimed this Meſſiahſhip, and declined all the overtures made to him about it; and he would not be received and owned as that *branch from the root of Jeſſe*, who was to reſtore the nation to their ancient liber-

ties and independency, as had been declared to them from the mouths of all the prophets.

When our Saviour came upon his trial before Pilate, he renounced this Jewiſh character of the Meſſias, and declared that he had never ſet up any ſuch pretenſions, that he had made no ſuch claim among the Jews, and that though this was what they charged him with, and he muſt die for it, yet they could bring no proof of it.

But ſurely, had the revelation of the angel to Mary, and the prophecies of Zacharias, Simeon, and Anna, been now produced and proved, the evidence muſt have been very ſtrong againſt him, and he had been juſtly put to death as an impoſtor and falſe prophet.

I know not what you may think of me, Sir, for the freedom of theſe obſervations; but I can aſſure you, that I am not at all intereſted in the matter, and therefore ſhould not be ſorry if the quite contrary ſhould happen to be true.

You may keep this correſpondence as deep a ſecret as you pleaſe, for I ſhall diſcover the ſubject of it to nobody without your leave.

I thought I could not talk to any man of greater impartiality and integrity, or who might be more likely to remove my ſcruples; and therefore I ſhall beg leave to ſubſcribe myſelf,

SIR,

Your moſt ſincere friend,

and humble ſervant,

May 10, 1735. T. MORGAN.

Mr. LARDNER anſwered:

Hoxton Square, June 17, 1735.

SIR,

I AM honoured with your letter of the 10th of May. It is a great ſatisfaction to me, that the Credibility, &c. has been ſo far approved by a perſon of your learning and acuteneſs. I know, that I did not willingly diſſemble, or leſſen any objections againſt the Evangelical Hiſtory; and was in hopes, I had removed

removed them to the ſatisfaction of the attentive and candid, who will make but juſt allowances for the loſs of ancient writings.

I ſhall offer a few things in anſwer to your letter, with a deſign of giving farther ſatisfaction, or receiving farther light myſelf.

You ſay, "that any taxation, enrolment, or cenſus, ſhould "be laid upon the whole country by the ſole authority of "Auguſtus, while Herod was king of Judea, and in high "favour with the emperor, ſeems incredible." I apprehend that this ought not be thought incredible, conſidering the few remaining accounts of the treatment of dependent princes, or provinces. You indeed put it, "in high favour;" but I have plainly ſhewn, that Herod was for ſome time under the diſpleaſure of Auguſtus. And it is evident from Joſephus himſelf, that there was an oath exacted, and an enrolment made, at the latter end of the reign of Herod; an affair that anſwers very well to that mentioned by St. Luke.

But you ſay, the "main thing is the authority of Euſebius." This ought not to be ſo. For it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that Euſebius was fully maſter of the ſtate of every province of the Roman empire, almoſt three hundred years before his own birth, ſcarce of any one. A learned Engliſhman might be miſtaken about the time of ſome governor of Jamaica, or even of Ireland, who had lived two or three hundred years ago. And it is likewiſe poſſible, that Euſebius, though honeſt in the main, might have ſome partiality for the Evangelical hiſtory. Therefore he applied that paſſage, which relates to the taxation after the removal of Archelaus, to the enrolment in St. Luke; that is, he was willing to have St. Luke's hiſtory confirmed by a paſſage of Joſephus, which makes expreſs mention of Cyrenius: and therefore he took that, relating to Archelaus, or the time after his removal; but very injudiciouſly, to ſay nothing worſe. For Euſebius, in that very chapter, places the birth of Chriſt in the 28th year of Auguſtus, after the conqueſt of Egypt, and the death of Antony. And according to all our Goſpels, Jeſus muſt have been born in the time of Herod, or

at

at leaſt before the removal of Archelaus; how otherwiſe could he have been crucified under Pontius Pilate, after a miniſtry of ſome years, which miniſtry could not begin till he was thirty years compleat, or in his thirtieth year?

You think it incredible, that there ſhould be a taxing in all Judea, in the time of Herod the Great. But how ſhould there be ſuch a one afterwards? when the land of Iſrael was divided, part made a province, part remaining under the government of Herod the tetrarch, and his brother Philip. And if the taxation, after the removal of Archelaus, affected the territories of Herod the tetrarch, you allow taxations of dependent princes. But indeed that cenſus made by Cyrenius after the removal of Archelaus, was not univerſal (for all the land of Iſrael), nor would it have brought Joſeph and Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem.

I ſee no good reaſon to call all the latter part of the firſt chapter of Luke a parentheſis: it is a part of his hiſtory, and is quoted by Juſtin Martyr, and other writers of the ſecond century. Mary might keep ſome things and ponder them, and be ſurpriſed, though ſhe had before had general intimations of them. Luke ii. 19, is one of theſe places, where ſhe is ſaid to *ponder*, and with good reaſon. The ſong of the angels, which breathes nothing but peace and good-will, the mean circumſtances of herſelf and her ſon at that time, might well lead her to ſerious meditation. Again, ver. 33, Joſeph and Mary had reaſon to marvel, when Simeon ſpoke of the nature and extent of this benefit, and went on alſo to hint the diſgraces and ſufferings of Jeſus. Nor are theſe things contrary to thoſe related in the firſt chapter, but only ſome farther explications of things there ſpoken by the ſame ſpirit, for the inſtruction of Joſeph and Mary, and the forming them to a becoming temper and conduct. For, chap. i. ver. 75, the deſign of this bleſſing now vouchſafed, is ſaid to be, that we *might ſerve God in holineſs and righteouſneſs*.

In all the Goſpels Jeſus is the king of Iſrael, and the ſon of David. He no where diſclaims theſe characters, though he was not ſuch a prince as ſome fondly expected and imagined, and

and others maliciouſly charged him to be. Matt. xxi. 15. There were many at the temple, who ſaid *Hoſanna to the Son of David*; whom he juſtifies, though the Phariſees were diſpleaſed. Mat. xxii. 42. *&c.* he ſpeaks of the Meſſiah as David's Son and Lord, ſo as to claim thoſe characters to himſelf.

Though Luke ſays nothing of the journey into Egypt, it may have been performed according to the account in Matthew. The words of Luke amount to no more than an omiſſion of that affair, without denying it to have been done. Such omiſſions are common in the Evangeliſts. Don't you, Sir, plainly perceive many things related in St. John's Goſpel, between the baptiſm of Jeſus, and the time when the other Evangeliſts begin their hiſtory of our Lord's public miniſtry?

In my appendix it is largely ſhewn that Herod died in the Julian year 42, or 43: I have not determined which; though I ſuppoſe the arguments there propoſed, appear ſtrongeſt for the year 42. But the matter is of no great conſequence, which of thoſe two years be right.

St. Luke's words concerning Cyrenius, ought, by no means, to incline us to think, that he meant the cenſus made in Judea after the removal of Archelaus, but rather the contrary. Theſe words are a parentheſis, and you know, Sir, that they admit of various ſenſes. Whatever is the ſenſe of that parentheſis, it is probable that the deſign of it is, to diſtinguiſh the enrolment there mentioned, from that made after the removal of Archelaus.

Theſe things I ſubmit to your conſideration. I enlarge no farther upon them to a perſon of your learning and judgment. I am,

SIR,

Your humble Servant,

N. LARDNER.

APPENDIX,

APPENDIX, N° V.

REMARKS upon ſome DIFFICULTIES concerning the CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

AS to the exellence and uſefulneſs of the rules of Chriſtianity, ſeveral ſtrong objections have been made. The ſubſtance of them is as followeth.

Obj. In the Goſpel there are many excellent precepts; but ſince they are the effect of heavenly inſpiration, ſhould not they have been rather ſupported with ſhort and clear reaſons, than delivered in the way of authority.

Anſ. I. It cannot be improper for a perſon who has a heavenly inſpiration, or divine commiſſion, to ſpeak ſometimes, or even often, in the way of authority.

II. When our Saviour delivers precepts in the way of authority, the fitneſs of ſo doing may be perceived. Particularly, this is obſervable in the 5th chapter of St. Matthew's Goſpel, where he repreſents the deſign of his commiſſion, and the nature of his doctrine. The Jews expected not a reformation under the Meſſiah, but great earthly advantages and great ſenſual indulgences. He therefore ſays, Matt. v. 17, *Think not, that I am come to deſtroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to deſtroy, but to fulfil.* The deſign of my commiſſion is not to abrogate or weaken, but rather to confirm, ſtrengthen, and enlarge the moral precepts and obligations contained in, or taught by the law and the prophets. Then, at ver. 21, *Ye have heard that it has been ſaid by them of old time,* (it ſhould be rendered to the ancients, ἐῤῥέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις) *Thou ſhalt not kill.* This is the ſixth commandment, delivered by divine authority in the law of Moſes, forbidding in expreſs words actual murder only. And it is likely, that many of the Phariſees taught, that forbearing the ſin expreſsly forbidden in the law was ſufficient. When, therefore, Chriſt taught the reſtraint or moderation of anger, as a neceſſary duty, and as a compleating, fulfilling, or enlarging that law; was it not fit to ſpeak in the way of authority? as a divine teacher, furniſhed with a commiſſion from heaven, as he does ver. 22; *But I ſay unto you, whoſoever is angry with his brother without a*

cauſe,

cauſe, and what follows. This obſervation ought to be applied to the other precept of the law of Moſes, afterwards inſiſted on, and in a like manner fulfilled by our Saviour.

III. The laws or precepts of Chriſt being in themſelves all reaſonable, need not to be demonſtrated. When once they are propoſed with authority, the mind aſſents to them immediately; they having an internal and manifeſt reaſonableneſs and equity. Is not this evident in that rule, Matt. vi. 12, *Whatſoever ye would that men ſhould do unto you, do ye even ſo to them?* The reaſonableneſs of all Chriſt's other precepts is alike evident.

IV. Nevertheleſs Chriſt does reaſon ſometimes, and gives ſuch ſhort and clear reaſons as the objecter requires. He heaps up reaſons in a conciſe manner againſt ſolicitude or anxiety, Matt. vi. 25—34; and, Luke xii. 15, he forbids covetouſneſs in theſe words; *Take heed, and beware of covetouſneſs:* and then adds that excellent reaſon, *For a man's life conſiſteth not in the abundance of the things which he poſſeſſeth:* and proceeds likewiſe to confirm and illuſtrate his doctrine by a parable. And in a like manner often. Thus when, Matt. v. 33, he improves or fulfils the precept or prohibition of the law, which ſays, *Thou ſhalt not forſwear thyſelf*, and forbids ſwearing at all, that is in common converſation, he argues, and by reaſons ſhews, the folly and wickedneſs of thoſe mincing oaths which were uſed by the Jews, who ſcrupled uſing the name of God expreſsly. ver 33—37. Ver. 34. *But I ſay unto you, Swear not at all, neither by heaven,* FOR *it is God's throne, nor by the earth,* FOR *it is his foot-ſtool*; and what follows: giving a reaſon againſt every one of thoſe oaths, and ſhewing that they were each one of them equivalent to ſwearing by the name of God: and then, laſtly, ſhews the wickedneſs of all common ſwearing in ordinary converſation, ver. 37, *But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay:* FOR *whatſoever is more than theſe cometh of evil.* This is the deſign of all the context.

Obj. It is farther urged, that many things are forbidden in the moſt ſtrict and ſevere manner, which are innocent, indifferent, or however not directly criminal. Thus, calling Fool,

Fool, and Raca, are offences againſt which the judgment of hell-fire are denounced. Looking on a woman and luſting after her are equally culpable with commiting adultery. Is the venereal act more criminal than any other? is it not equally natural and neceſſary? Can we forbear liking an agreeable object?

Anſ. In the particulars firſt mentioned, Chriſt only forbids that anger, which is really evil and unreaſonable; and thoſe injurious and contemptuous expreſſions or names, which are really improper and unbecoming, and which we ought not to give each other at all, or not without very good and ſufficient reaſon. And then theſe, or ſomewhat like them, may be uſed without contracting guilt. So St. Paul ſays, 1 Cor. xv. 36, *Thou fool:* and Chriſt ſays, Luke xiii. 32, *Tell that fox.* However, it may be obſerved, that the two words forbid by Chriſt, are reckoned by commentators to be expreſſive of the utmoſt contempt; and therefore are not to be indulged by us.

As to what concerns the thing next mentioned, the objector proceeds too faſt. The original word uſed by Chriſt for WOMAN, and the context, and every expreſſion there made uſe of, ſhews that our Lord is ſpeaking of a married woman; and the obvious literal ſenſe of the words is this: "That whoſoever "caſts an eye upon a married woman, ſo as to deſire" to have venereal commerce with her, "has committed adultery with "her already in his heart." And is not this ſelf-evident? Have not all mankind, that have been civilized, eſteemed adultery a ſin, or injurious? and if any action be criminal, the intention to do it is alſo criminal; and men who indulge criminal deſigns and intentions, muſt be guilty in the ſight of God; for God, who is the governor of the world, and particularly of rational and intelligent agents, is judge of thoughts as well as actions. Civil magiſtrates can judge only of words and actions; but God can and does judge thoughts. All theſe things are evident beyond diſpute. And no wiſe and good man, but, when he knows a woman is married, caſts off his eye from her, or ſuffers not concupiſcence to ariſe, and if it does, checks and condemns it: and every man ought to do ſo.

Obj.

Obj. How impracticable and intolerable are ſome other precepts? ſuch as theſe, *Whoſoever ſhall ſmite the on the right cheek, turn to him the other alſo. If any man take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak alſo.*

Anſ. I. Theſe precepts relate to ſmall matters.

II. They are hyperbolical and proverbial expreſſions, and not to be explained or underſtood literally. That they are ſo, is evident. 'Tis ſaid, John xviii. 22, *And when he had thus ſpoken, one of the officers which ſtood by, ſtruck Jeſus with the palm of his hand.* But our Lord does not offer himſelf to receive another blow. On the contrary, he remonſtrates againſt the injury done him; ver. 23, *Jeſus anſwered him, If I have ſpoken evil, bear witneſs of the evil; but if well, why ſmiteſt thou me?* And St. Paul directs, 2 Theſſ. iii. 10, *We command you, that if any would not work, neither ſhould he eat:* which ſufficiently ſhews, that Chriſtians need not be impoſed upon, though Chriſt has ſaid, *Give to every one that aſketh thee*; and St. Paul has earneſtly taught diligence in the two epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, as well as in other places.

Obj. And are we not forbidden to take thought for the morrow?

Anſ. The precept is, Μη μεριμνᾶτε; be not anxious or ſolicitous; or, be not anxiouſly thoughtful, or careful;—which is a reaſonable precept.

Obj. In order to perſuade to an unreſiſting ſubmiſſion and ſubjection to governments of the moſt cruel and abſolute kind, is not the doctrine of the New Teſtament urged and pleaded?

Anſ. St. Paul's directions, Rom. xiii, and St. Peter's, 1ſt ep. ii. 13, are very reaſonable. There were ſome Jews at that time, whom Chriſtians were in danger of following, who refuſed obedience to heathen magiſtrates, eſpecially to their inferior governors and officers. The Apoſtles therefore charge their converts to be obedient to magiſtrates of every rank. And, as magiſtracy is neceſſary, and very uſeful, obedience thereto is very reaſonable, and ſubmiſſion muſt be earneſtly recommended. The Apoſtles inſtructions upon this head afford

afford no ſupport to arguments for unreſiſting ſubmiſſion to cruel and abſolute governments, for their exhortations are founded in the benefit of government. St. Paul ſays, *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher powers—for rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil—for he is the miniſter of God to thee for good—for he is the miniſter of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.*—St. Peter: *Submit yourſelves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake; whether it be to the king, as ſupreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are ſent by him, for the puniſhment of evil-doers, and the praiſe of them that do well.* And it appears from the hiſtory in the New Teſtament, that the Chriſtians had a benefit from the Roman magiſtracy at that time; otherwiſe they would have been deſtroyed by the rudeneſs of the common people, and the Jewiſh malice. But yet, that ſome Chriſtians were in danger of pernicious notions of liberty, like the Jews of that time, is evident from what follows in the fore-cited context of St. Peter: *As free, and not uſing your liberty for a cloak of maliciouſneſs.* ver. 16.—St. Paul writes, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, that *prayers ſhould be made for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlineſs and honeſty*; or that we may, without diſturbance, profeſs the principles of true religion, and practiſe the ſeveral branches of piety and virtue. And certainly, if Chriſtians deſire peace and tranquillity, and the protection of magiſtrates, they ought to be peaceable, and behave as good ſubjects. Nor has the Chriſtian religion been prejudicial to civil liberty. Look abroad in the world: Have the people more rights and privileges in Mahometan and heathen governments and conſtitutions than in Chriſtian?

Obj. Hath Chriſtianity had a more real and extenſive influence than philoſophy? The beſt precepts cannot command attention and regard. A plain uſeful rule is wanted, that may be ſuited to the multitude.

Anſ. I. Since the publication of the Chriſtian religion, all immoralities have appeared more glaring and odious than in former times, which occaſions complaints of miſconduct and miſcarriages,

miſcarriages, that gave none, or little offence among Heathen people, though they were very common.

II. Men are always apt to complain of their own times, and make unfair compariſons between the ancient and preſent or later times. They take the bright ſide of the former, and the dark ſide of the later, and ſo compare them together.

III. Chriſtianity has had a real and extenſive influence (far beyond philoſophy) for reforming the manners and promoting the happineſs of mankind. What miſeries did the people ſuffer in the Roman republic! How terrible were their triumvirates and their proſcriptions, and ſome other things at times, in an age as philoſophical and polite as any before it! How barbarous and ſhameful the Roman diverſions in the amphitheatre! 'Tis to Chriſtianity, which has aboliſhed ancient Heatheniſm, that Mahometans owe their better ſentiments. Chriſtianity has aboliſhed human ſacrifices, and obliged parents to bring up their children, which were formerly expoſed in Greece and Rome without mercy, and are ſo ſtill in Heathen countries. In the city of Pekin, ſeveral thouſand infants periſh this way annually. There is no ſuch thing among Chriſtians. If that number periſh in one city, how many through all the Chineſe empire, and this number counting on from year to year! Chriſtianity took with the common people, or the multitude, in the firſt and purer ages, and in a ſhort time, without the aid of civil power, made a progreſs, gained ground againſt ſuperſtition, which philoſophy did not; had advantages of ſuperſtition, which philoſophy never had.

I have anſwered particular objections, I hope to ſatisfaction. I deſire leave to add ſome general obſervations.

Obſ. I. It cannot be thought ſtrange, that true religion, or a teacher of true religion, ſhould recommend great meekneſs, forbearance, and a contempt of riches and honours. Many wiſe men and philoſophers have ſeen, that there is neceſſity that good men bear and forbear; and they have ſaid great and fine things of the vanity of riches and honours, and ſuch like

advantages. Indeed all earthly things deſerve little value, conſidering their uncertainty, and the ſhortneſs of human life.

II. Chriſtianity is reaſonable throughout, or, to uſe a modern phraſe, it is a republication of the law of nature, with the two poſitive appointments of Baptiſm and the Lord's-ſupper or the Euchariſt. Therefore all its precepts are to be taken in a reaſonable ſenſe. You are required to ſhew no more meekneſs than is fit and reaſonable in this world of ours; you may defend yourſelves, reſiſt, remonſtrate againſt all injuries, when you have any proſpect of advantage; you may go to law, if the thing you contend for be worth it, and you have a proſpect of ſucceſs. But to reſiſt, when you are in danger of periſhing in the attempt; to go to law, when the thing deſired will not repay the loſs of time, if gained that way; or to appeal to judges, when they are ignorant, or partial and corrupt, what avails it? even though we have right, and the thing controverted be of ſome importance. The diſciples were obliged to the greateſt exactneſs of behaviour, and to as much generoſity and ſelf-denial as any men: yet our Lord teaches them to be wiſe as ſerpents, as well as harmleſs as doves. St. Paul inſiſted on his privilege of a Roman citizen, as often as it would be of any ſervice. He humbled the magiſtrates of Philippi, and defended himſelf againſt the Jews to the utmoſt. In ſhort, the Chriſtian precepts ought to be underſtood, as they are defined to be exactly ſuitable to men in the preſent ſtate of things.

III. Though the goſpel be allowed to be only a republication of the law of nature, it is of great advantage, becauſe men, through indolence, love of pleaſure, or ſome other means, did not trace out the great truths of religion, or the obligations of virtue, by the exerciſe of reaſon; and they needed to be awakened and excited to the practice of what they did know.

IV. True religion could not be diſcovered or recommended to men in a wiſer and more effectual manner, than it is, or has been, in the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt: or, there are the greateſt advantages attending the method in which true religion has been taught by Jeſus Chriſt. To have publiſhed the precepts of

of religion and virtue in a plain and clear manner, ſuppoſe, and with ſome few plain and clear reaſons, in the moſt ſolemn manner conceivable, as the ten commandments at Mount Sinai; together with plain and expreſs promiſes of future happineſs; would not have been ſo effectual as the Goſpel method. And all the truths of religion, and precepts of happineſs and virtue, are better recommended and enforced by the example of Chriſt's life, the patience, meekneſs, and fortitude of his death, and divine teſtimony to the truth, and his after reſurrection, than by the fore-mentioned method, or any other I can think of. However, to this Goſpel method belongs (beſides what has been already mentioned) alſo the example of Chriſt's Apoſtles.

V. It was therefore fit, that the publiſher, or republiſher, of true religion, with a commiſſion from Heaven, ſhould publiſh it in ſome particular country, and, as a public preacher, be liable to contradictions, oppoſition, and all kinds of ſufferings, which paſſionate and prejudiced men might be diſpoſed to bring upon him; and no place or time could be more fit than the land of Judea, and the time when Jeſus appeared.

VI. It follows, that in order to underſtand true religion as publiſhed in the Goſpels, or the New Teſtament, men ſhould exerciſe their reaſon, and ſtudy the language, dialect, and cuſtoms of the times when Chriſt and his Apoſtles preached, of which times every one ſees plain indications in the New Teſtament itſelf. Therefore Chriſtian clergy, and people, ſhould endeavour to be as knowing as they can.

VII. I ſhall add but one thing more to the honour of the Chriſtian religion; that it is no enemy to learning, or any branch of ſcience, that I know of. All religion ſuppoſes men rational: the Chriſtian religion was publiſhed in a learned and a polite age. St. Paul often recommends to Chriſtians to have the underſtanding of men; he prays to God for them, that they may increaſe in knowledge. Every branch of learning has flouriſhed among Chriſtians. More of them, I believe, have underſtood a variety of languages, than any had done before. Natural philoſophy has been cultivated by them. In the early

age of Chriſtianity, there were ſuch men as Clement of Alexandria, Pantaenus; Julius Africanus, Origen, with other learned men, in the third century; Euſebius of Ceſarea, and Jerom, in the fourth; men acquainted with hiſtory, chronology, criticiſm, never ſince ſuch in ſpirit; not to mention the many learned men of the later ages, until the revival of learning in Chriſtendom, about the time of the Reformation*.

APPENDIX, No VI.

CHARACTER of the Rev. Mr. RICHARD LARDNER.

THE Rev. Mr. Richard Lardner was born at Portſmouth, May 28, 1653, and educated for the miniſtry, by the Rev. Mr. Charles Morton, of Newington-Green.

He entered upon his work in the year 1673, when he could have no other worldly proſpect, but bonds, impriſonment, and the loſs of all things, and which he was content to undergo, and accordingly had a large ſhare in the ſufferings of thoſe times for conſcientious nonconformity.

Having had early impreſſions of religion on his ſpirit, he joined in communion with the church, under the paſtoral care of the Reverend and learned Dr. Owen, whom he always mentioned with the profoundeſt reſpect and veneration to his death.

His firſt ſettlement was at Deal in Kent; but after ſome years he removed to London, and ſome other places; in all which he was greatly beloved, and, as we have reaſon to believe, had many ſeals to his miniſtry, being made very uſeful for the converſion of ſome, and the edification of others, in the faith of the Goſpel.

He

He was a little man, but a bold and undaunted ſoldier of Jeſus Chriſt, being afraid of no dangers or difficulties in his maſter's work.

His manner of preaching was lively, maſculine, awakening like a ſon of thunder, and generally acceptable to the more ſerious part of his hearers, many of whom, and ſome yet alive, have dated their firſt impreſſions of religion from his miniſtry.

It pleaſed God to continue him a great many years in his ſervice, till he might be juſtly eſteemed the father of all the nonconformiſt miniſters in England. He was a preacher of the Goſpel for near ſixty years, in all which time he was not only frequent, but fervent and unwearied in his work, till the providence of God, by a paralytic diſorder, put an end to his labours in the eightieth year of his age, but not to his life.

He was a cloſe walker with God, throughout the whole courſe of his long life, and always deſirous to be uſeful. When it pleaſed God to raiſe him a family, he was particularly careful, not only for the temporal, but ſpiritual welfare of his children, endeavouring to ſecure and promote it by frequent inſtructions, and importunate prayers to God for them; in all which we hope his labour was not in vain with regard to any of them.

In the laſt ſeven years of his life, he had the pleaſure of obſerving the goodneſs of God in the growing hopes of his poſterity, enjoying much peace and compoſure, while he endured the conſequences of his late diſorder with an uncommon patience and firmneſs of mind; till at length, it pleaſed God to releaſe him from the infirmities of his preſent life, to a better, January 17, 1740; in the 87th year of his age. So that it may be ſaid, in him have been fulfilled thoſe words in the book of Job, chap. v. 26, *Thou ſhalt come to thy grave in a full age, like as a ſhock of corn cometh in his ſeaſon.*

APPENDIX, No. VII.

LETTER from Dr. SECKER, then Biſhop of Oxford, to Dr. LARDNER; with the Doctor's ANSWER.

St. James's Weſtminſter, December 6, 1750.

SIR,

IF I had not of late been more engaged in buſineſs than ordinary, I ſhould have returned you my thanks before now, for the kind and very acceptable preſent of your eighth volume. I have only been able, as yet, to take a curſory view of ſome parts of it: in doing which, I have been much pleaſed with your inſertion of that long citation, page 83, &c. with your diviſion of the ſorts of books, page 108, &c. and with your excellent reaſonings, page 124—137. As to the points, to which you occaſionally digreſs, page 19, &c. I agree with you entirely in condemning all temporal puniſhments for any opinions, which are conſiſtent with the welfare of ſociety: all claims of ſubmiſſion to the judgment of church governors, whether ſeparate or aſſembled; excepting ſuch deference, as any one's diſtruſt of his own abilities, or learning, may reaſonably incline him to pay to guides ſet over him, whom he believes to be faithful and ſkilful: and, laſtly, all terms of communion, which are not neceſſary articles of Chriſtianity, or indiſpenſably required by decency and order. What the terms, thus neceſſary and requiſite, are, all churches, and, ſo far as they are concerned, all perſons, muſt judge for themſelves: and there may be good and important reaſons to ſubmit, even without remonſtrating, to what we do not approve; provided we are not obliged to do any thing which we apprehend to be unlawful. He who thinks more things neceſſary, ſhould neither treat thoſe ill who believe fewer, nor rank them with total unbelievers, nor entertain any harſher opinion of the future ſtate of either, than ſerious and calm enquiry directs him to. And, on the other hand,

hand, he who believes fewer things to be neceſſary, ſhould not cenſure thoſe who believe more to be ſo, as tyrannical or uncharitable, merely becauſe they dare not acknowledge him to be what, according to the beſt judgment they can form, he is not. The former of theſe faults I admit to be the more common: but the latter is by no means without example, and ought to be conſcientiouſly avoided. The terms of admiſſion to the miniſtry may with reaſon, I think, be made ſtraiter than thoſe of communion. For doctrines not neceſſary, may be very uſeful: and doctrines not deſtructive, may be very hurtful. And every church, both particular and national, hath much reaion, both for its edification and its credit, to deſire and endeavour to have teachers, who hold and will inculcate the former ſort, and not the latter. Still a diſcreet moderation ought to be carefully preſerved in this matter, not only to prevent hypocriſy, but for ſeveral other reaſons. And yet, ſurely the danger of tempting men to diſſemble, is no more a ſufficient objection againſt requiring ſome declaration, in this caſe, than in many that civil life preſents; where, however, I acknowledge, that this practice is carried much too far: nor perhaps is there leſs danger, both of diſſimulation and farther inconveniencies, in leaving every one to declare himſelf in his own forms, than in propoſing a form to be ſubſcribed. In either way, ſome will think more articles proper, ſome fewer. And thoſe of greater latitude ſhould be mild in their opinions of thoſe who have leſs, as well as the contrary: and every one ſhould labour to reſtrain and ſoften thoſe, with whom he has weight. Otherwiſe, not only at ſome times power may be oppreſſive, as it often hath been; but at others a ſpirit of liberty may degenerate into one of bitterneſs, I had almoſt ſaid of perſecution.—I have run on into a long letter without deſigning it. In moſt, if not all, of what I have ſaid, I am perſuaded you will agree with me. But I am ſure you will excuſe me, if you ſee cauſe to think, as I hope you will, that the whole proceeds from a ſincere zeal for univerſal charity;

and a firm belief that you have the promotion of it deeply at heart: on which account, yet much more than on that of your great learning, accuracy, and diligence, I am, with high eſteem,

SIR,

Your very humble Servant,

THOMAS OXFORD.

To this Dr. Lardner anſwered:

Hoxton-Square, December 18, 1750.

My Lord,

I AM greatly indebted to your Lordſhip for the favour of your letter of the 6th inſtant, and think it no ſmall honour done me, that amidſt your many engagements you have read ſo large a part of my work. I have reaſon to be well pleaſed, that ſo many things in it have obtained your approbation. It affords me ſome ſpecial ſatisfaction that the reaſonings at page 124—137 have not been diſliked by your Lordſhip; becauſe I had flattered myſelf with ſome hopes, they might be approved by perſons of good judgment. I am likewiſe obliged to your Lordſhip for your free, candid, and charitable obſervations, relating to the firſt chapter of the volume. It is very natural to oppoſe that extreme which is moſt apt to prevail: there have been particular perſons, and ſome ſocieties, that have advanced and maintained great extravagancies; but oppreſſive power, on one ſide or other, has been very common, and produced extenſive miſchief. In the early ages, when catholics and heretics contended with reaſons and arguments only, the juſter ſentiments uſually had the advantage; which cannot be ſaid of ſome later times.

I take this opportunity to congratulate your Lordſhip on your late preferment; which, though it adds nothing to your dignity, if it affords more leiſure, may open a new ſphere of uſefulneſs. And your Lordſhip, I hope, will think of making

more

more public ſome of thoſe diſcourſes, which have been heard with ſo much attention and applauſe. If it may not be too preſuming, when I hear of your ſettlement at the deanery, I will order a volume of plain diſcourſes to be left there by the bookſeller. I am,

My Lord,
Your Lordſhip's
Moſt humble and obedient ſervant,
N. LARDNER.

APPENDIX, N° VIII.

LETTER from Dr. DODDRIDGE to Dr. LARDNER.

Northampton, May 23, 1751.

Reverend and dear Sir,

AS ſoon as ever I had the honour of receiving the valuable preſent you were ſo good as to ſend me, of the two volumes you publiſhed toward the cloſe of the laſt year, ſo elegantly bound, which I eſteem doubly as a memorial of the friendſhip of the learned, pious, and generous author; I deſired our good friend Mr. Neal, to preſent you with my moſt reſpectful acknowledgments, but deferred writing to you myſelf, till I had read them. I ſet about the ſermons immediately, and read three or four of them every week till I had finiſhed them; but having been ſomething interrupted by my journey to St. Alban's, and the little additional labour of publiſhing good Dr. Clarke's funeral ſermon; after ſuch a delay, I waved writing to you, till I might have an opportunity of reading this laſt volume of the Credibility. But really, Sir, the labour of my Family Expoſitor, added to the other neceſſary buſineſs daily incumbent upon me, as a paſtor and tutor, with the neceſſity I have been under of anſwering letters, of which I have ſince laſt Chriſtmas received between four and five hundred, has ſo entangled me, that it is but very lately I have been able to ſecure the pleaſure which that excellent volume had in ſtore

for

for me. And now my journey is ſo near, that it may ſeem almoſt ſuperfluous to write to you; and yet, under the load of ſuch obligations to ſo worthy a friend, I cannot bear to ſee his face till I have made this poor acknowledgment of his goodneſs: accept it, dear Sir, with your uſual candour, and be aſſured, that though I am not able to expreſs it as I would, I do actually feel a conſtant and deep ſenſe of your goodneſs to me, and, which is much more, of your continual readineſs to ſerve the public with thoſe diſtinguiſhed abilities, which God has been pleaſed to give you; and which have rendered your writings ſo great a bleſſing to the Chriſtian world. And I heartily pray they may be yet more abundantly ſo, for promoting the cauſe of virtue and piety, Chriſtian principles, and a Chriſtian temper. In the interpretation of particular texts, and the manner of ſtating particular doctrines, good men and good friends may have different apprehenſions; but you always propoſe your ſentiments with ſuch good-humour, modeſty, candour, and frankneſs, as is very amiable and exemplary; and the grand deſire of ſpreading righteouſneſs, benevolence, prudence, the fear of God, and a heavenly temper and converſation, ſo plainly appears, particularly in this volume of ſermons, that, were I a much ſtricter Calviniſt than I am, I ſhould honour and love the author, though I did not perſonally know him. As to what you ſay of the council of Nice, I do not doubt but it will give umbrage to ſome who look on its decrees as the great bulwark of the orthodox faith; but I ſee nothing ſolid that can be objected to your remarks, and I think, there would have been much leſs Arianiſm in the world, and much leſs miſchief done by that which there is, if it had been conducted in that more catholic manner you deſcribe, as what might have been wiſhed; and I have never ſeen any good done by ſevere anathemas, and ſecular puniſhments, ſo aukwardly liſted into the ſervice of Chriſtianity, oppoſite as they are to its true genius. Neither my time nor my paper will allow me to enlarge, &c.

APPENDIX, N° IX.

LETTER from Dr. CHANDLER to Dr. LARDNER, with the Doctor's ANSWER.

Old Jury, December 4, 1764.

Reverend and dear Sir,

WHEN I received your propoſals, I determined to purchaſe the work immediately on its publication, but am extremely obliged to you for ordering it as a token of your reſpect to me, on whoſe friendſhip and eſteem I ſet, as I ought to do, the higheſt value. I have read the whole through with care, and to my great ſatisfaction and improvement. The only thing in which I am not fully ſatisfied, is your opinion about the teſtimony of Joſephus concerning our bleſſed Saviour, which I have always been inclined to think, as to the far greateſt part of it, genuine. I have not time to anſwer all the objections that are urged againſt the genuineneſs of the teſtimony, but you will give me leave to make two or three obſervations on the teſtimony itſelf.

That it is introduced with great propriety, as what happened under Pilate's adminiſtration, and as what was one occaſion of the diſturbances amongſt the Jews in his time.

He teſtifies that "he was a wiſe man."

Is uncertain "whether he was not ſomething more than a "common man," which is the meaning of the words, ειγε ανδρα αυτον λεγειν χρε; for Joſephus, upon Jewiſh principles, could not but think him a man, though he was uncertain whether he was not ſomewhat greater; a more extraordinary perſon, than any mere man.

And your own quotation from Joſephus, about Moſes, that "he was a man ſuperior to his own nature," page 158, accounts for the character given to Jeſus.

He ſays he was παραδοξων εργων ποιητης. That, the Jews themſelves, his contemporaries and enemies, acknowledged. Matt. xiii. 54.—xiv. 2. &c.

"He

" He was a teacher of ſuch men as received the truth with " pleaſure." You aſk, would he call the Chriſtian religion the truth? Yes certainly, as to the moral precepts of Chriſtianity; which is all, I ſuppoſe, that Joſephus knew or regarded of it, Matt. xxii. 16.

" He drew over to him many Jews and Gentiles." This was true in the time when Joſephus wrote. I refer you to page 169 of your own excellent work, which juſtifies the expreſſion.

" This was the Chriſt." Ο Χριστος ουτος ην. I render the words, ' This, viz. Jeſus, was the famous, or remarkable Chriſt.' Jeſus was a common name, and would not have ſufficiently pointed him out to the Greeks and Romans. The name by which he was known to them was, Chreſtus, or Chriſtus; as in Suetonius and Tacitus; and if Tacitus had read Joſephus, as you juſtly think he had, I imagine he took this very name from Joſephus. Joſephus did not certainly believe him to be the Meſſiah, and therefore, when he wrote this hiſtory, he could never mean by Chriſtus the Jewiſh Meſſiah, of which the Greeks and Romans knew nothing; but that he was the remarkable Chriſt, who was the founder of that people who were called Chriſtians. This appears to me to be the real meaning of the expreſſion, and as ſuch it was intelligible to the Heathens.

In the period that follows: " When Pilate, at the inſtigation, &c." to the words, " did not ceaſe to adhere to him;" the whole is true, and what might be ſaid by any man, though not a Chriſtian, who was acquainted with his hiſtory.

The next words, " for on the third day, &c." if he ſpeaks only of what were the common ſentiments of his followers, they may be allowed to be his. But, to ſpeak my mind freely, I think them rather an interpolation of Euſebius, or ſome other Chriſtian; and that the connection in Joſephus runs thus.

" They who before had conceived an affection for him, did " not ceaſe to adhere to him; and the ſect of Chriſtians, ſo " called from him (the Ο Χριστος) ſubſiſts to this day." Such an addition he could not well avoid,

As

As to the remarks on the expreſſion των Χρίστιανων φυλον, that φυλον is here put for *ſect*, or muſt neceſſarily ſignify *ſect*, I am not thoroughly clear in it. Joſephus certainly uſes the word φυλον frequently for nation, but I think alſo ſometimes with greater latitude. Thus in a quotation from Strabo, he tells us, τοπον αν επι ραδίως ευρειν της οικουμενης, ος α παραδεδεκται τουτο το φυλον, not *this nation*, which is too extenſive, but as it is in the Latin verſion, *hoc genus hominum*. line 14. cap. 7. page 695. I alſo find in Dion Caſſius, τας Βαλευτικα φυλα γεγενημενας. *Qui ſunt ſenatoria origine*. Vol. ii. page 912, edit. Reimari. Φυλον. εθνος, γενος. Heſychius. Why then may we not render the words in Joſephus, Χρίστιανων φυλον, *the ſort of people called Chriſtians?* And I think it is not unlikely that Joſephus ſhould add, "that they ſubſiſted "to his own time" when he wrote this hiſtory, A. C. 93.

Give me leave juſt to add, that this paragraph, concerning Jeſus, doth not ſeem to me, ſo much to interrupt the courſe of the narration as is complained of: it is introduced under the article of Pilate, and placed between two circumſtances which occaſioned diſturbances. And was not the putting of Jeſus to death, and the continuance of the apoſtles and diſciples after him, declaring his reſurrection, another very conſiderable circumſtance, which created very great diſturbances? And though Joſephus doth not expreſsly ſay this, and perhaps had good reaſons for not ſaying it, yet he intimates it, by placing it between the two cauſes of commotion, by giving ſo honourable a teſtimony to Jeſus, and telling us, that he was crucified at the inſtigation of the chief perſons of the nation. It would ſcarce have been decent in him to have ſaid more on this head.

I have ſometimes thought that this paſſage was originally in Joſephus, and that Joſephus himſelf omitted it afterwards in ſome other copies, at the deſire of ſome of his own nation, as containing too honourable an account of Jeſus, or that they falſified ſome other copies by omitting it; and I think, as you allow, with great reaſon, his teſtimony to the Baptiſt to be genuine, it is not to be accounted for, that he ſhould wholly omit to ſay any thing of Jeſus.

But

But I beg your pardon for giving you the trouble of ſo long a letter, eſpecially as what I have urged may appear to be of little weight. I own I cannot wholly give up the paſſage, and yet I feel the weight of your objections againſt it. Your book will ever remain a ſolid proof of your learning, candour, and good judgment; and I pray God continue your life till you have finiſhed your deſign, and every other view for the ſervice of religion. I am, with the ſincereſt affection and eſteem,

Reverend and dear Sir,

Your greatly obliged, and
moſt humble Servant,
SAMUEL CHANDLER.

To this Dr. Lardner anſwered:

Reverend and dear Sir,

I AM much obliged to you for your friendly and valuable letter of December 4, and for all your arguings therein upon the ſubject: which you have urged with great force, and to the beſt advantage: and I will further conſider. In the mean time, you may be ſenſible, that I cannot be eaſily moved from an opinion, which I have long held agreeable to the ſentiments of very judicious critics.

The teſtimony of Joſephus to the fulfilment of our Saviour's predictions in the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, is invaluable. His accounts of the ſtate of things in Judea, before the commencement of the war, and during the miniſtry of our Saviour and his apoſtles, are alſo very valuable, indeed above all price. But I do not perceive, that we at all want the ſuſpected teſtimony to Jeſus, which was never quoted by any of our Chriſtian anceſtors before Euſebius. Nor do I recollect that he has any where mentioned the name, or word, Chriſt, or Meſſiah, in any of his works, except the teſtimony above-mentioned, and the paſſage concerning James the Lord's brother. If you recollect any place, where Meſſiah is mentioned by him, let me know it. If that word is never

to

to be found in him elſewhere, he muſt have deſignedly and ſtudiouſly declined it; for he had many occaſions to mention it. It therefore is unlikely, he ſhould produce that word in ſpeaking of Jeſus. Explain the term as you pleaſe, it muſt be unaccountable, that it ſhould be brought in here. This, I now mention to you; but, as before ſaid, I will further weigh your reaſons.

You ſeem to be well acquainted with an argument propoſed in a Diſſertation, &c. publiſhed at Oxford ſome years ago, and aſcribed to Dr. Nathaniel Foſter. I ſhall be obliged to you, if you have leiſure, to inform me whether that Dr. Foſter be ſtill living, and what are his preferments: if he be dead, what was his ſtation, and of what other works was he author. For poſſibly I may be obliged publicly to make ſome remarks upon his diſcourſe. If I do, a farther acquaintance with the writer of it will be expedient. For there have been ſeveral of that name, Foſter.

Wiſhing you continued ſucceſs in your ſtudies and public labours, I remain, with the ſincereſt regard,

Your friend and ſervant,

December, 31, 1764. N. LARDNER.

APPENDIX, N° X.

OBSERVATIONS on the Teſtimony of JOSEPHUS.

Communicated by the Rev. Mr. HENLEY.

To the Rev. Dr. KIPPIS.

Rendleſham, Suffolk, Dec. 4, 1786.

SIR,

THE teſtimony of Joſephus concerning CHRIST having been conſidered in a new point of view, ſince the death of Dr. Lardner, by my learned friend the Abbé du Voiſin (who hath

hath lately quitted the divinity chair, which he had filled for ſeveral years in the Sorbonne, with the higheſt reputation), I take the liberty of tranſmitting to you his communication upon that ſubject, as a valuable Supplement to Dr. Lardner's remarks; and, at the ſame time, to ſubjoin the late Abbé Bullet's obſervations, which I doubt not will be the more acceptable to the public, as Dr. Lardner was long anxious to avail himſelf of the book which contains them, [Hiſtoire de l'Etabliſſement du Chriſtianiſme, tirée des ſeuls Auteurs Juifs et Payens, &c.] but was never able to procure it.

I am,

SIR,

With great reſpect,

Your obedient ſervant,

S. HENLEY.

"MANY critics ſince the time of Oſiander, Blondel, Tanaquil Faber, and Le Clerc, have ſuſpected, but, in my opinion, unwarrantably, the authenticity of this celebrated teſtimony: for—1. It is extant in all the copies of Joſephus, both unpubliſhed and publiſhed. Baronius, Annal. Eccleſiaſtic. ad an. 134, relates, that a manuſcript of this hiſtorian's Antiquities was found in the library of the Vatican, tranſlated into Hebrew, in which this paſſage was marked with an obelus; a thing that could have been done by none but a Jew. In an Arabic verſion preſerved by the Maronites of Mount Libanus, the narrative exiſts entire: ſee the new edition of the Bibliotheque Françoiſe de Duverdier, par M. de Bréquigny.—2. This teſtimony of Joſephus has been applauded by Euſebius (Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtic. lib. i. c. 10—Demonſtrat. Evangelic. lib. iii. c. 5.), Jerom (Catal. Script. Eccleſiaſtic.), Rufinus (Hiſtor. lib. i.), Iſidorus of Peluſium, Sozomen, Caſſiodorus, Nicephorus, and many more, who all indiſputably had ſeen various manuſcripts, and of conſiderable antiquity.—3. The ſtyle of the paſſage ſo exactly reſembles the other writings of Joſephus, that, to adopt the expreſſion of Huetius, one egg is not more like to another. Proofs of this aſſertion may be ſeen in the diſſertation of Daubuz, ſubjoined to Havercamp's edition.

—4. Joſephus

—4. Joſephus not only mentions, with reſpect, John Baptiſt (Antiquit. lib. xviii. c. 1) but alſo James: "Ananus aſſem-"bled the Jewiſh Sanhedrim, and brought before it James the "brother of Jeſus who is called Chriſt, with ſome others, "whom he delivered over to be ſtoned, as infractors of the "law." Lib. xx. c. 8. This paſſage, the authenticity of which has never been ſuſpected, contains an evident reference to what had been already related concerning Chriſt; for why elſe ſhould he deſcribe James, a man of himſelf but little known, as the brother of Jeſus, if he had made no mention of Jeſus before? —5. It is highly improbable that Joſephus, who hath diſcuſſed with ſuch minuteneſs the hiſtory of this period—mentioned Judas of Galilee, Theudas, and the other obſcure pretenders to the character of the Meſſiah—as well as John Baptiſt and James the brother of Chriſt—ſhould have preſerved the profoundeſt ſilence concerning Chriſt himſelf, whoſe name was at that time ſo celebrated both amongſt the Jews and the Romans. But in all the writings of Joſephus not a hint occurs on the ſubject, except the teſtimony in queſtion.—6. Let no one perſuade himſelf that this paſſage was forged either by Euſebius, who firſt cited it, or any other earlier writer; for the Chriſtian cauſe is not only ſo far from needing any fraud to ſupport it, that nothing could be more deſtructive to its intereſt, more eſpecially a fraud ſo palpable and obtruſive.

It has been objected by Blondel, That what is here related of Chriſt could not poſſibly have been recorded by Joſephus, who was not only a Jew, but rigidly attached to the Jewiſh religion: viz. "That Chriſt could ſcarcely be ſaid to be a "man," that is, that he was God, that he was a performer of wonderful works, a teacher of truth, moreover, Chriſt or the Meſſiah, whom the prophets had foretold; and, finally, who appeared on the third day reſtored to life. Theſe are not the expreſſions of a Jew, but a Chriſtian.

To this however it may be anſwered, That Joſephus was not ſo addicted to his own religion, as to approve the conduct and opinion of the Jews concerning Chriſt and his doctrine. From the moderation which pervades his whole narrative of

the Jewiſh war, it may be juſtly inferred, that the fanatic fury which the chief men of his nation exerciſed againſt Chriſt, could not but have been diſpleaſing to him. He has rendered that atteſtation to the innocence, ſanctity, and miracles of Chriſt, which the fidelity of hiſtory required. Nor does it follow that he was neceſſitated to renounce, on this account, the religion of his fathers. Either the common prejudice of the Jews, that their Meſſiah would be a victorious and temporal ſovereign, or the indifference ſo prevalent in many, towards controverted queſtions, might have been ſufficient to prevent him from renouncing the religion in which he had been brought up, and embracing a new one, the profeſſion of which was attended with danger: or elſe, he might think himſelf at liberty to be either a Jew or a Chriſtian, as the ſame God was worſhipped in both ſyſtems of religion. On either of theſe ſuppoſitions, Joſephus might have written every thing which this teſtimony contains. By the expreſſion, "if it be right to "ſpeak of him as a man," it is not meant to imply that Chriſt is God, but only an extraordinary man, one whoſe wiſdom and works had raiſed him above the common condition of humanity. He repreſents him as "a performer of wonderful works," becauſe miracles were wrought by him, as the Jews themſelves were obliged to confeſs. He ſtyles him "an inſtructor of thoſe "who gladly received the truth," both becauſe the moral precepts of Chriſt were ſuch as Joſephus approved, and alſo becauſe the diſciples of Chriſt were influenced by no other motive than the deſire of diſcerning it. The phraſe "this man was Chriſt," or rather, ὁ Χριστὸς ἀνὴρ οὗτος ἦν, "Chriſt was this man," by no means intimates that Jeſus was the Meſſiah, but only that he was the perſon called Chriſt both by the Chriſtians and Romans, amongſt whom Joſephus wrote: juſt as if we ſhould ſay, in our language, "this was the ſame man as he named Chriſt." As to the reſurrection of Chriſt, and the prophecies referring to him, Joſephus rather ſpeaks the language uſed by the Chriſtians, than his own private opinion; or elſe he thought that Chriſt had appeared after his revival, and that the prophets had foretold this event: a point which, if admitted, and he had been conſiſtent,

ought

ought to have induced him to embrace Chriſtianity. But there might be many circumſtances to prevent his becoming a proſelyte, as every one will readily imagine; nor is it either new or wonderful, that men, eſpecially in their religious concerns, ſhould contradict themſelves, and withſtand the conviction of their own minds. It is certain that, of our own times, no one hath ſpoken in higher terms concerning Chriſt than the philoſopher of Geneva, who nevertheleſs, not only in his other writings, but alſo in the very work which contains this moſt eloquent eulogium, inveighs againſt the Chriſtian religion with acrimony and rancour.

It has been further objected, That no perſon before Euſebius ever mentioned this teſtimony; neither Juſtin in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew; nor Clemens Alexandrinus, who made ſo many extracts from ancient authors; nor Origen againſt Celſus: but, on the contrary, in the 35th chapter of the 1ſt book of that work, Origen openly affirms that Joſephus, who had mentioned John Baptiſt, did not acknowledge Chriſt; and therefore it is inferred, that before the age of Euſebius this teſtimony had no exiſtence in the copies of Joſephus.

To this it may be anſwered, That there is no ſtrength in this negative argument againſt Euſebius, drawn from the ſilence of the ancient fathers. The fathers did not cite the teſtimony of Joſephus, either becauſe they had no copies of his writings; or, becauſe his teſtimony was foreign to the ſcope of their own; or, becauſe it could be of little uſe, eſpecially in the earlieſt times, when the miracles of Chriſt were admitted by the Jews at large; or, becauſe that for this very teſtimony the evidence of Joſephus was diſregarded by the Jews themſelves. To this laſt conſideration Juſtin apparently alluded, when he thus addreſſed himſelf to Trypho: "Ye yourſelves know, O Jews! "that Jeſus is riſen again and aſcended into heaven, accord-"ing as the prophets foretold." What Origen aſſerted was not, that Chriſt was unknown to Joſephus, but only that Joſephus did not acknowledge him as the Chriſt or Meſſiah, Ιησεν ε καλαδεξαμενοι ειναι Χριστον, and in his Commentary on Matthew, και, τοι γε απιστων τω Ιησε ὡς Χριστω: by which words it is manifeſt, that Jeſus was known to Joſephus, but not admitted

by him to be the Chriſt, or Meſſiah. Thus much, however, Origen might ſay in perfect conſiſtency with the paſſage in queſtion, where the name of Chriſt, as hath been already obſerved, is an appellative, without aſcribing to him who bore it the character of the Meſſiah, expected by the Jews."

A more diffuſe and minute diſcuſſion of this ſubject may be ſeen in a diſſertation by the excellent VERNET, profeſſor of divinity at Geneva, intitled, Traité de la Vérité de la Religion Chrétienne, tom. ix. Lauſanne, 1782; and in Mr. Bryant's Vindiciæ Flavianæ, or a Vindication of the Teſtimony given by Joſephus concerning our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. Printed for White, 1777. I mention the latter publication more particularly, as not only coinciding in many points with the preceding obſervations, but alſo as having made ſeveral converts, amongſt whom Dr. Prieſtley, I have underſtood, may be mentioned as one. If, however, the defence ſet up by theſe learned writers ſhall be ſtill thought inſufficient, let us take the converſe of the poſition, and conſider the concluſions drawn from it by the late Abbé BULLET.

" I. JOSEPHUS, who was born about three or four years after the death of Jeſus Chriſt, could not be ignorant that there had appeared in Judea a charlatan, impoſtor, magician, or prophet, called Jeſus, who had either performed wonders, or found the ſecret of perſuading numbers to think ſo. He could not but know that, in his own time, there ſtill were in that province many who acknowledged this man as their maſter. When he was himſelf carried captive to Rome, it muſt have been notorious to him, that Nero had puniſhed, in the moſt extraordinary and unheard-of manner, a great number of Chriſtians in that city; he muſt have been aware, that their martyrdom had been exhibited as a ſpectacle to the Roman people, and was a ſpectacle of ſo uncommon a kind, as to have been recorded by Tacitus and Suetonius in the annals of the empire. He muſt have ſeen that, under Domitian, the Chriſtians were proſecuted both

in

in Rome and the provinces, and put to death publicly by the orders of the emperor.

II. Ought not Joſephus then to have taken ſome notice of Jeſus and his diſciples, in his hiſtory? Or did he think the ſubject too inconſiderable to occupy a place in it? That he did not, may be concluded from the following reaſons.

1. In the time of this hiſtorian, the Chriſtians were of themſelves ſo numerous a ſociety as to engage the attention of the Roman emperors. Theſe ſovereigns of the world enacted edicts againſt them, devoted them to death, and cauſed the magiſtrates every where to purſue them. The faith of hiſtory, therefore, required that they ſhould not be paſſed over in ſilence. Thus thought Tacitus and Suetonius, to whom the Chriſtians, as a ſect, were a much leſs intereſting object than to a Jew, like Joſephus. Theſe two hiſtorians conſidered the riſe and eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity as of ſufficient magnitude to rank amongſt the great events tranſmitted by them to poſterity.

2. Joſephus in his Antiquities, book xviii. c. 2, has mentioned three ſects amongſt the Jews, the Eſſenes, the Sadducees, and the Phariſees; though the two laſt had ceaſed to exiſt after the downfall of their nation, and at the time when he wrote. He ought not then to have been ſilent in reſpect to the ſect of Chriſtians, which had been formed amongſt the Jews, and not only ſubſiſted in his own time, but had increaſed in a very different manner from the others he had mentioned, and was extended through the various provinces of the empire, and the capital itſelf; whilſt they had ſcarcely exceeded the confines of Judea.

3. Joſephus has given an accurate account of all the impoſtors, or heads of parties, which aroſe amongſt the Jews, from the empire of Auguſtus to the ruin of Jeruſalem.

He relates, that Judas of Galilee ſtirred up the Jews to an inſurrection againſt the Romans; Antiq. book xviii. c. 1. And alſo, that the preſident Tiberius Alexander cauſed the two ſons of this inſurgent to be cruified; Book xx. c. 5.

He recounts that an impoſtor aſſembled the Samaritans upon mount Gerizim, under the pretence of diſcovering to them the ſacred veſſels which Moſes had there buried.

He

He ſpeaks of the preaching of John Baptiſt, and the concourſe of people which flocked to hear him. He bears record to the ſanctity of his life; and adds, that the Jews believed the defeat of Herod's army by Aretas king of the Arabs, to have been a puniſhment for the crime he had committed in putting this holy man to death. Book xviii. c. 7.

He relates that an impoſtor, named Theudas, ſeduced a great number of the Jews, and led them towards Jordan, under the promiſe that he would divide the river, and make them paſs over dry-foot. Cuſpius Fadus, preſident of Judea, having received notice of this expedition, diſpatched a party of ſoldiers, who ſlew Theudas, and brought back his head to the preſident. Book xx. c. 2.

He mentions that Felix, preſident of the province, having taken by ſtratagem Eleazar the ſon of Dinæus, the leader of a large gang of banditti, ſent him in chains to Rome. Book xx. c. 6.

He recounts that an Egyptian coming to Jeruſalem, gave himſelf out for a prophet, and perſuaded a mob to follow him to the mount of Olives, where they ſhould ſee the walls of Jeruſalem fall down at his command; but that Felix, on hearing of it, put himſelf at the head of the troops which were then in the city, and charging the miſguided populace, killed four hundred, and took two hundred priſoners. The Egyptian having ſaved himſelf, was heard of no more. Book xx. c. 6.

He ſubjoins a narrative of a pretended magician, who drew the people into the deſert, by promiſing them that under his conduct they ſhould be ſafe from every kind of evil. The preſident Feſtus ſent troops againſt them, which defeated and diſperſed them. Book xx. c. 7.

Jeſus was the founder of a party much more conſiderable, and which occaſioned much greater noiſe, than all thoſe whom this author has mentioned. Theſe impoſtors, theſe ringleaders, theſe men who had collected mobs, had no followers beyond the precincts of Judea: their partizans and adherents were ſoon diſperſed, and at the time when this hiſtory was written, nothing but the

bare remembrance of them remained. It was far different with the ſect, the aſſemblies and community which Jeſus had formed; it not only ſubſiſted in the time of the hiſtorian, but was extended through every province of the empire, and flouriſhed in the very capital. The ſovereigns of the world exerted all their authority to ſuppreſs it. This party or ſect, then, deſerved, far more than all the others together, to have been noticed by Joſephus in his hiſtory.

Joſephus could not be ignorant of Jeſus, nor the ſect which had been founded by him: how then, conſiſtently with the laws of hiſtory, and the method which he had preſcribed to himſelf, of recording every thing he knew, could he preſerve an intire ſilence on this head? Let us try to ſolve this ænigma.

Either this hiſtorian believed, that all which the diſciples of Jeſus had ſaid of their maſter was falſe, or elſe was true. If falſe, he could not have remained ſilent; every thing would have ſtimulated him to ſpeak out on the occaſion; the intereſt of virtue; zeal for his own religion, the foundations of which the Chriſtians had ſapped by their impoſtures; the love of his own nation, whom the diſciples of Jeſus accuſed and upbraided with having, from a malignant and cruel jealouſy, put to death the Meſſiah, the Son of God. By expoſing the impoſtures of the Apoſtles, Joſephus muſt have overwhelmed with confuſion the enemies of his own people; have ingratiated himſelf moſt effectually with his nation; conciliated the favour of thoſe emperors who perſecuted the growing cauſe of Chriſtianity; attracted the applauſes of all who looked with horror on this new ſuperſtition; and undeceived the Chriſtians themſelves, whom the firſt diſciples of Jeſus had ſo miſerably miſled. Can any perſon for a moment believe, that a man able to expoſe ſo groſs an impoſture, and who had ſo many powerful inducements to do it, ſhould, in ſpite of every incitement, perſevere in the moſt obſtinate ſilence; eſpecially, when ſo natural an occaſion ſolicited him to ſpeak? If falſe miracles were propagated for the purpoſe of ſeducing the people of our days, with what zeal, with what ardour would our writers march forth

to

to detect the impoſture, and prevent the ſeduction! Should we not regard their ſilence, on ſuch an occaſion, as a criminal prevarication? It appears then indiſputable, that if Joſephus had believed the relations of the Apoſtles, concerning their maſter, to have been falſe, he would have taken care to declare his conviction: but, if he did not believe them to have been falſe, he muſt have known them to be true; and, for fear of diſpleaſing his nation, the Romans and their emperors, held his peace. In this caſe, his ſilence is of more importance than his teſtimony, and equally ſerves to authenticate the truth of thoſe facts upon which Chriſtianity is founded."

THE

CREDIBILITY

OF THE

GOSPEL HISTORY,

OR, THE

FACTS OCCASIONALLY MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CONFIRMED BY PASSAGES OF ANCIENT AUTHORS, WHO WERE CONTEMPORARY WITH OUR SAVIOUR, OR HIS APOSTLES, OR LIVED NEAR THEIR TIME.

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

CONCERNING THE

TIME OF HEROD'S DEATH.

PART I. VOL. I.

[FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCXXVII.]

THE PREFACE.

WHATEVER argument is inſiſted on in behalf of Chriſtianity, whether the purity of its doctrine, the fulfilment of ancient prophecies, the predictions and miracles of our Saviour and his apoſtles, or the peculiar circumſtances of its propagation; it is neceſſary, that we be apprized of the truth of the things related in the New Teſtament.

The evidence of the truth of any hiſtory is either internal or external. The internal evidence depends on the probability of the things related, the conſiſtence of the ſeveral parts, and the plainneſs and ſimplicity of the narration. The external evidence conſiſts of the concurrence of other ancient writers of good credit, who lived at, or near the time, in which any things are ſaid to have happened; and who bear teſtimony to the books themſelves, and their authors, or the facts contained in them.

Every ſerious and attentive reader is able, in a great meaſure, to judge of the internal marks of the credibility of the hiſtory contained in the New Teſtament: though he may be very much aſſiſted by the obſervations of others, who are more curious, or more judicious than himſelf. And for this purpoſe many excellent writings have been publiſhed with very great advantage in our own, and other modern languages.

The external evidence of the truth of any ancient hiſtory, and particularly of the goſpel-hiſtory, lies not ſo much within the reach of the generality of mankind. And though in ſome modern defences of the Chriſtian religion, there have been appeals and references made to other ancient authors; yet thoſe appeals have not been ſo diſtinct, full, and expreſs, as might have been wiſhed. The writer has ſuppoſed his readers learned; and, not producing at length the teſtimonies he appeals to, the faith of the unlearned, as to this part of the evidence for Chriſtianity, is ſtill reſolved very much into the credit and authority of the apologiſt.

The peculiar deſign of this work is to enable perſons of ordinary capacities, who, for want of a learned education, or of ſufficient leiſure, are deprived of the advantage of reading over ancient writings, to judge for themſelves concerning the external evidence of the facts related in the New Teſtament.

At preſent I offer only the evidence of the facts *occaſionally* mentioned in the books of the New Teſtament, intending hereafter to treat of the *principal facts* in a like manner.

The method taken in this work is to ſet down in the firſt place the repreſentation, which the ſacred writers have given of perſons, facts, cuſtoms, or principles; and then to produce paſſages of other ancient writers, which confirm or illuſtrate the account delivered in the New Teſtament.

Wherever the matter treated of is of any ſpecial importance, and wherever there is any ambiguity, or any peculiar beauty or emphaſis in the ſtyle and expreſſion of the authors I quote, I have placed their original words at the bottom of the page.

There are added likewiſe, here and there, ſome ſhort notes for the benefit of the unlearned reader. Theſe are referred to by ſmall capitals. And I hope, they will be diſtinguiſhed from the original quotations, which are marked with ſmall letters.

I preſume it is needleſs for me to acknowledge particularly, that I am accountable for the tranſlations of all the paſſages here tranſcribed: or to declare, that I have uſed the beſt care I could about them. I may have miſtaken, but I am ſure, that I have not, with a view to any particular purpoſe whatever, deſignedly miſrepreſented any fact, or given a wrong turn to any paſſage. My putting down the original words of my authors, or very particular references to them, will prevent all ſuſpicions of this kind.

The reader is not to ſuppoſe, that I have exhauſted the argument. The geography of the New Teſtament, and many facts, cuſtoms and principles, beſides thoſe here inſiſted on by me, are alſo confirmed by teſtimonies of ancient writers. I apprehend however, that what is here offered is ſufficient to anſwer the end propoſed. And though the poſitive part be not full and complete, and indeed could not be ſo without being tedious; yet I think I have, in the ſecond book, taken in all the chief difficulties affecting that kind of facts I am now concerned with.

The point I was to make out is the Credibility of the Goſpel-Hiſtory. And to that I have confined myſelf. But no one may hence ſurmiſe, that I give up the inſpiration of the books of the New Teſtament. Nor am I aware, that I have in the leaſt weakened any argument, that they were written under a ſpecial direction and influence of the Spirit of God. I think however, that if the goſpel-hiſtory be credible, the truth of the Chriſtian religion cannot be conteſted.

I flatter

I flatter myself, my design will be approved. I wish the execution had been equal to the subject. Imperfect as it is, I hope what is here performed, may be of use to remove, or abate the prejudices of some; to confirm others upon a good foundation in the belief of the Christian religion, and in their high esteem for the writers of the New Testament, and to enable them to read them with new pleasure and profit.

ADVERTISEMENT

CONCERNING THE

SECOND EDITION.

I now allow, that the words of St. Luke, chap. ii. 2. are capable of the sense, in which they are understood by Herwaert and Perizonius. But as I still dispute most of the examples alledged by those learned men in support of that sense, there is but a small alteration made in that article. The Rev. Mr. Masson * has given me occasion to consider afresh what I had said concerning Macrobius's passage. I hope what is now added will be to his and others satisfaction. I have also taken this opportunity to add some farther observations on Josephus's silence about the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem. But the most important addition, is a curious observation on Josephus concerning the Egyptian impostor, which I received from Mr. Ward. These and the few other alterations and additions made in this edition, can need no apology with those who understand the nature of this design. And as they are printed by themselves, and may be had separate, I hope the first edition is not much prejudiced hereby.

* See his Slaughter of the Children in Bethlehem, as an historical Fact, vindicated, &c. In the dedication to the Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield.

Having in the following work made great uſe of Philo *and* Joſephus, *I here prefix a ſhort account of thoſe two writers.*

PHILO was a Jew, of Alexandria in Egypt, brother[a] of Alexander the Alabarch, or chief magiſtrate of the Jews in that country. The Jews having been much abuſed by the Egyptians and by Flaccus the Roman preſident, in the year of our Lord 39, or 40. Philo with others was ſent to Caligula the emperor in the name of the whole Jewiſh people living in Alexandria. The embaſſy conſiſted of[b] five, and he[c] has aſſured us himſelf, that he was the eldeſt and moſt experienced perſon among them. It is reaſonable to conclude therefore, that he was born at, or before the commencement of the Chriſtian æra. He was eminent for his wit and learning, as well as for his family. Many of his writings are ſtill remaining, though ſome have been loſt. The two books which I have chiefly quoted are his diſcourſe againſt the forementioned Flaccus, preſident of Egypt, and his account of the embaſſy to Caligula.

JOSEPHUS, the ſon of Matthias, of the race of the prieſts, by his mother deſcended from the Aſmonean family, which for a conſiderable time had the ſupreme government of the Jewiſh nation, was born at Jeruſalem in the firſt year of the[d] reign of Caligula, A. D. 37. In the beginning of the Jewiſh war he commanded in Galilee. Veſpaſian, then general under Nero, having conquered that country, Joſephus became his priſoner, and continued with him as long as Veſpaſian ſtaid in those parts. When Veſpaſian, upon his being declared emperor, went to Rome to take poſſeſſion of the empire; Joſephus ſtaid with Titus, was preſent at the ſiege of Jeruſalem, and ſaw the ruin of his city and country. Joſephus afterwards ſettled at Rome, and obtained the freedom of the city from Veſpaſian. Some time after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, he wrote his *hiſtory of the Jewiſh war* in ſeven books. After that he wrote in twenty books the *Jewiſh antiquities*, or, hiſtory of the Jews from the creation of the world to the twelfth of Nero, in which year the work began. This work he finiſhed in the 56th year of his own age, in the 13th year of the reign of Domitian, A. D. 93. Beſides theſe, we have his life, written by himſelf and two books againſt Apion, an Egyptian author who had calumniated the Jewiſh[e] people. The works of Philo and Joſephus were written in the Greek language.

[a] Joſeph. Antiq. 18. c. 9. §. 1. [b] Philo de legat. p. 1043. C. [c] Ibid. 1018. C.
[d] In vit. §. 1. [e] Vid. Antiq. 20. c. 10. Vit. §. 75, 76. De Bell. in Proœm.

An Explication of ſome Terms and Abbreviations.

A. U. or, *Anno Urbis*, is the year of the foundation of the city of Rome, according to Varro's account.

The Julian year is an epoch, ſo called from Julius Cæſar. The firſt year of this epoch, when Cæſar's reformation of the Roman year took place, commences the firſt of January, A. U. 709.

A. D. *Anno Domini*, or the year of our Lord, or the vulgar Chriſtian æra. According to this account our Saviour was born Dec. 25. Julian year 45. A. U. 753. But the computation does not begin till the year following, *viz.* January 1. Julian year 46. A. U. 754. This computation all writers, as well as others, follow. But learned men are ſenſible, it is defective. Our Saviour was born in the reign of Herod the great. But it is certain, that Herod died before the paſſover, A. U. 752; very probable in A. U. 750. or 751.

The Reigns of the Roman Emperors, during the period of the Evangelical Hiſtory.

		A. U.	A. D.
Auguſtus having reigned from the death of Julius Cæſar 57 years and ſome months, and from the defeat of Mark Antony at Actium 44 years, died,	Aug. 19.	767.	14.
Tiberius began his reign	Auguſt 19.	767.	14.
Caius Caligula	March 16.	790.	37.
Claudius	Jan. 24.	794.	41.
Nero	Octob. 13.	807.	54.
Nero died	June 9.	821.	68.

Galba reigned	from	June 9.	A. D. 68.	to	Jan. 15.				
Otho reigned	from	Jan. 17.	69.	to	Apr. 16.	822.	69.		
Vitellius reigned	from	Jan. 2.	69.	to	Dec. 21.				
Veſpaſian reigned	from July 1. A. D. 69. to June 24.					832.	79.		

THE

INTRODUCTION.

THE Hiſtory of the New Teſtament hath, in an eminent degree, all the internal marks and characters of credibility. The writers appear honeſt and impartial. They ſeem to have ſet down very fairly the exceptions and reflexions of enemies, and to have recorded without reſerve the weakneſſes, miſtakes, or even greater faults, which they themſelves, or any of their own number, engaged in the ſame deſign with them, were guilty of. There is between the four evangeliſts an harmony, hitherto unparalleled between ſo many perſons, who have all written of the ſame times or events. The leſſer differences, or ſeeming contradictions, which are to be found in them, only demonſtrate they did not write with concert. The other parts of the New Teſtament concur with them in the ſame facts, and principles. Theſe are things obvious to all, who read the books of the New Teſtament with attention. And the more they are read, the more conſpicuous will the tokens of credibility appear.

But it muſt be an additional ſatisfaction, to find that theſe writers are ſupported, in their narration, by other approved authors of different characters, who lived at or near the time, in which the facts, related by the evangeliſts, are ſuppoſed to have happened.

It is plainly the deſign of the hiſtorians of the New Teſtament to write of the actions of Jeſus Chriſt, chiefly thoſe of his public miniſtry; and to give an account of his death and reſurrection, and of ſome of the firſt ſteps, by which the doctrine, he had taught, made its way in the world. But though this was their main deſign, and they have not undertaken to give us the political ſtate or hiſtory of the countries in which theſe things were done; yet in the courſe of their narration, they have been led unavoidably to mention many perſons of note; and to make alluſions and references to the cuſtoms and tenets of the people, whom Jeſus Chriſt and his apoſtles were concerned with.

Here are therefore two kinds of facts, principal, and occaſional. The principal facts are the birth, and preaching of John the Baptiſt; the miraculous conception and birth, the diſcourſes, miracles, predictions, crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt; the miſſion of the apoſtles, the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon them, and the other atteſtations which were given

given to the divine authority of Jeſus Chriſt, and the truth of his doctrine. The things occaſionally mentioned are the eſtate and character of the princes and governors, in whoſe time theſe events are placed; the ſtate of the Jews, their opinions, and practices, and alſo thoſe of other people, to whom the apoſtles came.

The facts related in the New Teſtament are all (except ſome few mentioned in the book of the Revelation;) ſuppoſed to have come to paſs before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, which happened in the ſeventieth year of the Chriſtian æra. And theſe hiſtorians do throughout maintain the character of perſons perfectly well acquainted with the matters of which they write.

Two of theſe books, the goſpels of Matthew and John, bear the names of perſons, who are ſaid to have been preſent at a good part of thoſe tranſactions, which they give an account of. Mark writes as one fully maſter of his ſubject, and Luke affirms expreſsly, that he *had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt*, Luke i. 3. and that he was able to write in order of thoſe things he undertook to relate. In theſe four pieces we have the hiſtory of between thirty and forty years, from the viſion of Zacharias in the temple at Jeruſalem, to the aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt.

Beſides theſe, we have alſo a book called the Acts of the apoſtles, aſcribed to the laſt mentioned writer; in which is contained the hiſtory of many wonderful events, which followed the reſurrection, and aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt. If he had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very beginning of the goſpel of Chriſt, he may be well ſuppoſed throughly acquainted with theſe later events, as nearer his own time. And indeed in a great part of this work he ſuſtains the character of an eye-witneſs.

Omitting, for the preſent, the particular conſideration of the principal facts of this hiſtory, and the direct and poſitive atteſtations given to the truth of them (as well as to the genuineneſs of theſe writings) by a great number of perſons, who lived near the time in which they are ſuppoſed to have happened; and who after a ſerious and diligent enquiry were convinced of the truth of them, and upon the ground of that perſuaſion renounced the principles of their education, and ever after conſtantly maintained and confeſſed the truth of the facts and principles contained in theſe books, with great hazard of their eaſe, reputation, eſtates and lives: I ſhall now take a view of thoſe facts only, which are occaſionally mentioned in the New Teſtament; and enquire into the external evidences of the truth of them.

If

If it appear from other writers, that our ſacred hiſtorians have miſtaken the people and affairs of the time, in which, according to their own account, the things they relate, happened; it will be an argument that they did not write, till ſome conſiderable time afterwards. But if upon enquiry there be found an agreement between them and other writers, of undoubted authority, not in ſome few, but in many, in all the particulars of this kind which they have mentioned; it will be a very ſtrong preſumption that they wrote at, or very near the time, in which the things they relate are ſaid to have happened.

This will give credit to the other, the main parts of their narration. An hiſtory written and publiſhed near the time of any events is credible, unleſs there appear ſome particular views of intereſt; of which there is no evidence in the preſent caſe, but quite the contrary.

The hiſtory now before us, is the hiſtory of many great and wonderful works done in ſome of the beſt peopled and moſt frequented parts of the earth. They are related with very particular circumſtances of time and place, and ſome of them are ſaid to have been done in the preſence of great numbers of people. Here is withal an account of proceedings and ſentences of courts of judicature, in cities of the firſt rank, at times of the greateſt and moſt general reſort; and of ſome diſcourſes made before perſons (next under the Roman emperor,) of the higheſt rank and diſtinction. One manifeſt deſign of the whole is to overthrow the religious tenets, then generally received in the world. It is written in the language, not of ſome obſcure kingdom, but of a learned and numerous people, underſtood at that time by all the polite, and by many others in every part of the known world. For any men to publiſh ſuch an hiſtory of ſuch things as lately done, if not punctually true, could have been only to expoſe themſelves to an eaſy confutation, and certain infamy.

I propoſe therefore to give a long enumeration of particulars, occaſionally mentioned by the writers of the New Teſtament, in which they are ſupported by authors of the beſt note; and then in anſwer to divers objections, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, that they are not contradicted in the reſt.

If I ſucceed in this attempt, here will be a good argument for the genuineneſs of theſe writings, and for the truth of the principal facts contained in them; diſtinct from the expreſs and poſitive teſtimonies of Chriſtian writers, and the conceſſions of many others.

THE

THE

CREDIBILITY

OF THE

GOSPEL HISTORY.

PART I. VOL. I.

BOOK I. CHAP. I.

Of PRINCES and GOVERNORS mentioned in the NEW TESTAMENT.

I. *Herod.* II. *Archelaus.* III. *Herod the Tetrarch, and Philip.* IV. *Herod the Tetrarch, and Herodias.* V. *Lysanias Tetrarch of Abilene.* VI. *Herod (Agrippa.)* VII. *Felix and Festus.* VIII. *Felix and Drusilla.* IX. *Agrippa (the younger.)* X. *Bernice.* XI. *Sergius Paulus deputy of Cyprus.* XII. *Gallio deputy of Achaia.*

THE first thing, I would obſerve, is, that Joſephus and Heathen authors have made mention of Herod, Archelaus, Pontius Pilate, and other perſons of note, whoſe names we meet with in the Goſpels and Acts of the apoſtles; and have delivered nothing material concerning their characters, poſts, or honours, that is different from what the writers of the New Teſtament have ſaid of them.

§. I. St. Matthew aſſures us that *Jeſus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod, the king*, Matt. ii. whom St. Luke ſtyles expreſly *the king of Judea*, Luke i. 5. Herod was the ſon of Antipater, who had enjoyed conſiderable poſts of honour and truſt under Alexander Iannæus, and Alexandra his wife and ſucceſſor in the civil government of Judea, and their eldeſt ſon Hyrcanus; who was high-prieſt in his mother's life-time, and after her death, had the civil power alſo united in him.

Nicolas of Damaſcus ſays, that Antipater was deſcended from one of the chief of the Jewiſh families that returned into Judea from Babylon. But Joſephus makes no ſcruple to declare,

clare, that Nicolas said this, only to flatter Herod, who came to be king of Judea; and that in truth he was an Idumean[a].

These Idumeans were a branch of the ancient Edomites, who, as Dr. Prideaux[b] has observed, 'while the Jews were in 'the Babylonish captivity, and their land lay desolate, took 'possession of as much of the southern part of it, as con- 'tained what had formerly been the whole inheritance of the 'tribe of Simeon, and also half of that, which had been the 'inheritance of the tribe of Judah; and there dwelt ever after, '—till at length going over into the religion of the Jews, 'they became incorporated with them into the same nation.'

Josephus gives this account of their conversion. 'Hyrcanus 'took also Adora and Marissa, cities of Idumea: and having 'subdued all the Idumeans, he permitted them to remain in 'the country, upon condition they would be circumcised, 'and use the Jewish laws. Rather than leave their native 'land, they received circumcision, and submitted to live in 'every respect as Jews. And from that time they became 'Jews[c].'

This happened in the 129th year before the Christian æra[d]. Consequently Herod was a Jew, though not of the ancient stock of Israel.

Moreover Josephus calls Judea, Antipater's native country[e]. And the Idumeans in the Jewish war 'promised to defend 'the house of God (at Jerusalem) and fight for their com- 'mon country.' [f] And the Jews themselves allowed Herod to be a Jew. Whilst Felix was procurator of Judea, 'there 'arose a dispute between the Jews and Syrians that dwelt in 'Cæsarea concerning the equal rights of citizenship. The 'Jews thought they ought to have the preference, because 'the founder of Cæsarea, Herod their king, was a Jew[g].'

Herod obtained the crown of Judea upon occasion of a difference between two branches of the Asmonean family. Hyr-

a Joseph. Ant. lib. 14. cap. 1. §. 3. Edit. Hudf. b Connection, Part II. Book iii. p. 199. Oct. Edit. 1718.

c Υρκανος δε και της Ιδουμαιας αιρει πολεις Αδωρα και Μαρισσαν· και απαντας τους Ιδουμαιους υποχειριους ποιησαμενος επετρεψεν αυτοις μενειν εν τη χωρα, ει περιτεμνειν τε τα αιδοια, και τοις Ιουδαιοις νομοις χρησθαι θελοιεν· οι δε ποθω της πατριου γης και την περιτομην και την αλλην του βιου διαιταν υπεμειναν την αυτην Ιουδαιοις ποιησασθαι· κακεινος αυτοις χρονος υπηρχεν, ωστε ειναι το λοιπον Ιουδαιοις· Antiq lib. 13. cap. 9. §. 1.

d Prideaux's Conn. P. II. Book v. p. 307.

e Και πρωτον μεν το τειχος ανεδειματο της πατριδος υπο Πομπηιου κατεστραμμενον· de Bell. J. lib. 1. c. 10. p. 979. v. 28. vid. etiam ibid. v. 21.

f Τηρησομεν Ιδουμαιοι τον οικον του Θεου, και της κοινης πατριδος προπολεμησομεν· ibid. lib. 4. p. 1180. v. 43.

g Περι ισοπολιτειας. Οι μεν γαρ Ιουδαιοι πρωτευειν ηξιουν, δια το τον κτιστην της Καισαρειας Ηρωδην αυτων βασιλεα γεγονεναι το γενος Ιουδαιον. Joseph. Ant. lib. 20. cap. 7. §. 7.

canus

canus had been for a conſiderable time prince and high prieſt of the Jewiſh nation. But whilſt the Roman empire was in an unſettled ſtate after the death of Julius Cæſar, Antigonus, ſon of Ariſtobulus brother of Hyrcanus, by means of ſome friends he had amongſt the Jews, and by the aſſiſtance of the Parthians, made himſelf maſter of Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and took Hyrcanus priſoner, who was put into the hands of the Parthians (A).

Hereupon, Herod, who had been governor of Galilee under Hyrcanus, and whoſe intereſts had hitherto depended entirely upon him, ſet ſail for Rome. All he then aimed at, was to obtain the kingdom for Ariſtobulus, brother of his wife Mariamne, by his father grandſon of Ariſtobulus, and by his mother, of Hyrcanus. But the Senate of Rome, moved by the recommendations of Mark Antony and ſome reaſons of ſtate, conferred the kingdom of Judea upon Herod [i].

Having had this unexpected ſucceſs at Rome, he returned with all expedition to Judea; and, in about three years time, got poſſeſſion of the whole country. Antigonus was taken priſoner, ſent to Antony, and by him put to death at Herod's requeſt [k]. 'He (Herod) reigned after the death of Antigonus 'thirty four years, and from the time he was declared king 'by the Romans thirty ſeven [l].'

He died of a very painful and loathſome diſtemper; inſomuch that, as Joſephus ſays, 'Some then pronounced it to 'be a judgment of God upon him for his many impieties [m].'

§. II. St. Matthew informs us, that Joſeph, having been ſome time in Egypt, by divine direction *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, he turned aſide into the parts of Galilee*, Matt. ii. 21, 22.

By which words it is implied, not only, that Archelaus ſucceeded Herod in Judea properly ſo called; but alſo that his power did not reach over all the land of Iſrael, and particularly not to Galilee.

Joſephus has informed us, that Herod uſually called the Great, by his laſt will and teſtament, which he made a little

(A) In the year before the Chriſtian æra 42. [i] Joſeph. Ant. lib. 14. c. 14. de Bell. lib. 1. c. 13. [k] Ant. lib. 15. cap. ult. de B. Jud. lib. 1. cap. 18. Ant. lib. 17. 8. §. 1.

[l] Ως ουκ αν επιδειξειεν ποινην ειναι των σωφρονων τα τοιαυτα λεγειν. de B. J. lib. 1. cap. 33. p. 1041. v. 6. [m] ελελειο δη υπο των θεραζοντων, και ως ταυτα προαιτοφθεγξεσθαι σοφια τις εκειθεν, ποινην τε πολλων ουσεβειας ταυτην ο Θεος εισπρατσεσθαι παρα του βασιλεως· Ant. lib. 17. c. 6. §. 5.

before

before his death, appointed Archelaus his ſucceſſor in Judea, with the title of king; and aſſigned the reſt of his dominions to Herod Antipas, and Philip, excepting only ſome ſmall part, which he gave to his ſiſter Salome. However, the diſpoſal of all was left to the determination of Auguſtus. This will the emperor ratified, as to the main parts of it. Archelaus was decreed ſucceſſor to his father in Judea, Samaria, and Idumea, with the title of ethnarch: but was not to have the title of king, till he ſhould do ſomewhat to deſerve it. Herod Antipas was appointed tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa; and Philip, of Trachonitis and the neighbouring countries[n].

If Joſeph returned out of Egypt immediately after the death of Herod, I preſume no one will except againſt the propriety of the expreſſion here made uſe of, that Archelaus reigned. For his father had in his laſt will appointed him his ſucceſſor with the title of king. If this return out of Egypt be ſuppoſed not to have happened, till after the decree of Auguſtus was paſſed, by which Archelaus was forbid as yet to uſe the ſtyle of king; yet, no juſt exception will lie againſt St. Matthew's phraſe. For Joſephus himſelf, who has given us an account of this limitation, calls Archelaus, the king that ſucceeded Herod[o]. And he has uſed the verb reigning concerning the duration of his government[p]. And what in one place he calls a tetrarchy, in another, he calls a kingdom[q].

St. Matthew ſays, that *when Joſeph heard* that *Archelaus did reign in Judea, he was afraid to go thither.* There muſt have been ſome particular reaſon for this fear, and for his *turning aſide into the parts of Galilee*, (by virtue of a pure choice of his own, or of a new direction from heaven;) though Galilee alſo was in the poſſeſſion of one of Herod's ſons.

Some may infer from hence, that Archelaus muſt have had a bad character in Judea, even in his father's life-time. And there are divers particulars in Joſephus, which may confirm ſuch a ſuſpicion.

After his father's death, and before he could ſet out for Rome, to obtain of Auguſtus the confirmation of Herod's laſt will; the Jews, upon his not granting ſome demands they made, became very tumultuous at the temple. And he ordered his ſoldiers in among them, who ſlew above three thou-

n Joſ. Ant. lib. 17. c. 8. §. 1. de Bell. lib. 1. c. 33. §. 7. 8. & lib. ii. cap. 6. §. 3. —Et gentem coercitam, liberi Herodis tripartito rexere. Tacit. Hiſt. lib. v. cap. 9.

o Ο επικλαγαθεις αυτω βασιλευς Αρχελαος υιος ων. Antiq. l. 18. p. 802. v. 16, 17.

p Ως βασιλευσειν μεν αυτον του των ϛαϛυων αριθμου· de B. lib. ii. c. 7. p. 1030. vid. etiam p. 789. v. 23. & p. 904. v. 20.

q Την Αυσανιε τετραρχιαν. p. 818. v. 27. βασιλειαν την Αυσανιε καλεμενην. p. 1071. v. 14.

ſand;

ſand [r]; which was reckoned a great piece of ſeverity, in the beginning of his reign, or rather whilſt he was but a private perſon: for many reckoned him no more, till the ſucceſſion was confirmed by Auguſtus.

As Archelaus went to Rome, ſo did Herod Antipas, and almoſt all the reſt of the family. When they came thither, Herod made intereſt for Archelaus's ſhare, which was called the kingdom: and the whole family favoured Herod's pretenſions, 'not out of any love to him, but out of hatred to 'Archelaus [s].'

After Archelaus had left Judea, with the leave of Quintilius Varus preſident of Syria, an embaſſy of fifty of the chief men of Jeruſalem was ſent to Rome, in the name of the whole nation, with a petition to Auguſtus, that they might be permitted to live according to their own laws under a Roman governor: and when they came to Rome, they were joined by above eight thouſand Jews who lived there. They arrived before Auguſtus had given his ſentence upon Herod's will. When he gave Archelaus and this embaſſy an audience, none of the royal family would attend Archelaus to ſupport his intereſt; ſuch was their averſion to him. 'Nor did they join 'in with the embaſſy, being aſhamed to oppoſe ſo near a 'relation in the preſence of Auguſtus [t].'

'And in the tenth year of his government, (B) the chief 'of the Jews and Samaritans, not being able to endure his 'cruelty and tyranny, preſented complaints againſt him to 'Cæſar. Auguſtus, having heard both ſides, baniſhed Arche-'laus to Vienna in Gaul, and confiſcated his treaſury [x].'

Indeed, he ſeems to have been the worſt of all Herod's ſons, except Antipater, whom Herod had put to death five days before his own deceaſe.

As the evangeliſts have ſaid little concerning our Saviour after his return out of Egypt, and ſettlement in Galilee, till the time of his public miniſtry, when the government of Ju-

[r] Ant. lib. 17. cap. 9. §. 3.

[s] Ὁτοι δὲ εἰς Ῥώμην ἀφικέλο (Ἀντιπας), τὰ μὲν παρ' ὀλίγον τῶν συγγενῶν ἀποσασις ἦν πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐπεὶ ἐνίκα τὴ ἐκείνε, μισει δὲ τῷ πρὸς Ἡρώδην· ibid. §. 4.

[t] Ὁπόσοι δὲ συγγενεις ησαν τῷ πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀρχέλαῳ μὲν συνήλαχθαι διὰ μισος τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπῆρχεν, τοις δὲ πρεσβεσιν ἐναντίοις κατ' αὐτὸ δεινὸν ἡγεῖτο, ἐν αἰσχυνῃ τὰ αὐτῶν ποιεμενοι γενησεσθαι παρα Καισαρι καὶ αὐτὸς οἰκειε τοιῶδε πρασσειν προθυμειθαι. Antiq. lib. 17. cap. 13. §. 1.

(B) A. D. 6. or 7.

[x] Δεκάτῳ δὲ ἔτει της ἀρχης Ἀρχελαε, οἱ πρῶτοι των ἀδελφῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐνῆε Ἰουδαιοις καὶ Σαμαρεῖταις μὴ φερόντες τὴν ὠμότητα αὐτε καὶ τυραννίδα, κατηγορεσιν αὐτε ἐπὶ Καισαρος— Καὶ ὁ Καισαρ ἀφικομενε ἐπὶ τινων κατηγόρων ἀκροάται καὶ αὐτε λεγόντος, καὶ ἐκεινον μὲν φυγαδα ἐλαυνει, δὲς οἰκητήριον αὐτῷ Βιενναν πολιν της Γαλλίας· τα δὲ χρηματα ἀπηνεκάλο· ibid. cap. 15. §. 2.

dea

dea was in other hands, we find no farther mention made of Archelaus by them.

§. III. But of the two other sons of Herod, between whom the other half of his dominions was divided, we have mention made long after this. For St. Luke says, Luke iii. 1. that when *the word of God came to John in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, Herod* was *tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea, and the region of Trachonitis.* That is, they were then in possession of the same territories and titles, which were assigned them by their father's last will, and Augustus's decree. And it was this same Herod tetrarch of Galilee, to whom our Saviour was sent by Pilate, Luke xxiii. 6, 7. when he was accused before him.

That Philip was tetrarch of Trachonitis, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, we are assured by Josephus, who says, that 'Philip the brother of Herod died in the twentieth year of 'Tiberius, when he had governed Trachonitis, and Batanea, 'and Gaulanitis thirty-seven years [y].'

And Herod continued tetrarch of Galilee, till he was removed by Caligula, the successor of Tiberius [z].

§. IV. Of this Herod some other things are related, namely, his marrying Herodias, and beheading John the Baptist. These are mentioned by several of the evangelists. Matt. xiv. 1—13. Mark iv. 14—29. Luke iii. 19, 20.——I shall only set down St. Mark's account. *For Herod had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison, for Herodias sake, his brother Philip's wife; for he had married her. For John said unto Herod, it is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife. therefore Herodias had a quarrel against him, and would have killed him, but she could not. For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him.——And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birth-day made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief estates of Galilee: and when the daughter of the said Herodias came in and danced and pleased Herod, and them that sat with him, the king said unto the damsel, ask of me whatsoever thou will, and I will give it thee. And he sware unto her, whatsoever thou wilt ask of me, I will give it thee unto half of my kingdom.* Mark vi. 17—23.

This unlawful marriage is recorded in Josephus. 'About 'this time there happened a difference between Aretas king 'of Petræa, and Herod, upon this occasion. Herod the te-

[y] Antiq. lib. 18. c. 5. §. 6. [z] Ibid. c. 8. §. 2.

trarch

'trarch had married the daughter of Aretas, and lived a con-'siderable time with her. But in a journey he took to Rome, 'he made a visit to Herod, (c) his brother; though not by 'the same mother, for Herod was born of Simon's the high-'priest's daughter. Here falling in love with Herodias, the 'wife of the said Herod, daughter of their brother Aristo-'bulus, and sister of Agrippa the Great, he ventured to 'make her proposals of marriage. She not disliking them, 'they agreed together at this time, that when he was returned 'from Rome, she should go and live with him. And it was 'one part of their contract, that Aretas's daughter should be 'put away [b]."

Josephus speaks again of this marriage in another place, from which it appears likewise, that Herodias had a daughter by her first husband. She is generally supposed to be the person, whose dancing so much entertained Herod the tetrarch. Giving an account of Herod's children and grand-children he says: 'Herodias was married to Herod, son of Herod the 'great, by Mariamne daughter of Simon the high-priest. 'They had a daughter whose name was Salome, after whose 'birth, Herodias, in utter violation of the laws of her 'country, left her husband then living, and married Herod 'the tetrarch of Galilee, her husband's brother by the father's 'side [c].'

It may, perhaps, be expected, I should here produce an instance about that time, of some lady of a like station with Herodias's daughter, who danced at a public entertainment. But I must own, I am not furnished with any instance exactly parallel. And I should conclude from this very story, as related by the evangelists, that this dance was a very unusual, if not a singular piece of complaisance. If it had been a common thing, it is not to be supposed that Herod would

(c) Josephus here calls Herodias's first husband Herod. The evangelists call him Philip. This difficulty will be considered amongst the objections.

[b] Εν τουτῳ δε ςασιαζουσιν Αρετας τε ο Πετραιος βασιλευς και Ηρωδης, δια τοιαυτην αιτιαν. Ηρωδης ο Τετραρχης γαμει την Αρετα θυγατερα, και συνην χρονον ηδη πολυν· ςελλομενος δ' επι Ρωμης καταγεται εν Ηρωδου αδελφου οντος ουχ ομομητριου· εκ γαρ της Σιμωνος του αρχιερεως θυγατρος Ηρωδης εγεγονει· ιλασθεις δε Ηρωδιαδος της τουτου γυναικος, θυγατηρ δε ην Αριςοβολου, και ουτος αδελφος αυτει, Αγριππου δε αδελφη του μεγαλου, τολμα λογων απτεσθαι περι γαμων· και δεξαμενης, συνθηκαι γινονται μετοικισασθαι προς αυτον, οποτε απο Ρωμης παραγενοιτο· ην δε εν ταις συνθηκαις, ωςε και του Αρετα την θυγατερα εκβαλειν. Antiq. 18. c. 6. § 1.

[c] Ηρωδιας δε αυτων η αδελφη γημεται Ηρωδη Ηρωδου του μεγαλου παιδι, ος γεγονεν εκ Μαριαμμες της του Σιμωνος του αρχιερεως, και αυτοις Σαλωμη γινεται, μεθ' ης τας γονας Ηρωδιας, επι συγχυσει φρονησασα των πατριων, Ηρωδη γαμειται του ανδρος τω ομοπατριω αδελφω, διαςασα ζωντος. την δε Γαλιλαιων τετραρχιαν ειχεν ουτος. ibid. § 4.

have thought of requiting it with ſo large a preſent as half his kingdom.

However, the daughter of the ſaid Herodias, having received from Herod a ſolemn promiſe, confirmed by an oath, that he would give her *whatſoever ſhe ſhould aſk of him*, and ſhe having withdrawn and adviſed with her mother, Mark vi. 25, 27, 28. *came with haſte unto the king, and aſked, ſaying, I will that thou give me by and by in a charger the head of John the Baptiſt. —And immediately the king ſent an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the priſon. And brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damſel, and the damſel gave it to her mother.*

At the time of this event, it was common for princes to require the heads of eminent perſons, whom they ordered for execution, to be brought to them, eſpecially where there was any particular reſentment.

We have an inſtance in Joſephus, which follows the ſtory of this marriage. Aretas was extremely provoked at the treatment of his daughter, and at length a war broke out betwixt him and Herod. A battle was fought, and Herod's troops were defeated. 'Herod ſent an account of this to Ti-'berius; and he reſenting the attempt of Aretas, wrote to 'Vitellius to declare war againſt him, with orders, that if he 'were taken priſoner he ſhould be brought to him in chains, 'and that if he were ſlain, his head ſhould be ſent to 'him[d].'

Agrippina, then wife of Claudius, and mother of Nero, who was afterwards emperor, ſent an officer to put to death Lollia Paulina, who had been her rival for the imperial dignity. And Dio Caſſius ſays, that when Lollia's head was brought to her, not knowing it at firſt, ſhe examined it with her own hands, till ſhe perceived ſome particular feature, by which that lady was diſtinguiſhed[e]. I have put down this inſtance, becauſe it ſeems to give us the reaſon of this practice among great people, namely, that they might be certain their orders had been executed.

Joſephus has repreſented Herodias as a woman full of ambition and envy, as having a mighty influence on Herod, and

[d] Ant. lib. 19. cap. 6. §. 1.

[e] Και τηνγε Παυλιναν την Λολλιαν, επειδαν ελπιδα τινα ες την τε Κλαυδιε συνοικησιν εσχηκεν, απεκλεινε. την τε κεφαλην αυτης κομισθεισαν αυτη, μη γνωρισασα, το, τε σωμα αυτης αυτοχειρια ηνεωξε, και τας οδοντας εσκεψαλο, ιδιως πως εχουσας. Dio. lib. 60. p. 686. E. Hanov. 1606. Iiſdem conſulibus atrox odii Agrippina ac Lollie infenſa, quod ſecum de matrimonio principis certaviſſet.—In Lolliam mittitur tribunus a quo ad mortem adigeretur. Tacit. Ann. xii. c. 22.

able

able to persuade him to things he was not of himself at all inclined to. It is on occasion of the emperor Caligula's advancing her own brother to the government of the countries that had belonged to their uncle Philip; and that not with the old title of tetrarch, which he had, but with the more honourable character of king [f]. Upon this, 'Herodias, 'sister of Agrippa, wife of Herod tetrarch of Galilee and Pe'ræa, envied her brother's power, when she saw him in a 'more honourable station than her husband [g].' The historian proceeds to relate, that she persuaded her husband to go into Italy, that he might obtain the same title. He was averse at first: however at length she prevailed upon him to undertake the journey. But the emperor was so far from granting his petition, that upon some informations he received concerning him, he took away from him the tetrarchy of Galilee, and gave it to Agrippa, the brother of Herodias, who had been the object of her envy; and moreover banished Herod to Lyons in Gaul, whither this wife of his also followed him. Josephus concludes his account with this reflection: 'This punishment did God inflict on Herodias for envying 'her brother, and on Herod for following the vain counsels 'of a woman [h].'

I have set down thus much of their story here, because it may serve to give us a clear idea how things passed between Herod the tetrarch and Herodias; and may satisfy us, the evangelists have not been mistaken in representing her as the first mover in the barbarous usage, which John the Baptist met with (D).

§ V. I have now said what is sufficient concerning Herod and Philip, two of the princes in whose time St. Luke says, John the Baptist commenced his ministry. All the rest will be more properly considered in some other places, except Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene; of whom there is no [hh] distinct account in any of the ancient writers, which we now have in

[f] Ant. xxviii. cap. vii. § 10. fin.

[g] Ηρωδιας δ' η αδελφη τȣ Αγριππȣ, συνοικȣσα Ηρωδη, τετραρχης δε ȣτος ην Γαλιλαιας και Περαιας, φθονῳ ταδελφȣ την ιξȣσιαν [illegible], ορωσα εν πολυ μειζονι αξιωσιαν γενομενον ανδρος τȣ αυτης. ibid. cap. 8. § 1.

[h] Ηρωδιαδι μεν δη φθονȣ τȣ προς τον αδελφον, και Ηρωδη γυναικειων ακροασαμενȣ [illegible], δικην ταυτην επιτιμησεν ο Θεος. ibid. § 2.

(D) *Note*, There is now in Josephus's works a paragraph [Ant. lib. 18. cap. 6. § 2.] in which the death of John Baptist by Herod is related, though Herodias is not mentioned as the cause of it. But some learned men suspecting the genuineness of this paragraph, I have no right to make use of it here, where I intend to produce nothing but what is unquestionably genuine. And, I think, we have no need of it.

[hh] Vid. Casaub. Exercit. in Bar. xii. 3. & Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. Hist. Ec. L. 1. c. 10.

our hands. But if the reader will be pleaſed to obſerve ſome paſſages, which will be produced immediately concerning the two Agrippas, he will be convinced there muſt have been about this time ſome prince of this name, who was tetrarch of Abilene.

§ VI. We may now proceed to another of Herod's family, of whom St. Luke has given us a very remarkable hiſtory.

Now about that time, HEROD *the king ſtretched forth his hands, to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the ſword. And becauſe he ſaw it pleaſed the Jews, he proceeded farther to take Peter alſo. Then were the days of unleavened bread.* Acts xii. 1—3.

St. Luke calls this perſon Herod, by the family name; Joſephus calls him Agrippa. He was grandſon of Herod the great. His father was Ariſtobulus, Herod's ſon by Mariamne, grandaughter of Hyrcanus: and is the ſame perſon who has been already mentioned as brother of Herodias. St. Luke gives him the title of king, and relates ſeveral acts of ſovereign authority done by him. He does not ſay expreſly, that they were done by him at Jeruſalem: but there are divers particulars in the relation, which plainly determine *that* to be the ſcene of action. For St. Luke obſerves, that when he took Peter, *then were the days of unleavened bread*; *and* that *he intended, after* EASTER *to bring him forth to the* PEOPLE. And that when Peter was out of priſon, *and was come to himſelf, he ſaid,* ver. 11. *Now I know of a ſurety, that the Lord—has delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and from all the expectation of the* PEOPLE OF THE JEWS. And when he had *commanded the keepers to be put to death,* ver. 19. *he went down from Judea to Cæſarea and there abode.* A paſſage or two from Joſephus will confirm the repreſentation St. Luke gives of Herod's being king, and that of Judea.

It was by ſeveral ſteps that he was advanced to this dignity. His firſt preferment was from Caligula, A. D. 37. 'And 'ſending for him to his palace, he [Caligula] put a crown 'upon his head, and appointed him king of the tetrarchy 'of Philip, intending alſo to give him the tetrarchy of Ly-'ſanias[1].'

His next preferment was the addition made by the ſame emperor, of the tetrarchy of Galilee[k], which has been mentioned already. The laſt was what follows: 'Claudius[l] 'by

1 Ant. xviii. c. vii. § 10. fin. k Vid. Joſeph. p. 820. v. 20. p. 1067. v. 20.

l Κλαυδίῳ δε—διαγραμμα προηλθεν, τη τε αρχην Αγριππα βεβαιων, τι ο Γαιος

'by a decree confirmed to Agrippa the dominion, which 'Caius [Caligula] had given him; adding alſo Judea, and 'Samaria, in the utmoſt extent as poſſeſſed by his grandfather 'Herod. This he reſtored, as due to him by right of con-'ſanguinity; and moreover, added of his own Abila, which 'had been Lyſanias's, together with the country in mount 'Libanus.'

Joſephus therefore confirms the repreſentation, which St. Luke has given of Herod's ſovereign power in Judea. This is worthy of our particular notice, becauſe his three years reign in Judea, the laſt of his life, was the only time, in which Judea properly ſo called was not a Roman province, from the baniſhment of Archelaus in the ſixth or ſeventh year of the Chriſtian æra, to the year 66, when they revolted from the Romans.

St. Luke ſays, that having *killed James the brother of John with the ſword*; BECAUSE HE SAW IT PLEASED THE JEWS, *he proceeded farther, to take Peter alſo.* That it is very likely he ſhould be moved by ſuch a conſideration as this, is evident from the character which Joſephus has given of him. Herod the great, his grandfather, he ſays, was continually obliging foreign ſtates and cities by large bounties, but did very few things to gratify the Jews. Whereas, 'Agrippa was of a 'mild and gentle diſpoſition, and good to all men; he was 'beneficent to ſtrangers, but eſpecially kind to the Jews his 'countrymen, and ſympathized with them in all their troubles. 'For which reaſon alſo he lived much at Jeruſalem, obſerved 'the Jewiſh inſtitutions, practiſed the purity they require, 'and did not let a day paſs without worſhipping God accord-'ing to the law [m].' This his zeal for the inſtitutions and cuſtoms of the Jews, and his deſire to oblige that people, very much confirm the account St. Luke gives of his forwardneſs in perſecuting the diſciples of Jeſus.

What St. Luke adds concerning this perſon is a very extraordinary relation, and Joſephus concurs with him in it. *And*

εχησεν, και δ' εξωνιων αυτων τον βασιλικον προσηκειν δε αυτω ποιεισθαι πασαν την των Ηρωδου βασιλευθεισαν, ος ην παππος αυτω, Ιουδαιαν και Σαμαρειαν. και ταυτα μεν ως οφειλομενα τη οικειοτητι του γενους απεδωκε· Λεπιλαν δε την Δυσανιου, και οποσα εν τω Λιβανω ορει, εκ των αυτου προσεθηκεν. Ant. 19. c. 5. § 1. vid. & de B. lib. 2 cap. 10.

προς παντας το ευεργετικον ομοιον· τοις αλλοεθνεσιν ην φιλανθρωπος, κακεινοις ενδεικνυμενος το φιλοδωρον, τοις ομοφυλοις αναλογως χρης, και συμπαθης μαλλον. ηδεια γαρ αυτω διαιτα, και συνεχης εν τοις Ιεροσολυμοις ην, και τα παλαια καθαρως ειδως. δια πασης γαρ αυτον ηγεν αγνειας, ουδε ημερα τις παρωδευεν αυτω της νομιμης χρεουσα θυσιας. Antiq. lib. 19. cap. 7. § 3.

(m) Ηγαπα δε ο τροπος Αγριππας, και

he went down from Judea to Cæſarea, and there abode—And upon a ſet day, Herod arrayed in royal apparel, ſat upon his throne, and made an oration to them. And the people gave a ſhout, ſaying, It is the voice of a god and not of a man. And immediately the angel of the Lord ſmote him, becauſe he gave not God the glory; and he was eaten of worms and gave up the ghoſt. Acts xii. 19, 21—23.

Joſephus's words are theſe: 'Having now reigned three 'whole years over all Judea, he went to the city Cæſarea for- 'merly called Straton's tower. Here (E) he celebrated 'ſhows in honour of Cæſar, a feſtival having been appointed 'to be obſerved there at this time for his ſafety. On this 'occaſion there was a vaſt reſort of perſons of rank and diſ- 'tinction from all parts of the country. On the ſecond day 'of the ſhows early in the morning he came into the theatre, 'dreſſed in a robe of ſilver, of moſt curious workmanſhip. 'The rays of the riſing ſun, reflected from ſo ſplendid a 'garb, gave him a majeſtic and awful appearance. In a 'ſhort time they began in ſeveral parts of the theatre flat- 'tering acclamations, which proved pernicious to him. They 'called him a god, and entreated him to be propitious to them, 'ſaying, *Hitherto we have reſpected you as a man; but now we 'acknowledge you to be more than mortal.* The king neither 'reproved theſe perſons, nor rejected the impious flattery. 'Soon after this, caſting his eyes upward, he ſaw an owl ſit- 'ting upon a certain cord over his head. He perceived it 'to be a meſſenger of evil to him, as it had been before of 'his proſperity, and was ſtruck with the deepeſt concern. 'Immediately after this, he was ſeized with pains in his 'bowels extremely violent at the very firſt. Then turning 'himſelf toward his friends, he ſpoke to them in this man- 'ner: I, *your god, am required to leave this world; fate in- 'ſtantly confuting theſe falſe applauſes juſt beſtowed upon me: 'I, who have been called immortal, am hurried away to death. 'But God's appointment muſt be ſubmitted to. Nor has our 'condition in this world been deſpicable; we have lived in the 'ſtate which is accounted happy.* While he was ſpeaking 'theſe words, he was oppreſſed with the increaſe of his pains. 'He was carried therefore with all haſte to his palace. Theſe 'pains in his bowels continually tormenting him, he expired

(E) A. D. 44.

'in

in five days time, in the fifty-fourth year of his age (*), and of his reign the ſeventh (F).'

It is needleſs to make many reflections here. The reader's thoughts cannot but carry him to many points of agreement in theſe two relations. They agree, that this event happened at Cæſarea: St. Luke ſays, it was upon a ſet day; Joſephus, that it was upon the ſecond day of the ſhows celebrated in honour of the emperor. The magnificence of Herod's dreſs is hinted by St. Luke, and particularly deſcribed by Joſephus. The flattery is exactly the ſame in both. But in two things, above all others, is the harmony of theſe accounts obſervable. Firſt, the temper of mind with which Herod received this flattery. St. Luke ſays, *he gave not God the glory*; Joſephus, 'he neither reproved theſe perſons, nor rejected the impious 'flattery:' words that deſerve particular notice in Joſephus, becauſe he has at times repreſented this Herod Agrippa as an extraordinary perſon, and free from the vices of his grandfather Herod; and indeed has endeavoured to raiſe his character for lenity and goodneſs, beyond what is conſiſtent with ſome other accounts. For Dio Caſſius ſays, Agrippa was reckoned one of Caligula's adviſers in his cruel and tyrannical meaſures [n].

Another thing, in which this harmony is very conſiderable, is, that according to St. Luke, *immediately the angel of the*

(*) Τριτον δε ετος αυτω βασιλευοντι της ολης Ιουδαιας επληρωτο, και παρην εις πολιν Καισαρειαν, η προτερον Στρατωνος πυργος ωνομαστο· συντελει δε ενταυθα θεωριας εις την Καισαρος τιμην, υπερ της εκεινου σωτηριας εκεινη τινα ταυτην επιτελουμενος. και παρ' αυτου καθιστατο τω καθα την επαρχιαν εν τελει και προεδρευσοντων εις αξιαν πληθος. δευτερα δε των θεωριων ημερα στολην ενδυσαμενος εξ αργυρου πεποιημενην παση, ως θαυμασιον εξην ειναι, παρηλθεν εις το θεατρον αρχομενης ημερας· ενθα ταις πρωιαις των ηλιακων ακτινων επιβολαις ο αργυρος καταυγασθεις θαυμασιως απεστιλβε, φοβερα μαρμαιρων τι φοβερον και τοις εις αυτον ατενιζουσι φρικωδες. ευθυς δε οι κολακες, τας, ουδε εκεινω προς αγαθου, αλλως αλλοθεν φωνας ανεβοων, Θεον προσαγορευοντες, ευμενης τε ειης, επιλεγοντες, ει και μεχρι νυν ως ανθρωπον εφοβηθημεν, αλλα τοσουτου κρειττονα σε θνητης φυσεως ομολογουμεν. ου επεπληξε τουτοις ο βασιλευς, ουδε τον κολακευτικον απεδυσατο· αναβλεψας δ' ου μετ' ολιγον τον βουβωνα της κεφαλης υπερκαθεζομενον ειδεν επι σχοινου τινος· αγγελον τε τουτον ευθυς ενοησεν αυτου ειναι, τον και ποτε των αγαθων γενομενον, και δικαιως εσχεν οδυνην· αθρουν δε κατα της κοιλιας προσεφυσεν αλγημα, μετα σφοδροτητος αρξαμενον. αναθεωρων δε προς τους φιλους, ο Θεος υμιν εγω, φησιν, ηδη καλουμενον επιτεμνομαι τον βιον, παραχρημα της ειμαρμενης τας αρτι μεν καλουσας φωνας ελεγχουσης. και ο κληθεις αθανατος υφ' υμων, ηδη θνητος απαγομαι· δεκτεον δε την προτεινομενην, η Θεος βεβουληται· και γαρ βεβιωκαμεν ενδαιμων φαυλως, αλλ' επι της μακαριζομενης λαμπροτητος. ταυτα λεγων επιτασει της οδυνης καταπονουμενος· μετα σπουδης δε εις το βασιλειον εκομισθη—— συνεχως δε εφ' ημερας πεντε τω της γαστρος αλγηματι διεργασθεις τον βιον καταστρεψεν, απο γενεσεως αγων πεντηκοστον ετος και τελαιον, της βασιλειας δε εβδομον. Antiq. lib. 19. c. 8. § 2.

(F) *Note*; The ſeventh year of his reign is computed from the time of his firſt advancement, by Caligula, to the tetrarchy of his uncle Philip: A. D. 37.

n Ου μεντοι ταυθ' ουτως αυτω εκυρωθη, ως το προσδοκαν επι πλειον την τε ομοτητα την τε Γαιου και την ασελγειαν αυξησειν· και μαλιστ' οτι ηπυνθανοντο τον τε Αγριππαν αυτω και τον Αντιοχον, τους βασιλεας, ωσπερ τινας τυραννοδιδασκαλους, συνειναι. Dio. lib. 59. p. 658.

Lord ſmote him: and Joſephus aſſures us, that theſe pains ſeized him in the theatre, before all the aſſembly, and that he apprehended a fatal neceſſity of ſpeedily leaving this world. And when Joſephus ſays, 'theſe flattering acclamations proved 'pernicious to Agrippa,' he plainly intimates, that his death was ſuppoſed to be a puniſhment for the approbation with which he received them.

Though St. Luke only had related this event, and there had been no account of it extant in Joſephus, or any other ancient writer, yet I ſhould not have doubted the truth of it. St. Luke would not otherwiſe have dared to relate an affair ſo diſadvantageous, as this is in many reſpects, to ſo conſiderable a perſon as Herod; who was very acceptable to the Jewiſh people, and had received many honours and civilities from two ſucceſſive Roman emperors, Caligula and Claudius. Nor would any man of tolerable capacity, much leſs ſo ſenſible a perſon as St. Luke appears to be by his writings, have expoſed his credit, by placing ſuch an event in ſo public and noted a place as Cæſarea, the perſon concerned being ſeated on a throne, ſurrounded by attendance ſuitable to the occaſion of a particular ſolemnity, if he had not been ſure of the fact. And yet it may be ſaid to receive a farther confirmation from Joſephus, who, we may be aſſured, out of regard to his own credit, and his favourable inclination to Agrippa, would never invent ſuch a ſtory as this.

As for the owl which Joſephus ſpeaks of, and which is now ſaid to be a 'Meſſenger of evil to Agrippa,' as 'it had been 'before of his proſperity;' it has reference to an account he has given of the perching of ſuch a bird upon a tree near this ſame Agrippa, when he was put into chains by order of Tiberius; and to a prognoſtication, which a German aſtrologer is ſaid to have delivered at that time concerning him[o]. Whether ſuch a bird did now appear in the theatre or not, I will not determine, nor do I think it material. Joſephus does now and then throw a circumſtance or two into his relations that give them an heatheniſh air; with a deſign, it is probable, of rendering his hiſtory more agreeable to the Greeks and Romans, for whom it was principally intended. But it is evident, from his account, that Herod was ſeized with a very uncommon diſorder, and that he had the moſt lively apprehenſions of his approaching death.

[o] Joſ. Antiq. l. 18. cap. vii. §7.

St

St. Luke ſays, *Herod was eaten of worms.* This is not mentioned by Joſephus. And this has been ſuppoſed by ſome to be a conſiderable objection againſt St. Luke's account; but in my opinion without any good reaſon. For the diſtemper, of which Herod Agrippa died, was, according to Joſephus's own deſcription of it, very like to that of Herod his grandfather; who, beſide other diſorders, was afflicted with violent pains in his bowels, and an ulcer which bred worms[p]. And it is not at all unlikely that Agrippa's caſe was, in this laſt reſpect alſo, very much the ſame with that of Herod the great. I ſhould think, that moſt perſons muſt be aſhamed to repreſent the omiſſion of this particular in Joſephus, as an objection of any moment. The diſtempers of great men are ſeldom particularly deſcribed. A certain delicacy often reſtrains men from making mention of ſuch matters, and eſpecially are hiſtorians ſhy of relating them concerning thoſe princes, in whoſe honour they are intereſted. Upon the whole, I believe this paſſage of Joſephus will be allowed to be a very remarkable atteſtation of this extraordinary event related by St. Luke.

It will be of uſe to put down here from Joſephus the names of Herod Agrippa's children. 'Thus died king Agrippa, 'leaving behind him one ſon named Agrippa, then ſeventeen 'years of age, and three daughters; Bernice, who was mar-'ried to Herod her father's brother, being ſixteen years of 'age, Mariamne, and Druſilla, who were unmarried. The 'former was ten years old, and Druſilla ſix.—Druſilla was 'contracted to Epiphanes, ſon of Antiochus king of Com-'magene[q].'

§ VII. From the xxiiid and two following chapters of the Acts of the apoſtles, we learn that Felix was governor in Judea, and that Porcius Feſtus ſucceeded him; the truth of which is particularly atteſted by Joſephus[r], in divers parts of his hiſtory.

§ VIII. Concerning Felix, St. Luke has mentioned divers things, beſide his being governor, that will deſerve our conſideration. Whilſt St. Paul was at Cæſarea, St. Luke ſays: *and after certain days, when Felix came with his wife Druſilla, which was a Jeweſs, he ſent for Paul, and heard him concerning the faith in Chriſt.* Acts xxiv. 24. This Druſilla is the youngeſt daughter of Herod Agrippa, as was ſhewn juſt now. We have this account in Joſephus, of her marriage with Felix.

[p] Ant. lib. xvii. cap. vi. § 5. [q] Ibid. lib. xix. c. 9. in. [r] Ibid. xx. cap. vii. viii. De B. J. lib. 2. c. 12. § 8. c. 13, 14.

'Agrippa

'Agrippa having received this present from Cæsar, [viz. 'Claudius,] gave his sister Drusilla in marriage (G) to Azizus, 'king of the Emesenes, when he had consented to be cir-'cumcised [s]. For Epiphanes, the son of king Antiochus, 'had broke the contract with her, by refusing to embrace the 'Jewish customs, although he had promised her father he 'would.—But this marriage of Drusilla with Azizus was dis-'solved, in a short time, after this manner. When Felix was 'procurator of Judea, having had a sight of her, he was 'mightily taken with her; and indeed she was the most 'beautiful of her sex. He therefore sent to her Simon, a 'Jew of Cyprus, who was one of his friends, and pretended 'to magic; by whom he persuaded her to leave her husband, 'and marry him; promising to make her perfectly happy, if 'she did not disdain him. It was far from being a sufficient 'reason; but to avoid the envy of her sister Bernice, who was 'continually doing her ill offices, because of her beauty, she 'was induced to transgress the laws of her country and marry 'Felix.'

It has been thought indeed by some, that Tacitus gives a different account of this Drusilla, when he says, that Felix had for his wife Drusilla, grandaughter of Cleopatra and Antony [t]. But I don't know that I am obliged to take notice of this, since Josephus agrees with St. Luke, *that she was a Jewess.* And he may be justly supposed to be as well acquainted with Drusilla's original as Tacitus. I shall only observe, that Suetonius says, that Felix married three queens [u], or three women of royal families. It is certain that Drusilla, a Jewess, sister of Agrippa the younger, was one of them. And if Tacitus was not mistaken, another of them was descended from Cleopatra the queen of Egypt, and Antony, and was called

(G) This was done A. D. 52, or 53.

[s] Λαβων δε την δωρεαν παρα τȣ Καισαρος Αγριππας, εκδιδωσι προς γαμον Αζιζῳ τῳ Εμεσων βασιλει, περιτεμνεσθαι θελησαντι, Δρȣσιλλαν την αδελφην. Επιφανης γαρ ο Αντιοχȣ τȣ βασιλεως παις παρητησατο τον γαμον, μη βȣληθεις εις τα Ιȣδαιων εθη μεταβαλειν, καιπερ τȣτο ποιησειν προυποσχομενος αυτης τῳ πατρι——Διαλυονται δε τῃ Δρȣσιλλῃ προς τον Αζιζον οι γαμοι, μετ' ȣ πολυν χρονον, τοιαυτης εμπεσȣσης αιτιας. καθ' ον καιρον της Ιȣδαιας επετροπευσε Φηλιξ, θεασαμενος ταυτην, και γαρ ην καλλει πασων διαφερωσα, λαμβανει της γυναικος επιθυμιαν, και Σιμωνα ονοματι, των εαυτȣ φιλων, Ιȣδαιον, Κυπριον δε γενος, μαγον ειναι σκηπτομενον, πεμπων προς αυτην, επειθε τον ανδρα καταλιπȣσαν αυτῳ γημασθαι, μακαριαν ποιησειν επαγγελλομενος, μη υπερφανησασαν αυτον. η δε κακως πρατιȣσα, και φυγειν τον εκ της αδελφης Βερνικης βȣλομενη φθονον, δια γαρ το καλλος παρ' εκεινης εν ȣκ ολιγοις εβλαπτετο, παραβαναι τατε πατρια νομιμα πειθεται, και τῳ Φηλικι γημασθαι. Antiq. lib. 20. c. 6. § 1, 2.

[t] —— Drusilla Cleopatræ & Antonii nepte in matrimonium accepta: ut ejusdem Antonii, Felix progener, Claudius nepos esset. Hist. lib. v. cap. 9.

[u] Felicem, quem—provinciæque Judææ præposuit, trium reginarum maritum. Suet. Claud. c. 28.

Drusilla.

Druſilla (H). Who the third was, doth not appear that I know of.

Tacitus ſays, that whilſt Felix was procurator of Judea, 'he 'acted in a very arbitrary manner, and ſcrupled no kind of 'injuſtice [x].' Joſephus has recorded one inſtance of abominable villainy he was guilty of. 'Jonathan the high prieſt often 'admoniſhed Felix to correct his adminiſtration; for that 'otherwiſe he himſelf was in danger of the ill-will of the 'people, ſince he had deſired the emperor to make him pro-'curator of Judea.' But he not being able to bear theſe frequent remonſtrances, 'by a large ſum of money corrupted 'an intimate friend of Jonathan's, who got him to be aſ-'ſaſſinated [y].' His government was ſo irregular, that the Jews followed him with complaints to Rome after he had left the province: and it was owing to a very powerful intereſt made for him at court, that he eſcaped the reſentment of Nero.

All theſe above-mentioned particulars from Joſephus and Tacitus, may ſatisfy us, that when Acts xxiv. 25. *Paul reaſoned of righteouſneſs, temperance,* [or chaſtity] *and judgment to come,* his ſubjects were well choſen with reſpect to both his hearers; and that what St. Luke adds concerning Felix, that he, ver. 26. *hoped that money ſhould have been given him of Paul* [z], *that he might looſe him,* is no calumny.

Some, indeed, may think it ſtrange, that Felix ſhould have had any hopes of receiving money from this priſoner, when it does not appear he had any eſtate; and he has intimated, that he was at times obliged to *labour, working with his hands* for a ſubſiſtence. 1 Cor. iv. 12. Acts xx. 34. But in anſwer to this, it has been obſerved by expoſitors, that Paul had told Felix, that *after many years* he *came to bring alms to his nation and offerings.* Acts xxiv. 17. It is likely, therefore, that Felix imagined that the money had not been all diſtributed as yet,

(H) She is ſuppoſed by ſome learned men to be the daughter of Juba, king of Mauritania, by Cleopatra, daughter of M. Antony and Cleopatra; and to have died before Felix came into Judea. vid. Joſeph. p. 811. not. 6. & notas in Sueton. Claud. c. 28.

[x] E quibus Antonius Felix, per omnem ſæviti am ac libidinem, jus regium ſervili ingenio exercuit. Tacit. Hiſt. lib. v. c. 9. At non frater ejus cognomento Felix pari moderatione agebat, jam pridem Judææ impoſitus, & cuncta malefacta ſibi impunè ratus, tanta potentia ſubnixo. Ann. lib. xii. c. 54.

[y] Εχων δε απεχθως προς τον αρχιερεα τον Ιωναθην ο Φηλιξ, δια το πολλακις υπ' αυτε νεθελειτθαι, περι τε κρειτονως προιτατθαι των κατα την Ιεδαιαν πραγματων, μη και μειψιν αυτος οφλοιη παρα τοις πληθεσιν, αιτησαμενος εκεινον παρα τε Καισαρος πεμφθηναι της Ιεδαιας επιτροπον, —— και δη δια τοιαυτης αιτιας ο Φηλιξ τον πιτολαιον των Ιωναθε φιλων, —— πειθει, πολλα χρηματα δωτει ιπισχνεμενος· κ. τ. λ. Ant. 20. c. 7. § 5.

[z] Scelus eſt accipere ab reo: quanto magis ab accuſatore? quanto etiam ſceleratius ab utroque? Cicer. in Verr. lib. ii. n. 78.

ſince

ſince Paul was apprehended within a few days after his coming to Jeruſalem: ch. xxi. 27. xxiv. 11. or, at leaſt, concluded he muſt needs be a perſon of ſome conſequence, and have good friends.

§ IX. St. Luke ſays, Acts xxv. 13. *And after certain days, king* AGRIPPA *and Bernice came to Cæſarea to ſalute Feſtus.* This Agrippa is the ſon of Herod Agrippa above-mentioned. St. Luke calls him king, as Joſephus alſo does very often[a]. But St. Luke does not ſuppoſe him to be king of Judea: for all the judicial proceedings in that country, relating to Paul, are tranſacted before Felix, and this Feſtus his ſucceſſor. Beſides, he ſays here, that *Agrippa came to Cæſarea to ſalute Feſtus*; that is, to pay his reſpects to him, and compliment him upon his arrival in the province. See Acts xxv. 1.

When his father was dead, Claudius intended at firſt to have put him immediately in poſſeſſion of his father's dominions; but Agrippa being then but ſeventeen years of age, the emperor was perſuaded to alter his mind, 'and appointed Cuſpius 'Fadus prefect of Judea, and the whole kingdom[b].' Which Fadus was ſucceeded by Tiberius Alexander, Cumanus, Felix, Feſtus[c]; though theſe did not poſſeſs the province in the ſame extent that Fadus did.

Agrippa therefore was diſappointed of his father's kingdom; but he had by this time got conſiderable territories.

'Herod, brother of king Agrippa the great, died in the 'eighth year of the reign of Claudius Cæſar.—Claudius then 'gave his government to Agrippa the younger[d].' This is our Agrippa we are now ſpeaking of.

'The twelfth year of his reign being completed, he [Clau-'dius] gave Agrippa the tetrarchy of Philip, and Batanea, 'adding alſo Trachonitis with Abila. This had been the te-'trarchy of Lyſanias. But he took away from him Chalcis, 'after he had governed it four years[e].' This from his Antiquities. In the War of the Jews, Joſephus expreſſeth it thus: 'After this, he ſent Felix the brother of Pallas to be Procu-'rator of Judea, Galilee, Samaria, and Peræa; and pro-'moted Agrippa from Chalcis to a greater kingdom, giving 'to him the tetrarchy which had been Philip's. (This is Ba-'tanea and Trachonitis, and Gaulanitis.) And he added 'moreover the kingdom of Lyſanias, and the province that 'had been Varus's[f].'

[a] Ant. xx. l. viii. § 6. & paſſim. [b] Ant. xix. c. ix. fin. [c] Ant. xx. de Bell. lib. ii.
[d] Joſ. Ant. xx. p. 887. in. [e] Ibid. p. 890. v. 25, &c. [f] De B. lib. ii. c. xii. fin.

'Nero

'Nero in the firſt year of his reign, gave Agrippa a certain 'part of Galilee, ordering Tiberias and Taricheas to be ſub-'ject to him. He gave him alſo Julias a city of Peræa, and 'fourteen towns in the neighbourhood of it[g].' St. Luke therefore is in the right in giving Agrippa the title of king at this time.

The reader has, doubtleſs, obſerved, that when Paul was before Agrippa, he addreſſed himſelf to him as a Jew. Acts xxvi. 2, 3. *I think myſelf happy, king Agrippa, becauſe I ſhall anſwer for myſelf this day before thee.—Eſpecially becauſe I know thee to be expert in all cuſtoms and queſtions which are among the Jews.* Ver. 27. *King Agrippa, believeſt thou the prophets? I know that thou believeſt.*

From what hath been alleged, relating to Herod Agrippa, it is plain he was a zealous Jew, or at leaſt appeared ſo at Jeruſalem, and had educated all his children in the Jewiſh religion. This Agrippa, his ſon, undoubtedly maintained the ſame profeſſion; and now he had, by the permiſſion of the emperor, the direction of the ſacred treaſury, the government of the temple, and the right of nominating the high prieſts (1). No wonder, therefore, that St. Paul told Agrippa, *he knew* him *to be expert in all cuſtoms and queſtions which were among the Jews.*

§ X. *Bernice* was a lady well known in thoſe times. There are ſeveral reflections made upon her conduct by Joſephus[h], as well as other writers[i]. But as St. Luke ſays nothing of her, beſide her making a viſit to Feſtus with Agrippa; and it has been ſhewn already who ſhe was, namely, the daughter of

[g] Ant. xx. c. vii. § 4.

(1) Joſephus indeed ſays, Antiq. l. xx. c. 1. § 3. that Herod [King of Chalcis, brother of Agrippa the great,] did, upon the death of his brother, requeſt of Claudius Cæſar the power of the temple and of the ſacred money, and the right of nominating the high prieſt, and that he obtained all theſe privileges: and that from him this power continued to all his deſcendants, till the end of the war. Ητησε δε και Ηρωδης, ο αδελφος μεν Αγριππα του τελευτηκοτος, Χαλκιδος δε την αρχην κατα του χρονου εκεινου παραλαβων, Κλαυδιον Καισαρα την εξουσιαν του νεω, και των ιερων χρηματων, και της των αρχιερεων χειροτονιας, παντων τε επετυχεν· εξ εκεινου τε παντες τους απογονους αυτου παρεμεινεν η εξουσια μεχρι της του πολεμου τελευτης. But either there is ſome error here in the copies of Joſephus, or elſe we do not underſtand him right. For none of the ſons of Herod of Chalcis did nominate any high prieſts. But according to Joſephus's own account, all the changes in the prieſthood, after the death of the ſaid Herod, [which happened in the 8th of Claudius] to the time of the war, were made by Agrippa the younger, nephew of this Herod king of Chalcis. See Ant. xx. c. vii. § 11. c. viii. §. 1. And when the people of Jeruſalem had a mind to apply the ſacred money to any particular purpoſe, they addreſſed to Agrippa; and he gave the directions. ibid. § 7. And Joſephus ſays expreſly, that the king [Agrippa] had been entruſted with the care or government of the temple, by Claudius Cæſar. Ο βασιλευς δε, επεπιστευτο γαρ υπο Κλαυδιου Καισαρος την επιμελειαν του ιερου. κ. λ. ibid.

[h] Ant. lib. xx. c. vi. § 3. [i] Tacit. Hiſt. l. ii. c. 2. & 81. Juv. Sat. 6. v. 155.

Herod

Herod Agrippa, and the sister of Agrippa the younger, I am not bound to add any thing farther concerning her. I shall only say, the respect which Titus Vespasian shewed her, gave occasion for much discourse; and that she had once hopes of being empress, but the murmurs of the people of Rome prevented it [k].

§ XI. There are but two things more I shall take notice of in this chapter. They may be judged by some, too minute to be insisted on; but they appear to me instances of great exactness and propriety, and to afford a strong proof, that St. Luke was perfectly well acquainted with the matters of which he wrote.

Paul and Barnabas, having preached the word of God at Salamis [in Cyprus] went through *the isle to Paphos, where they found Barjesus, which was with the* DEPUTY *of the country, Sergius Paulus*; Acts xiii. 7. But in the Greek it is, with the PROCONSUL Sergius Paulus [l].

It is well known to the learned, that upon Augustus's becoming absolute master of the Roman commonwealth, there was a division made of the provinces of the empire [m]: the most powerful, or at least, those which required the greatest number of troops, the emperor kept to himself, the rest were made over to the people and senate. The officers sent by the emperor were called lieutenants, or proprætors, though they were consular persons; that is, though they had served the consulship in the city [n]. The governors sent by the senate, into the provinces that belonged to their share, he appointed to be called proconsuls, a name more suitable to the peaceful state, which the provinces allotted to the senate were in. But the division made at this time (K) underwent many changes. And a province, assigned at first to the senate, was afterwards made over to the emperor, and on the contrary. Such a change happened with reference to this province of Cyprus; which in the first partition, was one of the emperor's provinces, but

k Βερενικη δε ισχυρως τε ηνθει, και δια τȣτο και ες την Ρωμην μετα τȣ αδελφȣ τȣ Αγριππα ηλθε——η δε εν τῳ παλατιῳ ωκεσε, και τῳ Τιτῳ συνεγιγνετο. προσεδοκατο δε γαμηθησεσθαι αυτῳ, και παντα ηδη ως και γυνη αυτȣ ȣσα εποιει· ως' εκεινον δυσχεραινοντας τȣς Ρωμαιȣς επι τȣτοις ησθημενον, αποπεμψασθαι αυτην. Dio ex Xiphil. lib. 66. p. 752. Nec minus Libido, [*suspecta in eo erat*]—propterque insignem reginæ Berenices amorem, cui etiam nuptias pollicitus ferebatur,—præcipueque sumtam sibi Berenicem statim ab urbe dimisit invitus invitam. Suet. in Tit. c. 7.

l Ος ην συν τῳ ανθυπατῳ Σεργιῳ Παυλῳ.

m Strabon. Geog. lib. 3. p. 166. Ed. Amst. 1707. & lib. xvii. fin. Suet. August. c. 47, 48. Dio lib. 53. p. 503.

n Τȣς τε ετερȣς υπο τε εαυτȣ αιρεισθαι, και πρεσβευτας αυτȣ αντιστρατηγȣς τε ονομαζεσθαι, καν εκ των υπατευκοτων ωσι, διεταξε. Dio lib. 53. p. 504. D.

(K) A. U. 727. before Christ, 27. vid. Basnage annal. Polit. Eccl.

was

was afterwards, together with Gallia Narbonensis, given to the senate; in the room of which he took Dalmatia, which at first was theirs [o]. In this state the province continued, and the proper title of the governor of Cyprus was that of proconsul.

It is true, Strabo says, Cyprus was a prætorian province [p]; and this has made this text a mighty difficulty with many learned men. Beza went so far into the opinion of the impropriety of this expression, as to attempt to correct it, in his translation of this text, and he put proprætor in the room of proconsul. And the solutions, which have been offered by divers other learned men [q], have, I believe, appeared unsatisfactory. But if Dio's whole account of this matter had been attended to, the difficulty had vanished [r]. Cyprus was undoubtedly a prætorian province, as all the people's provinces were, except two. But the governors of all their provinces had the title of proconsul. 'It was decreed, that two of their 'provinces, Asia and Africa, should be appropriated to sena-'tors that had been consuls; and all the rest were given to 'those which had been prætors [s].' 'But that they should be 'all called proconsuls, not only those which had been consuls, 'but those also which had been only prætors [t].' And Suetonius says, 'That Augustus took the most powerful provinces 'to himself, and gave the rest to proconsuls chosen by the 'senate [u].'

Examples also support this use of the word. Crete was a prætorian province, according to Strabo and Dio; yet Tacitus calls Cæsius Cordus, proconsul of Crete [x]. There is also an ancient inscription, of Caligula's reign, in which Aquius Scaura is called proconsul of Cyprus [y]. If I have done St. Luke justice in this place, it is chiefly owing to assistances borrowed from Cardinal Noris: and I think myself obliged to make a particular acknowledgment of it.

[o] —Κυπρος, και Αιγυπτιοι εν τῃ τȣ Καισαρος μεριδι τοτε εγενοντο· υστερον γαρ την μεν Κυπρον και την Γαλατιαν την περι Ναρβωνα τῳ δημῳ απεδωκεν, κ. τ. λ. Dio. ibid. p. 504. A. το τε δ' ȣν και την Κυπρον και την Γαλατιαν την Ναρβωνησιαν απεδωκε τῳ δημῳ —— και ȣτως, ανθυπατοι και ες εκεινα τα εθνη πεμπεσθαι ηρξαντο· id. lib. 54. ad A. U. 732. p. 523. B.

[p] Ες εκεινȣ δ' εγενετο επαρχια η νησος, καθαπερ και νυν εστι, στρατηγικη. lib. 14. sub fin. [q] Baron. A. Chr. 46. n. xi. Grot. in loc. &c. [r] Vid. Noris. Cenotaph. Pisan. p. 219.

[s] Τῃ δε δη βȣλῃ, ιδια μεν τοις τε υπατευκοσι την τε Αφρικην και την Ασιαν, και τοις εστρατηγηκοσι τα λοιπα παντα απενειμε. Dio. p. 505. C.

[t] Και ανθυπατȣς καλεισθαι μη οτε τȣς υπατευκοτας, αλλα και τȣς αλλȣς, των εστρατηγηκοτων, η δοκουντων γαρ εστρατηγηκεναι, μονον οντας. id. p. 504. C.

[u] Provincias validiores ipse suscepit—cæteras proconsulibus sortito permisit. August. cap. 47. [x] Ancharius Priscus Cæsium Cordum proconsulem Cretæ postulaverat repetundis. Ad A. U. 774. Ann. l. iii. cap. 38. [y] P. Aquius Scaura—C. CÆSARE PRO CONSULE CYPRUM OBTINUIT. Gruter. Inscript. pag. 360. 3. laudat. a Noris. Cenotaph. Pisan. Dissert. ii. p. 219.

§ XII.

§ XII. The last thing I shall take notice of, is the title given to *GALLIO* (l); who in our translation is called the deputy, but in the Greek, proconsul [z] of Achaia. In this instance, St. Luke's accuracy appears more conspicuous than in the former, because this province had a more various fortune than the other. In the original partition, they were assigned to the people and senate [a]. In the reign of Tiberius they were, at their own request, made over to the emperor [b]. In the reign of Claudius, when L. Quinctius Crispinus and M. Statilius Taurus were consuls, A. U. 797. A. D. 44. they were again restored to the senate [c]. And therefore 'from that time [as Dio says upon Augustus's giving Cyprus to the senate] pro-'consuls were sent into this country.' St. Paul was brought before Gallio in the year of our Lord 52 [d], or [e] 53; consequently Gallio was proconsul of Achaia, as St. Luke calls him.

And perhaps it will not be amiss to observe, that afterwards Nero made the Achaians a free people [f]. The senate therefore lost this province again. However, that they might not be sufferers, Nero gave them the island of Sardinia in the room of it [g]. Vespasian made Achaia a province again [h].

There is likewise a peculiar propriety in the name of the province of which Gallio was proconsul. The country subject to him was all Greece; but the proper name of the province among the Romans was Achaia. This is evident from some passages already set down in the margin, and has been particularly observed by Pausanias [i].

(l) Of Gallio see more Ch. viii. § 1.

z Ανθυπατευοντος της Αχαιας.

a Dio. p. 503. fin. b Achaiam ac Macedoniam, onera deprecantes, levari in præsens proconsulari imperio, tradique Cæsari placuit. Tacit. An. lib. 1. cap. 76.

c Provincias Achaiam & Macedoniam, quas Tiberius ad curam suam transtulerat, senatui reddidit. Sueton. in Claud. cap. 25. Την τε Αχαιαν και την Μακεδονιαν—απεδωκεν ο Κλαυδιος τοις τω κληρω. Dio. lib. 60. p. 680. E. d Basnage Ann. P. E.

e Pearson. Ann. Paul. f Universæ Achaiæ libertatem Domitius Nero dedit. Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. iv. cap. vi.

g Και ελευθερον ο Νερων αφηκεν απαντων, αλλαξην ωρος δημον ωοιησαμενος τα Ρωμαιων· Σαρδω γαρ την νησον ες τα μαλιστα ευδαιμονα αντι Ελλαδος σφισιν αποδωκεν. Pausan. p. 428. Hanov. 1613.

h Achaiam—libertate ademta, in provinciarum formam redegit. Sueton in Vespas. c. 8. i Καλουσι δε ουχ Ελλαδος, αλλ Αχαιας ηγεμονα οι Ρωμαιοι, διοτι εχουσαν το Ελληνας δι Αχαιων, τοις τα Ελληνων ωροεστηκοσιν. Pausan. Descript. lib. viii. p. 563.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the state of the Jews in Judea, during the ministry of our Saviour and his Apostles.

I. *The religious state of the Jews, according to the writers of the New Testament.* II. *According to other ancient writers.* III. *The method of considering their civil state, in four periods, proposed.* IV. *Three preliminary observations.* V. *Their civil state in the first period, according to the writers of the New Testament. Some difficulties relating to it considered.* VII. *Their state, in the second period, according to the same writers.* VIII. *In the third.* IX. *In the fourth period.* X. *Some difficulties relating to this last period.* XI. *The civil state of Judea, in the first and last periods, according to other ancient writers.* XII. *In the second.* XIII. *In the third period.* XIV. *The chief captain at Jerusalem.* XV. *The captain of the temple.* XVI. *Festus's council.*

In considering the state of the Jews in their own country, two things are to be regarded, their religious and their civil state.

§ I. That they had, according to the sacred writers, the free exercise of their religion, is evident, from the whole tenor of the history contained in the gospels and the Acts of the apostles. They had their synagogues, the law and the prophets were read there; our Saviour taught in the synagogues. Whenever he healed any lepers, he *bid* them *go and shew* themselves *to the priests*, Matt. viii. 4. *and offer the gift that Moses commanded*, Luke v. 14.

There appears to have been a great resort to the temple at Jerusalem, from Galilee, and other parts, at all their usual great feasts. They were at full liberty to make what contributions they saw fit to their sacred treasury; Mark xii. 41, 44. Luke xxi. 1. and so secure were they, that they used indirect practices to enrich it; Matt. xv. 5. Mark vii. 11, 12. There is no mention made in the history of our Saviour's ministry, of any restraint, or obstruction they met with in their worship, save that one of the *Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices*, Luke xiii. 1.

§ II. That they might thus freely perform all the services of their religion, though they be supposed to have been then under the Roman government, is not at all improbable. For the Romans had ever permitted the people they conquered to practise their own religious rites in their own way: and seem not to have departed from this principle, till after the period

of the evangelical history. And that the Jews were now at full liberty to worship God, according to the institutions of Moses, we are assured by Josephus, who has left us the history of these times. The Roman presidents did indeed, for some time, put in, and turn out their high priests at pleasure. Valerius Gratus, Pilate's predecessor, made several high priests, in the time of his government [a]. The last high priest he made was Caiaphas, who continued in that office during all Pilate's administration. He being removed from the province, Vitellius, president of Syria, put in Jonathan the son of Ananus, or Annas [b]; and afterward Theophilus, another son of Ananus, in the room of Jonathan [c]. But in this there was nothing unusual or extraordinary. Herod the great and Archelaus had been wont, before this, to constitute and remove the high priests at pleasure [d]. Theophilus, just now mentioned, continued high priest till Herod Agrippa, [mentioned Acts xii.] then king of all Judea displaced him, and put Simon the son of Boethus into his room [e]. However, this Herod was a Jew; and from thence to the time the war broke out with the Romans, the nomination of the high priests, and the government of the temple, were committed to princes of the Jewish religion, by the direction of the Roman emperors. After the death of Herod Agrippa, Claudius invested Herod king of Chalcis, brother of Herod Agrippa, with these powers [f]; and after his death, Agrippa the younger, son of the said Herod Agrippa [g]. And though they might all act somewhat arbitrarily in the nomination of the high priests, yet they always confined their choice to those who were of the race of the priests.

The Roman governors did indeed sometimes offer them abuses, or suffer abuses to be committed in the country, contrary to the institutions of the law, as they did also injure them in their civil properties. But these abuses seem not to have been very numerous; when any were committed, it was without the emperor's authority; and usually, the Jews at length obtained satisfaction [h].

This general view of the religious state of the Jews in Judea may suffice at present. I shall have occasion to enlarge more upon this subject hereafter.

§ III. Their civil state will require a more particular consideration in this place. It will be needful to lay together a good number of texts, that the reader may be able to judge

[a] Ant. l. 18. c. ii. [b] Ibid. cap. v. § 3. [c] Cap. vi. § 3. [d] Ant. l. xx. cap. ix. fin. [e] Lib. xix. c. 6. § 2. [f] Ant. xx. cap. i. § 3. [g] Ibid. p. 899. l. 10. [h] Vid. Joseph. Antiq. xx. c. iv. § 3, 4.

what

what representation the sacred historians have given of this matter. That it may be done distinctly, I desire leave to divide their history into four periods. These will serve to relieve us in a disquisition, which will be of some length. And perhaps we may have some other advantages, and receive some clearer light into this matter, by this method, than we should have otherwise.

1. The first period reaches from the preaching of John Baptist to our Saviour's resurrection.
2. The second, from thence to the time of Herod the king, mentioned Acts xii.
3. The reign of this Herod.
4. From the end of his reign to the conclusion of the evangelical history.

§ IV. I must here premise, that in going over the several passages of scripture relating to this matter, we are particularly to have our eye to a point, in which learned men are not entirely agreed, namely, what power and authority the Jewish nation was now possessed of; and whether they had the power of life and death, or only a right to inflict some lesser penalties.

2. I would likewise observe, that our enquiry here will chiefly be confined to the state of the Jews in Judea, properly so called. I have already shewn (in part at least) in the foregoing chapter, that St. Luke has given a just account of the several divisions of the land of Israel, and of the princes and governors to whom they belonged: but now we are to consider the power, which the Jews were possessed of in Judea. Therefore the beheading of John the Baptist is a fact, that does not at present come particularly under our consideration. He was beheaded by Herod tetrarch of Galilee, son of Herod the great. And there can be no doubt, but he had the power of life and death (however he abused it) in his own territories.

3. I would also premise, that the evangelists are not answerable for the legality of all the facts they have related. It is said that, *all they in the synagogue when they heard these things, were filled with wrath, and rose up and thrust him* [Jesus] *out of the city,* [Nazareth] *and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong*, Luke iv. 28, 29.

The Jews are said to have taken up stones to cast at Jesus more than once, and that in the temple. John viii. 59. x. 31, 33, 39. It is also said, that when *Paul* was *about to sail into Syria*, from Greece, *the Jews laid wait for him*, Acts xx. 3. So that he was forced to alter his purpose, and go another

way. It can never be supposed, that any of these attempts were legal. It cannot be thought, that Herod the tetrarch, in whose territories Nazareth was, permitted the multitude to throw men off the precipice, whenever they did not like their doctrine. Much less can it be supposed, that such practices were allowed in any places where the government was in the hands of the Romans, as it certainly was in Greece, if not also in Judea. Such practices as these are never countenanced by those who are in authority. And if the scribes and pharisees, and the great men among the Jews had, at this time, any principles that justified and encouraged such actions; and if they excited the common people to them in Judea, as well as in other parts; it may be reckoned an argument, they had not the government in their own hands, or the power of putting men to death by their own authority, when they judged them guilty. This observation may be of some use hereafter.

§ V. I shall now proceed to consider the account we meet with in the Evangelists in the first period, from the commencement of John the Baptist's ministry to the resurrection of our Saviour.

St. Luke has informed us, that when the word of God came to John, in the fifteenth *year of Tiberius, Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, and Annas and Caiaphas were high priests*, Luke iii. 1, 2. And all the evangelists have assured us, that our Saviour was brought before Pilate, and condemned by him. So that (according to them) Pilate was governor in Judea, during the whole time of our Saviour's ministry, or the period we are now in. But because the power of this governor is not particularly described by any of the evangelists, in order to judge what authority he had here, and what power Annas or Caiaphas, or any other chief men among the Jews were possessed of in this country, we must observe the discourses, proceedings, and events recorded by the sacred historians, which have any relation to this matter.

1. The Jews appear to have been at liberty to follow their own laws and customs in most matters, particularly in the affair of marriage and divorce, in which they differed considerably from many other people.

It has been said, whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery, Matt. v. 31, 32. It is evident, from the manner in which our Lord condemns all divorces,

divorces, ſave thoſe made for the *cauſe of fornication*, that they did at this time put them in practice upon other accounts. This appears alſo from the queſtions put to him, concerning this matter, and the anſwers he gave to them, and the ſurprize and uneaſineſs which the diſciples expreſs at his deciſions, when he forbad ſuch licentious divorces as thoſe made *for every cauſe*; *for they ſaid unto him, If the caſe of the man be ſo with his wife, it is not good to marry.* See Matt. xix. 3, 10. Mark x. 2—9.

It is ſaid, indeed, that when the phariſees brought theſe queſtions, *they came to him tempting him.* But there ſeems not to have been any danger of giving offence to the Roman government, in this caſe, which way ſoever the queſtion was anſwered. The deſign could be only to expoſe him to the reſentment of the Jewiſh people, by deciſions contrary to practices they indulged themſelves in, and were very fond of; as I think appears likewiſe, from the notice the diſciples took of what he ſaid upon this ſubject.

However, this is no proof of any great degree of power in the nation at this time. Joſephus ſays, he put away his ſecond wife, becauſe 'he did not like her manners[i].' This was after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and he was ſettled at Rome.

Juſtin Martyr, about the middle of the ſecond century, ſays, 'That to that very day, their rabbies permitted them to 'have, each man, four or five wives[k].' And 'that, where-'ever they were, they converſed with as many women as they 'pleaſed, and that under the notion of marriage[l].' Their rabbies indulged them in theſe practices; and, it ſeems, the Romans did not interrupt them.

2. Our Lord ſays, *Ye have heard, that it was ſaid by them of old time,* [or, to the ancients,] *thou ſhalt not kill: and whoſoever ſhall kill, ſhall be in danger of the judgment,* Matt. v. 21, 22. *But I ſay unto you, that whoſoever is angry with his brother without a cauſe, ſhall be in danger of the judgment: and whoſoever ſhall ſay to his brother, Racha, ſhall be in danger of the council.*

Grotius[m] ſuppoſes, that though the power of inflicting capital puniſhments had been now for ſome time taken away

i Μη αρεσχομενος αυτης τοις ηθεσιν· in vit. p. 945. 44.

k Ολιγες και μεχρι και τεσσαρας και πεντε εχειν υμας γυναικας, εκαστον συγχωρεσι. Dialog. ii. p. 358. D.

l Επει ει συνεχωρειτο την βουλεσι τις, και ουκ βουλεσι λαμβανειν γυναικας, οποιον πραττουσιν οι απο τε γενους υμων ανθρωποι, καλα πασαν γην ενθα αν επιδημησωσιν, η προσπεμφωσιν, αγομενοι ονομαζι γαμε γυναικας. ibid. p. 371. A.

m Matt. v. 21.

from the Jews, yet our Saviour alludes to thoſe methods of proceeding, which had been in uſe among them, and were ſtill freſh in their memory. Our Lord, I think, does not declare at all, what power they now had, or made uſe of; but from the mention of the words of their law, and referring perhaps to the ſenſe in which they then underſtood it, that they who committed murder deſerved puniſhment, and that they who forbore that were innocent, proceeds to lay down a more ſtrict and pure morality. What he delivers, in terms accommodated to their courts of judicature, is certainly no repreſentation of their conduct, or the ſtate of things at that time. For it cannot be thought, that every one, who was angry with his brother without a cauſe, was then in danger of the judgment; [unleſs the word mean the judgment of God;] or that every one, who ſaid to his brother, *Racha*, was in danger of being brought by them before the council.

3. Our Lord delivered many predictions concerning the treatment, which his followers would meet with. Luke xi. 49. *Therefore alſo ſaid the wiſdom of God, I will ſend them prophets and apoſtles; and ſome of them they ſhall ſlay and perſecute.* Matt. xx. 34. *Wherefore behold I ſend unto you prophets and wiſe men and ſcribes; and ſome of them ſhall ye kill and crucify, and ſome of them ſhall ye ſcourge in your ſynagogues, and perſecute them from city to city.* Mark xiii. 9. See John xvi. 2. *Take heed to yourſelves, for they ſhall deliver you up to the councils: and in the ſynagogues ye ſhall be beaten, and ye ſhall be brought before rulers and kings for my ſake.*

Theſe words of our Lord would, I think, be underſtood by his hearers, agreeably to the ſtate of things at that time, whatever it was: thoſe puniſhments which are purely Jewiſh, ſuch as being ſcourged in their ſynagogues, or driven from them, would be underſtood to be inflicted by Jewiſh hands. If the Jews had not then the power of condemning men to death, the capital puniſhments ſpoken of, as to be inflicted by them, would be underſtood to be brought about by their means and procurement; unleſs it were thought, that the words implied a prediction, that they would have ſupreme power, though they now had it not, and that then they would uſe it for theſe purpoſes.

It can never be inferred from hence, that they had at this time ſupreme power in Judea, or any where elſe. It is very common to aſcribe to men, not only thoſe things they do themſelves, but thoſe alſo which are brought about by their means. In all languages, and in all countries, the puniſh-

ment

p. 71.

ment of an offender is aſcribed to the proſecutor, the judge, and the executioner, though this laſt only puts him to death in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. Thus it is certain, that Pilate condemned our Lord, and his officers crucified him: Yet the Jews are more than once ſaid to have crucified Chriſt, becauſe his death was owing to their proſecution and importunity. Cleophas, one of the diſciples whom Jeſus met in the way to Emmaus, told him, Luke xxiv. 20. *how the chief prieſts, and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have* CRUCIFIED *him.* The *crucifying*, as well as *delivering up* Jeſus, is here aſcribed to the chief prieſts. Peter ſpeaks to his hearers in this manner: Acts ii. 22, 23. *Ye men of Iſrael hear theſe words; Jeſus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you. —Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have* CRUCIFIED AND SLAIN. Again, chap. vi. 8, 10. *Peter, filled with the Holy Ghoſt, ſaid unto them, Ye rulers of the people and elders of Iſrael. —Be it known unto you all, and to the people of Iſrael, that by the name of Jeſus of Nazareth, whom* YE *crucified, does this man ſtand here before you whole.*

So Joſephus ſays, that Herod reigned thirty-four years after he had killed Antigonus[n]. Though every one knows, it was Mark Antony who beheaded Antigonus, at the requeſt of Herod.

And not only is this ſtyle uſed in relating facts that have already happened, but alſo in predicting thoſe that are future. John viii. 28. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto them, when* YE HAVE LIFT UP *the Son of man,* &c. Though at other times, when he ſpeaks of his death, he repreſents the ſhare they would have in it more diſtinctly. Mark x. 33. *Saying, behold we go up to Jeruſalem: and the Son of man ſhall be delivered unto the chief prieſts;—and they ſhall condemn him to death,* AND SHALL DELIVER HIM TO THE GENTILES.

In like manner, he thus repreſents the ſufferings his followers would be expoſed to. Mark xiii. 12. *Now the brother ſhall betray the brother to death, and the father the ſon: and the children ſhall riſe up againſt their parents, and ſhall cauſe them to be put to death*; Και θανατωσουσιν αυτους, *and ſhall put them to death.* It never was legal, according to any conſtitution in the world, for children in a private capacity to put their parents to death. And this phraſe is to be explained by thoſe

[n] Τελευτα, βασιλευσας αφ' ὧ μεν αποκτεινας Αντιγονον εκρατησε των πραγματων ἐτη τεσσαρα και τριακοντα· Joſeph. de Bell. lib. i. cap. 33. § 8. Μεθ' ὃ μεν ανειλεν Αντιγονον ἐτη τεσσαρα και τριακοντα. Antiq. p. 770. v. 37.

from the Jews, yet our Saviour alludes to those methods of proceeding, which had been in use among them, and were still fresh in their memory. Our Lord, I think, does not declare at all, what power they now had, or made use of; but from the mention of the words of their law, and referring perhaps to the sense in which they then understood it, that they who committed murder deserved punishment, and that they who forbore that were innocent, proceeds to lay down a more strict and pure morality. What he delivers, in terms accommodated to their courts of judicature, is certainly no representation of their conduct, or the state of things at that time. For it cannot be thought, that every one, who was angry with his brother without a cause, was then in danger of the judgment; [unless the word mean the judgment of God;] or that every one, who said to his brother, *Racha*, was in danger of being brought by them before the council.

3. Our Lord delivered many predictions concerning the treatment, which his followers would meet with. Luke xi. 49. *Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles; and some of them they shall slay and persecute.* Matt. xx. 34. *Wherefore behold I send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes; and some of them shall ye kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city.* Mark xiii. 9. See John xvi. 2. *Take heed to yourselves, for they shall deliver you up to the councils: and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten, and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake.*

These words of our Lord would, I think, be understood by his hearers, agreeably to the state of things at that time, whatever it was: those punishments which are purely Jewish, such as being scourged in their synagogues, or driven from them, would be understood to be inflicted by Jewish hands. If the Jews had not then the power of condemning men to death, the capital punishments spoken of, as to be inflicted by them, would be understood to be brought about by their means and procurement; unless it were thought, that the words implied a prediction, that they would have supreme power, though they now had it not, and that then they would use it for these purposes.

It can never be inferred from hence, that they had at this time supreme power in Judea, or any where else. It is very common to ascribe to men, not only those things they do themselves, but those also which are brought about by their means. In all languages, and in all countries, the punish-

ment

ment of an offender is aſcribed to the proſecutor, the judge, and the executioner, though this laſt only puts him to death in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. Thus it is certain, that Pilate condemned our Lord, and his officers crucified him: Yet the Jews are more than once ſaid to have crucified Chriſt, becauſe his death was owing to their proſecution and importunity. Cleophas, one of the diſciples whom Jeſus met in the way to Emmaus, told him, Luke xxiv. 20. *how the chief prieſts, and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have* CRUCIFIED *him.* The *crucifying*, as well as *delivering up* Jeſus, is here aſcribed to the chief prieſts. Peter ſpeaks to his hearers in this manner: Acts ii. 22, 23. *Ye men of Iſrael hear theſe words; Jeſus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you. —Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have* CRUCIFIED AND SLAIN. Again, chap. vi. 8, 10. *Peter, filled with the Holy Ghoſt, ſaid unto them, Ye rulers of the people and elders of Iſrael. —Be it known unto you all, and to the people of Iſrael, that by the name of Jeſus of Nazareth, whom* YE *crucified, does this man ſtand here before you whole.*

So Joſephus ſays, that Herod reigned thirty-four years after he had killed Antigonus[n]. Though every one knows, it was Mark Antony who beheaded Antigonus, at the requeſt of Herod.

And not only is this ſtyle uſed in relating facts that have already happened, but alſo in predicting thoſe that are future. John viii. 28. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto them, when* YE HAVE LIFT UP *the Son of man,* &c. Though at other times, when he ſpeaks of his death, he repreſents the ſhare they would have in it more diſtinctly. Mark x. 33. *Saying, behold we go up to Jeruſalem: and the Son of man ſhall be delivered unto the chief prieſts;—and they ſhall condemn him to death,* AND SHALL DELIVER HIM TO THE GENTILES.

In like manner, he thus repreſents the ſufferings his followers would be expoſed to. Mark xiii. 12. *Now the brother ſhall betray the brother to death, and the father the ſon: and the children ſhall riſe up againſt their parents, and ſhall cauſe them to be put to death;* Και θανατωσουσιν αυτους, *and ſhall put them to death.* It never was legal, according to any conſtitution in the world, for children in a private capacity to put their parents to death. And this phraſe is to be explained by thoſe

[n] Τελευτα, βασιλευσας αφ' ὡ μεν αποκτεινας Αντιγονον εκρατησε των πραγματων ἐτη τεσσαρα και τριακοντα· Joſeph. de Bell. lib. i. cap. 33. § 8. Μεθ' ὁ μεν ανειλεν Αντιγονον &c. Antiq. p. 770, v. 37.

that go before, of betraying or delivering, that is, accusing, and prosecuting them, that they may be put to death.

In all these places then, our Lord would be understood by his hearers, according to the quality of the persons spoken of, and the state of affairs at that time, whatever it was.

The *persecuting from city to city*, is no argument of supreme power any where. Acts xiii. 50. *The Jews* [at Antioch in Pisidia] *stirred up up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts.* Again, the same thing happened at Iconium. Acts xiv. 4, 6. *But the multitude of the city was divided, and part held with the Jews, and part with the apostles. And when there was an assault made, both of the Gentiles and also of the Jews—they were ware of it, and fled unto Lystra and Derbe.* And in many cities, situated undoubtedly in countries subject to the Roman jurisdiction, but in which the Jews had settlements, did they foment disturbances against the apostles, and thus drive them from place to place.

Farther, our Lord bid his disciples to *beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues*, Matt. x. 17. xxiii. 34. It must be supposed, since the Jews had the free exercise of their religion, and we often read of the ruler of the synagogue, that the expelling from the synagogue, and beating in the synagogues, were punishments purely Jewish, and that they inflicted these penalties by their own proper authority. The Jews agreed, in our Saviour's life time, that *if any man did confess that he was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue*, John ix. 22. This was a decree of theirs; and they did actually cast out, or excommunicate the man, that had been cured of his blindness. St. Paul says, that before his conversion, *he beat in every synagogue them that believed in Jesus*, Acts xxiii. 19. Nay, as they had settlements in many parts, and were protected by the laws in the exercise of their religion, it is not unlikely, that they inflicted this punishment also out of Judea. St. Paul says, *of the Jews received I five times forty stripes save one*, 2 Cor. xi. 24. He usually made so short a stay when he came into Judea, the several times he was there after his conversion, that it is most likely these scourgings had happened, most or all of them, in some other country. Epiphanus, who lived in the fourth century, informs us, that one Joseph, a Jew, whom he knew, having received a book of the gospels from a Christian bishop, and being surprized by some of his countrymen

countrymen when he was reading it, they took the book out of his hands with great violence, threw him on the ground, 'dragged him to the ſynagogue, and there beat him[o].'

Uriel Acoſta ſuffered this puniſhment in the ſynagogue at Amſterdam, in the laſt century, of which he has himſelf publiſhed a curious relation[p]. This, therefore, muſt be reckoned one of thoſe leſſer penalties, which they had a right to inflict in Judea, and poſſibly out of it.

4. The queſtion brought to our Saviour about tribute is remarkable. Matt. xxii. 15, 20. *Then went the phariſees, and took counſel how they might entangle him in his talk; and they ſent out their diſciples—ſaying, We know that thou teacheſt the way of God in truth.—Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæſar or not? But Jeſus perceived their wickedneſs,* [*craftineſs*, Luke xx. 23.] *and ſaid, why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? ſhew me the tribute money. And they brought him a penny: and he ſaith unto them, Whoſe is this image and ſuperſcription? And they ſay unto him Cæſar's.* This is a proof the emperor's coin was current among them, and that they paid tribute to him. St. Luke's introduction to this ſtory is in theſe words: Luke xx. 20. *And they watched him, and ſent forth ſpies, which ſhould feign themſelves juſt men, that they might take hold of his words, that ſo they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor.*

5. In the viiith chapter of St. John we have another enſnaring queſtion put to our Saviour. *The ſcribes and phariſees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery: and when they ſet her in the midſt, they ſay unto him, maſter, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act: Now Moſes in the law commanded us, that ſuch ſhould be ſtoned; but what ſayeſt thou[q]?* It is evident this was an enſnaring queſtion, for St. John adds, ver. 6. *This they ſaid tempting him, that they might have to accuſe him.*

The ſpeech they made, ſeems to me very artful, and it is not eaſy to ſay, which way they deſired to have their queſtion anſwered. But they ſeem to have ſuggeſted the ſtrongeſt reaſons they could, againſt his determining, that they *might not ſtone her.* Perhaps, therefore, they wiſhed he would ſay, they ought to obey the law of Moſes. Now, if the Romans

[o] Απαγεσι μεν εις την συναγωγην και μαστιγεσι αυτον. Epiph. l. i. Tom. ii. c. xl. Hæreſ. 30. Vid. etiam Grot. ad Matt. x. 17.

[p] Vid. Limborch. Amic. Collat. p. 349, 350.

[q] It is well known, there are very ſtrong objections brought by learned men againſt the genuineneſs of this paragraph of St. John's Goſpel concerning the woman taken in adultery. Vid. Millii N. T. Edit. Kuſteri, & S. Baſnage. Annal. Polit. Eccl. A. D. 32. n. 50. But I do not take any advantage of theſe objections.

did

did not allow them at that time to inflict this puniſhment in this caſe, here would have been matter of accuſation before the governor, if the queſtion were ſo reſolved by him.

Our Lord, however, gives a moſt ſurprizing and unlooked for deciſion. *So when they continued aſking him, he lift up himſelf, and ſaid unto them, he that is without ſin, let him firſt caſt a ſtone at her*, ver. 7. *And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conſcience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldeſt even unto the laſt*, ver. 9. It gives one, indeed, a terrible idea of the wickedneſs of that people at that time; but I think, it is evident from hence, that all then preſent, were guilty of crimes of a like nature with that they charged this woman with. And I ſhould think it may be concluded, with ſome probability, from the deciſion our Saviour pronounced, that they had not at this time the power of ſtoning any one for this crime; becauſe the deſign of the anſwer given them at laſt by our Saviour ſeems to have been, to ſhew them how unworthy they were of the power of inflicting capital puniſhments; and to intimate, that they ought not to expect to be reſtored to the authority they wiſhed for, whilſt they were ſo univerſally [r] corrupt. And how little they deſerved to be entruſted with the adminiſtration of juſtice, appears from their notorious partiality; ſee Deut. xxii. 23, 24. for if this woman was taken in the act, as they ſaid, they might have brought the man alſo. This our Saviour takes no notice of: they were a ſet of men, whom it was in vain to argue with in a direct way. The deciſion he gave is a proof of the higheſt wiſdom, and had the effect to fill them, for the preſent, with confuſion.

6. They had their councils; theſe were ſummoned, met, iſſued out orders. There is alſo frequent mention of their forming deſigns to apprehend Jeſus and put him to death.

Jeſus having healed a man with a withered hand on the ſabbath day, the *Phariſees held a council againſt him, how they might deſtroy him*, Matt. xii. 14. The man that had been cured by him at the pool of Bethesda, having told the Jews, that it was *Jeſus that had made him whole*, it is ſaid, *therefore did the Jews perſecute Jeſus, and ſought to ſlay him, becauſe he had done theſe things on the ſabbath day*. John v. 15—18. *But Jeſus anſwered them, my Father worketh hitherto, and I work. There-*

r There is a remarkable paſſage to this purpoſe in the ſpeech of Joſephus to the Jews in Jeruſalem, while Titus with the Roman army lay before the city. Ποθεν δ' ηξαμεθα δουλειας; αρ' ουχι εκ στασεως των προσονων, οτε η Αριστοβουλε και Υρκανε μανια, και η προς αλληλους εριs, Πομπηιον επηγαγε τη πολει, και Ρωμαιους υπεδαξεν ο Θεος τους ουκ αξιους ελευθεριας. Joſeph. de Bell. l. v. cap. 9. § 4.

fore

fore the Jews ſought the more to kill him, not only becauſe he had broken the ſabbath, but ſaid alſo, that God was his father, making himſelf equal with God. Ch. vii. 1. *After theſe things, Jeſus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him.*—Ver. 25. *Then ſaid ſome of them of Jeruſalem, Is not this he whom they ſeek to kill?* Ver. 32. *The phariſees heard that the people murmured ſuch things concerning him: and the phariſees and chief prieſts ſent officers to take him:* Ch. x. 39. *Therefore they ſought again to take him, but he eſcaped out of their hands.* After he had raiſed Lazarus, ſome of them that were by, *went their ways to the phariſees, and told them what things Jeſus had done.* Ch. xi. 45, 47. *Then gathered the chief prieſts and the phariſees a council, and ſaid, what do we? For this man does many miracles?* Ver. 53. *Then from that day forth they took counſel together for to put him to death. But the chief prieſts conſulted, that they might put Lazarus alſo to death,* Ch. xii. 0.

7. But the actual apprehending, trial, and proſecution of Jeſus, is the moſt particular, and material inſtance of their authority in this period. And, if I miſtake not, the method of proceeding in this affair does explain the nature of all thoſe deſigns hitherto mentioned to put Jeſus to death, excepting only clandeſtine or tumultuous attempts.

It will ſuffice to tranſcribe St. Matthew's account, taking in, here and there, a circumſtance from the other evangeliſts.

Matt. xxvi. 3, 4. *Then aſſembled together the chief prieſts, and the ſcribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high prieſt, which was called Caiaphas, and conſulted that they might take Jeſus by ſubtilty, and kill him.* Ver. 14—16. *Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iſcariot, went unto the chief prieſts.—And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of ſilver. And from that time he ſought opportunity to betray him.* Ver. 47. When Jeſus was in the garden, whither he had retired after ſupper, *lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came; and with him a great multitude with ſwords and ſtaves from the chief prieſts and elders of the people.* St. John ſays, ch. xviii. 3. *Judas then having received a band of men and officers from the chief prieſts and phariſees*[s]. *This band* muſt be a company of ſoldiers. Our Saviour is evidently apprehended by the authority of the Jewiſh council; but beſide the officers of the high prieſt, here are ſoldiers, taken, it is likely, with the governor's leave, from the guard conſtantly kept by the Romans at Jeruſalem. This may be inferred, from the Jews going to the governor,

[s] Ο ουν Ιουδας λαβων την σπειραν, και εκ των αρχιερεων και Φαρισαιων υπηρετας.

after

after our Saviour's crucifixion, for a guard to secure the sepulchre, which he readily granted. Matt. xxvii. 64, 66. And it is likely, had done the same now, to assist the officers of the high priest, if any disturbance should happen.

Ver. 50. *Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him.* St. Luke informs us, that when they came to apprehend Jesus, chap. xxii. 52. *He said unto the chief priests and* CAPTAINS OF THE TEMPLE[t], *and the elders which were come to him; Be ye come out as against a thief, with swords and staves?* And St. John says, ch. xviii. 12, 13. Then the *band and the* CAPTAIN[u], and *officers of the Jews took Jesus, and bound him, and led him away.* Who this captain, or captains of the temple were, whether Roman or Jewish officers, has been doubted. I think they were Jewish officers, who presided there over the priests and levites, and the inferior officers of the temple[x]. This I may shew more particularly hereafter, but now we pass on. Matt. xxvi. 57. *And they that had laid hold on Jesus, led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and elders were assembled. Now the chief priests and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death, but found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At last came two false witnesses, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy this temple, and build it in three days. And the high priest arose, and said, Answerest thou nothing? What is it that these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us, whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, he hath spoken blasphemy: What think ye? They answered and said, he is guilty of death.* ver. 59, 66.

St. Mark delivers their sentence in these words, Mark xiv. 64. *Then the high priest saith—Ye have heard the blasphemy? What think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death.*

These are the proceedings of the council, while Jesus was before them.

Matt. xxvii. 1, 2. *When the morning was come, all the chief priests, and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus, to put him to death. And when they had bound him, they led him away*

t Ειπε προς τους παραγενομενους επ' αυτον Αρχιερεις, και στρατηγους του ιερου.
u Η συν σπειρα και ο χιλιαρχος και οι υπηρεται των Ιουδαιων.
x Vid. Grot. ad Matt. xxvi. 45. Whitby, Luke xxii. 52.

and

and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor. See Mark xv. 1. Luke xxiii. 1.

St. John obſerves, ch. xviii. 28, 29. that the Jewiſh elders not entering into *the Judgment-hall, leſt they ſhould be defiled, Pilate went out unto them, and ſaid, What accuſation bring you againſt this man?*

Having heard from them what things they had to lay to his charge, Pilate examined Jeſus: having ſo done, *he ſaid to the chief prieſts and the people,* Luke xxiii. 4—8. *I find no fault in this man; and they were the more fierce, ſaying, He ſtirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place. When Pilate heard of Galilee,* he ſent Jeſus to Herod, who was then at Jeruſalem.—He, having mocked him, ſent him again to Pilate. Being therefore again returned to him, ver. 13—16. *Pilate, when he had called together the chief prieſts and the rulers, and the people, ſaid unto them, ye have brought this man unto me as one that perverteth the people: and behold, I having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man, touching thoſe things whereof ye accuſe him. No, nor yet Herod.—I will therefore chaſtiſe him, and releaſe him.* They deſired that he would rather releaſe Barabbas; ver. 17—24. *Pilate therefore willing to releaſe Jeſus, ſpake again to them: but they cried, ſaying, crucify him, crucify him. And he ſaid unto them the third time, why what evil has he done? I have found no cauſe of death in him: I will therefore chaſtiſe him, and let him go. And they were inſtant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified, and the voices of them, and of the chief prieſts prevailed: and Pilate gave ſentence, that it ſhould be as they required.*

A few remarks will be needful. The Jewiſh council having adjudged that Jeſus was guilty of death, or that according to their law he deſerved to die, they carry him to Pilate, and produce their charges againſt him. It is ſurprizing, that they ſhould do this, if they had themſelves the power of life and death. A people fond of authority and power, would not have committed to a foreigner a cauſe that was within their own juriſdiction. If they had not the power of life and death in this caſe, they had it not in any. For the only crime, that Jeſus was ſuppoſed to be convicted of before them, was that of blaſphemy, or aſſuming without foundation the character of the Meſſias. The evangeliſts are extremely unanimous in this point: Matt. xxvi. 59, 60. *Now the high prieſts, and all the council ſought falſe witneſs againſt him, but found none; yea, though many falſe witneſſes came, yet found they none.*——

Mark

Mark xiv. 56. *Many bare falſe witneſs againſt him, but their witneſs agreed not together.* St. Matthew, ch. xxvi. 63—66. St. Mark, ch. xiv. 60—64. St. Luke, ch. xxii. 69—71. have particularly informed us, that the condemnation paſſed by the council upon Jeſus was founded upon the declaration he made, that he was the Chriſt, when the high prieſt had adjured him to tell them who he was. And St. John ſays, chap. xix. 7. this was what they inſiſted on before Pilate: *We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf the Son of God.* As, therefore, the only fact which they had the proof of, was that of our Lord's own confeſſion made before them, which they called blaſphemy, if they had had the power of inflicting death in this caſe, they would have puniſhed him accordingly, by their own authority, and not have carried him to Pilate.

They did indeed accuſe him before *Pilate of many things*, and ſaid, *he ſtirred up the people*, and the like. But theſe appear to have been merely malicicious inventions of their own, without any ground in the leaſt from any action they knew of, or that had been proved, when he was under examination before them; or elſe, were concluſions they pretended to draw, and inſinuated to the governor, muſt be the conſequence of Jeſus's confeſſion and declaration, *that he was the Chriſt.* And it ſeems to me, that this declaration of his was the only ground of all theſe charges, from what St. Luke ſays, chap. xxiii. 2. *and they began to accuſe him, ſaying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæſar, ſaying,* THAT HE HIMSELF IS CHRIST A KING; as alſo from what St. John relates: chap. xix. 13. *the Jews cried, ſaying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæſar's friend: whoſoever* MAKETH HIMSELF A KING, *ſpeaketh againſt Cæſar*; as likewiſe, becauſe this was the thing which Pilate ſeems more eſpecially to have informed himſelf about. For he aſked him, *art thou the king of the Jews?* John xviii. 33. Where we have the anſwer that Jeſus returned him—to ver. 38. Pilate perceiving there was nothing criminal in this pretenſion of Jeſus, went out again unto the Jews, and ſaith unto them, *I find in him no fault at all.* There being no crime in this, he was fully ſatisfied of his innocence.

Perhaps, it will be objected againſt this, that the title ſet upon the croſs, of *Jeſus of Nazareth king of the Jews*, is a proof the crime he was condemned for by Pilate, was that of ſedition, or high treaſon. But I think, this is no proof of any ſuch thing. For Pilate judging, that our Saviour was

really

really innocent, [since it was the Roman cuſtom to put ſome title,] might write what he pleaſed. And our Lord had ſatisfied Pilate, there was nothing ſeditious in the claim he made under that character, foraſmuch as his kingdom was not of this world. But I contend not about this. It is not at all material, what was the pretended crime for which Pilate at laſt condemned Jeſus.

Blaſphemy was the only crime, of which Jeſus was ſuppoſed to be convicted before the council; and yet theſe Jewiſh high prieſts and elders carried him to the governor; and it appears from the ſequel, that Pilate was the ſupreme judge in this cauſe, and the maſter of the event. For he gives the caſe a freſh hearing, aſks the Jews what accuſation they brought, examined Jeſus; and when he had done ſo, told them, he *found in him no fault at all.* This his conduct is a full proof, that he was the judge, and that they were only proſecutors and accuſers.

Pilate, indeed, propoſes to them, which he ſhould releaſe to them, Barabbas or Jeſus. But certainly, he does not appeal to them as judges. This is evident from the perſons to whom he addreſſed himſelf with this propoſal, namely, the people, the multitude; which never had, among the Jews, a legal power of life and death. Matt. xxviii. 15. *At that feaſt the governor was wont to releaſe unto the* PEOPLE *a priſoner, whom they would.* Ver. 17. *Therefore, when they were gathered together, Pilate ſaid unto them, whom will ye that I releaſe unto you?* ver. 20. *But the chief prieſts and elders perſuaded the* MULTITUDE *that they ſhould aſk Barabbas, and deſtroy Jeſus.* See Mark xv. 8—15. This appeal to the people ſeems to have been only to diſcern, how far he might act in this matter conſiſtent with the peace of the province, which depended upon the diſpoſition of the people.

Moreover, Pilate at length pronounced the ſentence. John xix. 19. He wrote the title upon the croſs, and would not alter what he had written, though deſired by the high prieſts. When the ſentence was pronounced, the (Matt. xxvii. 27, 28.) *ſoldiers of the governor took Jeſus into the common hall, and gathered unto them the whole band of ſoldiers, and they ſtripped him,* ver. 31. *and put on him a ſcarlet robe, and led him away to crucify him.* Ver. 54. The crucifixion was performed by theſe ſoldiers, under the command of a centurion.—Ver. 58. *Joſeph of Arimathea went to* PILATE, *and begged the body of Jeſus. Then* PILATE *commanded the body to be delivered. The chief prieſts and phariſees came to* PILATE, *deſiring that he would command,*

mand, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day.—Pilate *said unto them, ye have a watch, go your way, make it as sure as you can.* Ver. 66. *So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.*

These soldiers were entirely accountable to Pilate. For when (Matt. xxviii. 11—14.) *some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done —they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, say ye, 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.*

Beside the light we receive into this matter, from the proceedings relating to our Saviour himself, we learn that Pilate had in his custody divers prisoners which were of the Jewish nation: for it could be such only, that it can be supposed, they should desire to have released to them. And it seems, it had been an usual custom with him, during his government, to release to them some prisoner at that feast; *and the multitude crying aloud, began to desire him to do, as he had ever done unto them.* Mark xv. 8. See Matt. xxvii. 15.

When Pilate said unto them, John xviii. 31. TAKE YE HIM, *and judge him according to your law; the Jews said unto him,* IT IS NOT LAWFUL FOR US TO PUT ANY MAN TO DEATH.

As they here affirm expressly, that they had not the power of life and death, so Pilate told our Saviour that He had. John xix. 10. *Then Pilate said unto him,—knowest thou not, that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?*

So that the whole course of the proceedings in this transaction, and these express declarations of these two parties, the high priests and elders on the one hand, and Pilate on the other, assure us, that the Jewish nation had not, at this time, within themselves, the power of life and death upon any occasion.

§ VI. But yet there are some expressions of the evangelists, relating to this matter, that may require consideration.

1. There is a prediction of our Lord, concerning the manner of his death, related by John, with the evangelist's own reflection: ch. xii. 32. *And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die.* Again, ch. xviii. 31, 33. *Then Pilate said unto them, take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death. That the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die.*

Possibly,

Poſſibly, ſome may hence conclude, that the Jews had the power of putting men to death; and therefore the evangeliſt obſerves, that the fulfilment of this prediction was remarkable: ſince, though they had the power, yet they diſclaimed, and would not exerciſe it upon this occaſion.

But without this ſuppoſition, the accompliſhment of this prediction was remarkable on two accounts: firſt, in that he did not die a natural death: and ſecondly, that he was not put to death in a tumult; but his death was the reſult of a legal proceſs, according to the form of government which then obtained in that country. No man, without a prophetic ſpirit, could foreſee certainly, that he ſhould not die a natural death; and yet, perhaps, it was more extraordinary to foreſee, that he ſhould eſcape all the ſudden attempts upon his life. We have many of theſe recorded in the evangeliſts: but, notwithſtanding, he ſuffered as a criminal by the ſentence of the government.

And the meaning of the evangeliſts in the laſt mentioned place, I think, is this: the Jews ſaid, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death; and hereby, that is, by their not having the power of inflicting capital puniſhments, it came to paſs that the words of Jeſus were fulfilled, in which he had predicted, that he ſhould be crucified; that being a Roman, and not an ordinary Jewiſh puniſhment.

2. Perhaps ſome may think, their departing willingly at this time from their right, is implied in the phraſe, *delivering up to the Gentiles*; which our Lord made uſe of ſometimes when he ſpoke of his death. Mark x. 33. See Luke xviii. 32. *Behold we go up to Jeruſalem, and the Son of Man ſhall be delivered unto the chief prieſts, and unto the ſcribes; and they ſhall condemn him to death, and ſhall* DELIVER *him to the Gentiles:* and after the council had condemned Jeſus, Matt. xxvii. 2. *it is ſaid, when they had bound him, they led him away, and* DELIVERED *him to Pontius Pilate the Governor.*

Hereby ſome may be pleaſed to underſtand, that for ſome reaſons, the Jews voluntarily ſurrendered him to Pilate; though if they had thought fit, they might have put him to death themſelves.

But this is not the meaning of this word in the New Teſtament, as is evident from the firſt text here quoted, Mark x. 33. Judas, of whom that *delivery to the chief prieſts* is intended, releaſed no right. The word is often uſed to expreſs the acts of private perſons, who accuſed, proſecuted, betrayed, or any other way contributed to the bringing another before a

court of juſtice, in order to be condemned and put to death. Matt. x. 17—21. *But beware of men, for they will* DELIVER *you up to the councils, and they will ſcourge you in their ſynagogues, and ye ſhall be brought before governors and kings for my ſake:—but when they* DELIVER *you up, take no thought, how, or what ye ſhall ſpeak.—And the brother ſhall* DELIVER *the brother to death, and the father the child.* Mark xiii. 11. *But when they ſhall lead you and* DELIVER *you up, take no thought beforehand.* And in the next verſe, *betraying* is uſed for *delivering. Now the brother ſhall betray the brother, and the father the ſon.*

3. But ſtill ſome may ſuſpect, that they might have ſome particular reaſons, for not employing at this time all the authority they were poſſeſſed of. For St. Luke ſays, ch. xxii. 2. *And the chief prieſts and ſcribes ſought how they might kill him, for they feared the people.* And St. Matthew, ch. xxvi. 4, 5. *that they conſulted that they might take Jeſus by ſubtilty, and kill him. But they ſaid, not on the feaſt-day, leſt there be an uproar among the people.* Poſſibly, therefore, ſuſpecting the affections of the people, they might be willing to decline the odium of this action, and throw it upon Pilate.

But whatever apprehenſions they might have concerning the people at firſt, yet when they had ſeiſed Jeſus without any diſturbance, and many had ſhewn their forwardneſs in coming in to them, and bringing them falſe accuſations againſt him, theſe fears might then be pretty well over. And certainly, they could be in no fear of the people, after the multitude had unanimouſly demanded with loud voices, that Barabbas might be releaſed, and Jeſus crucified. For that offer which Pilate made them, John xix. 6. *ſaying, take ye him, and crucify him,* was plainly after that the people had petitioned for Barabbas. Ch. xviii. 40. *Then cried they all again, ſaying, not this man, but Barabbas.* If they could have put any man to death, would not they now have joyfully accepted this offer which Pilate made them? Would they not have been willing now to merit with the people, by putting to death a man whom they diſliked as well as themſelves, if before they were afraid to kill one, whom they ſuſpected the people were fond of?

4. And this brings me to another difficulty. For it may be ſaid, If the Jews had not the power of life and death, what could Pilate mean by ſaying, John xviii. 31. *Take ye him, and judge him according to your law?* And again, ch. xix. 6. *Take ye him and crucify him, for I find no fault in him?*

I anſwer

I answer, that Pilate's meaning in the first place is very evident, and the answer they make him, shews they had not the power of life and death. The context is thus: *Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment.* They scrupling to go in, Pilate *went out unto them, and said, what accusation bring you against this man? They answered and said unto him, if he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee. Then said Pilate, take ye him and judge him according to your law*; that is, go then and punish him yourselves. John xviii. 28—31. *The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death*; that is, 'This is a criminal we cannot punish according to his deserts. It is not 'one of the lesser faults, for which we are wont to scourge 'men, or to cast out of the synagogue; but he is guilty of 'blasphemy, which by our law ought to be punished with 'death. And since we are not permitted to punish any man 'capitally, we have brought him to your tribunal, where 'alone we can have satisfaction.'

The other words are thus introduced: Pilate had scourged Jesus, platted a crown of thorns upon him, and offered him other indignities, hoping hereby to pacify the Jewish rage, and save his life: and goes out, *and saith unto them, behold, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him:* he is an innocent man, and I cannot punish him as you desire. *When the chief priests therefore*, John xix. 1—6. *and officers saw him, they cried out saying, crucify him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, take ye and crucify him, for I find no fault in him.* It is not unlikely, that some may suppose, the word *crucify* here, ought to be interpreted by the general word *judge*, used before. But I think, the most natural meaning of Pilate's words here is this: 'You must crucify him then your-'selves, if you can commmit such a villainy, for I cannot. 'He appears to me innocent, as I have told you already; and 'I have now punished him as much, or more than he deserves.

The answer they make again, goes upon the supposition, that they could not take away any man's life. Ver. 7. *The Jews answered him, we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God*; that is, 'Indeed, 'Sir, you need not be so scrupulous: he is a blasphemer, 'and by our law all such ought to be put to death. And if 'you do not condemn him to death, we shall think you do not 'pay that respect to our law which you ought to do.' And then they threaten him with the general resentment of the na-

tion, if he would not punish capitally the most heinous violation of their law.

This discourse, which now passed between Pilate and the chief priests, is a proof, they had not the power of life and death; and that the intent of what Pilate said, is not, that they might crucify him if they pleased: if this had been Pilate's meaning, and they could have legally executed Jesus, would they have put a matter they were intent upon to an uncertain issue? would they have refused to take the cause into their own hands, when they saw the governor was backward to gratify their intentions? Their still pressing Pilate to pronounce a sentence of death, is a proof, that they knew very well, if Jesus was not condemned by Pilate he must be set at liberty.

5. But though these particulars, thus laid together, appear decisive; and the Jews here, in a most critical season, say expressly, that it was *not lawful for them to put any man to death*; yet in another place, there are some Jews, who seem to assert, they had at that time an absolute freedom. John viii. 31—33. *Then said Jesus unto the Jews which believed on him, if ye continue in my words, then are ye my disciples indeed. And ye shall knew the truth, and the truth shall make you free. They answered him, we be Abraham's seed,* AND WERE NEVER IN BONDAGE TO ANY MAN: HOW SAYEST THOU, YE SHALL BE MADE FREE?

It is not very material to inquire at present, who they were who made this reply to our Saviour; whether the believers before spoken of, who seem not to have owned him upon right grounds; or 'whether they were unbelieving Jews, who hypocritically joined themselves with these new professors, with 'intent of taking some private opportunity of killing[y] him.' What we are concerned with is the reply itself.

If these Jews do not speak here of civil temporal liberty, and of a freedom from all foreign jurisdiction, then we have no concern with them at present; but if they do, (as it is generally supposed) they deserve no regard at all: for then, what they here say is a downright contradiction of God himself in the solemn preamble to the law at mount Sinai, *I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.* There is no relying upon the word of such men as these. Notwithstanding they ask *how sayest thou ye shall be made free*, as if they could be no freer than they were, they might at that time be downright slaves. For they who scrupled not to contradict God himself, with

[y] See Dr. Clarke's Paraphrase upon this text.

reference

reference to the time paſt, might well have aſſurance to deny a fact evident to every man's ſenſe and reaſon at that time. Our Lord, indeed, does not deny the truth of what they ſaid: it was to no purpoſe ſo to do. But with an unexampled firmneſs he proſecutes the ſubject he was upon: ver. 34. *Jeſus anſwered them, verily I ſay unto you, whoſoever committeth ſin is the ſervant of ſin.*

But though the moſt expreſs declarations of ſuch men can never aſſure us of the truth, yet their angry reply to our Saviour, this fierce diſclaiming the charge of ſubjection, upon ſo ſmall, upon no occaſion at all, affords more than a preſumption they were not free at this time. An inſinuation of their being in ſubjection, if ſuch had been given, would have been treated with contempt, and not anſwered with indignation, if they had had all the power their proud hearts deſired.

6. There is another text hitherto omitted, which ſome may think deſerves notice. John xi. 47, 48. *Then gathered the chief prieſts and phariſees a council, and ſaid, what do we? for this man doth many miracles. If we let this man alone, all men will believe on him,* AND THE ROMANS SHALL COME, AND TAKE AWAY BOTH OUR PLACE AND NATION. Some may apprehend theſe words imply, that there was then no Roman government eſtabliſhed in Judea.

I preſume there is no neceſſity of inquiring, at preſent, into the views of this ſpeech. All I ſhall ſay, by way of anſwer, is, 1. That this ſpeech ſuppoſes that they were in ſubjection to the Romans, otherwiſe, *all men's believing on Jeſus*, could not have been any offence to the Romans, or be pretended to be ſo. 2. The meaning of theſe words is, that then the Romans would no longer protect them in their religion and laws, and treat them as ſubjects, but ſend an army to deſtroy them, as rebels and enemies.

A paſſage of Joſephus will illuſtrate this text. The Samaritans had obſtructed the Galileans in their way to Jeruſalem, and killed ſome of them. The chief men of Galilee complain to Cumanus the procurator, and demanded juſtice. He took a bribe from the Samaritans, and let the matter paſs. 'The Galileans then being exaſperated, perſuaded the mul-'titude of the Jews to betake themſelves to arms and aſſert 'their liberty. Servitude, they ſaid, was grievous in itſelf, 'but to be inſulted under it, was altogether intolerable[z].' Joſephus ſays, that the chief men of Jeruſalem, dreading

[z] Δεδιεναι γαρ και καθ'-αυτην μεν πικραν ελεον ειναι, την εφ' υβρει δε παυλαπασιν αφορητον.

the issue, endeavoured by all means to appease the people; 'and bid them set before their eyes the utter ruin of their 'country, the conflagration of their temple, the captivity 'and slavery of themselves, their wives and children; and as 'they would avoid these dreadful calamities, beseeched them 'to alter their present designs[a].' What is this, but the *Romans coming and taking away both their place and nation?* which words, as I observed, imply a present subjection: and this state they appear evidently to have been in, when that exhortation was given, which I have just transcribed from Josephus.

I have now set before the reader the main passages of this period, concerning the power the Jews were possessed of in their own country. The sum is, they practised their own religious rites, worshipped at the temple and in their synagogues, followed their own customs, and lived very much according to their own laws. They had their high priests, council or senate, inflicted lesser punishments; they could apprehend men, and bring them before the council; and if a guard of soldiers was needful, could be assisted by them, upon asking the governor for them: they could bind men and keep them in custody: the council could summon witnesses, take examinations, and when they had any capital offenders carry them before the governor. This governor usually paid a regard to what they offered; and, if they brought evidence of the fact, pronounced sentence according to their laws. But he was the proper judge in all capital causes; for when the council of the Jews had had before them a case, which they pretended was of this kind, having prepared it, they go with it immediately to the governor, who re-examines it, and pronounces the sentence.

§ VII. The next period reaches from our Saviour's resurrection, to the reign of Herod, mentioned in the twelfth of the Acts of the apostles.

I shall set down all the facts mentioned in this interval, which relate to this subject; after I have just observed, that we have here no notice taken of any Roman officer or president in the country. It does not follow there was none all this time, but it was proper to observe it here, though the reason of this omission do not appear. And this is one reason why I have made a distinct period of this interval.

[a] Και πειθοντες προ οφθαλμων θεμενους καλασκαφησομενην μεν αυτων την πατριδα, το δε ιερον πυρποληθησομενον, αυτων δε και γυναικων συν τεκνοις ανδραποδισμους εσομενους μειλισεσθαι τον λογισμον. Joseph. Ant. lib. 20. c. 5. § 1.

1. The

1. The first fact is a case that followed soon after the cure wrought by Peter and John, upon the lame man that lay at the gate of the temple.——Acts iv. 1—3. *And as they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon them——and they laid hands on them, and put them in hold unto the next day: for it was now eventide.*—Ver. 5—10. And *it came to pass on the morrow, that their rulers and elders and scribes, and Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas—were gathered together at Jerusalem. And when they had set them in the midst, they asked; By what power, or in what name have ye done this? Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people and elders of Israel,—Be it known unto you.*——Peter having made his defence——*When they had commanded them* [Peter and John] *to go aside out of the council, they conferred among themselves.* Their resolution was,——ver. 15—21. *That it spread no farther among the people, let us straitly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name—and having threatened them, they let them go.*

A council was called; Peter and John were aprehended by Jewish officers, put in prison, brought before the council, examined, threatened, dismissed. No penalty is inflicted, and what punishment was threatened is not said.

2. The next case is in the following chapter. Acts v. 17, 18. *Then the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him (which is the sect of the Sadducees) and were filled with indignation. And laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison.* The apostles were delivered out of prison that night by an angel, and went to the *temple, early in the morning, and taught. But the high priest came, and they that were with him, and called the council together, and all the senate of the children of Israel, and sent to the prison to have them brought.*——The officers not finding them in the prison, returned to the council, informing them of it. *Now when the high priest, and the captain of the temple, and the chief priests heard these things, they doubted of them whereunto this would grow.* Having received information that the apostles were in the temple, *Then went the captain with the officers, and brought them without violence.—And when they had brought them they set them before the council: and the high prist asked them, saying,* ver. 21—28. *Did not we straitly command you, that you should not teach in this name?* Peter and the rest of the apostles made their defence. *When they heard that, they were cut to the heart, and took council to slay them.* Gamaliel then stood up,

and desired the apostles to be put forth a little space: and gave his opinion in these words; *And now I say unto you, refrain from these men and let them alone.—And to him they agreed.* Ver. 40. *And when they had called the apostles and beaten them, they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go.*

We have here a fact, or circumstance or two, not mentioned before. The apostles were put into the common prison[b]. But we are told in the former instance in this period, Acts iv. 3. *they laid hands on them, [Peter and John] and put them in hold[c], unto the next day.* And in the former period we find, that our Saviour was bound by the high priest's authority. St. John says, he was bound as soon as apprehended; ch. xviii. 12. *Then the band, and the captain, and officers of the Jews took Jesus and* BOUND *him:* though St. Matthew does not speak of it, till he comes to relate his being carried from the high priest to Pilate: and *when they had bound him, they led him away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate.* Matt. xxvii. 2. See Mark xv. 1.

However, there can be no doubt, I think, but the power of apprehending implies also the power of keeping in custody. Sometimes a prisoner might be kept all night in the high priest's house, as our Saviour seems to have been, when they intended to meet again the next morning. At other times they might send their prisoners to the common or public prison, as in the case before us; for it is not at all unlikely, that they had the free use of it, and that the place of confinement was at their own discretion.

Another particular here is, that the apostles were beaten. We often meet in the New Testament with whipping in the synagogues: but it is likely, this was a more public beating. And possibly the ruler, and chief men of every synagogue, had the right of appointing a whipping there: this punishment now ordered by the sanhedrim, it is likely, was in some open market-place, whereby the sufferers were exposed; and therefore it is said, Acts v. 41. *And they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing, that they were counted worthy to suffer* SHAME *for his name.*

There is one thing more we ought to observe here; the apostles were *beaten*, and yet it is said, that they agreed to Gamaliel, whose advice was, that they should refrain from these men, *and let them alone.* This implies, that they had the power of inflicting, or procuring at least, a heavier punish-

[b] Και εθεντο αυτους εν τηρησει δημοσια. [c] Εθεντο εις τηρησιν.

ment

ment than that of whipping or beating. And it is said, they TOOK COUNSEL TO SLAY THEM. But, I think, this does not imply, that they could by their own authority put them to death. Forasmuch as this is said of their designs against Jesus, and yet it has appeared, I presume, that they could not themselves legally, or according to the constitution of things at that time, put him to death. Thus St. Matthew says, ch. xxvi. 3, 4. *Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest—and consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty and kill him.* See Luke xxii. 2, 3. And after he had been apprehended, examined, convicted, and condemned by them, as far as their authority reached;—*When the morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death.* Matt. xxvii. 1. See Mark xv. 1. As therefore this phrase in the gospels, when used concerning the proceedings against our Saviour, can mean no more, than their resolving to prosecute him before the governor as a criminal worthy of death, and consulting together how they might manage the prosecution, and get him condemned to death; so it is not unlikely, that the phrase ought to be understood in the same sense here: and when Gamaliel advises them *to refrain from these men and let them alone*, for any thing that appears, he must be understood to dissuade them from pursuing their resentment, so far as to prosecute them before the governor, as men worthy of death; and only to threaten them afresh, and if they thought fit order them to be beaten, as we find they did.

3. The next affair of this kind, which we meet with in the Acts, is the prosecution and death of Stephen: the occasion and circumstances of which are related in this manner.

Acts vi. 8—15. *And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people. Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines,—disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. Then they suborned men which said, we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God. And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and caught him, and brought him to the council; and set up false witnesses, which said, this man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law. For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us. And all that sat*

in

in the council, looking ſtedfaſtly on him, ſaw his face as it had been the face of an angel. Then ſaid the high prieſt, are theſe things ſo? Stephen then made his ſpeech. Acts vii. 1—53. *When they heard theſe things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnaſhed on him with their teeth. But he being full of the Holy Ghoſt, looked up ſtedfaſtly into heaven, and ſaw the glory of God, and Jeſus ſtanding on the right hand of God. Then they cried out with a loud voice, and ſtopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and caſt him out of the city, and ſtoned him, and the witneſſes laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whoſe name was Saul: and they ſtoned Stephen calling upon God, and ſaying, Lord Jeſus receive my ſpirit,* ver. 54—60. To which ought to be ſubjoined ſome expreſſions of Paul, in his ſpeech to the people at Jeruſalem. Acts xxii. 20. *And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was ſhed, I alſo was ſtanding by, and conſenting to his death, and kept the raiment of them that ſlew him.*

Here we have a caſe, in many particulars different from any we have yet met with. Here is not only a man brought before the council, and witneſſes heard; but he is put to death, by ſtoning, an ordinary Jewiſh puniſhment, without any mention of his being proſecuted before a Roman magiſtrate. And it has, in the concluſion, very much the appearance of a legal Jewiſh puniſhment; for the witneſſes ſeem to have ſtoned him, or thrown the firſt ſtone at him.

The reader will be pleaſed now to recollect a previous propoſition, which was laid down at the beginning of this enquiry; namely, that the ſacred hiſtorians are not accountable for the legality of the facts or proceedings which they relate. Though this affair ſhould be allowed to have all the forms of a legal proceſs, ſentence and puniſhment, according to the Jewiſh law and cuſtoms, yet it does not follow, that it was rightful, according to the conſtitution they were then under. It is certain, that magiſtrates do ſometimes tranſgreſs the bounds of their authority, as well as people commit diſorders. We have a plain inſtance of this at Philippi, Acts xv. where the magiſtrates commanded Paul and Silas to be beaten and impriſoned. But in this their ſudden paſſion, they acted very irregularly, as they were ſoon ſenſible themſelves. And it is not impoſſible, but the Jewiſh council at Jeruſalem, in compliance with their own malice, and the clamours of the people, might pronounce a ſentence, that exceeded the bounds of their authority, and execute it, before the Roman officer could come in to prevent it.

This might be ſaid, ſuppoſing there were here the complete form of a legal proceſs, which I think there is not. It is true, here were witneſſes, and they bring their charge; but here is no ſentence pronounced by the council, not one word of it; nor does the high prieſt collect the opinions. If this had been done, it is not likely that St. Luke would have omitted it. In the account of the proceedings againſt our Saviour, Matt. xxvi. 66. Mark xiv. 64. particular mention is made of the high prieſt's aſking the council their opinion, *What think ye?* and of the anſwer they made, *He is guilty of death.* And St. *Luke*, ch. xxii. 71. has given the reſult of their debates: *And they ſaid, what need we any farther witneſſes? for we ourſelves have heard of his own mouth.* In the two caſes already conſidered in this period, St. Luke has informed us, not only of the accuſations againſt the priſoners and the defence they made, but of the debates of the council after the priſoners had been heard. Theſe were ordered to go aſide, there are debates, and the final reſolution is taken, and then the priſoners are called in again, and the ſentence is pronounced. Concerning Peter and John, ſee Acts iv. 15—18. of the apoſtles, ch v. 34—40.

And in the preſent caſe, after the witneſſes, which they had ſuborned, had delivered their accuſations, Then *ſaid the high prieſt*, Acts vii. 1. *are theſe things ſo?* That is, he gave Stephen leave to make his defence. If after Stephen had done, the council had ordered him to go out; or if there had been any debates in the council concerning him, or the high prieſt had aſked their opinion, and a ſentence had been pronounced, it is incredible theſe things ſhould have been omitted, as they are entirely. For what St. Luke ſays is, that having heard what Stephen ſaid, *they gnaſhed on him with their teeth*; and that *he then looked up to heaven and ſaid—I ſee the heavens opened, and Jeſus ſtanding on the right hand of God; then they cried out with a loud voice,—and ran upon him with one accord, and caſt him out of the city, and ſtoned him.* This has all the appearance of a tumultuous proceeding of the people, which the council, probably, had no inclination to check, but were highly pleaſed with; for of them I underſtand thoſe words, *When they heard theſe things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnaſhed on him with their teeth*; words which repreſent an ungoverned rage.

And, if I miſtake not, Stephen is not convicted upon the evidence of the witneſſes: but upon his ſaying, *I ſee the Son of man*

man ſtanding on the right hand of God, they ran upon him with one accord.

His expreſſions they termed blaſphemous; and in that caſe the Jewiſh people at this time ſeem to have made no ſcruple at all of ſtoning a man immediately, without any trial. There are ſo many inſtances of this in the Goſpels, that it ſeems needleſs to allege any in particular. See John v. 17, 18. viii. 58, 59. x. 30—39.

And, as for the appearance of a legal puniſhment in theſe particulars, *that they caſt him out of the city, and ſtoned him; and the witneſſes laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whoſe name was Saul,* I think, they cannot prove, that this was not a tumultuous action: for even the moſt unruly and diſorderly multitude will oftentimes, in their utmoſt extravagances, aſſume ſome formalities of a legal procedure.

Notwithſtanding this, there are ſome learned men who think, this was not a ſudden act of the people, but that it was a puniſhment inflicted by the Jewiſh council. They ſay, that it was not allowed for private perſons to put any man to death for any crime againſt their law, unleſs they did it whilſt the criminal was in the very act [d].

But it may be queſtioned, whether the ſcheme of zealotiſm at this time, was exactly the ſame which is repreſented in the writings which theſe learned men quote. And though it were, it is not impoſſible, but when ſuch a principle was countenanced, as that of the right of private perſons to kill men *in the act*, they might ſometimes go beyond the bounds of that principle. And it is highly probable, that the chief men of the Jewiſh nation, when their authority was certainly under ſome reſtraints, might connive at the exorbitances of this zeal. It is certain, we have in the Acts of the Apoſtles, many inſtances of the Jews, in ſeveral places, lying in wait for Paul's life; not to catch him *in the act* of what they might call blaſphemy, or any other violation of their law, but to kill him for facts done by him ſome time before. It is not material to enquire, what this was owing to; whether it ought

[d] Sed uti bene obſervavit Seldenus, lib. x. de jure nat. & gent. cap. 4. ex zeli judicio, ſupplicium capitale in ipſo dum committebatur facinus duntaxat momento, ſeu homini επ' αυτοφωρω deprehenſo, a zelotis, id eſt, privato zelo ductis infligi permittebatur. M. Wagenſelius in Carm. Lip. Confut. p. 301. and he alleges ſeveral paſſages from Jewiſh authors as proof of this, particularly from Maimonides. Quiſquis paganam mulierem init.—Si iſtud propalam fiat, hoc eſt, decem vel pluribus ſcelus inſpectantibus, tum ſi zelotæ hominem adoriantur, & impigre trucident, laudantur.——Veruntamen haud aliter licet zelotæ impetum in concubitores facere, quam ſi ipſi venereo operi ſint intenti.—Quod ſi ab opere ceſſent, tum porro trucidare nefas eſt. Ibid. p. 301, 302.

to

to be called zealotiſm, or any thing elſe. It is certain, theſe were common practices among them. One thing, which they ſeem at this time to have thought the proper object of this private zeal, is what they called blaſphemy. Now a criminal could not well be puniſhed for this in the very act. The words muſt firſt be out of a man's mouth, before he could be guilty. Here were words ſpoken by Stephen, which they termed blaſphemy: *Behold I ſee the heavens opened, and the ſon of man ſtanding at the right hand of God.* Theſe words were ſpoken before the council, and it is likely, before a good many other perſons, who were preſent as witneſſes and proſecutors, therefore before *ten* or more perſons. And Stephen was put to death with all the expedition poſſible, that is, in the very *act*, as near as could be. For it follows immediately, Acts vii. 57, 58. *Then they cried out with a loud voice, and ſtopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and caſt him out of the city and ſtoned him.*

Nor is the putting Stephen to death by ſtoning any proof, that there had been a ſentence pronounced, or that there was any legal form obſerved in his death. For this was common in their tumultuous attempts. Jeſus having ſaid ſome things which gave them offence, John x. 31. *Then the Jews took up ſtones again to ſtone him.* He went on to argue with them: ver. 33. They *anſwered him, ſaying, for a good work we ſtone thee not, but for blaſphemy.* See John xi. 7, 8. The ſtoning which Paul ſuffered at Lyſtra was merely tumultuous.—Acts xiv. 19. *And there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium, who perſuaded the people,* [τὸς ὀχλους, the multitude] *and having ſtoned Paul, drew him out of the city, ſuppoſing he had been dead.* Thus much for the caſe of Stephen.

4. It follows, Acts viii. 1. *And Saul was conſenting to his death. And at that time there was a great perſecution againſt the church which was at Jeruſalem, and they were all ſcattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apoſtles.*——Ver. 3. *As for Saul, he made havock of the church, entering into every houſe, and haling men and women, committed them to priſon.*——Ch. ix. 1, 2. *And Saul, yet breathing out threatnings and ſlaughter againſt the diſciples of the Lord, went unto the high prieſt, and deſired of him letters to Damaſcus, to the ſynagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jeruſalem.* When Ananias, at Damaſcus, was directed in a viſion to go to Saul, ch. ix. 13, 14. *he anſwered, Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he has done to thy ſaints at Jeruſalem.*

ſalem. And here he has authority from the chief prieſts to bind all that call on thy name.

It muſt, I think, be ſuppoſed that Saul could not have taken up any at Damaſcus, (which was ſubject to Aretas) by the authority of the council at Jeruſalem, unleſs the governor there gave him leave: and it is highly probable, the correſpondence between them was ſuch as that he would not refuſe it*.

And St. Paul ſays of himſelf, in his ſpeech to the people of Jeruſalem, Acts xxii. 4, 5. *I perſecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into priſons both men and women, as alſo the high prieſt doth bear me witneſs, and all the eſtate of the elders: from whom alſo I received letters unto the brethren, and went to Damaſcus, to bring them which were there, bound unto Jeruſalem, for to be puniſhed.*—Ver. 19, 20. *And I ſaid, Lord, they know that I impriſoned, and beat in every ſynagogue them that believed on thee: and when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was ſhed*, &c.

In his ſpeech to king Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 9—13. Paul ſays, *—Which thing I alſo did in Jeruſalem, and many of the ſaints did I ſhut up in priſon, having received authority from the chief prieſts, and when they were put to death, I gave my voice againſt them. And I puniſhed them oft in every ſynagogue, and compelled them to blaſpheme; and being exceedingly mad againſt them, I perſecuted them even unto ſtrange cities. Whereupon as I went to Damaſcus with authority and commiſſion from the chief prieſts, at mid-day, O king, I ſaw in the way a light from heaven*, &c.

Here is a great variety of particulars, *impriſoning, beating in the ſynagogue, perſecuting into ſtrange cities, and putting to death.*

As for the perſecuting into ſtrange cities, it is not at all ſurpriſing, that the Jews ſhould have ſufficient authority and power in their own country, (though they had a Roman governor amongſt them,) to impoſe hardſhips upon the followers of Chriſt, that would make them leave Judea; ſince, as has appeared from inſtances in the Acts of the apoſtles already alledged, they were able to drive them from one place and city to another, in Greece, and ſeveral parts of Aſia.

The puniſhments inflicted in the ſynagogues, muſt be ſuppoſed inflicted by a mere Jewiſh authority, ſince they had the free exerciſe of their religion.

The apoſtle ſays alſo expreſly, that *many of the ſaints* did he impriſon by *authority from the chief prieſts.* When he ſays, he *perſecuted this way unto the death*, I think, he expreſſes his

* Vid. Acts ix. 23, 24. 2 Cor. xi. 32. & Clerici Hiſt. Eccleſ. Ann. xxxi. Num. 1.

aim

aim and design; and that in the opposition he had made against the followers of Jesus, he proposed to bring upon them not the lesser punishment only of fines, whipping or imprisonment, but death itself.

The case of the loss of life is that of Stephen, whose death, he says, he was consenting to, and kept the *raiment of them that slew him*. Besides this, in his speech to Agrippa, he says, *and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them.*

Here it ought to be observed, that it is not expressed by what authority they *were put to death*. Though the sentences were pronounced and executed by the Roman magistrate, (as in the case of our Saviour,) Saul might be one who *gave his voice* against those who were so punished; as the people at Jerusalem did demand of Pilate, that Jesus might be crucified. It is of some such act as this, that Saul's *giving his voice against them* must be understood; of witnessing against them, promoting a popular clamour against them, or of approving, and consenting to their condemnation and punishment. This is all that can be intended, because, whether they *were put to death* by the authority of the sanhedrim, or of a Roman governor, it cannot be supposed that Saul was one of the judges.

But I think, it may very well be questioned, whether in these words Paul refers to any thing beside the death of Stephen. This is the only person, whose death he has any where expressly said he was concerned in. There is not any one instance, beside the death of Stephen, hinted by St. Luke: whereas, if there had been any, it is very improbable that he should have omitted them, since he has given so particular an account of that of Stephen. It is very common, in less exact, nay in almost all kinds of relations, to use the plural number, where one only is meant. Thus St. Matthew says, Matt. xxvii. 44. *that the thieves also which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth.* Whereas it appears from St. Luke, (ch. xxiii. 39, 40.) that only *one of the malefactors, which were hanged, railed on him*, whilst he was rebuked by the other for it. Again, *Paul said unto them*, [the keepers of the prison at Philippi] Acts xvi. 37. *They have beaten us openly uncondemned being* ROMANS. And yet, most probably, Paul only was a Roman and not Silas. And in no case could a plural number be put for a singular more properly than here, where the apostle, in his great humility, aggravates his former blindness and madness. And the meaning of his words here

here is no more than, when any one was put to death, I was very forward in approving it.

Thus I think, that all which does evidently appear to have been done by a proper authority of the chief priests and council of the Jews, is imprisoning, scourging in the synagogue, and in some public place, and harrassing in such a manner, as to oblige men to leave Judea. Stephen is put to death, but it seems to have been in a tumultuous manner.

However it must be allowed, that this was a time of very heavy sufferings for the followers of Jesus. And one would be apt to suppose, that for a good part of this period, the Jews had no Roman governor residing among them; or if they had, that he connived at some disorders: or else, that their zeal rendered them so tumultuous, that he was not able to keep things in good order amongst them.

There is one thing very observable, that for some time before the end of this period, the disciples of Christ enjoyed peace in Judea. Acts ix. 31. *Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria.* I hope we shall be able to perceive, in some measure, the occasion of this, when we come to enquire what light foreign writers give us into this time.

§ VIII. We go on now to the third period, which is the reign of Herod the king. The account we have of the transactions in this period, is contained in the twelfth chapter of the Acts of the apostles; particularly from ver 1 to the 7th, and ver. 18, 19. There being no difficulty in it, I need not transcribe it. Every order and act of Herod here mentioned, *his killing James with the sword, imprisoning Peter* with intent to bring him forth to the people, *commanding the keepers to be put to death,* is an undeniable proof of his sovereign authority at this time in Judea.

§ IX. The fourth period reaches from the reign of this Herod, to the conclusion of the evangelical history.

The main thing which occurs here, is the treatment of Paul in Judea, so far as there is any appearance of a legal procedure. He being come to Jerusalem, and having been persuaded to purify himself with others that had a vow, entered into the temple, Acts xxi. 26—34. *to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification.—And when the seven days were almost ended, the Jews which were of Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the people, and laid hands on him, crying out, Men and brethren, help: this is the man that teacheth all men every where against the people, and the law, and this*

this place: and farther, brought Greeks also into the temple, and has polluted this holy place. (For they had seen before with him in the city Trophimus an Ephesian, whom they supposed that Paul had brought into the temple.) And all the city was moved, and the people ran together, and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple: and forthwith the doors were shut. And as they went about to kill him, tidings came to the chief captain of the band, that all Jerusalem was in an uproar. Who immediately took soldiers and centurions, and ran down unto them; and when they saw the chief captain, and the soldiers, they left beating of Paul. Then the chief captain came near, and took him, and commanded him to be bound with two chains, and demanded who he was, and what he had done.—And when he could not know the certainty for the tumult, he commanded him to be carried into the castle.—But before he was led in, with the chief captain's leave, he made a speech to the people in the Hebrew tongue: in which he relates at length, that he had received directions in a trance, —*saying, Depart,* for *I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles.* The Jews, not being able to contain themselves any longer, *lift up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live. The chief captain* then *commanded that he should be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging,* Acts xxii. 22, 23, 24. But Paul affirming that he was a Roman, the centurion appointed to attend the torture, went and gave the chief captain information of it. *On the morrow, because he* [the chief captain] *would have known the certainty, wherefore he was accused of the Jews, he loosed him from his bands, and commanded the chief priests and all their council to appear, and brought Paul down and set him before them,* ver. 30. *And Paul earnestly beholding the council, said, Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day. And the high priest Ananias commanded them that stood by to smite him on the mouth. Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law? And they that stood by, said, Revilest thou God's high priest? Then said Paul, I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people,* Acts xxiii. 1—5. A dissension arising in the council, *the chief captain, fearing lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go down, and to take him by force from among them, and to bring him into the castle,* ver. 9, 10.

The chief captain after this, being informed of a conspiracy against Paul, sent him with a guard of two hundred soldiers to Felix at Cesarea; who, when he had received him, together with a letter from Lysias the chief captain, told Paul, he would *hear him, when his accusers also were come,* ver. 35. *After five days, Ananias the high priest descended with the elders and a certain orator named Tertullus, who informed the governor against Paul,* Acts xxiv. 1—22. Felix having heard both sides, *deferred them, and said, When Lysias the chief captain shall come down, I will know the uttermost of your matter.*—But *after two years, Porcius Festus came into Felix room: and Felix willing to shew the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound,* ver. 27.

Now when Festus was come into the province, after three days he ascended from Cæsarea to Jerusalem. Then the high priest, and the chief of the Jews, informed him against Paul, and besought him, and desired favour against him, that he would send for him to Jerusalem, laying wait in the way to kill him. But Festus answered, that Paul should be kept at Cæsarea; and that he himself would depart shortly thither. Let them therefore, said he, which among you are able, go down with me, and accuse this man, if there be any wickedness in him.—Accordingly, he went down to Cæsarea—*and sitting on the judgment-seat—the Jews which came down from Jerusalem—laid many and grievous complaints against Paul, which they could not prove.—Paul answered for himself.—But Festus willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me?* Acts xxv. 1—9. Hereupon Paul appealed to Cæsar, and was carried to Rome.

The case is this: a man was like to have been killed in a popular tumult at Jerusalem; a Roman officer there rescues him, takes him into his own hands, and lodges him in a castle. Afterwards, that his prisoner might be safer, he removes him to Cæsarea, the residence of the governor, before whom there are divers hearings. There was therefore at this time a Roman governor in Judea, at first Felix, who was succeeded by Festus. But beside them here is also a Jewish council, which appears not void of authority.

This is the sum of the story. But here are divers particulars to be reviewed. The pretenee for seizing this man at first is extremely complicated: *That he taught men every where against the people, and the law, and this place, and had brought Greeks into the temple, and polluted this holy place.* The whole charge, however, seems to have been of a religious nature. This appears from divers testimonies.

When

When Paul was brought before the council at Jeruſalem by Lyſias, he *ſaid, I am a phariſee, the ſon of a phariſee: of the hope and reſurrection of the dead am I called in queſtion*, Acts xxiii. 6. This is a preſumption the debates then ran upon matters of religion. Lyſias, in the letter he ſent with Paul to Felix, ſays:—*I brought him forth into their council, whom I perceived to be accuſed of queſtions of their law*, ver. 28, 29. Tertullus, whom Ananias took along with him to Cæſarea, tells Felix, *We have found this man a peſtilent fellow, and a mover of ſedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the ſect of the Nazarenes, who alſo hath gone about to profane the temple*, ch. xxiv. 5, 6. Here are hard words, and ſome grievous charges thrown in to increaſe the account; and nothing true, but that Paul was a Nazarene, as Paul affirms, and ſeems to make out to Felix. *And they neither found me in the temple diſputing with any man, neither raiſing up the people, neither in the ſynagogue, nor in the city: neither can they prove the things whereof they accuſe me. But this I confeſs to thee, that after the way which they call hereſy, ſo worſhip I the God of my fathers*, ver. 12—14. *And after certain days, when Felix came with his wife Druſilla, he ſent for Paul, and heard him concerning the faith in Chriſt*, ver. 24. Theſe new notions therefore of Paul were the great ſubject of enquiry, to ſee whether there was any thing dangerous or puniſhable in them.

Thus, before Feſtus at Cæſarea, the Jews, which were come down from Jeruſalem, *laid many and grievous complaints againſt Paul, which they could not prove*, ch. xxv. 7. When Agrippa came to ſalute Feſtus, Feſtus declared Paul's cauſe unto the king, and tells him, *Againſt whom when the accuſers ſtood up, they brought none accuſation of ſuch things as I ſuppoſed; but had certain queſtions againſt him of their own ſuperſtition, and of one Jeſus which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive*, ver. 20. They might mix other matters in their complaints, as men intent upon a point are wont to do; but Feſtus perceived no truth in their charges, but what concerned their ſuperſtition or religion. Feſtus afterwards brings forth Paul to Agrippa; and Paul having rehearſed the manner of his life from firſt to laſt, before, and ſince his converſion; and having acquainted them in particular with his commiſſion from Chriſt to preach the goſpel; after all was over, Agrippa ſaid unto Feſtus, *This man might have been ſet at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæſar*, ch. xxvi. 15—30. Which words ſhew, Agrippa was convinced by what Paul ſaid; firſt, that theſe principles of his were his only crime; and ſecondly, that notwithſtanding the

charges and pretences of the Jews, Festus had a right to set Paul at liberty.

From all which particulars it appears, that all the evidence against Paul, was of facts that concerned the Jewish religion, or the security of their worship; and yet we find, that Felix and Festus were the judges of this prisoner, in this cause: all parties acknowledge it.

The Jews seem to have owned it by their conduct: for Ananias went down to Cæsarea with Tertullus, and accused Paul there before Felix, Acts xxv. 6, 7. And when Festus came into the province, they went to Cæsarea again, and pleaded against Paul. Festus, speaking of Paul to Agrippa, says, about whom *when I was at Jerusalem the chief priests and the elders of the Jews informed me, desiring to have judgment against him*, ver. 15. And again, *Ye see this man, about whom all the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me, both at Jerusalem, and also here, crying, that he ought not to live any longer*, ver. 24.

Paul plainly acknowledges them to be so. *Then Paul, after that the governor had beckoned to him, to speak, answered for himself: Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do the more cheerfully answer for myself*, ch. xxiv. 10. And that his cause belonged to the Roman jurisdiction, he declared farther by his appeal at last to Cæsar.

These Governors evidently claim the right of judgment. When Paul was first delivered to Felix at Cæsarea, Felix said to him, *I will hear thee, when thine accusers also are come*, ch. xxiii. 35. And after he had heard the accusers and Paul the prisoner in judgment, *he deferred them, and said, When Lysias the chief captain shall come down, I will know the uttermost of your matter*, ch. xxiv. 22. When Festus went first to Jerusalem, after he came into the province, *the high priest and chief of the Jews desired favour against him, [Paul,] that he would send for him to Jerusalem. But Festus answered, that Paul should be kept at Cæsarea, and that he himself would depart shortly thither. Let them therefore, said he, which among you are able, go down with me, and accuse this man, if there be any wickedness in him*, ch. xxv. 2—5. Paul having pleaded there before him, *Festus willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things* BEFORE ME? ver. 9.

It ought to be observed likewise, that the Jews are all along stiled accusers only: the places are too many to be instanced in, and the reader cannot but recollect divers of them.

§ X. But though this affair, thus ſtated, favours much the ſuppoſition, that the Jews had not now the power of life and death, yet there are ſome difficulties that deſerve conſideration.

1. It may be thought, that the Jews had at this time the power of life and death, according to the conſtitution they were then under, but that Lyſias had acted irregularly in taking Paul out of the Jewiſh hands, and that the governors likewiſe acted arbitrarily in ſupporting Lyſias. This objection is founded upon what Tertullus ſays to Felix in his pleading before him: *For we have found this man a peſtilent fellow, and a ringleader of the ſect of the Nazarenes, who alſo has gone about to profane the temple: whom we took, and would have judged according to our law. But the chief captain Lyſias came upon us, and with great violence took him out of our hands,* Acts xxiv. 5—7.

In anſwer to this, it is not eaſy to ſay, what we ought to underſtand by thoſe words, *whom we would have judged according to our law.* Perhaps he may be ſuppoſed by ſome to ſay, that Paul having, beſide other crimes, polluted the temple, by bringing heathens and uncircumciſed perſons into it, or beyond the bounds which were preſcribed to ſuch, we were going for this laſt offence to put him to death immediately. Titus in an expoſtulatory ſpeech to the Jews, toward the concluſion of the ſiege of Jeruſalem, ſays, 'Did not you erect 'pillars there at certain diſtances, with inſcriptions in Greek 'and Latin, forbidding any to paſs thoſe bounds? and did not 'we give you leave to kill any man that paſſed them, though 'he were a Roman[f]?' But though it could be ſuppoſed, that here was ſome reference to this matter, yet certainly they had no right by virtue of this permiſſion, to put Paul to death. This grant only empowered them to kill ſtrangers that paſſed thoſe limits, whereas Paul was a Jew. So that they acted irregularly in attempting to kill him on this account.

But poſſibly this man here attempted to miſrepreſent the fact, and pretended, that they were not going to kill Paul, but only to inflict one of thoſe leſſer puniſhments for the breach of their laws, which they had a right to inflict. And indeed I think, there is but little regard to be had to what Tertullus ſays. It ſeems plain to me, that he endeavours to impoſe upon the governor. Their attempt upon Paul was a mere tumult, as appears from St. Luke's hiſtory of it, Acts xxi. 27—31. And if we had not any particular account of that firſt action of the Jews at Jeruſalem, yet Paul confuted, or invalidated all

[f] Οὐχ ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰς ὑπερβασίας ὑμῖν ἀναιρεῖν ἐπετρέψαμεν, κ' ἂν Ῥωμαῖος τις ἦ. Joſ. de Bell. lib. 6. c. ii. §. 4.

this part of Tertullus's speech, by that one observation in his defence and reply: *Whereupon certain Jews from Asia found me purified in the temple, neither with multitude nor with tumult; who ought to have been here before thee, and object, if they had ought against me*, ch. xxiv. 18, 19. The non-appearance of these persons is a proof, that what they had done was not legal, and could not be justified: and doubtless Felix so understood it.

As for the charge, which Tertullus brings against Lysias, *that he came upon us, and with great violence took him out of our hands*, this is undoubtedly of a piece with what went before. He that could call that tumultuous attempt upon Paul's life, judging him according to their law, might say any thing. Lysias sustains so excellent a character in every other part of this narration, that it is not easy to suppose he had acted irregularly in this action. He paid such a regard to the disposition of the Jewish people against Paul, as to bind him with two chains, as soon as he had got him into his possession. Not being able to find the truth from the different accounts given him, he ordered Paul to be examined by scourging. As soon as he knew that he was a Roman, he desisted from that method of enquiry. That he might know the certainty, he summoned a council at Jerusalem, brought Paul down to them, and had the goodness to unbind him whilst he pleaded. As soon as he was informed of a clandestine conspiracy against Paul, he prudently contrives to send him under a strong guard to Cæsarea, where he might be safe. In his letter to Felix, he gives a most just account of the whole affair, and of his own conduct in particular. *This man was taken of the Jews, and should have been killed by them; then came I with an army, and rescued him.* And though I pass by many advantageous parts of his character, I must not omit his goodness, or exactness at least, in not consigning this prisoner to Felix without adding, beside his innocence, that he was a Roman.

These things are sufficient to assure us, that Lysias had a strict regard to justice, and the form of government then established in Judea; and that, in rescuing Paul from a mob, he had acted nothing but the part of a faithful and vigilant commander.

2. Farther, those words of St. Paul may create some difficulty, which we have in his answer to Festus's proposal of his going to be judged at Jerusalem:—*But if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may* DELIVER ME *unto them*, ch. xxv. 11. Whereby some may apprehend, that Paul was afraid Festus would give the cause out of his own hands, and permit the Jewish council to try him for his life.

But

But this cannot be the intention of Paul. For Feſtus's propoſal was, *wilt thou go up to Jeruſalem, and there be judged of theſe things* BEFORE ME?

Nor, ſecondly, is this the meaning of this phraſe, Ουδεις με δυναται αυτοις χαρισασθαι. The meaning is, no man may condemn me to death to pleaſe the Jews. Paul was afraid, that if he was carried up to Jeruſalem, Feſtus might be induced by the whole weight of the Jewiſh people there to condemn him, though innocent. This is the common meaning of this word in like caſes, when a judge is induced to depart from the merits of a cauſe, or from his own judgment, and to pronounce a ſentence to gratify other people. It is uſed in a good and in a bad ſenſe. It is uſed in a good ſenſe by Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus, who ſays, Amulius gave (or delivered) Rhea Silvia to his daughter: that is, granted Rhea her life at the requeſt of his daughter [g]: and by Joſephus, for thus he addreſſeth himſelf to Juſtus of Tiberias, 'And did not Agrippa, when he 'had ordered you to be put to death, grant [or deliver] your 'life to his ſiſter Bernice [h], when ſhe earneſtly requeſted it?

It is alſo uſed in a bad ſenſe. Thus the Jewiſh ambaſſadors, in the complaints they made to Auguſtus at Rome, of Herod the great's government, after his death, ſay, 'He gave (or 'delivered) the blood of Judea to foreign people [i].' This, therefore, is what Paul ſays, that ſince he was innocent, no man might condemn him to pleaſe others, no not a whole nation.

3. Still ſome may have a ſuſpicion, that if this was not a cauſe within the juriſdiction of the Jews, the reaſon might be, that the priſoner concerned was a Roman citizen: and they may think, ſuch a ſuſpicion may be founded upon what Lyſias ſays in his letter to Felix: *This man was taken of the Jews, and ſhould have been killed of them: then came I with an army, and reſcued him*, HAVING UNDERSTOOD THAT HE WAS A ROMAN, Acts xxiii. 27.

[g] Επικλασθηναι δε τον Αμυλιον εις τελος, ικετευσης της θυγατρος χαρισασθαι την αδελφην αυτη· ησαν δε συνηροφοι και ηλικιαν εχουσαι την αυτην, ασπαζομεναι τε αλληλας ως αδελφας· χαριζομενον ουν ταυτη τον Αμυλιον. p. 63. v. 14. edit. Hudſ.

[h] Και αποθανειν δε κελευσας, απαξ τη αδελφη Βερνικη πολλα δεηθεισα, την σωτηριαν εχαρισω. Joſeph. in Vit. Cap. 65. p. 839. v. 1. It is uſed by him in a good ſenſe again, χωρις των Αγριππα χαρισθεντων de B. J. lib. 3. cap. ult. ſub. fin.

[i] Και το της Ιουδαιας αιμα κεχαρισθαι τοις εξωθεν δημοις, de Bell. lib. 2. cap. 6. § 2. jam citat. a Grot. in loc. I ſubjoin a beautiful ſentence of Socrates in Plato, in which he ſays, Nor is a judge appointed to give away right and juſtice to favour or intreaty, but to judge according to the laws. Ου γαρ επι τουτω καθηται ο δικαστης επι τω καλα χαριζεσθαι τα δικαια, αλλ' επι τω κρινειν ταυτα· και ομωμοκεν ε χαριεισθαι οις αν δοκη αυτω, αλλα δικασειν κατα τους νομους. Apol. Socr. p. 35. c. edit. Serran. There is another example in Euſ. H. E. l. v. p. 163. Και γαρ και τον απο ταλου τω οχλω χαριζομενος ο ηγεμων,

In anſwer to this, ſome learned men place a full point after *reſcued him.* And join theſe laſt words, not with what goes before them, but with what follows, and tranſlate them thus: Having underſtood that he was a Roman citizen, and being deſirous to know the cauſe wherefore they accuſed him, I brought him forth to the council [k]. But the original will not admit of this interpretation [l].

I anſwer, therefore, that this cannot be the meaning of Lyſias, that having underſtood he was a Roman, he then came upon them and reſcued him; becauſe this was not the fact, as St. Luke himſelf, who has given us this letter, relates it. Lyſias did not know that Paul was a Roman, till after he had put him into the caſtle, and ordered him to be there examined by ſcourging, Acts xxiii. 26, 27. Nor do the words neceſſarily imply, that he knew this before he had taken him out out of the Jewiſh hands. They import no more than this, as Grotius has obſerved; then came I with an army and reſcued him, and I have underſtood that he is a Roman [m].

And it appears to me very obſervable, that in the courſe of this long affair in Judea, St. Paul has never inſiſted upon the privilege of a citizen, but in that one caſe, of the chief captain's ordering him to be examined by ſcourging.

However, if any are inclined to ſuſpect, that Paul's being a Roman citizen might exempt him from the juriſdiction of the Jews, then this particular caſe muſt be ſet aſide; and we have in it no proof, one way or other, what was the power of the Jewiſh council over their own people in their own country.

But though we ſet aſide aſide all the proceedings relating to Paul, after he was known to be a Roman citizen, yet it ſeems to me, that we have ſome particulars mentioned in this narration, which ſhew the Jewiſh magiſtrates had not the ſupreme government in Judea, no not in religious matters.

The reſcue of Paul by Lyſias is one part of this ſtory. The Jews were about to kill him. *The chief captain, hearing of the uproar, immediately took ſoldiers and centurions, and ran down to them.—Then the chief captain came near and took him,* Acts xxi. 31—38. He did not then know who, or what Paul was: he might have been a mere Jew for ought he knew.

[k] Ayant apris qu'il eſt citoyen Romain, & voulant ſavoir quel étoit le crime, dont ils l' accuſoient, je l' avois mené devant leur Sanhedrim. Nouv. Teſtament traduit par Mr. Le Clerc. [l] For then the words would have been μαθων δε ὁτι Ρωμαιος εστι, και βελομενος. Whereas they are—μαθων δε ο, P, ε' βελομενος δε γνωναι. κ. τ. λ. I think, that the δε following βελομενος and not μαθων, ſhews Mr. Le Clerc's interpretation is not juſt. [m] Aoriſtus hic nullum certum tempus deſignat: & tantum valet quantum και εμαθον & cognoveram. Grot. in loc.

And

And I think that Paul's defence before Felix, in anſwer to Tertullus, is remarkable: *Foraſmuch as I know, that thou haſt been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do the more cheerfully anſwer for myſelf*, Acts xxiv. 10. This argument had been ridiculous, if ſuch caſes as theſe had never come before Felix, and did not belong to him. All the particulars inſiſted on from ver. 11 to 21, have ſome regard to religion and the ſecurity of it. *They neither found me in the temple diſputing with any man.*—Felix was a judge unto this nation in theſe cauſes. Nor does Paul ſpeak of himſelf as a Roman, but as a Jew. *Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings*, ver. 17.

And if all this do not amount to a proof, that cauſes of a religious nature belonged to the Roman juriſdiction, yet certainly here is ſufficient to prove, that the Romans had ſupreme power over the Jews in civil matters, or elſe they had no power at all. For, I preſume, no man will ſuppoſe, that Felix and Feſtus were ſent to govern Romans and Greeks only in Judea. I need not remind the reader of all the particulars that have already paſſed before us. But he cannot forget the acknowledgment St. Paul makes of Felix being *judge unto that nation*, nor the Roman garriſon at Jeruſalem, nor the title of governor given to Felix and Feſtus, nor what Tertullus ſays: *Seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietneſs, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence, we accept it always, moſt noble Felix, with all thankfulneſs*, Acts xxiv. 23. And of Lyſias, an officer plainly inferior to Felix, it it ſaid, that, *becauſe he would have known the certainty, wherefore he* [Paul] *was* ACCUSED OF THE JEWS, HE COMMANDED THE CHIEF PRIESTS AND ALL THEIR COUNCIL TO APPEAR, ch. xxii. 30.

This is what we can collect from the ſacred writers, concerning the ſtate of Judea, at the time of their hiſtory.

§ XI. I proceed now to ſhew their agreement with other ancient writers. The firſt and laſt periods are evidently of the ſame kind; and therefore I ſhall endeavour jointly to confirm what we have met with concerning them.

During the whole firſt period, Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea: and all we have taken notice of in the fourth, or laſt period, happened under Felix, or Porcius Feſtus, likewiſe Roman governors of Judea. That Judea was, at the times the evangeliſts ſpeak of, under the government of theſe Roman officers, has been ſhewn already, or will be ſhewn in other parts of this work. This being taken for granted, we are now only

to

to enquire, whether the evangelists appear to have had a just idea of the power which these governors had in this country.

In order to determine this, I shall

1. Set down the opinions of divers Roman lawyers concerning the power of the presidents of provinces.

2. I shall give some passages of ancient writers relating to the state of Judea in particular.

3. Some passages of ancient writers concerning the state of people in other provinces.

1. I shall set down the opinions of divers Roman lawyers concerning the power of the presidents of provinces.

Ulpian, who flourished in the very beginning of the third century of the Christian æra says, 'It is the duty of a good 'and vigilant president to see to it, that his province be peaceable and quiet.—And that he ought to make diligent search 'after sacrilegious persons, robbers, menstealers, and thieves, 'and to punish every one according to his guilt[u].'

The same celebrated lawyer says, 'They who govern whole 'provinces have the right of the sword, and the power of 'sending to the mines[o].'

And the right of the sword, or power of the sword, appears from another passage of the same lawyer to be the power of punishing malefactors[p].

Again, he says, 'The president of a province hath the highest 'authority in his province next to the emperor[q].'

Hermogenianus says, 'Governors and presidents of provinces have the cognisance of all causes, which belong to 'the prefect of the city, or the prefect of the prætorium, and 'the consuls, and prætors, and other magistrates at Rome[r].'

And Marcianus: 'All affairs in the provinces, which at 'Rome are under the jurisdiction of several judges, do belong 'to the presidents[s].'

n Congruit bono & gravi præsidi curare, ut pacata atque quieta provincia sit, quam regit:—Nam & sacrilegos, latrones, plagiarios, fures conquirere debet: & prout quisque deliquerit, in eum animadvertere. L. 13. pr. ff. de off. Præs. o Qui universas provincias regunt, jus gladii habent: & in metallum dandi potestas eis permissa est. L. 6. § 8. ff. eod.

p Imperium aut merum [est] aut mixtum est. Merum est imperium, habere gladii potestatem ad animadvertendos facinorosos homines, quod etiam potestas appellatur. Mixtum est imperium, cui etiam jurisdictio inest, quod in danda bonorum possessione consistit. L. 3. ff. de Jurisd. q Præses provinciæ majus imperium in ea provincia habet omnibus post principem. L. 4. ff. de Off. Præs. r Ex omnibus causis, de quibus vel Præfectus Urbi, vel Præfectus prætorio, itemque Consules & Prætores, cæterique Romæ cognoscunt, Correctorum & Præsidum provinciarum est notio. L. 10. ff. eod. s Omnia enim provincialia desideria, quæ Romæ varios judices habent, ad officium Præsidum pertinent. L. 11. ff. eod. Tit. To which may be subjoined from Proculus: Sed licet is qui provinciæ præest, omnium Romæ magistratuum vice & officio fungi debeat, non tam spectandum est, quid Romæ factum est, quam quid fieri debeat. L. 12. eod.

Ulpian

Ulpian says, 'No one can transfer to another the power of 'the sword, which has been committed to himself, nor the 'right of any other punishment [t].'

Marcianus says, 'Adrian wrote thus to Julius Secundus: 'It has already been enjoined by rescripts, that credit is not 'to be given to the epistles of those, who send persons to the 'presidents as condemned.' 'The same rule extends to the 'peace-officers.—Therefore they who are sent with a bill [or 'information] are to be re-heard, although they are sent with 'a letter, or are brought by the peace-officers [u].'

This illustrates several particulars in the causes we have been considering in the New Testament. Though the Jewish council, upon their examination of Jesus, pronounced him to be *guilty of death*, Matt. xxvi. 66. and when they came before Pilate, said, *If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee*, John xviii. 30. yet Pilate gave the cause a fresh hearing, and did not at all rely upon the information of the council. And Paul was heard again before Felix, though Lysias sent him with a letter, in which he informed the governor of his innocence. Nor did Lysias expect, that Felix should rely upon the hearing he had given the cause, and the sentence he gave concerning it, but referred the issue to Felix.

Ulpian says, 'The magistrates of municipal places may 'not punish a slave (with death): but the inflicting lesser pe-'nalties is not to be denied them [x].'

Municipia [y] were towns, or cities, which had the citizenship of Rome bestowed upon them, and yet still lived according to

[t] Solent etiam custodiarum cognitionem mandare legatis: scilicet, ut præauditas custodias ad se remittant, ut innocentem liberet: Sed hoc genus mandati extraordinarium est: nec enim potest quis gladii sibi datam, vel cujus alterius potestatem coercitionis ad alium transferre. L. 6. pr. ff. de Officio Proconsulis & Legati. Papinianus says the same thing; Qui mandatam jurisdictionem suscepit, proprium nihil habet: sed [&] ejus, qui mandavit, jurisdictione utitur. Verum est enim more majorem jurisdictionem quidem transferri, sed merum imperium, quod lege datur, non posse transire: quare nemo dicit, animadversionem legatum proconsulis habere mandata jurisdictione. L. 1. § 1. ff. de Officio ejus cui mandat. est Jurisd. [u] Divus Hadrianus Julio Secundo ita rescripsit: 'Et alias rescriptum est, non esse utique 'epistolis eorum credendum, qui quasi 'damnatos ad præsidem remiserint.' Idem de irenarchis præceptum est: quia non omnes ex fide bona elogia scribere compertum est.——Igitur, qui cum elogio mittuntur, ex integro audiendi sunt, etsi per literas missi fuerint, vel etiam per irenarchas perducti. L. 6. pr. & § 1. ff. de custodia & Exhibitione reorum. [x] Magistratibus municipalibus supplicium a servo sumere non licet: modica autem castigatio non est deneganda. L. 12. ff. de Jurisdictione. What Paulus says agrees herewith: Ea, quæ magis imperii sunt, quam jurisdictionis, magistratus municipalis facere non potest. L. 26. ff. Ad municip. & de incolis.

[y] Municipes ergo sunt cives Romani ex municipiis, legibus suis & suo jure utentes. A. Gell. Lib. xiii. cap. 13. vid. & Fest. voc. Municipes, & Municipium.

their

their own laws and constitutions. In which they differed from colonies, which were governed by the Roman laws[z].

I take this to decide the matter fully. The Jews lived according to their own laws, as municipal people did: but then, if these last, who were Roman citizens, had not the right of punishing a slave with death, certainly the Jews had not, whilst under the Roman government.

2. I shall now proceed to some passages of ancient writers, that particularly concern the state of Judea about this time.

Archelaus, Herod's son, being banished by Augustus, A. D. 6 or 7, Judea was put under the government of Roman officers sent from Rome. Of this affair Josephus, in the Jewish war, speaks in these words: 'The dominion of Archelaus being 'reduced to a province, Coponius, a person of the equestrian 'order among the Romans, is sent thither invested by Cæsar 'with the power of life and death[a].'

Speaking of this same revolution in his Antiquities, he says, 'In the mean time Cyrenius, a senator—came into Syria— 'being sent thither by Cæsar, as judge of that nation, and 'censor of their estates. And Coponius, a person of the 'equestrian rank, is sent with him to govern the Jews with 'supreme authority: Cyrenus also came into Judea, it being 'annexed to the province of Syria[b].'

When St. Luke mentions Festus's arrival into the province[c], namely of Judea, Acts xxv. 1. he uses the same word that Josephus does, when he says, that Archelaus's dominion was reduced to a province. And when St. Paul stiles Felix the judge unto that[d] nation, he uses a phrase equivalent to that, by which Josephus describes the authority, with which Cyrenius was sent into Syria; namely, as judge of that people, or to administer justice among them.

As Cyrenius came at this time into Judea, and made an assessment there, so the Jews continued, whilst a Roman province, to pay tribute to the emperor. Tacitus informs us, that in the third of Tiberius, A. D. 17. the Jews presented a petition to Tiberius for an abatement of their tribute[e]. And

z Et jura institutaque omnia populi Romani, non sui imperii habent. A. Gell. ubi supra.

a Της δε Αρχελαȣ χωρας εις επαρχιαν περιγραφεισης, επιτροπος τις επικης παρα Ρωμαιοις ταξεως Κωπωνιος πεμπεται, μεχρι τȣ κτεινειν λαβων παρα τȣ Καισαρος εξȣσιαν· Jos. de B. Lib. ii. cap. viii. § 1.

b Κυρηνιος δε επι Συριας παρην, υπο Καισαρος δικαιοδοτης τȣ εθνȣς απεσταλμενος——Κωπωνιος τε αυτῳ συγκαταπεμπεται, ταγματος των ιππεων, ηγησομενος Ιȣδαιων τῃ επι πασιν εξȣσιᾳ· παρην δε και Κυρηνιος εις την Ιȣδαιων προσθηκην της Συριας γενομενην· Antiq. L. 18. cap. 1. § 1.

c Φηστος ȣν επιβας τῃ επαρχιᾳ·

d Κριτην τῳ εθνει τȣτῳ. Acts xxiv. 10.

e Et provinciæ Syria atque Judæa, fessæ oneribus, diminutionem tributi orabant. Ann. lib. 2. cap. 42.

Agrippa

Agrippa the younger, A. D. 66. tells the Jews, that the Alexandrians paid the Romans more tribute in a month than they did in a year[f].

Philo has given a long representation of Pilate's government, in the complaints which the Jews made to Pilate, upon his dedicating shields at Jerusalem. They tell him, 'It was not the 'will of Tiberius, that any of their laws and customs should 'be violated[g]. And Pilate was afraid that if they should send 'an embassy to Rome, they would discover to the emperor 'the many crimes of his administration, his taking of bribes, 'his extortions, his murders of innocent and uncondemned 'persons, and other cruelties[h].' Here are the tokens of civil power, but much abused.

In Josephus there are many instances of the authority of Felix and Festus, who punished not only bands of robbers, but those also that got together under religious pretences, though with designs of making innovations in the government[i]. And these facts Josephus relates without any marks of censure; whereas, when these, or any other of the governors committed any acts of violence and injustice, he never fails to make reflections upon them.

I shall transcribe here but one passage concerning an action of Albinus, successor of Porcius Festus, just before he left the province. 'But when Albinus[k] heard that Gessius Florus was 'coming to succeed him, being desirous to seem to do some-'thing to gratify the people of Jerusalem; having enquired 'into the case of all that were in prison, he gave orders for the 'putting to death all that were manifestly guilty of capital 'crimes; but set at liberty all those who had been imprisoned 'for lesser offences, having first received a sum of money. 'Thus the prisons were emptied, and the country was filled 'with robbers.' This is a proof, that Albinus had the supreme power in all offences. These must be Jewish prisoners, or the releasing them had been no obligation upon the people of Jerusalem.

[f] Τȣ δε ενιαυσιȣ παρ' υμων φορȣ καθ' ενα μηνα πλεον Ρωμαιοις παρεχει· De B. J. lib. 2. cap. 16. p. 1088. v. 45.

[g] Τιβεριος ȣδεν εθελει των ημετερων καταλυεσθαι· Philo de legat. ad Cai. p. 1034. B.

[h] Τȣτο μαλιστα αυτον εξετραχυνε, καταδεισαντα μη τῳ οντι πρεσβευσαμενοι, και της αλλης αυτȣ επιτροπης εξελεγξωσι τας δωροδοκιας, τας υβρεις, τας αρπαγας, τας αικιας,—τȣς ακριτȣς και επαλληλȣς φονȣς—διεξελθοντες· ib. ibid. C.

[i] See Antiq. lib. xx. cap. vii. § 6. 10. de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 13.

[k] Ως δε ηκȣσεν Αλβινος διαδοχον αυτῳ Γεσσιον Φλωρον αφικνεισθαι, βȣλομενος δοκειν τι τοις Ιεροσολυμιταις παρεσχησθαι, προσαγαγων τȣς δεσμωτας, οσοι ησαν αυτων προδηλως θανειν αξιοι, τȣτȣς προσεταξεν αναιρεθηναι· τȣς δε εκ μικρας και της τυχȣσης αιτιας εις την ειρκτην καταθεθεντας, χρηματα λαμβανων αυτος απελυε· και, ȣτως, η μεν φυλακη των δεσμωτων εκαθαρθη, η χωρα δε λῃστων επληρωθη· Antiq. 20. cap. 8. § 5.

But

But though these procurators acted with the highest authority under the emperor, yet the Jews had a senate and magistrate; as appears undeniably from a letter of Claudius, sent to them in answer to a petition he had received from them; which letter was written A.D. 45. and is thus directed: 'To the 'magistrates of Jerusalem, to the council, the people, and the 'whole nation of the Jews, greeting[l].' Josephus often makes mention of the magistrates and chief men of Jerusalem[m]. When the war was just breaking out between them and the Romans, they being very uneasy under the government of their procurator Florus, Josephus says, that the 'high priests of the Jews, 'and the chief men, and the COUNCIL, waited upon Agrippa, 'to inform him of the state of their affairs[n].'

We have a proof of their power of beating or whipping, in the punishment of Jesus the son of Ananus; who, at the feast of tabernacles, four years before the war, began his lamentable cry: 'A voice against Jerusalem, a voice against the tem-'ple.—He went through all the streets of the city, crying thus 'day and night.—Some of the chief of the people, being un-'easy at so ill boding a sound, take the man up and have him 'beaten most severely.'—But he still continuing his cry; 'The 'magistrates thinking the man must be under some more than 'ordinary impulse, as indeed he was, bring him to the Roman 'president.—He having examined and whipped him again, 'dismissed him as a madman[o].'

This shews, the magistrates of Jerusalem could order a whipping: but whether their carrying the man after that to the Roman procurator amounts to a proof, that they could not inflict any heavier punishment, I must leave to the reader's consideration.

The Jews had likewise senates in some other cities, beside Jerusalem, which senates had also the power of imprisoning. Josephus thus characterizes Albinus's government. 'For sums 'of money, paid by relations, he set at liberty thieves and rob-'bers, which had been imprisoned by the senate of any place, 'or by the former procurators[p].'

[l] Ιεροσολυμιτων αρχουσι, βουλη, δημω, Ιουδαιων παντι εθνει χαιρειν. Antiq. L. 20. cap. 1. § 2. [m] Αρχοντες των Ιεροσολυμων. p. 1073. 28. & alibi passim.

[n] Ενθα και Ιουδαιων οι τε αρχιερεις αμα τοις δυνατοις, και η βουλη παση, δεξιουμενη τον βασιλεα. de Bell. L. ii. cap. 16. § 2.

[o] Των δ' επισημων τινες δημοται, ασανακλησαντες προς το κακοφημον, συλλαμβανουσι τον ανθρωπον, και πολλαις αικιζουσι πληγαις—νομισαντες δ' οι αρχοντες, οπερ ην, δαιμονιωτερον ειναι το κινημα του ανδρος, αναγουσιν αυτον επι τον παρα Ρωμαιοις επαρχον, ενθα μαστιξι μεχρις οστεων ξαινομενος, ουθ' ικετευσεν, ουτ' εδακρυσεν—τον δ' επι τη πολει θρηνον ειρων ου διελιπεν μεχρι καταγνους μανιαν, ο Αλβινος απελυσεν αυτον. de B. J. lib. 6. c. 5. § 3.

[p] Αλλα και τους επι ληστεια δεδεμενους, υπο της παρ' εκαστοις βουλης, η των προτερων επιτροπων απελυσε τοις συγγενεσι. De bell. lib. ii. cap. 14. § 1.

And

And now I reckon we have gone over the ſeveral inſtances of the Jews power and authority. The nature of the Roman government in Judea, and the extent of the Jewiſh privileges under that government, may however be farther illuſtrated by two or three other paſſages. When Herod the great was dead, the Jews having been oppreſſed by him, and being deſirous to be no longer ſubject to any of his family, ſent an embaſſy to Auguſtus. The ſubſtance of their petition preſented to the emperor, Joſephus ſays, was this, 'That they might no longer 'continue in the ſtate of a kingdom, but might be annexed to 'Syria, and be governed by prætors ſent from thence [q].' Thus he repreſents it in his Antiquities. In his Jewiſh War he expreſſes it thus: 'Ambaſſadors were ſent away to obtain a right 'of living according to their own laws [r].' Theſe two paſſages laid together aſſure us, their petition was, that they might be governed by Roman officers according to their own laws.

And Joſephus ſays, that after the death of Herod Agrippa, 'Claudius made Judea a province again, and ſent Cuſpius Fa-'dus to be procurator, and afterwards Tiberius Alexander. 'They MAKING NO ALTERATIONS IN THE LAWS AND CUSTOMS 'OF THE COUNTRY, kept the nation in peace [s].'

It is likewiſe worth while to place here a part of the ſpeech, which Agrippa the younger made to the people at Jeruſalem, to diſſuade them from entering into war with the Romans. 'I 'know very well,' ſays he, 'that many make loud complaints 'of the oppreſſions of the procurators, and run out into the 'praiſes of liberty. Before I come therefore to conſider the 'proſpect of ſucceſs in this your deſign, by ſhewing you what 'is your ſtrength, and what is theirs with whom you are about 'to contend, I would firſt diſtinguiſh the pretences, which 'are ſtrangely connected by ſome. For if you would revenge 'thoſe who do you wrong, why do you talk of liberty? But 'if you judge ſervitude intolerable, complaints of the go-'vernors are ſuperfluous. For though they be ever ſo juſt 'and moderate in their government, the ſcandal of ſubjection '(or ſervitude) remains [t].' This is a proof, that whilſt they

[q] Η δε κεφαλαιον αυλοις της αξιωσεως, βασιλειας μεν και τοιωνδε αρχων απηλλαχθαι, προσθηκην δε Συριας γεγονοιας υποκεισθαι τοις εκειθε πεμπομενοις στρατηγοις. Antiq. lib. 17. cap. 13. § 1.

[r] Πρεσβεις εξεπεμψαν περι της του βιου αυτονομιας. De B. lib. ii. cap. 6. § 1.

[s] Παλιν τας βασιλειας Κλαυδιος επαρχιαν ποιησας επιτροπον πεμπει Κασπιον Φαδον, επειτα Τιβεριον Αλεξανδρον· οι μηδεν παρακινουντες των πατριων εθων, εν ειρηνη το εθνος διεφυλαξαν. De bell. lib. ii. cap. xi. § 6.

[t] Εγω δε, πριν εξεταζειν τινες αιτιες, και τισιν επιχειρειτε πολεμειν, πρωτον διαζευξω την συμπλοκην των προφασεων· ει μεν αμυνεσθε τους αδικουντας, τι σημαινει την ελευθεριαν; ει δε το δουλευειν αφορητον ηγεισθε, περισσα πασα τους ηγεμονας η μεμψις· και γαρ εκεινων μετριαζοντων, αισχρον ομοιως το δουλευειν. De B. J. lib. ii. cap. 16. § 4.

had

had a Roman governor in their country, no sober men among them would pretend they were a free people.

And it is a kind of presumption, that the Jews had not at this time the power of life and death, in that, in all Josephus's history of these times, when criminals abounded in Judea, and many were put to death by the Roman governors, we find not the mention of any one put to death by the Jewish council or magistracy, except those which were stoned in a vacancy between the death of Festus, (which happened in the province) and the arrival of Albinus his successor.

The case is remarkable, and some readers may be willing to see it here. 'Ananus the younger, who we said just now had 'been put into the priesthood, was fierce and haughty in his 'behaviour, and extremely resolute and daring: and moreover was of the sect of the sadducees, who are, above all 'other Jews, cruel in their judicial sentences. This then being the temper of Ananus, he thinking he had a fit opportunity, because Festus was dead, and Albinus was yet upon 'the road, calls a council; and bringing before them James, 'the brother of him who is called Christ, and some others, he 'accused them as transgressors of the laws, and had them stoned 'to death[u].' Josephus says, many were offended at this proceeding. 'And some went away to meet Albinus, who was 'coming from Alexandria, and[x] put him in mind, that Ananus 'had no right to call a council without his leave. Albinus, 'approving of what they said, wrote a very angry letter to 'Ananus, threatening to punish him for what he had done. And 'king Agrippa took away from him the priesthood, after he had 'enjoyed it three months, and put in Jesus the son of Damnæus.'

Some learned men have suspected those words, 'the brother 'of him who is called Christ,' to be an interpolation. But we have no occasion at present to concern ourselves with that. It is certain, here were some men put to death by the procurement of the high priest and the council he summoned; and the action was judged illegal by many at Jerusalem, by Albinus the procurator, and by Agrippa, who had then the government of the temple, and the right of nominating the high

[u] Ο δε νεωτερος Ανανος, ον την αρχιεροσυνην εφαμεν παρειληφεναι, θρασυς ην τον τροπον, και τολμητης διαφερόντως· αιρεσιν δε μετηει την Σαδδυκαιων· οιπερ εισι περι τας κρισεις ωμοι παρα παντας τους Ιουδαιους· —αλλ δη ων τοιουτος ων ο Ανανος, νομισας εχειν καιρον επιτηδειον, δια το τεθναναι μεν Φηστον, Αλβινον δε ετι κατα την οδον υπαρχειν, καθιζει συνεδριον κριτων· κ. λ. Antiq. 20. cap. 8. § 1.

[x] Τινες δε αυτων και των Αλβινον υπαντιαζουσιν απο της Αλεξανδρειας οδοιπορουντα, και διδασκουσιν ως ουκ εξον ην Ανανῳ χωρις της εκεινου γνωμης καθισαι συνεδριον· Αλβινος δε, πεισθεις τοις λεγομενοις, γραφει μετ' οργης τῳ Ανανῳ λημψεσθαι παρ' αυτου δικας απειλων· κ. λ. ibid.

priests,

priests. Nay, Ananus had not the right of summoning the council without Albinus's leave. And I think, that Josephus's introduction to this story is a proof, that the council had not the power of life and death under a Roman procurator. Ananus was of the sect of the sadducees, who were cruel in their sentences above all other Jews. Ananus was of the same temper. Festus being dead, and Albinus yet upon the road, Ananus thought he had a fit opportunity to gratify his cruel disposition, and calls a council, in order to have some men stoned to death. It is herein implied, that even this fierce and daring high priest could not have gratified his cruelty in this way, if a procurator had been in the country. And though he thought he had had a fit opportunity, what he did then cost him the priesthood.

There was likewise a sort of council summoned at Jerusalem, in order to have [y] Zacharias, the son of Baruch, condemned to death: but then they had shook off their subjection to the Romans.

But though there appear not any token of this power of life and death, whilst they were under the Roman government, yet as soon as they resolve upon the war, we meet with it very distinctly. They then appointed such and such to govern at Jerusalem, others to command in Idumea, others in other places, and Josephus the son of Matthias, our historian, to command in the two Galilees. When he came into his government, he says, "choosing seventy of the most prudent men of 'the country, he appointed them to be rulers of all Galilee, 'and in each city also, seven men judges of lesser matters: and 'directed that the more weighty matters, and all capital causes, 'should be brought to himself and the seventy [z].'

It may be said, there is scarce any mention made in Josephus, of the Jews inflicting lesser punishments. To this I answer, that these are particulars which rarely occur in large histories; the writers judging them too trifling, for the most part, to appear in their works. I have, however, given plain evidences from Josephus, of their power of imprisoning and inflicting lesser penalties.

It is likely also, that what Titus says, of the right of the Jews to kill any man, though a Roman, who entered beyond the limits prescribed to uncircumcised men, may be thought an instance of their having the power of life and death.

[y] De B. J. lib. 4. cap. 5. § 4. [z] Των μεν γραμματων εβδομηκοντα της σωφρονεστατης επιλεξας εκ του εθνους, καλεσησεν αρχοντας απασης της Γαλιλαιας·——τα γαρ μειζω πραγματα και τας φονικας δικας εφ' εαυτον αναπεμπειν εκελευσε και τους εβδομηκοντα. De Bell. lib. ii. c. 20. § 5.

But I apprehend the meaning of Titus to be, that if the Jews had found any gentile in the court of the Jews, the Romans had permitted them to take such a one and kill him immediately. This was a grant or permission with respect to one particular offence only. Nor can there be any consequence drawn from hence to any other cases, nor to a right of inflicting death in the way of a judicial process, either upon Jews or Romans. It is evident, that upon occasion of other violations of things sacred, committed by common Roman soldiers, the Jews applied to their procurator for justice [a].

3. I would now, by way of collateral evidence, give some few passages of ancient authors concerning the state of other provinces.

Pilate has, in the gospels, the power of life and death in Judea. All governors of provinces seem to have had the same power. If the reader doubts of it, I refer him to the tenth book of Pliny's epistles, which contain his letters to Trajan, and the emperor's rescripts. I produce here only one passage from Philo, who thus aggravates the sufferings of Flaccus, president of Egypt, when he was accused before Caligula by some of the most considerable men of that country. 'He who 'had been governor was accused by his subjects, by those who 'had always been his great enemies, by men, of whose lives 'he had lately been lord and master [b].'

According to the Roman lawyers whose opinions I have produced above, the governors of provinces had not only the power of life and death, but they were also the supreme judges in matters of property. The same thing is evident from the ancient Roman authors [c].

As we find the Jews had a council, so had also the people of most other provinces senates in their great towns; the members of which were chosen according to ancient custom [d], or rules prescribed by the senate or emperors [e].

It is also extremely remarkable, that the Jews had councils and magistrates, not in Judea only, but in all the provinces of the Roman empire where they lived. For Philo says, 'Flac-'cus apprehending eight and thirty of our senate, which our

[a] Joseph. Antiq. lib. xx. c. 4. § 3, 4.

[b] Ὁ δὲ ὑ καλησορηθη μονον, αρχων προς ὑπηκοων, και υπο δυσμενων αει γειομενων, ὁ προ μικρυ κυριος ων της εκασ ζωης. In Flacc. p. 986. Confer. 983. C. D. [c] Erat mihi in animo rectâ proficisci ad exercitum, æstivos menses reliquos rei militari dare, hibernos jurisdictioni. Cic. ad Att. lib. v. ep. 14. vid. & Ep. ad Quintum Fratrem, lib. i. c. 2, 3. & alibi passim. [d] Quorum ex testimoniis cognoscere potuistis, tota Sicilia per triennium neminem ulla in civitate, senatorem factum esse gratis: neminem, ut leges eorum sunt, suffragiis.—Cic. in Verr. lib. ii. cap. 49. n. 120. vid. & quæ sequuntur. [e] Cautum est.—Pompeia lege quæ Bithynis data est, ne quis capiat magistratum, neve sit in senatu minor annorum 30. eadem lege comprehensum est, ut qui ceperint magistratum sint in senatu. Plin. lib. x. ep. 83. vid. & ep. 84.

'saviour

'saviour and benefactor Augustus had appointed to take care 'of the Jewish affairs, he led them through the town to the 'theatre, and there ordered them to be whipped[f]. Beside these eight and thirty, Philo mentions three other Jewish senators who were scourged by Flaccus, after their houses had been plundered by the Egyptian rabble; which disgrace he aggravates in this manner: 'There are in that city different 'methods of inflicting this punishment, according to the quality of persons. Egyptians are whipped by Egyptians, with 'one sort of rods: Alexandrians by Alexandrians only, with 'another sort of rods. This custom former presidents, and 'Flaccus himself in the former part of his government, had observed with regard to our people[g]. Was it not then intolerable, that, when an ordinary Alexandrian Jew received 'the more honourable and liberal stripes, if he committed an 'offence, these rulers, the senate, men venerable for their age 'and dignity, should be treated in this respect worse than their 'subjects, and be levelled with the most obscure and most criminal Egyptians[h]?'

From the number of senators mentioned in these two passages, it may be concluded, the Jews had at Alexandria a full senate of seventy. Philo speaks of these men in very magnificent terms, and he also calls the other Jews their subjects: but nevertheless the Jews were not exempt from the jurisdiction of the Roman president, whose authority appears to be paramount over all. And the former presidents, whom Philo does not condemn, and Flaccus in the former part of his government, when according to Philo's own account, his administration had been admirable and exemplary, had been wont to punish Jewish people, if they thought them culpable.

What Philo says of the Jewish magistracy at Alexandria is confirmed by other writers. For Josephus assures us, that this same Philo's brother Alexander was alibarch of the Jews in Egypt[i]. And Claudius, in an edict published in favour of the Jews in the beginning of his reign, (which edict is preserved entire in Josephus) observes as a precedent, 'That when a 'Jewish ethnarch died, Augustus had not forbid the creation

[f] Της γαρ ημετερας γερουσιας, ην ο σωτηρ και ευεργετης Σεβαστος επιμελησομενην των Ιουδαικων ειλετο—οκτω και τριακοντα συλλαβων ευθυς μεν δησαι κελευει. In Flacc. p. 975. D. [g] Το εθος τουτο και επι των ημετερων διετηρησαν οι προ Φλακκου, και Φλακκος αυτος τους πρωτους χρονους. Ibid. p. 976. C. [h] Πως ουν παγχαλεπον των ιδιωτων Αλεξανδρεων Ιουδαιων ταις ελευθεριωτεραις και πολιτικωτεραις μαστιξιν τετυπτομενων, ειποτε εδοξαν πληγων αξια εργασασθαι, τους αρχοντας, την γερουσιαν, οι και γερως, και τιμης εισιν επωνυμοι, κατα τουτο το μερος ελαττον των υπηκοων ενεγκασθαι, καθαπερ των Αιγυπτιων τους αφανεστατους και ενοχους τοις μεγιστοις αδικημασιν. Ibid. D. E. [i] Antiq. l. 18. cap. 9. p. 821. v. 11. vid. & p. 809. v. 43.

'of a new ethnarch[k], willing that all should remain subject to 'him, but in the observation of their own customs.' Which shews likewise, that the Jewish magistracy there was entirely subject to the Romans, and was not to derogate from their government of all.

And after this, Demetrius the alebarch of the Jews at Alexandria, was so considerable a person, that Mariamne the second daughter of Herod Agrippa thought fit to bestow herself upon him, when she had divorced her first husband[l].

Strabo, in a passage, not now in his works but cited by Josephus, says, that 'a good part of Alexandria is inhabited by 'this people [the Jews]. They had likewise an ethnarch, who 'administers their affairs, decides causes and presides over 'contracts and mandates, as if he were the governor of a per-'fect republic[m].'

Josephus likewise makes mention of a person, who was archon or chief magistrate of the Jews at Antioch in Syria[n], at the time that the war against the Jews in Judea was proclaimed by the Romans.

There is somewhat very remarkable in a decree concerning the Jews of Sardis. It deserves to be transcribed here from Josephus: 'Lucius Antonius son of Mark, proquæstor and 'proprætor to the magistrates, senate and people of Sardis, 'greeting. The Jews which are our citizens, have shewn 'me, that they have always had an assembly of their own ac-'cording to the laws of their country, and [o] a place of their 'own, in which they decide the affairs and differences which 'concern themselves. Having desired of me that it may be 'lawful for them so to do, I have decreed that this (right) be 'preserved and permitted to them (A).'

I have here given this account of the state of the Jews in other countries, because I apprehend that one great reason, why

[k] Και τελευτησαντος τω Ιωδαιων εθναρχω, τον Σεβαστον μη κεκωλυκεναι εθναρχας γινεσθαι, βουλομενον υπολειφθηναι εκαστω εμμενουσας τοις ιδιοις εθεσι. Joseph. ibid. l. xix. c. 5. p. 865. v. 34. [l] Τω αυτω δε καιρω και Μαριαμνη, παραιτησαμενη τον Αρχελαον, συνωκησε Δημητριω, τω εν Αλεξανδρεια Ιουδαιων πρωτευοντι γενει τε και πλουτω· τοτε δη και την Αλαβαρχιαν αυτος ειχε. Joseph. Antiq. l. xx. cap. 6. § 3.

[m] Καθιστασι δε και εθναρχης αυτων, ος διοικει τε το εθνος και διαιτα κρισεις, και συμβολαιων επιμελειται και προσταγμασιν, ως αν πολιτειας αρχων αυτοτελους. Joseph. Ant. lib. xiv. cap. 7. § 2. vid. & Ant. lib. xix. c. 5. § 2. [n] Ην γαρ αρχων των εν Αντιοχειας Ιουδαιων. De Bell. lib. vii. cap. 3. § 3. [o] Μοι επεδειξαν εαυτους συνεδριον εχειν ιδιαν και τους πατριους νομους απ' αρχης, και τοπον ιδιον, εν ω τα τε προς αλληλους αντιλογιας κρινουσι· τελο τε αιτησαμενοις, ιν εξη αυτοις ποιειν, τηρησαι και επιτρεψαι εκρινα. Antiq. xiv. cap. 10. § 17.

(A) This decree shews, how justly the apostle rebuked the Christians at Corinth, 1 Cor. vi. 5, 6. *for going to law*, one with another *before the unbelievers:* when they might have decided all lesser differences among themselves.

many have ſuppoſed the Jews had the power of life and death in Judea, is, becauſe they perceive they had there an high prieſt, a council, and other officers or magiſtrates. The privileges of the Jews in other countries, which I have here inſtanced in, ſhew the inference is not good. They had even there a ſenate and magiſtrates; but no one will ſuppoſe theſe had the power of life and death. Indeed it does not appear, that the people of any province had it. But the Roman preſidents, and they alone, are ever repreſented as the ſupreme judges (next under the ſenate or the emperor) in all cauſes whatever in their ſeveral provinces [p].

We muſt therefore ſuppoſe, that though the Jewiſh ſenate and other magiſtrates ſubſiſted in Judea, yet their power was not exactly the ſame they had formerly, but was reſtrained and diminiſhed under the Roman governors. So it appears to be in the evangeliſts; and between them and the other writers which I have quoted, there is a perfect harmony.

Every reader will now be able to obſerve the beauty and propriety of St. Peter's ſtyle, as well as the reaſonableneſs of his advice, which he gives, 1 Pet. i. 1. to the *ſtrangers ſcattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia*; provinces, or parts of provinces of the Roman empire: 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14. *Submit yourſelves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake, whether it be to the* KING (it ſhould be rendered emperor) [q] *as ſupreme, or unto* GOVERNORS, AS UNTO THEM THAT ARE SENT BY HIM (from Rome) FOR THE PUNISHMENT OF EVIL DOERS [r], *and for the praiſe of them that do well.* Here is an exact deſcription of the power and authority which the preſidents of provinces were inveſted with, for the adminiſtration of juſtice.

[p] Præclarum eſt enim SUMMO CUM IMPERIO fuiſſe in Aſia triennium, ſic ut nullum te ſignum,——nulla conditio pecuniæ ab ſummа integritate continentiaque deduxerit. Cic. ad Quint. Frat. Lib. i. Ep. 1. cap. 2. n. 7. Quare quoniam in iſtis urbibus cum SUMMO IMPERIO ET POTESTATE verſaris. Ibid. cap. 10. n. 24. Quam jucunda tandem prætoris comitas in Aſia poteſt eſſe, in quâ tanta multitudo civium UNIUS hominis nutum intuentur?—Quare cùm permagni hominis eſt,——ſic ſe adhibere in tanta poteſtate, ut NULLA ALIA POTESTAS ab iis, quibus ipſe præſit deſideretur. Ibid. cap. 7. n. 18.

[q] The Greek writers made no ſcruple to call the Roman emperors kings, though the Romans did. This is Grotius's obſervation upon the place. He has given no inſtances, becauſe, I ſuppoſe, he thought it needleſs. However, I will put down two or three here; οι μεν γαρ Ρωμαιων βασιλεις ειλιμησαν τε και προσεκοσμησαν το ιερον αει. Joſeph. de B. J. lib. 5. c. 13. § 6. χρονω δε υστερον εις Νερωνα, η βασιλεια περιηλθε η Γωμαιων. Pauſan. p. 429.—μονος τε βασιλεων φιλοσοφιαν, ε λοσοις, ουδε δοσμαλων γνωσεσι, σεμνω δ' ηθει, και βιω σωφρονι επιγωσαλο [Μαρκος] Herodian. lib. i. § 3. But as we never call the Roman emperors kings in our language, the word emperor ſeems to me more proper in this place. [r] Compare this with Ulpian's deſcription of the power of the ſword.——St. Peter's (κακοποιοι) evil doers, are Ulpian's facinoroſi.

§ XII. We are now to consult for the external evidences relating to the state of the Jews during the second period, which reaches from the resurrection of our Saviour to the reign of Herod Agrippa.

If our Saviour was crucified at the passover in the 19th year of Tiberius, A. D. 33. which is the opinion of many learned men, then we have here the space of about eight years. For Caligula was killed, and Claudius succeeded him the 24th day of January, A. D. 41 [t]. And Claudius, in the beginning of his reign, made Herod Agrippa king of all Judea. But if our Saviour was crucified two or three years sooner, which is the opinion of many other learned men, then this period is proportionably of a longer duration. I enter not here into any enquiry which of these two computations is the most probable, because, as will appear presently, it is not material in the present case, or at least not necessary.

I must however desire the reader to observe here a few particulars, though they have been partly mentioned already. Archelaus was removed from the government of Judea, A. D. 6 or 7. Judea and Samaria were then made a Roman province, with this particular circumstance, that they were to be a branch of the province of Syria [u]. But that this country of Judea might be kept in good order, there was an officer, with the title of procurator, sent by Augustus to reside and govern there, invested with the supreme authority, or the power of life and death. The first of these was Coponius, the next Marcus Ambivius, his successor Annius Rufus, in whose time Augustus died, A. D. 14. The next was Valerius Gratus, who was appointed procurator by Tiberius, and continued in the province eleven years; and was then succeeded by Pontius Pilate, who governed Judea ten years. So far every thing is exceeding clear in Josephus [x]. There is indeed some debate, whether these ten years of Pilate expired some time before the passover, A. D. 36 or 37. I think that Pilate left Judea before the passover, A. D. 36. and shall give my reasons in another place.

We must now endeavour to clear up the state of Judea during the remainder of this period, that is, after the removal of Pilate, which cannot be above four or five years at the most. It may be questioned, whether they had now any procurator residing among them with power of life and death, as they had from the year of our Lord 7, to the year 36 or 37. But that they were subject to the Romans is certain. For at the same

t Joseph. de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 11. Sueton. Calig. 58. Dio. lib. 59. p. 663. C. D.
u Joseph. de Bell. l. ii. c. 8. Antiq. l. xvii. c. ult. x Antiq. l. xviii. c. 2. § 1, 2.

time

time that the (B) Samaritans waited upon Vitellius the president of Syria, entreating that Pilate might be removed, they made very solemn professions of their willingness to continue under the Roman government, and only complained of the tyranny of Pilate [y]. And that the Jews were subject to the Romans in the last year of this period, A. D. 40, appears from what Herod Agrippa says to Caligula, in the letter he sent to him to persuade him to revoke the orders he had given for erecting his statue at Jerusalem: 'I presume not (says he) to 'ask for my country the freedom of the city, nor yet liberty, nor 'immunity from tribute [z]:' as his letter is given us by Philo.

But I am apt to think, they had no procurator residing among them, from the time of Pilate's removal to Agrippa's accession to the kingdom of Judea in the reign of Claudius. My reasons are these: Josephus's account in his Antiquities, of the removal of Pilate, is in these words: 'Then Vitellius, having sent Marcellus his friend to administer the affairs of Judea, commanded Pilate to go to Rome, to answer to the 'emperor for those things of which he was accused by the 'Jews [a].' Now I think, that Marcellus could not have the power of life and death in Judea, because he was sent thither by Vitellius only; and no officer under the emperor could convey this power to another, as we are assured by Ulpian [b]. The Jews therefore could not have any one in their country with this power, till one was sent thither with it from Italy. But there was no one sent from Rome to Judea, after this, till the beginning of Caligula's reign. I shall shew hereafter, that Pilate was removed by Vitellius before the passover, A. D. 36. Therefore for one whole year, the last of Tiberius, there was no officer residing in Judea with power of life and death.

Now let us see who was sent into Judea by Caligula in the beginning of his reign, and what was the commission of this officer. Josephus's words are these: 'He [Caligula] sent 'Marullus to be master of the horse in Judea [c].' Some would read in Josephus, instead of [ιππαρχην] master of the horse, [επαρχον] president. But all copies agree in the present read-

(B) The Jews are to be supposed to join with them herein, for they likewise brought accusations against Pilate, as will appear presently.

[y] Ου γαρ επι αποστασει Ρωμαιων, αλλ' επι διαφυγη της Πιλατου υβρεως, εις την Τιραβαθα παραγενεσθαι.—Joseph. Ant. l. xviii. cap. 5. § 2.

[z] Ει και μη την Ρωμαικην πολιτειαν, ελευθεριαν γουν η φορων αφεσιν, ουδεν αν ετολμησα τοιουτον αιτησασθαι. De Legat. ad Caium. p. 1032. C.

[a] Και Ουιτελλιος, Μαρκελλον τον αυτου φιλον εκπεμψας επιμηλητην τοις Ιουδαιοις γενησομενον, Πιλατον εκελευσεν επι Ρωμης απιεναι, προς α κατηγοροιεν Ιουδαιοι διδαξαντα τον αυτοκρατορα. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 5. § 2.

[b] L. vi. pr. ff. de Off. Proconf. & Leg. His words are above, p. 75.

[c] Ιππαρχην δε επι της Ιουδαιας εκπεμπει Μαρυλλον. Marullum autem misit, qui equitum magister esset in Judæa. Hudf. verf. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 7. § 10.

ing, and so it was in the time of Epiphanius [d]. It is, indeed, difficult to say what Josephus means by this word [e]. But he gives the same title to one Jucundus, an officer in Judea in the time of Florus, their last governor before the war [f]. If I may offer a conjecture, (and I can do no more) I suspect that Josephus means the same officer who is called in Latin Præfectus, and Præfectus equitum, an officer of considerable power under the presidents [g]; and who was sometimes sent into a remote part of a province to keep things in good order. Thus Scaptius was a præfect under Appius, Cicero's predecessor in the province of Cilicia, and was sent by him into Cyprus, then a branch of the province of Cilicia. In like manner Marcellus was sent into Judea by Vitellius. And as for Marullus, as he seems to me to have had the same title with Scaptius, so I think he had the same power and authority with him and Marcellus, only he was appointed by the emperor, they by presidents.

But whatever was Marullus's post, there is no reason to think he was procurator or governor, since in all the copies of Josephus he is called only master of the horse.

Farther, I think there was no procurator of Judea between the removal of Pilate and Agrippa's reign, because all the great concerns of Judea in this time are managed by Vitellius, and then by Petronius, presidents of Syria. Soon after the removal of Pilate, Vitellius displaced Caiaphas the high priest [h], and the next year Jonathan [i], whom he had put into Caiaphas's room. It was through the hands of Vitellius, that the Jews obtained from Tiberius the liberty of having the high priest's vestment in their own keeping [k]. Afterwards all Caligula's orders about setting up his statue at Jerusalem, and the method of treating the Jews if they opposed it, are directed to Petronius, Vitellius's successor; and the Jews make all applications to him. We have here one particular advantage. During the rest of the time which we are concerned for, we have

[d] Ιππαρχην. Ita quidem & Epiphanius. Forsan tamen επαρχον legendum. Hudf. Not. o. p. 818. [e] Sed ιππαρχε vocabulum non satis expedio. Petav. Doct. Temp. Vol. ii. p. 314. [f] Προσελθων δε Ιωκενδος ο διακωλυειν τελασμενος ιππαρχης. De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 14. p. 1079. v. 21. [g] Appius noster turmas aliquot equitum dederat huic Scaptio, per quas Salaminios coerceret, & eundem habuerat præfectum. Vexabat Salaminios. Ego equites ex Cypro decedere jussi, molestè tulit Scaptius. Cic. ad Att. lib. v. ep. 21. Fuerat enim præfectus Appio; & quidem habuerat turmas equitum, quibus inclusum in curia senatum Salamine obsederat.—Itaque ego, quo die tetigi provinciam, cum mihi Cyprii legati obviam veniissent, literas misi, ut equites ex insula statim decederent. Id. l. vi. ep. 1. Scaptium, quia non habuit a me turmas equitum, quibus Cyprum vexaret, ut ante me fecerat, fortasse succensetis aut quia præfectus non est, &c. ib. ep. 3. Gabius Bassus, præfectus oræ Ponticæ,—venit ad me. Plin. L. x. ep. 32. vid. & ep. seq. [h] Joseph. Ant. l. xviii. c. 5. § 3. [i] Ibid. cap. 6. § 3. [k] Ibid. cap. 5. § 3.

little

little light from any one but Josephus. But the history of Caligula's design to pollute the temple at Jerusalem, is to be found in Philo as well as Josephus. But yet there is nothing said of any Jewish procurator; no orders sent to him by Caligula or Petronius; no mention made of him by the Jews in any of the petitions they presented at this time; nor is his conduct blamed or commended by either of the forementioned writers. That the name of an inferior officer does not appear is not strange[1], but that the procurator of Judea should not be mentioned, if there was one, is unaccountable.

This then was the state of Judea in this period. Pontius Pilate was procurator there till some time before the passover, A. D. 36. After that there was no procurator in the country, but the Jews were immediately under the government, first of Vitellius, and then of Petronius, presidents of Syria, till the accession of Herod Agrippa. There might be an officer under these presidents of Syria, called master, or prefect of the horse, but there was no officer constantly residing in Judea with power of life and death.

We are now to cast our eye upon the transactions of this period related in the Acts of the apostles. Peter and John and the other apostles, were summoned before the Jewish council, imprisoned, threatened, scourged, Stephen was stoned, and a very severe persecution commenced, and was carried on for a considerable time against all the disciples of Jesus in that country, and at Damascus. This may be thought very extraordinary, if the Jews were (as certainly they were at this time) under the Roman government, and if they had not the power of life and death within themselves.

Now I would in the first place observe, that though the state of Judea, as I have just now represented it from Josephus and Philo, did not afford us any considerations which might enable us to account for such a behaviour of the Jews, as seems inconsistent with their subjection to the Romans, yet it may be fairly supposed, from St. Luke's history, that the Jews were very riotous and turbulent at this time.

[1] And yet Philo has made mention of one Capito, who was at this time collector of the Roman tribute in Judea; and ascribes in part the ill-will which Caligula bore the Jewish nation, to calumnies forged against them by this Capito, the better to defeat the complaints which might be brought against himself, for the exactions he had been guilty of in his office. Παρατεθηκται δε νυν μαλλον η προτερον εξ επιστολης ην επεμψε Καπιτων φορων εκλογευς·—— ειτα ευλαβηθεις μητις αυτȣ γενηται κατηγορια, τεχνην επενοησεν η διαβολαις των αδικηθεντων διακρȣσεται τας αιτιας· κ. τ. λ. Philo de legat. p. 1020. E. And this passage ought to be added to the proofs I have given above, that the Jews were tributary to the Roman emperor.

Here

Here was now in this country a number of men, who affirmed that Jeſus, who had wrought no temporal deliverance for the Jewiſh people, was the Chriſt; that He who had been lately condemned and crucified by them, was now riſen from the dead, and was aſcended up to heaven. They exhorted even the rulers of the Jews and all the people to repentance. They proved their aſſertions, and ſupported their exhortations by no other method, but by reaſonings from the ſcriptures, and by a healing power exerted on many miſerable objects. But, however, the prieſts and all the rulers were grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jeſus the reſurrection of the dead; and though theſe diſciples of Jeſus made no tumult, yet they were very firm in their tenets; and, when commanded by the council, *not to ſpeak at all, nor preach in the name of Jeſus*, they ſcrupled not to profeſs, that it was with them an undoubted maxim rather to *obey God than them*, and told them, Acts iv. 20. that they *could not but ſpeak the things which they had ſeen and heard.* And ſo they did. Whereupon we find, they were brought again before the council, ch. v. 28. and *the high prieſt aſked them, ſaying, Did not we ſtraitly command you, that you ſhould not teach in this name? And behold ye have filled Jeruſalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us.* May not any man be aſſured that the high prieſt, who ſpoke theſe words, and the council in whoſe name he ſpoke, would exert all the authority they were poſſeſſed of againſt the diſciples of Jeſus? as rulers in ſynagogues beat them there, as members of the council iſſue out orders for apprehending all of that way, impriſon them, whip them in public places; and, if this was all they could do themſelves, have them, after that, before the governor; and if he did not fully execute their rage, by artful inſinuations raiſe a ſpirit in their people, which the moſt vigilant adminiſtration could not hinder from breaking out ſometimes into riots, and ſuch like diſorders, by which ſome of the followers of Jeſus might loſe their lives. No people in the world are always peaceable and orderly as they ſhould be, and the Jews were as likely as any to aſſume a power that was not legal. We have proofs of it in Joſephus. 'When Fadus came procurator into Judea, he 'found the Jews of Peræa (c) in a riot fighting with the Phi-'ladelphians about the limits of the village Mias. And 'indeed the people of Peræa had taken up arms without the 'conſent of their chief men, and had killed a good number of 'the Philadelphians. When Fadus heard of it, he was very

(c) That is, on the other ſide of Jordan.

'much

'much provoked that they had taken up arms and not left the 'decision to him, if they thought the Philadelphians had 'done them any wrong[m].' There is another instance of the like kind afterwards. The Samaritans had offered an injury to some Jews, as they were passing through their country to Jerusalem. The Jews made reprisals. 'Hereupon the chief 'men of the Samaritans go to Umidius Quadratus, president 'of Syria, then at Tyrus, and accuse the Jews of plundering 'and burning their towns. Nor were they so much concerned, 'they said, for the injury done to them, as for the contempt 'shewed to the Romans, to whom they ought rather to have 'appealed as judges, if they had been injured, and not make 'incursions of their own heads as they had done, as if they 'were under no subjection to the Romans. They therefore 'came to him for justice[n].'

The riot of the Jews beyond Jordan seems to have happened in the interval between the death of Herod Agrippa, and the arrival of Fadus in the province. The incursions into Samaria were made while Cumanus was actually in Judea. Indeed Josephus endeavours to acquit the chief men of Judea as to both these facts. But the common people seldom take arms, and make incursions, without some encouragement from their superiors. And if the chief men at Jerusalem were perfectly innocent as to this last affair, Quadratus, the president of Syria, must have been horribly imposed upon, though he came into the country on purpose to examine the case upon the spot. For he beheaded some Jews, and crucified others, and sent the high priest, the captain of the temple, and divers other chief men at Jerusalem, to Rome, to answer for themselves[o].

If then some of the Jewish proceedings mentioned in the Acts, seem not very suitable to the state of a Roman province, it may be fairly taken for granted, they were illegal or tumultuous.

But, secondly, I am apt to think the state of the Jews at this time, if reflected on, will help us to account for these proceedings. If our Saviour was crucified at the passover, A. D. 33. then this was the eighth passover of Pilate's administration, for he came into the province before the passover of the year 26. But if our Saviour was crucified in the 29th year of the Christian æra, which is the soonest that is supposed by any,

[m] Ταυτα πυθομενον τον Φαδον σφοδρα παρωξυνεν, ὁτι μη την κρισιν αυτῳ παραλειποιεν, ειπερ υπο των Φιλαδελφηνων ενομιζον αδικεισθαι, αλλ' αδεως εφ' οπλα χωρησειεν. Ant. xx. c. 1. § 1.

[n] Και, περι μεν ων αυτοι πεπονθασιν, ουχ ουτως αγανακτειν, εφασκον, ως ὁτι Ρωμαιων καταφρονησειαν, εφ' ους κριτας εχρην αυτους ειπερ ηδικουντο παραγενεσθαι η νυν, ως ουχ εχοντων ηγεμονας Ρωμαιους καταδραμειν. Antiq. xx. c. 5. § 2.

[o] Vid. de Bell. l. ii. c. 12. § 6. Antiq. ubi supra.

yet

yet that would be the fourth passover after Pilate's arrival in that country. Now it was very common for the presidents, if they had not behaved well, to stand in fear of the people of their province; and they dreaded extremely the sending complaints to the emperor. And in order to ward off these, they usually thought it proper to do some popular things.

Philo has given us a remarkable instance in Flaccus, prefect of Egypt, about this very time. The five first years of his administration, which were the five last years of Tiberius's reign, Flaccus was a most excellent governor. But in the sixth year of his presidentship, which was the first of Caligula's reign, he became quite another [p] man. It is not necessary to produce here all the reasons of this alteration. But in the life-time of Tiberius, Flaccus had been no friend of Caligula. When therefore Caligula came to be emperor, and had put to death the young Tiberius, and Macro, in whom Flaccus had some interest, he was thrown into a terrible fright: his concern was visible, and all the Egyptians knew very well the cause of it: hereupon they got him entirely into their own hands, ' and of a governor Flaccus became a subject, and they ' of subjects became presidents, inventors of useless decrees, ' directors of all affairs, taking him in as a mere mute image ' in a play, for no other reason but because he had the name ' of governor [q]. These men therefore, the Dionysii, the Lampones, the Isidores, all these conspire together to form a ' most wicked design against the Jews; and coming to Flaccus, ' they tell him; " Sir, you have lost the young Tiberius, and " your next hope after him, your friend Macro; you have no " expectations of favour from the emperor, but rather otherwise. We must necessarily contrive for you some powerful " advocate with Caius [Caligula]. This advocate, Sir, is the " city of Alexandria, which has been ever honoured by the " imperial family, and especially by our present sovereign:

p Philo in Flacc. p. 965, 966.

q Και γινεται ο μεν αρχων υπηκοος, οι δ' υπηκοοι ηγεμονες, εισηγουμενοι μεν αλυσετελεστατας γνωμας——βεβαιωται γαρ ων εβουλευσαντο παντων εγινοντο, κωφον ως επι σκηνης προσωπειον, ενεκα προσχηματος αυτον μονον παραλαμβανοντες επιγεγραμμενον ονομα αρχης, Διονυσιοι, Λαμπωνες, Ισιδωροι, στασιαρχαι, φιλοπραγμονες, κακων ευρεται——συνταξαμενοι παντες ουτοι βουλευμα βουλευουσι κατα των Ιουδαιων αγραλεωτατον, και τῳ Φλακκῳ προσελθοντες, ιδιᾳ φασιν, ερρει μεν σοι τα απο Τιβεριου Νερωνος του παιδος, και ερρει δε και ο μετ' εκεινον ελπις εταιρος σοι Μακρων, αισια δ' ουκ εστι σοι τα απο του κρατουντος, δει δε παρακλητον, ημας ευρειν δυνατωτερον, υφ' ου Γαιος εξευμενισθησεται· ο δε παρακλητος, η πολις Αλεξανδρεων εστιν, ην τετιμηκεν μεν εξ αρχης απας ο Σεβαστος οικος, διαφεροντως δ' ο νυν ημων δεσποτης· μειζον δ' αγαθον ουδεν αυτη παρεξεις, η τους Ιουδαιους εκδους και προεμενος· επι τουτοις οφειλων αποσεσθαι και δυσχεραναι τους λεγοντας ως νεωτεροποιους και κοινους πολεμιους, συνεπιγραφεται τοις λεχθεισι· ibid. p. 988. A.—C.

" if

« if ſhe may but obtain ſome favour of you, ſhe will under-
« take your cauſe. You can oblige her by nothing ſo much,
« as by delivering up the Jews into her hands." Then he, who
‘ ought to have been provoked at ſo impudent a propoſal, and
‘ to have reprimanded the authors of it as incendiaries, and
‘ diſturbers of the public peace, tamely complied with what
‘ they deſired.’

After this, Flaccus began to ſhew a ſtrange neglect of the Jews, and in all cauſes the Jews were caſt, till at length he became their open enemy. The Egyptians taking encouragement from this behaviour, came by degrees to the rifling of the Jews' houſes, and murdered great numbers of them. ‘ And
‘ the preſident of the country, who, if he had pleaſed, could
‘ in one hour have quieted this mad multitude, pretended not
‘ to ſee or hear any thing[r].’ The Egyptians receiving no rebukes for what they had done already, proceeded to demoliſh the Jewiſh oratories at Alexandria.

Thus matters went in Egypt. The people there had no right, according to the conſtitution of the country, to treat the Jews as they did; nor did the prefect formally convey the power of life and death to them. But for his own convenience he overlooked their diſorderly proceedings. The caſe of Pilate in Judea ſeems very much to have reſembled that of Flaccus in Egypt: that is, they were both apprehenſive of the emperor's diſpleaſure, though perhaps the grounds of theſe apprehenſions were different. Pilate had been tyrannical in the very beginning of his adminiſtration, and had thereby rendered himſelf diſagreeable to the Jews: for this reaſon he ſtood in fear of them. This appears in the proſecution of Jeſus before him. The Jews cried out, John xix. 12. *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæſar's friend.* Pilate ſeems to have underſtood the meaning of this ſpeech. If he had not gratified them in this point, they might have drawn up a long liſt of mal-adminiſtrations for the emperor's view.

His condemnation of Jeſus at the importunity of the Jews, contrary to his own judgment and inclination declared to them more than once, was a point gained: and his government muſt have been ever after much weakened by ſo mean a condeſcenſion. And that Pilate's influence in the province continued to decline is manifeſt, in that, the people of it prevailed at laſt to have him removed, in a very ignominious

[r] Τε δε επιτροπε τε χωρας, ος μονος εδυναλο βεληθεις ωρα νικα την οχλοκραλιαν καθελειν, προσποιεμενε α, τε εωρα μη οραν και ων ηκεε μη επακεειν. Id. de Legat. ad Cai. p. 1010. E.

manner,

manner, by Vitellius president of Syria. It is therefore highly probable, that to screen other acts of injustice, and to gratify the chief men at Jerusalem, he might sign decrees of condemnation against some of the disciples of Jesus; or at least connive at, or not restrain some irregular proceedings of the Jewish magistrates, and the riots of the people. Nor can it be concluded, that Pilate did not act in this manner, because he had not the favour of the people of his province. For Flaccus did himself no real service by all his compliances with the Egyptians, but was at last accused by the men whose tool he had been[s].

After this manner then, affairs might be carried on in Judea, during the remainder of Pilate's administration after the resurrection of our Saviour, till about the beginning of the year 36.

And after the removal of Pilate, the Jews would, very probably, take an unusual licence; they not having then any procurator among them, but being more immediately under the government of the president of Syria, whose chief residence was at Antioch.

Besides, Vitellius seems to have been at a yet greater distance from them the greatest part of the year that followed the removal of Pilate. This, if I mistake not, was the season of Vitellius's expedition to Parthia. It is true, that Suetonius[t] and Dio[u] place the congress of Vitellius and Artabanus in the first year of Caligula. But Josephus[x] placeth it in the last of Tiberius's reign; and gives so distinct an account of this matter, that he cannot but be relied on. He says, that Vitellius having, whilst in Syria, ordered Pilate away for Rome, went up to Jerusalem to the passover, which appears to me very evidently to be the passover of the year 36. Having put Caiaphas out of the priesthood, and done divers other things to the great satisfaction of the Jews, he returned to Antioch. Josephus then says, that Vitellius having received orders from Tiberius to make an alliance with Artabanus, went to the Euphrates where Vitellius and Artabanus had a congress, and a league was made; that Artabanus sent his son hostage to Tiberius; that after the league was made, Herod the Tetrarch of Galilee, who was there, entertained the president of Syria

[s] Vid. Phil. in Flacc. p. 985, 986.

[t] Namque Artabanus Parthorum rex, odium semper contemptumque Tiberii præ se ferens, amicitiam ejus [Caii] ultro petiit venitque ad colloquium legati consularis: & transgressus Euphratem, aquilas & signa Romana Cæsarumque imagines adoravit, Calig. cap. 14.

[u] Ο γȣν Βιτελλιος ο Λȣκιος—και τον Αρταβανον κατεπληξε τε απαντησας αυτῳ εξαπιναιως περι τον Ευφρατην ηδη ουτι, και ες τε λογȣς αυτον υπηγαγετο, και θυσαι ταις τȣ Αυγȣστȣ τȣ τε Γαιȣ εικοσιν ηναγκασε. Lib. 59. p. 661. B. C.

[x] Antiq. l. 18, c. 5.

and

and the king of Parthia; and ſent an expreſs to Rome with an account of the concluſion of this treaty, as did alſo Vitellius. Herod's meſſenger came firſt to Rome, and Tiberius wrote back to Vitellius, that his expreſs brought him no news, for he had heard all before. Vitellius thinking Herod had done him a great injury herein, retained a ſecret grudge againſt him, till he had an opportunity of being revenged in the reign of Caligula. At the next paſſover, A. D. 37, Vitellius was again at Jeruſalem. So that this expedition to the Euphrates was made in the year 36. Joſephus appears perfectly maſter of this whole affair: the concerns of Herod the tetrarch are interwoven with it. Joſephus was nearer the event than Suetonius or Dio. Beſides, Tacitus concurs with him. For he ſays, that A. U. 788, which is the year of our Lord 35, when C. Ceſtius Gallus and M. Servilius Nonianus were conſuls, Tiberius [y] gave Vitellius the command of all things in the eaſt. He then relates Vitellius's expedition, and what he performed in it, and concludes his account thus; 'And then he returned 'with the army into Syria. I have here put together the ac-'tions of two ſummers [z].' I think it therefore very plain, that according to Tacitus, this commiſſion, given to Vitellius in the year 35, was finiſhed in 36.

This then was a fine opportunity for a people fond of power, to exert ſome acts of authority they could not have done, whilſt a governor was among them or near them. The behaviour of Ananus and his council, in the interval between the death of Porcius Feſtus, and the arrival of his ſucceſſor Albinus, is a proof of it. Nor were there any, on whom they were ſo likely to ſhew their power, as the followers of Jeſus.

Moreover, ſuch was the temper of this Vitellius, that it may be fairly ſuppoſed, the Jews enjoyed ſome peculiar indulgencies under his adminiſtration.

There are divers things recorded of him in Joſephus, which may ſatisfy us there was a very loving correſpondence between him and the chief men of the Jewiſh nation. At the requeſt of the Jews and Samaritans he removed Pilate. The paſſover following, he went up to Jeruſalem, and was magnificently received by the Jews. It was through his hands that the Jews obtained from Tiberius the right of having in their own keeping the high prieſt's ſacred veſtment, which he wore on their

[y] Et cunctis quæ apud Orientem parabantur, L. Vitellium præfecit. Ann. l. 6. c. 32.

[z] Exin cum legionibus in Syriam remeavit. Quæ duabus æſtatibus geſta conjunxi, quo requieſceret animus a domeſticis malis. Ibid. c. 37. fin. 38. init.

great solemnities[a]; a privilege they had not enjoyed before, since the beginning of Herod's reign. This favour they received at the passover in the year 36.

In the beginning of the next year, when Vitellius was going to march his forces through Judea, which was the shortest way, to attack Aretas, at the request of the Jews he ordered his troops to take another route, that he might not offend them with his idolatrous ensigns; and when he had given these orders, he went up himself to Jerusalem to worship God[b]. Vitellius is not to be blamed for any of these things; but they are an argument, that the Jewish people had a great influence upon him.

And from the Roman historians it appears, that Vitellius was a man of a most obsequious disposition. For he, who had sacrificed to God at Jerusalem, when he was out of his province and returned to Rome, paid divine honours to the emperor; and indeed was one of the first that began that idolatrous worship, which Caligula was so fond of in the latter part of his reign. Vitellius was so exquisite in this and other kinds of flattery, that at length his name became proverbial to denote an eminent flatterer[c].

And though it should be still thought, notwithstanding what I have said above, that Marcellus and Marullus were possessed of the full powers of a procurator in Judea, yet it must be allowed, that Vitellius had a great influence on the affairs of Judea all the time he was president of Syria after the removal of Pilate, because all the great concerns of the Jews mentioned by Josephus are transacted by him.

I have not attempted to settle the date of the particular facts of this second period related in the Acts of the apostles. Learned men are very much divided about the year of Stephen's death, which is the most remarkable of all those facts. Archbishop Usher places it in the year 33[d], Bishop Pearson in the latter end of the year 34[e], Mr. Basnage in the year 37[f]. The disciples of Jesus were, I think, much harrassed by the Jewish council from the very beginning, immediately after the descent

a Joseph. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 5. § 3.

b Και δια μεσαλυ πεδιυ κελευσας χωρειν το στρατοπεδον, αυλος τε μετα Ηρωδυ τυ τετραρχυ και των φιλων εις Ιεροσολυμα ανηει, ΘΥΣΩΝ ΤΩ ΘΕΩ. Joseph. ibid.

c Idem miri in adulando ingenii, primus C. Cæsarem adorari ut Deum instituit: cum reversus ex Syria non aliter adire ausus esset, quam capite velato, circumvertensque se, deinde procumbens. Suet. A. Vitell. cap. 2. Cæterum regendis provinciis prisca virtute egit. Unde regressus, & formidine C. Cæsaris, familiaritate Claudii, turpe in servitium mutatus, exemplar apud posteros adulatorii dedecoris habetur. Tacit. Ann. lib. vi. c. 32. vid. & Senec. Natur. Quæst. l. iv. c. 1. & Dion. l. lix. p. 661, C. D.

d Ann. p. 617. ed. Lat. Lond. 1650.

e Ann. Paulin. p. 1.

f Annal. P. Eccles. A. D. 37. n. 14, 15.

of

of the Holy Ghoſt upon them at Pentecoſt; though about the time that Stephen was ſtoned, a more fierce and more general perſecution came on, and continued for ſome time, Acts viii. 1. xi. 19. And though it may be difficult to ſettle exactly when it began, and when it ended, yet I think it moſt probable, that though it might be abated in the year 38, it was not over before the third year of Caligula's reign, that is, the thirty-ninth year of the Chriſtian æra; in which year Vitellius was recalled from Syria, and was ſucceeded by Petronius[g]. Nay, poſſibly it was not quite at an end till the year 40.

If ſome few of the Jewiſh proceedings in this period ſeem ſomewhat extraordinary, I imagine, they may be accounted for from the particular ſtate of the affairs in Judea, which I have juſt given a view of. The reader is able to judge of it himſelf; and I make no more reflections.

We are now to obſerve the remarkable words of St. Luke, Acts ix. 31. *Then had the churches reſt throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria.* This reſt of the churches will be eaſily accounted for from the following particulars. Soon after Caligula's acceſſion, the Jews at Alexandria ſuffered very much from the Egyptians in that city, (as has been already obſerved) and at length their oratories there were all deſtroyed. In the third year of Caligula, A. D. 39, Petronius was ſent into Syria, with orders to ſet up the emperor's ſtatue in the temple at Jeruſalem. It is not improbable, but the Jews of Judea might be affected at the condition of their countrymen at Alexandria, where by this time they were almoſt ruined; but this order from Caligula was a thunder-ſtroke. There is indeed ſome doubt, whether Petronius publiſhed this order in the year of our Lord 39 or 40. But whenever it was made known, the Jews muſt have been too much engaged afterwards to mind any thing elſe, as may appear from the accounts which Philo and Joſephus have given us of this affair.

Joſephus ſays, 'That Caligula ordered Petronius to go 'with an army to Jeruſalem to ſet up his ſtatues in the temple 'there; enjoining him, if the Jews oppoſed it, to put to death 'all that made any reſiſtance, and to make all the reſt of the 'nation ſlaves. Petronius therefore marched from Antioch 'into Judea with three legions, and a large body of auxiliaries 'raiſed in Syria.——All were hereupon filled with conſterna-'tion, the army being come as far as Ptolemais[h]. The Jews 'then gathering together went to the plain near Ptolemais,

[g] Vid. Noriſ. Cenotaph. Piſ. Diſſ. ii. p. 330, 331. Pagi Critic. in Baron. A. D. 32. n. 2.

[h] Joſeph de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 10. § 1.

'and entreated Petronius in the first place for their laws, and 'in the next place for themselves.' Petronius was moved by their entreaties, and leaving his army and the statues at Ptolemais, went into Galilee; and at Tiberias calls together the chief men of the Jewish people, and exhorts them to submit to the emperor's orders. When they could not engage so to do, he asked them, 'Will ye then fight against Cæsar? The 'Jews answered him, that they offered up sacrifices twice every 'day for Cæsar and the Roman people. But that if he would 'set up the images, he ought first of all to sacrifice the whole 'Jewish nation, and that they were ready to submit themselves, 'their wives and children, to the slaughter[i].'

Philo says, that the tidings of these orders having reached Jerusalem, the Jews, 'abandoning their cities, villages, and 'the open country, all went to Petronius in Phenicia, both 'men and women, the old, the young, and the middle aged; '—that they threw themselves down upon the ground before 'Petronius, with weeping and lamentation;—that being ordered by him to rise up, they approached him covered with 'dust, with their hands behind them, as men condemned to 'die; and that then the senate bespoke Petronius in this manner: "We come to you, Sir, as you see, unarmed. We have "brought with us our wives, and children, and relations, and "throw ourselves down before you, as at the feet of Caius, having left none at home, that you may save all, or destroy all[k]."

Petronius deferred his journey to Jerusalem, that the Jews might not, out of concern for such a violation of their religion, neglect their gathering in their corn, it being then ripe, as Philo says[l]; or lose the seeds-time, as Josephus says[m]. He was the more moved by this consideration, because it was expected, that Caligula would be at Alexandria the next summer: and he judged it not proper to do any thing that might hinder a sufficient plenty for the company that would follow the emperor from Italy, and the concourse of the princes of Asia, and other great men in those parts. And in his letter to Caligula he made use of this, as the excuse for not immediately executing his orders[n]. These two writers differ somewhat as to the time when the Jews waited on Petronius. Possibly they might be reconciled together even as to this. However, they agree in representing the concern of the Jews as very great and general. And it is very likely, that the persecution of the

[i] Ibid. § 3, 4. vid. & Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 9. [k] Philo de legat: ad Cai. p. 1024, 1025. [l] Ibid. p. 1028. A. [m] Joseph. Antiq. l. xviii. cap. 9. § 4. [n] Philo ubi supra.

Christians

Chriſtians ceaſed now, and that the Jews were fully employed in warding off this terrible blow from the temple, which was their glory and confidence.

Some learned men have aſcribed this reſt of the churches to the converſion of St. Paul, who had been a very zealous perſecutor. But this is, in my opinion, to do St. Paul a great deal of wrong on one hand, and too much honour on the other. It appears to me a great injuſtice, to aſcribe to him all the ſufferings of the Chriſtians which enſued upon the death of Stephen; when, after his converſion, we find the Jews of Judea Damaſcus and every other place, were filled with malice and ſpite againſt Chriſtianity, and againſt St. Paul and every one elſe of that way. On the other hand, it is doing him at the ſame time too much honour. St. Paul was then but a young man, Acts vii. 58. and though a forward and active inſtrument, yet he could be no more than an inſtrument in that perſecution. It cannot be ſuppoſed, that whilſt he was with the high prieſts and phariſees, they were directed and animated by him; and that when he had left them, their ſpirits were ſo ſunk that they could no longer purſue their old meaſures. His own dangers at Damaſcus and Jeruſalem are a proof of the contrary.

Moreover, according to the ſeries of St. Luke's hiſtory, though the great perſecution he ſpeaks of, Acts viii. 1. xi. 19. might be abated ſooner, yet it could not be quite over till ſeveral years after St. Paul's converſion. St. Luke firſt mentions St. Paul's return from Damaſcus to Jeruſalem, (which was not till three years after his converſion, Gal. i. 18.) and the treatment he met with from the Grecians: *which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæſarea, and ſent him forth to Tarſus.* THEN *had the Churches reſt throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghoſt, were multiplied,* Acts ix. 30, 31.

LASTLY, according to the deſcription St. Luke gives us of this reſt of the churches in the words juſt now tranſcribed, it was very extenſive, even all over Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and very complete, and the churches had no moleſtation. So conſiderable an event muſt have been owing to ſome other conſiderable event, with which the whole people of that country was affected. I had no ſooner read the account which Philo and Joſephus have given of the ſufferings of the Jews in Alexandria, and the imminent danger of ruin which that whole people in Judea and other places were in, in the reign of Caligula, but I concluded, that this ſtate of their affairs

brought on the reſt of the Chriſtian churches which St. Luke ſpeaks of, and which certainly happened about this time. Whether I am in the right or not others will judge.

St. Luke has not expreſsly told us how long this reſt of the churches laſted, but it is likely that it reached ſome way into Herod Agrippa's reign. He was at Rome when Caligula was killed, and was very ſerviceable to his ſucceſſor Claudius, in ſettling matters between him and the ſenate [o]. But this is certain, that the great danger the Jews were in of utter ruin in the reign of Caligula, and the gracious as well as juſt edicts paſſed in their favour by Claudius, in the beginning of his reign, had little effect upon them. For St. Luke ſays, that when *Herod ſtretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church, and killed James with the ſword*, the ſatisfaction which they expreſſed in theſe cruelties, was an inducement to him *to take Peter alſo*, Acts xii. 1—3.

§ XIII. This brings me to the proceedings of the third period, the reign of Herod. But I need not add any thing here to what has been already ſaid in the former chapter; where it has been ſhewn, that Herod had at this time ſovereign authority in Judea, though he was dependent on the Roman emperor.

I have now given the reader a view of the ſtate of Judea, according to the ſacred and other writers, ſo far as I propoſed at the beginning of this chapter.

I muſt not proceed any farther, till I have owned myſelf much indebted to Mr. Huber, for his Diſſertation [p] on this ſubject. But by this acknowledgment I have not diſcharged all my obligations to that learned and agreeable writer. I have found him a good guide upon other occaſions beſide this.

I am ſenſible ſome learned men have given a different account of this matter: but it will not be expected I ſhould enter here into controverſies with any. This argument is long enough already. I ſhall, however, make a few remarks upon Dr. Lightfoot's [q] account taken from the Talmudical and other Jewiſh writers.

1. Lightfoot [r] quotes theſe words from the Jeruſalem Talmud. 'A tradition: forty years before the temple was de-'ſtroyed, judgment in capital cauſes was taken away from If-'rael.' And he ſays himſelf [s], 'It cannot be denied but that

[o] Joſeph. de Bell. lib. ii. c. 11.

[p] Zachariæ Huber Diſſertationum Libri tres. Amſt. 1721. Diſſertatio prima, qua aſſeritur Judæorum magiſtratus tempore Chriſti Servatoris, non habuiſſe merum imperium, ſive jus gladii.

[q] See his Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations on Matt. xxvi. 3. John xviii. 31.

[r] Ibid. p. 248.

[s] Ibid. p. 611.

'all

'all capital judgment, or ſentence upon life, had been taken 'from the Jews for above forty years before the deſtruction of 'Jeruſalem, as they oftentimes themſelves confeſs.' I think, the natural meaning of the words of the tradition is, that the people of the Jews were deprived of the right of inflicting capital puniſhment, by ſome ſuperior power or force. It does therefore in the main confirm my account. For ſince we know, that Judea was a Roman province for ſome conſiderable time before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, it may be reaſonably concluded, the Roman government had taken away judgment in capital cauſes. But this tradition is inaccurate as to the time; for if the Jews had loſt this power for forty years before the deſtruction of the temple, then they had it not in the reign of Herod Agrippa, and conſequently not after Judea was firſt made a Roman province, A. D. 6 or 7, which was above ſixty years before the ruin of their city. However, it is plain the juſt mentioned Herod had ſupreme power in Judea. How far he entruſted the council with judgment in capital cauſes, I do not pretend to determine.

2. But yet Lightfoot ſays, 'The Romans did not take away 'their power of judging in capital matters, but they by their 'own oſcitancy, ſupine and unreaſonable lenity, loſt it them-'ſelves. For ſo the Gemarah goes on: "Rabh Nachmanbar "Iſaac ſaith, Let him not ſay that they did not judge judg-"ments of mulcts, for they did not judge capital judgments "neither. And whence comes this? When they ſaw that ſo "many murders and homicides multiplied upon them, that "they could not well judge and call them to an account, they "ſaid, It is better for us that we remove from place to place; "for how can we otherwiſe not contract a guilt upon our-"ſelves?"—They thought themſelves obliged to puniſh mur-'derers, whilſt they ſat in the room Gazith; for "the place it-"ſelf engaged them to it." They are the words of the Gemar-'iſts. Upon which the gloſs.—They removed therefore from 'Gazith, and ſate in the Taberne[t].' I cannot think this a juſt account. If robbers and murderers were ſo numerous, that the council could not puniſh them; yet certainly the chriſtians were not able for forty years together, before the deſtruction of the temple, either by their own numbers, or by their intereſt with the people, to ſtrike any awe upon the council. And if they had a lenity and tenderneſs for Iſraelitiſh robbers and murderers (which I do not deny) yet they had little or no tenderneſs for chriſtians, if there be any truth in the hiſtory

[t] Id. ibid. p. 612.

of the New Testament, or of ancient christian writers. And yet they did not judge any of these capitally. For so the tradition, confirmed likewise (as Lightfoot allows) by many Jewish writers, says, 'judgment in capital causes had been taken 'away from them for forty years before the destruction of the 'temple.' Since therefore they did not judge christians capitally, and since they could not be restrained from it by any dread of the christians, nor by lenity toward them, it follows, they must have been hindered by some superior authority. And what could that be but the Roman?

3. 'That we may yet farther confirm our opinion,' says Lightfoot, 'that the authority of their council was not taken 'away by the Romans, we will produce two stories, as clear 'examples of the thing we assert. One is this: R. Lazar, son 'of R. Sadock, said, "When I was a little boy, sitting on my "father's shoulders, I saw the daughter of a priest that had "played the harlot, compassed round with faggots and burnt." 'Hieros. Sanhedr. fol. 24. 2. The council no doubt judging 'and condemning her, and this after Judea had then groaned 'many years under the Roman yoke, for that same R. Lazar 'saw the destruction of the city.' The other story is taken from the same book, and is told of one 'Ben Sudta in Lydda. 'They placed two disciples of the wise in ambush for him, 'and they brought him before the council, and stoned him.— 'The Jews openly profess that this was done to him in the 'days of R. Akiba, long after the destruction of the city; and 'yet then, as you see, the council still retained its authority 'in judging of capital causes. They might do it for all the 'Romans, if they dared to do it to the criminals[u].' I think the first, R. Lazar's story proves too much; for it not only proves that the Romans had not taken away this power from the council, but that it was not taken away at all for forty years before the destruction of the temple. But this is a contradiction to the tradition, which Lightfoot allows to be true, and well supported. If we must suppose the sight, the little boy is said to have had sitting upon his father's shoulders, to be matter of fact, it will be needful to reconcile it with the tradition above-mentioned. This I do not know how to do any otherwise, than by supposing, that the tradition represents the legal state of the constitution they were under, for forty years before the destruction of the temple; and that the burning of the priest's daughter, if it was done by order of the Jewish council, was an irregular and illegal action. The same thing

[u] Ibid. p. 219.

ought

ought also to be supposed of the second story, if it be true. But this way of reconciliation would not suit Lightfoot.

Upon the whole, though the tradition confirms my account, I cannot but think, that the testimonies I have alledged relating to this subject, are preferable to the testimonies of Talmudical, or other later Jewish writers. All the authors I have quoted must be allowed to have been acquainted with the form of government, which the Romans established in their provinces; and Josephus must have known the state of Judea in particular. And I hope the reader is convinced, that there is upon this subject a perfect agreement between these authors and the sacred writers of the New Testament.

I shall borrow one passage more from that learned writer: 'Christ answers the treachery of the question propounded (upon the tribute money) out of the very determinations of the schools, where this was taught;—Wheresoever the money of any king is current, there the inhabitants acknowledge that king for their lord. Maimon. on Gezelah, ch. 5.[x].'

There remain two or three particulars, which, not regarding the main point in question, have not yet been considered; but however may not be quite omitted.

§ XIV. St. John says, chap. xviii. 3. *Judas then having received a* BAND *of men, and officers from the chief priests and pharisees, cometh thither,* to the garden. Ver. 12. *Then the* BAND, *and the captain, and officers of the Jews took Jesus.* This band I suppose to have consisted of Roman soldiers. The Greek word [σπειρα] is, I think, ever used in the New Testament concerning soldiers. *Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus.—And gathered unto him the whole* BAND *of soldiers,* Matt. xxvii. 27. Mark xv. 6. *Cornelius a centurion of the Italian band,* Acts x. 1. xxi. 31. xxvii. 1.

Farther, when the chief priests and pharisees went to Pilate, and desired he would *command that the sepulchre be made sure unto the third day.*—He *said unto them, Ye have a watch,* [εχετε κουστωδιαν] *go your way, make it as sure as you can,* Matt. xxvii. 64, 65. From whence one would be apt to conclude, that there was, at least at the feast times, a guard of soldiers upon duty, from which they might draw out a sufficient number for any particular purpose.

As they were about to kill him, [Paul,] *tidings came unto the* CHIEF CAPTAIN OF THE BAND *that all Jerusalem was in an uproar: who immediately took soldiers and centurions, and ran down unto them,* Acts xxi. 31, 32. *And he commanded him to be car-*

x Id. on Matt. xxii. 20.

ried into the CASTLE. *And as Paul was to be led into the caſtle,* —when the chief captain *had given him licence, Paul ſtood on the* STAIRS, and there ſpake unto the people, ver. 37—40. And when Lyſias ſent Paul from Jeruſalem to Cæſarea, it was under a ſtrong guard of horſe and foot, ch. xxiii. 33.

There was therefore at Jeruſalem a Roman officer, who had the government of the caſtle, and a good body of troops under him.

A paſſage or two from Joſephus will confirm and illuſtrate theſe particulars. 'Antonia,' ſays he, 'was ſituated at the 'angle of the weſtern and northern porticoes of the outer 'temple, [or outer court of the temple]. It was built upon 'a rock fifty cubits high, ſteep on all ſides. It was the work 'of king Herod, in which he had ſhewn his uſual magnifi- 'cence.—On that ſide where it joined to the porticoes of the 'temple, there were STAIRS reaching to each portico, by which 'the guard deſcended; (for there was always lodged here a 'Roman legion) and poſting themſelves in their armour in ſe- 'veral places in the porticoes, they kept a watch on the peo- 'ple on the feaſt days, to prevent all diſorders. For as the 'temple was a guard to the city, ſo was Antonia to the tem- 'ple.' This from the hiſtory of the Jewiſh War[y]. In his Antiquities he ſays: 'The feaſt called the paſſover approach- 'ing, at which it is our cuſtom to eat unleavened bread, and 'a great number of people being come up from all parts to 'the feaſt, Cumanus fearing ſome diſturbance, commanded a 'company of ſoldiers to poſt themſelves in their armour in the 'porticoes of the temple, to ſuppreſs diſorders, if any ſhould 'happen: which was what the procurators had been wont to 'do at the feaſts[z].' This Cumanus was Felix's predeceſſor: and this order was given, as it ſeems, A. D. 48[a].

The reader muſt needs obſerve here two things: firſt, that there was always a legion which kept garriſon in the caſtle at Jeruſalem. Secondly, that at the feaſts there was a detachment of theſe ſoldiers, which came down from the caſtle, and kept guard in the porticoes of the temple. It may be queſtioned what was Lyſias's poſt at Jeruſalem. Grotius[b] ſuppoſed

[y] Καθα δε συνηπτο ταις τε ιερε ςοαις, εις αμφοτερας ειχε καταβασεις· δι ων κατιοντες οι φρεροι, καθησο γαρ αει επ' αυτης ταγμα Ρωμαιων, και διεςαμενοι περι τας ςοας μετα των οπλων, εν ταις εορταις, τον δημον ως μη τι νεωτερισθειη παρεφυλαττον· φρεριον γαρ επεκειτο τη πολει μεν το ιερον, τω ιερω δε η Αντωνια. Lib. v. c. 5. § 8.

[z] Κελευει των ςρατιωτων μιαν ταξιν αναλαβουσαν τα οπλα επι των τε ιερε ςοων εςαναι καταςελευτας τον νεωτερισμον, ει αρα τις γενοιτο· τυτο δε και οι προ αυτε της Ιουδαιας επιτροπευσαντες εν ταις εορταις επραττον. Antiq. l. xx. c. 4. § 3.

[a] Vid. Pagi Critic. in Baron. & Baſnage Annal. A. D. 48.

[b] Præfecto ejus cohortis quæ temporibus feſtis, ac proinde etiam in Pentecoſte, præſidium habebat in porticibus templi ad prohibendos tumultus, ſi qui orirentur, in Act. xxi. 31.

that

that he was captain of a cohort that kept guard at the feaſt time. I cannot at preſent aſſent to this. It does not appear to have been feaſt time when Paul was ſeized, (though Pentecoſt was near, Acts xx. 6, 16.) It ſeems plain to me, that Lyſias was not upon duty at the temple at this time. *They laid hands upon Paul.—And all the city was moved, and the people ran together; and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple, and forthwith the doors were ſhut. And as they went about to kill Paul, tidings came to the chief captain of the band, that all Jeruſalem was in an uproar. Who immediately took ſoldiers, and centurions, and ran down unto them,* ch. xxi. 30—32. If Lyſias had been in the porticoes of the temple, he would have perceived the diſturbance himſelf; whereas he knew nothing of it but by *tidings* brought to him, and that not till *all Jeruſalem was in an uproar.* It is obſervable alſo, that Lyſias afterwards ſummoned the whole council of the Jews. The word[c] which we render 'band,' is uſed with conſiderable latitude: the word we have rendered 'chief captain,' ſignifies properly a captain of a thouſand, and is often uſed particularly for a tribune. I ſuppoſe therefore, that Lyſias was the oldeſt tribune at Jeruſalem, and that he was the commanding officer at the caſtle of Antonia, and was entruſted by Felix with what power he thought fit to give to the chief officer under him at Jeruſalem.

§ XV. We may now proceed to another particular. St. John ſays, ch. xviii. 12. *Then the band, and the* CAPTAIN [και ο χιλιαρχος] *and officers of the Jews, took Jeſus and bound him.* I am inclined to think the captain here mentioned was a Jewiſh officer; but I do not inſiſt upon it. I add, therefore, two or three other texts. *And as they ſpake to the people, the prieſts, and the captain of the temple* [ο στρατηγος τε ιερε] *and the ſadducees came upon them,* Acts iv. 1. *Now when the high prieſt, and the* CAPTAIN OF THE TEMPLE, *and the chief prieſts heard theſe things,* ver. 24. *Then went the* CAPTAIN *with the officers,* ver. 26. I believe moſt perſons will ſuppoſe, that this *captain of the temple* was a Jewiſh officer. There is in Joſephus ſuch an officer mentioned, who is evidently a Jew.

Whilſt the above-named Cumanus was procurator of Judea, there happened a dreadful difference between the Jews and Samaritans. Cumanus not being able to put an end to it, Ummidius Quadratus preſident of Syria came into Judea, and puniſhed ſeveral Jews and Samaritans upon the ſpot, and ſent others to Rome. This laſt part of his conduct is thus expreſſed

[c] Σπειρα, συναξις, πληθος στρατευματων. Phavorinus.

by

by Josephus in his Antiquities: 'Having bound the high 'priest Ananias, and the CAPTAIN Ananus[d], he sent them to 'Rome to give an account of their conduct to Claudius Cæ-'sar[e].' In his War of the Jews it is thus: 'And moreover 'he sent away to Cæsar the high priests Jonathan and Ananias, 'and Ananus the son of this last mentioned[f].' Ananus, who in the former passage has the title of captain, is in this latter said to be the son of the high priest.

When Josephus is reckoning up the causes of offence which the Jews gave the Romans, he says: 'And at the temple Elea-'zar, the son of Ananias the high priest, a young man of a 'bold and resolute disposition, then CAPTAIN[g], persuaded those 'who performed the sacred ministrations, not to receive the 'gift or sacrifice of any stranger (or man of another nation). 'This was the foundation of the war with the Romans; for 'they rejected the sacrifice of Cæsar for them. And though 'the high priests, and many of the chief men, entreated them 'not to omit the ancient custom of sacrificing for their go-'vernors, they would not be persuaded; relying upon the 'multitude they had on their side,—and especially being much 'at the direction of the captain Eleazar.' Here is another captain, who is a son of an high priest; and he appears to have an authority over those who were in waiting at the temple.

St. Luke, in one place, speaks of the captains in the plural number, ch. xxii. 52. *Then Jesus said unto the chief priests and* CAPTAINS[h] *of the temple, and the elders which were come to him.* As there was a great variety of ministrations at the temple, and a great number of priests and Levites always in waiting, but especially at the feasts; it is very likely there was an officer who presided over each division, and that there was one who had a command above all the rest.

§ XVI. I have but one thing more to take notice of here. When St. Paul had appealed to Cæsar, *Then Festus, when he had consulted with the* COUNCIL, *answered, Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar shalt thou go,* Acts xxv. 12. The rea-son of the thing will induce us to suppose this was not the

[d] Τον στρατηγον Ανανον δησας. [e] L. xx. cap. 5. § 2. [f] Και Ανανιαν, τον-τε τοτε παιδα Ανανου. De Bell. l. ii. cap. 12. § 6. [g] Ελεαζαρος υιος Ανανιαν τε αρχιερεως, νεανιας θρασυτατος, στρατηγων τοτε, τους περι την λατρειαν λειτουργους ανα-πειθει, μηδενος αλλοφυλε δωρον η θυσιαν προσδεχεσθαι· τουτο δε ην τοις προς Ρωμαιους πολεμω καταβολη· την γαρ υπερ των ξε-νιαν Καισαρος απερριψαν· και πολλα των τε αρχιερεων και των γνωριμων παρακαλου-των, μη παραλιπειν το υπερ των ηγεμονων εθος, ουκ ενεδοσαν· πολυ μεν και τω πλη-θει πειθομενοις——μαλιστα δε αφη-γουντος εις τον Ελεαζαρον στρατηγουντα. De B. J. ii. c. 17. § 2. [h] See Whitby upon the place.

Jewish

Jewish sanhedrim, but some council which the governor had with him.

It was always usual for the presidents to have a council consisting of their friends, and other chief Romans in the province[i]. Philo says, when the Jews waited upon Petronius, and entreated him to defer his march to Jerusalem till they had sent an embassy to Rome, Petronius was moved by their tears and lamentations, 'and consulted with his assessors what was 'proper to be done[k].' Josephus speaks of Cumanus's acting 'with the advice of his friends,' in the sentence he pronounced upon a Roman soldier, who had tore a book of the law of Moses[l]. In the year of our Lord 66, Florus, who was then procurator of Judea, sent Cestius Gallus president of Syria, false accounts (as Josephus says) of the Jewish behaviour. 'And the chief men of Jerusalem were not silent. For they, 'and Bernice, wrote to Cestius an account of Florus's mal-'administrations in the city. He, therefore, having read the 'informations he had received from both parties, consulted 'with his captains[m].' It is one of Cicero's complaints against Verres, that when he was in Sicily, he condemned a person without asking the advice of the council, which his predecessor, and he himself had been wont to advise with[n].

CHAP. III.

Of the state of the Jews out of Judea.

I. *The Jews numerous in divers parts out of Judea.* II. *The twelve Tribes in being.* III. *Prayer wont to be made [at Philippi] by the river side.* IV. *The Synagogue of the Libertines.* V. *Of Jewish Proselytes.*

I intend not here a distinct consideration of the power or privileges, which the Jews enjoyed in foreign countries. Somewhat has been already said upon this subject in the preceding

[i] Τȣς δε δη παρεδρȣς αυτος εαυτῳ εκαστος μιρειται· κ. τ. λ. Dio. p. 505. E.

[k] Επεξαναστας δε μετα των συνεδρων εβȣλευετο τα πρακτεα. De legat. ad Cai. p. 1027. B.

[l] Και ο Κȣμανος——συμβȣλευσαντων και των φιλων, τον ενυβρισαντα τοις νομοις στρατιωτην πελεκισας. Ant. lib. xx. cap. 4. § 4.

[m] Μετα ηγεμονων εβȣλευετο. De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 16. § 1.

[n] Illud negare posses, aut nunc negabis; te consilio tuo dimisso, viris primariis, qui in consilio C. Sacerdotis fuerant, tibique esse solebant, remotis, de re judicata judicasse? In Verrem. lib. ii. n. 81.

chapter,

chapter, and more particulars may be found in the eighth chapter of this book. I here take notice of a few things which fall within the compass of my design, but are omitted in those other places.

§ I. There are frequent intimationts in the New Testament, that at the time the apostles preached the gospel, after the ascension of our Saviour, there were great numbers of Jews in several parts of the world, beside those which lived in Judea.

When the disciples had *been filled with the Holy Ghost, (on the day of Pentecost), and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance,* it is said: *There were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. —And they were all amazed, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man, in our own tongue wherein we were born? Parthians, and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God,* Acts ii. 4—11.

The persons spoken of are Jews, or proselytes, chiefly the former. By dwelling at Jerusalem must be understood residing there for a time only, on account of the feast, or some other particular occasion. The word [a] is so used sometimes, and the context obliges us to understand it so here.

In the history of St. Paul's travels, we find him preaching in Jewish synagogues in many places: when *Paul and Barnabas came to Antioch in Pisidia, they went into the synagogue on the sabbath day,* Acts xiii. 14. They did so likewise at Iconium, ch. xiv. 1. Paul taught in a synagogue at Thessalonica, ch. xvii. 2. at Athens, ver. 17. at Corinth, ch. xviii. 4. at Ephesus, ch. xix. 8.

That the Jews were scattered abroad, and dwelt in almost all parts of the world, even before the destruction of their city and state by Titus, is evident from many passages of Philo, Josephus, and several heathen authors. I shall select a few of them, which will be sufficient for the present design.

Philo, in his book against Flaccus prefect of Egypt in the beginning of Caligula's reign, says, 'There were not less 'than a million of Jews in Alexandria and other parts of 'Egypt [b].' He adds, 'For one country does not contain the

[a] Vid. Grot. Act. ii. 5. [b] Και οτι ουκ αποδεουσι μυριαδων εκατον την Αλεξανδρειαν και την χωραν Ιουδαιοι κατοικουντες επι του προς Λιβυην καταβαθμου μεχρι των οριων Αιθιοπιας. In Flacc. p. 971. C.

'Jewish

'Jewish people, they being extremely numerous; for which 'reason there are of them in all the best and most flourishing 'countries of Europe and Asia, in the islands as well as on 'the continents; all esteeming for their metropolis the holy 'city, in which is the sacred temple of the most high [c] God.'

Caligula had given orders (A) to Petronius president of Syria, to erect his statue at Jerusalem. When the tidings that Petronius had published these orders came to Rome, Agrippa the elder was there. He therefore sent the emperor a letter (for he was not then able to appear before him in person) to dissuade him from this design. In this letter, which Philo has given us an account of, among other things Agrippa says: 'Nor can I forbear to allege in behalf of the holy city, the 'place of my nativity, that it is the metropolis, not of the 'country of Judea only, but of many others, on account of 'the many colonies that have been sent out of it at different 'times, not only into the neighbouring countries, Egypt, Phe-'nicia, both the Syrias, but also into places more distant, to 'Pamphylia, Cilicia, and many parts of Asia, as far as Bithy-'nia, and the recesses of Pontus. They are in the same man-'ner in Europe, in Thessaly, Beotia, Macedonia, Ætolia, 'Argos, Corinth, in the most and best parts of Peloponnesus. 'Nor are the continents only full of Jewish colonies, but also 'the most celebrated islands, Eubœa, Cyprus, Crete; not to 'mention those which are beyond the Euphrates. For except-'ing only a small part of Babylon, and some other lesser dis-'tricts, scarce any country of note can be mentioned, in which 'there are not Jewish inhabitants. If you grant this request 'in favour of my native place, you will be a benefactor not 'to one city only, but to thousands of cities in every part of 'the world; in Europe, in Asia, in Lybia, in the maritime 'and in the inland parts of the continents and the islands [d].'

When the war was breaking out in Judea, Agrippa the younger, in a speech he delivered at Jerusalem, makes use of this as an argument to persuade the Jews in Judea to be peaceable; that if they should be worsted, they would involve their countrymen in other parts of the Roman empire in the same

[c] Ιουδαιους γαρ χωρα μια δια πολυανθρωπιαν ου χωρει· ης αιτιας ενεκα τας πλειστας και ευδαιμονεστατας των εν Ευρωπη και Ασιᾳ κατα τε νησους και ηπειρους εκνεμονται, μητροπολιν μεν την ιεροπολιν ηγουμενοι, καθ' ην ιδρυται ο του υψιστου θεου νεως αγιος. Ibid. E.

(A) A. D. 39, or 40.

[d] Πασαι γαρ εξω μερους βραχεος Βαβυλωνος και των αλλων σατραπειων, αι αρετωσαν εχουσι την εν κυκλῳ γην, Ιουδαιους εχουσιν οικητορας· ως τε αν μεταλαβη σου της ευμενειας η εμη πατρις, ου μια πολις, αλλα και μυριαι των αλλων ευεργετουνται καθ' εκαστον κλιμα της οικουμενης ιδρυθεισαι, το ευρωπαιον, το λιβυκον, το ασιανον το εν ηπειροις το εν νησοις παραλον τε και μεσογειον. De legat. ad Cai. p. 1031, 1032.

ruin.

ruin. 'You expoſe to danger, ſays he, not only yourſelves, 'but thoſe alſo who live in other cities: for there is not a 'people in all the world, which has not ſome of you among 'them.'

§ II. St. James's epiſtle is thus inſcribed, ch. i. 1. *To the twelve tribes which are ſcattered abroad greeting:* by whom, I think, the apoſtle intends the believing Jews of all the twelve tribes, who lived in any part of the world out of Judea[f]. For I ſuppoſe, that the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin were not entire in Judea, but that many of thoſe tribes lived alſo in other parts, and that the ten other tribes were not extinct. Ptolemy Philadelphus having a deſire to enrich his library at Alexandria with the Jewiſh law, wrote to Eleazar the high prieſt, to ſend ſix Jews out of each tribe to make a tranſlation of it for him into the Greek language. In the anſwer which Eleazar ſent to Ptolemy are theſe words: 'We have choſen 'ſix elders out of each tribe, whom we have ſent to you with 'the law[g].' This is a proof that Joſephus (from whom I have taken this account) did not ſuppoſe the ten tribes were extinct.

In the account of Ezra's journey from Babylon to Jeruſalem, and of the people that went with him, in the reign of Artaxerxes, Joſephus is more expreſs. For he ſays: 'But the whole 'people of the Iſraelites remained in that country; whence it 'has come to paſs, that there are but two tribes ſubject to 'the Romans in Aſia and Europe. But the ten tribes are ſtill 'in being beyond the Euphrates, an infinite multitude, whoſe 'numbers are not to be known[h].'

§ III. There is frequent mention made in the Acts of the apoſtles, of the Jewiſh ſynagogues in the heathen countries, and of the worſhip they performed in them: but there is ſomewhat particular in the deſcription of the place of worſhip which the Jews had at Philippi. Acts xvi. 13. *And on the ſabbath we went out of the city by a* RIVER SIDE, *where prayer was wont to be made.* There is ſome difference among learned men, whether the original word in this place, which we have rendered prayer, ſhould be here underſtood of the act, or the place of prayer[i].' I am inclined to think with Whitby, Grotius and others, that it is a place of worſhip which is here ſpoken of.

[e] Joſeph. de Bell. l. ii. cap. 16. p. 1089. fin. [f] Vid. Grot. in loc. [g] Ἐπελεξαμεν δε και πρεσβυτερους ανδρας εξ απο φυλης εκαστης, ους πεπομφαμεν εχοντας τον νομον. Antiq. lib. xii. cap. 2. § 5.

[h] Ὁ δε πας λαος Ισραηλιτων καλα χωραν εμεινε· διο και δυο φυλας ειναι συμβεβηκεν επι τε της Ασιας και των Ευρωπης Ρωμαιοις υπακουσας· αι δε δεκα φυλαι περαν εισιν Ευφρατου εως δευρο, μυριαδες απειροι, και αριθμω γνωσθηναι μη δυναμεναι. Antiq. l. xi. c. 5. § 2. [i] Ου νομιζομεν προσευχην ειναι.

But what I am chiefly concerned to obſerve here, agreeably to my deſign, is, that it may be inferred from this text, that it was not unuſual for the Jews, at leaſt in ſtrange countries, to worſhip, or to erect places of worſhip, near a RIVER.

There is an inſtance of this kind recorded by Joſephus, who has given us the decree of the city of Halicarnaſſus, permitting the Jews to build oratories; a part of which decree runs thus: 'We ordain that the Jews, who are willing, men and 'women, do obſerve the ſabbaths, and perform ſacred rites 'according to the Jewiſh laws, and build oratories BY THE 'SEA-SIDE according to the cuſtom of their country; and if 'any man, whether magiſtrate or private perſon, give them 'any let or diſturbance, he ſhall pay a fine to the city[k].'

And Tertullian[l], among other Jewiſh rites and cuſtoms, ſuch as feaſts, ſabbaths, faſts, and unleavened bread, mentions ſhore-prayers, that is, prayers by the ſea-ſide, or river-ſide.

Theſe two paſſages are ſufficient to perſuade us, that it was common for the Jews to worſhip in theſe places. But it may be a queſtion, whether this practice was owing to their choice, or to ſome neceſſity laid upon them by the heathen magiſtrates, to perform their worſhip without the gates of their cities.

I ſhall lay together a few paſſages and remarks relating to this ſubject.

It ſeems to me, that Tertullian ſuppoſed the ſhore-prayers to be properly a Jewiſh cuſtom, ſince he reckons them with others that were ſo. The terms of the decree of the people of Halicarnaſſus imply the ſame thing. And the ſea-ſide does not appear to be mentioned as a reſtraint or limitation, but as a grant of a privilege, eſtabliſhing the oratory in the place moſt agreeable to the Jews. Philo ſays, that when Flaccus the prefect of Egypt had been taken into cuſtody at Alexandria by order of Caligula, the Jews offered up thankſgiving to God, ſpent the whole night in hymns and ſongs, 'and early 'in the morning flocking out of the gates of the city, they go 'to the neighbouring ſhores, for the [proſeuchæ] oratories 'were deſtroyed; and ſtanding in a moſt pure place, they lift 'up their voices with one accord[m].'

[k] Δεδοχθαι ημιν Ιυδαιων τους βυλομενους ποιεισθαι τας σαββατικας αγιστειας τε και γυναικας τα τε σαββατα αγειν, και τα ιερα συνελειν μετα των Ιυδαικων νομων, και τας προσευχας ποιεισθαι προς τη θαλατση κατα το παλριον εθος· κ. τ. λ. Joſ. Ant. lib. 14. c. 10. § 24. [l] Judæi enim feſt, ſabbata, & cœna pura,—& jejunia cum azymis, & orationes LITORALES, quæ utique aliena ſunt à diis veſtris. Tertul. ad Nat. lib. 1. cap. 13.

[m] Αμα τη εω δια πυλων εκχυθεντες, επι τους πλησιον αιγιαλους αφικνουνται· τας γαρ προσευχας αφηρηντο· και τω καθαρωτατω χωρω στανλες ανεβοησαν ομοθυμαδον, κ. τ. λ. Phil. in Flacc. p. 982. D.

It

It is true, their oratories at Alexandria were then all down. But yet methinks here are some signs, that the sea-side was a place agreeable to them. Why else did they go out of the city so universally toward the neighbouring shores, rather than any way? Besides, Philo expresses much satisfaction in this situation, when he calls it a most pure place.

There is a passage very apposite to this text in the account Philo gives of the annual rejoicings, the Jews were wont to make for the Septuagint translation. 'Wherefore,' says he, 'even to this day, there is kept every year a feast and solemnity in the isle of Pharos; whither not only the Jews, 'but many others also cross over, to pay a respect to the place, 'where this version was first seen.—And after prayers and 'thanksgivings, some raise tents on the shore, others lay themselves down upon the sea sand, in the open air, and there 'feast with their friends and relations, ESTEEMING the SHORE 'more sumptuous than the furniture of the richest palaces[n].

These passages have sometimes inclined me to think, that the true rendering of this text is thus: *Where it had been thought fit that the oratory should be*; implying the Jews choice of that situation. But if any think, that the more natural meaning of the words is, *Where a house of prayer was allowed*, or appointed, *to be by the law*; yet I believe it ought to be supposed, that this appointment was perfectly agreeable to the Jews, if not owing to their own choice. Josephus, having mentioned the privileges bestowed upon the Jews at Alexandria by Alexander the great, says: 'They continued to 'enjoy the same honour under his successors, who set apart for 'them a distinct place; that they might live in greater purity, 'than they could well do if they were mixed promiscuously 'with strangers; and allowed them also to be called Macedo-'nians[o].' This separating the Jews from other people was no hardship therefore, but a privilege.

St. Luke tells us, that St. Paul and his company, in their way to Jerusalem from Miletus, *sailed into Syria and landed at Tyre. And finding disciples, we tarried there seven days.—And when we had accomplished those days, we departed and went our way, and they all brought us on our way, with wives and children, till we were out of the city: and we kneeled down on* THE SHORE AND PRAYED, Acts xxi. 3—5. I should have concluded

[n] Πολυτελεστεραν της εν βασιλειοις καλασκευης τοδε την ακλην NOMIZONTES. Phil. de vit. Mosis. lib. ii. p. 660. A. B.

[o] Διεμεινε δε αυλοις η τιμη και παρα των διαδοχων, οι και τοπον ιδιον αυλοις αφορισαν, οπως καθαρωτεραν εχοιεν την διαιταν, ηττον επιμισσομενων των αλλοφυλων, κ. λ. De Bell. lib. ii. c. 18. § 7.

from

from this very text, that it was then uſual for the Jews, or ſome other people to pray by the ſea-ſide. It appears from paſſages alleged above, that it was a very common practice among the Jews.

§ IV. We may now proceed to ſomewhat elſe. Ch. vi. 9. *Then there aroſe certain of the ſynagogue which is called the ſynagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia, and of Aſia, diſputing with Stephen.* This ſynagogue of the Libertines was at Jeruſalem. But it has ſome relation to the ſtate of the Jews out of their own country, as will appear preſently: and therefore I conſider this particular here.

Some have made a queſtion, whether there be any more than one ſynagogue here ſpoken of. Others think the moſt natural meaning of the words imports as many ſynagogues, as there are nations, or ſorts of men ſpoken of. The copulative particle *and* is ſuppoſed a proof of it. If St. Luke had intended but one ſynagogue, he would have ſaid, of the ſynagogue of the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, &c. not as he does, of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians.

The Jewiſh writers ſay, there were four hundred and eighty ſynagogues in Jeruſalem [p]. It is generally ſuppoſed by learned men, that beſide the ſynagogues which belonged to the ſtated inhabitants of the city, the Jews of other countries, in which there was any conſiderable number of that people, had a ſynagogue at Jeruſalem, built at their own coſt, together with a ſchool or academy adjoining, to which they might reſort for divine worſhip, when they came to Jeruſalem; and where their children might be educated and inſtructed in the perfect knowledge of their law. The Jewiſh authors do expreſly mention a ſynagogue, which the Alexandrian Jews had at Jeruſalem [q]. It is highly probable, the Jews of ſeveral other nations had one there likewiſe.

But the Libertines here mentioned ſeem not to be ſo called from any particular country. Libertinus, or Libertine, is one who had been a ſlave, but has now obtained his freedom; or one who is the ſon of a perſon that had been a ſlave, and was afterwards made free. And it is ſuppoſed by ſeveral learned men [r], that the Libertines here ſpoken of are Jews, or proſelytes of the Jewiſh religion, who had been ſlaves to Roman maſters, and had been made free, or the children of ſuch.

That theſe are the perſons here ſpoken of, will appear from the following particulars.

[p] Vid. Vitring. de Synag. vet. l. i. Part 1. cap. 14. p. 253. vid. & Grot in loc.
[q] Vid. Lightfoot Heb. & Talm. Exercit. in loc. [r] Vid. Grot. in loc. Pearſon. Lection. in Act. Apoſt. iv. § 7. Vitring. ubi ſupra. p. 254, 255.

There was a great number of Jews at Rome. Joſephus ſays, the embaſſy which came thither from Judea to petition Auguſtus, that Archelaus might not be their king after Herod, was joined by above eight thouſand Jews at Rome[s]. Philo informs us, that the Jews who lived at Rome, and who occupied a large quarter of the city[t], were chiefly ſuch as had been taken captive at ſeveral times, and had been carried into Italy, and were made free by their Roman maſters[u].

That theſe Jews were called Libertines will appear plainly from paſſages of Tacitus, and Joſephus, and Suetonius, in which they ſpeak of the baniſhment of the Jews from Rome in the reign of Tiberius. 'It was then reſolved alſo' ſays Tacitus, 'to expel the Egyptian and Jewiſh rites. And a decree 'of the ſenate was paſſed, that four thouſand of the Libertine 'race infected with that ſuperſtition, and who were of a fit 'age, ſhould be tranſported into the iſland of Sardinia,—and 'that the reſt ſhould depart Italy within a time limited, unleſs 'they renounced their profane rites[x].'

Joſephus ſays of the ſame affair, 'Tiberius ordered that all 'the Jews ſhould be expelled from Rome. And the Conſuls 'choſe out four thouſand of them, whom they ſent into the 'iſland Sardinia[y].'

Suetonius ſays, 'That Tiberius ſent the Jewiſh youth into 'ſome of the moſt unhealthful provinces, and ordered the reſt 'of that nation, and all others of their religion to leave the 'city, upon pain of perpetual ſervitude[z].'

Joſephus and Suetonius expreſly call thoſe Jews, whom Tacitus calls men of the Libertine race. As there were ſo great numbers of theſe men at Rome, it is not at all unlikely, that they had a ſynagogue at Jeruſalem.

I have ſaid nothing new under this article. I have only followed Grotius and Vitringa, eſpecially the latter; who, I think, has given a juſt account of this matter: though it is likely, ſome learned men may not be exactly of the ſame opinion.

[s] Ant. lib. xvii. cap. 13. in.

[t] Μεγαλην της Ρωμης απολαμβανον. Philo de leg. ad Cai. p. 1014. C.

[u] Ρωμαιοι δε ησαν οι πλειους απελευθερωθεντες· αιχμαλωτοι γαρ αχθεντες εις Ιταλιαν υπο των κτησαμενων ηλευθερωθησαν. Ibid. D.

[x] Actum & de ſacris Ægyptiis Judaicisque pellendis: factumque patrum conſultum, ut quatuor millia libertini generis ea ſuperſtitione infecti, quis idonea ætas, inſulam Sardiniam veherentur.—cæteri cederent Italia, niſi certum ante diem profanos ritus exuiſſent. Tac. Ann. lib. ii. cap. 85.

[y] Κελευει παν το Ιουδαικον της Ρωμης απελαθηναι· οι δε υπαιοι, τεσσαρακισχιλιους ανθρωπων εξ αυτων στρατολογησαντες, επεμψαν εις Σαρδω την νησον. Joſ. Ant. lib. xviii. cap. 4. fin.

[z] Judæorum juventutem, per ſpeciem ſacramenti, in provincias gravioris cœli diſtribuit: reliquos gentis ejuſdem, vel ſimilia ſectantes urbe ſubmovit, ſub pœna perpetuæ ſervitutis, niſi obtemperaſſent. Suet. Tiber. cap. 36.

§ V. We have mention made several times in the gospels and Acts of the apostles, of the zeal of the Jews to make proselytes to their religion, and of several proselytes in particular. Matt. xxiii. 15. *Wo unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites; for ye compass sea and land to make one* PROSELYTE.——Acts ii. 10. *And there were dwelling at Jerusalem—strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes.* Acts vi. 5. *And the saying pleased the multitude: and they chose* [for deacons] *Stephen, Philip, Nicanor, and Nicolas a* PROSELYTE OF ANTIOCH.——Ch. xiii. 43. *Now when the congregation* [in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia] *was broken up, many of the Jews and religious* PROSELYTES, *followed Paul and Barnabas.*——Ch. viii. 26—28. *And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Go—unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza. And he arose and went: and behold a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch of great authority under Candace the queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship, was returning, and sitting in his chariot, read Esaias the prophet.*

Josephus in his second book against Apion says, 'We 'choose not to imitate the institutions of other people: but 'we willingly embrace all that will follow ours[a].' But the history which Josephus[b] has given us of Izates the king of the Adiabenes, who was converted to the Jewish religion about the fortieth year of the christian æra, will throw a great deal of light upon this subject. And therefore I shall set it here before the reader, though in as few words as I can.

'About this time,' says Josephus, 'Helene the queen of 'the Adiabenes, and her son Izates, came over to the observa-'tion of the Jewish customs[c]. It happened in this manner. 'Monobazus, king of the Adiabenes, fell in love with his 'sister Helene, and married her.'—By this marriage he had a son, whom he called Izates. 'But there was an elder son 'called Monobazus, whom he had by Helene, beside other 'sons by other wives.' However it was apparent to all, that Izates had his best affections, as if he had been an only son. The rest of the sons therefore envied him. The father was sensible of it: 'And therefore, lest any mischief should happen, 'having given Izates considerable presents, he sent him to 'king Abennerigus, who resided in a fortress called Spasina,

[a] Ημεις δε τα μεν των αλλων ζηλουν ουκ αξιουμεν, τους μεντοι μετεχειν των ημετερων βουλομενους ευεως δεχομεθα. Cont. Ap. l. ii. § 36.

[b] Ant. lib. xx. cap. ii.

[c] Κατα τουτον δε τον καιρον των Αδιαβηνων βασιλις Ελενη, και ο παις αυτης Ιζατης εις τα Ιουδαιων εθη τον βιον μετεβαλλον, δια ταιαυτην αιτιαν. Ibid. § 1.

'entruſting him with the care of his ſon. Abennerigus re-
'ceived him very civilly, and married his daughter to him.'

Some time after this Monobazus the father dies: the queen calls a council of her nobles, puts them in mind, 'that they 'knew the king her huſband had appointed her ſon Izates his 'ſucceſſor.' They came into theſe meaſures; Izates returned home, was received, and gained peaceable poſſeſſion of his father's kingdom.

'But whilſt Izates reſided in the fortreſs Spaſina, a Jewiſh 'merchant, whoſe name was Ananias, who was wont to have 'acceſs to the women of the court, [or the king's wives,] 'taught them to worſhip God according to the Jewiſh manner. 'By their means Ananias was introduced to Izates, and brought 'over him likewiſe to the ſame ſentiments.—It happened alſo 'that Helene was taught by another Jew, and came over to 'their laws [d].'

When Izates was returned and ſeated upon the throne, 'underſtanding that his mother was highly pleaſed with the cuſ-'toms of the Jews, he became extremely deſirous to enter 'fully into them. And underſtanding that he could not be 'a perfect Jew unleſs he was circumciſed, he was diſpoſed to 'that alſo [e].' His mother having had notice of theſe his intentions, diſſuaded him from it, fearing it ſhould alienate his ſubjects, and provoke them to rebel. She alſo informed Ananias what advice ſhe had given her ſon. Ananias was of the ſame opinion with her, and told Izates, that if he perſiſted in this deſign he muſt neceſſarily leave him; for the people would impute this action to him, and it would not be ſafe for him to ſtay any longer in the country. He told him moreover, "That "he might worſhip God without circumciſion, if he did but "fully determine to follow the Jewiſh inſtitutions. For this "was more important [or eſſential] than circumciſion [f]." And 'having aſſured him that God would forgive him his not doing 'what he declined only out of neceſſity, and for fear of his 'ſubjects, the king for a time ſubmitted to what he ſaid. 'However he had not wholly abandoned his deſign. And

[d] Καθ' ον δε καιρον ο Ιζαλης εν τω Σπασινε χαρακι διετριβεν, Ιυδαιος τις εμπορος, Ανανιας ονομα, προς τας γυναικας εισιων τυ βασιλεως, εδιδασκεν αυτας τον Θεον ευσεβειν, ως Ιυδαιοις πατριον ην· και δη δι' αυτων εις γνωσιν αφικομενος τω Ιζαλη, κακεινον ομοιως συνανεπεισε —— συνεβεβηκει δε και την Ελενην ομοιως υφ' ετερυ τινος Ιυδαιυ διδαχθεισαν, εις τας εκεινων μεταχεχωρηκεναι νομους. Ibid. § 4. [e] Πυθομενος δε την μητερα την εαυτυ πανυ χαιρειν τοις Ιυδαιων εθεσιν, εσπευσε και αυτος εις εκεινα μεταβαινειν· νομιζων τε μη αν ουτω βεβαιως Ιυδαιος, ει μη περιτεμοιτο, τρεφεσθαι την ετοιμος. Ibid. § 5. [f] Δυναμενον δε αυτον, εφη, και χωρις της περιτομης το θειον σεβειν, εις πανυ κεκρινε ζηλος τα πατρια των Ιυδαιων· τυτο ειναι κυριωτερον τε επιτηδευεσθαι. Ibid.

'ſome-

'sometime after this another Jew, named Eleazar, coming 'thither out of Galilee, who was reckoned to be very skilful 'in the laws, he brought him to perfect his design. For when 'he came in to wait upon the king, he found him reading 'the law of Moses. And thereupon addressed himself to him 'in this manner: "You little think, O king, how great an "injury you offer to the laws, and in them to God. For you "ought not only to read the laws, but, in the first place, to "do the things which are enjoined by them. How long "do you remain uncircumcised! If you have not yet read "the law concerning circumcision, read it now, that you may "know what impiety you are in." The king, having heard 'these words, deferred the thing no longer, but going into 'another chamber, and having called in a physician, performed 'the commandment [g]. And then sending for his mother, and 'the master Ananias, he told them, he had now done the 'work. They were immediately seized with an uncommon 'surprise and fear, lest, if this matter came to be public, the 'king should be in danger of losing his kingdom.—But God 'suffered not those things to come to pass which they feared. 'For though Izates was in many dangers, God preserved him 'and his sons, and opened a way for their safety, when they 'were compassed with difficulties; manifesting [h] thereby, that 'they who look up to him, and trust in him alone, do not 'lose the fruit of their piety (B)'

This story may give occasion for many reflections. I put the reader in mind of some of them only. We learn hence, that the Jews did sometimes gain over persons of distinction to their religion: we see here, in part, their methods of gaining proselytes. Here appear two distinct sentiments; Ananias did not absolutely insist upon circumcision, but Eleazar did. And it seems somewhat probable, that Josephus himself was on this side the question. Ananias dispensed with it only on account of a very great necessity: Eleazar is represented as most skilful

[g] Ἀλλ' εἰ μηπω τον περι τελε νομον ανεγνω ὁ βασιλευς τις εστιν η ασεβεια, νυν αναγινωσκε ταυτα ακουσας ὁ βασιλευς, ωχ υπερεβαλετο την πραξιν, μεταβας δε εις ετερον οικημα, και τον ιατρον εισκαλεσαμενος το προσταχθεν ἐδρασε· και μεταπεμψαμενος την τε μητερα, και τον διδασκαλον Ανανιαν, ἐσημαινεν ἀπλουν πεπραχεναι τερπον. Ibid.

[h] Ἐπιδεικνυς ὁτι τοις εις αυτον αποβλεπουσι, και μονῳ πεπιστευκοσι, ο καιρος ωκ αποβαλλει των της ευσεβειας. Ibid.

(B) And Josephus says, that afterward the king's brother Monobazus, and many of his relations, observing Izates, for his piety to God, blessed above all men, were induced to forsake their own rites and customs, and embrace those of the Jews. Antiq. l. xx. c. 3. § 1. And several of Izates's sons and brothers were within Jerusalem during the siege; and when the city was taken, fell into the hands of Titus: who out of his great generosity gave them their lives, but put them in chains, and carried them bound to Rome. De Bell. lib. vi. cap. 6. § 4.

in the laws: and in the conclusion Josephus intimates, that Izates, by embracing circumcision, had entitled himself to the special protection of providence.

St. Luke has expressly called Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch. I must, therefore, set down here one passage particularly for his sake. Josephus, speaking of the Jews at Antioch, says, 'They were continually bringing over a great number of 'Greeks to their religion; they made them also in some 'measure a part of themselves[i].'

St. Luke has more than once spoke of women among the Gentiles who were worshippers of God. When Paul was at Philippi, he says, Acts xvi. 14. *And a certain woman, named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira*[k], *which* WORSHIPPED *God, heard us.* At Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 50. *The Jews stirred up*[l] *the* DEVOUT *and honourable women,—and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas.* From the history I have just now given of Izates's conversion, it appears, that some women were brought to approve of the Jewish customs, and to worship God after the manner of the Jews. Josephus says moreover, that when the men of Damascus [in the year 66.] had formed a design to make away with all the Jews of that place, 'They concealed their design very carefully from their 'wives, because all of them, except a very few, were devoted 'to the Jewish religion[m].' It appears from a verse of Horace[n], that the Jewish zeal in making proselytes was very extraordinary, and much taken notice of: and they were censured[o] as unkind to all who were not of their own religion.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the JEWISH SECTS, and the SAMARITANS.

I. *Of the principles of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and their opposition to each other.* II. *The Sadducees members of the Jewish council.* III. *Of*

[i] Αει τε προσαγομενοι ταις θρησκειαις πολυ πληθος Ελληνων, κακεινους τροπῳ τινι μοιραν αυτων πεποιηντο. De B. J. lib. vii. cap. 3. § 3.

[k] Σεβομενη τον Θεον.

[l] Τας σεβομενας.

[m] Εδεδοικεσαν δε τας εαυτων γυναικας, απασας πλην ολιγων υπηγμενας τη Ιουδαικη θρησκεια· διο μεγιστος αυτοις αγων εγενετο λαθειν εκεινας. De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 20. § 2.

[n] ——Ac veluti te
Judæi cogemus in hanc concedere turbam. Lib. i. sat. iv. v. ult.

[o] Non monstrare vias, eadem nisi sacra colenti;
Quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.
JUVEN. Satyr. xiv. v. 203, 204.

the

the Scribes and Lawyers. IV. *Of the Herodians not mentioned by Joſephus.* V. *Of the Eſſenes not mentioned by the Evangeliſts.* VI. *Of the Samaritans.*

§ I. From the frequent mention of the phariſees and ſadducees in the goſpels and Acts of the apoſtles, it is natural to conclude, that they were the prevailing ſects among the Jews at that time. This is agreeable to the accounts which Joſephus [a] has given of the Jewiſh ſects; and will be evident from the particulars which will be taken notice of preſently.

'The phariſees,' Joſephus ſays, 'were reckoned the moſt religious of any of the Jews, and to be the moſt exact and 'ſkilful in explaining the laws [b].' In which he concurs with St. Paul, who ſays, Acts xxvi. 5. *After the ſtraiteſt ſect of our religion, I lived a phariſee.* There is an agreement not only in the ſenſe, but alſo in the expreſſion [c].

St. Mark ſays, ch. vii. 3, 4. *That the phariſees, and all the Jews, except they waſh, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders: and many other things there be which they have received to hold.* And there is in the goſpels frequent mention of the traditions of the elders. Joſephus ſays, 'The phariſees have delivered 'to the people many inſtitutions as received from the fathers, 'which are not written in the laws of Moſes [d].' Whereas St. Mark ſays, *The phariſees, and* ALL THE JEWS, *except they waſh, eat not*; his expreſſions are extremely juſt. For Joſephus adds, almoſt immediately after the words juſt now cited from him, 'That the ſadducees were able to draw over to them the rich 'only, the people not following them: for the multitude was 'with the [e] phariſees.'

In many parts of the goſpels, and eſpecially in the proſecution of our Saviour before Pilate, the common people appear to have been very much at the devotion of the phariſees. It is evident from what has been already alleged here from Joſephus, that the people were uſually on their ſide. He has ſaid the ſame thing in other places. 'They had (ſays he) ſuch an 'influence on the multitude, that if they gave out any thing 'againſt a king or an high prieſt, they were credited [f].'

[a] De B. J. lib. ii. cap. 8. § 14. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 1. § 2. & alibi. [b] Φαρισαιοι σαφεστερα τι ιδοκουσιν ειναι περι τα πατρια εθη, και τας νομιμας αιρεσεις ακριβεστερον αγειν. De B. J. l. i. cap. 5. § 2. [c] Κατα την ακριβεστατην αιρεσιν. Vid. & Joſeph. in vit. § 38. p. 923.—της δε Φαρισαιων αιρεσεως, οι περι τα παλαια νομιμα ειναι δοκουσι των αλλων ακριβειᾳ διαφερειν.

[d] Οτι νομιμα πολλα τινα παρεδοσαν τῳ δημῳ οι Φαρισαιοι εκ παλαιας διαδοχης, απερ εκ αναγεγραπται εν τοις Μουσεως νομοις. Antiq. l. xiii. cap. 10. § 6.

[e] Των μεν Σαδδουκαιων τους ευπορους μονον πειθομενους, τον δε δημοτικον ουκ επομενον αυτοις εχοντων, των δε Φαρισαιων τον πληθους συμμαχον εχοντων. Ibid. [f] Τοσαυτην δε εχουσι την ισχυν παρα τῳ πληθει, ως

According to the evangelists, they affected the direction of public affairs, and very much abused the credulity of the people, and the reputation they had for sanctity. *They loved salutations in the market-places, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts, devoured widows houses, and for a pretence made long prayers,* Matt. xxiii. 14. Mark xii. 38—40. Luke xx. 46, 47.

And Josephus allows, they did sometimes make an ill use of the esteem they were in for piety. Alexandra, the widow of Alexander Jannæus, had for some time the government of Judea. She being a 'very religious woman,' thought the pharisees might be her best counsellors; but 'they abusing 'her simplicity in this respect,' though on other accounts she was a woman of very good capacity, 'got the management of 'all things into their own hands, condemned or acquitted, 'punished or rewarded men according to their own pleasure; 'in a word, she governed others, the pharisees governed her[g].'

The pharisees and sadducees are plainly represented in the gospels as very different from each other, and holding in a manner opposite opinions. Josephus, in one place, calls the sadducees, 'the sect opposite to that of the pharisees[h].' They did at some times join together in one and the same design against our Saviour. Matt. xvi. 1. *The pharisees also with the sadducees came, and tempting him, desired him that he would shew them a sign from heaven.* At other times they attacked him separately, and endeavoured to ensnare or puzzle him with questions suitable to their several schemes, Matt. xxii. 23—34. We have one instance, wherein their different principles drove them into very different measures, and occasioned a downright quarrel. When St. Paul was called before the council at Jerusalem, *and perceived that the one part were sadducees and the other pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a pharisee——Of the hope and resurrection of the dead, I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between them:—for the sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: but the pharisees confess both: And there arose a great cry.—And when there arose a great dissension, the chief captain, fearing lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go down,*

και κατα βασιλεως τι λεγοντες, και κατα αρχιερεως, ευθυς πιστευεσθαι. Ibid. § 5.

g Τουτοις περισσον δε τι προσειχεν η Αλεξανδρα σεβομενη περι το θειον· οι δε την απλοτητα της ανθρωπου κατα μικρον υπιοντες, ηδη και διοικηται των ολων εγινοντο, διωκειν τε και καταγειν ους εθελοιεν, λυειν τε και δειν ——εκρατει δε των μεν αλλων αυτη, Φαρισαιοι δ' αυτης. De B. J. lib. i. c. 5. § 2.

h Σαδδουκαιων αιρεσεως, οι την εναντιαν τοις Φαρισαιοις προαιρεσιν εχουσιν. Ant. lib. xiii. c. 10. § 6. in.

and

and to take him by force from among them, and to bring him into the castle, Acts xxiii. 6—10.

This will lead us to the consideration of some of their distinguishing tenets. I shall, therefore, set down now the account Josephus has given of their opinions concerning the points mentioned in this text. Of the pharisees he says, 'Moreover it is their belief, that there is an immortal power 'in souls, and that under the earth there are rewards and pu-'nishments for those who in this life have practised virtue or 'vice; and that to these [souls] there is appointed an eternal 'prison, but that to the former there is a power of reviving[i].' In another place he says of them, 'That they believe every 'soul to be immortal, but that the soul of the good only passes 'into another body, and the soul of the wicked is punished 'with eternal punishment[k].' On the other hand he says: 'It is the opinion of the sadducees, that souls perish with the 'bodies[l].' And in another place, 'that they deny the con-'tinuance of souls, and the punishments and rewards of *Hades*[m].'

It has been thought by some[n] that Josephus, in this account of the pharisees, has endeavoured to accommodate their sentiments to those of some of the Greek philosophers; and that he here represents them as believing something very much like the Pythagorean transmigration of souls. And there seem to be in the New Testament the traces of some such sentiment; particularly in some of the instances mentioned, Matt. xvi. 14. *And they said, some say, that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets.*—Again it is said, *His disciples asked him, saying, master, who did sin,* THIS MAN *or his parents,* THAT HE WAS BORN BLIND? John ix. 2.

Some[o] think, that Josephus's words above-mentioned are altogether inconsistent with the notion of a transmigration, and that they import the belief of a proper resurrection. Possibly there were different sentiments concerning this matter among those called pharisees. It may be, they had none of them exactly that notion of a future state and a resurrection, which our Lord, and his apostles after him, taught: for St. Paul

[i] Αθανατον τε ισχυν ταις ψυχαις πιστις αυτοις ειναι, και υπο χθονος δικαιωσεις τε και τιμας οις αρετης η κακιας επιτηδευσις εν τῳ βιῳ γεγονε· και ταις μεν ειργμον αιδιον προσιθεσθαι, ταις δε ῥασωνην τȣ αναβιȣν. Illis verò facultatem esse in vitam redeundi. vers. Hudf. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 1. § 3.

[k] Ψυχην δε πασαν μεν αφθαρτον, μεταβαινειν δε εις ετερον σωμα την των αγαθων μονην, την δε των φαυλων αιδιῳ τιμωρια κολαζεσθαι. De Bell. l. ii. c. 8. § 14.

[l] Σαδδȣκαιοις δε τας ψυχας ο λογος συναφανιζει τοις σωμασι. Ant. lib. xviii. c. 1. § 4.

[m] Ψυχης δε την διαμονην, και τας καθ' αδȣ τιμωριας και τιμας αναιρȣσι. De Bell. ubi supra.

[n] Vid. Grot. in Matt. xiv. 2. xxii. 28. Cleric. Hist. Ec. Prolegom. § 1. c. 2.

[o] Basnage, Ann. Pol. Ecc. A. D. i. n. 12.

says, 2 Tim. i. 10. that *Jesus Christ had brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.*

However, St. Paul's notions did directly contradict those of the sadducees, and favour and confirm, not to say improve those of the pharisees, as is evident from Josephus's account. And it is not at all wonderful, that one sect laid hold of an advantage against the other.

Without staying any longer here, I shall give a passage or two, in which Josephus, who was of the sect of the pharisees, has represented some of his own sentiments concerning these points. The city of Jotapata, where Josephus commanded, was now taken; and he and some others had hid themselves in a cave. He was for surrendering to Vespasian; the rest of the company were rather for killing themselves, and threatened to kill him if he did not come into the same sentiment. In order to dissuade them from this design, among other things, he says, 'All have mortal bodies, formed of corruptible matter. But the soul is immortal, and being a portion of God, 'is housed in bodies.—What! know you not, that they who 'depart out of life according to the law of nature, and return 'to God the debt they have received from him, when it is 'the will of him that gave it, have eternal praise, and durable 'houses and generations; and that pure and obedient souls 'remain, having received an holy place in heaven, from whence, 'after the revolution of ages, they shall be again housed in 'pure bodies. But the souls of those who have laid violent 'hands on themselves, shall be lodged in the darkest *Hades*[p].' If I mistake not, St. Paul's figures in 2 Cor. v. 1, 2. have a resemblance with these of Josephus. *For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.*

The pharisees are said in the gospels *to fast oft*, Matt. ix. 14. and Josephus says, 'They practise great temperance, and never 'indulge themselves in a luxurious way of life[q].' This is as much as is reasonable to expect from him. It was not proper

[p] Τα μεν γε σωματα θνητα πασι, και εκ φθαρτης υλης δημιουργειται· ψυχη δη αθανατος αει, και θεου μοιρα τοις σωμασιν ενοικιζεται· ——αρα ουκ ιστε, οτι των μεν εξιοντων του βιου κατα τον της φυσεως νομον, και το ληφθεν παρα του θεου χρεος εκτινοντων, οταν ο δους κομισασθαι θελῃ, κλεος μεν αιωνιον, οικοι δε και γενεαι βεβαιοι, καθαραι δε και υπηκοοι μενουσιν αι ψυχαι, χωρον ουρανου λαχουσαι τον αγνωτατον, ενθεν εκ περιτροπης αιωνων αυτοις παλιν αντενοικιζονται σωμασιν· οσοις δε κατ' εαυτων εμανησαν αι χειρες, τουτων μεν αδης δεχεται τας ψυχας σκοτιωτερος. De Bell. lib. iii. c. 7. p. 1144, 1145.

[q] Ουτε γαρ Φαρισαιοι την διαιταν εξευτελιζουσιν, ουδεν εις το μαλακωτερον ενδιδοντες. Ant. lib. xviii. cap. 1. § 3.

to

to tell all the world, that they *fasted twice in a week*, from sun-set to sun-set[r], Luke xviii. 12. The Jews fasting was one of those things which the Romans had always ridiculed[s]. And some thought they fasted on their sabbaths[t]; though that was a great mistake. Josephus, however, cannot be much blamed for endeavouring to give a good turn to what had been a foundation for many unlucky jests.

I do not remember that the evangelists have any where said expressly, that the sadducees rejected the *tradition of the elders*; but as these were the great concern of the pharisees, and as these two sects seem opposite to each other, I should think it very likely even from the New Testament, that the sadducees were not very fond of these traditions; and Josephus says it plainly. 'The pharisees have delivered to the people many 'institutions as received from the fathers, which are not writ-'ten in the laws of Moses. For this reason the sadducees[u] 'reject these things, saying, that those things are binding 'which are written, but that the things received by tradition 'from the fathers need not to be observed. And about these 'things there have happened many disputes and contentions.' And again: 'They pretend not to observe any thing beside 'the laws; and it is with them a virtue to contradict the mas-'ters of wisdom, and wrangle with them about the science they 'teach[x].'

§ II. But though these two sects stood thus, in a manner, in opposition to each other, yet St. Luke represents them both as concerned together in that administration of affairs, which was allowed the Jewish nation by the Romans, to whom they were then subject: and says, that the members of the council, before which St. Paul was brought, were *the one part sadducees, and the other pharisees*, Acts xxiii. 6. And we have, before this, mention made made of a council in which there was a good number of sadducees: *Then the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him, which is the sect of the sadducees*, ch. v. 17.

And there is no reason to suspect that St. Luke has been mistaken herein. The sadducees were not excluded from pub-

[r] Buxt. Synag. Jud. cap. 30. [s] Jejunia Sabbatariorum. Mart. l. iv. Epigr. 4.

[t] Ne Judæus quidem, mi Tiberi, tam diligenter Sabbati jejunium servat quam ego hodie servavi. Suet. August. cap. 76.

[u] Και δια τουτο ταυτα το Σαδδουκαιων γενος εσβαλλει, λεγον εκεινα δειν ηγεισθαι νομιμα τα γεγραμμενα, τα δ' εκ παραδοσεως των πατερων μη τηρειν· και περι τουτων ζητησεις αυτοις και διαφορας γενεσθαι συνεβαινε μεγαλας. Antiq. lib. xiii. c. 10. § 6.

[x] Φυλακας δε ουδαμων τινων μεταποιησις αυτοις η των νομων· προς γαρ τους διδασκαλους σοφιας, ην μετιασιν, αμφιλογειν αρετην αριθμουσιν. Ant. l. xviii. c. 1. § 4.

lic

lic offices; but in proportion to their numbers seem to have had an equal share in the administration with the pharisees: But the reader is to judge for himself from what Josephus says. 'This opinion (speaking of the sadducees) is embraced by a 'few only; but then they are some of the chief men for dig-'nity: however, they can do but little; for when they are in 'the magistracy, they generally fall into the measures of the 'pharisees; (though unwillingly, and out of pure necessity;) 'for otherwise they would not be endured by the multitude[y].' He says likewise, 'That they are the most cruel of all the 'Jews in their judicial sentences[z],' which I think does appear also in some instances in the Acts of the apostles, where the pharisees were for the milder sentence and had a majority. However these passages of Josephus plainly intimate that the sadducees were not seldom in office.

The high priests themselves were sometimes sadducees. John Hyrcanus, prince and high priest of the Jews, who died in the year 107 before the christian æra[a], forsook the pharisees upon a disgust and turned sadducee. 'He abrogated the insti-'tutions which the pharisees had prescribed to the people, and 'punished those that observed them. Hence the multitude 'conceived an aversion for him and his sons.—But having sup-'pressed this disturbance, he afterwards lived very happily; 'and having administered the government in an excellent 'manner one and thirty years, he died, leaving behind him 'five sons[b].' There was another instance of this about the year of our Lord 60[c]. 'Cæsar having heard of the death of 'Festus sent Albinus prefect into Judea; and the king [sc. 'Agrippa the younger] took away the high priesthood from 'Joseph, and gave the succession of that office to Ananus the 'son of Ananus.—This Ananus the younger, who, as we said 'just now, had received the high priesthood, was fierce and 'haughty in his behaviour, and above all men bold and daring: 'and moreover was of the sect of the Sadducees[d].'

y Εις ολιγους τε ανδρας ουτος ο λογος αφικετο, τους μεντοι πρωτους τοις αξιωμασι· πρασσεται τε απ' αυτων ουδεν ως ειπειν· οποτε γαρ επ' αρχας παρελθοιεν, ακουσιως μεν και κατ' αναγκας, προσχωρουσι δ' ουν οις ο Φαρισαιος λεγει, δια το μη αλλως ανεκτους γενεσθαι τοις πληθεσιν· ibid. z Ant. 20. c. 8. p. 896. v. 37. a Prideaux Connect. Part II. Book iv. p. 328. b Μαλιστα δε αυτον επιπαρωξυνεν Ιωναθης, και διεθηκεν ουτως, ωστε τη Σαδδουκαιων ποιεισθαι προσθεσθαι μοιρα, των Φαρισαιων αποσταντα, και τατε υπ' αυτων καταστασθεντα νομιμα τω δημω καταλυσαι, και τους φυλαττοντας αυτα κολασαι· μισος ουν εντευθεν αυτω τε και τοις υιοις παρα του πληθους διεγενετο—Υρκανος δε παυσας την στασιν, και μετ' αυτην βιωσας ευδαιμονως, και την αρχην διοικησαμενος τον αριστον τροπον ετεσιν ενι και τριακοντα, τελευτα καταλιπων υιους πεντε. Antiq. l. xiii. c. 10. § 6, 7. c Vid. Pagi Crit. in Bar. & Basnage An. P. E. d Ο δε νεωτερος Ανανος, ον την αρχιερωσυνην εφαμεν παρειληφεναι, θρασυς ην τον τροπον, και τολμητης διαφεροντως· αιρεσιν δε μετηει την Σαδδουκαιων· ibid. l. xx. c. 8. § 1.

Many

Many do ſuppoſe, that the high prieſt whom St. Luke ſpeaks of, Acts v. 17. as being of the ſect of the ſadducees, was Caiaphas. But Joſephus has ſaid nothing concerning Caiaphas's principles one way or other.

We may, as we paſs along, obſerve here the agreement between the ſtyle of the evangeliſts and Joſephus. The people, as is evident, very generally held the tenets and obſerved the traditions of the phariſees; yet they are never dignified ſo far as to be called phariſees. They are rather an appendage than a part of the ſect, and are always called very plainly the people, the multitude, and the like. The title of phariſee ſeems to have been almoſt entirely appropriated to men of leiſure and ſubſtance. St. Auguſtine* made the ſame obſervation long ago.

Again, St. Mark introduces our Saviour telling the phariſees, ch. vii. 9. *Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your* OWN *tradition.* So that in one reſpect a tradition might be the fathers and in another the phariſees. And afterward; *Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which* YE HAVE DELIVERED, ver. 13. And to add no more texts, *They* (the ſcribes and phariſees) *bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's ſhoulders,* Matt. xxiii. 4. Luke xi. 46. Here alſo the phraſe and ſenſe of the evangeliſts and Joſephus agree together. In one of the paſſages juſt tranſcribed from him he ſays, 'The phariſees have 'DELIVERED to the people many inſtitutions:' in another, he ſpeaks of the inſtitutions which the phariſees had preſcribed to, or enjoined upon the people.

§ III. There is in the goſpels frequent mention of a ſet of men called ſcribes and lawyers. They are often joined with the chief prieſts, elders, and phariſees. They ſeem to have been men of ſkill and learning, and to have had a particular deference paid to them on that account, Matt. ii. 4. *And when he had gathered all the chief prieſts and ſcribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Chriſt ſhould be born?—For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the ſcribes,* chap. vii. 39.

A paſſage or two of Joſephus will explain theſe men's characters. 'Whilſt he (Herod in his laſt ſickneſs) lay under 'theſe diſorders, there happened a tumult among the people. 'There were in the city two ſophiſts [or rabbies] who were 'reckoned exceeding ſkilful in the laws of their country, and 'for that reaſon were highly honoured throughout the whole

* Phariſæi illi Judæi erant, quaſi egregii Judæorum. Nobiliores enim atque doctiores iſti Phariſæi vocabantur. Aug. Serm. 106. n. 2. T. v. Benedict.

'nation,

'nation, Judas the ſon of Sepphoræus, and Matthias the ſon 'of Margalus. Not a few of the young men frequented them 'to hear them interpret the laws, and they had with them 'every day an army of the youth [e].'

Of this ſame affair he ſpeaks thus in his Antiquities. 'There 'were Judas the ſon of Sariphæus, and Matthias the ſon of 'Margalothus, men who had the moſt perſuaſive eloquence 'of any among the Jews, and were eminent interpreters of 'the laws, and were dear to the people becauſe they taught 'the youth. Theſe were daily frequented by thoſe who gave 'themſelves to the ſtudy of virtue [f].'

Whether there be any difference between lawyers and ſcribes, or whether they are words perfectly ſynonomous, I cannot ſay. Perhaps ſome were chiefly employed in the ſchools, and others uſually ſpoke in public in the ſynagogues.

§ IV. It ought to be obſerved, that Joſephus has given an account of a third ſect among the Jews which were called Eſſenes: and on the other hand there is a ſort of men ſpoken of in the goſpels of which Joſephus has taken no notice, namely the Herodians.

As for the Herodians, they (or their leaven) are not often mentioned in the New Teſtament; I think not above four times in all the goſpels, Matt. xxii. 16. Mark iii. 6. viii. 15. xii. 13. What their particular tenets were does not appear to me, and I ſuppoſe it is not neceſſary I ſhould ſet down here all the conjectures of learned men concerning them [g]. They might be a ſubdiviſion or branch of one of the other ſects, either of the phariſees or ſadducees: or if they were properly a diſtinct ſect from the reſt, it might be a character that ſubſiſted but a ſhort time, at leaſt under that name. From the time that prophecy ceaſed among the Jews new ſects were continually ariſing. There were two diſciples of Antigonus Sochæus that were the authors of two new ſects: Sadoc of the ſect of the ſadducees; Baithos, or Bathus, the author likewiſe of a new ſect which had its name from him, and which is mentioned in the Gemara [h], though not in Joſephus. There was likewiſe at this time a diviſion in the ſect of the phariſees,

[e] Δυο ησαν σοφισται καλα την πολιν, μαλιστα δοκουντες ακριβως τα πατρια, και δια τουτο εν απασι τω εθνει μεγιστης ηξιωμενοι δοξης, Ιουδας τε υιος Σεπφωραιου, και Ματθιας ετερος Μαργαλω· τουτοις ουκ ολιγοι προσηεσαν των νεων εξηγουμενοις τους νομους, και συνηθες ησημεραι των ηβωντων σχολοπεδον· de B. J. lib. i. cap. 33. § 2. [f] Ιουδαιων λογιωτατοι, και πας ες τινας των πατριων εξηγησαι νομων, ανδρες και δημω προφιλεις δια παιδειαν τε νεωτερω· οσημεραι γας ... ρευον αυτοις παρ' οις προσπαιζων ... επαιδευετο· Antiq. l. xvii. c. 6. § 2.

[g] Vid. St. Hieron. Matth. ... Prid. Conn. Part ii. Book v. ... Heb. p. 242. 263. Clerici ... Hiſt. Ecc. p. 15. [h] Vid. ... ſupra, p. 262.

some following Hillel and others Shammai[i]. The followers of Judas of Galilee were at first but a small portion of the pharisees; in time they swallowed up almost all the other parties. Josephus, who so often says that the sects of the Jews are three, once or twice calls Judas of Galilee the leader or head of a fourth sect[k]. The reason of his not always distinguishing these from the rest was, I imagine, because they differed from the pharisees only in some few particulars. So that one and the same writer, who has professedly reckoned up the Jewish sects according to different ways of considering them, makes sometimes more and sometimes fewer: much more may two different writers, though they write professedly of this matter, which the evangelists have not done.

And after all, perhaps, these Herodians were never properly a distinct sect. Mr. Basnage, and[l] others, suppose they were some of the officers of Herod tetrarch of Galilee, which came up to Jerusalem at the feasts, and who were more devoted to the interests of the emperor than some of the Jews; and therefore the pharisees persuaded some of them to go along with their own disciples, when they sent them to our Saviour with the question concerning the lawfulness of tribute. Their leaven might comprize several things. Mr. Basnage supposes, that one thing meant by it, might be a conformity to Roman customs in some points which were forbidden the Jews[m]. If this was the case, it is not strange, that they are not particularly mentioned by Josephus among the Jewish sects.

The late learned Albert Fabricius * supposed, that the Herodians mentioned in the gospels, were the courtiers and soldiers of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee; and that the name Herodians no more denotes a sect, than Cæsareans and Pompeians, or any such like name would do. And he cites a passage of St. Jerom, which deserves to be remarked; who even banters those, who thought the Herodians were men who believed Herod the great to be the Christ.

[i] See Dr. Prideaux's Connect. Part ii. Book viii. at the beginning. [k] Ant. lib. xvii. p. 791. in. [l] Vid. Poli Synops. Matt. xxii. 16. [m] Vid. Basnage Ann. Polit. Ecc. Vol. i. p. 293. n. 5. p. 318. n. 16 & passim. * Herodem magnum tribuisse nomen sectæ Herodianorum contendunt viri doctissimi, præeunte Eusebio hæresi xx. & Niceta lib. i. Thesaur. c. 34. Verum Herodiani Matt. xxii. 16. Marc. iii. 6. xii. 13. fuere ministri vel milites Herodis Antipæ, qui Johannem Baptistam interfecit, & Herodis magni filius fuit. Nec magis hæresin vel sectam significat ibi hoc nomen, quam Cæsareanorum, Pompeianorum, & similia. S. Hieronymus ad Matt. xxii. 'Mittunt 'igitur Pharisæi discipulos suos cum Hero-'dianis, id est, militibus Herodis; seu 'quos illudentes Pharisæi, quia Romanis 'tributa solvebant, Herodianos vocabant, '& non divino cultui deditos. Quidam 'Latinorum ridicule Herodianos putant, 'qui Herodem Christum esse credebant 'quod nusquam omnino legimus.' Vid. Fabric. ad Philastr. de Hær. cap. 28.

§ V.

§ V. As for the Essenes not being mentioned by the evangelists; it was not their design to write the history of the Jewish sects, but of our Saviour's ministry. And it is likely this did not lead them to take any particular notice of them. They were not very numerous. Josephus computes their number at about four thousand; but I think, he means only those of them that entirely rejected marriage[n]. Philo says, that in Syria and Palestine there were about four thousand of them[o]. As they were not very numerous, so they lived very retired. Philo says, they sacrificed no living creatures, and that they shunned cities[p]. Josephus says, they sent presents to the temple, but offered no sacrifice there[q]. They seem not therefore to have come much abroad; and they would not admit a man of another sect into the apartments in which they lived[r]. In order to be admitted among them, a year's probation was required without doors, that it might be seen whether a person could bear their way of life[s]. 'The sect itself is divided into 'four classes, according to the time of their initiation. And 'the younger are reckoned so much inferior than the elder, 'that if any of these do but touch one of a junior class, they 'wash themselves, just as they would do if they had conversed 'with a stranger of another nation[t].'

Is it any wonder, that the evangelists had no particular occasion to mention this private set of men in writing the life of our Saviour? John xviii. 19, 20. *The high priest then asked Jesus, of his disciples and of his doctrine. Jesus answered him; I spake openly to the world, I ever taught in the synagogue, and the temple, whither the Jews always resort: and in secret have I said nothing.* This is one of the glories of our Saviour's character, as it is our very great happiness, that what he said and did was public. These men would not come to him; and it would have been a disparagement for him to have gone to them. It is, I think, a just observation of Dr. Prideaux, 'that 'almost all that is peculiar in this sect, is condemned by Christ 'and his apostles[u].' And that is sufficient for us.

n P. 793. o Quod omnis probus liber. p. 876. C. D. p Ου ζωα καταθυοντες· ibid. q Εις δε το ιερον αναθηματα τε ςελλοντες, θυσιας ουκ επιτελουσι· κ. τ. λ. Antiq. xviii. c. 1. § 5. r Και μετα ταυτην την αγνειαν εις ιδιον οικημα συνιασιν, ενθα μηδενι των ετεροδοξων επιτετραπται παρελθειν· de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 8. p. 1061. v. 25. s Τῳ δε ζελουντι την αιρεσιν αυτων ουκ ευθυς η παροδος, αλλ' επ' ενιαυτον εξω μεροντι την αυτην υποτιθενται διαιταν. Joseph. ibid. p. 1062. v. 18. t Διηρηνται δε, κατα χρονον ασκησεως, εις μοιρας τεσσαρας· και τοσουτον οι μεταγενεςεροι των προγενεςερων ελλαττουνται, ωςε ει ψαυσειαν αυτων εκεινους, απολουεσθαι, καθαπερ αλλοφυλῳ συμφυρεντας· ibid. p. 1063. v. 32—34.

u Connect. Part ii. Book v. p. 364.

Sir

Sir John Marſham has ſtrongly repreſented the obſcurity of this ſect in a paſſage, which I ſhall place in the * margin.

§ VI. We may not improperly ſubjoin the Samaritans to the Jewiſh ſects.

In the diſcourſe that paſſed between our Saviour and the woman of Samaria, ſhe tells him, *our fathers worſhipped in this mountain*, John iv. 20. And Joſephus ſays, that 'mount Ga-'rizim (the ſame the woman here ſpeaks of) is by them eſteem-'ed the moſt ſacred of all mountains [x].'

The Jews and Samaritans appear to have had a very great averſion and contempt for each other. John iv. 5—9. *Then cometh he to a city of Samaria. Now Jacob's well was there. There cometh a woman to draw water. Jeſus ſaith unto her give me to drink. For his diſciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat. Then ſaith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it, that thou, being a Jew, aſkeſt drink of me which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings [y] with the Samaritans.*

It ſeems that the Jews were wont to take up proviſions at their own coſt of the Samaritans, as they paſt through their country; and therefore the diſciples made no ſcruple to go into the city to buy what they wanted. And it is likely, that as Judea and Samaria were now both under one and the ſame government, namely that of the Romans, there was ſo good order preſerved, that neceſſary accommodations ſhould not be ordinarily refuſed any travellers, upon their paying the full value of them. But theſe people ſcorned to aſk, or receive a favour of each other, even ſo ſmall a kindneſs as a draught of water. Our Lord did not think himſelf bound by the rules they followed, as he was not moved by the paſſions with which they were poſſeſſed. But this woman was not a little ſurprized, that He, being a Jew, ſhould aſk drink of her that was a Samaritan.

They all knew how they ſtood affected to each other. The enmity betwixt them muſt have been the greateſt that can be

* Eſſeni autem παραπλησιοι ασιδηλοις, a ſimilitudine nominati, κατοικουσιν οικεσι, τας πολεις ἐφεξης ου οικουσιν, vicatim habitant, urbes fugiunt. Philo, Probus liber, p. 876. C D. Gens ſola, ſine ulla fœmina, ſine pecunia, ſocia Palmarum. Plin. l. v. c. 17. a populorum ſequentia ſeparata. Adeo ut non mirum ſit, tantum eſſe de iis ſilentium in Evangeliis, cum eſſent illi Hieroſolymis peregrini & ignoti. Neque rabbinorum cauſam eorum Hebraice meminit, ante Zacutum, ſcriptorem nuperum. [A. D. 1500.] Marſh. Can. Chr. Sæc. ix. p. 157, 158. Franeq. 1696.

[x] Κελευων επι το Γαριζειν ορος αυτω συνελθειν, ο αγιωτατον τε αυτοις ορων υπειληπται. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 5. § 1.

[y] Cuthæi Cæſarienſes interrogaverunt R. Ahhuc. Patres veſtri uſi ſunt patribus noſtris: vos igitur quare non utimini nobis? Dixit ipſis, Patres veſtri non corruperunt opera ſua: vos corrupiſtis opera veſtra. Talm. Hieroſ. apud Buxtorf. Lex. Thalm. p. 1370.

conceived. Doubtless those Jews gave our Saviour the most opprobrious language, which the most furious resentment could suggest, when *they said unto him, Say we not well, that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?* John viii. 48.

It is certain, the animosity between these people had ever been very great, and new affronts and injuries had increased it about this time. Josephus has related a particular provocation, which the Samaritans gave the Jews, A. D. 8 or 9.

'When Coponius governed in Judea, an affair happened 'that deserves to be mentioned. At the feast of unleavened 'bread, which we call the passover, it was the custom of the 'priests to set open the gates of the temple at midnight. Soon 'after they had been opened, some Samaritans, who had come 'privately into Jerusalem, entered in and threw dead men's 'bones in the porticoes; for which reason the priests ever after 'guarded the temple more strictly [z].'

The conversation which our Lord had with the woman of Samaria, happened as he was going from Jerusalem to Galilee. *He left Judea, and departed again into Galilee. And he must needs go through Samaria,* John iv. 3, 4. And St. Luke has given us an account of an affront our Saviour met with in that country at another time, when he was passing through it to one of the feasts at Jerusalem. This may incline us to suppose, that as this was the shortest way, so it was usual for the Jews of Galilee to go this way up to their feasts. Josephus has assured us it was so. The story in which this is mentioned being remarkable, I shall set it down at length. The fact happened about the year of our Lord 52 [a].

'Moreover a difference arose between the Samaritans and 'the Jews upon this occasion. It was the custom of the Gali-'leans, who went up to the holy city at the feasts, to travel 'through the country of Samaria. As they were in their jour-'ney, some of the village called Ginæa, which lies on the 'borders of Samaria and the great plain, falling upon them, 'killed a great many of them. When the chief men of Gali-'lee heard what had been done, they went to Cumanus, (he 'was then procurator,) and desired that he would revenge the 'death of those men that had been killed. But he having been 'bribed by the Samaritans, paid no regard to them [b].'

z Κωπωνιȣ δε την Ιȣδαιαν διεποντος, —— ταδε πρασσεται, των αζυμων της εορτης αγομενης, ην Πασχα καλȣμεν, εκ μεσης νυκτος εν εθει τοις ιερευσιν ην ανοιγνυναι τȣ ιερȣ τȣς πυλωνας· και τοτε ȣν επει το πρωτον γινεται η ανοιξις αυτων, ανδρες Σαμαρειται κρυφα εις Ιεροσολυμα ελθοντες διαρριψιν ανθρωπειων οστων εν ταις στοαις ποιȣνται. Ant. l. xviii. c. 2. § 2.

a Vid. Cleric. Histor. Eccl.

b Antiq. lib. xx. cap. 5. § 1. Vid. & de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 12. § 3.

This

This paſſage gives light to what is ſaid, Luke ix. 51.—*And it came to paſs, when the time was come that he ſhould be received up, he ſtedfaſtly ſet his face to go up to Jeruſalem. And ſent meſſengers before his face, and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. And they did not receive him, becauſe his face was, as though he would go up to Jeruſalem.* It was upon this people, that ſome of our Saviour's diſciples were for commanding fire to *come down from heaven to conſume them.* Our bleſſed Lord rebuked his diſciples: but it is evident, both from the evangeliſts and Joſephus, that however this people might treat other travellers, or even Jews at other times, they were very apt to violate the common laws of civility and hoſpitality toward thoſe that were going to worſhip God at Jeruſalem, or that had been there upon that account.

CHAP. V.

OF THE JEWS AND SAMARITANS EXPECTATIONS, AND THEIR IDEA OF THE MESSIAH.

I. *The Jews had expectations of the Meſſiah, as a temporal deliverer.* II. *Of the Jews requiring a ſign.* III. *The Samaritans expected the Meſſiah.* IV. *The Jews and Samaritans ſuppoſed the Meſſiah to be a prophet as well as a king.* V. *Some reflections.*

§ I. Two things are plainly intimated by the evangeliſts; that the Jewiſh nation had, about the time of our Saviour, very general expectations of the coming of the Meſſiah; and that the idea they formed of him, was that of a powerful and victorious temporal prince.

Firſt, It is intimated, that they had very general expectations of the Meſſiah. *The Jews ſent prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem, to aſk him,* (John the Baptiſt) *who art thou? and he confeſſed and denied not: but confeſſed, I am not the Chriſt. And they aſked him, what then?—and they which were ſent were of the phariſees,* John i. 19—24. *And as the people were in expectation, and all men muſed in their hearts of John, whether he were the Chriſt or not.* Luke iii. 15. See ch. ii. 25, 26. John iv. 25.

Secondly, It is intimated, that the idea the Jews then had of the Meſſiah, was that of a powerful temporal prince. The

diſciples of Chriſt had theſe apprehenſions; therefore there *aroſe a reaſoning among them, which of them ſhould be greateſt*, Luke ix. 46. This notion was the ground of that petition preſented to our Saviour by the mother of Zebedee's children: *Grant that theſe my two ſons may ſit, the one on the right hand, and the other on the left in thy kingdom*, Matt. xx. 21.

The common people, whenever they had formed a great idea of Jeſus, from what he ſaid or performed, continually betrayed expectations of his aſſuming ſome external marks of royalty, and very forwardly offer him their ſervice, John vi. 14, 15. This was the intention of thoſe acclamations they made, and of that ſolemn ſtate, with which they attended him at laſt into Jeruſalem; the circumſtances of which are related by all the four evangeliſts: Matt. xxi. 8, 9. *And a very great multitude ſpread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees and ſtrewed them in the way; and the multitude that went before, and that followed, cried, ſaying, Hoſanna to the Son of David.* John xii. 13. *Bleſſed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord.* The acclamations, and the ceremonies they uſed, ſufficiently declare their meaning. When Jehu had been anointed king, 2 Kings ix. 13. they that were with him, *haſted, and took every man his garment and put it under him, and blew the trumpet ſaying, Jehu is king* [a].

Theſe were their expectations, this the notion they had of the Meſſiah; as is evident from the many impoſtors (A) which aroſe about this time in Judea; all which, according to Joſephus, gained many followers. But as ſeveral paſſages concerning them will appear in other parts of this work, and one or two by and by in this chapter, I ſhall take no farther notice of them in this place. There are paſſages of divers ancient writers, in which theſe things are expreſly aſſerted. Moſt of them have been already offered to the world in our own language; but nevertheleſs they cannot be omitted here.

One is in Joſephus. 'But that which principally encour-
'aged them to the war, was an ambiguous oracle, found like-
'wiſe in the ſacred writings, that about that time, ſome one
'from their country ſhould obtain the empire of the world.
'This they underſtood to belong to themſelves [b]. And many
'of the wiſe men were miſtaken in their judgment of it. For

[a] Joſeph. Antiq. l. ix. cap. 6. § 2.

(A) See the Biſhop of Coventry and Litchfield's Defence of Chriſtianity, Ch. i. particularly p. 29. firſt edit.

[b] For this they had received (by tradition) that it was ſpoke of one of their Nation. Biſhop of Cov. Defence, p. 26.

'the oracle intended Vespasian's government, who was pro-'claimed emperor in Judea [c].'

There are two heathen historians, who have mentioned this same thing. Suetonius in his life of Vespasian says, 'There 'had been for a long time, all over the east, a notion firmly 'believed, that it was in the fates [in the decrees or books of 'the fates] that at that time, some which came out of Judea, 'should obtain the empire of the world. By the event it ap-'peared, that prediction related to the Roman emperor. The 'Jews applying it to themselves went into a rebellion [d].'

What Tacitus says is much to the same purpose. Having related many calamities of the Jews, and divers prodigies that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem, he goes on: 'The ge-'nerality had a strong persuasion, that it was set down in the 'ancient writings of the priests, that at that very time the 'east should prevail; and that some who came out of Judea 'should obtain the empire of the world. Which ambiguities 'foretold Vespasian and Titus. But the common people, ac-'cording to the usual influence of human passions, having 'once appropriated to themselves this vast grandeur of the 'fates, could not be brought to understand the true meaning 'by all their adversities [e].'

There is a passage or two more, which I would give here, and which appear to me very material: they are the words of Celsus, who flourished not long after the middle of the second century. They are cited by Origen, from Celsus's books against the Christian religion, in a good part of which he argued in the character of a Jew. 'How could we,' says he, 'who had told all men, there would come one from God, who 'should punish the wicked, despise him if he came [f]?' And in another place he says, 'The prophets say, that he who is to 'come is great, and a prince, and lord of all the earth, and 'of all the nations, and of armies [g].'

[c] Το δε επαραν αυτȣς μαλιςα προς τον πολεμον, ην χρησμος αμφιβολος ομοιως εν τοις ιεροις ευρημενος γραμμασιν, ως κατα τον καιρον εκεινον, απο της χωρας τις αυτων αρξει της οικȣμενης· τȣτο οι μεν ως οικειον εξελαβον, και πολλοι των σοφων επλανηθησαν περι την κρισιν· εδηλȣ δ'αρα περι την Ουεσπασιανȣ το λογιον ηγεμονιαν, αποδειχθεντος επιζȣδαιας αυτοκρατορος. Jos. de Bell. l. vi. c. 5. § 4.

[d] Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus & constans opinio: esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur. Id de Imperatore R. quantum eventu postea prædictum paruit. Judæi ad se trahentes, rebellarunt. Cap. iv.

[e] —Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judæâ rerum potirentur. Quæ ambages Vespasianum ac Titum prædixerant. Sed vulgus, more humanæ cupiditatis, sibi tantam Fatorum magnitudinem interpretati, ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur. Tacit. Hist. l. v. c. 13.

[f] Πως δε, φησιν, ημεις οι πασι ανθρωποις δηλωσαντες ηξειν απο Θεȣ τον κολασοντα τȣς αδικȣς, ελθοντα ατιμαζομεν· Or. con. Cels. lib. i. p. 61. Ed. Cant. 4to.

[g] Οτι μεγαν και δυναςην και πασης της

Beside these, there is another passage in Josephus [h], which, I think, deserves a particular attention. It must be produced hereafter, upon [i] another occasion, and for that I reserve it.

§ II. The evangelists have related many wonderful works, of various kinds, which were performed by our Saviour. And in some places they say, he wrought signs. *And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples,* John xx. 30. And St. Peter tells the Jews, Acts ii. 22. *that Jesus* was a *man approved of God among them by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of them.* But yet, they assure us, that notwithstanding this, the Jews would be often asking him for a sign. Matt. xii. 38. *Then certain of the scribes and of the pharisees answered, saying, master we would see a* SIGN *from thee.* The sadducees also had this demand to make; ch. xvi. 1. *The pharisees also with the sadducees came, and tempting him, desired him, that he would shew them a sign from heaven.* Again, John vi. 30. *they said unto him, what sign shewest thou then that we may see and believe thee?* The sign they wanted must needs have been of a different kind from any of those, which Jesus had given them. The words that follow, ver. 31. are somewhat remarkable: *our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, he gave them bread from heaven to eat.* And the apostle Paul, a good while after this, says, *the Jews require a sign,* 1 Cor. i. 22.

A short passage or two from Josephus will confirm and explain this matter. Representing the state of affairs in Judea under Felix, he says, 'And deceivers and impostors [k], under 'a pretence of divine inspiration aiming at innovations and 'changes, persuaded the people into distraction, and drew them 'into the wilderness, where they assured them God would shew 'them SIGNS OF LIBERTY.' This is in his Jewish War. In his Antiquities he writes thus of the same affair: 'And im-'postors and deceivers persuaded the multitude to follow them 'into the wilderness. For they said they would there shew 'them manifest wonders and signs, which would be wrought by 'the power [or providence] of God [l].' This shews they wanted some sign of liberty or of a temporal deliverance.

γης, και παντων των εθνων και χαλεπωτερων κυριον φασιν οι προφηται ειναι τον επιδημησοντα. Id. lib ii. p. 78. [h] Ant. lib. xvii. cap. 2. sub fin. [i] See Josephus in the Index, his account of a terrible execution at Jerusalem. [k] Πλανοι γαρ ανθρωποι και απατεωνες, προσχημα δε ειασαμενοι, νεωτερισμους και μεταβολας πραγματευομενοι, δαιμονων το πληθος ανεπειθον, και ηγουντο εις την ερημιαν, ως εκει τον Θεον δειξοντος αυτοις σημεια ελευθερας. De Bell. J. lib. ii. c. 13. § 4. [l] Οι δε γοητες και απατεωνες ανθρωποι τον οχλον επεισαν αυτοις εις την ερημιαν επεσθαι· δειξειν γαρ εφασαν εναργη τερατα και σημεια, κατα την του Θεου προνοιαν γενομενα. Antiq. lib. xx. cap. 7. § 6.

§ III.

§ III. According to St. John the Samaritans also had at this time expectations of the Messiah. *The woman saith unto him, I know that* MESSIAS COMETH, *which is called Christ: when he is come he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he—The woman went her way into the city, and saith to the men, come see a man which told me all things that ever I did, is not this the Christ? Now when the Samaritans were come unto him*—and had heard him, *they said unto the woman, now we believe, not because of thy saying; for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is the Christ the Saviour of the world*, John iv. 25, 26, 29, 42.

This supposition is confirmed by an account which Josephus has given of an affair which happened in the latter end of Pilate's government, A. D. 35 or 36. 'Nor were the Samaritans,' says he, 'free from disturbance. For there was among them a man who made no scruple of a lie, and contrived all he said so as might best please the people. He published orders that they should meet together and go with him up to mount Garizim, which is esteemed by them the most holy of all mountains. He assured them that when they were got to the top of it, he would shew them the sacred vessels which had been laid up there under ground by [m] Moses. They taking what he said for truth, armed themselves, and posting themselves in a certain village called Tirathaba, there received all that flocked to them, intending to ascend the mountain in a large body. But a detachment of Pilate's soldiers, horse and foot, having first intercepted their passage, fell upon them in the village, and at the first attack slew some, dispersed others, and took a good number prisoners, the chief of whom Pilate put to death.'

This affair is a proof that the Samaritans were now in expectation of some extraordinary events. This deceiver accommodated his speeches to the humour and sentiments of the people, and they credited readily what he said. But this is not all: the substance of his promises is a proof they were now in expectation of some discoveries and regulations concerning

[m] Ουκ απηλλακτο δε θορυβου και το Σαμαρεων εθνος· συστρεφει γαρ αυτους ανηρ εν ολιγῳ το ψευδος τιθεμενος, και εφ' ηδονῃ της πληθυος τεχναζων τα παντα, κελευων επι το Γαριζειν ορος αυτῳ συνελθειν, ο αγνοτατον τε αυτοις ορων υπειληπται, ισχυριζετο τε παραγενομενοις δειξειν τα ιερα σκευη τῃ δε κατορυγμενα, Μωυσεως τῃδε αυτων ποιησαμενου καταθεσιν· οι δε εν οπλοις τε ησαν, πιθανει ηγουμενοι τον λογον· και καθισαντες εν τινι κωμῃ, Τιραθαβα λεγεται, παρελαμβανον τους επισυλλεγομενους, ως μεγαλῳ πληθει την αναβασιν εις το ορος ποιησομενοι· φθανει δε Πιλατος την ανοδον αυτων προκαταλαβομενος ιππεωντε πομπῃ και οπλιτων, οι συμβαλοντες τοις εν τῃ κωμῃ προσυνηθροισμενοις, παραταξεως γενομενης, τους μεν εκτειναι, τους δε εις φυγην τρεπονται, ζωγριᾳ τε πολλους ηγον, ων τους κορυφαιοτατους—εκτεινε Πιλατος· Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 5. § 1.

matters of religion. For certainly if they found theſe ſacred veſſels, they ſuppoſed they ſhould have ſome inſtructions alſo what to do with them. Nor could they think him an ordinary prophet that ſhould be honoured with ſuch a commiſſion (B).

I muſt inform the reader, that in all our preſent copies of Joſephus the hiding theſe ſacred veſſels is aſcribed to Moſes. And his name was read in this place by Epiphanius and Zonaras[n]. But Reland ſuſpected that for Moſes we ought to read Ozes. One of his reaſons is, that in an ancient Samaritan chronicle, the manuſcript of which he had in his poſſeſſion, there is an account of the laying up of ſacred veſſels by the divine appointment in a cave on Mount Garizim, during the high prieſthood of Ozes, or Ozi: but that, when afterwards he came to look for them, he could not find them. Reland is inclined to think, that the high prieſt here intended is Uzzi, mentioned 1 Chron. vi. 6. who was the fifth from Aaron. The ſtory related in his Chronicle is almoſt the very ſame which is told in the ſecond Book of Maccabees, ch. ii. with ſcarce any other difference but that of Jeremy for Ozi, and Nebo for Garizim[o]. I ſhall therefore ſet down here the account in the Maccabees. It is, I think, an argument that according to traditions which they then had among them, the diſcovery of the ſacred veſſels would be immediately followed by very glorious times; and conſequently that this paſſage from Joſephus is to the purpoſe for which I have alleged it. 2 Macc. ii. 4—8. *It was alſo contained in the ſame writing, that the prophet being warned of God, commanded the tabernacle and the ark to go with him, as he went forth into the mountain, where Moſes climbed up, and ſaw the heritage of God. And when Jeremy came thither, he found an hollow cave wherein he laid the tabernacle and the ark, and the altar of incenſe, and ſo ſtopped the door. And ſome of thoſe that followed him came to mark the way, but they could not find it. Which when Jeremy perceived, he blamed them, ſaying, As for that place, it ſhall be unknown until the time that God gather his people again together, and receive them unto mercy. Then ſhall the Lord ſhew them theſe things, and the glory of the Lord ſhall appear, and the cloud alſo as it was ſhewed under Moſes, and as when Solomon deſired that the place might be honourably ſanctified.*

§ IV. It has been ſhewn that the Jews had now expectations of the coming of the Meſſiah, and that they hoped for a tem-

(B) See Biſhop Chandler's Defence of Chriſtianity, chap. 1. ſect. 3. at the end.

n Vid. Hudſon. Notas in Joſeph. loc.

o Subſtitue pro Jeremia Ozin, pro monte Nebo Garizim, cætera conveniunt. Reland. Diſſert. de Monte Garizim, § 14.

poral

poral ſalvation from him. But it is not to be thought they looked for nothing elſe. After the miracle of the five loaves, St. John ſays, chap. vi. 14, 15. *Then theſe men, when they had ſeen the miracle which Jeſus did, ſaid, This is of a truth that prophet which ſhould come into the world. When Jeſus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himſelf alone.* Theſe two characters therefore of a prophet, and a king, were joined together in the thoughts of theſe men.

The woman of Samaria likewiſe plainly ſuppoſes the Meſſiah was to be a great prophet. She knew that when he who is called Chriſt was come, he would *tell them all things*. Upon Jeſus *telling her all things that ever ſhe did*, ſhe concluded he was *the Chriſt*. And ſhe ſuppoſed this would be an argument with the men whom ſhe went to, to believe the ſame thing: and we find it had great weight with them, though they were farther confirmed by what they afterwards heard from Jeſus themſelves. The expectation of great diſcoveries in matters of religion appears alſo in the paſſage juſt tranſcribed from Joſephus.

§ V. I chooſe to conclude this chapter with ſome reflections.

1. We may now perceive one reaſon why our Bleſſed Lord often forbad men to publiſh the cures he had wrought upon them; why he ſo often moved from one place to another; why he ſo rarely affirmed in expreſs terms, in the hearing of the people, that he was the Chriſt. Whilſt they had ſo ſtrong a perſuaſion that the Meſſiah would be a temporal deliverer, there was a neceſſity for this conduct. It was impoſſible otherwiſe to avoid giving umbrage to the Roman government, and to hinder the people from actually making attempts that would have expoſed them to juſtice. He therefore contented himſelf with declaring that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, that the Father had ſent him, that he was he of whom Moſes and the prophets had written, that he was bleſſed who ſhould not be offended in him; (all which they knew to be characters of the Meſſiah;) wrought miracles, preached righteouſneſs, and endeavoured to correct their falſe ſentiments and corrupt affections. In a word, it was neceſſary he ſhould do juſt as he did, according to the divine character he ſuſtains throughout the goſpels.

2. We ſee here the ground of the different reſpect which ſeems to have been ſhewn to John the Baptiſt and Jeſus. *Many of the phariſees and ſadducees came to his baptiſm*, Matt. iii. 7. And of others there ſeems to have been a general reſort. And for ſome time afterwards it was dangerous to deny the validity

or

or authority of his baptiſm: *for all held John to be a prophet*, Matt. xxi. 26. The general expectation of the Meſſiah raiſed their attention to John: but their particular idea of the Meſſiah diſguſted them againſt Jeſus. *He* (ſays our Lord to them) *was a burning and ſhining light, and ye were willing for a ſeaſon to rejoice in his light*, John v. 35. They had no doubt but that a very great perſon was coming among them; and they were pleaſed to hear John ſay that he was his fore-runner: but when Jeſus came, he was not ſuch a perſon as they wiſhed for.

3. We ſee here the reaſon of the different reception given to Jeſus by the Phariſees and the people. The ſame notions ſeem to have been common to all, and the paſſion of the people for liberty was as warm as that of the phariſees for power and grandeur. But the people could not ſee very far; and they hoped, even contrary to preſent appearances, that Jeſus might ſome time undertake the deliverance they wanted. But the phariſees, who had more penetration, ſaw from the beginning that he was a man void of all worldly ambition, and that no ſuch principle would be gratified under him. His peculiar bleſſings were all beſtowed on the *poor in ſpirit, the meek, and thoſe that were perſecuted for righteouſneſs ſake*; he exhorted *men to pray, faſt, give alms in ſecret*, to entertain *the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind*, in hopes of being *recompenſed at the reſurrection of the juſt*; and he openly neglected *the traditions of the elders*. They could be ſure from hence, that Jeſus did not intend to enrich his followers by worldly conqueſts; that this doctrine was no prelude to an univerſal temporal empire; and that according to theſe meaſures their darling principles inſtead of prevailing would be for ever diſgraced. Therefore theſe men purſued him, almoſt univerſally, from firſt to laſt, with an uninterrupted courſe of ſecret or open malice.

4. This notion of theirs gives us the reaſon why many owned Jeſus *for a time* and then forſook him. They came in to him upon the ſuppoſition of his being a temporal deliverer of the Jewiſh nation: but by his conduct, or ſome things they heard from him, they were convinced they had gone upon a wrong foundation.

5. It does alſo account for that ſudden change in the people at the concluſion of our Saviour's miniſtry. They attend him with great ſtate into Jeruſalem; and a few days after they cry out, *not this man, but Barabbas*. The reaſon ſeems to be this: his not aſſuming then the character of a temporal prince, or at leaſt not giving them ſome ſign of liberty, had been a vaſt diſappoinment, and left a deep reſentment, which rendered them

them ſuſceptible afterwards of the worſt impreſſions from the chief prieſts and phariſees.

6. The particulars abovementioned may help us to conceive the truth of what is related, Acts v. 26. *Then went the captain with the officers, and brought them without violence; for they feared the people, leſt they ſhould have been ſtoned.* Strange! that they ſhould now have ſuch a zeal and affection for the diſciples of Jeſus, whom they had ſo lately deſired with loud voices to be crucified, as to be ready to do violence to the officers of the council for their ſecurity. But however ſtrange this may ſeem, there is no manner of reaſon to doubt the truth of it. What has been alleged from Joſephus and Tacitus aſſures us, that though often diſappointed they were not diſheartned. Though Jeſus had been crucified, a ſurpriſing power appeared in his diſciples, and wonderful works were wrought by them in the name of Jeſus, which were infallible proofs of his reſurrection and aſcenſion. Hereupon undoubtedly the hopes of the ſalvation they wiſhed for revived in theſe men.

7. The Jews' expectation of a temporal deliverance for their nation, nouriſhed and ſtrengthened by ſenſual paſſions, together with their prodigious wickedneſs, which they in their fond imaginations had reconciled with the peculiar friendſhip and favour of God, does fully account for this people's ſo generally rejecting and deſpiſing Jeſus, though there was the fulleſt proof given that he was he who was to come. John v. 43. *I am come,* ſays our Lord, *in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another ſhall come in his own name, him ye will receive.* They were ready to join any one who made them promiſes of a temporal ſalvation; but they would not receive, or at leaſt not hold to any one that did not. If they would have received any one without this condition, they would have received Jeſus.

CHAP. VI.

Of the great Corruption of the Jewish People.

The evangeliſts have repreſented the Jewiſh nation as very corrupt and wicked about the time our Saviour converſed and taught in this world. When John the Baptiſt *ſaw many of the phariſees*

pharisees and sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Matt. iii. 7. Our Lord himself calls them *an evil and adulterous generation*, ch. xii. 39. When they boasted of their relation to Abraham, and yet sought to kill him, who had told them the truth, our Saviour tells them: *Ye are of your father the devil, and the works of your father ye will do*, John viii. 40—44. Our Lord often intimates, that the true reason why his doctrine was so little regarded by them, was this, that their affections were entirely engaged by worldly advantages, and they had no sincere love of truth or virtue. *This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world; and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil*, John iii. 19. *How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not that honour which cometh from God only?* ch. v. 44. And from many other parts of the Gospels it is evident, their righteousness consisted in a regard to some ritual parts of Moses's law, and in observing the traditional rules of the elders; *making broad their phylacteries, and enlarging the border of their garments; in paying tythes of mint and anise and cummin; while they omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith.* Matt. xxiii. 5—23.

That the corruption of the Jews is not at all aggravated here, is evident from the character given of these times, or of those very near them, by Josephus himself, who was zealous for the honour of his country. 'Eleazer,' says he, 'the chief 'man among the Sicarii (A) was a descendant of Judas, who 'had persuaded not a few of the Jews not to enrol themselves, 'when Cyrenius the censor was sent into Judea. For then the 'Sicarii conspired against all that were willing to submit to 'the Romans. They treated all such as public enemies:— 'Affirming they were no better than strangers, since they sur-'rendered to the Romans those privileges of their nation, 'which ought to be precious to all Jews.—But all this was 'mere pretence, and given out with no other view than to 'cover their cruelty and avarice.—That was indeed a time 'fruitful of all sorts of wickedness among the Jews, so that 'no evil whatever was left unpractised. It is impossible for 'man to contrive any new wickedness, which was not then 'committed. All were corrupt in their private and public 'character. They strove to exceed each other in impiety to-'ward God, and injustice toward their neighbour. The great 'men oppressed the people, and the people strove to ruin them.

(A) Villains that went with short swords concealed under their clothes.

'The

'The former were ambitious of dominion and power, the latter had an insatiable thirst of violence and plunder[a].'

It appears from hence, that the corruption of this people was general. If Josephus had not made this acknowledgment, it might have been proved by an enumeration of the many acts of injustice and villainy he has related, that all sorts of people were abandoned to wickedness. I think this is not needful; I shall however, add two or three more passages.

In his account of their affairs, whilst Felix was procurator of Judea, he has these words: 'Such was the impudence of 'the high priests, that they would send their servants to the 'store-houses, to seize and bring away the tythes that belonged to the priests; by which means some of the priests, whose 'circumstances were but strait, perished for want: so far did 'the violence of factious men prevail over justice and equity[b].' Did not our Saviour say very truly, *It is written, my house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves?* Matt. xxi. 13.

Not far off from this passage there is another, which may give us an idea of their hypocrisy, (a crime they are often charged with in the gospels) and of their artful and impudent pretensions to religion, when they intended the greatest villainies. Felix by a large sum of money persuaded Dora, a native of Jerusalem, and an intimate friend of the high priest Jonathan, to undertake that the said high priest should be murdered. Dora accordingly hired some of the [c] robbers (so Josephus calls a set of men the country was then filled with) for this purpose. 'Some of these men coming up into the 'city, as if with a design to worship God, and having short 'swords under their coats, mixing themselves with the multitude, kill Jonathan. This murder passing unpunished, after 'this the robbers came in at the feasts without any manner of 'concern; and carrying, as before, swords under their clothes, 'and mixing with the multitudes, they killed divers people; 'some whom they reckoned their enemies, some whom they 'were hired by others to destroy. This they did, not only in 'other parts of the city, but within the bounds of the temple

[a] Ἔοικε γὰρ πως ὁ χρόνος ἐκεῖνος πανδοκεῖον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις πονηρίας πολυφόρους, ἐκ τοῦ καὶ ἔργον ἀπρακτον καλαλιπεῖν, μὴ οὐ τις ἐπίνοια διαπλαττειν εὐθυμήσειεν ἐφ' ᾧ τι καινότερον ἐξευρεῖν· εἴως ἰδιᾳ τε κατὰ πόλεις ἐνοσησαν, καὶ πρὸς ὑπερτάτων ἀλλοίως ἐς τε τὰς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐσεβείας καὶ τὰς εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἀδικίαν ἐφιλονείκησαν· οἱ μὲν δυνάλοι τὰ πλήθη κακωνῖες, οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ τὸς δυνάλας ἀπολλύναι σπεύδοντες· ἦν γὰρ ἐκείνοις μὲν ἐπιθυμία τε τυραννεῖν, τοῖς δὲ τὸ βιάζεσθαι καὶ τὰ εὐπόρων διαρπάζειν. De B. J. lib. vii. c. 8. § 1. [b] Antiq. lib. xx. cap. 7. § 8. [c] Κακεῖνος ὑπακούσας ἐμηχανήσατο διὰ τῶν λῃστῶν πραχθῆναι τοιῷδε τρόπῳ τὸν φόνον. Ibid. § 5.

'itself.

'itself[d]. For even there would they kill men, and yet not 'seem to commit any crime. For this reason, it seems to me, 'that God, detesting their impiety, forsook our city; and not 'esteeming the temple any longer a pure habitation for him, 'brought the Romans against us, threw on the city a fire to 'purify it, and delivered up us with our wives and children to 'servitude, that by these calamities we might learn wisdom.'

There is another noted passage of the same historian, which may not be omitted. 'I cannot say it without regret, yet I 'must declare it is my opinion, that if the Romans had de-'layed to come against these wretches, the city [Jerusalem] 'would have been swallowed up by an earthquake, or over-'whelmed by a deluge, or else been consumed by fire from 'heaven, as Sodom was: for it bore a generation of men 'more wicked than those which had suffered such calamities[e].' I conclude with the following short passage. 'To reckon up 'all their villainies,' says he, 'is impossible; but in a word, 'never did any city suffer so great calamities; nor was there 'ever from the beginning of the world, a time more fruitful 'of wickedness than that was[f].'

CHAP. VII.

The Circumstances of our Saviour's last Sufferings.

I. *Caiaphas high priest at that time.* II. *Pontius Pilate governor of Judea.* III. *Pilate's wife in Judea.* IV. *Herod the tetrarch at Jerusalem.* V. *Of the high priest's rending his clothes.* VI. *High priests spoken of in the plural number.* VII. *Pilate now at Jerusalem.* VIII. *Pilate condemns Jesus to content the Jews.* IX. *Remarks concerning Pilate's power in Judea.* X. *Of the title written upon the cross,* XI. *In Hebrew, Greek, and Latin,* XII. *Of the scoffs and derisions which our Saviour met with.* XIII. *Jesus scourged before he was crucified.* XIV. *Bore his cross.* XV. *Of his being crucified without the city.* XVI. *Of his burial,* XVII. *And embalming.*

[d] Ου μονον κατα την αλλην πολιν, αλλα, και κατα το ιερον ενιους· και γαρ εκει σφαττειν ετολμων, ουδε εν τουτῳ δοκουντες ασεβειν. Ibid.

[e] Ουκ αν υποστειλαιμει, ειπειν, α μοι κελευει το παθος οιμαι Ρωμαιων βραθυνοντων επι τους αλιτηριους, η καταποθηναι αν υπο χασματος, η κατακλυσθηναι την πολιν, η τους της Σοδομηνης μεταλαβειν κεραυνους· πολυ γαρ των ταυτα παθοντων ηνεγκε γενεαν αθεωτεραν. De B. J. lib. v. c. 13. § 6.

[f] Καθ' εκαστον μεν ουν επεξιεναι την παρανομιαν αυτων, αδυνατον· συνελοντα δ' ειπειν, μητε πολιν αλλην τοιαυτα πεπονθεναι, μητε γενεαν εξ αιωνος γεγονεναι κακιας γονιμωτεραν. Ibid. cap. 10. § 5.

In

IN the hiſtory of our Saviour's laſt ſufferings at Jeruſalem, there is mention made of four perſons of diſtinction; Caiaphas the high prieſt, Pontius Pilate the governor, his wife, and Herod the tetrarch of Galilee.

§ I. St. Matthew ſays, ch. xxvi. 3. *Then aſſembled together the chief prieſts and the ſcribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the* HIGH PRIEST, *who was called* CAIAPHAS. And afterwards, ver. 57. *Then they that had laid hold on Jeſus, led him away to* CAIAPHAS *the high prieſt*. St. John likewiſe aſſures us, that at this time Caiaphas was the high prieſt, and has informed us of a particular omitted by St. Matthew, namely, that our Saviour was carried to Annas, ch. xviii. 13. *And led him away to Annas firſt, (for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas which was the high prieſt that ſame year)*. And again, *Now Annas had ſent him bound unto* CAIAPHAS THE HIGH PRIEST, ver. 24--28.

That Caiaphas was now high prieſt appears hence: he was made high prieſt by Valerius Gratus predeceſſor of Pontius Pilate, and was put out of that office by Vitellius preſident of Syria, after Pilate was ſent away out of the province of Judea. Joſephus informs us of Caiaphas's advancement to the prieſthood in theſe words: 'And a year after he [Gratus] removed 'him, [Eleazar the ſon of Ananus,] and gave the high prieſt-'hood to Simon the ſon of Camithus. He, having enjoyed 'this honour not above a year, was ſucceeded by Joſeph who is 'alſo called CAIAPHAS. After this Gratus went away for 'Rome, having been eleven years in Judea, and Pontius Pi-'late came thither as his ſucceſſor[a].' The ſame hiſtorian gives us the account of Caiaphas's removal in this manner. Vitellius whilſt in Syria ſent orders to Pilate to repair to Rome; after which Vitellius went up to Jeruſalem, and there gave directions concerning ſeveral matters. 'Having done theſe things,' ſays Joſephus, 'he took away the prieſthood from the high prieſt 'Joſeph who is alſo called CAIAPHAS, and appointed Jonathan 'the ſon of Ananus high prieſt, and then returned to Antioch[b].'

It is evident therefore that Caiaphas was high prieſt all the time that Pilate was in Judea.

§ II. We ſhall preſently have occaſion to take notice of ſeveral things concerning Pilate: I ſhall here only ſhew that PI-

[a] Ενιαυτῳ δε διαλειφαντος, και τοιδε παυτος, δωρειται τῳ Καιαφα τον αρχιερατικον παρεσκευην· ὁ δε ουτος και τωδε ενιαυτῳ την τιμην εχων διετελεσε χρονος, και Ιωσηπος, ὁς και Καιαφας, διαδοχος ην αυτῳ· και Γρατος μεν ταυτα πραξας εις Ρωμην επαισχυθεις ενεκα ων διαπεπραχε εις Ιουδαιαν· Ποντιος δε Πιλατος διαδοχος αυτῳ ηκεν. Antiq lib. xviii. c. 2. § 2. [b] Και ταυτα πραξας επι ευσεβεσιᾳ τε εθνους, και τον αρχιερεα Ιωσηπον τον και Καιαφαν επικαλουμενον απαλλαξας της ιερωσυνης, Ιωναθην καθιστησι Ανανου τε αρχιερεως υιον· επ' Αντιοχειας δ' αυθις επορευετο την οδον. Ibid. c. 5. § 3.

LATE

LATE was at this time governor of Judea. St. Luke ſays, ch. iii. 1, 2. *Now in the* FIFTEENTH YEAR *of the reign of Tiberius Cæſar,* PONTIUS PILATE BEING GOVERNOR OF JUDEA, *the word of God came unto John the ſon of Zacharias in the wilderneſs.* If St. Luke in this text intends not the fifteenth year of Tiberius's reign from the death of Auguſtus, but the fifteenth year of his proconſular power when he was made colleague of Auguſtus, it may poſſibly admit a debate, whether Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea when John the Baptiſt began to preach: therefore I have reſerved the conſideration of that particular for the next book. But there can be no queſtion made but that Pilate was governor of Judea at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion; whether St. Luke be underſtood in that place to ſpeak of the proconſular power of Tiberius, or of his ſole empire after the death of Auguſtus.

The fifteenth year of Tiberius's proconſular empire, and the twelfth of his ſole empire are pretty near coincident. For the 15th of his proconſular empire is ſuppoſed to begin[c] about the 27th of Auguſt, A. D. 25. And the 12th of his ſole empire began the 19th of Auguſt in the ſame year.

There is undoubtedly ſome difficulty in computing exactly the time which the evangeliſts have allotted to John the Baptiſt's and our Saviour's miniſtry. But whether we underſtand St. Luke to ſpeak of the *fifteenth year of Tiberius's* proconſular power, or of his ſole empire, I think, that the earlieſt date of our Saviour's crucifixion muſt be that of the Jewiſh paſſover, which happened in the fifteenth year of Tiberius's ſole empire, A. D. 29. and the lateſt date the Jewiſh paſſover, which happened in the 19th year of Tiberius's ſole empire, A. D. 33.

Take any year from 29 to 33 incluſively, and Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea.

This may be made appear in this manner. Tiberius died the 16th of March, A. D. 37[d]. Vitellius received the tidings of it at Jeruſalem[e]. But Pilate had been removed ſome time before this[f], as is allowed by all: how long before we will not now enquire. Pilate therefore was removed from his government before the paſſover A. D. 37. when he had been there ten years. So Joſephus ſays expreſly: 'And Pilate having 'been ten years in Judea haſtened away to Rome, in obedience 'to the orders he had received from Vitellius, not daring to

c Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. A. D. 25. d Ibid. A. 37. n. ii. e Joſeph. Ant. lib. xviii. cap. vi. p. 806. in. f Ibid. cap. v. § 2.

'refuſe.'

'refuſe[g].' Subtract 10 from 37, and it appears that Pilate was governor of Judea before the paſſover in A. D. 27, and conſequently before our Saviour's laſt ſufferings.

That our Saviour was crucified in Judea in the reign of Tiberius under Pontius Pilate, is the unanimous teſtimony of Chriſtian writers, is particularly mentioned[h] by Tacitus an heathen author, and is not denied by any. But this being a principal fact, I am not obliged to produce any paſſages relating to it now. All I am concerned to do at preſent is, to ſhew that according to the notes of time mentioned by the evangeliſts, Pontius Pilate muſt have been governor of Judea when our Saviour was crucified. This I preſume I have made appear from Joſephus, who muſt be allowed to have known what government his own country was under at that time.

§ III. St. Matthew ſays, ch. xxvii. 19. that *when he* [*Pilate*] *was ſet down on the judgment-ſeat, his* WIFE *ſent unto him, ſaying, Have thou nothing to do with that juſt man: for I have ſuffered many things this day in a dream becauſe of him.*

So long as the commonwealth ſubſiſted, it was very unuſual for the governors of the provinces to take their wives with them; and afterwards Auguſtus ſeems not much to have approved of it[i]. But however, the contrary cuſtom prevailed. It is evident from Tacitus, that at the time of Auguſtus's death, Germanicus had his wife Agrippina with him in Germany[k]. And in the beginning of Tiberius's reign he carried her with him into the eaſt[l]. And Piſo the prefect of Syria took his wife alſo along with him at the ſame time[m]. But there is nothing can render this more apparent, than a motion made in the Roman ſenate by Severus Cæſina, in the fourth conſulſhip of Tiberius and ſecond of Druſus Cæſar, A. D. 21. 'That no 'magiſtrate, to whom any province was aſſigned, ſhould be ac-'companied by his wife[n];' except the ſenate's rejecting it, and that with ſome indignation[o].

§ IV. St. Luke ſays, ch. xxiii. 7. that *when Pilate heard of Galilee, he aſked whether the man were a Galilean. And as ſoon as he knew that he belonged to Herod's juriſdiction, he ſent him*

[g] Καὶ Πιλάτος, δεκα ἔτεσιν διατρίψας ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας, εἰς Ῥώμην ἀπεστάλη τοῖς Ουιτελλίου πράγμασιν ἐπιτάξαι, ἐπ' ὀυ ἀπέπεμψεν Joſeph. Ant.

[h] Auctor nominis ejus Chriſtus, qui Tiberio imperitante, per PROCURATOREM PONTIUM PILATUM, ſupplicio affectus erat. Ann. lib. xv. cap. 44.

[i] Diſciplinam ſeveriſſime rexit, ne legatorum quidem cuiquam niſi gravate, hibernaſque demum menſibus, permiſit uxorem interviſere. Sueton. in Aug. cap. 24.

[k] Tacit. ann. lib. i. cap. 40, 41. [l] Id. lib. ii. cap. 54. [m] Ibid. cap. 55.

[n] Inter quæ Severus Cæcina cenſuit, ne quem magiſtratum, cui provincia obveniſſet, uxor comitaretur. Id. An. lib. iii. c. 33.

[o] Paucorum hæc adſenſu audita, plures obturbabant, neque relatum de negotio, neque Cæcinam dignum tantæ rei cenſorem. Ibid. cap. 34.

to Herod, who himſelf was alſo at Jeruſalem at that time. As this Herod was the ſon of Herod the great, and a Jew, there is all the reaſon in the world to ſuppoſe, that he often went to Jeruſalem at the Jewiſh feaſts. Joſephus has particularly mentioned his being there at one of their feaſts, A. D. 37, which I believe none will deny to be the feaſt of the paſſover. He is ſpeaking of Vitellius preſident of Syria. 'Having given 'directions about theſe matters, he [Vitellius] went up to Je- 'ruſalem with Herod the tetrarch and his friends to worſhip 'God, a feaſt of the Jews being nigh at hand[p].'

Having diſpatched theſe general things, we may now take the remaining particulars in the order in which they lie.

§ V. Whilſt our Saviour was under examination before the high prieſt and rulers of the Jews, after they had in vain attempted to get evidence againſt him from witneſſes, it is related, Matt. xxvi. 63—65. that the high prieſt *ſaid unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Chriſt the Son of God. Jeſus ſaith unto him, thou haſt ſaid: nevertheleſs I ſay unto you, hereafter ſhall ye ſee the Son of man ſitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high prieſt* RENT HIS CLOTHES, *ſaying, He hath ſpoken blaſphemy.*

It has been thought by ſome that the high prieſt might not rend his clothes: but that he might, and did do ſo, upon extraordinary occaſions, will appear from the following particulars. The author of the firſt book of Maccabees ſays, ch. xi. 71. *Then Jonathan rent his clothes, and caſt earth upon his head.* Jonathan was then high prieſt; the occaſion of this action was his men's running away from their enemies. Lightfoot in his Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations upon this text of St. Matthew, quotes theſe words from Maimonides: 'When wit- 'neſſes ſpeak out the blaſphemy which they heard, then all 'hearing the blaſphemy are bound to rend their clothes.' As the high prieſt among the Jews was one of their judges, and was preſent at their trials, he muſt be comprehended in this rule. I ſubjoin to theſe a paſſage of Joſephus. Perhaps it will not be thought to come up to our point, becauſe he does not ſpeak of the high prieſt in the ſingular number. But I do not ſee why the perſon who was actually in the high prieſthood muſt be excluded; and in one reſpect it exceeds the fact now before us. For Caiaphas undoubtedly had on at this time his ordinary clothes; whereas Joſephus ſpeaks of the prieſts rend-

[p] Ἄυλος τε μέλα Ἡρῳδε τε τετράρχε και των φίλων εις Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀνηει, Θυσων τῳ Θεῳ ἐυρίχς παρῆν, Ἰουδαίοις συνεσκευάς. Joſ. Ant. lib. xviii. c. 6. § 3.

ing

ing the garments which they wore in their ministrations at the temple.

The case was this: Florus governor of Judea had plundered the sacred treasury at Jerusalem [q], and committed many other abuses. Hereupon the Jews being highly provoked, were ready to break out into war with the Romans. And a great number of them being got together into an open place in the city, gave out many reflections upon Florus. Josephus says, that upon this, 'The chief men and the high priests being filled with 'concern RENT THEIR GARMENTS, and falling down upon their 'knees [r] beseeched the people to be peaceable, and to bear 'patiently what had passed already, rather than provoke Florus 'to do still worse.'

When this tumult was appeased, Florus intending (as Josephus supposes) to exact conditions the people would not comply with, and thereby to bring on an open war, 'called the 'chief men to him, and told them, that "he would esteem "this a testimony of their fidelity and of their intention to be "quiet for the future, if the people would go out of the city "and salute his soldiers which were then coming from Cæsarea." The chief men of the Jews then called the people to the temple and desired them to submit to these demands, but were not able to prevail upon them. 'Then every priest and minister 'of God, when they had brought forth the holy vessels, being 'clothed in the vestments which they wear in their sacred 'functions, entreated them not to exasperate the Romans to 'come and take away from them those things which were con-'secrated to God. Then might be seen the high priests them-'selves with ashes on their heads, and their breasts naked, THEIR 'GARMENTS BEING RENT [s].'

§ VI. In this history we have frequent mention of chief priests, in the plural number. Matt. xxvi. 59. *Now the chief priests and elders and all the council sought false witness against him.* Mark xiv. 53. *And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and with him were assembled the chief priests and the elders and the scribes.* I know not, but this may be thought by some an impropriety, in the evangelists expression, because strictly there was but one high priest among the Jews at a time. This is certainly very true, and the evangelists appear to have known it very

[q] De Bell. J. lib. ii. cap. 14. § 6.

[r] Οι δυνατοι συν τοις αρχιερευσι τας εσθητας περιερρηξαντο· ibid. cap. 15. § 2.

[s] Ενθα δη πας μεν ιερευς, πας δ' υπερητης τȣ Θεȣ, τα αγιασκευη προκομισαντες, και τον κοσμον εν ω λειτȣργειν εθος ην αυτοις, αναλαβοντες,—κατηντιβολȣν φυλαξαι τον ιερον κοσμον αυτοις, και μη προς αρπαγην των θειων κειμηλιων Ρωμαιȣς ερεθισαι· τȣς δε αρχιερεις αυτȣς ην ιδειν, καταμωμενȣς μεν της κεφαλης κονιν, γυμνȣς δε τα στερνα των εσθητων περιερρηγμενων· ibid. § 3, 4.

 well.

well. But then, all thoſe who had ever bore the office of high prieſt were called ſo likewiſe, and I believe ſome others beſides; I need not now enquire who. But ſo far is this ſtyle from affording any juſt objection againſt the ſacred hiſtorians, that it may very well be reckoned one proof of their being well acquainted with the things of which they have written, ſince it is the uſual ſtyle of Joſephus. I need not produce any particular paſſages for the proof of it. The expreſſion occurs more than once in thoſe I have juſt now tranſcribed.

§ VII. We are informed, that from the high prieſt's our Saviour *was led away, and delivered to Pontius Pilate.* All the evangeliſts aſſure us of this, Matt. xxvii. 2. Mark xv. 1. Luke xxiii. 1. John xviii. 28, 29. It is plain from the New Teſtament, and other ancient writings, that the Roman governor of Judea uſually reſided at Cæſarea [t], there being only an inferior officer left at Jeruſalem with a band or legion of ſoldiers to keep all things there in order: but yet it is certain, that at the time of their great feaſts, and eſpecially at the paſſover, the governor himſelf was wont to be at Jeruſalem, to prevent or ſuppreſs diſturbances. There is frequent mention in Joſephus's hiſtory of the preſence of the procurators of Judea, or of the preſidents of Syria, at Jeruſalem at theſe times. I have juſt now ſhewn that Vitellius, preſident of Syria, was at Jeruſalem, at the paſſover, A. D. 37. He had been there alſo at the paſſover of the year before, as is very plain in Joſephus [u]. In the reign of Claudius, Cumanus, procurator of Judea, was at Jeruſalem at one of the paſſovers [x]. And afterwards, in the reign of the ſame emperor, Quadratus, preſident of Syria, having ſent away Cumanus, juſt now mentioned, to give an account of his adminiſtration to Cæſar, went up himſelf to Jeruſalem. Joſephus's words are theſe: 'Having 'finiſhed theſe affairs, he went up from Lydda to Jeruſalem: 'and finding the people celebrating the feaſt of unleavened 'bread very quietly, he returned to Antioch [y], the ſeat of the 'preſidents of Syria.' In another place he ſpeaks of a great number of Jews, who preſented complaints at the paſſover to Ceſtius Gallius, preſident of Syria, againſt Florus their own governor, then likewiſe at Jeruſalem [z].

[t] Haud dubia deſtinatione diſceſſere, Mucianus Antiochiam, Veſpaſianus Cæſaream: illa Syriæ; hæc Judææ caput eſt. Tacit. Hiſt. lib. ii. cap. 79. vid. & Joſeph. de B. J. lib. ii. cap. 9. § 2. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 4. § 1. l. xx. cap. 4. § 4. [u] Ant. lib. xviii. c. 5. § 3. [x] Ibid. l. xx. cap. 4. § 3. de B. J. lib. ii. cap. 12. § 1.

[y] Ταῦτα διαπραξάμενος, απο Λυδδης ανεβαινεν εις Ιεροσολυμα· και καλαλαβων το πληθος αζυμων εορτην αδεως, εις Αντιοχειαν επανηει· de Bell. l. ii. cap. 12. § 6. [z] Ibid. cap. 14. § 3.

Moreover,

Moreover, very probably Pilate was often at Jeruſalem, at the feaſts, for the adminiſtration of juſtice. Jeruſalem was the chief city of Judea, and had a council in it. And it was very uſual for the Roman governors to go, at times, to the chief towns of their provinces, on this account, as is evident from many paſſages of the Roman authors [a]. And it may be fairly concluded from the evangeliſts, that Pilate was at Jeruſalem now for this very end: as it is alſo very plain, that he had uſed to keep court there at this feaſt. *Ye have a cuſtom*, ſays he, *that I ſhould releaſe unto you one at the paſſover*, John xviii. 39.

§ VIII. In the account the evangeliſts have given us of Pilate's conduct, there are ſeveral things very remarkable; which ought therefore to be conſidered, and accounted for. The high prieſts and elders of the Jews were very earneſt for our Saviour's condemnation; but Pilate appears very backward to pronounce any ſentence upon him. *He knew that for envy they had delivered him*, Matt. xxvii. 18. When they charged him with ſtirring up the people, and ſaying that he was a king, *Pilate ſaid unto him, art thou the king of the Jews? Jeſus anſwered, my kingdom is not of this world. Pilate therefore ſaid unto him, art thou a king then? Jeſus anſwered, thou ſayeſt that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cauſe came I into the world, that I ſhould bear witneſs to the truth.—Pilate ſaith unto him, what is truth? And when he had ſaid this, he went out again unto the Jews, and ſaith unto them, I find in him no fault at all*, Luke xxiii. 2, 3. John xviii. 33, 36—38.

There being no proof of any diſturbances cauſed by our Saviour among the people, Pilate enquires into this charge, of his taking upon him the title of a king: and perceiving, that he intended not by it any worldly government, but only that his deſign had been to teach men ſome certain principles, he aſks him *What is truth?* or what was that truth which he profeſſed to teach? But not being ſolicitous to know particularly what theſe principles were, and being ſatisfied from what he

[a] Paucos dies ipſe [Cæſar] in provincia moratus, quum celeriter omnes conventus percurriſſet; publicas controverſias cognoviſſet, &c. A Hirt. de Bell. Gall.—Laodiceam pridie kal. Sext. venimus, ibi morati biduum perilluſtres fuimus, honorificiſque verbis omnis injurias revellimus ſuperiores. Quod idem dein Apameæ quinque dies morati, & Synnadis triduum, Philomeli quinque dies, Iconii decem fecimus. Nihil ea jurisdictione æquabilius, nihil lenius, nihil gravius. Cic. ad Att. lib. v. ep. 20, vid. & lib. vi. ep. 2. Quo loco mihi non prætermittenda videtur præclari imperatoris egregia ac ſingularis diligentia. Nam ſcitote eſſe oppidum in Sicila nullum ex iis oppidis, in quibus conſiſtere prætores, & conventum agere ſolent, quo in oppido non iſti ex aliqua familia, non ignobili, delecta ad libidinem mulier eſſet. In Ver. lib. v. cap. 11.

had already heard from our Saviour, that there was nothing ſeditious in them, he did not ſtay for an anſwer to this queſtion, but immediately goes out to the Jews, and tells them, *I find in him no fault at all.*

Grotius ſuppoſes that Pilate, by the kingdom our Saviour ſpoke of, underſtood ſuch a kingdom as the Stoics aſcribed to their wiſe men, a kingdom no more prejudicial to the Roman government than theirs [b]. He certainly conceived of our Saviour as a leader only of ſome innocent ſect, and apprehended, that it was nothing but envy and ſecret malice, that moved the phariſees to demand judgment againſt him.

But notwithſtanding what Pilate ſaid of the innocence of Jeſus, the Jews were ſtill preſſing for a ſentence againſt him. However Pilate could not yet be prevailed on to anſwer their demands, but ordered him to be ſcourged; and the ſoldiers platted *a crown of thorns, and put it upon his head, and they put on him a purple robe*, abuſed and mocked him. Pilate, hoping * they might be ſatisfied with this, *went forth again; and ſaith unto them, behold I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him. When the chief prieſts therefore and the officers ſaw him, they cried out, ſaying, crucify him, crucify him. Pilate ſaith unto them, Take ye him and crucify him; for I find no fault in him. The Jews anſwered him, we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf the ſon of God.* WHEN PILATE THEREFORE HEARD THAT SAYING HE WAS THE MORE AFRAID, John xix. 1—8.

Many learned and judicious expoſitors underſtand by theſe laſt words, that Pilate became yet more afraid than before to paſs ſentence of condemnation upon Jeſus; leſt after all, he ſhould prove to be ſome extraordinary perſon. They think, that having, probably, received ſome accounts of our Saviour's miracles, and hearing this charge, that he *had made himſelf the ſon of God*, he was brought into ſome doubts whether he might not be ſome uncommon perſon, like thoſe heroes or demi-gods, which were ſo much ſpoken of among the Greeks and Romans, and therefore he was ſeized with a freſh fear of being concerned in his death [c].

[b] Grot. in Joh. xviii. 38. * So Auguſtine underſtood this place. Tunc cum flagellaſſet Jeſum, & a militibus veſte illuſoria, multiſque illuſionibus male tractari permiſiſſet; (credo ut hoc modo ſaltem eorum furorem mitigaret, ne uſque ad mortem ſævire pertenderent;) exiit iterum Pilatus foras, & dicit eis: ecce adduco eum vobis, &c. Aug. De Conſ. Evang. l. 3. c. 13. n. 46. Ed. Bened. [c] Metuens ob res miras de eo auditas ne forte verum eſſet ortum eum divino fatu, ſicut Romani & Græci de heroibus ſuis credebant. Grot. in loc. vid. & Hammond, &c.

The words will bear another ſenſe, and ever ſince I have read Joſephus, in whom there are divers inſtances of the Jewiſh zeal about this time, and of tumults and ſeditions which they run into, upon the leaſt affront offered to their religious inſtitutions, ſome of which tumults Pilate had been witneſs to, I have underſtood theſe words in a different ſenſe; and have thought that Pilate finding they intereſted their religion in this cauſe, and that they were reſolute in it, became afraid he muſt at laſt ſubmit to them. And I am glad to find, that I am not ſingular in this interpretation. Beza ſays upon this place, 'he 'was not without reaſon afraid, that an open ſedition might 'happen, if he did not comply with the multitude[d].'

But this ſenſe being liable to an objection, from an expreſſion St. John uſes after this, it will be needful to conſider what follows. John xix. 9—12. Pilate having heard this, *went again into the judgment-hall, and ſaith unto Jeſus, Whence art thou? but Jeſus gave him no anſwer. Then ſaith Pilate unto him, ſpeakeſt thou not unto me? Knoweſt thou not, that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to releaſe thee? Jeſus anſwered, thou couldeſt have no power at all againſt me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee, hath the greater ſin. And from thenceforth Pilate ſought to releaſe him.*

Theſe laſt words may be reckoned an objection againſt the ſenſe, in which I underſtand the words above-mentioned. But certainly St. John does not hereby intend, that Pilate then began to ſeek to releaſe Jeſus. He has, before this, related divers attempts which Pilate had made to bring the Jews to temper. What he means hereby is, that he ſtill ſought to releaſe him; that upon hearing what Jeſus ſaid in this laſt examination, he made another trial of the Jews, to ſee if they could not be contented. Our Lord had maintained his innocence, told Pilate that he could have no power againſt him, if it had not been allowed by the providence of God for particular ends and reaſons; and that they who had delivered him to him, had been guilty of an heinous and aggravated crime. Pilate therefore, being ſtill ſatisfied of his innocence, made one and another attempt after this, to bring the Jews to conſent to his being releaſed. But at length, *the voices of them*

[d] *Magis metuit.*] Ergo jam antea perculſus erat, alternante nimirum conſcientiâ, & clamoribus Judæorum, nunc etiam legem præ ſe ferentium: non temerè veritus, ne tandem ſeditio aperta erumperet, niſi multitudinis voluntati obtemperaret. Bez. Nov. Teſt. in loc. Calvin alſo allows that the words are capable of this ſenſe. Duplex poteſt elici ſenſus; prior eſt quod veritus fuerit Pilatus ne ſuſtineret aliquam culpam ſi exortus eſſet tumultus, qui Chriſtum non damnaſſet; alter, quod auctoritate Filii Dei nomine, mens ejus religioſe tacta fuerit. Which laſt Calvin approves, in loc.

and of the chief prieſts prevailed. When Pilate ſaw that he could prevail nothing, but rather a tumult was made, then delivered he him unto them to be crucified, Luke xxiii. 23. Matt. xxvii. 24. John xix. 16.

So that, whether the fear which ſeized Pilate, upon the Jews telling him, that Jeſus had *made himſelf the ſon of God,* was a fear ariſing from an apprehenſion, that he might be ſome extraordinary perſon, and more than a man; or whether it was an apprehenſion of diſturbances and tumults, if he did not hearken to the Jews; yet it is evident from the paſſages laſt quoted, and from many others in the goſpels, that the evangeliſts have repreſented Pilate's condemnation of our Lord, as extorted from him.

He told them once and again, that he *found no fault in him:* he had him ſcourged, and brought him out to them in a mock royal dreſs, hoping they might be ſatisfied with this puniſhment and diſgrace. It being his cuſtom at the paſſover to releaſe to them ſome priſoner of their nation, and the people being gathered together in great numbers, and now demanding this favour of him, he propoſed to them, that Jeſus might be the perſon. But they being moved by the high prieſts, *deſired that Barabbas might be releaſed*; a criminal ſo infamous, that no one not void of all ſhame, would have ſpoke for him; a man that had been taken up in an inſurrection againſt the Roman government, and that had committed robbery and murder. Not being able, by all theſe methods, to move the compaſſion or equity of the Jews; nor obſerving that there was any party among the common people, that favoured Jeſus; and being willing *to content the people, he delivered Jeſus unto them to be crucified,* Mark xv. 15. The evangeliſts are unanimous in the account, that this ſentence was pronounced only *to content the Jews*; that is, either to ſecure the peace of the province, or to maintain his intereſt with the people, when he ſaw that nothing could ſatisfy or appeaſe their rage but the death of Jeſus. *When Pilate ſaw that he could prevail nothing, but rather a tumult was made, he took water, and waſhed his hands before the multitude, ſaying, I am innocent from the blood of this juſt perſon: ſee ye to it. Then anſwered all the people and ſaid, His blood be on us and on our children,* Matt. xxvii. 24, 25. Luke xxiii. 24, 25. John xix. 14—16.

It will ſeem ſtrange to ſome, that a Roman governor ſhould have any inducements to comply with the demands of people, contrary to his own judgment and inclination. But he that conſiders the account we have of the principles and behaviour of

of the Jewish nation at this time, will be satisfied, the evangelists have here given a just and true representation of this transaction; and will be convinced, that a Roman governor, with all his authority, could not pass by any thing which they apprehended to be a breach on their religious constitution, without hazarding the peace of his province. All this will not justify an unrighteous sentence, but that this was the case is plain.

We have seen that the high priests pretended, that Jesus had been guilty of blasphemy, in making *himself the son of God*, and that *by their law he ought to die*, John xix. 7. And Pilate had had experience of their prodigious firmness and zeal for all the parts of their religion. There are two particular proofs they gave him of this, related by Josephus; the one on occasion of his placing the Roman ensigns in Jerusalem; the other upon his attempting to bring water into the city with money taken out of the sacred treasury. The former is related by Josephus thus: 'Pilate the prefect of Judea, sending his army from Cæsarea, and putting them into winter 'quarters at Jerusalem, brought the carved images of Cæsar, 'which are on the ensigns, into the city, in violation of the 'Jewish laws, since our law forbids the making of any images. 'For which reason the former governors were wont to come 'into the city with ensigns destitute of those ornaments. Pi'late was the first who set up images in Jerusalem; and he 'did it privately, the army making their entry in the night 'time. But as soon as the people knew it, they went in a 'vast body to Cæsarea, making earnest supplication for many 'days, that the images might be removed. He not granting 'their petition, thinking it would be dishonourable to the 'emperor to do so, and they still persisting in their request to 'him; on the sixth day, having privately ordered his soldiers 'to their arms, he seated himself on his tribunal in the Circus, 'near which he had placed his men, that they might be in 'readiness. And when the Jews came to him thither with 'their petition, his soldiers having, upon a signal given, sur'rounded them, he threatened them with immediate death, 'if they did not give over their clamours, and return home. 'They then threw themselves on the ground, and offered their 'necks to the sword, and said, "they could die much more "easily, than they could dare to do any thing contrary to the "wisdom of their laws." Pilate surprized at their firmness in 'the observation of their laws, immediately gave orders for 'bringing back the images from Jerusalem to Cæsarea [e].'

[e] Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 4. § 1.

There

There immediately follows after this an account of the diſturbance raiſed at Jeruſalem by Pilate's attempting to bring water into the city, at the expence of money taken out of the ſacred treaſury. Joſephus ſays, 'That many thouſands got together, crying out, that he ought to deſiſt from this undertaking; that many vented moſt reproachful ſpeeches againſt him.—Some were killed and others wounded in this tumult, but at length the ſedition was ſuppreſſed.'

Both theſe attempts of Pilate were made at the beginning of his government. Some learned men, who ſuppoſe that Pilate came into Judea, A. D. 25, place them in that year[f]. And others, who ſuppoſe that Pilate was not procurator of Judea till the year 27, place them there[g]. I am of opinion, the firſt attempt was made by him at the beginning of the firſt winter after his arrival in the province, and the other the ſummer following. Undoubtedly, he had ſeen the Jews firmneſs upon both theſe occaſions, and poſſibly upon ſome others, before the time of the event which we are conſidering.

We have another attempt of Pilate's, of the ſame nature, mentioned in the letter, which Agrippa the elder ſent to Caligula, as this letter is given us by Philo. In ſome particulars it has a great reſemblance with the ſtory Joſephus has told, of Pilate's bringing the enſigns into Jeruſalem, and in others it is very different from it: which has given occaſion to ſome learned men to ſuppoſe, that Philo has been miſtaken[h]. For my own part, as I make no doubt, but Joſephus's account of the enſigns is true; ſo I think, that Philo may alſo be relied on for the truth of a fact he has mentioned, as happening in his own time in Judea: and conſequently I judge them to be two different facts.

Agrippa, reckoning up to Caligula the ſeveral favours conferred on the Jews by the imperial family, ſays: 'Pilate was 'procurator of Judea. He not ſo much out of reſpect to Ti'berius, as a malicious intention to vex the people, dedicates 'gilt ſhields, and places them in Herod's palace within the 'holy city. There was no figure upon them, nor any thing 'elſe which is forbidden, except an inſcription, which ex'preſſed theſe two things, the name of the perſon who dedi'cated them, and of him to whom they were dedicated. 'When the people perceived what had been done,—they de'ſired this innovation of the ſhields might be rectified, that 'their ancient cuſtoms, which had been preſerved through ſo

[f] Cleric. Hiſt. Ecc. A. 27. n. 6.

[g] Baſnage Ann. Pol. Eccl.

[h] Vid. Baſnage Ann. P. E.

'many

'many ages, and had been hitherto untouched by kings and 'emperors, might not now be violated. He refuſed their de-'mands with roughneſs: ſuch was his temper, fierce and un-'tractable. They then cried out, do not you raiſe a ſedition 'yourſelf; do not you diſturb the peace by your illegal prac-'tices.—It is not Tiberius's pleaſure, that any of our laws 'ſhould be broken in upon. If you have received any edict, 'or letter from the emperor to this purpoſe, produce it, that 'we may leave you, and depute an embaſſy to him, and en-'treat him to revoke his orders. This put him out of all 'temper; for he was afraid, that if they ſhould ſend an em-'baſſy, they might diſcover the many mal-adminſtrations of 'his government, his extortions, his unjuſt decrees, his inhu-'man cruelties. This reduced him to the utmoſt perplexity. 'On the one hand, he was afraid to remove things that had 'been once dedicated, and was alſo unwilling to do a favour 'to men that were his ſubjects: and on the other hand, he 'knew very well the inflexible ſeverity of Tiberius. The 'chief men of the nation obſerving this, and perceiving that 'he repented of what he had done, though he endeavoured to 'conceal it, write a moſt humble and ſubmiſſive letter to Ti-'berius. It is needleſs to ſay, how he was provoked, when 'he had read the account of Pilate's ſpeeches and threatenings, 'the event ſhewing it ſufficiently. For he ſoon ſent a letter 'to Pilate, reprimanding him for ſo audacious a proceeding, 'requiring alſo, that the ſhields ſhould be removed. And 'accordingly they were carried from the metropolis to Cæſarea 'by the ſea ſide, called Sebaſte, from your great grandfather, 'that they might be placed in the temple there conſecrated to 'him: and there they were repoſited [i].'

The reader doubtleſs obſerves the ſeveral different circumſtances of this ſtory from that of the enſigns, which Joſephus has told; and particularly, that this dedication of the ſhields was made ſome time after Pilate had been in the province, becauſe now he had been guilty of many mal-practices in his government: whereas, the fact which Joſephus has related, happened very ſoon after his arrival in the province. This circumſtance may be an argument, that Philo did not take the enſigns for ſhields; it being very unlikely, he ſhould miſtake the time of ſuch an affair.

I cannot however be poſitive, that this fact happened before our Saviour's crucifixion. But yet methinks, it may help us to form an idea, how Pilate underſtood that threatening ſpeech

[i] Philo de leg. ad Cai. p. 1033, 1034.

of

of the Jews, John xix. 12. *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæſar's friend.* For, ſuppoſing this affair of the ſhields not to have happened till after our Saviour's crucifixion, (which however is not certain,) yet undoubtedly Pilate had, before this time, committed many abuſes. And though he might be very well ſatisfied, the acquitting Jeſus and ſetting him at liberty would not be deemed any crime, if the caſe was fairly ſtated; yet he might be unwilling to provoke the principal men of the Jewiſh nation to ſend Tiberius an account of his behaviour on other occaſions. This we may the more eaſily credit, not only becauſe at all times the remonſtrances of a province were very much dreaded by the prefects, but becauſe they were more eſpecially ſo under Tiberius; who was very ſolicitous for the peace of his provinces, and had endeavoured to ſecure them from the exactions of his officers. And it was for this reaſon, as he himſelf ſaid, that he ſuffered the preſidents to remain in the provinces for ſo long a time, becauſe they all endeavoured to enrich themſelves, and the ſhorter time they ſtaid in them, the more eager they were to improve it to that end [k].

Thus we ſee how Pilate, a man chiefly ſwayed by a regard to his private intereſt, might be in ſubjection to a clamorous and tumultuous people, in an affair in which they pretended their religion was concerned.

§ IX. I have, in the ſecond chapter, ſhewn at large, what power the Jewiſh magiſtracy and the Roman governor were poſſeſſed of at this time in Judea. But the juſtneſs of the evangeliſts account upon this head (in which likewiſe they are perfectly harmonious) appears to me ſo very material, that I know not how to forbear making here two or three remarks upon occaſion of Pilate's pronouncing the ſentence of condemnation on Jeſus; which is a proof of his ſupreme authority in that country, in capital cauſes.

1. According to the evangeliſts then, the Jews had not now the power of life and death. I have ſhewed, that according to other ancient authors, they had it not at this time, and could not have it, whilſt in the ſtate of a Roman province.

2. According to the evangeliſts, Pilate had the power of life and death. So he has alſo in Philo and Joſephus. This is a place, in which later writers would have been in great danger of tripping. The accuracy of the evangeliſts is remarkable on two accounts. 1. Judea, though ſometimes called a province, was properly a branch of the province of Syria [l]: but yet had

[k] Vid. Joſ. Ant. lib. xviii. cap. 7. § 5. Sohemo atque Agrippa PROVINCIÆ
[l] Iturææque & Judæi, defunctis regibus SYRIÆ ADDITI. Tacit. Ann. 12. cap.

a Roman

a Roman governor reſiding in it with ſupreme authority, which was a very uncommon thing. 2. Pilate's proper title was that of procurator. The reader may perceive this from my tranſlations of many paſſages concerning the Roman governors of Judea, in which, in conformity to Joſephus's ſtyle, I alſo call them procurators. Tacitus alſo calls Pilate procurator[m]. Now this was ordinarily the title of the officer that took care of the emperor's revenue in a province, and is equivalent to that of quæſtor under the republic, or in a province ſubject to the ſenate; which officer had not the power of life and death. But Pilate, though he had the title of procurator, had the power of a preſident. The evangeliſts uſually give Pilate, Felix, and Feſtus the title of governor; a general word, and very proper, according to the uſage of the beſt writers, and of Joſephus in particular, in many places.

3. According to the evangeliſts, the Jewiſh council having, as they pretended, convicted Jeſus of blaſphemy, and judged him guilty of death, they go with him to Pilate; and they ſeem to have expected that Pilate ſhould confirm their ſentence, and ſign an order that he might be puniſhed accordingly. And they afterwards openly and confidently inſiſt upon it, that he ſhould not acquit a perſon who, they ſaid, had been guilty of a crime, which according to their law was capital. John xix. 7. *The Jews anſwered him, we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf the ſon of God.* This appears to me very obſervable: but yet nothing is more likely than that they ſhould talk in this way, ſince they were governed by the Romans according to their own laws, as I have ſhewn above (A). Theſe are the remarks I had to make in this place.

But I would alſo take this opportunity of adding a text, not yet inſiſted on, which, if I underſtand it aright, is a freſh indication, that according to the ſacred writers, the Jews had not now ſupreme power within themſelves. When the Jewiſh elders had brought Jeſus before Pilate, he ſaid to them, John xviii. 29, 30. *What accuſation bring you againſt this man? They anſwered and ſaid unto him,* IF HE WERE NOT A MALEFACTOR, WE WOULD NOT HAVE DELIVERED HIM UP UNTO THEE. The original word, and our Engliſh word malefactor, I think, uſually denote a criminal guilty of one of the worſt of crimes: ſuch

23. What Tacitus here ſays was done upon the death of Agrippa, had been the caſe before his reign: and was ſo, particularly, in the time of Pilate; as is evident, in that he was diſplaced by Vitellius, preſident of Syria. Vid. & Joſeph. de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 8. § 1. Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. ult. § 5. & alibi. [m] Ann. 15. cap. 44. See above, p. 145. n. h. (A) See p. 79.

as

as are ordinarily punished with death, perpetual imprisonment, the mines, galleys, or some such very heavy punishment. These words then, in their mouths, imports thus much: 1. 'If the 'crime he is charged with were not capital, we should have 'punished him ourselves and not have come to you. 2. If 'he were not really guilty we would not have accused him.' But to return to the course we were in.

§ X. Pilate having at length passed sentence on Jesus, and delivered him to be crucified, it will be proper next to consider what is said of an inscription put upon the cross. John xix. 19, 20. *And Pilate wrote a title and put it on the cross: and the writing was* JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS. This was the usual custom of the Romans, when any were condemned to death, to affix to the instrument of their punishment, or to order to be carried before them, a writing expressing the crime for which they suffered. And this writing was called in Latin, title, which word St. John has made use of. It will be sufficient to give an example or two of this in the margin[n].

§ XI. St. John says that this title was *written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.* And it was at this time usual at Jerusalem to set up advertisements, that were designed to be read by all sorts of people in several languages. Titus, in a message he sent to the Jews by Josephus when the city was almost in his hands, and by which he endeavoured to persuade them to surrender, says: 'Did you not erect pillars with inscriptions on them in 'the Greek and in our language, "Let no one pass beyond "these bounds[o]?"

§ XII. Every one must needs observe the scoffs and derisions our Saviour met with. There are three or four instances recorded in the evangelists. One was whilst he was in the high priest's house. *Then did they spit in his face and buffeted him, and others smote him with the palms of their hands; saying, prophesy unto us thou Christ, who is he that smote thee?* Matt. xxvi. 67, 68. Mark xiv. 65. Pilate hearing our Lord was of Galilee sent him to Herod; and before he was dismissed by him, *Herod*

n Romæ publico epulo servum, ob detractam lectis argenteam laminam carnifici confestim tradidit [Cajus] ut manibus abscissis, atque ante pectus è collo pendentibus, præcedente titulo qui caussam pœnæ indicaret per cœtus epulantium circumduceretur. Suet. in Calig. c. 34. Patrem familias, quod Thracem mirmilloni parem, munerario imparem dixerat, detractum spectaculis in arenam, canibus objecit, cum hoc titulo impiè locutus parmularius. Sueton. Domit. cap. 10. Δια τε της αγορας μεσης μετα γραμματων την αιτιαν της θανατωσεως αυτου δηλουντων διαγαγοντος, και μετα ταυτα ανασταυρωσαντος. Dio lib. liv. p. 523. A.

o Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. vi. c. 2. § 4.

with

with his men of war ſet him at nought: and mocked him, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, Luke xxiii. 11. He was inſulted and mocked by the ſoldiers, when Pilate ordered him to be ſcourged the firſt time, that by that leſſer puniſhment he might ſatisfy the Jews and ſave his life, as is related by St. John (B). After Pilate had condemned him to be crucified, the like indignities were repeated by the ſoldiers as we are aſſured by two evangeliſts. Matt. xxvii. 27—31. Mark xv. 16—20. *And they ſtripped him and put on him a ſcarlet robe, and when they had platted a crown of thorns they put it on his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, ſaying, Hail King of the Jews. And they ſpit upon him, and took the reed, and ſmote him on the head.*

Theſe are tokens of contempt and ridicule which were in uſe at that time. Dio, among the other indignities offered to Sejanus the favourite of Tiberius, (in whoſe reign our Saviour was crucified,) as they were carrying him from the ſenate-houſe to priſon, particularly mentions this; 'That they ſtruck him on 'the head [P].' But there is one inſtance of ridicule which happened ſo ſoon after this time, and has ſo great a reſemblance with what our Saviour met with, that it ought to be ſet down here at length. Caligula the ſucceſſor of Tiberius, had in the very beginning of his reign given Agrippa the tetrarchy of his uncle Philip, being about the fourth part of his grandfather Herod's dominions, with the right of wearing a diadem or crown. When he was ſetting out from Rome to make a viſit to his people, the emperor adviſed him to go by Alexandria as the beſt way. When he came thither he kept himſelf very private; but the Alexandrians having got intelligence of his arrival there, and of the deſign of his journey, were filled with envy, as Philo ſays, at the thoughts of a Jew's having the title of king. Many ways they ſhewed their indignation: one was this:

'There was one Carabas, a ſort of diſtracted fellow, that in 'all ſeaſons of the year went naked about the ſtreets. He was 'ſomewhat between a madman and a fool, the common jeſt 'of boys and other idle people. This wretch they brought 'into the theatre, and placed him on a lofty ſeat that he might 'be conſpicuous to all: then they put a thing made of paper 'on his head for a crown, the reſt of his body they covered 'with a mat inſtead of a robe, and for a ſceptre one put into 'his hand a little piece of a reed which he had juſt taken up

(B) John xix. 1, 2. See Dr. Clarke's paraphraſe of theſe two verſes.

P Επι τῆς κεφαλῆς. Dio. lib. lviii. p. 628. A.

'from

'from the ground. Having thus given him a mimic royal 'dreſs, ſeveral young fellows with poles on their ſhoulders 'came and ſtood on each ſide of him as his guards. Then 'there came people toward him, ſome to pay their homage to 'him, others to aſk juſtice of him, and ſome to know his will 'and pleaſure concerning affairs of ſtate; and in the crowd 'were loud and confuſed acclamations of Maris, Maris; that 'being, as they ſay, the Syriac word for Lord, thereby inti-'mating whom they intended to ridicule by all this mock 'ſhew[q]; Agrippa being a Syrian, and king of a large country 'in Syria (c).'

§ XIII. Before our Saviour was had away to be crucified he was ſcourged. *Then releaſed he Barabbas unto them; and when he had* SCOURGED *Jeſus, he delivered him to be crucified,* Matt. xxvii. 26. Mark xv. 15. That it was the uſual cuſtom of the Romans, before execution, to ſcourge perſons condemned to capital puniſhment, is evident from many examples recorded in ancient hiſtorians. I ſhall ſet down from them in the margin two or three inſtances in the original words[r]. Accounts of the executions of perſons generally run in this form: They were ſtripped, whipped, and beheaded, or crucified, according as the ſentence was.

§ XIV. Another particular mentioned here is, that our Saviour bore his croſs. John xix. 16, 17. *And they took Jeſus and led him away; and he bearing his croſs went forth.* But he having been fatigued by a long examination and a double ſcourging, (as is it ſeems,) they were obliged after he had gone a ſhort way to put it upon another. *And they laid hold on one Simon a Cyrenian: and on him they laid the croſs that he might bear it after Jeſus,* Luke xxiii. 26. Mark xv. 21.

This was the conſtant practice among the Romans for criminals to carry their own croſs. Inſomuch that Plutarch makes uſe of it as an illuſtration of the miſery of vice: 'that every 'kind of wickedneſs produces its own particular torment, juſt 'as every malefactor when he is brought forth to execution 'carries his own croſs[s].'

q Ειτ' εκ περιεργωλος εν κυκλω πληθυς εξηχει βοη τις αλοπος, Μαριν αποκαλυντων· ητως δε φασιν τον κυριον ονομαζεσθαι παρα Συροις· ηδεσαν γαρ Αγριππαν και γενει Συρον, και Συριας μεγαλην απολομην εχοντα, ης εβασιλευσε. In Flacc. p. 970. B. C.

(c) Judea is here reckoned by Philo, a part of Syria: as it is alſo by many other writers.

r Miſſique lictores ad ſumendum ſupplicium, nudatos virgis cædunt. Liv. lib. ii. c. 5. Productique omnes, virgiſque cæſi, ac ſecuri percuſſi. Id. lib. xxvi. c. 15. Ους μαστιξι προαικισαμενος ανεσταυρωσε (Φλωρος). Joſeph. p. 1080. 45. Μαστιθμενοι——ανεσταυρουτο τε τειχους αντικρυ. Id. p. 1247. 24. Ζων γαρ κατακαυθη προτερον αικισθεις. Id. p. 1327. 43.

s Και τω σωματι των κολαζομενων εκαστος των κακουργων εκφερει τον αυτω σταυρον· πασα κακια των κολαστηριων εφ' εαυτη εκαστον εξ αυτης τελειουται. Plutarch. de iis qui ſero puniuntur, p. 554. A. Pariſ. 1624.

§ XV. It appears from the evangeliſts that our Lord was crucified without the city. *And he bearing his croſs went forth to a place called the place of a ſkull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha*, John xix. 17. *For the place where Jeſus was crucified was nigh to the city*, ver. 20. And the apoſtle to the Hebrews has likewiſe mentioned this circumſtance: *Wherefore Jeſus alſo—ſuffered without the gate*, Heb. xiii. 12.

This is conformable to the Jewiſh law, and to examples mentioned in the Old Teſtament. Numb. xv. 35. *And the Lord ſaid unto Moſes, the man ſhall ſurely be put to death: all the congregation ſhall ſtone him with ſtones without the camp.* 1 Kings xxi. 13. *Then they carried him* [Naboth] *forth out of the city, and ſtoned him with ſtones that he died.* This was done at Jeſreel, in the territories of the king of Iſrael, not far from Samaria. And if this cuſtom was practiſed there, we may be certain the Jews did not chooſe that criminals ſhould be executed within Jeruſalem, the ſanctity of which they had ſo high an opinion of, and which they were very zealous to preſerve free from all ceremonial impurity, though they defiled it with the practice of the moſt horrid immoralities. It is poſſible indeed they might, in their ſudden and ungoverned rage, a thing they were mighty ſubject to at this time upon any affront offered to their laws or cuſtoms, put perſons who thus provoked them to death, upon the ſpot, in the city, or the temple, or wherever they found them: but whenever they were calm enough to admit the form of a legal proceſs, I dare ſay, they did not approve of an execution within the city.

And among the Romans this cuſtom was very common [t], at leaſt in the provinces. The robbers at Epheſus which [u] Petronius Arbiter mentions, were crucified by order of the governor of the province without the city. This was the cuſtom likewiſe in Sicily, as appears from Cicero [x].

§ XVI. All the four evangeliſts have particularly mentioned our Saviour's burial: that *Joſeph of Arimathea went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jeſus; Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. And when Joſeph had taken the body, he laid it in his own new tomb*, Matt. xxvii. 58—60. Mark xv. 45, 46. Luke xxiii. 50—53. John xix. 38—40. And it may be fairly con-

[t] Credo ego iſtoc exemplo tibi eſſe eundum actutum extra portam, diſpeſſis manibus patibulum cum habebis. Plautus in Mil. Glor. Act. 2. Scen. iv. [u] Quum interim imperator provinciæ latrones juſſit crucibus adfigi, ſecundum illam eandem caſulam, in qua recens cadaver matrona deflebat. Satyr. c. 71. [x] Quid enim attinuit, cum Mamertini more atque inſtituto ſuo crucem fixiſſent poſt urbem in via Pompeia: te jubere in ea parte figere, quæ ad fretum ſpectaret? in Verr. lib. v. c. 66. n. 169.

cluded, the rulers of the Jews did not diſapprove of it: ſince they were ſolicitous that the bodies might be taken down, and not hang on the croſs the next day. John xix. 31. *The Jews therefore,* ſays St. John, *becauſe it was the preparation, that the bodies ſhould not remain on the croſs on the ſabbath day, (for that ſabbath day was an high day;) beſought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.*

Burial was not always allowed by the Romans in theſe caſes. For we find that ſometimes a ſoldier was appointed to guard the bodies of malefactors, that they might not be taken away and buried [y]. However it ſeems that it was not often refuſed, unleſs the criminals were very mean and infamous. Cicero reckons it one of the horrid crimes of Verres's adminiſtration in Sicily, that he would take money of parents for the burial of their children whom he had put to death [z]. Both Suetonius [a] and Tacitus [b] repreſent it as one of the uncommon cruelties of Tiberius in the latter part of his reign, that he generally denied burial to thoſe who were put to death, by his orders at Rome. Ulpian in his treatiſe of the Duty of a Proconſul ſays: 'The bodies of thoſe who are condemned to death are 'not to be denied to their relations: and Auguſtus writes 'in the tenth book of his own life, "that he had been wont to "obſerve this cuſtom [c];" that is, to grant the bodies to relations. Paulus ſays: 'that the bodies of thoſe who have been 'puniſhed, [with death,] are to be given to any that deſire 'them in order to burial [d].'

It is evident therefore from theſe two lawyers, that the governors of provinces had a right to grant burial to the bodies of thoſe who had been executed by their order: nay they ſeem to intimate, that it ought not uſually to be denied when requeſted by any.

We may then depend upon it, that burial was ordinarily allowed to perſons put to death in Judea. The law of Moſes is expreſs, that malefactors ſhould be buried. Deut. xxi. 22, 23. *And if a man have committed a ſin worthy of death, and he*

y Miles cruces aſſervabat, ne quis ad ſepulturam corpora detraheret. Petron. Arb. Satyr. c. 71. z Rapiunt eum ad ſupplicium dii patrii: quod iſte inventus eſt, qui e complexu parentum abreptos filios ad necem duceret, & parentes pretium pro ſepultura poſceret. In Verr. lib. i. cap. 3.

a Nemo punitorum non & in Gemonias abjectus uncoque tractus. Vit. Tiber. c. 61.

b Et quia damnati, publicatis bonis, ſepulturâ prohibebantur. Ann. lib. vi. cap. 29. c Corpora eorum qui capite damnantur cognatis ipſorum neganda non ſunt: & id ſe obſervaſſe etiam D. Aug. lib. x. de vitâ ſuâ, ſcribit. Hodie autem eorum, in quos animadvertitur, corpora non aliter ſepeliuntur, quam ſi fuerit petitum & permiſſum: & nonnunquam non permittitur, maxime majeſtatis causâ damnatorum. l. i. ff. de cadaver. Punit. d Corpora animadverſorum quibuſlibet petentibus ad ſepulturam danda ſunt, l. iii. eod.

be

be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body ſhall not remain all night on the tree, but thou ſhalt in any wiſe bury him that day—that thy land be not defiled. And the later Jews retained a reverence for this law. A body of the Idumeans having been let into Jeruſalem by the zealots, in order to ſtrengthen their party; after the mention of very great barbarities they had committed in the city and in the temple, Joſephus gives their neglect to bury thoſe whom they had murdered, as one of the ſtrongeſt proofs of their wickedneſs. 'They came, ſays he, to ſuch impiety, as to throw out men 'unburied, though the Jews had ſo great concern for burial, 'as to take down and bury before ſun-ſet thoſe who were cru-'cified by a legal ſentence[c].' Since burial was ſo ſtrictly required by the Moſaic law, and was ſo agreeable to the ſentiments and inclinations of the Jewiſh people, we have all the reaſon in the world to ſuppoſe it was ſeldom denied by the Roman governors in that country.

§ XVII. St. John ſays, ch. xix. 39, 40. *There came alſo Nicodemus, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they* [Joſeph of Arimathea and Nicodemus] *the body of Jeſus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the ſpices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.* This may ſeem to ſome a large quantity of ſpices to be beſtowed on a ſingle body at its interment. And it has been made an objection by a modern (D) Jew againſt the hiſtory of the New Teſtament. And yet according to St. Mark and St. Luke, Mary Magdalene and ſome other women having obſerved the *ſepulchre, and where the body was laid*, went and *brought ſweet ſpices, that they might anoint him. And on the firſt day of the week, early in the morning, they came to the ſepulchre, bringing the ſpices which they had prepared,* Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiii. 55, 56. xxiv. 1.

But the largeneſs of this quantity will not ſurpriſe any who conſider the Jewiſh cuſtom; and that they were wont not only to embalm or anoint the body, but to lay it alſo in a bed of ſpices. It is ſaid of Aſa, 2 Chron. xvi. 14. *They buried him in the bed which was filled with ſweet odours, and divers kinds of ſpices prepared by the apothecaries art: and they made a very great burning for him.* The Jews of this time ſeem not to have

[c] Προηλθον δε εις τοσουτον ασεβειας, ωστε και ἀταφους ἰδειν, καιτοι τοσαυτην Ιουδαιων περι τας ταφας φροντιδα ποιουμενων, ωστε και τους εκ καταδικης ανασταυρουμενους προ δυσμων κατελειν τε και θαπτειν. De B. J. l. iv. c. 5. § 2.

(D) Amram, in B. Kidder, affirms, that this was enough for two hundred dead bodies, and that it could not be carried with leſs than the ſtrength of a mule, and therefore not by Nicodemus. Kidder's Demonſtrat. of the Meſſias, Part III. ch. iii. § 11.

fallen ſhort of their anceſtors in this kind of expence: for Joſephus in the account of Herod's funeral proceſſion ſays: 'The 'ſoldiery was followed by five hundred ſlaves and freed-men 'bearing ſweet ſpices[f].' He mentions the ſame number in the 'War, and in the Antiquities. It is likely there were ſpices here for a burning, as well as for a bed to lay Herod's body in.

It is likewiſe objected by the ſame Jew, that the quantity of ſpices mentioned by St. John was a load for a mule, and therefore could not be carried by Nicodemus. One would not have expected ſuch an objection from a reaſonable creature, who might know it to be a very juſt, as well as common way of ſpeaking, to aſcribe to any perſon that which is done by his order or direction. St. John has made particular mention of Joſeph and Nicodemus as preſent at the burial of Jeſus. They were both of them men of ſubſtance, and may be ſuppoſed to have ordered the attendance of ſome of their ſervants on this occaſion.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Treatment which the Apostles and other Disciples of Jesus met with from Jews and Gentiles.

I. *The malice of the Jews againſt the firſt Chriſtians, and the favour ſhewed to them by Governors and other Roman Officers, according to St. Luke.* II. *Proofs of the Jewiſh malice from other writers.* III. *The Romans at this time protected all people in the obſervation of their ſeveral religious rites.* IV. *The Jews in particular.* V. *Inſtances of the juſtice and equity of Roman Governors to men of different religions.* VI. *An objection conſidered.* VII. *Three obſervations for clearing up this matter.* VIII. *A difficulty removed, and the concluſion.*

§ I. THERE is no one that has read the New Teſtament, but muſt have obſerved the implacable malice of the Jews not only againſt our Saviour, but alſo againſt the apoſtles; and the heat and rage with which they oppoſed them, not only in Judea, but likewiſe in all other countries where they met with them, becauſe they did not practiſe and recommend all their particular rites and traditions. But the Roman officers and

[f] Πενλακοσιοι δε υπ' αυλοις των οικελων και απελευθερων αρωμαλοφοροι' de B. J. l. i. c. ult. § 9. Τελοις εισπομπο πενλακοσιοι οικελων αρωμαλοφοροι' Antiq. lib. xvii. c. 8. § 3. As Biſhop Kidder has not quoted theſe paſſages, I hope they will not be unacceptable here.

governors

governors were far from being equally offended with the neglect they ſhewed of their religion, and uſually protected them from the injuries the Jews would have done them.

At Theſſalonica, Acts xvii. 5—9. *The Jews which believed not, moved with envy took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baſer ſort, and gathered a company, and ſet all the city in an uproar, and aſſaulted the houſe of Jaſon, and ſought to bring them* [Paul and Silas] *out to the people. And when they found them not, they drew Jaſon and certain of the brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, Theſe that have turned the world upſide down, are come hither alſo, whom Jaſon has received, and theſe all do contrary to the decrees of Cæſar, ſaying, that there is another king, one Jeſus. And they troubled the people and the rulers of the city, when they heard theſe things. And when they had taken ſecurity of Jaſon, and the other,* [brethren,] *they let them go.* This was a piece of great goodneſs. The magiſtrates did not impriſon Jaſon and thoſe with him, but took their ſecurity that Paul and Silas ſhould appear if called for; which it is likely they never were.

St. Paul preached a year and ſix months at Corinth, and the Jews commenced a warm proſecution againſt him. But it was impoſſible to move Gallio, elder brother of Seneca the ſtoic philoſopher, and then deputy of Achaia, to give any judgment upon the caſe. He protected Paul from their rage, ſtopped the proſecution, and did not ſo much as give Paul the trouble of replying. Acts xviii. 11—16. *And he continued there* [at Corinth] *a year and ſix months, teaching the word of God among them. And when Gallio was deputy of Achaia, the Jews made inſurrection with one accord againſt Paul, and brought him to the judgment ſeat, ſaying, This fellow perſuadeth men to worſhip God contrary to the law. And when Paul was now about to open his mouth, Gallio ſaid unto the Jews, If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdneſs, O ye Jews, reaſon would that I ſhould bear with you. But if it be a queſtion of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it, for I will be no judge of ſuch matters. And he drave them from the judgment ſeat.*

At Epheſus, Demetrius a ſilverſmith, *which made ſilver ſhrines for Diana, with the workmen of like occupation,* made a ſpeech to the people in behalf of themſelves and their goddeſs; inſomuch that *the whole city was filled with confuſion, and having caught Gaius and Ariſtarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, they ruſhed with one accord into the theatre. And when Paul would have entered in unto the people, the diſciples ſuffered him not.* And *certain of* the CHIEF OF ASIA, *which*

which were his friends, ſent unto him, deſiring him that he would not adventure himſelf into the theatre, Acts xix. 24—31.

By *the chief men of Aſia,* or Aſiarchs, as it is in the Greek [a], we are to underſtand the rulers of the games of Aſia [b]. It is generally ſuppoſed they were prieſts. But if they were not always prieſts, it is certain, that the rulers of games were magiſtrates of conſiderable wealth and reputation. And it was a piece of civility in them to ſend Paul a meſſage from the theatre to adviſe him of the temper of the people, and to diſſuade him from coming thither.

The town-clerk went yet farther, for he reprimanded the people who had been drawn into a riot by Demetrius and the other artificers and their workmen: aſſuring them, they might depend upon having juſtice done them according to the law, but that for this aſſembly they had deſerved to be puniſhed. Acts xix. 35—40. *And when the town-clerk had appeaſed the people, he ſaid, Ye men of Epheſus, what man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Epheſians is a worſhipper of the great goddeſs Diana?—ſeeing then that theſe things cannot be ſpoken againſt, ye ought to be quiet and to do nothing raſhly. For ye have brought hither theſe men, which are neither robbers of churches, nor yet blaſphemers of your goddeſs. Wherefore if Demetrius and the craftſmen—have a matter againſt any man, the law is open; and there are deputies, let them implead one another. But if ye enquire any thing concerning other matters, it ſhall be determined in a lawful aſſembly. For we are in danger to be called in queſtion for this day's uproar, there being no cauſe whereby we may give an account of this concourſe.* He blames this tumultuous aſſembly, and aſſerts the innocence of Paul and his companions, for as much as they had not been guilty of ſacrilege, or of reviling their goddeſs; that is, had done nothing againſt religion that was puniſhable by the laws.

When the Jews had ſeized St. Paul at Jeruſalem with intent to kill him, neither Lyſias the chief captain there, nor Felix the governor to whom Lyſias ſent him, nor Feſtus his ſucceſſor would condemn him, though earneſtly importuned by the Jews, Acts xxii. xxiv. xxv.

St. Paul had made but a ſhort progreſs in his voyage from Cæſarea to Rome, before he received a particular civility from Julius *a centurion of Auguſtus's band,* to whom he and the other priſoners were committed. Acts xxvii. 2, 3. *And entering into a ſhip of Adramyttium, we launched, meaning to ſail by the coaſts*

[a] Τινες δε και των Ασιαρχων. [b] Vid. Grot. & Whitb. in loc. Baſnage Ann. Polit. Ecc. A. 55. n. 7.

of

of Aſia.—And the next day we touched at Sidon. And Julius COURTEOUSLY INTREATED PAUL, *and gave him liberty to go unto his friends to refreſh himſelf.*

When the apoſtle and his company were ſhipwrecked in their voyage to Rome, the ſoldiers formed a deſign *to kill the priſoners, leſt they ſhould eſcape. But the* (forementioned) *centurion*, who had the charge of them, *kept them from their purpoſe, being willing to ſave Paul*, Acts xxvii. 42, 43.

And when he came to Rome he was well uſed there. *The centurion delivered the priſoners to the captain of the guard: but Paul was ſuffered to dwell by himſelf with a ſoldier that kept him. There he dwelt two whole years in his own hired houſe, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching thoſe things which concern the Lord Jeſus Chriſt with all confidence, no man forbidding him*, Acts xxviii. 16, 30, 31. And there is no doubt but that he was quite freed from theſe bonds, and travelled again into Aſia, Phil. i. 25. ii. 24.

We have here not one only but many inſtances of lenity, or juſtice at leaſt, in the Roman officers or governors, toward Paul and other the firſt followers of Jeſus: ſome in one place, and ſome in another: at Theſſalonica, Corinth, Epheſus, in Judea, at Rome. Theſe officers withſtood the tumults, remonſtrances, ſolicitations of the Jews of all characters, and of the common people of their own religion.

Theſe facts did not all happen in one and the ſame reign. Pilate made ſome efforts to ſet Jeſus at liberty in the reign of Tiberius. Gallio was deputy of Achaia under Claudius. Felix was ſent into Judea by Claudius; but the juſtice which he and Feſtus did Paul was in the time of Nero. And it was from the captain of the guard or chief favourite of this ſame emperor, that he received ſo good treatment at Rome.

If Gallio only, who was a man of much wit and good ſenſe [c], and of a ſweet and gentle diſpoſition [d], and, (if we may credit his brother,) of much generoſity and virtue [e], had protected the firſt followers of Jeſus from the injuries which were offered them, we might have aſcribed ſuch conduct to his eminent qualifications. But Felix was infamous for his exactions and other crimes, not in Judea only but at Rome; and yet he could not be brought to condemn Paul.

[c] Vid. Dion. Caſſ. lib. lxi. p. 689. init.

[d] Nemo enim mortalium uni tam dulcis eſt quam hic omnibus. Senec. Nat. Quæſt. l. iv. in Præf.

[e] Solebam tibi dicere, Gallionem fratrem meum (quem nemo non parum amat, etiam qui amare plus non poteſt) alia vitia non noſſe, hoc etiam odiſſe.—Hoc quoque loco blanditiis tuis reſtitit, ut exclamares inveniſſe te inexpugnabilem virum adverſus inſidias, quas nemo non in ſinum recipit. Id. ibid.

Not that I think that Felix did Paul all the juſtice he ought to have done; far from it. After the firſt hearing of Paul and the chief prieſts and elders at Cæſarea, he ought to have releaſed him: and his detaining an innocent man in priſon ſo long as he did Paul, and leaving him in chains when he went out of the province, were very unrighteous actions.

St. Luke ſays, Acts xxiv. 27. *But after two years Porcius Feſtus came into Felix room: and Felix willing to* SHEW THE JEWS A PLEASURE, *left Paul bound.* I believe that Felix at this time ſhewed the Jews a double pleaſure; releaſed robbers and other criminals, and *left Paul bound.* The former pleaſure St. Luke has omitted, according to his great candour and moderation, obſervable upon divers occaſions in other parts of his hiſtory. But I make very little doubt but it was now done. Joſephus has particularly taken notice that Albinus, ſucceſſor of Porcius Feſtus, did ſo when he left the province, and that he aimed at pleaſing the Jews in it. Joſephus ſays, that thereby the priſons were emptied, but the country was filled with robbers[f]. Felix and Albinus were both of them diſagreeable in their adminiſtration. It is likely they both took the ſame method of pacifying the Jews at the concluſion. Perhaps Felix's conduct was the pattern Albinus followed; nor was it I ſuppoſe an uncommon thing, for governors to releaſe ſome priſoners at their leaving a province.

Porcius Feſtus was alſo manifeſtly unjuſt to Paul, in that he did not ſet him at liberty, but conſtrained him to appeal to Cæſar.

But though they did not do Paul all the juſtice which they ought to have done, yet they did not condemn him to death as the Jews deſired. It is plain they withſtood very preſſing ſolicitations, and poſſibly, conſiderable offers of money. Felix gave him a great deal of liberty after the firſt hearing at Cæſarea, Acts xxiv. 23. which we may ſuppoſe was alſo allowed by Feſtus. Though they had neither of them reſolution enough to releaſe Paul againſt the inclinations of the people of their province, they both give plain indications they thought him an innocent man. And it cannot be queſtioned but that Feſtus tranſmitted a favourable account of him to Rome.

In order to find out the true reaſon and foundation of this conduct, I mean the favour ſhewed to the diſciples of Jeſus by the Roman officers, it is needful to conſider the grounds they go upon, and the reaſons they themſelves aſſign for it, as repreſented by St. Luke.

[f] Joſ. Ant. lib. xx. c. 8. § 5.

The

The reader will recollect the ſpeeches of Gallio, and the town clerk of Epheſus, ſo that I need not repeat any part of them here. The ſubſtance of them all is, in ſhort, in the letter which Lyſias ſent with Paul to Felix at Cæſarea. *And when I would have known the cauſe, wherefore they accuſed him, I brought him forth into their council, whom I perceived to be accuſed of queſtions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death, or of bonds,* Acts xxiii. 28, 29.

And with this agrees alſo the account, which Feſtus gave of Paul's affair at length to king Agrippa, Acts xxv. 13—27. *And after certain days, king Agrippa and Bernice came unto Cæſarea to ſalute Feſtus. And when they had been there many days, Feſtus declared Paul's cauſe unto the king, ſaying, There is a certain man left in bonds by Felix. About whom, when I was at Jeruſalem, the chief prieſts and the elders of the Jews informed me, deſiring to have judgment againſt him. To whom I anſwered, it is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accuſed have the accuſers face to face.—— Therefore when they were come hither, without any delay, on the morrow I ſat on the judgment-ſeat, and I commanded the man to be brought forth. Againſt whom when the accuſers ſtood up, they brought none accuſations of ſuch things as I ſuppoſed: but had certain queſtions againſt him of their own ſuperſtition, and of one Jeſus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And becauſe I doubted of ſuch manner of queſtions, I aſked him, whether he would go to Jeruſalem, and there be judged of theſe matters. But when Paul had appealed to be reſerved unto the hearing of Auguſtus, I commanded him to be kept till I might ſend him to Cæſar. Then Agrippa ſaid unto Feſtus, I would alſo hear the man myſelf:—And on the morrow, when Agrippa was come, and Bernice, with great pomp,—at Feſtus commandment Paul was brought forth. And Feſtus ſaid, King Agrippa, and all men which are here preſent with us, ye ſee this man, about whom* ALL *the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me, both at Jeruſalem, and alſo here, crying, that he ought not to live any longer. But when I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death, and that he himſelf hath appealed to Auguſtus, I have determined to ſend him. Of whom* I HAVE NO CERTAIN THING TO WRITE UNTO MY LORD: *wherefore I have brought him forth before you, and eſpecially before before thee, O king Agrippa, that after examination had,* I MIGHT HAVE SOMEWHAT TO WRITE. *For it ſeemeth to me unreaſonable to ſend a priſoner, and not withal to ſignify the crimes laid againſt him.*

Strange!

Strange! Felix, it is likely, left behind him ſome memorial concerning this priſoner, and Feſtus had given Paul and his accuſers a ſolemn hearing at Cæſarea: the high prieſt and the elders, and all the multitude of the Jews, had dealt with him about Paul once and again, at Jeruſalem, and at Cæſarea: Feſtus ſeems to have ſpared no pains to go to the bottom of the matter: and yet after all, he brought him before Agrippa, that he *might have ſomewhat to write to Auguſtus.* According to this account, the Roman empire muſt have had no laws, at this time, againſt new ſects in religion, or the leaders of them, provided they injured no man's civil property, and gave no diſturbance to other people in their worſhip.

Let us however ſee the progreſs of this examination before Agrippa and Bernice, and thoſe who were with them, Acts xxvi. 4—23. Paul acquaints them with the manner of his life from the firſt, informs them of his converſion, freely declares his principles and conduct; tells them, that he had *ſeen a light from heaven, and heard a voice*; that he had been ſent unto the *Gentiles, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkneſs to light, that they might receive forgiveneſs of ſins, and inheritance among them that are ſanctified by faith that is in Jeſus.* He lets them know, that he had not been *diſobedient to the heavenly viſion, but ſhewed firſt unto them of Damaſcus, and at Jeruſalem, and throughout all the coaſts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they ſhould repent and turn to God;—that having obtained help of God, he continued unto this day, witneſſing both to ſmall and great, that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and that he ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the dead, and ſhould ſhew light unto the people and to the gentiles.*

Paul here acknowlegeth two things, moſt contrary to the general opinion of the Jews at that time; firſt, *that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer*; and ſecondly, he mentions particularly his commiſſion *to go to the gentiles*; which thing, when he related in his ſpeech to the people at Jeruſalem, Acts xxii. 22, 23. *they lift up their voices, and ſaid, Away with ſuch a fellow from the earth; for it not fit that he ſhould live.* And he now declares, that he had propagated theſe principles every where with all his might.

Well, what is the reſult? Why truly, Paul's diſcourſe appears to Feſtus ſo extravagant, that he tells him he was *beſide himſelf*; only he ſoftens the charge a little, by ſubjoining, that it was *much learning* that *made him mad.* But ſtill there was no crime diſcerned. Nay, after all this, Paul had the preſence of mind to deliver a ſolemn wiſh, that not only Agrippa, but alſo

alſo *all that heard him that day, were not only almoſt but altogether ſuch as he was, except his bonds. And when he had thus ſpoken, the king roſe up, and Bernice, and they that ſat with them. And when they were gone aſide, they talked between themſelves, ſaying, this man doth nothing worthy of death or of bonds. Then ſaid Agrippa,* (a Jew, but well acquainted with the Roman conſtitution) *This man might have been ſet at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæſar*, Acts xxvi. 30—32.

The ſum, I think, is this; that ſince St. Paul had affirmed in his defence before Felix, ch. xxiv. 12. that *they had not found him in the temple diſputing with any man, neither raiſing up the people, neither in the ſynagogues, nor in the city*; and before Feſtus, ch. xxv. 8. that *neither againſt the law, neither againſt the temple, nor yet againſt Cæſar, had he offended any thing at all*: And, ſince the Jews had brought no proofs of any ſuch offences, but only there were ſome differences between Paul and the Jews, concerning *certain queſtions of their own ſuperſtition* [religion]; Paul was an innocent man, and might have been very juſtly ſet at liberty, and left to himſelf to go and propagate his principles in the way he had done hitherto.

This then was the reaſon of this conduct, they were not uſed to interpoſe their authority in differences purely religious: there was no act of ſedition, injuſtice, or violence proved againſt Paul, or any of his companions: and theſe were the only things which theſe officers had a right to puniſh.

Here are therefore two things, which we are to look for ſome foreign proof of; namely, the fierce oppoſition made by the Jews againſt the followers of Jeſus Chriſt; and then, in the next place, that the Roman officers had no right, according to the conſtitution of the Roman government at that time, to puniſh men for innocent principles, but only for wicked practices.

§ II. To the firſt point, the proceedings of the Jews, little needs to be ſaid. Their character [f] for violence is ſo allowed, that no one can well ſuſpect the evangeliſts have miſrepreſented them: not to ſay, that it was by no means their intereſt to ſay theſe things of them if not true. I ſhall however allege a paſſage or two to this purpoſe. Juſtin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, written about the 140th [g] year of the chriſtian æra, ſays, that in his time, 'the Jews curſed [h] in their ſyna-'gogues all that believed in Chriſt. This,' ſays he, 'is all you

[f] Πολλα μεν δη και δεινα και οι Ιουδαιοι τε Ρωμαιοις εδρασαν (το γαρ τοι γενος αυτων δυμωδες, στιφρολαιον εστι.) Dio. l. lix. p. 405. D.

[g] Vid. Pagi Critic. in Baron. A. C. 148.

[h] Καταρωμενοι εν ταις συναγωγαις υμων τους πιστευοντας επι τον Χριστον. Dialog. p. 234. B.

'can

'can do. You have not now the power of killing us your-
'ſelves, becauſe others have the governing of things. But
'this you have done, whenever you have been able. Nor
'have any other people ſhewed ſo much enmity againſt us and
'Chriſt as you, who have been likewiſe the authors of all
'thoſe prejudices, which others have conceived againſt that
'righteous perſon and us his followers. For after that you
'had crucified that one unblameable and righteous man, (by
'whoſe ſtripes they are healed who go to the Father through
'him); when you knew, that he was riſen from the dead, and
'aſcended up into heaven, according as the prophecies had
'foretold he ſhould, you were ſo far from repenting of your
'evil deeds, that you ſent out from Jeruſalem choſen men
'into all the world, giving out that the ſect of the chriſtians
'is atheiſtical, and ſaying all thoſe evil things of us, which
'they, who know us not, do ſtill ſay of [i] us.' And Tertullian affirms the ſame thing; 'That the Jews were the principal
'authors of the evil reports which were ſpread abroad con-
'cerning the chriſtians [k].'

§ III. Moderation and equity toward men of a different religion are more uncommon things. And therefore, it will be needful to be more particular on this head, and to account for the protection, which the heathen officers gave St. Paul and others, when the multitude would have mobbed them, or when the Jewiſh magiſtrates demanded a judicial ſentence againſt them.

I ſhall therefore ſhew, that the Roman people did at this time protect all men in the practice of their ſeveral religious rites and inſtitutions.

In the firſt place I ſhall conſider, how they treated the heathen people in thoſe provinces which they had ſubdued.

And ſecondly, I ſhall give a brief account of the treatment which the Jews received from them.

1. I ſhall conſider how they treated the heathen people, in thoſe provinces which they ſubdued to their obedience.

Livy informs us, that the Anagnini, a people in Italy, having diſobliged the Romans, the ſenate took away from them ſeveral privileges, which they had let them enjoy to that time. 'Their ſenates were diſſolved, and their magiſtrates were de-
'prived of all power and authority, except what was neceſſary
'for the adminiſtration of their religious rites [l].' This was

i Ibid. C. D. k Et credidit vulgus Judæo. Quod enim aliud genus ſeminarium eſt infamiæ noſtræ? Tertul. ad Nat. l. i. c. 14. l Anagninis, quique arma Romanis intulerant—concilia, connubiaque adepta: & magiſtratibus, præterquam ſacrorum curatione, interdictum. Liv. lib. ix. cap. 43. n. 24.

done

done in the year of the city 449, before Chriſt 305; and is a proof, that they eſteemed all men's religion inviolable.

The people of Syracuſe in Sicily had an ancient cuſtom of chooſing an annual prieſt to Jupiter. It is one of the heavy charges which Cicero brings againſt Verres, that whilſt he was prætor of that province, he had obſtructed the people there, in the uſual method of the choice, in order to get into the prieſthood a creature of his own [m].

Verres had a ſtrong fancy for fine [n] ſtatues: and, whenever he had ſeen any ſuch in any town or city, as he travelled in his province, he would ſend to the people, and inform them of a deſire he had to purchaſe of them the ſtatue of ſuch or ſuch a god or goddeſs. Sometimes the people out of fear of his reſentments complied with his deſires, though with much regret. But others were more reſolute, and told him plainly, ſuch things could not be done without impiety. However this wretch (as Cicero ſays) would ſend his ſervants in the night time to ſteal images, which the people refuſed to part with. There was a ſtatue of Ceres at Enna, which ſtood in an open place before her temple. 'The curious workmanſhip of 'it was a ſtrong temptation, but it's bulk obſtructed a clan-'deſtine removal. She held in her right hand a beautiful 'image of victory. This he cauſed to be taken away and 'brought to his houſe [o].'

This ſtatue of Ceres was, it ſeems, in great veneration at Rome, as well as in Sicily. Let us now hear, what Cicero ſays to the judges upon the trial of Verres. 'Heal, O ye 'judges, the wounds given to the religion of your allies; pre-'ſerve your own. For this is not the branch of any foreign 'or ſtrange religion. But if it were, and if you did not ſee 'fit to adopt it into your own religion, yet you ought to be 'willing to ſecure it by an exemplary puniſhment of him who 'has offered to violate it [p].'

[m] ——Sacerdotia: quibus in rebus non ſolum jura, ſed etiam deorum religiones immortalium omnes repudiavit. Syracuſis lex eſt de religione, quæ in annos ſingulos Jovis ſacerdotem ſortito capi jubebat, &c. in Verr. lib. ii. cap. 51. [n] Deum denique nullum Siculis, qui ei paullo magis affabre atque antiquo artificio factus videretur, reliquit. In Verr. act. 1. c. 5. n. 14.

[o] Ante ædem Cereris in aperto & propatulo loco ſigna duo ſunt, Cereris unum, alterum Triptolemi, & pulcherrima & perampla, his pulchritudo periculo, amplitudo ſaluti fuit, quod eorum demolitio atque aſportatio perdifficilis videbatur. Inſiſtebat in manu Cereris dextra ſimulachrum pulcherrimè factum Victoriæ. Hoc ille e ſigno Cereris avellendum aſportandumque curavit. In Verr. lib. iv. cap. 49. n. 110.

[p] Medemini religioni ſociorum, judices: conſervate veſtram. Neque enim hæc externa vobis religio, neque aliena: quod ſi eſſet, ſi ſuſcipere eam nolletis: tamen in eo, qui violaſſet, ſancire vos velle oporteret. Ibid. cap. 51. n. 114.——Sancire (inquit Servius) eſt ſanguine fuſo confirmare. Hinc noſter in orat. pro Bald. Sanctiones ait ſacrandas aut genere ipſo, ut

Of

Of all heathen rites within the bounds of the Roman empire, the Egyptian seem to have been the most different from those of the Romans. They were contemned and ridiculed by the emperors, by Augustus in particular[q], and by the Roman[r] authors. And, if we may credit Philo, no strangers came into Egypt, but they were tempted to laugh at them, and banter them, till they became accustomed to those absurdities: and all travellers of good sense were wont to be filled with the utmost astonishment, joined with pity[s].

But yet they were practised, without any molestation from the Romans: and continued to be so, long after the time I am at present concerned with[t]

It is true the Egyptian rites were more than once prohibited in the city of Rome. Augustus 'laid a restraint upon them 'and forbade the performing them in the city or suburbs, or 'within five hundred paces of the suburbs[u].' And by Tiberius's order 'the temple of Isis at Rome was demolished, and 'her image thrown into the Tiber[x].' But then this was for an high offence; and because her priests, under the cloke of religion, had promoted acts of debauchery which were ruinous of the peace of families, and that in the very temple itself which she had at Rome[y].

And Flaccus the president of Egypt[z], in the latter end of the reign of Tiberius, prohibited their fellowships at Alexandria; which they held under a pretence of religion indeed, but made use of for drunkenness only and such like excesses: on other accounts they met with no interruptions.

obtestatione & consecratione legis: aut pœna, cum caput ejus qui contra facit consecratur. Hotom. not. in loc.

q Κακ της αυτης ταυτης αιτιας, ουδε τω Απιδι εντυχειν ηθελησε· λεγων Θεους, αλλ' ουχι βους προσκυνειν ειθισθαι. Dio. l. li. p. 455. A. r Omne fere genus bestiarum Ægyptii consecraverunt. Cic. de nat. Deor. lib. iii. cap. 15.

——————Qualia demens
Ægyptus portenta colat! Crocodilon adorat
Pars hæc——————Illic
Oppida tota canem venerantur, nemo Dianam. Juv. Sat. xv. in.

s Ων τι αν γενοιτο καταγελαστοτερον· και δη των ξενων οι πρωτον εις Αιγυπτον αφικομενοι, πριν τον εγχωριον τυφον ταις διανοιαις εισοικισασθαι, εξησθενηκασι χλευωζοντες· οσοι δε παιδειας ορθης εγευσαντο, την επ' ασεμνοις πραγμασι σεμνοποιιαν καταπλαγεντες, οικτιζονται τους χρωμενους. Philo de decalogo. p. 755. E. t Οι δε Αιγυπτιοι και αιλουρους, και κροκοδειλους, και οφεις, και ασπιδας, και κυνας, θεους νομιζουσιν· και τουτοις πασιν επιτρεπετε και υμεις και οι νομοι. Athenag. Legat. p. 2. A Parisiis. 1636. Nemo se ab invito coli volet, ne homo quidem: atque ideo & Ægyptiis permissa est tam vanæ superstitionis potestas, avibus & bestiis consecrandis, & capite damnandis qui aliquem hujusmodi deum occiderint. Unicuique etiam provinciæ & civitati suus deus est.——Sed nos soli arcemur a religionis proprietate.—Sed apud vos quodvis colere jus est præter Deum verum. Tertul. Apol. cap. 24. u Τα τε ιερα τα Αιγυπτια επεισιοντα αυθις ες το αστυ ανεστειλεν· απειπων μηδενα μηδε εν τω προαστειω αυτα εντος ογδοον ημισταδιον ποιειν. Dio. lib. liv. p. 525. A. x Joseph. Ant. lib. xviii. cap. 4. § 4. y Id. ibid. z Τας τε εταιρειας και συνοδους αι αει επι προφασει θυσιων εισιωντο, τοις πραγμασιν εμπαροινουσαι, διελυε. Philo in Flac. p. 965. D.

And

And thoſe ſacred rites which were more properly their own, were as ſeverely reſtrained, when they were known to be abuſed to the like infamous practices. For this reaſon the Bacchanalia were prohibited at Rome and throughout Italy by a decree of the ſenate[a]. A. U. 568, before Chriſt 186.

That I may not enter into needleſs particulars, I ſhall take notice here of but one thing more. Philo ſays, that when the Jews waited on Petronius preſident of Syria, to entreat him not to proceed as yet to erect the ſtatue of Caligula at Jeruſalem, they deſired that he would give them leave to ſend an embaſſy to the emperor: 'Poſſibly, ſay they, we may obtain thus 'much, not to be treated worſe than the meaneſt of all people, 'whoſe religion is preſerved inviolate[b].'

§ IV. In the ſecond place I ſhall give a brief account of the treatment which the Jews had from the Romans.

The Jews received very conſiderable favours and privileges from Alexander; and they enjoyed the ſame under his ſucceſſors in Syria and Egypt, though with ſome interruptions, eſpecially in Syria[c]. But I intend not to go ſo high as this. I take notice of this only, becauſe the Jews enjoyed under the Romans the moſt extenſive privileges out of Judea, which had been granted by Alexander and his immediate ſucceſſors; and becauſe the privileges which they received firſt from them, ſeem to have been in a great meaſure the models of thoſe immunities which were granted by the Romans.

For Joſephus ſays, that 'Seleucus Nicator gave them [the 'Jews] the privileges of citizens in all the cities which he 'built in Aſia and in lower Syria, and even in Antioch the 'metropolis of his kingdom, and made them equal to the 'Macedonians and Grecians; which rights[d] they ſtill enjoy.'

When Flaccus the prætor of Aſia was accuſed (A) at Rome of ſeveral mal-adminiſtrations in that province, one of the charges brought againſt him was, that he by an edict had forbid the Jews of Aſia to ſend any money out of that province to Jeruſalem. Cicero endeavours to defend Flaccus's conduct

[a] Deinde ſenatuſconſulto cautum eſt, Ne qua Bacchanalia Romæ, neve in Italia eſſent. Si quis tale ſacrum ſolenne & neceſſarium duceret, nec ſine religione & piaculo ſe id omittere poſſe, apud prætorem urbanum profiteretur, prætor ſenatum conſuleret, ſi ei permiſſum eſſet, quum in ſenatu non minus centum eſſent, ita id ſacrum faceret, dum ne plus quinque ſacrificio intereſſent: neu qua pecunia communis, neu quis magiſter ſacrorum, aut ſacerdos eſſet. Liv. lib. xxxix. cap. 18.

[b] Ταχα δε προσευξαμενοι πεισομεν,— η περι τε μη παθειν, και των εν εσχαλιαις εθνων, οις τελεθηλαι τα πατρια, ελαττον ενεσκασθαι. Philo de Leg. ad Cai. p. 1026. E.

[c] Vid. Joſeph. Ant. lib. xii. cap. 3. § 1. Contr. Apion. lib. ii. § 4. [d] Joſeph. Ant. ubi ſupra. See Prideaux Conn. Part. I. Book viii. year before Chr. 293. p. 572.

(A) About the year 60 before Chriſt.

in

in this as well as other matters; but Cicero[e] owns, that the Jews did then send money to Jerusalem annually from Italy, and from all the provinces subject to the commonwealth. The bringing a charge against Flaccus upon this head is a proof that his edict was a novelty. Nor does Cicero produce an instance of a like restraint laid upon the Jews before this, by the president of any province, which he certainly would have done if there had been any.

There were after this several decrees passed by Julius Cæsar and the senate of Rome, in favour of the Jews who lived in Alexandria, Syria, and Asia; which were lodged in the capitol at Rome, and copies of them directed to the cities in which the Jews dwelt; requiring the magistrates of those cities to put them in their public acts, engraved upon two tables of brass, one in the Roman, another in the Greek language[f]. We have likewise in Josephus copies of the decrees of Delos, Laodicea, Pergamos, Sardis, and other cities, in their proper forms; which were passed and registered there in pursuance of the decrees of the Roman senate: 'Declaring, that out of their piety 'to God and the concern they have always had for the support 'of religion, and in imitation of the Roman people who are 'benefactors to all mankind, who had written to them that the 'Jews should be permitted to perform the sacred rites of their 'religion, observe their usual feasts, and hold their assemblies; 'they ordain that the Jews who think fit so to do, both men 'and women, do keep the sabbaths and perform sacred rites 'according to the Jewish laws.—And if any man, whether 'magistrate or private person, do give them any let or hin-'derance herein, he shall be fined, and be reckoned debtor to 'the city[g].' This is the substance of the decree of the city of Halicarnassus, which the rest resemble.

But the rites of the Jews being extremely different from those of all others, and the people of most of the cities being superior in number to the Jews, they were often giving them disturbance: and perhaps the Jews did sometimes give them offences which they needed not to have done. It was then the

[e] Sequitur auri illa invidia Judaici.—— Cum aurum Judæorum nomine, quotannis ex Italia, & ex omnibus vestris provinciis Hierosolymam exportari soleret, Flaccus sanxit edicto, ne ex Asia exportari liceret. Pro Flacc. cap. 28. [f] Vid. Joseph. Ant. lib. xiv. cap. 10. § 2. [g] Επει το προς το θειον ευσεβες, και οσιον εν απαντι καιρῳ δια σπουδης εχομεν, κατακολουθουντες τῳ δημῳ των Ρωμαιων παντων ανθρωπων οντι ευεργετῃ, και οις περι της Ιουδαιων φιλιας και συμμαχιας προς την πολιν εγραψεν, οπως συντελωνται αυτοις αι εις τον Θεον ιεροποιιαι και εορται αι ειθισμεναι και συνοδοι· δεδοκται ημιν Ιουδαιων τους βουλομενους ανδρας τε και γυναικας τατε Σαββατα αγειν και τα ιερα συντελειν κατα τους Ιουδαικους νομους·—αν δε τις κωλυσῃ η αρχων η ιδιωτης, οδε τῳ ζημιωματι υπευθυνος εστω και οφειλετω τῃ πολει. Ibid. § 23.

business

business of the Roman officers to do them justice, according to the edicts of the senate and the emperor.

And we have some instances of their receiving relief from the higher powers, when they had been injured, and it is likely could not obtain satisfaction from the ordinary officers; either through their want of inclination, or of sufficient power and authority to controul the dispositions of the people where they resided.

When Agrippa the favourite of Augustus was in the East with extraordinary power, as he was passing through Ionia with HEROD THE GREAT (B) in his company, the Jews made complaints to him, that they were hindered in sending their tribute to the temple at Jerusalem; that they were obliged to serve in the army (C); and had many other hardships put upon them inconsistent with the privileges granted them by the Romans [h]. Agrippa gave them and their adversaries a solemn hearing, and in court confirmed to them their ancient privileges, and gave orders, 'that no one should molest them in the observation of their peculiar rites and customs [i].'

Some time after this (D), the Jews who lived in Asia and in Cyrene in Lybia, were oppressed and abused by the people in those countries; upon which the Jews sent an embassy to Augustus himself for redress. Josephus has preserved a copy of the edict of the emperor upon this occasion: wherein, having first briefly mentioned the favours shewed to the Jews by Julius Cæsar, and their fidelity to the Roman state, 'He ordains by 'his own authority, with the advice of his council, that the [k] 'Jews do practise their peculiar rites according to the law of 'their country, that their offerings be inviolable, that they be 'permitted to send them to Jerusalem, and to deliver them to 'those who are deputed to carry them to Jerusalem, that they

(B) About the 13th or 14th year before the nativity of our Lord, according to the common account. (C) The Jews had been excused from serving as soldiers, because they could not travel on the sabbath, nor have provisions agreeable to their laws and customs. Vid. Joseph. Antiq l. xiv. cap. 10. § 12. [h] Και τας επηρειας ιλετον ας επηρεαζοιτο, μητε νομοις οικειοις εωμενοι χρησθαι, —— και την εις Ιεροσολυμα χρηματων αναλιθεμενων αφαιροιντο, στρατιων και λειτουργιων αναγκαζομενοι κοινωνειν, —— Ρωμαιων αυτοις επιτρεψαντων κατα τους οικειους ζην νομους. Ant. lib. xvi. cap. 2. § 3.

[i] Βεβαιουν αυτοις ανεπηρεαστους εν τοις οικειοις διατελειν εθεσι. Ibid. § 5. (D) Year before Christ 9. [k] Εδοξε μοι και τω εμω συμβουλιω μετα ορκωμοσιας γνωμη δημου Ρωμαιων, τους Ιουδαιους χρησθαι τοις ιδιοις θεσμοις κατα τον πατρωον αυτων νομον, τατε ιερα ειναι εν ασυλια, και αναπεμπεσθαι εις Ιεροσολυμα, και αποδιδοσθαι αυτα τοις αποδοχευουσιν Ιεροσολυμων, εγγυας τε μη ομολογειν αυτους εν σαββασιν, η τη προ ταυτης παρασκευη, απο ωρας εναλης· εαν δε τις φωραθη κλεπτων τας ιερας βιβλους αυτων, η τα ιερα χρηματα, εκ τε σαββατειου, εκ τε ανδρωνος, ειναι αυτον ιεροσυλον, και τον βιον αυτου ενεχθηναι εις το δημοσιον των Ρωμαιων. Ant. l. xvi. c. 6. § 2. vid. & Philon. de legat. ad Cai. p. 1035. E. 1026. A. B.

'be not obliged to give appearance in any court of justice on 'the sabbath, nor on the day before, being the preparation, 'after the ninth hour. And if any man be taken stealing their 'sacred books or their sacred money, out of the places of 'their worship, or out of the chests in which they are kept, 'he shall be deemed sacrilegious, and his goods shall be con-'fiscated to the public treasury of the Romans.'

And Philo assures us, that Augustus maintained throughout his reign the indulgence given to the Jews: 'that there was 'in his time a large quarter of the city of Rome on the other 'side of the Tiber inhabited by Jews; that Augustus[l] knew 'they had oratories there, and they resorted to them especially 'on the sabbaths, and that they also sent money instead of 'first fruits by their own officers to Jerusalem.'

In the reign of Tiberius they were generally well used. They were indeed banished out of Italy by an edict: but it was for a misdemeanor committed by some villains of their nation at Rome[m]. The only hardship of it was, that a great many innocent persons suffered beside the guilty. On other occasions Tiberius shewed them all the favour they could desire, especially after the death of Sejanus: and is much applauded for it by Philo[n]. It was in the latter end of this reign that Vitellius president of Syria performed an act of great complaisance to them. He was marching with his forces against Aretas king of Petra in pursuance of orders he had received from Tiberius, and intended to pass through Judea. 'But 'some of their chief men waited upon him and intreated him 'not to lead his army through their country, because it was 'contrary to their laws that any images should be brought into 'it; whereas there were a great many in his ensigns. And he 'hearkened to them, altered his intention, and ordered his 'troops another way[o].'

During the reign of Caligula, they met with great hardships, especially at Alexandria. But the orders which Caligula had given for the erecting a statue to himself as a god, in the temple at Jerusalem, and for punishing the Jews if they opposed it, did not take effect. By the kind and prudent management

[l] Ηπιςαλο ȣν και προσευχας εχοντας και συνιοντας εις αυτας, και μαλιςα ταις ιεραις εβδομαις, οτε δημοσια την πατριον παιδευονται φιλοσοφιαν· ηπιςαλο και χρηματα συναγαγοντας απο των απαρχων ιερα, και πεμποντας εις Ιεροσολυμα δια των τας θυσιας αναξοντων. Ibid. p. 1014. D. [m] Jos. Ant. lib. xviii. c. 4. § 5. [n] Ubi supra, p. 1015. B. C. [o] Ωρμημενῳ δ' αυτῳ δια της Ιȣδαιων αγειν τον ςρατον, υπαντιασαντες ανδρες οι πρωτοι παρητȣντο δια την της χωρας οδον· ȣ γαρ αυτοις ειναι πατριον περιοραν εικονας εις αυτην φερομενας· πολλας δ' ειναι σημαιας επικειμενας· και πεισθεις μετεβαλε τε της γνωμης το επι τοιȣτοις προβȣλευσαν, και δια τȣ μεγαλȣ πεδιȣ κελευσας χωρειν το ςρατοπεδον· κ. τ. λ. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 6. § 3.

of

of Petronius president of Syria, and the interceſſions of Agrippa the great, delays were obtained, and Caligula died before the attempt was made.

Claudius the next ſucceeding emperor renewed to them all their privileges. He directed in particular, by a decree, that the Jews at Alexandria ſhould be reſtored to all their rights, which had been injuriouſly taken away from them [p] in the reign of Caligula. He likewiſe publiſhed another edict in favour of the Jews living in other parts, in which he ſays: 'We approve 'that the Jews ſhould in all parts of the world ſubject to us, 'practiſe the rites of their country without moleſtation; ex-'horting them likewiſe [q] to uſe this our humanity with 'moderation and ſobriety, and not to reproach the religions 'of other nations but to obſerve their own laws. And I will 'that all magiſtrates of cities and colonies and municipal 'places, both within and without Italy, and all kings and 'princes, have this my edict tranſcribed by their own officers, 'and that within thirty days it be fixed in ſome public place 'where it may be conveniently read by all men.'

There was in the beginning of this reign (E), a remarkable piece of juſtice done the Jews at Doris in Syria, by Petronius preſident of that province. The fact is this: Some raſh young fellows of the place got in and ſet up a ſtatue of the emperor in the Jews' ſynagogue. Agrippa the great made complaints to Petronius concerning this injury. Whereupon Petronius iſſued a very ſharp precept to the magiſtrates of Doris. 'He 'terms [r] this action an offence not againſt the Jews only but 'alſo againſt the emperor: ſays, it is agreeable to the law of 'nature, that every man ſhould be maſter of his own places

[p] Βουλομαι μηδεν δια την Γαιου παραφροσυνην των δικαιων τω Ιουδαιων εθνει παραπεφυκεναι, φυλασσεσθαι δε αυτους και τα πατριον δικαιωματα· κ. λ. Ibid. l. xix. c. 5. § 2. [q] Καλως αν εχειν και Ιουδαιους τους εν παση τω υφ' ημας κοσμω τα πατρια ηθη ανεπικωλυτως φυλασσειν, οις και αυτοις τουτων παραγγελλω μετα ταυτης της φιλανθρωπιας επιεικεστερον χρεσθαι, και μη τας των αλλων εθνων δεισιδαιμονιας εξουθενιζειν, τους ιδιους δε νομους φυλασσειν· τουτο μεν το διαταγμα της αρχουσης των πολεων και των κατοικιων και μεσογειτιων, των εν τη Ιταλια και των εκτος, βασιλεις τε και δυναστας δια των ιδιων πρεσβευτων εγγραψασθαι βουλομαι, εκκειμενους τε εχειν, ουκ ελαττον ημερων τριακοντα, οθεν εξεστιν εδρα καλως αναγινωσθηναι δυνασθαι. Ib. § 3. (E) A. D. 41, or 42. [r] Παρανομειν ουκ εις μονους Ιουδαιους, αλλα και εις τον αυτοκρατορα,—τη φυσει δικαιον ειναι εκαστον των ιδιων τοπων κυριευειν και το Καισαρος επικριμα· —τους μεν παρα το διαταγμα του Σεβαστου τοιαυτα τετολμηκοτας, εφ' ω και αυτοι ηγανακτησαν οι δοκιμοι αυτων εξεχειν, ου τη ιδια προαιρεσει γεγενησθαι λεγοντες, αλλα τη του πληθους ορμη, υπο εκατονταρχου Προκλου Ουιτελλιου εκελευσα επ' εμε αναχθηναι των πεπραγμενων λογον αποδωσοντας, τοις δε πρωτοις αρχουσι παραινω, ει μη βουλονται δοκειν και την αυτων προαιρεσιν γεγενησθαι το αδικημα, επιδειξαι τους αιτιους τω εκατονταρχη, μηδεμιας σασεως μηδε μαχης εωντας αφορμην γενεσθαι, ην περ δοκουσι μοι θηρευεσθαι δια των τοιουτων εργων.—εις τε αν το λοιπον, παραγγελλω, μηδεμιαν προφασιν σασεως μηδε ταραχης ζητειν, αλλα εκαστους τα ιδια θρησκευειν εαν. Ant. lib. xix. c. 6. § 3.

'according to the decree of the emperor. I have, ſays he, 'given directions that they who dared to do theſe things contrary 'to the edict of Auguſtus, be delivered to the centurion Vitel- 'lius Proculus, that they may be brought to me and anſwer 'for their behaviour. And I require the chief men in the 'magiſtracy to diſcover the guilty to the centurion, unleſs they 'are willing to have it thought, that this injuſtice has been done 'with their conſent; and that they ſee to it that no ſedition 'or tumult happen upon this occaſion; which I perceive is 'what ſome are aiming at.——I do alſo require, that for the 'future you ſeek no pretence for ſedition or diſturbance, but 'that all men worſhip [God] according to their own cuſtoms.'

The reader will perhaps indulge a ſhort interruption here in the courſe of this narration, in favour of an account we have in the xvith of the Acts of the apoſtles, of a tranſaction that in ſome reſpects reſembles this fact at Doris, and may receive conſiderable light from it.

St. Paul was at Philippi in Macedonia: (it was now the 11th year of [s] Claudius.) He there cured *a certain damſel poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of divination, which brought her maſters much gain by ſoothſaying. And when her maſters ſaw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the market-place unto the rulers——and the multitude roſe up together againſt them, and the magiſtrates rent off their clothes, and commanded to beat them. And when they had laid many ſtripes upon them, they caſt them into priſon, charging the jaylor to keep them ſafely. And when it was day the magiſtrates ſent the ſergeants, ſaying, let thoſe men go. And the keeper of the priſon told this ſaying to Paul.—But Paul ſaid,——they have beaten us openly uncondemned being Romans, and have caſt us into priſon, and now do they thruſt us out privily? but let them come themſelves and fetch us out.——And when they heard that they were Romans—they came, and beſought them and brought them out, and deſired them to depart out of the city*, Acts xvi. 16—39.

Here we have an inſtance of a tumult raiſed by ſome ſelf-intereſted and deſigning men, the common people incenſed by their arguments, the magiſtrates drawn into an act of injuſtice. Petronius ſeems to have ſuſpected, that the diſorder at Doris had been committed with the connivance of the rulers there. It is not at all unlikely that the magiſtrates of cities and towns, who poſſibly were but a few degrees above the common people, might ſometimes approve of theſe outrages and act a part in them: but the preſidents and proconſuls, men of a larger ge-

[s] Vid. Pearſ. Ann. Paul. p. 11. A. ch. 51.

nius,

nius, who had been educated at Rome and ſerved offices there, who were better acquainted with the Roman conſtitution, had a greater charge, and were more immediately accountable to the emperor and the ſenate for the obſervation of their edicts and the peace of the provinces, never or very rarely entered into theſe meaſures; but puniſhed ſuch diſorderly practices when they happened, and by freſh precepts endeavoured to prevent them for the future.

However, this act of the magiſtrates at Philippi was a ſudden thing; (*they have beaten us openly uncondemned*). The order was given without a hearing; and as ſoon as it was light the next morning, they ſent their officers with directions that the priſoners ſhould be releaſed. They ſoon repented of what they had done, and notwithſtanding the ſpecious pretences and obnoxious charges of the maſters of this damſel, that Paul and Silas had *taught cuſtoms which were not lawful for them to obſerve*, they were ſenſible they had gone beyond their commiſſion, and were apprehenſive of being called to an account, by a higher authority to which they were ſubject. This order of releaſe was ſent before they had heard that theſe men were Romans, and whilſt they knew no better than that they were mere Jews, and defended by no other privileges than thoſe that belonged to all of that nation. And the hiſtory Joſephus has given us of the fact at Doris, and the conduct of the preſident of Syria upon the occaſion of it, may very well render every part of this relation here highly probable. When theſe magiſtrates knew that Paul and Silas were Romans their concern was ſtill increaſed; and their own intereſt obliged them to all the farther condeſcenſions which Paul demanded.

But to return to the courſe of the narration.

There was another ſignal inſtance of the moderation of Claudius to the Jews, which may not be paſſed by. But before I produce it, I muſt give ſome ſhort hiſtory of the veſtment of the high prieſt[t], which I ſhall do in almoſt the very words of Joſephus; who ſays, that Herod the great and his ſon Archelaus had this ſacred veſtment in their keeping, and lodged it in the caſtle Antonia; and that the Roman procurators who ſucceeded to them in the government of Judea finding it there, kept the poſſeſſion of it till Vitellius preſident of Syria, in the latter end of Tiberius's reign, gave it to the Jews to keep it themſelves. The high prieſt wore this garment four times only in the year; at the three great feaſts and on the day of the faſt. It was delivered to him ſeven days before theſe ſea-

[t] Την στολην του αρχιερεως.

sons, and was first purified before he put it on. The next day after these solemnities were over it was returned to the officer of the chest. This was the method whilst it was kept by Herod and the Roman governors. But, as was just hinted, Vitellius gave it to the Jews, that they might lock it up in a chest of their own in the temple, and take it out thence for their use without asking particular leave [u].

But when Cuspius Fadus (F) was procurator of Judea, he received orders from the emperor to take 'the holy garment 'which the high priest alone wears into his own possession.' Josephus does immediately before this mention a disturbance which the Jews of Paræa gave to some of their neighbours. He does not say that irregular proceeding had brought upon them this disagreeable message: though it was highly probable, that it was owing to their irregular conduct in that or some other affair.

But however that be, when Fadus had received these orders, he called together 'the high priests [x] and chief men of Jerusa-'lem, acquainted them with the emperor's orders, and com-'manded them "to deliver to him the vestment of the high "priest, that it might be lodged in the castle of Antonia as "formerly." They did not dare absolutely to refuse: but 'they earnestly entreated Fadus, and Cassius Longinus presi-'dent of Syria, who was then likewise at Jerusalem,' (and who was indeed come thither with forces on purpose to prevent the sedition which it was apprehended the delivery and execution of this order might occasion;) 'that they would give them 'leave to send ambassadors to the emperor, and that they 'would wait till fresh directions came from Rome; with 'which request they complied.' When the Jewish ambassadors came to Rome they found there Agrippa the younger, who seconded their petition. The emperor granted their petition, and sent by them a letter directed to the magistrates of Jerusalem, the senate, people, and the whole nation of the Jews: in which he says, 'Agrippa—having introduced to me your 'ambassadors, who thankfully acknowledge the benefits I have 'conferred upon your nation, and earnestly beseeched me, that 'you might have the sacred vestment and the crown in your 'own keeping, according as it had been allowed by the excel-'lent and my well beloved Vitellius, I have granted that so

u Jos. Ant. lib. xviii. c. 5. § 3.

(F) A. D. 45.

x Ος δη και τοτε μεταπεμψαμενος τους αρχιερεις, και τους πρωτους Ιεροσολυμιτων, και την κελευσιν τω αυλοκραλορος, παρηνεσεν αυτοις τον ποδηρη χιτωνα, και την ιερατικην λην την Φορειν μονος ο αρχιερευς εθος εχει, εις την Αντωνιαν, υπερ εστι Φρεριον, καλαβεσθαι, κεισομενην υπο τη Ρωμαιων εξουσια, καθαπερ και προτερον ην. Ant. lib. xx. c. 1. § 1.

'it

'it ſhould be. I have ratified this ſentence from that princi-
'ple of piety with which I am poſſeſſed, and becauſe I will
'that all men worſhip [God] according to the laws of their
'country [y].'

This argument will be imperfect if I do not ſhew ſome inſtance of this equity to the Jews in the reign of Nero. The only fact I ſhall mention here is this. It happened in the time that Feſtus was governor of Judea (G), who was the perſon who ſent Paul to Rome. Agrippa the younger raiſed the buildings of the houſe in which he reſided when he was at Jeruſalem, and which had been the palace of the Aſmonæan family: by which he had not only a fine proſpect of the city, but likewiſe overlooked the inner court of the temple. 'When the people
'of Jeruſalem ſaw what he had done they were greatly in-
'cenſed; for neither do our cuſtoms nor our laws permit, that
'any beſide the prieſts ſhould ſee what is done in the temple.
'They therefore raiſed a high wall at the extremity of the
'weſt ſide of the inner court of the temple [z], whereby they
'obſtructed not only the king's view [ſc. Agrippa's] out of his
'dining room, but alſo the view from the weſtern portico with-
'out the court, where the Romans uſed to keep guard on the
'feſtival days. Agrippa was exceedingly provoked at it, and
'Feſtus the governor yet more; and commanded them to pull
'the wall down again. But they deſired he would permit
'them to ſend ambaſſadors to Nero. Feſtus giving them leave,
'they deputed to Nero ten of their chief men, and Iſhmael
'the high prieſt, and Helchias the keeper of the ſacred trea-
'ſury. Nero having given them an audience, not only for-
'gave what they had done, but allowed that the building ſhould
'remain *.'

This muſt be acknowledged to be a remarakble inſtance of goodneſs. It ſhews a great backwardneſs in Nero, or thoſe who then governed him, to break in upon their religion or any thing they eſteemed ſacred. This palace of Agrippa and the Roman fort ſtood either directly weſt, or at leaſt very near weſt of the temple. The entrance into the temple was at the eaſt end, ſo that they had no view from theſe buildings into the temple itſelf; only the high ground they ſtood upon and the loftineſs of the fabric, gave a view into the inner court where the ſacri-

[y] Συγκατεθεμην δε τη γνωμη ταυτη, πρωτον δια το εμαυτου ευσεβες, και το βουλεσθαι εκαστους κατα τα πατρια θρησκευειν· ib. § 2.

(G) A. D. 60. Baſnage Ann. P. E. A. 60. n. 3.

[z] Τοιχον ουν εγειρουσιν επι της εξεδρας υψηλον, ητις ην εν τῳ εσωθεν ιερῳ τετριμμενη προς δυσιν.

* Νερων δε διακουσας αυτων, ου μονον συνεγνω περι του πραχθεντος, αλλα και συνεχωρησεν ουτως εαν την οικοδομιαν, τη γυναικι Ποππηια, θεοσεβης γαρ ην, υπερ των Ιουδαιων δεηθειση χαριζομενος. Ant. l. xx. c. 8. § 11.

fices were performed. And it being, as it seems, inconsistent with their law, or at least with their customs, that their sacred acts should be overlooked by any but the priests, the building that obstructed the view was permitted by the emperor to remain. I have already taken notice of the permission the Roman government had given the Jews, to kill any gentile, though a Roman, who entered beyond the bounds prescribed to those who were not Jews, and need not repeat it here.

§ V. I have now brought down my account of the treatment which the Roman commonwealth and empire gave to the several religions which obtained in the countries under their dominion, and particularly to the Jewish religion during the period I am concerned with. There are in this short view several acts of goodness and justice done to the Jews by presidents of provinces, besides the edicts and declarations of the senate or the emperors. But as the particulars relating to this subject mentioned in the Acts of the apostles, are chiefly instances of the conduct of governors of provinces, or of the officers next in authority under them, it will not be amiss to add two or three more testimonies relating to the behaviour of persons of those characters.

'There happened likewise, says Josephus, another disturbance at Cæsarea (H); the Jews and Syrians, who lived there promiscuously, running both into a seditious behaviour. For they would have it that the city was theirs, because the founder of it Herod their king was a Jew. These allowed that the founder indeed was a Jew, but they asserted, that notwithstanding that the city was the Greeks. For if it had been given to the Jews, there would have been no right of erecting statues and temples in it. This point they disputed one with another till they came to blows, and the more resolute of each party had daily skirmishes together. For the elders of the Jews were not able to keep the seditious part of their own people in order; and the Greeks were ashamed to yield to the Jews. These had the advantage in point of wealth and strength of body; but the Greeks had the encouragement and assistance of the soldiers. For the greatest part of the Roman garrison there consisting of men raised in Syria, they were ready to join with the Greeks as being their countrymen[a]. The officers however did their best to suppress these disturbances, and from time to time seized the most factious of each side, and punished them with scourging

(H) A. D. 56. vid. Basnage Ann. Polit. Ecc.

[a] Τοις γη μην επαρχοις φροντις [illegible] ταραχην, και τους μαχιμωτερους εκατερωθεν αει συλλαμβανοντες εκολαζον μαστιξι και δεσμοις· Cæterum militum præfectis curæ erat tumultum comprimere, &c. Hudson. Vers.

'or

'or imprisonment. But yet the sufferings of those who were 'apprehended did very little restrain or terrify the rest, for 'they were the rather the more provoked to be seditious. At 'length the Jews having had the better in a combat, Felix 'coming into the market-place required them to withdraw 'peaceably, threatening them severely if they did not. They 'not obeying him, he ordered his soldiers in amongst them: 'many were killed upon the spot, whose goods[b] happened also 'to be plundered afterwards. The sedition still continuing 'there, he having selected several of the chief men of each 'body sent them to Nero, that they might both lay their se-'veral pretensions before him[c].'

This is the account which Josephus gives of this affair in the Jewish War. In his Antiquities[d] a part of this story stands thus: 'At length they came to throwing of stones at each 'other: and many were wounded on both sides. The Jews 'however had the victory. Felix then perceiving this conten-'tion between them like to become a sort of open war, came 'out to them and desired the Jews to give over. They not 'obeying him, he gave his soldiers orders to take their 'arms and fall upon them; and he slew a great many, took 'more prisoners, and gave his soldiers leave to plunder some 'houses which were full of treasure. But the more moderate 'and the most eminent men of the Jews, being concerned for 'themselves as well as for their people, intreated Felix to or-'der his soldiers to retreat and to spare the rest, and also to 'forgive what had passed. And Felix granted their requests.'

These passages of Josephus deserve the more to be respected, because they assure us of the good measures taken by Felix, a person not much celebrated for the justice of his administration in other matters, and by the chief officers under him, where they had concerns with men of different religions: and that they did not attempt to subvert the rights of either side, but only endeavoured to keep the peace among them, as far as they were able, at a season in which the Jews were extremely resolute and tumultuous. And St. Paul received some civilities from Felix, as well as from Lysias, one of his principal officers.

[b] Αναιρει συχνους, ων διαπραξηναι συνεβη και τας υσιας. [c] De Bell. lib. ii. c. 13. fin. [d] Φηλιξ δε, ως εθεασατο φιλονεικιαι εν πολεμω τροπω γενομενην, προπηδησας, παυεσθαι τους Ιουδαιους παρεκαλει· μη πειθομενους δε τους στρατιωτας οπλισας επαφιησι, και πολλους μεν αυτων ανειλε, πολεις δε ζωντας ελαβεν, οικιας δη τινας των εν τη πολει πολλων παυ χρηματων γεμουσας διαρπαζειν εφηκεν τοις στρατιωταις· οι δε των Ιουδαιων επιεικεστεροι, και πρεσβυτεροι καλα την αξιωσιν, δεισαντες περι εαυτων, παρεκαλουν τον Φηλικα τους στρατιωτας ανακαλεισθαι τη σαλπιγγι, και φειδεσθαι το λοιπον αυτων, δουναι τε μεταυοιαν επι τοις πεπραγμενοις· και Φηλιξ επεισθη· lib. xx. c. 6. § 7.

Josephus

Josephus gives an account of a sedition raised by the Jews at Alexandria, about the time (1) the war broke out in Judea. Having mentioned the privileges granted to the Jews there by Alexander the great, he says; 'And when the Romans became 'masters of Egypt, neither Cæsar the first (of that name) nor 'any of his successors would suffer the honours conferred upon 'them [the Jews] by Alexander to be diminished. There 'were however continual contentions between them and the 'Greeks. And[e] THOUGH THE PRESIDENTS DAILY PUNISHED 'MANY ON BOTH SIDES, yet animosities increased. And as 'there were disturbances at that time in other places, so espe- 'cially at Alexandria. The Alexandrians having called an 'assembly to consider of the embassy they were about to 'send to Nero, a great many of the Jews came into the am- 'phitheatre, and mixed themselves with the Greeks. When 'some of the Alexandrians perceived them, they cried out, 'that there were enemies come in amongst them, to be spies 'upon their debates, and immediately laid hands upon several 'of them. Some others perished as they were getting out: 'and three in particular, which had gotten out, were taken 'and brought back. These they threatened to burn alive. 'Hereupon, all the Jews in general came to the rescue of 'these men. They began with throwing stones at the Greeks; 'then getting lighted torches they surrounded the amphithea- 'tre, and threatened to set fire to it, and burn all the people 'there to a man. So they would have done, if Tiberius 'Alexander, prefect of the city, had not prevented them. 'Though indeed he did not begin immediatly with hostilities; 'but sending some persons of distinction to them, advised them 'to be peaceable, and not to draw upon themselves the Ro- 'man garrison. But these seditious people ridiculed the ad- 'vice, and reviled Tiberius.'

The president happened to have with him five thousand soldiers, who had halted at Alexandria, in their march from Lybia into Judea, beside the two legions, the usual garrison there.

Tiberius therefore ordered his soldiers to their arms. The Jews made a long defence, but when once they were routed, there was a dreadful slaughter of them: 'fifty thousand were 'killed. Nor would any of them have been left alive, if they 'had not submitted, and cried out for mercy. Alexander 'then taking compassion on them, ordered his soldiers to de- 'sist. They being always trained to obedience, gave over

(1) A. D. 66. [e] Και των ηγεμονων πολλους οσημεραι παρ' αμφοιν κολαζοντων, η στασις μαλλον παρωξυνετο.

'the

'the ſlaughter at the very firſt word of command. But the 'Alexandrians, being filled with inveterate hatred were 'difficultly drawn off, and could ſcarce be reſtrained from in-'ſulting and abuſing the dead bodies[f].'

This is indeed a long ſtory. But the paſſage containing not only a character of the uſual conduct of the preſidents of Egypt, but giving us likewiſe an inſtance of a very great moderation, I was unwilling to abridge it very much. I term it moderation; for ſo it ſeems to me, for the governor to ſend amicable advice to ſo tumultuous a body of people, and warn them of the conſequences of obſtinacy, inſtead of coming upon them with his forces, eſpecially when he was ſo well provided. And it was very honourable to accept the firſt tenders of ſubmiſſion.

I ſhall give but one paſſage more relating to this matter. 'They [the Jews] received likewiſe,' ſays Joſephus, 'con-'ſiderable honours from the king of Aſia, becauſe they had 'ſerved them in their wars. Seleucus Nicator gave them the 'privileges of citizens in Antioch the metropolis of his king-'dom, which privilege they enjoy to this day. I need give 'no other proof of it than this, that the Jews refuſing to uſe 'oil prepared by other people, the Gymnaſiarchs (κ) give 'them a certain preſcribed piece of money inſtead of the oil 'which ſhould be allowed[g] them. And when the people of 'Antioch, in the time of the late war, would have broke in 'upon this cuſtom, Mucianus, then preſident of Syria, obliged 'them to continue it. And afterwards, when Veſpaſian and 'his ſon Titus were become lords of the whole world, and the 'Alexandrians and Antiochians deſired that the rights of citi-'zenſhip might be taken from the Jews, they would not com-'ply with their deſire. From whence any may perceive the 'equity and true greatneſs[h] of the Romans, and eſpecially of 'Veſpaſian and Titus; who though they had undergone many 'fatigues in the war with the Jews, and had been very much 'offended with them, that they would not ſubmit themſelves 'to them, but fought againſt them to the laſt as long as they 'were able, yet they did not take away from them the fore-'mentioned citizenſhip: but ſo moderated and reſiſted their 'own former diſpleaſure againſt the Jews, and the intreaties 'of the Alexandrians and Antiochians, people of the greateſt

[f] De Bell. lib. ii. c. 18. § 7, 8.

(κ) Officers that governed the places of exerciſe in the Greek cities.

[g] Τειμιους δε τους Ιουδαιους, μη βουλομενους αλλοφυλῳ ελαιῳ χρησασθαι, λαμβανειν ωρισμενον τι παρα των γυμνασιαρχων εις ελαιου τιμην αργυριον.

[h] Την Ρωμαιων επιεικειαν και μεγαλοφροσυνην.

'conſequence,

'conſequence, as not to abrogate any part of the ancient pri-
'vileges given to the Jews, out of favour for thoſe cities, or
'out of reſentment toward thoſe wicked people whom they
'had vanquiſhed; ſaying, that they who had taken up arms
'againſt them, and had been ſubdued by them, had been ſuf-
'ficiently puniſhed; and that it would be unjuſt to deprive
'thoſe of their privileges, who had commited no fault[i].'
Here is one remarkable inſtance of Jewiſh niceneſs, and more than one example of Roman generoſity.

Theſe are authentic teſtimonies in behalf of the equity of the Roman government in general, and of the impartial adminiſtration of juſtice by the Roman preſidents toward all the people of their provinces, how much ſoever they differed from each other in matters of religion.

It is undoubted, that many of theſe preſidents were guilty of extortion, and other acts of injuſtice, and endeavoured to enrich themſelves in the provinces. But there ſeem not to have been any one thing, which the Romans were more concerned to preſerve inviolable, than the religion of all the people whom they conquered; judging, it is likely, that there is nothing gives a people ſo univerſal a diſguſt, as injuries done to their religion; and that therefore, the only way to preſerve peace throughout their empire, was to protect all men every where in the practice of their own religious[k] rites.

§ VI. I imagine however, that the reader will be apt to recollect here the ſeveral violations of things ſacred, which I have related to have been committed by Verres in Sicily; and he may be inclined to think, that ſuch inſtances do very much weaken this argument.

But then it ought to be remembered likewiſe, that theſe actions were very much cried out upon, and Verres was called to an account for them. Beſides, there is no reaſon to think there were many ſuch as Verres, whoſe adminiſtration was infamous to a * proverb. It ought alſo to be conſidered, that Verres was prætor of Sicily under the commonwealth, at a time when the courts of judicature at Rome, before whom complaints from the provinces were brought, were extremely corrupt; when juſtice was adminiſtered very ſlowly, and oftentimes not obtained at all. There are in Cicero himſelf

[i] Joſ. Ant. lib. xii. cap. 3. init.

[k] Quid hem! mediocrine tandem dolore eos affectos eſſe arbitramini? non ita eſt, judices: primum quod omnes religione moventur: & deos patrios quos a majoribus acceperunt, colendos ſibi diligenter & retinendos eſſe arbitrantur. Cic. in Verr. lib. iv. c. 59. * Eodem tempore Metellus, Siciliæ prætor, cum fœdiſſima illa C. Verris prætura Siciliam adflictam inveniſſet, &c. P. Oroſ. Hiſt. l. vi. c. 3. p. 376. Ed. Havercamp.

many

many acknowledgments of the bad ſtate of affairs at that time in this reſpect[l]. And I believe, the provinces were much happier under the emperors for a conſiderable time below the period of the evangelical hiſtory, than they had been for ſome time under the commonwealth.

There was a very ſignal piece of juſtice done the Jews by the emperor Claudius. It lies ſo much in the very midſt of our hiſtory, that it is not eaſy to paſs it by. In the time that Cumanus, predeceſſor to Felix, was procurator of Judea, there happened a difference between the Jews and Samaritans; the riſe of which was an aſſault made by the Samaritans upon ſome Galileans as they were going up to Jeruſalem. Cumanus not doing his duty, complaints were made to Ummidius Quadratus, preſident of Syria. The Jews affirmed that Cumanus had been bribed by the Samaritans, and each ſide made many complaints. Quadratus came into Judea, puniſhed ſome himſelf, ſent ſeveral of the chief of the Jews and Samaritans, as well as Cumanus, and Celer the tribune, to Rome, to give an account of themſelves to Claudius: who having heard both ſides, pronounced ſentence, baniſhed[m] Cumanus, and ordered that Celer the tribune ſhould be had back to Jeruſalem, and after he had been led through the city, be beheaded.

I cannot be certain that Celer had the ſame poſt at Jeruſalem under Cumanus, that Lyſias had under Felix, though Joſephus gives Celer the ſame title that St. Luke does Lyſias. Nor would I be underſtood to inſinuate, that this puniſhment of Celer was the chief cauſe of Lyſias's good conduct. He appears to me ſo juſt, punctual, and prudent in every part of his behaviour, during that ſhort time that St. Paul was at Jeruſalem, after he was taken into cuſtody, that I take it for granted he was actuated by ſome better principle. But though this favourable ſuppoſition be a piece of juſtice to Lyſias, yet I make no doubt, but that this execution of Celer was a reſtraint upon ſome people; and that St. Paul and many others in Judea, and poſſibly in other provinces likewiſe had ſome benefit by it.

I have, I hope, in this chapter and other parts of this work, given paſſages enough to enable every reader to judge for himſelf in this point; and whereby he may be aſſured the Jews

[l] Spoliaſti Siculos. Solent enim inulti eſſe in injuriis ſuis provinciales. Cic. in Verr. lib. iii. c. 41. Lugent omnes provinciæ: queruntur omnes liberi populi: regna denique jam omnia de noſtris cupiditatibus & injuriis expoſtulant. Ibid. cap. 89.

[m] Τῳ Κυμανῳ φυγην επεβαλε, Κελερα δε τον χιλιαρχον εκελευσεν αγοντας εις τα Ιεροσολυμα, παντων ορωντων επι την πολιν πασαν συραντας, ϑτως αποκτειναι. Antiq. lib. xx. c. 5. § 3. vid. & de B. p. 1074. 20.

enjoyed

enjoyed their religion in Judea and out of it, without any very conſiderable moleſtations. They had particularly in Judea, their high prieſts, frequented Jeruſalem at their great feaſts; images and other abominations were kept out of the country, or if they were brought in they were ſoon carried back again.

Nay there appear in the accounts I have given, ſeveral poſitive proofs of an equal adminiſtration of juſtice in divers parts, where injuries were offered; and more might be given. A Roman ſoldier in Judea having rent and burnt a book of the laws of Moſes, the forementioned Cumanus, at the requeſt of the Jews, had him put[n] to death. I believe that moſt will allow, a capital puniſhment of a crime not particularly ſpecified, it is likely, in any law whatſoever, to be an act of complete juſtice at leaſt.

§ VII. It will be needful however, in order fully to clear up this matter, to ſubjoin two or three remarks.

1. It muſt be owned, that according to the Roman laws no man might introduce any new gods, or worſhip publicly or privately any ſtrange or foreign gods not allowed of by public authority[o].

2. But yet the diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt were under the protection of the Roman laws, ſince the God whom they worſhipped, and whoſe worſhip they recommended, was the God of the heavens and the earth, the ſame God whom the Jews worſhipped, the worſhip of whom was allowed of all over the Roman empire, and eſtabliſhed by ſpecial edicts and decrees in moſt, perhaps in all the places in which we meet with St. Paul in his travels.

It is evident that St. Paul makes his defence before Felix in Judea upon this foot. *They neither found me in the temple diſputing with any man.—But this I confeſs to thee, that after the way which they call hereſy, ſo worſhip* I THE GOD OF MY FATHERS, Acts xxiv. 14. They call this way a ſect, a new ſect; grant it to be ſo: but in this way I worſhip the God of my fathers, the ſame God which they do, and believe all things which are written in the law and the prophets as firmly as any Jew whatever: nor do I ſay any thing inconſiſtent with them, or which I cannot ſupport by them: and therefore I am entitled to protection equally with them, ſince I have not attempted nor adviſed any diſturbance or inſurrection. This therefore was a

n Antiq. lib. xx. cap. 4. § 4. de B. J. l. ii. c. 12. § 2. o Separatim nemo habeſſit deos neve novos: Sed ne advenas, niſi publicè adſcitos, privatim colunto. Cic. de legib. lib. ii. c. 8. init.

very

very juſt and proper defence before Felix, a heathen magiſtrate, and it was compleatly valid.

And the Roman magiſtrates out of Judea, and the heathen people every where, conſidered St. Paul and his companions as Jews. It was ſo evidently in Achaia. The Jews brought Paul before the judgment-ſeat, *ſaying, this fellow perſuadeth men to worſhip God contrary to the law*, Acts xviii. 13. But Gallio ſuppoſed that Paul had as good a right to protection as themſelves, and that the differences between Paul and them were no other than ſuch as might happen between men of one and the ſame religion; and that the only reaſon why Paul was brought before him, was the envy, malice, and bigotry of ſome of the leading men among the Jews of his province. *If it be a queſtion of words and names*, ſays he, AND OF YOUR LAW, *look ye to it, for I will be no judge of ſuch matters*, ver. 15.

From whence I think it appears, that Gallio was not ſo ignorant of the caſe brought before him as ſome may be ready to imagine. If, ſays he, the matter in diſpute[p] be a *word*, ſome particular opinion[q] and doctrine, which you ſay Paul preaches; or of names whether Jeſus may be called the Chriſt; (or perhaps he means of matters about which the difference is ſo ſmall that it is rather a controverſy about names than things:) or *of your law*, whether it obliges all men to be circumciſed who go over to the worſhip of your God, I will be no judge between you concerning ſuch matters.

If the ſenſe I here give of theſe words, and particularly *of your law* be right, it is an evidence that Gallio knew very well that Paul had converted heathens to his ſentiments, and yet he took no offence at it: only he was reſolved not to paſs any judicial ſentence upon theſe matters. And indeed I think it plain from St. Luke's account, that Gallio had heard the Jews tell their ſtory out. But when they had done, he had more honour and good ſenſe than to oblige Paul to make any apology for his principles in court, under the character of a criminal or accuſed perſon.

Nor is it at all ſtrange, that Gallio did not reſent St. Paul's converting men from heatheniſm to the worſhip of the true God; ſince the Jews had done the ſame thing in many parts of the Roman empire without offence, though not with ſo good ſucceſs as St. Paul.

But to proceed. It is apparent that the heathen people alſo conſidered the apoſtle and thoſe with him as Jews.

[p] Περι λογου Joſeph. p. 793. 20.

[q] Σαδδυκαιοις δε τας ψυχας ο ΛΟΓΟΣ συναφανιζει τοις σωμασι. εις ολιγες τε ανδρας ειλε ο ΛΟΓΟΣ αφικετο. Ibid. 23.

It

It is with this ſpeech that the maſters of the damſel at Philippi come before the magiſtrates, when they brought along with them Paul and Silas: *Theſe men* BEING JEWS *do exceedingly trouble our city*, Acts xvi. 20. And though the magiſtrates were ſo far heated and miſled by theſe men, as to order Paul and Silas to be beaten and impriſoned; yet they had no ſooner reflected upon what they had done, but they were ſenſible that they themſelves had broken the laws, in puniſhing men that were Jews for ſpreading their principles, and that they were liable to be reprimanded for it.

The uproar at Epheſus affords a remarkable proof of the ſame thing. The ſilverſmiths that made ſhrines for Diana began a popular ſpeech there, Acts xix. 26—34. *Ye ſee*, ſay they, *and hear, that not alone at Epheſus, but almoſt throughout all Aſia, this Paul hath perſuaded and turned away much people, ſaying,* THAT THEY BE NO GODS WHICH ARE MADE WITH HANDS. (All the Jews ſaid the ſame-thing). *And the whole city was filled with* confuſion.—*And they ruſhed with one accord into the theatre.* —*And they drew Alexander out of the multitude,* THE JEWS PUTTING HIM FORWARD. *And Alexander beckoned with the hand, and would have made his defence unto the people. But when they knew that he was a* JEW, *all with one voice about the ſpace of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Epheſians.*

Alexander was put forward by the Jews, and undoubtedly intended to have declaimed againſt Paul; but ſo ſoon as the *people knew that he was a Jew*, inſtead of hearkening to him they were thrown into a freſh ferment.

I think I need not add that Feſtus ſo underſtood the matter likewiſe, his words having been already more than once produced, in which he tells Agrippa, that when Paul's accuſers ſtood up they had only *certain queſtions againſt him of* THEIR OWN SUPERSTITION, Acts xxv. 18, 19.

3. It ought to be obſerved, that the firſt followers of Jeſus did every where obſerve an admirable decorum in all their words and actions. It may perhaps be inconceivable by ſome, how they ſhould be able thus to behave every where, animated as they were with a warm as well as juſt zeal for the truths of the Chriſtian doctrine, and a thorough diſlike of all the abominations and abſurdities of the heathen worſhip. But yet it is certain they did ſo. We have unconteſted evidence of it.

St. Luke aſſures us, Acts xvii. 16. that when St. Paul was at Athens, *his ſpirit was ſtirred in him, when he ſaw the city was wholly given to idolatry.* But when he comes to make his ſpeech in the Areopagus, his temper and addreſs are equal

to his argument, which certainly can never be exceeded. According to our translation indeed there is harshness in the very introduction: *Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious:* whereas the original [r] is peculiarly soft, if any censure was intended: but [s] I apprehend that St. Paul tells them, he perceived they were *in all things very devout.* This would give no offence at Athens. It was their peculiar [t] character, the encomium which they were fond of above any other.

[r] Si lenitatem Pauli spectemus——confirmat hoc imprimis a Δεισιδαιμονια traducta vox: cui quidem inest multâ suavitate permista castigatio. Sam. Drake S.T.P. de arâ Ignoto Deo Sacrâ. Cantab. 1724. p. 12.

[s] Κατα παντα ως δεισιδαιμονεστερους υμας θεωρω. The word δεισιδαιμονια is often used in a bad sense, but it has also a good, or at least an innocent meaning. Festus tells Agrippa, that Paul's accusers had nothing against him *but certain questions περι της ιδιας δεισιδαιμονιας, of their own superstition,* Acts xxv. 19. It should be rendered *religion.* It cannot be supposed that Festus would speak contemptuously to Agrippa of the Jewish, that is, Agrippa's own religion; when Agrippa was come to Cæsarea with his sister Bernice to salute him. It is also apparent, that Festus does shew Agrippa a great deal of respect. Josephus says, that Manasses having repented of his idolatry and other sins against God, he resolved for the future, παση χρησθαι περι αυτον δεισιδαιμονια, to be constant in the worship of him. Jos. p. 437. 20. Claudius, in his edict published in favour of the Jews, exhorts them μη τας των αλλων δεισιδαιμονιας εξουθενιζειν, id. p. 866. 18. not to set at nought, or to revile the religions of other nations. Vid. eund. p. 632. 39. p 1066. 31. It appears also from what follows, that St. Paul had not blamed the Athenians. Having mentioned the inscription of the altar, *To the unknown God*; he goes on, ον ουν αγνοουντες ευσεβειτε; *whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.* The verb here used for worship is always expressive of a laudable piety. See examples in Grotius upon the place. The harsh sense of the word Δεισιδαιμονια, is inconsistent with the whole design of St. Paul's argument. If he had told them at first that they were superstitious, he encourages them in it, and endeavours to make them more so. If St. Paul's instance had been that of some false god, there had been some reason to put the harsh sense upon the word in this place. But now there is no reason at all for it; since the inscription he produces directly intended, or at least comprehended under it, the true God, whom St. Paul preached. I think therefore that St. Paul says: *I perceive that ye are in all things very devout. For as I passed along, and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this inscription:* TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. *Whom therefore ye worship without knowing him, him do I declare unto you.*

[t] Ει γαρ τι αλλο της Αθηναιων πολεως, και τουτ' εν πρωτοις εστιν εγκωμιον, το περι παντος πραγματος, και εν παντι καιρῳ τοις θεοις επεσθαι, και μηδεν ανευ μαντικης και χρησμων επιτελειν. Dionys. Hal. de Thucyd. judic. § 40. vid. & Sophoc. Oed. Col. v. 1000. & seq. It was customary for eminent strangers who spoke in public at Athens, to give them in their first discourse some commendation from the wisdom of their laws and institutions, or some other topic. St. Paul had good reason not to be defective in this point upon so nice an occasion. He could very truly say they were a devout people. It was extremely to his purpose, and they would be much pleased to hear it from him. Η μεν δη διαλεξις επαινοι ησαν του αστεως, και απολογιαι προς τους Αθηναιους, υπερ του μη προτερον προς αυτους αφιχθαι. Philost. vit. Alexand. Sophist. § 3. Αθηναιοις μεν γαρ επιδεικυμενος αυτοσχεδιους λογους, οτε και πρωτον Αθηναζε αφικετο, ουκ ες εγκωμιον κατεστησεν εαυτον του αστεως, τοσουτων οντων, α τις υπερ Αθηναιων ειποι· id. vit. Polem. § 4. It was therefore a singularity in Polemon, a most proud man, that in his discourse at Athens, at his first visit, he said nothing in their praise. There is another like example particularly observed in Adrian the sophist. Μεστος δε ουτω παρρησιας επι τον θρονον παρηλθε, τον Αθηνησιν, ως και προοιμιον οι γενεσθαι της προς αυτους διαλεξεως, μη την εκεινων σοφιαν, αλλα την εαυτου· id. vit. Adrian. § 2. Grotius understood St. Paul to speak here of the Athenians in the way of commendation, as I do.

I take the liberty to add, in this third edition, a passage or two from Mr. War-

It is true, St. Luke ſays, that at the concluſion, ver. 32. *when they heard of the reſurrection of the dead, ſome mocked: and others ſaid, We will hear thee again of this matter.* It is very poſſible, ſome might be ſurpriſed at the novelty of St. Paul's principles, and be inclined to make themſelves merry with them. But I do not perceive by St. Luke that they were; I think, there could not be any exceptions made to the propriety or decency of any of his expreſſions.

St. Luke has not recorded any of the diſcourſes made by St. Paul, or thoſe who were with him at Epheſus. But however, we have authentic evidence of the innocence of their words and actions there alſo. *Ye have brought hither,* ſays the town-clerk to the people of Epheſus, Acts xix. 37. *theſe men, which are neither robbers of churches, nor yet blaſphemers of your goddeſs.* He ſays this of Gaius and Ariſtarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in his travels. So that this temper and prudence were not peculiar to St. Paul, but common to him with his companions. What the town-clerk ſays here may be relied on: he is ſpeaking to the enraged multitude: if there had been any blaſphemies uttered by theſe men he had made them his own.

The conduct or expreſs declarations of Felix, Feſtus, Agrippa, are teſtimonies to the like unblameable and inoffenſive behaviour of St. Paul at Jeruſalem.

I do not ſay, that according to laws ſince enacted in ſome ſtates, the apoſtles would not have been judged offenders. But it ought to be remembered, that the Romans did for a long time as far ſurpaſs many modern governments in the juſtice and equity of their political maxims, as in the grandeur of their empire: nor had they yet renounced or departed from them.

Had there been any affront offered by Paul to the Jewiſh religion, either Felix or Feſtus would have diſcovered and puniſhed it. When ſuch things were done by Romans they could not eſcape. Undoubtedly therefore Paul had been as innocent in Judea as he had been out of it.

Upon the whole then, from the ſeveral particulars here alleged, it muſt appear highly probable, that the chief officers of

burton, confirming the interpretation I have given of this text. His words are theſe: 'Athens was a city the moſt devoted 'to religion of any upon the face of the 'earth. On this account their poet So-'phocles calls it "the ſacred building of "the gods, Αθηνων των θεοδμητων." Warburton's Divine Legation of Moſes. B. i. Sect. 4. p. 136. 2d. Edit. Again: 'This 'was the reaſon why St. Paul, who was 'regarded as the bringer in of foreign 'gods, was had up to the court of Areo-'pagus; not as a criminal, but rather as a 'public benefactor, who had a new worſhip 'to propoſe to a people, "above all others "religions, ως δεισιδαιμονεστερους." Id. ib. Book ii. Sect. 6. p. 296.

ſuch a government as the Roman was at the riſe of the Chriſtian religion, ſhould treat the firſt preachers of it juſt as they are repreſented by St. Luke to have done.

They had no authority by virtue of any edicts or decrees then paſſed, to enter into the controverſies then on foot between ſeveral cities in Egypt, who worſhipped ſome one animal and ſome another, but none of them the gods of the Romans. Theſe governors had not been wont to interpoſe between any of the ſects of the Jews, of which there had been ſeveral for a long time, when no tumult or ſedition aroſe among them. The Jews it is likely would have thought it the higheſt injuſtice, and would have made the loudeſt complaints if they had. The firſt chriſtians did not differ more from the phariſees or eſſenes, I do not ſay from the ſadducees, than theſe three ſects differed one from another. How can it be thought then, that theſe governors ſhould undertake to ſuppreſs the firſt[a] chriſtians, when they were obliged to protect all the reſt; not this or that ſect, but all the Jews in general?

The Roman government protected the many rites of all their provinces. They protected Jews and heathens in one and the ſame city. The Jews had been now for ſome while, from time to time, making proſelytes of Greeks and Syrians; converted them to the worſhip of the true God, the God whom the chriſtians preached; and brought them, ſome indeed to part only, others, to the obſervation of all the peculiar rites of their religion. This they had done, and the preſidents gave them no interruption or moleſtation. Muſt not then theſe officers have eſteemed it, as St. Luke repreſents them to have done, a new ſpecies of envy and malice in the Jews, to bring before them and deſire juſtice againſt Paul and his companions, barely becauſe they did not ſubmit to them in every particular? And muſt not theſe officers have been prepared likewiſe to controul their own people, when they would have abuſed Paul for what the Jews had been permitted to do; that is, for converting men to his peculiar ſentiments when his principles were not at all more diſagreeable to them, than thoſe of the Jews; and his behaviour was far more peaceable and inoffenſive than theirs had been?

§ VIII. There is however one difficulty which I am aware may be ſtarted by ſome perſons. If the Roman government,

[a] 'When the Romans permitted the 'Jewiſh ſynagogues to uſe their own laws, 'and proper government, Why, I pray, 'ſhould there not be the ſame alteration 'allowed to the apoſtolical churches? the 'Roman cenſure had as yet made no difference between the judaizing ſynagogues 'of the Jews and the chriſtian ſynagogues, 'or churches of the Jews: nor did it permit 'them to live after their own laws, and 'forbid theſe.' Dr. Lightfoot. Hebr. and Talmud. Exerc. on Matt. iv. 23.

to which all the world was then subject, was so mild and gentle, and protected all men in the profession of their several religious tenets, and the practice of all their peculiar rites, whence comes it pass, that there are in the epistles so many exhortations to the christians to patience and constancy; and so many arguments of consolation suggested to them as a suffering body of men? Does not the apostle Paul tell the Philippians, Phil. i. 29. that *to them it was given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake?* And the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. ii. 14. *that they had suffered like things of their own countrymen; even as they* (the churches of Judea) *have of the Jews?* Is not Timothy directed, 2 Tim. ii. 3. to *endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ?* Are not the Hebrews reminded, Heb. x. 32. that they had *endured a great fight of affliction?* Does not St. Peter intimate, that they whom he wrote to had *been in heaviness through manifold temptations?* 1 Pet. i. 6.

To this I answer.

1. That the account St. Luke has given in the Acts of the apostles, of the behaviour of the Roman officers out of Judea and in it, is confirmed not only by the account I have given of the genius and nature of the Roman government, but also by the testimonies of the most ancient christian writers. The Romans did afterwards depart from these moderate maxims; but it is certain that they were governed by them, as long as the history of the Acts of the apostles reaches. Tertullian and divers others do affirm, that Nero was the first emperor that persecuted the christians [x]; nor did he begin to disturb them till after Paul had left Rome the first time he was there, (when he was sent thither by Festus,) and therefore not till he was become an enemy to all mankind. And I think, that according to the account which Tacitus has given of Nero's inhuman treatment of the christians at Rome in the tenth year of his reign, what he did then was not owing to their having different principles in religion from the Romans, but proceeded from a desire he had to throw off from himself the odium of a vile action, namely setting fire to the city, which he was generally charged [y] with. And Sulpicius Severus, a christian historian of the fourth century, says the same thing [z].

x Consulite commentarios vestros: illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam, cum maximè Romæ orientem, cæsariano gladio ferociisse. Tertul. Apol. cap. 5. Primus omnium persecutus Dei servos. Lactantius de Mortib. persecut. c. 2. Hic primus Christianorum nomen tollere aggressus est. Sulpic. Sev. Hist. l. ii. c. 40.

y Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos—Tacit. Ann. xv. c. 44. z Neque ulla re Nero efficiebat, quin ab eo jussum incendium putaretur. Igitur vertit invidiam in Christianos, actæque in innoxios crudelissimæ quæstiones. Sulpic. ibid. c. 41.

2dly, I anſwer, that if the reader will be at the pains of comparing the epiſtles of the New Teſtament with the hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles, he will find a perfect harmony in all theſe particulars which are mentioned in both.

Thus St. Paul writes to the Theſſalonians, 1 Theſſ. ii. 14. *Ye became followers of the churches which in Judea are in Chriſt Jeſus: for ye alſo have ſuffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews.* And St. Luke informs us, Acts xvii. 5. that at *Theſſalonica, the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baſer ſort, and gathered a company, and ſet all the city on an uproar, and aſſaulted the houſe of Jaſon.*——

As according to St. Luke, they were the Jews who uſually began, or aggravated the diſturbances againſt Paul; ſo Paul himſelf aſcribes his own ſufferings, and thoſe of others likewiſe, to the Jews. Thus it follows in the place juſt now cited from him: 1 Theſſ. ii. 15, 16. *who both killed the Lord Jeſus and their own prophets, and have perſecuted us; and they pleaſe not God, and are contrary to all men: forbidding us to ſpeak unto the gentiles that they may be ſaved.* And to the Galatians he ſays, Gal. v. 11. *And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumciſion, why do I yet ſuffer perſecution? Then is the offence of the croſs ceaſed.* From which words it is plain, that all the apoſtle's ſufferings came from the bigotted Jews; and that, if it had not been for them, he might have preached the goſpel quietly enough.

3dly, Though the Romans were maſters of the world, and were governed by theſe moderate maxims, as I have ſhewn; yet the firſt chriſtians might be expoſed to many hardſhips and ſufferings, as they certainly were. The ſources of them are very evident. There was a heavy perſecution in Judea, which commenced not long after our Saviour's aſcenſion, and laſted, probably, ſeveral years. The Jews had a right to call men before the council, could excommunicate men out of their ſynagogues, ſcourge and beat them; they could bring men before the governor, and proſecute for capital crimes. Doubtleſs, they exerted all the power they had againſt the believers, and did other things they had no right to do; partly, through connivance it is likely of the governor, and partly perhaps, becauſe he could not hinder them. Then Herod Agrippa was king of Judea three years and more; and he, out of his own averſion to chriſtianity, and to pleaſe the Jews, was an inveterate enemy of the followers of Jeſus. And after this, when Judea was again put under Roman procurators, beſide the leſſer puniſhments the Jews could inflict themſelves, they

could prosecute before the procurators, as they did Paul. And we find, that though Felix and Festus were both convinced of his innocence, yet they did neither of them dare to release him against the inclinations of the people of their province. And such was the Jewish influence in this cause, that by their means Paul was kept two years in prison in Judea, and as many afterwards at Rome.

As for the sufferings which the christians were liable to out of Judea, every one must be sensible, that where-ever Paul, or any other made any considerable number of converts among the heathens, many of the common people were provoked, and would be apt to insult them; and in some places, the inferior magistrates might be so weak as to concur with them, Acts xvi. 22. Besides, the Jews were numerous every where, throughout the Roman empire. When Paul was at Lystra, ch. xiv. 19. *there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the people; and having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead.* How the Jews of Thessalonica behaved, we have seen just now, ch. xvii. 5. These very same Jews of Thessalonica followed Paul and Silas to Beræa, *and stirred up the people*, ver. 13. In Achaia, *the Jews made insurrection against Paul, and brought him before the judgment-seat*, ch. xviii. 12. At Ephesus, they would have heightened the rage of the people, though *the whole city was*, before, *filled with confusion*, ch. xix. 29. When this *uproar was ceased, and Paul was about to sail into Syria, the Jews laid wait for him*, ch. xx. 1—3.

Nor ought it to be supposed, that the Jews were inconsiderable enemies. The malicious, however unfurnished, will always find some weapons; and rage makes men, for a time at least, strong and terrible. We see a great deal of enmity against the first followers of Jesus, in the Jewish speeches and proceedings in Judea and other parts. But perhaps it is not easy to form a complete idea of it. What vexation must it not have given to the generality of this people, who were now in full expectation of subduing the whole world to themselves, to see a number of men of their own nation travelling over the Roman empire, teaching that Jesus, who had been crucified, was the Messiah, the great king and deliverer that had been promised to the Jews; inviting gentiles also to the participation of all the privileges of the people of God, without insisting on circumcision or other rites of their law!

The peculiar principles, temper, and disposition of the Jewish people deserve to be somewhat farther considered in this place.

place. Theſe were ſuch, that though the Roman governors had taken the firſt chriſtians into their ſpecial protection, they could not have ſecured them from all injuries. The Jews then not only ſcorned ſubjection and obedience to others, and affected liberty and independence, but they expected dominion over all mankind. This we may perceive from divers characters and admonitions in the New Teſtament, and from the writings of Joſephus. *They deſpiſe governments*, ſays St. Peter, *preſumptuous are they, ſelf-willed: they are not afraid to ſpeak evil of dignities*, 2 Pet. ii. 10. Jude 8. For this reaſon, there was ſo great occaſion for thoſe earneſt exhortations to the believers among the Jews, not to follow the example of the reſt of their countrymen, but *to ſubmit themſelves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake*, 1 Pet. ii. 13. Again, *Let none of you*, ſays the ſame Apoſtle, 1 Pet. iv. 15. *ſuffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a buſy body in* [a] *other mens matters.* This laſt character, I apprehend, is not generally underſtood. A mere prying into, or meddling with the concerns of private families or particular perſons, would not have been ranked with crimes that expoſed to the ſevereſt cenſures of the civil magiſtrate. The word, I think, intends one that affects the inſpection and direction of the affairs of other men; and in this place relates to the [b] public affairs of other people. Of this temper of the Jewiſh people at that time, we have a remarkable ſpecimen in the long paſſage I have tranſcribed above, concerning the buſineſs at Alexandria: where divers Jews intruded themſelves into the public councils of the people of that place; and the reſt of the Jews would have reſcued the offenders, or deſtroyed the whole people of Alexandria, if the preſident had not been furniſhed with a good body of regular forces. We have ſeen above (K), that in the time of Felix, the Jews at Cæſarea were not contented with equal rights of citizenſhip, but would have the preference. They became after that, ſtill more and more troubleſome and tumultuous. Their behaviour at Alexandria, juſt now mentioned, is a proof of it. The Jews diſdain of other men, and their thirſt of dominion ran

[a] Η ως αλλοτριοεπισκοπος. [b] The phraſe we have here is not that uſed in other places for an impertinent inquiſitiveneſs. See 2 Theſſ. iii. 11. 1 Tim. v. 13. Αλλοτριος ſignifies ſometimes a man of another nation. Αλλ' ης αλλοτριος ων, πολιτης γεγονα. Dionyſ. H. p. 468. 10. And if it ſhould be ſtill ſuppoſed, that Peter intends only a meddling with private affairs; yet he muſt refer to a buſy governing temper, that led them into a very offenſive conduct: ſince theſe buſy bodies are reckoned up with criminals, who, in thoſe places, could have their proper puniſhment from none but the chief Roman officers; or as Philoſtratus expreſſes it, judges who had the ſword: δικας γαρ δεισθαι αυτας [δικας επι μοιχοις, &c.] ξιφος εχοντος. Vit. Sophiſt. l. i. n. 25. § 2.

(K) Page 184, &c.

so high at last, that they put the people of the several countries in which they lived, and the whole Roman empire, into a fright. They had been hated before, but now they were feared [c]. Josephus says expressly, that the expectation they had of some one from their country, who would obtain the empire of the world, was the great thing that induced them to the war with the Romans *. If the Romans were not able to preserve the heathen people from all injuries from the Jews, (as it is certain [d] they were not,) much less could they secure the christians, who were above all others the object of their envy. And if the Jews thought themselves able to contend with, and overturn the Roman empire, it cannot be supposed unlikely, that they should attempt to destroy a christian, without asking the Romans leave, when they would not do it for them.

St. Jerom † in divers places of his commentaries, describes the sufferings of the apostles, and the causes and occasions of them, in a way very agreeable to the account here given by me.

These discouragements and sufferings then, the first christians met with and underwent, whippings in synagogues, excommunications from the ordinary places of God's worship, beatings in public market-places; tumults, some that endangered, others that cost them their lives, [Acts xiv. 19. ch. vii. 54—60]; during the reign of Herod Agrippa, imprisonment and death; in the rest of this period, from the beginning to the end of it, troublesome prosecutions before heathen governors in Judea, and out of it; the severest reproaches, and dangerous conspiracies, and lyings in wait of the Jews in all parts; among the heathen, the scorn and ridicule of the great and the witty, insults of the common people, and abuses of inferior

[c] Ου μην οι Σκυθαι των Ιουδαιων ελαττον πληθος ανηρουν, αλλα και αυτοι τους εν ταις πολεσι λαμβανομενους ανεσφαττον, ου μονον καλα μισους ως πρoτερον, αλλ' ηδη και τον επ' εαυτοις κινδυνον φθανοντες. Joseph. de B. J. l. ii. cap. 18. § 2. Josephus says, the revolt of the Jews, A. D. 66. gave Nero a great deal of concern, though he endeavoured to conceal it. Antiq. l. xx. c. 1. His appointing Vespasian, the most experienced and successful commander at that time, General in the war, is a proof of it, especially considering the aversion he had for his person. Peregrinatione Achaica inter comites Neronis cum cantante eo aut discederet sæpius, aut præsens obdormisceret, gravissimam contraxit offensam: prohibitusque non contubernio modo, sed etiam publica salutatione, secessit in parvam ac * viam civitatem, &c. Sueton. in Vespas. cap. 4. vid. & Tacit. Ann. lib. xvi. cap. 5.

* See above, p. 132. [d] Vid. Joseph. de Bell. lib. ii. c. 18. § 1, 5. & alibi.

(†) Quod autem crebro Paulus in carcere fuerit, & de vinculis liberatus sit, ipse in alio loco dicit: *in carceribus frequenter*, de quibus nonnunquam Domini auxilio, crebro ipsis persecutoribus nihil dignum in eo morte invenientibus, dimittebatur. Nec dum enim super nomine Christiano senatusconsulta præcesserant: nec dum Christianum sanguinem Neronius gladius dedicarat. Sed pro novitate prædicationis, sive a Judæis invidentibus, sive ab his qui sua videbant idola destrui, ad furorem populis concitatis, missi in carcerem, rursum impetu, & furore depositio, laxabantur, &c. Hieron. Comm. in Ep. ad Philem. p. 453. Conf. eund. in Ep. ad Gal. c. vi. p. 315.

magistrates;

magiſtrates; laſtly, perils from falſe brethren, who might find it no hard matter to augment the prejudices, both of Jews and gentiles, againſt a ſingular ſet of men.

It may be, I think, reaſonably ſuppoſed, that the ſufferings of the followers of Jeſus, in the period we are now concerned with, were not equal to thoſe, which they were afterwards expoſed to, when the Roman emperors treated them as public enemies, authorized their officers every where to puniſh them, and countenanced the common people in thoſe abuſes and outrages they were diſpoſed to of themſelves. Much leſs did they equal the torments which good men have undergone, ſince men of the moſt exquiſite malice and ſubtilty, in ſeveral ages, have improved perſecution into a ſcience, and devoted themſelves to this work as their ſolemn buſineſs and profeſſion; till at length they have completed this worſt of all inventions, and with a dexterity truly diabolical, have at once increaſed the fatigue of the ſufferer, and abated the horror and compaſſion of all heedleſs and inconſiderate ſpectators. Theſe things perhaps may (but theſe only could) make us think the difficulties, dangers, and ſufferings of the firſt chriſtians ſmall.

But yet after all, if we duly conſider the vaſt ſenſibility of human nature to pain and diſgrace; I believe it will be allowed, that the ſubſiſtence and growth of chriſtianity, under the diſcouragements it met with in its very infancy, at a time when there had been but few examples of patience and conſtancy under ſufferings, in any caſe that bears any near reſemblance with this, are a ſtrong argument in favour of its divine original; and a proof, that they who then embraced it, and were ſteady in the profeſſion of it, were, upon the beſt evidences, fully perſuaded of the facts on which it depends; and were animated by the hopes of that great reward, which is one diſtinguiſhed article of the chriſtian doctrine.

CHAP. IX.

Concerning divers Opinions and Practices of the Jews.

I. *The Jews, at the time of their great feaſts, came up to Jeruſalem in great numbers, from all parts.* II. *The Jews of Jeruſalem frequented the temple at other times.* III. *Their hours of prayer.* IV. *Their zeal for the temple,* V. *For the law.* VI. *Of their ſynagogue worſhip.* VII. *They practiſed*

practiſed at this time the vow of the Nazarite, and ſhaved their heads. VIII. *Of their inflicting forty ſtripes ſave one.* IX. *Of private zeal.* X. *The paying tribute to the Romans, a great grievance to the Jews.* XI. *Nevertheleſs there were publicans of the Jewiſh nation.*

THE Jews appear to have been, in the time of our Saviour and his apoſtles, very zealous for the temple, and devout and exact in the obſervation of the rituals of the Moſaic law. The new Teſtament abounds with proofs of this zeal. I ſhall take notice of ſome inſtances.

§ I. They came up to Jeruſalem at the feaſts, in great numbers, not only from thoſe parts of Judea that lay near the city, but alſo from Galilee, and likewiſe from foreign countries, where they reſided. John iv. 3. *He* [Jeſus] *left Judea, and departed into Galilee.* Ver. 45. *Then when he was come into Galilee, the Galileans received him, having ſeen all the things that he did at Jeruſalem at the* FEAST, *for they alſo went unto the feaſt.*—Ch. vii. 1—4. *After theſe things Jeſus walked in Galilee.* —*Now the Jews feaſt of* TABERNACLES *was at hand. His brethren therefore ſaid unto him, depart hence, and go into Judea, that thy diſciples alſo may ſee the works that thou doeſt: For there is no man that doeth any thing in ſecret, and he himſelf ſeeketh to be known openly: if thou do theſe things, ſhew thyſelf to the world.* This reaſoning of theirs is built upon the ſuppoſition, that there would be a general reſort at Jeruſalem, *at the feaſt of tabernacles, which was then at hand.* Ch. xi. 55, 56. *And the Jews* PASSOVER *was nigh at hand, and* MANY *went out of the country, up to Jeruſalem, before the paſſover, to purify themſelves. Then ſought they for Jeſus, and ſpake among themſelves, as they ſtood in the temple, what think ye, that he will not come unto the feaſt?*——Ch. xii. 12, 13. *And on the next day* MUCH *people that were come to the* FEAST, *when they heard that Jeſus was coming to Jeruſalem, took branches of palm-trees and went forth to meet him.*—Ver. 23. *And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worſhip at the feaſt.* See Acts ii. 5.

I ſhall ſet down from Joſephus evidences of all theſe particulars.

'At that time (A) the feaſt was approaching, in which the 'Jews are wont to eat unleavened bread. The feaſt is called 'the paſſover, and is kept in remembrance of their departure 'out of Egypt: they obſerve it with great joy, and at this 'feaſt offer up more ſacrifices than at any other, and an innu-

(A) Year before Chriſt 3, or 4. It was the paſſover next after Herod's death.

'merable

'merable multitude of perſons come up to worſhip God, not 'only out of Judea, but alſo from other parts [a].'

Again, 'When the feaſt which is called the paſſover was 'nigh (B), in which it is our cuſtom to eat unleavened bread, 'and a great multitude was gathered together FROM ALL 'PARTS [b], Cumanus fearing ſome diſturbance might happen 'among them, ordered a cohort of the ſoldiers to take their arms, 'and poſt themſelves in the porticos of the temple [c].'

Again, 'From Antipatris Ceſtius marched to Lydda, but 'found no men in it, for all the people were gone up to Jeru-'ſalem, to the feaſt (C) of tabernacles. However, meeting 'with fifty men, he ſlew them all, burnt the city, and went 'forwards, and pitched his camp at a place called *Gabao*, at 'the diſtance of fifty ſtadia from Jeruſalem. The Jews per-'ceiving the enemy to approach to their metropolis, neglect-'ing the feaſt, betook themſelves to their arms; and placing 'great confidence in their numbers, marched out to the fight 'with loud ſhouts, but very little order, not ſo much as mind-'ing the reſt of the ſeventh day. For it happened to be the 'ſabbath, which is reſpected and obſerved by them above all 'others [d].' This ſabbath is the day ſpoken of, John vii. 37. where it is called, *the laſt day, that great day of the feaſt*; of which Moſes ſays, *It is a ſolemn aſſembly, and ye ſhall do no ſervile work therein*, Lev. xxiii. 36.

But the number of people that reſorted to Jeruſalem upon theſe occaſions, will appear more particularly from a computation, which the prieſts made at the paſſover of this very ſame year (D).

Ceſtius, juſt now mentioned, preſident of Syria, deſired the prieſts to number the people, if they had any way of doing it. 'The feaſt of the paſſover was then at hand, in which they 'kill ſacrifices from the ninth to the eleventh hour: and there 'is concerned in each ſacrifice a ſort of fraternity, of at the 'leaſt ten in number, and ſometimes twenty. The prieſts 'then endeavoured to gratify him, and they found the num-'ber of ſacrifices amount to two hundred fifty-ſix thouſand 'five hundred. And reckoning a company of ten to each 'ſacrifice, the whole number of perſons muſt have been two 'millions and ſeven hundred thouſand (E), and theſe all clean

[a] Καίτοι δε πληθυς αναριθμητος εκ της χωρας ηδη δε και εκ της υπορειας επι θρησκειαν τω Θεω. Joſ. Ant. lib. xvii. c. 9. § 3.

(B) A. D. 48. [b] Πανταχοθεν.

[c] Ant. lib. xx. c. 4. § 3. (C) A. D. 66. [d] De B. J. lib. ii. cap. 19. init.

(D) 66. (E) There is ſome error in one of theſe numbers in Joſephus. For 256500, which was the number of the ſacrifices, multiplied by ten make but 2565000. But Dr. Hudſon ſays, that ſome are for reading the number of the ſacrifices 270000, which multiplied by ten makes the number of perſons here mentioned.

'and

'and pure. For all leprous persons,—and all who are under 'any kind of defilement, are excluded from this sacrifice, as 'are also the strangers that come up to worship [e].'

The concluding sentence of this passage is a proof, that some strangers, Greeks, as St. John calls them, ch. xii. 20. did come up to the Jewish feasts. These are the persons, who are called *devout men*, and *men that fear God*. They are also termed proselytes of the gate. If they had been proselytes of righteousness, that is, circumcised, they would have had a right to eat of the passover. For so was the law: *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*, Exod. xii. 43, 44.

In another place Josephus says, that when this Cestius Gallus came to Jerusalem, a little before this very same feast of the passover, he was surrounded by the people there, to the number of three millions, who made their complaints to him against their own procurator [f] Gessius Florus: and, as Dr. Hudson has observed, this number does mightily correspond with the above-mentioned computation; for if the number of those who were clean was 2700000, it is easy to conclude, that if the unclean be added to this sum, the number of all the people might be three millions.

§ II. As there was a great resort to Jerusalem, from all parts, at the feasts, so they who resided at Jerusalem, seem to have frequented the temple very much at other times also. This appears very plainly in the Acts of the Apostles, ch. ii. 46. *And they* [all that believed] *continuing* DAILY *with one accord in the* TEMPLE.—Acts iii. 1, 2—9. *Now Peter and John went up together into the temple, at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour; and a certain man lame from his mother's womb was carried, whom they laid* DAILY *at the gate of the* TEMPLE, *which is called beautiful, to ask alms of them that entered into the temple.* —*And* ALL THE PEOPLE *saw him walking*. See ch. v. 20—25.

Josephus tells this story of Alexandra, mother of Herod's wife Mariamne. Herod lay (F) sick at Samaria, and he was thought to be near his end. 'Alexandra was at that time at 'Jerusalem, and having constant intelligence brought to her 'of his case, she endeavoured to get the two forts, which are 'in the city, into her own hands; (one is properly a guard

[e] Γινονται δ' ανδρων, ιν εκαστου δεκα δαιτυμονας θωμεν, μυριαδες εβδομηκοντα και διακοσιαι, καθαρων απαντων, και αγιων·—αλλ' ουδε τοις αλλοφυλοις, οσοι κατα θρησκειαι παρεσαν. De Bell. lib. vi. cap. 9. § 3.

[f] De Bell. lib. ii. p. 1078. 19.

(F) Year before Christ 28, vid. Basnage, Ann. P. E.

'upon

'upon the city, as the other is upon the temple;) for they 'who have theſe in their poſſeſſion, have the whole nation in 'ſubjection to them; becauſe that without theſe they cannot 'come to offer ſacrifices. But it is impoſſible for any Jew to 'omit theſe. They can ſooner ceaſe to breathe, than neglect 'the worſhip they are wont to pay to God[g].'

§ III. We had juſt now mention made of the ninth hour as one of the Jews hours of prayer. Another hour of prayer is referred to in another place. When the diſciples had been filled with the Holy Ghoſt, after our Saviour's aſcenſion, and ſpake with divers tongues, there was a reflection caſt upon them, Acts ii. 13. *Others mocking, ſaid, theſe men are full of new wine.* St. Peter confutes them in this manner, ver. 15. *For theſe are not drunken, as ye ſuppoſe, ſeeing it is but the* THIRD HOUR OF THE DAY. The argument depends on the cuſtom of the Jews, who uſed to attend their morning prayer faſting.

Joſephus ſays: 'Twice every day, in the morning and at 'the ninth hour, the prieſts perform their duty at the altar, 'and omit not the ſacrifices, though in the greateſt diſtreſs of 'a ſiege[h].' Theſe then were the two hours of performing ſacrifices at the temple: and it is likely, that a great number of devout Jews, who lived at Jeruſalem, uſually went up to the temple at thoſe hours.

§ IV. The Jews are repreſented to have had a very high veneration for the temple, as not able to hear any thing ſaid of it that was not honourable; and as ſolicitous to preſerve it from every thing which they thought a pollution of it. Acts vi. 13. *And ſet up falſe witneſſes, which ſaid, this man* [Stephen] *ceaſeth not to ſpeak blaſphemous words againſt this* HOLY PLACE, *and the law.*—Ch. xxi. 27, 28. *The Jews which were of Aſia ſtirred up all the people, and laid hands on him* [Paul], *crying out, Men of Iſrael, help: This is the man that teacheth all men every where againſt the people, and the law, and* THIS PLACE. *And farther, brought Greeks into the temple, and hath polluted this* HOLY PLACE.

I have already given in this work, from Philo and Joſephus, many evidences of the veneration the Jews of this time had for the temple. I add here one paſſage more from Philo, in which the Jewiſh reſolution to preſerve the purity of the temple, is repreſented by him in the ſtrongeſt terms that can be uſed. 'One thing, ſays he, we deſire inſtead of all others, that no

[g] Το δε ως ταυτα συνελειν εδοξεν Ιουδαιων ανδρι τω ζην ειοιμοτερον αι παραχαραξαι, η της θρησκειας, ην εις τον Θεον εισεβειν συνηθεσαν. Antiq. lib. xv. cap. 7. § 8.

[h] Αλλα δις της ημερας, πρωι τε και περι ενατην ωραν, ιερατευσιν επι τω βωμω, και μηδ', ει τι περι τας προσβολας δυσκολοι ειη, τας θυσιας παριεσθαι. Antiq. lib. xiv. cap. 4. § 2.

'novelty

'novelty be introduced into the temple, but that it be pre-
'ſerved ſuch as we have received it from our foreſathers. If
'we cannot obtain this, we yield up ourſelves to be deſtroyed,
'that we may not live to ſee a greater evil than death[i].'

We muſt purſue the ſtory of the Jews ſeizing St. Paul at Jeruſalem, though it was tranſcribed above upon another occaſion. Acts xxi. 30—32. *And all the city was moved, and the people ran together: and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple. —And as they went to kill him, tidings came to the chief captain of the band, that all Jeruſalem was in an uproar*, &c.

A ſoldier of the Roman guard at the temple had been guilty of a very indecent action there, and vented ſome rude expreſſions in the hearing of the Jews. 'At this the whole multi-
'tude was moved with indignation, and cried out, that Cu-
'manus ought to puniſh the ſoldier. But ſome young people
'and others with them of a warm diſpoſition, immediately
'made a tumult, and began to throw ſtones at the ſoldiers.
'Cumanus fearing leſt all the people ſhould make an aſſault
'upon him, ſent for more ſoldiers. When they had poſted
'themſelves in the porticos, the Jews were thrown into a pro-
'digious fright, and fled from the temple into the city. So
'great was the crowd in the paſſages, that ten thouſand were
'preſſed or trod to death[k].'

Theſe two caſes have this difference, that in the latter there had been a manifeſt affront offered to the temple; but in the former they only ſuppoſed there had been one. For the reſt, there is a great agreement: the temper of the people is much the ſame, and they were for immediately doing themſelves juſtice: and a ſtrong body of ſoldiers is brought to keep the peace.

§ V. The Jews great reſpect for the law appears in ſome texts already tranſcribed in this chapter, and in many other places of the New Teſtament, ſome of which cannot but occur to the reader's thoughts.

Not long after the juſt mentioned inſolence at the temple,
'A ſoldier having found the ſacred law in a certain village,
'tore the book to pieces and threw it into the fire. The Jews
'were hereupon no leſs aſtoniſhed than if the whole country
'had been in flames; and all with one accord, out of concern
'for their religion, as if moved by one common ſpring, flocked
'to Cumanus[l] at Cæſarea, and intreated him that the man

[i] Εν αυλι παντων αιρεμεθα, μηδεν εν τω ιερω γενεσθαι ιεωτερον, αλλα φυλαχθηναι τοιουτοι, οιον παρα των παππων και προγονων παρελαβομεν· ει δε μη πειθομεν, παραδιδομεν εαυτους εις απωλειαν, ινα μη ζωντες επιδωμεν θανατω χειρω κακον. De leg. p. 1025. E. [k] De B. J. lib. ii. cap. 12. § 1. [l] Ιουδαιοι δε, ως ολης αυτοις της χωρας καταφλεγεισης, συνεχυθησαν, και καθαπερ ορμαν τινι τη δεισιδαιμονιᾳ συνε-

'who

'who had offered this affront to God and the law might not 'go unpunished. He perceiving the multitude was not to be 'appeased unless some satisfaction were given them, ordered 'the soldier to be brought forth, and to be led through the 'crowd of his accusers, and put to death.'

§ VI. Beside the great resort to Jerusalem at the feasts, and the worship at the temple at other seasons, and the regard expressed for the temple itself and the law, we have in the New Testament frequent mention of the synagogue worship. Luke iv. 17—20. *And he [Jesus] came to Nazareth, and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias.* Acts xv. 21. *For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day.*

Nor had they only readings of the law and the prophets, but they had discourses made in their synagogues. *And when he was come into his own country, he* TAUGHT *them in their synagogue.—And straightway on the sabbath day he entered into their synagogue and* TAUGHT. Matt. xiii. 54. Mark i. 21.—*And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together [Paul and Barnabas] into the synagogue of the Jews, and so* SPAKE, *that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed,* Acts xiv. 1.

A passage or two from Josephus and Philo will confirm both these particulars. Josephus in his second book against Apion, speaking of Moses, says: 'And that men might not have the 'pretence of ignorance for their transgression, (in points he 'fore mentioned,) he gave us the law, the most excellent of 'all institutions. Nor did he appoint that it should be heard 'once only, or twice, or often, but that laying aside all other 'works we should meet together every week to hear it read, 'and gain a perfect understanding[m].'

Josephus relates a difference which happened between the Greeks and Jews at Cæsarea in the 12th year of Nero's (G) reign. The Jews presented a petition to Florus their procurator. He made them fair promises, but immediately went from Cæsarea to Sebaste, without taking care about the matter.—'The next 'day being the seventh day, as the Jews were coming to the 'SYNAGOGUE, a turbulent fellow of Cæsarea brought an earthen

κομενοι, εις εν κηρυγμα παντες εις Καισαρειαν επι Κουμανον συνεδραμον· κ. λ. Ibid. § 2.

[m] Ουδε γαρ την απ' αγνοιας υποτιμησιν ηνεσχετο καταλιπειν, αλλα και καλλιστον και αναγκαιοτατον απεδειξεν παιδευμαθων τον νομον· ουκ εισαπαξ ακροασαμενους, ουδε δις η πολλακις, αλλ' εκαστης εβδομαδος των αλλων εργων αφεμενους· επι την ακροασιν του νομου εκελευσε συλλεγεσθαι και τουτον ακριβως εκμανθανειν· p. 1378. in.

(G) A. D. 66.

'vessel,

'veſſel, and having placed it with the bottom uppermoſt, ſa-
'crificed birds as the Jews were coming in. This provoked
'the Jews extremely, to ſee their laws thus inſulted and the
'place defiled.'—It was impoſſible to compoſe them; they and the Cæſareans had a battle. Jucundus, a Roman officer who was there, came in to the aſſiſtance of the Jews, but he had but a few men with him. 'He being overpowered by the 'violence of the Cæſareans, the Jews TAKING THE LAWS with-
'drew to Narbata, a place ſixty ſtadia diſtant from Cæſarea[n].'

There ſhould be ſome evidence of their having diſcourſes made in their ſynagogues. This I ſhall give in the words of Philo.—'And from that time [the days of Moſes] to this,
'the Jews are wont to inculcate the principles of their religion
'on the ſeventh days, ſetting apart that time to the ſtudy and
'contemplation of the things of nature: for the oratories
'which are in every city, what are they but ſchools of wiſdom,
'of fortitude, ſobriety, juſtice, and piety, and of every virtue[o]?'

I believe that very few of our modern Jewiſh antiquaries are of Philo's and Joſephus's opinion, that the ſynagogue worſhip is an inſtitution of Moſes; but I think none will conteſt their authority, that the Jews frequented the ſynagogues on the ſabbath day at the time they wrote.

§ VII. When Paul had been acquitted by Gallio at Corinth, it is ſaid, Acts xviii. 18. *After this he tarried there yet a good while, and then took his leave of the brethren, and ſailed thence into Syria, and with him Priſcilla and Aquila; having ſhorn his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow. And he came to Epheſus,* ——*and from thence he ſailed to Cæſarea, and went up to Jeruſalem.* We have again mention made of this very ſame cuſtom, or one very near a-kin to it, when Paul went up to Jeruſalem ſeveral years after this; and James and all the elders that were there gave him ſome advice for the taking off the aſperſions, that had been caſt upon him by the Jews. Acts xxi. 23, 24. *Do therefore this that we ſay unto thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyſelf with them, that they may ſhave their heads.* Ver. 26. *Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himſelf with them entered into the temple, to ſignify the accompliſhment of the days of purification, until that an offering ſhould be offered for every one of them.*

n De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 14. § 5.

o Ἀφ' ὃ καὶ εἰσὶ νῦν φιλοσοφοῦσι ταῖς ἑβδόμαις Ἰουδαῖοι τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν, τὸν χρόνον ἀναθέντες ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ θεωρίᾳ τῶν περὶ φύσιν· τὰ γὰρ καθ' ἑκάστην πόλεις προσευκήρια, τί ἕτερόν ἐστιν, ἢ διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως καὶ ἀνδρίας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης εὐσεβείας τε καὶ ὁσιότητος, καὶ συμπάσης ἀρετῆς. Lib. iii. de vit. Moſ. p. 685. D.

The

The reader may do well to consult here the law of the Nazarite, as delivered by Moses, Num. vi. 13—18.

That this custom was in use among the Jews at the time of the evangelical history, is evident from what Josephus has said of Bernice. 'She was then (H) at Jerusalem performing a 'vow to God: for it is customary for those who have been 'afflicted with some distemper, or have laboured under any 'other difficulties, to make a vow, thirty days before they offer 'sacrifices, to abstain from wine, and shave the hair of their 'head [p].'

Cappell [q] indeed does make a doubt, whether the vow of the four men in the Acts, or of Bernice in Josephus, be the vow of the Nazarite. But I see no good reason for this doubt. However he allows theirs and Bernice's vow to have been of one and the same nature.

Josephus says, it was a custom to make a vow of thirty days. There is no particular time prescribed for the vow of the Nazarite in the law of Moses. And it is my opinion, that the only reason of Josephus's mentioning that particular number here was, because it happened to be the term of Bernice's vow, of which he had occasion to speak.

There may be a difficulty raised with reference to St. Paul's vow at Cenchrea; because the Jewish writers say, that a Nazarite ought not to be out of the land of Israel [r]; and in the law of Moses it is said, Num. vi. 18. *the Nazarite shall shave the head of his separation, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.* This is some difficulty: but I am very much inclined to think, that notwithstanding all their zeal, they did at this time dispense with the exactness of many things required in the law of Moses. It seems to be the necessary consequence of their living, as there now did great numbers of them, at a vast distance from Jerusalem. Was there any law more ex-

(H) A. D. 66. [p] Επεδημει δε εν τοις Ιεροσολυμοις, ευχην εκτελουσα τῳ Θεῳ· τοιουτος γε ἡ νοσῳ καταπονημενους, η τισιν αλλοις αναγκαις, εθος ευχεσθαι προ τριακοντα [illegible] μελλοιεν θυσιας, οινου [illegible] και ξυρησασθαι τας κομας. Hierosolymis quippe agebat ut vota Deo solveret: nam iis qui morbo laboraverant, [illegible] quascunque conjecti fuerant, [illegible] erat precibus vacare xxx. diebus, [illegible] victimas oblaturi essent, & vino abstinere & radere comam. De Bell. lib. [illegible] c. 15. init. Upon a review, I find my translation of this passage is somewhat different from the common interpretation; and therefore I have subjoined Dr. Hudson's version to the original. But I can see no reason why ευχεσθαι should be rendered orare, as in Rufinus's version, or precibus vacare, as in Dr. Hudson's; since they have translated ευχην εκτελουσα, ut vota deo solveret. Besides, prayer is not mentioned in the law of the Nazarite; nor is it ever reckoned up, that I know of, in the catalogue of the ten precepts and prohibitions, which belonged to the Nazarite. Vid. Reland. Ant. Heb. de personis sacris. p. 274. [q] Spicileg. in Act. Apost. xxi. 23. [r] Nec licebat Naziræo esse extra terram Israeliticam. Nazir. iii. 6. Reland. ubi supra, p. 277.

press than this? *Three times a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place that he shall choose,* Deut. xvi. 16. Exod. xxiii. 17. But this they could not do who lived in Italy or Persia.

Moreover, it seems there is a rule in the Jewish books, 'that 'they who make the vow of the Nazarite out of the land of 'Israel shall go into it to complete the 'vow.' This will go a great way toward solving the difficulty, if it will but be allowed, that this was the reason of St. Paul's great concern to *keep the next feast at Jerusalem.* Thus St. Luke's account stands, Acts xviii. 9—22, after Paul was come to Corinth.—*Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision; Be not afraid, but speak and hold not thy peace: For I am with thee; and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee.—And when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul; and brought him to the judgment seat.* Paul was now in great danger, and was delivered. *And Paul after this tarried there yet a good while, and then took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila, having shorn his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow. And he came to Ephesus, and left them there: but he himself entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews. When they desired him to stay longer time with them, he consented not: but bade them farewel, saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh* IN JERUSALEM.—*And he sailed from Ephesus. And when he had landed at Cæsarea, and gone up and saluted the church, he went down to Antioch.*

There is nothing in this relation that contradicts the supposition, that St. Paul's vow was the occasion of his going to Jerusalem at this time: or in other words, that he went thither to complete his vow and offer the appointed sacrifices; but there is a great deal to countenance it. The Lord had appeared to Paul, and promised to stand by him. Paul had actually been in a great danger, and received a very signal deliverance. It is likely, that at this season, or soon after, he made a vow; and perhaps had made the engagement to take the vow when the Lord appeared to him.

The account of his setting out from Corinth and going to Syria begins with the mention of the vow; and Paul makes all possible expedition to get to Jerusalem. When he comes thither he makes no long stay: and the *saluting the church* could not be the principal end of this journey, for that imports no

[s] Si quis voviſſet Nazireatum extra terram, proficiſci debuit in terram, & illic votum implere. Eduioth. iv. 11. apud Reland. ubi ſupra.

more

more than a compliment of civility. St. Luke it is true does not mention expreſsly any thing which St. Paul did at Jeruſalem beſide ſaluting the church: but there was no neceſſity he ſhould. The occaſion of his going thither appears in the beginning of the account. And it is likely, that this was then ſo well underſtood that he could not be more particular without an unneceſſary repetition. Throw away this deſign, and St. Luke has been guilty of a very great omiſſion: and though Paul was in great haſte to get to Jeruſalem, there is no hint at all what was aimed at in the journey. Take in this deſign, and then we have here a complete ſtory.

It is true St. Paul ſays: *I muſt by all means keep* THIS FEAST *that cometh in Jeruſalem.* But the feaſt time was not the only reaſon, becauſe Paul did not keep every feaſt there. There was ſome particular inducement to this feaſt, which ſeems to me to be this: St. Paul was obliged, on account of his vow, to go to Jeruſalem about this time; and a feaſt then approaching, it was certainly moſt eligible to be there at that ſeaſon.

I have taken no notice of Grotius's[s] opinion, who thought it was Aquila and not Paul who had this vow at Cenchrea: becauſe, though there may be ſome ambiguity in the words themſelves, yet the whole thread of St. Luke's narration renders it much more probable, if not certain, that St. Paul is the perſon ſpoken of. And learned men ſeem to be generally convinced of it[t].

The vow at Cenchrea, whether Paul's or Aquila's, and *the four men* at Jeruſalem *who had a vow*, are an argument that this piece of devotion was not uncommon among the Jews at this time. Joſephus has aſſured us expreſsly it was not. But there is ſomething very particular in the advice given to Paul, Acts xxi. 24. namely, that he *ſhould take theſe men and be at charges with them that they may* SHAVE THEIR HEADS. [u] This may incline us to ſuppoſe, that it was an uſual thing now for zealous men who had it in their power, to bear the whole, or at leaſt a part of the charges, which a Nazarite was to be at when his vow was expired. It ſeems to have been a pretty heavy offering which was required of them. Perhaps this might give riſe to this cuſtom: but whatever was the reaſon of it, it appears to have been a common practice.

The emperor Claudius, in the beginning of his reign, made Herod Agrippa king of all Judea. 'And he, (Joſephus ſays)

[s] In Acts xviii. 18. [t] Whitby in loc. Cleric. Hiſt. Ecc. An. 54. n. 1. Baſnage. Ann. P. E. Vol. i. p. 657. n. 6. [u] Και δαπανησον επ' αυτοις ινα ξυρησωνται την κεφαλην.

'as it was very likely for one to do, who had had ſo conſider-
'able an advancement, made all the expedition he could into
'his kingdom; and coming to Jeruſalem, he offered up
'ſacrifices of thankſgiving, and omitted nothing that was pre-
'ſcribed by the law. For which reaſon, he alſo ordered a good
'number of Nazarites to be ſhaved[x].'

And here we have a remarkable agreement between the ſtyle of St. Luke and Joſephus. St. Luke does not ſay,——*Be at charges with them*, that they may perform ſacrifices or make their offerings, but that they may SHAVE *their heads*. We learn from Joſephus, that this was the common phraſe among the Jews at this time.

We ſee likewiſe, how very proper this advice given by the brethren was to anſwer the purpoſe for which it was intended. It ſeems to have been a popular action. It was one of thoſe things by which Agrippa obliged the Jews when he took poſſeſſion of the kingdom.

§ VIII. St. Paul ſays, 2 Cor. xi. 24. *Of the Jews five times received I forty ſtripes ſave one.* The number of ſtripes limited by Moſes was forty. Deut. xxv. 3. *Forty ſtripes he may give him and not exceed.* But the Jews at this time underſtood themſelves to be confined to thirty-nine. For ſo Joſephus gives us this law of Moſes: 'He that acts contrary hereto, let him re-
'ceive forty ſtripes wanting one[y] from the public officer.'

§ IX. We have in the New Teſtament divers examples of a ſtrange kind of zeal, ſometimes called, I think, by learned men, 'private zeal.' The Jews ſeem not to have made any ſcruple at all of putting a man to death without any the leaſt form of a legal proceſs, if he had ſaid or done any thing which they judged a diminution of their religion. There were ſeveral attempts of this kind made upon the life of our Saviour, Luke iv. 28, 29. John viii. 59. We have many inſtances of ſuch attempts made upon Paul.—*And when the Jews* LAID WAIT for him,—*he purpoſed to return through Macedonia*, Acts xx. 3. This deſign was concerted by them in Greece. Afterwards when he was at Jeruſalem, *The Jews which were of Aſia ſtirred up all the people, and laid hands on him.—And as they were about to* KILL *him, tidings came unto the chief captain of the band, that all Jeruſalem was in an uproar*, ch. xxi. 27—31.

The next day after this popular tumult, that the chief captain *might know the certainty wherefore he was accuſed, he called*

x Διο και Ναζιραιων ξυρασθαι διελαξε πολλα συγχας. Joſ. Ant. l. xix. c. 6. init.
y Ο δε παρα τουτα ποιησας, πληγας μια λιπουσας τεσσαρακοντα τω δημοσιω ραβδω λαβων. Ant. l. iv. c. 8. § 21.

the

the chief prieſts and the whole council together, and had Paul examined before them. But a diſſenſion ariſing amongſt them, he took Paul from them and brought him again into the caſtle.

The Jews obſerving this, and finding they were not like to obtain a ſentence with the expedition they wiſhed for, and fearing poſſibly they ſhould never get ſuch an one as they deſired; *When it was day certain of them banded together, and bound themſelves under a curſe, ſaying, that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. And they were more than forty which had made this conſpiracy. And they came to the chief prieſts and elders, and ſaid, we have bound ourſelves under a great curſe, that we will eat nothing till we have ſlain Paul. Now therefore, ye with the council ſignify to the chief captain, that he bring him down to you to-morrow, as though ye would inquire ſomething more perfectly concerning him: and we, or ever he come near, are ready to kill him*, Acts xxiii. 10—15.

Here are forty men who enter into a conſpiracy to take away Paul's life in a clandeſtine manner; and they make no ſcruple to declare it to the council, relying upon their approbation. And it is plainly implied, that they entered readily into the meaſures they were to take for the accompliſhing this vile deſign.

They were now diſappointed by the vigilance of Lyſias, who was chief captain at Jeruſalem under Felix. But no ſooner was Feſtus come into the province but they renew the ſame deſign. And, it is likely, they hoped to have ſurprized their new governor. It was very fit he ſhould be gracious at his firſt arrival; and how could he ſuſpect any harm, who was as yet a ſtranger among them? *Now when Feſtus was come into the province, after three days he aſcended from Cæſarea to Jeruſalem. Then the* HIGH PRIEST AND THE CHIEF OF THE JEWS *informed him againſt Paul, and beſought him, and deſired favour againſt him that he would ſend for him to Jeruſalem,* LAYING WAIT IN THE WAY TO KILL HIM, Acts xxv. 1—3.

If we had remaining any conſiderable number of the Jewiſh writers who flouriſhed about this time, one might juſtly expect, (if we have here a true repreſentation of theſe facts,) to find in them ſome traces of a principle that might produce ſuch a behaviour, and poſſibly ſome examples reſembling thoſe here related. And though we have but very few of their writers come down to us, yet we have authentic evidences of a principle which obtained amongſt them at this time, and which muſt neceſſarily have carried them into the conduct here deſcribed.

We have this principle laid down in Philo: he is ſpeaking of what may be done toward a Jew that forſakes the worſhip

of the true God. 'And[z] it is highly proper,' says he, 'that 'all who have a zeal for virtue, should have a right to punish 'with their own hands without delay those who are guilty of 'this crime: not carrying them before a court of judicature, 'or the council, or any magistrate whatsoever; but to indulge 'the abhorrence of evil, the love of God their minds are filled 'with, in the immediate punishment of those impious wretches; 'reckoning that they are for that time all things, senators, 'judges, prætors, serjeants, accusers, witnesses, the laws, the 'people; that nothing hindering, they may without fear espouse 'the cause of piety.'

Philo here recommends this conduct toward those that forsake the true God; and he after this illustrates his principle from the example of Phinehas, Num. xxv. 7.

Let us next see how Josephus speaks concerning this point. When he has given the abridgment of the laws of Moses he says, that Moses having delivered them, 'called together the 'people with their wives and their children, their slaves being 'present likewise; and adjured them to observe his laws,—and 'that if any one of their kindred, or if any city should attempt 'to alter or dissolve the form of government they were under, 'they should both jointly and singly [or publickly and privately] 'take vengeance of them[a].—And if they were not able to take 'punishment of them, they should however make it appear 'that such things had not been done with their consent. And 'the multitude swore to do so.'

One would think from what Josephus here says, that they understood this obligation to extend not only to the case of idolatry, but to every branch of their laws. If they did so, it must have occasioned many extravagant attempts at this time; when, by means of the Roman power, they were unable in the way of legal processes to gratify their zeal; which, it is certain, ran very high at this time.

What Josephus says is the more to be regarded, in that these books of his Jewish Antiquities were professedly written by him for the information of the Greeks and Romans. And therefore it cannot be supposed, he would give a more offensive view of

[z] Και επιτετραφθαι δε καλον απασι τοις ζηλον εχουσιν αρετης, εκ χειρος αναπραττειν ανυπερθετως τας τιμωριας, μητε εις δικαστηριον, μητ' εις βουλευτηριον, μητε συνολως επ' αρχην αγοντας, αλλα τω παραστατι μισοπονηρω παθει και φιλοθεω καταχρησθαι προς τας των ασεβων απαραιτητους κολασεις, νομισαντας αυτους υπο του καιρου τα παντα γεγενησθαι, βουλευτας, δικαστας, στρατηγους, εκκλησιαστας, κατηγορους, μαρτυρας, νομους, δεμον, ινα μηδενος οντος εμποδων, αφοβοι συνοδω πολλη προαγωνιζωνται οσιοτητος. Philo. de Monarch. lib. i. p. 818. D. E.

[a] Αλλ' αν τε τις των εξ αιματος συγχειν και καταλυειν επιχειρη την κατ' αυτους πολιτειαν, αν τε πολις, αμυνειν αυτους και κοινη και κατ' ιδιαν· eos & publicè & privatim ulciscerentur. Hudf. vers. Antiq. l. iv. c. 8. § 45.

this

this tranſaction than was abſolutely neceſſary to ſatisfy the Jews of thoſe times, who might happen to ſee his performance.

Beſide the diſcovery theſe two writers have made of the principle itſelf, there is in Joſephus a ſtory of a conſpiracy againſt Herod which may not be omitted.

'Now Herod deviated more and more from our ancient 'cuſtoms, and by foreign inventions corrupted our conſtitu-'tion which is inviolable.—He inſtituted quinquennial games 'in honour of Cæſar, and built a theatre at Jeruſalem.—The 'magnificene of theſe works was admired by foreigners, but to 'the Jews theſe things appeared to be a breach upon thoſe 'laws which they highly reſpected.—But nothing diſguſted 'them ſo much as the trophies. Suppoſing there were images 'under the arms, they were enraged at the ſight of them, it 'being contrary to our law to worſhip any images.

'Herod knew very well how much they were provoked, 'but did not think it a proper opportunity to uſe violence; 'wherefore he endeavoured to appeaſe them by fair words; 'but in vain. For with one conſent they cried out, that they 'would ſuffer any extremity, rather than have images of men 'in their city.—Whereupon, Herod took ſome of their chief 'men into the theatre; and having ordered the ornaments to 'be taken off, when nothing appeared underneath but a naked 'piece of wood, the company ſmiled at the miſtake.

'The people ſeemed upon this to be brought into a better 'temper.—But yet ſome there were, who ſtill retained the 'offence they had taken at theſe practices: and eſteeming the 'alteration of their laws to be the beginning of all manner of 'evils,——thought it their duty to run any hazard, rather 'than ſeem to connive at Herod, who was forcibly introducing 'things contrary to their cuſtoms; and who, whilſt he had the 'name of king, was in fact the enemy of the whole nation. 'Ten men therefore of the city, binding themſelves by an 'oath to run all hazards together, armed themſelves with 'ſhort daggers, which they hid under their clothes. And 'there was a blind man, who, being exceedingly moved at 'the reports he had heard, offered himſelf, and took the ſame 'oath with them. Not that he could give them any aſſiſtance, 'but he was reſolved to ſuffer with them, if any accident befel 'them. And the zeal of this man added not a little to their 'reſolution.'

Joſephus goes on to relate, that they entered into the theatre, expecting Herod's arrival; reſolved, if poſſible, to kill Herod himſelf, or, if they failed of that, a good number of

his attendants. But one of Herod's spies getting intelligence of the design, prevented his going to the theatre. Being seized, they remitted nothing of their firmness; they did not so much as attempt to 'deny their intention; but produced the 'swords they had under their clothes, and professed that the 'conspiracy they had entered into was laudable and pious, 'and that they had not entered into it for private profit, or 'any other particular interest, but for what was much more 'valuable, the ancient customs of their nation; which it was 'fit that all should see observed, or die in the defence of [b] them.'

This conspiracy against Herod himself, with all the circumstances here mentioned, must needs satisfy all men, there is nothing improbable in the facts of this kind related by St. Luke. According to all accounts, this mad and furious zeal was not altogether so much in vogue, or at so great a height, in Herod's time, as it was afterwards.

§ X. As Judea was a Roman province, during the time of our Saviour's ministry, so there appear, in the history the evangelists have given us, many tokens of the uneasiness which this circumstance gave the Jewish nation.

The asking Jesus that question, *Is it lawful for us to give tribute to Cæsar or not?* is represented as a very subtle artifice to ensnare him, Matt. xxii. 17. Mark xii. 14. Luke xx. 21, 22. There can be no doubt, but it would have been judged an offence against the government they were subject to, to say it was not lawful; and it must have been unpopular among the Jews to affirm it was: for otherwise there would have been no extraordinary subtlety in this contrivance, which yet it is plainly intimated there was.

Moreover, a publican appears to have been a very odious and ignominious character. They are usually reckoned with harlots and sinners.

When our Lord went into the house of Zaccheus, this being done in the view of a great crowd of spectators, it is said, Luke xix. 7. that *all they who saw it, murmured, saying, that he was gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner.* They were surprized, and even offended, that Jesus, whom they seemed then to have considered as a prophet, should make a visit to a man of that character; when they themselves, it is likely, disdained to have any conversation with him.

[b] Διωμολογησαντο δε καλως και συν ευσεβεια την συνωμοσιαν αυτοις γενεσθαι, κερδους μεν ουδενος, ου δ' οικειων ενεκα παθων, το δε πλειστον υπερ των κοινων εθων, α και ποσιν η φυλαττειν η συγχωρειν προ αυτων αξιον. Ant. l. xv. c. 8. § 1—4.

It

It is certain, the paying taxes to the Romans was at this time a very heavy affliction to the Jewish nation. When Josephus gives the history of the census or enrollment of their estates by Cyrenius, after Archelaus was deposed by Augustus, and had been banished into Gaul, he says, 'that the Jews were 'at first surprized at the name of a census, but that, by the 'persuasion of Joazar the high priest, they generally acquiesced 'in it. However, Judas Gaulanites, associating to himself 'Sadduc a pharisee, excited the people to rebellion; told them 'that an assessment would introduce downright slavery, and 'persuaded them to assert their liberty.——The people heard 'their discourses with incredible pleasure. And it is impossi-'ble to represent the evils the nation has suffered, which were 'owing to these men.—For Judas and Sadduc brought in 'amongst us this fourth sect; and there being many who em-'braced their notions, they not only caused disturbances in the 'government at that time, but laid the foundation of those 'evils that followed; which indeed are owing to this princi-'ple, till then unknown [c].'

He then delivers the character and principles of the three chief and more ancient sects of the Jews; (as he calls them,) the pharisees, the sadducees, and the [d] essenes. And afterwards returns again to the men he had been speaking of before. 'Judas the Galilean was the leader of the fourth sect. In all 'other points they hold the same sentiments with the pharisees. 'But they have an invincible affection for liberty, and ac-'knowledge God alone their Lord and Governor. From this 'time the nation became infected with this distemper: and 'Gessius Florus, by abusing his power when he was president, 'threw them into despair, and provoked them to rebel against 'the Romans [e].'

What is here transcribed from Josephus is enough to convince us, that the paying tribute to the Romans must have been very grievous to the Jews, and that they who collected it for them, must have been scorned and abhorred by the people: for he says, that Judas's and Sadduc's speeches were heard by them with incredible pleasure; that their principle had caused many great evils to the nation, and that it was one ground of the war with the Romans. But I must make two or three remarks. Josephus calls this a principle till then unknown to them. But this [f] is not exactly true without some limitation. There was an oath of fidelity to Augustus and

[c] Ant. lib. xviii. c. 1. § 1. [d] Ibid. § 2, 3, 4, 5. [e] Ibid. § 6. [f] Τῷ [illegible] προτερον φιλοσοφιας τοιασδε· p. 792. 37.

Herod

Herod tendered to the Jewiſh nation, at the latter end of Herod's reign. But there were above ſix thouſand phariſees[g], who refuſed at that time to take it. Joſephus ſays, that at the perſuaſion of Joazer the high prieſt the nation generally acquieſced. Doubtleſs, the Romans carried their point, but yet a very deep grudge remained in the minds of the Jewiſh people. And the ſervice which Joazer had done the Romans upon this occaſion, rendered him ſo unpopular, that it coſt him the prieſthood. Theſe are the very words of Joſephus: 'Cyrenius 'having made a ſeizure of Archelaus's effects, and finiſhed 'the cenſus in the thirty-ſeventh year after the victory at Ac-'tium, conſtituted Ananus the ſon of Seth high prieſt, having 'taken away that dignity and honour from the high prieſt Jo-'azar; who was overpowered by the ſeditions and tumults of 'the multitude[h],' or in other words, who had been mobbed by the people.

Laſtly, Joſephus calls Judas of Galilee the head of a fourth ſect. But, though he uſes theſe words here, he oftentimes makes but three ſects of the Jews. And I think, that the ſect of the phariſees muſt generally have held the ſame notion, which he aſcribes to Judas. The ſix thouſand, who refuſed to take the oath above-mentioned, were phariſees. Joſephus owns, that Judas's followers differed from the phariſees in nothing elſe, but this one principle of an exceſſive fondneſs for liberty. He expreſsly calls Sadduc, who joined with Judas, a phariſee. And I would fain know what ſect Judas had been of before. If he had been of the ſect of the ſadducees or eſſenes, Joſephus would have ſaid ſo. The caſe ſeems to me to have been thus: Judas and they that held his principles were generally of the SECT of the phariſees, but they were not PHARISEES; becauſe this title was more peculiarly appropriated to thoſe, who had ſome diſtinction for their learning, riches, poſts, employments; or to thoſe who had a great deal of leiſure, and little elſe to do, but to make an uncommon ſhew of devotion and ſanctity. Thus, I ſuppoſe, the phariſees in general had this principle, but the common people only avowed it. Joſephus had a difficult taſk: he was concerned to ſave the honour of the ſupreme parts of the Roman government, and of the chief men of the Jewiſh nation, and particularly of thoſe properly called phariſees, of whom he was one; and to throw the blame of the war, and all their ſufferings, upon the cruelty

[g] Ant. l. xvii. p. 753. 41. [h] Ιωαζαρον τον αρχιερεα καθαιρεθεντα υπο της πληθυος αφελομενος το αξιωμα της τιμης, Ανανον τον Σεθ' ιερα αρχιερεα. Ant. l. xviii. cap. 2. in.

and

and avarice of Albinus and Geſſius Florus, the two laſt Roman procurators, and the common people among the Jews and their leaders. This part he has acted very finely. But I think, that if the phariſees had controlled this principle ſincerely, they might have ſuppreſſed it. For a proof of this, I refer the reader to the chapter of the Jewiſh ſects, where the power of the phariſees appears very evident. I ſhall here add only one paſſage more from Joſephus. 'And on the account 'of theſe, [principles] they [the phariſees] are in great autho-'rity with the people; and all parts of divine worſhip, whe-'ther prayers or ſacrifices, are performed according to their 'interpretations. This teſtimony have the cities given to their 'virtue, becauſe of their following in all things that which is 'beſt, both in their words and actions [i].'

§ XI. But though the Roman tribute was a heavy grievance, and they who collected it were much hated, yet it is evident, that many Jews were employed in this work. The publicans mentioned in the goſpels, muſt have been of the Jewiſh nation. *Then came alſo the* PUBLICANS *to be baptiſed, and ſaid unto him* [John,] *maſter, what ſhall we do?* Luke iii. 12. See Matt. xxi. 31, 32. It appears likewiſe, that ſome of the publicans in Judea were honeſt perſons, and men of ſubſtance. Such an one was Levi, or Matthew. *And Levi made him a great feaſt in his own houſe: and there was a great company of publicans and of others that ſate down with them,* Luke v. 29. See Matt. ix. 10. Mark ii. 14. Nor is there any hint of any unjuſt practices, which Levi had been guilty of in the poſt he had enjoyed. And from the great openneſs and impartiality with which the evangeliſts have written their hiſtory, it is reaſonable to conclude, there was no exception againſt Matthew's character, beſide his employment; which, undoubtedly, was not reputable. Zaccheus, when he entertained Jeſus, was certainly a thorough convert to virtue; and I think, he could not have been a very wicked man before. *And Zaccheus ſtood and ſaid,——Behold Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken any thing from any man by falſe accuſation, I reſtore him four-fold,* Luke xix. 8. According to his computation, he ſuppoſed himſelf capable of making ample reſtitution to all he had injured, out of the remaining half of his goods, and it is likely ſuppoſed he ſhould have ſomewhat left for him-

[i] Και δι' αυτα τοις τε δημοις πιθανωτατοι τυγχανουσι, και οπόσα θεια ευχων τε και ιερων ποιησεως εξεησει τη εκεινων τυχαι πρασσόμενα· ουτως τοσουτον αρετης αυτοις αι πολεις εμαρτυρησαν επιηδευσει τε επι πασιν κρεισσονος, εν τε τη διαιτη τε βιε και λογοις. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 1. § 3.

self. His unjust gains, therefore, were but a small portion of his estate.

That there were Jews who were publicans, and that some of these were honest and wealthy men, will appear from a story in Josephus. 'There lay near the Jewish synagogue at Cæsarea, 'a piece of ground in the possession of a Greek of the same 'place. The Jews had often attempted to make a purchase 'of it, and had offered a great deal more than the intrinsic 'value. But the owner refused all their offers: and, as if he 'intended to affront them, began to build workhouses on the 'ground, leaving the Jews but a very strait and narrow pas- 'sage. The warmer part of the people attempted to obstruct 'the builders. But Florus not restraining these practices by 'his authority, the chief men of the Jews, among whom was 'John the publican, not knowing well what course to take, 'wait upon Florus, and give him eight talents of silver to 'stop the building. That he might get the money into his 'hands, he promised all they desired; but having received it, 'went away from Cæsarea to Sebaste, leaving the riotous peo- 'ple to themselves, as if the Jews had only purchased a li- 'cence to quarrel.' And so it happened, the Jews and Greeks at Cæsarea had a battle, in which the former were worsted. Upon this John with twelve of the chief of the Jews go to Sebaste, and coming to Florus, 'make complaints to him 'concerning these proceedings, and intreat his assistance, 'modestly putting him in mind likewise of the [k] eight talents.'

This John must have been one of the most considerable of the Jews at Cæsarea, since he only is mentioned by name. Nor is there any thing here said of him, but what is very honourable; unless any think fit to except against the giving a bribe to a bad man, to do what is in itself just and reasonable.

There is, in the gospels, so frequent mention of publicans who were Jews, that I have been sometime inclined to think that the Roman tribute was collected for the most part by Jews. The Romans might choose this method. The Jews employed in this work became odious thereby, but the Roman government was relieved.

Josephus [l] has made mention of several Jews who were Roman knights. It is certain, that the Roman knights were the great [m] farmers and collectors of the Roman tribute. It seems to me, therefore, very probable, that those Jews had merited

[k] De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 14. § 4, 5.
[l] De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 14. § 9.
[m] Certe huic homini spes nulla salutis esset, si publicani, hoc est, si equites Romani judicarent. Cic. in Verr. lib. iii. cap. 62. n. 168.

the

the honour of knighthood by their good ſervices in ſome part of the revenue.

I do not pretend to be maſter of the Roman method of collecting taxes, but it appears to me not unlikely, that in moſt provinces the natives were employed in the towns as the under collectors, and that the receivers general or other ſuperior officers only were Romans. It is plain, that in the province of Sicily, in the time of the republic, when a new aſſeſſment was made there, (as it was every fifth year,) Sicilians were appointed to be the under cenſors[n]. The publicans were far from being beloved in any province[o]; the Romans might therefore judge it prudent to employ ſome natives in collecting taxes: and it is probable, that in all places ſome would be found, who were willing to make an advantage of the ſubjection of their country, and accept places under the Romans their maſters.

CHAP. X.

ROMAN CUSTOMS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. *The Romans uſed the queſtion.* II. *Examined by ſcourging.* III. *Unlawful to ſcourge a Roman,* IV. *Eſpecially uncondemned.* V. *Lyſias's power at Jeruſalem.* VI. *Of St. Paul's citizenſhip.* VII. *This privilege bought with a great ſum.* VIII. *Accuſations not to be heard in the abſence of the accuſed perſon.* IX. *Of St. Paul's impriſonment.* X. *Priſoners ſent to Rome from the provinces.* XI. *Delivered there to the captain of the guard.*

IN the hiſtory of St. Paul, there are many Roman cuſtoms expreſsly mentioned or alluded to. I ſhall here endeavour to take ſome notice of all thoſe we meet with, from the time of his being apprehended at Jeruſalem to his confinement at Rome; excepting only thoſe, which have been already obſerved in the chapter of the State of the Jews in Judea.

When Lyſias, the chief captain, had reſcuſed Paul out of the hands of the Jewiſh multitude, *he commanded him to be brought into the caſtle, and bade that he ſhould be examined by ſcourging, that he might know wherefore they cried ſo againſt him. And as they bound him with thongs, Paul ſaid unto the centurion*

[n] Cic. in Verr. lib. ii. cap. 53. n. 131. & ſeq.

[o] Sic porro noſtros homines diligunt, ut his SOLIS neque publicanus, neque negotiator odio ſit. Ibid. cap. 3. n. 7.

that

that ſtood by, Is it lawful for you to ſcourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? Acts xxii. 24, 25.

Three or four things are here implied: that it was cuſtomary for the Romans to uſe the queſtion or torture, for the diſcovery of crimes; that this was ſometimes done by beating or whipping; that it was unlawful to ſcourge a Roman, eſpecially uncondemned.

§ I. It was cuſtomary for the Romans to make uſe of the queſtion for the diſcovery of crimes. There are many inſtances of it about this time, in the hiſtory of the Roman [a] emperors. Nor had the Jews any particular reaſon to complain of the Romans putting this in practice in their country, provided it was not done when there were no grounds of ſuſpicion, ſince Herod the great had openly practiſed it there [b] before.

§ II. This was ſometimes done by whipping or beating. There were ſeveral ways of examining perſons, ſome were uſed to citizens or freemen, others were reckoned [c] ſervile. But that ſcourging was practiſed in this caſe, is evident from an example I give of it from Tacitus in the reign of [d] Nero. Epicaris, a woman, among other tortures was ſo examined. And it is obſervable that ſhe was not then a ſlave. There are other inſtances in [e] Grotius. It is likely that a ſtick was [f] made uſe of in examining a citizen, rods for others.

§ III. Thirdly, It is intimated, that it was unlawful to ſcourge a Roman: which thing is alſo taken notice of in the account of the treatment of Paul and Silas at Philippi, Acts xvi. 22—37. Cicero ſays, it was a crime to bind or whip a Roman [g] citizen. It is one of his charges againſt Verres, that he had openly whipped a Roman at Meſſina who had claimed the privilege of the city, and when they were going to inflict this puniſhment upon him, cried out to the officers; (much after the ſame manner that Paul is ſaid to have done;) *I am a Roman*

a Nihil enim exprimi quæſtione potuit, Suet. in vit. Auguſt. 19. Diverſi interrogantur.——Tum exorta ſuſpicio, quia non congruentia reſponderant: inditaque vincla: Et tormentorum aſpectum ac minas non tulere. Tacit. Ann. 15, 56, & paſſim.

b Antiq. lib. xvi. cap. 10. § 2—5.

c Et Q. Gallium prætorem—ſervilem in modum torſit: ac fatentem nihil, juſſit occidi. Sueton. Aug. c. 27. d Atque interim Nero recordatus Voluſii Proculi indicio Epicharim attineri, ratuſque muliebre corpus impar dolori, tormentis dilacerari jubet. At illam non VERBERA, non ignes, non ira eo acrius torquentium ne a femina ſpernerentur, pervicere quin abjecta denegaret—clariore exemplo LIBERTINA mulier——cum ingenui & viri & equites Romani ſenatoreſque intacti tormentis, chariſſima ſuorum quiſque pignorum proderent. Ann. xv. c. 57.

e Ad Matt. c. xxvii. 19. f Nullam exiſtimationis infamiam avunculus tuus pertimeſcat ictibus fuſtium ſubjectus ob crimen quæſtione habita. L. Nullam. c. ap. Grot. ibid. g Facinus eſt, vinciri Civem Romanum: Scelus verberari. In Verr. l. v. n. 170.

citizen.

citizen[h]. Here again it is to be observed, that a citizen of Rome, if he had committed a fault that deserved it, might be beaten with a stick, but might not be whipped with rods[i].

§ IV. But it was more especially unlawful to punish a man uncondemned, or before he had been convicted. This the magistrates at Philippi did, but they soon repented of it. It is said to have been one of the laws of [k] the twelve tables, that no man should be put to death before he had been tried. According to [l] Dionysius, this was a law among the Romans long before the twelve tables were composed. Indeed I think, it must be a law with all people who have any sense of justice or equity. Cicero lays it down as an undoubted maxim, that no sentence of condemnation ought to be pronounced before a cause had been heard[m].

§ V. From Lysias's order to examine St. Paul, and from other things done by him at Jerusalem, it may be inferred that he had there some sort of jurisdiction. It appears from a passage alleged by me above (A) from Marcianus, that it was usual for presidents of provinces to delegate part of their power and authority to under officers. For this reason Cicero advises his brother, then president of Asia, not only to observe himself the rules of justice, but to have a strict eye upon all the [n] ministers of his government, and to be very circumspect in the choice of persons to whom he committed any [o] power. And it appears from a passage of Josephus already (B) transcribed, that there were at Cæsarea officers under Felix who had the power of whipping offenders.

[h] Cædebatur virgis in medio foro Messanæ civis Romanus, judices; cum interea nullus gemitus, nulla vox alia istius miseri, inter dolorem crepitumque plagarum audiebatur, nisi hæc, CIVIS ROMANUS SUM. Hac se commemoratione civitatis omnia verbera depulsurum cruciatumque a corpore dejecturum arbitrabatur. Ibid. n. 162. O nomen dulce libertatis! O jus eximium nostræ civitatis! O lex Porcia, legesque Semproniæ!——Huccine tandem omnia reciderunt; ut civis Romanus in provincia populi Romani,—deligatis in foro virgis cæderetur? n. 163. Oblitosne igitur hos putatis esse, quemadmodum sit iste solitus virgis plebem Romanam concidere? In Verr. lib. i. n. 122. [i] Ex quibus causis liber fustibus cæditur, ex his servus flagellis cædi. Lib. x. in pr. ff. de pœnis.

[k] Interfici indemnatum quemcunque hominem, etiam xii. Tabularum decreta vetuerant. Hæc Salvianus episcopus Massiliensis de judicio & providentia. Fragment. xii. Tab. Tit. 27. § 1. [l] Τȣς νομȣς παρεχομενοι τȣς ȣκ εωντας ακριτον αποκτεινειν ȣδενα. Antiq. Rom. lib. iii. c. 22. p. 153. v. 7. [m] Nam causâ cognitâ multi possunt absolvi: incognitâ quidem condemnari nemo potest. In Verr. lib. i. n. 25. (A) p. 74. note [s]. [n] Nequaquam satis esse, ipsum hasce habere virtutes, sed esse circumspiciendum diligenter, ut in hac custodia provinciæ non te unum, sed omnes ministros imperii tui, sociis, & civibus & reipublicæ præstare videare. Ad Quint. Fratr. lib. i. cap. 3. [o] Sed si quis est, in quo jam offenderis, de quo aliquid senseris: huic nihil credideris, nullam partem existimationis tuæ commiseris. Ibid. cap. 4. (B) p. 184.

I have

I have in answer to Tertullus's accusation given Lysias (c) a great character. But perhaps some may think, that this order for examining St. Paul by scourging is unjustifiable. They may be of opinion, that here were not sufficient grounds of suspicion to put him to the question. To this I say: If I should here abandon Lysias, my apology for him will in some respect be strengthened by it. If Lysias here strained a point in complaisance to the Jewish multitude, and bore too hard upon his prisoner, Tertullus's complaints will appear the more unreasonable. But I am still inclined to think that Lysias acted honestly herein. Paul was a stranger to him, and he could not but pay some regard to the vehement and general clamour of the people of the city in which he resided, and which was the metropolis of the province. Any man in the same case with Lysias would have been apt to conclude, that Paul must have committed some offence or other when *they cried so against him.* The method of enquiry he had appointed was not fit to be practised upon a Roman; but Lysias did not then know that Paul was a Roman. In other respects it must have been unexceptionable; for I cannot but think, it was a more gentle way of examining than some others then in use.

§ VI. After St. Paul had been beaten at Philippi, he complained of the injustice done him because he was a Roman. As they were binding him at Jerusalem, he claimed the privilege of a Roman citizen, and it was granted him; for it follows: *When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying; Take heed what thou dost, for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him; Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, with a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born. Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him,* Acts xxii. 26—29.

St. Paul therefore does expresly affirm that he was a Roman. Nor ought it to be thought strange that a Jew should be a citizen of Rome. There were many such instances about this time. Julius Cæsar bestowed the freedom of the city upon Antipater[p], the father of Herod the great, in consideration of services he had done him. Philo says that there was a great number of Jews in Augustus's time at Rome, who had been taken captives and carried thither, and who had obtained their

(c) p. 70.

p Πολιτειά τε αυτον τῃ Ρωμαιων ἐτιμησεν. Joseph. de Bell. lib. i. p. 978, v. 29.

freedom

freedom from their masters [q]. Josephus complains loudly, as well as very justly, of Florus the last procurator of Judea, 'That he had been guilty of an unheard of cruelty, and what 'had never been done before, when he whipped before his 'tribunal, and crucified men of the equestrian rank. For, 'says he, though their extraction was Jewish their quality [r] was 'Roman.' And our historian Josephus, who was a Jewish priest, received the freedom of the city from Vespasian after the war was finished, as he has assured us himself [s].

But though there is no improbability but that St. Paul might be a Roman citizen, yet it has been a question how he came by this privilege. Some learned [t] men are of opinion that Tarsus was a Roman colony, and that St. Paul was therefore a citizen of Rome by virtue of his nativity at Tarsus. But it will be worth our while to take a view of St. Luke's account of this matter. Lysias took Paul out of the hands of the Jews. *And as Paul was to be led into the castle, he said unto the chief captain, May I speak unto thee? Who said, Canst thou speak Greek? Art thou not that Egyptian—? But Paul said, I am a man which am a Jew of Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city: and I beseech thee, suffer me to speak unto the people,* Acts xxi. 37—39. In his speech, St. Paul *tells the Jews, I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia,* chap. xxii. 3.

When the people had interrupted Paul's speech, *the chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging,* ch. xxii. 23, 24. The chief captain therefore did not suspect as yet that Paul was a citizen of Rome, though he had been told by Paul he was of Tarsus. St. Paul had also said the same thing at the beginning of his speech to the Jews: but I do not insist upon that; for though it is likely the chief captain stood by, I suppose he did not understand Paul, his speech being made in the Hebrew tongue.

It cannot be said, that the chief captain bade that he should be examined with scourging, though he knew Paul to be a Roman: because Lysias does not appear to be one of those fierce officers, that have no regard to laws. Quite the contrary: as soon as Paul had claimed his privilege, *then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him.*

[q] De legat. p. 1014. C. E.

[r] Ων ει και το γενος Ιουδαιων, αλλα το γουν αξιωμα Ρωμαικον ἀν. Jos. de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 14. fin.

[s] De vita. p. 945. 28.

[t] Baron. Ann. A. 58. n. 147, 148. Hamm. ad Acts xxii. 27. Tillemont memoir. Ecclesi. Witsius de vita Pauli. § 1. n. 6.

Then the chief captain came, and ſaid unto him; Tell me, art thou a Roman? He ſaid, Yea. If Tarſus had been a town of Roman citizens, St. Paul having before told the chief captain that he was of Tarſus, the queſtion now put would not have been, Art thou a Roman? but, Art thou really of Tarſus?

The ſequel of this diſcourſe affords more proof. *The chief captain anſwered, With a great ſum obtained I this freedom.* Lyſias having purchaſed this privilege with a great ſum, and obſerving nothing conſiderable in Paul's perſon or mien, and ſuppoſing therefore that he had no money to ſpare, he ſtill makes a doubt of the truth of his claim. This anſwer of Lyſias had been altogether impertinent, if Tarſus had been a town of Roman citizens. *And Paul ſaid, But I was free born:* a plain indication that it was a privilege derived to him from his parents. And on this account the oppoſition between the chief captain's purchaſe and Paul's free birth is ſtrong and beautiful. If Paul's freedom had been owing to his nativity in any place, the place would certainly have been mentioned in this conference between him and Lyſias.

And it is obſervable, that St. Luke has often mentioned Tarſus, but never calls it a colony or municipium, as he would have done in all probability if it had been ſo. Upon the whole I think it very plain, that St. Luke does not ſuppoſe Paul to have been a Roman by virtue of his birth at Tarſus.

Let us now conſider the external evidence, and enquire what privileges the Roman or Greek authors aſcribe to Tarſus. Strabo ſays, The people of Tarſus were much given to the ſtudy of philoſophy, and all other parts of polite literature: 'That Tarſus was very populous, and reckoned the metropolis 'of the country[u];' but he no where ſays it was a colony or municipium. It has been thought by ſome that Auguſtus conferred upon them the honour of the citizenſhip of Rome, beſide other privileges, as a reward for their attachment to the intereſt of Julius Cæſar, and as a recompence for the hardſhips they ſuffered from [x] Caſſius. But there is no proof of this. None of the authors who have mentioned theſe matters ſay any thing of the citizenſhip. Appian ſays, 'that Mark Antony 'gave liberty and immunity from taxes to Laodicea and Tar- 'ſus, and ordered by a ſpecial decree, that all citizens of Tar- 'ſus, that had been taken captive and ſold for ſlaves[y], ſhould

[u] Τοσαυτη δε τοις ενθαδε ανθρωποις σπουδη προς τε φιλοσοφιαν, και την αλλην εγκυκλιον απασαν παιδειαν γεγονεν——και τ' αλλα τ' ευανδρει, και πλειστον διαλαι, του της μητροπολεως επεχουσα λογον. Lib. xiv. p. 991. A. B. [x] Vid. Tillemont Memoires Eccleſiaſtiques: St. Paul. Article premier. [y] Λαοδικειας δε και Ταρ-

'be

'be ſet at liberty.' Lucian ſays, 'that at the requeſt of Athe-'nodorus of Tarſus, the ſtoic philoſopher, and preceptor of 'Auguſtus, the city of Tarſus obtained freedom from tribute[z].' Pliny calls[a] Tarſus a free city: which is an inconteſtable proof it was not a Roman colony, for then he would have called it ſo. When Ammianus Marcellinus[b] mentions Tarſus, he ſpeaks of it only as a conſiderable city of Cilicia. Ulpian ſays there were two colonies in Cilicia; but Tarſus is not one of thoſe which he mentions[c].

Tillemont[d] refers to Baron Spanheim's Treatiſe of Medals, as the ſource of the proofs he brings for the citizenſhip of Tarſus. But though the Baron did then ſuppoſe Tarſus had this privilege, yet, I think, the arguments he uſes are no proof of it, as he himſelf was ſatisfied[e] afterwards. The only proof he then had of it was a medal of Gordian, in which[f] Tarſus is ſtyled a colony, and a free city. But though it were a colony then, it is no evidence that it was ſo when St. Paul was born; or that it was made a colony by Auguſtus. And after all, the medal on which Spanheim relied, does not ſtyle Tarſus a colony, but only a free city, as he found afterwards[g].

Upon the whole, therefore, St. Luke's account is fully confirmed by the beſt authorities. Tarſus was no *mean city*, but it was not a municipium, or town of Roman citizens.

Poſſibly ſome may enquire, If St. Paul was not a Roman citizen, or entitled to ſome other peculiar privileges, by his being born at Tarſus, to what purpoſe did he make any mention of it? I anſwer, every one in St. Paul's circumſtances is naturally led to mention the place of his nativity or reſidence, eſpecially when he is aſked who he is. But St. Paul's inno-

σιας ελευθερας ηφιει και αλελεις φορων, και Ταρσεων τας περαμενας απελυε της δηλειας διαλαμβανει. Appian. de Bell. Civ. l. v. p. 1077. ed. Amſtel. Oct. 1670.

[z] Αθηνοδωρος, Ταρσευς, ςωικος, ος και διδασκαλος εγενετο Καισαρος Σεβαςω θεω, υφ' ε η Ταρσεων πολις και φορων εκυφισθη, κ. λ. Vol. 2. edit. Amſt. p. 473. Macrob.

[a] Sydnus Tarſum, liberam urbem, procul a mari ſecans. Plin. l. v. c. 27. in.

[b] Ciliciam vero Tarſus nobilitat urbs perſpicabilis, L. xiv. c. 8. [c] Eſt & in Bithynia (colonia) Apamena, & in Ponto Sinopenſis. Eſt & in Cilicia Selinus & Trajanopolis. L. 1. § 10, 11. ff. de cenſibus. [d] Ubi ſupra. [e] See his Orbis Romanus. p. 141, &c. The edition which Mr. Tillemont refers to of Spanheim de Præſtantia, &c. is the quarto edit. Amſt. 1671. His Orbis Romanus was publiſhed at London, 1703. [f] Iis vero liberæ Ciliciæ locis adſcribenda caput ejuſdem provinciæ Tarſus, juxta inſignem Gordiani nummum (in Cimel. Reg. Gall.) ΚΟΛ. ΕΛΕΥΘ. ΤΑΡC. qui inſuper Romanam Coloniam eandem extitiſſe arguit. Span. de Præſt. p. 785. [g] Ipſum vero ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΑΣ ſeu liberæ nomen, quod eidem largitur Plinius (Lib. v. c. 27.) huic Ciliciæ metropoli in antiquo Regiæ Gallorum Gazæ (Specim. Morell. Tab. iv.) nummo ſub Caracalla percuſſo tribuitur; non vero, quod Cl. Patini fide olim credideram, Coloniæ itidem appellatio. Immo ut dies diem docet, & ſi Romana Colonia ſub primis Cæſaribus, quod de ea nuſpiam legitur, evaſiſſet eadem Tarſus; haud ideo oppidum civium Romanorum——extitiſſet. Spanh. Orb. Rom. p. 141.

cence did not depend upon his being a Roman, but a Jew: and therefore this laſt, together with the place of his birth, is what he here mentions. The outcry, when St. Paul was ſeized, was, *Men of Iſrael help, this is the man that teacheth all men every where againſt the people;—And farther brought Greeks alſo into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place.——And all the city was moved, and the people ran together; and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple; and forthwith the doors were ſhut,* Acts xxi. 28—30.

The Jews which were of Aſia, who began the diſturbance, knew well enough that Paul was a Jew; but the cry being, that the *temple had been polluted*, and Paul being taken by them, and drawn out of the temple, it is likely, a great part of the multitude thought St. Paul had been a gentile, who had gone beyond the bounds preſcribed to ſuch: which when any one but a Jew had done, he was liable to the heavieſt puniſhment. Therefore, when the chief captain aſked him who he was, he told him he was a Jew of Tarſus; which was enough to ſatisfy him, the Jews had no right to uſe him as they did, for going into the temple. And it is obſervable, that immediately upon St. Paul's beginning to ſpeak: *Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence; when they heard that he ſpake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more ſilence.* This for the preſent allayed the heat, becauſe it was a ſtrong preſumption, that he was not a gentile.

St. Paul therefore had no reaſon, at this time, to tell them he was a Roman citizen; but it was of the laſt importance, to aſſure both the chief captain and the multitude that he was a Jew.

St. Luke has not informed us, how St. Paul's citizenſhip was derived to him. He *was free born:* but what was the original of this privilege does not appear. It ſeems to me, however, not unlikely, that ſome of St. Paul's anceſtors had obtained it for ſervices they had done the Roman commonwealth in [h] the wars. The Jews had formerly ſerved the kings of Syria in their armies, and afterwards the Romans. But they had been long ſince diſcharged from that ſervice, upon the account of ſome religious ſcruples which they had. There are in Joſephus the copies of theſe diſcharges given them at Epheſus, Delus, and other places. One of theſe diſcharges runs thus: 'Lucius [i] Lentulus the conſul declared: "I have "diſmiſſed from the ſervice the Jewiſh Roman citizens, who

h Vid. Grot. ad Act. xxii. 28.

i Λευκιος δε Λεντυλος υπατος ειπεν· Πολλας Ρωμαιων Ιουδαιους, ιερα Ιουδαικα εχοντας και φοιτωντας εν Εφεσω, προ τυ βηματος δεισιδαιμονιας ενεκα γραπτειας απελυσα. Ant. l. xiv. c. 10. § 13.

"obſerve

"observe the rites of the Jewish religion at Ephesus." Again, the decree of the Delians is thus: 'Bæotus being archon, the 'order of the prætors. Marcus Piso the ambassador, who 'was also the officer appointed to raise soldiers, being in our 'city, having called together us, and a sufficient number of 'other citizens, gave orders, that if there were any Jews Ro-'man citizens, no man should disturb any of them on the 'account of military service; for as much as Cornelius Len-'tulus, the consul, had dismissed the Jews from the military 'service on account of their religion[k].'

This may give ground to suppose, that a good number of Jews, who served the Romans in some auxiliary armies, had obtained the freedom of the city. But whether any of St. Paul's ancestors deserved it in this, or some other way, I do not determine, nor is it necessary we should.

§ VII. We have sufficiently considered St. Paul's citizenship. We must not, however, pass by what the chief captain said to him: *With a great sum, obtained I this freedom.* It was often given to men and cities as a reward[l] of some special merit or services: but that it was also bought, and that at a great price, appears from a passage of Dio, which I leave with the reader. 'He [Claudius] took away the freedom of the city from many 'who were unworthy of it, and he gave it without any reason 'to others; sometimes to single persons, at other times to 'great numbers together. For Romans having the preference 'above strangers, there were many who begged the citizenship 'of the emperor; and others who bought it of Messalina, or 'the freed men. By which means this privilege, which had 'been bought formerly at a great price, became so cheap, that 'merry people would say, a man might be made a Roman 'citizen for a few pieces of broken glass[m].'

§ VIII. We have already had occasion to observe the justice of the Roman laws, in forbidding to punish any man, till he had been tried and convicted. We have something farther observable in the conduct of Felix and Festus, who refused to give Paul's cause a hearing unless both parties, namely St. Paul and his accusers, were present. Lysias sent Paul under

[k] Ibid. § 14.

[l] —Eoque Romana civitas olim data, cum id rarum, nec nisi virtuti pretium esset. Tacit. Ann. lib. iii. c. 40.

[m] Συχνυς δε δη και αλλυς αναξιυς της πολιτειας απηλασε, και ετεροις αυτην και πανυ αναιδην, τοις μεν κατ' ανδρα, τοις δε και αθροοις, εδιδυ· επειδαν γαρ εν πασιν, ως ειπειν, οι Ρωμαιοι των ξενων προετετιμηντο, πολλοι αυτην παρα τε εκεινυ αυτυ ητυντο, και παρα της Μεσσαλινης των τε Καισαρειων ωνυτο· και δια τυτο μεγαλων το πρωτον χρηματων πραθεισα, επειθ' υτως υπο της ευχερειας επευωνηθη, ωςε και λογοποιηθηναι, οτι κ' αν υαλινα τις σκευη συντετριμμενα δω τινι, πολιτης εςαι. Dio. l. lx. p. 676. C. D.

a strong guard from Jerusalem to Cæsarea. *Who when they came to Cæsarea, and delivered the epistle to the governor,* [*Felix*] *presented Paul also before him. And when the governor had read the letter, he asked of what province he was. And when he understood that he was of Cilicia: I will hear thee, said he, when thine accusers also are come,* Acts xxiii. 33—35. xxiv. 7, 8. When the Jews at Jerusalem *desired favour of Festus against Paul, Festus answered, that Paul should be kept at Cæsarea, and that he himself would depart shortly thither. Let them therefore, said he, which among you are able, go down with me, and accuse this man, if there be any wickedness in him,* ch. xxv. 4, 5. This is somewhat more particularly related, when *Festus declared Paul's cause unto the king,* [Agrippa,] *saying, There is a certain man left in bonds by Felix. About whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and the elders of the Jews informed me, desiring to have judgment against him. To whom I answered,* IT IS NOT THE CUSTOM OF THE ROMANS, *to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers* FACE *to* FACE, *and* HAVE LICENCE TO ANSWER FOR HIMSELF *concerning the crime laid against him,* ver. 14—16.

Cicero, in his orations against Verres, the infamous prætor of Sicily, continually represents these as the most illegal and inhuman proceedings, that he received accusations against men when they were absent, and condemned[n] them without a hearing. And Tertullian makes mention of a Roman president, who, when a christian was sent to him with a libel, perceiving there had been some unfair dealing, tore the libel to pieces, and said, he should not act contrary to law, and hear a man without[o] his accuser.

§ IX. We will now proceed to St. Paul's imprisonment. I have deferred it till now, that we might take in at once the whole account of this matter, from his being taken into custody at Jerusalem, to his two years confinement at Rome.

When Lysias heard that all Jerusalem was in an uproar, he *immediately took soldiers, and ran down to them, and when they saw him, they left beating Paul. Then the chief captain came near, and took him, and commanded him to be bound with*

n Iste non dubitat jubere nomen deferri: & tum primùm opinor istum absentis nomen recepisse. Res clara Siciliâ totâ, propter cælati argenti cupiditatem reos fieri rerum capitalium: neque solùm reos fieri, sed etiam absentes. In Verr. lib. iv. c. 40, 41. Deinde crimen sine accusatione, sententia sine consilio; damnatio sine defensione. Lib. v. n. 23. Sed quid ego hospitii jura in hac tam immani bellua commemoro? qui Sthenium——absentem in reos retulerit, causâ indictâ, capite damnavit. Ibid. n. 109.

o Pudens etiam missum ad se christianum, in elogio concussione ejus intellecta, dimisit, scisso eodem elogio, sine accusatore negans se auditurum hominem, secundum mandatum. Ad Scapulam. c. 4.

two

two chains, Acts xxi. 32, 33. *On the morrow, becauſe he would know the certainty, wherefore he was accuſed of the Jews, he looſed him from his bands, and commanded the chief prieſts, and all their council, to appear: and brought Paul down, and ſet him before them*, ch. xxii. 30. St. Paul was removed from Jeruſalem to Cæſarea, and *Felix commanded him to be kept in Herod's judgment-hall.* The chief prieſt and others went down thither, and accuſed him before Felix. After this hearing, *He* [Felix] *commanded a centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he ſhould forbid none of his acquaintance to miniſter, or come unto him. But after two years, Porcius Feſtus came into Felix's room: and Felix being willing to ſhew the Jews a pleaſure, left Paul bound*, ch. xxiv. 23—27. King Agrippa having ſaid to Paul, *Almoſt thou perſuadeſt me to be a chriſtian*; *Paul ſaid, I would to God that not only thou, but alſo all that hear me this day, were both almoſt, and altogether ſuch as I am, except theſe bonds*, ch. xxvi. 29. *And when he had thus ſpoken, the king roſe up,——and they talked between themſelves, ſaying, this man doth nothing worthy of death or of bonds.* After this St. Paul was carried to Italy, *and when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the priſoners to the captain of the guard: but Paul was ſuffered to dwell by himſelf with a ſoldier that kept him*, ch. xxviii. 16. *After three days Paul called the chief of the Jews together. And he ſaid unto them,——For the hope of Iſrael I am bound with this chain*, ver. 20.——*And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging*, ver. 23. *And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired houſe, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching thoſe things which concern the Lord Jeſus Chriſt with all confidence, no man forbidding him*, ver. 30, 31. St. Paul makes mention of his bonds in ſeveral of his epiſtles; but thoſe places I need not tranſcribe.

We have obſerved from Cicero, that it was unlawful to bind, as well as to ſcourge a Roman citizen: and it is ſaid, that *the chief captain was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and becauſe he had* BOUND *him*; and yet St. Paul was ſeveral years in bonds. But there is no inconſiſtence in this. A citizen might not be bound with thongs as a puniſhment, or in order to be ſcourged: but a Roman citizen might certainly be kept in cuſtody, upon juſt ſuſpicions, or when there were any credible accuſations brought againſt him. And there was nothing at all illegal in the way in which St. Paul was confined. There are many inſtances in the Roman authors,

of knights and ſenators of Rome, who were chained in the ſame manner that Paul was [q].

In this hiſtory of St. Paul there is mention ſometimes of *chains* in the plural number, and at other times of *chain* in the ſingular. When the chief captain *took him* from the Jews, he *commanded*[r] *him to be bound with two chains*, Acts xxi. 33. Whether St. Paul continued to be bound with two chains ſo long as he was kept in Judea I cannot ſay; becauſe, though the word *bands* be uſed generally afterwards in the plural number, yet the word[s] is of a general meaning, and may imply no more than confinement with one or more chains. However it is certain he was bound with but one chain whilſt he was at Rome: for it is ſaid, that *Paul was ſuffered to dwell with a ſoldier that kept him*, ch. xxviii. 16. And he tells *the chief of the Jews*, whom he had ſent for there, *that for the hope of Iſrael he was*[t] *bound with this chain.* And in another place he ſays, (though the text is generally thought not to relate to this confinement,) *The Lord give mercy to the houſe of Oneſiphorus, for he oft refreſhed me, and was not aſhamed of my* CHAIN, 2 Tim. i. 16.

The way of chaining priſoners was in this manner. There was an iron chain of a convenient length, which was faſtened at one end to the hand of the priſoner, and at the other to the arm of the ſoldier. When a perſon was committed to the care of one ſoldier, which was a very common way, and conſequently there was but one chain, the chain was faſtened to the right arm of the priſoner, and to the left arm of the ſoldier. This is evident from a paſſage of [u] Seneca. It is eaſy to conclude, that when a ſecond ſoldier and another chain was appointed, the priſoner muſt wear the other chain on his left hand, and the ſoldier on his right.

It is likely, that this method of confinement obtained very much all over the Roman empire. St. Peter was bound thus at Jeruſalem by Herod Agrippa then king of Judea. *The ſame night Peter was ſleeping between two ſoldiers, bound with two chains, and the keepers before the door kept the priſon*, Acts xii. 6.

q At Claudius nihil ultra ſcrutatus, citis cum militibus, —— Criſpinum prætorii præfectum miſit: a quo repertus [Valerius Aſiaticus bis conſul] eſt apud Baias, vinciſque inditis in urbem raptus. Tacit. Ann. lib. xi. c. i. P. Sabinum prætorii præfectum, ob amicitiam Cæcinæ vinciri jubet. [Vitellius] Id. Hiſt. lib. iii. c. 36. Et Julius Celſus tribunus, in vinclis laxatam catenam, & circumdatam in diverſum tendens, ſuam ipſe cervicem perfregit. Id. Ann. lib. vi. c. 14.

r Δεθηναι αλυσεσι δυσι.

s Ελυσεν αυτον απο των δεσμων. Act. xxii. 30. Παρεκλος των δεσμων τελων. Act. xxvi. 29.

t Την αλυσιν ταυτην περικειμαι.

u Aliorum aurea catena eſt, & laxa——ſed quid refert? eadem cuſtodia univerſos circumdedit. Allegatique ſunt etiam qui allegaverunt. Niſi tu forte leviorem in ſiniſtra catenam putas. Seneca de Tranquil. cap. 10. Quemadmodum eadem catena, & cuſtodiam & militem copulat, ſic iſta quæ tam diſſimilia ſunt, pariter incedunt. Id. Epiſt. 5.

It

It is obſervable, that when Lyſias brought Paul before the council, *that he might know wherefore he was accuſed of the Jews*, HE LOOSED *him from his bands*, ch. xxii. 30. But it is ſomewhat doubtful, whether St. Paul had not his chain on when he appeared before Agrippa; for he ſays, *I would to God that all that hear me this day were altogether ſuch as I am, except theſe bonds.* Perhaps St. Paul means no more hereby than this ſtate of impriſonment. I think indeed, that it was not a generous treatment of his priſoner, nor very decent upon other accounts, for Feſtus to ſet Paul before Agrippa and Bernice with his chains on. However, there was a Roman of conſiderable quality, who was accuſed, and made his defence before the ſenate of Rome, in the reign of Tiberius, with his chains[x] upon him.

St. Paul ſeems to have been under a military cuſtody. I need not remind the reader of any particulars for a proof of this, it runs through the whole account. There were however ſeveral changes of the manner of his confinement. At firſt he was carried into the caſtle of Antonia at Jeruſalem, chained undoubtedly to a ſoldier or ſoldiers, for that muſt be ſuppoſed all along, ch. xxi. 37. xxii. 24. When he was ſent to Cæſarea, *Felix commanded that he ſhould be kept in Herod's judgment-hall*, ch. xxiii. 35. But there was ſome alteration made, after that Felix had heard Paul and the high prieſt and others that came down from Jeruſalem. *And he* [Felix] *commanded a centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he ſhould forbid none of his acquaintance to miniſter, or come unto him*, Acts xxiv. 23. Theſe are certainly new orders, the former ſtraitneſs muſt have been hereupon abated; and perhaps the place of confinement was changed. I am inclined to think, that St. Paul was now removed from *Herod's judgment-hall* to the centurion's own habitation, or to that part of the city where the ſoldiers had their quarters.

But the moſt gentle eaſy confinement of all was that which St. Paul had at Rome. There *he was ſuffered to dwell by himſelf with a ſoldier that kept him,—in his lodging,—in his own hired houſe*, ch. xxviii. 16, 23, 30. This muſt have been owing very much to the honourable teſtimonial which Porcius Feſtus tranſmitted with him; and in part, it is likely, to the account given in by the centurion, who had conducted Paul and the other priſoners from Cæſarea into Italy; as alſo in part, and

[x] Iiſdem conſulibus miſeriarum ac ſævitiæ exemplum atrox, reus pater, accuſator filius, nomen utrique Vibius Serenus, in ſenatum inducti ſunt. Ab exilio retractus, & tum CATENA vinctus perorante filio. ——At contra reus nihil infracto animo, obverſus in filium, quatere VINCULA, vocare ultores Deos, &c. Tacit. Ann. lib. iv. c. 28.

perhaps

perhaps chiefly, to the goodness[y] of Burrhus, then præfect of the prætorium, or captain of the guard to Nero.

There were several methods of [z] keeping prisoners made use of in the city and in the provinces. Ulpian says, 'That the 'proconsul is wont to judge, whether the person ought to be 'put into the prison, or delivered to a soldier to keep, or 'whether he should be committed to sureties, or even to him-'self;' (that is, to the accused person himself;) 'And herein 'usually regard is had to the nature of the crime charged 'upon any one, and to the preservation of his honour, as also 'to the wealth or substance, seeming[a] innocence, or dignity 'of the party accused.'

It is very easy to perceive what was chiefly regarded by those Roman officers who treated St. Paul so mildly; not his wealth, not his dignity, but his innocence.

There is no one single instance that I know of, that will so much illustrate the whole story of St. Paul's imprisonment, as that of Herod Agrippa; who was imprisoned by Tiberius in the latter end of his reign, and afterwards came to be king of all Judea, as has been shewn already.

Agrippa had said some improper things of Tiberius, in the hearing of one of his own servants; who, having some time after taken a disgust at his master[b], went and informed Tiberius against him. Agrippa went one day, as others did, to wait on Tiberius. Tiberius crediting what the servant had said, and bearing likewise some grudge against Agrippa, ordered Macro the præfect of the prætorium to bind him. Whereupon 'the 'officers took him and bound him in his purple dress which he 'was then in.—But Antonia (B) was extremely afflicted at this 'misfortune of Agrippa, and yet she judged it very difficult 'to say any thing to Tiberius in his favour; and, that indeed, 'it would be to no purpose. She therefore went to Macro, 'and desired that he would take care that the soldiers which 'kept guard upon him should be civil, good natured fellows, 'and that the centurion who presided over the guard, and the 'soldier[c] to whom Agrippa was bound, might be men of the 'same character, and that his freed men and friends might

y Tacit. Ann. lib. xiv. c. 15 & 51. Dio. lib. lxii. p. 706. E. z Vid. Lipsii & Mureti notas ad Tacit. Ann. l. iii. c. 22. & Lipsii Excurs. B. a Proconsul æstimare solet, utrum in carcerem recipienda sit persona, an militi tradenda, vel fidejussoribus committenda, vel etiam sibi: hac autem vel pro criminis, quod objicitur, qualitate, vel propter honorem, aut propter amplissimas facultates, vel pro innocentiâ personæ, vel pro dignitate ejus, qui accusatur, facere solet. L. i. ff. de custod. & exhib. reor. b Joseph. Ant. Lib. xviii. c. 7. § 5. p. 810. (B) Widow of Drusus, Tiberius's brother, a lady of great virtue, and at good terms with Tiberius. Vid. Joseph. p. 812. c Καὶ συνδέτου ἐσομένου.

'have

'have acceſs to him; and in a word, that he might want no-'thing neceſſary for his health. Theſe therefore went to him, 'his friend Silas, and his freedmen Marſyas and Stœcklus, 'who brought him the proviſions he choſe to have. They 'brought in likewiſe bed-clothes, and ſuch like things, as if 'they were for ſale, which they accommodated him with at 'at night; the ſoldiers themſelves joining with them in theſe 'ſervices, in obedience to Macro's orders. Thus things went 'with Agrippa for ſix months [d].'

When Tiberius was dead, 'there came two letters to Rome 'from Caius [Caligula]; one to the ſenate, notifying the death 'of Tiberius, and his own acceſſion to the empire; and another 'to Piſo the præfect of the city, containing the ſame things, 'and alſo ordering that Agrippa ſhould be removed from the '[e] prætorium to the houſe in which he had lived before he was 'bound. Here indeed he was in cuſtody, but however he had 'more liberty, and was at eaſe. In a ſhort time Caius came 'to Rome,—and in a few days after ſent for Agrippa to his 'palace, ordered him to be ſhaved, and changed his garments; 'and then put a diadem on his head——and made him alſo a 'preſent of a gold chain, of the ſame weight with the iron one 'with which he had been [f] bound. This chain Agrippa after-'wards laid up in the temple of Jeruſalem, as a monument 'that God can bring down thoſe things that are great, and 'raiſe up thoſe things which are [g] fallen.'

I take it, that Agrippa's firſt confinement was of the ſame kind with that which was allotted St. Paul by Felix after the firſt hearing at Cæſarea; with this difference however, that a good deal of Agrippa's kind uſage was given him by ſtealth, it not being by the orders of Tiberius, by whom he was committed: whereas the centurion who kept St. Paul had expreſs orders from Felix, the chief officer in the province, *to let him have liberty, and to forbid none of his acquaintance to miniſter or come unto him*; which muſt have been a conſiderable advantage. And I reckon that Agrippa's confinement at laſt, when he was 'removed to the houſe he had lived in before he was bound,' was of the ſame kind with St. Paul's cuſtody, when he *dwelt* at *Rome in his own hired houſe*.

§ X. Our taking in at once the whole ſtory of St. Paul's imprisonment, has obliged us to paſs by a particular or two, which the reader will perhaps think it worth while to look back for.

[d] Ibid. p. 814, 815. [e] Απο πραιτωριου. [f] Ibid. p. 818. [g] Id. lib. xix. c. 6. in.

I think

I think it not needful to enquire, what St. Paul's right of appeal was founded in, whether in his citizenſhip or not, Acts xxv. 10, 11. I ſhall only obſerve, that he does not inſiſt upon that expreſsly, but only his innocence. Some learned men have indeed, upon the occaſion of this appeal, cited the words of Pliny; in which he tells Trajan, that he had noted down ſome of thoſe who were infected with Chriſtianity to be ſent to Rome, 'becauſe they were [h] citizens.' But I cannot perceive to what purpoſe theſe words are alleged here. For if Pliny ſent thoſe perſons to Rome, not for ſome ſpecial reaſon, but becauſe his power extended only to the lives of provincials, and not of Roman citizens, then his power was not at that time equal to that of the Roman governors in Judea. It is plain from St. Luke, Acts xxv. 11, 24, 25. that Paul was proſecuted by the Jews for his life, after he was known to be a Roman. And it is as plain from Joſephus, that the Roman governors of Judea had power over the lives of Romans. Cumanus [i] put to death a Roman ſoldier in Judea. And when Joſephus * complains of Florus's crucifying ſome Jews who were Roman knights, he would have complained of ſomewhat elſe beſide the manner of their death, if Florus had had no right to pronounce a capital ſentence upon any Roman whatever. And thus I have by the by given the evidence of a very material circumſtance in this hiſtory, namely, that Felix and Feſtus had power of trying a Roman for life.

Upon Paul's appeal to Cæſar he was in fact ſent to Rome; cauſes were therefore by appeal removed out of the provinces to Rome. Suetonius ſays, that Auguſtus appointed a number of conſular perſons at Rome to receive the appeals of provincial people, namely, one perſon to preſide over the affairs of each province [k].

St. Luke ſays alſo, Acts xxvii. 1. *And when it was determined that we ſhould ſail into Italy, they delivered Paul and certain* OTHER PRISONERS, *unto one named Julius, a centurion of Auguſtus band.* It was very common to ſend perſons from Judea to be tried at Rome. Quintilius Varus ſent to Rome divers of thoſe that had made diſturbances in Judea, in the interval between Herod's death and Archelaus's taking poſſeſſion [l] of the government. Ummidius Quadratus, preſident of Syria,

[h] Fuerunt alii ſimilis amentiæ: quos quia cives Romani erant, annotavi in urbem remittendos. Lib. x. ep. 97. [i] De Bell. lib. ii. c. 12. § 2. * See above, p. 225. [k] Appellationes quotannis urbanorum qui-dem litigatorum prætori delegavit: ac provincialium conſularibus viris, quos ſingulos cujuſque provinciæ negotiis præpoſuiſſet. Vit. Auguſt. c. 33. [l] Joſeph. de B. J. l. ii. c. 5. § 3.

ſent

ſent [m] Ananus the high prieſt and other Jews to Claudius, to anſwer for themſelves at Rome, as alſo ſeveral of the moſt conſiderable of the Samaritans. Joſephus ſays that 'Felix, for 'ſome ſlight offence, bound and ſent to Rome ſeveral prieſts 'of his acquaintance, and very good and honeſt men, to an-'ſwer for themſelves to [n] Cæſar.' Felix alſo ſent to Rome Eleazar, captain of a troop of robbers, and ſeveral of his men, whom he had taken [o] priſoners.

§ XI. There remains but one thing more. *And when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the priſoners to the* CAPTAIN OF THE GUARD: *but Paul was ſuffered to dwell by himſelf, with a ſoldier that kept him*, Acts xxviii. 16. Doubtleſs Paul was conſigned by Felix to the *captain of the guard*, as well as the other *priſoners:* but he was ſuffered to *dwell by himſelf*, the reſt were ordered to a more ſtrait confinement. The only thing we have to obſerve here is, that the captain of the guard often had the cuſtody of priſoners. This appears from the hiſtory I have given above of Agrippa. And it ſeems, that generally the priſoners which were ſent from the provinces were tranſmitted to this officer, and not to the præfect of the city. For ſo Trajan directs Pliny, when he had written to him for ſome advice concerning a particular perſon whom he had with him in the province; 'That he ſhould ſend him bound to the præ-'fects of his [p] prætorium:' or in other words, to the captains of the guard; there being two at that time, whereas there was but one when Paul was ſent to Rome. Heliodorus the ſophiſt, being in a [q] certain iſland, fell under a charge of murder. 'Whereupon,' ſays [r] Philoſtratus, 'he was ſent to Rome, to 'anſwer for himſelf before the præfects of the prætorium.'

CHAP. XI.

THREE REMARKABLE FACTS.

I. *The temple forty-ſix years in building.* II. *The dearth in the reign of Claudius.* III. *The Jews baniſhed from Rome by the ſame emperor.*

§ I. WHEN our Saviour was at Jeruſalem, at one of the Jews' paſſovers, he *made a ſcourge of ſmall cords, and drove them*

[m] Ibid. c. 12. § 6. & Ant. l. xx. c. 5. § 2.

[n] Καθ' ον χρονον Φηλιξ της Ιουδαιας επιτροπευεν, ιερεις τινας συνηθεις εμοι, καλως χαβθες, δια μικραν και την τυχουσαν αιτιαν δησας εις την Ρωμην επεμψεν, λογον υφεξοντας τω Καισαρι· in vit. § 3.

[o] De Bell. lib. ii. c. 13. § 2.

[p] Si—vinctus mitti ad præfectos prætorii mei debet. Plin. lib. x. ep. 65.

[q] About A. D. 223.

[r] Λαβων δη εν τη νησω φοινικην αιτιαν, ανεπεμφθη ες την Ρωμην, ως απολογησομενος τοις των τραπεδων ηγεμοσι. Vit. Sophiſt. l. 2. num. 32.

that

that sold oxen and sheep, and the changers of money out of the temple, John ii. 14, 15. This action implied a claim of some particular authority. *Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, what sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou dost these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews* FORTY AND SIX YEARS WAS THIS TEMPLE IN BUILDING, *and wilt thou rear it up in three days?* Or in other words: 'Forty and six 'years has this temple been building, so far as the work is 'carried on, and many thousand men have been employed 'upon it all this time. And wilt thou alone rebuild it in 'three days time, if it were pulled down and demolished?' Ver. 18—20.

It ought to be observed here, that Josephus has informed us, that [a] Herod the great, in the eighteenth year of his reign, made a proposal to the Jews of rebuilding the temple. In eight or nine years time he finished what he intended to do to this sacred place. But the people of the Jews were after this, as it seems, continually adorning and improving the buildings of the temple.

It is highly probable, that the term of forty-six years, mentioned here by the Jews in their reply to our Saviour, commences at the time when Herod made his proposal to the Jews, or else at the time, when in pursuance of that proposal, he actually set about repairing the temple.

There being some chronological difficulties attending the period of Herod's reign, as well as our Saviour's ministry, there is between learned men the difference of two or three years about the exact time when these words were spoken by the Jews. But I have no occasion at present to concern myself with any of those difficulties; because it is easy to shew, that the buildings of the temple were continued below any of the dates affixed to this discourse between our Saviour and the Jews.

The evidences for this fact are these: Josephus relating affairs which happened in the reign of Nero, after the arrival of Gessius Florus, procurator of Judea in the year of the christian æra 65 [b], says: 'At that time was the temple finished. The 'people, therefore, [c] seeing the workmen to the number of

a De Bell. l. i. c. 21. Ant. l. xv. c. 11.

b Usser. Ann.

c Ηδη δε τοτε και το ιερον ετετελεστο· βλεπων ουν ο δημος αργησαντας τους τεχνιτας, υπερ μυριους και οκτακισχιλιους οντας, και μισθοφοριας ενδεεις εσομενους δια το την τροφην εκ της κατα το ιερον εργασιας ποριζεσθαι, και χρηματα μεν αποθετα δια των εκ Ρωμαιων φοβον εχειν ου θιλων, προνουμενος δε των τεχνιτων, και εις τουτους αναλουν τους θεσαυρους βουλομενος· και γαρ ει μιαν τις ωραν της ημερας ειργασαιτο, τον μισθον υπερ ταυτης ευθεως ελαμβανεν· επειθον τον βασιλεα την ανατολικην στοαν ανεγειραι· κ. λ. Ant. l. xx. c. 8. § 7.

'eighteen

'eighteen thousand lie idle, and apprehending that they would 'stand in need of the wages which they were wont to receive 'for working at the temple; and being afraid that the money, 'if laid up, should fall into the hands of the Romans; and 'moreover, having a regard to the workmen, and being will-'ing that the treasures should be laid out upon them, (for if 'any man worked but one hour of the day, he presently re-'ceived his pay); they petitioned the (A) king to rebuild the 'east portico.—It was the work of king Solomon, who first 'built the whole temple. But the king (the charge and over-'sight of the temple had been committed to him by Claudius 'Cæsar), considering, that this would be a work of much 'time and vast expence, did not grant their request. However, 'he was not against paving the city with white marble.'

It appears from hence, that the Jews had continually employed men upon the temple; for Josephus says, it was now finished.

If it be enquired, how they were supplied with money to maintain so many men constantly at work; I answer, that Josephus, in the passage just now transcribed, intimates what the fund was, namely, their sacred treasury. He has more particularly informed us in another place, where he says, that on the temple were expended 'all the sacred treasures, which 'were supplied by tributes sent to God from all parts of the 'world[d].' Beside the ordinary tribute sent to the temple, the zeal of the people for this work produced liberal contributions[e].

If it be objected, that Josephus, in the account of the building of the temple by Herod, says, that the ιερον, that is, the cloisters and other buildings of the temple were raised in eight years, and the ναος, or temple itself, in a year and a half[f], that is, in nine years and a half; I answer, that Josephus can mean no more than that the temple was then fitted for use, or that all was then finished that Herod proposed to do at his cost, and not the completing the temple and all the buildings belonging to it. This is evident, from the passage just described at length, in which he says, 'At that time the temple 'was finished.' And even these words are to be understood with a limitation. The temple was not then completed: there was something still wanting, which the people would have had

(A) Agrippa the younger.

d Εις ο μακροι μεν εξανηλωθησαν αιωνες αυτοις, και οι ιεροι δε θησαυροι παντες, ους ανεπιμπλασαν οι παρα της οικουμενης δασμοι πεμπομενοι τῳ Θεῳ· de Bell. lib. v. c. 5. § 1.

e Η τε γαρ δαψιλεια των χρηματων, και η του λαου φιλοτιμια, λογου μειζονας εποιειτο τας επιβολας· id. Ibid. vid. & Ant. l. xiv. c. 7. § 2.

f Ant. l. xv. c. 11. § 5, 6.

done.

done. But they then put an end to repairing and building, and there was no more work done at the temple.

It is poſſible, that there might be ſome interruptions in the works at the temple; but it is likely they were very ſhort, (if there were any), and ſuch as were not worth taking notice of in a long period.

§ II. The next event I would here confirm from ſome foreign teſtimony, is the famine ſaid to have happened in the reign of Claudius. *And in theſe days came prophets from Jeruſalem unto Antioch. And there ſtood up one of them named Agabus, and ſignified by the Spirit, that there ſhould be great dearth throughout all the world, which came to paſs in the days of Claudius Cæſar. Then the diſciples, every man according to his ability, determined to ſend relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea. Which alſo they did, and ſent it to the elders, by the hands of Barnabas and Saul,* Acts xi. 27—30.

I do not take notice of this famine, as the fulfilment of a prophecy, becauſe I do not enter into that argument, but only as a remarkable event, which St. Luke aſſures us, happened in the reign of Claudius.

St. Luke ſays, *In thoſe days came prophets from Jeruſalem unto Antioch.* It may be queſtioned, what was the exact time of the arrival of theſe prophets to Antioch, and of the delivery of the prophecy: but I think, it is eaſy to perceive from St. Luke, when the famine happened. It is obſervable, that St. Luke having, in the words juſt now tranſcribed from him in the concluſion of the xith of the Acts, given an account of the reſolution of the church at Antioch, and of the commiſſion given by them to Barnabas and Saul, to carry their contributions to Jeruſalem, proceeds in the xiith chapter to relate the tranſactions concerning the church at Jeruſalem, during the reign of Herod Agrippa, and alſo Herod's death. And then ſays, *But the word of God grew and multiplied. And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jeruſalem, when they had fulfilled their miniſtry,* Acts xii. 24, 25.

There can be no reaſon aſſigned for that interruption in the courſe of the narration, and for the delay to mention the fulfilment of the commiſſion of the church at Antioch, but this, that the commiſſion was not executed till the death of Herod Agrippa. Moreover, as the chriſtians at Antioch had a previous knowledge of this famine, according to St. Luke's account, before it happened, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the famine was but then coming on, when Barnabas and Saul fulfilled their miniſtry. Herod died in the fourth year of Claudius's

dius's reign, A. D. 44. It is very evident therefore to me, that [g] the commencement of this famine ought not to be placed before the latter end of the year 44, or perhaps, not till the beginning of the year following.

But before I proceed to the proofs of this fact, I must let the reader know how I understand it. I think the dearth prophesied of by Agabus, and related by St. Luke, was in Judea only. I desire the words themselves may be considered. There *came prophets from Jerusalem, and one of them signified by the Spirit, that there should be great dearth throughout the whole world*; that is, throughout the whole land, the country before-mentioned, from whence those prophets came, namely, the land of Judea: that there would be a great dearth and scarcity, not at Jerusalem only, which might have been occasioned by some circumstances peculiar to the city, a siege or some other accident; but that there would be scarcity throughout all the land of Judea, by means of a general failure of the usual produce of the earth.

The original word [οικουμενη] does sometimes signify not the whole world, but a particular country only [h].

[g] Vid. Usser. Ann. P. J. 4755.

[h] Η γη signifies the earth: yet the coherence of the words in many places determines the meaning to some particular country. Josh. ii. 3. *They be come to search out [illegible] country* [την γην]. Luke iv. 25. *[illegible] tell you of a truth many widows were in [illegible], when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land*, επι πασαν την γην. Not all the earth, but all the land of Israel; that being the country before mentioned.

In like manner οικουμενη signifies, according to the original notation of the word, the habitable, or rather the inhabited earth: but the connexion of the discourse often restrains the meaning to some particular country. Isa. xiii. 5. *They came from a far [illegible]—to destroy the whole land.* In the [illegible] version it is πασαν την οικουμενην: [illegible] goes before and follows shews, that a particular country is intended. Ver. 1. *[illegible] of Babylon, which Isaiah the son [illegible] did* see. Ver. 19——22. *And* BABYLON *the glory of kingdoms*, THE [illegible] OF THE CHALDEES EXCELLENCY, *shall be as when God overthrew So[illegible] [illegible]. It shall never be inha[illegible] [illegible] it be dwelt in from gene[illegible] [illegible]: neither shall the Arabian [illegible] [illegible] shall the shepherds [illegible]. But wild beasts of the desart shall be there.——And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces.* I know very well that some understand the destruction of the whole land, in the 5th ver. of the whole Babylonian empire; but it is without reason. The whole empire, it is true, would be hereupon dissolved. But any one may perceive, that the judgment threatened or foretold, is confined properly to the city and province of Babylon, the seat of the empire, and of the oppressions now to be avenged. Can any one bear the supposition, that the dreadful destruction described in this chapter extended, or was intended to extend to all the parts of the Babylonish empire? A note of St. Jerom upon Is. xiii. 4, 5. deserves to be inserted here, as not a little to our purpose: —'*ut disperdant omnem terram*:' non quod totum orbem vastaverint, sed omnem terram Babylonis & Chaldæorum. Idioma est enim sanctæ scripturæ, ut omnem terram illius significet provinciæ, de qua sermo est: quod quidam non intelligentes ad omnium terrarum subversionem trahunt. Hieron. T. 3. p. 109. in.

St. Luke has himself used this word in this sense in another place. I think it cannot be disputed: Luke xxi. 26. *Men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth*;

It is evident that the prophecy was underſtood by the diſciples at Antioch, in whoſe hearing it was delivered, to relate to Judea only. There is not the leaſt hint of any thought of ſending relief to any other place, nor yet of any heſitation in taking the reſolution here mentioned, for fear their own circumſtances might be neceſſitous.

And when it is added, that in purſuance of their determination, they did actually ſend relief by the hands of Barnabas and Saul, there is not one word beſtowed to enhance the eminence of their charity, in aſſiſting others when they were in ſtraits themſelves, or in immediate danger of them. And yet it is unlikely, this ſhould have been altogether omitted, if it had been the caſe. It is certain, St. Paul has placed this circumſtance in the moſt beautiful manner, in the teſtimony he gives to the churches of Macedonia: *How that in a great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy, and their deep poverty, had abounded unto the riches of their liberality,* 2 Cor. viii. 2.

I am very ſenſible, that the Jews who lived out of their own country, and all the worſhippers of God, in all parts of the world, had a ſpecial regard to the people of Jeruſalem and Judea; and were very ready to contribute to them, when under difficulties. But a famine is a very ſore evil; and if the diſciples of Antioch had ſent a ſupply to the brethren in Judea, when they were apprehenſive of a great dearth [i] among themſelves, ſuch an action would not have been ſimply related, but alſo commended; at leaſt, this circumſtance would have been taken notice of. It ſeems to have been a very general contribution: but ſo far is there from being any hint of any ſtraits they were in, that it is intimated they were in good circumſtances: *Every man according* [k] *to his ability determined,* &c.— The phraſe imports an eaſy and plentiful condition. If the dearth had reached to Antioch, St. Luke would not have ſaid, *every man, according as he abounded*; but would have been obliged to ſay, not regarding his own want or neceſſity, or the general calamity, or ſomewhat like it.

I hope no one will do me ſo much wrong, as to ſuſpect, that I have attempted to put this meaning on the words, becauſe I

or *the land*, των επερχομενων τη οικουμενη.— The whole diſcourſe relates to the calamities that were coming, not upon the whole world, or the whole Roman empire, but the land of Judea, ver. 21. *Then let them that are in Judea flee to the mountains.* Out of Judea therefore there would be ſafety, ver. 23. *But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give ſuck in thoſe days, for there ſhall be great diſtreſs in the land, and wrath upon* THIS PEOPLE. And they who ſhould then be in the circumſtances juſt mentioned, would then be particularly unhappy, becauſe they would be unfit for flight.

[i] Λιμον μεγαν. [k] Καθως ευποροῦτο τις, ωρισαν εκαστος αυτων.

have

have no proof the famine was univerſal. For I declare, that if I thought the expreſſions here uſed, repreſented an univerſal dearth; and at the ſame time, perceived the ancient hiſtorians deſcribed only a particular one, I would have acknowledged the difficulty. But I think, the ſenſe I have here repreſented, is the natural genuine ſenſe of the words; and I perſuade myſelf, the reader is now of the ſame opinion[1].

[1] I am not ſingular in this interpretation. M. Lenfant underſtands this text in the ſame manner: and I have had aſſiſtance from his notes in compoſing this article. Since that, I have perceived that Dr. Hammond was of the ſame mind. Vid. Annot. in Luc. ii. 1.

Two things ſeem to me to have carried the generality of learned men off from the true meaning of St. Luke, and to have induced them to ſuppoſe, that the famine here ſpoken of was univerſal; either all over the world, or at leaſt the Roman empire. One is the word οἰκουμενη· but this difficulty, I imagine, I have removed already. The other is, that ſeveral ancient hiſtorians have ſpoken of famines in the reign of Claudius, at Greece and Rome. Theſe muſt be the only reaſons for this ſuppoſition; for the connexion of the words in St. Luke would never lead any man to think the famine was out of Judea.

But though there is mention made of famines in Greece, and at Rome, or in Italy, this will not prove that there was a general famine. It is evident from Joſephus, that during the famine in Judea, there was plenty in other parts; in Cyprus, Egypt, and the territories of king Izates. From the two former countries queen Helene procured proviſions, and Izates ſent money to Jeruſalem; which he could not have done, if his own people had been in want.

The proofs of the famine in Judea I tranſcribe, or refer to in the text part. Of the other famines in this reign there are four accounts. Of the famine in Greece Euſebius makes mention in his Chronicon. Ad ann. λιμὸς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλαδα γενόμενος μέγας, ὧν καὶ ὁ τῶν ἁγίων μισθὸς ἐξ διδράχμων ἐστάθη. This famine happened, according to him, in the 9th of Claudius, A. D. 49. At Rome there were ſeveral famines in this reign, one or more of which are mentioned by Dio, Suetonius, Tacitus or Oroſius. The firſt happened in the beginning of the reign of this emperor. But it ſeems, from the proviſions made by him for preventing the like for the future, that it was not owing to a general ſcarcity at that time, but to the want of a good harbour at the mouth of the Tiber, by which means the city was ill ſupplied. Dio's words are thus: 'There being a great famine, [λιμὸς τε ἰσχυρὸς γενομένου, or ſcarcity,] he [Claudius] 'not only took care for a preſent ſupply, 'but provided alſo for the time to come. 'Rome is ſupplied almoſt ſolely with corn 'imported from abroad; but there being 'then no good harbour at the mouth of the 'Tiber, nor any ſecure ſtations for ſhips, 'the empire of the ſea was almoſt uſeleſs 'to the Romans. For, except the corn 'that was brought in in the ſummer time, 'and laid up in granaries, none was brought 'thither in the winter: or if any attempted 'it, it was with the utmoſt hazard.' Dio. lib. 60. p. 671, 672. He then proceeds to deſcribe the great expence which Claudius was at, in making a good port at the mouth of the Tiber, and a convenient paſſage from thence up to the city; of which Suetonius likewiſe ſpeaks. Claud. cap. 20. Dio places this famine in the ſecond year of Claudius, A. D. 42. But it muſt have begun the year before: for there are extant medals ſtruck in each of theſe years in honour of the emperor, having on their reverſe a corn meaſure with ears of corn hanging over the ſide. Vid. Pagi Critic. in Baron. A. D. 42. n. 7. But I very much queſtion, whether there was any famine then ariſing from the failure of crops. Λιμὸς is often uſed for a famine or ſcarcity in a city during a ſiege or blockade. And Dio proceeding, immediately after the mention of the famine, to obſerve the difficulty of coming to Rome in the winter, makes me ſuſpect, this ſcarcity was only a hardſhip the people were in, during the winter, for want of ſufficient ſtores and a free paſſage.

There was another famine at Rome in the latter end of this reign, of which Tacitus ſpeaks. It is placed by him in the 11th of Claudius, A. D. 51. Claudio V. Serv. Cornelio Orſito Coſſ. Frugum quoque egeſtas, & orta ex eo fames, in prodigium accipiebatur. Nec occulti tantum queſtus; ſed jura reddentem Claudium circumvaſere

Supposing, therefore, St. Luke to have informed us, that there was in the reign of Claudius, a great dearth throughout all the land of Judea, I proceed now to give some foreign evidence of this event.

Josephus, speaking of Helene, the queen of the Adiabenes, has these words: 'Her arrival at Jerusalem was a great blessing to 'the people; for the city labouring at that time under a heavy 'famine, so that a great many perished for want, the queen 'sent abroad several of her officers; some to Alexandria for the 'purchase of corn, others to Cyprus to buy up dried figs. 'These having used the utmost expedition, as soon as they 'returned, she distributed food to those that were necessitous. 'By this liberality, she laid a lasting obligation upon our 'whole nation. Moreover, her son Izates, having heard of 'the famine, sent a large sum of money to the chief men of 'Jerusalem [m].'

clamoribus turbidis, pulsumque in extremam fori partem vi urgebant, donec militum globo infestos perrupit. Quindecim dierum alimenta urbi non amplius superfuisse constitit. Magnâque Deûm benignitate & modestiâ hiemis, rebus extremis subventum. At hercule olim ex Italiæ regionibus loginquas in provincias commeatus portabant. Nec nunc infecunditate laboratur, sed Africam potius & Ægyptum exercemus, navibusque & casibus vita populi Romani permissa est. Ann. 12. cap. 43. Suetonius also has taken notice of a famine in this reign. He does not say what year it happened in; but the agreement of circumstances shews it to be the same that Tacitus speaks of. Arctiore autem annona ob assiduas sterilitates detentus quondam medio foro a turba, convitiisque ac simul fragminibus panis ita instratus, ut ægrè nec nisi postico evadere in palatium valuerit: nihil non excogitavit ad invehendos etiam in tempore hiberno commeatus—& naves mercaturæ causa fabricantibus magna commoda constituit. Claud. cap. 18. Orosius speaks of the same thing; Veruntamen sequenti anno tanta fames Romæ fuit, ut medio foro, imperator correptus a populo convitiis & fragminibus panis infestatus, ægrè per pseudotyrum in palatium refugiens furorem excitatæ plebis evaserit, lib. vii. cap. 6.

I have set down these passages at length. I reckon I have hereby saved myself the trouble of making many remarks. The frugum egestas of Tacitus, the assiduæ sterilitates of Suetonius, were in Italy only; and these, possibly, not so much owing to bad seasons as wrong management, as is intimated by Tacitus. This was certainly one reason why famines were so common at Rome. There is no notice taken by these authors of scarcities in other places at the same time. The famine, as described by Tacitus, was only in the winter. And when the granaries at Rome were almost empty, by the goodness of the gods, and the mildness of the winter [modestiâ hiemis] ships arrived safe with sufficient provisions.

I am not at all sollicitous to prove, that there was no general famine throughout the Roman empire in the reign of Claudius. However, I thought it not amiss to let the reader see how the case seems to me to stand at present. And though some person should hereafter shew, that there was an universal famine some time in this reign; yet that alone would not alter my opinion concerning the meaning of the words of St. Luke, who, I think, speaks of nothing beside a dearth in Judea.

[m] Γινεται δε αυτης η αφιξις παυυ συμφερουσα τοις Ιεροσολυμιτας· λιμω γαρ αυτην την πολιν μετα τον καιρον εκεινον πιεζομενην, και πολλων υπ' ενδειας αναλωμαλων φθειρομενων, η Βασιλισσα Ελενη πεμπει τινας των εαυτης, τους μεν εις την Αλεξανδρειαν πολυν σιτον ωνησομενους χρημαλων, τους δε εις Κυπρον ισχαδων φορτον οισονλας· ως δε ταχιστα ηλθον ταχεως κομιζονλες, τοις απορουμενοις διενειμε τροφην, και μετιησιν αυτης μνημην της ευποιιας ταυτης εις το παν ημων εθνος καταλελοιπε· πυθομενος δε και ο παις αυτης Ιζατης τα περι τον λιμον, επεμψε πολλα χρηματα τοις πρωτοις των Ιεροσολυμιτων. Ant. lib. xx. c. 2. § 6.

Josephus

Joſephus does afterwards inform us when this famine happened. For having mentioned Cuſpius Fadus, (who was ſent procurator into Judea, after the death of Herod, in the fourth of Claudius, in the latter end of the year 44), and his ſucceſſor Tiberius Alexander, he ſays, 'In their time [n] a great dearth 'happened in Judea: when queen Helene, having purchaſed 'corn in Egypt with large ſums of money, gave it away amongſt 'the poor, as I have related above.'

So that this famine oppreſſed the land of Judea ſeveral years. It might begin in the fourth of Claudius; but I think, it muſt have been chiefly in the fifth and ſixth years of his reign.

I apprehend, I have ſhewn from Joſephus, that what St. Luke has here related is punctually true. Joſephus may be juſtly ſuppoſed to be well acquainted with what happened at Jeruſalem and in Judea, in the reign of Claudius: and the whole ſtory of Izates and his mother Helene, is an affair he is much pleaſed with.

Euſebius likewiſe mentions this famine in his Chronicles [o], and in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory [p]. He places it in the fourth of Claudius, and ſeems to have ſuppoſed it univerſal [q], all over the world.

Oroſius alſo ſpeaks of this famine, and ſays it happened in the fourth of Claudius, and that it oppreſſed Syria. I place his words in the margin [r], though he has committed one great miſtake, in ſuppoſing that Helene, the queen of the Adiabenes, was a chriſtian.

Though I ſhould take no particular notice of it here, yet I hope the reader would not omit to obſerve the agreement of cuſtoms in the ſacred writers and Joſephus. The diſciples at Antioch no ſooner heard that there was like to be a dearth in the land of Judea, but they, *every man according to his ability*, ſome Jews by birth, others proſelytes of righteouſneſs, others, poſſibly, proſelytes of the gate, *determined to ſend relief unto the brethren which dwelt there.* Helene, the queen of the Adiabenes, and Izates her ſon, both proſelytes to Judaiſm, did the ſame thing.

[n] Επι τουτοις δη και τον μεγαν λιμον καθ' ὁν η βασιλισσα Ελενη, πολλων χρηματων ωνησαμενη σιτα απο της Αιγυπτου, διενειμε τοις ενδεεσιν, ως προειπον· ibid. c. 5. § 2.

[o] Page 79. 204. [p] Lib. ii. c. 12.

[q] Η εν ταις πραξεσιν Αγαβε προφητεια πεπληρωται, λιμε μεγαλε καθασχοντος την οικουμενην επι Κλαυδιε. Chronic. Can. p. 204. [r] Eodem anno (quarto) fames graviſſima per Syriam facta eſt, quam etiam prophetæ prænuntiaverant. Sed Chriſtianorum neceſſitatibus apud Hieroſolymam, convectis ab Ægypto frumentis, Helena Adiabenorum regina converſa ad fidem Chriſti largiſſime miniſtravit, lib. vii. c. 6.

We may proceed somewhat farther to observe upon this occasion, that the Jews of Judea seem to have expected it as due to them, that some particular regard should be shewed them by the rest of their countrymen, and by all who came over to the worship of the true God, and were admitted to share in any of the privileges of the Jewish people. Thus St. Paul assures us, Gal. ii. 10. *Only they would that we should remember the poor, the same which I also was forward to do.* The very last (B) time that St. Paul was at Jerusalem: *After many years,* says he, *I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings,* Acts xxiv. 17. Nor was St. Paul's argument a new thought, though expressed by him with a divine temper: *But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints: for it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia, to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It has pleased them verily, and* THEIR DEBTORS *they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister to them in carnal things,* Rom. xv. 25—27.

No wonder therefore, that the bigots among the Jews were startled at the thought of any relaxation of the ancient rigour, with which they had treated proselytes; and that they laboured, as they did, to maintain their jurisdiction over them. This contention was not at all for the sake of God and the law, but partly for themselves. Doubtless, the outcry of the Jews against St. Paul, though very unjust and groundless, was, every word of it, expressive and popular, especially at Jerusalem: *This is the man, that teacheth* ALL MEN EVERY WHERE, *against the people, and the law, and this place,* Acts xxi. 28.

§ III. I conclude with the banishment of the Jews from Rome. *After these things, Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth. And found a certain Jew, named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla,* BECAUSE THAT CLAUDIUS HAD COMMANDED ALL JEWS TO DEPART FROM ROME, Acts xviii. 1, 2.

Dio says, that Claudius did not banish the Jews from Rome, but only prohibited their [s] assemblies. But Suetonius, who lived nearer the time, says, 'He expelled the Jews from Rome, 'who were continually raising disturbances, Chrestus being 'their leader [t].

(B) Unless we suppose (which is the opinion of some very learned and judicious men) that he went thither again, after he had been sent to Rome. See in Miscellanea sacra, the Abstract, p. 48.

[s] Τȣς τε Ιȣδαιȣς, πλεονασαντας αυθις, ωςε χαλεπως αν ανευ ταραχης υπο τȣ οχλȣ σφων τῆς πολεως ειρχθηναι, ȣκ εξηλασε μεν, των δε δη πατριῳ νομȣ βιῳ χρωμενȣς ενελευσε μη συναθροιζεσθαι· Dio lib. lx. p. 669. B.

[t] Judæos impulsore CHRESTO assidue

It

It is disputed by learned men[u], whether by Chrestus, Suetonius means Jesus Christ. I need not concern myself with that point here. This passage proves what I bring it for.

Josephus has no where particularly mentioned this event. This edict of Claudius seems not to have been long in force. That may be one reason of this omission in Josephus: another reason might be, that it was no agreeable task to him, to mention any disgraces cast upon his people. If some disputes between the Jews and followers of Jesus Christ were really the cause of this order, that might be another reason; Josephus having been very reserved, if not altogether silent, about the affairs of the Christians.

tumultuantes Roma expulit. Sueton. Claud. c. 25. [u] Vid. Usser. Ann. P. J. 4767. Wissi Meletemata Leyd. de vit. Paul. § vii. n. 2, 3.

THE END OF THE FIRST BOOK.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

PART I. VOL. II.

BOOK II. CHAP. I.

THREE OBJECTIONS AGAINST LUKE, CHAP. ii. VER. 1, 2.

I. *The first objection, That there is no mention made by any ancient author of a decree in the reign of Augustus for taxing all the world, stated and answered.* II. *The second objection, That there could be no taxing made in Judea, during the reign of Herod, by a decree of Augustus, stated and answered.* III. *The third objection, That Cyrenius was not governor of Syria, till several years after the birth of Jesus, stated, together with a general answer.* IV. *Divers particular solutions of this objection.* V. *The last solution confirmed and improved.* VI. *Divers particular difficulties attending the supposition, that this taxing was made by Cyrenius, considered.*

THE history of the New Testament is attended with many difficulties. Jewish and heathen authors concur with the sacred historians in many things. But it is pretended, that there are other particulars in which they are contradicted by authors of very good note.

Among these, the difficulties which may be very properly considered in the first place, are those which relate to the account St. Luke has given of the taxing in Judea, which brought Joseph and the Virgin to Bethlehem, a little before the birth of Jesus. Luke ii. 1—5. *And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. (And this taxing was first made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria). And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of*

the

the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, (becauſe he was of the houſe and lineage of David); to be taxed with Mary his eſpouſed wife, being great with child.

Againſt this account ſeveral objections have been raiſed [a]. They may be all reduced to theſe three.

I. It is objected, That there is no mention made in any ancient Roman or Greek hiſtorian, of any general taxing of people all over the world, or the whole Roman empire, in the time of Auguſtus, nor of any decree of the emperor for that purpoſe: whereas, if there had been then any ſuch thing, it is highly improbable, that it ſhould have been omitted by them.

II. St Matthew ſays, ch. ii. 1. that Jeſus was born *in the days of Herod the king*. Judea, therefore, was not at that time a Roman province, and there could not be any taxing made there by a decree of Auguſtus.

III. Cyrenius was not governor of Syria till nine or ten, perhaps twelve years after the birth of Jeſus. St. Luke therefore was miſtaken, in ſaying, that this taxing was made in his time. This objection will be ſtated more fully hereafter.

§ I. By way of anſwer to the firſt objection,

1. I allow, that there is not any mention made by ancient writers of any general taxing all over the world, or of all the ſubjects of the Roman empire, in the reign of Auguſtus.

Many learned men having been of a different opinion, I am obliged to conſider their proofs.

Tillemont [b] puts the queſtion, (for he does not aſſert it), whether Pliny has not referred to ſuch a thing? But it is plain from Pliny's words, that he ſpeaks of a partition of Italy only into ſeveral diſtricts [c].

There is a paſſage alſo of Dio, which has been referred to upon this occaſion: but it has evidently no relation to the matter before us. The Romans had a tax called the twentieth: this tax was grievous to many people; Auguſtus therefore deſired the ſenate to conſider of ſome other. 'But the ſenate 'not finding any proper expedient, he intimated, that he 'would raiſe money upon lands and houſes, without telling 'them what, or in what manner it ſhould be; and hereupon 'ſent officers abroad, ſome one way, and ſome another, to

[a] Vid. Spanhem. Dubia Evangelica Part ii. Dub. iv, v, &c. Huet. Demonſt. Evangel. Prop. ix. cap. x. & Commentatores.

[b] Tillemont Memoires Eccleſ. Tom. i. Not. ii. Sur Jeſus Chriſt.

[c] Nunc ambitum ejus, urbeſque enumerabimus. Qua in re præfari neceſſarium eſt, auctorem nos Divum Auguſtum ſecuturos, deſcriptionemque ab eo factam Italiæ totius in regiones xi. Plin. lib. iii. cap. 5.

'make

'make a survey of the estates, both of particular persons and 'cities. But upon this the senate complied immediately, 'and the old tax of the twentieth was confirmed, lest a worse 'thing should come in its room. This was all Augustus aimed 'at, and the survey was laid aside[d].' Besides, this affair happened, A. U. 766, A. D. 13, long after the taxing which St. Luke speaks of.

The passage which Baronius[e] has quoted from Æthicus, he does himself allow to relate only to a geometrical description of the empire, begun by order of Julius Cæsar, and finished in thirty-two years, and therefore over long before the taxing mentioned by St. Luke.

I am afraid to mention his argument from Pliny, lest it should be thought, that I intend to divert the reader, when we ought to be serious. Pliny says, 'And as for Augustus 'himself, whom all mankind rank in this class, [of fortunate 'persons,] if the whole course of his life be carefully consider-'ed, there will be observed in it many instances of the fickle-'ness and inconstancy of human affairs[f].' But Baronius supposes, that Pliny says, that 'in every census mention is made 'of Augustus, and that there was so particularly in that made 'by Vespasian and Titus, because he first made[g] a survey of 'the whole Roman empire:' thus making Pliny to refer, in the passage he quotes from him, not to what went before, but to a passage which follows four chapters lower.

Some have alleged, as a proof of this general taxing, some words of Suidas, who in his Lexicon[h] says, 'That Augustus 'sent out twenty men of great probity into all parts of his 'empire, by whom he made an assessment of persons and 'estates, ordering a certain quota to be paid into the treasury. 'This was the first census; they who were before him having

[d] Και παραχρημα μηδεν ειπων, μηθ' οσον, μηθ' οπως αυτο δωσουσιν, επεμψεν αλλους αλλη τα τε των ιδιωτων και τα των πολεων κτηματα απογραψομενους· ινα ως και μειζονως ζημιωθησομενοι δεισωσι, και την εικοστην τελειν αν θελωνται· ο και εγενετο· Dio l. 56. p. 588. E.

[e] Apparat. N. 97.

[f] In Divo quoque Augusto, quem universa mortalitas in HAC CENSURA nuncupat, si diligenter æstimentur cuncta, magna sortis humanæ reperiantur volumina. Lib. vii. cap. 45.

[g] Idemque dum hæc alibi ait: [lib. vii. cap. 45.] In Divo quoque Augusto, quem universa mortalitas in hac censura nuncupat, nempe eam, quam Vespasianus & Titus recens egerunt, de qua idem inferius [ibid. cap. 49.] meminit, significare videtur, in quolibet repetito in orbe Romano lustris singulis censu, mentionem Augusti fieri; quod primus omnium universum orbem Romanum subjectum imperio censuisset. At de censibus satis. Baron. ubi supra.

[h] In Voc. Απογραφη· Απογραφη η απαριθμησις. Ο δε Καισαρ Αυγουστος, ο μοναρχησας, εικοσιν, ανδρας τους αριστους τον βιον και τον τροπον επιλεξαμενος, επι πασαν την γην τω υπηκοων εξ· επεμψε· δι ων απογραφας εποιησατο των τε ανθρωπων, και των ουσιων, αυταρχη τινα προσταξας τω δημοσιω μοιραν εκ τουτων εισφερεσθαι. Αυτη η απογραφη πρωτη εγενετο, των προ αυτου τους κεκτημενους τι μη αφαιρημενων, ως ειναι τοις ευποροις δημοσιον εγκλημα τον πλουτον.

'at pleasure exacted tribute of those who had any thing; so 'that it was a public crime to be rich.'

But it is difficult to take this upon Suidas's authority alone, since he says not in what part of Augustus's reign it was done, quotes no author for it, and it is not to be found in any ancient writer now extant; though possibly, he refers to the story just now told from Dio; who assures us, that project he mentions was never executed. Besides, Suidas says, this was the first census; which is a very great mistake. There had been before Augustus many assessments of Roman citizens, and likewise of divers provinces of the Roman empire.

In another place Suidas says, 'Augustus had a desire to 'know the number of all the inhabitants of the Roman em-'pire[i].' And he mentions the number, which, he says, was found upon the enquiry. But Suidas must have been mistaken. Archbishop Usher's remark upon this passage is worth placing here. 'In their consulship [Caius Marcius Censorinus, and 'C. Asinius Gallus] there was a second muster made at Rome, 'in which were numbered 4233000 Roman citizens, as is ga-'thered out of the fragments of the Ancyran marble. In Sui-'das, in Αυγουστος the number is far less of those that were muster-'ed, 4101017, which yet he very ridiculously obtrudeth upon 'us, not for the muster of the city only, but of the world[k].'

The late learned editor[l] of Suidas does also highly approve of this censure passed upon his author, by our most learned and excellent archbishop. It is observable, that they both use here the word city [urbis censu]. I hope, however, they mean not the city of Rome only, and the country round about it, but the Roman citizens all over the Roman empire, or at least all Italy: for otherwise, with submission, I should think them, in this particular, almost as unreasonable as Suidas. It is incredible, that there should have been at Rome and in the country round about it, beside strangers and slaves, which were very numerous, so many Roman citizens, as are mentioned on the Ancyran marble; even though all who were entered in a census, be set down there; which, however, is denied by some. I suppose then, that by the muster of the city, these learned

[i] V. Αυγουστος· Αυγουστος Καισαρ δοξαν αυτῳ παντας οικητορας Ρωμαιων κατα προσωπον αριθμει, βουλομενος γνωναι ποσον εστι πληθος· και ευρισκονται οι την Ρωμαιων οικουντες οι μυριαδες και χιλιοι ιζ' ανδρες.

[k] Annals: year of the world, 3996. p. 786. Engl. Edit. Lond. 1658. In the Latin the last words are: Qui tamen non pro urbis tantùm sed pro orbis etiam Romani censu ridiculè nobis ibi obtruditur.

[l] De hoc loco vide omnino Casaubonum contra Baron. Exerc. 1. Num. 93. Et Usser—qui recte observarunt, Suidam hic censum urbis pro censu orbis Romani lectori obtrudere: cum ridiculum sit credere, non plures fuisse totius imperii Romani incolas, quam quot Suidas hic exprimit. Kuster in loc.

men

men mean the muſter or cenſus of Roman citizens in any part of the Roman empire, as oppoſed to all the people in general, living in the ſame empire. And in this ſenſe only[m] I adopt their cenſure of Suidas; and cannot but think it very juſt. The number of the inhabitants of the Roman empire muſt needs have exceeded the numbers mentioned by Suidas, or on the marble; though it ſhould be ſuppoſed, that none are included in theſe numbers, but thoſe who were arrived at military age. This might be ſufficient to ſhew, that the number of the Ancyran marble is not the number of all the people of the Roman empire: but other reaſons will appear preſently.

I muſt in the next place, take the liberty of conſidering what Prideaux has ſaid upon this ſubject, who with Huet[n] and others thinks, that this deſcription or ſurvey in Judea, belonged to one of the ſurveys made by Auguſtus; and that in particular, it was a part of his ſecond cenſus. 'The firſt was 'in the year when he himſelf was the ſixth time, and M. Agrippa the ſecond time conſuls, that is, in the year before the 'chriſtian æra 28. The ſecond time in the conſulſhip of C. 'Marcius Cenſorinus, and C. Aſinius Gallus, that is, in the 'year before the chriſtian æra 8. And the laſt time in the 'conſulſhip of Sextus Pompeius Nepos, that is, in the year of 'the chriſtian æra 14. In the firſt and laſt time he executed 'this with the aſſiſtance of a colleague; but the ſecond time 'he did it by himſelf alone, and this is the deſcription 'which St. Luke refers to. The decree concerning it was 'iſſued out the year I have mentioned, that is, in the 8th year 'of the chriſtian æra, which was three years before that in 'which Chriſt was born.—That we allow three years for the 'execution of this decree, can give no juſt reaſon for exception. '——The account taken by the decree of Auguſtus at the 'time of our Saviour's birth, extended to all manner of per'ſons, and alſo to their poſſeſſions, eſtates, qualities, and 'other circumſtances. And when a deſcription and ſurvey 'like this was ordered by William the conqueror, to be taken 'for England only, I mean that of the Doomſday book, it was 'ſix years in making: and the Roman province of Syria was 'much more than twice as big as all England[o].'

To all this I ſhall only ſay, (1.) That the ſurveys made by Auguſtus were of ROMAN CITIZENS only. So he ſays himſelf,

[m] I think this evidently Kuſter's ſenſe. His Orbis Romani is explained afterwards by totius imperii Romani Incolas. Therefore his urbis cenſus imports Roman citizens living any where.

[n] Demon. Evang. ubi ſupra, § iii.

[o] Prideaux Conn. Part ii. p. 659, 652. 8vo. Edit. 1718.

in

in the inſcription on the Ancyran marble [p]. And the Roman hiſtorians ſay the ſame thing [q]. But the cenſus or deſcription made in Judea, according to St. Luke's account, was of all the inhabitants of that country, which certainly were not, all of them, Roman citizens.

(2.) The years which Prideaux mentions, were not the years in which the decrees were iſſued out, but in which the ſurveys were finiſhed. This appears to me the moſt natural meaning of the words of the inſcription.

Perhaps it will be objected, that the conſulſhips here ſet down, do not denote the years in which a cenſus was finiſhed, but in which it was reſolved upon and entered in the *Faſti*, or public acts; and that the ſenſe of the inſcription may be thus: In ſuch and ſuch a conſulſhip I made a cenſus, by which cenſus, when finiſhed, the number of citizens was found to be ſo and ſo. It may be likewiſe ſaid, that the phraſe *Luſtrum feci*, does not neceſſarily import the making the *Luſtrum*, which was done when the cenſus was over, but that *Luſtrum* is here ſynonymous with cenſus. And it may be urged, that when *Luſtrum* denotes the ſolemn ſacrifice at the concluſion of the cenſus, the verb *condo* is uſed, and not *facio*, which we have here.

To this I anſwer, that by the account here given of the third cenſus, we are obliged to ſuppoſe, that the conſulſhips here named, denote the times when each cenſus was finiſhed. Sextus Pompeius and Sextus Apuleius, in whoſe conſulſhip the laſt cenſus is placed, were conſuls A. U. 767, A. D. 14. And Auguſtus died the 19th of Auguſt, that very ſame year. If the cenſus had been only begun, and not finiſhed, he could not have ſet down on the table, as he has done, the number of citizens which was found in that cenſus. Moreover, it is plain from [r] Suetonius, that Tiberius was nominated for colleague of Auguſtus in this cenſus, the year before, if not ſooner. It is likely, the cenſus might be then entered in the public acts: but however that be, it is plain, that the date on the

[p] Et in Conſulatu. Sexto. Cenſum. POPULI. Collega. M. Agrippa. Egi—Quo. Lustro CIVIUM ROMANORUM. Cenſita ſunt Capita. Quadragiens. Centum. Millia. Et. Sexaginta. Tria.——Cum——Nuper. Lustrum. Solus. Feci. Legi. Cenſorum. I. CENTO. Coſ. Quo. Luſtro. Cenſa. ſunt. CIVIUM ROMANORUM. Quadragens. Centum. Millia. Et. Ducenta. Trigenta. Tria—In conſulatu. Fi.—Cum. nuperrime —Luſtrum. Cum. Lega. Tiberio. Sext. Pompeio. Et Sext. Apuleio. Coſ. Quo. Luſtro. ROM. CAPITUM. Quadragens. Centum. Mil.—IGIENTA. Et. Septem. Mil. Legi. [q] Recepit & morum legumque regimen æque perpetuum: quo jure, quamquam ſine cenſuræ honore, cenſum tamen POPULI ter egit. Suet. in Aug. c. 27. [r] A Germania in urbem poſt biennium regreſſus, triumphum, quem diſtulerat, egit.——Dedicavit & concordiæ ædem.—Ac non multo poſt lege per Coſſ. lata, ut provincias cum Auguſto communiter adminiſtraret, ſimulque cenſum ageret, condito luſtro in Illyricum profectus eſt. Vit. Tiber. c. 20, 21.

Ancyran

Ancyran marble ſignifies the completing of the cenſus. And I think, that the paſſage I have juſt quoted from Suetonius may remove the ſcruple relating to the phraſe; ſince he has uſed the verb *condo*; by which we are fully aſſured, that the cenſus was finiſhed, and the ſolemn ſacrifice performed at the concluſion of it, in the year ſet down on the Ancyran marble.

Farther, Auguſtus in the Ancyran marble, places his firſt cenſus in his own ſixth conſulſhip, Agrippa being his colleague. And Dio ſays expreſsly, that Auguſtus made, or finiſhed [s] the cenſus in that year. This being the caſe as to the firſt and third cenſus of Auguſtus, we may conclude the ſame thing alſo with reference to the ſecond, and that it was finiſhed the eighth year before the chriſtian æra: conſequently, it is impoſſible that St. Luke's deſcription ſhould have been a part of it.

After Auguſtus's death, there were three books found among his papers: and one of theſe is alleged as a proof, that there had been made ſome general ſurvey of the Roman empire, and that about this time. Prideaux's words are theſe, 'Of the 'book, which Auguſtus made out of the ſurveys and deſcrip-'tions, which were at this time returned to him out of every 'province and depending kingdom of the Roman empire, 'Tacitus [t], Suetonius [u], and Dio Caſſius [x], make mention, and 'repreſent it to be very near of the ſame kind with our Doomſ-'day book above-mentioned.'

But I do not ſee how Auguſtus's having had by him a little book, (libellum, Breviarium imperii), written with his own hand, containing a ſmall abridgment of the public taxes, impoſts, and revenues, can be any proof, that this ſtate of the empire was formed upon a ſurvey made at this time, or indeed, upon any general ſurvey made at any other time, by virtue of any one ſingle decree (that is St. Luke's phraſe,) for the whole empire. This ſtate, which Auguſtus had by him, of the public ſtrength and riches, might have been formed upon ſurveys made at different times. Nay, he might have in this book the ſtate of dependent kingdoms, in ſome of which a cenſus had never been made. And it is likely, it may ap-

[s] Και τας υποσραφας εξελεσε. Lib. liii. p. 496. c.

[t] Cum proferri libellum recitariquè juſſit. Opes publicæ continebantur. Quantum civium, ſociorumque in armis: quos claſſes, regna, provinciæ, tributa aut vectigalia, & neceſſitates & largitiones, quæ cuncta ſuâ manu perſcripſerat Auguſtus. Tacit. Ann. Lib. i. c. 11.

[u] De tribus voluminibus, uno mandata de funere ſuo complexus eſt: altero, indicem rerum a ſe geſtarum, quem vellet incidi in æneis tabulis, quæ ante Mauſoleum ſtatuerentur: tertiò, breviarium totius imperii, quantum militum ubique ſub ſignis eſſet, quantum pecuniæ in ærario & fiſcis, & vectigaliùm reſiduis. Suet. in Aug. c. 101.

[x] Το τριτον τα τε των στρατιωτων, και τα των προσοδων, των τε αναλωματων των δημοσιων, το, τε πληθος των εν τοις ταμιειοις χρηματων. Dio. l. lvi. p. 591. B.

pear in the progreſs of this argument, that there were ſeveral countries, branches of the Roman empire, which had never been obliged to a cenſus.

Beſide that there is not found in any ancient Roman hiſtorian any account of a general cenſus of all the countries and people of the Roman empire; there are conſiderations taken from the nature of the thing, which render it very improbable, that a general cenſus ſhould ever have been appointed at one time. The Roman aſſeſſments were always diſagreeable things in the provinces, and often cauſed diſturbances. An univerſal cenſus at the ſame time ſeems to have been impracticable. And there does not appear in any Roman hiſtorian ſo much as a hint, that ſuch a thing was ever thought of by any of their emperors.

What is juſt now ſaid of the difficulty of making a general ſurvey at one and the ſame time, affects chiefly Prideaux's ſentiment, who ſeems to think that the taxing St. Luke ſpeaks of was a proper Roman cenſus. They who ſuppoſe, that it was only a numbering of the people, are not particularly concerned with it.

2. I am of opinion, that St. Luke ſpeaks only of a taxing in Judea; and that the firſt verſe of his ſecond chapter ought to be rendered after this manner: *And it came to paſs in thoſe days, that there went forth a decree from Cæſar Auguſtus, that all the* land *ſhould be taxed.* So Lenfant has tranſlated it [y]. Bynæus likewiſe is of the ſame ſentiment, and has ſupported it, in my judgment, very well [z].

I have ſhewn in another [a] place, that the word we have here does ſometimes denote a particular country only, and that St. Luke has uſed it for the land of Judea. And he muſt be ſo underſtood in this place. The decree relates to the land of Judea only, becauſe [b] the account that follows is of that country only. And muſt not every one perceive ſome deficiency,

[y] En ce temps là, il fût publié un Edit de la part de Céſar Auguſte, pour faire un dénombrement de tout le pais. Nouveau. Teſt. voyez les notes. [z] Antonius Bynæus de natali J. Chriſti. lib. i. c. 3. §. vi. [a] See B. i. p. 542. n. h. Sometime after this whole chapter was in a manner quite finiſhed, I met with Keuchenii Annotata in N. T. He has upon this text alleged ſome other examples of this uſe of οἰκουμενη. I rely upon thoſe I have produced in the place referred to, and ſhall not trouble the reader with more.

[b] What is above was written ſeveral months before I had ſeen Keuchenius. But my ſentiments are ſo much confirmed by what he has ſaid upon the ſame ſubject, that I am perſuaded the reader will allow me to take the advantage of ſubjoining here from him what follows: Præterea, an veri ſpeciem habet, Auguſtum uno eodemque tempore deſcriptionem per totum orbem Romanum inſtituere voluiſſe? accedit quod omnes v. 3. ad civitatem patriam profecti leguntur, ut deſcriberentur, nimirum illud πασας reſpicit ad πασαν την οικουμενην, cujus deſcriptio injuncta fuiſſe verſ. 1. legitur, & illius mandati authoritate omnes impulſi, & ad propriam civitatem profecti eſſe memorantur.

if

if οικεμενη be here rendered the whole world, or the Roman empire? Let us see what St. Luke says, omitting at present the parenthesis. *And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth.* If the account of the decree had been worded by St. Luke so generally, as to comprehend the whole world, would he not have taken some notice of the land of Judea, before he came to relate particularly what was done in it?

If it be enquired: if the land of Judea only be meant, what does the term *all* signify? I answer, it was very necessary to be added. At the time when St. Luke wrote, and indeed from the death of Herod, which happened soon after the nativity of Jesus, the land of Judea, or of Israel, had suffered a dismembering. Archelaus had to his share Judea properly so called, together with Samaria and Idumea; and the province of Judea, which was afterwards governed by Roman procurators, was pretty much of the same extent. But Galilee, Iturea, and other parts of the land of Israel, had been given to other descendents of Herod the great.

St. Luke's words, therefore, are extremely proper and expressive, that ALL THE LAND *should be taxed*; to shew, that this decree of Augustus comprehended Galilee, the country in which Joseph lived. That this was the intention in adding this term of universality, is evident from St. Luke's specifying immediately afterwards the name of the city, from which Joseph came to Bethlehem; which city was not in the country that originally belonged to the tribe of Judah, nor situated in the bounds of the province of Judea at the time in which St. Luke is supposed to write, but was of the kingdom of Judea, in the reign of Herod.

It seems needless to observe, that it was very common to add the term all or whole, to Judea or land, when persons intended the land of the Israelites. There are divers instances in the Old and New Testament. And Josephus, speaking of Agrippa the elder, who had been possessed of all the territories subject to his grandfather Herod the great, says: 'He had now 'reigned three years over the WHOLE land of Judea[c].'

Though I am very well satisfied from the context, that St. Luke comprehends nothing in Augustus's decree beside the land of Judea; yet it is no small confirmation of this interpretation, that the most early christian writers seem to have under-

[c] Τριτον δε ηδη αυτω βασιλευοντι της ολης Ιουδαιας πεπληρωτο. Joseph. pag. 871. v. 34.

stood

ſtood St. Luke in the ſame manner. For when they ſpeak of this circumſtance of our Saviour's nativity, they never ſay any thing of a general cenſus all over the world, or the Roman empire.

Juſtin Martyr in his firſt Apology informs the emperor and the ſenate of the time and place of Chriſt's nativity. 'Bethlehem,' ſays he, 'in which Jeſus Chriſt was born, is a village 'in the country of the Jews, at the diſtance of five and thirty 'ſtadia from Jeruſalem. You may aſſure yourſelves of this 'from the cenſus made in the time of Cyrenius, your firſt 'procurator in Judea [d].' He mentions this cenſus alſo in ſeveral other places, and always in the ſame manner [e]. I do not recollect above one paſſage of Irenæus, in which there is any notice taken of this cenſus [f], and that is not very material.

St. Clement of Alexandria ſays: 'Our Lord was born in 'the eight and twentieth year, when they firſt ordered a cen'ſus to be made in the time of Auguſtus [g].'

Origen confounds this cenſus with that afterwards made in Judea by [h] Cyrenius, but ſays nothing of its being univerſal. And indeed the paſſage amounts almoſt to a poſitive proof, that he thought the cenſus related to Judea only.

Tertullian has often made mention of the time of the riſe of Chriſtianity, in his Apology addreſſed to the Roman magiſtrates [i], in his books inſcribed to the gentiles [k]: of this and the cenſus, in his treatiſes written againſt the Jews [l] and againſt heretics [m]: but yet there is no notice taken of any cenſus beſide that in Judea.

[d] Κωμη δε τις εστιν εν τη χωρα Ιουδαιων, απεχουσα σταδιους τριακοντα πεντε Ιεροσολυμων, εν η εγεννηθη Ιησους Χριστος; ως και μαθειν δυνασθε εκ των αποτραφων των γενομενων επι Κυρηνιου του υμετερου εν Ιουδαια πρωτου γενομενου επιτροπου. Juſt. Mart. Ap. 1. p. 75. E. [e] Προ ετων εκαιον πεντηκοντα γεγεννησθαι τον Χριστον λεγειν ημας επι Κυρηνιου. Ibid. p. 83. B. Αποτραφης ουσης εν τη Ιουδαια τοτε πρωτης επι Κυρηνιου κ. τ. λ. Dial. ii. p. 303. D. [f] Sed proxima ætatis dicebant, [Judæi Joh. viii. 56, 57.] ſive verè ſcientes ex conſcriptione cenſus, ſive conjicientes ſecundum ætatem, quam videbant habere eum ſuper quadraginta. Iren. lib. ii. cap. xxii. § 6. [g] Εγεννηθη δε ο Κυριος ημων τω ογδοω και εικοστω ετει, οτε πρωτον εκελευσαν αποτραφας γενεθσαι. Clem. Strom. lib. i. p. 339. D.

[h] Και μετ' εκεινον [Θευδαν] εν ταις της αποτραφης ημεραις, οτ' εοικε γεγεννησθαι ο Ιησους, Ιουδας τις Γαλιλαιος πολλους εαυτω συναπεστησεν απο του λαου των Ιουδαιων. Orig. cont. Celſ. lib. i. p. 44. [i] Apol. cap. 5, 7, 21. [k] Ad Nat. lib. i. cap. 7.

[l] Fuit enim de patria Bethlehem, & de domo David, ſicut apud Romanos in cenſu deſcripta eſt Maria, ex quâ naſcitur Chriſtus. Adv. Judæos. cap. 9. [m] Auſer hinc, inquit, moleſtos ſemper Cæſaris cenſus. De carne Chriſti. cap. 2. Sed & cenſus conſtat actos ſub Auguſto nunc in Judæa per Sentium Saturninum, apud quos genus ejus inquirere potuiſſent. Adv. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 19. Tam diſtincta fuit a primordio Judæa gens per tribus & populos, & familias, & domos, ut nemo facile ignorari de genere potuiſſet, vel de recentibus Auguſtinianis cenſibus, adhuc tunc fortaſſe pendentibus. Ibid. cap. 36.

If any think that we are to expect no mention of a general cenſus from the chriſtian writers, becauſe the cenſus in Judea was all that was to their purpoſe: I ſay, that a general cenſus of all the people and countries of the Roman empire was very much to their purpoſe, the more to illuſtrate the epoch of our Saviour's nativity. A general cenſus muſt have been better known than one that was particular. Would Juſtin Martyr, Origen, and Tertullian, have omitted this circumſtance, if St. Luke had mentioned it? or if they themſelves were aware of it? And yet in their time certainly an univerſal cenſus, made in the reign of Auguſtus, could not have been forgotten.

Nay, though the univerſality of the cenſus had been a circumſtance of no importance at all in their argument, yet it is almoſt impoſſible, but it muſt have dropped from them in ſome one of thoſe many occaſions in which they have mentioned our Saviour's nativity, and the cenſus which accompanied it.

I ſhall proceed but one ſtep farther to obſerve, that Euſebius has made no mention of any more than the cenſus performed in Judea, neither in his hiſtory [n], nor in his Chronicle [o].

I cannot ſay, that this interpretation is ſupported by any ancient verſion. But Bynæus [p] obſerves, that in an ancient gloſs there is this explanation of it: [*That all the world ſhould be taxed*] or ſurveyed; not the orb of all the earth, but the orb of Judea and Syria.

If then the cenſus or deſcription, ordered by the decree of Auguſtus at the time of our Saviour's nativity, was of the land of Judea only, the ſilence of ancient hiſtorians is no objection at all againſt St. Luke's account. There muſt have been many ſurveys of provinces of the Roman empire in the reign of Auguſtus, of which there is no notice taken by any of the Roman or Greek authors now in our hands.

The only writer in whom we could expect any mention of it is Joſephus. Whether he has ſpoke of it or not will be conſidered hereafter. But ſuppoſing at preſent, that there is no notice at all taken of it by him, this is no objection againſt St. Luke. It is not to be expected we ſhould find in one ſingle hiſtorian all the affairs that were tranſacted in his country. We

[n] Vid. Hiſt. Ecc. lib. i. cap. τῳ λγ Ἡρῳδὲ Κυρηνιος ὑπο της συγκλητου βουλης απεσταλμενος εις την Ἰουδαιαν απογραφας εποιησατο των ὑσιων και των οικετων. p. 76. vid. & p. 200.

[o] Edit, legimus. Octavius xlii. imperii ſuo anno, publico decreto edixit, ut univerſus orbis Judæorum & Syriæ deſcriberetur; & paulo poſt, [ut cenſeretur totus orbis] ſive deſcriberetur: non quidem orbis terrarum, ſed orbis Judæorum & Syriæ. Bynæus. De natali Jeſu Chriſti. p. 306.

[p] Hoc a nemine interpretum, quod quidem ego ſciam, animadverſum eſſe niſi in ſpecimine Gloſſæ Ordinariæ, quod Robertus Stephanus edi-

have

have undoubted evidence of this enrolment in the early teſtimonies of the Chriſtian writers. I have already exhibited more than enough of them. Juſtin Martyr ſpeaks of it in his Apology to the emperor and the ſenate before the middle of the ſecond century. Tertullian mentions it in ſeveral of his pieces. There is ſcarce any one occaſional fact or circumſtance relating to the hiſtory of Jeſus, which was more frequently and more publicly mentioned by the chriſtian writers: and yet it was never conteſted, that I know of, in all antiquity, not even by the adverſaries of the chriſtian religion. Julian ſpeaks of it as a thing univerſally known. I ſubjoin his words. 'The 'Jeſus, ſays he, whom you extol, was one of Cæſar's ſubjects. 'If you make a doubt of it, I will prove it by and by: though 'it may be as well done now. For you ſay yourſelves, that 'he was enrolled with his father and mother in the time of 'Cyrenius [q].'

I preſume I have anſwered this objection: but it is upon the ſuppoſition, that St. Luke ſpeaks of a cenſus or enrolment in Judea only. I have not taken up this interpretation to avoid a difficulty, but becauſe I really think it to be St. Luke's meaning. However, if St. Luke be ſuppoſed to ſpeak of a general cenſus of the Roman empire, I own, that the ſilence of antiquity would be a very great objection. Nor is the difficulty much leſſened by ſuppoſing, this enrolment was of perſons only and not of lands or goods. The numbering the people was far from being the principal deſign of a cenſus of Roman citizens. But yet, oftentimes, when an hiſtorian mentions a cenſus, he gives very little account of any thing relating to it, beſide the number of citizens that was found. If ever the number of all the people of the Roman empire had been taken in the reign of Auguſtus, it would have been a very great curioſity; and hiſtorians would have been very fond of gratifying their readers with it. Though we have but few writers of thoſe times, yet it is with me unqueſtionable, that in ſome of thoſe we have, there would have been a particular account of ſo remarkable an event, or at leaſt many references to it: whereas there are none at all.

§ II. St. Matthew ſays, that Jeſus was born in the days of Herod. Judea therefore was not at that time a Roman province: and there could be no taxing made there by virtue of a decree of Auguſtus.

[q] Ο παρ υμιν κηρυττομενος Ιησους εις ην των Καισαρος υπηκοων· ει δε απιστειτε, μικρον υστερον αποδειξω· μαλλον δη ηδη λεγεσθω· φαλε μεν τοι αυλον αποσραψασθαι μετα τω πατρος και της μητρος επι Κυρηνιε. Apud. Cyril. l. vi. p. 213. ed. Spanh.

This objection has been anſwered already. For it is evident from what has been alleged from the chriſtian writers, in the reply to the former objection, that there was ſome cenſus, deſcription, or ſurvey, made in Judea at the time of our Saviour's nativity, by a decree of Auguſtus. However, that no ſcruples may remain in the minds of any from a falſe notion of the ſtate of Judea under Herod, I ſhall particularly conſider the matter of this ſecond objection.

But I would firſt obſerve in general, that though we have the word *taxing* in our verſion, *that all the world ſhould be taxed; this taxing was firſt made*; yet the words uſed by St. Luke do not import a tax, or laying a tax or duty upon a people. In the margin of our Bibles we have the word *enrolled*; and in moſt other tranſlations[r] a word of like ſignification is uſed.

I muſt alſo premiſe, that ſome have thought that this enrolment was to be only of names and perſons; and that all Auguſtus aimed at by this decree, was to know the number of people inhabiting the Roman empire, with their employments and conditions of life. Whitby paraphraſes theſe words thus: *That all the world ſhould be taxed:* that is, 'ſhould have their 'names and conditions of life ſet down in court rolls, accord-'ing to their families.'

Others have thought, that this decree obliged to a regiſtry not only of the names of perſons and their conditions of life, but alſo of their goods and poſſeſſions; and that in ſhort, it was a Roman cenſus, which was now made, in order to the people's paying taxes for the future, according to the value of their eſtates. I own I am inclined to this latter opinion; and that St. Luke ſpeaks only of a cenſus in Judea, as I have already declared.

Having premiſed theſe things, that we may find out what kind of enrolment or regiſtring was now ordered by Auguſtus; whether a decree of Auguſtus could be obligatory at this time upon the people of Judea; and whether it is likely there was a Roman cenſus made there at this time; I ſhall conſider theſe following particulars.

1. I ſhall explain the nature of a Roman cenſus.
2. I ſhall conſider the force of St. Luke's words.
3. I ſhall deſcribe in general the ſtate of Judea under Herod.
4. I ſhall enquire what grounds there are to believe, that a Roman cenſus was made in Judea at this time.

r Ut deſcriberetur univerſus orbis. Hæc deſcriptio prima facta eſt: Verſ. vulg. pour faire un denombrement—ce denombrement ſe fit. Mons verſ. M. Le Clerc. Lenfant, &c.

1. I ſhall explain the nature of a Roman cenſus. A cenſus (as I take it,) conſiſted of theſe two parts: firſt, the account which the people gave in of themſelves and their eſtates; and ſecondly, the value ſet upon their eſtates by the cenſors, who took the account from them. The people did undoubtedly repreſent in ſome meaſure the value of the things they entered; but the cenſors ſeem to have had the power of determining and ſettling the value.

There was indeed another thing which belonged to the office of the cenſors at Rome, the cenſure or correction of manners: but, as I ſuppoſe, that belonged only to a cenſus of Roman citizens, and that it was no part of a cenſus of all the inhabitants of a province, or of a country ſubject to a dependent prince, I take no notice of it here.

The Roman cenſus was an inſtitution of Servius Tullius, the ſixth king of Rome. Dionyſius of Hallicarnaſſus gives us this account of it; that 'he ordered all the citizens of 'Rome to regiſter their eſtates according to their value in 'money, taking an oath, in a form he preſcribed, to deliver 'a faithful account according to the beſt of their knowledge, 'ſpecifying withal the name of their parents, their own age, 'and the names of their wives and children, adding alſo what 'quarter of the city, or what town in the country they lived in[s].

And after much the ſame manner do we find a Roman cenſus deſcribed in the [t] Fragments of the twelve tables, and in the Roman [u] orators, [x] hiſtorians, and [y] lawyers. From all whom it appears, the people were required to give in an account of their names, their quality, employments, wives, children, ſervants and eſtates.

Beſide what the people did, there ſeems to have been ſomething done by the cenſors more than the bare taking the account the people gave in: that is, they were to determine the value of each particular of their eſtates, and the amount [z] of

[s] Εκελευσεν απανλας Ρωμαιες αποφραϊσθαι τε και τιμασθαι τας υσιας προς αρξιον, ομοσανλας τον νομιμον ορκον, η μη τ' αληθη και απο παντος τε βελτιςε τετιμησθαι, παιδων τε ων εισι γραφουλας, και ηλικιαν ην εχουσι δηλουλας, γυναικας τε και παιδας ονομαζουλας, και εν τινι καλοικουσιν εκαςοι της πολεως τοπω, η πωλω της χωρας προσιθουλας. Dionyſ. Hal. Ant. Rom. l. iv. c. 15. p. 212. init. Hudſ. Edit.

[t] Cenſores populi civitates, ſoboles, familias, pecuniaſque cenſento. Cic. de Leg. lib. iii. cap. 3.

[u] Jam (ut cenſoriæ tabulæ loquuntur) fabrûm & procûm, audeo dicere, non fabrorum & procorum. Cic. Orator. n. 156.

[x] Ab hoc (Servio Tullio) populus Romanus relatus in cenſum.—Summâque regis ſolertiâ ita eſt ordinata reſpublica, ut omnia patrimonii, dignitatis, ætatis, artium, officiorumque diſcrimina in tabulas referrentur, ac ſi maxima civitas minimæ domus diligentiâ contineretur. Florus, lib. i. cap. 6. vid. Liv. lib. i. cap. 42. & ſeq.

[y] Vid. Digeſta Tit. de cenſibus.

[z] In cenſu habendo poteſtas omnis æſtimationis habendæ, ſummæque faciundæ, cenſori permittitur. Cic. in Verr. lib. ii. n. 131.

the whole; and from this seems to have been taken the name or title of this office, both in the [a] Latin and in the [b] Greek language. For not only was the compass of ground which any one possessed to be considered, but the nature of it, and the profits it might yield: nor the number only of slaves or servants which any one had, but also the work [c] they were employed in, according to which their service was to be valued. And therefore every one reckoned himself worth so [d] much as the censors valued his estate at.

This power, which the censors had of rating or valuing the estates of all persons, gave them an opportunity of committing injustice, in favouring some and oppressing others. For though there were [e] rules, by which they ought to regulate their estimation of every particular; and the supreme censors [f] were wont to issue out precepts to their under officers, enjoining justice and equity in their posts; yet if the supreme censors were men of ill principles, very great enormities often went unpunished [g].

That the reader may have a complete idea of the design of these enrolments among the Romans, at least so far as is necessary to our purpose, I shall add here the account which Dionysius has given of the census made by Laertius the dictator, A. U. 258. before Christ, 496. Being chosen dictator, 'He 'immediately ordered that all, according to the excellent in- 'stitution of Servius Tullius, should in their several tribes 'give in an account of their estates, setting down the names 'of their wives and children, and their own age, and that of 'their children. All having in a short time offered themselves 'to be assessed, (for the penalty of neglect was no less than 'forfeiture of estate and citizenship;) there were found to be 'one hundred and fifty thousand and seven hundred Romans 'at man's estate. After this, he separated those who were of 'military age from the elder; and disposing those into centu- 'ries, he formed four bodies of horse and [h] foot.' From this

[a] Censio æstimatio, unde Censores. Festus de verb. Sign. Censores ab re appellati sunt. Liv. lib. iv. cap. 8. fin. [b] Τιμητης.

[c] In servis deferendis observandum est, ut & nationes eorum, & officia, & artificia specialiter deferantur. l. iv. §. 5. ff. de censibus. [d] Censores dicti, quod rem suam quisque tanti æstimare solitus sit, quantum illi censuerint. Festus. V. Censores. [e] Formâ censuali cavetur, ut agri sic in censum referantur,——arvum quod in decem annos proximos satum erit, quot jugerum sit,——illam æquitatem debet admittere censitor, ut officio ejus congruat, relevari eum, qui in publicis tabulis delato modo frui certis ex causis non possit. Lib. iv. pr. eod. [f] Edicis enim, te in decumanum, si plura sustulerit, quam debitum sit, in octuplum judicium daturum esse. Cic. in Verr. l. iii. n. 26.

[g] Sic census habitus est, te Prætore, ut eo censu nullius civitatis respublica posset administrari. Nam locupletissimi cujusque census extenuârant, tenuissimi auxerant. Ibid. lib. ii. n. 138. [h] Το κεφαλιωτων υπο Σερβιε Τυλλιε τε δημοτικωτατε βασι-

passage

paſſage it appears, that the knowledge of the military ſtrength of the ſtate was intended in this inſtitution, as well as the regulating the public revenue. It was neceſſary to obſerve this here, that the reader may the better judge of ſome arguments that follow.

2. We ſhall now conſider the force and import of the words St. Luke makes uſe of in his account of the matter before us.

Now it muſt be allowed, that the verb made uſe of by St. Luke in the firſt verſe, *that all ſhould be taxed*, or enrolled [i], is uſed by Greek authors for the making any kind of entry or enrolment. Thus Servius Tullius obſerving many Roman citizens to be in debt, ordered all of them, who had not wherewithal to ſatisfy their creditors, to enter [k] their names, and the ſum they owed in public rolls; that it might be known what the whole amounted to, and proviſion might be made for payment.

This word is likewiſe uſed concerning the enrolments which were made when the Roman citizens gave in their names, and enliſted themſelves in the ſervice of a general [l].

So that perhaps there may be ſome reaſon to queſtion, whether St. Luke intended not, a bare entry or enrolment made by the people of Judea of their names and conditions of life, as many learned men have ſuppoſed.

But yet on the other hand it is certain, that the whole of a cenſus is oftentimes expreſſed, by the Greek authors, by the words which St. Luke has uſed. Thus Dio Caſſius, ſpeaking of Auguſtus's firſt cenſus, ſays, 'in the ſame year he finiſhed [m] 'the enrolments:' hereby meaning the whole of a cenſus, including alſo the cenſure of manners, which belonged to a cenſus of Roman citizens. And in another place, when he particularly deſcribes the office of a cenſor, he ſays: 'As 'cenſors, they [the emperors] enquire [n] into our lives and 'manners, and make enrolments.' He intends therefore in

λεις καλασαθειλων νομιμων, πρωλος επελαξε Ρωμαιοις απασι ποιησαι, τιμησεις καλα φυλας των βιων ενεγκειν, προσγραφουλας γυναικων και παιδων ονομαλα, και ηλικιας εκαλαι τι και τεκνων· εν ολιγω δε χρονω πανλων τιμησαμενων, δια το μεγεθος της τιμωριας· την τε γαρ ουσιαν απολεσαι τους απειθησανλας εδει, και την πολιλειαν· επλακοσιοις σλειως ευρεθησαν οι εν ηδη Ρωμαιων πενλεκαιδεκα μυριαδων· μελα τουλο διακρινας τους εχονλας την σρατευσιμον ηλικιαν απο των πρεσβυλερων· κ. τ. λ. Lib. v. c. 75. p. 324.

[i] Απογραφεσθαι πασαν την οικουμενην (Αυδη η απογραφη· κ. τ. λ.) [k] Απογραφεσθαι κελευσας τους αποχρεως, οσοι την πιστιν αδυναλοι ησαν φυλαλτειν τοις οφειλεσι, και ποσον εκαστος. Dionyſ. Hal. L. iv. c. 10. p. 207. [l] Συνεγρεον απογραφομενοι τε προς τους ηγεμονας τα ονομαλα, και τον σραλιωλικον ομνυνλες αρχον. Dion. Hal. Lib. x. cap. 16. init. [m] Εν δ' ουν τω τοτε παροντι ταλε αλλα ωσπερ ειθιστο επραξε, και τας απογραφας εξελεσε. Dio. L. liii. p. 496. C. ad A. U. C. 726.—— vid. etiam p. 512. B. και αυλων (ſc. Gallorum) και απογραφας εποιησαλο, &c.

[n] Εκ δε του τιμαλευειν, τους τε βιους και τους τροπους ημων εξελαζουσι, και απογραφας ποιουνλαι. Id. L. liii. p. 508. B. C.

this place the whole of a cenſus, except the correction of manners, by the noun, which St. Luke makes uſe of in the ſecond verſe; only it is in the plural number.

Farther, St. Luke's narration contains in it ſo many circumſtances of a Roman cenſus, that I cannot but think there was at this time a proper cenſus. The ſubſtance of the decree was, that all the land ſhould be enrolled. Again, *All went to be taxed*, or enrolled. And he intimates very plainly, that Mary alſo was enrolled with Joſeph. All theſe are particulars extremely agreeable to the nature of a Roman cenſus.

Though therefore the words in St. Luke, and eſpecially the verb in the firſt verſe, are uſed for the making of any kind of entry, yet the whole relation obliges us to underſtand it concerning this particular kind of enrolment.

And St. Luke's words appear to be extremely proper. The edicts for a cenſus ſeem to have generally run in this form, expreſſing the duty of the people. There is in Cicero the title of ſuch an edict, publiſhed by Verres prætor of Sicily, when a cenſus was to be made in that province. It is called an EDICT concerning the ENROLMENT [o].

In a cenſus of the citizens of Rome, the number of the people was always taken and obſerved, but there was a cenſus made of goods and lands as well as of perſons. This appears from paſſages already quoted from Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus and others. And Livy ſays expreſsly, that the very deſign of the inſtitution was, that people might contribute to the expences of the ſtate not by the head, but in proportion to their eſtates [p].

And for aught that appears, the ſame views were purſued in the aſſeſſments made in the provinces. Tacitus indeed ſays, that the Batavi paid no tribute to the Romans, and furniſhed the ſtate with arms and [q] men only upon occaſion. And ſome may be diſpoſed to infer from hence, that there might be enrolments made in ſuch a province, of the names of the people and their conditions of life, in order to know what number of troops it might furniſh the ſtate with.

[o] EDICTUM DE PROFESSIONE. Cic. in Verr. lib. iii. n. 26. [p] Ut quemadmodum Numa divini auctor juris fuiſſet, ita Servium conditorem omnis in civitate diſcriminis, ordinumque, quibus inter gradus dignitatis FORTUNÆQUE aliquid interlucet, poſteri fama ferrent: Cenſum enim inſtituit, rem ſaluberrimam tanto futuro imperio: ex quo belli pacisque munia NON VIRITIM SED PRO HABITU PECUNIARUM, FIERENT. Liv. lib. i. cap. 42. [q] Nec opibus Romanis, ſocietate validiorum attriti, viros tantum armaque imperio miniſtrant. Tacit. Hiſt. lib. iv. cap. 12. Nam nec tributis contemnuntur, nec publicanus atterit, exempti oneribus & collationibus, & tantum in uſum præliorum ſepoſiti, velut tela atque arma bellis reſervantur. Id. de Morib. Germ. cap. 29.

This

This is very poſſible, and I think not unlikely: though I have not yet ſeen any particular inſtance of it referred to by learned men upon this occaſion. Some however do ſuppoſe, that the ſurvey of Judea at this time was made by Auguſtus with this very view[r]. But I believe Judea was the laſt place in which the Romans would look for ſoldiers. The Jews had formerly ſerved the kings of Syria and Egypt in their wars; they had likewiſe been in the Roman armies. But now they had ſcruples about ſerving heathens in this way: and all of them who were in the ſervice of the Romans had been diſcharged in form[s]. Their own kings kept foreign troops in Judea. After the conqueſt of Egypt, Auguſtus made Herod a preſent of four hundred Gauls, that had been the life guard of Cleopatra queen of Egypt[t]. And in the deſcription of Herod's funeral ſolemnity, Joſephus reckons up three diſtinct corps of foreign ſoldiers, Thracians, Germans, and Gauls[u]. Indeed the Jews were at this time ſo ſelf-willed and tumultuous, that, as it ſeems, no prince was very forward to put weapons into their hands.

I recollect but one inſtance, that looks like a deſign of any of the Roman emperors to take Jews into their ſervice. This was in the reign of Tiberius, who, as Suetonius ſays, ſent the Jewiſh youth (who were at Rome) under a ſort of military oath into the more unhealthful provinces[x]. But this ſeems to me to have been more like ſending them to the mines, than taking them into military ſervice. We are certain the Jews did afterward pay tribute to the Romans; and perhaps I may hereafter make it appear they were now, and had been before this, tributary to the Romans. It is therefore much more likely, that ſurveys ſhould be made in Judea with a view to tribute than to military ſervice.

Nor do I perceive what learned men gain by this. They think it diſhonourable to Herod to have the goods of his ſubjects enrolled and rated by a Roman officer for the paying of tribute. But where lies the difference between this, and the numbering and entering his people, in order to demand for ſoldiers as many men as his country could afford? If indeed this enrolment of his people had been made by Herod, by his own authority, and at his own diſcretion, in order to furniſh the emperor with a certain quota of men upon occaſion, Herod's

[r] Breviario igitur quod meditabatur Auguſtus quantum militum Judæa ſuppeditare poſſet, includi debuit. Baſnage. Ann. Polit. Ecc. ante D. 5. n. 11. [s] Joſeph. Ant. l. xvii. c. 10. § 12. [t] Id. de B. J. lib. i. p. 1006, 15. [u] Ibid. cap. ult. ſub. fin. [x] Judæorum juventutem, per ſpeciem ſacramenti, in provincias gravioris cœli diſtribuit. vit. Tiber. c. 36. vid. & Tacit. Ann. ii. c. 85.

honour

honour had been ſaved. But this is not St. Luke's account. *There went out a decree from Cæſar Auguſtus, that all the land ſhould be taxed.* And by virtue of this decree of Auguſtus, all Herod's ſubjects, men and women, in every part of his dominions, were enrolled with great exactneſs, and as it ſeems with great expedition. And the order of enrolment muſt have been very preſſing. I do not ſuppoſe indeed, that the virgin was obliged at all by the decree to go to Bethlehem; but I think, that Joſeph would not have gone thither, when ſhe was ſo near the time of her delivery, if the enrolment would have admitted of a delay, or could have been done at another time.

And that this enrolment was performed by ſome Roman officer, as well as ordered by an imperial decree, may be very fairly concluded from the parentheſis, ver. 2. ſince the main intention of it is to diſtinguiſh it from another, which was certainly made by a Roman officer.

Mr. Whiſton indeed ſays, 'It is very probable that the enrolment of the Jews was made by Herod, at the requeſt of Auguſtus.'[y] It would have been to Mr. Whiſton's purpoſe to give a few ſpecimens of the ſtyle of Auguſtus, or of the republic toward ſome of their dependent nominal kings. But it would not have ſignified much in this caſe, becauſe St. Luke does not ſay, *there went out* a requeſt *from Cæſar Auguſtus*, but a *decree*; and therefore we ſhould have been ſtill obliged to call it a *decree:* and I believe we may do ſo very ſafely. We ſhall find by and by, from the hiſtory of Herod, that it is very unlikely that Auguſtus ſhould have ſent Herod any requeſts about this time.

Again: Mr. Whiſton ſuppoſes 'that Herod the king of the Jews was requeſted or required to get him [Auguſtus] a like exact account of the Jewiſh nation, as he had already attained of the reſt of the Roman empire.' But if this had been all that Auguſtus did, namely, requiring or requeſting this of Herod, then Herod muſt have iſſued a command or order to all his people to enrol themſelves. But how came St. Luke to mention Auguſtus's requirement or requeſt to Herod, and call it a decree too, and yet ſay nothing of Herod's order? I think, St. Luke does plainly repreſent the people of Judea in motion for enrolling themſelves in their ſeveral cities in obedience to Auguſtus's decree; and he ſays nothing of Herod.

Some have thought that this enrolment was the effect of Auguſtus's curioſity. And ſome expreſſions of Claudius[z], in his

[y] Short view of the Harm. of the four Evan. p. 149.

[z] Et quidem cum ad cenſus novo tum opere & inadſueto Galliis ad bellum avocatus eſſet. Quod opus,

ſpeech

ſpeech to the ſenate about giving the freedom of the city to the Gauls, have been alleged by learned men as a proof, that aſſeſſments were ſometimes made in the provinces purely out of curioſity. For he ſays, that he had found a cenſus to be a very difficult work, even when nothing more was intended by it, than to know what his eſtate (or riches) was. But even from theſe words it appears, that an account was taken of the eſtates of the people, as well as their names and conditions of life. And the cenſors muſt have made an eſtimation: otherwiſe, the value could never have been known with any certainty. Beſides I think, that all the emperor intends here is, that he could eaſily conceive with what difficulty a cenſus was at firſt introduced into a province, when even now a freſh cenſus was ſeldom made without ſome diſturbance. And as a proof of this, he inſtances in the rebellion which the firſt cenſus of Gaul produced in that country [a]. And though he calls this renewing a cenſus, only an enquiry, that his eſtate or revenue might be publicly known, yet certainly the tribute to be paid according to the cenſus is not to be excluded. Princes do not, nor is it reaſonable they ſhould, reckon their people only all their riches. The revenue ariſing from the tribute or taxes which they pay, is certainly a part of the prince's riches. The emperor's meaning therefore is, that the making of a cenſus now is not the impoſing any new hardſhip: the great uſe of them is to preſerve exactneſs and order in the ſtate of the revenues; and yet they give people uneaſineſs: how much more muſt they have done ſo formerly?

Moreover, the taxing afterwards made in Judea was certainly a cenſus of goods as well as perſons. And yet when St. Luke makes mention of it in Gamaliel's [b] ſpeech, he uſes the ſame word he does here.

All the firſt chriſtians thought this was a cenſus of goods. It is apparent that Juſtin Martyr thought ſo, in that he tells the emperor and the ſenate, it was made by their firſt procurator in Judea. Tertullian makes no ſcruple to call it very plainly a cenſus. And Euſebius in his chronicle ſays expreſsly, that enrolments were then made of goods as well as of perſons. All theſe conſiderations, if I miſtake not, render it highly pro-

quam arduum ſit nobis, nunc cum maxime, quamvis nihil ultra quam ut publice notæ ſint facultates noſtræ exquiratur, nimis magno experimento cognoſcimus. Vid. Lipſ. excurſ. ad. Tacit. Ann. xi. A.

[a] Livy ſpeaks likewiſe of this diſturbance. Tumultus, qui ob cenſum exortus erat, compoſitus. Epitome libri 137. Liviani.

[b] Μετα τουτον ανεστη Ιουδας ο Γαλιλαιος εν ταις ημεραις της απογραφης. Act. v. 37.

bable,

bable, that according to St. Luke, there was now a proper census made in Judea throughout the territories of Herod.

But though it be supposed that here was now a census made, yet a census is not a tax. Assessments were certainly made, that tribute might be paid according to them; and where a census was made, a tribute might be required; but yet it might be forbore or remitted. And whether any tribute was raised upon this census or not, I leave at present undetermined.

Supposing the affair St. Luke gives us an account of to have been a Roman census, it is possible two or three enquiries may be here made. (1.) What occasion was there for Joseph to enrol himself, since he was a poor man; as may be concluded from the lesser offering which the virgin made at the temple for her purification?

I answer, that it was the custom in a Roman census, for persons of all employments and characters to enter themselves, as appears from the descriptions given of it in the authors which I have before quoted. And though Joseph was not a rich man, it does not follow he had nothing. However, whatever his condition was, the edict obliged him to give in an account of himself to the officers; unless there was a particular exception made, and only such persons were required to appear who were possessed of estates to such a value. Augustus seems once to have made such a census of the Roman citizens[c]. But that this was not the usual method is evident, because this particular circumstance of that census is mentioned as somewhat extraordinary.

(2.) Since Joseph lived in Galilee, how came he to go up from thence to be registered at Bethlehem?

To this I answer, that possibly he might be obliged to it by virtue of some clause in the edict. Ulpian says[d], that persons ought to enrol themselves in the place where their estate lies. Though Joseph was not rich, yet he might have some small inheritance in or near Bethlehem, and might be obliged to go thither upon that account. But this I do not insist upon here.

St. Luke gives us this reason of his going to Bethlehem: *because he was of the house and lineage of David*, v. 4. It is probable, that this journey was owing to the custom of the Jews, who, whenever they were numbered, entered themselves

[c] Αυτος δε απογραφας, των εν τη Ιταλια κατοικουντων, και μη ελαττω πεντε μυριαδων ουσιαι κεκτημενων, εποιησατο. Τους γαρ ασθενεστερους, τους τε εξω της Ιταλιας οικουντας ουκ ηναγκασεν απογραψασθαι, δεισας μη νεωτερισωσι τι ταραχθεντες. Dio l. lv. p. 557. B.

[d] Is verò qui agrum in aliâ civitate habet, in eâ civitate profiteri debet, in quâ ager est. Agri enim tributum in eam civitatem debet levare, in cujus territorio possidetur, l. iv. § 2. ff. de censibus.

according

according to their tribes and families. If against this it be objected, That the Jews had lost the registers of their families before this time; I answer, that this does not appear. They were reckoned by them to be of great importance: and it is not unlikely that many, if not most of them, had the registers of their families till the final ruin of their state and constitution, and perhaps for some time after it. Anna is said to be the *daughter of Phanuel, of the* TRIBE OF ASSER, Luke ii. 36. Barnabas was a LEVITE, Acts iv. 36. Paul affirms, that he was of the TRIBE OF BENJAMIN, Rom. xi. 1. Phil. iii. 5. And these two were born in foreign countries, the one in Cyprus, the other at Tarsus.

Josephus, the Jewish historian, having mentioned the time of his birth, and the names of several of his ancestors, says; 'Thus have I given an account of my family, as I found it in 'the public records[e].' It is true, Josephus was of the race of the priests, and their registers might be kept with greater care and exactness than others: but it is evident, from what he says of the marriages of the priests, that the registers of other families were in being likewise. 'Every priest,' says he, 'among 'us is obliged to marry a woman of his own nation, and not 'so much to regard money or any other advantages, but to 'make an exact enquiry into her descent, and to accept of no 'account but what is well attested. This is done not in Judea 'only, but in all places; wherever there is any part of our 'nation, this law relating to the marriages of the priests is 'most carefully observed; I mean in Egypt and Babylon, and 'every other part of the world in which any of our priests live[f].'

(3.) What necessity was there, for the Virgin Mary to go to Bethlehem? Surely every master of a family was not obliged by a Roman census, to appear before the officer, with his wife, children and servants, if he had any.

I answer, that I know not of any obligation she was under by virtue of Augustus's edict, to go to Bethlehem at this time: but yet Joseph and Mary might choose it; and they might have very good reasons for it that we are unacquainted with. St. Luke says, ch. ii. 41, 42. *Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year, at the feast of the passover. And when he was*

[e] Την μεν ουν τȣ γενȣς ημων διαδοχην ως εν ταις δημοσιαις Δελτοις ανεγεγραμμενην ευρον, ȣτως παρατιθεμαι. Joseph. in vit. init.

[f] Δει γαρ τον μετεχοντα της ιεροσυνης εξ ομοεθνȣς γυναικος παιδοποιεισθαι, και μη προς χρηματα μηδε τας αλλας αποβλεπειν τιμας, αλλα το γενος εξεταζειν εκ των αρχαιων λαμβανοντα την διαδοχην, και πολλȣς παρασχομενον μαρτυρας· και ταυτα πραττομεν ȣ μονον επ' αυτης Ιȣδαιας αλλ' οπȣ ποτε συστημα τȣ γενȣς εστιν ημων, κακει το ακριβες αποσωζεται τοις ιερευσι περι τȣς γαμȣς· κ. τ. λ. Cont. Apion. l. i. § 7.

twelve

twelve years old, they went up to Jeruſalem, after the cuſtom of the feaſt. And yet by the law of Moſes, the males only were obliged to appear before God at the great feaſts. And many learned men are of opinion, that our Saviour did not go up to Jeruſalem till this paſſover, (which St. Luke here ſpeaks of,) when he was twelve years of age: though his parents, Mary, as it ſeems, as well as Joſeph, had gone up to Jeruſalem every year; that is, from their laſt ſettlement in Galilee, after their return from Egypt.

3. I ſhall now give a general deſcription of the ſtate and condition of Judea under Herod, that we may be able to judge, whether a Roman cenſus could be made in it by virtue of a decree of Auguſtus.

The Roman empire extended at this time to all the moſt conſiderable countries of the known world, whether ſituated in Europe, Aſia, or Africa. Beſide thoſe countries which were properly called provinces, and were governed by officers ſent from Rome, with the title of preſidents, prætors, or procon-ſuls, there were other countries governed by kings, tetrarchs or dynaſts, dependent upon the Roman ſtate.

In the ſtate and condition of theſe dependent princes, there was a conſiderable difference. Some few received their crown from the emperor, and acknowledged a dependence, but paid no tribute[g]; among the reſt, who were in a more proper ſubjection, ſome were called friends of the emperor, or the Roman ſtate. This was undoubtedly a very great honour, eſpecially when conferred in form[h]. Theſe friends of the Romans furniſhed them with part of their troops, or with ſums of money upon particular occaſions; or made preſents to the emperor and his miniſters, when needful; that is, they paid tribute in the genteeleſt way. Others were more properly tributary, and were obliged to the payment of certain ſums of money; but it is generally ſuppoſed, that they raiſed it themſelves among their people by their own officers. But I ſuſpect, that many of thoſe princes, called friends, were properly tributary, and that the emperor had an officer in the territories of moſt of them, who took care of his revenue. Beſide theſe, there were (if I miſtake not) ſome countries under the government of

g Hς [Αρμενιας] Ρωμαιοι εκ αρχεσι μεν εις φορε κομιδην, αυλοι δε αυλοις αποδειχνυσι τες βασιλεως. Appian. in Præf. init.

(h) Cognitis dehinc Ptolemæi per id bellum ſtudiis, repetitus ex vetuſto mos, miſſuſque è ſenatoribus qui ſcipionem ebur-num, togam pictam, antiqua munera patrum daret, regemque & ſocium, atque amicum appellaret. Tacit. Ann. lib. iv. cap. 26. vid. & aliud exemplum apud Dionyſ. Hal. lib. v. cap. 35. p. 291.

dependent

dependent kings, in which a tribute was raised in the way of a Roman census.

That Herod was a dependent prince, I think was never denied. He obtained the kingdom of Judea at first by virtue of a decree of the Roman [i] senate; and was assisted in taking possession of it by Roman troops, commanded by their own [k] officers. Augustus gave him leave to nominate, for his successor, which of his sons he pleased. But yet in his last will there was a clause, by which the final determination of all was submitted to the will and pleasure of the emperor. And after his death, his sons were obliged to go to Rome [l], to obtain the grant and confirmation of Augustus, before they dared to take possession of the territories assigned them by their father.

That Herod was tributary to Augustus, immediately before his death, seems evident from the sentence pronounced by the emperor, after he had considered Herod's will. 'To Archelaus were given,' says Josephus, 'Idumea and Judea, and 'the country of the Samaritans. These were eased of a fourth 'part of their tribute, Cæsar decreeing them this relief, be'cause they had not joined with the other people in their late 'disturbances [m].' I think it most reasonable to understand this of a tribute paid, or to be paid, not to Herod or Archelaus, but to the emperor. If the Samaritans were tributary to Cæsar, the Jews were so likewise. It is plain, these were not more favoured, than the former; and they were both equally subject to Herod and Archelaus.

That Herod had been always tributary to the Roman empire, may be inferred from what Agrippa the younger says to the Jews, in his speech to dissuade them from the war. 'At this time,' says he, 'the desire of liberty is unseasonable. 'It had been much better to have maintained it with vigour 'formerly.———Then all ought to have been done that was 'possible, to have kept out the Romans, when Pompey first 'entered into this land. But our ancestors, and their kings, 'superior to you in wealth, in strength, and conduct, yielded 'to a small part of the Roman power. And you now, the 'hereditary subjects of the Romans, attempt to resist their 'whole empire [n].' And Josephus, in his speech to the Jews

[i] Joseph. de Bell. lib. i. cap. 14. fin.
[k] Ibid. cap. 18.
[l] De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 2.
[m] Τα δε Αρχελαῳ συντελουντα Ιουμαια τε και Ιουδαια, το, τε Σαμαρειτικον τεταρτου μερους ουτοι των φορων παρελελυντο Καισαρος αυτοις κουφισιν ψηφισαμενου, δια το μη συναποστησαι τη λοιπη πληθυι. Joseph. Ant. l. xvii. c. 13. § 4. vid. & de Bell. lib. ii. c. 6.
[n] Αλλα μην τοτε νυν ελευθεριας επιθυμειν αωρον, δεον υπερ του μηδε αποβαλειν αυτην αγωνιζεσθαι προτερον· —τοτε γαρ ουν εχρην παντα υπερ του μη δεξασθαι Ρωμαιους ποιειν, οτε την αρχην επεβαινε της χωρας ο Πομπηιος· αλλ' οι μεν

besieged

beſieged in Jeruſalem, to perſuade them to ſurrender to Titus, plainly dates the beginning of the Jewiſh ſervitude to the Romans, from Pompey's conqueſt of Judea[o]. It may be concluded from hence, that from that time the Jews were tributary to the Romans. Subjection and ſervitude muſt needs imply the paying of tribute.

Appian mentions Herod king of the Idumeans and Samaritans among the other kings, who, according to Mark Antony's direction, were to bring in a certain preſcribed tribute[p]. Antony and Herod were always very good friends, and it cannot be ſuppoſed that Herod was better uſed by Auguſtus, than he had been by Antony.

In the ſtory of the difference between Herod and Syllæus the Arabian, which difference ſeems to have aroſe about three years before Herod's death, and to have continued a year or two at leaſt, if not as long as Herod lived, there is a paſſage that deſerves to be obſerved in this place. 'Syllæus, moreover, bribed Fabatus, Cæſar's procurator, and employed him againſt Herod. But Herod, by a larger ſum of money, drew off Fabatus from Syllæus, and by him required the performance of thoſe things which Cæſar had ordered [to be done by Syllæus]. However, Syllæus went on in his old way, performed none of thoſe things; and moreover accuſed Fabatus to Cæſar, ſaying, that he was a procurator more in Herod's intereſts than the emperor's[q].' By procurator can be meant no other than an officer that took care of the emperor's revenue; and the nature of the charge ſeems to imply, that Fabatus had a truſt under the emperor in Herod's dominions. This indeed may be queſtioned, becauſe that afterwards, Syllæus having killed Fabatus, Aretas the king of Arabia, proſecuted Syllæus at Rome for the murder of Fabatus, as well as for other crimes committed by him[r]. And from hence it may be inferred by ſome, that Fabatus was rather an officer in Arabia. Let it be ſo. However, here is a proof,

ημελεροι προγονοι, και οι βασιλεις αυτων, και χρημασι και σωμασι και ψυχαις αμεινον υμων πολλω διακειμενοι, προς μοιραν ολιγην της Ρωμαιων δυναμεως ουκ αντεσχον. υμεις δε, οι το μεν υπακουειν εκ διαδοχης παρειληφοτες—προς ολην ανθιστασθε την Ρωμαιων ηγεμονιαν. Joſeph. de Bell. lib. ii. cap. 16. p. 1085, 1086. ο Ποθεν δ' ηξαμεθα δουλειας, αρ' ουχι εκ στασεως των προγονων, ὁτε η Αριστοβουλου, και Υρκανου μανια, και η προς αλληλους εριs Πομπηιον επηγαγε τη πολει, και Ρωμαιοις υπεταξεν ο Θεος τους ουκ αξιους ελευθεριας· id. ib. l. v. c. ix. p. 1242. fin.

p Ισην δε ποι και βασιλειας ως δοκιμασθεν, επι φοροις αρα τεταγμενοις·—Ιδουμαιων δε και Σαμαρεων, Ηρωδην· Appian. de Bell. Civ. l. v. p. 1135. q Πεισας δε [Συλλαιος] πολλοις χρημασι Φαβαλον του Καισαρος διοικητην, εχρητο βοηθω και καθ' Ηρωδου· πλειονα δε δους Ηρωδης, αφιστησι τε απο Συλαιου Φαβαλον, και δι' αυτου τα κελευσθεντα υπο Καισαρος εισπραττει· ο δε μηδεν αποδους, ει και καλησοι Φαβαλου προς Καισαρα, διοικητην ειναι λεγων, ου των εκεινου, των δε Ηρωδου συμφερουτων· Joſeph. de Bell. lib. i. c. 29. p. 1030. v. 21.— r Vid. Joſeph. Ant. lib. xvii. cap. 3.

that

that the emperor had a procurator to take care of his tribute or revenue in the country of a dependent prince: for ſuch was the king of Arabia. And it is not impoſſible, that Fabatus might be concerned in both thoſe kingdoms, of Judea and Arabia.

Upon the whole then, Herod was always a dependent tributary Prince. Whether he was at laſt obliged to ſubmit to a cenſus, will be the ſubject of enquiry under the next head.

All that I would ſhew farther here is, that a cenſus was not inconſiſtent with the rights allowed to theſe dependent princes, according to the Roman conſtitution. This is generally denied, therefore ſome proof muſt be given of it: but it cannot be expected, that I ſhould produce many examples of a cenſus in dependent kingdoms: partly, becauſe the Roman hiſtorians never take any notice of theſe things, unleſs they are attended with ſome accidents that render them remarkable: and partly, becauſe the Romans had ſeveral ways of raiſing tribute; and a cenſus, which was the moſt diſagreeable way of all, was not uſed in all thoſe countries that were properly provinces.

After the battle of Philippi, in which Brutus and Caſſius were defeated, Mark Antony went over into Aſia, and coming to Epheſus, ſummoned the ſtates of the nations thereabout to give him a meeting. In a ſpeech he made to theſe ſtates, among other things, he tells them: 'Your king Attalus be-'queathed his kingdom to us by teſtament. Our government 'has been milder than his was; for we remitted the taxes 'you had been wont to pay to him, till men of turbulent 'ſpirits aroſe amongſt us, and laid us under a neceſſity of de-'manding tribute of you. And even then we did not impoſe 'it upon you in the way of a cenſus, that we might collect it 'with leſs hazard and trouble to ourſelves; and we required 'only the annual payment of a ſum of money out of the pro-'duce of your country[s].' In the concluſion they agreed to pay a whole nine years tribute in two years time. The battle of Philippi was fought[t] A. U. 712, Attalus died[u] A. U. 621: ſo that Aſia (propria) had been a province 90 years, and yet they had not had any cenſus among them. It is not likely therefore, that we ſhould meet with many inſtances of a cenſus made in dependent kingdoms.

Tacitus, however, has given us one inſtance: 'About this 'time,' ſays he, 'the Cilicians, ſubject to Archelaus the Cap-

[s] Ἔπειτα δὲ εἶπεν, ὅ πρὸς τὰ τιμήματα ἐπιτάττεται, ὡς αὐτὸν ἡμεῖς ἀκινδύνου φόρου ἀφέντες, πολλὰ μέρη φέρειν τῶν ἑκάστοις ὑπαρχόντων ἠξιώσαμεν. Appian. de Bell. Civ. lib. v. p. 1074.

[t] Vid. Petavii Rationarium Temporum Part i. lib. iv. cap. 20.

[u] Vid. ibid. cap. 14.

 'padocian,

'padocian[x], being required to enrol themselves in our way, 'and to pay tribute accordingly, withdrew themselves into the 'fastnesses of mount Taurus; and by the advantage of the situ-'ation, maintained themselves against the weak forces of the 'king; till Marcus Trebellius came in to his assistance, from 'Vitellius president of Syria, with four thousand Roman sol-'diers, and a body of auxiliaries[y].'

By Cilicia I here understand, not Cilicia the Plain, [Cilicia Campestris,] which had been a Roman province long before this; but Cilicia the Rugged [Aspera,] which had been annexed by Augustus to the kingdom of Cappadocia[z]. It is true, that upon the death of old Archelaus, A.U. 770. A.D. 17[a], the kingdom of Cappadocia was reduced to the state of a[b] province; and this disturbance, which Tacitus here speaks of, is placed by him in A.U. 789, A.D. 36[c]. But Tacitus has no where said, that this Cilicia was made a province. If it had, he must have known it, and could not have spoke of it as he does here. He says, that the people maintained themselves in their fastnesses against the king's weak forces, till a general arrived from Vitellius with a reinforcement of Roman soldiers. If it had been a province, he would have said, that the people had been too hard for the troops which the præfect had with him. And this account is in the main confirmed by several other historians, who say, that this Cilicia was governed by kings till the time of Vespasian[d].

Nor is it very hard to trace the fortune of this people, from the beginning of the reign of Caligula to Vespasian. For Dio says, that Caligula gave the maritime Cilicia, (which was another name of this country,) to Antiochus, as an accession to his kingdom of Comagene[e]. Before Caligula died, he took it away from him; by Claudius it was again restored to the same Antiochus[f]. And from an account, which Tacitus has

x Or, that had been subject to Archelaus the Cappadocian. y Per idem tempus Clitarum natio Cappadociæ Archelao subjecta, quia nostrum in modum deferre census, pati tributa adigebatur, in juga Tauri Montis abscessit: locorumque ingenio sese contra regis imbelles copias tutabatur; donec M. Trebellius Legatus a Vitellio præside Syriæ cum quatuor millibus legionariorum, & dilectis auxiliis missus, duos colles, quos barbari insederant, operibus circumdedit: & erumpere ausos, ferro; cæteros, siti ad deditionem coegit. Tacit. Annal. lib. vi. cap. 41. z Vid. Strabonem lib. xiv. p. 987. D. a C. Cœlio L. Pomponio Coss. b Regnum in provinciam redactum est. Tacit. Ann. lib. ii. cap. 42.

c Q. Plautio & Sext. Papinio Coss.

d Item Thraciam, Ciliciam, & Comagenem ditionis regiæ usque ad id tempus, in provinciæ formam redegit. Sueton. in Vespas. cap. 8. Item Thraciam, Ciliciam Tracheam, & Comagenam, quæ sub regibus amicis fuerant, in provinciarum formam redegit [Vespasianus]. Eutrop. l. vii. c. 19.

e Ο γαρ Αντιοχῳ τȣ Αντιοχȣ την Κομμαγηνην, ην ο πατηρ αυτȣ εσχε, και προσεν και τα παραθαλασσια της Κιλικιας δȣς· Dio. l. lix. p. 645. D. f Και μετα τȣτο τῳ τε Αντιοχω την Κομμαγηνην απεδωκεν (ο γαρ Γαιος, και περ αυτος οι δȣς αυτην αφηρητο·) id. lib. lx. p. 670. A.

given

given of another tumult of this people, A. U. 805, A. D. 52. [Fauſto Sulla & Salvio Othone Coſſ.] they appear to have been then ſubject to Antiochus [g]. And it is likely they continued under him, till it was made a province by Veſpaſian; becauſe Comagene alſo was at that time reduced to a province, as appears from Suetonius and Eutropius already quoted; and from Joſephus, who ſays, that this Antiochus was diſpoſſeſſed of all his dominions in the fourth year of Veſpaſian [h].

The only difficulty is, who they were ſubject to, when this cenſus was ordered to be made among them in the latter end of Tiberius's reign; for by the manner in which the firſt words of this paſſage of Tacitus are quoted by Cardinal Noris [i], and by Pagi [k] from him, they muſt have underſtood by Archelao ſubjecta, the people that had been ſubject to Archelaus, that is, to Archelaus the king of Cappadocia. However, Lipſius and Muretus [l] underſtand Tacitus to ſay, that they were then ſubject to Archelaus, a ſon of the former Archelaus, who died at Rome, A. U. 770.

I am under no obligation to determine this matter, becauſe it is the ſame thing to my purpoſe, whether they were now ſubject to the king of Comagene, or ſome other dependent prince, or whether they were ſubject to a ſon of the old Archelaus, king of Cappadocia; the imbelles regis copiæ [the king's weak forces], proving they were under a king. But it ſeems to me moſt natural, to interpret Tacitus as Lipſius does: the imbelles regis copiæ imply, that a king had been mentioned before; and therefore Archelao ſubjecta, cannot be very fairly underſtood to mean no more than a deſcription of theſe Cilicians, to diſtinguiſh them from others of that name.

Tiberius had been indeed very angry with old Archelaus; but nevertheleſs he might be willing, when he had made his kingdom of Cappadocia a province, to give one of his ſons this ſmall appendage of it. This Cilicia was far from being any ſtrong temptation; the country was mountainous, and the people were apt to turn to robbery or piracy, and for theſe reaſons they had been given before by Auguſtus to the above-mentioned Archelaus [m] Cappadocia had been a very rich booty to Tiberius: upon its being made a province, by the ready

[g] Nec multo poſt agreſtium Cilicum nationes, quibus Clitarum cognomentum, ſæpe & alias commotæ, tunc Troſobore duce, montes aſperos caſtris cepere.—— Dein rex ejus oræ Antiochus, blandimentis adverſus plebem, fraude in ducem, cum barbarorum copias diſſociaſſet, Troſobore pauciſque primoribus interfectis, cæteros clementia compoſuit. Tacit. Ann. lib. xii. cap. 55. [h] Vid. Joſeph. de Bell. Jud. lib. vii. cap. 7. [i] Noris Cenotaph. Piſ. Diſ. ii. p. 308. [k] Appar. ad Annal. num. 127. [l] In loc.

[m] Vid. Strabo. l. xiv. p. 987. D.

money and effects of Archelaus and the revenues of the country, such sums came into the public treasury of the Romans, that their tax, called the hundredth, fell immediately to a two hundredth[n]. We may therefore suppose, that by Archelaus here is meant a son of the former king of Cappadocia, though he be an obscure person: and the weakness of the king's forces is an argument, that he was no considerable prince, and that these people were his only subjects.

Though here be but one example, it is sufficient for my design. I believe it was disgraceful to a prince, to have a census made in his dominions: however, Tacitus does not insinuate, that there was any injustice in it, or that it was absolutely inconsistent with the rights indulged to dependent princes: and the king, to whom this people were subject, supported this census as far as he was able.

4. I am now to enquire, whether we have any reasons to believe, that there was a census made in Judea at this time.

We can hope for no light in this matter from any author but Josephus, except the notice which the christian writers have taken of it. If we will rely upon them, I think the point is decided already: but at present we will lay aside their testimonies, and confine our inquiries to Josephus.

That Herod was always tributary, has been proved. I apprehend, that toward the latter end of his reign there was some alteration made in his circumstances for the worse. In order to judge of the evidence there is for it, we must trace the history of Herod's affairs about this time.

Obodas was now king of Arabia, and Syllæus his chief officer under him, who indeed administered all affairs of that country with almost kingly authority. Herod had lent Obodas a considerable sum of money: when the time of payment came, Herod demanded the money, but in vain. Moreover a band of robbers had infested Herod's dominions, and carried off several of his subjects, and were afterwards sheltered by Obodas and Syllæus in Arabia. These differences between the two courts of Judea and Arabia were brought before Saturninus and Volumnius, the emperor's chief officers in Syria, the neighbouring province. Here it was stipulated, that Herod should surrender to Obodas all the Arabians he had in his custody, and that Obodas should release all Jewish prisoners, and pay the money he owed in thirty days time[o]. But when

[n] Regnum ejus in provinciam redactum est; fructibusque ejus levari posse centesimæ vectigal, professus Cæsar, ducentesimam in posterum statuit. Tacit. Ann. lib. ii. cap. 42.

[o] Joseph. Ant. lib. xvi. cap. 9. p. 734.

that

that time was expired, none of theſe conditions were performed on the part of the Arabians; and Syllæus, full of reſentment againſt Herod, ſails for Rome. The terms agreed upon not having been performed by Obodas, Herod, with the conſent of Saturninus and Volumnius, marches into Arabia, and routs the forces that oppoſed him. Advice of this is immediately ſent to Syllæus, then in Italy: he procures an audience of Auguſtus; tells him, that Herod had made an incurſion into Arabia, laid waſte the country, and killed five and twenty hundred Arabians with their general. Auguſtus having heard this, inquires of Herod's friends at Rome, and of perſons who arrived from Syria, whether this was matter of fact. Being aſſured it was, without ever aſking the occaſion, 'He writes a 'letter to Herod in very angry terms[p]. The ſubſtance of this 'letter was, that whereas he had hitherto treated him as a 'FRIEND, he ſhould for the future treat him as a SUBJECT.'

Herod then ſent ambaſſadors to Rome; but they were forced to return, without ſo much as obtaining an audience. A ſecond embaſſy likewiſe went to Rome without any effect[q].

In the mean time Obodas dies, and Aretas takes upon him the crown of Arabia, and then ſends away ambaſſadors to Rome, with large preſents; withal accuſing Syllæus, his predeceſſor's chief miniſter, of many great crimes. But Syllæus was ſtill in great favour at Rome, and Auguſtus was offended, that Aretas had taken upon him the government of Arabia without firſt obtaining his leave; and ſent back the ambaſſadors, without receiving the preſents, or admitting them to an audience. 'The affairs of theſe two kingdoms of Judea and 'Arabia were then in a very bad poſture. In one there was a 'king not confirmed in his government; and Herod having 'loſt the emperor's favour, was forced to ſubmit to many diſ-'graces and affronts. Seeing no end of theſe evils, he reſolved 'to ſend once more an embaſſy to Rome, and to try whether 'he could gain friends there, and by them recover the empe-'ror's good-will. The perſon ſent upon this occaſion was 'Nicolas of Damaſcus[r].'

[p] Οὐδὲν τε μειζόν εἶνεκα τῷ Καισαρι, καὶ γράφει πρὸς τὸν Ἡρῴδην, τότε ἀλλα χαλεπὰ καὶ τέλος τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὸ κεφάλαιον, ὡς πάλαι χρώμενος αὐτῷ φίλῳ, νῦν ὑπήκοῳ χρήσθαι. Id. ibid. p. 735.

[q] p. 736. init.

[r] Τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ Ἀραβίαν, καὶ μάλλον ἐπεδίδε,——τῶν γὰρ βασιλέων ὁ μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν βεβαίαν ἐχων;—Ἡρῴδης δὲ, ἐφ' οἷς ἠμύνετο ταχίον, ὀργισθείς αὐτῷ Καίσαρος, ἁπάσας τὰς εἰς αὐτὸν παραινομίας φέρειν ἠναγκάζετο· πέρας ὁ' οὐδὲν ὁρῶν τῶν περιεστώτων κακῶν, εἶνω πάλιν εἰς Ῥώμην ἀποστέλλει, εἴ τι δυναίτο μεῖριώτερον εὑρεῖν διὰ τε τῶν φίλων, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν Καίσαρα τὴν εὐτυχίαν ποιησόμενος. κ.τ.λ. p. 736.

This Nicolas, who was ever firm to Herod's interest, was a man of great abilities, and of admirable address. When he came to Rome, Syllæus's power was declining: new informations against him had been brought from Arabia, and Nicolas artfully joining in with the Arabians, procures an audience of Augustus; and having first supported the charges brought by them against Syllæus, he proceeded to the defence of Herod. 'Here the emperor stopped him short, and bid him answer, whether Herod had not marched his forces into Arabia, and slain five and twenty hundred men?' To which Nicolas replied, that the things the emperor had heard concerning Herod, were in part true and in part false, and that the occasion of all had been concealed from him. He informed the emperor of the differences between Obodas and Herod; that certain stipulations had been entered into, in the presence of Saturninus and Volumnius: that Syllæus had sworn by the emperor's fortune, that the terms agreed upon should be punctually executed, but that nothing had been done: that Herod had not moved his forces, till he had first obtained the consent of the emperor's chief officers in Syria, and that the numbers of the slain had been very much magnified. Augustus, perceiving that his displeasure against Herod had been built upon misrepresentations, was appeased; and at length pronounced a sentence, that Syllæus should return home, give Herod satisfaction, and then be punished for his crimes [s].

Some time after this we have an account of some disturbances in Herod's family. A very strict friendship had commenced between Antipater Herod's eldest son, Pheroras Herod's brother, and Pheroras's wife, who was particularly disagreeable to Herod. Salome Herod's sister, who knew almost every thing, suspected that these three were carrying on designs against her brother. She came and told him what she knew; and Herod had had some intelligence before, and was full of suspicions, but what he had heard was not fully confirmed. There follows immediately upon this, a passage of so extraordinary a nature, that it must be transcribed without any abridgment. 'There was moreover,' says [t] Josephus, 'a cer-

[s] Id. ibid. cap. 10. pag. 740, 741.

[t] Και ην γαρ μοριον τι Ιουδαικων ανθρωπων επ' ακριβωσει μετα φρονουν του πατριου νομου, οις χαιρειν το θειον προσποιουμενων υπηκτο η γυναικωνιτις· Φαρισαιοι καλουνται, βασιλευσι δυναμενοι μαλιστα αντιπρασσειν, προμηθεις, κακ του προυπτου εις το πολεμειν τε και βλαπτειν επηρμενοι· παντος γουν του Ιουδαικου βεβαιωσαντος δι' ορκων η μην ευνοησαι Καισαρι, και τοις βασιλεως πραγμασι, οι δε οι ανδρες ουκ ωμοσαν, οντες υπερ εξακισχιλιοι· και αυτους βασιλεως ζημιωσαντος χρημασιν, η Φερωρου γυνη την ζημιαν υπερ αυτων εισφερει· οι δε αμειβομενοι την ευνοιαν αυτης, προγνωσιν δε επεπιστευοντο επιφοιτεσει του Θεου, προυλεγον ως Ηρωδη μεν καταπαυ-

'tain

'tain ſect of Jews, who valued themſelves highly for their 'exact knowledge of the law; and talking much of their in-'tereſt with God, were greatly in favour with the women. 'They are called phariſees, men who had it in their power to 'controul kings; extremely ſubtle, and ready to attempt any 'thing againſt thoſe whom they did not like. When there-'fore the whole Jewiſh nation took an oath to be faithful to 'Cæſar, and the intereſts of the king, theſe men, to the num-'ber of above ſix thouſand, refuſed to ſwear. The king 'having laid a fine upon them, Pheroras's wife paid the money 'for them. They, in requital for this her kindneſs, (for they 'were ſuppoſed, by their great intimacy with God, to have 'attained to the gift of foreknowledge;) foretold, that God 'having decreed to put an end to the government of Herod 'and his race, the kingdom would be tranſferred to her and 'Pheroras and their children. Salome, who was ignorant of 'none of theſe things, came and told the king of them, and 'aſſured him likewiſe, that many of the court were corrupted 'by them. Then the king put to death the moſt guilty of 'the phariſees, and Bagoas the eunuch, and one Carus, the 'moſt beautiful young man about the court, and the great 'inſtrument in the king's unlawful pleaſures. He likewiſe 'ſlew every one in his own family, who adhered to thoſe things 'which were ſaid by the phariſees. But Bagoas had been 'elevated by them, in that he ſhould be called father and be-'nefactor, the king, who was to be appointed according to 'their prediction, (for all things would be in his power), being 'to give him a capacity of marriage, and of having children of 'his own.'

In the margin [u] I juſtify my verſion of this paſſage, as to one particular, in which it is ſingular. But beſide that, poſſi-

σεως αρχης υπο Θεου εψηφισμενης αυλῳ τε και γενει τῳ απ' αυλου, της τε βασιλειας ες τε εκεινην περιηξουσης και Φερωραν, παιδας τε οι εσεν αυτοις. Και τοδε, ὁ γαρ εφοβειτο την Σαλωμην, εξαγγελλα βασιλει τη και ὁτι των περι την αυλην διαφθειροιεν τινας· και ὁ βασιλευς των τε Φαρισαιων τους αδικους αναιρει, και Βαγωαν τον ευνουχον, καρυ τε τινα των τοις περιοχοις αρεσκοντα τε περιπεπες, και παιδικα ουτα αυτου· κλεινει δε και παν ὁ, τι τε οικειου συνειδηκει οις ὁ Φαρισαιος ελεγε· Ηρου δε ὁ Βαγωας υπ' αυτου ως παιδι τε και ευεργετης ονομασθησομενος, τε επικαιρα θησομενου προρρησει βασιλεως, καλα χειρα γαρ εκεινῳ παιδια ποιησαι, παρεξουσης αυτῳ γαμου τε ισχυν, και παιδοποιιας τεκνων γνησιων. Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. 2. § 6.

[u] This paſſage of Joſephus has been already quoted very often by learned men, who have treated of this cenſus, or of the true time of our Saviour's nativity. But all, whom I have ſeen, have followed Gelenius's verſion of theſe laſt words, which is thus: Nam Bagoas in eam ſpem ſublatus erat, quaſi parens & benefactor appellandus regis, quem deſtinarent vaticinia; proſpere enim ceſſura novo regi omnia, conſtabiliendo ſucceſſionem prolis legitimæ. I ſuppoſe they did not look upon the original; if they had, they would have eaſily perceived his miſtake. Nor does the argument, that this affair has a relation to our cenſus, ſtand thus in its full force, as will appear by and by. Hudſon

bly some may have a scruple about this sentence, 'He likewise 'slew every one of his own family, who adhered to those things 'which were said by the pharisees.' The original word is in the singular number, 'which were said by the pharisee,' or 'which the pharisee said.' If any should be apt to think from hence, that this has reference to something said by some particular pharisee, I must desire them to consider the context. It is evident, from what goes before and follows that period, that the pharisees in general were concerned in this affair, though some only were punished; the most guilty, as Josephus calls them. The same phrase is in another place used by Josephus, where the pharisees in general are intended. Thus he says, 'The sadducees, when in office, usually go into the mea-'sures[x] of the pharisees*.' in the original it is, 'of the pharisee.'

I take this oath, which Josephus here speaks of, to be the same thing with St. Luke's taxing, for these reasons:

(1.) As far as I can perceive, this oath must have been taken much about the same time with the taxing or census mentioned by St. Luke, according to all those who place the nativity of Jesus some time between twelve, or fifteen months, and two years, before the death of Herod.

(2.) There is a great variety of circumstances attending this oath of Josephus, that accord with the history the evangelists have given us of the birth of Jesus. I imagine I am very much prevented by the reader, but I shall specify some of them.

St. Luke says, *There went out a decree from* CÆSAR AUGUSTUS, *that all the land should be taxed.* The substance of the oath in Josephus was, to 'be faithful to CÆSAR,' as well as to Herod. An oath is a formal acknowledgment of subjection, as well as an engagement to fidelity: no greater acknowledgment of subjection could be made than an enrolment

has very much corrected Gelenius's version, and translates the concluding words thus: Fuit autem per eos elatus Bagoas, quod discerent eum patrem beneficumque appellatum iri ejus, qui ex eorum prædictione creandus rex esset; habiturum enim eum regem omnium rerum potestatem, & Bagoæ vires conciliaturum cum muliere congrediendi, propriosque liberos gignendi. But, methinks, the sense of this is not very extraordinary. Bagoas is to receive a great benefit from the king, and bestows none upon him, that I see; and yet he is to be called his father and benefactor. I think, that Josephus says, that the pharisees gave out, that Bagoas was to become, or to be called, a father: and hereby, that is, by his having children, would also be a benefactor to his country. I have made no alteration in the original words of Josephus. I have only inserted a comma after ὀνομασθεισομένος, and changed the colon after βασιλέως to a comma. This interpretation is not my own; I had it from my learned and ingenious friend, Mr. Ward, to whom I am very much indebted for this, and divers other critical observations, which I highly value.

[x] Ὁπότε γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρχὰς παρέλθοιεν,——προσχώρουσι δ' οὗ οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει. Ant. l. xviii. c. 1. § 4.

in

in a Roman cenſus. St. Luke ſays the decree was, that *all the land ſhould be taxed*, and that *all went to be taxed*. Joſephus agrees with him ſurpriſingly, when he ſays, that 'All the 'Jewiſh nation' took the oath, except ſix thouſand phariſees.

St. Luke's *taxing*, and Joſephus's oath, are followed with parallel events. When the wiſe men came, ſaying, *Where is he that is born king of the Jews? Herod was troubled, and all Jeruſalem with him.* Joſephus's account is a perfect comment upon St. Matthew. St. Matthew ſays, ch. ii. 4, 5. *When he* [*Herod*] *had gathered 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—art not the leaſt among the princes of Juda: for out of thee ſhall come a* GOVERNOR THAT SHALL RULE MY PEOPLE ISRAEL. So that all the diſturbance at Jeruſalem, which St. Matthew ſpeaks of, was on account of the birth of a king of the Jews. It is the ſame thing in Joſephus. And the chief prieſts and ſcribes in St. Matthew were undoubtedly of the phariſees, which are the perſons ſo much ſpoken of by Joſephus. The king in Joſephus has a character of the Chriſt or Meſſias: *for all things would be in his power.* Whether the jeſt upon Bagoas, and through him upon the phariſees, be of Joſephus's own invention; or whether it was an old piece of wit in uſe among profane people, to banter thoſe who expected great things from the Meſſias; or whether it be matter of fact, that ſome of the phariſees did at that time give any ſuch aſſurances to ſome perſon of influence in Judea, the better to carry on ſelfiſh deſigns, I do not determine. But it is an evidence that the king, who was then the ſubject of diſcourſe, was ſuppoſed to be an extraordinary perſon.

In Joſephus the phariſees give out a prediction, that 'God 'had decreed to put an end to Herod's government,' &c. This I take to be the ſame thing with *the chief prieſts and ſcribes*[y]: *Thus it is written by the prophet*, in St. Matthew: that is, what Joſephus calls a prediction or prophecy of the phariſees, is no more than an interpretation or application of an ancient prophecy. Thus Joſephus took upon himſelf the air and character

[y] Unde putas factum, ut eo ipſo tempore, proximè poſt deſcriptionem Judaicam Phariſæi vaticinia iſta tractarent, & pro lubitu ſuo interpretarentur? Numquid res ipſa teſtimonium perhibet Matthæi narrationi? Nonne audis magos ab oriente quærentes, ubi natus ſit Rex Judæorum? Nonne Herodem ſciſcitantem a Phariſæis, ubi Chriſtus naſceretur? His enim occaſionibus, his Herodis mandatis, Phariſæi ad Prophetarum libros remiſſi, vaticinia de quibus quærebatur prolata, ad placitum uxoris Pheroræ, ſecretis colloquiis detorſerunt. Kepler. de Anno Natal. Chriſt. cap. 12.

of a prophet, when he applied the ancient Jewish prophecies of the Messias to Vespasian. He was taken prisoner by Vespasian, then general in Judea under Nero. Josephus, hearing that Vespasian had a design to send him to the emperor, desired that he might speak with the general in private. Being brought before Vespasian, and all the company being dismissed, except Titus and two friends, Josephus begins: 'You think, Vespasian, that you have in Josephus a meer prisoner: but I am 'come to you as a messenger of great things. Had I not 'been sent to you by God, I knew what the law of the Jews 'is, and how it becomes a general to die. Do you send me 'to Nero? What! are they who are to succeed Nero before 'you to continue? You, Vespasian, will be Cæsar: you, and 'this your son will be emperor. Bind me therefore still faster, 'and reserve me for yourself; for you shall be lord not of me 'only, but of the earth, and the sea, and of all mankind: 'and for punishment I deserve a closer confinement, if I now 'speak falsehood to you in the name of God[z].'

However, beside the answer given by the scribes to Herod's enquiry, we are to remember the speech made by old Simeon, an eminent pharisee, at the presentation of Jesus at the temple; and that Anna a PROPHETESS *gave thanks unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Israel.* And there might be many other such like things said there by others; to all which Josephus, a priest, and well informed of what was said and done at the temple, may be justly supposed to have a reference.

St. Matthew says, that *when Herod saw that he was* MOCKED *of the wise men, he was* EXCEEDING WROTH, *and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof.* Josephus has given us the tokens of an uncommon rage in Herod: and though St. Matthew has related, upon this occasion, no other instance of Herod's cruelty, beside the orders for destroying the children in and near Bethlehem; yet nothing is more likely, than that Herod, the most jealous of mortals, should, upon the retreat of the wise men, be filled with suspicions that the scribes and pharisees, whom he had lately consulted about the birth-place of the King of the Jews, had been accessary to the disappointment he had met with from the said wise men: and that being heated by the insinuations of his sister Salome, (provided Josephus has not brought her in here for the sake of a jest;) and by the barbarous counsels

z Εγω δε επι τιμωριαν δεομαι φρουρας μειζονος, τι κατεσχεδιαζω και Θεου. Joseph. de Bell. l. iii. c. vii. § 9.

of

of his ſon Antipater, now in Judea, and in high favour, he ſhould then make alſo that cruel ravage in his court and at Jeruſalem, of which our Jewiſh hiſtorian has given us a ſummary account.

(3.) As I think that Joſephus was a very firm Jew, ſo his indecent way of ſpeaking of this affair is a ſtrong proof, it relates to the tranſactions at Jeruſalem after the birth of Jeſus. Is it not ſtrange, that Joſephus ſhould banter the phariſees for pretending to the gift of foreknowledge, when he himſelf, a phariſee, has been moſt notoriouſly guilty of it? I intend not only his ſpeech to Veſpaſian juſt now tranſcribed: there are other, rather more flagrant inſtances, and that in the hiſtory of the Jewiſh war, written long before his Antiquities, in which is the paſſage we are upon. His ridicule of the phariſees appears to me very unſeaſonable in an account of ſuch a ſcene of cruelty, and when they were under very heavy ſufferings: and for what? For refuſing the oath of fidelity? No. They had eſcaped with a fine for not ſwearing to Cæſar, if there had not followed ſome offences more particularly againſt Herod, as is pretended. And what are theſe? Why predictions and expectations, that the kingdom was by the decree and appointment of God to be transferred to ſome perſon not of Herod's race: another inſtance of agreement with the time that ſucceeded the birth of Jeſus, which, according to the evangeliſts, was a time of great expectation of a king predicted and propheſied of. But here is not one riotous or ſeditious action mentioned or hinted; the utmoſt is ſeditious words: and yet Joſephus juſtifies, triumphs in theſe terrible executions. In a word, he, who uſes to condemn Herod as a man of an inhuman diſpoſition, here treats the phariſees of this time with Herodian cruelty.

All this is abſolutely unaccountable to me, but upon the ſuppoſition that this affair relates to the birth of Jeſus; nor do I think that I wrong Joſephus in the leaſt. It is to me more than probable, that every Jew who did not believe Jeſus to be the Chriſt, (as Joſephus did not,) had a great deal of ill-will againſt him and all his followers. That any Jew of thoſe times ſhould have been long in a ſtate of indifference upon this point, was impoſſible.

If it be ſaid, that the predictions mentioned by Joſephus relate not to Jeſus, but to *Pherora's wife, and her children*; I do not deny, but that ſhe might pay a regard to what the pha-

[a] Vid. de Bell. lib. iii. cap. 7. § 3. vid. etiam quæ ſequuntur Joſephi ad Veſpaſianum alloquium. Ibid. § 9.

riſees

risees said at this time, as well as others did: but that she, or Pheroras, or any one issuing from them was the person then discoursed of, and the chief subject of the pharisees predictions, I do not believe, because it is inconsistent with the rest of Josephus's story. If Pheroras's wife had been the person chiefly concerned in this affair, as Josephus pretends here; would she have escaped with her life in so wide a scene of cruelty, in which even the former favourites of Herod were involved? If the dispositions of people ran now all toward Pheroras and his wife, would Antipater have been still great with them? Would Antipater, so desirous of the crown, have gone away to Rome, as he did soon after this execution, and leave things in this posture? Would he, when he went away, leave securely in the hands of Pheroras and his wife the work of poisoning his father, and securing the succession for himself? Would not Antipater, who had lately with exquisite artifice and cruelty accomplished the death of his two brothers, sons of Herod by Mariamne, have been able to effect the ruin of Pheroras's wife?

It is true, after this execution was over, she was called to account by Herod.

That it may not be insinuated that I conceal any difficulty, I will here give the reader Josephus's words, which follow next after the long passage we are concerned with. 'Herod having 'punished the pharisees, who had been convicted of concern- 'ing themselves in this affair, calls a council of his friends, 'and there accuses Pheroras's wife: ascribing to her the affront 'that had been offered to the virgins (B), and therein to him: 'adding, that she did all she could to create a difference be- 'tween him and his brother; that the fine imposed upon the 'pharisees had been evaded by her means, and that in the 'present affair nothing had been done without her:——and 'that if Pheroras had any regard for him, he would of his 'own accord put away his wife. You will then, says he to 'Pheroras, be my brother indeed, and we shall live[b] together 'in friendship.'

(B) The virgins] The meaning is, Pheroras's wife had been his servant. Herod had offered Pheroras one of his daughters, and after that another. But Pheroras refused them both, out of his affection for this woman.

[b] Ηρωδης δε, κολασας των Φαρισαιων τους επι τοισδε εληλεγμενους συνεδριον τε ποιειται των φιλων, και κατηγοριαν της Φερωρου γυναικος, την τε υβριν των παρθενων τῃ τολμῃ της γυναικος ανατιθεις, και εγκλημα ταυτην ατιμιαν αυτῳ ποιουμενος, ωστε αγωνοθετειν στασιν αυτῳ προς τον αδελφον και πολεμον εκ φυσεως αυτοις και λογῳ και δι' εργων οσα δυναιτο, την τε διαλυσιν της ζημιας της υπ' αυτου επιβληθεισης τελεσι διαφευχθηναι τοις εκεινης, των τε νυν πεπραγμενων ουδεν ο, τι ου μετ' αυτης· ανθ' ων Φερωρᾳ καλως εχειν, ου δεησει ουδε γνωμων εισηγησεως των ημων, αυτοκελευσον αποπεμπεσθαι γυναικα ταυτην, ως πολεμου

If

If the meaning of the last words of the charge against this woman be not, that in the 'present affair nothing had been 'done without her,' as I have rendered them, but that 'now-'a-days nothing was done without her,' as Dr. Hudson translates them [c]; then her conduct in the late affair is not so much as made any particular crime, but is only comprehended in a general charge of an over busy intriguing temper.

But let it be granted that Josephus says, her conduct in this affair was an express charge in Herod's accusation; yet the punishment proposed confutes the supposition, that she was the main agent in this concern. Herod assures Pheroras, they two should be very good friends if this woman were but 'put 'away.' Would this disgrace have satisfied Herod, if, beside many other provocations, she had now been the principal in a crime for which many accessaries, and those in all other respects very acceptable persons, had been punished with death? I hope we may be allowed, not to credit Josephus in a circumstance so inconsistent with the rest of his account; and I think, it is not hard to guess why Josephus gave some false turns in this story

I hav one thing more to desire of the reader, that is, that he will be pleased to consider, whether Josephus does not contradict himself in the main passage in which he is so merry. He tells us at first, that the pharisees in requital for the kindness shewed to them, foretold that God had decreed to transfer the kingdom to 'Pheroras's wife, and Pheroras, and their 'children:' but at the end, it is 'the king who was to be ap-'pointed according to their prediction.' How comes 'Phe-'roras's wife, and Pheroras, and their children' to be all a king? Or how came the king to be all them? If the reader can reconcile these things together, it will be very well; but if he cannot, perhaps he will allow, that here are some things said of Pheroras's wife and the pharisees without foundation. I ever take it, that inconsistences are a certain sign, that an historian has not confined himself barely to matter of fact, but has indulged his fancy or his passions, and gone into fiction.

For these reasons then I think, that the oath in Josephus, taken by all the Jewish nation, is the same thing with the taxing or enrolment mentioned by St. Luke: and I think, that this oath refers to a census made in Judea, for the following reasons. In a census the people gave in account of themselves and their estates upon oath. It seems to me very probable

τε προς με σοι αιτιαν εσομενην· και νυν, ειπερ αιτιποιη συγγενειας της εμης, απειπασθαι τηνδε την γαμετην· μενεις γαρ ουτως ημος αδελφος τε και στεργειν ουκ απηλλαγμενος. Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. 3. § 1.

[c] Suisque impendiis evitata esset solutio mulctæ ab ipso impositæ, nihilque jam sine illa ageretur.

that

that a cenſus was made, or at leaſt ordered by Auguſtus, during the time that Herod lay under his diſpleaſure. Under the former particular I ſhewed, that Herod had been before this a tributary prince. His great ſubjection appears likewiſe in the difference between him and Obodas; he was obliged to refer the matter in diſpute to the emperor's officers in Syria: after Obodas had broke the ſtipulations, Herod did not dare to move his forces without the conſent of the fore-mentioned officers; and Auguſtus, ſuppoſing that he had done ſo, was very angry, and threatens, that whereas he had 'hitherto uſed him 'as a friend, he ſhould for the future treat him as a ſubject.' Theſe words are undoubtedly proper and expreſſive words: if Herod, when a friend of Auguſtus, was in ſuch ſubjection, what can a ſubject mean, but the reducing him to the loweſt ſtate of dependent princes? Which ſeems to be that of obliging them to ſubmit to a cenſus, and then raiſing tribute in their dominions according to it.

Joſephus ſays, that after the receipt of this letter from Auguſtus, Herod ſent in vain two embaſſies to Rome, that the ſtate of Judea grew worſe and worſe, that Herod was obliged to ſubmit to many diſgraces. The emperor's diſpleaſure againſt Herod was manifeſt therefore, not at Rome only, but in all the countries about Judea.

(1.) But it may be objected, that Joſephus has no where ſaid, that there was any enrolment of the Jews, much leſs that there was a proper cenſus made in Judea.

To this I anſwer, that it is apparent there was an enrolment and numbering of the people. How elſe ſhould all the people have taken an oath, except ſix thouſand phariſees? Did they not enter the people that took the oath? If they did not, how ſhould it have been known who ſwore and who did not?

Nor can it be inferred there was no enrolment or cenſus, becauſe Joſephus has not expreſly ſaid there was. Joſephus's account of this matter is very ſlight and defective: if it had not been for ſome things which followed after the oath, and had ſome connexion with it, it ſeems that he would have taken no notice of it at all. An oath had been taken by all the Jewiſh nation to Cæſar and Herod, and great exactneſs had been obſerved in relation to it; the numbers and characters of thoſe which had refuſed were known. This was an affair of importance, and deſerved a much more particular account than he has given us: and we are allowed to ſuppoſe ſome things not expreſſed, which muſt neceſſarily have been concomitants of it.

I do not pretend to aſſign poſitively the reaſons of his ſlight mention of this affair, but I apprehend I can give ſome probable account of it. Herod's ſubjects were all enroled in a cenſus, but there was no tribute demanded upon it: Herod had great dexterity, or very good fortune in ſurmounting the difficulties he met with in the ſeveral parts of his life; he was himſelf a man of a great genius, and ſome of his ſervants were men of great abilities. Nicolas of Damaſcus in particular was eminent for learning and addreſs; and Herod knew very well how to beſtow a preſent or a bribe.

I am moreover rather inclined to think, that no tax was raiſed upon this cenſus, becauſe it appears that after theſe troubles, of which Joſephus has given us an account, Auguſtus was in a great meaſure reconciled to Herod. Perceiving that his reſentment againſt Herod had been very much founded upon aſperſions, he might be diſpoſed to forbear exacting the tribute upon the cenſus, and to let things go on in the old way. Then Herod had taken care, that the decree ſhould be obeyed and executed in his dominions without diſturbance: all had ſworn or enroled themſelves except ſix thouſand phariſees, and they were fined.

Moreover, Herod was now an old man and had many ſons; it was therefore very likely, there would be ſome partition made of his dominions at his death, and Auguſtus might be very willing there ſhould be ſo. Three or four little princes are better governed than one that is powerful. Tribute could not be paid according to this cenſus, any longer than the ſeveral parts of the kingdom continued united in one perſon; when it came to be divided or parcelled out, a new cenſus would be neceſſary.

If then no tribute was paid upon this cenſus, an hiſtorian could the more eaſily paſs it by without a particular deſcription, eſpecially ſince it had been finiſhed without any popular tumults.

It may be inferred from the manner in which St. Luke mentions this ſurvey, that it was not very much taken notice of: if it had been univerſally known, there had been hardly any occaſion, upon the mention of a decree of Auguſtus in the reign of Herod to enrol all the land, to ſubjoin a parentheſis, the chief intent of which ſeems to be, to diſtinguiſh this from another that happened not till after the removal of Herod's ſucceſſor.

If this cenſus was not univerſally known when Joſephus wrote, he might be well pleaſed to touch upon it ſlightly. The Jewiſh writers were very forward to enumerate the honours done

done to their people by the Roman senate, or the chief men of the commonwealth, or the emperors afterwards; the better to gain some regard among other nations, by whom they were generally despised and hated: but as for any disgraces they received from the Romans, the case was very different.

Thus Josephus has mentioned many favours conferred on the Jews by Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Livia, Marcus Agrippa, Claudius, and other Romans: but yet he says nothing of the journey which Caius, Augustus's eldest adopted son, made through Judea, in the beginning of the reign of Archelaus. This we have from[d] Suetonius only, an author very little concerned in Jewish affairs. The reason seems to be, that Caius offered no sacrifice at Jerusalem, nor made any present to the temple, which was deemed a piece of contempt shewn to their religion.

Possibly, Josephus found but a slender account of this transaction in the history of Nicolas of Damascus, from which he took his materials for this reign. Though Nicolas was no Jew, yet he was a great friend and flatterer of Herod; and it could not but be an ungrateful task to him, after he had in the former part of his work drawn his master as a great genius, a founder of cities, and friend of Augustus, to describe at last so disagreeable a scene, as that of one of the emperor's officers enrolling all the subjects of his dominions.

Nicolas[e] had great intimacies with Herod: Josephus has affirmed more than once, that he was a great flatterer[f] of him. And in one place says particularly, 'that living in his king-'dom, and together with him, he composed his history with 'a view to please the king and advance his interest, touching 'upon those things only which made for[g] his honour.' This enrolment, even though it was not a proper assessment, but only an entry of the names of all the people, their age and condition, accompanied with an oath of strict fidelity to the emperor, must have been the greatest mortification of Herod's whole life: and from the character of Nicolas, just set down, it may be concluded almost with certainty, that he did not give a particular account of this affair: nor had Josephus any inducements to supply his defects in this place.

(2.) But it will be said, that the silence of Josephus is not the only difficulty: there is in him well nigh positive proof,

d Sed & Caium Nepotem, quod Judæam prætervehens apud Hierosolymam non supplicasset, collaudavit [Augustus]. Suet. in Aug. c. 93. e Και Νικολαος ο Δαμασκηνος φιλος τε ων τω βασιλεως, και τα πολλα συνδιαιτωμενος εκεινω, κ. λ. Antiq. lib. xvii. c. 5. § 3. f Ibid. l. xiv. c. 1. § 3. g Ζωντι γαρ εν τη βασιλεια και συν αυτω, κεχαρισμενως εκεινω και καθ' υπερβολην ανεγραφεν, μονον απτομενος των προς ευκλειαν αυτω φερουσων. Ant. l. xvi. c. 7. § 1.

that

that there had been no census or enrolment made in Judea before the removal of Archelaus; for upon the occasion of this he says: 'Moreover Cyrenius came into Judea, it being annexed to the province of Syria, to make an assessment of their goods, and seize Archelaus's estate. The Jews were at first very much moved at the [h] mention of the enrolments, but by degrees they were brought to acquiesce at the persuasion of Joazar the high priest.' He observes also, 'that at this time Judas the Gaulanite excited them to a rebellion, telling them that a census would introduce downright [i] slavery.' It will be said: It may be hence inferred, that there had been no enrolments made before; if there had, they could not have been so frightful now.

I answer, that there must have been an enrolment made, when the oath mentioned by Josephus was taken: and that oath was likewise an express and solemn acknowledgment of subjection to the Romans.

Besides, though this oath had been quite omitted by Josephus, it would not have followed, that there had been no enrolment made before this time in Judea. People are not always of the same temper. Judas of Galilee now broached or revived the principle, that they ought to obey none but God; and for some reasons it was received with great applause, spread and gained ground. But the Jews must have been more submissive when they all took the oath to Cæsar, except six thousand. And after Herod was dead, there was a very numerous embassy sent to Rome in the name of the whole Jewish nation, intreating, that instead of being governed by any of Herod's descendants, 'they [k] might be annexed to the province of Syria, and be subject to prætors sent from thence, promising likewise a most quiet and peaceable behaviour under such a government.'

In another place, Josephus represents Judas's arguments in these terms: 'And at this time a certain man, called Judas the Galilean, excited the people to rebellion, telling them, they had a mean spirit, if they could endure to pay tribute to the Romans, and acknowledge mortal men for their lords;——after God had been their king [l].' It might be as well inferred from what Judas says here, that the Jews had

[h] Οι δε καιπερ το κατ' αρχας εν δεινῳ φερεντες την επι ταις αποτραφαις ακροασιν. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 1. § 1.

[i] Ibid.

[k] Η, δε κεφαλαιον αυτοις της αξιωσεως, βασιλειας μεν και τοιων δε αρχων απηλλαχθαι προσθηκην δε Συριας γεγονοτας υποτασσεσθαι τοις εκεισε πεμπομενοις στρατηγοις. κ. τ. λ. Jos. Ant. l. xvii. p. 784. v. 35.

[l] Κακιζων, ει φορον τε Ρωμαιοις τελειν υπομενουσι, και μετα τον Θεον οισουσι θνητους δεσποτας. De Bell. l. ii. cap. 8. § 1.

never before paid tribute to the Romans, or been ſubject to mortal lords; as from what he ſays in the other place, that they had never before been enrolled. I preſume it need not be proved, that they had been ſubject, before this, to mortal lords. I think too, that I have ſhewn, they had been tributary to the Romans in the reign of Herod. They had likewiſe paid tribute to the Romans before Herod's reign: for Joſephus ſays, that 'Caſſius impoſed a heavy tribute upon the 'people [in Syria]; and in particular bore very hard upon 'Judea, exacting of them ſeven hundred talents of ſilver[m].' This ſum was laid in ſeveral portions upon the ſeveral parts of Judea; and Herod, then governor of Galilee under Hyrcanus, brought in his quota the firſt, and thereby very much obliged Caſſius. Judas's ſpeech therefore is no proof, that there had been no enrolment or cenſus made in Judea before the removal of Archelaus.

(3.) I can think of but one difficulty more. Perhaps ſome will ſay, my argument is defective, and that in order to make it out, that this oath taken by the Jews, in Joſephus, was a cenſus, I ought to produce ſome paſſages of an ancient writer, in which a cenſus is called an oath, or the act of the people enrolling themſelves in a cenſus, is expreſſed by taking an oath. I own then, that I have not any ſuch example by me. However, I would offer here two or three conſiderations.

[1.] In a Roman cenſus the people gave in their account of themſelves and their eſtates upon oath: and that oath, as repreſented by Dionyſius, has a very near reſemblance with the words of Joſephus. Dionyſius ſays, the people were commanded to 'take an oath to give in a true account, according 'to the beſt of their knowledge:' and Joſephus ſays, that the whole Jewiſh nation engaged by an[n] oath to be 'faithful to 'Cæſar and the intereſts of the king.'

[2.] We have in the ancient writers very few accounts of aſſeſſments made in provinces. The Roman hiſtorians ſcarce ever take any notice of them, but when they were attended with ſome diſturbances which make them remarkable. As we have but very few writers of thoſe times, eſpecially ſuch as lived in the provinces, it is not to be wondered that we meet

[m] Και φορας αυθις μεγαλας επεθετο· μαλιστα δε την Ιουδαιαν εκακωσεν, επλακοσια ταλαντα αργυριου εισπραττομενος. Ant. lib. xiv. cap. xi. § 2. [n] There is another thing which may deſerve notice. Dionyſius ſays, That the penalty at Rome for not enrolling in a cenſus was loſs of eſtate and citizenſhip. Perhaps the fine impoſed on the phariſees, who refuſed to ſwear, was now ordered in conformity to the Roman cuſtoms upon like occaſions. For Herod had been wont before to inflict puniſhments of another kind for refuſing to ſwear fidelity to him. Vid. Antiq. l. xv. c. 10. § 4.

with some singular phrases in those we have, and which we cannot parallel in any other authors now in our hands. If we had before us the works of a good number of provincial writers, it is not unlikely, but we might see some of them represent their nation enrolling themselves in a census, especially in the first census made in their country, by the taking an oath of allegiance and fidelity to the emperor. I shall give an instance from Josephus, which has likewise some affinity with our subject. In the Jewish War he calls Fabatus Cæsar's procurator[o]: in his Antiquities[p] he calls him Cæsar's servant. He also calls one Stephen, who was in Judea in the time of Cumanus, Cæsar's servant. 'And[q] at this time,' says he, 'some who aimed 'at innovations, set upon Stephen, a servant of Cæsar, in the 'high-way about a hundred stadia from the city, and robbed 'him of all he had.' I have shewn above, that Fabatus was Augustus's procurator in the kingdom of Arabia, if not also in Judea. And that Stephen also was procurator in Judea, may be concluded from the treasure he had with him, and from his being particularly the object of the spite of the seditious Jews, who were uneasy under the Roman government. So that with Josephus, the emperor's servant, and the procurator of the emperor's revenue, were synonymous terms. If Josephus appears at present singular in this style, yet I doubt not, but it was at that time very common.

[3.] I apprehend, that though the Jews entered themselves and their estates in the way of a Roman census, yet there was no tribute raised upon it: which might be the reason of Josephus's representing this affair simply by taking an oath, rather than by the name of a census.

I have now laid before the reader the evidence I have for this supposition, that there was a census made in Judea a little before the death of Herod. The particulars mentioned by St. Luke, and the expressions he uses, are very suitable to a census. And the posture of Herod's affairs about this time, inclines me to think there was an enrolment, after the manner of a Roman census, made in his dominions by order of Augustus.

But whether I am in the right or not, St. Luke certainly says, that there was an enrolment; and Josephus says, that the whole Jewish nation had taken an oath to be faithful to Cæsar

[o] Πεισας δε πολλοις χρημασι Φαβατον τον Καισαρος διοικητην. De Bell. l. i. cap. 29. p. 1030. v. 22. vid. & v. 29.

[p] —— Διηρηκεναι δε και Φαβατον Καισαρος δουλον. Ant. l. xvii. cap. 3. p. 755. v. 6.

[q] Των γαρ εφεστωτων επι νεωτερισμῳ τινες, κατα την δημοσιαν οδον ως εκατον σταδιων απωθεν της πολεως, Στεφανον Καισαρος δουλον οδοιπορουντα λησευσαντες, απασαν αυτου την κτησιν διαρπαζουσιν. Ant. l. xx. cap. 4. § 4. vid. & Bell. p. 1072. v. 32.

and Herod. Some entry therefore muſt have been made: and if St. Luke be underſtood to ſpeak only of an enrolment of names and perſons, his account is confirmed by Joſephus as fully as one could wiſh.

And though it ſhould be thought, that I have not fully proved, that there was at this time a proper aſſeſſment made in Judea; yet I have, I think, ſhewn undeniably, that about this time that country was brought into a very ſtrict ſubjection to Auguſtus: and herein alſo St. Luke and Joſephus agree entirely.

I am ſenſible, that they who have hitherto ſuppoſed, that Jeſus was not born till a few weeks before the death of Herod, will very unwillingly allow, that the oath in Joſephus has any relation to St. Luke's enrolment. But then, beſide the taſk of evading all the many concurring circumſtances in St. Luke and Joſephus, they will labour under one very great difficulty. For this oath appears to have been taken by the Jews ſo very near the end of Herod's reign, that it will be utterly inconceivable, that the Romans ſhould have ordered another general enrolment, and harraſs the people again before Herod's death. Nor will they be able to remove this difficulty by ſaying, that the ſwearing began about the time it is placed in by Joſephus, but was not finiſhed till a few weeks before Herod died; for it was all over at the time Joſephus ſpeaks of it. All had taken the oath, but ſix thouſand phariſees; they had refuſed, and were fined.

§ III. The third objection is this: Cyrenius was not governor of Syria till nine or ten, perhaps twelve years after our Saviour was born: therefore St. Luke has made a miſtake in ſaying, that this taxing happened in the time of Cyrenius.

This objection muſt now be ſtated more at length. In our tranſlation the words are, *And this taxing was firſt made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.* What is the ſenſe of our tranſlation, I do not know: and it muſt be owned likewiſe, that the words of the original [r] ſeem to have in them an uncommon ambiguity. Many think, the moſt genuine natural ſenſe of the original words is, *This firſt taxing* [or enrolment] *was made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.* Upon this ſenſe of them the objection is founded. And it is urged, this cannot be agreeable to the truth: for the evangeliſts have aſſured us, that Jeſus was born in the latter end of Herod's reign. But Joſephus ſays, that [s] Quintilius Varus was then preſident of Syria, and he muſt have been ſo at leaſt a year before Herod

[r] Αὐτη ἡ ἀπογραφη πρωτη ἐγενετο ἡγεμονευοντος της Συριας Κυρηνιου. [s] Joſ. Antiq. l. xvii. cap. 5. § 2.

died;

died; and Saturninus was his predeceſſor. Moreover, Joſephus ſays, that Cyrenius was ſent governor into Syria, when Archelaus was removed from his government of Judea, who yet reigned there between nine and ten years after Herod. Joſephus relates this matter in his Antiquities thus:

'But in the tenth year[t] of Archelaus's government, the 'chief of the Jews and Samaritans, not being able to bear 'his cruelty and tyranny, accuſed him to Cæſar. The em- 'peror ſent an officer into Judea to bring him to Rome. 'When he came thither, Cæſar, having heard what he had 'to ſay in anſwer to his accuſers, baniſhed him, appointing 'Vienna a city in Gaul, for the place of his abode[u]. And 'the country of Archelaus being annexed to the province of 'Syria, Cyrenius a conſular perſon, was ſent by Cæſar to make 'an aſſeſſment in Syria, and to ſeize Archelaus's eſtate[x].'

Afterwards he ſays, 'In the mean time Cyrenius a Roman 'ſenator, who had ſerved all other offices, and through them 'arrived at the conſulſhip, and was diſtinguiſhed likewiſe by 'divers other honours and dignities, came into Syria with a 'few troops, being ſent thither by Cæſar to adminiſter juſ- 'tice to that people, and to make an aſſeſſment of their goods. 'And Coponius a perſon of the equeſtrian rank, was ſent with 'him to govern in Judea with ſupreme authority. Cyrenius 'alſo came into Judea, now annexed to Syria, both to aſſeſs 'their eſtates, and to ſeize Archelaus's effects and treaſure[y].'

It is objected therefore, that St. Luke has committed a very groſs miſtake, in ſaying, that *this taxing was made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria*; ſince it appears from Joſephus, that Cyrenius was not preſident of that province, till after the baniſhment of Archelaus, Herod's ſon and ſucceſſor.

To this I anſwer, that though the ſenſe of the words, as they now ſtand in St. Luke's goſpel, ſhould be ſuppoſed inconſiſtent with this account taken from Joſephus, yet it would be unreaſonable to conclude, that St. Luke had really made any miſtake. St. Luke appears in the reſt of his hiſtory, and from many particulars of this account before us, to be to ſo fully

t Δεκατῳ δε ετει αρχης Αρχελαȣ.

u Ant. lib. xvii. cap. 15. § 2.

x Της δε Αρχελαȣ χωρας υποτελȣς προσνεμηθεισης τῃ Συρων, πεμπεται Κυρηνιος υπο Καισαρος, ανηρ υπατικος, αποτιμησομενος τα εν Συριᾳ, και τȣ Αρχελαȣ αποδωσομενος οικον. Ibid. § 5.

y Κυρηνιος δε, των εις την βȣλην συναγομενων ανηρ, τας τε αλλας αρχας επιτετελεκως, και δια πασων οδευσας υπατος γενεσθαι, τατε αλλα αξιωματι μεγας, συν ολιγοις επι Συριας παρην, υπο Καισαρος δικαιοδοτης τȣ εθνȣς απεσταλμενος, και τιμητης των ȣσιων γενησομενος. Κωπωνιος τε αυτῳ συγκαταπεμπεται, ταγματος των ιππεων, ηγησομενος Ιȣδαιων τῃ επι πασιν εξȣσιᾳ· παρην και Κυρηνιος εις την Ιȣδαιων προσθηκην της Συριας γενομενην, αποτιμεσομενος τε αυτων τας ȣσιας, και αποδωσομενος τα Αρχελαȣ χρηματα. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 1. § 1.

maſter of the ſtate of Judea, and of the nature of this affair he is here ſpeaking of, that it is impoſſible he ſhould commit any ſuch miſtake.

In the beginning of his third chapter, he has moſt exactly ſpecified the ſtate of all Judea, or the land of Iſrael, as it was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, by ſetting down the ſeveral tetrarchs and governors of it, and the true extent of their territories.

St. Luke underſtood the nature of enrolments, as made by the Romans. The enrolment now made, was by virtue of a decree of Auguſtus. And he ſays, that *Joſeph went to be taxed with Mary his eſpouſed wife.* This was the cuſtom of the Romans, as has been ſhewed from undoubted teſtimonies, to enrol women as well as men; whereas the Jews uſed to number or enrol males only.

Moreover, St. Luke appears to be well acquainted with the cenſus which Joſephus gives us an account of. Gamaliel ſays, Acts v. 37. *After this man roſe up Judas of Galilee, in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him: he alſo periſhed, and as many as obeyed him, were diſperſed.* I think it may be fairly ſuppoſed, that St. Luke underſtood what he has related from Gamaliel. And then, here are particulars enough to ſatisfy us, he wanted no information concerning the cenſus, which Joſephus ſpeaks of.

That Gamaliel here ſpeaks of the cenſus made in Judea after the baniſhment of Archelaus, is evident, becauſe it was at that time, that Judas of Galilee raiſed a diſturbance. Gamaliel calls them *the days of the taxing*, which implies, that this was a very noted and remarkable period; as it is certain it was.

Gamaliel here calls this Judas by his proper name: Joſephus does in one place call him Judas Gaulanites [z], but he often ſtyles him Judas the Galilean, or of Galilee [a]. Gamaliel ſays, that he *drew away much people after him.* Joſephus ſays the ſame thing of him in almoſt the ſame words [b].

Gamaliel does exactly ſpecify the time in which this man *roſe up*, namely, in *the time of the taxing*, or of the enrolment: for Joſephus ſays, 'he perſuaded not a few not to enrol themſelves, when Cyrenius the cenſor was ſent into Judea [c].'

Gamaliel ſays, *he alſo periſhed, and all, even as many as obeyed him, were ſcattered.* Joſephus has no where related particularly

[z] Ant. lib. xviii. cap. 1. p. 792. v. 3.

[a] Ο Γαλιλαιος Ιουδας, p. 974. 3. τις ανηρ Γαλιλαιος, Ιουδας ονομα· p. 1060. 8.

[b] Ελεαζαρος αποσονος Ιουδα τε πεισαντος Ιουδαιων εκ ολιγες μη πειθεσθαι τας αποσασιας, ὁτε Κυρηνιος τιμητης εις την Ιουδαιαν επεμφθη. De B. J. lib. vii. p. 1313. v. 41.

[c] Ibid. & p. 792. init.

the

the end of this Judas. But that his enterpriſe was defeated at that time, we may be certain; otherwiſe the Roman government could not have ſubſiſted in that country with any quiet, which yet it did for near ſixty years after the baniſhment of Archelaus. Nor is there after this any mention made in Joſephus's hiſtory, of any action or attempt of Judas.

Perhaps it will be here objected, that Gamaliel's words imply, that this deſign of Judas was quite confounded, and his principles ſunk at once: and yet it ſeems likely, from the uneaſineſs which the Jews expreſs under the Roman tribute in ſome places of the evangeliſts, that his principles were in being long afterwards: and from Joſephus it appears, that his notions were very prevalent, and were one cauſe of their war at laſt with the Romans.

But if any ſo underſtand Gamaliel, they appear to me very much to miſtake the deſign of his argument. Doubtleſs, it was not without ſpecial reaſon that Gamaliel alleged theſe two inſtances; and he ſpeaks of each in a very different manner. Of Theudas he ſays, *He was ſlain, and all, as many as obeyed him, were ſcattered and brought to nought:* διελυθησαν και εξενοηθησαν εις ουδεν· they were ruined and came to nothing. Of Judas he ſays, *He alſo periſhed, and all, as many as obeyed him, were diſperſed:* διεσκορπισθησαν. Having mentioned theſe two inſtances, which the council were well acquainted with, and thereby laid a foundation for the advice he propoſed to give, he goes on: *And now I ſay unto you, refrain from theſe men, and let them alone: for if this counſel or this work be of men,* [as Theudas's was,] *it will come to*[d] *nought* [as his did]. *But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, leſt haply ye be found even to fight againſt God.*

It is not to be ſuppoſed, that Gamaliel ſhould expreſsly ſay, Judas's deſign was of God. However the chief men of the Jewiſh nation might approve his principles, they were wiſer than openly to eſpouſe them: they left that to the common people.

The force of Gamaliel's argument is this: Theudas and his meaſures came to nothing. After him Judas roſe up; he himſelf periſhed, and his people were diſperſed; but yet his principles prevail. You likewiſe may now puniſh theſe men, and put an end to their lives; but if their principles be of God, they will prevail notwithſtanding; and all the iſſue will be, that you will contract guilt, fight againſt God, but in vain.

And to this, ſeems to be owing the great ſucceſs of Gamaliel's reaſoning, and the ſervice he did the apoſtles at this time. He inſinuates ſome hopes, that their deſign might be of the

[d] Καταλυθησεται

same nature with Judas's. This may be inferred from his way of expressing himself, *lest haply ye be found to fight against God.* This was Judas's peculiar principle, that they were to own no mortal lords, but God only[e]. And it is not unlikely, that Gamaliel intended hereby to insinuate, not only that there was danger of their opposing a design which came from God, and of opposing it with no other effect, but that of contracting guilt to themselves, but also of opposing the very kingdom and government of God, which they wished to be under.

It deserves likewise to be observed, that Gamaliel mentions Theudas with contempt and indignation. *Before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody:* but nothing like this follows the mention of Judas.

Gamaliel concludes upon the whole, that they should *let these men alone.* We have no occasion to meddle in this matter: it is not unlikely but the Romans, our present governors, will be jealous of these men. But it seems to me an affair we have no reason to concern ourselves in.

St. Luke therefore must be supposed to be well acquainted with the census made after the banishment of Archelaus.

I must be permitted to observe farther, that St. Luke does here call Cyrenius by his true name. It has indeed been a dispute among learned men, whether his Roman name was Quirinus or Quirinius: Onuphrius in his Fasti printed it Quirinus; Grotius[f] and Lipsius[g] thought Onuphrius was mistaken, and that it ought to be corrected Quirinius. Perizonius[h] seems to have proved, that Quirinus is the true way of writing it in Latin; since it was not the family name, or the nomen, but cognomen, the third name of this gentleman: for his name was Caius Sulpicius Quirinus; and in the Syriac version of St. Luke he is written Curinus, and in the Latin vulgate Cyrinus. But however that be, he allows it to be common for the Greeks to make some alteration in the termination of Roman names, when they turn them into their own language. It is certain, his name in all the Greek authors has the termination of ιος or ius; Strabo[i] and Dio[k] call him Κυρινιος, Cyrinius; but in Josephus[l] his name is always written, as in St. Luke, Cyrenius.

Moreover it is certain, Cyrenius was governor of Syria; and he has here a very proper title, by which he must have been well known in Judea, and in all that part of the world.

[e] 2. p. 1060. v. 10. [f] In Luc. ii. 2. [g] In not. ad Tacit. ann. l. iii. c. 48. [h] Dissert. de Aug. orb. Terr. Descr. § 30. [i] Lib. xii. p. 854. [k] Vid. Dio. lib. liv. ad A. U. 742. p. 791. v. 5. 12. p. 794. v. 21. 37. & alibi.

Lastly

Lastly, if we consider that the words now before us are a parenthesis, and that St. Luke calls the enrolment or census he was speaking of, the first, we cannot well doubt, but that the original intention of them was, in some manner or other, to distinguish this enrolment, which was now made in the reign of Herod, from that which was afterwards made when Archelaus was banished.

He that will seriously consider all these particulars, will have no suspicions that St. Luke has made any mistake.

If then the sense, which is now ordinarily given these words, is not consistent with truth, it is highly reasonable to conclude, that either we do not take the true meaning of them, or else that some small alteration or other has happened in the text of St. Luke.

§ IV. But though what has been here offered, and which has also been in the main alleged before by those who have considered this place, be sufficient to take away the force of this objection, yet I presume it will be expected, I should give some account of the particular solutions that have been offered by learned men: this I shall do, and then endeavour to support or improve that which appears to me the fairest.

1. One solution proposed by [m] Calvin, and much approved by Salmeron and Baronius, is, that Josephus was mistaken in the account which he has given of Cyrenius. The two last mentioned writers especially are of opinion, that we need pay little regard to Josephus, whose history, they say, abounds with mistakes and falshoods [n]. And Baronius [o] has taken some pains to make out a new series of the succession of the governors of Syria about this time; for he thinks that Cyrenius was twice, if not thrice, president of Syria: but this project can be but little approved by learned men at present. No one that reads Josephus without prejudice, and that considers he had before him the history of Herod's reign, written by Nicolas of Damascus, who was a learned man, Herod's favourite, and employed by him in affairs of government, can make any doubt, but that Quintilius Varus was governor of Syria when Herod died; that C. Sentius Saturninus was his predecessor, and was in the province at least two or three years; and that M. Titius was president before him. With all these governors of Syria

[m] In loc.

[n] Præstat ut Josephi verò fidem & historiam deseramus, tanquam incertam, & fluctuantem & veritati in multis dissentientem. Salmeron in Evang. T. iii. Tractat. 32.

[o] Sicque contra Josephi deliria certo appareret, sub Augusto imperatore, vivente Herode seniore, reperiri duplicem, immo triplicem Quirinii in Syria præfecturam. Baron. Ann. A. D. 3. Vid. etiam App. ad An. num. 80, 86.

Herod

Herod had ſome concerns. What Joſephus has ſaid of them may likewiſe be confirmed in a great meaſure from other authors[p]; ſo that there is no room for Cyrenius at this time.

Nor can there well be any queſtion made, but that Joſephus has given us, in the main, a true account of the enrolment or cenſus made by Cyrenius after Archelaus's baniſhment. It appears from the manner in which Gamaliel ſpeaks of the taxing, when Judas of Galilee roſe up, that it was a remarkable event: and the account Joſephus gives of it may aſſure us, this was an affair all men were then well acquainted with. The diſturbance raiſed by Judas was ſuppreſſed, but yet the principle ſubſiſted; it was the occaſion of much uneaſineſs under the Roman government, and many were at times puniſhed on account of it[q].

2. Another ſolution propoſed by[r] Calvin, and which Valeſius[s] judgeth to be moſt commodious of any, is, that the decree of Auguſtus was iſſued in the latter end of Herod's reign; but that for ſome reaſon or other the cenſus could not be made, or at leaſt not finiſhed, till the time that Cyrenius was governor of Syria, ten or twelve years afterwards.

But this is to make St. Luke ſpeak very improperly and confuſedly in what he ſays of Cyrenius, and it is directly contrary to what follows. Having related, that there *went out a decree from Cæſar Auguſtus, that all the world ſhould be taxed*, he ſubjoins: *and all went to be taxed every one into his own city.* And there was ſo great a reſort at this time at Bethlehem upon this account, that Joſeph and Mary were obliged to take up with very indifferent accommodations: *there was no room for them in the inn.*

3. Some think, that inſtead of Cyrenius we ought to read Saturninus; becauſe, according to Joſephus, he was præfect of Syria within a year or two before Herod died; and Tertullian ſays, this cenſus was made by him. This is one of the ſolutions propoſed by[t] Valeſius, though he rather approves that laſt mentioned. But againſt this it has been obſerved by many learned men, that Cyrenius is in all our copies of St. Luke, and appears to have been there before Tertullian's time; ſince Juſtin Martyr ſays expreſly, that this cenſus was made by Cyrenius.

4. Other learned[u] men have thought it a very eaſy and probable conjecture, that originally the name of St. Luke was

[p] Vid. Noriſ. Cenot. Piſ. Diſſ. ii. cap. 16. § 9, 10. [q] Joſ. Ant. l. xviii. cap. 1. § 6. [r] Ubi ſupra. [s] Vid Notas ad Euſeb. Hiſt. Ec. lib. i. cap. 5. [t] Ubi ſupra. [u] Huet. Dem. Evang. Prop. iv. c. 10. Parker's Demonſtration of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, p. 219. 4to. 1681.

Quin-

p. 675.

Quintilius. Quintilius Varus ſucceeded Saturninus, and was in the province of Syria when Herod died. The cenſus afterwards made by Cyrenius was certainly beſt known, and ſome ignorant tranſcriber might therefore imagine Quintilius a miſtake, and pretend to correct the original by inſerting Cyrenius in his room. Beſides, the alteration of Quintilius to Cyrenius is a change of only a few [x] letters, and therefore might the more eaſily happen.

But this ſolution is liable to the ſame objection with the former, that Cyrenius is in all the copies of the Greek original, and in all the ancient verſions; and beſides has this diſadvantage, that this cenſus St. Luke ſpeaks of is not aſcribed to Quintilius Varus by any ancient chriſtian writer whatever, whereas Saturninus has been mentioned by Tertullian.

5. The next [y] I ſhall mention is that offered by [z] Mr. Whiſton, which is this: 'that a deſcription or enrolment of the 'Jews was made juſt before our Saviour's birth, but the tax 'itſelf was not raiſed till the baniſhment of Archelaus, when 'Cyrenius was governor of Syria.' And Dr. Prideaux ſeems to approve of this way of ſolving this difficulty. For he ſays: 'If the ſecond verſe of the ſecond chapter of St. Luke be ſo 'rendered as to imply, that the levying the tax, according to 'the deſcription mentioned in the former verſe, was firſt exe-'cuted while Cyrenius was governor of Syria, this will remove 'all difficulties: and the text can well bear this interpretation [a].'

In order to ſupport this interpretation, Mr. Whiſton ſays [b]: 'The word uſed for the deſcription at our Saviour's birth, is 'the verb απογραφομαι, and that uſed for the taxation under 'Cyrenius is the noun απογραφη.' He adds, 'that by cuſtom 'a noun of the ſame original with a verb does vary in ſignifi-'cation from it. Γεωμέτρειν is to meaſure the earth: Γεωμέτρια is 'geometry, or the ſcience that conſiſts of the knowledge of 'numbers and figures.—Nay, in Engliſh, in the words directly 'appoſite to this matter, the verb to tax is oftentimes to lay 'an imputation, while the noun a tax is the levy of money only.'

But (1.) Mr. W——n's argument from the uſe of nouns and verbs is not valid here. He ſays: 'by cuſtom a noun of 'the ſame original with a verb does vary in ſignification from it.' This may be, and there may be many inſtances of it; but it had been much more material to give an example or two of

[x] Κυιντιλιου, Κυρηνιου. [y] I have paſſed by the conjecture of thoſe, who have ſuppoſed this whole parentheſis to be an interpolation, as not deſerving to be mentioned. [z] A ſhort View of the Harmony of the Evang. Prop. xi. [a] Connex. Par. ii. l. ix. Anno ante ch. 5. [b] Ubi ſupra.

the

the use of the noun απογραφη for a tax, namely, in the sense in which he here understands it. This he has not done, and I presume no such example can be alleged from any Greek author.

I know of but two, or at the most three senses, in which this noun is used, which can have any relation to this matter.

[1.] It is used for the act of the people in presenting themselves to be enrolled; as when soldiers offered themselves to be enlisted [c] or enrolled under a general: and in a census it may be used for the act of the people, who come and offer themselves to be enrolled and assessed. So the word seems to be used by Josephus, when he says in the place above quoted, that Judas persuaded not a few [d] of the Jews not to make enrolments or entries; that is, not to offer themselves to be entered and assessed.

[2.] The word is used for a census; so it is used by Dio in many places: απογραφας ποιεισθαι is the same as censum agere; that is, to make enrolments, is the same as to make a census [e].

[3.] This noun is used for the public rolls or court books in which the entries were made: this sense of the word is very common. Thus Caligula being at play at dice, and having lost all his money, he asked for the Gallic court rolls [f], and ordered several of the most wealthy of that people to be put to death, and seized their cash. And the citizens of Rome, whose debts were more than they could discharge, having entered the sums they owed in books opened for that purpose, Servius Tullius took the books or rolls, τας απογραφας ελαβε, brought them into the forum, and paid the creditors [g].

Thus I have reckoned up all the senses I know of this noun, relating to this matter; however it never signifies a tax. Taxes were paid according to the census, where any had been made, but they were no part of it: they might be remitted or demanded; and the tribute is never expressed by the noun απογραφη, but is ever distinguished from what that signifies [h].

(2.) This interpretation of these words is contrary to matter of fact. There was no tax levied after the banishment of Archelaus, according to the enrolment made at the birth of our Saviour. But as soon as Archelaus was banished, 'Cyrenius 'came into Judea to make an assessment of their goods.' Jo-

[c] See above, p. 263. n. l.

[d] Ελεαζαρος Ιουδα απογονος του πεισαντος Ιουδαιων ουκ ολιγους μη ποιεισθαι τας απογραφας. De B. J. l. vii. p. 1343. 40.

[e] Πλην εν ταις απογραφαις. p. 509. C. αυτος δε απογραφας των εν τη Ιταλια κατοικουντων εποιησατο. 557. B. vid. etiam jam citat. pag. 496. C. 508. B. C.

[f] Κυβευων δε ποτε και μαθων οτι ουκ ειη οι αργυριον, ητησε τε τας των Γαλατων απογραφας· κ. τ. λ. Dio. lib. lix. p. 657. B.

[g] Dion. Hal. l. iv. c. 10 p. 207. 23.

[h] Τον τε φορον τον εκ των απογραφων αφηκε, τελη τε τινα κατελυσε. Dio. l. xlix. p. 401. B.

sephus

ſephus is as expreſs in this matter as can be[i]: 'Then it was 'that Judas of Galilee and his followers exclaimed, that an 'aſſeſſment would bring in among them downright ſlavery[k].'

This interpretation therefore is ſo far from being of any ſervice to us, that it would introduce a new, and I think inſuperable difficulty, by putting upon theſe words a ſenſe directly contrary to what Joſephus has ſaid.

Joſephus is ſo expreſs, that there ſeems no need of reaſoning upon the matter to confute this ſuppoſition. But I can never conceive, how a tax could be levied in Judea, after the removal of Archelaus, upon the cenſus or enrolment made at our Saviour's birth, without the utmoſt confuſion or the utmoſt injuſtice. When the enrolment which St. Luke ſpeaks of was made, Galilee, Trachonitis, and other countries were ſubject to Herod, beſide Judea: many who lived in Galilee enrolled themſelves in Judea, particularly Joſeph, as St. Luke aſſures us. But when Archelaus was baniſhed, one half of Herod's dominions was in the poſſeſſion of Herod the tetrarch and Philip, and had been ſo ever ſince the death of Herod called the great: and only Judea, Samaria, and Idumea, which had been ſubject to Archelaus, were thrown into the form of a Roman province. The Jews having enrolled themſelves according to their families at the time of our Saviour's nativity, and many having come into Judea, properly ſo called, from Galilee, and other parts of Herod's territories, a new enrolment was abſolutely neceſſary in Judea at the time of Archelaus's removal, if they were to pay tribute there in the way of a cenſus; Judea otherwiſe muſt have been very much over burdened. If there was an aſſeſſment of goods made at the latter end of Herod's reign, undoubtedly Joſeph's ſtock at Nazareth was entered and rated at Bethlehem: and as the Jews in that part of the world were chiefly of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, the inhabitants of Galilee, and Trachonitis, &c. muſt have very generally enrolled themſelves in towns that belonged to the province of Judea. But it would have been very unreaſonable in the Romans to demand tribute of the people of Judea, properly ſo called, for eſtates and goods which were in the territories of the tetrarchs Herod and Philip.

And we are aſſured, that the Romans did uſe to act equitably and with great exactneſs in theſe matters. Many of the Roman citizens had been for a long time oppreſſed with the

[i] Παρὼν δὲ Κυρήνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίων—— ἀποτιμησόμενος τε αὐτῶν τὰς οὐσίας. Ant. lib. xviii. c. 1. § 1.

[k] Τήν τε ἀποτίμησιν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ αἰτίαν δουλείας ἐπιφέρειν λεγόντες. Id. Ibid.

weight

weight of their debts. A way having been found out A. U. 402 to give them eaſe, Livy ſays, that the next year a cenſus was ordered, becauſe the property of many things had been altered[l].

6. The ſolution I ſhall conſider in the next place, is that which was firſt offered by Herwaert[m]: I give it here in the words of [n] Whitby, by whom it is eſpouſed. *And this taxing was firſt made* (before that made) *when Cyrenius was governor of Syria:* or rather, *This taxing was made before Cyrenius was governor of Syria.* The learned Kepler[o] approved of this interpretation, as perfectly agreeable to the genius of the Greek language: notwithſtanding which [p] Caſaubon rejected it, and was ſuppoſed by moſt to have confuted Herwaert's arguments for it. Perizonius, in his diſſertation upon this ſubject of the taxing, has afreſh ſupported this interpretation. Mr. Le Clerc, in his additions to Dr. Hammond's annotations, expreſſes his approbation of it; and has ſince declared, [q] that he thinks it has been ſet in ſo clear a light as to be inconteſtable. And it is now embraced by many other learned men, both proteſtants and catholicks.

I am very deſirous this ſolution ſhould appear here to as much advantage, as an argument ſo full of Greek criticiſms can do in a deſign of this nature in our own language. Perizonius allows, that a great many of Herwaert's inſtances are not to the [r] purpoſe. I reckon, therefore, that it will be ſufficient to repreſent this argument as it is drawn up by Whitby and Perizonius; eſpecially if I take in by the by an inſtance or two, inſiſted on by others, though neglected by them.

Whitby ſays: ‘ I would rather read προ της than πρωτη. But ‘ neither do we need this criticiſm, ſince the words πρωτος and ‘ πρότερος are by the ſeventy oft uſed according to this ſenſe; ‘ of the word πρότερον, this is beyond doubt, God ſaying twice

[l] Quia ſolutio æris alieni multarum rerum mutaverat dominos; cenſum agi placuit. Lib. vii. cap. 22. n. 6. vid. & c. 21.

[m] Ut hoc loco genitivus ἡγεμονευοντος vocabulo πρωτη additus, vim comparationis efficiat, & perinde ſit, ac ſi diceretur deſcriptionem illam eſſe priorem priuſque factam, quàm Quirinius Syriæ præficeretur, præfecturamque ipſius gereret. Herwaert nova & vera Chronologia, Monachii 1612. p. 189. [n] In loc. [o] Cum igitur omnium Græcè doctorum judicio conſtet ſic optimè verſum eſſe hunc locum Lucæ, multoque emendatius quam habet antiqua verſio, ſpero omnes acquieturos hac ſolutione objectionis prius propoſitæ. De Natal. J. Chr. p. 116, 117. [p] Exerc. in Baron. i. n. 32. [q] Ce denombrement ſe fit avant que Quirinius fut gouverneur de la Syrie. Des ſavans hommes ont mis cette explication de ce paſſage de St. Luc dans un ſi grand jour qu'elle paroit deſormais inconteſtable. Nouv. Teſtam.

[r] Interpretationem hanc primus protulit Joh. Ceorg. Herwartus, multiſque argumentis, vel potius exemplis probare laboravit, ſed in quibus non pauca attulit valde ἀπροσδιονυσα. Periz. de Auguſt. Deſcript. § 21.

‘ απογελω

'αποσελω σφηκιας προλερας σε, *I will ſend hornets before thee,* 'Exod. xxiii. 28. Joſ. xxiv. 12.—That πρωτος alſo is uſed in 'the ſenſe of priority we learn from theſe inſtances; πρωτοτοκος 'εἰμι η συ, I am before thee, I am elder than thou; και ινα τι 'εκ ελοτισθη ο λοτος μου πρωτος; Chal. מדם יותא לי, *Why then was* 'not *the word firſt ſpoken to me? Cur mihi non annunciatum eſt* 'prius? 2 Sam. xix. 43. Iſa. xlv. 16. *The former troubles are* 'forgotten, Gr. επιλησονται την θλιψιν αυτων την πρωτην, and ver. 17. 'ε μη μνησθωσι των προλερων, *they ſhall not remember the former.* 'So John i. 15, 30. ὁτι πρωτος μου ην, *for he was before me.* And 'chap. xv. 18. *know that they hated,* εμε πρωτον, *me before you.* '1 Cor. xiv. 30. ο πρωτος, *Let the former hold his peace*; and '1 John iv. 19. *We love him,* ὁτι πρωτος, becauſe he loved us 'before. And in Ariſtophanes, αλλ' εκ αν προλε is interpreted 'αλλ' εκ αν προλερον' Neph. p. 122. And ſo Theophylact in-'terprets the word here. Τελει προλερα ηγεμονευοντος, ηγεν προλερον 'η ηγεμονευε της Συριας Κυρηνιος.'

Perizonius underſtands theſe words in much the ſame ſenſe[s] with Whitby; only he differs from him and Herwaert, in that they ſuppoſe πρωτη to be the ſame as προλερα; whereas he ſays, theſe numeral adjectives have the force of adverbs[t].

He alleges divers of the ſame examples which Whitby does, particularly John i. 15. and xv. 18. Of the latter, ὁτι εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκε, he ſays, it muſt by all means be underſtood[u] of priority of time: *It hated me before it hated you.*

He ſuppoſes alſo[x] that we have a parallel inſtance in a word of an oppoſite meaning, 2 Macc. vii. 41. εσχατη των υιων η μητηρ ἐτελευτησε· *Laſt of all after the ſons the mother died.* In the ſame manner is πρωτον the adverb uſed in Ariſtophanes in avibus, v. 484. de Gallo; ηρχε τε πρωτον Δαρειε και Μεγαβυζε, i. e. imperabatque Perſis priuſquam Darius & Megabyzus; vel ante Darium & Megabyzum.

Perizonius ſays, that the genitives that follow πρωτος are governed by an ellipſis[y], and that πρωτος μου is the ſame as πρωτος

[s] Verus itaque meâ ſententiâ verborum ſenſus eſt: Hæc deſcriptio prius, vel, ante, facta eſt, quam præſideret Syriæ Quirinus. Diſſertatio de Auguſtæ orbis terrarum Deſcriptione, § xxi. [t] Voluit autem Herwartus πρωτη poni αντι τε προλερα, atque hujus locutionis vi, genitivum, qui ſequitur, a τω πρωτη, tanquam a comparativo, regi. Durum hoc pleriſque viſum. Ego rem aliter expediendam omnino cenſeam. Hæc ſimpliciter, ut adjectivum numerale regitur verbo, quemadmodum ſolent adjectiva habitum vel modum rei geſtæ ſignificantia, tanquam ſi ſint adverbia.——— Sic plane πρωτος, verbis adjunctum, ſæpe ſignificat ſolam ordinis & numeri rationem, ſine diſcrimine, pluresne ſint, an unus, qui ſequantur; atque adeo tunc non tam ſuperlativi, quam poſitivi naturam induit, eandemque ſubit conſtructionem, quam δευτερος & ſeq. Ibid. § 22. [u] Vertendum omnino cum ſignificatu temporis, me primum ante vos. Ibid. & § 23. [x] Ibid.

[y] Nempe genitivi hi non reguntur ab adjectivis, ſed a præpoſitionibus, quæ per ellipſin ſunt omiſſæ. § 24. Προ enim eſſe particulam, quæ in iſta locutione deſideratur, & a qua regitur genitivus, certiſſimum

ex

προ μυ, πρωΐος υμων the ſame as πρωΐος προ υμων. Thus in Luke xi. 38. *He wondered,* ὁτι ου πρωΐον εβαπτισθη προ αριστου, *that he had not waſhed before dinner.* From this and another ſuch inſtance he concludes, that the genitive is governed by προ underſtood, when it is wanting.

This is the ſubſtance of the argument in favour of this meaning of this paſſage of St. Luke.

It has been thought by ſome to be an objection againſt this ſolution, that then St. Luke has omitted to name the perſon by whom this enrolment was made: but methinks this is a defect which may be diſpenſed with, if that be the only difficulty. For my own part I dare not abſolutely reject it; but yet I am not fully ſatisfied, that this is the ſenſe of the words. I think myſelf obliged to review the arguments here offered by theſe learned men, and hope it may be done without offence.

Whitby's inſtances of the uſe of προΐερος and προΐερον from the Seventy are not to the point, becauſe the word in St. Luke is πρωΐη. There is no doubt but προΐερος, the comparative, is very often followed by a genitive caſe, and denotes ſuch or ſuch a thing to be before another; we want ſome plain examples of this uſe of πρωΐος· nor is πρωΐοΐοχος εΐω η συ to the point, becauſe the η is wanting in St. Luke, and the conſtruction is different. The example from Iſa. lxv. 16. only proves that πρωΐος ſignifies the former: and though πρωΐη in St. Luke ſhould be ſo rendered, the difficulty will remain in its full force. For then the ſenſe will be, *This former taxing was made when Cyrenius was governor of Judea.* Nor can the πρωΐος in 1 Cor. xiv. 30. or 1 John iv. 19. do us any ſervice, for want of a regimen equivalent to what we have in our text; nor do I ſee what uſe can be made of the phraſe borrowed from Ariſtophanes. The paſſage from 2 Sam. xix. 43. as it is quoted

ex eo, quod ubi ellipſis nulla, & ſententia plene ac integre exponitur, illa potiſſimum occurrit expreſſa. Apud. Anton. Liber. fab. 29. Και προ Ηρακλεους εορΐη Θυσι Γαλινθιαδι πρωΐη. Galinthias ibi optime dicitur merita fuiſſe de Hercule, & idcirco Thebanos in feſto Herculis ſacrificare Galinthiade prius, ſeu primæ, ante Herculem. ——Sed & ipſe Lucas Evang. xi. 38. expreſſit ſimiliter το προ poſt πρωΐος, ο δε Φαρισαιος, inquit, ΐδων εθαυμασεν, ὁτι ου πρωΐον εβαπτισθη προ του αριστου· quod non primum ſe laverit, antequam cibum ſumeret. Vides utrobique poſt πρωΐη & πρωΐον ante genitivum expreſſam hanc præpoſitionem; quod certo eſt indicio, ab ea etiam regi, quando nulla comparet, omiſſa per ελλειψιν, ſed tamen intelligenda: atque adeo explicandum etiam πρωΐον Δαρειου, quaſi dictum eſſet πρωΐον προ Δαρειου· η αποΐραφη πρωΐη Κυρηνιου quaſi πρωΐη προ Κυρηνιου. § 25.—mihique idem eſt, ac ſi dixiſſet Lucas, non quidem προΐερα ηΐεμονευονΐος, verum πρωΐη προ ηΐεμονευονΐος.—Sed nihil ſimilius, quod ad conſtructionis & linguæ rationem, Lucæ verbis ſecundum noſtram eorum interpretationem, quam locus LXX. Interpretum Jerem. xxix. 1. ΐδοι οι λοΐοι ους απεστειλεν Ιερεμιας εις Βαβυλωνα υστερον εξελθοντος Ιεχονιου εξ Ιερουσαλημ. Hæc ſunt verba, quæ miſit, vel ſcripſit Jeremias Babylonem, poſtquam exiit Jechonias ex Hieroſolymis. § 28.

by

by Keuchenius [z], ſeems to me more ſtrongly to ſupport this interpretation, than as it is quoted by Whitby, though I ſuppoſe he had his reaſons for quoting it in that way; nor has Perizonius quoted this text, though he had Keuchenius before him. It is obſervable, that Ιεδα is wanting in [a] Grabe's edition of the Septuagint, as there is nothing anſwerable to it in the Hebrew: his inſtances from St. John's Goſpel will be diſtinctly conſidered preſently.

The firſt quotation in Perizonius [§ 23.] which I ſhall conſider is John xx. 3, 4. *Peter therefore went forth, and that other diſciple, and came to the ſepulchre. So they ran both together, and the other diſciple did out-run Peter,* και ηλθε πρωτος εις το μνημειον *and came firſt to the ſepulchre.* Which Perizonius would render thus: *and came firſt*, or before Peter; and ſays, that the meaning cannot be *came firſt of all*, πρωτος παντων, becauſe Mary Magdalene had been there before. No, for certain, it is not, *came firſt of all*, becauſe two only are here ſpoken of; and *omnium primus* is not properly ſaid of two. But I wonder Perizonius did not perceive the proper ellipſis in this place, and which is very obvious, namely, των δυοιν, and came the *firſt of the two.* Perizonius does not deny, that πρωτος is uſed where two only are ſpoken of; nay, he contends for it. But becauſe it is often denied [b], and becauſe his proofs appear to me not very clear, or at leaſt not ſo fully to ſuit my interpretation of this text, I ſhall give two undoubted examples. Thus [c] Dionyſius ſays, that Servius Tullius's wife was daughter of Tarquin the firſt, though there were but two Tarquins kings of Rome. Plutarch thus deſcribes a reſtleſs uneaſy mind. 'If he is a native of a province, of Galatia 'for inſtance, or Bithynia, he thinks he is not well uſed, 'if he has not ſome eminent poſt among his citizens. If 'he has that, he laments that he has not a right of wearing 'the patrician habit: if he has that, he grieves that he is not 'a Roman prætor: if he is prætor, that he is not conſul:

[z] Silentio tandem præterire nequeo quod 2 Sam. cap. xix. 43. legitur, *Et vir Iſraelis reſpondit viro Judæ, & dixit, mihi ſunt decem partes in rege*, ubi LXX. de ſuo addere videntur, και πρωτοτοκος εγω η συ, *& etiam in Davide ego præ te: cur igitur me vilipendiſti, & non fuit verbum meum primum ſeu prius* (inter duos enim ſermo eſt) *mihi ad reducendum regem meum*; quod LXX. vertunt, και ουκ ελογισθη ο λογος μου πρωτος μου τε Ιεδα επιστρεψαι τον βασιλεα εμου; ubi πρωτος τε Ιεδα manifeſte ponitur pro πρωτερος. Petri Keuchen. annot. in loc.

[a] Και ουκ ελογισθη ο λογος μου πρωτος μου τε επιστρεψαι τον βασιλεα εμου. [b] Πρωτος και πρωτερος διαφερει· πρωτος γαρ επι πολλων, πρωτερος δε, επι δυο. Ammon. de Sim. & Diff. ap. H. Steph. Theſ. Gr. in Appendice. [c] Ταρκυνιου θυγατηρ ουσα του πρωτου βασιλεως. Dionyſ. Hal. Antiq. p. 234. v. 13. confer. p. 250. v. 42. ου Ταρκυνιος του πρωτερου βασιλευσαντος Ρωμαιων αδελφου παις ην. & p. 253. 10. του πρωτερου βασιλεως Ταρκυνιου θυγατηρ.

'and if consul, that he was not declared first, but[d] only the 'latter (of the two).'

This text then will not help Perizonius. All that can be proved from it is, that πρωτος is used very properly where two only are spoken of: if πρωτη in St. Luke be allowed to signify the *first* or *former* of *two* taxings, all that will result from hence is, that St. Luke thought there was another taxing beside this; and that this now made by Cyrenius was the former of the two. No instance of this sort will prove, that the meaning of this passage is, this taxing was *before*, or *prior* to, that made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.

The examples from John i. 15. 30. xv. 18. are some of the most proper examples in the whole number; and if they are rightly understood, they are very much to the purpose. But, with submission to these learned men, I think they are taken by them in a wrong sense. They are both much of the same kind; but I choose to consider first of all that alleged from John xv. 18. Ει ο κοσμος υμας μισει, γινωσκετε οτι εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν· *If the world hate you, know that it hated me before it hated you.* Herwaert[e] is much pleased with this example.

If πρωτον be supposed to be an adverb, then this is not a parallel instance: but indeed, as I take it, it is neither an adverb, nor an adjective, but a noun substantive; or at least, an adjective used substantively; and the latter part of the verse ought to be rendered, *Know that it has hated me* YOUR CHIEF. The connexion of the words may satisfy us, that this was our Saviour's meaning. His argument is, that men had hated him, who was superior to them; nay, they had hated even his father; the disciples therefore ought not to be surprized if they hate them also, v. 20. *Remember the words that I said unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord; if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you.* v. 24. *But now they have both seen and hated me and my father.* The force of the argument is not, that the world had hated him *before* it hated them; but he bids them consider, that it had hated him who was *their master*, and whom they allowed to be so. This is the argument made use of in other places with the same view, Matt. x. 24, 25. *The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord.— If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his houshold?*

[d] Εαν δε και στρατηγων, οτι μη υπατευει· και υπατευων, οτι μη πρωτος, αλλ' υστερος ανηγορευθη. Plutarch. de Anim. Tranq. p. 470. c.

[e] Ille verò S. Joannis xv. 18. locus ad hoc institutum mirificè facit,—*Si mundus vos odit, scitote quia me priorem vobis odio habuit.*

If

If it be ſaid, that there was no occaſion to ſubjoin *your chief* after *me*, and that the diſciples could conſider Jeſus no otherwiſe than as their maſter; I anſwer, that it is apparent from the texts already alleged here by me, that this was not our Saviour's ſtyle; and that he did not truſt ſo much to his diſciples' underſtandings. When he had occaſion to draw any inferences from his ſuperiority, he always expreſſeth it. John xiii. 14. *Ye call me Maſter, and Lord, and ye ſay well: for ſo I am. If I then your Lord and Maſter have waſhed your feet, ye ought alſo to waſh one another's feet.*

Πρωτος is uſed ſeveral times in the New Teſtament, in the plural number, for ſuperiority of honour and dignity: Και τοις πρωτοις της Γαλιλαιας, is not ill rendered in our verſion, Mark vi. 21. *chief eſtates of Galilee*: γυναικων τε των πρωτων ουκ ολιγαι, *of the chief women not a few*, Acts xvii. 4. or, as perhaps the words might be rendered, not a few of the wives of the chief men.

It is likewiſe uſed in the ſingular number in the ſame ſenſe. Και ος εαν θελη εν υμιν ειναι πρωτος, εσω υμων δουλος· Matt. xx. 27. *And whoſoever will be chief among you, let him be your ſervant.* There is another unexceptionable inſtance of this uſe of the word: Acts xxviii. 7. Εν δε τοις——υπηρχε χωρια τω πρωτω της νησου· *In the ſame quarters were poſſeſſions of the* CHIEF MAN *of the Iſland.* Grotius, in his annotations upon this place, has exhibited a Greek inſcription, found in this very iſland of Melita, a part of which inſcription is thus: Λ. Κ. ΚΙΟΣ. ΙΠΠΕΥΣ. ΡΩΜ. ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΑΙΩΝ. L. C. Kius, Roman knight, chief of the Melitenes.

The word is often ſo uſed in the ſeptuagint verſion: πρωτος των τριακοντα, chief of the thirty, 1 Chron. xi. 11. Και Ασαφ πρωτος των αδοντων, Neh. xii. 46. and in many other places. And in Joſephus: Ιησους ο Πισθ ου παις, ο της τριτης μεριδος πρωτος, Juſtus the ſon of Piſtus, chief or leader of the third faction in [f] Tiberias. I throw an example or two more from other [g] authors into the margin.

Nor do I ſee, why πρωτος ſhould not be allowed to be uſed ſubſtantively in divers of the places I have produced. Princeps in Latin is properly an adjective, and is often ſo uſed; at other times it is a ſubſtantive. Αυτοκρατωρ is ſometimes an [h] adjective; it is alſo uſed ſubſtantively: no one will deny it. Υπατος is a word very near parallel with πρωτος; is often an adjective, at other times is uſed ſubſtantively, and denotes a conſul.

[f] Joſeph. in vit. p. 907. v. 12.

[g] Ων τε δη δευτερα ειρηται ανηρ πρωτος παρ εμοι· κ. λ. Herodot. l. i. c. 115. ην δε ουτος ανηρ, και ο πρωτος αυτων, κ. λ. Ibid. c. 173. Και Σταμπιδιος βιβλιαρχων, ον Λευκιος επικλησε Λακεδαιμονιους, και των Ρωμαιων [Θηβαιων legit Perizonius] και των Ελληνων πρωτος εξεπλω. Ælian. Var. H. vii. 14.

[h] Λαδων την αυτοκρατορα αρχην. Dionyſ. Hal. l. vii. p. 408. v. 1.

I come now to the other inſtance, John i. 15. ουτος ην ον ειπον, ο οπισω μου ερχομενος εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν, ὁτι πρωτος μου ην· *This was he of whom I ſpake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me.* The ſame words occur again, ver. 30. with little variation; but the laſt clauſe ought not, in my opinion, to be rendered, *for he was before me*, but, *for he is my Prince, or Lord.*

What I have already ſaid in favour of this meaning of πρωτος in the former inſtance, may, I preſume, make way for admitting it here.

I apprehend John to ſay: *He that follows me*, or comes behind me, was always before me, or *in my view*, for he is my Prince. Εμπροσθεν and οπισω (unleſs I am much miſtaken) are never uſed in the New Teſtament for priority or poſteriority of time, nor for ſuperiority or inferiority in reſpect of dignity, (unleſs they are ſo uſed here in the caſe of John the Baptiſt,) but always have a regard to place. *For we muſt all appear before the judgment-ſeat of Chriſt*, 2 Cor. v. 10. Εμπροσθεν του βηματος του Χριστου. *I ſaid unto Peter before them all*, Gal. ii. 14. Εμπροσθεν παντων. *Forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto thoſe things which are before*, Phil. iii. 13. Τα μεν οπισω επιλανθανομενος, τοις δε εμπροσθεν επεκτεινομενος· ενωπιον and εμπροσθεν are frequently uſed the one for the other. See Matt. x. 33. Luke xii. 9. It is true, John came before Chriſt, that is, before his face. He went before him as an officer before a great man; but that is expreſſed here in οπισω μου ερχομενος.

But I will not contend about this. Perhaps εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν is not ill rendered in our tranſlation, *is preferred before me*, though it appears to me an unuſual ſenſe of the word.

However, πρωτος μου muſt nevertheleſs be underſtood, as I render it. And I learn from Beza [i], that others have been of the ſame opinion before me.

Thus then John ſays, toward the concluſion of his miniſtry, *Ye yourſelves bear witneſs, that I* [from the beginning] *ſaid, I am not the Chriſt, but that I am ſent before him*, John iii. 28. Referring to what he had declared at firſt: *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderneſs*, MAKE STRAIT THE WAY OF THE LORD, ch. i. 23. That is, I came not on my own account, but barely as a harbinger that makes way for his Lord. This is the peculiar character of John, under which he was propheſied of, Iſa. xl. 3. Mal. iii. 1. iv. 5. and under which he always ſpeaks of himſelf. And what in the 15th and 30th verſes of this 1ſt chapter of John, is ὁτι πρωτος μου ην, *He is my Prince*,

i Quamobrem etiam nonnulli πρωτος μου interpretantur *Princeps meus*: quod mihi penitus inſolens videtur. Bez. in loc.

is in the 27th verse represented by an expression that denotes the vast superiority of Christ above him[k]: *He it is, who coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoes latchet I am not worthy to unloose:* that is, I am so far inferior to him, and am in so low a post under him, that I am not worthy to perform the meanest office about his person: or, in other words, I am a mere harbinger, and he is my Lord. Athenagoras[l] has used this word in this very sense of a prince or chief.

I hope it will be no objection against this interpretation, that then the words would not have been πρωτος μȣ ην, but εστιν· for these are all one and the same. I need go no farther for proof than these two verses: ȣτος ην ον ειπον in the 15th, in the 30th is ȣτος εστι περι ȣ εγω ειπον. So that ην and εστι signify the very same thing, and are used one for the other.

I am indeed aware, that some grammarians will except against my notion of πρωτος being a substantive: I will then, for the present, suppose it to be an adjective; but yet I cannot part with the interpretation I have given of either of these texts. The context satisfies me, the sense I affix to the words is the true meaning; and I can, if I mistake not, account for it according to the strictest rules of the grammarians. Let then πρωτον in John xv. 18. be inclusive, and be understood partitively, and υμων will be governed by the ellipsis εξ; this I suppose will not be contested: but I choose to understand πρωτον here exclusively. I think that is the best sense, and then the ellipsis may be[m] προ, περι, επι, or whatever else the grammarians like best. Πρωτος in John i. 15. 30. is evidently exclusive, according to my way of rendering it; and the μȣ following is governed by an ellipsis of one of the last mentioned prepositions. This I take to be perfectly agreeable to the rules of the grammarians: and thus, in one place, Jesus tells his disciples, that he was chief *above* them; and in the other, John the Baptist says, that Jesus was prince or chief *above* him. And now I have Beza on my side, with reference to John i. 15. for though he would not allow, that πρωτος μȣ is *my prince*, yet

[k] Αυτος εστιν ο οπισω μȣ ερχομενος, ος γεγονεν μȣ γεγονεν· ȣ εγω ȣκ ειμι αξιος ινα λυσω αυτȣ τον ιμαντα τȣ υποδηματος.

[l] Πρωσηκε δε τῳ μεν το πρωτευειν κατα φυσιν, τῳ δε δορυφερειν τον ΠΡΩΤΟΝ, οδοποιειν τε και προανεργειν παν οποσον εμποδων και προσαντες· Decet enim hoc secundum naturam principatum habere, illud autem, satellitis vice PRINCIPI suo viam facere, & prævio cursu, omnia impedimenta & prærupta tollere. De Resur. p. 50. D. Paris. 1636.

[m] Perizonius says § 24. Apud Græcos hanc vicem præstant præpositiones προ & περι, quarum illa respondet τῳ ante, hæc τῳ præ. Προ is also used to denote preference and preeminence, both simply and in composition. Simply: Και ȣτος ποιμην αποδεικνυται διανοιας, τυφον προ αληθειας ασπαζομενης, και προ τȣ ειναι το δοκειν αποδεχομενης· Philo p. 193. D. vid. & p. 194. D. In composition: in προεστως, προτιμαω, &c.

he says[n], after a very careful examination, he is convinced, it expresses the vast excellence and superiority of Christ above John. I am not singular therefore in supposing, that this text does not express directly and simply priority of time, but only virtually and consequentially, as it is implied and comprehended in the superior dignity of which it is a part.

There is another πρωτη in the New Testament, which has been understood by some in the same sense in which these learned men have taken the two former instances, though it is not alleged by them. Matt. xxvi. 17. Mark xvi. 12. *Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread.* This was the fourteenth day of the month: but it is argued here, that the fifteenth day was the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; for Josephus says, that the sixteenth day of the month was[q] the second day of the feast; and the words of the Law agree herewith. *And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the Lord. And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast. Seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten,* Num. xxviii. 16, 17. See Exod. xii. 18. The fourteenth day therefore was the day of the passover: the feast of unleavened bread was distinct from it, and lasted seven days from the fourteenth at night; the fifteenth day of the month was the first of unleavened bread. Therefore when the evangelists, speaking of the fourteenth day say, it was πρωτη των αζυμων, they mean not the *first* day of unleavened bread, but the day *before* that feast.

The Jews have a rule, that in the computation of feasts, the day[p] precedes the night: what stress ought to be laid upon this rule in this case I know not, I am satisfied we do not need it. The passover was, strictly speaking, distinct from the feast of *unleavened bread*, and seven days of unleavened bread followed the day of the passover: but their houses were cleansed from all leaven on the morning of the day on which the paschal lamb was slain, and therefore after noon they could eat no leavened bread. For this reason, perhaps, the day of the passover was called the first of unleavened bread; but whatever was the reason of it, it is certain, that the passover and the

[n] Cæterum hoc loco diligentius expenso, quam antea,—Declarat igitur præstantiam, sed Christo peculiarem, & ipsi propriam: nempe quasi diceret Joannes. Qui me sequitur quasi magistrum præeuntem discipulus quispiam, mihi ante positus est, idque optimo jure quia infinitis modis est præstantior: quamvis ante docere cœperim quàm ille sese mundo patefecerit. In loc.

[o] Τῃ δε δευτερα των αζυμων (ημερα εκτη δ' εστιν αυτη και δεκατη·) Ant. lib. iii. c. x. p. 124. v. 20. [p] Quum autem Matt. xxvi. 17. & Marc. xiv. 12. ipse dies 14. Nisan appellatur primus dies azymorum, intelligendum id est secundum canonem Judæorum, mox traditum, scilicet in sacris comedendis diem præcedere noctem; sic ut tempus vespertinum diei 14. & nox subsequens hoc modo diei 14 accenseantur. Reland. Antiq. Heb. p. 422.

feast

feast of unleavened bread are often taken promiscuously the one for the other. And though Josephus, in the particular account of the institution, distinguishes the passover from the feast of unleavened bread, yet he often calls the one the other. 'At[q] that time,' says he, 'the feast approaching, in which 'the Jews are wont to eat unleavened bread: the feast is called 'the passover, it being kept in remembrance of their departure out of Egypt.' And in one place he says, 'we keep 'the [r]feast of unleavened bread eight days.' According to this method of computation, the fourteenth day was the first of unleavened bread: so that when the passover and feast of unleavened bread were considered as one, (as they were very often,) and the whole was called by the feast of unleavened bread, the fourteenth day must be the first. The evangelists perhaps do not write in system; nor does Josephus, as it seems, nor indeed any other good writers, but according to the usual way of speaking.

Herwaert[s] lays great stress upon a passage of Athenæus, who quotes Aristotle, saying, (as Herwaert understands the words,) that Alexamenus's dialogues were written before the Socratic dialogues; [that is, the dialogues in which Plato introduces Socrates;] expresly affirming, says Athenæus, that Alexamenus wrote dialogues before Plato.

But it is very plain to me, that Aristotle says, that Alexamenus's dialogues were the first Socratic dialogues; that is, that Alexamenus was the inventor of that way of writing. I have transcribed the passage of Athenæus more at length than Herwaert has done; and if the reader will consider the whole of it, I think he will be convinced, 1st, That by Socratic dialogues is here meant, not Plato's dialogues, in which he introduces Socrates, but in general that way of writing: and

[q] Ενστασης δε κατα τονδε τον καιρον εορτης, ἐν ᾗ Ιουδαιοις αζυμα προτιθεσθαι πατριον. Πασχα δε ἡ εορτη καλειται, υπομνημα ουσα της εξ Αιγυπτου απαρσεως αυτων γενομενης. Antiq. l. xvii. c. 9. § 3. p. 773. v. 25. vid. & p. 609. v. 51. 887. v. 10.

[r] Οθεν εις μνημην της τοτε ενδειας εορτην αγομεν εφ' ημερας οκτω, την των αζυμων λεγομενην. Ant. l. ii. c. 15. p. 88. init.

[s] Ille vero locus Aristotelis est singularis. Eum recenset Athenæus Lib. xi. p. 505. Προ γαρ αυτου [Πλατωνος] τουθ' ευρε το ειδος των λογων ο Τηιος Αλεξαμενος, ως Νικιας ο Νικαευς ιστορει και Σωτηριων. Αριστοτελης δε ἐν τω περι ποιητων ουτως γραφει, Ουκουν ουδε ιαμετρους τους καλουμενους Σωφρονος μιμους μη φωμεν ειναι λογους και μιμησεις, η τους Αλεξαμενου του Τηιου τους πρωτους γραφεντας των Σωκρατικων διαλογων· αντικρυς φασκων ο πολυμαθεστατος Αριστοτελης προ Πλατωνος διαλογους γεγραφεναι τον Αλεξαμενον. Hæc quidem Athenæus: ubi sane verba illa Aristotelis τους πρωτους γραφεντας των Σωκρατικων διαλογων, Athenæus hisce interpretatur: [τους προτερον] προ Πλατωνος διαλογους, κ. τ. λ. Plato enim in suis dialogis introducit Socratem qui hortetur juvenes, sophistas redarguat, viros doceat; unde haud immerito vocantur Socratici.—Quemadmodum igitur Aristoteles Alexameni dialogos prius scriptos, quam Plato suos Socraticos conscripsisset, vocat τους πρωτους γραφεντας των Σωκρατικων διαλογων, sic Divus Lucas, &c. Herw. ubi supra, p. 197.

2dly, That Aristotle says, that Alexamenus's dialogues were the [t] first of the kind. From whence Athenæus infers very justly, that Aristotle says expressly, that Alexamenus wrote dialogues before Plato.

I think likewise, that Athenæus never dreamed of that meaning of Aristotle's words, which Herwaert affixes to them. Interpret Aristotle as Herwaert does, and Athenæus is guilty of a ridiculous tautology in his inference.

That I understand Aristotle right, is farther evident from Diogenes Laertius, whose words upon the same subject are thus; 'Some say, that Zeno the Elean was the first writer 'of dialogues, but Aristotle, in his first book of Poets, says, 'that Alexamenus the Teian was, as does also Phavorinus 'in his commentaries [u].'

But though I contest all these instances, (as thinking I have given the true meaning of all those places,) it must be allowed, that Perizonius's example from Aristophanes, and another from Alexander Aphrodisius [x], alleged by others in this cause, prove that πρωτον, used adverbially, is put without προ following it to denote the priority they contend for. How far the argument will hold by way of analogy from adverbs to adjectives, I cannot say. It ought also to be allowed, that the πρωτος μοι τȣ Ιȣδα of 2 Sam. xix. 43. (but not found in all copies of the Seventy,) is an equivalent phrase to that in St. Luke, and to be understood in the sense put upon St. Luke's words. The passage from the Maccabees, *Last of all after the sons the mother died*, contains also a parallel phrase. To these I add two other instances [y] of πρωτος itself, which I am unwilling to contest, and shall leave with the reader.

Perizonius's way of accounting for this construction by the ellipsis of a preposition to be understood, when not expressed, is well argued from the two instances he has alleged of προ subjoined to πρωτος. I add another like instance from Eusebius [z]: though perhaps the other way of supposing πρωτη used for προτερα [a] need not be quite rejected.

[t] So Athenæus says expressly: τȣθ' ευρε το ειδος των λογων· [u] Διαλογȣς τοινυν φασι πρωτον γραψαι Ζηνωνα τον Ελεατην· Αριστοτελης δε εν πρωτῳ περι ποιητων Αλεξαμενον Στυρεα η Τηιον, ως και Φαβωρινος εν απομνημονευμασι· Diog. Laert. lib. iii. Segm. 48. [x] Η πληγη πρωτον της αστρα. πης την βροντην αποτελει η αμα. Ictus prius tonitru perficit quam fulgur, aut simul. Alex. Aphrod. Problem. l. i. [y] Προ των οντως οντων, και των ολων αρχων εστι θεος εις, πρωτος και τȣ πρωτȣ θεȣ και βασιλεως. Ante eas res quæ vere sunt, & ante principia universalium est unus deus prior etiam primo deo & rege. Jamblich. de Mysteriis, § viii. c. 2. Και πρωτος εστεφανȣτο των αλλων· primus ante alios corona honoratus est. Dionys. Hal. Hist. Rom. l. iv. c. 3.

[z] Αυτικα γȣν μαλα θεασωμεθα, οπως μεν ο Πλατων τȣς προ αυτȣ πρωτȣς εσκωπτειν, οπως δε τȣς Πλατωνος διαδοχȣς αλλοι· Præpar. Ev. l. xiv. c. 2. [a] Εστι δε τις

I pre-

I presume this may be sufficient to shew, that the phrase in St. Luke is capable of the sense contended for by these learned men. But I cannot yet persuade myself, that it is the real sense of the text for the following reasons.

1. This is a very uncommon use of the word πρωτος. This I think is evident, in that the critics have been so much at a loss for instances. Stevens knew of [b] none, beside that produced above from Aphrodisius, where πρωτον is used adverbially. There are also almost innumerable other ways of expressing this priority of time [c]. The reason of the Greek writers so rarely using this word thus is very obvious; it can hardly be done without causing some ambiguity, therefore when they use it in this sense, we see they often subjoin προ. That this use of πρωτος was designedly avoided, seems to me evident, from a passage of Herodotus; where having in the former branch of the sentence twice used the superlative, in the latter he takes the comparative; either to avoid ambiguity, or as more agreeable to the genius of the Greek language [d].

2. It does not appear, that any of the first christians understood St. Luke in this sense. That they did not so interpret this text, we are assured from the Syriac, Vulgate, and other versions; from Justin Martyr, Eusebius, and from the passage of Julian above quoted; in which he certainly represents the common opinion of people in his time, of christians and others.

7. There is another solution, which was first proposed by [e] Beza, and has been embraced by many learned [f] men. The Roman catholic authors, that approve of this solution, agree to understand the words, as they stand in the Vulgate version: *This first description, or enrolment, was made by Cyrenius* [g]. The Protestants generally render them: *This first enrolment was*

δυναμις, ουσιαν μεν δευτερα, ψυχης δε πρωτης. Est autem quædam vis essentiâ quidem inferior, sed nobilior animo. Sallust. de mundo. c. 8. [b] Πρωτον· προτερον, prius. Alexander Aphrodisius, η πολησις, κ. λ. Quem alioqui usum apud vetustiores scriptores rarissimum esse puto: affertur tamen & ex Aristotelis Rhet. πρωτον η, pro prius quam. Thesaur. Gr. Tom. iii. 567. A.

[c] Προ, προτερος, πρωτος, [adverb] πρωτερα, πρωτη, προ, πριν, &c. [d] Οι δε Αιγυπτιοι, πριν μεν η Ψαμμητιχον σφεων βασιλευσαι, ενομιζον εωυτους πρωτους γενεσθαι παντων ανθρωπων· επειδη δε ψαμμητιχος βασιλευσας, ηθελησε ειδεναι οι τινες γενοιατο πρωτοι, απο τουτου νομιζουσι Φρυγας πρωτερους γενεσθαι εωυτων, των δε αλλων εωυτους. Herodot. l. ii. init. The Egyptians, before the reign of Psammetichus, thought themselves the first [or most ancient] of all people. But since the reign of Psammetichus, who made an experiment for finding out who were the first of all people, they have thought that the Phrygians were before them, they before others. [e] Bez. in loc. Vid. & Huet. Dem. Ev. Prop. ix. cap. 10. § 3. [f] Grot. & Hamm. in loc. Scaliger. animad. in Chron. Euseb. ad A. 2016. Casaub. in Bar. Exerc. i. Num. xxxi. 32. Usser. Ann. ant. ær. Chris. v. Noris. Cenot. Pis. Dissert. ii. p. 320—322. Pagi. App. ad ann. Bar. Num. 126—129.

(g) Hæc descriptio prima facta est a præside Syriæ Cyrino.

made,

made, Cyrenius being president of Syria: or, *when Cyrenius was president of Syria* [h].

By president of Syria, they do not understand president in the most strict and proper sense of the word; it being apparent from Josephus, that either Saturninus or Quintilius Varus, must have been president of Syria at the time this enrolment was made. And there is no instance of two persons being jointly presidents with equal power in the same province, when a province was in peace, as Syria was at this time [i].

They suppose, that when Augustus had issued his decree, that all the world, that is, all the Roman empire should be taxed, (for in this wide and extensive sense do these learned men understand these words of St. Luke,) Cyrenius was sent with extraordinary power to make the census in Syria and Judea: and Saturninus, or Quintilius Varus, whichsoever of them was then president, was joined with him; and was subordinate to him, or had equal power with him in this particular work. Cyrenius therefore, having at this time some power in Syria, he is called president of it, though he was not properly president, or the ordinary chief magistrate of that province.

In order to justify this solution, two things are to be considered: 1. Whether Cyrenius, though not properly president of Syria, may be called so in a loose and general sense: 2. It must be shewn, that it is not unlikely, that Cyrenius might be sent upon this affair at this time with extraordinary power.

As to the first point, it is alleged, that the title of governor or president is often given to others beside those who are properly possessed of that dignity. Josephus calls Saturninus and Volumnius presidents of Syria [k], though Saturninus was at that time president, according to his own account, and Volumnius procurator only; that is, the officer that took care of the emperor's revenue in that province.

That Cyrenius might be sent upon this affair with extraordinary power, is not at all unlikely. For the office of censor in the city was very honourable, and was a distinct charge from that of the consuls and prætors, the ordinary magistrates. The surveys in provinces also were often performed, not by the ordinary governors, but by persons sent thither with extraor-

[h] Hæc descriptio prima facta est præsidente Syriæ Cyrenio. Bez. Hæc descriptio prima facta est, cum præesset Syriæ Cyrenius. Casaub. ubi supra, Num. xxxi.

[i] Vid. Noris. Cenotaph. Pis. Diss. ii. c. 16. § 10.

[k] Εκεινος δε διελεγετο περι τουτων τοις Καισαρος ηγεμοσιν Σατουρνινῳτε και Ουολομνιῳ —— περι ων επι τε Σατουρνινου και Ουολομνιου της Συριας επιστατουντων· Ant. l. xvi. c 9. p. 734. v. 25. & 37. Πολλακις μεν επι Σατουρνινον ελθοντα και Ουολομνιον τους της Συριας ηγεμονας· ib. c. 10. p. 741. v. 1.

dinary

dinary power, and thoſe, perſons of the higheſt eminence and dignity [l].

Such an one was this Cyrenius. He was not deſcended from a noble, or patrician family; but by his early ſervices he had obtained the honour of the conſulſhip, and paſſed through that and other offices with great reputation; obtained a memorable victory over the Homonadenſes, for which he received the honour of triumphal ornaments: was afterwards governor to Caius Cæſar, Auguſtus's eldeſt adopted ſon: married Æmelia Lepida, who had been deſigned by Auguſtus for the wife of Lucius, his ſecond adopted ſon; and at laſt had the honour of a public funeral by a decree of the ſenate in the reign of Tiberius [m].

The quick diſpatch he made of affairs of importance, rendered him a very fit man for ſuch an affair as this cenſus in Syria and Judea.

Moreover there is nothing in the hiſtory that we have of Cyrenius, which is any way inconſiſtent with his coming into Judea about this time; but divers particulars, which render it very probable he might be employed in this work.

Cyrenius was conſul of Rome, A. U. 742. He might therefore very well be ſent upon the expedition againſt the Homonadenſes in the year U. C. 747, or, poſſibly, in 746. It was a piece of prudent advice, which Mæcenas gave [n] Auguſtus, never to beſtow a provincial government upon the ſenators, or other great men, till ſome time after they had laid down their city magiſtracy: which advice Auguſtus followed, and appointed the ſpace of five years interval between their ſerving any public office in the city, and receiving another in the provinces [o].

As Cyrenius's expedition againſt the fore-mentioned people was his firſt action after his conſulſhip, he might very probably be employed in it, A. U. 747. Archbiſhop Uſher [p] thinks

[l] Regimen ſummæ rei penes Germanicum agendo Galliarum cenſui tum intentum. Tacit. Ann. l. i. c. 31. ad A. U. 767. Interea Germanico per Gallias, ut diximus, cenſus accipienti, exceſſiſſe Augallum, adfertur. Id. c. 33. vid. & l. ii. c. 6. [m] Sub idem tempus, ut mors Sulpicii Quirinii publicis exſequiis frequentaretur, petivit [Tiberius] a ſenatu. Nihil ad veterem & patriciam Sulpiciorum familiam Quirinius pertinuit, ortus apud municipium Lanuvium: ſed impiger militiæ, & ceteris miniſteriis conſulatum ſub Divo Auguſto; mox expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadenſium Caſtellis inſignia triumphi adeptus; datuſque Rector Caio Cæſari Armeniam obtinenti, Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat. Tacit. Ann. l. iii. c. 48. Quirinio—deſtinata quondam uxor L. Cæſari, ac Divo Auguſto nurus, dederetur. Id. ibid. c. 23. De hac re vid. etiam Sueton. Tib. c. 49. & de victoriâ in Homonadenſes partâ. Strabon. l. xii. p. 854. [n] Dio lib. 52. p. 479. fin. [o] Μηδένα πρὸ πενταετίας μετὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀρξαι καταστῆναι. Id. l. liii. p. 505. C. Auctor & aliarum rerum fuit. In queis—ne magiſtratus depoſito honore ſtatim in provincias mitterentur. Sueton. Aug. c. 36.

[p] Vid. Ann. A. 5. ante ær. Chr.

he

he was then proconſul of Cilicia. Cardinal Noris thinks it more likely, that he was not then the ordinary governor of Cilicia, but that he was ſent upon this expedition with extraordinary [q] power. However, the learned men that embrace this ſolution ſuppoſe, that having finiſhed this war, he might be ſent into Syria and Judea to perform the cenſus there, in the latter end of the year of Rome 747; or, as others, in 748, or 749. About which time the cenſus or enrolment, which St. Luke ſpeaks of, muſt have been made; for Herod died in the year 750, or 751.

Cyrenius was not appointed governor to Caius Cæſar till the year U. C. 755. Cardinal Noris infers this from the words of Tacitus above-cited; *datus Rector Caio Cæſari Armeniam obtinenti.* It is evidently a miſtake of thoſe learned men who have thought, that Cyrenius was governor to Caius, when he firſt went into the eaſt. It is certain, that M. Lollius was then his governor. And Cyrenius was not put into that poſt, till after the death of Lollius [r], which ſeems to have happened ſome time in the year of Rome 755. Beſides, it is certain from Joſephus, that Caius was at Rome after the death of Herod, and therefore was not yet ſet out for the eaſt; for he was one of thoſe, whom Auguſtus called to the council he held after Herod's death about confirming his laſt will [s].

Cyrenius therefore ſeems to have been at leiſure for this work; and from the whole of his ſtory and character, ſo far as it is come down to us from the Greek and Roman authors, no man appears more likely to have been employed in it.

This ſolution has one advantage above moſt of thoſe above-mentioned, in that it is here allowed, that this ſurvey was performed by Cyrenius, in which all the ancient chriſtian writers agree, except Tertullian; who in one place (but the only place in which he has named the chief officer concerned in it,) aſcribes it to Saturninus. And we are much obliged to theſe learned men, for tracing the hiſtory of Cyrenius, and thereby removing, in part at leaſt, the objections againſt this ſuppoſition, which has been the current opinion of chriſtians.

There is, however, one difficulty attending this ſolution; I mean the ſenſe in which theſe learned men underſtand Cyrenius's government or preſidentſhip. I do not at all conteſt the validity of their argument, that the title of ἡγεμὼν may be given to one who is not properly preſident. But ſince Cyrenius certainly was afterwards the ordinary governor of Syria, it is not

[q] Cenotaph. Piſ. Diſſ. ii. p. 319. [r] Velleius, l. ii. c. 102. Suet. Tib. c. 13. Noriſ. ubi ſupra, p. 317. [s] Joſeph. Ant. lib. xvii. c. 9. p. 775. v. 24.

eaſy

eaſy to underſtand this title in St. Luke in a looſe and general way: and I can never perſuade myſelf, that St. Luke intended no more than the power and authority of making a cenſus in Syria. If Cyrenius had never been preſident of Syria, perhaps their inſtances had been to the point; but now I think they are not. Beſides, according to the way in which theſe learned men generally interpret St. Luke, ηγεμονευοντος, &c. is here the genitive caſe abſolute, or governed by επι underſtood: either of which does as fully expreſs Cyrenius's being preſident of Syria, as any form of expreſſion can do.

Joſeph Scaliger ſeems to have interpreted theſe words ſomewhat differently from other learned men, who embrace this ſolution. He takes them thus: *This deſcription was the firſt under Cyrenius, preſident of Syria.* I put his words in the margin [t], that the reader may judge whether I miſunderſtand him. But ſtill this interpretation is liable to the objection laſt mentioned; for it is implied in it, that Cyrenius was preſident of Syria, at the time of both theſe ſurveys.

§ V. There is yet another interpretation, which theſe words are capable of, and which has for ſome time appeared to me the genuine meaning of them. *This was the firſt aſſeſſment of Cyrenius, governor of Syria.* The natural order of the words is this: Αυτη εγενετο η πρωτη απογραφη ηγε τ. σ. κ. There are innumerable inſtances of a conſtruction parallel with this here of Αυτη η απογραφη πρωτη· Matt. xxii. 38. Αυτη εστι πρωτη και μεγαλη εντολη· *This is the firſt and great commandment,* Mark xii. 30. Αυτη πρωτη εντολη· Numb. ii. 32. Αυται επισκεψις των υιων Ισραηλ· *Theſe are thoſe which were numbered of the children of Iſrael.* I put an inſtance or two more into [u] the margin. It is eaſy for the reader to obſerve, theſe inſtances are parallel with the words before us: the particle η or αι follows αυτη or αυται, and precedes the ſubſtantive.

Εγενετο is not here *facta eſt, was made,* but *fuit, was.* I preſume I need not give any proofs, that this is a very common meaning of this verb.

The diſtant ſituation of εγενετο in St. Luke from αυτη, need not create any ſcruple. In ſome examples the verb ſubſtantive is quite wanting, as in Mark xii. 30. Numb. i. 44. Sometimes

[t] Ideo S. Lucas non contentus eſt dicere Αυτη απογραφη εγενετο ηγεμονευοντος της Συριας Κυρηνιου. Sed quum duas απογραφας ſciret fuiſſe, addidit, πρωτη· αυτη η απογραφη εγενετο πρωτη. Certè, ſi eſt πρωτη, ergo quædam fuit δευτερα; & ſane της δευτερας meminit, idem. Act. v. 37. Atque ita diſtinguendum eſſe nemo dubitare poteſt. Scaliger. animadv. in Chron. Euſeb. ad A. 2016. [u] Numb. i. 44. Αυτη η επισκεψις ην επεσκεψαλο Μωυσης· cap. iii. 1. Και αυται αι γενεσεις Ααρων. v. 2. και ταυτα τα ονομαλα των υιων Ααρων· vid. c. iv. 31, 37. Deut. vi. 1. & alibi.

εγιν

εστιν is expreſſed, and follows immediately after αυλη. But it is found in all kinds of poſitions in paſſages parallel with this of St. Luke. I give one inſtance, which anſwers the conſtruction of this verſe in every reſpect, Rev. xix. 9. ειοι οι λογοι αληθινοι εισι τε Θεε· *Theſe are the true ſayings of God.* And another inſtance from [x] Plato of εσενετο itſelf, in a ſituation exactly parallel with this in St. Luke. Η δε η τελευτη, ω Εχεκρατες, τε εταιρε ημιν εσενετο, ανδρος, ως ημεις φαιμεν αν, των τοτε ων επειραθημεν αριστε και, αλλως φρονιμωτατε και δικαιοτατε. 'This, O Echecrates, was the 'end of our friend; and, as we ſay, the beſt, wiſeſt and juſteſt 'man that ever we knew.'

If it be objected, that it muſt be this cenſus, or this firſt cenſus was made, and not this was the firſt cenſus; becauſe there is no noun ſubſtantive preceding αυτη, by which it can be governed: I anſwer, that as I interpret the words, αυτη is governed by the απογραφη that follows, or by an απογραφη underſtood. And this is the caſe of many other [y] paſſages, which yet muſt be conſtrued, as I do St. Luke.

Let us proceed. When St. Luke calls Cyrenius *governor of Syria,* I underſtand the words in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe. Ηγεμονευοντος της Συριας is not the genitive caſe abſolute, or governed by επι underſtood, and to be conſtrued, *Cyrenius being governor of Syria,* or *when Cyrenius was governor of Syria;* but it is governed by απογραφη. They do not expreſs any time at all: but this is Cyrenius's title, the title by which he was well known in that part of the world: as we ſay, Antony the triumvir, or Cato the cenſor, to diſtinguiſh them from others of the ſame names. Ηγεμονευοντος, &c. is with me the ſame thing, as if St. Luke had ſaid, ηγεμονος της Συριας Κυρηνιε.

It is certain, that Greek authors delight very much in the uſe of participles; and I think more eſpecially, when they ſpeak of titles and dignities. Thus Cicero, in [z] Dio, ſays: 'We expect that our prætors and conſuls ſhould follow the 'laws of reaſon and juſtice.' The ſame hiſtorian [a] ſays; 'The 'three brothers, the Antonies, had all of them ſome office in 'the city at one and the ſame time; Marcus was conſul, Lu-'cius tribune, and Caius prætor.'

Theſe participles ſeem to me to be ſometimes ſubſtantives, or at leaſt, to be [b] uſed ſubſtantively. I believe all are ſenſible

x Phædo. Fin.

y Ezek. xlviii. v. 1. Και ταυτα τα ονομαλα των φυλων. v. 29. 30. Αυτη η γη, ην βαλειτε εν κληρω ταις φυλαις τε Ισραηλ· και ειοι οι διαμερισμοι αυτων— Και αυται αι διεξοδοι της πολεως.

z Τες μεν στρατηγειας τες θ' υπατευοντας παντα απ' ορθης της διανοιας ποιειν αξιωσομεν· Lib. xliii. p. 250. D.

a Τρεις γαρ οι αδελφοι οι Αντωνιοι ειοι οντες αρχας αμα παντες εσχον· Ο μεν γαρ Μαρκος υπατευων. ο δε Λεκιος δημαρχων· ο δε Γαιος στρατηγων· Lib. xlv. p. 274. C.

b Δεικτικως

that

that αρχων is so used. Some of those other titles of offices or dignities expressed by participles, seem to me to be very near, or altogether parallel with it.

But let ηγεμονευοντος be a mere participle; only then it will be said, if it be governed by απογραφη, it ought to have been ηγεμευσαντος. To this I answer, that undoubtedly ηγεμονευσαντος would have been very proper, but so is also ηγεμονευοντος. It is no uncommon thing, for Greek authors to use the present tense for the first aorist. I give an instance or two that may fully justify my interpretation. Josephus says, 'And it is certain 'that Varus was of a royal family, since he was a descendant 'of Soemus, who was tetrarch of a country near mount 'Libanus.' Και ην ομολογημενως ο Ουαρος βασιλικης γενης, εγγονος Σοεμου τε περι Λιβανον τετραρχουντος. Dionysius says, that the Latins were so called from Latinus, a king of that country [d]. If any should say, it is improper to understand this participle as I do, because Cyrenius was not governor of Syria till after the time in which St. Luke's survey was made, I add one example more, which must fully obviate this exception. Herodian says, 'That to Marcus the emperor were born several daughters [e] 'and two sons.' Τω βασιλευοντι Μαρκω θυγατερες μεν εγενοντο πλειους, παιδες δε δυο. Yet several of those children were born to him before he was emperor. This instance shews plainly, that these participles do not always import only the time when men are in office.

I hope this is sufficient to shew, that ηγεμονευοντος is the same as ηγεμονος, at least that it is governed by απογραφη. The supposing ηγεμονευοντος τ. σ. κ. to be the genitive absolute, or governed by επι, as it has given occasion for the objection we are now upon, so it seems to have carried most learned men off from the right way of solving it.

I apprehend I have now justified my interpretation of every part of this verse: *This was the first assessment* (or survey) *of Cyrenius, the governor of Syria*, or *of Cyrenius, who was governor of Syria.*

But if any choose rather to take Scaliger's method, as to the first part of the verse, I shall not contend about that, provided my sense of the latter part be admitted. Then the interpretation will stand thus: this survey was the first [survey] of Cyrenius the governor of Syria.

Καλως ο της νησου επιτροπευων· Dio. l. lxii. p. 791. A. Κυρηνιω Γαλλω τω της Συριας ηγεμονευοντι· Joseph. p. 907. v. 12. Αυτος υπο του της χωρας ηγεμονευοντος δεθεις· id. p. 945. v. 35.

[d] Ονομα δε κοινον οι συμπαντες υιοι Λατινοι εκληθησαν επ' ανδρος δυναστευοντος των τοπων Λατινου· Antiq. R. lib. ii. p. 76. v. 24.

[e] Lib. i. init.

[c] p. 909. v. 29.

Nor

Nor can I ſee any reaſon why all thoſe who follow Beza, and ſuppoſe that this ſurvey was made by Cyrenius, as well as that made after Archelaus's removal, ſhould not receive this interpretation. When they come to ſhew, why this is called by St. Luke the firſt ſurvey, though indeed they have not tranſlated the place as I do[f], they unavoidably run into the ſame meaning. Baronius[g] likewiſe underſtands the words much after the ſame manner, only he falſly ſuppoſed that Cyrenius was twice preſident of Syria.

Some time after I had been perſuaded that this was the ſenſe of this text, I met with theſe words of Tanaquil Faber[h]. *Beatus Lucas*, cap. 2. *ait natum eſſe Chriſtum dominum tempore primi cenſus, ſeu deſcriptionis, quæ a Cyrenio ſeu Quirinio facta eſt.* This paſſage gave me a great deal of pleaſure, though it does not appear how this acute and learned man underſtood πρωτογενος.—But I have ſince met with a more explicit authority for my way of tranſlating Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφη. The title of Origen's xith Homily upon St. Luke, in the Latin edition of his works, is thus: *De eo quod ſcriptum eſt, Puer autem creſcebat & confortabatur ſpiritu, uſque ad eum locum ubi ait: Hæc eſt deſcriptio prima quæ facta eſt ſub præſide Syriæ Cyrino.* And in the body of the homily[i] are words to the ſame effect.

The verſion I here offer does not only appear to me a very natural and obvious meaning of the words, but it is very good ſenſe, and extremely ſuitable to their poſition in a parentheſis. *In thoſe days there went out a decree from Cæſar Auguſtus, that all the world* [land] *ſhould be taxed.* (*This was the firſt aſſeſſment of Cyrenius the governor of Syria.*) It is needleſs to obſerve, that if this verſion be allowed, the objection we are conſidering vaniſhes. There is no colour or pretence to ſay, that St. Luke confounded the cenſus or ſurvey made in the time of Herod, with that made after the removal of Archelaus†.

f Denique dicitur hæc deſcriptio πρώτη, ut diſtinguatur ab aliâ, de qua Act. v. 37. quam Joſephus & Euſebius literis conſignarunt, & ſub Cyrenio etiam factam dicunt, licet diverſo tempore. Hamm. in loc. ex verſione Cleric.

Hunc igitur cenſum Quirinius habuit A. U. 749. cum extraordinario imperio in Syriam miſſus; quæ deſcriptio prima à S. Luca dicitur, quod idem poſtea Quirinius A. U. 760. præſes ordinarius in Syriam veniens, cenſum iterum in Judæa egit, eâdem tum primum in provinciæ formam redactâ Noriſ. Cenotaph. Piſ. p. 322.

g Quod igitur ab Evangeliſta ea deſcriptio a Quirino prima facta dicitur, non ſic (ut vidimus) eſt accipiendum, ut tunc primùm Judæi fuerint deſcripti atque cenſi: ſed primam dixerit reſpectu ſecundæ ſub eodem præſide facta. App. Num. 88.

h Epiſt. lib. i. ep. 43. i Hæc fuit deſcriptio prima, a præſide Syriæ Cyrino.

† Non poteſt hic cenſus eſſe, de quo Lucas meminit, quippe tandiu poſt natum Dominum factus. In quo turpiter lapſus eſt Euſebius, l. i. Hiſt. c. 5. qui eundem fuiſſe credidit. Nos ab Quirino bis in Judæa cenſum actum eſſe conjicimus, & extraordinarium utrumque, hoc eſt, præter ordinarios Præſides Syriæ, miſſum eſſe cum

§ VI.

§ VI. I apprehend there lies now no objection againſt St. Luke, but what may ariſe from the doubts which ſome may have in their minds, concerning Cyrenius being the officer employed in making this ſurvey. I wiſh the reader be not quite tired with this long ſucceſſion of criticiſms; but whether he will accompany me any farther or not, I think myſelf obliged to take into conſideration all the difficulties which attend this particular circumſtance.

Here I adopt at once all that has been already offered by thoſe who embrace Beza's ſolution, to make it appear probable, that Cyrenius performed the cenſus of which St. Luke ſpeaks. But now I enjoy a peculiar advantage above thoſe learned men, in the ſuppoſition I advanced at firſt, that this cenſus of Cyrenius was of Judea only. They think, that Auguſtus's decree extended to the whole empire; and that Cyrenius was ſent with extraordinary power to make the cenſus in Syria and Judea. But they ſuppoſe, (and indeed they are obliged to allow it,) that Saturninus was joined with him, if Saturninus was then preſident. This has given Perizonius[k] a fine advantage againſt their ſuppoſition, that Cyrenius was concerned in this cenſus. To give Cyrenius ſuperior, or equal power to Saturninus in Syria, the province of which he was the ordinary governor, would have been an affront; eſpecially conſidering, that Saturninus was equal to Cyrenius in every reſpect, and ſuperior to him in ſome: for he was of a better family, and the elder conſul by ſeven years. And it is no leſs injurious to Cyrenius to put him under Saturninus.

I am not at all concerned with this. I think Cyrenius performed the cenſus alone, by virtue of the extraordinary power with which he was ſent; but if any are inclined to think, that Saturninus was joined in the commiſſion with him, this would be no diſparagement to Saturninus. To give him authority in a neighbouring kingdom, where he had none before, would not be to leſſen him, but to augment his power: nor do I ſuppoſe it could be any diſgrace to Cyrenius, to have the governor of Syria made his partner.

I proceed to conſider all the difficulties that can affect the ſuppoſition, that this cenſus was made by Cyrenius, as far as I am concerned with them.

extraordinaria curatione & poteſtate Quirinum. Primus ab illo cenſus inſtitutus eſt ſub ortum Domini, quo tempore Cn. Sentius Saturninus Syriæ præerat.——Poſterior cenſio, poſt Archelai relegationem ab eodem facta Quirino eſt. Ideo S. Lucas ſuperiorem illam deſcriptionem primam appellat. In qua tributi nihil, aut capitationis, exactum puto, &c. Petavii Rationarium Temporum. P. 2. lib. iv. c. 2. [k] Diſſert. de Aug. Deſcrip. § 15, 16, 17.

1. It is ſaid, that it was not cuſtomary for the Romans to ſend any great man twice into the ſame country. Since it is certain from Joſephus, that Cyrenius afterwards made a cenſus in Syria and Judea, it may be concluded, he did not perform that ſurvey, which St. Luke ſays was made in Judea at the time of our Saviour's nativity [l].

To this I anſwer: I allow, that it was not uſual for the ſame perſon to be more than once made the preſident of one and the ſame province; and in this Baronius, who thought Cyrenius was twice or thrice governor of Syria, is deſerted by all learned men. For none of the defenders of Beza's ſolution, who maintain the double cenſus of Cyrenius, do ſay, that Cyrenius was twice the ordinary preſident of Syria.

But it was very common for one and the ſame perſon to be ſent twice or oftener into the ſame country in different poſts, or with different degrees of authority. Caſaubon [m] has produced inſtances enough to ſilence this objection. M. Vipſanius Agrippa, the perſon laſt mentioned by him, was ſent twice into Syria by Auguſtus with extraordinary power: firſt of all, A. U. 731 [n], and again, A. U. 738 [o].

I will give an undeniable example of an officer's being twice in the ſame province with different degrees of power. When Piſo, præfect of Syria, had been removed by Germanicus, and after that Germanicus himſelf died, the officers in the province had a conſultation together, who ſhould be made preſident of Syria: Vibius Marſus laid claim to it, but at laſt yielded to Cn. Sentius Saturninus [p], the elder officer. Thus Sentius, one of the chief officers then in the province, was made preſident. This alone is a proof, that it was very common for officers to ſerve different poſts in the ſame province. But this is not the only thing I aim at. This conſultation [q] was held A. U. 772. A. D. 19. and it appears from Joſephus [r], and Ta-

[l] Multis de cauſis diſplicet nobis gemina hæc Cyrenii deſcriptio. Bis ad eandem rem Quirinium in Syriam fuiſſe miſſum, fidem vix imperat, nec Romanos ad mores quadrat. Baſnage. Ann. Pol. Ecc. ant. Dom. 5. num. 14. [m] Neque vero nullum eſt exemplum illorum, qui in caſdem provincias cum eodem, vel diverſo munere ſunt miſſi. C. Caſſius profectus in Syriam Quæſtor M. Craſſi; mox ipſo & ejus exercitu deleto, res magnas ibi geſſit, & aliquamdiu provinciam obtinuit: eidemque poſt aliquot annos ſenatus Syriam & bellum contra Dolabellam decrevit. Ventidius Baſſus, quando primum cum Parthis bellum geſſit, Antonii fuit Legatus: poſtea ejuſdem belli gerendi cura illi demandata eſt,—Agrippa qui per decennium Aſiam adminiſtravit, bis ex Italia eodem, eſt profectus. Caſaub. in Baron. Exerc. 1. num. 32.

[n] Dio l. liii. p. 518. c. [o] Id. lib. liv. p. 534. B. [p] Conſultatum inde inter legatos, quique alii ſenatorum aderant, quiſnam Syriæ præficeretur. Et cæteris modice niſis, inter VIBIUM MARSUM & Cn. Sentium diu quæſitum: dein Marſus ſeniori, & acrius tendenti Sentio conceſſit. Tacit. Ann. lib. ii. cap. 74. [q] M. Silano & L. Norbano Coſſ. [r] Καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν, Πάρθοις μὲν Μάρσος διεδέξατο, καὶ διῆκε Συρίαν. Ant. l. xix. c. 6. § 4.

citus,

citus[s], that long after this, in the reign[t] of Claudius, this ſame Vibius Marſus came to be actually preſident of Syria. There is therefore no abſurdity at all in ſuppoſing, that Cyrenius was ſent by Auguſtus with extraordinary power at the latter end of Herod's reign to make a ſurvey in Judea, and that about ten or twelve years afterwards he came as the ordinary governor into Syria, and then made a cenſus in that province, and in Judea annexed to it.

2. It is objected, that none of the Roman or Greek hiſtorians, though Cyrenius has been ſpoken of by ſeveral of them, have taken any notice of this cenſus.

I anſwer, that this is no difficulty at all. I ſuppoſe, that no one will make any queſtion, but that Cyrenius made an aſſeſſment in Syria and Judea when he was ſent preſident into Syria, becauſe we have Joſephus's authority for it; and yet none of the Roman or Greek authors have ſaid any thing of that cenſus.

Though Tacitus has in the paſſage above cited reckoned up divers of Cyrenius's exploits and honours, and others have made mention of him, and ſome of his ſervices, yet Florus[u] has taken notice of a conſiderable action of his omitted by all the reſt: if indeed he means our Cyrenius.

3. But it will be ſaid: It may be certainly concluded from the account, which Joſephus has given of the cenſus made (c) by Cyrenius after Archelaus's baniſhment, that Cyrenius had never been in Judea, or enrolled the Jews before; if he had, Joſephus could not well have omitted to take notice of it then.

I own, that at firſt ſight this muſt appear a very conſiderable difficulty.

(1.) But it ought to be obſerved, that Joſephus does not particularly name any of Cyrenius's honours or ſervices, beſide thoſe which relate to the city of Rome. Joſephus knew of divers others, but he does not expreſs them: and among thoſe omitted or referred to in the general only, may be that of the firſt ſurvey in Judea.

(2.) I think it is plain, that either Joſephus did not care to give any particular account of that oath taken by the Jews to Auguſtus in the latter end of Herod's reign, or elſe that he found but a ſlight account of it in thoſe memoirs or hiſtories

[s] Et reciperare Armeniam, ni VIBIO MARSO Syriæ legato bellum minitante cohibitus foret. Tacit. Ann. xi. cap. 10.

[t] About A. U. 795. vid. Pagi. Crit. in Bar. A. D. 42. n. 8.

[u] Marmaridas atque Garamantas Curinio ſubigendo dedit [Auguſtus]. Potuit & ille redire Marmaricus; ſed modeſtior in æſtimanda victoria fuit. Florus lib. iv. c. 12.

(c) See the account above, p. 293.

which he made use of. He had said nothing of it, had it not been for a most remarkable disturbance in Herod's court and family, with which it had a connexion.

And any one may perceive, that it is then touched upon very slightly. Is it not strange, that Josephus should not name the officer that took the oath for Augustus? No one can make any doubt, but there was some person of eminence deputed by the emperor for that work. As Josephus did not mention him then, I should never expect to find his name afterwards. And whoever can account for Josephus's omissions relating to the affair of the oath, may account for his silence in this passage, though Cyrenius had been once before in Judea.

(3.) I think, that arguments formed upon the omissions of historians are of very little weight. There are in Josephus other omissions as remarkable as this. I desire to consider the account he gives, in his War of the Jews, of the reducing Judea to a province. 'Archelaus's country being reduced to 'a province, Coponius, a man of the equestrian rank among 'the Romans, was sent procurator, being invested with the 'power of life and death. In his time [επι τελει] a certain 'Galilean, whose name was Judas, excited the people to a 'rebellion; telling them, That they were of a mean spirit, if they could endure to pay tribute to the Romans, and acknowledge mortal men for their lords after God had been 'their king. This man was the head of a distinct sect in no-'thing like[x] the rest.' This is all he says. He does not say there was now any census made, has not one word of Cyrenius, or his coming into Judea.

It is true, that Josephus has in two other places in the War of the Jews[y], occasionally mentioned Cyrenius, and in the latter of those places his census also; but it must be allowed to be a very great omission, not to do this in the proper place, in the account of the reduction of Judea to the state of a province. This might have been reasonably expected in the history of the war, when this assessment made by Cyrenius, and the principles broached at that time, were main foundations of it.

If it be said, that Josephus passed over this affair slightly in the War, because he intended to write his Antiquities, and mention it more particularly then: I answer, this is said without ground: and I might as well say, that Josephus omitted in his Antiquities the particular account of Cyrenius's first assessment, because he intended to write afterward another book

[x] De Bell. lib. ii. cap. 8. § 1. [y] Ibid. cap. 17. § 8. & l. vii. c. 8. § 1.

of

of the history of the Jews, and go over their affairs once more, as he expressly assures us at the conclusion of his Antiquities.

Josephus informs us in his Life, written after the War and the Antiquities, that the Jews had a battle with Gessius Florus, their last procurator, and killed him, and a good many of his men; and that this victory was fatal to them, forasmuch as this determined them to the war with the [z] Romans. Is it not strange that Josephus should say nothing of this in the history of the War, where he has made so frequent mention of Florus, and ascribed the Jewish uneasiness under the Roman government to the cruelties and other irregularities of this man? For this instance I am indebted to [a] Mr. Le Clerc.

There is another omission appears to me very remarkable. Pheroras, Herod's youngest brother, is often mentioned by Josephus. He has particularly informed us, that when Augustus was in Syria, he gave this Pheroras a tetrarchy [b], at the request of Herod; and we are informed by Josephus, of Pheroras's retirement into his tetrarchy, of Herod's visiting him there, and of Pheroras's dying [c] at home, and of his being brought afterwards from thence to be buried. But yet, if I mistake not, he has never once said, what this tetrarchy was, whose it had been before, nor where it lay. It is true, that whereas in the Antiquities [d] Josephus says, Pheroras went to his tetrarchy; in his War [e] he says, he went to Peræa; or, as in some copies, Petræa: but Peræa, properly so called, could not be this tetrarchy, because Peræa belonged all along to Herod. But this tetrarchy of Pheroras was given him by Augustus, and was distinct from that estate or revenue which had [f] been settled upon him by Herod. These particulars may convince us, that though Cyrenius was in Judea in the time of Herod, Josephus was capable of omitting to take notice of it.

4. Again, it will be said: It may be fairly concluded from another place in Josephus, that Cyrenius was but once in Judea. For he says, that 'Massada was then held by Eleazar, 'the chief man of the sicarii, a descendant of Judas, who per-'suaded not a few of the Jews not to enrol themselves, as I

[z] Ο δ' επελθων και συμβαλων μαχη. ενικηθη, πολλων των μετ' αυτȣ πεσοντων· και γινεται το Γεσσιȣ πταισμα, συμφορα τȣ παντος ημων εθνȣς· επηρθησαν γαρ επι τȣτῳ μαλλον οι τον πολεμον αγαπησαντες, και νικησαντες τȣς Ρωμαιȣς εις τελος ηλπισαμεν· in Vit. § 6.

[a] Hist. Eccl. A. D. 66. p. 12.

[b] Antiq. l. xv. c. 10. § 3.

[c] Ibid. l. xvii. c. 3. de B. J. l. i. c. 29.

[d] Φερωραν δ' επι της αυτȣ τετραρχιας· p. 756. v. 37.

[e] Φερωρας δε υποχωρησειεν εις την Περαιαν, p. 1031. v. 41. vid. & p. 1032. v. 26.

[f] Τῳ μεν αδελφῳ Φερωρα παρα Καισαρος ητησατο τετραρχιαν, αυτος απονειμας εκ της βασιλειας προσοδον εκατον ταλαντων. κ. λ. Antiq. l. xv. c. 10. § 3.

'have said[g] above, when Cyrenius the censor[h] was sent into 'Judea.'

I own this is a difficulty, but the argument is not conclusive. It is true, that Judas made this disturbance when *Cyrenius was sent into Judea*, or in the time of Cyrenius: but it does not follow, that Cyrenius was sent but once into Judea. The New Testament will afford us an instance upon this very subject, which will be of use to us. Gamaliel says, Acts v. 37. *After this man rose up Judas of Galilee, in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him.* If we had in our hands this book only of St. Luke, namely, the Acts of the apostles, it is not unlikely, that many would have supposed, that St. Luke knew of no other taxing made in Judea, but that in the time of which Judas rose up. But we are assured from his gospel, that this conclusion would have been false: for there he has spoke very particularly of another, which he calls *the first*, or at least distinguishes very plainly from some other.

I must be allowed to repeat here once more, that arguments formed upon the silence of writers are very seldom of much moment. Josephus is the only Jewish writer of those times in whom we have the history of that country; and it cannot be justly concluded, that any particular thing was not done, or that such or such circumstance did not attend it, because he has not mentioned it. All writers have their particular views, and some things we are very desirous to know, might, for some reason or other which we are ignorant of, lie without the compass of their designs. Besides, the most accurate and careful historians have omitted many facts or incidents, that might be very properly mentioned, through forgetfulness or oversight. I take the omission of the description of the tetrarchy that belonged to Pheroras, to be a remarkable instance of this sort.

5. But it will be said, that Tertullian is positive, the census in Judea at the time of our Saviour's birth was made by Sentius Saturninus[i].

I answer to this: (1.) It ought to be considered, that the heretic Marcion, with whom Tertullian disputes in this place, did not admit the authority of the first chapter[k] of St. Luke's

g Vid. de Bell. l. ii. c. 17. § 8.

h Καλεῖται δε το μεν φρουριον Μασαδα, προειστηκει δε των κατειληφοτων αυτο σικαριων δυνατος ανηρ Ελεαζαρος, απογονος Ιουδα του πεισαντος Ιουδαιων ουκ ολιγους, ως προτερον δεδηλωκαμεν, μη ποιεισθαι τας απογραφας, οτε Κυρηνιος τιμητης εις την Ιουδαιαν επεμφθη· de B. l. vii. c. 8. § 1.

i Sed & census constat actos sub Augusto nunc in Judæa per Sentium Saturninum. Apud quos genus ejus inquirere potuissent. Cont. Marc. lib. iv. c. 19.

k Accedit his Cerdon quidam.——Solum evangelium Lucæ, nec tamen totum recipit. Post hunc discipulus ipsius emersit Marcion.—Hæresin Cerdonis approbare conatus est. De præscrip. Hæret. c. 51.

gospel,

goſpel. And it was the cuſtom of Tertullian, to argue from thoſe parts of ſcripture which the heretics he was dealing with[l] acknowledged. Poſſibly therefore Tertullian having, or ſuppoſing he had reaſon to think, that this cenſus was made when Saturninus was preſident of Syria, he might chooſe to mention the ordinary officer as a thing certain; but yet might not intend to affirm, that the cenſus was made by him, but only that it happened in his time. Iſaac Caſaubon judged it not unreaſonable ſo to underſtand Tertullian, who often uſes[m] words improperly. I thought it not fit to deprive the reader of this anſwer of that learned man: but I do not adopt his interpretation of Tertullian.

(2.) Tertullian's authority ought not to outweigh the teſtimony of more ancient writers, who were nearer the event. Juſtin Martyr, in his firſt apology, preſented to the Roman emperor ſixty years before Tertullian wrote his books againſt Marcion, ſays, this cenſus was performed in Judea by Cyrenius; and all other writers agree with Juſtin, as has been ſhewn already.

(3.) Tertullian's authority is of the leſs weight in this point, becauſe he has made very groſs blunders in hiſtory, of which I ſhall ſay ſomewhat more in the third chapter.

(4.) I imagine ſome account may be given of this miſtake of Tertullian. It has been obſerved, that Marcion, whom Tertullian was now arguing with, did not own the firſt chapters of St. Luke's goſpel. Tertullian therefore not having his eye particularly on St. Luke, and ſuppoſing that this cenſus was made in Judea when Saturninus was preſident of Syria, ſays, it was made by him.

Judea having been afterwards a branch of the province of Syria, he concluded it was ſo at this time, and that therefore the cenſus muſt have been made by the preſident of Syria: but this was arguing from later to more early times, as men not thoroughly verſed in hiſtory are apt to do.

After the baniſhment of Archelaus Judea was annexed to Syria; but whilſt Herod was living, the preſident of Syria had not any proper authority in Judea. The preſident of Syria was always the moſt conſiderable officer in the eaſtern part of

[l] Quam & argumentationibus earum, & ſcripturis quibus utuntur, provocavimus ex abundanti. De carne Chriſti. cap. 25.

[m] Tertullianus cum adverſus Marcio. ſcribit, Sed & conſtat,——ad majorem fidem magiſtratum ordinarium potius nominat, quam extraordinarium. Ait autem per ſentium Saturninum durè & Tertullianice, hoc eſt, improprie pro επι Σενλιε Σαλορνινε, vel ηγεμονευοντος της Σ. K. Caſaub. Exercit. 1. n. 31.

the empire. When the Romans had any war[n] in that part of the world, the neighbouring kings were obliged to follow his directions; to furnish those sums of money, or those troops, which he required, and to send these to the places he appointed. When any differences happened between these kings and tetrarchs, they were bound to refer them to him, nor could they march any forces out of their territories without his consent: but he seems not, especially in a time of peace, to have had any proper authority within their dominions.

Nor do I think I here impute to Tertullian any very gross mistake. The state of dependent kingdoms and provinces in the Roman empire underwent frequent changes, and a person had need to have made history his peculiar study, and to have aimed at some uncommon accuracy, in order to understand the state of the Roman provinces for a couple of centuries.

I have now gone through all the difficulties which are of any moment in this point.

I have nothing farther to add to those evidences which I have already produced, except these two observations: 1st, That it seems to me highly probable, from the manner in which Eusebius speaks of this matter in his chronicle, that it was originally the common opinion of christians, that Cyrenius was sent into Judea on purpose to make this census: 'In the thirty 'third year of Herod, Cyrenius being sent by the Roman se-'nate, made a census (or enrolments) of goods and persons[o].' This does very much confirm the opinion of those learned men, who think that Cyrenius was sent with extraordinary power: though why Eusebius mentions the senate instead of the emperor I know not.

Possibly some may be disposed to set aside Eusebius's authority, because in his Ecclesiastical History he has confounded the two surveys. But I must confess I ascribe that, not to ignorance, but to somewhat a great deal worse. It is impossible, that a man of Eusebius's acuteness, who had the New Testament and Josephus before him, should think a census made after Archelaus's banishment was the same with that made before Herod died; but Eusebius was resolved to have St. Luke's history confirmed by the express testimony of the Jewish historian, right or wrong. Here Eusebius was under a bias.

n Tum intellecto Barbarorum irriſu, qui peterent quod eripuerant, conſuluit inter primores civitatis Nero, bellum anceps an pax inhpueſta placeret, nec dubitatum de BELLO—ſcribitur *tetrarchis ac regibus* præfectiſque ac procuratoribus,—juſſis Corbulonis obſequi. Tacit. Ann. lib. xv. cap. 25.

o Chron. p. 76.

In

In his Chronicle we have a ſimple unbiaſſed account of what was the opinion of Chriſtians, and others, at that time.

Secondly, It ſeems to me in the nature of the thing moſt probable, that ſome perſon was ſent with extraordinary power to make this enrolment. There is no evidence in Joſephus, that Auguſtus had any intention to take away the kingdom from Herod, and make Judea a province. A cenſus in his dominions was a very great diſgrace; but to have ordered it to be performed by the preſident of Syria, would have been an additional affront; it would have looked like making Herod ſubject to Syria. Since Judea was to continue a diſtinct kingdom as hitherto, and only to be reduced to a more ſtrict dependence, the only method of making this cenſus, could be that of ſending ſome perſon of honour and dignity, like Cyrenius, to enrol the ſubjects of Herod, and value their eſtates; that for the future, tribute might be paid according to this cenſus. And this does admirably ſuit the nature of the oath mentioned in Joſephus, the ſubſtance of which was, to be faithful to Cæſar and Herod.

I conclude therefore, that it is upon the whole moſt probable, that the firſt aſſeſſment, of which St. Luke here writes, was performed by Cyrenius, as well as the ſecond. This appears to me a very natural meaning of St. Luke's words, and the external evidences for this ſuppoſition ſeem to me to outweigh the objections.

We have now got through the affair of the cenſus. If I have not been ſo happy as to remove every difficulty attending this text of St. Luke, yet I hope the reader will allow at leaſt, that I have not concealed or diſſembled any.

CHAP. II.

Two Objections taken from the Silence of Josephus.

I. *He has not mentioned the ſlaughter of the Infants of Bethlehem:* II. *Nor of the Galileans, whoſe blood Pilate had mingled with their ſacrifices.*

St. Matthew ſays, chap. ii. 16. *Then Herod, when he ſaw that he was mocked of the wiſe men, was exceeding wroth, and ſent forth, and ſlew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in*

in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men.

It is objected to this, that if there had been so cruel a slaughter made by Herod, of innocent infants at Bethlehem, a place not far from Jerusalem, it is very unlikely it should have been omitted by Josephus, who has written the history of the Jews, and particularly of the reign of Herod.

To this I answer: 1. This appears to me to be at the best an objection of a very extraordinary nature. The most exact and diligent historians have omitted many events, that happened within the compass of those times of which they undertook to write: nor does the reputation which any one historian has for exactness, invalidate the credit of another, who seems to be well informed of the facts he relates. Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dio Cassius, have all three written of the reign of Tiberius: but it is no objection against the veracity of any one of them, that he has mentioned some things of that emperor, which have been omitted by the rest. No more is it any objection against St. Matthew, that he has related an action of Herod not mentioned by Josephus.

2. There have been as great cruelties committed by many eastern princes: nor was there ever any man more likely than Herod to give the orders here mentioned by St. Matthew. When he had gained possession of Jerusalem [a] by the assistance of the Romans, and his rival Antigonus was taken prisoner, and in the hands of the Roman general Sosius, and by him carried to Mark Antony, Herod by a large sum of money persuaded Antony to put him to death. Herod's great fear was, that Antigonus might some time revive his pretensions, as being of the Asmonean family. Aristobulus, brother of his wife Mariamne, was murdered [b] by his directions at eighteen years of age, because the people at Jerusalem had shewn some affection for his person. In the seventh year of his reign from the death of Antigonus, he put to death Hyrcanus, grandfather of Mariamne, then eighty years of age, and who had saved Herod's life when he was prosecuted by the sanhedrim; a man, who in his youth, and in the vigour of his life, and in all the revolutions of his fortune, had shewn a mild and peaceable disposition [c]. His beloved wife, the beautiful and virtuous Mariamne, had a public execution [d], and her mother Alexandra was put to death soon after [e]. Alexander and Aristobulus, his two sons by Mariamne, were strangled in prison by his or-

a Jos. Ant. l. xiv. c. 16. § ult. b Antiq. l. xv. c. 3. § 3. De Bell. l. i. c. 22.
c Ant. l. xv. c. 6. de Bell. ubi supra. d Ant. xv. c. 7. § 5, 6. e Ib. § 8.

der

der[f] upon groundless suspicions, as it seems, when they were at man's estate, were married and had children. I say nothing of the death of his eldest son Antipater: if Josephus's character of him be just, he was a miscreant, and deserved the worst death that could be inflicted.

In his last sickness, a little before he died, he sent orders throughout Judea, requiring the presence of all the chief men of the nation at Jericho. His orders were obeyed, for they were enforced with no less penalty than that of death. When these men were come to Jericho, he had them all shut up in the Circus; and calling for his sister Salome, and her husband Alexas, he told them, 'My life is now but short: I know the 'dispositions of the Jewish people, and nothing will please 'them more than my death. You have [g] these men in your 'custody; as soon as the breath is out of my body, and before 'my death can be known, do you let in the soldiers upon 'them and kill them. All Judea and every family will then, 'though unwillingly, mourn at my death." Nay, Josephus says, 'That with tears in his eyes he conjured them, by their 'love to him, and their fidelity to God, not to fail of doing 'him this honour; and they promised [h] they would not fail.'

These orders indeed were not executed; but, as a modern historian of very good sense observes, 'The [i] history of this 'his most wicked design, takes off all objection against the 'truth of murdering the innocents, which may be made from 'the incredibility of so barbarous and horrid an act. For this 'thoroughly shews, that there can nothing be imagined so 'cruel, barbarous, and horrid, which this man was not capa-'ble of doing.'

It may be also proper to observe, that almost all the executions, which I have instanced in, were sacrifices to his state jealousy and love of empire. And the slaughter, which St. Matthew has given an account of, was made upon the occasion of tidings brought to Jerusalem, of the birth of one who was *king of the Jews*.

3. Josephus has given us an account of a terrible execution made in Herod's court, and at Jerusalem, about this very time, upon the occasion of some predictions, that God was about to take away the kingdom from Herod. I think it was

[f] Antiq. l. xvi. c. 11. § 6. de Bell. l. i. c. 27. [g] Τȣς δε τȣς φρȣρȣμενȣς ανδρας επειδαν εκπνευσω, ταχιστα κτεινατε περιστησαντες τȣς στρατιωτας, ινα πασα Ιȣδαια και πας οικος ακων επ' εμοι δακρυση. de Bell. l. i. c. 33. § 6. [h] Και ο μεν μετα δακρυων ποτνιωμενος, και τȣ συγγενȣς την ευνοιαν και πιστιν τȣ Θειȣ προσκαλων, επεσκηπτε μη ητιμωσθαι αξιων. κακεινοι ωμολογȣν ȣ παραβησεσθαι· Ant. l. xvii. c. 6. § 5. [i] Prideaux Conn. Part ii. p. 655.

made at the very same time with the slaughter of the infants. St. Matthew relates only what was done at Bethlehem, Josephus what happened at Jerusalem. The silence of Josephus about the former, and of St. Matthew about the latter, may be in a good measure accounted for by these two or three considerations.

(1.) St. Matthew was not concerned to relate state matters, but barely to give the history of Jesus Christ; and therefore all that he was obliged to take notice of upon this occasion, was the attempts made upon the life of Jesus. Josephus's is a political history of the Jewish nation, and therefore the executions at court might be more suitable to his design.

(2.) All writers of good sense and candour, who have written the history of such jealous and cruel princes as Herod, have been obliged, both out of a regard to themselves, and their readers, to omit some of their odious and offensive actions, and to pass by some parts or circumstances of those transactions which they mention [k]. And I cannot help paying a particular respect to the evangelists, for the many instances of their candour and goodness, and for this in particular, that none of them strove to brand the memory of Herod, who sought the life of Jesus, with the many cruelties of his reign, or the dreadful circumstances of his death; and that Matthew, who alone has informed us of the murder of the infants, confined his narration to that, and passed by all the other tokens, which I doubt not, Herod shewed at this time, of a most odious jealousy.

Nor would I blame Josephus barely for the omission of the barbarities committed at Bethlehem. He has related many cruel actions of Herod; to have related them all would probably have appeared spite and ill-will, rather than faithfulness or impartiality. It is evident, there were many put to death at Jerusalem, beside those he nameth in the account of that execution. Possibly, the omission of the murder of the infants may be owing to those reasons I have here hinted, namely, a fear of being charged with a design to load Herod unreasonably, or a fear of rendering his history disagreeable, by too particular a detail of cruel actions.

(3.) I have thus far endeavoured to account for Josephus's silence in the way of apology for him, and should be glad to leave the matter here: but his strange way of speaking, and that in two (A) places of his works, of an execution at Jerusa-

k Neque sum ignarus, a plerisque scriptoribus omissa multorum pericula & pœnas, dum copiâ fatiscunt, aut quæ ipsis nimia & mœsta fuerant, ne pari tædio lecturos adficerent, verentur. Tacit. An. l. vi. c. 7.

(A) One of those passages with observations upon it may be seen above, p. 279. It is the passage I referred to, p. 134, &c.

lem

lem about this time, though according to his own account and acknowledgment it was very severe and terrible, will not permit me to conclude here. Supposing then, that execution to have been made on account of discourses, which happened at Jerusalem upon the rumour of the birth of Jesus, I think, that since Josephus was determined in the main to vindicate Herod upon that occasion, he was obliged for his own honour, to say nothing of what was done at Bethlehem. The slaughter of the infants, from two years old and under, of a whole city, town, or village; and the district round about it, whatever colours an historian might have put upon it, would have appeared to all mankind, but prejudiced and hardened Jews, an horrid inhumanity.

In a word, the objection against this relation of St. Matthew must be founded on the silence of the Greek and Roman historians, or of Josephus. As for the silence of the former; the Roman republic or empire about this time was so vast, that the affairs of many dependent princes have been lost in the crowd. Tacitus goes over the history of the Jews, from Pompey's conquest of Judea to the government of Felix, mentioned in the Acts, in one short chapter. Of Herod he says, 'The kingdom he received from Antony was enlarged [or 'confirmed] by Augustus. And that after his death, his king-'dom was divided between three of his sons[k]:" without so much as naming the sons of Herod, who arrived at sovereign power, and succeeded their father. Strabo says, 'Herod ob-'tained the title of king first from Antony, and then from 'Augustus. Some of his sons he put to death, as guilty of 'designs against himself: others he appointed his successors, 'dividing his kingdom among them. But his sons were not 'happy, for they fell under some accusations: one of them 'was banished into Gaul, and the other two by means of a 'great deal of submission, with much difficulty kept their 'several tetrarchies[l].' He does not so much as name those

as deserving a particular attention. If the reader has not yet observed it, I would now recommend it to his perusal. The other passage will be found toward the latter end of § 1. of the next chapter to this. See in the index of Josephus, his account of a terrible 'execution at Jerusalem.'

k Regnum ab Antonio Herodi datum, victor Augustus [illegible]. Post mortem Herodis, [illegible] expectato Cæsare, Simon quidam regnum nomen invaserat. Is a Quinctilio Varo obtinente Syriam punitus. Et gentem [illegible] liberi Herodis tripartito rexere. Tacit. Hist. l. v. c. 9.

l Ηρωδης—ωςε και βασιλευς εχρηματισε, δοντος το μεν πρωτον Αντονιȣ την εξȣσιαν, υςερον δε και Καισαρος τȣ Σεβαςȣ· των δε υιων τȣς μεν αυτος ανειλεν, ως επιβȣλευσαντας αυτῳ· τȣς δε τελευτων διαδοχȣς απελιπε, μεριδας αυτοις αποδȣς·—ȣ μεν τοι ευτυχησαν οι παιδες, αλλ' εν αιτιαις εγενοντο· και ο μεν εν φυγῃ διετελεσε, παρα τοις Αλλοβροξι Γαλαταις λαβων οικησιν· οι δε θεραπεια πολλῃ μολις ευροντο καθοδον, τετραρχιας αποδοθεισης εκατερῳ. Strabo. l. xvi. p. 765. ed. Casaub.

sons

sons whom Herod killed, nor those that succeeded him. It is with a like brevity, that some other writers have mentioned Herod. Dio Cassius's history of affairs about the latter part of Herod's reign is wanting. I leave it to any one to judge, whether it be reasonable to expect the particular fact at Bethlehem from historians, who plainly content themselves with delivering the successions of princes, without relating their affairs, or so much as recording all their names.

As for Josephus, his silence is no more an objection against St. Matthew, than the silence of other writers is against him. Josephus has said a great deal of Herod's liberality to foreigners, to Antioch, Berytus, Tyrus, Sidon, Damascus, and many other cities in Syria; to the Athenians, Lacedæmonians, Rhodians, and other people of Greece. Of his benefaction to the Eleans, he says, 'It was a common benefit not to Greece only 'but to all the world [m]:' and 'that he was so remarkable for 'his liberality, that Augustus and Agrippa often said, Herod's 'kingdom was too small for him, and that he deserved to be 'king of all Syria and Egypt [n].' I suppose people take these things upon Josephus's authority. I cannot conceive, how the single silence of Josephus (and of Justus of Tiberias, if you please to add him,) should be an objection against St. Matthew, when the silence of the Greeks and Syrians, people that abounded so much in writers, (several of which are also still in being,) is no objection against Josephus; who has recorded many things done by Herod for those people, of which they have made no mention, that we know of.

It has been pretended indeed, that Josephus was a great enemy to Herod, and seems willing to tell all his various acts of cruelty. But this is not certain. For Herod's character in Josephus has a mixture of good and bad: he has related a great many things to his advantage, which can be verified by no other writers. Herod put to death every member of the Jewish great council in Hyrcanus's time, except Hillel and Shammai; yet Josephus mentions this very slightly [o]: he even takes part with Herod against the pharisees in an account of an execution made at Jerusalem in the latter part of his reign. Though Josephus were an enemy to Herod, he might have inducements to shew him favour upon some occasions: Agrippa the

younger

[m] Antiq. l. xvi. c. 5. § 3, 4. De Bell. l. i. c. 21. § 11, 12. Το δε Ηλειοις χαρισθεν, ου μονον κοινον της Ελλαδος, αλλ' ολης της οικουμενης δωρον. Ibid. § 12.

[n] Και φασιν αυτον τε Καισαρα και Αγριππαν πολλακις ειπειν, ως αποδοι τα της αρχης Ηρωδη της ουσης εν αυτω μεγαλοψυχιας. Αξιον γαρ ειναι και Συριας απασης και Αιγυπτου την βασιλειαν εχειν. Antiq. l. xvi. c. 5. § 1.

[o] Antiq. l. xiv. c. 9. § 4. l. xv. 1.

younger was living, when Joſephus wrote, and he had ſome acquaintance with him, and obligations to him[p]: it was not for the honour of the Jewiſh nation, to make a mere monſter of Herod, who had reigned over them between thirty and forty years. A particular recital of all Herod's cruelties, could not but make the uneaſineſs of the Jewiſh people under the Roman government appear very unreaſonable: they might be thought a ſtrange people, who rebelled againſt the Romans, and yet had bore with a man who had ſpared neither young nor old; who had ſlaughtered all the members of their great council, and the innocent infants of a whole town and all its diſtrict. I have ſometimes thought, that this was really one reaſon, why Joſephus made ſo ſlight mention of the cutting off the members of that ſenate: it might alſo be ſome inducement not to relate the ſlaughter of the infants.

But Joſephus, as a firm Jew, had certainly a particular reaſon for paſſing over this event at Bethlehem: he could not mention it, without giving the chriſtian cauſe a great advantage. To write, that Herod, at the latter end of his reign, had put to death all the young children at Bethlehem, on occaſion of a report ſpread at Jeruſalem, that the *king of the Jews* had been newly born there, would have greatly gratified the chriſtians; ſince it was well known, when he wrote, that about thirty years after the death of Herod, Jeſus, being then about thirty years of age, had been ſtyled the *king of the Jews*, and had been publicly crucified at Jeruſalem with that title; and it was firmly believed by all his followers, that he was the great perſon ſpoken of under that character, and was now advanced to dominion and power.

Nay, I do not ſee how any ſerious and attentive heathen, who had heard any thing of Jeſus, could read a relation of this event in Joſephus, a Jewiſh hiſtorian, known to be no favourer of thoſe called chriſtians, but he muſt be diſpoſed to think, the chriſtian belief deſerved ſome conſideration. For if there was a report ſpread at Jeruſalem, the capital city of Judea, that the *king of the Jews* had been newly born; and if this report was ſo far credited, that Herod, notwithſtanding his numerous iſſue, thought it needful to make away with all the young children at Bethlehem and its borders, in order to ſecure the ſucceſſion in his own family: this is at once a ſtrong argument, that the Jewiſh expectation of a great perſon to ariſe from among them is no new thing, and that there were ſome reaſons to think, that great perſon had been born at that time.

[p] Joſeph. vit. § 65.

More-

Moreover, he must also suppose it possible, that the child, whose life was aimed at, escaped, notwithstanding the care of Herod: for it is plain he did not certainly know the child, of whom the discourse was; if he had, he would not have given orders for destroying all the young children under such an age.

The more any heathen knew of the Jewish expectations, or of the story of Jesus, either by hearsay from the christians, or by having looked into any of the gospels, the more would he have remarked such a relation in this historian.

For this reason, Josephus could by no means be willing to relate this event, with its most peculiar circumstances; though I think he has given a general account of Herod's cruelty at that time, as I have sufficiently shewn already.

4. St. Matthew's account is confirmed by the testimony of ancient christian authors. I give one passage from Justin Martyr, who wrote before the middle of the second century. 'But,' says he, 'Herod, when the Arabian wise men did not 'come back to him as he had desired them, but according to 'a command given them returned by another way into their 'own country; and when Joseph, together with Mary and the 'young child, were gone into Egypt, according to directions 'given to them also by a divine revelation; not knowing the 'child whom the wise men had come to worship, commanded 'all the children in Bethlehem, without exception, to be killed [q]. This was propheſied of by Jeremiah, the spirit of God 'saying by him thus, *A voice was heard in Rama.*'——

This event is also mentioned by [r] Irenæus, who lived in the same century; and by Origen [s] in the third century, in his answer to Celsus, where he says, 'Herod put to death all the 'little children in Bethlehem and its borders, with a design to 'destroy the *king of the Jews*, who had been born there.' It is needless to make any more quotations of christian [t] writers.

There is also a noted passage in Macrobius, a heathen author, who flourished in the latter end of the fourth century, who among other jests of Augustus has this. 'When he [Au- 'gustus] had heard that among the children within two years

[q] Παντας απλως τους παιδας τους εν Βηθλεεμ εκελευσεν αναιρεθηναι. Dialog. Part ii. p. 304. Paris. (p. 307. Thirlb.)

[r] Propter hoc & pueros eripiebat, qui erant in domo David, bene fortiti in illo tempore nasci, ut eos præmitteret in suum regnum; ipse infans cum esset, infantes hominum martyres parans, propter Christum, qui in Bethlehem natus est Judæ, in civitate David, interfectos secundum scripturas. Contra Hær. lib. iii. c. 16. § 4. al. c. 17. In qua [Ægypto] & dominus noster servatus est, effugiens eam persecutionem quæ erat ab Herode. Ibid. c. 21. § 3. al. c. 28.

[s] Ο δ' Ηρωδης ανειλε παντα τα εν Βηθλεεμ και τοις οριοις αυτης παιδια, ως συναιρησων τον γεννηθεντα Ιουδαιων βασιλεα. Lib. i. p. 47.

[t] Vid. Euseb. Hist. Ec. l. i. c. 8. P. Oros. l. vii. c. 3. &c. &c.

'of

‘ of age, which Herod king of the Jews commanded to be ‘ ſlain in Syria, his own ſon had been killed, he ſaid, “ It is “ better to be Herod’s hog than his ſon[x].”

I lay little or no ſtreſs upon this paſſage, partly becauſe it comes too late, partly becauſe there is reaſon to ſuppoſe, Macrobius has been miſtaken about the occaſion of the jeſt. No early chriſtian writers have ſaid any thing of Herod’s having had a young child of his own killed in the ſlaughter at Bethlehem. If Auguſtus did paſs this jeſt upon Herod, it might be occaſioned by the death of Antipater, or rather of Alexander and Ariſtobulus[x].

This is what I ſaid of this paſſage in the firſt edition. I would now add; it ought to be allowed, that Auguſtus did paſs this jeſt upon Herod, upon ſome occaſion or other, and that Macrobius has given us exactly the words of the jeſt. This paſſage alſo ſhews, that Herod’s ſlaughter of the infants in Judea was a thing well known in Macrobius’s time, and was not conteſted by heathens.

If we could be aſſured, that Macrobius tranſcribed this whole paſſage, not only the jeſt itſelf, but the occaſion of it likewiſe, from ſome more ancient author, it would be a proof, that this event was well known in that author’s time alſo. And we ſhould have a great deal of reaſon to ſuppoſe that author was a heathen, becauſe it is moſt likely, that Macrobius, a bigotted heathen himſelf[y], did not much deal in chriſtian writers.

But it is poſſible, that Macrobius found only the jeſt in his author, and added the occaſion, having collected it from the common diſcourſe of the chriſtians of his time, who frequently ſpoke of this cruel action of Herod. There is ſome reaſon to ſuſpect this, becauſe it is very likely, that Auguſtus’s reflexion upon Herod was occaſioned by the death of one of thoſe ſons whom Joſephus has mentioned, and that it has no relation at all to the ſlaughter of the infants at Bethlehem. This ſuſpicion may be farther ſtrengthened by the great agreement of Macrobius with St. Matthew, in the words he uſes concerning the children[z]. Macrobius being ignorant of Herod’s ſtory, and having heard of the ſlaughter of the infants, when he met with

[x] Cum audiſſet inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes Rex Judæorum intra bimatum juſſit interfici, filium quoque ejus occiſum; ait, Melius eſt Herodis porcum eſſe quam filium. Macrob. Sat. lib. ii. c. 4.

[x] See Whitby’s Annot. on Matth. ii. 16, 17.

[y] This is very evident from his works: and the reader may ſee a full proof of it in the Rev. Mr. Maſſon’s Slaughter of the Children in Bethlehem, as an hiſtorical Fact, vindicated, § 3.

[z] Children within two years of age, which Herod king of the Jews commanded to be ſlain.

this jest in some author, concluded there had been some young child of Herod put to death together with them.

I am content therefore to leave it a doubtful point, whether Macrobius transcribed this whole passage, or the jest only, from some more ancient author.

Upon the whole then, there lies no objection against this relation of St. Matthew: there is nothing improbable in the thing itself, considering the jealous, cruel temper of Herod. The silence of Josephus, or of the ancient Greek and Roman historians, can be no difficulty with any reasonable person. This fact is confirmed by the express testimony of very early christian writers, and by Macrobius, a heathen author, in the latter end of the fourth century; from whom it appears, that this event was not then contested, and that it was even better known, than the fate of those sons of Herod, whom Josephus says he put to death at man's estate.

§ II. An objection of the like sort with that we have been considering, may be made against St. Luke, who says, ch. xiii. 1. *There were present at that season, some that told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.* It has been thought strange by some, that Josephus has made no mention of this event.

In answer to this objection, I shall transcribe a passage of Josephus. 'Judas the Galilean introduced a fourth sect among 'the Jews. In all other things they agree with the pharisees, 'but they have an invincible love of liberty, and acknowledge 'God alone their lord and governor: nor can any kind of 'death, or any punishments of their friends and relations, 'make them call any man lord. As many have been witnesses 'of their immoveable firmness, I shall say no more upon this 'head; not out of a fear lest my accounts should be thought 'incredible, but rather because it is not easy fully to represent 'their contempt of all kinds of sufferings[a].'

Perhaps, the Galileans mentioned by St. Luke, were some of the followers of the before-mentioned Judas. Josephus says, he has omitted the greatest part of the sufferings of that sect. I think, it is not difficult to guess the reason. Judas's principles were very popular among the Jews, but in the opinion of the Romans they were criminal, as being inconsistent with subjection to their government. And it was next to impossible,

[a] Ου γαρ δεδοικα μη εις απιστιαν υποληφθη τι των λεγομενων επ' αυτοις, τουναντιον δε μη ελασσονως του εκεινων καταφρονηματος, δεχομενου την ταλαιπωριαν της αληθονος, ο λογος αφηγηται. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 1. § 6.

for

for Joſephus to give a particular account of all tranſactions in Judea relating to this matter, without offending the Jews, his countrymen, on the one hand, or the Romans on the other.

But whether the Galileans in St. Luke were men of this principle, is not certain, nor is it material. For though they were not, the paſſage juſt tranſcribed from Joſephus may ſatisfy us, that many remarkable events have been omitted by him upon ſome account or other.

CHAP. III.

An OBJECTION againſt the FIFTEENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF TIBERIUS, compared with the AGE OF JESUS AT HIS BAPTISM.

I. *The Objection ſtated.* II. *The firſt ſolution: That St. Luke, by the fifteenth of Tiberius, might intend the fifteenth of his proconſular power, not of his ſole empire after the death of Auguſtus.* II. *The conſiſtence of other notes of time in the Goſpels with this ſuppoſition.* IV. *The ſecond ſolution: That the age of thirty years aſcribed to Jeſus at his baptiſm may be underſtood with latitude.*

St. Luke ſays, ch. iii. 1, 2. *Now in the* FIFTEENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF TIBERIUS CÆSAR, *Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea,—the word of God came unto John the ſon of Zacharias in the wilderneſs.—Now when all the people were baptized, it came to paſs, that Jeſus alſo being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened: And the Holy Ghoſt deſcended in a bodily ſhape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which ſaid, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleaſed. And Jeſus himſelf*——BEGAN TO BE ABOUT THIRTY YEARS OF AGE, ver. 23.

Againſt this account of St. Luke this objection may be formed. St. Matthew ſays expreſsly, that Jeſus was *born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king.* Though Jeſus was born but a month or two before the death of Herod, he would be at leaſt thirty one years of age at his baptiſm. But if Jeſus was born above a year, much more, if above two years before Herod's death; then the age of *thirty years* here aſcribed to him at his baptiſm, is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the notes of time mentioned at the commencement of John the Baptiſt's miniſtry; even allowing, that *the word of God came to John*

in the very beginning of the *fifteenth year of Tiberius*, and that Jesus was baptized a few months after.

Before I state this objection at length, I would observe, that the true genuine meaning of these words, *Jesus himself* [a] *began to be about thirty years of age*, is not that he then *entered* the thirtieth year of his age, but that Jesus was about thirty years of age when he began his ministry; or, *when* [b] *he thus began to shew himself publicly.* This, I think, is now the general opinion of learned [c] men: so the Greek word of this text is used by St. Luke in other places. Thus the high priests and others charge Jesus before Pilate, saying, Luke xxiii. 5. *He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry,* BEGINNING [αρξαμενος *having begun*] *from Galilee to this place.* St. Peter, in the debate concerning the choice of an apostle in the room of Judas, says, Acts i. 21, 22. *Wherefore of these men, which have accompanied with us* ALL THE TIME *that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us,* BEGINNING *from the baptism* [d] *of John, unto the same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.*

I come now to the objection: Augustus died, and Tiberius succeeded him the 19th of August, A. U. 767, Julian year 59, A. D. 14. Therefore the fifteenth of Tiberius began the 19th Aug. A. U. 781, A. D. 28. Herod died (A) before the passover in A. U. 750, Jul. year 42, or else before the passover in A. U. 751, Jul. year 43. If then John the Baptist began to preach in the beginning of the fifteenth of Tiberius, in the latter end of A. U. 781, and Jesus be supposed to have been baptized by John a few months after, on the 6th of January of the year following, viz. A. U. 782, Jesus must have been in the 32d year of his life, if Herod died in the spring, A. U. 751, and if Jesus was born the 25th Decemb. preceding, viz. A. U. 750. But if Herod died, A. U. 750, and Jesus was born the 25th Decemb. before, viz. A. U. 749, then he would be at his baptism in the 33d year of his age.

But it may be made appear several ways, that Jesus was born above a year, probably above two years before Herod died.

1. This may be inferred from the evangelists themselves. For it is very probable, that Herod lived a year or more after

[a] Και αυτος ην ο Ιησους ωσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος, ων, κ. λ. [b] Dr. Clarke's Paraphrase. [c] Lucæ mentem Jansenius [Conc. cap. 14.] optimè assecutus est, quam sic exprimit: Sensus erit, & ipse Jesus erat fere triginta annorum, cum jam suscepto baptismo auspicaretur deinde munus suum. Bas. Ann. Pol. Ecc. ant. D. 5. n. 28. vid. & Anton. Cappell. de cœnâ Christi supremâ. Sect. 12. c. 23. Mr. Whiston's short View of the Harmony, &c. p. 136. [d] Εν ω πασηλθε και εξηλθεν εφ' ημας ο Κυριος Ιησους, αρξαμενος απο του βαπτισματος Ιωαννου. (A) See the Appendix.

the

the murder of the infants. The wise men having worshipped Jesus, when they were departed, Matt. ii. 13, 14. *Behold, the angel of the Lord appeared 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. The direction given to Joseph by the angel, may afford ground to suppose, that Joseph was to make some stay in Egypt, at least some months, or more than a few weeks or days: which, from what follows, appears to have been *till the death of Herod.*

Moreover, St. Matthew says, ch. ii. 19, 20. that *when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream in Egypt, saying, Arise, 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.

It being known from Josephus, that Antipater died but five days before his father Herod, it may be inferred from the use of the plural number, that Antipater is meant by the angel as well as Herod, and that he had been concerned in the design to put Jesus to death, and that his cruel intentions were one cause of Joseph's removal out of Judea into Egypt. But Antipater could have no influence on his father's counsels for ten months or more before Herod died, as will appear presently: therefore the murder of the infants happened, most probably, a year before the death of Herod.

It may likewise be concluded from St. Matthew's account, that Jesus was born near two years before the murder of the infants. For thus he says, ch. iii. 1, 2. *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.* Ver. 7. *Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men, inquired of them diligently, what time the star appeared.*

The wise men having been to worship the child, and departing into their own country without coming back to Jerusalem, ver. 16. *Then Herod, when he saw he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men.*

Jesus was born before the wise men came, for their question was, *Where is he that is born?* They knew he was born, because they had seen his star in the east. Herod inquired what time the star appeared, and slew all the children from two years and under, according to that time. Therefore the star had appeared two years before, and Jesus was born at or near that time.

Nor can the supposed distance between the appearing of the star, and the arrival of the wise men, weaken this calculation. There might be many reasons to hinder their undertaking the journey immediately: possibly, they apprehended no necessity of setting out sooner. For allowing the truth of the fact, that they had seen a star, by which they understood the birth of a king in Judea, they could not well make any doubt of his living, or of their having an opportunity to worship him, though they delayed a year or two. But, whatever were the reasons of their delay, we have no right to depart from the words of St. Matthew; who intimates very plainly, that it was *two years* from the appearing of the star, to the time in which Herod ordered the children to be slain.

Add these two years to the forementioned year, which Herod lived after the slaughter of the children, and it will appear, that according to St. Matthew, Jesus was born three years before Herod's death.

2. It may be proved from Tertullian, that Jesus was born above two years before the death of Herod: for he says, that the census or tax made in Judea, at the time of which Jesus was born, was made[e] by Sentius Saturninus. But Josephus assures us, that Quintilius Varus was come into Syria as successor to Saturninus, before[f] the death of Herod. It may not be easy to determine exactly from Josephus the time of Varus's arrival in Syria: but there are in being some ancient coins[g] or medals of the city of Antioch, the capital of that province, that demonstrate the time of his government. One of these coins has on the reverse a figure representing the city of Antioch, and the name of Varus with a date in Greek numerals, xxv. And there are others with the same figure and inscription, with the numerals xxvi. xxvii. The first of these coins af-

e Adv. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 19. See above, p. 327.

f Antiq. lib. xvii. c. 5. § 2. & alibi.

g Scripsit ad me Card. Norisius, extare in Scrinio illustrissimi Marchionis Riccardi nummum minimæ magnitudinis caput Jovis in antica repræsentantem, in cujus posticâ habetur, ΕΠΙ ΟΥΑΡΟΥ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΩΝ, mulier sedens pede super figuram Orontis fluminis, tenens dextrâ palmam: & in medio ΕΚ. id est. Anno xxv. Pagi Appar. ad Bar. n. 136. vid. omnino. Noris. Epoch. Syromaced. Dissert. 3. c. 7. & Memoires de l'Academie des Inscrip. Tom. 4. p. 181. ed. Amst.

fures

ſures us, that Varus was in Syria before September, A. U. 748. For the æra in which the Antiochians uſed at that time was that of the Actiac victory, which was obtained A. U. 723[h]. The 25th year of this æra ended the ſecond of Sept. A. U. 748. It is therefore manifeſt, that Jeſus was born before September in that year, if Saturninus made the cenſus of which St. Luke ſpeaks, or if it was made in his time: and if it be ſuppoſed, that Jeſus was born on the 25th of December, then his nativity muſt neceſſarily be placed as far back as the 25th Decemb. A. U. 747.

3. I expect likewiſe to be here reminded of ſome things advanced by me in the firſt chapter of this book; and that it will be urged: If the oath which Joſephus ſays was taken by all the Jews to Auguſtus and Herod, relating to the cenſus or enrolment which St. Luke ſpeaks of, then Jeſus muſt have been born three years before the death of Herod.

Poſſibly the objection may be ſtated in this manner:

It cannot be leſs than ten months from the commencement of the inquiries made by Herod into the cauſe of Pheroras's death, and the crimes of Antipater, to the death of Herod. When the firſt diſcoveries were made Antipater was at Rome: Herod ſent for him in a very preſſing but kind manner, diſſembling all ſuſpicions concerning him, that he might not delay to return to Judea. Joſephus ſays, that when Antipater returned, he knew nothing of the accuſations which had been brought againſt him, though[i] ſeven months had then paſſed from the firſt diſcovery of his crimes. In a day or two after Antipater's return to Judea, Herod calls a council, in which[k] he himſelf and Varus, governor of Syria, preſided. Antipater is brought before them, convicted, and remanded to priſon. But Herod not daring to pronounce ſentence on Antipater without leave from Auguſtus, expreſſes were ſent to Rome with an account of what had paſſed. After that theſe meſſengers were ſent away from Judea, a letter was intercepted, which was written to Antipater by Acme a Jewiſh woman at Rome, in the ſervice of the empreſs Livia, in which letter were freſh proofs of Antipater's deſigns. Hereupon Herod ſent away freſh diſpatches to Rome. Theſe return to Judea, and bring word, that Acme had been put to death by Auguſtus, and that the emperor left

[h] Allix ſuppoſes, that the Antiochian æra of the Actiac victory does not begin till A. U. 724. Vid. Differt. de J. C. Anno & [illegible] p. 102. It is not my buſineſs to [illegible] diſpute upon this head: the other opinion ſeems to me moſt probable. Vid. Noriſ. ubi ſupra. Pagi Apparat. n. 103, 104. [i] Και τοι μεταξυ των ελεγχων και της επαγωγης διελθοσων επτα μηνων. De Bell. lib. i. c. 31. p. 1034. v. 27. [k] Ibid. cap. 32.

it to Herod to do with Antipater as he thought fit. Soon after this Antipater was put to death, and in five days after Herod died [l].

As there was a second embassy sent to Rome after the trial of Antipater, and this returned before Herod died, with an account that Acme had been put to death, upon informations they had carried with them to Rome; it is impossible to assign less than three months for the interval between the arrival of Antipater in Judea, and Herod's death, which added to the former seven make ten months.

It being supposed in the first chapter, that the execution which Herod made in his own family, happened at the same time with the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem; it must next be considered, how long time that execution preceded the first inquiries into Antipater's designs. The facts mentioned by Josephus in this interval stand thus.

Herod having put to death several of his courtiers and servants, calls his friends together, charges Pheroras's wife with creating disturbances, and insists upon it that Pheroras put her away. Pheroras loving his wife too well to comply with this demand, the two brothers fall out. Pheroras leaves Herod, and goes to his tetrarchy, withal swearing solemnly never to come to Herod more. About this time, as it seems, Antipater, with his father's consent, left Judea and went to Rome. Soon after Pheroras was gone home, Herod fell sick: but though Herod sent for Pheroras, he would not come to him. Not long after, Pheroras is sick; Herod goes to see him, they are reconciled, Pheroras dies. Herod has him brought to Jerusalem and buried there [m].

When Pheroras was buried, some of his servants made applications to Herod, desiring him to inquire into the manner and causes of Pheroras's death. These inquiries open a horrid scene of wickedness. And it appears, that a conspiracy had been formed by Antipater to poison his father Herod; and that he had committed the execution of this design to Pheroras, and servants of his own, whom he had left behind him when he went to Rome, and who were to obey Pheroras's directions [n].

It will not be easy to allot less than three months for the facts just now mentioned, in the interval between the execution in Herod's family, and the first inquiries into the cause of

[l] Vid. Jos. de Bell. l. i. c. 30—33. Ant. l. xvii. c. 3—8 [m] Joseph. de Bell. l. i. cap. 29. § 4. Ant. l. xvii. cap. 3. [n] De Bell. ibid. cap. 30. Ant. ibid. 4.

Pheroras's

Pheroras's death. Three months added to the former ten make thirteen.

The execution ſpoken of by Joſephus, and the ſlaughter of the children mentioned by St. Matthew, being allowed to have happened both at the ſame time, the interval between the birth of Jeſus and this execution is already computed. It cannot be leſs than a year and nine or ten months, that is, near two years; conſequently, we have a freſh argument that Jeſus was born three years before the death of Herod: but how inconſiſtent this is with Jeſus being *about thirty years of age* in the *fifteenth* year of Tiberius, appears from what has been ſaid already.

Having now ſtated theſe objections, and given them their full force, as I imagine; before I proceed to offer a reply, I would make two or three reflections upon ſome particulars contained in them.

I do allow that it appears to me highly probable, that Herod did live a year at leaſt after the ſlaughter of the infants.

But as for Tertullian's teſtimony, that the tax in Judea was made by Saturninus, I think it is not of much weight; ſince he is the only perſon that has ſaid this, and he flouriſhed not till about two hundred years after the event. Beſides, though Tertullian was well ſkilled in the Roman laws and cuſtoms, he has committed many groſs blunders in hiſtory. The reader may ſee ſeveral of them collected by [o] Dodwell in his Diſſertations upon Irenæus. One of them is the computation Tertullian has made of the time, from the nativity of Jeſus to the taking of Jeruſalem [p] by Veſpaſian; which, according to him, was not full fifty-three years. And in reckoning up the reigns of the ſeveral emperors he has quite omitted that of Claudius, and allotted not quite ten years to the reign of Nero. He, who could make ſuch miſtakes in the hiſtory of the Roman emperors, might very eaſily be ignorant who was preſident of Syria at the time of our Saviour's nativity.

Nor am I ſatisfied with the proofs offered in theſe objections, that Jeſus was born two years before the ſlaughter of the children at Bethlehem. Whitby [q] queſtions whether απο διετους και κατωτερω ſhould not be rendered from *one year old* and under, rather than from *two years old* and under. But let διετης ſignify two years, yet I think no concluſion can be made about the preciſe time of the birth of Jeſus from Herod's orders. It is moſt likely, that this ſtar appeared ſome time before the birth

[o] Differt. iii. § 13. [p] Vid Tertul. adverſ. Jud. cap. 8. [q] Matt. ii. 16.

of Jesus, and that it was understood by the wise men to prefignify it. Hereby they were prepared for their journey, and it is highly probable, that these wise men came into Judea to worship this King, as soon as they could, after they concluded he was born, and that they arrived at Jerusalem in a very few months after his birth. But since their inquiry was, *Where is he that* IS BORN *King of the Jews?* Herod, whose cruelty had in a manner no bounds, orders all children near Bethlehem to be slain who had been born since the appearing of the star; or perhaps even for some space[r] before the time, at which, after an exact inquiry of the wise men, he perceived it had appeared.

As there appears not any proof from St. Matthew, that Jesus was born two years, or near two years before the slaughter of the infants; so, I think also, that there are no proofs in Josephus that the oath taken by the Jews had preceded two years, or near two years, the execution made in Herod's court. The oath and the execution are related by Josephus both together. The reader is referred to that passage, as also to the charge brought against Pheroras's wife immediately after that execution was over: among other things in the charge Herod says,—'That she did all she could to create a difference be-'tween him and his brother; that the fine imposed upon the 'pharisees had been evaded by her means; and that in the pre-'sent affair nothing had been done without her.' This present affair I suppose to relate to the predictions given out by the pharisees, that God would take away the kingdom from Herod and his children. The payment of the fine is the last crime she is charged with before this affair, which had preceded the execution; it certainly therefore is not a crime of two year's standing. Herod, in so long a time, might have found out some new fault in a woman he was so much offended with. We may be pretty well assured from this account, if I mistake not, that this oath had preceded the said execution and predictions but some few months only.

Supposing then the execution to be truly dated in the objection, at about thirteen months before the death of Herod, we may infer, that the oath in Josephus, and the description in St. Luke was made, and that Jesus was born about a year and six or seven months before Herod's death.

If indeed Antipater had been at Rome two years before he was recalled by his father, as some learned men have thought,

[r] Neque vero sequitur, si Herodes, omni modo cavens ne puer elaberetur, latius sævitiam extendit, non minus in ætate quam loci ratione, ideo stellam quoque tanto ante apparuisse. Grot. ad Matt. ii. 1.

then this execution must have been made above thirteen months before Herod's death; because it is likely, or rather certain, that Antipater was in Judea at the time of that execution. But I think it is a mistake to suppose he had been so long out of Judea. Antipater staid some time in Judea after his brothers Alexander and Aristobulus were [s] dead; and took a great deal of pains to defeat and set aside the advantageous marriages, which Herod designed for their children: he also entered into cabals with Pheroras and his wife, in order to secure the succession for himself: moreover, Saturninus was got to Rome a good while before Antipater went from home. Josephus says in his Antiquities, that Antipater having resolved, if possible, to hasten his father's death, and being desirous to strengthen and secure his own interest, that he might reign after him; 'He remitted large sums of money to his father's friends at 'Rome, that he might gain their good will, but especially 'that he might have the favour of Saturninus the governor of 'Syria[t].' Saturninus is not here called governor of Syria, because he was then actually in that post, for he is manifestly at Rome, but to distinguish him from others of that name, of which there were many. And it appears from the parallel place in the War of the Jews, that one favour which Antipater desired of these persons at Rome, who had influence on his father, was, that they would write to Herod that his [Antipater's] presence at Rome would be serviceable to him in the present posture of affairs. Antipater had now settled all things with Pheroras for the poisoning of Herod, as soon as an opportunity offered: but Antipater, so long as he staid in Judea, could not forbear conversing with Pheroras and his wife, which was extremely disagreeable to Herod. 'Therefore Antipater[u] 'contrived, by the interest of friends at Rome, to pro-'cure leave for a voyage thither. These writing, that it 'would be very proper for Antipater to be sent to Cæsar with-'out delay; he [Herod] immediately sent him thither, hav-'ing furnished him with a sumptuous equipage and large sums 'of money, giving him also his will to carry with him to the 'emperor.'

It is true, that after Antipater's journey to Rome, mention is made of Saturninus as in Syria; but then it is, because Jo-

[s] Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. 1.

[t] Και μαλιστα τους επι Ρωμης φιλους ΠΟΜΠΑΙΣ μεγαλων δωρεων ευνους καθισαμενος προ παντων δε Σατορνινον, τον της Συριας επιμελητην· ibid. p. 750. v. 10.

[u] Πραγματευεται, δια των επι της Ιταλιας φιλων, την εις Ρωμην αποδημιαν αυτω· γραψαντων γαρ εκεινων, δειν Αντιπατρον πεμφθηναι δια χρονου προς Καισαρα, ο δε υπ' μελλησας εξεπεμψε, κ. λ. de Bell. l. i. c. 29. § 2.

sephus

sephus relates a fact, that had happened before Antipater went from Judea. Josephus, giving an account of what Antipater did at Rome, mentions[x] some accomplices of Syllæus sent thither by Saturninus to answer for themselves. But this might have been done by Saturninus some time before,

Again, if Antipater had been two years out of Judea, Herod, who wanted plausible reasons to induce him to return, could not have failed to have put this, of his long absence, into his letters, as a very cogent and unexceptionable argument, which yet he does not appear[y] to have done.

It may be further argued, that Antipater's journey to Rome did not precede the death of Herod two years. The very commencement of the inquiries into the death of Pheroras, could not be above ten months before the death of Herod, as has been shewn already. A great progress had been made in those examinations; Doris, Antipater's mother, had been detected and put out of[z] Herod's house; Mariamne the high priest's daughter[a] was also put away, and her son struck out of a new will Herod had made. 'When these things were doing,' says Josephus, 'Bathyllus, Antipater's freedman, arrived from 'Rome, and being put to the question, was discovered to 'have brought with him a fresh quantity of poison to be given 'to his [Antipater's] mother and Pheroras, and that if the 'former had failed to dispach the king, they might try[b] this 'upon him.' Before Antipater had gone to Rome, he had provided[c] poison for Pheroras to give his father. It is plain, that when Bathyllus was sent from Rome, Antipater did not know whether Pheroras had made any use of the first poison or not, and that he had still a full confidence in him; but if Antipater had been gone from Judea two years, and had heard nothing of the effect of that poison, such a delay would have created suspicions. Moreover, this second preparation appears to be sent to back the former; so that we may be assured, we are to go backward, not years, but only some months, for the true time of Antipater's leaving Judea.

Once more, the first opening of the enquiries into the causes of Pheroras's death has been laid at about ten months before the death of Herod. That Antipater was then but newly set out for Rome, may be inferred from hence, Pheroras being

x De B. ibid. § 3. Ant. l. xvii. c. 3. § 2.

y See the substance of these letters. De B. l. i. c. 31. § 3. Ant. l. xvii. c. 5. § 1.

z Ant. l. xvii. c. 4. § 2.

a Ibid.

b Εν τȣτῳ δε και Βαθυλλος εκ Ρωμης απελευθερος Αντιπατρȣ παρην, και βασανισθεις ευρισκεται φαρμακον κομιζων, δωσειν τῃ τε αυτȣ μητρι και Φερωρα, ως ει το προτερον μη απτοιτο τȣ βασιλεως, τȣτῳ γȣν μεταχειριζοιντο αυτον. ibid. § 3. De B. c. 31. § 1.

c Antiq. ib. § 3. De Bell. ibid. c. 30. § 5.

dead,

dead, Herod had him brought to Jeruſalem, honoured him with a funeral, and made great lamentations for him. 'This,' ſays Joſephus, 'was the beginning of ſorrow to Antipater, 'though[d] he was then ſailed to Rome, God requiring of him 'the blood of his brothers. I ſhall give a particular relation 'of this whole affair, that it may be an admonition to all 'mankind to adhere to the practice of virtue.' If Antipater had been then any long time out of Judea, Joſephus would have ſaid, though he was then at Rome, or though he had been ſome time there. It is poſſible, Antipater might have been gone from home a month or two; but the phraſe here uſed by Joſephus ſeems to me to import, that there were not yet come to Jeruſalem any tidings of Antipater's arrival at Rome.

I hope it will be excuſed, that I have inſiſted ſo long upon this point. The ſuppoſition, that Antipater was gone to Rome before the removal of Saturninus, and two years or more before the death of Herod, has cauſed much confuſion in the chronology of many learned men about this time.

There is in Joſephus another paſſage, not yet obſerved by any one upon this occaſion, that I know of, which may help to determine the time of the execution made by Herod in his court and at Jeruſalem, and which will confirm my opinion about it. Joſephus, having given the hiſtory of Herod's putting to death his two ſons Alexander and Ariſtobulus, makes divers reflections upon that action. 'It might have been ſuf-'ficient,' ſays he[e], 'even ſuppoſing them guilty of the crimes 'laid to their charge, to have condemned them to perpetual 'impriſonment, or to have baniſhed them, but to take away 'their lives was a piece of downright cruelty. Nor does the 'delay extenuate the crime; for after deliberation, having been 'reſolved at one time and in ſuſpenſe at another, to commit 'ſuch a fact, is an argument of a cruel diſpoſition, and of a 'mind obſtinately bent upon wickedneſs: which ſame temper 'he ſhewed afterwards upon another occaſion, when he ſpared 'not others [or the reſt], perſons who ſeemed to be the moſt 'dear to him of any. The juſtice of their puniſhment abates 'our compaſſion for their ruin, but yet his cruelty was alike

[d] Και πενθος μεγα επ' αυτῳ προεθετο· πυθῳ Αντιπατρῳ και τοιγε επι Ρωμης πεπλευκοτι κακων εγενετο αρχη, της αδελφοκτονιας αυτον τιννυμενου του Θεου. κ. λ. Antiq. l. xvii. c. 3. § 3.

[e] Εν επιστασει δε, και πολλακις μεν ορμηθεντα πολλακις δε μελλησαντα, το τελευταιον δε υποστηναι και διαπραξασθαι, φονωσης και δυσμετακινητου ψυχης απο των χειρονων· εδηλωσε δε και τοις αυθις ουκ αποσχομενος ουδε των περιλοιπων οσους εδοκει φιλτατους, εφ' οις το μεν δικαιον ελαττον εποιει συμπαθεισθαι τους απολλυμενους, το δε ωμον ομοιον ην, τῳ μηδε εκεινων φεισαμενῳ· δειξιμεν δε υπερ αυτων εξης αφηγουμενοι. Ant. l. xvi. c. ult. ad fin.

'here

'here also, in that he spared not even them. But of these 'more in course by and by.'

This last piece of cruelty, I take to mean the execution made by Herod in his court, and which Josephus relates afterwards in the next book of these Antiquities. It cannot refer to the death of Antipater, because he is but one; nor to the design upon the chief men of Judea shut up in the Circus, because they had committed no offence, and that design was never executed; nor to the rabbies, because they do not appear to have ever been dear to Herod: but it must be the before-mentioned execution, of which I hope the reader has a clear idea. Then Herod put to death all of his own family, that adhered to the things said by the pharisees, and other persons, who appear to have been favourites with him. And it is observable, that as in that account Josephus is pleased to divert himself with those executions; so here also, even when he is aggravating the cruelty of Herod, he betrays the same good will toward those who then suffered under the rage of this inhuman tyrant.

It would be desirable here to settle exactly the time, when these two sons of Herod were put to death. Allix [f] places the council of Berytus, before which they were tried, and by which they were condemned, in the month of May, A. U. 749, about ten months before Herod died. But if Herod died in the spring, A. U. 750, as Allix supposes, this council is certainly placed by him too late. It is evident, from particulars insisted on in the objection, and since allowed, or mentioned by me, that it must have preceded the death of Herod above ten months. Moreover, Saturninus was one of this council, and if the first medal and the epoch above-mentioned be allowed, Saturninus was gone from Syria before Sept. 748. It may be however supposed, I think, that this council was not held long before the removal of Saturninus: and it is certain from the passage just transcribed, that the execution of the pharisees and others at Jerusalem, happened some considerable time after the death of Alexander and Aristobulus.

If any should object, that according to the account I have given of the oath or enrolment, that it was owing to the displeasure of Augustus against Herod; it cannot be placed so near the end of Herod's reign as I here suppose, but must have happened a considerable time before the removal of Saturninus; because Augustus appears to have been reconciled to Herod

[f] —Conventum Berytensem qui habitus est in causa Alexandri & Aristobuli Maio mense A. U. 749. ibid. p. 18. vid. etiam p. 13. & alibi.

before

before Saturninus left the province, and before the council at Berytus, in which Alexander and Ariſtobulus were condemned: I anſwer, that the enrolment is not placed by me too late at all. It might be reſolved upon by Auguſtus before, and yet not be executed till after Saturninus went away. And though Auguſtus might be in ſome meaſure pacified, yet he might think fit to have the aſſeſſment made. Beſides, though Joſephus ſays, that upon the applications which Nicolas of Damaſcus had made to Auguſtus at Rome, the emperor was reconciled to Herod; that Syllæus was ordered home, required to pay the money he owed, and give all proper ſatisfaction, and was[g] afterwards to be puniſhed: yet it is certain, that Syllæus did not give Herod, or any one elſe, ſatisfaction. And it may be from thence inferred, that Herod was not fully reinſtated in Auguſtus's favour, for then Syllæus would have been more ſubmiſſive. Joſephus, relating Antipater's voyage to Rome, of which we have made frequent mention, ſays: 'Syllæus the 'Arabian[h] alſo went thither at the ſame time, not having 'performed any of thoſe things which Cæſar enjoined: and 'Antipater accuſed him to Cæſar upon the ſame heads he had 'been before accuſed of by Nicolas.' From what has been ſaid concerning the time of Antipater's journey, it appears, that this accuſation muſt have been brought againſt Syllæus in the laſt year of Herod's life.

It is evident, that Herod's affairs were not in a good poſture at this time at Rome: if they had, Antipater could not have made the ſtate of them, and the ſervice he might do his father there, a pretence for his journey. Moreover, Antipater[i] charged Herod with a ſum of two hundred talents, laid out chiefly, as he pretended, in the cauſe againſt Syllæus, his father's great enemy. From all which it is reaſonable to conclude, that Nicolas had, in his hiſtory, out of regard to his maſter and himſelf, magnified the ſucceſs of his negociations at Rome. Nor can it be juſtly expected from an hiſtorian, that when he comes down to the affairs of his own time, he ſhould be perfectly indifferent toward thoſe in which he acted a part himſelf.

[g] Καὶ πέμπας εἰς τέλος κάλεσεν Καισαρ, ὡς ἡμῶν Συλλαιῳ καλέσαντων δικαίοι, Ἡρῳδῃ δ' διαλλαγῆσθαι.—τὸ δὲ συμπαν, ὁ μὲν Σύλλαιος ἀπεπεμπέλο, τας δίκας και τα χρήματα δεδαιεικόσιν ἀποδώσων εἶτα θῦ κολασθησόμενος. Ant. l. xvi. c. x. § 9.

[h] Συνέβαινε δὲ Λιλιπάτρῳ και Συλλαιος ὁ Ἀράψ, μηδεν ὧν προσέταξε Καισαρ διαπεπραγμένος· και Λιλιπάτρος αὐλὸς καλησόμενος ἐπι Καισαρος, περι ὧν πρόλερον Νικόλαος· ib. l. xvii. c. 3. § 2.

[i] Διακόσια γὰρ ἀναλώματος ἀνηνέγκε τάλαντα, και τέλων μέσιτη προφασις ἦν ἡ πρὸς Συλλαιον δίκη· De B. l. i. c. 32. § 2.

Having

Having now cleared the way, I would lay down two or three conclusions.

1. I apprehend it appears from what has been here offered, that there is no neceſſity of placing the birth of Jeſus above a year and ſix months before the death of Herod. If Herod died in March, A. U. 750, I ſhould be inclined to place the nativity of Jeſus in September or October, A. U. 748: if Herod died in March 751, then the nativity of Jeſus might very well be placed in September or October 749. As I am not able fully to determine the time of Herod's death, I ſhall for the future have ſome regard to both theſe dates of our Saviour's nativity.

2. The account that has been given above of the time of Saturninus's removal, and Varus's arrival in the province of Syria, does alſo incline us to one of theſe dates. It is not improbable, that the oath was taken, or the aſſeſſment made much about the ſame time that Varus came into Syria. And it is ſuppoſed by many learned men, that the Roman governors uſually came from Rome into theſe eaſtern provinces at the latter end of the ſummer. It is certain, that upon the removal of Archelaus, when Cyrenius came governor into Syria, there was an aſſeſſment made in Syria and Judea. I am the rather inclined to think this the time of the oath, becauſe Joſephus in his hiſtory does not relate when it was taken, but mentions it only upon occaſion of a diſturbance at Jeruſalem, which had a connexion with it. And it is obſervable, that he has ſaid nothing of Varus, nor of the concerns of Syria, till we hear of Varus being at Jeruſalem when Antipater returned home; but, if thoſe medals are to be relied on, Varus had now been a good while in Syria. There is therefore in Joſephus a long gap in the concerns of Syria, and alſo in the public concerns of Judea, from the council at Berytus to the execution at Jeruſalem: during this time of Joſephus's ſilence, I ſuppoſe the aſſeſſment was made. According to the firſt of the Antiochian medals, Varus came into Syria before Sept. 748; if this be ſuppoſed the moſt likely date of his government, and if it be alſo moſt probable that Herod died A. U. 750, theſe may ſtrongly diſpoſe us to place the nativity of Jeſus in September or October 748.

3. The latter part of the ſummer, or the autumn ſeaſon, ſeems to be the moſt likely time of the year for the birth of Jeſus; there is no particular reaſon to determine us to the 25th of December. The very depth of winter is not a very proper ſeaſon for a ſurvey and aſſeſſment, when people are to enter themſelves according to their tribes or families: the autumn, when

when harveſt and vintage are over, is a time of general leiſure. When Jeſus was born at Bethlehem, *there were in the ſame country ſhepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night*, Luke ii. 8. In ſome very mild climates ſheep may be abroad in the night time in December; but it is not very likely, they ſhould be ſo in thoſe countries where they muſt be attended by ſhepherds: this circumſtance is not very favourable to the ſuppoſition, that Jeſus was born the 25th of December, and we are at liberty to place it in autumn, a more likely ſeaſon.

It is not improbable then, that Jeſus might be born ſome time between the middle of Auguſt and the middle of November. Cyrenius, we may ſuppoſe, came into Judea at the time, or ſoon after the time, that Varus came governor into Syria, and publiſhed the decree of Auguſtus, requiring all people to enter themſelves, their dependents, and eſtates. Judea was a country of a narrow compaſs, and the aſſeſſment might very well be made in two or three months. Cyrenius coming into the country, and being a man of diſpatch in all his undertakings; being deſirous alſo to haſten to Rome to receive the honours decreed him for the victory over the Homonadenſes; being alſo concerned to ſet ſail before the bad weather came on, he appointed all people to enroll themſelves with all expedition within a certain limited time, which they did accordingly, ver. 3. *And all went to be taxed, every one in his own city.* The ſhort time appointed for this work may be fairly concluded from St. Luke's hiſtory of it. If the ſpace of time allotted for it had been of any conſiderable length, it cannot be thought but that Joſeph would have taken an opportunity to go to Bethlehem ſome while before the time of the virgin's delivery, or elſe have deferred the journey till that was over. There is not the leaſt hint, that this journey was taken juſt at this ſeaſon, in obedience to a divine admonition; it is given us as the pure reſult of obedience to this decree of Auguſtus.

We will now lay together a few events of this time, in the order in which it may be ſuppoſed they happened.

About a year and ſix or ſeven months before the death of Herod, ſoon after the arrival of Varus in the province of Syria, in Auguſt or September, A. U. 748, or 749, Julian year 40, or 41, Cyrenius [or ſome other perſon of eminence] came into Judea, an aſſeſſment was made there, and in the time of it, Jeſus was born at Bethlehem, in the month of September or October. After the term of forty days was expired, Jeſus was preſented in the temple at Jeruſalem, and Mary made her of-

fering according to the law. When theſe things were finiſhed, they went from Jeruſalem, and dwelt in ſome city of Judea, poſſibly at Bethlehem. In the year following, viz. A. U. 749, or 750, about the beginning of February, came *wiſe men from the eaſt to Jeruſalem, ſaying, Where is he that is born king of the Jews?* they being guided by the ſtar, which they *had ſeen in the eaſt, went and worſhipped him.* After their departure, the virgin and the child Jeſus being now fit for travelling, Joſeph was admoniſhed by *an angel, to take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt*; which he did. Herod ſoon perceiving from the wiſe men's not returning to him, that he had been *mocked* by them, and being much enraged thereat, *ſent forth and ſlew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coaſts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently enquired of the wiſe men.* He alſo put to death at the ſame time divers phariſees, and other perſons at Jeruſalem, ſome of his own family and attendants; who, being before in expectation of the coming of a great prince, who was to riſe up from among them, and by the arrival of the wiſe men had been confirmed in the belief that this event was now at hand, expreſſed themſelves in terms, which Herod and his ſon Antipater and their flatterers termed ſeditious. Immediately after theſe executions, Pheroras's wife was called to an account alſo, as being ſuppoſed to have entertained the ſame principles with theſe phariſees; to whom ſhe had lately ſhewn great favour, in paying the fine impoſed upon them for not entering themſelves, nor taking the appointed oath in the time of the fore-mentioned aſſeſſment. Pheroras not ſubmitting to the orders given him by Herod in council to put away his wife, Herod and Pheroras fell out; hereupon, in the latter end of February, or beginning of March, the ſame year, Pheroras retires with his wife to his tetrarchy. And Antipater having before this, by various practices, and particularly by [k] letters procured from Rome, diſpoſed his father to conſent to his making a journey into Italy; and ſuppoſing, that by the execution now juſt over, all turbulent ſpirits had been awed, and that peace and quiet might enſue, ſet ſail for

k The account of Antipater's ſending letters and preſents to Rome is Antiq. lib. xvii. c. 1. § 1. of Herod's laſt quarrel with Pheroras, his forbidding Antipater to converſe with Pheroras, or his wife; of Antipater's journey to Rome, and Pheroras's retirement, is ibid. c. 3. In the War, [lib. i. c. 29. § 2.] Antipater's letters to Rome, and his journey, are mentioned together: but as his journey is here alſo repreſented, as the effect of advice brought from Rome, it is ſuppoſed that theſe letters were ſent by him ſome time before. And Pheroras's retirement is the thing next mentioned.

Rome,

Rome. In the latter end of April, or the beginning of May following, Pheroras dies, is brought to Jeruſalem and buried: no ſooner is the mourning for him over, but his ſervants apply to Herod to make enquiry into the cauſes of his death; and now in the middle of May, or ſoon after, the examinations into this matter began: and though Antipater was ſailed from Judea for Rome, and got at a diſtance from the place in which juſtice ought to be executed on him, and therefore, according to the ordinary courſe of things, it might have been ſuppoſed he was in ſafety; yet from this time the divine vengeance began to prepare itſelf againſt him, till at laſt it fell upon him for all his horrid crimes. The evidence was at firſt obſcure and imperfect, but opened continually more and more: Herod, in his letters to Antipater, diſſembled his reſentments, but earneſtly preſſed his return to Judea. About the middle of December, ſeven months after the firſt enquiry into the cauſe of Pheroras's death, Antipater arrived at Jeruſalem: and is tried before Herod, and Varus preſident of Syria, and condemned to death. Herod however, not daring to proceed to execute the ſentence without expreſs leave from Auguſtus, ſent ambaſſadors to Rome with a full account of what had paſſed; and ſoon after a ſecond embaſſy, new evidence having been found after the departure of the former. Theſe laſt ambaſſadors return to Judea, with full power from Auguſtus, about the middle of March, A. U. 750, or 751; ſoon after which Antipater was executed, and in five days after Herod himſelf died, about a year and five or ſix months after the birth of Jeſus.

Upon the whole, I preſume it appears, we lie under no neceſſity of dating the birth of Jeſus before the latter end of the year of Rome 748, or 749. We hereby in part abate the objection, as ſtated above; but ſtill we have before us undoubtedly a very great difficulty: we will now enquire, what can be ſaid to it.

§ II. 1. When St. Luke ſays, *Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius,—the word of God came unto John*; he may intend ſome computation of the reign of Tiberius, different from that of his ſole empire after the death of Auguſtus. It is no unuſual thing, for the reigns of princes to be computed from ſeveral dates. There were two computations of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. For, as Prideaux obſerves, 'Nabopolaſſer, king of Babylon, being old and infirm, took his ſon 'Nebuchadnezzar into partnerſhip in the empire, and ſent 'him with an army into thoſe parts [Syria and Paleſtine]. 'And from hence the Jewiſh computation of the years of

'Nebuchadnezzar's reign begins.—But, according to the 'Babylonians, his reign is not reckoned to begin till after his 'father's death, which happened two years afterwards. And 'both computations being found in ſcripture, it is neceſſary to 'ſay ſo much here for the reconciling of them[l].' And there were two or three ways of computing the reign of[m] Cyrus.

But to come nearer to our time; there were many computations of the reign of[n] Auguſtus. Some computed the beginning of his reign from the year in which Julius Cæſar was killed; as[o] Joſephus, who ſays, Auguſtus reigned fifty-ſeven years ſix months and odd days. Some from the year after, and reckoned his reign fifty-ſix years; others computed from the year in which the victory was obtained at[p] Actium, and ſay, he reigned forty-four years; others from the year after, as Ptolemy in his canon, and St. Clement[q] of Alexandria, and give him only forty-three years. And Herod reigned thirty-four years from the death of Antigonus, thirty-ſeven from the time he was declared king of Judea by the[r] Roman ſenate.

2. There ſeems to be very good reaſon to conclude, from divers paſſages of the Roman hiſtorians, and the moſt ancient chriſtian writers, that there were two different computations of the beginning of Tiberius's reign; one from the time he was made colleague with Auguſtus, and the other from his ſole empire after the death of Auguſtus.

Several very learned men and very eminent chronologers[s] are of opinion, that St. Luke intends the former of theſe two computations. I ſhall give a brief account of the grounds there are for this ſuppoſition, taken chiefly from Pagi; who appears to have beſtowed a great deal of pains upon this argument, and muſt be allowed to have treated it with great accuracy and judgment.

(1.) That Auguſtus did in part lay aſide government ſome time before he died, may be inferred from the words of an uncertain author of a panegyric, in which, in the name of the city of Rome, he diſſuades Maximianus Herculeus from reſigning the empire. 'Is it fit,' ſays he, 'that you ſhould now

l Conn. Part 1. p. 60. m Marſhall's Treatiſe of the 70 Weeks, p. 44.

n Vid. Petav. Rationarium Temp. Par. 2. l. 3. c. 15. Pagi, Appar. n. 66—73, 103, 114. o Antiq. l. xviii. c. 2. § 2. De Bell. l. ii. c. 9. § 1. p Atque ab eo tempore exercitibus comparatis, primum cum M. Antonio. Marcoque Lepido, dein tantum cum Antonio per duodecim fere annos, noviſſime per quatuor & quadraginta ſolus rempublicam tenuit. Sueton. in Auguſt. c. 8. vid. Dio. l. li. q Strom. p. 339. A. Edit. Pariſ. r Joſeph de B. l. i. c. ult. § 8. Antiq. l. xvii. c. 8. § 1.

s Herwaertus in nova & vera chronologia c. 248. Uſſer. Ann. A. M. 4015. Joann. Cleric. Diſſertatio de Ann. vitæ Chriſti. Prideaux Conn. Part ii. Book ix. A. D. xii. Pagi Critic. in Baron. A. Chr. 11. 71. 117. 147.

'give

'give yourself a discharge, and do that so soon, which Au-'gustus did not do till after the seventieth year of his age, 'and the fiftieth of [t] his reign?'

(2.) Several of the Roman historians have expresly mentioned Tiberius's being taken into partnership in the government with Augustus.

Velleius Paterculus, who lived in the reigns of these two emperors; says, 'that at the desire of Augustus there was a 'law passed by the senate and people of Rome, that Tiberius 'might have equal power with him in all the provinces and [u] 'armies.' Suetonius says; 'There was a law made, that Ti-'berius should govern the provinces jointly with Augustus, 'and make the census with [x] him.' Tacitus says; 'That Ti-'berius was made colleague in the empire (with Augustus), 'taken into partnership in the tribunician power, and recom-'mended [y] to all the armies.' And there are in this last mentioned [z] historian frequent references to Tiberius's partnership in the empire with Augustus.

I must be allowed to be particular in the account of some things said by Dio. In his history of the affairs, A. U. 765. A. D. 12. he says: 'Augustus [a] now advanced in years, re-'commended in a writing Germanicus to the senate, and the 'senate to Tiberius. He did not however read the writing 'himself, (not being able,) but Germanicus, as he had been 'wont to do.—But yet he did not lay aside the care of the 'public.'—Under the next year, A. U. 766. A. D. 13. the same

[t] Quo usque hoc Maximiane, patiar, me quasi, te quiescere, mihi libertatem adimi, te usurpare tibi illicitam missionem? An quod Divo Augusto post septuaginta ætatis, quinquaginta imperii, non licuit annos, tam cito licuit tibi? Panegyr. cap. 11. laudat. à Pagio. Critic. A. Ch. 11. n. iii.

[u] Cum res Galliarum maximæ molis, accensasque plebis Viennensium dissensiones, coercitione magis quam pœnâ mollisset, & Senatus Populusque Rom. (postulante patre ejus ut æquum ei jus in omnibus provinciis exercitibusque esset, quam erat ipsi, decreto complexus esset.—In urbem reversus, jampridem debitum, sed continuatione bellorum dilatum, ex Pannoniis Dalmatiisque egit triumphum.) Vellei. lib. ii. c. 121.

[x] A Germania in urbem post biennium regressus, triumphum quem distulerat egit. —Dedicavit & Concordiæ ædem: item Pollucis & Castoris, suo fratrisque nomine, de manubiis. Ac non multo post lege per Coss. lata, ut provincias cum Augusto communiter administraret, simulque censum ageret, condito lustro in Illyricum profectus est. Suet. in Tiber. cap. 20, 21.

[y] Drusoque pridem extincto, Nero solus è privignis erat: illic cuncta vergere: filius, collega imperii, consors tribunitiæ potestatis adsumitur, omnisque per exercitus ostentatur. Tacit. An. lib. i. cap. 3.

[z] Etenim Augustus, paucis ante annis, cum Tiberio Tribuniciam potestatum A PATRIBUS RURSUM postularet, &c. id. ibid. c. 10. Versæ inde ad Tiberium preces. Et ille variè disserebat, de magnitudine imperii, sua modestia: solam Divi Augusti mentem tantæ molis capacem: se in PARTEM CURARUM VOCATUM, experiendo didicisse, quam arduum,—regendi cuncta onus. Ibid. c. 11.

[a] Ο δε δη Αυγουστος εκεινον τε, ως και επι γηρως ων, τη βουλη, και ταυτην τῳ Τιβεριῳ παρακατεθετο· ανεγνω δε το βιβλιον ουκ αυτος (ου γαρ οιος τε ην γεγωνισκειν) αλλ' ο Γερμανικος, ωσπερ ειωθει·——ου μεντοι και ταλλα ηττον τι παρα τουτο διωκει. Dio. l. lvi. p. 587. B. C.

historian says: 'Augustus then accepted [b] for the fifth time, 'though unwillingly, the government of the state for ten 'years, and renewed also the tribunician power to Tiberius.' He says also, 'That Augustus, [c] on account of his great age, '(which likewise hindered his coming to the senate, except 'very rarely,) desired he might have twenty annual counsel-'lors.—And a decree was passed, that whatever was enacted in 'council by him, together with Tiberius, and those said 'counsellors, and the consuls in being, and the consuls elect, 'and his grandsons adopted by him, and any others, whom 'he should call to his council, should be ratified, and deemed 'of the same authority, as if enacted by the authority of the 'whole senate.' This mention of Tiberius, and of him only by name, in this decree of the senate, next after Augustus, appears to me remarkable. I do not observe, that any of these passages of Dio have been quoted by Pagi; for what reason he omitted them I do not know. He has however insisted upon another passage of this historian, taken from the preceding year, A. U. 764. A. D. 11. but his argument from it seems to me to be founded upon a forced and arbitrary construction of Dio; and therefore I content myself with referring the reader for it to [d] him, and [e] Mr. Le Clerc, who also lays a stress upon it.

Once more, Dio says, 'that upon the death of Augustus, 'Tiberius immediately [f] sent away letters from Nola to the 'armies and all the provinces as emperor; but yet did not 'call himself so, though that, with other titles, had been 'given him by a decree.'

(3.) There is a particular fact related of Tiberius by several historians, said to be done by him when prince, which yet must have been done before Augustus died. Pliny says, that Tiberius was much given to drinking: 'And that it was thought, 'that for this reason Lucius Piso had been chosen by him to 'be præfect of Rome, because he had continued two days and 'two nights drinking with him, [g] when prince.' Suetonius

[b] Την τε προςασιαν των κοινων την δεκετιν, την πεμπτην ακων δη ο Αυγουςος ελαβε, και τῳ Τιβεριῳ την εξουσιαν την δημαρχικην αυθις εδωκε. Ibid. p. 588. B. [c] Και συμβουλους, υπο του γηρως (υφ' ουπερ ουδε ες το βουλευτηριον ετι, πλην σπανιωτατα, συνεφοιτα) εικοσιν ετησιους ητησατο——και προσεψηφισθη, πανθ' οσα αν αυτῳ μετα τε του Τιβεριου και μετ' εκεινων, των τε αει υπατευοντων, και των ες τουτο αποδεδειγμενων, των τε εγγονων αυτου των ποιητων δηλονοτι, των τε αλλων οσους αν εκαςοτε προσπαραλαβη, βουλευομενῳ δοξῃ, κυρια, ως και παση τη γερουσια αρεσαντα, ειναι. Ib. C. D.

[d] A. C. 11. n. 13, 14, 15. [e] Ubi supra. [f] Τοιουτος ουν δη τις ων, ες τα ςρατοπεδα και ες τα εθνη, παντα, ως Αυτοκρατωρ, ευθυς απο της Νωλης επεςειλε, μη λεγων αυτοκρατωρ ειναι· ψηφισθεν γαρ αυτῳ και μετα των αλλων ονοματων, ουκ εδεξατο. Dio. l. lvii. p. 602. D. [g] —Tribus congiis (unde & cognomen illi fuit,)

says;

ſays; 'That Tiberius, in his firſt campaigns, was much re-
'flected on for his exceſs in drinking; and that afterwards,
'when prince, in the very time of the correction of the pub-
'lic manners, he ſpent a night and two days in eating and
'drinking with Pomponius Flaccus and Lucius Piſo; to the
'former of which he gave immediately the province of Syria,
'and to the other the præfecture of the city[h].'

It may be worth while to obſerve with Pagi, that theſe two writers, who tell us the ſtory of this drunken bout of Tiberius, and the conſequences of it, ſeem not to have had their accounts from one and the ſame ſource. They differ from each other in two or three particulars: one ſays, that this piece of exceſs laſted 'two days and two nights;' the other, 'one night and 'two days.' Pliny mentions only the preferment of Piſo, Suetonius adds that of Flaccus alſo; but they both agree in ſaying, that Tiberius was 'then prince, and Suetonius adds a very particular circumſtance as to the time, that it was during the correction of the public manners; which may very naturally lead us to what he had ſaid of the law paſſed, that Tiberius ſhould govern the provinces jointly with Auguſtus, and make the cenſus with him, one part of which at Rome was the correction of manners.

But we muſt inquire ſomewhat more particularly into the time of this act of intemperance: it may be eaſily inferred from Tacitus, who relating the affairs of the year in which Domitius Ænobarbus and M. Furius Camillus were conſuls, ſc. A.U. 785. A.D. 32. ſays: 'Then Piſo had the honour of a public funeral by 'decree of the ſenate, having behaved in his office to general 'ſatisfaction for [i] twenty years.' If we go back twenty years, we are brought to the 12th year of the chriſtian æra, and the 765th of the city, in which year, according to Tacitus, Piſo muſt have been præfect of Rome, which is two years before the death of Auguſtus.

There are however ſome objections to this ſtory, which muſt be conſidered before we leave it. Several[k] learned men would

epotis uno impetu, ſpectante miraculi gratia Tib. principe, in ſenecta jam ſevero atque etiam ſævo aliis, ſed ipſa juventa ad merum pronior fuerat: eaque commendatione credidere L. Piſonem urbis Romæ curæ ab eo delectum, quod biduo duabuſque noctibus perpotationem continuaſſet apud ipſum jam PRINCIPEM. Plin. Nat. Hiſt. lib. xiv. c. 22. [h] In caſtris tiro etiam tum, propter nimiam vini aviditatem pro Claudio Caldius, pro Nerone Mero vocabatur. Poſtea PRINCEPS in ipſa publicorum morum correctione cum Pomponio Flacco & L. Piſone noctem continuumque biduum epulando potandoque conſumpſit: quorum alteri Syriam provinciam, alteri præfecturam urbis confeſtim detulit. Suet. in Tib. cap. 42. [i] Dein Piſo viginti per annos pariter probatus, publico funere ex decreto Senatus celebratus eſt. Tacit. Ann. l. vi. cap. 11. [k] Lipſius in loc. Noriſ. Cenot. Piſ. Diſſ. ii. p. 324.

read in Tacitus X. instead of XX. but to this Pagi's reply is sufficient, that this emendation is without the authority of any manuscripts. It is likewise objected, that Pomponius Flaccus was not præfect of Syria till long after the year of the city 765; consequently, neither was Piso then made præfect[l] of Rome. Dr. Pagi[m] allows very readily, that Pomponius did not at this time go præfect into Syria; but then he gives several instances of men who have been nominated governors of provinces, who yet never went into them; one is Ælius Lamia, who by this very same emperor had been nominated præfect of the same province likewise, namely of Syria, but yet never went thither. The fact is taken notice of by[n] Tacitus, and Dio[o]; which last observes, that this was a common practice with Tiberius. Tacitus has mentioned another like instance in the reign of Nero[p].

Another objection against Piso's being made præfect of the city, A. U. 765, is this: Suetonius says, that this excess of Tiberius was committed during the public correction of manners; by which he has been supposed to refer to Tiberius's being made censor with Augustus. But cardinal Noris objects, that the census was not made by Augustus, A. U. 765, but 767; and[q] he is of opinion, that the 'public correction of 'manners,' which Suetonius here speaks of, intends the edicts which Tiberius published against luxury, A. U. 775. For my own part, I cannot see, but that the words of Suetonius may very well refer to the time in which Tiberius was decreed censor with Augustus, which might be done, A. U. 765; though the census was not made, or at least not finished, till the year 767.

But that this 'correction of manners,' which Suetonius here speaks of, is not that which he has himself mentioned in another[r] place, and which Tacitus says was made, A. U. 775[s],

[l] Sed hoc amplius ex Suetonio colliges, factum Pisonem præfectum, sub idem tempus quo Pomponius Syriæ prætor. Ille autem Syriæ non ante annum 773 præponi potuit: (Mæsiam enim provinciam administrabat, A. 772. uti ex Tacit. lib. ii. clarum:) non ergo tot annos Piso præfectus urbi. Lipsius ubi supra. vid. etiam Norisium ibid. [m] A Chr. 11. n. v.

[n] Extremo anni [A. U. 786. A. D. 33.] Mors Ælii Lamiæ funere censorio celebrata, qui administrandæ Suriæ imagine tandem exsolutus, urbi præfuerat. Tacit. Ann. l. vi. c. 27. [o] Τοῦ Πείσωνα τον πολιαρχον τελεῦτησαντα δημοσια ταφη ἐθαψε, και Λούκιον (legendum Λαμιον, id est, Lamiam) ἐπ' αὐτῶ ταμιαν ἀνθ' ἐλεο, ον προπαλαι τη ἐρωμη (legendum Συρια. Muretus in Tacit. Ann. vi.) προσαξας κατειχεν ἐν Ρωμη. ἐκεῖνο δὲ και ἐφ' ἑτερων πολλων ἐποιει, ἐργῳ μεν, μηδενος αὐτῶν δεομενος, λογῳ δὲ ὃν, τιμαν αὐτῶς προσποιουμενος. Dio. l. lviii. p. 633. D. [p] Syria P. Antcio destinata, & variis mox artibus elusus, ad postremum in urbe retentus est. Tacit. Ann. l. 13. cap. 22. [q] Sed Suetonius si censorem Tiberium significaret, annum U. C. 767. designasset, quo ipsa publicorum morum correctio a censoribus peracta est. Itaque designat tempus, quo Tiberius publicis edictis urbano luxui modum ponebat, A. U. 775. ibid. p. 324. vid. eund. p. 329. [r] In Tib. cap. 34.

[s] Caius Sulpicius, D. Haterius consules

may be made evident from two or three paſſages, not particularly inſiſted on by Pagi. Seneca ſays, that Tiberius gave ſecret directions of importance to Piſo, when he went into Campania, at which time there were divers uneaſineſſes and diſcontents in the city [t]. This journey of Tiberius was made in the beginning of the year before that, in which the edicts were publiſhed for the ſuppreſſing of luxury, namely, in the year of the city 774, as appears from Tacitus [u]. It is plain therefore, that Piſo was præfect of Rome in 774, and in the very beginning of it; and it may be ſuppoſed, that Tiberius had had conſiderable experience of Piſo's fidelity and ability in that poſt before that, ſince he relied upon him in a very critical conjuncture.

Cardinal Noris objects [x] farther: It is true Tiberius had proconſular power in the provinces two years before Auguſtus's death; all the authority he had in the city was owing to his tribunician power, but that included only a right of interceding or forbidding, but could not give the power of appointing a præfect.

I think it is undoubted, that Tiberius might call the ſenate by virtue of the tribunician power [y], and it is likely do ſeveral other things: but there is no need of contending about this point. Perhaps Tiberius did not nominate and appoint Piſo præfect of the city; he might however recommend him ſo effectually to Auguſtus, his colleague, that he might appoint him. Pagi obſerves, that Pliny, ſpeaking of this matter, uſes the word chooſing, not appointing [z].

I imagine, that this fact is now cleared up and vindicated againſt the ſeveral objections which have been made to it; and that Piſo was appointed or choſen to be præfect of the city of Rome by Tiberius, 'then prince,' two years before the death of Auguſtus, namely, in A. U. 765.

ſequuntur. Inturbidus externis rebus annus, domi ſuſpecta ſeveritate adverſum luxum. Ann. lib. iii. c. 52. [t] L. Piſo, urbis cuſtos, ebrius, ex quo ſemel factus eſt, fuit, majorem partem noctis in convivio exigebat: uſque in horam ſextam fere dormiebat: hoc erat ejus matutinum. Officium tamen ſuum, quo tutela urbis continebatur, diligentiſſime adminiſtravit. Huic & Divus Auguſtus dedit ſecreta mandata, cum illum præponeret Thraciæ, quam perdomuit, & Tiberius proficiſcens in Campaniam, cum multa in urbe & ſuſpecta relinqueret & inviſa. Seneca ep. 83. [u] Sequitur Tiberii Quartus, Druſi ſecundus conſulatus, ejus anni principio Tiberius, quaſi firmandæ valetudini, in Campaniam conceſſit: longam & continuam abſentiam paulatim meditans. Tacit. Ann. lib. iii. cap. 31. [x] His accedit, Tiberium in provinciis biennio ante mortem Auguſti imperium obtinuiſſe; intra urbem verò non habuiſſe, niſi jus intercedendi ob tribuniciam poteſtatem. Quare unus Auguſtus Urbis præfecti deſignandi poteſtatem habebat. Noriſ. ibid. p. 324. [y] Vid. Uſſer. Ann. A. M. 4015, & 4017. [z] Eâque commendatione credidere L. Piſonem Urbis Romæ curæ ab eo delectum. Vid. Pagi Critic. ad An. Ch. 11. n. 4.

But

But before I quite leave this story, I would strengthen the argument founded upon it by a remark or two upon the title of prince, given here to Tiberius by Pliny and Suetonius.

It is well known, that prince was the soft title which Augustus chose, rather than that of [a] king or dictator. This title therefore, when used absolutely, is equivalent to emperor; and Dio says, that Tiberius had the title of emperor given him by a decree before Augustus died, as has been observed already. Moreover this title of emperor is frequently given by Roman and Greek authors to Titus and Trajan, on account of their tribunician and proconsular power which they enjoyed, the former in the life-time of his father Vespasian, the latter of Nerva. Pagi thinks, this title of emperor which was given to these colleagues in the empire, was founded particularly on the perpetual proconsular power in all the provinces [b]. But, however that be, it is certain, they are often called emperors. Josephus, in his description of Vespasian's and Titus's triumph at Rome, after the Jewish war, says, That the [c] emperors lodged the night before near the temple of Isis. Pliny the elder, in his dedication of his Natural History to Titus, written before the death of Vespasian, calls Titus emperor [d] more than once. Philostratus says, that Titus was declared emperor at Rome, and admitted to equal power in the government [e] with his father. It is in vain therefore to say, that Titus was called emperor in his father's life-time, purely on account of his having been saluted emperor by his soldiers in the camp, or in the sense in which this word was used under the commonwealth; since Philostratus says, he was declared emperor at Rome: moreover Capitolinus [f] calls Vespasian and Titus princes without any distinction. All these passages thus laid together may satisfy us, that prince and emperor are equivalent in these writers; and that Tiberius had a right to the title of prince,

[a] Qui cuncta discordiis civilibus fessa, nomine PRINCIPIS sub imperium accepit. Tacit. Ann. lib. i. cap. 1. Non regno tamen, neque dictatura, sed PRINCIPIS nomine constitutam rempublicam. Id. ibid. c. 9.

[b] Titus enim, quemadmodum & ante eum Tiberius, ac post eum Trajanus, imperii Collega fuit, ideoque imperatoris titulo exornatus. Imperii collegæ Tribunicia potestate, & imperio proconsulari donabantur, ratione cujus imperatores nuncupati. Pagi A. D. 71. n. 3. in Crit. ad Bar.

[c] Εκει γαρ ανεπαυοντο της νυκτος εκεινης οι αυτοκρατορες. Joseph. de Bell. lib. vii. cap. 5. p. 1305. v. 2.

[d] Jucundissime Imperator——Sciantque omnes quam ex æquo tecum vivat imperium. Triumphalis & Censorius tu, sexiesque consul, ac Tribuniciæ potestatis particeps. Plin. in Præfat.

[e] Αναρρηθεις και Αυτοκρατωρ εν τη Ρομη, και αριστειων αξιωθεις τουτων, απηει μεν ισομοιρησων της αρχης τω πατρι. κ. τ. λ. Cumque imperator Romæ esset appellatus, omnibus ornatus dignitatibus. Romam iter ingressus, ut patris collega fieret. Philost. vit. Apollonii lib. vi. cap. 30. p. 269. Lipsiæ, 1709.

[f] Avus Annius Rufus, item Consul & præfectus urbi adscitus in patricios a PRINCIPIBUS Vespasiano & Tito censoribus. In Marc. Antonin. Philos.

even

even during the life-time of Auguſtus, after he was made his colleague in the empire. I ſhall refer the reader to but one paſſage more, in which Pliny the younger aſſures us, that Trajan was declared emperor[g] by Nerva in his life-time: and it ſeems very ſtrongly to ſupport Pagi's opinion, that the title of emperor given to theſe colleagues was founded rather on their proconſular empire than their tribunician power.

(4.) There are two or three verſes of Dionyſius the geographer, which Pagi eſteems a very remarkable teſtimony to the proconſular empire of Tiberius[h]. It appears from the two laſt of theſe verſes, that in Dionyſius's time Rome was governed by more than one prince. It has been queſtioned indeed when Dionyſius lived, and who are thoſe princes he ſpeaks of; ſome have thought they were the two Antonines, others have thought he intended Severus, Caracalla and Geta. Cardinal[i] Noris, I think, hath put it beyond all doubt, by a paſſage alleged from[k] Pliny, that Dionyſius lived in the time of Auguſtus: the cardinal indeed ſuppoſes, that the princes here referred to are Caius and Lucius Cæſar, Auguſtus's adopted ſons. Pagi ſeems to me to have ſhewn, that the title of ἀνακτες cannot belong to them; and that Auguſtus and Tiberius are the princes which Dionyſius means: but for the particulars I muſt refer the reader to Pagi himſelf[l].

(5.) There were two different computations of Tiberius's reign in the time of St. Clement of Alexandria: for having firſt ſaid, that Auguſtus reigned forty-three years, and Tiberius twenty-two[m], he adds: 'But ſome reckon the reigns of 'the Roman emperors thus.—Auguſtus reigned forty-ſix years 'four months and one day. Then Tiberius, twenty-ſix years, 'ſix months, nineteen days[n].'

[g] Simul filius, ſimul Cæſar, mox IMPERATOR, & cenſors Tribuniciæ poteſtatis, & omnia pariter & ſtatim factus es, quæ proximè parens verus tantum in alterum filium contulit. Plin. Paneg. c. 8.

[h] Ἐκ διος Αυσονιης αει μεγα κοιρανεοντες, v. 78.
A Jove Auſonii ſemper longe lateque dominantes.
Ῥωμην τιμησεσαν, εμων μεγαν οικον ανακτων, 355
Μιξερα πασαων πολιων, αφνειον εδεθλον. 356
De amne Tiberi loquitur; aitque, Qui amabilem ſecat in duas partes Romam, Romam honorabilem: meorum magnam domum Principum vel Dominorum. Dionyſ. orbis deſcript.

[i] Cenot. Piſ. Diſſ. 2. p. 193.

[k] Hoc in loco [Arabia nempe] genitum eſſe Dionyſium, terrarum orbis ſitus recentiſſimum auctorem, quem ad commentanda omnia in orientem præmiſit Divus Auguſtus, ituro in Armeniam ad Parthicas Arabicaſque res majore filio. Plin. Hiſt. Nat. lib. vi. cap. 27.

[l] Critica in Baron. A. D. 11. n. 6, 7.

[m] Αυγυστος, ἐτη τεσσαρακονθα τρια· Τιβεριος, ἐτη κϛ. Clem. Strom. l. i. p. 339. A Pariſiis 1629.

[n] Τινες μεν τοι τους χρονους των Ρωμαικων βασιλεων ὡδε αναγραφουσι.—— Αυγυστος εβασιλευσεν ἐτη μϛ, μηνας δ, ημεραν μιαν. Επειτα Τιβεριος, ἐτη κϛ, μηνας ϛ, ημερας ιθ. Id. ib. C.

Having

Having laid before the reader the chief arguments that have been produced for the proconsular, or joint empire of Tiberius with Augustus, I will consider also some of the objections which there are against this opinion.

1. It is objected, that Spartian says, that Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus[o] were the two first Augusti that governed the Roman empire together. But to this it is answered, that none of the patrons of this opinion ever said, that Tiberius had the title of Augustus whilst Augustus lived, but only that he was colleague with him in the empire. These words of Spartian are no more an objection against Tiberius's proconsular empire, than they are against Titus's and Trajan's; who certainly enjoyed this honour, the one with his father Vespasian, and the other with Nerva.

Nor indeed did the title of Augustus give any new power; it was only a title of honour[p], which sort of titles were usually taken gradually. Tiberius ever refused that of father of his country, and would not permit that of Augustus to be given him by any decree, though he accepted of it from some persons, and made use of it himself in letters to[q] foreign princes. And Dio takes notice of it as a singularity in Caligula, that in one day he accepted all those titles which Augustus had received throughout his long reign, and had suffered to be given him only one by one, (some of which Tiberius never would accept of,) except only that of father of his country, which he took upon him also in a short time after[r].

2dly, It is objected: If Tiberius had been made colleague in the empire with Augustus, there could have been no reason for those fears about the succession of Tiberius which Livia shewed upon the death[s] of Augustus; nor would Tiberius have hesitated to accept the empire when offered to him by the senate: or indeed, what occasion could there have been for any new investiture at all?

But to this, I think, it is easy to answer; that it is no surprising thing that Livia should be under some pain, when the settlement of her son in the empire was at stake. Though

o Hi sunt quo postea duo pariter Augusti, primi rempublicam gubernaverunt. Spartian. in Hadrian. cap. 24. Vid. Eutrop. lib. viii. c. 9. & Capitolin. in Marc. c. 7.

p Vid. Dio. lib. liii. p. 507.

q Το τε τȣ πατρος της πατριδος προσρημα παντελως διεωσατω, και το τȣ Αυγȣστȣ ȣκ επεθετο μεν (ȣδε γαρ ψηφισθηναι ποτε ειασε) λεγομενον δ' ακȣων, και γραφομενον αναγινωσκων, εφερε· και οσακις γε βασιλευσι τισιν επεστελλε, και εκεινο προσενεγραφε. Dio. lib. lvii. p. 607. A.

r Ωστε παντα οσα ο Αυγȣστος εν τοσȣτῳ της αρχης χρονω μολις και καθ' εν εκαστον ψηφισθεντα οι εδεξατο (ων ενια Τιβεριος ȣδ' ολως προσηκατο) εν μιᾳ ημερᾳ λαβειν. κ. τ. λ. Dio lib. lix. p. 641. D.

s Acribus namque custodiis domum, & vias sepserat Livia. Tacit. Ann. lib. i. cap. 5.

Tiberius

Tiberius had been partner in the empire, yet certainly the death of Auguſtus made a great change. Germanicus was very popular, and at the head of a numerous army [t]: and as for Tiberius's heſitation, he had been hitherto but partner in the empire, and ſome kind of new inveſtiture was needful. It is true, he carried his diſſimulation very far; but Auguſtus himſelf never renewed a freſh term of government, (which he did ſeveral ſeveral times,) but with much difficulty; and not till he had been overcome by importunity, and the conſideration of the neceſſity of affairs.

However, this diſſimulation of Tiberius has afforded a new proof, that he had been colleague with Auguſtus: for, as Tacitus and Dio intimate very plainly the fears which Tiberius had of Germanicus, ſo Suetonius in particular ſays: 'He pre-'tended a bad ſtate of health, that Germanicus might enter-'tain hopes of a ſpeedy ſucceſſion, or at leaſt [u] a partnerſhip 'in the empire.' But ſuch an expectation had been ridiculous in Germanicus, and this pretence of Tiberius could never have had the effect he deſigned, if no one had been partner in the empire before.

3. But the chief objection againſt the ſuppoſition, that St. Luke has computed the reign of Tiberius from the time of his proconſular empire, ſeems to be this; That it does not appear that any writers have computed the reign of thoſe who were colleagues in the empire by the epoch of their proconſular empire, and that in particular there are no traces of this computation of Tiberius's reign [x].

To this I anſwer: There is reaſon to think, that people did often compute according to the epoch of the proconſular empire. Pagi mentions a medal which has this inſcription: 'In 'the xi. new ſacred year of the emperor Titus Cæſar [y] Veſ-'paſian Auguſtus.' Now Titus reigned alone after his father's death but a little above two years.

It will not be expected, I ſhould here attempt to explain the meaning of the epoch of the 'new ſacred year.' All that I

[t] Tacit. Ann. lib. i. cap. 33—35. Dio lib. lvii. p. 803. [u] Simulavit & valetudinem, quo æquiore animo Germanicus celerem ſucceſſionem vel certè ſocietatem principatus operiretur. Suet. in Tiber. cap. 25. [x] Eſt autem inauditum in omni memoria, Titi annos ab alio initio fuiſſe deductos quam a morte Veſpaſiani. S. Baſnage Annal. Pol. Eccleſ. A. D. 11. n. iv. [y] Sic in numno Græco apud Occonem p. 166. legitur ΑΥΤ. ΤΙΤΟΥ. ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ. ΟΥΕΣΠΑΣΙΑΝΟΥ. ΣΕΒ. ΕΤΟΥΣ, ΙΕΡΟΥ. ΙΑ. id eſt, Imperatoris Titi Cæſaris Veſpaſiani Auguſti anno novo Sacro xi. Quo ex Titi nummo manifeſte apparet, deceptos viros eruditos qui negant annos Tiberii, Titi, aliorumque Imperii Collegarum numeratos fuiſſe. Hæc porro epocha non niſi in Veſpaſiani, Titi, Domitiani & Nervæ nummis occurrit. Pagi Crit. in Baron. A. D. 81. n. iii.

ſhall

shall observe is, that it appears not to have been used upon the coins of any emperors beside those of Vespasian, Titus, Domitian and Nerva: and that it does not begin at any one common period, such as the building or dedication of any one particular temple, but that the numbers answer exactly to the years of the several emperors on whose coins it is found[z]. And Pagi is of opinion, that it was an epoch chiefly used by the people of Syria and Egypt, because the epithet 'sacred' is more common upon their coins than any others[a].

And I cannot but think, that there were for some time different computations of the length of Nerva's and Trajan's reigns; and that they were owing to this, that Trajan was for some time Nerva's colleague in the empire. Mr. Dodwell[b] was of opinion, that Nerva did actually resign the empire to Trajan before his death: and so [c] Aurelius Victor, and [d] Lactantius seem to say. I think indeed that Nerva did not resign, not only because Eutropius[e] says, that Diocletian was the first of all the Roman emperors that did so, but especially because the younger Pliny, who served under Nerva and Trajan, and knew them both very well, says nothing of it, though he often mentions[f] their joint empire. But I think, that the notion which the forementioned authors had of Nerva's resigning, may be very well accounted for upon the supposition, that they had met with different computations of the time of these two princes' reigns in some ancient writers; and their mistake is not easy to be accounted for otherwise.

As for Tiberius, I take it for granted that it has been fully proved, that he was for some time partner in the empire with Augustus; and particularly that it has been made appear, that Piso was præfect of Rome twenty years, and that he was put

z Nisi enim hoc modo in nummis Titi, Domitiani & Nervæ epocha hæc explicetur, impossibile est nummos inter se posse convenire; cum eorum imperii annos non excedat, sed ad amussim iis respondeat. Pagi ibid. a Et nullibi sacri nomen frequentius, quam in nummis in Syria & Ægypto percussis, usurpatum. Ibid. n. 4.

b Vid. Append. ad Dissert. Cypr. n. 39, 40. c Quid enim Nerva prudentius? —Qui cum extrema ætate apud Sequanos, quo Tyranni defecit metu, imperium arbitrio legionum cepisset; ubi prospexit, nisi a superioribus robustioribusque corpore, animoque geri non posse, mense Sexto ac Decimo semet eo abdicavit. Aurel. Vict. de Cæsar. in Nerva. d Simul & exemplum Nervæ proferebat, qui imperium Trajano tradidisset. De Mort. Persecut. c. 18. e Diocletianus privatus in villa, quæ haud procul a Salonis est, præclaro otio senuit; inusitata virtute usus; ut solus omnium post conditum Romanum imperium ex tanto fastigio sponte ad privatæ vitæ statum civilitatemque remearet. Eutrop. lib. ix. cap. 28. f Assumptus es in laborum curarumque consortium. Plin. Paneg. c. 7. Inde QUASI depositio imperio qua securitate, qua gloria lætus? (Nerva nempe) Nam quantulum refert deponans an PARTIARIS imperium, nisi quod difficilius HOC est? ib. c. 8. Magnum hoc tuæ moderationis indicium, quod non solum successor imperii, sed PARTICEPS etiam SOCIUSQUE placuisti, c. 9.

into

into that poſt by the appointment or procurement of Tiberius. Thus much I think Baſnage allows[g], and Suetonius and Pliny both ſay that Tiberius was 'then prince.'

And it is highly probable that the chriſtians had a perſuaſion, that there were two different epochs of the beginning of Tiberius's reign: otherwiſe, when they ſaid that Jeſus was crucified in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, when the two Gemini were conſuls, namely, A. D. 29. (as they did almoſt univerſally,) after he had preached above[h] two years, or a[i] whole year including two paſſovers, or a year and ſome[k] few months; they muſt have been ſenſible that they contradicted St. Luke, who ſays, that the *word of God came* to John the Baptiſt in the *fifteenth year of Tiberius*; ſince alſo they muſt neceſſarily have allowed ſome time for the miniſtry of John, diſtinct from that of Jeſus.

That we have ſo few examples of this way of computing the reign of Tiberius, is not to be wondered, conſidering how few ancient writers who lived near his time are come down to us, and eſpecially ſuch as lived in the provinces where this epoch muſt have been chiefly uſed. The diſtinct computation of Auguſtus's reign to the time of his death, and of Tiberius's after him, was undoubtedly moſt commodious; and for this reaſon, probably, the computation of Tiberius's reign from the time of his proconſular empire was ſoon dropped. Beſides, Tiberius ſeems to have taken pains to obliterate this date of his government, inaſmuch as he was unwilling to have it thought that he owed his greatneſs to the adoption of Auguſtus, or the intrigues of his mother Livia; but would have it aſcribed ſolely to the free choice of the people after Auguſtus's death[l], that is, to his own merit, as Dio expreſsly ſays[m].

Tiberius then having had for ſome time before the death of Auguſtus, equal power with him in all the provinces and armies, and having been made thereby partner with him in the

[g] Ubi ſupra, A. D. 11. n. 2.

[h] Triceſimo enim juxta Evangeliſtam Lucam anno ætatis ſuæ cœpit in carne Dominus Evangelium prædicare, & juxta Johannem Evangeliſtam, per tria paſchata quos poſtea implevit annos: & inde ſex Tiberii ſupputantur anni, &c. Apollinarius Laodic. apud. Hieron. Com. in Dan. c. 9. Ο δε Ιουδας παρα τω Ιησου ουδε τρια διετριψεν ετη. Orig. cont. Celſ. l. ii. p. 67.

[i] Και οτι ενιαυτον μονον εδει αυτον κηρυξαι, και τουτο γεγραπται ουτως—πεντεκαιδεκατω ουν ετει Τιβεριου, και πεντεκαιδεκατω Αυγουστου. ου ω πληρουνται τα τριακοντα ετη εως ου επαθεν. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. p. 340. A.

[k] Ενιαυτον γαρ που και μηνας ολιγους εδιδαξεν· Orig. Phil. p. 4.

[l] Dabat & famæ, ut vocatus electuſque potius a Republica videretur, quam per uxorium ambitum & ſenilem adoptionem irrepſiſſe. Tacit. Ann. l. i. c. 8.

[m] Ηδη μεν γαρ ηκουσα οτι επειδαν η Λιουια ακοντος του Αυγουστου την αρχην αυτω περιπεποιηκεναι ελεγετο, επλαττεν οπως μη παρ' εκεινης, αλλα παρα της βουλης αναγκαστος, ως και κατα αρετην σφων προηκων, δοξειεν αυτην ειληφεναι· Dio. l. lvii. p. 603. D.

empire,

empire, it is not impoſſible, but that St. Luke might compute the reign of Tiberius by this epoch.

We ſhould now, if poſſible, ſettle the exact time when Tiberius was made partner with Auguſtus: it may be concluded that he was ſo, A. U. 765, two years before Auguſtus died, becauſe in that year Piſo was made præfect of Rome, Tiberius being prince: and Archbiſhop Uſher and Prideaux place the beginning of this government of Tiberius in this year.

There is however a conſiderable difficulty attending this matter, becauſe Velleius and Suetonius differ about the time in which the law was paſſed by the ſenate, decreeing Tiberius equal power with Auguſtus in the provinces and armies. According to Suetonius this law was not paſſed till after Tiberius's triumph, which certainly happened A. U. 765. A. D. 12. But according to Velleius [n] this law was paſſed at the deſire of Auguſtus, before Tiberius returned to Rome from Germany to make his triumph. Pagi [o] is inclined to prefer the teſtimony of Velleius Paterculus before that of Suetonius, becauſe Velleius was contemporary with Tiberius; but yet he dares not be poſitive in this matter, becauſe St. Clement's numbers are different from both. However, as Tiberius was conſul in the 21ſt and 31ſt years of our Lord, he judges this piece of reſpect to the 10th and 20th years from the 11th year of our Lord, to [p] be a confirmation of the ſuppoſition, that Tiberius's proconſular power commenced, A. D. 11. He obſerves alſo marks of honour ſhewn to the Quinquennals of this epoch, ſuch as the dedication of temples by himſelf, or the people of provinces, the founding of cities by dependent princes, and ſuch other the like things, with which the Quinquennials and Decennals, that is, the fifth and tenth years of remarkable events, were wont to be celebrated.

As he thinks it moſt probable, that Tiberius's proconſular empire began, A. U. 764. A. D. 11; ſo he is pretty well ſatisfied as to the month and day of the month, which he thinks was the 28th of Auguſt, or the fifth of the Kalends of September. One reaſon for it is, that from the 725th year of the city, Auguſtus ſeems to have had a particular reſpect for the vth of the Kalends of months. Moreover, according to the

[n] Sueton. in Tiber. c. 21, 22. Velleius Pat. l. ii. c. 121. Their words are tranſcribed above, p. 357.

[o] Vid. Crit. A. Ch. 11. n. 10.

[p] Quia tamen Tiberius anno Chriſti xxi. rurſuſque anno Chriſti xxxi. Conſul proceſſit, exiſtimandum, utrumque conſulatum ob Decennalia & Vicennalia Imperii Proconſularis Tiberii geſtum, ideque & illum anno Chriſti xi. Imperio Proconſulari donatum: quamquam uterque conſulatus anno Chriſti xii. quo rem actam narrat Suetonius, reſpondere etiam poſſit, etiamſi quinquennalia legitimo tempore celebrata fuerint, id. ib.

ſecond computation, which Clemens Alexandrinus mentions of the reign of Tiberius, it muſt have begun on the 28th of Auguſt. St. Clement ſays, that Tiberius reigned twenty-ſix years, ſix months, and nineteen days. Now Tiberius died the 16th of March, A. D. 37. from the 28th of Auguſt, A. D. 10, to the 16th of March, A. D. 37, are exactly, (according to Dr. Pagi's reckoning,) ſo many years, months, and days, as St. Clement mentions. So that though St. Clement has been in the wrong as to the year, ſince he begins this computation of Tiberius's reign, A. D. 10, yet he has helped us to the month and day of the month on which it commenced[q].

I have repreſented Pagi's ſenſe of this matter, as well as I can, in a few words; but I cannot ſay, that this reaſoning is altogether convincing. I muſt acknowledge, I ſee not how any argument can be drawn from St. Clement's teſtimony, either for the year or month of this epoch; if his numbers have been altered, as Pagi allows they have in many places, and particularly in this very paſſage.

There appears to me ſome weight in his obſervation upon the Quinquennals and Decennals of this epoch; but yet it is not fully concluſive: there might be ſome other reaſon, beſide that here ſuppoſed, for Tiberius's taking the conſulſhip, A. D. 21, and 31. The 22d and 26th years of the chriſtian æra are as remarkable as any other for the founding of cities, dedicating temples, and erecting of monuments. Though indeed, if this epoch began in the middle of any year, it is obvious at firſt ſight, that theſe honours may be divided betwixt two years.

And perhaps Velleius Paterculus and Suetonius may be reconciled by ſuppoſing only, that there was ſome time between Auguſtus's propoſing Tiberius's partnerſhip with him to the ſenate, and the paſſing of the act.

Upon the whole, I think there is good reaſon to believe, that Tiberius was colleague in the empire with Auguſtus; and that this epoch of Tiberius's empire was followed for ſome time by ſome perſons, in the provinces at leaſt: but it appears to me uncertain, when this proconſular empire began, whether about two years, or about three years before Auguſtus died.

Let us, however, adjuſt the numbers in St. Luke to this computation of the reign of Tiberius, which commenced either about two years, or about three years before his empire after the death of Auguſtus. And we will have an eye to the two

[q] Quare Clemens Alexandrinus rei geſtæ diem nobis conſervavit, ſed numeri annorum ſcripti, quod in eo auctore non infrequens. Pagi. Critic. A. D. 11. n. 9.

dates of our Saviour's nativity above-mentioned, namely, September or October, A. U. 748, and 749.

If Tiberius's proconſular empire began about three years before Auguſtus died, on the 28th of Aug. A. U. 764, A. D. 11, then this 15th of Tiberius's reign (according to this computation of it,) began Aug. 28, A. U. 778, A. D. 25. Suppoſing that John the Baptiſt began his miniſtry November following, in the ſame year, and that Jeſus was baptized by him the 6th of January following, in A. U. 779, A. D. 26; then upon the ſuppoſition that Jeſus was born in September, A. U. 748, he would be at his baptiſm thirty years of age and ſome months over.

If Tiberius's proconſular empire commenced about two years before the death of Auguſtus, in A. U. 765, A. D. 12, then the fifteenth of the reign of Tiberius began in A. U. 779, A. D. 26. And ſuppoſing that John the Baptiſt began his miniſtry in November of that year, and that Jeſus was baptized by him the 6th of January following, A. U. 780, A. D. 27, then, upon the ſuppoſition that Jeſus was born in September, A. U. 749, he would be at the time of his baptiſm thirty years of age and ſome months over; or, if born A. U. 748, he would be ſomewhat more than thirty-one years of age.

We will put this matter one way more. If John the Baptiſt began his miniſtry in the fifteenth of Tiberius, A. U. 778, A. D. 25, (as in the firſt ſtating of this queſtion,) but did not baptize Jeſus till the 6th of January, A. U. 780, A. D. 27, after he had preached ſomewhat above a year, then Jeſus would be at his baptiſm thirty years of age and odd months, if he was born A. U. 749; thirty-one years of age and ſome odd months, if born the latter end of the year 748.

I ſee not, but that we have a very good right to take thoſe dates of theſe events, which appear moſt favourable to St. Luke; ſince it is not abſolutely certain, when Herod died, or when Tiberius's proconſular empire began: nor have any of the writers of harmonies determined, that I know of, beyond contradiction, the ſpace of time between the commencement of John the Baptiſt's miniſtry and our Saviour's baptiſm. But if we allow on each hand the dates the leaſt favourable to St. Luke's numbers, namely, that Jeſus was born A. U. 748, and that he was not baptized till January, A. U. 780, A. D. 27; yet even then Jeſus would be little more (as has been ſhewn,) than thirty-one years of age; at which time a perſon may be ſaid very properly to be ABOUT *thirty years of age*, as will appear by and by.

I imagine

I imagine I have now ſhewed, that there is nothing improbable in the ſuppoſition, that St. Luke computed the reign of Tiberius, not from his ſole empire after the death of Auguſtus, but from the time of his proconſular empire, when he had equal power with Auguſtus given him in all the provinces and armies; and that upon this ſuppoſition, there lies no objection againſt the age aſcribed to Jeſus at his baptiſm.

§ III. However, in order to complete this ſolution of this difficulty, it will be proper to conſider ſome other notes of time, which we find in the evangeliſts; and to enquire, whether theſe likewiſe agree with this ſuppoſition.

St. Luke ſays, *Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæſar*, PONTIUS PILATE BEING GOVERNOR OF JUDEA,—*the word of God came unto John the ſon of Zacharias*, Luke iii. 1, 2.

It has been the opinion of ſome learned men, that Pilate did not come into Judea ſo ſoon as the fifteenth year of Tiberius's proconſular empire, the 12th of his ſole empire, A. U. 778, A. D. 25.

That every one may judge of this matter, I ſhall ſet down the account Joſephus has given of Pilate's leaving Judea; from which we ſhall be able to conclude when he came into it.

The ſenate of the Samaritans ſent complaints againſt Pilate to Vitellius, preſident of Syria. And Joſephus ſays: 'Vitellius, ſending his friend Marcellus to adminiſter the affairs of Judea, commanded Pilate to go to Rome, to anſwer to the emperor for thoſe things of which he was accuſed by the Jews. And Pilate having ſpent TEN YEARS IN JUDEA, haſtened away to Rome, in obedience to the commands of Vitellius, not daring to refuſe. But before he got to Rome, Tiberius was dead.

'Moreover Vitellius came into Judea, and went up to Jeruſalem. It was then a feaſt time; the feaſt is called the PASSOVER. Vitellius being received there with great magnificence, aboliſhed entirely the tax upon vendible fruits, and granted to the prieſts the right of keeping in the temple the veſtment of the high prieſt and all its ornaments, as they had done formerly.—Having conferred theſe favours upon the nation, he alſo took away the prieſthood from the high prieſt Joſeph, who is likewiſe called Caiaphas, and ſubſtituted in his room Jonathan, the ſon of Ananus the high prieſt, and then returned to Antioch[r].'

[r] Και Ουιτελλιος, Μαρκελλον τον αυτω φιλον επιτρεψας επιμελεισθαι των Ιουδαιων, Πιλατον εκελευσεν επι Ρωμης απιεναι, προς ᾧ καταλυσοντα Ιουδαιοι δικας των αιτιωμενων· και Πιλατος, δεκα ετη την Ιουδαιαν διατριψας επι Ρωμην επεσι-

Josephus immediately after this says, that Tiberius sent orders to Vitellius, to go and make a league with the king of the Parthians; that Vitellius having had a meeting with the king at the river Euphrates, and executed his commission, returned again to Antioch [s].'

After this, Vitellius received orders from Tiberius to go and make war with Aretas king of Petra.

'Vitellius then, having got all things ready for the war 'with Aretas, hastened away for Petra with two legions, and 'other auxiliary forces, and was come as far as Ptolemais. 'But as he was about to march his army through Judea, the 'chief men met him, intreating him not to go through their 'country.——He complied with their request; and having 'ordered his army to take their rout through the great plain, 'he himself, with Herod the tetrarch and their friends, went 'up to Jerusalem, to worship God, a feast of the Jews being 'at hand [t]. He was received by the people of the Jews with 'great respect. Having been there three days, he took away 'the high priesthood from Jonathan, and gave it to his bro-'ther Theophilus: and on the fourth day after his arrival, 'receiving letters which brought him an account of the death 'of Tiberius, he took an oath of the people to Caius [u].'

A few remarks on this account will suffice.

It is not expressly said, which feast of the Jews the last mentioned feast was: but there can be no doubt, but that it was the passover, A. D. 37. I think this is not contested by any one. Tiberius died the 16th of March, A. D. 37; the news of his death might easily reach Judea by the passover of that year, and could not be retarded to the feast of pentecost.

The passover first mentioned in this account, must have been the passover, A. D. 36. It is evident, that the summer following, Vitellius went as far as the river Euphrates, and returned to Antioch; and the next spring he was to go and make war with Aretas: but whilst his troops marched towards Petra, he went up to Jerusalem at the passover in the year thirty-seven, as has been observed. Nothing can be plainer, I think, than that Pilate was removed before the passover in thirty-six;

γετο, ταις Ουιτελλιου πειθομενος εντολαις, ουκ ον αντειπειν· πριν δε η τη Ρωμη προσχειν αυτον, φθανει Τιβεριος μεταστας. Ουιτελλιος δε, εις την Ιουδαιαν αφικομενος, επι Ιεροσολυμων ανηει, και ην αυτοις εορτη. Πασχα δε καλειται· δεχθεις δε μεγαλοπρεπως Ουιτελλιος, τα τελη των ωνουμενων καρπων ανιησιν ει, το παν τοις ταυτην κατοικουσι, και την στολην του αρχιερεως, και τον παντα αυτου κοσμον συνεχωρησεν εν τω ιερω κειμενον υπο τοις ιερευσιν εχειν την επιμελειαν, καθαι και προτερον ην αυτοις εξουσια· κ. τ. λ. Joseph. Ant. l. xviii. c. 5. § 2, 3. p. 801, 802.

s Id. ibid. p. 802, 803.

t Εορτης πατριου τοις Ιουδαιοις ενεστηκυιας.

u Id. ibid. cap. vi. § 3.

and

and muſt have been out ſome time before: Vitellius did not go to Jeruſalem immediately after he had ſent away Pilate, but firſt ordered his friend Marcellus to take care of affairs there.

It is not ſaid here, how long Pilate had been out, before Vitellius went up to Jeruſalem; but it is probable, it was half a year. This may be concluded from hence: Joſephus ſays, that Vitellius, when he was at Jeruſalem, the firſt time here ſpoken of, put the high prieſt's veſtment into the prieſt's hands, to be kept by them in the temple. Joſephus is very expreſs, that this favour was conferred by Vitellius upon the nation at this time, and that having done ſo, he put out Caiaphas, and returned to Antioch. Now in another place Joſephus ſays: 'This veſtment king Herod [x] kept here [in the caſtle of Antonia]. And after his death it was kept in the ſame place 'by the Romans till the time of Tiberius Cæſar. In his reign 'Vitellius preſident of Syria, having come to Jeruſalem, and 'the people receiving him in a very honourable manner, he 'being willing to make them a ſuitable return, ſince they had 'deſired that the ſacred veſtment might be in their own cuſtody, wrote to Tiberius Cæſar about it, and he granted their 'requeſt.' From this paſſage it appears, that Vitellius did not put the high prieſt's veſtment into the hands of the Jews without leave from Tiberius. If Vitellius actually made this grant when he was at Jeruſalem at the paſſover, A. D. thirty-ſix, (as Joſephus ſays expreſsly in the firſt paſſage,) it is likely the Jews had ſent their requeſt to him about the time that Pilate was removed. And conſidering the ſlowneſs of Tiberius in all his proceedings, it will not be thought ſtrange, that we allow half a year between the Jews preſenting their requeſt to Vitellius in Syria, and the return of an anſwer from the emperor; it is rather ſurprizing it ſhould have come back ſo ſoon.

It is poſſible, that ſome may except againſt this argument, and ſay, that the grant was not made by Vitellius when he was at Jeruſalem; but that he there received the Jews requeſt, then wrote to Tiberius, and ſome time after this put the ſacred veſtment into their cuſtody. But though Joſephus does in this laſt paſſage ſeem to place things in this order, yet I ſhould think, that ſince in the paſſage firſt cited, he ſays Vitellius beſtowed this favour upon the Jews whilſt at Jeruſalem at that

[x] Ταυτην ὁ βασιλευς Ηρωδης εφυλαξεν εν τῳ τοπῳ, και μετα την εκεινου τελευτην υπο Ρωμαιοις ην, μεχρι των Τιβεριου Καισαρος χρονων· επι τουτου δε Ουιτελλιος ὁ της Συριας ηγουμενος, επιδημησας τοις Ιεροσολυμοις, δεξαμενων τε παντων αυτον λαμπρως και θελων αυτων της ευποιιας αμειψασθαι, επει παρεκαλεσαν την ιεραν στολην υπο την αυτων εξουσιαν εχειν, ερραψε περι τουτων Τιβεριῳ Καισαρι, κακεινος επετρεψε. Ant. lib. xv. c. 11. § 4.

time; it may be inferred, that the petition had been preſented to him whilſt in Syria, and that he brought Tiberius's grant to Jeruſalem with him.

However, though this argument ſhould not be allowed me, yet ſince upon Pilate's removal Marcellus was ſent to govern in Judea, it is plain there was ſome time between Vitellius's iſſuing his orders to Pilate to go to Rome, and his own journey to Jeruſalem. This time might be the ſpace of five or ſix months; and I apprehend that the probability at leaſt of my reaſoning above, that Vitellius received the Jews petition for keeping the high prieſt's veſtment in Syria, then wrote to Tiberius, and delivered it to them when he was at Jeruſalem, may very much diſpoſe us to admit the ſuppoſition of this ſpace.

And though it ſhould be thought, that at the paſſover next after Pilate's removal, Vitellius did not give the high prieſt's veſtment into the Jewiſh hands, but only received their petition for that favour; yet this does fully overthrow the opinion of thoſe, who have thought, that Pilate was removed but a few weeks before the death of Tiberius. Vitellius, after the removal of Pilate, was at Jeruſalem at a paſſover; and having been magnificently received by the Jews, in requital of their civilities wrote to Tiberius, (ſo we will ſuppoſe at preſent,) that they might have the keeping of the high prieſt's garment, and Tiberius granted it. This paſſover then was not that paſſover at which Vitellius, being at Jeruſalem, heard of the death of Tiberius. We are therefore fully aſſured, that the paſſover which followed the removal of Pilate, was not the paſſover, A. D. 37, before which Tiberius died, but the paſſover preceding, namely, that in A. D. 36.

It is certain then, that Pilate was removed before the paſſover, A. D. 36; and probable, that he was removed about five or ſix months before it; about September or October, A. D. 35, about a year and a half before the death of Tiberius.

Since Joſephus ſays, that Pilate ſpent ten years in Judea, he came thither about October, A. D. 25, or at leaſt before the paſſover, A. D. 26, in the twelfth year of Tiberius's ſole empire, which twelfth year began the nineteenth of Auguſt, A. D. 25. This alſo is perfectly conſiſtent with what Joſephus ſays of Valerius Gratus, the firſt procurator of Judea under Tiberius; 'that he ſpent eleven years in Judea, and was then 'ſucceeded by Pontius Pilate [y].'

[y] Και Γρατος μεν ταυτα πραξας εις Ρωμην επαναχωρει, ενδεκα ετη διατριψας εν Ιουδαια· Ποντιος δε Πιλατος διαδοχος αυτω ηκεν· Antiq. l. xviii. c. 2. § 2.

So

So that though we ſhould ſuppoſe that Tiberius's proconſular empire began three years before the death of Auguſtus, as Dr. Pagi is inclined to do, 28 Auguſt, A.U. 764, A.D. 11; yet Pontius Pilate would even then be in Judea in the fifteenth of that empire, which began Aug. 28, A.U. 778, A.D. 25.

There is one difficulty, and but one in all this mattter. Joſephus ſays, that 'Pilate—haſtened away to Rome in obedience 'to the commands of Vitellius, not daring to refuſe. But be-'fore he got to Rome, Tiberius was dead.'

It will be beſt to take the objection from Mr. Whiſton. 'Now it is known from Joſephus, that Pontius Pilate was 'procurator of Judea but ten years; and that he was put out 'ſo little before the death of Tiberius, that the emperor was 'actually dead, before Pilate arrived at Rome to anſwer for 'himſelf. Tiberius died March 26, [z] A.D. 37; and Pilate 'might be out of his office a month, or ſix weeks before, ſup-'poſe it February; from thence we muſt count ten years back-'ward for the beginning of Pilate's government, which will 'therefore fall into February, A.D. 27 [a].'

This is the difficulty: but I think it would be very wrong to be determined by one ſingle ſentence againſt all the evidence, which ariſes from the whole ſeries of a narration. It is extremely evident, that the feaſt time in which Vitellius, being at Jeruſalem, heard of the death of Tiberius, is not the paſſover which followed next after Pilate's removal. I ſhall not repeat particulars, but content myſelf with referring the reader to Joſephus's account, already tranſcribed.

And if this one ſentence about the time of Pilate's arrival at Rome be inconſiſtent with the reſt of the ſtory, it is more reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that Joſephus was miſtaken in this particular, than in every thing elſe. He might be miſinformed about the time when Pilate got to Rome, but he could not well be ignorant of ſome of the moſt remarkable events in his own country; that is, when Pilate left Judea, when Caiaphas, and his ſucceſſor Jonathan, were put out of the high prieſt's office.

But there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe, this particular is inconſiſtent with the other circumſtances mentioned in this relation. Mr. Whiſton indeed can allow but a month or ſix weeks between the time of Pilate's removal out of his office, and his arrival at Rome: but it ought to be conſidered, that Pilate

[z] I ſuppoſe, that Mr. Whiſton herein follows Dio, unleſs it be a fault of the preſs: but according to Suetonius and Tacitus, Tiberius died the 16th of March. Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. A.D. 37. n. 2.

[a] Whiſton's ſhort view of the harmony of the four evangeliſts, p. 139.

was not sent to Rome in order to take possession of a kingdom, or some new ample province, but to answer for his conduct in his late government. Nor was he sent express; nor was he recalled by the emperor himself: but he was sent away by Vitellius, a fellow subject, though a superior officer. Josephus says, that 'Pilate hastened away to Rome.' I have given his words the strongest sense in the translation; but I think, the meaning is no more than that he went away out of Judea. And Josephus intimates very plainly, the reluctance with which Pilate obeyed Vitellius, when he says, that he went, 'not 'daring to refuse.'

There was, if I mistake not, some law under the commonwealth, which required the governors of provinces to be at Rome in three months time after their term of government was expired; but whether that law was in force now, I cannot say. However, it is plain it was not observed: Piso's conduct is a proof of it. Germanicus died in November, or [b] sooner; as may be inferred from a passage of Suetonius, who says, 'that the public sorrow for his death at Rome continued even 'through the holy days of December [c]:' meaning, I suppose, the Saturnalia, which were celebrated in the middle of that month. And as Germanicus died in Syria, some time must be allowed for the carrying the news of his death from thence to Rome. Piso was gone from the province of Syria before the death of Germanicus; it is most probable, that he was turned out by Germanicus [d]; and yet he was not come to Rome at the time of the Megalensian games of the next year, which were kept on the fifth of April [e]. It is true, the people of Rome were very uneasy at these delays of Piso; because they wanted to have him brought to his trial for the death of Germanicus, whom he was thought to have poisoned; but yet I do not perceive, that when [f] his trial came on, his long absence from Rome is reckoned up amongst his other crimes.

And to add no more, the slowness of Tiberius in all his proceedings may help us to account for Pilate's delays in going to

[b] Basnage [Ann. Pol Ec. Vol. 1. p. 221.] supposes he died in July. Decimo quinto Julii Germanicum vitam cum morte commutasse ex Tacito conjecturam facimus: Equester ordo instituit, uti turmæ idibus Juliis imaginem ejus sequerentur. Ann. l. ii. c. 83.

[c] Sed ut demum fato functum palam factum est, non solatiis ullis, non edictis ullis inhiberi luctus publicus potuit, duravitque etiam per festos Decembris mensis dies. Sueton. in Calig. cap. 6.

[d] Addunt plerique jussum [Pisonem] provincia decedere. Tacit. Ann. l. ii. c. 79.

[e] Et quia Ludorum Megalensium spectaculum fuberat, etiam voluptates resumerent. Tum exuto justitio, reditum ad munia; & Drusus Illyricos ad exercitus profectus est, erectis omnium animis petendæ a Pisone ultionis; & crebro questu, quod vagus interim per amœna Asiæ atque Achaiæ, adroganti & fubdola mora scelerum probationes subverteret. Tacit. Ann. lib. iii. cap. 6, 7.

[f] Id. Ibid. c. 18.

Rome,

Rome, though it be ſuppoſed that he made a year and a half of it.

Joſephus ſays, that Tiberius was the moſt dilatory prince that ever lived [g]. His conduct toward Herod Agrippa affords a ſtrong proof of it. A ſervant of Agrippa waited upon the prefect of Rome, aſſuring him he had ſome informations of great conſequence to give the emperor relating to his maſter: the prefect ſent him to Tiberius, but he, without making any particular inquiry into the matter, only keeps the man ſafe in cuſtody. Agrippa lying under the emperor's diſpleaſure, was forced to make intereſt to have his ſervant heard: and though he then informed the emperor of words ſpoken by Agrippa, which were little leſs than treaſon, and Agrippa was immediately thereupon confined; yet he was never called for again, though Tiberius lived ſix months [h] after. Tacitus has mentioned another inſtance well nigh, or quite as remarkable [i]. This ſlow way of thinking and acting was viſible in Tiberius in his very youth [k]; and no hiſtorian of thoſe times is ſilent about it. Pilate, who had ſerved Tiberius ten years, could not be ignorant of what all the world knew; he might have many probable reaſons to think, that if he did not come in the emperor's way, he ſhould never be called for; if inquiry was made for him, an excuſe might be found out that would ſerve for ſome time: ſickneſs might be pretended, as a reaſon for his ſtay in Aſia, Achaia, or ſome other place where he was got. Perhaps this was really the caſe. To be put out of his government by Vitellius, upon the complaints of the people of his province, muſt have been a very grievous mortification: Euſebius aſſures us, that not long after this, Pilate made away with himſelf, out of vexation for his many misfortunes [l].

There is another note of time mentioned in St. John's goſpel, which ought alſo to be conſidered. Chap. ii. 20. *Then ſaid the Jews, forty and ſix years was this temple in building: and wilt thou rear it up in three days?*

I ſuppoſe, that the objection to be formed upon this text is to this effect: theſe words were ſpoken by the Jews at the firſt

[g] Μελλητης ει και τις ετερων βασιλεων η τυραννων γενομενος. Antiq. lib. xviii. p. 811. v. 3. [h] Joſeph. Ant. l. xviii. c. 7. [i] Conſultuſque Cæſar an ſepeliri ſineret, (De Aſinio Gallo loquitur) non erubuit permittere, ultroque incuſare caſus, qui reum abſtuliſſent antequam coram convinceretur. Scilicet medio triennio defuerat tempus ſubeundi judicium conſulari ſeni tot conſularium parenti. Tacit. Ann l. vi. c. 23. [k] Sæva ac lenta natura ne in puero quidem latuit. Sueton. in Tiber. c. 57. Sed mitigavit Sejanus, non Galli amore, verum ut cunctationes principis aperirentur; gnarus eum lentum in meditando. Tacit. Ann. lib. iv. c. 71.

[l] Ποντιος Πιλατος επι Γαιȣ Καισαρος ποικιλαις περιπεσων συμφοραις, ως φασιν οι τα Ρωμαιων συγγραψαμενοι, αυτοφονευτης εαυτȣ εγενετο. Euſeb. Chron. p. 78.

paſſover

passover of our Saviour's public ministry, and the next after his baptism by John. The temple which the Jews spoke of, was the temple then before their eyes, and which Herod had rebuilt or repaired. But Herod did not make the proposal for rebuilding it till the eighteenth year of his reign, reckoning from the death of Antigonus. Therefore, if the fifteenth of Tiberius's reign, mentioned by St. Luke, be the fifteenth of his proconsular empire, and not of his sole empire after the death of Augustus, this temple could not have been so long as forty-six years in building, at the time these words were spoken.

To this I might answer, that an objection taken from Josephus's account of the time when Herod repaired the temple can be of little moment; because in one place he says, that Herod repaired the temple in the fifteenth [m], and in another the eighteenth year [n] of his reign. As the fifteenth year from the death of Antigonus is supposed to be coincident with the eighteenth year from the time in which Herod was declared king of Judea by the senate of Rome; some may be disposed to conclude, that when Josephus says Herod's proposal to rebuild the temple was made to the Jews in the eighteenth year of his reign, he computes from the time in which Herod was declared king by the Roman senate.

But I do not insist upon this, and am willing to allow, that Herod made the proposal to the Jews of building their temple, in the eighteenth year of his reign from the death of Antigonus.

And I think it is as likely, that the Jews, in these words recorded by St. John, refer to the time of Herod's proposal, as to the time in which he began actually to repair the temple. It is most probable, that Herod made this offer to the Jewish people, when assembled together at one of their great feasts; this therefore would be the most solemn and remarkable epoch of rebuilding the temple, which work undoubtedly he set about as soon afterwards as he could.

And it is very common to say, that men do things, when they propose to do them, or begin to do them. Thus Josephus says in his War of the Jews: 'In the fifteenth year of 'his reign he [Herod] repaired the temple itself, and inclosed 'a spot of ground about it, of double the compass with that 'which surrounded it before: this was done at a vast expence, 'and is a proof of his uncommon magnificence [o].' We will allow, that the fifteenth year in this place ought to be corrected by his Antiquities, where he says, that 'in the eighteenth year

[m] De Bell. l. i. c. 21. init. [n] Ant. l. xv. c. 11. init. [o] Πεντεκαιδεκατῳ γεν ἐτει της βασιλειας, αυτον τε τον ναον επεσκευασε, και τὴν περι αυτον ανετειχισατο χωραν, της ουσης διπλασιαν, αμετροις μεν χρησαμενος τοις αναλωμασιν, ανυπερβλητῳ δε τῃ πολυτελειᾳ. De Bell. lib. i. cap. 21. init.

'of

'of his reign Herod projected [or undertook] the rebuilding 'of the temple, which was the greateſt of all his works[p].' But then it appears from hence, that Herod is ſaid by Joſephus in one place to do, what in another he is only ſaid at the ſame time to purpoſe or begin.

Suppoſing that the Jews, in this text of St. John, refer to the time in which Herod made the propoſal of rebuilding the temple, we will ſee how this term of forty-ſix years will agree with the ſuppoſition, that St. Luke's fifteenth year of Tiberius is the fifteenth of his proconſular empire.

If the fifteenth of Tiberius's proconſular empire began the 28th of Auguſt, A. U. 778. A. D. 25. (according to Dr. Pagi's opinion) and if John the Baptiſt began to preach in November that year, but did not baptize Jeſus till after he had preached a year and ſome months, then the paſſover at which theſe words were ſpoken was the paſſover A. U. 780. A. D. 27.

Or if the fifteenth of Tiberius's reign began A. U. 779. A. D. 26. and John began then to preach, and Jeſus was baptized by him ſome time before the paſſover next following, ſtill theſe words would be ſpoke by the Jews at the paſſover A. U. 780. A. D. 27.

The eighteenth year of Herod's reign, from the death of Antigonus, is ſuppoſed to have begun ſome time in A. U. 734. Herod might make his offer to the Jews of rebuilding the temple at the feaſt of tabernacles in November that year; from November A. U. 734, to the paſſover, A. U. 780, A. D. 27. is almoſt forty-five years and an half: at this time therefore the Jews might not improperly ſay, the temple had been *forty-ſix years in building*. The forty-ſixth year was then current, and it was to the purpoſe of the Jews, rather to add to than to diminiſh the time which had been ſpent in that work: ſo that there is no time more ſuitable to theſe words of the Jews than the paſſover A. D. 27. though there is no manner of inconſiſtence between underſtanding the fifteenth of Tiberius, of his proconſular empire, and ſuppoſing that theſe words were ſpoken at the paſſover A. D. 28. and then the temple might have been above forty-ſix years in building.

What has been here ſaid may be ſufficient to ſhew, that St. Luke might compute the reign of Tiberius from the epoch of his proconſular empire; that if he did, Jeſus might be ſaid, with great exactneſs and propriety, to be *about thirty years of*

[p] Τῶν δὲ ἐνιαυτῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑπτακαιδεκάτοις τῆς Ἡρῴδου βασιλείας γενομένοις ἐνιαυτὸς ἦν,——ἔργον ἐστὶ τὸ τυχὸν ἐπιτελεῖν, τὸν νεὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ κατασκευασθῆναι. Ant. lib. xv. cap. 11. init.

age

age at his baptiſm; and that there is nothing in this ſuppoſition, inconſiſtent with any other notes of time mentioned in the goſpels.

§ IV. Another way of ſolving this difficulty is this. Theſe words of St. Luke, *And Jeſus himſelf began to be about thirty years of age*, may be underſtood with ſome latitude. Jeſus might be thirty[q] two years of age or more at this time; the word *about*, ωσει, is often uſed where a preciſe exactneſs is not intended or expected, Matt. xiv. 21. *And they that had eaten were* ABOUT *five thouſand*, ωσει πενταχισχιλιοι, *beſide women and children.* And the other evangeliſts, in ſpeaking of this miracle, uſe the ſame phraſe, Mark vi. 44. Luke ix. 14. John vi. 10. St. Luke ſays, Acts ii. 41. *And the ſame day there were added unto them about* [ωσει] *three thouſand ſouls.* And with a like latitude does this phraſe ſeem to be uſed in many places, as Luke i. 56. xxii. 41. xxiii. 44. John i. 39. Acts v. 36.

It is Kepler's opinion, that round and decimal numbers may be uſed with great latitude; and that a perſon may be very truly ſaid to be about thirty years of age, if he be above five and twenty, and under thirty five; but that, if a perſon be ſaid to be about eight and twenty, or about two and thirty years of age, it is to be ſuppoſed, he is exactly ſo old, or not above a month or two more or leſs[r].

And indeed many examples of this uſe of round numbers may be found in the[s] beſt writers, even without the particle

q Ex noſtrâ quidem Chronologiâ, ſequitur Chriſtum jam annum xxxii. evaſiſſe cum ad baptiſmum acceſſit. Nil tamen in ea, vel abſurdi, vel pugnæ aliquid cum Lucâ intelligimus, cùm de viro annos duos & triginta nato, cujus ætas dubitanter profertur, non incongrue dici poſſit, eſt annorum circiter triginta.—Iterum iterumque monemus, ex phraſi Lucæ, Joſephi de ſupremo Herodis anno chronologiâ damnari nequit. Baſnage Ann. Pol. Ec. Ante Dom. 3. n. vi. vid. etiam ad A. D. 30. num. iv.

r Hic receptus mos eſt linguis omnibus ut circiter 5000 dicamus quicquid eſt inter 4500 & 5500. Quare ſic etiam in noſtro exemplo quicquid eſt inter 25 & 35, id omne circiter 30 dici poteſt. Alia eſſet voculæ ratio, ſi præfixiſſet numero non rotundo. Ut ſi dixiſſet circiter 28 annos, vel circiter 32 annos. Quæ enim infra decem nominatim exprimuntur, iis appoſita vocula *circiter* raro unum annum ſolidum in dubio ponat, ſed fere menſes tantum aut dies aliquot numero paucos & infra quantitatem anni ſolidi. Keplerus de Anno C. Natali. cap. 12. p. 140, 141.

s Ab illo enim profectu viribus datis tantum valuit, ut in QUADRAGINTA deinde annos tutam pacem haberet. Livius, l. i. cap. 15. n. 7. This refers to Numa's reign, of which afterwards Livy ſays:—Romulus ſeptem & triginta regnavit annos, Numa TRES ET QUADRAGINTA. Ibid. c. 21. When the city of Rome was taken by the Gauls, and the remnant of the people were entering into the Capitol, Livy uſes theſe words: Verſæ inde adhortationes ad agmen juvenum; quos in Capitolium atque in arcem proſequebantur, commendantes virtuti eorum juventæque urbis per TRECENTOS SEXAGINTA annos omnibus bellis victricis,——fortunam. Id. lib. v. cap. 49. Camillus, not long after, in the very ſame year, in his ſpeech to diſſuade them from removing to Veii, ſays, TRECENTESIMUS SEXAGESIMUS QUINTUS annus urbis, Quirites, agitur. Ibid. c. 54. vid. eundem lib. vi. c. 28. n. 7. & Joan. Cleric. notas.

ωσει, *about*; which of itſelf ſeems to be a hint, that the writer does intend to be underſtood with ſome latitude.

If we may take St. Luke's words in this manner, there is ſcarce any need that I ſhould trouble the reader with any calculation, to ſhew the agreement of his numbers with the time of our Saviour's nativity.

The fifteenth of Tiberius's ſole empire began A. U. 781. A. D. 28. If Jeſus was baptized the 6th January, A. U. 782. A. D. 29, he would be but ſome months above thirty-three years of age, though he was born ſo ſoon as September A. U. 748. And if he was born A. U. 749, then, though his baptiſm be placed in the beginning of A. U. 783, A. D. 30. ſtill he would be little more than thirty-three years of age.

All the other notes of time in the goſpels are alſo very eaſily reconciled with this fifteenth of Tiberius's ſole empire. Pontius Pilate came into Judea before the paſſover in the 12th year of Tiberius's ſole empire, A. U. 779. A. D. 26. as has been ſhewn, and continued there ten years: therefore he was undoubtedly governor of Judea at the commencement of John the Baptiſt's miniſtry, and till after our Saviour's crucifixion.

As for thoſe words of the Jews ſpoken by them at the firſt paſſover of our Saviour's miniſtry, *Forty-ſix years has this temple been in building*; it is but to ſuppoſe that they referred not to the time when Herod made the propoſal of repairing the temple in the eighteenth year of his reign, but to the time when in purſuance of that propoſal he actually ſet about the work, after he had got all things in a readineſs for it, and it will be eaſily perceived that theſe words are agreeable to truth.

I do not preſume to determine which of theſe two ſolutions is the juſteſt; or whether St. Luke intended the fifteenth of Tiberius's proconſular empire, when he was made colleague with Auguſtus, or the fifteenth of his ſole empire. In order to do this, it would be needful, as I apprehend, to conſider the time allotted by the evangeliſts to the miniſtry of John the Baptiſt and our Saviour, the chronology of the acts of the apoſtles, compared with ſome paſſages in the epiſtles, and alſo the teſtimonies of the ancient chriſtian writers. As I have not here room for all theſe premiſes, it may be beſt to wave the concluſion. All I ſhall ſay at preſent is, that the ſuppoſition that St. Luke intended the former of theſe two epochs, ſeems to be very much favoured by the firſt chriſtians; who generally place the crucifixion of Jeſus at the paſſover of the fifteenth of Tiberius's ſole empire, when the two Gemini were conſuls of Rome, A. D. 29: and that their teſtimonies are of great

great weight with me. I ſubjoin in the margin[t] a few of them, for the ſake of thoſe who may happen to be unacquainted with theſe matters.

I apprehend, that each of theſe is a very good ſolution of the objection ſtated at the beginning of this chapter, though I believe many will think, it is there ſtated by me in a manner very favourable to an objector. Nay, I imagine I have ſaid what is ſufficient to ſatisfy any reaſonable perſon, that there does not lie any objection againſt any notes of time mentioned by the evangeliſts from the chronology of other ancient writers. This is ſufficient to my preſent purpoſe.

I have nothing farther to add here beſide this one obſervation.

It is no diſparagement to the ſacred hiſtorians, that we are ſomewhat at a loſs to ſettle preciſely the very year of ſome of thoſe events which they have related. Many important facts related by the beſt hiſtorians are attended with chronological difficulties: I ſhall give but one inſtance, an inſtance with which we are nearly concerned. Joſephus was a man of a learned education, is a profeſſed writer of hiſtory, of the civil and ſacred hiſtory of his country, and is generally allowed to be an accurate writer. He has expreſsly mentioned two epochs of the commencement of Herod's reign, and has given us an account of his death, and the duration of his government: he has written the hiſtory of the whole reign of this prince: he has related the ſeries of events, and the ſucceſſion of the princes and governors of Judea before and after Herod: he has put down the years of the Olympiads, and the names of the conſuls, when ſome of the moſt remarkable of theſe events happened. Nor have all Roman and Greek hiſtorians been ſilent about Herod or his deſcendents, and the Jewiſh affairs, near this time; not to mention Talmudical, or other Jewiſh authors. And yet, notwithſtanding all theſe advantages, whether through prejudice, or want of ſufficient light, it has happened, that learned men have differed widely about the time of Herod's death, and are not yet come to a full agreement.

[t] Hujus [Tiberii] quinto decimo anno imperii paſſus eſt Chriſtus.——Quæ paſſio hujus exterminii intra tempora LXX. hebdomadarum perfecta eſt ſub Tiberio Cæſare, Coſſ. Rubellio Gemino & Rufio Gemino, menſe Martio, temporibus Paſchæ. Tertul. adverſ. Jud. c. 8. Atque exinde uſque ad annum quintum decimum Tiberii Cæſaris, quando paſſus eſt Chriſtus, numerantur anni ſexaginta. Africanus apud Hieron. Dan. C. ix. Qui fuit ſub imperio Tiberii Cæſaris; cujus anno quinto decimo, id eſt, duobus Geminis conſulibus,—Judæi Chriſtum cruci affixerant. Lactant. Inſt. l. iv. c. 10. Extremis temporibus Tiberii Cæſaris, ut ſcriptum legimus, Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus a Judæis crucifixus eſt,—duobus Geminis conſulibus, de Mort. Perſecut. c. 2.

CHAP. IV.

OF ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS.

I. *The difficulty relating to their being both high-prieſts at the ſame time conſidered.* II. *Of Caiaphas being high-prieſt that year, in which Jeſus was crucified.*

§ I. WE have another objection againſt the account St. Luke gives of the government Judea was under, when John the Baptiſt began to preach. Ch. iii. 1, 2. *Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæſar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee;*—ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS BEING THE HIGH-PRIESTS, *the word of God came unto John.*

It is objected, that it appears from the books of the Old Teſtament, the writings of Joſephus and other Jews, that there was but one high-prieſt among the Jews at a time: St. Luke therefore has been miſtaken in ſaying, that Annas and Caiaphas were both high-prieſts.

Much has been written upon this ſubject, and learned men[a] have been of divers opinions. I hope I may be excuſed, if in this place I depart from the method I uſually take in conſidering theſe objections, and do not ſet down all the ſentiments of writers upon this point.

I ſhall here therefore do little more than deliver my own ſentiments concerning this matter in a few particulars; which, I hope, will contain a ſufficient anſwer to the objection.

1. It would be extremely unreaſonable to impute to St. Luke ſo great a miſtake, as the ſuppoſing, that there were properly two high-prieſts among the Jews at the ſame time. He appears in the reſt of his hiſtory well acquainted with Jewiſh affairs. It is plain, that he knew very well there was one who was in the office of high-prieſt: ch. xxii. 50. *And one of them ſmote the ſervant of the* HIGH-PRIEST.—54. *Then took they him and led him, and brought him to the* HIGH-PRIEST'*s houſe.*

2. It is likely, that the power which the Jewiſh people were poſſeſſed of under the Romans, was lodged chiefly in the hands of two perſons; and it may be ſuppoſed the Jews choſe to have it ſo. When they had reſolved upon the war with the Romans,

[a] Vid. Baron. Ann. A. D. 31. num. 8.——Caſaubon in Baron. Exerc. xiii. num. 5. Selden. de Succeſſ. in Pontif. lib. i. c. 12. Hammond. Annot. cum multis aliis.

Joſephus

Josephus says: 'They assembled in the temple, and appointed 'several generals; and Joseph the son of Gorion, and the 'high-priest Ananus, were chosen to be supreme governors 'of all things in the city.' I have not observed this passage quoted by any upon this occasion: whether it be material or not the reader will judge: but it has inclined me to suppose, that about this time there were usually among the Jews two persons, to whom the government was chiefly committed. I must however advertise the reader, that Ananus, here called high-priest, was not then in the office of the priesthood.

3. Since Caiaphas was now properly high-priest, and Annas had been so: if the latter was now in some post of authority, they might be both said very properly to be high-priests at this time. Josephus often calls Saturninus and Volumnius presidents or governors of Syria[c], though Saturninus only was president, and Volumnius the emperor's procurator, that is, the officer that took care of the revenue.

There happened a disturbance between the Jews and the Samaritans in the reign of Claudius; Cumanus the procurator of Judea was not able to compose it; appeals were made to Quadratus president of Syria. He having punished several, 'sent 'two others of the most powerful men of the Jews, as also 'THE HIGH-PRIESTS Jonathan and Ananias, and Ananus the 'son of this last mentioned person, and some other considera-'ble men to Cæsar[d].' I take this passage of Josephus (which has been often cited by learned men) to be very near parallel with St. Luke's.

Jonathan had been high-priest, but had been put out long before now by [e] Vitellius: Ananias was [f] now high-priest. In like manner, in the case in question, Annas had formerly been high-priest, but Caiaphas was now in that office.

I am the more inclined to think Josephus's style here parallel with St. Luke's, because it appears from another place, where Josephus mentions this affair, that Ananus, the third person named, was then captain of the temple[g]. From whence I conclude, that the three persons here mentioned, were then in the three chief posts of the Jewish civil and sacred govern-

[b] Και συναθροισθεντες εις το ιερον, στασιησας απεδειξαν τω πολεμω πλειονας· ηρεθη δε Ιωσηπος υιος Γωριωνος, και ο αρχιερευς Ανανος, των τε καθ' την πολιν απαντων αυτοκρατορες, και μαλιστα τα τειχη της πολεως ανεσειφειν. De Bell. l. ii. c. 20. § 3.

[c] Πολλακις μεν επι Σατερνινον ελθοντα και Ουολεμνιον της Συριας ηγεμονας. Ant. l. xvi. c. 10. p. 741. v. 1, 2. Τοις Καισαρος ηγεμοσιν Σατερνινω τε και Ουολεμνιω—επι τε Σατερνινου και Ουολεμνιου των Συριας επιτροπευοντων· ib. c. 9. p. 734. v. 25. & 37.

[d] Δυο δε ιερεις των δυναμενων, και τους αρχιερεις Ιωναθην και Ανανιαν, τον τε τουτων παιδα Ανανον,—απεπεμψεν επι Καισαρα. De Bell. l. ii. c. xii. § 6. [e] Ant. l. xviii. c. 6. § 3. [f] Ib. l. xx. c. 4. p. 886. v. 41.

[g] Ant. l. xx. c. 5. p. 889. v. 36.

ment.

ment. He ſpeaks indeed of two others, whom he calls the 'moſt powerful of the Jews;' but I apprehend they were ſo only in reſpect of their influence: it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the perſons named were in the moſt eminent ſtations.

There is another particular in which theſe two paſſages are parallel: Jonathan, who had been high-prieſt, is named before Ananias, then in office: the two names ſtand in the ſame order in St. Luke. I ſuppoſe, that theſe propoſitions may afford a clear ſolution of this difficulty.

The learned Selden conjectures, that Annas and Caiaphas are not mentioned in this place by St. Luke, on account of any ſacred function they diſcharged, but as they were the two perſons who had then the chief authority under the Romans in the civil adminiſtration of the Jewiſh affairs: that Annas was now prince of the ſanhedrim, and Caiaphas the father of it; and that therefore Annas is firſt named, as being in the more honourable ſtation in the civil government. He ſuppoſes, that theſe two poſts might then be annual; that Annas was prince of the ſanhedrim when John the baptiſt began his miniſtry, and that Caiaphas was prince when our Saviour was crucified. And therefore St. John ſays particularly, ch. xi. 49, 51. that Caiaphas was high-prieſt *that ſame year:* but that afterwards, when Peter and John were called before the council, Annas, who is firſt named, [Acts iv. 6.] was prince, and Caiaphas father of the ſanhedrim[h].

Selden offers theſe thoughts as conjectures only. I hope, therefore, it will not be deemed preſumption to be of another mind, or to offer ſome different thoughts upon this ſubject.

As Caiaphas was now in the office of the prieſthood, when John the Baptiſt began his miniſtry, I ſuppoſe that Caiaphas is mentioned by St. Luke on account of the high prieſthood, and the civil authority joined with it; and that the Jewiſh go-

[h] Hinc, ſi conjecturæ venia detur, exiſtimarim, Annam & Caiapham pontifices ſimul a D. Luca dictos, non qua ſacræ functionis dignitas illo nomine denotatur, ſed qua civilis eorum adminiſtratio, ut & cæterorum cuibuſcum conjunguntur, ad ipſum annum, de quo verba ibi fiunt, indicandum denotaretur. Scilicet Annam tunc fuiſſe Synedrii Principem, Caiapham verò ejuſdem Patrem.—Ita demum cur Caiaphas, quem ſacram dignitatem ipſam velut Aharonis ſucceſſorem geſſiſſe intervallo illo ex Joſepho docemur, Annæ poſtponatur, ratio non inepta reddi poteſt. Etenim Principi Synedrii Pater Synedrii erat ſemper ſecundarius. Sed vero nec Principis nec Patris Synedrii munus ſemper perpetuum erat, ſed ab alio ad alium, pro re nata tranſlatum. Quod ex titulo Talmudico Horaijoth, cap. iii. aliiſque Magiſtrorum commentariis elicitur. Et forſan tunc temporis annuum erat.—Atque illinc forſan altera illa quæſtio de Caiaphæ pontificatu ſuo anno apud D. Joannem deſignato ſolvenda.——Adeo ut Anno Tiberii xv. ſeu in loco D. Lucæ, Annas eſſet Princeps Synedrii, Caiaphas Pater, anno vero Paſſionis Annas Pater, Caiaphas Princeps; poſtmodum vero Annas, inter ſuos utpote eminentiſſimus, itidem Princeps, & Caiaphas Pater, ut in Actorum quarto. Selden de Suc. in Pontif. lib. i. c. 12.

vernment being at this time under the Romans ariſtocratical, Annas is mentioned together with Caiaphas, as being the other chief perſon in the Jewiſh adminiſtration: but I am of opinion, that we have not ſufficient light at preſent to determine what poſt of honour Annas was in, though that of prince of the ſanhedrim be as likely as any. However, I cannot eaſily perſuade myſelf, that during the Jews' ſubjection to the Romans, the prince of the ſanhedrim, or any other Jew not in the high-prieſthood, was equal, much leſs ſuperior to him who enjoyed that office; unleſs when there was ſome Jewiſh prince appointed governor of the temple by the Roman emperor. If Joſephus's authority be ſufficient to decide this matter, it is plain the high-prieſt had the chief power in the Jewiſh nation under the Romans: this may be concluded from hence, that he has preſerved the ſucceſſion of the high-prieſts, and of them only, to the deſtruction of the temple. But if there had been, after the removal of Archelaus, any perſons in an office of ſuperior authority to the high-prieſt, he would have alſo given us their names: we ſhould alſo, in all probability, have met with ſome accounts in his hiſtory, of the putting out of theſe officers by the Roman governors, when they did not behave to ſatisfaction. And indeed Joſephus ſeems to me expreſly to ſay, that the high-prieſt was the chief perſon in the Jewiſh nation under the Romans. Having at the concluſion of his Antiquities reckoned up the Jewiſh high-prieſts, he ſays: 'Some of theſe adminiſtered affairs under Herod the king, 'and his ſon Archelaus: after their death the adminiſtration 'was ariſtocratical, but the preſidentſhip of the nation was 'committed to the high-prieſts[i].'

Farther, I apprehend no myſtery at all in the order in which theſe two perſons are named by St. Luke. Ancient writers ſeem not to be very ſolicitous about the order in which they name perſons who are near equal[k]. I ſuppoſe that Caiaphas

[i] Και τινες μεν αυτων επολιτευσαντο επι τε Ηρωδε βασιλευοντες, και επι Αρχελαω τω παιδι αυτε· μετα δε την τελευτην, αριστοκρατια μεν ην η πολιτεια, την δε προστασιαν τε εθνες οι αρχιερεις επιτευον. Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xx. c. 9. fin.

[k] Thus Herodotus ſays, that Cambyſes was the ſon of Cyrus and Caſſandana: and preſently after, that he was ſon of this woman and Cyrus. Παρελαβε την βασιληιην Καμβυσης, Κυρω εων παις και Κασσανδανης——ταυτης δε της γυναικος εων παις και Κυρε Καμβυσης· Euterp. init. Joſephus ſays, Herod had two ſons by a Samaritan woman, namely, Antipas and Archelaus. Soon after Archelaus is mentioned firſt, Ην δε αρα τω Σαμαρεων εθνες μια, και παις αυτη Αντιπας και Αρχελαος——Αρχελαος και Αντιπας επι Ρωμης παρα τον Καισαρα ησαν· Antiq. l. xvii. c. 1. § 3. Joſephus ſays again, that Herod called to the council at Berytus, Salome and Pheroras. De Bell. l. i. c. 27. § 3. Afterwards Teco the old ſoldier complains to Herod, that he hearkened to Pheroras and Salome before his own ſons, ib. § 4.

Was

was at this time chief in dignity and authority in the government: but that nevertheleſs, there is no abſurdity or impropriety in naming Annas firſt, inaſmuch as he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, and was paſt the prieſthood.

§ II. It will perhaps be expected, I ſhould here ſay ſomewhat to a text of St. John, which has a relation to this matter, and which does appear at firſt to be a very difficult place. John xi. 49—52. *And one of them named Caiaphas, being* HIGH-PRIEST [l] THAT SAME YEAR, *ſaid unto them, ye know nothing at all, nor conſider that it is expedient for us, that one man ſhould die for the people, and that the whole nation periſh not. And this ſpake he, not of himſelf: but being* [m] HIGH-PRIEST THAT YEAR, HE PROPHESIED, *that Jeſus ſhould die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that alſo he ſhould gather together in one the children of God that were ſcattered abroad.*

There are here two things which need to be explained; firſt, why Caiaphas is ſaid to be high-prieſt *that ſame year:* and ſecondly, what is meant by his *propheſying*, being *high-prieſt.*

Some have thought, that the phraſe, *being high-prieſt that year*, implies that St. John ſuppoſed the high prieſthood was annual; and upon this account they have been willing to charge him with a great miſtake: for Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea ten years, and Caiaphas was put put into the prieſthood by Valerius Gratus, Pilate's predeceſſor, and continued in it till after Pilate's removal. Selden thought, that by high-prieſt, is meant the chief man of that nation, and particularly the prince of the ſanhedrim, which poſt might be at that time annual. For my own part, I think, *that year* (as it ought to have been rendered, and as the ſame phraſe is rendered ver. 51. and not *that ſame year*;) denotes no more than *at that time.* It is very common to put *years* and *days* in the plural number, for time. Ezek. xxxviii. 8. *After many* DAYS *thou ſhalt be viſited: in the latter* YEARS *thou ſhalt come into the land that is brought back from the ſword*, &c. Mal. iii. 4. *Then ſhall the offerings of Judah be pleaſant unto the Lord, as in the* DAYS *of old, and as in the former* YEARS. There are other texts perhaps more appoſite to our purpoſe. Deut. xxvi. 3. *And thou ſhalt go unto the prieſt that ſhall be in* THOSE DAYS. Joſh. xx. 6. *And he ſhall dwell in that city, until the death of the high prieſt that ſhall be in* THOSE DAYS. Philo uſes the word day in the ſingular number, in the ſame manner: ſpeaking of the trial of jealouſy, he ſays, the man and the woman ſhall go

[l] Αρχιερευς ων τω ενιαυτω εκεινω. [m] Αλλα αρχιερευς ων τω ενιαυτω εκεινω, προεφητευσεν.

up to the temple, 'and the man standing before the altar shall 'declare the cause of his jealousy in the presence of him who 'is priest at that [n] day.' All that St. John says therefore is, that Caiaphas was high-priest at that time, or the high priest of that time. And if we ought to suppose any thing emphatical in the expression, (which yet I cannot see,) I apprehend it arises from the distance between the time of the event and the writing. St. John writing his gospel a considerable time after the crucifixion of Jesus, when many might be supposed to be ignorant who was then high-priest; and there having been under the Romans frequent removals made in that office; it was natural enough for him to express this circumstance with some peculiar emphasis, or to mention it more than once.

The other difficulty to be considered lies in the words, *being high-priest that year he prophesied.* Here I cannot perceive the sense of this observation, supposing with Selden, high-priest to stand for prince of the Sanhedrim. By prophesying I understand in this place, declaring the event; which it was in a peculiar manner the office of the priest to do, when he was enquired of, or when God was enquired of (A) by him, concerning any important matters under deliberation. Thus Josephus says: 'But the Philistines, when they heard that the Hebrews had 'made David king, brought forth their army against him.— 'But the king [o] of the Jews (for he allowed not himself to do 'any thing without prophesy, and the command of God, and 'assurance of the event from him,) required the high-priest to 'foretel him, what was the will of God, and what would be 'the issue of the battle. When he had prophesied victory and 'power, he led out his forces against the Philistines.' And presently after, 'The king [p] of the Israelites enquiring again 'of God, concerning the event of the battle, the high-priest 'prophesied,' that he should do so and so, and then would

[n] Και ο μεν ανηρ ςας αντικρυ τȣ βωμȣ, παροντος τȣ κατ' εκεινην την ημεραν ιερωμενȣ, δηλȣτω την υπονοιαν αμα. κ. λ. De Legibus special. p. 785. C. (A) *Then the king sent to call Abimelech the* PRIEST *the son of Ahitub.—— And Saul said unto him, Why have ye conspired against me, thou and the son of Jesse,——and hast* ENQUIRED *of God for him?* 1 Sam. xxii. 11—13. *And David said to Abiathar the* PRIEST, *Bring hither the Ephod. Then said David, O Lord God of Israel,—Will the men of Keilah deliver me into his hand? Will Saul come down, as thy servant hath heard?—And the Lord said, he will come down.* 1 Sam. xxiii. 9—11. *And when Saul enquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor* BY URIM, *nor by prophets,* ch. xxviii. 6.

[o] Ο δε των Ιȣδαιων βασιλευς· ȣδεν γαρ ανευ προφητειας, και τȣ κελευσαι τον Θεον, και περι των εσομενων λαβειν εγγυητην εκεινον, εαυτῳ ποιειν επετρεπεν· εκελευσε τον αρχιερεα τι δοκει τῳ Θεῳ, και ποδαπον εςαι το της μαχης τελος, προλεγειν αυτῳ· προφητευσαντος δε νικην και κρατος, εξαγει την δυναμιν επι τȣς Παλαιςινȣς· Antiq. l. vii. c. 4. § 1.

[p] Παλιν δε τȣ βασιλεως, των Ισραηλιτων ερομενȣ τον Θεον, περι της περι την μαχην εξοδȣ, προφητευει ο αρχιερευς, κ. λ. ibid.

have

have a sure and easy victory; referring to the story told 2 Sam. v. 22—25.

Let us now apply these remarks in a general paraphrase of this text of St. John. Some of the council, of a different opinion from those whose words are recorded ver. 48. having, as may be supposed, from considerations taken from the dispositions of the people, the temper of the Roman governor, and other circumstances of their affairs, expressed some doubts about the success of a prosecution of Jesus, and the consequences of taking away his life: 'Caiaphas, who was the high-'priest at that time, when it came to his turn to deliver his 'opinion, said, You have hitherto talked very weakly and 'ignorantly; you may proceed in the case before you without 'hesitation. The taking [q] away the life of this man will be so 'far from being ruinous to the whole nation in this country 'and in other parts, as some of you fear, that it will be much 'for the advantage of the people of God every where. This 'however he said, not merely of himself, but being then high-'priest, he foretold the issue and event of their counsels, and 'of the death of Jesus: and that it [r] would come to pass that 'Jesus would die for that nation, and not for that nation only, 'but that through his death, he would also gather together in 'one the children of God which were scattered abroad.'

CHAP. V.

OF THE DIFFERENT NAMES GIVEN TO HERODIAS'S FIRST HUSBAND BY THE EVANGELISTS AND JOSEPHUS.

I COME now to consider the difficulty hinted above (A), arising from the different names given by the evangelists and Josephus to the first husband of Herodias; whom they call Philip, Josephus, Herod. I need not transcribe here the passages of the gospels, Matt. xiv. 3. Mark vi. 17. Luke iii. 19. or of Josephus, relating to this affair. If the reader will be pleased to look back (B) he will find what is sufficient for the purpose.

[q] Υμεις εκ οιδατε ουδεν· ουδε διαλογιζεσθε ὁτι συμφερει ὑμιν, ινα εις ανθρωπος αποθανη ὑπερ του λαου, και μη ὁλον το εθνος απολητα.

[r] Προεφητευσεν ὁτι εμελλεν ὁ Ιησους αποθνησκειν ὑπερ του εθνους, κ. λ. (A) p. 17, note (C). (B) p. 16—18.

As Josephus, speaking of this unlawful marriage of Herod the tetrarch and Herodias, calls her first husband Herod; so it is certain, that according to him, Philip, whom St. Luke, ch. iii. 1. styles *tetrarch of Iturea and the region of Trachonitis*, could not be the person: for Josephus says, that Herodias's daughter Salome was married to Philip, Herod's son, the tetrarch [a] of Trachonitis. Nor is there any mention made in Josephus of any other son of Herod the great, who was called Philip, beside the fore-mentioned tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis.

I have no reason to say any thing more of Philip the tetrarch, than I have done already; having shewn in another place (c), that St. Luke has given a just account of him. But I will here give a brief history of Herod, to whom Josephus says Herodias was first married; because I apprehend it may be needful for some readers, and it will be of great use to us upon this occasion.

Herod was the son of Herod the great by Mariamne, daughter of Simon the high-priest. After Herod the great had killed his two sons Alexander and Aristobulus, he repented of what he had done, and resolved to take special care of their children. And in particular, he contracted Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, to the above-mentioned Herod [b]. There happened indeed afterwards some alterations in the dispositions made by Herod the great at this time; but, however, this [c] contract remained good, as may be concluded from hence; that this contract is not mentioned among those alterations, and because in the account Josephus gives of Herod the tetrarch's unlawful marriage with Herodias, her first husband, whom she left in his life-time, is expressly said to be Herod son of Mariamne the high-priest's daughter.

Herod the great in one of his wills, made after this contract, appointed the said Herod his successor, in case Antipater should die before him. But afterwards, in the inquiries concerning Antipater's design to poison his father, it appeared that Mariamne, mother of Herod, had been concerned in the same design: whereupon Herod the great put away Mariamne, altered the clause of his will relating to her son, and took away

[a] Η δε θυγατηρ αυτης Σαλωμη Φιλιππῳ γαμειται, Ηρωδε παιδι τῳ Τετραρχῃ της Τραχωνιτιδος. Antiq. l. 18. c. 6. § 4.

(c) page 16.

[b] Ενεγυησε τε εις γαμοι,——την δε ετεραν των Αριστοβουλε θυγατερων, Ηρωδη παιδι τῳ αυτε· γυναικα δε τῳ βασιλει εκ της τε Αρχιερεως θυγατρος. Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. 1. p. 751. v. 1. vid. etiam p. 1027. v. 36.

[c] Vid. Joseph. p. 751. v. 20. p. 1028. v. 35.

the

the priesthood from her father [d] Simon. After this we hear no more of Herod, till we have the account of Herodias's leaving him.

Here then lies our difficulty. The evangelists call Herodias's first husband Philip. It is objected, that they must mean Philip the tetrarch. But it is plain from Josephus, that Philip the tetrarch was not her first husband, but Herod, son of Herod the great, by Mariamne the high-priest's daughter.

In answer to this: 1. It has been said by some, that Josephus was mistaken. Basnage [e] of Flottemanville, whom I have often quoted, is fully persuaded, that Philip tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis, was Herodias's first husband. Beside that the evangelists lived nearer the time of the event than Josephus, he says, they had more reason to be well informed in this matter than Josephus, and they are three to one. Mr. Basnage does not deny, Herod's having had a son of his own name by the high-priest's daughter; but he says, this son died before his father. And he thinks, that Josephus says as much, and has assured us, that after Antipater was dead, Herod had no sons left, beside Archelaus, Herod Antipas, and Philip, betwixt whom he divided his kingdom. And therefore Josephus is guilty of a most flagrant self-contradiction, in making the son of the high-priest's daughter Herodias's husband. Besides, there is no mention of this son in Herod the great's last will; which would be very strange, if he was then alive, especially considering that Herod left his sister Salome a very good estate in land.

This is Basnage's solution; but, in my opinion, a very poor one. I will not be positive, that Josephus has made no mistake in the accounts of Herod's family; because where a man has issue by seven or eight wives, as Herod had, perhaps a writer had need to have a head peculiarly turned for gene-

[d] Και δια ταδε Ηρωδης εκεινην τε εξεβαλε, και τον υιον αυτης εξηλειψε των διαθηκων, εις το βασιλευσαι μεμνημενων εκεινου· και τον πενθερον την αρχιερωσυνην αφειλατο Σιμωνα τον του Βοηθου. Ant. l. xvii. c. iv. p. 757. v. 43. vid. etiam p. 1032. v. 33. [e] Nulla ergo excusatio Josepho parari potest. Cujus narrationi, illa Evangelistarum, missâ vel eorum αναμαρτησια, dubio procul est anteponenda, cum testes & plures, & antiquiores fuerint, & rationes longè graviores habuerint diligentius inquirendi in causas mortis illatæ Joanni, quas ducunt ex Herodiadis, Philippo legitimo viro, contra jus & fas, ab Antipa ereptæ odio, in Joannem, sceleſtas nuptias damnantem. Equidem Josephus tenetur επ' αυτοφωρῳ deprehensus, cum ipse docuerit, Herodi Magno post mortem Antipatri, nil filiorum fuisse, præter Archelaum, Herodem Antipam, & Philippum, quos inter, regnum diviserat suum. Nec vero simile est in testamento, hujus Herodis, Herodiadi, ut ait Josephus, matrimonio conjuncti, parentem non meminisse, ne expers partis esset, de bonis ejus; eo magis, quo multa Salomi sorori suæ prædia moriendo dederat Herodes. Id faciles Josepho largiemur, ex Simonis Pontificis filia procreatum Herodi regi filium fuisse, paterno nomine donatum. Parenti superstitem fuisse, negabimus, ex alto historiæ Judaicæ silentio, in quâ vir ille partes egisset suas.——Erravit igitur Josephus.—Basn. Ann. Polit. Eccles. A. D. 29. n. 3.

 alogy,

alogy, to be secure from all errors, in giving an account of his children and all their marriages; especially, considering how much the (D) female descendants of Herod increased the task in a short time, by leaving or divorcing their husbands. But I can never persuade myself, that Josephus, a professed writer of Jewish history, could be guilty of so many mistakes, as are included in a mistake about Herodias's first husband. If he was not furnished with the events of all Herod's children, yet he must certainly know the marriages of the last princes in the land of Israel, his own country. Could he be ignorant, who was Philip the tetrarch's wife? who was the first husband of Herod the tetrarch's second wife, and of Agrippa the great's sister? Was not Herodias's leaving her first husband in all respects a most notorious action? was not Josephus well acquainted with her nephew, Agrippa the younger?

Basnage says, Josephus has assured us, Herod had but three sons left after the death of Antipater. I think, Josephus has never said any such thing. If he had, he would be a writer of no weight; since he has afterwards expressly said, that Herodias's first husband was Herod, the son of the high-priest's daughter. And if Josephus had assured us, that Herod the great had but three sons left after Antipater was dead, Basnage might have spared his arguments from the omission of Herod the high-priest's daughter's son, and the large estate left to Salome, in Herod the great's last will.

(D) Beside Herodias, her three nieces, daughters of her brother Herod Agrippa, would employ the attention of an historian. Bernice, the eldest, after the death of her first husband, Herod king of Chalcis, married Polemon king of Cilicia, [or, as some read it, Lycia.] 'But this marriage lasted 'not long, for Bernice left Polemon.' Ου μεν επι πολυ συνεμεινεν ο γαμος, αλλα Βερνικη δι ακολασιαν, ως εφασαν, καλλειπει τον Πολεμωνα. Antiq. lib. xx. c. 6. § 3. 'Mariamne [the second daughter] about 'the same time, having divorced Archelaus, 'the son of Helchias, married Demetrius 'the Alabarch of the Jews at Alexandria.' τω αυτω δε καιρω και Μαριαμνη, παραιτησαμενη τον Αρχελαον, συνωκησε τω Δημητριω'— τοτε δη και την αλαβαρχιαν αυτος ειχε· ib. Drusilla, the youngest, left Azizus king of the Emesenes, and married Felix: as has been shewn already, p. 25, 26. I have put down here all these instances for the sake of a remark. Our Saviour says: *Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery*, Mark x. 11, 12. It may be inferred from hence, that the Jewish women, as well as the men, did then practise divorces, and after that marry to others. These instances from Josephus confirm the inference. We may be assured these ladies were not singular: their examples would be followed by others; and, it is likely, were supported by many precedents. If the women took this licence, what would not the men do! Our historian Josephus affords us a double example of this practice. His first wife left him, vit. § 75. and he married another. Her he divorced, after he had had three children by her, because he was not pleased with her manners. And then he married a third, by whom also he had children: κατ' ον δη καιρον και την γυναικα, μη αρεσκομενος αυτης τοις ηθεσιν, απεπεμψαμην, τριων παιδων γενομενων μοι· § 76.

Indeed,

Indeed, there is no reason to conclude that Herod, son of the high-priest's daughter, died before his father; but a great deal of reason to suppose he survived him, beside the express mention made of him long afterwards, as the husband of Herodias. For in the will his father made after the inquiries into Antipater's conspiracy, and therefore in the last year of his life, this said Herod's succession was struck out, as Josephus expressly says[f]. And though there be no mention made in the account of Herod's last will, of any other sons by name, beside those to whom he left a part of his territories; yet it is very likely, there were others to whom he left presents[g]. It is not strange, that Herod should leave no towns or lordships to this son (though living) in his last will, since his mother had been lately detected in a great crime. Nay, it is not strange, that three sons only of Herod had tetrarchies, and the rest, though never so many, only sums of money or revenues. As for the towns bequeathed by Herod to his sister Salome, she had been always faithful to him, and it was fit she should have some extraordinary testimony of his affection. Josephus himself[h] assigns this as the reason of that regard shewed to her in Herod's wills.

And Philo says, that when Pilate dedicated shields, and placed them in Herod's palace at Jerusalem[i], the Jews got[k] four of the king's sons, and other his descendants, to make use of their interest with Pilate to remove the shields. If Philo may be relied upon in this matter, and if we may understand the word sons in the most proper sense, (which it seems most reasonable to do,) and not for grandchildren, or other descendants; then Herod must have left behind him at least two sons, beside the three betwixt whom he divided his dominions: for Archelaus certainly was not one of the four sons, whom Philo speaks of, because he had been banished into Gaul long before Pilate's government. Supposing then, that Herod tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip tetrarch of Trachonitis, were two of the four, there must have been two other sons of Herod, beside them and Archelaus.

[f] See before, p. 348. [g] Josephus's account of Herod's last will is, that he gave to Herod Antipas, Galilee, &c. to Philip, Gaulonitis, &c. to Archelaus the kingdom, to Salome his sister, Jamnia, &c. and that he took care of all the rest of his family, leaving them handsome legacies of money, or ample revenues. Πρȣνοησε δε και των λοιπων οποσοι συγγενεις ησαν αυτῳ, χρηματων τε δοσεσι και προσοδων αναφοραις, εκαστȣς εν ευποριᾳ καθιστᾳμενος. Antiq. l. xvii. c. 8. § 1. [h] Σαλωμην τε επι μεγα επλȣτιζεν την αδελφην, ευνȣν τε εν πασι προς αυτον διαμεμενηκυιαν, κ. τ. λ. Antiq. lib. xvii. c. 6. § 1. [i] Ανατιθησιν εν τοις κατα την ιεροπολιν Ηρωδȣ βασιλειοις. Philo de legat. in Cai. p. 1034. A. [k] Προστησαμενοι τȣς τε βασιλεως υιεις τετταρας,—— και τȣς αλλȣς απογονȣς· id. ibid.

But however Philo ought to be underſtood, I can never think it a fair way of getting rid of this difficulty, to charge Joſephus with a great many groſs blunders.

2. I proceed therefore to lay before the reader another ſolution, which has been in the main approved of already by many learned men.

(1.) The evangeliſts and Joſephus are in the right, and none of them have committed any miſtake in this matter. I have juſt ſhewn, that there is no reaſon to think Joſephus was miſtaken; and it is as unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the evangeliſts are miſtaken. They all agree in calling Herodias's firſt huſband Philip; and they appear to be fully maſters of the hiſtory of Herod the great's family. One or other of them have told us, that Archelaus ſucceeded his father in Judea; that Herod (who was alſo called Antipas,) was tetrarch of Galilee, Philip of Trachonitis. If they had not been well informed, ſome errors would have appeared here. St. Luke has given the proper titles and characters to all the other deſcendants of Herod, whom he has mentioned afterwards; Herod the king, Agrippa, Bernice, Druſilla.

They ſpeak of this unlawful marriage of Herodias, as a matter they were well acquainted with, and Joſephus concurs with them in the main.

(2.) The evangeliſts do not intend Philip the tetrarch, but the ſame perſon that Joſephus does. If they had intended Philip the tetrarch, when they ſpeak of Herodias's huſband, they would have given him his title: this is their conſtant method. St. Matthew ſays, that Jeſus was born *in the days of Herod the king*, ch. ii. 1. St. Luke, that the viſion of Zacharias was *in the days of Herod the king of Judea*, ch. i. 5. In the account of our Saviour's return from Egypt, St. Matthew ſays, that Joſeph heard that *Archelaus did reign in Judea, in the room of his father Herod*, ch. ii. 22. St. Luke gives the proper titles to all the princes, whom he mentions at the beginning of John the Baptiſt's miniſtry. In the account of Pilate's ſending our Saviour to Herod, it appears plainly, that he was the tetrarch of Galilee, to whom he was ſent, Luke xxiii. 6—8. When St. Luke begins the hiſtory of Herod Agrippa, he calls him *the king*, Acts xii. 1. He gives alſo the title of *king* to *Agrippa*, Acts xxv. 13.

Indeed, the church at Jeruſalem in their prayer to God, give Herod and Pontius Pilate no titles, Acts iv. 27. and I believe, none would have them there at length. In the account of the death of John the Baptiſt, and of this marriage, all the

evangelists do ever give Herod his title: Matt. xiv. 1. Mark vi. 14. Luke iii. 19. ix. 7. But not one of them has given the Philip, whom they mention, any title; but that *Herod had laid hold of John, and put him in prison for Herodias sake, his brother Philip's wife,* Matt. xiv. 3. or bound him in prison *for Herodias sake, his brother Philip's wife,* Mark vi. 17. Again, *Herod the tetrarch being reproved by him for Herodias his brother Philip's wife,* Luke iii. 19. I make no doubt therefore, but that Philip, Herodias's first husband, was a private person, who lived, in all probability, at Jerusalem; and that Herod the tetrarch, in his way to Rome, there fell in love with her, and made the contract. Philip then, whom the evangelists speak of, as the first husband of Herodias, was a private person, invested with no titles or dignities: so is Josephus's Herod, as appears from the history I have given of him. And it is not unlikely, that this was one reason, among others, why Herod the tetrarch's proposal of marriage was so soon accepted by Herodias, an ambitious woman.

The only difficulty therefore concerning this matter, arises from the name. Josephus calls this person Herod, the evangelists Philip: moreover, Philip was the name of the tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis; therefore it may be thought strange, that Herod the great should have another son called Philip.

This difficulty will be cleared by the following considerations. It is not at all strange, that Herod the great should have two sons called by the same name, when he had children by seven or eight wives. Even according to Josephus, the eldest son was called Antipater, and another, who was the youngest, Antipas, or Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee. These are but one and the same name, only a different termination. Josephus mentions three of Herod's sons of the name of Herod, without any addition[l]. But yet it is highly probable, they had some other names, by which they were distinguished, though Josephus has not mentioned them. Grotius[m] thinks it very probable, there was a Philip among the ancestors of Herod the great, after whom two of his sons were named Philip; as there were two of them, who bore the name of Antipater or Antipas from his father.

Though there was another brother by the same father, namely Philip the tetrarch, called by the same name with Herodias's husband; yet it was not necessary for the evangelists to take notice of it. When writers relate a well known fact,

[l] Vid. Jos. Ant. l. xvii. c. 1. l. xviii. c. 6. § 4. De Bell. l. i. c. 28. & Geneal. Herod. in Reland. Palest. Illustr. [m] In Matt. xix. 3.

near

near the time in which it happened, whilst there is no danger of persons making a mistake, this precaution is often neglected. Dio's account of Archelaus's removal is thus: 'Herod of Palestine being accused by his brothers, was banished to the other [n] side the Alps.' Herod was the name, by which the tetrarch of Galilee was usually called; and he also was afterwards banished to the other side the Alps: yet I believe, no one ever charged Dio with a mistake here, as to the person he speaks of, or suspected, that he thought the tetrarch of Galilee was banished from his dominions A. U. 759. I will transcribe here an observation of the learned and judicious[o] Prideaux. 'He [Ptolemy Lathyrus] was succeeded by Cleopatra his 'daughter, and only legitimate child. Her proper name was 'Berenice, and so Pausanias calls her. For it is to be noted, 'that as all the males of this family had the common name of 'Ptolemy, so all the females of it had the name of Cleopatra, 'and besides had other proper names to distinguish them from 'each other. Thus Selene was called Cleopatra, and so were 'also two other of her sisters. And in like manner, this 'daughter of Lathyrus, whose proper name was Berenice, 'bore also that of Cleopatra, according to the usage of her 'family. The observing of this will remove many obscurities 'and difficulties in the Egyptian history.'

The evangelists do all agree in calling Herodias's first husband Philip, and they appear fully masters of their story: it is therefore highly reasonable to suppose, he was called Philip as well as Herod. I shall put a case resembling this: Josephus always calls Livia, Augustus's wife[p], Julia, though that was the proper name of Augustus's daughter, without ever giving the least hint of his reason for it. It is true, that though the Roman historians do generally call her Livia, yet they have told us, that she had also the name of Julia, and have informed us of the reason for it; which was, that Augustus in his last will adopted his wife into the Julian family, and appointed that she should bear the name of Julia[q]. And there are medals on which she bears this name. But if nothing of this had appeared in any of the Roman authors, or inscriptions that are extant, yet since Josephus appears to be well acquainted with the Roman affairs from Julius Cæsar down to his own time; I believe most men would have allowed, that he had some good

[n] Ο, τε Ηρωδης ο Παλαιστινος, αλλιαν τινα απο των αδελφων λαξων, υπο τας Αλπεις υπερωρισθη. Lib. lv. p. 767. B.

[o] Conn. Part II. year before Christ 81. p. 396.

[p] Vid. Jos. p. 1028, not. h.

[q] Tiberium & Liviam heredes habuit. Livia in familiam Juliam nomenque Augustæ adsumebatur. Tacit. lib. i. c. 8. vid etiam Sueton. Aug. c. 101. Dion. p. 600. A.

reason

reason for calling the wife of Augustus, Julia. For the same reason, a like supposition ought to be made in behalf of the evangelists, in the case before us.

It was exceeding common among the ancients, Jews and others, for persons to have two names, and to be called sometimes by the one, and sometimes by the other. There are several instances in the New Testament: *Simon, who is called Peter*; *Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus*; Matt. x. 2, 3. *Thomas, which is called Dydimus*, John xi. 16. *Simeon, that was called Niger*, Acts xiii. 1. *Saul, who was also called Paul.*

Josephus calls Caiaphas, the high-priest, Joseph. He has indeed told us, that he was also called Caiaphas[r]. If mankind would have been as equitable to the writers of the New Testament, as they usually are to other authors, to some who are far from giving equal tokens of skill or probity with them; this would have created no difficulty, though Josephus had never subjoined the name of Caiaphas to that of Joseph. But if any had been disposed to give the evangelists unfair and unequal treatment, it is likely they would have pretended, that here was a notorious blunder; and that Caiaphas was so far from being high-priest when John Baptist began his ministry, and when Jesus was crucified, that there never was any such person high-priest among the Jews.

I hope what is already said, may be sufficient to convince all reasonable men, there is no just ground to suspect the evangelists of any mistake in the name of Herodias's first husband. However, there is somewhat farther to be offered: there are other writings extant, in which he is called Philip. I shall transcribe here the account of it in Whitby's words: 'Gori-'onides saith, Herodias was first married to Philip, and then 'taken away from him by Herod Antipas. The old Hebrew 'chronicle saith, "Uxorem fratris sui Philippi ipso vivente "junxit sibi matrimonio, quæ liberos ex fratre ejus susceperat, "& tamen is eam duxit uxorem," (chap. 36.) And an old 'chronicle of the second temple saith, "Antipas Philippi fra-"tris sui uxorem accepit, ex qua ille liberos ante genuerat," '(F. 54. c. 4.) i. e. "Antipas married the wife of his bro-"ther Philip, he being yet living, and having had children "by her[s]."

[r] p. 795. v. 23. p. 802. v. 28. [s] Whitby on Matt. xiv. 3.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Zacharias, the Son of Barachias.

There are ſome difficulties attending the prophetical repreſentation, given by our Lord, of thoſe judgments, which he foreſaw would ſoon befal the Jewiſh nation. This we have in two of the evangeliſts, in St. Matthew and St. Luke. One account will illuſtrate the other, and we may have ſome occaſion to refer to each of them; therefore I ſhall ſet them both down here at once.

The account of this matter, as it ſtands in St. Matthew, is thus: ch. xxiii. 29—36. *Woe unto you, ſcribes and phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garniſh the ſepulchres of the righteous; and ſay, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witneſſes unto yourſelves, that ye be the children of them that killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the meaſure of your fathers. Ye ſerpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye eſcape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold, I ſend unto you prophets, and wiſe men and ſcribes, and ſome of them ye ſhall kill and crucify, and ſome of them ſhall ye ſcourge in your ſynagogues, and perſecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood ſhed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of* ZACHARIAS, SON OF BARACHIAS, *whom ye ſlew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I ſay unto you, all theſe things ſhall come upon this generation.*

The parallel place in St. Luke, ch. xi. 47—51. is in theſe words: *Woe unto you, for ye build the ſepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Truly ye bear witneſs, that ye allow the deeds of your fathers; for they indeed killed them, and ye build their ſepulchres. Therefore alſo ſaid the wiſdom of God, I will ſend them prophets and apoſtles, and ſome of them they ſhall ſlay and perſecute; that the blood of all the prophets, which was ſhed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; from the blood of Abel, unto the* BLOOD OF ZACHARIAS, *which periſhed between the altar and the temple: verily, I ſay unto you, it ſhall be required of this generation.*

Here the evangeliſts may be charged with a miſtake ſeveral ways. They who would ſuppoſe, that Zacharias here referred to is Zacharias, one of the twelve leſſer Jewiſh prophets, will ſay,

ſay, they muſt have been miſtaken, becauſe in the time of this Zacharias, the temple is ſuppoſed to have been in ruins: and therefore it is impoſſible he ſhould have been killed *between the temple and the altar*. And others, who ſuppoſe Zacharias, here intended, is Zacharias, whoſe death is related in 2 Chron. xxiv. may ſay, that St. Matthew miſtook the name of his father; for his name was Jehoiada, and not Barachias.

There is another Zacharias, whoſe death is related by Joſephus; but that happened not, till long after the time in which our Saviour is ſuppoſed to have ſpoken theſe words. This ſeems to afford the moſt formidable objection: I ſhall therefore ſtate and conſider it particularly; and in anſwering this, I hope to anſwer alſo the other two.

Before I ſtate this objection, I ſhall here tranſcribe the paſſage of Joſephus on which it is founded. I muſt abridge it indeed, but I ſhall omit nothing that is material to the point before us.

'The zealots,' ſays Joſephus, 'were exceedingly enraged 'againſt Zacharias [a], the ſon of Baruch: for he was a man 'who deteſted all wickedneſs, was a lover of liberty, and 'moreover was very rich. They call [b] together therefore by 'a decree ſeventy of the chief of the people, and form a kind 'of council, deſtitute of all authority. They then brought 'Zacharias before them, and accuſed him of a conſpiracy with 'the Romans; and in particular charged him with ſending 'meſſengers to Veſpaſian, the better to concert meaſures for 'betraying them into his hands.' But they had no witneſſes. The facts were not proved. Zacharias, in a ſpeech he delivered before the council, confuted all the calumnies of the zealots, and warmly reproved them for their wickedneſs. 'The ſeventy 'then acquitted him, chooſing rather to die with him, than 'to bring upon themſelves the imputation of his death. He 'being thus abſolved, the zealots raiſed a loud clamour againſt 'thoſe judges, as not underſtanding the deſign, for which 'they had been inveſted with authority. And two of the moſt 'daring of the zealots, falling upon Zacharias in the middle 'of the temple, ſlew him there [c].'

It may be ſaid then: from hence it appears, that the writers of theſe books were not acquainted with the affairs of thoſe times; theſe writings therefore do not come from St. Matthew or St. Luke: at leaſt the authors of them did not live at the

[a] Ζαχαριαν υιον Βαρυχου. [b] Συγκαλουσιν εξ επιταγματος εβδομηκοντα των εν τοιαν δημοτων. [c] Δυο δε των τολμηροτατων, προσπεσοντες εν μεσω τω ιερω, διαφθειρουσι τον Ζαχαριαν. De Bell. l. iv. c. 5. §4.

time

time they are ſuppoſed to have lived; poſſibly not till long afterwards. How elſe could they have committed ſuch a blunder, as to make Jeſus tell the Jews of his time, in the reign of Tiberius, that they had killed Zacharias the ſon of Barachias, or Baruch? when Joſephus informs us, that he was not killed till the latter end of Nero's reign, above thirty years after theſe words are ſaid to have been ſpoken by Chriſt.

I. To this I anſwer, in the firſt place, that the fact related by Joſephus does not ſuit the words of Chriſt in the evangeliſts.

For (1.) the name of the father of Zacharias ſeems to be different. Whitby[d] obſerves, 'that as Baruch in Jeremiah, 'and the Apocrypha is always called by the Septuagint Βαρυχ, 'Baruch, ſo ברכיה, Barachiah, is rendered by them Βαραχιας, 'Barachiah, Iſa. viii. 2. Zech. i. 1. 7. And in Neh. iii. we find 'Βαραχιας, Barachias, v. 4. and Βαρυχ, Baruch, v. 20. which 'ſhews they were not the ſame name.

(2.) Their characters are not the ſame. The deſign of our Saviour's diſcourſe obliges us to ſuppoſe, that Zacharias, whom he mentioned, was a *prophet:* whereas Zacharias in Joſephus has not that character from him.

(3.) The place in which they are ſaid to have been ſlain, is not the ſame. Zacharias, in the goſpels, periſhed *between the temple and the altar*, according to both St. Matthew and St. Luke: but there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe, that Joſephus's Zacharias was ſlain in the inner court, in which the altar ſtood. The council was not held within that court: and Zacharias ſeems to have been ſlain immediately after his abſolution by the council. If he was ſlain in any part of the Ιερον, temple, that is perfectly agreeable to the words of Joſephus; for under that name were comprehended the temple, and all the courts and buildings belonging to it.

Theſe ſeveral inſtances of diſagreement, I ſhould think, muſt incline moſt perſons to conclude, that the ſame Zacharias was not intended by the evangeliſts and Joſephus.

But perhaps this is more than is reaſonable to expect ſhould be allowed by an objector. He can eaſily believe of writers, who are in little credit with him, that they may run far wide of the truth, and really intend a fact that has but a ſmall reſemblance with their relation. With ſuch, what hath been ſaid hitherto will have little weight.

I proceed therefore to ſome other conſiderations.

II. I ſay then, that our Lord, in the words we are conſidering, inſtanceth in facts ſuppoſed to have been

[d] On Matt. xxiii. 35.

ſiderable time before. The whole tenor and deſign of his diſcourſe aſſures us of it.

The Zacharias he mentions is not one, whom they of that age had themſelves ſlain, but rather one of thoſe prophets whoſe tombs they built.

The ſum of what our Saviour ſays (if I miſtake not) is this: Ye ſay, *If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.* This you ſay; but, as hereby you own, that you *are the children of them that killed the prophets*; ſo by your conduct, by your malice, your pride, your hypocriſy, your obſtinate diſobedience to God, you make it appear, that you allow the deeds of your fathers, and are their genuine offſpring: you even exceed them in wickedneſs; you are now filling up, and will ſtill go on to fill up the meaſure of their iniquity. I am come among you in my father's name, and have done works, which no man ever did, but you do not hearken to me; my words you do not receive, and me you will crucify. God will ſend among you, as he did to your fathers, prophets and wiſe men, to inſtruct you in the moſt excellent doctrine, to admoniſh and reclaim you; but ye will kill and crucify them, ſcourge them in your ſynagogues, and perſecute them from city to city. Hereby you will make the wicked deeds of your fathers your own, and bring the guilt of them upon yourſelves: you will hereby deſerve, that all the righteous blood, ſhed from the foundation of the world, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias, ſhould be required of you: and verily I ſay unto you, *it ſhall be required of this generation.*

Our Lord ſeems to me to remind them of inſtances of diſobedience and cruelty, which they were well acquainted with, *which they avowedly condemned*, and pretended to ſee the evil of, but yet did, and would imitate in a moſt notorious manner; and hereby would bring the guilt of them upon themſelves. And the concluſion of all obliges us to ſuppoſe, that the death of the Zacharias he had mentioned, was an act of cruelty committed by their fathers. This is the ſenſe of the words in both the evangeliſts.

This appears to me ſo evident, that if there had been no event recorded in any of their ancient writings, which anſwered to the death of Zacharias here deſcribed; yet I ſhould have ſuppoſed, that there was ſome ſuch event that had happened ſome time before, and which they were then well acquainted with.

III. However, we have[c] a fact recorded in the Old Teſtament, which exactly anſwers the words of our Saviour. It is in 2 Chron. xxiv. 17—22. *Now after the death of Jehoiada—they left the houſe of the Lord God of their fathers,—and wrath came upon Judah and Jeruſalem: yet he ſent prophets unto them to bring them again unto the Lord, and they teſtified againſt them: but they would not give ear. And the ſpirit of God came upon Zachariah, the ſon of Jehoiada the prieſt, which ſtood above the people, and ſaid unto them, Thus ſaith God, Why tranſgreſs ye the commandment of the Lord? And they conſpired againſt him, and ſtoned him with ſtones at the commandment of the king in the court of the houſe of the Lord. Thus Joaſh the king remembered not the kindneſs which Jehoiada his father had done to him, but ſlew his ſon: and when he died, he ſaid, the Lord look upon it, and require it.*

This fact is exactly parallel with that deſcribed by our Lord. (1.) This Zachariah ſpoke in the name of the Lord, *the ſpirit of God came upon him.* It was ſuitable to our Lord's deſign to inſtance in the death of a *prophet. Ye ſay, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the death of the* PROPHETS.—*I ſend unto you* PROPHETS, *and wiſe men and ſcribes.* Abel was a *righteous man*, and this Zacharias a *prophet.*

(2.) The place, in which this Zacharias is ſaid to have been killed, anſwers the deſcription in the evangeliſts; he was ſlain in the *court of the houſe of the Lord*, that is, in the court of the prieſts, the inner court of the temple. In both the evangeliſts the ſame place is ſpecified, *between the temple and the altar:* This particular circumſtance of ſo remarkable an event was, doubtleſs, handed down to them by tradition. According to the account in the Chronicles, he was in the inner court, when he delivered his meſſage from God to them: *He ſtood above the people.* The ground of the inner court was raiſed above the reſt; he ſtood at the extremity of that, and ſpoke to the people ſtanding in the next court below him: *at the commandment of the king* they ruſhed in upon Zachariah: he retired, they purſued him, and *ſtoned him with ſtones*, ſo that he fell down in the ſpace between the altar of burnt-offerings and the temple.

(3.) Our Lord ſubjoins, *whom* YE SLEW. The death of Zacharias, in the Chronicles, was the act of the nation, of king and people: this particular is added to this inſtance with the higheſt propriety. The death of Abel was the death of a

[c] See Whitby, Matt. xxiii. 36.

righteous

righteous man, but not committed by them: the death of Zacharias was the act of their anceſtors, that is, of that people to whom our Lord was ſpeaking; for a nation is in all ages reckoned the ſame people. *And he anſwered and ſaid unto them, what did Moſes command* YOU? Mark x. 3. *Verily I ſay unto you, Moſes gave* YOU *not that bread from heaven.* John vi. 32. *Did not Moſes give* YOU the law? Ch. vii. 19. See 22.

(4.) Expreſſions made uſe of in the hiſtory of Zacharias in the Chronicles, and by our Saviour in his diſcourſe to the Jews, put it paſt doubt, that he intended this fact, and alluded to this very account in that book. *Behold I ſend unto you prophets and wiſe men and ſcribes.* The hiſtory in the Chronicles begins thus: *Yet he ſent unto them prophets to bring them again unto the Lord, and they teſtified againſt them*, &c. It concludes: *And when he died, he ſaid, the Lord look upon it, and require it.* Our Saviour tells the Jews, *that the blood of all the prophets would be required of that generation.*

(5.) As the fact related in the Chronicles does in all its circumſtances anſwer that deſcribed by our Lord, ſo there is a ſuitableneſs in the order in which it ſtands in our Lord's diſcourſe. Abel is the firſt *righteous man* ſlain, and the death of Zacharias is the laſt act of cruelty to a *prophet* related in the Jewiſh ſacred writings.

IV. It ought to be obſerved, that there is an exact harmony between the evangeliſts, in the account they have given of this diſcourſe of our Saviour, though there is no reaſon to think, that one has copied the other. This ought to ſatisfy us, that no miſtake has been made.

In one particular indeed there is a difference. In St. Matthew Zacharias is ſtyled the ſon of Barachias, whereas in St. Luke's account it is not ſaid who was his father.

And in this particular the perſon, whom our Saviour ſpeaks of, ſeems not to anſwer to him mentioned in the Chronicles; for there he is called the ſon of Jehoiada.

There is therefore but one objection againſt ſuppoſing, that our Saviour meant the Zacharias in the Chronicles: but it is ſuch an objection as deſerves conſideration.

It has been obſerved by[f] divers learned men, that many perſons among the Jews were called by two names, eſpecially when their true name happened to have ſome of the letters of the word Jehovah in it. For this reaſon Barachias may have been uſed for Jehoiada, ſince likewiſe theſe two names have much the ſame meaning.

[f] Vid. Grot. & Whitb. in loc.

Other learned men ſuppoſe, that Barachias was very early inſerted into St. Matthew's goſpel by ſome tranſcriber. There is the more reaſon for this ſuppoſition, becauſe it is wanting in St. Luke. Or elſe Jehoiada might have been originally in St. Matthew, but ſome Chriſtian tranſcriber, not well acquainted with the Jewiſh hiſtory, nor knowing who Jehoiada was, and therefore ſuſpecting that to be a miſtake, might pretend to correct it, by putting Barachias in the room of Jehoiada. Zachariah, the ſon of Barachias, whoſe prophecies form one of the books of the Old Teſtament, was certainly better known among the chriſtians, than Zacharias the ſon of Jehoiada. It is not at all unlikely therefore, that our not having this name in St. Matthew, may be owing to the ignorance and raſhneſs of ſome tranſcriber. This ſuppoſition ſeems to be favoured by what St. Jerom ſays, who informs us, that in the goſpel of the Nazarenes, Zachariah is called the ſon [g] of Jehoiada.

Some have thought, that there is a like inſtance in Matt. xiii. 35. where we have theſe words, *That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by the prophet, ſaying, I will open my mouth in parables,* &c. The words of this quotation are in Pſ. lxxviii. 2. the title of which is *Maſchil of Aſaph.* St. Jerom [h] ſays, that in ſome copies of St. Matthew it was written, *That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by the prophet Eſaias.* He thinks it was originally, *which was ſpoken by the prophet Aſaph:* but ſome tranſcriber, not knowing Aſaph to be a prophet, put Eſaias in his room. Afterwards others, perceiving there were no ſuch words as thoſe which follow here to be found in Eſaias, left out his name; and from thence forward in moſt copies it was written, *which was ſpoken by the prophet, ſaying,* &c.

I crave leave to mention an obſervation, that may ſupport the former of theſe two ſuppoſitions, viz. that originally *the ſon of Barachias* was wanting in St. Matthew, as well as in St. Luke. The ancient chriſtians ſeem to have been very much divided in their opinion, who was the Zacharias here ſpoken of. Many chriſtians in St. Jerom's time thought, he was Zacharias the father of John the Baptiſt; borrowing this notion (as he [i] adds,) from ſome apocryphal books of no authority. In the copies of St. Matthew's goſpel in his time, he was ſtyled the ſon of Barachias, as in ours: but the Nazarene chriſtians, being Jews by birth, and underſtanding the hiſtory of their own

g In evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni pro filio Barachiæ, filium Joiadæ reperimus ſcriptum. S. Hieron. comment. Matt. xxiii. 36. h In loc. i Comm. in Matt. xxiii. 36.

nation,

nation, had it in their goſpel, *Zacharias the ſon of Jehoiada.* This indeed was the truth, but it ſeems to have been an inſertion.

But this is left to the reader, to judge of as he thinks fit. It is highly probable, that one of theſe may be the caſe; either that Jehoiada, not being well known, Barachias was put in his room; or elſe, that *the ſon of Barachias*, was added.

There being ſo probable an account of this reading, I hope there remains no farther ſcruple about this text.

There is another interpretation of theſe words, which ſome have inclined to, namely, that Zacharias here mentioned is Zacharias, whoſe death Joſephus has given us the hiſtory of, and that our Saviour ſpoke of him by way of prophecy. But as there can be no objection, which I am concerned with, formed againſt the evangeliſts from this ſenſe of the words, I have taken no notice of it.

Beſides, I think it is by no means the true ſenſe of the place. Whitby obſerves very well, 'that Chriſt ſpeaks here of the 'prophets, whom they had ſlain, not of one who was to be 'ſlain a little before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem; for then none 'of the people could have underſtood his meaning.'

By the whole tenor of our Saviour's diſcourſe, the Zacharias he ſpeaks of is excluded from the number of thoſe that were to be ſlain. If Zacharias, whom Joſephus ſpeaks of, was as good a man as he repreſents him, and did faithfully reprove the wickedneſs of the prevailing party of his nation, he might be one of thoſe *holy and wiſe men*, whom our Saviour foreſaw would be ſlain by the Jews: but he can never be the Zacharias whom our Saviour mentioned by name; for he is one of thoſe prophets which had been ſlain before, and whoſe blood would be required of them.

CHAP. VII.

OF THEUDAS.

It will be proper in the next place to conſider the objection relating to Theudas. The apoſtles were brought before the council at Jeruſalem, Acts v. 34—36. *And when they took counſel to ſlay them, Gamaliel commanded to put the Apoſtles forth a little ſpace; and ſaid unto them, Ye men of Iſrael take heed to*

yourselves, what ye intend to do as touching these men. FOR BEFORE THESE DAYS ROSE UP THEUDAS, *boasting himself to be somebody, to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves: who was slain, and all as many as obeyed him, were scattered and brought to nought.* AFTER THIS MAN *rose up Judas of Galilee, in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him: and all, even as many as obeyed him, were dispersed.*

This speech of Gamaliel was made not long after our Saviour's ascension: Ludovicus Cappellus places it in the beginning of Caligula's [a] reign; Whitby [b] and others, three or four years sooner, in the 20th of Tiberius, A. D. 34. And Gamaliel here speaks of Theudas, as having given disturbance before Judas of Galilee, who in the days of the taxing drew away much people. This refers doubtless to the assessment made by Cyrenius after Archelaus was deposed, when Judea was reduced to a Roman [c] province: which happened in the sixth or seventh year of the christian æra. It was at this time that Judas, whom Josephus calls Judas Gaulanites, and likewise Judas the Galilean, raised disturbances in that country.

But Josephus gives us an account of an impostor called Theudas, when Cuspius Fadus was procurator in Judea; and therefore not before the fourth year of Claudius the Roman emperor, A. D. 44, that is, seven years after Gamaliel's speech was made, according to Cappellus's computation, and ten years after it, according to Whitby's.

Josephus's words are these: 'Whilst Fadus was procurator 'of Judea, a certain impostor called Theudas, persuaded a 'very great multitude, taking their effects along with them, 'to follow him to the river Jordan: for he said he was a 'prophet, and that causing the river to divide at his com'mand, he would give them an easy passage over. By these 'speeches he deceived many: but Fadus was far from suffering 'them to go on in their madness; for he sent out a troop of 'horse, who, coming upon them unexpectedly, slew many, 'and took many prisoners. Theudas himself was among the 'latter; they cut off his head, and brought it to Jerusalem. 'These things happened in Judea, while Cuspius Fadus was 'procurator [d].'

[a] Spicileg. in Act. v. 36. [b] Whitby Par. on this text. [c] Jos. Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. ult. l. xviii. cap. 1. De B. Jud. lib. vii. cap. 8. § 1. [d] Φάδου δὲ της Ιουδαιας επιτροπευοντος, γοης τις ανηρ, Θευδας ονομαι, πειθει τον πλειστον οχλον, αναλαβοντα τας κτησεις επεσθαι προς τον Ιορδανην ποταμον αυτω· προφητης γαρ ελεγεν ειναι, και προσταγματι τον ποταμον σχισας, διοδον εφη παρεξειν αυτοις ραδιαν· και ταυτα λεγων πολλους ηπατησεν· ου μην ειασεν αυτους της αφροσυνης ονασθαι Φαδος, αλλ' εξεπεμψει ιλην ιππεων επ' αυτους, ητις, απροσδοκητος επιπεσουσα, πολλους με ανειλε, πολλους

Ιε

It may therefore be pretended, that St. Luke has made a miſtake. The Theudas whom Joſephus mentions, appeared not till ſeveral years after Gamaliel's ſpeech was made: nor has Joſephus ſaid any thing of any other. The perſon Gamaliel ſpeaks of, is of the ſame name; he likewiſe *boaſted himſelf to be ſomebody*, that is, a prophet: he was ſlain, and his followers were ſcattered. In theſe particulars Gamaliel and Joſephus agree, therefore they mean the ſame perſon, but they differ moſt widely about the time: for which reaſon St. Luke muſt have been miſtaken.

Divers ſolutions have been offered of this difficulty.

1. Some ſay, St. Luke might put the affair of Theudas into Gamaliel's ſpeech by way of anticipation. He knew very well, that Theudas did not appear till after this time; but this being a very proper inſtance, and ſuitable to the main ſcope and deſign of the ſpeech which Gamaliel made, he inſerted it himſelf. But this is not at all agreeable to the ſimplicity of St. Luke's narration, eſpecially conſidering how particular he is as to the number of Theudas's followers: *To whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themſelves.* And one would think Valeſius was at a loſs for examples of anticipation, when the only one he produces is out of a poet, and that has ſcarce any reſemblance with this before us [e].

2. Some think that Joſephus has been miſtaken, and has miſplaced Theudas's inſurrection. This ſolution Valeſius prefers before the former, and it is approved likewiſe by [f] Le Clerc. They underſtand Gamaliel to ſay, *Before theſe days* [g], that is, a little while ago, *roſe up Theudas, boaſting himſelf to be ſomebody.* And if you look farther back [h], *before this man,*

δ. ζωντας ελαβεν· αυτον τε τον Θευδαν ζωγρησαντες αποτεμνουσι την κεφαλην, και κομιζουσιν εις Ιεροσολυμα· τα μεν ουν συμβαντα τοις Ιουδαιοις κατα τους Κυσπιου Φαδου της ουτοπης χρονους, ταυτα εγενετο. Ant. l. xx. c. 4. § 1. [e] Alia quoque conciliandi ratio excogitari poteſt; ſi dicamus B. Lucam in eo loco κατα προληψιν locutum eſſe. Quæ quidem figura occurrit interdum apud antiquos ſcriptores, exempli cauſa apud Virgilium, cum dicit:

——portuſque require Velinos.

Atque cum hæc dicerentur Æneæ, nondum condita erat Velia. Valeſ. Annot. in Euſeb. H. E. l. ii. c. 11. [f] Clerici Hiſtor. Eccl. A. D. 28. n. 60. [g] Προ γαρ τουτων των ημερων ανεστη Θευδας. Quæ verba [illegible] ac noviſſimè factam demonſtrant. Valeſ. [illegible] [h] Sed quoniam Caſaubonus negat Græcos unquam ita locutos fuiſſe, producendus eſt teſtis omni exceptione major. Is eſt Clemens Alexandrinus, qui in lib. vii. Stromat. ſub finem, eodem prorſus modo locutus eſt quo B. Lucas:——Nam Marcion iiſdem quidem temporibus vixit quibus Baſilides & Valentinus. Verum tanquam ſenior cum illis adhuc junioribus verſatus eſt. Addit deinde, μεθ' ον Σιμων επ' ολιγον κηρυσσοντος του Πετρου υπηκουσεν. *Poſt quem Simon prædicantem Petrum audivit aliquamdiu.* Quis non videt in hoc Clementis loco poſt hunc idem valere atque ante hunc,—ſed & geographiæ ſcriptores, quoties terrarum ſitum & populorum nomina deſcribunt, eodem loquuntur modo. Dicunt enim μετα τουτους εισιν εκεινοι. Id. ib.

(not *after this man*, as we render it,) *rose up Judas of Galilee.* ——Thus, according to Valesius, Josephus has not misplaced this event of Theudas above 12 years; but according to Mr. Le Clerc, the error is greater, for he supposes he *rose up* A.D. 28.

But this kind of solutions appears to me perfectly arbitrary, and not to be untying, but cutting the knot; and I freely own I have no right to them. It is very unlikely, that Josephus should have been mistaken about the time of that Theudas's insurrection which he gives an account of; he may have made mistakes in chronology; but Josephus is very express here, that this affair happened in the time of Fadus, when he himself must have been seven years of age.

And in my opinion these learned men give a wrong meaning to two expressions in Gamaliel's speech. It is not necessary to understand those words, *Before these days rose up Theudas*, of a *little while ago*, two or three years before: these common phrases are loose and undetermined in all languages, and signify sometimes a shorter, at others, a longer space of time; and the subject matter of the discourse, or the coherence of things, or some light from abroad, can alone determine what the space of time intended is. It is said, Acts ix. 22, 23. *But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which were at Damascus.*—AND AFTER THAT MANY DAYS *were fulfilled, the Jews took council to kill him.* By these *many days* can be meant but a short space of time, as appears from Gal. i. 17, 18. St. Paul tells Felix, Acts xxiv. 10. *Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do the more cheerfully answer for myself:* though it is likely, Felix had not then been in Judea above five years. And yet it might be said very properly, that he had been there *many years*; since in five years time, a governor may be supposed to gain a good insight into the laws and customs of his province, and the temper of the people; as also, because very often governors were removed in a shorter space of time. When Pilate's soldiers had marched into Jerusalem with ensigns, the Jews went from thence in a great body to Pilate at Cæsarea, and there made 'supplications,' Josephus[i] says, 'many days.' But it appears presently afterwards, that on the[k] sixth day from their arrival, Pilate seated himself on his tribunal and granted their petition. So Josephus relates this in his Antiquities: in his War these earnest supplications continued 'five whole days[l] and nights.'

[i] Ικετειαν ποιουμενοι επι πολλας ημερας. Ant. l. xviii. cap. 4. § 1.

[k] Κατα εκτην ημεραν——αυτος επι το βημα ηκε. ib.

[l] Επι πεντε ημερας και νυκτας ισας ακινητοι διεκαρτερουν. l. ii. c. 9. § 2.

Thus

Thus these phrases, that seem to import a long duration, are much limited by the connexion of a discourse, or by the nature of the things spoken of: and other phrases, that denote ordinarily a shorter duration, must be understood sometimes with great latitude. There is an example in Jeremiah, chap. xxxi. 31. *Behold* THE DAYS COME, *saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel.* Ver. 33. AFTER THOSE DAYS, *saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts.* I suppose no one thinks these promises or predictions were to be accomplished presently. Porphyry says, 'that 'many of the ancients had been supposed to understand the 'sounds of birds and other animals, and Apollonius[m] of 'Tyana not long ago.' Apollonius died before the end of the first century of the christian æra: Porphyry was not born till the 232d or 233d year[n] of the same æra. Every one must be sensible, with what latitude Porphyry's 'not long ago' is to be understood. I place another remarkable example from Cicero in the margin[o].

I see no necessity therefore of restraining the sense of the phrase, *before these days*, to two or three years; it may as well intend twenty or thirty years: it is plain it does so here, since it was not till after Theudas that Judas rose up.

Which brings me to the other phrase misunderstood by these learned men: *After this man*, μετα τουτον. The instances of the use of this preposition by geographers for a remoter distance are not to the point, because here it imports time: and as for Valesius's quotation from St. Clement; I think it not worth while to consider here, whether he understands it right or not. At the best, St. Clement's passage is very obscure and perplexed. St. Luke's phrase is one of the most common phrases in all the Greek language, and is ever understood as it is rendered in this place by our translators. It would be unreasonable to affix a new meaning to a very common phrase, upon the single authority of one obscure passage: this is said upon the supposition, that the phrase in St. Clement was the same with that in St. Luke, and that the sense assigned by Valesius to St. Clement's passage was the most likely sense of any. But indeed the phrase in St. Clement is not the same, and for that reason is of the less weight here.

[m] Ὡς επι μεν των παλαιων ο Μελαμπος, [illegible] ὁ τοιουτοι, ου προ πολλου δε Απολλω- [illegible] ο Τυανευς. Porphyr. de Abst. l. iii. [illegible]

[n] Vid. Luc. Holsten. de Vit. & Script. Porphyr. cap. 2.

[o] Quid ea, quæ NUPER, id est paucis ante seculis, medicorum ingeniis reperta sunt? De Nat. Deor. l. ii. c. 50.

I see

I suppose then that our translation is just, and that the substance of this part of Gamaliel's speech is this: Not long since rose up Theudas. It might be thirty years or more. The persons he spoke to knew very well how long. And after this man, in the time of the celebrated assessment, when Judea was made a Roman province, rose up Judas of Galilee. Both these men perished, and their adherents were scattered.

3. And the solution, already offered by divers learned[p] men, of the difficulty under consideration, appears to me perfectly just. There were two Theudases in Judea that were impostors, one before Judas of Galilee, and another in the reign of Claudius. There is no mistake upon this head in Josephus, nor in St. Luke, who has given us an exact and true account of Gamaliel's speech.

It is not at all unlikely, that there should be two impostors in Judea of the same name in the compass of about forty (A) years, and that they should both come to the same end. These are the two chief difficulties in this matter, and they may be both cleared up.

1. It is not at all strange, that there should be two impostors in Judea of the name Theudas in the space of forty years. There were several impostors named Simon. Beside Simon Magus, mentioned in the New Testament, and often spoken of by the first Christian writers, there was one Simon a servant of Herod; who, after his master's death, had the impudence to set himself up for king, and put[q] on a diadem. After a long and obstinate engagement with Gratus, he was defeated, and his men were dispersed; he was taken prisoner, and by Gratus's order his head was [r] cut off. There was another Simon, son of Judas of Galilee, who was crucified in the [s] reign of Claudius by Tiberius Alexander, governor of Judea after Fadus. There was in the time of Felix one Simon of Cyprus, who pretended to magic; I have already mentioned him in another place (B).

There were likewise several Judases who gave disturbance to this country in a very short time. Judas of Galilee was a noted person, mentioned here by Gamaliel, and oftentimes by

p Casaub. Exerc. in Baron. ii. n. 18. Grot. & Hamm. in Act. v. 36. Basnage Hist. des Juifs, l. vi. c. 9. § 7. edit. 1706.

(A) The interval cannot be shorter. Josephus's Theudas could not appear before the year 44. Gamaliel's Theudas rose up before Judas of Galilee, who made his disturbance in the 6th or 7th year of the christian æra.

q Ην δε και Σιμων δουλος μεν Ηρωδου του βασιλεως·—ουτος αρθεις τη ακρασια των πραγματων, διαδημα τε ετολμησε περιθεσθαι. Ant. l. xvii. c. 12. § 6.

r Γρατος ειτυχων την κεφαλην αποτεμνει· ibid.

s Ibid. l. xx. c. 4. § 2.

(B) Book I. p. 26.

Josephus

Josephus; he rose up in the time of the taxing presently after the removal of Archelaus. There was [t] another Judas (c), son of Ezechias, who soon after Herod's death affected regal authority, and did a great deal of mischief. There was one Judas, son of Sepphoræus, a man in great reputation for his skill in the law, who with some others raised a sedition during Herod's last sickness: he and some of his confederates [u] were burnt alive. So that there were three men of the same name, who in the space of about ten years raised commotions in Judea.

(2.) Nor is the agreement of character and circumstances mentioned by Gamaliel and Josephus, a proof they speak of one and the same person. There are but two particulars of this sort: that they pretended to be extraordinary persons, and that they were slain, and their followers scattered or brought to nought. But in this there is nothing extraordinary: though there had been yet more circumstances in which they had agreed, this would have been no proof that one and the same person is spoken of.

Gamaliel says, 'Theudas boasted himself to be somebody,' and he 'was slain:' Josephus, that 'Theudas said he was a 'prophet,' and 'his head was cut off.'

Josephus has informed us, concerning the Theudas he speaks of, that he got a good number of people to follow him to Jordan. Though Gamaliel and Josephus had concurred in so particular a circumstance as this, (which they do not,) yet it would not have been a sufficient reason for our supposing that they intended the same person.

I shall give an instance. Of Simon [x] above-mentioned, servant of Herod, Josephus says, that he plundered and burnt the palace at Jericho; and that he burnt several royal houses in divers parts, having first given them to be plundered by his followers. He says also, that the people with Simon were chiefly [y] Peræans, or people that lived on the other side of Jordan. Afterwards, even while he is speaking of affairs that passed in Judea soon after the death of Herod, he says, that 'at Amatha near Jordan, a royal palace was burnt down by a 'number of men very much like those who were with [z] Simon.'

[t] Ιουδας δε ην Εζεκιου υιος, κ. λ. Antiq. l. xvii. cap. 12. § 5. (c) Archbishop Usher thinks, this Judas to be Gamaliel's Theudas. 'For whereas Jehudah of the 'Hebrews is the same with Theudah of 'the Syrians, from whence Judas and Thaddeus [compare Luke vi. 16. with Mark 'iii. 18.] and much rather Theudas, the 'same name plainly comes. This Judas 'seems to be no other than Theudas, of 'whom Gamaliel speaks, Acts v. 36.' Annals, p. 797.

[u] De Bell. l. i. c. 33. § 2—4.

[x] Το εν Ιεριχουντι βασιλειον πιμπρησι δι' αρπαγης αγων τα εγκαταλελειμμενα. Ant. l. xvii. c. 12. § 6.

[y] Το τε πολυ των Περαιων· ibid.

[z] Κατεπρησθη δε και τα επι τῳ Ιορδανη ποταμῳ εν Αμαθοις βασιλεια υπο τινων συσταντων ανδρων Σιμωνι παραπλησιων· ibid.

If

If Joſephus had omitted this laſt fact, and ſome other hiſtorian had related it, together with the name of the leader of this body of men, and given them their character; which, if true, muſt have reſembled that of the men with Simon: unleſs the reputation of this hiſtorian had been very well eſtabliſhed, it would have been thought that he was miſtaken, and that the perſon he meant was Simon, though he called him by another name. A palace burnt down at Amatha by Jordan: who could theſe be but Simon's people? who, Joſephus ſays, were moſtly Peræans. Then the time agrees exactly: both facts in the abſence of Archelaus from Judea after his father's death. This writer therefore muſt have been groſsly miſtaken in the name of the perſon, to whom he aſcribes the conduct of this action.

Or, it is not unlikely, that critics might have been divided; ſome would have vindicated Joſephus, and ſome the other writer: and yet they would have been all miſtaken, unleſs they had allowed two different bodies of men, and two different matters to be ſpoken of, and that both the hiſtorians were in the right.

It is certain, that theſe impoſtors about this time had a reſemblance in their pretenſions, and their fates; one boaſted he would give his followers a paſſage over Jordan, as Joſephus's Theudas; another promiſed his people they ſhould ſee the walls of Jeruſalem fall down before them, as the Egyptian impoſtor. The great ſcene of expectation was the [a] wilderneſs. But in this they agreed univerſally, the company was routed and diſperſed, and uſually the leaders executed. This, we may be certain, was the caſe, or elſe the government had been overturned.

Theſe few circumſtances then, in which Gamaliel's Theudas reſembles him mentioned by Joſephus, are no good argument, that one and the ſame perſon is intended.

Beſides, there is one material circumſtance in which they differ. Gamaliel ſays: *Before theſe days roſe up Theudas—to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themſelves.* But Joſephus ſays of his Theudas, that he 'perſuaded a very 'great multitude to follow him:' and that 'many were ſlain, 'and many taken priſoners.' Joſephus's Theudas muſt have had with him a much larger company than the former.

(3.) It has been very well obſerved by Whitby [b], that the ancients generally agreed there was a Theudas before the com-

[a] Matt. xxiv. 26. Joſ. Ant. l. xx. c. 7. § 6. 10. & alibi.

[b] Ερωμεν δη Θευδας προ της γενεσεως Ιησυ γεγονε τις παρα Ιεδαιοις, μεγαν τινα εαυτον λεγων. Orig. cont. Celſ. p. 44. See more citations in Whitby upon the place.

ing

ing of our Lord, though Josephus has taken no notice of him. Beza[b] was of opinion, that the Theudas of whom Gamaliel speaks, did not arise before our Saviour's nativity, but soon after Herod's death, in that sort of interregnum, which there was in Judea, whilst Archelaus was at Rome. Which was also archbishop Usher's opinion, as I have shewn above.

It is certain, that this was a time of the utmost confusion. Josephus has mentioned several by name, who then gave disturbance in that country; and hinted at mischiefs done by others, whose names he has not put down. It is plain, he has past by many more than he has mentioned: for he says, 'At 'that time[d] there were innumerable disturbances in Judea.'

Considering all these things, that there had been before this many pretenders in Judea; that Josephus has been far from mentioning all that rose up in the latter end of Herod's reign, and in that remarkable time of confusion which succeeded his death; since there had been in this country, in a very short time, divers adventurers for power and authority of one and the same name; and since Theudas[e] was no uncommon name among the Jews; and since these leaders of parties and factions very much resembled each other, and that sometimes in more particulars than those specified by Gamaliel; it is not at all unlikely, that there were two Theudases who were impostors. We may depend upon it there were: Gamaliel speaks of one who was before Judas of Galilee, and Josephus of another in the time of Claudius.

Indeed I am somewhat surprized, that any learned man should find it hard to believe, that there were two impostors in Judea of the name of Theudas in the compass of forty years[f].

Patricides, patriarch of Alexandria, about the middle of the eighth century, supposed that the high-priest Simon, surnamed the Just, and who according to other historians[g] died about 290 years before the christian æra, and Simeon, who took our Saviour into his arms when he was presented at the temple, were one and the same person, and that he was then 350 years of age[h]. I do not say that these two mistakes are equal, but the

[c] In loc. [d] Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ ἕτερα μύρια δεινὰ ἐγένετο τὴν Ἰουδαίαν κατειληφότα. Ant. l. xvii. c. 12. § 4. vid. & de B. l. ii. c. 4. [e] Frequens erat id nomen apud Hebræos. Itaque non mirum est diversis temporibus plures extitisse factiosos homines ejusdem nominis. Grot. in loc. [f] Duos enim Theudas fuisse, qui se prophetas esse mentiti, alter post alterum Judæos ad spem rerum novarum concitaverat, nunquam adduci possim ut credam. Vales. ubi supra. [g] See Prideaux Conn. Part i. Book 8. year before Christ 290.

[h] In septuaginta autem fuit vir, qui nuncupatus est Simeon Justus; is qui excepit ulnis Dominum nostrum Christum e Templo.——Produxit autem Deus ei vitæ terminum, adeo ut viveret CCCL annos, & videret Dominum nostrum Christum. Quem cum vidisset, dixit, nunc dimitte servum tuum O Domine, &c. apud Selden. De Succ. Pontif. l. i. c. vii.

pretence

pretence for thus confounding two perſons is juſt the ſame in both theſe caſes, which is the agreement in name and character. For the high-prieſt's name is ſometimes written Simeon: he was called the Juſt; and the evangeliſt ſays, that Simeon was *juſt and devout.*

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Egyptian Impostor.

THERE is yet another particular, in which it has been thought by ſome that Joſephus contradicts St. Luke. In ch. xxi. of the Acts of the Apoſtles, is the account of the *uproar* at Jeruſalem, when the Jews apprehended Paul, and would have *killed him.* When the chief captain had taken him from the Jews, and had got him in his own cuſtody, it is ſaid, he put this queſtion to him: *Art not thou that Egyptian, which before theſe days madeſt an uproar, and leddeſt out into the wilderneſs* FOUR THOUSAND *men that were murderers?* Acts xxi. 38.

The objection lies againſt the number here mentioned. For Joſephus, ſpeaking of this ſame Egyptian, ſays, 'he gathered 'together thirty thouſand men.'

We have the ſtory twice told in Joſephus, in his Antiquities, and in his hiſtory of the Jewiſh War. I ſhall ſet down Joſephus's words, and leave it to the reader to judge, whether an objection of any weight can be formed againſt St. Luke from the account we have of this affair in Joſephus. I ſhall in the firſt place tranſcribe the account in the Jewiſh War, becauſe that was firſt written.

'But the Egyptian falſe prophet brought a yet heavier diſ-'after upon the Jews. For this impoſtor coming into the 'country, and gaining the reputation of a prophet, gathered 'together thirty thouſand men, who were deceived [a] by him.

[a] Μειζονι δε ταυτης πληγη Ιουδαιους εκακωσεν ο Αιγυπτιος ψευδοπροφητης· παραγενομενος γαρ εις την χωραν, ανθρωπος γοης, και προφητης πιστιν επιθεις εαυτω, περι τρισμυριους μεν αθροιζει των ηπαλημενων· περιαγαγων δε αυτους εκ της ερημιας εις το Ελαιων καλουμενον ορος, εκειθεν οιος τε ην εις Ιεροσολυμα παρελθειν βιαζεσθαι, και κρατησας της τε Ρωμαικης φρουρας και του δημου τυραννειν, χρωμενος τοις συνεισπεσουσι δορυφορις· φθανει δε αυτου την ορμην Φηλιξ υπαντησας μετα των Ρωμαικων οπλιτων, και παις ο δημος συνεφηψατο της αμυνης· ως συμπεσουσης γενομενης, τον μεν Αιγυπτιον φευγει μετ' ολιγων, διαφθαρηναι δε και ζωγρηθηναι πλειους των συν αυτω· το δε λοιπον πληθος συνδραμον επι την εαυτων εκαστον διαλυθεν. De Bell. l. ii. c. 13. § 5.

'Having

'Having brought them round out of the wilderness up to the 'mount of Olives, he intended from thence to make his at- 'tack upon Jerusalem, and having beaten the Roman guard, 'to bring the people into subjection to him, and govern them 'by the help of his armed associates. But Felix coming sud- 'denly upon him with the Roman soldiers, prevented the at- 'tack: and all the people joined with him in their own de- 'fence, so that when they came to engage, the Egyptian 'fled, followed by a few only. A great number [or, the 'the greatest part,] of those that were with him were either 'slain, or taken prisoners. The rest of the multitude being 'scattered, shifted for themselves as they could.'

The account he gives of this affair in the Antiquities is thus: 'About the same time [he had been speaking of some other 'events in the beginning of Nero's reign,] there came [b] a 'person out of Egypt to Jerusalem, who pretended to be a 'prophet, and having persuaded a good number of the meaner 'sort of people to follow him to the mount of Olives, he told 'them, that from thence he would let them see the walls of 'Jerusalem fall down at his command, and promised through 'them to give them entrance into the city. But Felix being 'informed of these things, ordered his soldiers to their arms, 'and marching out of Jerusalem with a large body of horse 'and foot, fell upon those who were with the Egyptian, killed 'four hundred of them, and took two hundred prisoners; but 'the Egyptian getting out of the fight, escaped.'

The reader, if he thinks it needful, may consult the commentators, and other writers, who [c] have considered this difficulty. Grotius supposes, that they were at first four thousand, but that at length they increased to the number of thirty thousand. Valesius reckons there were four thousand only that were murderers, or sicarii; though the whole company amounted to the number which Josephus mentions. Whitby thinks, that it is likely the number in Josephus was originally three thousand. And certainly none of these solutions are contemptible. But, for my own part, I think there is more need

[b] Ἀφικνεῖται δέ τις ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν εἰς τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα, προφήτης εἶναι λέγων, καὶ συμβουλεύων τῷ δήμῳ τῷ ὑποταττομένῳ σὺν αὐτῷ πρὸς ὄρος τὸ προσαγορευόμενον Ἐλαιῶν ἐρχεσθαι—Θέλειν γὰρ, ἔφα τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖθεν ἐπιδείξαι, ὡς, κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦ, πίπτοι τὰ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων τείχη, δι' ὧν τὴν εἴσοδον αὐτοῖς παρέξειν ἐπηγγέλλετο. Φήλιξ δὲ, ὡς ἐπύθετο ταῦτα, κελεύει τοὺς στρατιώτας αἰτάλασθαι τὰ ὅπλα, καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν ἱππέων τε καὶ πεζῶν ὁρμήσας ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων προσβάλλει τοῖς περὶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον· καὶ τετρακοσίους μὲν αὐτῶν ἀνεῖλε, διακοσίους δὲ ζωγρίας ἔλαβε· ὁ δὲ Αἰγύπτιος αὐτὸς διαφυγὼν ἐκ τῆς μάχης ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο. Ant. l. xx. c. 7. § 6. [c] Grot. Whitby in loc. Joseph. p. 1075. not. p. Vales. Euseb. Hist. l. ii. c. 21.

of reconciling Joſephus with himſelf, or at leaſt one of theſe accounts with the other, than to reconcile St. Luke with Joſephus.

If indeed we had any good reaſon to think, that the number in Joſephus was originally three thouſand, the diſagreement would be ſmall. The number of a multitude got together in a ſhort time, and ſoon diſperſed, might not be exactly known: the chief captain at Jeruſalem might compute them at four thouſand, and Joſephus think they were but three thouſand.

Aldrich has propoſed another very ingenious conjecture; that originally the number of the whole company in Joſephus's War of the Jews was four thouſand; and that the number of two hundred ſaid in the Antiquities to be taken priſoners, was originally two thouſand: both which errors might happen only by a very ſmall alteration [d].

But I chooſe not to inſiſt upon any of theſe ſolutions, which rely on emendations, made without the authority of any manuſcripts. The numbers in Joſephus are at preſent plainly faulty. In the firſt account he ſays, they were thirty thouſand in all, and that a great number of theſe were either ſlain or taken priſoners. I might have rendered the words, the moſt of them, or, the greateſt part of them. But though I have not given them that ſenſe, yet certainly the four hundred ſlain, and two hundred taken priſoners, in the other account, cannot be reckoned a great number, or a large part of thirty thouſand.

But then, as I do not inſiſt on theſe conjectural emendations for reconciling Joſephus with St. Luke; ſo, on the other hand, it would be very unfair, firſt to take it for granted, that the number of thirty thouſand in Joſephus is right, and then arbitrarily to reform all the other numbers in him, in order to form an objection againſt the New Teſtament.

I think therefore, there can be no objection brought againſt the numbers in St. Luke, from what Joſephus has ſaid of this affair, becauſe his two accounts are not conſiſtent one with another in this point: and that is ſufficient.

Theſe were my thoughts concerning this difficulty formerly. But I have now an obſervation to offer to the reader, which I think will not only reconcile St. Luke with Joſephus, but likewiſe Joſephus with himſelf; and that, without making any alterations in his numbers. This obſervation has been communicated to me by the truly learned and accurate Mr. John Ward, profeſſor of rhetoric at Greſham college.

[d] Suſpicamur interim pro διακοσιες ſcriptum olim δισχιλιες permutatis λ & δ, vel etiam Λ. & Δ. ex τετρακισχιλιες factum eſſe τρισμυριες; ne dubitamus quidem. Aldr. in Joſeph. p. 1075. not. p.

The

The hiſtory of this impoſtor ſeems to lie thus. He came firſt to Jeruſalem, went from thence into the country, and taking a circuit by the wilderneſs, returned again to mount Olivet. In the Antiquities (which contain the ſhorter account of this affair,) Joſephus mentions only the beginning and end of the ſtory, that is, the impoſtor's coming at firſt to Jeruſalem, and at laſt to the mount of Olives; and drops the middle part, of which he had given a ſufficient account in the books of the War. The chief captain's *four thouſand*, therefore, were the men carried out of Jeruſalem, who were afterwards [e] joined by others in the country to the number of thirty thouſand, as related by Joſephus. It is likely alſo, that before he left the city, he had ſo concerted matters with ſome friends, whom he left behind him, as to entertain hopes, that upon his return his deſign would be favoured by great numbers of Jews in Jeruſalem, and that he ſhould have no oppoſition from any but the Romans. But upon his arrival at mount Olivet, finding the Romans drawn out to attack him, and the citizens in general prepared to oppoſe him, he did not dare to venture an engagement, but preſently fled with a body of his moſt truſty friends, as is uſual in ſuch caſes. With theſe in particular the Roman ſoldiers were ordered to engage, neglecting the reſt, who were only a confuſed multitude, and immediately made off as they could by different ways. When therefore Joſephus ſays, the Egyptian fled accompanied by a few [f] only, he is to be underſtood of that body which at firſt fled away with the impoſtor, and were but a few, with reſpect to the whole thirty thouſand. When he ſays, the greateſt [g] part, or moſt of thoſe that were with him were ſlain, or taken priſoners, which in the Antiquities are ſaid to be four hundred killed, and two hundred taken, he means the greateſt part of thoſe few that fled with him. Nor need it be thought ſtrange, that the number of the ſlain and the priſoners is no greater; ſince, as it ſeems, Joſephus ſpeaks only of that body of men who fled with the impoſtor. It is poſſible, ſome of the reſt of the multitude might be killed likewiſe, though Joſephus takes no notice of them; but it is moſt likely not many. For it ſeems by Joſephus, as if only the Roman ſoldiers marched out againſt them, while the Jewiſh people in Jeruſalem ſtood upon their own defence, if any onſet had been made upon them.

[e] The words εξαγαγων in St. Luke, and αθροιζει in Joſephus, ſeem very well adapted to this diſtinction. [f] Τον μεν Αιγυπτιον φυγειν μετ' ολιγων. [g] Διαφθαρηναι δε και ζωγρηθηναι πλειους συν αυτω.

Thus then, though there were but four thouſand of theſe men at firſt, they might be joined by others afterwards to the number of thirty thouſand. So St. Luke is reconciled with Joſephus. And the number, ſaid by Joſephus to be ſlain, or taken priſoners, might be a great number, or the greateſt part, of that body which fled with the Egyptian upon the attack made by Felix and his ſoldiers. Thus Joſephus is reconciled with himſelf.

But yet I cannot leave the hiſtory Joſephus has given us of this Egyptian, without making two or three obſervations.

1. The chief captain here aſks St. Paul, *Art not thou that Egyptian, which* [h] LEDDEST OUT *into the wilderneſs?*—which ſeems to imply, ſince the queſtion was aſked in Jeruſalem, that theſe men, or a good number of them at leaſt, were drawn out of Jeruſalem: and Joſephus ſays expreſsly in the latter account, that this impoſtor came 'out of Egypt to Je-'ruſalem; and perſuaded a good number of the meaner ſort 'of people, (i. e. who were there,) to follow him.'

2. The chief captain ſpeaks of their being *led out into the* WILDERNESS. This circumſtance Joſephus has mentioned in the firſt account, where he more particularly relates their march, and the compaſs they took, than in the other.

3. This Egyptian eſcaped. Joſephus has put down this in both places, and undoubtedly this is ſuppoſed in the queſtion put to St. Paul by the chief captain. The agreement in this particular deſerves to be taken notice of, becauſe it was the common fate of theſe impoſtors to periſh themſelves, with a good number of their followers.

4. This Egyptian cauſed this diſturbance, according to Joſephus, when Felix was governor of Judea. This impoſtor therefore did not ariſe any long time before the ſeizure of St. Paul at Jeruſalem. He might be ſtill living therefore; in this reſpect there was no abſurdity in this queſtion of the chief captain.

5. Another particular, which we are obliged to Joſephus for, is, that all the people (at Jeruſalem) favoured, or joined with Felix, upon this occaſion, in their own defence: that is, all but ſome very mean people. If Joſephus had not mentioned this, perhaps it would have been ſaid, ſince conſiderable numbers uſually joined theſe impoſtors, and it is likely more favoured them, how was it poſſible, that the chief captain ſhould aſk Paul, when he ſaw the whole city was in an uproar, and the people were ready to tear him to pieces, *Art not thou*

[h] Ο εξαγαγων.

that

that Egyptian? that pretended prophet, that *before theſe days madeſt an uproar?* a man of a favourite character at this time among the Jews!

I think indeed, that if Joſephus had omitted this circumſtance, it would have been a very good reply, to ſay, that the chief captain did not yet know what was the matter: and though there was a loud cry in the multitude, of *away with him*; yet the confuſion was ſuch, *ſome ſaying one thing*, and *ſome another*, that the chief captain had yet no notion what the caſe was. However, we have no occaſion to have recourſe to this reply. Joſephus has told us, that all the people favoured Felix in his enterprize againſt this man: whether it was becauſe he came from Egypt, or what was the reaſon, is of no importance.

6. There is a remarkable agreement between the chief captain in the Acts and Joſephus, in the deſcription they give of this man. The chief captain ſays, *Art not thou that Egyptian?* And it is obſervable, that Joſephus has not mentioned this man's name in either of the accounts. In the firſt he calls him the Egyptian falſe prophet, and the Egyptian: in the other he ſays, there came one (or a certain perſon,) out of Egypt: and again, Felix fell upon thoſe who were with the Egyptian; but the Egyptian eſcaped.

We have then in the Acts the exact manner, in which the Jews about this time ſpoke of this impoſtor. This is with me a proof, that St. Luke lived and wrote about this time: that is, at the time he is ſuppoſed to write. We have here undoubtedly the chief captain's queſtion in the very words in which it was put. St. Luke muſt have received this account from St. Paul, or ſome one elſe who was preſent, if he was not by himſelf.

I hope therefore, that the account which Joſephus has given of this impoſtor, will be no longer reckoned an objection againſt St. Luke, but a confirmation of his hiſtory.

THE CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now performed what I undertook, and have ſhewn, that the account given by the ſacred writers, of perſons and things, is confirmed by other ancient authors of the beſt note. There is nothing in the books of the New Teſtament unſuitable

to the age in which they are ſuppoſed to have been written. There appears in theſe writers a knowledge of the affairs of thoſe times not to be found in authors of later ages. We are hereby aſſured, that the books of the New Teſtament are genuine, and that they were written by perſons, who lived at or near the time of thoſe events, of which they have given the hiſtory.'

Any one may be ſenſible, how hard it is for the moſt learned, acute, and cautious man, to write a book in the character of ſome perſon of an earlier age, and not betray his own time by ſome miſtake about the affairs of the age in which he pretends to place himſelf, or by alluſions to cuſtoms or principles ſince ſprung up, or by ſome phraſe or expreſſion not then in uſe. It is no eaſy thing to eſcape all theſe dangers in the ſmalleſt performance, though it be a treatiſe of theory or ſpeculation: theſe hazards are greatly increaſed when the work is of any length, and eſpecially if it be hiſtorical, and be concerned with characters and cuſtoms. It is yet more difficult to carry on ſuch a deſign in a work conſiſting of ſeveral pieces, written to all appearance by ſeveral perſons. Many indeed are deſirous to deceive, but all hate to be deceived: and therefore, though attempts have been made to impoſe upon the world in this way, they have never or very rarely ſucceeded, but have been detected and expoſed by the ſkill and vigilance of thoſe who have been concerned for the truth.

The volume of the New Teſtament conſiſts of ſeveral pieces; theſe are aſcribed to eight ſeveral perſons; and there are the ſtrongeſt appearances, that they were not all written by any one hand, but by as many perſons as they are aſcribed to. There are leſſer differences in the relations of ſome facts, and ſuch ſeeming contradictions, as would never have happened, if theſe books had been all the work of one perſon, or of ſeveral who wrote in concert. There are as many peculiarities of temper and ſtyle, as there are names of writers; divers of which ſhew no depth of genius or compaſs of knowledge. Here are repreſentations of titles, poſts, behaviour of perſons of higher and lower rank in many parts of the world; perſons are introduced, and their characters are ſet in a full light; here is a hiſtory of things done in ſeveral cities and countries; and there are alluſions to a vaſt variety of cuſtoms and tenets of perſons of ſeveral nations, ſects, and religions. The whole is written without affectation, with the greateſt ſimplicity and plainneſs, and is confirmed by other ancient writers of unqueſtioned authority.

If

If it be difficult for a perſon of learning and experience, to compoſe a ſmall treatiſe concerning matters of ſpeculation, with the characters of a more early age than that in which he writes; it is next to impoſſible, that ſuch a work of conſiderable length, conſiſting of ſeveral pieces, with a great variety of hiſtorical facts, repreſentations of characters, principles, and cuſtoms of ſeveral nations, and diſtant countries, of perſons of all ranks and degrees, of many intereſts and parties, ſhould be performed by eight ſeveral perſons, the moſt of them unlearned, without any appearance of concert.

I might perhaps have called this argument a demonſtration, if that term had not been often miſapplied by men of warm imaginations, and been beſtowed upon reaſonings that have but a ſmall degree of probability. But though it ſhould not be a ſtrict demonſtration that theſe writings are genuine; or though it be not abſolutely impoſſible in the nature of the thing, that the books of the New Teſtament ſhould have been compoſed in a later age, than that to which they are aſſigned, and of which they have innumerable characters; yet, I think, it is in the higheſt degree improbable, and altogether incredible.

If the books of the New Teſtament were written by perſons, who lived before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem; that is, if they were written at the time, in which they are ſaid to have been written, the things related in them are true. If they had not been matter of fact, they would not have been credited by any perſons near that time, and in thoſe parts of the world in which they are ſaid to have been done, but would have been treated as the moſt notorious lies and falſhoods. Suppoſe three or four books ſhould now appear amongſt us in the language moſt generally underſtood, giving an account of many remarkable and extraordinary events, which had happened in ſome kingdom of Europe, and in the moſt noted cities of the countries next adjoining to it; ſome of them ſaid to have happened between ſixty and ſeventy years ago, others between twenty and thirty, others nearer our own time: would not they be looked upon as the moſt manifeſt and ridiculous forgeries and impoſtures that ever were contrived? Would great numbers of perſons, in thoſe very places, change their religious principles and practices upon the credit of things reported to be publicly done, which no man had ever heard of before? Or rather, is it poſſible, that ſuch a deſign as this ſhould be conceived by any ſober and ſerious perſons, or even the moſt wild and extravagant?

If the hiſtory of the New Teſtament be credible, the Chriſtian Religion is true.' If the things here related to have been done by Jeſus, and by his followers, by virtue of powers derived from him, do not prove a perſon to come from God, and that his doctrine is true and divine, nothing can. And as Jeſus does here in the circumſtances of his birth, life, ſufferings, and after exaltation, and in the ſucceſs of his doctrine, anſwer the deſcription of the great perſon promiſed and foretold in the Old Teſtament, he is at the ſame time ſhewed to be the Meſſiah.

From the agreement of the writers of the New Teſtament with other ancient writers, we are not only aſſured that theſe books are genuine, but alſo that they are come down to us pure and uncorrupted, without any conſiderable interpolations or alterations. If ſuch had been made in them, there would have appeared ſome ſmaller differences at leaſt between them and other ancient writings.

There has been in all ages a wicked propenſity in mankind, to advance their own notions and fancies by deceits and forgeries: they have been practiſed by heathens, Jews, and chriſtians, in ſupport of imaginary hiſtorical facts, religious ſchemes and practices, and political intereſts. With theſe views ſome whole books have been forged, and paſſages inſerted into others of undoubted authority. Many of the chriſtian writers of the ſecond and third centuries, and of the following ages, appear to have had falſe notions, concerning the ſtate of Judea between the nativity of Jeſus and the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and concerning many other things occaſionally mentioned in the New Teſtament. The conſent of the beſt ancient writers with thoſe of the New Teſtament is a proof, that theſe books are ſtill untouched, and that they have not been new modelled and altered by chriſtians of later times in conformity to their own peculiar ſentiments.

This may be reckoned an argument, that the generality of chriſtians have had a very high veneration for theſe books; or elſe, that the ſeveral ſects among them have had an eye upon each other, that no alterations might be made in thoſe writings, to which they have all appealed. It is alſo an argument, that the divine providence has all along watched over and guarded theſe beſt of books, (a very fit object of an eſpecial care,) which contain the beſt of principles, were apparently written with the beſt views, and have in them inimitable characters of truth and ſimplicity.

AN APPENDIX

CONCERNING THE TIME OF HEROD'S DEATH.

IN all inquiries concerning the chronology of the New Teſtament, and particulary concerning the true time of our Saviour's nativity, and the commencement of his miniſtry, it is very needful to take into conſideration the time of Herod the great's death. Indeed it is very deſirable, in the firſt place, to ſettle exactly the date of this event; but to do this is a very hard taſk: nor has any one yet been ſo happy, as to remove all difficulties, and give univerſal ſatisfaction upon this head.

That none may be quite at a loſs in judging of the difficulty conſidered in the third chapter of this book, I ſhall here give a brief account of this matter.

The chief opinions at preſent concerning the time of Herod's death are theſe three. Some think he died a little before the paſſover of A. U. 750. Julian year 42. others, on November 25 that ſame year: others, a ſhort time before the paſſover, A. U. 751.

§ I. The Engliſh reader may ſee all, in a manner, that can be ſaid for the ſecond opinion, in Mr. Whiſton's 'Short View 'of the Harmony of the four Evangeliſts, Prop. 12.' But, though ſeveral very learned men have embraced this opinion, it appears to me a mere hypotheſis without foundation: the only ground of it is a Jewiſh account of their feaſts and faſts, in which that day is noted as a feaſt, becauſe on it Herod died: but that [a] book appears to be of no authority.

§ II. That Herod died but a ſhort time before ſome one of the Jewiſh paſſovers, is evident from Joſephus [b]. If we reject entirely his authority, it is in vain to talk about the time of Herod's death. Archelaus kept a paſſover in Judea after his father's death, before he went to Rome; which he would not have done if it had not been near. He had good reaſon to haſten to Rome; he had many enemies; Herod Antipas had been appointed his father's ſucceſſor in a former will, and he pretended that will ought to take place. When the Jews at

[a] See Whitby Annotat. Matt. ii. 23. Lamy Apparat. Chronol. Par. i. cap. 9. § 5.
[b] De Bell. lib. ii. c. 1. Antiq. l. xvii. c. 9.

the temple made their demands of Archelaus, he gave them fair words, that they might not make any disturbance and retard his journey[c], he being in haste to go to Rome: this haste is expressed by Josephus in the War, and in the Antiquities, in very strong terms. Archelaus, in his way to Rome, at Cæsarea met Sabinus, the emperor's procurator in Syria, who was going[d] in all haste to Jerusalem to secure Herod's treasure for Augustus. By help of the intercessions of Varus, president of Syria, (who was then likewise at Cæsarea,) Archelaus prevailed upon Sabinus to promise, that he would not proceed any farther. But notwithstanding that, when Archelaus was gone away he went up to Jerusalem, and there ordered all things according to his own will and pleasure. This was all managed without any orders from Rome. If Herod had been dead two or three months, they would have had directions from thence upon this matter: nay, if Herod had been dead one month, this vigilant procurator would have been at Jerusalem before now. I take this to be a kind of demonstration, that, according to Josephus, Herod's death happened but a very short space before some passover.

§ III. That Herod died a little before the passover A. U. 750. Julian year 42, is argued in this manner. His distemper had made great progress before the pulling down the golden eagle at the temple. The Jewish rabbies excited their scholars to this action, 'news being brought that Herod[e] was DYING,' as it is in the War; [f] DEAD, as it is in the Antiquities. These rabbies were taken up, and carried to Jericho, where Herod was; a council was called, and they were tried. Herod was so ill that he could not stand, and notwithstanding the new strength[g] which rage gave him upon the occasion, he was carried[h] to the council in a chair. Soon after this these rabbies were burnt to death, and that very night[i] there was an eclipse of the moon; this eclipse, according to astronomical computa-

[c] Προς α παρωξυνετο μεν Αρχελαος, απειχετο δε την αμυναν ευπο της περι την εξοδον επειξεως, κ. λ. De Bell. l. ii. c. 1. § 3. Τε οις Αρχελαος, καιπερ δεινως φερων την ορμην αυτων, επεινε, εχων την επι Ρωμης οδον ανυεσθαι προκειμενην αυτω ταχος, επι περισκοπησει των δοξαντων τω Καισαρι. Ant. l. xvii. c. 9. § 1. [d] Υπαντιαζει δ' ω Καισαρειᾳ Αρχελαον Σαβινος, Καισαρος επιτροπος των εν Συριᾳ πραγματων, εις Ιουδαιαν ωρμημενος επι φυλακῃ των Ηρωδου χρηματων. Antiq. ibid. § 3. vid. etiam De Bell. ibid. c. 2. § 2. [e] Διηφημισθη [illegible] και θνησκειν ο βασιλευς. De Bell. l. i. c. 33. § 1. [f] Και οι μεν τοιουτοις λογοις εξηραν τους νεους· αφικνειται και λογος εις αυτους τεθναναι φραζων τον βασιλεα, και συνεπραττε τοις σοφισταις. Ant. l. xvii. c. 6. § 3. [g] Επι τουτοις ο βασιλευς, δι' υπερβολην της οργης κρειττων της νοσου γενομενος, προεισιν εις εκκλησιαν, κ. λ. De Bell. l. i. c. 33. § 4. [h] Και παραγενομενων, εξεκκλησιασας εις το αυτο θεατρον επι κλινιδιου κειμενος αδυμανιᾳ του σηναι. Antiq. ibid. [i] Και η σεληνη δε τῃ αυτῃ νυκτι εξελιπεν. ibid. § 4.

tions,

tions, happened[k] the 13th of March, A. U. 750. After this, Herod grew worse and worse; it is plain, he could not live long. The passover[l] of this year happened the 11th of April. From the 13th of March to the 11th of April, is a sufficient space of time for all that Josephus has related concerning Herod's illness, his settling his affairs, the execution of Antipater, Herod's death and funeral; which are the things placed between the eclipse and Archelaus's coming to Jerusalem at the passover.

In the War[m], Josephus says, that Archelaus was banished in the ninth year of his reign: in the Antiquities, that he was accused before Augustus by the Jews and Samaritans in the[n] tenth year of his government. In his Own Life, Josephus says, that his father was born in the[o] tenth year of Archelaus's reign. From whence one would be apt to conclude, that Archelaus reigned nine years complete, and that the tenth year was current when he was banished. Dio[p] places Archelaus's banishment in the 759th year of Rome. If Herod did not die till the beginning of A. U. 751, the ninth year of Archelaus's reign could not be completed in the 759th year of Rome. But if Herod be supposed to have died the beginning of A. U. 750, Josephus and Dio agree. Moreover, Josephus says, that Cyrenius[q] seized Archelaus's estate, and finished the assessment in Judea in the thirty-seventh year after the defeat of Antony at Actium by Cæsar Augustus. The victory at Actium was obtained on September 2, A. U. 723; therefore the 37th year from it begins Sept. 2, A. U. 759, and ends Sept. 2, 760. Supposing then, that Herod died the beginning of A. U. 750, there is in this particular also a very good harmony between Josephus and Dio.

There is, however, one great difficulty attending this opinion. For Josephus has said in two places, that Herod reigned thirty-four years after the death of[r] Antigonus, and thirty-seven years after he was declared king by the Roman senate. And he placeth this declaration[s] of the senate in A. U. 714, the

[k] Petav. Doctrin. Temp. l. xi. c. 1.

[l] Vid. Lamy App. Chron. p. 58.

[m] Ετει της αρχης εννατῳ φυγαδευεται μεν εις Βιενναν. De Bell. l. ii. c. 7. § 3.

[n] Δεκατῳ δε ετει της αρχης Αρχελαȣ, οι πρωτοι——κατηγορȣσιν αυτȣ επι Καισαρος. L. xvii. c. 15. § 2.

[o] Και [γινεται] Ματθιας βασιλευοντος Αρχελαȣ το δεκατον. § 1.

[p] Ο, τε Ηρωδης ο Παλαιστηνος,—υπο τας Αλπεις υπερωρισθη· και το μερος της αρχης αυτȣ εδημοσιωθη· l. lv. p. 567. B.

[q] Κυρηνιος δε τα Αρχελαȣ χρηματα αποδομενος ηδη, και των αποτιμησεων περας εχȣσων, αι εγενοντο τριακοστῳ και εβδομῳ ετει μετα την Αντωνιȣ εν Ακτιῳ ητταν υπο Καισαρος. Ant. l. xviii. c. 2. § 1.

[r] —— Τελευτα βασιλευσας αφ' ȣ μεν αποκτεινας Αντιγονον εκρατησε των πραγματων, ετη τεσσαρα και τριακοντα, αφ' ȣ δε υπο Ρωμαιων απεδειχθη βασιλευς, επτα και τριακοντα· de B. J. l. i. c. ult. § 8. vid. etiam Ant. l. xvii. c. 8. § 1.

[s] Ant. l. xiv. c. 14. § 5. De B. l. i. c. 14. § 4.

death

death of [t] Antigonus in the year 717. If indeed at the beginning of A. U. 750, Herod had reigned thirty-ſix years complete from the firſt date of his reign, and thirty-three from the latter; ſo that the 37th of the one epoch, and the 34th of the other, were to be current at the time of his death; then Herod might be ſaid not improperly to have reigned, with reſpect to the one, thirty-ſeven years, and to the other thirty-four. It is ſuppoſed by ſome learned men, that Herod was declared king by the ſenate [u], toward the very end of the year 714; by others [x] at the latter end of October, or beginning of November; by others [y] in September or October; by others [z] about the middle of July that year. But then, at the beginning of the year 750, Herod could not have reigned from this date thirty-ſix years complete, nor was the 37th year current. Herod took Jeruſalem, as ſome [a] think, in September, A. U. 717; others [b], about the end of June; archbiſhop Uſher [c] on the firſt of January this year. If the archbiſhop's ſuppoſition could be allowed, we ſhould have here no difficulty. But if any of the others are followed, then from this date, of Herod's reign, the taking of Jeruſalem, or the death of Antigonus, (which are all one;) to the beginning of the year 750, we have not quite thirty-three years complete, nor is the thirty-fourth current.

In anſwer to this difficulty it is ſaid [d] by learned men, that the years of the Jewiſh kings were computed from the beginning of the month Niſan, which uſually anſwers pretty near to our March. Inſomuch, that if a king began to reign in any part of the year before, even in February, another year of his reign would begin with Niſan, that is, March. So Joſephus relates, that Jeruſalem was taken [e] by Pompey, when Antony and Cicero were conſuls; by Herod, when M. Agrippa and Caninius Gallus were conſuls, 'on the very anniverſary of the 'ſame calamity from Pompey, it having been taken by him 'on the ſame [f] day twenty-ſeven years before:' though there were but twenty-ſix years complete between theſe two events. And from the taking of Jeruſalem by Herod to its deſtruction by Titus, Joſephus computes [g] one hundred and ſeven years,

[t] Ant. l. xiv. c. ult. §4. [u] Alix. de J. C. Anno & menſe natali. p. 75. [x] Baſnage Ann. Polit. E. Vol. i. p. 17. n. 16. [y] Noriſ. Cenot. Piſ. p. 139. Pagi Appar. p. 80. [z] Whiſton's ſhort view, p. 150. [a] Alix ubi ſupra, p. 117. [b] Whiſton ibid. p. 152. Baſnage ibid. p. 30. n. 9. [c] Annals, P. J. 4677. [d] Inde etiam anni regum Hebræorum ſupputabantur, ita ut ſi quis Rex in Adar regnaret, a Niſan alter annus imperii ejus inciperet. Reland. Antiq. Heb. de Temporib. ſacris, c. 1. init. vid. etiam Kepler. de ann. natal. J. C. cap. 7. p. 46. [e] Ant. l. xiv. c. 4. § 3. [f] Ibid. c. 16. § 4. [g] Ibid. l. xx. c. 9. vid. Kepler ibid.

though

though it was but one hundred and ſix complete. But, in my opinion, theſe inſtances are not home to the point. For in them the year named is current; whereas, in the caſe before us it is not ſo. If Herod died in the beginning of the year 750, the thirty-third and thirty-ſixth years of his reign were not complete.

§ IV. Other[h] learned men ſuppoſe, that Herod died a ſhort time before the paſſover A. U. 751. This they argue from the number of years aſſigned to Herod's reign in the places above-mentioned. They do not allow the truth of the Talmudical account of computing the reigns of the Jewiſh kings from the beginning of Niſan, or from the paſſover. If Joſephus had followed ſuch a kind of computation, he would have given ſome hint of it, in his books written in the Greek language and for the inſtruction of ſtrangers. They ſay alſo, that Herod's was a ſlow lingering diſtemper, and that it is not likely he ſhould die ſo ſoon after the execution of the rabbies and their accomplices, as is ſuppoſed by the patrons of the former opinion. Laſtly, they obſerve the (A) agreement of all the other numbers in Joſephus, concerning the dates of the reign of Archelaus and other ſons of Herod.

This opinion, however, labours under ſeveral very great difficulties. Dio's account of the removal of Archelaus is intirely rejected. But to do this[i] is not very reaſonable. Farther, the ſupporters of this opinion muſt allow of the eclipſe above-mentioned; or they muſt ſay, it was no real eclipſe, but only ſome obſcurity that was taken for an eclipſe. If they allow the eclipſe, then Herod muſt have lived a year after the execution of the rabbies, provided he[k] died but a few days before the paſſover, A. U. 751. But it is incredible, that Herod ſhould live ſo long, conſidering the deſcription Joſephus gives of his diſtemper. Beſides, it is evident, that the mourning of the Jewiſh people for the rabbies, at the paſſover next after Herod's death, was[l] very freſh, which it could not have been, if the rabbies had been dead above a year before. Moreover, it is evident, that Herod's ambaſſadors were ſent

[h] Vid. Lamy Appar. Chron. Par. i. c. 9. Baſnage Annal. Pol. Eccl. Vol. i. p. 156. n. v. (A) Note; the learned men, who eſpouſe the former opinion, ſuppoſe alſo, that Joſephus's numbers in all other places agree with them. [i] Vid. Noriſ. Cenot. Piſ. p. 147. [k] Quæ aptis temporibus tribui non poſſunt, niſi hæc mors corrigerit jam aliquibus menſibus promoto Anno U. C. 751, in quo comprobavimus mortuum fuiſſe Herodem. Quoquo autem anno mortuus ſit, NON MULTIS ANTE PASCHA DIEBUS mors illa obtigit, ut teſtatur Joſephus, cui fidem adhibemus. Lamy ubi ſupra, §. [l] Ην δε το πενθος ουκ υπεραλμενον, αλλ' οιμωξαι διαπρυσιοι, και θρηνος εξηλευτος, κοπετοι τε περιηχουντες ολην την πολιν. De B. l. ii. c. 1. § 2. vid. & Ant. l. xvii. c. 9. § 1.

away to Rome, to know Auguſtus's pleaſure concerning Antipater, ſome [m] time before the diſturbance at the temple, when the golden eagle was taken down. And it is very plain, that Herod lived not [n] many days after the arrival of the ambaſſadors. So that, according to this opinion, theſe ambaſſadors muſt have ſpent above a year in their journey from Judea to Rome and back again, though they were ſent upon very preſſing buſineſs, which is alſo incredible. Or they muſt reject the account of the eclipſe, and ſay, as Lamy [o] does, that it was only a paleneſs or obſcurity, which was no real eclipſe of the moon; which, I believe, will appear very unreaſonable to all aſtronomers.

Theſe are the three principal opinions concerning the time of Herod's death: and theſe the main arguments for, and objections againſt them. I preſume it appears to the reader, from particulars alleged from Joſephus and Dio, that Herod did not die before the year 750, nor ſurvive the year 751: and that he died a ſhort time before the Jewiſh paſſover of one of theſe years. It follows, that if Herod died in 750, he died three years and nine months before the vulgar chriſtian æra, which commences January 1, A. U. 754: if at the time abovementioned in the year 751, then he died about two years and nine months before the ſaid æra. Which is the truth, I am not able to determine.

m De B. l. i. c. 32. fin. Ant. l. xvii. c. 5. fin. ibid. c. 7. &c. 8. § 1.

n De B. ibid. c. 33. § 7, 8. Ant.

o Ubi ſupra, § 6.

THE END OF THE FIRST PART.

THE CASE OF THE DÆMONIACS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

FOUR DISCOURSES UPON MARK V. 19.

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

FOR FARTHER ILLUSTRATING THE SUBJECT.

[FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCLVIII.]

PREFACE.

THESE diſcourſes were preached to a ſmall, but attentive audience, in 1742. In the year 1737, were publiſhed by a learned author, 'An Enquiry, and a further Enquiry into the 'Meaning of Dæmoniacs in the New Teſtament.' But as the ſubject had much employed my thoughts, and the plan had been drawn up a good while before, I did not diſcern any ſufficient reaſon for laying it aſide.

The publication of theſe diſcourſes has been often deſired by divers of thoſe that heard them, and by others. They who know how I have been engaged, need not be told the reaſon of the delay. They might have been put into one continued diſſertation, but then the practical obſervations muſt have been ſtruck out; which I was unwilling to have done. And in their preſent form they muſt remain, for a while at leaſt, a monument, that any ſubject, tending to illuſtrate the ſcriptures, may be treated in chriſtian aſſemblies, if it be done with modeſty and diſcretion.

Theſe diſcourſes, with the appendix, may be reckoned a ſupplement to the firſt part of the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory.

MARCH 15, 1758.

DIS-

DISCOURSE I.

MARK v. 19.

Howbeit Jeſus ſuffered him not, but ſaith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compaſſion on thee.

IT is now ſome years, ſince I explained and improved, as I was able, the hiſtory of our Lord's miracles, recorded in the goſpels. I think, that very few were intirely omitted, which are particularly related, except this in the country of the Gadarenes. And I always intended to conſider this likewiſe; though it is has been long deferred. As life, through the divine goodneſs, is ſtill preſerved, I propoſe now to conſider this hiſtory, which, with ſome few differences only, is found in three ſeveral evangeliſts, Matt. viii. 28—34. Mark v. 1—20. Luke viii. 26—39.

I. In the firſt place, I ſhall conſider diſtinctly this whole narration, comparing together the ſeveral evangeliſts, as we go along.

II. After which I intend to make ſome remarks upon this miracle, and the hiſtory of it.

I. In the firſt place, I ſhall diſtinctly conſider the whole of this narration, comparing the ſeveral evangeliſts, as we go along.

The time of this miracle may be in ſome meaſure perceived by the connexion: in all the three evangeliſts, it is preceded by an account of our Lord's croſſing the ſea of Galilee, with his diſciples, and laying a tempeſt, which they had met with in their paſſage.

St. Luke had before given an account of divers of our Lord's diſcourſes, ch. viii. 19, 22, 26. *Then came unto him his mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the preſs.—Now it came to paſs on a certain day, that he went into a ſhip with the diſciples. And he ſaid unto them, Let us go unto the other ſide of the lake.—And they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes, which is over-againſt Galilee.*

St. Mark alſo, having related divers of our Lord's diſcourſes, ſays, *And the ſame day, when even was come, he ſaith unto them, Let us paſs over unto the other ſide. And when they had ſent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ſhip. And there were alſo with him other little ſhips. And there aroſe a great*

a great ſtorm of wind, and the waves beat into the ſhip, ſo that it was now full. And he was in the hinder part of the ſhip aſleep on a pillow; and they awake him,—And he aroſe, and rebuked the wind. And the wind ceaſed, and there was a great calm.—And they feared exceedingly, and ſaid one to another, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the ſea obey him! And they came over unto the other ſide of the ſea, into the country of the Gadarenes. That is, our Lord paſſed from the weſtern to the eaſtern ſide of the ſea of Galilee, or of Tiberias, as it is called at other times.

St. Matthew calls the place where our Lord arrived, *the country of the Gergeſenes:* whereas the two other evangeliſts, as we have juſt ſeen, call it *the country of the Gadarenes.* Some learned men think, that this laſt is the right reading in St. Matthew's goſpel alſo.

It follows in St. Mark, whoſe hiſtory we ſhall for the moſt part take for our text, and cite in the firſt place: *And when he was come out of the ſhip, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean ſpirit.* From which words, I think, it may be concluded, that this man's abode, and the burial-place, where he chiefly was, lay near the ſhore, or upon the ſea-ſide. St. Luke's words confirm this ſuppoſition, which are theſe: *And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time.*

But here is a difference between St. Matthew and the two other evangeliſts. St. Mark ſays, *Immediately there met him a man with an unclean ſpirit.* St. Luke, *A certain man, which had devils.* But St. Matthew ſays, *There met him two poſſeſſed with devils, coming out of the tombs.* Of this difficulty ſeveral ſolutions have been offered by learned interpreters of ſcripture. The moſt likely ſeems to be this, that one of theſe men was upon divers accounts more remarkable than the other: he, eſpecially, may have been *exceeding fierce,* and his diſtemper of the longeſt ſtanding. Perhaps, he was beſt known in thoſe parts, being an inhabitant of the city, not far off. He likewiſe was the perſon, with whom our Lord diſcourſed chiefly, aſking him his name, and receiving for anſwer, that he was called *Legion.* It is likely, that one only deſired to accompany the Lord Jeſus when cured: and poſſibly, he only of the two had a grateful ſenſe of the benefit conferred, and afterwards declared, *how great things the Lord had done for him.* There being therefore ſeveral things peculiar to one, two of the evangeliſts ſpeak of him only, omitting the other, for the ſake of brevity: but there is no contradiction between them

and

and the third evangeliſt. There were two, as St. Matthew ſays: which is not denied by St. Mark or St. Luke, though they confine their relation to one only.

Says St. Mark, *Immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean ſpirit, who had his dwelling among the tombs.* St. Luke, *Neither abode in any houſe, but in the tombs.* St. Matthew, *There met him two poſſeſſed with devils, coming out of the tombs.*

This circumſtance therefore is mentioned by all the three evangeliſts; that this man, or theſe two men, had their abode *in tombs*, or among tombs. It was not then uſual to bury within the walls of cities, but at ſome diſtance without them, more or leſs. By *tombs* may be meant in general a burying-place, where were many ſepulchres; or by tombs may be meant ſepulchres. And indeed many of the ſepulchres of the eaſtern countries at that time were large, capable of containing divers perſons. And to this day, travellers, when overtaken by ſtorms and bad weather, take ſhelter in them.

Theſe men then being fierce and melancholy, ſhunning company, and being ſhunned, abode at a diſtance from all cities, and particularly *among* or *in ſepulchres*. This place ſuited their gloomy apprehenſions, and here in the night-ſeaſon, and in bad weather, they had ſhelter. Moreover, there might be another reaſon of this. For ſome are of opinion, that the dæmons, or unclean ſpirits, by which theſe perſons were poſſeſſed, were not ſuppoſed to be fallen angels, but the ſouls or departed ſpirits of bad men. If ſo, a lunatic, acted by ſuch ſpirits, or thinking himſelf acted by them, might be much diſpoſed to be chiefly among the dead, or in burial-places. But whether there be any ground for that opinion or not, it is likely, the two reaſons before-mentioned ought not to be diſregarded: theſe places ſuited their melancholy apprehenſions, and here at ſome ſeaſons they had ſhelter and relief from rain and cold.

There follows in the evangeliſts a deſcription of the unhappy circumſtances of one or both theſe perſons. Says St. Mark, who is moſt particular: *And no man could bind him, no not with chains; becauſe that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked aſunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces. And always night and day he was on the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himſelf with ſtones.* St. Luke's account is: *There met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and wore no clothes, neither abode in any houſe, but in the tombs.* And afterwards:

For

For oftentimes it had caught him. And he was kept bound with chains, and in fetters. And he brake the bands, and was driven of the devil into the wilderneſs, or the deſert mountainous country, where the tombs were ſituated. St. Matthew more briefly ſays, *There met him two poſſeſſed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, ſo that no man might paſs that way.*

The ſum is, that this was a deplorable caſe. One of theſe men eſpecially, had been in this condition, of a diſcompoſed mind, for a long ſeaſon. He was exceeding fierce, and dangerous at ſome times. He had been faſt bound, but he had broken his bands, eſcaped out of his confinement, and had been for ſome while in deſert, mountainous places, lodging in ſepulchres only, not in any houſe. All which are evident ſymptoms of lunacy or diſtraction. That is the unhappy caſe before us.

Poſſibly it may be here inquired by ſome, how came the evangeliſts, eſpecially Mark and Luke, who are moſt particular, to be ſo well acquainted with the hiſtory of this man's caſe in time paſt, to be able to ſay, *he had been ſo long time*, and that he had been *often bound with chains, and that* they had been *broken aſunder by him?* His preſent circumſtances and actions, his nakedneſs, his fierceneſs, his cutting himſelf with flints, his crying, or raving, as he did, were diſcerned immediately. Theſe things the diſciples were eye or ear-witneſſes of, upon the man's approaching them, when they came out of the ſhip. But how came they to know the circumſtances of his indiſpoſition in time paſt, and the treatment that had been given him?

To which I anſwer, that it is eaſy to ſuppoſe divers things, which are not mentioned in relations of this kind: which therefore are omitted, becauſe all intelligent and attentive perſons are able to ſupply them. It is not unlikely, that the man himſelf, when cured by our Lord, gave ſome account of his former condition. Moreover, here were the keepers of the ſwine, who might be able to relate ſeveral things concerning him. Poſſibly too it was a well known caſe, and the people who came over with Jeſus from the other ſide of the lake, might be able to give the diſciples ſome information concerning him.

Finally, before our Lord went away, great multitudes of that country had come to the place where Jeſus was. And it is reaſonable for us to conclude, that ſome of thoſe perſons were able and diſpoſed to give an account of both theſe men, eſpecially of one of them: which indeed, as before hinted, I take to be a main reaſon, why the evangeliſts Mark and Luke

confined their hiſtory to one, though there were two of theſe men, as ſaid by St. Matthew: even becauſe they had received more particular intelligence concerning one than the other.

It follows in St. Mark: *But when he ſaw Jeſus afar off, he ran and worſhipped him. And cried with a loud voice, and ſaid, What have I to do with thee, Jeſus, thou Son of the moſt high God. I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. (For he had ſaid unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean ſpirit.) And he aſked him, What is thy name? And he anſwered, ſaying, My name is Legion, for we are many. And he beſought him much, that he would not ſend them away out of the country.* St. Luke likewiſe ſays: *When he ſaw Jeſus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice ſaid, What have I to do with thee, Jeſus, thou Son of God moſt high. I beſeech thee torment me not. (For he had commanded the unclean ſpirit to come out of the man.) And Jeſus aſked him, ſaying, What is thy name? And he ſaid, Legion, becauſe many devils were entered into him. And they beſought him, that he would not command them to go out into the deep.* St. Matthew, though briefer than the others, ſays: *And behold, they cried out, ſaying, What have we to do with thee, Jeſus, thou Son of God! Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?*

By all the evangeliſts we are aſſured, that one, or both theſe men, either they, or the evil ſpirits in them, owned our Lord's character, as the Meſſiah, or the Son of God; and they intreat him not to ſend them away. But I think it appears, both from St. Mark and St. Luke, that theſe things are not ſaid by them until our Lord had ſignified his will, that the man, or men, ſhould be delivered from this unhappy circumſtance: then they own the character of Jeſus, that he was the Chriſt, and his power, as ſuch, to command and ſend them whither he pleaſed. But they intreat him, not to puniſh them for having taken poſſeſſion of theſe perſons, and made them miſerable. Yea, they are repreſented complaining of his command as unreaſonable: *What have we to do with thee?* Why ſhould you concern yourſelf with us? Leave us to act as we think fit, until the laſt day, the time of the full puniſhment allotted to us.

The unclean ſpirits ſpeaking in this manner, Jeſus aſked one of the men, what was his name, and he anſwered Legion, becauſe there were in him many unclean ſpirits.

As theſe ſpirits deſired, that they might not be *tormented before the time*; ſo in particular, they petitioned our Lord, that he would *not ſend them away out of the country*, as it is expreſſed in

in St. Mark: or, that he would *not command them to go out into the deep*, as in St. Luke.

Evil ſpirits delight in miſchief, and are afraid of puniſhment. They therefore make it their requeſt to Jeſus, if he would be obeyed with regard to the commandment he had given them, to *come out* of the men whom they had ſo long tormented, that yet he would not require them quite to leave that country, but permit them to act as they pleaſed toward ſome other perſons in thoſe parts. At leaſt they intreat him, however, that he would not order them away into *the deep*, or *the abyſs*, that is, the place of torment.

As the full puniſhment[a] of fallen angels, as well as of bad men, was deferred to the great day of the general judgment; it was the opinion of many at that time, that ſome of thoſe evil angels and ſpirits were allowed, (though ſubject to controul,) to viſit the region of our air, and this earth, and to inflict diſeaſes and other calamities upon men. Of this number are theſe unclean ſpirits, and they earneſtly intreat not to be ſent back to their priſon, and confined in the abyſs, or place of torment, as yet.

I proceed to what remains, now firſt reading St. Matthew: *And there was a good way off from them an herd of many ſwine feeding. So the devils beſought him, ſaying, If thou caſt us out, ſuffer us to go into the herd of ſwine. And he ſaid unto them, Go. And when they were come out, they went into the herd of ſwine. And behold, the whole herd of ſwine ran violently down a ſteep place into the ſea, and periſhed in the waters. And they that kept them fled, and went their ways into the city, and told every thing, and what was befallen to the poſſeſſed of the devils. And behold, the whole city came out to meet Jeſus. And when they ſaw him, they beſought him, that he would depart out of their coaſts. And he entered into a ſhip, and paſſed over, and came into his own city.*

Here I would obſerve, that this great work of our Lord was performed with deliberation. There was ſome time between his intimation, that theſe evil ſpirits ſhould remove, and their actual departure; or, in other words, the men were not healed at once, immediately upon his commanding the evil ſpirits *to come out* of the men: but he allowed a petition to be preſented to him, which was in part granted.

St. Mark's account is after this manner: *Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of ſwine feeding. And all the devils beſought him, ſaying, Send us into the ſwine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jeſus gave them leave.*

[a] See 2 Pet. ii. 4. and Jude ver. 6.

And the unclean ſpirits went out and entered into the ſwine. And the herd ran violently down a ſteep place into the ſea (they were about two thouſand) and were choked in the ſea. And they that fed the ſwine fled, and told it in the city, and in the country. And they went out to ſee what it was that was done. And they came to Jeſus, and ſee him that was poſſeſſed with the devil, and had the legion, ſitting, and clothed, and in his right mind, and they were afraid. And they that ſaw it, told them, how it befel to him that was poſſeſſed with the devils, and alſo concerning the ſwine. And they began to pray him to depart out of their coaſts.

St. Luke's relation is to the like purpoſe: *And there was there an herd of many ſwine feeding on the mountain. And they beſought him, that he would ſuffer them to enter into them. And he ſuffered them. Then went the devils out of the men and entered into the ſwine. And the herd ran violently down a ſteep place into the lake, and were choked. When they that fed them ſaw what was done, they fled, and went and told it in the city, and in the country. Then they went out to ſee what was done, and came to Jeſus, and found the man, out of whom the devils departed, ſitting at the feet of Jeſus, clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid. They alſo which ſaw it, told them by what means he that was poſſeſſed of the devils was healed. Then the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes round about beſought him to depart from them, for they were taken with great fear. And he went up into the ſhip, and returned back again.*

As this country was a part of the land of Iſrael, and the Jews were forbidden by the law of Moſes to eat ſwine's fleſh; it may ſeem ſtrange to ſome, that there ſhould have been in this place ſo large a number of thoſe animals. But there is reaſon to think, that this country was then chiefly inhabited by Gentiles, though there were Jews likewiſe: and it may be ſuppoſed, that the herd belonged to the Gentile inhabitants. However, poſſibly ſome Jews might have a property in them, and might trade in thoſe creatures, ſelling them to heathens, without partaking of them as food.

The evangeliſts do all agree in this part of the hiſtory. But two inquiries may be here put. 1. By what means was this herd of ſwine hurried down the precipice, and drowned in the waters? 2. For what reaſons did our Lord ſuffer this to be done?

Firſt, How, or by what means was this herd hurried down the precipice, and drowned in the waters? And there are ſeveral ways of accounting for this. They who ſuppoſe that there was here only a diſtemper, and are unwilling to admit the

the agency of any bad ſpirits in this caſe, ſay; theſe men, or one of them, might, with the permiſſion of Jeſus, go and drive the ſwine off the precipice into the ſea, where they were drowned. Or elſe, our Lord was pleaſed to transfer the lunacy, or diſtraction, from this man, or theſe men, to the ſwine; and the diſtemper having ſeized them, they took their way down a ſteep road, and periſhed in the ſea.

Others, who readily admit the agency of evil ſpirits in this affair, ſay, that with our Lord's permiſſion, when theſe ſpirits were removed out of the men, they took poſſeſſion of the ſwine, and hurried them into the waters, where they were drowned.

Every one is at liberty to judge for himſelf. But I readily own, that I do not approve of that ſolution, which ſuppoſeth, that the lunacy was transferred from the men to the ſwine; for this implies, that the drowning of the ſwine was owing to our Lord's agency or interpoſition: whereas I do not perceive, that our Lord wrought any miracles that were hurtful. The only inſtance of this kind which I recollect, is the withering a barren uſeleſs fig-tree in the way between Bethany and Jeruſalem. As then there is no clear evidence of our Lord's interpoſing in this matter, I preſume it ought not to be admitted.

Secondly, it is inquired: why, or for what reaſons did our Lord ſuffer this to be done; by the men themſelves before they were quite cured; or by the evil ſpirits when they were departed from the men? For according to the accounts given by the evangeliſts, it was not, and could not be done without his permiſſion: his leave was aſked, and granted.

Some think, that our Lord permitted this to be done, as a proof of the real agency of evil ſpirits, in this caſe.

But whether that was a reaſon or not, there are, I think, other uſes which this event would anſwer, and therefore probably were intended herein. For the loſs of the ſwine tended to make the cure of the man public. It had this effect: *They that fed the ſwine fled, and told it in the city, and in the country*; that is, they haſted to noiſe it abroad every where: and many were brought to Jeſus, and came to ſee the man who was healed, and ſtayed with him, ſitting at his feet. Hereby therefore, and by means of the immediate publication of the miracle, the people of the neighbouring town and country were [b] proved. Jeſus, by his preſence with them, and by the great miracle

[b] Non quod conceſſerit Salvator dæmonibus quod petebant, dixit, Ite: Sed ut per interfectionem porcorum hominibus ſalutis occaſio præberetur. Paſtores enim iſta cernentes, ſtatim nunciant civitati. Hieron. in Matt. Tom. 4. p. 29. m.

performed among them, with which they were preſently acquainted, made them a tender of divine knowledge, and other ſpiritual bleſſings. But though a great and evident miracle had been wrought among them, one of the moſt deſirable works that can be thought of, delivering a man from diſtraction, reſtoring him to the uſe of reaſon and underſtanding; theſe people were ſo carnal, and ſo apprehenſive of ſuffering in their worldly intereſts, that inſtead of intreating Jeſus to ſtay with them, a while at leaſt, that they might partake in ſome other like benefits of his great power, and be inſtructed by him in things of religion, that they joined together with much unanimity in beſeeching him to depart out of their coaſts: which he did, and went back again to the other ſide of the lake.

There remains yet one article in this hiſtory, omitted indeed by St. Matthew, but related by both the other evangeliſts. Says St. Mark: *And when he was come into the ſhip, he that had been poſſeſſed with the devils, prayed him, that he might be with him: Howbeit, Jeſus ſuffered him not, but ſaith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compaſſion on thee. And he departed, and began to publiſh in Decapolis, how great things Jeſus had done for him, and all men did marvel.* St. Luke's words are theſe: *Now the man, out of whom the devils were departed, beſought him, that he might be with him. But Jeſus ſent him away, ſaying, Return to thy own houſe, and ſhew how great things God hath done unto thee. And he went his way, and publiſhed throughout the whole city, how great things Jeſus had done unto him.*

It is likely, that this perſon requeſted to be with Jeſus for his own ſecurity, fearing that thoſe evil ſpirits would again take poſſeſſion of him and torment him. But Jeſus ſuffered him not to be with him. For our Lord to have allowed the man to accompany him in his journeys would have looked like oſtentation, and might have been eſteemed vain-glorious: beſides, the power of Jeſus was more conſpicuous in the man's ſafety at a diſtance. And it was fit likewiſe, that this perſon ſhould now increaſe in faith, and live without fear, truſting in God every where, and at all times.

His requeſt not being granted, *he went his way, and publiſhed throughout the whole city, how great things Jeſus had done unto him.* He was an honeſt and grateful man; and in the place where he dwelt, and every where, and to all men, as he had opportunity, he declared the great work which Jeſus had done for him.

Perhaps

Perhaps ſome may here inquire: How ſhall we reconcile the direction given by Chriſt upon this occaſion with what we find elſewhere? Sometimes he commanded ſilence, and charged men not to ſpeak of the miracles he had wrought. Here he directs this man to tell others what *God had done for him.* To which I anſwer: Our Lord never deſired, that any miracles wrought by him ſhould be denied or diſowned by any: nor did he intend that men, on whom they were performed, ſhould conceal them from their friends and relatives, or their own family; though he did forbid a general and open publication of ſome of his mighty works. And what he ſays to this man is no more than this: *Return to thy own houſe:* or, *go home to thy friends: and tell them, how great things the Lord has done for thee, and has had compaſſion on thee.*

II. Having gone over this hiſtory, I would now add ſome remarks and obſervations.

1. We hence perceive, that St. Mark's goſpel is not an abridgment of St. Matthew's, as ſome have thought. St. Mark entirely omits divers things recorded by St. Matthew, and he has ſome hiſtories quite wanting in that other evangeliſt. This hiſtory, which we have now conſidered, affords a good argument againſt that opinion: St. Matthew ſpeaks of two in this country of the Gergeſenes poſſeſſed with devils, St. Mark mentions one only. If he had ſeen St. Matthew's goſpel, he would not have ſo written this hiſtory, without aſſigning ſome reaſon for the difference, or inſerting a hint for reconciling it. St. Mark ſays, *the number of the ſwine was about two thouſand,* which is not mentioned by either of the other evangeliſts. St. Mark is, beſides, in ſeveral parts of his relation of this miracle, more full and copious than St. Matthew, who has nothing of the diſcourſe which our Lord held with the man called Legion; and alſo entirely omits the man's requeſt, when cured, to be with Jeſus, and our Lord's refuſal, and the publication which the man afterwards made every where, of the great cure which had been wrought upon him.

In a word, the firſt three evangeliſts are all diſtinct and independent witneſſes of our Lord's life and miracles; they did not write by concert: nor had any one of them, when he wrote, ſeen either of the other two goſpels. The caſe however is ſomewhat different with regard to St. John: he peruſed the other three goſpels before he wrote, and he has both confirmed their hiſtory, and made additions of his own.

2. The diſtemper, with which theſe men were afflicted, was lunacy or diſtraction: I ſay, the diſtemper of this man, or

theſe two men, (whatever influence evil ſpirits might have,) was lunacy or diſtraction. This is evident from particulars mentioned by all the evangeliſts. St. Matthew ſays, that the two men which met Jeſus upon his coming on ſhore, were *exceeding fierce, ſo that no man might paſs that way.* The particulars related by the other evangeliſts, concerning one of thoſe men, are indications of the ſame thing: his having been bound, and fettered, and his breaking his bands, living in the tombs, without clothing, cutting himſelf with flints; as alſo the whimſical anſwer which he made, when our Lord aſked what was his name. And the cure is repreſented by his recovering his reaſon and underſtanding, and a compoſed temper and behaviour: for it is obſerved, that when the people came out of the city, they ſaw him *ſitting, and clothed, and in his right mind.*

3. This is the only miracle of this kind which is particularly recorded in the goſpels. There might be many others; but I do not recollect any other particularly related by the evangeliſts. There are divers inſtances of perſons who had *evil ſpirits*, and were *lunatic*; but their diſtemper was not the ſame with that of theſe men. The young man brought to the diſciples, when our Lord was in the mount, was *lunatic, and ſore-vexed*; but his diſtemper was the epilepſy, or falling ſickneſs: *Oft-times*, it is ſaid, Matt. xvii. 15. *he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water:* and other ſymptoms of that diſtemper are to be found in the hiſtory of his caſe.

Of Mary Magdalene it is ſaid, that *out of her went ſeven devils*, Mark xvi. 9. and I am not unwilling to allow her caſe to have been much the ſame with that of the two men at the tombs: though it is not quite certain. But her cure, or the miracle wrought upon her, is no where particularly related: all that is ſaid of her caſe is no more than this, Luke viii. 1, 2. *And the twelve were with him, and certain women, which had been healed of evil ſpirits and infirmities: Mary Magdalene, out of whom went ſeven devils, Joanna, and many others.*

4. The miracle, which we have now conſidered, was the effect of our Lord's benevolence. It does not appear, that he had any invitation to come into the country of the Gadarenes; but he went thither of his own accord, with a view of healing the two men at the tombs: knowing their ſad caſe from ſome occaſional informations that had been given him, or by the perfect comprehenſive knowledge which he had of things remote, as well as near at hand.

The context which was read before aſſures us, that compaſſion and benevolence, without any particular invitation, brought

brought our Lord hither: his words therefore are extremely proper, when he ſays to the man: *Go home to thy friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord has done for thee, and has had compaſſion on thee.* Unaſked, unſought by friends, or any one elſe, he croſſed the ſea, and came on ſhore, converſed with theſe unhappy perſons, relieved them in their deplorable and diſconſolate condition, and then went back again to the other ſide.

How conſpicuous is the benevolence! how great and amiable is the benignity of the Lord Jeſus! He is entitled to the eſteem and love of all. He came to ſeek and to ſave thoſe who were loſt. And by mighty works of goodneſs on the bodies of men, or for rectifying and putting in order the human frame, as conſtituted of ſoul and body; he demonſtrated the truth of his prophetical character and miſſion, and invited men to embrace and obey that doctrine, which directs them in the way to the poſſeſſion of eternal life.

That word ye know, ſays St. Peter at the houſe of Cornelius, *how God anointed Jeſus of Nazareth, with the holy Ghoſt, and with power: who went about doing good,* Acts x. 37. They who were afflicted, as theſe men were, could not be eaſily brought to Jeſus: and it is likely, that few had faith enough to aſk ſuch a cure of him, eſpecially at a diſtance. Our Lord therefore, as when Lazarus was dead, now alſo of his own good-will left the place where he was, took ſhipping, and went over the ſea of Galilee, for the ſake of theſe men in the country of the Gadarenes, whoſe caſe was extremely deplorable, and above all human relief.

5. I would obſerve, that this miracle was very public, at leaſt well known. Our Lord went to this place attended by his diſciples; as he came out of the ſhip the *two men met him.* Some of the mariners therefore belonging to that ſhip, in all probability, were preſent at the miracle, for the appearance of ſuch miſerable objects could not but excite their curioſity. It is probable, that divers others were ſpectators of this great cure. St. Mark proceeding to this matter ſays, ch. iv. 35, 36. *And the ſame day, when the even was come, he ſaith unto them, Let us paſs over unto the other ſide. And when they had ſent away the multitude, they took him, as he was, in the ſhip. And there were alſo with him ſeveral other little ſhips.* All theſe, it is likely, followed Jeſus, and came on ſhore with him on the other ſide. Moreover, as before obſerved, our Lord performed this miracle deliberately: he diſcourſed with one of the men, who, by the anſwer he made, as well as by his outward form, manifeſted

manifeſted the great diſorder of his mind. And this part of that country muſt have been extremely deſolate and unpeopled, if ſome paſſing by, and others, did not in this ſpace of time join our Lord's company, There is therefore reaſon to conclude, that a good number of perſons were gathered together from the ſhips, and from elſewhere, and were ſpectators of this great work. So much is intimated in thoſe words of St. Mark: *And they that ſaw it told them, how it had befallen him that was poſſeſſed with the devils.*

Then indeed it was very public: for upon the cure, and the loſs of the ſwine, they who fed them went into the neighbouring city; and the people came out to Jeſus, and beheld the man calm and compoſed. And as St. Mark ſays in the words juſt cited, *they who ſaw it*, then related to them particularly how the thing had been done. And as the caſe of one of theſe men was well known, he having been often bound ineffectually, and a long time afflicted with this diſorder, and having been often terrible to ſuch as paſſed that way: many, who afterwards ſaw him enjoying a compoſed mind, and the right exerciſe of reaſon, muſt have been fully apprized of his miraculous cure, if they were attentive.

As our Lord performed this miracle with deliberation, ſo I think he ſtayed in the ſame place ſome time afterwards; by which means many had an opportunity of ſeeing him with the man at his feet. We do not know exactly how long our Saviour was here: but we may form a conjecture. It was even, when he took ſhipping: in the paſſage there was a ſtorm. It is very likely, he did not arrive at the other ſide until morning: and probably he ſtayed there the greateſt part of that day before he embarked again.

6. We learn by this hiſtory to truſt in divine providence, and not to live in fear of evil ſpirits, and their influence, or any accident whatever. They are under ſtrict confinement; or, if they are permitted at all to viſit our region and orb, they are under reſtraint and controul. They ſhall not be allowed to inflict on us any evil, nor ſhall any accident whatever befal us, but what ſhall be over-ruled and ſanctified for our benefit, if we chooſe the thing that is good, and caſt our care upon God.

7. We learn the reaſonableneſs of gratitude for benefits beſtowed upon us, eſpecially if we receive any ſignal deliverance from great and uncommon afflictions. Our bleſſed Lord did not chooſe that this perſon ſhould attend him: however, he *did him go home, and tell his friends there, how great things God*

had

had done for him, and had compaſſion on him. Though our Lord was meek and humble, and was far from ſeeking honour from men; he could not but be pleaſed with a thankful mind, ſenſible of benefits. Once, as he was travelling, and preaching the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven, *he met ten lepers, and they lifted up their voices, and ſaid: Jeſus, maſter, have mercy upon us,* Luke xvii. 13. He had mercy upon them, and bade them go and ſhew themſelves to the prieſt. *As they went they were cleanſed. And one of them, when he ſaw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, and fell down on his face at his feet, giving him thanks: and he was a Samaritan. And Jeſus anſwering ſaid, Were there not ten cleanſed? But where are the nine? There are not found that returned to give glory to God, ſave this ſtranger. And he ſaid unto him, Ariſe, go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole.*

8. Finally, from this hiſtory we may learn, to bear meekly rebukes and diſcouragements in the proſecution of good deſigns. Jeſus came into this country with a good intention: he here wrought a miracle, a work of the greateſt kindneſs, reſtoring a man, who had been long under the ſoreſt of afflictions, whoſe cure was beyond all human ſkill, to the full uſe of reaſon and underſtanding. Nor was the neighbourhood altogether unconcerned in this benefit: the man, who before was diſagreeable and terrible, was compoſed, and might be uſeful among them. But becauſe this happy event was attended with temporal loſs to ſome of them, they intreat the compaſſionate author of that great benefit, in whom was ſo much wiſdom, and ſo much goodneſs, and ſo much power, *to depart out of their coaſts.* And he acquieſced, not chooſing to obtrude himſelf upon them, as the evangeliſts inform us: *And he went up into the ſhip, and returned back again.* However it is added: *And it came to paſs, that when Jeſus was returned, the people gladly received him, for they were all waiting for him.* Theſe things are written for the direction and ſupport of wiſe and good men.

DIS-

DISCOURSE II.

MARK v. 19.

Howbeit Jeſus ſuffered him not, but ſaith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compaſſion on thee.

HAVING formerly explained and improved the hiſtory of moſt of our Lord's miracles, and lately that of the cure of the two men at the tombs, in the country of the Gadarenes; I have thought it not improper, to conſider in general the caſe of thoſe, who in the New Teſtament are ſpoken of as having *evil*, or *unclean ſpirits*.

The ſubject is not immediately practical: and it is moſt agreeable to inſiſt upon the general principles of true religion, which are univerſally acknowledged, or are controverted by a few only; together with the virtues of a good life, which are of the greateſt importance, and of abſolute neceſſity, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord; and thoſe helps and means, which in their own nature, or by divine appointment, are fitted to promote faith in God, good works, and an heavenly frame of mind. Theſe are the moſt excellent, the moſt delightful ſubjects of meditation and diſcourſe. Upon no conſiderations, by no means whatever, would one be called off from theſe points, or ceaſe to make them the uſual topics of diſcourſe in chriſtian aſſemblies.

Nevertheleſs, it may not be altogether unprofitable, to treat on the ſubject I am now entering upon; it being what frequently occurs in the hiſtory of our Saviour's miracles, as recorded in the goſpels. It is likely therefore, that by conſidering the ſeveral texts, wherein theſe unhappy caſes and their cure are mentioned, ſome light may be caſt upon the holy ſcriptures, and ſome parts of the evangelical hiſtory may be better read with underſtanding.

In treating this ſubject I propoſe to obſerve the following method.

I. I would ſhew what are the opinions of men of the preſent, and late times, concerning this matter.

II. I would obſerve, what was the general opinion in the time of our Saviour, and his apoſtles, and what notions men then formed of theſe caſes.

III.

III. I will endeavour to diſcover the truth, and what idea we ought to have of thoſe unhappy perſons, who are ſpoken of as *poſſeſſed of devils*.

IV. I intend to conſider objections and difficulties, relating to that opinion, which may appear to be moſt probable.

I. In the firſt place I would ſhew, what are the opinions of men of the preſent, or late times, concerning this matter. For there are two different opinions; one general and common, the other leſs general, and ſomewhat uncommon.

The opinion which I take to be moſt common, is this; that theſe perſons were poſſeſſed, and inhabited, acted, governed and influenced by ſome evil ſpirit, or ſpirits; there having been in ſome of theſe perſons one, in others many of theſe evil ſpirits.

And I reckon, that moſt in our times ſuppoſe theſe evil ſpirits to have been bad, or fallen angels, ſome of the companions, inſtruments, and agents of him, who is the chief of fallen angels, and called Satan, or Beelzebub, or the Devil, by way of eminence.

This I take to be the opinion of the vulgar: it obtains alſo very much among the learned. We have theſe words of a great and eminent writer in a late defence and vindication of our bleſſed Saviour's miracles againſt modern cavils and objections. He is ſpeaking of the two men at the tombs, and the drowning of the herd of ſwine. 'So [c] that even this permiſſion of Jeſus to the evil ſpirits was amply compenſated, 'by caſting a whole legion of devils out of one perſon, that 'is, by ſuffering about three of them to enter into each hog, 'inſtead of about ſix thouſand of them keeping poſſeſſion of 'one man. And this diſpoſſeſſion of thoſe evil ſpirits, and 'permiſſion given them in conſequence of it, were arguments 'of great force, to ſhew the power of Jeſus, over ſo numerous 'a regiment of them.' So that great author.

The number of the ſpirits that had taken poſſeſſion of the unhappy man, is here inferred and concluded from his calling himſelf Legion. A Roman legion at that time uſually conſiſted of ſix thouſand ſoldiers or more. That learned writer therefore ſuppoſeth, that there were about ſo many evil ſpirits in that man. And when thoſe ſpirits were caſt out of the man, there being about two thouſand ſwine that were drowned in the ſea, the ſame writer ſuppoſeth, that each ſwine became poſſeſſed, and was hurried down the precipice by three devils.

Every one, perhaps, does not judge it needful to conclude, that there were exactly ſuch a number of ſpirits in the man,

[c] See Bp. Smallbrook's Vindication of our Saviour's Miracles, Vol. I. p. 203.

becauſe

becauſe he called himſelf Legion: but it is generally ſuppoſed, that there were in him very many evil [d] ſpirits.

It being thought, that theſe perſons were poſſeſſed and tormented by one or more evil ſpirits, whereas ſuch caſes are now very uncommon among us, if there are any at all; it has been ſuppoſed, that [e] it might be wiſely allowed of and ſuffered by the divine being at that time. Satan and his inſtruments were then looſed, and permitted to poſſeſs and torment many perſons in the land of Judea, and the adjoining countries. Hereby the power of Jeſus, the Meſſiah, was rendered the more conſpicuous, by delivering men from thoſe poſſeſſions, and all the infirmities conſequent upon them. Since which time, and eſpecially ſince the power of miracles has ceaſed in the church, Satan has not been permitted to torment men in this world in that extraordinary and remarkable manner.

This I take to be the prevailing ſentiment of learned and unlearned, and the ſcheme that has been formed concerning this point.

The other opinion, leſs common, is, that theſe caſes were diſtempers only, which the human frame is ſubject to in this ſtate of mortality; through its weakneſs and imperfection, and the accidents it is expoſed to, and the temper of particular conſtitutions, and the influences of diet, and the circumambient air, and other natural cauſes.

Theſe are the two principal ſentiments of moderns upon this head.

II. In the ſecond place I am to ſhew, what was the general opinion in the time of our Saviour and his apoſtles, and what notions men then formed of thoſe caſes, which are ſo frequently mentioned in the goſpels.

I ſhall endeavour to ſhew the ancient ſentiment in ſeveral propoſitions and obſervations.

1. In the firſt place it is fit to obſerve the ſtyle, or the ſeveral phraſes and expreſſions made uſe of in the New Teſtament in ſpeaking of this matter. For there can be no doubt, but

[d] Jeſus aſked him, ſaying, *What is thy name?* Which queſtion was not aſked to gratify his own, or others curioſity; but for this good end, that the Gadarenes might ſee what a miſerable condition their countryman was in, and be more ſenſible of the mercy of his cure, and their own great danger amidſt ſuch vaſt numbers of evil ſpirits as then ſwarmed amongſt them: ſince ſo many had taken poſſeſſion of that one unhappy man, as to deſerve the name of Legion, (above ſix thouſand,) as one of them told our Lord in the name of the reſt, in anſwer to his queſtion: *My name is Legion, for we are many.* Fr. Bragge on our Saviour's Miracles, Vol. I. p. 75.

[e] He caſt out evil ſpirits, who by the divine Providence were permitted to exert themſelves at that time, and to poſſeſs many perſons. Dr. Jortin's Remarks upon Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Vol. II. p. 17. See the ſame, Vol. I. p. 14.

the

the evangeliſts have uſed the expreſſions, which obtained at that time.

One expreſſion, which frequently occurs, is *poſſeſſed with devils*. So in St. Matthew, chap. iv. 24. *And his fame went throughout all Syria. And they brought unto him all ſick people, that were taken with divers diſeaſes and torments, and thoſe which were poſſeſſed with devils.* Again, ch. viii. 16. *When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were poſſeſſed with devils. And he caſt out the ſpirits with his word, and healed all that were ſick.* The ſame evangeliſt, ſpeaking of the men in the country of the Gadarenes, ſays, ver. 28. *There met him two poſſeſſed with devils.*

Another phraſe very frequent in ſpeaking of this matter is that of perſons having *unclean ſpirits*. When our Lord ſent forth the diſciples, *he gave them power againſt unclean ſpirits, and to caſt them out, and to heal all manner of ſickneſs.* Matt. x. 1. And St. Mark, v. 13. in the acccount of the man called Legion, ſays: *And forthwith Jeſus gave them leave, and the unclean ſpirits went out, and entered into the ſwine.* It is in the Acts likewiſe, v. 16. *There came alſo a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jeruſalem, bringing ſick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean ſpirits.* And at Samaria, Acts viii. 7. when Philip, the deacon and evangeliſt, was there, *unclean ſpirits, crying with a loud voice, came out of many.*

Sometimes the phraſe is *unclean ſpirit* in the ſingular number; Mark i. 23. *And there was in the ſynagogue a man with an unclean ſpirit.* And St. Mark uſeth alſo this ſame expreſſion, ver. 2. of this chapter, ſpeaking of the man called Legion; *When he was come out of the ſhip, there met him a man with an unclean ſpirit.* And at ver. 8. our Lord ſays, *Come out of the man, thou unclean ſpirit.*

There is another form of expreſſion ſomewhat different from this in Luke iv. 33. *And in the ſynagogue there was a man, which had a ſpirit of an unclean devil.*

Sometimes they are called *evil* or wicked ſpirits; Luke vii. 21. *In that ſame hour he cured many of their infirmities, and plagues, and of evil ſpirits.* See alſo viii. 2. and elſewhere.

2. Give me leave to obſerve in the ſecond place, that in ſpeaking of this matter, particularly of perſons *poſſeſſed with devils*, our tranſlation is not exact; and inſtead of *devils*, the word dæmons would be much more proper: for that is the word which we have in the Greek original, and in the ancient Latin verſion, and in many modern tranſlations.

If

If any will be pleaſed to obſerve carefully, I believe they will find, that throughout the New Teſtament there is but one evil ſpirit called devil: who is ſuppoſed to be the chief or prince of the fallen angels, and is often called Satan and Beelzebub. Nor is that word once uſed in the plural number, in the New Teſtament, where Satan, or the fallen angels are ſpoken of.

That the ſcripture ſuppoſes but one evil being, or ſpirit, called *the devil*, may be eaſily perceived by every one from ſome plain texts. Matt. xxv. 41. *Then ſhall he ſay unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye curſed, into everlaſting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.* Rev. xii. 9. *The great dragon was caſt out, that old ſerpent, called the devil and Satan.* Again, Act xiii. 10. St. Paul ſays to Elymas, the ſorcerer: *Thou child of the devil*, or of Satan, that wicked one, prince of evil ſpirits. James iv. 7. *Reſiſt the devil, and he will flee from you.* 1 Pet. v. 8. *Be ſober, be vigilant, becauſe your adverſary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, ſeeking whom he may devour.* Here the original word is rightly rendered. And every one may perceive, that hereby is meant, that one great tempter and ſeducer of mankind, called Satan, and the prince of evil ſpirits. This is that evil being, by whom our Lord is ſaid to have been tempted in the wilderneſs; Matt. iv. 1, *Then was Jeſus led up of the Spirit, to be tempted of the devil.* Mark i. 13. *And he was there in the wilderneſs forty days tempted of Satan.*

There is therefore but one evil ſpirit, meant by that word in ſcripture; and wherever we have it in our tranſlation in the plural number, the original word is dæmons. For inſtance, 1 Cor. x. 20. *Now I ſay, that the things, which the gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to devils, not to God.* The original word is dæmons [Δαιμονιοις]. And ſo throughout that context the word dæmons ſhould be put in the tranſlation, in the room of that which we have. *Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of dæmons. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of dæmons.* This is the exact and literal verſion of that place.

For ſettling this matter, and for giving full ſatisfaction to ſuch as are not able to conſult the original language of the New Teſtament, I would take notice of a few more places. Matt. x. 8. Our Lord ſaid to the diſciples, when he ſent them forth from him: *Heal the ſick, cleanſe the lepers, caſt out devils.* In the Greek it is, *Caſt out dæmons.* Matt. xii. 27. *If I by Beelzebub caſt out devils, by whom do your children caſt them out?* It ſhould be rendered dæmons. As alſo ver. 28. *But if I caſt out*

out devils, rather dæmons *by the finger of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you.* And what is ſaid of Mary Magdalene Luke viii. ſhould be thus rendered: *Out of whom went ſeven dæmons.* And James ii. 19. *Thou believeſt that there is one God. The devils alſo believe and tremble.* In the original it is dæmons.

3. It is ſomewhat difficult to determine, what ought to be underſtood by the word dæmon, as uſed in the New Teſtament. It is likely, that many now by dæmons underſtand fallen angels. But at preſent our inquiry is, what was the meaning of the evangelical writers; in what ſenſe this word was uſed by them, and was uſed and underſtood by their contemporaries, or thoſe who lived in the times of Chriſt and his apoſtles. And though it may be difficult to determine this point with full and abſolute certainty; yet there are ſome reaſons, which may diſpoſe us to think, that thereby they meant the ſouls of bad men.

The word dæmon, uſed in the goſpels, and in other parts of the New Teſtament, is very frequent in Greek authors. And in thoſe profane authors, as we call them, the word has various ſenſes. It ſometimes denotes[f] God himſelf, or the ſupreme deity; ſometimes an inferior deity, and ſometimes thoſe genii, or lower orders of ſpirits, of which ſome were reputed good, others bad.

In the New Teſtament the word is almoſt always uſed in a bad ſenſe, to denote an evil, or impure ſpirit. Nevertheleſs in one place we may allow it to be taken in a good ſenſe. Acts xvii. 18. when St. Paul was at Athens, ſome ſaid of him, *He ſeemeth to be a ſetter forth of ſtrange gods:* in the original, *ſtrange dæmons*; ξενων δαιμονιων. Thoſe perſons imagined, that St. Paul deſigned to recommend to them, and introduce among them, the worſhip of ſome foreign dæmons, or gods of another city and country, not received in their city. As they were heathens, they may be ſuppoſed to have uſed the word in a good

[f] Επει δε η τε δαιμονιε προνοια, υφ' ης απι σωζομεθα, κ. λ. Ap. Dionyſ. Hal. Antiq. Roman. l. x. cap. 10. p. 607. ed. Hudſon. And ſee Cudworth's Intellectual Syſtem. B. i. ch. 4. p. 26—263. edit. 1678.

I ſhall tranſcribe here an article of an ancient lexicographer; whereby it appears, that in ancient heathen writers god, and dæmon, are often uſed, as equivalent: and that Plato, once at leaſt, called the ſupreme governor of the world, the chief dæmon. Θεος, και θεοι, και δαιμονες. Ουτω γαρ αμφω λεγει, δαιμονας καλειν θεους. Και Πλατων δε τον τε παντος κυβερνητην, μεγιστον δαιμονα ενομασσεν. Εχει δη της αυτης χρειας το θειον, και το δαιμονιον. J. Polluc. Onom. l. i. § 1. Conf. Platon. Politic T. 2. p. 272. E. Serran.

And what is ſometimes called the dæmon, is at other times called the god of Socrates. Μαντευα, ω Σωκρατες· ωτι δη συ το δαιμονιον ὁς τακτα σωφρων γιγνεσθαι. Platon. Euthyph. T. i. p. 3. β. Vid. & Apol. Socr. p. 40. & alibi. Maximus Tyrius has two chapters, entitled in this manner: Τι το δαιμονιον Σωκρατες. Ετι περι του Σωκρατες δαιμονιε. The chapter of Apuleius upon the ſame ſubject is intitled, De Deo Socratis.

ſenſe. But generally, for certain, in the New Teſtament, and ever ſince, among all Chriſtian writers, the word has been uſed to denote an evil ſpirit.

And there are remaining ſome paſſages of ancient authors, which may be of no ſmall ſervice for aſſuring us, what was meant by this word among Jewiſh people, and by the writers of the New Teſtament. One is a paſſage of Joſephus, the celebrated Jewiſh hiſtorian, who was contemporary with Chriſt's apoſtles. He ſays, 'that [g] dæmons are the ſpirits of wicked 'men, who enter into living men, and deſtroy them, unleſs 'they are ſo happy as to meet with ſpeedy relief.' Another is a paſſage of Juſtin Martyr, a Chriſtian writer, born of Greek parents, in the country of Samaria, who flouriſhed about the middle of the ſecond century. He is arguing for a future ſtate, and among other things he there ſpeaks 'of [h] thoſe who 'are ſeized and tormented by the ſouls of the dead, whom all 'call dæmoniacs and madmen.' And there are many other [i] authors, to whom I might refer, as countenancing this opinion.

This ſenſe of the word may alſo be argued from divers texts of the New Teſtament, ſome of which have been already quoted, 1 Cor. x. 20. *The things which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to dæmons, not to God.* Now the heathen deities, or dæmons, to whom they offered ſacrifices, were not angels good or bad; of whom it does not appear, that the ancient Greeks and Romans had any notion; but departed heroes, or the ſouls of men whom they reſpected, but whom the Jews the worſhippers and ſervants of the one God, always conſidered as evil beings.

g Τα γαρ καλεμενα δαιμονια, ταυτα δε πονηρων εστιν ανθρωπων πνευματα τοις ζωσιν εισδυομενα, και φθειροντα τους βοηθειας μη τυγχανοντας. De Bell. Jud. l. vii. c. 25. al. cap. 6. § 3. h Και οι ψυχαι; αποθανοντων λαμβανομενοι και ενοχλουμενοι ανθρωποι, ους δαιμονολημπτους και μαινομενους καλουσι παντες. Juſtin. Ap. I. i. al. 2. p. 65. Par. 1620. p. 54. ed. Bened.

i ——— ειναι τε παντα τον αερα ψυχων εμπλεων· και τουτους δαιμονας τε και ηρωας νομιζεσθαι· και υπο τουτων πεμπεσθαι ανθρωποις τους τε ονειρους, και τα σημεια νοσου τε και υγιειας. κ. λ. Pythagoras, Ap. Diog. Laert. in vita Pythagoræ, n. 32. p. 514.

Plerique tamen ex Platonis magiſterio, dæmones putant animas corporeo munere liberatas: laudabilium quoque virorum æthereos dæmones, improborum vero nocentes. Chalcid. in Platon. Tim. cap. 135. p. 330.

In Chryſoſtom's time ſome dæmoniacs would ſay, that they were poſſeſſed by the ſoul of ſuch, or ſuch, a monk: which muſt have been owing to a common opinion, that dæmons were the ſouls of dead men. Τι εν, ὁτι οι δαιμονες λεγουσι, τον μοναχον τινος η ψυχη εισι, φησι. Chryſ. de Lazaro. Conc. 2. Tom. i. p. 728.

Λυσοι, φησιν, οι δαιμονιωντες βοωσι, τινος ψυχη τον δεινος εσω. In Matt. hom. 29. al. 29. Tom. 7. p. 336. C.

He mentions it as the common opinion of meaner people in his time, that the ſouls of all who died a violent death, became dæmons. Και γαρ πολλοι των αφελεστερων νομιζουσι τας ψυχας των βιαιως θανατω τελευτησαντων δαιμονας γινεσθαι. De Laz. Serm. 2. Tom. i. p. 727. E. Vid. & Tertullian. De Anima. cap. 57. p. 355.

More-

Moreover, heathen deities are often ſpoken of in the Old Teſtament, as dead men, or dæmons. Among directions given to the Iſraelites, it is ſaid, Levit. xvii. 7. *And they ſhall no more offer their ſacrifices to devils*, or dæmons; which is the word in the ancient Greek tranſlation, made from the Hebrew before the time of our Saviour. And Pſal. xcvi. 5. *For all the gods of the nations are idols.* The ſame ancient Greek verſion, called that of the Seventy Jewiſh elders, render it: *All the gods of the nations are dæmons*, meaning dead men, or the ſouls of ſuch. Pſal. cvi. 37. Among the offences of the people of Iſrael this is reckoned up, when they forſook God, and turned idolaters, in imitation of the heathens, *They ſacrificed their ſons and their daughters unto devils.* It ſhould rather be rendered dæmons. And that thereby is meant dead men, or their departed ſpirits, is manifeſt from the ſame pſalm, ver. 28. *They joined themſelves to Baal-Peor, and ate the ſacrifices of the dead.* And herein is ſhewn the abſurdity of the Jewiſh people, when, inſtead of inquiring of God, they applied to heathen idols, who were dead men, and incapable of giving any counſel. Iſa. viii. 19. *Should not a people ſeek unto their God! For the living to the dead!* How ſtrange is that conduct! what infatuation! Deut. xxxii. 15. *But Jeſhurun waxed fat, and provoked the Lord to anger. They ſacrificed to dæmons, not to God.*

The word dæmon, therefore, being uſed not only by heathens themſelves, for their deities, but alſo, and that not ſeldom, in the ſacred ſcriptures: and heathen deities being generally ſuppoſed to be dead men, or departed ſpirits; there is ſome reaſon to think, this is what is meant, when any are ſpoken of as under their influence.

However, notwithſtanding the ſpecioufneſs of this argument, I chooſe to leave the point undecided, and to ſubmit it to every one's judgment, to think as he pleaſeth.

4. I would obſerve, that among the Jews it was a general opinion, that neither the puniſhment of fallen angels, nor of bad men, was to be completed, till the great day of the general judgment.

Concerning the fallen angels, I before referred[k] to places in the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter, and the epiſtle of St. Jude: where they are ſpoken of, as *reſerved unto judgment*, or *unto the judgment of the great day.* It is the ſame with regard to men. Therefore St. Peter ſays, 2 ep. iii. 7. *The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the ſame word are kept in ſtore, reſerved unto fire, againſt the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men.*

[k] See p. 425.

Their punishment therefore not being yet full and complete, it was the opinion of many, that for serving the wise ends of Providence, some of these beings, both fallen angels, and the departed souls of men, were permitted to come abroad, out of Hades, the receptacle of spirits.

It was certainly the common opinion, (whether there was any ground for it or not,) that[l] the region of our air was filled with invisible beings. Chrysostom reckons it among the favours of Providence, that[m] when the air is full of dæmons and adverse powers, we do not discern them; for the sight of them might frighten us out of our wits, if not to death. Cassian[n] speaks to the like purpose. The great Eusebius of Cæsarea supposed these spirits, or at least many of them, to be fallen angels. 'He says, that[o] when they had sinned, and for 'their transgression were expelled the heavenly abodes; a large 'part of them were thrust into hell, called the abyss, and 'confined there: others of them were suffered to dwell near 'the moon, and in the region of the air, below the moon, 'and near our earth.'

This also was a common opinion of the heathen people concerning their inferior deities, that they were in the air near the earth. And[p] they were supposed by many to subsist in part by fumes of incense, and the steams of slain beasts offered to them in sacrifice.

[l] Ουτοι τοινυν οι αγγελοι οι εκπεσοντες των ουρανων, περι τον αερα εχοντες και την γην, ουκετι εις τα υπερουρανια υπερκυψαι δυναμενοι, και αι των γιγαντων ψυχαι, οι περι τον κοσμον εισι πλανωμενοι δαιμονες. Athenag. Apol. p. 28. B.

[m] Ποσοι δαιμονες εις τον αερα φερονται τουτον; ποσαι εναντιαι δυναμεις; ει μονον επετρεψεν αυτοις την οψιν την εαυτων δειξαι την φοβεραν εκεινην και ατερπη, ουκ αν εξεστημεν; ουκ αν απολωμεθα; ουκ αν διεφθαρημεν. Chr. in Ps. xli. Tom. v. p. 137.

[n] Tanta vero spirituum densitate constipatus est aër iste, qui inter cœlum terramque diffunditur, in quo non quieti, non otiosi pervolitant: ut satis utiliter humanis aspectibus eos providentia divina absconderit, & subtraxerit, &c. Cassian. Coll. 8. cap. xii. Ap. Bib. PP. Tom 7. Vid. & Euseb. Dem. Ev. l. x. p. 502. C. D.

[o] ——τοι εφαρμοζοντα τοις δυσσεβεσι χωρον, κρισει δικαιᾳ, και αποφασει του μεγαλου θεου ταρταρον οικειν, ον αβυσσον οι θειοι λογοι προσαγορευουσι, και σκοτος——ων βραχυ τι και μικρον αποσπασμα, γυμνασιου χαριν των ευσεβιας αθλητων, αμφι γην, και υπο σεληνην αερα καταλειφθεν. Euseb. Pr. Ev. l. vii. c. 16. p. 329.

[p] Οι δε γουν περιγειοι τινες οντες και καταχθονιοι——ταφοις νεκρων και μνημασι—αιμασι τε και λυθροις, και παντοιων ζωων σωμασι, τη τε εκ των αναθυμιωμενων, και απο της γης εξατμιζομενων αναδυσει χαιροντες. Præp. Ev. l. v. p. 181. B.

Τοιουτος γαρ ο των δαιμονων τροπος, ουτ' αν μεν τη κνισση, και τῳ καπνῳ, και τοις αιμασιν αυτους θεραπευουσι, καθαπερ κυνες αιμοβοροι και λιχνοι παραγινονται λαψοντες· ουτ' αν δε μηδεις ο ταυτα παρεχων η, καθαπερ τινι λιμω διαφθειρονται. Chr. de S. Babyla. Contr. Julian. & Gentiles. Tom. 2. p. 558.

Nisi forte hostiarum deus animas devorat, aut ex aris ardentibus nidorem consectatur & fumos, &c. Arnob. l. vii. in. p. 212.

Ορω δε υμας μαλιστα χαιροντας τῳ καπνῳ, και την ευωχιαν ταυτην ηδιστην οιομενους, οποταν εις τον ουρανον η κνισσα γινηται ελισσομενη περι καπνῳ. Lucian. Prometh. T. i. p. 183. ed. Græv.

Vid. & idem de Sacrificiis. ib. p. 366. & Porphyr. de Abst. l. ii. cap. 42. p. 86. ed. Cantabr. & Aristoph. Aves. ver. 183. & seqq. & ver. 1515. & seqq. ed. Kust.

To

To theſe, whether fallen angels, or ſpirits of another kind St. Paul[q] is thought to refer, when he ſays, Eph. vi. 11, 12. *Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to ſtand againſt the wiles of the devil. For we wreſtle not againſt fleſh and blood:* we contend not with men only, *but againſt principalities, againſt powers, againſt the rulers of the darkneſs of this world, againſt ſpiritual wickedneſs in high places:* that is, againſt wicked ſpirits, that are in the upper regions above, or in the air, as he plainly expreſſeth it, ch. ii. 2. *Wherein, in time paſt, ye walked, according to the courſe of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air.*

5. All theſe evil ſpirits, in general, (whether fallen angels, or others,) were ſuppoſed to be in ſubjection to Satan, or the Devil, who is their head and prince: at leaſt this was the opinion of the Jewiſh people, as will be ſhewn preſently. However, it was fit to be mentioned here; and it appears from the texts of St. Paul juſt cited. He deſires, that the Epheſians might be *able to ſtand againſt the wiles of the devil:* and then adds, *For we wreſtle againſt principalities, and powers, and ſpiritual wickedneſs in high places.* They therefore were under him. And in the other place he ſpeaks expreſly of *the prince of the power of the air, the ſpirit that now worketh in the children of diſobedience:* undoubtedly meaning Satan, even him, who is the evil one by way of diſtinction, and the great tempter and ſeducer of mankind.

6. Theſe evil ſpirits, or dæmons, (whether fallen angels or ſouls of bad men,) were ſuppoſed to be, under Satan their head, the inſtruments of many afflictions and inconveniences to men in this mortal frame.

This is evident from many places in the goſpels, where thoſe unhappy perſons are mentioned, who are ſaid to have *an unclean ſpirit*, or to be *poſſeſſed of devils*, as we ſometimes render the word, but who would be more properly ſaid to be *dæmoniacs*, that is, affected by one or more dæmons. I ſhall remind you of ſeveral inſtances.

Madneſs, or diſtraction, is one evil often aſcribed to them. This was the caſe of the two men at the tombs, who were exceeding fierce, and one of them at leaſt had been thus afflicted for a long ſeaſon, and when confined and chained, had broken his bands. This was one of the opprobrious reflections caſt upon our Saviour. John x. 20, 21. *Many*[r] *of them ſaid, he has has a dæmon, and is mad. Why hear ye him? Others*

[q] Vid. Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l. vii. p. 329. D.

[r] Ελεγον δε πολλοι εξ αυτων· Δαιμονιον εχει, και μαινεται· τι αυτου ακουετε;

ſaid, Theſe are not the words of a dæmoniac. Can a dæmon open the eyes of the blind?

There are ſeveral other indiſpoſitions which are aſcribed to them, Matt. ix. 32, 33. *And as they went out, they brought unto him a dumb man poſſeſſed with a devil:* literally, *a dumb man, a dæmoniac:* ανθρωπον κωφον δαιμονιζομενον. *And when the dæmon was gone out, the dumb man ſpake. and the multitude marvelled.*

In the xiith chapter of the ſame goſpel, ver. 22. and therefore certainly another caſe: *Then was brought unto him one poſſeſſed with a devil, or a dæmoniac,* δαιμονιζομενος, *blind and dumb. And he healed him: inſomuch that the blind and dumb both ſpake and ſaw.* In St. Luke xi. 14. the ſame miracle is thus related: *And he was caſting out a dæmon. And it came to paſs, when the dæmon was gone out, the dumb ſpake, and the people wondered.*

Mark ix. 25. *When Jeſus ſaw that the people came running together, he rebuked the unclean ſpirit, ſaying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf ſpirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him.* That is the young man who was brought to the diſciples when our Lord was on the mount, and they could not cure him: he was plainly epileptical; and beſides, either conſtantly, or at leaſt under the paroxyſms of his diſtemper, was deaf and dumb.

Mark i. 23, 26. *And there was in their ſynagogue a man with an unclean ſpirit. And he cried out, ſaying, Let us alone, what have we to do with thee thou Jeſus of Nazareth. And Jeſus rebuked him, ſaying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the unclean ſpirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him.* This perſon, as I ſuppoſe every one may allow, had the epilepſy, or falling ſickneſs, and it is aſcribed to an unclean ſpirit. The ſame hiſtory is in Luke iv. 33—35.

Once more, Luke xiii. 11—16. *And behold, there was a woman, which had a ſpirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed down, and could in no wiſe lift up herſelf. And when Jeſus ſaw her, he called her to him, and ſaid unto her, Woman, thou art looſed from thy infirmity.* The ruler of the ſynagogue pretending to take offence, becauſe it was the ſabbath day, our Lord, beſide other things, ſaid: *Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound, lo, theſe eighteen years, to be looſed from this bond on the ſabbath day?*

Here Satan himſelf is conſidered as the cauſe of this infirmity; though, very frequently, theſe caſes are ſpoken of as effects of the malicious influences of dæmons. The reaſon is, that

that Satan is their prince and ruler, and what is done by inſtruments, or ſubjects, with the approbation of a ruler, or principal agent, is fitly aſcribed to him.

And, not to mention any more particular inſtances, it ſeems, that the Jewiſh people ſuppoſed Satan and his inſtruments, that is, dæmons, evil ſpirits, to be capable of inflicting almoſt all ſorts of diſeaſes. St. Peter therefore, at the houſe of Cornelius, as his diſcourſe is ſummarily rehearſed, Acts x. 38. ſays: *You know, how God anointed Jeſus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghoſt, and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppreſſed of the devil. For God was with him.*

7. I muſt proceed to obſerve farther, for ſhewing the ſentiment of the Jewiſh people in our Saviour's time, that they ſuppoſed, the diſtempers or torments afflicted by evil ſpirits might be removed or cured.

So Joſephus ſaid in a paſſage cited above, that theſe evils were mortal, unleſs ſpeedy relief was obtained.

Doubtleſs the Jews believed, that theſe inconveniences might be removed by the divine diſpoſal, and by a prophet, ſpeaking in the name of God, who had power of working miracles. Therefore many, who believed Jeſus to be a prophet, and the Meſſiah, brought ſuch caſes to him for cure.

They likewiſe ſuppoſed, that dæmons might be exorciſed or adjured out of the bodies of men, of which they had taken poſſeſſion. St. Luke informs us, that at Epheſus, *certain of the vagabond Jews, exorciſts, took upon them to call over them that had evil ſpirits the name of the Lord Jeſus, ſaying: We adjure you by Jeſus, whom Paul preacheth*, Acts xix. 13.

It is likely, that from the miracles which they had ſeen wrought by Paul, thoſe exorciſts hoped for better ſucceſs by making uſe of the name of Jeſus, than by their common forms and methods of exorciſm.

That exorciſms were uſed by the Jews, we are expreſly aſſured[a] by Joſephus. He ſpeaks as if Solomon had left ſome preſcriptions for theſe caſes, and directed to the uſe of herbs and roots, that would be of great advantage.

I have now ſhewn, what were the Jewiſh ſentiments upon this head in the time of our Saviour and his apoſtles, and when the books of the New Teſtament were written.

8. It is fit I ſhould add, that there were dæmoniacs likewiſe among the heathens about the ſame time; that is, there were many among them who had indiſpoſitions, which were reputed to be owing to the influence of dæmons.

[a] Antiq. Jud. l. viii. cap. 2. § 5.

Some learned men have denied, or overlooked this: they have gone upon a supposition, that such cases were to be found among the Jews only, and in their own country; but that is manifestly a mistake, as may be shewn from the New Testament itself. Matt. xv. 21, 22. *Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David. My daughter is grievously vexed with a dæmon:* St. Mark has the same history, ch. vii. 24—26. *And thence he arose, and went into the borders of Tyre and Sidon. And a certain woman, whose daughter had an unclean spirit, heard of him, and came, and fell at his feet:* [*the woman was a Greek, a Syrophenician by nation:*] *and she besought him, that he would cast forth the dæmon ought of her daughter.* And ver. 29, 30. *And he said unto her, the dæmon is gone out of thy daughter. And when she was come to her house, she found the dæmon was gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.*

The affair at Ephesus, just taken notice of, is another proof. The young maiden at Philippi, who had a *spirit of divination*, is a third instance, Acts xvi. 16, 18.

Many proofs of this might be alleged from heathen[t] writers. But I forbear to take notice of them.

Undoubtedly there was a difference between the Jews and them in some respects. The Jews thought all dæmons in general to be evil and unclean: but the heathens esteemed many dæmons to be good, for they were among their deities; and therefore in some cases they might the more respect some people for having a dæmon, though the patient himself was unhappy. However, it is certain, that there were among the heathens at this time many people, who had indispositions which are ascribed to dæmons.

We have now made good progress in this argument. The next thing to be inquired into is, what is the most reasonable opinion concerning these cases. But that must be reserved for another season.

In the mean time we may hence take occasion, as some of old did who were witnesses of our Saviour's miracles, *to praise God, who had given such power unto men.* Matt. ix. 8. says the evangelist: *When the even was come, they brought unto him many dæmoniacs: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and*

[t] See an Enquiry, and a farther Enquiry into the Meaning of Dæmoniacs in the New Testament. See likewise Mr. W. Weston's Enquiry into the rejection of the Christian Miracles by the Heathens, p. 231, 233. and elsewhere.

healed

healed all that were ſick. That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by Eſaias the prophet, ſaying: Himſelf took our infirmities, and bare our ſickneſſes, Matt. viii. 16, 17.

The like gift did Jeſus confer upon his diſciples. *He gave them power againſt unclean ſpirits, to caſt them out, and to heal all manner of ſickneſs, and all manner of diſeaſe*, Matt. x. 1. Which power they diſplayed in the moſt honourable manner after his aſcenſion; and it was a great benefit to the men of that age to have their diſeaſes ſo cured. But the principal uſe, and the greateſt benefit of theſe wonderful works, both to the men of that time, and to us, is, that they aſcertained and confirmed the excellent and important doctrine of the goſpel: which is ſo ſuited to improve and exalt our minds, and cure evil affections, and deliver us from the malignant influence of all the ſnares and temptations of Satan, and this evil world. Which if we overcome, we ſhall in the end attain to a world, where there are no ſickneſſes nor ſorrows; where no evil men nor evil ſpirits ſhall enter; where good men of all ages ſhall be united in one happy and glorious ſociety, and ſhall be for ever with the Lord.

DISCOURSE III.

MARK v. 19.

Howbeit Jeſus ſuffered him not, but ſaith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compaſſion on thee.

We now proceed to the third head of diſcourſe, under which we are to conſider what is really the truth, or what idea we ought to form of thoſe unappy perſons, who in the New Teſtament are ſpoken of as having *an unclean ſpirit*.

Here I certainly intend to ſpeak my mind freely, and to ſhew plainly what appears to me to be the truth. Nevertheleſs, I am under little or no apprehenſion of giving offence: partly, becauſe I think I can rely upon the candour of thoſe who hear me: partly, becauſe I do not deſire to impoſe a particular ſentiment upon any. All are at liberty to judge for themſelves, when they have heard and conſidered what may be ſaid on one

ſide

ſide or another. For no one opinion concerning theſe caſes is like thoſe articles of faith; that Jeſus is the Chriſt, that he lived and died in Judea, and roſe again, and aſcended into heaven, and will come again to judge men according to their works: or, that he and his apoſtles wrought many wonderful works of an extraordinary nature.

Whether the indiſpoſitions that theſe perſons laboured under were owing to the influence of evil ſpirits or not, the cure of them was miraculous. Nor is the miracle at all leſſened, by ſuppoſing them to be only grievous and long continued bodily diſtempers. The [u] rectifying the human frame, all on a ſudden, which had been before greatly diſordered, is at leaſt as great a work, as commanding an evil ſpirit to leave the body, or any other particular place.

Were I to attempt to repreſent the diſplays of the divine perfections in the works of nature, and the more conſpicuous parts of the viſible creation, and to obſerve the greatneſs, the number, the wonderful diſpoſition, and regular order and motions of the heavenly bodies: ſhould I do this upon the ground of the now prevailing ſcheme of modern philoſophy, it is likely, it would give no offence to any: though the preſent ſcheme is very different from the ſentiment of the ancients: and though there are divers texts of ſcripture which ſuppoſe, or countenance the opinion that prevailed in ancient times.

The ſun, ſays the Pſalmiſt, *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*, Pſal. xix. 5, 6. Again: *He appointeth the moon for ſeaſons; the ſun knoweth his going down*, Pſal. civ. 19. And in ver. 5 of the ſame Pſalm, it is ſpoken of as one of the wonderful works of God, *that he has laid the foundations of the earth, ſo that it ſhould not be removed for ever.*

[u] 'Now which is an inſtance of the 'greateſt power, to command an inferior 'to depart one's preſence, which if he 'refuſes to do, one can turn him out, 'whether he will or not? or to correct 'the juices and ſolids of a diſordered body, 'and regulate its motions by a word? 'There ſeems to be no compariſon in the 'inſtances of power. And therefore I 'think it more to the credit of the miracle, 'and more to our Saviour's glory, to have 'cured the unhappy people in the manner 'by me contended for, than in the other.' Further Enquiry into the meaning of Dæmoniacs in the N. T. p. 107.

Ils penchent a croire, que leurs maladies étoient naturelles, mais que les cauſes en étoient inconnues. Cette opinion ne me ſcandaliſeroit point. La raiſon en eſt, que les miracles de N. S. qui les gueriſſoit n'en ſont que plus grands. Car que des etres intelligens obeiſſent au commandement de J. C. cela n'a' eſt pas ſi miraculeuſe, que de commander à des maladies, et de les faite ceſſer par un ſimple ordre. Beauſobre Remarques ſur le N. T. p. 14.

Yet

Yet it is now generally ſuppoſed, that the ſun is the fixed centre of our grand ſyſtem, and that the earth, beſide its diurnal rotation upon its own axis, makes an annual revolution about the ſun.

The ancient chriſtians, and others, almoſt univerſally ſuppoſed, that our earth is a flat, with here and there riſing hills and mountains; and could by no means allow, that there were any inhabitants in that part of the earth which was oppoſite to themſelves. We think the earth to be globoſe, and find no difficulty to believe, that it is inhabited all round, on every ſide.

Nor do we judge thoſe to have been enemies to mankind, or to the ſacred ſcriptures, who have taken pains to confute and overthrow the once eſtabliſhed opinions; and to ſhew, that the ſcriptures, without deciding any thing in thoſe points, only uſe the common way of ſpeaking.

If the like ſhould be attempted by any with regard to ſome ancient opinions, concerning the ſuppoſed agency of evil ſpirits; I preſume there would be no reaſon to be offended, provided their ſentiment be modeſtly propoſed, and with a view to promote knowledge among chriſtians.

The opinions of modern interpreters, and other chriſtians, concerning the caſe of thoſe who are ſpoken of as having unclean ſpirits, you may remember were theſe two: one, more generally received, which allows, that they were real poſſeſſions: the other leſs common, that they were mere bodily diſeaſes and indiſpoſitions: though it was then the prevailing opinion, that thoſe diſorders were cauſed by evil ſpirits. And thoſe perſons, and their friends, attributing theſe diſorders to Satan, and dæmons under him, our Saviour often adapts his expreſſions to that opinion, without countenancing or approving it.

That this laſt mentioned is the more juſt and probable account of theſe caſes, may appear from ſeveral conſiderations, which I ſhall now propound to you.

1. It having been in thoſe times a very common opinion, that there were many evil ſpirits in the region of the air, it is not at all ſtrange, that many people ſhould live under apprehenſions of ſuffering from them.

And many might be induced to ſubſcribe to ſuch ſpirits, and to their power and influence, ſeveral indiſpoſitions, and other calamities that befel them. Moreover, ſome perſons of a ſpeculative and philoſophical temper might think it beſt to cheriſh this opinion among the people, with a view to ſubſerve divers ends and purpoſes, which they deemed innocent and uſeful; one of which might be promoting the belief of the exiſtence

exiſtence of ſpirits or inviſible beings. Some there were, as the ſadducees among the Jews, who denied the exiſtence of angels, and the ſouls of men after death. The phariſees therefore, and ſome others, might lay hold of and encourage the notion, that many bodily diſorders were owing to evil ſpirits, the better to ſecure the perſuaſion of their real exiſtence. For effects cannot be without cauſes. If ſuch affecting diſorders proceeded from ſpirits, they have a being, though they are not viſible.

This therefore may in ſome meaſure help us to account for the prevalence of this opinion, though it had no good foundation.

2. I obſerve, ſecondly, that the chief foundation of the opinion of real poſſeſſions may be called in queſtion.

By the principal foundation of this opinion, I mean the ſuppoſition of the liberty of evil ſpirits, either bad angels, or others, to rove about near this earth, in the region of the air.

The Jewiſh people might be in the right, in ſuppoſing, that neither the puniſhment of the fallen angels, nor bad men, was completed before the day of general judgment. But does it thence follow, that till that time they were at liberty to go where they thought fit, and to do all the miſchief they pleaſed, or were able to execute? St. Jude ſpeaks indeed of the fallen angels being *reſerved unto judgment*. But how? It is under confinement. His words are, ver. 6. *And the angels which kept not their firſt eſtate, but left their own habitation, he has reſerved in everlaſting chains under darkneſs, unto the judgment of the great day.* And St. Peter, *God ſpared not the angels that ſinned, but delivered them into chains of darkneſs, to be reſerved unto judgment*, 2 ep. ii. 4.

However, poſſibly, this argument may not be reckoned concluſive. For though many of the fallen angels are ſo confined, yet the expreſſions of St. Jude and St. Peter need not to be underſtood abſolutely and univerſally. For Satan is ſpoken of as *our adverſary, like a roaring lion, walking about, ſeeking whom he may devour*.

That therefore is all, which I have choſen to ſay: that the principal foundation of this opinion may be called in queſtion: not intending to deny the liberty of Satan, and ſome other evil angels, to tempt and annoy men, with the divine permiſſion. At the ſame time I perceive not any clear evidence of the permiſſion of ſuch numbers of evil angels to act upon this earth, as the common opinion ſuppoſes.

But if by dæmons be meant other evil ſpirits, different from fallen angels, then the ſuppoſition of their liberty ſeems to be altogether

altogether without foundation. In Iſa. lxiii. 16. the Jewiſh people are introduced by the prophet, owning, that *Abraham was ignorant of them, and that Iſrael did not acknowledge them.* If good men are not allowed after death to concern themſelves in the affairs of this world, not ſo much as of their own deſcendants; how can it be reaſonable to think, that bad men are permitted after death, to concern themſelves in our affairs, for injuring and tormenting us?

3. Allowing evil ſpirits the liberty juſt mentioned, and alſo the power of inflicting ſome evils on men; it does not follow, that ever there were any poſſeſſions, in the ſtrict and groſs ſenſe of the word: that is, evil ſpirits, actuating and inhabiting the bodies of living men upon this earth.

4. It does not appear, that the common opinion of poſſeſſions has any ſupport and countenance in the Old Teſtament.

Satan, it is true, is there repreſented as the great enemy and ſeducer of mankind. He tempted Job, and was permitted to bring upon him divers loſſes and calamities. Still his power received farther enlargement. And then *Satan went forth from the preſence of the Lord, and ſmote Job with ſore boils, from the ſole of his foot unto his crown,* Job ii. 7. Here is a particular caſe, and it is very affecting. But yet it comes not up to poſſeſſion: ſeizing the body of a man, diſcompoſing his mind, and acting him at will and pleaſure.

1 Sam. xvi. 14. It is ſaid of Saul, *that an evil ſpirit from the Lord troubled him:* that is, he contracted a melancholic habit and diſpoſition: for it was often ſoothed by muſic. Said his attendants: *Let our lord now command his ſervants to ſeek out a man, who is a ſkilful player on a harp. And it ſhall come to paſs, that when the evil ſpirit from God is upon thee, that he ſhall play with his hand, and thou ſhalt be well.* David was ſent for: *And it came to paſs, when the evil ſpirit from God was upon Saul, that David took an harp, and played with his hand. So Saul was refreſhed, and was well, and the evil ſpirit departed from him.*

Neither this, then, nor any thing elſe mentioned in the Old Teſtament, that I can recollect, countenanceth the ſuppoſition of that terrible caſe, which ſeems to be implied in the real poſſeſſion of evil ſpirits.

And it is not unreaſonable to conclude hence, that [x] the notion of poſſeſſions was received by the Jews from the Chaldæan

[x] 'The Jews ſeem to have received 'ſome additional notions concerning evil 'ſpirits, and their operations, from the 'Chaldæans; and, after their return from 'the captivity, to have aſcribed many 'diſeaſes and diſorders to theſe inviſible 'agents, beſides thoſe which were not to 'be accounted for by natural cauſes.' Re-

or

or Greek philoſophers, after the ſhutting up of the canon of the Old Teſtament by the ancient prophets.

5. We find not any inſtances of poſſeſſions by good angels, or other good ſpirits. Why then ſhould poſſeſſions by evil ſpirits be allowed of? Can it be reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that Divine Providence would permit evil ſpirits to have more power to do evil, than others have to do good?

There has been an opinion, maintained by ſome, that every man has a tutelar, or guardian angel. Others have ſuppoſed, that every man has two angels attending him, one good, the other bad; each ſuggeſting to him counſels and warnings, according to their ſeveral diſpoſitions, one wiſhing his welfare, the other waiting for his halting. But theſe opinions, (though [y] deſtitute of all good authority,) do not amount to the thing which we are ſpeaking of. Nor are they by any means ſo unreaſonable.

6. Poſſeſſion by evil ſpirits is a thing in itſelf abſurd and impoſſible, at the leaſt unreaſonable and improbable, and not to be ſuppoſed, unleſs there be clear and full proof of it. Which I think there is not.

Man conſiſts of ſoul and body; and it ſeems to be unſuitable to the wiſe methods of Providence, that other ſpirits ſhould enter into any man, without his conſent, and actuate and govern him. *There is a ſpirit in man, and the inſpiration of the Almighty giveth them underſtanding*, Job xxxii. 8. *The ſpirit of a man will ſuſtain his infirmity, but a wounded ſpirit who can bear?* Prov. xviii. 14. The ſame wiſe man ſpeaks of *the ſpirit of a man that goeth upward*, Eccl. iii. 21. And St. Paul, *What man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of man that is in him*, 1 Cor. ii. 11. I refer alſo to Matt. x. 28. 1 Theſſ. v. 23. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Heb. xii. 9. not now to take notice of any other places.

The ſcripture therefore in agreement with reaſon, and [z] the general perſuaſion of mankind, ſuppoſes one ſoul or ſpirit in a man. And for other ſpirits to ſubſiſt therewith, and to controul and actuate all his powers and members, is an incongruity that ought not to be admitted.

7. Real poſſeſſions ſeem inconſiſtent with the goodneſs of God.

I ſay, it ſeems to be inconſiſtent with the wiſdom and goodneſs of the divine government, to allow of poſſeſſions, in the groſs meaning of the word. If indeed, there were any clear

marks on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Vol. i. p. 243. So ſays Dr. Jortin, though he allows, that there were real dæmoniacs. See there, p. 14. and 190. [y] See Whitby upon Matt. xviii. 10. and Acts xii. 9.

[z] Mens ſana in corpore ſano,

and

and undeniable evidences of ſuch a thing, we ſhould be willing to do our beſt, to reconcile it to wiſdom and goodneſs. But as there is not, that I know of, any clear and undoubted evidence of this fact, and the thing appears to be very ſtrange and ſhocking; I apprehend we may ſay, it appears to be inconſiſtent with the wiſdom and goodneſs of God.

For let any man think with himſelf, if it be not a ſtrange, and hard caſe, for a man to be put into the power of evil ſpirits: or for apoſtate angels, or other impure and wicked ſpirits, one or more of them, to be allowed to take poſſeſſion of him, and to teaze and torment him, as they think fit. Is this ſuited to that ſtate of trial, in which we now are? Such unhappy perſons, it is true, are not caſt into hell, nor fixed in a ſtate of damnation. But apoſtate angels, or other infernal ſpirits, are ſuppoſed to be permitted to come to him, ſeize on him, torment, and diſtreſs him, and that for many years together.

Is this a ſuppoſition, that ſhould be eaſily made or allowed of? Can we fairly reconcile this to the wiſdom and equity of the divine government?

Beſides, from many things ſaid in the goſpels it appears, that divers of the perſons there ſpoken of, as *having evil ſpirits*, were not the worſt of men. Yea for any thing we can perceive, divers of them were honeſt, virtuous perſons. And ſome had laboured under thoſe diſtempers, commonly aſcribed to evil ſpirits, from their youth, or from childhood, before they can be ſuppoſed to have been guilty of great and heinous tranſgreſſions.

This argument, if it does not hold againſt the ſuppoſition, that evil ſpirits may be ſometimes permitted to inflict diſeaſes, certainly has a good deal of force againſt poſſeſſions, eſpecially in the groſs ſenſe, in which they have been underſtood and allowed of by ſome in late times.

8. Another argument againſt poſſeſſions, ariſes from the manner in which the perſons, ſaid to *have unclean ſpirits*, ſpeak of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

For ſuch perſons did often bear an honourable teſtimony to our Lord; Luke iv. 41. *And dæmons alſo came out of many crying out, and ſaying, Thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God.* But it is incredible, that Satan, or any other evil ſpirits, under his influence and direction, ſhould freely and chearfully bear witneſs to our Lord, as the Chriſt.

When the phariſees reviled him, and ſaid, that he caſt out dæmons by Beelzebub, the prince of dæmons, our Lord confuted that reflection and charge, by ſhewing, that the thing

was very unlikely. So in Matt. xii. 25, 28. and elſewhere. For the doctrine taught by our Lord being contrary to the kingdom and intereſt of Satan, it was altogether improbable, that ſo ſubtile and malicious a ſpirit ſhould concur with him for the ſupport of it.

In like manner it is incredible, that any unclean ſpirits ſhould chearfully bear teſtimony to Jeſus, as the Chriſt, the Son of God. Therefore that profeſſion, or declaration, did not proceed from ſuch ſpirits, but from the unhappy diſeaſed perſons, who under their melancholic affections, thought themſelves to have dæmons, in conformity to the prevailing opinion, though they had not.

This is a much more reaſonable way of accounting for this matter, than to ſuppoſe, that evil ſpirits openly profeſſed Jeſus to be the Chriſt, the Son of God.

Indeed this appears to me a very forcible argument: I have been ſometimes apt to think, that this conſideration has been overlooked by learned and pious men, who have ſo readily admitted real poſſeſſions.

However, it may be here ſaid, that poſſibly this teſtimony was not free and voluntary, but conſtrained and compelled. To which I anſwer, that this cannot be ſaid with good reaſon. Our Lord certainly did not conſtrain any ſuch to bear that teſtimony to him, and ſpeak ſo of him: for he never received it, but diſallowed of it, and checked it: though afterwards, when thoſe perſons were by his mighty power delivered from the indiſpoſitions under which they had laboured, he was not unwilling that they ſhould bear witneſs to him, as we ſee in the caſe before us: *He bid the man go home to his friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord had done for him, and had compaſſion on him.*

9. All thoſe perſons who are ſpoken of as having dæmons, or an unclean ſpirit, had ſome bodily indiſpoſition. Nor does it appear clearly from their hiſtory, that there was any thing beſide ſuch indiſpoſition.

That all theſe people had ſome bodily indiſpoſition, is manifeſt, and cannot be denied by any. Some laboured under diſtraction, as the men in the country of the Gadarenes; others had other diſorders. St. Peter, Acts x. 38. gives this general account of our Lord's miraculous works: *Who went about doing good, and* HEALING *all that were oppreſſed of the devil.* Therefore they who were ſuppoſed to be under the oppreſſion of Satan, had diſtempers which our Lord *healed.* Obſervable are the words of St. Matthew, ch. iv. 24. *And his fame went through-*

throughout all Syria, and they brought unto him all ſick people, that were taken with divers diſeaſes, and torments, and thoſe which were poſſeſſed of dæmons, or dæmoniacs, and *thoſe that were lunatic, and thoſe that had the palſy, and he* HEALED *them.*

Theſe perſons therefore, are reckoned up among other ſick people, and they are ſaid to be *healed*, or *cured*, by the Lord Jeſus, when brought to him.

Nor does it appear from the hiſtory of theſe caſes, that there was any thing more than bodily indiſpoſitions, and that diſcompoſure of mind, which uſually accompanies them.

Let us obſerve the hiſtory of the young man, firſt brought to the diſciples, when our Lord was in the mount, and then to himſelf, when he was come down, and is related by the firſt three evangeliſts.

Matt. xvii. 14, 15. *And when they were come to the multitude, there came to him a certain man, kneeling down to him, and ſaying, Lord have mercy on my ſon, for he is lunatic, and ſore vexed. For oft-times he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water. And I brought him to thy diſciples, and they could not cure him.*

That is the whole deſcription of the caſe: but undoubtedly the affliction was ſuppoſed to be owing to an evil ſpirit. Therefore the cure is thus related by the ſame evangeliſt: *And Jeſus rebuked the dæmon, and he departed out of him, and the child was cured from that very hour*, ver. 18.

In the deſcription, then, of this diſtemper, which appears to have been the epilepſy, or falling ſickneſs, the parent ſays, *his child was lunatic, and ſore vexed:* that is, his diſtemper was influenced by the changes of the moon, and the fits, or paroxyſms, were very violent, and more violent at ſome ſeaſons than others. And does it not uſe to be ſo in ſuch caſes? What neceſſity is there then for the ſuppoſition of the agency, or interpoſition of evil ſpirits?

In Mark ix. 17, 18. the ſame caſe is repreſented in this manner: *One of the multitude anſwered, I have brought unto thee my ſon, which has a dumb ſpirit. And whereſoever he taketh him, he foameth, and gnaſheth with his teeth, and pineth away. And I ſpake to thy diſciples, that they ſhould caſt him out, and they could not.* Ver. 20. *And they brought him to him. And when he ſaw him, ſtraitway the ſpirit tare him, and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming.* It was a grievous epilepſy, a dangerous indiſpoſition, the convulſions were ſometimes extremely violent, ſo that the young man had begun to pine away.

In St. Luke, ch. ix. 38, 39. the parent ſays, *Maſter, I beſeech thee, look upon my ſon, for he is my only child. And lo a*

ſpirit taketh him, and he ſuddenly crieth out, and it teareth him, that he foameth again, and bruiſing him, hardly departeth from him. Ver. 42. *And as he was yet coming, the dæmon threw him down, and tare him. And Jeſus rebuked the unclean ſpirit, and healed the child, and delivered him again to his father.*

It was a ſad epileptical diſeaſe. The convulſions were very violent; the fits were ſometimes ſevere and long: inſomuch that his friends feared, he would never get out of them, but die away in them: a thing not uncommon ſtill in ſuch caſes. And yet we do not now, generally, introduce evil ſpirits as the cauſes of them.

This, however, was a grievous and dangerous epilepſy. And the cure performed by our Lord was a great and gracious work.

10. There were ſome in ancient times, who were of opinion, that thoſe called dæmoniacs, were diſeaſed only.

Undoubtedly, the other was the more prevailing opinion, but not univerſal. The ſadducees among the Jews muſt have had different apprehenſions about theſe caſes. But I chooſe not to take any particular notice of men, who were ſo unreaſonable, as to deny the exiſtence of angels and ſeparate ſpirits. See Acts xxiii. 8.

I ſhall however obſerve what is ſaid by Origen, who lived about two hundred years after our Lord's aſcenſion, in his Commentary upon St. Matthew's goſpel. He is treating of the miracle wrought by our Lord upon the young man, brought to Chriſt by his father, after he was come down from the mount; of which we ſpoke juſt now. Origen himſelf believed the influence of dæmons in ſuch caſes. But he ſays, 'That 'y phyſicians endeavoured to account for them in a natural 'way; not allowing the agency of any impure ſpirits, but call-'ing them bodily diſtempers.' So ſaid phyſicians in thoſe times; and they muſt be reckoned as good judges as any.

Plotinus, a celebrated heathen philoſopher, who flouriſhed about the middle of the third century, blames ſome, who[z] aſcribed to dæmons diſeaſes, which, as he ſays, may be accounted for in an ordinary way, and indeed are owing to fatigue, exceſs, indigeſtion, and other cauſes either internal or external, and are oftentimes cured by medicines.

y Ἰατροὶ μὲν οὖν φυσιολογεῖσθωσαν, ἀλλ᾽ μηδὲ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα εἶναι νομίζοντες καὶ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ σωματικὸν συμπλωμα. κ.λ. In Matt. Tom. xiii. vol. 1. p. 311. Huet. Vol. 3. p. 577. Bened.

z Νῦν δὲ ἀποχησαμένοι, τὰς νόσους δαιμόνια εἶναι——τοὺς μέντοι εὐφρονήσας οὐκ ἂν πεισθοιεν, ὡς ἐκ᾽ αἰτίας νόσοι τὰς αἰτίας ἐχούσιν, ἢ καμάτοις, ἢ πλησμοναῖς, ἢ ἐνδείαις, ἢ σήψεσι, καὶ ὅλως μεταβολαῖς ἢ ἔξωθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν, ἢ ἐνδοθεν λαβούσαις. Δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ αἱ θεραπεῖαι αὐτῶν. κ.λ. Plotin. Enn. 2. lib. ix. cap. 14.

And

And Philoſtorgius, an eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, at the beginning of the fifth century, mentions [a] one Poſidonius, a learned phyſician, whom he knew, who aſcribed all the bad ſymptoms of thoſe called dæmoniacs to natural cauſes; and did not believe, that dæmons had power to torment men, though he did not deny their exiſtence. That Poſidonius ſeems to have been a Chriſtian.

I might ſhew, that this has likewiſe been the opinion of ſome judicious, and thoughtful, and pious men of late times. But as I ſuppoſe you to be rather determined by reaſon than authority, I forbear to inſiſt on their judgment.

I therefore would recommend to your conſideration the obſervations which have been now mentioned: which ſeem to me to render it very probable, that the afflictions, which thoſe laboured under, who among the Jews were ſaid to have a dæmon, or unclean ſpirit, were mere bodily diſtempers and indiſpoſitions. They are at leaſt, ſo far as I am able to judge, cogent arguments againſt poſſeſſions, in the groſs ſenſe of the word, as underſtood by ſome learned men of late times.

There are however ſome difficulties attending this ſuppoſition, which ſhall be taken notice of hereafter.

For the preſent, we may do well to recollect ſome apoſtolical obſervations and admonitions. *Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth*, 1 Cor. viii. 1. *Speaking the truth, in love, let us grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Chriſt.* Eph. iv. 15.

Then are our minds rightly tempered in our inquiries after the true nature of things, when our firſt and greateſt care is to pleaſe and glorify God: when we are humble and diffident, ſenſible of the weakneſs of our capacities, and of our liableneſs to err: when we are diſpoſed to think and judge according to evidence, and to embrace that as true, which appears to be founded in reaſon: when ſtill we are willing to exerciſe charity and forbearance toward ſuch as differ from us, and do not ſee things exactly in the ſame light that we do.

Some are greatly delighted with ſimplicity in all things. They enter not into any ſpeculations about the orders, the powers, the ranks, or œconomy of inviſible beings. Nor do they willingly admit their agency and interpoſition in human affairs in this life, our time and ſtate of trial. Others love to multiply beings; and an intricate ſyſtem, with a great variety

[a] Θαυμασθαι δε τον Ποσειδωνιον εν ιατρικη βιβλιοις πολλα. Αξιει δ' αιτιον ομως μη ορθως μηδ' ὑφ' ὑμων επιδεσει τους ανθρωπους εκδαιχεσθαι, ὑγρον δε τινων κακοχυμιαν το παθος εργαζεσθαι· μη δε γαρ ειναι το παραπαν ισχυν δαιμονων, ανθρωπων φυσιν επηρεαζειν. Philoſt. l. viii. cap. 10.

of movements, pleaſeth them beſt. They like frequent, or continual interpoſitions of good and bad ſpirits; and ſcarcely any thing happens in the world, but they aſcribe it to their influence and cauſality.

Let every one be ſatisfied in his own mind, after ſerious and diligent inquiry: but let us take care, that by introducing numerous inferior and intermediate beings, and their agency, we do not derogate from the divine empire and government, as ſupreme over all cauſes and things, viſible and inviſible.

And let us remain fully perſuaded, that our bleſſed Lord's doctrine, authority, and character, were ſupported and atteſted by numerous miracles performed by him, in healing every diſeaſe and affliction to which the human frame is expoſed, and in raiſing the dead. And that, being himſelf raiſed from the dead and aſcended to heaven and living for ever, he is able to beſtow eternal life upon all thoſe, who ſincerely obey the reaſonable precepts of true holineſs delivered by him.

DISCOURSE IV.

MARK v. 19.

Howbeit Jeſus ſuffered him not, but ſaith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compaſſion on thee.

I HAVE diſtinctly explained and improved the great cure, and miraculous work, here referred to. And the laſt time it was obſerved, that ſome are inclined to think, that the afflictions which they laboured under who are ſpoken of as having evil ſpirits, were mere bodily diſeaſes and indiſpoſitions: though it was then the prevailing opinion, that they were under the power and influence of ſome evil ſpirit. And thoſe perſons themſelves, and their friends, attributing their diſtempers to Satan and dæmons under him, our Saviour ſometimes adapts his expreſſions to that opinion, without countenancing or approving it.

In favour of that ſentiment divers arguments and conſiderations were propoſed, taken from the reaſon of things, from the

the Old Teſtament, and from the hiſtory and deſcription of theſe very perſons, and their caſes, as recorded in the New Teſtament.

IV. What now remains to be ſpoken to is the fourth and laſt head relating to this ſubject, the objections againſt the forementioned opinion, or the arguments in favour of real poſſeſſions.

I ſhall take notice of, and conſider theſe four.

1. There might be ſuch caſes in former times, though there are none now.

2. There are divers things ſaid of thoſe perſons, who were called dæmoniacs, which are very difficult, or even impoſſible to be accounted for, but by the ſuppoſition of real poſſeſſions, or the operation or interpoſition of evil ſpirits.

3. The evangeliſts appear to have believed, that theſe perſons had really one or more unclean ſpirits.

4. Our Lord himſelf does not oppoſe the opinion of real poſſeſſions, as he would have done, it is likely, if not true.

Of theſe in order.

1. Obj. In the firſt place, it is ſaid, that there might be ſuch caſes in former times, though there are none now.

Poſſibly, ſuch things may not be allowed of in the common and ordinary courſe of Divine Providence; but yet might be permitted at the time of our Saviour's appearance, when there was an uncommon and effectual remedy at hand. Bad angels, or other evil ſpirits, might be then ſuffered to leave their confinement, and come abroad, and inflict grievous diſtempers upon men, eſpecially in the land of Judea, and near it; that the power of Jeſus might be rendered more conſpicuous, by ſhewing his authority over them, and removing by his word thoſe evils which they had inflicted, and cauſing thoſe malignant ſpirits to leave thoſe perſons of whom they had taken poſſeſſion.

To which I anſwer, that this ſuppoſition does not ſuit the hiſtories related in the goſpels: for theſe caſes do not there appear to be extraordinary, but are looked upon by every body as ordinary and uſual things. No one expreſſeth a ſurprize, that ſuch people are brought to Jeſus. His enemies never mention it, as a reproach and diſhonour to him, that their country was then infeſted with evil ſpirits. If people had been now all on a ſudden ſeized with diſorders, never heard of among them before, and if ſuch caſes had been numerous; would it not have occaſioned the utmoſt aſtoniſhment? Would it not have raiſed a loud and general clamour? Would they not have

thought, they had indeed good reaſon to ſay, when they ſaw the cures performed by Jeſus and his diſciples, that there was a combination between them, and ſome malignant powers? They firſt brought them in among them into the country, and then they caſt them out and drove them away again. But there was no ground for ſuch a charge: it was never mentioned: it was impoſſible to be made: for ſuch caſes were well known, and are ſpoken of by other writers contemporary with the evangeliſts, by Joſephus and others, as common in Judea and elſewhere, not only at that time, but alſo before and afterwards, as was obſerved by us in a preceding diſcourſe.

The Jews had among them methods of exorciſing ſpirits, or curing the diſeaſes which they were ſuppoſed to inflict; though, poſſibly, with but little ſucceſs, any farther than they were aſſiſted by the art of medicine. However, as exorciſms had been in uſe among them, they afford proof, that ſuch caſes, and the opinion concerning them, were known before our Saviour's appearance in the world.

2. Obj. It is ſaid, that divers things appear in the hiſtory of theſe perſons, which are very difficult, if not impoſſible to be accounted for, but upon the ſuppoſition of real poſſeſſions, or at leaſt the interpoſition and operation of evil ſpirits.

(1.) Firſt of all it may be ſaid: if there was no agency of evil ſpirits, how came it to paſs, that this opinion ſo prevailed as it did; and how came it, that many perſons thought themſelves to be poſſeſſed by evil ſpirits? The man at the tombs, when aſked by Jeſus what was his name, anſwered; *Legion, for we are many.* And divers brought their children, or other friends to Chriſt, deſiring him to have mercy on them, becauſe an evil ſpirit afflicted and tormented them.

To which I anſwer; it is no uncommon thing for opinions to prevail in the world which have no ſolid foundation. How many have been diſpoſed to aſcribe the diſeaſes of the human body, and other diſaſtrous events in the world, to the planets, or other ſtars? It was for a long time a very common opinion, that ſpirits, of inferior orders, in a manner filled the region of the air; and many diſtempers were aſcribed to their influence. When ſuch an opinion prevailed, it was very likely that ſome who fell under grievous diſtempers, ſhould think themſelves harraſſed and tormented by evil ſpirits, and upon ſome occaſions ſpeak in conformity to their inward apprehenſions. This, particularly, was the caſe with the man called Legion, and perhaps of many others who were under a deep melancholy.

(2.) It is urged; how came theſe perſons, who are ſaid to have evil ſpirits, to know Jeſus to be the Chriſt, if they were not under the influence of evil ſpirits, of great knowledge, as well as much power? *And there was in their ſynagogue,* [at Capernaum,] *a man with an unclean ſpirit, and he cried out, ſaying, Let us alone, what have we to do with thee, thou Jeſus of Nazareth. Art thou come to deſtroy us? I know thee, who thou art, the holy one of God,* Mark i. 23, 24. Compare Luke iv. 33, 34. And the two men, in the country of the Gadarenes, *cried out, ſaying, What have we to do with thee, Jeſus, thou ſon of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?* Matt. viii. 29.

To which I beg leave to anſwer; it ſeems to me, that theſe perſons knew Jeſus to be the Chriſt, the ſon of God, in the ſame way that others did. The expectation of the coming of the Meſſiah had been for ſome while very common, and even univerſal, founded upon juſt interpretations of the ancient prophets, which were publicly read in the ſynagogues, and were in the hands of all men. Theſe people, before they were ſeized with the diſorders which they now laboured under, were well apprized of the common notions concerning the greatneſs of the Meſſiah, which were allowed by the Jews in general.

We ought likewiſe to recollect, that none of the miracles recorded by the firſt three evangeliſts, were performed by our Lord till after the commencement of his public miniſtry, that is, the moſt public and open part of it. This is evident from St. John's goſpel, compared with the reſt. The firſt three evangeliſts ſay but little of our Lord's miniſtry, till after John was caſt into priſon: but before that, as St. John aſſures us, he had wrought divers miracles, and had begun to gather diſciples. Moreover, ſome of the miracles recorded by the firſt three evangeliſts, might be wrought, and ſome of our Lord's excellent diſcourſes ſpoken by him, before any of thoſe perſons ſaid to have an unclean ſpirit, made acknowledgments of our Lord's great character.

The expectation of the Meſſiah being general, and John the Baptiſt having preached in the moſt public manner, and declared to all, that the great perſon whom they looked for was at hand, and would ſoon appear among them; and our Lord beginning to ſpeak as no man ever ſpake before, and doing many great and miraculous works, ſhewing forth his glory, and many believing on him, and his fame being very great in Judea, and in neighbouring places; no man could be altogether ignorant of him. It is therefore not at all ſtrange, that theſe

diseased persons, should in their way, bear testimony to him. All those, said to have evil spirits, as we readily perceive, were not discomposed in mind; many of them were epileptical or paralytical. These undoubtedly enjoyed, at some seasons, the free use of their senses and understandings, and might discern the evidences of our Lord's great character; and being sincere and honest, might be disposed to own it, and declare the sense of their minds. But thinking their distempers to be owing to the operation and influence of evil spirits, they affect to speak in their name.

As for the men in the country of the Gadarenes, who were disordered in their minds, and yet acknowledged Jesus to be the Christ, the thing may be thought more difficult. But, as just said, before they were seized with that distemper, they were acquainted with the expectation of the Messiah, and the general apprehensions concerning his character; and before now they had heard of Jesus. Many who labour under that indisposition are honest and acute: they have also some intervals of ease; nor are they unreasonable in every respect; but setting aside some particular fancy, can reason and argue consistently enough. It therefore is not impossible, nor improbable, that some labouring under this affliction, having heard of the fame of Jesus who was much talked of every where, should think, and then be disposed to speak, honourably of him.

(3.) The escape of the man called Legion from his confinement, it is argued, is a proof of the interposition of evil spirits of more than human power, and not to be otherwise accounted for. For the evangelist Mark says, *that no man could bind him, no not with chains. For he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder, and the fetters broken in pieces. Neither could any man tame him,* chap. v. 3, 4.

But, as seems to me, the escape of such a person from his confinement, needs not to be reckoned so very extraordinary a thing, when it is well known, that persons in the like disorders have at some seasons uncommon strength.

Moreover, I apprehend that many do imprudently magnify the security with which that man had been confined. We are too apt, inconsiderately, to judge of former times by our own. It is likely, that great improvements have been made in late ages, in the method of treating people in that unhappy circumstance.

Hospitals for the relief and cure of such as labour under this and other grievous distempers, may be said to be a Christian

tian inſtitution [a]. They owe their original to that benevolence, which Chriſtian principles inſpire men with toward their fellow creatures. In thoſe houſes where there is conſtant attendance, the ſecurity muſt be much greater than in other places. Suppoſing there was, for ſome ſhort ſeaſon, a want of attention to this perſon, the bands with which he was faſtened, whether of metal or cord, with his continual and violent motion would fret and wear, and then break and burſt aſunder: and when he felt himſelf at liberty, his melancholic apprehenſions would carry him to the deſolate and ſolitary place where our Lord found him.

(4.) The loſs of the ſwine is reckoned unaccountable, but upon the ſuppoſition of a real poſſeſſion, and the interpoſition of many evil ſpirits.

It may be remembered, that [b] formerly we mentioned three ſeveral ways of accounting for that event. One, ſuppoſing that the diſtraction which the man had laboured under, was transferred by our Lord from him to the ſwine. Another, that the dæmons, leaving the man, at Chriſt's order, did with his permiſſion take poſſeſſion of the ſwine, and hurry them down the precipice: the third, that the lunatic man, or men, drove the ſwine into the lake.

Several reaſons were then offered againſt the firſt of thoſe opinions. There remain therefore the other two only to be now conſidered.

Every one ſhould judge for himſelf. But to me it appears moſt probable, that this was done by the man himſelf, called Legion, either alone, or with the joint aſſiſtance of the other, his companion in affliction. For this miracle, as was obſerved before, was performed by our Lord with great deliberation. Some time paſſed between our Lord's ſignifying his will and pleaſure, that the evil ſpirits ſhould depart, or that the man ſhould be cured, and his perfect recovery. Some things may be reaſonably ſuppoſed by us, which are not inſerted in ſuch a relation as this. When the people of the neighbouring city had been informed of the cure of this unhappy perſon, as St. Mark aſſures us, *they come to Jeſus, and ſee him that was poſſeſſed with a dæmon, and had the legion, ſitting, and clothed, and in his right mind.* Clothing therefore had been brought to him: but the evangeliſt does not ſay how it was procured; becauſe indeed it is needleſs to relate particularly what may be eaſily ſuppoſed.

[a] See the Biſhop of Oxford's Sermon preached before the Governors of the London Hoſpital, in the year 1754, p. 8—11. [b] See before, p. 436, 437.

The

The diſtraction under which this man had laboured, was very grievous and outrageous: he was a hideous form, and his action was very violent. When he had conceived the thought of gratifying the evil ſpirits, by which he imagined himſelf to be poſſeſſed, with the deſtruction of the ſwine, he would without much difficulty drive them off the precipice. If ſome few of them were put in motion, the whole herd would follow. Nor is it unlikely, that the other perſon, his companion in affliction, joined his aſſiſtance: for St. Matthew ſpeaks of two. They inveſted the herd then on each ſide, and thus drove them before them.

This appears to me a much more reaſonable way of accounting for the loſs of the ſwine, than to ſuppoſe, that[c] our bleſſed Lord accepted and granted the petition of evil ſpirits.

(5.) The caſe of Mary Magdalene may create a difficulty in the minds of ſome: and it may be inquired, what notion we ought to have of it, ſince it is ſaid, that *out of her went ſeven dæmons?* Is not this an evident proof of the reality of poſſeſſions? See Mark xvi. 9. Luke viii. 2.

To which I anſwer, that many of late time have ſuppoſed Mary Magdalene to be the woman mentioned by St. Luke in the ſeventh chapter of his goſpel, who is there ſpoken of as a *ſinner*, who, when our Lord was in the houſe of Simon the phariſee, came to him, and gave proof of repentance. For which reaſon Mary Magdalene is often ſet forth as a remarkable example of repentance.

But that opinion, ſo far as I am able to judge, is entirely without foundation in the goſpels. There is no reaſon at all to think, that Mary Magdalene and that woman are one and the ſame.

What was Mary's caſe appears in general by St. Luke's account, chap. viii. 1, 2. *He went through every city and village, preaching the glad tidings of the kingdom of God. And the twelve were with him, and certain women, which had been healed of evil ſpirits, and infirmities; Mary, called Magdalene, out of whom went ſeven dæmons, and others.* Here Mary is reckoned among thoſe whom our Lord had *healed of infirmities*, and ſuch infirmities as were aſcribed to evil ſpirits.

But I do not think we can with certainty conclude from thoſe words, what was her particular affliction; becauſe the Jews in thoſe times imputed a great variety of diſtempers to the influence of dæmons. But though we dare not ſay poſitively what was her caſe, whether a diſcompoſed frame of mind, or

[c] See before p. 437, 438. and Note [b].

epilepſy,

epilepſy, or ſomewhat elſe; it appears to me very evident, that ſome natural, not moral diſtemper, is thereby intended; and that by *ſeven dæmons* is meant many, a certain number being put for an uncertain. It was ſuppoſed, as in the caſe of the man who called himſelf Legion, that more than one dæmon or unclean ſpirit, was concerned in inflicting, or aggravating the infirmity, which ſhe had been afflicted with, and which our bleſſed Lord graciouſly removed.

(6.) The next thing which I ſhall take notice of, is the hiſtory of an affair at Epheſus. Acts xix. 10—17. *And this continued by the ſpace of two years, ſo that all they which dwelt in Aſia heard the word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks. And God wrought ſpecial miracles by the hands of Paul: ſo that from his body were brought unto the ſick handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diſeaſes departed from them, and evil ſpirits went out of them. Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorciſts, took upon them to call over them that had evil ſpirits the name of the Lord Jeſus, ſaying, We adjure you by Jeſus, whom Paul preacheth. And there were ſeven ſons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the prieſts, which did ſo. And the evil ſpirit anſwered, and ſaid, Jeſus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil ſpirit was, leapt on them, and overcame them, and prevailed againſt them: ſo that they fled out of the houſe naked and wounded. And this was known to all the Jews, and Greeks alſo, dwelling at Epheſus. And fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jeſus was magnified.*

This hiſtory might afford occaſion for many remarks; as that dæmoniacs were common among Gentiles, and in heathen countries, as well as among the Jews in Judea: that the Jews practiſed exorciſms at home and abroad: and that ſome, who took upon them the office of exorciſts, were men of indifferent characters, and were impoſtors.

But what I allege this paſſage for, and which we are chiefly to attend to, is the argument which it affords for real poſſeſſions, or the influence of malignant, powerful ſpirits. For this man ſpeaks as if he were actuated by ſome ſuch beings: moreover he ſhews great force and activity; he alone overcomes ſeveral men at once.

Nevertheleſs, in my opinion, here is far from being any ſufficient evidence of the preſence or power of inviſible beings. The knowledge which the man ſhews, is common and ordinary. St. Paul had before this time wrought many miracles at Epheſus, in the name of Jeſus, in curing all kinds of diſeaſes: and the man before us was convinced of the truth and greatneſs

greatneſs of divers of the works, which he had either ſeen or heard of.

When therefore theſe Jewiſh exorciſts came to him, and made an attempt to give him relief under the indiſpoſition with which he was afflicted, and he found no benefit from all their exorciſms; he was enraged, and treats them as hateful deceivers, and ſays, *Jeſus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?* No evil ſpirit, under the direction of Satan the prince of evil ſpirits, would bear ſuch a teſtimony to Jeſus and his apoſtles. But it is the honeſt, underſtanding man, who expreſſes the ſenſe of his own mind.

Says St. Luke, *And the man, in whom the evil ſpirit was*, that is, in whom there was ſuppoſed to be an evil ſpirit, *leapt on them, and overcame them, and prevailed:* which is not at all hard to conceive, conſidering his juſt indignation, and that this aſſault was unexpected. The exorciſts were unprovided for defence, and at the ſame time were diſpirited by fear and ſhame, at the diſappointment which they had met with, and the detection of their impoſture, and the inefficacy of their boaſted ſkill.

As St. Luke ſays, *fear fell on all, and the name of the Lord Jeſus was magnified.* And very juſtly, after ſo many miracles wrought by Paul, and the manifeſt proof now afforded of the inſufficiency of thoſe methods of cure, which were moſt depended upon.

(7.) There is one thing more to be taken notice of by us, before we leave this head. We muſt go back for it to the xvith chapter of the Acts. But I have reſerved it for this place, it ſeeming to ſome, one of the ſtrongeſt proofs in the New Teſtament in behalf of real poſſeſſions. It was at Philippi in Macedonia. Says St. Luke: *And it came to paſs, as we went to prayer.* It might as well be rendered, *As we went to the oratory*, or the Jewiſh ſynagogue, a little way out of the city, by the river ſide. *As we went to the oratory, a certain damſel, poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of divination, met us, which brought her maſters much gain by ſoothſaying. The ſame followed Paul, and us, and cried, ſaying, Theſe men are the ſervants of the moſt high God, which ſhew unto us the way of ſalvation. And this ſhe did many days. But Paul being grieved, turned, and ſaid to the ſpirit, I command thee in the name of Jeſus Chriſt to come out of her. And he came out the ſame hour. And when her maſters ſaw, that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the market-place, unto the rulers. And brought them to the magiſtrates, ſaying, Theſe men, being Jews, do exceedingly*

exceedingly trouble our city. And teach cuſtoms, which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to obſerve, being Romans, Acts xvi. 16—21. And the magiſtrates being exaſperated by the clamour of theſe men, they ordered Paul and Silas to be beaten, and ſhut up in priſon.

A certain damſel, poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of divination, literally, *having a ſpirit of Python.* St. Luke, undoubtedly, makes uſe of the common heathen appellation. And the phraſe ſeems to denote, that this woman was ſuppoſed to have the ſame ſpirit of Python or Apollo, that delivered oracles in the name of Apollo in the Pythian temple. In ſhort, by the help of this maid-ſervant, her maſters were ſuppoſed to be able to deliver out oracles, and to anſwer all manner of queſtions, and foretel future events concerning thoſe who conſulted them: hereby her owners had much gain.

And many there are in our time, who ſtill think, this woman had in her a ſpirit of divination, and that ſhe was able to foretel futurities.

They who are of this opinion, expreſs themſelves after this manner. 'The [d] ancient Greeks and Romans poſſeſſed ſlaves 'of all profeſſions, philoſophers, rhetoricians, grammarians, 'phyſicians, as well as perſons bred up to every ſort of me-'chanic trade. Among the reſt, they ſometimes happened to 'have ſlaves that were aſtrologers, or magicians, or diviners. 'Εγγαστριμυθοι, or thoſe who had the ſpirit of Python, were 'doubtleſs very rare, and the purchaſe of ſuch an one muſt 'have been exceeding high. The maid-ſervant, here men-'tioned, is repreſented as having more than one owner. Her 'price, it is likely, was too great to be advanced by a ſingle 'perſon. At leaſt, no one cared to riſk ſo large a ſum upon the 'uncertainty of a life. For though ſhe brought much gain, 'how ſoon might it be cut off by her deceaſe?' It is farther ſaid, 'that [e] the reputation of this woman was eſtabliſhed. 'There was a general belief, that ſhe did foretel things, and 'there was a great concourſe of people after her, to make in-'quiry into their future fortunes.' So ſay [f] thoſe perſons, who are of that opinion.

[d] Biſcoe upon the Acts, p. 342, 343.

[e] The ſame, p. 296.

[f] 'The plain 'truth therefore is, St. Paul prevented her 'future propheſying. He caſt out the 'ſpirit which ſpake within her, ſo that ſhe 'was no more heard to ſpeak as from her 'belly or breaſt. Her maſters ſoon per-'ceived that ſhe was no longer inſpired or 'poſſeſſed, that ſhe could now utter no more 'divinations or prophecies: and therefore 'all hope of their gains from her, whether 'in Philippi, or any other city, was wholly 'gone.' The ſame, p. 297, 298. See alſo Dr. Jortin's Remarks upon Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Vol. i. p. 123, 124.

Upon

Upon which I obſerve, that unqueſtionably here was a ſort of oracle; for ſuch things were common in heathen countries, not only carried on by their prieſts in the temples of their deities, but alſo by others in other places. But as I think, there is good reaſon to believe, that all thoſe oracles in general were cheats and impoſtures, the effects of human ſkill and contrivance only; ſo I think, there was a like cheat and impoſture in this caſe. But it may not be eaſy to ſay exactly, wherein the impoſture conſiſted.

It has been ſuppoſed, that the woman was a ſlave, and the joint property of ſeveral; which might be. But none of thoſe oracles could be carried on with credit, without a combination, for getting intelligence, and for the ſake of other tranſactions at the office. And whether ſhe was a ſlave, or a hired ſervant, does not clearly appear.

I make no queſtion, that the maſters were artful and deceitful: but poſſibly, the woman was honeſt. If ſhe had once been otherwiſe, ſhe was ſeized with compunction, when ſhe declared Paul and his companions to be *ſervants of the moſt high God.* But that would not cure her diſtemper: for ſome diſtemper ſhe had, which Paul removed.

It ſeems to me not improbable, that this woman laboured under ſome indiſpoſition; poſſibly, ſome kind of melancholy, which was imputed to the influence of a dæmon, and particularly to Apollo, as was common among heathen people. The maſters, pretending that hereby ſhe was qualified to reſolve all manner of queſtions, ſet up an oracle at Philippi, and delivered out anſwers, as if received from the ſpirit of Python. And their project was carried on very artfully, inſomuch, that they had a good deal of employment, and many inquirers, and made great gain.

But the maid being honeſt, or at leaſt well diſpoſed, and hearing of Paul, what doctrine he taught, and what works he performed; or perhaps, out of curioſity attending at a diſtance, and making inquiries after him, ſhe was convinced, and then openly declared, that he and his companions were *ſervants of the moſt high God.* Or, ſhe might have received information of Paul from her maſters. For no people were ſo inquiſitive, and ſo careful to get early intelligence, as the conductors of thoſe [g] oracles. But the information given her (if ſhe received it from them,) had a different effect from what was intended. However, her high character of Paul did not throw her maſters into deſpair that we can perceive. But ſhe having often fol-

g Vid. Luciani Alexander, ſeu Pſeudomantis.

lowed

lowed Paul, and he not valuing ſuch a teſtimony, and being touched with compaſſion for the maid, under her melancholic affection, adapting his expreſſions to the common opinion about her, *ſaid to the ſpirit, I command thee, in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, to come out of her. And he came out the ſame hour.* And thereupon the woman immediately became compoſed and chearful. This happy alteration being evident, and public, her maſters' hope of farther gain by her was ruined.

This appears to me to have been the caſe: nor can it be thought, that a ſpirit of Python ſhould publicly ſay what tended to diminiſh a regard for himſelf, and all heathen deities in general.

But I may not ſtay to allege at large the proofs which might be offered, that the heathen oracles, and ſuch as were ſaid to ſpeak by the ſpirit of Python, were the impoſtures of artful men, unſupported by inviſible beings of vaſt knowledge and power, as ſome have ſuppoſed.

I only obſerve, that what is here advanced, is agreeable to the ſentiments of the ancient prophets, who continually repreſent heathen idols as altogether inſignificant and vain; and did not imagine, that they were inhabited by inviſible beings, who could aſtoniſh their worſhippers with real wonders, and almoſt rival the true Deity. Iſa. xli. 21—24. *Produce your cauſe, ſaith the Lord; bring forth your ſtrong reaſons, ſaith the King of Jacob. Let them ſhew the former things, what they be, that we may conſider them, and know the latter end of them.* Let them ſhew the accompliſhment of any events, conformably to their predictions in time paſt. *Or declare us, now, things to come. Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know ye are gods. Yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be diſmayed, and behold it together. Behold ye are of nothing, and your work of nought: an abomination is he, that chooſeth you.* Compare Iſa. xl. 18—20.

Jer. x. 3—5. *For the cuſtoms of the people are vain: for one cutteth a tree out of the foreſt (the work of the hands of the workman,) with the axe. They deck it with ſilver and with gold, they faſten it with nails and hammers, that it move not. They are upright, as the palm-tree, but ſpeak not: they muſt needs be borne, becauſe they cannot go: be not afraid of them, for they cannot do evil, neither is it in them to do good.*

Iſa. xliv. 9. *They that make a graven image, are all of them vanity.* 10. *Who hath formed a god, or molten a graven image, that is profitable for nothing?* 12. *The ſmith with the tongs both worketh in the coals, and faſhioneth it with hammers,* and what follows

follows to the end of ver. 17. *He burneth part thereof in the fire: with part thereof, he eateth fleſh: he roaſteth roaſt, and is ſatisfied. And the reſidue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down to it, and prayeth unto it, and ſaith, Deliver me, for thou art my god.*

Pſal. cxv. 3—8. *But our God is in the heavens, he hath done whatſoever he pleaſed. Their idols are ſilver and gold, the work of men's hands. They have mouths, but they ſpeak not; eyes have they, but they ſee not. They have ears, but they hear not. They have hands, but they handle not; feet have they, but they walk not; neither ſpeak they through their throat.* They have not the faculty of ſpeech. *They that make them, are like unto them. So is every one, that truſteth in them.* Comp. Pſ. cxxxv. 15—18.

Pſal. xcvii. 7. *Confounded be all they that ſerve graven images, that boaſt themſelves of idols.*

Dan. v. 4. *They drank wine, and praiſed the gods of gold, and of ſilver, of braſs, of iron, of wood, and of ſtone.* Ver. 23. *And thou haſt praiſed the gods of ſilver and gold, of braſs, iron, wood, and ſtone, which ſee not, nor hear, nor know: and the God, in whoſe hand thy breath is, and whoſe are all thy ways, haſt thou not glorified.*

Habakkuk ii. 18, 19. *What profiteth the graven image, that the maker of his work truſteth therein, to make him dumb idols? Woe unto him that ſaith to the wood, Awake: to the dumb ſtone, Ariſe, it ſhall teach. It is laid over with gold and ſilver, and there is no breath at all in the midſt of it.*

Juſtly therefore does the prophet ſay, *the ſtock is a doctrine of vanities*, Jer. x. 8. Compare Jer. ii. 27. and Iſa. xliv. 19. And I refer to the ſixth chapter of the apocryphal book of Baruch.

Acts xvii. 29. *We ought not to think, that the Godhead is like unto gold, or ſilver, or ſtone graven by art, and man's devi.e.* So ſays St. Paul, preaching at Athens. He does not flatter them: he plainly intimates, that their conſecrated images conſiſted only of earthly materials, poliſhed by the hand of the artificer.

1 Cor. viii. 4. *We know, that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one.* Ch. x. 19. *What ſay I then? that the idol is any thing?* Ch. xii. 2. *Ye know, that ye were gentiles, carried away unto theſe dumb idols, as ye were led.*

1 Theſſ. i. 9. *And how ye turned to God from idols*, meaning lifeleſs idols, *to ſerve the living and true God.*

After all this, can any Chriſtians believe, that heathen idols had either power or knowledge?

Can we think, that by invocation, and conſecration, aëreal, inviſible beings were brought to reſide in images of hollow braſs,

braſs, or ſolid marble? And that they thence delivered anſwers to ſuch as ſought to them? Such [g] was indeed, the perſuaſion of heathen people: but it was a mere deluſion appertaining to their ſuperſtition; for which they were derided by the primitive Chriſtians, and the ancient [h] apologiſts; who are juſtified by the ſcriptures, as we have lately ſeen.

Can we imagine, that heathen deities were able to do great things for thoſe who ſought to them, and recompenſe them for all their coſtly oblations and ſacrifices? I ſay, can any Chriſtians admit ſuch an imagination, when the prophets repreſent them as things of nought, ſenſeleſs idols, who could not ſee, hear, ſpeak, or walk, as graven or molten images, as mere ſtocks, that could do neither good nor evil? Do we not all know, how the prophet Elijah expoſed the inability of Baal, in the preſence of his numerous prieſts and worſhippers? And ſhall any Chriſtians ſtill ſuppoſe, that Baal was a being of mighty power? No, no, Saturn, or Baal, or Belus, or by whatever other name he was invoked, to whom ſo many fine children were offered in ſacrifice, by that warlike people the Carthaginians, and their anceſtors [i] the Phœnicians, was ſo far from holding the balance of power in that, or any other part of the world, or being able to give victory to what people he pleaſed, that he was not able to raiſe or lay a ſtorm, could not form or blaſt one ſpire of graſs, or flower of the field, but was [k] a dead man, and, as to power and influence, mere nothing.

g Sed erras, inquitis, & laberis. Nam neque nos aëra neque auri argentique materias, neque alias quibus ſigna conſiunt, ea eſſe per ſe deos, & religioſa decernimus numina: ſed eos in his colimus, eoſque veneramur, quos dedicatio infert ſacra, & fabrilibus efficit inhabitare ſimulachris. Arnob. l. vi. p. 203. in. Vid. ib. p. 207. in.

Επειτα δε και ολυμπιος τις εν φιλοσοφω σχημαθι συνων αυλοις, και πειθων χρηναι μη αμελειν των παλριων—καθαιρεμενων δε των ξοανων, αθυμενλας ορων, συνεβαλενε, μη εξιστασθαι της θρησκειας, υλην φθαρτην και παλαιαν λεγων ειναι τα αγαλματα, και δια τελο αφανισμον υπομενειν· δυναμεις δε τινας ενοικησαι αυλοις, και εις θρανον αποπτηναι. Sozom. H. E. l. vii. p. 724. C. Vid. & Clementin. Hom. X. ſect. xxi.

h Simulachra iſta, quæ vos terrent, quæque in templis omnibus proſtrati, atque humiles adoratis, oſſa, lapides, aëra ſunt, argentum, aurum, lignum ſumptum ex arbore aut commixtum glutinum gypſo, &c. O utinam liceret in ſimulachri alicujus medias introire pendigines! Immo utinam liceret Olympiacos illos, & Capitolinus Joves in membra reſolutos, omneſque illas partes, quibus ſumma concluditur corporum, diſcretas & ſingulas intueri, &c. Arnob. l. vi. p. 200, 201. & ſeqq.

Quiſquamne igitur tam ineptus eſt, ut putet aliquid eſſe in ſimulachro Dei, in quo ne hominis quidem quicquam eſt præter umbram.—Adorant ergo inſenſibilia, qui ſentiunt: irrationabilia, qui ſapiunt: exanima, qui vivunt: terrena, qui oriuntur e cœlo. Lact. l. ii. cap. 2. p. 147.

i Κρονω μεν γαρ φοινικες καθ' εκαστον ετος εθυον τα αγαπητα και μονογενη των τεκνων. Euſeb. de Laudib. Conſtant. p. 646. A. Vid. Hieron. Columna ad Fragmenta Ennii. p. 74—76. k Saturnum enim principem hujus generis & examinis omnes ſcriptores vetuſtatis, Græci Romanique, hominem prodiderunt. Minuc. Fel. cap. 22.

When we ſpeak of heathen deities as dead men, we are countenanced by many wiſe men [l] among the ancients, and by the ſcriptures, as was ſhewn [m] before.

And do we think, that [n] their fond and ſorrowful ſurvivors could by any methods and ſolemnities of deification, performed on this earth, ſeat them in heaven, and advance them to extenſive power and empire?

Some learned men among Chriſtians have ſuppoſed, that the young woman at Philippi, whoſe caſe we have had under our conſideration, who is ſaid to have had a *ſpirit of divination*, had extraordinary knowledge. They ſay, that *ſhe propheſied, that ſhe could diſcover loſt goods, and reveal what happened in diſtant places, and do many other things of a like nature.* But their opinion is confuted by the text in Iſa. viii. 19. before quoted. For ſhe was one of thoſe who are particularly mentioned by the prophet, as having *a familiar ſpirit*, or ſpirit of Python, and *muttering*, that is, ſpeaking as out of the belly or breaſt. And ſo the place was underſtood of old by [o] Jerom.

3. Obj. The third objection to be conſidered by us is, that the evangeliſts ſeem to have believed real poſſeſſions, and to have thought, that divers of the afflicted perſons, whoſe cures they relate, had evil ſpirits.

To which I anſwer, that I think this cannot be denied, and that it needs not to be conteſted. Nor ought this to be thought ſtrange, even ſuppoſing that there was no agency or interpoſition of evil ſpirits: for the opinion of poſſeſſions being common at that time, and generally admitted by the knowing, as well as by the others, it is no wonder that the evangeliſts ſhould be of the ſame ſentiment. The twelve apoſtles of Chriſt were unlearned men: our Lord choſe to have ſuch for apoſtles; and he did not teach them philoſophy, but religion. And indeed,

l Quibus ex rebus cum conſtet illos homines fuiſſe, non eſt obſcurum, quâ ratione dii cœperint nominari. Hac ſcilicet ratione Romani Cæſares ſuos conſecraverunt, & Mauri reges ſuos. Lactant. l. i. cap. 15.

——— & ideo ſimulachra conſtituunt. Quæ quia mortuorum ſunt imagines, ſimilia mortuis ſunt. Omni enim ſenſu carent. Id. l. ii. cap. 2. p. 146.

Si vero ſcrutari vetera, & ex his ea, quæ ſcriptores Græciæ prodiderunt, eruere coner: ipſi illi majorum gentium dii qui habentur, hinc a nobis profecti in cœlum reperientur. Cic. Tuſcul. Diſp. i. c. 13. Et Conf. Lact. l. i. c. 15. p. 85.

Vid. Euſeb. de vita Conſtant. l. ii. cap. 16. l. iii. cap. 25. & 54. & paſſim. Vid. Dem. Evang. l. viii. p. 364. Clementin. Hom. 6. n. xxi. xxii. p. 669, 670.

m See here p. 451.

n Ignoſci mœrentibus poteſt, credentibus non poteſt. Quis enim tam demens, qui conſenſu, & placito innumerabilium ſtultorum, aperiri cœlum mortuis arbitretur? aut aliquem, quod ipſe non habeat, dare alteri poſſe. Lact. l. i. cap. 15. p. 86.

o Si dixerint, inquit, patres veſtri, quos reliquiſtis: Quærite ventriloquos, quos Pythonas intelligimus. Qualem & in Actibus Apoſtolorum ancillam legimus, quæ quæſtui erat dominis ſuis. Hieron. Comm. in. Iſ. cap. viii. Tom. 3. p. 81.

if

if the evangeliſts had appeared to know more than others, in this and other points of a philoſophical nature, it might have diminiſhed the credibility of their hiſtory. If they had been wiſer and more knowing than moſt others, and even than the knowing and learned of that time; ſome would have been apt to charge them with art and contrivance in the main parts of their hiſtory. But now there is no room for ſuch a charge or ſuſpicion.

4 Obj. The fourth and laſt objection is, that our bleſſed Lord, if he did not countenance the common and prevailing opinion upon this head, does not appear to have oppoſed or diſcouraged it: which we may think he would have done if it was not right. For it might have been an uſeful work, and a benefit to mankind, to deliver them from wrong apprehenſions upon this point.

To which I anſwer: undoubtedly our bleſſed Lord knew the truth of the caſe, for he knew all things. But it does not follow, that he was therefore obliged to ſpeak his mind, or to correct every falſe and miſtaken notion among the people whom he taught. Our [p] Lord was concerned in the moſt important deſign, teaching the principles of true religion, and recommending them by works of mighty power and great goodneſs. When any afflictive caſes were brought to him, it was ſufficient to heal them, to whatever cauſe they were aſcribed. It was expedient not to enter into any debate upon that head: it might have diverted him from his main work.

We do not obſerve in the Old Teſtament, that it was cuſtomary for any prophet to inſtruct men in the things of nature. The people of the Jews, in the time of our Saviour, were generally free from idolatry: and as they conſidered the ſpirits, which they ſuppoſed ſometimes to inflict diſtempers on men, to be *evil and unclean*, there was no danger of their honouring and worſhipping them. There was therefore no urgent neceſſity, that he ſhould interpoſe for correcting any miſapprehenſions concerning the cauſes of ſome indiſpoſitions and diſtempers.

That our Lord ſtudiouſly declined to concern himſelf with things foreign to the office of a prophet, or extraordinary meſſenger from heaven, may appear from two particular inſtances.

[p] D'ailleurs, N. S. n' étoit pas apellé à corriger les fauſſes idées que les Juifs pouvoient avoir ſur la nature de ces maladies. Et s'il leur avoit dit, qu'elles étoient l'effet de quelques cauſes naturelles, ils en auroient pris un prétexte de l'accuſer de nier qu'il y eût de mauvais eſprits: & par conſequent qu'il y en eût auſſi de bons. Les Phariſiens en auroient fait un Sadducéen. Beauſ. Remarques ſur le N. T. p. 14.

One is at the beginning at the ninth chapter of St. John's goſpel. *And as Jeſus paſſed by, he ſaw a man which was blind from his birth. And his diſciples aſked him, ſaying, Maſter, who did ſin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? Jeſus anſwered, Neither hath this man ſinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God ſhould be made manifeſt in him.* Here the diſciples give the Lord a fair occaſion to ſay ſomething about the philoſophical notion of the pre-exiſtence of the human ſoul: but our Lord declines that point, and only ſays, that the blindneſs of this man was not owing to any ſin of his own, or his parents.

The other inſtance is in Luke xii. 13, 14. *And one of the company ſaid unto him, Maſter, ſpeak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me. And he ſaid unto him, Man, who made me a judge and a divider over you? And he ſaid unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetouſneſs,* and what follows. Here one comes to our Lord with a petition; and it may be thought to be very reaſonable: for it cannot but be a good work to decide a cauſe truly, and with a juſt ſentence, and to reconcile brethren. Nevertheleſs our Lord abſolutely rejects the propoſal, as improper to be hearkened to by him. His work was to teach religion, to mortify earthly affections, to deliver men from covetouſneſs, and to raiſe men's thoughts to things above. For ſuch ends as theſe, he embraced the preſent, and all other occaſions. But to interpoſe in particular differences among men, was not his province.

I take this to be a ſufficient anſwer to the difficulty under conſideration.

But then here ariſeth an objection againſt all that has been ſaid in this, and the two preceding diſcourſes. For it may be ſaid, if Chriſt confined his doctrine to the important truths and duties of religion, ſhould not a preacher of the goſpel do the ſame, and decline every thing not expreſly taught by Chriſt or his apoſtles?

To which I anſwer, that in the courſe of this argument I have intimated over and over, that no particular ſentiment concerning this point, ought to be reckoned an article of religion. It is left undetermined by Chriſt and his apoſtles: and men may think of it as they find beſt, if they do but take care to maintain the ſupremacy of the divine government, and guard againſt undue fears and apprehenſions of evil ſpirits. And having inculcated ſuch obſervations and cautions as theſe, I hope no harm has been done in ſetting before you the different ſentiments of learned, and judicious, and pious interpreters

preters of ſcripture, concerning the caſe of thoſe, who in the New Teſtament are ſpoken of as having evil ſpirits.

And having now finiſhed the argument, I again declare, (what no one can doubt the truth of,) that it is more ſatisfactory to promote good works among men, than to bring them over to any particular opinion. There is more pleaſure in advancing the happineſs of others, than in raiſing a man's own reputation for ſkill in any branch of ſcience. Humility is better than knowledge: a right diſpoſition of heart is more valuable than right ſentiments. At the ſame time it is a reaſonable ambition, to promote both knowledge and piety: the character of Chriſtians then becomes complete. A love of truth, a thirſt after knowledge, an inquiſitive temper, ſeem to be inſeparable concomitants of integrity. Such diſpoſitions therefore may be fitly cheriſhed and encouraged.

Solomon ſays, that *wiſdom excelleth folly, as far as light excelleth darkneſs*, Eccl. ii. 13. *That the ſoul be without knowledge, it is not good*, Prov. xix. 2. *The heart of the prudent getteth knowledge, and the ear of the wiſe ſeeketh knowledge*, xviii. 15. I therefore take the liberty to conclude with that exhortation to you, which St. Paul gave to the Chriſtians at Corinth, *Brethren, be not children in underſtanding: howbeit, in malice be ye children, but in underſtanding be men*, 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

A N

APPENDIX,

FOR FARTHER ILLUSTRATING THE SUBJECT.

I. *Two paſſages of Joſephus concerning Dæmoniacs, with Remarks.* II. *Divers texts of the New Teſtament, relating to Dæmoniacs, explained,* 1. *Matt.* xii. 27, 28. 2. *Matt.* xii. 43—45. 3. *Matt.* xvii. 21. 4. *Luke* x. 17, 18. 5. *Texts, where Dæmons are ſaid to be rebuked by our Lord.* III. *A remarkable Explication of Acts* vi. 9.

I. JOSEPHUS, having deſcribed the caſtle of Machærus, or Machæruns, ſays: 'On[a] the north ſide of the city is a valley, 'in which is a place called Baaras. It bears a plant of the 'ſame name. It is of a flaming colour, and toward evening 'it ſhines very bright. It is not eaſy to be taken by thoſe who 'would gather it: for it withdraws itſelf, and does not ſtay, 'unleſs one pours upon it the urine of a woman, or menſtru-

[a] De B. Jud. l. vii. cap. 25. al. vi. § 3.

'ous blood: and even then it is certain death to him who 'akes it, unless he carries the root hanging down upon the 'hand. There is another way of getting this plant without 'danger. It is this. They dig all round it, so that a very 'small bit only of the root is left in the ground; then they tie 'a dog to it, and he attempting to follow him that tied it, the 'root is easily pulled up: but the dog dies presently, as it 'were in the stead of him who would get the plant: afterwards 'there is no danger to those who touch it. With all these 'dangers the root is very desirable, for the sake of one virtue. 'For dæmons[b], as they are called, who are the spirits of 'wicked men, entering into the living, and killing those who 'have no help, this root presently expels, if it be only brought 'near to those who are diseased.'

It is astonishing, that any man in repute for good sense, should be able to write in this manner. Surely there never was in any part of the world a plant with all these properties.

That passage is taken from the history of the Jewish War. There is another passage in his Jewish Antiquities, in the history of Solomon.

In the former part of the paragraph is the substance of what is said of Solomon's great wisdom, in 1 Kings iv. 29—23. After which it follows: 'God[c] also gave him understanding 'to attain to skill against dæmons for the benefit of mankind. 'For having composed incantations, whereby diseases are re-'moved, he also left behind him certain kinds of exorcisms, 'whereby dæmons may be expelled, so as never to return 'again. And this method of cure is effectual [or prevails 'much] among us to this day. For I saw one Eleazar, my 'countryman, in the presence of Vespasian, and his sons, 'and many tribunes, and other soldiers, deliver men who 'were seized by these dæmons. The cure was in this man-'ner. Applying to the nostrils of the dæmoniacs a ring,

[b] Τα γαρ καλȣμενα δαιμονια, ταυτα δε πονηρων εςιν ανθρωπων πνευματα, τοις ζωσιν εισδυομενα, και κτεινοντα τȣς βοηθειας μη τυγχανοντας, αυτη ταχεως εξελαυνει, καν προσενεχθη μονον τοις νοσȣσι. Ibid.

[c] Παρεσχε δε αυτῳ μαθειν ο θεος, και την κατα των δαιμονων τεχνην εις ωφελειαν και θεραπειαν τοις ανθρωποις· επῳδας τε συνταξαμενος, αις παρηγορειται τα νοσηματα, και τροπȣς εξορκωσεων κατελειπεν, οις ενδȣμενα τα δαιμονια ως μηκετ' επανελθειν εκδιωκȣσι. Και αυτη μεχρι νυν παρ' ημιν η θεραπεια πλειςον ισχυει. Ιςορησα γαρ τινα Ελεαζαρον των ομοφυλων, Ουεσπασιανȣ παροντος——τȣς υπο των δαιμονιων λαμβανομενȣς απολυοντα τȣτων. Ο δε της θεραπειας τροπος τοιȣτος ην. Προσφερων ταις ῥισι δαιμονιζομενȣ τον δακτυλιον, εχοντα υπο τῃ σφραγιδι ῥιζαν εξ ων υπεδειξε Σολομων, επειτα εξειλκεν οσφραινομενῳ δια των μυκτηρων το δαιμονιον. Και πεσοντος ευθυς τȣ ανθρωπȣ, μηκετ' εις αυτον επανελθειν ωρκȣ, Σολομωνος τε μεμνημενος, και τας επῳδας, ας συνεθηκεν εκεινος, επιλεγων. Βȣλομενος δε πεισαι και παραςησαι τοις παρατυγχανȣσιν ο Ελεαζαρος, οτι ταυτην εχει ισχυν, ετιθει μικρον εμπροσθεν ητοι ποτηριον πληρες υδατος, η ποδονιπτρον· και τω δαιμονιȣ προσετατ τεν εξιοντι τȣ ανθρωπȣ ταυτ' ανατρεψαι, και παρασχειν επιγνωναι τοις ορωσιν, οτι καταλελοιπε τον ανθρωπον. κ. λ. Antiq. l. viii. cap. ii. § 5.

'having

'having under the seal one of those roots, of which Solomon 'taught the virtues, he drew out the dæmon at the nostrils 'of the man who smelled to it. The man presently falling 'down, he mentioned *Solomon*, and reciting the charms com- 'posed by him, he adjured the dæmon never to return any 'more. Moreover Eleazar being desirous to satisfy all the 'company that he had that power, he placed a little way off 'a cup full of water, or a small vessel, in which the feet are 'washed. Then he commanded the dæmon, as he went out 'of the man, to overthrow them, that all present might be 'sensible he had left the man. This being done, the wisdom 'of Solomon was made manifest.'

We are now to make remarks upon these two passages.

1. We hence evidently perceive, that Josephus believed there were real dæmoniacs, or persons into whom dæmons entered, and to whom they were troublesome.

2. Therefore this must have been a common opinion at that time, as we perceive in the gospels.

3. The dæmons, who entered into men, and took possession of them, according to his account, were the spirits or souls of wicked men. And it may be also hence concluded, that this was the opinion of many other Jews at that time.

And by the way I would observe, that we have here full proof that the pharisees, of which sect Josephus was, believed the separate existence of souls after death. This was shewn[d] formerly from several passages in his works, where he speaks of the souls of good and bad men, and says, 'That[e] according 'to the doctrine of the sadducees souls perish with the bodies.' But he and the rest of the pharisees believed the continuance or subsistence of souls after death. I think, we are hereby led to the true and certain interpretation of Acts xxiii. 8. *For*[f] *the sadducees say, that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: but the pharisees confess both.* Where by *spirit* must be meant the human soul, subsisting separate from the body.

4. We farther learn from Josephus, that incantations and exorcisms were practised by Jews in his time, for expelling dæmons out of the bodies of men, of which they were supposed to have taken possession.

5. The story told by Josephus of Eleazar lies open to many exceptions, and appears ridiculous. For what reason can there be to think, that dæmons, whether they be bad angels, or the

[d] See p. 120—122.

[e] Σαδδουκαιοις δε τας ψυχας ο λογος συναφανιζει τοις σωμασι. Ant. lib. xviii. cap. 1. § 4.

[f] Deum esse credebant, sed præter eum nihil quod non sensibus perciperetur, non angelos υφιστασθαι, non superesse corporibus animos, ideoque nec fore αναστασιν. Grot. in Act. xxiii. 8. Vid. & Wolf. in eundem locum.

ſouls of bad men, ſhould be affected by the ſmell of a root? It is likely, that Eleazar was an impoſtor, and the whole affair related by Joſephus, as tranſacted before Veſpaſian and his court, was artifice and deluſion. There was a compact between Eleazar and the pretended dæmoniac. Joſephus has not mentioned the ſymptoms of any diſtemper under which the man laboured. If the man had been afflicted with ſome grievous diſorder, the removal of it would have been ſufficient proof of the power of Eleazar, and of the virtues of Solomon's incantations, without overturning a ſmall veſſel of water, placed near the exorciſt or his dæmoniac. How that was done I do not know; but I ſuppoſe, our ſlight-of-hand gentlemen can eaſily account for ſuch a feat, and gratify ſpectators with others more ſurpriſing.

6. It may be hence argued, that the Jewiſh exorciſts, with all their incantations, were of very little ſervice to mankind, for relieving them under any indiſpoſition. How ineffectual the exorciſms of the ſons of Sceva, a Jewiſh prieſt, were at Epheſus, we have ſeen in the hiſtory related in Acts xix. 13—17. Nor does it appear that Eleazar, of whom Joſephus writes, performed any cure, or expelled any dæmon; but it was mere artifice, as juſt ſhewn.

7. From theſe two paſſages we may be fully ſatisfied, that Joſephus was not a Chriſtian. And it may be alſo argued with great probability, that the paſſage concerning Jeſus, in the xviiith book of his Antiquities, is not genuine, but is an interpolation.

8. Muſt it not appear very remarkable, that Joſephus, ſhunning the affairs of Chriſtians, and omitting the great works of our Lord and his apoſtles, has not been able to relate one credible ſtory of a miracle, excepting thoſe of the Old Teſtament? Joſephus is willing enough to relate miracles and extraordinary things, or ſuch things as have an appearance of being ſo. But they will not bear examination. How came this to paſs, that Joſephus, a phariſee, a learned man, of the race of the prieſts, ſhould fall ſo far below our honeſt artleſs evangeliſts? In their hiſtories we ſee ſimplicity and dignity. The reaſon is, becauſe they are truth: they copy a real original. They write the hiſtory of the great prophet that was to come, the Meſſiah; who cures diſeaſes of all kinds, and raiſes the dead with his word, without parade and oſtentation. But the learned Joſephus, the prieſt, the ſtateſman; Joſephus, when he attempts to relate a miracle for the honour of his country, even the diſpoſſeſſing a dæmon, produceth nothing extraordinary, but the overturning a ſmall tottering veſſel full of water, and ſays, that the dæmon came out at the man's noſe!

And

And can any man, who reads the above cited paſſages, think it any diſparagement to the Chriſtian religion, that it was not embraced by Joſephus, who has given ſuch proofs of want of judgment, and had not juſt notions in things of religion? For he could not conceive, that [g] intentions, without the act, were liable to puniſhment.

II. 1. Matt. xii. 27. *And if I by Beelzebub caſt out dæmons, by whom do your children caſt them out? Therefore they ſhall be your judges.* 28. *But if I caſt out dæmons by the ſpirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.* Comp. Luke xi. 19, 20.

Joſephus has aſſured us, that the Jews practiſed exorciſms for expelling dæmons; and has informed us of one method of performing them. Divers ancient chriſtian writers, Juſtin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and others, (whoſe paſſages may be ſeen in Grotius and Whitby upon this text of St. Matthew,) do alſo ſpeak of Jewiſh exorciſms; and ſuppoſe, that they adjured dæmons in the name of the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob. To theſe [h] exorciſts, it is likely, our Lord refers; and not to his own diſciples, or any others who had a reſpect for him, like the perſon mentioned Mark ix. 38—40. and Luke ix. 49, 50.

What our Lord ſays is to this effect: 'If I, as you ſay, by 'Beelzebub caſt out dæmons, by whom do your countrymen 'and diſciples caſt them out, or attempt to do ſo? You do 'not impute to them a combination with Satan; but you ap-'prove of them. From their practices therefore, mean and 'contemptible as they are, may be formed an argument ſuffi-'cient to ſhew the injuſtice and the malignity of your cen-'ſure paſſed upon me. For if I caſt out dæmons, and by a 'word inſtantly cure all manner of diſeaſes uſually aſcribed to 'thoſe evil ſpirits, and all their worſt ſymptoms, as you ſee 'me to do daily: you cannot but know, it is owing to an im-'mediate exertion of the power of God; and you might con-'clude, that his kingdom by the Meſſiah is now ſetting up 'among you.'

Our Lord does not here aſcribe any virtue to the Jewiſh exorciſms, he rather ſuppoſes them ineffectual and inſignificant; and tells the phariſees, they could not but know, that the great works done by him were full proof of his authority and miſſion, and of the moſt extraordinary divine manifeſtation among them.

[g] Το γαρ μελλειν ποιησαι το εργον βεβλευσθαι, ουκ εστι τιμωριας αξιον. Antiq. l. xii. cap. 9. § 1. [h] 'Filii veſtri.' Non Apoſtoli, qui a Phariſæis una cum Chriſto accuſabantur, ſed populares Phariſæorum, & diſcipuli. Grot. ad Matt. xii. 27. See alſo Whitby upon the place.

2. Our

2. Our Lord, reproving the hypocriſy of the phariſees, and the prevailing unbelief of the Jewiſh people, and apprizing them of the imminent danger they were in of falling under the heavy judgments of God, ſays: *When the unclean ſpirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places ſeeking reſt, and findeth none. Then he ſaith, I will return unto my houſe whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, ſwept, and garniſhed. Then goeth he, and taketh with him ſeven other ſpirits more wicked than himſelf, and they enter in and dwell there: and the laſt ſtate of that man is worſe than the firſt. Even ſo ſhall it be alſo unto this wicked generation,* Matt. xii. 43—45. The ſame is recorded alſo Luke xi. 24—26.

This diſcourſe of our Lord is a compariſon, wherein he repreſents the ſtate of the Jewiſh people, by way of alluſion to thoſe diſtempers which they aſcribed to evil ſpirits.

When the unclean ſpirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, ſeeking reſt, and findeth none. The Jewiſh people, in the latter times of their commonwealth, had a notion, that dæmons did often frequent deſert places. In Iſa. xiii. 21. repreſenting the deſolation of Babylon, it is ſaid: *Wild beaſts of the deſert ſhall lie there, and their houſes ſhall be full of doleful creatures, and owls ſhall dwell there, and ſatyrs ſhall dance there.* Inſtead of *ſatyrs*, which is our tranſlation, the Greek verſion of the Seventy puts dæmons, Και δαιμονες εκει ορχησονται. The ſame language is adopted in the deſcription of the ruin of the antichriſtian Babylon, in Rev. xviii. 2. *Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of dæmons, and the hold of every foul ſpirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird,* καλοικητηριον δαιμονων.

In our Lord's compariſon which we are conſidering, it is ſuppoſed, that evil ſpirits might leave a man for a while, and afterwards return. This alſo muſt have been a very common opinion of the Jews. Therefore Joſephus obſerves in the hiſtory before tranſcribed, of Eleazar's diſpoſſeſſing a dæmon, 'that reciting the charms compoſed by Solomon, he adjured 'the dæmon never to return any more.' This opinion, as may be well ſuppoſed, was the reaſon why the dæmoniac, in the country of the Gadarenes, intreated our Lord to permit him to accompany him; thinking, it is likely, that to be the only ſecurity againſt the return of the evil ſpirits, with which he had been vexed, as he imagined. *When he was entered into the ſhip, he that had been poſſeſſed with the dæmon, prayed him that he might be with him. Howbeit Jeſus ſuffered him not,* Mark v. 18, 19. Comp. Luke viii. 38. And our Lord alſo in his great goodneſs, to prevent troubleſome fears and diſquieting appre-

apprehenſions, when he cured the young man of the epilepſy, which had been aſcribed to an evil ſpirit, as the evangeliſt aſſures us, *rebuked the foul ſpirit, ſaying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf ſpirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him*, Mark ix. 25.

Once more, it is ſuppoſed in this compariſon, that if a dæmon returned to a man, and took poſſeſſion of him again after having left him for a while, the ſtate of that man would be very unhappy. And it is very reaſonable to think, that if a perſon had been relieved under any diſtemper, which was aſcribed to evil ſpirits, and he was again ſeized with it, the ſymptoms would be more violent, and the man's caſe be very deplorable, and even deſperate.

The Jewiſh people had been ſeverely chaſtiſed by the Babyloniſh captivity, and a partial reformation had been obtained. They now enjoyed much peace in their own land, and they had the liberty of worſhip at the temple. They had lately been under the ſearching miniſtry of John the Baptiſt, calling them to repentance, and telling them, that *the axe was laid to the root of the tree. He was a burning and a ſhining light: and for a ſeaſon they rejoiced in his light.* They now enjoyed the excellent inſtructions of Jeſus, who alſo wrought among them works which no prophet had done before, fully proving his high commiſſion. And *many heard him gladly.* They ſaid, *never man ſpake like him: John did no miracles: but all things that John ſpake of this man were true: many believed on him, and ſaid, When the Meſſiah comes, will he do more miracles than theſe, which this man has done?* If after all, this people ſhould generally admit, and indulge within themſelves, the worſt paſſions, and ſhould be guilty of the worſt crimes, and grow more and more hardened in wickedneſs, they would bring down upon themſelves, by the righteous judgment of God, heavier calamities than ever had befallen them in former times.

That is what our Lord declares in the figurative expreſſions of this compariſon. Every one will be led to recollect here what St. Peter ſays, 1 ep. ii. 20—22. And I refer to the commentators, eſpecially Grotius, upon the place which we have been now conſidering.

3. Matt. xvii. 21. *Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and faſting.* Mark ix. 29. *And he ſaid unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and faſting.*

The occaſion of theſe words is well known. Whilſt our Saviour was in the mount with three of his diſciples, Peter, and James, and John, the ſons of Zebedee; a man brought to the reſt of the diſciples his ſon, who was *lunatic and ſore vexed*, with

with an epileptic disorder ascribed to an evil spirit; but they could not cure him. When the father told this to our Lord, he reproved their want of faith. See Matt. xvii. 16, 17. Mark ix. 18, 19. Luke ix. 40, 41. When the young man had been healed, and the company was withdrawn, *the disciples came to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out? And Jesus said unto them, because of your unbelief. For verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you. Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting*, Matt. xvii. 19—21.

A faith of miracles may be defined after this[i] manner. 'It 'was a firm and well grounded persuasion of mind, enabling 'men to set about a miraculous operation, in full assurance of 'God's assisting them.' Our Lord told his disciples, that[k] their not being able to cure this young man was owing to the defect of faith, and he reproves them for it. At the same time he teaches them how they might obtain an increase of faith, so as to be able to perform the greatest miracles. The method prescribed by him for that end is humble and fervent prayer, and mortification to this world; a temper mightily suited to the sublime and heavenly doctrine of the gospel, and very necessary in the preachers of it in all times, especially at its first publication.

The defect of faith was blameable in the disciples: for our Lord had *given them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease*, Matt. x. 1. And unquestionably they had before now wrought many miracles: this they must have done, when sent forth by Jesus during the time of his abode on this earth. St. Mark says, ch. vi. 12, 13. *And they went out and preached, that men should repent. And they cast out many dæmons, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.* Our Lord gave like powers afterwards to seventy other disciples. Luke x. beginning, *And they returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the dæmons are subject to us through thy name.*

But though the disciples had performed some miracles, their faith was not sufficient for the cure of this young man, whose distemper was obstinate and inveterate, and the symptoms very violent.

[i] Compare Dr. Benson's Reasonableness of the Christian Religion, p. 6, 7.

[k] Supra dixerat Christus, fiduciâ opus esse ad hæc præsertim notæ majoris miracula. Nunc ostendit, quomodo ea parari possit, precibus nimirum fervidis. Jejunium ideo adjungit, quia ad preces imprimis requiritur animus demissus, cui rei inservit jejunium. Unde plerumque conjungi videmus νηστειαν & δεησιν sive προσευχας. Luc. ii. 37. Act. x. 30, &c. Grot. ad Matt. xvii. 21.

This

This hiſtory may be illuſtrated by another inſtance of defect of faith in the diſciples. When they met with a great ſtorm, as they were croſſing over the ſea of Galilee with our Lord in the ſhip, they were exceedingly affrighted, and came to him, ſaying, *Lord, ſave us, we periſh*, Matt. viii. 24—26. Mark iv. 37—39. Luke viii. 22—25. Says an ingenious[1] writer, 'According to the harmony of the four goſpels, there are above 'twenty places where Jeſus is ſaid to have worked miracles 'before this. And therefore the diſciples, who had been eye-'witneſſes of moſt of thoſe miracles, had juſt reaſon to think, 'that he was able to deliver them in the greateſt danger: 'and that they, eſpecially in his preſence, were under the pe-'culiar inſpection and care of God.' Conſequently, our Lord juſtly reproved them at that ſeaſon, ſaying, *Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?*

The greatneſs of the danger which they were then in, too much alarmed their fears; and the violence of the ſymptoms of the young man's diſtemper too much diſcouraged them: for which they were juſtly reproved. Nevertheleſs, our bleſſed Lord, ever mild and compaſſionate, makes allowance for their prejudices and want of conſideration; and encourageth them to hope, that they ſhould obtain an increaſe of faith, and be able to diſcharge the ſervice to which he had appointed them, in an honourable manner.

We may here fitly recollect a prayer of the apoſtles, and the anſwer vouchſafed. Acts iv. 24—31. *And now Lord, behold their threatenings. And grant unto thy ſervants, that with all boldneſs they may ſpeak thy word: and that ſigns and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child* [rather ſon, or ſervant] *Jeſus. And when they had prayed, the place was ſhaken where they were aſſembled together. And they were all filled with the holy ghoſt, and they ſpake the word with boldneſs.* That is, there was a freſh effuſion upon them of knowledge, power, and comfort: whereby they were aſſured of their being enabled to do every thing needful to confirm the truth of Chriſt's reſurrection. Accordingly it is ſaid there at ver. 33. *And with great power gave the apoſtles witneſs of the reſurrection of the Lord Jeſus.*

4. Luke x. 17, 18. *And the ſeventy returned with joy, ſaying, Lord, even the dæmons are ſubject to us through thy name. And he ſaid unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.*

Thoſe words cannot be taken literally; for by *heaven* underſtand the ſupreme heaven, the place of the bleſſed; and it is allowed by all, that Satan, with his angels, was long before driven thence, and could have no acceſs there. Nor can it

[1] Dr. Benſon's Reaſonableneſs of the Chriſtian Religion, p. 209, 210.

be

be hereby intended, that Chriſt ſaw Satan fall like lightning from the upper region of the air; for that is a thing of no moment. The words therefore figuratively repreſent the ſpeedy overthrow of error, falſhood, idolatry, and ſin, by the preaching of the goſpel, accompanied with mighty ſigns and wonders, done by the apoſtles, and others in the name of Jeſus Chriſt.

5. Our bleſſed Lord is ſometimes ſaid in the goſpels to have *rebuked* dæmons. Thoſe places ſhall be here taken notice of.

Mark i. 23—26. *And there was in their ſynagogue* [at Capernaum] *a man with an unclean ſpirit. And he cried out, ſaying, Let us alone. What have we to do with thee, thou Jeſus of Nazareth? Art thou come to deſtroy us? I know thee, who thou art, the holy one of God. And Jeſus rebuked him, ſaying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him.* The ſame miracle is related, and in the ſame manner, by St. Luke, ch. iv. 33—35.

In the hiſtory of the cure of the young man who had the epilepſy, which was aſcribed to the influence of an evil ſpirit, it is ſaid: *And Jeſus rebuked the dæmon, and he departed out of him: and the child was cured from that hour*, Matt. xvii. 18. *When Jeſus ſaw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul ſpirit, ſaying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf ſpirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him*, Mark ix. 25. *And Jeſus rebuked the unclean ſpirit, and healed the child, and delivered him again to his father*, Luke ix. 42.

It ſhould be obſerved, that the word *rebuke* is alſo uſed concerning things, to which we do not aſcribe either life or intelligence. *Then he aroſe, and rebuked the winds and the ſea, and there was a great calm*, Matt. viii. 26. *And he aroſe and rebuked the wind, and ſaid, Peace, be ſtill. And the wind ceaſed, and there was a great calm*, Mark iv. 39. *Then he aroſe and rebuked the wind, and the raging of the water: and they ceaſed, and there was a calm*, Luke viii. 24.

Luke iv. 39. *And he ſtood over her, and rebuked the fever, and it left her.*

The truth of the caſe, as before ſaid, I take to be this. Our Lord, in curing diſtempers generally aſcribed to evil ſpirits, ſometimes accommodated his expreſſions, and manner of treating ſuch afflicted perſons, to the common opinion of the people, without countenancing or approving it.

III. Acts vi. 9. *Then there aroſe certain of the ſynagogue, which is called the ſynagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia, and of Aſia, diſputing with Stephen.*

In the firſt part of the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory[m] I

[m] See p. 113, 114.

endeavoured

endeavoured to ſhew who they were, who are called Libertines. Since that time I have met with another interpretation, which I am now deſirous to propoſe to my readers, and to render it more common than it ſeems to be. It does not immediately relate to the ſubject of which we have been treating here: nevertheleſs, I preſume none will be much offended at my inſerting the obſervation in this place.

It is in the Academical Exercitations[n] of Mr. Daniel Gerdes, profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of Groningen. He is of opinion, that[o] theſe Libertines are ſo called from a city, or country, named Libertus, or Libertina, ſituated in Africa. This appears to be very probable, becauſe all the other people here mentioned are denominated from the places inhabited by them. Suidas in his Lexicon, at the word Λιβερτινος, ſays, it was the name of a people, though he does not mention the country in which they dwelt. The Gloſſa Interlinearis, of

n Danielis Gerdeſii Exercitationum Academicarum libri tres. Qto. Amſt. 1738.

o Nationis autem atque regionis, non ſtatus ſive conditionis, λιβερτινων nomen eſſe, cum maxime nobis ſit probabile, & Libertinos dictos Judæos, a Liberto, Africæ Propriæ, ſive Carthaginenſis, quæ & Proconſularis dicebatur, ſive oppido, ſive regione, quam habitabant, tametſi ad inſtar cæterorum, vel Cyrenen vicinam, vel Alexandriam inhabitantium, Hieroſolymis ſuam haberent ſynagogam, a proprio ſuo nomine, æque ac Alexandrinorum ac Cyrenenſium appellatam—Et quidem quod ad rationes, nemo non videt, nihil planius nihilque ſimplicius eſſe hâc hypotheſi, quæ veram vocabulorum retinet notionem—Accedit in genere, quod cum Libertini jungantur Cyrenenſibus, Alexandrinis, Cilicibus, & Aſianis, & hi tamen omnes a locis habitationis ſuæ appellentur, credibile quoque non ſit, Libertinos non a loco vel habitationis ſede, ſed a conditione, μεταβασει εις αλλο γενος, prorſus inſolita, denominatos eſſe: imprimis ſi in ſpecie conſideremus, quod Libertinis ſtatim jungantur Cyrenenſes & Alexandrini, quibus nominibus itidem Africæ incolæ deſignantur, & ſive Judæi ſive Proſelyti ex illis regionibus oriundi indicabantur.—Suidas tamen in Lexico ſuo, Tom. 2. fol. 445. edit. Kuſter, vocem noſtram ad gentem ita nominatam applicari debere manifeſto indicat. Λιβερτινος ονομα εθνους. Libertini, nomen gentis. Gloſſa quoque interlinearis, cui ſuas cum primis notas ſuperſtruxit Nicolaus de Lyra, voci Libertinorum ſuperſcripſit a regione. Unde ipſe Lyra: Libertinorum, inquit, a regione ſic nominatorum, ut dicit gloſſa interlinearis. Sed ubinam ea ſita eſt regio? Duo ſunt in Actis publicis eccleſiaſticis nobis relicta monumenta, ex quibus de Libertinis vel Libertinenſibus, eorumque ſitu, judicare tuto poſſumus.—Alterum monumentum habemus in Geſtis celeberrimæ illius A. 411. habitæ cum Donatiſtis Collationis Carthaginenſis. Quod cum conſervatum ſit a conſiliorum collectoribus—atque cum ipſis Actis ſubjunctum editioni præſtantiſſimæ Optati Milevitani adverſus Donatiſtas, quam procuravit Elias Du Pinius. Legitur in Actis Collationis ita: 'Item re-'citavit. Victor Epiſcopus eccleſiæ catho-'licæ Libertinenſis.' Cel. Baluzii nota ad vocabulum Libertinenſis hæc eſt l. c. Libertinenſis. In provincia Proconſulari. Atque ita ſua ſponte ducimur ad alterum illud quod dicebamus monumentum, ex Actis Concilii Lateranenſis, A. 649. habiti, depromptum, ubi habetur Epiſtola—Epiſcoporum ſancti Concilii, Proconſularis ad Paulum Conſtantinopolitanum, ſubſcriptæ ab ipſis Epiſcopis, inter quos quoque occurrit, 'Januarius gratia Dei Epiſcopus 'ſanctæ Eccleſiæ Libertinenſis.'——Cum ea propter etiam Cl. Fabricius ſuo Epiſcopatuum orbis Chriſtiani Indici Geographico, quem ſubjecit libro, cui tit. *Salutaris Lux Evangelii*, &c. Libertinenſem Epiſcopatum in Africa Proconſulari inſeruerit: Cum Abrahamus Ortelius non minus jam antehac in Theſauro Geographico quoque annotaverit, 'Libertinorum tanquam gen-'tis meminiſſe Divum Lucam Actor. vi. 'atque gentis nomen eſſe apud Suidam, 'Libertinenſis autem Eccleſiæ in Africa 'epiſcopum habere Collationem Africa-'nam.' Dan. Gerdeſ. Diſputatio de Synagoga Libertinorum, num. xxvii—xxix. p. 509—513.

which

which Nicolas de Lyra made great uſe, intimates upon this text, that the Libertines were ſo called from a country. In the Acts of the famous Conference with the Donatiſts at Carthage in the year 411, is the name of a biſhop of the church of Libertina: which is ſuppoſed to have been ſituate in Africa Propria, or the proconſular province in Africa. Another biſhop of the ſame place, Libertina, is mentioned in the Acts of the Lateran council held in 619. Accordingly Fabricius, in his Geographical Index of Chriſtian Biſhopricks, has placed Libertina as being in the proconſular Africa. And long before, Abraham Ortelius, in his Theſaurus Geographicus, at the word Libertini, obſerves, that St. Luke in the vith chapter of the Acts had ſpoken of the Libertines as a people. Moreover Oecumenius, in his Commentary upon the Acts, has mentioned this as one interpretation; that[p] the Libertines, as well as the Cyrenians, were a people living beyond Alexandria, who had a ſynagogue at Jeruſalem.

All theſe particulars are inſiſted on by Mr. Gerdes in his argument upon the ſubject. I have tranſcribed a large part below in his own words.

The learned and judicious compilers of the Bibliothêque Raiſonnée, at the concluſion of their account of this diſputation of Mr. Gerdes, add[q] a reference to Pool's Synopſis. I ſhall place below[r] the paſſage to which they refer. Whence it may appear, that this interpretation has not been unknown to learned men: but it has not been ſo much attended to as I think it deſerves. And Mr. Gerdes has caſt a great deal of new light upon it, and much confirmed it.

Upon the whole, it appears to be very probable, that the Libertines were native Jews, and proſelytes, living at Libertus or Libertina, who had a ſynagogue at Jeruſalem. And the order of the names in St. Luke might lead us to think, that they were farther off from Jeruſalem than Alexandria and Cyrene: which confirms the ſuppoſition, that the place whence they were named, was ſituated in what was called Africa propria, or the proconſular province.

p Αλλως. Λιβερτινων και κυρηναιων των επεκεινα Αλεξανδρειας——ων και διαφοροι συναγωγαι εν Ιερουσαλημ καλα εθνη ειαυλιζομενων. Διο και συναγωγας ειχον τοπους οφωρισμενους επ' αναγνωσει των μωσεως νομων. Oecum. in Act. T. 1. p. 57.

q Biblioth. Raiſonnée, Tom. 24. Part i. p. 67. Amſt. 1740.

r Quinam hi? Reſp. 2. Apud Suidam eſt. Λιβερτινοι ονομα εθνες, nomen gentis. Idem ſcribit Ortelius. Quin & Eccleſia Libertinenſis in Africa habetur in Collatione Carthaginenſi. Pol. Syn. ad Act. vi. 9.

THE END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.